

*Pacific
Journal of
Mathematics*

CONVERGENCE OF INFINITE EXPONENTIALS

GENNADY BACHMAN

Volume 169 No. 2

June 1995

CONVERGENCE OF INFINITE EXPONENTIALS

GENNADY BACHMAN

In this paper we give two tests of convergence for an infinite exponential $a_1^{a_2^{a_3^{\dots}}}$. We also show that these tests are essentially the best possible.

1. Introduction and Statement of Results. Given a sequence of positive real numbers $a_n, n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, we associate with it a sequence of partial exponentials $E_n, n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, defined by

$$(1.1) \quad E_n = a_1^{a_2^{a_3^{\dots^{a_n}}}}.$$

We will call $\{a_n\}$ a sequence of exponents and the sequence $\{E_n\}$ an infinite exponential. As in the study of sums and products one would like to develop tests of convergence of an infinite exponential. Euler [E] was the first to give such a test. He showed that in the special case $a_1 = a_2 = a_3 = \dots = a$, E_n is convergent if and only if $e^{-e} \leq a \leq e^{1/e}$. This result has been rediscovered by many authors. An extensive bibliography of papers containing this and related results may be found in the survey paper by Knoebel [K].

In the general case of non-constant exponents the best known results are due to Barrow [B]. He showed (although some of his arguments are rather sketchy) that $\{E_n\}$ is convergent for $e^{-e} \leq a_n \leq e^{1/e}, n \geq n_0$. He also considered the cases $a_n \geq e^{1/e}$ and $a_n \leq e^{-e}$. In the first case, writing $a_n = e^{1/e} + \epsilon_n$, with $\epsilon_n \geq 0$, he showed that $\{E_n\}$ is convergent if

$$(1.2) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_n n^2 < \frac{e^{1/e}}{2e},$$

and is divergent if

$$(1.3) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_n n^2 > \frac{e^{1/e}}{2e}.$$

In the second case, writing $a_n = e^{-e} - \epsilon_n$, with $\epsilon_n \geq 0$, he obtained the conditions $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_n = 0$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^q \epsilon_n = 0$ for some $q > 1$, as necessary and sufficient for the convergence of $\{E_n\}$ respectively.

Ramanujan made the following entry (without a proof) on page 30 of his third notebook (see [R], page 390, also posed as an unsolved problem at the 1991 West Coast Number Theory Conference, see Problem 91:06 in [G]): E_n is convergent when

$$(1.4) \quad 1 + \log \log a_n \leq \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{1}{n^2} + \frac{1}{(n \log n)^2} + \frac{1}{(n \log n \log \log n)^2} + \cdots \right\},$$

and is divergent when the left hand side is greater than the right hand side with any 1 replaced by $1 + \epsilon$. This statement requires some clarification. What Ramanujan probably had in mind was a test of convergence of an infinite exponential of a sequence of exponents $a_n \geq 1$. A sufficient condition for the convergence was furnished by the inequality $1 + \log \log a_n \leq f(n)$, $n \geq n_0$ for an appropriate, possibly any, function $f(n)$ with an asymptotic expansion given by the right hand side of (1.4) as $n \rightarrow \infty$. An easy calculation shows that Barrow's statements (1.2), even in the much stronger form with $<$ replaced by \leq , and (1.3) are contained in Ramanujan's assertion with the right hand side of (1.4) truncated after the first term.

The main purpose of this paper is to give a proof of Ramanujan's test of convergence of an infinite exponential and to generalize it to the case of complex exponents a_n . In order that the exponentiation be unambiguous we assume that the sequence of complex numbers b_n , $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ is given and set

$$(1.5) \quad a_n = e^{b_n}.$$

With this definition of the sequence $\{a_n\}$ (1.1) is well defined. The case of complex exponents has also been considered before. The best known results here are due to Shell [S], in the case of equal exponents, and Thron [T], in the general case. We state here only the results of Thron, who showed that $\{E_n\}$ is convergent if $|b_n| \leq 1/e$, $n \geq n_0$. We first give the following test of convergence of an infinite exponential with complex exponents:

THEOREM 1. *Let $\{a_n\}$ and $\{E_n\}$ be defined by (1.5) and (1.1)*

respectively. Now set

$$(1.6) \quad \hat{a}_n = e^{|b_n|} \quad [n \geq 1],$$

and define \hat{E}_n , $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, by (1.1) in terms of the sequence $\{\hat{a}_n\}$. Then if \hat{E}_n converges, then so must E_n .

The above test of convergence is of independent interest. In particular, Thron's result follows immediately from Barrow's results for real exponents a_n , $1 \leq a_n \leq e^{1/e}$, and Theorem 1.

To state our results concerning Ramanujan's test of convergence we introduce the following notation for the iterated logarithm. Setting $x_1 = e$ and

$$L_1(x) = L(x) = \log(x), \quad \text{for } x \geq e,$$

we define recursively x_k and $L_k(x)$, for $k \geq 2$, by $x_k = e^{x_{k-1}}$, and

$$L_k(x) = L_{k-1}(L(x)), \quad \text{for } x \geq x_k.$$

With this notation we have:

THEOREM 2. *Let $\{E_n\}$ be defined by (1.5) and (1.1) respectively. Then the infinite exponential converges if there exist positive integers k_0 and n_0 such that for all $n \geq n_0$ we have*

$$(1.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & 1 + \log |\log a_n| = 1 + \log |b_n| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{1}{n^2} + \frac{1}{(nL_1(n))^2} + \frac{1}{(nL_1(n)L_2(n))^2} + \dots \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{1}{(nL_1(n)L_2(n) \cdots L_{k_0}(n))^2} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

To complement this result we prove:

THEOREM 3. *Let E_n be defined by (1.1) in terms of a sequence of real numbers a_n satisfying $a_n > 1$ and*

$$(1.8) \quad \begin{aligned} & 1 + \log \log a_n \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{1}{n^2} + \frac{1}{(nL_1(n))^2} + \dots \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{1}{(nL_1(n)L_2(n) \cdots L_{k_0-1}(n))^2} + \frac{1 + \epsilon}{(nL_1(n)L_2(n) \cdots L_{k_0}(n))^2} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

for $n \geq n_0$, for some positive integers k_0 and n_0 , and $\epsilon > 0$. Then the infinite exponential diverges.

2. Preliminaries. In this section we prove three lemmas. The first of these reduces the principal case of our problem to an equivalent problem which is easier to handle. We will find it convenient to use the notation

$$[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n] = x_1^{x_2^{\dots^{x_n}}} \quad \text{and} \quad [x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots]$$

to denote partial exponents and an infinite exponential respectively. We also set

$$(2.1) \quad l_0(x) = \frac{1}{x} \quad \text{and} \quad l_k(x) = \frac{1}{xL_1(x)L_2(x)\cdots L_k(x)} \quad [k \geq 1].$$

LEMMA 1. *Let a sequence of real numbers x_n , $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, satisfying $x_n > 1$ be given. Define a sequence X_n , $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ by*

$$(2.2) \quad x_n = \exp\left(\frac{1 + X_n}{e}\right).$$

Then $[x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots]$ converges if and only if there exists a sequence Y_n , $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, satisfying $Y_n \geq -1$ and such that the inequality

$$(2.3) \quad 1 + Y_n \geq (1 + X_n)e^{Y_{n+1}}$$

holds.

Proof. Since $x_n > 1$ the sequence $[x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots]$ is monotonically increasing. Hence to show that it is convergent it suffices to show that it is bounded. But this follows immediately from (2.2) and (2.3) since

$$[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n] \leq [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, e^{1+Y_{n+1}}] \leq e^{1+Y_1}.$$

In the opposite direction suppose that the infinite exponential $[x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots]$ is convergent. Since $x_n > 1$ then so must be an infinite exponential $[x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}, \dots]$ for any $n \geq 1$. Denoting a limit of $[x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}, \dots]$ by e^{1+Y_n} , we observe that $Y_n \geq -1$ and that the sequence $\{Y_n\}$ satisfies

$$e^{1+Y_n} = [x_n, e^{1+Y_{n+1}}] = e^{(1+X_n)e^{Y_{n+1}}}.$$

This gives (2.3) with equality and completes the proof of the lemma. \square

The next two lemmas are the main ingredients in the proofs of Theorems 2 and 3.

LEMMA 2. Let T_n^k , C_n^k and X_n^k be defined by

$$(2.4) \quad T_n^k = \sum_{j=0}^k l_j(n-1),$$

$$(2.5) \quad C_n^k = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^k l_j^2(n),$$

and

$$(2.6) \quad 1 + X_n^k = (1 + T_n^k) e^{-T_{n+1}^k},$$

where $l_j(n)$ is given by (2.1), for any integers $k \geq 0$ and $n \geq 2$ for which the right hand sides of (2.4) and (2.5) are defined. Then there exists a sequence of integers $\{n_k\}$ such that for all $n \geq n_k$ we have

$$(2.7) \quad C_n^k < X_n^k < C_n^{k+1}.$$

Proof. Let an integer $k \geq 0$ be fixed. We write T_n and X_n to denote T_n^k and X_n^k respectively. By (2.4) and (2.1) we have $T_n = O_k(1/n) < 1$, for $n \geq n_k$ sufficiently large in terms of k . For such integers n we can expand the right hand side of (2.6) in a Taylor series to obtain

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{aligned} 1 + X_n &= (1 + T_n)e^{-T_{n+1}} \\ &= (1 + T_n) \left(1 - T_{n+1} + \frac{1}{2}(T_{n+1})^2 - \frac{1}{6}(T_{n+1})^3 + O_k\left(\frac{1}{n^4}\right) \right) \\ &= 1 + T_n - T_{n+1} + \frac{1}{2}(T_{n+1})^2 - T_n T_{n+1} + \frac{1}{2}T_n(T_{n+1})^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{6}(T_{n+1})^3 + O_k\left(\frac{1}{n^4}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Now, by (2.4) and (2.1), expanding T_n about $n + 1$ we get

$$(2.9) \quad T_n = T_{n+1} - T'_{n+1} + \frac{1}{2}T''_{n+1} - \frac{1}{6}T'''_{n+1},$$

for some ξ with $n < \xi < n + 1$, where

$$(2.10) \quad T'_{n+1} = \sum_{j=0}^k l'_j(n) = - \sum_{j=0}^k l_j(n) \sum_{i=0}^j l_i(n),$$

$$(2.11) \quad \begin{aligned} T''_{n+1} &= \sum_{j=0}^k l''_j(n) = - \left((l_0^2(n))' + \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{i=0}^j (l_j(n)l_i(n))' \right) \\ &= \frac{2}{n^3} + O_k \left(\frac{1}{n^3 \log n} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(2.12) \quad T'''_{\xi} = \sum_{j=0}^k l'''_j(\xi - 1) = O_k \left(\frac{1}{n^4} \right).$$

Substituting (2.9)–(2.12) into (2.8) and simplifying the resulting expression we obtain

$$1 + X_n = 1 - T'_{n+1} - \frac{1}{2}(T_{n+1})^2 + \frac{1}{3n^3} + O_k \left(\frac{1}{n^3 \log n} \right).$$

Hence by (2.10), (2.4) and (2.5) we have

$$(2.13) \quad \begin{aligned} X_n &= -T'_{n+1} - \frac{1}{2}(T_{n+1})^2 + \frac{1}{3n^3} + O_k \left(\frac{1}{n^3 \log n} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^k l_j^2(n) + \frac{1}{3n^3} + O_k \left(\frac{1}{n^3 \log n} \right) \\ &= C_n^k + \frac{1}{3n^3} + O_k \left(\frac{1}{n^3 \log n} \right). \end{aligned}$$

This, for $n \geq n_k$ sufficiently large in terms of k , implies (2.7) and completes the proof of the lemma. \square

LEMMA 3. *Let T_n^k and X_n^k be defined by (2.4) and (2.6) of Lemma 2. Moreover, let x_n^k be defined by*

$$(2.14) \quad x_n^k = \exp \left\{ \frac{1 + X_n^k}{e} \right\}.$$

Then we have

$$(2.15) \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} [x_n^k, x_{n+1}^k, \dots, x_m^k] = e^{1+T_n^k}.$$

Proof. We begin by observing that it suffices to show that there exists a sequence of integers $\{n'_k\}$ such that (2.15) holds for all $n \geq n'_k$. Indeed, assuming this we have, for any $l \geq n'_k$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} [x_n^k, x_{n+1}^k, \dots, x_m^k] &= [x_n^k, \dots, x_l^k, \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} [x_{l+1}^k, \dots, x_m^k]] \\ &= [x_n^k, \dots, x_l^k, e^{1+T_{l+1}^k}] \\ &= e^{1+T_n^k}, \end{aligned}$$

by (2.14) and (2.6). To exhibit the existence of such a sequence $\{n'_k\}$ we first observe that by (2.14), Lemma 1 and Lemma 2, any infinite exponential $[x_n^k, x_{n+1}^k, x_{n+2}^k, \dots]$, with $n \geq n_k$, where $\{n_k\}$ is a sequence defined in the statement of Lemma 2, is convergent. Let us denote the limit of such an infinite exponential by $e^{1+S_n^k}$. Then (2.15) will follow if we can show that

$$(2.16) \quad S_n^k = T_n^k,$$

for all $n \geq n'_k \geq n_k$ sufficiently large in terms of k .

To this end let us define, for integers $k \geq 0$ and $n \geq n_k$, t_n^k by

$$(2.17) \quad t_n^k = T_n^k - S_n^k.$$

We will deduce (2.16) from the following three inequalities:

$$(2.18) \quad S_n^k > S_n^l > 0 \quad [k > l; n \geq \max(n_k, n_l)],$$

$$(2.19) \quad t_n^k \geq 0,$$

and

$$(2.20) \quad t_m^k \geq t_n^k \left(\frac{L_k(m-1)}{L_k(n)} \right)^{t_n^k/2} l_k(m-1) \quad [m > n \geq n'_k],$$

with $n'_k \geq n_k$ sufficiently large in terms of k , where in the case $k = 0$ $L_0(x) = x$. Indeed, assume (2.16) fails with $k = 0$ and some

$n \geq n'_0$. Then by (2.19) $t_n^0 > 0$, and hence by (2.20) and (2.4) we get

$$t_m^0 \geq t_n^0 \left(\frac{m-1}{n} \right)^{t_n^0/2} l_0(m-1) > l_0(m-1) = T_m^0,$$

for some $m > n$ sufficiently large in terms of t_n^0 . But by (2.17) this implies that $S_m^0 < 0$, which contradicts (2.18). Thus (2.16), with $k = 0$, must hold for all $n \geq n'_0$. We now proceed by induction on k . Assume that (2.16) fails for some $k > 0$ and $n \geq n'_k$. Arguing as above we obtain the inequality

$$t_m^k > l_k(m-1),$$

for some $m > n$ sufficiently large in terms of t_n^k . This, together with (2.17) and (2.4) yield

$$(2.21) \quad S_m^k = T_m^k - t_m^k < T_m^{k-1} = S_m^{k-1},$$

by the inductive hypothesis, provided $m \geq n'_{k-1}$, as we may assume. But since (2.21) contradicts (2.18) we conclude that (2.16) and hence (2.15) hold. Therefore it only remains to prove (2.18)–(2.20).

To this end, assuming as we may that the sequence $\{n_k\}$ is increasing, we have, for $k > l$ and $n \geq n_k \geq n_l$,

$$X_n^k > X_n^l > 0,$$

and hence

$$(2.22) \quad x_n^k > x_n^l > e^{1/e},$$

by (2.7), (2.5) and (2.14). It was already shown by Euler [E] that the infinite exponential with constant exponents $e^{1/e}$ converges to e . This fact together with (2.22) yields (2.18). To prove (2.19) we observe that for $m > n \geq n_k$, we have

$$\left[x_n^k, x_{n+1}^k, \dots, x_m^k \right] < \left[x_n^k, \dots, x_m^k, e^{1+T_{m+1}^k} \right] = e^{1+T_n^k},$$

by (2.14) and (2.6). Hence $S_n^k \leq T_n^k$ and thus (2.19) holds by the definition (2.16) of t_n^k .

We begin proving (2.20) by observing that by the definition of S_n^k and (2.14) we have

$$e^{1+S_n^k} = \left[x_n^k, e^{1+S_{n+1}^k} \right] = e^{(1+X_n^k)e^{S_{n+1}^k}}.$$

Hence S_n^k satisfies the identity (2.6) with T_n^k replaced by S_n^k . Let us fix k and write S_n, T_n and t_n for S_n^k, T_n^k and t_n^k respectively. From our last observation it follows that

$$(1 + S_n)e^{-S_{n+1}} = (1 + T_n)e^{-T_{n+1}}.$$

Substituting $S_m = T_m - t_m, m = n, n + 1$, into the last identity leads to

$$(2.23) \quad \frac{t_n}{1 + T_n} = 1 - e^{-t_{n+1}}.$$

Now, by (2.19), (2.18), (2.4) and (2.1), we have

$$(2.24) \quad 0 \leq t_n \leq T_n \ll_k \frac{1}{n}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - e^{-t_{n+1}} &= t_{n+1} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i!} (-t_{n+1})^{i-1} \\ &< t_{n+1} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(-\frac{t_{n+1}}{2}\right)^{i-1} = \frac{t_{n+1}}{1 + t_{n+1}/2}, \end{aligned}$$

provided $n \geq n'_k$ sufficiently large in terms of k . Using this bound for the right hand side of (2.23) we obtain

$$t_{n+1} > t_n \frac{1 + t_{n+1}/2}{1 + T_n}.$$

It now follows that for any integers $m > n \geq n'_k$ we have

$$(2.25) \quad t_m > t_n \prod_{i=n}^{m-1} \frac{1 + t_{i+1}/2}{1 + T_i}.$$

We use (2.25) in two steps. Firstly, by (2.25) and (2.24), we have

$$\begin{aligned} t_m &> t_n \prod_{i=n}^{m-1} \frac{1}{1 + T_i} = t_n \exp \left\{ \sum_{i=n}^{m-1} \log \frac{1}{1 + T_i} \right\} \\ &> t_n \exp \left\{ - \sum_{i=n}^{m-1} T_i \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

for $m > n \geq n'_k$ sufficiently large in terms of k . Now, by (2.4) and (2.1),

$$\sum_{i=n}^{m-1} T_i = \sum_{i=n}^{m-1} \sum_{j=0}^k l_j(i-1) < \sum_{j=0}^k \int_{n-2}^{m-1} l_j(x) dx < \sum_{j=0}^k L_{j+1}(m-1).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} (2.26) \quad t_m &> t_n \exp \left\{ - \sum_{j=0}^k L_{j+1}(m-1) \right\} \\ &= t_n \frac{1}{(m-1)L_1(m-1) \dots L_k(m-1)} \\ &= t_n l_k(m-1), \end{aligned}$$

for any integers $m > n \geq n'_k$. We now reiterate the above argument this time using (2.26) instead of (2.19) on the right hand side of (2.25). To this end we observe that for $m > n \geq n'_k$ sufficiently large in terms of k we have $t_n l_k(i)/2 < T_i/2 \ll_k 1/i$ and

$$\sum_{j=n}^{m-1} l_k(i) > \int_n^{m-1} l_k(x) dx = L_{k+1}(m-1) - L_{k+1}(n).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} t_m &> t_n \prod_{i=n}^{m-1} \frac{1 + t_n l_k(i)/2}{1 + T_i} = t_n \exp \left\{ \sum_{i=n}^{m-1} \log \left(\frac{1 + t_n l_k(i)/2}{1 + T_i} \right) \right\} \\ &> t_n \exp \left\{ \sum_{i=n}^{m-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} t_n l_k(i) - T_i \right) \right\} \\ &> t_n \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} t_n (L_{k+1}(m-1) - L_{k+1}(n)) - \sum_{j=0}^k L_{j+1}(m-1) \right\} \\ &= t_n \left(\frac{L_k(m-1)}{L_k(n)} \right)^{t_n/2} l_k(m-1). \end{aligned}$$

This gives (2.20) and completes the proof of the lemma. \square

3. Proofs of Theorems. *Proof of Theorem 1.* We may assume that for all n , $a_n \neq 1$, for otherwise both $[a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots]$ and $[\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2, \hat{a}_3, \dots]$ converge trivially. Now fix an integer n , and for $z \in C$, set

$$(3.1) \quad f(z) = \frac{d}{dz}[a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n, z],$$

and

$$(3.2) \quad g(z) = \frac{d}{dz}[\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2, \dots, \hat{a}_n, z].$$

We have, for any $m > n$,

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} [a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m] - [a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n] &= [a_1, \dots, a_n, [a_{n+1}, \dots, a_m]] - [a_1, \dots, a_n, 1] \\ &= \int_1^{[a_{n+1}, \dots, a_m]} f(z) dz. \end{aligned}$$

Setting

$$(3.4) \quad u = [a_{n+1}, \dots, a_m],$$

and

$$(3.5) \quad w = [\hat{a}_{n+1}, \dots, \hat{a}_m],$$

we estimate the right hand side of (3.3) to obtain

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} |[a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m] - [a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n]| &= \left| \int_1^u f(z) dz \right| \\ &= \left| \int_0^1 f(1 + (u-1)t) d(1 + (u-1)t) \right| \\ &\leq |u-1| \int_0^1 |f(1 + (u-1)t)| dt. \end{aligned}$$

Now, by (3.1), (1.5), (3.2) and (1.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(z) &= b_1[a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n, z] \frac{d}{dz}[a_2, a_3, \dots, a_n, z] \\ &= \prod_{k=1}^n b_k[a_k, a_{k+1}, \dots, a_n, z], \end{aligned}$$

and

$$g(z) = \prod_{k=1}^n |b_k| [\hat{a}_k, \hat{a}_{k+1}, \dots, \hat{a}_n, z].$$

Hence, by (1.5), (1.6), (3.4) and (3.5), we obtain the inequality

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} |f(1-t+ut)| &= \prod_{k=1}^n |b_k| [a_k, a_{k+1}, \dots, a_n, (1-t+ut)] \\ &\leq \prod_{k=1}^n |b_k| [\hat{a}_k, \hat{a}_{k+1}, \dots, \hat{a}_n, (1-t+|u|t)] \\ &\leq g(1-t+wt), \end{aligned}$$

valid for $0 \leq t \leq 1$. Applying (3.7) to the right hand side of (3.6) we get

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} |[a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m] - [a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n]| &\leq |u-1| \int_0^1 g(1+(w-1)t) dt \\ &= \frac{|u-1|}{w-1} \int_0^1 g(1+(w-1)t) d(1+(w-1)t) = \frac{|u-1|}{w-1} \int_1^w g(z) dz \\ &= \frac{|u-1|}{w-1} ([\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2, \dots, \hat{a}_m] - [\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2, \dots, \hat{a}_n]), \end{aligned}$$

by (3.2) and (3.5). We observe that $w > 1$ since $a_n \neq 1$ and hence $\hat{a}_n > 1$. Moreover,

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} |u-1| &= \left| e^{b_{n+1}[a_{n+2}, \dots, a_m]} - 1 \right| = \left| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} (b_{n+1}[a_{n+2}, \dots, a_m])^k \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} (|b_{n+1}| [\hat{a}_{n+2}, \dots, \hat{a}_m])^k = w-1. \end{aligned}$$

The statement of the theorem now follows from (3.8) and (3.9) by the Cauchy criterion for convergence. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. By Theorem 1 it suffices to consider real exponents $a_n \geq 1$. In this case the sequence $[a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots]$ is monotonically increasing and it suffices to show that it is bounded. Define a sequence $\{c_n\} = \{c_n^{k_0+1}\}$ by

$$c_n = \exp \left\{ \frac{1 + C_n^{k_0+1}}{e} \right\} \quad [n \geq n_{k_0+1}],$$

where C^{k_0+1} and n_{k_0+1} are defined in the statement of Lemma 2. Setting $C_n = C^{k_0+1}$, we have, by (2.5), (2.1) and (1.7),

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + \log \log c_n &= \log(1 + C_n) = C_n + O(C_n^2) > \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{k_0} l_j^2(n) \\ &\geq 1 + \log \log a_n, \end{aligned}$$

for $n \geq n_0$ sufficiently large in terms of k_0 as we may assume. Therefore for $n \geq n_0$, $a_n \leq c_n$ and hence

$$[a_{n_0}, a_{n_0+1}, \dots, a_n] \leq [c_{n_0}, c_{n_0+1}, \dots, c_n].$$

Thus it suffices to show that the infinite exponential $[c_{n_0}, c_{n_0+1}, c_{n_0+2}, \dots]$ converges. By Lemma 1 this in term is equivalent to the existence of a sequence S_n , $n = n_0, n_0 + 1, n_0 + 2, \dots$, satisfying $S_n \geq -1$ and

$$(3.10) \quad 1 + S_n \geq (1 + C_n)e^{S_{n+1}}.$$

But by Lemma 2

$$1 + C_n = 1 + C_n^{k_0+1} < 1 + X_n^{k_0+1} = (1 + T_n^{k_0+1})e^{-T_{n+1}^{k_0+1}}.$$

Hence (3.10) is satisfied with $S_n = T_n^{k_0+1}$, $n \geq n_0$. This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

Proof of Theorem 3. We argue by contradiction. Suppose to the contrary that the infinite exponential $[a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots]$ is convergent. Then, since $a_n > 1$, so is $[a_n, a_{n+1}, a_{n+2}, \dots]$ for any $n \geq 1$. Let us denote the limit of such an infinite exponential by e^{1+S_n} . Let us also define A_n by

$$(3.11) \quad a_n = \exp \left\{ \frac{1 + A_n}{e} \right\}.$$

Then

$$(3.12) \quad e^{1+S_n} = [a_n, e^{1+S_{n+1}}] = e^{(1+A_n)e^{S_{n+1}}}.$$

In the remainder of this proof we will use n to denote an integer satisfying $n \geq n_0$. For such n , it is immediate from (1.8) that

$A_n > 0$, since $a_n > e^{1/e}$. Moreover, by (3.11), (1.8), (2.1), (2.5) and (2.7), we have

$$(3.13) \quad \begin{aligned} A_n &\geq \log(1 + A_n) = 1 + \log \log a_n \geq C_n^{k_0} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} l_{k_0}^2(n) \\ &> C_n^{k_0+1} > X_n^{k_0}, \end{aligned}$$

for $n \geq n_0$ sufficiently large in terms of k_0 and ϵ , as we may assume. This gives

$$a_n > x_n^{k_0},$$

where $x_n^{k_0}$ is defined by (2.14). Therefore, by the definition of S_n and Lemma 3, we get

$$(3.14) \quad S_n > T_n^{k_0}.$$

We set

$$R_n = S_n - T_n^{k_0}$$

and

$$B_n = A_n - X_n^{k_0}.$$

Then by (3.14)

$$(3.15) \quad R_n > 0$$

and by (3.13), (2.13), (2.5) and (2.1)

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{aligned} B_n &\geq C_n^{k_0} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} l_{k_0}^2(n) - X_n^{k_0} = \frac{\epsilon}{2} l_{k_0}^2(n) + O_{k_0} \left(\frac{1}{n^3} \right) \\ &= \epsilon \left(C_n^{k_0} - C_n^{k_0-1} \right) + O_{k_0} \left(\frac{1}{n^3} \right) \\ &= \epsilon \left(X_n^{k_0} - X_n^{k_0-1} \right) + O_{k_0} \left(\frac{1}{n^3} \right) \\ &> \frac{\epsilon}{2} \left(X_n^{k_0} - X_n^{k_0-1} \right), \end{aligned}$$

for $n \geq n_0$ sufficiently large in terms of k_0 and ϵ . Now, by (3.12), (2.6), (3.15) and (3.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &1 + T_n^{k_0} + R_n \\ &= \left(1 + X_n^{k_0} + B_n \right) e^{T_{n+1}^{k_0} + R_{n+1}} = \left(1 + T_n^{k_0} \right) e^{R_{n+1}} + B_n e^{T_{n+1}^{k_0} + R_{n+1}} \\ &> \left(1 + T_n^{k_0} \right) \left(1 + R_{n+1} \right) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \left(\left(1 + X_n^{k_0} \right) - \left(1 + X_n^{k_0-1} \right) \right) e^{T_{n+1}^{k_0}} \\ &= \left(1 + T_n^{k_0} \right) \left(1 + R_{n+1} \right) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \left(T_n^{k_0} - T_n^{k_0-1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

This together with (3.15) and (2.4) yield

$$R_n > R_{n+1} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} l_{k_0}(n-1).$$

Hence we obtain the bound

$$R_n > \frac{\epsilon}{2} \sum_{m=n-1}^{\infty} l_{k_0}(m).$$

But the last assertion is absurd in view of the definition (2.1) of $l_{k_0}(m)$. This contradicts our assumption and thus completes the proof of the theorem. \square

REFERENCES

- [B] D.F. Barrow, *Infinite exponentials*, American Math. Monthly, **43** (1936), 150–160.
- [E] Leonhard Euler, *De formulis exponentialibus replicatis*, Acta Academiae Scientiarum Petropolitanae, **1** (1778), 38–60.
- [G] Richard Guy, *Western Number Theory Problems*, 1991–12–19&22, 1992.
- [K] Arthur Knoebel, *Exponentials reiterated*, American Math. Monthly, **88** (1981), 235–252.
- [R] S. Ramanujan, *Notebooks*, Vol. 2, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Bombay, 1957.
- [S] Donald L. Shell, *On the convergence of infinite exponentials*, Proceedings of the American Math. Society, **13** (1962), 678–681.
- [T] W.J. Thron, *Convergence of infinite exponentials with complex elements*, Proceedings of the American Math. Society, **8** (1957), 1040–1043.

Received October 26, 1992 and in revised form March 4, 1994. I would like to thank Professor Adolf Hildebrand for both suggesting this problem and for his help which led to the present version of this paper.

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA
 LAS VEGAS, NV 89154–4020
E-mail address: bachman@nevada.edu

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

Founded by E. F. Beckenbach (1906-1982) and F. Wolf (1904-1989)

EDITORS

Sun-Yung Alice Chang (Managing Editor)
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1555
pacific@math.ucla.edu

F. Michael Christ
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1555
christ@math.ucla.edu

Robert Finn
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305
finn@gauss.stanford.edu

Martin Scharlemann
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA 93106
mgscharl@math.ucsb.edu

Thomas Enright
University of California
San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093
tenright@ucsd.edu

Vaughan F. R. Jones
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720
vfr@math.berkeley.edu

Gang Tian
Courant Institute
New York University
New York, NY 10012-1100
tiang@taotao.cims.nyu.edu

Nicholas Ercolani
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721
ercolani@math.arizona.edu

Steven Kerckhoff
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305
spk@gauss.stanford.edu

V. S. Varadarajan
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1555
vsv@math.ucla.edu

SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

The supporting Institutions listed above contribute to the cost of publication of this Journal, but they are not owners or publishers and have no responsibility for its contents or policies.

Manuscripts must be prepared in accordance with the instructions provided on the inside back cover.

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* (ISSN 0030-8730) is published monthly except for July and August. Regular subscription rate: \$215.00 a year (10 issues). Special rate: \$108.00 a year to individual members of supporting institutions.

Subscriptions, orders for back issues published within the last three years, and changes of subscribers address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, P.O. Box 4163, Berkeley, CA 94704-0163, U.S.A. Prior back issues are obtainable from Kraus Periodicals Co., Route 100, Millwood, NY 10546.

The Pacific Journal of Mathematics at the University of California, c/o Department of Mathematics, 981 Evans Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720 (ISSN 0030-8730) is published monthly except for July and August. Second-class postage paid at Berkeley, CA 94704, and additional mailing offices. POSTMASTER: send address changes to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, P.O. Box 6143, Berkeley, CA 94704-0163.

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS at University of California,
Berkeley, CA 94720, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

This publication was typeset using AMS-LATEX,
the American Mathematical Society's TEX macro system.
Copyright © 1995 by Pacific Journal of Mathematics

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

Volume 169 No. 2 June 1995

On Banach spaces Y for which $B(C(\Omega), Y) = K(C(\Omega), Y)$	201
SHAMIM ISMAIL ANSARI	
Convergence of infinite exponentials	219
GENNADY BACHMAN	
Cohomologie d'intersection modérée. Un théorème de de Rham	235
BOHUMIL CENKL, GILBERT HECTOR and MARTINTXO SARALEGI-ARANGUREN	
Kleinian groups with an invariant Jordan curve: J -groups	291
RUBEN A. HIDALGO	
Multiplicative functions on free groups and irreducible representations	311
M. GABRIELLA KUHN and TIM STEGER	
A Diophantine equation concerning finite groups	335
MAOHUA LE	
Nilpotent characters	343
GABRIEL NAVARRO	
Smooth extensions and quantized Fréchet algebras	353
XIAOLU WANG	



0030-8730(1995)169:2;1-B