


LECTURE 12

Date of Lecture: March 4, 2020

As always, $\mathbf{K} \in \{\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{C}\}$.

The symbol  is for flagging a cautionary comment or a tricky argument. It occurs in the margins and is Knuth's version of Bourbaki's "dangerous bend symbol".

An n -tuple (x_1, \dots, x_n) of symbols (x_i not necessarily real or complex numbers) will also be written as a column vector when convenient. Thus

$$(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

A map \mathbf{f} from a set S to a product set $T_1 \times \dots \times T_n$ will often be written as an n -tuple $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$, with f_i a map from S to T_i , and hence, by the above convention, as a column vector

$$\mathbf{f} = \begin{bmatrix} f_1 \\ \vdots \\ f_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

(See Remark 2.2.2 of [Lecture 5](#).)

The default norm on Euclidean spaces of the form \mathbf{R}^n is the Euclidean norm $\| \cdot \|_2$ and we will simply denote it as $\| \cdot \|$.



Note that $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \neq [x_1 \dots x_n]$. Each side is the transpose of the other.

1. Examples and counter examples (continued)

1.1. **Counterexamples (continued).** Here is the last of the counter examples that we were discussing last lecture.

3. All directional derivatives of f exist but f is not differentiable. Let

$$f(x, y) = \begin{cases} \frac{x^2 y}{x^6 + y^2} & (x, y) \neq \mathbf{0} \\ 0 & (x, y) = \mathbf{0}. \end{cases}$$

Let \mathbf{u} be a unit vector. Then $\mathbf{u} = (\cos \theta, \sin \theta)$ for a unique $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$. Clearly $D_{\mathbf{u}}f(\mathbf{0}) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(t \cos \theta, t \sin \theta)}{t}$, provided the limit on the right exists. If θ equals 0 or π , then $f(t \cos \theta, t \sin \theta) = f(t \cos \theta, 0) = 0$ for all $t \in \mathbf{R}$, and hence $D_{\mathbf{u}}f(\mathbf{0}) = 0$ in these two cases. So now suppose $\theta \notin \{0, \pi\}$. Then $\sin \theta \neq 0$ and we have:

$$D_{\mathbf{u}}f(\mathbf{0}) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} \frac{t^3 \cos^2 \theta \sin \theta}{t^6 \cos^6 \theta + t^2 \sin^2 \theta} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{t^3 \cos^2 \theta \sin \theta}{t^3(t^4 \cos^6 \theta + \sin^2 \theta)} = \frac{\cos^2 \theta}{\sin \theta}.$$

Thus $D_{\mathbf{u}}f(\mathbf{0})$ exists for all unit vectors \mathbf{u} . On $\mathbf{R}^2 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, clearly f is \mathcal{C}^∞ and the directional derivative $D_{\mathbf{u}}f(\mathbf{p})$ exists for all $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{R}^2 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ and all unit vectors \mathbf{u} .

Now, for $x \neq 0$,

$$f(x, x^3) = \frac{1}{2x}$$

and clearly $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} f(x, x^3)$ does not exist. It follows that f is not continuous at $\mathbf{0}$, and hence not differentiable there.

Another way of seeing that f is not differentiable is to note that since $D_1f(\mathbf{0}) = D_2f(\mathbf{0})$ therefore if $Df(\mathbf{0})$ exists it must be $\mathbf{0}$ (since $(Jf)(\mathbf{0}) = 0$). In particular $\nabla f(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0}$. Then $D_{\mathbf{u}}f = \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{0}), \mathbf{u} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{u} \rangle = 0$. However, as we have seen $D_{\mathbf{u}}f(\mathbf{0}) \neq 0$ for many unit vectors \mathbf{u} . For example, if $\mathbf{u} = (\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}})$, then $D_{\mathbf{u}}f(\mathbf{0}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$.

2. Inner Product spaces

2.1. The orthogonal complement. By the *usual inner product*, or the *standard inner product* on \mathbf{K}^n we mean the inner product given by

$$\langle (x_1, \dots, x_n), (y_1, \dots, y_n) \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \bar{y}_i$$

where \bar{y}_i is the complex conjugate of y_i . The default inner product on \mathbf{K}^n , one we may often not specify, is this one.

Here are a couple of important definitions.

Definition 2.1.1. A mapping $f: X \rightarrow Z$ between \mathbf{K} vector spaces is said to be *anti linear* if $f(ax + by) = \bar{a}f(x) + \bar{b}f(y)$ for $a, b \in K$ and $x, y \in X$. Note that if $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{R}$, then anti linear maps are the same as linear maps. An *anti linear isomorphism* is an anti linear map which is an isomorphism on the underlying abelian groups.

Definition 2.1.2. Let $(V, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$ be a finite dimensional inner product space over \mathbf{K} , where $\mathbf{K} \in \{\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{C}\}$. Let H be a subspace of V . The *orthogonal complement* H^\perp of H is the subset

$$H^\perp = \{v \in V \mid \langle v, h \rangle = 0 \text{ for all } h \in H\}.$$

Proposition 2.1.3. Let V be a finite dimensional inner product space over \mathbf{K} and H a subspace of V . Then,

- (a) H^\perp is a subspace of V .
- (b) $H^\perp = 0$ if and only if $H = V$.
- (c) $H^{\perp\perp} = H$.

Proof. This is Problem 1 of [Homework 5](#). □

Definition 2.1.4. Let V be a finite dimensional inner product space over \mathbf{K} . A basis e_1, \dots, e_n of V is called an *orthogonal basis* if $\langle e_i, e_j \rangle = 0$ for $i \neq j$, $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. It is called an *orthonormal basis* if $\langle e_i, e_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}$ for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Note that an orthonormal basis is necessarily an orthogonal basis, but a orthogonal basis e_1, \dots, e_n need not be an orthonormal basis. However, in this case, $\frac{1}{\|e_1\|}e_1, \dots, \frac{1}{\|e_n\|}e_n$ is an orthonormal basis.

Lemma 2.1.5. [Gram-Schmidt] *Let $n \in \mathbf{N}$ and V be an inner product space over \mathbf{K} with ordered basis v_1, \dots, v_n . Let $V_0 = \{0\}$ and for $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, let V_k be the linear span of $\{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$. Then there exist $e_1, \dots, e_n \in V$ such that*

- (a) $e_k \in V_k \cap V_{k-1}^\perp$, $k = 1, \dots, n$;
- (b) $\|e_k\| = 1$ for $k = 1, \dots, n$.

Moreover any such sequence of vectors e_1, \dots, e_n is a basis of V .

Proof. The last assertion is easily disposed. In fact one can prove a (seemingly) stronger statement, namely, if $1 \leq k \leq n$ and we have found e_1, \dots, e_k such that $e_j \in V_j \cap V_{j-1}^\perp$, $j = 1, \dots, k$, and $\|e_j\| = 1$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$, then e_1, \dots, e_k is a basis for V_k . Indeed, suppose i and j are distinct indices in $\{1, \dots, k\}$. Without loss of generality, we assume $i < j$. Then clearly $e_i \in V_{j-1}$ and hence $\langle e_i, e_j \rangle = 0$. Since $\|e_i\| = 1$ for all i , we see that $\langle e_i, e_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}$. If $c_1, \dots, c_k \in K$ are such that $\sum_{i=1}^k c_i e_i = 0$, then we have

$$c_j = \sum_{i=1}^k c_i \delta_{ij} = \sum_{i=1}^k c_i \langle e_i, e_j \rangle = \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^k c_i e_i, e_j \right\rangle = 0 \quad (j = 1, \dots, k).$$

Thus e_1, \dots, e_k are linearly independent vectors in the k -dimensional space V_k . Hence they must form a basis.

Set $e_1 = v_1/\|v_1\|$. Suppose $1 \leq k < n$ and we have found e_1, \dots, e_k such that $e_j \in V_j \cap V_{j-1}^\perp$, $j = 1, \dots, k$, and $\|e_j\| = 1$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$. Let $w_{k+1} = v_{k+1} - \sum_{i=1}^k \langle v_{k+1}, e_i \rangle e_i$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle w_{k+1}, e_j \rangle &= \langle v_{k+1}, e_j \rangle - \sum_{i=1}^k \langle v_{k+1}, e_i \rangle \langle e_i, e_j \rangle = \langle v_{k+1}, e_j \rangle - \sum_{i=1}^k \langle v_{k+1}, e_i \rangle \delta_{ij} \\ &= \langle v_{k+1}, e_j \rangle - \langle v_{k+1}, e_j \rangle \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Thus w_{k+1} is orthogonal to every element in a basis of V_k . It follows that $w_{k+1} \in V_k^\perp$. Now $w_{k+1} \notin V_k$, for if w_{k+1} lies in V_k then $v_{k+1} = w_{k+1} + \sum_{i=1}^k \langle v_{k+1}, e_i \rangle e_i$ must also lie in V_k , which is not possible, for v_1, \dots, v_n is a basis for V . In particular $w_{k+1} \neq 0$. Set $e_{k+1} = w_{k+1}/\|w_{k+1}\|$. Then $e_{k+1} \in V_k^\perp \cap V_{k+1}$ and $\|e_{k+1}\| = 1$. By induction we have found e_1, \dots, e_n meeting the specifications of the theorem. \square

Theorem 2.1.6. [Gram-Schmidt] *Every finite dimensional inner product space over \mathbf{K} has an orthonormal basis.*

Proof. This is immediate from Lemma 2.1.5 \square

Remark 2.1.7. The process of extracting an orthonormal basis from a given basis described in Lemma 2.1.5 is called the *Gram-Schmidt orthogonalisation process* (or, in US spelling, *Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization process*).

Proposition 2.1.8. *Let H be a subspace of a finite dimensional inner product space V over \mathbf{K} . Then $V = H \oplus H^\perp$, i.e. every $v \in V$ has a unique decomposition $v = v' + v''$ such that $v' \in H$ and $v'' \in H^\perp$.*

Proof. This is Problem 2 of Homework 5. \square

Proposition 2.1.9. *Let d and m be non-negative integers and $n = d+m$. Consider \mathbf{K}^n with the standard inner product and identify \mathbf{K}^n with $\mathbf{K}^d \times \mathbf{K}^m$ in the usual way. Let $\pi: \mathbf{K}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{K}^d$ and $\mathbf{K}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{K}^m$ be the projection maps given by $\pi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{x}$ and $\pi'(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{y}$. Let H be a d -dimensional subspace of \mathbf{K}^n . Then $\pi(H) = \mathbf{R}^d$ if and only if $\pi'(H^\perp) = \mathbf{R}^m$.*

Proof. By symmetry (since $H^{\perp\perp} = H$) it is enough to prove that if $\pi(H) = \mathbf{K}^d$ then $\pi'(H^\perp) = \mathbf{K}^m$. According to Proposition 2.1.8, $\mathbf{K}^n = H \oplus H^\perp$, and hence $\dim_{\mathbf{K}} H^\perp = m$. Thus $\pi'(H^\perp) = \mathbf{K}^m$ if and only if $\pi'|_{H^\perp}: H^\perp \rightarrow \mathbf{K}^m$ is an isomorphism.

Suppose $\pi(H) = \mathbf{K}^d$ and suppose $\mathbf{v} \in H^\perp$ is such that $\pi'(\mathbf{v}) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$. Then $\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0})$. Since $\pi(H) = \mathbf{K}^d$, there exists $\mathbf{h} \in H$ be such that $\pi(\mathbf{h}) = \mathbf{x}$. In fact, since $\dim_{\mathbf{K}} H = d$, $\pi|_H$ is an isomorphism, and the element \mathbf{h} is the unique element in H such that $\pi(\mathbf{h}) = \mathbf{x}$. Clearly $\mathbf{h} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ for some $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{K}^m$. Since $\mathbf{v} \in H^\perp$, we have $\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{h} \rangle = 0$. Thus $\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 = \langle (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0}), (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \rangle = \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{h} \rangle = 0$. This means $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$, i.e. $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}$. It follows that $\pi'|_{H^\perp}: H^\perp \rightarrow \mathbf{K}^m$ is injective. Matching the dimensions of H^\perp and \mathbf{K}^m , we see that $\pi'|_{H^\perp}$ is an isomorphism. \square

3. Matrix representations

3.1. Complexification. This rightly ought to be addressed through tensor products. However, since you probably do not know what a tensor product of modules over a ring (or of vector spaces over a field) is, here is a poor person's version of complexification. We restrict ourselves to linear endomorphisms of \mathbf{R}^n .

Let $T: \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ be a linear transformation, and A the $n \times n$ matrix of T with respect to the standard basis on \mathbf{R}^n . The *complexification* $T_{\mathbf{C}}$ of T is the \mathbf{C} -linear map

$$(3.1.1) \quad T_{\mathbf{C}}: \mathbf{C}^n \longrightarrow \mathbf{C}^n$$

given by the formula

$$(3.1.2) \quad T_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{x}) = A\mathbf{x}, \quad (\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C}^n)$$

where the right side of the equality is matrix multiplication. It is obvious that the matrix of $T_{\mathbf{C}}$ with respect the standard basis of \mathbf{C}^n is also A .

About these notes. These course notes are a reasonably faithful record of the lectures given at the [Chennai Mathematical Institute](https://www.cmi.ac.in/) (CMI) in the January-April semester of 2019-20. The course is Analysis II, a core course for first year undergraduates at CMI. For more material related to this course, visit <https://www.cmi.ac.in/~pramath/teaching.html#ANA2>. If you have comments on these notes, or on related course material, please send an email to pramath@cmi.ac.in.