## MATH 208: Homework #8

Jesse Farmer

## 01 March 2004

- 1. Show that the following are locally Euclidian:
  - (a)  $SL_n(F)$
  - (b) O(n, F)
  - (c) SO(n, F)
  - (d) U(n)
  - (e) SU(n)
- 2. Show that the following are Lie groups:
  - (a) U(n)
  - (b) SU(n)
- 3. Show that the derivative L exists at  $x_0$  if and only if  $\lim_{h\to 0} \left| \frac{f(x_0+h)-f(x_0)-Lh}{h} \right| = 0$ .

Let

$$\lim_{h \to 0} \frac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0)}{h} = L$$

Then for any  $\epsilon > 0$  we have there is some  $\delta$  such that for  $0 < |h| < \delta$ 

$$\left| \frac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0) - Lh}{h} \right| < \epsilon$$

But

$$\left| \frac{f(x_0+h) - f(x_0) - Lh}{h} \right| = \left| \left| \frac{f(x_0+h) - f(x_0) - Lh}{h} \right| \right|$$

So if either of these is less than  $\epsilon$  then the other is, which guarantees that the derivative L exists at  $x_0$  if and only if  $\lim_{h\to 0}\left|\frac{f(x_0+h)-f(x_0)-Lh}{h}\right|=0$ .

4. Find the center of  $GL_n(F)$ .

The center of  $GL_n(F)$  is the set of elements which commute with every element in  $GL_n(F)$ .

Consider the  $n \times n$  matrix

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & & & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and let A be an arbitrary matrix

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & \cdots & a_{1n} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & & a_{2n} \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{n1} & a_{n2} & \cdots & a_{nn} \end{pmatrix}$$

Then

$$AB = \begin{pmatrix} a_{1n} & a_{11} & \cdots & a_{1,n-1} \\ a_{2n} & a_{21} & & a_{2,n-1} \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{nn} & a_{n1} & \cdots & a_{n,n-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$BA = \begin{pmatrix} a_{21} & a_{22} & \cdots & a_{2n} \\ a_{31} & a_{32} & & a_{3n} \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{11} & a_{12} & \cdots & a_{1n} \end{pmatrix}$$

Look at AB then BA we see  $a_{11} = a_{22}$ , but finding  $a_{22}$  in AB we see that it corresponds to  $a_{33}$  in CA. Likewise for  $a_{33}$ , so continuing this process we get that  $a_{11} = a_{22} = \cdots = a_{nn}$ .

Now consider the  $n \times n$  matrix

$$S = \left(\begin{array}{ccc} 0 & \cdots & 1 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \cdots & 0 \end{array}\right)$$

Requiring that SA = AS for any A in the center we see that, in general

$$a_{ij} = a_{(n-i+1),(n-j+1)} \tag{1}$$

Define  $S_k$  as the matrix S with a -1 in the  $k^{th}$  row. For each  $k \leq n$  we see  $AS_k$  is AS with the  $k^{th}$  column having a minus sign and  $S_kA$  is AS with the  $k^{th}$  row having a minus sign. From (1) we see that the only elements that must not satisfy  $a_{ij} = -a_{ij}$  are precisely the diagonals of A. Therefore the center of  $GL_n(F)$  consists precisely of those matrices of the form  $\alpha I$  where  $\alpha \in F^{\times}$ , since we know already all of these matrices commute.

5. Let

$$f_r(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{q^r} & \frac{p}{q} = x \in \mathbb{Q} \\ 0 & x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q} \end{cases}$$

Show that  $f_r$  is not differentiable anywhere if  $1 \le r \le 2$ .

First,  $f_r$  is not differentiable at any non-zero rational point since  $f_r$  is not continuous there.  $0 \neq x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ . We know that there exists infinitely many  $\frac{p}{q}$  such that  $|x - \frac{p}{q}| < \frac{1}{q^r}$  by the next problem, but between each of these points and x the slope is at at most -1, i.e., in any interval we can find infinitely many rational numbers such that the slope of the secant is bounded away from zero by a constant. Hence, the derivative, which is the limit of secant slopes, does not exist.

6. Let  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ . Show that there exists infinitely many  $\frac{p}{q} \in \mathbb{Q}$  such that  $|\alpha - \frac{p}{q}| < \frac{1}{q^2}$ .

Let  $\alpha$  be arbitrary and irrational and  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ . For brevity's sake we will denote  $[\alpha] = \alpha - \lfloor \alpha \rfloor$ .

Consider the intervals

$$\left[0, \frac{1}{N}\right), \left[\frac{1}{N}, \frac{2}{N}\right), \dots, \left[\frac{N-1}{N}, 1\right)$$

Clearly since  $\alpha$  is irrational we have  $0 \leq [q\alpha] < 1$  for any irrational  $\alpha$  and rational q. Consider  $[0], [\alpha], [2\alpha], [3\alpha], \ldots, [N\alpha]$ . There are N+1 of these and each is less than 1, but only N intervals above. Therefore there exist  $q_1, q_2, S \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$[q_1\alpha], [q_2\alpha] \in \left[\frac{S}{N}, \frac{S+1}{N}\right)$$

Letting  $q = |q_1 - q_2|$  we get that for some  $p \in \mathbb{Z}$ 

$$|q\alpha - p| < \frac{1}{N}$$

or

$$|\alpha - \frac{p}{q}| < \frac{1}{Nq} \leq \frac{1}{q^2}$$

Assume for contradiction that there are only a finite such  $\frac{p_i}{q_i}$  satisfying this condition. Since  $\alpha$  is irrational this difference is never exactly 0 and so there exists some N' such that for all  $i=0,\ldots,N$ 

$$|\alpha - \frac{p_i}{q_i}| > \frac{1}{N'}$$

But we can apply the original argument for this N', producing a  $\frac{p}{q}$  which is within  $\frac{1}{q^2}$  of  $\alpha$ .

7. *Let* 

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} e^{\frac{-1}{x^2}} & x \neq 0\\ 0 & x = 0 \end{cases}$$

For all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  show that  $f^{(n)}(0) = 0$ .

Let p(x) be a *n* degree polynomial of  $\frac{1}{x}$ , that is

$$p(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} a_i \frac{1}{x^i}$$

We will first show that  $f^{(n)}(x)$  is of the form  $e^{\frac{-1}{x^2}}p(x)$  when  $x \neq 0$ . Clearly  $f^{(0)}(x)$  is of this form, so assume

$$f^{(n)}(x) = e^{\frac{-1}{x^2}} \sum_{i=0}^{n} a_i \frac{1}{x^i}$$

Then applying the product rule and chain rule we get that

$$f^{(n+1)}(x) = e^{\frac{-1}{x^2}} \left( \frac{2}{x^3} \sum_{i=0}^n a_i \frac{1}{x^i} + \sum_{i=0}^n a_i \frac{-i}{x^{i-1}} \right)$$

which is still of the the form  $e^{\frac{-1}{x^2}}p(x)$ , for the appropriate p(x).

Because the following is true

$$\lim_{x \to 0} e^{\frac{-1}{x^2}} \left( \sum_{i=0}^n a_i \frac{1}{x^i} \right) = \lim_{x \to 0} \sum_{i=0}^n a_i \frac{\frac{1}{x^i}}{e^{\frac{1}{x^2}}}$$

$$= \lim_{u \to \pm \infty} \sum_{i=0}^n a_i \frac{u^i}{e^{u^2}}$$

$$= 0$$

we see that each  $f^{(n)}(x)$  is continuous at zero since we define  $f^{(n)}(0) = 0$ . All that remains to be shown is that each  $f^{(n)}$  is differentiable at zero. Since  $f^{(n)}(0) = 0$ , it follows that

$$\lim_{x \to 0} \frac{e^{\frac{-1}{x^2}} \left(\sum_{i=0}^n a_i \frac{1}{x^i}\right)}{x} = \lim_{x \to 0} \frac{\frac{1}{x} \left(\sum_{i=0}^n a_i \frac{1}{x^i}\right)}{e^{\frac{1}{x^2}}}$$
$$= \lim_{x \to 0} \frac{\left(\sum_{i=0}^n a_i \frac{1}{x^{i+1}}\right)}{e^{\frac{1}{x^2}}}$$
$$= 0$$

which is true by the same argument by which we showed continuity. Therfore  $f^{(n)}(x)$  is differentiable at 0 and  $f^{(n)}(0) = 0$ .

- 8. Let  $f: \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2$  be such that  $f(x,y) = (x\sin(y), e^x + y^2)$ .
  - (a) Is f differentiable at any point? f is differentiable at every point in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .
  - (b) What is Df(x,y)?

    Consider f as  $f(x,y) = (f_1(x,y), f_2(x,y))$ . For any point  $(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  the linear transformation which best approximates f at (x,y) is

$$Df(x,y) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial y} \\ \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial y} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \sin(y) & x\cos(y) \\ e^x & 2y \end{pmatrix}$$

9. Show that if Df(x) exists then it is unique.

Let f be differentiable at  $x_0$ .

Assume there exists a  $D_1 f(x_0)$ ,  $\delta_1$  such that for  $0 < |h| < \delta_1$ 

$$\left| \frac{f(x_0+h) - f(x_0) - D_1 f(x_0)h}{h} \right| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

and a  $D_2 f(x_0), \delta_2$  such that for  $0 < |h| < \delta_2$ 

$$\left| \frac{f(x_0+h) - f(x_0) - D_1 f(x_0)h}{h} \right| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

Assume  $D_1 f(x_0) \neq D_1 f(x_0)$  since otherwise we are done and let  $\delta = \min\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$ , then for  $0 < |h| < \delta$  we have

$$\left| \frac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0) - D_1 f(x_0) h}{h} \right| + \left| \frac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0) - D_1 f(x_0) h}{h} \right| < \epsilon$$

Assuming ...

I've tried to work through this, and all I know is that  $D_1 \neq D_2$  iff  $||D_1 - D_2|| > 0$ , but this always produces an inequality in the wrong "direction."

- 10. Let  $\mu: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^k$ .
  - (a) What conditions are required for a "μ-product rule?"

We require that  $\mu(a, b + c) = \mu(a, b) + \mu(a, c)$ , i.e., distributivity,  $\mu(0, a) = \mu(a, 0) = 0$ ,  $\alpha\mu(a, b) = \mu(\alpha a, b) = \mu(a, \alpha b)$ , i.e., associativity with respect to "normal" multiplication, and commutativity. We also require that  $|\mu(a, b)| = \alpha |a| |b|$  for some  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^k$ . Finally  $\mu$  must be continuous.

I don't like all these conditions, especially the second-to-last, however I see now way to avoid it. The proof for the other product rules work because we can talk about what  $|a \cdot b|$  and  $|a \times b|$  mean, and the result comes from the fact that they are related to the "normal" absolute value. I think if we require this we can drop continuity, since I originally included it to guarantee that  $\lim_{x\to 0} \mu(x,x) = 0$  and things of this form.

(b) Prove the " $\mu$ -product rule" under these conditions.

$$\lim_{x \to a} \left| \frac{\mu(f(x), g(x)) - \mu(f(a), g(a)) - \left(\mu(g(a), Df(a)(x - a)) + \mu(f(a), Dg(a)(x - a))\right)}{x - a} \right|$$

is equivalent to the following after adding and subtracting the same thing a few times, several applications of commutativity, and three applications of distributivity (the line is broken because otherwise it is too long)

$$\lim_{x \to a} \left| \frac{\mu(g(a), f(x) - f(a) - Df(a)(x - a))}{x - a} \right| + \lim_{x \to a} \left| \frac{\mu(f(a), g(x) - g(a) - Df(a)(x - a))}{x - a} \right| + \lim_{x \to a} \left| \frac{\mu(f(x) - f(a), g(x) - g(a))}{x - a} \right|$$

For the first we get  $\alpha |g(a)| \frac{|f(x)-f(a)-Df(a)(x-a)|}{|x-a|}$ , which goes to zero as  $x \to a$  since f is assumed to be differentiable. The second follows from the same facts, but with f and g switched.

The third we can write as  $\alpha |g(x) - g(a)| \frac{|f(x) - f(a)|}{|x - a|}$ , which also goes to zero as  $x \to a$ . Therefore if f, g are differentiable at a then  $D\mu(f(a), g(a))(a) = \mu(g(a), Df(a)) + \mu(f(a), Dg(a))$ .