

Complex Analysis Lecture Notes

Simon Xiang

These are my lecture notes for the Fall 2020 section of Complex Analysis (Math 361) at UT Austin with Dr. Radin. These were taken live in class, usually only formatting or typo related things were corrected after class. You can view the source code here: https://git.simonxiang.xyz/math_notes/file/freshman_year/complex_analysis/master_notes.tex.html.

Contents

1	August 27, 2020	2
1.1	Basic Properties of Complex Numbers	2
1.2	Real and Imaginary Parts	3
1.3	Complex Numbers in the Plane	3
2	September 1, 2020	4
2.1	Units and Zero Divisors in the Complex Numbers	4
2.2	Polar Coordinate Notation	4
2.3	On the Norm (Modulus) of a Complex Number	5
2.4	Euler's Formula	5

§1 August 27, 2020

§1.1 Basic Properties of Complex Numbers

We talk about functions $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ that map variables $z \mapsto f(z)$. This course is “not a very hard course” (it’s a fun course!). Holomorphic functions have very nice properties automatically that real valued differentiable functions simply don’t have.

Definition 1.1 (Complex Addition). We define complex numbers as ordered pairs $z = (x, y)$ where $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, with the binary operation of complex addition being defined as

$$(x_1, y_1) + (x_2, y_2) = (x_1 + x_2, y_1 + y_2),$$

where $+$ denotes addition on the reals.

Once we define multiplication and additive/multiplicative inverses, we will have (almost) formed the field \mathbb{C} .

Definition 1.2 (Complex Multiplication). For $x, y \in \mathbb{C}$, we have

$$(x_1, y_1)(x_2, y_2) = (x_1x_2 - y_1y_2, x_1y_2 + y_1x_2).$$

Note: for $a \in \mathbb{R}$, we define

$$a(x, y) = (ax, ay).$$

Recall $(a, 0)(x, y) = (ax, ay)$. So one can understand that $a \in \mathbb{R}$ is simply the real analog of $(a, 0)$ (or simply, $\text{Re}(a, 0) = a \in \mathbb{R}$).

How do we define multiplication of a complex number by a real number? We can think of the reals acting (in a group sense) on the complex numbers, with the operation being the standard multiplication.

Example 1.1. Take $(1, 0)(x, y) = (x, y)$. So $1(x, y) = (x, y)$ (where $1 \in \mathbb{R}$).

Example 1.2 (Complex Addition is Commutative). We have already defined the sum of two complex numbers $z_1 + z_2$ as $z_3 = z_1 + z_2 = (x_1 + x_2, y_1 + y_2)$. Since addition is commutative on the real numbers, we have

$$z_1 + z_2 = (x_1 + x_2, y_1 + y_2) = (x_2 + x_1, y_2 + y_1) = z_2 + z_1,$$

so complex addition is commutative.

Claim: multiplication of complex numbers is commutative. You can verify this at home.

Theorem 1.1 (Distributive Law). *We have*

$$z_1(z_2 + z_3) = z_1z_2 + z_1z_3,$$

for $z_1, z_2, z_3 \in \mathbb{C}$.

Proof. This follows from the fact that \mathbb{C} has a ring structure. □

§1.2 Real and Imaginary Parts

Definition 1.3. If $z = (x, y)$, then $x = \operatorname{Re} z$ and $y = \operatorname{Im} z$. Furthermore, we can associate a complex number with a point in the plane in many ways:

(insert figure 1 later)

§1.3 Complex Numbers in the Plane

Point: the plane is just a plane. The plane doesn't have to have a coordinate system (coordinate axes don't have to be perpendicular). Any coordinate system is "useful" for adding complex numbers. For example, you can interpret complex addition as simply vector addition in the plane (no need for orthogonal axes!).

Definition 1.4 (Additive Inverse). We have

$$-(x, y) = (-1)(x, y) = (-x, -y).$$

So $(x, y) + [-(x, y)] = (0, 0)$.

Note: $(x, y)(0, 1) = (-y, x)$, a *rotation* of (x, y) by 90° . Another note: We have $(x, y) \in \mathbb{C} \cong x + iy$ and $i = (0, 1)$. So

$$(x, y) \cong x + iy \cong (x, 0) + (0, 1)(y, 0).$$

§2 September 1, 2020

§2.1 Units and Zero Divisors in the Complex Numbers

Recall from last time: A complex number can be defined as $(x, y) = x + iy$, where $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$. Addition is easy: $(x_1 + iy_1) + (x_2 + iy_2) = (x_1 + y_1) + i(y_1 + y_2)$. In particular, $(0, 0) = 0 + i \cdot 0 = 0$. For multiplication, assume $i^2 = -1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}(x_1 + iy_1)(x_2 + iy_2) &= (x_1x_2 + iy_1x_2 + iy_2x_1 + i^2y_1y_2) \\ &= x_1x_2 - y_1y_2 + i(y_1x_2 + y_2x_1).\end{aligned}$$

On division: what does it mean to divide complex numbers? We say the multiplicative unit of a complex number (wrt the ring \mathbb{C}) as the unique $\frac{1}{z} = z^{-1}$ s.t. $z \cdot z^{-1} = z^{-1} \cdot z = (1, 0) \in \mathbb{C}$ (the unity of \mathbb{C}). Assume $(x, y)(x, y)^{-1} = (1, 0)$. Then do u and v exist such that the system of equations

$$\begin{cases} xu - yv = 1 \\ xv + yu = 0 \end{cases}$$

holds? Yes, iff the determinant $\begin{vmatrix} x & -y \\ y & x \end{vmatrix} = x^2 + y^2$ is non zero.

Definition 2.1 (Complex Conjugate). We have $(x, -y)$ the complex conjugate of the complex number $z = (x, y)$, denoted \bar{z} .

We show that \mathbb{C} has no zero divisors and is therefore an integral domain. WLOG, assume there exists z_1, z_2 such that $z_1 \neq 0, z_1z_2 = 0$: then we have z_1^{-1} exists. So $z_1^{-1}z_1z_2 = 1z_2 = 0$, therefore $z_2 = 0$. For example: the group $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{R})$ is not an integral domain, since we have zero divisors (two matrices that when multiplied equal zero).

§2.2 Polar Coordinate Notation

Definition 2.2 (Polar Coordinates). Think of (x, y) as rectangular coordinates in the xy -plane, and consider the *polar coordinate* notation $z = [r, \theta]$, where $r = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2} = |z|$ (modulus of z), and $\theta = \arctan(\frac{y}{x})$. So $[r, \theta] = (r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta)$.

Example 2.1 (Multiplication with Polar Coordinates). We have

$$[r_1, \theta_1][r_2, \theta_2] = (r_1 \cos \theta_1, r_1 \sin \theta_1)(r_2 \cos \theta_2, r_2 \sin \theta_2).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}(r_1 \cos \theta_1 + ir_1 \sin \theta_1)(r_2 \cos \theta_2 + ir_2 \sin \theta_2) &= \\ r_1r_2 [\cos \theta_1 \cos \theta_2 - \sin \theta_1 \sin \theta_2] + ir_1r_2 [\sin \theta_1 \cos \theta_2 + \sin \theta_2 \cos \theta_1] &= \\ r_1r_2 \cos(\theta_1 + \theta_2) + r_1r_2i \sin(\theta_1 + \theta_2) &= \\ [r_1r_2, \theta_1 + \theta_2].\end{aligned}$$

Example 2.2. Assume that a complex number $z = (x, y)$ is nonzero. Then

$$\frac{1}{(x, y)} = \frac{1(x, -y)}{(x, y)(x, -y)} = \frac{(x, -y)}{x^2 + y^2}.$$

§2.3 On the Norm (Modulus) of a Complex Number

Example 2.3. Some properties of the modulus (norm) $|z|$:

1. $|z_1 z_2| = |z_1| |z_2|$,
2. $\left| \frac{z_1}{z_2} \right| = \left| z_1 \cdot \frac{1}{z_2} \right| = \left| z_1 \cdot \frac{\bar{z}_2}{|z_2|^2} \right| = |z_1| \frac{|z_2|}{|z_2|^2} = \frac{|z_1|}{|z_2|}$ (clearly $|\bar{z}_2| = |z_2|$),
3. $|z_1 + z_2| \leq |z_1| + |z_2|$ (\mathbb{C} is a metric space, so the triangle inequality holds),
4. $|z_1 + z_2| \geq ||z_1| - |z_2||$ (reverse triangle inequality).

We prove the Reverse Triangle Inequality.

Proof. We have $|z_1| = |z_1 + z_2 - z_2| \leq |z_1 + z_2| + |z_2|$, so $|z_1 + z_2| \geq |z_1| - |z_2|$. A similar argument holds for z_2 . \square

Think of the polar angle as only well defined for multiples of 2π . Define the argument (angle) as $\text{Arg} = -\pi < \theta \leq \pi$ (what??). So $\text{Arg}(1, 1) = \frac{\pi}{4}$, $\text{Arg}(-1, 0) = \pi$. OTOH, we would have $\arg(1, 1) = \frac{\pi}{4} + 2\pi n$.

§2.4 Euler's Formula

Theorem 2.1 (Euler's Formula). *We claim*

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

Proof. Try using Maclaurin series. \square

This suggests $e^{i\theta_1} e^{i\theta_2} = e^{i(\theta_1 + \theta_2)}$. We proved this when we showed $[r_1, \theta_1][r_2, \theta_2] = [r_1 r_2, \theta_1 + \theta_2]$.

The reason why Dr. Radin says to "forget about Euler" is because he's trying to make a semi-rigorous (or self-contained) construction of the complex numbers. I think it's fine to rely on intuition from other courses, this isn't Real Analysis (nowhere near as rigorous). If we truly were to construct the field \mathbb{C} , we would have to cover polynomial rings and the fields generated by PID's quotient irreducible polynomials, then show that $\mathbb{C} \simeq \mathbb{R}[x]/\langle x^2 + 1 \rangle$ (and show that this new field is algebraically closed too!). Of course this isn't feasible. So let's just think of this as Euler's Formula, and not some weird definition!

Back to math: using our newfound formula, we can simply say $\arg z = \theta$ such that $z = re^{i\theta}$ for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$. Similarly, $\text{Arg} z$ is just θ restricted to the interval $(-\pi, \pi]$.

Example 2.4. If $z = re^{i\theta}$ nonzero, then what is the polar form of $\frac{1}{z}$? It must be

$$\frac{1}{r} e^{-i\theta}.$$

Example 2.5. We've seen that $e^{i\theta_1} e^{i\theta_2} = e^{i(\theta_1 + \theta_2)}$. Then

$$e^{i\theta_1} (e^{i\theta_2} e^{i\theta_3}) = e^{i\theta_1} e^{i(\theta_2 + \theta_3)} = e^{i(\theta_1 + \theta_2 + \theta_3)}.$$

So $(\cos \theta + i \sin \theta)^m = \cos(m\theta) + i \sin(m\theta)$. This is known as *de Moivre's formula*.