

# Notes On Geometric Calculus

Spencer T. Parkin

July 30, 2012

This paper is a formal account of everything I have or have tried to learn about geometric calculus. Take it for what it's worth, if anything.

I will compile a list of references later. Most of this comes from Hestenes' stuff. I go into more detail to prove his statements so that I can understand what-the-hell he's saying.

## 1 Outermorphism

Let  $f : \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$  be a linear transformation from the vector space  $\mathbb{A}$  to the vector space  $\mathbb{B}$ . Every such transformation  $f$  can be extended to what we call an outermorphism  $\underline{f}$  if for all vectors  $a \in \mathbb{A}$ , we have  $\underline{f}(a) = f(a)$  and for all blades  $A \in \mathbb{G}(\mathbb{A})$ , we define  $\underline{f}$  for  $A$  as preserving the outer product. Notice that by preserving the outer product, this does not necessarily mean that  $\underline{f}$  preserves grade. For any  $k$ -blade  $A \in \mathbb{G}(\mathbb{A})$ , letting  $A = \bigwedge_{i=1}^k a_k$  with each  $a_k \in \mathbb{A}$ , we may write

$$\underline{f}(A) = \underline{f} \left( \bigwedge_{i=1}^k a_k \right) = \bigwedge_{i=1}^k \underline{f}(a_k),$$

yet while  $A \neq 0$ , we may have  $\underline{f}(A) = 0$ , showing that while  $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^k$  is a linearly independent set,  $\{\underline{f}(a_i)\}_{i=1}^k$  is not. As we become clear later on, if  $\underline{f}$  was always grade preserving, then  $\underline{f}^{-1}$  must exist.

Of particular interest is how  $\underline{f}$  maps the unit psuedo-scalar of  $\mathbb{G}(\mathbb{A})$ , which we'll denote by  $I_{\mathbb{A}}$ . Clearly this will be some scalar multiple of the unit psuedo-scalar of  $\mathbb{G}(\mathbb{B})$ , which we'll denote by  $I_{\mathbb{B}}$ . We define this scalar multiple as the determinant of  $\underline{f}$  and write

$$\underline{f}(I_{\mathbb{A}}) = (\det \underline{f}) I_{\mathbb{B}}.$$

Associated with every outermorphism is a function  $\overline{f}$  denoting what we call the adjoint of  $\underline{f}$ . We define  $\overline{f} : \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$  as an outermorphism with the property that for any pair of vectors  $a, b \in \mathbb{A}$ , we have

$$a \cdot \underline{f}(b) = \overline{f}(a) \cdot b.$$

Using the  $k$ -blade  $A$  given earlier, this leads to the following result.

$$\begin{aligned} a \cdot \underline{f}(A) &= - \sum_{i=1}^k (-1)^i (a \cdot \underline{f}(a_i)) \bigwedge_{j=1, j \neq i}^k \underline{f}(a_j) \\ &= - \sum_{i=1}^k (-1)^i (\overline{f}(a) \cdot a_i) \bigwedge_{j=1, j \neq i}^k \underline{f}(a_j) \\ &= \underline{f} \left( - \sum_{i=1}^k (-1)^i (\overline{f}(a) \cdot a_i) \bigwedge_{j=1, j \neq i}^k a_j \right) \\ &= \underline{f}(\overline{f}(a) \cdot A) \end{aligned}$$

Now since  $\overline{f}$  is an outermorphism, we may interchange underbars and overbars in the above equation.

Letting  $A, B \in \mathbb{G}(\mathbb{A})$  be  $i$  and  $j$ -blades, respectively, recall that if  $i \leq j$ , we have the identity

$$A \cdot B = \left( \bigwedge_{k=1}^{i-1} a_k \right) \cdot (a_i \cdot B),$$

which is not hard to show. Recursively applying this identity, we get

$$A \cdot B = a_1 \cdot \dots \cdot a_i \cdot B,$$

where here, right to left associativity of the inner product is understood. It then follows that

$$A \cdot \underline{f}(B) = \underline{f}(\overline{f}(a_1) \cdot \dots \cdot \overline{f}(a_i) \cdot B) = \underline{f}(\overline{f}(A) \cdot B), \quad (1)$$

where here again we recursively applied the identity above.

We can now use the result in equation (1) to show that  $\underline{f}$  and  $\overline{f}$  have the same determinant in the case that  $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{B}$ . In the case that  $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{B}$ , let

$I$  denote the unit psuedo-scalar of  $\mathbb{G}(\mathbb{A}) = \mathbb{G}(\mathbb{B})$ . Recalling that for any  $k$ -blade  $A$ , we have  $\bar{A} = (-1)^{k(k-1)/2}A$ , it follows that  $I^{-1} = \lambda I$ , where  $\lambda = \pm 1$ , depending on the dimension of  $\mathbb{A}$ . We then see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\det \underline{f} &= I^{-1} \cdot \underline{f}(I) \\
&= \underline{f}(\bar{f}(I^{-1}) \cdot I) \\
&= \underline{f}(\bar{f}(\lambda I) \cdot I) \\
&= \underline{f}(\bar{f}(I) \cdot \lambda I) \\
&= \underline{f}(\bar{f}(I) \cdot I^{-1}) \\
&= \underline{f}(\det \bar{f}) \\
&= \det \bar{f}.
\end{aligned}$$

We also have enough at this point to find a formula for the inverse of the outermorphism  $\underline{f}$ . Letting  $A$  be a blade in  $\mathbb{G}(\mathbb{A})$ , we have

$$(\det \underline{f})A \cdot I_{\mathbb{B}} = A \cdot \underline{f}(I_{\mathbb{A}}) = \underline{f}(\bar{f}(A) \cdot I_{\mathbb{A}}).$$

From this we get

$$(\det \underline{f})\underline{f}^{-1}(A \cdot I_{\mathbb{B}}) = \bar{f}(A) \cdot I_{\mathbb{A}}.$$

We can then make the substitution  $B = A \cdot I_{\mathbb{B}}$  to get

$$\underline{f}^{-1}(B) = \frac{\bar{f}(B \cdot I_{\mathbb{B}}^{-1}) \cdot I_{\mathbb{A}}}{\det \underline{f}}. \quad (2)$$

We'll now show that  $\underline{f}^{-1}$  is an outermorphism. Do that here...

Using some calculus, we can find a formula for the adjoint  $\bar{f}$  in terms of  $\underline{f}$ . Do that here...