

## 5 Multilinear Maps

An invaluable feature of vector spaces over the field of real numbers is that they admit *inner products*. Geometric concepts, such as orthogonality or norm, can be introduced with respect to a given inner product. The definition of multilinear maps generalizes both inner products and linear maps in a natural way.

Throughout this section, let  $(R, +, \cdot)$  always denote a commutative ring with a multiplicative identity element. For an  $R$ -module  $(M, +, \cdot)$  we will simply write  $M$ .

**5.1 Definition.** Let  $p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ . Let  $M_1, \dots, M_p$  and  $N$  be  $R$ -modules. A  $p$ -linear map from  $M_1 \times \dots \times M_p$  to  $N$  is a map

$$\varphi : M_1 \times \dots \times M_p \rightarrow N$$

such that for all  $(m_1, \dots, m_p) \in M_1 \times \dots \times M_p$  and for all  $i = 1, \dots, p$  the map

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \varphi_{m_1, \dots, m_p}^i : & M_1 \times \dots \times M_p & \rightarrow & N \\ & m & \mapsto & \varphi(m_1, \dots, m_{i-1}, m, m_{i+1}, \dots, m_p) \end{array}$$

is a homomorphism of  $R$ -modules.

**5.2 Remark.** a) An 1-linear map  $\varphi : M_1 \rightarrow N$  is a homomorphism of  $R$ -modules, or equivalently, an  $R$ -linear map. A 2-linear map is called *bilinear*. For a general  $p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ , a  $p$ -linear map is called *multilinear*.

b) A map  $\varphi : M_1 \times M_2 \rightarrow N$  is bilinear, if and only if for  $i = 1, 2$ , for all  $m_i, m'_i \in M_i$  and for all  $r \in R$  hold

$$\begin{array}{ll} (1) & \varphi(m_1 + m'_1, m_2) = \varphi(m_1, m_2) + \varphi(m'_1, m_2) \\ (2) & \varphi(r \cdot m_1, m_2) = r \cdot \varphi(m_1, m_2) \\ (3) & \varphi(m_1, m_2 + m'_2) = \varphi(m_1, m_2) + \varphi(m_1, m'_2) \\ (4) & \varphi(m_1, r \cdot m_2) = r \cdot \varphi(m_1, m_2). \end{array}$$

**5.3 Example.** Let  $(R, +, \cdot) = (K, +, \cdot)$  be a field. Consider the vector space  $V := K^n$  of dimension  $n > 0$  over  $K$ . For typographical reasons, we use throughout the “horizontal” notation for a vector  $v \in K^n$ , so that the corresponding column vector is written as the transpose  ${}^t v$ .

a) The *standard inner product*

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : K^n \times K^n &\rightarrow K \\ (u, v) &\mapsto \langle u, v \rangle := u \cdot^t v \end{aligned}$$

is a bilinear map.

b) The determinant map  $\det : \text{Mat}(n, n, K) = (K^n)^n \rightarrow K$ , considered as a map in the columns of the respective matrices,

$$\begin{aligned} \det : K^n \times \dots \times K^n &\rightarrow K \\ (v_1, \dots, v_n) &\mapsto \det(v_1, \dots, v_n) \end{aligned}$$

is an  $n$ -linear map.

**5.4 Notation.** Let  $p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ . Let  $M_1, \dots, M_p$  and  $N$  be  $R$ -modules. We denote by

$$L_R(M_1, \dots, M_p; N) := \{\varphi : M_1 \times \dots \times M_p \rightarrow N \text{ } p\text{-linear}\}$$

the set of all  $p$ -linear maps from  $M_1 \times \dots \times M_p$  to  $N$ . In particular, for  $M_1 = \dots = M_p =: M$ , we write for  $p$ -linear maps from the  $p$ -fold direct product of  $M$  to  $N$  simply

$$L_R^p(M; N) := L_R(M \times \dots \times M; N).$$

**5.5 Remark.** a) The triple  $(L_R(M_1, \dots, M_p; N), +_{p-w}, \cdot_{p-w})$  is again an  $R$ -module, with respect to the point-wise defined composition and operation.

b) For  $p = 1$ , we clearly have  $L_R(M; N) = L_R^1(M; N) = \text{Hom}_R(M, N)$ . In the special case  $N = R$  we obtain the dual module  $L_R^1(M; R) = M^*$ .

**5.6 Exercise.** Show that for any  $p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$  there is an isomorphism of  $R$ -modules

$$L_R^p(R; R) \cong R.$$

**5.7 Proposition.** Let  $M, N$  and  $L$  be  $R$ -Modules. Then there is an isomorphism of  $R$ -modules

$$L_R(M, N; L) \cong \text{Hom}_R(M, \text{Hom}_R(N, L)).$$

*Proof.*

□

**5.8 Corollary.** *Let  $M$  and  $N$  be  $R$ -modules. Then there is an isomorphism of  $R$ -modules*

$$L_R(M, N; R) \cong \text{Hom}_R(M, N^*).$$

*Proof.* Immediately from proposition 5.7, since  $N^* = \text{Hom}_R(N, R)$ .  $\square$

**5.9 Example.** To get an intuitive idea of the statement in corollary 5.8, we consider a standard problem from physics.

We think of a physical object as a point in real-world space, so its *position* is given by a vector  $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3 =: V$ . Suppose that a constant *force* is present (e.g. gravitation). The force has a magnitude and a direction, so it is also represented by a vector  $\vec{f} \in \mathbb{R}^3 =: F$ . Note that from a physicist's point of view  $V \neq F$  (for a start, one is measured in "meters"  $m$ , while the other is measured in "Newton"  $N = \frac{kg \cdot m}{s^2}$ ).

Moving the physical object involves *work* (measuring the change of its potential energy). The amount of work while moving our object from  $\vec{x}$  to  $\vec{x} + \vec{y}$  is denoted by  $W(\vec{f}, \vec{y}) \in \mathbb{R}$ . Note that negative work occurs, when energy is released (think of dropping a stone).

Clearly, doubling the force doubles the work involved. Moreover, forces are additive: if they act in different directions, they may cancel each other out. Mathematically, we have an  $\mathbb{R}$ -linear map

$$\begin{aligned} w_{\vec{y}}: F &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ \vec{f} &\mapsto W(\vec{f}, \vec{y}) \end{aligned}$$

computing how much work is needed to move the object a fixed distance  $\vec{y}$ , depending on varying forces acting.

On the other hand, we may wish to compute the work needed to move the object an arbitrary distance  $\vec{y}$  in the presence of a constant force  $\vec{f}$ . Obviously, the longer the distance is, the more work is needed. Again, we have an  $\mathbb{R}$ -linear map

$$\begin{aligned} w_{\vec{f}}: V &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ \vec{y} &\mapsto W(\vec{f}, \vec{y}). \end{aligned}$$

In summary, we found a bilinear map  $W : F \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . The formula for computing the work in physics is simply

$$W = \langle \vec{f}, \vec{y} \rangle$$

where  $\langle \vec{f}, \vec{y} \rangle$  denotes the standard inner product on  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , up to physical measuring units.

Let us relate this to corollary 5.8. Note that for any  $\vec{f} \in F$  holds  $w_{\vec{f}} \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{R}}(V, \mathbb{R}) = V^*$ . As a bilinear map, we have  $W \in L_{\mathbb{R}}(F, V; \mathbb{R})$ . It corresponds uniquely to the map  $\vec{f} \mapsto w_{\vec{f}}$  in  $\text{Hom}(F, V^*)$ .

**5.10 Lemma.** *Let  $M$  be a free  $R$ -module of dimension  $n < \infty$ , together with a basis  $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\} \subset M$ . Then there is a canonical isomorphism of  $R$ -modules*

$$L_R^2(M; R) \cong \text{Mat}(n, n, R).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\varphi \in L_R^2(M; R)$ . We define a matrix  $A_{\varphi} := (a_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \in \text{Mat}(n, n, R)$  by

$$a_{ij} := \varphi(e_i, e_j).$$

With this notation, we obtain a map

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha : L_R^2(M; R) &\rightarrow \text{Mat}(n, n, R) \\ \varphi &\mapsto A_{\varphi} \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to verify for two bilinear maps  $\varphi, \psi : M \times M \rightarrow R$  and elements  $r \in R$  the equations

$$A_{\varphi+\psi} = A_{\varphi} + A_{\psi} \quad \text{and} \quad A_{r\varphi} = rA_{\varphi}.$$

Thus  $\alpha$  is a homomorphism of  $R$ -modules. It is even an isomorphism, where for a matrix  $A \in \text{Mat}(n, n, R)$  the image  $\varphi_A := \alpha^{-1}(A)$  under the inverse homomorphism is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_A : M \times M &\rightarrow R \\ (m_1, m_2) &\mapsto m_1 \cdot A \cdot {}^t m_2 \end{aligned}$$

□

Note that the isomorphism of lemma 5.10 is canonical only because a basis  $E$  is given a priori. In general, for a free  $R$ -module of finite dimension, all we can say is that such an isomorphism always exists.

**5.11 Lemma.** *Let  $p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ . Let  $M_1, \dots, M_p$  and  $N, N'$  be  $R$ -modules, and let  $\varphi : M_1 \times \dots \times M_p \rightarrow N$  be a  $p$ -linear map. Let  $\beta : N \rightarrow N'$  be a homomorphism of  $R$ -modules. Then  $\beta \circ \varphi : M_1 \times \dots \times M_p \rightarrow N'$  is  $p$ -linear.*

*Proof.* Straightforward.  $\square$

**5.12 Remark.** In the special case  $M_1 = \dots = M_p =: M$ , lemma 5.11 implies that for any homomorphism  $\beta : N \rightarrow N'$  of  $R$ -modules, there is a map

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \beta_* : L_R^p(M; N) & \rightarrow & L_R^p(M; N') \\ \varphi & \mapsto & \beta \circ \varphi \end{array}$$

which is in fact a homomorphism of  $R$ -modules. We thus obtain for any given  $R$ -module  $M$  a (covariant) functor

$$\begin{array}{ccc} L_R^p(M, \bullet) : (R\text{-Mod}) & \rightarrow & (R\text{-Mod}) \\ N & \mapsto & L_R^p(M; N) \\ \beta & \mapsto & \beta_* \end{array}$$

The verification of the details is left to the reader.

**5.13 Exercises.** **a)** Let  $p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ , and let  $\sigma \in \Sigma_p$  be a permutation of the set  $\{1, \dots, p\}$ . Let  $M_1, \dots, M_p$  and  $N$  be  $R$ -modules. Then there exists a natural isomorphism of  $R$ -modules

$$L_R(M_1, \dots, M_p; N) \cong L_R(M_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, M_{\sigma(p)}; N).$$

**b)** Let  $M_1, \dots, M_p$  and  $M'_1$  and  $N$  be  $R$ -modules. Then there exists a natural isomorphism of  $R$ -modules

$$L_R(M_1 \oplus M'_1, M_2, \dots, M_p; N) \cong L_R(M_1, \dots, M_p; N) \oplus L_R(M'_1, \dots, M_p; N).$$

**c)** Let  $M_1, M_2$  and  $N$  be  $R$ -modules, with submodules  $M'_1 \subseteq M_1$  and  $N' \subseteq N$ . Let  $\varphi \in L_R(M_1, M_2; N)$  be a bilinear map. Suppose that for all  $m'_1 \in M'_1$  and all  $m_2 \in M_2$  holds  $\varphi(m'_1, m_2) \in N'$ . Then the map

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bar{\varphi} : M_1/M'_1 \times M_2 & \rightarrow & N/N' \\ ([m_1], m_2) & \mapsto & [\varphi(m_1, m_2)] \end{array}$$

is well-defined and bilinear.

**5.14 Remark.** Let  $\varphi : M_1 \times \dots \times M_p \rightarrow N$  be a  $p$ -linear map of  $R$ -modules. By looking at examples, it is easy to see that in general neither is  $\varphi^{-1}(\{0\})$  a submodule of  $M_1 \times \dots \times M_p$ , nor is  $\varphi(M_1 \times \dots \times M_p)$  a submodule of  $N$ .

**5.15 Definition.** Let  $\varphi : M_1 \times \dots \times M_p \rightarrow N$  be a  $p$ -linear map of  $R$ -modules. The *image* of  $\varphi$  is the smallest submodule of  $N$ , which contains the set-theoretic image of  $\varphi$

$$\text{im}(\varphi) := \text{span}(\varphi(M_1 \times \dots \times M_p)).$$