

Matrix groups as manifolds

• Def. 1: Smooth embedded submanifolds of \mathbb{R}^n

Let $0 \leq m \leq n$, $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$.

A C^∞ -embedded submanifold of \mathbb{R}^n of dim. m is a non-empty set $M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\forall x_0 \in M$

- $\exists \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ open, $x_0 \in \Omega$

- $\exists U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ open

- $\exists \phi \in C^\infty(U, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $D\phi(x_0)$ is injective such that $M \cap \Omega = \phi(U)$ and $\phi: U \rightarrow M \cap \Omega$ is a homeomorphism.

The pair (U, ϕ) is called a chart.

The set of all charts is called an atlas.

• Def. 2: Tangent space

Let $M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a m -dim smooth submanifold and $x \in M$.

The vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is called a tangent vector to M at the point x , if there is a function $\gamma \in C^1(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon, M)$, $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\gamma'(0) = v$.

The set of all tangent vectors $T_x M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ to M at x is called the tangent space (m -dim. VS).

Comment 1: About differentiability of functions

For the Euclidean case differentiability of a function $f: M \rightarrow N$, where $M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, $N \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ are smooth embedded submanifolds is canonically defined.

Notice that in the general topological case the concept is (a priori) not defined in any way.

• Def. 3: Lie-group

Let G be a smooth manifold which is also a group. Let $\text{mult}: G \times G \rightarrow G$, $\text{inv}: G \rightarrow G$.

Then G is called a Lie group if mult and inv are smooth maps.

• Examples of smooth embedded submanifolds:

- $S^{n-1} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a $(n-1)$ -dim. submanifold

- \mathbb{R}^n is n -dim submanifold

- every open subset of \mathbb{R}^n is n -dim. submanifold

• Examples of Lie groups:

- Isometries: $O(n)$, $U(n)$, $SO(n)$, $SU(n)$

- \mathbb{R}^n with vector addition

- $GL_n \mathbb{K}$, $SL_n \mathbb{K}$

• Theorem 1: Matrix groups and Lie groups

Every matrix group is a Lie group.

The inverse implication is in general wrong.