



18.06.23: Determinants & Permutations

Lecturer: Barwick

Friday, 8 April 2016



So here's an $n \times n$ matrix

$$A = \left(\vec{v}_1 \quad \cdots \quad \vec{v}_n \right),$$

and we have this number

$$\det(A) = \det(\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_n) \in \mathbf{R}$$

that measures the *signed n -dimensional volume* of the parallelepiped spanned by $\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_n$.

Let's list the things we know about $\det(A)$.



(1) *Normalization.* The identity matrix has determinant 1:

$$\det(I) = \det(\hat{e}_1, \dots, \hat{e}_n) = 1.$$

(2) *Multilinearity.* For any real numbers $r, s \in \mathbf{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \det(\vec{v}_1, \dots, r\vec{x}_i + s\vec{y}_i, \dots, \vec{v}_n) &= r \det(\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_i, \dots, \vec{v}_n) \\ &\quad + s \det(\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{y}_i, \dots, \vec{v}_n). \end{aligned}$$



(3) *Alternation*. The determinant

$$\det(\vec{v}_1, \dots, \dots, \vec{v}_n) = 0$$

if any two of the \vec{v}_i s are equal.

These are the core, defining properties of \det .



Here are more properties, which we *deduced* from the three core properties above:

- (4) Multiplying a row or column by a number $r \in \mathbf{R}$ multiplies the determinant by that r .
- (5) Swapping two rows or columns in A multiplies the determinant by a -1 .
- (6) Adding a multiple of a row or column onto another row or column doesn't change the determinant.



And here are some general computational facts we extract from these properties.

(8) $\det(A) \neq 0$ if and only if A is invertible.

(9) $\det(MN) = \det(M) \det(N)$.

(10) $\det(A^T) = \det(A)$. (Why?)

(11) $\det \operatorname{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = \prod_{i=1}^n \lambda_i$.

(12) More generally, if A is triangular, then $\det(A)$ is the product of the entries along the diagonal. (Why?)



Let's compute the determinant of the following matrices:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 4 \\ 1 & 3 & 9 \\ 1 & 4 & 16 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 & 2 & 3 \\ 2 & 2 & 3 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 & 5 \\ 1 & 2 & 5 & 14 \\ 2 & 5 & 14 & 42 \\ 5 & 14 & 42 & 132 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 5 & 14 \\ 2 & 5 & 5 & 14 \\ 5 & 14 & 42 & 132 \\ 14 & 42 & 132 & 429 \end{pmatrix}$$



I was half-joking about the last two; this is actually a neat little piece of mathematics: there's only one sequence of integers c_0, c_1, c_2, \dots such that for any $n \geq 1$,

$$\det(c_{i+j-2}) = \det(c_{i+j-1}) = 1.$$

These are called the *Catalan numbers*, and your mathematical life isn't complete until you've read about them! (I was going to put a problem about these on the homework, but I thought that might be too much.)



Suppose $\sigma: \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$ a *permutation* of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ – i.e., a bijection from that set to itself.

One can express a permutation very compactly, by writing down the matrix

$$P_\sigma = \left(\hat{e}_{\sigma(1)} \quad \cdots \quad \hat{e}_{\sigma(n)} \right)$$

called the *permutation matrix* corresponding to σ .

This is great, because matrix multiplication corresponds to composition of permutations:

$$P_{\sigma \circ \tau} = P_\sigma P_\tau \quad \text{and} \quad P_{id} = I.$$



Also, these matrices are orthogonal; in fact,

$$P_{\sigma}^{\top} = P_{\sigma}^{-1} = P_{\sigma^{-1}}.$$



Here's a permutation matrix for $n = 5$:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{e}_2 \\ \hat{e}_4 \\ \hat{e}_1 \\ \hat{e}_3 \\ \hat{e}_5 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

What's its determinant?



This is a general pattern: the determinant of a permutation matrix P_σ is called the *sign* of the permutation σ :

$$\text{sgn}(\sigma) := \det(P_\sigma)$$

In effect, it's

$$(-1)^{\text{number of swaps in } \sigma}.$$

What's weird about this is that you can imagine performing more or fewer swaps to get σ . The magic of determinants is telling you that the *parity* of the number of swaps stays the same!

Note that $\text{sgn}(\sigma) = \text{sgn}(\sigma^{-1})$. (Why?)



It turns out that permutations give you a formula for the determinant of any matrix $A = \left(\vec{v}_1 \quad \cdots \quad \vec{v}_n \right)$. Let's see why.

First, the j -th column \vec{v}_j can be written as

$$\vec{v}_j = \sum_{k=1}^n a_{k,j} \hat{e}_k.$$



The multilinearity of \det can then be deployed:

$$\begin{aligned}\det(A) &= \det\left(\sum_{k(1)=1}^n a_{k(1),j} \hat{e}_{k(1)}, \dots, \sum_{k(n)=1}^n a_{k(n),j} \hat{e}_{k(n)}\right) \\ &= \sum_{k(1)=1}^n \cdots \sum_{k(n)=1}^n \left(\prod_{i=1}^n a_{k(i),i}\right) \det(\hat{e}_{k(1)}, \dots, \hat{e}_{k(n)})\end{aligned}$$

Now all those sums can be combined into one sum. You're summing over the set E_n of all maps $k: \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$:

$$\det(A) = \sum_{k \in E_n} \left(\prod_{i=1}^n a_{k(i),i}\right) \det(\hat{e}_{k(1)}, \dots, \hat{e}_{k(n)}).$$



$$\det(A) = \sum_{k \in E_n} \left(\prod_{i=1}^n a_{k(i),i} \right) \det(\hat{e}_{k(1)}, \dots, \hat{e}_{k(n)}).$$

Now we use the alternatingness: if any two columns are equal, then the determinant is zero. So any summand in which $k: \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$ is not injective doesn't appear:

$$\det(A) = \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_n} \left(\prod_{i=1}^n a_{\sigma(i),i} \right) \det(\hat{e}_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, \hat{e}_{\sigma(n)}),$$

where Σ_n is the set of permutations of $\{1, \dots, n\}$.



Now we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\det(A) &= \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_n} \left(\prod_{i=1}^n a_{\sigma(i),i} \right) \det(\hat{e}_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, \hat{e}_{\sigma(n)}) \\ &= \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_n} \left(\prod_{i=1}^n a_{\sigma(i),i} \right) \det(P_\sigma) \\ &= \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_n} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) \left(\prod_{i=1}^n a_{\sigma(i),i} \right).\end{aligned}$$



$$\det(A) = \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_n} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) \left(\prod_{i=1}^n a_{\sigma(i),i} \right)$$

There it is – *the Leibniz formula* for the determinant.

Do you care? Well, if you're trying to program a computer to compute determinants, no. Evaluating this formula involves $\Omega(n!n)$ operations. Gaussian elimination uses $O(n^3)$ operations. We have a winner.

On the other hand, the fact that there *is* a formula is vaguely reassuring. But there's another advantage ...



Think of the determinant as a function from $\mathbf{R}^{n^2} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$; this formula expresses that function as a *polynomial* in n^2 variables. That means that it's continuous and infinitely differentiable. So this leads us to the following result:

Proposition. *Suppose $A = (a_{i,j})$ an invertible $n \times n$ matrix. Then there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that if $A' = (a'_{i,j})$ is an $n \times n$ matrix such that $|a'_{i,j} - a_{i,j}| < \varepsilon$, then A' is invertible too.*

That is, invertible matrices are stable under small perturbations.



Here's another wacky-sounding consequence. Suppose $L \subseteq \mathbf{R}^{n^2}$ is a line. Then if there exists one point on L that corresponds to an invertible matrix, then all but finitely many points on L correspond to invertible matrices.



Question. Suppose A an $n \times n$ matrix. For how many real numbers $t \in \mathbf{R}$ is $A + tI$ invertible (none, finitely many, infinitely many, all)?