

Compendium on Multivector Contractions

André L. G. Mandolesi *

May 17, 2022

Abstract

We reorganize and expand the theory of contractions or interior products of multivectors, and related topics like Hodge duality. Results are generalized and new ones are presented, like a higher-order graded Leibniz rule, a geometric characterization of blade contractions, a regressive product formula, a study of spaces determined by multivectors, special decompositions, factorizations and carvings of multivectors, generalized grades, new simplicity criteria, supercommutators of creation and annihilation operators, etc. Different conventions found in the literature are discussed, in special those of Clifford geometric algebra.

Keywords: Grassmann algebra, exterior algebra, Clifford algebra, contraction, interior product, inner multiplication, interior derivative.

MSC: 15A75, 15A66, 81Q60

1 Introduction

In essence, contractions or interior products of multivectors date back to Grassmann [20], and have since found applications in many areas, from Differential Geometry [1, 42] and Physics [36] to Computer Science [13]. But many still see them as somewhat obscure operations.

A difficulty is the various kinds of contraction (left, right, with vectors, multivectors, forms, etc.), some quite abstract [5]. Contraction by vectors is prevalent, even when multivectors could be of great use [47]. Contraction between multivectors is simpler than with forms, but needs an inner product, and in Clifford Geometric Algebra (GA) [23] it often appears in a symmetrized version (Hestenes inner product) with worse properties.

Also, contractions are often presented in ways that allow their computation, but obfuscate their simple nature as adjoints of exterior products. Differential geometers view the contraction or insertion of vector fields on differential forms as an antiderivation linked to exterior and Lie derivatives [9, p.207], making it seem more complicated than necessary.

*Instituto de Matemática e Estatística, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Av. Adhemar de Barros s/n, 40170-110, Salvador - BA, Brazil. E-mail: andre.mandolesi@ufba.br

Different conventions are another source of confusion: notations vary, and nonequivalent definitions give contractions with distinct properties. Most authors present their favorite one without warning about the others, and there is little discussion in the literature about their differences.

This work reorganizes, simplifies and extends the theory of contractions and related subjects, with new results like: a higher-order graded Leibniz rule; an expansion via determinants; a full geometric characterization of blade contractions; triple products; relations between regressive products and angles; special decompositions, factorizations and ‘carvings’ of multivectors; simplicity criteria involving generalized grades; supercommutators of multi-fermion creation and annihilation operators; etc.

To achieve this, we use an improved multi-index formalism, concepts from [32, 34], like partial orthogonality and asymmetric angles, and ideas from GA, like involutions and outermorphisms.

For simplicity, we focus on contractions of multivectors, in Euclidean or unitary vector spaces, but most results adapt for contractions with forms, in pseudo-Euclidean spaces, or on manifolds. The complex case is included as it differs little from the real one (contractions are sesquilinear and there are some complex conjugations), is not usually treated, and is useful in the geometry of Quantum Information [3].

While most authors focus on blades or homogeneous multivectors, we use arbitrary ones whenever possible. This actually leads to simpler proofs for more general results, as it frees us from tracking grades and from grade dependent signs that clutter the algebra. And the importance of non-homogeneous multivectors should not be underestimated, as they: result from Clifford products; store data about subspaces of different dimensions; represent quantum superpositions of states with different numbers of fermions [36]; and even appear in Graph Theory [7], via Berezin calculus (whose derivatives and integrals are contractions in disguise [28]).

Many authors find it redundant to have left and right contractions, as for homogeneous elements they differ only by a sign. But with non-homogeneous ones distinct terms can have different sign changes, so it is best to use both. A ‘mirror principle’ keeps the theory simple: each formula with the left contraction mirrors another with the right one, and vice-versa. And some formulas become simpler with both contractions.

Likewise, use of mutually inverse left and right Hodge-like star operators [39, 41] simplifies the algebra. While the usual complex Hodge theory is based on the star of the underlying real space [45], our complex stars are based on a generalized concept of orientation for complex spaces, and are better suited for their geometry.

Section 2 reviews concepts and results. Section 3 defines contractions and studies their properties. Section 4 discusses Hodge-like star operators and the regressive product. Section 5 shows how contractions and stars behave under outermorphisms. Section 6 describes spaces determined by multivectors, and studies special decompositions, factorizations and carvings. Section 7 defines grades for non-homogeneous multivectors, and gives simplicity criteria. Section 8 links contractions to supersymmetry, creation and annihilation operators. Appendix A discusses the various kinds of contraction and different conventions, with special attention to those of GA.

2 Preliminaries

Here we set up our notation and terminology, review some results, and introduce others, like a new involution and a multi-index formalism. The reader may prefer to skim this section at first, returning as needed.

In this article X is a n -dimensional ($n > 0$) Euclidean or unitary space, with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ (Hermitian product in the complex case, with conjugate-linearity in the left entry). When we mention linearity, it should be understood in the complex case as sesquilinearity, as appropriate.

Much of the theory adapts for pseudo-Euclidean spaces, though many results apply only for non-null blades or have extra signs depending on the signature [37, 39, 41]. Contractions can also be defined in spaces with degenerate metrics, via Propositions 3.5v, 3.6, 3.8 and linearity (see [13, p.73] or [30, p.223], noting that their contractions differ a little from ours).

2.1 Multi-index Formalism

Definition 2.1. The set of *non-repeating multi-indices* is $\mathcal{M} = \bigcup_{q=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{M}^q$, where $\mathcal{M}^q = \bigcup_{p=0}^q \mathcal{M}_p^q$ with $\mathcal{M}_0^q = \{\emptyset\}$ and, for $1 \leq p \leq q$,

$$\mathcal{M}_p^q = \{(i_1, \dots, i_p) \in \mathbb{N}^p : 1 \leq i_j \leq q \ \forall j \text{ and } i_j \neq i_k \text{ if } j \neq k\}.$$

The set of *increasing multi-indices* is $\mathcal{I} = \bigcup_{q=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{I}^q$, where $\mathcal{I}^q = \bigcup_{p=0}^q \mathcal{I}_p^q$ with $\mathcal{I}_0^q = \{\emptyset\}$ and, for $1 \leq p \leq q$,

$$\mathcal{I}_p^q = \{(i_1, \dots, i_p) \in \mathbb{N}^p : 1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_p \leq q\}.$$

The *length* or *grade* of $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_p) \in \mathcal{M}$ is $|\mathbf{i}| = p$ and its *norm*¹ is $\|\mathbf{i}\| = i_1 + \dots + i_p$. Also, $\|\emptyset\| = \|\emptyset\| = 0$.

In general, we use $\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}$ for arbitrary elements of \mathcal{M} , and $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}$ for those in \mathcal{I} . At times, we write simply $i_1 \cdots i_p$ for (i_1, \dots, i_p) .

Definition 2.2. For $\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{M}$, we obtain $\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{M}$ by removing from \mathbf{s} any indices of \mathbf{r} . We write $\mathbf{r} \subset \mathbf{s}$ if all indices of \mathbf{r} are in \mathbf{s} . If \mathbf{r} and \mathbf{s} have no common indices they are *disjoint*, and their *concatenation* $\mathbf{rs} \in \mathcal{M}$ is formed by the indices of \mathbf{r} followed by those of \mathbf{s} . For $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{I}$, we form $\mathbf{i} \cup \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{I}$ from the union and intersection of their indices. In a given \mathcal{I}^q , the *complement* of $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_p^q$ is $\mathbf{i}' = (1, \dots, q) - \mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_{q-p}^q$. Also, let $[\mathbf{r}] \in \mathcal{I}$ be obtained by ordering \mathbf{r} , and $|\mathbf{r} > \mathbf{s}|$ be the number of pairs of indices (r, s) with $r \in \mathbf{r}, s \in \mathbf{s}$ and $r > s$.

Though \mathbf{i}' depends on the \mathcal{I}^q used, this should cause no confusion.

Proposition 2.3. Let $\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{M}$ be pairwise disjoint. Then:

- i) $|\mathbf{rs}| = |\mathbf{r}| + |\mathbf{s}|$ and $\|\mathbf{rs}\| = \|\mathbf{r}\| + \|\mathbf{s}\|$.
- ii) $|\mathbf{rs} > \mathbf{t}| = |\mathbf{r} > \mathbf{t}| + |\mathbf{s} > \mathbf{t}|$ and $|\mathbf{r} > \mathbf{st}| = |\mathbf{r} > \mathbf{s}| + |\mathbf{r} > \mathbf{t}|$.
- iii) $|\mathbf{r}] > \mathbf{s}| = |\mathbf{r} > [\mathbf{s}]| = |\mathbf{r} > \mathbf{s}|$.

Proof. Immediate. □

¹Some authors refer to our norm $\|\mathbf{i}\|$ as length $|\mathbf{i}|$.

Definition 2.4. Let $\epsilon_{\mathbf{r}}$ be the sign of the permutation that puts a nonempty $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{M}$ in increasing order, and $\epsilon_{\emptyset} = 1$.

Properties of $\epsilon_{\mathbf{r}}$ for concatenations will be useful, and have been mostly ignored in the literature for similar generalizations of the Levi-Civita symbol. Note that, while that symbol is totally anti-symmetric, i below shows $\epsilon_{\mathbf{r}}$ is graded-symmetric for transpositions of adjacent multi-indices.

Proposition 2.5. Let $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_m \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}, \mathbf{i}_1, \dots, \mathbf{i}_m, \mathbf{j}_1, \dots, \mathbf{j}_n \in \mathcal{I}$ be pairwise disjoint.

- i) $\epsilon_{\mathbf{r}_1 \cdots \mathbf{r}_a \mathbf{r}_{a+1} \cdots \mathbf{r}_m} = (-1)^{|\mathbf{r}_a| |\mathbf{r}_{a+1}|} \epsilon_{\mathbf{r}_1 \cdots \mathbf{r}_{a+1} \mathbf{r}_a \cdots \mathbf{r}_m}$.
- ii) $\epsilon_{\mathbf{r}_1 \cdots \mathbf{r}_a \cdots \mathbf{r}_m} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{r}_a} \cdot \epsilon_{\mathbf{r}_1 \cdots [\mathbf{r}_a] \cdots \mathbf{r}_m}$.
- iii) $\epsilon_{\mathbf{ij}} = (-1)^{|\mathbf{i}| |\mathbf{j}|}$.
- iv) $\epsilon_{[\mathbf{i}_1 \cdots \mathbf{i}_m][\mathbf{j}_1 \cdots \mathbf{j}_n]} = \prod_{1 \leq a \leq m, 1 \leq b \leq n} \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}_a \mathbf{j}_b}$.
- v) $\epsilon_{\mathbf{r}_1 \cdots \mathbf{r}_m} = \prod_{1 \leq a < b \leq m} \epsilon_{\mathbf{r}_a \mathbf{r}_b}$ if m is even or $\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_m \in \mathcal{I}$.
- vi) $\epsilon_{[\mathbf{ij}]1} \cdot \epsilon_{[\mathbf{ik}]1} = \epsilon_{[\mathbf{jk}]1}$.
- vii) $\epsilon_{\mathbf{ijk}} \cdot \epsilon_{\mathbf{ijl}} = \epsilon_{[\mathbf{ij}][\mathbf{kl}]}$.
- viii) $\epsilon_{\mathbf{acd}} \cdot \epsilon_{\mathbf{ace}} \cdot \epsilon_{\mathbf{bcd}} \cdot \epsilon_{\mathbf{bce}} = (-1)^{|\mathbf{ab}| |\mathbf{de}|}$.

Proof. (i) It takes $|\mathbf{r}_a| |\mathbf{r}_{a+1}|$ index transpositions to swap \mathbf{r}_a and \mathbf{r}_{a+1} .
(ii) To order $\mathbf{r}_1 \cdots \mathbf{r}_a \cdots \mathbf{r}_m$, we can order \mathbf{r}_a , then order $\mathbf{r}_1 \cdots [\mathbf{r}_a] \cdots \mathbf{r}_m$.
(iii) As $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{I}$, the number of transpositions to put each $j \in \mathbf{j}$ (first j_1 , then j_2 , etc.) in order in \mathbf{ij} equals the number of indices $i \in \mathbf{i}$ with $i > j$.
(iv) $\epsilon_{[\mathbf{i}_1 \cdots \mathbf{i}_m][\mathbf{j}_1 \cdots \mathbf{j}_n]} = (-1)^{|\mathbf{i}_1 \cdots \mathbf{i}_m| |\mathbf{j}_1 \cdots \mathbf{j}_n|} = (-1)^{\sum_{a,b} |\mathbf{i}_a| |\mathbf{j}_b|} = \prod_{a,b} \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}_a \mathbf{j}_b}$.
(v) For $m = 2$ it is immediate, and assuming it for $m = 2k$, ii and iv give $\epsilon_{\mathbf{r}_1 \cdots \mathbf{r}_{2(k+1)}} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{r}_1 \cdots \mathbf{r}_{2k}} \cdot \epsilon_{\mathbf{r}_{2k+1} \mathbf{r}_{2k+2}} \cdot \epsilon_{[\mathbf{r}_1 \cdots \mathbf{r}_{2k}][\mathbf{r}_{2k+1} \mathbf{r}_{2k+2}]} = \prod_{1 \leq a < b \leq 2k} \epsilon_{\mathbf{r}_a \mathbf{r}_b} \cdot \epsilon_{\mathbf{r}_{2k+1} \mathbf{r}_{2k+2}} \cdot \prod_{1 \leq a \leq 2k} \epsilon_{[\mathbf{r}_a][\mathbf{r}_{2k+1} \mathbf{r}_{2k+2}]} = \prod_{1 \leq a < b \leq 2(k+1)} \epsilon_{\mathbf{r}_a \mathbf{r}_b}$, with ordering brackets removed via ii as each $[\mathbf{r}]$ appears an even number of times. If m is odd, an extra $\mathbf{r}_{m+1} = \emptyset$ gives $\epsilon_{\mathbf{r}_1 \cdots \mathbf{r}_m} = \prod_{1 \leq a < b \leq m} \epsilon_{\mathbf{r}_a \mathbf{r}_b} \cdot \prod_{1 \leq a \leq m} \epsilon_{\mathbf{r}_a}$, and $\epsilon_{\mathbf{r}_a} = 1$ for $\mathbf{r}_a \in \mathcal{I}$. (vi) By iv, $\epsilon_{[\mathbf{ij}]1} \cdot \epsilon_{[\mathbf{ik}]1} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}1} \cdot \epsilon_{\mathbf{j}1} \cdot \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}1} \cdot \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}1} = \epsilon_{[\mathbf{jk}]1}$. (vii) By iv and v, $\epsilon_{\mathbf{ijk}} \cdot \epsilon_{\mathbf{ijl}} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{ij}} \cdot \epsilon_{\mathbf{ik}} \cdot \epsilon_{\mathbf{jk}} \cdot \epsilon_{\mathbf{ij}} \cdot \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}1} \cdot \epsilon_{\mathbf{j}1} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{ik}} \cdot \epsilon_{\mathbf{jk}} \cdot \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}1} \cdot \epsilon_{\mathbf{j}1} = \epsilon_{[\mathbf{ij}][\mathbf{kl}]}$. (viii) Each multi-index appears an even number of times on the left side, so ii lets us assume $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{I}$. By iii, vi and vii, $\epsilon_{\mathbf{acd}} \cdot \epsilon_{\mathbf{ace}} \cdot \epsilon_{\mathbf{bcd}} \cdot \epsilon_{\mathbf{bce}} = \epsilon_{[\mathbf{ac}][\mathbf{de}]} \cdot \epsilon_{[\mathbf{bc}][\mathbf{de}]} = \epsilon_{[\mathbf{ab}][\mathbf{de}]} = (-1)^{|\mathbf{ab}| |\mathbf{de}|}$. \square

The following signs will help us work with $\epsilon_{\mathbf{iv}}$.

Definition 2.6. $\zeta_k = (-1)^{\frac{k(k+1)}{2}}$ and $\xi_{\mathbf{r}} = (-1)^{|\mathbf{r}|}$, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{M}$.

Proposition 2.7. For $k, q \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}^q$ and disjoint $\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{M}$:

- i) $\epsilon_{\mathbf{iv}} = \zeta_{|\mathbf{i}|} \cdot \xi_{\mathbf{i}}$.
- ii) $\zeta_{k+1} = (-1)^{k+1} \zeta_k$.
- iii) ζ_k follows the pattern $+ - - +$ for $k \bmod 4 = 0, 1, 2, 3$.
- iv) $\xi_{\mathbf{r}} = (-1)^{\text{odd}(\mathbf{r})}$, where $\text{odd}(\mathbf{r}) = \text{number of odd indices in } \mathbf{r}$.
- v) $\xi_{\mathbf{rs}} = \xi_{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \xi_{\mathbf{s}}$.

Proof. (i) $\epsilon_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{i}'}$ = $(-1)^{|\mathbf{i}|>|\mathbf{i}'|}$, and for $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_p)$ we have $|\mathbf{i}| > |\mathbf{i}'| = (i_1 - 1) + (i_2 - 2) + \dots + (i_p - p) = \|\mathbf{i}\| - \frac{\mathbf{i}!(\mathbf{i}+1)}{2}$. (*ii-v*) Immediate. \square

By i, $\epsilon_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{i}'}$ does not depend on the \mathcal{I}^q used to take the complement \mathbf{i}' .

2.2 Grassmann Algebra

The *Grassmann or exterior algebra* [5, 47] of a subspace $V \subset X$ is a graded algebra $\bigwedge V = \bigoplus_{p \in \mathbb{Z}} \bigwedge^p V$, with $\bigwedge^0 V = \{\text{scalars}\} = \mathbb{R}$ or \mathbb{C} , $\bigwedge^1 V = V$, and $\bigwedge^p V = \{0\}$ for $p < 0$ or $p > \dim V$, and having a bilinear associative *exterior product* $\wedge : \bigwedge^p V \times \bigwedge^q V \rightarrow \bigwedge^{p+q} V$ which is alternating in V . For a subspace $U \subset V$ we have $\bigwedge U \subset \bigwedge V$. Any $M \in \bigwedge V$ is a *multivector*, and $\langle M \rangle_p$ denotes its component in $\bigwedge^p V$. If $M \in \bigwedge^p V$ it is *homogeneous of grade* $|M| = p$, or a *p-vector*. The *even subalgebra* is $\bigwedge^+ V = \bigoplus_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \bigwedge^{2k} V$, and we call its elements *even*.

Any $B = v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_p$, for $v_1, \dots, v_p \in X$, is called *simple, decomposable* or a *p-blade*. $B \neq 0$ if, and only if, v_1, \dots, v_p are linearly independent, in which case its *space* is $[B] = \text{span}(v_1, \dots, v_p)$. Any $B \in \bigwedge^0 X$ is a 0-blade, with $[B] = \{0\}$. Note that 0 is a *p-blade* for all p , and if we say a blade is non-scalar, it must be nonzero. Given a p -dimensional subspace $V \subset X$ and a p -blade $B \neq 0$, we have $V = [B] \Leftrightarrow \bigwedge^p V = \text{span}(B)$. Blades A and B have *same orientation* if $A = kB$ for $k > 0$ (even in the complex case).

To help distinguish results that are only valid for certain kinds of multivectors, we usually (but not always) use L, M, N for arbitrary multivectors, F, G, H for homogeneous ones, and A, B, C for blades.

The inner product of p -blades $A = v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_p$ and $B = w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge w_p$ is $\langle A, B \rangle = \det(\langle v_i, w_j \rangle)$. The norm $\|A\| = \sqrt{\langle A, A \rangle}$ gives, in the real case, the p -dimensional volume of the parallelotope spanned by v_1, \dots, v_p , and in the complex case $\|A\|^2$ gives the $2p$ -dimensional volume of that spanned by $v_1, iv_1, \dots, v_p, iv_p$. For $A, B \in \bigwedge^0 V$ we set $\langle A, B \rangle = \bar{A}B$, where \bar{A} is the complex conjugate. Setting blades of distinct grades as orthogonal, the inner product is extended (sesqui)linearly to $\bigwedge X$.

Definition 2.8. Given $e_1, \dots, e_q \in X$, let $e_{\mathbf{r}} = e_{r_1} \wedge \dots \wedge e_{r_p}$ for $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_p) \in \mathcal{M}_p^q$, and $e_{\emptyset} = 1$. If $\beta_V = (e_1, \dots, e_q)$ is a basis of $V \subset X$, $\beta_{\bigwedge^p V} = \{e_{\mathbf{i}}\}_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_p^q}$ and $\beta_{\bigwedge V} = \{e_{\mathbf{i}}\}_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}^q}$ are *induced bases* of $\bigwedge^p V$ and $\bigwedge V$. For $V = \{0\}$ we set $\beta_{\bigwedge^0 V} = \beta_{\bigwedge V} = \{1\}$.

If β_V is orthonormal, so are $\beta_{\bigwedge^p V}$ and $\beta_{\bigwedge V}$.

Example 2.9. If $\beta_V = (e_1, e_2, e_3)$ then $\beta_{\bigwedge^2 V} = (e_{12}, e_{13}, e_{23})$, where $e_{12} = e_1 \wedge e_2$, $e_{13} = e_1 \wedge e_3$ and $e_{23} = e_2 \wedge e_3$.

Any $M \in \bigwedge V$ admits a *blade decomposition* $M = \sum_i B_i$ for blades $B_i \in \bigwedge V$. It is *minimal* if no blade decomposition of M has less blades.

For blades A and B , A is a *subblade* of B if $[A] \subset [B]$. Some authors write $A \subset B$, but we will use this symbol in a slightly different way.

Definition 2.10. For $M, N \in \bigwedge X$ we write $M \subset N$ if there are blade decompositions $M = \sum_i A_i$ and $N = \sum_j B_j$ with $[A_i] \subset [B_j] \forall i, j$.

Corollary 6.36 gives a simpler formulation. As one can check, if M or N is a blade, and $N \neq 0$, there is no loss in assuming its decomposition has just the blade itself. So, for blades, $A \subset B$ does mean $[A] \subset [B]$, but

only if $B \neq 0$. The case $N = 0$ is exotic but important: $M \subset 0$ for any M , since $0 = B - B$ for a blade with $[B] = X$. Some care is needed with this symbol, as $M \subset N$ and $N \subset M$ does not imply $M = N$.

Definition 2.11. We use $P_V : X \rightarrow V$ and $\mathcal{P}_V : \bigwedge X \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ for orthogonal projections onto subspaces $V \subset X$ and $\mathcal{V} \subset \bigwedge X$, and write $P_B = P_{[B]}$ for a blade B and $\mathcal{P}_M = \mathcal{P}_{\text{span}\{M\}}$ for $M \in \bigwedge X$. We also use P_V for its linear extension $P_V : \bigwedge X \rightarrow \bigwedge V$ given by $P_V 1 = 1$ and $P_V(v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_p) = (P_V v_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge (P_V v_p)$ for $v_1, \dots, v_p \in X$.

Proposition 2.12. $P_V = \mathcal{P}_{\bigwedge V}$.

Proof. Let $\beta_X = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$ be an orthonormal basis of X such that $\beta_V = (v_1, \dots, v_p)$ is a basis of V , and $\beta_{\bigwedge X}$ and $\beta_{\bigwedge V}$ be the induced orthonormal bases. Decomposing $M \in \bigwedge X$ in terms of $\beta_{\bigwedge X}$, $\mathcal{P}_{\bigwedge V} M$ is given by the components corresponding to elements of $\beta_{\bigwedge V}$. As $P_V v_i = v_i$ if $i \leq p$, vanishing otherwise, $P_V M$ gives these same components. \square

So the extension of P_V is still an orthogonal projection. For a p -blade A , if $P_V A \neq 0$ then $[P_V A] = P_V([A])$. If $\dim P_V([A]) < p$ then $P_V A = 0$.

2.3 Involutions

Involutions [13, 23] of $\bigwedge X$ help state results for arbitrary multivectors.

Definition 2.13. *Grade involution* $\hat{}$, *reversion* $\check{}$ and *Clifford conjugation* $\bar{}$ are linear operators $\bigwedge X \rightarrow \bigwedge X$ given, for a homogeneous $H \in \bigwedge^p X$, by $\hat{H} = (-1)^p H$, $\check{H} = (-1)^{\frac{p(p-1)}{2}} H$ and $\bar{H} = (\hat{H})^\check{} = (-1)^{\frac{p(p+1)}{2}} H = \zeta_p H$.

The sign changes produced by them follow, respectively, the patterns $+-+-, ++--$ and $+-+-$ for $p \bmod 4 = 0, 1, 2, 3$. In general, $\hat{M}, \check{M}, \bar{M} \neq \pm M$ for $M \in \bigwedge X$. The Clifford conjugate \bar{M} should not be confused with the complex conjugate \overline{M} (only defined for scalars).

A new involution depending on $n = \dim X$ will be useful.

Definition 2.14. Let $M^{\wedge k} = M^{\wedge \cdots \wedge}$ denote a composition of k grade involutions of $M \in \bigwedge X$, and $\check{} : \bigwedge X \rightarrow \bigwedge X$ be given by $\check{M} = M^{\wedge(n+1)}$.

Proposition 2.15. Let $M, N \in \bigwedge X$, $H \in \bigwedge^k X$ and $v, v_1, \dots, v_p \in X$.

- i) $(\hat{M})^\check{} = (\check{M})^\wedge = (\check{\check{M}})^\wedge = (\bar{M})^\wedge = M$.
- ii) $\langle \hat{M}, \hat{N} \rangle = \langle \check{M}, \check{N} \rangle = \langle \check{\check{M}}, \check{\check{N}} \rangle = \langle \bar{M}, \bar{N} \rangle = \langle M, N \rangle$.
- iii) $(M \wedge N)^\wedge = \hat{M} \wedge \hat{N}$, $(M \wedge N)^\check{} = \check{M} \wedge \check{N}$, $(M \wedge N)^\wedge = \check{N} \wedge \check{M}$ and $(M \wedge N)^\wedge = \bar{N} \wedge \bar{M}$.
- iv) $(v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_p)^\check{} = v_p \wedge \cdots \wedge v_1$.
- v) $v \wedge M = \hat{M} \wedge v$ and $H \wedge M = M^{\wedge k} \wedge H$.
- vi) $\check{H} = (-1)^{k(n-k)} H$.
- vii) If M is even, n is odd or $M \in \bigwedge^n X$ then $\check{M} = M$.

Proof. Most results are immediate as, by linearity, we can assume $M \in \bigwedge^p X$ and $N \in \bigwedge^q X$. In ii we also use $\langle M, N \rangle = 0$ if $p \neq q$, and iii uses $(M \wedge N)^\wedge = (-1)^{\frac{(p+q)(p+q-1)}{2}} M \wedge N = (-1)^{pq} \check{M} \wedge \check{N} = \check{N} \wedge \check{M}$. \square

Note how the reversion reverses (hence its name) the order of terms in exterior products (it is an anti-involution w.r.t. this product).




Figure 1: Principal bases (e_1, e_2) and (f_1, f_2) of planes V and W .

2.4 Principal Bases and Angles

Definition 2.16. Associated principal bases of nonzero subspaces $V, W \subset X$ are orthonormal bases $\beta_V = (e_1, \dots, e_p)$ and $\beta_W = (f_1, \dots, f_q)$ with $\langle e_i, f_j \rangle = 0$ if $i \neq j$, and $\langle e_i, f_i \rangle \geq 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq m = \min\{p, q\}$, ordered so $0 \leq \theta_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta_m \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$, where $\theta_i = \cos^{-1} \langle e_i, f_i \rangle$ is a *principal angle*. We also say β_W is a principal basis of W w.r.t. V , and any orthonormal basis of W is a principal basis w.r.t. $\{0\}$.

The θ_i 's are also called *canonical or Jordan angles* [17, 19, 26]. The e_i 's and f_i 's can be obtained as eigenvectors of $P_V^W P_W^V$ and $P_W^V P_V^W$, respectively, for orthogonal projections $P_W^V : V \rightarrow W$ and $P_V^W : W \rightarrow V$. We can switch the signs of e_i and f_i (or one of them if $\theta_i = \frac{\pi}{2}$ or $i > m$), and there is more ambiguity in case of repeated θ_i 's or if $p \neq q$.

A geometric interpretation (Fig. 1) is that the unit sphere of V projects orthogonally to an ellipsoid in W , β_W is formed by unit vectors along its semi-axes (in the complex case there are also semi-axes along if_i 's), and β_V by unit vectors that project on them, with extra vectors to complete orthonormal bases if necessary.

Proposition 2.17. With the above notation, let $A = e_1 \wedge \dots \wedge e_p$.

- i) $\dim(V \cap W)$ equals the number of null θ_i 's.
- ii) If $p \leq q$ then $\langle f_1 \wedge \dots \wedge f_p, e_1 \wedge \dots \wedge e_p \rangle = \cos \theta_1 \dots \cos \theta_p$.
- iii) $P_W A = \cos \theta_1 \dots \cos \theta_p f_1 \wedge \dots \wedge f_p$ if $p \leq q$, otherwise $P_W A = 0$.
- iv) $P_W V = [f_1 \wedge \dots \wedge f_k]$, where $k = \max\{1 \leq i \leq m : \theta_i \neq \frac{\pi}{2}\}$.

Proof. Immediate. □

2.5 Orthogonalities

For subspaces $V, W \subset X$ we write, as usual, $V \perp W$ if $\langle v, w \rangle = 0$ for all $v \in V, w \in W$. Other orthogonality concepts will also be useful [32].

Definition 2.18. V is *partially orthogonal* (\perp) to W if $V \cap W^\perp \neq \{0\}$.

For distinct dimensions this is not a reflexive relation: any plane is partially orthogonal to any line, but the converse is not true.

Proposition 2.19. $V \lrcorner W \Leftrightarrow \dim V > \dim W$ or a principal angle is $\frac{\pi}{2}$.

Proof. The case $p = \dim V > \dim W$ is trivial, and if $p \leq \dim W$ the principal angle θ_p is the largest angle a nonzero $v \in V$ makes with W . \square

Definition 2.20. Let $A, B \in \bigwedge X$ be blades.

- i) A is *partially orthogonal* to B , $A \lrcorner B$, if $[A] \lrcorner [B]$.
- ii) A and B are *orthogonal*, $A \perp B$, if $\langle A, B \rangle = 0$.
- iii) A and B are *completely orthogonal*, $A \perp\!\!\!\perp B$, if $[A] \perp [B]$.

Proposition 2.21. For non-scalar blades, $A \perp\!\!\!\perp B \Rightarrow A \perp B$ and $A \lrcorner B$.

Proof. Assuming, w.l.o.g., $A = e_1 \wedge \dots \wedge e_p$ and $B = f_1 \wedge \dots \wedge f_q$ for principal bases of $[A]$ and $[B]$, if $[A] \perp [B]$ then $\langle e_i, f_j \rangle = 0 \forall i, j$. \square

Proposition 2.22. $A \lrcorner B \Leftrightarrow P_B A = 0$, for blades $A \neq 0$ and B .

Proof. Follows from Propositions 2.17iii and 2.19. \square

The following is a natural generalization, as Proposition 6.25 will show.

Definition 2.23. For $M, N \in \bigwedge X$, we write:

- i) $M \lrcorner N$ if $0 \neq M = v \wedge M'$ and $N \in \bigwedge([v]^\perp)$ for $v \in X$, $M' \in \bigwedge X$.
- ii) $M \perp N$ if $\langle M, N \rangle = 0$.
- iii) $M \perp\!\!\!\perp N$ if $M \in \bigwedge V$ and $N \in \bigwedge W$ with $V \perp W$.

Example 2.24. If (e_1, \dots, e_6) is orthogonal, $M = e_{12} + e_{34}$ and $N = e_{56}$ then $M \perp\!\!\!\perp N$, $M \perp N$, but $M \not\lrcorner N$ (M is not simple, so it can not be factored as in i). And for $M = 1 + e_1$ and $N = 1 + e_2$ we have $M \perp\!\!\!\perp N$ but $M \not\lrcorner N$. So Proposition 2.21 no longer holds.

Proposition 2.25. If $M \lrcorner N$ (resp. $M \perp\!\!\!\perp N$) there are blade decompositions $M = \sum_i A_i$, $N = \sum_j B_j$ with $A_i \lrcorner B_j$ (resp. $A_i \perp\!\!\!\perp B_j$) $\forall i, j$.

Proof. If $M \lrcorner N$, let v, M' be as in Definition 2.23i. Given blade decompositions $M' = \sum_i A'_i$ and $N = \sum_j B_j$, the result follows with $A_i = v \wedge A'_i$. The case $M \perp\!\!\!\perp N$ is immediate. \square

It is not clear whether a similar result holds for \perp . The converse holds for \perp and $\perp\!\!\!\perp$, but not for \lrcorner , as the next example shows.

Example 2.26. Let $M = e_{12} + e_{34}$ for (e_1, \dots, e_4) orthogonal. Then $e_{12} \lrcorner e_1$ and $e_{34} \lrcorner e_1$, but $M \not\lrcorner e_1$.

2.6 PO- and OP-Factorizations

Let $A \in \bigwedge^p X$ and $B \in \bigwedge^q X$ be nonzero blades, $m = \min\{p, q\}$, and if $q > 0$ let (f_1, \dots, f_q) be a principal basis of $[B]$ w.r.t. $[A]$.

Definition 2.27. A *projective-orthogonal (PO-)factorization* of B w.r.t. A is $B = B_P \wedge B_\perp$, where $B_P = \epsilon_B \|B\| f_1 \wedge \dots \wedge f_m$ ($= \epsilon_B \|B\|$ if $m = 0$) and $B_\perp = f_{m+1} \wedge \dots \wedge f_q$ ($= 1$ if $m = q$) are, respectively, *projective and right-orthogonal subblades*, and ϵ_B is a unit scalar. An *orthogonal-projective (OP-)factorization* is $B = B'_\perp \wedge B_P$, where $B'_\perp = (-1)^{m(q-m)} B_\perp$ is a *left-orthogonal subblade*.

If $p < q$ these factorizations depend on the choice of principal basis.

Proposition 2.28. *With the above notation:*

- i) $\|B_P\| = \|B\|$ and $\|B_\perp\| = 1$.
- ii) B_\perp is completely orthogonal to A and B_P .
- iii) $P_B A = \frac{\langle B_P, A \rangle}{\|B\|^2} B_P$.
- iv) If $A \not\sim B$ then $[B_P] = P_B[A]$ and $[B_\perp] = [A]^\perp \cap [B]$.

Proof. (i,ii) Immediate. (iii) If $p > q$ both sides vanish. If $p \leq q$ we can assume $A = e_1 \wedge \dots \wedge e_p$ and $B = f_1 \wedge \dots \wedge f_q$ for associated principal bases of $[A]$ and $[B]$. Then $B_P = f_1 \wedge \dots \wedge f_p$ and Proposition 2.17 gives $P_B A = \langle B_P, A \rangle B_P$. (iv) By iii and Proposition 2.22, $[B_P] = [P_B A] = P_B[A]$. So $[B_\perp] = [B] \cap [B_P]^\perp = [B] \cap (P_B[A])^\perp = [B] \cap [A]^\perp$. \square

If $A \not\sim B$, i and iv imply B_P and B_\perp are unique up to unit scalars, but if $A \sim B$ and $p < q$ we can also exchange f_p for any f_i of B_\perp .

2.7 Asymmetric Angles

The following angles were introduced and studied in [32, 34]. While $\Theta_{[A],[B]}$ gauges the relative inclination of subspaces via volume contraction, $\Theta_{A,B}$ also stores data about the relative orientation of the blades.

Definition 2.29. Let $A \in \bigwedge^p X$ and $B \in \bigwedge^q X$ be nonzero blades, and $B = B_P \wedge B_\perp$ be a PO-factorization w.r.t. A . The *asymmetric angle* of $[A]$ with $[B]$ is $\Theta_{[A],[B]} = \cos^{-1} \frac{|\langle A, B_P \rangle|}{\|A\| \|B\|}$, and the *oriented asymmetric angle* of A with B is $\Theta_{A,B} = \cos^{-1} \frac{\langle A, B_P \rangle}{\|A\| \|B\|}$. We also set $\Theta_{0,0} = \Theta_{0,B} = \Theta_{[0],[0]} = \Theta_{[0],[B]} = 0$. If $p = 0$ we set $\Theta_{A,0} = 0$, otherwise $\Theta_{A,0} = \Theta_{[A],[0]} = \frac{\pi}{2}$.

In the real case $\Theta_{A,B} \in [0, \pi]$, but in the complex one it is a complex-valued angle [40]. If $p \leq q$ it is the angle between A and B_P in $\bigwedge^p X$. If $p < q$ then $\Theta_{A,B}$ depends, in a useful way, on the choice of PO-factorization, but $\Theta_{[A],[B]}$ does not. If $p > q$ then $\Theta_{A,B} = \Theta_{[A],[B]} = \frac{\pi}{2}$. In general, $\Theta_{[A],[B]} \neq \Theta_{[B],[A]}$ when $p \neq q$, reflecting the asymmetry between subspaces of different dimensions and leading to better properties.

Proposition 2.30. *Let $A \in \bigwedge^p X$ and $B \in \bigwedge^q X$ be blades, $m = \min\{p, q\}$, $r = \dim([A] \cap [B])$, and $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m$ be the principal angles of $[A]$ and $[B]$.*

- i) $\|P_B A\| = \|A\| \cos \Theta_{[A],[B]}$.

- ii) $\langle A, B \rangle = \|A\| \|B\| \cos \Theta_{A,B}$ if $p = q$.
- iii) $\|A \wedge B\| = \|A\| \|B\| \cos \Theta_{[A],[B]^\perp}$.
- iv) $\cos \Theta_{[A],[B]} = \begin{cases} \prod_{i=1}^p \cos \theta_i & \text{if } p \leq q, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$
- v) $\cos \Theta_{[A],[B]^\perp} = \prod_{i=1}^m \sin \theta_i$.
- vi) $\cos \Theta_{[A]^\perp,[B]} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } [A] + [B] \neq X, \\ \prod_{i=r+1}^m \sin \theta_i & \text{if } [A] + [B] = X \text{ and } [A], [B] \neq X, \\ 1 & \text{if } [A] = X \text{ or } [B] = X. \end{cases}$
- vii) $\Theta_{A,B} = 0 \Leftrightarrow [A] \subset [B]$.
- viii) $\Theta_{A,B} = \frac{\pi}{2} \Leftrightarrow [A] \perp [B]$.
- ix) If $p = q$ then $\Theta_{A,B} = \overline{\Theta_{B,A}}$ and $\Theta_{[A],[B]} = \Theta_{[B],[A]}$.
- x) $\Theta_{[A],[B]^\perp} = \Theta_{[B],[A]^\perp}$ and $\Theta_{[A]^\perp,[B]} = \Theta_{[B]^\perp,[A]}$.

Proof. (i) By Proposition 2.28, $\|P_B A\| = \frac{\langle B, P_B A \rangle}{\|B\|}$. (ii) $B_P = B$ if $p = q$. (iii) Follows from i, as $\|A \wedge B\| = \|(P_{[B]^\perp} A) \wedge B\| = \|P_{[B]^\perp} A\| \|B\|$. (iv) Follows from Proposition 2.17ii, assuming w.l.o.g. $A = e_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_p$ and $B = f_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge f_q$ for associated principal bases of $[A]$ and $[B]$. (v) Assuming the same and $p \leq q$ (the case $p > q$ is similar), iii gives $\cos \Theta_{[A],[B]^\perp} = \|A \wedge B\| = \|e_1 \wedge f_1\| \cdots \|e_p \wedge f_p\| \|f_{p+1}\| \cdots \|f_q\| = \sin \theta_1 \cdots \sin \theta_p$. (vi) See [32]. (vii) Follows from iv and Proposition 2.17i. (viii) Follows from iv and Proposition 2.19. (ix) Follows from ii. (x) Follows from v and vi, as the θ_i 's do not depend on the order of the subspaces. \square

As blade norms measure volumes, i shows $\cos \Theta_{[A],[B]}$ (squared, in the complex case) gives the projection factor [33] by which volumes contract when orthogonally projected from $[A]$ to $[B]$. As x shows, the asymmetry of the angle between subspaces is broken (in a sense) by a \perp in one of them. In general, $\Theta_{[A],[B]^\perp} \neq \Theta_{[A]^\perp,[B]} \neq \frac{\pi}{2} - \Theta_{[A],[B]}$ (see Examples 4.19–4.20), and the relation between these angles is quite complicated [32].

3 Contractions

We will consider contractions between multivectors, but most of the theory adapts for the other kinds discussed in Appendix A.

Definition 3.1. The *left contraction* $M \lrcorner N$ of a *contractor* $M \in \bigwedge X$ on a *contractee* $N \in \bigwedge X$, and the *right contraction* $N \lrcorner M$ of N by M , are the unique elements of $\bigwedge X$ satisfying, for all $L \in \bigwedge X$,

$$\langle L, M \lrcorner N \rangle = \langle M \wedge L, N \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \langle L, N \lrcorner M \rangle = \langle L \wedge M, N \rangle. \quad (1)$$

Contractions are bilinear in the real case, but in the complex one they are conjugate-linear in the contractor and linear in the contractee. For simplicity, we often give results and proofs only for the left contraction, as they can be readily adapted for the right one.

Definition 3.2. For a proposition \mathbf{P} , let $\delta_{\mathbf{P}} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mathbf{P} \text{ is true,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$

Proposition 3.3. For an orthonormal basis (e_1, \dots, e_n) and $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{I}^n$,

$$e_{\mathbf{i}} \lrcorner e_{\mathbf{j}} = \delta_{\mathbf{i} \subset \mathbf{j}} \cdot \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}(\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i})} \cdot e_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}} \quad \text{and} \quad e_{\mathbf{j}} \lrcorner e_{\mathbf{i}} = \delta_{\mathbf{i} \subset \mathbf{j}} \cdot \epsilon_{(\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i})\mathbf{i}} \cdot e_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}}. \quad (2)$$

Proof. For $\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{I}^n$, $\langle e_{\mathbf{k}}, e_{\mathbf{i}} \lrcorner e_{\mathbf{j}} \rangle = \langle e_{\mathbf{i}} \wedge e_{\mathbf{k}}, e_{\mathbf{j}} \rangle$, which vanishes unless $\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{k} = \emptyset$ and $\mathbf{j} = [\mathbf{i}\mathbf{k}]$ (so $\mathbf{i} \subset \mathbf{j}$ and $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{j} - \mathbf{i}$), in which case it gives $\epsilon_{\mathbf{i}(\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i})}$. \square

This makes it easy to compute contractions in terms of orthonormal bases: $e_{\mathbf{i}} \lrcorner e_{\mathbf{j}}$ (resp. $e_{\mathbf{j}} \lrcorner e_{\mathbf{i}}$) vanishes if $\mathbf{i} \not\subset \mathbf{j}$, and if $\mathbf{i} \subset \mathbf{j}$ we simply move the elements of $e_{\mathbf{i}}$ to the left (resp. right) of $e_{\mathbf{j}}$ and cancel them.

Example 3.4. For (e_1, \dots, e_5) orthonormal, $[3e_{25} + (2+i)e_{34}] \lrcorner e_{1245} = 3e_{25} \lrcorner e_{1245} + (2-i)e_{34} \lrcorner e_{1245} = -3e_{25} \lrcorner e_{2514} + 0 = -3e_{14}$, and also $(e_4 + ie_{345}) \lrcorner e_{34} = e_4 \lrcorner e_{34} + ie_{345} \lrcorner e_{34} = 0 + ie_{534} \lrcorner e_{34} = ie_5$.

Proposition 3.5. Let $\lambda \in \bigwedge^0 X$, $G \in \bigwedge^p X$, $H \in \bigwedge^q X$, $L, M, N \in \bigwedge X$.

- i) $G \lrcorner H, H \lrcorner G \in \bigwedge^{q-p} X$.
- ii) If $p = q$ then $G \lrcorner H = H \lrcorner G = \langle G, H \rangle$.
- iii) If $p > q$ then $G \lrcorner H = H \lrcorner G = 0$.
- iv) $G \lrcorner H = (-1)^{p(q+1)} H \lrcorner G$.
- v) $\lambda \lrcorner M = \bar{\lambda}M$ and $M \lrcorner \lambda = \lambda \overline{\langle M \rangle_0}$.
- vi) If $N \in \bigwedge V$ for a subspace $V \subset X$ then $M \lrcorner N \in \bigwedge V$.
- vii) $L \lrcorner (M \lrcorner N) = (L \lrcorner M) \lrcorner N$.
- viii) $(M \lrcorner N)^\wedge = \hat{M} \lrcorner \hat{N}$, $(M \lrcorner N)^\sim = \check{M} \lrcorner \check{N}$, $(M \lrcorner N)^\sim = \tilde{N} \lrcorner \tilde{M}$ and $(M \lrcorner N)^- = \bar{N} \lrcorner \bar{M}$.

Proof. (i–v) By linearity, it is enough to prove these for elements of an induced orthonormal basis, in which case they follow from (2). (vi) Likewise, but the basis must extend one of V . (vii) For $K \in \bigwedge X$, $\langle K, L \lrcorner (M \lrcorner N) \rangle = \langle L \wedge K, M \lrcorner N \rangle = \langle L \wedge K \wedge N, M \rangle = \langle K \wedge N, L \lrcorner M \rangle = \langle K, (L \lrcorner M) \lrcorner N \rangle$. (viii) For $K \in \bigwedge X$, Proposition 2.15 gives $\langle K, (M \lrcorner N)^\sim \rangle = \langle \check{K}, M \lrcorner N \rangle = \langle M \wedge \check{K}, N \rangle = \langle K \wedge \tilde{M}, \tilde{N} \rangle = \langle K, \tilde{N} \lrcorner \tilde{M} \rangle$. The others are similar, except that \wedge and \sim do not reverse the order of K and M . \square

By i and ii, contractions generalize the inner product, giving a $(q-p)$ -vector instead of a scalar. By iii, they vanish if the contractor has larger grade, and are asymmetric: $M \lrcorner N \neq N \lrcorner M$. This allows more general results, as contractions vanish when appropriate. In contrast, results for Hestenes inner product, a symmetrized contraction, often have grade conditionals (see Appendix A.3). Note the specific combination of left–right contractions in vii, which lets us write simply $L \lrcorner M \lrcorner N$. As vi implies, in general $L \lrcorner (M \lrcorner N) \neq (L \lrcorner M) \lrcorner N$ (Proposition 3.26 gives an exception). In contrast to iv, in general $M \lrcorner N \neq \pm N \lrcorner M$. If an element is homogeneous we have $M \lrcorner H = H \lrcorner M^{\wedge q+1}$ and $G \lrcorner M = M^{\wedge p} \lrcorner \hat{G}$, but more generally left and right contractions are related by reversions, as in viii (note how M and N remain as contractor and contractee after switching places).

As \sim also reverses exterior products, applying it to a formula, distributing over all elements, and renaming them, we are led to:

Mirror Principle. *If a formula, in terms of exterior products, contractions and sums, is valid for any multivectors (or any homogeneous ones, or any blades), its mirror version, with all elements in reversed order, and switching left and right contractions, is also valid.*

This extends to formulas with regressive products or the stars of Section 4, or with ‘sideless’ operators that commute with $\tilde{\cdot}$, like $\hat{\cdot}$. It might include other elements, except that notations were not designed for this: e.g. projections would need a symmetric notation. It is best to add flexibility to the principle, allowing some elements to keep their order (learning which ones takes just a little practice): e.g. Hermitian products would need an asymmetric notation showing which entry is conjugate-linear (not the worst idea), but we opt not to switch the order of entries.

For example, the mirror of $(M \lrcorner N)^\wedge = \hat{M} \lrcorner \hat{N}$ is $(N \lrcorner M)^\wedge = \hat{N} \lrcorner \hat{M}$, obtained by applying $\tilde{\cdot}$ to find $(\tilde{N} \lrcorner \tilde{M})^\wedge = \hat{\tilde{N}} \lrcorner \hat{\tilde{M}}$, and relabeling $\tilde{M} \mapsto M$, $\tilde{N} \mapsto N$. The mirror of Proposition 3.6 below is $N \lrcorner (M \wedge L) = (N \lrcorner L) \lrcorner M$. In Proposition 3.5, it has a formula and its mirror, both with the same inner product order so it remains conjugate-linear on G , and $\tilde{\cdot}$ is its own mirror (with a proper relabeling).

An exterior product in the contractor leads to the following result.

Proposition 3.6. $(L \wedge M) \lrcorner N = M \lrcorner (L \lrcorner N)$, for $L, M, N \in \bigwedge X$.

Proof. For any $K \in \bigwedge X$ we have $\langle K, (L \wedge M) \lrcorner N \rangle = \langle L \wedge M \wedge K, N \rangle = \langle M \wedge K, L \lrcorner N \rangle = \langle K, M \lrcorner (L \lrcorner N) \rangle$. \square

The reordering of L and M reflects the fact that $M \lrcorner$ is the adjoint operator of $M \wedge$, by (1). Many authors define contractions in ways that avoid this, but cause other inconveniences (see Appendix A.2).

Corollary 3.7. $G \lrcorner (H \lrcorner M) = (-1)^{pq} H \lrcorner (G \lrcorner M)$, for $G \in \bigwedge^p X$, $H \in \bigwedge^q X$ and $M \in \bigwedge X$.

3.1 Graded Leibniz Rules

Exterior products in the contractee lead instead to the following results.

Proposition 3.8. For $v, w_1, \dots, w_k \in X$,

$$v \lrcorner (w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge w_k) = \sum_{i=1}^k (-1)^{i-1} w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \langle v, w_i \rangle \wedge \dots \wedge w_k. \quad (3)$$

Proof. For $v_1 = v$ and any $L = v_2 \wedge \dots \wedge v_k \in \bigwedge^{k-1} X$, Laplace expansion gives $\langle L, v \lrcorner (w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge w_k) \rangle = \langle v \wedge L, w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge w_k \rangle = \det(\langle v_i, w_j \rangle) = \sum_{i=1}^k (-1)^{i-1} \langle v, w_i \rangle \langle L, w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge w_{i-1} \wedge w_{i+1} \wedge \dots \wedge w_k \rangle$. \square

Note that the alternating sign is $+$ in the first term of the sum. For the right contraction, it is $+$ in the last term: $(w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge w_k) \lrcorner v = \sum_{i=1}^k (-1)^{k-i} w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \langle v, w_i \rangle \wedge \dots \wedge w_k$.

Example 3.9. For $v \in X$ and $B = w_1 \wedge w_2 \in \bigwedge^2 X$, we have $v \lrcorner B = \langle v, w_1 \rangle w_2 - \langle v, w_2 \rangle w_1$ and $B \lrcorner v = -\langle v, w_1 \rangle w_2 + \langle v, w_2 \rangle w_1$.

Proposition 3.10. For $v \in X$ and $M, N \in \bigwedge X$,

$$v \lrcorner (M \wedge N) = (v \lrcorner M) \wedge N + \hat{M} \wedge (v \lrcorner N). \quad (4)$$

Proof. By linearity, it is enough to prove (4) for blades $M = w_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge w_p$ and $N = w_{p+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge w_{p+q}$. By (3),

$$\begin{aligned} v \lrcorner (M \wedge N) &= \sum_{i=1}^p (-1)^{i-1} w_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \langle v, w_i \rangle \wedge \cdots \wedge w_p \wedge N \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=p+1}^{p+q} (-1)^{i-1} M \wedge w_{p+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \langle v, w_i \rangle \wedge \cdots \wedge w_{p+q} \\ &= (v \lrcorner M) \wedge N + (-1)^p M \wedge (v \lrcorner N). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

This is a graded Leibniz rule, so contraction by a vector v is a graded derivation of the exterior algebra. For the right contraction, $(M \wedge N) \lrcorner v = M \wedge (N \lrcorner v) + (M \lrcorner v) \wedge \hat{N}$. The notation makes the formulas look ‘natural’: as v ‘approaches’ $M \wedge N$ from either side, it applies $\hat{\cdot}$ on the element over which it ‘jumps’. Some authors switch left and right contractions, losing this (see Appendix A.2).

Proposition 3.11. For $v \in X$, disjoint subspaces $V, W \subset X$, and nonzero $M \in \bigwedge V$ and $N \in \bigwedge W$, we have $v \lrcorner (M \wedge N) = 0 \Leftrightarrow v \lrcorner M = v \lrcorner N = 0$.

Proof. (\Leftarrow) Follows from (4). (\Rightarrow) By (4), $(v \lrcorner M) \wedge N = -\hat{M} \wedge (v \lrcorner N)$, so if M is scalar the result is trivial. For bases $\beta_V = (e_1, \dots, e_p)$ and $\beta_W = (f_1, \dots, f_q)$, $\{e_i \wedge f_j\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}^p, j \in \mathcal{I}^q}$ is a basis of $\bigwedge(V \oplus W)$. If the largest grade in M is $r \neq 0$, it is at most $r - 1$ in $v \lrcorner M \in \bigwedge V$. So $(v \lrcorner M) \wedge N$ has no component with $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}^p$, but $\hat{M} \wedge (v \lrcorner N)$ has, unless $v \lrcorner N = 0$. We obtain $v \lrcorner M = 0$ in the same way. \square

Contraction by a p -blade B is a graded derivation of order p , and a higher-order graded Leibniz rule partitions B in all possible ways into two subblades (respecting a given decomposition into vectors), and contracts each into one of the elements of the contractee, with appropriate signs.

Definition 3.12. Given a decomposed blade $B = v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_q \in \bigwedge^q X$, let $B_{\mathbf{i}} = v_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{i_p}$ for $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_p) \in \mathcal{I}_p^q$, and $B_{\emptyset} = 1$. The \mathbf{i} -factorization of B , for $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}^q$, is $B = \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{i}'} B_{\mathbf{i}} \wedge B_{\mathbf{i}'}$.

Theorem 3.13. For $B = v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_p \in \bigwedge^p X$ and $M, N \in \bigwedge X$,

$$B \lrcorner (M \wedge N) = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}^p} \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{i}'} (B_{\mathbf{i}'} \lrcorner M^{\wedge|\mathbf{i}|}) \wedge (B_{\mathbf{i}} \lrcorner N). \quad (5)$$

Proof. For $p = 1$, it corresponds to (4). Suppose (5) is valid for $A = v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{p-1}$. By Proposition 3.6, $B \lrcorner (M \wedge N) = v_p \lrcorner [A \lrcorner (M \wedge N)] = v_p \lrcorner \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}^{p-1}} \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{i}'} (A_{\mathbf{i}'} \lrcorner M^{\wedge|\mathbf{i}|}) \wedge (A_{\mathbf{i}} \lrcorner N) = I + II$, where, by (4),

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}^{p-1}} \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{i}'} [v_p \lrcorner (A_{\mathbf{i}'} \lrcorner M^{\wedge|\mathbf{i}|})] \wedge (A_{\mathbf{i}} \lrcorner N) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}^{p-1}} \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{i}'} [(A_{\mathbf{i}'} \wedge v_p) \lrcorner M^{\wedge|\mathbf{i}|}] \wedge (A_{\mathbf{i}} \lrcorner N) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{I}^p, p \notin \mathbf{j}} \epsilon_{\mathbf{j}\mathbf{j}'} (B_{\mathbf{j}'} \lrcorner M^{\wedge|\mathbf{j}|}) \wedge (B_{\mathbf{j}} \lrcorner N), \end{aligned}$$

for $\mathbf{j} = \mathbf{i}$ and $\mathbf{j}' = \mathbf{i}' \cup p$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
II &= \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}^{p-1}} \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{i}'} (A_{\mathbf{i}'} \lrcorner M^{\wedge|\mathbf{i}|})^{\wedge} \wedge [v_p \lrcorner (A_{\mathbf{i}} \lrcorner N)] \\
&= \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}^{p-1}} \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{i}'} [(A_{\mathbf{i}'}^{\wedge} \lrcorner M^{\wedge|\mathbf{i}|+1}) \wedge [(A_{\mathbf{i}} \wedge v_p) \lrcorner N]] \\
&= \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{I}^p, p \in \mathbf{j}} \epsilon_{\mathbf{j}\mathbf{j}'} (B_{\mathbf{j}'} \lrcorner M^{\wedge|\mathbf{j}|}) \wedge (B_{\mathbf{j}} \lrcorner N),
\end{aligned}$$

for $\mathbf{j} = \mathbf{i} \cup p$ and $\mathbf{j}' = \mathbf{i}'$, since $(A_{\mathbf{i}'}^{\wedge})^{\wedge} = (-1)^{p-1-|\mathbf{i}|} A_{\mathbf{i}'}$ and Proposition 2.7 gives $(-1)^{p-1-|\mathbf{i}|} \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{i}'} = (-1)^{|\mathbf{i}|+1} \zeta_{|\mathbf{i}|} \cdot (-1)^p \xi_{\mathbf{i}} = \zeta_{|\mathbf{j}|} \cdot \xi_{\mathbf{j}} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{j}\mathbf{j}'}$. Adding I and II we find $B \lrcorner (M \wedge N) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{I}^p} \epsilon_{\mathbf{j}\mathbf{j}'} (B_{\mathbf{j}'} \lrcorner M^{\wedge|\mathbf{j}|}) \wedge (B_{\mathbf{j}} \lrcorner N)$. \square

For explicit calculations, we can use Proposition 2.7 to write

$$B \lrcorner (M \wedge N) = \sum_{k=0}^p \zeta_k \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_k^p} \xi_{\mathbf{i}} (B_{\mathbf{i}'} \lrcorner M^{\wedge k}) \wedge (B_{\mathbf{i}} \lrcorner N). \quad (6)$$

If $M \in \wedge^q X$ and $N \in \wedge^r X$, the first summation can be restricted to $\max\{0, p-q\} \leq k \leq r$, as the other terms vanish.

Example 3.14. Let $e_1, \dots, e_4 \in X$ and $M, N \in \wedge X$. For $B = e_{12} \in \wedge^2 X$, (6) gives, with Proposition 2.7,

$$\begin{aligned}
B \lrcorner (M \wedge N) &= + (e_{12} \lrcorner M) \wedge N \\
&\quad - [-(e_2 \lrcorner \hat{M}) \wedge (e_1 \lrcorner N) + (e_1 \lrcorner \hat{M}) \wedge (e_2 \lrcorner N)] \\
&\quad - [-M \wedge (e_{12} \lrcorner N)].
\end{aligned}$$

For $B = e_{1234} \in \wedge^4 X$ we have the following (the first 3 lines and the last one vanish if $M \in \wedge^2 X$ and $N \in \wedge^3 X$, for example):

$$\begin{aligned}
B \lrcorner (M \wedge N) &= + (e_{1234} \lrcorner M) \wedge N \\
&\quad - [-(e_{234} \lrcorner \hat{M}) \wedge (e_1 \lrcorner N) + (e_{134} \lrcorner \hat{M}) \wedge (e_2 \lrcorner N) \\
&\quad \quad - (e_{124} \lrcorner \hat{M}) \wedge (e_3 \lrcorner N) + (e_{123} \lrcorner \hat{M}) \wedge (e_4 \lrcorner N)] \\
&\quad - [-(e_{34} \lrcorner M) \wedge (e_{12} \lrcorner N) + (e_{24} \lrcorner M) \wedge (e_{13} \lrcorner N) \\
&\quad \quad - (e_{23} \lrcorner M) \wedge (e_{14} \lrcorner N) - (e_{14} \lrcorner M) \wedge (e_{23} \lrcorner N) \\
&\quad \quad + (e_{13} \lrcorner M) \wedge (e_{24} \lrcorner N) - (e_{12} \lrcorner M) \wedge (e_{34} \lrcorner N)] \\
&\quad + [(e_4 \lrcorner \hat{M}) \wedge (e_{123} \lrcorner N) - (e_3 \lrcorner \hat{M}) \wedge (e_{124} \lrcorner N) \\
&\quad \quad + (e_2 \lrcorner \hat{M}) \wedge (e_{134} \lrcorner N) - (e_1 \lrcorner \hat{M}) \wedge (e_{234} \lrcorner N)] \\
&\quad + M \wedge (e_{1234} \lrcorner N).
\end{aligned}$$

A slightly different formulation of (5), with $B_{\mathbf{i}}$ and $B_{\mathbf{i}'}$ swapped, and $|\mathbf{i}'|$ grade involutions outside the bracket, can be convenient at times:

$$B \lrcorner (M \wedge N) = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}^p} \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{i}'} (B_{\mathbf{i}} \lrcorner M)^{\wedge|\mathbf{i}'|} \wedge (B_{\mathbf{i}'} \lrcorner N).$$

3.2 Inner Product and Determinant Formulas

Another generalization of (3) expands the contraction of a p -vector H on a blade B via inner products of H with all p -subblades of B (respecting a given decomposition), each leaving a complementary subblade.

Proposition 3.15. *Given a decomposed blade $B = w_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge w_q \in \bigwedge^q X$ and $H \in \bigwedge^p X$, with $0 \leq p \leq q$,*

$$H \lrcorner B = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_p^q} \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{i}'} \langle H, B_{\mathbf{i}} \rangle B_{\mathbf{i}'} \quad \text{and} \quad B \lrcorner H = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_p^q} \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{i}'} \langle H, B_{\mathbf{i}'} \rangle B_{\mathbf{i}}. \quad (7)$$

Proof. By linearity, we can assume H is a blade. For a blade $A \in \bigwedge^{q-p} X$, $\langle A, H \lrcorner B \rangle = \langle H \wedge A, B \rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_p^q} \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{i}'} \langle H, B_{\mathbf{i}} \rangle \langle A, B_{\mathbf{i}'} \rangle$, by Laplace expansion. The right contraction is similar. \square

Example 3.16. For $H \in \bigwedge^2 X$ and $B = w_1 \wedge w_2 \wedge w_3 \in \bigwedge^3 X$,

$$H \lrcorner B = \langle H, w_1 \wedge w_2 \rangle w_3 - \langle H, w_1 \wedge w_3 \rangle w_2 + \langle H, w_2 \wedge w_3 \rangle w_1. \quad (8)$$

While (7) gives contractions as sums of subblades, the next result expands them in an induced basis (which does not need to be orthogonal). Still, unless the determinants below can be computed efficiently (as when they are sparse), it may be easier to expand the subblades in (7).

Proposition 3.17. *If $A = v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_p \in \bigwedge^p X$, $B = w_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge w_q \in \bigwedge^q X$, with $p \leq q$, and $w_i = \sum_{j=1}^n w_{ij} e_j$ for a basis (e_1, \dots, e_n) of X ,*

$$A \lrcorner B = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{I}_{q-p}^n \\ \mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_{q-p})}} \begin{vmatrix} \langle v_1, w_1 \rangle & \cdots & \langle v_p, w_1 \rangle & w_{1j_1} & \cdots & w_{1j_{q-p}} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \langle v_1, w_q \rangle & \cdots & \langle v_p, w_q \rangle & w_{qj_1} & \cdots & w_{qj_{q-p}} \end{vmatrix} e_{\mathbf{j}}.$$

Proof. Follows from (7) and Laplace expansion, as $\langle A, B_{\mathbf{i}} \rangle$ is the minor of the above matrix formed with the first p columns and rows given by \mathbf{i} , and writing $\mathbf{i}' = (i'_1, \dots, i'_{q-p})$ we have $B_{\mathbf{i}'} = w_{i'_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge w_{i'_{q-p}} = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{I}_{q-p}^n} b_{\mathbf{i}'\mathbf{j}} e_{\mathbf{j}}$, where $b_{\mathbf{i}'\mathbf{j}} = \det(w_{ij})_{i \in \mathbf{i}', j \in \mathbf{j}}$ equals the complementary minor. \square

Example 3.18. Let $A = v_1 \wedge v_2$ and $B = w_1 \wedge w_2 \wedge w_3$ for $v_1 = i - j$, $v_2 = i - 2k$, $w_1 = 2i + k$, $w_2 = j + k$ and $w_3 = i + j + 3k$, in the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^3 . Then $v_1 \lrcorner B = \begin{vmatrix} 2 & 2 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{vmatrix} i \wedge j + \begin{vmatrix} 2 & 2 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 3 \end{vmatrix} i \wedge k + \begin{vmatrix} 2 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 3 \end{vmatrix} j \wedge k = 3i \wedge k + 3j \wedge k$ and $A \lrcorner B = \begin{vmatrix} 2 & 0 & 2 \\ -1 & -2 & 0 \\ 0 & -5 & 1 \end{vmatrix} i + \begin{vmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & -2 & 1 \\ 0 & -5 & 1 \end{vmatrix} j + \begin{vmatrix} 2 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & -2 & 1 \\ 0 & -5 & 3 \end{vmatrix} k = 6i + 6j + 3k$. By (3) and (8), $v_1 \lrcorner B = 2w_2 \wedge w_3 - (-1)w_1 \wedge w_3 + 0w_1 \wedge w_2$ and $A \lrcorner B = \begin{vmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ -1 & -2 \end{vmatrix} w_3 - \begin{vmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & -5 \end{vmatrix} w_2 + \begin{vmatrix} -1 & -2 \\ 0 & -5 \end{vmatrix} w_1$, and expanding the w 's we find the same results.

3.3 Geometric Properties

Proposition 3.19. *Let $M, N \in \bigwedge X$.*

- i) *If $M \lrcorner N$ then $M \lrcorner N = 0$.*
- ii) *If $M \perp\!\!\!\perp N$ then $M \lrcorner N = \overline{\langle M \rangle_0} N$.*

Proof. Proposition 2.25 lets us assume M and N are blades. (i) We can also assume $M = v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_p$ and $N = w_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge w_q$ with $p \leq q$ and $\langle v_1, w_j \rangle = 0 \forall j$. For any $(q-p)$ -blade $L = v_{p+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_q$ ($= 1$ if $p = q$), $\langle L, M \lrcorner N \rangle = \langle M \wedge L, N \rangle = \det(\langle v_i, w_j \rangle) = 0$, so $M \lrcorner N = 0$. (ii) Follows from Proposition 2.21 and i, for non-scalars, or from Proposition 3.5v. \square

The converse of i holds for blades (see Theorem 3.24), but not in general, as the following example shows.

Example 3.20. Let $M = e_{12} + e_{34}$ and $N = e_{12} - e_{34}$, for (e_1, \dots, e_4) orthonormal. Then $M \lrcorner N = 0$, but $M \not\lrcorner N$ (as M does not factor).

Corollary 3.21. Let $L, M, N \in \bigwedge X$ and $H \in \bigwedge^p X$.

- i) If $L \perp\!\!\!\perp N$ then $L \lrcorner (M \wedge N) = (L \lrcorner M) \wedge N$.
- ii) If $H \perp\!\!\!\perp M$ then $H \lrcorner (M \wedge N) = M^{\wedge p} \wedge (H \lrcorner N)$.

Proof. (i) Propositions 2.25 and 3.5v let us assume $L = B$ is a non-scalar blade. Then, in (5), $B_i \lrcorner N = 0$ for all $i \neq \emptyset$. (ii) Similar. \square

Proposition 3.22. Given nonzero blades A and B , and PO- and OP-factorizations of B w.r.t. A , $A \lrcorner B = \langle A, B_P \rangle B_\perp = \|A\| \|B\| \cos \Theta_{A, B} B_\perp$ and $B \lrcorner A = \langle A, B_P \rangle B'_\perp = \|A\| \|B\| \cos \Theta_{A, B} B'_\perp$.

Proof. As $A \perp\!\!\!\perp B_\perp$, if $|A| \leq |B|$ then $A \lrcorner B = A \lrcorner (B_P \wedge B_\perp) = (A \lrcorner B_P) B_\perp = \langle A, B_P \rangle B_\perp$, and otherwise all terms are 0. \square

This links the asymmetries of contractions and $\Theta_{A, B}$, and shows a contraction of blades is a blade: $A \lrcorner B$ takes an inner product of A with a subblade of B where it projects, leaving a completely orthogonal subblade.

Proposition 3.23. Given blades A and B with $A \lrcorner B \neq 0$, we have $B = \frac{P_B A}{\|P_B A\|^2} \wedge (A \lrcorner B) = (B \lrcorner A) \wedge \frac{P_B A}{\|P_B A\|^2}$.

Proof. By Proposition 2.28iii, $(P_B A) \wedge (A \lrcorner B) = \frac{\langle B_P, A \rangle}{\|B\|^2} B_P \wedge \langle A, B_P \rangle B_\perp = \frac{|\langle B_P, A \rangle|^2}{\|B\|^2} B = \|P_B A\|^2 B$, and $P_B A \neq 0$ by Propositions 2.30i and 3.22. \square

We can now give a full geometric characterization of contractions (Fig. 2). Previous descriptions in GA (e.g. [13, p. 76], [31, p. 45]) gave the orientation only for a vector and a 2-blade, possibly because it is less immediate for GA contractions (see Appendix A.3).

Theorem 3.24. For nonzero blades $A \in \bigwedge^p X$ and $B \in \bigwedge^q X$, $A \lrcorner B \Leftrightarrow A \lrcorner B = B \lrcorner A = 0$. Otherwise these are the only $(q-p)$ -blades with:

- i) $[A \lrcorner B] = [B \lrcorner A] = [A]^\perp \cap [B]$;
- ii) $\|A \lrcorner B\| = \|B \lrcorner A\| = \|A\| \|B\| \cos \Theta_{[A], [B]} = \|P_B A\| \|B\|$;
- iii) $(P_B A) \wedge (A \lrcorner B)$ and $(B \lrcorner A) \wedge (P_B A)$ have the orientation of B .

Proof. Follows from Proposition 3.22, with Proposition 2.30viii for $A \lrcorner B$, otherwise with Propositions 2.28iv, 2.30i and 3.23. \square

We note that i allows a nice reformulation of the Gram-Schmidt process using contractions [39, p. 65].




Figure 2: Contractions remove from a 2-blade B the direction where a vector A projects, leaving a subblade orthogonal to it, such that the rectangles are similar, with same orientations. PO- and OP-factorizations of B were chosen to aid visualization, another choice would switch the signs of B_P , B_\perp and B'_\perp .

3.4 Triple Products

Triple products combine contractions or exterior products of 3 elements. Some, with a repeated blade, give orthogonal projections.

Lemma 3.25. *Let (e_1, \dots, e_n) be orthonormal, and $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{I}^n$.*

- i) *If $\mathbf{j} \subset \mathbf{k}$ then $(e_j \lrcorner e_i) \lrcorner e_k = (P_{e_j} e_i) \wedge (e_j \lrcorner e_k)$.*
- ii) *If $\mathbf{i} \subset \mathbf{k}$ then $(e_j \lrcorner e_i) \lrcorner e_k = e_i \wedge (e_j \lrcorner e_k)$.*
- iii) *$e_i \lrcorner (e_j \lrcorner e_i) = (e_i \lrcorner e_j) \lrcorner e_i = e_j \cdot \delta_{i \subset j}$.*
- iv) *$e_i \lrcorner (e_i \wedge e_j) = e_j \cdot \delta_{i \subset j}$.*
- v) *$e_i \wedge (e_i \lrcorner e_j) = e_j \cdot \delta_{i \subset j}$.*
- vi) *$(e_i \lrcorner e_j) \lrcorner e_i = (e_j \lrcorner e_i) \wedge e_i = e_j \cdot \delta_{i=j}$.*

Proof. (i) Both sides vanish unless $\mathbf{i} \subset \mathbf{j}$. In this case $\mathbf{j} = [\mathbf{i}l]$ and $\mathbf{k} = [\mathbf{i}lm]$ for $\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{I}^n$, so Propositions 2.5 and 3.3 give $(e_j \lrcorner e_i) \lrcorner e_k = \epsilon_{il} e_l \lrcorner e_k = \epsilon_{il} \epsilon_{lm} e_l e_m = \epsilon_{[il]m} e_l \wedge e_m = e_l \wedge (e_j \lrcorner e_k) = (P_{e_j} e_i) \wedge (e_j \lrcorner e_k)$. (ii) Follows from i, since, as $\mathbf{i} \subset \mathbf{k}$, both sides vanish unless $\mathbf{i} \subset \mathbf{j} \subset \mathbf{k}$. (iii) If $\mathbf{i} = [\mathbf{j}l]$ for $\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{I}^n$ then $e_i \lrcorner (e_j \lrcorner e_i) = \epsilon_{jl} e_l \lrcorner e_i = \epsilon_{jl}^2 e_j = e_j$, otherwise $e_j \lrcorner e_i = 0$. Likewise for $(e_i \lrcorner e_j) \lrcorner e_i$. (iv) Follows from Corollary 3.21i if $\mathbf{i} \subset \mathbf{j}'$, otherwise $e_i \wedge e_j = 0$. (v) If $\mathbf{j} = [\mathbf{i}l]$ for $\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{I}^n$ then $e_i \wedge (e_i \lrcorner e_j) = \epsilon_{il} e_l \wedge e_i = e_j$, otherwise $e_i \lrcorner e_j = 0$. (vi) All terms are 0 if $\mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{j}$. \square

Given $B \in \wedge X$ and a subspace $V \subset X$, we write $B \wedge \wedge V$ to denote the subspace $\{B \wedge N : N \in \wedge V\} \subset \wedge X$. Note that $B \wedge \wedge X = B \wedge \wedge ([B]^\perp)$.

Proposition 3.26. *Let $L, M, N \in \wedge X$, $A \in \wedge X$ be a blade and B be a unit p -blade.*

- i) *If $A \subset N$ then $(A \lrcorner L) \lrcorner N = (P_A L) \wedge (A \lrcorner N)$.*
- ii) *If $L \subset N$ then $(M \lrcorner L) \lrcorner N = L \wedge (M \lrcorner N)$.*
- iii) *$B \lrcorner M \lrcorner B = P_B M$.*
- iv) *$B \lrcorner (B \wedge M) = P_{[B]^\perp} M$.*
- v) *$B \wedge (B \lrcorner M) = \mathcal{P}_{B \wedge \wedge X} M$.*
- vi) *$(B \lrcorner M) \lrcorner B = (M \lrcorner B) \wedge B = P_B \langle M \rangle_p = \mathcal{P}_{\wedge^p [B]} M$, in the real case.*




Figure 3: Two views of Proposition 3.27 for a vector $v = B$ and a blade $A = M$. Horizontal rectangles are congruent and represent the same blade.

Proof. (i) Definition 2.10 and linearity let us assume $N \neq 0$ is a blade with $[A] \subset [N]$. Extending an orthonormal basis of $[A]$ to $[N]$ and X , linearity lets us assume $L = e_i$, $A = e_j$ and $N = e_k$ for $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{I}^n$, $\mathbf{j} \subset \mathbf{k}$. The result follows from Lemma 3.25. (ii) Similar, extending a basis from $[L]$ to $[N]$ and X we can assume $L = e_i$, $M = e_j$ and $N = e_k$ with $\mathbf{i} \subset \mathbf{k}$. (iii–vi) Similar, extending from $[B]$ to X , so $B = e_i$ and $M = e_j$. The δ 's in Lemma 3.25 pick the components for the projections above. \square

Note the particular combination of right–left contractions in iii, and that $B \lrcorner (M \lrcorner B) = (B \lrcorner M) \lrcorner B$ only due to the B 's. The products in vi coincide for the same reason, and in the complex case they are conjugate-linear in M , giving $\langle (M)_p, B \rangle B$ instead of a projection. Other products are proven similarly, like $(M \lrcorner B) \lrcorner B = P_B M^{\wedge (|B|+1)}$; $B \lrcorner (M \lrcorner B) = \overline{\langle M \rangle}_0$; and $B \lrcorner M \lrcorner B = \lambda^2 M$ if $B = \lambda$ is scalar, vanishing otherwise.

The following cases of v merit a separate presentation.

Proposition 3.27. *Let $v, w \in X$ with $\|v\| = 1$, $M \in \bigwedge X$, and $A_P \wedge A_\perp$ be a PO-factorization of a q -blade $A \neq 0$ w.r.t. a unit p -blade B .*

- i) $v \wedge (v \lrcorner w) = P_v w$.
- ii) $v \wedge (v \lrcorner M) = M - P_{[v]^\perp} M$.
- iii) $B \wedge (B \lrcorner A) = P_{B \wedge A_\perp} A$ if $p \leq q$, otherwise it vanishes.
- iv) $B \wedge (B \lrcorner M) = M$ if $B \subset M$.

Proof. (i) $v \wedge (v \lrcorner w) = \langle v, w \rangle v = P_v w$. (ii) By Proposition 3.26iv, $P_{[v]^\perp} M = v \lrcorner (v \wedge M) = M - v \wedge (v \lrcorner M)$. (iii) For $p \leq q$, Proposition 3.22 gives $B \wedge (B \lrcorner A) = \langle B, A_P \rangle B \wedge A_\perp = (P_B A_P) \wedge A_\perp = P_{B \wedge A_\perp} A$. (iv) Follows from iii, as Definition 2.10 and linearity let us assume $M = A \neq 0$ is a blade, and $[A] = [A_P \wedge A_\perp] = [B \wedge A_\perp]$, as $B \subset A$. \square

Fig. 3 shows ii and iii coincide for a vector and a blade. The relevance of $[B \wedge A_\perp]$ is that [32] it minimizes $\Theta_{V, [A]}$ among all subspaces $V \supset [B]$. We also have $P_{B \wedge A_\perp} A = \|A\| \cos \Theta_{B, A} B \wedge A_\perp$.

4 Star Operators

Hodge-like star operators can be defined by contraction with an orientation element (also called a *unit pseudoscalar* or *volume element*).

Definition 4.1. An *orientation (element)* of X is a unit $\Omega \in \bigwedge^n X$, where $n = \dim X$.

An orthonormal basis $\beta_X = (e_1, \dots, e_n)$ gives $\Omega = e_{1\dots n}$, and another β'_X gives $\Omega' = \epsilon \Omega$ for $\epsilon = \det T$, where T is the basis change map. In the real case $\epsilon = \pm 1$, but in the complex one $\epsilon = e^{i\varphi}$ ($\varphi \in \mathbb{R}$).

While a real vector space has a choice of 2 orientations $\pm\Omega$, a complex structure fixes a canonical (real) orientation $\Omega_{\mathbb{R}} \in \bigwedge^{2n} X_{\mathbb{R}}$ in the underlying real space $X_{\mathbb{R}}$, and so some authors say a complex space is naturally oriented, or non-orientable (as orientable involves a choice of orientations). Our approach is unusual: as Ω is any unit complex n -vector, we have a continuum of complex orientations, the unit circle in $\bigwedge^n X$.

Definition 4.2. For an orientation $\Omega \in \bigwedge^n X$, we define *left and right star operators* $\star : \bigwedge X \rightarrow \bigwedge X$, respectively, by ${}^*M = \Omega \lrcorner M$ and $M^* = M \lrcorner \Omega$, for $M \in \bigwedge X$, and call *M and M^* *left and right duals* of M .

These operators are linear (conjugate-linear, in the complex case) and map p -blades to $(n - p)$ -blades. Whenever we use them, it is implicit an orientation Ω has been chosen. Note that the left star uses a right contraction, and vice-versa (the star is on the same side as Ω). If necessary, we write \star_L and \star_R to distinguish left and right stars. By convention, stars take precedence over products: e.g. $M \wedge N^*$ means $M \wedge (N^*)$.

Example 4.3. If \star is the star for the orientation $\Omega = e_{1234}$ of an orthonormal basis (e_1, \dots, e_4) then $e_1^* = e_{234} = -{}^*e_1$, $e_2^* = -e_{134} = -{}^*e_2$, $e_{12}^* = e_{34} = {}^*e_{12}$, $e_{34}^* = e_{12} = {}^*e_{34}$, $e_{234}^* = -e_1 = -{}^*e_{234}$, etc.

In the real case, our right dual M^* is similar to the Hodge dual $*M$ [1, 25] (usually defined for forms) and the GA dual M^* [13] (up to a grade dependent sign). Also, our *M and M^* correspond, respectively, to $*M$ and M^* in [39], and to $*M$ and *M in [41].

The usual complex Hodge star, useful for analysis in complex spaces [45], is a \mathbb{C} -linear² extension of the star from $X_{\mathbb{R}}$ to its complexification $(X_{\mathbb{R}})^{\mathbb{C}}$, mapping a \mathbb{C} -valued \mathbb{R} -linear p -form ($p \leq 2n$, if n is the complex dimension) to a \mathbb{C} -valued \mathbb{R} -linear $(2n - p)$ -form. Our complex stars are different, and better suited for the geometry of complex spaces, since they relate complex p - and $(n - p)$ -blades representing \mathbb{C} -orthogonal (w.r.t. Hermitian product) complex subspaces, as we show.

Proposition 4.4. For a nonzero p -blade $B \in \bigwedge^p X$, *B and B^* are the unique $(n - p)$ -blades such that:

- i) $[{}^*B] = [B^*] = [B]^{\perp}$.
- ii) $\|{}^*B\| = \|B^*\| = \|B\|$.
- iii) ${}^*B \wedge B$ and $B \wedge B^*$ have the same orientation as Ω .

Proof. Follows from Theorem 3.24. □

²Sometimes conjugate-linear, in which case some authors use the notation $\bar{*}$.

Note that $[0^*] = [0] \neq [0]^\perp$.

Proposition 4.5. *Let $M \in \wedge X$, and \star be the star for an orientation Ω .*

- i) $M^* = \epsilon M^*$ if $*$ is the star for $\epsilon\Omega$, where ϵ is a unit scalar.*
- ii) $(M^*)^\smile = (\check{M})^{\check{\star}} = (\check{M})^{\check{\star}}$, where $\check{\star}$ is the star for $\check{\Omega} = \Omega$.*
- iii) $(M^*)^\smile = (\hat{M})^{\hat{\star}} = (-1)^n (\hat{M})^{\hat{\star}}$, where $\hat{\star}$ is the star for $\hat{\Omega}$.*
- iv) $(M^*)^\smile = \bar{\star}(\check{M}) = (-1)^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} \bar{\star}(\check{M})$, where $\bar{\star}$ is the star for $\bar{\Omega}$.*
- v) $(M^*)^\smile = \bar{\star}(\bar{M}) = (-1)^{\frac{n(n+1)}{2}} \bar{\star}(\bar{M})$, where $\bar{\star}$ is the star for $\bar{\Omega}$.*

Proof. (i) Immediate. (ii) Propositions 2.15vii and 3.5viii give $(M^*)^\smile = (M \lrcorner \Omega)^\smile = \check{M} \lrcorner \check{\Omega} = \check{M} \lrcorner \Omega = (\check{M})^{\check{\star}}$. (iii-v) Similar, using i as well. \square

Mirror versions, with left and right stars switched, also hold.

Proposition 4.6. *Let (e_1, \dots, e_n) be an orthonormal basis of X , \star be the star for $\Omega = e_{1\dots n}$, $M \in \wedge X$ and $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}^n$.*

- i) $\star 1 = 1^\star = \Omega$ and $^\star \Omega = \Omega^\star = 1$.*
- ii) $e_{\mathbf{i}}^\star = \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{i}'} e_{\mathbf{i}'}$ and $^\star e_{\mathbf{i}} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{i}'} e_{\mathbf{i}'}$.*
- iii) $^\star M^\star = M$.*
- iv) $^\star M = M^{\star\star} = \check{M}$.*
- v) $^\star M = \check{M}^\star$.*
- vi) $\star_L = \star_R$ and $\star^2 = \mathbb{1}$ on $\wedge^+ X$, and on $\wedge X$ if n is odd.*

Proof. (i) Immediate. (ii) Follows from (2). (iii) Follows from Proposition 3.26iii. (iv) Follows by linearity, as $^\star e_{\mathbf{i}} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{i}'} e_{\mathbf{i}'}$ and $e_{\mathbf{i}}^\star = (-1)^{|\mathbf{i}|\mathbf{i}'(n-|\mathbf{i}'|)} e_{\mathbf{i}'}$. (v) $^\star M = M^{\star\star} = \check{M}$. (vi) Follows from Proposition 2.15vii. \square

As \star_L and \star_R are similar, we could use just one (as usual for the Hodge star), but using both simplifies the algebra. By iii, they are mutual inverses, and this implies, as usual, that all $(n-1)$ -vectors are blades. By vi, when n is even (resp. odd) \star is an involution of $\wedge^+ X$ (resp. $\wedge X$).

Proposition 4.7. *Let $M, N \in \wedge X$.*

- i) $(M \wedge N)^\star = N \lrcorner M^\star$.*
- ii) $(M \lrcorner N)^\star = N \wedge M^\star$.*
- iii) $M^\star \lrcorner N^\star = M \lrcorner N$.*
- iv) $\langle M^\star, N^\star \rangle = \langle N, M \rangle$.*

Proof. (i) $(M \wedge N)^\star = (M \wedge N) \lrcorner \Omega = N \lrcorner (M \lrcorner \Omega) = N \lrcorner M^\star$. (ii) With the mirror of i, $(M \lrcorner N)^\star = (^\star M^\star \lrcorner N)^\star = (^\star (N \wedge M^\star))^\star = N \wedge M^\star$. (iii) $M^\star \lrcorner N^\star = (^\star M \lrcorner ^\star N)^\smile = (^\star M \lrcorner ^\star N)^{\star\star} = (^\star N \wedge M)^\smile = M \lrcorner N$. (iv) As elements of distinct grades are orthogonal, we can assume $M, N \in \wedge^p X$, so that $\langle M^\star, N^\star \rangle = N^\star \lrcorner M^\star = N \lrcorner M = \langle N, M \rangle$. \square

Mirror formulas are ${}^*(M \wedge N) = {}^*N \lrcorner M$, ${}^*(M \lrcorner N) = {}^*N \wedge M$, ${}^*M \lrcorner {}^*N = M \lrcorner N$ and $\langle {}^*M, {}^*N \rangle = \langle N, M \rangle$. Proposition 4.6v allows other formulations, like $(M \lrcorner N)^* = N^* \wedge M$. Though stars can turn wedges into contractions and vice-versa, and switch left and right contractions, one must pay attention to the sides. The complex case gives a way to avoid some mistakes: e.g., clearly ${}^*(M \wedge N) \neq {}^*M \lrcorner N$, as only the left side is conjugate-linear on M and N .

By iv, stars are orthogonal (anti-unitary, in the complex case) operators, giving isometries (anti-isometries, in the complex case) between $\bigwedge^p X$ and $\bigwedge^{n-p} X$. It implies $\langle M^*, N \rangle = \langle {}^*N, M \rangle$, which, in the real case, means \star_L is the adjoint of \star_R (if n is odd, \star is self-adjoint).

Corollary 4.8. $\|{}^*M\| = \|M^*\| = \|M\|$, for $M \in \bigwedge X$.

Corollary 4.9. $G \wedge H^* = \langle H, G \rangle \Omega$, for $G, H \in \bigwedge^p X$.

Some authors use this to define stars, or to, given a star, determine an inner product by $\langle G, H \rangle = (G \wedge H^*)^*$.

Example 4.10. In \mathbb{R}^3 , oriented by $\hat{i} \wedge \hat{j} \wedge \hat{k}$, the cross product is $u \times v = (u \wedge v)^* = v \lrcorner u^* = v^* \lrcorner u$. The usual triple product is $\langle u, v \times w \rangle = u \lrcorner (v \wedge w)^* = (u \wedge v \wedge w)^*$, whose modulus is the volume of $u \wedge v \wedge w$. We easily obtain other formulas, like $u \times (v \times w) = (v \times w)^* \lrcorner u = (v \wedge w) \lrcorner u = \langle u, w \rangle v - \langle u, v \rangle w$, and $\langle u \times v, w \times y \rangle = \langle (u \wedge v)^*, (w \wedge y)^* \rangle = \langle u \wedge v, w \wedge y \rangle = \langle u, w \rangle \langle v, y \rangle - \langle u, y \rangle \langle v, w \rangle$.

Stars with respect to blades of subspaces are also useful at times.

Definition 4.11. For a unit blade $B \in \bigwedge X$, we define left and right stars $\star_B : \bigwedge X \rightarrow \bigwedge[B]$ by ${}^{\star_B}M = B \lrcorner M$ and $M^{\star_B} = M \lrcorner B$, for $M \in \bigwedge X$, and call ${}^{\star_B}M$ and M^{\star_B} *left and right duals of M w.r.t. B* .

Proposition 4.12. Let $M, N \in \bigwedge X$, and A, B be blades with $\|B\| = 1$.

- i) If $M \subset B$ then $M^* = M^{\star_B} \wedge B^*$.
- ii) $M^{\star_B} = (P_B M)^{\star_B}$.
- iii) $(M \wedge N)^{\star_B} = N \lrcorner M^{\star_B}$.
- iv) If $A \subset B$ then $(A \lrcorner N)^{\star_B} = (P_A N) \wedge A^{\star_B}$.
- v) If $N \subset B$ then $(M \lrcorner N)^{\star_B} = N \wedge M^{\star_B}$.

Proof. (i) By Propositions 4.4i and 4.9, $M \perp B^*$ and $B \wedge B^* = \Omega$, so $M^* = M \lrcorner (B \wedge B^*) = (M \lrcorner B) \wedge B^*$. (ii) By Proposition 3.26iii, $(P_B M)^{\star_B} = (B \lrcorner M \lrcorner B) \lrcorner B = B \lrcorner (M \lrcorner B) \lrcorner B = P_B(M^{\star_B}) = M^{\star_B}$. (iii) Immediate. (v, iv) Follow from Proposition 3.26. \square

Also, \star_B has in $\bigwedge[B]$ properties like those of \star (but with $\wedge^{(|B|+1)}$ instead of \wedge), and with ii they generalize to $\bigwedge X$: ${}^{\star_B}M^{\star_B} = P_B M$, $M^{\star_B \star_B} = P_B M^{\wedge(|B|+1)}$, $M^{\star_B} = {}^{\star_B}M^{\wedge(|B|+1)}$, $M^{\star_B} \lrcorner N^{\star_B} = P_B M \lrcorner P_B N$, $\langle M^{\star_B}, N^{\star_B} \rangle = \langle P_B N, P_B M \rangle$, etc.

4.1 Regressive Product

Star duality gives a regressive product dual to the exterior one. These two are the basic products of the Grassmann-Cayley algebra [46] (in which, however, their symbols are usually swapped).

Definition 4.13. The *regressive product* $M \vee N$ of $M, N \in \bigwedge X$ is given by $(M \vee N)^* = M^* \wedge N^*$.

It is bilinear and associative, and $(M \wedge N)^* = M^* \vee N^*$ as well.

Proposition 4.14. Let $G \in \bigwedge^p X$, $H \in \bigwedge^q X$, $M, N \in \bigwedge X$, (e_1, \dots, e_n) be an orthonormal basis, and $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{I}^n$.

- i) $G \vee H \in \bigwedge^{p+q-n} X$.
- ii) If $p + q < n$ then $G \vee H = 0$.
- iii) $G \vee H = (-1)^{(n-p)(n-q)} H \vee G$.
- iv) $M \lrcorner N^* = N^* \vee M^*$.
- v) $*M \lrcorner N = N \vee M$.
- vi) $e_i \vee e_j = \delta_{\mathbf{i} \cup \mathbf{j} = 1 \dots n} \cdot \epsilon_{(\mathbf{i}-\mathbf{j})(\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i})} \cdot e_{\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{j}}$.

Proof. (i–iii) Immediate. (iv) Follows from Proposition 4.7i. (v) By iv, $*M \lrcorner *N^* = *N^* \vee *M^*$. (vi) By v, $e_i \vee e_j = *e_j \lrcorner e_i = \epsilon_{j' \mathbf{j}} e_{j'} \lrcorner e_i = \delta_{j' \subset \mathbf{i}} \epsilon_{j' \mathbf{j}} \epsilon_{j'(\mathbf{i}-j')} e_{\mathbf{i}-j'} = \delta_{\mathbf{i} \cup \mathbf{j} = 1 \dots n} \epsilon_{(\mathbf{i}-\mathbf{j})\mathbf{j}} \epsilon_{(\mathbf{i}-\mathbf{j})(\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{j})} e_{\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{j}}$. The result follows since $\epsilon_{(\mathbf{i}-\mathbf{j})\mathbf{j}} = \epsilon_{(\mathbf{i}-\mathbf{j})[(\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{j})(\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i})]} = \epsilon_{(\mathbf{i}-\mathbf{j})(\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{j})} \epsilon_{(\mathbf{i}-\mathbf{j})(\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i})}$. \square

For nonzero blades, $A \wedge B \neq 0 \Leftrightarrow [A] \cap [B] = \{0\}$, in which case $[A \wedge B] = [A] \oplus [B]$. The next result dualizes this, and shows the regressive product computes ‘non-accidental’ intersections, i.e. of subspaces that are too large (dimension-wise) to fit in X without intercepting.

Proposition 4.15. For nonzero blades, $A \vee B \neq 0 \Leftrightarrow [A] + [B] = X$, in which case $A \vee B$ is a blade with $[A \vee B] = [A] \cap [B]$.

Proof. $(A \vee B)^* = A^* \wedge B^* \neq 0 \Leftrightarrow \{0\} = [A^*] \cap [B^*] = ([A] + [B])^\perp$. And if $A \vee B = *B \lrcorner A \neq 0$ then $[A \vee B] = [A] \cap [B]^\perp = [A] \cap [B]$. \square

Theorem 4.16. $\|A \vee B\| = \|A\| \|B\| \cos \Theta_{[A]^\perp, [B]}$ for blades $A, B \in \bigwedge X$.

Proof. By Proposition 2.30iii, $\|A \vee B\| = \|(A \vee B)^*\| = \|A^* \wedge B^*\| = \|A^*\| \|B^*\| \cos \Theta_{[A^*], [B^*]^\perp} = \|A\| \|B\| \cos \Theta_{[A]^\perp, [B]}$. \square

This formula supplements others, from [34], relating various products of blades to asymmetric angles. It is interesting to see how it links Propositions 4.14iii and 4.15 to Proposition 2.30(x and vi).

Example 4.17. If $[A]$ and $[B]$ are hyperplanes, their principal angles are $\theta_1 = \dots = \theta_{n-2} = 0$ and $\theta_{n-1} = \theta$, where θ is the dihedral angle. By Proposition 2.30vi, $\|A \vee B\| = \|A\| \|B\| \sin \theta$. Note how this still holds if $\theta = 0$, even though $[A] + [B] \neq X$.

The following examples show how blade products give information about the relative inclination of subspaces. In them, (e_1, \dots, e_4) is an orthonormal basis of X , $\Omega = e_{1234}$ is the orientation, and roman numerals between brackets refer to Proposition 2.30.

Example 4.18. The relative position of $A = e_{14}$ and $B = e_{123}$ is obvious, but it will be instructive to analyze it. Proposition 4.14vi gives $A \vee B = e_1$, so $[A] \cap [B] = [e_1]$ and $[A] + [B] = X$, and Theorem 4.16 gives $\Theta_{[A]^\perp, [B]} = 0$, which agrees with (vii). Principal angles are $\theta_1 = 0$, as $\dim([A] \cap [B]) = 1$, and $\theta_2 = 90^\circ$, by (vi). So (iv,v) give $\Theta_{[A], [B]} = \Theta_{[A], [B]^\perp} = 90^\circ$, reflecting the fact that, as $[A] \perp [B]$ and $\dim[A] > \dim[B]^\perp$, areas in $[A]$ vanish when orthogonally projected on $[B]$ or $[B]^\perp$.

Example 4.19. Let $A = \frac{e_{12} + \sqrt{3}e_{14} - e_{23} + \sqrt{3}e_{34}}{2\sqrt{2}} = f_1 \wedge f_2$ for $f_1 = \frac{e_1 + e_3}{\sqrt{2}}$ and $f_2 = \frac{e_2 + \sqrt{3}e_4}{2}$, and $B = e_{12}$. Then $A \vee B = \frac{\sqrt{6}}{4}$, so $[A] \cap [B] = [\frac{\sqrt{6}}{4}] = \{0\}$, $[A] \oplus [B] = X$ and $\Theta_{[A]^\perp, [B]} = \cos^{-1} \frac{\sqrt{6}}{4} \cong 52^\circ$. By (ii,iii), $\Theta_{[A], [B]} = \cos^{-1} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4} \cong 69^\circ$ and $\Theta_{[A], [B]^\perp} = \cos^{-1} \frac{\sqrt{6}}{4} \cong 52^\circ$. As (f_1, f_2) and (e_1, e_2) are principal bases of $[A]$ and $[B]$, with $\theta_1 = 45^\circ$ and $\theta_2 = 60^\circ$, (iv,v,vi) give the same angles. To interpret them, note that f_1 and f_2 contract by $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ if projected on $[B]$, so areas in $[A]$ contract by $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{4}$. Projected on $[B]^\perp$, areas contract by $\sin \theta_1 \cdot \sin \theta_2 = \frac{\sqrt{6}}{4}$. As $\dim[A] = \dim[B]^\perp$, (ix,x) show the same happens when projecting from $[A]^\perp$ to $[B]$.

Example 4.20. For $A = e_1 \wedge (e_2 + e_4) \wedge (e_3 + e_4) = e_{123} + e_{124} - e_{134}$ and $B = e_{123}$ we obtain $A \vee B = e_1 \wedge (e_3 - e_2)$ and $\Theta_{[A]^\perp, [B]} \cong 35^\circ$. As $\dim([A] \cap [B]) = \dim[A \vee B] = 2$ we have $\theta_1 = \theta_2 = 0$, and so $\theta_3 \cong 55^\circ$, by (vi). Thus $\Theta_{[A], [B]} \cong 55^\circ$ and $\Theta_{[A], [B]^\perp} = 90^\circ$, by (iv,v) or (ii,iii).

4.2 join and meet

The usefulness of the regressive product for finding intersections is limited by the condition $[A] + [B] = X$ in Proposition 4.15, which is too restrictive for low grade blades in large spaces. A workaround is to reduce the ambient space to $[A] + [B]$, but this carries some difficulties. We use a different notation in such case, following [4, 13] (some authors use the terms **join** and **meet** for the exterior and regressive products).

Definition 4.21. The **join** $A \cup B$ and **meet** $A \cap B$ of blades A and B are defined, up to scalar multiples, as nonzero blades J and M , respectively, such that $[J] = [A] + [B]$ and $[M] = [A] \cap [B]$.

These operations are not bilinear, and are restricted to blades. They are only defined up to scalar multiples because, in general, there is no meaningful way to give $A \cup B$ and $A \cap B$ norms and orientations in terms of those of A and B . If a **join** J is known, a **meet** can be obtained via regressive product if we consider $X = [J]$ and use \star_J . This yields a bilinear formula which holds even if A or B changes, as long as $[A] + [B]$ remains the same. Likewise, given a **meet** we can obtain a **join**.

Proposition 4.22. Let $A, B \in \wedge X$ be nonzero blades.

- i) Given a unit $J = A \cup B$, a **meet** is $A \cap B = \star_J B \lrcorner A$.
- ii) Given a $M = A \cap B$, a **join** is $A \cup B = (M \lrcorner A) \wedge B$.

Proof. (i) Follows from Proposition 4.14v, with $X = [J]$. (ii) $A = M \wedge A'$ and $B = M \wedge B'$ for blades A' and B' completely orthogonal to M . Thus $M \lrcorner A = \|M\|^2 A'$ and so $[(M \lrcorner A) \wedge B] = [A' \wedge M \wedge B'] = [A] + [B]$. \square

Example 4.23. Let (e_1, \dots, e_4) be an orthonormal basis of X . For $A = (e_1 + e_4) \wedge (e_2 + 2e_4)$ and $B = e_{12}$ we find $A \vee B = 0$, which tells us nothing about $[A] \cap [B]$. But as $[A]$ and $[B]$ are distinct planes in $[e_{124}]$, a unit **join** is $J = e_{124}$, and so a **meet** is $M = {}^*J B \lrcorner A = e_4 \lrcorner A = -2e_1 + e_2$. Thus $[A] \cap [B] = [2e_1 - e_2]$ and $\Theta_{[A]^\perp, [B]} \cong 24^\circ$, which imply $\theta_1 = 0$ and $\theta_2 \cong 66^\circ$, and so $\Theta_{[A], [B]} \cong 66^\circ$ and $\Theta_{[A], [B]}^\perp = 90^\circ$.

5 Outermorphisms

Outermorphisms, used in GA [13, 23], are extensions of linear maps to exterior algebras, respecting the exterior product. By convention, maps take precedence over products, i.e. $TM \lrcorner N$ means $(TM) \lrcorner N$.

Let Y be a Euclidean or unitary space (as X). If necessary, we write $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_X$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_Y$ for their inner products, otherwise we use $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ for both.

Definition 5.1. A linear map $T : \bigwedge X \rightarrow \bigwedge Y$ is an *outermorphism* if $T(M \wedge N) = TM \wedge TN$ for all $M, N \in \bigwedge X$.

Any linear map $T : X \rightarrow Y$ extends to an outermorphism, represented by the same letter (e.g. the extension P_V of Definition 2.11). It satisfies $T(1) = 1$, and $T(\bigwedge^p V) = \bigwedge^p T(V)$ for a subspace $V \subset X$. If B is a p -blade, so is TB , and $[TB] \subset T([B])$, with equality if $TB \neq 0$.

T is *orthogonal (injection)* if $\langle Tu, Tv \rangle_Y = \langle u, v \rangle_X$ for $u, v \in X$, in which case $\langle TM, TN \rangle_{\bigwedge Y} = \langle M, N \rangle_{\bigwedge X}$ for $M, N \in \bigwedge X$.

Proposition 5.2. *If T is orthogonal then $T(M \lrcorner N) = TM \lrcorner TN$ for $M, N \in \bigwedge X$.*

Proof. $TM \lrcorner TN \in \bigwedge T(X) = T(\bigwedge X)$, and if $L \in T(\bigwedge X)$ then $L = TK$ for $K \in \bigwedge X$. The result follows as $\langle L, TM \lrcorner TN \rangle = \langle TM \wedge TK, TN \rangle = \langle T(M \wedge K), TN \rangle = \langle M \wedge K, N \rangle = \langle K, M \lrcorner N \rangle = \langle L, T(M \lrcorner N) \rangle$. \square

For arbitrary T we have instead the following result, in terms of the outermorphism $T^\dagger : \bigwedge Y \rightarrow \bigwedge X$ of the adjoint $T^\dagger : Y \rightarrow X$, which satisfies $\langle M, T^\dagger N \rangle = \langle TM, N \rangle$ for $M \in \bigwedge X, N \in \bigwedge Y$.

Proposition 5.3. *For an outermorphism $T : \bigwedge X \rightarrow \bigwedge Y, M \in \bigwedge X$ and $N \in \bigwedge Y$, the following diagrams are commutative:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bigwedge X & \xrightarrow{M \lrcorner} & \bigwedge X \\ T^\dagger \uparrow & & \uparrow T^\dagger \\ \bigwedge Y & \xrightarrow{TM \lrcorner} & \bigwedge Y \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} \bigwedge X & \xrightarrow{T^\dagger N \lrcorner} & \bigwedge X \\ T \downarrow & & \downarrow T \\ \bigwedge Y & \xrightarrow{N \lrcorner} & \bigwedge Y \end{array}$$

Proof. For $L \in \bigwedge X, \langle L, T^\dagger(TM \lrcorner N) \rangle = \langle TL, TM \lrcorner N \rangle = \langle TM \wedge TL, N \rangle = \langle T(M \wedge L), N \rangle = \langle M \wedge L, T^\dagger N \rangle = \langle L, M \lrcorner T^\dagger N \rangle$. Likewise, we obtain $T(T^\dagger N \lrcorner M) = N \lrcorner TM$ by taking inner products with $L \in \bigwedge Y$. \square

Corollary 5.4. *If $Y = X$ then, for $M \in \bigwedge X, T^\dagger((TM)^*) = (\overline{\det T}) M^*$ and $T((T^\dagger M)^*) = (\det T) M^*$.*

Proof. $T\Omega = (\det T)\Omega$ and $T^\dagger\Omega = (\overline{\det T})\Omega$, for the orientation Ω . \square

For $M \neq 0$, this gives $T^\dagger((TM)^*) \neq 0 \Leftrightarrow T$ is invertible.

5.1 Invertible Outermorphisms

In this section $T : X \rightarrow Y$ is invertible, so $T : \bigwedge X \rightarrow \bigwedge Y$ is an algebra isomorphism.

Proposition 5.5. $T(L \lrcorner M) = ((T^\dagger)^{-1}L) \lrcorner TM$, for any $L, M \in \bigwedge X$.

Proof. Follows from Proposition 5.3, with $L = T^\dagger N$. \square

An orientation Ω of X induces another $\Omega_T = \frac{T\Omega}{\|T\Omega\|}$ in Y . We use \star for the star of Ω , and $*$ for that of Ω_T . The results below can be adapted if T is only injective (but then Ω_T is an orientation in $T(X)$).

Definition 5.6. The *volume factor* of T is $\nu(T) = \|T\Omega\|$.

Note that $\nu(T)$ does not depend on Ω . If T is orthogonal, $\nu(T) = 1$.

Lemma 5.7. $T\Omega = \nu(T)\Omega_T$ and $T^\dagger\Omega_T = \nu(T)\Omega$.

Proof. The first formula follows from the definition of Ω_T , and the other one from it, as $\langle T^\dagger\Omega_T, \Omega \rangle = \langle \Omega_T, T\Omega \rangle = \nu(T) \|\Omega_T\|^2 = \nu(T)$. \square

Proposition 5.8. For $T : X \rightarrow Y$ invertible, the first diagram below is commutative, and so is the second one if T is also orthogonal. Stars can be left or right, but must have equal (resp. opposite) sides for equal (resp. opposite) arrows.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bigwedge X & \xleftarrow{\star} & \bigwedge X \\ T \downarrow \uparrow_{T^{-1}} & \frac{T^\dagger}{\nu(T)} \uparrow \downarrow_{\nu(T)(T^\dagger)^{-1}} & T \downarrow \uparrow_{T^{-1}} \\ \bigwedge Y & \xleftarrow{\star} & \bigwedge Y \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} \bigwedge X & \xleftarrow{\star} & \bigwedge X \\ T \downarrow \uparrow_{T^{-1}} & & T \downarrow \uparrow_{T^{-1}} \\ \bigwedge Y & \xleftarrow{\star} & \bigwedge Y \end{array}$$

Proof. For $M \in \bigwedge X$, Proposition 5.3 gives $T^\dagger((TM)^\star) = T^\dagger(TM \lrcorner \Omega_T) = M \lrcorner T^\dagger\Omega_T = \nu(T)M \lrcorner \Omega = \nu(T)M^\star$. If T is orthogonal, Proposition 5.2 gives $T(M^\star) = T(M \lrcorner \Omega) = TM \lrcorner T\Omega = TM \lrcorner \Omega_T = (TM)^\star$. Other relations are obtained similarly. \square

Note the distinct stars in the upper and lower horizontal arrows. Applied to blades, the first diagram gives the usual result that if T maps $V \subset X$ to $W \subset Y$ then T^\dagger maps W^\perp to V^\perp .

Corollary 5.9. $T^{-1}N = \frac{1}{\nu(T)} \star (T^\dagger(N^\star))$, for $N \in \bigwedge Y$.

Example 5.10. Let $T : X \rightarrow Y$ be given by $T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 2 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$ in orthonormal bases (e_1, e_2, e_3) of X and (f_1, f_2, f_3) of Y . If $\Omega = e_{123}$ is the orientation of X then $T\Omega = -3f_{123}$, so $\Omega_T = -f_{123}$ and $\nu(T) = 3$. For $N = f_2 + 3f_{13}$ we have $N^\star = f_{13} + 3f_2$ and $T^\dagger(N^\star) = (e_2 - e_3) \wedge (e_1 + 2e_3) + 3(2e_1 + e_2)$, and so $T^{-1}N = \frac{1}{3}\Omega \lrcorner (T^\dagger(N^\star)) = 2e_{23} - e_{13} + \frac{1}{3}(-e_3 - e_2 + 2e_1)$.

When $Y = X$, we have $\nu(T) = |\det T|$ and $\Omega_T = \frac{\det T}{|\det T|}\Omega$, so the stars are related by $M^\star = \frac{\det T}{|\det T|}M^\star$. Then we can write Corollary 5.9 in terms of \star only, as the usual $T^{-1}N = \frac{1}{\det T} \star (T^\dagger(N^\star))$. Also:

Corollary 5.11. Let $T : X \rightarrow X$ be invertible and $M \in \bigwedge X$.

i) $T^\dagger(M^\star) = (\overline{\det T}) (T^{-1}M)^\star$ and $(T^\dagger M)^\star = (\det T) T^{-1}(M^\star)$.

ii) $T(M^*) = (\det T)(TM)^*$ if T is orthogonal.

iii) $T(M^*) = (TM)^*$ if $T \in SO(X)$ ($SU(X)$ in the complex case).

As usual, $SO(X)$ (resp. $SU(X)$) is the special orthogonal (resp. special unitary) group of X .

6 Spaces Determined by Multivectors

For a non-simple multivector M the concept of space is replaced by two distinct ones, related to the solutions $v \in X$ of $v \wedge M = 0$ and $v \lrcorner M = 0$.

Definition 6.1. The *inner* and *outer spaces* of $M \in \wedge X$ are, respectively, $\lfloor M \rfloor = \{v \in X : v \wedge M = 0\}$ and $\lceil M \rceil = \bigcap \{V \subset X : M \in \wedge V\}$.

The notation and terminology is from Rosén, but oddly he does not define the spaces for “inhomogeneous multivectors, since this is not natural geometrically” [39, p. 36]. As we show, most properties hold for any multivectors. $\lfloor M \rfloor$ is also called *annihilator* $\text{Ann } M$ [27]. For a blade B , $\lfloor B \rfloor$ is called *outer product null space* in GA [13], and $\lceil B \rceil^\perp$ is the *inner product null space*, as Proposition 6.5 shows. Proposition 6.9 shows $\lceil H \rceil$ is the *rank space* [27] for a homogeneous H .

The three spaces of a blade $B \neq 0$ coincide, but $B = 0$ is an important exception. Proposition 7.5 gives a converse.

Proposition 6.2. $\lfloor B \rfloor = \lceil B \rceil = [B]$ for a blade $B \neq 0$. We also have $\lfloor 0 \rfloor = \lceil 0 \rceil = \{0\}$, but $\lfloor 0 \rfloor = X$.

Proof. Follows from the definitions if B is scalar. If $B = v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_p \neq 0$ then $v_i \wedge B = 0 \ \forall i$, so $\lfloor B \rfloor = \text{span}(v_1, \dots, v_p) \subset \lfloor B \rfloor$, and if $v \in \lfloor B \rfloor$ then $v \wedge v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_p = 0$, so that $v \in \text{span}(v_1, \dots, v_p)$. Also, $B \in \wedge [B]$ and any subspace $V \subset X$ with $B \in \wedge V$ has $[B] \subset V$, so $\lceil B \rceil = [B]$. \square

6.1 Alternative Characterizations

Other descriptions are given below and in Corollaries 6.40 and 6.54.

Proposition 6.3. $\lceil M \rceil$ is the smallest subspace whose exterior algebra contains M .

Proof. Let W be a subspace of minimal dimension in $\mathcal{S} = \{V \subset X : M \in \wedge V\}$. For any $V \in \mathcal{S}$ we have $M \in (\wedge V) \cap (\wedge W) = \wedge(V \cap W)$, so $V \cap W \in \mathcal{S}$ and minimality implies $W \subset V$. Thus $W = \bigcap \mathcal{S} = \lceil M \rceil$. \square

In particular, this means $M \in \wedge \lceil M \rceil$, so that:

Corollary 6.4. For $M, N \in \wedge X$ with $\lceil M \rceil \cap \lceil N \rceil = \{0\}$, $M \wedge N = 0 \Leftrightarrow M = 0$ or $N = 0$.

Proposition 6.5. $\lceil M \rceil = \{v \in X : v \lrcorner M = 0\}^\perp$, for $M \in \wedge X$.

Proof. If $v \in \lceil M \rceil^\perp$ then $v \lrcorner M = 0$, so $v \lrcorner M = 0$. Let $0 \neq v \in X$ with $v \lrcorner M = 0$. If (e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}) is an orthogonal basis of $\lceil v \rceil^\perp$, $\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{n-1}} \{e_i, v \wedge e_i\}$ is an orthogonal basis of $\wedge X$. As $\langle v \wedge e_i, M \rangle = \langle e_i, v \lrcorner M \rangle = 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}^{n-1}$, $M \in \text{span}\{e_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{n-1}} = \wedge(\lceil v \rceil^\perp)$. So $\lceil M \rceil \subset \lceil v \rceil^\perp$ and $v \in \lceil M \rceil^\perp$. \square

Corollary 6.6. For $B = v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_p \in \bigwedge^p X$, $B \perp M \Leftrightarrow v_i \lrcorner M = 0 \forall i$.

Corollary 6.7. $[M] = \{v \in X : v \wedge M^* = 0\}^\perp$ and $[M] = \{v \in X : v \lrcorner M^* = 0\}$, for $M \in \bigwedge X$.

Proof. By Proposition 4.7, $v \lrcorner M = 0 \Leftrightarrow v \wedge M^* = 0$, and $v \wedge M = 0 \Leftrightarrow v \lrcorner M^* = 0$. \square

This gives a dual representation of subspaces [13]: in terms of a blade B , as the set of solutions of $v \wedge B = 0$, or in terms of B^* , as the solutions of $v \lrcorner B^*$ (just as a plane in \mathbb{R}^3 can be represented by a normal vector).

Corollary 6.8. $[M^*] = [M]^\perp$ and $[M^*] = [M]^\perp$, for $M \in \bigwedge X$.

Proposition 6.9. $[H] = \{G \lrcorner H : G \in \bigwedge^{p-1} X\}$, for $H \in \bigwedge^p X$.

Proof. By linearity, $V = \{G \lrcorner H : G \in \bigwedge^{p-1} X\} \subset X$ is a subspace. By Proposition 6.5, $v \in [H]^\perp \Leftrightarrow v \lrcorner H = 0 \Leftrightarrow \langle v, G \lrcorner H \rangle = \langle G \wedge v, H \rangle = \langle \hat{G}, v \lrcorner H \rangle = 0 \forall G \in \bigwedge^{p-1} X \Leftrightarrow v \in V^\perp$. So $[H] = V$. \square

Proposition 6.10. $[M] = \{v \in X : v = 0 \text{ or } M = v \wedge N \text{ for } N \in \bigwedge X\}$. Also, given $0 \neq v \in [M]$, for each complement V of $[v]$ there is a unique $N \in \bigwedge V$ such that $M = v \wedge N$.

Proof. If $M = v \wedge N$ then $v \wedge M = 0$, so $v \in [M]$. Given $0 \neq v \in [M]$ and a complement V of $[v]$, we have $M = v \wedge N + L$ for $N, L \in \bigwedge V$, and $v \wedge M = 0 \Rightarrow v \wedge L = 0 \Rightarrow L = 0$. If $M = v \wedge N = v \wedge N'$ for $N, N' \in \bigwedge V$ then $v \wedge (N - N') = 0$, so $N - N' = 0$. \square

Example 6.11. Let $M = e_{134} - e_{145} + e_{345} + e_{1235}$ for an orthonormal basis (e_1, \dots, e_5) of X . Solving $v \lrcorner M = 0$ we only find $v = 0$, so $[M] = X$. And solving $v \wedge M = 0$ we find $[M] = \text{span}(e_1 - e_3, e_3 + e_5)$, so we can factorize $M = (e_1 - e_3) \wedge \left(\frac{e_{34} + e_{14} + e_{235} - e_{125}}{2} - e_{45}\right)$, for example.

Example 6.12. Let $M = e_{123} + 2e_{145} - e_{146}$ for an orthonormal basis (e_1, \dots, e_6) of X . We now find $[M] = [e_1]$, so only scalar multiples of e_1 can be factored out of M . And $[M] = [e_5 + 2e_6]^\perp = [e_5^* + 2e_6^*] = [e_{12346} - 2e_{12345}] = [e_{1234} \wedge (e_6 - 2e_5)]$.

Corollary 6.13. Let $M, N \in \bigwedge X$. If $[M] \cap [N] \neq \{0\}$ then $M \wedge N = 0$.

Proof. $M = v \wedge M'$ and $N = v \wedge N'$ for $0 \neq v \in [M] \cap [N]$. \square

So, $M \wedge N \neq 0$ implies $[M] \cap [N] = \{0\}$. As the following example shows, it does not imply $[M] \cap [N] = \{0\}$.

Example 6.14. If $B = e_1$ and $N = 1 + e_{12}$ for a basis (e_1, e_2) of \mathbb{R}^2 then $B \wedge N = e_1 \neq 0$. As expected, $[B] = [e_1]$ and $[N] = \{0\}$ have zero intersection, but $[B] = [e_1]$ and $[N] = \mathbb{R}^2$ do not.

Corollary 6.15. Let $0 \neq v \in X$ and $M \in \bigwedge X$.

- i) $v \wedge M = 0 \Leftrightarrow M = v \wedge N$ for some $N \in \bigwedge X$.
- ii) $v \lrcorner M = 0 \Leftrightarrow M = v \lrcorner N$ for some $N \in \bigwedge X$.

Proof. (i) Immediate. (ii) By i and Proposition 4.7, $v \lrcorner M = 0 \Leftrightarrow {}^*M \wedge v = 0 \Leftrightarrow {}^*M = L \wedge v$ for some $L \Leftrightarrow M = v \lrcorner L^* = v \lrcorner N$ for $N = L^*$. \square

6.2 General Properties

Proposition 6.16. $\llbracket M \rrbracket \subset \lceil M \rceil$, for $0 \neq M \in \wedge X$.

Proof. Let $0 \neq v \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$. As $v \wedge M = 0$, Corollary 6.4 implies $\lceil v \rceil \cap \lceil M \rceil \neq \{0\}$. As $\lceil v \rceil = \text{span}(v)$, this means $v \in \lceil M \rceil$. \square

Corollary 6.17. $\{v \in X : v \wedge M = 0\} \perp \{v \in X : v \lrcorner M = 0\}$, for $0 \neq M \in \wedge X$.

Corollary 6.18. If $v \wedge M = v \lrcorner M = 0$ for some $0 \neq v \in X$ then $M = 0$.

Proposition 6.19. Let $M, N \in \wedge X$.

- i) $\lceil M \wedge N \rceil \subset \lceil M \rceil + \lceil N \rceil$.
- ii) $\llbracket M \wedge N \rrbracket \supset \llbracket M \rrbracket + \llbracket N \rrbracket$.
- iii) If $M, N \neq 0$ and $\lceil M \rceil \cap \lceil N \rceil = \{0\}$ we have equalities and \oplus in both.

Proof. (i) $M \in \wedge \lceil M \rceil, N \in \wedge \lceil N \rceil \Rightarrow M \wedge N \in \wedge (\lceil M \rceil + \lceil N \rceil)$. (ii) $v \in \llbracket M \rrbracket \Rightarrow v \wedge (M \wedge N) = (v \wedge M) \wedge N = 0 \Rightarrow v \in \llbracket M \wedge N \rrbracket$, and likewise for $\llbracket N \rrbracket$.

(iii) For $v \in \llbracket M \wedge N \rrbracket^\perp$, Propositions 3.11 and 6.5 give $v \lrcorner M = v \lrcorner N = 0$, so $v \in \lceil M \rceil^\perp \cap \lceil N \rceil^\perp = (\lceil M \rceil \oplus \lceil N \rceil)^\perp$. Thus $\llbracket M \wedge N \rrbracket \supset \llbracket M \rrbracket \oplus \llbracket N \rrbracket$.

Let $v \in \llbracket M \wedge N \rrbracket$. Proposition 6.16 gives $\llbracket M \rrbracket \cap \llbracket N \rrbracket = \{0\}$ and, as $M \wedge N \neq 0$ by Corollary 6.4, $v \in \lceil M \wedge N \rceil = \lceil M \rceil \oplus \lceil N \rceil$. So $v = u + w$ for $u \in \lceil M \rceil, w \in \lceil N \rceil$. As $v \wedge M \wedge N = 0$, we have $w \wedge M \wedge N = -u \wedge M \wedge N$, so $(u \wedge \hat{M}) \wedge (w \wedge N) = -u \wedge u \wedge M \wedge N = 0$. As $u \wedge \hat{M} \in \wedge \lceil M \rceil$ and $w \wedge N \in \wedge \lceil N \rceil$, this implies $u \wedge M = 0$ or $w \wedge N = 0$. But then both must be 0, since $\hat{M} \wedge (w \wedge N) = -(u \wedge M) \wedge N$. So $u \in \llbracket M \rrbracket, w \in \llbracket N \rrbracket, v \in \llbracket M \rrbracket \oplus \llbracket N \rrbracket$, and therefore $\llbracket M \wedge N \rrbracket \subset \llbracket M \rrbracket \oplus \llbracket N \rrbracket$. \square

If $M = N = 0$ we still have $\lceil M \wedge N \rceil = \lceil M \rceil \oplus \lceil N \rceil = \{0\}$, while if $M = 0$ or $N = 0$ we have $\llbracket M \wedge N \rrbracket = \llbracket M \rrbracket + \llbracket N \rrbracket = X$.

Corollary 6.20. If $N \neq 0$ and $\lceil M \rceil \cap \lceil N \rceil = \{0\}$ then $\lceil M \rceil \subset \lceil M \wedge N \rceil$.

Corollary 6.21. If B is a blade and $B \wedge N \neq 0$ then $\llbracket B \rrbracket \subset \llbracket B \wedge N \rrbracket$.

Proof. $B \neq 0$, so $\llbracket B \rrbracket = \llbracket B \rrbracket \subset \llbracket B \wedge N \rrbracket \subset \lceil B \wedge N \rceil$. \square

Example 6.22. In Example 6.14, $\llbracket B \rrbracket = \lceil B \wedge N \rceil$ but $\lceil N \rceil \not\subset \lceil B \wedge N \rceil$.

Proposition 6.23. Let $M, N \in \wedge X$.

- i) $\llbracket M \lrcorner N \rrbracket \subset \llbracket M \rrbracket^\perp \cap \lceil N \rceil$, with equality if $\lceil M \rceil \not\subset \llbracket N \rrbracket$.
- ii) $\llbracket M \lrcorner N \rrbracket \supset \lceil M \rceil^\perp \cap \llbracket N \rrbracket$, with equality if $M, N \neq 0$ and $\lceil M \rceil \not\subset \llbracket N \rrbracket$, or if $M = N = 0$.

Proof. Follows from Proposition 6.2 if $M = 0$ or $N = 0$. For $M, N \neq 0$, Propositions 6.8 and 6.19 give $\llbracket M \lrcorner N \rrbracket = \lceil (*N \wedge M)^* \rceil = \llbracket *N \wedge M \rrbracket^\perp \subset (\llbracket *N \rrbracket + \llbracket M \rrbracket)^\perp = \llbracket *N \rrbracket^\perp \cap \llbracket M \rrbracket^\perp = \lceil N \rceil \cap \llbracket M \rrbracket^\perp$, with equality if $\lceil M \rceil \cap \lceil *N \rceil = \lceil M \rceil \cap \llbracket N \rrbracket^\perp = \{0\}$, and likewise for $\llbracket M \lrcorner N \rrbracket$. \square

Corollary 6.24. For nonzero $M, N \in \wedge X$, $M \lrcorner N = 0 \Rightarrow \lceil M \rceil \not\subset \llbracket N \rrbracket$.

Proof. If $M \lrcorner N = 0$ but $\lceil M \rceil \not\sim \lceil N \rceil$ then $\lceil M \rceil^\perp \cap \lceil N \rceil = \lceil M \lrcorner N \rceil = X$, so $\lceil M \rceil = \{0\}$. But then M is a scalar, and $M \lrcorner N = \overline{MN} \neq 0$. \square

Proposition 6.25. *Let $M, N \in \bigwedge X$.*

- i) $M \smile N \Leftrightarrow \lceil M \rceil \smile \lceil N \rceil$, for $M \neq 0$.
- ii) $M \perp\!\!\!\perp N \Leftrightarrow \lceil M \rceil \perp \lceil N \rceil$.

Proof. (i) By Definition 2.23 and Proposition 6.10, $M \smile N \Leftrightarrow M = v \wedge M'$ for $v \in \lceil N \rceil^\perp$, $M' \in \bigwedge X \Leftrightarrow \lceil M \rceil \cap \lceil N \rceil^\perp \neq \{0\} \Leftrightarrow \lceil M \rceil \smile \lceil N \rceil$. (ii) $M \perp\!\!\!\perp N \Leftrightarrow \exists V, W \subset X$ with $V \perp W$, $\lceil M \rceil \subset V$, $\lceil N \rceil \subset W \Leftrightarrow \lceil M \rceil \perp \lceil N \rceil$. \square

With Proposition 3.19i, this gives:

Corollary 6.26. $\lceil M \rceil \smile \lceil N \rceil \Rightarrow M \lrcorner N = 0$, for $M \neq 0$.

Note how the implications $\lceil M \rceil \smile \lceil N \rceil \Rightarrow M \lrcorner N = 0 \Rightarrow \lceil M \rceil \smile \lceil N \rceil$, for $M \neq 0$, become for blades $\lceil A \rceil \smile \lceil B \rceil \Leftrightarrow A \lrcorner B = 0$, if $A \neq 0$.

Proposition 6.27. *Let T be an outermorphism and $M \in \bigwedge X$. Then $\lceil TM \rceil \supset T(\lceil M \rceil)$ and $\lceil TM \rceil \subset T(\lceil M \rceil)$, with equalities if T is invertible.*

Proof. For $v \in \lceil M \rceil$, $Tv \wedge TM = T(v \wedge M) = 0$, so $Tv \in \lceil TM \rceil$. And $TM \in T(\bigwedge \lceil M \rceil) = \bigwedge T(\lceil M \rceil)$. If T is invertible, $\lceil M \rceil = \lceil T^{-1}TM \rceil \supset T^{-1}(\lceil TM \rceil)$, so $T(\lceil M \rceil) \supset \lceil TM \rceil$, and likewise for the outer space. \square

6.3 Balanced and Minimal Decompositions

Here we consider decompositions $M = \sum_i M_i$, for $M, M_i \in \bigwedge X$.

Proposition 6.28. $\lceil M \rceil \supset \bigcap_i \lceil M_i \rceil$ and $\lceil M \rceil \subset \sum_i \lceil M_i \rceil$.

Proof. If $v \in \lceil M_i \rceil \forall i$ then $v \wedge M = \sum_i v \wedge M_i = 0$, so $v \in \lceil M \rceil$. The other formula is similar, using Proposition 6.5. \square

This and Proposition 6.5 imply the following equivalences.

Definition 6.29. A decomposition $M = \sum_i M_i$ is *inner balanced* if the following equivalent conditions hold:

- i) $\lceil M \rceil = \bigcap_i \lceil M_i \rceil$;
- ii) $\lceil M \rceil \subset \lceil M_i \rceil \forall i$;
- iii) $v \wedge M = 0 \Leftrightarrow v \wedge M_i = 0 \forall i$, for $v \in X$.

It is *outer balanced* if the following equivalent conditions hold:

- i) $\lceil M \rceil = \sum_i \lceil M_i \rceil$;
- ii) $\lceil M \rceil \supset \lceil M_i \rceil \forall i$;
- iii) $v \lrcorner M = 0 \Leftrightarrow v \lrcorner M_i = 0 \forall i$, for $v \in X$.

It is *balanced* if it is inner and outer balanced.

Example 6.30. The initial decomposition of M in Example 6.11 is outer but not inner balanced, as $\lceil M \rceil = X$ but $\lceil M \rceil \not\subset \lceil e_{134} \rceil$.

Example 6.31. The decomposition in Example 6.12 is inner but not outer balanced: $(e_5 + 2e_6) \lrcorner M = 0$ but $(e_5 + 2e_6) \lrcorner e_{145} \neq 0$.

Example 6.32. $M = \sum_p \langle M \rangle_p$ is balanced: since the terms in $v \wedge M = \sum_p v \wedge \langle M \rangle_p$ have distinct grades, the sum vanishes if, and only if, they are all zero, and the same happens for the contraction. In particular, any sum of blades of distinct grades is balanced.

Proposition 6.33. $M = \sum_i M_i$ is inner balanced if, and only if, $M^* = \sum_i M_i^*$ is outer balanced, and vice-versa.

Proof. Follows from Corollary 6.8. \square

Theorem 6.34. Any minimal blade decomposition is balanced.

Proof. If a minimal blade decomposition $M = \sum_{i=1}^m B_i$ is not outer balanced, there is $v \in X$ with $v \lrcorner M = 0$ but $v \lrcorner B_m \neq 0$ (w.l.o.g.). Let $I = \{1 \leq i \leq m-1 : v \lrcorner B_i \neq 0\}$ and $I' = \{1, \dots, m-1\} \setminus I$. For $i \in I \cup \{m\}$, Proposition 3.23 gives $B_i = u_i \wedge (v \lrcorner B_i)$ for $u_i \in X$. As $v \lrcorner B_m = -\sum_{i \in I} v \lrcorner B_i$, we have $M = \sum_{i \in I'} B_i + \sum_{i \in I} B_i + B_m = \sum_{i \in I'} B_i + \sum_{i \in I} u_i \wedge (v \lrcorner B_i) + u_m \wedge (v \lrcorner B_m) = \sum_{i \in I'} B_i + \sum_{i \in I} (u_i - u_m) \wedge (v \lrcorner B_i)$. This decomposition has at most $m-1$ blades, contradicting minimality.

Thus any minimal blade decomposition is outer balanced. As $M^* = \sum_{i=1}^m B_i^*$ is also a minimal blade decomposition, it is outer balanced, so Proposition 6.33 implies $M = \sum_{i=1}^m B_i$ is inner balanced as well. \square

Example 6.35. Let $M = i + j \wedge k$, in the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^3 . As $\lceil M \rceil = \{0\}$ and $\lfloor M \rfloor = \mathbb{R}^3$, any blade decomposition of M is balanced, even if non-minimal. So the converse of the above result is not valid.

We can now simplify Definition 2.10, which set $M \subset N$ if $M = \sum_i A_i$ and $N = \sum_j B_j$ for blades A_i, B_j with $\sum_i \lceil A_i \rceil \subset \bigcap_j \lfloor B_j \rfloor$.

Corollary 6.36. $M \subset N \Leftrightarrow \lceil M \rceil \subset \lfloor N \rfloor$, for $M, N \in \bigwedge X$.

Proof. Follows from Propositions 6.28 (\Rightarrow) and 6.34 (\Leftarrow). \square

This helps explain why $M \subset 0$ for any M .

6.4 Blade Factorizations

Now we analyze which blades can be factored out of $M \in \bigwedge X$, discuss special factorizations, and relate them to balanced decompositions.

Definition 6.37. A blade factorization of M is $M = B \wedge N$, where $B \neq 0$ is a blade and $N \in \bigwedge X$. It is:

- *efficient* if $\lceil N \rceil \cap \lfloor B \rfloor = \{0\}$;
- *orthogonal* if $\lceil N \rceil \subset \lfloor B \rfloor^\perp$;
- *maximal* if $\lfloor B \rfloor = \lceil M \rceil$;
- *optimal* if it is efficient and maximal.

A factorization describes how to build M from B by appending blades of N , being efficient if N has no needless components that vanish in the product with B . Note that orthogonal implies efficient.

Definition 6.38. An *inner blade* of M is a blade $0 \neq B \subset M$, and it is *maximal* if $[B] = [M]$.

Note that any nonzero blade is an inner blade of $M = 0$.

Theorem 6.39. A blade $B \neq 0$ is an inner blade of $M \in \bigwedge X$ if, and only if, $M = B \wedge N$ for some $N \in \bigwedge X$. In this case, for any complement V of $[B]$ there is a unique such $N \in \bigwedge V$. For $V = [B]^\perp$, $N = \frac{B \lrcorner M}{\|B\|^2}$.

Proof. If $M = B \wedge N$ then $[B] \subset [M]$, so $B \subset M$ by Corollary 6.36. And if $B \subset M$ then $M = B \wedge N$ for $N = \frac{B \lrcorner M}{\|B\|^2} \in \bigwedge([B]^\perp)$, by Propositions 3.27iv and 6.23i. Given V , we find $N \in \bigwedge V$ in the same way using an inner product for which $V = [B]^\perp$. If $M = B \wedge N'$ for another $N' \in \bigwedge V$ then $B \wedge (N - N') = 0$, and Corollary 6.4 implies $N' = N$. \square

Corollary 6.40. $[M]$ is the space of any maximal inner blade of M , i.e. any nonzero blade of largest possible grade that can be factored out of M .

Note that $0 = B \wedge 0$ for any B , which is why $[0] = X$.

Proposition 6.41. Let $0 \neq M = B \wedge N$ be a blade factorization.

- i) It is efficient $\Leftrightarrow [M] = [B] \oplus [N]$ and $[M] = [B] \oplus [N]$.
- ii) It is orthogonal $\Leftrightarrow N = \frac{B \lrcorner M}{\|B\|^2}$.
- iii) If it is maximal then $[N] = \{0\}$.
- iv) It is optimal \Leftrightarrow it is efficient and $[N] = \{0\}$.

Proof. (i) Follows from Proposition 6.19. (ii) Follows from Theorem 6.39. (iii) By Proposition 6.19, $[N] \subset [M] = [B]$, and $[B] \cap [N] = \{0\}$ by Corollary 6.13. (iv) Follows from iii (\Rightarrow) and i (\Leftarrow). \square

Example 6.42. Let (e_1, e_2, e_3) be orthonormal, $M = e_{123}$, $B = e_1$ and $N = e_1 + e_{23}$. Then $M = B \wedge N$ and $[N] = \{0\}$, but $[M] \neq [B]$. So the converse of iii does not hold without efficiency.

Proposition 6.43. Let $0 \neq M = B \wedge N = \mathbf{B} \wedge \mathbf{N}$ be blade factorizations, with $\mathbf{B} \wedge \mathbf{N}$ being maximal. Then $B \subset \mathbf{B}$, and if $B \wedge N$ is:

- i) efficient then $[\mathbf{B}] = [B] \oplus [N]$;
- ii) orthogonal then $[N] = [B \lrcorner \mathbf{B}]$;
- iii) maximal then $B = \lambda \mathbf{B}$ for a scalar $\lambda \neq 0$.

Proof. $[B] \subset [M] = [\mathbf{B}]$. (i) Follows from Proposition 6.41i. (ii) $[N] \subset [N] \subset [B]^\perp$, so i gives $[N] = [B]^\perp \cap [\mathbf{B}] = [B \lrcorner \mathbf{B}]$. (iii) $[B] = [\mathbf{B}]$. \square

Theorem 6.44. Given $M \in \bigwedge X$ and a complement V of $[M]$, there is a unique (up to scalar multiples of B and N) optimal blade factorization $M = B \wedge N$ with $N \in \bigwedge V$.

Proof. Given a maximal inner blade B , it follows from Propositions 6.39 and 6.43iii if $M \neq 0$, and for $M = 0$ it holds with $N = 0$. \square

Example 6.45. In Example 6.11, $B = (e_1 - e_3) \wedge (e_3 + e_5)$ is a maximal inner blade, so $M = B \wedge N$ for $N = \frac{B \lrcorner M}{\|B\|^2} = e_4 + \frac{e_{23} - e_{12} - e_{25}}{3}$ is an optimal orthogonal factorization. $M = B \wedge N'$ for $N' = e_4 + e_{23}$ is optimal ($\lceil N' \rceil = [e_{234}]$ and $B \vee e_{234} = -1$, so $[B] \cap \lceil N' \rceil = \{0\}$), but not orthogonal, as $(e_1 - e_3) \lrcorner N' \neq 0$. And $M = B \wedge N''$ for $N'' = e_4 + e_{23} + e_{15}$ is maximal but non-efficient, as $\lceil N'' \rceil = X$. A non-maximal orthogonal factorization is given by $B' = e_1 - e_3$ and $N''' = \frac{e_{14} + e_{34} - e_{125} + e_{235}}{2} - e_{45}$, with $\lceil N''' \rceil = [e_1 + e_3 + 2e_5] = [B' \lrcorner B]$.

Proposition 6.46. *Given a blade factorization $0 \neq M = B \wedge N$ and a decomposition $N = \sum_i N_i$, the decomposition $M = \sum_i B \wedge N_i$ is:*

- i) *inner balanced if the factorization is maximal;*
- ii) *outer balanced (resp. balanced) if the factorization is efficient (resp. optimal) and the decomposition of N is outer balanced.*

Proof. (i) $\lceil M \rceil = [B] \subset [B \wedge N_i]$. (ii) $[N_i] \subset [N]$ and $[B], [N] \subset [M]$, by Proposition 6.41i, so $[B \wedge N_i] \subset [M]$. \square

Proposition 6.47. *If $M = \sum_i M_i$ is inner balanced and B is a maximal inner blade of M then $M_i = B \wedge N_i$ for $N_i \in \bigwedge X$ and the factorization $M = B \wedge \sum_i N_i$ is maximal. It can be made optimal and orthogonal as we can take the N_i 's in any given complement of $[B]$.*

Proof. $[B] = [M] \subset [M_i]$, so Theorem 6.39 gives the N_i 's. \square

Example 6.48. In Example 6.45, $M = B \wedge N'$ is optimal, so it gives a balanced decomposition $M = B \wedge e_4 + B \wedge e_{23}$ (which is actually a minimal blade decomposition, since M is not simple).

Example 6.49. In Examples 6.12 and 6.31, $M = e_1 \wedge (e_{23} + 2e_{45} - e_{46})$ is an optimal orthogonal factorization.

6.5 Blade Carvings

Dualizing the previous section, we analyze how $M \in \bigwedge X$ can be expressed in terms of a contraction of another multivector on a blade.

Definition 6.50. A *blade carving* of M is $M = N \lrcorner B$, where $B \neq 0$ is a blade and $N \in \bigwedge X$ (we also say M is *carved* from B by N). It is:

- *efficient* if $\lceil N \rceil \cap [B]^\perp = \{0\}$;
- *internal* if $\lceil N \rceil \subset [B]$;
- *minimal* if $[B] = [M]$;
- *optimal* if it is efficient and minimal.

This describes M as obtained from B by removing subblades specified (via projection) by N , being efficient if N has no needless components with a null projection. Note that internal implies efficient.

Definition 6.51. An *outer blade* of M is a blade $0 \neq B \supset M$, and it is *minimal* if $[B] = [M]$.

Proposition 6.52. *Let $M, N \in \bigwedge X$ and $B \neq 0$ be a blade.*

- i) B is an outer blade of $M \Leftrightarrow B^*$ is an inner blade of M^* . Moreover, B is minimal $\Leftrightarrow B^*$ is maximal.
- ii) $M = B \wedge N \Leftrightarrow M^* = N \lrcorner B^*$. Also, the factorization is efficient (resp. orthogonal, maximal, optimal) \Leftrightarrow the carving is efficient (resp. internal, minimal, optimal).

Proof. Follows from Propositions 4.7 and 6.8. \square

Likewise, B is an inner blade of $M \Leftrightarrow {}^*B$ is an outer blade of *M , $M = N \lrcorner B \Leftrightarrow {}^*M = {}^*B \wedge N$, and so on. With this, one can easily turn the results of the previous section into the following dual versions, which we leave as an exercise (note that there is no star on N , so only M and B are dualized).

Theorem 6.53. *A blade $B \neq 0$ is an outer blade of $M \in \wedge X$ if, and only if, $M = N \lrcorner B$ for some $N \in \wedge X$. In this case, for any complement V of $[B]^\perp$ there is a unique such $N \in \wedge V$. For $V = [B]$, $N = \frac{B \lrcorner M}{\|B\|^2}$.*

Corollary 6.54. *$[M]$ is the space of any minimal outer blade of M , i.e. any nonzero blade of smallest possible grade from which M can be carved.*

Proposition 6.55. *Let $0 \neq M = N \lrcorner B$ be a blade carving.*

- i) *It is efficient $\Leftrightarrow [M] = [N]^\perp \cap [B]$ and $[M] = [N]^\perp \cap [B]$.*
- ii) *It is internal $\Leftrightarrow N = \frac{B \lrcorner M}{\|B\|^2}$.*
- iii) *If it is minimal then $[N] = \{0\}$.*
- iv) *It is optimal \Leftrightarrow it is efficient and $[N] = \{0\}$.*

Example 6.56. Let (e_1, e_2, e_3) be orthonormal, $M = 1$, $B = e_{23}$ and $N = e_1 + e_{23}$. Then $M = N \lrcorner B$ and $[N] = \{0\}$, but $[M] \neq [B]$. So the converse of iii does not hold without internalness.

Proposition 6.57. *Let $0 \neq M = N \lrcorner B = \mathbf{N} \lrcorner \mathbf{B}$ be blade carvings, with $\mathbf{N} \lrcorner \mathbf{B}$ being minimal. Then $\mathbf{B} \subset B$, and if $N \lrcorner B$ is:*

- i) *efficient then $[\mathbf{B}] = [N]^\perp \cap [B]$;*
- ii) *internal then $[N] = [\mathbf{B} \lrcorner B]$;*
- iii) *minimal then $B = \lambda \mathbf{B}$ for a scalar $\lambda \neq 0$.*

Theorem 6.58. *Given $M \in \wedge X$ and a complement V of $[M]^\perp$, there is a unique (up to scalar multiples of B and N) optimal blade carving $M = N \lrcorner B$ with $N \in \wedge V$.*

Example 6.59. In Example 6.12, $B = e_{1234} \wedge (e_6 - 2e_5)$ is a minimal outer blade, so $M = N \lrcorner B$ for $N = \frac{B \lrcorner M}{\|B\|^2} = \frac{e_{46} - 2e_{45}}{5} - e_{23}$ is an optimal internal carving ($[N] = [e_{234} \wedge (e_6 - 2e_5)] \subset [B]$). $M = N' \lrcorner B$ for $N' = e_{46} - e_{23}$ is optimal ($[N'] \cap [B]^\perp = [N'] \cap [B^*] = [e_{2346}] \cap [e_5 + 2e_6] = \{0\}$), but not internal ($e_6 \in [N']$ but $e_6 \notin [B]$). And $M = N'' \lrcorner B$ for $N'' = e_{46} - e_{23} + e_{15} + 2e_{16}$ is minimal but non-efficient, as $e_5 + 2e_6 \in [N''] = X$ and $(e_5 + 2e_6) \lrcorner B = 0$. A non-minimal internal carving is given by $B' = e_{123456}$ and $N''' = -e_{456} - 2e_{236} - e_{235}$, for which $[N'''] = [e_5 + 2e_6] = [B \lrcorner B']$.

Proposition 6.60. *Given a blade carving $0 \neq M = N \lrcorner B$ and a decomposition $N = \sum_i N_i$, the decomposition $M = \sum_i N_i \lrcorner B$ is:*

- i) outer balanced if the carving is minimal;
- ii) inner balanced (resp. balanced) if the carving is efficient (resp. optimal) and the decomposition of N is outer balanced.

Proposition 6.61. *If $M = \sum_i M_i$ is outer balanced and B is a minimal outer blade of M then $M_i = N_i \lrcorner B$ for $N_i \in \wedge X$ and the carving $M = (\sum_i N_i) \lrcorner B$ is minimal. It can be made optimal and internal as we can take the N_i 's in any given complement of $[B]^\perp$.*

Example 6.62. In Example 6.59, $M = N' \lrcorner B$ is optimal, so it gives a balanced decomposition $M = e_{123} - e_{14} \wedge (e_6 - 2e_5)$ (which is actually a minimal blade decomposition, since M is not simple).

Example 6.63. In Examples 6.11 and 6.30, $M = N \lrcorner e_{12345}$ for $N = e_{12345} \lrcorner M = e_{25} - e_{23} + e_{12} - e_4$ is an optimal internal carving.

7 Multivector Grades and Simplicity

For a general multivector we define 4 kinds of grade, which for nonzero blades coincide with the usual one (by Proposition 6.2).

Definition 7.1. The *inner* and *outer grades* of $M \in \wedge X$ are $|M|_{\text{in}} = \dim[M]$ and $|M|_{\text{out}} = \dim[M]$. If $M \neq 0$, its *bottom* and *top grades* are $|M|_{\text{bot}} = \min\{p : \langle M \rangle_p \neq 0\}$ and $|M|_{\text{top}} = \max\{p : \langle M \rangle_p \neq 0\}$.

So $|M|_{\text{in}}$ is the dimension of the set of solutions of $v \wedge M = 0$, while $|M|_{\text{out}}$ is the codimension of the set of solutions of $v \lrcorner M = 0$ (also called *rank* of M [41]). And $|M|_{\text{bot}}$ and $|M|_{\text{top}}$ are the lowest and highest grades of nonzero homogeneous components of M .

Proposition 7.2. $|M|_{\text{in}} \leq |M|_{\text{bot}} \leq |M|_{\text{top}} \leq |M|_{\text{out}}$, for $0 \neq M \in \wedge X$.

Proof. A maximal blade factorization $M = B \wedge N$ gives $|M|_{\text{in}} = |B| \leq |M|_{\text{bot}}$. The other inequalities are immediate. \square

Note that $|0|_{\text{in}} = \dim X > 0 = |0|_{\text{out}}$, and $|0|_{\text{bot}}, |0|_{\text{top}}$ are undefined.

Proposition 7.3. $|M^*|_{\text{in}} + |M|_{\text{out}} = \dim X$ for any $M \in \wedge X$, and if $M \neq 0$ then $|M^*|_{\text{bot}} + |M|_{\text{top}} = \dim X$.

Proof. Follows from Propositions 4.4 and 6.8. \square

The next result shows $M + N$ is inner or outer balanced if M and N are distinct enough, as measured by how big $[M] + [N]$ is compared to their smallest top grade, or how small $[M] \cap [N]$ is compared to their largest bottom grade.

Theorem 7.4. Let $t = \min\{|M|_{\text{top}}, |N|_{\text{top}}\}$ and $b = \max\{|M|_{\text{bot}}, |N|_{\text{bot}}\}$ for nonzero $M, N \in \wedge X$.

- i) If $\dim([M] + [N]) \geq t + 2$ then $[M + N] = [M] \cap [N]$ and also $|M + N|_{\text{in}} \leq b - 2$.
- ii) If $\dim([M] \cap [N]) \leq b - 2$ then $[M + N] = [M] + [N]$ and also $|M + N|_{\text{out}} \geq t + 2$.

Proof. (i) Let $\beta_U, \beta_V, \beta_W, \beta_Y$ be bases (possibly empty) of $U, V, W, Y \subset X$ with $U = \lfloor M \rfloor \cap \lfloor N \rfloor$, $U \oplus V = \lfloor M \rfloor$, $U \oplus W = \lfloor N \rfloor$ and $U \oplus V \oplus W \oplus Y = X$. Exterior products of all elements of $\beta_U \cup \beta_V \cup \{1\}$ and $\beta_U \cup \beta_W \cup \{1\}$ yield blades A and B with $\lceil A \rceil = \lfloor M \rfloor$ and $\lceil B \rceil = \lfloor N \rfloor$, and Theorem 6.44 gives optimal factorizations $M = A \wedge M'$ and $N = B \wedge N'$ with $\lceil M' \rceil \subset W \oplus Y$ and $\lceil N' \rceil \subset V \oplus Y$. For $q = \dim U$, $r = \dim V$ and $s = \dim W$ we have $|M|_{\text{top}} = |M'|_{\text{top}} + q + r$, $|N|_{\text{top}} = |N'|_{\text{top}} + q + s$ and, by hypothesis, $q + r + s \geq 2 + \min\{|M|_{\text{top}}, |N|_{\text{top}}\}$, so that

$$r > 1 + |N'|_{\text{top}} \quad \text{or} \quad s > 1 + |M'|_{\text{top}}. \quad (9)$$

Let $x \in \lfloor M + N \rfloor$, and decompose it as $x = u + v + w + y$ for $u \in U$, $v \in V$, $w \in W$ and $y \in Y$. As $u, v \in \lceil A \rceil$ and $u, w \in \lceil B \rceil$, we have

$$0 = x \wedge (M + N) = (w + y) \wedge A \wedge M' + (v + y) \wedge B \wedge N'. \quad (10)$$

In the basis of $\bigwedge X$ induced from $\beta_U \cup \beta_V \cup \beta_W \cup \beta_Y$, nonzero components of $(w + y) \wedge A \wedge M'$ have all r elements of β_V and at most $1 + |M'|_{\text{top}}$ of β_W , and those of $(v + y) \wedge B \wedge N'$ have at most $1 + |N'|_{\text{top}}$ of β_V and all s of β_W . By (9) there are no common components, so (10) gives $(w + y) \wedge A \wedge M' = (v + y) \wedge B \wedge N' = 0$. As $\lceil A \rceil = U \oplus V$ and $\lceil (w + y) \wedge M' \rceil \subset W \oplus Y$, Corollary 6.4 gives $(w + y) \wedge M' = 0$. By Proposition 6.41iv, $\lfloor M' \rfloor = \{0\}$, so $w = y = 0$. Likewise, from $(v + y) \wedge B \wedge N' = 0$ we obtain $v = 0$, so $x = u \in \lfloor M \rfloor \cap \lfloor N \rfloor$.

Thus $\lfloor M + N \rfloor \subset \lfloor M \rfloor \cap \lfloor N \rfloor$, and Proposition 6.28 gives equality. Then $|M + N|_{\text{in}} = \dim(\lfloor M \rfloor \cap \lfloor N \rfloor) = |M|_{\text{in}} + |N|_{\text{in}} - \dim(\lfloor M \rfloor + \lfloor N \rfloor) \leq |M|_{\text{bot}} + |N|_{\text{bot}} - t - 2 \leq |M|_{\text{bot}} + |N|_{\text{bot}} - \min\{|M|_{\text{bot}}, |N|_{\text{bot}}\} - 2 = b - 2$.

(ii) Follows from i applied to M^* and N^* . \square

7.1 Simplicity Criteria

We can now give easy proofs for some known simplicity criteria, and obtain new ones in terms of the generalized grades.

Proposition 7.5. $0 \neq M \in \bigwedge X$ is simple $\Leftrightarrow \lfloor M \rfloor = \lceil M \rceil$.

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Follows from Proposition 6.2. (\Leftarrow) An optimal blade factorization $M = B \wedge N$ gives $\lceil B \rceil = \lfloor M \rfloor = \lceil M \rceil = \lceil B \rceil \oplus \lceil N \rceil$, by Proposition 6.41i. So $\lceil N \rceil = \{0\}$, N is a scalar and M is a blade. \square

Thus, $M \neq 0$ being simple is equivalent to $|M|_{\text{in}} = |M|_{\text{out}}$, and to $\{v \in X : v \wedge M = 0\} = \{w \in X : w \lrcorner M = 0\}^\perp$ (\subset always holds).

Corollary 7.6. $M \in \bigwedge X$ is simple $\Leftrightarrow v \wedge M = 0$ for all $v \in \lceil M \rceil$.

Proposition 7.7. For $H \in \bigwedge^p X$, the following are equivalent:

- i) H is simple.
- ii) $(F \lrcorner H) \wedge H = 0$ for all $F \in \bigwedge^{p-1} X$.
- iii) $(H \lrcorner G) \lrcorner H = 0$ for all $G \in \bigwedge^{p+1} X$.
- iv) $\langle H \lrcorner G, F \lrcorner H \rangle = 0$ for all $F \in \bigwedge^{p-1} X$ and $G \in \bigwedge^{p+1} X$.

Proof. $(i \Leftrightarrow ii)$ Follows from Propositions 6.9 and 7.6. $(ii \Leftrightarrow iii \Leftrightarrow iv)$ For $F \in \bigwedge^{p-1} X$ and $G \in \bigwedge^{p+1} X$, $\langle F, (H \lrcorner G) \lrcorner H \rangle = \langle (H \lrcorner G) \wedge F, H \rangle = \langle H \lrcorner G, H \lrcorner F \rangle = \langle G, H \wedge (H \lrcorner F) \rangle = \pm \langle G, (F \lrcorner H) \wedge H \rangle$. \square

As H is simple $\Leftrightarrow H^*$ is simple, this is also equivalent to $(F \wedge H) \vee H = 0 \forall F \in \bigwedge^{n-p-1} X$, and to $(G \vee H) \wedge H = 0 \forall G \in \bigwedge^{n-p+1} X$.

Corollary 7.8. $H \in \bigwedge^2 X$ is simple $\Leftrightarrow H \wedge H = 0$.

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Immediate. (\Leftarrow) Follows from Proposition 7.7ii, as, for $v \in X$, $(v \lrcorner H) \wedge H = \frac{1}{2}v \lrcorner (H \wedge H) = 0$. \square

Proposition 7.9. Let $i = |M|_{in}$, $b = |M|_{bot}$, $t = |M|_{top}$ and $o = |M|_{out}$ for $0 \neq M \in \bigwedge X$.

- i) $\langle M \rangle_i$, $\langle M \rangle_{i+1}$, $\langle M \rangle_{o-1}$ and $\langle M \rangle_o$ are blades (possibly 0).
- ii) If $\langle M \rangle_b$ is not simple then $i + 2 \leq b \leq o - 2$.
- iii) If $\langle M \rangle_t$ is not simple then $i + 2 \leq t \leq o - 2$.

Proof. (i) A maximal blade factorization $M = B \wedge N$ gives $\langle M \rangle_i = \langle N \rangle_0 B$ and $\langle M \rangle_{i+1} = B \wedge \langle N \rangle_1$, and a minimal blade carving $M = L \lrcorner B$ gives $\langle M \rangle_o = \langle L \rangle_0 B$ and $\langle M \rangle_{o-1} = \langle L \rangle_1 \lrcorner B$. (ii,iii) Follow from i. \square

Corollary 7.10. For $0 \neq H \in \bigwedge^p X$, there are 2 possibilities:

- i) H is simple and $|H|_{in} = |H|_{out} = p$.
- ii) H is not simple, $|H|_{in} \leq p - 2$ and $|H|_{out} \geq p + 2$.

Corollary 7.11. If $M \in \bigwedge X$ has a non-simple homogeneous component then $|M|_{out} \geq |M|_{in} + 4$.

Proof. As $M = \sum_p \langle M \rangle_p$ is balanced (Example 6.32), if some $\langle M \rangle_p$ is not simple then $|M|_{out} \geq |\langle M \rangle_p|_{out} \geq |\langle M \rangle_p|_{in} + 4 \geq |M|_{in} + 4$. \square

Corollary 7.12. For nonzero $G, H \in \bigwedge^p X$, if $\dim([G] + [H]) \geq p + 2$ then $[G + H] = [G] \cap [H]$. If $\dim(\lceil G \rceil \cap \lceil H \rceil) \leq p - 2$ then $\lceil G + H \rceil = \lceil G \rceil + \lceil H \rceil$. In either case $G + H$ is not simple.

Proof. Follows from Propositions 7.4 and 7.10. \square

Proposition 7.13. For nonzero p -blades A and B with $[A] \neq [B]$, either:

- i) $A + B$ is simple, $\dim([A] \cap [B]) = p - 1$, $\dim([A] + [B]) = p + 1$ and $[A] \cap [B] \subsetneq [A + B] \subsetneq [A] + [B]$.
- ii) $A + B$ is not simple, $\dim([A] \cap [B]) \leq p - 2$, $\dim([A] + [B]) \geq p + 2$, $[A + B] = [A] \cap [B]$ and $\lceil A + B \rceil = [A] + [B]$.

Proof. $d = \dim([A] \cap [B]) < p$, as $[A] \neq [B]$. If $d = p - 1$ then $A = u \wedge C$ and $B = v \wedge C$ for $u, v \in X$ with $[u] \neq [v]$ and a blade C with $[C] = [A] \cap [B]$, so $A + B = (u + v) \wedge C$ and the rest follows. If $d \leq p - 2$ then $\dim([A] + [B]) \geq p + 2$, and the rest follows from Corollary 7.12. \square

7.2 Plücker Relations

The following quadratic equations are the *Plücker relations* [18], which describe the embedding of the Grassmannian of p -dimensional subspaces of X as an algebraic variety in the projective space $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^p X)$.

Proposition 7.14. *Let (e_1, \dots, e_n) be an orthonormal basis of X . An $H = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_p^n} \lambda_i e_i \in \wedge^p X$ is simple \Leftrightarrow for all $\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{I}_{p-1}^n$ and $\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{I}_{p+1}^n$,*

$$\sum_{i \in \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{j}} (-1)^{|\mathbf{j}| > i| + |\mathbf{k}| > i|} \lambda_{\mathbf{j} \cup i} \lambda_{\mathbf{k} - i} = 0. \quad (11)$$

Proof. Proposition 7.7iv is the same as having, for $\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{I}_{p-1}^n$ and $\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{I}_{p+1}^n$, $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_p^n, l \in \mathcal{I}_p^n} \lambda_i \lambda_l \langle e_i \lrcorner e_{\mathbf{k}}, e_j \lrcorner e_l \rangle = 0$. The inner product vanishes unless $e_i \lrcorner e_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $e_j \lrcorner e_l$ equal $\pm e_i$ for some $i \in \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{j}$, in which case $\mathbf{i} = \mathbf{k} - i$, $\mathbf{l} = \mathbf{j} \cup i$, and it gives $\epsilon_{(\mathbf{k}-i)i} \cdot \epsilon_{\mathbf{j}i} = (-1)^{|\mathbf{k}| > i| + |\mathbf{j}| > i|}$. \square

As one can check, (11) is trivial if $\mathbf{j} \subset \mathbf{k}$. If $|\mathbf{j} \cap \mathbf{k}| = p - 2$, swapping the only index of $\mathbf{j} - (\mathbf{j} \cap \mathbf{k})$ and each of the 3 indices of $\mathbf{k} - (\mathbf{j} \cap \mathbf{k})$ we find other 3 equivalent equations. All equations are inequivalent for $|\mathbf{j} \cap \mathbf{k}| < p - 2$.

Example 7.15. Let $p = 2$ and $n = 4$. For $(\mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}) = (1, 123)$, (11) gives the trivial $-\lambda_{12}\lambda_{13} + \lambda_{13}\lambda_{12} = 0$. The only nontrivial equation is $\lambda_{12}\lambda_{34} - \lambda_{13}\lambda_{24} + \lambda_{14}\lambda_{23} = 0$, obtained, up to sign, from $(1, 234)$, $(2, 134)$, $(3, 124)$ and $(4, 123)$. It describes the Grassmannian as an algebraic variety of dimension $p(n - p) = 4$ in a projective space of dimension $\binom{n}{p} - 1 = 5$.

Example 7.16. For $p = 2$ and $n = 5$, a minimal set of Plücker relations is given by $(\mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}) = (1, 234), (1, 235), (1, 245), (1, 345)$ and $(2, 345)$, which lead to $\lambda_{ij}\lambda_{kl} - \lambda_{ik}\lambda_{jl} + \lambda_{il}\lambda_{jk} = 0$ for $1 \leq i < j < k < l \leq 5$. Though there are 5 equations and the projective space has dimension 9, the Grassmannian has dimension 6, as it is not a complete intersection of the solution sets of the equations.

Example 7.17. For $p = 3$ and $n = 5$, $(\mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}) = (13, 2345), (23, 1345), (34, 1235)$ and $(35, 1234)$ give $\lambda_{123}\lambda_{345} - \lambda_{134}\lambda_{235} + \lambda_{135}\lambda_{234} = 0$, up to sign. A minimal set of relations is given by $(12, 1345), (12, 2345), (13, 2345), (14, 2345)$ and $(15, 2345)$.

8 Supersymmetry

Here we relate exterior products and contractions to supersymmetry [10, 43] and to multi-fermion creation and annihilation operators [36, 41]. First we review some concepts of superalgebras.

Definition 8.1. A *superalgebra* \mathcal{A} is a \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded algebra, i.e. it decomposes as $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_0 \oplus \mathcal{A}_1$ and the product respects the grading, $\mathcal{A}_i \mathcal{A}_j \subset \mathcal{A}_{i+j}$ for $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_2$. The subspaces \mathcal{A}_0 and \mathcal{A}_1 (and their elements) are called *even* and *odd*, respectively. If $T \in \mathcal{A}_i$, it has *parity* $|T| = i$.

Definition 8.2. If $S, T \in \mathcal{A}$ have parities s and t , their *supercommutator* is $\llbracket S, T \rrbracket = ST - (-1)^{st}TS$. It is extended linearly to all $S, T \in \mathcal{A}$.

If S or T is even this is the usual commutator $[\cdot, \cdot]$, and if both are odd it is the usual anticommutator $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$. For arbitrary $S, T \in \mathcal{A}$, decomposing $S = S_0 + S_1$ and $T = T_0 + T_1$ for $S_0, T_0 \in \mathcal{A}_0$ and $S_1, T_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1$ we find $\llbracket S, T \rrbracket = [S_0, T_0] + [S_0, T_1] + [S_1, T_0] + \{S_1, T_1\}$.

Example 8.3. $\text{End}(\mathcal{A}) = \text{End}_0(\mathcal{A}) \oplus \text{End}_1(\mathcal{A})$ is also a superalgebra, where $\text{End}_i(\mathcal{A}) = \{T \in \text{End}(\mathcal{A}) : T(\mathcal{A}_j) \subset \mathcal{A}_{i+j} \forall j \in \mathbb{Z}_2\}$ is the set of endomorphisms of parity $i \in \mathbb{Z}_2$. Indeed, if $P_i : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_i$ is the projection, any $T \in \text{End}(\mathcal{A})$ decomposes as $T = T_0 + T_1$ with $T_0 = P_0 T P_0 + P_1 T P_1 \in \text{End}_0(\mathcal{A})$ and $T_1 = P_1 T P_0 + P_0 T P_1 \in \text{End}_1(\mathcal{A})$. And, as even endomorphisms preserve parities, mapping $\mathcal{A}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_0$ and $\mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_1$, and odd ones switch them, mapping $\mathcal{A}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_0$, their compositions respect the grading.

Example 8.4. $\bigwedge X$ is a superalgebra, with even and odd subspaces $\bigwedge^+ X = \bigoplus_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \bigwedge^{2k} X$ and $\bigwedge^- X = \bigoplus_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \bigwedge^{2k+1} X$, respectively. It is *supercommutative*, i.e. $\llbracket M, N \rrbracket = 0$ for all $M, N \in \bigwedge X$.

We will be interested in the superalgebra $\text{End}(\bigwedge X)$.

8.1 Operators of Exterior and Interior Products

Definition 8.5. The (left) exterior and interior products by $M \in \bigwedge X$ are, respectively, $\varepsilon_M, \iota_M \in \text{End}(\bigwedge X)$ defined, for any $N \in \bigwedge X$, by $\varepsilon_M(N) = M \wedge N$ and $\iota_M(N) = M \lrcorner N$.

These operators have the parity (or lack thereof) of M , and their dependence on M is linear for ε_M and conjugate-linear for ι_M . For $H \in \bigwedge^p X$, ε_H and ι_H map $\bigwedge^k X \rightarrow \bigwedge^{k \pm p} X$, i.e. they respect the \mathbb{Z} -grading of $\bigwedge X$, being homogeneous of degrees p and $-p$, respectively.

Proposition 8.6. Let $M, N \in \bigwedge X$.

- i) $\iota_M \iota_N = \iota_N \wedge M$.
- ii) $\varepsilon_M \varepsilon_N = \varepsilon_{M \wedge N}$.
- iii) $\iota_M^\dagger = \varepsilon_M$.
- iv) $\varepsilon_M^2 = \iota_M^2 = 0$ if M is odd or is a non-scalar blade.

Proof. (i) Follows from Proposition 3.6. (ii–iv) Immediate. \square

Note the reordering of M and N in i. By iii, $\iota_M + \varepsilon_M$ is self-adjoint (we also note that $\iota_v + \varepsilon_v$ gives the left Clifford product by $v \in X$, and a Majorana operator in Physics [23, 44]).

We have the following supercommutation relations [36].

Proposition 8.7. Let $M, N \in \bigwedge X$, and B be a p -blade.

- i) $\llbracket \varepsilon_M, \varepsilon_N \rrbracket = \llbracket \iota_M, \iota_N \rrbracket = 0$.
- ii) $\llbracket \iota_B, \varepsilon_M \rrbracket = \varepsilon_{B \lrcorner M} + \sum_{k=1}^{p-1} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_k^p} \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{i}'} \varepsilon_{B_{\mathbf{i}' \lrcorner M} \wedge k} \iota_{B_{\mathbf{i}}}$.

Proof. Assume $M \in \bigwedge^q X$, $N \in \bigwedge^p X$. (i) $\varepsilon_M \varepsilon_N = \varepsilon_{M \wedge N} = (-1)^{pq} \varepsilon_N \varepsilon_M$, and likewise for $\iota_M \iota_N$. (ii) By (5), $\iota_B \varepsilon_M = \sum_{k=0}^p \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_k^p} \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{i}'} \varepsilon_{B_{\mathbf{i}' \lrcorner M} \wedge k} \iota_{B_{\mathbf{i}}} = \varepsilon_{B \lrcorner M} + (-1)^{pq} \varepsilon_M \iota_B + \sum_{k=1}^{p-1} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_k^p} \epsilon_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{i}'} \varepsilon_{B_{\mathbf{i}' \lrcorner M} \wedge k} \iota_{B_{\mathbf{i}}}$. \square

Example 8.8. For $B = e_1 \wedge e_2 \in \bigwedge^2 X$ and $M \in \bigwedge X$, we have $\llbracket \iota_B, \epsilon_M \rrbracket = \epsilon_{B \lrcorner M} + \epsilon_{e_2 \lrcorner M} \iota_{e_1} - \epsilon_{e_1 \lrcorner M} \iota_{e_2}$ (compare with Example 3.14).

Corollary 8.9. $\llbracket \iota_v, \epsilon_M \rrbracket = \epsilon_{v \lrcorner M}$ and $\llbracket \iota_v, \epsilon_w \rrbracket = \langle v, w \rangle \mathbf{1}$, for $v, w \in X$ and $M \in \bigwedge X$.

If $\|v\| = 1$, we have $\iota_v \epsilon_v M + \epsilon_v \iota_v M = M$ for $M \in \bigwedge X$. With Proposition 8.6iv, this shows the following cochain complex is exact,

$$0 \xrightarrow{\epsilon_v} \bigwedge^0 X \xrightarrow{\epsilon_v} \dots \xrightarrow{\epsilon_v} \bigwedge^k X \xrightarrow{\epsilon_v} \bigwedge^{k+1} X \xrightarrow{\epsilon_v} \dots \xrightarrow{\epsilon_v} \bigwedge^n X \xrightarrow{\epsilon_v} 0,$$

and the same holds for the corresponding chain complex with ι_v . This gives us another way to look at Corollary 6.15.

8.2 Creation and Annihilation Operators

Here we fix an orthonormal basis (e_1, \dots, e_n) of X .

Definition 8.10. $a_{\mathbf{r}} = \iota_{e_{\mathbf{r}}}$ and $a_{\mathbf{r}}^\dagger = \epsilon_{e_{\mathbf{r}}}$ are *annihilation* and *creation operators*, respectively, for any multi-index $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{M}^n$.

The terminology is from Physics [36]: fermions are particles such that at most one can occupy a single-particle quantum state e_i . For $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}^n$, $e_{\mathbf{i}}$ is a multi-particle state with $|\mathbf{i}|$ fermions, one in each e_i with $i \in \mathbf{i}$. Acting on it, $a_{\mathbf{j}}$ and $a_{\mathbf{j}}^\dagger$ remove or add particles in the states specified by \mathbf{j} , if possible (if not, they give 0).

Definition 8.11. For $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}^n$, let $\mathcal{S}'_{\mathbf{i}} = \{\mathbf{j} : \mathbf{j}' \supset \mathbf{i}\} = \{\mathbf{j} : \mathbf{j} \cap \mathbf{i} = \emptyset\} \subset \mathcal{I}^n$ and $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{i}} = \{\mathbf{j} : \mathbf{j} \supset \mathbf{i}\} = \{\mathbf{ij} : \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{S}'_{\mathbf{i}}\} \subset \mathcal{I}^n$. For any $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{I}^n$, let $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{S}} = \text{span}\{e_{\mathbf{i}} : \mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{S}\}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{S}}}$.

Clearly, $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{S}'_{\mathbf{i}}} = \bigwedge([e_i]^\perp)$ and $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{i}}} = e_{\mathbf{i}} \wedge \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{S}'_{\mathbf{i}}} = e_{\mathbf{i}} \wedge \bigwedge X$.

Proposition 8.12. Let $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{I}^n$ and $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{M}^n$.

- i) $a_{\emptyset} = a_{\emptyset}^\dagger = \mathbf{1}$.
- ii) $a_{[\mathbf{r}]} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{r}} a_{\mathbf{r}}$ and $a_{[\mathbf{r}]}^\dagger = \epsilon_{\mathbf{r}} a_{\mathbf{r}}^\dagger$.
- iii) $a_{\mathbf{i}}^\dagger$ and $a_{\mathbf{i}}$ give mutually inverse isomorphisms $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{S}'_{\mathbf{i}}} \xrightleftharpoons[a_{\mathbf{i}}]{a_{\mathbf{i}}^\dagger} \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{i}}}$ and vanish on $(\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{S}'_{\mathbf{i}}})^\perp$ and $(\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{i}}})^\perp$, respectively.
- iv) $a_{\mathbf{i}}^2 = (a_{\mathbf{i}}^\dagger)^2 = 0$, if $\mathbf{i} \neq \emptyset$.
- v) $\llbracket a_{\mathbf{i}}, a_{\mathbf{j}} \rrbracket = \llbracket a_{\mathbf{i}}^\dagger, a_{\mathbf{j}}^\dagger \rrbracket = 0$.

Proof. (i) Immediate. (ii) $a_{[\mathbf{r}]} = \iota_{e_{[\mathbf{r}]}} = \iota_{\epsilon_{\mathbf{r}} e_{\mathbf{r}}} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{r}} a_{\mathbf{r}}$, likewise for $a_{[\mathbf{r}]}^\dagger$. (iii) $a_{\mathbf{i}}^\dagger e_{\mathbf{j}} = e_{\mathbf{ij}}$ and $a_{\mathbf{i}} e_{\mathbf{ij}} = e_{\mathbf{j}}$ if $\mathbf{i} \subset \mathbf{j}'$, $a_{\mathbf{i}}^\dagger e_{\mathbf{j}} = 0$ if $\mathbf{i} \not\subset \mathbf{j}'$, and $a_{\mathbf{i}} e_{\mathbf{j}} = 0$ if $\mathbf{i} \not\subset \mathbf{j}$. (iv) Follows from Proposition 8.6iv. (v) Follows from Proposition 8.7i. \square

Example 8.13. For (e_1, \dots, e_4) orthonormal, $a_{14} e_{124} = -e_2$, $a_{14} e_{123} = 0$, $a_{14}^\dagger e_2 = -e_{124}$ and $a_{14}^\dagger e_1 = 0$.

The supercommutator $\llbracket a_{\mathbf{i}}^\dagger, a_{\mathbf{j}} \rrbracket$ is not trivial as those in v. We discuss first the case $\mathbf{i} = \mathbf{j}$.

8.2.1 Supercommutator $\llbracket a_i^\dagger, a_i \rrbracket$

We have $\llbracket a_i^\dagger, a_i \rrbracket = n_i - (-1)^{|\mathbf{i}|} m_i$ for the following self-adjoint operators.

Definition 8.14. $m_i = a_i a_i^\dagger$ and $n_i = a_i^\dagger a_i$ are *vacancy* and *occupancy operators*, respectively, for $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}^n$.

For a single index i , n_i is a *number operator*, as it shows (actually, its eigenvalues do) how many particles are in e_i (0 or 1 for fermions, showing if the state is vacant or occupied). For a multi-index \mathbf{i} , n_i tests if all states specified by \mathbf{i} are occupied, while m_i shows if all are vacant.

Proposition 8.15. $m_i e_{\mathbf{k}} = e_{\mathbf{k}} \cdot \delta_{\mathbf{i} \subset \mathbf{k}'}$ and $n_i e_{\mathbf{k}} = e_{\mathbf{k}} \cdot \delta_{\mathbf{i} \subset \mathbf{k}}$, for $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{I}^n$. So $m_i = \mathcal{P}_{S_i'} = P_{[e_i]^\perp}$ and $n_i = \mathcal{P}_{S_i} = \mathcal{P}_{e_i \wedge \Lambda X}$.

Proof. Follows from Lemma 3.25(iv,v). \square

Corollary 8.16. For $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{I}^n$, $\llbracket a_i^\dagger, a_i \rrbracket e_{\mathbf{k}} = \begin{cases} e_{\mathbf{k}} & \text{if } \emptyset \neq \mathbf{i} \subset \mathbf{k}, \\ (-1)^{|\mathbf{i}|+1} e_{\mathbf{k}} & \text{if } \emptyset \neq \mathbf{i} \subset \mathbf{k}', \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$

Proposition 8.17. Let $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{I}^n$.

- i) $m_\emptyset = n_\emptyset = \mathbf{1}$.
- ii) $m_i + n_i = \mathbf{1}$, for a single index $1 \leq i \leq n$.
- iii) $m_i^2 = m_i$ and $n_i^2 = n_i$.
- iv) $m_i m_j = \mathcal{P}_{S_i' \cap S_j'} = m_{i \cup j}$ and $n_i n_j = \mathcal{P}_{S_i \cap S_j} = n_{i \cup j}$.
- v) $[m_i, m_j] = [n_i, n_j] = [m_i, n_j] = 0$.
- vi) $m_i = \prod_{i \in \mathbf{i}} m_i$ and $n_i = \prod_{i \in \mathbf{i}} n_i$.
- vii) $m_i = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \subset \mathbf{i}} (-1)^{|\mathbf{j}|} n_j$ and $n_i = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \subset \mathbf{i}} (-1)^{|\mathbf{j}|} m_j$.
- viii) The following diagram is commutative. Stars can be \star_L or \star_R , but must be equal (resp. opposite) for equal (resp. opposite) arrows.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \wedge X & \xleftarrow{\star} & \wedge X \\ m_i \downarrow & & \downarrow n_i \\ \wedge X & \xleftarrow{\star} & \wedge X \end{array} \quad (12)$$

Proof. (i-vi) Follow from Proposition 8.15. (vii) By ii and vi, $m_i = \prod_{i \in \mathbf{i}} (\mathbf{1} - n_i)$, and likewise for n_i . (viii) $(m_i e_{\mathbf{k}})^\star = e_{\mathbf{k}}^\star \cdot \delta_{\mathbf{i} \subset \mathbf{k}'} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'} e_{\mathbf{k}'} \cdot \delta_{\mathbf{i} \subset \mathbf{k}'} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'} n_i e_{\mathbf{k}'} = n_i (e_{\mathbf{k}})^\star$. Other relations are similar. \square

Note that vii can be written as decompositions of the identity operator, $\mathbf{1} = m_i - \sum_{\emptyset \neq \mathbf{j} \subset \mathbf{i}} (-1)^{|\mathbf{j}|} n_j = n_i - \sum_{\emptyset \neq \mathbf{j} \subset \mathbf{i}} (-1)^{|\mathbf{j}|} m_j$, and interpreted in terms of the inclusion-exclusion principle of combinatorics (Fig. 4). It is curious that m_i and n_i appear in $\llbracket a_i, a_i^\dagger \rrbracket = m_i - (-1)^{|\mathbf{i}|} n_i$ and in $\llbracket a_i^\dagger, a_i \rrbracket = n_i - (-1)^{|\mathbf{i}|} m_i$ with the same signs as in these decompositions. It is not clear if this is a coincidence or has some deeper meaning.




Figure 4: Decompositions of $\mathbb{1}$ via inclusion-exclusion principle, and supercommutators. (a) n_1 , n_2 and n_4 project on spaces spanned by e_j 's with \mathbf{j} in the corresponding circles, n_{124} on their intersection, and m_{124} on their complement. (b) Alternative decomposition, switching the roles of m 's and n 's, and the order in the supercommutator. The symmetry between the diagrams is due to (12).

Example 8.18. In Example 8.13, $m_{14}e_2 = e_2$, $m_{14}e_{12} = 0$, $n_{14}e_{124} = e_{124}$ and $n_{14}e_{234} = 0$. Also, $m_{14} = n_\emptyset - n_1 - n_4 + n_{14}$, meaning $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{j} \cap 14 = \emptyset} = \mathbb{1} - \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{j} \supset 1} - \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{j} \supset 4} + \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{j} \supset 14}$, i.e. the projection on the (space spanned by e_j 's with) \mathbf{j} 's disjoint from 14 is the projection on all \mathbf{j} 's, minus those with 1 and those with 4, plus those with both, which were removed twice. And $n_{14} = m_\emptyset - m_1 - m_4 + m_{14}$ means $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{j} \supset 14} = \mathbb{1} - \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{j} \cap 1 = \emptyset} - \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{j} \cap 4 = \emptyset} + \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{j} \cap 14 = \emptyset}$. Similar interpretations can be obtained for $\mathbf{i} = 124$ in Fig. 4.

8.2.2 Supercommutator $\llbracket a_i^\dagger, a_j \rrbracket$

This supercommutator is more complex for $\mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{j}$, and it has not been described before, as far as we know.

Theorem 8.19. *Given $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{I}^n$, separate their indices into pairwise disjoint $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{M}^n$ as in the Venn diagram of Fig. 5. Then*

$$\llbracket a_i^\dagger, a_j \rrbracket e_{\mathbf{k}} = \delta_{\mathbf{xy}=\emptyset} (\delta_{\mathbf{d}=\emptyset} - \delta_{\mathbf{c}=\emptyset}) \cdot (-1)^{|\mathbf{d}|+|\mathbf{ab}>\mathbf{de}|} e_{[\mathbf{ace}]}. \quad (13)$$

Proof. If $\mathbf{x} \neq \emptyset$ then $\mathbf{j} \not\subset \mathbf{i} \cup \mathbf{k}$, while $\mathbf{i} \cap (\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{j}) \neq \emptyset$ if $\mathbf{y} \neq \emptyset$, and in either case $a_i^\dagger a_j e_{\mathbf{k}} = e_{\mathbf{i}} \wedge (e_{\mathbf{j}} \lrcorner e_{\mathbf{k}}) = 0$ and $a_j a_i^\dagger e_{\mathbf{k}} = e_{\mathbf{j}} \lrcorner (e_{\mathbf{i}} \wedge e_{\mathbf{k}}) = 0$. If $\mathbf{xy} = \emptyset$ then $\mathbf{i} = [\mathbf{acd}]$, $\mathbf{j} = [\mathbf{bcd}]$ and $\mathbf{k} = [\mathbf{bce}]$, and Proposition 8.12ii gives $\llbracket a_i^\dagger, a_j \rrbracket e_{\mathbf{k}} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{acd}} \epsilon_{\mathbf{bcd}} \epsilon_{\mathbf{bce}} \llbracket a_{\mathbf{acd}}^\dagger, a_{\mathbf{bcd}} \rrbracket e_{\mathbf{bce}}$. We have $a_{\mathbf{acd}}^\dagger a_{\mathbf{bcd}} e_{\mathbf{bce}} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{acd}} \wedge (e_{\mathbf{bcd}} \lrcorner e_{\mathbf{bce}}) = \delta_{\mathbf{d}=\emptyset} \epsilon_{\mathbf{ac}} \wedge e_{\mathbf{e}} = \delta_{\mathbf{d}=\emptyset} (-1)^{|\mathbf{d}|} e_{\mathbf{ace}}$ and $a_{\mathbf{bcd}} a_{\mathbf{acd}}^\dagger e_{\mathbf{bce}} = e_{\mathbf{bcd}} \lrcorner (e_{\mathbf{acd}} \wedge e_{\mathbf{bce}}) = \delta_{\mathbf{c}=\emptyset} e_{\mathbf{bd}} \lrcorner e_{\mathbf{adbe}} = \delta_{\mathbf{c}=\emptyset} (-1)^{|\mathbf{b}||\mathbf{d}|+|\mathbf{a}||\mathbf{bd}|} e_{\mathbf{ae}} = \delta_{\mathbf{c}=\emptyset} \cdot (-1)^{|\mathbf{acd}||\mathbf{bcd}|+|\mathbf{d}|} e_{\mathbf{ace}}$, so $\llbracket a_{\mathbf{acd}}^\dagger, a_{\mathbf{bcd}} \rrbracket e_{\mathbf{bce}} = (\delta_{\mathbf{d}=\emptyset} - \delta_{\mathbf{c}=\emptyset}) (-1)^{|\mathbf{d}|} e_{\mathbf{ace}}$. Thus $\llbracket a_i^\dagger, a_j \rrbracket e_{\mathbf{k}} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{acd}} \epsilon_{\mathbf{ace}} \epsilon_{\mathbf{bcd}} \epsilon_{\mathbf{bce}} \cdot (\delta_{\mathbf{d}=\emptyset} - \delta_{\mathbf{c}=\emptyset}) \cdot (-1)^{|\mathbf{d}|} e_{[\mathbf{ace}]}$, and the result follows from Proposition 2.5viii. \square

Note that when $\mathbf{xy} = \emptyset$ we have $[\mathbf{ace}] = (\mathbf{k} \cup (\mathbf{i} - \mathbf{j})) - (\mathbf{j} - \mathbf{i})$. If $\mathbf{i} = \mathbf{j}$ then (13) reduces to Corollary 8.16.




Figure 5: Partitioning the indices of $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{I}^n$ as indicated, if both dashed sets \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} are empty, and one of the dotted sets \mathbf{c} or \mathbf{d} is empty but the other is not, then $\llbracket a_i^\dagger, a_j \rrbracket e_{\mathbf{k}} = \pm e_{\mathbf{ace}}$, otherwise $\llbracket a_i^\dagger, a_j \rrbracket e_{\mathbf{k}} = 0$.

Corollary 8.20. $\llbracket a_i^\dagger, a_j \rrbracket e_{\mathbf{k}} = 0$ if, and only if, at least one of the following conditions is satisfied:

- i) $\mathbf{j} - (\mathbf{i} \cup \mathbf{k}) \neq \emptyset$.
- ii) $(\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{k}) - \mathbf{j} \neq \emptyset$.
- iii) $(\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{j}) - \mathbf{k} \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{j} \cap \mathbf{k} \neq \emptyset$.
- iv) $\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{j} = \emptyset$.

Proof. (i) $\mathbf{x} \neq \emptyset$. (ii) $\mathbf{y} \neq \emptyset$. (iii) $\mathbf{d} \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathbf{c} \neq \emptyset$. (iv) $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{c} = \emptyset$. \square

Corollary 8.21. $\llbracket a_i^\dagger, a_j \rrbracket = 0 \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{j} = \emptyset$.

Proof. If $\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{j} \neq \emptyset$, none of the above conditions holds for $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{j} - \mathbf{i}$. \square

Example 8.22. As one can check by expanding the supercommutators, $\llbracket a_{12}^\dagger, a_{234} \rrbracket e_{45}$, $\llbracket a_{123}^\dagger, a_{24} \rrbracket e_{2345}$, $\llbracket a_{123}^\dagger, a_{234} \rrbracket e_{345}$ and $\llbracket a_1^\dagger, a_2 \rrbracket e_{23}$ are all 0, as each satisfies one of the conditions above. Also, $\llbracket a_{2347}^\dagger, a_{136} \rrbracket e_{1356} = (1-0) \cdot (-1)^{0+|12467>5|} e_{23457} = e_{23457}$, as $\mathbf{a} = 247$, $\mathbf{b} = 16$, $\mathbf{c} = 3$, $\mathbf{e} = 5$ and $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y} = \emptyset$. And $\llbracket a_{1236}^\dagger, a_{13467} \rrbracket e_{457} = (0-1) \cdot (-1)^{3+|247>1356|} e_{25} = -e_{25}$, as $\mathbf{a} = 2$, $\mathbf{b} = 47$, $\mathbf{d} = 136$, $\mathbf{e} = 5$ and $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y} = \emptyset$.

A Contractions, Interior Products, etc.

The literature has many contractions (also called interior products, inner multiplications, interior derivatives or insertion operators, among other names), all playing similar roles, but with subtle differences which can be confusing. For example, each of the following works has a different contraction: [5, 6, 13, 18, 23, 35, 37, 38, 39, 42]. Here we explain their differences and the reason for such diversity.

A.1 Different Contractions

First we describe the different kinds of contraction, showing how they arise from pairings or inner products. We do not follow a historical development, but rather a logical one. Here, X does not need an inner product at first, X^* is the dual space, and we use A, B, C for any multivectors.

The simplest contraction is the evaluation of a functional $\varphi \in X^*$ at a vector $v \in X$ to get a scalar $\varphi(v)$, also represented as a pairing $\langle \varphi, v \rangle$. For general tensors [5], contractions trace out selected pairs of covariant and contravariant indices, giving a product of pairings $\varphi_i(v_j)$ and a lower order tensor. For multivectors and forms (multi-covectors), alternativity makes us add the results of all correspondences of indices of one element with those of the other, choosing an initial one as positive, and changing sign for each index transposition.

For $\alpha = \varphi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \varphi_k \in \bigwedge^k X^*$ and $A = v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_k \in \bigwedge^k X$ of equal grades, choosing $\varphi_1(v_1) \cdots \varphi_k(v_k)$ as positive we obtain a pairing $\langle \alpha, A \rangle = \det(\varphi_i(v_j))$, which is their contraction. Setting $\langle \alpha, A \rangle = 0$ for distinct grades, and extending linearly, we obtain a nondegenerate pairing of $\bigwedge X$ and $\bigwedge(X^*)$, and so an isomorphism $(\bigwedge X)^* \cong \bigwedge(X^*)$.

Contractions deviate from this pairing when grades are distinct: instead of a scalar, they give a lower grade form or multivector obtained from the φ_i 's or v_i 's left out of each index correspondence. In this case, two choices for an initial positive correspondence give left and right contractions: first functionals with first vectors, or last functionals with last vectors. Actually, these are the choices for convention I, described in Appendix A.2. Convention II switches left and right contractions, while III matches last functionals with first vectors, or vice-versa.

For a vector v and a q -form α , contractions are partial evaluations. The left contraction $v \lrcorner \alpha$ is the $(q-1)$ -form obtained by inserting v in the first entry of α , i.e. $(v \lrcorner \alpha)(u_1, \dots, u_{q-1}) = \alpha(v, u_1, \dots, u_{q-1})$ for $u_1, \dots, u_{q-1} \in X$. The right one, $\alpha \llcorner v$, places v in the last entry, $(\alpha \llcorner v)(u_1, \dots, u_{q-1}) = \alpha(u_1, \dots, u_{q-1}, v)$. For $\alpha = \varphi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \varphi_q$, this gives

$$v \lrcorner \alpha = \sum_{i=1}^q (-1)^{i-1} \varphi_i(v) \varphi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \varphi_{i-1} \wedge \varphi_{i+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \varphi_q,$$

$$\alpha \llcorner v = \sum_{i=1}^q (-1)^{q-i} \varphi_i(v) \varphi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \varphi_{i-1} \wedge \varphi_{i+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \varphi_q,$$

so v is matched positively with φ_1 in $v \lrcorner \alpha$, and with φ_q in $\alpha \llcorner v$. Equivalently, $\langle v \lrcorner \alpha, B \rangle = \langle \alpha, v \wedge B \rangle$ and $\langle \alpha \llcorner v, B \rangle = \langle \alpha, B \wedge v \rangle$ for $B \in \bigwedge^{q-1} X$.

Likewise, for a p -vector A and a functional φ , left and right contractions give $(p-1)$ -vectors defined, respectively, by $\langle \beta, \varphi \lrcorner A \rangle = \langle \varphi \wedge \beta, A \rangle$ and $\langle \beta, A \llcorner \varphi \rangle = \langle \beta \wedge \varphi, A \rangle$ for $\beta \in \bigwedge^{p-1} X^*$. Thus, for $A = v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_p$, φ is applied positively on v_1 for $\varphi \lrcorner A$, and on v_p for $A \llcorner \varphi$.

Generalizing, we obtain four contractions of multivectors and forms. If $p = q$ they coincide, $A \lrcorner \alpha = \alpha \llcorner A = \alpha \lrcorner A = A \llcorner \alpha = \langle \alpha, A \rangle$.

Definition A.1. For $A \in \bigwedge^p X$ and $\alpha \in \bigwedge^q X^*$, let $A \lrcorner \alpha$, $\alpha \llcorner A \in \bigwedge^{q-p} X^*$

and $\alpha \lrcorner A$, $A \lrcorner \alpha \in \bigwedge^{p-q} X$ be defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A \lrcorner \alpha, B \rangle &= \langle \alpha, A \wedge B \rangle, & \langle \beta, \alpha \lrcorner A \rangle &= \langle \alpha \wedge \beta, A \rangle, \\ \langle \alpha \lrcorner A, B \rangle &= \langle \alpha, B \wedge A \rangle, & \langle \beta, A \lrcorner \alpha \rangle &= \langle \beta \wedge \alpha, A \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

for all $B \in \bigwedge^{q-p} X$ and $\beta \in \bigwedge^{p-q} X^*$. These operations are extended linearly for any $A \in \bigwedge X$ and $\alpha \in \bigwedge X^*$.

The element switching sides is the *contractor*, the other is the *contractee*. The result is of the same kind (multivector or form) as the contractee, vanishing if the contractor has larger grade. The left (resp. right) contraction matches the contractor positively with the first (resp. last) components of the contractee. These contractions, between forms and multivectors, are bilinear, even in the complex case.

Example A.2. For $A \in \bigwedge^3 X$ and $\alpha = \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \wedge \varphi_3 \wedge \varphi_4 \in \bigwedge^4 X^*$, we have $\alpha \lrcorner A = A \lrcorner \alpha = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} A \lrcorner \alpha &= + \langle \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \wedge \varphi_3, A \rangle \varphi_4 - \langle \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \wedge \varphi_4, A \rangle \varphi_3 \\ &\quad + \langle \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_3 \wedge \varphi_4, A \rangle \varphi_2 - \langle \varphi_2 \wedge \varphi_3 \wedge \varphi_4, A \rangle \varphi_1, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \lrcorner A &= + \varphi_1 \langle \varphi_2 \wedge \varphi_3 \wedge \varphi_4, A \rangle - \varphi_2 \langle \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_3 \wedge \varphi_4, A \rangle \\ &\quad + \varphi_3 \langle \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \wedge \varphi_4, A \rangle - \varphi_4 \langle \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \wedge \varphi_3, A \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

An inner product provides the musical isomorphism $\flat : X \rightarrow X^*$, given by $v^\flat(w) = \langle v, w \rangle$ for $v, w \in X$, which extends to an outermorphism $\flat : \bigwedge X \rightarrow \bigwedge X^*$. Contractions between multivectors $A, B \in \bigwedge X$ can then be given by $A \lrcorner B = A^\flat \lrcorner B$ and $B \lrcorner A = B \lrcorner A^\flat$. They are not so common outside of GA, possibly due to their dependence on the inner product, but are simpler and have more direct geometric interpretations. So, just as it is easier to study inner product spaces before dual spaces, they are a better entry point into the theory of contractions, which is why we use them in the main part of this work.

To see that these contractions are the same as those of Definition 3.1, note that $\langle A^\flat, B \rangle = \langle A, B \rangle$ for $A, B \in \bigwedge X$, where one $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the pairing of form and multivector, and the other is the inner product in $\bigwedge X$. So, $\langle C, A \lrcorner B \rangle = \langle C^\flat, A^\flat \lrcorner B \rangle = \langle A^\flat \wedge C^\flat, B \rangle = \langle (A \wedge C)^\flat, B \rangle = \langle A \wedge C, B \rangle$ for any $C \in \bigwedge X$. In the complex case, contractions between multivectors are sesquilinear because \flat is conjugate-linear.

A.2 Different Conventions

If having different kinds of contraction is not confusing enough, one must be aware of the various conventions. For simplicity, we use blades A, B, C , but depending on the author these might be forms.

Most authors use \lrcorner for the left contraction, with the lower side of the ‘hook’ towards the contractor. But in [38] it is towards the contractee; in [35] the contractor is on the left of either \lrcorner or \llcorner ; [42] uses \lrcorner and \llcorner depending on whether a multivector is contracting on a form or vice-versa.

Alternative symbols, like \dashv [2], \ominus [6], $:$ [37], \dashv [41] and \lrcorner [13], are also used. In Differential Geometry, contraction by a vector v is often

I	(i)	$\langle A \lrcorner B, C \rangle = \langle B, A \wedge C \rangle$
	(ii)	$(A \wedge B) \lrcorner C = B \lrcorner (A \lrcorner C)$
	(iii)	$v \lrcorner (B \wedge C) = (v \lrcorner B) \wedge C + (-1)^{ B } B \wedge (v \lrcorner C)$
II	(i)	$\langle A \dashv B, C \rangle = \langle B, C \wedge A \rangle$
	(ii)	$(A \wedge B) \dashv C = A \dashv (B \dashv C)$
	(iii)	$v \dashv (B \wedge C) = (-1)^{ C } (v \dashv B) \wedge C + B \wedge (v \dashv C)$
III	(i)	$\langle A \rfloor B, C \rangle = \langle B, \tilde{A} \wedge C \rangle$
	(ii)	$(A \wedge B) \rfloor C = A \rfloor (B \rfloor C)$
	(iii)	$v \rfloor (B \wedge C) = (v \rfloor B) \wedge C + (-1)^{ B } B \wedge (v \rfloor C)$

Table 1: Properties of the left contraction in conventions I, II and III. We use slightly different symbols to distinguish them, but this is not common practice.

represented by \lrcorner or \dashv . We use \dashv and \rfloor to distinguish conventions II and III, described below, but this is not common practice. Geometric algebraists follow III, and though many [13, 24, 44] use \rfloor , there is an effort to make \lrcorner the standard notation (in our opinion, this is unfortunate, as \rfloor helped distinguish their convention).

There are also differences in definitions and properties. Table 1 shows how some properties of the left contraction vary in common conventions. The one we use is I [21, 39, 41]. In II, used by many authors [15, 16, 18, 27, 29], sides are switched: their left contraction $A \dashv B$ is our right one $B \lrcorner A$, and vice-versa. And III, used by Bourbaki [5] and in GA [13, 24, 30], has a reversion in the contractor: its $A \rfloor B$ equals $\tilde{A} \lrcorner B$.

Property (i) sets contractions as adjoints of exterior products. In I (resp. II), the left contraction is the adjoint of the left (resp. right) exterior product. In III, left contraction by A is the adjoint of the left exterior product by the reversed \tilde{A} .

(ii) shows that left contractions turn $\bigwedge X$ into a left $(\bigwedge X)$ -module in II and III. As in I the order of A and B is reversed, the left contraction gives a right module, but the notation does not make this evident.

(iii) is a graded Leibniz rule in I and III, but in II the sign appears at the ‘wrong’ term. For the right contraction, in I and III we have $(B \wedge C) \lrcorner v = (-1)^{|C|} (B \lrcorner v) \wedge C + B \wedge (C \lrcorner v)$, which might also seem to have a misplaced sign, but becomes natural if we think of v as ‘coming from the right’, as the notation suggests.

As these contractions differ only by (grade dependent) signs or involutions, they all work well. Still, there would be less confusion if a standard notation and terminology could be established, preferably one leading to more intuitive formulas and results.

We clearly advocate for I. Some authors see the reordering of A and B in (ii) as a drawback, hiding the module structure. For us, thinking in terms of modules seems to bring little advantage, while the reordering fits well with the nature of the contraction as an adjoint operator.

The weird ‘Leibniz rule’ of II is for us a deal breaker. Many authors seem glad to accept it to avoid the reordering, but its popularity may be

an accident of history: according to [18, p. 112], Bourbaki used II in the 1958 edition of [5], which may explain its early dissemination.

Bourbaki's switch to III in the 1970 edition does not seem to have been well assimilated, and III only became popular with its use in GA [30]. The reversion in (i) 'fixes' the Leibniz rule while preserving the left module structure (Bourbaki used a homomorphism into the opposite algebra for this), but it makes orientations harder to interpret, as we discuss below.

A.3 Geometric Algebra Contractions

The contractions of III were introduced in GA by Lounesto [30]. Dorst [11, p. 134] says the reversion in (i) is used "to absorb some inconvenient signs". But these force their way back, requiring other adjustments to compensate: e.g., $A]B = \langle \tilde{A}, B \rangle$, for equal grades, becomes $A]B = A * B$ for a *scalar product* $A * B = \langle \tilde{A}, B \rangle$. In [12, p. 38], the contraction is defined by $C * (A]B) = (C \wedge A) * B$, with the reversion 'hidden' in the $*$ and in placing A at the right side of the \wedge .

The reversion in III (i) serves another purpose in GA. For $A \in \bigwedge^p X$ and $B \in \bigwedge^q X$, it allows $A]B$ and $A[B$ to be the components of grades $q-p$ and $p-q$ of the Clifford product AB , like other GA products: $A * B$ is the 0-component, and $A \wedge B$ is the $(p+q)$ -component. But AB relates the orientations of \tilde{A} and B [34], so to obtain a result whose orientation is directly related to those of A and B one must use $\tilde{A}B$. This is why the scalar product often appears with a reversion: e.g., the norm of a blade A is $\|A\|^2 = \tilde{A} * A$. The exterior product is not affected by this problem [34, p. 25], but contractions are.

In general, interpreting the orientation of $A]B = (-1)^{\frac{p(p-1)}{2}} A \lrcorner B$ takes some thought and knowledge of $p = |A|$, being less immediate than in Theorem 3.24. For example, $(i \wedge j](i \wedge j \wedge k) = -k$ for the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^3 , a result which, even if algebraically easy to obtain, has a sign whose meaning is not obvious. In fact, the only interpretation for the orientation of $A]B$ we could find in the GA literature ([14, p. 29], [13, p. 76]) is for $p = 1$, in which case $A]B = A \lrcorner B$.

Another example of signs gone awry in GA is the *dualization operator* $*$: $\bigwedge^p X \rightarrow \bigwedge^{n-p} X$, given (in the Euclidean case) by $A^* = A] \tilde{\Omega}$, where Ω is a unit pseudoscalar. It differs from the usual Hodge star, and our \star_R , by a sign $(-1)^{\frac{p(p-1)+n(n-1)}{2}}$. For example, in \mathbb{R}^3 , oriented by $i \wedge j \wedge k$, we have $i^* = -j \wedge k$ (strangely, a figure in [13, p. 82] describes this as the usual result of the right-hand rule).

For beginners, these strange signs that carry no obvious meaning and make it harder to interpret orientations are an off-putting aspect of GA. After a while one gets used to them, and learns to put some to good use: as the Clifford product gives $I^2 = -1$ for $I = i \wedge j$, one can treat it as an imaginary unit and identify \mathbb{C} with the even Clifford algebra of \mathbb{R}^2 . But mostly the signs remain a nuisance, specially for the other products: e.g., we also have $I * I = -1$, which brings no new information and is less useful, as the scalar product is less manageable than the Clifford one. To make sense of this sign, one must think in terms of $\langle I, I \rangle = (-1)^{\frac{p(p-1)}{2}} I * I = 1$, which is more geometrically meaningful.

Such details, and the use of deceptively familiar symbols and terms, often without notice of the differences, might explain why GA is still not as widely used as it could be. It seems the theory was thrown a little off-track by the idea of all products being components of the Clifford one, perhaps due to a sense of algebraic elegance trumping geometric interpretation.

Instead of $A * B$, $A \rfloor B$ and $A \llcorner B$, it might be better to use $\langle A, B \rangle$, $A \sqcup B$ and $A \sqcap B$, which can be described as components of $\tilde{A}B$ (Chisolm [8] does define $A * B = \langle \tilde{A}B \rangle_0$, so it coincides with $\langle A, B \rangle$, but keeps $A \rfloor B = \langle AB \rangle_{q-p}$). This change requires adapting some GA formulas (e.g., the projection $P_B A = (A \rfloor B) \rfloor B^{-1}$ becomes $P_B A = \frac{B \sqcap A \sqcup B}{\|B\|^2}$), but does not seem to cause any loss of computational power, and it might improve the theory in terms of intuitive understanding and familiarity.

Another GA product which should perhaps be avoided is *Hestenes inner product* $A \cdot B$ [23], which is a symmetrized contraction³:

$$A \cdot B = \begin{cases} A \rfloor B & \text{if } |A| \leq |B|, \\ A \llcorner B & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

The symmetry $A \cdot B = \pm B \cdot A$ may seem convenient, but results with this product tend to be less general than similar ones with contractions. They often carry grade conditionals, which tend to accumulate as they are combined into more complex results, with proofs requiring an analysis of various grade dependent cases. The asymmetry of contractions, which appropriately vanish when grade conditions are not satisfied, often allows us to treat all cases at once. For discussions of the advantages of using contractions instead of Hestenes inner product, see [11, pp. 134–136], [12, pp. 39,45], [30, pp. 224–225] and [34, pp. 22–24].

References

- [1] R. Abraham, J. E. Marsden, and T. Ratiu, *Manifolds, tensor analysis, and applications*, Springer New York, 1993.
- [2] E. Bayro-Corrochano, *Geometric algebra applications vol. I: Computer vision, graphics and neurocomputing*, Springer, 2018.
- [3] I. Bengtsson and K. Życzkowski, *Geometry of quantum states: an introduction to quantum entanglement*, Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- [4] T.A. Bouma, L. Dorst, and H.G.J. Pijls, *Geometric algebra for subspace operations*, Acta Appl. Math. **73** (2002), no. 3, 285–300.
- [5] N. Bourbaki, *Algebra I. Chapters 1–3*, Springer, 1998.
- [6] J. Browne, *Grassmann algebra. Foundations: Exploring extended vector algebra with Mathematica*, vol. 1, Barnard Publishing, 2012.
- [7] S. Caracciolo, A.D. Sokal, and A. Sportiello, *Grassmann integral representation for spanning hyperforests*, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **40** (2007), no. 46, 13799–13835.

³Originally [23], Hestenes defined $A \cdot B = 0$ if A or B were scalars, but this exceptional case was eliminated in later works [22].

- [8] E. Chisolm, *Geometric algebra*, arXiv:1205.5935 (2012).
- [9] Y. Choquet-Bruhat, C. DeWitt-Morette, and M. Dillard-Bleick, *Analysis, manifolds and physics, Part I: Basics, revised edition*, Elsevier Science Publishers, 1991.
- [10] P. Deligne and J. Morgan, *Notes on supersymmetry (following Joseph Bernstein)*, Quantum fields and strings: a course for mathematicians (P. Deligne, P. Etingof, D. Freed, L. Jeffrey, D. Kazhdan, J. Morgan, D. Morrison, and E. Witten, eds.), AMS, 1999, pp. 41–97.
- [11] L. Dorst, *Honing geometric algebra for its use in the computer sciences*, Geometric Computing with Clifford Algebras (G. Sommer, ed.), Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2001, pp. 127–152.
- [12] ———, *The inner products of geometric algebra*, Applications of Geometric Algebra in Computer Science and Engineering (L. Dorst, C. Doran, and J. Lasenby, eds.), Birkhäuser, 2002, pp. 35–46.
- [13] L. Dorst, D. Fontijne, and S. Mann, *Geometric algebra for computer science: an object-oriented approach to geometry*, Elsevier, 2007.
- [14] L. Dorst and S. Mann, *Geometric algebra: A computational framework for geometrical applications (part 1)*, IEEE Comput. Graph. (2002), no. 3, 24–31.
- [15] H. Federer, *Geometric measure theory*, Springer, 1969.
- [16] W. Fulton and J. Harris, *Representation theory. A first course*, Springer-Verlag New York, 1991.
- [17] A. Galántai and C. J. Hegedűs, *Jordan’s principal angles in complex vector spaces*, Numer. Linear Algebra Appl. **13** (2006), no. 7, 589–598.
- [18] J. Gallier and J. Quaintance, *Differential geometry and Lie groups : a second course*, Springer Nature, 2020.
- [19] H. Gluck, *Higher curvatures of curves in Euclidean space, II*, Amer. Math. Monthly **74** (1967), no. 9, 1049–1056.
- [20] H. Grassmann, *A new branch of mathematics: the Ausdehnungslehre of 1844 and other works*, Open Court Pub. Co., Chicago, 1995.
- [21] W. H. Greub, *Multilinear algebra*, Universitext - Springer-Verlag, Springer-Verlag, 1978.
- [22] D. Hestenes, *Gauge theory gravity with geometric calculus*, Found. Phys. **35** (2005), no. 6, 903–970.
- [23] D. Hestenes and G. Sobczyk, *Clifford algebra to geometric calculus*, D. Reidel, Dordrecht, 1984.
- [24] E. Hitzer, *Introduction to Clifford’s geometric algebra*, Journal of SICE **51** (2012), no. 4, 338–350.
- [25] D. Huybrechts, *Complex geometry: an introduction*, Springer-Verlag, 2005.
- [26] C. Jordan, *Essai sur la géométrie à n dimensions*, Bull. Soc. Math. France **3** (1875), 103–174.

- [27] S. E. Kozlov, *Geometry of real Grassmann manifolds. Parts I, II*, J. Math. Sci. **100** (2000), no. 3, 2239–2253.
- [28] A. Lasenby, C. Doran, and S. Gull, *Grassmann calculus, pseudoclassical mechanics, and geometric algebra*, J. Math. Phys. **34** (1993), no. 8, 3683–3712.
- [29] E. L. Lima, *Álgebra exterior*, IMPA, Rio de Janeiro, 2009.
- [30] P. Lounesto, *Marcel Riesz’s work on Clifford algebras*, Clifford Numbers and Spinors (E. F. Bolinder and P. Lounesto, eds.), Springer Netherlands, 1993, pp. 215–241.
- [31] ———, *Clifford algebras and spinors*, 2nd ed., vol. 286, Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- [32] A. L. G. Mandolesi, *Grassmann angles between real or complex subspaces*, arXiv:1910.00147 (2019).
- [33] ———, *Projection factors and generalized real and complex Pythagorean theorems*, Adv. Appl. Clifford Algebras **30** (2020), no. 43.
- [34] ———, *Blade products and angles between subspaces*, Adv. Appl. Clifford Algebras **31** (2021), no. 69.
- [35] M. Marcus, *Finite dimensional multilinear algebra*, vol. 2, Marcel Dekker Inc., New York, 1975.
- [36] Z. Oziewicz, *From Grassmann to Clifford*, Clifford Algebras and Their Applications in Mathematical Physics (J. S. R. Chisholm and A. K. Common, eds.), Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 1986, pp. 245–255.
- [37] V. Pavan, *Exterior algebras: Elementary tribute to Grassmann’s ideas*, Elsevier, 2017.
- [38] H. Reichardt, *Vorlesungen über Vektor- und Tensorrechnung*, vol. 34, Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, Berlin, 1957.
- [39] A. Rosén, *Geometric multivector analysis*, Springer-Verlag, 2019.
- [40] K. Scharnhorst, *Angles in complex vector spaces*, Acta Appl. Math. **69** (2001), no. 1, 95–103.
- [41] R. Shaw, *Linear algebra and group representations: Multilinear algebra and group representations*, vol. II, Academic Press, 1983.
- [42] S. Sternberg, *Lectures on differential geometry*, Prentice-Hall, 1964.
- [43] V. S. Varadarajan, *Supersymmetry for mathematicians: An introduction*, vol. 11, American Mathematical Soc., 2004.
- [44] J. Vaz Jr and R. Rocha Jr, *An introduction to Clifford algebras and spinors*, Oxford University Press, 2016.
- [45] R. O. Wells, *Differential analysis on complex manifolds*, Springer New York, 1980.
- [46] N. L. White, *Geometric applications of the Grassmann-Cayley algebra*, Handbook of discrete and computational geometry, Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2017, pp. 1581–1592.
- [47] S. Winitzki, *Linear algebra via exterior products*, Ludwig-Maximilians University, Munich, Germany, 2010.