Trigonometric motivation for the dot product

The dot product — somewhat bizarre when first encountered — can be well-motivated by the following elementary line of thought.

Suppose we have two vectors in the plane, say, $u = (u_1, u_2)$ and $v = (v_1, v_2)$, and we are interested in the angle θ between them. Thinking of angles, we think of polar coordinates, so we write, say,

$$u_1 = r \cos \alpha \qquad v_1 = s \cos \beta u_2 = r \sin \alpha \qquad v_2 = s \sin \beta$$
(1)

If we know α and β , then we can just subtract:

$$\theta = \beta - \alpha$$
 . (2)

But if we only know the rectangular coordinates u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2 , then finding α and β is annoying (and except in a few special cases, computationally difficult with pencil and paper).

Can we still say something about θ , using only the rectangular coordinates? From (1) we see that in the rectangular coordinates we have, not the angles α and β , but trigonometric functions of those angles. Perhaps it would be easier to say something, not about θ , but about some trigonometric function of it. Taking, say, the cosine of both sides of (2) yields

$$\cos \theta = \cos(\beta - \alpha)$$
.

The only thing to do here is to apply the addition formula for cosine, obtaining

$$\cos \theta = \cos \alpha \cos \beta + \sin \alpha \sin \beta$$

Now the right-hand side involves nearly the same quantities as in (1). We make them exactly the same by multiplying by rs:

$$rs\cos\theta = (r\cos\alpha)(s\cos\beta) + (r\sin\alpha)(s\sin\beta)$$
$$= u_1v_1 + u_2v_2.$$

Thus we naturally discover the dot product in \mathbb{R}^2 . It is then easy to invent the dot product in \mathbb{R}^n by analogy (though not so easy to show that it has the same relation to angle).

Incidentally, if we try for sin θ instead of cos θ , we end up with the determinant. Alas, the higher dimensional analogues are not so obvious here.