# Part IB — Linear Algebra Sheet 1

Supervised by Mr Rawlinson ( jir25@cam.ac.uk ) Examples worked through by Christopher Turnbull

Michaelmas 2017

As all of the following basis are of order n, we need only check for linear independence (or spanning).

(a)  $\alpha_1(\mathbf{e}_1 + \mathbf{e}_2) + \alpha_2(\mathbf{e}_2 + \mathbf{e}_3) + \dots + \alpha_{n-1}(\mathbf{e}_{n-1} + \mathbf{e}_n) + \alpha_n \mathbf{e}_n = \mathbf{0}$ 

The first vector is the only one that contains  $\mathbf{e}_1$ , so  $\alpha_1 = 0$ . But then  $\alpha_2 = 0, \dots, \alpha_n = 0$  so this set is linearly independent, and thus a basis.

(b)  $\alpha_1(\mathbf{e}_1 + \mathbf{e}_2) + \alpha_2(\mathbf{e}_2 + \mathbf{e}_3) + \dots + \alpha_{n-1}(\mathbf{e}_{n-1} + \mathbf{e}_n) + \alpha_n(\mathbf{e}_n + \mathbf{e}_1) = \mathbf{0}$ 

Then  $\alpha_2 = -\alpha_1, \alpha_3 = \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n = (-1)^{n+1}\alpha_1$ . Thus for n even, it is possible to cancel out the  $\mathbf{e}_1$  and have linear dependence, but not when n is odd. Thus

 $\begin{cases} \text{basis} & \text{if } n \text{ odd} \\ \text{not a basis} & \text{if } n \text{ even} \end{cases}$ 

- (c) Vectors in this basis are of the form  $\mathbf{e}_i + (-1)^i \mathbf{e}_{n-i}$ . If n is odd, say n = 2k + 1, setting
  - $\alpha_{k+1} = 0$  (middle coefficient), only vector containing  $\mathbf{e}_{k+1}$
  - $-\alpha_1 = -\alpha_n, \alpha_2 = -\alpha_{n-1}, \cdots$

is enough to show linear dependence.

If n is even, the first and last vector are  $\mathbf{e}_1 - \mathbf{e}_n$  and  $\mathbf{e}_1 + \mathbf{e}_n$ , so these coefficients must both be set so zero. Likewise for  $\mathbf{e}_2 - \mathbf{e}_{n-1}$  and  $\mathbf{e}_2 + \mathbf{e}_{n-1}, \cdots$  etc, all the coefficients are zero, thus linear independence, thus this set is a basis when n is even. ie.

 $\begin{cases} \text{basis} & \text{if } n \text{ even} \\ \text{not a basis} & \text{if } n \text{ odd} \end{cases}$ 

(i)

**Proposition.**  $T \cup U$  is a subspace of V only if either  $T \leq U$  or  $U \leq T$ 

*Proof.* – Choose  $v_1 \in T \setminus U$ ,  $v_2 \in U \setminus T$ 

- As  $T \cup U$  is a subspace of V.  $v_1, v_2 \in T \cup U \Rightarrow v_1 + v_2 \in T \cup U$
- $\Rightarrow v_1 + v_2 \in T \text{ or } U$
- If  $v_1 + v_2 \in T$ , then  $v_2 \in T$ . But we said  $v_2 \in U \setminus T$ . Contradiction.
- Hence  $U \setminus T$  is empty and  $U \leq T$ .
- Similarly,  $v_1 + v_2 \in U$  then  $T \leq U$

(ii) (a) Choose

$$T = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x \\ x \end{pmatrix} \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x \in \mathbb{R} \right\}, U = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x \\ 2x \end{pmatrix} \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x \in \mathbb{R} \right\}$$

and

$$W = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x \\ 3x \end{pmatrix} \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x \in \mathbb{R} \right\}$$

Then LHS =  $T + (U \cap W) = T + \mathbf{0} = T$ , and RHS =  $(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap (\mathbb{R}^2) = \mathbb{R}^2$ 

- (b) Choosing T, U and W as before, LHS =  $(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap W = W$ , and RHS =  $\mathbf{0} + \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0}$
- (iii) The counter examples suggest which way the inclusions are:

**Proposition.**  $T + (U \cap W) \subset (T + U) \cap (T + W)$ 

*Proof.* – Let 
$$a + b \in T + (U \cap W)$$

- $-a \in T, b \in U \cap W$
- Then  $b \in U$  and  $b \in W$
- $-a \in T, b \in U \Rightarrow a+b \in (T+U)$
- $-a \in T, b \in W \Rightarrow a+b \in (T+W)$
- Thus  $a + b \in (T + U) \cap (T + W)$

**Proposition.**  $(T+U)\cap W\supset (T\cap W)+(U\cap W)$ 

Proof. – Similarly, let  $a + b \in RHS$ 

- so  $a \in (T \cap W), b \in (U \cap W)$
- In particular,  $a \in T$ ,  $b \in U \Rightarrow a + b \in (T + U)$
- And  $a \in W$ ,  $b \in W \Rightarrow a + b \in W + W = W$
- Thus  $a + b \in (T + U) \cap W$

Hint to show isomorphism: Guess an explicit inverse, compose both with right and left to get the identity

(a) Let  $T: V \to W$  be defined by

$$T \begin{pmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \\ v_4 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \\ v_4 \\ -v_1 - v_2 - v_3 - v_4 \end{pmatrix}$$

It is straightforward to see that  $T(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{y}) = T(\mathbf{x}) + T(\mathbf{y})$  and  $T(\alpha \mathbf{x}) = \alpha T(x)$ , thus T is linear.

To show it is one-to-one, consider the map  $T': W \to V$  defined by

$$T' \begin{pmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \\ w_3 \\ w_4 \\ w_5 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \\ w_3 \\ w_4 \end{pmatrix}$$

Then  $T \circ T' = T' \circ T = id$ .

(b) Note that  $\{1, x, x^2, x^3, x^4, x^5\}$  is a spanning set for W. It is also linearly independent; suppose that

$$a_0 + a_1 x + a_2 x^2 + a_3 x^3 + a_4 x^4 + a_5 x^5 = \theta(x)$$

where  $\theta(x)$  is the zero polynomial. If this holds for all values of x, then (since  $\theta'(x) = \theta(x)$ ) we can differentiate both sides to obtain

$$a_1 + 2a_2x + 3a_3x^2 + 4a_4x^3 + 5a_5x^4 = \theta(x)$$

Continuing differentiation in this fashion we arrive at

$$5!a_5 = \theta(x)$$

And we must have  $a_5 = 0$ . Going one differitation step back the previous equation insist  $a_4 = 0$ , and so we have  $a_i = 0$  for all i, and thus  $\{1, x, x^2, x^3, x^4, x^5\}$  is linearly independent in W.

Hence we have found a basis for W and conclude  $\dim W = 6$ . But  $\dim V = 5$ , and therefore there can be no such isomorphism.

(c) Define  $T: W \to V$  as  $T(f(x)) \mapsto f(2x+1)$ :

- Linear:

$$T(\lambda f_1(x) + \mu f_2(x)) = (\lambda f_1 + \mu f_2)(2x+1)$$
  
=  $\lambda f_1(2x+1) + \mu f_2(2x+1)$   
=  $\lambda T(f_1(x)) + \mu T(f_2(x))$ 

- Bijective: Define  $T':W\to V$  as  $T'(f(x))=f(\frac{x-1}{2})$ Show that  $T\circ T'=T'\circ T=\mathrm{id}$
- (d) Define  $T: V \to W$  as  $T(f(x)) \mapsto \int_{-\infty}^{x} f(t) dt$
- (e) A natural basis for W is  $\{A, B\}$  where solutions are of the form  $A \cos t + B \sin t$ . Hence define  $T: V \to W$  as  $T(v_1, v_2) = v_1 \cos t + v_2 \sin t$ .
- (f) Suppose  $\varphi: \mathbb{R}^4 \to C[0,1]$  is an isomorphism. Let  $e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4$  be a basis for  $\mathbb{R}^4$ . Then

$$\{\varphi(e_1), \varphi(e_2), \varphi(e_3), \varphi(e_4)\}$$

is a basis for C[0,1].

In particular, we have a spanning set of size 4. But, eg.  $\{1, x, x^2, x^3, x^4, x^5\}$  is a linearly independent set of size 5. This is a contradiction (by Steinitz)

(g) Suppose  $\phi: \mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$  is an isomorphism, with  $\phi$  having the natural basis  $\{1, x, x^2, \cdots, x^N\}$ . Then

$$\{\phi(1),\phi(x),\cdots,\phi(x^N)\}$$

is a countable basis for  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ . But,  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$  has no countable basis, no  $\phi$  cannot be an isomorphism.

# **QUESTION 4**

(i) Let  $\alpha, \beta$  be linear maps from U to V. Then

$$(\alpha + \beta)(v_1 + v_2) = \alpha(v_1 + v_2) + \beta(v_1 + v_2)$$
  
=  $\alpha(v_1) + \alpha(v_2) + \beta(v_1) + \beta(v_2)$   
=  $(\alpha + \beta)(v_1) + (\alpha + \beta)(v_2)$ 

and

$$(\alpha + \beta)(\lambda v) = \alpha(\lambda v) + \beta(\lambda v)$$
$$= \lambda \alpha(v) + \lambda \beta(v)$$
$$= \lambda(\alpha + \beta)(v)$$

Thus  $\alpha + \beta$  is also a linear map

(a) Let 
$$\alpha, \beta: V \to V$$
 st.  $\alpha = \mathrm{id}, \beta = -\alpha$ .  
Then  $\mathrm{Im}(\alpha + \beta) = 0$ ,  $\mathrm{Im}(\alpha) = V$ ,  $\mathrm{Im}(\beta) = V$ .

$$\operatorname{Im}(\alpha + \beta) \neq \operatorname{Im} \alpha + \operatorname{Im} \beta$$

(b) Using the same maps,  $\ker(\alpha+\beta)=V$ ,  $\ker\alpha=\mathbf{0}$  and  $\ker\beta=\mathbf{0}$ , hence

$$\ker(\alpha + \beta) \neq \ker \alpha \cap \ker \beta$$

#### Proposition.

$$\operatorname{Im}(\alpha + \beta) \subset \operatorname{Im} \alpha + \operatorname{Im} \beta$$

*Proof.* Suppose  $v \in LHS$ , that is

$$\begin{split} v &\in \{v \in V \mid v = (\alpha + \beta)(u), \text{ some } u \in U\} \\ &= \{v \in V \mid v = \alpha(u) + \beta(u), \text{ some } u \in U\} \\ &\subset \{v \in V \mid v = \alpha(u), \text{ some } u \in U\} + \{v \in V \mid v = \beta(u), \text{ some } u \in U\} \\ &= \operatorname{Im} \alpha + \operatorname{Im} \beta \end{split}$$

Hence  $v \in \text{RHS}$ 

Proposition.

$$\ker(\alpha+\beta)\supset\ker\alpha\cap\ker\beta$$

*Proof.* Suppose 
$$u \in RHS$$

*Proof.* Let  $u \in RHS$ , ie

$$u \in \{u \in U \mid \alpha(u) = \mathbf{0}\} \cap \{u \in U \mid \beta(u) = \mathbf{0}\}$$
$$= \{u \in U \mid \alpha(u) = \beta(u) = \mathbf{0}\}$$
$$\subset \{u \in U \mid \alpha(u) + \beta(u) = \mathbf{0}\}$$
$$= \ker(\alpha + \beta)$$

- (ii) (Might be helpful to think of  $\alpha$  geometrically as a projection). We want to prove that if  $\alpha^2 = \alpha$ , then
  - $-\operatorname{Im}\alpha\cap\ker\alpha=\{\mathbf{0}\}$
  - $-\operatorname{Im}\alpha + \ker\alpha = V$

*Proof.* – Given  $v \in \operatorname{Im} \alpha \cap \ker \alpha$ , there exists some w st.  $v = \alpha(w)$ . So

$$v = \alpha(w)$$

$$= \alpha^{2}(w)$$

$$= \alpha(\alpha(w))$$

$$= \alpha(v) \in \ker \alpha$$

$$= \mathbf{0}$$

- Given  $v \in V$ , then

$$v = \underbrace{\alpha(v)}_{\in \operatorname{Im} \alpha} + \underbrace{(v - \alpha(v))}_{\in \ker \alpha}$$

since

$$\alpha(v - \alpha(v)) = \alpha(v) - \alpha^{2}(v)$$

$$= \alpha(v) - \alpha(v)$$

$$= \mathbf{0}$$

So  $V = \ker \oplus \operatorname{im} \alpha$ 

 $U \cap W = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^5 : x_1 + 2x_2 = 0, x_2 = x_3 = x_4, x_1 + x_5 = 0\}$  by combining the conditions on U and W. Vectors in U, W and  $U \cap W$  respectively have the form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \\ -x_1 - x_3 \\ -\frac{1}{2}(x_1 + x_2) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_2 \\ x_2 \\ -x_1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{pmatrix} -2x \\ x \\ x \\ x \\ 2x \end{pmatrix}$$

Thus a natural basis for  $U \cap W$  is

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} -2\\1\\1\\1\\2 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$

Basis for U, W:

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -1 \\ -\frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ -1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\} \qquad \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$

Now add the vector to each of these basis and perform Gaussian elimination. Or, note that we can switch it for the first vector in U and the second vector in W, as the first component is non-zero. Thus the required basis for U, W are:

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} -2\\1\\1\\1\\2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0\\2\\0\\0\\-\frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0\\0\\1\\-1\\0 \end{pmatrix} \right\} \qquad \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0\\1\\1\\1\\0\\0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} -2\\1\\1\\1\\2 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$

Now the basis for U+W is just basis for  $U\cup$  basis for V, provided the basis for  $U\cap W$  is a subset of both.

So a basis for U + W is

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} -2\\1\\1\\1\\2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0\\2\\0\\0\\-\frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0\\0\\1\\-1\\0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0\\1\\1\\1\\0 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$

(i) Let  $\alpha: V \to V$  linear, and let  $v_1 = \alpha(u_1), v_2 = \alpha(v_2)$ From the first isomorphism theorem we have  $\text{Im}(\alpha) \leq V$ ,  $\text{ker}(\alpha) \leq V$ 

$$\begin{split} \operatorname{Im}(\alpha^{k+1}) &= \{v \in V \mid \alpha^{k+1}(u) \in V, \operatorname{some} \ u \in V\} \\ &= \{v \in V \mid \alpha^k(\alpha(u)) \in V, \operatorname{some} \ u \in V\} \\ &\subseteq \{v \in V \mid \alpha^k(v) \in V, \operatorname{some} \ v \in V\} \qquad \text{as } \operatorname{Im}(\alpha) \leq V \\ &= \operatorname{Im}(\alpha^k) \end{split}$$

Hence

$$V \ge \operatorname{Im}(\alpha) \ge \operatorname{Im}(\alpha^2) \ge \cdots$$

Next,  $\alpha(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0}$ , so trivially  $\{0\} \leq \ker(\alpha)$ , and

$$\begin{split} \ker(\alpha^{k+1}) &= \{v \in V \mid \alpha^{k+1}(v) = 0\} \\ &= \{v \in V \mid \alpha^k(\alpha(v)) = 0\} \\ &\subseteq \{v \in V \mid \alpha^k(v) = 0\} \quad \text{as } \ker(\alpha) \leq V \\ &= \ker(\alpha^k) \end{split}$$

It now follows that

$$\{\mathbf{0}\} \le \ker \alpha \le \ker \alpha^2 \le \cdots$$

Next, taking dim of the first inequality gives

$$\dim V \ge r_1 \ge r_2 \ge \cdots$$

Thus  $r_k \ge r_{k+1}$ . Let  $\widetilde{\alpha}_k : \operatorname{Im} \alpha_k \to V$  be defined by  $v \mapsto \alpha(v)$ . Note that  $\operatorname{Im}(\widetilde{\alpha}_k) = \operatorname{Im}(\alpha^{k+1})$ 

Applying R-N to  $\widetilde{\alpha}_k$ ,

$$\dim(\operatorname{Im}(\alpha^k)) = r(\widetilde{\alpha}_k) + n(\widetilde{\alpha}_k)$$

So

$$r_k = r_{k+1} + n(\tilde{\alpha}_{k+1})$$

Note that  $\operatorname{Im}(\alpha^{k+1}) \leq \operatorname{Im}(\alpha^k)$ , so that  $n(\tilde{\alpha}_k) \geq n(\tilde{\alpha}_{k+1})$ . Thus

$$r_k - r_{k+1} \ge r_{k+1} - r_{k+2}$$

Now for each  $k \geq 0$  we have that

$$r_k - r_{k+1} \ge r_{k+1} - r_{k+2} \ge 0$$
 (\*)

Suppose, for some  $k \geq 0$ , that we have  $r_k = r_{k+1}$ . Then (\*) becomes

$$0 \ge r_{k+1} - r_{k+2} \ge 0$$

so  $r_k = r_{k+1} = r_{k+2}$ . Applying (\*) again gives

$$\underbrace{r_{k+1} - r_{k+2}}_{=0} \ge r_{k+2} - r_{k+3} \ge 0$$

and so  $r_{k+2} = r_{k+3}$ .

Hence, keep going in this way to deduce that  $r_k = r_{k+l}$  for all  $l \ge 0$ 

- (ii) We are given  $r_0 = 5$  (dim V),  $r_3 = 0$ ,  $r_2 \neq 0$ . Consider the different cases:
  - If  $r_1 = 5$ : then since  $r_0 = r_1$ , we have  $r_0 = r_3$ , contradiction.
  - If  $r_1 = 4$ : then

$$r_0 - r_1 \ge r_1 - r_2$$

$$\Rightarrow 5 - 4 \ge 4 - r_2$$

$$\Rightarrow r_2 \ge 3$$

and

$$r_1 - r_2 \ge r_2 - r_3$$
$$r_3 \ge 2r_2 - 4$$
$$\Rightarrow r_3 \ge 2$$

Contradiction.

- If  $r_1 = 3$ : then

$$r_0 - r_1 \ge r_1 - r_2$$

$$\Rightarrow 5 - 3 \ge 3 - r_2$$

$$\Rightarrow r_2 \ge 1$$

Also  $r_1 \geq r_2$ , so  $r_2$  is 1,2 or 3.

- If  $r_1 = 3$  and  $r_2 = 3$ , then  $r_1 = r_3 = 3$ , contradiction.
- $\circ$  If  $r_1 = 3$  and  $r_2 = 2$ , then

$$r_1 - r_2 \ge r_2 - r_3$$

$$\Rightarrow 3 - 2 \ge 2 - r_3$$

$$\Rightarrow r_3 \ge 1$$

Contradiction

- $\circ\,$  Hence, can only have  $r_1=3, r_2=1$
- If  $r_1=2$ , a similar argument rules out all except  $r_1=2, r_2=1$
- If  $r_1=1$ , since  $r_1\geq r_2$ , can only have  $r_2=0$  or 1. But if  $r_2=0$ , contradiction. If  $r_2=1$ , then  $r_1=r_2=r_3=1$ , contradiction.
- If  $r_1 = 0$ , then  $r_2 = 0$ , contradiction.

Hence two possibilities:

$$(r_1, r_2) = (3, 1)$$
 or  $(2, 1)$ 

With respect to the standard basis,  $\alpha$  is represented by the matrix A, where

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$$

Change of basis matrix P and it's inverse are given by

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad P^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

So the matrix  $\tilde{A}$  representing the linear map with respect to the new basis is given by

$$\tilde{A} = P^{-1}AP$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$$

EASIER: Given the basis

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1\\1\\1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1\\1\\0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1\\0\\0 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$

for the domain, and the same one for the range,  $\alpha$  maps

$$\alpha \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 3 \\ 3 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix} = 2 \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + 1 \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

So the first column of A is  $\begin{pmatrix} 2\\1\\0 \end{pmatrix}$ , etc.

(i)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii) Suppose that  $\exists$  some  $b \in \mathcal{B}_i \cap \mathcal{B}_j$  with  $i \neq j$ . Then b can be written as

$$b = \underbrace{0}^{\in U_1} + \dots + \underbrace{b}^{\in U_i} + \dots + \underbrace{0}^{\in U_j} + \dots + \underbrace{0}^{\in U_k}$$

$$= 0 + \dots + \underbrace{0}_{j^{\text{th}} \text{ position}} + \dots + \underbrace{0}_{j^{\text{th}} \text{ position}} + \dots + 0$$

and so, by (i) (uniqueness of expression), b = 0. But  $\mathcal{B}_i$  cannot contain 0 as it is a basis.

Write  $\mathcal{B} = \bigcup_i \mathcal{B}_i$ . Need to show  $\mathcal{B}$  basis.

–  $\mathcal{B}$  spans  $\sum_{i} U_{i}$ : any  $v \in \sum_{i} U_{i}$  can be written as

$$v = u_1 + \dots + u_k$$
 with  $u_i \in U_i$ 

Also, any  $u_i \in U_i$  can be written as a finite linear combination of elements in  $\mathcal{B}_i \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ .

 $-\mathcal{B}$  is a linearly independent set.

suppose  $\sum \lambda_i b_i = 0$  for some  $b_i$  distinct,  $b_i \in \mathcal{B}$ . Each  $b_i$  belongs to some  $\mathcal{B}_j$ , so we can split up the sum as

$$0 = \underbrace{\sum_{i \text{ st. } b_i \in \mathcal{B}_1} \lambda_i b_i}_{\in U_1} + \dots + \underbrace{\sum_{i \text{ st. } b_i \in \mathcal{B}_k} \lambda_i b_i}_{\in U_k}$$

Then by (i), we have that

$$\sum_{i \text{ st. } b_i \in \mathcal{B}_i} \lambda_i b_i = 0, \qquad \text{ for each } j$$

But  $\mathcal{B}_j$  is a linearly independent set by assumption, and so  $\lambda_i = 0$ , for all

(iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii). Given  $v \in U_j \cap \sum_{i \neq j} U_i$ Since  $v \in U_j$ , can write

$$v = \sum_{b_i \in B_i} \lambda_i b_i$$

Since  $v \in \sum_{i \neq j} U_i$ , can write

$$v = \sum_{b_i \in \cup_{k \neq j} B_k} \mu_i b_i$$

No  $b_i$ 's in common because of the pairwise disjointness of the  $B_i$ . But  $\cup_k B_k$  is a basis, so by uniqueness of expression,  $\lambda_i = \mu_i = 0$  for all i.

So 
$$v = \mathbf{0}$$
.

$$(ii) \Rightarrow (i)$$

Suppose that

$$\sum u_i = \sum u_i'$$

Then for each j,

$$u_j - u'_j = \sum_{i \neq j} (u'_i - u_i) \in U_j \cap \sum_{i \neq j} U_i = \mathbf{0}$$

So  $u_j = u'_j$ , for all j. Thus uniqueness of expression