

Notes on “Finite-Dimensional Vector Spaces”

by Paul R. Halmos

October 18, 2022

Each `\section` corresponds to the scope of one member’s assignment, and each `\subsection` corresponds to one theorem or exercise in the textbook, specified in the format $m.n$ where m is the section number and n is the theorem/exercise number. If n is not given, we use $n = 1$ instead.

Contents

1	Toga (2022/09/19)	1
1.1	Exercise 1.1	1
2	Mohehe (2022/09/27)	1
2.1	Exercise 1.1	1
3	Mohehe (2022/09/19)	2
3.1	Exercise 1.2	2
4	Mohehe (2022/10/8)	3
4.1	Exercise 1.3	3
4.2	Exercise 1.4	5

1 Toga (2022/09/19)

1.1 Exercise 1.1

- (a) Since addition is commutative, $0 + \alpha = \alpha + 0$ holds. We also have $\alpha + 0 = \alpha$ by definition, hence $0 + \alpha = \alpha$.

2 Mohehe (2022/09/27)

2.1 Exercise 1.1

- (b) If $\alpha + \beta = \alpha + \gamma$, we have $\beta = \beta + 0 = 0 + \beta = (\alpha + (-\alpha)) + \beta = ((-\alpha) + \alpha) + \beta = (-\alpha) + (\alpha + \beta) = (-\alpha) + (\alpha + \gamma) = ((-\alpha) + \alpha) + \gamma =$

- $(\alpha + (-\alpha)) + \gamma = 0 + \gamma = \gamma + 0 = \gamma$ by definition. Therefore, $\beta = \gamma$ holds.
- (c) We have $\alpha + (\beta - \alpha) = \alpha + (\beta + (-\alpha)) = \alpha + ((-\alpha) + \beta) = (\alpha + (-\alpha)) + \beta = 0 + \beta = \beta + 0 = \beta$ by definition. Therefore, $\alpha + (\beta - \alpha) = \beta$ holds.
- (d) We have $\alpha 0 + \alpha 0 = \alpha(0 + 0) = \alpha 0 = \alpha + 0$ by definition, hence $\alpha 0 = 0$ by Exercise 1(b). We also have $\alpha \cdot 0 = 0 \cdot \alpha$ by definition. Therefore, $\alpha \cdot 0 = 0 \cdot \alpha = 0$
- (e) We have $\alpha + (-1)\alpha = 1\alpha + (-1)\alpha = (1 + (-1))\alpha = 0\alpha = 0$ by definition and Exercise 1(d). Since the additive inverse is unique, we obtain $(-1)\alpha = -\alpha$.
- (f) We have $(-\alpha)(-\beta) = ((-1)\alpha)((-1)\beta) = (\alpha(-1))((-1)\beta) = \alpha((-1)((-1)\beta)) = \alpha((-1)(-1)\beta)$ by Exercise 1(e) and definition. We also have $(-1)(-1) = 0 + (-1)(-1) = (1 + (-1)) + (-1)(-1) = 1 + (-1) + (-1)(-1) = 1 + (-1)((-1) + 1) = 1 + (-1)(1 + (-1)) = 1 + (-1)0 = 1 + 0 = 1$ by definition. By it and definition, $\alpha((-1)(-1)\beta) = \alpha(1\beta) = \alpha(\beta 1) = \alpha\beta$ holds. Therefore, $(-\alpha)(-\beta) = \alpha\beta$ holds.
- (g) If $\alpha\beta = 0$, suppose $\alpha \neq 0$ and $\beta \neq 0$ hold. By supposition and definition, we have $0 = \alpha^{-1}0 = \alpha^{-1}(\alpha\beta) = (\alpha^{-1}\alpha)\beta = (\alpha\alpha^{-1})\beta = 1\beta = \beta 1 = \beta$, hence $\beta = 0$. However, this result contradicts supposition, “ $\alpha \neq 0$ and $\beta \neq 0$ ”. Therefore, if $\alpha\beta = 0$, then either $\alpha = 0$ or $\beta = 0$ (or both).

3 Mohehe (2022/09/19)

3.1 Exercise 1.2

- (a) The set of positive integers is not a field since there is no additive inverse for 1.
- (b) The set of integers is not a field since there is no multiplicative inverse for 2.
- (c) There exists a bijective map φ from \mathbb{N} (or \mathbb{Z}) to \mathbb{Q} [1], where \mathbb{Q} is a field [2]. We can make \mathbb{N} a field by re-defining (i) addition by $a \oplus b = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(a) + \varphi(b))$ and (ii) multiplication by $a \otimes b = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(a)\varphi(b))$ for each $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that the additive and multiplicative identities become $\varphi^{-1}(0)$ and $\varphi^{-1}(1)$, respectively. For each $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, the additive inverse becomes $\varphi^{-1}(-\varphi(\alpha))$, and the multiplicative inverse becomes $\varphi^{-1}(1/\varphi(\alpha))$ if $\alpha \neq \varphi^{-1}(0)$.

Let $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \alpha', \beta' \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that

- 1) $\alpha \oplus \beta = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) + \varphi(\beta)) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\beta) + \varphi(\alpha)) = \beta \oplus \alpha$ holds. (addition is commutative)

- 2) $\alpha \oplus (\beta \oplus \gamma) = \alpha \oplus (\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\beta) + \varphi(\gamma))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) + \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\beta) + \varphi(\gamma)))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) + (\varphi(\beta) + \varphi(\gamma))) = \varphi^{-1}((\varphi(\alpha) + \varphi(\beta)) + \varphi(\gamma)) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) + \varphi(\beta))) + \varphi(\gamma)) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) + \varphi(\beta)) \oplus \gamma = (\alpha \oplus \beta) \oplus \gamma$ holds.(addition is associative)
- 3) $\alpha \oplus \varphi^{-1}(0) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) + \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(0))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) + 0) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)) = \alpha$ holds.(there exists additive identity, $\varphi^{-1}(0)$) If α' and β' are additive identity, we have $\alpha' = \alpha' \oplus \beta' = \beta' \oplus \alpha' = \beta'$ by 1) and the definition of additive identity.(additive identity is unique)
- 4) $-\varphi(\alpha) \in \mathbb{Q}$ holds by definition, so $\varphi^{-1}(-\varphi(\alpha)) \in \mathbb{N}$ holds. Therefore, $\alpha \oplus \varphi^{-1}(-\varphi(\alpha)) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) + \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(-\varphi(\alpha)))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) + (-\varphi(\alpha))) = \varphi^{-1}(0)$ holds.(for each α ($\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$), there exists additive inverse) For each α , if α' and β' are additive inverse, we have $\alpha' = \alpha' \oplus \varphi^{-1}(0) = \alpha' \oplus (\alpha \oplus \beta') = (\alpha' \oplus \alpha) \oplus \beta' = (\alpha \oplus \alpha') \oplus \beta' = \varphi^{-1}(0) \oplus \beta' = \beta \oplus \varphi^{-1}(0) = \beta'$ by 1), 2), 3) and the definition of additive inverse.(additive inverse is unique)
- 5) $\alpha \otimes \beta = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\beta)) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\beta)\varphi(\alpha)) = \beta \otimes \alpha$ holds.(multiplication is commutative)
- 6) $\alpha \otimes (\beta \otimes \gamma) = \alpha \otimes (\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\beta)\varphi(\gamma))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\beta)\varphi(\gamma)))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\beta)\varphi(\gamma)) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\beta)))\varphi(\gamma)) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\beta)) \otimes \gamma = (\alpha \otimes \beta) \otimes \gamma$ holds.(multiplication is associative)
- 7) $\alpha \otimes \varphi^{-1}(1) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(1))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) \cdot 1) = \alpha$ holds.(there exists additive identity, $\varphi^{-1}(1)$) If α' and β' are additive identity, we have $\alpha' = \alpha' \otimes \beta' = \beta' \otimes \alpha' = \beta'$ by 5) and definition of multiplicative identity.(multiplicative identity is unique)
- 8) For each α ($\alpha \neq \varphi^{-1}(0)$), $(1/\varphi(\alpha)) \in \mathbb{Q}$ holds by definition, so $\varphi^{-1}(1/\varphi(\alpha)) \in \mathbb{N}$ holds. Therefore, $\alpha \otimes \varphi^{-1}(1/\varphi(\alpha)) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(1/\varphi(\alpha)))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)(1/\varphi(\alpha))) = \varphi^{-1}(1)$ holds.(for each α ($\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$), there exists multiplicative inverse) For each α ($\alpha \neq \varphi^{-1}(0)$), if α' and β' are multiplicative inverse, we have $\alpha' = \alpha' \otimes \varphi^{-1}(1) = \alpha' \otimes (\alpha \otimes \beta') = (\alpha' \otimes \alpha) \otimes \beta' = (\alpha \otimes \alpha') \otimes \beta' = \varphi^{-1}(1) \otimes \beta' = \beta' \otimes \varphi^{-1}(1) = \beta'$ by 5), 6), 7) and the definition of multiplicative inverse.(multiplicative inverse is unique)
- 9) $\alpha \otimes (\beta \oplus \gamma) = \alpha \otimes (\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\beta) + \varphi(\gamma))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\beta) + \varphi(\gamma)))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)(\varphi(\beta) + \varphi(\gamma))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\beta) + \varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\gamma)) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\beta))) + \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\gamma)))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha \otimes \beta) + \varphi(\alpha \otimes \gamma)) = \alpha \otimes \beta \oplus \alpha \otimes \gamma$ holds.(distributive law stands)

4 Mohehe (2022/10/8)

4.1 Exercise 1.3

For two integers a and b , we denote by $a \% b$ the remainder after dividing a by b , and write $b \mid a$ if and only if $a \% b = 0$. For clarity, we denote the ordinary

sum and product of two integers a and b by $a +_{\mathbb{Z}} b$ and $a \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} b$, respectively. Note that $\alpha + \beta = (\alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) \% m$ and $\alpha\beta = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) \% m$ for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{Z}_m$.

(a) Let $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathcal{Z}_m, k \in \mathbb{Z}$

1' Proof : if m is a prime, \mathcal{Z}_m is a field.

Suppose m is a prime,

- 1) $\alpha + \beta = (\alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) \% m = (\beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} \alpha) \% m = \beta + \alpha$ (addition is commutative)
- 2) Since $\alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} (\beta + \gamma) = \alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} (\beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma) \% m \equiv \alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} (\beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma) = (\alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) +_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma \equiv (\alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) \% m +_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma = (\alpha + \beta) +_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma \pmod{m}$ holds, $\alpha + (\beta + \gamma) = (\alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} (\beta + \gamma)) \% m = ((\alpha + \beta) +_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma) \% m = (\alpha + \beta) + \gamma$ holds. (addition is associative)
- 3) $\alpha + 0 = (\alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} 0) \% m = \alpha \% m = \alpha$ (there exists additive identity)
By it and 1), if β and γ are additive identity, $\beta = \beta + \gamma = \gamma + \beta = \gamma$ (additive identity is unique)
- 4) If $\alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta = m$, $\alpha + \beta = (\alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) \% m = m \% m = 0$ (there exists additive inverse)
- 5) $\alpha\beta = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) \% m = (\beta \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \alpha) \% m = \beta\alpha$ (multiplication is commutative)
- 6) Since $\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} (\beta\gamma) = \alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} ((\beta \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma) \% m) \equiv \alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} (\beta \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma) = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma \equiv ((\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) \% m) \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma = (\alpha\beta) \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma \pmod{m}$ holds, $\alpha(\beta\gamma) = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} (\beta\gamma)) \% m = ((\alpha\beta) \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma) \% m = (\alpha\beta)\gamma$ holds. (multiplication is associative)
- 7) $\alpha 1 = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} 1) \% m = \alpha \% m = \alpha$ (there exists multiplicative identity) By it and 5), if β and γ are multiplicative identity, $\beta = \beta\gamma = \gamma\beta = \gamma$ (multiplicative identity is unique)
- 8) For all $\alpha (\alpha \neq 0)$, suppose there doesn't exist β that makes $\alpha\beta = 1$. There exist $\beta, \gamma \in \mathcal{Z}_m$ with $\beta \neq \gamma$ and $\alpha\beta = \alpha\gamma$, because β is any one from 0 to $m-1$ and $\alpha\beta$ is any one from 0 to $m-1$ except 1. Therefore, $(\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} (-\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma)) = \alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} (\beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} (-\gamma)) = km$ holds. The right side has divisor m , but it contradicts that the left side doesn't have divisor of m except 1, because $0 < \alpha < (m-1)$ and $((-m) < (\beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} (-\gamma)) < 0$ or $0 < (\beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} (-\gamma)) < m$) holds. Thus, there exists β that makes $\alpha\beta = 1$. (there exists multiplicative inverse)

A brief proof: Since each $\alpha \in \mathcal{Z}_m \setminus \{0\}$ is coprime to m , there exist integers x and y such that $\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} x +_{\mathbb{Z}} m \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} y = 1$ by [3]. Putting $x' = x \% m \in \mathcal{Z}_m$, we obtain $\alpha x' = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} x) \% m = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} x +_{\mathbb{Z}} m \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} y) \% m = 1 \% m = 1$. Hence $x' = \alpha^{-1}$.

- 9) $\alpha(\beta + \gamma) = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} (\beta + \gamma)) \% m = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} ((\beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma) \% m)) \% m \equiv (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} (\beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma)) \% m = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta + \alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma) \% m \equiv ((\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) \% m +_{\mathbb{Z}} (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma) \% m) \% m \equiv (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) \% m + (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma) \% m \equiv \alpha\beta + \alpha\gamma$ holds. (distributive law stands)

In conclusion, if m is a prime, \mathcal{Z}_m is a field.

2' Proof : If \mathcal{Z}_m is a field, m is a prime.

By contraposition, it is equivalent to prove "If m is not a prime, \mathcal{Z}_m is not a field." We can show 1) to 7) and 9) in the same way as 1'. For each m , suppose there exist α and β that make $\alpha\beta = 1$. m is not a prime, so let p be one of prime factors of m and then we have $m = p \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} p' (p' \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } 1 < p' < m)$

If $\alpha = p$, by $\alpha\beta = 1$ and $m = p \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} p'$, we have $\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta = k \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} m + 1 (k \in \mathbb{Z}) \Leftrightarrow p \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta = k \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} p \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} p' +_{\mathbb{Z}} 1 \Leftrightarrow (\beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} (-k \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} p')) \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} p = 1$. The right side is 1 but the left one is not 1 because of $1 < p$ and $\beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} (-k \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} p') \in \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore It is contradicted. For each m , there doesn't exist α and β that make $\alpha\beta = 1$. In conclusion, "If m is not a prime, \mathcal{Z}_m is not a field." and "If \mathcal{Z}_m is a field, m is a prime."

Because of 1' and 2', \mathcal{Z}_m is a field if and only if m is a prime.

(b) 4

(c) 5

4.2 Exercise 1.4

Define $\alpha_n = \overbrace{1 + \dots + 1}^{n \text{ terms}}$ for $n \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \alpha_m \alpha_n &= \alpha_m \left(\overbrace{1 + \dots + 1}^{n \text{ terms}} \right) \\
 &= \overbrace{\alpha_m + \dots + \alpha_m}^{n \text{ terms}} && \text{(by ...)} \\
 &= \overbrace{(1 + \dots + 1) + \dots + (1 + \dots + 1)}^{n \text{ terms}} \\
 &= \overbrace{1 + \dots + 1}^{mn \text{ terms}} && \text{(by ...)} \\
 &= \alpha_{mn}
 \end{aligned}$$

for all m, n .

Assume there exists an n with $\alpha_n = 0$ but $\alpha_k \neq 0$ for any $k < n$. It suffices to prove that n is a prime.

Suppose n is not any prime. Let p be one of prime factors of n and then we have $n = pp' (p' \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } p' > 1)$. By $\alpha_m \alpha_n = \alpha_{mn}$ for all m and n , $\alpha_n = \alpha_p \alpha_{p'}$ holds. We have either $\alpha_p = 0$ or $\alpha_{p'} = 0$ (or both) because of $\alpha_n = 0$ and Exercise 1.1 (g). However, it is contradictory to $\alpha_p = 0$ and $\alpha_{p'} = 0$. Therefore, n is a prime.

References

- [1] https://proofwiki.org/wiki/Rational_Numbers_are_Countably_Infinite
- [2] https://proofwiki.org/wiki/Rational_Numbers_form_Field
- [3] https://proofwiki.org/wiki/Bezout%27s_Identity