

Homework 1

Problem 1.1

a) E_1 is a subspace of \mathbb{R}^3 . Indeed, E_1 is non-empty because $(0,0,0) \in E_1$ and:

• if $u \in E_1, v \in E_1$ with $\begin{cases} u = (u_1, u_2, u_3) \\ v = (v_1, v_2, v_3) \end{cases}$ then

$$(u_1 + v_1) - 2(u_2 + v_2) + (u_3 + v_3) = \underbrace{u_1 - 2u_2 + u_3}_{=0} + \underbrace{v_1 - 2v_2 + v_3}_{=0} = 0 \quad \text{because } u, v \in E_1$$

hence $u+v \in E_1$

• if $u \in E_1$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, with $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$ then $(\alpha u_1) - 2(\alpha u_2) + (\alpha u_3) = \alpha(u_1 - 2u_2 + u_3) = 0$ because $u \in E_1$

hence $\alpha u \in E_1$

b) $0 - 2 \cdot 0 + 0 \neq 3$ hence $(0,0,0) \notin E_2$: E_2 is not a subspace of \mathbb{R}^3

c) E_3 is not a subspace of \mathbb{R}^3 . Indeed: $(0,1,-1) \in E_3$ but $(-1) \cdot (0,1,-1) = (0,-1,1) \notin E_3$.

Problem 1.2 In order to show $\text{Span}(x_1 - x_n) = \text{Span}(x_2 - x_n)$ we show successively:

① $\text{Span}(x_2 - x_n) \subset \text{Span}(x_1 - x_n)$: This is obvious.
if we want to give the details:
Let $u \in \text{Span}(x_2 - x_n)$. Then, there exists $\alpha_2 \dots \alpha_n \in \mathbb{R}$
such that $u = \alpha_2 x_2 + \dots + \alpha_n x_n$
 $= 0 \cdot x_1 + \alpha_2 x_2 + \dots + \alpha_n x_n \in \text{Span}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$

② $\text{Span}(x_1 - x_n) \subset \text{Span}(x_2 - x_n)$.

Let $u \in \text{Span}(x_1 - x_n)$. There exists $\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$u = \alpha_1 x_1 + \dots + \alpha_n x_n = \underbrace{\alpha_1 x_1}_{\in \text{Span}(x_2 - x_n)} + \underbrace{\alpha_2 x_2 + \dots + \alpha_n x_n}_{\in \text{Span}(x_2 - x_n)}$$

~~Since $x_1 \in \text{Span}(x_2 - x_n)$~~

Since $\text{Span}(x_2 - x_n)$ is a subspace of \mathbb{R}^n , we get
that it is closed under vector addition, hence $u \in \text{Span}(x_2 - x_n)$.

Problem 1.3

Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k+1} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\alpha_1 v_1 + \dots + \alpha_k v_k + \alpha_{k+1} x = 0$$

We are going to show that $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_{k+1} = 0$, which gives that (v_1, \dots, v_k, x) is linearly independent.

We have two cases:

Case 1: $\alpha_{k+1} = 0$. In that ^{case we} get $\alpha_1 v_1 + \dots + \alpha_k v_k = 0$.

Since (v_1, \dots, v_k) is linearly independent this implies that $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_k = 0$ and we are done.

Case 2: $\alpha_{k+1} \neq 0$. In that case, we get:

$$x = -\frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_{k+1}} v_1 - \dots - \frac{\alpha_k}{\alpha_{k+1}} v_k \in \text{Span}(v_1, \dots, v_k)$$

This is not possible because $x \notin \text{Span}(v_1, \dots, v_k)$.

We conclude that only Case 1 happens: $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_{k+1} = 0$.
The vectors v_1, \dots, v_k, x are linearly independent.

Problem 1.4

a) By contradiction, assume that $(x_1 \dots x_n)$ are not a basis of S . Since they are linearly independent, we have then: $\text{Span}(x_1 \dots x_n) \neq S$.

- Since $x_1 \dots x_n \in S$, $\text{Span}(x_1 \dots x_n) \subset S$: hence there exists $v \in S \setminus \text{Span}(x_1 \dots x_n)$.

- Problem 1.3 gives that $(x_1 \dots x_n, v)$ is linearly independent.

- This is absurd, because ~~the set of~~ $\dim(S) = k$: any family of ~~linearly indep~~ vectors of S contains at most k vectors!
linearly indep

we conclude that $(x_1 \dots x_n)$ is a basis of S .

b). By contradiction, assume that $x_1 \dots x_n$ are linearly dependent.

- Hence, one of the vectors $x_1 \dots x_n$ belongs to the span of the others. We can assume that this vector is x_1 (up to a relabelling of the vectors): $x_1 \in \text{Span}(x_2 \dots x_n)$

- Now, Pb 1.2 Gives: $\text{Span}(x_2 \dots x_n) = \text{Span}(x_1 \dots x_n) = S$

we get that S is spanned by $k-1$ vectors $(x_2 \dots x_n)$. (by assumption)

This is absurd because $\dim S = k$! We conclude that $(x_1 \dots x_n)$ is a basis of S .

Problem 1.5 Let $k = \dim U$ and $l = \dim V$.

Let $(u_1 \dots u_k)$ be a basis of U and $(v_1 \dots v_l)$ be a basis of V .

By contradiction, assume that $U \cap V \neq \{0\}$.

We are going to show that $(u_1 \dots u_k, v_1 \dots v_l)$ are linearly independent.

Let $\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_k, \beta_1 \dots \beta_l \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\alpha_1 u_1 + \dots + \alpha_k u_k + \beta_1 v_1 + \dots + \beta_l v_l = 0$$

$$\text{Then: } x \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underbrace{\alpha_1 u_1 + \dots + \alpha_k u_k}_{\in U} = \underbrace{-\beta_1 v_1 - \dots - \beta_l v_l}_{\in V}$$

hence $x \in U \cap V \neq \{0\}$. We get $x = 0$ and therefore:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_1 u_1 + \dots + \alpha_k u_k = 0 \\ \beta_1 v_1 + \dots + \beta_l v_l = 0 \end{cases}$$

$(u_1 \dots u_k)$ is linearly independent, hence $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_k = 0$
 $(v_1 \dots v_l)$ linearly indep. $\beta_1 = \dots = \beta_l = 0$

We conclude that $(u_1 \dots u_k, v_1 \dots v_l)$ is a family of $k+l > n = \dim \mathbb{R}^n$ vectors of \mathbb{R}^n : this is absurd!

Conclusion: $U \cap V = \{0\}$.