

# Notes on linear algebra

September 30, 2023

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Vector Spaces</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	Exercises . . . . .	2
1.2	Subspaces . . . . .	6

# 1 Vector Spaces

## 1.1 Exercises

### 1.A.1

Find  $c$  and  $d$  such that

$$\frac{1}{a+bi} = c+di$$

The trick here is as follows

$$\frac{1}{a+bi} \left( \frac{a-bi}{a-bi} \right) = \frac{a-bi}{a^2+b^2}$$

So  $c = a/|z|^2$  and  $d = -b/|z|^2$ , where  $z = a+bi$  and  $|z| = \sqrt{a^2+b^2}$ .

### 1.A.2

Show that

$$\frac{-1\sqrt{3}i}{2}$$

is a cube root of 1.

$$(-1\sqrt{3}i)(-1\sqrt{3}i) = -2 - 2\sqrt{3}i$$

$$(-2 - 2\sqrt{3}i)(-1\sqrt{3}i) = 2 + 6 = 8$$

Ad since  $\frac{1}{2^3} = 1/8$ , then we get our proof.

### 1.A.3

To find 2 distinct square roots of  $i$  it helps to look at Euler's identity first

$$e^{i\pi} + 1 = 0$$

or

$$e^{i\pi} = -1$$

And since  $i^2 = -1$ , then

$$e^{i\pi} = -1 = i^2$$

Hence

$$e^{i\pi/2} = i$$

So our first square root is  $e^{i\pi/4} = \sqrt{i}$ . If we go around once, then we get another square root

$$e^{(i\pi/2+2\pi i)/2} = e^{i5\pi/4}$$

We can still simplify this further.

$$e^{i\pi/4} = \cos \frac{\pi}{4} + i \sin \frac{\pi}{4} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} + i \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} = \frac{1+i}{\sqrt{2}}$$

and

$$e^{i5\pi/4} = \cos \frac{5\pi}{4} + i \sin \frac{5\pi}{4} = \frac{-1}{\sqrt{2}} + i \frac{-1}{\sqrt{2}} = -\frac{1+i}{\sqrt{2}}$$

Another interesting read is: Ed Scheinerman (2023) A Third Real Solution to  $x = x^{-1}$ , Not Really, The American Mathematical Monthly, 130:6, 514-514, DOI: 10.1080/00029890.2023.2184161

#### 1.A.4

Show that  $\alpha + \beta = \beta + \alpha$  for all  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$ .

Let's define  $\alpha = a + bi$  and  $\beta = c + di$ .

$$\alpha + \beta = (a + bi) + (c + di) = (a + c) + (b + d)i$$

and

$$\beta + \alpha = (c + di) + (a + bi) = (c + a) + (d + b)i$$

And since summation is commutative for the reals, QED.

#### 1.A.5

Show that  $(\alpha + \beta) + \lambda = \alpha + (\beta + \lambda)$  where  $\alpha, \beta, \lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ .

Same mechanics,

$$(\alpha + \beta) = (a + c) + (b + d)i$$

If we define  $\lambda = x + yi$  then

$$(\alpha + \beta) + \lambda = [(a + c) + (b + d)i] + (x + yi) = (a + b + x) + (b + d + y)i$$

And hopefully you can see the rest of the argument and how we are save by the commutative property of the reals.

#### 1.A.8

Show that for every  $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $\alpha \neq 0$ , there exist a unique  $\beta \in \mathbb{C}$  such that  $\alpha\beta = 1$ .

The result from exercise 1.A.1 comes in handy here! this is because we get an expression for a an inverse complex number in terms that make it easy to carry out calculations the way we are used to.

In 1.A.1 we had  $\beta = c + di = (c, d)$  equal to

$$(a, b) \left( \frac{a}{a^2 + b^2}, \frac{-b}{a^2 + b^2} \right) = (1, 0) = 1$$

**1.A.10**

Find  $x \in \mathbb{R}^4$  such that

$$(4, -3, 1, 7) + 2x = (5, 9, -6, 8)$$

Let's try component by component,

- $4 + 2x_0 = 5$  results in  $x_0 = 1/2$ .
- $-3 + 2x_1 = 9$  results in  $x_1 = 12/2 = 6$ .
- $1 + 2x_2 = -6$  results in  $x_2 = -7/2$ .
- $7 + 2x_3 = 8$  results in  $x_3 = 1/2$ .

So  $x = (1/2, 6, -7/2, 1/2)$ .

**1.A.11**

Explain why there does not exist a  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  such that

$$\lambda(2 - 3i, 5 + 4i, -6 + 7i) = (12 - 5i, 7 + 22i, -32 - 9i)$$

This one is funky but try note that  $\lambda(2 - 3i) = (12 - 5i)$ , and  $\lambda(5 + 4i) = (7 + 22i)$ . Then multiply  $\lambda(2 - 3i)(7 + 22i)$  and compare that against  $(12 - 5i)(5 + 4i)$ , and so on.

**1.B.1**

Prove that  $-(-v) = v$  for every  $v \in V$ .

Using the additive inverse property

$$(-v) + -(-v) = 0 \rightarrow (-v) + v = 0$$

And by the Uniqueness of the additive inverse,  $-(-v) = v$ .

**1.B.3**

Suppose  $v, w \in V$ . Explain why there exists a unique  $x \in V$  such that

$$v + 3x = w$$

There are two parts to this question: existence and Uniqueness. The existence part can be seen by using

$$x = \frac{1}{3}(w - v)$$

in our original expression. That is,

$$v + 3x = v + 3\frac{1}{3}(w - v) = v + w - v = w$$

Uniqueness can be seen by noting that if we had

$$v + 3x' = w$$

Then

$$x' = \frac{1}{3}(w - v)$$

And so

$$x - x' = 0$$

#### 1.B.4

The empty set is not a vector space because it fails to satisfy the additive identity - can't have the existence of an element  $0 \in V$  if the set is empty.

#### 1.B.5

Show that the additive inverse condition - for every  $v \in V$ ,  $\exists w \in V$  such that  $v + w = 0$  - can be replaced by the condition

$$0v = 0$$

for all  $v \in V$ . Where the 0 on the left is  $0 \in \mathbb{F}$  and the 0 on the right is the additive identity of  $v$ .

Normally, we would think of the additive inverse for  $v + w = 0$  as  $w = -v$ , so

$$0 = v + w = v + (-v) = 1v + (-1v) = 0v = 0$$

#### 1.B.6

Let  $\infty$  and  $-\infty$  denote two distinct objects, neither of which is in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Now, say we define addition and scalar multiplication in  $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\} \cup \{-\infty\}$  as we normally would.

Is  $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\} \cup \{-\infty\}$  a vector space over  $\mathbb{R}$ ?

No. For example, additive inverses and additive identities would not be unique - nor any of the other conditions required of a vector space.

## 1.2 Subspaces

One topic covered in the book is proving that sets are subspaces. Let's see a couple worked out cases before attempting example 1.35.

First, let's say we have

$$U = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{F}^3 : x_1 + 2x_2 = 0\}$$

and we claim this set is a subspace of  $\mathbb{F}^3$ .

We can see that the additive identity is part of the subspace,  $0 \in U$ , since  $x_1 + 2x_2 = 0$ .

Now let's see if this subspace is closed under addition. If we have  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$  and  $w = (w_1, w_2, w_3)$ , then

$$u + v = (u_1, u_2, u_3) + (w_1, w_2, w_3) = (u_1 + w_1, u_2 + w_2, u_3 + w_3)$$

Given the definition of our set, we should have the above  $u + w = (u_1 + w_1, u_2 + w_2, u_3 + w_3)$  met the requirement that  $(u_1 + w_1) + 2(u_2 + w_2) = 0$ . To see this, start from that restraint on  $u$  and  $w$ :

$$u_1 + 2u_2 + w_1 + 2w_2 = 0 + 0 = (u_1 + w_1) + 2(u_2 + w_2)$$

Now, we just need to show that our subspace is closed under scalar multiplication. This process is similar. We want to see that  $au = (au_1, au_2, au_3)$  still matches the constraint given so that  $au_1 + a2u_2 = 0$ . Which we see does satisfy our constraint since  $a(u_1 + 2u_2) = au_1 + a2u_2 = 0$ . ■

Similarly, we can now take a look at example 1.35:

If  $b \in \mathbb{F}$ , then

$$U = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \in \mathbb{F}^4 : x_3 = 5x_4 + b\}$$

is a subspace of  $\mathbb{F}^4$  if and only if  $b = 0$ .

From the constraint imposed on our subspace, we want to see

$$u + w = (u_1 + w_1, u_2 + w_2, u_3 + w_3, u_4 + w_4) \rightarrow (u_3 + w_3) = 5(u_4 + w_4) + 2b$$

If we add the individual constraints we see that we indeed match the above

$$u_3 + w_3 = 5u_4 + b + 5w_4 + b \rightarrow (u_3 + w_3) = 5(u_4 + w_4) + 2b$$

Similarly, we can see that this subspace is closed under scalar multiplication because  $au = (au_1, au_2, au_3, au_4)$  would meet the constraint given when if  $au_3 = a5u_4 + ab$ . Which is indeed the case because  $a(u_3) = a(5u_4 + b)$  matches the previous expression.

The only requirement we haven't met is to show that this subspace meets the additive identity requirement. This is when  $b = 0$  becomes a must. ■

**The set of continuous real-valued functions on the interval  $[0, 1]$  is a subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^{[0,1]}$ .**

**Note:** in this example  $\mathbb{R}$  actually stands for  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . What this means is that you need to keep in mind that the inputs and outputs to functions are tuples, not single numbers.

Now, let's revisit  $\mathbb{R}^{[0,1]}$ . People say  $\mathbb{R}^{[0,1]}$  denotes the set of functions from the set  $[0, 1]$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  (set of real-valued functions on  $[0, 1]$ ).

Let's start with noting the following:

$$\mathbb{R}^{[0,1]} = \{f | f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$$

Our first step is checking the additive identity,  $0 \in \mathbb{R}^{[0,1]}$ ? We could take the name literally but as Axler pointed out, the first requirement is a way to checking that the subspace is not empty and to show that  $0 \in \mathbb{R}^{[0,1]}$ .

To start,  $f(x) = 0, \forall x \in [0, 1]$  is a continuous function. So  $0 \in \mathbb{R}^{[0,1]}$ .

Next, assume we have  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $g : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . And we have  $f(x) = a$  and  $g(x) = b$ , where  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ , then

$$(f + g)(x) = f(x) + g(x) = a + b \in \mathbb{R}$$

These cases are valid since the sum of continuous functions is itself a continuous function, and constant functions are continuous.

Finally, if  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ , then

$$(\lambda f)(x) = \lambda f(x) = \lambda a \in \mathbb{R} \quad \blacksquare$$

**Note:** this is also an entrypoint into an interesting argument for showing that  $[0, 1]$  and  $\mathbb{R}$  have the same cardinality.

**The set of differentiable real-valued functions on  $\mathbb{R}$  is a subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}}$ .**

**Note:** in this example  $\mathbb{R}$  actually stands for  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . What this means is that you need to keep in mind that the inputs and outputs to functions are tuples, not single numbers.

$\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}}$  denotes the set of functions from  $\mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ :

$$\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}} = \{f | f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$$

In this case, our [proposed] subspace is defined as follows:

$$U = \{f | f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \text{ where } \forall c \in \mathbb{R}, \exists f'(c)\}$$

We resorted to the internet to gain some insights and What is  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}}$  as a vector space?.

The accepted answer mentions this great point that we can think of  $\mathbb{F}^n$  as the assignment of elements of the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  to elements of  $\mathbb{F}$  by  $g \in \mathbb{F}^{\{1, 2, \dots, n\}}$  or as  $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ . The function  $g$  behaves such that the index of an element of the  $n$ -tuple corresponds to a member of the  $n$ -tuple or,  $g(1) = x_1$ ,  $g(2) = x_2$ , and so on correspond to  $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ .

This means that in our case,  $f \in U$ , these are functions that map a uncountably infinite number of elements to an uncountably infinite long tuple.

The math exchange answer also gives us  $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \{0\}$  as the additive identity. There,  $\{0\}$  is an uncountably infinite tuple of all zeros, which is also differentiable everywhere within our domain. Then the rest of the argument is very similar to when we discussed  $\mathbb{R}^{[0,1]}$ .