## Math 240 Tutorial Solutions

May 30

**Question 1.** Consider the set  $S = \{(1, 3, -4, 2), (2, 2, -4, 0), (1, -3, 2, -4), (-1, 0, 1, 0)\}$  of vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^4$ . Show they form a linearly dependent set, and express one vector as a linear combination of the others.

We form a matrix whose columns are the given vectors

$$\left(\begin{array}{ccccc}
1 & 2 & 1 & -1 \\
3 & 2 & -3 & 0 \\
-4 & -4 & 2 & 1 \\
2 & 0 & -4 & 0
\end{array}\right).$$

The reduced row echelon form is given by

$$\left(\begin{array}{cccc} 1 & 0 & -2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \frac{3}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right).$$

Since the number of pivot rows is less than the number of rows, the columns form a dependent set.

Since the third column is not a pivot column, we can express it as a linear combination of the other three. Reading the answer off from the reduced row echelon form given above, we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -3 \\ 2 \\ -4 \end{pmatrix} = -2 \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 3 \\ -4 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix} + \frac{3}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 2 \\ -4 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

**Question 2.** Consider the set  $S = \{(1,0,0,-1),(0,1,0,-1),(0,0,1,-1),(0,0,0,1)\}$  of vectors in  $\mathbf{R}^4$ . Show they form a linearly independent set. For a general vector  $(a_1,a_2,a_3,a_4) \in \mathbf{R}^4$ , derive the coefficients for this vector when it is expanded as a linear combination of the vectors in S.

We form a matrix whose columns are the given vectors

$$\left(\begin{array}{ccccc}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
-1 & -1 & -1 & 1
\end{array}\right).$$

The reduced row echelon form is given by

$$\left(\begin{array}{cccc} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{array}\right).$$

This is the identity matrix of order four, which shows that the given vectors are linearly independent. To find expressions for the coefficients a directed, we row reduce the following augmented matrix

$$\left(\begin{array}{cccc|c}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & a_1 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & a_2 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & a_3 \\
-1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & a_4
\end{array}\right).$$

The reduced row echelon form is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ a_1 + a_2 + a_3 + a_4 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore, an arbitrary vector in  $\mathbb{R}^4$  can be expressed as

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_1 \\ a_2 \\ a_3 \\ a_4 \end{pmatrix} = a_1 \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} + a_2 \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} + a_3 \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} + (a_1 + a_2 + a_3 + a_4) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

**Question 3.** Let  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  be finite subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , for some n, such that  $S_1 \subseteq S_2$ . Prove that if  $S_1$  is a linearly dependent set, then so is  $S_2$ . Show that this is equivalent to if  $S_2$  is a linearly independent set, then so is  $S_1$ .

Let  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  be finite subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $S_1 \subseteq S_2$ . Suppose that  $S_1$  is linearly dependent, but  $S_2$  is linearly independent. For definiteness, we write

$$S_1 = \{\vec{v}_1, \, \vec{v}_2, \dots, \, \vec{v}_m\}$$

and

$$S_2 = \{\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_2, \dots, \vec{v}_m, \vec{v}_{m+1}, \dots, \vec{v}_k\}$$

By assumption, there is a collection  $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$  of scalars such that  $a_1 \vec{v}_1 + a_2 \vec{v}_2 + \cdots + a_m \vec{v}_m = \vec{0}$  but  $a_i \neq 0$  for some  $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$ . Set  $a_{m+1} = a_{m+2} = \cdots = a_k = 0$  so that

$$a_1\vec{v}_1 + a_2\vec{v}_2 + \dots + a_m\vec{v}_m + a_{m+1}\vec{v}_{m+1} + \dots + a_k\vec{v}_k = \vec{0}.$$

By our assumption that  $S_2$  is linear independent, we have

$$a_1 = a_2 = \dots = a_m = a_{m+1} = \dots = a_k = 0$$

by the definition of linearly independent. But this implies that each  $a_i = 0$  for  $i \in \{1, 2, ..., m\}$ , contrary to what we have observed. This contradiction proves the result.

**Question 4.** Let S be a linearly independent set of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and let  $\vec{v}$  be a vector in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  that is not in S. Prove that  $S \cup \{\vec{v}\}$  is linearly dependent if and only if  $\vec{v} \in \operatorname{span}(S)$ .

We may assume that  $\vec{v} \neq \vec{0}$ ; for otherwise, the result is trivial. Write  $S = \{\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_2, \dots, \vec{v}_m\}$ . Suppose that  $S \cup \{\vec{v}\}$  is linearly dependent but  $\vec{v} \notin \vec{v} \in \operatorname{span}(S)$ . Then there are scalars  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m, b$  not all zero such that

$$a_1\vec{v}_1 + a_2\vec{v}_2 + \dots + a_m\vec{v}_m + b\vec{v} = \vec{0}.$$

If b=0, then S is linearly dependent, contrary to assumption, hence  $b\neq 0$ . But then

$$\vec{v} = -\frac{a_1}{b}\vec{v}_1 - \frac{a_2}{b}\vec{v}_2 - \dots - \frac{a_m}{b}\vec{v}_m$$

so that  $\vec{v} \in \text{span}(S)$ , again, contrary to our assumption. Since we have shown that each possibility for b ends in a contradiction, we have that  $\vec{v} \in \text{span}(S)$  given  $S \cup \{\vec{v}\}$  is dependent.

Conversely, assume that  $S \cup \{\vec{v}\}$  is linearly independent, but  $\vec{v} \in \text{span}(S)$ . Then there are scalars  $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$  not all zero (recall  $\vec{v} \neq \vec{0}$ ) for which

$$\vec{v} = a_1 \vec{v}_1 + a_1 \vec{v}_2 + \dots + a_m \vec{v}_m.$$

But then

$$a_1\vec{v}_1 + a_1\vec{v}_2 + \dots + a_m\vec{v}_m - \vec{v} = \vec{0}.$$

But then each  $a_1 = a_2 = \cdots = a_m = 0$ , contrary to assumption. Therefore,  $\vec{v} \notin \text{span}(S)$  given  $S \cup \{\vec{v}\}$  is linearly independent.

## **Question 5.** Do the following.

(a) Let  $\vec{u}$  and  $\vec{v}$  be distinct vectors in  $\mathbf{R}^n$ . Prove that  $\{\vec{u}, \vec{v}\}$  is linearly independent if and only if  $\{\vec{u} + \vec{v}, \vec{u} - \vec{v}\}$  is linearly independent.

Suppose first that  $\{\vec{u}, \vec{v}\}$  is linearly independent, but  $\vec{u} + \vec{v} = a(\vec{u} - \vec{v})$  for some  $a \in \mathbf{R}$ . If a = 1, then  $\vec{v} = \vec{0}$ , contradicting the fact that  $\{\vec{u}, \vec{v}\}$  is independent. So  $a \neq 1$  and  $\vec{u} = -\frac{1+a}{1-a}\vec{v}$ , again, contradicting the fact that  $\{\vec{u}, \vec{v}\}$  is independent.

Conversely, suppose that  $\vec{u} = b\vec{v}$  for some  $b \in \mathbf{R}$ . Then  $\vec{u} + \vec{v} = (1+b)\vec{u}$  and  $\vec{u} - \vec{v} = (1-b)\vec{u}$ . But this means that both  $\vec{u} + \vec{v}$  and  $\vec{u} - \vec{v}$  are in span $\{\vec{u}\}$ , whereupon  $\{\vec{u} + \vec{v}, \vec{u} - \vec{v}\}$  is linearly dependent.

(b) Let  $\vec{u}, \vec{v}, \vec{w}$  be distinct vectors in  $\mathbf{R}^n$ . Prove that  $\{\vec{u}, \vec{v}, \vec{w}\}$  is linearly independent if and only if  $\{\vec{u} + \vec{v}, \vec{u} + \vec{w}, \vec{v} + \vec{w}\}$  is linear independent.

First, we assume that  $\{\vec{u}, \vec{v}, \vec{w}\}$  is linearly independent, and we assume there are scalars a, b, c such that

$$\vec{0} = a(\vec{u} + \vec{v}) + b(\vec{u} + \vec{w}) + c(\vec{v} + \vec{w}) = (a+b)\vec{u} + (a+c)\vec{v} + (b+c)\vec{w}.$$

Since we are assuming that  $\{\vec{u}, \vec{v}, \vec{w}\}$  is linearly independent, it must be that a+b=a+c=b+c=0. This linear system has only the trivial solution a=b=c=0, whereupon  $\{\vec{u}+\vec{v}, \vec{u}+\vec{w}, \vec{v}+\vec{w}\}$  is linearly independent as well.

Next, we assume that  $\{\vec{u}+\vec{v}, \vec{u}+\vec{w}, \vec{v}+\vec{w}\}$  is independent. Suppose there are scalars a, b, c such that  $a\vec{u}+b\vec{v}+c\vec{w}=\vec{0}$ . Then

$$(a-b+c)(\vec{u}+\vec{v}) + (a+b-c)(\vec{u}+\vec{w}) + (-a+b+c)(\vec{v}+\vec{w}) = \vec{0}.$$

By our assumed linear independence of  $\{\vec{u}+\vec{v},\vec{u}+\vec{w},\vec{v}+\vec{w}\}$ , we have a-b+c=a+b-c=-a+b+c=0. Solving, we find this possesses only the trivial solution a=b=c=0. It follows  $\{\vec{u},\vec{v},\vec{w}\}$  is independent as well.

## **Question 6.** Show the following for $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

(a) Show that scalar multiplication is a linear transformation.

Fix  $a \in \mathbf{R}$ , and let  $T : \mathbf{R}^n \to \mathbf{R}^n$  be the map  $T(\vec{v}) = a\vec{v}$ . Then  $T(b\vec{v}) = ab\vec{v} = ba\vec{v} = bT(\vec{v})$  and  $T(\vec{v} + \vec{u}) = a(\vec{v} + \vec{u}) = a\vec{v} + a\vec{u} = T(\vec{v}) + T(\vec{u})$ . We have shown that T is linear.

(b) When is this linear map invertible?

This map is invertible precisely in the case the scalar by which we are multiplying is nonzero.

(c) Is its inverse a linear transformation?

Let T be as in part (a), and assume that  $a \neq 0$ . Then T is invertible and  $T^{-1}$  is given by multiplication by  $a^{-1}$ . Since this is multiplication by a scalar, it is linear.

(d) Fix an element  $a \in \mathbf{R}^n$ . What is the matrix corresponding to the linear transformation  $\vec{v} \mapsto a\vec{v}$  with respect to the standard spanning vectors?

Recall the standard spanning vectors are  $\{\vec{e}_1, \vec{e}_2, \dots, \vec{e}_n\}$  where  $\vec{e}_i$  is the vector with a 1 in position i and zeros everywhere else. Then the matrix corresponding to multiplication by a is givn by

$$[T(\vec{e}_1)|T(\vec{e}_2)|\cdots|T(\vec{e}_n)] = [a\vec{e}_1|a\vec{e}_2|\cdots|a\vec{e}_n] = aI.$$

**Question 7.** Fix  $a \in \mathbf{R}$  and  $\vec{u} \in \mathbf{R}^n$  with  $\vec{u} \neq \vec{0}$ . Is the map given by  $\vec{v} \mapsto a\vec{v} + \vec{u}$  linear? Why or why not?

No; it is not a linear map. Let  $\vec{v}_1$ ,  $\vec{v}_2 \in \mathbf{R}^n$ . Then  $\vec{v}_1 + \vec{v}_2 \mapsto a\vec{v}_1 + a\vec{v}_2 + \vec{u}$ . But  $\vec{v}_1 \mapsto a\vec{v}_1 + \vec{u}$  and  $\vec{v}_2 \mapsto a\vec{v}_2 + \vec{u}$ . However,  $(a\vec{v}_1 + \vec{u}) + (a\vec{v}_2 + \vec{u}) = a\vec{v}_1 + a\vec{v}_2 + 2\vec{u} \neq a\vec{v}_1 + a\vec{v}_2 + \vec{u}$ .

**Question 8.** Consider a linear transformation  $T: \mathbf{R}^n \to \mathbf{R}^n$ , and define  $\mathrm{Ker}(T) = \{ \vec{v} \in \mathbf{R}^n : T(\vec{v}) = \vec{0} \}$ . This is the kernel of the linear transformation T. For  $\vec{v} \in \mathbf{R}^n$ , define  $\vec{v} + \mathrm{Ker}(T) = \{ \vec{v} + \vec{u} : \vec{u} \in \mathrm{Ker}(T) \}$ . Show the following.

(a) Ker(T) is closed under scalar multiplication and vector addition.

Let  $\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_2 \in \operatorname{Ker}(T)$ . Then  $T(\vec{v}_1 + \vec{v}_2) = T(\vec{v}_1) + T(\vec{v}_2) = \vec{0} + \vec{0} = \vec{0}$ , so  $\vec{v}_1 + \vec{v}_2 \in \operatorname{Ker}(T)$ . Similarly,  $T(a\vec{v}) = aT(\vec{v}) = a\vec{0} = \vec{0}$  whenever  $\vec{v} \in \operatorname{Ker}(T)$ ; so,  $a\vec{v} \in \operatorname{Ker}(T)$ . This shows that  $\operatorname{Ker}(T)$  is closed under vector addition and scalar multiplication.

(b) For  $\vec{v} \in \mathbf{R}^n$ , show that  $\vec{v} + \text{Ker}(T)$  consists of all and only those elements of  $\mathbf{R}^n$  that map to  $T(\vec{v})$  under T.

Let  $V = \{u \in \mathbf{R}^n : T(\vec{u}) = T(\vec{v})\}$ . We show  $\vec{v} + \mathrm{Ker}(T) = V$ . Indeed, let  $\vec{u} \in V$ . Then  $T(\vec{v}) = T(\vec{u})$  so that  $T(u - v) = \vec{0}$ . It follows that there is an  $\vec{x} \in \mathrm{Ker}(T)$  such that  $\vec{u} - \vec{v} = \vec{x}$ , that is,  $\vec{u} = \vec{v} + \vec{x}$ . This means  $\vec{u} \in \vec{v} + \mathrm{Ker}(T)$ .

Conversely, let  $\vec{u} \in \vec{v} + \text{Ker}(T)$ . Then there is some  $\vec{x} \in \text{Ker}(T)$  for which  $\vec{u} = \vec{v} + \vec{x}$ . It follows that  $T(\vec{u}) = T(\vec{v} + \vec{x}) + T(\vec{v}) + T(\vec{x}) = T(\vec{v}) + \vec{0} = T(\vec{v})$ . So,  $\vec{u} \in V$ , as required.

(c) For  $\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_2 \in \mathbf{R}^n$ , show that either  $\vec{v}_1 + \operatorname{Ker}(T) = \vec{v}_2 + \operatorname{Ker}(T)$  or  $\vec{v}_1 + \operatorname{Ker}(T) \cap \vec{v}_2 + \operatorname{Ker}(T) = \emptyset$ .

Let  $\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_2 \in \mathbf{R}^n$ , and suppose that  $\vec{v}_1 + \operatorname{Ker}(T) \cap \vec{v}_2 + \operatorname{Ker}(T) \neq \emptyset$ . Then there is some  $\vec{u} \in v_1 + \operatorname{Ker}(T) \cap \vec{v}_2 + \operatorname{Ker}(T)$ . By definition, there must be  $\vec{u}_1, \vec{u}_2 \in \operatorname{Ker}(T)$  such that  $\vec{u} = \vec{v}_1 + \vec{u}_1 = \vec{v}_1 + \vec{v}_2 = \vec{v}_1 + \vec{v}_2 = \vec{v}_1 + \vec{v}_2 = \vec{v}_2 + \vec{v}_3 = \vec{v}_1 + \vec{v}_2 = \vec{v}_1 +$ 

 $\vec{v}_2=\vec{u}_2$ . But then  $\vec{v}_1-\vec{v}_2=\vec{u}_2-\vec{u}_1=\vec{u}_3$  for some  $\vec{u}_3\in \mathrm{Ker}(T)$ . It follows that  $\vec{v}_1=\vec{v}_2+\vec{u}_3$ , so  $\vec{v}_1\in \vec{v}_2+\mathrm{Ker}(T)$ . Similarly,  $\vec{v}_2=\vec{v}_1-\vec{u}_3$ , so  $\vec{v}_2\in \vec{v}_1+\mathrm{Ker}(T)$ . It follows, therefore, that  $\vec{v}_1+\mathrm{Ker}(T)=\vec{v}_2+\mathrm{Ker}(T)$ .