

Things you should definitely know by memory (to the point where you can recite it): **FILL IN THE BLANKS** (I've filled in some of them for you)

- When people write the words “let V be a vector space”, they implicitly mean 4 pieces of data:
 1. a set V , whose elements we call _____
 2. a base field F , whose elements we call _____
 3. an operation $+$, called _____, which eats 2 vectors $\in V$ as input, and spits out one output
 4. an operation \cdot , called _____, which eats one _____ \in ___ AND one _____ \in ___ as input, and spits out one output

that satisfy the following 10 axioms: **FILL IN THE BLANKS** (I've filled in some of them for you)

	$+$	\cdot
Closure	The image of the $+$ function lies in $\subseteq V$, i.e. all outputs that $+$ spits out are vectors in V . Or more mathematically, $\forall v_1, v_2 \in V$, we want $v_1 + v_2 \in V$.	The image of the \cdot function lies in $\subseteq V$, i.e. all outputs that \cdot spits out are vectors in V . Or more mathematically, $\forall a \in F, v \in V$, we want $a \cdot v \in V$.
Commutativity	$\forall v_1, v_2$, we want $v_1 + v_2 = v_2 + v_1$	
Associativity		
Identity		Let 1_F denote the (unique) multiplicative identity in the field F . Then $\forall v \in V$, we want $1_F \cdot v = v$.
Inverse		
	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100%; height: 40px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> Distributativity (2 axioms for VS)	

- For a set $S \subseteq V$, a **linear combination (LC) over S** or **linear combination (LC) of elements of S** is a **FINITE** sum of the form $\sum_{i \in I}$ _____ with **coefficients** $a_i \in$ _____, and $v_i \in$ _____ for ALL $i \in I$, where I is some **FINITE** set of indices.

Or if you don't want to talk about index sets I , you can say instead: a **LC over S** is a **FINITE** sum of the form $\sum_{i \in 1}^n$ _____ with $a_i \in$ _____, $v_i \in$ _____ for ALL $i = 1, \dots, n$, where n is some natural number $n \in \mathbb{N} := \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$

- A set \mathcal{L} of vectors in V is **linearly independent** if:

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \forall a_1, \dots, a_n \in F, \quad \forall v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathcal{L},$$

if the linear combination $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i v_i = 0$, then all the a_1, \dots, a_n must be 0.

In English, this would be “the only linear combination over \mathcal{L} that equals 0, is the trivial linear combination (all the coefficients are 0)”

- to **PROVE** a set $S \subseteq V$ is LI, you should begin with the phrase: “To show that S is LI, let us consider an arbitrary linear combination over S that equals 0, i.e. $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i v_i = 0$ with $v_i \in S, a_i \in F$. We want to show that the coefficients a_i (for $i = 1, \dots, n$) are all = 0.”
- if you want to **USE** the known fact that a set $S \subseteq V$ is LI, it would look like this: suppose you are at a point in your proof where you have a linear combination $\sum_{i=1}^n b_i v_i = 0$, with $v_i \in S$, which you know equals 0; then you can say “Because S is LI, and we have that the linear combination $\sum_{i=1}^n b_i v_i = 0$, we can now conclude the coefficients of this linear combination, b_i (for $i = 1, \dots, n$), are all = 0.”
- **Here’s an example** where I use both the above phrases. **CLAIM:** if $\{u, v\} \subseteq V$ is a LI set, then so is $\{u, u + v\}$.

Proof: “To show that $\{u, u + v\}$ is LI, let us consider an arbitrary linear combination over $\{u, u + v\}$ that equals 0, i.e. $a_1 u + a_2(u + v) = 0$ with $a_1, a_2 \in F$. We want to show that the coefficients a_1, a_2 are both = 0.”

Observe that $a_1 u + a_2(u + v) = 0$ can be rearranged to $(a_1 + a_2)u + a_2 v = 0$ (using the various distributativity, commutativity, and associativity properties of + and \cdot).

“Because $\{u, v\}$ is LI, and we have that $(a_1 + a_2)u + a_2 v = 0$, we can now conclude that the coefficients of this linear combination, $(a_1 + a_2), a_2$, are both = 0.”

Finally, now that we know $a_2 = 0$ and $a_1 + a_2 = 0$, we conclude that also $a_1 = 0$. So we have shown that both coefficients $a_1, a_2 = 0$, and we are done.

EXERCISE: prove that $\{u, v, w\}$ LI $\implies \{u, u + v, u + v + w\}$ LI, using the above language!

- A set \mathcal{D} of vectors in V is **linearly dependent** if:

$$\exists n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \exists a_1, \dots, a_n \in F, \quad \exists v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathcal{D}, \text{ such that}$$

not all the a_1, \dots, a_n equal 0 (i.e. at least 1 is $\neq 0$), but STILL the LC $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i v_i = 0$

In English, this would be “there is a non-trivial linear combination over \mathcal{D} that equals 0”

- to **PROVE** a set $S \subseteq V$ is LD, you should (somehow) cook up a non-trivial linear combination over \mathcal{D} that equals 0, and say “We have produced some NON-zero $a_1, \dots, a_n \in F$ and $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathcal{D}$ s.t. $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i v_i = 0$, and so by definition, S is LD.”
- if you want to **USE** the known fact that a set $S \subseteq V$ is LD, it would look like this: “Because S is LD, by definition there must exist some natural number n , and NON-zero $a_1, \dots, a_n \in F$ and $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i v_i = 0$.”

EXERCISE: given $S_1 \subseteq S_2$, prove (use direct proof!) that if S_1 is LD, then S_2 is LD also. Use the above language!

- The **Cutting Down/Culling Theorem:** \forall (finite) spanning lists \mathcal{S} , by reading from head to tail and kicking out any vectors that are “redundant”, i.e. in the span of the vectors preceding it in the list \mathcal{S} , I can cut it down to an LI list (that is still spanning).

To **USE** the Culling Theorem, you would say “We can use the Culling Theorem on the (finite) spanning set \mathcal{S} , which tells us we can cut it down to a subset $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ that is still spanning, but now guaranteed to be LI. (i.e. \mathcal{S}' is a basis)”

- The **Replacement Theorem:** \forall LI lists \mathcal{L} , and \forall spanning lists \mathcal{S} , I can replace elements of \mathcal{S} by elements of \mathcal{L} one-by-one (so the list “ \mathcal{S} ” is updating/changing at every step!!!), (by inserting each element of \mathcal{L} at the head of \mathcal{S} , and kicking the first element (reading head to tail) of \mathcal{S} that is “redundant”, i.e. in the span of the vectors preceding it in the list \mathcal{S}), so that \mathcal{S} remains spanning (at every step). The end result is a new **spanning** list \mathcal{S}' of the **same size** as the original $\mathcal{S}_{\text{original}}$, **but now with \mathcal{L} contained within it:** $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{S}'$.

To **USE** the Replacement Theorem, you would say “Because \mathcal{L} is LI and \mathcal{S} is spanning, we can apply the Replacement Theorem, which produces a new spanning set \mathcal{S}' (of the same size as \mathcal{S}), but now contains \mathcal{L} .”

Using these 2 theorems, you should be able to prove ALL of the following corollaries: (You should do ALL these proofs, to master using the Replacement Theorem. I did the first one to show you. You may want to come back to these after doing some of the later problems on this document.)

- **Corollary 1:** every LI set has a smaller size than every spanning set. i.e. $\forall \mathcal{L}$ LI and $\forall \mathcal{S}$ spanning, we have $|\mathcal{L}| \leq |\mathcal{S}|$.

Proof: let us fix (like “fix in place”, not “repair”) \mathcal{L} an arbitrary LI set, and \mathcal{S} an arbitrary spanning set. We want to show that $|\mathcal{L}| \leq |\mathcal{S}|$.

“Because \mathcal{L} is LI and \mathcal{S} is spanning, we can apply the Replacement Theorem, which produces a new spanning set \mathcal{S}' (of the same size as \mathcal{S}), but now contains \mathcal{L} .”

So, we have $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{S}' \implies |\mathcal{L}| \leq |\mathcal{S}'| = |\mathcal{S}|$, and we are done.

- **Corollary 2:** if $\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2$ are 2 bases of the F -VS V , they are the same size. In other words, all bases of a given vector space V are the same size. This size is called the dimension of V , denoted $\dim_F V$.

Proof: (Hint: use Cor. 1). _____

- **Corollary 3:** suppose V is a finite-dimensional F -VS. If $W \subseteq V$ is a subspace, show that $m := \dim_F W \leq \dim_F V =: n$. Also show that if $\dim_F W = \dim_F V$, then in fact $W = V$.

Proof: I’ll start. W has dimension m means there is a basis $\{w_1, \dots, w_m\}$ of W . And V having dimension n means there is a basis $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ of V . (Hint: use Replacement Theorem). _____

- **Corollary 4:** suppose V is a finite-dimensional F -VS, with $\dim_F V = n$. Let \mathcal{L} be an LI set. Prove that $|\mathcal{L}| \leq n$ (intuitively, “LI sets must be small”). Also prove that if $|\mathcal{L}| = n$, then \mathcal{L} is also spanning (and hence automatically a basis).

Proof: (Hint: for the first part, use the Replacement theorem on \mathcal{L} and any basis of V . For the second part, use Cor. 3, with $W = \text{span}_F \mathcal{L}$).

- **Corollary 5:** suppose V is a finite-dimensional F -VS, with $\dim_F V = n$. Let \mathcal{S} be a spanning set. Prove that $|\mathcal{S}| \geq n$ (intuitively, “spanning sets must be big”). Also prove that if $|\mathcal{S}| = n$, then \mathcal{S} is also LI (and hence automatically a basis).

Proof: (Hint: use the Culling Theorem.)

I’ll give you starting point for the 2nd part: suppose we are given some spanning set \mathcal{S} with $|\mathcal{S}| = n$.

Suppose f.s.o.c. that it’s not LI. So it’s LD. “We can use the Culling Theorem on the (finite) spanning set \mathcal{S} , which tells us we can cut it down to a subset $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ that is still spanning, but now guaranteed to be LI. i.e. \mathcal{S}' is a basis.”

Because \mathcal{S}' is LI, and \mathcal{S} we said was LD, and $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, it must be that they are not the same, or in other words, \mathcal{S}' is a STRICT subset $\subsetneq \mathcal{S}$. So $|\mathcal{S}'| < |\mathcal{S}| = n$. (Hint: finish by using Cor. 2)

- **Corollary 6:** suppose V is a finite-dimensional F -VS. Let \mathcal{L} be an LI set, and \mathcal{B} be a basis of V . Prove that applying the Replacement Theorem to infiltrate \mathcal{L} into \mathcal{B} , resulting in (a still spanning set) \mathcal{B}' (of the same size as \mathcal{B}), is so that \mathcal{B}' also remains LI (and is hence still a basis).

Proof: (Hint: use Cor. 5.)

1. Recall that $P(\mathbb{F}) := \{f(x) = a_k x^k + \cdots + a_1 x + a_0 \mid a_i \in \mathbb{F}, k = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ is the vector space of polynomials in \mathbb{F} . What is implicit base field for this VS (vector space)? What are the implicit addition, and scalar multiplication operations to make the set $P(\mathbb{F})$ a VS (over the base field you just named)?

2. What is the span of the set

$$S = \{1, 1 + x, 1 + x + x^2\}$$

in $P(\mathbb{F})$?

3. Find a subspace $U \subseteq P(\mathbb{F})$ such that

$$S = \{1, 1 + x, 1 + x + x^2\}$$

is a **basis** of U . (You must prove that S is a basis)

Let $U = \{\langle x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5 \rangle \in \mathbb{R}^5 \mid x_1 = 3x_2, \text{ and } x_3 = 7x_4\}$ be a subspace of \mathbb{R}^5 .

1. Find a basis \mathcal{B} of U .
2. Extend your basis from part (a) to a basis of \mathbb{R}^5 , by using the Replacement theorem/algorithm on the LI list \mathcal{B} and the spanning list $\{(1, 0, 0, 0, 0), \dots, (0, 0, 0, 0, 1)\}$ (the standard basis for \mathbb{R}^5)?

Consider the vector space \mathbb{R}^3 over \mathbb{R} . The following vectors generate \mathbb{R}^3 :

$$v_1 = (0, 2, -1), \quad v_2 = (3, 2, 1), \quad v_3 = (3, 6, -1), \quad v_4 = (2, 0, -3) \quad \text{and} \quad v_5 = (1, 2, 3).$$

1. Apply the Cutting Down theorem/algorithm to the vectors v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5 to construct a basis for \mathbb{R}^3 .

2. Apply the Cutting Down theorem/algorithm to the vectors v_3, v_5, v_2, v_4, v_1 to construct a basis for \mathbb{R}^3 .

3. Are your answers in (a) and (b) the same or different? Why?

1. Let V be a vector space over a field \mathbb{F} and W_1, W_2 subspaces of V .

(a) Show that $W_1 \cup W_2$ need not be a subspace of V .

(b) The **sum** of W_1 and W_2 is defined by

$$W_1 + W_2 := \{w_1 + w_2 \mid w_1 \in W_1 \text{ and } w_2 \in W_2\}$$

Prove that $W_1 + W_2$ is a subspace of V .

(c) Prove that the span of $W_1 \cup W_2$ is exactly $W_1 + W_2$. (Remember to prove equality of sets $A = B$, you must show both directions: $A \subseteq B$, i.e. letting $x \in A$ be arbitrary, show that also $x \in B$; and also the other way around: $B \subseteq A$, i.e. letting $y \in B$ be arbitrary, show that also $y \in A$.)

2. On the next page is a proof given for the statement: The set of vectors $\langle 1, 0, 0 \rangle, \langle 1, 1, 0 \rangle, \langle 1, 1, 1 \rangle \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is linearly independent.

Explain the mistake(s) in the proof.

Let $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose $a\langle 1, 0, 0 \rangle + b\langle 1, 1, 0 \rangle + c\langle 1, 1, 1 \rangle = 0$. If $a = b = c = 0$, then $a\langle 1, 0, 0 \rangle + b\langle 1, 1, 0 \rangle + c\langle 1, 1, 1 \rangle = \langle a + b + c, b + c, c \rangle = \langle 0, 0, 0 \rangle$. Therefore, the set of vectors $\langle 1, 0, 0 \rangle, \langle 1, 1, 0 \rangle, \langle 1, 1, 1 \rangle$ is linearly independent.

3. Let V be a vector space over a field \mathbb{F} and $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \in V$ linearly independent vectors. Do the following steps to show that $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}$ are linearly independent.
- (a) State what it means for $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}$ to be linearly independent.

 - (b) Express 0 as a linear combination of $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}$.

 - (c) Rewrite the linear combination of (b) in terms of $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}$.

 - (d) Use that $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}$ is linearly independent to obtain a system of linear equations.

 - (e) Solve the system of linear equations, and conclude that $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}$ are linearly independent.

Let V be a vector space and let W_1 and W_2 be finite-dimensional subspaces of V .

1. Show that $W_1 + W_2$ is finite-dimensional (**Hint:** prove this without finding an explicit basis for $W_1 + W_2$).

2. Suppose that $\{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$ is a basis of W_1 , and suppose that $\{w_1, \dots, w_n\}$ is a basis of W_2 . If $W_1 \cap W_2 = \{0\}$, find a basis for $W_1 + W_2$.

You must prove your set is a basis.

3. Prove or give a counterexample to the following statement:

Let V be a vector space and let W_1 and W_2 be finite-dimensional subspaces of V . Then $\dim(W_1 + W_2) = \dim(W_1) + \dim(W_2)$.