

PROBLEM SET #2 SOLUTIONS
PART A
October 4, 2002

Note. Following the convention in higher mathematics, I will denote vectors by x, y, \dots rather than by \vec{x}, \vec{y}, \dots

- (1) (a) To show that $W \subset V$ is a subspace we need only verify that it is closed under addition and scalar multiplication (this is a generalization of Definition 1.1.5 on p. 39 of Hubbard and Hubbard).

Closure under addition: Let $x, y \in W_1 \cap W_2$. Since x and y are in W_1 and W_1 is a subspace of V , $x + y \in W_1$. Similarly, since x and y are in W_2 and W_2 is a subspace of V , $x + y \in W_2$. Therefore $x + y \in W_1 \cap W_2$.

Closure under scalar multiplication: Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and let $x \in W_1 \cap W_2$. Since $x \in W_1$ and W_1 is a subspace, $\lambda x \in W_1$, and since $x \in W_2$ and W_2 is a subspace, $\lambda x \in W_2$, so we see that $\lambda x \in W_1 \cap W_2$ as well.

- (b) (\Rightarrow) Suppose that $W_1 \cup W_2$ is a subspace of V , and suppose that neither W_1 nor W_2 is contained in the other. Then there exists $x \in W_1, x \notin W_2$ and $y \in W_2, y \notin W_1$. Consider the vector $x + y$. Now, since $W_1 \cup W_2$ is a subspace, $x + y$, being the sum of two elements of $W_1 \cup W_2$, must be an element of $W_1 \cup W_2$. However, $x + y$ cannot be in W_1 : since W_1 is closed under addition and scalar multiplication then $(x + y) + (-1)x = y \in W_1$, a contradiction. Similarly $x + y$ cannot be in W_2 , for that would imply that $(x + y) + (-1)y = x \in W_2$, again a contradiction. Therefore either $W_1 \subset W_2$ or $W_2 \subset W_1$.

(\Leftarrow) Suppose that $W_1 \subset W_2$ (the proof is exactly the same for $W_2 \subset W_1$). Then $W_1 \cup W_2 = W_2$, and so is a subspace of V by our initial assumption.

- (2) As in the previous problem, we show that each of these subsets is closed under addition and scalar multiplication.

Remark. The image of T , $T(V)$, is often denoted by $\text{Im}(T)$, which I use here.

- (a) *Closure under addition:* Let $w_1, w_2 \in \text{Im}(T)$. Then there exist $v_1, v_2 \in V$ such that $T(v_1) = w_1$ and $T(v_2) = w_2$. Since V is a vector space $(v_1 + v_2) \in V$, and by linearity of T , $T(v_1 + v_2) = T(v_1) + T(v_2) = w_1 + w_2 \in \text{Im}(T)$.

Closure under scalar multiplication: Let $w = T(v) \in \text{Im}(T)$ and let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Then since $\lambda v \in V$ and T is linear we have $T(\lambda v) = \lambda T(v) = \lambda w \in \text{Im}(T)$, and so $\text{Im}(T)$ is a subspace of V .

- (b) *Closure under addition:* Let $x, y \in \text{Ker}(T)$, so that $T(x) = T(y) = 0$. Then by linearity of T , $T(x + y) = T(x) + T(y) = 0 + 0 = 0 \Rightarrow (x + y) \in \text{Ker}(T)$.

Closure under scalar multiplication: Let $x \in \text{Ker}(T)$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Then by linearity of T $T(\lambda x) = \lambda T(x) = \lambda \cdot 0 = 0 \Rightarrow \lambda x \in \text{Ker}(T)$, proving that $\text{Ker}(T)$ is a subspace of V .

- (3) (a) Define addition and scalar multiplication in the “natural” way: for $v \in V, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $S, T \in \text{Lin}(V, W)$, let

$$(S + T)(v) = S(v) + T(v) \quad \text{and} \quad (\lambda T)(v) = \lambda \cdot T(v).$$

We now verify the vector space axioms for $\text{Lin}(V, W)$. In what follows let $R, S, T \in \text{Lin}(V, W)$, $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{R}$, and $v \in V$.

- (i) (Existence of zero) Let $0 \in \text{Lin}(V, W)$ be the map sending all elements of V to 0. It is clear that 0 is linear, and for any v and T , $(0 + T)(v) = 0(v) + T(v) = 0 + T(v) = T(v)$, so that $0 + T = T$.
- (ii) (Existence of additive inverse) For all T let $(-T)$ be defined by $(-T)(v) = -(T(v))$, the additive inverse of $T(v)$ in W , for all $v \in V$. It is clear from the definition that $-T \in \text{Lin}(V, W)$. To see that $(-T)$ does in fact behave as an additive inverse consider that $(T + (-T))(v) = T(v) + (-T)(v) = T(v) + -(T(v)) = 0 \forall v \Rightarrow (T + (-T)) = 0$.
- (iii) (Commutativity under addition) $(S + T)(v) = S(v) + T(v) = T(v) + S(v) = (T + S)(v)$, by commutativity under addition in W .
- (iv) (Associativity under addition) Since addition is associative in W . we have

$$\begin{aligned} ((R + S) + T)(v) &= (R + S)(v) + T(v) \\ &= R(v) + S(v) + T(v) \\ &= R(v) + (S(v) + T(v)) \\ &= R(v) + (S + T)(v) \\ &= (R + (S + T))(v) \end{aligned}$$

so that $R + (S + T) = (R + S) + T$, as desired.

- (v) (Existence of multiplicative identity) In this case the multiplicative identity is simply the multiplicative identity 1 in W (i.e. the real number 1), for then $(1T)(v) = 1 \cdot T(v) = T(v) \forall T$.
- (vi) (Associativity under multiplication) By associativity of multiplication in W , we have $(\lambda(\mu T))(v) = \lambda \cdot (\mu T)(v) = \lambda \mu \cdot T(v) = (\lambda \mu) \cdot T(v) = ((\lambda \mu)T)(v)$.
- (vii) (Distributivity under scalar addition) By distributivity under scalar addition in W , we have $((\lambda + \mu)T)(v) = (\lambda + \mu)(T(v)) = \lambda \cdot T(v) + \mu \cdot T(v) = (\lambda T + \mu T)(v)$.
- (viii) (Distributivity under vector addition) By distributivity under vector addition in W , we have $(\lambda(S + T))(v) = \lambda \cdot (S + T)(v) = \lambda \cdot S(v) + \lambda \cdot T(v) = (\lambda S + \lambda T)(v)$.
- (b) As shown in class, the linear transformations between \mathbb{R}^n and \mathbb{R}^m can all be represented by $m \times n$ matrices. Thus $(\mathbb{R}^n)^* = \text{Lin}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R})$ is the set of all $1 \times n$ matrices with real entries. In other words, if \mathbb{R}^n is thought of as the set of all n dimensional column vectors with real entries, $(\mathbb{R}^n)^*$ is the set of all n dimensional row vectors with real entries (hence—in part—the term *dual* to describe it).

- (4) Let $v_1, v_2 \in V$ and $w_1, w_2 \in W$, and let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Denote elements of $V \times W$ as ordered pairs (v, w) , where the first entry always denotes an element of V and the second always denotes an element of W . Then we define addition and scalar multiplication by letting

$$(v_1, w_1) + (v_2, w_2) = (v_1 + v_2, w_1 + w_2) \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda(v, w) = (\lambda v, \lambda w).$$

Note that these operations are well-defined.

We now verify that these operations make $V \times W$ into a vector space. In what follows let $v, v_1, v_2, v_3 \in V, w, w_1, w_2, w_3 \in W$, and $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{R}$. We will also assume—and make liberal use of—the vector space properties of V and W .

- (i) (Existence of zero) Consider the element $(0, 0)$. Then $(0, 0) + (v, w) = (0 + v, 0 + w) = (v, w)$, so that $(0, 0)$ indeed functions as an additive identity.
- (ii) (Existence of additive inverse) Let $-(v, w) = (-v, -w)$. Then $(v, w) + (-(v, w)) = (v + (-v), w + (-w)) = (0, 0)$, so $(-v, -w)$ is the required additive inverse of (v, w) .
- (iii) (Commutativity under addition) $(v_1, w_1) + (v_2, w_2) = (v_1 + v_2, w_1 + w_2) = (v_2 + v_1, w_2 + w_1) = (v_2, w_2) + (v_1, w_1)$.
- (iv) (Associativity under addition) Here we have

$$\begin{aligned} ((v_1, w_1) + (v_2, w_2)) + (v_3, w_3) &= (v_1 + v_2, w_1 + w_2) + (v_3, w_3) \\ &= ((v_1 + v_2) + v_3, (w_1 + w_2) + w_3) \\ &= (v_1 + (v_2 + v_3), w_1 + (w_2 + w_3)) \\ &= (v_1, w_1) + (v_2 + v_3, w_2 + w_3) \\ &= (v_1, w_1) + ((v_2, w_2) + (v_3, w_3)). \end{aligned}$$

- (v) (Existence of multiplicative identity) The multiplicative identity is again the real number 1, which we verify by observing that $1(v, w) = (1v, 1w) = (v, w)$.
- (vi) (Associativity under multiplication) $\lambda(\mu(v, w)) = \lambda(\mu v, \mu w) = (\lambda\mu v, \lambda\mu w) = ((\lambda\mu)v, (\lambda\mu)w) = (\lambda\mu)(v, w)$.
- (vii) (Distributivity under scalar addition) $(\lambda + \mu)(v, w) = ((\lambda + \mu)v, (\lambda + \mu)w) = (\lambda v + \mu v, \lambda w + \mu w) = (\lambda v, \lambda w) + (\mu v, \mu w) = \lambda(v, w) + \mu(v, w)$.
- (viii) (Distributivity under vector addition) $\lambda((v_1, w_1) + (v_2, w_2)) = \lambda(v_1 + v_2, w_1 + w_2) = (\lambda(v_1 + v_2), \lambda(w_1 + w_2)) = (\lambda v_1 + \lambda v_2, \lambda w_1 + \lambda w_2) = (\lambda v_1, \lambda w_1) + (\lambda v_2, \lambda w_2) = \lambda(v_1, w_1) + \lambda(v_2, w_2)$.
- (5) (a) We need to show that \sim is reflexive, transitive, and associative. In what follows let $u, v, w \in V$.
- Reflexivity:* Since W is a subspace, $0 \in W$. Therefore $v - v = 0 \in W$, i.e. $v \sim v$.
- Transitivity:* If $v \sim w$, then $v - w = 0 \Rightarrow w - v = 0$, so that $w \sim v$.
- Associativity:* If $u \sim v$ and $v \sim w$, then $u - v = v - w = 0 \Rightarrow (u - v) + (v - w) = u - w = 0$, and so $u \sim w$.
- (b) We first show that addition and multiplication are well-defined. Let $[v_1]$ and $[v_2]$ be equivalence classes represented by v_1 and v_2 , respectively. Let v'_1, v'_2 be two other elements in $[v_1]$ and $[v_2]$, and let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. We need to show that $(v_1 + v_2) \sim (v'_1 + v'_2)$, so that $[v_1] + [v_2] = [v_1 + v_2]$, and that $\lambda v_1 \sim \lambda v'_1$, so that $\lambda[v_1] = [\lambda v_1]$. Since $v'_1 - v_1 \in W$

and $v'_2 - v_2 \in W$, we see that $(v'_1 + v'_2) - (v_1 + v_2) = (v'_1 - v_1) + (v'_2 - v_2) \in W$, so $(v'_1 + v'_2) \sim (v_1 + v_2)$, i.e. $(v'_1 + v'_2) \in [v_1 + v_2]$.

To check multiplication, note that if $v_1 \sim v'_1$ then $\lambda v_1 - \lambda v'_1 = \lambda(v_1 - v'_1) \in W$, so that $\lambda v_1 \sim \lambda v'_1$ and $\lambda v'_1 \in [\lambda v_1]$. Thus addition and multiplication on equivalence classes is well-defined by considering addition and multiplication on representative elements of each equivalence class. With that we see that the axioms of a vector space are trivially satisfied by considering the vector space structure on the representative elements v_i of the elements of V/W .

- (6) (a) This is an exercise in notation. Let A be an $m \times n$ matrix and let B be an $n \times p$ matrix. Let the (i, j) th element $(A)_{ij} = a_{ij}$ and $(B)_{ij} = b_{ij}$; then $(A^t)_{ij} = a_{ji}$ and $(B^t)_{ij} = b_{ji}$, and we see that

$$\begin{aligned} ((A \cdot B)_{ij})^t &= \left(\sum_{k=1}^n a_{ik} b_{kj} \right)^t \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n a_{jk} b_{ki} \\ &= (B^t \cdot A^t)_{ij}. \end{aligned}$$

Since this equality holds for every i and j running through the elements of A and B , we see that $(A \cdot B)^t = B^t \cdot A^t$.

- (b) Suppose that A is invertible, i.e. that there exists a matrix A^{-1} with the property that $A \cdot A^{-1} = A^{-1} \cdot A = I$.

Claim. $(A^t)^{-1} = (A^{-1})^t$.

Proof. First note that because A^{-1} exists for all invertible A , the matrix $(A^{-1})^t$ is always well-defined. We will simply check that $(A^{-1})^t$ is indeed the two-sided multiplicative inverse for A^t . Using the multiplicative property proved in the previous part of this exercise and the fact that $I^t = I$, we see that

$$A^t \cdot (A^t)^{-1} = A^t \cdot (A^{-1})^t = (A^{-1} \cdot A)^t = I^t = I$$

and

$$(A^t)^{-1} \cdot A^t = (A^{-1})^t \cdot A^t = (A \cdot A^{-1})^t = I^t = I$$

as desired. □