

**Math 24**  
**Spring 2012**  
**Sample Homework Solutions**  
**Week 1**

Section 1.2

(9) Prove Corollaries 1 and 2 to Theorem 1.1, and Theorem 1.2(c).

Corollary 1: The vector  $0$  described in (VS 3) is unique.

Proof: Suppose  $0'$  is another additive identity. We must show  $0 = 0'$ . Because  $0'$  is an additive identity, we have  $0 + 0' = 0$ , and by the commutativity of addition we have  $0' + 0 = 0$ . Because  $0$  is an additive identity we have  $0 + 0 = 0$ . By Theorem 1.1 we can “cancel out” the  $+0$ , and so  $0' = 0$ .

Corollary 2: The vector  $y$  described in (VS 4) is unique.

Proof: Let  $y$  be as in (VS 4), so  $x + y = 0$ , and let  $z$  be another such vector, so  $x + z = 0$ . We must show  $y = z$ .

By the commutativity of addition we have  $y + x = 0 = z + x$ , so by Theorem 1.1 we can “cancel out” the  $+x$ , and so  $y = z$ .

Theorem 1.2(c): In any vector space  $V$  over a field  $F$ , for each  $a \in F$ , we have  $a0 = 0$ .

Proof: Because  $0$  is an additive identity,  $0 + 0 = 0$ , and so  $a(0 + 0) = a0$ . Because multiplication by scalars distributes over addition of vectors, we have  $a0 + a0 = a0$ .

Because  $0$  is an additive identity and addition is commutative,  $a0 = a0 + 0 = 0 + a0$ , and putting this together with  $a0 + a0 = a0$  we have  $a0 + a0 = 0 + a0$ .

Now, by Theorem 1.1,  $a0 = 0$ .

(18) Let  $V = \{(a_1, a_2) \mid a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{R}\}$ . For  $(a_1, a_2), (b_1, b_2) \in V$  and  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , define

$$(a_1, a_1) + (b_1, b_2) = (a_1 + 2b_1, a_2 + 3b_2) \quad \text{and} \quad c(a_2, a_2) = (ca_1, ca_2).$$

Is  $V$  a vector space over  $\mathbb{R}$  with these operations? Justify your answer.

No.  $(1, 0) + (0, 0) = (1, 0)$  and  $(0, 0) + (1, 0) = (2, 0)$ , which shows that addition (defined in this way) is not commutative, so (VS 1) fails.

### Section 1.3

(10) Prove that  $W_1 = \{(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in F^n \mid a_1 + \dots + a_n = 0\}$  is a subspace of  $F^n$ , but  $W_2 = \{(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in F^n \mid a_1 + \dots + a_n = 1\}$  is not.

Since the zero vector  $(0, \dots, 0)$  is in  $W_1$  but not in  $W_2$ , we know  $W_2$  cannot be a subspace. To show  $W_1$  is, take any two vectors  $x$  and  $y$  in  $W_1$  and a scalar  $c$  in  $F$ , and show that  $cu$  and  $u + v$  are in  $W_1$ .

Let  $u = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$  and  $v = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$  be in  $W_1$ , so  $a_1 + \dots + a_n = 0$  and  $b_1 + \dots + b_n = 0$ . Then we have  $cu = (ca_1, \dots, ca_n)$  and  $u + v = (a_1 + b_1, \dots, a_n + b_n)$ .

$$ca_1 + \dots + ca_n = c(a_1 + \dots + a_n) = c(0) = 0;$$

$$(a_1 + b_1) + \dots + (a_n + b_n) = (a_1 + \dots + a_n) + (b_1 + \dots + b_n) = 0 + 0 = 0;$$

this shows that  $cu$  and  $u + v$  are in  $W_1$ .

(15) Is the set of all differentiable real-valued functions defined on  $\mathbb{R}$  a subspace of  $C(\mathbb{R})$ ? Justify your answer.

Yes. We know from calculus that a differentiable function must be continuous, so this set is a subset of  $C(\mathbb{R})$ . We also know from calculus that the sum of differentiable functions is differentiable, and a constant multiple of a differentiable function is differentiable. Therefore this set is closed under addition and multiplication by scalars; since it also contains the zero function, it is a subspace.

(19) Let  $W_1$  and  $W_2$  be subspaces of a vector space  $V$ . Prove that  $W_1 \cup W_2$  is a subspace of  $V$  if and only if  $W_1 \subseteq W_2$  or  $W_2 \subseteq W_1$ .

If  $W_1 \subseteq W_2$ , then  $W_1 \cup W_2 = W_2$ , so  $W_1 \cup W_2$  is a subspace of  $V$ . In the same way, if  $W_2 \subseteq W_1$  then  $W_1 \cup W_2$  is a subspace of  $V$ .

Conversely, suppose  $W_1 \cup W_2$  is a subspace of  $V$ . To show that either  $W_1 \subseteq W_2$  or  $W_2 \subseteq W_1$ , suppose not. Then there is  $w_1 \in W_1, w_1 \notin W_2$  and there is  $w_2 \in W_2, w_2 \notin W_1$ . As  $W_1 \cup W_2$  is a subspace,  $w_1 + w_2 \in W_1 \cup W_2$ , so  $w_1 + w_2$  is either in  $W_1$  or in  $W_2$ .

Without loss of generality,  $w_1 + w_2 \in W_1$ . Then, because  $W_1$  is a subspace,  $w_2 = (w_1 + w_2) - w_1 \in W_1$ . This is a contradiction, since  $w_2 \notin W_1$ . Therefore we must have either  $W_1 \subseteq W_2$  or  $W_2 \subseteq W_1$ .