

7 - Bases

Exercise 3 (page 12)

Yes, it is true. Suppose $x + y$, $y + z$ and $x + z$ were not linearly independent. For instance, suppose $\exists \alpha, \beta$ s.t. $\alpha(x + y) + \beta(y + z) = x + z$. Then we'd have

$$\alpha(x + y) + \beta(y + z) = x + z$$

$$(1 - \alpha)x + (1 - \beta)z = y(\alpha + \beta)$$

If any two of $1 - \alpha$, $1 - \beta$ and $\alpha + \beta$ are zero, then the third one is not zero:

$$1 - \alpha = 0 \text{ and } 1 - \beta = 0 \Rightarrow \alpha + \beta = 2$$

$$1 - \alpha = 0 \text{ and } \alpha + \beta = 0 \Rightarrow 1 - \beta = 2$$

$$1 - \beta = 0 \text{ and } \alpha + \beta = 0 \Rightarrow 1 - \alpha = 2$$

Therefore $\{x, y, z\}$ are linearly dependent. ■

12 - Dimension of a subspace

Exercise 6 (page 19)

By theorem 2, we can find a basis of \mathfrak{V} s.t. $\{x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_{N-m}\}$, where $N = \dim(\mathfrak{V})$, $\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ is a basis for \mathfrak{m} and $m \neq 0, N$. It is clear that $\mathfrak{n} = \text{span}y_i$ is a complement to \mathfrak{m} . Now let $y = a_1x_1 + \dots + a_mx_m + b_1y_1 + \dots + b_{N-m}y_{N-m}$ where not all a_i and not all b_i are zero. This means that $y \notin \mathfrak{m}$ and $y \notin \mathfrak{n}$. Suppose, without loss of generality, that $b_1 \neq 0$. Then $\{x_1, \dots, x_m, y, y_2, \dots, y_{N-m}\}$ also spans \mathfrak{V} , and so $\{y, y_2, \dots, y_{N-m}\}$ is a different complement to \mathfrak{m} . Thus, the answer to (a) is “no”. As for (b), the only thing to note is that if $\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ is a basis for \mathfrak{m} and $\{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ is a basis for \mathfrak{n} , and if \mathfrak{m} and \mathfrak{n} are complements, then clearly $\{x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ spans \mathfrak{V} , and furthermore this set is linearly independent since the $\{x_i\}$ and $\{y_i\}$ are, and since $\mathfrak{m} \cap \mathfrak{n} = \mathfrak{o}$. Thus $\dim \mathfrak{V} = m + n$. ■

17 - Annihilators

Exercise 7 (page 26)

Since V and V' are isomorphic (they are both n -dimensional), their counts of m -dimensional subspaces are equal. The mapping $\mathfrak{m} \rightarrow \mathfrak{m}^0$ together with theorems 1 and 2 then fashions a bijection of the m -dimensional subspaces of \mathfrak{V} with the $n - m$ -dimensional subspaces of \mathfrak{V}' . **Injectivity:** suppose $\mathfrak{m}_1^0 = \mathfrak{m}_2^0$. Then by theorem 2, we get $\mathfrak{m}_1 = \mathfrak{m}_2$. **Surjectivity:** let \mathfrak{m}' be a subspace of \mathfrak{V}' . Then $((\mathfrak{m}')^0)^0 = \mathfrak{m}'$, again by theorem 2.

Exercise 8 (page 27)

(c) We need to show $(\mathfrak{m} + \mathfrak{n})^\circ = \mathfrak{m}^\circ \cap \mathfrak{n}^\circ$ and $(\mathfrak{m} \cap \mathfrak{n})^\circ = \mathfrak{m}^\circ + \mathfrak{n}^\circ$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{m} \cap \mathfrak{n} &\subset \mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{n} \\ (\mathfrak{m} \cap \mathfrak{n})^\circ &\supset \mathfrak{m}^\circ, \mathfrak{n}^\circ\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$(\mathfrak{m} \cap \mathfrak{n})^\circ \supset \mathfrak{m}^\circ + \mathfrak{n}^\circ \tag{1}$$

But then it follows (by applying \cdot° to all sets) that

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathfrak{m}^\circ \cap \mathfrak{n}^\circ)^\circ &\supset (\mathfrak{m}^\circ)^\circ + (\mathfrak{n}^\circ)^\circ \\ \mathfrak{m}^\circ \cap \mathfrak{n}^\circ &\supset \mathfrak{m} + \mathfrak{n}\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

From (1) also follows that

$$\dim(\mathfrak{m} \cap \mathfrak{n})^\circ \geq \dim(\mathfrak{m}^\circ + \mathfrak{n}^\circ)$$

Letting $N = \dim(\mathfrak{V})$, $m = \dim \mathfrak{m}$, $n = \dim(\mathfrak{n})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}N - \dim(\mathfrak{m} \cap \mathfrak{n}) &\geq \dim(\mathfrak{m}^\circ) + \dim(\mathfrak{n}^\circ) - \dim(\mathfrak{m}^\circ \cap \mathfrak{n}^\circ) \\ N - (m + n - \dim(\mathfrak{m} + \mathfrak{n})) &\geq N - m + N - n - \dim(\mathfrak{m}^\circ \cap \mathfrak{n}^\circ) \\ \dim(\mathfrak{m} + \mathfrak{n}) &\geq N - \dim(\mathfrak{m}^\circ \cap \mathfrak{n}^\circ) \\ \dim(\mathfrak{m}^\circ \cap \mathfrak{n}^\circ) &\geq N - \dim(\mathfrak{m} + \mathfrak{n})\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Now, (2) and (3) together imply that

$$\mathfrak{m}^\circ \cap \mathfrak{n}^\circ = (\mathfrak{m} + \mathfrak{n})^\circ$$

and in a similar way as (2) follows from (1), we may turn this formula into $(\mathfrak{m} \cap \mathfrak{n})^\circ = \mathfrak{m}^\circ + \mathfrak{n}^\circ$.