

**21-241 MATRICES AND LINEAR TRANSFORMATIONS**  
**SUMMER 1 2012**  
**COURSE NOTES**  
**MAY 29**

PAUL MCKENNEY

**Definition.** A subset  $S$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is called a *subspace* (of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ) if:

- (1)  $0 \in S$ .
- (2) For all  $x \in S$ , and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\lambda x$  is also in  $S$ .
- (3) For all  $x, y \in S$ ,  $x + y$  is also in  $S$ .

Note that the second condition implies the first, *so long as  $S$  is nonempty*. Thus the first condition is just there to ensure that a subspace is nonempty.

**Fact 1.** If  $S$  is a subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and  $x_1, \dots, x_k \in S$  and  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k \in \mathbb{R}$ , then

$$\lambda_1 x_1 + \dots + \lambda_k x_k \in S$$

*Example.* Let  $A$  be an  $m \times n$  matrix. Then

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid Ax = 0\}$$

is a subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . This is called the *null space* of  $A$  and is denoted by  $\text{null}(A)$ . On the other hand,

$$\{Ax \mid x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$$

is a subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , and is called the *range space* of  $A$ , written  $\text{ran}(A)$ .

**Definition.** Let  $S$  be a subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . A subset  $X \subseteq S$  of  $S$  is said to *span*  $S$  if for every  $s \in S$ , there are some  $x_1, \dots, x_k \in X$  and  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$s = \lambda_1 x_1 + \dots + \lambda_k x_k$$

If  $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ , then the *span* of  $X$  is the set

$$\text{span}(X) = \{\lambda_1 x_1 + \dots + \lambda_k x_k \mid k \in \mathbb{N} \wedge x_1, \dots, x_k \in X \wedge \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

This last definition provides us with a wealth of examples of subspaces of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

**Fact 2.** If  $X$  is any subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  then  $\text{span}(X)$  is a subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

It's easy to see that if  $X \subseteq Y \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ , then  $\text{span}(X) \subseteq \text{span}(Y)$ . However, the converse doesn't hold. In fact, we have the following example where  $X \not\subseteq Y$  and  $Y \not\subseteq X$ , but  $\text{span}(X) = \text{span}(Y)$ .

*Example.* Consider the following two finite subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^3$ .

$$X = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 3 \\ -2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 2 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} \right\} \quad Y = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 3 \\ -2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 4 \\ -3 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$

Then we have  $\text{span}(X) = \text{span}(Y)$ .

The proof of the above is made much easier using the following, which we call the “linear combination lemma.”

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . If each of  $y_1, \dots, y_\ell$  is a linear combination of  $x_1, \dots, x_k$  then so is any linear combination of  $y_1, \dots, y_\ell$ .*

*Proof.* The hardest part of this proof is figuring out what the statement of the lemma is, in formal terms. We have our vectors  $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ; suppose  $y_1, \dots, y_\ell$  are vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , each of which is a linear combination of  $x_1, \dots, x_k$ ;

$$y_i = \lambda_{i1}x_1 + \dots + \lambda_{ik}x_k \quad 1 \leq i \leq \ell$$

Now suppose  $z = \mu_1y_1 + \dots + \mu_\ell y_\ell$  is a linear combination of  $y_1, \dots, y_\ell$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} z &= \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \mu_i y_i \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \mu_i \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_{ij} x_j \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \mu_i \lambda_{ij} x_j \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^k \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \mu_i \lambda_{ij} \right) x_j \end{aligned}$$

So  $z$  is also a linear combination of  $x_1, \dots, x_k$ , namely the one whose coefficient for  $x_j$  is

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \mu_i \lambda_{ij}$$

□

**Lemma 2.** *Suppose  $S$  is a subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and  $X \subseteq S$ . Then  $\text{span}(X) \subseteq S$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $y \in \text{span}(X)$ ; then there are  $x_1, \dots, x_k \in X$  and  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $y = \lambda_1x_1 + \dots + \lambda_kx_k$ . But  $x_1, \dots, x_k \in S$ , and so

$$y = \lambda_1x_1 + \dots + \lambda_kx_k \in S$$

□

**Definition.** If  $A$  is an  $m \times n$  matrix with columns  $c_1, \dots, c_n \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , and rows  $r_1, \dots, r_m \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , then we write

$$\text{col}(A) = \text{span}\{c_1, \dots, c_n\} \quad \text{row}(A) = \text{span}\{r_1, \dots, r_m\}$$

We call  $\text{col}(A)$  and  $\text{row}(A)$  the *column space* and *row space* of  $A$ , respectively.

**Fact 3.** If  $A$  is any matrix, then  $\text{ran}(A) = \text{col}(A)$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $A$  is  $m \times n$  and  $c_1, \dots, c_n \in \mathbb{R}^m$  are the column vectors of  $A$ . We've seen before that if  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , then

$$Ax = x_1c_1 + \dots + x_nc_n$$

The right-hand side of the above equation is a member of  $\text{col}(A)$ , since it's a linear combination of the columns of  $A$ . Since  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  was arbitrary, this shows  $\text{ran}(A) \subseteq \text{col}(A)$ . Now if  $y \in \text{col}(A)$ , then  $y$  is a linear combination of the columns of  $A$ , and hence for some  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$y = \lambda_1c_1 + \dots + \lambda_nc_n$$

But then by the same fact,

$$y = \lambda_1c_1 + \dots + \lambda_nc_n = A \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 \\ \vdots \\ \lambda_n \end{pmatrix}$$

and the right-hand side of this equation is in  $\text{ran}(A)$ . This shows  $\text{col}(A) \subseteq \text{ran}(A)$ .  $\square$

You might guess now, since  $\text{row}(A)$  and  $\text{null}(A)$  are both subspaces of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , that they are equal; but you'd be wrong! They *are* related, but we won't see how for a while yet. For now, let's see how we can phrase a problem related to spanning sets in terms of Gaussian elimination.

*Example.* Let

$$X = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ -2 \\ 3 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 4 \\ 6 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 3 \\ -5 \\ 7 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$

Is the vector  $b = \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 3 \\ 5 \\ 7 \end{pmatrix}$  in the span of  $X$ ?

To solve this, let

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 & 3 \\ 1 & 4 & -5 \\ -2 & 6 & 7 \\ 3 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Then  $b$  is in the span of  $X$  if and only if there is some  $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$  such that  $Ax = b$ .

*Example.* Let  $X$  be the following set.

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 2 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 2 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$

Prove that  $\text{span}(X) = \mathbb{R}^3$ .

To prove this it suffices to prove that the following matrix is right-invertible;

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

for which it suffices to prove that  $A$  is fully invertible;

$$\begin{array}{l} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \qquad \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ \rho_2 \rightarrow \rho_2 - \rho_1 \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 2 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \qquad \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ \rho_3 \rightarrow \rho_3 + \rho_1 \\ \rho_2 \rightarrow \rho_2 - 2\rho_3 \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 4 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \qquad \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -3 & 1 & -2 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ \rho_1 \leftrightarrow \rho_2 \quad \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 4 \end{pmatrix} \qquad \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -3 & 1 & -2 \end{pmatrix} \\ \rho_1 \leftrightarrow \rho_3 \\ \rho_3 \rightarrow \rho_3/4 \quad \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \qquad \begin{pmatrix} 1/4 & 1/4 & 1/2 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -3/4 & 1/4 & -1/2 \end{pmatrix} \\ \rho_1 \rightarrow \rho_1 + \rho_3 \end{array}$$

(I computed  $A^{-1}$  above, but this is not necessary to prove that  $A$  is invertible; it just suffices to show, since  $A$  is square, that  $A$  reduces to  $I$ .)