

## Chapter 8: Linearly Independence and Spanning sets.

(48)

Last time, we saw that a set of vectors  $\{\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_m\}$  is "linearly independent" (LI) if the only solution to the dependence equation

$$a_1 \vec{v}_1 + a_2 \vec{v}_2 + \dots + a_m \vec{v}_m = \vec{0}$$

is the trivial solution ( $a_1 = 0, a_2 = 0, \dots, a_m = 0$ ), and the set of vectors is "linearly dependent" (LD) if there is a non-trivial solution to

$$a_1 \vec{v}_1 + a_2 \vec{v}_2 + \dots + a_m \vec{v}_m = \vec{0}$$

(i.e. a solution in which not coefficients are zeros).

### Facts about LI & LD:

- 1) A set  $\{\vec{v}\}$  consisting of just one vector is LI if and only if  $\vec{v} \neq \vec{0}$ .
- 2) If a set  $S$  is LD, then any set containing  $S$  is also LD.
- 3) If a set  $S$  is LI, then any subset of  $S$  is also LI.
- 4)  $\{\vec{0}\}$  is LD.
- 5) Any set containing the zero vector  $\vec{0}$  is LD.
- 6) A set with two vectors is LD if and only if one of the vectors is a multiple of the other.
- 7) A set with three or more vectors could be LD even if no two vectors are multiples of one another.

## Theorem (8.1): Relation between LI & Spanning

A set  $\{\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_m\}$  is LD if and only if there is at least one vector  $\vec{v}_k$  which is in the span of the rest.

(Warning: this does not mean that every vector is a linear combination of the others.)

proof: Suppose  $\{\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_m\}$  is LD, so there is some non-trivial solution to the dependence equation

$$a_1 \vec{v}_1 + a_2 \vec{v}_2 + \dots + a_m \vec{v}_m = \vec{0}$$

for not all  $a_i = 0$ . Let's say  $a_1 \neq 0$ , then

$$\vec{v}_1 = \frac{-a_2}{a_1} \vec{v}_2 + \dots + \frac{-a_m}{a_1} \vec{v}_m,$$

$$\Rightarrow \vec{v}_1 \in \text{Span}\{\vec{v}_2, \dots, \vec{v}_m\}.$$

Suppose  $\vec{v}_n \in \text{Span}\{\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_{n-1}\}$ , or  $\vec{v}_n = b_1 \vec{v}_1 + \dots + b_{n-1} \vec{v}_{n-1}$ . Then,

$$b_1 \vec{v}_1 + b_2 \vec{v}_2 + \dots + b_{n-1} \vec{v}_{n-1} + (-1) \vec{v}_n = \vec{0}$$

and the coefficient of  $\vec{v}_n$  is  $-1 \neq 0 \Rightarrow \{\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_m\}$  is LD. □

\* Remark: Any linearly dependent spanning set can be reduced.

## \* Theorem (8.2): Reducing spanning sets

Suppose  $W = \text{Span}\{\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_m\}$  is a subspace of  $V$ . If  $\vec{v}_1 \in \text{Span}\{\vec{v}_2, \dots, \vec{v}_m\}$

then  $W = \text{Span}\{\vec{v}_2, \dots, \vec{v}_m\}$ .

In other words, we can decrease the size of any linearly dependent spanning set, until we reach a linearly independent subset.

\* Theorem (8.3): Enlarging linearly independent sets.

suppose  $\{\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_m\}$  is a LI subset of a subspace  $W$ . For any  $\vec{v} \in W$ , we have

$$\{\vec{v}, \vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_m\} \text{ is LI} \iff \vec{v} \notin \text{Span}\{\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_m\}$$

proof: suppose  $\{\vec{v}, \vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_m\}$  is LI, then from the previous theorem, no element of it can be a linear combination of the rest, or  $\vec{v}$  can't be a linear combination of  $\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_m$ . Therefore,

$$\vec{v} \notin \text{Span}\{\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_m\}.$$

conversely, suppose  $\vec{v} \notin \text{Span}\{\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_m\}$ , then we want to decide if the dependence equation

$$a_0 \vec{v} + a_1 \vec{v}_1 + \dots + a_m \vec{v}_m = \vec{0},$$

could have any non-trivial solution. If  $a_0 \neq 0$ , then we could solve it for  $\vec{v}$  as a linear combinations of others, but our hypothesis is that this is not the case; therefore,  $a_0 = 0$ . Hence,

$$a_1 \vec{v}_1 + \dots + a_m \vec{v}_m = \vec{0},$$

which is the dependence equation for  $\{\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_m\}$ , which is LI.

Therefore,  $\{\vec{v}, \vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_m\}$  is LI.

□

In other words, we can increase the size of any linearly independent set, so long as it does not span our vector space. (51)

Examples:

(1)  $\{x^2, 1+2x\} \subset \mathbb{P}_3$  is LI, then so is the set  $\{x^3, 1+2x, x^3\}$ ,  
since  $x^3 \notin \text{span}\{x^2, 1+2x\}$ .

(2)  $\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$  is LI, since  $\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$   
is also LI;

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \notin \text{span} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\},$$

$$\text{or } \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \neq a \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + b \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$