

Lecture 6: Basis and Dimension

Week 2

UCSB 2013

In our last talk, we introduced the concepts of **span** and **linear independence**. We continue introducing new vector space concepts with today's pair of definitions: the concepts of **basis** and **dimension**.

1 Basis

We closed our talk Monday by proving the following theorem:

Theorem 1. *Any finite set of vectors S has a linearly independent subset T , such that $\text{span}(S) = \text{span}(T)$.*

The motivation for this theorem was the desire to take a set S and “remove” all of the elements that aren't necessary when we construct $\text{span}(S)$. I.e. if a set S was linearly dependent, we showed that this meant that one of its vectors \vec{v} can be written as a linear combination of other elements of S . Therefore, in a sense, this vector \vec{v} is “superfluous” with respect to the span of S : we could remove it without changing anything!

This idea — of a set S that doesn't have any redundancy in it, like the ones created by our theorem 1 — is a valuable one in linear algebra. Accordingly, we have a term for these kinds of sets:

Definition. Take a vector space V . A **basis** B for V is a set of vectors B such that B is linearly independent, and $\text{span}(B) = V$.

Bases are really useful things. You're already aware of a few bases:

- The set of vectors $e_1 = (1, 0, 0 \dots 0), e_2 = (0, 1, 0 \dots 0), \dots, e_n = (0, 0 \dots 0, 1)$ is a basis for \mathbb{R}^n .
- The set of polynomials $1, x, x^2, x^3, \dots$ is a basis for $\mathbb{R}[x]$.

As a quick example, we study another interesting basis:

Question. Consider the set of vectors

$$S = \{(1, 1, 1, 1), (1, 1, -1, -1), (1, -1, 1, -1), (1, -1, -1, 1)\}.$$

Show that this is a basis for \mathbb{R}^4 .

Proof. Take any $(w, x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^4$. We want to show that there are always a, b, c, d such that

$$a(1, 1, 1, 1) + b(1, 1, -1, -1) + c(1, -1, 1, -1) + d(1, -1, -1, 1) = (w, x, y, z),$$

and furthermore that if $(w, x, y, z) = (0, 0, 0, 0)$ that this forces a, b, c, d to all be 0. This proves that the span of S is all of \mathbb{R}^4 and that S is linearly independent, respectively.

We turn the equation above into four equalities, one for each coordinate in \mathbb{R}^4 :

$$a + b + c + d = w$$

$$a + b - c - d = x$$

$$a - b + c - d = y$$

$$a - b - c + d = z$$

Summing all four equations gives us

$$4a = w + x + y + z.$$

Adding the first two equations and subtracting the second two equations gives us

$$4b = w + x - y - z.$$

Adding the first and third, and subtracting the second and fourth gives us

$$4c = w + y - x - z.$$

Finally, adding the first and fourth and subtracting the second and third yields

$$4d = w + z - x - y.$$

So: if $(w, x, y, z) = (0, 0, 0, 0)$, this means that $a = b = c = d = 0$. Therefore, our set is linearly independent.

Furthermore, for any (w, x, y, z) , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{w + x + y + z}{4}(1, 1, 1, 1) + \frac{w + x - y - z}{4}(1, 1, -1, -1) \\ & + \frac{w + y - x - z}{4}(1, -1, 1, -1) + \frac{w + z - x - y}{4}(1, -1, -1, 1) = (w, x, y, z). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can combine these four elements to get any vector in \mathbb{R}^4 ; i.e. our set spans \mathbb{R}^4 . \square

This example is interesting because its entries satisfy the following two properties:

- Every vector is made up out of entries from ± 1 .
- The dot product of any two vectors is 0.

Finding a basis of vectors that can do this is actually an open question. We know that they exist for any \mathbb{R}^n where n is a multiple of 4 up to 664, but no one's found such a basis for \mathbb{R}^{668} . Find one for extra credit?

Another natural idea to wonder about is the following: given a vector space V , what is the smallest number of elements we need to make a basis? Can we have two bases with different lengths?

This is answered in the following theorem:

Theorem. Suppose that V is a vector space with two bases $B_1 = \{\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_n\}$, $B_2 = \{\vec{w}_1, \dots, \vec{w}_m\}$ both containing finitely many elements. Then these sets have the same size: i.e. $|B_1| = |B_2|$.

Proof. Take any two sets $B_1 = \{\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_n\}$, $B_2 = \{\vec{w}_1, \dots, \vec{w}_m\}$ such that

- B_1, B_2 span V .
- B_1, B_2 are linearly independent.

We will show that these two sets must be the same size.

To do this, pick any vector $\vec{v}_1 \in B_1$. Use the fact that B_2 spans V to write \vec{v}_1 as a linear combination of elements in B_2 . I.e. find constants a_i such that

$$\vec{v}_1 = a_1 \vec{w}_1 + \dots + a_n \vec{w}_n$$

Because \vec{v}_1 is nonzero, there is some a_j such that $a_j \neq 0$. Consequently, we can take this equality and solve for \vec{w}_j :

$$\vec{w}_j = \frac{-1}{a_j} (a_1 \vec{w}_1 + \dots + a_{j-1} \vec{w}_{j-1} + a_{j+1} \vec{w}_{j+1} + \dots + a_n \vec{w}_n + \vec{v}_1).$$

Therefore, we have that \vec{w}_j is in the span of the set $B'_2 = \{\vec{w}_1, \dots, \vec{w}_{j-1}, \vec{w}_{j+1}, \dots, \vec{w}_n, \vec{v}_1\}$. We also have all of the other \vec{w}_i 's in this set: therefore, we have all of B_2 in this span! In other words, the span of this B'_2 is all of V , just like the span of B_2 ! Essentially, we've shown that we can "replace" one of the \vec{w}_j vectors with one of the elements from B_1 .

Moreover, we know that this set is still linearly independent. To see this, notice the following things:

- There is only one way to write \vec{v}_1 as a sum of elements in B_2 . (If there were two different ways, then their difference would be a nontrivial combination of elements in B_2 that sums to 0. B_2 is linearly independent, so that's impossible.)
- If we have any linear combination of elements in B'_2 that sums to 0, if it does not use \vec{v}_1 , then it must be trivial (i.e. all scalars are 0) because B_2 is linearly independent.
- So if we have a linear combination of elements in B'_2 that sums to 0, it must use \vec{v}_1 nontrivially. Using this, we can simply solve for \vec{v}_1 in terms of the other vectors. This combination does not use \vec{w}_j , because that vector is not in B'_2 : which means we have found a second way to write \vec{v}_1 as a sum of elements in B_2 . But we said that was impossible!

We repeat this trick with \vec{v}_2 : i.e. we find a combination of vectors in B'_2 that yields \vec{v}_2 . This combination cannot consist only of \vec{v}_1 , because we know that B_1 is linearly independent, and therefore that there is no nontrivial way to combine some of the elements of B_1 to get another element of B_1 . Therefore, there must be some $a_i \vec{w}_i$ used in this linear combination with a_i nonzero; again, solve for \vec{w}_i and use this observation to "replace" \vec{w}_i with \vec{v}_2 . Call this new set $B_2^{(2)}$. Again, this set is linearly independent, for the same reasons as before.

Keep doing this. As stated before, we can always find a way to express each v_{k+1} as a linear combination of elements in $B_2^{(k)}$ because these sets span our whole vector space; moreover, these combinations always involve an element $a_i \vec{w}_i$ because the set B_1 is linearly independent.

Therefore, the only way this process stops is when we run out of elements in B_1 . When this happens, look at the set $B_2^{(n)}$ that we get. We've placed all of the elements of B_1 in this set. If there was an element \vec{w}_k of B_2 left in this set, then our set would be linearly dependent: this is because B_1 spans all of V , and therefore we can express \vec{w}_k as some combination of elements in B_2 .

But this is impossible: we showed that these sets $S^{(k)}$ are always linearly independent! Therefore, there are no elements of B_2 left in this set. Because we got rid of elements one at a time and stopped after n steps, this means that there are n elements in B_2 . In other words, B_2 and B_1 have the same number of elements. \square

Using this, we can finally define the concept of **dimension**:

Definition. Suppose that V is a vector space with a basis B containing finitely many elements. Then we say that the **dimension** of V is the number of elements in B .

For example, the dimension of \mathbb{R}^n is n , because this vector space is spanned by the vectors $\vec{e}_1 = (1, 0, 0 \dots 0), e_2 = (0, 1, 0 \dots 0), \dots, e_n = (0, 0 \dots 0, 1)$.