

This was an 80-minute exam, 3:40–5PM. There were 30 points on the test, with two questions being worth 7 points and two being worth 8 points. The explanations that follow are intended to communicate the main points of each problem but might be a little skeletal. (They're more like extended hints than complete solutions.)

1. Let $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{R})$ be the real vector space consisting of all polynomials with coefficients in \mathbf{R} . Let $D : \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{R})$ be the linear map $f(x) \mapsto f'(x)$ that takes a polynomial to its derivative.

(a.) Describe the null space and the range of D .

The null space is the space of polynomials with derivative = 0. Those are the constant polynomials. The range is all of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{R})$ since every polynomial is the derivative of some polynomial. (We know how to integrate.)

(b.) Find a subspace U of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{R})$ such that $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{R}) = U \oplus \text{null } D$.

We can take U to be the space of polynomials whose constant terms are 0. The intersection of U and $\text{null } D$ is $\{0\}$ because the only constant in U is the polynomial 0. The sum of U and the null space is all of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{R})$ because each polynomial is the sum of its constant term and a polynomial whose constant term is 0.

2. Let $T : V \rightarrow W$ be a linear map between \mathbf{F} -vector spaces.

(a.) Suppose that $\text{null } T = \{0\}$ and that (v_1, \dots, v_n) is a linearly independent list in V . Show that (Tv_1, \dots, Tv_n) is linearly independent in W .

I think that this is a good problem because it requires knowledge of the definitions and some proof-writing skills. To show that (Tv_1, \dots, Tv_n) is linearly independent in W , we start with the equation $0 = a_1Tv_1 + a_2Tv_2 + \dots + a_nTv_n$ and seek to show that the coefficients a_i are all 0. Because T is linear, we can rewrite the equation as

$$0 = T(a_1v_1 + \dots + a_nv_n).$$

Since $\text{null } T = \{0\}$, the vector $a_1v_1 + \dots + a_nv_n$ is 0. Since (v_1, \dots, v_n) is a linearly independent list in V , all a_i are 0.

(b.) Assume that (Tv_1, \dots, Tv_n) is linearly independent in W for all linearly independent lists (v_1, \dots, v_n) in V . Show that $\text{null } T = \{0\}$.

The assumption is that T sends independent lists to independent lists—there is no restriction on the size of the lists. In particular, it sends independent lists of length 1 to

independent lists of length 1. Note that (v) is linearly independent if and only if v is non-zero! Hence if v is non-zero, (v) is linearly independent; thus (Tv) is linearly independent, so Tv is non-zero. Therefore the null space of T is $\{0\}$, which is what we wanted to prove.

3. Let V be an \mathbf{F} -vector space such that $\dim U \leq 4$ for all finite-dimensional subspaces U of V . Prove that V is finite-dimensional and that its dimension is at most 4.

This is kind of a silly problem (sorry). If V is *not* finite-dimensional, then there are independent lists (v_1, \dots, v_n) in V of arbitrary length. (We proved this in homework and discussed the proof in office hours a lot. This is a good place to cite a homework problem; alternatively, you could recapitulate the proof that there are such lists.) If (v_1, \dots, v_n) is linearly independent in V , its span is a subspace of V of dimension n . By the assumption of the problem, n can be at most 4, so we have a contradiction.

4. Let $S : V \rightarrow W$ and $T : W \rightarrow V$ be linear maps between finite-dimensional \mathbf{F} -vector spaces. Suppose that TS is the identity map on V .

(a.) Prove that T is surjective (onto) and that S is injective (1-1).

This has little to do with linear algebra: it's just a fact about composed functions. The hypothesis is that $T(S(v)) = v$ for all v in V . We see that the range of T is all of v because each v is T of something, namely v is $T(S(v))$. In a similar vein, if $S(v) = S(v')$, we get $v = v'$ by applying T to both sides of the equation $S(v) = S(v')$. Hence S is indeed 1-1.

(b.) Show that we have $\dim V \leq \dim W$.

We can use, for instance, the fact that the dimension of V is the sum of the nullity of S and the rank of S . Since S is 1-1, the nullity is 0; thus $\dim V = \text{rank } S$. Since the range of S is a subspace of W , the dimension of the range is at most the dimension of W . In other words, as we discussed in class, $\text{rank } S \leq \dim W$. We thus have the desired inequality $\dim V \leq \dim W$.