

12 Explain why there does not exist a list of six polynomials that is linearly independent in  $\mathcal{P}_4(\mathbb{F})$ .

Solution: If the list does exist, say  $f_1(x), \dots, f_6(x) \in \mathcal{P}_4(\mathbb{F})$  linearly independent.

We assume  $f_i(x) = a_{i0} + a_{i1}x + \dots + a_{i4}x^4$ ,  $a_{ij} \in \mathbb{F}$ ,  
 $\forall 1 \leq i \leq 6, 0 \leq j \leq 4$ .

If there exist  $x_1, \dots, x_6 \in \mathbb{F}$ , such that  
 $x_1 f_1(x) + \dots + x_6 f_6(x) = 0$ , then

$$\sum_{i=1}^6 a_{i0} x_i + \left( \sum_{i=1}^6 a_{i1} x_i \right) x + \dots + \left( \sum_{i=1}^6 a_{i4} x_i \right) x^4 = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^6 a_{ij} x_i = 0, \quad \forall 0 \leq j \leq 4$$

$$\Rightarrow \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} a_{10} & a_{20} & \dots & a_{60} \\ a_{11} & a_{21} & \dots & a_{61} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ a_{14} & a_{24} & \dots & a_{64} \end{pmatrix}}_{5 \times 6} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ \vdots \\ x_6 \end{pmatrix} = 0 \quad \dots \quad (*)$$

This  $5 \times 6$  matrix has rank at most 5,  
 but the number of unknowns is 6,  
 so (\*) has infinitely many solutions.

So  $f_1(x), \dots, f_6(x)$  are not linearly independent.  
 #

- 7 Prove or give a counterexample: If  $v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4$  is a basis of  $V$  and  $U$  is a subspace of  $V$  such that  $v_1, v_2 \in U$  and  $v_3 \notin U$  and  $v_4 \notin U$ , then  $v_1, v_2$  is a basis of  $U$ .

Solution: Let  $V = \mathbb{R}^4$ ,  $v_1 = (1, 0, 0, 0)$ ,  $v_2 = (0, 1, 0, 0)$ ,  
 $v_3 = (0, 0, 1, 0)$ ,  $v_4 = (0, 0, 0, 1)$

and let  $U = \{(x, y, z, z) \in \mathbb{R}^4 : x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}\}$

then  $v_1, v_2 \in U$ ,  $v_3 \notin U$ ,  $v_4 \notin U$ .

i.e.  $U$  can be spanned by  $v_1, v_2, v_3 + v_4$ .

#

- 6 (a) Let  $U = \{p \in \mathcal{P}_4(\mathbb{F}) : p(2) = p(5)\}$ . Find a basis of  $U$ .  
 (b) Extend the basis in part (a) to a basis of  $\mathcal{P}_4(\mathbb{F})$ .  
 (c) Find a subspace  $W$  of  $\mathcal{P}_4(\mathbb{F})$  such that  $\mathcal{P}_4(\mathbb{F}) = U \oplus W$ .

Solution: (a).  $\forall p(x) \in U$ , Let  $q(x) = p(x) - p(2) = p(x) - p(5)$ ,  
 then  $q(2) = q(5) = 0 \Rightarrow \exists h(x) = ax^2 + bx + c \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{F})$ ,  
 such that  $q(x) = (x-2)(x-5)h(x)$   
 $\Rightarrow p(x) = (x-2)(x-5)h(x) + p(2)$   
 $= \underbrace{ax^2(x-2)(x-5)} + \underbrace{bx(x-2)(x-5)} + \underbrace{c(x-2)(x-5)} + \underbrace{p(2) \cdot 1}$

thus we have  $U = \text{span}\{x^2(x-2)(x-5), x(x-2)(x-5), (x-2)(x-5), 1\}$

(b). (c). It suffices to find a  $p(x) \in \mathcal{P}_4(\mathbb{F})$ , such that  
 $p(x), x^2(x-2)(x-5), x(x-2)(x-5), (x-2)(x-5), 1$  are lin. indept.  
 Obviously,  $p(x) = x \notin U$  and satisfies lin. indepe.  
 i.e.  $\mathcal{P}_4(\mathbb{F}) = \text{span}\{x\} \oplus U$ .

#

Ex Show that

$\{e^{nx} : n \in \mathbb{Z}\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}}$  is lin indept

Hint: Differentiation and Vandermonde matrix

Solution:

To prove  $\{e^{nx} : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  is lin. indept. is to prove for any finite integer  $N > 0$ , the finite subset  $\{e^{nx} : n \in \mathbb{Z}, -N \leq n \leq N\}$  is lin. indept.

So if there exist  $a_n \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $-N \leq n \leq N$ , such that

$$f(x) \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \sum_{n=-N}^N a_n e^{nx} = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow f^{(k)}(x) = \sum_{n=-N}^N a_n \cdot n^k e^{nx} = 0, \quad \forall k \geq 0$$

$$\Rightarrow f^{(k)}(0) = \sum_{n=-N}^N a_n \cdot n^k = 0, \quad \forall k \geq 0 \quad \dots (\star_k)$$

Or you can just use Taylor's expansion:  $e^{nx} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} (nx)^k$  and the lin. independence of  $1, x, x^2, \dots, x^k, \dots$  to achieve  $(\star_k)$ .

These infinitely many equations  $(\star_k)$  can be written in the form

$$\begin{array}{l} k=0 \rightarrow \\ k=1 \rightarrow \\ k=2 \rightarrow \\ \vdots \end{array} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ -N & (-N+1) & \dots & N \\ (-N)^2 & (-N+1)^2 & \dots & N^2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ (-N)^k & (-N+1)^k & \dots & N^k \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a_{-N} \\ a_{-N+1} \\ \vdots \\ a_{N-1} \\ a_N \end{bmatrix} = 0 \quad \dots (\star)$$

Theorem:

For the Vandermand matrix: 
$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \alpha_1 & \alpha_1^2 & \dots & \alpha_1^{n-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 1 & \alpha_m & \alpha_m^2 & \dots & \alpha_m^{n-1} \end{bmatrix}_{m \times n}$$

if  $m \leq n$  and  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$  are distinct,  
then it has full rank  $m$ .

So taking  $k \geq 2N+1$ , we have that the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ -N & -N+1 & \dots & N \\ (-N)^2 & (-N+1)^2 & \dots & N^2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ (-N)^{k-1} & (-N+1)^{k-1} & \dots & N^{k-1} \end{bmatrix}_{k \times (2N+1)}$$
 has rank  $2N+1$ .

So  $(\star)$  has the unique solution  $a_n = 0, \forall -N \leq n \leq N$ .  
i.e.  $\{e^{nx}, n \in \mathbb{Z}, -N \leq n \leq N\}$

is lin. indept.

#