

Linear Algebra Done Right – Chapter 3 Solutions

1 Exercises 3B

Exercise 1. Give an example of a linear map T with $\dim \text{null } T = 3$ and $\dim \text{range } T = 2$.

The intuition behind the solution is that we can define a linear map just on the values on a basis of the linear space V we choose. I will choose V to be \mathbb{R}^5 and $T \in \mathcal{L}(V)$.

Therefore, I define $T : \mathbb{R}^5 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^5$ with:

- $T((1,0,0,0,0))=0$
- $T((0,1,0,0,0))=0$
- $T((0,0,1,0,0))=0$
- $T((0,0,0,1,0))=(0,0,0,1,0)$
- $T((0,0,0,0,1))=(0,0,0,0,1)$

It is clear that $\text{null } T$ has a basis the first 3 basis vectors of \mathbb{R}^5 and the range of T has as a basis the last 2 basis vectors of \mathbb{R}^5 .

Exercise 2. Suppose $S, T \in \mathcal{L}(V)$ such that $\text{range } S \subseteq \text{null } T$. Prove that $(ST)^2=0$.

Solution. $(ST)^2(v) = (ST)(ST(v))$. We have that $ST(V) \in \text{range } S$. Therefore $ST(V) \in \text{null } T$.

Which means that $T(ST(v)) = 0, \forall v \in V$. Therefore $(ST)^2(v) = S(0) = 0$, because S is a linear map.

Exercise 3. Suppose v_1, \dots, v_m is a list of vectors in V . Define $T \in (\mathcal{F}^m, V)$ by:

$$T(z_1, \dots, z_m) = z_1v_1 + \dots + z_mv_m.$$

- What property of T corresponds to v_1, \dots, v_m spanning V ?
- What property of T corresponds to the list v_1, \dots, v_m being linearly independent?

Solution. To answer the questions in order:

- If v_1, \dots, v_m span V , then T would be surjective as practically range T is just span V .
- If v_1, \dots, v_m are linearly independent, this means that $T(z_1, \dots, z_m) = 0$ only if $z_1 = \dots = z_m = 0$, therefore $\dim \text{null } T = 0$, so it is injective.

Exercise 4. Show that $X = \{ T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^5, \mathbb{R}^4) : \dim \text{null } T > 2 \}$ is not a subspace of $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^5, \mathbb{R}^4)$

Solution. My intuition for this exercise was just to build two linear maps that had no overlap of values over the basis. So in one case, one of the maps would map a basis vector to 0 and in another it would map the basis vector to itself.

Therefore, let v_1, \dots, v_5 be a basis of \mathbb{R}^4 . I define the following maps T_1 and T_2 :

- $T_1(v_1) = v_1, T_1(v_2) = v_2, T_1(v_3) = 0, T_1(v_4) = 0, T_1(v_5) = 0$
- $T_2(v_1) = 0, T_2(v_2) = 0, T_2(v_3) = v_3, T_2(v_4) = v_4, T_2(v_5) = 0$

Both of them clearly have $\dim \text{null } T_1 = \dim \text{null } T_2 = 3$.

However, when we calculate $T_1 + T_2$ we get:

- $(T_1 + T_2)(v_1) = v_1, (T_1 + T_2)(v_2) = v_2, (T_1 + T_2)(v_3) = v_3, (T_1 + T_2)(v_4) = v_4, (T_1 + T_2)(v_5) = v_5$

Therefore, $\dim \text{null } T_1 + T_2 = 1$, which means that $T_1 + T_2 \notin X$ which shows that the set X is not closed under addition, therefore it cannot be a subspace.

Exercise 5. Give an example of $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^4)$ such that $\text{range } T = \text{null } T$.

Solution. My intuition behind this problem was that if $\text{range } T = \text{null } T$, then $T(T(x)) = 0, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^4$. Now, I did "cheat" a little bit by thinking that T was a matrix and just looking for a matrix with $T^2 = 0$, where 0 here is the null 4×4 matrix.

Therefore, the final map that I have reached is: $T(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) = (x_1 - x_4, x_2 - x_3, x_2 - x_3, x_1 - x_4) = (x_1 - x_4) * (1, 0, 0, 1) + (x_2 - x_3) * (0, 1, 1, 0)$. It is clear that the range is a linear combination between $(1, 0, 0, 1)$ and $(0, 1, 1, 0)$ which are linearly independent, therefore $\dim \text{range } T = 0$. We have that

$$T(T(x)) = 0$$

which means that $\text{range } T \subseteq \text{null } T$.

Now I need to prove that $\text{null } T \subseteq \text{range } T$.

Let $y \in \text{null } T$, be an arbitrary vector in $\text{null } T$. Therefore, $T(y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4) = 0$ which means that $y_1 = y_4, y_2 = y_3$.

I will choose $x_1 = y_1, x_2 = y_2, x_3 = 0, x_4 = 0$, and get that $T(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) = (y_1, y_2, y_2, y_1) = (y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4)$. Therefore I have found x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 such that $T(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) = (y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4)$ so $y \in \text{range } T$. Therefore $\text{null } T \subseteq \text{range } T$.

So $\text{null } T = \text{range } T$.

Exercise 6. Prove that there does not exist $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^5)$ such that $\text{range } T = \text{null } T$.

Solution. We know that $\dim \text{range } T + \dim \text{null } T = \dim \mathbb{R}^5$, which means $2 * \dim \text{range } T = 5$ which is not possible as $\dim \text{range } T$ is an integer.

Exercise 7. Suppose V and W are finite-dimensional with $2 \leq \dim V \leq \dim W$. Show that $\{T \in \mathcal{L}(V, W) : T \text{ is not injective}\}$ is not a subspace of $\mathcal{L}(V, W)$.

Solution. I will build two maps that are not injective, but whose sum is. I will denote $\dim V = n$, $\dim W = m$. Let v_1, \dots, v_n be a basis of V and w_1, \dots, w_m be a basis of W . I can create the following mappings, using the fact that $2 \leq n \leq m$:

- $T_1(v_1) = w_1, T_1(v_2) = w_1, T_1(v_i) = w_i, \forall i \in \{3, \dots, n\}$
- $T_2(v_1) = w_2, T_2(v_2) = -w_2, T_2(v_i) = w_i, \forall i \in \{3, \dots, n\}$

They are both not injective as their nullspaces do not have dimension 0, clearly $T_1(v_1 - v_2) = 0$ and $T_2(v_1 + v_2) = 0$.

If we look at $T_1 + T_2$, we find that $(T_1 + T_2)(v_1) = w_1 + w_2, (T_1 + T_2)(v_2) = w_1 - w_2, \dots, (T_1 + T_2)(v_i) = 2 * v_i, \forall i \in \{3, \dots, n\}$. Let $x \in \text{null}(T_1 + T_2)$. We have that $(T_1 + T_2)(x) = 0$, we can write x uniquely according to the basis v_1, \dots, v_n and get that: $(T_1 + T_2)(\alpha_1 v_1 + \dots + \alpha_n v_n) = 0$. Therefore $\alpha_1(w_1 + w_2) + \alpha_2(w_1 - w_2) + \sum_{i=3}^n 2\alpha_i w_i = 0$.

So we get that $(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)w_1 + (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)w_2 + \sum_{i=3}^n 2\alpha_i w_i = 0$. We know that the w 's are linearly independent, therefore $\alpha_i = 0, \forall i \in \{3, \dots, n\}$ and $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = 0$ and $\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 = 0$. This means that $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0$, so $x = 0$. Therefore, $\text{null } T_1 + T_2 = \{0\}$, so it is injective, therefore the set given in the hypothesis is not a subspace.

Exercise 8. Suppose V and W are finite-dimensional with $\dim V \geq \dim W \geq 2$. Show that $\{T \in \mathcal{L}(V, W) : T \text{ is not surjective}\}$ is not a subspace of $\mathcal{L}(V, W)$.

Solution. I will construct two linear maps that are not surjective, but whose sum is surjective. Let $\dim V = n$ and $\dim W = m$, where $n \geq m \geq 2$.

Let v_1, \dots, v_n be a basis of V and w_1, \dots, w_m be a basis of W .

Define the following two maps:

- $T_1(v_1) = w_1, T_1(v_2) = 0, T_1(v_i) = w_i$ for all $i \in \{3, \dots, m\}$, and $T_1(v_j) = 0$ for all $j \in \{m+1, \dots, n\}$ (if $n > m$)
- $T_2(v_1) = 0, T_2(v_2) = w_2, T_2(v_i) = 0$ for all $i \in \{3, \dots, n\}$

Both T_1 and T_2 are not surjective because:

- For T_1 : range $T_1 \subseteq \text{span}\{w_1, w_3, \dots, w_m\}$, which has dimension $m-1 < m$
- For T_2 : range $T_2 \subseteq \text{span}\{w_2\}$, which has dimension $1 < m$

Now consider $T_1 + T_2$:

- $(T_1 + T_2)(v_1) = w_1$
- $(T_1 + T_2)(v_2) = w_2$
- $(T_1 + T_2)(v_i) = w_i$ for all $i \in \{3, \dots, m\}$
- $(T_1 + T_2)(v_j) = 0$ for all $j \in \{m+1, \dots, n\}$ (if $n > m$)

Therefore $(T_1 + T_2)(v_i) = w_i, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and 0 otherwise.

If $x \in W$, let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$ be the coefficients such that $x = \alpha_1 w_1 + \dots + \alpha_m w_m$ because w_1, \dots, w_m is a basis. We will have that $(T_1 + T_2)(\alpha_1 v_1 + \dots + \alpha_m v_m) = \alpha_1 w_1 + \dots + \alpha_m w_m = x$, therefore there is $y \in V$ such that $(T_1 + T_2)(y) = x \in W, \forall x \in W$. So $(T_1 + T_2)$ is surjective, therefore the given subspace is not closed under addition.

Exercise 9. Suppose $T \in \mathcal{L}(V, W)$ is injective and v_1, \dots, v_n is linearly independent in V . Prove that Tv_1, \dots, Tv_n is linearly independent in W .

Solution. Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ be scalars such that $\alpha_1 T v_1 + \dots + \alpha_n T v_n = 0$. We will have that $T(\alpha_1 v_1 + \dots + \alpha_n v_n) = 0$. We know that T is injective, therefore $\text{null } T = \{0\}$, so $\alpha_1 v_1 + \dots + \alpha_n v_n = 0$. v_1, \dots, v_n are linearly independent $\Rightarrow \alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_n = 0$. Therefore Tv_1, \dots, Tv_n are also linearly independent, as if $\alpha_1 T v_1 + \dots + \alpha_n T v_n = 0 \Rightarrow \alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_n = 0$

Exercise 10. Suppose v_1, \dots, v_n spans V and $T \in \mathcal{L}(V, W)$. Show that Tv_1, \dots, Tv_n spans range T .

Solution. Let $x \in \text{range } T$, this means that $\exists y \in V$ such that $T(y) = x$. v_1, \dots, v_n spans V , therefore $\exists \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ scalars such that $\alpha_1 v_1 + \dots + \alpha_n v_n = y$. This means that $\alpha_1 T(v_1) + \dots + \alpha_n T(v_n) = x$, due to T 's linearity. Therefore, $\forall x \in \text{range } T$, $\exists \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ such that $\alpha_1 T(v_1) + \dots + \alpha_n T(v_n) = x$. Therefore, Tv_1, \dots, Tv_n span range T .

Exercise 11. Suppose that V is finite-dimensional and that $T \in \mathcal{L}(V, W)$. Prove that there exists a subspace U of V such that:

$$U \cap \text{null } T = \{0\} \text{ and } \text{range } T = \{Tu : u \in U\}$$

Solution. Let t_1, \dots, t_n be a basis of range T . We know that there must exist $u_1, \dots, u_n \in V$ such that $T(u_1) = t_1, \dots, T(u_n) = t_n$. $T(u_1), \dots, T(u_n)$ are linearly independent, we can use exercise 4 from 3A and get that u_1, \dots, u_n are also linearly independent.

I will denote my subspace U to be $\text{span}\{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$. Let $u \in U \cup \text{null } T$. We have that $T(u) = 0$. However, u is a linear combination of $\{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$ so we get that $\exists \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ scalars such that $u = \alpha_1 u_1 + \dots + \alpha_n u_n$. Therefore, $T(\alpha_1 u_1 + \dots + \alpha_n u_n) = 0 \iff \alpha_1 t_1 + \dots + \alpha_n t_n = 0$, but t_1, \dots, t_n are linearly independent, therefore $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_n = 0$. This means that $u = 0$. Therefore $U \cup \text{null } T = \{0\}$.

Finally, I need to prove that $\text{range } T = \{Tu : u \in U\}$. I will prove this by double inclusion.

Let $x \in \text{range } T$. This means that $\exists \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ such that $\alpha_1 t_1 + \dots + \alpha_n t_n = x$. If we choose $u = \alpha_1 u_1 + \dots + \alpha_n u_n$, it will be in U because $U = \text{span}\{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$ and we will have that $T(u) = \alpha_1 T(u_1) + \dots + \alpha_n T(u_n) = \alpha_1 t_1 + \dots + \alpha_n t_n = x$. Therefore, $x \in \{Tu : u \in U\}$. Therefore, $\text{range } T \subseteq \{Tu : u \in U\}$.

Let $x \in \{Tu : u \in U\}$. This means that $\exists u \in U \subseteq V$ such that $Tu = x$. Therefore, $x \in \text{range } T$. So we have that $\{Tu : u \in U\} \subseteq T$.

Finally, $\{Tu : u \in U\} = \text{range } T$.

Exercise 12. Suppose T is a linear map from \mathbb{F}^4 to \mathbb{F}^2 such that

$$\text{null } T = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \in \mathbb{F}^4 : x_1 = 5x_2 \text{ and } x_3 = 7x_4\}$$

Prove that T is surjective.

Solution. $\text{null } T = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \in \mathbb{F}^4 : x_1 = 5x_2 \text{ and } x_3 = 7x_4\}$.

$$\text{null } T = \{(5x_2, x_2, 7x_4, x_4) \in \mathbb{F}^4 | x_2, x_4 \in \mathbb{F}^2\}$$

$$\text{null } T = \{x_2(5, 1, 0, 0) + x_4(0, 0, 7, 1) | x_2, x_4 \in \mathbb{F}^2\}.$$

$\text{null } T = \text{span}\{(5, 1, 0, 0), (0, 0, 7, 1)\}$. Also, it is clear that $(5, 1, 0, 0)$ and $(0, 0, 7, 1)$ are linearly independent, therefore $\{(5, 1, 0, 0), (0, 0, 7, 1)\}$ is a basis for $\text{null } T$. Therefore $\dim \text{null } T = 2$. From the Fundamental Theorem of Linear Maps we have that $\dim \text{range } T + \dim \text{null } T = \dim \mathbb{F}^4 = 4$. Therefore, $\dim \text{range } T = 2$. But $\text{range } T$ is a subspace of \mathbb{F}^2 which also has $\dim \mathbb{F}^2 = 2$. So we will have that $\text{range } T = \mathbb{F}^2$ which means that T is surjective.

Exercise 13. Suppose U is a three-dimensional subspace of \mathbb{R}^8 and that T is a linear map from \mathbb{R}^8 to \mathbb{R}^5 such that $\text{null } T = U$. Prove that T is surjective.

Solution. U is a three-dimensional subspace of \mathbb{R}^8 , therefore $\dim U = 3$. We have that $\text{null } T = U$, so $\dim \text{null } T = 3$. From the Fundamental Theorem of Linear Maps we will have that $\dim \text{range } T = 5$. But $\text{range } T$ is a subspace of \mathbb{R}^5 which also has dimension 5, therefore $\text{range } T = \mathbb{R}^5$ so we will have that T is surjective.

Exercise 14. Prove that there does not exist a linear map from \mathbb{F}^5 to \mathbb{F}^2 whose null space equals $\{(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5) \in \mathbb{F}^5 : x_1 = 3x_2 \text{ and } x_3 = x_4 = x_5\}$.

Solution. Let T be a map with the null space from the hypothesis. We can use the same logical steps as in Exercise 13 and prove that $\dim \text{null } T = 2$. Therefore, using the Fundamental Theorem of Linear Maps we will have that $\dim \text{range } T = 3$. However, range T is a subspace of \mathbb{F}^2 which means that $\dim \text{range } T \leq \dim \mathbb{F}^2 = 2$. This is a contradiction, therefore there exists no linear map defined from \mathbb{F}^5 to \mathbb{F}^2 with the given null space.

Exercise 15. Suppose there exists a linear map on V whose null space and range are both finite-dimensional. Prove that V is finite-dimensional.

Solution. Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(V, V)$ be the linear map such that $\dim \text{null } T = m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\dim \text{range } T = n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let b_1, \dots, b_n be a basis of range $T = \{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$ such that $T(u_1) = b_1, \dots, T(u_n) = b_n$.

Let $v \in V$, this means that $T(v) \in \text{range } T$. Therefore, $\exists \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ such that $T(v) = \alpha_1 b_1 + \dots + \alpha_n b_n$. This means that $T(v) = T(\alpha_1 u_1 + \dots + \alpha_n u_n) \iff T(v - \alpha_1 u_1 - \dots - \alpha_n u_n) = 0$. So, $v - \alpha_1 u_1 - \dots - \alpha_n u_n \in \text{null } T$.

The last part tells us that $\exists k_1, \dots, k_m$ such that $v - \alpha_1 u_1 - \dots - \alpha_n u_n = k_1 n_1 + \dots + k_m n_m$ where n_1, \dots, n_m is a basis of null T . We have thus proved that for any $v \in V$ there exists $n+m$ scalars such that $v = \alpha_1 u_1 + \dots + \alpha_n u_n + k_1 n_1 + \dots + k_m n_m$. Therefore, $V = \text{span}\{u_1, \dots, u_n, n_1, \dots, n_m\}$. So V is spanned by a finite list of vectors, therefore V is finite-dimensional.

Exercise 16. Suppose V and W are both finite-dimensional. Prove that there exists an injective linear map from V to W if and only if $\dim V \leq \dim W$.

Solution. To prove the if and only if, we need to prove both ways of the implication.

The left to right implication is that if there exists an injective linear map from V to W then $\dim V \leq \dim W$. This is equivalent to If $\dim V > \dim W$ then there exists no injective linear map from V to W and this was proved in the text.

Now the right to left implication is that if $\dim V \leq \dim W$ then there exists an injective linear map from V to W . To build this linear map we take v_1, \dots, v_n the basis of V , where $\dim V = n$ and w_1, \dots, w_m the basis of W where $\dim W = m$. We then create the linear map T such that $T(v_i) = w_i, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. If $v \in \text{null } T$, we will write v in terms of the basis vectors and get $T(\alpha_1 v_1 + \dots + \alpha_n v_n) = 0 \iff \alpha_1 w_1 + \dots + \alpha_n w_n = 0$, but w_1, \dots, w_m are linearly independent, therefore $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_n = 0$, so $v=0$. This means that $\text{null } T = \{0\}$, therefore T is injective.

Exercise 17. Suppose V and W are both finite-dimensional. Prove that there exists a surjective linear map from V to W if and only if $\dim V \geq \dim W$.

Solution. The left to right implication is that if there exists a surjective linear map from V to W then $\dim V \geq \dim W$. This is equivalent to If $\dim V < \dim W$ then there exists no surjective linear map from V to W and this was proved in the text.

Now for the right to the left implication, we denote $\dim W = m$, $\dim V = n$. Then we construct the linear map by taking $T(v_i) = w_i, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and $T(v_i) = 0 \forall i \in \{m+1, \dots, n\}$. Then, it is trivial to prove that this is surjective.

Exercise 18. Suppose V and W are finite-dimensional and that U is a subspace of V . Prove that there exists $T \in \mathcal{L}(V, W)$ such that $\text{null } T = U$ if and only if $\dim U \geq \dim V - \dim W$.

Solution. The left to right implication says that if there exists $T \in \mathcal{L}(V, W)$ such that $\text{null } T = U$ then $\dim U \geq \dim V - \dim W$. Well we can use the Fundamental Theorem of Linear Maps and

get that $\dim \text{null } T + \dim \text{range } T = \dim V$, which means that $\dim U + \dim \text{range } T = \dim V$. $\dim \text{range } T \leq \dim W$, therefore $-\dim \text{range } T \geq -\dim W$, so we have that $\dim U \geq \dim V - \dim W$.

For the right to left implication we are told that if $\dim U \geq \dim V - \dim W$ then there exists $T \in \mathcal{L}(V, W)$. We can prove the contrapositive, that if $\dim U < \dim V - \dim W$ there is no linear map $T \in \mathcal{L}(V, W)$ such that $\text{null } T = U$.

To prove this contrapositive we do it by a proof of contradiction. Let there be a linear map $T \in \mathcal{L}(V, W)$ such that $\text{null } T = U$. We know that $\dim U < \dim V - \dim W$. However, $\dim \text{range } T + \dim \text{null } T = \dim \text{range } T + \dim U = \dim V$. Therefore $\dim U = \dim V - \dim \text{range } T$. This means that $\dim V - \dim \text{range } T < \dim V - \dim W$, therefore $\dim W < \dim \text{range } T$ which is a contradiction because $\text{range } T$ is a subspace of W .

Q.E.D

Exercise 19. Suppose W is finite-dimensional and $T \in \mathcal{L}(V, W)$. Prove that T is injective if and only if there exists $S \in \mathcal{L}(W, V)$ such that ST is the identity operator on V .

Solution. Let's prove the right to left implication. We know there exists $S \in \mathcal{L}(W, V)$ such that ST is the identity operator on V . Let $u, v \in V$ such that $T(u) = T(v)$. If $T(u) = T(v)$, this means that $ST(u) = ST(v)$, but ST is the identity operator on V , therefore $u = v$. So we obtained that $\forall u, v \in V$, if $T(u) = T(v) \Rightarrow u = v$. Therefore T is injective.

Now for the left to right implication, we know that T is injective, we want to find $S \in \mathcal{L}(W, V)$ such that ST is the identity operator on V . I will first define the linear map $S' \in \text{range } T$, such that $S'(x) = T^{-1}(x), \forall x \in \text{range } T$. Where with $T^{-1}(x)$ I have denoted the pre-image $v' \in V$ such that $T(v') = x$. We know it is unique because T is injective. Therefore, we can write that $S'(T(v')) = v', \forall v' \in V$, so $S'(T)$ acts as the identity operator on V . Now, we can use exercise 13 from 3A, because $\text{range } T$ is a subspace of W we can extend S' to $S \in \mathbb{J}(W, V)$ such that $S'(T(v)) = S(T(V)), \forall v \in V$ and we have now found the necessary map.

Exercise 20. Suppose W is finite-dimensional and $T \in \mathcal{L}(V, W)$. Prove that T is surjective if and only if there exists $S \in \mathcal{L}(W, V)$ such that TS is the identity operator on W .

Solution. Let's prove the right to left implication. If there exists $S \in \mathcal{L}(W, V)$ such that TS is the identity operator on W , then we have that $TS(w) = w, \forall w \in W$. This means that $\forall w \in W$, there exists $v = S(w) \in V$ such that $T(v) = w$. Therefore, T is surjective.

Now for the left to right implication. Let T be a surjective linear map from $\mathcal{L}(V, W)$. This means that $\forall w \in W, \exists v' \in V$ such that $T(v') = w$. Let w_1, \dots, w_n be a basis of W where $n = \dim W$. We will have that $S(w_i) = v_i$, where v_i is a vector such that $T(v_i) = w_i$. We know v_i exists because T is surjective. S is a properly defined map from W to V as we defined it on a basis of W . With this construction we have that $TS(w_i) = w_i, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Now, we will have that $TS(w) = T(S(\alpha_1 w_1 + \dots + \alpha_n w_n)) = \alpha_1 TS(w_1) + \dots + \alpha_n TS(w_n) = \alpha_1 w_1 + \dots + \alpha_n w_n = w$, therefore TS acts as the identity operator on W .

Exercise 21. Suppose V is finite-dimensional, $T \in \mathcal{L}(V, W)$, and U is a subspace of W . Prove that $\{v \in V : Tv \in U\}$ is a subspace of V and

$$\dim \{v \in V : Tv \in U\} = \dim \text{null } T + \dim (U \cap \text{range } T).$$

Solution. First we will prove that $A = \{v \in V : Tv \in U\}$ is a subspace of V :

- $T(0) = 0 \in U$, therefore $0 \in A$.

- If $v_1, v_2 \in A$, we have that Tv_1 is in U and Tv_2 is in U , U is a subspace, therefore $T(v_1 + v_2) \in U$, so $v_1 + v_2 \in A$. A is closed under addition
- If $v \in A$, then Tv is in U , which means that $\alphaTv \in U$, so $T(\alpha v) \in U$ by T 's linearity, so $\alpha v \in A$. A is closed under scalar multiplication.

Therefore, A is a subspace of V .

Now if $v \in \text{null } T$, we have that $Tv = 0 \in U$, therefore $\text{null } T \subseteq A$. We know that $\text{null } T$ is a vector space therefore it is also a subspace of A . We take a basis b_1, \dots, b_m of $\text{null } T$ where $\dim \text{null } T = m$. We can extend the basis over $\text{null } T$ to be a basis over A as A is a finite-dimensional space, let's denote the extension basis vectors c_{m+1}, \dots, c_n where $n = \dim A$.

The conclusion of the problem now is equivalent to proving that $n - m = \dim(U \cap \text{range } T)$.

Let $v \in A$, we can write $v = \alpha_1 b_1 + \dots + \alpha_m b_m + \alpha_{m+1} c_{m+1} + \dots + \alpha_n c_n$. We will have that $Tv = T(\alpha_{m+1} c_{m+1} + \dots + \alpha_n c_n) = \alpha_{m+1} T(c_{m+1}) + \dots + \alpha_n T(c_n)$. Therefore if $Tv \in U$, then we can write it as a linear combination of $T(c_{m+1}), \dots, T(c_n)$, so $U \cup \text{range } T = \text{span}\{T(c_{m+1}), \dots, T(c_n)\}$.

Now we need to prove that $T(c_{m+1}), \dots, T(c_n)$ are linearly independent. If $\alpha_{m+1} T(c_{m+1}) + \dots + \alpha_n T(c_n) = 0$, we will have that $T(\alpha_{m+1} c_{m+1} + \dots + \alpha_n c_n) = 0$, which means $\alpha_{m+1} c_{m+1} + \dots + \alpha_n c_n \in \text{null } T$. This means that there exist $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$ such that $\alpha_{m+1} c_{m+1} + \dots + \alpha_n c_n = \alpha_1 b_1 + \dots + \alpha_m b_m$. But we know that $b_1, \dots, b_m, c_{m+1}, \dots, c_n$ are linearly independent, so $\alpha_{m+1} = \dots = \alpha_n$ so we get that $T(c_{m+1}), \dots, T(c_n)$ are linearly independent.

With the result from above we get that $T(c_{m+1}), \dots, T(c_n)$ is a basis of $U \cap \text{range } T$, so $\dim(U \cap \text{range } T) = n - (m + 1) + 1 = n - m$. Q.E.D.

Exercise 22. Suppose U and V are finite-dimensional vector spaces and $S \in \mathcal{L}(V, W)$ and $T \in \mathcal{L}(U, V)$. Prove that

$$\dim \text{null } ST \leq \dim \text{null } S + \dim \text{null } T.$$

Solution. $\text{null } ST = \{v \in U : Tv \in \text{null } S\}$. We know that $\text{null } S$ is a subspace of V . Using exercise 21 we find out that:

$$\dim \text{null } ST = \dim \text{null } T + \dim(\text{null } S \cap \text{range } T)$$

Clearly, $\dim(\text{null } S \cap \text{range } T) \leq \dim \text{null } S$. So we have proved that:

$$\dim \text{null } ST \leq \dim \text{null } T + \dim \text{null } S$$

Exercise 23. Suppose U and V are finite-dimensional vector spaces and $S \in \mathcal{L}(V, W)$ and $T \in \mathcal{L}(U, V)$. Prove that:

$$\dim \text{range } ST \leq \min\{\dim \text{range } S, \dim \text{range } T\}$$

Solution. $\text{range } ST$ is a vector space and $\text{range } ST \subseteq \text{range } S$. This means that $\text{range } ST$ is a subspace of $\text{range } S$, so we have that $\dim \text{range } ST \leq \dim \text{range } S$.

Now, let $x \in \text{range } ST$, this means that $\exists v' \text{ such that } x = ST(v')$. Let's take a basis of $\text{range } T$, let it be b_1, \dots, b_n where $n = \dim \text{range } T$. Therefore, $\exists \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ such that $x = S(\alpha_1 b_1 + \dots + \alpha_n b_n)$. $x = \alpha_1 S(b_1) + \dots + \alpha_n S(b_n)$. So, $\text{range } ST$ is the span of the vectors $S(b_1), \dots, S(b_n)$ which from theory means that we can reduce this spanning set into a basis for ST , so $\dim \text{range } ST \leq n = \dim \text{range } T$.

We have that $\dim \text{range } ST \leq \dim \text{range } T$ and $\dim \text{range } ST \leq \dim \text{range } S$. In conclusion,

$$\dim \text{range } ST \leq \min\{\dim \text{range } S, \dim \text{range } T\}$$

Exercise 24. • Suppose $\dim V = 5$ and $S, T \in \mathcal{V}$ are such that $ST = 0$. Prove that $\dim \text{range } TS \leq 2$.

- Given an example of $S, T \in \mathbb{F}^5$ with $ST = 0$ and $\dim \text{range } TS = 2$.

Solution. For the first point, we have that $ST = 0 \Rightarrow \dim \text{range } ST = 0 \Rightarrow \dim \text{null } ST = 5$. This means that $5 \leq \dim \text{null } S + \dim \text{null } T$. We know that $S, T \in \mathcal{L}(V)$, therefore $\dim \text{range } T + \dim \text{null } T + \dim \text{range } S + \dim \text{null } S = 5$. Which means that $5 \leq 5 - \dim \text{null } S + 5 - \dim \text{null } T \Leftrightarrow \dim \text{range } S + \dim \text{range } T \leq 5$. With the last inequality we have that $2 \min\{\dim \text{range } S, \dim \text{range } T\} \leq 5$. Which means that $\min \dim \text{range } S + \min \dim \text{range } T \leq 2$ because that minimum is an integer.

Finally, we know that $\dim \text{range } TS \leq \min \dim \text{range } S + \min \dim \text{range } T$ due to symmetry, so $\dim \text{range } TS \leq 2$.

For the second point, let v_1, \dots, v_5 be a basis of \mathbb{F}^5 . I will define S and T at the basis vectors:

- $S(v_1) = v_1, S(v_2) = v_4, S(v_3) = S(v_4) = S(v_5) = 0$
- $T(v_1) = T(v_2) = T(v_3) = v_3, T(v_4) = T(v_5) = v_4$.

Therefore we will have:

- $ST(v_1) = ST(v_2) = ST(v_3) = S(v_3) = 0, ST(v_4) = ST(v_5) = S(v_4) = 0$
- $TS(v_1) = T(v_1) = v_3, TS(v_2) = T(v_4) = v_4, TS(v_3) = TS(v_4) = TS(v_5) = 0$

It is clear from here that $ST = 0$ and $\dim \text{range } TS = 2$ as a basis for range TS is $\{v_3, v_4\}$.

Exercise 25. Suppose that V is finite-dimensional and $S, T \in \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}$. Prove that $\text{null } S \subseteq \text{null } T$ if and only if there exists $E \in \mathcal{W}$ such that $T = ES$.

Solution. Let's prove the assertion from left to right. Let $\text{null } S \subseteq \text{null } T$. I will prove that there exists $E \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $T = ES$.

Let $v_1, \dots, v_n \in V$ be a basis of V with $\dim V = n$. Therefore, $S(v_1), \dots, S(v_n)$ is a basis for range S . I can define E' to be the map on range \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{W} such that $E'(w) = T(v')$, for $w \in \text{range } S$ and $Sw' = v$. Now, for each w we just choose one of the v' such that $Sw' = v$. What I now have to show is that $E'S(v_i) = T(v_i), \forall v_i$. Let v'_i be the pre-image chosen when building E' for $S(v_i)$. This means that $E'S(v_i) = E'(v'_i) = T(v'_i)$, however we know that $S(v'_i) = S(v_i)$, therefore $v'_i - v_i \in \text{null } S \subseteq \text{null } T$ therefore $v'_i - v_i \subseteq \text{null } T$ which means that $T(v'_i) = T(v_i)$, so $E'S(v_i) = T(v'_i) = T(v_i)$. So we now have this map $E' \in \text{range } \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{W}$ such that $E'S(v_i) = T(v_i)$ for all $v_i \in V$. I can extend E' to obtain $E \in \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{W}$ such that $E(w) = E'(w), \forall w \in \text{range } S$.

So now, we have that $ES(v_i) = T(v_i), \forall v_i \in V$. This completely defines the ES map, and it is clear that $T = ES$. Q.E.D.

Now for the assertion from right to left, if there exists the map $E \in \mathcal{W}$ such that $T = ES$. If $x \in \text{null } S$, we have that $ES(x) = E(0) = 0 = T(x)$, so $x \in \text{null } T$. Therefore $\text{null } S \subseteq \text{null } T$.

Exercise 26. Suppose that V is finite-dimensional and $S, T \in \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}$. Prove that $\text{range } S \subseteq \text{range } T$ if and only if there exists $E \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $S = TE$.

Solution. Let's prove the assertion from left to right: Let $\text{range } S \subseteq \text{range } T$. Let v_1, \dots, v_n be a basis of V . As the range of S is included in the range of T , for each $S(v_i)$ there exists a u_i such that $T(u_i) = S(v_i)$. I will uniquely define $E \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $E(v_i) = u_i$. This means that $\forall v_i, TE(v_i) = T(u_i) = S(v_i)$, so TE and S are the same map as they have the same unique representation over the basis vectors.

For the assertion from right to left: There exists a map $E \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $S = TE$. Let $x \in \text{range } S$. This means that $\exists v' \in V$ such that $S(v') = x$. But $S(v') = TE(v') = x$, so $x \in \text{range } T$ with one of the possible pre-images being $E(v')$. Therefore, $\text{range } S \subseteq \text{range } T$.

Exercise 27. Suppose $P \in \mathcal{V}$ and $P^2 = P$. Prove that $V = \text{null } P \oplus \text{range } P$.

Solution. First, let's look at the intersection between $\text{null } P$ and $\text{range } P$. Let $x \in (\text{null } P \cap \text{range } P)$. We have that $P(x) = 0$ and $\exists x' \in V$ s.t $P(x') = x$. This means that $P^2(x') = P(x)$, so $P(x') = 0$, but $P(x') = x$, so $x = 0$. Therefore $\text{null } P \cap \text{range } P = \{0\}$. This means that $\text{null } P + \text{range } P = \text{null } P \oplus \text{range } P$.

From theory we also know that $\dim(\text{null } P \oplus \text{range } P) = \dim \text{null } P + \dim \text{range } P = \dim V$. $\text{null } P \oplus \text{range } P$ is actually a subspace of V , so we will have that $\text{null } P \oplus \text{range } P = V$.

Exercise 28. Suppose $D \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ is such that $\deg Dp = (\deg p) - 1$ for every non-constant polynomial $p \in \mathcal{P}(R)$. Prove that D is surjective.

Solution. To prove that D is surjective, I will show that $\forall n \in N, x^n \in \text{range } D$. Then, it is easy to show that any polynomial of finite degree is in range T .

To prove the above, I will use strong induction. I define the proposition as being $P(n) : x^n \in \text{range } D$.

First we solve the base case. We know that $D(x)$ is a polynomial of degree 0. This means that $\exists t \in \mathbb{R}, t \neq 0$ such that $D(x) = t$. Because D is linear, we have that $D(\frac{x}{t}) = 1$ and the division is possible because t is not 0. Therefore, $P(0)$ is true. Now we will solve $P(0), \dots, P(n-1) - \text{True} \Rightarrow P(n) - \text{True}$. Given the properties of D we know that $D(x^{n+1})$ must be a polynomial of degree n , $D(x^{n+1}) = a_n x^n + \dots + a_0$, where a_n needs to be different than 0 and the others not necessarily.

Now we know that $P(0), \dots, P(n-1)$ are all true, so we denote the pre-image (which exists) of x^i with p_i such that $D(p_i) = x^i$. Therefore we will find that $D(x^{n+1} - a_{n-1}p_{n-1} - a_{n-2}p_{n-2} - \dots - a_0p_0) = D(x^{n+1}) - a_{n-1}x^{n-1} - \dots - a_0 = x^n$. As such, $P(n)$ is also true.

Thus, $P(n) - \text{True} \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ so we have that D is surjective.

Exercise 29. Suppose $p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$. Prove that there exists a polynomial $q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ such that $5q'' + 3q' = p$.

Solution. We can just define $D \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}))$ such that $D(q) = 5q'' + 3q'$. It is clear that it has the property from exercise 28, so we can use the result and say that D is surjective, therefore for every $p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$, there exists q such that $D(q) = p$, Q.E.D.

Exercise 30. Suppose $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}(V, \mathbb{F})$ and $\varphi \neq 0$. Suppose $u \in V$ is not in $\text{null } \varphi$. Prove that

$$V = \text{null } \varphi \oplus \{au : a \in \mathbb{F}\}$$

Solution. $\text{range } \varphi$ is a subspace of F , therefore $\dim \text{range } \varphi \in \{0, 1\}$. However, $\varphi \neq 0$, which means that $\dim \text{range } \varphi = 1$. Therefore, $\dim V = \dim \text{null } \varphi + 1$.

Now, let's analyze what $\text{null } \varphi \cup \{au : a \in \mathbb{F}\}$ looks like. If $x \in \text{null } \varphi$, $\varphi(x) = 0$. If $x \in \{au : a \in \mathbb{F}\}$, then there exists a' such that $x = a'u$. Putting them together, we get that $\varphi(a'u) = 0$, so $a'\varphi(u) = 0$. We know that $\varphi(u)$ cannot be 0, so $a' = 0$, so $x = 0$. Thus, $\text{null } \varphi \cup \{au : a \in \mathbb{F}\} = \{0\}$. This means $\text{null } \varphi + \{au : a \in \mathbb{F}\} = \text{null } \varphi \oplus \{au : a \in \mathbb{F}\}$.

From theory this means that $\dim(\text{null } \varphi \oplus \{au : a \in \mathbb{F}\}) = \dim \text{null } \varphi + \dim \{au : a \in \mathbb{F}\} = \dim \text{null } \varphi + 1$. But $\dim V = \dim \text{null } \varphi + 1$ and the direct sum is a subspace of V , therefore they must be equal Q.E.D.

Exercise 31. Suppose V is finite-dimensional, X is a subspace of V , and Y is a finite-dimensional subspace of W . Prove that there exists $T \in \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}$ such that $\text{null } T = X$ and $\text{range } T = Y$ if and only if $\dim X + \dim Y = \dim V$.

Solution. The left to right proposition is: There exists $T \in \mathcal{L}(V, W)$ such that $\text{null } T = X$ and $\text{range } T = Y$. Prove that $\dim X + \dim Y = \dim V$. This comes easily from the Fundamental Theorem of Linear Maps, $\dim \text{null } T + \dim \text{range } T = \dim X + \dim Y = \dim V$.

The right to left proposition is: If $\dim X + \dim Y = \dim V$ then there exists $T \in \mathcal{L}(V, W)$ such that $\text{null } T = X$ and $\text{range } T = Y$. We will get the basis of X to be x_1, \dots, x_n with $n = \dim X$. Then we are going to extend this basis with the vectors b_{n+1}, \dots, b_m where $m = \dim V$. Now we know that $\dim Y = m - n$. We can construct the following linear map T : $T(x_i) = 0, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $T(b_j) = y_{j-n}, \forall j \in n+1, \dots, m$, where y_1, \dots, y_{m-n} is a basis of Y . With this construction, x_1, \dots, x_n will be the basis of $\text{null } T$ and $T(b_j) = y_{j-n}$ will be the basis of $\text{range } T$. This means that the basis of X is the basis of $\text{null } T$ and the basis of Y is the basis of $\text{range } T$, so $\text{null } T = X$, $\text{range } T = Y$. Q.E.D.

Exercise 32. Suppose V is finite-dimensional with $\dim V > 1$. Show that if $\varphi : \mathcal{L}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ is a linear map such that $\varphi(ST) = \varphi(S)\varphi(T)$ for all $S, T \in \mathcal{V}$, then $\varphi = 0$.

Solution. Let $x \in \text{null } \varphi$. Let $E \in \mathcal{V}$ be a random element of that set. We will have:

- $\varphi(xE) = \varphi(x)\varphi(E) = 0$, so $xE \in \text{null } \varphi$.
- $\varphi(Ex) = \varphi(E)\varphi(x) = 0$, so $Ex \in \text{null } \varphi$.

Therefore $\text{null } \varphi$ is a two-sided ideal of $\mathcal{L}(V)$. Using the hint, this means that $\text{null } \varphi$ is either $\{0\}$ or $\mathcal{L}(V)$.

We need to show that there is a non-zero map in $\text{null } \varphi$ and then that means $\text{null } \varphi = \mathcal{L}(V)$, so $\varphi = 0$.

We need to create S and T such that $ST = 0$ but $S \neq 0$ and $T \neq 0$. We can do this by taking a basis of V , v_1, \dots, v_n with $n = \dim V \geq 1$ and then we define:

- $S(v_1) = v_1, S(v_2) = S(v_3) = \dots = S(v_n) = 0$
- $T(v_1) = T(v_2) = \dots = T(v_n) = 0$

We are guaranteed that $v_1 \neq v_2$ because $n \geq 2$. Therefore $ST(v_i) = 0, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ so we have that $\varphi(ST) = 0 = \varphi(S) * \varphi(T)$ which means that either $S \in \text{null } \varphi$ or $T \in \text{null } \varphi$. This means that there is a non trivial element in $\text{null } \varphi$. Q.E.D.

Exercise 33. This exercise will be added later.