

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:

$$T(z_1, \dots, z_m) = z_1 v_1 + \dots + z_m v_m.$$

- 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 $\text{range } T$ is just $\text{span } V$.
- 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}^5 . 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 $\dim \text{range } T = 2$. 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 $(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)w_1 + (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)w_2 + \sum_{i=3}^n w_i = 0$. 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.