

**EXAM 2 SOLUTIONS**

This is an closed book, closed notes exam. No calculators are allowed.

**Useful shorthand:** Feel free to write:

- “LI” instead of “linearly independent”
- “LD” instead of “linearly dependent”
- “LT” instead of “linear transformation”
- “v.s.” instead of “vector space”
- “f.d.”, or “fin. dim.” instead of “finite dimensional”. You can also write “ $\dim V < \infty$ ” for “ $V$  is finite dimensional”.

If you use this, make sure you write **very clearly**.

**Reminders:** A *linear operator* on a vector space  $V$  is a linear map  $T : V \rightarrow V$ . If  $T$  is a linear operator on a vector space  $V$ , and  $W \subset V$  is  $T$ -invariant, then  $T_W$  denotes the linear operator  $T_W : W \rightarrow W$  given by  $T_W(w) = T(w)$ . Also, if  $v \in V$ , then the  $T$ -invariant subspace generated by  $v$  is  $\langle v \rangle_T := \text{Span}\{v, Tv, T^2v, \dots\}$ .

For a linear operator  $T : V \rightarrow V$ , if  $\beta$  is a basis of  $V$ , then  $[T]_\beta$  denotes the matrix of  $T$  w.r.t. the basis  $\beta$ . If  $V = \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\text{std} := \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$  denotes the standard basis.

If you are asked to prove and if and only if (“ $\iff$ ”), then you must prove *both directions*. If you are asked to prove that two sets  $A, B$  are equal, then you must prove  $A \subset B$  and  $B \subset A$ .

Every vector space is implicitly over some field  $F$ . Recall the definition of a field:

**Definition 0.0.1** (Fields). A field  $F$  is a set with two operations  $+$  :  $F \times F \rightarrow F$  and  $\cdot$  :  $F \times F \rightarrow F$ , such that the following hold for all  $a, b, c \in F$ :

(F1)  $a + b = b + a$  and  $a \cdot b = b \cdot a$

(F2)  $(a + b) + c = a + (b + c)$  and  $(a \cdot b) \cdot c = a \cdot (b \cdot c)$

(F3) There exist distinct elements “0” and “1” in  $F$  such that

$$0 + a = a \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \cdot a = a$$

(F4) For each  $a \in F$  and *nonzero*  $b \in F$ , there exist elements  $c, d \in F$  such that

$$a + c = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad b \cdot d = 1$$

(F5)  $a \cdot (b + c) = a \cdot b + a \cdot c$

In F4,  $c$  is called the negative of  $a$ , denoted “ $-a$ ”, and  $d$  is called the multiplicative inverse of  $b$ , denoted “ $b^{-1}$ ” or “ $1/b$ ”.

1. (24 points, 3 points each) Label the following statements (T)rue or (F)alse. Include a short justification of your answer.

- (a) If  $\lambda$  is an eigenvalue of a linear operator  $T$  on  $V$ , then  $E_\lambda := \{v \in V \mid Tv = \lambda v\}$  is the span of the  $\lambda$ -eigenvectors.

**Solution.** TRUE. Every nonzero vector in  $E_\lambda$  is a  $\lambda$ -eigenvector, and any vector space is spanned by its nonzero vectors.

- (b) If  $T$  is a linear operator on a 2-dimensional vector space, then  $T$  is diagonalizable if and only if it has at least one eigenvalue.

**Solution.** FALSE. Take for example  $T = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$  on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .

- (c) If  $\dim V < \infty$ ,  $T : V \rightarrow V$  is linear, and  $\beta, \beta'$  are two bases for  $V$ , then  $[T]_\beta$  and  $[T]_{\beta'}$  have the same characteristic polynomial.

**Solution.** TRUE. Let  $Q := [I]_{\beta}^{\beta'}$ , then  $[T]_\beta = Q^{-1}[T]_{\beta'}Q$ , so  $[T]_\beta$  is similar to  $[T]_{\beta'}$ , so they have the same characteristic polynomial.

- (d) If  $T$  is a linear operator on a finite dimensional vector space, then  $T$  is 1-1 if and only if it is onto.

**Solution.** TRUE. By rank-nullity,  $\text{nullity}(T) + \text{rank}(T) = \dim V$ . Thus  $T$  is 1-1 if and only if  $\text{nullity}(T) = 0$  if and only if  $\text{rank}(T) = \dim V$  if and only if  $T$  is onto.

- (e) Let  $T$  be a linear operator on a vector space  $V$  with distinct eigenvalues  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$ . If  $S_i$  is a linearly independent subset of  $E_{\lambda_i}$ , then  $S_1 \cup S_2 \cup \dots \cup S_k$  is linearly independent.

**Solution.** TRUE. This is theorem 5.5 in the book.

- (f) If  $A \in M_n(F)$  and  $\mu \in F$ , then  $\det(\mu A) = \mu \det(A)$ .

**Solution.** FALSE. Take  $A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ , then  $\det(2A) = 4$  which is not equal to  $2 \det(A) = 2$ .

- (g) If  $A, B \in M_n(F)$ , then  $\det(AB) = \det(BA)$ .

**Solution.** TRUE. We know  $\det(AB) = \det(A) \det(B)$  and  $\det(BA) = \det(B) \det(A)$ , but  $\det(A) \det(B) = \det(B) \det(A)$  since determinants lie in  $F$  and  $xy = yx$  in any field.

- (h) The linear map  $T : P_3(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow P_3(\mathbb{R})$  given by  $T(f(x)) = f'(x)$  has no eigenvalues.

**Solution.** FALSE, it has 0 as an eigenvalue, since  $T(x) = 0$ .

2. (10 pts) Let  $T : V \rightarrow V$  be a linear operator. Let  $\mu, \lambda$  be two distinct eigenvalues of  $T$ . Show that  $E_\mu \cap E_\lambda = \{0\}$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $v \in E_\mu \cap E_\lambda$ . Since  $v \in E_\mu$ , we know  $Tv = \mu v$ . Since  $v \in E_\lambda$ , we know  $Tv = \lambda v$ . Thus we have  $\mu v = \lambda v$ , so  $\mu v - \lambda v = \vec{0}$ , so

$$(\mu - \lambda)v = \vec{0}$$

Since  $\mu \neq \lambda$ ,  $\mu - \lambda \neq 0$ , so it has an inverse in  $F$ . Multiplying both sides of the above equation by its inverse, we get

$$v = (\mu - \lambda)^{-1}\vec{0} = \vec{0}$$

This shows that any vector in  $E_\mu \cap E_\lambda$  must be equal to 0, as desired.  $\square$

3. (a) (8 pts) Show that 0 is an eigenvalue of the matrix  $X$  with a 1-dimensional eigenspace. Hint: Don't try to compute the characteristic polynomial.

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -3 & -1 & 2 \\ 3 & -8 & -1 & 5 \\ 5 & -14 & 0 & 10 \\ -2 & 6 & 5 & -3 \end{bmatrix}$$

*Proof.* Computing determinants of 4x4 matrices without a lot of zeroes is very cumbersome. Instead, we will directly calculate the null space  $N(X)$  and show that it is 1-dimensional. For this we simply row reduce. Using the first row to make zeroes in the first column, we get

$$\rightsquigarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -3 & -1 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 5 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 3 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Doing the same with the second and third columns, we get

$$\rightsquigarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -3 & -1 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 3 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 3 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \rightsquigarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -3 & -1 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 3 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

It follows that there are 3 pivots, so  $X$  has rank 3 and hence nullity 1. Since the eigenspace for the eigenvalue 0 is  $N(X - 0I) = N(X)$ , this shows that the 0-eigenspace is 1-dimensional.  $\square$

- (b) (3 pts) What is  $\det(X)$ ?

**Solution.** Since  $X$  has positive nullity, it is not invertible, so  $\det(X) = 0$ . In general, we have:

$$\det(X) = 0 \iff 0 \text{ is an eigenvalue of } X \iff N(X) \neq \{0\}$$

4. (10 pts) Is the matrix

$$A := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 2 \\ -1 & 3 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$$

diagonalizable? If so, find a diagonal matrix  $D$  and an invertible matrix  $Q$  such that  $Q^{-1}AQ = D$ .

**Solution.** Since  $A$  has two identical rows, clearly  $\text{rank}(A) \leq 2$ , so  $\text{nullity}(A) \geq 1$ , so  $0$  is an eigenvalue of  $A$ . However to check for diagonalizability, we need to understand its other eigenvalues. Its characteristic polynomial can be computed by cofactor expansion along the first row:

$$\chi_A(t) = \det \begin{bmatrix} 1-t & 0 & 2 \\ -1 & 3-t & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 2-t \end{bmatrix} = (1-t) \det \begin{bmatrix} 3-t & 1 \\ 0 & 2-t \end{bmatrix} + 2 \det \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 3-t \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\dots = (1-t)(3-t)(2-t) - 2(3-t) = (t^2 - 3t + 2)(3-t) - 2(3-t) = (t^2 - 3t)(3-t) = -t(t-3)^2$$

It follows that the eigenvalues of  $A$  are  $0, 3$  with multiplicities  $1$  and  $2$  respectively. To check for diagonalizability, it suffices to show that the  $3$ -eigenspace  $E_3$  is  $2$ -dimensional. For this, we need to compute

$$N(A - 3I) = N \left( \begin{bmatrix} -2 & 0 & 2 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \right) = \text{Span} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\}$$

It follows that  $E_3$  is  $2$ -dimensional, with basis  $(1, 0, 1), (0, 1, 0)$ , so  $A$  is diagonalizable. To compute  $Q$ , we must find a basis for each eigenspace. We already did this for  $E_3$ . For  $E_0$ , we have  $N(A - 0I) = N(A)$ . This can be computed by row-reduction. Performing a sequence of elementary row operations, we get

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 2 \\ -1 & 3 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \rightsquigarrow Z_1 A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 3 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \rightsquigarrow Z_2 Z_1 A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Where  $Z_1, Z_2$  are each a product of elementary matrices. Clearly

$$N(Z_2 Z_1 A) = \text{Span} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} -2 \\ -1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\}$$

But since  $N(A) = N(Z_2 Z_1 A)$ , it follows that  $(-2, -1, 1)$  is a basis for  $E_0 = N(A)$ . This can also be verified directly by checking that  $A \cdot (-2, -1, 1) = \vec{0}$ . Thus, we find that

$$\beta = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} -2 \\ -1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\}$$

is an eigenbasis for  $A$ . Thus we can take  $Q$  to be any matrix which sends the standard basis to the eigenbasis (in whatever order). If we send  $e_i \mapsto \beta_i$ , then we should take  $Q$  to be

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} -2 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{in which case} \quad Q^{-1}AQ = D = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 3 \end{bmatrix}$$

5. Let  $T : \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$  be given by:

$$T(x, y, z, w) = (x + y + 2z - w, x + 2y + 3z - w, -x + 3y + 2z + w, 3y + 2z + 2w)$$

- (a) (5 pts) Let  $W := \langle e_1 \rangle_T$  be the  $T$ -invariant subspace generated by  $e_1$ . Show that  $\dim W = 3$ . Hint: It may help to write down the matrix  $[T]_{\text{std}}$ .

**Solution.** The matrix for  $T$  is:

$$[T] = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 & -1 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & -1 \\ -1 & 3 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 3 & 2 & 2 \end{bmatrix}, \text{ and } e_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, T e_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ -1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, T^2 e_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, T^3 e_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -1 \\ -1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$$

It's easy to see that the first three vectors are linearly independent, whereas  $T^3 e_1 = 2T^2 e_1 - T e_1$ . Thus  $W = \langle e_1 \rangle_T$  is 3-dimensional.

- (b) (4 pts) Find the matrix of  $T_W$  with respect to the basis  $\{e_1, T e_1, T^2 e_1\}$  of  $W$ .

**Solution.** Let  $\beta = \{e_1, T e_1, T^2 e_1\}$ . By Theorem 5.21 in the book, we have

$$[T_W]_{\beta} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$$

- (c) (4 pts) Find the characteristic polynomial of  $T_W$ .

**Solution.** By Theorem 5.21 in the book, the characteristic polynomial of  $T_W$  is  $\chi_{T_W}(t) = (-1)^3(t - 2t^2 + t^3) = -t(t^2 - 2t + 1) = -t(t - 1)^2$ .

- (d) (5 pts) Is the characteristic polynomial of  $T$  split (over  $\mathbb{R}$ )? Why?

**Solution.** Yes, because  $\chi_{T_W}(t)$  must divide  $\chi_T(t)$ . This means that  $\chi_T(t) = \chi_{T_W}(t)f(t) = -t(t - 1)^2 f(t)$  for some polynomial  $f(t)$ . Since  $\chi_T$  has degree 4 and  $\chi_{T_W}$  has degree 3,  $f(t)$  is degree 1, so  $\chi_T(t)$  is split.

- (e) (5 pts) Is  $T_W$  diagonalizable? Is  $T$  diagonalizable? Why?

**Solution.** The eigenvalues of  $T_W$  are 0,1. The 1-eigenspace  $E_1$  of  $T_W$  has the same dim. as

$$N([T_W]_{\beta} - I_3) = N\left(\begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}\right)$$

which clearly has dimension 1. Thus the 1-eigenspace of  $E_1$  has dimension 1 which is less than the multiplicity of the eigenvalue 1. It follows that  $T_W$  is not diagonalizable.

We claim that this implies that  $T$  is not diagonalizable. Suppose for the sake of a contradiction that  $T$  is diagonalizable. Then  $V$  has an eigenbasis, so every  $w \in W$  can be written as  $a_1 v_{w,1} + \dots + a_r v_{w,r}$ , where the  $v'_{w,i}$  are eigenvectors of  $T$  with distinct eigenvalues (if there are multiple eigenvectors for the same eigenvalue involved in the linear combination, you can treat their sum as a single eigenvector). By §5.4 Exercise 23, this implies that  $v_{w,i}$  lies in  $W$  for every  $w \in W$  and every  $i$ . Thus,  $W$  is spanned by eigenvectors, so a maximal linear independent subset is an eigenbasis. This shows that  $T_W$  would be diagonalizable, which we already found to be false.

6. (10 points) Suppose  $T$  is a linear operator on a 4-dimensional vector space  $V$  with  $\det(T) = 0$ . Suppose  $W \subset V$  is a 3-dimensional  $T$ -invariant subspace such that  $T_W$  is diagonalizable and  $\det(T_W) \neq 0$ . Prove that  $T$  is diagonalizable.

*Proof.* Since  $\det(T) = 0$ , 0 is an eigenvalue of  $T$ , so  $t$  divides  $\chi_T(t)$ . Since  $\det(T_W) \neq 0$ , 0 is not an eigenvalue of  $T_W$ , so  $t$  does not divide  $\chi_{T_W}(t)$ . Since  $\chi_{T_W}(t)$  has degree 3 and divides  $\chi_T(t)$ , this means that  $t$  can divide  $\chi_T(t)$  at most once, so it must divide  $\chi_T(t)$  exactly once. In fact we must have

$$\chi_T(t) = -t \cdot \chi_{T_W}(t)$$

Since  $T_W$  is diagonalizable, for each root  $\lambda$  of  $\chi_{T_W}(t)$ , the  $\lambda$ -eigenspace of  $T_W$  has dimension equal to the multiplicity of  $\lambda$  as a root of  $\chi_{T_W}$ . Since 0 is not a root of  $\chi_{T_W}$ , the multiplicity of  $\lambda$  as a root of  $\chi_{T_W}$  is the same as its multiplicity as a root of  $\chi_T$ . Since the  $\lambda$ -eigenspace for  $T_W$  is contained in the  $\lambda$ -eigenspace for  $T$  (and is already the maximum possible, equal to the multiplicity), it follows that every eigenspace has dimension equal to the multiplicity, so  $T$  is diagonalizable. □

7. Every complex number can be represented uniquely as a sum  $a + bi$ , where  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ . One can check that  $\mathbb{C}$  is a vector space over  $\mathbb{R}$  with basis  $\beta = \{1, i\}$ . If  $z = a + bi \in \mathbb{C}$ , write  $m_z : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  for the “multiplication map”  $m_z(w) = zw$ .

- (a) (2 pts) Show that  $m_z : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is a linear map of  $\mathbb{R}$ -vector spaces.

*Proof.* For additivity:

$$m_z(w + w') = z(w + w') = zw + zw' = m_z(w) + m_z(w')$$

Here we used the distributivity axiom “(F5)” of fields (see page 1). For scalar-multiplicativity:

$$m_z(aw) = zaw = azw = am_z(w)$$

Here we used the commutativity axiom “(F1)”. □

- (b) (4 pts) Find the matrix  $[m_z]_\beta$  in terms of  $a$  and  $b$ .

**Solution.** We know  $m_z(\beta_1) = m_z(1) = z = a + bi$ , and  $m_z(\beta_2) = m_z(i) = iz = ai + bi^2 = -b + ai$ . Thus, we have

$$[m_z]_\beta = \begin{bmatrix} a & -b \\ b & a \end{bmatrix}$$

- (c) (3 pts) Compute the eigenvalues of  $[m_z]_\beta$  viewed as a matrix in  $M_2(\mathbb{C})$ .

**Solution.** We have  $\chi_{[m_z]_\beta}(t) = (a - t)^2 + b^2 = t^2 - at^2 + a^2 + b^2$ . By the quadratic formula, its roots are  $a + bi, a - bi$ , which are the eigenvalues of  $[m_z]_\beta$ .

- (d) (3 pts) Find the matrix  $[m_i]_\beta$ , where  $i \in \mathbb{C}$  is the imaginary unit. Describe how  $m_i$  acts geometrically on the complex plane.

**Solution.** From the formula in part (b), we have  $[m_i]_\beta = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ . It acts on  $\mathbb{C}$  by rotating everything counterclockwise around the origin by 90 degrees.