

# Math 416: Abstract Linear Algebra

Date: Oct. 27, 2025

Lecture: 22

## Announcements

- HW 7 due Friday @ 9pm
- Midterms will be graded by Friday  
↳ Corrections due next Fri (Nov 7)

## Last time

- upper-triangular matrices

## This time

- Upper-triangular matrices (existence proof)
- Diagonalizable & commuting operators

## Reading/watching

- §5C-E of Axler 4<sup>th</sup> ed.

Recall from lecture 21 we proved  
the following prop. relating invariant  
Subspaces & upper-tri. matrices

### 5.39 conditions for upper-triangular matrix

Suppose  $T \in \mathcal{L}(V)$  and  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  is a basis of  $V$ . Then the following are equivalent.

- (a) The matrix of  $T$  with respect to  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  is upper triangular.
- (b)  $\text{span}(v_1, \dots, v_k)$  is invariant under  $T$  for each  $k = 1, \dots, n$ .
- (c)  $Tv_k \in \text{span}(v_1, \dots, v_k)$  for each  $k = 1, \dots, n$ .

We know eigenvalues are related to invariant subspaces & we have now related upper-tri matrices to invariant subspaces...

So, if eigenvalues always exist, does a basis making an operator upper-triangular always exist?

5.47 if  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ , then every operator on  $V$  has an upper-triangular matrix

Suppose  $V$  is a finite-dimensional complex vector space and  $T \in \mathcal{L}(V)$ . Then  $T$  has an upper-triangular matrix with respect to some basis of  $V$ .

Note: I prefer the proof in the third edition of Axler b/c it is slightly more self contained.

Proof. We will use induction on  $\dim V$ .

Base case ( $\dim V = 1$ ): Trivially true.

Induction hypothesis: Suppose  $\dim V > 1$  & result holds for all complex vs w/ dimension strictly less than  $\dim V$ .

In any such space, we know an eigenvalue of  $T$  will exist. Let  $\lambda$  be said eigenval & let

$$U = \text{range}(T - \lambda I)$$

B/c  $\lambda$  is an eigenval  $\Rightarrow T - \lambda I$  is not surj. thus  $\dim U < \dim V$ .

Moreover,  $U$  is invariant under  $T$ . To see this, let  $v \in U$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}Tv &= T_U - \lambda v + \lambda v \\&= \underbrace{(T - \lambda I)v}_{\in U} + \underbrace{\lambda v}_{\in U}\end{aligned}$$

$\therefore Tv \in U$ , so  $U$  is invar. under  $T$ .

This establishes that  $T|_U$  is an operator on  $U$ . By ind. hyp.,  $\exists$  basis

$u_1, \dots, u_m$  of  $U$  s.t.  $T|_U$  is upper-tri.

Then, using Prop 5.39,  $\forall j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$

$$Tu_j = (T|_U)(u_j) \in \text{Span}(u_1, \dots, u_j)$$

Extend  $u_1, \dots, u_m$  to a basis  $u_1, \dots, u_m, v_1, \dots, v_n$  of  $V$ . For each  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}Tv_k &= Tv_k - \lambda v_k + \lambda v_k \\&= \underbrace{(T - \lambda I)v_k}_{\in U} + \lambda v_k \\&\Rightarrow Tv_k \in \text{Span}(u_1, \dots, u_m, v_1, \dots, v_n)\end{aligned}$$

Thus, again by 5.39, we have that  $T$  has an upper-triang. w.r.t  $u_1, \dots, u_m, v_1, \dots, v_n$ . □

If we can find this basis, which is not always easy, we can simply read off the eigenvals.

Example. From before,

$$T(x, y, z) = (2x+y, 5y+3z, 8z).$$

↓  
standard basis

$$M(T) = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 5 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$$

Thus, eigenvalues are simply 2, 5, 8.

See Axier 5.41 for proof.

#### 5.41 determination of eigenvalues from upper-triangular matrix

Suppose  $T \in \mathcal{L}(V)$  has an upper-triangular matrix with respect to some basis of  $V$ . Then the eigenvalues of  $T$  are precisely the entries on the diagonal of that upper-triangular matrix.

# Diagonalizable Operators

Upper-triangular matrices exist for all operators on complex vector spaces.

- pro: we can read off eigenvalues!
- cons:
  - eigenvectors require more work to be determined
  - raising operator to higher powers is still tedious

We'd like to find a basis for  $V$  s.t.  $T \in L(V)$  has matrix

$$M(T) = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & & & 0 \\ & a_{22} & & \\ 0 & & \ddots & \\ & & & a_{nn} \end{pmatrix}$$

Such matrices are called **diagonal** & the corresponding operator is called **diagonalizable**.

# Eigenspaces

When can we diagonalize  $T \in L(V)$ ?

The following def. will allow us to succinctly state the conditions

5.52 definition: *eigenspace*,  $E(\lambda, T)$

Suppose  $T \in L(V)$  and  $\lambda \in F$ . The *eigenspace* of  $T$  corresponding to  $\lambda$  is the subspace  $E(\lambda, T)$  of  $V$  defined by

$$E(\lambda, T) = \text{null}(T - \lambda I) = \{v \in V : Tv = \lambda v\}.$$

Hence  $E(\lambda, T)$  is the set of all eigenvectors of  $T$  corresponding to  $\lambda$ , along with the 0 vector.

$\hookrightarrow E(\lambda, T)$  is a subspace of  $V$

$\hookrightarrow \lambda$  is an eigenvalue of  $T$  iff  
 $E(\lambda, T) \neq \{0\}$

## Example

Let  $T \in L(V)$  &  $\{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$  be a basis of  $V$

5.6.  $M(T) = \begin{pmatrix} 8 & 0 \\ 0 & 5 \end{pmatrix}$  Then,  $E(8, T) = \text{span}(v_1)$   
&  $E(5, T) = \text{span}(v_2, v_3)$

With the above def in mind, we have the following proposition.

### 5.54 sum of eigenspaces is a direct sum

Suppose  $T \in \mathcal{L}(V)$  and  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m$  are distinct eigenvalues of  $T$ . Then

$$E(\lambda_1, T) + \cdots + E(\lambda_m, T)$$

is a direct sum. Furthermore, if  $V$  is finite-dimensional, then

$$\dim E(\lambda_1, T) + \cdots + \dim E(\lambda_m, T) \leq \dim V.$$

**Proof.** To show that  $\sum_{i=1}^m E(\lambda_i, T)$  is

a direct sum, suppose

$$\sum_{i=1}^m v_i = 0,$$

where  $v_i \in E(\lambda_i, T) \quad \forall i \in [1, m]$ .

Since each  $v_i$  is an eigenvector corresponding to distinct eigenvalue,  $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^m$  is a LI list. Thus  $v_i = 0 \quad \forall i \quad \& \quad \text{so} \quad \sum_{i=1}^m (\lambda_i, T) \text{ is}$  a direct sum (by Axier 1.45). Moreover

$$\dim E(\lambda_1, T) + \cdots + \dim E(\lambda_m, T) = \dim [E(\lambda_1, T) \oplus \cdots \oplus E(\lambda_m, T)]$$

Axier 2.37  $\rightarrow \leq \dim V$



Note: in the above inequality, we simply used that the dimension of a subspace is less than or equal to the dim of the full space.

If  $m = \dim V$  (i.e. we have a # of distinct eigenvalues equal to the dimension of the space) then each eigenspace is 1D and we have  $m$  of them thus

$$\sum_{k=1}^m \dim E(\lambda_k, T) = \dim V.$$

However, if we have multiplicities, we will "miss" some dimensions. In other words, eigenvectors corresponding to the same eigenvalue may be linearly dependent.

Lets do a concrete example

## Example

Consider  $T : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  s.t.

$$M(T) = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{w.r.t. Standard basis.}$$

Let  $v_1, v_2$  be two eigenvectors

of  $T$  w.r.t. matrices  $v_1 = \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix}, v_2 = \begin{pmatrix} c \\ d \end{pmatrix}$

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix} = 2 \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix} \quad \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c \\ d \end{pmatrix} = 2 \begin{pmatrix} c \\ d \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2a+b \\ 0a+2b \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 2a \\ 2b \end{pmatrix} \quad \begin{pmatrix} 2c+d \\ 0c+2d \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 2c \\ 2d \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\Rightarrow b=0$$

$$\Rightarrow d=0$$

$$\Rightarrow v_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\Rightarrow v_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Thus  $E(2, T) = \text{Span}(v_1, v_2) = \text{Span}(v_1)$   
 $\therefore \dim E(2, T) = 1 < 2.$

# Conditions for diagonalizability

## 5.55 conditions equivalent to diagonalizability

Suppose  $V$  is finite-dimensional and  $T \in \mathcal{L}(V)$ . Let  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m$  denote the distinct eigenvalues of  $T$ . Then the following are equivalent.

- (a)  $T$  is diagonalizable.
- (b)  $V$  has a basis consisting of eigenvectors of  $T$ .
- (c)  $V = E(\lambda_1, T) \oplus \dots \oplus E(\lambda_m, T)$ .
- (d)  $\dim V = \dim E(\lambda_1, T) + \dots + \dim E(\lambda_m, T)$ .

**Proof.** ( $a \Leftrightarrow b$ )

$T \in \mathcal{L}(V)$  has a matrix w.r.t basis  $\{v_k\}_{k=1}^n$

iff  $Tv_k = \lambda_k v_k \quad \forall k$  essentially by def.

$$\begin{matrix} v_1 & \cdots & v_n \\ \vdots & & \end{matrix} \left( \begin{matrix} \lambda_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \lambda_n \end{matrix} \right) \iff Tv_k = \lambda_k v_k$$

$(b \Rightarrow c)$  If b) holds,  $V$  has a basis consisting of eigenvectors of  $T$ . Thus, all  $v \in V$  may be expressed

$$v = \sum_{k=1}^m \underbrace{a_k v_k}_{\in E(\lambda_k, T)}$$

$$\text{Thus, } V = \sum_{k=1}^m E(\lambda_k, T) \quad \text{by Axler 5.54,}$$

$$V = \bigoplus_{k=1}^m E(\lambda_k, T),$$

so c) holds.

(c  $\Rightarrow$  d) Follows from Axler 3.94

$\sum_{k=1}^m V_k$  is a direct sum iff

$$\dim\left(\sum_{k=1}^m V_k\right) = \sum_{k=1}^m \dim V_k$$

(d  $\Rightarrow$  b) Want to show

$\dim V = \sum_{k=1}^m \dim E(\lambda_k, T) \Rightarrow V$  has a basis consisting of eigenvectors of  $T$ .

Choose basis of each  $E(\lambda_k, T)$  & consider list  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  ( $n = \dim V$ ). To see that this list is LI (& thus a basis) suppose

$$\sum_{k=1}^n a_k v_k = 0. \text{ Partition } n \text{ into } m \text{ bins}$$

and let  $U_k$  be the sum of all  $a_j v_j$  s.t.  $v_j \in E(\lambda_k, T) \quad \forall k = 1, \dots, m$ .

Thus  $v_k \in E(\lambda_k, T) \Rightarrow v_1 + \cdots + v_m = 0$ .

But  $v_1, \dots, v_m$  are eigenvectors corresponding to distinct eigenvalues, thus  $v_1, \dots, v_m$  must be LI  $\Rightarrow v_k = 0 \ \forall k$ . But each  $v_k$  is a sum of  $a_j v_j$  terms where  $v_j$  was a basis of  $E(\lambda_k, T)$ .

Thus  $a_j = 0 \ \forall j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  is LI as desired.

□

### 5.58 enough eigenvalues implies diagonalizability

Suppose  $V$  is finite-dimensional and  $T \in \mathcal{L}(V)$  has  $\dim V$  distinct eigenvalues. Then  $T$  is diagonalizable.

**Proof.** Eigenvectors corresponding to distinct eigenvalues are LI.

An LI list of length  $= \dim V$  is a basis of  $V$ . Thus, if we have  $\dim V$  LI eigenvectors,  $T$  is diag. w.r.t to this basis □

# Commuting Operators

## 5.71 definition: *commute*

- Two operators  $S$  and  $T$  on the same vector space *commute* if  $ST = TS$ .
- Two square matrices  $A$  and  $B$  of the same size *commute* if  $AB = BA$ .

## 5.74 commuting operators correspond to commuting matrices

Suppose  $S, T \in \mathcal{L}(V)$  and  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  is a basis of  $V$ . Then  $S$  and  $T$  commute if and only if  $\mathcal{M}(S, (v_1, \dots, v_n))$  and  $\mathcal{M}(T, (v_1, \dots, v_n))$  commute.

## 5.75 eigenspace is invariant under commuting operator

Suppose  $S, T \in \mathcal{L}(V)$  commute and  $\lambda \in \mathbf{F}$ . Then  $E(\lambda, S)$  is invariant under  $T$ .

## 5.76 simultaneous diagonalizability $\iff$ commutativity

Two diagonalizable operators on the same vector space have diagonal matrices with respect to the same basis if and only if the two operators commute.

## 5.78 common eigenvector for commuting operators

Every pair of commuting operators on a finite-dimensional nonzero complex vector space has a common eigenvector.

## 5.80 commuting operators are simultaneously upper triangularizable

Suppose  $V$  is a finite-dimensional complex vector space and  $S, T$  are commuting operators on  $V$ . Then there is a basis of  $V$  with respect to which both  $S$  and  $T$  have upper-triangular matrices.