# Topic#17 Normal operator & Self-adjoint operator

**Goal:** Recall that for  $A \in M_{n \times n}(F)$   $(F = \mathbb{C} \text{ or } \mathbb{R})$ ,

A is normal 
$$\iff AA^* = A^*A$$
.

- 1°. Define a normal operator  $T \in \mathcal{L}(V)$ ?
- 2°. Characterize a normal operator  $T \in \mathcal{L}(V)$ ?
- 3°. A self-adjoint matrix (i.e.  $A = A^*$ ) is normal. Can we do a similar extension as well as its characterization?

**Other terminology:** A complex self-adjoint matrix is also usually called a **Hermitian** matrix. Hermitian matrices can be understood as the complex extension of real symmetric matrices.

Throughout this topic, we always let  $T \in \mathcal{L}(V)$ , where V is an i.p.s. (dim can be finite or infinite). Assume that  $T^* \in \mathcal{L}(V)$  exists.

Def.

```
T is normal if TT^* = T^*T.
```

T is self-adjoint if  $T = T^*$ .

Note: Similar to the matrix case, if T is self-adjoint, then it's also normal.

## 1<sup>st</sup> goal is to show:

<u>**Theorem.**</u> Let  $T \in \mathcal{L}(V)$ , where V is a complex i.p.s. with  $\underline{dim}(V) < \infty$ . Then T is normal **iff**  $\exists$  an orthonormal basis for V consisting of eigenvectors of T.

We divide the proof by a few steps.

# **Step 1.** Proof of " $\Leftarrow$ ":

Let  $n = \dim(V)$  and  $\beta = \{v_1, ..., v_n\}$  be an orthonormal basis for V of eigenvectors of T, with

$$T(v_i) = \lambda_i v_i, \quad \lambda_i \in \mathbb{C}, 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

Then,  $[T]_{\beta} = \operatorname{diag}(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n)$  is diagonal, and hence  $[T^*]_{\beta} = ([T]_{\beta})^* = \operatorname{diag}(\overline{\lambda}_1, ..., \overline{\lambda}_n)$  is also diagonal. Note:  $\lambda_i \overline{\lambda_i} = |\lambda_i|^2$ , then

$$[TT^*]_{\beta} = [T]_{\beta}[T^*]_{\beta} = \begin{pmatrix} |\lambda_1|^2 \cdots & 0\\ \vdots & \vdots\\ 0 & \cdots & |\lambda_n|^2 \end{pmatrix} = [T^*]_{\beta}[T]_{\beta} = [T^*T]_{\beta}.$$

So, it follows  $[TT^*]_{\beta} = [T^*T]_{\beta}$ . One then has  $TT^* = T^*T$ .

**Remark:** "  $\Leftarrow$  " is also true if V is a finite-dim real i.p.s.

But, the converse statement "  $\Rightarrow$  "may not be true in the following cases:

- (a) V is a finite-dim real i.p.s.
- (b) V is an infinite-dim complex i.p.s.

#### Counterexample to treat case

(a) V is a finite-dim real i.p.s.:

In the previous lecture we showed that the rotation  $T_{\pi/2} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^2)$  has no eigenvector. But,

$$T_{\pi/2} = L_A, \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \ T^*_{\pi/2} = L_A *, \quad A^* = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Note:  $AA^* = I_2 = A^*A$  (Exercise),  $\therefore T_{\pi/2}T_{\pi/2}^* = T_{\pi/2}^*T_{\pi/2}$ 

 $\therefore$   $T_{\pi/2}$  is normal. But  $T_{\pi/2}$  has no eigenvetor.

### Counterexample to treat case

(b): V is an infinite-dim complex i.p.s.

Recall: H = set of continuous complex-valued functions on  $[0, 2\pi]$ .

$$\langle f,g \rangle = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f(t)\overline{g(t)}dt$$
  
 $S = \{f_n : n = 0, \pm 1, ...\}$  with  $f_n \stackrel{def}{=} e^{int}$  is orthonormal.

 $V \stackrel{def}{=} span(S)$  is an infinite-dim complex i.p.s.

**<u>Claim.</u>**  $\exists$  a normal operator  $T \in \mathcal{L}(V)$  which has no eigenvector.

**Pf.** Def 
$$T, U \in \mathcal{L}(V)$$
 as  $T(f) \stackrel{def}{=} f_1 f, \quad U(f) \stackrel{def}{=} f_{-1} f.$   
Then,  $T(f_n) = f_{n+1}, \quad U(f_n) = f_{n-1}, \quad n = 0, \pm 1, \dots$   
Thus,  $\langle T(f_m), f_n \rangle = \langle f_{m+1}, f_n \rangle = \delta_{m+1,n} = \delta_{m,n-1}$   
 $= \langle f_m, f_{n-1} \rangle = \langle f_m, U(f_n) \rangle$ 

 $\therefore T^* = U \text{ exists (think about why),}$ and  $TT_* = TU = I = UT = T^*T$ , i.e. T is normal.

## But T has no eigenvectors.

Otherwise, let  $f \in V$  be an eigenvector of T, i.e.  $T(f) = \lambda f$  for some  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ . As V = span(S), we may write

$$f=\sum_{i=n}^m a_i f_i, \quad a_m \neq 0, \quad n \leq m.$$

Thus,

$$T(f) \stackrel{T \in \mathcal{L}}{=} \sum_{i=n}^{m} a_i T(f_i) = \sum_{i=n}^{m} a_i f_{i+1} = \lambda f = \sum_{i=n}^{m} \lambda a_i f_i.$$

By this identity and  $a_m \neq 0$ , we see

 $f_{m+1}$  is a linear combination of  $f_n, f_{n+1}, \ldots, f_m$ ,

which is a contradiction with the fact that S is I. indep.

**Step 2.** To show "  $\Rightarrow$  ", we need to make two preparations. In this step, we make the 1<sup>st</sup> preparation.

Note: V can be either complex or real i.p.s.

**Thm** (Schur Lemma). Let  $T \in \mathcal{L}(V)$ , where V is a finitedim i.p.s. Aussume further that the c.p. of T splits over  $\mathbb{F}$ . Then,  $\exists$  an orthonormal o.b.  $\beta$  for V such that  $[T]_{\beta}$  is upper triangular. Proof of Theorem. As a preparation, we need to

<u>Claim.</u> Let  $T \in \mathcal{L}(V)$  for a finite-dim i.p.s. V. If T has an e.v., then so does  $T^*$ .

**<u>Proof of Claim.</u>** Let  $T(v) = \lambda v, 0 \neq v \in V, \lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ . Then,  $\forall x \in V$ ,

$$0 = \langle 0, x \rangle = \langle (T - \lambda I)v, x \rangle$$
  
=  $\langle v, (T - \lambda I)^*(x) \rangle$   
=  $\langle v, (T^* - \overline{\lambda} I)(x) \rangle$ ,  $\therefore v \perp R(T^* - \overline{\lambda} I)$ .

As  $v \neq 0$ ,  $R(T^* - \overline{\lambda}I) \neq V$ .  $\therefore T^* - \overline{\lambda}I$  is not onto and hence not one-to-one.  $\therefore N(T^* - \overline{\lambda}I)$  contains at least one nonzero vector, call it u.  $(T^* - \overline{\lambda})(u) = 0$  i.e.  $T^*(u) = \overline{\lambda}u$ .  $0 \neq u \in V$  $\therefore u$  is an eigenvector of  $T^*$  associated with  $\overline{\lambda}$ . We continue: Induction in  $n \stackrel{def}{=} dim(V)$ .

n = 1: true obviously.

Assume "true" for  $n - 1(n \ge 2)$ , to show "true" for n, i.e., let  $T \in \mathcal{L}(V)$  split with dim(V) = n, to find the desired  $\beta$ .

As T splits, T has an eigenvector, so  $T^*$  also has an eigenvector by the previous claim. Let  $T^*(z) = \lambda z$  for some unit eigenvector z and for some  $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$ . Set  $W = span(\{z\})$ .

<u>Claim.</u>  $W^{\perp}$  is *T*-invariant. <u>Proof of claim.</u> Let  $y \in W^{\perp}$ , to show  $T(y) \in W^{\perp}$ , i.e. to show

$$\langle T(y), x \rangle = 0, \forall x \in W.$$

Take  $x = cz \in W$ , then

By this claim,

 $T_{W^{\perp}} \in \mathcal{L}(W^{\perp})$  is well-defined and c.p. of  $T_{W^{\perp}}$  divides c.p. of T. As T splits, so does  $T_{W^{\perp}}$ . So,  $T_{W^{\perp}} \in \mathcal{L}(W^{\perp})$  splits, where  $W^{\perp}$ is an (n-1)-dim i.p.s. for  $V = W \bigoplus W^{\perp}$  where dim W=1. Induction assumption implies that

 $\exists$  an orthonormal basis  $\gamma$  for  $W^{\perp}$  s.t.  $[T_{W^{\perp}}]_{\gamma}$  is upper triangular. then we see

 $\beta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \gamma \cup \{z\} \text{ is an orthonormal basis for } V$ s.t.  $[T]_{\beta} = \begin{pmatrix} an \ upper & * \\ triangular \ matrix & \vdots \\ 0 \cdots 0 & * \end{pmatrix}$  is upper triangular. Note: The 1st to the (n-1)th entries in the last row are zeros because each entry corresponds to the *n*th component of  $\beta$ -coordinates of each basis vector in  $\gamma$  acted by T.

# **Step 3:** We make the $2^{nd}$ preparation.

**Note:** Below V can be either complex or real i.p.s. and it can be either finite-dim or  $\infty$ -dim.

**Theorem.** Let  $T \in \mathcal{L}(V)$  be normal for an i.p.s. V. Then, (a)  $||T(x)|| = ||T^*(x)||$ ,  $\forall x \in V$ . (b) T - cl is normal for any  $c \in F$ . (c) If  $x \neq 0$  is a  $\lambda$ -e.v. of T, then x is also a  $\overline{\lambda}$ -e.v. of  $T^*$ . (d) Two e-vectors associated with two distinct e-values of

(d) Two e-vectors associated with two distinct e-values of T must be orthogonal.

### Proof.

- (a) Let  $x \in V$ ,  $\|T(x)\|^2 = \langle T(x), T(x) \rangle = \langle x, T^*T(x) \rangle = \langle x, TT^*(x) \rangle$  $= \langle T^*(x), T^*(x) \rangle = \|T^*(x)\|^2$ .
- (b) Let  $c \in F$ , check  $(T-cI)^{*}(T-cI) = (T^{*}-\bar{c}I)(T-cI) \stackrel{ok}{=} (T-cI)(T-cI)^{*}.$ **Exercise:** Use  $(T - cI)^* = T^* - \overline{c}I$ , and  $TT^* = T^*T$ . (c) Let  $T(x) = \lambda x$ ,  $0 \neq x \in V$ , i.e.  $(T - \lambda I)(x) = 0$ . Note:  $T - \lambda I$  is also normal, then  $0 = \|(T - \lambda I)(x)\| = \|(T - \lambda I)^*(x)\| \stackrel{(a)(b)}{=} \|(T^* - \overline{\lambda} I)(x)\|.$  $\therefore (T^* - \overline{\lambda}I)(x) = 0$ , i.e.  $T^*(x) = \overline{\lambda}x$ ,  $0 \neq x \in V$ . (d) Let  $T(x_1) = \lambda_1 x_1, T(x_2) = \lambda_2 x_2, x_1 \neq 0, x_2 \neq 0, \lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$ . By (c),  $T^*(x_2) = \lambda_2 x_2$ . Then  $\lambda_1 \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle = \langle \lambda_1 x_1, x_2 \rangle = \langle T(x_1), x_2 \rangle = \langle x_1, T^*(x_2) \rangle$  $=\langle x_1, \overline{\lambda_2} x_2 \rangle = \lambda_2 \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle$  $\therefore \lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$  and  $(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2) \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle = 0 \therefore \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle = 0$ .

**Step 4:** This last step is to give the proof of " $\Rightarrow$ ": Assume: *T* is normal.  $\because F = \mathbb{C}, \therefore$  the c.p. of *T* splits, then by Schur's lemma,

 $\exists$  an orthonormal basis  $\beta$  such that  $[T]_{\beta}$  is upper triangular.

Set  $\beta = \{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$ , and  $A = [T]_{\beta}$ .

<u>**Claim.**</u> All vectors in  $\beta$  are eigenvectors of T.

## Proof of claim.

 $1^{st}$  column,  $[T(v_1)]_{\beta} = 1^{st}$  column of A. For A is upper triangular,  $T(v_1) = A_{11}v_1 + 0v_2 + \cdots + 0v_n = A_{11}v_1$ . So,  $v_1 \neq 0$  is an e-vector of T with e-value  $A_{11}$ .

 $2^{nd}$  column:  $[T(v_2)]_{\beta} = 2^{nd}$  column of A. Keep in mind, to show  $A_{21} = 0$ .  $\therefore T(v_2) = A_{21}v_1 + A_{22}v_2$  and  $||v_1|| = 1$  and  $\langle v_2, v_1 \rangle = 0$  $\therefore \langle T(v_2), v_1 \rangle = \langle A_{21}v_1 + A_{22}v_2, v_1 \rangle = A_{21}\langle v_1, v_1 \rangle = A_{21}$ 

On the other hand,  $LHS = \langle T(v_2), v_1 \rangle = \langle v_2, T^*(v_1) \rangle = \langle v_2, \overline{A_{11}}v_1 \rangle = A_{11} \langle v_2, v_1 \rangle = 0$  $\therefore A_{21} = 0.$ 

Similarly,  $3^{rd}$  column: one can shows  $A_{31} = A_{32} = 0 \cdots$ . Remark: you may use induction argument to show:  $A_{ij} = 0$ , i > j (Exercise).  $\therefore$  the upper-triangular matrix A becomes diagonal!

2<sup>nd</sup> goal:

**<u>Theorem.</u>** Let  $T \in \mathcal{L}(V)$ , where V is a real i.p.s. with  $dim(V) < \infty$ . Then, T is self-adjoint **iff**  $\exists$  an orthonormal basis  $\beta$  for V consisting of e-vectors of T.

**Proof of** "  $\Leftarrow$  " :

Assume:

 $\exists$  an orthonormal basis  $\beta$  for V consisting of e-vectors of T. Then  $[T]_{\beta}$  is a diagonal real matrix, thus  $[T]_{\beta}$  is real symmetric and hence self-adjoint, so T is self-adjoint.

$$(:: [T - T^*]_{\beta} = [T]_{\beta} - [T^*]_{\beta} = [T]_{\beta} - [T]_{\beta}^* = [T]_{\beta} - [T]_{\beta} = 0)$$

To show "  $\Rightarrow$  ", we need a

**Lemma.** Let  $T \in \mathcal{L}(V)$  be self-adjoint, where V is a finite-dim i.p.s. (either complex or real). Then

(a) Any eigenvalue of T is real.

(b) If  $F = \mathbb{R}$ , then the c.p. of T splits over R.

## Proof of lemma.

(a) Let  $T(x) = \lambda x, x \neq 0, \lambda \in F$ . Then  $\lambda x = T(x) \stackrel{(T=T^*)}{=} T^*(x) = \overline{\lambda} x.$  $\therefore x$  is a nonzero vector, and  $(\lambda - \overline{\lambda})x = 0 \therefore \lambda = \overline{\lambda}$ , i.e.  $\lambda$  is

 $\therefore x$  is a nonzero vector, and  $(\lambda - \lambda)x = 0$   $\therefore \lambda = \lambda$ , i.e.  $\lambda$  is real.

(b) Let  $n = \dim(V), F = \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $\beta$  be an o.b. for V and  $A = [T]_{\beta}$ . Note: A is self-adjoint (indeed, real symmetric). Also note:  $L_A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^n)$  is self-adjoint  $(\because [L_A]_{\gamma} = A$  for the s.o.b. orthonormal  $\gamma$  for  $\mathbb{C}^n$ ). Note: Fundamental theorem of algebra tells: the c.p. of  $L_A$ 

$$= det(L_{\mathcal{A}} - tI) = (t - \lambda_1)^{m_1} \cdots (t - \lambda_k)^{m_k}$$
 each  $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{C}$ .

By (a), each  $\lambda_i$  is real.

 $\therefore \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{R}$ , it means that the c.p. of  $L_A$  splits over  $\mathbb{R}$ . Note:  $T\&L_A$  have the same c.p.

 $\therefore$  the c.p. of *T* splits over  $F = \mathbb{R}$ .

**Proof of** "  $\Rightarrow$  " in thm.

Assume: T is self-adjoint. As  $F = \mathbb{R}$ , the previous lemma tells the c.p. of T splits. Apply the Schur's theorem, then  $\exists$  an orthonormal basis  $\beta$  for V such that  $[T]_{\beta}$  is upper triangular. Note:

$$([T]_{\beta})^* = [T^*]_{\beta} \stackrel{(T^*=T)}{=} [T]_{\beta},$$

i.e.  $[T]_{\beta}$  is real symmetric, but it is also upper triangular, hence  $[T]_{\beta}$  is real diagonal.

 $\therefore$  all vector in  $\beta$  must be eigenvectors of T.

Last remark: for  $A \in M_{n \times n} \mathbb{F}$ 

If A is real-symmetric, then A is self-adjoint and hence normal.

But, if A is complex-symmetric, then A may NOT be self-adjoint and A may NOT be normal.

## Example:

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} i & i \\ i & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in M_{2 \times 2}(\mathbb{C})$$

 $\therefore A^{t} = A$   $\therefore A \text{ is complex symmetric.}$ Note  $A^{*} = \overline{A}^{t} = \begin{pmatrix} -i & -i \\ -i & 1 \end{pmatrix} \neq A$  then A is NOT self-adjoint.  $AA^{*} = \begin{pmatrix} i & i \\ i & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -i & -i \\ -i & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -i^{2} - i^{2} - i^{2} + i \\ -i^{2} - i & -i^{2} + 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 + i \\ 1 - i & 2 \end{pmatrix},$   $A^{*}A = \begin{pmatrix} -i & -i \\ -i & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} i & i \\ i & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -i^{2} - i^{2} - i^{2} - i \\ -i^{2} + i & -i^{2} + 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 - i \\ 1 + i & 2 \end{pmatrix}.$ 

 $\therefore AA^* \neq A^*A$ , i.e. A is **NOT** normal.