

# A short proof of the existence of the Jordan normal form of a matrix

Luděk Kučera  
Dept. of Applied Mathematics  
Charles University, Prague

April 6, 2016

**Theorem 1** *Let  $V$  be an  $n$ -dimensional vector space and  $\Phi : V \rightarrow V$  be a linear mapping of  $V$  into itself. Then there is a basis of  $V$  such that the matrix representing  $\Phi$  with respect to the basis is*

$$\begin{pmatrix} J_1 & & & & \\ & J_2 & & & \\ & & \cdots & & \\ & & & \cdots & \\ & & & & J_k \end{pmatrix}$$

where empty space is filled by 0's and  $J_1, \dots, J_k$  are square matrices, called Jordan blocks, of the form

$$J_i = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_i & 1 & & & \\ & \lambda_i & 1 & & \\ & & \cdots & \cdots & \\ & & & \lambda_i & 1 \\ & & & & \lambda_i \end{pmatrix}$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , where  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$  are complex numbers and empty space is filled by 0's.

**Conclusion 1 (Jordan's normal form of a matrix)** *Let  $\mathbf{A}$  be a square matrix; there is a regular matrix  $\mathbf{P}$  such that the matrix  $\mathbf{P}^{-1}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}$  has the form described in the preceding theorem.*

The matrix form shown in the theorem is called Jordan canonical form or Jordan normal form.

Remark: The numbers  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$  of the theorem need not be distinct. E.g., the unit matrix is a matrix in Jordan canonical form, where Jordan blocks are matrices of size  $1 \times 1$  equal to (3), i.e. with  $\lambda_1 = \dots = \lambda_k = 1$ .

We need one definition

**Definition 1** We say that a vector space  $V$  is a direct sum of its subspaces  $V_1, \dots, V_m$ , if for each vector  $v \in V$  there is the unique sequence of vectors  $v_1, \dots, v_m$  such that  $v_i \in V_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m$  and  $v = v_1 + \dots + v_m$ . In such a case we write  $V = V_1 \oplus V_2 \oplus \dots \oplus V_m$ .

Uniqueness in the definition means that it must be  $V_i \cap V_j = \mathbf{0}$  for any two different  $i$  and  $j$  in the range  $1 \leq i, j \leq m$ , because if a non-zero vector  $v$  was a member of both  $V_i$  and  $V_j$  then the uniqueness of the sequence  $v_1, \dots, v_m$  is corrupted: it would be possible to choose  $v_i = v$  and the other vector equal to  $\mathbf{0}$ , or  $v_j = v$  and others vectors equal to the null vector.

Thus,  $\dim(V) = \dim(V_1) + \dots + \dim(V_m)$ .

The proof of the theorem is based of the following two lemmatae:

**Lemma 1** Let  $V$  be an  $n$ -dimensional vector space and  $\Phi : V \rightarrow V$  be a linear mapping of  $V$  into itself. Let  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r$  be different eigenvalues of  $\Phi$ . Then there are integer  $s_1, \dots, s_r$  such that

$$V = \text{Ker}(\Phi - \lambda_1 I)^{s_1} \oplus \dots \oplus \text{Ker}(\Phi - \lambda_r I)^{s_r}.$$

**Proof** Choose first one of the eigenvalues of  $\Phi$  and denote it by  $\lambda$ .

**Part 1**

Define  $W_i = \text{Ker}(\Phi - \lambda I)^i$  for each natural number  $i$ . It is clear that

$$W_1 \subset W_2 \subset W_3 \subset \dots \subset W_i \subset \dots$$

Since we suppose that  $V$  has finite dimension, the sequence could not be strictly increasing forever, but there must be a number  $t$  such that  $W_t = W_{t+1}$ . Assume that  $t$  is the smallest among such numbers. It is almost obvious that this would imply  $W_{t+1} = W_{t+2} = W_{t+3} = \dots$ .

**Part 2**

We will prove that  $\text{Ker}(\Phi - \lambda I)^t \cap \text{Im}(\Phi - \lambda I)^t = \mathbf{0}$ .

Assume that a non-zero vector  $v$  belongs to  $\text{Ker}(\Phi - \lambda I)^t \cap \text{Im}(\Phi - \lambda I)^t$ .

This implies that

there exists  $w \in V$  such that  $v = (\Phi - \lambda I)^t(w)$  (because  $v \in \text{Im}(\Phi - \lambda I)^t$ ) and also  $(\Phi - \lambda I)^t(v) = 0$  (because  $v \in \text{Ker}(\Phi - \lambda I)^t$ ).

Thus,  $(\Phi - \lambda I)^{2t}(w) = (\Phi - \lambda I)^t(v) = 0$ , and hence  $w \in W_{2t}$ . But since  $W_t = W_{2t}$ , it is also  $w \in W_t = \text{Ker}(\Phi - \lambda I)^t$ , and hence  $v = (\Phi - \lambda I)^t(w) = 0$ .

**Part 3**

We already know that  $\dim(V) = \dim(\text{Ker}(\Phi - \lambda I)^t) + \dim(\text{Im}(\Phi - \lambda I)^t)$ . Moreover, we know that if  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  are subspaces of  $V$ , then the subspace that spans both  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  has the dimension  $\dim(V_1) + \dim(V_2) - \dim(V_1 \cap V_2)$ . Applying this to  $V_1 = \text{Ker}(\Phi - \lambda I)^t$  and  $V_2 = \text{Ker}(\Phi - \lambda I)^t$  (i.e.,  $\dim(V_1 \cap V_2) = 0$ ), we

obtain that the dimension of the subspace of  $V$  that spans both  $\text{Ker}(\Phi - \lambda I)^t$  and  $\text{Im}(\Phi - \lambda I)^t$  is equal to  $\dim(V)$ , and hence

$$V = \text{Ker}(\Phi - \lambda I)^t \oplus \text{Im}(\Phi - \lambda I)^t.$$

**Part 4**

Both  $\text{Ker}(\Phi - \lambda I)^t$  and  $\text{Im}(\Phi - \lambda I)^t$  are invariant subspaces of  $\Phi$  (a subspace  $U$  of  $V$  is an invariant subspace of  $\Phi$ , if  $v \in U$  implies  $\Phi(v) \in U$ ).

Note that

$$\Phi(\Phi - \lambda I) = \Phi\Phi - \lambda(\Phi I) = \Phi\Phi - \lambda(I\Phi) = (\Phi - \lambda I)\Phi.$$

This implies that

if  $v \in \text{Ker}(\Phi - \lambda I)^t$ , then  $(\Phi - \lambda I)^t(v) = 0$ , and

$$0 = \Phi(0) = \Phi(\Phi - \lambda I)^t(v) = (\Phi - \lambda I)^t\Phi(v),$$

and hence  $\Phi(v) \in \text{Ker}(\Phi - \lambda I)^t$ , and

if  $v \in \text{Im}(\Phi - \lambda I)^t$ , then  $v = (\Phi - \lambda I)^t(w)$  for some  $w \in V$ , and

$$\Phi(v) = \Phi(\Phi - \lambda I)^t(w) = (\Phi - \lambda I)^t\Phi(w),$$

i.e.,  $\Phi(v) \in \text{Im}(\Phi - \lambda I)^t$ .

**Part 5**

Now, the lemma can be proved by the induction on the number of different eigenvalues of  $\Phi$ : if  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r$  are different eigenvalues of  $\Phi$  and we put  $\lambda$  of Parts 1-4 to be  $\lambda_1$ , then the eigenvalues of the restriction of  $\Phi$  to  $\text{Im}(\Phi - \lambda I)^t$  are  $\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_r$ , and, by the induction hypothesis,

$$\text{Im}(\Phi - \lambda I)^t = \text{Ker}(\Phi - \lambda_2 I)^{s_2} \oplus \dots \oplus \text{Ker}(\Phi - \lambda_r I)^{s_r}$$

for some  $s_2, \dots, s_r$ . ♣

The second lemma that we will use in order to prove the Jordan form theorems is

**Lemma 2 (Mark Wildon[1])** *Let  $V$  be an  $n$ -dimensional vector space and  $T : V \rightarrow V$  be a linear mapping of  $V$  into itself such that  $T^s = \mathbf{0}$  for some natural number  $s$ . Then there are vectors  $u_1, \dots, u_k$  and natural numbers  $a_1, \dots, a_k$  such that*

$$T^{a_i}(u_i) = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, k,$$

and the vectors

$$u_1, T(u_1), \dots, T^{a_1-1}(u_1), \dots, u_k, T(u_k), \dots, T^{a_k-1}(u_k)$$

are non-zero vectors that form a basis of  $V$ .

**Proof** If  $T$  itself maps all vectors to  $\mathbf{0}$ , then it is sufficient to put  $u_1, \dots, u_k$  to be a basis of  $V$  and  $a_1 = \dots = a_k = 1$ .

Now, the proof is by induction on the dimension of  $V$ . Suppose first that the dimension of  $V$  is 1: in this case  $T^s$  could be a constant mapping to  $\mathbf{0}$  only if  $T$  is, and we use the previous statement.

Let us suppose that the lemma holds for all cases when the dimension is smaller than  $n$ , and we will prove the lemma for  $n$ . Consider the vector space  $\text{Im}(T)$ . If  $\dim(\text{Im}(T)) = 0$ , then  $T$  is a zero mapping and the lemma follows. The assumption  $\dim(\text{Im}(T)) = n$  would imply that  $T$  is a one-to-one mapping, which would contradict to the assumption that  $T^s = \mathbf{0}$  for some  $s$ . Thus, we can assume that  $0 < \dim(\text{Im}(T)) < n$  and, by the induction hypothesis, there are vectors  $v_1, \dots, v_\ell$  and natural numbers  $b_1, \dots, b_\ell$  such that

$$T^{b_i}(v_i) = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, \ell, \text{ and}$$

$$v_1, T(v_1), \dots, T^{b_1-1}(v_1), \dots, v_\ell, T(v_\ell), \dots, T^{b_\ell-1}(v_\ell) \quad (1)$$

form a basis of  $\text{Im}(T)$ .

For each  $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ ,  $v_i \in \text{Im}(T)$ , and hence we can choose  $w_i \in V$  such that  $T(w_i) = v_i$ . Vectors  $T^{b_1-1}(v_1), \dots, T^{b_\ell-1}(v_\ell)$  are linearly independent vectors in  $\text{Ker}(T)$ . Steinitz theorem says that we can extend these vectors to a basis

$$T^{b_1-1}(v_1), \dots, T^{b_\ell-1}(v_\ell), z_1, \dots, z_m \quad (2)$$

of  $\text{Ker}(T)$ .

Note that in our notation,  $T^j(w_i) = T^{j-1}(v_i)$  for all relevant  $i$  and  $j$ .

Now it is sufficient to prove that the vectors

$$w_1, T(w_1), \dots, T^{b_1}(w_1), \dots, w_\ell, T(w_\ell), \dots, T^{b_\ell}(w_\ell), z_1, \dots, z_m \quad (3)$$

form a basis of  $V$ .

We will first prove their linear independence. Assume that

$$\alpha_{1,0}w_1 + \alpha_{1,1}T(v_1) + \dots + \alpha_{1,b_1}T^{b_1}(w_1) + \dots + \alpha_{\ell,0}w_\ell + \dots + \alpha_{\ell,b_\ell}T^{b_\ell}(w_\ell) +$$

$$+ \beta_1z_1 + \dots + \beta_mz_m = 0.$$

Apply the linear mapping  $T$  to the equation to get

$$\alpha_{1,0}T(w_1) + \alpha_{1,1}T^2(w_1) + \dots + \alpha_{1,b_1-1}T^{b_1}(w_1) + \dots + \alpha_{\ell,0}T(w_\ell) + \dots + \alpha_{\ell,b_\ell-1}T^{b_\ell}(w_\ell) = 0$$

i.e.,

$$\alpha_{1,0}v_1 + \alpha_{1,1}T(v_1) + \dots + \alpha_{1,b_1-1}T^{b_1-1}(v_1) + \dots + \alpha_{\ell,0}v_\ell + \dots + \alpha_{\ell,b_\ell-1}T^{b_\ell-1}(v_\ell) = 0$$

and since the left side of the last equation is a linear combination of elements of a basis (1) of  $\text{Im}(T)$ , the corresponding  $\alpha$ 's must be 0.

Putting  $\alpha_{1,0} = \alpha_{1,1} = \cdots = \alpha_{1,b_1-1} = \cdots = \alpha_{\ell,0} = \cdots = \alpha_{\ell,b_\ell-1} = 0$  into the original equation, we get

$$\alpha_{1,b_1}T^{b_1}(w_1) + \cdots + \alpha_{\ell,b_\ell}T^{b_\ell}(w_\ell) + \beta_1z_1 + \cdots + \beta_mz_m = 0,$$

but the left side of this equation is a linear combination of elements of a basis (2) of  $\text{Ker}(T)$ , and hence even  $\alpha$ 's in the last equation are equal to 0, which proves the linear independence of the original system of vectors listed in (3).

In order to prove that the system (3) forms a basis of  $V$  we just need to prove that the number of vectors in (3) is equal to the dimension of  $V$ . The system (1) is a basis of  $\text{Im}(T)$ , which means that  $\dim(\text{Im}(T)) = b_1 + \cdots + b_\ell$ . Moreover, the system (2) is a basis of  $\text{ker}(T)$ , i.e.,  $\dim(\text{Ker}(T)) = \ell + m$ . Using the theorem on the dimension of the image and the kernel of a linear mapping, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \dim(V) &= \dim(\text{Im}(T)) + \dim(\text{Ker}(T)) = b_1 + \cdots + b_\ell + \ell + m = \\ &= (1 + b_1) + \cdots + (1 + b_\ell) + m, \end{aligned}$$

which is exactly the number of vectors of the system (3). ♣

**An example for the Wildon's lemma:** Let  $V$  be a vector space of the dimension 3 and  $T(x_1, x_2, x_3) = (x_2 + x_3, 0, 0)$ . Then  $\text{Im}(T)$  is one-dimensional vector space generated by the vector  $(1, 0, 0)$ . We can easily choose  $\ell = 1$ ,  $v_1 = (1, 0, 0)$ , and  $a_1 = 1$ .

Now, there are two important vectors that  $T$  maps to  $v_1$ , namely  $(0, 1, 0)$  and  $(0, 0, 1)$ . Moreover, any vector  $(x_1, x_2, 1 - x_2)$  maps into  $v_1$  as well. We choose one of them as  $w_1$ , e.g.,  $(0, 0, 1)$ . Now, what about the vector  $(0, 1, 0)$  and other vectors that map into  $v_1$ ? If  $T(w) = v_1$  for some vector  $w$  other than  $w_1$  (e.g., if  $w = (0, 1, 0)$ ), then  $T(w - w_1) = v_1 - v_1 = \mathbf{0}$ , and hence  $w - w_1$  is a member of  $\text{Ker}(T)$  that was not included in  $\text{Im}(T)$ , and we can choose that vector as  $z_1$ , an additional member of a basis of  $\text{Ker}(T)$ . Thus, we obtain the basis  $w_1 = (0, 0, 1)$ ,  $v_1 = (1, 0, 0)$ , and  $z_1 = (0, 1, -1)$ , and we know that  $T(w_1) = v_1$ ,  $T(v_1) = \mathbf{0}$ , and we also have  $T(z_1) = \mathbf{0}$ . ♣

**Proof** of the Theorem:

Using the first lemma, there are integer  $s_1, \dots, s_r$  such that

$$V = \text{Ker}(\Phi - \lambda_1 I)^{s_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus \text{Ker}(\Phi - \lambda_r I)^{s_r},$$

where  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s$  are different eigenvalues of  $\Phi$ .

Assume a basis of  $V$  obtained so that we concatenate bases of  $\text{Ker}(\Phi - \lambda_1 I)^{s_1}, \dots, \text{Ker}(\Phi - \lambda_r I)^{s_r}$ . With respect to such a basis, the matrix represen-

tation of  $\Phi$  is a matrix of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{J}_1 & & & & \\ & \mathcal{J}_2 & & & \\ & & \cdots & & \\ & & & \cdots & \\ & & & & \mathcal{J}_k \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $\mathcal{J}_1, \dots, \mathcal{J}_k$  are general square matrices;  $\mathcal{J}_i$  is the matrix of the restriction of  $\Phi$  to  $\text{Ker}(\Phi - \lambda_i I)^{s_i}$  with respect to the chosen basis.

However, if the basis of  $\text{Ker}(\Phi - \lambda_i I)^{s_i}$  was constructed using Wildon's lemma, then each  $\mathcal{J}_i$  turns to be

$$\begin{pmatrix} J_{i,1} & & & & \\ & J_{i,2} & & & \\ & & \cdots & & \\ & & & \cdots & \\ & & & & J_{i,\ell_i} \end{pmatrix},$$

where each  $J_{i,j}$  is a Jordan block with  $\lambda_i$  on the diagonal; each Jordan block corresponds to one chain of vectors  $v_j, T(v_j), \dots, T^{a_j-1}(v_j)$ , where  $T = (\Phi - \lambda_i I)^{s_i}$ .

♣

## References

- [1] Mark Wildon, Royal Holloway, University of London,  
A short proof of the existence of Jordan Normal Form,  
[https://www.math.vt.edu/people/renardym/class\\_home/Jordan.pdf](https://www.math.vt.edu/people/renardym/class_home/Jordan.pdf)