(*July 24, 2017*)

Spectral theorem for self-adjoint continuous operators on Hilbert spaces

Paul Garrett garrett@math.umn.edu http://www.math.umn.edu/~garrett/

[This document is http://www.math.umn.edu/~garrett/m/fun/notes_2016-17/spectral_theorem_bdd.pdf]

---

1. *Spectral theorem, part one*

The isomorphism of the theorem is a special, concrete case of the *Gelfand isomorphism*.

Let T be a continuous linear map $V \to V$ for a (separable) Hilbert space V. Its spectrum $\sigma(T)$ is a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}$, so is certainly contained in some finite interval $[a,b]$. As usual, for a self-adjoint continuous operator S on V, write $S \ge 0$ when $\langle Sv, v\rangle \ge 0$ for all $v \in V$. For self-adjoint S,T, write $S \le T$ when $T - S \ge 0$. At the outset, with $a \le -|T|_{\text{op}}$ and $b \ge |T|_{\text{op}}$, we have, $\langle a\cdot v, v\rangle \le \langle Tv, v\rangle \le \langle b \cdot v, v\rangle$. That is, $a \le T \le b$, where the scalars refer to scalar operators on V. As a corollary of part one of the spectral theorem, we will see that, in fact, $\inf_{\lambda\in\sigma(T)} \lambda \le T \le \sup_{\lambda\in\sigma(T)}$, but it seems difficult (and un-necessary) to prove this inequality directly.

In the following all functions are real-valued, so $C^o[a,b]$ refers to real-valued continuous functions on $[a,b]$.

[1.1] Theorem: The map $\mathbb{R}[x] \to \mathbb{R}[T]$ on polynomials given by $f \to f(T)$ is *continuous* for $\mathbb{R}[x]$ with the sup-norm on $[a,b]$, and $\mathbb{R}[T]$ with the operator norm. Thus, by Weierstraß approximation, this map extends to a continuous map $C^o[a,b] \to \overline{\mathbb{R}[T]}$, the latter being the operator-norm completion of $\mathbb{R}[T]$. This map factors through $C^o(\sigma(T))$:

$$C^o[a,b] \longrightarrow C^o(\sigma(T)) \longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}[T]}$$

and the map $C^o(\sigma(T)) \to \overline{\mathbb{R}[T]}$ is an *isometric isomorphism*, where $C^o(\sigma(T))$ has sup-norm.

Proof: We claim that for $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ with $f(x) \ge 0$ on $[a,b]$, then $f(T) \ge 0$. From the goofy lemma on polynomials, f is expressible as a finite sum of the form

$$f \;=\; \sum_i P_i^2 + (x-a)\sum_j Q_j^2 + (b-x)\sum_k R_k^2$$

for polynomials P_i, Q_j, R_k in $\mathbb{R}[x]$. We have

[1.2] Lemma: For *commuting* self-adjoint S,T with $T \ge 0$, also $S^2T \ge 0$.

Proof: $\langle S^2Tv, v\rangle = \langle TSv, S^*v\rangle = \langle T(Sv), (Sv)\rangle \ge 0$. ///

Thus, since $a \le T \le b$, and all these operators commute (being polynomials in T), each $P_i^2(T) \ge 0$, each $(T-a)Q_j^2(T) \ge 0$, and $(b-T)R_k^2(T) \ge 0$. Thus, $f(T) \ge 0$, proving the claim.

Since $g(x) = \sup_{[a,b]} |f| \pm f(x) \ge 0$ on $[a,b]$, $\sup_{[a,b]} |f| \pm f(T) \ge 0$. That is, $-\sup_{[a,b]} |f| \le f(T) \le \sup_{[a,b]} |f|$, which gives

$$|f(T)|_{\text{op}} \;=\; \sup_{|v|\le 1} |f(T)v| \;\le\; \sup_{|v|\le 1} |\sup_{[a,b]} |f| \cdot |v| \;=\; |\sup_{[a,b]} |f|$$

which is the desired inequality. Thus, we can extend by continuity to the sup-norm closure of $\mathbb{R}[x]$ in $C^o[a,b]$, which by Weierstraß is the whole $C^o[a,b]$, giving $C^o[a,b] \to \overline{\mathbb{R}[T]}$, the latter being the operator-norm closure of $\mathbb{R}[T]$, with $|f(T)|_{\mathrm{op}} \le |f|_{C^o[a,b]}$. Since $\mathbb{R}[x] \to \mathbb{R}[T]$ is a ring homomorphism, the extension by continuity is also a ring homomorphism.

We capture some useful partial results:

[1.3] Corollary: *(Existence of square roots of positive operators)* For $T \ge 0$, there is $S \in \overline{\mathbb{R}[x]}$ such that $S \ge 0$ and $S^2 = T$.

Proof: Since $T \ge 0$, without yet claiming anything about the spectrum of T, we can take $[a,b] = [0,b]$ in the previous discussion. The function $f(x) = \sqrt{x} \in C^o[0,b]$ is non-negative on $[0,b]$, and $f(T)^2 = f^2(T) = T$. Take $S = f(T)$. ///

[1.4] Corollary: *(Positivity of products of commuting positive operators)* For $S \ge 0$ and $T \ge 0$ with $ST = TS$, also $ST \ge 0$.

Proof: From the previous corollary, there is $R \in \overline{\mathbb{R}[S]}$ such that $R \ge 0$ and $R^2 = S$. Also, R commutes with T, by continuity. Thus,

$$\langle STv, v\rangle \;=\; \langle R^2Tv, v\rangle \;=\; \langle RTRv, v\rangle \;=\; \langle TRv, Rv\rangle \;\ge\; 0$$

because $T \ge 0$. ///

Next, let I be the kernel of $C^o[a,b] \to \overline{\mathbb{R}[T]}$. It is an *ideal* in $C^o[a,b]$, and is (topologically) *closed* because $C^o[a,b] \to \overline{\mathbb{R}[T]}$ is continuous. Let $\tau(T) \subset [a,b]$ be the simultaneous zero-set of all the functions in I. Shortly, we will see that $\tau(T) = \sigma(T)$, but we cannot use this yet.

The following is a sort of *Nullstellensatz* for the present situation:

[1.5] Claim: The restriction map $C^o[a,b] \to C^o(\tau(T))$ has kernel I. That is, if $f|_{\tau(T)} = 0$, then $f(T) = 0$. More precisely, $f \ge 0$ on $\tau(T)$ if and only if $f(T) \ge 0$.

Proof: It suffices to show that $f(T) \ge 0$ implies $f \ge 0$ on $\tau(T)$. If f is not non-negative on $\tau(T)$, then there is $x_o \in \tau(T)$ where $f(x_o) < 0$. Using the continuity of f, take a small neighborhood N of x_o in $[a,b]$ such that $f(x) < 0$ on N. Let $g \in C^o[a,b]$ be supported inside N, non-negative, and strictly positive at x_o. Then $fg \le 0$, and $fg(x_o) < 0$, so $-fg(T) \ge 0$. But $f(T) \ge 0$ and $g(T) \ge 0$, so by the corollary on positivity of commuting positive operators, $fg(T) \ge 0$. Thus, $fg(T) = 0$, so $fg \in I$, and $fg|_{\tau(T)} = 0$, contradiction. Thus, $f \ge 0$ on $\tau(T)$.

Thus, if $f = 0$ on $\tau(T)$, both $f \ge 0$ and $-f \ge 0$ on $\tau(T)$, so both $f(T) \ge 0$ and $-f(T) \ge 0$, so $f(T) = 0$, and $f \in I$. ///

[1.6] Corollary: $C^o[a,b] \to \overline{\mathbb{R}[T]}$ factors through $C^o(\tau(T))$, giving a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} C^o[a,b] \arrow[r] \arrow[rr, bend left] & C^o(\tau(T)) \arrow[r] & \overline{\mathbb{R}[T]} \end{tikzcd}$$

The induced map $C^o(\tau(T)) \to \overline{\mathbb{R}[T]}$ is a *bijection*, and $|f(T)|_{\mathrm{op}} \ge |f|_{C^o(\tau(T))}$.

Proof: By the Tietze-Urysohn-Brouwer extension theorem (see appendix), every continuous function on $\tau(T)$ has an extension to a continuous function on $[a,b]$, with the same sup-norm. This gives the surjectivity of $C^o[a,b] \to C^o(\tau(T))$. By the claim, $C^o(\tau(T)) \approx C^o[a,b]/I$, giving the injectivity to $\overline{\mathbb{R}[T]}$.

Given the positivity, since $|f(T)_{\mathrm{op}} \pm f(T) \ge 0$, from the previous claim $|f(T)_{\mathrm{op}} \pm f(x) \ge 0$ for $x \in \tau(T)$. Thus, $\sup_{x\in\tau(T)} |f(x)| \le |f(T)|_{\mathrm{op}}$. ///

Now we can refine the earlier argument to give the other inequality on norms:

[1.7] Corollary: The induced map $C^o(\tau(T)) \to \overline{\mathbb{R}[T]}$ is an *isometric isomorphism*. That is, the map is a bijection, and $|f(T)|_{\text{op}} = |f|_{C^o(\tau(T))}$.

Proof: For $f \geq 0$ on $\tau(T)$, again by Tietze-Urysohn-Brouwer, there is an extension $g \geq 0$ of f to $[a, b]$ with the same sup norm. The first claim of the proof showed that $|f(T)|_{\text{op}} \leq |g|_{C^o[a,b]}$, so

$$|f|_{C^o(\tau(T))} \;\leq\; |f(T)|_{\text{op}} \;\leq\; |g|_{C^o[a,b]} \;=\; |f|_{C^o(\tau(T))}$$

giving the isometry. In particular, for $f_n(T)$ a Cauchy sequence in the operator norm (for $f_n \in C^o(\tau(T))$), the sequence f_n is Cauchy in $C^o(\tau(T))$, so converges to some $f \in C^o(\tau(T))$. By the isometry, $f_n(T) \to f(T)$, giving the surjection to the closure. ///

What remains is to show that $\tau(T) = \sigma(T)$.

First, we reprove the fact that $\sigma(T) \subset \mathbb{R}$. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ such that there is no $(T - \lambda)^{-1}$, the polynomial $f(x) = (x - \lambda)(x - \overline{\lambda}lambar)$ is non-zero on $\mathbb{R}$, so certainly on $\tau(T)$, so has an inverse $h(x) = 1/g(x) \in C^o(\tau(T))$. Then $h(T)(T - \overline{\lambda})$ would be an inverse for $T - \lambda$, contradiction. Thus, $\sigma(T) \subset \mathbb{R}$.

For λ real and not in $\tau(T)$, $x - \lambda$ is invertible on $\tau(T)$ with inverse $h \in C^o(\tau(T))$, so

$$h(T) \circ (T - \lambda) \;=\; (h \cdot (x - \lambda))(T) \;=\; 1(T) \;=\; 1$$

and similarly $(T - \lambda) \circ h(T) = 1$, so $T - \lambda$ is invertible. For $\lambda \in \tau(T)$, for $n > 0$, let $f_n(x) \in C^[a, b]$ be

$$f_n(x) \;=\; \begin{cases} N & (\text{for } |x - \lambda| \leq \frac{1}{N}) \\ \\ \frac{1}{|x-\lambda|} & (\text{for } |x - \lambda| \geq \frac{1}{N}) \end{cases}$$

Thus, $|(x - \lambda) \cdot f_n|_{C^o(\tau(T))} \leq 1$, and $(T - \lambda)f_n(T)|_{\text{op}} \leq 1$. If $T - \lambda$ had an inverse S, then for all n

$$n \;\leq\; |f_n|_{C^o(\tau(T))} \;=\; |f_n(T)|_{\text{op}} \;=\; |1 \cdot f_n(T)|_{\text{op}} \;=\; |S \cdot (T - \lambda) \cdot f_n(T)|_{\text{op}} \;\leq\; |S|_{\text{op}} \cdot |(T - \lambda) \cdot f_n(T)|_{\text{op}} \;\leq\; |S|_{\text{op}}$$

This is impossible, so there is no inverse. This proves that $\tau(T) = \sigma(T)$. ///

---

2. *Schur's lemma and other corollaries*

[2.1] Corollary: For $\inf \sigma(T) \leq T \leq \sup \sigma(T)$.

Proof: Let $a = \inf \sigma(T)$ and $b = \sup \sigma(T)$. Since $x - a \geq 0$ on $\sigma(T)$, $(x - a)(T) = T - a \geq 0$. Since $b - x \geq 0$ on $\sigma(T)$, $(b - x)(T) = b - T \geq 0$. ///

[2.2] Corollary: If $\sigma(T) = \{\lambda\}$, then T is the scalar operator λ.

Proof: Because the function $f(x) = x$ restricted to $\{\lambda\}$ is equal to the restriction of the constant function $g(x) = \lambda$,

$$T \;=\; f(T) \;=\; g(T) \;=\; \lambda$$

meaning the scalar operator. ///

[2.3] Remark: Certainly the converse is not true: there easily can be eigenvalues *imbedded* in continuous spectrum.

[2.4] Corollary: (*Schur's lemma*) Let R be a set of continuous linear operators on a Hilbert space V, and suppose V is R-*irreducible*, in the sense that there is no R-stable closed subspace of V other than $\{0\}$ and V itself. Let T be a self-adjoint operator commuting with all operators from R. Then T is *scalar*.

Proof: Suppose that $\sigma(T)$ contains at least two distinct points x_1, x_2, and show that V is not R-irreducible. Let f, g be continuous functions with disjoint supports, such that $f(x_1) = 1$ and $g(x_2) = 1$. Thus, $fg = 0$, and $f(T)g(T) = g(T)f(T) = 0$. The image $f(T)(V)$ is not 0, because $f(T) \neq 0$. Also, $f(T)(V)$ is inside the kernel of $g(T)$, because $g(T)f(T) = (gf)(T) = 0$. By continuity of $g(T)$, the closure W of $f(T)(V)$ is also inside the kernel of $g(T)$. Since $g(T) \neq 0$, necessarily $W \neq V$.

Since T commutes with all operators in R, $\mathbb{R}[T]$ commutes with R, and by continuity of operators in R, $\overline{\mathbb{R}[T]}$ commutes with R. Thus, R commutes with $f(T)$ and $g(T)$, so for $S \in R$,

$$S(f(T)(V)) \; = \; f(T)(SV) \; \subset \; f(T)(V)$$

That is, R stabilizes $f(T)(V)$. By continuity of operators in R, R stabilizes the closure W of $f(T)(V)$. But W is a proper closed subspace of V, so V is not R-irreducible. Since $\sigma(T) \neq \phi$, it is a singleton $\{\lambda\}$. By the previous corollary, T is the scalar operator λ. ///

[2.5] Remark: Recall that Liouville's theorem on bounded entire functions implies that the spectrum of a continuous linear operator on a Hilbert space is not empty, as follows. If a continuous $R_\lambda = (T - \lambda)^{-1}$ exists for every complex λ, then for $0 \neq v \in V$, $R_\lambda v \in V$ is never $0 \in V$. Take $w \in V$ such that $\langle R_{\lambda_o} v, w\rangle \neq 0$ for some $\lambda_o \in \mathbb{C}$. Then $f(\lambda) = \langle R_\lambda v, w\rangle$ is a not-identically 0 entire function. At the same time, for large $|\lambda|$, the operator norm of R_λ is small. Thus, $f(\lambda)$ is small for large $|\lambda|$, and must be identically 0, by Liouville, contradiction. ///

---

3. *Spectral theorem, part two: projectors*

The earlier spectral theorem gives an isomorphism of the operator-norm-topology closure of $\mathbb{R}[T]$ to $C^o(\sigma(T))$. In the (larger) closure in the *strong operator topology*, given by seminorms $\mu_v(S) = |Sv|$ for all $v \in V$, we will exhibit a family of *projectors* that includes projectors to eigenspaces.

For each $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, consider a family of continuous approximations to step functions:

$$h_{t,\varepsilon}(x) \; = \; \begin{cases} 1 & (\text{for } x \leq t) \\ 1 - \dfrac{x-t}{\varepsilon} & (\text{for } t \leq x \leq t+\varepsilon) \\ 0 & (\text{for } x \geq t+\varepsilon) \end{cases}$$

The proof of the following accomplishes more along the way than in its assertion. The operators P_t in the theorem are *projectors*:

[3.1] Theorem: The strong operator topology limit $P_t = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0^+} h_{t,\varepsilon}(T)$ exists. For $s \leq t$, we have $P_s \leq P_t$. For real scalars $a \leq b$ such that $a \leq T \leq b$, $P_t = 0$ for $t < a$, and $P_t = 1$ for $t > b$. For all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $P_t^2 = P_t$. There is one-sided continuity: $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0^+} P_{t+\varepsilon} = P_t$.

Proof: First we need

[3.2] Claim: Monotone-decreasing, bounded-from-below limits of self-adjoint operators converge in the strong operator topology. That is, for self-adjoint operators $T_1 \geq T_2 \geq \ldots$ with $T_n \geq c$ for some c, for all n, the $\lim_n T_n$ exists in the strong operator topology, namely, $\lim_n T_n v$ exists (in the topology on V) for all $v \in V$.

Proof: The inequality gives $\langle T_n v, v\rangle \ge \langle T_{n+1}v, v\rangle \ge \ldots \ge c \cdot \langle v, v\rangle$. That is, $\langle T_n v, v\rangle$ is a monotone-decreasing, bounded-from-below sequence of reals. Thus, it has a limit. By *polarization*, $\lim_n \langle T_n v, w\rangle$ exists for all $v, w \in V$. That is, $\lim_n T_v$ exists in the *weak* operator topology. We must improve the result to obtain the better result that it converges in the *strong* operator topology. To this end, let $\lambda_v(w) = \lim_n \langle T_n v, w\rangle$. This is a conjugate-linear functional on V, and is continuous:

$$|\lambda_v(w)| \;\le\; |\langle T_1 v, w\rangle| \;\le\; |T_1|_{\mathrm{op}} \cdot |v| \cdot |w|$$

Thus, λ_v is bounded, hence continuous. By Riesz-Fréchet, for all $v \in V$ there is $Tv \in V$ such that $\langle Tv, w\rangle = \lim_n \langle T_n v, w\rangle$, for all $w \in V$. One can check that T is linear, continuous, and self-adjoint. ///

[3.3] Claim: For a bounded-from-below function f on $\sigma(T)$ expressible as a monotone-decreasing limit f of $f_n \in C^o(\sigma(T))$ (bounded from below on $\sigma(T)$), the strong operator limit $\lim_n f_n(T)$ is independent of the sequence $\{f_n\}$ having limit f. Thus, there is an unambiguous operator $f(T) = \lim_n f_n(T)$.

Proof: Let g_n also decrease monotonically to f. For all $\varepsilon > 0$, for all m, for sufficiently large n, $\max(g_n(x), f_m(x)) \le f_m(x) + \varepsilon$ for all x, so $g_n(x) \le f_m(x) + \varepsilon$. Thus, $g_n(T) \le f_m(T) + \varepsilon$. Thus, $\lim_n g_n(T) \le f_m(T) + \varepsilon$, and then $\lim_n g_n(T) \le \lim_m f_m(T) + \varepsilon$. Since this holds for all $\varepsilon > 0$, and the roles of g_n and f_m can be reversed, we have equality. ///

[3.4] Corollary: Thus, the map $C^o(\sigma(T)) \to \overline{\mathbb{R}[T]}$ (operator-norm-closure) extends to a map defined on monotone-decreasing, bounded-below limits of functions in $C^o(\sigma(T))$, mapping continuously to the strong operator topology closure of $\mathbb{R}[T]$. The extension is still additive, inequality-preserving, and multiplicative (in the sense that $fg(T) = f(T) \cdot g(T)$). ///

[3.5] Corollary: Since $\mathrm{ch}_{(-\infty,t]}$ is the monotone-decreasing (bounded below) limit of $h_{t,\varepsilon}$, we have $P_t = \mathrm{ch}_{(-\infty,t]}(T)$. Further, $P_s \le P_t$ for $s \le t$, and $P_t^2 = P_t$, $(1 - P_t)P_t = P_t(1 - P_t) = 0$. Further, P_t is an *orthogonal* projection, in the sense that $(P_t V)^\perp = (1 - P_t)V$.

Proof: The first assertion is a special case of the previous claim. Since $\mathrm{ch}_{(-\infty,s]} \le \mathrm{ch}_{(-\infty,t]}$ for $s \le t$, the second assertion follows. The third assertion follows from $\mathrm{ch}^2_{(-\infty,t]} = \mathrm{ch}_{(-\infty,t]}$ and $(1 - \mathrm{ch}_{(-\infty,t]}) \cdot \mathrm{ch}_{(-\infty,t]} = 0$. Since P_t is in the strong. Since P_t is in the strong operator topology closure of a set of self-adjoint operators, it is self-adjoint. The computation

$$\langle P_t v, (1 - P_t)w\rangle \;=\; \langle (1 - P_t)P_t v, w\rangle \;=\; \langle 0, w\rangle \;=\; 0$$

shows that $(1 - P_t)V \subset (P_t V)^\perp$. Equality follows from $(1 - P_t) + P_t = 1$. ///

[3.6] Claim: $a \le T|_{(P_b - P_a)V} \le b$ for $a \le b$.

Proof: Let

$$f(x) \;=\; \begin{cases} 0 & (\text{for } x \le t) \\ x - t & (\text{for } x \ge t) \end{cases} \qquad \text{and} \qquad g(x) \;=\; \begin{cases} |x - t| & (\text{for } x \le t) \\ 0 & (\text{for } x \ge t) \end{cases}$$

Thus, $f(x) + g(x) = |x - t|$. Since $(x - t) \cdot (1 - \mathrm{ch}_{(-\infty,t]}) = f(x)$, we have $(T - t)(1 - P_t) = f(T)$. Thus, $T - t = f(T)$ on $(P_t V)^\perp$. Since $f \ge 0$, $T - t \ge 0$ on $(P_t V)^\perp$. Take $t = a$.

Since $(x - t)\mathrm{ch}_{(-\infty,t]} = -g(x)$, we have $(T - t)P_t = -g(T)$. Thus, $T - b = -g(T)$ on $P_t V$. Since $-g \le 0$, $T \le t$ on $P_t V$. Take $t = b$. ///

[3.7] Claim: $t \to P_t$ is strong operator topology continuous *on the right*.

Proof: The claim is that $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0^+} P_{t+\varepsilon} = P_t$ in the strong operator topology. Since $\langle (P_{t+\varepsilon} - P_t)v, v\rangle = |(P_{t+\varepsilon} - P_t)v|^2$, it suffices to show that, for all $v \in V$, $\langle P_{t+\varepsilon}v, v\rangle \to \langle P_t v, v\rangle$. And $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0^+} h_{t,\varepsilon}(T) = P_t$ in the strong operator topology, meaning that $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0^+} h_{t,\varepsilon}(T)(v) = P_t(v)$ for every $v \in V$.

Certainly $\mathrm{ch}_{(-\infty,t]} \le \mathrm{ch}_{(-\infty,t+\delta]} \le h_{t+\delta,\varepsilon}$ so $P_t \le P_{t+\delta} \le h_{t+\delta,\varepsilon}(T)$. Since $\lim_{\delta\to 0^+} h_{t+\delta,\varepsilon} = h_{t,\varepsilon}$ in sup-norm, $h_{t+\delta,\varepsilon}(T) \to h_{t,\varepsilon}(T)$ in operator norm topology. Given small $\eta > 0$, let $\delta > 0$ be small enough so that $h_{t+\delta}(T) \le h_t(T) + \eta$. Then

$$P_t \;\le\; P_{t+\delta} \;\le\; h_{t+\delta}(T) \;\le\; h_t(T) + \eta$$

and

$$\langle P_t v, v\rangle \;\le\; \langle P_{t+\delta}v, v\rangle \;\le\; \langle h_{t+\delta}(T)v, v\rangle \;\le\; \langle (h_t(T)+\eta)v, v\rangle$$

Since $h_t(T)v \to P_t v$, we have $\langle P_t v, v\rangle \le \langle P_{t+\delta}v, v\rangle \le \langle P_t v, v\rangle + \eta\langle v, v\rangle$. This holds for arbitrary η. ///

[3.8] Theorem: $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0^+} P_t - P_{t-\varepsilon}$ is the projector to the t-eigenspace of T.

Proof: Certainly $\mathrm{ch}_{(-\infty,t]} - \mathrm{ch}_{(-\infty,t-\varepsilon]}$ is monotone decreasing (and bounded below) as $\varepsilon \to 0^+$, so $P_t - P_{t-\varepsilon}$ converges in the strong operator topology to a continuous operator Q. From $a \le T|_{(P_b - P_a)V} \le b$ for $a \le b$,

$$(t-a)(P_t - P_{t-\varepsilon}) \;\le\; T\,(P_t - P_{t-\varepsilon}) \;\le\; t(P_t - P_{t-\varepsilon})$$

so $|T - t|(P_t - P_{t-\varepsilon})|_{\mathrm{op}} \le \varepsilon$. Let $w = Qv$. Then $|(T-t)w| \le \varepsilon$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$, so $(T-t)w = 0$. Thus, Q maps to the t-eigenspace.

Conversely, we show that Q is the identity map on the t-eigenspace V_t. For continuous, real-valued f, and for a T-stable subspace W of V, $f(T|_W) = f(T)|_W$, so we may assume without loss of generality that T is a scalar t on V. For all $\varepsilon > 0$, $h_{t,\varepsilon} = 1$ on $\sigma(T) = \{t\}$, so $h_{t,\varepsilon}(T) = 1$, and the strong operator topology limit is 1. For $s < t$, for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, $h_{s,\varepsilon} = 0$ on $\sigma(T) = \{t\}$, so $h_{s,\varepsilon}(T) = 0$. Thus, $Q = 1$. ///

[3.9] Corollary: An isolated point λ of $\sigma(T)$ is an *eigenvalue* of T.

Proof: $\mathrm{ch}_{(-\infty,\lambda]} - \mathrm{ch}_{(-\infty,\lambda-\varepsilon]}$ is non-zero for $\varepsilon > 0$, because $\lambda \in \sigma(T)$. Thus, $P_\lambda - P_{\lambda-\varepsilon}$ is non-zero for $\varepsilon > 0$. For λ isolated, $P_{\lambda-\varepsilon}$ is constant for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. Thus, the limit $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0^+} P_\lambda - P_{\lambda-\varepsilon}$ is non-zero, and by the previous theorem this is the projector to the eigenspace. ///

---

4. *Appendix: goofy lemma on polynomials*

The following peculiar lemma is not surprising, is essentially elementary, and facilitates a usefully gradual approach to the spectral theorem and its corollaries.

[4.1] Lemma: Let $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ be *non-negative-valued* on a finite interval $[a, b]$. Then f is expressible as a finite sum of the form

$$f \;=\; \sum_i P_i^2 + (x-a)\sum_j Q_j^2 + (b-x)\sum_k R_k^2$$

for polynomials P_i, Q_j, R_k in $\mathbb{R}[x]$.

Proof: It suffices to consider monic f, since positive constants can be absorbed. Factor f into irreducibles over $\mathbb{R}$, show that each of the linear and quadratic factors can be expressed in the given form, and then show that a product of such expressions can be re-written in the same form.

For quadratic irreducibles with complex-conjugate roots $z, \overline{z}$, by completing the square,

$$(x-z)(x-\overline{z}) \;=\; x^2 - (z+\overline{z})x + z\overline{z} \;=\; (x - \frac{z+\overline{z}}{2})^2 + (z\overline{z} - (\frac{z+\overline{z}}{2})^2)$$

Since
$$z\overline{z} - (\frac{z+\overline{z}}{2})^2 \;=\; z\overline{z} - \frac{1}{4}(z^2 + 2z\overline{z} + \overline{z}^2) \;=\; -\frac{1}{4}(z-\overline{z})^2 \;=\; (\frac{z-\overline{z}}{2i})^2 \;=\; (\mathrm{Im}\, z)^2 \;>\; 0$$
we have the desired expression for $(x-z)(x-\overline{z})$.

A linear factor $x-\alpha$ with $a < \alpha < b$ must occur to an *even* power, since otherwise $f(x)$ would take opposite signs on the two sides of α, contradicting the positivity of f on $[a,b]$.

A linear factor $x - \alpha$ with $\alpha \le a$ can be rewritten as
$$x - \alpha \;=\; (x-a) + (a-\alpha) \;=\; (x-a)\cdot 1 + (a-\alpha)$$
Since $a - \alpha \ge 0$, it is a square of an element of $\mathbb{R}$, and this gives the desired expression. Similarly, a linear factor $\alpha - x$ with $\alpha \ge b$ can be rewritten as
$$\alpha - x \;=\; (b-x) + (\alpha - b)$$
Thus, all the *factors* of f can be written in the desired form. As for products, we can inductively rewrite them by
$$P^2\cdot Q^2 \;=\; (PQ)^2 \qquad (x-a)P^2\cdot Q^2 \;=\; (x-a)\cdot(PQ)^2 \qquad (x-a)P^2\cdot(x-a)Q^2 \;=\; ((x-a)PQ)^2$$
$$(b-x)P^2\cdot Q^2 \;=\; (b-x)\cdot(PQ)^2 \qquad (b-x)P^2\cdot(b-x)Q^2 \;=\; ((b-x)PQ)^2$$
The only possible issue is the form $(x-a)P^2\cdot(b-x)Q^2$. By luck,
$$(x-a)(b-x) \;=\; (x-a)(b-x)\cdot\frac{(b-x)+(x-a)}{(b-x)+(x-a)} \;=\; \frac{(x-a)\cdot(b-x)^2 + (b-x)\cdot(x-a)^2}{b-a}$$
which is of the desired form. Iterating these rewritings gives the lemma. ///

---

5. *Appendix: Tietze-Urysohn-Brouwer extension theorem*

Granting Urysohn's lemma, this result is not difficult.

[5.1] Theorem: For X a *normal* space (meaning that any two disjoint closed sets have disjoint open neighborhoods), closed subset $E \subset X$, every continuous, bounded, real-valued f on E extends to F on X such that $\sup_X |F| = \sup_E |f|$.

Proof: Without loss of generality, the image of f is contained in $[0,1]$. Urysohn's lemma will be repeatedly invoked: given disjoint, closed B_n, C_n in X, there is continuous g_n on X taking values in $[0, \frac{1}{2}(2/3)^n]$ such that $g_n = 0$ on B_n and $g_n = \frac{1}{2}(2/3)^n$ on C_n. Specify the subsets B_n, C_n ($n = 1, 2, \ldots$) of E inductively by
$$B_1 \;=\; \{x \in E : f(x) \le \frac{1}{3}\} \qquad C_1 \;=\; \{x \in E : f(x) \ge \frac{2}{3}\}$$
and
$$B_n \;=\; \{x \in E : f(x) - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} g_i(x) \le \frac{2^{n-1}}{3^n}\} \qquad C_n \;=\; \{x \in E : f(x) - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} g_i(x) \ge \frac{2^n}{3^n}\}$$
These are disjoint closed subsets of E, so are closed in X. The sum $F = \sum_{i=1}^\infty g_i$ converges uniformly, so is continuous. On E, $0 \le f - F \le (2/3)^n$ for all n, so $F = f$ on E.

///

6. *Appendix: Urysohn's lemma*

[6.1] Theorem: *(Urysohn)* In a locally compact Hausdorff topological space X, given a compact subset K contained in an open set U, there is a continuous function $0 \le f \le 1$ which is 1 on K and 0 off U.

Proof: First, we prove that there is an open set V such that

$$K \subset V \subset \overline{V} \subset U$$

For each $x \in K$ let V_x be an open neighborhood of x with compact closure. By compactness of K, some finite subcollection $V_{x_1}, \ldots, V_{x_n}$ of these V_x cover K, so K is contained in the open set $W = \bigcup_i V_{x_i}$ which has compact closure $\bigcup_i \overline{V}_{x_i}$ since the union is *finite*.

Using the compactness again in a similar fashion, for each x in the closed set $X - U$ there is an open W_x containing K and a neighborhood U_x of x such that $W_x \cap U_x = \phi$.

Then

$$\bigcap_{x \in X-U} (X-U) \cap \overline{W} \cap \overline{W}_x = \phi$$

These are compact subsets in a Hausdorff space, so (again from compactness) some *finite* subcollection has empty intersection, say

$$(X-U) \cap \left(\overline{W} \cap \overline{W}_{x_1} \cap \ldots \cap \overline{W}_{x_n}\right) = \phi$$

That is,

$$\overline{W} \cap \overline{W}_{x_1} \cap \ldots \cap \overline{W}_{x_n} \subset U$$

Thus, the open set

$$V = W \cap W_{x_1} \cap \ldots \cap W_{x_n}$$

meets the requirements.

Using the possibility of inserting an open subset and its closure between any $K \subset U$ with K compact and U open, we inductively create opens V_r (with compact closures) indexed by rational numbers r in the interval $0 \le r \le 1$ such that, for $r > s$,

$$K \subset V_r \subset \overline{V}_r \subset V_s \subset \overline{V}_s \subset U$$

From any such configuration of opens we construct the desired continuous function f by

$$f(x) = \sup\{r \text{ rational in } [0,1] : x \in V_r, \} = \inf\{r \text{ rational in } [0,1] : x \in \overline{V}_r, \}$$

It is not immediate that this sup and inf are the same, but if we *grant* their equality then we can prove the *continuity* of this function $f(x)$. Indeed, the sup description expresses f as the supremum of characteristic functions of open sets, so f is at least *lower semi-continuous.* [1] The inf description expresses f as an infimum of characteristic functions of closed sets so is *upper* semi-continuous. Thus, f would be continuous.

To finish the argument, we must construct the sets V_r and prove equality of the inf and sup descriptions of the function f.

To construct the sets V_i, start by finding V_0 and V_1 such that

$$K \subset V_1 \subset \overline{V}_1 \subset V_0 \subset \overline{V}_0 \subset U$$

[1] A (real-valued) function f is *lower* semi-continuous when for all bounds B the set $\{x : f(x) > B\}$ is open. The function f is *upper* semi-continuous when for all bounds B the set $\{x : f(x) < B\}$ is open. It is easy to show that a sup of lower semi-continuous functions is lower semi-continuous, and an inf of upper semi-continuous functions is upper semi-continuous. As expected, a function both upper and lower semi-continuous is continuous.

Fix a well-ordering $r_1, r_2, \ldots$ of the rationals in the open interval $(0,1)$. Supposing that $V_{r_1}, \ldots, v_{r_n}$ have been chosen. let i, j be indices in the range $1, \ldots, n$ such that

$$r_j \;>\; r_{n+1} \;>\; r_i$$

and r_j is the *smallest* among $r_1, \ldots, r_n$ *above* r_{n+1}, while r_i is the *largest* among $r_1, \ldots, r_n$ *below* r_{n+1}. Using the first observation of this argument, find $V_{r_{n+1}}$ such that

$$V_{r_j} \;\subset\; \overline{V}_{r_j} \;\subset\; V_{r_{n+1}} \;\subset\; \overline{V}_{r_{n+1}} \;\subset\; V_{r_i} \;\subset\; \overline{V}_{r_i}$$

This constructs the nested family of opens.

Let $f(x)$ be the sup and $g(x)$ the inf of the characteristic functions above. If $f(x) > g(x)$ then there are $r > s$ such that $x \in V_r$ and $x \notin \overline{V}_s$. But $r > s$ implies that $V_r \subset \overline{V}_s$, so this cannot happen. If $g(x) > f(x)$, then there are rationals $r > s$ such that

$$g(x) \;>\; r \;>\; s \;>\; f(x)$$

Then $s > f(x)$ implies that $x \notin V_s$, and $r < g(x)$ implies $x \in \overline{V}_r$. But $V_r \subset \overline{V}_s$, contradiction. Thus, $f(x) = g(x)$. ///

7. *Appendix: historical notes*

To a considerable degree, our first section follows the outline in Appendix A1 of S. Lang's $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$. There, on page 362, it is noted that F. Riesz first used a positivity argument to get a form of the spectral theorem, but the sequel of that argument aimed toward an *integral* form of a spectral decomposition, while, in contrast, a 1950 seminar of J. von Neumann followed the outline of that appendix and section one here.