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Last time we defined the adjoint of a bounded, linear map between normed vector spaces. By definition, the adjoint of a map $T: X \rightarrow Y$ acts by "pulling back" linear functionals on $Y$ to linear functionals on $X$. Below, we show that the adjoint is itself a bounded linear map from $Y^{\prime}$ to $X^{\prime}$, and that its norm is well-behaved.
2.23 Proposition. If $T \in B(X, Y)$ where $X$ and $Y$ are normed spaces, then $T^{\prime} \in B\left(X^{\prime}, Y^{\prime}\right)$, and $\left\|T^{\prime}\right\|=\|T\|$.

Proof. First, we show $T^{\prime}$ is in fact linear. Take $f, g \in Y^{\prime}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{K}$. Then for any $x \in X$,

$$
\begin{array}{rlr}
\left\langle T^{\prime}(\alpha f+g), x\right\rangle & =\langle\alpha f+g, T(x)\rangle & \text { (by definition of the adjoint) } \\
& =\alpha\langle f, T(x)\rangle+\langle g, T(x)\rangle & \text { (by linearity of the dual pairing) } \\
& =\alpha\left\langle T^{\prime}(f), x\right\rangle+\left\langle T^{\prime}(g), x\right\rangle . &
\end{array}
$$

Since this holds for all $x \in X$, we see $T^{\prime}(\alpha f+g)=\alpha T^{\prime}(f)+T^{\prime}(g)$. Thus $T^{\prime}$ is linear.
To calculuate the norm of $\left\|T^{\prime}\right\|$, we use that for $f \in Y^{\prime}$,

$$
\left|\left\langle T^{\prime}(f), x\right\rangle\right| \stackrel{(1)}{=}|\langle f, T(x)\rangle| \stackrel{(2)}{=}|f(T(x))| \stackrel{(3)}{\leq}\|T\|\|f\|\|x\|
$$

where (1) follows from the definition of the adjoint, (2) by the definition of the dual pairing, and (3) by the fact that $f$ and $T$ are bounded. Taking the supremum on both sides over all $x \in X$ with $\|x\| \leq 1$ yields:

$$
\left|T^{\prime}(f)\right|=\sup _{x \in X,\|x\| \leq 1}\left|\left\langle T^{\prime}(f), x\right\rangle\right| \leq\|T\|\|f\| .
$$

Thus $T^{\prime}$ is bounded, so $T^{\prime} \in B\left(Y^{\prime}, X^{\prime}\right)$, and $\left\|T^{\prime}\right\| \leq\|T\|$.
To prove the reverse inequality, recall the following corollary to Hahn-Banach (discussed in class on $11 / 8 / 16$ ): If $Z$ is a normed space and $b_{0} \in Z$, there exists $f \in Z^{\prime}$ such that $f\left(z_{0}\right)=\left\|z_{0}\right\|$ and $|f(z)| \leq\|z\|$ for all $z \in Z$. For any $x \in X$ :

$$
\|T(x)\| \stackrel{(4)}{=} \max _{g \in Y^{\prime},\|g\| \leq 1}|\langle g, T(x)\rangle| \stackrel{(5)}{=} \max _{g \in Y^{\prime},\|g\| \leq 1}\left|\left\langle T^{\prime}(g), x\right\rangle\right| \stackrel{(6)}{\leq}\left\|T^{\prime}\right\|\|x\|,
$$

where (4) follows from the aforementioned corollary, (5) by definition of the adjoint, and (6) by the fact that $T^{\prime}$ is bounded (shown above). Thus $\|T\| \leq\left\|T^{\prime}\right\|$, so equality holds.

If we have a bounded linear map $T: X \rightarrow Y$ between normed spaces, we can view $T^{\prime}: Y^{\prime} \rightarrow X^{\prime}$ as a sort of "mirror image" of $T$, in that it reverses direction yet mimics the properties of $T$. In particular, we show that the adjoint of an invertible map is also invertible and determine its inverse.
2.24 Lemma. If $T \in B(X, Y)$ is invertible, then $T^{\prime} \in B\left(Y^{\prime}, X^{\prime}\right)$ is also invertible. Moreover, $\left(T^{\prime}\right)^{-1}=\left(T^{-1}\right)^{\prime}$.

Proof. Since $T$ is invertible we know $T^{-1} \in B(Y, X)$, so we may consider $\left(T^{-1}\right)^{\prime} \in B\left(X^{\prime}, Y^{\prime}\right)$. Let $S=\left(T^{-1}\right)^{\prime}$.

For any $f \in X^{\prime}$ and any $x \in X$ :

$$
\left\langle T^{\prime}(S(f)), x\right\rangle=\langle S(f), T(x)\rangle=\left\langle f, T^{-1}(T(x))\right\rangle=\langle f, x\rangle .
$$

Thus $T^{\prime}(S(f))=f$ for all $f \in X^{\prime}$, so $S$ is a right-inverse for $T^{\prime}$.
Similarly, for any $g \in Y^{\prime}$ and any $y \in Y$ :

$$
\left\langle S\left(T^{\prime}(g)\right), y\right\rangle=\left\langle T^{\prime}(g), T^{-1}(y)\right\rangle=\left\langle g, T\left(T^{-1}(y)\right)\right\rangle=\langle g, y\rangle .
$$

Thus $S\left(T^{\prime}(g)\right)=g$ for all $g \in Y^{\prime}$, so $S$ is a left-inverse for $T^{\prime}$. This means $T^{\prime}$ is invertible and $\left(T^{\prime}\right)^{-1}=S=\left(T^{-1}\right)^{\prime}$.

We can use the above lemma to show that $T^{\prime}$ inherits the isometry property from $T$.
2.25 Proposition. If $T \in B(X, Y)$ is an (isometric) isomorphism, then so is $T^{\prime} \in B\left(Y^{\prime}, X^{\prime}\right)$.

Proof. By the above lemma we know $T^{\prime}$ is invertible, and $\left(T^{\prime}\right)^{-1}=S=\left(T^{-1}\right)^{\prime}$. It remains to show that $T^{\prime}$ is an isometry.

Since $T$ is an isometric isomorphism we know $\|T\|=1$ and $\left\|T^{-1}\right\|=1$. The earlier proposition tells us that $\left\|T^{\prime}\right\|=\|T\|=1$, and also that $\left\|\left(T^{\prime}\right)^{-1}\right\|=\left\|\left(T^{-1}\right)^{\prime}\right\|=\left\|T^{-1}\right\|=1$. So for any $g \in Y^{\prime}$ :

$$
\left\|T^{\prime}(g)\right\| \leq\|g\|=\left\|\left(T^{\prime}\right)^{-1}\left(T^{\prime}(g)\right)\right\| \leq\left\|\left(T^{\prime}\right)^{-1}\right\|\left\|T^{\prime}(g)\right\|=\left\|T^{\prime}(g)\right\|,
$$

so equality holds throughout. Thus $T^{\prime}$ is an isometry.

The above proposition says more than just $X \cong Y \Longrightarrow X^{\prime} \cong Y^{\prime}$. It gives a specific, canonical way to convert an isomorphism of Banach spaces into an isomorphism of their duals (i.e., take the inverse of the adjoint).

## 2.A Annihilators

Next we examine the geometric aspects of duality. Our definitions and notation are motivated from those in Hilbert spaces, highlighting the parallel between the bilinear pairing $\langle f, x\rangle$ (of $x$ in a Banach space $X$ and $f \in X^{\prime}$ ) and the bilinear/sesquilinear inner product $\langle v, w\rangle$ (of elements $v, w$ in a Hilbert space). The following definitions and propositions can be phrased in an even more general setting, the only requirement is that we have a locally convex topological vector space.
2.26 Definition. Let $B$ be a Banach space, $M$ a subspace of $B$, and $N$ a subspace of $B^{\prime}$. We write the annihilators of $M$ and $N$ as:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& M^{\perp}=\left\{f \in B^{\prime}:\langle f, M\rangle=\{0\}\right\} \\
& N^{\perp}=\{x \in B:\langle N, x\rangle=\{0\}\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

We next explore some topological properties of annihilators.
2.27 Proposition. Let $B$ be a Banach space, $M$ a subspace of $B$, and $N$ a subspace of $B^{\prime}$. Then $M^{\perp}$ and $N^{\perp}$ are closed subspaces.

Proof. Recall that if $X$ is a first-countable topological space and $S \subset X$, then $x \in \bar{S}$ iff there exists a sequence of elements $\left(s_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset S$ such that $s_{n} \rightarrow x$. In other words, the sequential closure is the same as the topological closure. For this proposition $B$ and $B^{\prime}$ are first-countable because they are Banach spaces (obviously metrizable), so to show $M^{\perp}$ and $N^{\perp}$ are closed we need only show that they are sequentially closed.

Let $\left(f_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of elements in $M^{\perp}$ that converges to some $f \in B^{\prime}$. By the continuity of $\langle\cdot, \cdot\rangle$ in the first argument, we see that for any $m \in M,\left\langle f_{n}, m\right\rangle$ converges to $\langle f, m\rangle$. But since $\left\langle f_{n}, m\right\rangle=0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that $\langle f, m\rangle=0$. Since $m \in M$ was arbitrary we see $f \in M^{\perp}$, thus $M^{\perp}$ is closed.

Next, let $\left(x_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of elements in $N^{\perp}$ that converges to some $x \in B$. By the continuity of $\langle\cdot, \cdot\rangle$ in the second argument, we see that for any $n \in N,\left\langle n, x_{n}\right\rangle$ converges to $\langle n, x\rangle$. But since $\left\langle n, x_{n}\right\rangle=0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that $\langle n, x\rangle=0$. Since $n \in N$ was arbitrary we see $x \in N^{\perp}$, thus $N^{\perp}$ is closed.
2.28 Proposition. If $M$ is a subspace of a Banach space $B$, then $\left(M^{\perp}\right)^{\perp}=\bar{M}$.

Proof. Let $x \in M$, then for each $f \in M^{\perp},\langle f, x\rangle=0$ so $x \in\left(M^{\perp}\right)^{\perp}$. Thus $M \subset\left(M^{\perp}\right)^{\perp}$, and because $\left(M^{\perp}\right)^{\perp}$ is closed by the above proposition we also see $\bar{M} \subset\left(M^{\perp}\right)^{\perp}$.

To show the reverse inequality, we will use the following corollary of Hahn-Banach: Suppose $Y$ is a subspace of a locally convex space $X$, and $x_{0} \in X$. If $x_{0} \notin \bar{Y}$, then there exists $\Lambda \in X^{\prime}$ such that $\Lambda\left(x_{0}\right)=1$ but $\Lambda(x)=0$ for all $x \in Y$. Note: We can apply this corollary because every normed space is locally convex.

Let $x_{0} \notin \bar{M}$. Then there is a linear functional $f \in B^{\prime}$ such that $f\left(x_{0}\right)=1$ and $f(x)=0$ for all $x \in M$. So $f \in M^{\perp}$, but $\left\langle f, x_{0}\right\rangle=1 \neq 0$, thus $x_{0} \notin\left(M^{\perp}\right)^{\perp}$. So we have $\bar{M}^{c} \subset\left(\left(M^{\perp}\right)^{\perp}\right)^{c}$, which implies $\left(M^{\perp}\right)^{\perp} \subset \bar{M}$.

We now formulate a generalization of the classical rank-nullity theorem.
2.29 Theorem. Let $X$ and $Y$ be normed spaces and $T \in B(X, Y)$. Then $\operatorname{ker} T=\left(\operatorname{ran} T^{\prime}\right)^{\perp}$ and $\operatorname{ker} T^{\prime}=(\operatorname{ran} T)^{\perp}$.

Proof. We identify the sets as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
x \in \operatorname{ker} T & \Longleftrightarrow T x=0 \\
& \Longleftrightarrow\langle f, T x\rangle=0, \forall f \in Y^{\prime} \\
& \Longleftrightarrow\left\langle T^{\prime} f, x\right\rangle=0, \forall f \in Y^{\prime} \\
& \Longleftrightarrow x \in\left(T^{\prime}\left(Y^{\prime}\right)\right)^{\perp}=\left(\operatorname{ran} T^{\prime}\right)^{\perp}
\end{aligned}
$$

Similarly, for the second identification:

$$
\begin{aligned}
f \in \operatorname{ker} T^{\prime} & \Longleftrightarrow T^{\prime} f=0 \\
& \Longleftrightarrow\left\langle T^{\prime} f, x\right\rangle=0, \forall x \in X \\
& \Longleftrightarrow\langle f, T x\rangle, \forall x \in X \\
& \Longleftrightarrow f \in(\operatorname{ran} T)^{\perp} .
\end{aligned}
$$

2.30 Remark. Consider the above theorem in the context where $T: X \rightarrow Y$ is a linear map between finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces. In this case, by the Riesz representation theorem the adjoint map $T^{\prime} \in B\left(Y^{\prime}, X^{\prime}\right)$ can be identified with a map $T^{*}: Y \rightarrow X$. If we let $A$ be the matrix representation of $T$ with respect to some fixed bases for $X$ and $Y$, then the corresponding matrix representation for $T^{*}$ is $A^{*}$ (where here * denotes the conjugate transpose). Using the Hilbert space notion of orthogonality, note that $A x=0$ iff $\langle r, x\rangle=0$ for each row $r$ of $A$, i.e. iff $x \in(\operatorname{row}(A))^{\perp}=\left(\operatorname{col}\left(A^{*}\right)\right)^{\perp}$. Thus $\operatorname{ker}(T)=\left(\operatorname{ran}\left(T^{*}\right)\right)^{\perp}$. Similarly, we also get that $\operatorname{ker}\left(T^{*}\right)=(\operatorname{ran}(T))^{\perp}$.

We next study the interplay between annihilators and quotient spaces.
2.31 Proposition. Let $M$ be a closed subspace of a Banach space $B$, then:

1. $M^{\prime}$ is (isometrically) isomorphic to $B^{\prime} / M^{\perp}$.
2. $(B / M)^{\prime}$ is (isometrically) isomorphic to $M^{\perp}$.

Proof. For (1), define a map $\sigma: M^{\prime} \rightarrow B^{\prime} / M^{\perp}$ by $\sigma(f)=[F]$, where $F \in B^{\prime}$ is an extension of $f$ (possible by Hahn-Banach). Note that the equivalence class [ $F$ ] is independent of the particular choice of the extension $F$, because if $F$ and $G$ are both extensions of $f$, then:

$$
\left.F\right|_{M}=\left.\left.G\right|_{M} \Longrightarrow(F-G)\right|_{M}=0 \Longrightarrow F-G \in M^{\perp} \Longrightarrow[F]=[G] .
$$

Also note that $\sigma$ is linear by definition. It is also surjective, since if $[F] \in B^{\prime} / M^{\perp}$ then $[F]=\sigma\left(\left.F\right|_{M}\right)$.

It remains to show that $\sigma$ is an isometry. By definition, $\|\sigma(f)\|=\|[F]\|=\inf _{G \in[F]}\|G\|$. Since any extension $G$ of $f$ must satisfy $\|G\| \geq\|f\|$, we have that $\inf _{G \in[F]}\|G\| \geq\|f\|$. Also, since Hahn-Banach gives an extension of $f$ with the same norm as $f$, we get $\inf _{G \in[F]}\|G\| \leq\|f\|$, so equality holds. Thus $\sigma$ is an isometry.

For (2), consider $\tau:(B / M)^{\prime} \rightarrow B^{\prime}$ defined by setting $\langle\tau(f), x\rangle=\langle f,[x]\rangle$. Note that if $x \in M$, then $[x]=[0]$ so:

$$
\langle\tau(f), x\rangle=\langle f,[x]\rangle=\langle f,[0]\rangle=0 .
$$

Thus $\tau(f) \in M^{\perp}$ for every $f \in(B / M)^{\prime}$, so ran $(\tau) \subset M^{\perp}$. Also, if $g \in M^{\perp}$, then there is some $f \in(B / M)^{\prime}$ with $\langle f,[x]\rangle=\langle g, x\rangle$, so $g=\tau(f)$. Thus $\tau$ is onto $M^{\perp}$.

We will conclude this proof next time by showing that $\tau$ is an isometry.

Last time we saw that every separable Banach space is isometrically isomorphic to a quotient space of $\ell_{1}$. Combining this observation with the above proposition yields the following characterization of the dual spaces of separable Banach spaces.
2.32 Corollary. The dual of a separable Banach space is isometrically isomorphic to a closed subspace of $\ell_{\infty}$.

Proof. Given a Banach space $B$ there exists a closed subspace $W \subset \ell_{1}$ such that $B \cong \ell_{1} / W$. From item (2) above, we see that $\left(\ell_{1} / W\right)^{\prime} \cong W^{\perp}$, so $B^{\prime} \cong W^{\perp}$. In this case, $W^{\perp}$ is a closed subset of $\ell_{1}^{\prime}=\ell_{\infty}$.

