

# ROWS VERSUS COLUMNS

Franciszek Hugon Szafraniec

Uniwersytet Jagielloński, Kraków

*reporting on the joint effort with Manfred Möller (WITS, SA)*

The **anatomy** of matrices of unbounded operators will be presented in some detail.

## *Declaration*

The environment for this presentation is exclusively that of Hilbert spaces.

## *Declaration*

The environment for this presentation is exclusively that of **Hilbert** spaces.

However the positive results are true in locally convex spaces as well.

The environment for this presentation is exclusively that of **Hilbert** spaces.

However the positive results are true in locally convex spaces as well. In this way **Krein** spaces are included too.

The environment for this presentation is exclusively that of **Hilbert** spaces.

However the positive results are true in locally convex spaces as well. In this way **Krein** spaces are included too.

On the other hand, the odd examples are unsurpassed as they are settled within the richest structure; the most exhaustive situation to happen.

## Matrix: the pictograph and its meanings

---

Formal matrix – this is our INPUT

└ operator matrix *versus* ...

└ matrix operator

This is a matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$$

Formal matrix – this is our INPUT

└ operator matrix *versus* ...

└ matrix operator



This is a matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$$

This is an operator matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}, \quad A, B, C, D \text{ (rather) unbounded operators}$$

Formal matrix – this is our INPUT

└ operator matrix *versus* ...

└ matrix operator

This is a matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$$

This is an operator matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}, \quad A, B, C, D \text{ (rather) unbounded operators}$$

This is a matrix operator

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{A}) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathcal{D}(A) \cap \mathcal{D}(C)) \oplus (\mathcal{D}(B) \cap \mathcal{D}(D)) \\ \mathbf{A}(f \oplus g) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (Af + Bg) \oplus (Cf + Dg), \quad f, g \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{A}) \end{aligned}$$

Formal matrix – this is our INPUT

└ operator matrix versus ...

└ matrix operator

This is a matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$$

This is an operator matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}, \quad A, B, C, D \text{ (rather) unbounded operators}$$

This is a matrix operator

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{A}) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathcal{D}(A) \cap \mathcal{D}(C)) \oplus (\mathcal{D}(B) \cap \mathcal{D}(D)) \\ \mathbf{A}(f \oplus g) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (Af + Bg) \oplus (Cf + Dg), \quad f, g \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{A}) \end{aligned}$$

Formal

└ operator matrix

└ sometimes also a matrix operator with coupled domain



$\mathcal{H}_1$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_2$  and  $\mathcal{H}$  Hilbert spaces.

$\mathcal{H}_1$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_2$  and  $\mathcal{H}$  Hilbert spaces.

## Row operators

Given the operators  $R_i \subset \mathcal{H}_i \oplus \mathcal{H}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ .

$\mathcal{H}_1$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_2$  and  $\mathcal{H}$  Hilbert spaces.

## Row operators

Given the operators  $R_i \subset \mathcal{H}_i \oplus \mathcal{H}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . Define

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{R}_{(R_1, R_2)}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{D}(R_1) \oplus \mathcal{D}(R_2),$$

$$\mathbf{R}_{(R_1, R_2)}(f_1 \oplus f_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R_1 f_1 + R_2 f_2, \quad f_1 \oplus f_2 \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{R}_{(R_1, R_2)}).$$

$\mathcal{H}_1$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_2$  and  $\mathcal{H}$  Hilbert spaces.

### Row operators

Given the operators  $R_i \subset \mathcal{H}_i \oplus \mathcal{H}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . Define

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{R}_{(R_1, R_2)}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{D}(R_1) \oplus \mathcal{D}(R_2),$$

$$\mathbf{R}_{(R_1, R_2)}(f_1 \oplus f_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R_1 f_1 + R_2 f_2, \quad f_1 \oplus f_2 \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{R}_{(R_1, R_2)}).$$

### Column operators

Given the operators  $C_i \subset \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H}_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ .



$\mathcal{H}_1$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_2$  and  $\mathcal{H}$  Hilbert spaces.

## Row operators

Given the operators  $R_i \subset \mathcal{H}_i \oplus \mathcal{H}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . Define

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{R}_{(R_1, R_2)}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{D}(R_1) \oplus \mathcal{D}(R_2),$$

$$\mathbf{R}_{(R_1, R_2)}(f_1 \oplus f_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R_1 f_1 + R_2 f_2, \quad f_1 \oplus f_2 \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{R}_{(R_1, R_2)}).$$

## Column operators

Given the operators  $C_i \subset \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H}_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . Define

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{D}(C_1) \cap \mathcal{D}(C_2),$$

$$\mathbf{C}_{(C_1, C_2)} f \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C_1 f_1 \oplus C_2 f_2, \quad f \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}).$$

## *The anatomy*

---

This is a rather formal (and elementary) linear algebra

## The subject for dissection

Let

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

be an operator matrix and  $\mathbf{A}$  the matrix operator it generates (with proper domains).

## The subject for dissection

Let

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

be an operator matrix and  $\mathbf{A}$  the matrix operator it generates (with proper domains).

Then

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C}_{(\mathbf{R}_{(A_{11}, A_{21})}, \mathbf{R}_{(A_{12}, A_{22})})}$$

## *The lesson*

---

Now the essence enters

## The goal

Examine **closures** and **adjoints** (duals, remember: it has to serve other than Hilbert spaces as well) of matrix operators.

## The goal

Examine **closures** and **adjoints** (duals, remember: it has to serve other than Hilbert spaces as well) of matrix operators.

## The way

Examine those of row and column operators!

## The goal

Examine **closures** and **adjoints** (duals, remember: it has to serve other than Hilbert spaces as well) of matrix operators.

## The way

Examine those of row and column operators!

## Warning

The case when at most of one of the operators in a row or/and in a column is **bounded** is reluctantly not excluded (this is just **trivial**;



## The goal

Examine **closures** and **adjoints** (duals, remember: it has to serve other than Hilbert spaces as well) of matrix operators.

## The way

Examine those of row and column operators!

## Warning

The case when at most of one of the operators in a row or/and in a column is **bounded** is reluctantly not excluded (this is just **trivial**; everything goes as someone might have dreamed of).

## *Row operators*

---

Rows and columns

└ Some notation, it's never ending

## About 'dashing' or 'overlining'

The 'dash' put over and aside of an operator stands as usually for its closure.

### About 'dashing' or 'overlining'

The 'dash' put over and aside of an operator stands as usually for its closure.

### About 'crossing'

By  $\times$  we denote always the adjoint operation applied entrywise regardless an object in question is: a row, a column or a matrix.

## *Row and column operators*

---

Rows

└ Pretty well-mannered results

The pleasure



Rows

└ Pretty well-mannered results

The pleasure

$$\mathbf{R}^* = \mathbf{C}_{(R_1^*, R_2^*)}$$

The pleasure

$$R^* = C_{(R_1^*, R_2^*)}$$

A little bit less pleasant



The pleasure

$$\mathbf{R}^* = \mathbf{C}_{(R_1^*, R_2^*)}$$

A little bit less pleasant

For  $\mathbf{R}_{(R_1, R_2)}$  to be closable it is **necessary**  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  to be so.

The pleasure

$$\mathbf{R}^* = \mathbf{C}_{(R_1^*, R_2^*)}$$

A little bit less pleasant

For  $\mathbf{R}_{(R_1, R_2)}$  to be closable it is **necessary**  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  to be so.

To recompose you the above

If  $\mathcal{R}(R_2) \subset \mathcal{R}(R_1)$ ,  $R_1$  is injective and  $R_1 R_2^{-1}$  extends to a bounded operator  $K$ , say, then

$$\overline{\mathbf{R}_{(R_1, R_2)}} = \mathbf{R}_{(\overline{R_1}, 0)} \begin{pmatrix} I & K \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}.$$

## The pleasure

$$\mathbf{R}^* = \mathbf{C}_{(R_1^*, R_2^*)}$$

## A little bit less pleasant

For  $\mathbf{R}_{(R_1, R_2)}$  to be closable it is **necessary**  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  to be so.

## To recompose you the above

If  $\mathcal{R}(R_2) \subset \mathcal{R}(R_1)$ ,  $R_1$  is injective and  $R_1 R_2^{-1}$  extends to a bounded operator  $K$ , say, then

$$\overline{\mathbf{R}_{(R_1, R_2)}} = \mathbf{R}_{(\overline{R_1}, 0)} \begin{pmatrix} I & K \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}.$$

In other words, the entrywise closure does the job!



Entries are closed but the row operator is not

Entries are closed but the row operator is not

Be in  $\ell^2$  space with the usual '0 – 1' basis  $(e_n)_n$ , please. Set

$$R_1 e_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \beta_k e_k, \quad R_2 e_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \alpha_k e_1 + \beta_k e_k$$

and

Entries are closed but the row operator is not

Be in  $\ell^2$  space with the usual '0 – 1' basis  $(e_n)_n$ , please. Set

$$R_1 e_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \beta_k e_k, \quad R_2 e_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \alpha_k e_1 + \beta_k e_k$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}(R_1) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ f = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma_k e_k : \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\gamma_k|^2 < \infty, \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\gamma_k \beta_k|^2 < \infty \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{D}(R_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ f = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma_k e_k \in \mathcal{D}(R_1) : \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma_k \alpha_k \text{ converges} \right\}.$$

Entries are closed but the row operator is not

Be in  $\ell^2$  space with the usual '0 – 1' basis  $(e_n)_n$ , please. Set

$$R_1 e_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \beta_k e_k, \quad R_2 e_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \alpha_k e_1 + \beta_k e_k$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}(R_1) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ f = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma_k e_k : \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\gamma_k|^2 < \infty, \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\gamma_k \beta_k|^2 < \infty \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{D}(R_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ f = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma_k e_k \in \mathcal{D}(R_1) : \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma_k \alpha_k \text{ converges} \right\}.$$

Then the patient calculation makes it.



## Column operators

---

Rows and columns

└ The foretaste

This is the foretaste of what may happen

This is the foretaste of what may happen

$$\mathbf{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}^\times = \mathbf{R}_{(C_1^*, C_2^*)} \subset \mathbf{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}^*$$

This is the foretaste of what may happen

$$\mathbf{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}^\times = \mathbf{R}_{(C_1^*, C_2^*)} \subset \mathbf{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}^*$$

The troublemaker shows its real face

Let  $C_1$  and  $T$  be densely defined operators such that

$$\mathcal{D}(C_1) = \mathcal{D}(T) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}(C_1^*) \subsetneq \mathcal{D}(T^*).$$

This is the foretaste of what may happen

$$\mathbf{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}^\times = \mathbf{R}_{(C_1^*, C_2^*)} \subset \mathbf{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}^*$$

The troublemaker shows its real face

Let  $C_1$  and  $T$  be densely defined operators such that

$$\mathcal{D}(C_1) = \mathcal{D}(T) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}(C_1^*) \subsetneq \mathcal{D}(T^*).$$

Then, after  $C_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} T - C_1$

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}^\times) \subsetneq \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}^*).$$

## A little something again

Suppose  $\mathcal{D}(C_1) = \mathcal{D}(C_2)$  and  $C_1$  is injective with  $C_2 C_1^{-1}$  having a bounded extension. Let  $\mathcal{D}_0$  be a subspace of  $\mathcal{D}(C_{(C_1, C_2)}^*)$  such that there exists (at least one)  $v_0 \in \mathcal{H}_2 \setminus \{0\}$  for which  $(-K v_0, v_0) \in \mathcal{D}_0$ .

## A little something again

Suppose  $\mathcal{D}(C_1) = \mathcal{D}(C_2)$  and  $C_1$  is injective with  $C_2 C_1^{-1}$  having a bounded extension. Let  $\mathcal{D}_0$  be a subspace of  $\mathcal{D}(C_{(C_1, C_2)}^*)$  such that there exists (at least one)  $v_0 \in \mathcal{H}_2 \setminus \{0\}$  for which  $(-K v_0, v_0) \in \mathcal{D}_0$ .

Then  $\mathcal{D}_0$  is a core of  $C_{(C_1, C_2)}$  if and only if  $\mathcal{D}_0$  is dense in  $\mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2$  and  $C_{(I, K^*)}(\mathcal{D}_0) \cap \mathcal{D}(C_1^*)$  is a core for  $C_1^*$ .

## Column operators

---

Rows and columns

└ Some pleasure comes anyway



Still something



## Still something

For  $C_{(C_1, C_2)}$  to be closable it is **sufficient**  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  to be so.

Still something

For  $C_{(C_1, C_2)}$  to be closable it is **sufficient**  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  to be so.

Not too bad so far

### Still something

For  $\mathcal{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}$  to be closable it is **sufficient**  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  to be so.

### Not too bad so far

1°  $\mathcal{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}$  is closed if so are  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ ;

## Still something

For  $\mathcal{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}$  to be closable it is **sufficient**  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  to be so.

## Not too bad so far

1°  $\mathcal{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}$  is closed if so are  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ ;

2°  $\overline{\mathcal{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}^\times} = \mathcal{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}^*$  if and only if  $\overline{\mathcal{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}} = \mathcal{C}_{(\bar{C}_1, \bar{C}_2)}$ .

### Still something

For  $\mathcal{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}$  to be closable it is **sufficient**  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  to be so.

### Not too bad so far

1°  $\mathcal{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}$  is closed if so are  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ ;

2°  $\overline{\mathcal{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}^\times} = \mathcal{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}^*$  if and only if  $\overline{\mathcal{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}} = \mathcal{C}_{(\bar{C}_1, \bar{C}_2)}$ .

Again some clouds are coming (next slide please).

It has been known that there are closed column operators with at least one of the entries not closable. Even more, it turns out this situation is **generic**.

It has been known that there are closed column operators with at least one of the entries not closable. Even more, it turns out this situation is **generic**.

### An eccentric example

Let  $C$  be a merely unbounded operator which is closable. Then  $C$  decomposes as  $C_{(C_1, C_2)}$  with  $C_1$  not closable.



It has been known that there are closed column operators with at least one of the entries not closable. Even more, it turns out this situation is **generic**.

### An eccentric example

Let  $C$  be a merely unbounded operator which is closable. Then  $C$  decomposes as  $C_{(C_1, C_2)}$  with  $C_1$  not closable.

Hint: take  $x \notin \mathcal{D}(C^*)$  and set  $C_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} PC$  and  $C_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (I - P)C$  where  $P$  is the rank one projection on  $\{x\}$ .

## Column operators

---

Rows and columns

└ something to improve the mood a bit

To factor or to factorize, again

Suppose  $\mathcal{D}(C_1) = \mathcal{D}(C_2)$ . If  $C_1$  is injective with  $C_2C_1^{-1}$  having a bounded extension. Then

To factor or to factorize, again

Suppose  $\mathcal{D}(C_1) = \mathcal{D}(C_2)$ . If  $C_1$  is injective with  $C_2 C_1^{-1}$  having a bounded extension. Then

$$C_{(C_1, C_2)}^\times = R_{(C_1^*, C_1^* K^*)} \quad \text{but} \quad C_{(C_1, C_2)}^* = C_{(C_1^*, 0)} \begin{pmatrix} I & K^* \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}.$$

To factor or to factorize, again

Suppose  $\mathcal{D}(C_1) = \mathcal{D}(C_2)$ . If  $C_1$  is injective with  $C_2 C_1^{-1}$  having a bounded extension. Then

$$C_{(C_1, C_2)}^\times = R_{(C_1^*, C_1^* K^*)} \quad \text{but} \quad C_{(C_1, C_2)}^* = C_{(C_1^*, 0)} \begin{pmatrix} I & K^* \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}.$$

What is the difference in the above?

To factor or to factorize, again

Suppose  $\mathcal{D}(C_1) = \mathcal{D}(C_2)$ . If  $C_1$  is injective with  $C_2 C_1^{-1}$  having a bounded extension. Then

$$\mathbf{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}^\times = \mathbf{R}_{(C_1^*, C_1^* K^*)} \quad \text{but} \quad \mathbf{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}^* = \mathbf{C}_{(C_1^*, 0)} \begin{pmatrix} I & K^* \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}.$$

What is the difference in the above?

Look at

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}^\times) = \{f \oplus g: f \in \mathcal{D}(C_1^*), K^* g \in \mathcal{D}(C_1^*)\}$$

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}^*) = \{f \oplus g: f + K^* g \in \mathcal{D}(C_1^*)\}$$

and notice the difference! The latter is like coupling, isn't it?

To factor or to factorize, again

Suppose  $\mathcal{D}(C_1) = \mathcal{D}(C_2)$ . If  $C_1$  is injective with  $C_2 C_1^{-1}$  having a bounded extension. Then

$$\mathbf{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}^\times = \mathbf{R}_{(C_1^*, C_1^* K^*)} \quad \text{but} \quad \mathbf{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}^* = \mathbf{C}_{(C_1^*, 0)} \begin{pmatrix} I & K^* \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}.$$

What is the difference in the above?

Look at

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}^\times) = \{f \oplus g: f \in \mathcal{D}(C_1^*), K^* g \in \mathcal{D}(C_1^*)\}$$

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}^*) = \{f \oplus g: f + K^* g \in \mathcal{D}(C_1^*)\}$$

and notice the difference!

To factor or to factorize, again

Suppose  $\mathcal{D}(C_1) = \mathcal{D}(C_2)$ . If  $C_1$  is injective with  $C_2 C_1^{-1}$  having a bounded extension. Then

$$\mathbf{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}^\times = \mathbf{R}_{(C_1^*, C_1^* K^*)} \quad \text{but} \quad \mathbf{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}^* = \mathbf{C}_{(C_1^*, 0)} \begin{pmatrix} I & K^* \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}.$$

What is the difference in the above?

Look at

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}^\times) = \{f \oplus g: f \in \mathcal{D}(C_1^*), K^* g \in \mathcal{D}(C_1^*)\}$$

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{C}_{(C_1, C_2)}^*) = \{f \oplus g: f + K^* g \in \mathcal{D}(C_1^*)\}$$

and notice the difference! The latter is like coupling, isn't it?



Just to remind

$$A = C_{(R_{(A_{11}, A_{21})}, R_{(A_{12}, A_{22})})}$$

Applying all the permissible procedures which help one gets

$$A^\times = R_{(C_{(A_{11}^*, A_{21}^*)}, C_{(A_{12}^*, A_{22}^*)})} \subset A^*.$$

This results in

Just to remind

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C}_{(\mathbf{R}_{(A_{11}, A_{21})}, \mathbf{R}_{(A_{12}, A_{22})})}$$

Applying all the permissible procedures which help one gets

$$\mathbf{A}^\times = \mathbf{R}_{(\mathbf{C}_{(A_{11}^*, A_{21}^*)}, \mathbf{C}_{(A_{12}^*, A_{22}^*)})} \subset \mathbf{A}^*.$$

This results in

1°  $\mathbf{A}^\times$  is closable;

Just to remind

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C}_{(\mathbf{R}_{(A_{11}, A_{21})}, \mathbf{R}_{(A_{12}, A_{22})})}$$

Applying all the permissible procedures which help one gets

$$\mathbf{A}^\times = \mathbf{R}_{(\mathbf{C}_{(A_{11}^*, A_{21}^*)}, \mathbf{C}_{(A_{12}^*, A_{22}^*)})} \subset \mathbf{A}^*.$$

This results in

- 1°  $\mathbf{A}^\times$  is closable;
- 2° if  $\mathbf{A}^\times$  is densely defined,  $\mathbf{A}$  is closable;

Just to remind

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C}_{(\mathbf{R}_{(A_{11}, A_{21})}, \mathbf{R}_{(A_{12}, A_{22})})}$$

Applying all the permissible procedures which help one gets

$$\mathbf{A}^\times = \mathbf{R}_{(\mathbf{C}_{(A_{11}^*, A_{21}^*)}, \mathbf{C}_{(A_{12}^*, A_{22}^*)})} \subset \mathbf{A}^*.$$

This results in

- 1°  $\mathbf{A}^\times$  is closable;
- 2° if  $\mathbf{A}^\times$  is densely defined,  $\mathbf{A}$  is closable;
- 3° even if all  $A_{ij}$  are closed,  $\mathbf{A}$  **may not** be closable (this comes out from combining previous examples).

$\mathcal{H}_1 = \mathcal{H}_2 = \mathcal{L}^2(0, 1)$  and the operators  $A_{ij}$  are defined by

$$\mathcal{D}(A_{11}) = \{f \in W_2^1(0, 1) : f(0) = 0\}, \quad A_{11}f = f',$$

$$\mathcal{D}(A_{12}) = L_2(0, 1), \quad A_{12} = 0,$$

$$\mathcal{D}(A_{21}) = \{f \in W_2^1(0, 1) : f(1) = 0\}, \quad A_{21}f = f',$$

$$A_{22} = -A_{21},$$

where  $W_2^1(0, 1)$  denotes the usual Sobolev space of order 1.

$\mathcal{H}_1 = \mathcal{H}_2 = \mathcal{L}^2(0, 1)$  and the operators  $A_{ij}$  are defined by

$$\mathcal{D}(A_{11}) = \{f \in W_2^1(0, 1) : f(0) = 0\}, \quad A_{11}f = f',$$

$$\mathcal{D}(A_{12}) = L_2(0, 1), \quad A_{12} = 0,$$

$$\mathcal{D}(A_{21}) = \{f \in W_2^1(0, 1) : f(1) = 0\}, \quad A_{21}f = f',$$

$$A_{22} = -A_{21},$$

where  $W_2^1(0, 1)$  denotes the usual Sobolev space of order 1.

### The worst example for today

Then all  $A_{ij}$  are closed,  $\mathbf{A}$  as well as  $\mathbf{A}^\times$  is densely defined but

$$\overline{\mathbf{A}^\times} \subsetneq \mathbf{A}'.$$