# GENERALIZED FREDHOLM TRANSFORMATIONS 

D. G. TACON

(Received 29 November 1982)


#### Abstract

In an earlier paper we showed that the set $\psi_{+}(X, Y)$ of super Tauberian transformations between two Banach spaces $X$ and $Y$ forms an open subset of $\mathscr{G}(X, Y)$ which is closed under perturbation by super weakly compact transformations. In this note we characterize a class dual to $\psi_{+}(X, Y)$ which we denote by $\psi_{-}(X, Y)$. We show that $$
T \in \psi_{+}(X, Y) \text { if and only if } T^{\prime} \in \psi_{-}\left(Y^{\prime}, X^{\prime}\right)
$$ and that $$
T^{\prime} \in \psi_{+}\left(Y^{\prime}, X^{\prime}\right) \text { if and only if } T \in \psi_{-}(X, Y)
$$ and provide standard and nonstandard characterizations of elements of $\psi_{-}(X, Y)$. These two classes thus play in some ways analogous roles to the sets of semi-Fredholm transforms $\phi_{+}(X, Y)$ and $\phi_{-}(X, Y)$.

Moreover $\psi(X, Y)=\psi_{+}(X, Y) \cap \psi_{-}(X, Y)$ then forms an open subset of $\mathscr{B}(X, Y)$ closed under the taking of adjoints, under the taking of nonstandard hull extensions, and under perturbation by super weakly compact transformations.


1980 Mathematics subject classification (Amer. Math. Soc.): 47 A 53.

## 1. Preliminaries

This paper is a continuation of the investigation begun in an earlier paper [8]. We are concerned with transformations between (real infinite dimensional) Banach spaces and with their extensions on the nonstandard hulls of these spaces. Our notation is generally consistent with [8] except for a limited number of instances which we comment on explicitly. As before we are assuming that our objects of study are embedded in some set theoretical structure $\mathfrak{N}$ of which $* \mathfrak{K}$ is an $\kappa_{1}$-saturated enlargement. For a Banach space $X$ the nonstandard hull $\hat{X}$ (with

[^0]respect to * ${ }^{*}$ () is constructed by factoring the infinitesimal elements of ${ }^{*} X$ from the finite elements of ${ }^{*} X$. The original space $X$ is embedded in $\hat{X}$ and $\hat{X}$ is a Banach space under the norm $\|\hat{p}\|=$ standard part ${ }^{*}\|p\|$ where $\hat{p}$ denotes the equivalence class determined by the finite element $p \in{ }^{*} X$. An element $S \in$ finite $* \mathscr{B}(X, Y)$ defines an element $\hat{S} \in \mathscr{B}(\hat{X}, \hat{Y})$ by the equation $\hat{S}(\hat{p})=(S(p))$ where $p \in$ finite ${ }^{*} X$.

We remind the reader that the class of Tauberian transformations $\mathscr{T}(X, X)$ consists of those transformations $T$ between $X$ and $Y$ for which $T^{\prime \prime} x^{\prime \prime} \in Y$ implies $x^{\prime \prime} \in X$. The class of super Tauberian transformations, which we now denote by $\psi_{+}(X, Y)$, consists of those transformations which have Tauberian extensions between the nonstandard hulls, that is, $T \in \psi_{+}(X, Y)$ if $\hat{T} \in \mathscr{T}(\hat{X}, \hat{Y})$. Theorem 3 in [8] provides alternate characterizations of $\psi_{+}(X, Y)$ the simplest of which is the condition that ker $\hat{T}$ is reflexive or superreflexive. It seems to be an open question whether or not $T \in \mathscr{F}(X, Y)$ implies $T^{\prime \prime} \in \mathscr{T}\left(X^{\prime \prime}, Y^{\prime \prime}\right)$ (see Kalton and Wilansky [7] and [8, Proposition]). The principal difficulty in establishing a result like this arises since a Tauberian transformation $T$ need not have closed range. Thus one cannot assume that the range of the adjoint is the set of $f \in X^{\prime}$ for which $T x=0$ implies $f(x)=0$, that is, we cannot assume $\mathscr{R}\left(T^{\prime}\right)=(\text { ker } T)^{\perp}$ (see Dunford and Schwartz [2, page 487]).

Without the conclusion that $T^{\prime \prime} \in \mathscr{T}\left(X^{\prime \prime}, Y^{\prime \prime}\right)$ it is impossible to define a class of transformations which is completely dual to $\mathscr{T}(X, Y)$. Yang [10] counters this problem by calling a transformation $T$ co-Tauberian if $T$ has closed range and reflexive cokernel. Then, for transformations with closed range, Tauberian and co-Tauberian transformations are completely dual. It is not true that a super Tauberian transformation $T$ need have closed range (see Section 4) but nevertheless if $T$ is super Tauberian then $T^{\prime \prime}$ is super Tauberian.

## 2. The existence of $\psi_{-}(X, Y)$

We show in this section that there exists a class of transformations satisfying the duality properties stated in the abstract.

Lemma 1. Let $X$ and $Y$ be Banach spaces and suppose $T: X \rightarrow Y$. Let $S=$ $\left\{f_{1}, f_{2}, \ldots, f_{n}\right\}$ be a finite subset of $X^{\prime}$ and suppose $\phi \in X^{\prime \prime}$ is such that $\left\|T^{\prime \prime} \phi\right\|<\varepsilon$ where $\varepsilon>0$. Then, given $\delta>0$, there exists a point $x \in X$ such that
(i) $\|x\| \leqslant 3\|\phi\|+\delta$;
(ii) $f_{i}(x)=\phi\left(f_{i}\right)$ for $i=1,2, \ldots, n$; and
(iii) $\|T x\|<\varepsilon$.

Proof. By Helly's theorem (Wilansky [9, page 103]) there exists a point $x_{0} \in X$ with $\left\|x_{0}\right\| \leqslant\|\phi\|+\delta / 2$ such that $\left(f_{i}\right)\left(x_{0}\right)=\phi\left(f_{i}\right)$ for $i=1,2, \ldots, n$. Let $S_{\perp}=\left\{x \in X: f_{i}(x)=0\right.$ for $\left.i=1,2, \ldots, n\right\}$ and $S^{\perp}=\left\{x^{\prime \prime} \in X^{\prime \prime}: x^{\prime \prime}\left(f_{i}\right)=0\right.$ for $i=1,2, \ldots, n\}$. Then $\phi \in x_{0}+S^{\perp}$ and so we can write $\phi=x_{0}+x^{\prime \prime}$ where $x^{\prime \prime} \in S^{\perp}$ and $\left\|x^{\prime \prime}\right\| \leqslant 2\|\phi\|+\delta / 2$. Suppose $A=\left\{x \in S_{\perp}:\|x\| \leqslant 2\|\phi\|+\delta / 2\right\}$ and $B=T\left(x_{0}\right)+T(A)$. Then there exists a net of points $\left\{x_{\alpha}\right\} \subset A$ such that $x_{\alpha} \rightarrow x^{\prime \prime}$ in the weak* topology. Consequently $T x_{\alpha} \rightarrow T^{\prime \prime} x^{\prime \prime}$ in the weak* topology or equivalently $T x_{0}+T x_{\alpha} \rightarrow T^{\prime \prime} \phi$ in the weak* topology. But $\left\|T^{\prime \prime} \phi\right\|<\varepsilon$ so for all $g \in Y^{\prime \prime}$ with $\|g\| \leqslant 1$ there exists a point $b \in B$ such that $|g(b)|<\varepsilon$. Now let us suppose that $d(0, B) \geqslant \varepsilon$, so that $Y_{\varepsilon} \cap B=\varnothing$. Then $B$ and $Y_{\varepsilon}$ can be separated by a non-zero continuous linear functional (Dunford and Schwartz [2, page 417]). This means there exists an element $g \in Y^{\prime}$ with $\|g\|=1$ and a real constant $d$ such that

$$
g(B) \geqslant d \quad \text { and } \quad g\left(Y_{\varepsilon}\right) \leqslant d .
$$

But $\sup g\left(Y_{\varepsilon}\right)=\varepsilon$ and so $d \geqslant \varepsilon$ forcing the inequality $g(B) \geqslant \varepsilon$. This is a contradiction and so $d(0, B)<\varepsilon$. Thus there is a point $x_{1} \in A$ such that $\left\|T\left(x_{0}+x_{1}\right)\right\|$ $<\varepsilon$ and $x=x_{0}+x_{1}$ then satisfies the three conditions of the lemma.

Theorem 1. Let $X$ and $Y$ be Banach spaces and suppose $T \in \psi_{+}(X, Y)$. Then $T^{\prime \prime} \in \psi_{+}\left(X^{\prime \prime}, Y^{\prime \prime}\right)$.

Proof. Suppose $T^{\prime \prime} \notin \psi_{+}\left(X^{\prime \prime}, Y^{\prime \prime}\right)$. Then, by [8, Theorem 3], there exists a real number $r$ satisfying $0<r<1$ such that for all positive integers $n$ there exist finite sequences of elements $\left\{\phi_{1}, \phi_{2}, \ldots, \phi_{n}\right\}$ in $X^{\prime \prime}$ and $\left\{F_{1}, F_{2}, \ldots, F_{n}\right\}$ in $X^{\prime \prime}$ such that $\left\|\phi_{k}\right\|,\left\|F_{k}\right\|<1$ for $k=1,2, \ldots, n$ satisfying

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
F_{j}\left(\phi_{i}\right)>r & \text { for } 1 \leqslant j \leqslant i \leqslant n \text { and } \\
F_{j}\left(x_{i}\right)=0 & \text { for } 1 \leqslant i<j \leqslant n .
\end{array}
$$

with $\left\|x_{k}\right\|<3$ and $\left\|T x_{k}\right\|<1 / k$ for $k=1,2, \ldots, n$. It follows by [8, Theorem 3] that $T \notin \psi_{+}(X, Y)$.
We now define $\psi_{-}(X, Y)$ to consist of those transformations $T \in \mathscr{B}(X, Y)$ for which $T^{\prime} \in \psi_{+}\left(Y^{\prime}, X^{\prime}\right)$. Since $\psi_{+}\left(Y^{\prime}, X^{\prime}\right)$ is open it follows that $\psi_{-}(X, Y)$ is an open subset of $\mathscr{B}(X, Y)$. Further, since the converse of Theorem 1 is also true, we have

$$
T \in \psi_{+}(X, Y) \quad \text { if and only if } \quad T^{\prime} \in \psi_{-}\left(Y^{\prime}, X^{\prime}\right)
$$

## 3. Characterizations of the set $\psi_{-}(X, Y)$

If $T \in \mathscr{B}(X, Y)$ we let $\bar{\Re}(T)$ denote the closure of the range of $T$, and we then call the quotient space $Y / \bar{R}(T)$ the cokernel of $T$. We shall show that $T \in$ $\psi_{-}(X, Y)$ if and only if $\hat{T}$ has reflexive cokernel, or equivalently, a superreflexive cokernel. The proof of this result would be immediate except that, in general, $(\hat{T})^{\prime} \neq\left(T^{\prime}\right)^{\text {; }}$, recall $(\hat{X})^{\prime}=\left(X^{\prime}\right)^{\text {if }}$ if and only if $X$ is superreflexive (see Henson and Moore [3, Theorem 8.5]).

Lemma 2. Let $X$ and $Y$ be Banach spaces and suppose $T: X \rightarrow Y$. If $\operatorname{ker}\left(T^{\prime}\right) \hat{i}$ is reflexive (respectively, superreflexive) then $\hat{T}$ has reflexive cokernel (respectively, superreflexive cokernel).

Proof. Let $W$ and $Z$ denote $\operatorname{ker}\left(T^{\prime}\right)^{\wedge}$ and $\hat{Y} / \overline{\mathscr{R}}(\hat{T})$ respectively. We can consider $\left(X^{\prime}\right)^{\wedge}$ to be embedded in $(\hat{X})^{\prime}$ in which case $\left(T^{\prime}\right)$ is the restriction of $(\hat{T})^{\prime}$ to $\left(X^{\prime}\right)^{\prime}$. Thus we can suppose $W \subset \operatorname{ker}(\hat{T})^{\prime}$ and thus that $W$ is a subspace of $Z^{\prime}$ (see, for example, Brown and Page [1, page 196]). Let $\pi: Z \rightarrow W^{\prime}$ be the canonical map defined by $(\pi(z)) w=w(z)$. If $\pi$ is an isometric embedding then it follows that $Z$ is reflexive (respectively, superreflexive) since it is then a closed subspace of the reflexive space (respectively, superreflexive space) $W^{\prime}$. To establish that $\pi$ is an isometry it suffices to show that if $\|z\|=1$ then for each $\varepsilon>0$ there exists an element $w \in W_{1}$ such that $|w(z)|>1-2 \varepsilon$. Suppose to the contrary that $z=\hat{q}+\bar{\Re}(\hat{T})$ is an element of $Z$ for which $w(z)<1-2 \varepsilon$ for all $w \in W_{1}$ where $\varepsilon>0$ is fixed. This implies $g(q)<1-2 \varepsilon$ for all norm 1 elements $g \in{ }^{*}\left(Y^{\prime}\right)$ such that $g \simeq 0$ on $T\left(X_{1}\right)$. Now $d(\hat{q}, \bar{\Re}(\hat{T}))=1$ and so $d\left(q, T\left(X_{n}\right)\right)>1-\varepsilon$ for $n=1,2,3, \ldots$ Consequently there is an $\omega \in * \mathbf{N} \backslash \mathbf{N}$ such that $d\left(q, T\left(X_{\omega}\right)\right)>1-$ $\varepsilon$. We now argue in a similar way to the last part of the proof of Lemma 1. Specifically there exists a norm 1 functional $g \in Y^{\prime}$ with the property that $g\left(T\left(X_{\omega}\right)-q\right) \geqslant 1-\varepsilon$. If $g\left(T\left(X_{1}\right)\right) \simeq 0$ then $-g(q) \geqslant 1-2 \varepsilon$ which contradicts the above assumption on $q$. If $g \neq 0$ on $T\left(X_{1}\right)$ then $g\left(T\left(X_{\omega}\right)\right)$ contains infinite values and $g(q)$ must take an infinite value which is impossible. Thus we can conclude that there is no point $z$ with the stated property and it follows that $\pi$ is an isometry.

Theorem 2. Let $X$ and $Y$ be Banach spaces and suppose $T: X \rightarrow Y$. Then $T \in \psi_{-}(X, Y)$ if and only if $\hat{T}$ has reflexive cokernel (or, equivalently, superreflexive cokernel).

Proof. Suppose $\hat{T}$ has reflexive cokernel. Then the conjugate space of $Y / \bar{R}(\hat{T})$ is reflexive, that is, $(\bar{\Re}(\hat{T}))^{\perp}=\operatorname{ker} \hat{T}$, is reflexive. Consequently $\operatorname{ker}\left(T^{\prime}\right)$ is reflexive whence $T^{\prime} \in \psi_{+}\left(Y^{\prime}, X^{\prime}\right)$ by the characterization of [8]. The converse
implication now follows by this characterization and Lemma 2. The equivalent result in term of superreflexivity follows by the same argument.

We comment that if $M$ is a closed subspace of $Y$ then $Y / M$ is reflexive if and only if $Y^{\prime \prime}=Y+M^{\perp \perp}$. This fact shows the connection between what we are now doing and the class in [8] denoted by $\mathfrak{D T}(X, Y)$ (see [8, Proposition]).

Theorem 3. Let $X$ and $Y$ be Banach spaces and suppose $T: X \rightarrow Y$. Then $T \in \psi_{-}(X, Y)$ if and only if $\operatorname{ker}(\hat{T})^{\prime}=\operatorname{ker}\left(T^{\prime}\right)^{\hat{}}$.

Proof. We begin by supposing that $\operatorname{ker}\left(T^{\prime}\right) \subset \operatorname{ker}(\hat{T})^{\prime}=(\bar{\Re}(\hat{T}))^{\perp}$. Then there exists a nonzero $\phi \in\left((\bar{\Re}(\hat{T}))^{\perp}\right)^{\prime}=(\hat{Y} / \overline{\mathscr{R}}(\hat{T}))^{\prime \prime}$ which vanishes on $\operatorname{ker}\left(T^{\prime}\right)$. By Theorem $2 \hat{Y} / \overline{\mathscr{R}}(\hat{T})$ is reflexive and thus we can suppose $\phi \in \hat{Y} / \bar{\Omega}(\hat{T})$, say $\phi=\hat{q}+\bar{\Re}(\hat{T})$. We then have $\hat{g}(q+\overline{\mathbf{R}}(\hat{T}))=0$ for all $\hat{g} \in \operatorname{ker}\left(T^{\prime}\right)$. Consequently $g(q) \simeq 0$ whenever $g \simeq 0$ on $T\left(X_{1}\right)$. We then argue as in Lemma 2. Since $\phi$ is nontrivial $\hat{q} \notin \bar{\Omega}(\hat{T})$ and thus there exists a (standard) positive real $\delta$ such that $d\left(q, T\left(X_{n}\right)\right)>\delta$ for $n=1,2, \ldots$. Thus there is an $\omega \in{ }^{*} \mathbf{N} \backslash \mathbf{N}$ such that $d\left(q, T\left(X_{\omega}\right)\right)>\delta$ and in turn a norm 1 element $g \in^{*} Y^{\prime}$ such that $g\left(T\left(X_{\omega}\right)-q\right)$ $\geqslant \delta$. If $g \simeq 0$ on $T\left(X_{1}\right)$ then $g(q)<-\delta / 2$ which contradicts our above assumption on $q$. On the other hand if $g \not \neq 0$ on $T\left(X_{1}\right)$ then inf $g\left(T\left(X_{\omega}\right)\right)$ is an infinite negative nonstandard real. This then contradicts the inequality $g(q) \geqslant-\|q\|$. Consequently $\phi$ does not exist and we have the conclusion $\operatorname{ker}\left(T^{\prime}\right)^{\hat{\prime}}=\operatorname{ker}(\hat{T})^{\prime}$.

The converse argument is essentially that used by Henson and Moore in [3, Theorem 8.5]. Suppose that $\operatorname{ker}\left(T^{\prime}\right)^{\hat{1}}=\operatorname{ker}(\hat{T})^{\prime}$, and that $T \notin \psi_{-}(X, Y)$. Following the notation of Lemma 2 let $W$ and $Z$ denote $\operatorname{ker}\left(T^{\prime}\right)^{\hat{*}}$ and $\hat{Y} / \overline{\mathscr{R}}(\hat{T})$ respectively so that $W=Z^{\prime}$. Since $Z$ is not reflexive by James' characterization of reflexivity, [6, Theorem 3], there exists a real number $r$ satisfying $0<r<1$ such that there exist bounded sequences $\left\{q_{n}+\overline{\mathbf{R}}(\hat{T})\right\}$ and $\left\{\hat{\mathrm{g}}_{n}\right\}$ in $Z$ and $W$ respectively such that $\hat{g}_{i}\left(\hat{q}_{j}+\bar{\Re}(\hat{T})\right)>r$ for $i \leqslant j$, and such that $\hat{g}_{i}\left(\hat{q}_{j}+\bar{\Re}(\hat{T})\right)=0$ for $j<i$. Since ${ }^{*} \mathfrak{N}$ is assumed to be $\aleph_{1}$-saturated we can suppose that the sequences $\left\{q_{n}\right.$ : $n \in \mathbf{N}\}$ and $\left\{g_{n}: n \in \mathbf{N}\right\}$ are restrictions of internal sequences $\left\{q_{n}: n \in{ }^{*} \mathbf{N}\right\}$ and $\left\{g_{n}: n \in{ }^{*} \mathbf{N}\right\}$ respectively. Thus we can assume there is an element $\omega \in{ }^{*} \mathbf{N} \backslash \mathbf{N}$ such that $g_{i}\left(q_{j}\right)>r$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant j \leqslant \omega$, and such that $g_{i}\left(q_{j}\right)<r / 2$ for $l \leqslant j<i \leqslant$ $\omega$. Now the sequence $\left\{\hat{g}_{n}: n \in \mathbf{N}\right\}$ has a $\sigma(W, Z)$-limit point $\hat{g} \in W$. Hence $g\left(q_{j}\right) \geqslant r$ for $j \in{ }^{*} \mathbf{N} \backslash \mathbf{N}$ provided $j \leqslant \omega$, whilst $g\left(q_{j}\right) \leqslant r / 2$ for $j \in \mathbf{N}$. This implies $\mathbf{N}$ is internal which is incorrect.

Before setting our final characterizations of $\psi(X, Y)$ we need to introduce two definitions. We say $T$ has property $Q$ if for all reals $r$ satisfying $0<r<1$ there do
not exist sequences of norm 1 elements $\left\{y_{1}, y_{2}, \ldots\right\}$ in $Y$ and $\left\{g_{1}, g_{2}, \ldots\right\}$ in $Y^{\prime}$ such that
(i) $\left|g_{k}\right|<1 / k$ on $T\left(X_{1}\right)$ for all $k$;
(ii) $g_{j}\left(y_{i}\right)>r$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant j$, and $g_{j}\left(y_{i}\right)=0$ for $1 \leqslant j<i$.

We say $T$ has property $\hat{Q}$ if for all reals $r$ satisfying $0<r<1$ there exists a positive integer $n$ for which there do not exist finite sequences of norm 1 elements $\left\{y_{1}, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{n}\right\}$ in $Y$ and $\left\{g_{1}, g_{2}, \ldots, g_{n}\right\}$ in $Y^{\prime}$ satisfying conditions (i) and (ii) above.

Theorem 4. Let $X$ and $Y$ be Banach spaces and suppose $T: X \rightarrow Y$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:
(i) $T$ has property $\hat{Q}$;
(ii) $T \in \psi_{-}(X, Y)$;
(iii) $\hat{T}$ has property $\hat{Q}$;
(iv) $\hat{T}$ has property $Q$.

Proof. We show (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (iv) $\Rightarrow$ (i).
(i) implies (ii). Suppose $T \notin \psi_{-}(X, Y)$ so that $T^{\prime} \notin \psi_{+}\left(Y^{\prime}, X^{\prime}\right)$. Then, see [8], there exists a real number $r$ satisfying $0<r<1$ such that for all positive integers $n$ there exist finite sequences $\left\{g_{1}, \ldots, g_{n}\right\} \subset Y^{\prime}$ and $\left\{\phi_{1}, \ldots, \phi_{n}\right\} \subset Y^{\prime \prime}$ such that $\left\|T^{\prime} g_{k}\right\|<1 / k$ for $k=1,2, \ldots, n ; \phi_{i}\left(g_{j}\right)>r$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant j \leqslant n$ and $\phi_{i}\left(g_{j}\right)=0$ for $1 \leqslant j<i \leqslant n$. Then by Helly's theorem we can assume that $\phi_{k} \in Y$ for $k=$ $1,2, \ldots, n$; and it follows that $T$ doesn't possess property $\hat{Q}$.
(ii) implies (iii). Let $E=\hat{X}, F=\hat{Y}, S=\hat{T}$ and suppose these objects are embedded with $X, Y, T$ etc. in a structure $\mathscr{H}$ of which $* \mathscr{K}$ is an $\aleph_{1}$-saturated enlargement. If $S$ doesn't possess property $\hat{Q}$ then for some (standard) $r$ satisfying $0<r<1$ there exist, for $\omega \in{ }^{*} \mathbf{N} \backslash \mathbf{N}$, finite sequences of norm one elements $\left\{q_{1}, q_{2}, \ldots, q_{2 \omega}\right\}$ in ${ }^{*} \mathbf{F}$ and $\left\{g_{1}, g_{2}, \ldots, g_{\omega}\right\}$ in $F^{\prime}$ for which $\left|g_{k}\right|<1 / k$ on $S\left(E_{1}\right)$ for $k=1,2, \ldots, 2 \omega ; g_{j}\left(q_{i}\right)>r$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant j \leqslant 2 \omega$, and $g_{j}\left(q_{i}\right)=0$ for $1 \leqslant j<i$ $\leqslant 2 \omega$. For $k=1,2,3, \ldots$ let $\hat{p}_{k}=\hat{q}_{\omega+k}$ and $\hat{f}_{k}=\hat{g}_{\omega+k}$. These are elements in the hulls $\hat{F}$ and $\left(F^{\prime}\right) \hat{\text { c }}$ constructed with respect to ${ }^{*} \mathscr{R}$. Then $\hat{S}^{\prime} \hat{f}_{k}=0$ for $k=1,2,3, \ldots$; $\hat{f}_{j}\left(\hat{p}_{i}\right)>r$ for $i \leqslant j$ and $\hat{f}_{j}\left(\hat{p}_{i}\right)=0$ for $j>i$. Consequently by the James' characterization of reflexivity $\operatorname{ker} \hat{S}^{\prime}$ is not reflexive. C. Ward Henson has shown that a Banach space and its hull have isometric hulls when constructed from an $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{1}$-saturated enlargement which has the $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{0}$-isomorphism property (see [4, Propositions 1 and 2] and [5]). Moreover he has an "isometric nonstandard hulls" theorem for operators in which it is established that the isometries respect the induced action of $T$ (private communication).

Consequently ker $\hat{T}$ is not reflexive (when constructed with respect to such a $* \mathfrak{H}$ ), and therefore $T \notin \psi_{-}(X, Y)$. Since (iii) trivially implies (iv) we are finished once we show (iv) implies (i).
(iv) implies (i). Suppose $T$ doesn't possess property $\hat{Q}$. Then for some (standard) real $r$ satisfying $0<r<1$ and $\omega \in * \mathbf{N}$ there exist finite sequences of norm 1 elements $\left\{q_{1}, q_{2}, \ldots, q_{\omega}\right\}$ in ${ }^{*} Y$ and $\left\{g_{1}, g_{2}, \ldots, g_{\omega}\right\}$ in ${ }^{*} Y^{\prime}$ satisfying conditions (i) and (ii) above. But then the sequences $\left\{\hat{q}_{k}: k \in \mathbf{N}\right\}$ and $\left\{\hat{g}_{k}: k \in \mathbf{N}\right\}$ satisfy $\left|\hat{g}_{k}\right|<1 / k$ on $\hat{T}\left(\hat{X}_{1}\right)$ for all $k, \hat{g}_{j}\left(\hat{q}_{i}\right)>r$ for $i \leqslant j$, and $\hat{g}_{j}\left(\hat{q}_{i}\right)=0$ for $j \leqslant i$. Thus $\hat{T}$ does not possess property $Q$.

One consequence of the above result is that $T \in \psi_{-}(X, Y)$ if and only if $\hat{T} \in \psi_{-}(\hat{X}, \hat{Y})$. Now let $\psi(X, Y)=\psi_{+}(X, Y) \cap \psi_{-}(X, Y)$, that is, $T \in \psi(X, Y)$ if and only if $\hat{T}$ has reflexive kernel and cokernel. It is a consequence of results proven here and in [8] that:
(i) $\psi(X, Y)$ is an open subset of $\mathscr{B}(X, Y)$;
(ii) $T \in \psi(X, Y)$ if and only if $T^{\prime} \in \psi\left(Y^{\prime}, X^{\prime}\right)$;
(iii) $T \in \psi(X, Y)$ if and only if $\hat{T} \in \psi(\hat{X}, \hat{Y})$; and
(iv) $T$ is closed under perturbation by super weakly compact transformations.

## 4. Transformations with closed range

If $T$ is a transformation with closed range the conditions for membership of $\psi_{+}(X, Y)$ or $\psi_{-}(X, Y)$ can be simplified.

Lemma 3. Let $X$ and $Y$ be Banach spaces and suppose $T: X \rightarrow Y$. Then the following properties are equivalent:
(i) $\mathcal{R}(T)$ is closed;
(ii) $(\Re(T) \hat{)}=\Omega(\hat{T})$;
(iii) $\Omega(\hat{T})$ is closed.

Proof. Suppose $\Re(T)$ is closed and let $(T(p) \hat{)} \in(\Re(T)) \hat{1}$. By the open mapping theorem we can assume $p$ is finite so that $(T(p)) \hat{=}=\hat{T}(\hat{p})$. This shows $(\Re(T))=\Re(\hat{T})$. Since the hull of a normed space constructed with respect to an $\kappa_{1}$-saturated model is complete it follows that (ii) implies (iii). Finally suppose $\mathscr{R}(\hat{T})$ is closed. Let $Z=\bar{\Re}(T)$ and suppose $y \in Z_{1}$. Then $\hat{y} \in \bar{\Re}(\hat{T})=\Re(\hat{T})$ and so, by the open mapping theorem, there exists a positive constant $r$ independent of $y$, such that $y=\hat{T}(\hat{p})$ for some point $p \in{ }^{*} X_{r}$. By transfer it follows that $Z_{1} \subseteq\left(T\left(X_{r}\right)\right)^{-}$whence $Z_{1} \subseteq T\left(X_{2 r}\right)$ (see Brown and Page [1, Lemma 8.5.2]). This proves that (iii) implies (i).

We then have

Theorem 5. Let $X$ and $Y$ be Banach spaces and suppose $T: X \rightarrow Y$ has closed range. Then
(i) $T \in \psi_{+}(X, Y)$ if and only if $\operatorname{ker} T$ is superreflexive;
(ii) $T \in \psi_{-}(X, Y)$ if and only if $Y / \Re(T)$ is superreflexive.

Proof. We check (ii) first. We have $T \in \psi_{-}(X, Y)$ if and only if $\hat{Y} / \Re(\hat{T})$ is reflexive, or equivalently if and only if $\hat{Y} /(\Re(T))^{\hat{\prime}}$ is reflexive. But $\hat{Y} /(\Re(T))^{\hat{Y}}$ is isomorphically isometric to $(Y / \Re(T)) \hat{n}$ which is reflexive if and only if $Y / \Re(T)$ is superreflexive.

Next $T \in \psi_{+}(X, Y)$ if and only if $T^{\prime} \in \psi_{-}\left(Y^{\prime}, X^{\prime}\right)$, that is, if and only if $X^{\prime} / \mathcal{R}\left(T^{\prime}\right)$ is superreflexive since $T^{\prime}$ has closed range. But for transformations with closed range $\mathscr{R}\left(T^{\prime}\right)=(\operatorname{ker} T)^{\perp}$ so that $X^{\prime} / \mathscr{R}\left(T^{\prime}\right)$ equals $X^{\prime} /(\operatorname{ker} T)^{\perp}$ which is isometrically isomorphic to $(\operatorname{ker} T)^{\prime}$. Thus $T \in \psi_{+}(X, Y)$ if and only if $(\operatorname{ker} T)^{\prime}$ is superreflexive, or equivalently if and only if $\operatorname{ker} T$ is superreflexive.

We finish by remarking that elements of $\psi_{+}(X, Y)$ with closed range do not in general form an open subset in $\mathscr{B}(X, Y)$. To see this let $T$ be the zero operator on $l^{2}$, and let $S$ be any operator on $l^{2}$ which doesn't have closed range. Then $T$ has closed range and is a member of $\psi_{+}(X, Y)$ although $T=\lambda S=\lambda S$ does not have closed range for any value of the scalar $\lambda$.
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