

## ON SOME NEW SEQUENCE SPACES DEFINED BY ORLICZ FUNCTIONS

AYHAN ESI\*, MAHMUT ISIK\*\* AND AYTEN ESI\*

\*Department of Mathematics, University of Inonu, Adiyaman, 02100 Turkey

\*\*Department of Mathematics, University of Firat, Elazig, 23119, Turkey

(Received 24 January 2003; accepted 11 May 2003)

In this paper we introduce some new sequence spaces using Orlicz function. We also examine some properties of these sequence spaces.

**Key Words :** Sequence Space; Orlicz Function; Invariant Mean

1. Lindenstrauss and Tzafriri<sup>1</sup> used the idea of Orlicz function to construct the sequence space

$$l_M = \left\{ x : \sum_k M\left(\frac{|x_k|}{r}\right) < \infty \text{ for some } r > 0 \right\}.$$

The space  $l_M$  with the norm

$$\|x\| = \inf \left\{ r > 0 : \sum_k M\left(\frac{|x_k|}{r}\right) \leq 1 \right\}$$

becomes a Banach space which is called an Orlicz sequence space. The space  $l_M$  is closely related to the space  $l_p$  which is an Orlicz sequence space with  $M(x) = x^p$  for  $1 \leq p < \infty$ .

In the present note we introduce and examine some properties of three sequence spaces defined using Orlicz function  $M$ , which generalize the well-known sequence spaces  $l_\infty$ ,  $c$  and  $c_0$  the Banach spaces of bounded and convergent and null sequences  $x = (x_k)$  normed by  $\|x\| = \sup_k |x_k|$  respectively.

Let  $\sigma$  be a one-to-one mapping of the set of positive integers into itself such that  $\sigma^m(n) = \sigma(\sigma^{m-1}(n))$ ,  $m = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ . A continuous linear functional  $\varphi$  on  $l_\infty$  is said to be an invariant mean or a  $\sigma$ -mean if and only if

1.  $\varphi(x) \geq 0$  when the sequence  $x = (x_n)$  has  $x_n \geq 0$  for all  $n$ ,
2.  $\varphi(e) = 1$ , where  $e = (1, 1, \dots)$  and
3.  $\varphi(\{x_{\sigma(n)}\}) = \varphi(\{x_n\})$  for all  $x \in l_\infty$ .

For certain kinds of mappings  $\sigma$ , every invariant mean  $\varphi$  extends the limit functional on the space  $c$ , in the sense that  $\varphi(x) = \lim x$  for all  $x \in c$ . Consequently,  $c \subset V_\sigma$ , where  $V_\sigma$  is the set of bounded sequences all of whose  $\sigma$ -means are equal.

If  $x = (x_n)$ , set  $Tx = (Tx_n) = (x_{\sigma(n)})$ . it can be shown that

$$V_\sigma = \{x \in l_\infty : \lim_m t_{mn}(x) = Le, \text{ uniformly in } n, L = \sigma\text{-lim } x\} \quad .. (1.1)$$

where  $t_{mn}(x) = (x_n + Tx_n + \dots + T^m x_n)/m + 1$  (See Schafer<sup>2</sup>).

The special case of (1.1) in which  $\sigma(n) = n + 1$  was given by Lorentz<sup>3</sup> (Theorem 1) and the general result can be proved in a similar way.

An Orlicz function is a function  $M : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ , which is continuous, nondecreasing and convex with  $M(0) = 0, M(x) > 0$  for  $x > 0$  and  $M(x) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ . If convexity of Orlicz function  $M$  is replaced by  $M(x + y) \leq M(x) + M(y)$  then this function is called modulus function, defined and discussed by Ruckle<sup>4</sup> and Maddox<sup>5</sup>.

Let  $p = (p_k)$  be a sequence of real numbers such that  $p_k > 0$  for all  $k$  and  $\sup_k p_k = H < \infty$ . We define the following sequence spaces.

$$l_\infty(M, p, \sigma, s) = \left\{ x : \sup_{n, k} k^{-s} \left[ M \left( \frac{|x_{\sigma^k(n)}|}{\rho} \right) \right]^{p_k} < \infty, \text{ for some } \rho > 0, s \geq 0 \right\},$$

$$c(M, p, \sigma, s) = \left\{ x : \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} k^{-s} \left[ M \left( \frac{|x_{\sigma^k(n)} - L|}{\rho} \right) \right]^{p_k} = 0, \right.$$

uniformly in  $n$ , for some  $\rho, L > 0, s \geq 0$ },

$$c_0(M, p, \sigma, s) = \left\{ x : \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} k^{-s} \left[ M \left( \frac{|x_{\sigma^k(n)}|}{\rho} \right) \right]^{p_k} = 0, \right.$$

uniformly in  $n$ , for some  $\rho > 0, s \geq 0$ }.  
 When  $M(x) = x$ , then we have  $l_\infty(p, \sigma, s), c(p, \sigma, s)$  and  $c_0(p, \sigma, s)$ . For instance,

$$c(p, \sigma, s) = \left\{ x : \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} k^{-s} \left( \frac{|x_{\sigma^k(n)} - L|}{\rho} \right)^{p_k} = 0, \right.$$

uniformly in  $n$ , for some  $\rho, L > 0, s \geq 0$ }.  
 When  $M(x) = x, \sigma(n) = n$  for all  $n$  and  $s = 0$  and then the family of sequences defined above become  $l_\infty(p), c(p)$  and  $c_0(p)$  which were defined by Maddox<sup>6</sup>. When  $\sigma(n) = n$  for all  $n$ , and Orlicz function  $M$  is replaced by Modulus function  $f$ , the family of sequences defined above become  $l_\infty(p, f, s), c(p, f, s)$  and  $c_0(p, f, s)$  which were defined by Esi<sup>7</sup>. When  $M(x) = x, \sigma(n) = n$  for all  $n, s = 0$  and  $p_k = 1$  for all  $k$ , we have  $l_\infty, c$  and  $c_0$ .

2. In this section we shall establish some basic properties of three sequence spaces defined by Orlicz function  $M$ . In order to discuss the properties of these spaces we assume that  $p = (p_k)$  is bounded.

**Theorem 1** —  $l_\infty(M, p, \sigma, s)$ ,  $c(M, p, \sigma, s)$  and  $c_0(M, p, \sigma, s)$  are linear spaces over the set of complex numbers  $C$ .

PROOF : We consider only  $c_0(M, p, \sigma, s)$ . The others can be treated similarly. Let  $x, y \in c_0(M, p, \sigma, s)$  and  $\alpha, \beta \in C$ . In order to prove the result we need to find some  $\rho_3$  such that

$$k^{-s} [M(|\alpha x_{\sigma(n)}^k + \beta y_{\sigma(n)}^k|/\rho_3)]_k^p \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty, \text{ uniformly in } n, s \geq 0.$$

Since  $x, y \in c_0(M, p, \sigma, s)$ , therefore there exist some  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$  such that

$$k^{-s} [M(|x_{\sigma(n)}^k|/\rho_1)]_k^p \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty, \text{ uniformly in } n, s \geq 0.$$

and  $k^{-s} [M(|y_{\sigma(n)}^k|/\rho_2)]_k^p \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty, \text{ uniformly in } n, s \geq 0.$

Define  $\rho_3 = \max(2|\alpha|\rho_1, 2|\beta|\rho_2)$ . Since  $M$  is non-decreasing and convex

$$\begin{aligned} k^{-s} [M(|\alpha x_{\sigma(n)}^k + \beta y_{\sigma(n)}^k|/\rho_3)]_k^p &\leq k^{-s} [M(|\alpha x_{\sigma(n)}^k|/\rho_3 + |\beta y_{\sigma(n)}^k|/\rho_3)]_k^p \\ &\leq k^{-s} \frac{1}{2^{p_k}} [M(|x_{\sigma(n)}^k|/\rho_1)] + M(|y_{\sigma(n)}^k|/\rho_2)]_k^p \\ &\leq Ck^{-s} [M(|x_{\sigma(n)}^k|/\rho_1)]_k^p + Ck^{-s} [M(|y_{\sigma(n)}^k|/\rho_2)]_k^p \\ &\rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty, \text{ uniformly in } n, s \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = \max(1, 2^{H-1})$ . This proves that  $c_0(M, p, \sigma, s)$  is linear.

**Theorem 2** — Let  $H = \max(1, \sup_k p_k)$ . Then  $c_0(M, p, \sigma, s)$  is a linear topological space paranormed by

$$g(x) = \text{Inf} \{r^{p_n/H} : (k^{-s} [M(|x_{\sigma(n)}^k|/\rho)]_k^p)^{1/H} \leq 1, s \geq 0, n = 1, 2, 3, \dots\}$$

PROOF : Clearly  $g(x) = g(-x)$ . Thus subadditivity of  $g$  follows from Theorem 1. Since  $M(0) = 0$ , we get  $\text{Inf} \{r^{p_n/H}\} = 0$  for  $x = 0$ . Conversely, suppose that  $g(x) = 0$ , then it is easy to see that  $x = 0$ . Finally using the same technique of Theorem 2 of Nuray and Gülcü<sup>8</sup>, it can be easily seen that scalar multiplication is continuous. This completes the proof.

In order to discuss further result we need the following definition.

**Definition** (Krasnoselskii and Rutitsky<sup>9</sup>) — An Orlicz function  $M$  is said to satisfy  $\Delta_2$ -condition for all values of  $u$ , if there exists, constant  $K > 0$ , such that  $M(2u) < KM(u)$  ( $u > 0$ ). The  $\Delta_2$ -condition is equivalent to the satisfaction of inequality  $M(Lu) \leq KLM(u)$  for all values of  $u$  and for  $L > 1$ .

**Theorem 3** — Let  $M$  be an Orlicz function which satisfies  $\Delta_2$ -condition. Then

(i)  $l_\infty(p, \sigma, s) \subset l_\infty(M, p, \sigma, s)$ ,

(ii)  $c(p, \sigma, s) \subset c(M, p, \sigma, s)$

(iii)  $c_0(p, \sigma, s) \subset c_0(M, p, \sigma, s)$ .

PROOF : We give the proof only for (ii). Let  $x \in c(p, \sigma, s)$ , then

$$S_k = k^{-s} |x_{\sigma(n)^k} - L|_{k^p} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty, \text{ uniformly in } n. \quad \dots (2.1)$$

Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  and choose  $\delta$  with  $0 < \delta < 1$  such that  $M(t) < \varepsilon$  for  $0 \leq t \leq \delta$ .

Write  $z_{\sigma(n)}^k = |x_{\sigma(n)^k} - L|$  and consider

$$I_1 = \{k \in N : z_{\sigma(n)^k} > \delta\} \text{ and } I_2 = \{k \in N : z_{\sigma(n)^k} \leq \delta\}.$$

For  $z_{\sigma(n)^k} > \delta$ ,

$$z_{\sigma(n)^k} < z_{\sigma(n)^k} / \delta < 1 + z_{\sigma(n)^k} / \delta$$

where  $k \in I_2$ . Since  $M$  is nondecreasing and convex, it follows that

$$M(z_{\sigma(n)^k}) < M(1 + z_{\sigma(n)^k} / \delta) < \frac{1}{2} M(2) + \frac{1}{2} M(2 z_{\sigma(n)^k} / \delta).$$

Since  $M$  satisfies  $\Delta_2$ -condition, therefore

$$\begin{aligned} M(z_{\sigma(n)^k}) &< \frac{1}{2} K z_{\sigma(n)^k} / \delta M(2) + \frac{1}{2} K z_{\sigma(n)^k} / \delta M(2) \\ &= K z_{\sigma(n)^k} / \delta M(2). \end{aligned}$$

For  $z_{\sigma(n)^k} \leq \delta$ ,

$$M(z_{\sigma(n)^k}) < \varepsilon,$$

where  $k \in I_1$ . Hence

$$k^{-s} [M(|z_{\sigma(n)^k}|)]^k_p = k^{-s} [M(|z_{\sigma(n)^k}|)]^k_p + k^{-s} [M(|z_{\sigma(n)^k}|)]^k_p$$

where the first term in the right side over  $k \in I_1$  and the second over  $k \in I_2$ .

$$k^{-s} [M(|z_{\sigma(n)^k}|)]^k_p \leq k^{-s} \varepsilon^H + \max(1, K \delta^{-1} M(2))^H S_k \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

uniformly in  $n$ .

This and from (2.1)  $c(p, \sigma, s) \subset c(M, p, \sigma, s)$ . Following similar arguments we can prove that  $c_0(p, \sigma, s) \subset c_0(M, p, \sigma, s)$  and  $l_\infty(p, \sigma, s) \subset l_\infty(M, p, \sigma, s)$ .

**Theorem 4** — (i) Let  $0 < \inf_k p_k \leq p_k \leq 1$ . Then  $c(M, p, \sigma, s) \subset c(p, \sigma, s)$ ,

(ii) Let  $1 \leq p_k \leq \sup_k p_k < \infty$ . Then  $c(p, \sigma, s) \subset c(M, p, \sigma, s)$ ,

(iii) Let  $0 < p_k \leq q_k$  and  $(q_k/p_k)$  be bounded. Then  $c(M, q, \sigma, s) \subset c(M, p, \sigma, s)$ ,

(iii) Let  $0 < p_k \leq q_k$  and  $(q_k/p_k)$  be bounded. Then  $c(M, q, \sigma, s) \subset c(M, p, \sigma, s)$ ,

(iv)  $s_1 \leq s_2$  implies  $c(M, p, \sigma, s_1) \subset c(M, p, \sigma, s_2)$ .

PROOF : (i) Let  $x \in c(M, p, \sigma, s)$ , since  $0 < \inf_k p_k \leq 1$ , we get

$$k^{-s} [M_k (|x_{\sigma(n)}|^k - L/\rho)] \leq k^{-s} [M_k (|x_{\sigma(n)}|^k - L/\rho)]^p$$

for each  $n$  and hence get  $x \in c(p, \sigma, s)$ .

(ii) Let  $p_k \geq 1$  for each  $k$ ,  $\sup_k p_k < \infty$  and  $x \in c(p, \sigma, s)$ . Then for each  $0 < \epsilon < 1$  there exists a positive integer  $N$  such that

$$k^{-s} [M_k (|x_{\sigma(n)}|^k - L/\rho)] \leq \epsilon < 1 \text{ for each } n \text{ and for all } k \geq N.$$

This implies that

$$k^{-s} [M_k (|x_{\sigma(n)}|^k - L/\rho)]_k^p \leq k^{-s} [M_k (|x_{\sigma(n)}|^k - L/\rho)]$$

Thus we get  $x \in c(M, p, \sigma, s)$ .

(iii) If we take  $w_k = k^{-s} [M (|x_{\sigma(n)}|^k - L/\rho)]_k^q$  for all  $k$ , then using the same technique of Theorem 2 of Nanda<sup>10</sup>, it is easy to prove (iii).

(iv) Let  $s_1 \leq s_2$ . Then  $k_2^{-s} < k_1^{-s}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since

$$k_2^{-s} [M (|x_{\sigma(n)}|^k - L/\rho)]_k^p \leq k_1^{-s} [M (|x_{\sigma(n)}|^k - L/\rho)]_k^p$$

for all  $k$  and  $n$ , then we have  $c(M, p, \sigma, s_1) \subset c(M, p, \sigma, s_2)$ .

For  $r > 0$ , a nonempty subset  $\Delta$  of a linear space  $X$  is said to be absolutely  $r$ -convex if  $x, y \in \Delta$  and  $|\lambda|^r + |\mu|^r \leq 1$  together imply that  $\lambda x + \mu y \in \Delta$ . A linear topological space  $X$  is said to be  $r$ -convex (see Maddox and Roles<sup>11</sup>) if every neighbourhood of  $0 \in X$  contains as absolutely  $r$ -convex neighbourhood of  $0 \in X$ .

We have :

**Theorem 5** —  $c_0(M, p, \sigma, s)$  and  $c(M, p, \sigma, s)$  are 1-convex.

PROOF : Let  $x \in (M, p, \sigma, s)$ . We define

$$h(x) = \sup_{k, n} (k^{-s} [M (|x_{\sigma(n)}|^k - L/\rho)]_k^p)^{1/H}$$

If  $0 < \delta < 1$ , then  $\Delta = \{x : h(x) \leq \delta\}$  is an absolutely 1-convex set, for  $x, y \in \Delta$  and  $|\lambda| + |\mu| \leq 1$ , then using by convexity of  $M$ ,

$$h(\lambda x + \mu y) \leq (|\lambda| + |\mu|)^{p/H} \delta \leq \delta.$$

This completes the proof.

## REFERENCES

1. J. Lindenstrauss and L. Tzafriri, *Israel J. math.*, **10** (1971), 379-90.
2. P. Schaefer, *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.*, **36** (1972), 104-10.
3. G. G. Lorentz, *Acta Math.*, **80** (1948), 167-90.
4. W. H. Ruckle, *Canad. J. Math.*, **25** (1973), 973-78.
5. I. J. Maddox, *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.*, **100** (1986), 161-66.
6. I. J. Maddox, *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **64** (1968), 335-40.
7. A. Esi, *Istanbul Univ. Fen-Fak. Mat. Dergisi*, **55-56** (1996-97), 17-21.
8. F. Nuray and A. Gülcü, *Indian J. pure appl. Math.*, **26**(12) (1995), 1169-76.
9. M. A. Krasnoselskii and Y. B. Rutitsky, *Convex Function and Orlicz Spaces*, Groningen, Netherlands, 1961.
10. S. Nanda, *Acta Math. Hung.*, **49** (1-2), (1987), 71-6.
11. I. J. Maddox and J. W. Roles, *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.*, **66** (1969), 541-45.