

SOME NEW SEQUENCE SPACES AND ALMOST CONVERGENCE

Sameer Ahmad Gupkari

Abstract. The sequence space a_c^r have been defined and the classes $(a_c^r : \ell_p)$ and $(a_c^r : c)$ of infinite matrices have been characterized by Aydin and Başar (On the new sequence spaces which include the spaces c_0 and c , Hokkaido Math. J. 33(2) (2004), 383-398) [1], where $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. The main purpose of the present paper is to characterize the classes $(a_c^r : f)$ and $(a_c^r : f_0)$, where f and f_0 denote the spaces of almost convergent and almost convergent null sequences with real or complex terms.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 46B20; 46E30; 40C05

Keywords and phrases. Sequence spaces of non absolute type, almost convergent sequences, β – duals and matrix mappings.

Received : July 12, 2008

Communicated by Vladimir Rakočević

1. Introduction

Let ω be the space of all sequences, real or complex and let ℓ_∞ and c respectively be the Banach spaces of bounded and convergent sequences $x = (x_k)$ with the usual norm $\|x\| = \sup_k |x_k|$. Let $S : \ell_\infty \rightarrow \ell_\infty$ be the shift operator defined by $(Sx)_n = x_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. A Banach limit L is defined on ℓ_∞ , as a non negative linear functional such that $L(Sx) = L(x)$ and $L(e) = 1$, $e = (1, 1, 1, \dots)$ [2]. A sequence $x \in \ell_\infty$ is said to be almost convergent to the generalized limit α if all Banach limits of x are α [3]. We denote the set of almost convergent sequences by f and almost convergent null sequences by f_0 , i.e.

$$f = \left\{ x \in \ell_\infty : \lim_m t_{mn}(x) = \alpha, \text{ uniformly in } n \right\}$$

$$\text{and } f_0 = \left\{ x \in \ell_\infty : \lim_m t_{mn}(x) = 0, \text{ uniformly in } n \right\}$$

$$\text{Where } t_{mn}(x) = \frac{1}{m+1} \sum_{k=0}^m x_{k+n}, \quad t_{-1,n} = 0$$

$$\text{and } \alpha = f - \lim x.$$

Let λ and μ be two sequence spaces and $A = (a_{nk})$ be an infinite matrix of real or complex numbers a_{nk} , where $n, k \in \square = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. Then we say that A defines a matrix mapping from λ into μ , and denote it by writing $A : \lambda \rightarrow \mu$ if for every sequence $x = (x_k) \in \lambda$, the sequence $Ax = \{(Ax)_n\}$, the A -transform of x , is in μ , where

$$(Ax)_n = \sum_k a_{nk} x_k, \quad (n \in \square) \quad (1.1)$$

For simplicity in notation, here and in what follows, the summation without limits runs from 0 to ∞ . We denote by $(\lambda : \mu)$ the class of all matrices A such that $A : \lambda \rightarrow \mu$. Thus $A \in (\lambda : \mu)$ if and only if the series on the right side of (1.1) converges for every $n \in \square$ and every $x \in \lambda$.

For a sequence space λ , the matrix domain λ_A of an infinite matrix A is defined by

$$\lambda_A = \{x = (x_k) \in \omega : Ax \in \lambda\}$$

The object of this paper is to characterize the classes $(a_c^r : f)$ and $(a_c^r : f_0)$ of infinite matrices.

The sequence space a_c^r is defined as the set of all sequences whose A^r -transform is in c [1], i.e.

$$a_c^r = \left\{ x = (x_k) \in \omega : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{k=0}^n (1+r^k) x_k \text{ exists} \right\}$$

Where A^r denotes the matrix $A^r = (a_{nk}^r)$ defined by

$$a_{nk}^r = \begin{cases} \frac{1+r^k}{n+1} & , \quad (0 \leq k \leq n) \\ 0 & , \quad (k > n) \end{cases}$$

We refer the reader to [1] for relevant terminology and additional references on the space a_c^r .

2. Main Results

Define the sequence $y = (y_k(r))$, which will be used as the A^r -transform of a sequence $x = (x_k)$, i.e.

$$y_k(r) = \sum_{j=0}^k \frac{1+r^j}{k+1} x_j \quad ; \quad (k \in \square) \quad (2.1)$$

For brevity in notation, we write

$$a(n, k, m) = \frac{1}{m+1} \sum_{j=0}^m a_{n+j, k}$$

and

$$\tilde{a}(n, k, m) = \Delta \left[\frac{a(n, k, m)}{1+r^k} \right] (k+1) = \left[\frac{a(n, k, m)}{1+r^k} - \frac{a(n, k+1, m)}{1+r^{k+1}} \right] (k+1)$$

for $n, k, m \in \square$.

We denote by λ^β , the β -dual of a sequence space λ and mean the set of the sequences $x = (x_k)$ such that $x y = (x_k y_k) \in cs$ for all $y = (y_k) \in \lambda$. Now, we may give the following lemma which is needed in proving the Theorem (2.1) below.

Lemma 2.1[1]: Define the sets d_1^r and d_2^r as follows

$$d_1^r = \left\{ a = (a_k) \in \omega : \sum_k \left| \Delta \left(\frac{a_k}{1+r^k} \right) (k+1) \right| < \infty \right\}$$

and
$$d_2^r = \left\{ a = (a_k) \in \omega : \left(\frac{a_k}{1+r^k} \right) \in cs \right\}$$

where $\Delta \left(\frac{a_k}{1+r^k} \right) = \frac{a_k}{1+r^k} - \frac{a_{k+1}}{1+r^{k+1}}$ for all $k \in \square$.

Then $[a_c^r]^\beta = d_1^r \cap d_2^r$.

Theorem 2.1: $A \in (a_c^r : f)$ if and if

$$\sup_{m, n \in \square} \sum_k |\tilde{a}(n, k, m)| < \infty \quad (2.2)$$

$$\left\{ \frac{a_{nk}}{1+r^k} \right\}_{k \in \square} \in cs \text{ for all } n \in \square. \quad (2.3)$$

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{a}(n, k, m) = \alpha_k \quad \text{uniformly in } n, \text{ for each } k \in \square \quad (2.4)$$

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_k |\tilde{a}(n, k, m) - \alpha_k| = 0 \quad \text{uniformly in } n. \quad (2.5)$$

Proof: Suppose that the conditions (2.2), (2.3), (2.4) and (2.5) hold and $x \in a_c^r$. Then Ax exists and at this stage, we observe from (2.4) and (2.2) that

$$\sum_{j=0}^k |\alpha_j| \leq \sup_{m, n \in \square} \sum_j |\tilde{a}(n, j, m)| < \infty$$

holds for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. This gives that $(\alpha_k) \in \ell_1$. Since $x \in a_c^r$ by the hypothesis, and $a_c^r \cong c$, we have $y \in c$. Therefore, one can easily see that $(\alpha_k y_k) \in \ell_1$ for each $y \in c$ and also there exists $M > 0$ such that $\sup_k |y_k| < M$. Now for any $\varepsilon > 0$, choose a fixed $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, there is some $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ by (2.4) such that

$$\left| \sum_{k=0}^{k_0} [\tilde{a}(n, k, m) - \alpha_k] y_k \right| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$$

for every $m \geq m_0$, uniformly in n .

Also, by (2.5), there is some $m_1 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$\sum_{k=k_0+1}^{\infty} |\tilde{a}(n, k, m) - \alpha_k| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2M}$$

for every $m \geq m_1$ uniformly in n . Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{m+1} \sum_{i=0}^m (Ax)_{n+i} - \sum_k \alpha_k y_k \right| &= \left| \sum_k [\tilde{a}(n, k, m) - \alpha_k] y_k \right| \\ &\leq \left| \sum_{k=0}^{k_0} [\tilde{a}(n, k, m) - \alpha_k] y_k \right| + \left| \sum_{k=k_0+1}^{\infty} [\tilde{a}(n, k, m) - \alpha_k] y_k \right| \\ &< \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \sum_{k=k_0+1}^{\infty} |\tilde{a}(n, k, m) - \alpha_k| |y_k| \\ &< \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + M \frac{\varepsilon}{2M} = \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

for all sufficiently large m , uniformly in n . Hence $Ax \in f$, which proves the sufficiency.

Conversely suppose that $A \in (a_c^r : f)$. Then Ax exists for every $x \in a_c^r$ and this implies that $\{a_{nk}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in [a_c^r]^\beta$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$; the necessity of (2.3) is immediate.

Now $\sum_k a(n, k, m) x_k$ exists for each m, n and $x \in a_c^r$, the sequence

$a_{mn} = \{a(n, k, m)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ define the continuous linear functionals ϕ_{mn} on a_c^r by

$$\phi_{mn}(x) = \sum_k a(n, k, m) x_k, \quad (m, n \in \mathbb{N}).$$

Since a_c^r and c are norm isomorphic ([1], Theorem 2.2), it should follow with (2.1) that

$$\|\phi_{mn}\| = \|\tilde{a}_{mn}\|$$

This just says that the functionals defined by ϕ_{mn} on a_c^r are point wise bounded. Hence, by the Banach-Steinhaus theorem, they are uniformly bounded, which yields that there exists a constant $M > 0$ such that

$$\|\phi_{mn}\| \leq M \quad \text{for all } m, n \in \mathbb{N}$$

It therefore follows, using the complete identification just referred to that

$$\sum_k |\tilde{a}(n, k, m)| = \|\phi_{mn}\| \leq M$$

holds for all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ which shows the necessity of the condition (2.2).

To prove the necessity of (2.4), consider the sequence $b^{(k)}(r) = \{b_n^{(k)}(r)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in a_c^r$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, where

$$b_n^{(k)}(r) = \begin{cases} (-1)^{n-k} \frac{1+k}{1+r^k}, & (k \leq n \leq k+1) \\ 0, & (0 \leq n \leq k-1 \text{ or } n > k+1) \end{cases}; \quad (n, k \in \mathbb{N})$$

Since Ax exists and is in f for each $x \in a_c^r$, one can easily see that

$$Ab^{(k)}(r) = \left\{ \Delta \left(\frac{a_{nk}}{1+r^k} \right) (k+1) \right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in f$$

for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, which shows the necessity of (2.4).

Similarly by taking $x = e \in a_c^r$, we also obtain that

$$Ax = \left\{ \sum_k \Delta \left(\frac{a_{nk}}{1+r^k} \right) (k+1) \right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in f$$

and this shows the necessity of (2.5). This completes the proof.

If the space f is replaced by f_0 , then Theorem (2.1) is reduced to

Corollary 2.1: $A \in (a_c^r : f_0)$ if and if (2.2), (2.3) and (2.4), (2.5) also hold with $\alpha_k = 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

References

- [1] C. Aydin, Feyzi Başar, On the new sequence spaces which include the spaces c_0 and c , Hokkaido Math. J. 33 (2)(2004), 383-398.
- [2] S. Banach, Théorie des opérations linéaires, Warszawa, 1932.
- [3] G. G. Lorentz, A contribution to the theory of divergent sequences, Acta Math.

80(1948), 167-190.

- [4] S. Nanda, Matrix transformations and almost boundedness, Glasnik Mat. (34), 14(1979), 99-107.

Department of Mathematics, National Institute of Technology, Srinagar-190006, India

E-mail: sameergupkari@rediffmail.com