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In this paper we examine the Köthe-Toeplitz reflexivity of certain sequence spaces and we characterize some classes of matrix transformations defined on them. The results are used to prove a generalization of a theorem by V. G. Iyer, concerning the equivalence of the notions of strong and weak convergence on the space of all integral functions, and also to generalize some theorems by Ch. Rao.

Let $X, Y$ be two nonempty subsets of the space $s$ of all complex sequences and $A = (a_{nk})$ an infinite matrix of complex numbers $a_{nk}(n, k = 1, 2, \cdots)$. For every $x = (x_k) \in X$ and every integer $n$ we write

$$A_n(x) = \sum_k a_{nk} x_k,$$

where the sum without limits is always taken from $k = 1$ to $k = \infty$. The sequence $Ax = (A_n(x))$, if it exists, is called the transformation of $x$ by the matrix $A$. We say that $A \in (X, Y)$ if and only if $Ax \in Y$ whenever $x \in X$.

Throughout the paper, unless otherwise indicated, $p = (p_k)$ will denote a sequence of strictly positive numbers (not necessarily bounded in general). The following classes of sequences were defined by Maddox [4] (see also Simons [10], Nakano [8]):

$$l(p) = \left\{ x : \sum_k |x_k|^{p_k} < \infty \right\},$$

$$l_\infty(p) = \left\{ x : \sup_k |x_k|^{p_k} < \infty \right\},$$

$$c(p) = \left\{ x : |x_k - l|^{p_k} \to 0 \text{ for some } l \right\},$$

$$c_0(p) = \left\{ x : |x_k|^{p_k} \to 0 \right\}.$$

When all the terms of $(p_k)$ are constant and all equal to $p > 0$ we have $l(p) = l_p$, $l_\infty(p) = l_\infty$, $c(p) = c$, and $c_0(p) = c_0$, where $l_p$, $l_\infty$, $c$, $c_0$, are respectively the spaces of $p$-summable, bounded, convergent and null sequences. It is easy to see that $l_\infty(p) = l_\infty$ if and only if $0 < \inf p_k \leq \sup p_k < \infty$ and similarly for $c_0(p) = c_0$, $c(p) = c$ (see [4]). It was shown in [4], [5], [6], that the sets $l(p)$, $l_\infty(p)$, $c(p)$ and $c_0(p)$ are linear spaces under coordinatewise addition and scalar multiplication.
if and only if \( p \in L \). The special linear space \( c_0(l/k) \) was studied by Iyer [1], who identified it with the space of all integral functions.

Whenever \( p \in l_\infty \) we shall write \( H = \sup p_k \) and \( M = \max(1, H) \).

Now let \( E \) be a nonempty subset of \( s \). Then we shall denote by \( E' \) the generalized Köthe-Toeplitz dual of \( E \), i.e.,

\[
E' = \{ a: \sum_k a_k x_k \text{ converges for every } x \in E \}.
\]

The following lemma collects some simple and well-known properties of dual spaces:

**Lemma 1.** The Köthe-Toeplitz duality has the following properties:

1. \( E' \) is a linear subspace of \( s \) for every \( E \subset s \).
2. \( E \subset F \) implies \( E' \supset F' \) for every \( E, F \subset s \).
3. \( E'' = (E')' \supset E \) for every \( E \subset s \).
4. \( (\cup E_j)' = \cap E_j' \) for every family \( \{E_j\} \) with \( E_j \subset s \).

A nonempty subset \( E \) of \( s \) is said to be perfect or Köthe-Toeplitz reflexive if and only if \( E'' = E \). It is well-known that \( E' \) is perfect for every \( E \). It is also obvious that if \( E \) is perfect then it is a linear space. The converse is not always true, e.g., \( c \) is a linear space with Köthe-Toeplitz dual \( l \) and therefore not perfect.

Let \( E(p) \) be any one of the sets \( l(p), l_\infty(p), c(p), c_0(p) \). Then to contract notation we shall put \( E(p; 1) = E(p) \), \( E(p; 2) = E(p) \), etc.

\[ \text{Lemma 2. } (i) \text{ If } 0 < p_k \leq 1 \text{ for every } k, \text{ then } l(p; 1) = l_\infty(p) \] (see Theorem 7 in [10]).

(ii) If \( p_k > 1 \) for every \( k \), then \( l(p; 1) = M(p) \), (see Theorem 1 in [6], where

\[
M(p) = \bigcup_{\lambda > 1} \left\{ a: \sum_k |a_k|^{|q_k|^n - q_k} < \infty \right\}
\]

with \( p_k^r + q_k^s = 1 \). For convenience we shall, in the future, write \( r_k = p_k^r \), \( s_k = q_k^s \).

(iii) For every \( p = (p_k) \), we have \( l_\infty(p; 1) = M_\infty(p) \), (see Theorem 2 in [3]), where

\[
M_\infty(p) = \bigcap_{\lambda > 1} \left\{ a: \sum_k |a_k|^{|r_k|} < \infty \right\}.
\]

(iv) Also for every \( p = (p_k), c_0(p; 1) = M_0(p) \), (see Theorem 6 in [6], where
We determine the Köthe-Toeplitz dual of \( c(p) \) in

**Theorem 1.** For every \( p = (p_k) \) we have \( c(p; 1) = c_0(p; 1) \cap \gamma \) where \( \gamma \) is the space of all convergent series.

**Proof.** Let \( a \in c_0(p; 1) \cap \gamma \) and \( |x_k - l|^k \to 0 \). Then \( l \sum_k a_k \) and \( \sum_k a_k(x_k - l) \) are well defined and therefore \( \sum_k a_k x_k \) converges. Whence \( c_0(p; 1) \cap \gamma \subseteq c(p; 1) \). On the other hand, let \( a \in c(p; 1) \). Then \( e = (1, 1, \cdots) \in c(p) \) implies \( a \in \gamma \), and \( c_0(p) \subseteq c(p) \) implies \( c(p; 1) \supseteq c_0(p; 1) \) by Lemma 1 (ii).

We continue by characterizing the Köthe-Toeplitz second duals and discussing the reflexivity of the sets \( c_0(p), l(p) \) and \( l_\infty(p) \).

We have the following theorems:

**Theorem 2.** For every \( p = (p_k) \) we have \( c_0(p; 2) = \lambda_1 \), where

\[
\lambda_1 = \bigcap_{N>1} \left\{ y: \sup_k |y_k| N^{-r_k} < \infty \right\}.
\]

**Proof.** Let \( E_N = \{ a: \sum_k |a_k| N^{-r_k} < \infty \} \). Then \( c_0(p; 1) = M_0(p) = \bigcup_{N>1} E_N \) and therefore by Lemma 1 (iv), we have \( c_0(p; 2) = M_0(p; 1) = \bigcap_{N>1} E_N' \). It is easy to check now that \( E_N' = \{ y: \sup_k |y_k| N^{-r_k} < \infty \} \) for every \( N \geq 1 \), whence \( c_0(p; 2) = \lambda_1 \).

**Theorem 3.** For every \( p = (p_k) \) we have \( l_\infty(p; 2) = \lambda_2 \), where

\[
\lambda_2 = \bigcup_{N>1} \left\{ a: \sup_k |a_k| N^{-r_k} < \infty \right\}.
\]

**Proof.** It is easy to see that \( \lambda_2 \subseteq l_\infty(p; 2) \). On the other hand if \( a \in l_\infty(p; 2) - \lambda_2 \) then there exists a strictly increasing sequence \((k(N))\) positive integers such that for \( k = k(N) \), \( |a_k| N^{-r_k} > N^2 \) and if we define a sequence \( x = (x_k) \) by \( x_k = 0 \) \( (k \neq k(N)) \), \( x_k = N^{-(-r_k+1)} \) \( \text{sgn} a_k \) \( (k = k(N)) \), \( N = 2, 3, \cdots \) then for any integer \( R > 1 \) we have, for every \( N \geq R \), \( |x_k| R^{r_k} \leq N^{-2} \), when \( k = k(N) \). Hence \( x \in l_\infty(p; 1) \). However, for \( k = k(N) \), \( a_k x_k > 1 \), contrary to \( a \in l_\infty(p; 2) \).

**Theorem 4.** (i) Let \( p_k > 1 \) for every \( k \). Then \( l(p) \) is perfect if and only if \( p \in l_\infty \).

(ii) Let \( 0 < p_k \leq 1 \) for every \( k \). Then \( l(p) \) is perfect if and only if \( l(p) = l_1 \).
Proof. (i) Let $1 < p_k \leq H$. Then we have
\[ q_k = (1 - r_k)^{-1} \geq H(H - 1)^{-1} > 1 \]
for every $k$. It is obvious now that, by Lemma 2 (ii), $l(q) \subset l(p; 1)$ and therefore that $l(q; 1) \supset l(p; 2)$, by Lemma 1 (ii). On the other hand $\inf q_k > 1$ implies $l(q; 1) = l(p)$ (see [6] p. 432) and therefore
\[ l(p) \subset l(p; 2) \subset l(q; 1) = l(p) . \]
Whence $l(p; 2) = l(p)$, i.e., $l(p)$ is perfect. Conversely if $l(p)$ is perfect then it is a linear space and therefore $p \in l_\omega$.

(ii) The sufficiency is trivial. For the necessity we observe that $l(p; 2) = l(p)$ implies $m = \inf p_k > 0$. For suppose not. Then there exists a strictly increasing sequence $(k_i)$ of positive integers such that $p_{k_i} < i^{-1}$. We put $a_k = 0$ ($k \neq k_i$), $a_{k_i} = i^{-r_k}$ ($k = k_i$). Then for every integer $N > 1$ we have, for $i \geq 2N$, $|a_k|N^{-r_k} \leq 2^{-i}$ and $|a_k|^p_k = i^{-1}$, where $k = k_i$. Whence $a \in l(p; 2) - l(p)$, contrary to the assumption that $l(p)$ is perfect. Now from $0 < m \leq p_k \leq 1$ we have $l'' \subset l(p) \subset l_\omega$, i.e., $l(p) = l(p; 2) = l_i$ (since $l'' = l_\omega$ by Theorem 7 in [8]).

**Theorem 5.** $l_\omega(p)$ is perfect if and only if $p \in l_\omega$.

Proof. Sufficiency. Let $p \in l_\omega$ and $a \in l_\omega(p; 2)$. Then there exists $N > 1$ such that $\sup_k |a_k| N^{-r_k} = K < \infty$. Hence $|a_k|N^{-r_k} K^{-1} < 1$ for every $k$ and therefore $|a_k|^p_k \leq N \max(1, K^\omega)$ for every $k$, i.e., $a \in l_\omega(p)$. Whence $l_\omega(p)$ is perfect.

Necessity. Let $l_\omega(p; 2) = l_\omega(p)$ and suppose that there exists a strictly increasing sequence $(k_i)$ of positive integers such that $p_{k_i} > i$. Then the sequence $a$ defined by $a_k = 0$, $k \neq k_i$, $a_{k_i} = 2$, $i = 1, 2, 3 \cdots$, belongs to $l_\omega(p; 2) - l_\omega(p)$ and this contradicts the assumption that $l_\omega(p)$ is perfect.

**Theorem 6.** The following statements are equivalent:

(i) $\inf p_k > 0 ;$
(ii) $l_\omega(p; 1) = l_i ;$
(iii) $l_\omega(p; 2) = l_\omega.$

Proof. The proof is trivial.

**Theorem 7.** The following statements are equivalent:

(i) $c_\omega(p; 2) = l_\omega ;$
(ii) $\inf p_k > 0 ;$
(iii) $c_\omega \subset c_\omega(p) . $
Proof. (i) implies (ii). For we have $l_1 = c_0(p; 3) = c_0(p; 1) = M_0(p)$ and therefore $\inf p_3 > 0$ (see [6] p. 434). (ii) implies (iii) by Lemma 1 in [4]). Finally from (iii) and Theorem 2 we have $l_\infty = c_0(p; 2) \subset l_\infty$, i.e., $c_0(p; 2) = l_\infty$. Whence (iii) implies (i).

**Theorem 8.** $c_0(p)$ is perfect if and only if $p \in c_0$.

**Proof.** For the sufficiency let $p \in c_0$ and take $x \in c_0(p; 2)$. Then by Theorem 2 we have $C_N = \sup_k |x_k| N^{r_k} < \infty$ for every integer $N > 1$. Suppose that $x \notin c_0(p)$. Then there exists a strictly increasing sequence $(k(s))$ of positive integers and a positive number $l$ such that $|x_k|^{r_k} \geq l$ for $k = k(s), s = 1, 2, \ldots$. Therefore, for every integer $N > 1$, we have

$$(Nl)^{r_k} \leq N^{r_k} |x_k| \leq \sup_k N^{r_k} |x_k| \leq C_N < \infty, (k = k(s)).$$

Let now $N_0$ be an arbitrary integer bigger than 1 and choose $N$ such that $Nl > N_0$. Then we have $N_0^{r_k} < (Nl)^{r_k} < C_N, (k = k(s))$, i.e., $\limsup_k N_0^{r_k} < \infty (k = k(s))$ contrary to the fact that $r_k(s) = p_k(s) \rightarrow \infty (s \rightarrow \infty)$. Whence $x \notin c_0(p)$ and this proves the sufficiency. For the necessity let us suppose that $c_0(p; 2) = c_0(p)$ and that $p \notin c_0$. Then there exists a strictly increasing sequence of positive integers $k_j$ and a positive number $l$ such that $p_{k_j} \geq l (j = 1, 2, \ldots)$. We define a sequence $x$ as follows: $x_k = 0 (k \neq k_j), x_k = 1 (k = k_j), (j = 1, 2, \ldots)$. Then it is easy to see that $x \notin c_0(p; 2) = c_0(p)$ contrary to the assumption that $c_0(p)$ is perfect. Whence $p \in c_0$ and this completes the proof of the theorem.

In the second part of this paper we characterize certain classes of matrix transformations and we show that certain theorems proved by K. Ch. Rao (see [9]) are particular cases of our theorems.

We start by characterizing the class $(c(p), c)$ of matrix transformations. We have the following theorem.

**Theorem 9.** Let $p \in l_\infty$. Then $A \in (c(p), c)$ if and only if 

(i) There exists an absolute constant $B > 1$ such that 

$$C = \sup_n \sum_k |a_{nk}| B^{-r_k} < \infty.$$ 

(ii) $\lim a_{nk} = a_k (n \rightarrow \infty)$ exists for every fixed $k$.

(iii) $\lim_n \sum_k a_{nk} = \alpha$ exists.

**Proof.** Sufficiency. Let $|x_k - l|^{r_k} \rightarrow 0$. It is easy to check that $(\alpha_k) \in c_0(p; 1)$. Given $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $k_0 = k_0(\varepsilon, x)$ such that
for every \( k > k_0 \). Therefore, we have

\[
B^{rk} |x_k - l| < B^{M_{rk}} |x_k - l| < (\min (1, \epsilon)(2C + 1)^{-1})^{M_{rk}} < \epsilon(2C + 1)^{-1}
\]

for every \( k > k_0 \). Putting \( b_{nk} = a_{nk} - \alpha_k \) we have \( b_{nk} \to 0 \ (n \to \infty, \ k \ \text{fixed}) \) and \( \sum_k |b_{nk}| B^{-rk} \leq 2C \). Whence

\[
\left| \sum_k (a_{nk} - \alpha_k)(x_k - l) \right| \leq \left| \sum_{k \leq k_0} b_{nk}(x_k - l) \right| + \epsilon
\]

and therefore

\[
\lim_n \sum_k x_{nk} x_k = l\alpha + \sum_k \alpha_k (x_k - l),
\]

i.e., \( A \in (c(p), c) \).

**Necessity.** Then necessity of (ii) and (iii) is obvious. For the necessity of (i) we observe that \( A \in (c_0(p), c) \) whenever \( A \in (c(p), c) \) (since \( (c(p), c) \subset (c_0(p), c) \)). Therefore each \( A_n \), defined by \( A_n(x) = \sum_k a_{nk} x_k \) for every \( x \in c_0(p) \), is a continuous linear functional on \( c_0(p) \) (see Theorem 6 in [6]) which is a complete linear topological space since \( p \in l_\infty \). The proof of the necessity of (i) is now a simple application of the uniform boundedness principle.

**Corollary 1.** Let \( p \in l_\infty \) and denote by \( (c(p), c; P) \) the class of matrix transformations which transform every sequence in \( c(p) \) to a sequence in \( c \) with the same limit. Then \( A \in (c(p), c; P) \) if and only if

(i)' Condition (i) Theorem 9 holds.

(ii)' \( \lim_n a_{nk} = 0 \) for every fixed \( k \).

(iii)' \( \lim_n \sum_k a_{nk} = 1 \).

**Corollary 2.** Let \( p \in l_\infty \). Then \( A \in (c_0(p), c) \) if and only if conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 9 hold.

**Corollary 3.** (See C. Rao’s Theorem (III) in [9]). \( A \in (c_0(1/k), c) \) if and only if

(i)" \( |a_{nk}|^{1/k} \leq D \) for every \( n, k \).

(ii)" \( \lim_n a_{nk} = \alpha_k \) exists for every fixed \( k \).

**Proof.** It is enough to prove that in the case \( p_k = 1/k \) for every \( k \), condition (i)* and condition (i) of Theorem 9 are equivalent. If condition (i) of Theorem 9 holds then \( \sum_k |a_{nk}| B^{-k} \leq C \) for an absolute constant \( B > 1 \) and therefore \( |a_{nk}| B^{-k} \leq C \) for every \( n, k \). Whence, for every \( n, k \) we have
\[ |a_{nk}|^{1/k} \leq C^{1/k} B \leq B \max (1, C) \equiv D < \infty , \]
i.e., condition (i). On the other hand if condition (i)* holds, then for an integer \( T \geq \max (1, 2D) \) we have
\[ |a_{nk}| \leq D^k \leq T^k 2^{-k}, \text{ for every } n, k. \]
Whence
\[ \sum_k |a_{nk}| T^{-k} \leq \sum_k 2^{-k} < \infty \text{ for all } n, \]
i.e., condition (i) of Theorem 9 holds.

**Theorem 10.** Let \( p \in l_\infty \). Then \( A \in (c_0(p), l_\infty(p)) \) if and only if there exists an absolute constant \( B > 1 \) such that
\[ T = \sup_n \left\{ \sum_k |a_{nk}| B^{-r_k} \right\}^{p_n} < \infty . \]

*Proof. Sufficiency.* Let \( x \in c_0(p) \). Then there exists \( k_0 \) such that \( |x_k| < B^{-r_k} \) for every \( k > k_0 \). Therefore for every \( n \) we have
\[ \left| \sum_k a_{nk} x_k \right|^{p_n} \leq K(S_1 + S_2) , \]
where,
\[ K = \max (1, 2^{N-1}), \quad S_1 = \left| \sum_{k \leq k_0} a_{nk} x_k \right|^{p_n}, \quad S_2 = \left| \sum_{k > k_0} a_{nk} x_k \right|^{p_n} . \]
We observe now that (1) implies
\[ |a_{nk}| T^{-r_n} < B^{-r_k} \leq \max_{k \leq k_0} B^{-r_k} \equiv R < \infty \]
for every \( n \) and for every \( k \in [1, k_0] \). Whence
\[ S_1 \leq \left( \sum_{k \leq k_0} RT^{r_n} |x_k| \right)^{p_n} = T \left( R \sum_{k \leq k_0} |x_k| \right)^{p_n} \leq T \max (1, Q) < \infty \]
where \( Q = (R \sum_{k \leq k_0} |x_k|)^N \). For the term \( S_2 \) we have
\[ S_2^{p_n} = \left| \sum_{k > k_0} a_{nk} x_k \right|^{p_n} \leq \sum_{k > k_0} |a_{nk}| B^{-r_k} \leq T^{r_n}, \]
i.e., \( S_2 \leq T \). Whence \( A \in (c_0(p), l_\infty(p)) \).

*Necessity.* Let \( A \in (c_0(p), l_\infty(p)) \). Then we have
\[ N(x) = \sup_n |A_n(x)|^{p_n} < \infty \]
for every \( x \in c_0(p) \). Put \( f_n(x) = |A_n(p)|^{p_n} \). Then for every \( n, f_n \) is a
continuous function on $c_0(p)$ (see Theorem 6 in [6]). Since $c_0(p)$ is a complete metric space (see Theorem 1 in [5] and p. 318 in [7]) and $f_n(x) \leq N(x)$ for every $n$, we have, by the uniform boundedness principle, that there exists a sphere $S[\theta, \delta] \subset c_0(p)$ with $\delta < 1, \theta = (0, 0, \cdots)$ and an absolute constant $K$ such that

$$\left| \sum_k a_{nk} x_k \right|^p_n \leq K$$

for every $n$ and for every $x \in S[\theta, \delta]$. For every integer $m > 0$ we define a sequence $(x^{(m)})$ of elements of $c_0(p)$ as follows:

$$x^{(m)}_k = \delta^{mr_k} \text{sgn} a_{nk} \quad (1 \leq k \leq m), \quad x^{(m)}_k = 0 \quad (k > m).$$

Then $x^{(m)} \in S[\theta, \delta]$ for every $m$ and by (2)

$$\left\{ \sum_n \left| a_{nk} B^{-r_k} \right|^p_n \right\}^{1/p} \leq K,$n

for every $m, n$, where $B = \delta^{-m}$. Whence $T < \infty$.

**Remark.** It is easy to check that if $p \in l_\infty, p' \in l_\infty$, then we have $A \in (c_0(p), l_\infty(p'))$ if and only if there exists an absolute constant $B > 1$ such that

$$S = \sup_n \left\{ \sum_k \left| a_{nk} B^{-r_k} \right|^p_n \right\}^{1/p} < \infty.$$

Let now $Q$ be the set of all $p = (p_k)$ for which there exists $N > 1$ such that $\sum_k N^{-r_k} < \infty$. Then we have the following

**Theorem 11.** Let $p \in Q$. Then $A \in (c_0(p), l_\infty(p))$ if and only if

$$D = \sup_{n, \#} \left| a_{nk} B^{(r_k + r_n)_{\#}} \right| < \infty.$$n

**Proof.** Let condition (i) of Theorem 10 holds. Then we have

$$\left| a_{nk} B^{-r_k} \right| \leq T_r^n$$

for all $n, k$. Hence $|a_{nk} B^{r_k T_r^n}$ and if we put $C = \max(T, B)$ we have $D \leq C < \infty$. Obviously in this part of the proof we do not require that $p \in Q$. If now $p \in Q$, then there exists $N > 1$ such that $\sum_k N^{-r_k}$ and therefore if $D < \infty$ we have for an integer $B > ND$ that

$$\sum_k \left| a_{nk} B^{-r_k} \right| \leq (B/N)^{r_k} \sum_k N^{-r_k}.$$

Whence condition (1) of Theorem 10 holds and therefore $A \in (c_0(p), l_\infty(p))$.

**Corollary 1.** (See C. Rao's Theorem (v) in [9]). $A \in (c_0(1/k),$
THEOREM 12. For every \( p = (p_k) \) we have \( A \in (M_0(p), c_0) \) if and only if

\[
\text{sup}_{w,fc} |a_{n,k}| [n+k]^{-1} < \infty.
\]

Proof. The sufficiency is trivial and so is the necessity of (ii). The necessity of (i) is proved by an argument similar to the one that was used to prove Theorem 3 in [3].

Before we proceed to discuss weak convergence in \( c_0(p) \) we prove a theorem concerning the relation between the classes \( c_0(p) \) and \( l_1 \).

THEOREM 13. The following statements are true:

1. \( l_1 \subset c_0(p) \) if and only if \( \inf p_k > 0 \).
2. \( c_0(p) \subset l_1 \) if and only if \( p \in Q \).
3. \( c_0(p) \neq l_1 \) for every \( p = (p_k) \).

Proof. (1) If \( \inf p_k > 0 \) then \( c_0(p) = c_0 \supset l_1 \). On the other hand if \( l_1 \subset c_0(p) \) but we suppose that \( \inf p_k = 0 \) then we can find a strictly increasing sequence \( (k_i) \) of positive integers such that \( p_{ki} < i^{-1} \) (\( i = 1, 2, \cdots \)). It is easy to see now that the sequence \( x_k = 0 \) (\( k \neq k_i \)), \( x_k = 2^{-rk} \) (\( k = k_i \)), (\( i = 1, 2, \cdots \)) belong to \( l_1 - c_0(p) \) contrary to the assumption that \( l_1 \subset c_0(p) \). Hence (1) is true.

(2) Let \( p \in Q \), \( x \in c_0(p) \). Then there exist \( N > 1 \) and \( k_0 = k_0(N, x) \) such that \( \sum_k N^{-rk} < \infty \) and \( |x_k| \leq N^{-rk} \) for every \( k > k_0 \). Whence \( x \in l_1 \). On the other hand if \( c_0(p) \subset l_1 \) but \( \sum_k N^{-rk} = \infty \) for every \( N > 1 \) then there exists strictly increasing sequence \( (k,n) \) of positive integers such that

\[
\sum_{k_{N-1} < k \leq k_N} (N + 1)^{-rk} > N
\]

and if we put \( x_k = (N + 1)^{-rk} \) for \( k_{N-1} < k \leq k_N \) then we have \( x \in c_0(p) - l_1 \) contrary to the assumption that \( c_0(p) \subset l_1 \). Hence (2) is true.

(3) If \( p \in Q \) then there exists \( N > 1 \) such that \( \sum_k N^{-rk} < \infty \) and \( (N^{-r}) \in l_1 - c_0(p) \), i.e., \( c_0(p) \) is in this case a proper subset of \( l_1 \). On the other hand if \( p \in Q \) then by (2) \( c_0(p) \) contains an element which is not in \( l_1 \) and hence (3) is true.

In the proof of our next theorem we will make use of the following

**Lemma 3.** \( l_\infty(1/k) = M_0(1/k) \).
Proof. Let $x \in L_\infty(1/k)$. Then by choosing an integer $N > 2(D+1)$, where $D = \sup_k |x_k|^{1/k} < \infty$, we have
\[ \sum_k |x_k| N^{-k} < \sum_k 2^{-k} < \infty, \] i.e., $x \in M_0(1/k)$.

Conversely for $x \in M_0(1/k)$ we have
\[ |x_k|^{1/k} \leq NC^{1/k} \leq N \max(1, C) < \infty \]
for some $N > 1$ such that $C = \sum_k |x_k| < \infty$. Whence $x \in L_\infty(1/k)$ and therefore the lemma is true.

We now prove the following.

**Theorem 14.** The following statements are equivalent:

1. $A \in (L_\infty(1/k), c_0)$;
2. $\sum_k |a_{nk}| N_k \to 0$ (as $n \to \infty$) for every $N > 1$;
3. $\sup_k |a_{nk}|^{1/k} \to 0$ (as $n \to \infty$);
4. (i) $\sup_{a_{nk}} |N_k^k < \infty$ for every $N > 1$,
   (ii) $\lim_{n} a_{nk} = 0$ for every fixed $k$.

Proof. By Theorem 3 in [3], (1) implies (2). Now given $\varepsilon > 0$ we choose $N > 1$ such that $N^{-1} < \varepsilon$. By (2) there exists $n_0$ such that $\sum_k |a_{nk}| N_k < 1$, $n > n_0$, which implies $|a_{nk}| N_k < 1$ for all $k \geq 1$, $n > n_0$. Therefore
\[ \sup_k |a_{nk}|^{1/k} < N^{-1} < \varepsilon, \]
for every $n > n_0$. Hence (2) implies (3). It is easy to see that (3) implies (4) and finally that (4) implies (1) by Theorem 12 and Lemma 3.

This completes the proof of Theorem 14.

We conclude this paper with the study of weak convergence in $c_0(p)$.

In 1948, V. G. Iyer [1] proved an interesting theorem concerning the equivalence of the notions of strong and weak convergence in $c_0(1/k)$. Namely

**Theorem I.** The notions of strong and weak convergence in $c_0(1/k)$ are equivalent.

In the present paper we show that Iyer’s theorem is true for a more general class of $c_0(p)$ spaces, namely for the spaces $c_0(p)$ for which $p \in c_0$.

Before proceeding any further we make some remarks concerning the $c_0(p)$ spaces and give some definitions.

It has been shown by Maddox (see Theorem 6 in [6]) that for
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pelco the space cf(p) of all continuous linear functional on \( c_0(p) \) is isomorphic to the space \( M(p) \) in the sense that every continuous linear functional on \( c_0(p) \) can be expressed in the form \( f(x) = \sum a_k x_k \) with \( a \in M(p) \) and vice versa. Therefore in what follows we can talk of expressions \( \sum a_k x_k, \ a \in M(p), \ x \in c_0(p) \) instead of continuous linear functionals on \( c_0(p) \).

The following definitions are well-known.

**Definition 1.** Let \( X \) be a linear topological space. Then we say that a sequence \( (x^{(n)}) \) of elements of \( X \) converges weakly to an element \( x \) of \( X \) if and only if \( \lim_n f(x^{(n)}) = f(x) \) for every \( f \in X^* \) (i.e., for every continuous linear functional on \( X \)).

**Definition 2.** A linear metric space is said to have the Schur property if and only if every weakly convergent sequence of its elements is necessarily convergent in the metric of the space. If the above space is a \( B \)-space then the definition coincides with the one given in [2].

Note that convergence in metric (strong convergence) implies weak convergence to the same limit.

We now examine the conditions under which the space \( c_0(p) \) has the Schur property. It has been remarked that \( p \in l_\infty \) is necessary and sufficient for the linearity of \( c_0(p) \). Furthermore if \( p \in l_\infty \) then \( c_0(p) \) is a complete linear topological space under the topology induced by the paranorm \( g \) defined by \( g(x) = \sup_k |x_k|^p/k! \) for every \( x = c_0(p) \) (see Theorem 1 in [5]).

The following result gives the exact condition for \( c_0(p) \) to have the Schur property and consequently includes Iyer's theorem as a special case.

**Theorem 15.** The linear topological space \( c_0(p) \) has the Schur property if and only if \( p \in c_0 \).

**Proof.** Sufficiency: Let \( p \in c_0 \), and \( (x^{(n)}) \subset c_0(p) \) be convergent weakly to \( \theta \), i.e., \( \lim_n f(x^{(n)}) = 0 \) for every \( f \in c_0^*(p) \). Then

\[
\lim_n \sum a_k x^{(n)}_k = 0
\]

for every \( a \in M(p) \). Whence \( X = (x^{(n)}) \in (M(p), c_0) \) (where for convenience we put \( x^{(n)}_k \) instead of \( x^{(n)}_k \)) and therefore by Theorem 12 we have

(i) \( C_N = \sup_{n,k} |x^{(n)}_k| N^{p/k} < \infty \) for every \( N > 1 \),

(ii) \( \lim_n x^{(n)}_k = 0 \) for every fixed \( k \).

We shall prove now that \( g^w(x^{(n)}) \to 0 \) \( (n \to \infty) \). Suppose, on the contrary, that
\[ \limsup_n g^\nu(x^{(n)}) > 0. \]

Then there exists a subsequence \((y^{(s)})\) of \((x^{(n)})\) and a positive number \(l\) such that
\[ g^\nu(y^{(s)}) \geq 2l \quad s = 1, 2, \ldots. \]
We write \(s(1) = 1\) and let \(k(1) \geq 1\) be such that
\[ |y_{s(1)k(1)}|^{p_k(1)} > l, \]
where \(y^{(s)} = (y_{s,k})\) for every \(s\). Obviously such an integer \(k(1)\) exists because of (1). Now \(p \in c_0\) implies that there exists \(\bar{k}(1)\) such that \(p_k < 2^{-i}\) for every \(k > \bar{k}(1)\). By (ii) there exists \(s(2) > s(1)\) such that
\[ \max_{1 \leq k \leq \bar{k}(1) + \bar{k}(1)} |y_{s(2)k}|^{p_k(2)} < l. \]
Whence there exists \(k(2) > k(1) + \bar{k}(1)\) such that
\[ p_k(2) < 2^{-1}, \quad |y_{s(2)k}|^{p_k(2)} > l. \]
Continuing this way let \(k(i - 1), s(i - 1)\) be defined such that,
\[ k(i - 1) > k(i - 2) > \cdots > k(1) \geq 1, \quad s(i - 1) > s(i - 2) > \cdots > s(1) = 1, \quad p_k(i - 1) < (i - 1)^{-1}, \quad |y_{s(i - 1)k(i - 1)}|^{p_k(i - 1)} > l. \]
Then there exists \(\bar{k}(i - 1) > k(i - 1)\) such that \(p_k < i^{-i}\) for every \(k > \bar{k}(i - 1)\) and \(s(i) > s(i - 1)\) such that
\[ \max_{1 \leq k \leq \bar{k}(i - 1) + \bar{k}(i - 1)} |y_{s(i)k}|^{p_k} < l. \]
Whence there exists \(k(i) > k(i - 1) + \bar{k}(i - 1)\) such that
\[ |y_{s(i)k(i)}|^{p_k(i)} > l. \]
With this method we construct two strictly increasing sequences \((k(i)), (s(i))\) of positive integers such that
\[ p_k(i) < i^{-1}, \quad |y_{s(i)k(i)}|^{p_k(i)} > l, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots. \]
Now we choose an integer \(N > 1\) such that \(Nl > 2\). Then we have
\[ C_N = \sup_{n,k} |x_{nk}| N^{r_k} \geq \sup_{i} |y_{s(i)k(i)}| N^{r_k(i)} \geq \sup_{i} (Nl)^{r_k(i)} \geq \sup_{i} 2^{r_k(i)} = \infty, \]
contrary to condition (i). Whence we must have
\[
\lim_{n} \sup g^{\nu}(x^{(n)}) = 0,
\]
i.e., that \(x^{(n)} \rightarrow \theta\) strongly.

Necessity. Suppose now that the space \(c_{0}(p)\) has the Schur property. If \(p \notin c_{0}\) then there exists a positive number \(l\) and a strictly increasing sequence \((k(i))\) of positive integers such that \(p_{k(i)} \geq l\) for \(i = 1, 2, \ldots\). Consider the sequence
\[
(x^{(i)}) = (e_{k(i)}) \subset c_{0}(p)
\]
where \(e_{k(i)}\) denotes the sequence with 1 in the \(k(i)\)th place and 0 everywhere else. Then for every integer \(N > 1\) we have
\[
(i) \quad \sup_{i,k} |x_{ik}| N^{r_{x}} = \sup_{i} N^{r_{k(i)}} < N^{r_{x}} < \infty,
\]
\[
(ii) \quad \lim_{i} x_{ik} = 0 \quad \text{for every fixed } k,
\]
i.e., \(x^{(i)} \rightarrow \theta\) weakly in \(c_{0}(p)\). On the other hand for every pair of integers \(m, n (m \neq n)\) we have
\[
g(x^{(n)} - x^{(m)}) = g(e_{k(n)} - e_{k(m)}) = 1,
\]
i.e., the sequence \((x^{(i)})\) is not a Cauchy sequence in \(c_{0}(p)\) and therefore not convergent. Whence we have a contradiction to the fact that \(c_{0}(p)\) has the Schur property.

COROLLARY. (Theorem I). The space \(c_{0}(1/k)\) has the Schur property.

Note that by Theorems 8 and 15 \(c_{0}(p)\) has the Schur property if and only if it is perfect.

Finally, I am grateful to my supervisor Dr. I. J. Maddox for drawing my attention to the problems examined in this paper, for his constructive criticism of this work and for his help and guidance in general. I also wish to thank the referee for several valuable comments and suggestions.
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