

Proyecciones  
Vol. 20, N° 1, pp. 19-31, May 2001.  
Universidad Católica del Norte  
Antofagasta - Chile  
DOI: 10.4067/S0716-09172001000100002

# A MULTIPLIER GLIDING HUMP PROPERTY FOR SEQUENCE SPACES

CHARLES SWARTZ

*New Mexico State University - USA*

## Abstract

*We consider the Banach-Mackey property for pairs of vector spaces  $E$  and  $E'$  which are in duality. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an algebra of sets and assume that  $P$  is an additive map from  $\mathcal{A}$  into the projection operators on  $E$ . We define a continuous gliding hump property for the map  $P$  and show that pairs with this gliding hump property and another measure theoretic property are Banach-Mackey pairs, i.e., weakly bounded subsets of  $E$  are strongly bounded. Examples of vector valued function spaces, such as the space of Pettis integrable functions, which satisfy these conditions are given.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

H. Lebesgue introduced the gliding hump technique of proof to establish several uniform boundedness results for concrete function spaces such as  $L[0,1]$  ([L]). Subsequently, Schur and Hellinger/Toeplitz also used the gliding hump method to establish similar uniform boundedness principles for concrete function spaces ([Sc],[HT]). The early proofs of abstract uniform boundedness principles by Banach, Hahn and Hillebrandt all employed gliding techniques ([B],[Ha],[Hi]). Abstract gliding hump assumptions have been used to treat a number of topics in sequence spaces; for example, Noll used a "strong gliding hump" property to establish the weak sequential completeness of the beta dual of a sequence space ([N] ; see [BF] for a list of various gliding hump properties for sequence spaces). In this paper we introduce a gliding hump assumption involving multipliers from a scalar sequence space which is particularly useful in establishing uniform boundedness results for a vector-valued sequence space and its beta dual; in particular, our results establish Banach-Mackey properties for sequence spaces.

## 2. DEFINITIONS AND EXAMPLES

We begin with the notations and assumptions which will be used. Let  $X$  be a Hausdorff locally convex space and let  $E$  be a vector space of  $X$ -valued sequences containing  $c_{00}(X)$ , the space of all  $X$ -valued sequences which are eventually 0. We assume that  $E$  has a Hausdorff locally convex topology under which  $E$  is a K-space, i.e., the coordinate maps  $x = \{x_k\} \rightarrow x_k$  from  $E$  into  $X$  are continuous for every  $k$ . An interval in  $\mathbf{N}$  is a set of the form  $[m, n] = \{k \in \mathbf{N} : m \leq k \leq n\}$ , where  $m \leq n$ ; a sequence of intervals  $\{I_k\}$  is increasing if  $\max I_k < \min I_{k+1}$  for every  $k$ . If  $I$  is an interval in  $\mathbf{N}$  the characteristic function of  $I$  is denoted by  $\chi_I$ , and if  $x = \{x_k\}$  is an  $X$ -valued sequence,  $\chi_I x$  denotes the coordinatewise product of  $\chi_I$  and  $x$ .

Let  $\lambda$  be a vector space of scalar valued sequences which contains  $c_{00}$  the space of sequences which are eventually 0. The  $\beta$ -dual of  $\lambda$ ,  $\lambda^\beta$ ,

is defined to be  $\{t = \{t_k\} : \sum t_k s_k \text{ converges for every } s = \{s_k\} \in \lambda\}$ . If  $s \in \lambda$  and  $t \in \lambda^\beta$ , we set  $t \cdot s = \sum t_k s_k$ ;  $\lambda$  and  $\lambda^\beta$  are in duality with respect to the bilinear pairing  $(s, t) \rightarrow s \cdot t$ .

**Definition 1.**  $E$  has the strong  $\lambda$  gliding hump property (strong  $\lambda$ -GHP) if whenever  $\{I_k\}$  is an increasing sequence of intervals and  $\{x^k\}$  is a bounded sequence in  $E$ , then for every  $t = \{t_k\} \in \lambda$  the coordinate sum of the series  $\sum t_k \chi_{I_k} x^k$  belongs to  $E$ .

**Definition 2.**  $E$  has the weak  $\lambda$  gliding hump property (weak  $\lambda$ -GHP) if whenever  $\{I_k\}$  is an increasing sequence of intervals and  $\{x^k\}$  is a bounded sequence in  $E$ , there is a subsequence  $\{n_k\}$  such that the coordinate sum  $\sum t_k \chi_{I_{n_k}} x^k$  belongs to  $E$  for every  $t \in \lambda$ .

We refer to the elements of  $\lambda$  in Definitions 1 and 2 as multipliers since their coordinates multiply the blocks  $\{\chi_{I_k}\}$  determined by  $\{I_k\}$  and  $\{x^k\}$ . The weak  $\lambda$ -GHP is like the strong gliding humps property introduced by Noll ([N]) where the multipliers consist only of the constant sequence  $\{1\}$ . After giving examples of spaces with  $\lambda$ -GHP we will make remarks comparing  $\lambda$ -GHP with other gliding hump properties.

We proceed to give an extensive list of examples of spaces with  $\lambda$ -GHP. The reader may want to skip ahead to section 3 where the main results are established and then refer back to the examples. For our first example we need a definition.

**Definition 3.**  $E$  satisfies the boundedness property (B) if for every increasing sequence of intervals  $\{I_k\}$  and every bounded set  $A \subset E$ , the set  $\{\chi_{I_k} x : k \in \mathbf{N}, x \in A\}$  is bounded in  $E$ .

For example, if  $\mathcal{I}$  is the family of all intervals in  $\mathbf{N}$  and the maps  $\chi_I : E \rightarrow E, x \rightarrow \chi_I x, I \in \mathcal{I}$  are equicontinuous, then (B) holds. This is the case if  $p(\chi_I x) \leq p(x)$  holds for every  $I \in \mathcal{I}, \S \in \mathcal{E}$  and continuous seminorm  $p$  on  $E$ .

**Proposition 4.** If  $E$  is a locally complete space with property (B), then  $E$  has strong  $l^1$ -GHP.

**Proof:** Let  $\{I_k\}$  be an increasing sequence of intervals and  $\{x^k\} \subset E$  be bounded. By (B)  $\{\chi_{I_k} x^k : k\}$  is bounded so if  $t = \{t_k\} \in l^1$ ,

the series  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} t_k \chi_{I_k} x^k$  is absolutely convergent in  $E$  and, therefore, converges to an element  $x \in E$  by local completeness. Since  $X$  is a  $K$ -space,  $x$  is also the coordinate sum of the series.

Proposition 4 gives a large supply of spaces with  $l^1$ -GHP. We also have

**Example 5.**  $l^\infty$  and  $c_0$  have strong  $c_0$ -GHP;  $l^p$  has strong  $l^p$ -GHP for  $0 < p \leq \infty$ .

We now give examples of non-complete scalar sequence spaces with weak  $l^p$ -GHP.

**Example 6.** Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . Let  $\mathbf{P}$  be the power set of  $\mathbf{N}$  and let  $\mu : \mathbf{P} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be a finitely additive set function with  $\mu(\{j\}) > 0$  for every  $j$ . Put  $l^p(\mu) = L^p(\mu)$ , the space of all  $p$ th power  $\mu$ -integrable functions with the norm  $\|f\|_p = (\int_{\mathbf{N}} |f|^p d\mu)^{1/p}$  [ see [RR] for details on the integration with respect to finitely additive set functions; the assumption  $\mu(\{j\}) > 0$  for every  $j$  makes  $l^p(\mu)$  a  $K$ -space]. We show that  $l^p(\mu)$  has weak  $l^p$ -GHP. Let  $\{I_k\}$  be an increasing sequence and  $\{f_k\} \subset l^p(\mu)$  be bounded with  $\|f_k\|_p \leq 1$ . By Drewnowski's Lemma ([Dr],[Sw2]2.2.3), there is a subsequence  $\{n_k\}$  such that  $\mu$  is countably additive on the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\{I_{n_k}\}$ . Suppose that  $t \in l^p$ . Put  $f = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} t_k \chi_{I_{n_k}} f_{n_k}$  [coordinatewise]. We claim that  $f \in l^p(\mu)$  and the series converges to  $f$  in  $l^p(\mu)$  by using Theorem 4.6.10 of [RR]. Put  $s_n = \sum_{k=1}^n t_k \chi_{I_{n_k}} f_{n_k}$  and note that  $s_n \rightarrow f$   $\mu$ -hazily [ $\mu$ -measure] since if  $\epsilon > 0$ ,

$$\mu(\{j : |s_n(j) - f(j)| \geq \epsilon\}) \leq \mu(\cup_{j=n+1}^{\infty} I_{n_j}) = \sum_{j=n+1}^{\infty} \mu(I_{n_j}) \rightarrow 0$$

by countable additivity. Next,  $\{s_n\}$  is Cauchy in  $l^p(\mu)$  since

$$\|s_n - s_m\|_p^p = \left\| \sum_{j=m}^n t_j \chi_{I_{n_j}} f_{n_j} \right\|_p^p \leq \sum_{j=m}^n |t_j|^p \rightarrow 0.$$

It follows that  $\{\int |f_{n_j}|^p d\mu : j\}$  is uniformly  $\mu$ -continuous. The claim is thus justified, and it follows that  $l^p(\mu)$  has weak  $l^p$ -GHP.

**Problem.** Does  $l^p(\mu)$  have strong  $l^p$ ?

We next give examples of vector-valued sequence spaces with  $\lambda - GHP$ . Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a family of semi-norms which generate the topology of  $X$ . Let  $\mu$  be a normal (scalar) K-space whose topology is generated by the family of semi-norms  $\mathcal{M}$ . If  $t = \{t_k\} \in \mu$ , we set  $|t| = \{|t_k|\}$ . We make the following assumptions on  $\mu$ :

(\*) If  $A \subset \mu$  is bounded, then  $|A| = \{|t| : t \in A\}$  is bounded in  $\mu$ .

(\*\*) If  $s, t \in \mu$  with  $|s| \leq |t|$  and if  $q \in \mathcal{M}$ , then  $q(s) \leq q(t)$ .

These assumptions are satisfied by many of the classical sequence spaces.

We define  $\mu\{X\}$  to be the space of all  $X$ -valued sequences  $x = \{x_k\}$  such that  $\{p(x_k)\} \in \mu$  for every  $p \in \mathcal{X}$ . Since  $\mu$  is normal,  $\mu\{X\}$  is a vector space. We assume that  $\mu\{X\}$  has the locally convex topology generated by the semi-norms

$$(1) \quad \pi_{q,p}(\{x_k\}) = q(\{p(x_k)\}), p \in \mathcal{X}, q \in \mathcal{M}.$$

Spaces of this type were considered in [FP] and [F].

The spaces  $l^p\{X\}$  and  $c_0\{X\}$  are the usual spaces of pth power convergent and null sequences, respectively. As in Example 5 it is easily seen that  $l^\infty\{X\}$  and  $c_0\{X\}$  have strong  $c_0 - GHP$  and  $l^p\{X\}$  has strong  $l^p - GHP$ . More generally, we have

**Proposition 7.** If  $\mu$  has strong  $\lambda - GHP$ , then  $\mu\{X\}$  has strong  $\lambda - GHP$ .

**Proof:** Let  $\{I_k\}$  be an increasing sequence of intervals and  $\{x^k\} \subset \mu\{X\}$  be bounded. Let  $t \in \lambda$  and put  $x = \sum_{k=1}^\infty t_k \chi_{I_k} x^k$  {coordinatewise}. Let  $p \in \mathcal{X}$  and note  $p(x(\cdot)) = \sum_{k=1}^\infty |t_k| \chi_{I_k} p(x^k(\cdot))$ , where  $x(\cdot)$  is the function  $j \rightarrow x_j$ . Now  $\{\{p(x_j^k)\}_{j=1}^\infty : k\}$  is bounded in  $\mu$  by the definition in (1). By strong  $\lambda - GHP$ ,  $\{p(x_j)\} \in \mu$ , i.e.,  $x \in \mu\{X\}$ .

**Proposition 8.** If  $\mu$  has weak  $\lambda - GHP$  and  $X$  is normed, then  $\mu\{X\}$  has weak  $\lambda - GHP$ .

**Proof:** Continue the notation from Proposition 7 and let  $\|\cdot\|$  be the norm on  $X$ . For every  $k$   $\{\|x_j^k\|\}_{j=1}^\infty \in \mu$  and  $\{\{\|x_j^k\|\}_{j=1}^\infty : k\}$

is bounded in  $\mu$  so by weak  $\lambda - GHP$  there is a subsequence  $\{n_k\}$  such that  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} t_k \chi_{I_{n_k}} \|x^{n_k}(\cdot)\| = s \in \mu$  for every  $t \in \lambda$ . Therefore,  $x = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} t_k \chi_{I_{n_k}} x^{n_k} \in \mu\{X\}$ .

Propositions 7 and 8 give a large supply of spaces with  $\lambda - GHP$  many of which are not sequentially complete [ e.g.,  $l^p\{X\}$  or  $c_0\{X\}$ ].

We now give other examples of (non-monotone) vector-valued sequence spaces.

**Example 9.** Let  $CS(X)$  be the space of all  $X$ -valued sequences  $\{x_k\}$  such that the series  $\sum x_k$  is Cauchy in  $X$ . If  $X$  is the scalar field,  $CS(X)$  is the space  $cs$  of convergent series. We define a topology on  $CS(X)$  induced by the semi-norms  $p'(\{x_k\}) = \sup\{p(\sum_{j \in I} x_j) : I \in \mathcal{I}\}$ ,  $p \in \mathcal{X}$ .

We claim that  $CS(X)$  has strong  $l^1 - GHP$ . Suppose  $\{I_k\}$  is increasing and  $\{x^k\} \subset CS(X)$  is bounded. If  $t \in l^1$ , put  $x = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} t_k \chi_{I_k} x^k$  [coordinatewise]. Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $p \in X$  and set  $M = \sup\{p(\sum_{j \in I} x_j^k) : I \in \mathcal{I}, k\}$ . Pick  $N$  such that  $\sum_{k=N}^{\infty} |t_k| < \varepsilon$ . Suppose  $I \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $\min I > N$ . Then

$$p(\sum_{j \in I} x_j) \leq \sum_{k=N}^{\infty} |t_k| M \leq M\varepsilon$$

so  $x \in CS(X)$ .

**Example 10.** Let  $BS(X)$  be all  $X$ -valued sequences  $\{x_k\}$  such that the partial sums  $\{\sum_{k=1}^n x_k\}$  are bounded. If  $X$  is the scalar field,  $BS(X)$  is the space of bounded series  $bs$ . As above define a topology on  $BS(X)$  by the semi-norms  $p'(\{x_k\}) = \sup\{p(\sum_{j \in I} x_j) : I \in \mathcal{I}\}$ ,  $p \in \mathcal{X}$ . It is easily checked that  $BS(X)$  has strong  $l^1 - GHP$ .

**Example 11.** Let  $BV(X)$  be all  $X$ -valued sequences  $\{x_k\}$  such that the series  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (x_{i+1} - x_i)$  is absolutely convergent in  $X$ , i.e.,  $\{x_{i+1} - x_i\} \in l^1\{X\}$ . If  $X$  is the scalar field  $BV(X)$  is the space  $bv$  of sequences of bounded variation. If  $p \in \mathcal{X}$ , we define a semi-norm  $p'(\{x_k\}) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} p(x_{i+1} - x_i) + \lim p(x_i)$  and topologize  $BV(X)$  by the semi-norms  $\{p' : p \in \mathcal{X}\}$ .

We show that  $BV(X)$  has strong  $l^1 - GHP$ . First note that if  $x \in BV(X)$ , then  $\sup\{p(x_i) : i\} \leq p'(x)$  for  $p \in X$  [for  $n > m$ ,  $x_m =$

$\sum_{k=m}^n (x_k - x_{k+1}) + x_{n+1}]$ , so if  $I \in \mathcal{I}$ ,  $p'(\chi_I x) \leq p'(x) + 2 \sup_i p(x_i) \leq 3p'(x)$ . If  $\{I_k\}$  is increasing,  $\{x^k\} \subset BV(X)$  is bounded,  $t \in l^1$  and we set  $x = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} t_k \chi_{I_k} x^k$ , we have  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} p(x_{k+1} - x_k) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |t_k| 3p'(x^k) < \infty$  so  $x \in BV(X)$ .

As noted earlier the weak  $\lambda - GHP$  resembles the strong gliding hump property introduced by Noll where the multipliers consist of the single constant sequence  $\{1\}$  ( $[N]$ ). A weaker gliding hump property is the *zero-GHP*;  $E$  has *zero-GHP* if  $x^k \rightarrow 0$  in  $E$  and  $\{I_k\}$  increasing implies there exists a subsequence  $\{n_k\}$  such that  $x = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \chi_{I_{n_k}} x^{n_k} \in E$  ([Sw3] 12.5). We give an example of a space with  $l^1 - GHP$  but without *zero-GHP*.

**Example 12.** Let  $E$  be  $l^2$  with the weak topology. Since  $E$  is sequentially complete,  $E$  has strong  $l^1 - GHP$  by Proposition 4. However,  $E$  fails to have *zero-GHP* [consider  $\{k\}$  and  $\{e^k\}$ ].

**Problem.** Does *zero-GHP* imply  $l^1 - GHP$ ?

### 3. MAIN RESULTS

We now prove several uniform boundedness results for spaces with weak  $\lambda - GHP$ . The (scalar)  $\beta - dual$  of  $E$  is defined to be  $E^\beta = \{\{y_k\} : y_k \in X', \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \langle y_k, x_k \rangle \text{ converges for every } x = \{x_k\} \in E\}$ . If  $x = \{x_k\} \in E$  and  $y = \{y_k\} \in E^\beta$ , we write  $y \cdot x = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \langle y_k, x_k \rangle$ ;  $E$  and  $E^\beta$  are then in duality with respect to the bilinear pairing  $(x, y) \rightarrow y \cdot x$ .

If  $Z$  and  $Z'$  are two vector spaces in duality, we denote the weak (strong) topology of  $Z$  with respect to this duality by  $\sigma(Z, Z')$  ( $\beta(Z, Z')$ ). Recall that the pair  $Z, Z'$  is a Banach-Mackey pair if  $\sigma(Z, Z')$  bounded sets in  $Z$  are  $\beta(Z, Z')$  bounded, and  $X$  is a Banach-Mackey space if  $X, X'$  is a Banach-Mackey pair ([Wi] 10.4).

We begin with a basic lemma. If  $A \subset E$  and  $B \subset E^\beta$ , we write  $|B \cdot A| = \sup\{|y \cdot x| : y \in B, x \in A\}$ .

**Lemma 1.** Let  $X$  be a Banach-Mackey space. Suppose  $A \subset E$  is coordinatewise bounded and  $B \subset E^\beta$  has coordinates which are  $\sigma(X', X)$  bounded. If  $|B \cdot A| = \infty$ , then there exists an increasing

sequence of intervals  $\{I_k\}, \{x^k\} \subset A$  and  $\{y^k\} \subset B$  such that  $|y^k \cdot \chi_{I_k} x^k| > k^2$ .

**Proof:** There exist  $y^k \in B, x^k \in A$  such that  $|y^k \cdot x^k| > k^2 + 1$ . Set  $k_1 = 1$ . There exists  $n_1$  such that  $|\sum_{j=1}^{n_1} \langle y_j^{k_1}, x_j^{k_1} \rangle| > k_1^2 + 1$ . For every  $j$   $\{x_j^k : k\}$  is bounded in  $X$  by hypothesis and  $\{y_j^k : k\}$  is  $\sigma(X', X)$  bounded since  $B$  has  $\sigma(X', X)$  bounded coordinates. Since  $X$  is Banach-Mackey,  $\{\langle y_j^k, x_j^k \rangle : k\}$  is bounded for every  $j$  so  $\lim_k \frac{1}{k} \langle y_j^k, x_j^k \rangle = 0$ . Hence, there exists  $k_2 > k_1$  such that  $\sum_{j=1}^{n_1} |\langle y_j^{k_2}, x_j^{k_2} \rangle| < 1$ . Then  $|\sum_{j=n_1+1}^{\infty} \langle y_j^{k_2}, x_j^{k_2} \rangle| > k_2^2$ . Pick  $n_2 > n_1$  such that  $|\sum_{j=n_1+1}^{n_2} \langle y_j^{k_2}, x_j^{k_2} \rangle| > k_2^2$  and set  $I_2 = [n_1+1, n_2]$  so  $|y^{k_2} \cdot \chi_{I_{k_2}} x^{k_2}| > k_2^2$ . Now just continue this construction and relabel.

We now establish our first uniform boundedness result for  $E$  and its  $\beta$ -dual. In what follows  $e^k$  is the canonical vector with a 1 in the  $k$ th coordinate and 0 in the other coordinates.

**Theorem 2.** Let  $X$  be a Banach-Mackey space and suppose that  $E$  has weak  $\lambda - GHP$ . Assume

$$(2) \quad \{e^k : k\} \text{ is } \beta(\lambda, \lambda^\beta) \text{ bounded in } \lambda.$$

If  $A \subset E$  is bounded and  $B \subset E^\beta$  is  $\sigma(E^\beta, E)$  bounded, then  $|B \cdot A| < \infty$ .

**Proof:** If the conclusion fails, Lemma 1 applies. Let the notation be as in Lemma 1 and let  $\{n_j\}$  be the subsequence in the definition of the weak  $\lambda - GHP$ . Define a linear operator  $T : \lambda \rightarrow E$  by  $Tt = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} t_j \chi_{I_{n_j}} x^{n_j}$  [coordinatewise sum].

We claim that  $T$  is  $\sigma(\lambda, \lambda^\beta) - \sigma(E, E^\beta)$  continuous. For this let  $t \in \lambda, y \in E^\beta$ . Then  $y \cdot Tt = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} t_j (y \cdot \chi_{I_{n_j}} x^{n_j})$  and since this series converges for every  $t \in \lambda$ ,  $\{y \cdot \chi_{I_{n_j}} x^{n_j}\}$  belongs to  $\lambda^\beta$  and  $y \cdot Tt = \{y \cdot \chi_{I_{n_j}} x^{n_j}\} \cdot t$  which implies that  $T$  is  $\sigma(\lambda, \lambda^\beta) - \sigma(E, E^\beta)$  continuous. Hence,  $T$  is also  $\beta(\lambda, \lambda^\beta) - \beta(E, E^\beta)$  continuous ([Wi] 11.2.6, [Sw1] 26.15). Thus, by hypothesis,  $\{Te^k\} = \{\chi_{I_{n_k}} x^{n_k}\}$  is  $\beta(E, E^\beta)$  bounded. But this contradicts the conclusion of Lemma 1.



A similar uniform boundedness result for spaces with *zero-GHP* is given in [Sw3] 12.5.7.

**Corollary 3.** Under the hypothesis of Theorem 2 if  $E' \subset E^\beta$ , then  $E$  is a Banach-Mackey space.

We have a general criterion for the hypothesis in Corollary 3 to hold. If  $z \in X$ , we define  $e^k \otimes z$  to be the sequence with  $z$  in the  $k$ th coordinate and 0 in the other coordinates. We say that  $E$  is an AK-space if the series  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^k \otimes x_k$  converges to  $x = \{x_k\} \in E$  in the topology of  $E$  for all  $x$ .

**Proposition 4.** Assume that the map  $z \rightarrow e^k \otimes z$  from  $X$  into  $E$  is continuous for every  $k$ . If  $E$  is an AK-space, then  $E' \subset E^\beta$ .

**Proof:** Let  $f \in E'$ . For every  $k$  define  $y_k : X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  by  $\langle y_k, z \rangle = \langle f, e^k \otimes z \rangle$ . Then  $y_k \in X'$  by hypothesis, and if  $x \in E$ ,  $\langle f, x \rangle = \langle f, \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^k \otimes x_k \rangle = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \langle y_k, x_k \rangle$  so  $y \in E^\beta$  and  $\langle f, x \rangle = y \cdot x$ .

**Example 5.**  $CS(X)$  is an AK-space so it follows from Proposition 4, Corollary 3 and Example 2.9 that  $CS(X)$  is a Banach-Mackey space when  $X$  is a Banach-Mackey space.

For the vector-valued sequence spaces  $\mu\{X\}$ , we have

**Example 6.** It is easily checked that  $\mu\{X\}$  is an AK-space when  $\mu$  is an AK-space. If

- (3)  $X$  is a Banach-Mackey space and either  $\mu$  has strong  $\lambda - GHP$  or  $\mu$  has weak  $\lambda - GHP$  and  $X$  is normed,

(2) holds and  $\mu$  is an AK-space, then  $\mu\{X\}$  is a Banach-Mackey space [Proposition 4, Corollary 3 and Propositions 2.7 or 2.8].

In particular,  $c_0\{X\}$  is a Banach-Mackey space when  $X$  is a Banach-Mackey space; this was established by Mendoza ([M]). It also follows that  $l^p\{X\}$  is a Banach-Mackey space for  $1 \leq p < \infty$ ; Fourie has given a general criterion for spaces of the type  $\mu\{X\}$  to be Banach-Mackey spaces ([F] 3.7) but his result does not cover  $l^1\{X\}$ .

We also have a general uniform boundedness result for the spaces  $\mu\{X\}$  and their  $\beta$ -duals.

**Corollary 7.** Assume (3). If  $A \subset \mu\{X\}$  is bounded and  $B \subset \mu\{X\}^\beta$  is  $\sigma(\mu\{X\}^\beta, \mu\{X\})$  bounded, then  $|B \cdot A| < \infty$ .

We consider conditions which guarantee that  $E, E^\beta$  form a Banach-Mackey pair and then consider specific examples. From Theorem 2, we obtain

**Corollary 8.** Assume that  $X$  is a Banach-Mackey space,  $E$  has weak  $\lambda - GHP$  and (2) holds. If  $E$  is such that  $\sigma(E, E^\beta)$  bounded sets are bounded in the topology of  $E$ , then  $E, E^\beta$  is a Banach-Mackey pair.

**Example 9.** The space  $l^\infty\{X\}$  satisfies the boundedness criterion in Corollary 8. For suppose  $A \subset l^\infty\{X\}$  is  $\sigma(l^\infty\{X\}, l^\infty\{X\}^\beta)$  bounded. For  $t \in l^1, x' \in X'$  define  $t \otimes x' \in l^\infty\{X\}^\beta$  by  $t \otimes x' \cdot x = \sum_{k=1}^\infty t_k \langle x', x_k \rangle$ . Then  $\sup\{|t \otimes x' \cdot x| : x \in A\} < \infty$ . Thus,  $\{\langle x', x_k \rangle : x \in A, k\} \subset l^\infty$  is  $\sigma(l^\infty, l^1)$  bounded and, therefore, norm bounded in  $l^\infty$ . Hence,  $\sup\{|\langle x', x_k \rangle| : x \in A, k\} < \infty$  and  $\{x_k : x \in A, k\}$  is bounded in  $X$  or  $A$  is bounded in  $l^\infty\{X\}$ . From Corollary 8 and Proposition 7, it follows that  $l^\infty\{X\}, l^\infty\{X\}^\beta$  is a Banach-Mackey pair when  $X$  is a Banach-Mackey space [the  $\beta$ -dual of  $l^\infty\{X\}$  is described in [GKR] 2.6].

Similarly,  $c_0\{X\}, c_0\{X\}^\beta$  is a Banach-Mackey pair.

When  $E$  is a monotone space [or more generally when  $E$  has the signed weak GHP] and  $X'$  is weak\* sequentially complete, then  $(E^\beta, \sigma(E^\beta, E))$  is sequentially complete so  $E, E^\beta$  form a Banach-Mackey pair ([Sw3] 12.4.1, [Wi] 10.4). This result applies to  $l^\infty\{X\}$  and  $c_0\{X\}$  when  $X'$  is weak\* sequentially complete; however, our assumption on  $X$  being a Banach-Mackey space is weaker.

We show that the (non-monotone) space  $BS(X)$  satisfies the boundedness criterion of Corollary 8. For this we require a description of the  $\beta$ -dual of  $BS(X)$ . Let  $X'_b$  be the dual of  $X$  equipped with the strong topology and let  $BV_0(X)$  be the subspace of  $BV(X)$  consisting of the null sequences.

**Proposition 10.**  $BS(X)^\beta = BV_0(X'_b)$ .

**Proof:** Let  $y \in BS(X)^\beta$ . To show that  $y_k \rightarrow 0$  strongly, it suffices to show that  $\langle y_k, x_k \rangle \rightarrow 0$  for every bounded sequence  $\{x_k\} \subset X$ . If  $x_0 = 0$ , then  $\{x_k - x_{k-1}\} \in BS(X)$  so  $\sum_{k=1}^\infty \langle y_k, x_k - x_{k-1} \rangle$  converges and we have that  $\lim_k \langle y_k, x_k - x_{k-1} \rangle = 0$  for every bounded sequence  $\{x_k\}$ . This implies that  $\lim_k \langle y_k, x_k \rangle = 0$  for every bounded sequence [Define a bounded sequence  $\{z_j\}$  by  $0, x_1, 0, x_3, 0, \dots$ ; then the sequence  $\{\langle y_j, z_{j+1} - z_j \rangle\}$  contains the sequence  $\{\langle y_{2j+1}, x_{2j+1} \rangle\}$  as a subsequence so  $\lim_j \langle y_{2j+1}, x_{2j+1} \rangle = 0$ . Similarly,  $\lim_j \langle y_{2j}, x_{2j} \rangle = 0$  so  $\lim_j \langle y_j, x_j \rangle = 0$ ]. Thus,  $y \in c_0\{X'_b\}$ .

Put  $w_k = x_{k+1} - x_k$  so  $\{w_k\} \in BS(X)$  and  $\sum_{k=1}^\infty \langle y_k, w_k \rangle$  converges. Now

$$(4) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \langle y_i, w_i \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \langle y_i, x_{i+1} - x_i \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \langle y_i - y_{i+1}, x_i \rangle - \langle y_n, x_n \rangle.$$

By the above  $\langle y_n, x_n \rangle \rightarrow 0$  so  $\sum_{i=1}^\infty \langle y_i - y_{i+1}, x_i \rangle$  converges for every bounded  $\{x_k\}$  by (4). Hence,  $\sum_{i=1}^\infty (y_i - y_{i+1})$  is absolutely convergent in  $X'_b$ , i.e.,  $y \in BV_0(X'_b)$ .

Next, let  $y \in BV_0(X'_b)$  and  $x \in BS(X)$ .  $\{s_i = \sum_{j=1}^i x_j\}$  is bounded so  $\sum_{i=1}^\infty \langle y_{i+1} - y_i, s_i \rangle$  converges absolutely. Now

$$(5) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \langle y_i, x_i \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \langle y_i - y_{i+1}, s_i \rangle + \langle y_n, s_n \rangle.$$

$\langle y_n, s_n \rangle \rightarrow 0$  since  $y_n \rightarrow 0$  strongly so (5) implies that  $\sum_{i=1}^\infty \langle y_i, x_i \rangle$  converges. That is,  $y \in BS(X)$ .

**Proposition 11.** If  $A \subset BS(X)$  is  $\sigma(BS(X), BS(X)^\beta)$  bounded, then  $A$  is bounded in  $BS(X)$ .

**Proof:** For  $t \in bv_0$  and  $x' \in X'$  define  $tx' \in BV_0(X'_b)$  by  $(tx')_k = t_k x'$ . If  $x \in A$ ,

$$(6) \quad tx' \cdot x = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} t_j \langle x', x_j \rangle.$$

Since  $\{\langle x', x_j \rangle\} \in bs$ , (6) implies  $\{\{\langle x', x_j \rangle\} : x \in A\}$  is  $\sigma(bs, bv_0)$  bounded and, therefore, bounded in  $bs$  ([KG] p.69). Therefore,  $\{\sum_{j=1}^n \langle x', x_j \rangle : x \in A, n\}$  is bounded. Hence,  $\{\sum_{j=1}^n x_j : x \in A, n\}$  is  $\sigma(X, X')$  bounded and, therefore, bounded in  $X$ . That is,  $A$  is bounded in  $BS(X)$ .

From Corollary 8 and Example 10, we have

**Example 12.** If  $X$  is a Banach-Mackey space, then  $BS(X), BS(X)^\beta$  is a Banach-Mackey pair.

## 4. REFERENCES

- [B] S. Banach, *Theorie des Operations Lineaires*, Warsaw, (1932).
- [BF] J. Boos and D. Fleming, Gliding hump properties and some applications, *Int. J. Math. Math. Sci.*, 18, pp. 121-132, (1995).
- [Dr] L. Drewnowski, Equivalence of Brooks-Jewett, Vitali-Hahn-Saks and Nikodym Theorems, *Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci.*, 20, pp. 725-731, (1972).
- [FP] M. Florencio and P. Paul, Barrelledness conditions on certain vector valued sequence spaces, *Arch. Math.*, 48, pp. 153-164, (1987).
- [F] J. Fourie, Barrelledness Conditions on Generalized Sequence Spaces, *South African J. Sci.*, 84, pp. 346-348, (1988).
- [GKR] M.Gupta, P.K.Kamthan, and K.L.N. Rao, Duality in Certain Generalized Kothe Sequence Spaces, *Bull. Inst. Math. Acad. Sinica*, 5, pp. 285-298, (1977).

- [Ha] H. Hahn, Uber Folgen linearen Operationen, Monatsch. fur Math. und Phys., 32, pp. 1-88, (1922).
- [HT] E. Hellinger and O. Toeplitz, Grundlagen fur eine Theorie den unendlichen Matrizen. Math. Ann., 69, pp. 289-330, (1910).
- [Hi] T. H. Hildebrandt, On Uniform Boundedness of Sets of Functional Operations, Bull. Amer. Math Soc., 29, pp. 309-315, (1923).
- [K] G. Kothe, Topological Vector Spaces, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (1979).
- [L] H. Lebesgue, Sur les integrales singulieres, Ann. de Toulouse, 1, pp. 25-117, (1909).
- [M] J. Mendoza, A barrelledness criteria for  $C_0(E)$ , Arch. Math., 40, pp. 156-158, (1983).
- [N] D. Noll, Sequential Completeness and Spaces with the Gliding Hump Property, Manuscripta Math., 66, pp. 237-252, (1990).
- [RR] K.P.S. Rao and M. Rao, Theory of Charges, Academic Press, N. Y., (1983).
- [S] H.H. Schaefer, Topological Vector Spaces, MacMillan, N. Y., (1966).
- [Sw1] C.
- [Sw2] C. Swartz, Measure, Integration and Function Spaces, World Sci. Publ., Singapore, (1994).
- [Sw3] C. Swartz, Infinite Matrices and the Gliding Hump, World Sci. Publ., Singapore, (1996).
- [Sw4] C. Swartz, Topological Properties of the Space of Integrable Functions with respect to a Charge, Ricerche di Mat., to appear.
- [Wi] A. Wilansky, Modern Methods in Topological Vector Spaces, McGraw-Hill, N. Y., (1978).

Received : March, 2001.

**Charles Swartz**

Department of Mathematics

New Mexico State University

Las Cruces, NM 88003

USA

e-mail : [cswartz@nmsu.edu](mailto:cswartz@nmsu.edu)