

**STRONGLY LACUNARY SUMMABLE DOUBLE SEQUENCE
SPACES IN n -NORMED SPACES DEFINED BY IDEAL
CONVERGENCE AND AN ORLICZ FUNCTION**

AYHAN ESI

ABSTRACT. In this paper we introduce some certain new double sequence spaces via ideal convergence, double lacunary sequence and an Orlicz function in n -normed spaces and examine some properties of the resulting these spaces.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let X be a non-empty set, then a family of sets $I \subset 2^X$ (the class of all subsets of X) is called an *ideal* if and only if for each $A, B \in I$, we have $A \cup B \in I$ and for each $A \in I$ and each $B \subset A$, we have $B \in I$. A non-empty family of sets $F \subset 2^X$ is a *filter* on X if and only if $\emptyset \notin F$, for each $A, B \in F$, we have $A \cap B \in F$ and each $A \in F$ and each $A \subset B$, we have $B \in F$. An ideal I is called *non-trivial ideal* if $I \neq \emptyset$ and $X \notin I$. Clearly $I \subset 2^X$ is a non-trivial ideal if and only if $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(I) = \{X/A : A \in I\}$ is a filter on X . A non-trivial ideal $I \subset 2^X$ is called *admissible* if and only if $\{\{x\} : x \in X\} \subset I$. Further details on ideals of 2^X can be found in Kostyrko, et.al [3]. The notion was further investigated by Salat, et.al [4] and others.

By the convergence of a double sequence we mean the convergence on the Pringsheim sense that is, a double sequence $x = (x_{k,l})$ has Pringsheim limit L (denoted by $P - \lim x = L$) provided that given $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|x_{k,l} - L| < \varepsilon$ whenever $k, l > n$, [1]. We shall write more briefly as "*P-convergent*".

The double sequence $x = (x_{k,l})$ is bounded if there exists a positive number M such that $|x_{k,l}| < M$ for all k and l . Let l_{∞}^2 the space of all bounded double such that

$$\|x_{k,l}\|_{(\infty,2)} = \sup_{k,l} |x_{k,l}| < \infty.$$

The double sequence $\theta_{r,s} = \{(k_r, l_s)\}$ is called *double lacunary sequence* [5] if there exist two increasing of integers such that

$$k_o = 0, h_r = k_r - k_{r-1} \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } r \rightarrow \infty \text{ and } l_o = 0, h_s = l_s - l_{s-1} \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } s \rightarrow \infty.$$

***AMO - Advanced Modeling and Optimization. ISSN: 1841-4311**

Date: September 19, 2011.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 40A99; Secondary 40A05.

Key words and phrases. P-convergent, Double lacunary sequence, n -normed space, Orlicz function.

Notations: $k_{r,s} = k_r l_s$, $h_{r,s} = h_r \bar{h}_s$, $\theta_{r,s}$ is determined by

$$I_{r,s} = \{(k, l) : k_{r-1} < k \leq k_r \text{ and } l_{s-1} < l \leq l_s\}, q_r = \frac{k_r}{k_{r-1}}, \bar{q}_s = \frac{l_s}{l_{s-1}} \text{ and } q_{r,s} = q_r \bar{q}_s.$$

Recall in [6] that an *Orlicz function* M is continuous, convex, nondecreasing function define for $x > 0$ such that $M(0) = 0$ and $M(x) > 0$. If convexity of Orlicz function is replaced by $M(x + y) \leq M(x) + M(y)$ then this function is called the *modulus function* and characterized by Ruckle [7]. An Orlicz function M is said to satisfy Δ_2 -condition for all values u , if there exists $K > 0$ such that $M(2u) \leq KM(u)$, $u \geq 0$.

Lemma 1. *Let M be an Orlicz function which satisfies Δ_2 -condition and let $0 < \delta < 1$. Then for each $t \geq \delta$, we have $M(t) < Kt\delta^{-1}M(2)$ for some constant $K > 0$.*

A double sequence space X is said to be *solid* or *normal* if $(\alpha_{k,l}x_{k,l}) \in X$, and for all double sequences $\alpha = (\alpha_{k,l})$ of scalars with $|\alpha_{k,l}| \leq 1$ for all $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and X be a real vector space of dimension d , where $n \leq d$. A real-valued function $\|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|$ on X satisfying the following four conditions:

- (i) $\|x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\| = 0$ if and only if x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n are linearly dependent,
- (ii) $\|x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\|$ is invariant under permutation,
- (iii) $\|\alpha x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\| = |\alpha| \|x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\|$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$,
- (iv) $\|x_1 + x_1^i, x_2, \dots, x_n\| \leq \|x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\| + \|x_1^i, x_2, \dots, x_n\|$

is called an n -norm on X , and the pair $(X, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|)$ is called an n -normed space [2].

A trivial example of n -normed space is $X = \mathbb{R}$ equipped with the following Euclidean n -norm:

$$\|x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\|_E = \text{abs} \left(\begin{pmatrix} x_{11} \dots x_{1n} \\ \dots \\ x_{n1} \dots x_{nn} \end{pmatrix} \right)$$

where $x_i = (x_{i1}, \dots, x_{in}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

2. MAIN RESULTS

Let I_2 be an ideal of $2^{\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}}$, $\theta_{r,s}$ be a double lacunary sequence, M be an Orlicz function, $p = (p_{k,l})$ be a bounded double sequence of strictly positive real numbers and $(X, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|)$ be an n -normed space. Further $w(n-X)$ denotes X -valued sequence space. Now, we define the following double sequence spaces:

$$w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_o = \left\{ x = (x_{k,l}) \in w(n-X) : \forall \varepsilon > 0, \right. \\ \left. \left\{ (r, s) \in I_{r,s} : \frac{1}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l}}{\rho}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} \geq \varepsilon \right\} \in I_2 \right. \\ \left. \text{for some } \rho > 0 \text{ and for every } z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \in X \right\},$$

$$w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|] = \left\{ x = (x_{k,l}) \in w(n-X) : \forall \varepsilon > 0, \right. \\ \left. \left\{ (r, s) \in I_{r,s} : \frac{1}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l} - L}{\rho}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} \geq \varepsilon \right\} \in I_2 \right. \\ \left. \text{for some } \rho > 0, L \in X \text{ and for every } z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \in X \right\},$$

$$w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_{\infty} = \left\{ x = (x_{k,l}) \in w(n-X) : \exists K > 0, \right. \\ \left. \left\{ (r, s) \in I_{r,s} : \frac{1}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l}}{\rho}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} \geq K \right\} \in I_2 \right. \\ \left. \text{for some } \rho > 0 \text{ and for every } z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \in X \right\},$$

and

$$w_{\theta_{r,s}} [M, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_{\infty} = \left\{ x = (x_{k,l}) \in w(n-X) : \exists K > 0, \right. \\ \left. \frac{1}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l}}{\rho}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} \leq K \right. \\ \left. \text{for some } \rho > 0 \text{ and for every } z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \in X \right\}.$$

The following well-known inequality will be used in this study:

If $0 \leq \inf_{k,l} p_{k,l} = H_o \leq p_{k,l} \leq \sup_{k,l} p_{k,l} = H < \infty$, $D = \max(1, 2^{H-1})$, then

$$|x_{k,l} - y_{k,l}|^{p_{k,l}} \leq D \{ |x_{k,l}|^{p_{k,l}} + |y_{k,l}|^{p_{k,l}} \}$$

for all $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x_{k,l}, y_{k,l} \in \mathbb{C}$. Also $|x_{k,l}|^{p_{k,l}} \leq \max(1, |x_{k,l}|^H)$ for all $x_{k,l} \in \mathbb{C}$.

Theorem 1. *The sets $w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M, p, \|\cdot, \cdot, \cdot\|]_o$, $w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M, p, \|\cdot, \cdot, \cdot\|]$ and $w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M, p, \|\cdot, \cdot, \cdot\|]_{\infty}$ are linear spaces over the complex field \mathbb{C} .*

Proof. We will prove only for $w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M, p, \|\cdot, \cdot, \cdot\|]_o$ and the others can be proved similarly. Let $x, y \in w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M, p, \|\cdot, \cdot, \cdot\|]_o$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$. Then

$$\left\{ (r, s) \in I_{r,s} : \frac{1}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l}}{\rho_1}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right\} \in I_2, \text{ for some } \rho_1 > 0$$

and

$$\left\{ (r, s) \in I_{r,s} : \frac{1}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M \left(\left\| \frac{y_{k,l}}{\rho_2}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right\} \in I_2, \text{ for some } \rho_2 > 0.$$

Since $\|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|$ is a n -norm and M is an Orlicz function, the following inequality holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M \left(\left\| \frac{\alpha x_{k,l} + \beta y_{k,l}}{|\alpha| \rho_1 + |\beta| \rho_2}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} \\
& \leq \frac{D}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[\frac{|\alpha|}{|\alpha| \rho_1 + |\beta| \rho_2} M \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l}}{\rho_1}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} \\
& \quad + \frac{D}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[\frac{|\beta|}{|\alpha| \rho_1 + |\beta| \rho_2} M \left(\left\| \frac{y_{k,l}}{\rho_2}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} \\
& \leq \frac{D}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l}}{\rho_1}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} \\
& \quad + \frac{D}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M \left(\left\| \frac{y_{k,l}}{\rho_2}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}}
\end{aligned}$$

From the above inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\{ (r, s) \in I_{r,s} : \frac{1}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M \left(\left\| \frac{\alpha x_{k,l} + \beta y_{k,l}}{|\alpha| \rho_1 + |\beta| \rho_2}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} \geq \varepsilon \right\} \\
& \subset \left\{ (r, s) \in I_{r,s} : \frac{D}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l}}{\rho_1}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right\} \\
& \cup \left\{ (r, s) \in I_{r,s} : \frac{D}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M \left(\left\| \frac{y_{k,l}}{\rho_2}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Two sets on the right hand side belong to I_2 and this completes the proof.

It is also easy verify that the space $w_{\theta_{r,s}} [M, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_{\infty}$ is also a linear space. \square

Theorem 2. For fixed $(n, m) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$, $w_{\theta_{r,s}} [M, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_{\infty}$ paranormed space with respect to the paranorm defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
h_{(n,m)}(x) = \inf \left\{ \rho^{\frac{p_{n,m}}{H}} > 0 : \left(\sup_{r,s} \frac{1}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l}}{\rho}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} \right)^{\frac{1}{H}} \leq 1, \right. \\
\left. \text{for some } \rho > 0 \text{ and for every } z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \in X \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. $h_{(n,m)}(\theta) = 0$ and $h_{(n,m)}(-x) = h_{(n,m)}(x)$ are easy to prove, so we omit them. Let us take $x, y \in w_{\theta_{r,s}} [M, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_{\infty}$. Let

$$A(x) = \left\{ \rho > 0 : \sup_{r,s} \frac{1}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l}}{\rho}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} \leq 1, \forall z \in X \right\}$$

and

$$A(y) = \left\{ \rho > 0 : \sup_{r,s} \frac{1}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M \left(\left\| \frac{y_{k,l}}{\rho}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} \leq 1, \forall z \in X \right\}.$$

Let $\rho_1 \in A(x)$ and $\rho_2 \in A(y)$. If $\rho = \rho_1 + \rho_2$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{r,s} \frac{1}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l} + y_{k,l}}{\rho}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right] \\ & \leq \frac{\rho_1}{\rho_1 + \rho_2} \sup_{r,s} \frac{1}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l}}{\rho_1}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right] \\ & \quad + \frac{\rho_2}{\rho_1 + \rho_2} \sup_{r,s} \frac{1}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M \left(\left\| \frac{y_{k,l}}{\rho_1}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\sup_{r,s} \frac{1}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l} + y_{k,l}}{\rho_1 + \rho_2}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} \leq 1$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} h_{(n,m)}(x+y) &= \inf \left\{ (\rho_1 + \rho_2)^{\frac{p_{n,m}}{H}} : \rho_1 \in A(x) \text{ and } \rho_2 \in A(y) \right\} \\ &\leq \inf \left\{ (\rho_1)^{\frac{p_{n,m}}{H}} : \rho_1 \in A(x) \right\} + \inf \left\{ (\rho_2)^{\frac{p_{n,m}}{H}} : \rho_2 \in A(y) \right\} \\ &= h_{(n,m)}(x) + h_{(n,m)}(y). \end{aligned}$$

Now, let $\lambda_{k,l}^u \rightarrow \lambda$, where $\lambda_{k,l}^u, \lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and $h_{(n,m)}(x_{k,l}^u - x_{k,l}) \rightarrow 0$ as $u \rightarrow \infty$. We have to show that $h_{(n,m)}(\lambda_{k,l}^u x_{k,l}^u - \lambda x_{k,l}) \rightarrow 0$ as $u \rightarrow \infty$. Let $\lambda_{k,l} \rightarrow \alpha$, where $\lambda_{k,l}, \lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and $h_{(n,m)}(x_{k,l}^u - x_{k,l}) \rightarrow 0$ as $u \rightarrow \infty$. Let

$$A(x^u) = \left\{ \rho_u > 0 : \sup_{r,s} \frac{1}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l}^u}{\rho_u}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} \leq 1, \right. \\ \left. \forall z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \in X \right\}.$$

and

$$A(x^u - x) = \left\{ \rho_u^i > 0 : \sup_{r,s} \frac{1}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l}^u - x_{k,l}}{\rho_u^i}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} \leq 1, \right. \\ \left. \forall z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \in X \right\}.$$

If $\rho_u \in A(x^u)$ and $\rho_u^i \in A(x^u - x)$ then we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& M \left(\left\| \frac{\lambda_{k,l}^u x_{k,l}^u - \lambda x_{k,l}}{\rho_u |\lambda_{k,l}^u - \lambda| + \rho_u^i |\lambda|}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \\
& \leq M \left(\left\| \frac{\lambda_{k,l}^u x_{k,l}^u - \lambda x_{k,l}}{\rho_u |\lambda_{k,l}^u - \lambda| + \rho_u^i |\lambda|}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| + \left\| \frac{\lambda x_{k,l}^u - \lambda x_{k,l}}{\rho_u |\lambda_{k,l}^u - \lambda| + \rho_u^i |\lambda|}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \\
& \leq \frac{\rho_u |\lambda_{k,l}^u - \lambda|}{\rho_u |\lambda_{k,l}^u - \lambda| + \rho_u^i |\lambda|} M \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l}^u}{\rho_u}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \\
& \quad + \frac{\rho_u^i |\lambda|}{\rho_u |\lambda_{k,l}^u - \lambda| + \rho_u^i |\lambda|} M \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l}^u - x_{k,l}}{\rho_u^i}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right).
\end{aligned}$$

From this inequality, it follows that

$$\left[M \left(\left\| \frac{\lambda_{k,l}^u x_{k,l}^u - \lambda x_{k,l}}{\rho_u |\lambda_{k,l}^u - \lambda| + \rho_u^i |\lambda|}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} \leq 1$$

and consequently

$$\begin{aligned}
h_{(n,m)} (\lambda_{k,l}^u x_{k,l}^u - \lambda x_{k,l}) &= \inf \left\{ (\rho_u |\lambda_{k,l}^u - \lambda| + \rho_u^i |\lambda|)^{\frac{p_{n,m}}{H}} : \rho_u \in A(x^u) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \text{and } \rho_u^i \in A(x^u - x) \right\} \\
&\leq (|\lambda_{k,l}^u - \lambda|)^{\frac{p_{n,m}}{H}} \inf \left\{ (\rho_u)^{\frac{p_{n,m}}{H}} : \rho_u \in A(x^u) \right\} \\
&\quad + (|\lambda|)^{\frac{p_{n,m}}{H}} \inf \left\{ (\rho_u^i)^{\frac{p_{n,m}}{H}} : \rho_u^i \in A(x^u - x) \right\} \\
&\leq \max \left\{ |\lambda|, (|\lambda|)^{\frac{p_{n,m}}{H}} \right\} h_{(n,m)} (x_{k,l}^u - x_{k,l}).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence by our assumption the right hand side tends to zero as $u \rightarrow \infty$. This completes the proof. \square

Corollary 1. *It can be noted that $h = \inf_{n,m \in \mathbb{N}} h_{(n,m)}$ also gives a paranorm on the above sequence spaces. However if one consider the sequence space $w_{\theta_{r,s}}[M, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_\infty$ which is larger space than the space $w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2}[M, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_\infty$ the construction of the paranorm is not clear and we leave it as an open problem. However it should be noted that for a fixed $F \in I_2$, the space*

$$\begin{aligned}
w_{\theta_{r,s}}^F [M, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_\infty &= \left\{ x = (x_{k,l}) \in w(n - X) : \exists K > 0, \left\{ (n, m) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} : \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \sup_{(r,s) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}/F} \frac{1}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l}}{\rho}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} \geq K \right\} \in I_2, \right. \\
&\quad \left. \text{for some } \rho > 0 \text{ and for every } z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \in X \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

which is subspace of the space $w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2}[M, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_\infty$ is a paranormed space with the paranorms $h_{(n,m)}$ for $(n, m) \notin F$ and $h_F = \inf_{(n,m) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}/F} h_{(n,m)}$.

Theorem 3. Let M, M_1 and M_2 be Orlicz functions. Then we have

(i) $w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M_1, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_o \subset w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M \circ M_1, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_o$ provided that $p = (p_{k,l})$ is such that $H_o > 0$.

(ii) $w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M_1, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_o \cap w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M_2, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_o \subset w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M_1 + M_2, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_o$.

Proof. (i). For given $\varepsilon > 0$, we first choose $\varepsilon_o > 0$ such that $\max\{\varepsilon_o^H, \varepsilon_o^{H_o}\} < \varepsilon$. Now using the continuity of M , choose $0 < \delta < 1$ such that $0 < t < \delta$ implies $M(t) < \varepsilon_o$. Let $x \in w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M_1, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_o$. Now from the definition of the space $w^{I_2} [M_1, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_o$, for some $\rho > 0$

$$A(\delta) = \left\{ (r, s) \in I_{r,s} : \frac{1}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M_1 \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l}}{\rho}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} \geq \delta^H \right\} \in I_2.$$

Thus if $(n, m) \notin A(\delta)$ then

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M_1 \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l}}{\rho}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} < \delta^H \\ \Rightarrow & \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M_1 \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l}}{\rho}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} < h_{r,s} \delta^H, \\ \Rightarrow & \left[M_1 \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l}}{\rho}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} < \delta^H \text{ for all } (k,l) \in I_{r,s}, \\ \Rightarrow & M_1 \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l}}{\rho}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) < \delta \text{ for all } (k,l) \in I_{r,s}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence from above inequality and using continuity of M , we must have

$$M \left(M_1 \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l}}{\rho}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right) < \varepsilon_o \text{ for all } (k,l) \in I_{r,s}$$

which consequently implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M \left(M_1 \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l}}{\rho}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} < h_{r,s} \max\{\varepsilon_o^H, \varepsilon_o^{H_o}\} < h_{r,s} \varepsilon, \\ \Rightarrow & \frac{1}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M \left(M_1 \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l}}{\rho}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} < \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$\left\{ (r, s) \in I_{r,s} : \frac{1}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M \left(M_1 \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l}}{\rho}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} \geq \varepsilon \right\} \subset A(\delta)$$

and so belongs to I_2 . This completes the proof.

(ii) Let $x \in w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M_1, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_o \cap w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M_2, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_o$. Then the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{h_{r,s}} \left[(M_1 + M_2) \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l}}{\rho}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} \\ \leq & \frac{D}{h_{r,s}} \left[M_1 \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l}}{\rho}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} + \frac{D}{nm} \left[M_2 \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l}}{\rho}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} \end{aligned}$$

gives us the result. \square

Theorem 4. (i) If $0 < H_o \leq p_{k,l} < 1$, then $w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_o \subset w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_o$.

(ii) If $1 \leq p_{k,l} \leq H < \infty$, then $w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_o \subset w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_o$.

(iii) If $0 < p_{k,l} < q_{k,l} < \infty$ and $\frac{q_{k,l}}{p_{k,l}}$ is bounded, then $w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_o \subset w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M, q, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_o$.

Proof. The proof is standard, so we omit it. \square

Theorem 5. The sequence spaces $w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_o$, $w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]$, $w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_\infty$ and $w_{\theta_{r,s}} [M, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_\infty$ are solid.

Proof. We give the proof for only $w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_o$. The others can be proved similarly. Let $x \in w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M_1, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_o$ and $\alpha = (\alpha_{k,l})$ be a double sequence of scalars such that $|\alpha_{k,l}| \leq 1$ for all $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we have

$$\left\{ (r, s) \in I_{r,s} : \frac{1}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M \left(\left\| \frac{\alpha_{k,l} x_{k,l}}{\rho}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} \leq \varepsilon \right\}$$

$$\subset \left\{ (r, s) \in I_{r,s} : \frac{T}{h_{r,s}} \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{r,s}} \left[M \left(\left\| \frac{x_{k,l}}{\rho}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1} \right\| \right) \right]^{p_{k,l}} \leq \varepsilon \right\} \in I_2,$$

where $T = \max_{k,l} \left\{ 1, |\alpha_{k,l}|^H \right\}$. Hence $\alpha x \in w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M_1, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_o$ for all double sequences $\alpha = (\alpha_{k,l})$ with $|\alpha_{k,l}| \leq 1$ for all $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$ whenever $x \in w_{\theta_{r,s}}^{I_2} [M_1, p, \|\cdot, \dots, \cdot\|]_o$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Pringsheim, Zur Theori der zweifach unendlichen Zahlenfolgen, Math. Ann., **53**(1900), 289-321.
- [2] H. Gunawan, On n-inner product, n-norms and the Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality, Scientiae Mathematicae Japonicae Online, 5(2001), 47-54.
- [3] P. Kostyrko, T.Salat and W. Wilczyński, I-convergence, Real Analysis Exchange, 26(2)(2000/2001), 669-686.
- [4] T. Salat, B. C. Tripathy and M. Ziman, On I-convergence field, Italian J. Pure and Appl. Math., 17(2005), 45-54.
- [5] E. Savaş and R. F. Patterson, Some double lacunary sequence spaces defined by Orlicz functions, (preprint).
- [6] M. A. Krasnoselski and Y. B. Rutickii, Convex function and Orlicz spaces, Groningen, Nederland, 1961.
- [7] W. H. Ruckle, FK-spaces in which the sequence of coordinate vectors is bounded, Canad. J. Math., **25**(1973), 973-978.

ADIYAMAN UNIVERSITY, SCIENCE AND ART FACULTY, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, 02040, ADIYAMAN, TURKEY

E-mail address: aesi23@hotmail.com