

# A REMARK ON MAZUR-ORLICZ'S NORM

By

Shôzô KOSHI

1. Let  $\Omega$  be a measure space with finite measure  $\mu$ , and let  $M(u, v)$  be a real valued function which is defined on  $[0, \infty) \times \Omega$  such that

(M. 1)  $0 \leq M(u, v) \leq +\infty$  for  $(u, v) \in [0, \infty) \times \Omega$  with  $M(0, v) = 0$  a.e.  $v \in \Omega$ ;

(M. 2)  $M(u, v)$  is an increasing function and left-hand continuous with  $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0} M(u, v) < +\infty$  a.e.  $v \in \Omega$ ;

(M. 3)  $M(u, v)$  is a measurable function of  $u$  for a fixed  $v \in [0, \infty)$ ;

(M. 4)  $\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} M(u, v) > \lim_{u \rightarrow 0} M(u, v)$  a.e.  $v \in \Omega$ .

Now, we shall consider the function space  $L_{M(u, v)}$  whose element  $f$  is as follows:

$$(1) \quad \rho(\alpha f) = \int_{\Omega} M(\alpha |f(v)|, v) d\mu < +\infty \quad \text{for some } \alpha > 0.$$

If we identify  $f$  and  $g$  when  $f(v) = g(v)$  except a measure zero set, then we can consider  $L_{M(u, v)}$  as a conditionally complete vector lattice with a functional  $\rho^{(1)}$ :

$$(2) \quad \rho(f) = \int_{\Omega} M(|f(v)|, v) d\mu.$$

In the case that  $M(u, v) = M(u)$  for every  $v \in \Omega$ , and  $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0} M(u) = 0$ , Mazur and Orlicz has considered in his paper [2], the quasi-norm such that

$$(3) \quad \|f\| = \inf \left\{ \varepsilon; \rho\left(\frac{f}{\varepsilon}\right) < \varepsilon \right\}.$$

$\|\cdot\|$  has the following properties:

(F. 1)  $\|f + g\| \leq \|f\| + \|g\|$  for  $f, g \in L_{M(u)}$ ;

(F. 2)  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ , then  $\|\alpha f\| \rightarrow 0$  for each  $f \in L_{M(u)}$ ;

(F. 3)  $\|f\| \rightarrow 0$ , then  $\|\alpha f\| \rightarrow 0$  for every real number  $\alpha$ ;

(F. 4)  $0 \leq f \leq g$ , then  $\|f\| \leq \|g\|$ ;

(F. 5)  $0 \leq f_1 \leq f_2 \leq \dots$ ,  $\sup_n \|f_n\| < +\infty$ , then  $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} f_n \in L_{M(u)}$  and  $\|\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} f_n\| = \sup_n \|f_n\|$ ;

---

1). This space is an example of quasi-modular spaces. cf. [3].

(F. 6)  $\|\cdot\|$  is complete.

The fact that  $\|\cdot\|$  is complete is considered as a generalization of Riesz-Fisher's theorem concerning the completeness of norms. (cf. [1])

In the case of  $L_{M(u,v)}$ , we define  $\rho^*$  and  $\|\cdot\|$  with

$$(4) \quad \rho^*(f) = \rho(f) - \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \rho(\alpha f) \quad \text{for } f \in L_{M(u,v)}$$

and

$$(5) \quad \|f\| = \inf \left\{ \varepsilon; \rho^*\left(\frac{f}{\varepsilon}\right) < \varepsilon \right\} \quad \text{for } f \in L_M(u, v).$$

Then,  $\|\cdot\|$  has the properties (F. 1), (F. 2), (F. 3), (F. 4). But,  $\|\cdot\|$  is not complete in general cases.

We have the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.**  $\|\cdot\|$  is complete, if and only if  $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0} M(u, v) = M(v)$  is an integrable function of  $\Omega$  with respect to  $\mu$ .

Moreover, we have

**Theorem 2.**  $L_{M(u,v)}$  has a complete quasi-norm if and only if  $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0} M(u, v) = M(v)$  is an integrable function of  $\Omega$  with respect to  $\mu$ .

2. From the definition of  $\rho$  and  $\rho^*$ , we have

$$(6) \quad \rho(|f|) = \rho(f), \quad \rho^*(|f|) = \rho^*(f)$$

and

$$(7) \quad \rho(\alpha f + \beta g) \leq \rho(f) + \rho(g), \quad \rho^*(\alpha f + \beta g) \leq \rho^*(f) + \rho^*(g) \\ \text{for } \alpha + \beta = 1; \alpha, \beta \geq 0.$$

Hence, for  $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n \in L_{M(u,v)}$ ,

$$(8) \quad \rho^*(|f_1| + |f_2| + \dots + |f_n|) \leq \rho^*(2f_1) + \dots + \rho^*(2^n f_n).$$

*Proof of Theorem 1.* It is easily proved that if  $M(v)$  is an integrable function of  $\Omega$ , it follows

$$(9) \quad \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \rho(\alpha f) < +\infty \quad \text{for each } f \in L_{M(u,v)};$$

especially

$$(10) \quad \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \rho(\alpha 1) < +\infty \quad \text{where } 1 \text{ is a characteristic function of } \Omega.$$

Let  $\{f_n\}$  be a sequence of elements of  $L_{M(u,v)}$  with  $\|f_n\| \leq 1/2^n$ . From the definition of  $\|\cdot\|$ ,  $\|f_n\| \leq 1/2^n$  implies

$$(11) \quad \rho^*(2^n f_n) \leq \frac{1}{2^n} \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

Hence,  $f = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |f_n|$  is an element of  $L_{M(u,v)}$  because of

$$(12) \quad \begin{aligned} \rho(|f_1| + \cdots + |f_n|) &\leq \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \rho(\alpha 1) + \rho^*(|f_1| + \cdots + |f_n|) \\ &\leq \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \rho(\alpha 1) + \sum_i \rho^*(2^i f_i) < +\infty; \end{aligned}$$

i.e.  $\rho(f) < +\infty$ .

Since  $L_{M(u,v)}$  is a conditionally complete (in order sense),  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f_n$  exists in  $L_{M(u,v)}$  (in order sense).

Let  $\{g_n\}$  ( $n=1, 2, \dots$ ) be a Cauchy sequence of  $L_{M(u,v)}$ . There exists a subsequence  $\{g_{n_i}\}$  of  $\{g_n\}$  with

$$(12) \quad \|g_{n_i} - g_{n_{i+1}}\| \leq \frac{1}{2^i}.$$

Hence

$$h = g_{n_1} + (g_{n_2} - g_{n_1}) + \cdots + (g_{n_i} - g_{n_{i-1}}) + \cdots$$

is an element of  $L_{M(u,v)}$ , and

$$(13) \quad \|h - g_{n_i}\| \leq \frac{1}{2^{i-1}};$$

i.e.  $g_{n_i}$  is convergent to  $h$  in norm's sense. This shows that  $\{g_n\}$  is a convergent sequence.

Now, we shall prove the converse. We shall assume

$$(14) \quad \int_{\Omega} M(v) d\mu = +\infty.$$

Putting

$$(15) \quad \inf \{M(v), n\} = M_n(v),$$

we have

$$(16) \quad \int_{\Omega} M_n(v) d\mu < +\infty.$$

Now, we define the sets as follows:

$$(17) \quad A_n = \{v \in \Omega \ ; \ M_n(v) \neq 0\}$$

and

$$(18) \quad A = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n.$$

Moreover, if we put

$$(19) \quad B_n = A_n - A_{n-1} \quad (A_0 = \phi),$$

then

$$(20) \quad A = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n.$$

We can choose the function  $f_n$  with

$$(21) \quad \rho^*(f_n) \leq \frac{1}{2^n}$$

and

$$(22) \quad B_n = \{v; f_n(v) \neq 0\}.$$

If we put  $f_n^0 = \frac{1}{2^n} f_n$ , then we have

$$(23) \quad \|f_n^0\| \leq \frac{1}{2^n}.$$

Hence,  $g_m = \sum_{n=1}^m f_n^0$  ( $m=1, 2, \dots$ ) is a Cauchy sequence. But  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f_n^0 \notin L_{M(u,v)}$ .

This shows that  $\|\cdot\|$  is not complete.

Q. E. D.

The proof of Theorem 2 is quite similar to that of Theorem 1. Because, if

$\int_{\Omega} M(v) d\mu = +\infty$ , then there exists a sequence  $f_n$  ( $n=1, 2, \dots$ ) satisfying

(21), (22), (23) for a quasi-norm  $\|\cdot\|$  defined on  $L_{M(u,v)}$  which is not necessary equal to (5). Similarly to the proof of Theorem 1,  $\{f_n\}$  is a Cauchy sequence which is not convergent.

Theorem 1 is essentially equal to Theorem 3.2 in [4]. But the proof here is more simpler than that of Theorem 3.2.

### References

- [1] I. AMEMIYA: A generalization of Riesz-Fischer's theorem, Jour. of Math. Soc. of Japan, Vol. 5 (1953), pp. 353-354.
- [2] S. MAZUR-W. ORLICZ: On some classes of linear metric spaces, Studia Math. 17 (1958), pp. 97-119.
- [3] S. KOSHI-T. SHIMOGAKI: On quasi-modular spaces, Studia Math. 21 (1961), pp. 15-35.
- [4] S. KOSHI-T. SHIMOGAKI: On  $F$ -norms of Quasi-modular spaces, Jour. of the Fac. of Sci. Hokkaido University, Series 1, Vol. 15 (1961), pp. 202-218.

Department of Mathematics,  
Hokkaido University

(Received May 7, 1962)