

COMPOSITIO MATHEMATICA

G. FRICKE

R. E. POWELL

A theorem on entire methods of summation

Compositio Mathematica, tome 22, n° 3 (1970), p. 253-259

http://www.numdam.org/item?id=CM_1970__22_3_253_0

© Foundation Compositio Mathematica, 1970, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Compositio Mathematica » (<http://http://www.compositio.nl/>) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (<http://www.numdam.org/conditions>). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques

<http://www.numdam.org/>

A THEOREM ON ENTIRE METHODS OF SUMMATION

by

G. Fricke and R. E. Powell

1. Introduction

Recently H. I. Brown [1] introduced the concept of entire methods of summation and proved a necessary and sufficient condition that an infinite matrix $A = (a_{n,k})$ be an entire method. In this paper we prove directly the necessity and sufficiency of a different condition which ensures that the matrix A is an entire method. We conclude the paper by considering applications of this theorem to the Sonnenschein matrix and to two recent generalizations of the Taylor matrix.

2. Entire methods

Let $x = \{x_k\}_0^\infty$ be a sequence of complex numbers. The sequence x is entire ($x \in \xi$) provided

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |x_k| q^k < \infty \text{ for every positive integer } q.$$

The infinite matrix $A = (a_{n,k})$ is an entire method provided the A -transform of $x \in \xi$ (written $A(x)$) is an entire sequence, i.e., the sequence $y = \{y_n\}_0^\infty \in \xi$ where

$$y_n = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_{n,k} x_k.$$

In order to prove the main result (Theorem 3) we first state and prove two preparatory lemmas.

LEMMA 1. *If $A = (a_{n,k})$ is an entire method then*

$$(2.1) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_{n,k} q^n = 0 \text{ for all integers } q > 0 \text{ and each fixed } k = 0, 1, \dots.$$

and

$$(2.2) \quad \text{for each } n = 0, 1, \dots \text{ there exists an integer } p_n > 0 \text{ such that } |a_{n,k}| \leq p_n^{k+1} \text{ for each } k = 0, 1, \dots.$$

PROOF. (2.1) Let v be a fixed non-negative integer and define the sequence $x = \{x_n\}_0^\infty$ by

$$x_n = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n = v \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since $x \in \xi$ and A is an entire method we have that $A(x) \in \xi$. So, for $q > 0$ an integer, it follows that

$$\sum_{n=0}^\infty |y_n|q^n < \infty,$$

in particular, $0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n q^n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_{n,v} q^n$.

(2.2) Suppose there exists a non-negative integer N such that for each integer $p > 0$ there exists an integer $k_p \geq 0$ where

$$|a_{N,k_p}| > p^{k_p+1}.$$

So, for $p_1 = 1$ there exists k_1 such that $|a_{N,k_1}| > 1^{k_1+1} = 1$. In general, choose $p_m > p_{m-1}$ ($m \geq 2$) such that

$$\max \{|a_{N,k}| : k \leq k_{m-1}\} < p_m.$$

There exists $k_m > k_{m-1}$ such that $|a_{N,k_m}| > p_m^{k_m+1}$. Define the sequence $x = \{x_n\}_0^\infty$ by

$$x_n = \begin{cases} p_m^{-(k_m+1)} & \text{for } n = k_m \quad (m = 1, 2, \dots) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The sequence $x \in \xi$ since, for $q > 0$ an integer, we have that

$$\sum_{n=0}^\infty |x_n|q^n = \sum_{m=1}^\infty p_m^{-(k_m+1)} q^{k_m} < \infty.$$

Since A is an entire method we have that $A(x) \in \xi$, however,

$$\sum_{k=0}^\infty a_{N,k} x_k = \sum_{m=1}^\infty a_{N,k_m} p_m^{-(k_m+1)}$$

diverges since $|a_{N,k_m} p_m^{-(k_m+1)}| \geq 1$ for all $m \geq 1$. Δ

LEMMA 2. If $A = (a_{n,k})$ has properties (2.1) and (2.2) and, in addition,

(2.3) *there exists an integer $q > 0$ such that for each integer $p > 0$ and each constant $M > 0$ there exist integers n, k where $|a_{n,k}|q^n > p^k M$*

then for a given integer $p > 0$, constant $M > 0$, and integers n_0, k_0 there exist integers $N > n_0$ $K > k_0$ such that

$$|a_{N,K}|q^N > p^K M.$$

PROOF. By (2.1) there exists $B_k > 0$ (for each $k = 0, 1, \dots$) such that $|a_{n,k}q^n| < B_k$ for all $n = 0, 1, \dots$. Let

$$B = \max \{1, B_0, \dots, B_{k_0}\} \text{ and } P = \max \{1, p_0, \dots, p_{n_0}\}$$

where p_n is given in (2.2). Therefore

$$|a_{n,k}q^n| < B \text{ for all } n = 0, 1, \dots; k = 0, 1, \dots, k_0.$$

Also

$$|a_{n,k}q^n| \leq p_n^{k+1}q^n \leq P^{k+1}q^{n_0} \text{ for all } n = 0, 1, \dots, n_0; k = 0, 1, \dots.$$

Therefore

$$(1) \quad |a_{n,k}q^n| \leq q^{n_0}BP^{k+1} \text{ for all } n, k = 0, 1, \dots \text{ with either } n \leq n_0 \text{ or } k \leq k_0.$$

By (2.3) there exist N, K such that

$$|a_{N,k}q^N| > P^Kq^{n_0}BP.$$

So, by (1), $N > n_0$ and $K > k_0$. Δ

Before stating Theorem 3 we note that it can be proved using Brown's theorem [1]. Brown's theorem, however, used results of $l-l$ methods [3] (which depended upon the Uniform Boundedness Principle) and, thus, it is of interest that Theorem 3 can be proved directly. Such a proof is given.

THEOREM 3. *A matrix $A = (a_{n,k})$ is an entire method if and only if for each integer $q > 0$ there exists an integer $p = p(q) > 0$ and a constant $M = M(q) > 0$ such that*

$$|a_{n,k}q^n| \leq p^kM \text{ for all } n, k = 0, 1, \dots.$$

PROOF. (\Leftarrow) Let $x \in \xi$, $y = A(x)$, and $q > 0$ be an arbitrary fixed integer. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |y_n|q^n &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |a_{n,k}| |x_k| \right) q^n \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^n \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |a_{n,k}| (2q)^n |x_k|. \end{aligned}$$

There exists $p = p(2q) > 0$ and $M = M(2q) > 0$ such that

$$|a_{n,k}|(2q)^n \leq p^kM \text{ for all } n, k = 0, 1, \dots.$$

Therefore

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |y_n|q^n \leq 2M \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |x_k|p^k < \infty \text{ since } x \in \xi, \text{ i.e., } y = A(x) \in \xi.$$

(\Rightarrow) Suppose there exists an integer $q > 0$ such that for each integer $p > 0$ and each constant $M > 0$ there exist integers n, k where $|a_{n,k}|q^n > p^k M$. By Lemma 1 (2.2) choose a sequence of positive integers $\{p_n\}_0^\infty$ such that

$$(2) \quad |a_{n,k}| \leq p_n^{k+1} \text{ for all } k = 0, 1, \dots.$$

Let $\bar{p}_n = \max \{p_i : i = 0, \dots, n\}$. Construct the sequence $\{a_{n_j, k_j}\}_{j=1}^\infty$ as follows:

Choose n_1, k_1 such that $a_{n_1, k_1} \neq 0$. Suppose that $n_1, \dots, n_j; k_1, \dots, k_j$ ($j \geq 1$) have been chosen. By Lemma 1 (2.1), given

$$\varepsilon = (4(j+1))^{-1} \min \{|a_{n_t, k_t}| : 1 \leq t \leq j\} > 0,$$

there exists $\bar{n}_j = \bar{n}_j(\varepsilon, k_j)$ such that

$$|a_{n,k}|q^n < \varepsilon \text{ for all } n \geq \bar{n}_j, k \leq k_j.$$

By Lemma 2 there exists $n_{j+1} > \max \{\bar{n}_j, n_j\}$ and $k_{j+1} > k_j$ such that

$$|a_{n_{j+1}, k_{j+1}}|q^{n_{j+1}} > q^{n_j} [8(k_j+1)\bar{p}_{n_j}]^{k_{j+1}+1}.$$

So, we have a sequence $\{a_{n_j, k_j}\}_{j=1}^\infty$ such that

$$(3) \quad |a_{n, k_t}|q^n \leq (4)^{-1} |a_{n_t, k_t}| \text{ for all } n > n_j, t < j$$

and

$$(4) \quad |a_{n_j, k_j}|q^{n_j} > q^{n_{j-1}} (8(k_{j-1}+1)\bar{p}_{n_{j-1}})^{k_j+1} \text{ for } j \geq 2.$$

Define the sequence $x = \{x_m\}_1^\infty$ by

$$x_m = \begin{cases} [a_{n_j, k_j} q^{n_j}]^{-1} & \text{for } m = k_j \text{ (} j = 2, 3, \dots) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By (4) it follows that

$$|x_{k_{j+1}}| < [q^{n_j} (8(k_j+1)\bar{p}_{n_j})^{k_{j+1}+1}]^{-1} \leq (k_j+1)^{-(k_{j+1})}, j \geq 1.$$

Therefore $|x_n| \leq (1/n)^n$ ($n \geq 1$) and, hence, $x \in \xi$. So $y = A(x) \in \xi$. Now

$$(5) \quad |y_{n_j}| = \left| \sum_{k=0}^\infty a_{n_j, k} x_k \right| \\ \geq |a_{n_j, k_j}| |x_{k_j}| - \sum_{t=1}^{j-1} |a_{n_j, k_t}| |x_{k_t}| - \sum_{t=j+1}^\infty |a_{n_j, k_t}| |x_{k_t}|.$$

From (3) we have that

$$(6) \quad \sum_{t=1}^{j-1} |a_{n_j, k_t}| |x_{k_t}| \leq (4j q^{n_j})^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^{j-1} |a_{n_t, k_t}| |x_{k_t}| \leq (4q^{n_j})^{-1}$$

and, from (2) and (4), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (7) \quad \sum_{t=j+1}^{\infty} |a_{n_j, k_t}| |x_{k_t}| &\leq \sum_{t=j+1}^{\infty} (\bar{p}_{n_j})^{k_t+1} |x_{k_t}| \\
 &\leq \sum_{t=j+1}^{\infty} (\bar{p}_{n_j})^{k_t+1} [q^{n_t-1} (8\bar{p}_{n_t-1} (k_{t-1} + 1))^{k_t+1}]^{-1} \\
 &\leq \sum_{t=j+1}^{\infty} [q^{n_t-1} (8(k_{t-1} + 1))^{k_t+1}]^{-1} \\
 &\leq q^{-n_j} \sum_{t=j+1}^{\infty} 8^{-(k_t+1)} \leq (4q^{n_j})^{-1}.
 \end{aligned}$$

So, from (5), (6), and (7), it follows that

$$|y_{n_j}| \geq \frac{1}{2} q^{-n_j}.$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |y_n| q^n \geq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2}$$

which diverges, i.e., $y = A(x) \notin \zeta$. This contradicts the fact that A is an entire method. Δ

COROLLARY 4. *An upper triangular matrix $A = (a_{n,k})$ is an entire method if and only if there exists an integer $p > 0$ and a constant $M > 0$ such that*

$$|a_{n,k}| \leq p^k M \text{ for all } n, k = 0, 1, \dots$$

PROOF. (\Rightarrow) This follows from Theorem 3 (let $q = 1$). (\Leftarrow) Let $q > 0$ be given. Thus

$$|a_{n,k}| q^n \leq p^k M q^n = (pq)^k M q^{n-k} \leq (pq)^k M \text{ for } n \leq k.$$

Since $a_{n,k} = 0$ for $n > k$ we have, by Theorem 3, that A is an entire method. Δ

3. Applications

The Sonnenschein matrix $A(f) = (a_{n,k})$ has been studied by many people including Meyer-König [4]. It is defined by

$$[f(z)]^n = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_{n,k} z^k \text{ (for } n \geq 1)$$

where f is analytic at $z = 0$ and $a_{0,0} = 1, a_{0,k} = 0$ for $k \geq 1$.

LEMMA 5. *The Sonnenschein matrix $A(f)$ is an entire method if and only if $f(0) = 0$.*

PROOF. (\Rightarrow) Suppose that $f(0) \neq 0$. Choose an integer $q > 0$ such

that $|f(0)|q > 1$. By Theorem 3 there exists an integer $p = p(q) > 0$ and a constant $M = M(q) > 0$ such that

$$|a_{n,k}|q^n \leq p^k M \text{ for all } n, k = 0, 1, \dots$$

However, there exists N such that if $n \geq N$ then

$$|a_{n,0}|q^n = |f(0)|^n q^n > M.$$

Therefore $f(0) = 0$.

(\Leftarrow) If $f(0) = 0$ then $A(f) = (a_{n,k})$ is upper triangular. Since $f(z)$ is analytic at $z = 0$ there exists $R > 0$ such that $f(z)$ is analytic on $\{z : |z| < 2R\}$ (hence $[f(z)]^n$ is analytic on $\{z : |z| < 2R\}$). Let $\Gamma = \{t : |t| = R\}$. There exists $M > 0$ such that $\sup \{|f(z)| : t \in \Gamma\} \leq M$. So, by the Cauchy Integral Formula, we have that

$$|a_{n,k}| = \left| \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma} \frac{[f(z)]^n}{t^{k+1}} dt \right| \leq R^{-k} M^n \text{ for } k \geq n > 0.$$

Choose an integer $p > R^{-1}(M+1)$ and $M^* = 1$. So

$$|a_{n,k}| \leq p^k M^* \text{ for all } n, k = 0, 1, \dots$$

So, by Corollary 4, $A(f)$ is an entire method. Δ

In the special case of the Karamata matrix (see [4]) where

$$f(z) = \frac{\alpha + (1 - \alpha - \beta)z}{1 - \beta z}$$

we have

COROLLARY 6. *The Karamata matrix is an entire method if and only if $\alpha = 0$.*

In this case the Karamata matrix gives us the Taylor matrix $T(\beta)$ hence

COROLLARY 7. *The Taylor matrix $T(\beta)$ is an entire method for all complex numbers β .*

Brown proved this result in his examples [1].

There are two other generalizations of the Taylor matrix which are of interest, namely, the $T(r_n)$ matrix (see [2]) and the $\mathfrak{F}(r_n)$ matrix (see [5]). For $\{r_n\}_0^\infty$, a sequence of complex numbers, the $T(r_n) = (b_{n,k})$ matrix is defined by

$$\left\{ \frac{(1-r_n)z}{1-r_n z} \right\}^{n+1} = \sum_{k=n}^\infty b_{n,k} z^{k+1}, b_{n,k} = 0 \text{ for } k < n$$

and the $\mathfrak{F}(r_n) = (c_{n,k})$ matrix is defined by

$$\prod_{k=0}^n \frac{(1-r_k)z}{1-r_k z} = \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} c_{n,k} z^{k+1}, c_{n,k} = 0 \text{ for } k < n.$$

By applying Corollary 4 and the technique used in the proof of Lemma 5 we have

- LEMMA 8. (i) *The $T(r_n)$ matrix is an entire method if and only if $\{r_n\}_0^\infty$ is bounded.*
 (ii) *The $\mathfrak{S}(r_n)$ matrix is an entire method if and only if $\{r_n\}_0^\infty$ is bounded.*

REFERENCES

H. I. BROWN

- [1] A note on type P methods of summation, *Compositio Math.* 22 (1970) pp. 23–28.

J. P. KING

- [2] An extension of the Taylor summability transform, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 16 (1965), pp. 25–29.

K. KNOPP AND G. G. LORENTZ

- [3] Beiträge zur absoluten Limitierung, *Arch. Math.* 2 (1949) pp. 10–16.

W. MEYER-KÖNIG

- [4] Untersuchungen über einige verwandte Limitierungsverfahren, *Math. Z.* 52 (1950), pp. 257–304.

R. E. POWELL

- [5] The $\mathcal{S}(r_n)$ summability transform, *J. Analyse Math.* 20 (1967), pp. 289–304.

J. SONNENSCHNEIN

- [6] Sur les séries divergentes, *Acad. Roy. Belgique Bull. Cl. Sci.* 35 (1949), pp. 594–601.

(Oblatum 23–V–69)

The University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.
and
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio, U.S.A.