SOME RESULTS ON GENERALIZED LOTOTSKY SUMMABILITY

ΒY

J. F. MILLER

ABSTRACT. The (F, d_n) method is investigated with respect to perfectness, strong regularity, and summing bounded divergent sequences. In the process the columns of the inverse matrix are characterized in terms of $\{d_n\}$.

1. **Introduction**. We wish to investigate perfectness, strong regularity, and the summation of bounded divergent sequences for the Jakimovski methods (F, d_n). These methods were introduced by Jakimovski in [2] as a generalization of Lototsky summability.

DEFINITION 1.1. The (F, d_n) method is defined by the triangular matrix $A = (a_{nk})$ which has $a_{oo} = 1$, $a_{ok} = 0$ when k > 0 and

(1.2)
$$\prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{z+d_j}{1+d_j} = \sum_{k=0}^{n} a_{nk} z^k, n \ge 1.$$

Here $\{d_n\}_{1}^{\infty}$ is an arbitrary complex sequence with $d_n \neq -1$.

For convenience we will denote $\prod_{j=1}^{n} (1 + d_j)$ by $(1 + d_n)!$ If $A^{-1} = (b_{nk})$, then explicit formulas for a_{nk} and b_{nk} are given by (see [2])

(1.3)
$$a_{nk} = \frac{l}{(1+d_n)!} \sum_{1 \le j_1 < \cdots < j_{n-k} \le n} d_{j_1} \cdots d_{j_{n-k}}$$

where $k \leq n$ and the sum is defined to be 1 when k = n, and

(1.4)
$$b_{nk} = (1 + d_k)!(-1)^{n-k}[d_1^n, \dots, d_{k+1}^n]$$

where $k \leq n$ and we take $(1 + d_o)! \equiv 1$.

We note that the formula (1.4) and the proof given in [2, \$8] when the d_j 's are pairwise different remain valid even when some of the d_j 's are equal, if the definition of a divided difference for multiple knots is used (see [3]).

302

Received by the editors August 9, 1984, and, in revised form, March 4, 1985. AMS Subject Classification (1980): 40G99.

Key words and phrases: perfectness, strong regularity, bounded divergent sequences. © Canadian Mathematical Society 1985.

In the next section we will use the fact that the divided difference of a function or a sequence is a linear functional and that the divided difference $[f(d_1), \ldots, f(d_{m+1})]$ is a linear combination, with non-zero coefficients depending on d_1, \ldots, d_{m+1} only, of $f(d_j), f'(d_j), \ldots, f^{(r_j-1)}(d_j)$ where r_j is the number of times the number d_j appears in the sequence d_1, \ldots, d_{m+1} and in the linear combination d_j ranges over all the different values in the sequence d_1, \ldots, d_{m+1} .

2. Perfectness and (F, d_n)

DEFINITION 2.1. Let A be a conservative triangle. Then A is perfect if the convergent sequences c are dense in c_A , the summability field of A, with respect to the usual norm topology on c_A .

Before relating perfectness to (F, d_n) , we give two results characterizing the columns of the inverse of the (F, d_n) matrix.

THEOREM 2.2. For the (F, d_n) method with associated matrix $A = (a_{nk})$ the following are equivalent.

(i) $|d_n| < 1$ for each *n*.

(ii) A^{-1} has null columns.

(iii) A^{-1} has convergent columns.

PROOF. Let $A^{-1} = (b_{nk})$. From the remarks at the end of the previous section, for $n \ge 1$ and a fixed $k \ge 0$

$$b_{nk} = (-1)^{n-k}(1+d_k)![d_1^n,\ldots,d_{k+1}^n]$$

is a finite linear combination, with non-zero coefficients depending on d_1, \ldots, d_{k+1} only, of terms of the form $n(n-1) \ldots (n-r+1)d_j^{n-r}$ where d_j ranges over all the different values in the sequence d_1, \ldots, d_{k+1} and $r < r_j$. The proof follows by considering first $b_{n,0}$ then $b_{n,1}$ and so on.

THEOREM 2.3. For the (F, d_n) method with associated matrix $A = (a_{nk})$ we have that $|d_n| \le 1$ for each n and the d_n 's of modulus one are distinct if and only if A^{-1} has bounded columns.

PROOF. Let $A^{-1} = (b_{nk})$. If d_j appears only once among d_1, \ldots, d_{k+1} then its only contribution to the sum defining b_{nk} is of the form of a constant times d_j^n (which is a geometric sequence). Otherwise d_j contributes additional terms which are of the form of a constant times each one of the following: $nd_j^{n-1}, n(n-1)d_j^{n-2}, \ldots$. The proof follows again by considering $b_{n,0}$ then $b_{n,1}$ and so on.

From this last result and Lemma 1 of [8] we obtain a sufficient condition for (F, d_n) to be perfect.

[September

THEOREM 2.4. Let A be the matrix associated with a regular (F, d_n) method. If $|d_n| \leq 1$ for each n and the d_n 's of modulus one are distinct, then A is perfect. We note that the converse is not true, e.g.,

$$d_1 = d_2 = 1$$
 and $d_n = 0$ for $n \ge 3$ or $d_n = p > 1, n = 1, 2, ...$

are each regular and perfect.

3. Strong Regularity for (F, d_n)

DEFINITION 3.1. A bounded sequence $x = \{x_k\}$ is said to be almost convergent to s, its generalized limit, if each Banach limit (see [5] p. 58) of x is s. We denote the class of almost convergent sequences by f.

DEFINITION 3.2. A matrix $A = (a_{nk})$ is strongly regular if it sums every $x \in f$ to the value to which it is almost convergent.

In [5] p. 62 we have the following characterization of strong regularity:

THEOREM 3.3. A regular matrix $A = (a_{nk})$ is strongly regular if and only if

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}|a_{nk}-a_{n,k+1}|=0.$$

As noted in [5], p. 65, the matrices $A = (a_{nk})$ satisfying $\max_{0 \le k \le n} |a_{nk}| \to 0$ $(n \to \infty)$ form a wider class than the strongly regular matrices. However, when restricted to the (F, d_n) matrices with $d_n \ge 0$ for each n, we have

THEOREM 3.4. Let (F, d_n) with corresponding matrix $A = (a_{nk})$ be regular with $d_n \ge 0$ for each n. Then the following are equivalent.

(i) (F, d_n) is strongly regular.

(ii)
$$\max_{0 \le k \le n} |a_{nk}| \to 0 \ (n \to \infty)$$

(iii)
$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_n}{(1+d_n)^2} = \infty.$$

PROOF. (iii) \Rightarrow (i). This is due to Groetsch in [1]. (i) \Rightarrow (ii). This follows from Theorem 3.3 and the remark following it. (ii) \Rightarrow (iii).

304

Assume

1986]

(3.5)
$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_n}{(1+d_n)^2} < \infty.$$

From Lemma 2.2 of [6] we have

(3.6) An (F, d_n) method with $d_n \ge 0$ for each *n* is regular if and only if

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1+d_n} = \infty.$$

From (ii) and (1.3) we have $a_{nn} = 1/(1 + d_n)! \rightarrow 0 \ (n \rightarrow \infty)$, i.e., $(1 + d_n)! \rightarrow \infty$ $(n \rightarrow \infty)$ and thus

(3.7)
$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} d_n = \infty.$$

We have $\overline{\lim}_{n\to\infty} d_n = \infty$. Otherwise, there would exist an L > 0 such that $d_n \le L$ for each *n*. Thus, for each *n*, $d_n/(1 + d_n)^2 \ge d_n/(1 + L)^2$, which along with our assumption (3.5) implies $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} d_n < \infty$. This contradicts (3.7). Similarly, $\underline{\lim} d_n = 0$. If not, then there would exist an $\epsilon > 0$ such that $d_n \ge \epsilon$ for *n* sufficiently large. The function x/1 + x is increasing for x > 0 hence

$$\frac{d_n}{\left(1+d_n\right)^2} \ge \frac{1}{1+d_n} \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}$$

which forces

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1+d_n} < \infty.$$

This contradicts (3.6).

Consider the subsequences of n given by

$$\{v_i | d_{v_i} \leq 1\}$$
 and $\{l_i | d_{l_i} > 1\}$.

Then

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_n}{(1+d_n)^2} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_{\nu_i}}{(1+d_{\nu_i})^2} + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_{l_i}}{(1+d_{l_i})^2}$$

Since each series converges by our assumption in (3.5), we have

(3.8)
$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} d_{\nu_i} < \infty \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1+d_{l_i}} < \infty$$

305

J. F. MILLER

by the same arguments used to determine $\lim_{n\to\infty} d_n$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} d_n$. Now let m = m(n) be the number of d_j 's, $1 \le j \le n$, such that $d_j > 1$. We may suppose, by (3.7), that n is sufficiently large such that $m \ge 1$. Consider the *n*th row of $A = (a_{nk})$. By (1.3) with k = n - m,

(3.9)
$$a_{n,n-m} = \frac{1}{(1+d_n)!} \sum_{\substack{1 \le j_1 < j_2 < \cdots < j_m \le n \\ 1 \le j_1 < j_2 < \cdots < j_m \le n}} d_{j_1} d_{j_2} \dots d_{j_n} \\ \ge \frac{\prod_{i=1}^m \left(1 - \frac{1}{1+d_{l_i}}\right)}{\prod_{i=1}^{n-m} (1+d_{\nu_i})}.$$

But by (3.8) $\prod_{i=1}^{\infty} (1 + d_{\nu_i})$ converges and hence is bounded, say $\prod_{i=1}^{N} (1 + d_{\nu_i}) \le M$ for all N. Also $\prod_{i=1}^{\infty} (1 - 1/1 + d_{i_i})$ converges by (3.8). These imply from (3.9) that

$$a_{n,n-m} \ge rac{\prod\limits_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(1 - rac{1}{1+d_{l_i}}\right)}{M} = \mathrm{const} > 0.$$

Thus $\max_{0 \le k \le n} |a_{nk}| \not\rightarrow 0_{(n \to \infty)}$. This contradicts hypothesis (ii). Hence

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_n}{\left(1 + d_n\right)^2} = \infty.$$

4. Summation of Bounded Divergent Sequences for (F, d_n) . Applying the corollary on p. 505 of [7] and Theorem 2.3 we have

THEOREM 4.1. Let (F, d_n) be regular with $|d_n| \leq 1$ for each n and such that the d_n 's of modulus one are distinct. Then (F, d_n) is either Mercerian or sums a bounded divergent sequence.

From this result we have the following special cases.

COROLLARY 4.2. Under the same hypotheses as in Theorem 4.1, if at least one d_n is such that $|d_n| = 1$, then (F, d_n) sums a bounded divergent sequence.

PROOF. This follows from Theorem 2.1 (iv) of [4].

COROLLARY 4.3. If (F, d_n) is regular, non-Mercerian, and sums no bounded divergent sequences, then

(i) $|d_n| \neq 1$ for each *n*, and

(ii) $|d_n| > 1$ for some *n*.

[September

PROOF. (i) If some d_n has modulus one, say d_N , then the (F, d'_n) method given by $d'_n = d_n$ for $n \neq 1$ and $N, d'_1 = d_N$, and $d'_N = d_1$, sums the columns of its own inverse. But the first column of the inverse for (F, d'_n) is by (1.4) $b'_{no} = (-d_N)^n$, a bounded divergent sequence. It is easily seen from (1.2) that interchanging two d_j 's (or any finite number for that matter) results in essentially the same (F, d_n) matrix, i.e., for sufficiently large n, $a_{nk} = a'_{nk}$ for each k. Therefore (F, d_n) sums a bounded divergent sequence.

(ii) This now follows from Theorem 4.1 and (i).

If we restrict $\{d_n\}$ to $d_n \ge 0$ for each *n*, then, since *f* clearly contains bounded divergent sequences, from Theorem 3.4 we have

COROLLARY 4.4. Let $(F_n d_n)$ be regular with $d_n \ge 0$ for each n. If (F, d_n) sums no bounded divergent sequences, then

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_n}{\left(1 + d_n\right)^2} < \infty$$

From this last result and an argument in the proof of Theorem 3.4, it follows that $\lim d_n = 0$. In particular then, $d_n \neq \infty$ $(n \rightarrow \infty)$. Thus we have

COROLLARY 4.5. If (F, d_n) is regular with $d_n \ge 0$ for each n and $d_n \to \infty$ $(n \to \infty)$, then (F, d_n) sums a bounded divergent sequence.

The conclusion of Corollary 4.4 yields

COROLLARY 4.6. If (F, d_n) is regular with $d_n \ge 0$ for each n and sums no bounded divergent sequences, then d_n is either a null sequence (in fact is in l) or has exactly 0 and ∞ as limit points.

REFERENCES

1. C. W. Groetsch, *Remarks on a Generalization of the Lototsky Summability Method*, Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. 5 (4) (1972), pp. 277–288.

2. A. Jakimovski, A Generalization of the Lototsky Method of Summability, Mich. Math. J. 6 (1959), pp. 277–290.

3. M. J. Marsden, An Identity for Spline Functions to Variation — Diminishing Spline Approximation, J. of Approx. Theory 3 (1970), pp. 7-49.

4. J. F. Miller and H. B. Skerry, *Regular and Mercerian Generalized Lototsky Method*, Can. Math. Bull. **27** (1) (1984), pp. 65–71.

5. G. M. Petersen, Regular Matrix Transformation, McGraw-Hill, 1966.

6. G. Smith, On the (f, d_n) Method of Summability, Can. J. Math. 17 (1965), pp. 506-526.

7. A. Wilansky and K. Zeller, *Summation of Bounded Divergent Sequences*, *Topological Methods*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **78** (1955), pp. 501–509.

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY THE BERKS CAMPUS READING, PA

1986]