Pacific Journal of Mathematics

ON A TAUBERIAN THEOREM FOR ABEL SUMMABILITY

Otto Szász

Vol. 1, No. 1 November 1951

ON A TAUBERIAN THEOREM FOR ABEL SUMMABILITY

OTTO SZÁSZ

1. Introduction. In 1928 the author proved the following theorem [2, Section 2]:

THEOREM A. *If* $p > 1$ *and*

$$\sum_{\nu=1}^{n} \nu^p |a_\nu|^p = O(n), \qquad n \longrightarrow \infty, \tag{1.1}$$

then Abel summability of the series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n$ *to* s *implies its convergence to* s.

The theorem is the more general the smaller p is; it does not hold for $p = 1$ [2, Section 1; 1, pp. 119, 122]. However, for this case Rényi proved the following theorem:

THEOREM B. *If*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\nu=1}^{n} \nu |a_\nu| = l < \infty$$

exists, then Abel summability of $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n$ *to* s *implies convergence of the series to* s.

2. Generalization. We give a simpler proof and at the same time a slight generalization of Theorem B.

THEOREM 1. *Assume that*

$$V_n = \sum_{\nu=1}^{n} \nu |a_\nu| = O(n), \tag{2.1}$$

and that

$$\frac{1}{m} V_m - \frac{1}{n} V_n \longrightarrow 0, \tag{2.2}$$

Received April 10, 1950. The preparation of this paper was sponsored (in part) by the Office of Naval Research.

Pacific J. Math. 1 (1951), 117-125.

for every sequence $m = m_n$*, such that* $m_n/n \longrightarrow 1$ *as* $n \longrightarrow \infty$*. Then Abel summability to* s *of* $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n$ *implies its convergence to* s*.*

Property (2.2) is called *slow oscillation* of the sequence V_n/n.

Proof of Theorem 1. We write

$$\sum_{\nu=0}^{n} a_\nu = s_n , \qquad \sum_{\nu=0}^{n} s_\nu = (n+1)\,\sigma_n .$$

It is easy to verify that, for $k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$, we have

$$(2.3) \qquad s_{n-1} - \sigma_{n+k} = \frac{n}{k+1}\left(\sigma_{n+k} - \sigma_{n-1}\right) - \frac{1}{k+1}\sum_{\nu=0}^{k}(k+1-\nu)\,a_{n+\nu} .$$

It is known [see 2, Section 2] that if for a finite s we have

$$\lim_{x \to 1} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n x^n = s ,$$

then (2.1) implies $\sigma_n \longrightarrow s$; thus, if

$$(2.4) \qquad \underset{k \geq 0}{\mathrm{l.u.b.}}\ |\sigma_{n-1} - \sigma_{n+k}| = \epsilon_n ,$$

then $\epsilon_n \longrightarrow 0$.

We now choose

$$(2.5) \qquad k = k_n = [n\,\epsilon_n^{1/2}] , \qquad \text{so that} \quad k \leq n\,\epsilon_n^{1/2} < k+1 ;$$

it follows, in view of (2.4), that

$$\frac{n}{k+1}\,|\sigma_{n-1} - \sigma_{n+k}| < \epsilon_n^{1/2} .$$

In view of (2.3) our theorem will be proved if we show that

$$\frac{1}{k+1}\sum_{\nu=0}^{k}(k+1-\nu)\,a_{n+\nu} \longrightarrow 0 , \qquad n \longrightarrow \infty .$$

Now

$$\frac{1}{k+1}\left|\sum_{\nu=0}^{k}(k+1-\nu)\,a_{n+\nu}\right|$$

$$\leq\frac{1}{k+1}\sum_{\nu=0}^{k}(n+\nu)\,|a_{n+\nu}|\,\frac{k+1-\nu}{n+\nu}\leq\frac{1}{n}\,(V_{n+k}-V_{n-1})\,,$$

and

$$\frac{1}{n}\,(V_{n+k}-V_{n-1})=\frac{V_{n+k}}{n+k}\cdot\frac{n+k}{n}-\frac{V_{n-1}}{n-1}\cdot\frac{n-1}{n} \tag{2.6}$$

$$=\frac{V_{n+k}}{n+k}-\frac{V_{n-1}}{n-1}+\frac{k}{n}\,\frac{V_{n+k}}{n+k}+\frac{1}{n}\,\frac{V_{n-1}}{n-1}\,;$$

using (2.2) and (2.5), we see that

$$\frac{1}{n}\,(V_{n+k}-V_{n-1})\longrightarrow 0\qquad\text{as}\quad\frac{k}{n}\longrightarrow 0\qquad\text{and}\quad n\longrightarrow\infty\,, \tag{2.7}$$

and thus Theorem 1 is proved.

Rényi observed that the Theorems A and B are overlapping. We now show that Theorem 1 includes not only Theorem B, but also Theorem A. Clearly (2.1) follows from (1.1) by Hölder's inequality. Furthermore,

$$V_{n+k}-V_n=\sum_{\nu=n+1}^{n+k}\nu\,|a_\nu|\leq k^{(p-1)/p}\left(\sum_{\nu=n+1}^{n+k}\nu^p\,|a_\nu|^p\right)^{1/p}$$

$$=k^{(p-1)/p}\,O[(n+k)^{1/p}]\,;$$

hence,

$$\frac{1}{n}\,(V_{n+k}-V_n)=\frac{k}{n}\,O\left[\left(\frac{n}{k}\right)^{1/p}\right]=O\left[\left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^{(p-1)/p}\right]\longrightarrow 0\qquad\text{as}\quad\frac{k}{n}\longrightarrow 0\,.$$

It now follows from (2.6) that (2.2) holds; thus (1.1) implies (2.1) and (2.2), which proves our assertion.

An example of a sequence $V_n > 0$, and increasing, for which (2.2) holds, while $n^{-1} V_n \uparrow \infty$, is

$$V_n = n \log n , \qquad n \geq 2 ,$$

because

$$\frac{V_{n+k}}{n+k} - \frac{V_n}{n} = \log\left(1 + \frac{k}{n}\right) \longrightarrow 0 , \qquad \text{as } \frac{k}{n} \longrightarrow 0, \qquad n \longrightarrow \infty .$$

3. A more general result. A generalization of Theorem A is the following [see 5, p.56]:

THEOREM A′. *If for some* $p > 1$, *we have*

$$\sum_{\nu=1}^{n} \nu^p (|a_\nu| - a_\nu)^p = O(n) , \qquad n \longrightarrow \infty, \tag{3.1}$$

then the Abel summability of $\Sigma_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n$ *implies its convergence to the same value.*

An analogue to Theorem 1 is the theorem:

THEOREM 2. *Assume that*

$$U_n = \sum_{\nu=1}^{n} \nu(|a_\nu| - a_\nu) = O(n) , \tag{3.2}$$

and that

$$\frac{1}{m} U_m - \frac{1}{n} U_n \longrightarrow 0 \qquad \text{as } \frac{m}{n} \longrightarrow 1 , \qquad n \longrightarrow \infty . \tag{3.3}$$

If now $\Sigma_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n$ *is Abel summable to* s, *then it converges to* s.

Proof of Theorem 2. We have

$$- \sum_{\nu=1}^{n} \nu a_\nu \leq \sum_{\nu=1}^{n} \nu (|a_\nu| - a_\nu) = O(n) ;$$

hence [see 5, the Lemma on p.52] Abel summability of $\Sigma_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n$ implies its summability $(C, 1)$. From (2.3) we have

$$s_{n-1} - \sigma_{n+k} \leq \frac{n}{k+1} (\sigma_{n+k} - \sigma_{n-1})$$

$$+ \frac{1}{k+1} \sum_{\nu=0}^{k} (k+1-\nu)(|a_{n+\nu}| - a_{n+\nu}) \, ;$$

from (2.4) and (2.5) we obtain

$$\frac{n}{k+1} (\sigma_{n+k} - \sigma_{n-1}) < \epsilon_n^{1/2} \, .$$

Using the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 1, replacing V_n by U_n, we find that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} s_n \leq s \, . \tag{3.4}$$

We next employ the identity, similar to (2.3),

$$s_n - \sigma_{n-k-1} = \frac{n+1}{k+1} (\sigma_n - \sigma_{n-k-1})$$

$$+ \frac{1}{k+1} \sum_{\nu=0}^{k} (k-\nu)\, a_{n-\nu} \, , \qquad k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots,$$

and the inequality

$$a_\nu \geq a_\nu - |a_\nu| \, .$$

The same reasoning as before now yields

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} s_n \geq s \, . \tag{3.5}$$

Finally (3.4) and (3.5) prove Theorem 2.

It is clear from the proof that condition (3.3) can be replaced by

$$\frac{1}{n} (U_m - U_n) \longrightarrow 0 \, , \qquad \text{as } \frac{m}{n} \longrightarrow 1 \, , \qquad n \longrightarrow \infty \, .$$

4. An equivalent result. A glance at the proof of Theorem 1 shows that the following lemma holds:

LEMMA 1. *If V_n is positive and monotone increasing, and if*

$$V_n = O(n), \qquad \text{as } n \longrightarrow \infty, \tag{4.1}$$

and (2.2) *holds, then*

$$\frac{1}{n}(V_m - V_n) \longrightarrow 0, \qquad \text{as } \frac{m}{n} \longrightarrow 1, \quad n \longrightarrow \infty. \tag{4.2}$$

We now prove the inverse:

LEMMA 2. *If $V_n > 0$, and increasing, and if* (4.2) *holds, then* (4.1) *and* (2.2) *hold.*

Proof. We write

$$V_n = n\,\omega_n, \qquad \omega_n \geq 0,$$

and

$$\frac{1}{n}(V_m - V_n) = \omega_m - \omega_n + \left(\frac{m}{n} - 1\right)\omega_m. \tag{4.3}$$

Let

$$\max_{\nu \leq n} \omega_\nu = \rho_n;$$

then $\rho_n \uparrow \rho \leq \infty$. If $\rho < \infty$, then $V_n = O(n)$. Suppose now that $\rho = \infty$; then there are infinitely many indices $m = m_\nu$, so that $\omega_m = \rho_m$ for $m = m_\nu, \nu = 1,2,3,\cdots$. For these m and for $n < m$, from (4.3) we get

$$\frac{1}{n}(V_m - V_n) > \left(\frac{m}{n} - 1\right)\rho_m. \tag{4.4}$$

We now choose

$$n = \frac{m\rho_m^{1/2}}{1 + \rho_m^{1/2}} < m,$$

so that

$$\frac{m}{n} = \frac{1 + \rho_m^{1/2}}{\rho_m^{1/2}} \longrightarrow 1;$$

then, using (4.4), we have

$$\frac{1}{n}(V_m - V_n) > \rho_m^{1/2} \longrightarrow \infty,$$

in contradiction to the assumption (4.2). It follows that (4.1) holds; finally (2.2) follows from (4.1), (4.2), and (4.3). This proves Lemma 2.

We now prove the following theorem:

THEOREM 3. *Let* $U_n = \sum_{\nu=1}^{n} \nu(|a_\nu| - a_\nu)$; *if*

$$\frac{1}{n}(U_m - U_n) \longrightarrow 0, \qquad as \quad \frac{m}{n} \longrightarrow 1, \quad n \longrightarrow \infty, \tag{4.5}$$

and if $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n$ *is Abel summable, then* $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n$ *is convergent to the same value.*

Proof of Theorem 3. In view of Lemma 2, Theorem 3 includes Theorem 2; it also includes Theorem 1, because of Lemma 2, and of the inequality

$$U_m - U_n \leq 2(V_m - V_n), \qquad m > n.$$

Conversely, by Lemma 2, (4.5) implies (3.2) and (3.3), so that Theorem 3 is equivalent to Theorem 2, and is thus valid.

To show that Theorem 1 is actually more general than Theorem B we give an example of a sequence ω_n so that $n\omega_n$ is increasing, ω_n is slowly oscillating and $\omega_n = O(1)$, but $\lim \omega_n$ does not exist. Let

$$\omega_n = \sum_{\nu=1}^{n} \nu^{-1}\epsilon_\nu, \qquad \text{where } \epsilon_\nu = \pm 1;$$

choose $\epsilon_\nu = +1$ as long as $\omega_n \leq 3$; $\nu = 1, 2, \cdots, n_1$, say. Choose $\epsilon_\nu = -1$ as long as $\omega_n \geq 2$; $\nu = 1 + n_1, 2 + n_1, \cdots, n_2$, say; and so on. It is clear that $\omega_n = O(1)$, and that $\lim \omega_n$ does not exist. Furthermore, for $n \leq n_1$, $\omega_n \uparrow$, for $n_1 < n \leq n_2$, $\omega_n \downarrow$, and so on. Now

$$(n+1)\omega_{n+1} - n\omega_n = n(\omega_{n+1} - \omega_n) + \omega_{n+1} \geq \frac{3}{2} - 1 = \frac{1}{2},$$

hence $n\omega_n \uparrow$. Finally

$$|\omega_m - \omega_n| \leq \sum_{\nu=n+1}^{m} \frac{1}{\nu} < \frac{m-n}{n} \longrightarrow 0, \qquad \text{for } \frac{m}{n} \longrightarrow 1,$$

hence ω_n is slowly oscillating.

5. Another equivalent result. We first establish the following lemma.

LEMMA 3. *Suppose that* $U_n \geq 0$ *and increasing, with* $U_0 = 0$, *and let*

$$b_n = \frac{1}{n}(U_n - U_{n-1}), \qquad n \geq 1, \qquad b_0 = 0; \tag{5.1}$$

$$B_n = \sum_{\nu=0}^{n} b_\nu, \qquad n \geq 0. \tag{5.2}$$

Then whenever $k = k(n)$ *is so chosen that* $k/n \longrightarrow 0$, *as* $n \longrightarrow \infty$, *the two statements*

$$\frac{1}{n}(U_{n+k} - U_n) \longrightarrow 0 \tag{5.3}$$

and

$$B_{n+k} - B_n \longrightarrow 0 \tag{5.4}$$

are equivalent.

Proof. From (5.1) we have

$$U_n = \sum_{\nu=0}^{n} \nu b_\nu, \qquad U_{n+k} - U_n = \sum_{\nu=n+1}^{n+k} \nu b_\nu.$$

Now

$$B_{n+k} - B_n = \sum_{\nu=n+1}^{n+k} b_\nu \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\nu=n+1}^{n+k} \nu b_\nu = \frac{1}{n}(U_{n+k} - U_n);$$

thus (5.3) implies (5.4). Furthermore,

$$B_{n+k} - B_n \geq \frac{1}{n+k}(U_{n+k} - U_n);$$

hence (5.4) implies (5.3). This proves the lemma.

We note that

$$B_n = \frac{1}{n} U_n + \sum_{\nu=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{\nu(\nu+1)} U_\nu ,$$

and

$$U_n = nB_n - \sum_{\nu=0}^{n-1} B_\nu .$$

It is an immediate consequence of Lemma 3 that Theorem 3 is equivalent to the following theorem (for a direct proof see [4, Theorem IV]).

THEOREM 4. *If*

$$\sum_{\nu=n+1}^{n+k} (|a_\nu| - a_\nu) \longrightarrow 0 , \qquad \textit{as} \quad \frac{k}{n} \longrightarrow 0 , \quad n \longrightarrow \infty ,$$

then Abel summability of $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n$ *implies convergence of the series to the same value.*

A generalization of this theorem to Dirichlet series and to Laplace integrals, on different lines, is given in [3].

REFERENCES

1. A. Rényi, *On a Tauberian theorem of O. Szász*, Acta Univ. Szeged. Sect. Sci. Math. **11** (1946), 119-123.

2. O. Szász, *Verallgemeinerung eines Littlewoodschen Satzes über Potenzreihen*, J. London Math. Soc. 3 (1928), 254-262.

3. ———, *Verallgemeinerung und neuer Beweis einiger Sätze Tauberscher Art*, Sitzungsberichte d. Bayer. Akad. d. Wissenchaften *zu* München, 59 (1929), 325-340.

4. ———, *Generalization of two theorems of Hardy and Littlewood on power series*, Duke Math. J., **1** (1935), 105-111.

5. ———, *Introduction to the theory of divergent series*, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, 1944; Hafner, New York, 1948.

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI AND
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS, LOS ANGELES

Vari-Type Composition by
Cecile Leonard
Ruth Stafford

With the cooperation of
E. F. Beckenbach
E. G. Straus

Printed in the United States of America by
Edwards Brothers, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS • BERKELEY AND LOS ANGELES

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

Vol. 1, No. 1 November, 1951