## An Application of Abel's Lemma to Double Series.<sup>1</sup>

By C. E. WALSH.

(Received 20th November 1928. Read 1st March 1929.)

Let  $b_{mn}$  be a positive function of m and n which decreases steadily with n, so that  $b_{mn} \ge b_{m, n+1}$  for all values of m and n. Assume also that  $|a_{m1} + a_{m2} + \ldots + a_{mn}| < K$  for all values of m and n, K being finite. Denote by  $S_{mn}$  the sum of the first n terms in the first m rows of the double series

$a_{11}b_{11}, a_{12}b_{12}, \ldots, a_{1n}b_{1n}, \ldots$
$a_{21} b_{21} \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$
$a_{m1}b_{m1},\ldots\ldots$
·····

Then it can be shewn that if

- (1)  $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} b_{m1}$  converges, and  $b_{mn}$  tends to zero as  $n \to \infty$  (*m* being fixed) the double series  $S_{mn}$  converges.
- (2)  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_{m1}$  converges, and the sum of  $S_{mn}$  by rows exists, being S, the double series  $S_{mn}$  will also converge to S.

(3) The sum of  $S_{mn}$  by columns exists, being S, and  $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} b_{mn}$  converges for all values of n greater than a fixed value  $N_1$ , tending to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , then the double series converges to S.

Of course in cases (2) and (3) by Pringsheim's Theorem it is merely necessary to prove that  $S_{mn}$  converges, but to prove that it

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For various similar results, and for other applications of this Lemma to multiple series, together with extensions of it, see e.g. Hardy :—*Proc. London. Math. Soc.* 2, 1 (1903), 124-128; 2 (1904), 190; *Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc.* 19 (1919), 86, etc. Also, Bromwich, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* 2, 6 (1907), 58-76; and papers and theorems by Hadamard, Ferrar, *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, 29 (1929), and others.

converges to S is just as short. For all values of m and n, and for all positive values of p we have

$$|\sum_{r=n+1}^{n+p} a_{mr}| = |\sum_{r=1}^{n+p} a_{mr} - \sum_{r=1}^{n} a_{mr}| < 2K.$$

Hence since  $b_{mn}$  decreases steadily with n, by Abel's Lemma  $\left|\sum_{r=n+1}^{n+p} b_{mr} a_{mr}\right| < b_{m, n+1}$ . V, where V is the greatest of the moduli  $\left|a_{m, n+1}\right|, \left|\sum_{r=n+1}^{n+2} a_{mr}\right|, \ldots, \left|\sum_{r=n+1}^{n+p} a_{mr}\right|, i.e. \ V < 2K$ . Thus  $\left|\sum_{n+1}^{n+p} b^{mr} a_{mr}\right| < 2Kb_{m, n+1}$ .

Putting  $m = 1, 2, \ldots, M$ , we have for all values of M, n and p,

$$|S_{M,n+p} - S_{Mn}| = |\sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{r=n+1}^{n+p} b_{mr} a_{mr}| \leqslant \sum_{m=1}^{M} |\sum_{r=n+1}^{n+p} b_{mr} a_{mr}| < 2K \ (b_{1\,n+1} + b_{2,n+1} + \dots + b_{M,n+1}).$$
(A)

Also putting n = 0 in the inequality  $\left| \sum_{n+1}^{n+p} b_{mr} a_{mr} \right| < 2Kb_{m, n+1}$ , and

letting  $m = M + 1, M + 2, \ldots, M + s$ , in succession, it follows similarly that

$$|S_{M+s, p} - S_{Mp}| \ll \sum_{m=M+1}^{M+s} |\sum_{r=1}^{p} b_{mr} a_{mr}| < 2K (b_{M+1, 1} + b_{M+2, 1} + \dots + b_{M+s, 1}),$$
(B)

M, s, and p being arbitrary.

In case (1), given  $\epsilon$ , M can be found so that if m > M,  $\sum_{r=m}^{\infty} b_{r} < \epsilon$ , hence from (B) if m > M,

 $|S_{mn} - S_{Mn}| < 2K \epsilon$ , for all values of n. Now N can be found so that if n > N,  $b_{1n}$ ,  $b_{2n}$ , ...,  $b_{Mn}$  are each less than  $\frac{\epsilon}{M}$ . Accordingly from (A) if n > N, q > N,  $|S_{Mn} - S_{Mq}| < 2K \cdot M \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{M}$ , *i.e.*  $< 2K\epsilon$ . and so when p, m, > M, q, n > N,

 $|S_{mn} - S_{pq}| \leqslant |S_{mn} - S_{Mn}| + |S_{Mn} - S_{Mq}| + |S_{Mq} - S_{pq}| < 6K\epsilon$ which is arbitrarily small, thus  $S_{mn}$  converges.

For case (2), if  $r_m$  denote the sum of the first m rows of  $S_{mn}$  M can be found such that  $|r_m - S| < \epsilon$ , and  $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} b_{r_1} < \epsilon$ , if  $m \ge M$ . Then we can find N so that  $|S_{Mn} - r_M| < \epsilon$  if n > N. Thus

 $|S_{Mn} - S| < 2\epsilon$  if n > N, and as in case (1),  $|S_{mn} - S_{Mn}| < 2K\epsilon$ for all values of n, if m > M. Hence if m > M, n > N,

$$|S_{mn}-S| \leqslant |S_{mn}-S_{Mn}|+|S_{Mn}-S|<2$$
 (K+1) e

which is arbitrarily small, and the result follows.

In case (3) if the sum of the first *n* columns be denoted by  $l_n$ ,  $N(>N_1)$  can be found so that if  $n \ge N$ ,  $|l_n - S| < \epsilon$ , and  $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} b_{mn} < \epsilon$ . Then we can find *M* so that if m > M,  $|S_{mN} - l_N| < \epsilon$ , and consequently  $|S_{mN} - S| < 2\epsilon$ . But from (A), we have for all values of *m*, if *p* is positive

$$|S_{m, N+p} - S_{mN}| < 2K (b_{1N+1} + b_{2, N+1} + \ldots + b_{m, N+1}) < 2K\epsilon.$$

Therefore if m > M, n > N

$$|S_{mn}-S| \leqslant |S_{mn}-S_{mN}| + |S_{mN}-S| < 2 (K+1) \epsilon$$

so  $S_{mn}$  converges to S.

[Note added 30th March 1929.—It was noticed, too late to alter proof sheets, that (1) and (2) above are merely particular cases of

(a) The double series  $S_{mn}$  converges if  $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} b_{m1}$ , and each row of  $S_{mn}$ , converges. For M can then be found so that  $\sum_{m=M}^{\infty} b_{m1} < \epsilon$ , hence from (B), if m > M, then  $|S_{mn} - S_{Mn}| < 2K\epsilon$  for all values of n. As  $\lim_{n \to \infty} S_{Mn}$  exists we can find N so that if n, q > N,

$$|S_{Mn}-S_{Mq}|<\epsilon.$$

Thus when m, p > M, n, q > N,

 $|S_{mn} - S_{pq}| \leq |S_{mn} - S_{Mn}| + |S_{Mn} - S_{Mq}| + |S_{Mq} - S_{pq}| < (4K+1)\epsilon,$ so that the double series converges.

Also (3) above is only a particular case of

(b) If the columns of 
$$S_{mn}$$
 converge, and  $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} b_{mn}$  converges when  $n > N_1$ , tending to zero as  $n \to \infty$ ,  $S_{mn}$  will converge.

To shew this;  $N(>N_1)$  can be found so that if

$$n \gg N, \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} b_{mn} < \epsilon;$$

hence as in (3),  $|S_{m, N+r} - S_{mN}| < 2K\epsilon$  for all values of m and r. As  $\lim_{m\to\infty} S_{mN}$  exists, M can be chosen such that

 $|S_{mN}-S_{pN}|<\epsilon$ , if m, p>M.

And so when m, p > M, n, q > N $|S_{mn} - S_{pq}| \leq |S_{mn} - S_{mN}| + |S_{mN} - S_{pN}| + |S_{pN} - S_{pq}| < (4K+1)\epsilon$ *i.e.*  $S_{mn}$  converges.]