

SOME PROPERTIES OF THE NATARAJAN METHOD OF SUMMABILITY FOR DOUBLE SEQUENCES IN ULTRAMETRIC FIELDS

*P N Natarajan

Old No. 2/3, New No. 3/3, Second Main Road, R.A. Puram, Chennai 600 028, India

*Author for Correspondence

ABSTRACT

Throughout the present paper, K denotes a complete, non-trivially valued, ultrametric field. Entries of double sequences, double series and 4-dimensional infinite matrices are in K . In this paper, we study some properties of the $(M, \lambda_{m,n})$ method of summability introduced earlier by the author in Natarajan (2014).

Keywords: Ultrametric Field, Double Sequence, Double Series, $(M, \lambda_{m,n})$ Method (or the Natarajan Method) of Summability, Cauchy Product, Inclusion, Equivalence, Iteration Product

INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARIES

Throughout the present paper, K denotes a complete, non-trivially valued, ultrametric field. Entries of double sequences, double series and 4-dimensional infinite matrices are in K .

To make the paper self-contained, we recall the following (Natarajan and Srinivasan (2002):

Definition 1.1: Let $\{x_{m,n}\}$, $m, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ be a double sequence in K . Let $x \in K$. We say that

$$\lim_{m+n \rightarrow \infty} x_{m,n} = x,$$

if for every $\varepsilon > 0$, the set

$$\{(m,n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : |x_{m,n} - x| \geq \varepsilon\}$$

is finite, $\mathbb{N}$ being the set of positive integers. In such a case, x is unique and x is called the limit of the double sequence $\{x_{m,n}\}$. We also say that $\{x_{m,n}\}$ converges to x .

Definition 1.2: Let $\{x_{m,n}\}$ be a double sequence in K and $s \in K$. We say that

$$\sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty, \infty} x_{m,n} = s,$$

if,

$$\lim_{m+n \rightarrow \infty} s_{m,n} = s,$$

where,

$$s_{m,n} = \sum_{k,\ell=0}^{m,n} x_{k,\ell}, \quad m, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

In such a case, we say that the double series $\sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty, \infty} x_{m,n}$ converges to s .

Remark 1.1: If $\lim_{m+n \rightarrow \infty} x_{m,n} = x$, then the double sequence $\{x_{m,n}\}$ is bounded.

It is easy to prove the following results.

Theorem 1.1:

$$\lim_{m+n \rightarrow \infty} x_{m,n} = x,$$

if and only if

$$(i) \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} x_{m,n} = x, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots;$$

$$(ii) \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_{m,n} = x, \quad m = 0, 1, 2, \dots;$$

Research Article

and

(iii) for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|x_{m,n} - x| < \varepsilon$, $m, n \geq N$,

which we write as

$$\lim_{m,n \rightarrow \infty} x_{m,n} = x$$

(Note that this is Pringsheim's definition of limit of a double sequence).

Theorem 1.2: The double series $\sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty, \infty} x_{m,n}$ converges if and only if

$$\lim_{m+n \rightarrow \infty} x_{m,n} = 0.$$

4-Dimensional Regular Matrices and Silverman-Toeplitz Theorem

Definition 2.1: Given a 4-dimensional infinite matrix $A = (a_{m,n,k,\ell})$, $a_{m,n,k,\ell} \in K$, $m, n, k, \ell = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ and a double sequence $\{x_{k,\ell}\}$, $x_{k,\ell} \in K$, $k, \ell = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, by the A-transform of $x = \{x_{k,\ell}\}$, we mean the sequence $A(x) = \{(Ax)_{m,n}\}$, where,

$$(Ax)_{m,n} = \sum_{k,\ell=0}^{\infty, \infty} a_{m,n,k,\ell} x_{k,\ell}, \quad m, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots,$$

assuming that the double series on the right converge. If $\lim_{m+n \rightarrow \infty} (Ax)_{m,n} = s$, we say that the double sequence $x = \{x_{k,\ell}\}$ is summable A or A-summable to s, written as,

$$x_{k,\ell} \rightarrow s(A).$$

If $\lim_{m+n \rightarrow \infty} (Ax)_{m,n} = s$, whenever $\lim_{k+\ell \rightarrow \infty} x_{k,\ell} = s$, we say that the 4-dimensional infinite matrix A is "regular".

The following theorem, proved in Natarajan and Srinivasan (2002), gives a characterization of a 4-dimensional infinite matrix $A = (a_{m,n,k,\ell})$ to be regular, in terms of the entries of the matrix.

Theorem 2.1: (Silverman-Toeplitz) The 4-dimensional infinite matrix $A = (a_{m,n,k,\ell})$ is regular if and only if

$$(2.1) \quad \sup_{m,n,k,\ell \geq 0} |a_{m,n,k,\ell}| < \infty;$$

$$(2.2) \quad \lim_{m+n \rightarrow \infty} a_{m,n,k,\ell} = 0, \quad k, \ell = 0, 1, 2, \dots;$$

$$(2.3) \quad \lim_{m+n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k,\ell=0}^{\infty, \infty} a_{m,n,k,\ell} = 1;$$

$$(2.4) \quad \lim_{m+n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{k \geq 0} |a_{m,n,k,\ell}| = 0, \quad \ell = 0, 1, 2, \dots;$$

and

$$(2.5) \quad \lim_{m+n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\ell \geq 0} |a_{m,n,k,\ell}| = 0, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

Some Properties of the $(M, \lambda_{m,n})$ Method (or the Natarajan Method)

In Natarajan (2014), the author introduced the $(M, \lambda_{m,n})$ method for double sequences and extended some of the results of the (M, λ_n) method for simple sequences.

Definition 3.1: Let $\{\lambda_{m,n}\}$ be a double sequence in K such that

$$\lim_{m+n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{m,n} = 0.$$

The $(M, \lambda_{m,n})$ method is defined by the 4-dimensional infinite matrix $(a_{m,n,k,\ell})$, where,

$$a_{m,n,k,\ell} = \begin{cases} \lambda_{m-k,n-\ell}, & 0 \leq k \leq m, 0 \leq \ell \leq n; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Definition 3.2: We say that $(M, \lambda_{m,n})$ is included in $(M, \mu_{m,n})$ (or $(M, \mu_{m,n})$ includes $(M, \lambda_{m,n})$), written as

$$(M, \lambda_{m,n}) \subseteq (M, \mu_{m,n}) \quad (\text{or } (M, \mu_{m,n}) \supseteq (M, \lambda_{m,n})),$$

if

$$s_{k,\ell} \rightarrow \sigma(M, \lambda_{m,n}) \text{ implies that } s_{k,\ell} \rightarrow \sigma(M, \mu_{m,n})$$

too.

Research Article

The methods $(M, \lambda_{m,n})$, $(M, \mu_{m,n})$ are said to be “equivalent”, if

$(M, \lambda_{m,n}) \subseteq (M, \mu_{m,n})$ and vice versa.

It is easy to prove the following result.

Theorem 3.1: Natarajan (2014) The method $(M, \lambda_{m,n})$ is regular if and only if

$$(3.1) \quad \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} \lambda_{m,n} = 1.$$

Analogous to Theorem 1 of Natarajan (1978), we have the following result in the context of double sequences.

Theorem 3.2: Natarajan and Sakthivel (2008) If $\lim_{m+n \rightarrow \infty} a_{m,n} = 0$ and $\lim_{m+n \rightarrow \infty} b_{m,n} = 0$, then,

$$\lim_{m+n \rightarrow \infty} c_{m,n} = 0,$$

where,

$$c_{m,n} = \sum_{k,\ell=0}^{m,n} a_{m-k,n-\ell} b_{k,\ell}, \quad m, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

Proof: Since $\lim_{m+n \rightarrow \infty} a_{m,n} = 0$, $\lim_{m+n \rightarrow \infty} b_{m,n} = 0$, there exists $M > 0$ such that

$$|a_{m,n}| < M, |b_{m,n}| < M, \quad m, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

Given $\varepsilon > 0$, choose positive integers M_1, N_1 such that

$$|a_{m,n}| < \frac{\varepsilon}{M}, |b_{m,n}| < \frac{\varepsilon}{M}, \quad m > M_1, n > N_1.$$

Since $\lim_{m+n \rightarrow \infty} a_{m-k,n-\ell} = 0$, for every fixed $k, \ell = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, we can choose positive integers $M_2 > M_1, N_2 > N_1$ such that for $m > M_2, n > N_2$,

$$\sup_{\substack{0 \leq k \leq M_1 \\ 0 \leq \ell \leq N_1}} |a_{m-k,n-\ell}| < \frac{\varepsilon}{M};$$

$$\sup_{\substack{0 \leq k \leq M_1 \\ N_1+1 \leq \ell \leq n}} |a_{m-k,n-\ell}| < \frac{\varepsilon}{M};$$

and

$$\sup_{\substack{M_1+1 \leq k \leq m \\ 0 \leq \ell \leq N_1}} |a_{m-k,n-\ell}| < \frac{\varepsilon}{M}.$$

Thus, for $m > M_2, n > N_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} |c_{m,n}| &= \left| \sum_{k,\ell=0}^{m,n} a_{m-k,n-\ell} b_{k,\ell} \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{\substack{0 \leq k \leq M_1 \\ 0 \leq \ell \leq N_1}} a_{m-k,n-\ell} b_{k,\ell} + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq k \leq M_1 \\ \ell > N_1}} a_{m-k,n-\ell} b_{k,\ell} + \sum_{\substack{k > M_1 \\ 0 \leq \ell \leq N_1}} a_{m-k,n-\ell} b_{k,\ell} + \sum_{\substack{k > M_1 \\ \ell > N_1}} a_{m-k,n-\ell} b_{k,\ell} \right| \\ &\leq \max \left[\sup_{\substack{0 \leq k \leq M_1 \\ 0 \leq \ell \leq N_1}} |a_{m-k,n-\ell}| |b_{k,\ell}|, \sup_{\substack{0 \leq k \leq M_1 \\ \ell > N_1}} |a_{m-k,n-\ell}| |b_{k,\ell}|, \sup_{\substack{k > M_1 \\ 0 \leq \ell \leq N_1}} |a_{m-k,n-\ell}| |b_{k,\ell}|, \sup_{\substack{k > M_1 \\ \ell > N_1}} |a_{m-k,n-\ell}| |b_{k,\ell}| \right] \\ &\leq \max \left[\frac{\varepsilon}{M} M, \frac{\varepsilon}{M} M, \frac{\varepsilon}{M} M, \frac{\varepsilon}{M} M \right] \\ &= \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

In other words,

Research Article

$$\lim_{m+n \rightarrow \infty} c_{m,n} = 0,$$

completing the proof of the theorem. $\square$

We now have the following results on the Cauchy multiplication of $(M, \lambda_{m,n})$ -summable double sequences and double series.

Theorem 3.3: If $\lim_{m+n \rightarrow \infty} a_{m,n} = 0$ and $\{b_{m,n}\}$ is $(M, \lambda_{m,n})$ -summable to B, then $\{c_{m,n}\}$ is $(M, \lambda_{m,n})$ -summable to AB, where,

$$c_{m,n} = \sum_{k,\ell=0}^{m,n} a_{m-k,n-\ell} b_{k,\ell}, \quad m, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

and

$$\sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty, \infty} a_{m,n} = A.$$

Proof: We first note that $\lim_{m+n \rightarrow \infty} a_{m,n} = 0$ implies that $\sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty, \infty} a_{m,n}$ converges in view of Theorem 1.2. Let $\{t_{m,n}\}$,

$\{\tau_{m,n}\}$ be the $(M, \lambda_{m,n})$ -transforms of $\{b_{m,n}\}$, $\{c_{m,n}\}$ respectively,

$$\text{i.e., } t_{m,n} = \sum_{k,\ell=0}^{m,n} \lambda_{m-k,n-\ell} b_{k,\ell},$$

$$\tau_{m,n} = \sum_{k,\ell=0}^{m,n} \lambda_{m-k,n-\ell} c_{k,\ell}, \quad m, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

We can work out to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{m,n} &= \sum_{k,\ell=0}^{m,n} a_{m-k,n-\ell} (t_{k,\ell} - B) \\ &\quad + B \left(\sum_{k,\ell=0}^{m,n} a_{k,\ell} \right), \quad m, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

where, $\lim_{k+\ell \rightarrow \infty} t_{k,\ell} = B$, by hypothesis. Since $\lim_{m+n \rightarrow \infty} a_{m,n} = 0$ and $\lim_{m+n \rightarrow \infty} (t_{m,n} - B) = 0$, using Theorem 3.2, we see that

$$\lim_{m+n \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sum_{k,\ell=0}^{m,n} a_{m-k,n-\ell} (t_{k,\ell} - B) \right] = 0,$$

so that, taking limit as $m+n \rightarrow \infty$ in (3.2), we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{m+n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{m,n} &= B \left(\sum_{k,\ell=0}^{\infty, \infty} a_{k,\ell} \right) \\ &= AB, \end{aligned}$$

i.e., $\{c_{m,n}\}$ is $(M, \lambda_{m,n})$ -summable to AB, completing the proof of the theorem. $\square$

It is now easy to prove the following result on similar lines.

Theorem 3.4: If $\lim_{m+n \rightarrow \infty} a_{m,n} = 0$, $\sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty, \infty} b_{m,n}$ is $(M, \lambda_{m,n})$ -summable to B, then $\sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty, \infty} c_{m,n}$ is $(M, \lambda_{m,n})$ -summable to AB, where,

$$c_{m,n} = \sum_{k,\ell=0}^{m,n} a_{m-k,n-\ell} b_{k,\ell}, \quad m, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

and

Research Article

$$\sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty,\infty} a_{m,n} = A.$$

As in the case of the (M, λ_n) method for simple sequences (Natarajan, 2012), using Theorem 3.2 again, we can prove

Theorem 3.5: If $\sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty,\infty} a_{m,n}$ is $(M, \lambda_{m,n})$ -summable to A, $\sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty,\infty} b_{m,n}$ is $(M, \mu_{m,n})$ -summable to B, then $\sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty,\infty} c_{m,n}$ is $(M, \gamma_{m,n})$ -summable to AB, where,

$$c_{m,n} = \sum_{k,\ell=0}^{m,n} a_{m-k,n-\ell} b_{k,\ell},$$

$$\gamma_{m,n} = \sum_{k,\ell=0}^{m,n} \lambda_{m-k,n-\ell} \mu_{k,\ell}, \quad m, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

Again as in the case of the Natarajan method (M, λ_n) for simple sequences (Natarajan, 2013), we can prove the following result, using Theorem 3.2.

Theorem 3.6: Let $(M, \lambda_{m,n})$, $(M, \mu_{m,n})$ be regular methods. Then, $(M, \lambda_{m,n}) (M, \mu_{m,n})$ is also regular, where, we define, for $x = \{x_{m,n}\}$,

$$((M, \lambda_{m,n}) (M, \mu_{m,n}))(x) = (M, \lambda_{m,n}) ((M, \mu_{m,n}))(x).$$

We can prove the following results too.

Theorem 3.7: For given regular methods $(M, \lambda_{m,n})$, $(M, \mu_{m,n})$ and $(M, t_{m,n})$, let $|\lambda_{m,n}| < |\lambda_{0,0}|$, $|t_{m,n}| < |t_{0,0}|$, $(m, n) \neq (0, 0)$, $m, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Then

$$(M, \lambda_{m,n}) \subseteq (M, \mu_{m,n})$$

if and only if

$$(M, t_{m,n}) (M, \lambda_{m,n}) \subseteq (M, t_{m,n}) (M, \mu_{m,n}).$$

In view of Theorem 3.6 of Natarajan (2014), we can reformulate Theorem 3.7 as follows:

Theorem 3.8: Given the regular methods $(M, \lambda_{m,n})$, $(M, \mu_{m,n})$ and $(M, t_{m,n})$, $|\lambda_{m,n}| < |\lambda_{0,0}|$, $|t_{m,n}| < |t_{0,0}|$, $(m, n) \neq (0, 0)$, $m, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, the following statements are equivalent:

$$(i) (M, \lambda_{m,n}) \subseteq (M, \mu_{m,n});$$

$$(ii) (M, t_{m,n}) (M, \lambda_{m,n}) \subseteq (M, t_{m,n}) (M, \mu_{m,n});$$

and

$$(iii) \lim_{m+n \rightarrow \infty} k_{m,n} = 0 \text{ and } \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty,\infty} k_{m,n} = 1,$$

where,

$$\frac{\mu(x)}{\lambda(x)} = k(x) = \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty,\infty} k_{m,n} x^m y^n,$$

$$\lambda(x) = \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty,\infty} \lambda_{m,n} x^m y^n;$$

and

$$\mu(x) = \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty,\infty} \mu_{m,n} x^m y^n.$$

REFERENCES

Natarajan PN (1978). Multiplication of series with terms in a non-archimedean field. *Simon Stevin* **52** 157-160.

Research Article

Natarajan PN and Srinivasan V (2002). Silverman-Toeplitz theorem for double sequences and series and its application to Nörlund means in non-archimedean fields. *Annales Mathématiques Blaise Pascal* **9** 85-100.

Natarajan PN and Sakthivel S (2008). Multiplication of double series and convolution of double infinite matrices in non-archimedean fields. *Indian Journal of Mathematics* **50** 115-123.

Natarajan PN (2012). Some properties of the (M, λ_n) method of summability in ultrametric fields. *International Journal of Physics and Mathematical Sciences* **2** 169-176.

Natarajan PN (2013). Cauchy multiplication of (M, λ_n) summable series in ultrametric fields. *International Journal of Physics and Mathematical Sciences* **3** 51-55.

Natarajan PN (2013). On the Natarajan method of summability in ultrametric fields. 5th Dr. George Bachman Memorial Conference Proceedings. *Indian Journal of Mathematics* **55**(Supplement) 125-132.

Natarajan PN (2014). Natarajan summability method for double sequences and double series in ultrametric fields. *Advancement and Development in Mathematical Sciences* **6** 9-17.