# SUMMABILITY OF THE HEINE AND NEUMANN SERIES OF LEGENDRE POLYNOMIALS 

AMNON JAKIMOVSKI

With a holomorphic function $f(z)$ defined in a domain $H$ which includes the closed interval $[-1,1]$ we associate the Neumann series

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{n} P_{n}(z), \quad a_{n}=\frac{2 n+1}{2 \pi i} \oint_{\gamma} f(t) Q_{n}(t) d t \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $P_{n}(z), Q_{n}(t)$ are, respectively, the $n$th Legendre polynomials of the first and second kind and $\gamma$ is a closed and rectifiable Jordan curve which includes $[-1,1]$ in its interior and is included, together with its interior, in $H$.

It is known that the Neumann series (1) is convergent in the largest ellipse with foci $\pm 1$ which does not include in its interior singular points of $f(z)$ (3, p. 322, §15.41). It is also known that the Heine series

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(2 n+1) P_{n}(z) Q_{n}(t) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

is convergent to $(t-z)^{-1}$ for a fixed complex number $t$, not in $[-1,1]$, for all $z$ in the ellipse with foci $\pm 1$ and passing through $t(3$, p. 321, §15.4).

In this paper we obtain some results on the domain in which the series (1) and (2) are summable by linear transformations. We use the notations, definitions, and conventions of (1).

Theorem 1. Let $t$ be a complex number not in the closed interval $[-1,1]$. Suppose that $A$, the infinite matrix $\left\|a_{n m}\right\|(n, m=0,1,2, \ldots)$, is efficient ( 1 , Definition 2.1 ) in a certain domain $D$ satisfying Conditions (i), (ii), and (iii) of (1, Definition 1.1) and that $D(t)$ is defined as the union of all convex domains that contain the disk $\left\{z:|z|<\left|t-\left(t^{2}-1\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right|^{2}\right\}$ and are included in $D$. Denote

$$
D_{t}^{*}=\bigcap_{0 \leqslant u<\infty} \tau(t, u) D(t)
$$

and define

$$
D_{t} \equiv\left\{\frac{1}{2}\left(w+w^{-1}\right): w \in D_{t}^{*}-\{z:|z|<1\}\right\}
$$

Then the series (2) is $A$-summable to $(t-z)^{-1}$, that is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_{n m} \sum_{r=0}^{i n}(2 r+1) P_{r}(z) Q_{r}(t)=(t-z)^{-1} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $z \in D_{l}$. For each closed and bounded set $H \subset D_{t}$, the series (2) is uniformly $A$-summable to $(t-z)^{-1}$ in $z \in H$.
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If $D$ satisfied, in addition to the assumptions of Theorem 1 , Condition (iv) of (1, Definition 1.1), then for each $t$ not in $[-1,1]$ we have $D(t)=D$. Thus ( $\mathbf{1}$, Theorem 1.1) is a special case of Theorem 1. R. E. Powell's Theorem 4.3 of the preceding paper (2) is also included in Theorem 1.

Theorem 2. Let $f(z)$ be a holomorphic function in some domain that includes the closed interval $[-1,1]$. Suppose that $A$, the infinite matrix $\left\|a_{n m}\right\|(n, m=0,1$, $2, \ldots$. ), is efficient in a certain domain $D$ satisfying conditions (i), (ii), and (iii) of (1, Definition 1.1). Denote by $\Delta \equiv \Delta(f(z))$ the domain

$$
\Delta \equiv \bigcap_{t \in M^{c}} D_{t}
$$

If $H$ is a closed and bounded set included in $\Delta$, then the series (1) is uniformly $A$-summable in $z \in H$ tof(z); that is

$$
f(z)=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_{n m} \sum_{k=0}^{m} a_{k} P_{k}(z) \quad \text { uniformly in } z \in H
$$

It is evident that ( $\mathbf{1}$, Theorem 2.1) is a special case of Theorem 2.
Proof of Theorem 1. If $H \subset D_{t}$ is a closed and bounded set, then by (1, Lemma 6.2) the set

$$
G(H, t) \equiv\{\mu(z, \phi) / \tau(t, u): z \in H, 0 \leqslant \phi \leqslant \pi, 0 \leqslant u \leqslant \infty\}
$$

is also closed and bounded. The assumption $z \in D_{t}$ implies that

$$
z+\left(z^{2}-1\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \in D_{t}
$$

that is

$$
z+\left(z^{2}-1\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \in \bigcap_{0 \leqslant u<\infty} \tau(t, u) D(t)
$$

or $\left(z+\left(z^{2}-1\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) / \tau(t, u) \in D(t)$ for $u \geqslant 0$. We show now that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu(z, \phi) / \tau(t, u) \in D(t) \quad \text { for } 0 \leqslant \phi \leqslant \pi \text { and } 0 \leqslant u<\infty . \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

For a given $u \geqslant 0$ we divide the proof of (4) into three cases:
(i) If $\left|\left(z+\left(z^{2}-1\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) / \tau(t, u)\right|<1$, then $\left|z+\left(z^{2}-1\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right|>1$ and $\left|z-\left(z^{2}-1\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right|<1$ imply that

$$
|\mu(z, \phi) / \tau(t, u)| \leqslant\left|\left(z+\left(z^{2}-1\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) / \tau(t, u)\right|<1 .
$$

Hence by assumption (ii) of Definition 1.1 and the fact that $D(t)$ includes the unit disk $\{z:|z|<1\}$, we have (4) for $0 \leqslant \phi \leqslant \pi$ in this case.
(ii) Suppose that $\left|\left(z+\left(z^{2}-1\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) / \tau(t, u)\right|=1$. From $\left|z-\left(z^{2}-1\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right|<1$ and

$$
|\tau(t, u)| \geqslant|\tau(t, 0)| \equiv\left|t+\left(t^{2}-1\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right|>1
$$

we have $\left|\left(z-\left(z^{2}-1\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) / \tau(t, u)\right|<1$. Now since $D(t)$ includes the unit disk, we obtain the same result.
(iii) If $\left|\left(z+\left(z^{2}-1\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) / \tau(t, u)\right|>1$, then from $\left(z+\left(z^{2}-1\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) / \tau(t, u) \in D(t)$ and the definition of $D(t)$, there is a convex domain that includes

$$
\left(z+\left(z^{2}-1\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) / \tau(t, u)
$$

and the disk $\left\{w:|w|<\left|t-\left(t^{2}-1\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right|^{2}\right\}$ and is included in $D$. Now

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\left(z-\left(z^{2}-1\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) / \tau(t, u)\right|=\left|\tau(t, u)\left(z-\left(z^{2}-1\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)\right| /\left|\tau(t, u)^{2}\right| & <|\tau(t, 0)|^{-2} \\
& =\left|t-\left(t^{2}-1\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right|^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus this convex domain includes the segment with end points

$$
\left(z+\left(z^{2}-1\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) / \tau(t, u)
$$

and $\left(z-\left(z^{2}-1\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) / \tau(t, u)$. This proves again (4). Thus we proved that $G(H, t) \subset D(t) \subset D$. Now by (1, Lemma 7.2), (3) is valid uniformly in $z \in H$.

Proof of Theorem 2. The proof is the same as the proof of Theorem 2.1 in (1), but for the following three obvious changes: we now use the argument of the proof of Theorem 1 instead of the argument of the proof of ( 1 , Theorem 1.1); $D$ is replaced by $D(t)$ up to (8.3) in (1) and (1, (8.3)) is replaced by

$$
F \subset \Delta^{*}=\bigcap_{t \in M^{c}} D_{t^{*}}^{*}=\bigcap_{t \in M^{c}} \bigcap_{0 \leqslant u<\infty} \tau(t, u) D(t) \subset \bigcap_{t \in M^{c}} \bigcap_{0 \leqslant u<\infty} \tau(t, u) D=\bigcap_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^{c}} t D
$$
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