## ON THE NOTION OF REGULARITY OF METHODS OF SUMMATION OF INFINITE SERIES

BY J. D. TAMARKIN*

Let $\mathfrak{Q}=\left(a_{m n}\right)$ be the matrix of a method of summation which consists in replacing a given sequence $x=\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \cdots\right)$ by its transform

$$
\begin{equation*}
y=\left(y_{1}, y_{2}, \cdots\right), \quad y_{m}=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_{m n} x_{n}, \quad(m=1,2, \cdots) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and defining the generalized limit of $x_{n}$ as $\lim _{m \rightarrow \infty} y_{m}$, provided this limit exists.

The method $\mathfrak{H}$ is called regular if every convergent sequence $x=\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ is transformed into a convergent sequence $y=\left\{y_{m}\right\}$ with the same limit. Necessary and sufficient conditions for regularity of $\mathfrak{A}$ are too well known to be restated here. An essential point in the whole theory is the assumption that the sequence $y \equiv y(x)$ is determined by formula (1) for each convergent sequence $x$. A (quite trivial) gain in generality may be achieved by demanding that not all the terms $y_{m}$ of the sequence $\left\{y_{m}\right\}$ have to be considered but only those for which $m \geqq m_{0}$, where $m_{0}$ is a fixed integer. Even this requirement is not at all necessary, however, for the possibility of evaluating $\lim _{m \rightarrow \infty} y_{m}$, for which we have to know only almost all terms of the sequence $\left\{y_{m}\right\}$, that is all $y_{m}, m \geqq m^{\prime}$, where $m^{\prime}$ need not be fixed, but on the contrary, may depend on the sequence $x$.

Thus we are naturally led to the following apparently less restrictive definition of regularity of the method of summation $\mathfrak{2}$.

The method of summation $\mathfrak{A}$ is regular if (i) to every convergent sequence $x=\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ there corresponds an integer $m^{\prime}(x)$ such that $y_{m}$ as given by (1) exists for $m \geqq m^{\prime}(x)$, and (ii) for a fixed $x$,

$$
\lim _{m \rightarrow \infty} y_{m}=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} x_{n} .
$$

It turns out, however, that the modified definition of regularity
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[^0]:    * The result of this note answers a question raised by Dr. H. Lewy.

