## CORE-CONSISTENCY AND TOTAL INCLUSION FOR METHODS OF SUMMABILITY

G. G. LORENTZ and A. ROBINSON

1. Introduction. We shall consider methods of summation $A, B$, . . defined by matrices of real elements $\left(a_{m n}\right),\left(b_{m n}\right),(m, n=1,2, \ldots)$ which are regular, that is, have the three well-known properties of Toeplitz (4, p. 43). A method $A$ is said to be core-consistent with the method $B$ for bounded sequences if the $A$-core ( $3, \mathrm{p} .137$; and $4, \mathrm{p} .55$ ) of each real bounded sequence is contained in its $B$-core. $B$ is totally included in $A, B \ll A$, if each real sequence which is $B$-summable to a definite limit (this limit may be finite or infinite of a definite sign) is also $A$-summable to the same limit. It will be shown in the present paper that if the matrix $A$ is core-consistent with the positive matrix $B$, then $A$ is "almost" divisible by $B$ on the right. This statement is made precise in Theorem 1 below. The proof ( $\$ 2$ ) involves some elementary properties of convex sets in Banach spaces. In $\S 3$, the same method is used to prove a similar result for the relation $B \ll A$ (Theorem 2). Some simple corollaries are given in §4.

Let $l_{1}$ be the Banach space of elements $\mathbf{x}=\left(x_{n}\right)$, with norm

$$
\|\mathbf{x}\|=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left|x_{n}\right|,
$$

so that the rows of the matrices $A, B$ are elements $\mathbf{a}_{m}, \mathbf{b}_{m}$ of $l_{1}$. Elements $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in l_{1}$ are called disjoint if $x_{n} y_{n}=0(n=1,2, \ldots)$; an element $\mathbf{x} \in l_{1}$ is positive, $\mathbf{x} \geqslant 0$, if $x_{n} \geqslant 0(n=1,2, \ldots)$. If $\mathbf{x}=\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{n}, \ldots\right) \in l_{1}$, we shall write

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{x}^{q}=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{q}, 0,0, \ldots\right), \quad \mathbf{x}_{p}=\left(0, \ldots, 0, x_{p}, x_{p+1}, \ldots\right), \\
& \mathbf{x}_{p}^{q}=\left(0, \ldots, 0, x_{p}, \ldots, x_{q}, 0, \ldots\right),
\end{aligned} \quad p \leqslant q .
$$

We also use the same notation for sets $E \subset l_{1}$, for instance $E_{p}{ }^{q}$ is the set of all $\mathbf{x}_{p}{ }^{q}$ with $\mathbf{x} \in E$. A cone $\mathrm{K} \subset l_{1}$ is a set such that

$$
\sum_{1}^{n} c_{k} \mathbf{x}_{k} \in K
$$

whenever $c_{k} \geqslant 0, \mathbf{x}_{k} \in K$. For instance, the set of all positive elements is a cone in $l_{1}$.

We shall prove the following theorems:
Theorem 1. Let $A, B$ be regular matrices and let $A$ be core-consistent with $B$. If $B$ is positive, that is if $\mathbf{b}_{m} \geqslant 0(m=1,2, \ldots)$, there is a positive regular matrix $C$ such that the norm of the mth row of $C B-A$ tends to zero for $m \rightarrow \infty$.

[^0]The case where the elements of the sequences, or of the matrices, are complex is not essentially different as will be shown in §2.

If $A=\left(a_{m n}\right)$, we shall write $A_{p}$ for the matrix obtained from $A$ by replacing all $a_{m n}$ with $n<p$ by zeros.

Theorem 2. If $A, B$ are regular row-finite matrices, $B$ positive and

$$
\begin{equation*}
B \ll A, \tag{i}
\end{equation*}
$$

there is an integer $p$ and a regular positive row-finite matrix $C$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
C B_{p}=A_{p} ; \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

this remains true if (i) is replaced by the (formally weaker) hypothesis that
(ii) $\tau_{n} \rightarrow+\infty$ always implies $\left|\sigma_{n}\right| \rightarrow+\infty$, where $\sigma_{n}$ and $\tau_{n}$ are the $A$ - and the $B$ - transforms of a sequence $s_{n}$, respectively.

If $B$ is the unit matrix $I$, these results were known before; for the case of Theorem 1 see Agnew (1), also (3, p. 149); for Theorem 2, Hurwitz (5) or (4, p. 53).
2. Core-consistency. If Theorem 1 is true for a given pair of matrices $A, B$, it is also true for any two matrices $A^{\prime}, B^{\prime}$ with rows $\mathbf{a}^{\prime}{ }_{m}, \mathbf{b}^{\prime}{ }_{m}$ satisfying

$$
\left\|\mathbf{a}_{m}-\mathbf{a}_{m}^{\prime}\right\| \rightarrow 0,\left\|\mathbf{b}_{m}-\mathbf{b}_{m}^{\prime}\right\| \rightarrow 0
$$

This and the regularity of $A, B$ imply that we may assume $A, B$ to be rowfinite, and such that there is a sequence $n(m)$ increasing to $+\infty$ with $a_{m n}=b_{m n}$ $=0$ for $n<n(m)$.

Lemma. In the above conditions there exist two sequences $p=p(m)<q(m)$ such that $p(m) \rightarrow \infty$ for $m \rightarrow \infty$ and that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho\left(\mathbf{a}_{m}, K\right)=\rho\left(\mathbf{a}_{m}, K_{p}{ }^{q}\right) ; \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

here $\rho\left(\mathbf{a}_{m}, K\right)$ is the distance from $\mathbf{a}_{m}$ to the cone $K$ generated by the $\mathbf{b}_{\lambda}(\lambda=$ 1, 2, . . .).

Proof. For a given $m$, let $m_{1} \leqslant m_{2}$ be such that $\mathbf{b}_{\mu}$ is disjoint with $\mathbf{a}_{m}$ if $\mu$ does not satisfy $m_{1} \leqslant \mu \leqslant m_{2}$; we may assume that $m_{1} \rightarrow \infty$ for $m \rightarrow \infty$. Let $K^{\prime}$ be the cone generated by the $\mathbf{b}_{\mu}, m_{1} \leqslant \mu \leqslant m_{2}$, let $p(m)=n\left(m_{1}\right)$ and let $q$ be so large that $b_{\mu n}=0, m_{1} \leqslant \mu \leqslant m_{2}, a_{m n}=0$ for $n>q$. Then $\mathbf{a}_{m p}{ }^{q}=\mathbf{a}_{m}, K^{\prime}{ }_{p}{ }^{q}=K^{\prime}$, and therefore

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho\left(\mathbf{a}_{m}, K\right) \leqslant \rho\left(\mathbf{a}_{m}, K^{\prime}\right)=\rho\left(\mathbf{a}_{m}, K_{p}^{\prime}{ }^{\ell}\right) . \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

On the other hand, let $\mathbf{x} \in K$, then $\mathbf{x}$ is a linear combination, with positive coefficients, of some of the $\mathbf{b}_{\lambda}$. If we omit from it all those $\mathbf{b}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ which are not $\mathbf{b}_{\mu}$, we shall obtain another element $\mathbf{x}^{\prime} \in K^{\prime}$. The omitted $\mathbf{b}_{\lambda}$ are disjoint with $\mathbf{a}_{m}$ and all $b_{\lambda n}$ satisfy $b_{\lambda n} \geqslant 0$. This implies

$$
\left\|\mathbf{a}_{m}-\mathbf{x}_{p}{ }^{q}\right\| \geqslant\left\|\mathbf{a}_{m}-\mathbf{x}_{p}^{\prime}{ }^{q}\right\| .
$$

Since $K_{p}^{\prime}{ }^{q} \subset K_{p}{ }^{q}$, it follows that $\rho\left(\mathbf{a}_{m}, K_{p}{ }^{q}\right)=\rho\left(\mathbf{a}_{m}, K_{p}^{\prime}{ }^{q}\right)$ and using (3) we obtain $\rho\left(\mathbf{a}_{m}, K\right) \leqslant \rho\left(\mathbf{a}_{m}, K_{p}{ }^{q}\right)$. The inverse inequality is obvious, and (2) follows.

Proof of Theorem 1. We shall show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho\left(\mathbf{a}_{m}, K\right) \rightarrow 0 \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

If this is not true, there exists by the Lemma an $\epsilon>0$, a sequence of disjoint $\mathbf{a}_{m_{i}}$ and a sequence of disjoint intervals $\left[p_{i}, q_{i}\right]$ with

$$
\rho\left(\mathbf{a}_{m_{i}}, K_{p_{i}}{ }^{q_{i}}\right)>\epsilon .
$$

If

$$
\mathbf{y}=\sum c_{i} \mathbf{a}_{m_{i}}
$$

is a linear combination of the $\mathbf{a}_{m_{i}}$ with $c_{i}>0, \sum c_{i}=1$ and if $\mathbf{x} \in K$, we can put

$$
\mathbf{z}_{i}=c_{i}{ }^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{p_{i}}{ }^{q_{i}} \in K_{p_{i}}{ }^{q_{i}}
$$

and have

$$
\|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}\|=\left\|\sum c_{i} \mathbf{a}_{m_{i}}-\sum c_{i} \mathbf{z}_{i}\right\|=\sum c_{i}\left\|\mathbf{a}_{m_{i}}-\mathbf{z}_{i}\right\|>\epsilon .
$$

This shows that the convex set $E$ generated by the $\mathbf{a}_{m i}$ is at a distance $\geqslant \epsilon$ from $E$, hence the $\epsilon$-neighbourhood $E_{\epsilon}$ of $E$ is disjoint with $K$. If $K_{\epsilon}$ is the cone generated by $E_{\epsilon}, K$ and $K_{\epsilon}$ are disjoint except for the origin. By a wellknown theorem (7, Theorem 1.2), there is in $l_{1}$ a bounded linear functional $f(\mathbf{x})$ of norm one which is positive on $K$ and negative on $K_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$. Hence $f(\mathbf{y}) \leqslant-\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ on $E$ ( 7 , Lemma 1.2). This means that there is a bounded sequence $s_{\nu}$ with

$$
\begin{array}{cr}
\sum b_{m \nu} s_{\nu} \geqslant 0 & (m=1,2, \ldots) \\
\sum a_{m_{i}, \nu} s_{\nu} \leqslant-\epsilon & (i=1,2, \ldots),
\end{array}
$$

and contradicts the hypothesis of Theorem 1.
From (4) it follows that for some row-finite positive matrix $C=\left(c_{m n}\right)$,

$$
\left\|\mathbf{a}_{m}-\sum_{n} c_{m n} \mathbf{b}_{\boldsymbol{n}}\right\| \rightarrow 0, \quad \quad m \rightarrow \infty
$$

Finally, this $C$ will be necessarily regular, provided we agree to take $c_{m n}=0$ whenever $\mathbf{b}_{n}=0$. For

$$
c_{m n} b_{n \nu} \leqslant \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_{m n} b_{n \nu}=a_{m \nu}+o(1)=o(1), \quad \quad m \rightarrow \infty
$$

implies that $c_{m n} \rightarrow 0$ for $m \rightarrow \infty$ and each $n$. On the other hand,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} a_{m \nu} & =\sum_{\nu} \sum_{n} c_{m n} b_{n \nu}+o(1) \\
& =\sum_{n} c_{m n} \sum_{\nu} b_{n \nu}+o(1)
\end{aligned}
$$

together with

$$
\sum_{\nu} a_{m \nu}=1+o(1), \sum_{\nu} b_{n \nu}=1+o(1)
$$

imply that $\sum_{n} c_{m n} \rightarrow 1$ for $m \rightarrow \infty$. This completes the proof.
The concept of the core is defined also for sequences of complex numbers (3, p. 137). Accordingly, we may introduce the concept of core-consistency
as well for matrices and sequences with complex elements. With this new definition, Theorem 1 holds literally as before.

For the proof assume that $A$ is a regular matrix with complex elements, $B$ is positive and that $A$ is core-consistent with $B$ for bounded sequences. Hence, by Knopp's core theorem (6, p. 115) or (4, p. 55), the core of the $B$ transform of any bounded sequence $s_{n}$ is included in the core of $s_{n}$. But $A$ is core-consistent with $B$, and so the core of the $A$-transform of $s_{n}$ also is included in the core of $s_{n}$. This implies ( $3, \mathrm{p} .149$ ) that $A=A^{\prime}+V$ where $A$ is a positive regular matrix, and the norm of the $m$ th row of the matrix $V$ tends to zero as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Clearly, $A^{\prime}$ also is core-consistent with $B$, for complex or more particularly, for real sequences. It then follows from the original Theorem 1 that there exists a positive regular matrix $C$ such that the norm of the $m$ th row of $C B-A^{\prime}$ tends to zero from $m \rightarrow \infty$. Consequently, the norm of the $m$ th row of

$$
C B-A=C B-A^{\prime}-V
$$

also tends to zero for $m \rightarrow \infty$. This proves our assertion.
The converse of this (as well as the converse of Theorem 1) is a direct consequence of Knopp's core theorem. Thus, let $A, B, C$, be three regular matrices, $C$ positive, such that the norm of the $m$ th row of $C B-A$ tends to zero for $m \rightarrow \infty$. Then the core of the transform of any bounded complex sequence $s_{n}$ by $C B$ coincides with the core of the transform of $s_{n}$ by $A$. The transform of $s_{n}$ by $C B$ is the transform by $C$ of the transform of $s_{n}$ by $B$. Hence the core of the transform of $s_{n}$ by $C B$ is included in the core of the transform of $s_{n}$ by $B$, by virtue of Knopp's core theorem. In other words, $C B$, and hence $A$, are coreconsistent with $B$ for bounded sequences.
3. Total inclusion. We shall now prove Theorem 2, deducing (1) from the hypothesis (ii). Let $\rho_{m p}=\rho\left(\mathbf{a}_{m p}, K_{p}\right)$; we first show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho_{m p}=0 \text { for all } p \text { sufficiently large and } m=1,2, \ldots \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let (5) be false. Since the $\rho_{m p}$ decrease for $m$ fixed and increasing $p$ and finally become zero, we deduce that for each $p, \rho_{m p}>0$ for an infinity of $m$. Now $\rho_{m p}>0$ implies the existence of $\delta>0, \epsilon>0$ such that the sphere $S$ in $l_{1}$ with center $\mathbf{a}_{m p}$ and radius $\delta$ does not have common points with the cone $K^{\prime}$ generated by the points $\mathbf{b}_{\lambda p}(\lambda=1,2, \ldots)$, and by the spheres with radii $\epsilon$ around those of the $\mathbf{b}_{\mu \nu}(\mu=1,2, \ldots, m)$ which are not zero. Hence, there is a functional

$$
f(\mathbf{x})=\sum x_{n} s_{n},\|f\|=1 \text { in } l_{1}
$$

generated by a bounded sequence $s_{n}$ with $s_{n}=0$ for $n<p$, such that the hyperplane $f(\mathbf{x})=0$ separates $S$ and $K^{\prime}$ and supports $S$ (by Eidelheit's theorem, (7, Theorem 1.6)). If $f(\mathbf{x}) \geqslant 0$ on $K^{\prime}$, we have

$$
\tau_{\mu}=f\left(\mathbf{b}_{\mu p}\right) \geqslant \epsilon \quad \text { for } \mathbf{b}_{\mu p} \neq 0 \quad(\mu=1,2, \ldots, m)
$$

(7, Lemma 1.2) and

$$
0>\sigma_{m}=f\left(\mathbf{a}_{m p}\right) \geqslant-\| f| | \delta=-\delta .
$$

By fixing $\epsilon>0$, taking $\delta>0$ sufficiently small, and then multiplying the $s_{n}$ with a sufficiently large positive number, we obtain the following statement:
$\left(^{*}\right)$ For each $m, p$ with $\rho_{m p}>0$ and for any two positive numbers $M, \eta$, there is a bounded sequence $s_{n}$ with $s_{n}=0$ for $n<p$ such that

$$
\begin{gathered}
\sigma_{m}=\sum_{n} a_{m n} s_{n}=-\eta, \quad \tau_{\lambda}=\sum_{n} b_{\lambda n} s_{n} \geqslant 0 \quad(\lambda=1,2, \ldots) \\
\tau_{\mu}>M \text { if } 1 \leqslant \mu \leqslant m \text { and } \mathbf{b}_{\mu p} \neq 0
\end{gathered}
$$

We now define inductively increasing sequences of integers $p_{1}, p_{2}, \ldots, m_{1}$, $m_{2}, \ldots$ and bounded sequences $\mathbf{s}^{(i)}$ satisfying $s_{n}{ }^{(i)}=0$ for $n<p_{i}$. If

$$
p_{1}, \ldots, p_{i-i} ; m_{1}, \ldots, m_{i-i} ; \mathbf{s}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathbf{s}^{(i-1)}
$$

are already defined, take $p_{i}$ so large that $a_{\mu n}=0$ for $n \geqslant p_{i}, \mu=m_{1}, \ldots, m_{i-1}$, then find an $m_{i}>m_{i-1}$ with

$$
\left|\sum a_{m_{i}, n}\left(s_{n}^{(1)}+\ldots+s_{n}^{(i-1)}\right)\right|<\frac{1}{2}, \rho\left(\mathbf{a}_{m_{i} p_{i}}, K_{p_{i}}\right)>0 .
$$

By $\left({ }^{*}\right)$, there is a bounded sequence $\mathbf{s}^{(i)}$ with $s_{n}{ }^{(i)}=0$ for $n<p_{i}$ such that

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_{m_{i}, n}\left(s_{n}{ }^{(1)}+\ldots+s_{n}{ }^{(i)}\right)=-1, & \\
\sum_{n} b_{\lambda n} s_{n}{ }^{(i)} \geqslant 0 & (\lambda=1,2, \ldots) \\
\sum_{n} b_{\mu n} s_{n}{ }^{(i)}>i \text { if } b_{\mu p_{i}} \neq 0 & (\mu=1, \ldots, m) \tag{8}
\end{array}
$$

Let $\mathbf{s}=\left(s_{n}\right)$ be the sequence defined by $s_{n}=\sum_{i} s_{n}{ }^{(i)}$; for each $n$ this sum has only a finite number of terms. Since $\mathbf{a}_{m_{i}}$ and $\mathbf{s}^{(j)}$ are disjoint for $j>i$, we have by (6), $\sigma_{m_{i}}=-1$, and by (7) and (8), $\tau_{\lambda} \rightarrow \infty$, which contradicts the hypothesis and proves (5).

Fixing a $p$ for which (5) holds, we consider an arbitrary $m$. For each $\epsilon>0$ there is an $\mathbf{x}$ in $K$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\mathbf{a}_{m p}-\mathbf{x}_{p}\right\|<\epsilon, \quad \mathbf{x}=\sum c_{\mu} \mathbf{b}_{\mu}, c_{\mu} \geqslant 0 \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $q$ be the last index $n$ with $a_{m n} \neq 0$. If we omit from the last sum all $\mathbf{b}_{\mu}$ for which

$$
\sum_{n>q} b_{\mu n}>\sum_{n \leqslant q} b_{\mu n}
$$

we shall obtain an element $\mathbf{x}^{\prime} \in K$ with

$$
\left\|\mathbf{a}_{m p}-\mathbf{x}_{p}^{\prime}\right\| \leqslant\left\|\mathbf{a}_{m p}-\mathbf{x}_{p}\right\|
$$

It follows that $\mu$ in (9) may be assumed bounded for all $\epsilon$. Then we must have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{a}_{m p}=\sum_{n=1}^{N} c_{m n} \mathbf{b}_{n p}, \quad c_{m n} \geqslant 0 \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

This proves the theorem, for the argument used in the proof of Theorem 1 shows that $C=\left(c_{m n}\right)$ is regular, provided in (10) we take $c_{m n}=0$ whenever $\mathbf{b}_{n p}=0$.

We give some corollaries to Theorem 2, assuming that the matrices $A, B$ are regular and row-finite and that $B$ is positive. We compare the following relations (for the definition of the core of a possibly unbounded sequence see (4, p. 55) ) :
(i) $B \ll A$.
(ii) For each sequence $s_{n}, \tau_{n} \rightarrow+\infty$ implies that $\left|\sigma_{n}\right| \rightarrow+\infty$.
(iii) $A_{p}=C B_{p}$ for some $p$ with $C \geqslant 0$.
(iv) $A$ is core-consistent with $B$ for all real sequences.
(v) $A$ is core-consistent with $B$ for all complex sequences.

Then we have:
Theorem 3. Conditions (i)-(v) are equivalent.
Proof. Clearly, (i) $\rightarrow$ (ii). Theorem 2 shows that (ii) implies (iii) and it is easy to see that (iii) $\rightarrow$ (i). From the definitions of the properties concerned we have (v) $\rightarrow$ (iv) $\rightarrow$ (ii). Finally, Knopp's core theorem states that (iii) $\rightarrow$ (v). This completes the proof.
4. Applications. For further illustration of Theorems 1 and 2 we shall give some applications to totally equivalent and core equivalent methods. Two methods $A, B$ are totally equivalent, if $A \ll B$ and $B \ll A$; they are coreequivalent for bounded sequences if the $A$-core of each bounded sequence coincides with its $B$-core. In what follows, $V$ is a matrix such that the norm of the $m$ th row tend to zero for $m \rightarrow \infty$, and $I$ is the unit matrix.

Theorem 4. (i) $A$ method $A$ is core-equivalent with I for bounded sequences if and only if $A$ has a representation

$$
\begin{equation*}
A=A^{\prime}+V \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

with positive $A^{\prime}$, where $A^{\prime}$ contains a sequence of rows of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{a}_{m_{n}}^{\prime}=\left(0, \ldots, 0, a_{m_{n}, n}, 0, \ldots\right), \quad n=1,2, \ldots \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

(then necessarily $m_{n} \rightarrow \infty, a_{m_{n}, n} \rightarrow 1$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$.)
(ii) $A$ regular row-finite method $A$ is totally equivalent with $I$ if and only if for some $p, A_{p}$ is positive and contains a sequence of rows of the form (12).

Proof. (i) The conditions are clearly sufficient. It follows from Theorem 1 that (11) with a positive $A^{\prime}$ is necessary. Again by Theorem 1, there is a positive regular matrix $C$ and a $V^{\prime}$ with $C A^{\prime}=I+V^{\prime}$. For each $n$ we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} c_{n m} \mathbf{a}_{m}^{\prime}=\mathbf{e}_{n} \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $e_{n l} \geqslant 0, \mathbf{e}_{n}=\left(e_{n l}\right), e_{n n} \rightarrow 1$ and

$$
\sum_{l \neq n} e_{n l} \rightarrow 0
$$

for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let

$$
\epsilon_{n}=\sum_{l \neq n} \frac{e_{n l}}{e_{n n}} .
$$

Then $\epsilon_{n} \rightarrow 0$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since the $c_{n m}$ are all positive, it follows from (13) that there is at least one $m=m_{n}$ such that

$$
\sum_{l \neq n} \frac{a_{m l}^{\prime}}{a_{m n}^{\prime}} \leqslant \epsilon_{n} .
$$

For otherwise, multiplying the relations

$$
\sum_{l \neq n}{a^{\prime}}_{m l}>\epsilon_{n} a_{m n}^{\prime} \quad(m=1,2, \ldots)
$$

with $c_{n m}$ and adding we would obtain by means of (13) that

$$
\sum_{l \neq n} e_{n l}>\epsilon_{n} e_{n n},
$$

which contradicts the definition of $\epsilon_{n}$.
We now replace by zero the elements $a_{m l}$ of the rows of $A^{\prime}$ with $m=m_{n}$, $l \neq n(n=1,2, \ldots)$. Denoting the matrix thus obtained again by $A^{\prime}$, we see that (11) and (12) are satisfied. This proves (i); the proof of (ii) is similar.

Theorem 4(i) may serve to show, for instance, that if a regular Hausdorff method $H_{\theta}$ is core-equivalent with $I$ for bounded sequences, then $H_{g}$ is identical with $I$.

A method $A$ is normal if $a_{m n}=0$ for $n>m$ and $a_{n n} \neq 0(n=1,2, \ldots)$. In this case $A$ has an inverse $A^{-1}$. If $A, B$ are normal, there is a triangular matrix $C$ with $A=C B$.

Theorem 5. Let the regular normal methods $A, B$ be totally equivalent. Then there exists a sequence $c_{m} \rightarrow 1$ such that for some $p$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{m n}=c_{m} b_{m n}, \quad m=1,2, \ldots ; n=p, p+1, \ldots \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Let $A=C B, B=D A$, then the matrices $C, D$ are triangular, regular and totally equivalent with $I$. We have

$$
a_{m m}=c_{m m} b_{m m}, \quad b_{m m}=d_{m m} a_{m m},
$$

hence

$$
c_{m m} d_{m m}=1
$$

and we obtain $c_{m m} \rightarrow 1$. From Theorem 4 (ii) it follows that for all sufficiently large $n, c_{m n}=0$ if $n \neq m$. Putting $c_{m}=c_{m m}$, we obtain (14).

It should be added that sometimes it is even possible to prove that $A, B$ are identical if they are totally equivalent. Let $A=H_{\theta}, B=H_{\theta_{1}}$ be two regular and normal Hausdorff methods. Then

$$
\sum_{n=0}^{m}\left|a_{m n}\right|
$$

converges for $m \rightarrow \infty$ to the "essential" total variation of $g(x)$. From (14) it follows that

$$
\sum_{n=0}^{m}\left|a_{m n}-b_{m n}\right| \rightarrow 0
$$

hence $g$ and $g_{1}$ are essentially identical. Thus we obtain a remark of Bosanquet (2, p. 452) that $H_{g}, H_{g_{1}}$ are identical if they are totally equivalent.
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