

THE MULTIPLIERS OF THE SPACE OF ALMOST CONVERGENT SEQUENCES

BY
CHING CHOU

1. Introduction

Let N be the set of all positive integers, $m(N)$ the space of bounded real-valued functions on N with the sup norm. A continuous linear functional φ on $m(N)$ is called a *Banach limit*, cf. [6], if for $f \in m(N)$,

$$\inf_n f(n) \leq \varphi(f) \leq \sup_n f(n) \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi(f) = \varphi(\tau f),$$

where $\tau f \in m(N)$ is defined by $(\tau f)(n) = f(n+1)$. Let M be the set of all Banach limits. It is well-known that M is non-empty, w^* -compact and convex.

Let F be the set of all $f \in m(N)$ such that $\varphi(f)$ equals a fixed constant as φ runs through M . If $f \in F$ then we say f is *almost convergent*, cf. [6]. It is easy to see that F is a closed subspace of $m(N)$ and it contains constant functions. $f \in m(N)$ is a *multiplier* of F if $fF \subset F$. Since F is not an algebra, \mathfrak{M}_F , the set of all multipliers of F , is properly contained in F . Lloyd [5] gave an example to show that \mathfrak{M}_F is not even the largest subalgebra of F . The purpose of this paper is to provide a characterization of the set \mathfrak{M}_F . We show that $fF \subset F$ if and only if f converges to a constant α in the following weak sense: given $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a set $A \subset N$ such that $\varphi(X_A) = 0$ for all $\varphi \in M$ and $|f(n) - \alpha| < \varepsilon$ if $n \in N \setminus A$. Thus, in some sense, \mathfrak{M}_F is a very small subspace of F . For example, it follows from the above characterization that if f is a non-constant almost periodic function on N then $fF \not\subset F$.

In the last section of this paper we shall consider the generalization of the above results to groups. The author wishes to thank Professor M. M. Day for suggesting the generalization.

2. Preliminaries

Let k_j and n_j be two sequences of positive integers such that $k_j \rightarrow \infty$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. For $j \in N$ let φ_j be the linear functional on $m(N)$ defined as follows:

$$\varphi_j(f) = k_j^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^{k_j-1} f(n_j + i) \quad (f \in m(N)).$$

It is easily verified and is well known that the w^* -cluster points of the sequence (φ_j) are Banach limits. With the above observation and the Krein-Milman theorem, Raimi [9] proved the following.

LEMMA 2.1. For $f \in m(N)$, let

$$\bar{d}(f) = \sup \{\varphi(f) : \varphi \in M\} \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{d}(f) = \inf \{\varphi(f) : \varphi \in M\}.$$

Received July 16, 1970.

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{d}(f) &= \limsup_n \sup_k n^{-1} \sum_{j=k}^{k+n-1} f(j); \\ \underline{d}(f) &= \liminf_n \inf_k n^{-1} \sum_{j=k}^{k+n-1} f(j).\end{aligned}$$

If $f \in F$, then $\bar{d}(f) = \underline{d}(f)$ and we shall denote the common value by $d(f)$. The above lemma implies that $f \in F$ if and only if

$$\lim_n n^{-1} \sum_{j=k}^{k+n-1} f(j) \text{ exists uniformly in } k, \quad \text{cf. [6].}$$

For convenience, if $A \subset N$, then $\bar{d}(X_A)$, $\underline{d}(X_A)$ and $d(X_A)$ will be denoted by $\bar{d}(A)$, $\underline{d}(A)$ and $d(A)$ respectively, where X_A is the characteristic function of the set A in N . By applying Lemma 2.1 to the function X_A , we see that $d(A)$ exists if and only if A is "evenly distributed" in N and $d(A) = 0$ if and only if A is "thinly distributed" in N .

We shall also need the following consequence of Lemma 2.1. We quote it here for later reference.

LEMMA 2.2 (cf. [1]). *Let $A \subset N$. Then $\underline{d}(A) > 0$ if and only if there exists a positive integer m such that*

$$A \cap \{k, k+1, \dots, k+m-1\} \neq \emptyset \text{ for each } k \in N.$$

Let βN be the Stone-Čech compactification of the discrete set N , cf. [4]. Each $f \in m(N)$ can be extended uniquely to a continuous function f^- on βN . The mapping $f \rightarrow f^-$ is an isometry of $m(N)$ onto $C(\beta N)$, the space of real-valued continuous functions on βN with the sup norm. Therefore, each $\varphi \in m(N)^*$ corresponds to a measure μ_φ on βN . The correspondence is characterized by $\varphi(f) = \int_{\beta N} f^- d\mu_\varphi$, $f \in m(N)$.

If $A \subset N$, then A^- denotes the closure of A in βN . Sets of the form A^- , $A \subset N$, are closed-open and they form an open basis for βN . As in [10] we set

$$K^\tau = \bigcap \{A^- : A \subset N, d(A) = 1\}.$$

Then K^τ is a compact nowhere dense subset of βN and

$$K^\tau = \text{cl } [\cup \{\text{suppt } \mu_\varphi : \varphi \in M\}].$$

3. The main theorem

DEFINITION. $f \in m(N)$ is said to be τ -convergent if there is a real number α satisfying the following: given $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a set $A \subset N$ such that $d(A) = 0$ and $|f(n) - \alpha| < \varepsilon$ if $n \in N \setminus A$. In this case we denote α by $\tau\text{-lim } f$.

Clearly, every convergent sequence is τ -convergent and if $\tau\text{-lim } f = \alpha$ exists then $f \in F$ and $d(f) = \alpha$.

THEOREM 3.1. *Let $f \in m(N)$. Then the following three conditions are*

equivalent:

- (a) $fF \subset F$.
- (b) f is τ -convergent.
- (c) $f^- \equiv \alpha$ constant on K^τ .

Proof. (b) \Rightarrow (c). Assume that $\tau\text{-lim } f = \alpha$ exists. Then, for a given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a set $A \subset N$ with $d(A) = 1$ and $|f(n) - \alpha| < \varepsilon$ for $n \in A$. Therefore $|f^-(w) - \alpha| \leq \varepsilon$ if $w \in K^\tau \subset A^-$. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, $f^- \equiv \alpha$ on K^τ .

(c) \Rightarrow (b). Assume that $f^- \equiv \alpha$ on K^τ and let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. Then since K^τ is compact and sets of the form B^- , $B \subset N$, form a basis for βN , we can find a set $A \subset N$ such that $A^- \supset K^\tau$ and $|f^-(w) - \alpha| < \varepsilon$ if $w \in A^-$. It follows that $d(A) = 1$ and $|f(n) - \alpha| < \varepsilon$ if $n \in A$.

(c) \Rightarrow (a). Assume $f^- \equiv \alpha$ on K^τ . If $g \in m(N)$ then $(fg)^- \equiv \alpha g^-$ on K^τ . If $\varphi \in M$, then $\text{suppt } \mu_\varphi \subset K^\tau$ and hence

$$\varphi(fg) = \int_{K^\tau} \alpha g^- d\mu_\varphi = \alpha \varphi(g).$$

Thus if $g \in F$ then so is fg . Thus $fF \subset F$.

(a) \Rightarrow (b). This is the most difficult implication. Let $f \in \mathfrak{M}_F$ be fixed. We have to show that $\tau\text{-lim } f$ exists. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $f \geq 0$ and $d(f) = 1$. For $\varepsilon > 0$, let

$$A(\varepsilon) = \{n \in N : f(n) \geq 1 + \varepsilon\}, \quad B(\varepsilon) = \{n \in N : f(n) \leq 1 - \varepsilon\},$$

$$C(\varepsilon) = \{n \in N : |f(n) - 1| < \varepsilon\}.$$

Note that N is the disjoint union of $A(\varepsilon)$, $B(\varepsilon)$ and $C(\varepsilon)$. We need to show that $d(A(\varepsilon)) = 0$ and $d(B(\varepsilon)) = 0$ for each $\varepsilon > 0$. For the sake of clearness, we divide the proof of this fact into several steps.

I. Let $a < b$ be real numbers. Let

$$A = \{n \in N : f(n) \geq b\} \quad \text{and} \quad B = \{n \in N : f(n) \leq a\}.$$

Then either $\underline{d}(A) = 0$ or $\underline{d}(B) = 0$.

Notation. For a fixed positive integer m , N can be divided into blocks of m consecutive integers $N(m, n)$, where

$$N(m, n) = \{(n-1)m+1, (n-1)m+2, \dots, nm\}, \quad n \in N.$$

Proof of I. If both $\underline{d}(A)$ and $\underline{d}(B)$ are positive then by Lemma 2.2 there exists $m \in N$ such that $N(m, n) \cap A \neq \emptyset$ and $N(m, n) \cap B \neq \emptyset$ for $n \in N$. Choose

$$a_n \in N(m, n) \cap A \quad \text{and} \quad b_n \in N(m, n) \cap B, \quad n \in N.$$

Let k_1, k_2, \dots be an increasing sequence of positive integers such that

$k_{n+1} - k_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$; let $k_0 = 0$. Define a subset $S = \{s_1, s_2, \dots\}$ of N as follows

$$\begin{aligned} s_j &= a_j \quad \text{if } k_{2n} < j \leq k_{2n+1}, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \\ &= b_j \quad \text{if } k_{2n-1} < j \leq k_{2n}, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for each $n \in N$, $N(m, n) \cap S$ is a singleton. Thus, by Lemma 2.1

$$(1) \quad X_S \in F \quad \text{and} \quad d(S) = 1/m.$$

On the other hand, since $k_{n+1} - k_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we may apply Lemma 2.1 again to get the following inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{d}(fX_S) &\geq \limsup_n \frac{1}{m(k_{2n} - k_{2n-1})} \sum_{j=k_{2n-1}+1}^{k_{2n}} f(b_j) \\ &\geq b/m, \quad \text{since } b_j \in A, \\ d(fX_S) &\leq \liminf_n \frac{1}{m(k_{2n+1} - k_{2n})} \sum_{j=k_{2n}+1}^{k_{2n+1}} f(a_j) \\ &\leq a/m, \quad \text{since } a_j \in B. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$(2) \quad fX_S \notin F.$$

By (1) and (2), $f \notin \mathcal{M}_F$. This contradicts our assumption and the proof of I is completed.

II. For a given $\varepsilon > 0$, $\underline{d}(A(\varepsilon)) = 0$ and $\underline{d}(B(\varepsilon)) = 0$.

Proof. Let $A = \{n \in N : f(n) \geq 1\}$. Assume that $\underline{d}(B(\varepsilon)) > 0$. Then, by I, $\underline{d}(A) = 0$. Thus there exists a $\varphi \in M$ such that

$$(3) \quad \varphi(X_A) = 0.$$

But,

$$(4) \quad \varphi(X_{B(\varepsilon)}) \geq \underline{d}(B(\varepsilon)) > 0.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= d(f) = \varphi(f) \\ &= \varphi(fX_{B(\varepsilon)}) + \varphi(fX_A) + \varphi(fX_{C(\varepsilon) \setminus A}) \\ &\leq \sup \{f(n) : n \in B(\varepsilon)\} \varphi(X_{B(\varepsilon)}) + \|f\| \varphi(X_A) \\ &\quad + \sup \{f(n) : n \in C(\varepsilon) \setminus A\} \varphi(X_{C(\varepsilon) \setminus A}) \quad (\text{by (3)}) \\ &\leq (1 - \varepsilon) \varphi(X_{B(\varepsilon)}) + \varphi(X_{C(\varepsilon)}) \\ &= \varphi(X_{B(\varepsilon) \cup C(\varepsilon)}) - \varepsilon \varphi(X_{B(\varepsilon)}) < 1 \quad (\text{by (4)}). \end{aligned}$$

This is impossible and, hence, $\underline{d}(B(\varepsilon)) = 0$. Similarly, $\underline{d}(A(\varepsilon)) = 0$.

III. For a given $\varepsilon > 0$, $\bar{d}(C(\varepsilon)) = 1$.

Proof. If $\bar{d}(C(\varepsilon)) < 1$ then $d(A(\varepsilon) \cup B(\varepsilon)) = t > 0$. Since, by II, $d(A(\varepsilon t/2)) = 0$, there exists $\varphi \in M$ such that

$$(5) \quad \varphi(X_{A(\varepsilon t/2)}) = 0.$$

Since $\varphi(X_{A(\varepsilon) \cup B(\varepsilon)}) \geq t$ and $\varphi(X_{A(\varepsilon)}) \leq \varphi(X_{A(\varepsilon t/2)})$, we see that

$$(6) \quad \varphi(X_{B(\varepsilon)}) \geq t.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \varphi(f) = \varphi(fX_{B(\varepsilon)}) + \varphi(fX_{A(\varepsilon t/2)}) + \varphi(fX_{N \setminus B(\varepsilon) \setminus A(\varepsilon t/2)}) \\ &\leq (1 - \varepsilon)\varphi(X_{B(\varepsilon)}) + (1 + \varepsilon t/2)\varphi(X_{N \setminus B(\varepsilon)}) \quad (\text{by (5)}) \\ &\leq \varphi(X_{B(\varepsilon)}) - \varepsilon t + \varphi(X_{N \setminus B(\varepsilon)}) + \varepsilon t/2 \quad (\text{by (6)}) \\ &= 1 - \varepsilon t/2 < 1. \end{aligned}$$

This is impossible. Thus, $\bar{d}(C(\varepsilon)) = 1$, as we claimed.

IV. For $n \in N$, $d(f^n) = 1$.

Proof. Since $f \in \mathfrak{M}_F$, $f^n \in F$. For a fixed $\delta > 0$, since, by III, $\bar{d}(C(\delta)) = 1$, there exists a $\varphi \in M$ such that $\varphi(X_{C(\delta)}) = 1$. It follows that

$$(7) \quad d(f^n) = \varphi(f^n) = \varphi(f^n X_{C(\delta)}).$$

On the other hand, since $(1 - \delta)^n < f^n X_{C(\delta)} < (1 + \delta)^n$. We see that

$$(8) \quad (1 - \delta)^n \leq \varphi(f^n X_{C(\delta)}) \leq (1 + \delta)^n.$$

Combining (7) and (8), we have $(1 - \delta)^n \leq d(f^n) \leq (1 + \delta)^n$ for each $\delta > 0$. Thus $d(f^n) = 1$.

V. For $\varepsilon > 0$, $d(A(\varepsilon)) = 0$ and $d(B(\varepsilon)) = 0$.

Proof. Let $\varphi \in M$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \varphi(f^n) \geq \varphi(f^n X_{A(\varepsilon)}) \quad (\text{since } f \geq 0) \\ &\geq (1 + \varepsilon)^n \varphi(X_{A(\varepsilon)}). \end{aligned}$$

Since n can be arbitrarily big, $\varphi(X_{A(\varepsilon)}) = 0$. Thus $\bar{d}(A(\varepsilon)) = d(A(\varepsilon)) = 0$ for each $\varepsilon > 0$.

By way of contradiction, if there exist an $\varepsilon > 0$ and a $\varphi \in M$ such that $\varphi(X_{B(\varepsilon)}) > 0$ then set $\delta = \varphi(X_{B(\varepsilon)}) \cdot \varepsilon/2$. Then, by the above, $\varphi(X_{A(\delta)}) = 0$. Thus, as in the proof of III, we have the following inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\leq (1 - \varepsilon)\varphi(X_{B(\varepsilon)}) + (1 + \delta)\varphi(X_{C(\varepsilon) \setminus A(\delta)}) \\ &\leq 1 - \varepsilon\varphi(X_{B(\varepsilon)}) + \delta \\ &= 1 - \delta < 1. \end{aligned}$$

This is impossible. Thus $\varphi(B(\varepsilon)) = 0$ for each $\varepsilon > 0$ and each $\varphi \in M$. Thus $d(B(\varepsilon)) = 0$ for each $\varepsilon > 0$. This completes the proof of the theorem.

Remarks. (1) We actually proved that if (i) $fX_A \in F$ for each $X_A \in F$ and (ii) $f^n \in F$ for each $n \in N$, then f is τ -convergent. In particular, let $A \subset N$. Then $X_{A \cap B} \in F$ for each $X_B \in F$ if and only if $d(A) = 0$ or 1.

(2) Let $A(N)$ be the algebra of almost periodic functions on N . Then it is well known that $A(N) \subset F$. But $A(N) \cap \mathfrak{M}_F$ only consists of constant functions. Indeed, if $f \in A(N) \cap \mathfrak{M}_F$, say, $\tau - \lim f = \alpha$, then $f^- \equiv \alpha$ on K^+ . Thus $\varphi(|f - \alpha|) = 0$ for each $\varphi \in M$. Thus the non-negative almost periodic function $|f - \alpha|$ has mean value 0. Thus $f \equiv \alpha$ on N .

As an example, let $A = \{1, m+1, 2m+1, \dots\}$ where $m > 2, m \in N$. Then $X_A \in A(N)$ and there exists $B \subset N$ such that $X_B \in F$ but $X_A X_B \notin F$. Thus, the almost convergent function X_B is not even weakly almost periodic.

(3) The fact that $\tau - \lim f = \alpha$ exists does not imply the existence of a set $B = \{b_1, b_2, \dots\}$ in N , $b_1 < b_2 < \dots$, such that $d(B) = 1$ and $\lim_n f(b_n)$ exists.

Example. Let a_n be an arbitrary increasing sequence of positive integers such that $a_{n+1} - a_n \rightarrow \infty$. Let $A_n = (n-1) + \{a_1, a_2, \dots\}, n \in N$. Then $\cup A_n = N$ and $d(A_n) = 0$ for $n \in N$. Define a function $f \in m(N)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} f &\equiv 1 && \text{on } A_1 \\ &\equiv 1/n && \text{on } A_n \setminus (A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_{n-1}), \quad n \geq 2. \end{aligned}$$

Given $\varepsilon > 0$, choose $n_0 \in N$ such that $1/n_0 < \varepsilon$ and let $B = \cup_{k=1}^{n_0} A_k$. Then $d(B) = 0$ and $|f(n)| < \varepsilon$ if $n \in N \setminus B$. Thus $\tau - \lim f = 0$. On the other hand, if $B \subset N$ such that $\bar{d}(B) < 1$, then, by Lemma 2.1, there exists $n \in N$ such that $A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_n \setminus B$ is infinite. Let $N \setminus B = \{b_1, b_2, \dots\}$, where $b_1 < b_2 < \dots$. Then clearly $\lim_n f(b_n)$ does not exist. (A similar example is also considered by Raimi [8].)

4. The generalization

Let G be an amenable group and denote the set of all left invariant means on G by $ML(G)$ (cf. Day [3] for the basic facts concerning amenable groups.) As before, we set

$$\bar{d}(f) = \sup \{\varphi(f) : \varphi \in ML(G)\} \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{d}(f) = \inf \{\varphi(f) : \varphi \in ML(G)\},$$

where f is a bounded real function on G . If $\bar{d}(f) = \underline{d}(f)$ then we say f is almost convergent and in this case we denote the common value by $d(f)$. The space of almost convergent functions on G is denoted by $F(G)$. A bounded real function f on G is said to be G -convergent if there exists a real number α such that for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a set $A \subset G$ satisfying (a) $d(A) = 0$ and (b) $|f(x) - \alpha| < \varepsilon$ if $x \notin A$. We wonder whether $fF(G) \subset F(G)$ implies that f is G -convergent. (The other implications of Theorem 3.1 can be readily

generalized.) We can only answer the above question when G has an additional property:

(*) If $A \subset G$ and $\underline{d}(A) > 0$ then there exists $B \subset A$ such that X_B is almost convergent and $\underline{d}(B) > 0$.

It is easy to show that finitely generated abelian groups and locally finite groups have property (*). We would like to conjecture that every amenable group has property (*).

LEMMA 4.1. *Let G be an amenable group.*

(1) *If $C \subset G$ and $\underline{d}(C) > 0$ then there exist x_1, \dots, x_n in G such that for each $x \in G$,*

$$C \cap \{x_1x, \dots, x_nx\} \neq \emptyset.$$

(2) *If x_1, \dots, x_n are n distinct elements of G then there exists $C \subset G$ such that $\underline{d}(C) > 0$ and*

$$x_iC \cap x_jC = \emptyset, \quad i \neq j.$$

(3) *Let $C \subset G$ and $x_i \in G, i = 1, \dots, n$, such that $x_iC \cap x_jC = \emptyset$ if $i \neq j$. Assume that $c \in C$ is associated with an element*

$$t(c) \in \{x_1c, \dots, x_nc\}$$

and set $T = \{t(c) : c \in C\}$. Then for each $\varphi \in ML(G), \varphi(X_T) = \varphi(X_C)$.

Proof. (1) is an easy consequence of [7, Theorem 7].

(2) Choose $C \subset G$ such that $x_iC \cap x_jC = \emptyset$ if $i \neq j$ and that C is a maximal with this property. Then $\bigcup_{i,j=1}^n x_i^{-1}x_jC = G$. Thus $\underline{d}(C) > 0$.

(3) Let $C_i = \{c \in C : t(c) = x_ic\}$. Then $C = C_1 \cup \dots \cup C_n, C_i \cap C_j = \emptyset$ if $i \neq j$ and $T = x_1C_1 \cup \dots \cup x_nC_n$. Thus $\varphi(X_T) = \varphi(X_C)$ if $\varphi \in ML(G)$.

THEOREM 4.2. *Let G be an amenable group with property (*). Then $fF(G) \subset F(G)$ implies that f is G -convergent.*

Proof. The proof is similar to (a) \Rightarrow (b) of Theorem 3.1 except step I there. Let f be a multiplier of $F(G), f \geq 0$; let

$$A = \{x \in G : f(x) \geq b\} \quad \text{and} \quad B = \{x \in G : f(x) \leq a\}$$

where $a < b$ are real numbers. We have to show that either $\underline{d}(A) = 0$ or $\underline{d}(B) = 0$.

Assume that both $\underline{d}(A)$ and $\underline{d}(B)$ are positive. Then, by Lemma 4.1 (1) there exist x_1, \dots, x_n in G such that for each $x \in G$,

$$\{x_1x, \dots, x_nx\} \cap A \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \{x_1x, \dots, x_nx\} \cap B \neq \emptyset.$$

Let C be a subset of G such that $x_iC \cap x_jC = \emptyset$ if $i \neq j$ and that $\underline{d}(C) > 0$, cf. Lemma 4.1 (2). Since G has property (*), there exists $D \subset C$ such that $\underline{d}(D) > 0$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that G is infinite. Then there exists $E \subset G$ such that $\bar{d}(E) = 1$ and $\underline{d}(E) = 0$, cf. [2]. For

$x \in D$, choose

$$t(x) \in A \cap \{x_1x, \dots, x_nx\} \quad \text{if } x \in D \cap E,$$

$$t(x) \in B \cap \{x_1x, \dots, x_nx\} \quad \text{if } x \in D \setminus E.$$

Let $T = \{t(x) : x \in D\}$. Then, by Lemma 4.1 (3), $d(T) = d(D)$. It is clear that $\bar{d}(fX_T) \geq d(D) \cdot b$ and $\underline{d}(fX_T) \leq d(D) \cdot a$. This contradicts the fact that f is a multiplier of $F(G)$.

Added in Proof. (1) We are able to show that every group in EG has property (*). Cf. [3, p. 520] for the definition of EG . (2) J. P. Duran and the author have proved recently that Theorem 4.2 holds for countable left amenable cancellative semigroups.

REFERENCES

1. C. CHOU, *Minimal sets and ergodic measures for $\beta\mathbb{N}/\mathbb{N}$* , Illinois J. Math., vol. 13 (1969), pp. 777-788.
2. ———, *On the size of the set of left invariant means on a semigroup*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., vol. 23 (1969), pp. 199-205.
3. M. M. DAY, *Amenable semigroups*, Illinois J. Math., vol. 1 (1957), pp. 509-544.
4. L. GILLMAN AND M. JERISON, *Rings of continuous functions*, Van Nostrand, New York, 1960.
5. S. P. LLOYD, *Subalgebras in a subspace of $C(X)$* , Illinois J. Math., vol. 14 (1970), pp. 259-267.
6. G. G. LORENTZ, *A contribution to the theory of divergent sequences*, Acta. Math., vol. 80 (1948), pp. 167-190.
7. T. MITCHELL, *Constant functions and left invariant means on semigroups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., vol. 119 (1965), pp. 244-261.
8. R. A. RAIMI, *Convergence, density, and τ -density of bounded sequences*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., vol. 14 (1963), pp. 708-712.
9. ———, *Invariant means and invariant matrix methods of summability*, Duke Math. J., vol. 30 (1963), pp. 81-94.
10. ———, *Homeomorphisms and invariant measures for $\beta\mathbb{N}/\mathbb{N}$* , Duke Math. J., vol. 33 (1966), pp. 1-12.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO
BUFFALO, NEW YORK