Note on a B*-algebra.

By Tamio ONO

(Received Sept. 15, 1958) (Revised Dec. 12, 1958)

As is well-known I. Gelfand and M. Neumark [1] proved in 1943 that a Banach algebra over the complex number field with a unit 1 and an involution * satisfying

- (0.1) $x^{**} = x$
- (0.2) $(\alpha x)^* = \alpha^* x^*$ ($\alpha^* = \text{the conjugate complex number of } \alpha$),
- $(0.3) \quad (x+y)^* = x^*y^*,$
- (0.4) $(xy)^* = y^*x^*$

is isometric and *-isomorphic to a C^* -algebra, (i.e., a uniformly closed self-adjoint algebra acting on a Hilbert space over the complex number field) if and only if it satisfies the following three conditions:

- $(0.5) \quad ||x^*x|| = ||x^*|| ||x||,$
- $(0.6) \|x^*\| = \|x\|, \text{ and }$
- (0.7) 1+x*x has an inverse.

Also they conjectured that

- (A) this fact holds without (0.7) and
- (B) this fact holds without (0.6) (and (0.7)).

It was pointed out by I. Kaplansky that M. Fukamiya [2] gave implicitly an affirmative answer to the conjecture (A) (See J. A. Schatz' review [3] of [2]), and the assumption of existence of a unit was removed by I. Kaplansky and C. E. Rickart (cf. loc. cit.).

Their answer is very simple and stands on the following three facts:

- (0.8) A B^* -algebra without a unit is isometrically and *-isomorphically imbeddible into a B^* -algebra with a unit (I. Kaplansky, C. E. Rickart).
- (0.9) The set of non-zero spectra of xy (x, y being elements of a Banach algebra) coincides with that of yx.
- (0.10) The set of hermitian elements of a B^* -algebra with a unit has a semi-ordering $h \ge 0$ defined by $h = k^2$ (h, k being in the set) (M. Fukamiya [2], J. L. Kelley-R. L. Vaught [5]). (cf. I. Kaplansky [4] [8], M. Mimura [6]).

In this note, we shall give a direct proof of the theorem of I. Geland and M. Neumark by making no use of (0.7) in § 1. The present proof is not simple, for we make use neither of (0.7) nor of (0.8)—(0.10). In § 2, we shall give an affirmative answer to the conjecture (B).

I wish to express my deep gratitude to Prof. I. Kaplansky for sending me a copy of the appendix of the lecture note [4], to Prof. M. Fukamiya for his pointing me essential errors of my original proof of (B) and for his shortening my original proof of (B), to Prof. M. Nakamura for his valuable suggestions during my preparation of this paper, and to Mr. T. Saito for his shortening my original proof of (B). Also, I express my hearty thanks to Prof. S. Iyanaga for his valuable remarks and to Prof. O. Takenouchi for his kind proof-reading and valuable remarks.

§ 1. A direct proof of the theorem of I. Gelfand and M. Neumark.

A Banach algebra over the complex number field C is called a *-algebra if it has an involution * satisfying (0.1)—(0.4). A *-algebra is called a B^* -algebra if it satisfies (0.5) and (0.6). A *-algebra is called C-symmetric if every maximal commutative¹⁾ *-subalgebra of it is B^* .

The aim of this § is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. 1) A C-symmetric *-algebra is homeomorphic and *-isomorphic to a suitable C^* -algebra.

2) A B*-algera is isometric and *-isomorphic to a suitable C*-algebra.

Let R be a C-symmetric *-algebra²⁾ and h be an hermitian³⁾ element of R. Denote by R_h the *-subalgebra of R generated by h. Since R_h is commutative and contained in a maximal commutative *-subalgebra of R, it is B^* . By virtue of a theorem of I. Gelfand and M. H. Stone R_h is isometric and *-isomorphic to $C(\Omega_h)$ (or $C'(\Omega_h)$), Ω_h being the set of spectra⁴⁾ of h in R_h . The space Ω_h is considered as a bounded closed subset of C; $C(\Omega_h)$ is the B^* -algebra of complex-valued continuous functions on Ω_h and $C'(\Omega_h)$ is the B^* -algebra of complex-valued continuous functions g's on Ω_h with g(0) = 0, when R_h has no unit. For such a function g, we can find an element of R_h as the inverse image of g by the canonical *-isomorphism of R_h onto $C(\Omega_h)$ (or $C'(\Omega_h)$). Denote it by g(t)/h (or g(h)).

We denote by A the set of elements a's of R satisfying the following condition:

(1.1) every spectrum of a*a is non-negative.

Now we shall begin with the following

¹⁾ Two elements a, b of R are said to be commutative with each other if ab = ba and a*b = ba*.

²⁾ We do not assume that R has a unit.

³⁾ An element h of R is called hermitian if $h^* = h$.

⁴⁾ A non-zero scalar α is called a (left) spectrum of an element α of R (in R) if the equation $x\alpha - \alpha x = \alpha$ has no solution in R; 0 is called a (left) spectrum of α (in R) if α has no inverse. When R has no unit, of course, α has no inverse.

Lemma 1.1. If $a^2 = 0$, then $a \in A$ holds.

Proof. We have $a^*a+aa^*=(a+a^*)^2$ and further $a^*a\cdot aa^*=aa^*\cdot a^*a=0$. Combining these with the fact that $a+a^*\in A^{5}$ we finally get $a\in A$ by an easy computation. q. e. d.

Lemma 1.2. R is commutative if and only if

(1.2) a-ab=0 implies ac-acb=0 for any $c \in \mathbb{R}^{6}$

PROOF. The necessity is obvious and so we need only to see the sufficiency. Let R be a C-symmetric *-algebra satisfying (1.2). First of all, we show that any closed left ideal I of R is two-sided. For an element a of I, we denote by $u_n(a)$ (or briefly by u_n) the element $g_n(a*a)$ of I, where

(1.3)
$$g_n(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & (2/n \le t), \\ \text{linear} & (1/n \le t \le 2/n), \\ 0 & (-1/n \le t \le 1/n), \\ \text{linear} & (-2/n \le t \le -1/n), \\ 1 & (t \le -2/n). \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that $au_n \to a$ as $n \to \infty$. Further we have $u_n u_m = u_m u_n = u_n$ if $2n \le m$. Since $u_n - u_n u_m = 0$ for $2n \le m$, we have, from (1.2), $u_n c = u_n c u_m$ for any $c \in R$, from which it follows that $au_n c = au_n c u_m \in I$. As making $n \to \infty$, we get $ac \in I$ for any $c \in R$. This implies that I is two-sided. We say that I is proper if R/I is not (0) and has a unit. In this sense, for any proper ideal I of R, there exists a maximal proper ideal I of R containing I. Next, suppose I is a maximal proper (left) ideal of R. Since R/I constitutes a normed sfield over the complex number field C, we have $R/I \cong C$ by the theorem of I. Mazur and I. Gelfand. Denote by I the canonical homomorphism of I onto I. Let I be an hermitian element of I. If I is I if I if I if I is I if I if I is I if I is proper I if I is a proper I is proper I is proper I is proper I if I is the proper I is proper I is proper I is proper I if I is the proper I is the proper I is proper I if I is the proper I is proper I if I is the proper I is the proper I is proper I if I is the proper I is the proper I is the proper I is proper I if I is the proper I is the proper I is the proper I is the proper I is the prop

⁵⁾ For any hermitian element h of R, we have $h \in A$. In fact, if $xh - \alpha x = h$ has no solution in R for $\alpha \neq 0$, it has also no solution in R_h . And there is a simple proof by M. Fukamiya with regard as $h \in A$ when R is commutative (cf. [4]).

⁶⁾ When R has a unit, R is commutative if and only if ab = 0 implies acb = 0 for any $c \in \mathbb{R}$. The proof is similar.

⁷⁾ We notice that $a \in I$ implies $a^* \in I$ for any closed two-sided ideal I of R. In fact, we have $a^*u_n(a^*) \in I$ by Weierstrass' approximation theorem. Hence we get $a^* \in I$.

⁸⁾ We first show that $R/I \neq (0)$. For, otherwise, we can find a sequence $\{c_n\}$ such that $c_nh-\beta c \to h$ and hence $||ch-\beta c-h|| < |\beta|$ for some $c \in R$. Put $d = (1/\beta)$ $(ch-\beta c-h)$, $x = d-d^2+d^3+\ldots$ and y=x+c-xc. Then, $yh-\beta y=h$. This is impossible. Hence, $R/I \neq (0)$. Denote by — the canonical homomorphism of R onto R/I. Put $e=(1/\beta)h$. Then \bar{e} is hermitian and we have $\bar{c}\bar{e}=\bar{c}$ for any $c \in R$. This means that \bar{e} is a unit of R/I. Therefore I is proper.

R containing $(ch-\beta c; c \in R)$. Then we have $t_J(h) = \beta \neq 0$ by an easy computation. Thus we have h = 0 if and only if $t_J(h) = 0$ for any maximal proper ideal J of R. Now, suppose h, k are hermitian elements of R. Put $x = (1/2i) \cdot (hk - kh)$. Then, for any maximal proper ideal J of R, we have

(1.4) $t_J(x) = (1/2i)(t_J(h)t_J(k) - t_J(k)t_J(h)) = 0.$

Hence we get x = 0, that is, hk = kh. Since general elements of R are generated by hermitian elements of R, this completes the proof. q.e.d.

Denote by N the set of hermitian elements of R.

Lemma 1.3. 1) N is closed.

2) * is continuous.

PROOF. THE PROOF OF 1). Let $\{h_n\}$ be a Cauchy sequence of elements of N. Suppose its limit is not hermitian, that is, h+ik for h, $k \in N$ such as $k \neq 0$. Put $h_n' = h_n - h$. Then $h_n'^2 \to -k^2$ as $n \to \infty$. We may assume that $\|h_n'\| \leq 1$, $\|k\| \leq 1$. Denote by P the polynomial ring over the complex number field C. It is not so hard to see that $\|(1-h_n'^2)|p(h_n'^2)\| \leq \|p(h_n'^2)\|$ for all $p \in P$ with p(0) = 0. From this it follows that $\|(1+k^2)|p(-k^2)\| \leq \|p(-k^2)\|$ for all $p \in P$ with p(0) = 0. Since $k \neq 0$, we can find a spectre⁹ t of R_k with $t(k) \neq 0$ (and so $t(k^2) > 0$). Since Ω_k is compact, there exists a continuous function $g^{(10)}$ on Ω_k satisfying (1) g(t) = 1, (2) $0 \leq g(t') \leq 1$ for $t' \in \Omega_k$, and (3) when R_k has no unit, g(0) = 0. Then we get $\|(1+k^2)|g(k^2)\| \leq 1$ by making use of Weierstrass' approximation theorem. Hence $1+t(k^2) \leq 1$. This is impossible, for $t(k^2) > 0$. Thus we get 1).

The Proof of 2). We introduce a norm $\|\cdot\|'$ into R defined by $\|a\|' = \sup(\|h\cos\theta + k\sin\theta\|; 0 \le \theta \le 2\pi)$ for $a \in R$, where $h = (1/2)(a + a^*)$ and $k = (1/2i)(a - a^*)$. In view of 1), R constitutes a Banach space over the complex number field C with this norm. Denote it by R_1 . Further we see that $\|a\| \le 2\|a\|'$. Hence R_1 is homeomorphic to R by a theorem of S. Banach. Hence we have $\|a\|' \le K\|a\|$ for $a \in R$ and for some positive number K independent of a. Thus we get $\|a^*\| \le 2\|a^*\|' = 2\|a\|' \le 2K\|a\|$. This implies 2). q. e. d.

Denote by N^+ the set of hermitian elements h's of R with $h = k^2$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 1.4. 1) N^+ is closed.

2) A is closed.

PROOF. The proof of 1). Let $\{h_n^2\}$ be a Cauchy sequence of elements of N^+ . Denote its limit by k. Assume that $\|h_n\| \le 1$, $\|k\| \le 1$. Then we have $\|(1-k)p(k)\| \le \|p(k)\|$ for all $p \in P$ with p(0) = 0. Similarly as in the proof of 1), Lemma 1.3 and so every spectrum of k is non-negative. Hence we get $\sqrt{k} \in N$ and $k = (\sqrt{k})^2 \in N^+$. This shows 1). The statement 2) is an immediate

⁹⁾ A point t of Ω_k is called a spectre of R_k .

¹⁰⁾ The only case which can not be verified by P. Urysohn's theorem is: $R_k \cong C$.

consequence of 1) and so the proof will be omitted. q. e. d.

Lemma 1.5. There exists an element a of R satisfying $u_n(a)Ru_n(a) \subseteq A$ for $n \ge 1$. (The u_n 's are defined like those in Lemma 1.2.)

PROOF. If R is commutative, we have A=R and so we can choose an arbitrary non-zero element of R as the element a in question. On the other hand, if R is not commutative, from Lemma 1.2 it follows that there exist three elements b, c, and d such that b-bd=0 and $bc-bcd\neq 0$. Here we may assume without loss of generality that b, d are both hermitian. In fact, denoting by $u_n'(d^*)$ the element $(1-g_n(1+t))/(dd^*-d^*-d)$ of R, we have $u_n(b)-u_n(b)u_n'(d^*)=0$ by an easy computation. If $u_n(b)c-u_n(b)cu_n'(d^*)=0$ for any n, we would have $bu_n(b)c-bu_n(b)cu_n'(d^*)-(bu_n(b)c-bu_n(b)cu_n'(d^*))d=0$, from which it follows that bc-bcd=0 as making $n\to\infty$. This leads to a contradiction. We write a for bc-bcd. Since b, d are both hermitian, we have b-db=0 and so $a^2=bc(b-db)(c-cd)=0$. Hence $a\in A$ by Lemma 1.1. Denote $u_n(a)$ briefly by u_n and take v_n as the element $h_n(t)/(a^*a)$ of R, where

(1.5)
$$h_n(t) = \begin{cases} t^{-1/2} & (2/n \le t), \\ \text{linear} & (0 \le t \le 2/n), \\ 0 & (t \le 0). \end{cases}$$

Then we have $(au_{2n}v_{4n})^*(au_{2n}v_{4n})u_n = u_n$ and $u_na = 0$. Hence we have $(au_{2n}v_{4n}u_nxu_n)^*(au_{2n}v_{3n}u_nxu_n) = (u_nxu_n)^*(u_nxu_n)$ and $(au_{2n}v_{4n}u_nxu_n)^2 = 0$. Thus we have from Lemma 1.1 $u_nxu_n \in A$ for any $x \in R$. q. e. d.

Remark. We can find the element a of R in Lemma 1.5 such as it is contained in an arbitrary fixed closed ideal I of R. In fact, if for any $a, b \in I$ a-ab=0 implies ac-acb=0 for any $c \in R$, I must be commutative.

We may assume without loss of generality that $||a^*a|| = 1$ and $||u_n|| = 1$. Since A is closed by Lemma 1.4, the closure R_n of $u_n R u_n$ is contained in A. Denote by N_n the set of hermitian elements of R_n . As to N_n , we have the following

Lemma 1.6. The set N_n constitutes a semi-ordered linear space over the real number field $R^{(1)}$ with the semi-order $a \leq b$ for $a, b \in N_n$ defined by the relation that every spectrum of b-a is non-negative.

PROOF. The others are obvious and so we need only to see the transitive law. Denote $(\sqrt{1+t}-1)/(a^*a)+u_{4n}$ by x and $(tg_{1n}^2(t))^{-1}g_{2n}(t)/(a^*a)^{12}$ by x'. Then we have $x'x=xx'=u_{2n}$. Further we put y=bx' and denote $(\sqrt{1+t}-1)/(y^*y)$

¹¹⁾ A linear space over the real number field is called to be *semi-ordered* if it has a semi-ordering compatible with linear operation: (1) $a, b \ge 0$ imply $a+b \ge 0$ and (2) $a \ge 0$, $\alpha \ge 0$ imply $\alpha a \ge 0$.

¹²⁾ Here we consider $\infty \cdot 0$ as 0.

 $+u_{2n}$ by z. Then we have $x, y, z \in R_{4n}$ and $u_{2n}^2 + a^*a + b^*b = (xz)^*(xz)$ by an easy computation. Thus we get the assertion. q.e.d.

Let K be the linear space over the real number field generated by u_2 and N_1 . By Lemma 1.6, K constitutes an N-space over the real number field with u_2 as its order unit. Moreover we can see that K is admissible by an easy computation. Hence, by the extension theorem of Hahn and Banach, there exists at least one positive linear functional (say f') of K with $f'(u_1^2) > 0$. As to f', we have the following

Lemma 1.7. It holds that $f'(u_1c*cu_1) \ge 0$ for $c \in R$.

PROOF. Denote $(1-\sqrt{1-t})/u_2^2$ by v. Since $(cu_1-vcu_1)^2=0$, we have, by Lemma 5.1, $cu_1-vcu_1 \in A$ and so $f'(u_1c^*cu_1-u_1c^*u_2^2cu_1) \ge 0$. On the other hand, from $u_2cu_1 \in A$ it follows that $f'(u_1c^*u_2^2cu_1) \ge 0$. Hence we get $f'(u_1c^*cu_1) = 0$. q. e. d.

We define a functional f of R by $f(c) = f'(u_1(1/2)(cc^*)u_1) + if'(u_1(1/2i)(c-c^*)u_1)$ for $c \in R$. Then f is a state¹⁶⁾ of R by Lemma 1.7. Denote by Γ^* the set of states of R and, for $f \in \Gamma^*$, we denote by M_f the set of elements c's of R with $f(c^*c) = 0$, which is a closed left ideal of R. Denote by — the canonical homomorphism of R onto R/M_f and denote by H_f the completion of the unitary space R/M_f over the complex number field C with the inner product $(\bar{b}, \bar{c}) = f(c^*b)$. It is easy to see that R is represented on \mathfrak{F}_f . Its kernel will be denoted by I_f . Similarly we denote by \mathfrak{F} the direct sun of $(\mathfrak{F}_f; f \in \Gamma^*)$. Then R is also represented on \mathfrak{F}_f . Its kernal will be denoted by I. Then we have $I = \bigcap (I_f; f \in \Gamma^*)$, which must be (0). For, otherwise, from the remark of Lemma 1.5, we have a state f of R with $f(u^2) > 0$ for some hermitian element u of I. This leads to a contradiction. Thus R is *-isomorphic to a selfadjoint algebra acting on H, say S.

The following lemma is due to I. E. Segal.

Lemma 1.8. Let S_1 be a commutative B^* -algebra and S_2 be a commutative, not necessarily complete B^* -algebra. Suppose S_1 is *-isomorphic to S_2 . Then S_1 is isometric to S_2 .

¹³⁾ We mean by an N-space over the real number field the semi-ordered linear space over the real number field with an order unity $e: N = (a; a \le ne \text{ for some } n)$.

¹⁴⁾ With the same terminologies as in 13), N is called admissible if $a \leq \inf(\varepsilon; a \leq \varepsilon e)e$ for any $a \in N$.

¹⁵⁾ A linear functional f of a semi-ordered linear space is called to be *positive* if $a \ge 0$ implies $f(a) \ge 0$.

¹⁶⁾ A linear functional f of a^* -algebra R is called a *state* of R if $f(a^*a) \ge 0$ and $f(a^*) = \overline{f(a)}$.

¹⁷⁾ cf. [1], [2] and [7].

¹⁸⁾ cf. [1], [2] and [7].

PROOF. Denote by \mathcal{Q}_i the spectrum¹⁹⁾ of S_i . Then we may assume without loss of generality that \mathcal{Q}_2 is contained in \mathcal{Q}_1 . If $\bar{\mathcal{Q}}_2 \neq \mathcal{Q}_1$ ($\bar{\mathcal{Q}}_2$ being the closure of \mathcal{Q}_2 in \mathcal{Q}_1), there exists a non-zero continuous function g defined on \mathcal{Q}_1 such that $\mu(g) = 0$ for $\mu \in \mathcal{Q}_2$. Of course, this is a contradiction. Hence we get $\bar{\mathcal{Q}}_2 = \mathcal{Q}_1$. For $c_i \in S_i$, the norm of c_i is expressed as $\|c_i\| = \sup(|\mu(c_i)|; \mu \in \mathcal{Q}_i)$. Thus we obtain the assertion. q.e.d.

Now we are in a position to prove Theorem 1.1.

The Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let h be an hermitian element of R and let R' be a maximal commutative *-subalgebra of R containing h. In view of Lemma 1.8, R' is isometrically and *-isomorphically imbedded into S by the *-isomorphism obtained before. Hence N is isometrically imbedded into S by that *-isomorphism. From this it follows that S is closed by making use of Lemma 1.3. Denote by $\|\cdot\|_0$ the norm of S and by $\|\cdot\|_0'$ the norm of S defined by $\|a\|_0' = \sup(\|h\cos\theta + k\sin\theta\|; 0 \le \theta \le 2\pi)$, where $h = (1/2)(a + a^*)$, $k = (1/2i)(a - a^*)$. Moreover we use the norm of R and the norm of R cited in Lemma 1.3. Then these four norms are equivalent (that is, they induce homeomorphic topologies) to each others. This shows 1). Since N is isometrically imbedded into S, R is isometric to S by (0.5) and (0.6) if R is B^* . This implies 2). q. e. d.

By virtue of Theorem 1.1, following corollaries are reduced to the well-known results for the case of C^* -algebras.

COROLLARY 1. Let R be a C-symmetric *-algebra. Then R satisfies (A). (I. Kaplansky-M. Fukamiya-J. L. Kelley-R. L. Vaught).

COROLLARY 2. Let R be a C-symmetric *-algebra. Then N has an intrinsic semi-ordering $a \ge 0$ for $a \in N$ defined by $a = h^2$ for some $h \in N$ (loc. cit.)

Corollary 3. Let R be a B^* -algebra. Then R is isometrically and *-isomorphically imbedded into a B^* -algebra with a unit (I. Kaplansky [4]).

§ 2. An affirmative answer to (B).

We shall say, for a while, that a *-algebra R is B'^* if it satisfies the condition:

(2.1) $\|a^*a\| = \|a^*\| \|a\|$ for all $a \in R$.

¹⁹⁾ We say that a homomorphism t of a normed ring R over C onto C, if R has a unit, (into C, if R has no unit) is a spectre of R and the set of spectres of R is the spectrum of R. We notice that every spectre t of R is continuous. In fact, if $t(a) \neq 0$, the equation xa - t(a)x = a has no solution in R and so t(a) is a spectrum of a, and then $|t(a)| \leq ||a||$ by a theorem of R. Gelfand. From this it follows that the spectrum of R is compact with respect to the usual Stone topology. If R is a not necessarily complete normed ring, the spectrum of the completion of R is called the spectrum of R.

It is obvious²⁰⁾ that a B^* -algebra is always B'^* . The aim of this \S is, conversely, to give an affirmative answer to (B), that is, to prove the following

Theorem 2.1. Every B'^* -algebra is necessarily B^* .

Let R be a B'^* -algebra. The following lemma is well known and is included only for completeness.

Lemma 2.1. R is C-symmetric.

PROOF. By the definition of *C*-symmetricity we need only to see that *R* is B^* if it is commutative. Suppose *R* is commutative. Then it is obvious that $\|a\|_{\infty} \leq \|a\|$, $\|a^*\|_{\infty} \leq \|a^*\|$, and $\|a^*\|_{\infty} = \|a\|_{\infty}$. Moreover we have from (2.1) $\|a^*a\|_{\infty} = \|a^*a\|$ and from the commutativity of $\|a^*a\|_{\infty} \leq \|a^*\|_{\infty} \|a\|_{\infty}$. From these it follows that $\|a^*\| = \|a\|$. Thus we get $\|a^*a\| = \|a^*\| \|a\| = \|a\|^2$. q. e. d.

Combining this lemma with Corollary 1 of Theorem 1.1, we may use (A) for the present case. From now on we denote by $\beta(a)$ the positive number determined by $\|a^*\| = \beta(a) \|a\|$ for a non-zero element a of R and we put $\beta(0) = 1.^{21}$ We recall two elements a, b of R to be orthogonal to each other if $b^*a = ab^* = 0$ and mean by a, b,...(\bot) the fact that a, b,... are mutually orthogonal, non-zero elements of R.

The following lemma is a key to prove the theorem.

Lemma 2.2. $a, b \ (\bot)$ implies $\beta(a) = \beta(b) = \beta(a+b)$.

PROOF. Suppose $0 \neq \|b^*b\| \leq \|a^*a\|$. Then we have $\|a^*\| \|a\| = \|a^*a\| = \|a^*a\| = \|a^*(a+b)\| \leq \|a^*\| \|a+b\|$, that is, $\|a\| \leq \|a+b\|$. Similarly we have $\|a^*\| \leq \|(a+b)^*\|$. On the other hand, we have $\|a^*\| \|a\| \leq \|(a+b)^*\| \|(a+b)\| = \|(a+b)^*(a+b)\| = \|a^*a+b^*b\| \leq \|a^*a\| = \|a^*\| \|a\|$. Thus we get $\|a\| = \|a+b\|$ and $\|a^*\| = \|(a+b)^*\|$. This shows that $\beta(a) = \beta(a+b)$.

If we select a positive scalar α such that $\|(\alpha a)^*(\alpha a)\| = \|b^*b\|$, we similarly get $\beta(b) = \beta(\alpha a + b) = \beta(\alpha a) = \beta(a)$. Thus we reach the assertion. q. e. d.

In order to prove the theorem, we now prepare a tool to eliminate the trivial cases. A projection e of R is called minimal if it is non-zero and if every element a of eRe is written as $a = \beta e$ for some scalar β . Moreover an element a of R is called primitive if a*a is written as $a*a = \beta e_*$, where β is a non-zero scalar and e_* is a minimal projection of R. In this case, β is

²⁰⁾ If $a \neq 0$, $||a||^2 = ||a^*a|| \le ||a^*|| ||a||$ implies $||a|| \le ||a^*||$. Similarly we have $||a^*|| \le ||a||$. Thus we get $||a^*|| = ||a||$.

²¹⁾ According to [4] [9], we have already known the following facts: (a) * is continuous, (b) R is homeomorphic and isomorphic to a C^* -algebra, and (c) (R. Kadison) if α is regular, then $\beta(\alpha) = 1$. The facts (a) and (b) are contained in Lemma 1.3 and Theorem 1.1. As to the fact (c), we shall use it, to prove the theorem, in a weaker sense: if u is unitary, then $\beta(u) = 1$. And this fact is an immediate consequence of Lemma 2.1.

positive by (A) and $w = (\sqrt{\beta})^{-1}a$ is aprimitive partial isometry²², and then we get a polar decomposition $a = w(\sqrt{\beta}e_*)$, because $(w-we_*)^*(w-we_*) = 0$ and so $w = we_*$. This decomposition is unique in the sense that $\beta > 0$ and $w = we_*$. Put $e = ww^*$. Since $w = we_*$, we have $e^2 = e(=e^*)$ and hence e is a projection of e. We call e* the initial projection of e (denoted by e*(e)) and e the final projection of e (denoted by e(e)).

Lemma 2.3. If a is a primitive element of R, then e(a) is also minimal.

PROOF. Suppose b is an arbitrary element of R. Since w^*bw is contained in e_*Re_* , it is written as $w_*bw = \beta e_*$. Hence we have $ebe = w(w^*bw)w^* = w(\beta e_*)w^* = \beta e_*$. This shows that e is minimal. q.e.d.

If α is primitive, so is α^* by Lemma 2.3.

Lemma 2.4. If a is primitive and $ba \neq 0$ for $b \in R$, then ba is also primitive. Proof. Since $(ba)^*(ba)$ is contained in $e_*(a)Re_*(a)$, it is written as $(ba)^*(ba) = \beta e_*(a)$ for some scalar β . The scalar β is not zero, for $ba \neq 0$. Hence ba is primitive. q. e. d.

Lemma 2.5. Let w be a primitive partial isometry of R. Then we have $e(w)Re_*(w) = Cw$.

PROOF. Suppose a is an element of $e(w)Re_*(w)$. Since w*a is contained in $e_*(w)Re_*(w)$, it is written as $w*a = \beta e_*(w)$ and so we have $a = ww*a = \beta w \in Cw$. The converse is obvious and thus we obtain $e(w)Re_*(w) = Cw$. q. e. d.

Lemma 2.6. Let a be a primitive element of R. Denote $e(a)+e((1-e(a)))e_*(a)$ briefly by f. Then we have the following two propositions:

- 1) $a \in fRf$.
- 2) fRf is isomorphic to $(C)_1$ or $(C)_2$.²³⁾

PROOF. Suppose a is primitive. Denote $e_*(a)$, e(a) by e_* , e, and $e((1-e(a))e_*(a))$ by e'. Since $e'(1-e)e_*=(1-e)e_*$, we have $(e+e')e_*=e_*+e'ee_*$. By noticing that e'e=0, we get $fe_*=e_*$ or $e_*f=e_*$, that is, $af=ae_*f=ae_*=a$. On the other hand, it is obvious that fe=e and so fa=fea=ea=a. Thus we get the first assertion.

If eae' = e'ae = 0, we have $a = faf = eae + e'ae' = \alpha e + \beta e'$ (α , β , being scalars). This shows that a is normal²⁴ and so $e_* = e = f$. Therefore $fRf = eRe = Ce \cong (C)_1$.

On the other hand, if there is an element $b \ (= a \text{ or } a^*)$ of R such that $ebe' \neq 0$, ebe' is primitive by Lemma 2.4 and so written as $ebe' = \beta w$, where β is a non-zero scalar and w is a primitive partial isometry of fRf. We write e_{11} , e_{22} , e_{12} , and e_{21} for e, e', w, and w^* respectively. Then e_{ij} 's form a complete

²²⁾ An element w of R is called a partial isometry of R if w*w is a projection of R. In this case, ww* is also a projection of R.

²³⁾ We denote by $(C)_r$ the metric algebra of degree r over C.

²⁴⁾ An element a of R is called to be normal if a*a = aa*.

set of matrix units of degree 2. In view of Lemma 2.5, every element c of fRf is written as $c = \sum_{i,j=1} 2\gamma_{ij}e_{ij}$ (γ_{ij} being a scalar). Thus we get the second assertion. q. e. d.

Lemma 2.7. If a is primitive, then we have $\beta(a) = 1.25$

PROOF. In view of Lemma 2.6, we can assume without loss of generality that R is *-isomorphic to $(C)_1$ or $(C)_2$. As the assertion is quite obvious in the latter case, we restrict the proof only in the former case. Denote by $a = w(\beta e_*)$ the polar decomposition of a. An easy computation is used to find a partial isometry w' of R orthogonal to w. Then u = w + w' is a unitary²⁶ of R and so it satisfies $\beta(u) = 1$ by Lemma 2.1. Hence we have $\beta(a) = \beta(\beta w) = \beta(w) = 1$ by Lemma 2.2. q. e. d.

Now we enter the last lemma for the proof of Theorem 2.1.

Lemma 2.8. $a, b, c (\perp)$ implies $\beta(a) = 1$.

Proof. We write h for a*a and v for bb*. Then we have

(2.2) va = 0.

If hv=0, we have $a^*av=0$ and so $(av)^*(av)=0$ and then av=0. Hence we have $a, v (\bot)$ and $\beta(v)=1$. Thus we obtain $\beta(a)=1$ by Lemma 2.2. Therefore we may assume that $hv\neq 0$.

First we see Lemma 2.8 under the following assumption:

(2.3) hv is primitive.

Since $hv \neq 0$, we have $h\sqrt{v} \neq 0$ and so $a^*avh = hvh \neq 0$. Hence we get $avh \neq 0$. Moreover hv is primitive and so vh is also primitive. Hence avh is primitive by Lemma 2.4. Since $avh = a(va^*)a$, we have avh, $b(\bot)$. Hence we have $\beta(a) = \beta(b) = \beta(avh) = 1$ by Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.7.

Next we see Lemma 2.8 for the case that hv is not primitive. We write d for vh. Then d is non-zero and not primitive with hv.

We first show that there exist two hermitian elements v_1, v_2 of R enjoying the following three conditions:

- (2.4) $v_1, v_2, d*d$ are mutually commutative.
- $(2.5) \quad v_1 v_2 = 0.$
- (2.6) $dv_1 \neq 0$, $dv_2 \neq 0$.

If d^*d has at least two non-zero spectra (say β_1 , β_2 ; $0 < \beta_1 < \beta_2$), we can take $f_i(t)/d^*d$ as v_i , where $f_i(t)$ is the function defined by

²⁵⁾ This lemma is due to M. Fukamiya. Owing to this lemma, proofs of Lemma 2.8 and the theorem become much simpler than original ones. His proof is elegant: Suppose R has a unit. Since ae = eae is written as βe (β being a scalar), a = ea has at most two spectra with ae. Hence $a-\lambda$ is regular but for two exceptional λ 's. If $a-\lambda$ is regular, we have $\|(a-\lambda)^*\| = \|a-\lambda\|$ by R. Kadison's result. As making $\lambda \to 0$, we get $\|a^*\| = \|a\|$, that is, $\beta(a) = 1$.

²⁶⁾ An element u of R is called to be unitary if $u^*u = 1$.

²⁷⁾ For v is hermitian.

156 T. O_{NO}

$$f_1(t) = \left\{ egin{array}{ll} 0 & (t \leq (1/2)(eta_1 + eta_2)) \ & ext{linear} & ((1/2)(eta_1 + eta_2) \leq t \leq eta_2) \ 1 & (eta_2 \leq t) \ , \ & ext{linear} & (t \leq eta_1) \ , \ & ext{linear} & (eta_1 \leq t \leq (1/2)(eta_1 + eta_2)) \ , \ 0 & ((1/2)(eta_1 + eta_2) \leq t) \ . \end{array}
ight.$$

The verification of (2.4)-(2.6) is easy and so it will be omitted. On the other hand, if d^*d has exactly one non-zero spectrum (say β), we write w for $(\sqrt{\beta})^{-1}d$. Then w is a partial isometry of R and $d=w(\sqrt{\beta}w^*w)$ is a polar decomposition of d. Write e_* for w^*w . Since d is not primitive, e_* is not minimal. Hence we can find an element b of e_*Re_* , which is never written as $b=\alpha e_*$ for any scalar α . In this case, either $\Re(b)$ or $\Re(b)^{28}$ is never written as αe_* for any scalar α and so we may assume that b is hermitian. By taking, if necessary, γe_*-b (for some scalar γ) in place of b, we may assume moreover that b is positive and has an inverse in e_*Re_* . Since b is never written as αe_* for any scalar α , b has at least two non-zero spectra. We construct v_1 , v_2 by taking b in place of d^*d as before. Then it is not so hard to see that these v_1 , v_2 satisfy (2.4)-(2.6).

We put $v_2' = dv_2 d^*$, $k = vv_2'v$, and $l = ahv_1h$.

We see that

(2.7) $k \neq 0$.

For, otherwise, $vv_2'v = 0$ and so $(vd\sqrt{v_2})(vd\sqrt{v_2})^* = 0$. Hence we get $vd\sqrt{v_2} = 0$. This shows that $v^2hv_2 = 0$ and so $(vhv_2)^*(vhv_2) = 0$ and then $vhv_2 = 0$. That is, $dv_2 = 0$. This contradicts to (2.6). Therefore we must have (2.7).

Further we see that

(2.8)
$$l \neq 0$$
.

For, otherwise, we have $ahv_1h=0$ and so $(ah\sqrt{v_1})(ah\sqrt{v_1})^*=0$. Hence we have $ah\sqrt{v_1}=0$ and so $ahv_1=0$. This implies that $a^*ahv_1=h^2v_1=0$. From this it follows that $(hv_1)^*(hv_1)=0$ and so $hv_1=0$. Hence we get $dv_1=0$. This contradicts to (2.6). Therefore we must have (2.8).³⁰

Since $l = a(hv_1a^*)a$, l is orthogonal to c and so

(2.9)
$$\beta(c) = \beta(l)$$
.

In view of (2.2) we have $kl = vv_2'(va)hv_1h = 0$. On the other hand, we have $lk = ahv_1hvv_2'v = ah(v_1d^*dv_2d^*)v = ah(v_1v_2d^*dd^*)v = 0$. From these it follows that

²⁸⁾ $\Re(b) = (1/2)(b+b^*), \Re(b) = (1/2i)(b-b^*).$

²⁹⁾ For, otherwise, we have $b = \alpha e_1$, e_1 being a projection of e_*Re_* with $e_1 \neq e_*$. This contradicts to the existence of the inverse of b in e_*Re_* .

³⁰⁾ This proof of (2.7) is due to T. Saito.

k is orthogonal to l and so in view of (2.7) and (2.8) we have

(2.10)
$$\beta(l) = \beta(k)$$
.

Since k is hermitian, we have

(2.11)
$$\beta(k) = 1$$
.

In view of (2.9)—(2.11), we get $\beta(c) = 1$ and so $\beta(a) = 1$. Thus we reach the assertion. q. e. d.

We are now in a position to prove the theorem.

The Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let a be an arbitrary (but fixed) non-zero element of R. We shall see the assertion for this a by the induction from 3 to 1 with respect to r, which appears in the following statement:

(2.12) a*a has at least r non-zero spectra.

Suppose first a^*a has at least three non-zero spectra (say β_1 , β_2 , β_3 ; $0 < \beta_1$, $0 < \beta_2 < \beta_3$). Consider following three functions:

$$h_{1}(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & (t \leq \beta_{1}), \\ \text{linear} & (\beta_{1} \leq t \leq (1/2)(\beta_{1} + \beta_{2})), \\ 0 & ((1/2)(\beta_{1} + \beta_{2}) \leq t), \end{cases}$$

$$h_{2}(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & (t \leq (1/2)(\beta_{1} + \beta_{2})), \\ \text{linear} & ((1/2)(\beta_{1} + \beta_{2})) \leq t \leq \beta_{2}, \\ 1 & (t = \beta_{2}), \\ \text{linear} & (\beta_{2} \leq t \leq (1/2)(\beta_{2} + \beta_{3})), \\ 0 & ((1/2)(\beta_{2} + \beta_{3}) \leq t), \end{cases}$$

$$h_{3}(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & (t \leq (1/2)(\beta_{2} + \beta_{3})), \\ \text{linear} & ((1/2)(\beta_{2} + \beta_{3}) \leq t \leq \beta_{3}), \\ 1 & (\beta_{2} \leq t). \end{cases}$$

Write v_1 for $h_i(t)/a^*a$ and a_i for av_i $(1 \le i \le 3)$. Then a_i 's are non-zero and mutually orthogonal. Hence we have from Lemma 8 $\beta(a_1) = 1$. Therefore we have $\|a^*a\| = \|a^*av_1\| = \|a_1^*a_1\| = \|a_1\|^2 \le \|a\|^2 \|v_1\|^2 = \|a\|^2$, that is, $\|a^*a\|^{1/2} \le \|a\|$. Similarly we have $\|a^*a\|^{1/2} \le \|a^*\|^{32}$. On the other hand, we have $\|a^*a\|^{1/2} = \|a^*\| \|a\|$. Thus we get $\|a\| = \|a^*a\|^{1/2} = \|a^*\|$, that is, $\beta(a) = 1$.

Next we assume that a^*a has at least r (< 3) (eventually exactly r) non-zero spectra and that the assertion holds for every element b of R, for which b^*b has at least r+1 non-zero spectra. In this case, a^*a is expressed as $a^*a = \sum_{j=1}^r \alpha_j e_{*j}$, where α_j 's are scalars and e_{*j} 's are projections of R^{33}) Write

³¹⁾ When a = 0, the assertion is trivially valid and so this case is omitted.

³²⁾ aa* has also at least three non-zero spectra.

³³⁾ We notice that Ω_{a^*a} is a finite set.

 a_f for ae_{*f} . Then we have a_1, \dots, a_r (\perp) and $a = a_1 + \dots + a_r$. Hence we have $\beta(a_1) = \dots = \beta(a_r) = \beta(a)$ by Lemma 2.2.

If e_{*j} (say e_{*1}) is not minimal, then there exists an hermitian element h of $e_{*1}Re_{*1}$, which has at least two non-zero spectra. Moreover, it necessary, by taking $\beta e_{*1}-h$ in place of h (for a sufficiently large positive scalar β), we may assume without loss of generality that h is positive and has at least two non-zero spectra distinct from $\sqrt{\alpha_j/\alpha_1}$ ($2 \le j \le r$). Put $b = ah + \sum_{j=2}^r a_j$. Then ah, \dots, a_r (\bot) and b^*b has at least r+1 non-zero spectra. Hence we have $\beta(b) = 1$ and so, if $r \ge 2$, $\beta(a_2) = 1$, that is, $\beta(a) = 1$. On the other hand, if r = 1, we take $c = w\sqrt{h}$ in place of b, where $w = (\sqrt{\alpha_1})^{-1}a$ is a partial isometry of R. Then c^*c has at least two non-zero spetra and so $\beta(c) = 1$. Hence we have $\|\sqrt{h}\| = \|w\sqrt{h}\| \le \|w\| \|\sqrt{h}\|$ and so $1 \le \|w\|$. Similarly we get $1 \le \|w^*\|$. On the other hand, we have $1 = \|w^*w\| = \|w^*\| \|w\|$. Hence we get $\|w^*\| = \|w\| = 1$ and so $\beta(a) = \beta(\sqrt{\alpha_1 w}) = \beta(w) = 1$.

Thus we may assume without loss of generality that e_{*1} (and so all e_{*j} 's) is minimal. So a_j is primitive by Lemma 2.4 and then $\beta(a_j) = 1$ by Lemma 2.7. This implies that $\beta(a) = 1$. This completes our assertion. q. e. d.

References

- [1] I. Geland and M. Neumark. On the imbedding of normed rings into the rings of operators in Hilbert spaces, Mat. Sbornik, 12 (1943), 197-213.
- [2] M. Fukamiya, On a theorem of Gelfand and Neumark and the B*-algebra, Kumamoto J. Sci. Acad., 1 (1952), 17-22.
- [3] J.A. Schatz, Review of [2], Math. Rev., 14 (1953), 713-943.
- [4] I. Kaplansky, An appendix added in October 1955 to the paper "topological algebra".
- [5] J.L. Kelley and R.L. Vaught, The positive cone in Banach algebras, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 74 (1953), 44-55.
- [6] M. Mimura, Iso kaiseki (Functional analysis), Kyoritu, 1957. (Japanese)
- [7] M. Nakamura, A remark on a theorem of Gelfand and Neumark, Tohoku Math., 2 (1950), 182-187.
- [8] I. Kaplansky, Function analysis, Some aspects of analysis and probability, Surveys in Applied Mathematics vol. 4, 1958.