

NOTE ON IRREDUCIBLE DECOMPOSITION OF A POSITIVE

LINEAR FUNCTIONAL

By Hisaharu UMEGAKI

In this paper we shall introduce a stationary natural mapping in  $W^*$ -algebra generated by a two-sided representation of a  $D^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{O}$  with a motion  $G$  (e.g. cf. [8]) — a  $D^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{O}$  is mean by a normed  $*$ -algebra with an approximate identity and a motion  $G$  is mean by a group of  $*$ -automorphisms on  $\mathcal{O}$  (the motion has been introduced by Segal for  $C^*$ -algebra). Next, applying the stationary natural mapping and the decomposition theorem of Segal (cf. Th.4 and its proof of [7]) we shall prove an ergodic decomposition of a  $G$ -stationary semi-trace of separable  $\mathcal{O}$  under a restriction which generalizes an irreducible decomposition of finite semi-trace (cf. Th.1 of [9], I), ergodic decomposition of  $G$ -stationary trace (cf. Th.6 of [8]) and ergodic decomposition of invariant regular measure on a compact metric space with a group of homeomorphisms (cf. Th. in App. II of [3] and Th.7 of [7]).

1.<sup>0)</sup> Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be a  $D^*$ -algebra with an approximate identity  $\{e_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in D}$  and with a motion  $G (= \{s\})$  i.e.  $D$  is a directed set and  $e_\alpha^* = e_\alpha$ ,  $\|e_\alpha\| \leq 1$  for all  $\alpha \in D$ ,  $\|e_\alpha x - x\| \rightarrow 0$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{O}$ , and any  $s, t \in G$  are automorphisms on  $\mathcal{O}$  such that  $\|x^s\| = \|x\|$ ,  $x^{s^*} = x^{s^{-1}}$  and  $(x^s)^t = x^{st}$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{O}$ . Let  $\tau$  be a  $G$ -stationary semi-trace of  $\mathcal{O}$ , i.e.  $\tau$  is a linear functional on the self-adjoint subalgebra generated by  $\{xy; x, y \in \mathcal{O}\}$  (i.e.  $\mathcal{O}^2$ ) such that  $\tau(x^*x) \geq 0$ ,  $\tau(\gamma x) = \tau(x\gamma) = \tau(\gamma^* x^*)$ ,  $\tau((e_\alpha x)^* e_\alpha x) \xrightarrow{\alpha} \tau(x^*x)$ ,  $\tau((xy)^*(xy)) \leq \|x\|^2 \tau(\gamma^* \gamma)$  and  $\tau(x^s \gamma^s) = \tau(x\gamma)$  for all  $x, \gamma \in \mathcal{O}$  and  $s \in G$ .

Putting  $\mathcal{I} = \{x \in \mathcal{O}; \tau(x^*x) = 0\}$ ,  $\mathcal{I}$  is a two-sided ideal in  $\mathcal{O}$ . Let  $\mathcal{O}^0$  be quotient algebra of  $\mathcal{O} (= \mathcal{O}/\mathcal{I})$  and for any  $x \in \mathcal{O}$  let  $x^0$  be the class containing  $x$ . Letting  $(x^0, \gamma^0) = \tau(\gamma^* x)$  for all  $x, \gamma \in \mathcal{O}$ ,  $\mathcal{O}^0$  is an incomplete Hilbert space. Let

$\mathcal{H}_\gamma$  be completion of  $\mathcal{O}^0$ . Putting  $x^a \gamma^0 = (x\gamma)^0$ ,  $x^b \gamma^0 = (\gamma x)^0$  and  $j\gamma^0 = \gamma^{*0}$  for all  $x, \gamma \in \mathcal{O}$ ,  $\{x^a, x^b, j, \mathcal{H}_\gamma\}$  defines a two-sided representation of  $\mathcal{O}$ . Moreover putting  $U_s \gamma^0 = (\gamma^s)^0$  for all  $s \in G$  and  $\gamma \in \mathcal{O}$ ,  $\{U_s, \mathcal{H}_\gamma\}$  is a dual unitary representation of  $G$ . For,  $(U_s \gamma^0, x^0) = (\gamma^s, x^0) = \tau(x^* \gamma^s) = \tau(x^{s^{-1}*} \gamma) = (\gamma^0, U_{s^{-1}} x^0)$  and  $U_{st} \gamma^0 = (\gamma^{st})^0 = U_t \gamma^s = U_t U_s \gamma^0$ . Then we have:

$$(1) \quad (x^s)^a = U_s x^a U_{s^{-1}} \text{ and } (x^s)^b = U_s x^b U_{s^{-1}} \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{O} \text{ and } s \in G.$$

For,  $U_s x^a U_{s^{-1}} \gamma^0 = U_s x^a (\gamma^{s^{-1}})^0 = U_s (x\gamma^{s^{-1}})^0 = (x^s \gamma)^0 = x^{s^a} \gamma^0$  and similarly for the latter. Putting  $W^a$ ,  $W^b$  and  $W_G$   $W^*$ -algebras generated by  $\{x^a, x \in \mathcal{O}\}$ ,  $\{x^b; x \in \mathcal{O}\}$  and  $\{U_s, s \in G\}$  respectively,  $W^a = W^b$ ,  $W^a = W^b$ ,  $jA_j = A^*$  for all  $A \in W^a \cap W^b$  and the  $\tau$  is  $G$ -ergodic<sup>1)</sup> if and only if  $W^a \cap W^b \cap W_G' = \{\lambda I\}$  (cf. Th.2 and Th.5 of [8]) where for any set  $F$  of bounded operators on  $\mathcal{H}_\gamma$   $F'$  is the commutor of  $F$ .

Let  $\mathcal{L}_\tau$  be the family of all bounded elements  $v$  in  $\mathcal{H}_\gamma$  (i.e.  $v$  belongs to  $\mathcal{L}_\tau$  if and only if  $\|v^* v\| \leq M \|x^0\|$  for all cf. [8] and [9]) whose corresponding bounded operators on  $\mathcal{H}_\gamma$  be  $v^a$  and  $v^b$  such that  $v^a x^0 = x^b v^0$ ,  $v^b x^0 = x^a v^0$ . Then  $\{x^0; x \in \mathcal{O}\} \subset \mathcal{L}_\tau$  and  $x^0 a = x^a$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{O}$ , and the following relations are equivalent each other: for any  $v_1, v_2$  in  $\mathcal{L}_\tau$   $v_1^a = v_2^a$ ,  $v_1^b = v_2^b$  (both as operator) and  $v_1 = v_2$  (as point in  $\mathcal{H}_\gamma$ ). Now we can define in  $\mathcal{L}_\tau$  a  $*$ -involution and a ring product:  $v^*$  and  $v_1 v_2 (= v_1^a v_2^b = v_2^b v_1^a)$  for all  $v, v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{L}_\tau$  satisfying that  $v^* = jv$ ,  $v^{*a} = v^{a*}$ ,  $v^{*b} = v^{b*}$  ( $v^{a*}$ ,  $v^{b*}$  are adjoint operators of  $v^a$  and  $v^b$ ),  $jv^a j = v^{b*}$ ,  $(v_1 v_2)^a = v_1^a v_2^a$ ,  $(v_1 v_2)^b = v_2^b v_1^b$  and  $(\lambda_1 v_1 + \lambda_2 v_2)^a = \lambda_1 v_1^a + \lambda_2 v_2^a$  (for  $d = a$  or  $b$ ) (cf. p.35 of [8], p.61 of [9], II).

$$(2) \quad U_s v \in \mathcal{L}_\tau \text{ and } (U_s v)^a = U_s v^a U_{s^{-1}},$$

$(u_s v)^b = u_s v^b u_s^{-1}$  for all  $s \in G$  and  $v \in \mathcal{L}$ .

For,  $x^b u_s v = u_s u_{s^{-1}} x^b u_s v = u_s x^{s^{-1} b} v$   
and  $\|x^b u_s v\| = \|(x^{s^{-1}})^b v\| = \|v^a u_{s^{-1}} x^a\|$   
 $\leq \|v^a\| \|x^a\|$ .

Next  $u_s v^a u_{s^{-1}} x^a = u_s v^a (x^{s^{-1}})^a = u_s (x^{s^{-1}})^b v^a$   
 $= u_s u_{s^{-1}} x^b u_s v^a = x^b u_s v^a = (u_s v^a)^a x^a$ .  
The latter follows from the similar method.

Let  $W^{(u)}$  and  $W^{(u^*)}$  be the sets of all unitary operators in  $W^a$  and  $W^b$  respectively, and put  $u^* = u_j u_j$  for all  $u \in W^{(u)}$ . Then  $(u^* v)^a = (u_j u_j v)^a = u_j v^a u_j^{-1}$  for all  $v \in \mathcal{L}$  (cf. Lem 3 of [8]). It is evident that for any  $u \in W^{(u)}$ ,  $j u_j \in W^{(u)}$  and  $(u_j u_j)^{-1} = j u_j^{-1} j u_j^{-1} = u_j^{-1} j u_j^{-1}$ .

Put  $\mathcal{G}$  = unitary group generated by  $\{u^*; u \in W^{(u)}\}$  and  $\{u_s; s \in G\}$ .

Lemma 1. For any  $u' \in \mathcal{G}$  and  $v \in \mathcal{L}$ ,  $u' v \in \mathcal{L}$  and there exists a unitary operator  $u$  on  $\mathcal{L}$  such that  $(u' v)^a = u v^a u^*$  for all  $v \in \mathcal{L}$ .

Proof. For  $u' = u_s u^*$  (for some  $s \in G$  and  $u \in W^{(u)}$ ),  $u' v \in \mathcal{L}$  follows from (2) and the fact that  $\mathcal{L}^a$  is ideal in  $W^a$ , and  $(u' v)^a = (u_s u^* v)^a = (u_s u_j u_j v)^a = u_s (u_j u_j v)^a u_s^{-1} = u_s u v^a u^{-1} u_{s^{-1}} = (u_s u) v^a (u_s u)^{-1}$ . For  $u' = u^* u_s$ , similarly  $u' v \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $(u' v)^a = (u^* u_s v)^a = (u_j u_j u_s v)^a = u_j (u_j u_s v)^a u_j^{-1} = u_j u_s v^a u_j^{-1} = (u u_s) v^a (u u_s)^{-1}$ . Since general element in  $\mathcal{G}$  has product form of a finite number of the above forms  $u'$  and  $u''$ , we can prove for any  $u'$  in  $\mathcal{G}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{Z}$  be the closed linear manifold of all the vectors  $\xi$  in  $\mathcal{L}$  such that  $u' \xi = \xi$  for all  $u' \in \mathcal{G}$ , and let  $Z$  be the projection from  $\mathcal{L}$  onto  $\mathcal{Z}$ . For any  $\xi \in \mathcal{L}$ , put  $K_\xi =$  closed convex hull of  $\{u' \xi; u' \in \mathcal{G}\}$ . Then

Lemma 2. (Godement's lemma; cf. [2]). (i)  $K_\xi \cap \mathcal{Z}$  consists of only one point  $\xi_0$ , (ii)  $\|\xi_0\| = \inf\{\|\xi\|; \xi \in K_\xi\}$ , (iii)  $Z \xi = \xi_0$ .

(3)  $j u = u j$  for all  $u \in \mathcal{G}$  and  $j Z = Z j$

For,  $j u_s x^a = j (x^s)^a = x^{s^* a}$   
 $= x^{s^* a} = u_s j x^a$  and  $j u^* x^a = j u_j u_j x^a$

$= j j u_j u_j x^a = u_j u x^a = u_j u j x^a = u^* j x^a$   
for all  $s \in G$  and  $u \in W^{(u)}$ . For any  $\xi \in \mathcal{L}$  taking  $\xi_n = \sum \lambda_i^{(n)} u_i^{(n)} \xi \in K_\xi$  ( $u_i^{(n)} \in \mathcal{G}$ ) and  $\xi_n \rightarrow \xi_0 (= Z \xi)$ ,  $j Z \xi = j \xi_0 = j \lim \xi_n = \lim j \xi_n = \lim \sum \lambda_i^{(n)} u_i^{(n)} j \xi \in K_{j \xi}$ . While  $u' j \xi_0 = j u' \xi_0 = j \xi_0$  for all  $u' \in \mathcal{G}$  and  $j \xi_0 \in K_{j \xi} \cap \mathcal{Z}$ .

(4)  $x^a \xi = x^b \xi$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{O}$  and  $\xi \in \mathcal{Z}$ .

For,  $u_j u_j \xi = \xi$  implies  $j u_j \xi = u_j^{-1} \xi$ . Let  $x \in \mathcal{O}$  be  $x^* = x$  and  $\|x^a\| \leq 1$ . Putting  $u_1 = x^a + i(I - x^a)^{1/2}$  and  $u_2 = x^a - i(I - x^a)^{1/2}$ ,  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  belong to  $W^{(u)}$ . Hence  $(j x^a j - u_j (I - x^a)^{1/2} j) \xi = (x^a - i(I - x^a)^{1/2}) \xi$   
 $(j x^a j + u_j (I - x^a)^{1/2} j) \xi = (x^a + i(I - x^a)^{1/2}) \xi$

and  $j x^a j \xi = x^a \xi$ ,  $x^b \xi = x^a \xi$ . This holds for all s.a.  $x \in \mathcal{O}$ . Since any  $x \in \mathcal{O}$  can be represented as  $\gamma + i z$  ( $\gamma$  and  $z$  being self adjoint in  $\mathcal{O}$ ),  $x^a \xi = (\gamma^a + i z^a) \xi = (\gamma^b + i z^b) \xi = x^b \xi$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{O}$ .

(5)  $K_v \subset \mathcal{L}$  for any  $v \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $Z \mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{L}$ .

For, let  $\{\xi_n\} \subset K_v$  such that  $\xi_n = \sum_{i=1}^{m_i(n)} \lambda_i^{(n)} u_i^{(n)} v$  ( $u_i^{(n)} \in W^{(u)}$ ,  $\sum_{i=1}^{m_i(n)} \lambda_i^{(n)} = 1$

and  $\lambda_i^{(n)} \geq 0$ ) and  $\xi_n \rightarrow \xi$ . Then  $\|x^b \xi_n\| = \|\sum_{i=1}^{m_i(n)} \lambda_i^{(n)} u_i^{(n)} v\| = \|\sum_{i=1}^{m_i(n)} \lambda_i^{(n)} u_i^{(n)} v^a u_i^{(n)*} v\| \leq \|v^a\| \|x^a\|$   
and  $\|x^b \xi_n\| \rightarrow \|x^b \xi\| \leq \|v^a\| \|x^a\|$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{O}$ . Hence  $\xi \in \mathcal{L}$  and we have the former. The latter is evident by the former.

Putting  $(v^a)^{\sharp} = (Z v)^a$  for all  $v \in \mathcal{L}$ , by the proof of (5)  $\|(v^a)^{\sharp} x^a\| = \|(Z v)^a x^a\| = \|x^a Z v\| \leq \|v^a\| \|x^a\|$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{O}$  and we have

(6)  $\|v^a\|^{\sharp} \leq \|v^a\|$  for all  $v \in \mathcal{L}$

Let  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{R}^{\sharp}$  be the uniform closures of  $\mathcal{L}^a$  and  $\mathcal{L}^{a \sharp}$  respectively, then

Proposition 1. The mapping  $\sharp$  is uniquely extended to a linear mapping on  $\mathcal{R}$  onto  $\mathcal{R}^{\sharp}$  such that:

- (i)  $A \in \mathcal{R}^{\sharp}$  implies  $A^{\sharp} = A$ .
- (ii)  $A^{\sharp \sharp} = A^{\sharp}$  and  $(A^* A)^{\sharp} \geq 0$ .
- (iii)  $(u A u^{-1})^{\sharp} = A^{\sharp}$  for all  $u \in W^{(u)}$  and all  $u = u_s$  ( $s \in G$ ).
- (iv)  $(AB)^{\sharp} = (BA)^{\sharp}$  and  $(A^{\sharp} B)^{\sharp} = (A B^{\sharp})^{\sharp} = A^{\sharp} B^{\sharp}$  for all  $A, B \in \mathcal{R}$ .

$$(v) \quad (A\xi, \xi) = (A^s \xi, \xi) \quad \text{for all } A \in \mathcal{R} \text{ and } \xi \in \mathcal{Z}.$$

Proof. (i) follows immediately from (6). (ii):  $v^{s*} \xi = (Zjv)^s = (jZv)^s$  (by (3))  $= (Zv)^{s*} = v^{s*} \xi$ . While  $((v^*v)^s \xi, x^0) = (x^b Z v^* v, x^0) = \lim (\sum \lambda_i^{(n)} x^b u_i^{(n)} v^* v, x^0)$ .

Since  $(x^b U^i v^* v, x^0) = (U v^{*a} v^a U^i x^0, x^0) = \|v^a U^i x^0\|^2 \geq 0$  (where  $U$  is as in lemma 1),  $((v^*v)^s \xi, x^0) \geq 0$ .

Taking  $v_n \in \mathcal{L}$  such that  $\|v_n - A\| = \|v_n^* - A^*\| \rightarrow 0$  ( $n \rightarrow \infty$ ) we have (ii).

(iii): Since for any  $u \in W^{a(u)} K_{u^*v} < K_v$ ,  $ZU^*v \in K_v$  and  $ZU^*v \in K_v \cap \mathcal{Z}$ . Hence by lemma 2  $ZU^*v = Zv$  and  $(Uv^*U^i)^s = (U^*v)^s = (ZU^*v)^s = (Zv)^s = v^{s*} \xi$  for all  $U \in W^{a(u)}$  and  $v \in \mathcal{L}$ . While for  $s \in \mathcal{G}$ , similarly  $ZU_s v = Zv$  and  $(U_s v^* U_s)^s = (U_s v)^s = (ZU_s v)^s = (Zv)^s = v^{s*} \xi$ . Taking  $v \in \mathcal{L}$  as the previous we have (ii). (iv): For any  $v, w \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $x, y \in \mathcal{O}$ ,  $(Zv^*w, x^0) = (v^*w, Zx^0) = (w, v^{*a} Zx^0) = (w, v^{*b} Zx^0)^s = (v^*w, Zx^0)^s = (Zv^*w, x^0)^s$ , hence  $(v^*w)^s = (Zv^*w)^s = (Zv^*w)^s = (w^*v^*w)^s = (w^*v^*w)^s \xi, \gamma^0) = (x^b Z v^* w, \gamma^0) = (Z v^* w, (\gamma x^*)^0) = (w, v^{s*} Z(\gamma x^*)^0) = (Zw, v^{s*} Z(\gamma x^*)^0)$  (because  $v^{s*} Z(\gamma x^*)^0 \in \mathcal{Z}$ ),  $= (v^{s*} Z w, (\gamma x^*)^0) = (x^b v^{*a} Z w, \gamma^0) = (v^{*a} (Zw)^a x^0, \gamma^0) = (v^{*a} w^* w^* x^0, \gamma^0)$ .

For any  $A, B \in \mathcal{R}$ , taking  $\{v_n\}, \{w_n\} \subset \mathcal{L}$ :  $\|v_n - A\| \rightarrow 0$  and  $\|w_n - B\| \rightarrow 0$  we can prove  $(AB)^s = (BA)^s$ ,  $(A^s B)^s = A^s B^s$  and clearly  $(A^s B)^s = (A^s B^s)^s$ . (v): For  $v, w \in \mathcal{L}$ ,  $(v^* Z w, Z w) = (w^* v, Z w) = (Z v, w^{*a} Z w) = (w^{*a} Z v, Z w) = (v^{*a} Z w, Z w)$ . Since  $Z\mathcal{L}$  is dense in  $\mathcal{Z}$  and  $\|v_n - A\| \rightarrow 0$  implies  $\|v_n^s - A^s\| \rightarrow 0$ ,

(v) holds.

Lemma 3. If  $\mathcal{Z}$  has the following properties:

$$(7) \quad \{x^a \mathcal{Z}; x \in \mathcal{O}\} \text{ is dense in } \mathcal{L}.$$

Then the mapping  $v^a \rightarrow v^{*a}$  is strongly continuous on a sphere of  $\mathcal{L}^a$ .

Proof. Since  $Z\mathcal{L}$  is dense in  $\mathcal{Z}$ , (7) is equivalent to that  $\{x^a Z v; x \in \mathcal{O}, v \in \mathcal{L}\}$  is dense in  $\mathcal{L}$ . If  $v_n^a \rightarrow v^a$  strongly and  $\|v_n^a\| \leq M$ , then  $\|(v_n^a - v^a)^s w^* w^* x^0\| = \|x^b (v_n^a - v^a)^s Z w\|$ , (since  $((v_n^a - v^a)^s Z w, x^0) = ((Z w)^s Z (v_n^a - v), Z x^0) = (v_n - v, (Z w)^{a*} Z x^0) = (Z (v_n^a - v^a) Z w, x^0)$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{O}$ ,  $(v_n^a - v^a)^s Z w = Z (w_n^a - v^a) Z w$ )  $= \|x^b Z (v_n^a - v^a) Z w\| \rightarrow 0$  and  $v_n^a \rightarrow v^a$  strongly.

(8) The approximate identity  $\{e_\alpha\}$  in

$\mathcal{O}$  satisfies that  $e_\alpha$  belongs to the center of  $\mathcal{O}$  and  $e_\alpha^s = e_\alpha$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{G}$  and  $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}$ .

If  $\{e_\alpha\}$  satisfy (8), then (7) is always satisfied. For, clearly  $e_\alpha^0 \in \mathcal{Z}$  and  $e_\alpha^s x^0 \rightarrow x^0$  strongly in  $\mathcal{L}$ , and  $\{x^a e_\alpha^s; x \in \mathcal{O}, \alpha \in \mathcal{D}\}$  is dense in  $\mathcal{L}$ .

THEOREM 1. Under the assumption (7) or (8), the mapping  $\xi$  (on  $\mathcal{L}^a$ ) is uniquely extended to a linear mapping on  $W^a$  onto  $W^s (= W^a \cap W^s \cap W_0^s)$  satisfying the conditions (i) - (v) in the Prop. 1, where we take  $W^a$  and  $W^s$  in the place of  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{R}^s$  respectively which coincides with  $\xi$  on  $\mathcal{R}$  introduced in Prop. 1, and moreover

$$(vi) \quad I^s = I, \text{ and } (A^* A)^s = 0 \text{ for } A \in W^a \text{ implies } A = 0.$$

Proof. Since  $\mathcal{L}^a$  is dense in  $W^a$  under the bounded strong topology (cf. [4]), by lemma 3 and its proof  $\xi$  (on  $\mathcal{L}^a$ ) can be uniquely extended onto  $W^a$ . Since the uniform convergence in  $\mathcal{L}^a$  implies boundedly strong convergence (in the operator topology), the introduced mapping  $\xi$  (on  $W^a$ ) coincides with  $\xi$  (on  $\mathcal{R}$ ). If  $v_n \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $\|v_n^a\| \leq M$ , then  $v_n^a \rightarrow A$  (strongly) if and only if  $v_n^* \rightarrow A^*$ . For,  $w_n^a v_n^a Z w_n = w_n^a v_n^* Z w_n = v_n^* w_n^a Z w_n$  and  $\{v_n^* w_n^a Z w_n\}_n$  is Cauchy directed set for all  $w_1, w_2 \in \mathcal{L}$ ; since  $\{x^a Z v; x \in \mathcal{O}, v \in \mathcal{L}\}$  is dense in  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\|v_n^a\| = \|j v_n^* j\| = \|v_n^* \| \leq M$ , there exists a strongly limit  $B$  of  $v_n^*$ . Since for any  $\xi, \zeta \in \mathcal{L}$ ,  $(j B j \xi, \zeta) = \lim (j v_n^* j \xi, \zeta) = \lim (v_n^* \xi, \zeta) = \lim (\xi, v_n^a \zeta) = (\xi, A \zeta) = (A^* \xi, \zeta)$ ,  $j B j = A^*$  and hence  $v_n^* \rightarrow j v_n^* j \rightarrow j B j = A^*$ . The converse is clear. If  $(Zv)^a \xi = 0$  for all  $v \in \mathcal{L}$ , then  $(v^{*a} \xi, x^0) = ((Zv)^{a*} \xi, x^0) = (\xi, x^a Z v) = 0$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{O}$ ,  $v \in \mathcal{L}$ , and  $\xi = 0$ . Hence there exists  $\{u_n\} \subset Z\mathcal{L}$  such that  $\|u_n^a\| \leq 1$  and  $u_n^a \rightarrow I$  (strongly) by Satz 5 in [5] and Th.1 in [4]. For any  $u \in Z\mathcal{L}$ ,  $A \in W^s$  and  $u^0 \in \mathcal{G}$ ,  $u^* A = A u^*$ , and hence  $u^* A u = A u^* u = A u$  or  $A u \in Z\mathcal{L}$ . By the construction of  $\xi$  on  $W^a$ ,  $A^s$  is boundedly strong limit of a  $\{v_n^* \xi\}$  ( $v_n \in \mathcal{L}$ ) and hence  $A^s u_n^* = (A^* u_n^*)^s = (Z A u_n^*)^s = A u_n^*$ . Since  $u_n^* \rightarrow I$  strongly,  $A^s = A$ . The fact  $A^s \in W^s$  for any  $A \in W^a$  follows from that  $\mathcal{L}^a$  is dense in  $W^a$  under the bounded strong topology. Since for any  $A \in W^a$  we can take  $\{v_n\} \subset \mathcal{L}$  such that  $\|v_n^a\| \leq M$ ,  $v_n^a \rightarrow A$

and  $v_p^{a*} \rightarrow A^*$  strongly, for any  $\xi \in \mathcal{H}_\xi$   
 $\| (A^*A - v_p^{a*} v_p^a) \xi \|^2 \leq \| (A^* - v_p^{a*}) A \xi \|^2$   
 $+ M \| (A - v_p^a) \xi \|^2 + M \| (v_p^{a*} - v_p^a) \xi \|^2$  (\*)  
hence  $v_p^{a*} v_p^a \rightarrow A^*A$  strongly and  $\| v_p^{a*} v_p^a \|$   
 $= \| v_p^a \|^2 \leq M^2$ . Since (i) - (v) hold  
in  $\mathcal{L}^*$  (cf. Proof of Prop. 1), we have  
also (i) - (v) for  $A \in W^*$ .

(vi): Since  $I \in W^\beta$ ,  $I^\beta = I$  is  
evident. Let  $A \in W^*$  satisfies  $(A^*A)^\beta$   
 $= 0$ , then  $((A^*A)^\beta Z_\nu, Z_\nu) = (A^*A Z_\nu, Z_\nu)$   
(by (v))  $= \| A Z_\nu \|^2 = 0$  and  
 $x^\beta A Z_\nu = A x^\beta Z_\nu = A x^\beta Z_\nu = 0$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{O}$   
and  $\nu \in \mathcal{L}$ . Hence  $A = 0$ .

Now we have following

Corollary 1. Let  $\tau$  be arbitrary  
 $G$ -stationary trace of a  $D^*$ -algebra  
 $\mathcal{O}$  with a motion  $G$  and let  $W^a, W^b$   
and  $W_c$  be the  $W^*$ -algebras generated  
by the representations  $\{x^*, \mathcal{H}_\xi\}, \{x^\beta, \mathcal{H}_\xi\}$  and  
 $\{u_s, \mathcal{H}_\xi\}$ . Then there exists a  $G$ -  
stationary natural mapping on  $W^a$  onto  
 $W^a \wedge W^b \wedge W_c$  satisfying the properties  
(i) - (vi) on  $W^a$ .

Proof. There exists a strictly  
normalizing vector  $\xi \in \mathcal{H}_\xi$  such that  
 $j\xi = \xi$ ,  $x^\beta = x^* \xi = x^\beta \xi$ ,  $\tau(x) = (x^* \xi, \xi)$   
for all  $x \in \mathcal{O}$  and  $\{x^* \xi; x \in \mathcal{O}\}$  is  
dense in  $\mathcal{H}_\xi$  (e.g. cf. Th.1 in [8]).  
We now prove  $u_p^a \rightarrow \xi$  strongly in  $\mathcal{H}_\xi$   
for any approximate identity  $\{u_p^a\}$  in  
 $\mathcal{O}$ .  $(u_p^a, x^\beta) = (u_p^a \xi, x^\beta \xi) = \tau(u_p^a x^*) \rightarrow$   
 $\tau(x^*) = (\xi, \xi)$  and  $\| u_p^a \|^2 = \| u_p^a \xi \|^2 \leq \| \xi \|^2$   
for all  $p$ . Hence  $u_p^a \rightarrow \xi$  weakly, and  
 $u_p^a$  being uniformly bounded, con-  
verges strongly. Clearly  $e_s^\beta$  is also  
approximate identity in  $\mathcal{O}$  for all  $s \in G$   
Hence  $(e_s^\beta)^\beta = u_s e_s^\beta \rightarrow u_s \xi$ ,  $(e_s^\beta)^\beta \rightarrow \xi$   
and hence  $u_s \xi = \xi$  for all  $s \in G$ .  
Therefore  $\xi$  belongs to the manifold  
 $\mathcal{J}$ , and the condition (7) is always  
satisfied and by Th.1 we have Cor.1.

2. In this section, we shall prove  
an ergodic decomposition of a  $G$ -  
stationary semi-trace  $\tau$  of a sepa-  
rable  $D^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{O}$  with a motion  $G$ .  
We shall use the same notations in  
§ 1, and assume the condition (7) or  
(8). Since  $\mathcal{O}$  is separable, the  
Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_\xi$  is also separable  
(cf. Lem.5 of [8]).

Lemma 4. There exists a nonzero  
vector  $\xi$  in  $\mathcal{J}$  such that  $j\xi = \xi$  and  
 $\{x^* \xi; x \in \mathcal{O}\}$  is dense in  $\mathcal{H}_\xi$ .

The proof follows from the similar  
proof of a theorem of Segal (cf. the  
last paragraph of the proof of Th.9,  
p.49 of [7]): Let  $\{\xi_n\}$  be a countable  
family of nonzero elements of  $\mathcal{J}$  which  
is maximal with respect to the proper-  
ties: 1)  $j\xi_n = \xi_n$ , 2)  $\{\mathcal{O}^* \xi_n\}$  are  
orthogonal with respect to each other.  
Putting  $\xi = \sum \xi_n / 2^n \| \xi_n \|^2$  is the re-  
quired one. This follows from the  
proof of Segal adjoining the facts,  
that the closure  $\mathcal{M}_n$  of  $\mathcal{O}^* \xi_n$  and  
projection  $P_n$  (onto  $\mathcal{M}_n$ ) satisfy  
that  $\mathcal{O}^* \mathcal{M}_n \subset \mathcal{M}_n$ ,  $\mathcal{O}^\beta \mathcal{M}_n \subset \mathcal{M}_n$ ,  $j \mathcal{M}_n \subset \mathcal{M}_n$ ,  
 $u_s \mathcal{M}_n \subset \mathcal{M}_n$  for all  $s \in G$  and  $P_n \in W^\beta$   
 $(= W^a \wedge W^b \wedge W_c)$ , and that  $\{x^* \xi; x \in \mathcal{O}, \xi \in \mathcal{J}\}$   
spans  $\mathcal{H}_\xi$ .)

Let  $\mathcal{R}_1$  (resp.  $\mathcal{R}_1^\beta$ ) be  $C^*$ -algebras  
generated by  $\mathcal{R}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{R}^\beta$ ) and  $I$ .  
Then the natural mapping  $\xi$  on  $\mathcal{R}$  is  
uniquely extended on  $\mathcal{R}_1$  onto  $\mathcal{R}_1^\beta$   
which coincides with the contraction  
of the mapping  $\xi$  on  $W^a$ . For any  
 $s \in G$  and  $A \in \mathcal{R}$  (or  $\mathcal{R}_1$ ) putting  
 $A^s = u_s A u_s^{-1}$ ,  $A^s \in \mathcal{R}$  (or  $\mathcal{R}_1$ ),  $G$   
defines a motion on  $\mathcal{R}$  (or  $\mathcal{R}_1$ ) such  
that  $x^{s^2} = x^s$  for all  $s \in G$  and  $x \in \mathcal{O}$ .  
Let  $\Omega$  and  $\Omega_1$  be character spaces of  
 $\mathcal{R}^\beta$  and  $\mathcal{R}_1^\beta$ , and putting  $\omega(A) =$   
 $\omega(A^\beta)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{R}$  (or  $\mathcal{R}_1$ ),  $\omega$  are  
 $G$ -stationary traces of  $\mathcal{R}$  (or  $\mathcal{R}_1$ )  
respectively). Then  $\Omega$  (resp.  $\Omega_1$ )  
is locally compact (resp. compact)  
Hausdorff space, and there exists a  
Radon measure  $d\mu$  on  $\Omega$  such that

$$(9) \quad (SA\xi, \xi) = \int_{\Omega} S(\omega) \omega(A) d\mu(\omega)$$

for  $S \in \mathcal{R}^\beta$  and  $A \in \mathcal{R}$

The (9) follows from that  $\mu(A^\beta) = \mu(A)$ ,  
 $\mu(SA^\beta) = \mu(SA)$  and  $\omega(SA) = \omega((SA)^\beta) = \omega(SA^\beta)$   
 $= \omega(S)\omega(A)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{R}$ ,  $S \in \mathcal{R}^\beta$  and  
 $\omega \in \Omega$ , where  $\mu(A) = (A\xi, \xi)$ .

Denote  $\mathcal{R}$  the  $C^*$ -algebra generated  
by  $\{x^*; x \in \mathcal{O}\}$ .

THEOREM 2. Let  $\tau$  be  $G$ -stationary  
semi-trace on  $\mathcal{O}$  and  $\Omega$  the character  
space of  $\mathcal{R}^\beta$ . Then there exists a  
positive Radon measure  $\nu$  on  $\Omega$  such  
that

$$(10) \quad \tau(xy) = \int_{\Omega} \pi_\omega(xy) d\nu(\omega)$$

for all  $x, y \in \mathcal{O}$  and  $\pi_\omega$  are  $d\nu(\omega)$ -  
almost all  $G$ -ergodic traces on  $\mathcal{O}$ .

Proof. By a method of Segal which  
is done under the resolution of  
identity (cf. p.284-5 in [6]), for

any s.a.  $v \in Z\mathcal{L}$  there exists a sequence  $\{q_n\}$  of linear combinations of orthogonal s.a. idempotents in  $Z\mathcal{L}$  such that

$$(11) \quad \|q_n - v\| \rightarrow 0, \text{ and } \|q_n^2 - v^2\| \rightarrow 0 \text{ (} n \rightarrow \infty \text{)}.$$

For any  $v \in Z\mathcal{L}$ , taking  $v = v_1 + i v_2$  ( $v_1^* = v_1$  and  $v_2^* = v_2$ ), (11) also holds for  $v$ . Denote  $\mathcal{L}_p$  and  $\mathcal{L}_q$  be the sets of all s.a. idempotents in  $Z\mathcal{L}$  and linear extension of  $\mathcal{L}_p$ , respectively. Let  $\mathcal{R}_p^f$  be the set of all projections in  $\mathcal{R}^f$ , then  $\mathcal{R}_p^f = \mathcal{L}_p^f$  ( $= \{p^* : p \in \mathcal{L}_p\}$ ) (cf. (40), p.25 of [9], I). This follows from, that for  $P \in \mathcal{R}_p^f$  taking  $\{q_n\} \subset \mathcal{L}_q$  such that  $\|q_n^2 - P\| \rightarrow 0$  (which is possible by (11) and the fact that the uniform closure of  $\mathcal{L}^f$  is  $\mathcal{R}^f$ ),  $q_n^2(\omega) \rightarrow P(\omega)$  uniformly on  $\Omega$ , and that  $\mathcal{L}^f$  is an ideal in  $\mathcal{R}^f$ , Let  $C_c(\Omega)$  be the set of all continuous functions on  $\Omega$  with compact supports. Then  $C_c(\Omega) \subset \mathcal{L}^f$  ( $\mathcal{L}^f$  being an ideal in  $\mathcal{R}^f$ ).

Putting  $v_0(p^*) = \|p\|^2$  for any  $p \in \mathcal{L}_p$ ,  $v_0(\cdot)$  define a complete additive gage on  $\mathcal{L}_p$  which can be considered as a complete additive set function on the collection  $\mathcal{K}_p$  of all compact-open sets in  $\Omega$  (considering  $v_0(K_p) = v_0(p^*)$  where  $K_p$  is compact-open set corresponding to  $p \in \mathcal{L}_p$ ), and it can be uniquely extended to a complete additive measure  $\nu$  on the family of Borel sets generated by  $\mathcal{K}_p$ .

Then for any  $v, w \in Z\mathcal{L}$ ,  $v^*(\cdot)$  and  $w^*(\cdot)$  are in  $L_2(\Omega, \nu)$  and

$$(12) \quad (v, w) = \int_{\Omega} v^* w^{*a}(\omega) d\nu(\omega).$$

For, by (11) we can take  $\{q_n\}$  and  $\{r_n\}$  in  $\mathcal{L}_q$ :  $\|q_n - v\| \rightarrow 0, \|r_n - w\| \rightarrow 0, \|q_n^2 - v^2\| \rightarrow 0$  and  $\|r_n^2 - w^2\| \rightarrow 0$  ( $n \rightarrow \infty$ ). Since  $\|q_n - q_m\|^2 = \int |q_n^2(\omega) - q_m^2(\omega)|^2 d\nu(\omega) \rightarrow 0$  ( $m, n \rightarrow \infty$ ), there exists a  $v'(\cdot)$  in  $L_2(\Omega, \nu)$  such that  $q_n^2(\omega) \rightarrow v'(\omega)$  in measure, and  $\|q_n - v'\|_2 \rightarrow 0$  ( $\|\cdot\|_2$  being  $L_2(\nu)$ -norm). Since  $q_n^2(\omega) \rightarrow v^2(\omega)$  uniformly on  $\Omega$ ,  $v'(\omega) = v^2(\omega)$  a.e., and hence  $\|q_n - v\|^2 = \int |q_n^2(\omega) - v^2(\omega)|^2 d\nu(\omega) \rightarrow 0$ . Similarly  $\|r_n - w\|^2 = \int |r_n^2(\omega) - w^2(\omega)|^2 d\nu(\omega) \rightarrow 0$ . Hence  $(v, w) = \lim_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} (q_n, r_m) = \lim \int q_n^2(\omega) r_m^{*a}(\omega) d\nu(\omega) = \int v^2(\omega) w^{*a}(\omega) d\nu(\omega)$ . For any  $v \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $w \in Z\mathcal{L}$ ,  $(v, w) = (Zv, w) = \int (Zv)^*(\omega) w^{*a}(\omega) d\nu(\omega)$ , (since  $\omega(v^* w^{*a}) = \omega(v^*) \omega(w^{*a}) =$

$(Zv)^*(\omega) w^{*a}(\omega)$ ),  $= \int \omega(v^* w^{*a}) d\nu(\omega)$ . For any  $v, w \in \mathcal{L}$ , and  $u \in Z\mathcal{L}$ ,  $(u^* v, w) = (v^* u, w) = (u, v^* w) = \int_{\Omega} \omega(u^* v^* w^{*a}) d\nu(\omega)$ . Letting  $\{u_n\} \subset Z\mathcal{L}$  such that,  $u_n^2 \geq 0, \|u_n\| \leq 1$  and  $0 \leq \omega(u_n^2 v^* w^{*a}) \rightarrow \omega(v^* w^{*a})$  (the existence of  $\{u_n\}$  is possible by that  $v^* w^{*a}(\omega) (= \omega((v^* w^{*a})^{\sharp}))$  vanishes at infinite on  $\Omega$ ),  $\omega(u_n^2 v^* w^{*a}) \leq \omega(v^* w^{*a})$  and  $\int \omega(u_n^2 v^* w^{*a}) d\nu(\omega) = (u_n^2, v) \leq (v, v)$ . Hence by Fatou's lemma  $\omega(v^* w^{*a})$  is  $\nu$ -integrable and

$$\int \omega(v^* w^{*a}) d\nu(\omega) \leq (v, v).$$

Let  $\{A_n\} \subset (Z\mathcal{L})^*$  such that  $\|A_n\| \leq 1, A_n \geq 0$  and  $A_n \rightarrow I$  strongly on  $\mathcal{L}_q$ . Since  $\omega(A_n v^* w^{*a}) \leq \omega(v^* w^{*a})$  and  $\int \omega(A_n v^* w^{*a}) d\nu(\omega) = (A_n, v) \rightarrow (v, v) \leq \int \omega(v^* w^{*a}) d\nu(\omega)$ .

Hence  $\int \omega(v^* w^{*a}) d\nu(\omega) = (v, v)$  for all  $v \in \mathcal{L}$ .

For any  $v, w \in \mathcal{L}$ ,  $v w^{*a}$  is complex finite linear combinations of the form  $v_k v_k^*$  (i.e.  $v w^{*a} = \sum \lambda_k v_k v_k^* \in \mathcal{L}$ ). Then, taking  $\{A_n\}$  in  $(Z\mathcal{L})^*$  as above it can be shown that  $(v, w) = \sum \lambda_k (v_k, v_k)$ . This implies that  $\omega(v^* w^{*a}) (= \sum \omega(v_k^* v_k^{*a}))$  is  $\nu$ -integrable and  $\int \omega(v^* w^{*a}) d\nu(\omega) = \sum \lambda_k \int \omega(v_k^* v_k^{*a}) d\nu(\omega) = \sum \lambda_k (v_k, v_k) = (v, w)$ .

Since  $v_0(\cdot)$  determines a unique positive linear functional  $\nu(\cdot)$  on  $C_c(\Omega)$  which is the contraction of  $\nu(\cdot)$  onto  $C_c(\Omega)$  and  $\nu(p^*) = \nu_0(p^*) = v_0(p^*)$  for all  $p \in \mathcal{L}_p$ ,  $d\nu$  is a regular measure on  $\Omega$ . Since for any  $p \in \mathcal{L}_p$ ,  $W^{\sharp} p^*$  is contained in  $\mathcal{L}^{\sharp}$  and weakly closed,  $(K, \nu)$  is perfect measure space (cf. Lem. 1.4. of [7]). Hence any non-dense set in  $K_p$  or more general any non-dense set in  $\Omega$  is  $\nu$ -null set by the regularity of  $d\nu$ .

Let  $\Gamma$  be the character space of  $W^{\sharp}$ , then  $W^{\sharp}$  is \*isomorphic with  $C(\Gamma)$  by  $S \rightarrow S(\cdot)$ , and there exists a continuous mapping  $\phi$  from  $\Gamma$  on  $\Omega$ , such that  $S(\phi(\gamma)) = S(\gamma)$  for all  $S \in \mathcal{R}^{\sharp}$  and  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ . We prove that  $\phi(\Gamma) = \Omega$ : Since  $\phi(\Gamma)$  is compact in  $\Omega$ , if  $\Omega_1 - \phi(\Gamma)$  is non-empty, then there exists a  $0 \neq S \in \mathcal{R}_1^{\sharp}$  such that  $S(\phi(\gamma)) = 0$  for all  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ . Since  $S \in W^{\sharp}$  and  $S(\gamma) = 0$  for all  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ ,  $S$  is zero operator on  $\mathcal{L}_q$ . This is a contradiction. Let  $d\mu'$  be regular measure on  $\Gamma$  such that

$$(AS\xi, \xi) = \int \gamma(A) S(\gamma) d\mu'(\gamma)$$

for all  $A \in W^{\sharp}$  and  $\xi \in W^{\sharp}$

where  $\chi(A)$  are traces on  $W^a$  defined by  $\chi(A) = \chi(A^b)$  for all  $\chi \in \Gamma$  and  $A \in W^a$ .

We shall prove now that, putting  $m_\chi(A) = \chi(A)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{R}$  and  $A \in W^a$ ,  $m_\chi$  are  $G$ -ergodic traces excepting a  $\mu'$ -null set in  $\Gamma$ . Let  $\{\varphi_\gamma^a, \varphi_\gamma^b, j, \rho_\gamma\}$  ( $\gamma \in \Gamma - N'$ ) be the two-sided representations of  $\mathcal{R}$  and let  $\{\varphi_\gamma(u_s), \xi_\gamma\}$  be the dual unitary representation of  $G$  with normalizing vector  $\xi_\gamma \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma$  such that  $\varphi_\gamma^a(A)\xi_\gamma = \varphi_\gamma^b(A)\xi_\gamma$ ,  $\varphi_\gamma(u_s)\xi_\gamma = \xi_\gamma$ ,  $\varphi_\gamma^a(A)\xi_\gamma = \varphi_\gamma(u_s)\varphi_\gamma^a(A)\xi_\gamma$  and  $m_\chi(A) = (\varphi_\gamma^a(A)\xi_\gamma, \xi_\gamma)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{R}$ . Let  $W^{a(b)}$ ,  $W^{b(a)}$  and  $W_G(\chi)$  be  $W^*$ -algebras generated by  $\{\varphi_\gamma^a(A)\}_{A \in \mathcal{R}}$ ,  $\{\varphi_\gamma^b(A)\}_{A \in \mathcal{R}}$  and  $\{\varphi_\gamma(u_s)\}_{G}$ . As in the proof of Lem. 4.2 in [7] (cf. p.31), if  $2m_\chi = \rho_\gamma + \sigma_\gamma$  for  $G$ -stationary traces  $\rho_\gamma$  and  $\sigma_\gamma$  of  $\mathcal{R}$  such that  $\rho_\gamma(A)$  and  $\sigma_\gamma(A)$  are  $\mu'$ -measurable for all  $A \in \mathcal{R}$ , then  $\rho_\gamma(A) = (T_\gamma \varphi_\gamma^a(A)\xi_\gamma, \xi_\gamma)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{R}$  where  $T_\gamma \in W^{a(b)} \cap W^{b(a)} \cap W_G(\chi)$  and  $\|T_\gamma\| \leq 2$  (cf. Proof of Th.5 of [7]). For any  $A, B \in \mathcal{R}$ ,  $\rho_\gamma(B^*A) = (T_\gamma \varphi_\gamma^a(A)\xi_\gamma, \varphi_\gamma^b(B)\xi_\gamma)$  is  $\mu'$ -integrable and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int (T_\gamma \varphi_\gamma^a(A)\xi_\gamma, \varphi_\gamma^b(B)\xi_\gamma) d\mu'(\chi) \\ & \geq \left( \int \|\varphi_\gamma^a(A)\xi_\gamma\|^2 d\mu'(\chi) \int \|\varphi_\gamma^b(B)\xi_\gamma\|^2 d\mu'(\chi) \right)^{1/2} \\ & = \|A\xi\| \|B\xi\|. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\{A\xi; A \in \mathcal{R}\}$  is dense in  $\mathcal{H}_\gamma$ , there exists a bounded operator  $T$  on  $\mathcal{H}_\gamma$  such that

$$(13) \quad (TA\xi, B\xi) = \int (T_\gamma \varphi_\gamma^a(A)\xi_\gamma, \varphi_\gamma^b(B)\xi_\gamma) d\mu'(\chi) \text{ for all } A, B \in \mathcal{R}.$$

From (13) and  $T_\gamma \in W^{a(b)} \cap W^{b(a)} \cap W_G(\chi)$  it implies  $T \in W^a \cap W^b \cap W_G(\chi)$ , and  $(TSA\xi, B\xi) = \int T(\chi)S(\chi)(\varphi_\gamma^a(A)\xi_\gamma, \varphi_\gamma^b(B)\xi_\gamma) d\mu'(\chi)$  for all  $S \in W^b$  and  $A, B \in \mathcal{R}$ .

Hence  $T_\gamma = T(\chi)I_\gamma$  a.e.  $\chi$  where  $I_\gamma$  is unit operator on  $\mathcal{H}_\gamma$ . Thus we have Lem. 4.2 of Segal for  $G$ -stationary trace by the similar way. The proof of theorem of Segal (p.32-4 in [7]) is applicable for  $G$ -stationary traces in the place of state, and  $m_\chi$  are  $G$ -ergodic traces on  $\mathcal{R}$  (i.e. extrem points in the space of all  $G$ -stationary traces of  $\mathcal{R}$ ) excepting a  $\mu'$ -null set in  $\Gamma$ . For  $\omega \in \Omega$  putting  $\omega'(A + \lambda I) = \omega(A) + \lambda$  (for all  $A \in \mathcal{R}$  and  $\lambda$ ),  $\omega' \in \Omega_1$  (cf. p.32 of [7]) and the correspondence  $\omega \rightarrow \omega'$  is one-one (form  $\Omega$  into  $\Omega_1$ ). For such a  $\omega'$  we denote  $\omega$  under identification. The inverse  $\phi^{-1}$  of  $\phi$  induces on  $\Omega$ :

$\phi^{-1}(\omega) = \phi^{-1}(\omega')$  for all  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Let  $\Omega'$  be a set of all  $\omega$  in  $\Omega$  such that  $m_{\phi^{-1}(\omega)}$  are  $G$ -ergodic traces.  $(m_{\phi^{-1}(\omega)})$  is well defined as a  $G$ -stationary traces on  $\mathcal{R}$  excepting a  $\mu'$ -null set  $N'$  by the fact that  $m_\gamma(A) = m_\chi(A)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{R}$  and all  $\gamma, \chi \in \phi^{-1}(\omega)$ . If  $\Omega - \Omega'$  contains a non-null open set  $\Omega_0$ ,  $\phi^{-1}(\Omega_0)$  is non-null open set in  $\Gamma$  and for all  $\chi \in \phi^{-1}(\Omega_0)$   $m_\chi$  are not  $G$ -ergodic on  $\mathcal{R}$ . This is a contradiction. Putting  $m_\omega(A) = m_{\phi^{-1}(\omega)}(A)$ , there exists a  $\nu$ -null set  $N$  in  $\Omega$  such that  $m_\omega$  are  $G$ -ergodic for all  $\omega \in \Omega - N$ . Putting  $\pi_\omega(x) = m_\omega(x^*)$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{O}$ ,  $\pi_\omega(\omega \in \Omega - N)$  are  $G$ -ergodic traces on  $\mathcal{O}$ . Indeed, if  $\pi_\omega = \lambda\tau_1 + (1-\lambda)\tau_2$  for some  $G$ -stationary traces  $\tau_1$  and  $\tau_2$  on  $\mathcal{O}$  and  $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ , then  $|\tau_1(x^*y)|^2 \leq \tau_1(x^*x)\tau_1(y^*y) \leq \pi_\omega(x^*x)\pi_\omega(y^*y) = m_\omega(x^*x)m_\omega(y^*y) \leq \|x\|^2\|y\|^2$ , and hence  $|\tau_1(x \in \mathcal{O})| \leq \|x\|$  and  $\tau_1(x \in \mathcal{O}) \rightarrow \tau_1(x)$  implies  $|\tau_1(x)| \leq \|x\|$ . Putting  $\rho_i(x^*) = \tau_i(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{O}$   $\rho_i$  is well defined as a positive linear functional on  $\{x^*; x \in \mathcal{O}\}$  and  $\rho_i(x^{**}) = \rho_i(x^*) = \tau_i(x^*) = \tau_i(x) = \rho_i(x^*)$ . Hence  $\rho_i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) are extended to  $G$ -stationary traces  $\rho'_i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) on  $\mathcal{R}$  such that  $m_\omega = \lambda\rho'_1 + (1-\lambda)\rho'_2$ . Therefore  $\tau_1$  and  $\tau_2$  are linearly dependent. Since  $\pi_\omega(x) = m_\omega(x^*) = \omega(x^*)$ ,  $\pi_\omega(x^*y)$  is  $\nu$ -integrable for all  $x, y \in \mathcal{O}$  and  $\tau(x^*y^*) = \int \pi_\omega(x^*y^*) d\nu(\omega)$ . The proof is complete.  $\int_\Omega$

The decomposition of finite semi-trace onto pure traces follows as a special case (:  $G$  consists of only the identity automorphism) of Th.2, because (7) is always satisfied for finite semi-traces (cf. Prop. 1 of [8]); and we have Th.1 and 2 of [9], I as special cases, since for non-separable case the present proof remains valid for the type of [9].

As an application, we can prove an ergodic decomposition (to finite ergodic measures) of invariant (not ergodic) regular measure  $d\tau$  on separable locally compact space  $E$  with a group of homeomorphisms under a condition that if there exists a family of finite invariant regular measures  $\{d\mu_s\}$  such that  $d\tau$  and  $\{d\mu_s\}$  are absolutely continuous with respect to each other in the sense that for a Borel set  $B$  in  $E$  is  $d\tau$ -null set

if and only if  $\mu_\beta$ -null set for all  $\beta$ .

As another application, we have  $\mathcal{T}$ -ergodic decomposition of  $M_{\text{loc}}$  measure of a locally compact group with a complete compact nbd system invariant under  $\mathcal{T}$  where  $\mathcal{T}$  is the group of all inner-automorphisms.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] J. Dixmier; Les anneaux d'opérateurs de classe finie, Ann. Sci. de L'Ecole Norm. Sup. Paris 66 (1949) pp.209-261.
- [2] R. Godement, Les fonctions de type positif et la théorie des groupes, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 63 (1948) pp.1-84.
- [3] ———, Sur la théorie des représentations unitaires, Ann. of Math. 53 (1951) pp. 68-124.
- [4] I. Kaplansky; A theorem on rings of operators, Pacific Journ. of Math. 1 (1951) pp.227-232.
- [5] J. von Neumann; Zur Algebra der Funktionaloperationen und Theorie der normalen Operatoren, Math. Ann. 102 (1929) pp.371-427.
- [6] I. E. Segal; An extension of Plancherel's formula to separable unimodular groups, Ann. Math. 52 (1950) pp.272-292.
- [7] ———; Decompositions of operator algebras. I, Memoirs of Amer. Math. Soc. 1951.
- [8] H. Umegaki; Decomposition theorems of operator algebra and their applications, Jap. Journ. of Math. 22 (1952) pp.27-50.
- [9] ———; Operator algebra of finite class. I, Kōdai Math. Semi. Rep., (1952) pp.123-129; II, ibid, (1953) pp.61-63.

FOOTNOTES

0) The natural mapping  $\xi$  in this section will be introduced by a similar method with Godement for algebra of a representation of a unimodular locally compact group corresponding to a positive Radon measure (cf. Jour. de Math. pure et appl. 30 (1951)).

1) A stationary trace (resp. semi-trace)  $\tau$  on  $\mathcal{O}$  is called  $G$ -ergodic, if  $\tau$  is not convex combinations of

two other linearly independent  $G$ -stationary traces (resp. semi-traces) on  $\mathcal{O}$  where the trace  $\tau$  satisfies  $\sup \{ \tau(x^*x) ; x \in \mathcal{O}, \|x\| \leq 1 \} = 1$

2) In general,  $jAj \in W^b$  if  $A \in W^a$ , and  $jBj \in W^a$  if  $B \in W^b$ . For  $jAjx^*y^0 = jAx^*y^0 = jx^*Ay^0 = jx^*jAjy^0 = x^*jAjy^0$  and  $jAj \in W^b$ . The latter similarly follows.

3) (4) implies that  $v^*\xi = v^b\xi$  for all  $v \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $\xi \in \mathcal{O}$ . For  $(v^*\xi, x^0) = (jv^*j\xi, x^0) = (x^0, v^*j\xi) = (v^*x^0, j\xi) = (x^*v, j\xi) = (\xi, jx^*vj) = (\xi, x^*jv) = (\xi, x^*jv) = (\xi, v^*x^0) = (v^*v\xi, x^0)$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{O}$ .

4) J. von Neumann's theorem ([5]) stated for separable Hilbert space, but both the theorem and the cited proof remain valid for arbitrary Hilbert space.

5) For any  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $\beta_\epsilon$  such that  $\| (A^*A - v_\beta^*v_\beta^0)\xi \| \leq \| (A^* - v_\beta^*)A\xi \| + \| v_\beta^*(A - v_\beta^0)\xi \| + \| v_\beta^*(v_\beta^* - v_\beta^0)\xi \| \leq \| (A^* - v_\beta^*)A\xi \| + \| v_\beta^*(A - v_\beta^0)\xi \| + \| v_\beta^*(v_\beta^* - v_\beta^0)\xi \| \leq \| (A^* - v_\beta^*)A\xi \| + M \| (A - v_\beta^0)\xi \| + M \| (v_\beta^* - v_\beta^0)\xi \| < \epsilon$  for all  $\beta, \beta' > \beta_\epsilon$ .

6) Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be closed linear manifold generated by  $\{x^*\xi; x \in \mathcal{O}\}$  and let  $\mathcal{M}_1$  be the orthogonal manifold of  $\mathcal{M}$  (i.e.  $\mathcal{M}_1 = \mathcal{M}^\perp$ ). Since  $jx^*\xi = jx^*j\xi = x^*j\xi = x^*j\xi$  and  $U_\beta x^*\xi = U_\beta x^*U_\beta^{-1}\xi = x^*j\xi$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{O}$ ,  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{M}_1$  are invariant under  $j$  and  $Z$ . If  $Z\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_1 \neq \{0\}$ , then there exists  $\zeta$  in  $Z\mathcal{M}_1$  (such as  $j\zeta = \zeta \neq 0$ ) and  $\zeta \in \mathcal{M}_1$ . This is a contradiction of the maximality of  $\{ \xi_n \}$ . Hence  $Z\mathcal{M}_1 = \{0\}$ . For any  $\zeta \in \mathcal{M}_1, x \in \mathcal{O}$  and  $v \in \mathcal{L}, (\zeta, x^*Zv) = (x^*\zeta, Zv) = (Zx^*\zeta, v)$  (since  $x^*\zeta \in \mathcal{M}_1, Zx^*\zeta \in \mathcal{M}_1$ ) = 0. Hence  $\zeta = 0$  or  $\mathcal{M}_1 = \{0\}$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{L}$ .

7) For a locally compact space  $E$ , we denote  $C_\omega(E)$  (resp.  $C(E)$ ) be  $C^*$ -algebras of all continuous functions on  $E$  vanishing at infinite (resp. all bounded continuous functions) with norm  $\|f\| = \sup \{|f(p)|\}$  and \*-involution  $f^*(p) = \overline{f(p)}$  (:complex conjugate). Then  $\mathcal{R}^\beta$  and  $\mathcal{R}^\beta$  are \*-isomorphic (i.e. \*-preserving isomorph) with  $C_\omega(\Omega)$  and  $C(\Omega)$  by the isomorphisms  $A \rightarrow A(\cdot)$  and  $A(\omega) = \omega(A)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{R}^\beta, \omega \in \Omega$  and  $A \in \mathcal{R}^\beta, \omega \in \Omega_1$  respectively.

8) Because  $\{K_\beta; \beta \in \mathcal{L}_\beta\}$  form a complete basis of open sets in  $\Omega$ .

9) We can prove by the same proof of Segal (cf. p.14 of [7]) that  $\sup \{j(A^*A); A \in \mathcal{R}, \|A\| \leq 1\} = 1$  excepting a  $\mu'$ -null set  $N'$  in  $\Gamma$ .

Tokyo Institute of Technology.

(\* ) Received Feb. 8, 1954.