

ON POSITIVE DEFINITE SEQUENCES AND FUNCTIONS^{*)}

By

MASATSUGU TSUJI

Contents

1. Introduction. 2. Positive definite sequences of n indices. 3. Positive definite functions of n variables. 4. Some remarks.

1. Introduction.

1. Let $F(z) = \frac{1}{2}a_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n z^n$ ($a_0 = \text{real}$) be regular and $\Re F(z) \geq 0$ for $|z| < 1$, then Herglotz proved that

$$F(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{e^{i\theta} + z}{e^{i\theta} - z} d\mu(\theta), \quad (1)$$

where $\mu(\theta)$ is an increasing function for $0 \leq \theta < 2\pi$, so that

$$a_n = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} e^{-in\theta} d\mu(\theta) = \int_0^{2\pi} e^{in\theta} dv(\theta), \quad (n = 0, 1, 2, \dots), \quad (2)$$

where $v(\theta) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \mu(2\pi - \theta)$ is an increasing function for $0 \leq \theta < 2\pi$. Hence the Hermitian forms:

$$H_n(x) = \sum_0^n a_{\nu-\mu} x_\nu \bar{x}_\mu, \quad (a_{-\nu} = \bar{a}_\nu)^{1)} \quad (3)$$

are non-negative for $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$.

^{*)} Received August 5, 1949.

1) In this paper $\bar{\alpha}$ means the conjugate complex of α .

2) C. Carathéodory: Über die Variabilitätsbereich der Fourierkonstanten von positiven harmonischen Funktionen. Rendiconti del circolo mat. Palermo. **32** (1911). O. Toeplitz: Über die Fouriersche Entwicklung positiver harmonischen Funktionen. Rendiconti del circolo mat. Palermo. **32** (1911). I. Schur: Über Potenzreihen, die im Innern des Einheitskreises beschränkt sind. Crelle. **147** (1917). O. Szász: Über harmonischen Funktionen und L -Formen. Math. Zeits. **1** (1918). M. Tsuji: On a regular function, whose real part is positive in a unit circle. Proc. Japan Acad. **21**, No. 3-10. (1945).

We call such a sequence $\{a_n\}$ a positive definite sequence.

Conversely, if $H_n(x) \geq 0$ for $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, then $|a_n| \leq a_0$, so that $F(z)$ is regular and $\Re F(z) \geq 0$ for $|z| < 1$.³⁾

If $H_0(x)$, $H_1(x)$, $\dots$, $H_{k-1}(x)$ are positive definite and $H_k(x)$, $H_{k+1}(x)$, $\dots$ are positive semi-definite, then $\nu(\theta)$ is a step-function, so that

$$F(z) = \sum_{\nu=1}^k \frac{r_\nu}{2} \cdot \frac{1 + \varepsilon_\nu z}{1 - \varepsilon_\nu z}, \quad (|\varepsilon_\nu| = 1, \varepsilon_i \neq \varepsilon_j (i \neq j), r_\nu > 0). \quad (4)$$

We remark that

$$\Re F(z) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{-\infty}^{\infty} a_\nu r^{|\nu|} e^{i\nu\theta}, \quad (z = re^{i\theta}, a_{-\nu} = \bar{a}_\nu). \quad (5)$$

2. Let $f(t)$ be a bounded measurable function defined for $-\infty < t < \infty$, such that $f(-t) = \overline{f(t)}$ and $q(t)$ be a bounded measurable function, which vanishes for large $|t|$. We call such $q(t)$ a function of class (L^0) .

If for all $q(t)$ of class (L^0) , the Hermitian forms:

$$H(q) = \iint_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t-s) q(t) \overline{q(s)} dt ds \geq 0, \quad (6)$$

we call $f(t)$ a positive definite function.

Bochner³⁾ proved that, if $f(t)$ is a positive definite function, then

$$f(t) \sim \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{it\lambda} d\nu(\lambda), \quad (7)$$

where $\nu(\lambda)$ is an increasing function for $-\infty < \lambda < \infty$, such that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\nu(\lambda) \leq M = \lim_{-\infty < t < \infty} |f(t)|. \quad (8)$$

If we normalize $\nu(\lambda)$, such that $\nu(-\infty) = 0$, $\nu(\lambda-0) = \nu(\lambda)$, then $\nu(\lambda)$ is unique.

Let $F(z)$ be the Laplace transform of $f(t)$:

$$F(z) = \int_0^{\infty} f(t) e^{-tz} dt, \quad (z = x + iy), \quad (9)$$

which is regular for $x > 0$.

3) Bochner: Vorlesungen über Fouriersche Integrale. Kap. IV.

4) $f(t) \sim g(t)$ means that $f(t) = g(t)$ almost everywhere.

If $\Re F(z) \geq 0$ for $x > 0$, then we can prove (Theorem 5) that $f(t)$ can be expressed in the form (7), so that

$$F(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\nu(\lambda)}{z - i\lambda}. \quad (10)$$

Conversely, if $f(t)$ is a positive definite function, then $\Re F(z) \geq 0$ for $x > 0$, so that we have (7) and hence

$$\Re F(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{x}{|z - i\lambda|^2} d\nu(\lambda) \geq 0, \quad x > 0. \quad (11)$$

Hence a necessary and sufficient condition, that $f(t)$ is a positive definite function is that $\Re F(z) \geq 0$ for $x > 0$.

We remark that in virtue of $f(-t) = \overline{f(t)}$,

$$\Re F(z) = 1/2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t) e^{-(t|x + iy|)} dt, \quad (z = x + iy). \quad (12)$$

In this paper, we will define a positive definite sequence of n indices and a positive definite function of n variables and prove analogous theorems.

2. Positive definite sequence of n indices.

1. Let $a_{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n}$ be defined for $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$, such that

$$a_{-\nu_1, \dots, -\nu_n} = \overline{a_{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n}}, \quad |a_{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n}| \leq M \text{ for all } \nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_n. \quad (1)$$

If for all $N = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, Hermitian form:

$$HN(x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(n)}) = \sum_0^N \dots \sum_0^N a_{\nu_1 - \mu_1, \dots, \nu_n - \mu_n} x_{\nu_1}^{(1)} \overline{x_{\mu_1}^{(1)}} \dots x_{\nu_n}^{(n)} \overline{x_{\mu_n}^{(n)}} \geq 0, \quad (2)$$

then we call $\{a_{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n}\}$ a positive definite sequence of n indices. Analogous to (5) of § 1, we put

$$u(z_1, \dots, z_n) = u(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) = \sum_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \sum_{-\infty}^{\infty} a_{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n} r_1^{|\nu_1|} \dots r_n^{|\nu_n|} e^{i\nu_1 \theta_1 + \dots + i\nu_n \theta_n}, \quad (z_k = r_k e^{i\theta_k}), \quad (3)$$

then by (1), $u(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ is convergent for $|\xi_k| < 1$ and is real. From (3),

$$a_{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n} r_1^{|\nu_1|} \dots r_n^{|\nu_n|} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int_0^{2\pi} \dots \int_0^{2\pi} u(r_1 e^{-i\theta_1}, \dots, r_n e^{-i\theta_n}) e^{i\nu_1 \theta_1 + \dots + i\nu_n \theta_n} d\theta_1 \dots d\theta_n. \quad (4)$$

Writing $\rho_k - \varphi_k$, instead of r_k, θ_k in (4) and inserting $a_{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n}$ in (3), we see that $u(z_1, \dots, z_n)$ can be expressed by a Poisson integral:

$$\begin{aligned} & u(r_1 e^{i\theta_1}, \dots, r_n e^{i\theta_n}) \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int_0^{2\pi} \dots \int_0^{2\pi} u(\rho_1 e^{i\varphi_1}, \dots, \rho_n e^{i\varphi_n}) \prod_{k=1}^n \frac{\rho_k^2 - r_k^2}{\rho_k^2 - 2\rho_k r_k \cos(\varphi_k - \theta_k) + r_k^2} d\varphi_1 \dots d\varphi_n, \\ & \quad (0 \leq r_k < \rho_k < 1). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

We put for $0 \leq r_k < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & H_{N^{r_1} \dots r_n}(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(n)}) \\ &= \sum_0^N \dots \sum_0^N a_{\nu_1 - \mu_1, \dots, \nu_n - \mu_n} r_1^{|\nu_1 - \mu_1|} \dots r_n^{|\nu_n - \mu_n|} \mathbf{x}_{\nu_1}^{(1)} \overline{\mathbf{x}_{\mu_1}^{(1)}} \dots \mathbf{x}_{\nu_n}^{(n)} \overline{\mathbf{x}_{\mu_n}^{(n)}}, \\ & \quad (0 \leq r_k < 1), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

then by (4),

$$\begin{aligned} & H_{N^{r_1} \dots r_n}(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(n)}) \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int_0^{2\pi} \dots \int_0^{2\pi} u(r_1 e^{-i\theta_1}, \dots, r_n e^{-i\theta_n}) \prod_{k=1}^n |\mathbf{x}_0^{(k)} + \mathbf{x}_1^{(k)} e^{i\theta_k} + \dots + \mathbf{x}_N^{(k)} e^{iN\theta_k}|^2 d\theta_1 \dots d\theta_n. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

We will prove:

THEOREM 1. *If $u(z_1, \dots, z_n) \geq 0$ for $|z_k| < 1$, then $a_{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n}$ can be expressed by*

$$a_{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n} = \int_0^{2\pi} \dots \int_0^{2\pi} e^{i(\nu_1 \theta_1 + \dots + \nu_n \theta_n)} dv(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n), \quad (8)$$

where $v(e)$ is a positive additive set function defined for Borel sets e in $(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n)$ space, such that

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \dots \int_0^{2\pi} dv(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n) \leq M = \text{upper limit}_{(\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_n)} |a_{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n}|$$

and such $v(e)$ is unique.

From (8) and (2), we have

$$H_N(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(n)}) = \int_0^{2\pi} \dots \int_0^{2\pi} \prod_{k=1}^n |\mathbf{x}_0^{(k)} + \mathbf{x}_1^{(k)} e^{i\theta_k} + \dots + \mathbf{x}_N^{(k)} e^{iN\theta_k}|^2 dv(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n) \geq 0,$$

so that $\{a_{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n}\}$ is a positive definite sequence and from (3),

$$\mu(r_1 e^{-i\theta_1}, \dots, r_n e^{-i\theta_n}) = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \dots \int_0^{2\pi} \prod_{k=1}^n (1 - r_k^2) (1 - 2r_k \cos(\varphi_k - \theta_k) + r_k^2) d\varphi_1 \dots d\varphi_n, \\ (0 \leq r_k < 1). \quad (9)$$

PROOF. From (4) and (1), we have

$$0 \leq a_0, \dots, 0 = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int_0^{2\pi} \dots \int_0^{2\pi} \mu(r e^{-i\theta_1}, \dots, r e^{-i\theta_n}) d\theta_1 \dots d\theta_n \leq M. \quad (10)$$

Let e be a Borel set in $(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n)$ -space and we define a positive additive set function $v_\rho(e)$ ($0 < \rho < 1$) by

$$v_\rho(e) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int_e \dots \int \mu(\rho e^{-i\theta_1}, \dots, \rho e^{-i\theta_n}) d\theta_1 \dots d\theta_n. \quad (11)$$

Since $\mu \geq 0$, we have $v_\rho(e) \leq a_0, \dots, 0 \leq M$, so that $v_\rho(e)$ is uniformly bounded for $0 < \rho < 1$, hence we can find $\rho_1 < \rho_2 < \dots < \rho_n \rightarrow 1$, such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} v_{\rho_n}(e) = v(e)$, where $v(e)$ is a positive additive set function, such that

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \dots \int_0^{2\pi} dv(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n) \leq M. \quad (12)$$

Hence from (4),

$$a_{\nu_1}, \dots, \nu_n = \int_0^{2\pi} \dots \int_0^{2\pi} e^{i(\nu_1 \theta_1 + \dots + \nu_n \theta_n)} dv(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n). \quad (13)$$

Next we will prove the uniqueness of $v(e)$. It suffices to prove that if for all $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n$,

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \dots \int_0^{2\pi} e^{i(\nu_1 \theta_1 + \dots + \nu_n \theta_n)} dv(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n) = 0, \quad (14)$$

then $v(e) = 0$ for any Borel set e , where $dv(e)$ is an additive set function. From (14),

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \dots \int_0^{2\pi} P(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n) dv(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n) = 0 \quad (15)$$

for any trigonometrical polynomial $P(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n)$.

Let $Q_0: 0 \leq \theta_1 \leq 2\pi, \dots, 0 \leq \theta_n \leq 2\pi$ and $Q: \alpha_1 \leq \theta_1 \leq \beta_1, \dots, \alpha_n \leq \theta_n \leq \beta_n$ ($0 < \beta_k - \alpha_k \leq 2\pi$). If Q has points outside Q_0 , we replace them by points in $Q_0 \pmod{2\pi}$. Let $f(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n) = 1$ in Q and $= 0$ outside Q . Then for any $\epsilon > 0$, we can find, by Fejér's mean, a trigonometrical polynomial $P(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n)$, such that $0 \leq P(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n) \leq 1$ in Q_0 and $|f(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n) - P(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n)| < \epsilon$, except

in a neighbourhood of the boundary of $\mathcal{Q}$. From this and (15), we see that $\nu(\mathcal{Q}) = 0$, if the boundary of $\mathcal{Q}$ does not contain a mass. Since any $\mathcal{Q}$ can be approximated by such $\mathcal{Q}$, we see that $\nu(\mathcal{Q}) = 0$ for any $\mathcal{Q}$. From this, we conclude that $\nu(e) = 0$ for any Borel set e .

2. To prove the converse of Theorem 1, we use the following lemmas.

LEMMA 1.⁵⁾ If $\tau(\theta) = a_0 + \sum_{\nu=1}^n (a_\nu \cos \nu\theta + b_\nu \sin \nu\theta) > 0$ in $[0, 2\pi]$, then $\tau(\theta)$ can be expressed in the form:

$$\tau(\theta) = |\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 e^{i\theta} + \dots + \gamma_n e^{in\theta}|^2.$$

LEMMA 2.⁶⁾ Let $H_N(x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(n)})$, $H_N^{r_1 \dots r_n}(x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(n)})$ be defined by (2) and (6). If for all $x^{(k)}$, such that $|x_0^{(k)}|^2 + \dots + |x_N^{(k)}|^2 = 1$, ($k = 1, 2, \dots, n$),

$$\alpha \leq H_N(x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(n)}) \leq \beta,$$

then

$$\alpha \leq H_N^{r_1 \dots r_n}(x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(n)}) \leq \beta.$$

PROOF. Let

$$b_{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n} = \rho_1^{|\nu_1|} \dots \rho_n^{|\nu_n|} \quad (0 \leq \rho_k < 1),$$

then, for $|z_k| < 1$,

$$u_b(z_1, \dots, z_n) = \prod_{k=1}^n (1 - (\rho_k r_k)^2) / |1 - \rho_k r_k e^{i\theta_k}|^2 > 0, \quad (z_k = r_k e^{i\theta_k}),$$

so that by Theorem 1,

$$\rho_1^{|\nu_1|} \dots \rho_n^{|\nu_n|} = b_{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n} = \int \dots \int_0^{2\pi} e^{i(\nu_1 \theta_1 + \dots + \nu_n \theta_n)} d\nu(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n), \quad (16)$$

hence

$$H_N^{\rho_1 \dots \rho_n}(x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(n)}) = \int \dots \int_0^{2\pi} H_N(\xi^{(1)}, \dots, \xi^{(n)}) d\nu(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n), \quad (17)$$

where $\xi_v^{(k)} = e^{i\nu\theta_k} x_v^{(k)}$, so that

5) L. Fejér: Über trigonometrische Polynome. Crelle 146 (1916).

6) The case $n=1$ was proved by I. Schur: Bemerkungen zur Theorie der beschränkten Bilinearform mit unendlich vielen Veränderlichen. Crelle 140 (1911). O. Szász: l.c. 2)

$$|\xi_0^{(k)}|^2 + \dots + |\xi_N^{(k)}|^2 = |x_0^{(k)}|^2 + \dots + |x_N^{(k)}|^2 = 1, \quad (k = 1, 2, \dots, n),$$

hence by the hypothesis, $\alpha \leq H_N(\xi^{(1)}, \dots, \xi^{(n)}) \leq \beta$.

Since by (16),

$$1 = b_0, \dots, 0 = \int_0^{2\pi} \dots \int_0^{2\pi} d\nu(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n),$$

we have from (17), $\alpha \leq H_N^{p_1, \dots, p_n}(x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(n)}) \leq \beta$.

3. We will prove the converse of Theorem 1.

THEOREM 2. If $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ is a positive definite sequence, then

$$u_a(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) \geq 0 \quad \text{or} \quad |\zeta_k| < 1.$$

Hence by Theorem 1,

$$a_{\nu_1}, \dots, a_{\nu_n} = \int_0^{2\pi} \dots \int_0^{2\pi} e^{i(\nu_1 \theta_1 + \dots + \nu_n \theta_n)} d\nu(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n). \quad (18)$$

where

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \dots \int_0^{2\pi} d\nu(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n) \leq M = \text{upper limit}_{(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)} |a_{\nu_1}, \dots, a_{\nu_n}|.$$

Raikov⁷⁾ proved that if $\{a_{\nu_1}, \dots, a_{\nu_n}\}$ is a positive definite sequence, then it can be expressed in the form (18).

PROOF. Since by the hypothesis, $H_N(x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(n)}) \geq 0$, we have by Lemma 2 and (7),

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq H_N^{r_1, \dots, r_n}(x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(n)}) \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int_0^{2\pi} \dots \int_0^{2\pi} n(r_1 e^{-i\theta_1}, \dots, r_n e^{-i\theta_n}) \prod_{k=1}^n \left| x_0^{(k)} + x_1^{(k)} e^{i\theta_k} + \dots + x_N^{(k)} e^{iN\theta_k} \right|^2 d\theta_1 \dots d\theta_n. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Let $(\theta_1^0, \dots, \theta_n^0)$ be any point. For any $\delta > 0$, $\delta' > 0$, $\eta > 0$, we define $v_k(\theta)$, $g_k(\theta)$ as follows:

$$v_k(\theta) = 1 \text{ for } |\theta - \theta_k^0| \leq \delta, \quad v_k(\theta) = 0 \text{ for } |\theta - \theta_k^0| > \delta, \quad (20)$$

7). P. Raikov: Positive definite functions on discrete commutative groups, C. R. Acad. Sci. URSS., **27** (1940).

$g_k(\theta) = 1$ for $|\theta - \theta_k^0| \leq \delta$; $g_k(\theta) = \eta (> 0)$ for $|\theta - \theta_k^0| \geq \delta + \delta'$; $g_k(\theta)$ is a linear function for $\delta \leq |\theta - \theta_k^0| \leq \delta + \delta'$, such that

$$g_k(\theta_k^0 \pm \delta) = 1, \quad g_k(\theta_k^0 \pm (\delta + \delta')) = \eta. \quad (21)$$

Since $g_k(\theta)$ is continuous, we can find a trigonometrical polynomial $\tau_k(\theta)$ of order N , such that in $[0, 2\pi]$

$$|g_k(\theta) - \tau_k(\theta)| < \varepsilon < \eta, \quad (22)$$

then $\tau_k(\theta) > 0$ in $[0, 2\pi]$, so that by Lemma 1, for suitable $x^{(k)}$

$$\tau_k(\theta) = |x_0^{(k)} + x_1^{(k)} e^{i\theta} + \dots + x_N^{(k)} e^{iN\theta}|^2. \quad (23)$$

For such $x^{(k)}$, we have from (19),

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq H_N^{r_1 \dots r_n}(x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(n)}) \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int_0^{2\pi} \dots \int_0^{2\pi} u(r_1 e^{-i\theta_1}, \dots, r_n e^{-i\theta_n}) \prod_{k=1}^n \tau_k(\theta_k) d\theta_1 \dots d\theta_n. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Hence for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, $\delta' \rightarrow 0$, $\eta \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \int_0^{2\pi} \dots \int_0^{2\pi} u(r_1 e^{-i\theta_1}, \dots, r_n e^{-i\theta_n}) \prod_{k=1}^n \nu_k(\theta_k) d\theta_1 \dots d\theta_n \\ &= \int_{|\theta_k - \theta_k^0| \leq \delta} \dots \int u(r_1 e^{-i\theta_1}, \dots, r_n e^{-i\theta_n}) d\theta_1 \dots d\theta_n = (2\delta)^n u(r_1 e^{-i\theta_1^0}, \dots, r_n e^{-i\theta_n^0}), \end{aligned}$$

where $|\theta_k^0 - \theta_k^0| \leq \delta$, so that $u(r_1 e^{-i\theta_1^0}, \dots, r_n e^{-i\theta_n^0}) \geq 0$, hence for $\delta \rightarrow 0$ we have $u(r_1 e^{-i\theta_1^0}, \dots, r_n e^{-i\theta_n^0}) \geq 0$. Since $(\theta_1^0, \dots, \theta_n^0)$ is arbitrary, $u(z_1, \dots, z_n) \geq 0$ for $|z_k| < 1$, which proves the theorem.

3. Positive definite functions of n variables

1. Let $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ be a bounded measurable function defined for $-\infty < t_k < \infty$ ($k = 1, 2, \dots, n$), such that

$$f(-t_1, \dots, -t_n) = \overline{f(t_1, \dots, t_n)}, \quad (1)$$

$$\overline{\lim}_{-\infty < t_k < \infty} |f(t_1, \dots, t_n)| = M < \infty.$$

If for all $q_k(t)$ of class (L°) , Hermitian forms:

$$H(q_1, \dots, q_n) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t_1 - s_1, \dots, t_n - s_n) \prod_{k=1}^n \left(q_k(t_k) \overline{q_k(s_k)} \right) dt_1 \dots ds_n \geq 0, \quad (2)$$

then we call $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ a positive definite function of n variables. Analogous

to (12) of § 1, we put

$$\begin{aligned} u_f(z_1, \dots, z_n) &= u(z_1, \dots, z_n) \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \exp(-\sum_k (|t_k| x_k + it_k y_k)) dt_1 \dots dt_n, \\ &\quad (z_n = x_k + iy_k), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

which is convergent and is real for $x_k > 0$ by (1). From (1), we have

$$|u(z_1, \dots, z_n)| \leq M \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(-\sum_k |t_k| x_k) dt_1 \dots dt_n = \frac{2^n M}{x_1 \dots x_n} \quad (4)$$

especially,

$$x_1 \dots x_n |u(x_1, \dots, x_n)| \leq 2^n M, \quad (x_k > 0). \quad (5)$$

For $q_k(t)$ of class (L^0) and $\sigma_k > 0$, we put as (6) of § 2,

$$\begin{aligned} H^{\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_n}(q_1, \dots, q_n) \\ = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t_1 - s_1, \dots, t_n - s_n) \exp(-\sum_k |t_k - s_k| \sigma_k) \prod_{k=1}^n \left(q_k(t_k) \overline{q_k(s_k)} \right) dt_1 \dots ds_n. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

2. We will prove some lemmas.

LEMMA 3. $u(z_1, \dots, z_n)$ can be expressed by a Poisson integral:

$$\begin{aligned} u(z_1, \dots, z_n) \\ = -\frac{1}{\pi^n} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} u(\sigma_1 + i\lambda_1, \dots, \sigma_n + i\lambda_n) \prod_{k=1}^n \frac{(x_k - \sigma_k)}{((x_k - \sigma_k)^2 + (y_k - \lambda_k)^2)} d\lambda_1 \dots d\lambda_n, \\ (z_k = x_k + iy_k, \quad 0 < \sigma_k < x_k). \end{aligned}$$

This is an analogue of (5) of § 2.

PROOF. From

$$u(\sigma_1 + i\lambda_1, \dots, \sigma_n + i\lambda_n) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \exp(-\sum_k (|t_k| \sigma_k + it_k \lambda_k)) dt_1 \dots dt_n$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (x_k - \sigma_k) e^{-it_k \lambda_k} / ((x_k - \sigma_k)^2 + (y_k - \lambda_k)^2) d\lambda_k &= \pi e^{-C(|t_k| (x_k - \sigma_k) + it_k y_k)}, \\ &\quad (x_k > \sigma_k > 0), \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} u(\sigma_1 + i\lambda_1, \dots, \sigma_n + i\lambda_n) \prod_{k=1}^n (x_k - \sigma_k) ((x_k - \sigma_k)^2 + (y_k - \lambda_k)^2) d\lambda_1 \dots \\
 &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \exp\left(-\sum_k |t_k| \sigma_k\right) \left(\prod_{k=1}^n \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (x_k - \sigma_k) e^{-it_k \lambda_k} / ((x_k - \sigma_k)^2 + (y_k - \lambda_k)^2) d\lambda_k\right) dt_1 \dots dt_n \\
 &= \pi^n \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \exp\left(-\sum_k (|t_k| x_k + it_k y_k)\right) dt_1 \dots dt_n = \pi^n u(z_1, \dots, z_n).
 \end{aligned}$$

LEMMA 4. *Almost everywhere,*

$$f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \exp\left(-\sum_k |t_k| \sigma_k\right) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T^n} \int_0^T \dots \int_0^T I(a_1, \dots, a_n) da_1 \dots da_n, \quad (\sigma_k > 0),$$

where

$$I(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int_{-a_k}^{a_k} \dots \int_{-a_k}^{a_k} \exp\left(i \sum_k t_k \lambda_k\right) u(\sigma_1 + i\lambda_1, \dots, \sigma_n + i\lambda_n) d\lambda_1 \dots d\lambda_n.$$

Hence $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ is uniquely determined by $u(z_1, \dots, z_n)$. Especially, if $u(z_1, \dots, z_n) \equiv 0$ for $x_k > 0$, then $f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \sim 0$.

PROOF. From

$$\begin{aligned}
 u(\sigma_1 + i\lambda_1, \dots, \sigma_n + i\lambda_n) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n) \exp\left(-\sum_k (|\tau_k| \sigma_k + i\tau_k \lambda_k)\right) d\tau_1 \dots d\tau_n \\
 &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Phi(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n) \exp\left(-i \sum_k \tau_k \lambda_k\right) d\tau_1 \dots d\tau_n, \quad (7)
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Phi(t_1, \dots, t_n) = f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \exp\left(-\sum_k |t_k| \sigma_k\right), \quad (8)$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 I(a_1, \dots, a_n) &= \frac{1}{\pi^n} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Phi(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n) \prod_{k=1}^n (\sin a_k (\tau_k - t_k)) / (\tau_k - t_k) d\tau_1 \dots d\tau_n \\
 &= \frac{1}{\pi^n} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Phi(t_1 + v_1, \dots, t_n + v_n) \prod_{k=1}^n ((\sin a_k v_k) / v_k) dv_1 \dots dv_n,
 \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} J(T, t_1, \dots, t_n) &= \frac{1}{T^n} \int_0^T \dots \int_0^T I(a_1, \dots, a_n) da_1, \dots, da_n \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi^n} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Phi(t_1 + 2u_1/T, \dots, t_n + 2u_n/T) \prod_{k=1}^n ((\sin u_k)/u_k)^2 du_1 \dots du_n. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Since $|\Phi(t_1, \dots, t_n)| \leq |f(t_1, \dots, t_n)| \leq M$ and

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\sin x}{x} \right)^2 dx = \pi, \quad (10)$$

we have

$$|J(T, t_1, \dots, t_n)| \leq M. \quad (11)$$

From (9), (10),

$$\begin{aligned} &J(T, t_1, \dots, t_n) - \Phi(t_1, \dots, t_n) \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi^n} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left[\Phi(t_1 + 2u_1/T, \dots, t_n + 2u_n/T) - \Phi(t_1, \dots, t_n) \right] \prod_{k=1}^n ((\sin u_k)/u_k)^2 du_1 \dots du_n. \end{aligned}$$

We take N so large that

$$\int_{|u| \geq N} \left(\frac{\sin u}{u} \right)^2 du < \varepsilon,$$

then, since $|\Phi(t_1 + 2u_1/T, \dots, t_n + 2u_n/T) - \Phi(t_1, \dots, t_n)| \leq 2M$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|J(T, t_1, \dots, t_n) - \Phi(t_1, \dots, t_n)| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\pi^n} \int_{-N}^N \dots \int_{-N}^N |\Phi(t_1 + 2u_1/T, \dots, t_n + 2u_n/T) - \Phi(t_1, \dots, t_n)| du_1 \dots du_n + O(\varepsilon) \\ &= \left(\frac{T}{2\pi} \right)^n \int_{-2N/T}^{2N/T} \dots \int_{-2N/T}^{2N/T} |\Phi(t_1 + \tau_1, \dots, t_n + \tau_n) - \Phi(t_1, \dots, t_n)| d\tau_1 \dots d\tau_n + O(\varepsilon). \end{aligned} \quad \dots (12)$$

Since by Lebesgue's theorem,

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} T^n \int_{-2N/T}^{2N/T} \dots \int_{-2N/T}^{2N/T} |\Phi(t_1 + \tau_1, \dots, t_n + \tau_n) - \Phi(t_1, \dots, t_n)| d\tau_1 \dots d\tau_n = 0$$

almost everywhere, we conclude from (12) easily that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} J(Tt_1, \dots, Tt_n) = \Phi(t_1, \dots, t_n) = f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \exp(-\sum_k |t_k| \sigma_k)$$

almost everywhere.

3. We will prove:

THEOREM 3. If $u_f(z_1, \dots, z_n) \geq 0$ for $x_k > 0$, then

$$f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \sim \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(i(t_1 \lambda_1 + \dots + t_n \lambda_n)) dv(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n),$$

where $v(e)$ is a positive additive set function defined for Borel sets e in $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ -space, such that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dv(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \leq M = \lim_{-\infty < t_k < \infty} |f(t_1, \dots, t_n)|$$

and such $v(e)$ is unique.

Hence by (2),

$$H(q_1, \dots, q_n) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left| \prod_{k=1}^n \exp(it_k \lambda_k) q_k(t_k) dt_k \right|^2 dv(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \geq 0, \quad (13)$$

so that $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ is a positive definite function and by (3) and

$$\begin{aligned} & u(x_1 + iy_1, \dots, x_n + iy_n) \\ &= 2^n \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \prod_{k=1}^n x_k / (x_k^2 + (y_k - \lambda_k)^2) dv(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

PROOF. By Lemma 3,

$$\begin{aligned} & u_f(z_1, \dots, z_n) \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi^n} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \prod_{k=1}^n (x_k - \sigma_k) / ((x_k - \sigma_k)^2 + (y_k - \lambda_k)^2) u(\sigma_1 + i\lambda_1, \dots, \sigma_n + i\lambda_n) d\lambda_1 \dots d\lambda_n, \\ & \quad (z_k = x_k + iy_k, 0 < \sigma_k < x_k), \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

and from $u \geq 0$ and (5), we have for $T > 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} & 2^n M \geq x_1 \dots x_n u(x_1, \dots, x_n) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{\pi^n} \int_{-T}^T \dots \int_{-T}^T \left(\prod_{k=1}^n x_k (x_k - \sigma_k) / ((x_k - \sigma_k)^2 + \lambda_k^2) \right) u(\sigma_1 + i\lambda_1, \dots, \sigma_n + i\lambda_n) d\lambda_1 \dots d\lambda_n, \end{aligned}$$

so that for $x_k \rightarrow \infty$,

$$2^n M \geq \frac{1}{\pi^n} \int_{-T}^T \dots \int_{-T}^T u(\sigma_1 + i\lambda_1, \dots, \sigma_n + i\lambda_n) d\lambda_1 \dots d\lambda_n,$$

hence

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int \cdots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} u(\sigma_1 + i\lambda_1, \dots, \sigma_n + i\lambda_n) d\lambda_1 \cdots d\lambda_n \leq M. \quad (16)$$

For any Borel set e in $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ -space, we define a positive additive set function $v_\sigma(e)$ ($\sigma > 0$) by

$$v_\sigma(e) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int \cdots \int_e u(\sigma + i\lambda_1, \dots, \sigma + i\lambda_n) d\lambda_1 \cdots d\lambda_n \quad (\sigma > 0). \quad (17)$$

Since by (16), $v_\sigma(e)$ is uniformly bounded for $\sigma > 0$, we can find $\sigma_1 > \sigma_2 > \cdots > \sigma_n \rightarrow 0$, such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} v_{\sigma_n}(e) = v(e)$, where $v(e)$ is a positive additive set function, such that by (16)

$$\int \cdots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dv(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \leq M. \quad (18)$$

Hence from (15,)

$$u_f(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) = 2^n \int \cdots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\prod_{k=1}^n \frac{x_k}{(x_k^2 + (y_k - \lambda_k)^2)} \right) dv(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n). \quad (19)$$

Let

$$g(t_1, \dots, t_n) = \int \cdots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(i(t_1\lambda_1 + \cdots + t_n\lambda_n)) dv(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n), \quad (20)$$

then by (3),

$$u_g(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) = 2^n \int \cdots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\prod_{k=1}^n \frac{x_k}{(x_k^2 + (y_k - \lambda_k)^2)} \right) dv(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n),$$

so that

$$u_g(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) \equiv u_f(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n), \text{ or } u_{f-g}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) \equiv 0,$$

hence by Lemma 4, $g(t_1, \dots, t_n) \sim f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$, or

$$f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \sim \int \cdots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(i(t_1\lambda_1 + \cdots + t_n\lambda_n)) dv(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n). \quad (21)$$

Next we will prove the uniqueness of $v(e)$. It suffices to prove that if

$$\int \cdots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(i(t_1\lambda_1 + \cdots + t_n\lambda_n)) dv(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \sim 0, \quad (22)$$

then $\nu(e) = 0$ for any Borel set e , where $\nu(e)$ is an additive set function.

Let $(\lambda_1^0, \dots, \lambda_n^0)$ be any point. For any $\delta_k > 0$, we define $\nu_k(\lambda)$ as follows:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \nu_k(\lambda) &= 1 \text{ for } |\lambda - \lambda_k^0| < \delta_k, \\ \nu_k(\lambda_k^0 \pm \delta_k) &= 1/2, \\ \nu_k(\lambda) &= 0 \text{ for } |\lambda - \lambda_k^0| > \delta_k, \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (23)$$

then

$$\nu_k(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(it\lambda) q_k(t) dt, \quad (24)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} q_k(t) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \exp(-it\lambda) \nu_k(\lambda) d\lambda = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \exp(-it\lambda_k^0) (\sin t\delta_k)/t, \\ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |q_k(t)|^2 dt &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\nu_k(\lambda)|^2 d\lambda = 2\delta_k. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

For any $T > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-T}^T e^{i\lambda t} q_k(t) dt &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \int_0^T \left[\sin t(\lambda - \lambda_k^0 + \delta_k) - \sin t(\lambda - \lambda_k^0 - \delta_k) \right] / t dt \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \int_{T(\lambda - \lambda_k^0 - \delta_k)}^{T(\lambda - \lambda_k^0 + \delta_k)} \frac{\sin u}{u} du, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

hence

$$\left| \int_{-T}^T e^{i\lambda t} q_k(t) dt \right| \leq K, \quad (27)$$

where K is a constant independent of T and λ .

Now by (22),

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int \prod_{k=1}^n \left(\int_{-T}^T \exp(it_k \lambda_k) q_k(t_k) dt_k \right) d\nu(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \\ &= \int_{-T}^T \dots \int \left(\prod_{k=1}^n q_k(t_k) \right) dt_1 \dots dt_n \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(i \sum_{k=1}^n t_k \lambda_k) d\nu(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

In virtue of (27) and Lebesgue's theorem, for $T \rightarrow \infty$ we have from (24)

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int \left(\prod_{k=1}^n \nu_k(\lambda_k) \right) d\nu(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = \int \dots \int_{|\lambda_k - \lambda_k^0| \leq \delta_k} d\nu(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = \nu(Q) = 0,$$

where $Q: |\lambda_k - \lambda_k^0| \leq \delta_k (k = 1, 2, \dots, n)$.

From this we conclude easily that $\nu(e) = 0$ for any Borel set e .

REMARK. By the second mean value theorem, we have from (26)

$$\left| \int_{-T}^T e^{it\lambda} q_k(t) dt \right| \leq \frac{K}{T(|\lambda| + 1)}, \quad (|\lambda - \lambda_k^0| \geq 2\delta_k), \quad (28)$$

where $K = K(\delta_k)$ is a constant, which depends on δ_k only, so that by (27), (28),

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left| \int_{-T}^T e^{it\lambda} q_k(t) dt \right|^2 d\lambda \leq K, \quad (29)$$

where K is a constant independent of T and

$$\int_{|\lambda - \lambda_k^0| \geq 2\delta_k} \left| \int_{-T}^T e^{it\lambda} q_k(t) dt \right|^2 d\lambda = O\left(\frac{1}{T^2}\right). \quad (30)$$

4. To prove the converse of Theorem 3, we use the following lemma.

LEMMA 5. Let $H(q_1, \dots, q_n)$, $H^{\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_n}(q_1, \dots, q_n)$ be defined by (2) and (6). If for all $q_k(t)$ of class (L^0) , such that $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |q_k(t)|^2 dt = 1$,

$$\alpha \leq H(q_1, \dots, q_n) \leq \beta,$$

then

$$\alpha \leq H^{\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_n}(q_1, \dots, q_n) \leq \beta.$$

PROOF. Let

$$g(t_1, \dots, t_n) = \exp\left(-\sum_k |t_k| \sigma_k\right), \quad (\sigma_k > 0), \quad (31)$$

then by (3),

$$u_g(z_1, \dots, z_n) = 2^n \prod_{k=1}^n (x_k + \sigma_k) / ((x_k + \sigma_k)^2 + y_k^2) > 0 \quad \text{for } x_k > 0, \\ (z_k = x_k + iy_k),$$

so that by Theorem 3, since $g(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ is continuous,

$$\exp\left(-\sum_k |t_k| \sigma_k\right) = g(t_1, \dots, t_n) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int \exp\left(i \sum_{k=1}^n t_k \lambda_k\right) d\nu(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n). \quad (32)$$

Hence

$$H^{\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_n}(q_1, \dots, q_n) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} H(p_1, \dots, p_n) d\nu(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n), \quad (33)$$

where $p_k(t) = e^{it\lambda_k} q_k(t)$, so that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |p_k(t)|^2 dt = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |q_k(t)|^2 dt = 1,$$

hence by the hypothesis, $\alpha \leq H(p_1, \dots, p_n) \leq \beta$.

Since

$$1 = g(0, \dots, 0) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\nu(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n),$$

we have from (33), $\alpha \leq H^{\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_n}(q_1, \dots, q_n) \leq \beta$.

5. We will prove the converse of Theorem 3.

THEOREM 4. If $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ is a positive definite function, then $u_f(z_1, \dots, z_n) \geq 0$ for $x_k > 0$.

Hence by Theorem 3,

$$f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \sim \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(i \sum_{k=1}^n t_k \lambda_k) d\nu(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n), \quad (34)$$

where

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\nu(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \leq M = \text{upper limit}_{-\infty < t_k < \infty} |f(t_1, \dots, t_n)|.$$

Powzner and Raikov⁸⁾ proved that if $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ is a positive definite function, then it can be expressed in the form (34).

PROOF. Let $(z_1^0, \dots, z_n^0)$ ($z_k^0 = \sigma_k^0 + i\lambda_k^0$, $\sigma_k^0 > 0$) be any point.

By Lemma 4, almost everywhere,

$$f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \exp(-\sum_k |t_k| \sigma_k^0) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} J(T, t_1, \dots, t_n), \quad (35)$$

where

8) A. Powzner: Über positive Funktionen auf einer Abelschen Gruppe C. R. Acad. Sci. URSS **28**(1940). D. Raikov: Positive definite functions on commutative groups with an invariant measure, C. R. Acad. Sci. URSS **28** (1940).

$$J(T, t_1, \dots, t_n) = \frac{1}{T^n} \int_0^T \dots \int_0^T I(a, t_1, \dots, t_n) da_1 \dots da_n,$$

$$I(a, t_1, \dots, t_n) = \frac{1}{(\pi)^n} \int_{-a_k}^{a_k} \dots \int_{-a_k}^{a_k} \exp(i \sum_k t_k \lambda_k) u(\sigma_1^0 + i\lambda_1, \dots, \sigma_n^0 + i\lambda_n) d\lambda_1 \dots d\lambda_n. \quad (39)$$

By (11),

$$|J(T, t_1, \dots, t_n)| \leq M. \quad (37)$$

We define $v_k(\lambda)$, $q_k(t)$ by (23) and (25), then for $T' > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{-T'}^{T'} \dots \int_{-T'}^{T'} J(T, t_1 - s_1, \dots, t_n - s_n) \left(\prod_{k=1}^n q_k(t_k) \overline{q_k(s_k)} \right) dt_1 \dots ds_n \\ &= \frac{1}{T^n} \int_0^T \dots \int_0^T K(a_1, \dots, a_n) da_1 \dots da_n, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} & K(a_1, \dots, a_n) \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int_{-a_k}^{a_k} \dots \int_{-a_k}^{a_k} u(\sigma_1^0 + i\lambda_1, \dots, \sigma_n^0 + i\lambda_n) \left(\prod_{k=1}^n \left| \int_{-T'}^{T'} \exp(it_k \lambda_k) q_k(t_k) dt_k \right|^2 \right) d\lambda_1 \dots d\lambda_n. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

By (29), (30) and (4), we have uniformly for a_k ,

$$\begin{aligned} & K(a_1, \dots, a_n) \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int_{|\lambda_k - \lambda_{k_0} \leq 2\delta_k} \dots \int_{|\lambda_k - \lambda_{k_0} \leq 2\delta_k} u(\sigma_1^0 + i\lambda_1, \dots, \sigma_n^0 + i\lambda_n) \left(\prod_{k=1}^n \left| \int_{-T'}^{T'} \exp(it_k \lambda_k) q_k(t_k) dt_k \right|^2 \right) d\lambda_1 \dots d\lambda_n \\ & \quad + O(T'^{-2}), \end{aligned}$$

so that by (38),

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{-T'}^{T'} \dots \int_{-T'}^{T'} J(T, t_1 - s_1, \dots, t_n - s_n) \left(\prod_{k=1}^n q_k(t_k) \overline{q_k(s_k)} \right) dt_1 \dots ds_n \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int_{|\lambda_k - \lambda_{k_0} \leq 2\delta_k} \dots \int_{|\lambda_k - \lambda_{k_0} \leq 2\delta_k} u(\sigma_1^0 + i\lambda_1, \dots, \sigma_n^0 + i\lambda_n) \left(\prod_{k=1}^n \left| \int_{-T'}^{T'} \exp(it_k \lambda_k) q_k(t_k) dt_k \right|^2 \right) d\lambda_1 \dots d\lambda_n \\ & \quad + O(T'^{-2}). \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

If we make $T \rightarrow \infty$, then by (35), (37) and Lebesgue's theorem,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{-T'}^{T'} \dots \int_{-T'}^{T'} f(t_1 - s_1, \dots, t_n - s_n) \exp\left(-\sum_k |t_k - s_k| \sigma_k^0\right) \left(\prod_{k=1}^n q_k(t_k) \overline{q_k(s_k)}\right) dt_1 \dots ds_n \\
&= \frac{1}{(\pi)^n} \int_{|\lambda_k - \lambda_k^0| \leq 2\delta_k} \dots \int_{|\lambda_k - \lambda_k^0| \leq 2\delta_k} u(\sigma_1^0 + i\lambda_1, \dots, \sigma_n^0 + i\lambda_n) \left(\prod_{k=1}^n \left| \int_{-T'}^{T'} \exp(it_k \lambda_k) q_k(t_k) dt_k \right|^2\right) d\lambda_1 \dots d\lambda_n \\
&\quad + O(T'^{-2}). \tag{41}
\end{aligned}$$

Next we make $T' \rightarrow \infty$, then by (24), (27) and Lebesgue's theorem,

$$\begin{aligned}
& H^{\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_n}(q_1, \dots, q_n) \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t_1 - s_1, \dots, t_n - s_n) \exp\left(-\sum_k |t_k - s_k| \sigma_k^0\right) \left(\prod_{k=1}^n q_k(t_k) \overline{q_k(s_k)}\right) dt_1 \dots ds_n \\
&= \int_{|\lambda_k - \lambda_k^0| \leq 2\delta_k} \dots \int_{|\lambda_k - \lambda_k^0| \leq 2\delta_k} u(\sigma_1^0 + i\lambda_1, \dots, \sigma_n^0 + i\lambda_n) \left(\prod_{k=1}^n |v_k(\lambda_k)|^2\right) d\lambda_1 \dots d\lambda_n \\
&= \int_{|\lambda_k - \lambda_k^0| \leq \delta_k} \dots \int_{|\lambda_k - \lambda_k^0| \leq \delta_k} u(\sigma_1^0 + i\lambda_1, \dots, \sigma_n^0 + i\lambda_n) d\lambda_1 \dots d\lambda_n \\
&= 2^n \delta_1 \dots \delta_n u(\sigma_1^0 + i\lambda'_1, \dots, \sigma_n^0 + i\lambda'_n), (|\lambda'_k - \lambda_k^0| \leq \delta_k). \tag{42}
\end{aligned}$$

$q_k(t)$ is not a function of class (L^0) , but if we put $q_k^N(t) = q_k(t)$ for $|t| \leq N$ and $= 0$ for $|t| > N$, then $q_k^N(t)$ belongs to class (L^0) , so that by the hypothesis, $H(q_1^N, \dots, q_n^N) \geq 0$, hence by Lemma 5, $H^{\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_n}(q_1^N, \dots, q_n^N) \geq 0$, so that for $N \rightarrow \infty$, $H^{\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_n}(q_1, \dots, q_n) \geq 0$.

Hence from (42), $u(\sigma_1^0 + i\lambda'_1, \dots, \sigma_n^0 + i\lambda'_n) \geq 0$, so that for $\delta_k \rightarrow 0$, we have $u(\sigma_1^0 + i\lambda_1^0, \dots, \sigma_n^0 + i\lambda_n^0) = u(\varpi_1^0, \dots, \varpi_n^0) \geq 0$. Since $(\varpi_1^0, \dots, \varpi_n^0)$ is arbitrary, we have $u(\varpi_1, \dots, \varpi_n) \geq 0$ for $\varpi_k > 0$, which proves the theorem.

4. Some remarks.

1. Let $f(t)$ be a bounded measurable function defined for $0 \leq t < \infty$ and $F(\varpi)$ be its Leple transform :

$$F(\varpi) = \int_0^{\infty} f(t) e^{-t\varpi} dt, \quad (\varpi = \alpha + iy). \tag{1}$$

If we define $f(t)$ for $t < 0$ by $f(t) = \overline{f(-t)}$, then

$$\Re F(z) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t) \exp(-(|t| x + ity)) dt = \frac{1}{2} u_f(z). \quad (2)$$

Hence by Theorem 3 and 4, we have

THEOREM 5. If $\Re F(z) \geq 0$ for $x > 0$, then

$$f(t) \sim \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{it\lambda} dv(\lambda), \quad (3)$$

so that

$$F(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dv(\lambda)}{z - i\lambda}, \quad (4)$$

where $v(\lambda)$ is an increasing function for $-\infty < \lambda < \infty$, such that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dv(\lambda) \leq M = \limsup_{-\infty < t < \infty} |f(t)|.$$

If we normalize $v(\lambda)$, such that $v(-\infty) = 0$, $v(\lambda - 0) = v(\lambda)$, then $v(\lambda)$ is unique.

From this as remarked in the introduction, the necessary and sufficient condition, that $f(t)$ is a positive definite function, is that $\Re F(z) \geq 0$ for $x > 0$.

Let $f(t)$ be a positive definite function of the form (3), then for any $q(t)$ of class (L^0) , the Hermitian form:

$$H(q) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t-s) q(t) \overline{q(s)} dt ds \geq 0.$$

If $H(q) > 0$ for all $q(t)$, such that $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |q(t)|^2 dt > 0$, then we call $H(q)$ a positive definite form. If $H(q_0) = 0$ for a certain $q_0(t)$, such that $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |q_0(t)|^2 dt > 0$, then we call $H(q)$ a positive semi-definite form.

THEOREM 6. If $H(q)$ is a positive semi-definite form, then $v(\lambda)$ is a step-function, such that

$$f(t) \sim \sum_{\nu} e^{it\lambda_{\nu}} (v(\lambda_{\nu} + 0) - v(\lambda_{\nu} - 0)),$$

where $\{\lambda_{\nu}\}$ have no cluster point in a finite distance.

PROOF. Let $H(q_0) = 0$ for a certain $q_0(t)$ of class (L^0) , such that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |q_0(t)|^2 dt > 0, \quad (5)$$

then

$$H(q_0) = \iint_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t-s) q_0(t) \overline{q_0(s)} dt ds = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\nu(\lambda) \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{it\lambda} q_0(t) dt \right|^2 = 0. \quad (6)$$

If at a point λ , $\nu(\lambda + \delta) - \nu(\lambda - \delta) > 0$ for any $\delta > 0$, we denote $d\nu(\lambda) > 0$. Let E be the set of λ , such that $d\nu(\lambda) > 0$, then from (6) at any point λ of E ,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{it\lambda} q_0(t) dt = 0.$$

Suppose that E has a cluster point λ_0 in a finite distance, then there exists $\lambda_\nu \rightarrow \lambda_0$ ($\lambda_\nu \in E$), so that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{it\lambda_\nu} q_0(t) dt = 0, \quad (\nu = 1, 2, \dots). \quad (7)$$

Let $q_0(t) = 0$ for $|t| \geq T$, then from (7) we have

$$e^{iT\lambda_\nu} \int_{-T}^T e^{it\lambda_\nu} q_0(t) dt = \int_0^{2T} e^{i\tau\lambda_\nu} q_0(\tau + T) d\tau = 0.$$

Let

$$F(z) = \int_0^{2T} e^{-tz} q_0(t + T) dt,$$

then $F(z)$ is an integral function and $F(-i\lambda_\nu) = 0$, so that $F(z) \equiv 0$, a fortiori, $\Re F(z) \equiv 0$, hence by Lemma 4, $q_0(t + T) \sim 0$, or $q_0(t) \sim 0$, which contradicts (5). Hence E has no cluster point in a finite distance, so that $\nu(\lambda)$ is a step-function.

2. Let $u(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, $H_N^{(1)}(x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(n)})$ be defined by (3) and (6) of §2 and put for $0 \leq r_k < 1$,

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{Min. } u(r_1 e^{i\theta_1}, \dots, r_n e^{i\theta_n}) = m(r_1, \dots, r_n), \\ \text{Max. } u(r_1 e^{i\theta_1}, \dots, r_n e^{i\theta_n}) = M(r_1, \dots, r_n), \end{array} \right\} \quad (8)$$

and for all $x^{(k)}$, such that $|x_0^{(k)}|^2 + \dots + |x_N^{(k)}|^2 = 1$ ($k = 1, 2, \dots, n$), let

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \text{Min. } H_N^{r_1 \dots r_n} (x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(n)}) &= g_N (r_1, \dots, r_n), \\ \text{Max. } H_N^{r_1 \dots r_n} (x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(n)}) &= G_N (r_1, \dots, r_n). \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (9)$$

Since $g_N (r_1, \dots, r_n)$ decreases and $G_N (r_1, \dots, r_n)$ increases, when N increases, let

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} g_N (r_1, \dots, r_n) = g (r_1, \dots, r_n), \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} G_N (r_1, \dots, r_n) = G (r_1, \dots, r_n), \quad (0 \leq r_k < 1). \quad (10)$$

Then we will prove:

THEOREM 7.⁹⁾ $g (r_1, \dots, r_n) = m (r_1, \dots, r_n)$, $G (r_1, \dots, r_n) = M (r_1, \dots, r_n)$.

PROOF. From (21), (22), (23) of § 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{2\pi} g_k (\theta) d\theta &= 2\delta + O(\delta') + O(\eta), \\ 2\pi (|x_0^{(k)}|^2 + \dots + |x_N^{(k)}|^2) &= \int_0^{2\pi} \tau_k (\theta) d\theta = \int_0^{2\pi} g_k (\theta) d\theta + O(\varepsilon) \\ &= 2\delta + O(\delta') + O(\eta) + O(\varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$|x_0^{(k)}|^2 + \dots + |x_N^{(k)}|^2 = \delta/\pi + O(\delta') + O(\eta) + O(\varepsilon). \quad (11)$$

From (24) of § 2,

$$\begin{aligned} g (r_1, \dots, r_n) \prod_{k=1}^n \left(|x_0^{(k)}|^2 + \dots + |x_N^{(k)}|^2 \right) &\leq \\ g_N (r_1, \dots, r_n) \prod_{k=1}^n \left(|x_0^{(k)}|^2 + \dots + |x_N^{(k)}|^2 \right) &\leq H_N^{r_1 \dots r_n} (x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(n)}) \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int_0^{2\pi} \dots \int_0^{2\pi} u (r_1 e^{-i\theta_1}, \dots, r_n e^{-i\theta_n}) \prod_{k=1}^n \tau_k (\theta_k) d\theta_1 \dots d\theta_n. \end{aligned}$$

If we make $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, $\delta' \rightarrow 0$, $\eta \rightarrow 0$, we have from (11),

$$\begin{aligned} g (r_1, \dots, r_n) (\delta/\pi)^n &\leq \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int_0^{2\pi} \dots \int_0^{2\pi} u (r_1 e^{-i\theta_1}, \dots, r_n e^{-i\theta_n}) \prod_{k=1}^n g_k (\theta_k) d\theta_1 \dots d\theta_n \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int_{|\theta_k - \theta'_k| \leq \delta} \dots \int u (r_1 e^{-i\theta_1}, \dots, r_n e^{-i\theta_n}) d\theta_1 \dots d\theta_n = (\delta/\pi)^n u (r_1 e^{-i\theta'_1}, \dots, r_n e^{-i\theta'_n}), \end{aligned}$$

9) The case $n=1$ was proved by O. Szász: l.c. (2).

where $|\theta'_k - \theta_k^0| \leq \delta$.

Hence $g(r_1, \dots, r_n) \leq u(r_1 e^{-i\theta'_1}, \dots, r_n e^{-i\theta'_n})$, so that for $\delta \rightarrow 0$, $g(r_1, \dots, r_n) \leq u(r_1 e^{-i\theta_1^0}, \dots, r_n e^{-i\theta_n^0})$. Since $(\theta_1^0, \dots, \theta_n^0)$ is arbitrary,

$$g(r_1, \dots, r_n) \leq m(r_1, \dots, r_n). \quad (12)$$

On the other hand, for any $x^{(k)}$, such that $|x_0^{(k)}|^2 + \dots + |x_N^{(k)}|^2 = 1$ ($k = 1, 2, \dots, n$), we have from (7) of § 2,

$$\begin{aligned} & H_N^{r_1} r_n(x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(n)}) \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int_0^{2\pi} \dots \int_0^{2\pi} u(r_1 e^{-i\theta_1}, \dots, r_n e^{-i\theta_n}) \prod_{k=1}^n \left| x_0^{(k)} + x_1^{(k)} e^{i\theta_k} + \dots + x_N^{(k)} e^{iN\theta_k} \right|^2 d\theta_1 \dots d\theta_n \\ &\geq m(r_1, \dots, r_n) (2\pi)^{-n} \int_0^{2\pi} \dots \int_0^{2\pi} \prod_{k=1}^n |x_0^{(k)} + \dots + x_N^{(k)} e^{iN\theta_k}|^2 d\theta_1 \dots d\theta_n \\ &= m(r_1, \dots, r_n) \prod_{k=1}^n \left(|x_0^{(k)}|^2 + \dots + |x_N^{(k)}|^2 \right) = m(r_1, \dots, r_n), \end{aligned}$$

so that $g_N(r_1, \dots, r_n) \geq m(r_1, \dots, r_n)$, hence for $N \rightarrow \infty$,

$$g(r_1, \dots, r_n) \geq m(r_1, \dots, r_n). \quad (13)$$

From (12), (13), we have $g(r_1, \dots, r_n) = m(r_1, \dots, r_n)$. Similarly we can prove $G(r_1, \dots, r_n) = M(r_1, \dots, r_n)$.

3. Let $u(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)$, $H^{\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_n}(q_1, \dots, q_n)$ be defined by (3) and (6) of § 3 and we put for $\sigma_k > 0$,

$$\left. \begin{aligned} & \text{lower limit}_{-\infty < \lambda_k < \infty} u(\sigma_1 + i\lambda_1, \dots, \sigma_n + i\lambda_n) = m(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n), \\ & \text{upper limit}_{-\infty < \lambda_k < \infty} u(\sigma_1 + i\lambda_1, \dots, \sigma_n + i\lambda_n) = M(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n), \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (14)$$

and for all $q_k(t)$ of class (L^0) , such that $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |q_k(t)|^2 dt = 1$, let

$$\left. \begin{aligned} & \text{lower limit } H^{\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_n}(q_1, \dots, q_n) = g(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n), \\ & \text{upper limit } H^{\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_n}(q_1, \dots, q_n) = G(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) \end{aligned} \right\}. \quad (15)$$

Then

THEOREM 8. $g(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) = m(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)$, $G(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) = M(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)$.

PROOF. Let $q_k(t)$ be defined by (25) of § 3, where we take $\delta_k = \delta$ ($k = 1, 2, \dots, n$), then

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |q_k(t)|^2 dt = \delta.$$

Hence from (42) of § 3,

$$(2\delta)^n g(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) \leq H^{\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_n}(q_1, \dots, q_n) \leq (2\delta)^n u(\sigma_1 + i\lambda'_1, \dots, \sigma_n + i\lambda'_n),$$

or $g(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) \leq u(\sigma_1 + i\lambda'_1, \dots, \sigma_n + i\lambda'_n)$, so that for $\delta \rightarrow 0$, $g(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) \leq u(\sigma_1 + i\lambda_1^0, \dots, \sigma_n + i\lambda_n^0)$. Since $(\lambda_1^0, \dots, \lambda_n^0)$ is arbitrary,

$$g(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) \leq m(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n). \quad (16)$$

On the other hand, let $q_k(t)$ be any function of class (L^0) , such that $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |q_k(t)|^2 dt = 1$ and let $q_k(t) = 0$ for $|t| \geq T'$. We define $v_k(\lambda)$ by

$$v_k(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i\lambda t} q_k(t) dt = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-T'}^{T'} e^{i\lambda t} q_k(t) dt, \quad (17)$$

then

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |v_k(\lambda)|^2 d\lambda = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |q_k(t)|^2 dt = 1. \quad (18)$$

Writing σ_k instead of σ_k^0 in (38) of § 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{-T'}^{T'} \dots \int J(T, t_1 - s_1, \dots, t_n - s_n) \left(\prod_{k=1}^n q_k(t_k) \overline{q_k(s_k)} \right) dt_1, \dots, ds_n \\ &= \frac{1}{T^n} \int_0^T \dots \int K(a_1, \dots, a_n) da_1 \dots da_n, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} K(a_1, \dots, a_n) &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int_{-a_k}^{a_k} \dots \int u(\sigma_1 + i\lambda_1, \dots, \sigma_n + i\lambda_n) \\ &\quad \left(\prod_{k=1}^n \left| \int_{-T}^T \exp(it_k \lambda_k) q_k(t_k) dt_k \right|^2 \right) d\lambda_1 \dots d\lambda_n \\ &= \int_{-a_k}^{a_k} \dots \int u(\sigma_1 + i\lambda_1, \dots, \sigma_n + i\lambda_n) \left(\prod_{k=1}^n |v_k(\lambda_k)|^2 \right) d\lambda_1 \dots d\lambda_n. \end{aligned}$$

By (4) of § 3,

$$\left| K(a_1, \dots, a_n) \right| \leq \frac{2^n}{\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_n} \prod_{k=1}^n \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |v_k(\lambda_k)|^2 d\lambda_k \right) = \frac{2^n M}{\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_n},$$

so that $K(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is uniformly bounded, hence

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T^n} \int_0^T \cdots \int_0^T K(a_1, \dots, a_n) da_1 \cdots da_n &= \lim_{a_1 \cdots a_n \rightarrow \infty} K(a_1, \dots, a_n) \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \cdots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} u(\sigma_1 + i\lambda_1, \dots, \sigma_n + i\lambda_n) \left(\prod_{k=1}^n |v_k(\lambda_k)|^2 \right) d\lambda_1 \cdots d\lambda_n \\ &\geq m(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) \left(\prod_{k=1}^n \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |v_k(\lambda_k)|^2 d\lambda_k \right) = m(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Hence from (35) of § 3 and (19),

$$\begin{aligned} H^{\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_n}(q_1, \dots, q_n) &= \int_{-T'}^{T'} \cdots \int_{-T'}^{T'} f(t_1 - s_1, \dots, t_n - s_n) \exp\left(-\sum_k |t_k - s_k| \sigma_k\right) \left(\prod_{k=1}^n q_k(t_k) \overline{q_k(s_k)} \right) dt_1 \cdots ds_n \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-T}^T \cdots \int_{-T}^T J(T, t - s_1, \dots, t - s_n) \left(\prod_{k=1}^n q_k(t_k) \overline{q_k(s_k)} \right) dt_1 \cdots ds_n \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T^n} \int_0^T \cdots \int_0^T K(a_1, \dots, a_n) da_1 \cdots da_n \geq m(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n), \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$g(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) \geq m(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n). \quad (21)$$

From (16), (21), we have $g(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) = m(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)$. Similarly we can prove $G(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) = M(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)$.

MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, TOKYO UNIVERSITY.