

## HOMOMORPHISMS OF B\*-ALGEBRAS

JAMES D. STEIN, JR.

This paper is divided into two sections. The first deals with Banach algebra homomorphisms of a von Neumann algebra  $\mathfrak{A}$ , and extends the Bade-Curtis theory for commutative B\*-algebras to von Neumann algebras, as well as characterizing the separating ideal in the closure of the range of the homomorphism. The second section concerns homomorphisms of B\*-algebras; the chief result being the existence of an ideal  $\mathcal{I}$  with cofinite closure such that the restriction of the homomorphism to any closed, two-sided ideal contained in  $\mathcal{I}$  is continuous.

1. Homomorphisms of von Neumann algebras. Let  $\mathfrak{A}$  be a von Neumann algebra, and let  $\nu: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$  be a Banach algebra homomorphism. The reduction theory enables us to write

$$\mathfrak{A} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \oplus (C(X_i) \otimes B(\mathcal{H}_i)) \oplus \mathfrak{A}_1,$$

where  $\mathfrak{A}_1$  is the direct sum of the type II and type III parts,  $X_i$  is a hyperstonian compact Hausdorff space, and  $\mathcal{H}_i$  is Hilbert space of dimension  $i$  ( $\infty$  is an allowed index of  $i$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_{\infty}$  is separable Hilbert space). It was shown in [6] that there is an integer  $N$  such that

$$\nu \Big| \sum_{i=N+1}^{\infty} \oplus (C(X_i) \otimes B(\mathcal{H}_i)) \oplus \mathfrak{A}_1$$

is continuous.

Some definitions are in order.

$$S(\nu, \mathfrak{B}) = \{z \in \mathfrak{B} \mid \exists \{x_n\} \subset \mathfrak{A} \ni x_n \rightarrow 0, \nu(x_n) \rightarrow z\};$$

$S(\nu, \mathfrak{B})$  is a closed, 2-sided ideal in  $\mathfrak{B}$  ([2]). If  $f \in C(X_i)$ ,  $T \in B(\mathcal{H}_i)$ , then  $\langle f \otimes T \rangle$  will denote  $(x, y) \in \mathfrak{A}$ , where  $y = 0 \in \mathfrak{A}_1$  and

$$x \in \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \oplus (C(X_k) \otimes B(\mathcal{H}_k))$$

has  $f \otimes T$  in the  $i^{\text{th}}$  component and zero in all other components. Let  $\varphi_i: C(X_i) \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$  be defined by  $\varphi_i(f) = \nu(\langle f \otimes I_i \rangle)$ , where  $I_i$  is the identity of  $B(\mathcal{H}_i)$ , and let  $F_i$  be the Bade-Curtis [1] singularity set associated with  $\varphi_i$ . Let  $M(F_i) = \{f \in C(X_i) \mid f(F_i) = 0\}$ , let  $T(F_i) = \{f \in C(X_i) \mid f \text{ vanishes on a neighborhood of } F_i\}$ , and let  $R(F_i) = \{f \in C(X_i) \mid f \text{ is constant in a neighborhood of each point of } F_i\}$ . It was shown in [6] that  $\nu$  is continuous on

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \oplus (R(F_i) \otimes B(\mathcal{H}_i)) \oplus \sum_{i=N+1}^{\infty} \oplus (C(X_i) \otimes B(\mathcal{H}_i)) \oplus \mathfrak{A}_1,$$

and that this sub-algebra, denoted by  $\mathfrak{A}_0$ , is dense in  $\mathfrak{A}$ . Let  $\mu$  be the unique continuous extension of  $\nu \upharpoonright \mathfrak{A}_0$  to  $\mathfrak{A}$  and let  $\lambda = \nu - \mu$ . In this section the Bade-Curtis results ([1], Theorems 4.3 and 4.5) will be extended to  $\mathfrak{A}$ , and a complete characterization of  $S(\nu, \mathfrak{B})$  will be obtained.

**THEOREM 1.1.** (a) *The range of  $\mu$  is closed in  $\mathfrak{B}$  and  $\overline{\nu(\mathfrak{A})} = \mu(\mathfrak{A}) \oplus S(\nu, \mathfrak{B})$ , the direct sum being topological.*

(b)  $S(\nu, \mathfrak{B}) = \overline{\lambda(\mathfrak{A})}$ .

(c) *Let*

$$M = \sum_{i=1}^N \oplus (M(F_i) \otimes B(\mathcal{H}_i)) \oplus \sum_{i=N+1}^{\infty} \oplus (C(X_i) \otimes B(\mathcal{H}_i)) \oplus \mathfrak{A}_1.$$

*Then  $S(\nu, \mathfrak{B}) \cdot M = M \cdot S(\nu, \mathfrak{B}) = (0)$ , and  $\lambda \upharpoonright M$  is a homomorphism.*

*Proof.*  $\mu(\mathfrak{A})$  is closed by [2], Lemma 5.3. We first show  $\lambda(\mathfrak{A}) \subseteq S(\nu, \mathfrak{B})$ . If  $x \in \mathfrak{A}$ , choose a sequence  $\{x_n\}$  from the dense sub-algebra such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x$ . Since  $\mu$  is continuous,

$$\mu(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(x_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu(x_n),$$

and since  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (x_n - x) = 0$ ,

$$\mu(x) - \nu(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\nu(x_n) - \nu(x)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu(x_n - x) = s \in S(\nu, \mathfrak{B}).$$

But  $\nu(x) = \mu(x) + \lambda(x)$  and  $\nu(x) = \mu(x) - s$ , so  $\lambda(x) = -s \in S(\nu, \mathfrak{B})$ .

If  $s \in S(\nu, \mathfrak{B})$ , there is a sequence  $\{x_n\}$  in  $\mathfrak{A}$  such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = 0, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu(x_n) = s.$$

Now  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(x_n) = 0$ , and  $s = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\mu(x_n) + \lambda(x_n))$ , so

$$\|s - \lambda(x_n)\| \leq \|s - (\lambda(x_n) + \mu(x_n))\| + \|\mu(x_n)\| \rightarrow 0,$$

and so  $S(\nu, \mathfrak{B}) = \overline{\lambda(\mathfrak{A})}$ .

Let  $U = \nu^{-1}(S(\nu, \mathfrak{B}))$ . We now show  $\mu(\mathfrak{A}) \cap S(\nu, \mathfrak{B}) = (0)$ . If  $\mu(x) \in S(\nu, \mathfrak{B})$ , since  $\nu(x) = \mu(x) + \lambda(x)$  and  $\lambda(\mathfrak{A}) \subseteq S(\nu, \mathfrak{B})$ , we see that  $\nu(x) \in S(\nu, \mathfrak{B})$ , and so  $x \in U$ . But by [6], Theorem II. 5, and [7], Proposition 2.1,  $U = \overline{\text{Ker}(\nu)} = \text{Ker}(\mu)$ , so  $\mu(x) = 0$ .

To complete the proof of (a) and (b), all we need show is that any  $z \in \overline{\nu(\mathfrak{A})}$  can be written  $z = \mu(x) + s$ , where  $x \in \mathfrak{A}$ ,  $s \in S(\nu, \mathfrak{B})$ . Let  $\hat{\nu} : \mathfrak{A}/U \rightarrow \nu(\mathfrak{A})/S(\nu, \mathfrak{B})$  be defined by  $\hat{\nu}(x + U) = \nu(x) + S(\nu, \mathfrak{B})$ , by [2], Theorem 4.6, and [5], Theorem 4.9.2, this is a continuous

isomorphism of a  $B^*$ -algebra and thus has closed range. So  $z + S(\nu, \mathfrak{B}) = \nu(x) + S(\nu, \mathfrak{B})$ , and so  $\exists s \in S(\nu, \mathfrak{B})$  such that  $z = \nu(x) + s = \mu(x) + (\lambda(x) + s)$ . But  $\lambda(x) + s \in S(\nu, \mathfrak{B})$ .

Define  $T$  by substituting  $T(F_i)$  for  $M(F_i)$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , in the definition of  $M$ . The same proof as [6], Prop. II. 3, shows that  $T$  is dense in  $M$ , and by the continuity of  $\mu$  to show  $\mu(M) \cdot S(\nu, \mathfrak{B}) = (0)$  we need merely show  $x \in \mathfrak{A}$ ,  $z \in T \Rightarrow \mu(z)\lambda(x) = 0$  (the proof of  $S(\nu, \mathfrak{B}) \cdot \mu(M) = (0)$  is symmetric). Clearly  $zx \in T$ , and  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  agree on  $T$ , so  $\mu(z)\lambda(x) = \mu(z)(\nu(x) - \mu(x)) = \mu(z)\nu(x) - \mu(z)\mu(x) = \nu(zx) - \mu(zx) = 0$ . That  $\lambda \upharpoonright M$  is a homomorphism follows from  $\mu(M) \cdot S(\nu, \mathfrak{B}) = (0)$  and the arguments of Bade and Curtis ([1], p. 601).

The analogue of [1], Theorem 4.3d, will be stated but, once the definitions are made, the proofs precisely parallel the proofs given in [1], and so will be omitted. It should be noted, however, that the proofs carry over because, for  $1 \leq i \leq N$ ,  $C(X_i) \otimes B(\mathcal{H}_i)$  is actually the algebraic tensor product.

For  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , let  $F_i = \{\omega_{i,k} \mid 1 \leq k \leq n_i\}$ , and for each  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , choose functions  $e_{i,k} \in C(X_i)$  such that  $e_{i,k}$  is 1 in a neighborhood of  $\omega_{i,k}$  and  $e_{i,k}e_{i,j} = 0, k \neq j$ . Let  $I_i$  denote the identity of  $B(\mathcal{H}_i)$ , and define  $\lambda_{i,k}(x) = \lambda(\langle e_{i,k} \otimes I_i \rangle x)$  (note that this is equal to  $\lambda(x \langle e_{i,k} \otimes I_i \rangle)$ ). Let  $R_{i,k} = \overline{\lambda_{i,k}(\mathfrak{A})}$ , let  $M(\omega_{i,k})$  be all functions in  $C(X_i)$  vanishing at  $\omega_{i,k}$ , and let  $M_{i,k}$  be  $\mathfrak{A}$  with  $C(X_i) \otimes B(\mathcal{H}_i)$  replaced in the direct sum by  $M(\omega_{i,k}) \otimes B(\mathcal{H}_i)$ .

PROPOSITION 1.2.

$$(a) \quad \lambda = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \lambda_{i,k}$$

$$(b) \quad S(\nu, \mathfrak{B}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \oplus R_{i,k} ,$$

the direct sum being topological.

$$(c) \quad (i, j) \neq (k, l) \Rightarrow R_{i,j} \cdot R_{k,l} = (0) ,$$

and

$$R_{i,k} \cdot \mu(M_{i,k}) = \mu(M_{i,k}) \cdot R_{i,k} = (0) .$$

(d) The restriction of  $\lambda_{i,k}$  to  $M_{i,k}$  is a homomorphism.

It is possible to obtain a characterization of the ideal  $S(\nu, \mathfrak{B})$  by examining the action of  $\nu$  as related to the operator algebras  $B(\mathcal{H}_i)$ , rather than the function spaces  $C(X_i)$ . For  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , let  $e_i$  be the identity of  $C(X_i)$ , and let  $\lambda_i(x) = \lambda(\langle e_i \otimes I_i \rangle x)$ ; then  $\lambda(x) = \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i(x)$ . Now

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\langle e_j \otimes I_j \rangle) \lambda_i(x) &= \mu(\langle e_j \otimes I_j \rangle) [\nu(\langle e_i \otimes I_i \rangle x) - \mu(\langle e_i \otimes I_i \rangle x)] \\ &= \nu(\langle e_j \otimes I_j \rangle \langle e_i \otimes I_i \rangle x) - \mu(\langle e_j \otimes I_j \rangle \langle e_i \otimes I_i \rangle x) \\ &= \delta_{ij} \lambda_i(x), \end{aligned}$$

and if  $i \neq j$  then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_i(x_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_j(y_n)$$

yields the fact that both these limits are zero, and consequently

$$S(\nu, \mathfrak{B}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \oplus \overline{\lambda_i(\mathfrak{A})},$$

a topological direct sum. Now each of these components will be characterized.

Fix  $n$  such that  $1 \leq n \leq N$ , and let  $\{T_{i,j} \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq n\}$  be a system of matrix units for  $B(\mathcal{H}_n)$ , i.e.,  $T_{i,j} T_{k,l} = \delta_{jk} T_{i,l}$ . Define, for  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ , maps  $\nu_{i,j}$ ,  $\mu_{i,j}$ , and  $\gamma_{i,j}$  of  $C(X_n)$  into  $\mathfrak{B}$  by  $\nu_{i,j}(f) = \nu(\langle f \otimes T_{i,j} \rangle)$ ,  $\mu_{i,j}(f) = \mu(\langle f \otimes T_{i,j} \rangle)$ , and  $\gamma_{i,j}(f) = \nu_{i,j}(f) - \mu_{i,j}(f)$ . If

$$x = \left\langle \sum_{i,j=1}^n f_{i,j} \otimes T_{i,j} \right\rangle,$$

we can clearly write

$$\nu(x) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n \nu_{i,j}(f_{i,j});$$

similar assertions hold for  $\mu(x)$  and  $\lambda(x)$ . All maps are linear, but the "off-diagonal" maps (those for which  $i \neq j$ ) are not necessarily homomorphisms.

Computational procedures similar to those already employed will show

$$\mu(\langle e_n \otimes T_{k,l} \rangle) \gamma_{i,j}(f) = \delta_{il} \gamma_{k,j}(f)$$

and

$$\gamma_{i,j}(f) \mu(\langle e_n \otimes T_{k,l} \rangle) = \delta_{jk} \gamma_{i,l}(f),$$

so if

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{i,j}(f_m) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{k,l}(g_m)$$

and  $i \neq k$ , left multiplication by  $\mu(\langle e_n \otimes T_{i,i} \rangle)$  shows that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{i,j}(f_m) = 0;$$

the same trick with right multiplication works if  $j \neq l$ , and so

$$\overline{\lambda_n(\mathfrak{A})} = \sum_{i,j=1}^n \bigoplus \overline{\gamma_{i,j}(\mathfrak{A})},$$

and this is a topological direct sum.

Since  $T_{i,j} = T_{i,k}T_{k,j}$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{i,j}(fg) &= \nu(\langle fg \otimes T_{i,j} \rangle) \\ &= \nu(\langle f \otimes T_{i,k} \times g \otimes T_{k,j} \rangle) = \nu_{i,k}(f)\nu_{k,j}(g); \end{aligned}$$

consequently  $\nu_{i,i}$  is a homomorphism for  $1 \leq i \leq n$  (let  $j = k = i$ ) and so by [1], Th. 4.3b),  $\overline{\gamma_{i,i}(\mathfrak{A})}$  is the Jacobson radical of  $\overline{\nu_{i,i}(C(X_n))}$ . Since  $\mu(\langle e_n \otimes T_{i,j} \rangle)\gamma_{j,j}(f) = \gamma_{i,j}(f)$ , it is clear that

$$\overline{\gamma_{i,j}(\mathfrak{A})} = \mu(\langle e_n \otimes T_{i,j} \rangle)\overline{\gamma_{j,j}(\mathfrak{A})}. \text{ This yields}$$

**PROPOSITION 1.3.** *S( $\nu, \mathfrak{B}$ ) is the direct sum of Jacobson radicals of commutative Banach algebras and “rotations” of these radicals.*

Note that  $\nu_{i,j}(f) = \nu_{i,i}(f)\nu_{i,j}(e_n)$ , and so the continuity of the  $\nu_{i,j}$ , and hence the continuity of  $\nu$ , depends only on the continuity of the diagonal homomorphisms  $\nu_{i,i}$ . Coupling this fact with Theorem 4.5 of [1], we observe that if all the Jacobson radicals of the closures of the images of the diagonal homomorphisms are nil ideals, then the homomorphism is continuous.

**2. Homomorphisms of B\*-algebras.** Let  $\mathfrak{A}$  be a B\*-algebra, and let  $\nu : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$  be a Banach algebra homomorphism, with  $S(\nu, \mathfrak{B})$  defined as in §1.

**DEFINITION 2.1.**

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_L &= \{x \in \mathfrak{A} \mid \nu(x) \cdot S(\nu, \mathfrak{B}) = (0)\}, \\ \mathcal{I}_R &= \{x \in \mathfrak{A} \mid S(\nu, \mathfrak{B}) \cdot \nu(x) = (0)\}. \end{aligned}$$

**DEFINITION 2.2.**

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_L &= \{x \in \mathfrak{A} \mid \sup_{\|z\| \leq 1} \|\nu(xz)\| < \infty\}, \\ \mathcal{F}_R &= \{x \in \mathfrak{A} \mid \sup_{\|z\| \leq 1} \|\nu(zx)\| < \infty\}, \\ \mathcal{F} &= \mathcal{F}_L \cap \mathcal{F}_R. \end{aligned}$$

$\mathcal{I}_L, \mathcal{I}_R, \mathcal{F}_L, \mathcal{F}_R$ , and  $\mathcal{F}$  are all two-sided ideals in  $\mathfrak{A}$  (see [4] and [6]), and in a recent paper [4] Johnson has shown that  $\overline{\mathcal{F}_L}$  is a cofinite ideal in  $\mathfrak{A}$ , and observes that, if one could show  $\nu \upharpoonright \overline{\mathcal{F}_L}$  is continuous, one would have a direct extension of the Bade-Curtis

theory to arbitrary  $B^*$ -algebras. An examination of this problem, coupled with an analysis of these ideals, constitutes the body of this section.

We first note that  $\mathcal{I}_L \subset \mathcal{J}_L$ . For, if  $x \notin \mathcal{I}_L$  then there is an  $s \in S(\nu, \mathfrak{B})$  such that  $\nu(x)s \neq 0$ , and consequently  $\exists \{x_n\} \subset \mathfrak{A}$  such that  $x_n \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\nu(x_n) \rightarrow s$ , and so  $\nu(xx_n) \rightarrow \nu(x)s \neq 0$ . Given  $M > 0$ , choose  $x_n$  such that

$$\|x_n\| \leq \frac{\|\nu(x)s\|}{2M}, \quad \|\nu(xx_n)\| > \frac{1}{2} \|\nu(x)s\|.$$

Then

$$\frac{x_n}{\|x_n\|}$$

has norm one and

$$\left\| \nu\left(x \frac{x_n}{\|x_n\|}\right) \right\| > M,$$

and so  $x \notin \mathcal{I}_L$ . Similarly  $\mathcal{I}_R \subset \mathcal{J}_R$ .

Repeated use throughout this section will be made of the following lemma and its corollaries.

**LEMMA 2.1.** *Let  $\{f_n\}, \{g_n\}$  be sequences from  $\mathfrak{A}$  such that  $m \neq n \Rightarrow g_m g_n = 0, g_n f_m = 0$ . Then there is an integer  $N$  such that  $n \geq N \Rightarrow g_n f_n \in \mathcal{I}_R$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose not, and renumber to obtain a sequence such that  $g_n f_n \notin \mathcal{I}_R$  for any  $n$ . Then for each  $n$  choose  $x_n \in \mathfrak{A}$  such that  $\|x_n\| \leq 1$ ,

$$\|\nu(x_n g_n f_n)\| > n 2^n \|g_n\| \|\nu(f_n)\|.$$

Let

$$x = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (1/2^k \|g_k\|) x_k g_k;$$

then clearly  $x \in \mathfrak{A}$ . We also have

$$x f_n = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (1/2^k \|g_k\|) x_k g_k f_n = x_n g_n f_n / (2^n \|g_n\|),$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nu(x)\| \|\nu(f_n)\| &\geq \|\nu(x f_n)\| \\ &= \|\nu(x_n g_n f_n)\| / 2^n \|g_n\| > n \|\nu(f_n)\|, \end{aligned}$$

which implies  $\|\nu(x)\| > n$ , a contradiction.

**COROLLARY 2.1.1.** *If  $\{g_n\}, \{f_n\} \subset \mathfrak{A}$  satisfy  $g_m g_n = 0, g_n f_m = f_n$ , then  $\exists N$  such that  $n \geq N \Rightarrow f_n \in \mathcal{I}_R$ .*

COROLLARY 2.1.2. *If  $\{f_n\} \in \mathfrak{A}$  satisfies  $f_m f_n = 0$ , then  $\exists N$  such that  $n \geq N \Rightarrow f_n^2 \in I_R$ .*

COROLLARY 2.1.3. *If  $\{f_n\}, \{g_n\} \subset \mathfrak{A}$  satisfy  $g_m g_n = 0, f_m g_n = 0$ , then  $\exists N$  such that  $n \geq N \Rightarrow f_n g_n \in I_L$ .*

We can now combine these results with those of Johnson ([4], Th. 2.1) to see that, if  $\mathfrak{A}$  is a B\*-algebra,  $\mathcal{F}$  is a cofinite ideal. The advantage of using  $\mathcal{F}$  can be seen from the following.

PROPOSITION 2.1. *Let  $\nu : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$  be a Banach algebra homomorphism, and let  $\mathfrak{U}$  be a closed linear subspace of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Then*

$$\sup \{ \| \nu(xy) \| \mid x, y \in \mathfrak{U}, \| x \| \leq 1, \| y \| \leq 1 \} < \infty .$$

*Proof.* For  $z \in \mathfrak{A}$ , let  $L_z$  and  $R_z$  map  $\mathfrak{A}$  into  $\mathfrak{B}$  and be defined by  $L_z(x) = \nu(zx), R_z(x) = \nu(xz)$ ; these are clearly linear. If  $z \in \mathcal{F}$ , then both  $L_z$  and  $R_z$  are continuous. For, if  $x_n \rightarrow 0$  and  $L_z(x_n) \rightarrow 0$ , we can assume  $\| L_z(x_n) \| \geq \delta > 0$ . Given  $M > 0$ , choose  $x_n$  such that

$$\| x_n \| \leq \frac{\delta}{M} ,$$

then

$$\left\| \frac{M}{\delta} x_n \right\| \leq 1 , \quad \left\| L_z \left( \frac{M}{\delta} x_n \right) \right\| \geq M ;$$

since this can be done for any  $M$  it contradicts  $z \in \mathcal{F}$ . Now, for each  $x \in \mathfrak{U}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup \{ \| L_z(x) \| \mid z \in \mathfrak{U}, \| z \| \leq 1 \} &= \sup \{ \| \nu(zx) \| \mid z \in \mathfrak{U}, \| z \| \leq 1 \} \\ &\leq \sup \{ \| \nu(zx) \| \mid z \in \mathfrak{A}, \| z \| \leq 1 \} < \infty \end{aligned}$$

since  $x \in \mathcal{F}$ . By the Uniform Boundedness Principle ([3], 2.3.21)

$$\sup \{ \| L_z \| \mid z \in \mathfrak{U}, \| z \| \leq 1 \} < \infty$$

and so

$$\sup \{ \| \nu(zx) \| \mid z, x \in \mathfrak{U}, \| z \| \leq 1, \| x \| \leq 1 \} < \infty$$

completing the proof.

PROPOSITION 2.2. *Let  $\mathfrak{A}$  be a C\*-algebra, and let  $\mathfrak{U} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$  be a closed two-sided ideal. Then  $\nu | \mathfrak{U}$  is continuous.*

*Proof.* Let  $U \in \mathfrak{U}$ , and recall that  $\mathfrak{U}$  is a \*-ideal. Use the polar decomposition to write  $U = TP$ , where  $T$  is a partial isometry (hence  $\| T \| = 1$ ) and  $P$  is a positive operator satisfying  $P^2 = U^*U$ . Assume  $\| U \| = 1$ , then since  $P$  is self-adjoint,  $\| P \|^2 = \| P^*P \| = \| P^2 \| =$

$\|U^*U\| = \|U\|^2 = 1$ , so  $\|P\| = 1$ . Since  $P$  is self-adjoint, it has a square root  $Q \in \mathfrak{U}$ , so we can write  $U = (TQ)Q$ , where  $TQ, Q \in \mathfrak{U}$ ,  $\|TQ\| \leq \|T\| \|Q\| \leq 1, \|Q\| \leq 1$ . So, by Proposition 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup \{ \|\nu(U)\| \mid U \in \mathfrak{U}, \|U\| \leq 1 \} \\ & \leq \sup \{ \|\nu(xy)\| \mid x, y \in \mathfrak{U}, \|x\| \leq 1, \|y\| \leq 1 \} < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

and so  $\nu|_{\mathfrak{U}}$  is continuous.

If  $\mathfrak{U}$  is a commutative  $B^*$ -algebra, Proposition 2.2 shows that, if  $N$  is a closed neighborhood of the Bade-Curtis singularity set,  $\nu$  is continuous on the ideal of all functions vanishing on  $N$ , and Proposition 2.2 can be regarded as the analogue for  $B^*$ -algebras of that theorem, especially in view of the remarks following Corollary 2.1.3. However, it appears to be a difficult problem to obtain the full strength of the Bade-Curtis results using these methods, but if a method is found there is a good chance that it would generalize the Bade-Curtis results to arbitrary  $B^*$ -algebras.

We now turn our attention to  $C(X)$ , where  $X$  is a compact Hausdorff space. The notation of §1 applies.

PROPOSITION 2.3.  $T(F) \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ , and if  $\mathcal{S}$  is closed,  $\nu$  is continuous.

*Proof.* Let  $f$  vanish on a neighborhood of  $F$ . If  $f \notin \mathcal{S}$ ,  $\exists \{g_n\} \in C(X)$  such that  $\|g_n\| \leq 1, \|\nu(fg_n)\| \geq n^2$ . Let  $h_n = 1/n g_n$ , then  $h_n f \rightarrow 0$ , and since  $\nu$  is continuous on  $T(F)$ ,  $\nu(h_n f) \rightarrow 0$ . But

$$\|\nu(h_n f)\| = \frac{1}{n} \|\nu(g_n f)\| \geq n,$$

a contradiction.

If  $\mathcal{S}$  is closed,  $M(F) = \overline{T(F)} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ , and by Proposition 2.2,  $\nu|_{M(F)}$  is continuous. Using the technique of Theorem 4.1 of [1],  $\nu$  is continuous.

Since  $T(F) \subseteq \mathcal{S}$  and, if  $K$  denotes the kernel of  $\nu$ ,  $\bar{K} \cap T(F) = K \cap T(F)$  ([7], 2.3), one might wish to show that  $\bar{K} \cap \mathcal{S} = K$  (clearly  $K \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ ). If  $f \in \bar{K} \cap \mathcal{S}$ , then  $g_n \rightarrow 0 \Rightarrow \nu(g_n f) \rightarrow 0$ . Let  $g \in M(F)$ , and choose a sequence  $\{g_n\}$  from  $T(F)$  such that  $g_n \rightarrow g$ . Then  $g_n f \in \bar{K} \cap T(F) \subseteq K$ , and so

$$\nu(gf) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu(g_n f) = 0.$$

So  $M(F) \cdot (\bar{K} \cap \mathcal{S}) \subseteq K$ .

If  $\mathfrak{X} = C(X)$ , Corollary 2.1.2 can be strengthened so the conclusion is  $\exists N$  such that  $n \geq N \Rightarrow f_n \in \mathcal{S}$ . If this integer  $N$  is independent

of the sequence  $\{f_n\}$ , then the homomorphism is continuous, if  $X$  is such that every point is a  $G_\delta$ . We first note that, if  $\{E_n \mid n = 1, 2, \dots\}$  is a disjoint sequence of open sets, then  $n \geq N, f(E'_n) = 0 \Rightarrow f \in \mathcal{S}$ ; this is a clear consequence of Corollary 2.1.2. The goal will be to show that, if  $N$  is independent of sequence, then  $M(F) \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ , as in Proposition 2.3 this will show  $\nu$  is continuous. Choose open sets  $E, G \subseteq X$  such that  $\bar{E} \cap \bar{G} = F$ , and let  $f \in M(F)$ . Let

$$A_k = \left\{ x \in X \mid |f(x)| \geq \frac{1}{k} \right\},$$

and let  $B_k = A_k \cap \bar{G}$ ; then  $B_k$  is closed and disjoint from  $\bar{E}$  for all  $k$ . By Urysohn's Lemma, choose a function  $g_k$  such that  $0 \leq g_k \leq 1, g_k(\bar{E}) = 1, g_k(B_k) = 0$ . We assert that  $\{g_n f \mid n = 1, 2, \dots\}$  is Cauchy. Assume  $n > m$ , and look at  $\|g_n f - g_m f\|$ . This value is the maximum of the supremums of  $|g_n f(x) - g_m f(x)|$  on the sets  $\bar{E}, B_m$ , and  $K_m = X \sim (B_m \cup \bar{E})$ . This supremum is clearly 0 on  $\bar{E}$  (since  $g_n(\bar{E}) = g_m(\bar{E}) = 1$ ) and on  $B_m$  (since  $n > m \Rightarrow B_m \subseteq B_n$ ), and clearly

$$\sup_{x \in K_m} |g_n f(x) - g_m f(x)| \leq \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{m} < \frac{2}{m},$$

so the sequence is Cauchy, and there is an  $h \in C(X)$  such that  $\|g_n f - h\| \rightarrow 0$ .  $h(\bar{E}) = f(\bar{E})$ , since  $g_n(\bar{E}) = 1$  for all  $n$ . If  $x \in \bar{G}$  and  $|f(x)| > 0$ , there is an integer  $K$  such that  $k \geq K \Rightarrow x \in A_k \Rightarrow x \in B_k \Rightarrow g_k f(x) = 0$ ; if  $f(x) = 0$   $g_k f(x) = 0$  for all  $k$ , and so  $h(\bar{G}) = 0$ .

Now choose sequences of disjoint open sets  $\{E_n\}, \{G_n\}$  (the  $E_n$  are not necessarily disjoint from the  $G_n$ ) such that  $F \subseteq \bar{E}_n \cap \bar{G}_n, \bar{E} \supseteq \bar{E}'_n$ , and  $\bar{G} \supseteq \bar{G}'_n$ . If  $g \in C(X), g(G'_n) = 0 \Rightarrow g \in \mathcal{S}$ , or  $g(E'_n) = 0 \Rightarrow g \in \mathcal{S}$ , so  $h(\bar{G}) = 0 \Rightarrow h \in \mathcal{S}$ ; similarly  $(h - f)(\bar{E}) = 0 \Rightarrow h - f \in \mathcal{S}$ , so  $f = h + (f - h) \in \mathcal{S}$ . Thus  $M(F) \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ , completing the proof. A similar idea also works for von Neumann algebras by reducing it to a consideration of  $\varphi_i : C(X) \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$  defined by  $\varphi_i(f) = \nu \langle f \otimes I_i \rangle$ .

REFERENCES

1. W. G. Bade and P. C. Curtis, Jr., *Homomorphisms of commutative banach algebras*, Amer. J. Math. **82** (1960), 589-608.
2. S. B. Cleveland, *Homomorphisms of non-commutative \*-algebras*, Pacific J. Math. **13** (1963), 1097-1109.
3. N. Dunford and J. Schwartz, *Linear operators*, Interscience, New York, 1958.
4. B. E. Johnson, *Continuity of homomorphisms of algebras of operators* (II) (to appear)
5. C. E. Rickart, *Banach algebras*, Van Nostrand, New York, 1960.
6. J. D. Stein, Jr., *Homomorphisms of von Neumann algebras* (to appear Amer. J. Math.)
7. ———, *Homomorphisms of semi-simple algebras*, Pacific J. Math. **26** (1968), 589-594.

Received March 8, 1968.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

