

## THE REDUCING IDEAL IS A RADICAL

T. W. PALMER

For any  $*$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{A}$  the reducing ideal  $\mathfrak{A}_R$  of  $\mathfrak{A}$  is the intersection of the kernels of all the  $*$ -representations of  $\mathfrak{A}$ . Although the reducing ideal has been called the  $*$ -radical, and obviously satisfies  $(\mathfrak{A}/\mathfrak{A}_R)_R = \{0\}$ , it has not previously been shown to satisfy another of the fundamental properties of an abstract radical except in the case of hermitian Banach  $*$ -algebras where it equals the Jacobson radical. In this paper we prove two extension theorems for  $*$ -representations. The more important one states that any essential  $*$ -representation of a  $*$ -ideal of a  $U^*$ -algebra (*a fortiori*, of a Banach  $*$ -algebra) has a unique extension to a  $*$ -representation of the whole algebra. These theorems show in particular that  $(\mathfrak{A}_R)_R = \mathfrak{A}_R$  if  $\mathfrak{A}$  is either a commutative  $*$ -algebra or a  $U^*$ -algebra. The somewhat stronger statements which are actually proved, together with previously known properties of the reducing ideal, show that the reducing ideal defines a radical subcategory of each of the following three semi-abelian categories:

- (1) Commutative  $*$ -algebras and  $*$ -homomorphisms.
- (2) Banach  $*$ -algebras and continuous  $*$ -homomorphisms.
- (3) Banach  $*$ -algebras and contractive  $*$ -homomorphisms.

The concept of the reducing ideal was introduced by Gelfand and Naimark in their classic paper [2, p. 463]. It has subsequently been studied by Kelley and Vaught [5, p. 51] and the present author [7, p. 63] and [8, p. 930]. The concept is discussed in [10, pp. 210, 226] and [6, p. 259]. In [11, 1479] Yood gave a definition of the  $*$ -radical which agrees with our definition for Banach  $*$ -algebras but differs for certain other types of  $*$ -algebras.

Our main extension theorem (3.1, below) was previously known for  $B^*$ -algebras [1, Proposition 2.10.4]. It has a number of applications besides the one discussed here. For example it immediately implies the conclusion of [4, Theorem 23] with hypotheses weaker than those of [4, Theorem 22].

In §1 we give necessary background information. The case of commutative  $*$ -algebras is considered in §2 and of  $U^*$ -algebras in §3. The category theory results are described in §4 where we use the terminology of M. Gray [3] for the general theory of radicals.

In general we follow the terminology of Rickart's book [10]. Further details and related results will be found in the author's forthcoming monograph [9].