

## LOCAL MULTIPLIER ALGEBRAS, INJECTIVE ENVELOPES, AND TYPE I $W^*$ -ALGEBRAS

MARTÍN ARGERAMI and DOUGLAS R. FARENICK

*Communicated by William B. Arveson*

**ABSTRACT.** Characterizations of those separable  $C^*$ -algebras that have  $W^*$ -algebra injective envelopes or  $W^*$ -algebra local multiplier algebras are presented. The  $C^*$ -envelope and the injective envelope of a class of operator systems that generate certain type I von Neumann algebras are also determined.

**KEYWORDS:** *Local multiplier algebra, injective envelope, regular monotone completion,  $C^*$ -algebra,  $AW^*$ -algebra.*

**MSC (2000):** Primary 46L05; Secondary 46L07.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The local multiplier algebra  $M_{\text{loc}}(A)$  of a  $C^*$ -algebra  $A$  is the  $C^*$ -algebraic direct limit of multiplier algebras  $M(K)$  along the downward-directed system  $\mathcal{E}(A)$  of all (closed) essential ideals  $K$  of  $A$ . Such algebras first arose in the study of derivations and were formally introduced by Pedersen in [18], where he proves that every derivation on a separable  $C^*$ -algebra  $A$  extends to an inner derivation of  $M_{\text{loc}}(A)$ . The question of whether every derivation of  $M_{\text{loc}}(A)$  is inner remains open for arbitrary separable  $C^*$ -algebras.

A systematic study of local multiplier algebras is presented in the recent monograph by Ara and Mathieu [3]. One of the most important general facts concerning local multiplier algebras is that the centre  $\mathcal{Z}(M_{\text{loc}}(A))$  of  $M_{\text{loc}}(A)$  is an  $AW^*$ -algebra [2]. Although  $M_{\text{loc}}(A)$  itself need not be an  $AW^*$ -algebra, Frank and Paulsen [9] have showed recently that  $M_{\text{loc}}(A)$  can nevertheless be realized as a  $C^*$ -subalgebra of a certain minimal injective  $AW^*$ -algebra: namely, the injective envelope  $I(A)$  of  $A$  [10]. Further, even though  $M_{\text{loc}}(A)$  is not in general an  $AW^*$ -algebra, there are examples in which  $M_{\text{loc}}(A)$  is actually a  $W^*$ -algebra. We show herein that for separable  $C^*$ -algebras,  $M_{\text{loc}}(A)$  is a  $W^*$ -algebra if and only if  $A$  has a minimal essential ideal that is isomorphic to a  $C^*$ -algebraic direct sum of elementary  $C^*$ -algebras. This result is an analogue, for local multiplier algebras,

of an earlier theorem of Akemann, Pedersen, and Tomiyama [1] on multiplier algebras, and it also leads to a new proof of a theorem arising from work of Wright [21] and Hamana [13] that characterizes those separable  $A$  for which  $I(A)$  is a  $W^*$ -algebra.

As usual, we will denote by  $B(H)$  and  $K(H)$  the set of bounded and compact operators on a Hilbert space  $H$ .

The notion of injective envelope [10], [11], [17] first arose in two seminal papers of Arveson [5], [6]. One of the principal results of [6], the so-called boundary theorem, states that if  $E$  is an operator system acting on a Hilbert space  $H$  such that  $K(H) \subset C^*(E)$ , then the identity map on  $E$  has a unique completely positive extension to the algebra  $C^*(E) \subset B(H)$  if and only if the quotient homomorphism onto the Calkin algebra is not completely isometric on  $E$ . This theorem is revisited in the present paper for a class of operator systems that generate discrete type I von Neumann algebras.

Let  $\mathcal{E}(A)$  denote the set of (closed) essential ideals of a  $C^*$ -algebra  $A$ . For every  $K \in \mathcal{E}(A)$ , let  $M(K)$  denote the multiplier algebra of  $K$ . If  $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{E}(A)$  are such that  $K_1 \subseteq K_2$ , then  $M(K_1) \supseteq M(K_2)$ ; thus, the family  $\mathcal{E}(A)$  of essential ideals of  $A$  determines a downward-directed system of  $C^*$ -algebras. The local multiplier algebra  $M_{\text{loc}}(A)$  of  $A$  is  $C^*$ -algebraic direct limit that arises from  $\mathcal{E}(A)$ :

$$M_{\text{loc}}(A) = \varinjlim \{M(K) : K \in \mathcal{E}(A)\}.$$

Every  $C^*$ -algebra  $A$  is a  $C^*$ -subalgebra of its injective envelope  $I(A)$  [10]. Moreover, by Corollary 4.3 in [9],

$$M_{\text{loc}}(A) = \left( \bigcup_{K \in \mathcal{E}(A)} \{x \in I(A) : xK + Kx \subseteq K\} \right)^-,$$

where the closure is with respect to the norm topology of  $I(A)$ . Thus,

$$A \subseteq M_{\text{loc}}(A) \subseteq I(A)$$

is an inclusion of  $C^*$ -subalgebras. In [8], Frank showed an additional sequence of inclusions as  $C^*$ -subalgebras:

$$A \subseteq M_{\text{loc}}(A) \subseteq M_{\text{loc}}(M_{\text{loc}}(A)) \subseteq \bar{A} \subseteq I(A).$$

In the inclusions above,  $\bar{A}$  is the regular monotone completion [12] of  $A$ . For separable  $C^*$ -algebras,  $\bar{A}$  coincides with  $\bar{A}^\sigma$ , the regular monotone  $\sigma$ -completion [20] of  $A$ .

It is not known whether  $\bar{A} \neq I(A)$  for separable  $C^*$ -algebras  $A$ , but all other inclusions above can be proper. Most striking is the recent example of Ara and Mathieu [4] in which they show that  $M_{\text{loc}}(A) \neq M_{\text{loc}}(M_{\text{loc}}(A))$  for a certain prime AF  $C^*$ -algebra  $A$ . Further relations are:  $I(M_{\text{loc}}(A)) = I(A)$  (Theorem 4.6 in [9]) and  $\mathcal{Z}(M_{\text{loc}}(A)) = M_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{Z}(A)) = \mathcal{Z}(I(A))$  (Theorem 2 in [8]), where this last fact holds because  $\mathcal{Z}(M_{\text{loc}}(A))$  is an  $AW^*$ -algebra (by Proposition 3.1.5 in [3]) and, as it is abelian, is therefore injective.

We shall employ the following notation from [3]. If  $\{A_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$  is a family of  $C^*$ -algebras, then

$$\prod_{\alpha \in \Lambda} A_\alpha = \{(a_\alpha)_\alpha : a_\alpha \in A_\alpha \text{ and } \sup_\alpha \|a_\alpha\| < \infty\};$$

$$\bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda} A_\alpha = \{(a_\alpha)_\alpha : a_\alpha \in A_\alpha \text{ and } \forall \varepsilon > 0 \text{ only finitely many } a_\alpha \text{ satisfy } \|a_\alpha\| > \varepsilon\}.$$

Note that the direct product  $\prod_{\alpha} A_\alpha$  and the direct sum  $\bigoplus_{\alpha} A_\alpha$  are  $C^*$ -algebras and  $\bigoplus_{\alpha} A_\alpha$  is an ideal of  $\prod_{\alpha} A_\alpha$ .

2. THE LOCAL MULTIPLIER ALGEBRA AS A  $W^*$ -ALGEBRA

It need not be true that  $M_{loc}(A)$  is an  $AW^*$ -algebra. For example,  $M_{loc}(A) = A$  in the case where  $A$  is unital, simple, and separable — but  $AW^*$ -algebras (of infinite dimension) are nonseparable. Although it is even less likely that  $M_{loc}(A)$  is a  $W^*$ -algebra, this is precisely the case for a number of important examples (such as if  $A$  is a von Neumann algebra or if  $A$  can be represented faithfully as acting on a Hilbert space  $H$  in such a way as to contain the ideal  $K(H)$  of compact operators).

Theorem 2.2 below characterizes those separable  $C^*$ -algebras that admit  $W^*$ -algebra local multipliers. The regular monotone completion  $\overline{A}$  of  $A$  has a key role in the proofs.

PROPOSITION 2.1.  $\overline{M_{loc}(A)} = \overline{A}$  for every  $C^*$ -algebra  $A$ .

*Proof.* By Theorem 4.6 in [9] and by the remark on page 68 that follows it, the injective envelopes of  $A$  and  $M_{loc}(A)$  coincide. By Hamana’s construction in Theorem 3.1 of [12] the regular monotone completion of a  $C^*$ -algebra  $B$  is the monotone closure of  $B$  in the injective envelope  $I(B)$ . Hence,

$$A \subseteq M_{loc}(A) \subseteq \overline{A} \subseteq I(A) = I(M_{loc}(A))$$

implies that  $\overline{A} \subseteq \overline{M_{loc}(A)} \subseteq \overline{\overline{A}}$ . Thus,  $\overline{M_{loc}(A)} = \overline{A}$ . ■

Recall that an elementary  $C^*$ -algebra is one that is isomorphic to  $K(H)$  for some Hilbert space  $H$ .

THEOREM 2.2. *The next statements are equivalent for a separable  $C^*$ -algebra  $A$ :*

- (i)  $\overline{A}$  is a  $W^*$ -algebra.
- (ii)  $I(A)$  is a  $W^*$ -algebra.
- (iii)  $M_{loc}(A)$  is a  $W^*$ -algebra.
- (iv)  $M_{loc}(A)$  is a discrete type I  $W^*$ -algebra.
- (v)  $A$  contains a minimal essential ideal that is isomorphic to a direct sum of elementary  $C^*$ -algebras.

*Proof.* (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (v). Since  $A$  is separable,  $\overline{A}$  has a countable order-dense subset (Wright notes in page 84 of [22] that the equivalence of the separability and having a countable order-dense subset follows from Theorem 4.3 of [20]). Hence, by Proposition A in [22], the set of pure states of  $\overline{A}$  (in the weak\* topology) is hyperseparable. Since hyperseparability implies separability, another theorem of Wright (Corollary 7 in [21]) shows that  $\overline{A}$  is isomorphic to  $\prod_n B(H_n)$  (a countable product), with each  $H_n$  separable. Further, since  $\prod_n B(H_n)$  is injective, it follows that  $I(A) = \overline{A} = \prod_n B(H_n)$ . Finally, Lemma 3.1(iii) of [13] yields that  $\bigoplus_n K(H_n) \subseteq A \subseteq \prod_n B(H_n)$ . The minimality of  $\bigoplus_n K(H_n)$  is given by Proposition 3.3 in [13].

(v)  $\Rightarrow$  (iv). Suppose that  $A$  has a minimal essential ideal  $K$  such that  $K \cong \bigoplus_n K(H_n)$ . Therefore, by Lemma 1.2.1 in [3],

$$M(K) = M\left(\bigoplus_n K(H_n)\right) = \prod_n M(K(H_n)) = \prod_n B(H_n),$$

which shows that  $M(K)$  is a (discrete type I)  $W^*$ -algebra. Furthermore, because  $K$  is a minimal essential ideal of  $A$ ,  $M(K) = M_{\text{loc}}(A)$  by Remark 2.3.7 in [3]. Hence,  $M_{\text{loc}}(A)$  is a discrete type I  $W^*$ -algebra.

The implication (iv)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii) is trivial.

(iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii). Since  $M_{\text{loc}}(A)$  is a  $W^*$ -algebra, it is monotone complete; thus,  $M_{\text{loc}}(A) = \overline{M_{\text{loc}}(A)}$ . This implies that  $\overline{A}$  is a  $W^*$ -algebra, by Proposition 2.1. The proof of (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (v) shows therefore that  $\overline{A}$  is a direct product of at most countably many type I factors. As type I factors are injective, so is  $\overline{A}$ . Therefore, the inclusion  $\overline{A} \subseteq I(A)$ , with  $\overline{A}$  injective, implies that  $I(A) = \overline{A}$ , which yields that  $I(A)$  is a  $W^*$ -algebra.

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i). As  $A$  is a  $C^*$ -algebra whose injective envelope  $I(A)$  is a  $W^*$ -algebra,  $\overline{A}$  is also a  $W^*$ -algebra (because a monotone closed  $C^*$ -subalgebra of a von Neumann algebra is a von Neumann algebra [14]). ■

**COROLLARY 2.3.** *If any one of the equivalent conditions in Theorem 2.2 holds for a separable  $C^*$ -algebra  $A$ , then*

$$M_{\text{loc}}(A) = M_{\text{loc}}(M_{\text{loc}}(A)) = \overline{A} = I(A).$$

*Proof.* Assume that any one of the statements (i)–(iv) in Theorem 2.2 holds. Then  $M_{\text{loc}}(A)$  is an injective  $W^*$ -algebra. However,  $A \subseteq M_{\text{loc}}(A) \subseteq I(A)$  as  $C^*$ -subalgebras, and so by definition of the injective envelope, it must be that  $M_{\text{loc}}(A) = I(A)$ , which proves that  $M_{\text{loc}}(A) = M_{\text{loc}}(M_{\text{loc}}(A)) = \overline{A} = I(A)$ . ■

**COROLLARY 2.4.** *If  $A$  is a separable, prime  $C^*$ -algebra, then exactly one of the following two statements holds:*

- (i)  $I(A) \cong B(H)$ , for some separable Hilbert space  $H$ ;

(ii)  $I(A)$  is a wild type III  $AW^*$ -factor.

In particular, if  $A$  has no nonzero postliminal ideals, then  $I(A)$  is a wild type III  $AW^*$ -factor.

*Proof.* Because  $A$  is prime,  $I(A)$  is an  $AW^*$ -factor (Theorem 7.1 in [12]). This factor cannot be of type II for the following reasons.

If  $I(A)$  is a finite type II  $AW^*$ -factor, then the identity  $1 \in I(A)$  is a finite projection, and so  $1$  is a finite projection in  $\bar{A}$  as well. Therefore,  $\bar{A}$  is of type I by Theorem 2 in [16]. But type I algebras are injective; hence  $\bar{A} = I(A)$ , contradicting that  $I(A)$  is of type II. Thus, assume that  $I(A)$  is a type  $II_\infty$   $AW^*$ -factor. Since  $I(A)$  admits a faithful state (because  $A$  is separable),  $I(A)$  is a  $W^*$ -algebra by [7]. So Theorem 2.2 implies that  $I(A)$  is of type I, which is a contradiction. Hence,  $I(A)$  is a factor of either type I or type III.

In the case where  $I(A)$  is of type I we have  $I(A) \cong B(H)$  for some Hilbert space  $H$ , because all type I  $AW^*$ -factors have this form by Theorem 2 in [15]. Indeed, in this case,  $\bar{A} = I(A) \cong B(H)$ ; since  $\bar{A}$  is countably decomposable,  $H$  can be chosen to be separable.

If  $I(A)$  is not of type I, then the type III  $AW^*$ -factor  $I(A)$  cannot be a  $W^*$ -algebra, by Theorem 2.2. Every  $AW^*$ -factor that is not  $W^*$ -algebra is wild [22]; hence,  $I(A)$  is wild.

Finally, if  $A$  is prime and has a nonzero postliminal ideal, then  $I(A)$  is of type I [13]. Thus, a prime separable  $C^*$ -algebra with no nonzero postliminal ideals must have a wild type III injective envelope. ■

### 3. A VERSION OF THE BOUNDARY THEOREM

If  $E$  is an operator system, then the  $C^*$ -envelope [11], [17] of  $E$  is the  $C^*$ -subalgebra  $C_{\text{env}}^*(E)$  of  $I(E)$  generated by  $E$ . The  $C^*$ -algebra  $C_{\text{env}}^*(E)$  is independent of the choice of the embedding of  $E$  into an injective envelope  $(I, \kappa)$  of  $E$ ; thus, the notation  $C_{\text{env}}^*(E)$  is unambiguous.

The aim of the present section is to prove the following result.

**THEOREM 3.1.** *Let  $E \subseteq B(H)$  be an operator system for which the von Neumann algebra  $E''$  is generated by its minimal projections, each of which is contained in the  $C^*$ -subalgebra  $C^*(E)$  of  $B(H)$  generated by  $E$ . Then  $I(E)$  is a type I  $W^*$ -algebra and*

$$I(E) \cong E'' \quad \text{and} \quad C_{\text{env}}^*(E) \cong C^*(E).$$

Before turning to the proof of Theorem 3.1, recall that the original motivation for the concept of injectivity is Arveson's Hahn–Banach Extension Theorem [5] for completely positive linear maps, and that the idea of an injective envelope stems from Arveson's theory of boundary representations [6]. In Arveson's work on boundary representations, the operator systems were often realized as irreducible operator systems in  $B(H)$  and their generated  $C^*$ -algebras  $C^*(E)$  were

sometimes assumed to have nontrivial intersection with — and hence contain — the ideal  $K(H)$  of compact operators. In this spirit, Theorem 3.1 is a generalization of the boundary theorem from  $B(H)$  to discrete type I von Neumann algebras.

Two preliminary results are needed for the proof of Theorem 3.1. The first result is a proposition of Hamana that is a useful criterion for determining when an injective operator system  $I$  containing  $E$  is an injective envelope.

**PROPOSITION 3.2** (Lemma 3.7 in [10]). *Consider an inclusion  $E \subseteq I$  of operator systems, where  $I$  is injective. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

(i)  $I$  is an injective envelope of  $E$ .

(ii) The only completely positive linear map  $\omega : I \rightarrow I$  for which  $\omega|_E = \text{id}_E$  is the identity map  $\omega = \text{id}_I$ .

The second preliminary result is a kind of partial converse to the main result of [19].

**LEMMA 3.3.** *Suppose that  $A$  is a  $C^*$ -subalgebra of a von Neumann algebra  $M$  and that  $M = A''$ . If  $M$  is generated by its minimal projections, each of which is contained in  $A$ , then  $A$  is order dense in  $M$ .*

*Proof.* Choose a nonzero  $h \in M^+$  and consider the set

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ (k_i) \subset A^+ : \sum_{\text{finite}} k_i \leq h \right\}.$$

There is a strictly positive  $\lambda$  in the spectrum  $\sigma(h)$  of  $h$ . Let  $e \in M$  be the spectral projection  $e = e^h([\lambda, \infty))$ , where  $e^h$  denotes the spectral resolution of  $h$ . Thus,  $0 \neq \lambda e \leq he$ . Moreover,  $e$  majorizes a minimal projection  $p$  of  $M$ ; by hypothesis,  $p \in A$ . Thus,  $0 \neq \lambda p = e(\lambda p)e \leq e(\lambda)e = \lambda e \leq he \leq h$ , and so  $\lambda p \in \mathcal{F}$ , which proves that  $\mathcal{F} \neq \emptyset$ . It is clear that  $\mathcal{F}$  is inductive under inclusions of those families and so, by Zorn’s Lemma,  $\mathcal{F}$  has a maximal family  $W$ . Since every finite sum of this family is less than  $h$ ,

$$y = \sup \left\{ \sum_{k \in K} k : K \text{ is finite and } K \subset W \right\} \leq h.$$

If  $y \neq h$ , then  $h - y \in M^+$ , and so by the first paragraph there exists nonzero  $k \in A^+$  such that  $k \leq h - y$ . If it were true that  $k \in W$ , then for each net  $(h_i)$  of those finite sums of elements in  $W$  such that  $h_i \nearrow y$ , the net  $(h_i + k) \nearrow y + k$ , which contradicts the fact that  $y$  is the supremum. Hence,  $k \notin W$ . But if  $k \notin W$ , then the family  $W$  is not maximal, which is again a contradiction. Therefore, it must be that  $y = h$ , which proves that  $A$  is order dense in  $M$ . ■

**THEOREM 3.4.** *If  $A \subseteq B(H)$  is a  $C^*$ -algebra and if  $M = A''$  is generated by its minimal projections, each of which is contained in  $A$ , then  $\varphi = \text{id}_M$  for every completely positive linear map  $\varphi : M \rightarrow M$  for which  $\varphi|_A = \text{id}_A$ .*

*Proof.* Observe that because  $\varphi : M \rightarrow M$  is a unital completely positive map that preserves  $A$ ,  $\varphi$  has the following property:

$$\varphi(xk) = \varphi(x)k, \quad \text{for every } k \in A.$$

This fact follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and from the fact that  $A$  is in the multiplicative domain of  $\varphi$  (Theorem 3.18 in [17]). Using this fact we shall deduce below that

$$(3.1) \quad x \geq 0 \text{ if and only if } \varphi(x) \geq 0.$$

Indeed, one implication is obvious from the positivity of  $\varphi$ . To prove the other implication, assume that  $\varphi(x) \geq 0$ . Thus,  $\text{Im}(\varphi(x)) = \varphi(\text{Im}(x)) = 0$ . Let  $z = \text{Im}(x)$  and write  $z = z^+ - z^-$ , where  $z^+, z^- \in M^+$  are such that  $z^+z^- = z^-z^+ = 0$ .

Our first goal is to prove that  $z^+ = 0$ . Suppose, on the contrary, that  $z^+ \neq 0$ . Thus, there is a strictly positive  $\lambda$  in the spectrum of  $z^+$ ; hence, there is a spectral projection  $p \in M$  such that  $0 \neq \lambda p \leq pz^+ = z^+p$ . Note that  $z^-p = 0$ , as the projection  $p$  is in the von Neumann algebra generated by  $z^+$  and  $z^+z^- = z^-z^+ = 0$ . Let  $q \in A$  be an arbitrary minimal projection of  $M$  and consider the projection  $p \wedge q \in M$ . Because  $p \wedge q \leq q$  and  $q$  is minimal, either  $p \wedge q = 0$  or  $p \wedge q = q$ . We will show that the latter case cannot occur (under the conventional assumption that minimal projections are defined to be nonzero). Assume that it is true that  $p \wedge q = q$ . Then  $0 \neq q = p \wedge q \leq p$ . Pre- and post-multiply the inequality  $\lambda q \leq \lambda p \leq z^+p = zp$  by  $q$  to obtain  $\lambda q \leq q(zp)q \leq qzq$ . Note that  $\varphi(zq) = \varphi(z)q$  (because  $A$  is in the multiplicative domain of  $\varphi$ ) and that  $\varphi(z) = 0$  (by hypothesis). Likewise, for any hermitian  $y \in M$ ,  $\varphi(qy) = \varphi(yq)^* = q\varphi(y)$ . Thus,  $\varphi(qzq) = q\varphi(z)q = 0$  and  $0 \leq \lambda q = \varphi(\lambda q) \leq q\varphi(z)q = 0$ . This implies that  $q = 0$ , which contradicts the fact that  $q$  is minimal and, thus, nonzero. Therefore, it must be that  $p \wedge q = 0$ , for every minimal projection  $q$  of  $M$ . Because every nonzero projection in  $M$  majorizes a minimal projection, we conclude that  $p = 0$ , in contradiction to the fact that  $p$  is a nonzero spectral projection of  $z^+$ . Hence, it must be that  $z^+ = 0$ .

A similar argument shows that  $z^- = 0$ . We can find a nonzero  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+$  and a minimal projection  $q \in A$  such that  $qzq \leq -\lambda q$ ; thus  $-\lambda q = \varphi(-\lambda q) \geq \varphi(qzq) = q\varphi(z)q = 0$ , and again  $q = 0$ .

We conclude that  $z = 0$ , which implies that  $x$  is selfadjoint. It remains to show that  $x$  is positive. Assume that  $x$  is not positive. Thus, there exists a nonzero spectral projection in the negative part of  $\sigma(x)$ ; by taking once again a suitable minimal subprojection  $q$ , we can find  $\lambda > 0$  such that  $qxq \leq -\lambda q$ . But then  $\varphi(qxq) \leq -\lambda q$ ; and on the other hand,  $\varphi(qxq) = q\varphi(x)q \geq 0$ . The contradiction implies that no such  $q$  can exist, and so  $x \geq 0$ .

From (3.1) and the fact the  $\varphi$  preserves  $A$ , we have that for  $k \in A$ ,  $k \leq x$  if and only if  $k \leq \varphi(x)$ . Lemma 3.3 asserts that  $A$  is order dense in  $M$ . Hence,  $\varphi(x) = x$  for every  $x \in M^+$ , which implies that  $\varphi$  is the identity map on  $M$ . ■

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* By hypothesis,  $C^*(E)$  contains all the minimal projections that generate  $E''$ . Theorem 3.4 together with Proposition 3.2 show that  $E''$  is an injective envelope for  $E$ . Further, there is a completely positive projection  $\phi$  on  $B(H)$  with range  $E''$ . Hence, if  $x, y \in E''$ , then  $x \circ y$  — the product of  $x$  and  $y$  in the  $C^*$ -algebra  $I(E)$  — is given by  $x \circ y = \phi(xy) = xy$ , since  $E''$  is an algebra. Thus,  $E'' = I(E)$  and  $C^*(E)$  is precisely  $C_{\text{env}}^*(E)$ . ■

*Acknowledgements.* We wish to express our thanks to the referee and to Pere Ara and Martin Mathieu for a number of useful suggestions. Our original proof that (i) implies (v) in Theorem 2.2 was achieved by different methods than the proof included herein; the proof given here was communicated to us by Professor M. Hamana. This work has been supported in part by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

## REFERENCES

- [1] C.A. AKEMANN, G.K. PEDERSEN, J. TOMIYAMA, Multipliers of  $C^*$ -algebras, *J. Funct. Anal.* **13**(1973), 277–301.
- [2] P. ARA, M. MATHIEU, A local version of the Dauns-Hofmann theorem, *Math. Z.* **208**(1991), 349–353.
- [3] P. ARA, M. MATHIEU, *Local Multipliers of  $C^*$ -Algebras*, Springer Monographs Math., London, 2003.
- [4] P. ARA, M. MATHIEU, A not so simple local multiplier algebra, *J. Funct. Anal.* **237**(2006), 721–737.
- [5] W.B. ARVESON, Subalgebras of  $C^*$ -algebras, *Acta Math.* **123**(1969), 141–224.
- [6] W.B. ARVESON, Subalgebras of  $C^*$ -algebras. II, *Acta Math.* **128**(1972), 271–308.
- [7] G.A. ELLIOTT, K. SAITÔ, J.D.M. WRIGHT, Embedding  $AW^*$ -algebras as double commutants in type I algebras, *J. London Math. Soc.* **28**(1983), 376–384.
- [8] M. FRANK, Injective envelopes and local multiplier algebras of  $C^*$ -algebras, *Int. Math. J.* **1**(2002), 611–620.
- [9] M. FRANK, V.I. PAULSEN, Injective envelopes of  $C^*$ -algebras as operator modules, *Pacific J. Math.* **212**(2003), 57–69.
- [10] M. HAMANA, Injective envelopes of  $C^*$ -algebras, *J. Math. Soc. Japan* **31**(1979), 181–197.
- [11] M. HAMANA, Injective envelopes of operator systems, *Publ. RIMS Kyoto Univ.* **15**(1979), 773–785.
- [12] M. HAMANA, Regular embeddings of  $C^*$ -algebras in monotone complete  $C^*$ -algebras, *J. Math. Soc. Japan* **33**(1981), 159–183.
- [13] M. HAMANA, The centre of the regular monotone completion of a  $C^*$ -algebra, *J. London Math. Soc.* **26**(1982), 522–530.
- [14] R.V. KADISON, Operator algebras with a faithful weakly-closed representation, *Ann. of Math.* **64**(1956), 175–181.
- [15] I. KAPLANSKY, Algebras of type I, *Ann. of Math.* **56**(1952), 460–472.



- [16] M. OZAWA, K. SAITÔ, Embeddable  $AW^*$ -algebras and regular completions, *J. London Math. Soc.* **34**(1986), 511–523.
- [17] V.I. PAULSEN, *Completely Bounded Maps and Operator Algebras*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge 2002.
- [18] G.K. PEDERSEN, Approximating derivations on ideals of  $C^*$ -algebras, *Invent. Math.* **45**(1979), 299–305.
- [19] M. TAKESAKI, Faithful states on a  $C^*$ -algebra, *Pacific J. Math.* **52**(1973), 605–610.
- [20] J.D.M. WRIGHT, Regular  $\sigma$ -completions of  $C^*$ -algebras, *J. London Math. Soc.* **12**(1976), 299–309.
- [21] J.D.M. WRIGHT, On von Neumann algebras whose pure states are separable, *J. London Math. Soc.* **12**(1976), 385–388.
- [22] J.D.M. WRIGHT, Wild  $AW^*$ -factors and Kaplansky-Rickart algebras, *J. London Math. Soc.* **13**(1976), 83–89.

MARTÍN ARGERAMI, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF REGINA, REGINA, SASKATCHEWAN, CANADA S4S 0A2  
*E-mail address:* argerami@math.uregina.ca

DOUGLAS R. FARENICK, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF REGINA, REGINA, SASKATCHEWAN, CANADA S4S 0A2  
*E-mail address:* farenick@math.uregina.ca

Received November 28, 2005; revised December 21, 2005 and June 7, 2006.