

MAXIMAL C^* -COVERS AND RESIDUAL FINITE-DIMENSIONALITY

IAN THOMPSON

ABSTRACT. We study residually finite-dimensional (or RFD) operator algebras which may not be self-adjoint. An operator algebra may be RFD while simultaneously possessing completely isometric representations whose generating C^* -algebra is not RFD. This has provided many hurdles in characterizing residual finite-dimensionality for operator algebras. To better understand the elusive behaviour, we explore the C^* -covers of an operator algebra. First, we equate the collection of C^* -covers with a complete lattice arising from the spectrum of the maximal C^* -cover. This allows us to identify a largest RFD C^* -cover whenever the underlying operator algebra is RFD. The largest RFD C^* -cover is shown to be similar to the maximal C^* -cover in several different facets and this provides supporting evidence to a previous query of whether an RFD operator algebra always possesses an RFD maximal C^* -cover. In closing, we present a non self-adjoint version of Hadwin’s characterization of separable RFD C^* -algebras.

1. INTRODUCTION

The characterization of a C^* -algebra can often be reduced to studying its representation theory. To this end, a natural choice is to investigate the C^* -algebras which may be completely understood by their finite-dimensional $*$ -representations. This philosophy underlies nuclearity and quasidiagonality of C^* -algebras, which have generated a flurry of recent progress (see [22], [31]). However, where those notions constitute an approximation property which is ‘internal’ to the C^* -algebra, we study a finite-dimensional approximation property external to the C^* -algebra.

Namely, we study the notion of residual finite-dimensionality. Residually finite-dimensional C^* -algebras constitute a truly significant class of the quasidiagonal C^* -algebras and possess numerous equivalent characterizations (see [2], [12], [14], [21], [23]). But instead, we will consider residual finite-dimensionality of (possibly non self-adjoint) operator algebras. We say that an operator algebra is *residually finite-dimensional* (or RFD) if it may be embedded into a direct product of finite-dimensional C^* -algebras. This concept was recently introduced in [11] and there are still only a few characterizations of RFD operator algebras (see [9], [11]).

Operator algebras possess quite idiosyncratic behaviour up to complete isometric isomorphism and this poses many difficulties in characterizing residual finite-dimensionality. We will clarify this hurdle. Suppose $\mathcal{A} \subset B(\mathcal{H})$ is an operator algebra. Upon passing through a completely isometric representation $\iota : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{K})$, one may find an isomorphic copy of the same operator algebra. However, there may be a stark difference between the C^* -algebras generated by \mathcal{A} and $\iota(\mathcal{A})$, which

Date: November 10, 2021.

The author was partially supported by an NSERC CGS-M Scholarship.

we denote by $C^*(\mathcal{A})$ and $C^*(\iota(\mathcal{A}))$, respectively. It is not necessarily true that $C^*(\mathcal{A})$ and $C^*(\iota(\mathcal{A}))$ are $*$ -isomorphic. It can even be the case that $C^*(\mathcal{A})$ is RFD whereas $C^*(\iota(\mathcal{A}))$ possesses no finite-dimensional $*$ -representations (Example 2). In this sense, it is not clear how to detect residual finite-dimensionality of operator algebras.

We consider the collection of all C^* -covers of an operator algebra \mathcal{A} to study residual finite-dimensionality. A C^* -cover of \mathcal{A} is a pair (\mathfrak{A}, ι) where ι is a completely isometric representation of \mathcal{A} and $\mathfrak{A} = C^*(\iota(\mathcal{A}))$. In the literature on C^* -covers, there are two well-studied covers which dominate the theory: the minimal C^* -cover and the maximal C^* -cover. These two C^* -covers always exist for any operator algebra. Existence of the maximal C^* -cover is shown in [7, Proposition 2.4.2] and will be quite relevant for our purposes. On the other hand, existence of the minimal C^* -cover (or C^* -envelope) has been the basis of a research project spanning nearly half a century (see [5], [3], [16], [19], [24], [28]). The minimal C^* -cover will make appearances but, for our purposes, we focus heavily on the maximal C^* -cover.

The maximal C^* -cover of an operator algebra \mathcal{A} , denoted $(C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}), \mu)$, satisfies the universal property that every representation of \mathcal{A} lifts to a unique $*$ -representation of $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$. Hence, the representations of \mathcal{A} are in one-to-one correspondence with the $*$ -representations of $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$. As residual finite-dimensionality is encoded in the structural properties of spaces of representations, one could ask whether residual finite-dimensionality of operator algebras is closely linked to that of their maximal C^* -covers. This provides us with our main inquiry:

Question 1. If \mathcal{A} is an RFD operator algebra, then is $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$ necessarily RFD?

There have been several instances for which Question 1 has been answered in the affirmative [9], [11]. Most notably, it was shown that $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$ is RFD whenever \mathcal{A} is finite-dimensional. The maximal C^* -cover is also RFD for Popescu's disk algebra, the Schur-Agler class of functions, as well as some semigroup algebras and spaces of analytic functions. We remark that Question 1 is also related to a result of Pestov [30, Theorem 4.1].

Now we outline the structure of the paper and our approach to the main question. Within Section 2, we introduce background material on the spectrum of a C^* -algebra, C^* -covers and residual finite-dimensionality.

In Section 3, we study a natural partial ordering on the collection of all C^* -covers of a fixed operator algebra. This was previously observed in [25]. Under a natural interpretation, we show that the partial ordering is equivalent to the partial ordering given by inclusion of the spectra of the C^* -covers (Proposition 3.2). Moreover, this produces an isomorphism of complete lattices (Theorem 3.3) and allows us to equate topological statements on the spectrum of the maximal C^* -cover with order-theoretic statements on the collection of C^* -covers. This identification supplies us with a natural framework to study residual finite-dimensionality in Section 4.

Fix an RFD operator algebra \mathcal{A} . In Subsection 4.1, we derive the existence of a largest RFD C^* -cover of \mathcal{A} relative to the partial ordering of C^* -covers (Theorem 4.2). This is referred to as the *RFD-maximal C^* -cover*, denoted $(\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), \nu)$. As a consequence, Question 1 has an affirmative answer precisely when the RFD-maximal C^* -cover is the maximal C^* -cover (Corollary 4.3). In Theorem 4.4, we identify the spectrum of the RFD-maximal C^* -cover relative to the maximal C^* -cover.

In Subsection 4.2, we provide an explicit representation of the RFD-maximal C*-cover. Typically, the embedding $\mu : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$ is taken to be an appropriately large direct sum of completely contractive representations of \mathcal{A} . We show that the RFD-maximal C*-cover can be constructed in an analogous way and satisfies a universal property (Theorem 4.6):

Theorem 1.1. *Let \mathcal{A} be an RFD operator algebra. For any representation $\rho : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_\rho)$ on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, there is a unique *-representation $\theta : \mathfrak{K}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_\rho)$ such that $\theta \circ \mu = \rho$. Moreover, $(\mathfrak{K}(\mathcal{A}), \mu)$ is minimal among all C*-covers of \mathcal{A} which satisfy this property.*

As previously noted, to answer Question 1 in the affirmative we must show that the RFD-maximal C*-cover and the maximal C*-cover coincide. In Subsection 4.3, we exhibit several aspects of the RFD-maximal C*-cover which are reminiscent of known properties of the maximal C*-cover. Thus, this is consistent with Question 1 having an affirmative answer. For unital operator algebras, the maximal C*-cover is known to respect countable direct sum and the free product of finitely many operator algebras [6, Proposition 2.2], [11, Theorem 5.2]. We show that the RFD-maximal C*-cover also preserves these constructions (Theorems 4.10 and 4.11). In turn, this provides supporting evidence for an affirmative answer to Question 1.

Theorem 1.2. *The following statements hold:*

- (i) *If $\mathcal{A}_n, n \in \mathbb{N}$, are unital RFD operator algebras, $\mathfrak{K}(\bigoplus_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}_n) \cong \bigoplus_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{K}(\mathcal{A}_n)$.*
- (ii) *If \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} are unital RFD operator algebras, then $\mathfrak{K}(\mathcal{A} * \mathcal{B}) \cong \mathfrak{K}(\mathcal{A}) * \mathfrak{K}(\mathcal{B})$.*

In Section 5, we study the representation theory of RFD operator algebras and relate this to properties of the RFD-maximal C*-cover. Due to work of Exel and Loring, a C*-algebra is RFD precisely when all *-representations are point-strong limits of (possibly degenerate) finite-dimensional representations [21, Theorem 2.4]. In this setting, the point-strong and point-strong* topologies coincide. This subtlety regarding the adjoint is responsible for some of the phenomena we witness.

Specifically, the possible discrepancy of the point-strong and point-strong* topologies for operator algebras results in some uncertainty over how to interpret this condition. Here we consider two possible candidates: those representations which are point-strong limits of finite-dimensional representations are referred to as *residually finite-dimensional* representations (or RFD representations). Alongside RFD representations, we consider representations which are point-strong* limits of finite-dimensional representations, called **-residually finite-dimensional* representations (or *-RFD representations).

Recently, Clouâtre and Dor-On showed that $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$ is RFD precisely when every representation of \mathcal{A} is *-RFD [9, Theorem 3.3]. Utilizing this result, we are presented with a natural intermediate question. Indeed, for Question 1 to have an affirmative answer, it must be the case that RFD and *-RFD representations of an RFD operator algebra coincide. This provides us with a suitable motivation for considering both classes of representations.

We wish to study which C*-covers RFD and *-RFD representations lift to. Similar to the concrete construction of the RFD-maximal C*-cover, we may build two C*-covers concretely from appropriately large direct sums of RFD representations and *-RFD representations. We denote the associated C*-covers by $(\mathfrak{K}_s(\mathcal{A}), \mu_s)$ and $(\mathfrak{K}_{*s}(\mathcal{A}), \mu_{*s})$, respectively. In Corollary 5.5, we show that $(\mathfrak{K}_{*s}(\mathcal{A}), \mu_{*s})$ is the RFD-maximal C*-cover. Consequently, the *-RFD representations of \mathcal{A} are

precisely those representations which lift to the RFD-maximal C^* -cover. We then obtain equivalent conditions for RFD and $*$ -RFD representations of an RFD operator algebra to coincide (Theorem 5.6). For instance, this is equivalent to $(\mathfrak{R}_s(\mathcal{A}), v_s)$ being the RFD-maximal C^* -cover.

In Section 6, we study Hadwin's characterization of separable RFD C^* -algebras [23] and provide a non self-adjoint version of their result. We recount the details.

Let $\{e_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be an orthonormal basis for ℓ^2 . For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let P_n be the orthogonal projection onto the linear span of $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ and let $\mathcal{M}_n = P_n B(\ell^2) P_n$. Further, let \mathfrak{B} be the C^* -subalgebra of $\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{M}_n$ consisting of all sequences $(T_n)_{n \geq 1}$ which converge $*$ -strongly in $B(\ell^2)$. Let $\pi : \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow B(\ell^2)$ denote the $*$ -representation defined by $\pi((T_n)) = *SOT \lim_n T_n$. A representation $\rho : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\ell^2)$ is **-liftable in the sense of Hadwin* if there is a representation $\tau : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ such that $\pi \circ \tau = \rho$.

Hadwin showed that a separable C^* -algebra \mathfrak{A} is RFD if and only if every unital $*$ -representation $\sigma : \tilde{\mathfrak{A}} \rightarrow B(\ell^2)$ is $*$ -liftable [23, Theorem 11]. We show the following in Theorem 6.2:

Theorem 1.3. *Let \mathcal{A} be a separable operator algebra. Then, $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$ is an RFD C^* -algebra if and only if every unital representation $\rho : \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow B(\ell^2)$ is $*$ -liftable in the sense of Hadwin.*

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank their advisor, Raphaël Clouâtre, who was tremendously helpful during the preparation of this manuscript.

2. PRELIMINARIES

An *operator algebra* \mathcal{A} is a subalgebra of $B(\mathcal{H})$ where \mathcal{H} is some Hilbert space. The collection of $n \times n$ complex-valued matrices will be denoted by \mathbb{M}_n while the collection of $n \times n$ matrices with entries in \mathcal{A} is denoted by $\mathbb{M}_n(\mathcal{A})$. For a linear map $\rho : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_\rho)$, we let

$$\rho^{(n)} : \mathbb{M}_n(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_\rho^{(n)}), \quad [a_{ij}] \mapsto [\rho(a_{ij})].$$

A linear map ρ is *completely contractive* whenever $\rho^{(n)}$ is contractive for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We also refer to a map ρ as being *completely isometric* if $\rho^{(n)}$ is isometric for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. A *representation* of an operator algebra is a completely contractive algebra homomorphism $\rho : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_\rho)$. When \mathcal{A} is self-adjoint, \mathcal{A} is a C^* -algebra and a representation is referred to as a **-representation*.

If \mathcal{A} is a non-unital operator algebra, we let $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ denote the unitization. If \mathcal{A} is unital, we will simply refer to $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ as \mathcal{A} itself. We recall the relevant details from [27] on unitizations of operator algebras: given a non-unital operator algebra \mathcal{A} , there is a completely isometric representation $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$. Moreover, any representation $\rho : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_\rho)$ extends uniquely to a unital representation $\rho^+ : \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_\rho)$ and ρ is completely isometric precisely when ρ^+ is completely isometric.

2.1. Spectral Topology. Throughout our analyses, we work with topologies on spaces of representations. These representations will be defined on either C^* -algebras or non self-adjoint operator algebras. Here, we recount basic facts on the spectrum of a C^* -algebra (see [17, Chapter 3] for details).

Let \mathfrak{A} be a C^* -algebra. An ideal \mathfrak{J} is *primitive* whenever \mathfrak{J} is the kernel of an irreducible $*$ -representation of \mathfrak{A} . We define the *primitive ideal space*, denoted $\text{Prim}(\mathfrak{A})$, to be the collection of all primitive ideals. The primitive ideal space is

equipped with a natural topology: whenever \mathcal{J} is a collection of primitive ideals, the closure of \mathcal{J} is the collection of all primitive ideals which contain $\bigcap_{\mathfrak{J} \in \mathcal{J}} \mathfrak{J}$. The *spectrum* of \mathfrak{A} , denoted $\widehat{\mathfrak{A}}$, is the collection of unitary equivalence classes of irreducible $*$ -representations of \mathfrak{A} . For an irreducible $*$ -representation $\pi : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$, we let $[\pi]$ denote the unitary equivalence class of π . The topology on $\widehat{\mathfrak{A}}$ is defined to be the weakest topology such that the natural mapping

$$\widehat{\mathfrak{A}} \rightarrow \text{Prim}(\mathfrak{A}), \quad [\pi] \mapsto \ker \pi,$$

is continuous. If π and σ are $*$ -representations of \mathfrak{A} , then π is *weakly contained* in σ , denoted $\pi \prec \sigma$, if $\ker \sigma \subset \ker \pi$. Equivalently, $\pi \prec \sigma$ if and only if there is a $*$ -homomorphism $\Lambda : \sigma(\mathfrak{A}) \rightarrow \pi(\mathfrak{A})$ such that $\Lambda \circ \sigma = \pi$. Further, this is equivalent to stipulating that $\|\pi(t)\| \leq \|\sigma(t)\|$ for each $t \in \mathfrak{A}$. When π and σ are weakly contained in one another, we say the representations are *weakly equivalent*. The closure of a singleton $[\pi] \in \widehat{\mathfrak{A}}$ is $\{\sigma \in \widehat{\mathfrak{A}} : \sigma \prec \pi\}$. Let $\mathcal{D} \subset \widehat{\mathfrak{A}}$ and \mathcal{D}_0 be a set of irreducible $*$ -representations such that $\mathcal{D} = \{[\sigma] \in \widehat{\mathfrak{A}} : \sigma \in \mathcal{D}_0\}$. Note that if the $*$ -representation $\bigoplus_{\sigma \in \mathcal{D}_0} \sigma$ is injective, then the subset \mathcal{D} is dense within $\widehat{\mathfrak{A}}$.

Every irreducible $*$ -representation of a closed two-sided ideal $\mathfrak{J} \subset \mathfrak{A}$ extends uniquely to \mathfrak{A} . Conversely, if σ is an irreducible $*$ -representation of \mathfrak{A} , then $\sigma|_{\mathfrak{J}}$ is irreducible if and only if $\sigma|_{\mathfrak{J}} \neq 0$ [15, Lemmata 1.9.14-15]. These facts allow for a description of the spectrum which will be central to our arguments:

Theorem 2.1. [17, Propositions 3.2.1-2] *Let \mathfrak{J} be a closed two-sided ideal of a C*-algebra \mathfrak{A} . Let $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{J}} = \{[\sigma] \in \widehat{\mathfrak{A}} : \sigma|_{\mathfrak{J}} = 0\}$ and $\mathcal{U}_{\mathfrak{J}} = \{[\sigma] \in \widehat{\mathfrak{A}} : \sigma|_{\mathfrak{J}} \neq 0\}$. Then, the following statements hold:*

- (i) $\widehat{\mathfrak{A}}$ is the disjoint union of $\mathcal{U}_{\mathfrak{J}}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{J}}$;
- (ii) $\mathcal{U}_{\mathfrak{J}}$ is an open subset and $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{J}}$ is a closed subset in $\widehat{\mathfrak{A}}$;
- (iii) the natural mapping $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{J}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathfrak{A}/\mathfrak{J}}$ is a homeomorphism;
- (iv) the natural mapping $\mathcal{U}_{\mathfrak{J}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathfrak{J}}$ is a homeomorphism.

Moreover, the mapping $\mathfrak{J} \mapsto \mathcal{U}_{\mathfrak{J}}$ is an inclusion-preserving bijection between the closed two-sided ideals of \mathfrak{A} and the open subsets of $\widehat{\mathfrak{A}}$.

2.2. C*-covers. The C*-algebra that an operator algebra $\mathcal{A} \subset B(\mathcal{H})$ generates often carries strikingly different information based off the choice of representation for the algebra. We will make this explicit. Within $B(\mathcal{H})$, there is a smallest C*-algebra containing \mathcal{A} , denoted $C^*(\mathcal{A})$. Given a completely isometric representation $\iota : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{K})$, the C*-algebra $C^*(\iota(\mathcal{A}))$ could be quite unlike $C^*(\mathcal{A})$ (Example 1).

Let $\mathcal{A} \subset B(\mathcal{H})$ be an operator algebra. We call the pair (\mathfrak{A}, ι) a *C*-cover* of \mathcal{A} if $\iota : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{K})$ is a completely isometric representation and $\mathfrak{A} = C^*(\iota(\mathcal{A}))$. In our arguments, we will be concerned with a handful of particular C*-covers and we will frequently deal with several C*-covers at once. For this reason, we will typically not record the Hilbert space that an operator algebra is represented upon.

The most notable C*-cover we work with is the maximal C*-cover. The *maximal C*-cover* of an operator algebra \mathcal{A} is the essentially unique C*-cover, denoted $(C^*_{max}(\mathcal{A}), \mu)$, satisfying the following universal property: whenever $\rho : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_\rho)$ is a representation of \mathcal{A} , there is a unique $*$ -representation $\theta : C^*_{max}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_\rho)$ such that $\theta \circ \mu = \rho$. In particular, whenever (\mathfrak{A}, ι) is a C*-cover for \mathcal{A} , there is a unique surjective $*$ -representation $q_{\mathfrak{A}} : C^*_{max}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ such that $q_{\mathfrak{A}} \circ \mu = \iota$. We will utilize this notation throughout. The maximal C*-cover is known to exist for any

operator algebra and can be constructed in a concrete way [7, Proposition 2.4.2]. That is, one constructs the completely isometric representation $\mu : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$ by taking an appropriately large direct sum of representations of \mathcal{A} .

We remark that to answer Question 1 it suffices to consider the unital case. Indeed, the maximal C^* -cover of an operator algebra preserves unitizations in a natural way [7, 2.4.3]. With this in mind, we will occasionally make the assumption that the operator algebra \mathcal{A} is unital.

Another C^* -cover we make use of is the C^* -envelope of an operator algebra, denoted $(C_e^*(\mathcal{A}), \iota_{env})$. The C^* -envelope satisfies the following universal property: whenever (\mathfrak{A}, ι) is some C^* -cover of \mathcal{A} , there is a surjective $*$ -representation $\pi : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow C_e^*(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\pi \circ \iota = \iota_{env}$. We refer to the kernel of the representation $q_{C_e^*(\mathcal{A})}$ as the *Silov ideal* of \mathcal{A} , denoted $\text{Sh}\mathcal{A}$. The Silov ideal is known to be the largest closed two-sided ideal of $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$ such that the quotient map $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})/\text{Sh}\mathcal{A}$ is completely isometric on $\mu(\mathcal{A})$ [5]. It is not obvious, but this C^* -cover will always exist. Existence of the C^* -envelope was originally shown by Hamana [24] through so-called injective envelopes. An alternative, dilation theoretic, proof was recently completed due to several significant contributions [5], [16], [19], [28].

2.3. Residual finite-dimensionality. An operator algebra \mathcal{A} is *residually finite-dimensional* (or RFD) if there are positive integers $r_\lambda, \lambda \in \Lambda$, and a completely isometric representation $\iota : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathbb{M}_{r_\lambda}$. That is, there is a completely norming family of representations for \mathcal{A} on finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces.

For C^* -algebras there are many ways in which this property has been characterized. We recall some of the most relevant characterizations for our discussion. Let \mathfrak{A} be a C^* -algebra and $\pi : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ be a $*$ -representation. Then, π is a *residually finite-dimensional* (or RFD) $*$ -representation if there is a net of (possibly degenerate) $*$ -representations $\pi_\lambda : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\pi_\lambda(\mathfrak{A})\mathcal{H}$ is finite-dimensional and

$$\text{SOT} \lim_{\lambda} \pi_\lambda(t) = \pi(t), \quad t \in \mathfrak{A}.$$

Due to [17, 3.5.2], this is the same as the topology of point-weak convergence. The following may be found in [2].

Theorem 2.2. *Let \mathfrak{A} be a C^* -algebra. Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) \mathfrak{A} is an RFD C^* -algebra;
- (ii) the collection of unitary equivalence classes of irreducible finite-dimensional $*$ -representations in $\widehat{\mathfrak{A}}$ is dense;
- (iii) every $*$ -representation of \mathfrak{A} is residually finite-dimensional.

We analyze residual finite-dimensionality of operator algebras in the language of statements (ii) and (iii). These statements are the impetus for Sections 4 and 5.

Residual finite-dimensionality for operator algebras was first studied in [11]. Therein, a complementary analysis discussing residual finite-dimensionality of C^* -covers was provided. Our motivation deals with the residual finite-dimensionality of the maximal C^* -cover. However, we remark that there is no known description of the RFD C^* -covers of an operator algebra. The following Example 1 is of great importance. Here, we illustrate that there may be several RFD C^* -covers of an operator algebra but there may still be intermediate C^* -covers which are not RFD.

Example 1. Let $A(\mathbb{D})$ denote the algebra of complex functions which are holomorphic on the open unit disk \mathbb{D} and continuous on the boundary \mathbb{T} . The algebra $A(\mathbb{D})$ is called the disc algebra. There are several well-studied C*-covers for the disc algebra. Indeed, there are obvious completely isometric representations $\iota : A(\mathbb{D}) \rightarrow C(\mathbb{T})$ and $j : A(\mathbb{D}) \rightarrow C(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ which produce RFD C*-covers of $A(\mathbb{D})$.

The matricial von-Neumann inequality [29, Corollary 3.12] implies that the maximal C*-cover of $A(\mathbb{D})$ is the universal C*-algebra generated by a contraction (alternatively, see [6, Example 2.3]). By [13, Proposition 2.2], it follows that the maximal C*-cover of $A(\mathbb{D})$ is RFD.

Despite the fact that $C_{max}^*(A(\mathbb{D}))$ is RFD, there are other C*-covers of $A(\mathbb{D})$ which fail to be RFD. To show this, we utilize standard facts on the Toeplitz algebra which may be found within [1], [4], [18]. Let H^2 denote the classical Hardy space on the disc. Each $f \in A(\mathbb{D})$ determines a multiplication operator $M_f : H^2 \rightarrow H^2$ such that $\|M_f\| = \|f\|$. Further, the map

$$\omega : A(\mathbb{D}) \rightarrow B(H^2), \quad f \mapsto M_f$$

is a completely isometric representation. The C*-algebra $\mathfrak{T} = C^*(\omega(A(\mathbb{D})))$ is the Toeplitz algebra and there is a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathfrak{K}(H^2) \rightarrow \mathfrak{T} \rightarrow C(\mathbb{T}) \rightarrow 0.$$

Note that residual finite-dimensionality passes to subalgebras and \mathfrak{T} contains the ideal of compact operators $\mathfrak{K}(H^2)$. The C*-algebra $\mathfrak{K}(H^2)$ is not RFD by Theorem 2.2 (ii). Hence, \mathfrak{T} is not RFD either.

A very recent investigation showed that the maximal C*-cover for the polydisc algebra $A(\mathbb{D}^n)$ is also RFD [9, Corollary 5.13]. Also, while we saw in Example 1 that residual finite-dimensionality does not pass to quotient algebras of $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$, residual finite-dimensionality clearly passes to ideals of $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$. Topologically, this statement may be interpreted as saying that residual finite-dimensionality passes to open subsets of the spectrum but does not necessarily pass to closed subsets.

3. TOPOLOGY AND ORDERING FOR C*-COVERS

Within this section, we equate order theoretic statements on the collection of C*-covers of an operator algebra with topological data from the spectrum of the maximal C*-cover.

Fix an operator algebra \mathcal{A} . One can define a partial ordering on the C*-covers of \mathcal{A} as in [25, Proposition 2.1.1]. If (\mathfrak{A}, ι) and (\mathfrak{B}, j) are C*-covers for \mathcal{A} , then we say $(\mathfrak{A}, \iota) \preceq (\mathfrak{B}, j)$ if and only if there is a surjective *-representation $\pi : \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ such that $\pi \circ j = \iota$. Whenever we have $(\mathfrak{A}, \iota) \preceq (\mathfrak{B}, j)$ and $(\mathfrak{B}, j) \preceq (\mathfrak{A}, \iota)$, we say that the C*-covers are *equivalent*, denoted $(\mathfrak{A}, \iota) \sim (\mathfrak{B}, j)$. Two C*-covers are equivalent if and only if there is a *-isomorphism $\pi : \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ such that $\pi \circ j = \iota$. Up to equivalence of C*-covers, the maximal C*-cover is the unique maximal element under this ordering whereas the C*-envelope is the unique minimal element [25, Examples 2.1.8 and 2.1.13]. The reader should consult the thesis of Hamidi [25, Chapters 1-2] for details. The fundamental approach we take in this section complements Hamidi's work. Here, we equate the partial ordering with a lattice structure determined by the spectrum of the maximal C*-cover. These interpretations will be applied to residual finite-dimensionality in Section 4.

We start by identifying properties of the spectrum of the maximal C^* -cover in relation to the C^* -covers of \mathcal{A} . First, the spectrum of any C^* -cover of \mathcal{A} may be identified as a closed subset of $\widehat{C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})}$: Let $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}, \iota) \subset \widehat{C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})}$ denote the collection of unitary equivalence classes consisting of irreducible $*$ -representations $\pi : C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_\pi)$ such that $\pi = \sigma \circ q_{\mathfrak{A}}$ where σ is an irreducible $*$ -representation of \mathfrak{A} . Theorem 2.1 reveals that $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}, \iota)$ is naturally homeomorphic to $\widehat{\mathfrak{A}}$. In fact, every closed subset which contains the spectrum of the C^* -envelope is of this form.

Theorem 3.1. *Let \mathcal{A} be an operator algebra and $\mathcal{C} \subset \widehat{C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})}$ be some subset. Then, $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}, \iota)$ for some C^* -cover (\mathfrak{A}, ι) of \mathcal{A} if and only if \mathcal{C} is closed and contains $\mathcal{S}(C_e^*(\mathcal{A}), \iota_{env})$.*

Proof. (\Rightarrow) By Theorem 2.1 (ii), the subset $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}, \iota)$ is closed. Since $q_{\mathfrak{A}} : C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ is completely isometric on $\mu(\mathcal{A})$, we have that $\ker q_{\mathfrak{A}} \subset \text{Sh}\mathcal{A}$. Then, Theorem 2.1 implies that $\mathcal{S}(C_e^*(\mathcal{A}), \iota_{env}) \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}, \iota)$.

(\Leftarrow) As \mathcal{C} is closed, by Theorem 2.1, \mathcal{C} is the collection of all unitary equivalence classes consisting of irreducible $*$ -representations of $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$ which vanish on some ideal \mathfrak{J} . Similarly, the subset $\mathcal{S}(C_e^*(\mathcal{A}), \iota_{env})$ consists of all equivalence classes of irreducible $*$ -representations of $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$ which vanish on the Silov ideal $\text{Sh}\mathcal{A}$. As $\mathcal{S}(C_e^*(\mathcal{A}), \iota_{env}) \subset \mathcal{C}$, we have that $\mathfrak{J} \subset \text{Sh}\mathcal{A}$ by Theorem 2.1. Let $\mathfrak{A} = C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})/\mathfrak{J}$ and $q : C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ be the corresponding quotient map. Define a representation of \mathcal{A} by $\iota = q \circ \mu$. The map ι is completely isometric by [25, Proposition 1.3.2]. Furthermore,

$$C^*(\iota(\mathcal{A})) = C^*(q \circ \mu(\mathcal{A})) = q(C^*(\mu(\mathcal{A}))) = \mathfrak{A}.$$

So (\mathfrak{A}, ι) is a C^* -cover of \mathcal{A} and $q_{\mathfrak{A}} = q$ by uniqueness of the representation $q_{\mathfrak{A}}$. Therefore \mathcal{C} is the collection of all unitary equivalence classes consisting of irreducible $*$ -representations which vanish on $\mathfrak{J} = \ker q_{\mathfrak{A}}$ and $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}, \iota)$. \square

It will be a consequence of the subsequent Proposition 3.2 that the C^* -cover obtained in Theorem 3.1 is unique up to equivalence. Also, despite the conclusion of Theorem 3.1, the relative topology of $\mathcal{S}(C_e^*(\mathcal{A}), \iota_{env})$ does not impose an obvious restriction regarding residual finite-dimensionality of C^* -covers. In fact, there are operator algebras whose C^* -envelope does not possess any finite-dimensional $*$ -representations while there exist other C^* -covers which are RFD.

Example 2. Take a pair of isometries $V, W \in B(\mathcal{H})$ satisfying $VV^* + WW^* = I$ and let \mathcal{M} be the unital subspace of $B(\mathcal{H})$ generated by V and W . Form the unital operator algebra \mathcal{A} consisting of elements of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} \lambda I & T \\ 0 & \mu I \end{bmatrix} \in B(\mathcal{H}^{(2)})$$

where $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{C}$ and $T \in \mathcal{M}$. We have that $C_e^*(\mathcal{A}) \cong \mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{O}_2)$ where \mathcal{O}_2 denotes the Cuntz algebra [12, Example 5]. So $C_e^*(\mathcal{A})$ is a simple, infinite-dimensional C^* -algebra. Consequently, the subset $\mathcal{S}(C_e^*(\mathcal{A}), \iota_{env})$ does not possess any equivalence classes of finite-dimensional irreducible $*$ -representations. On the other hand, $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$ is RFD by [11, Theorem 5.1].

As there can easily be many inequivalent C^* -covers of a fixed operator algebra, Theorem 3.1 indicates that the topology of $\widehat{C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})}$ is non-trivial. This is the case for even the simplest choice of non self-adjoint algebra.

Example 3. Let \mathcal{T}_2 denote the algebra of upper-triangular 2×2 matrices. We show that the spectrum of $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{T}_2)$ is not even Hausdorff. Let

$$\mathfrak{M} = \{f \in C([0, 1], \mathbb{M}_2) : f(0) \text{ is a diagonal matrix}\}$$

and let $\mu : \mathcal{T}_2 \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ be defined by

$$\begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & c \end{bmatrix} \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} aI & b\sqrt{\cdot} \\ 0 & cI \end{bmatrix}.$$

In [6, Example 2.4], it was shown that μ is completely isometric and that (\mathfrak{M}, μ) is equivalent to the maximal C*-cover of \mathcal{T}_2 .

Let $\iota : \mathcal{T}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_2$ be the identity representation. As \mathbb{M}_2 is simple, (\mathbb{M}_2, ι) is the C*-envelope for \mathcal{T}_2 . Let $\gamma_\xi : \mathfrak{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_2$ denote evaluation at $\xi \in (0, 1]$. Observe that Theorem 3.1 implies that any closed subset of $\widehat{\mathfrak{M}}$ containing $[\gamma_1]$ determines the spectrum of a C*-cover for \mathcal{T}_2 . Indeed $\gamma_1 \circ \mu = \iota$ and then it is easy to see that $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{M}_2, \iota) = \{[\gamma_1]\}$ as there is a unique irreducible *-representation of \mathbb{M}_2 .

Note that $C([0, 1], \mathbb{M}_2) \cong C([0, 1]) \otimes \mathbb{M}_2$ is a liminal (or CCR) C*-algebra [32, Theorem 2 (c)]. As a result, \mathfrak{M} is also a liminal C*-algebra [17, Proposition 4.2.4]. As \mathfrak{M} is unital, it follows that all irreducible *-representations of \mathfrak{M} are finite-dimensional. Whence, $\widehat{\mathfrak{M}}$ is homeomorphic to $\text{Prim}(\mathfrak{M})$ via the natural mapping [17, Proposition 3.1.6].

For $f \in \mathfrak{M}$ and $j = 1, 2$, define $\eta_j(f)$ to be the (j, j) -th entry of $f(0)$. Then $\eta_j : \mathfrak{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a character. Take a sequence of points $(\xi_n)_{n \geq 1} \subset (0, 1]$ converging to 0. Let $\mathfrak{J}_n = \ker \gamma_{\xi_n}$ and for $j = 1, 2$, let $\mathfrak{L}_j = \ker \eta_j$. Then, we see that $\bigcap_{n=1}^\infty \mathfrak{J}_n \subset \mathfrak{L}_1, \mathfrak{L}_2$. Therefore, \mathfrak{L}_1 and \mathfrak{L}_2 are distinct accumulation points for the sequence $(\mathfrak{J}_n)_{n \geq 1}$. In particular, $\widehat{\mathfrak{M}}$ is not Hausdorff.

The reader should compare the conclusion of Example 3 with the following classical result of Kaplansky [26, Theorem 4.2]. Therein, it was shown that if all irreducible *-representations of a C*-algebra are finite-dimensional and of the same dimension, then the spectrum is Hausdorff.

Now we showcase how the partial ordering on the C*-covers of an operator algebra can be completely understood by topological statements.

Proposition 3.2. *Let \mathcal{A} be an operator algebra and $(\mathfrak{A}, \iota), (\mathfrak{B}, j)$ be C*-covers of \mathcal{A} . Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}, \iota)$ is a subset of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{B}, j)$;
- (ii) $q_{\mathfrak{A}}$ is weakly contained in $q_{\mathfrak{B}}$;
- (iii) $(\mathfrak{A}, \iota) \preceq (\mathfrak{B}, j)$.

In particular, $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}, \iota) = \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{B}, j)$ if and only if $(\mathfrak{A}, \iota) \sim (\mathfrak{B}, j)$.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii): As $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{B}, j)^C \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}, \iota)^C$, we have $\ker q_{\mathfrak{B}} \subset \ker q_{\mathfrak{A}}$ by Theorem 2.1.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii): Since $q_{\mathfrak{A}}$ is weakly contained in $q_{\mathfrak{B}}$, there is a surjective *-representation $q : \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ such that $q \circ q_{\mathfrak{B}} = q_{\mathfrak{A}}$. We see that

$$q \circ j = q \circ q_{\mathfrak{B}} \circ \mu = q_{\mathfrak{A}} \circ \mu = \iota.$$

Therefore $(\mathfrak{A}, \iota) \preceq (\mathfrak{B}, j)$.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i): Let $q : \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ be a surjective *-representation such that $q \circ j = \iota$. As $q \circ q_{\mathfrak{B}} \circ \mu = \iota$, we have that $q \circ q_{\mathfrak{B}} = q_{\mathfrak{A}}$. Take $[\pi] \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}, \iota)$ and let π be a representative for $[\pi]$. Express $\pi = \sigma \circ q_{\mathfrak{A}}$ where σ is an irreducible *-representation of \mathfrak{A} . Then $\pi = (\sigma \circ q) \circ q_{\mathfrak{B}}$ where $\sigma \circ q$ is an irreducible *-representation of \mathfrak{B} . So $[\pi] \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{B}, j)$. \square

Next, we provide a refinement of Proposition 3.2. First we recall the complete lattice structure of C^* -covers in [25, Section 2.1]. Fix an operator algebra \mathcal{A} . Let $\text{Cov}(\mathcal{A})$ denote the collection of all equivalence classes of C^* -covers of \mathcal{A} . Define a partial ordering \preceq_q on $\text{Cov}(\mathcal{A})$ by $[(\mathfrak{A}, \iota)] \preceq_q [(\mathfrak{B}, j)]$ if and only if $(\mathfrak{A}, \iota) \preceq (\mathfrak{B}, j)$. For brevity, we will refer solely to the ordering \preceq . A complete lattice structure on $\text{Cov}(\mathcal{A})$ is defined as follows. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{[(\mathfrak{A}_\lambda, \iota_\lambda)]\} \subset \text{Cov}(\mathcal{A})$ be some collection. Then, $\sup \mathcal{C}$ is the equivalence class $[(C^*(\iota(\mathcal{A})), \iota)]$ where $\iota = \bigoplus_\lambda \iota_\lambda$. For each λ , let $\mathfrak{J}_\lambda = \ker q_{\mathfrak{A}_\lambda}$ and let $\mathfrak{J} = \overline{\sum_\lambda \mathfrak{J}_\lambda}$ be the norm closure of the ideal generated by $\bigcup_\lambda \mathfrak{J}_\lambda$. Then, $\inf \mathcal{C}$ is the equivalence class $[(C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})/\mathfrak{J}, q \circ \mu)]$ where $q : C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})/\mathfrak{J}$ is the quotient map.

We show that $\text{Cov}(\mathcal{A})$ is isomorphic to a complete lattice arising naturally from $\widehat{C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})}$. To this end, let $\mathfrak{Q}(\mathcal{A})$ denote the collection of all closed subsets of $\widehat{C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})}$ which contain $\mathcal{S}(C_e^*(\mathcal{A}), \iota_{env})$, ordered by inclusion. Then $\mathfrak{Q}(\mathcal{A})$ is a complete lattice where $\inf \mathcal{D} = \bigcap_\lambda F_\lambda$ and $\sup \mathcal{D} = \overline{\bigcup_\lambda F_\lambda}$.

Theorem 3.3. *Let \mathcal{A} be an operator algebra. Then the mapping*

$$\Omega : \text{Cov}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{Q}(\mathcal{A}), \quad [(\mathfrak{A}, \iota)] \mapsto \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}, \iota),$$

is an isomorphism of complete lattices.

The subsequent arguments may be found within [25, Section 2.1] but we connect the details to draw different conclusions. Hence, we include the proof for completeness.

Proof. The map Ω is a well-defined bijection by Theorem 3.1 and Proposition 3.2. We will show that Ω respects (i) infima and (ii) suprema. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{[(\mathfrak{A}_\lambda, \iota_\lambda)]\} \subset \text{Cov}(\mathcal{A})$ be some collection. For each λ , let $\mathfrak{J}_\lambda = \ker q_{\mathfrak{A}_\lambda}$. Let π be an irreducible $*$ -representation of $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$.

(i) Let $\mathfrak{J} = \overline{\sum_\lambda \mathfrak{J}_\lambda}$ and let $q : C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})/\mathfrak{J}$ be the quotient map. Observe that $\mathcal{S}(C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})/\mathfrak{J}, q \circ \mu)$ consists of the equivalence classes of irreducible $*$ -representations of $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$ which vanish on \mathfrak{J} . As π vanishes on \mathfrak{J} if and only if π vanishes on each \mathfrak{J}_λ , we establish that

$$\mathcal{S}(C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})/\mathfrak{J}, q \circ \mu) = \bigcap_\lambda \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}_\lambda, \iota_\lambda).$$

(ii) Let $\iota = \bigoplus_\lambda \iota_\lambda$ and $\mathfrak{A} = C^*(\iota(\mathcal{A}))$. We show that

$$(1) \quad \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}, \iota) = \overline{\bigcup_\lambda \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}_\lambda, \iota_\lambda)}.$$

Suppose that $\pi = \sigma \circ q_{\mathfrak{A}_\lambda}$ for some λ and some irreducible $*$ -representation σ of \mathfrak{A}_λ . Let $\gamma_\lambda : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}_\lambda$ denote the obvious surjective $*$ -representation. Then $\sigma \circ \gamma_\lambda$ is an irreducible $*$ -representation of \mathfrak{A} . We have that

$$\sigma \circ \gamma_\lambda \circ q_{\mathfrak{A}} \circ \mu = \sigma \circ \gamma_\lambda \circ \iota = \sigma \circ \iota_\lambda = \sigma \circ q_{\mathfrak{A}_\lambda} \circ \mu = \pi \circ \mu.$$

So $\pi = \sigma \circ \gamma_\lambda \circ q_{\mathfrak{A}}$. Hence, $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}_\lambda, \iota_\lambda) \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}, \iota)$. By Theorem 3.1, $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}, \iota)$ is closed and so we have that $\overline{\bigcup_\lambda \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}_\lambda, \iota_\lambda)} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}, \iota)$.

Conversely, by Theorem 3.1, there is a C^* -cover (\mathfrak{B}, j) of \mathcal{A} such that $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{B}, j) = \overline{\bigcup_\lambda \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}_\lambda, \iota_\lambda)}$. For each λ , there is a surjective $*$ -representation $\beta_\lambda : \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}_\lambda$ such

that $\beta_\lambda \circ j = \iota_\lambda$ by Proposition 3.2. Let $\beta = \bigoplus_\lambda \beta_\lambda$. Then β is a $*$ -representation satisfying $\beta \circ j = \iota$. So

$$\beta(\mathfrak{B}) = \beta(C^*(j(\mathcal{A}))) = C^*(\beta \circ j(\mathcal{A})) = \mathfrak{A}$$

and we have that $(\mathfrak{A}, \iota) \preceq (\mathfrak{B}, j)$. By Proposition 3.2, we have that $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}, \iota) \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{B}, j)$. So equation (1) holds. \square

Theorem 3.3 confirms that the language arising from the spectral topology of the maximal C*-cover is equivalent to the ordering for C*-covers. This reflects the fact that, in place of studying completely isometric representations of an operator algebra, one may study a single completely isometric representation, namely the canonical embedding $\mu : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$, along with the representation theory of $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$. Due to the classical construction of the maximal C*-cover, it is feasible to interpret the canonical embedding μ as encoding all the representation theory for the algebra \mathcal{A} .

Since the representations of \mathcal{A} are in one-to-one correspondence with the $*$ -representations of $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$, it is feasible to identify the spectrum of an operator algebra as the spectrum of the maximal C*-cover. However, it is not clear to what degree one can identify the topology at the level of the operator algebra. We provide a partial answer to this question.

Let \mathcal{A} be an operator algebra. If π and ρ are representations of \mathcal{A} , then π and ρ are *approximately unitarily equivalent* if

$$\pi(a) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} U_n^* \rho(a) U_n, \quad a \in \mathcal{A},$$

where $U_n : \mathcal{H}_\pi \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\rho$ is a unitary operator for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proposition 3.4. *Let \mathcal{A} be an operator algebra. Let π and ρ be representations of \mathcal{A} and let θ_π, θ_ρ be $*$ -representations of $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$ satisfying $\theta_\pi \circ \mu = \pi$ and $\theta_\rho \circ \mu = \rho$. Then, π and ρ are approximately unitarily equivalent if and only if θ_π and θ_ρ are approximately unitarily equivalent.*

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Suppose that

$$\pi(a) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} U_n^* \rho(a) U_n, \quad a \in \mathcal{A},$$

where $U_n : \mathcal{H}_\pi \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\rho$ is unitary for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. So

$$\theta_\pi(\mu(a)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} U_n^* \theta_\rho(\mu(a)) U_n, \quad a \in \mathcal{A}.$$

As addition, multiplication and the adjoint are continuous in the norm topology, we infer that

$$\theta_\pi(w) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} U_n^* \theta_\rho(w) U_n$$

for each $w \in C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$ which lies in the linear span of words in $\mu(\mathcal{A}) \cup \mu(\mathcal{A})^*$. This set is dense in $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$ and so θ_π is approximately unitarily equivalent to θ_ρ .

(\Leftarrow) Suppose that

$$\theta_\pi(t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} U_n^* \theta_\rho(t) U_n, \quad t \in C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}),$$

where $U_n : \mathcal{H}_\pi \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\rho$ is unitary for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, for each $a \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$\pi(a) = \theta_\pi(\mu(a)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} U_n^* \theta_\rho(\mu(a)) U_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} U_n^* \rho(a) U_n.$$

So π and ρ are approximately unitarily equivalent. \square

By [17, Corollary 4.1.10] and [15, Corollary 2.5.6], it is easily seen that irreducible $*$ -representations of a separable C^* -algebra are weakly equivalent if and only if they are approximately unitarily equivalent. Consequently, the spectrum of a separable operator algebra can be identified pointwise as the spectrum of the maximal C^* -cover. In spite of this, it is not obvious whether one can make a similar statement involving weak containment (which determines the topology on $\widehat{C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})}$). Indeed, if one were to define weak containment of representations of \mathcal{A} (in any of the equivalent forms presented in Subsection 2.1), then it is not true that this is equivalent to weak containment of the respective lifts to $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$. This can be seen by taking two completely isometric representations of an operator algebra which induce inequivalent C^* -covers.

4. THE RFD-MAXIMAL C^* -COVER

Fix an RFD operator algebra \mathcal{A} . Our goal in this section is to analyse the largest RFD C^* -cover of \mathcal{A} in the partial ordering among all C^* -covers of \mathcal{A} which generate an RFD C^* -algebra. We refer to this C^* -cover as the *RFD-maximal C^* -cover* of \mathcal{A} . It is unclear what likeness the RFD-maximal C^* -cover might have to the maximal C^* -cover. If Question 1 were to have an affirmative answer, then the RFD-maximal C^* -cover inherits all possible characteristics of the maximal C^* -cover. This will be the motivation behind the material found within Subsection 4.3.

We outline our procedure. First we show that the RFD-maximal C^* -cover of an RFD operator algebra always exists (Theorem 4.2). Following this, in Theorem 4.4, we identify the spectrum of the RFD-maximal C^* -cover through spectral data of the maximal C^* -cover. In Theorem 4.6, we provide a concrete representation of the RFD-maximal C^* -cover which is akin to the classical construction of the maximal C^* -cover. This naturally endows the RFD-maximal C^* -cover with a certain universal property among RFD C^* -covers. Ending this section, we provide two instances in which the RFD-maximal C^* -cover shares commonality with the maximal C^* -cover (Theorems 4.10 and 4.11).

4.1. Abstract Characterization. To determine the RFD-maximal C^* -cover, we require a pivotal observation on how residual finite-dimensionality is affected in $\text{Cov}(\mathcal{A})$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let \mathcal{A} be an operator algebra and $\mathcal{R} = \{[(\mathfrak{A}_\lambda, \iota_\lambda)]\} \subset \text{Cov}(\mathcal{A})$ be some collection such that \mathfrak{A}_λ is an RFD C^* -algebra for each λ . If (\mathfrak{A}, ι) is any representative for $\sup \mathcal{R}$, then \mathfrak{A} is an RFD C^* -algebra.*

Proof. First note that if (\mathfrak{B}, j) is an RFD C^* -cover of \mathcal{A} , then any representative of $[(\mathfrak{B}, j)]$ is also RFD. Now, letting $\iota = \bigoplus_\lambda \iota_\lambda$, we have that $\sup \mathcal{R} = [(C^*(\iota(\mathcal{A})), \iota)]$ and

$$C^*(\iota(\mathcal{A})) \subset \prod_\lambda \mathfrak{A}_\lambda.$$

As each \mathfrak{A}_λ is an RFD C^* -algebra, $C^*(\iota(\mathcal{A}))$ is RFD as well. Therefore any representative of $\sup \mathcal{R}$ is RFD. \square

Due to Lemma 4.1, we may deduce the existence of the RFD-maximal C^* -cover:

Theorem 4.2. *Let \mathcal{A} be an RFD operator algebra and*

$$\mathcal{R} = \{[(\mathfrak{A}, \iota)] \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{A}) : \mathfrak{A} \text{ is RFD}\}.$$

Then, there is a unique element $[(\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), v)] \in \mathcal{R}$ which is maximal for \mathcal{R} .

Proof. As \mathcal{A} is RFD, there is an RFD C*-cover and so \mathcal{R} is non-empty. Suppose that \mathcal{C} is a chain in \mathcal{R} . By Lemma 4.1, we have that $\sup \mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{R}$. By Zorn's Lemma, \mathcal{R} contains maximal elements. If $[(\mathfrak{S}, \tau)] \in \mathcal{R}$ is also maximal for \mathcal{R} , then $(\mathfrak{R}, v) \preceq (\mathfrak{S}, \tau)$ and $(\mathfrak{S}, \tau) \preceq (\mathfrak{R}, v)$. So $[(\mathfrak{R}, v)] = [(\mathfrak{S}, \tau)]$. \square

Given an RFD operator algebra \mathcal{A} , we will let $(\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), v)$ denote the *RFD-maximal C*-cover* of \mathcal{A} as found in Theorem 4.2. The RFD-maximal C*-cover is unique up to equivalence of C*-covers and, as with the maximal and minimal C*-covers, we will frequently fix a representative of $[(\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), v)]$. Later, we will derive some explicit representations of this C*-cover. First, we highlight the connection this C*-cover has to Question 1:

Corollary 4.3. *Let \mathcal{A} be an operator algebra. Then, $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$ is an RFD C*-algebra if and only if $(\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), v) \sim (C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}), \mu)$.*

Proof. (\Rightarrow) When $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$ is RFD, \mathcal{A} is RFD itself. By Theorem 4.2, we have that the RFD-maximal C*-cover for \mathcal{A} exists. Also, we have that $(C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}), \mu) \preceq (\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), v)$ as $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$ is RFD. However, as the maximal C*-cover is maximal in the ordering, we have $(\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), v) \preceq (C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}), \mu)$.

(\Leftarrow) If $(\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), v) \sim (C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}), \mu)$, then there is a *-isomorphism $\pi : \mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$. As $\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A})$ is an RFD C*-algebra, so is $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$. \square

Next, we provide defining properties for the RFD-maximal C*-cover of an operator algebra. This is achieved by analyzing the spectrum of the maximal C*-cover. Here, we identify a dense subset of the spectrum of the RFD-maximal C*-cover. This is very natural when utilizing Proposition 3.2: the RFD-maximal C*-cover is the largest RFD C*-cover of \mathcal{A} , both under the ordering of C*-covers and under inclusion of the closed subsets $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}, \iota)$ where (\mathfrak{A}, ι) is an RFD C*-cover of \mathcal{A} .

Theorem 4.4. *Let \mathcal{A} be an RFD operator algebra. Let $q : C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A})$ denote the unique surjective *-representation satisfying $q \circ \mu = v$ and let $\mathfrak{J} = \ker q$. Then, the following statements hold:*

- (i) $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), v)$ is the closure of all equivalence classes which consist of finite-dimensional irreducible *-representations of $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$;
- (ii) \mathfrak{J} does not possess any finite-dimensional *-representations;
- (iii) $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), v)$ is the unique maximal closed subset of $\widehat{C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})}$ possessing a dense subset of equivalence classes of finite-dimensional irreducible *-representations.

Proof. (i): In Theorem 2.1 (iii), the homeomorphism produces a bijection between equivalence classes of finite-dimensional *-representations. Hence, by Theorem 2.2, if (\mathfrak{A}, ι) is a C*-cover of \mathcal{A} , then \mathfrak{A} is RFD if and only if there is a dense subset of equivalence classes in $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}, \iota)$ consisting of finite-dimensional *-representations.

Let $\mathfrak{F} \subset \widehat{C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})}$ be the closure of all equivalence classes of finite-dimensional irreducible *-representations. As \mathcal{A} is RFD, we have that \mathfrak{F} contains $\mathcal{S}(C_e^*(\mathcal{A}), \iota_{env})$. Indeed, if (\mathfrak{A}, ι) be an RFD C*-cover, then $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}, \iota)$ contains $\mathcal{S}(C_e^*(\mathcal{A}), \iota_{env})$ and possesses a dense subset of equivalence classes consisting of finite-dimensional *-representations. By Theorem 3.1, there is a C*-cover (\mathfrak{A}, ι) such that $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}, \iota) = \mathfrak{F}$. Note that \mathfrak{F} is the largest closed subset of $\widehat{C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})}$ containing a dense subset of equivalence classes of finite-dimensional irreducible *-representations. By Theorem

3.3. (\mathfrak{A}, ι) is the largest RFD C^* -cover up to equivalence. By Theorem 4.2, we have that $(\mathfrak{A}, \iota) \sim (\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), \nu)$. Whence, $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), \nu) = \mathfrak{F}$ by Proposition 3.2.

(ii): Let π be a finite-dimensional irreducible $*$ -representation of \mathfrak{J} . As \mathfrak{J} is an ideal of $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$, we may extend π to a finite-dimensional irreducible $*$ -representation of $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$, still denoted π . As $\pi|_{\mathfrak{J}}$ is non-zero, we see that $[\pi] \notin \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), \nu)$, a contradiction by (i).

(iii): This is obvious by (i). \square

Using the language of Section 3, we may view Theorem 4.4 (iii) as the topological counterpart to the order-theoretic statement of Theorem 4.2.

Theorem 4.4 (ii) is rather interesting with regards to Question 1. A counterexample to Question 1 would be determined by the presence of a particular ideal whose irreducible $*$ -representations are all infinite-dimensional. Thus, the ideal \mathfrak{J} should be easy to detect. In this sense, it is surprising that the answer to Question 1 is still unknown.

We highlight the following consequence which allows for a clear identification of the RFD-maximal C^* -cover:

Corollary 4.5. *Let \mathcal{A} be an RFD operator algebra and (\mathfrak{A}, ι) be a C^* -cover for \mathcal{A} . Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $(\mathfrak{A}, \iota) \sim (\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), \nu)$;
- (ii) \mathfrak{A} is an RFD C^* -algebra and, if $[\sigma] \in \widehat{C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})}$ is an equivalence class consisting of finite-dimensional $*$ -representations, then $[\sigma] \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}, \iota)$.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii): This follows by Theorem 4.4 (i).

(ii) \Rightarrow (i): Since \mathfrak{A} is an RFD C^* -algebra, we have that $(\mathfrak{A}, \iota) \preceq (\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), \nu)$. By Proposition 3.2, we have that $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}, \iota) \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), \nu)$. By Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 4.4 (i), we see that $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), \nu) \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}, \iota)$. Hence, $(\mathfrak{A}, \iota) \sim (\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), \nu)$ by Proposition 3.2. \square

4.2. Concrete Characterization. We exhibit an explicit identification of the RFD-maximal C^* -cover. The maximal C^* -cover can be constructed in a concrete way and this is a common method of proving existence. We show that the RFD-maximal C^* -cover can be constructed through analogous methods. The proof is an adaptation of [7, Proposition 2.4.2].

Theorem 4.6. *Let \mathcal{A} be an RFD operator algebra. Then, there is an RFD C^* -cover (\mathfrak{Q}, ι) of \mathcal{A} satisfying the following: for any representation $\rho : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_\rho)$ on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, there is a unique $*$ -representation $\theta : \mathfrak{Q} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_\rho)$ such that $\theta \circ \iota = \rho$. In particular, (\mathfrak{Q}, ι) is minimal among all C^* -covers of \mathcal{A} which satisfy this property. Moreover, $(\mathfrak{Q}, \iota) \sim (\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), \nu)$.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{F} be the set of representations $\rho : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_r, r \in \mathbb{N}$. As \mathcal{A} is RFD, the map $\iota = \bigoplus_{\rho \in \mathcal{F}} \rho$ defines a completely isometric representation of \mathcal{A} on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{\rho \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{C}^{r_\rho}$. Letting $\mathfrak{Q} = C^*(\iota(\mathcal{A}))$, we see that \mathfrak{Q} is an RFD C^* -algebra and that (\mathfrak{Q}, ι) is a C^* -cover of \mathcal{A} .

Let $\rho : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_\rho)$ denote a representation of \mathcal{A} on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space. Then there is some $r_\chi \in \mathbb{N}$ and a unitary operator $U : \mathbb{C}^{r_\chi} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\rho$ such that $\chi = U^* \rho(\cdot) U \in \mathcal{F}$. Let P_χ denote the orthogonal projection of \mathcal{H} onto \mathbb{C}^{r_χ} . By construction of \mathfrak{Q} , we obtain a $*$ -representation $\pi : \mathfrak{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_{r_\chi}$ defined by

$$\pi(T) = P_\chi T|_{\mathbb{C}^{r_\chi}} .$$

Then, this dictates that

$$\pi \circ \iota(a) = \chi(a) = U^* \rho(a) U, \quad a \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Take $\theta = U\pi(\cdot)U^* : \mathfrak{Q} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_\rho)$. Then θ is a finite-dimensional *-representation such that $\theta \circ \iota = \rho$.

For uniqueness of the map θ , suppose that θ and τ are *-representations of \mathfrak{Q} such that $\theta \circ \iota = \rho = \tau \circ \iota$. As τ and θ are *-representations which agree on $\iota(\mathcal{A})$, we infer that τ and θ agree on the linear span of words in $\iota(\mathcal{A}) \cup \iota(\mathcal{A})^*$. This latter set is dense within \mathfrak{Q} and so $\theta = \tau$.

For minimality, suppose that (\mathfrak{A}, j) is a C*-cover of \mathcal{A} such that every representation of \mathcal{A} on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space lifts to \mathfrak{A} . For each $\rho \in \mathcal{F}$, we obtain a *-representation $\theta_\rho : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_\rho)$ such that $\theta_\rho \circ j = \rho$. In particular, we have that

$$\iota = \bigoplus_{\rho \in \mathcal{F}} \rho = \bigoplus_{\rho \in \mathcal{F}} \theta_\rho \circ j.$$

Then, $\Theta = \bigoplus_{\rho \in \mathcal{F}} \theta_\rho$ is a *-representation of \mathfrak{A} such that $\Theta \circ j = \iota$. We see that

$$\Theta(\mathfrak{A}) = \Theta(C^*(j(\mathcal{A}))) = C^*(\Theta \circ j(\mathcal{A})) = C^*(\iota(\mathcal{A})) = \mathfrak{Q}$$

and so $(\mathfrak{Q}, \iota) \preceq (\mathfrak{A}, j)$ as desired.

Finally, we show that $(\mathfrak{Q}, \iota) \sim (\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), \nu)$. Since \mathfrak{Q} is an RFD C*-algebra, we show that the conditions in Corollary 4.5 hold. To this end, let $\pi : C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_\pi)$ be a finite-dimensional irreducible *-representation. Then $\pi \circ \mu$ is a representation of \mathcal{A} on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space. Hence, there exists a *-representation $\theta : \mathfrak{Q} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_\pi)$ such that $\theta \circ \iota = \pi \circ \mu$. Then, $\theta \circ q_\mathfrak{Q}$ is a *-representation of $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$ satisfying

$$\theta \circ q_\mathfrak{Q} \circ \mu = \theta \circ \iota = \pi \circ \mu.$$

So $\theta \circ q_\mathfrak{Q} = \pi$ and we have that $[\pi] \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{Q}, \iota)$ as desired. \square

Theorem 4.6 identifies a categorical property of the RFD-maximal C*-cover. This property may be identified as a universal property of the RFD-maximal C*-cover among the RFD C*-covers of \mathcal{A} . However, it will only be a universal property of all C*-covers of \mathcal{A} if $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$ is RFD.

Remark 4.7. If \mathcal{A} is a unital RFD operator algebra, then a slight modification to the proof of Theorem 4.6 shows that the embedding ι can taken to be unital. In turn, the universal property of Theorem 4.6 is equivalent to the following: for any unital completely contractive representation $\rho : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_\rho)$ on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, there is a unique (unital) *-representation $\theta : \mathfrak{Q} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_\rho)$ such that $\theta \circ \iota = \rho$.

4.3. Preservation of Algebraic Properties. We conclude this section by supplying a few instances in which the RFD-maximal C*-cover is akin to the traditional maximal C*-cover.

The maximal C*-cover of an operator algebra is known to preserve certain algebraic constructions. See [6, Proposition 2.2], [7, 2.4.3], [11, Theorem 5.2], [20, Theorem 4.1] for example. We provide supporting evidence for Question 1 to have an affirmative answer by showing that the RFD-maximal C*-cover preserves a few of the same algebraic constructions (Theorems 4.10 and 4.11). Indeed, for Question 1 to be true, the subsequent Theorems 4.10 and 4.11 have to hold. Withstanding

this, the results herein provide useful facts to compute the RFD-maximal C^* -cover. First we address a minor albeit worthwhile point.

Proposition 4.8. *Let \mathcal{A} be a non-unital RFD operator algebra and let $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ denote the unitization of \mathcal{A} . Let $(\mathfrak{R}(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}), v_1)$ be the RFD-maximal C^* -cover of $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$. If $\iota = v_1|_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\mathfrak{A} = C^*(\iota(\mathcal{A}))$, then we have that $(\mathfrak{A}, \iota) \sim (\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), v)$.*

Proof. First note that \mathfrak{A} is an RFD C^* -algebra. Let $\rho : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ be a representation of \mathcal{A} on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space. Let $\rho^+ : \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ be the unital representation which extends ρ . By Theorem 4.6, there is a $*$ -representation $\theta : \mathfrak{R}(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\theta \circ v_1 = \rho^+$. Then $\sigma := \theta|_{\mathfrak{A}}$ is a $*$ -representation of \mathfrak{A} such that $\sigma \circ \iota = \rho$. So $(\mathfrak{A}, \iota) \sim (\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), v)$ by Theorem 4.6. \square

We proceed with a technical fact which will aid in our derivations for the remainder of this subsection. The following roughly states that if all finite-dimensional irreducible $*$ -representations of an *isomorphic* copy of the maximal C^* -cover factor through a fixed RFD C^* -cover, then this RFD C^* -cover is isomorphic to the RFD-maximal C^* -cover.

Lemma 4.9. *Let \mathcal{A} be an RFD operator algebra. Suppose (\mathfrak{R}, \hat{v}) and $(\mathfrak{M}, \hat{\mu})$ are C^* -covers of \mathcal{A} where $(\mathfrak{R}, \hat{v}) \preceq (\mathfrak{M}, \hat{\mu})$ and $\mathfrak{M} \cong C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$. Let $q : \mathfrak{M} \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$ be the surjective $*$ -representation satisfying $q \circ \hat{\mu} = \hat{v}$. If every finite-dimensional $*$ -representation π of \mathfrak{M} is of the form $\pi = \sigma \circ q$ for some $*$ -representation σ of \mathfrak{R} , then $\mathfrak{R} \cong \mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A})$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}_{max} \subset \widehat{C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{M}} \subset \widehat{\mathfrak{M}}$ denote the unitary equivalence classes of finite-dimensional $*$ -representations in the respective spectra. Let $\chi : C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ be a $*$ -isomorphism. Then the mapping

$$\widehat{\mathfrak{M}} \rightarrow \widehat{C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})}, \quad [\beta] \mapsto [\beta \circ \chi],$$

is a homeomorphism which maps $\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{M}}$ bijectively onto \mathcal{F}_{max} . Let $\mathcal{F}'_{\mathfrak{M}}$ be a set of $*$ -representations of \mathfrak{M} such that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{M}} = \{[\beta] : \beta \in \mathcal{F}'_{\mathfrak{M}}\}$. Then $\mathcal{F}'_{max} = \{\beta \circ \chi : \beta \in \mathcal{F}'_{\mathfrak{M}}\}$ is a complete system of representatives for \mathcal{F}_{max} .

For each $\beta \in \mathcal{F}'_{\mathfrak{M}}$, there is a $*$ -representation $\beta_{\mathfrak{R}}$ of \mathfrak{R} satisfying $\beta = \beta_{\mathfrak{R}} \circ q$. Conversely, if σ is a finite-dimensional irreducible $*$ -representation of \mathfrak{R} , then $\sigma \circ q$ is unitarily equivalent to an element of $\mathcal{F}'_{\mathfrak{M}}$. Whence, σ is unitarily equivalent to $\beta_{\mathfrak{R}}$ for some $\beta \in \mathcal{F}'_{\mathfrak{M}}$. So $\{[\beta_{\mathfrak{R}}] \in \widehat{\mathfrak{R}} : \beta \in \mathcal{F}'_{\mathfrak{M}}\}$ is the collection of all unitary equivalence classes of finite-dimensional irreducible $*$ -representations of \mathfrak{R} . As \mathfrak{R} is an RFD C^* -algebra,

$$\mathfrak{R} \cong \left(\bigoplus_{\beta \in \mathcal{F}'_{\mathfrak{M}}} \beta_{\mathfrak{R}} \right) (\mathfrak{R}) = \left(\bigoplus_{\beta \in \mathcal{F}'_{\mathfrak{M}}} \beta \right) (\mathfrak{M}).$$

For each $\beta \in \mathcal{F}'_{\mathfrak{M}}$, we have that $[\beta \circ \chi] \in \mathcal{F}_{max}$. Conversely, if σ is a finite-dimensional irreducible $*$ -representation of $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$, then σ is unitarily equivalent to $\beta \circ \chi$ for some $\beta \in \mathcal{F}'_{\mathfrak{M}}$. By Theorem 2.2 (ii), the collection of unitary equivalence classes of irreducible finite-dimensional $*$ -representations in $\widehat{\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A})}$ is dense. Then, by Theorem 2.1 (iii), we see that the homeomorphism $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), v) \rightarrow \widehat{\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A})}$ maps

equivalence classes of finite-dimensional *-representations bijectively onto themselves. In turn, we may infer that

$$\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}) \cong \left(\bigoplus_{\theta \in \mathcal{F}'_{max}} \theta \right) (C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})).$$

Then,

$$\left(\bigoplus_{\theta \in \mathcal{F}'_{max}} \theta \right) (C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})) = \left(\bigoplus_{\beta \in \mathcal{F}'_{\mathfrak{M}}} \beta \circ \chi \right) (C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})) = \left(\bigoplus_{\beta \in \mathcal{F}'_{\mathfrak{M}}} \beta \right) (\mathfrak{M}) \cong \mathfrak{R}.$$

□

Our first consequence will pertain countable direct sums of operator algebras. For unital operator algebras $\mathcal{A}_n, n \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$\mathcal{A} = \bigoplus_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}_n = \left\{ (a_n) \in \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}_n : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|a_n\| = 0 \right\}.$$

In [11, Theorem 5.2], it was shown that

$$C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) \cong \bigoplus_{n=1}^{\infty} C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}_n).$$

We provide supporting evidence for Question 1 to have an affirmative answer by showing that the RFD-maximal C*-cover also satisfies this property.

Theorem 4.10. *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let \mathcal{A}_n be a unital RFD operator algebra and let $\mathcal{A} = \bigoplus_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}_n$. Then, $\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}) \cong \bigoplus_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}_n)$.*

Proof. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let μ_n and ν_n denote the completely isometric representations of \mathcal{A}_n into $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}_n)$ and $\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}_n)$, respectively. Moreover, let $q_n : C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}_n) \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}_n)$ denote the surjective *-representation satisfying $q_n \circ \mu_n = \nu_n$. Let

$$\mathfrak{R} = \bigoplus_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}_n), \quad \mathfrak{M} = \bigoplus_{n=1}^{\infty} C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}_n).$$

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\iota_n : C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}_n) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ denote the obvious embedding. We verify the conditions of Lemma 4.9.

First note that \mathfrak{R} is an RFD C*-algebra. Define completely isometric representations of \mathcal{A} by

$$\hat{\nu} : (a_n)_{n \geq 1} \mapsto (\nu_n(a_n))_{n \geq 1}, \quad \hat{\mu} : (a_n)_{n \geq 1} \mapsto (\mu_n(a_n))_{n \geq 1}.$$

We show that $C^*(\hat{\mu}(\mathcal{A})) = \mathfrak{M}$. It is clear that $C^*(\hat{\mu}(\mathcal{A})) \subset \mathfrak{M}$. For the reverse inclusion, note that

$$\iota_n(C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}_n)) \subset C^*(\hat{\mu}(\mathcal{A})), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Upon taking finite sums,

$$\bigoplus_{n=1}^m C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}_n) \oplus 0 \subset C^*(\hat{\mu}(\mathcal{A})), \quad m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

For $t = (t_n)_{n \geq 1} \in \mathfrak{M}$, we let

$$s^{(m)} = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m, 0, 0, \dots) \in C^*(\hat{\mu}(\mathcal{A})), \quad m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

As $\|t_n\|$ tends to 0, it follows that $s^{(m)}$ converges to t in the norm topology of \mathfrak{M} . Whence, we have that $t \in C^*(\hat{\mu}(\mathcal{A}))$. Therefore $\mathfrak{M} = C^*(\hat{\mu}(\mathcal{A}))$. Similarly, we may establish that $\mathfrak{R} = C^*(\hat{\nu}(\mathcal{A}))$.

Define a $*$ -representation $Q : \mathfrak{M} \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$ by $Q((t_n)) = (q_n(t_n))$. Note that $Q \circ \hat{\mu} = \hat{\nu}$. In particular, Q is surjective as

$$Q(\mathfrak{M}) = Q(C^*(\hat{\mu}(\mathcal{A}))) = C^*(Q \circ \hat{\mu}(\mathcal{A})) = C^*(\hat{\nu}(\mathcal{A})) = \mathfrak{R}.$$

Therefore $(\mathfrak{R}, \hat{\nu})$ and $(\mathfrak{M}, \hat{\mu})$ are C^* -covers for \mathcal{A} such that $(\mathfrak{R}, \hat{\nu}) \preceq (\mathfrak{M}, \hat{\mu})$.

Let $\pi : \mathfrak{M} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_\pi)$ be an irreducible finite-dimensional $*$ -representation. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and note that the C^* -algebra $\iota_n(C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}_n))$ is an ideal of \mathfrak{M} . Hence, the representation $\pi|_{\iota_n(C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}_n))}$ is either identically zero or irreducible (Subsection 2.1). In particular, $\pi \circ \iota_n$ is either identically zero or an irreducible $*$ -representation of $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}_n)$. In the latter case, Theorem 4.4 yields that $\pi \circ \iota_n = \sigma_n \circ q_n$ where σ_n is a finite-dimensional irreducible $*$ -representation of $\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}_n)$. In the former case, one can take σ_n to be the zero representation in order to establish that $\pi \circ \iota_n = \sigma_n \circ q_n$.

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathfrak{J}_n = \ker q_n \subset C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}_n)$. Then, $\mathfrak{J} = \bigoplus_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{J}_n = \ker Q$ is a closed two-sided ideal of \mathfrak{M} . Let $t = (t_n)_{n \geq 1} \in \mathfrak{J}$ and

$$s^{(m)} = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m, 0, 0, \dots), \quad m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(t) &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \pi(s^{(m)}) \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^m \pi \circ \iota_n(t_n) \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^m \sigma_n \circ q_n(t_n) \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $t_n \in \mathfrak{J}_n = \ker q_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. So π vanishes on \mathfrak{J} . Whence, $\pi = \sigma \circ Q$ where σ is a finite-dimensional $*$ -representation of \mathfrak{R} . By [11, Theorem 5.2], we have that $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) \cong \mathfrak{M}$. Hence, Lemma 4.9 yields that $\mathfrak{R} \cong \mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A})$. \square

Now we provide a similar statement for the unital free product of operator algebras. We recall the relevant details: Let \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} be unital operator algebras. The *free product* of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , denoted $\mathcal{A} * \mathcal{B}$, is the unique operator algebra satisfying the following universal property:

- (i) there exist unital completely isometric representations $\iota : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} * \mathcal{B}$ and $j : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} * \mathcal{B}$ such that $\iota(\mathcal{A}), j(\mathcal{B})$ generate $\mathcal{A} * \mathcal{B}$ and if $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and $\theta : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ are representations into a common operator algebra \mathcal{C} , then there exists a unique representation $\pi * \theta : \mathcal{A} * \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ such that $(\pi * \theta) \circ \iota = \pi$ and $(\pi * \theta) \circ j = \theta$.

In the self-adjoint setting, this coincides with the usual notion of free products for C^* -algebras. In [8, Theorem 4.1], it was shown that such an object exists for any pair of operator algebras and that the norm of $X \in \mathbb{M}_n(\mathcal{A} * \mathcal{B})$ may be defined by

$$(2) \quad \|X\| = \inf\{\|X_1\| \|X_2\| \dots \|X_k\|\}.$$

The infimum is over all expressions $X = X_1 X_2 \dots X_k$ where X_1 is an $n \times m_1$ matrix in $\iota(\mathcal{A})$, X_2 is an $m_1 \times m_2$ matrix in $j(\mathcal{B})$, X_3 is an $m_2 \times m_3$ matrix in $\iota(\mathcal{A})$, etc.

Theorem 4.11. *Let \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} be unital RFD operator algebras. Then, $\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A} * \mathcal{B}) \cong \mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}) * \mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{B})$.*

Proof. Let $(C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}), \mu_{\mathcal{A}})$ and $(\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), v_{\mathcal{A}})$ denote the maximal and RFD-maximal C*-covers of \mathcal{A} , respectively. Let $q_{\mathcal{A}} : C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A})$ be the surjective unital *-representation satisfying $q_{\mathcal{A}} \circ \mu_{\mathcal{A}} = v_{\mathcal{A}}$. Let $r_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}) * \mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{B})$ and $m_{\mathcal{A}} : C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) * C_{max}^*(\mathcal{B})$ be the usual unital isometric *-representations. Let $\iota_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} * \mathcal{B}$ be the unital completely isometric map given in (i). Define representations of \mathcal{B} and *-representations of $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{B})$ and $\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{B})$, denoted $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}, v_{\mathcal{B}}, q_{\mathcal{B}}, r_{\mathcal{B}}, m_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\iota_{\mathcal{B}}$, in an analogous way.

We check the conditions of Lemma 4.9. First note that $\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}) * \mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{B})$ is an RFD C*-algebra by [21, Theorem 3.2] and that $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A} * \mathcal{B}) \cong C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) * C_{max}^*(\mathcal{B})$ by [6, Proposition 2.2]. Take

$$q = (r_{\mathcal{A}} \circ q_{\mathcal{A}}) * (r_{\mathcal{B}} \circ q_{\mathcal{B}}) : C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) * C_{max}^*(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}) * \mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{B}).$$

Then q is a surjective unital *-representation. Indeed, as $q_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $q_{\mathcal{B}}$ are surjective, we have that

$$r_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A})) \cup r_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{B})) \subset q(C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) * C_{max}^*(\mathcal{B})).$$

The former set generates $\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}) * \mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{B})$ and so q is surjective.

Define a representation

$$\mu_* = (m_{\mathcal{A}} \circ \mu_{\mathcal{A}}) * (m_{\mathcal{B}} \circ \mu_{\mathcal{B}}) : \mathcal{A} * \mathcal{B} \rightarrow C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) * C_{max}^*(\mathcal{B}).$$

Note that $\mu_* \circ \iota_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\mu_* \circ \iota_{\mathcal{B}}$ are completely isometric. By virtue of equation (2), μ_* is easily seen to be completely isometric. Similarly, the map

$$v_* = (r_{\mathcal{A}} \circ v_{\mathcal{A}}) * (r_{\mathcal{B}} \circ v_{\mathcal{B}}) : \mathcal{A} * \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}) * \mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{B})$$

is also a completely isometric representation. Next, note that $C^*(\mu_*(\mathcal{A} * \mathcal{B})) = C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) * C_{max}^*(\mathcal{B})$: Indeed, by definition of μ_* , we see that

$$C^*(\mu_* \circ \iota_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A})) = C^*(m_{\mathcal{A}} \circ \mu_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A})) = m_{\mathcal{A}}(C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})) \subset C^*(\mu_*(\mathcal{A} * \mathcal{B})).$$

Similarly, we obtain that $m_{\mathcal{B}}(C_{max}^*(\mathcal{B})) \subset C^*(\mu_*(\mathcal{A} * \mathcal{B}))$. Therefore

$$C^*(\mu_*(\mathcal{A} * \mathcal{B})) = C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) * C_{max}^*(\mathcal{B}).$$

Observe that

$$q \circ \mu_* \circ \iota_{\mathcal{A}} = q \circ m_{\mathcal{A}} \circ \mu_{\mathcal{A}} = r_{\mathcal{A}} \circ q_{\mathcal{A}} \circ \mu_{\mathcal{A}} = r_{\mathcal{A}} \circ v_{\mathcal{A}}.$$

Similarly, we obtain $q \circ \mu_* \circ \iota_{\mathcal{B}} = r_{\mathcal{B}} \circ v_{\mathcal{B}}$. By the universal property of the free product, we have that $q \circ \mu_* = v_*$. Whence,

$$C^*(v_*(\mathcal{A} * \mathcal{B})) = q(C^*(\mu_*(\mathcal{A} * \mathcal{B}))) = q(C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) * C_{max}^*(\mathcal{B})) = \mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}) * \mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{B}).$$

So $(\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}) * \mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{B}), v_*) \preceq (C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) * C_{max}^*(\mathcal{B}), \mu_*)$.

Let $\pi : C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) * C_{max}^*(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_{\pi})$ be a finite-dimensional irreducible *-representation. Then the universal property of the free product dictates that $\pi = \sigma_{\mathcal{A}} * \sigma_{\mathcal{B}}$ where $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}} : C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_{\pi})$ and $\sigma_{\mathcal{B}} : C_{max}^*(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_{\pi})$ are *-representations. By Theorem 4.4 (i), there are *-representations $\hat{\sigma}_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_{\pi})$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{\mathcal{B}} : \mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_{\pi})$ such that $\hat{\sigma}_{\mathcal{A}} \circ q_{\mathcal{A}} = \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{\mathcal{B}} \circ q_{\mathcal{B}} = \sigma_{\mathcal{B}}$. Define a *-representation of $\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}) * \mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{B})$ by $\Pi = \hat{\sigma}_{\mathcal{A}} * \hat{\sigma}_{\mathcal{B}}$. Observe that

$$\Pi \circ q \circ m_{\mathcal{A}} = \Pi \circ r_{\mathcal{A}} \circ q_{\mathcal{A}} = \hat{\sigma}_{\mathcal{A}} \circ q_{\mathcal{A}} = \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$$

and similarly, $\Pi \circ q \circ m_{\mathcal{B}} = \sigma_{\mathcal{B}}$. So $\Pi \circ q = \pi$. Therefore, by Lemma 4.9, we obtain that $\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A} * \mathcal{B}) \cong \mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}) * \mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{B})$. \square

5. RESIDUALLY FINITE-DIMENSIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

In this section, we pursue a finer characterization of the RFD-maximal C^* -cover. Indeed, Theorem 4.4 only characterized the RFD-maximal C^* -cover up to a dense subset of representations. Now we uncover a wider class of representations by taking appropriate pointwise limits of representations. This is accomplished by analysing the so-called RFD and $*$ -RFD representations of an operator algebra. Motivated by Question 1, we consider the intermediate statement of whether these two classes of representations coincide.

The following two definitions will be central to our arguments. Let $\rho : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ be a representation of an operator algebra \mathcal{A} . Then, ρ is *residually finite-dimensional* (or RFD) if there is a net of representations $\rho_\lambda : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ such that $C^*(\rho_\lambda(\mathcal{A}))\mathcal{H}$ is finite-dimensional and

$$\text{SOT} \lim_{\lambda} \rho_\lambda(a) = \rho(a), \quad a \in \mathcal{A}.$$

We call the representation *$*$ -residually finite-dimensional* (or $*$ -RFD) if we further impose that

$$\text{SOT} \lim_{\lambda} \rho_\lambda(a)^* = \rho(a)^*, \quad a \in \mathcal{A}.$$

In other words, ρ is RFD (respectively, $*$ -RFD) if it is the point-strong limit (or point-strong* limit) of certain finite-dimensional representations of the operator algebra. These two concepts were introduced in [9] using different terminology. We will utilize the following result from their work several times. That is, $C^*_{max}(\mathcal{A})$ is RFD if and only if every representation of \mathcal{A} is $*$ -RFD [9, Theorem 3.3].

In the self-adjoint setting, RFD and $*$ -RFD representations coincide and agree with the notion of a residually finite-dimensional $*$ -representation (as introduced in Subsection 2.3). We warn the reader that these refer to three different notions. An RFD or $*$ -RFD representation refers to a possibly non self-adjoint setting. On the other hand, an RFD $*$ -representation refers to the self-adjoint setting.

First, we remark that residual finite-dimensionality of an operator algebra is equivalent to the algebra possessing either an RFD or $*$ -RFD embedding:

Proposition 5.1. *Let \mathcal{A} be an operator algebra. Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) \mathcal{A} is RFD;
- (ii) there exists a completely isometric $*$ -RFD representation of \mathcal{A} ;
- (iii) there exists a completely isometric RFD representation of \mathcal{A} .

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii): Let $\iota : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \prod_{\lambda} \mathbb{M}_{r_{\lambda}}$ be a completely isometric representation. For each λ , let $\gamma_{\lambda} : C^*(\iota(\mathcal{A})) \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_{r_{\lambda}}$ denote the projection mapping. Then the representation $j := \bigoplus_{\lambda} \gamma_{\lambda} \circ \iota$ is completely isometric. Moreover, since $\gamma_{\lambda} \circ \iota$ is $*$ -RFD for every λ , it follows that j is $*$ -RFD by [9, Lemma 2.2].

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii): Obvious.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i): Let $\iota : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ be a completely isometric RFD representation. Then there is a net of representations $\pi_{\lambda} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$, $\lambda \in \Lambda$, such that $C^*(\pi_{\lambda}(\mathcal{A}))\mathcal{H}$ is finite-dimensional and $\pi_{\lambda}(a)$ converges strongly to $\iota(a)$ for each $a \in \mathcal{A}$. For each λ , we may find a positive integer r_{λ} and a unitary operator $U_{\lambda} : C^*(\pi_{\lambda}(\mathcal{A}))\mathcal{H} \rightarrow C^{r_{\lambda}}$. Then $\bigoplus_{\lambda} U_{\lambda} \pi_{\lambda}(\cdot) U_{\lambda}^*$ is a completely isometric representation of \mathcal{A} . \square

Now we identify two constructions for C^* -covers of an RFD operator algebra. This is similar to the concrete representation of the RFD-maximal C^* -cover but

we require extra machinery to account for set-theoretic technicalities. This process can be seen in the classical construction of the maximal C*-cover [7, Proposition 2.4.2]. Our notation will be consistent throughout.

Let \mathcal{A} be an RFD operator algebra. Suppose that the cardinality of \mathcal{A} is less than or equal to a cardinal κ satisfying $\kappa^{\aleph_0} = \kappa$. For each cardinal $\alpha \leq \kappa$, fix a Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_α of dimension α . Let \mathcal{F} denote the set of all RFD representations $\rho : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_\alpha)$, $\alpha \leq \kappa$. Define a representation $v_s = \bigoplus_{\rho \in \mathcal{F}} \rho$. Necessarily, κ is infinite. In particular, \mathcal{F} contains a representative from each unitary equivalence class consisting of representations of \mathcal{A} which act on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space. As \mathcal{A} is RFD, v_s is completely isometric. Letting $\mathfrak{R}_s(\mathcal{A}) = C^*(v_s(\mathcal{A}))$, we see that $(\mathfrak{R}_s(\mathcal{A}), v_s)$ is a C*-cover of \mathcal{A} .

Similarly, let \mathcal{G} denote the set of all *-RFD representations $\rho : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_\alpha)$ where α is a cardinal such that $\alpha \leq \kappa$. Define a representation $v_{*s} = \bigoplus_{\rho \in \mathcal{G}} \rho$. Similarly, the map v_{*s} is completely isometric. Letting $\mathfrak{R}_{*s}(\mathcal{A}) = C^*(v_{*s}(\mathcal{A}))$, we have that $(\mathfrak{R}_{*s}(\mathcal{A}), v_{*s})$ is a C*-cover of \mathcal{A} .

It is not immediately clear whether either of the C*-algebras, $\mathfrak{R}_s(\mathcal{A})$ or $\mathfrak{R}_{*s}(\mathcal{A})$, generate RFD C*-algebras. We will work towards showing that the latter does in fact generate an RFD C*-algebra. Due to the succeeding Lemma 5.2, this will imply that the C*-cover $(\mathfrak{R}_{*s}(\mathcal{A}), v_{*s})$ is equivalent to the RFD-maximal C*-cover.

Lemma 5.2. *Let \mathcal{A} be an RFD operator algebra. Then, we have that $(\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), v) \preceq (\mathfrak{R}_{*s}(\mathcal{A}), v_{*s}) \preceq (\mathfrak{R}_s(\mathcal{A}), v_s)$.*

Proof. Note that the subsets \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} defined above satisfy $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$. Whence, there is a natural projection mapping $\Theta : \mathfrak{R}_s(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}_{*s}(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\Theta \circ v_s = v_{*s}$. So $(\mathfrak{R}_{*s}(\mathcal{A}), v_{*s}) \preceq (\mathfrak{R}_s(\mathcal{A}), v_s)$.

To show that $(\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), v) \preceq (\mathfrak{R}_{*s}(\mathcal{A}), v_{*s})$, we use minimality of Theorem 4.6. Let $\rho : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_\rho)$ be a representation of \mathcal{A} on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space. Then, there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and a unitary operator $U_\rho : \mathcal{H}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\rho$ such that $\chi = U_\rho^* \rho(\cdot) U_\rho : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_n)$. Similar to the proof of Theorem 4.6, the construction of $\mathfrak{R}_{*s}(\mathcal{A})$ allows us to obtain a *-representation $\pi : \mathfrak{R}_{*s}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_n)$ such that $\pi \circ v_{*s} = \chi$. Define a *-representation $\theta : \mathfrak{R}_{*s}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_\rho)$ by $\theta = U\pi(\cdot)U^*$. Then $\theta \circ v_{*s} = \rho$. Therefore, $(\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), v) \preceq (\mathfrak{R}_{*s}(\mathcal{A}), v_{*s})$. \square

We now identify how the two new C*-covers are equipped with lifting properties similar to that exposed in Theorem 4.6 with the RFD-maximal C*-cover.

Proposition 5.3. *Let \mathcal{A} be an RFD operator algebra and $\rho : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ be a representation. Then, the following statements hold:*

- (i) *If ρ is RFD, then there exists a unique *-representation $\theta : \mathfrak{R}_s(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\theta \circ v_s = \rho$;*
- (ii) *If ρ is *-RFD, then there exists a unique *-representation $\theta : \mathfrak{R}_{*s}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\theta \circ v_{*s} = \rho$.*

Proof. We show (ii) with the proof of (i) being similar. First, assume that $\dim \mathcal{H} \leq \kappa$. It is easy to verify that *-RFD representations are stable under unitary equivalence. So we may find a unitary operator U such that $\chi = U^* \rho(\cdot) U \in \mathcal{G}$. Define $\pi : \mathfrak{R}_{*s}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_\chi)$ by $\pi(T) = P_{\mathcal{H}_\chi} T |_{\mathcal{H}_\chi}$. By construction of $\mathfrak{R}_{*s}(\mathcal{A})$, we see that π is a *-representation. If we let $\theta = U\pi(\cdot)U^*$, then $\theta \circ v_{*s} = \rho$ as desired.

Now, suppose that $\dim \mathcal{H} > \kappa$. By [7, Proposition 2.4.2], we may express $\rho = \bigoplus_i \pi_i$ where each $\pi_i : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{K}_i)$ is a representation of \mathcal{A} on a Hilbert space with

dimension at most κ . Due to [9, Lemma 2.4], each π_i is also a *-RFD representation of \mathcal{A} (or RFD for statement (i)). By the previous paragraph, for each i , we obtain a *-representation $\theta_i : \mathfrak{K}_{*s}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{K}_i)$ such that $\theta_i \circ v_{*s} = \pi_i$. Taking $\theta = \bigoplus_i \theta_i$, we see that $\theta \circ v_{*s} = \rho$ as desired. Uniqueness holds for the same reason as in Theorem 4.6. \square

We remark that Proposition 5.3 makes no statement on the residually finite-dimensionality of the resulting *-representations. This will be clarified by showing that the lift of a *-RFD representation as in Proposition 5.3 is necessarily an RFD *-representation. However, we do not know of a corresponding statement about RFD representations. The following is a refinement of [9, Theorem 3.3].

Theorem 5.4. *Let \mathcal{A} be an operator algebra and $\rho : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ be a representation. Let $\theta : C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ denote the *-representation satisfying $\theta \circ \mu = \rho$. Then, ρ is a *-RFD representation if and only if θ is an RFD *-representation.*

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Let $\rho_\lambda : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}), \lambda \in \Lambda$, be a net of representations such that $C^*(\rho_\lambda(\mathcal{A}))\mathcal{H}$ is finite-dimensional and

$$*\text{SOT} \lim_{\lambda} \rho_\lambda(a) = \rho(a), \quad a \in \mathcal{A}.$$

For each ρ_λ , we obtain a corresponding *-representation $\theta_\lambda : C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ satisfying $\theta_\lambda \circ \mu = \rho_\lambda$. Note that

$$\theta_\lambda(C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}))\mathcal{H} = C^*(\theta_\lambda \circ \mu(\mathcal{A}))\mathcal{H} = C^*(\rho_\lambda(\mathcal{A}))\mathcal{H}$$

is finite-dimensional for each λ . For any $w \in C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$ which is a finite sum of words in $\mu(\mathcal{A}) \cup \mu(\mathcal{A})^*$, we obtain that

$$*\text{SOT} \lim_{\lambda} \theta_\lambda(w) = \theta(w)$$

as the adjoint, addition and multiplication are jointly continuous over bounded sets. This set is dense in $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$ and so θ is an RFD *-representation.

(\Leftarrow) Suppose that $\theta_\lambda, \lambda \in \Lambda$, is a net of *-representations such that $\theta_\lambda(C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}))\mathcal{H}$ is finite-dimensional and

$$\text{SOT} \lim_{\lambda} \theta_\lambda(t) = \theta(t), \quad t \in C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}).$$

Then the net $(\theta_\lambda \circ \mu)_\lambda$ demonstrates that ρ is a *-RFD representation of \mathcal{A} . \square

As a result, we have that $(\mathfrak{K}_{*s}(\mathcal{A}), v_s)$ is equivalent to the RFD-maximal C^* -cover:

Corollary 5.5. *If \mathcal{A} is an RFD operator algebra, then $(\mathfrak{K}(\mathcal{A}), v) \sim (\mathfrak{K}_{*s}(\mathcal{A}), v_{*s})$. In particular, for any *-RFD representation $\rho : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_\rho)$, there is a unique *-representation $\theta : \mathfrak{K}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_\rho)$ such that $\theta \circ v = \rho$. Furthermore, θ is an RFD *-representation.*

Proof. As $v_{*s} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ is a direct sum of *-RFD representations, it follows that v_{*s} is also a *-RFD representation [9, Lemma 2.2]. Let $q : C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{K}_{*s}(\mathcal{A})$ be the surjective *-representation satisfying $q \circ \mu = v_{*s}$. By Theorem 5.4, we have that q is an RFD *-representation.

Let $\theta_\lambda : C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}), \lambda \in \Lambda$, be a net of *-representations such that $\theta_\lambda(C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}))\mathcal{H}$ is finite-dimensional for each λ and

$$\text{SOT} \lim_{\lambda} \theta_\lambda(t) = q(t), \quad t \in C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}).$$

For each $\lambda \in \Lambda$, define a representation of \mathcal{A} by $\rho_\lambda = \theta_\lambda \circ \mu$. By Theorem 5.4, ρ_λ is a *-RFD representation of \mathcal{A} . Hence, by Proposition 5.3 (ii), there is a *-representation $\widehat{\theta}_\lambda : \mathfrak{R}_{*s}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\widehat{\theta}_\lambda \circ v_{*s} = \rho_\lambda$. Observe that

$$\widehat{\theta}_\lambda \circ q \circ \mu = \widehat{\theta}_\lambda \circ v_{*s} = \rho_\lambda = \theta_\lambda \circ \mu.$$

Hence, $\widehat{\theta}_\lambda \circ q = \theta_\lambda$ and so

$$\text{SOT} \lim_{\lambda} \widehat{\theta}_\lambda \circ q(t) = q(t), \quad t \in C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}).$$

Since $\widehat{\theta}_\lambda(\mathfrak{R}_{*s}(\mathcal{A}))\mathcal{H} = \theta_\lambda(C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}))\mathcal{H}$ is finite-dimensional for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$, we obtain that the identity representation of $\mathfrak{R}_{*s}(\mathcal{A})$ is an RFD *-representation. By Proposition 5.1 (or [21, Theorem 2.4]), we obtain that $\mathfrak{R}_{*s}(\mathcal{A})$ is an RFD C*-algebra. So $(\mathfrak{R}_{*s}(\mathcal{A}), v_{*s}) \preceq (\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), v)$ and Lemma 5.2 implies that the C*-covers are equivalent. The last two statements are direct consequences of Proposition 5.3 (ii) and Theorem 5.4. \square

The reader should exercise some care in utilizing Corollary 5.5. Indeed, let \mathcal{A} be an RFD operator algebra and (\mathfrak{A}, ι) be a C*-cover such that $(\mathfrak{A}, \iota) \preceq (\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), v)$. Suppose ρ is a representation of \mathcal{A} which lifts to a *-representation θ of \mathfrak{A} . Then, ρ is a *-RFD representation and the lift of ρ to $\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A})$ is an RFD *-representation. Withstanding this, it is not necessarily true that θ itself will be RFD:

Example 4. Let \mathcal{H} be a separable, infinite-dimensional Hilbert space with orthonormal basis $\{e_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let P_n be the orthogonal projection onto the subspace spanned by $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$. Let \mathcal{A} denote the operator algebra consisting of triangular operators. That is, $T \in \mathcal{A}$ precisely when $P_n T P_n = T P_n$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It is known that \mathcal{A} is an RFD operator algebra [10, Example 3.3]. Also, note that $C^*(\mathcal{A})$ is the Toeplitz algebra.

Define a representation $\pi_n : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ by $\pi_n(T) = T P_n$. We see that $C^*(\pi_n(\mathcal{A}))\mathcal{H}$ is finite-dimensional and that

$$*\text{SOT} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \pi_n(T) = T, \quad T \in \mathcal{A},$$

as $(P_n)_{n \geq 1}$ converges strongly to the identity operator on \mathcal{H} . Therefore the identity representation of \mathcal{A} is *-RFD. But the identity representation of \mathcal{A} lifts to the identity representation of $C^*(\mathcal{A})$, which is not an RFD *-representation. Indeed, otherwise $C^*(\mathcal{A})$ is an RFD C*-algebra by Proposition 5.1. This is a contradiction because $C^*(\mathcal{A})$ contains $\mathfrak{K}(\mathcal{H})$, which is not RFD.

In what follows next, we identify the connection between RFD and *-RFD representations. Although the SOT and *-SOT topologies are distinct, we are unable to determine whether RFD and *-RFD representations actually differ. For Question 1 to hold in the affirmative, it would be necessary that RFD and *-RFD representations coincide for RFD operator algebras. We now reflect on this and summarize when it is true. This reconceptualizes [9, Theorem 3.3] by using intermediate C*-covers.

Theorem 5.6. *Let \mathcal{A} be an RFD operator algebra. Consider the following statements:*

- (i) $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$ is an RFD C*-algebra;
- (ii) for any completely isometric RFD representation $\iota : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$, we have that $(C^*(\iota(\mathcal{A})), \iota) \preceq (\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{A}), v)$;

- (iii) $(\mathfrak{K}_s(\mathcal{A}), v_s) \sim (\mathfrak{K}(\mathcal{A}), v)$;
- (iv) every RFD representation of \mathcal{A} is $*$ -RFD;
- (v) for any RFD representation $\rho : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$, there is an RFD $*$ -representation $\theta : C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ satisfying $\theta \circ \mu = \rho$;

Then, we have that

$$(i) \implies (ii) \iff (iii) \iff (iv) \iff (v).$$

If, in addition, every representation of \mathcal{A} is RFD, then (v) \implies (i).

Proof. (i) \implies (ii): When $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$ is an RFD C^* -algebra, we have that $(\mathfrak{K}(\mathcal{A}), v) \sim (C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}), \mu)$ by Corollary 4.3. The statement is then trivial.

(ii) \implies (iii): The representation v_s is RFD by [9, Lemma 2.2]. So $(\mathfrak{K}_s(\mathcal{A}), v_s) \preceq (\mathfrak{K}(\mathcal{A}), v)$. By Lemma 5.2, we infer that (iii) holds.

(iii) \implies (iv): Let $\rho : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ be an RFD representation. By Proposition 5.3, there exists a $*$ -representation $\theta : \mathfrak{K}_s(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\theta \circ v_s = \rho$. The assumption implies that $\mathfrak{K}_s(\mathcal{A})$ is an RFD C^* -algebra. By [21, Theorem 2.4], θ is a $*$ -RFD representation. Let $q : C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{K}_s(\mathcal{A})$ be the surjective $*$ -representation satisfying $q \circ \mu = v_s$. Then $\theta \circ q$ is also a $*$ -RFD representation. Hence, by Theorem 5.4, we obtain that

$$\theta \circ q \circ \mu = \theta \circ v_s = \rho$$

is a $*$ -RFD representation of \mathcal{A} .

(iv) \implies (v): This is Theorem 5.4.

(v) \implies (ii): Let $\iota : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ be a completely isometric RFD representation. By assumption, there is an RFD $*$ -representation $\theta : C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ satisfying $\theta \circ \mu = \iota$. By Theorem 5.4, ι is in fact a $*$ -RFD representation. Whence, by Corollary 5.5, there is a $*$ -representation $\beta : \mathfrak{K}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\beta \circ v = \iota$. We have that

$$\beta(\mathfrak{K}(\mathcal{A})) = \beta(C^*(v(\mathcal{A}))) = C^*(\iota(\mathcal{A}))$$

and so $(C^*(\iota(\mathcal{A})), \iota) \preceq (\mathfrak{K}(\mathcal{A}), v)$.

Now, assume that every representation of \mathcal{A} is RFD and that (v) holds. In particular, μ is an RFD representation and, by assumption, the identity representation of $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$ is RFD. Then, Proposition 5.1 implies that $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$ is RFD. \square

We conclude by remarking that, to show the validity of Question 1, it suffices to prove two statements. Namely, it would be equivalent to show that (i) every representation of \mathcal{A} is RFD and (ii) every RFD representation of \mathcal{A} is $*$ -RFD. If (i) and (ii) are true, then $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$ is RFD by [9, Theorem 3.3]. We have not been able to find a counterexample to (ii), but despite this, there is essentially a unique possibility which could arise.

Remark 5.7. Let \mathcal{A} be a unital operator algebra and suppose that $\iota : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ is a unital completely isometric RFD representation. Let $\pi_\lambda : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$, $\lambda \in \Lambda$, be a net of completely contractive representations such that $C^*(\pi_\lambda(\mathcal{A}))\mathcal{H}$ is finite-dimensional and $(\pi_\lambda(a))_\lambda$ converges strongly to $\iota(a)$ for every $a \in \mathcal{A}$. For each λ , let P_λ be the finite-rank projection onto

$$\mathcal{E}_\lambda = \overline{C^*(\pi_\lambda(\mathcal{A}))\mathcal{H}}.$$

We utilize the following standard fact: whenever $F \in B(\mathcal{H})$ is a finite-rank operator and $(S_\lambda)_\lambda$ is a net in $B(\mathcal{H})$ which converges strongly to S , then $(FS_\lambda)_\lambda$ converges

to FS^* in the norm topology of $B(\mathcal{H})$. So

$$\lim_{\lambda} P_{\mu} \pi_{\lambda}(a)^* = P_{\mu} \iota(a)^*, \quad \mu \in \Lambda, a \in \mathcal{A},$$

in the norm topology of $B(\mathcal{H})$.

If $(\pi_{\lambda}(a)^*)_{\lambda}$ converges strongly to an operator $T(a) \in B(\mathcal{H})$ for some $a \in \mathcal{A}$, then $P_{\mu} T(a) = P_{\mu} \iota(a)^*$ for each $\mu \in \Lambda$. By [21, Lemma 3.1], the net $(P_{\lambda})_{\lambda}$ converges strongly to the identity operator and so we obtain that $T(a) = \iota(a)^*$.

6. HADWIN LIFTINGS FOR OPERATOR ALGEBRAS

To close, we obtain a non self-adjoint version of Hadwin's characterization of separable RFD C*-algebras [23]. We will recount the details of their work here.

Let $\{e_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be an orthonormal basis for ℓ^2 . For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let P_n be the orthogonal projection onto the linear span of $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ and let $\mathcal{M}_n = P_n B(\ell^2) P_n$. Let \mathfrak{B} be the C*-subalgebra of $\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{M}_n$ consisting of elements $(T_n)_{n \geq 1}$ for which there is an operator $T \in B(\ell^2)$ such that

$$*\text{SOT} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_n = T.$$

Define a *-representation

$$\pi : \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow B(\ell^2), \quad (T_n)_{n \geq 1} \mapsto *\text{SOT} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_n.$$

It is routine to check that π is a surjective unital *-representation [23, Lemma 1]. Let \mathcal{A} be an operator algebra. We say that a representation $\rho : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\ell^2)$ is **-liftable in the sense of Hadwin* if there is a representation $\tau : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ such that $\pi \circ \tau = \rho$. Recall that $\tilde{\mathfrak{A}}$ denotes the unitization of a C*-algebra \mathfrak{A} . Hadwin's result is then stated as follows [23, Theorem 11]:

Theorem 6.1. *Let \mathfrak{A} be a separable C*-algebra. Then, \mathfrak{A} is an RFD C*-algebra if and only if every unital *-representation $\sigma : \tilde{\mathfrak{A}} \rightarrow B(\ell^2)$ is *-liftable in the sense of Hadwin.*

We now present our non-self adjoint version to Theorem 6.1.

Theorem 6.2. *Let \mathcal{A} be a separable operator algebra. Then, $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$ is an RFD C*-algebra if and only if every unital representation $\rho : \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow B(\ell^2)$ is *-liftable in the sense of Hadwin.*

Proof. (\Rightarrow) If $C_{max}^*(\mathcal{A})$ is an RFD C*-algebra, then $C_{max}^*(\tilde{\mathcal{A}})$ is also RFD by [7, 2.4.3]. Hence, we have that $(C_{max}^*(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}), \mu_1)$ is the RFD-maximal C*-cover of $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$.

Let $\rho : \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow B(\ell^2)$ be a unital representation. Then, there is a *-representation $\theta : C_{max}^*(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}) \rightarrow B(\ell^2)$ such that $\theta \circ \mu_1 = \rho$. As in Remark 4.7, μ_1 may taken to be unital. Hence, θ is also unital. As $C_{max}^*(\tilde{\mathcal{A}})$ is a separable RFD C*-algebra, Theorem 6.1 yields that there is a unital *-representation $\sigma : C_{max}^*(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ such that $\pi \circ \sigma = \theta$. Then we see that

$$\pi \circ \sigma \circ \mu_1 = \theta \circ \mu_1 = \rho.$$

Taking $\tau = \sigma \circ \mu_1$ shows that ρ is *-liftable in the sense of Hadwin.

(\Leftarrow) By [7, 2.4.3] and [9, Theorem 3.3], it suffices to show that every representation of $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ is *-RFD. We first show that every unital representation $\rho : \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow B(\ell^2)$ is *-RFD. As ρ is *-liftable in the sense of Hadwin, there is a representation $\tau : \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ such that $\pi \circ \tau = \rho$. By definition of \mathfrak{B} , we see that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a

representation $\tau_n : \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ and $\tau(a) = (\tau_n(a))_{n \geq 1}$. Note that $C^*(\tau_n(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}))\ell^2 \subset \mathcal{M}_n$ is finite-dimensional for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Also,

$$\rho(a) = \pi \circ \tau(a) = *SOT \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_n(a), \quad a \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}},$$

and so ρ is a *-RFD representation.

Now let $\rho : \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ be an arbitrary representation. If ρ is non-unital, then we may express $\rho = \hat{\rho} \oplus 0$ where $\hat{\rho}$ is a unital representation of $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$. We have that ρ is *-RFD if and only if $\hat{\rho}$ is *-RFD. Whence, we may assume that ρ is unital. Further, we may assume the non-trivial case of when \mathcal{H} is infinite-dimensional. For each $h \in \mathcal{H}$, let $\mathcal{H}_h = \overline{\text{span}}\{C^*(\rho(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}))h\}$. Note that \mathcal{H}_h is a separable Hilbert space which is reducing for $\rho(\tilde{\mathcal{A}})$. So we may express $\rho = \bigoplus_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \rho|_{\mathcal{H}_h}$ and, for each $h \in \mathcal{H}$, $\rho|_{\mathcal{H}_h}$ is a representation of $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ on a separable Hilbert space. Hence, $\rho|_{\mathcal{H}_h}$ is unitarily equivalent to a unital representation of $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ on ℓ^2 and so $\rho|_{\mathcal{H}_h}$ is *-RFD. Therefore ρ is a *-RFD representation by [9, Lemma 2.2]. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Jim Agler, John McCarthy, and Linus E Kramer, *Pick interpolation and Hilbert function spaces*, Vol. 44, American Mathematical Soc., 2002.
- [2] R.J. Archbold, *On residually finite-dimensional C^* -algebras*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society (1995), 2935–2937.
- [3] William Arveson, *Subalgebras of C^* -algebras*, Acta Mathematica **123** (1969), no. 1, 141–224.
- [4] ———, *Subalgebras of C^* -algebras III: Multivariable operator theory*, Acta Mathematica **181** (1998), no. 2, 159–228.
- [5] ———, *The noncommutative Choquet boundary*, Journal of the American Mathematical Society **21** (2008), no. 4, 1065–1084.
- [6] David P Blecher, *Modules over operator algebras, and the maximal C^* -dilation*, Journal of Functional Analysis **169** (1999), no. 1, 251–288.
- [7] David P Blecher and Christian Le Merdy, *Operator algebras and their modules: an operator space approach*, Clarendon Press, 2004.
- [8] David P Blecher and Vern Paulsen, *Explicit construction of universal operator algebras and applications to polynomial factorization*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society **112** (1991), no. 3, 839–850.
- [9] Raphaël Clouâtre and Adam Dor-On, *Finite-dimensional approximations and semigroup coactions for operator algebras*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.09776 (2021).
- [10] Raphaël Clouâtre and Laurent W Marcoux, *Residual finite dimensionality and representations of amenable operator algebras*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications **472** (2019), no. 2, 1346–1368.
- [11] Raphaël Clouâtre and Christopher Ramsey, *Residually finite-dimensional operator algebras*, Journal of Functional Analysis **277** (2019), no. 8, 2572–2616.
- [12] Raphaël Clouâtre and Ian Thompson, *Finite dimensionality in the non-commutative Choquet boundary: peaking phenomena and C^* -liminality*, to appear in International Mathematics Research Notices (2021).
- [13] Kristin Courtney and David Sherman, *The universal C^* -algebra of a contraction*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.04043 (2018).
- [14] Kristin Courtney and Tatiana Shulman, *Elements of C^* -algebras attaining their norm in a finite-dimensional representation*, Canadian Journal of Mathematics **71** (2019), no. 1, 93–111.
- [15] Kenneth R Davidson, *C^* -algebras by example*, Vol. 6, American Mathematical Soc., 1996.
- [16] Kenneth R Davidson and Matthew Kennedy, *The Choquet boundary of an operator system*, Duke Mathematical Journal **164** (2015), no. 15, 2989–3004.
- [17] Jacques Dixmier, *C^* -algebras*, North-Holland, Amsterdam **8** (1977), 322–329.
- [18] Ronald G Douglas, *Banach algebra techniques in operator theory*, Vol. 179, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

- [19] Michael A Dritschel and Scott A McCullough, *Boundary representations for families of representations of operator algebras and spaces*, Journal of Operator Theory (2005), 159–167.
- [20] Benton L Duncan, *Universal operator algebras of directed graphs*, arXiv preprint math (2004).
- [21] Ruy Exel and Terry A Loring, *Finite-dimensional representations of free product C^* -algebras*, International Journal of Mathematics **3** (1992), no. 04, 469–476.
- [22] Guihua Gong, Huaxin Lin, and Zhuang Niu, *Classification of finite simple amenable \mathcal{Z} -stable C^* -algebras*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1501.00135 (2014).
- [23] Don Hadwin, *A lifting characterization of RFD C^* -algebras*, Mathematica Scandinavica (2014), 85–95.
- [24] Masamichi Hamana, *Injective envelopes of operator systems*, Publications of the Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences **15** (1979), no. 3, 773–785.
- [25] Mitchell A Hamidi, *Admissibility of C^* -covers and crossed products of operator algebras*, Ph.D. Thesis, <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/mathstudent/95>, 2019.
- [26] Irving Kaplansky, *The structure of certain operator algebras*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **70** (1951), no. 2, 219–255.
- [27] Ralf Meyer, *Adjoining a unit to an operator algebra*, Journal of Operator Theory (2001), 281–288.
- [28] Paul S Muhly and Baruch Solel, *An algebraic characterization of boundary representations* (1998), 189–196.
- [29] Vern Paulsen, *Completely bounded maps and operator algebras*, Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- [30] Vladimir G Pestov, *Operator spaces and residually finite-dimensional C^* -algebras*, Journal of functional analysis **123** (1994), no. 2, 308–317.
- [31] Aaron Tikuisis, Stuart White, and Wilhelm Winter, *Quasidiagonality of nuclear C^* -algebras*, Annals of Mathematics (2017), 229–284.
- [32] Jun Tomiyama, *Applications of Fubini type theorem to the tensor products of C^* -algebras*, Tohoku Mathematical Journal, Second Series **19** (1967), no. 2, 213–226.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA, WINNIPEG, MANITOBA, CANADA
R3T 2N2

Email address: `thompsoi@myumanitoba.ca`