

Graciela Carboni; Angel Rafael Larotonda

A characterization of holomorphic germs on compact perfect sets

Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae, Vol. 45 (2004), No. 3, 483--490

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/119475>

Terms of use:

© Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, 2004

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://project.dml.cz>

A characterization of holomorphic germs on compact perfect sets

GRACIELA CARBONI, ANGEL LAROTONDA

Abstract. Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ be a perfect compact set, E a quasi-complete locally convex space over \mathbb{C} and $f : K \rightarrow E$ a map. In this note we give a necessary and sufficient condition — in terms of differential quotients — for f to have a holomorphic extension on a neighborhood of K .

Keywords: differential quotients, holomorphic extensions

Classification: Primary 46J40; Secondary 46J15

Introduction

Assume that $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a compact set, E is a locally convex space (briefly: LC-space) over \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C} , and $f : K \rightarrow E$ is a map. It is well known that f has a C^∞ extension if and only if there exists a (non uniquely determined) sequence of maps $f_n : K \rightarrow E$, with $f_0 = f$, such that it satisfies appropriate conditions (see [5] and [6]).

In this note we propose a similar criterion for the analytic case, that is, we characterize in terms of an adequate boundedness condition on well specified differential quotients, those maps $f : K \rightarrow E$ (where $K \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ is a compact perfect set) which admit a holomorphic extension $\bar{f} : U \rightarrow E$ to some neighborhood U of K (Proposition 2.9).

In order to formulate it, we need to fix some notations. Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ be an open set and E a quasi-complete LC-space. We let $H(U, E)$ denote the space of all holomorphic maps $u : U \rightarrow E$, with the topology of uniform convergence on compact subsets of U (for the definitions and basic properties see [1], [3]). If $V \subseteq U$ is another open set, then there is an obvious restriction map $H(U, E) \rightarrow H(V, E)$. For a non-void compact set $K \subseteq \mathbb{C}$, we let $\mathcal{U}(K)$ denote the directed set of all open neighborhoods of K . Clearly we obtain a basis (a cofinal subset) of $\mathcal{U}(K)$ by taking the sets $W_r(K) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : d(z, K) < r\}$ for $r > 0$ (or else $r = \frac{1}{n}, n \geq 1$). Denote by $\mathcal{O}(K, E)$ the space of holomorphic E -valued germs on K , that is the LC-space $\varinjlim_r H(W_r(K), E)$.

Supported by UBACYT and CONICET.

1. Assume that K is a compact perfect set. Let $C(K, E)$ denote the space of all continuous maps $f : K \rightarrow E$, endowed with the topology of uniform convergence. It is clear that the natural continuous map $\mathcal{O}(K, E) \rightarrow C(K, E)$ is injective. The main aim of this note is to characterize the image of this map.

In the sequel we use the notations $B(a, \epsilon) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - a| < \epsilon\}$ and $\overline{B(a, \epsilon)} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - a| \leq \epsilon\}$.

Technical Lemma 1.1. *Let $K \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a compact perfect set. Let $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and let $f : K \rightarrow E$ be a map. Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (i) *there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$, such that for all $a \in K$, there exists $f_a \in H(B(a, \epsilon_0), E)$ such that $f_a(z) = f(z)$ for all $z \in K \cap B(a, \epsilon_0)$;*
- (ii) *there exist $\epsilon_1 > 0$ and $g \in H(W_{\epsilon_1}(K), E)$ such that $g(z) = f(z)$ for all $z \in K$.*

PROOF: It is clear that (ii) \Rightarrow (i). Let us see that (i) \Rightarrow (ii). It suffices to show that if $a, b \in K$ and $z \in B(a, \epsilon_0/4) \cap B(b, \epsilon_0/4)$, then $f_a(z) = f_b(z)$. In fact, in this case, $K \cap B(a, \epsilon_0/2) \cap B(b, \epsilon_0/2) \neq \emptyset$, which implies that $K \cap \overline{B(a, \epsilon_0/2)} \cap \overline{B(b, \epsilon_0/2)}$ is an infinite set, since K is a perfect set. From this, it follows that $f_a(z) = f_b(z)$. □

If K satisfies suitable conditions, then we can replace differential quotients by ordinary derivatives in the statement of the criterion. For instance this is the case if K is uniformly C^1 -regular. Recall the definition: we say that a perfect set X is C^1 -connected when for every $a, b \in X$ there exists a piecewise C^1 -curve $\Gamma \subseteq X$, such that $a, b \in \Gamma$. We can define then the geodesic distance $D(a, b)$ in the obvious way. We recall that for an open set X this distance is equivalent to the usual distance $d(a, b) = |a - b|$. Since this fails for general X we say that a compact perfect set is uniformly C^1 -regular if D is equivalent to d (see [2] for a similar and more general definition).

On this line of work we use later the following estimate:

Lemma 1.2. *Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ be a compact set, and $\Gamma \subseteq K$ a piecewise C^1 -curve which connects the points $a, z \in K$. Then*

$$\int_{\Gamma} |\xi - z|^r |d\xi| \leq \frac{\text{length}(\Gamma)^{r+1}}{r + 1}.$$

PROOF: We can assume $z = 0$. If we parametrize Γ by arc length $\varphi : [0, L] \rightarrow K$, then $|\varphi'(s)| = 1$. So,

$$|\varphi(t)| = |\varphi(t) - \varphi(0)| \leq \int_0^t |\varphi'(s)| ds \leq t,$$

and then

$$\int_{\Gamma} |\xi|^r |d\xi| \leq \int_0^L |\varphi(t)|^r dt \leq \int_0^L t^r dt = \frac{L^{r+1}}{r + 1}.$$

□

2. In the sequel we consider an LC-space E and a infinite compact set $K \subseteq \mathbb{C}$. For each $r \in \mathbb{N}$ we define $K^{(r)} = \{(x_0, \dots, x_{r-1}) \in K^r : x_i \neq x_j \text{ for every } i \neq j\}$.

Definition 2.1. We define “differential quotients” $\Delta^r : E^K \rightarrow E^{K^{(r+1)}}$ inductively for $r \geq 0$ by

- (i) Δ^0 is the identity map,
- (ii) $\Delta^{r+1}(f)(x_0, \dots, x_{r+1}) = \frac{r+1}{x_0 - x_{r+1}} (\Delta^r(f)(x_0, \dots, x_r) - \Delta^r(f)(x_1, \dots, x_{r+1}))$.

For the real case, some of the following properties can be found in [4].

Lemma 2.2. *The operator Δ^r has the following properties:*

- (a) Δ^r is \mathbb{C} -linear;
- (b) $\Delta^r(f)(x_0, \dots, x_r) = r! \sum_{k=0}^r f(x_k) \prod_{j \neq k} \frac{1}{x_k - x_j}$;
- (c) $\Delta^r(f)$ is symmetric in (x_0, \dots, x_r) ;
- (d) Let F be a LC-space. If $T : E \rightarrow F$ is a linear map, then $T(\Delta^r(f)) = \Delta^r(T \circ f)$ for each $r \geq 0$;
- (e) Let E_i ($i = 1, 2$) and F be LC-spaces, and $f \in E_1^K, g \in E_2^K$. If $B : E_1 \times E_2 \rightarrow F$ is a bilinear map, and $\tilde{B}(f, g) : K \rightarrow F$ is the map $z \rightarrow B(f(z), g(z))$, then $\sum_{k=0}^r \binom{r}{k} B(\Delta^k(f)(x_0, \dots, x_k), \Delta^{r-k}(g)(x_k, \dots, x_r)) = \Delta^r(\tilde{B}(f, g))(x_0, \dots, x_r)$;
- (f) Assume that E is an algebra. Then,

$$\Delta^r(fg)(x_0, \dots, x_r) = \sum_{k=0}^r \binom{r}{k} \Delta^k(f)(x_0, \dots, x_k) \Delta^{r-k}(g)(x_k, \dots, x_r).$$

PROOF: The statements (a)–(e) can be proved by induction on r and (f) is an immediate consequence of (e). □

Definition 2.3. We define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(K, E) &= \{f \in E^K : \text{for each } r \geq 0 \text{ the set } \frac{\Delta^r(f)(K^{(r+1)})}{r!} \text{ is bounded in } E\} \\ &= \{f \in E^K : \text{for each } r \geq 0 \text{ the set } \Delta^r(f)(K^{(r+1)}) \text{ is bounded in } E\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 2.4. *The following properties hold:*

- (a) $\mathcal{B}(K, E)$ is a vector subspace of E^K . Moreover, if E is an algebra, then $\mathcal{B}(K, E)$ is a subalgebra of E^K ;
- (b) If K is a perfect set and $f \in \mathcal{B}(K, E)$, then each $\Delta^r(f) : K^{(r+1)} \rightarrow E$ is uniformly continuous.

PROOF: (a) is obvious. For (b), let p be a continuous seminorm in E and let $M_{r,p} = \sup\{p(\Delta^r(f)(x_0, \dots, x_r)) : (x_0, \dots, x_r) \in K^{(r+1)}\}$. It suffices to prove that

$$(1) \quad p(\Delta^r(f)(x_0, \dots, x_r) - \Delta^r(f)(y_0, \dots, y_r)) \leq \frac{M_{r+1,p}}{r+1} \sum_{j=0}^r |x_j - y_j|.$$

This is clear when $x_i \neq y_j$ for every pair (i, j) . In fact, in this case,

$$\begin{aligned} & p(\Delta^r(f)(x_0, \dots, x_r) - \Delta^r(f)(y_0, \dots, y_r)) \\ & \leq \sum_{j=0}^r p(\Delta^r(f)(x_j, \dots, x_r, y_0, \dots, y_{j-1}) - \Delta^r(f)(x_{j+1}, \dots, x_r, y_0, \dots, y_j)) \\ & = \sum_{j=0}^r \frac{x_j - y_j}{r+1} p(\Delta^{r+1}(f)(x_j, \dots, x_r, y_0, \dots, y_j)) \leq \frac{M_{r+1,p}}{r+1} \sum_{j=0}^r |x_j - y_j|. \end{aligned}$$

Assume now that $x_{i_0} = y_{j_0}$ for some (i_0, j_0) . For $\epsilon > 0$ we can select $(z_0, \dots, z_r) \in K^{(r+1)}$, such that

- (a) $\sum_{j=0}^r |x_j - z_j| < \epsilon$,
- (b) $z_i \neq x_j$ y $z_i \neq y_j$ for all (i, j) .

Then, by the previous case we have

$$\begin{aligned} & p(\Delta^r(f)(x_0, \dots, x_r) - \Delta^r(f)(y_0, \dots, y_r)) \\ & \leq p(\Delta^r(f)(x_0, \dots, x_r) - \Delta^r(f)(z_0, \dots, z_r)) \\ & \quad + p(\Delta^r(f)(z_0, \dots, z_r) - \Delta^r(f)(y_0, \dots, y_r)) \\ & \leq \frac{M_{r+1,p}}{r+1} \sum_{j=0}^r |x_j - z_j| + \frac{M_{r+1,p}}{r+1} \sum_{j=0}^r |z_j - y_j| \\ & \leq \frac{M_{r+1,p}}{r+1} \left(2\epsilon + \sum_{j=0}^r |x_j - y_j| \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, (1) follows. □

In the sequel we assume that K is a perfect compact subset of the complex plane \mathbb{C} , and that E is a quasi-complete LC-space.

Corollary 2.5. *If $f \in \mathcal{B}(K, E)$, then all differential quotients $\Delta^r(f)$ can be extended to uniformly continuous maps $\Delta^r(f): K^{r+1} \rightarrow E$.*

We remark that all properties of Lemma 2.2 remain valid for these extensions. Now, we introduce the following notation:

$$f^{(r)}(a) = \Delta^r(f)(a, \dots, a) = \lim_{x_i \rightarrow a} \Delta^r(f)(x_0, \dots, x_r) \text{ for each } a \in K.$$

Remark 2.6. A map $f : K \rightarrow E$ is said to be differentiable in K if for every $a \in K$, there exists $f'(a) = \lim_{z \rightarrow a} \frac{f(z) - f(a)}{z - a}$ ($z \in K$) (see [2] for instance). From the previous discussion it follows that f has derivatives of any order when $f \in \mathcal{B}(K, E)$.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_r, z \in K$. We have:*

$$(2) \quad f(z) = \sum_{i=0}^r \frac{\Delta^i(f)(a_0, \dots, a_i)}{i!} \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} (z - a_j)^i + \frac{\Delta^{r+1}(f)(a_0, \dots, a_r, z)}{(r+1)!} \prod_{j=0}^r (z - a_j)^{r+1}.$$

In particular,

$$(3) \quad f(z) = \sum_{i=0}^r \frac{f^{(i)}(a)}{i!} (z - a)^i + \frac{\Delta^{r+1}(f)(a, \dots, a, z)}{(r+1)!} (z - a)^{r+1},$$

for all $a, z \in K$. Moreover, if we can connect the points $a, z \in K$ by a piecewise C^1 -curve $\Gamma \subseteq K$, then

$$(4) \quad \frac{\Delta^{r+1}f(a, \dots, a, z)}{(r+1)!} (z - a)^{r+1} = \int_{\Gamma} \frac{(z - \xi)^r}{r!} f^{(r+1)}(\xi) d\xi.$$

PROOF: (2) follows by induction on r and (4) follows by induction on r using integration by parts. □

Lemma 2.8. *Let U be open neighborhood of K . If $f : U \rightarrow E$ is a holomorphic map, then $f|_K \in \mathcal{B}(K, E)$ and there exists $R > 0$ such that for every continuous seminorm p in E we have*

$$\sup\{p(\Delta^r(f)(x_0, \dots, x_r)) \frac{R^r}{r!} : (x_0, \dots, x_r) \in K^{r+1}\} < \infty,$$

for every $r \geq 0$.

PROOF: Since for some $\delta > 0$ we have $W_\delta(K) \subseteq U$, we can take an adequate cycle $C \subseteq W_\delta(K)$ such that

$$\frac{\Delta^r(f)(x_0, \dots, x_r)}{r!} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_C \frac{f(z)}{\prod_{j=0}^r (z - x_j)} dz,$$

for every $(x_0, \dots, x_r) \in K^{r+1}$. If we set $R = \text{dist}(K, C)$ and $L = \text{length}(C)$ then for every continuous seminorm p in E we have $p(\Delta^r(f)(x_0, \dots, x_r)) \leq \frac{r!}{2\pi} \frac{M_p L}{R^{r+1}}$ where $M_p = \sup\{p(f(z)) : z \in W_\delta(K)\}$, which finishes the proof. □

Conversely we have

Proposition 2.9. *Let $f : K \rightarrow E$ be a map. The following assertions are equivalent:*

- (a) *there exist $R > 0$ and a holomorphic map $g : W_R(K) \rightarrow E$, such that $g|_K = f$.*
- (b) *there exist $R > 0$ and a bounded set $B \subseteq E$ such that $\frac{\Delta^r(f)(x_0, \dots, x_r)}{r!} R^r \in B$ for all $r \geq 0$ and all $(x_0, \dots, x_r) \in K^{(r+1)}$.*

If K is uniformly C^1 -regular, (a), (b) are equivalent to

- (c) *$f \in \mathcal{B}(K, E)$ and there exists $R > 0$, such that the sequence $\frac{f^{(r)}}{r!} R^r$ ($r \geq 0$) is bounded in $C(K, E)$.*

PROOF: Clearly (a) \Rightarrow (b) by the previous lemma. If (b) holds, then $f \in \mathcal{B}(K, E)$ and we can define holomorphic maps $f_a : B(a, R) \rightarrow E$ by setting $f_a(z) = \sum_{j \geq 0} \frac{f^{(j)}}{j!} (z - a)^j$ for each $a \in K$. Now (3) of Lemma 2.7 shows that $f_a|_{B(a, R) \cap K} = f|_{B(a, R) \cap K}$ for each $a \in K$, hence Technical Lemma 1.1 gives (a).

On the other hand, it is obvious that always (b) \Rightarrow (c). Conversely, assume (c) and that K is uniformly C^1 -regular, and let p any continuous seminorm in E . Then, for some $M_p > 0$, the inequality $p(\frac{f^{(r)}(\xi)}{r!}) \leq \frac{M_p}{R^r}$ holds for every $\xi \in K$ and $r \geq 0$. Hence, if Γ is a piecewise C^1 -curve in K with origin a and final point z , then, by Lemma 1.2,

$$p\left(\int_{\Gamma} \frac{(\xi - z)^r}{r!} f^{(r+1)}(\xi) d\xi\right) \leq \frac{M_p}{R^{r+1}} \text{length}(\Gamma)^{r+1}.$$

Since this inequality holds for every such Γ , (4) of Lemma 2.7 gives

$$p\left(\frac{\Delta^{r+1} f(a, \dots, a, z)}{(r + 1)!}\right) |z - a|^{r+1} \leq M_p \left(\frac{D(a, z)}{R}\right)^{r+1}.$$

But $D(a, z) \leq C|a - z|$ for some $C > 0$. Now, taking $R_1 < \min\{R/C, R\}$, we obtain

$$p\left(\frac{\Delta^{r+1} f(a, \dots, a, z)}{(r + 1)!}\right) |z - a|^{r+1} \leq M_p \left(\frac{|z - a|}{R_1}\right)^{r+1},$$

for all $a, z \in K$ and $r \geq 0$.

Finally if we define $f_a : B(a, R_1) \rightarrow E$ for each $a \in K$, as at the beginning of the proof, then (3) of Lemma 2.7 shows that $f(z) = f_a(z)$ for $z \in B(a, R_1) \cap K$. Hence the technical lemma applies again. □

Definition 2.10. Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ be a perfect compact set, E a quasi-complete LC-space and $R > 0$. We define $\Delta(R, K, E)$ as the subspace of $\mathcal{B}(K, E)$ of all maps $f : K \rightarrow E$ such that $\bigcup_{r \geq 0} \frac{\Delta^r(f)(K^{(r+1)})}{r!} R^r$ is bounded in E . We also

define $J(R, K, E)$ as the subspace of $\mathcal{B}(K, E)$ of all maps $f : K \rightarrow E$ such that $\bigcup_{r \geq 0} \frac{f^{(r)}(K)}{r!} R^r$ is bounded.

Clearly, from Remark 2.6 follows that $\Delta(R, K, E) \subseteq J(R, K, E)$ and if K is uniformly C^1 -regular these subspaces are equal. Furthermore, Proposition 2.9 has the following corollary:

Corollary 2.11. *The following assertions are true:*

- (a) $\mathcal{O}(K, E) = \bigcup_{R > 0} \Delta(R, K, E)$;
- (b) if K is uniformly C^1 -regular, then $\mathcal{O}(K, E) = \bigcup_{R > 0} J(R, K, E)$.

Example 2.12. Let $\Omega = \widehat{\mathbb{C}} - K$, where $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ is the Riemann sphere. We let $H(\Omega)$ denote the Fréchet space of all holomorphic maps $g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $g(\infty) = 0$. It is well known that $H(\Omega)$ can be identified with the strong dual of $\mathcal{O}(K)$ ([3]).

We define $\phi : K \rightarrow H(\Omega)$ by $\phi(a)(\xi) = (\xi - a)^{-1}$ ($\xi \in \Omega, a \in K$). It is easy to see that $\Delta^1(\phi)(a_0, a_1) = \phi(a_0)\phi(a_1)$, and in general we have $\Delta^r(\phi)(a_0, \dots, a_r) = r! \prod_{i=0}^r \phi(a_i)$.

Now we define the sequence H_m ($m \geq 1$) of compact sets $H_m = \{z \in \Omega : d(z, K) \geq \frac{1}{m}\}$. The seminorms $p_m(g) = \sup\{|g(z)| : z \in H_m\}$ form a fundamental system of seminorms in $H(\Omega)$. We let E_m denote the Banach space obtained by completing $H(\Omega)$ with respect to p_m , so that $H(\Omega) \simeq \varprojlim E_m$ via the maps $i_m : H(\Omega) \rightarrow E_m$. Then, we have for each m, r

$$(5) \quad p_m\left(\frac{\Delta^r(\phi)(a_0, \dots, a_r)}{r!}\right) = p_m\left(\prod_{i=0}^r \phi(a_i)\right) = m^{r+1}.$$

Hence, for a fixed m , the map $i_m \circ \phi : K \rightarrow E_m$ can be extended to a holomorphic map in a neighborhood K , thanks to Proposition 2.9. Nevertheless, the same formula (5) and the same argument shows that it is impossible to get an extension of $\phi : K \rightarrow H(\Omega)$. Consequently, $\mathcal{O}(K, H(\Omega)) \neq \varprojlim \mathcal{O}(K, E_m)$, since $\phi \in \varprojlim \mathcal{O}(K, E_m)$ but $\phi \notin \mathcal{O}(K, H(\Omega))$. Note that ϕ is a “virtual holomorphic map”, in the terminology of [3].

REFERENCES

- [1] Bochnak J., Siciak J., *Analytic functions in topological spaces*, Studia Math. **39** (1971), 77–112.
- [2] Dales H.G., Davie A., *Quasianalytic Banach function algebras*, J. Funct. Anal. **13** (1973), 28–50.
- [3] Grothendieck A., *Sur certains espaces de fonctions holomorphes. I–II*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **192** (1953), 35–64, 77–95.
- [4] Kriegl A., Michor P., *The convenient setting of global analysis*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 53 (Chapter III), American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997.

- [5] Malgrange B., *Ideals of Differentiable Functions*, Oxford Univ. Press, London, 1966.
- [6] Tougeron J.C., *Idéaux de fonctions différentiables*, Ergebrisse 71, Springer, Heidelberg, 1972.

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, FACULTAD DE CS. EXACTAS Y NATURALES, UNIVERSIDAD DE BUENOS AIRES, PABELLÓN 1 - CIUDAD UNIVERSITARIA, (1428) BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA

E-mail: gcarbo@dm.uba.ar

pucho@dm.uba.ar

(Received September 24, 2003, revised March 20, 2004)