

# SHCHERBINA'S THEOREM FOR FINELY HOLOMORPHIC FUNCTIONS

ARMEN EDIGARIAN AND JAN WIEGERINCK

ABSTRACT. We prove an analogue of Sadullaev's theorem concerning the size of the set where a maximal totally real manifold  $M$  can meet a pluripolar set.  $M$  has to be of class  $C^1$  only. This readily leads to a version of Shcherbina's theorem for  $C^1$  functions  $f$  that are defined in a neighborhood of certain compact sets  $K \subset \mathbb{C}$ . If the graph  $\Gamma_f(K)$  is pluripolar, then  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{z}} = 0$  in the closure of the fine interior of  $K$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $P \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  be any subset. We say that  $P$  is *pluripolar* if there exists a plurisubharmonic function  $u$  on  $\mathbb{C}^n$ ,  $u \not\equiv -\infty$ , such that  $P \subset \{u = -\infty\}$ . It is well known that this global definition is equivalent to the local definition (see [8]).

A. Sadullaev (see [12]) proved the following result

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $P \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  be a pluripolar set and let  $M$  be a maximal totally real submanifold of class  $C^3$  in some domain  $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ . Then  $P \cap M$  has zero measure on  $M$ .*

For the definition of a maximal totally real submanifold see Section 3. B. Coupet (see [3]) proved Theorem 1.1 for  $M$  of class  $C^2$ . We are interested in a similar problem but for manifolds  $M$  of class  $C^1$ . Before we present our result, we need the following definition. Let  $L \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  be any subset and let  $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}^n$  be a point. We say that  $L$  is thin at  $z_0$  if there exists a neighborhood  $U$  of  $z_0$  in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  and a negative plurisubharmonic function  $u$  on  $U$  such that  $u \leq -1$  on  $L \setminus \{z_0\} \cap U$  and  $u(z_0) > -\frac{1}{4}$ .

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $P \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  be a pluripolar set and let  $M \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  be a  $C^1$  maximal totally real manifold. Then  $M \setminus P$  is not thin at any point of  $M$ .*

The primary motivation of our paper was the following question: suppose that  $E \subset \mathbb{C}$  is any subset and  $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is any function. What is the relation between pluripotential properties of the graph of  $f$  over  $E$ , i.e.,

$$(1.1) \quad \Gamma_f(E) = \{(z, f(z)) : z \in E\},$$

and analytic properties of  $f$ ? To be more precise, recall that a set  $P \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  is called *pluripolar* if there exists a plurisubharmonic function  $u$  on  $\mathbb{C}^n$ ,  $u \not\equiv -\infty$ , such that  $P \subset \{u = -\infty\}$ . It is well known that this global definition is equivalent to the local definition (see [8]). In particular, if  $E$  is an open set and  $f$  is holomorphic on  $E$ , then  $\Gamma_f(E)$  is pluripolar in  $\mathbb{C}^2$ . If  $E$  is not an open set (for example, if  $E$  is a compact set without

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 32U15, 32H40, 31C40.

interior points) then the situation is very complicated, see e.g. [2] for  $E$  equal to the unit circle and  $f$  a quasianalytic function, or [4] for  $E$  a fine domain and  $f$  a finely holomorphic function, cf. Section 2 below.

The inverse problem, i.e., to deduce some analytic properties of  $f$  from the pluripolarity of  $\Gamma_f(E)$ , seems to be even more difficult. Recently, N. Shcherbina, [13], proved the following result, which was conjectured by T. Nishino.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $D \subset \mathbb{C}$  be a domain and let  $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be a continuous function. Assume that  $\Gamma_f(D)$  is pluripolar in  $\mathbb{C}^2$ . Then  $f$  is holomorphic on  $D$ .*

Shcherbina also mentioned (see Remark on page 204 in [13]) that one can prove Theorem 1.3 for a  $C^1$ -function  $f$  using Bishop's technique (see [1], c.f. also [9]). The assumption that  $f$  is not holomorphic would imply that  $M = \Gamma_f(D)$  is a totally real manifold, to which a family of analytic discs can be attached, which eventually leads to a contradiction.

What if one drops the assumption that  $f$  is defined on a domain? Using results of Coupet (see [3]), which are based on the approach of S. Pinchuk (see [11]) and A. Sadullaev (see [12]), T. Edlund proved in his thesis [5] the following result for compact sets. Actually, Edlund states less, but Theorem 1.4 follows immediately from his proof.

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $K \subset \mathbb{C}$  be a compact set and let  $f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be a  $C^2$ -function such that the graph of  $f$  over  $K$  is pluripolar in  $\mathbb{C}^2$ . Put*

$$S = \{z \in K : \text{for any } \epsilon > 0 \text{ the set } K \cap \mathbb{D}(z, \epsilon) \text{ has positive Lebesgue measure on } \mathbb{C}\}.$$

*Then  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{z}} = 0$  on  $S$ . In particular,  $f \in R(S)$ .*

Here,  $\mathbb{D}(z_0, r) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - z_0| < r\}$  and  $R(S)$  is the set of all continuous functions  $g : K \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  which can be uniformly approximated (in sup-norm) on  $S$  by functions holomorphic in a neighborhood of  $S$ . Edlund mentioned that he was unable to prove this for functions  $f$  that are merely  $C^1$ . Also Coupet wrote about problems with  $C^1$ . Generally, the problems with  $C^1$  stem from the fact that the Bishop construction of a family of discs yields at best a  $C^{k-\epsilon}$ -regular family of boundaries of the disc, where  $k$  is the regularity of  $f$ . Therefore, if  $f$  is  $C^1$  we have no differentiable family of boundary curves in  $M$ , and we are unable to use arguments involving the Jacobian of a mapping or the implicit function theorem for showing a diffeomorphism.

The main purpose of the present paper is to show that for  $C^1$ -functions, we still can prove a similar result for a smaller class of sets  $S$ . However the class is large enough to include the so-called *fine domains*. See Section 2 below, where we give a reformulation of our result in the language of fine domains and finely holomorphic functions. So, as a corollary of Theorem 1.2 we get

**Theorem 1.5.** *Let  $K \subset \mathbb{C}$  be a compact set and let  $f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be a  $C^1$ -function such that the graph of  $f$  over  $K$  is pluripolar in  $\mathbb{C}^2$ . Put*

$$S = \{z \in K : \text{the set } \mathbb{C} \setminus K \text{ is thin at } z\}.$$

*Then  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{z}} = 0$  on  $\bar{S}$ . In particular,  $f \in R(\bar{S})$ .*

We recall the definition of a thin set below.

**Acknowledgement.** Part of the paper was done while the first author was visiting Indiana University Mathematics Department as a Fulbright Scholar. He thanks the Department for its warm hospitality, especially Eric Bedford and Norm Levenberg.

## 2. THINNESS, FINE TOPOLOGY AND FINE HOLOMORPHY

We say that a set  $F \subset \mathbb{C}$  is *thin* at a point  $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$  if there exists a subharmonic function  $u$  on  $\mathbb{C}$  such that  $u \leq -1$  on  $F$  and  $u(z_0) > -1$ .

Cartan already observed that when we provide  $\mathbb{C}$  with the *fine topology*, i.e. the coarsest topology that makes all subharmonic functions continuous,  $F$  is thin at  $a$  can be expressed as  $a$  is not in the fine closure of  $F$ . It is a simple observation that if  $\Omega$  is finely open and  $z \in \Omega$  then there exists a compact set  $K \subset \Omega$  which is a fine neighborhood of  $z$ .

On fine domains one can introduce finely holomorphic functions, which have many properties much similar to holomorphic functions, cf. [6].

A function  $f$  on a fine domain  $\Omega$  is called *finely holomorphic* on  $\Omega$ , if for every  $z \in \Omega$  there exists a compact fine neighborhood  $z \in K \subset \Omega$ , such that  $f$  is a uniform limit on  $K$  of rational functions with poles off  $K$ . Equivalently, there exists a  $C^1$ -function  $f^*$  on  $\mathbb{C}$  such that  $f = f^*$  on  $K$  and  $\partial f^* = 0$  on  $K$ .

Thus we can reformulate Theorem 1.5 in the language of fine holomorphy as follows.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $D \subset \mathbb{C}$  be a finely open set and let  $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be a function. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1)  $f$  is finely holomorphic on  $D$ ;
- (2)  $\Gamma_f(D)$  is pluripolar and for any point  $z_0 \in D$  there exist a compact fine neighborhood  $K$  of  $z_0$  and a  $C^1$ -function  $f_K : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  such that  $f_K = f$  on  $K$ .

*Proof.* The implication (1)  $\implies$  (2) was proved in the paper [4]. The other implication follows directly from Theorem 1.5 and the definition of finely holomorphic function.  $\square$

## 3. PROOF OF THEOREMS 1.2 AND 1.5

Recall that a submanifold  $M$  of  $\mathbb{C}^n$  is maximal totally real if it has real dimension  $n$  and the tangent space  $T_z M$  at any point  $z \in M$  does not contain a complex line.

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* Fix  $z_0 \in M$ . Without loss of generality we may assume that  $z_0 = 0 \in \mathbb{C}^n$ .

According to E. Bishop (see [1]) because  $M$  is maximal totally real we may write in some neighborhood of the origin  $M = \{(x_1 + ih_1(x_1, \dots, x_n), \dots, x_n + ih_n(x_1, \dots, x_n))\}$ , where  $h_1, \dots, h_n$  are  $C^1$  functions in a neighborhood of 0 such that  $h_1(0) = \dots = h_n(0) = 0$  and  $\frac{\partial h_j}{\partial x_k}(0, 0) = 0$  for  $j, k = 1, \dots, n$ .

We recall the principal result from Coupet's paper [3]. Let  $\mathbb{D}$  be the unit disc in  $\mathbb{C}$  and let  $\mathbb{T}$  be its boundary. We denote by  $T : L^p(\mathbb{T}) \rightarrow L^p(\mathbb{T})$ ,  $p \geq 1$ , the Hilbert transform

(or, harmonic conjugate transform). In addition, for an  $L^1$  function  $\psi$  on  $\mathbb{T}$  we denote its harmonic extension by

$$(3.1) \quad \tilde{\psi}(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \psi(e^{i\theta}) P(e^{i\theta}, z) d\theta,$$

where  $P(e^{i\theta}, z) = \frac{1-|z|^2}{|e^{i\theta}-z|^2}$  is the Poisson kernel. In particular, for  $h \in L^1(\mathbb{T})$ ,

$$(3.2) \quad \tilde{\psi} + i\widetilde{T(\psi)}$$

is a holomorphic function on  $\mathbb{D}$ .

Recall the following result of B. Coupet (see Théorème 1 in [3]).

**Theorem 3.1.** *Assume that  $p > 2n + 1$ . Then there exists a constant  $\delta_0 > 0$  not depending on  $h, n$  and  $p$  such that for any function  $k \in C^1(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^{2n}; \mathbb{R}^n)$  with compact support and with  $\|k\|_{W^{1,p}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^{2n})} \leq \delta_0$ , the equation  $u = T(h \circ u) + k$  has a unique solution  $u \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^{2n})$ .*

*Moreover, the harmonic extensions of  $u$  and  $h \circ u$  are of class  $C^1$  on  $\mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  and the mapping  $\mathbb{R}^{2n} \ni w \mapsto u(\cdot, w) \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{T})$  is continuous.*

Fix  $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T})$  such that  $\varphi = 0$  on  $\mathbb{T}^+ = \{e^{i\theta} : |\theta| \leq \frac{\pi}{2}\}$  and  $\varphi < 0$  on  $\mathbb{T} \setminus \mathbb{T}^+$ . By Theorem 3.1 we get (see also Part II in [3]) that there exist a small ball  $B$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  centered at the origin and a unique function  $u = u(z, \zeta, \xi) : \mathbb{D} \times B \times B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  such that

- (1)  $u$  is harmonic in the first variable;
- (2)  $u \in C(\bar{\mathbb{D}} \times B \times B) \cap W^{1,p}(\mathbb{D} \times B \times B)$  for any fixed  $p > 2n + 1$ ;
- (3)  $u \in C^1(\mathbb{D} \times B \times B)$ ;
- (4)  $u(e^{i\theta}, \zeta, \xi) = -T(h(u(\cdot, \zeta, \xi)))(e^{i\theta}) + \zeta - \xi T(\varphi)(e^{i\theta})$ .

Note that  $u(e^{i\theta}, \zeta, 0) = \zeta$  and  $u(0, \zeta, \xi) = \zeta$ . Define  $H : \mathbb{T} \times B \times B \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  by

$$(3.3) \quad H(e^{i\theta}, \zeta, \xi) = u(e^{i\theta}, \zeta, \xi) + i \left( h(u(e^{i\theta}, \zeta, \xi)) + \xi \varphi(e^{i\theta}) \right) = (u + iTu)(e^{i\theta}, \zeta, \xi),$$

where (3) was used in the last equality. Then for  $\zeta, \xi \in B$ ,  $H(e^{i\theta}, \zeta, \xi) \in M$  for  $|\theta| < \pi/2$ . Moreover, for fixed  $\zeta, \xi$  the function  $\tilde{H}(\cdot, \zeta, \xi)$  is holomorphic.

Define  $H : \mathbb{T} \times B \times B \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  by

$$(3.4) \quad H(e^{i\theta}, \zeta, \xi) = u(e^{i\theta}, \zeta, \xi) + i \left( h(u(e^{i\theta}, \zeta, \xi)) + \xi \varphi(e^{i\theta}) \right) = (u + iTu)(e^{i\theta}, \zeta, \xi),$$

where (3) was used in the last equality. Then for  $\zeta, \xi \in B$ ,  $H(e^{i\theta}, \zeta, \xi) \in M$  for  $|\theta| < \pi/2$ . Moreover, for fixed  $\zeta, \xi$  the function  $\tilde{H}(\cdot, \zeta, \xi)$  is holomorphic. We have

$$(3.5) \quad \tilde{H}(0, \zeta, \xi) = \zeta + \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} h(u(e^{i\theta}, \zeta, \xi)) d\theta + i\xi \tilde{\varphi}(0).$$

Because  $h(x) = o(x)$ , we have  $\frac{\partial \tilde{H}_j}{\partial \zeta_k}(0, 0, 0) = \delta_{jk}$  and  $\frac{\partial \tilde{H}_j}{\partial \xi_k}(0, 0, 0) = \delta_{jk} i \tilde{\varphi}(0)$ , where  $\delta_{jk} = 1$  for  $j = k$  and  $\delta_{jk} = 0$  for  $j \neq k$ .

Now we will assume that  $M \setminus P$  is thin at 0 and show that this leads to a contradiction. Put  $L = M \setminus (P \cup \{0\})$ . Fix a neighborhood  $W \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  of 0 and a negative plurisubharmonic

function  $v$  in  $W$  such that  $v \leq -1$  on  $W \cap L$  and  $v(0) > -\frac{1}{4}$ . We put  $S' = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : v(z) > -\frac{1}{3}\}$ . Note that  $0 \in S'$ .

Fix also a plurisubharmonic function  $U$  on  $\mathbb{C}^n$  such that  $U = -\infty$  on  $P$ . Then for fixed  $\zeta, \xi$  the function  $u(w, \zeta, \xi) = U(H(w, \zeta, \xi))$  is subharmonic on  $\mathbb{D}$ .

We are interested in the set  $\{(\theta, \zeta, \xi) : H(e^{i\theta}, \zeta, \xi) \notin L\}$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $\zeta, \xi$  be near zero such that  $H(\overline{\mathbb{D}}, \zeta, \xi) \subset W$  and that  $H(0, \zeta, \xi) \in S'$ . Then  $\{\theta : |\theta| < \frac{\pi}{2}, H(e^{i\theta}, \zeta, \xi) \notin L\}$  is of positive measure.*

*Proof.* We have

$$(3.6) \quad v(H(0, \zeta, \xi)) \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\frac{\pi}{2}}^{\frac{\pi}{2}} v(H(e^{i\theta}, \zeta, \xi)) d\theta.$$

If for almost all  $\theta \in (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})$  we have  $H(e^{i\theta}, \zeta, \xi) \in L$  then

$$(3.7) \quad -\frac{1}{3} < v(H(0, \zeta, \xi)) \leq -\frac{1}{2}.$$

A contradiction. □

**Lemma 3.3.** *For a set of positive measure  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  we have  $H(0, \zeta, \xi) \in S'$ ,  $(\zeta, \xi) \in A$ .*

*Proof.* Indeed,  $\det[\frac{\partial H}{\partial \zeta}](0, 0, 0) = i$ . Hence, for small  $\zeta, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$  we have  $\det[\frac{\partial H}{\partial \zeta}](0, \zeta, \xi) \neq 0$ . Note that for any fixed  $\xi$  near zero the set  $(H)^{-1}(S')$  is of positive measure. □

The set  $\{H(0, \zeta, \xi) : (\zeta, \xi) \in A\}$  is of positive measure in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , because  $H$  is  $C^1$  at the origin. Then we get that  $U \equiv -\infty$  on  $\mathbb{C}^n$ . A contradiction. □

*Proof of Theorem 1.5.* Fix a point  $z_0 \in S$ . We want to show that  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{z}}(z_0) = 0$ . Assume that this is not the case. Then in some neighborhood of  $z_0$  we have

$$(3.8) \quad \frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{z}} \neq 0.$$

We put  $M = \{(z, f(z)) : z \text{ near } z_0\}$ . From (3.8) we see that  $M$  is a maximal totally real submanifold. This would contradict Theorem 1.2, where  $P = \{(z, f(z)) : z \in K\}$  is the pluripolar set. □

#### 4. AN EXAMPLE

The following example indicates how the compact sets that we considered may come about.

**Example 4.1.** Take sequences  $a_n \searrow 0$ ,  $r_n > 0$ , and take  $K = \{0\} \cup \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \overline{\mathbb{D}(a_n, r_n)}$ . Note that for any  $C^1$ -function  $f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  if  $\Gamma_f(K)$  is pluripolar then by Shcherbina's result  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{z}}(0) = 0$ . Now, take  $r_n$  so small that all discs  $\mathbb{D}(a_n, r_n)$  are disjoint.

Fix one of these discs, say  $\mathbb{D}(a_m, r_m)$ . We take a dense subset  $\{b_n\}$  in this disc. If we carefully remove balls about points  $b_n$  then we may obtain a set  $L_m$ , so that  $\mathbb{C} \setminus L_m$  is thin at  $a_m$ . We do this for all discs and we get a new compact set  $\tilde{K} = \{0\} \cup \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} L_m$  such that its interior is empty. Again take a  $C^1$  function  $f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  such that  $\Gamma_f(\tilde{K})$  is pluripolar.

Then neither Shcherbina's nor Edlund's result can be applied. But our main theorem gives  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{z}}(0) = 0$ . The reader can find similar, but even more sophisticated examples of this type.

#### REFERENCES

1. E. Bishop, *Differential manifolds in complex euclidean spaces*, Duke Math. J. 32 (1965), 1–22.
2. D. Coman, N. Levenberg, E.A. Poletsky, *Smooth submanifolds intersecting any analytic curve in a discrete set*, Math. Ann., **332** (2005), 55–65.
3. B. Coupet, *Construction de disques analytiques et régularité de fonctions holomorphes au bord*, Math. Zeit., 209 (1992), 179–204.
4. A. Edigarian, S. El Marzguioui, J. Wiegerinck, *The image of a finely holomorphic mapping is pluripolar* Preprint 2007 <http://front.math.ucdavis.edu/0701.5136>
5. T. Edlund, *Pluripolar sets and pluripolar hulls*, Thesis *Uppsala Dissertations in Mathematics* **41**.
6. B. Fuglede, *Sur les fonctions finement holomorphes*, Ann. Inst. Fourier. **31.4** (1981), 57–88.
7. T. Gamelin, *Uniform algebras*, Chelsea, New York, 1984.
8. B. Josefson, *On the equivalence between locally polar and globally polar sets for plurisubharmonic functions on  $(\mathbb{C}^n)$* , Ark. Math. **16** (1978), 109–115.
9. G. M. Khenkin & E. M. Chirka, *Boundary properties of holomorphic functions of several complex variables*, Journal of Mathematical Sciences, **Vol.5**, Number 5, (1976), 612–687 (translated from Russian).
10. M. Klimek, *Pluripotential Theory*, London Math. Soc. Monographs, 6, Clarendon Press, 1991.
11. S. Pinchuk, *A boundary uniqueness theorem for holomorphic functions*, Math. Notes 15 (1974), 116–120.
12. A. Sadullaev, *A boundary uniqueness theorem in  $\mathbb{C}^n$* , Mat. Sb. 101 (1976), 501–514.
13. N. Shcherbina, *Pluripolar graphs are holomorphic*, Acta Math., 194 (2005), 203–216.

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, JAGIELLONIAN UNIVERSITY, ŁOJASIEWICZA 6/2117, 30-348 KRAKÓW, POLAND

*E-mail address:* armen.edigarian@uj.edu.pl

KdV INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM, PLANTAGE MUIDERGRACHT, 24, 1018 TV, AMSTERDAM, THE NETHERLANDS

*E-mail address:* j.j.o.o.wiegerinck@uva.nl