

# TESTING HOLOMORPHY ON CURVES

BUMA L. FRIDMAN AND DAOWEI MA

ABSTRACT. For a domain  $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  we construct a continuous foliation of  $D$  into one real dimensional curves such that any function  $f \in C^1(D)$  which can be extended holomorphically into some neighborhood of each curve in the foliation will be holomorphic on  $D$ .

This paper complements the study of the following general question. Let  $f$  be a function on a domain  $D$  in complex  $n$ -dimensional space, and its restrictions on each element of a given family of subsets of  $D$  is holomorphic. When can one claim that  $f$  has to be holomorphic in  $D$ ?

This is a natural question arising from the fundamental Hartogs theorem stating that a function  $f$  in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ ,  $n > 1$ , is holomorphic if it is holomorphic in each variable separately, that is,  $f$  is holomorphic in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  if it is holomorphic on every complex line parallel to an axis. The complex lines parallel to an axis form a continuous foliation of  $\mathbb{C}^n$  into two real dimensional planes. So if a function is holomorphic along each component of these  $n$  foliations, then it is holomorphic on  $\mathbb{C}^n$ . We are interested in finding a one family of one real dimensional curves forming a foliation such that a similar theorem will hold. There is a body of interesting work on testing the holomorphy property on curves: see [A1-A3, AG, E, G1-G3, T1, T2] and references in those articles. Some of these results assume a holomorphic extension into the inside of each closed curve in a given family, others a “Morera-type” property.

Below we use the following definition. Let  $S \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ . We say that  $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is holomorphic if  $f$  is a restriction on  $S$  of a function holomorphic in some open neighborhood of  $S$ . We prove the following

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  be a domain. Then there exists a continuous foliation  $E$  of  $D$  into one (real) dimensional curves, such that any  $C^1$  function on  $D$  which is holomorphic on each of the curves of  $E$ , is holomorphic on  $D$ .*

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 32A10, 32A99 .

*Key words and phrases.* analytic functions, continuous foliation, Hartogs theorem.

The needed foliation will be constructed as a homeomorphic image of the natural continuous foliation of  $\overline{D}$  by segments parallel to the axis  $\operatorname{Re} z_1$ .

First we need the following notion (see [FM]). Let  $S \subset \mathbb{C}$ ,  $p \in S$ . A point  $t$  in  $T := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = 1\}$  is said to be a limit direction of  $S$  at  $p$  if there exists a sequence  $(q_j)$  in  $S$  such that  $\lim_j q_j = p$  and  $\lim_j \tau(p, q_j) = t$ , where  $\tau(p, q_j) := (q_j - p)/|q_j - p|$ .

**Lemma 1.2.** *Let  $U \subset \mathbb{C}$  be an open set,  $p \in U \cap S$  and there are at least two limit directions  $t_1, t_2$  of  $S$  at  $p$ . Suppose a function  $f \in C^1(U)$  is holomorphic on  $S \cap U$ . If  $t_1 \neq \pm t_2$  then  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{z}} = 0$  at  $p$ .*

*Proof.* The derivatives of  $f$  along linearly independent directions  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  coincide with derivatives of a holomorphic function in the neighborhood of  $p$ . The statement now follows from the Cauchy-Riemann equations.  $\square$

*Example 1.3.* Consider a set  $\gamma \subset \mathbb{C}$ , which is an angle ( $\gamma = \angle$ ) in a neighborhood of a point  $p \in \gamma$  formed by two linear segments. If this angle  $\theta$  satisfies  $0 < \theta < \pi$ , then at the tip of the angle  $p \in \gamma$ ,  $\gamma$  has two linearly independent directions.

In general if in a neighborhood of a point  $p \in \gamma$  the curve  $\gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^m$  lies in a two real dimensional plane  $M$  and forms an angle  $0 < \theta < \pi$  there, we will say that  $\gamma$  has an angular point at  $p$ .

For the construction of the continuous foliation in the Theorem 1.1 we also need the following general statement.

**Lemma 1.4.** *Let  $M$  be a two-dimensional plane in  $\mathbb{R}^m$  with  $m \geq 2$ , let  $p$  be a point in  $M$ , let  $U$  be a neighborhood of  $p$  in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , and let  $\gamma$  be a  $C^\infty$  curve passing through  $p$  and relatively closed in  $U$ . Then there is a homeomorphism  $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  such that (a) the function  $\Phi$  is a ( $C^\infty$ ) diffeomorphism on  $\mathbb{R}^m - \{p\}$ , (b) the restriction of  $\Phi$  to  $\mathbb{R}^m - U$  is the identity map, (c) a neighborhood of  $\Phi(p)$  in  $\Phi(\gamma)$  lies in  $M$ , and (d) the curve  $\Phi(\gamma)$  has an angular point at  $\Phi(p)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_m$  be the standard basis of  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , i.e.,  $e_1 = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$ ,  $e_2 = (0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$ , etc. Choose a vector  $v$  parallel to  $M$  such that  $v$  and the tangent vector of  $\gamma$  at  $p$  are linearly independent. Without loss of generality, we assume that  $p = 0$ ,  $v = e_2$ , and  $M$  is spanned by  $e_1$  and  $e_2$ . Let  $S = \mathbb{R}e_2 = \{te_2 \in \mathbb{R}^m : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ . For  $r > 0$  let  $B_r$  denote the open ball in  $\mathbb{R}^m$  of center 0 and radius  $r$ . There is a neighborhood  $V$  of 0, a  $\delta > 0$ , and a diffeomorphism  $G : V \rightarrow B_{3\delta}$  such that  $V \subset\subset U$ ,  $G(\gamma \cap V) = \mathbb{R}e_1 \cap B_{3\delta}$ , and  $G(S \cap V) = \mathbb{R}e_2 \cap B_{3\delta}$ .

Let  $\omega : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a  $C^\infty$  function such that  $0 \leq \omega(t) \leq 1$  for all  $t$ ,  $\omega(t) = 0$  for  $|t| \geq 2$ , and  $\omega(t) = 1$  for  $|t| \leq 1$ . Define a vector field  $X$  on  $\mathbb{R}^m$  by  $X(y) = \omega(|y|/\delta)(y_1 + y_2)(e_2 - e_1)$ , where  $y = \sum_{j=1}^m y_j e_j$ . Let  $\theta : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  be the associated action. Define  $\lambda : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  by  $\lambda(y) = \theta(1, y)$ . Then  $\lambda$  is a diffeomorphism, and the restriction of  $\lambda$  to  $\mathbb{R}^m - B_{2\delta}$  is the identity map, since  $X = 0$  there. We claim that for  $-\delta < s < \delta$ ,  $\lambda(se_1) = se_2$ . Indeed, it is straightforward to verify that the curve  $\tau(t) = s(1-t)e_1 + ste_2$  satisfies  $\tau(0) = se_1$ ,  $\tau(1) = se_2$ , and  $\tau'(t) = X(\tau(t))$  for  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ , and hence  $\tau|_{[0,1]}$  is a segment of an integral curve of  $X$ .

Define a diffeomorphism  $g : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  by

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} G^{-1} \circ \lambda \circ G(x), & \text{if } x \in G^{-1}(B_{2\delta}), \\ x, & \text{if } x \notin G^{-1}(B_{2\delta}). \end{cases}$$

Then  $g(0) = 0$ , and  $V_1 \cap g(\gamma) \subset S \subset M$ , where  $V_1 := G^{-1}(B_\delta)$ .

Choose a  $K > 0$  so that the function  $\psi(t) := K\omega(2t)(1-|t|)$  satisfies the Lipschitz condition  $|\psi(t_1) - \psi(t_2)| \leq |t_1 - t_2|/2$ . It is clear that for each  $\eta > 0$  the function  $\psi_\eta(t) := \eta\psi(t/\eta)$  satisfies the same Lipschitz condition.

Choose an  $\eta > 0$  such that  $B_\eta \subset\subset V_1$ . Define  $h : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  by  $h(x) = x + \psi_\eta(|x|)e_1$ . Then  $h$  is a homeomorphism, and it is a diffeomorphism away from the origin. For  $x \in \mathbb{R}^m - B_\eta$ ,  $h(x) = x$ . The set  $h(g(\gamma) \cap B_{\eta/2})$  lies in  $M$  and equals  $\{K(\eta - |t|)e_1 + te_2 : -\eta/2 < t < \eta/2\}$ , which is the union of two line segments forming an angle  $2 \tan^{-1}(1/K)$  at the point  $K\eta e_1$ .

Let  $\Phi = h \circ g$ . Then  $\Phi$  has all the prescribed properties.  $\square$

We now proceed with the construction of  $E$  and proof of the Theorem 1.1.

*Proof.* Consider  $E_0$  a natural continuous foliation of  $D$  by segments parallel to the axis  $Rez_1$ .

1. Pick a sequence  $\{w_k\} \subset D$ , such that  $\overline{\{w_m\}_{m \equiv l \pmod{n}}} = \overline{D}$  for every  $l = 1, \dots, n$ . We also can choose the sequence in such a way that no two points lie on the same line segment of  $E_0$ , so we assume that each of these points  $w_k$  lies on a unique segment  $L_k$ .

2. We now proceed by induction on  $k$ .

(1). For  $k = 1$  pick  $\varepsilon_1 > 0$  so small that the ball  $\overline{B}(w_1, \varepsilon_1) \subset D$ . Use Lemma 1.4 to create a homeomorphism  $\Phi_1 : \overline{D} \rightarrow \overline{D}$  which is a diffeomorphism on  $D \setminus \{w_1\}$  with the following properties. At the point  $\Phi_1(w_1)$  the image  $\Phi_1(L_1)$  has an angle  $0 < \alpha_1 < \pi$ , and that angle (as a portion of  $\Phi_1(L_1)$ ) lies in the plane parallel to  $z_1$ . Let

$d_1 = \min_{d(z,w) \geq 1/2} d(\Phi_1(z), \Phi_1(w))$ , where  $d$  is the Euclidean distance between two points in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ .

(2). Consider now step  $k = s + 1$ . By now we have constructed a homeomorphism  $\Phi_j : \overline{D} \rightarrow \overline{D}$  which is diffeomorphic on  $D \setminus \{w_1, \dots, w_j\}$ ,  $\varepsilon_j > 0$ , and  $d_j = \min_{d(z,w) \geq 1/(j+1)} d(\Phi_j(z), \Phi_j(w))$  for all  $j \leq s$ . Also for all  $j \leq s$  we assume that  $\Phi_s(L_j) = \Phi_j(L_j)$ , and that  $\Phi_j(L_j)$  has an angular point at  $\Phi_j(w_j)$  in the plane parallel to  $z_l$  axis, where  $l \equiv j \pmod{n}$ .

Pick now  $\varepsilon_{s+1} > 0$  such that the following four conditions hold:

- (a)  $\varepsilon_{s+1} < \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_s$ .
- (b)  $B(\Phi_s(w_{s+1}), \varepsilon_{s+1}) \subset D \setminus \{\cup_{j \leq s} \Phi_s(L_j)\}$ .
- (c)  $\varepsilon_{s+1} < \frac{1}{16}d_s$ .
- (d)  $\varepsilon_{s+1}$  is so small that one can use Lemma 1.4 to create the specific

perturbation  $\tilde{\Phi}_{s+1} : \overline{D} \rightarrow \overline{D}$  inside  $B(\Phi_s(w_{s+1}), \varepsilon_{s+1})$  that makes an angle  $0 < \alpha_{s+1} < \pi$  at the point  $\tilde{\Phi}_{s+1}(\Phi_s(w_{s+1}))$  in the plane parallel to  $z_l$  axis, where  $l \equiv s + 1 \pmod{n}$ , and is the identity map outside  $B(\Phi_s(w_{s+1}), \varepsilon_{s+1})$ .

Consider now  $\Phi_{s+1} : \overline{D} \rightarrow \overline{D}$ , which is defined the following way:  
 $\Phi_{s+1} = \tilde{\Phi}_{s+1} \circ \Phi_s$ .

One can see that  $\Phi_{s+1}(z)$  is a well defined homeomorphism which is diffeomorphic on  $D \setminus \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{s+1}\}$ . Also for all  $j \leq s+1$ ,  $\Phi_{s+1}(L_j) = \Phi_j(L_j)$ . Let  $d_{s+1} = \min_{d(z,w) \geq 1/(s+2)} d(\Phi_{s+1}(z), \Phi_{s+1}(w))$ .

Consider now  $\Phi_0 = \lim_j \Phi_j$ . The limit exists since  $\|\Phi_{s+1} - \Phi_s\| < \frac{1}{2^{s-1}}\varepsilon_1$  for all  $s$ . We shall prove that  $\Phi_0$  is a homeomorphism from  $\overline{D}$  onto  $\overline{D}$ . All we need to check is that for two points  $z \neq w$  in  $D$ ,  $\Phi_0(z) \neq \Phi_0(w)$ . Indeed, find the smallest  $s$ , such that  $d(z, w) \geq \frac{1}{s+1}$ . By the construction  $d(\Phi_s(z), \Phi_s(w)) \geq d_s$ ,  $\|\Phi_{j+1} - \Phi_j\| \leq 2\varepsilon_{j+1}$  for all  $j$ ; considering the last inequality for  $j \geq s$ , we have  $d(\Phi_s(z), \Phi_0(z)) \leq 2 \sum_{j \geq s+1} \varepsilon_j < \sum_{j \geq 0} \frac{1}{2^{j-1}} \varepsilon_{s+1} = 4\varepsilon_{s+1} < \frac{1}{4}d_s$ . Same inequality holds for the point  $w$ . So,  $d(\Phi_0(z), \Phi_0(w)) > \frac{1}{2}d_s > 0$ , and therefore  $\Phi_0(z) \neq \Phi_0(w)$ .

We now check that the continuous foliation  $E = \Phi_0(E_0)$  satisfies the theorem. First we notice that for all  $j$  by construction  $\Phi_0(L_j) = \Phi_j(L_j)$ , and therefore  $\Phi_0(L_j)$  has an angular point at  $\Phi_0(w_j)$  in the plane parallel to  $z_l$  axis, where  $l \equiv j \pmod{n}$ .

If a function  $f \in C^1(D)$  is holomorphic on each of the curves in  $E$ , then by Lemma 1.2,  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_l} = 0$  at an everywhere dense set in  $D$ , and therefore on all of  $D$ , and for each  $l$ . By Hartogs theorem,  $f$  is holomorphic on  $D$ .  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [A1] M. L. Agranovsky, Propagation of CR foliations and Morera type theorems for manifolds with attached analytic discs, *Advances in Math.*, 211 (2007), no.1, 284–326.
- [A2] M. L. Agranovsky, An analog of Forelli theorem for boundary values of holomorphic functions in the unit ball of  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , *Journal D'Analyse Mathématique*, 2010, to appear.
- [A3] M. L. Agranovsky, Characterization of polyanalytic functions by meromorphic extensions from chains of circles, *Journal D'Analyse Mathématique*, 2010, to appear.
- [AG] M. L. Agranovsky and J. Globevnik, Analyticity on circles for rational and real analytic functions of two real variables, *J. d'Analyse Math.* 91 (2003) 31–65.
- [E] L. Ehrenpreis, Three problems at Mount Holyoke, *Contemp. Math.* 278 (2001) 123–130.
- [FM] B. Fridman, D. Ma, Holomorphic functions on subsets of  $\mathbb{C}$ , preprint, arXiv:1006.3105v3.
- [G1] J. Globevnik, Analyticity on families of circles. *Israel J. Math.* 142 (2004), 29-45.
- [G2] J. Globevnik, Analyticity on translates of a Jordan curve, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 359 (2007), 5555–5565.
- [G3] J. Globevnik, Analyticity of functions analytic on circles. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 360 (2009), no. 2, 363-368.
- [T1] A. Tumanov, A Morera type theorem in the strip, *Math. Res. Lett.* 11 (2004) 23–29.
- [T2] A. Tumanov, Testing analyticity on circles, *Amer. J. Math.* 129 (2007), no. 3, 785-790.

BUMA.FRIDMAN@WICHITA.EDU, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY, WICHITA, KS 67260-0033, USA

DMA@MATH.WICHITA.EDU, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY, WICHITA, KS 67260-0033, USA