

HYPERSURFACES IN (DFC)-SPACES

LE MAU HAI

Abstract. It is shown that every hypersurface H in a (DFM)-space E is of uniform type. This means that there exist a continuous semi-norm ρ on E and a hypersurface \hat{H} in E_ρ , the Banach space associated to ρ , such that $H = \omega_\rho^{-1}(\hat{H})$, where $\omega_\rho : E \rightarrow E_\rho$ is the canonical map.

Introduction

In [2] Dineen, Meise and Vogt have proved that every polar set in a (DFN)-space is of uniform type. This means that there exist a continuous seminorm ρ on E and a polar set A_ρ in E_ρ , the Banach space associated to ρ , such that $\omega_\rho(A) \subseteq A_\rho$, where $\omega_\rho : E \rightarrow E_\rho$ is the canonical map. The aim of the present paper is to prove the above result for hypersurfaces in (DFM)-spaces.

To obtain the main result (Theorem 2.1) we study in Section 1 the extension of hypersurfaces in a Riemann domain over Banach spaces to its envelope of holomorphy. In the finite dimensional case the problem was solved by Dloussky in [3]. By extending the method of Dloussky to the infinite dimensional case we prove that for every hypersurface H in a Riemann domain D over a Banach space with a Schauder basis there exists an analytic set \hat{H} in \hat{D} , the envelope of holomorphy of D , such that

$$(D \setminus H)^\wedge \cong \hat{D} \setminus \hat{H}.$$

Using the fact that every plurisubharmonic function on a separable (DFC)-space is of uniform type [8], we show in Section 2 that every hypersurface in either a (DFC)-space, which has the approximation property, or in a (DFM)-space is of uniform type.

1. Extending hypersurfaces

We recall that a hypersurface in a Riemann domain D over a locally convex space E is an analytic set which locally is the zero-set of a holomorphic function.

In this section we prove the following.

THEOREM 1.1. *Let H be a hypersurface in a Riemann domain D over a Banach space B with a Schauder basis. Then there exists an analytic set \hat{H} in \hat{D} which is either empty or a hypersurface in \hat{D} such that*

$$(D \setminus H)^\wedge \cong \hat{D} \setminus \hat{H}.$$

First, as in [3] we give the following.

DEFINITION 1.2. We say that (D, H) , where D is a Riemann domain over a locally convex space E and H is a hypersurface in D , is maximal if for every Riemann domain D' containing D as an open subset such that $D' \setminus D \subseteq H'$ we have $D' = D$ provided $H' \cap D = H$, where H' is a hypersurface in D' .

PROPOSITION 1.3. *If (D, H) is maximal and $D \setminus H$ is a domain of holomorphy, then D is a domain of holomorphy.*

For the proof of Proposition 1.3 we need the following lemma:

LEMMA 1.4. *Let $p : X \rightarrow Y$ be a local homeomorphism between two connected topological spaces and $H \subseteq Y$ be a closed subset of Y such that H has an empty interior and $Y \setminus H$ is connected. If p has a section σ on $Y \setminus H$, then p is injective.*

PROOF. Since $X \setminus p^{-1}(H)$ is dense in X , it suffices to show that p is injective on $X \setminus p^{-1}(H)$. By hypothesis there exists a section σ_1 of p on a connected neighbourhood V in Y such that $V \cap H \neq \emptyset$. We need to prove that $\sigma_1 = \sigma$ on V . Take an arbitrary point $y \in V$. Since $V \setminus p^{-1}(H)$ is connected, there exists a curve $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow X \setminus p^{-1}(H)$ such that $\gamma(0) = \sigma(y)$ and $\gamma(1) = \sigma_1(y)$. For each $t \in [0, 1]$ we have the equality $\gamma(t) = \sigma p(\gamma(t))$. Hence $\sigma_1(y) = \gamma(1) = \sigma p(\gamma(1)) = \sigma p(\sigma_1(y)) = \sigma(y)$. It follows that $\sigma_1(y) = \sigma(y)$, which means $\sigma_1|_V = \sigma|_V$. The lemma is proved.

Now we return to the proof of Proposition 1.3.

For each $t \in [0, 1]$ we put

$$M_t = \{(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : |z_1| \leq 1 \text{ and } z_2 \in [0, t] \text{ or } |z_1| = 1 \text{ and } z_2 \in [t, 1]\}.$$

Let φ be an arbitrary holomorphic map from a neighbourhood U of M_0 to D such that $p\varphi : U \rightarrow p\varphi(U)$ is a homeomorphism and $p\varphi(U)$ is contained in a subspace B of E of dimension 2. By [4] it suffices to show that φ can be extended holomorphically to a neighbourhood of M_1 , where $p : D \rightarrow E$ is a locally homeomorphic map defining D as a Riemann domain over E . By a result of Dloussky [3] we can find an analytic set $\tilde{H} \in \tilde{U}$ such that

$$(U \setminus \varphi^{-1}(H))^\wedge \cong \hat{U} \setminus \tilde{H}.$$

Since $\varphi(U \setminus \varphi^{-1}(H)) \subseteq D \setminus H$ and, by hypothesis, φ can be extended to a holomorphic map $\tilde{\varphi}$ on $\hat{U} \setminus \hat{H}$ with values in $D \setminus H$. Write $E = B \oplus B^\perp$. Replacing U by a smaller neighbourhood of M_0 we can assume that there exists a neighbourhood V of $0 \in B$ such that p has a holomorphic section $\delta : p\varphi(U) \times V \rightarrow D$. Put

$$\tilde{\varphi} = \delta \cdot (p\varphi \times id) : U \times V \rightarrow D,$$

and assume that Z is the domain of existence of $\tilde{\varphi}$ over $\hat{U} \times V$. Then $\tilde{\varphi}$ has a holomorphic extension $\hat{\varphi}$ on Z with value in D and

$$((\hat{U} \setminus \hat{H}) \cup U) \times V \subseteq Z.$$

We have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} ((\hat{U} \setminus \hat{H}) \cup U) \times V & \longrightarrow & Z \\ \downarrow & \swarrow \pi & \\ \hat{U} \times V & & \end{array}$$

where $\pi : Z \rightarrow \hat{U} \times V$ defines Z as a Riemann domain over $\hat{U} \times V$. Since π is injective (by Lemma 1.4), Z is an open subset in $\hat{U} \times V$. Now on $(\hat{U} \times V) \sqcup D$ we can define an equivalent relation as follows. Let $x \in \hat{U} \times V$ and $y \in D$. We

write $x \sim y$ if $\hat{\varphi} = y$. Put $'D = (\hat{U} \times V) \sqcup D / \sim$ and

$$p = \begin{cases} p \text{ on } D, \\ \text{the holomorphic extension of } p\varphi \times id \text{ on } \hat{U} \times V. \end{cases}$$

It follows that (D, p) is a Riemann domain over E and $\hat{\varphi}$ can be extended holomorphically to a map from $\hat{U} \times V$ into $'D$. Moreover $'H = (\hat{H} \times V) \sqcup H / \sim$ is an analytic set in $'D$ with $D \cap 'H = H$ and $'D \setminus D \subseteq 'H$. By the maximality of D we have $D = 'D$ and hence $\hat{\varphi}$ is extended holomorphically on $\hat{U} \times V$. It implies that $Z = \hat{U} \times V$. Thus, φ can be extended to a holomorphic map on a neighbourhood \hat{U} of M_1 . The proposition is proved.

As in [3] we give the following.

DEFINITION 1.5. Let (D, p) be a Riemann domain over a Banach space E . A boundary point of (D, p) is a basic of a filter r consists of connected open set in D such that

- (i) r has no limit point in D ,
- (ii) $p(r)$ converges to a point $x \in E$,

(iii) For every open connected neighbourhood $U(x)$ of x , r contains one and only one connected component of $p^{-1}(U(x))$ and every element of r has such a form.

Let $\check{D} = D \cup \partial D$, where ∂D denotes the set of boundary points of (D, p) . If $q : (D_1, p_1) \rightarrow (D_2, p_2)$ is a morphism between Riemann domains over E , then it can be extended to a continuous map $\check{q} : \check{D}_1 \rightarrow \check{D}_2$. Now we assume that $r \in \partial D$. We say that ∂D is a local hypersurface at r if there exists a neighbourhood $U(r)$ of r in \check{D} such that $\check{p} : \check{U}(r) \rightarrow \check{p}(U(r))$ is a homeomorphism, $\check{p}(U(r))$ is an open set in E and $\check{p}(\partial D \cap U(r))$ is a hypersurface in $\check{p}(U(r))$.

PROPOSITION 1.6. Let (D, p) be a Riemann domain over a Banach space E and H a hypersurface in D which is singular for a holomorphic function f on $D \setminus H$. Then there exists a hypersurface \hat{H} in \hat{D} such that $\lambda^{-1}(\hat{H}) = H$ and

$$(D \setminus H)^\wedge = \hat{D} \setminus \hat{H},$$

where $\lambda : D \rightarrow \hat{D}$ is the canonical map.

PROOF. Let $\hat{\lambda} : (D \setminus H)^\wedge \rightarrow \hat{D}$ be the holomorphic map such that the following diagram is commutative

$$\begin{array}{ccc} D \setminus H & \xrightarrow{\lambda_H} & (D \setminus H)^\wedge \\ \lambda \downarrow & \swarrow \hat{\lambda} & \\ \hat{D} & & \end{array}$$

Construct (D, λ) , where $D = (D \setminus H)^\wedge \cup Z$ and Z denotes the set of boundary points of $(D \setminus H)^\wedge$ and as in [3], Z is a local hypersurface. Put

$$\lambda = \hat{\lambda}, \quad H = Z.$$

As in [3], H is a hypersurface of D such that $H \cap D = H$ and (D, H) is maximal. By Proposition 1.3 it implies that D is a domain of holomorphy. Hence $D \cong \hat{D}$. Since $D \setminus H = (D \setminus H)^\wedge$ we obtain $(D \setminus H)^\wedge = \hat{D} \setminus \hat{H}$, where $\hat{H} = \lambda(H)$. The proposition is proved.

Now based on Proposition 1.6 and ideas of Dloussky [3] we prove Theorem 1.1. We can assume that H is irreducible. Let H be the set of points $h \in H$ such that for every holomorphic function f on $D \setminus H$ there exists an open neighbourhood V_f of h to which f can be extended holomorphically. Then $H \setminus H$ is a hypersurface in D which is singular for a holomorphic function on $D \setminus (H \setminus H)$. Indeed, we have $(D \setminus (H \setminus H))^\wedge$ is the domain of existence of a holomorphic function f . Let $x \in (H \setminus H)$ be an arbitrary point. Assume that there exists a neighbourhood U_x of x such that f is holomorphic on U_x . Then $U_x \subset (D \setminus (H \setminus H))^\wedge$. By the definition of H it follows that if g is holomorphic on $D \setminus H$, then g is holomorphic on $(D \setminus (H \setminus H))^\wedge$. Hence, g can be extended holomorphically to $(D \setminus (H \setminus H))^\wedge$. Therefore, g is holomorphic on U_x . This is impossible because for every neighbourhood $U_x, x \in (H \setminus H)$, there always exists a holomorphic function g on $D \setminus H$ such that g can not be extended holomorphically to U_x . By Proposition 1.6 there exists a hypersurface \hat{H} in \hat{D} such that

$$(D \setminus (H \setminus H))^\wedge \cong \hat{D} \setminus \hat{H}.$$

By the definition of H it follows that

$$(D \setminus (H \setminus H))^\wedge \cong (D \setminus H)^\wedge.$$

The theorem is completely proved.

2. Hypersurfaces in (DFC)-spaces

Using Theorem 1.1 and [8] we shall prove the following

THEOREM 2.1. *Let E be a separable (DFC)-space and H a hypersurface in E . Then H is of uniform type if one of the following two conditions holds*

- (i) E has the approximation property and E has a fundamental system of continuous semi-norm $\{\rho\}$ such that E_ρ has the approximation property.
- (ii) E is a (DFM)-space.

We need the following five lemmas.

LEMMA 2.2. *Let S be a continuous linear map from a Banach space A onto a Banach space B . Let Z_0 be a locally closed submanifold of codimension 1 in an open subset D of B such that $Cl[S^{-1}(Z_0)]_{S^{-1}(D)}$ is an analytic set of codimension 1 in $S^{-1}(D)$. Then $Cl[Z_0]_D$ is an analytic set of finite dimension in D .*

PROOF. (i) First we show that $S(W) = Cl[Z_0]_D$, where $W = Cl[S^{-1}(Z_0)]_{S^{-1}(D)}$. Note that $Cl[S(W)]_D = Cl[Z_0]_D$. It suffices to check that $S(W)$ is closed in D . Indeed, let $y_n \in S(W)$, $y_n \rightarrow y$. Since $S(W) \subseteq Cl[Z_0]_D$ we can assume that $y_n \in Z_0$ for $n \geq 1$. By hypothesis, S is open, there exists a sequence $x_n \in S^{-1}(Z_0) \subseteq W$ such that $S(x_n) = y_n$ for $n \geq 1$ and $x_n \rightarrow x \in W$. Since $S(x) = y$, it follows that $x \in S^{-1}(D)$ and hence $y \in S(W)$.

(ii) Given $y_0 \in Cl[Z_0]_D$. We may assume that $y_0 = 0$. Since W is a hypersurface in $S^{-1}(D)$ we can find $e \in A$, $e \neq 0$ such that for a neighbourhood U of $0 \in A$ the map $\sigma_1 : W \cap U \rightarrow V := \sigma_1(U)$ is branched cover, where $\sigma_1 : A \rightarrow A/Ce$ is the canonical projection. Without loss of generality we may assume that B is a quotient space of A and hence $B/C\tilde{e}$ is also a quotient space of B , where $\tilde{e} = S(e)$. Moreover we can assume that U is the open unit ball in A . Then V , $S(U)$ and $\tilde{S}(V)$ are open unit balls in A/Ce , B and $B/C\tilde{e}$

respectively, where $\tilde{S} : A/Ce \rightarrow B/C\tilde{e}$ is the canonical map induced by S . Consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U \cap V & \xrightarrow{S} & S(U \cap W) \\ \sigma_1 \downarrow & & \sigma_2 \downarrow \\ V & \xrightarrow{\tilde{S}} & \tilde{S}(V) \end{array}$$

with $\sigma_2 : B \rightarrow B/C\tilde{e}$ is the canonical projection.

Assume that $\{y_n\} \subset \tilde{S}(V)$ and $y_n \rightarrow y \in \tilde{S}(V)$. Choose $\delta > 0$ such that $\|y_n\| < 1 - \delta$ for $n \geq 1$. Let $\{y_{n_k}\} \subset \{y_n\}$ such that

$$\sum_{k \geq 1} \|y_{n_{k+1}} - y_{n_k}\| < \delta/2,$$

and $\epsilon_k \downarrow 0$ such that

$$\sum_{k \geq 1} (1 + \epsilon_k) \|y_{n_{k+1}} - y_{n_k}\| < \delta/2.$$

For each $k \geq 1$ take $z_k \in V$ such that $\tilde{S}(z_k) = y_{n_{k+1}} - y_{n_k}$ and $\|z_k\| < (1 + \epsilon_k) \|y_{n_{k+1}} - y_{n_k}\|$. Then

$$\sum_{k \geq 1} \|z_k\| < \delta/2.$$

Hence for

$$z = \sum_{k \geq 1} z_k,$$

we have $\tilde{S}(z) = y - y_{n_1}$.

Choose $z' \in V$ such that $\tilde{S}(z') = y_{n_1}$ and $\|z'\| < (1 + \delta/2) \|y_{n_1}\|$. Then $\tilde{S}(z + z') = y$ and $\|z + z'\| < \|z\| + \|z'\| < \delta/2 + 1 - \delta + \delta/2 = 1$. Thus the sequence $\{u_k\}$ with $u_k = z_1 + \dots + z_k + z'$ is contained in V and $u_k \rightarrow u$ for which $\tilde{S}(u) = y$ and $\tilde{S}(u_k) = y_{n_{k+1}}$ for $k \geq 1$. By the property of σ_1 this implies that σ_2 is also proper. Since σ_1 is finite and $S : U \cap W \rightarrow S(U \cap W)$ is surjective, we get that

$$\infty > \sup\{\text{card } \sigma_1^{-1}(z) : z \in V\} = \sup\{\text{card } \sigma_2^{-1}(y) : y \in \tilde{S}(V)\}.$$

Hence $\sigma_2 : S(U \cap W) \rightarrow \tilde{S}(V)$ is a branched covering map.

(iii) As in (ii) for every sequence $\{y_N\} \subset S(U \cap W)$, converging to $y \in S(U)$, there exists a subsequence $\{y_{n_k}\}$ such that $y_{n_k} = S(u_k)$, $u_k \in U \cap W$ for $k \geq 1$, and $u_k \rightarrow u \in U \cap W$. Then $\sigma_2(y_{n_k}) \rightarrow \tilde{S}\sigma_1(u) \in \tilde{S}(V)$. Hence, by the propriety of σ_2 , we have $y \in S(U \cap W)$.

(iv) From (ii) and (iii) it implies that $S(U \cap W)$ is an analytic set in $S(U)$ of dimension 1. Now from the relation $U \cap S^{-1}(Z_0) \subseteq R(U \cap W)$, where $R(U \cap W)$ is the regular locus of $U \cap W$, we have

$$S(U) \cap Z_0 \subseteq S(R(U \cap W)).$$

This relation yields

$$S(U) \cap Cl(Z_0)_D = S(U \cap W).$$

The lemma is proved.

LEMMA 2.3. *Every separable Banach space is the image of the space l^1 under a continuous linear map.*

PROOF. Given B a separable Banach space. Take a continuous map S from a space $l^1(T)$ onto B , where T is some index set. By the open mapping theorem there exists $C \geq 0$ such that for every $y \in B$ there exists $x \in l^1(T)$ for which $S(x) = y$ and $\|x\| < C\|y\|$.

Let $\{y_n\}$ be a dense sequence in B . For each $n \geq 1$ choose $x_n \in l^1(T)$ with $S(x_n) = y_n$ and $\|x_n\| < C\|y_n\|$. Put

$$T_0 = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \{t \in T : x_{n,t} \neq 0\},$$

where $x_n = \{x_{n,t} : t \in T\}$ for $n \geq 1$. Then T_0 is countable and hence $l^1(T_0) \cong l^1$. Consider $S_0 = S|_{l^1(T_0)} : l^1(T_0) \rightarrow B$. It remains to check that $\text{Im } S_0 = B$. Again by the open mapping theorem it suffices to show that $Cl\{S_0(U)\}$ is a neighbourhood of $0 \in B$, where $U = \{x \in l^1(T_0) : \|x\| < 1\}$. Given $y \in B$ with $\|y\| < 1/C$. For each $\delta > 0$ take y_n with $\|y_n - y\| < \delta$. Then for x_n we have $S(x_n) = y_n$, $\|x_n\| < 1$ and $\|S(x_n) - y\| < \delta$.

LEMMA 2.4. *Every separable Frechet space is a subspace of a Frechet space with the approximation property.*

PROOF. We write $E = \text{limproj } E_n$, where E is a given separable Frechet space and E_n are separable Banach spaces. For each $n \geq 1$ there exists a Banach space F_n with a Schauder basis containing E_n as a subspace. Then $F := \prod_{n \geq 1} F_n$ is a Frechet space having the approximation containing E as a subspace.

LEMMA 2.5. *Let G be an open subset in a normed space E and σ a holomorphic function on G . Then σ can be extended to a holomorphic function $\hat{\sigma}$ on a neighbourhood \hat{G} of G in \hat{E} , the completion of E , such that $Z(\sigma)$ is dense in $Z(\hat{\sigma})$, where $Z(\sigma)$ and $Z(\hat{\sigma})$ are zero-sets of σ and $\hat{\sigma}$, respectively.*

PROOF. Obviously σ can be extended to a holomorphic function $\hat{\sigma}$ on a neighbourhood \hat{G} of G in \hat{E} . It remains to show that $Z(\sigma)$ is dense in $Z(\hat{\sigma})$. Since the regular locus $R(Z(\hat{\sigma}))$ is dense in $Z(\hat{\sigma})$ [7], it suffices to show that $Z(\sigma)$ is dense in $R(Z(\hat{\sigma}))$. Given $z_0 \in R(Z(\hat{\sigma}))$ with $x' = \hat{\sigma}'(z_0) \neq 0$. Choose $e \in E$ with $x'(e) = 1$ and write $E = Ce \oplus \text{Ker } x'_0$, with $x'_0 = x'|_E$. Then $\hat{E} = Ce \oplus \text{Ker } x'$. Define a biholomorphism θ from a neighbourhood U of z_0 onto a neighbourhood $\Delta \times V$, where Δ is the open unit disc in \mathbb{C} , as follow :

$$\theta(te, u) = (\hat{\sigma}(te + u), u) \text{ for } u \in V; te + u \in U.$$

We may assume that $U \cap R(Z(\hat{\sigma})) = U \cap Z(\hat{\sigma})$. We have

$$\theta(Z(\hat{\sigma}) \cap U) = 0 \times V \text{ and } \theta(Z(\sigma) \cap U) \subseteq 0 \times V_0,$$

where $V_0 = V \cap \text{Ker } x'_0$. Let $v_0 \in V_0$ and $(t_0e, u_0) \in Z(\hat{\sigma}) \cap U$ such that $(0, v_0) = \theta(t_0e, u_0) = (\hat{\sigma}(t_0e, u_0), u_0) = (0, u_0)$. This means that $(t_0e, u_0) \in Z(\sigma) \cap U$.

Hence

$$\theta(Z(\sigma) \cap U) = 0 \times V_0.$$

Since $0 \times V_0$ is dense in $0 \times V$, it follows that $Z(\sigma) \cap U$ is dense in $Z(\hat{\sigma}) \cap U$. The lemma is proved.

LEMMA 2.6. Let H be a hypersurface in a normed space E . Then H can be extended to a hypersurface in a neighbourhood of E in \hat{E} .

PROOF. Cover E by open subset $\{U_i : i \in I\}$ such that on each U_i we have a holomorphic function h_i for which $H \cap U_i = Z(h_i)$. By Lemma 2.5 for each $i \in I$ there exist a neighbourhood V_i of U_i in \hat{E} and a holomorphic function \hat{h}_i on V_i such that $\hat{h}_i|_{U_i} = h_i$ and $Z(h_i)$ is dense in $Z(\hat{h}_i)$. Let $D = \cup\{V_i : i \in I\}$ and let $\{W_i\}$ be a locally finite open cover of D such that $Cl(W_i)_D \subseteq V_i$ for $i \in I$. Put

$$\tilde{H} = \cup\{Z(\hat{h}_i|_{W_i}) : i \in I\}.$$

We check that \tilde{H} is a hypersurface in D . Given $z_0 \in D$. Choose a neighbourhood W of z_0 such that $W \cap W_i = \emptyset$ for $i \notin I(z_0)$, where $I(z_0)$ is a finite subset of I . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H} \cap W &= \cup\{Z(\hat{h}_i|_{W_i}) \cap W\} = \cup\{Z(\hat{h}_i|_{W_i}) \cap W_j \cap W : i, j \in I\} \\ &= \cup\{Z(\hat{h}_i|_{W_i}) \cap W \cap W_j : i, j \in I(z_0)\} \\ &= \cup\{Z(\hat{h}_i|_{W_i}) : i \in I(z_0)\} \cap (\cup\{W_j : j \in I(z_0)\}) \cap W. \end{aligned}$$

Hence it suffices to show that $\cup\{Z(\hat{h}_i|_{W_i}) : i \in I(z_0)\}$ is closed in $\cup\{W_i : i \in I(z_0)\}$. For simplicity we assume that $I(z_0) = (i_1, i_2)$. Let $\{z_n\} \subset Z(\hat{h}_{i_1}|_{W_{i_1}}) \cup Z(\hat{h}_{i_2}|_{W_{i_2}})$ with $z_n \rightarrow z \in W_{i_1} \cup W_{i_2}$. By Lemma 3.5 without loss of generality we may assume that $\{z_n\} \subset Z(\hat{h}_{i_1}|_{W_{i_1}})$. If $z \in W_{i_1}$, then $\hat{h}_{i_1}(z) = 0$, because \hat{h}_1 is holomorphic on $V_{i_1} \supseteq Cl(W_{i_1})_D$. Consider the case $z \in W_{i_2}$. Then with $n > N$, $z_n \in W_{i_1} \cap W_{i_2}$. Hence $\hat{h}_{i_2}(z) = 0$. The lemma is proved.

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1. (i) Since E has the approximation, H is singular for a holomorphic function on $E \setminus H$ [5]. From the Lindelöfness of E and $E \setminus H$ [5] there exist two open covers $\{z_j + U_j\}$ and $\{x_j + V_j\}$ of E and $E \setminus H$ respectively such that

$$H \cap (z_j + U_j) = Z(h_j) \text{ for } j \geq 1,$$

where h_j are bounded holomorphic functions on $z_j + U_j$, $f(x_j + V_j)$ are bounded and U_j, V_j are balanced convex neighbourhoods of $0 \in E$. Choose a sequence $\mu_j \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$V = \bigcap_{j \geq 1} \mu_j(U_j \cap V_j)$$

is a neighbourhood of $0 \in E$. Then $\omega_V(z_j + U_j)$ and $\omega_V(x_j + V_j)$ are open in $E/\text{Ker}\rho_V$, where we write $\omega_V = \omega_{\rho_V}$.

By Lemma 2.6 $\omega_V(H)$ can be extended to a hypersurface \tilde{H} in a neighbourhood D of $E/\text{Ker}\rho_V$ in $E_V = E_{\rho_V}$. On the other hand, the function f can be considered as a holomorphic function on $(E/\text{Ker}\rho_V) \setminus \omega_V(H)$. Given $z_0 \in R(\tilde{H})$ with $x' = h'(z_0) \neq 0$, where h is a holomorphic function on a neighbourhood $U(z_0)$ of z_0 in E_V such that

$$U(z_0) \cap \tilde{H} = U(z_0) \cap Z(h) = U(z_0) \cap R(\tilde{H}).$$

Take $e \in E/\text{Ker}\rho_V$ with $x'(e) = 1$ and write

$$E/\text{Ker}\rho_V = \mathbb{C}e \oplus \text{Ker } x'_0, \text{ with } x'_0 = x'|_{(E/\text{Ker}\rho_V)}.$$

Then

$$E_V = \mathbb{C}e \oplus \text{Ker } x'.$$

Define a biholomorphism θ_{z_0} from $U(z_0)$ onto a neighbourhood $\Delta \times W(z_0)$ of $0 \in E_V$, where Δ is the open disc in \mathbb{C} , by the formular

$$\theta_{z_0}(te, u) = (h(te + u), u) \text{ for } u \in W(z_0) \text{ and } te + u \in U(z_0),$$

Then as in the proof of Lemma 2.5, it follows that

$$\theta_{z_0}(Z(h) \cap U(z_0)) = 0 \times W(z_0)_0,$$

where $W(z_0)_0 = W(z_0) \cap E/\text{Ker}\rho_V$. Since $f\theta_{z_0}^{-1}$ is holomorphic on $\Delta^* \times W(z_0)_0$, where $\Delta^* = \Delta \setminus 0$, it can be extended to a holomorphic function g^{z_0} on $W_0^{z_0}$, where $W_0^{z_0}$ is a neighbourhood of $W(z_0)_0$ in $\text{Ker } x'$. This means also that $f|_{U(z_0) \cap (E/\text{Ker}\rho_V \setminus Z(h))}$ can be extended to a holomorphic function f^{z_0} on a neighbourhood G^{z_0} of $U(z_0) \cap (E/\text{Ker}\rho_V \setminus Z(h))$ in E_V . By the identity principle the family $\{f^{z_0} : z_0 \in R(\tilde{H})\}$ defines a holomorphic extension g of f to a neighbourhood G_0 of $E/\text{Ker}\rho_V \setminus \tilde{H}$ in E_V . Put

$$G = \text{Int}(G_0 \cup \tilde{H}).$$

Since

$$G \cap \theta_{z_0}^{-1}(\Delta e \times W_0^{z_0}) \subset G_0 \cap \tilde{H} \text{ for } z_0 \in R(\tilde{H}),$$

it follows that G is a neighbourhood of $E/\text{Ker}\rho_V \setminus S(\tilde{H})$, where $S(\tilde{H})$ is the singular locus of \tilde{H} . By hypothesis, we may assume that E_V has the approximation property. Hence, by Theorem 1.1, there exists a hypersurface \hat{H} in \hat{G} such that

$$(G \setminus \tilde{H})^\wedge \cong \hat{G} \setminus \hat{H}.$$

Since $\text{codim } S(\tilde{H}) \geq 2$, we have $\hat{G} \supset E/\text{Ker}\rho_V$. It is easy to see that \hat{H} is singular for g . This yields that

$$\hat{H} \cap E/\text{Ker}\rho_V = \tilde{H}.$$

Consider the plurisubharmonic function φ on \hat{G} given by

$$\varphi(z) = -\log d(z, \partial\hat{G}).$$

By [8] we can find a plurisubharmonic function ψ on E_ρ , with $\rho \geq \rho_V$, and ρ is a continuous semi-norm on E , such that

$$\psi\omega_\rho = \psi\omega_V.$$

It remains to check that $\text{Im } \omega_{\rho\rho_V} \subset \hat{G}$, where $\omega_{\rho\rho_V} : E_\rho \rightarrow E_V$ is the canonical map. In the converse case there would exist $z \in E_\rho$ with $\omega_{\rho\rho_V}(z) \in \partial\hat{G}$. Choose a sequence $\{z_n\} \subset E/\text{Ker}\rho$ which is convergent to z . Then

$$\infty = \lim \varphi_{\omega_{\rho\rho_V}}(z_n) = \lim \psi(z_n) \leq \psi(z) < \infty.$$

This is impossible. Hence $\text{Im } \omega_{\rho\rho_V} \subset \hat{G}$. Then $\hat{H} = \omega_{\rho\rho_V}^{-1}(\tilde{H})$ is a required hypersurface and (i) is proved.

(ii) Now assume that E is a (DFM)-space.

(a) Let F be a Frechet space given by Lemma 2.4 for $P = E'$, the dual space of E . Consider the restriction map

$$R : F'_c \rightarrow P'_c = E.$$

Since F'_c is B -complete and E is a barrelled space, the open mapping theorem implies that R is open. As in (i) we can find a continuous semi-norm ρ_1 on E and a hypersurface H_1 in a neighbourhood G_1 of $E/\text{Ker}\rho_1$ in E_{ρ_1} such that $H = \omega_{\rho_1}^{-1}(H_1)$.

(b) Let

$$\tilde{H} = R^{-1}(H).$$

Since F'_c has the approximation property, we can find, as in (i), a continuous semi-norm $\beta \geq \rho_1 R$ on F'_c , a neighbourhood \tilde{G}_1 of $F'_c/\text{Ker}\beta$, a hypersurface \tilde{H}_1 in \tilde{G}_1 and a holomorphic function \tilde{g}_1 on $\tilde{G}_1 \setminus \tilde{H}_1$ such that

$$\tilde{g}_1 \omega_\beta = f,$$

where f is a holomorphic function on $F'_c \setminus \tilde{H}$ such that \tilde{H} is singular for f .

(c) Choose a continuous linear map S from l^1 onto $F'_{c\beta}$ and consider

$$M = S^{-1}(\tilde{H}_1), \quad D = S^{-1}(\tilde{G}_1), \quad g = \tilde{g}_1 S|_{(D \setminus M)}.$$

We check that M is singular for g . Indeed, assume that there exists $z_0 \in M$ such that g can be extended to a bounded holomorphic function g_1 on a neighbourhood $z_0 + U$ where U is a balanced convex neighbourhood of $0 \in l^1$. Consider the Taylor expansion of g_1 on $z_0 + U/2$ at z_0

$$g_1(z_0 + z_1) = \sum_{k \geq 0} P_k g_1(z_0)(z),$$

where

$$P_k g_1(z_0)(z) = 1/2\pi i \int_{|t|=2} (g_1(z_0 + tz)/t^{k+1}) dt.$$

Let $\{z_n\} \subset D \setminus M$ with $z_n \rightarrow z_0$. Then

$$P_k g_1(z_n) \rightarrow P_k g_1(z_0) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty \text{ for } k \geq 1,$$

uniformly on every compact set in l^1 . Since every compact set in $F'_{c\beta}$ is the image of a compact set in l^1 , it follows that

$$P_k g_1(y_n) \rightarrow T_k \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty \text{ for } k \geq 1,$$

uniformly on every compact set in $F'_{c\beta}$, where $y_n = S(z_n)$ for $n \geq 1$. We have

$$\sup\{|P_k g_1(z_n)(z)| : z \in U/2\} \leq C/2^k \text{ for } k \geq 0,$$

where

$$C = \sup\{|g_1(z_0 + z)| : z \in U/2\}.$$

Hence the series

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} T_k(y_0 + y)$$

is convergent uniformly on $y_0 + V/2$, where $V = S(U)$ is a neighbourhood of $0 \in F'_{c\beta}$, to a holomorphic extension of \hat{g}_1 to $y_0 + V/2$. This is impossible, because $y_0 \in \tilde{H}_1$ is singular for \tilde{g}_1 . By Theorem 1.1, M can be extended to a hypersurface \hat{M} in \hat{D} such that

$$(D \setminus M)^\wedge = \hat{D} \setminus \hat{M}.$$

(d) Let α be a continuous seminorm on E induced by β , and $\tilde{R} : F'_{c\beta} \rightarrow E_\alpha$ be the map induced by R . Put $T = \tilde{R}S : I^1 \rightarrow E_\alpha$. Note that T is open. Moreover

$$T^{-1}(H_1) \subset M \text{ and } T^{-1}(G_1) \subset D.$$

Then as in (b) we have

$$T(\hat{D}) = \hat{G}_1.$$

Since $R(\tilde{H})$ is locally closed in G_1 , it is so in \hat{G}_1 . Using Lemma 2.2 to T , \hat{G}_1 , and $R(\tilde{H})$, we conclude that $\hat{H} = Cl[R(\tilde{H})]_{\hat{G}_1}$ is a hypersurface in \hat{G}_1 for which

$$H = \omega_\alpha^{-1}(\hat{H}).$$

(e) As in (i) we can find a continuous seminorm $\gamma \geq \alpha$ on E such that $\text{Im } \omega_{\gamma\alpha} \subset \hat{G}_1$. This completes the proof of (ii) and Theorem 2.1.

Now we have the following corollary on extending hypersurface from a subspace of a (DFC)-space E to E .

COROLLARY 2.7. *Let F be a subspace of a (DFC)-space E satisfying the condition (i) or (ii) of Theorem 2.1. Assume that the topology of E is defined by a system of Hilbert-seminorms $\{\rho\}$ and H is a hypersurface in F . Then H can be extended to a hypersurface \hat{H} in E .*

PROOF. By Theorem 2.1 there exists a semi-norm ρ on E and a hypersurface $\tilde{H} \subset E_\rho$ such that $\omega_\rho(H) = \tilde{H}$, where $\omega_\rho : E \rightarrow E_\rho$ is the canonical map. By the hypothesis we can assume that E_ρ is a Hilbert space and, hence, F_ρ is a closed subspace of E_ρ . Consider the orthogonal projection $\pi_\rho : E_\rho \rightarrow F_\rho$.

Then there exists a hypersurface $H' \subset E_\rho$ such that $\pi_\rho(H') = \tilde{H}$. Hence, $\hat{H} = \omega_\rho^{-1}(H')$ is a hypersurface in E and it is extending the hypersurface H . The corollary is proved.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. F. Colombeau, "Differential Calculus and Holomorphic," North-Holland Math. Stud., 64, 1982.
- [2] S. Dineen, R. Meise and D. Vogt, *Polar subsets of locally convex spaces*, Aspect of Math. and its Appl., Ed. J. Barroso, Elsevier Sci. Publ. BV. 1986, 295-319.
- [3] G. Dloussky, *Enveloppes d'holomorphic et prolongement d'hypersurfaces*, Seminaire Pierre Lelong (Analyse), Annees 1975-76, Lecture notes in Math, 578, Springer Verlag 1977.
- [4] M. Harita, *Continuation of meromorphic functions in a locally convex space*, Mem. Fac. Sci. Kyushu Univ. Ser. A 41 (1987), 115-132.
- [5] J. Mujica, *Domains of holomorphy in (DFC)-spaces*, "Functional Analysis, Holomorphy and Approximation Theory," Lecture Notes in Math. 834, Springer-Verlag, 1981, pp. 500-533.
- [6] J. Mujica, "Complex Analysis in Banach spaces," Mathematics Studies. Vol. 120, North-Holland, Amstesdam, 1986.
- [7] J. P. Ramis, "Sous Analytiques d'une Variete Banachique Complexe," Erg. der Math. 53 Springer-Verlag.
- [8] Bui Dac Tac and Nguyen Thu Nga, *The Oka-Weil Theorem in nuclear Frechet spaces and plurisubharmonic functions of uniform type*, Acta Math. Vietnam. 16 (1991), 133-145.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
 PEDAGOGICAL UNIVERSITY 1 HANOI, TU LIEM, HANOI VIET NAM