

# Pacific Journal of Mathematics

## REMOVABLE DISCONTINUITIES OF $A$ -HOLOMORPHIC FUNCTIONS

IRVING LEONARD GLICKSBERG

# REMOVABLE DISCONTINUITIES OF $A$ -HOLOMORPHIC FUNCTIONS

I. GLICKSBERG

**Under certain conditions a function continuous and  $A$ -holomorphic off a peak set extends continuously to the peak set if its restriction to the Šilov boundary does.**

1. Let  $A$  be a uniform algebra with spectrum  $M = M_A$  and Šilov boundary  $\partial_A$ . A function  $f$  is called  $A$ -holomorphic on an open subset  $U$  of  $M$  if it is locally uniformly approximable there by elements of  $A$ .

For  $K$  a zero set of  $A$  lying in the Choquet boundary, it was shown in [2, Th. 3] that any  $f \in C(M \setminus K)$ ,  $A$ -holomorphic on  $M \setminus \partial_A$ , has a continuous extension to  $M$  if  $f|(\partial_A \setminus K)$  has an extension in  $C(\partial_A)$ . Only at a late stage in the proof did it come into play that  $K$  was in the Choquet boundary, in the guise of the uniqueness of representing measures for its points<sup>1</sup>, and in some special situations this use of uniqueness in the proof is unnecessary. Here we want to note a variant of this kind which exploits the setting in which the abstract Radó theorem [1] holds, but features only a peak set  $K$  in  $M$  rather than a zero set. As was actually the case in [1, 2],  $M$  need only be a closed boundary for  $A$  for which local maximum modulus holds relative to another boundary  $\partial$  (i.e., for any open  $U$  in  $M \setminus \partial$  and  $a \in A$ ,  $|a(U)| \leq \sup |a(\partial U)|$ , where  $\partial U$  is the boundary of  $U$  in  $M$ ). Our main assumption about  $A$  is that

(1)  *$A$  is an intersection of closed subalgebras  $A_\alpha$  of  $C(M)$ , each satisfying local maximum modulus relative to  $\partial$  and maximal with respect to this property.*

In particular  $\partial$  is a boundary for  $A_\alpha$ , and  $A$  itself then satisfies local maximum modulus relative to  $\partial$ ; moreover any  $A$  with this last property lies in maximal algebras of the above kind by the proof of [1, 3, 4], while [1, 3.3] (applied to each  $A_\alpha$ ) shows that Radó's theorem holds for an algebra  $A$  satisfying (1):  $f \in C(M)$ ,  $A$ -holomorphic on  $M \setminus (f^{-1}(0) \cup \partial)$  is necessarily in  $A$ . (We should also note that an  $A_\alpha$  which satisfies local maximum modulus and is relatively maximal in  $C(M)$  (i.e., for which properly larger subalgebras of  $C(M)$  have properly large Šilov boundaries) is maximal in the required sense when  $\partial = \partial_{A_\alpha}$  for all  $\alpha$ .)

<sup>1</sup>  $K$  could have been any nowhere dense zero set in  $M$  for which all elements have unique Jensen measure on  $\partial$ , as is easily seen (cf. [2, p. 405, midpage]).

Now suppose  $K \subset M$  is a nowhere dense peak set and  $f \in C(M \setminus K)$  is  $A$ -holomorphic on  $M \setminus K$  (or just on  $M \setminus (\partial \cup K \cup f^{-1}(0))$ ), while  $f|_{(\partial \setminus K)}$  extends continuously to an element of  $C(\partial)$ . As we shall see later by an example, (1) is not sufficient to imply  $f$  extends to an element of  $C(M)$ , but there are simple conditions insuring this: for example, suppose there is a  $w^*$  continuous "section"  $t$  from  $M$  into the representing measures on  $\partial$  for which  $t(\phi)$  represents  $\phi$  on  $A$ . Then if  $g \in A$  peaks on  $K$  and we set

$$(2) \quad f_\varepsilon = \begin{cases} f \cdot \exp(-\varepsilon/(1-g)^{1/2}) & \text{on } M \setminus K \\ 0 & \text{on } K \end{cases}$$

(where  $|\arg(1-g)^{1/2}| \leq \pi/4$ ) then  $f_\varepsilon \in C(M)$  and is also  $A$ -holomorphic on  $(M \setminus (\partial \cup K \cup f^{-1}(0))) = M \setminus (\partial \cup f_\varepsilon^{-1}(0))$ , so  $f_\varepsilon \in A$  by Radó's theorem, whence  $t(\phi)(f_\varepsilon) = f_\varepsilon(\phi)$ . Now for any  $\lambda \geq 0$  representing  $\phi \in M \setminus K$ ,  $\lambda(K) = \lim \lambda(g^n) = \lim g(\phi)^n = 0$ , so the restriction  $\lambda_K = 0$ , and  $\lambda$  is carried by  $M/K$ ; in particular this is true for  $t(\phi)$ , and since  $f_\varepsilon \rightarrow f$  on  $M \setminus K$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , while  $|f_\varepsilon| \leq |f|$ , by dominated convergence  $t(\phi)(f_\varepsilon) = f_\varepsilon(\phi)$  implies  $t(\phi)(f) = f(\phi)$ ,  $\phi \in M \setminus K$ . But by hypothesis  $f|_{(\partial \setminus K)}$  has a continuous extension  $h$  in  $C(\partial)$  while  $\phi \rightarrow t(\phi)$  is  $w^*$  continuous into the space of measures on  $\partial$ , so that  $\phi \rightarrow t(\phi)(h)$  is continuous on  $M$ , and coincides with  $f$  on  $M/K$  since

$$t(\phi)(h) = t(\phi)_{M \setminus K}(h) = t(\phi)(f) = f(\phi) \text{ for } \phi \in M \setminus K.$$

It is precisely the fact that  $f_\varepsilon \in A$  which allows us to improve on [2, Th. 3] in our special setting.

Call a representing measure  $\lambda$  on  $\partial$  for  $\phi \in K$  *accessible from*  $M \setminus K$  if it is the  $w^*$  limit of a net  $\{\lambda_\delta\}$  of representing measures on  $\partial$  for points in  $M \setminus K$ . (We can in fact allow the  $\lambda_\delta$  to be complex representing measures if we insist they be carried by  $\partial \setminus K$ , which is automatic for  $\lambda_\delta \geq 0$  as we just saw.) Finally, let  $M^\phi$  denote the set of representing measures on  $\partial$  for  $\phi$ .

**THEOREM 1.** *Suppose  $A$  satisfies (1),  $K \subset M$  is a nowhere dense peak set, and*

(3)  *$f \in C(M \setminus K)$  is  $A$ -holomorphic on  $M \setminus (\partial \cup K \cup f^{-1}(0))$  while  $f|_{(\partial \setminus K)}$  has an extension in  $C(\partial)$ .*

*Then  $f$  extends continuously at each  $\phi \in K$  for which the subset of  $M^\phi$  accessible from  $M \setminus K$  is convex<sup>2</sup>. In particular, if the latter holds for all  $\phi \in K$ ,  $f$  has a continuous extension to all of  $M$  which (by*

<sup>2</sup> We could equally well only assume that for any pair  $\lambda, \lambda'$  of Jensen measures in  $M^\phi$  we have elements  $\lambda_1 = \lambda, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n = \lambda'$  in  $M^\phi_\alpha$  for which the open segment joining  $\lambda_i$  and  $\lambda_{i+1}$  contains an element of  $M^\phi_\alpha$  (so in particular if  $\lambda, \lambda'$  can be joined by a finite chain of convex subsets of  $M^\phi_\alpha$ ), as is easily seen from the final step in the proof.

Radó's theorem) is in  $A$ .

Alternatively, we could replace representing measures by Jensen measures everywhere, including the definition of accessibility. Moreover, when  $\partial = \partial_A$ , accessibility for all  $\phi$  in  $K$  is a priori a weaker condition than one which is fully equivalent to the existence of a continuous extension to  $M$  for each  $f$  satisfying (3). Indeed let  $A^\perp$  denote the measures on  $\partial$  orthogonal to  $A$ , and  $A_{K'}^\perp$  the set of restriction of such measures to the complement  $K'$  of  $K$ . ( $A_{K'}^\perp \subset A^\perp$  of course since  $\mu \in A^\perp$  implies  $\mu_K \in A^\perp$ .)

**THEOREM 2.** *If  $A$  satisfies (1) for  $\partial = \partial_A$  the following are equivalent:*

- (a) *Every  $f$  satisfying (3) has a continuous extension to  $M$ .*
- (b)  *$A_{K'}^\perp$  is  $w^*$  dense in  $A^\perp$ .*
- (c) *The real elements of  $A^\perp$  lie in the  $w^*$  closure of  $A_{K'}^\perp$ .*

**COROLLARY 3.** *If  $A$  satisfies (1) for  $\partial = \partial_A$  then the set of accessible elements of  $M^\phi$  is convex for each  $\phi \in K$  only if  $A_{K'}^\perp$  is  $w^*$  dense in  $A^\perp$ ; moreover this  $w^*$  density implies each element of  $M^\phi$  is accessible from  $M \setminus K$  using complex representing measures.*

We shall first prove Theorem 2 and Corollary 3, and then return to Theorem 1.

*Proof of Theorem 2.* Evidently (b) implies (c). To see (c) implies (a), suppose  $f$  satisfies (3) and in fact is extended to  $\partial \cup (M/K)$  so  $f|_\partial$  is in  $C(\partial)$ , while the real elements of  $A^\perp$  lie in the  $w^*$  closure of  $A_{K'}^\perp$ . As earlier,  $f_\varepsilon$  defined in (2) lies in  $A$  by Radó's theorem, while  $f_\varepsilon \rightarrow f$  on  $M \setminus K$  and  $|f_\varepsilon| \leq |f|$  there. So since  $f_\varepsilon \perp A_{K'}^\perp \subset A^\perp$ , by dominated convergence  $f \perp A_{K'}^\perp$ ; but  $f|_\partial \in C(\partial)$  and the  $w^*$  closure of  $A_{K'}^\perp$  contains the real elements of  $A^\perp$ , while all our measures are carried by  $\partial$ , so  $f$  (as extended) is orthogonal to those real measures.

Now for any  $\phi \in M$ , if  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in M^\phi$  then  $f \perp (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)$  so that  $f$  is constant on  $M^\phi$ : thus  $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda(f)$  is a continuous function on the  $w^*$  compact space  $S$  of all multiplicative probability measures on  $\partial$  which is constant on each set of constancy of the natural (continuous) map of  $S$  onto  $M$ , so setting  $\tilde{f}(\phi) = \lambda(f)$  for any  $\lambda \in M^\phi$  defines an  $\tilde{f} \in C(M)$ . On the other hand the fact that  $\lambda(f_\varepsilon) = f_\varepsilon(\phi)$  for  $\lambda \in M^\phi$  and  $\phi \in M \setminus K$  implies  $\lambda(f) = f(\phi)$  by dominated convergence again, so  $\tilde{f} = f$  on  $M \setminus K$ , and  $\tilde{f}$  is the desired extension of  $f$ .

It remains to prove (a) implies (b), and we argue by contradiction. Suppose that  $A_{K'}^\perp$  is not  $w^*$  dense in  $A^\perp$ , so we have an  $h \in C(\partial) \setminus (A|_\partial)$ ,  $h \perp A_{K'}^\perp$ . Since  $A_{K'}^\perp$  is an  $A$ -module,  $h \perp AA_{K'}^\perp \subset A_{K'}^\perp$ ,

or  $A \perp hA_{K'}^{\perp}$ , so  $(hA_{K'}) \subset A^{\perp}$  and thus  $hA_{K'} \subset A_{K'}^{\perp}$ , which  $h$  annihilates. So  $h \perp hA_{K'}^{\perp}$ , or  $h^2 \perp A_{K'}^{\perp}$ , whence  $Ah^2 \perp A_{K'}^{\perp}$ ; continuing we see that  $A_{K'}^{\perp}$  is orthogonal to the closed subalgebra  $B$  of  $C(\partial)$  generated by  $A$  and  $h$ . Moreover for  $\phi \in M \setminus K$ , the elements of  $M^{\phi}$  all coincide on any  $b \in B$  exactly as before:  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in M^{\phi}$  implies  $\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 \in A_{K'}^{\perp}$ . So we can view  $B$  as a subspace of the space of continuous functions on  $M \setminus K$  as in the preceding paragraph (although here our space of measures and  $M \setminus K$  are only locally compact): we set  $\tilde{b}(\phi) = \lambda(b)$ ,  $\lambda \in M^{\phi}$ . Finally if we now define  $h_{\varepsilon}$  on  $\partial$  as in (2) to be 0 on  $K \cap \partial$  and  $h \cdot \exp(-\varepsilon/(1-g)^{1/2})$  on  $\partial \setminus K$  then  $h_{\varepsilon} \in h(A|\partial)$  (since the exponential, defined to be zero on  $K$ , lies in  $A$  by Radó's theorem); thus  $h_{\varepsilon} \perp A_{K'}^{\perp}$  and since it vanishes on  $K$ ,  $h_{\varepsilon} \perp A^{\perp}$ . Consequently  $h_{\varepsilon} \in A|\partial$  and for  $\phi \in M \setminus K$  and  $\lambda \in M^{\phi}$ ,  $\lambda(h_{\varepsilon}^n a) = \lambda(h_{\varepsilon})^n \lambda(a)$ ,  $a \in A$ . So by dominated convergence  $\lambda(h^n a) = \lambda(h)^n \lambda(a)$ , which shows  $\lambda$  is multiplicative on  $B$ , and thus that our injection  $b \rightarrow \tilde{b}$  of  $B$  into  $C(M \setminus K)$  is an algebra homomorphism. Now for  $\phi \in \partial \setminus K$ ,  $\tilde{b}(\phi) = b(\phi)$  since we may use the point mass for  $\lambda$ ; in particular then  $\tilde{h} \in C(M \setminus K)$  has

$$\tilde{h} | (\partial \setminus K) = h | (\partial \setminus K) \in C(\partial) | (\partial \setminus K).$$

In fact  $\tilde{h}$  is  $A$ -holomorphic on  $M \setminus K$ , for  $\tilde{h}_{\varepsilon} = \hat{h}_{\varepsilon} \in A$ , since  $h_{\varepsilon} \in A|\partial$ ; thus dominated convergence and Mazur's theorem guarantee that  $\tilde{h}$  is uniformly approximable by elements of  $A$  on any compact subset of  $M \setminus K$ . Now our function  $\tilde{h}$  satisfies (3), and if it had a continuous extension  $k$  to all of  $M$  then by [2, 3.5] (a variant of the Radó theorem)  $k \in A$  since it is  $A$ -holomorphic except on a nowhere dense zero set  $K$ . But  $k = h$  on  $\partial \setminus K$ , hence on  $(\partial \setminus K)^-$ , and that set is precisely  $\partial$  (otherwise  $K \cap \partial$  contains a nonvoid subset open in  $\partial = \partial_A$ , so contains a peak point, whence the zero set  $K$  has nonvoid interior in  $M$  by the basic lemma 2.1 of [1]). So we conclude  $h = k$  on  $\partial$  and  $h \in A|\partial$  despite that fact that  $h \notin A|\partial$ . Our assumption that (b) failed has implied (a) fails, so (a) implies (b), completing our proof of Theorem 2.

At this point we should note that Corollary 3 follows directly from Theorems 1 and 2. First if the accessible elements of  $M^{\phi}$  are convex for each  $\phi \in K$  then Theorem 1 guarantees (a) of Theorem 2 holds, so (b) follows. On the other hand if  $A_{K'}^{\perp}$  is  $w^*$  dense in  $A^{\perp}$  and  $\phi \in K$  then  $\phi = \lim_{\delta} \phi_{\delta}$  for some net  $\{\phi_{\delta}\}$  in  $M \setminus K$ ; if  $\lambda \in M^{\phi_{\delta}}$  then  $\{\lambda_{\delta}\}$  has a  $w^*$  cluster point  $\lambda_0$  in  $M^{\phi}$ . For any other  $\lambda \in M^{\phi}$ ,  $\lambda - \lambda_0 = \lim_{\gamma} \nu_{\gamma}$ ,  $\nu_{\gamma} \in A_{K'}^{\perp}$ , so since we can assume  $\lambda_0 = \lim \lambda_{\delta}$ , passing to a confinal subnet, we have  $\lambda = \lim_{\Delta \times \Gamma} (\lambda_{\delta} + \nu_{\gamma})$  (where  $\Delta \times \Gamma$  is the product directed system). Consequently each element of  $M^{\phi}$  is accessible from  $M \setminus K$  using complex representing measures, as asserted.

Note that in contrast to the relatively trivial proof of the second

half of Corollary 3, the first half uses the more complicated part of Theorem 2 as well as Theorem 1.

Our proof of Theorem 1 uses most of the proof of [2, Th. 3], which we reproduce here because of the notational changes required, along with some of the argument already used. To begin let  $f$  be extended to  $M_0 = (\partial \setminus K)^- \cup (M \setminus K) = M \setminus (K \setminus (\partial \setminus K)^-)$  so  $f[(\partial \setminus K)^- \in C(\partial \setminus K)^-]$  and let  $B$  be the uniformly closed algebra of bounded functions on  $M_0$  generated by  $A$  and  $f$ . Let  $X$  be the closure in  $M_B$  of  $M_0$ ;  $X$  is of course a boundary for  $B$ , and we shall identify  $B$  and  $B^+ \setminus X$ . Since  $f$  and the elements of  $A$  are continuous when restricted to  $(\partial \setminus K)^-$  or  $M \setminus K$ , the natural injection of each of these spaces into  $X$  is continuous, and 1-1 of course. In particular,  $(\partial \setminus K)^-$  is imbedded homeomorphically in  $X$ . But the same is true of  $M \setminus K$  since the map  $\rho: X \rightarrow M$  dual to  $A \rightarrow B$  clearly provides inverses for our injections. (A priori,  $\rho$  maps  $X$  into  $M_A$ ; but of course it takes  $X$  into the closure of  $\partial \cup (M \setminus K)$  in  $M_A$  and that closure lies in our boundary  $M$ . Note that  $\hat{a}(x) = a(\rho(x))$  for  $a \in A, x \in X$ .)

Now  $M \setminus K$  is in fact imbedded as an open subset of  $X$ . For each  $\phi_0 \in M \setminus K$  has a compact neighborhood  $U$  in  $M$  disjoint from  $K$  of the form

$$U = \{ \phi \in M: |a_i(\phi) - a_i(\phi_0)| \leq \varepsilon, i \leq n \},$$

and since  $X = M_0^- = U^- \cup (M \setminus U)^- = U \cup (M \setminus U)^-, x \in X \setminus U$  implies  $x \in (M \setminus U)^-$  so  $|\hat{a}_i(x) - a_i(\phi_0)| \geq \varepsilon$  for some  $i$ , whence

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\phi_0} &= \{ \phi \in M: |a_i(\phi) - a_i(\phi_0)| < \varepsilon/2, i \leq n \} \\ &= \{ x \in X: |\hat{a}_i(x) - a_i(\phi_0)| < \varepsilon/2, i \leq n \} \end{aligned}$$

is a neighborhood of  $\phi_0$  in  $X$  lying in  $M \setminus K$ , so  $M \setminus K$  is open in  $X$  as asserted. Moreover, this also shows  $\rho$  is 1-1 over  $M \setminus K$  since  $\hat{a}_i(x) = a_i(\rho(x))$  so  $\rho(x) \in M \setminus K$  implies  $x \in W_{\rho(x)} \subset M \setminus K$ , and so  $x = \rho(x)$ .

The fact that  $M \setminus K$  is open in  $X$ , so that  $(M \setminus K) \setminus \partial = M \setminus (K \cup \partial)$  is also, along with local maximum modulus, shows  $\partial_B$  does not meet  $M \setminus (K \cup \partial)$ : for each element of  $B$  is  $A$ -holomorphic on this set (i.e., locally uniformly approximable), and precisely the trivial argument of [1, 3.2] applies. Now since  $\rho$  is 1-1 over  $M \setminus K$ ,

$$\rho(\partial_B) \cap (M \setminus (K \cup \partial)) = \emptyset$$

so  $\rho(\partial_B) \subset K \cup \partial$ . Thus for  $x \in \partial_B$ , if  $\rho(x) \notin K$  we have  $\rho(x) = x$ , again since  $\rho$  is 1-1 over  $M \setminus K$ , and  $\rho(x) \in K \cup \partial$ , so  $x = \rho(x) \in \partial \setminus K$ . So  $\rho(\partial_B \setminus (\partial \setminus K)) \subset K$ .

We can now conclude that  $\partial_B \subset (\partial \setminus K)^-$ . For  $\partial_B \setminus (\partial \setminus K)^-$  lies in the zero set  $\rho^{-1}(K)$  of the element  $1 - \hat{g} = 1 - g \circ \rho$  of  $B$  (where again  $g \in A$  peaks on  $K$ ), and so in the topological boundary of that set

since it is also in the closure in  $X$  of  $M \setminus K$  (where  $1 - \hat{g}$  never vanishes): indeed this follows from the fact that  $\partial \setminus K$  is dense in the subspace  $(\partial \setminus K)^-$  of  $M$ , hence in the subspace  $(\partial \setminus K)^-$  of  $X$ , so that the dense subset  $(\partial \setminus K)^- \cup (M \setminus K)$  of  $X$  lies in the closure in  $X$  of  $M \setminus K$ . But now by [1, 2.2],  $\partial_B \setminus (\partial \setminus K)^-$  must be void and we have  $\partial_B \subset (\partial \setminus K)^-$ , as asserted, and also the fact that  $M \setminus K$  is dense in  $X$ .

Now if  $\rho^{-1}(\phi)$  is a singleton  $\{\psi\}$  for  $\phi \in K$  then any net  $\{\phi_\delta\}$  in  $M \setminus K$  converging to  $\phi$  in  $M$  can only have  $\psi$  as a cluster point in the compact space  $X$ , so converges to  $\psi$  in  $X$  as well. Since  $\hat{f}$  is continuous on  $X \subset M_B$ ,  $\hat{f}(\psi) = \lim f(\phi_\delta)$  for any such net, and thus  $f$  extends continuously at such a  $\phi$ . Moreover if  $\rho^{-1}(\phi)$  is a singleton for each  $\phi \in K$  then  $\rho$  is 1-1, so  $X$  and  $M$  are homeomorphic, and  $\hat{f}$  provides a continuous extension of  $f$  to  $M$ .

So it only remains to see that if the subset of  $M^\phi$  accessible from  $M \setminus K$  is convex for  $\phi \in K$  then  $\rho^{-1}(\phi)$  is a singleton. First, each accessible  $\lambda$  in  $M^\phi$  is also multiplicative on  $B$  because our function  $f_\epsilon$  defined in (2) lies in  $A$ : for we have  $\lambda_\delta \rightarrow \lambda$   $w^*$ , with  $\lambda_\delta$  representing a point in  $M \setminus K$  and supported by  $\partial \setminus K$ , so that  $\lambda$  is supported by  $(\partial \setminus K)^-$  and

$$\lambda_\delta(f_\epsilon^n a) = \lambda_\delta(f_\epsilon)^n \lambda_\delta(a), \quad a \in A, \quad n \geq 0,$$

and since  $f_\epsilon \rightarrow f$  on  $M \setminus K$  and  $|f_\epsilon| \leq |f|$ , by dominated convergence

$$\lambda_\delta(f^n a) = \lambda_\delta(f)^n \lambda_\delta(a).$$

But  $\lambda_\delta \rightarrow \lambda$   $w^*$  as measures on  $(\partial \setminus K)^-$  while  $f|_{(\partial \setminus K)^-} \in C((\partial \setminus K)^-)$  so  $\lambda(f^n a) = \lambda(f)^n \lambda(a)$ , and  $\lambda$  is multiplicative on  $B$ , as asserted.

Since we know  $M \setminus K$  itself is dense in  $X$ , if  $\psi \in \rho^{-1}(\phi)$  then we have  $\phi_\delta$  in  $M \setminus K$ ,  $\phi_\delta \rightarrow \psi$  in  $X$ , and if  $\lambda_\delta$  is a probability measure on  $\partial_B$  representing  $\phi_\delta$  on  $B$  then  $\{\lambda_\delta\}$  has a cluster point  $\lambda$  carried by  $(\partial \setminus K)^-$  and representing  $\psi$  on  $B$ . Trivially  $\lambda$  represents  $\phi$  on  $A$  and is accessible from  $M \setminus K$ , so each element of  $\rho^{-1}(\phi)$  is represented by one of our convex set of accessible elements of  $M^\phi$ , all of which are multiplicative on  $B$ . But a convex set of multiplicative measures on an algebra  $B$  must all represent the same point of the spectrum<sup>3</sup>, so  $\rho^{-1}(\phi)$  is a singleton, completing our proof of Theorem 1.

(Note that if we take our  $\lambda_\delta$ 's to be Jensen measures then  $\lambda$  is also Jensen, hence accessible in the sense of the remark following Theorem 1, which now follows immediately. In particular, if the elements of  $K$  all have unique Jensen measures (necessarily accessible)

<sup>3</sup> If  $\lambda_i$  represents  $\phi_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ ,  $\phi_1 \neq \phi_2$ ,  $(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)/2$  is multiplicative and  $b(\phi_1) = 0$ ,  $b(\phi_2) = 1$  then  $1/2 = (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)/2(b^2) = ((\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)/2(b))^2 = 1/4$ . Note that we could use any interior point of the segment joining  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  to obtain this contradiction; thus for the modification indicated in footnote 2, we need only take our measures  $\lambda_\delta$  to be Jensen, so  $\lambda$  is, and all such  $\lambda$  agree on  $B$  by an obvious argument.

then the conclusion of Theorem 1 applies.

2. Some remarks are in order. First, (1) is not the most general hypothesis we could use (cf. [2, 3.2, and correction]), but seems nearly so. And  $K$  could equally well be a "generalized" peak set—an intersection of peak sets. To see this note that we have used the fact that our  $K$  was a true peak set mainly to construct  $f_\varepsilon$ ; in all our arguments we then proceed to the fact that  $\nu(f_\varepsilon) \rightarrow \nu(f)$  for some measure  $\nu$  supported by  $M \setminus K$ . In the more general case one has to select, given  $\nu$  and  $\eta > 0$ , a true peak set  $K_1 \supset K$  so  $|\nu|(K_1 \setminus K) < \eta$  and then construct  $f_\varepsilon$  using the peaking function for  $K_1$ , so that  $f_\varepsilon \rightarrow f$  on  $M \setminus K_1$  (and  $|f_\varepsilon| \leq |f|$  of course) whence  $\overline{\lim} |\nu(f_\varepsilon - f)| \leq \|f\| \cdot |\nu|(K_1 \setminus K) \leq \|f\| \cdot \eta$ , which of course suffices.

Next, using accessibility from  $F \subset M \setminus K$  in Theorem 1 yields an analogous assertion about a limiting value as we approach  $\phi$  along  $F$ . Slightly greater generality can also be obtained by noting that instead of assuming (1) for  $A$  we can assume it for any algebra between  $C + \{f \in A: f(K) = 0\}$  and  $A$  since  $f_\varepsilon$  then lies in that algebra, and so in  $A$ .

Finally even when  $f|(\partial \setminus K)$  has no continuous extension to  $\partial$  a bit of our argument survives to give some information on cluster values.

**THEOREM 4.** *Suppose  $A$  satisfies (1) and  $K \subset M$  is a nowhere dense peak set. If  $f \in C(M \setminus K)$  is  $A$ -holomorphic on  $M \setminus (\partial \cup K \cup f^{-1}(0))$  then  $\text{cl}(f, K)$ , the set of cluster values of  $f$  at points of  $K$ , is contained in  $\mathcal{C}(\text{cl}(f|(\partial \setminus K)), \partial \cap K)$ , the closed convex hull of the set of cluster values of  $f|(\partial \setminus K)$ .*

Indeed suppose  $c \in \text{cl}(f, K)$ , so  $c = \lim f(\phi_\delta)$ , where  $\phi_\delta \in M \setminus K$  and  $\phi_\delta \rightarrow \phi_0 \in K$ . If  $\lambda_\delta \in M^{\phi_\delta}$  then  $\lambda_\delta(K) = 0$ , and since  $f_\varepsilon \in A$ ,  $\lambda_\delta(f_\varepsilon) = f_\varepsilon(\phi_\delta)$ , we again conclude by dominated convergence that  $\lambda_\delta(f) = f(\phi_\delta)$ . Trivially all but  $\varepsilon$  of the mass of  $\lambda_\delta$  is carried by a given neighborhood  $V$  of  $\partial \cap K$  in  $\partial$  for  $\delta \geq \delta_{\varepsilon, V}$ , hence by  $V \setminus K$ , so

$$f(\phi_\delta) = \lambda_\delta(f) \in (1 - \varepsilon)\mathcal{C}(f(V \setminus K)) + \varepsilon D,$$

where  $D$  is the closed unit disc in  $C$ , and thus  $c \in \mathcal{C}(f(V \setminus K))$  for all  $V$ , whence our assertion.

3. We conclude with some examples. For  $M$  compact in  $C^N$  with interior  $M^\circ$  let

$$\begin{aligned} A &= A(M) = \{f \in C(M): f \text{ is analytic on } M^\circ\}, \\ A_i &= \{f \in C(M): f \text{ is analytic in } z_i \text{ on } M^\circ\}. \end{aligned}$$



and  $\partial = \partial M$ , not necessarily the Šilov boundary. Then  $A = \bigcap A_i$ , and (1) holds. For  $A_i$  satisfies local maximum modulus relative to  $\partial$ , and suppose  $B$  is a larger subalgebra of  $C(M)$  with this property. Then, since each slice

$$M_0 = M \cap \{z \in \mathbb{C}^N: z_j = z_j^0, j \neq i\}$$

of  $M$  is a peak set for  $A_i$ ,  $B|_{M_0}$  is closed, and for the same reason satisfies local maximum modulus relative to  $M_0 \setminus (M^0 \cap M_0)$ : if  $U$  is a neighborhood in  $M^0$  of  $p \in M^0 \cap M_0$  then  $|b(p)| \leq \sup |b(\partial U)|$  for all  $b \in B$  implies

$$|b(p)| = |ba^n(p)| \leq \sup |ba^n(\partial U)| \longrightarrow \sup |b(M_0 \cap \partial U)|$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $a \in A_i$  peaks on  $M_0$ ; this of course yields our assertion. But now taking  $U$  a ball in  $M^0$  about  $p \in M_0$ , so  $D = M_0 \cap U$  is a disc, we see from Wermer's maximality theorem [3] that  $b \in B$  is analytic in  $z_i$  at  $p$ , whence  $B = A_i$  as desired. (It may be worth noting that even for  $N = 1$  those  $M$  for which  $A(M)$  is relatively maximal have not been identified as yet, so that property (1) seems more easily applicable. A simple condition insuring the convexity of accessible measures frequently holds in this setting, but often when the conclusion can be obtained rather trivially from analytic structure. It is simply that we have a sequence  $\sigma_n: K \rightarrow M \setminus K$  of continuous maps tending pointwise to the identity, with  $A \circ \sigma_n \subset A|_K$  and  $\sigma_n((\partial \setminus K)^- \cap K) \subset \partial \setminus K$ . For then any  $\lambda$  on  $(\partial \setminus K)^-$  representing  $\phi \in K$  has  $\sigma_n^* \lambda$  carried by  $\partial \setminus K$  while  $\sigma_n^* \lambda(a) = \lambda(a \circ \sigma_n) = a \circ \sigma_n(\phi) = a(\sigma_n(\phi))$ ,  $a \in A$ , so  $\sigma_n^* \lambda$  represents  $\sigma_n(\phi) \in M \setminus K$  and  $\sigma_n^* \lambda \rightarrow \lambda$   $w^*$  by dominated convergence. Thus all representing measures for  $\phi$  on  $(\partial \setminus K)^-$  are accessible.)

As an application of Theorem 1, let  $E = \{z \in \mathbb{C}: 1/2 \leq |z| \leq 1\}$  and  $\{D_n\}$  be a sequence of disjoint open discs in  $E^0$  which accumulate only on  $\partial E$ . Set  $E_{2^{-n}} = E \setminus \bigcup_{j \geq n} D_j$ ,  $n \geq 0$ ,  $E_0 = E$ , and for  $2^{-n-1} < x < 2^{-n}$   $E_x = E \setminus \bigcup_{j \geq n+1} D_j \cup 2^{n+1}(x - 2^{-n-1})D_n$  (so that we continuously and successively fill the holes in  $E_{2^n}$ ). Now let  $M_x = \{x\} \times E_x$  and  $M = \bigcup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} M_x$ , the corresponding compact set in  $\mathbb{C}^2$ ; we take  $A \subset C(M)$  to consist of those  $f$  for which

$$z \longrightarrow f(x, z) \text{ is analytic on } E_x, \quad 0 \leq x \leq 1.$$

Trivially  $\partial = \bigcup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} \{x\} \times \partial E_x$  is compact and the Šilov boundary for  $A$ , and  $A$  satisfies local maximum modulus relative to  $\partial$ ; moreover  $A$  is maximal with respect to this property, again by Wermer's maximality theorem.

Now  $K = M_0$  is our peak set, and we next want to observe that for  $\phi = (0, z) \in \{0\} \times E^0$ , the measures in  $M^\phi$  accessible from  $M \setminus K$

form a convex set. Since  $A \mid M_0$  can be identified with  $A(E)$ , which has a one-dimensional set of real orthogonal measures on  $\partial E$ ,  $M^\phi$  is a segment, and its set  $F$  of accessible elements fails to be convex only if  $F$  lies in two disjoint subsegments, both meeting  $F$ . Let  $N_1$  and  $N_2$  be disjoint  $w^*$  compact neighborhoods of these subsegments in the space of these subsegments of measures on  $\partial$ . Then for a sufficiently small closed ball  $N$  in  $C^2$  about our  $\phi$  each  $\psi \in (M \setminus M_0) \cap N = N_0$  is represented by a convex set  $M^\psi$  of measures on  $\partial$  lying wholly in  $N_1$ , or in  $N_2$ ; thus since  $N_0$  is connected if  $N$  is sufficiently small (because of the accumulation of the discs  $D_j$  only on  $\partial E$ ) while

$$\{\psi \in N_0: M^\psi \subset N_i\}$$

is closed in  $N_0$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , we must have one empty, and  $F$  cannot meet both  $N_1$  and  $N_2$ .

Note that both Theorem 2 and Corollary 3 now apply to the example. (Indeed an alternative approach is to see that for  $0 < x < \varepsilon$  the functional on  $C(\partial E_x)$  given by

$$f \longrightarrow \int_{|z|=3/4} \frac{\partial f^*}{\partial n} |dz|$$

(where  $f^*$  is the harmonic extension of  $f$  to  $E_x$ , and the integral gives the period of the conjugate harmonic function) is represented by a measure  $\nu_x \geq 0$  on the part  $E_x^1$  of  $\partial E_x$  outside  $|z| = 3/4$  and  $\leq 0$  on the part  $E_x^2$  within. The restrictions  $\nu_x^1, \nu_x^2$  to these parts have equal mass  $\geq c > 0$  (consider  $f = 1$  and  $f = \log |z|$ ), and thus for some  $x_\delta \rightarrow 0, \nu_{x_\delta}^1 \rightarrow \lambda^1 \neq 0, \nu_{x_\delta}^2 \rightarrow \lambda^2$  and  $\lambda^1 - \lambda^2$  is a nonzero real measure on  $\{0\} \times \partial E$  orthogonal to  $A \mid M_0$ , hence spans the space of such measures, and (c) of Theorem 2 follows. Note that this approach would work if  $E$  had  $n > 2$  complementary components.)

(That (a) implies (b) in Theorem 2 can fail if  $\partial \neq \partial_A$ , as can Corollary 3, can be seen by taking  $\partial = \partial_A \cup \{\phi\}$  for some  $\phi$  in  $K \setminus \partial_A$  in this example: for  $\delta_\phi - \lambda$  is not in the  $w^*$ closure of  $A_{\frac{1}{n}}$ , for any  $\lambda$  on  $\partial_A$  representing  $\phi$  since the  $w^*$ closure is carried by  $(\partial \cap (M \setminus K))^- = \partial_A$ .)

We have complicated the preceding example (by the insertion of our shrinking holes) so as to avoid having our continuity obtainable in a trivial and direct way: Without the holes,

$$f(0, re^{i\theta}) = \lim f\left(\frac{1}{n}, re^{i\theta}\right)$$

uniformly for  $r = 1/2$  and 1 says  $f(0, \cdot)$  is the boundary value function of an element of  $A(E)$ . Even with the conclusion non-obvious, the example is not satisfying as an application of Theorem 1 since it really follows from the simple part, (c) implies (a), of Theorem 2.

However we can modify it by a hair and make Theorem 2 inapplicable. Indeed for  $z_0 \in E^0$ , now let

$$M = \bigcup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} M_x \cup ([-1, 0] \times \{z_0\})$$

so we have added a segment to our old  $M$  which meets that set in  $\{(0, z_0)\}$ . For  $A$  we take all continuous extensions of our old algebra, so our Šilov boundary is the old one plus our closed segment, and we take  $K = M_0$ . Again  $A$  satisfies (1) as before (there is a removable singularity at  $(0, z_0)$  in  $\{0\} \times E^0$  of course to be mentioned after applying Wermer), and it is trivial to give an  $f$  satisfying (3) which does not extend:  $f(x, z) = z$  for  $x > 0$ ,  $f(x, z_0) = -z_0$  for  $x \leq 0$ . On the other hand, every  $f$  satisfying (3) does extend to  $\phi = (0, z) \neq (0, z_0)$  since  $N_0$  is connected and our accessible measures, which must be carried by our old boundary, again lie on a segment. Our argument fails at  $\phi = (0, z_0)$  since  $M^\phi$  is a triangle; this could be changed to a segment simply by replacing  $E$  by the unit disc, but even then it fails since  $N_0$  is not connected.)

#### REFERENCES

1. I. Glicksberg, *Maximal algebras and a theorem of Radó*, Pacific, J. Math., **14** (1964), 919-941; correction **19** (1966), 587.
2. ———, *A Phragmén-Lindelöf theorem for function algebras*, Pacific, J. Math., **22** (1967), 401-406.
3. K. Hoffman, *Banach Spaces of Analytic Functions*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1962.

Received November 7, 1974. Work supported in part by the N.S.F.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY

AND

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

# PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

## EDITORS

RICHARD ARENS (Managing Editor)  
University of California  
Los Angeles, California 90024

J. DUGUNDJI  
Department of Mathematics  
University of Southern California  
Los Angeles, California 90007

R. A. BEAUMONT  
University of Washington  
Seattle, Washington 98105

D. GILBARG AND J. MILGRAM  
Stanford University  
Stanford, California 94305

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

E. F. BECKENBACH

B. H. NEUMANN

F. WOLF

K. YOSHIDA

## SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA  
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA  
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY  
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON  
OSAKA UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA  
STANFORD UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO  
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH  
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON  
\* \* \*  
AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY

---

The Supporting Institutions listed above contribute to the cost of publication of this Journal, but they are not owners or publishers and have no responsibility for its content or policies.

---

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be in typed form or offset-reproduced, (not dittoed), double spaced with large margins. Please do not use built up fractions in the text of your manuscript. You may however, use them in the displayed equations. Underline Greek letters in red, German in green, and script in blue. The first paragraph or two must be capable of being used separately as a synopsis of the entire paper. Items of the bibliography should not be cited there unless absolutely necessary, in which case they must be identified by author and Journal, rather than by item number. Manuscripts, in triplicate, may be sent to any one of the editors. Please classify according to the scheme of Math. Reviews, Index to Vol. **39**. All other communications should be addressed to the managing editor, or Elaine Barth, University of California, Los Angeles, California, 90024.

The Pacific Journal of Mathematics expects the author's institution to pay page charges, and reserves the right to delay publication for nonpayment of charges in case of financial emergency.

100 reprints are provided free for each article, only if page charges have been substantially paid. Additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

---

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* is issued monthly as of January 1966. Regular subscription rate: \$72.00 a year (6 Vols., 12 issues). Special rate: \$36.00 a year to individual members of supporting institutions.

Subscriptions, orders for back numbers, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 103 Highland Boulevard, Berkeley, California, 94708.

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

Printed at Kokusai Bunken Insatsusha (International Academic Printing Co., Ltd.),  
8-8, 3-chome, Takadanobaba, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160, Japan.

Copyright © 1975 by Pacific Journal of Mathematics  
Manufactured and first issued in Japan

Graham Donald Allen, Francis Joseph Narcowich and James Patrick Williams, <i>An operator version of a theorem of Kolmogorov</i> .....	305
Joel Hilary Anderson and Ciprian Foias, <i>Properties which normal operators share with normal derivations and related operators</i> .....	313
Constantin Gelu Apostol and Norberto Salinas, <i>Nilpotent approximations and quasinilpotent operators</i> .....	327
James M. Briggs, Jr., <i>Finitely generated ideals in regular <math>F</math>-algebras</i> .....	339
Frank Benjamin Cannonito and Ronald Wallace Gatterdam, <i>The word problem and power problem in 1-relator groups are primitive recursive</i> .....	351
Clifton Earle Corzatt, <i>Permutation polynomials over the rational numbers</i> .....	361
L. S. Dube, <i>An inversion of the <math>S_2</math> transform for generalized functions</i> .....	383
William Richard Emerson, <i>Averaging strongly subadditive set functions in unimodular amenable groups. I</i> .....	391
Barry J. Gardner, <i>Semi-simple radical classes of algebras and attainability of identities</i> .....	401
Irving Leonard Glicksberg, <i>Removable discontinuities of <math>A</math>-holomorphic functions</i> ...	417
Fred Halpern, <i>Transfer theorems for topological structures</i> .....	427
H. B. Hamilton, T. E. Nordahl and Takayuki Tamura, <i>Commutative cancellative semigroups without idempotents</i> .....	441
Melvin Hochster, <i>An obstruction to lifting cyclic modules</i> .....	457
Alistair H. Lachlan, <i>Theories with a finite number of models in an uncountable power are categorical</i> .....	465
Kjeld Laursen, <i>Continuity of linear maps from <math>C^*</math>-algebras</i> .....	483
Tsai Sheng Liu, <i>Oscillation of even order differential equations with deviating arguments</i> .....	493
Jorge Martinez, <i>Doubling chains, singular elements and hyper-<math>Z</math> <math>l</math>-groups</i> .....	503
Mehdi Radjabalipour and Heydar Radjavi, <i>On the geometry of numerical ranges</i> .....	507
Thomas I. Seidman, <i>The solution of singular equations, I. Linear equations in Hilbert space</i> .....	513
R. James Tomkins, <i>Properties of martingale-like sequences</i> .....	521
Alfons Van Daele, <i>A Radon Nikodým theorem for weights on von Neumann algebras</i> .....	527
Kenneth S. Williams, <i>On Euler's criterion for quintic nonresidues</i> .....	543
Manfred Wischnewsky, <i>On linear representations of affine groups. I</i> .....	551
Scott Andrew Wolpert, <i>Noncompleteness of the Weil-Petersson metric for Teichmüller space</i> .....	573
Volker Wrobel, <i>Some generalizations of Schauder's theorem in locally convex spaces</i> .....	579
Birge Huisgen-Zimmermann, <i>Endomorphism rings of self-generators</i> .....	587
Kelly Denis McKennon, <i>Corrections to: "Multipliers of type <math>(p, p)</math>"; "Multipliers of type <math>(p, p)</math> and multipliers of the group <math>L_p</math>-algebras"; "Multipliers and the group <math>L_p</math>-algebras"</i> .....	603
Andrew M. W. Glass, W. Charles (Wilbur) Holland Jr. and Stephen H. McCleary, <i>Correction to: "<math>a^*</math>-closures to completely distributive lattice-ordered groups"</i> .....	606
Zvi Arad and George Isaac Glauberman, <i>Correction to: "A characteristic subgroup of a group of odd order"</i> .....	607
Roger W. Barnard and John Lawson Lewis, <i>Correction to: "Subordination theorems for some classes of starlike functions"</i> .....	607
David Westreich, <i>Corrections to: "Bifurcation of operator equations with unbounded linearized part"</i> .....	608