

A Scalar Associated with the Inverse of Some Abelian Integrals on Open Riemann Surfaces and a Ramified Riemann Domain

Junjiro Noguchi*

April 24, 2019

Abstract

We introduce a positive scalar function $\rho(a, \Omega)$ for a domain Ω of a complex manifold X with a global holomorphic frame of the cotangent bundle by closed Abelian differentials, which heuristically measure the distance from $a \in \Omega$ to the boundary $\partial\Omega$. We prove an *estimate of Cartan–Thullen type with $\rho(a, \Omega)$* for holomorphically convex hulls of compact subsets.

In one dimensional case, we apply the obtained estimate of $\rho(a, \Omega)$ to give a new proof of Behnke–Stein’s Theorem for the Steiness of open Riemann surfaces. We then use the same idea to deal with the Levi problem for ramified Riemann domains over \mathbf{C}^n . We obtain some geometric conditions in terms of $\rho(a, X)$ which imply the validity of the Levi problem for a finitely sheeted Riemann domain over \mathbf{C}^n .

1 Introduction and main results

1.1 Introduction

In 1943 K. Oka wrote a manuscript in Japanese, solving affirmatively the Levi problem for unramified Riemann domains over complex Euclidean space $\mathbf{C}^{n\,1)}$ and in 1953 he published Oka IX [21] to solve it by making use of his Coherence Theorem proved in Oka VII [19]²⁾; there, he put a special emphasis on the difficulties of the ramified case (see [21], Introduction 2 and §23). H. Grauert also emphasized the Levi problem for

*Research supported in part by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B) 23340029.

Keywords: Abeian integral; open Riemann surface; Riemann domain; Stein manifold

¹⁾ This fact was written twice in the introductions of his two papers, [20] and [21]: The manuscript was written as a research report sent to Teiji Takagi, then Professor at the Imperial University of Tokyo, and now one can find it in [24].

²⁾ It is noted that Oka VII [19] is different to his original, Oka VII in [22]; therefore, there are two versions of Oka VII. The English translation of Oka VII in [23] was taken from the latter.

ramified Riemann domains in his lecture at OKA 100 Conference Kyoto/Nara 2001. Oka's Theorem was generalized for unramified Riemann domains over complex projective n -space $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$ by R. Fujita [9] and A. Takeuchi [27]. Later, H. Grauert [16] gave a counter-example to the problem for ramified Riemann domains over $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$, and J.E. Fornæss [6] gave a counter-example to it over \mathbf{C}^n . Therefore, it is natural to look for geometric conditions which imply the validity of the Levi problem for ramified Riemann domains.

Under a geometric condition (Cond A, 1.1) on a complex manifold X , we introduce a new scalar function $\rho(a, \Omega) (> 0)$ for a subdomain $\Omega \subset X$. We prove an *estimate of Cartan-Thullen type* ([4]) for the holomorphically convex hull \hat{K}_Ω of a compact subset $K \Subset \Omega$ with $\rho(a, \Omega)$ (see Theorem 1.7).

In one dimensional case, by making use of $\rho(a, \Omega)$ we give a *new proof of Behnke-Stein's Theorem*: Every Riemann surface is Stein. In the known methods one uses a generalization of the Cauchy kernel or some functional analytic method (cf. Behnke-Stein [2], Kusunoki [15], Forster [7], etc.). Here we will use Oka's Jôku-Ikô combined with Grauert's finiteness theorem, which is now a rather easy result by a simplification of the proof, particularly in 1-dimensional case (see §1.2.2). We see here how the scalar $\rho(a, \Omega)$ works well in this case.

Now, let $X \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^n$ be a Riemann domain, possibly ramified, such that X satisfies Cond A. Then, we prove that a domain $\Omega \Subset X$ is a *domain of holomorphy if and only if Ω is holomorphically convex* (see Theorem 1.20). We consider a boundary condition (Cond B, 1.23) with $\rho(a, X)$. We assume that X satisfies Cond A and that $X \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^n$ satisfies Cond B and is finitely sheeted. We prove that *if X is locally Stein over \mathbf{C}^n , then X is Stein* (see Theorem 1.25).

We give the proofs in §2. In §3 we will discuss some examples and properties of $\rho(a, X)$.

1.2 Main results

1.2.1 Scalar $\rho(a, \Omega)$

Let X be a connected complex manifold of dimension n with holomorphic cotangent bundle $\mathbf{T}(X)^*$. We assume:

Condition 1.1 (Cond A). There exists a global frame $\omega = (\omega^1, \dots, \omega^n)$ of $\mathbf{T}(X)^*$ over X such that $d\omega^j = 0$, $1 \leq j \leq n$.

Let $\Omega \subset X$ be a subdomain. With Cond A we consider an Abelian integral (a path integral) of ω in Ω from $a \in \Omega$:

$$(1.2) \quad \alpha : x \in \Omega \longrightarrow \zeta = (\zeta^j) = \left(\int_a^x \omega^1, \dots, \int_a^x \omega^n \right) \in \mathbf{C}^n.$$

We denote by $P\Delta(\rho) = \prod_{j=1}^n \{|\zeta^j| < \rho\}$ the polydisk of \mathbf{C}^n with center at 0 and the same radii $\rho > 0$. Then, $\alpha(x) = \zeta$ has the inverse $\phi_{a, \rho_0}(\zeta) = x$ on a small polydisk $P\Delta(\rho_0)$

$$(1.3) \quad \phi_{a, \rho_0} : P\Delta(\rho_0) \longrightarrow U_0 = \phi_{a, \rho_0}(P\Delta(\rho_0)) \subset \Omega.$$

Then we extend analytically ϕ_{a,ρ_0} to $\phi_{a,\rho} : P\Delta(\rho) \rightarrow X$, $\rho \geq \rho_0$, as much as possible, and set

$$(1.4) \quad \rho(a, \Omega) = \sup\{\rho > 0 : \exists \phi_{a,\rho} : P\Delta(\rho) \rightarrow X, \phi_{a,\rho}(P\Delta(\rho)) \subset \Omega\}.$$

Then we have the inverse of the Abelian integral α on the polydisk of the maximum radius

$$(1.5) \quad \phi_a : P\Delta(\rho(a, \Omega)) \longrightarrow \Omega.$$

To be precise, we should write

$$(1.6) \quad \rho(a, \Omega) = \rho(a, \omega, \Omega) = \rho(a, P\Delta, \omega, \Omega),$$

where $P\Delta$ denotes the unit polydisk (so that $P\Delta(\rho) = \rho P\Delta$). Unless confusion occurs, we use $\rho(a, \Omega)$ for notational simplicity.

We immediately see that (cf. §2.1.1)

- (i) $\rho(a, \Omega)$ is continuous;
- (ii) $\rho(a, \Omega) \leq \inf\{|v|_\omega : v \in \mathbf{T}(X)_a, F_\Omega(v) = 1\}$, where F_Ω denotes the Kobayashi hyperbolic infinitesimal form of Ω , and $|v|_\omega$ the maximum norm of v with respect to $\omega = (\omega^j)$.

For a subset $A \subset \Omega$ we write

$$\rho(A, \Omega) = \inf\{\rho(a, \Omega) : a \in A\}.$$

For a compact subset $K \Subset \Omega$ we denote by \hat{K}_Ω the holomorphically convex hull of K defined by

$$\hat{K}_\Omega = \left\{ x \in \Omega : |f(x)| \leq \max_K |f|, \forall f \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega) \right\},$$

where $\mathcal{O}(\Omega)$ is the set of all holomorphic functions on Ω . If $\hat{K}_\Omega \Subset \Omega$ for any $K \Subset \Omega$, Ω is called a holomorphically convex domain.

The following theorem of Cartan-Thullen type (cf. [4]) is our first main result.

Theorem 1.7. *Let X be a complex manifold satisfying Cond A. Let $\Omega \Subset X$ be a relatively compact subdomain, let $K \Subset \Omega$ be a compact subset, and let $f \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$. Assume that*

$$|f(a)| \leq \rho(a, \Omega), \quad \forall a \in K.$$

Then we have

$$(1.8) \quad |f(a)| \leq \rho(a, \Omega), \quad \forall a \in \hat{K}_\Omega.$$

In particular, we have

$$(1.9) \quad \rho(K, \Omega) = \rho(\hat{K}_\Omega, \Omega).$$

For a relatively compact subdomain $\Omega \Subset X$ we may naturally define the notion of domain of holomorphy.

Corollary 1.10. *Let $\Omega \Subset X$ be as above. Then, Ω is a domain of holomorphy if and only if Ω is holomorphically convex.*

1.2.2 Behnke-Stein's Theorem for open Riemann surfaces

We apply the scalar $\rho(a, \Omega)$ introduced above to give a new proof of Behnke-Stein's Theorem for the Steinness of open Riemann surfaces, which is one of the most basic facts in the theory of Riemann surfaces: Here, we do not use the Cauchy kernel generalized on a Riemann surface, but use Oka's Jôku-Ikô together with Grauert's finiteness theorem, which is now a rather easy result, particularly in 1-dimensional case. This is the very difference of our new proof to the known ones (cf. [2], [15], [7]).

To be precise, we recall the definition of Stein manifold:

Definition 1.11. A complex manifold M of pure dimension n is called a Stein manifold if the following Stein conditions are satisfied:

- (i) M satisfies the second countability axiom.
- (ii) For distinct points $p, q \in M$ there is an $f \in \mathcal{O}(M)$ with $f(p) \neq f(q)$.
- (iii) For every $p \in M$ there are $f_j \in \mathcal{O}(M)$, $1 \leq j \leq n$, such that $df_1(p) \wedge \cdots \wedge df_n(p) \neq 0$.
- (iv) M is holomorphically convex.

We will rely on the following H. Grauert's Finiteness Theorem in 1-dimensional case, which is now a rather easy consequence of Oka–Cartan's Fundamental Theorem, particularly in 1-dimensional case, thanks to a very simplified proof of L. Schwartz's Finiteness Theorem based on the idea of Demailly's Lecture Notes [5], Chap. IX (cf. [17], §7.3 for the present form):

L. Schwartz' Finiteness Theorem. *Let E be a Fréchet space and let F be a Baire vector space. Let $A : E \rightarrow F$ be a continuous linear surjection, and let $B : E \rightarrow F$ be a completely continuous linear map. Then, $(A + B)(E)$ is closed and the cokernel $\text{Coker}(A + B)$ is finite dimensional.*

Here, a Baire space is a space such that Baire's category theorem holds. The statement above is slightly generalized than the one usually stated, in which F is also assumed to be Fréchet (cf. L. Schwartz [25], Serre [26], Bers [3], Grauert-Remmert [12], Demailly [5]).

Grauert's Theorem in dimension 1. *Let X be an open Riemann surface, and let $\Omega \Subset X$ be a relatively compact subdomain. Then,*

$$(1.12) \quad \dim H^1(\Omega, \mathcal{O}_\Omega) < \infty.$$

Here, \mathcal{O}_Ω denotes the sheaf of germs of holomorphic functions over Ω .

N.B. It is the very idea of Grauert to claim only the finite dimensionality, weaker than a posteriori statement, $H^1(\Omega, \mathcal{O}_\Omega) = 0$: It makes the proof considerably easy.

By making use of this theorem we prove an intermediate result:

Lemma 1.13. *Every relatively compact domain Ω of X is Stein.*

Let $\Omega \Subset \tilde{\Omega} \Subset X$ be subdomains of an open Riemann surface X . Since $\tilde{\Omega}$ is Stein by Lemma 1.13 and $H^2(\tilde{\Omega}, \mathbf{Z}) = 0$, we see by the Oka Principle that the line bundle of holomorphic 1-forms over $\tilde{\Omega}$ is trivial, and so we have:

Corollary 1.14. *There exists a holomorphic 1-form ω on $\tilde{\Omega}$ without zeros.*

By making use of ω above we define $\rho(a, \Omega)$ as in (1.4) with $X = \tilde{\Omega}$.

Applying Oka's Jôku-Ikô combined with $\rho(a, \Omega)$, we give the proofs of the following approximations of Runge type:

Lemma 1.15. *Let Ω' be a domain such that $\Omega \Subset \Omega' \Subset \tilde{\Omega}$. Assume that*

$$(1.16) \quad \max_{b \in \partial\Omega} \rho(b, \Omega') < \rho(K, \Omega).$$

Then, every $f \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$ can be approximated uniformly on K by elements of $\mathcal{O}(\Omega')$.

Theorem 1.17. *Assume that no component of $\tilde{\Omega} \setminus \bar{\Omega}$ is relatively compact in $\tilde{\Omega}$. Then, every $f \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$ can be approximated uniformly on compact subsets of Ω by elements of $\mathcal{O}(\tilde{\Omega})$.*

Finally we give a proof of

Theorem 1.18 (Behnke-Stein [2]). *Every open Riemann surface X is Stein.*

1.2.3 Riemann domains

Let X be a complex manifold, and let $\pi : X \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^n$ (resp. $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$) be a holomorphic map.

Definition 1.19. We call $\pi : X \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^n$ (resp. $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$) a *Riemann domain* (over \mathbf{C}^n (resp. $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$)) if every fiber $\pi^{-1}z$ with $z \in \mathbf{C}^n$ (resp. $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$) is discrete; if $d\pi$ has the maximal rank everywhere, it is called an *unramified* Riemann domain (over \mathbf{C}^n (resp. $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$)). A Riemann domain which is not unramified, is called a *ramified Riemann domain*. If the cardinality of $\pi^{-1}z$ is bounded in $z \in \mathbf{C}^n$ (resp. $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$), then we say that $\pi : X \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^n$ (resp. $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$) is *finitely sheeted* or *k-sheeted* with the maximum k of the cardinalities of $\pi^{-1}z$ ($z \in \mathbf{C}^n$ (resp. $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$)).

If $\pi : X \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^n$ (resp. $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$) is a Riemann domain, then the pull-back of Euclidean metric (resp. Fubini-Study metric) by π is a degenerate (pseudo-) hermitian metric on X , which leads a distance function on X ; hence, X satisfies the second countability axiom.

We have:

Theorem 1.20. *Let $\pi : X \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^n$ be a Riemann domain such that X satisfies Cond A.*

- (i) *Let $\Omega \Subset X$ be a subdomain. Then, Ω is a domain of holomorphy if and only if Ω is Stein.*

- (ii) If X is Stein, then $-\log \rho(a, X)$ is either identically $-\infty$, or continuous plurisubharmonic.

Definition 1.21 (Locally Stein). (i) Let X be a complex manifold. We say that a subdomain $\Omega \Subset X$ is *locally Stein* if for every $a \in \bar{\Omega}$ (the topological closure) there is a neighborhood U of a in X such that $\Omega \cap U$ is Stein.

- (ii) Let $\pi : X \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^n$ be a Riemann domain. If for every point $z \in \mathbf{C}^n$ there is a neighborhood V of z such that $\pi^{-1}V$ is Stein, X is said to be *locally Stein over \mathbf{C}^n* (cf. [6]).

In general, the Levi problem is to ask if a locally Stein domain (over \mathbf{C}^n) is Stein. The following is a result for the Levi problem in case (i) for a Riemann domain:

Proposition 1.22. *Let $\pi : X \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^n$ be a Riemann domain such that X satisfies Cond A, and let $\Omega \Subset X$ be a subdomain. If Ω is locally Stein, then Ω is a Stein manifold.*

Let $\pi : X \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^n$ be a Riemann domain such that X satisfies Cond A. and let ∂X denote the ideal boundary of X over \mathbf{C}^n (called the accescible boundary in Fritzsche-Grauert [8], Chap. II §9). To deal with the total space X we consider the following condition which is a sort of *localization principle*:

Condition 1.23 (Cond B). (i) $\lim_{a \rightarrow \partial X} \rho(a, X) = 0$,

- (ii) For every ideal boundary point $b \in \partial X$ there are neighborhoods $V \Subset W$ of $\pi(b)$ in \mathbf{C}^n such that for the connected components $\tilde{V} \subset \tilde{W}$ which are elements of the defining filter of b ,

$$(1.24) \quad \rho(a, X) = \rho(a, \tilde{W}), \quad \forall a \in \tilde{V}.$$

For the Levi problem in case (ii) we prove:

Theorem 1.25. *Let $\pi : X \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^n$ be a finitely sheeted Riemann domain. Assume that Cond A and Cond B are satisfied. Then, if X is locally Stein over \mathbf{C}^n , then X is a Stein manifold.*

Remark 1.26. Fornæss' counter-example ([6]) for the Levi problem in the ramified case is a 2-sheeted Riemann domain over \mathbf{C}^n .

Acknowledgment. The author is very grateful to Professor Makoto Abe for interesting discussions on the present theme.

2 Proofs

2.1 Scalar $\rho(a, \Omega)$

Let X be a complex manifold satisfying Cond A.

We here deal with some elementary properties of $\rho(a, \Omega)$ defined by (1.4) for a subdomain $\Omega \Subset X$. We use the same notion as in §1.2.1. We identify $P\Delta(\rho_0)$ and U_0 in (1.3). For $b, c \in P\Delta(\rho_0)$ we have

$$\rho(b, \Omega) \geq \rho(c, \Omega) - |b - c|,$$

where $|b - c|$ denotes the maximum norm with respect to the coordinate system $(\zeta^j) \in P\Delta(\rho_0)$. Thus,

$$\rho(c, \Omega) - \rho(b, \Omega) \leq |b - c|.$$

Changing b and c , we have the converse inequality, so that

$$(2.1) \quad |\rho(b, \Omega) - \rho(c, \Omega)| \leq |b - c|, \quad b, c \in P\Delta(\rho_0) \cong U_0.$$

Therefore, $\rho(a, \Omega)$ is a continuous function in $a \in \Omega$.

Let $v = \sum_{j=1}^n v^j \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta^j} \right)_a \in \mathbf{T}(\Omega)_a$ be a holomorphic tangent at $a \in \Omega$. Then,

$$|v|_\omega = \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} |v^j|.$$

With $|v|_\omega = 1$ we have by the definition of the Kobayashi hyperbolic infinitesimal metric F_Ω (cf. [14], [18])

$$F_\Omega(v) \leq \frac{1}{\rho(a, \Omega)}.$$

Therefore we have

$$(2.2) \quad \rho(a, \Omega) \leq \inf_{v: F_\Omega(v)=1} |v|_\omega.$$

Provided that $\partial\Omega \neq \emptyset$, it immediately follows that

$$(2.3) \quad \lim_{a \rightarrow \partial\Omega} \rho(a, \Omega) = 0.$$

Remark 2.4. We consider an *unramified* Riemann domain $\pi : X \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^n$. Let (z^1, \dots, z^n) be the natural coordinate system of \mathbf{C}^n and put $\omega = (\pi^* dz^j)$. Then the boundary distance function $\delta_{P\Delta}(a, \partial X)$ to the ideal boundary ∂X with respect to the unit polydisk $P\Delta$ is defined as the supremum of such $r > 0$ that X is univalent onto $\pi(a) + rP\Delta$ in a neighborhood of a (cf., e.g., [13], [17]). Therefore, in this case we have that

$$(2.5) \quad \rho(a, X) = \delta_{P\Delta}(a, \partial X).$$

As for the difficulty to deal with the Levi problem for ramified Riemann domains, K. Oka wrote in IX [21], §23:

“ Pour le deuxième cas les rayons de *Hartogs* cessent de jouer du rôle; ceci présente une difficulté qui m'apparait vraiment grande.”

The above “le deuxième cas” is the ramified case. In the present paper, the scalar $\rho(a, X)$ defined under Cond A plays the role of “Hartogs’ radius”.

Remark 2.6. Let X be a complex manifold satisfying Cond A. We see that if $\rho(a_0, X) = \infty$ at a point $a_0 \in X$, then $\phi_{a_0} : \mathbf{C}^n \rightarrow X$ is surjective, and $\rho(a, X) \equiv \infty$ for $a \in X$. In fact, suppose that $\rho(a_0, X) = \infty$. Then, for any $a \in X$ we take a path C_a from a_0 to a and set $\zeta = \alpha(a)$. By the definition, $\phi_{a_0}(\zeta) = a$, and it follows that $\rho(a, X) = \infty$. Even if $\rho(a, \omega, X) = \infty$ (cf. (1.6)), $\rho(a, \omega', X)$ with respect another choice ω' may be finite (cf. §3).

2.2 Proof of Theorem 1.7

For $a \in \Omega$ we let

$$\phi_a : P\Delta(\rho(a, \Omega)) \longrightarrow \Omega$$

be as in (1.5). We take an arbitrary element $u \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$. With a fixed positive number $s < 1$ we set

$$L = \bigcup_{a \in K} \phi_a \left(\overline{P\Delta(s|f(a)|)} \right).$$

Then it follows from the assumption that L is a compact subset of Ω . Therefore there is an $M > 0$ such that

$$|u| < M \text{ on } L.$$

Let ∂_j be the dual vector fields of ω^j , $1 \leq j \leq n$, on X . For a multi-index $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ with non-negative integers $\alpha_j \in \mathbf{Z}^+$ we put

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^\alpha &= \partial_1^{\alpha_1} \dots \partial_n^{\alpha_n} \\ |\alpha| &= \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_n, \\ \alpha! &= \alpha_1! \dots \alpha_n!. \end{aligned}$$

By Cauchy’s inequalities for $u \circ \phi_a$ on $\overline{P\Delta(s|f(a)|)}$ with $a \in K$ we have

$$\frac{1}{\alpha!} |\partial^\alpha u(a)| \cdot |sf(a)|^{|\alpha|} \leq M, \quad \forall a \in K, \quad \forall \alpha \in (\mathbf{Z}^+)^n.$$

Note that $(\partial^\alpha u) \cdot f^{|\alpha|} \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$. By the definition of \hat{K}_Ω ,

$$(2.7) \quad \frac{1}{\alpha!} |\partial^\alpha u(a)| \cdot |sf(a)|^{|\alpha|} \leq M, \quad \forall a \in \hat{K}_\Omega, \quad \forall \alpha \in (\mathbf{Z}^+)^n.$$

For $a \in \hat{K}_\Omega$ we consider the Taylor expansion of $u \circ \phi_a(\zeta)$ at a :

$$(2.8) \quad u \circ \phi_a(\zeta) = \sum_{\alpha \in (\mathbf{Z}^+)^n} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \partial^\alpha u(a) \zeta^\alpha.$$

We infer from (2.7) that (2.8) converges at least on $P\Delta(s|f(a)|)$. Since Ω is a domain of holomorphy, we have that $\rho(a, \Omega) \geq s|f(a)|$. Letting $s \nearrow 1$, we deduce (1.8).

By definition, $\rho(K, \Omega) \geq \rho(\hat{K}_\Omega, \Omega)$. The converse is deduced by applying the result obtained above for a constant function $f \equiv \rho(K, \Omega)$; thus (1.9) follows. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.10: Assume that $\Omega \Subset X$ is a domain of holomorphy. Let $K \Subset \Omega$. It follows from (1.9) that $\hat{K}_\Omega \Subset \Omega$, and hence Ω is holomorphically convex. The converse is clear. \square

Remark 2.9. Replacing $P\Delta(r)$ by a ball $B(r)$ of radius r with center at 0, one may define similarly $\rho(a, \Omega)$. Then Theorem 1.7 remains to hold. Note that the union of all unitary rotations of $P\Delta(r/\sqrt{n})$ is $B(r)$.

2.3 Proof of Behnke-Stein's Theorem

2.3.1 Proof of Lemma 1.13

(a) We take a subdomain $\tilde{\Omega}$ of X such that $\Omega \Subset \tilde{\Omega} \Subset X$. Let $c \in \partial\Omega$ be any point, and take a local coordinate neighborhood system (W_0, w) in $\tilde{\Omega}$ with holomorphic coordinate w such that $w = 0$ at c . We consider Cousin I distributions for $k = 1, 2, \dots$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{w^k} & \text{ on } W_0, \\ 0 & \text{ on } W_1 = \tilde{\Omega} \setminus \{c\}. \end{aligned}$$

These induce cohomology classes

$$\left[\frac{1}{w^k} \right] \in H^1(\{W_0, W_1\}, \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\Omega}}) \hookrightarrow H^1(\tilde{\Omega}, \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\Omega}}), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots$$

Since $\dim H^1(\tilde{\Omega}, \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\Omega}}) < \infty$ by (1.12) (Grauert's Theorem), there is a non-trivial linear relation over \mathbf{C}

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\nu} \gamma_k \left[\frac{1}{w^k} \right] = 0 \in H^1(\tilde{\Omega}, \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\Omega}}), \quad \gamma_k \in \mathbf{C}, \quad \gamma_\nu \neq 0.$$

Therefore, there is a meromorphic function F on $\tilde{\Omega}$ with a pole only at c such that about c

$$(2.10) \quad F(w) = \frac{\gamma_\nu}{w^\nu} + \dots + \frac{\gamma_1}{w} + \text{holomorphic term}.$$

Therefore the restriction $F|_\Omega$ of F to Ω is holomorphic in Ω and $\lim_{x \rightarrow c} |F(x)| = \infty$. Thus we see that Ω is holomorphically convex.

(b) We show the holomorphic separation property of Ω (Definition 1.11 (ii)). Let $a, b \in \Omega$ be any distinct points. Let F be the one obtained in (a) above. If $F(a) \neq F(b)$,

then it is done. Suppose that $F(a) = F(b)$. We may assume that $F(a) = F(b) = 0$. Let (U_0, z) be a local holomorphic coordinate system about a with $z(a) = 0$. Then we have

$$(2.11) \quad F(z) = a_{k_0} z^{k_0} + \text{higher order term}, \quad a_{k_0} \neq 0, \quad k_0 \in \mathbf{N},$$

where \mathbf{N} denotes the set of natural numbers (positive integers). We define Cousin I distributions by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{z^{k k_0}} & \text{ on } U_0, \quad k \in \mathbf{N}, \\ 0 & \text{ on } U_1 = \Omega \setminus \{a\}, \end{aligned}$$

which lead cohomology classes

$$(2.12) \quad \left[\frac{1}{z^{k k_0}} \right] \in H^1(\{U_0, U_1\}, \mathcal{O}_\Omega) \hookrightarrow H^1(\Omega, \mathcal{O}_\Omega), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots$$

It follows from (1.12) that there is a linear relation

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\mu} \alpha_k \left[\frac{1}{z^{k k_0}} \right] = 0, \quad \alpha_k \in \mathbf{C}, \quad \alpha_\mu \neq 0.$$

It follows that there is a meromorphic function G on Ω with a pole only at a , where G is written as

$$(2.13) \quad G(z) = \frac{\alpha_\mu}{z^{\mu k_0}} + \dots + \frac{\alpha_1}{z^{k_0}} + \text{holomorphic term}.$$

With $g = G \cdot F^\mu$ we have $g \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$ and by (2.11) and (2.13) we see that

$$g(a) = \alpha_\mu a_{k_0}^\mu \neq 0, \quad g(b) = 0.$$

(c) Let $a \in \Omega$ be any point. We show the existence of an $h \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$ with non vanishing differential $dh(a) \neq 0$ (Definition 1.11 (iii)). Let (U_0, z) be a holomorphic local coordinate system about a with $z(a) = 0$. As in (2.12) we consider

$$(2.14) \quad \left[\frac{1}{z^{k k_0 - 1}} \right] \in H^1(\{U_0, U_1\}, \mathcal{O}_\Omega) \hookrightarrow H^1(\Omega, \mathcal{O}_\Omega), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots$$

In the same as above we deduce that there is a meromorphic function H on Ω with a pole only at a , where H is written as

$$(2.15) \quad H(z) = \frac{\beta_\lambda}{z^{\lambda k_0 - 1}} + \dots + \frac{\beta_1}{z^{k_0 - 1}} + \text{holomorphic term}, \quad \beta_k \in \mathbf{C}, \quad \beta_\lambda \neq 0, \quad \lambda \in \mathbf{N}.$$

With $h = H \cdot F^\lambda$ we have $h \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$ and by (2.11) and (2.15) we get

$$dh(a) = \beta_\lambda a_{k_0}^\lambda \neq 0.$$

Thus, Ω is Stein. □

2.3.2 Proof of Lemma 1.15

We take a domain $\tilde{\Omega} \Subset X$ with $\tilde{\Omega} \supset \Omega$. By Lemma 1.13, $\tilde{\Omega}$ is Stein, and hence there is a holomorphic 1-form on $\tilde{\Omega}$ without zeros. Then we define $\rho(a, \Omega)$ as in (1.4). With this $\rho(a, \Omega)$ we have by (1.9):

Lemma 2.16. *For a compact subset $K \Subset \Omega$ we get*

$$\rho(K, \Omega) = \rho(\hat{K}_\Omega, \Omega).$$

Lemma 2.17. *Let Ω' be a domain such that $\Omega \Subset \Omega' \Subset \tilde{\Omega}$. Assume that*

$$(2.18) \quad \max_{b \in \partial\Omega} \rho(b, \Omega') < \rho(K, \Omega).$$

Then,

$$\hat{K}_{\Omega'} \cap \Omega \Subset \Omega.$$

Proof. Since $\hat{K}_{\Omega'}$ is compact in Ω' by Lemma 1.13, it suffices to show that

$$\hat{K}_{\Omega'} \cap \partial\Omega = \emptyset.$$

Suppose that there is a point $b \in \hat{K}_{\Omega'} \cap \partial\Omega$. It follows from Lemma 2.16 that

$$\rho(b, \Omega') \geq \rho(\hat{K}_{\Omega'}, \Omega') = \rho(K, \Omega') \geq \rho(K, \Omega).$$

By assumption, $\rho(b, \Omega') < \rho(K, \Omega)$; this is absurd. \square

Proof of Lemma 1.15: Here we use Oka's Jôku-Ikô (transform to a higher space), which is a principal method of K. Oka to reduce a difficult problem to the one over a simpler space such as a polydisk, but of higher dimension, and to solve it (cf. K. Oka [22], e.g., [17]).

By Lemma 1.15 there are holomorphic functions $g_j \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega')$ such that a finite union P , called an analytic polyhedron, of relatively compact components of

$$\{x \in \Omega' : |g_j(x)| < 1\}$$

satisfies “ $\hat{K}_{\Omega'} \cap \Omega \Subset P \Subset \Omega$ ” and the Oka map

$$\Psi : x \in P \longrightarrow (g_1(x), \dots, g_N(x)) \in P\Delta_N$$

is a closed embedding into the N -dimensional unit polydisk $P\Delta_N$.

Let $f \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$. We identify P with the image $\Psi(P) \subset P\Delta_N$ and regard $f|_P$ as a holomorphic function on $\Psi(P)$. Let \mathcal{I} denote the geometric ideal sheaf of the analytic subset $\Psi(P) \subset P\Delta_N$. Then we have a short exact sequence of coherent sheaves:

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{P\Delta_N} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{P\Delta_N}/\mathcal{I} \rightarrow 0.$$

By Oka's Fundamental Lemma, $H^1(\mathbb{P}\Delta_N, \mathcal{I}) = 0$ (cf., e.g., [17], §4.3), which implies the surjection

$$(2.19) \quad H^0(\mathbb{P}\Delta_N, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}\Delta_N}) \rightarrow H^0(\mathbb{P}\Delta_N, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}\Delta_N}/\mathcal{I}) \cong \mathcal{O}(P) \rightarrow 0.$$

Since $f|_P \in \mathcal{O}(P)$, there is an element $F \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{P}\Delta_N)$ with $F|_P = f|_P$. We then expand F to a power series

$$F(w_1, \dots, w_N) = \sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha} w^{\alpha}, \quad w \in \mathbb{P}\Delta_N,$$

where α denote multi-indices in $\{1, \dots, N\}$. For every $\epsilon > 0$ there is a number $l \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\left| F(w) - \sum_{|\alpha| \leq l} c_{\alpha} w^{\alpha} \right| < \epsilon, \quad w \in \Psi(K).$$

Substituting $w_j = g_j$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} g(x) &= \sum_{|\alpha| \leq l} c_{\alpha} g^{\alpha} \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega'), \\ |f(x) - g(x)| &< \epsilon, \quad \forall x \in K. \end{aligned}$$

□

2.3.3 Proof of Theorem 1.17

Let Ω_t , $0 \leq t \leq 1$, be an increasing continuous family of domains of X with $\Omega_0 = \Omega$ and $\Omega_1 = \tilde{\Omega}$, in the sense that

- (i) $\Omega_s \Subset \Omega_t$ for $0 \leq s < t \leq 1$;
- (ii) $\bar{\Omega}_s = \bigcap_{t > s} \Omega_t$ for $0 \leq s < 1$.

Let $K \Subset \Omega$ be a compact subset and let $f \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$. We set

$$T = \{t : 0 < t \leq 1, \mathcal{O}(\Omega_t)|K \text{ is dense in } \mathcal{O}(\Omega)|K\},$$

where “dense” is taken in the sense of the maximum norm on K . Note that

- (i) $\rho(a, \Omega_t)$ is continuous in t ;
- (ii) $\rho(K, \Omega) \leq \rho(K, \Omega_s) < \rho(K, \Omega_t)$ for $s < t$;
- (iii) $\lim_{t \searrow s} \max_{b \in \partial\Omega_s} \rho(b, \Omega_t) = 0$.

It follows from Lemma 1.15 that T is non-empty, open and closed. Therefore $T \ni 1$, so that $\mathcal{O}(\tilde{\Omega})|K$ is dense in $\mathcal{O}(\Omega)|K$. □

2.3.4 Proof of Theorem 1.18

We owe the second countability axiom for Riemann surface X to T. Radó. We take an increasing sequence of relatively compact domains $\Omega_j \Subset \Omega_{j+1} \Subset X$, $j \in \mathbf{N}$, such that $X = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} \Omega_j$ and no component of $\Omega_{j+1} \setminus \bar{\Omega}_j$ is relatively compact in Ω_{j+1} . Then, (Ω_j, Ω_{j+1}) forms a so-called Rung pair (Theorem 1.17). Since every Ω_j is Stein (Lemma 1.13), the Steiness of X is deduced. \square

2.4 Proofs for Riemann domains

2.4.1 Proof of Theorem 1.20

(i) Suppose that $\Omega(\Subset X)$ is a domain of holomorphy. It follows from the assumption and Corollary 1.10 that Ω is K -complete in the sense of Grauert and holomorphically convex. Thus, by Grauert's Theorem ([10]), Ω is Stein.

(ii) Let $Z = \{\det d\pi = 0\}$. Then, Z is a thin analytic subset of X .

We first take a Stein subdomain $\Omega \Subset X$ and show the plurisubharmonicity of $-\log \rho(a, \Omega)$. By Grauert-Remmert [11] it suffices to show that $-\log \rho(a, \Omega)$ is plurisubharmonic in $\Omega \setminus Z$. Take an arbitrary point $a \in \Omega \setminus Z$, and a complex affine line $\Lambda \subset \mathbf{C}^n$ passing through $\pi(a)$. Let $\tilde{\Lambda}$ be the connected component of $\pi^{-1}\Lambda \cap \Omega$ containing a . Let Δ be a small disk about $\pi(a)$ such that $\tilde{\Delta} = \pi^{-1}\Delta \cap \tilde{\Lambda} \Subset \tilde{\Lambda} \setminus Z$.

Claim. The restriction $-\log \rho(x, \Omega)|_{\tilde{\Lambda} \setminus Z}$ is subharmonic.

By a standard argument (cf. e.g., [13], Proof of Theorem 2.6.7) it suffices to prove that if a holomorphic function $g \in \mathcal{O}(\tilde{\Lambda})$ satisfies

$$-\log \rho(x, \Omega) \leq \Re g(x), \quad x \in \partial \tilde{\Delta},$$

then

$$(2.20) \quad -\log \rho(x, \Omega) \leq \Re g(x), \quad x \in \tilde{\Delta},$$

where \Re denotes the real part. Now, we have that

$$\rho(x, \Omega) \geq |e^{g(x)}|, \quad x \in \partial \tilde{\Delta},$$

Since Ω is Stein by (ii), there is a holomorphic function $f \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$ with $f|_{\tilde{\Lambda}} = g$ (cf. the arguments for (2.19)). Then,

$$\rho(x, \Omega) \geq |e^{f(x)}|, \quad x \in \partial \tilde{\Delta},$$

Since $\widehat{\tilde{\Delta}}_{\Omega} = \tilde{\Delta}$, it follows from (1.8) that

$$\rho(x, \Omega) \geq |e^{f(x)}| = |e^{g(x)}|, \quad x \in \tilde{\Delta},$$

so that (2.20) follows.

Let $\{\Omega_\nu\}_{\nu=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of Stein domains of X such that $\Omega_\nu \Subset \Omega_{\nu+1}$ for all ν and $X = \bigcup_\nu \Omega_\nu$. Then, $-\log \rho(a, \Omega_\nu)$, $\nu = 1, 2, \dots$, are plurisubharmonic and monotone decreasingly converges to $-\log \rho(a, X)$. Therefore if $-\log \rho(a, X)$ is either identically $-\infty$, or plurisubharmonic ($\neq -\infty$).

Suppose that $-\log \rho(a, X) \not\equiv -\infty$. Then, the subset $A := \{a \in X : -\log \rho(a, X) \neq -\infty\}$ is dense in X . Take any point $a \in X$ and $U_0 (\cong P\Delta(\rho_0))$ as in (1.3). Then, there is a point $b \in A$. Since $\rho(b, X) < \infty$, we infer that $\rho(a, X) < \infty$. Therefore, $A = X$, and (2.1) remains valid for $\Omega = X$. Thus, $\rho(b, X)$ is continuous. \square

Corollary 2.21. *Let X be a Stein manifold satisfying Cond A. Then, $-\log \rho(a, X)$ is either identically $-\infty$ or continuous plurisubharmonic.*

Proof. Since X is Stein, there is a holomorphic map $\pi : X \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^n$ which forms a Riemann domain. The assertion is immediate from (ii) above. \square

2.4.2 Proof of Proposition 1.22

Here we will use the following result:

Theorem 2.22 (Andreotti-Narasimhan [1]). *Let $\pi : X \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^n$ be a Riemann domain. If X admits a continuous plurisubharmonic exhaustion function, then X is Stein.*

Since ω is defined in a neighborhood of $\bar{\Omega}$, Cond B is satisfied at every point of the boundary $\partial\Omega$; that is, for every $b \in \partial\Omega$ there are neighborhoods $U' \Subset U \Subset X$ of b such that

$$\rho(a, \Omega) = \rho(a, U \cap \Omega), \quad a \in U'.$$

If $U \cap \Omega$ is Stein, then $-\log \rho(a, \Omega)$ is plurisubharmonic in $a \in U'$ by Theorem 1.20 (iii). Therefore there is a neighborhood V of $\partial\Omega$ in X such that $-\log \rho(a, \Omega)$ is plurisubharmonic in $a \in V \cap \Omega$. Take a real constant C such that

$$-\log \rho(a, \Omega) < C, \quad a \in \Omega \setminus V.$$

Set

$$\psi(a) = \max\{-\log \rho(a, \Omega), C\}, \quad a \in \Omega.$$

Then, ψ is a continuous plurisubharmonic exhaustion function on Ω . By Andreotti-Narasimhan's Theorem 2.22, Ω is Stein. \square

2.4.3 Proof of Theorem 1.25

For an ideal boundary point $b \in \partial X$ there are connected open subsets $\tilde{V} \subset \widetilde{W}$ as in Cond B such that

$$(2.23) \quad \rho(a, X) = \rho(a, \widetilde{W}).$$

By the assumption, \widetilde{W} can be chosen to be Stein. By Theorem 1.20 (ii), $-\log \rho(a, \widetilde{W})$ is plurisubharmonic in $a \in \widetilde{V}$, and hence so is $-\log \rho(a, X)$ in \widetilde{V} . Since $\lim_{a \rightarrow \partial X} \rho(a, X) = 0$ by Cond B, there is a closed subset $F \subset X$ such that $F \cap \{x \in X : \|\pi(x)\| \leq R\}$ is compact for every $R > 0$, and

$$-\log \rho(a, X), \quad a \in X \setminus F,$$

is plurisubharmonic. From this we may construct a continuous plurisubharmonic exhaustion function on X as follows:

We fix a point $a_0 \in F$, and may assume that $\pi(a_0) = 0$. Let X_ν be a connected component of $\|\pi\| < \nu$ containing a_0 . Then, $\bigcup_\nu X_\nu = X$. Put

$$\Omega_\nu = X_\nu \setminus F \Subset X.$$

Take a real constant C_1 such that

$$-\log \rho(a, X) < C_1, \quad a \in \bar{\Omega}_1.$$

Then we set

$$\psi_1(a) = \max\{-\log \rho(a, X), C_1\}, \quad a \in X.$$

Then, ψ_1 is plurisubharmonic in X_1 . We take a positive constant C_2 such that

$$-\log \rho(a, X) < C_1 + C_2(\|\pi(a)\|^2 - 1)^+, \quad a \in \bar{\Omega}_2,$$

where $(\cdot)^+ = \max\{\cdot, 0\}$. Put

$$\begin{aligned} p_2(a) &= C_1 + C_2(\|\pi(a)\|^2 - 1)^+, \\ \psi_2(a) &= \max\{-\log \rho(a, X), p_2(a)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $\psi_1(a) = \psi_2(a)$ in $a \in X_1$ and $\psi_2(a)$ is plurisubharmonic in X_2 . Similarly, we take $C_3 > C_2$ so that

$$-\log \rho(a, X) < p_2(a) + C_3(\|\pi(a)\|^2 - 2^2)^+, \quad a \in \bar{\Omega}_3,$$

Put

$$\begin{aligned} p_3(a) &= p_2(a) + C_3(\|\pi(a)\|^2 - 2^2)^+, \\ \psi_3(a) &= \max\{-\log \rho(a, X), p_3(a)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $\psi_3(a) = \psi_2(a)$ in $a \in X_2$ and $\psi_3(a)$ is plurisubharmonic in X_3 . Inductively, we may take a continuous function $\psi_\nu(a)$, $\nu = 1, 2, \dots$, such that ψ_ν is plurisubharmonic in X_ν and $\psi_{\nu+1}|_{X_\nu} = \psi_\nu|_{X_\nu}$. It is clear from the construction that

$$\psi(a) = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \psi_\nu(a), \quad a \in X$$

is a continuous plurisubharmonic exhaustion function.

Finally by Andreotti-Narasimhan's Theorem 2.22 we see that X is Stein.

3 Examples and some more on $\rho(a, X)$

(a) (Grauert's example). Grauert [16] gave a counter-example to the Levi problem for ramified Riemann domains over $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$: There is a locally Stein domain Ω in a complex torus M such that $\mathcal{O}(\Omega) = \mathbf{C}$. Then, M satisfies Cond A. One may assume that M is projective algebraic, so that there is a holomorphic finite map $\pi : M \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$, which is a Riemann domain over $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$. Then, the restriction $\pi|_{\Omega} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$ is a Riemann domain over $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$, which satisfies Cond A and Cond B. Therefore, Theorem 1.25 cannot be extended to a Riemann domain over $\mathbf{P}^n(\mathbf{C})$.

(b) The products of open Riemann surfaces and complex tori serve for examples satisfying Cond A.

(c) An open Riemann surface X is *not* Kobayashi hyperbolic if and only if X is biholomorphic to \mathbf{C} or $\mathbf{C}^* = \mathbf{C} \setminus \{0\}$ (For the Kobayashi hyperbolicity in general, cf. [14], [18]).

Let $X = \mathbf{C}$. If $\omega = dz$, then $\rho(a, dz, \mathbf{C}) \equiv \infty$ for every $a \in \mathbf{C}$. If $\omega = e^z dz$, then a simple calculation implies that

$$\rho(a, e^z dz, \mathbf{C}) = |e^a|.$$

Let $X = \mathbf{C}^*$. If $\omega = dz$, then $\rho(a, dz, \mathbf{C}^*) = |a|$. If $\omega = \frac{dz}{z}$, then $\rho(a, \frac{dz}{z}, \mathbf{C}^*) \equiv \infty$.

Therefore, the finiteness or the infiniteness of $\rho(a, \omega, X)$ depends on the choice of ω .

(d) For a Kobayashi hyperbolic open Riemann surface X we take a holomorphic 1-form ω without zeros, and write

$$\|\omega(a)\|_X = |\omega(v)|, \quad v \in \mathbf{T}(X)_a, \quad F_X(v) = 1.$$

Then it follows from (2.2) that $\rho(a, \omega, X) \leq \|\omega(a)\|_X$. We set

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^+(a, X) &= \sup\{\rho(a, \omega, X) : \omega \text{ hol. 1-form without zeros, } \|\omega(a)\|_X = 1\}, \\ \rho^-(a, X) &= \inf\{\rho(a, \omega, X) : \omega \text{ hol. 1-form without zeros, } \|\omega(a)\|_X = 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $\rho^{\pm}(a, X)(\leq 1)$ are biholomorphic invariants of X , but we do not know the behavior of them.

References

- [1] A. Andreotti and R. Narasimhan, Oka's Heftungslemma and the Levi problem for complex spaces, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **111** (1964), 345–366.
- [2] H. Behnke and K. Stein, Entwicklung analytischer Funktionen auf Riemannschen Flächen, Math. Ann. **120** (1949), 430–461.
- [3] L. Bers, Introduction to Several Complex Variables, Lecture Notes, Courant Inst. Math. Sci., New York University, 1964.

- [4] H. Cartan and P. Thullen, Regularitäts- und Konvergenzbereiche, *Math. Ann.* **106** (1932), 617–647.
- [5] J.-P. Demailly, Complex Analytic and Differentiable Geometry, 2012, www-fourier.ujf-grenoble.fr/~demailly/.
- [6] J.E. Fornæss, A counterexample for the Levi problem for branched Riemann domains over \mathbf{C}^n , *Math. Ann.* **234** (1978), 275–277.
- [7] O. Forster, Lectures on Riemann Surfaces, transl. by B. Gilligan, *Grad. Texts Math.* 81, Springer, New York, 1981.
- [8] K. Fritzsche and H. Grauert, From Holomorphic Functions to Complex Manifolds, *Grad. Texts Math.* 213, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002.
- [9] R. Fujita, Domaines sans point critique intérieur sur l’espace projectif complexe, *J. Math. Soc. Jpn.* **15** (1963), 443–473.
- [10] H. Grauert, Charakterisierung der holomorph vollständigen komplexen Räume, *Math. Ann.* **129** (1955), 233–259.
- [11] H. Grauert and R. Remmert, Plurisubharmonische Funktionen in komplexen Räumen, *Math. Z.* **65** (1956), 175–194.
- [12] H. Grauert and R. Remmert, Theorie der Steinschen Räume, *Grundl. Math. Wiss.* 227 Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1977: Translated to English by A. Huckleberry, *Theory of Stein Spaces*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1979: Translated to Japanese by K. Miyajima, *Stein Kukan Ron*, Springer, Tokyo, 2009D
- [13] L. Hörmander, Introduction to Complex Analysis in Several Variables, First Edition 1966, Third Edition, North-Holland, 1989.
- [14] S. Kobayashi, Hyperbolic Complex Spaces, *Grundl. der Math. Wissen.* Vol. 318, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1998.
- [15] Y. Kusunoki, Function Theory (in Japanese), Asakura-Shoten, Tokyo, 1973.
- [16] R. Narasimhan, The Levi problem in the theory of several complex variables, *ICM Stockholm* (1962).
- [17] J. Noguchi, Analytic Function Theory of Several Variables (in Japanese), Asakura-Shoten, Tokyo, 2013: English translation in preprint.
- [18] J. Noguchi and J. Winkelmann, Nevanlinna Theory in Several Complex Variables and Diophantine Approximation, *Grundl. der Math. Wissen.* Vol. 350, Springer, Tokyo-Heidelberg-New York-Dordrecht-London,, 2014.
- [19] K. Oka, Sur les fonctions analytiques de plusieurs variables – VII Sur quelques notions arithmétiques, *Bull. Soc. Math. France* **78** (1950), 1–27
- [20] —, Sur les fonctions analytiques de plusieurs variables – VIII Lemme fondamental, *J. Math. Soc. Jpn.* **3** (1951) No. 1, 204–214, No. 2, 259–278.
- [21] —, Sur les fonctions analytiques de plusieurs variables – IX Domaines finis sans point critique intérieur, *Jpn. J. Math.* **23** (1953), 97–155.

- [22] —, Sur les fonctions analytiques de plusieurs variables, Iwanami Shoten, Tokyo, 1961.
- [23] —, Kiyoshi Oka Collected Papers, translated by R. Narasimhan, commentaries by H. Cartan, edited by R. Remmert, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Tokyo, 1984,
- [24] —, Kiyoshi Oka Digital Archives, Library of Nara Women's University,
URL "<http://www.lib.nara-wu.ac.jp/oka/>".
- [25] L. Schwartz, Homomorphismes et applications complèment continues, C. R. l'Acad. Sci., Paris **236** (1953), 2472–2473.
- [26] J.-P. Serre, Deux théorèmes sur les applications complèment continues, Séminaire Henri Cartan 6 (1953-1954), 1-7.
- [27] A. Takeuchi, Domaines pseudoconvexes infinis et la métrique riemannienne dans un espace projectif, J. Math. Soc. Jpn. **16** (1964), 159–181.

Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences
University of Tokyo
Komaba, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153-8914
Japan
e-mail: noguchi@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp