

ON CERTAIN CLASSES OF MEROMORPHIC FUNCTIONS

ZEEV NEHARI†.

The meromorphic functions $f(z)$ to be considered in this paper are characterized by the fact that the points z , at which a function $f(z)$ takes the values 0 , 1 or ∞ form a sub-set of a given closed set S of complex numbers. It is easy to see that, for $z \notin S$, these functions $f(z)$ form a normal family; indeed, if $z = p(x)$ denotes the analytic function, regular for $|x| < 1$, which maps $|x| < 1$ on the universal covering surface of the complement of S , then $g(x) = f[p(x)]$ differs from 0 , 1 and ∞ for $|x| < 1$. By a classical result, the functions $g(x)$ form a normal family, and this is therefore also true of the functions $f(z)$ so long as z differs from the points of S (since, at these points, the representation $g(x) = f[p(x)]$, i.e. $f(z) = g[p^{-1}(z)]$, breaks down).

The family of functions $f(z)$ being normal in the complement of S , extremum problems with regard to continuous functionals $J = J\{f(z)\}$ are certain to possess a solution within the family $\{f(z)\}$. The exact determination of such solutions will generally depend on a detailed knowledge of the properties of $p(x)$. This is, of course, where the difficulty comes in, since $p(x)$ (apart from the case where S is simply-connected) is an automorphic function of x and, as such, not easily accessible to numerical treatment.

We shall deal here with two cases in which the function $p(x)$ can be expressed in terms of classical functions. These are: (a) the case in which the set S consists of all integers $(0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots)$; (b) the case in which S consists of the numbers $m + in$, both m and n being integers.

It will be noted that, for the particular theorems to be proved below, not the automorphic function $p(x)$ but a slightly different function, connected with it by a simple transformation, is used. This is due to the fact that these results refer to the behaviour of the functions $f(z)$ in the points of S , and these are precisely the points not taken by $z = p(x)$ for $|x| < 1$. In order to study the properties of $f(z)$ at a point z_0 belonging to S , we shall therefore use a function $z = p^*(x)$ which takes the value z_0 for a particular $x = x_0$ and otherwise differs from all the points of S .

THEOREM I. *Let $w = f(z)$ be an analytic function, meromorphic in the entire finite z -plane, which takes the values $w = 0, 1, \infty$ only if z is an integer*

† Received 2 September, 1945; read 15 September, 1945. The original title of this paper, as read, was "On an extension of the principle of subordination".

($z = n$; $n = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$). If α_ν denote the zeros of $f(z)$, β_ν the zeros of $f(z) - 1$ and γ_ν the simple poles of $f(z)$, we have

$$|f'(\alpha_\nu)| \leq 2\pi, \quad |f'(\beta_\nu)| \leq 2\pi, \quad \lim_{z \rightarrow \gamma_\nu} |(z - \gamma_\nu)f(z)| \geq (2\pi)^{-1}$$

In these inequalities the value 2π is the best possible.

In order to prove this proposition, we consider the function

$$p(x) = 2\pi^{-1} \arcsin \sqrt{\{I(x^2)\}}, \quad [|x| < 1],$$

where $I(x) = 16x + \dots$ denotes the elliptic modular function defined by $I(x) = k^2(\tau)$, $x = e^{\pi i \tau}$, τ being the period ratio of the Jacobian elliptic functions and $k(\tau)$ their modulus. Since $\sqrt{\{I(x^2)\}}$, for $|x| < 1$, vanishes only at $x = 0$ and does not take the values ± 1 at all, it follows that $p(x)$ is regular for $|x| < 1$ and does not take there any value $0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$, except the value 0 for $x = 0$.

We now consider one of the points α_ν , say a , at which $f(z)$ vanishes. In the neighbourhood of this point, $f(z)$ may be expanded into a power series

$$f(z) = f'(a)(z - a) + \dots$$

Since a is an integer, we may consider instead the function $f_a(z) = f(z + a)$ which obviously is also one of the functions covered by our hypotheses. We have, therefore,

$$f_a(z) = f'(a)z + \dots$$

in a certain neighbourhood of $z = 0$ (at least for $|z| < 1$).

After these preparations, we consider the function

$$(1) \quad g(x) = f_a[p(x)] = f_a[2\pi^{-1} \arcsin \sqrt{\{I(x^2)\}}] = 8\pi^{-1}f'(a)x + \dots$$

As shown above, $p(x)$ does not take, for $|x| < 1$, any value $\pm n$ ($n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$) except for its zero at $x = 0$; on the other hand $f(x)$, by hypothesis, does not take any of the values $0, 1, \infty$ as long as z differs from $0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$. We may therefore conclude that the function $g(x)$ is regular, and $g(x) \neq 1$, for $|x| < 1$; and also that $g(x) \neq 0$ for $0 < |x| < 1$. By a classical result, due to Hurwitz†, functions $g(x)$ possessing these

† See, for example, Littlewood, *Lectures on the Theory of Functions* (Oxford University Press, 1944), Theorem 229.

properties are subordinate to the elliptic modular function $I(x) = 16x + \dots$, *i.e.* we have

$$(2) \quad g(x) = I[\omega(x)], \quad |\omega(x)| \leq |x| \quad [|x| < 1].$$

In view of (1), this entails

$$(3) \quad 8\pi^{-1}|f'(a)| \leq 16, \quad |f'(a)| \leq 2\pi.$$

This proves the proposition for the zeros of $f(z)$. As for the zeros of $f(z) - 1$ and the simple poles of $f(z)$, these cases can be disposed of by a slight modification of the same argument, the functions to be considered being $1 - f(z)$ and $1/f(z)$ respectively.

In order to show that the value 2π is the best possible, we have to find a function $f_0(z)$ for which the sign of equality holds in (3). To this end we consider the case $\omega(x) \equiv x$ in (2). This yields

$$f_0\{2\pi^{-1} \arcsin \sqrt{I(x^2)}\} = I(x).$$

We now substitute

$$2\pi^{-1} \arcsin \sqrt{I(x^2)} = z,$$

whence we obtain

$$(4) \quad \sqrt{I(x^2)} = \sin \frac{1}{2}\pi z, \quad f_0(z) = I(x).$$

But the elliptic modular function $I(x)$ satisfies the functional equation

$$(5) \quad I(x) = \frac{4 \sqrt{I(x^2)}}{[1 + \sqrt{I(x^2)}]^2},$$

which, in view of (4), leads to

$$f_0(z) = \frac{4 \sin \frac{1}{2}\pi z}{(1 + \sin \frac{1}{2}\pi z)^2} = 2\pi z + \dots$$

It now remains to be shown that $f_0(z)$ indeed satisfies our hypotheses; but it can easily be seen that $f_0(z)$ vanishes for $z = 2n$, ($n = 0, \pm 1, \dots$), and takes the values 1 and ∞ for $z = 4n + 1$ and $z = 4n - 1$ respectively. Apart from these points, $f_0(z)$ differs from 0, 1, ∞ .

2. By writing $2\pi^{-1} \arcsin \sqrt{I(x^2)} = z$, formulae (1) and (2) yield the parametric representation

$$f_a(z) = I[\omega(x)], \quad \sin \frac{1}{2}\pi z = \sqrt{I(x^2)},$$

which, in view of (5), may also be written

$$(6) \quad f_a(z) = I[\omega(x)],$$

$$[|\omega(x)| \leq |x|, |x| < 1]$$

$$(6a) \quad \frac{4 \sin \frac{1}{2}\pi z}{(1 + \sin \frac{1}{2}\pi z)^2} = I(x).$$

With the help of (6) and (6a), exact bounds for $|f(z)|$ may be obtained if z is real.

THEOREM II. *If $f(z)$, α_ν , β_ν and γ_ν have the same meaning as in Theorem I and t denotes a non-negative number smaller than 1, the following inequalities hold:*

$$(a) \quad |f(\alpha_\nu \pm t)| \leq \frac{4 \sin \frac{1}{2}\pi t}{(1 - \sin \frac{1}{2}\pi t)^2},$$

$$(b) \quad \left(\frac{1 - \sin \frac{1}{2}\pi t}{1 + \sin \frac{1}{2}\pi t}\right)^2 \leq |f(\beta_\nu \pm t)| \leq \left(\frac{1 + \sin \frac{1}{2}\pi t}{1 - \sin \frac{1}{2}\pi t}\right)^2,$$

$$(c) \quad \frac{(1 - \sin \frac{1}{2}\pi t)^2}{4 \sin \frac{1}{2}\pi t} \leq |f(\gamma_\nu \pm t)|.$$

Proof. In (6), $z = 0$ entails $x = 0$. Now $I(x)$ is locally schlicht in the vicinity of the origin and $I(x)$ increases steadily from 0 to 1 if x increases from 0 to 1. Hence the values of x corresponding, by (6a), to values of z which are non-negative and smaller than 1, must necessarily satisfy $0 \leq x < 1$, i.e.,

$$(7) \quad I(x) = \frac{4 \sin \frac{1}{2}\pi t}{(1 + \sin \frac{1}{2}\pi t)^2} \quad (0 \leq x < 1, 0 \leq t < 1).$$

On the other hand, $I(x)$ satisfies the functional equation

$$-I(-x) = \frac{I(x)}{1 - I(x)}$$

and the inequality

$$|I(x)| \leq -I(-|x|).$$

Hence

$$|f_a(t)| = |I[\omega(x)]| \leq -I(-|\omega(x)|) \leq -I(-x) = \frac{I(x)}{1 - I(x)}.$$

By (7) we have, therefore,

$$|f_a(t)| \leq \frac{I(x)}{1 - I(x)} = \frac{4 \sin \frac{1}{2}\pi t}{(1 - \sin \frac{1}{2}\pi t)^2},$$

which is inequality (a). (c) follows immediately by considering $1/f(\gamma_\nu + t)$. The right-hand side of (b) follows by observing that

$$|f(\beta_\nu + t)| \leq |1 - f(\beta_\nu + t)| + 1 \leq \frac{4 \sin \frac{1}{2}\pi t}{(1 - \sin \frac{1}{2}\pi t)^2} + 1 = \left(\frac{1 + \sin \frac{1}{2}\pi t}{1 - \sin \frac{1}{2}\pi t}\right)^2,$$

and the left-hand side from the fact that $f^*(z) = 1/f(\beta_\nu + z)$ is also covered by the hypotheses of Theorem II and satisfies $f^*(0) = 1$.

3. An argument similar to that used in the proof of Theorem I leads to the following more general proposition.

THEOREM III. *Let $w = f(z)$ be an analytic function, meromorphic in the entire finite z -plane, which takes the values $w = 0, 1, \infty$ only at points of the set $z = m + in$ ($m, n = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$). If α_ν denote the zeros of $f(z)$, β_ν the zeros of $f(z) - 1$ and γ_ν the simple poles of $f(z)$, we have*

$$|f'(\alpha_\nu)| \leq (2/\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma^2(\frac{1}{4}); \quad |f'(\beta_\nu)| \leq (2/\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma^2(\frac{1}{4});$$

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow \gamma_\nu} |(z - \gamma_\nu)f(z)| \geq [(2/\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma^2(\frac{1}{4})]^{-1}.$$

The value $(2/\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma^2(\frac{1}{4})$ is the best possible.

The trigonometric function used in the proof of Theorem I is here replaced by the Jacobian elliptic function $\operatorname{sn} z = z + \dots$ with the period ratio $(2K)/(4K') = \frac{1}{2}$. Since $K = K'$, all poles, zeros and k^{-1} -points (k being the modulus of the function) coincide with the corners of the quadratic lattice $z = K(m + in)$. Conversely, each such lattice-point coincides with either a zero, a pole, or a k^{-1} -point of $\operatorname{sn} z$. If instead of $\operatorname{sn} z$ we consider $\operatorname{sn} Kz$, the same is true for the lattice $z = m + in$. Since the expression of K' in terms of k' is the same as that of K in terms of k , we have (in view of $K = K'$ and $k^2 + k'^2 = 1$) $k^2 = \frac{1}{2}$. The inverse function $z = K^{-1} \operatorname{sn}^{-1}(w)$ can be uniformly continued everywhere in the finite w -plane, apart from the points $w = \pm 1, \pm \sqrt{2}$, where it possesses an infinity of simple branch-points.

We next consider the function

$$w = h(x) = \sqrt{\left(\frac{2 \sqrt{\{I(x^4)\}}}{1 + I(x^4)}\right)} = 2 \sqrt{2} x + \dots,$$

where $I(x)$ denotes the elliptic modular function mentioned above. From the fact that $I(x)$ never takes the values $0, 1, \infty$ (apart from $I(0) = 0$),

it follows that $w = h(x)$ never takes the values $w = 0, \pm 1, \pm\sqrt{2}, \infty$ ($h(0) = 0$ again excepted).

If a is a zero of $f(z)$, we write, as in the proof of Theorem 1,

$$f_a(z) = f(z+a) = f'(a)z + \dots$$

and note that $f_a(z)$ is also one of the functions covered by our hypotheses. We then consider

$$g(x) = f_a\{K^{-1} \operatorname{sn}^{-1}[h(x)]\}.$$

Since $h(x)/x$ does not vanish and $w = h(x)$ never takes the values

$$w = \pm 1, \pm\sqrt{2}, \infty$$

which are exactly the critical points of $\operatorname{sn}^{-1}(w)$, it follows that the function $K^{-1} \operatorname{sn}^{-1}[h(x)]$ is uniform for $|x| < 1$ and does not take there any value $m + in$ ($m, n = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$). Consequently, the function

$$(8) \quad g(x) = f_a\{K^{-1} \operatorname{sn}^{-1}[h(x)]\}$$

is regular for $|x| < 1$ and differs there from 0 and 1 (apart from $g(0) = 0$). From the latter property we conclude as before that $g(x)$ is subordinate to the elliptic modular function $I(x)$, *i.e.*,

$$(9) \quad g(x) = I[\omega(x)], \quad |\omega(x)| \leq |x| \quad [|x| < 1].$$

The expansions of $g(x)$ and $I(x)$ being $g(x) = 2^{\frac{3}{2}} K^{-1} f'(a)x + \dots$ and $I(x) = 16x + \dots$ respectively, this leads to

$$2^{\frac{3}{2}} K^{-1} |f'(a)| \leq 16, \quad |f'(a)| \leq 4\sqrt{2}K.$$

In virtue of the relations

$$K = \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}\pi} \frac{d\phi}{\sqrt{(1-k^2 \sin^2 \phi)}} = \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}\pi} \frac{d\phi}{\sqrt{(1-\frac{1}{2} \sin^2 \phi)}} = \frac{1}{4}\pi^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma^2(\frac{1}{4}),$$

we obtain finally

$$(10) \quad |f'(a)| \leq (2/\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma^2(\frac{1}{4}).$$

The results for the points at which $f(z) = 1$ or $f(z) = \infty$ follow again by considering the functions $1-f(z)$ and $1/f(z)$ respectively.

We now proceed to find a function $f_0(z)$ for which the sign of equality holds in (10). To this end we write $\omega(x) \equiv x$ in (9) and obtain, in view

of (8),

$$f_0 \left\{ K^{-1} \operatorname{sn}^{-1} \sqrt{\left(\frac{2 \sqrt{\{I(x^4)\}}}{1 + \sqrt{\{I(x^4)\}}} \right)} \right\} = I(x).$$

By substituting

$$z = K^{-1} \operatorname{sn}^{-1} \sqrt{\left(\frac{2 \sqrt{\{I(x^4)\}}}{1 + \sqrt{\{I(x^4)\}}} \right)}$$

we obtain

$$f_0(z) = I(x), \quad \sqrt{\{I(x^4)\}} = \frac{\operatorname{sn}^2 Kz}{2 - \operatorname{sn}^2 Kz}.$$

In view of the functional equation of $I(x)$ used above, we also obtain

$$I(x^2) = \frac{4 \sqrt{\{I(x^4)\}}}{[1 + \sqrt{\{I(x^4)\}}]^2} = \operatorname{sn}^2 Kz (2 - \operatorname{sn}^2 Kz),$$

and, by using this equation once more,

$$I(x) = \frac{4 \sqrt{\{I(x^2)\}}}{[1 + \sqrt{\{I(x^2)\}}]^2} = \frac{4 \operatorname{sn} Kz \sqrt{(2 - \operatorname{sn}^2 Kz)}}{[1 + \operatorname{sn} Kz \sqrt{(2 - \operatorname{sn}^2 Kz)}]^2}.$$

Remembering that $I(x) = f_0(z)$, we obtain finally

$$f_0(z) = \frac{4 \operatorname{sn} Kz \sqrt{(2 - \operatorname{sn}^2 Kz)}}{[1 + \operatorname{sn} Kz \sqrt{(2 - \operatorname{sn}^2 Kz)}]^2}.$$

By introducing the Jacobian elliptic function $\operatorname{dn} Kz$ [$k^2 \operatorname{sn}^2 Kz + \operatorname{dn}^2 Kz = 1$], and by observing that in our case we have $k = 2^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, this can also be written

$$f_0(z) = \frac{4 \sqrt{2} \operatorname{sn} Kz \operatorname{dn} Kz}{[1 + \sqrt{2} \operatorname{sn} Kz \operatorname{dn} Kz]^2} = 4 \sqrt{2} Kz + \dots$$

This function does, in fact, satisfy our hypotheses. Thus, as may easily be verified, $f_0(z)$ vanishes at the points $z = 2m + in$ and

$$2m + 1 + i(2n + 1),$$

it has poles at $4m - 1 + 2in$, and it takes the value $f_0(z) = 1$ at the points $4m + 1 + 2in$ ($m, n = 0, \pm 1, \dots$). At points other than $m + in$, $f_0(z)$ does not take any of the values 0, 1, ∞ .

House Dr. Kleeberg,
Talbieh, Jerusalem.