

## RADIAL DISTRIBUTIONS OF JULIA SETS OF MEROMORPHIC FUNCTIONS

LING QIU<sup>✉</sup> and SHENGJIAN WU

(Received 15 July 2004; revised 18 July 2005)

Communicated by P. C. Fenton

### Abstract

We consider a meromorphic function of finite lower order that has  $\infty$  as its deficient value or as its Borel exceptional value. We prove that the set of limiting directions of its Julia set must have a definite range of measure.

2000 *Mathematics subject classification*: primary 30D45, 37F10.

### 1. Introduction

Let  $f$  be a meromorphic function defined in the complex plane  $\mathbb{C}$  or on the Riemann sphere  $\overline{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ . The *Fatou set*  $F(f)$  of  $f$  is the subset of  $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$  where the iterates  $f^n$  ( $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ) of  $f$  are defined and  $\{f^n\}$  forms a normal family. The complement of  $F(f)$  is called the *Julia set*. It is obvious that  $F(f)$  is an open set and  $J(f)$  is closed. In general, the Julia set is very complicated.

Let  $f(z)$  be a transcendental meromorphic function in the complex plane. Suppose that  $\arg z = \theta$  is a ray from the origin. We say that  $\theta$  is a *limiting direction of  $J(f)$*  if, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and any  $R > 0$ , the domain  $\{z : \theta - \varepsilon < \arg z < \theta + \varepsilon, |z| > R\}$  has nonempty intersection with  $J(f)$ . We define the set  $E \in [0, 2\pi)$  to be all the limiting directions of  $J(f)$ .

Baker first proved in [3] that, for a transcendental entire function  $f$ , the set  $E$  contains infinitely many points. Later Qiao [6] proved that if the function is of finite lower order, then  $E$  contains an interval whose length depends on the lower order.

---

Supported by the National Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 10171003 and 10231040) and the Doctoral Education Program Foundation of China.

© 2006 Australian Mathematical Society 1446-8107/06 \$A2.00 + 0.00

In [8], the authors considered the case of meromorphic functions with  $\infty$  as their deficient value and, under some additional conditions, they proved the set  $E$  has a definitely positive measure.

In this paper, we remove the additional condition in [8, Theorem 1] and prove the following result.

**THEOREM 1.1.** *Let  $f(z)$  be a meromorphic function of lower order  $\mu < \infty$  with deficiency  $\delta(\infty, f) > 0$ . Then*

$$\text{mes } E \geq \min \left\{ 2\pi, \frac{4}{\mu} \arcsin \sqrt{\frac{\delta(\infty, f)}{2}} \right\}.$$

If  $\infty$  is a Borel exceptional value, then we can prove  $E$  contains an interval with a definite length. Let  $f(z)$  be a meromorphic function in  $\mathbb{C}$  of order  $0 < \lambda < \infty$ . Recall that  $a \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}$  is a *Borel exceptional value* of  $f(z)$  if it satisfies

$$\overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log n(r, f = a)}{\log r} < \lambda,$$

where  $n(r, f = a)$  is the counting function in value distribution theory of meromorphic functions.

In this case, we have the following result.

**THEOREM 1.2.** *Let  $f(z)$  be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order  $\lambda > 0$ . Suppose that  $\infty$  is a Borel exceptional value of  $f(z)$ . Then there exists a closed interval  $I \in \mathbb{R}$  such that all  $\theta \in I$  are limiting directions of  $J(f)$  and  $\text{mes } I \geq \pi/\max(1/2, \lambda)$ .*

The proofs of the theorems depend strongly on the Nevanlinna theory of meromorphic functions. The reader can refer to [4] and [7] for the basic definitions and results in value distribution theory of meromorphic functions, in particular for the symbols such as  $T(r, f)$ ,  $N(r, f)$ , and so on.

## 2. Proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2

The following lemma, which is a special form of the result proved in [2], is sufficient to prove our theorem.

**LEMMA 2.1 ([2]).** *Let  $f(z)$  be a meromorphic function of finite lower order  $\mu$ . Suppose  $\infty$  is a deficient value of  $f$  with  $\delta(\infty, f) > 0$ . Let  $M_j \rightarrow +\infty$  ( $j \rightarrow \infty$ ) and define*

$$(2.1) \quad E(r) = \{ \theta : |f(re^{i\theta})| > r^{M_j} \}.$$

Then there is a sequence  $\{r_j\}$  with  $r_j \rightarrow \infty$  ( $j \rightarrow \infty$ ) such that

$$\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \text{mes } E(r_j) \geq \min \left\{ 2\pi, \frac{4}{\mu} \arcsin \sqrt{\frac{\delta(\infty, f)}{2}} \right\}.$$

In the following we denote the angular domain  $\{z : \theta - \delta < \arg(z - z_0) < \theta + \delta\}$  by  $\Omega(z_0, \theta, \delta)$ , where  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $0 < \delta < \pi$ . We state Lemma 1 from [6] in the following form.

**LEMMA 2.2 ([6]).** *Let  $f(z)$  be analytic in  $\Omega(z_0, \theta, \delta)$ . Suppose that  $f(\Omega(z_0, \theta, \delta))$  is contained in a simply connected hyperbolic domain in  $\mathbb{C}$ . Then*

$$|f(z)| < O(|z|^{\pi/\delta}), \quad z \in \Omega(z_0, \theta, \delta')$$

for any  $\delta' \in (0, \delta)$ .

The proof of Lemma 2.2 is the same as that of [6, Lemma 1]. For meromorphic functions, the form we state in Lemma 2.2 is more convenient for our use.

**PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1.** Set

$$\sigma = \min \left\{ 2\pi, \frac{4}{\mu} \arcsin \sqrt{\frac{\delta(\infty, f)}{2}} \right\}.$$

We conversely suppose that  $\text{mes } E < \sigma$  and seek a contradiction.

Take a  $t > 0$  such that  $\sigma - \text{mes } E > t > 0$ . Since  $E$  is closed,  $S = [0, 2\pi) \setminus E$  consists of (at most countably many) open intervals  $I$  from which we can find finitely many open intervals  $I_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ ) such that  $\text{mes}(S \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^m I_i) < K/2$ , where  $K = \sigma - \text{mes } E - t > 0$ . By the assumption of Theorem 1.1, it follows from Lemma 2.1 that there exists a sequence  $\{r_j\}$  of positive numbers such that  $\text{mes } E(r_j) > \sigma - t > 0$ , where  $E(r_j)$  is defined as in (2.1). Obviously we have

$$\text{mes}(E(r_j) \cap S) = \text{mes}(E(r_j) \setminus (E \cap E(r_j))) \geq \text{mes } E(r_j) - \text{mes } E \geq K > 0.$$

Thus there exists an open interval  $I = I_{i_0} \subset S$  such that for infinitely many  $j$

$$(2.2) \quad \text{mes}(E(r_j) \cap I) > \frac{K}{2m} > 0.$$

By passing to a subsequence if it is necessary, we can assume that for each  $j$ , (2.2) holds. Write  $I = (a, b)$ . Take a positive number  $\alpha$  such that

$$(2.3) \quad \text{mes}(E(r_j) \cap I_\alpha) > \frac{K}{3m} > 0, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots,$$

where we denote by  $I_\alpha$  the interval  $(a + \alpha, b - \alpha)$ ,  $(0 < 8\alpha < b - a)$ . It is easy to see from  $I \cap E = \emptyset$  that there exists a positive  $R$  such that

$$\Omega(R, I_\alpha) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \geq R \text{ and } \arg z \in I_\alpha\} \subset F(f).$$

By choosing a point  $z_0$  on the bisector of  $I$ , we see that the angular domain

$$\{z : z \in \mathbb{C}; |z - z_0| \geq 0 \text{ and } \arg(z - z_0) \in I_\alpha\} \subset F(f).$$

So without loss of generality, we can suppose  $\Omega(0, I_\alpha) \subset F(f)$ .

In the following we assume that  $\alpha$  is a fixed number such that (2.3) holds. Since  $\Omega(0, I_\alpha) \subset F(f)$ ,  $f(z)$  has no pole in  $\Omega$  and also does not take the values in  $J(f)$ . Take two fixed points  $w_j \in J(f)$ ,  $(j = 1, 2)$ . Thus  $f$  is meromorphic in  $\Omega(0, I_\alpha)$  and misses three points including infinity. Therefore the family  $\{f \circ \varphi\}$ , where  $\varphi$  is a conformal automorphism of  $\Omega(0, I_\alpha)$ , is normal in  $\Omega(0, I_\alpha)$  (compare [5]). So take a sequence of automorphisms  $\varphi_j(z)$  of  $\Omega(0, I_\alpha)$  such that  $\varphi_j(z) = r_j z$ ,  $r_j = |z_j|$ . We see that  $f \circ \varphi_j$  converges to a function  $g$ , which is either analytic or identically  $\infty$  in  $\Omega(0, I_\alpha)$ . Now  $f$  is unbounded on  $\{z_j\}$  and hence  $g \equiv \infty$ . Thus  $f \circ \varphi_j$  converges uniformly on  $\{z : |z| = 1\} \cap \Omega(0, I_\alpha)$  to  $\infty$ . This implies that

$$(2.4) \quad \lim_{\substack{z \in L_j \\ j \rightarrow \infty}} |f(z)| = +\infty,$$

where  $L_j = \{z : |z| = r_j\} \cap \Omega(0, I_{2\alpha})$ .

In the following we prove the number of bounded components of  $\mathbb{C} \setminus f(\Omega')$ , where  $\Omega' = \Omega(0, I_{2\alpha})$  is at most one. If our conclusion is wrong, then we can take two bounded components  $U_1, U_2$  from  $\mathbb{C} \setminus f(\Omega')$ . Choose two Jordan curves  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$  in  $f(\Omega')$  such that  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  do not pass through critical values of  $f(z)$ ,  $U_1 \subset \text{int}(\gamma_1)$ ,  $U_2 \subset \text{int}(\gamma_2)$ , and  $\overline{\text{int}(\gamma_1)} \cap \overline{\text{int}(\gamma_2)} = \emptyset$ . We choose a branch of  $f^{-1}$  such that  $f^{-1}(\gamma_1), f^{-1}(\gamma_2) \subset \Omega'$ . Then  $f^{-1}(\gamma_1) \cap f^{-1}(\gamma_2) = \emptyset$ . Take a fixed  $R > 0$  such that  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \subset \{z : |z| < R\}$ . Noting that (2.4) holds, we see that every component of  $f^{-1}(\gamma_j)$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , is bounded. Since the interior of  $\gamma_j$  contains some points in  $J(f)$ , it is easy to see that any component of  $f^{-1}(\gamma_j)$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , cannot be closed. So it is a Jordan arc. Now we take fixed  $j_0$  such that  $|f(z)| > R$  for all  $z \in L_j (j > j_0)$  and  $f^{-1}(\gamma_j) \cap \Omega' \cap \{|z| < r_{j_0}\} \neq \emptyset, j = 1, 2$ .

Take a component of  $f^{-1}(\gamma_j)$ ,  $j = 1$  or  $2$ , in  $\Omega'_{j_0} = \Omega' \cap \{|z| < r_{j_0}\}$ . Let  $\sigma_j$  be a component of  $f^{-1}(\gamma_j)$  in  $\Omega'_{j_0}$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ . It is easy to see that  $\sigma_1$  is homotopic to  $\sigma_2$ . As  $f(z)$  is analytic on  $\overline{\Omega'_{j_0}}$ , we deduce that  $\gamma_1 = f(\sigma_1)$  is homotopic to  $\gamma_2 = f(\sigma_2)$ . This is a contradiction, which proves our claim.

For a transcendental meromorphic function  $f$ , its Julia set is an unbounded set in  $\mathbb{C}$ . If  $J(f)$  contains an unbounded component  $\Gamma$ , then  $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Gamma$  is a simply connected hyperbolic domain  $D$  and  $f(\Omega') \subset D$ . Otherwise all components of  $J(f)$  are bounded

and there are infinitely many bounded components in  $J(f)$ . Using the fact we just proved, it is not hard to find a simply connected hyperbolic domain  $D \subset \mathbb{C}$  such that  $f(\Omega') \subset D$ .

Using Lemma 2.2, there exists a positive number  $M$  such that  $|f(z)| < |z|^M$  for all sufficiently large  $z \in \Omega'$ . On the other hand, there are  $z_j \in L_j$  such that  $|f(z_j)| > |z_j|^{M_j}$  for all sufficiently large  $j$ . Noting that  $M_j \rightarrow \infty$ , we get a contradiction and Theorem 1.1 is proved.  $\square$

**PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2.** Let  $f(z)$  be a transcendental meromorphic function in the complex domain of order  $0 < \lambda < \infty$ . If  $\infty$  is the Borel exceptional value of  $f$ , then

$$\overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log N(r, f)}{\log r} < \lambda.$$

Thus  $f(z)$  must have the form  $f(z) = G(z)/\Pi(z)$ , where  $G(z)$  is a transcendental entire function and  $\Pi(z)$  is an entire function that is the typical product of the poles of  $f(z)$ . The functions  $G(z)$  and  $\Pi(z)$  have the following properties.

$$\overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log T(r, \Pi)}{\log r} = \overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log m(r, \Pi)}{\log r} = \overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log N(r, f)}{\log r} = \sigma < \lambda$$

and

$$\overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log T(r, f)}{\log r} = \overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log T(r, G)}{\log r} = \overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log m(r, G)}{\log r} = \lambda.$$

Since  $G(z)$  is a transcendental entire function of finite order  $\lambda$ , it follows from the Phragmén-Lindelöf Theorem that there is an interval  $(a, b)$  with  $b - a \geq \min(2\pi, \pi/\lambda)$  such that

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \log |G(re^{i\theta})|}{\log r} = \lambda$$

for all  $\theta \in (a, b)$ .

We are now able to prove  $[a, b] \subset E$ . If it is not true, then there is an subinterval  $I \subset (a, b)$  such that the angular domain  $\Omega(\{|z| > R, \arg z \in I\}) \subset F(f)$ . Let  $\arg z = \theta_0$  be the bisector of  $I$ . Then we have  $\log |\Pi(re^{i\theta_0})| < r^{\sigma+\varepsilon}$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \log |f(r_j e^{i\theta_0})| &= \log \left| \frac{G(r_j e^{i\theta_0})}{\Pi(r_j e^{i\theta_0})} \right| = \log |G(r_j e^{i\theta_0})| - \log |\Pi(r_j e^{i\theta_0})| \\ &> r_j^{\lambda-\varepsilon} - r_j^{\sigma+\varepsilon} = r_j^{\lambda-\varepsilon'} \end{aligned}$$

for some  $\varepsilon' > 0$ . Thus we can find a sequences of points  $\{z_j\}$  on the bisector such that  $\log |f(z_j)| > |z_j|^{\lambda-\varepsilon}$  for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

Therefore, as in the proof of Theorem 1.1, we can find a sequence of

$$L_j = \{|z_j|e^{i\theta} : a + \alpha \leq \theta \leq b - \alpha\}, \quad 0 < \alpha < (b - a)/8,$$

such that (2.4) holds.

By the same argument of the proof of Theorem 1.1, we arrive at a contradiction. The proof of Theorem 1.2 is completed.  $\square$

**REMARK.** Theorem 1.2 is also true for meromorphic functions of finite lower order  $\mu$  with poles having order of growth less than  $\mu$ . In fact in this case, as in the proof of Theorem 1.2,  $f$  can be written as  $f(z) = G(z)/\Pi(z)$ , where  $G(z)$  is an entire function of finite lower order  $\mu$ , and  $\Pi(z)$  is an entire function with order less than  $\mu$ . So applying a theorem of Baernstein in [1] to  $G(z)$ , we get a similar result as in Theorem 1.2.

### Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the referee for suggestions which improved the presentation of the paper. In fact, the final remark is due to them.

### References

- [1] A. Baernstein, 'A generalization of the  $\cos \pi \rho$  theorem', *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **193** (1974), 181–197.
- [2] ———, 'Proof of Edrei's spread conjecture', *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)* **26** (1973), 418–434.
- [3] I. N. Baker, 'Set of non-normality in iteration theory', *J. London Math. Soc.* **40** (1965), 499–502.
- [4] W. K. Hayman, *Meromorphic functions*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1964).
- [5] O. Letho and K. Virtanen, 'Boundary behavior and normal meromorphic functions', *Acta. Math.* **97** (1957), 47–65.
- [6] J.-Y. Qiao, 'On limiting directions of Julia sets', *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.* **26** (2001), 391–399.
- [7] L. Yang, *Value distribution theory*, Translated from 1982 Chinese original (Springer-Verlag, Berlin; Science Press, Beijing, 1993).
- [8] J.-H. Zheng, S. Wang and Z.-G. Huang, 'Some properties of Fatou and Julia set of transcendental meromorphic functions', *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc.* **66** (2002), 1–8.

LMAM

School of Mathematical Sciences

Peking University

Beijing 100871

P. R. China

e-mail: [tangdin@math.pku.edu.cn](mailto:tangdin@math.pku.edu.cn)