

## ON THE FAMILY OF ANALYTIC MAPPINGS AMONG ULTRAHYPERELLIPTIC SURFACES

Dedicated to Professor Yûsaku Komatu on his sixtieth birthday

BY HIDEO MUTŌ

§1. Let  $R$  (resp.  $S$ ) be an ultrahyperelliptic surface defined by an equation  $y^2=G(z)$  (resp.  $u^2=g(w)$ ), where  $G$  (resp.  $g$ ) is an entire function having no zero other than an infinite number of simple zeros.

Let  $\varphi$  be a non-trivial analytic mapping of  $R$  into  $S$ . Then

$$h(z)=\mathcal{P}_S\circ\varphi\circ\mathcal{P}_R^{-1}(z)$$

is an entire function, where  $\mathcal{P}_R$  (resp.  $\mathcal{P}_S$ ) is the projection map  $(z, y)\rightarrow z$  (resp.  $(w, u)\rightarrow w$ ) [4]. This entire function  $h(z)$  is called the projection of the analytic mapping  $\varphi$ .

In this paper we shall prove the following theorem.

**THEOREM.** *Let  $R$  and  $S$  be two ultrahyperelliptic surfaces. Suppose that there exists a non-trivial analytic mapping  $\varphi$  of  $R$  into  $S$  such that the projection of  $\varphi$  is a transcendental entire function. Then there is no non-trivial analytic mapping  $\psi$  of  $R$  into  $S$  such that the projection of  $\psi$  is a polynomial.*

Under some restrictions on  $R$  and  $S$ , Niino proved the above fact [3] (cf. [2]).

§2. To prove our theorem we need the following two lemmas. The standard symbols of the Nevanlinna theory are used throughout the paper.

**LEMMA 1** [4]. *If there exists a non-trivial analytic mapping  $\varphi$  of  $R$  into  $S$ , then the projection  $h(z)$  of  $\varphi$  satisfies an equation*

$$(1) \quad f(z)^2G(z)=g\circ h(z)$$

with a suitable entire function  $f(z)$ . Conversely, if a non-constant entire function  $h(z)$  satisfies the equation (1) with a suitable entire function  $f(z)$ , then there exists a non-trivial analytic mapping  $\varphi$  of  $R$  into  $S$  such that the projection of  $\varphi$  is  $h(z)$ .

**LEMMA 2** (cf. [1]). *Let  $h(z)$  be a transcendental entire function. For given three numbers  $A, B$  and  $C$  there is a number  $R_0 (>0)$  and an increasing sequence*

---

Received Dec. 18, 1973.

$\{R_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  with  $R_n \rightarrow \infty$  ( $n \rightarrow \infty$ ) such that for all  $n$  ( $\geq 1$ ) and all  $r$  in  $[R_n, R_n^A]$  and all  $\omega$  satisfying  $R_0 \leq |\omega| \leq r^B$  we have

$$(2) \quad n\left(r, \frac{1}{h-\omega}\right) > C.$$

*Proof.* We can prove this lemma along the same line as in [1]. Suppose at first that there is a number  $\tilde{R}$  such that for all  $r$  ( $\geq \tilde{R}$ ) and all  $\omega$  satisfying  $|\omega| = r^B$  we have

$$n\left(r, \frac{1}{h-\omega}\right) > C.$$

In this case our assertion holds for every increasing sequence  $\{R_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  with  $R_1 \geq \tilde{R}$  and  $R_0 \geq \tilde{R}^B$ .

Suppose next that the above is false, that is, for arbitrary large  $r$  there exists an  $\omega$  satisfying  $|\omega| = r^B$  such that

$$n\left(r, \frac{1}{h-\omega}\right) \leq C.$$

We choose  $\delta$  so that  $|\delta| > |h(0)|$  and

$$(3) \quad N\left(r, \frac{1}{h-\delta}\right) \sim T(r, h) \quad (r \rightarrow \infty).$$

Now put  $R_0 = |h(0)| + |\delta| + 1$ . Let  $\{R_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  be an increasing sequence with  $R_1 > R_0$  and  $R_n \rightarrow \infty$  ( $n \rightarrow \infty$ ) such that for all  $n$  ( $\geq 1$ ) there is an  $\omega$  satisfying  $|\omega| = R_n^{2AB}$  and

$$(4) \quad n\left(R_n^{2A}, \frac{1}{h-\omega}\right) \leq C.$$

Assume that for arbitrary large  $n$  the statement of our Lemma does not hold where  $R_0$  and  $\{R_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  are defined above. Then for such  $n$  there is an  $\Omega$ , depending on  $n$ , such that  $R_0 \leq |\Omega| \leq R_n^{AB}$  and

$$(5) \quad n\left(\rho, \frac{1}{h-\Omega}\right) \leq C \quad (\rho \leq R_n).$$

Choose  $\rho$  to satisfy  $R_n/2 \leq \rho \leq R_n$  such that

$$(6) \quad m\left(\rho, \frac{h'}{h-\omega}\right) = o(T(\rho, h)), \quad (n \rightarrow \infty),$$

$$(7) \quad m\left(\rho, \frac{h'}{h-\Omega}\right) = o(T(\rho, h)), \quad (n \rightarrow \infty).$$

The relations (6) and (7) can be derived from the choice of  $\omega$  and  $\Omega$ , since  $h(z)$  is transcendental. Hence by (5), (6) and (7) we have

$$(8) \quad T\left(\rho, \frac{h'}{h-\omega}\right) = o(T(\rho, h)), \quad (n \rightarrow \infty),$$

$$(9) \quad T\left(\rho, \frac{h'}{h-\Omega}\right) = o(T(\rho, h)), \quad (n \rightarrow \infty).$$

Put  $k=(\delta-\Omega)/(\omega-\delta)$  and consider

$$H(z)=\frac{h'(z)}{h(z)-\omega}+k\frac{h'(z)}{h(z)-\Omega}=\frac{(\omega-\Omega)h'(z)(h(z)-\delta)}{(\omega-\delta)(h(z)-\omega)(h(z)-\Omega)}.$$

Then

$$(10) \quad N\left(\rho, \frac{1}{H}\right) \geq N\left(\rho, \frac{1}{h-\delta}\right) = (1+o(1))T(\rho, h).$$

By (10) and the choice of  $\delta, \omega$  and  $\Omega$  yield

$$(11) \quad T(\rho, H) \geq (1+o(1))(T(\rho, h)).$$

On the other hand, by (8) and (9)

$$(12) \quad T(\rho, H) = o(T(\rho, h)).$$

The relations (11) and (12) are mutually incompatible for large  $n$ . Consequently we can see that there is a number  $R_0(>0)$  and a sequence  $\{R_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  with the properties given in the statement of the Lemma.

§ 3. We shall prove our theorem.

*Proof of theorem.* Suppose that there exists a pair of two ultrahyperelliptic surfaces  $R$  and  $S$  such that there exist two non-trivial analytic mappings  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$  with the projections  $p(z)$  and  $h(z)$ , respectively, where  $p(z)$  is a polynomial and  $h(z)$  is a transcendental entire function. Then by Lemma 1 we have

$$(13) \quad f_1(z)^2G(z) = g \circ p(z),$$

$$(14) \quad f_2(z)^2G(z) = g \circ h(z),$$

where  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  are suitable entire functions.

Put  $p(z) = \alpha z^\nu + \beta z^{\nu-1} + \dots + \gamma$  ( $\alpha \neq 0$ ). Then for given  $\epsilon$  ( $0 < \epsilon < 1$ )

$$n\left(r, \frac{1}{g \circ p}\right) \leq \nu n\left(|\alpha|r^\nu(1+\epsilon), \frac{1}{g}\right) + O(1).$$

Hence

$$N\left(r, \frac{1}{g \circ p}\right) \leq N\left(|\alpha|r^\nu(1+\epsilon), \frac{1}{g}\right) + O(\log r).$$

Since  $g$  is transcendental, by (13)

$$(15) \quad N\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right) \leq N\left(r, \frac{1}{g \circ p}\right) \leq (1+\epsilon)N\left(|\alpha|r^\nu(1+\epsilon), \frac{1}{g}\right).$$

This inequality holds for all large  $r$ .

By (14) we have

$$\begin{aligned} N\left(r, \frac{1}{f_2}\right) &\leq N\left(r, \frac{1}{h'}\right) \\ &\leq T(r, h') + O(1) \leq T(r, h) + O(\log rT(r, h)) \leq 2T(r, h) \end{aligned}$$

outside a set  $E$  of finite measure, since  $h(z)$  is a transcendental entire function.

On the other hand, by the second fundamental theorem, we have

$$\tilde{K}T(r, h) \leq N\left(r, \frac{1}{g \circ h}\right)$$

for arbitrary but fixed constant  $\tilde{K}$ , if  $r \in E$ . Hence we have

$$(16) \quad N\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right) \geq (1-\varepsilon)N\left(r, \frac{1}{g \circ h}\right)$$

outside the set  $E$ . By (15) and (16) we get

$$(17) \quad N\left(|\alpha| r^\nu(1+\varepsilon), \frac{1}{g}\right) \geq \frac{1-\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon} N\left(r, \frac{1}{g \circ h}\right),$$

which holds outside the set  $E$ .

Now we apply our Lemma 2 for  $A=3, B=\nu+1, C=4(\nu+1)$  and  $h(z)$ . Let  $\{R_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  be a sequence satisfying the statement of the Lemma 2.

Let  $\{w_\nu\}_{\nu=1}^\infty$  be the zeros of  $g(w)$ . Choose  $r_n$  satisfying  $R_n^2 \leq r_n \leq R_n^3$  and  $r_n \in E$ . Then, for large  $n$ ,

$$(18) \quad \begin{aligned} N\left(r_n, \frac{1}{g \circ h}\right) &\geq \int_{R_n}^{r_n} \frac{n(t, 1/g \circ h)}{t} dt \\ &\geq \int_{R_n}^{r_n} \frac{1}{t} \left\{ \sum_{w_\nu, R_0 \leq |w_\nu| \leq M(r_n, h)} n\left(t, \frac{1}{h-w_\nu^-}\right) \right\} dt \\ &\geq 4(\nu+1) \int_{R_n}^{r_n} \frac{n(t^{\nu+1}, 1/g) - n(R_0, 1/g)}{t} dt \\ &\geq 4 \int_{R_n^{\nu+1}}^{r_n^{\nu+1}} \frac{n(t, 1/g)}{t} dt - O(\log r_n) \\ &\geq 4N\left(r_n^{\nu+1}, \frac{1}{g}\right) - N\left(R_n^{\nu+1}, \frac{1}{g}\right) - O(\log r_n) \\ &\geq 2N\left(r_n^{\nu+1}, \frac{1}{g}\right). \end{aligned}$$

By (17) and (18), as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} N\left(r_n, \frac{1}{g \circ h}\right) &\geq 2N\left(r_n^{\nu+1}, \frac{1}{g}\right) \\ &\geq 2N\left(|\alpha| r_n^\nu(1+\varepsilon), \frac{1}{g}\right) \geq 2 \frac{1-\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon} N\left(r_n, \frac{1}{g \circ h}\right). \end{aligned}$$

It is untenable. This completes the proof of our theorem.

## REFERENCES

- [1] CLUNIE, J., The composition of entire and meromorphic functions, *Mathematical Essays dedicated to A. J. Macintyre*, 75–92, Ohio Univ. Press (1970).
- [2] MUTŌ, H., Analytic mappings between two ultrahyperelliptic surfaces, *Kōdai Math. Sem. Rep.*, 22 (1970), 53–60.
- [3] NIINO, K., On the family of analytic mappings between two ultrahyperelliptic surfaces. *Kōdai Math. Sem. Rep.*, 21 (1969), 182–190.
- [4] OZAWA, M., On complex analytic mappings between two ultrahyperelliptic surfaces. *Kōdai Math. Sem. Rep.*, 17 (1965), 158–165.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS  
FACULTY OF EDUCATION  
SAITAMA UNIVERSITY  
URAWA, JAPAN