

# NOTE ON DIRICHLET SERIES. (VII)

## ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF VALUES OF DIRICHLET SERIES ON THE VERTICAL LINES

By Chuji TANAKA

(1) INTRODUCTION. Let us put

$$(1.1) \quad F(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n \exp(-\lambda_n s)$$

$$(s = \sigma + it, \quad 0 \leq \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots < \lambda_n \rightarrow +\infty)$$

If  $F(s)$  has the uniform convergence-abscissa  $\sigma_0 < +\infty$ , then for  $\sigma_0 < \sigma$ ,  $F(\sigma + it)$  is an almost periodic function of  $t$  by H. Bohr's theorems. ([1] pp. 48-49, [2]) If we assume only the existence of the simple convergence-abscissa  $\sigma_1 < +\infty$ , what we can say about the behaviour of Dirichlet series on the vertical line  $\Re(s) = \sigma > \sigma_1$ ? Concerning this problem, we have not any knowledge except K. Ananda-Rau's short note. ([3]) In this present Note, we shall establish

THEOREM. Let (1.1) have the simple convergence-abscissa  $\sigma_1 < +\infty$ . Then, on the vertical line  $\Re(s) = \sigma > \sigma_1$ , next three cases are possible:

(a) On  $\Re(s) = \sigma > \sigma_1$ ,  $F(\sigma + it)$  is bounded and it is an almost periodic function of  $t$ .

(b) On  $\Re(s) = \sigma > \sigma_1$ ,  $F(\sigma + it)$  is bounded and it has no limit as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$  (or  $-\infty$ ). Furthermore, for any given  $\varepsilon (> 0)$ , in the vertical strip:  $\sigma_1 < \sigma - \varepsilon < \Re(s) < \sigma + \varepsilon$ ,  $F(s)$  assumes every value, except perhaps two ( $\infty$  included), infinitely many times.

(c) On  $\Re(s) = \sigma > \sigma_1$ ,  $F(\sigma + it)$  is unbounded, but it is impossible that we have simultaneously

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} |F(\sigma + it)| = +\infty, \quad |\arg F(\sigma + it) - \theta| \leq \psi < \frac{\pi}{2},$$

where  $\theta$  ( $0 \leq \theta < 2\pi$ ),  $\psi$  ( $0 < \psi < \frac{\pi}{2}$ ): arbitrary but fixed constants.

(2) LEMMAS. For its proof, we need next Lemmas.

LEMMA 1. Let (1.1) have the simple convergence-abscissa  $\sigma_1 < +\infty$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} F(s) &= \sum_{\lambda_n < \omega} a_n \exp(-\lambda_n s) \{1 - \exp(\nu(\lambda_n - \omega))\} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\beta - i\infty}^{\beta + i\infty} \frac{\nu F(z) \exp(\omega(z - s))}{(z - s)(z + \nu - s)} dz. \end{aligned}$$

for  $\max(\sigma_1, \sigma - \nu) < \beta < \sigma$ ,  $\sigma = \Re(s)$ , where  $\omega, \nu$  are arbitrary but fixed positive constants.

PROOF. By Perron's formula ([1] p.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (2.1) \quad F(s) &= \sum_{\lambda_n < \omega} a_n \exp(-\lambda_n s) - F(s) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\beta - i\infty}^{\beta + i\infty} \frac{F(z) \exp(\omega(z - s))}{z - s} dz \end{aligned}$$

for  $\sigma_1 < \beta < \sigma = \Re(s)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (2.2) \quad \sum_{\lambda_n < \omega} a_n \exp(-\lambda_n(s - \nu)) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\beta - i\infty}^{\beta + i\infty} \frac{F(z) \exp(\omega(z - s + \nu))}{(z - s + \nu)} dz \end{aligned}$$

for  $\sigma - \nu < \beta$ . Hence, by (2.1), (2.2),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\lambda_n < \omega} a_n \exp(-\lambda_n s) \{1 - \exp(\nu(\lambda_n - \omega))\} &= F(s) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\beta - i\infty}^{\beta + i\infty} \left\{ \frac{1}{z - s} - \frac{1}{z + \nu - s} \right\} F(z) \exp(\omega(z - s)) dz \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\beta - i\infty}^{\beta + i\infty} \frac{\nu F(z) \exp(\omega(z - s))}{(z - s)(z + \nu - s)} dz \end{aligned}$$

for  $\max(\sigma_1, \sigma - \nu) < \beta < \sigma = \Re(s)$ . q.e.d.

LEMMA 2. Let (1.1) have the simple convergence-abscissa  $\sigma_1 < +\infty$ . If  $|F(s)| \leq M$  on  $\Re(s) = \sigma_0 > \sigma_1$ , then  $|F(s)| \leq M$  for  $\Re(s) \geq \sigma_0 > \sigma_1$ .

PROOF. Since  $\sigma_1 < \sigma_0$ , for sufficiently small  $\varepsilon (> 0)$  we have

$$\sigma_1 < \sigma_0 - \varepsilon < \sigma_0,$$

so that  $f(\lambda)$  is evidently simply convergent for  $\lambda = \sigma_0 - \varepsilon$ . Hence, by the well-known theorem ([1] p.8), we have

$$(2.3) \quad |f(\sigma + it)| = o(|t|)$$

uniformly for  $\sigma_0 \leq \sigma$ . Putting  $\lambda = re^{i\varphi} = \sigma + it$ , we have by (2.3),

$$\begin{aligned} |f(\lambda)| &= |f(\sigma + it)| \\ &= o(|t|) \quad \text{for } |t| \leq \sqrt{2} \\ &= o(r|\sin \varphi|) \\ &= o(r) \end{aligned}$$

whence, for any given  $\varepsilon (> 0)$ ,

$$(2.4) \quad |f(\lambda)| = o(\exp(\varepsilon r)) \quad \text{for } |t| \leq \sqrt{2}$$

Since  $|f(\lambda)| \leq M$  on  $\Re(\lambda) = \sigma_0$ , by (2.4) and Phragmen-Lindelöf's theorem ([4] p.43) we have  $|f(\lambda)| \leq M$  for  $\Re(\lambda) \geq \sigma_0$ . q.o.d.

**LEMMA 3.** Let (1.1) have the simple convergence-abscissa  $\sigma_0 < +\infty$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} a_n &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \cdot \int_{\alpha}^{\alpha+T} f(\sigma + it) \exp(\lambda_n(\sigma + it)) dt \\ &\quad (n = 1, 2, \dots) \end{aligned}$$

for  $\sigma_0 < \sigma$ , where  $\alpha$  : an arbitrary but fixed constant.

**REMARK.** It is well known that this formula is valid for  $\mathcal{F} < \sigma$ , where  $\mathcal{F}$  is the boundedness-abscissa, which is defined as follows: for any given  $\varepsilon (> 0)$ ,  $f(\sigma + it)$  is regular and uniformly bounded for  $\mathcal{F} + \varepsilon \leq \sigma$ . ([1] p.15)

But the existence of  $\mathcal{F}$  is not necessary for the validity of this formula.

**PROOF.** Let us put

$$\begin{aligned} &\exp(\lambda_n \lambda) f(\lambda) \\ &= a_n + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \exp((\lambda_0 - \lambda_i) \lambda) + \sum_{i=n+1}^{\infty} a_i \exp(-(\lambda_i - \lambda_0) \lambda) \\ &= a_n + g_1(\lambda) + \exp(-\tau_n \lambda) \cdot g_2(\lambda), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(i) \quad g_1(\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \exp((\lambda_0 - \lambda_i) \lambda),$$

$$(ii) \quad g_2(\lambda) = \sum_{i=n+1}^{\infty} a_i \exp(-(\lambda_i - \lambda_0) \lambda),$$

$$\tau_n = \lambda_{n+1} - \lambda_n > 0, \quad \lambda_i' = \lambda_i - \lambda_{n+1} \geq 0 \quad \text{for } i \geq n+1$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} (2.5) \quad &\frac{1}{T} \int_{\alpha}^{\alpha+T} f(\sigma + it) \exp(\lambda_n(\sigma + it)) dt \\ &= a_n + \frac{1}{T} \int_{\alpha}^{\alpha+T} g_1(\lambda) dt + \frac{1}{T} \int_{\alpha}^{\alpha+T} \exp(-\tau_n \lambda) g_2(\lambda) dt \\ &= a_n + I_1 + I_2, \quad \text{say} \end{aligned}$$

With regard to  $I_1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{1}{T} \int_{\alpha}^{\alpha+T} g_1(\lambda) dt \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a_i \cdot \int_{\alpha}^{\alpha+T} \exp((\lambda_n - \lambda_i)(\sigma + it)) dt \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a_i \exp((\lambda_n - \lambda_i) \sigma) \cdot \left[ \frac{\exp((\lambda_n - \lambda_i) it)}{i(\lambda_n - \lambda_i)} \right]_{\alpha}^{\alpha+T} \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$(2.6) \quad |I_1| \leq \frac{1}{T} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |a_i| \cdot \frac{\exp((\lambda_n - \lambda_i) \sigma)}{\lambda_n - \lambda_i} = O\left(\frac{1}{T}\right)$$

Now let us define the angular domain  $\mathcal{P}$  as follows:

$$\begin{cases} (i) & |\arg(\lambda - \sigma_0)| \leq \vartheta \leq \vartheta_2, \quad \sigma_0 < \sigma_0 < \sigma' \\ (ii) & \sigma + i d \in \mathcal{P} \end{cases}$$

As regards  $I_2$ , by Cauchy's theorem we have

$$\begin{aligned} (2.7) \quad I_2 &= \frac{1}{T} \int_{\sigma + i d}^{\sigma + i(\alpha + T)} \exp(-\tau_n \lambda) g_2(\lambda) d\lambda \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \int_{\sigma + i d}^{\lambda_1} + \frac{1}{T} \int_{\lambda_1}^{\lambda_2} + \frac{1}{T} \int_{\lambda_2}^{\sigma + i(\alpha + T)} \\ &\quad (\text{on } \Re(\lambda) = \sigma) \quad (\text{on } \Re(\lambda) = \Re(\lambda_i)) \quad (\text{on } \Im(\lambda) = \alpha + T) \\ &= I_1' + I_2' + I_3', \quad \text{say,} \end{aligned}$$

where (i)  $\lambda_2$  is the intersecting point of two straight lines:

$$\begin{cases} g(\lambda) = \alpha + T, \quad \arg(\lambda - \sigma_0) = \vartheta, \\ (ii) \quad \lambda_1 = \sigma_1 + i d, \quad \sigma_1 = \Re(\lambda_2) \end{cases}$$

By the well-known theorem ([1] p.5),  $g_2(\lambda)$  converges uniformly in  $\mathcal{P}$ , so that there exists a constant  $K$  such that

$$(2.8) \quad |g_2(\lambda)| < K \quad \text{for } \lambda \in \mathcal{P}.$$

Since  $\mathcal{F}(\lambda) = \alpha$  is contained in  $\mathcal{P}$ , by (2.8) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (2.9) \quad |I_1'| &\leq \frac{1}{T} \int_{\sigma}^{\sigma_1} \exp(-\tau_n \sigma) K d\sigma \\ &< \frac{K}{T} \int_{\sigma}^{+\infty} \exp(-\tau_n \sigma) d\sigma = O\left(\frac{1}{T}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Since the segment:  $\alpha \leq f(\delta) \leq \alpha + T$ ,  
 $\mathcal{K}(\delta) = \delta_1$  is contained in  $\mathcal{P}$ ,  
 by (2.8) we get

$$|I_2'| \leq \frac{1}{T} \int_{\alpha}^{\alpha+T} \exp(-\tau_n \sigma_1) K dt = K \exp(-\tau_n \sigma_1)$$

Since  $\sigma_1 = O(\tau)$ , we have evidently

$$(2.10) \quad |I_2'| \leq K \exp(-\tau_n O(\tau)) = o(\tau) \\ \text{as } T \rightarrow +\infty$$

Since  $g_2(\delta)$  is simply convergent for  $\sigma_2 < \sigma'$ , by the above-mentioned theorem ([1] p.8) we have

$$g_2(\sigma + it) = o(|t|)$$

uniformly for  $\sigma_0 \leq \sigma'$ . Hence,

$$(2.11) \quad |I_3'| \leq \int_{\sigma}^{\sigma_2} \exp(-\tau_n \sigma') \left| \frac{g_2(\sigma + it + T)}{T} \right| d\sigma' \\ < o(\tau) \int_{\sigma}^{\infty} \exp(-\tau_n \sigma') d\sigma' = o(\tau) \\ \text{as } T \rightarrow +\infty$$

By (2.7), (2.9), (2.10), (2.11),

$$|I_2| < o(\tau) \quad \text{as } T \rightarrow +\infty,$$

so that by (2.5), (2.6) we get

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_{\alpha}^{\alpha+T} F(\sigma + it) \exp(\lambda_n(\sigma + it)) dt = a_n \\ \text{q.e.d.}$$

(3) PROOF OF THEOREM. We distinguish three cases:

- (a) On  $\mathcal{K}(\delta) = \sigma' > \sigma_2$ ,  $F(\delta)$  is bounded and it is also bounded on  $\mathcal{K}(\delta) = \sigma'$  ( $\sigma_2 < \sigma' < \sigma'$ ), where  $\sigma'$  is a suitable constant.
- (b) On  $\mathcal{K}(\delta) = \sigma' > \sigma_2$ ,  $F(\delta)$  is bounded, but it is not so on  $\mathcal{K}(\delta) = \sigma'$ , for every  $\sigma'$  ( $\sigma_2 < \sigma' < \sigma'$ ).
- (c) On  $\mathcal{K}(\delta) = \sigma' > \sigma_2$ ,  $F(\delta)$  is unbounded.

Case (a): Applying Lemma 1, in which we put  $\sigma_2 < \sigma' < \sigma' - \nu < \beta < \sigma'$ , we have

$$(3.1) \quad F(\delta) = \sum_{\lambda_n < \omega} a_n \exp(-\lambda_n \delta) \{1 - \exp(\nu(\lambda_n - \omega))\} \\ - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\beta-i\infty}^{\beta+i\infty} \frac{\nu F(z) \exp(\omega(z-\delta))}{(z-\delta)(z+\nu-\delta)} dz$$

By Lemma 2, there exists a constant  $M$  such that

$$|F(\delta)| \leq M \quad \text{for } \mathcal{K}(\delta) \geq \sigma'$$

Then we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\beta-i\infty}^{\beta+i\infty} \frac{\nu F(z) \exp(\omega(z-\delta))}{(z-\delta)(z+\nu-\delta)} dz \right| \\ \leq \frac{M\nu}{2\pi} \exp(-\omega(\sigma-\beta)) \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{(x-\delta)(x+\nu-\delta)} |dx| \\ = \frac{M\nu}{\pi} \exp(-\omega(\sigma-\beta)) \int_0^{\infty} \frac{1}{[\tau^2 + (\beta-\delta)^2][\tau^2 + (\beta+\nu-\delta)^2]} d\tau \\ = O(1) \exp(-\omega(\sigma-\beta)),$$

where  $O(1)$ : a constant independent upon  $t$ . Hence by (3.1) we get

$$F(\sigma + it) \\ = \sum_{\lambda_n < \omega} a_n \exp(-\lambda_n(\sigma + it)) \{1 - \exp(\nu(\lambda_n - \omega))\} \\ + O(\exp(-\omega(\sigma-\beta)))$$

Since  $\sigma - \beta > 0$ ,  $O(\exp(-\omega(\sigma-\beta)))$  tends to 0 uniformly for  $-\infty < t < +\infty$ , so that

$$(3.2) \quad F(\sigma + it) \\ = \lim_{\omega \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\lambda_n < \omega} a_n \exp(-\lambda_n(\sigma + it)) \{1 - \exp(\nu(\lambda_n - \omega))\} \\ \text{for } -\infty < t < +\infty. \quad \text{On the other hand, } \sum_{\lambda_n < \omega} a_n \exp(-\lambda_n(\sigma + it)) \{1 - \exp(\nu(\lambda_n - \omega))\}$$

is an almost periodic function of  $t$ , so that by (3.2)  $F(\sigma + it)$  is also an almost periodic function of  $t$  ([5] p.186), which proves (a) of our theorem.

Case (b): Since  $F(\delta)$  is bounded on  $\mathcal{K}(\delta) = \sigma'$ , by Lemma 2 there exists a constant  $M$  such that

$$(3.3) \quad |F(\delta)| \leq M \quad \text{for } \mathcal{K}(\delta) \geq \sigma'$$

Let us define the rectangle  $\mathcal{R}(\varepsilon)$  as follows:

$$|\mathcal{K}(\delta) - \sigma'| \leq \varepsilon, \quad |g(\delta)| \leq 1 + \varepsilon, \quad (\varepsilon > 0)$$

On account of the hypothesis, on  $\mathcal{K}(\delta) = \sigma' - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$   $F(\delta)$  is unbounded. Then without any loss of generality we can assume that  $F(\delta)$  is unbounded for  $\mathcal{K}(\delta) = \sigma' - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ ,  $g(\delta) \geq 0$ , so that there exists a sequence  $\{S_n\}$  such that

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{cases} (i) & \mathcal{K}(S_n) = \sigma' - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \quad g(S_n) \rightarrow +\infty \\ (ii) & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |F(S_n)| = +\infty \end{cases}$$

Now in  $\mathcal{R}(\varepsilon/2)$  we consider the functions-family  $\{F_n(\delta)\} = \{F(\delta + i2\pi n)\}$

( $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ). By (3.4) in  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{U}_2)$  there exists a sequence  $\{d_k\}$  such that

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{cases} (i) & \mathcal{R}(d_k) = \sigma - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \\ (ii) & d_k = d_k + i 2\pi n_k, \\ (iii) & |\overline{F}_{n_k}(d_k)| \rightarrow +\infty \text{ as } k \rightarrow +\infty \end{cases}$$

Then  $\{\overline{F}_n(d)\}$  is not normal in  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{U}_2)$ . In fact, by (3.3) and (3.5), any partial sequence of  $\{\overline{F}_{n_k}(d)\}$  neither tends to  $\infty$  uniformly nor tends to the finite analytic function in  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{U}_2)$ . Hence, there exists at least one not-normal point of  $\{\overline{F}_n(d)\}$  in  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{U}_2)$ , so that in  $|\mathcal{R}(d) - \sigma| < \varepsilon$ ,  $g(d) > 1 - \varepsilon$ , a fortiori in the vertical strip:  $|\mathcal{R}(d) - \sigma| < \varepsilon$   $\overline{F}(d)$  assumes every value, except perhaps two ( $\infty$  included), infinitely many times, which proves the second part of (b) of our theorem.

If  $\overline{F}(\sigma + it)$  should tend to the finite value  $\beta$  as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$ , then without any loss of generality, we could assume that  $\beta = 0$ . In fact, it suffices to consider  $\overline{F}(d) - \beta$  instead of  $\overline{F}(d)$ . Hence there exists a constant  $T_0(\varepsilon)$  such that

$$|\overline{F}(\sigma + it)| < \varepsilon \quad \text{for } t > T_0(\varepsilon)$$

Therefore by Lemma 3 we have

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} a_n &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_{\alpha}^{\sigma+T} \overline{F}(\sigma + it) \exp(\lambda_n(\sigma + it)) dt \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \frac{1}{T} \int_{\alpha}^{T_0} + \frac{1}{T} \int_{T_0}^{\sigma+T} \right\} \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} (I_1 + I_2), \quad \text{say} \end{aligned}$$

Then we get

$$|I_1| \leq \frac{1}{T} \cdot \max_{\alpha \leq t \leq T_0} |\overline{F}(\sigma + it)| (T_0 - \alpha) \cdot \exp(\lambda_n \sigma) = O\left(\frac{1}{T}\right),$$

$$|I_2| \leq (T + \alpha - T_0) \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{T} \exp(\lambda_n \sigma) = O(\varepsilon) \quad \text{as } T \rightarrow +\infty$$

Hence, by (3.6) we have

$$|a_n| \leq o(1) + O(\varepsilon)$$

Letting  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ ,  $a_n = 0$  ( $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ), which is impossible. Thus the first part of (b) is proved.

Case (c): If we should have simultaneously

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} |\overline{F}(\sigma + it)| = +\infty,$$

$$|\arg \overline{F}(\sigma + it) - \theta| \leq \vartheta < \frac{\pi}{2},$$

then without any loss of generality we could assume that  $\lambda_1 = 0$ ,  $\theta = 0$ . In fact, it suffices to consider  $\overline{F}(d) \exp(-i\theta)$  +  $\alpha$  instead of  $\overline{F}(d)$ , where

$$\alpha = 0, \quad \text{if } a_1 \neq 0, \quad \lambda_1 = 0$$

$$\alpha > 0, \quad \text{if } a_1 \neq 0, \quad \lambda_1 > 0$$

Then, by Lemma 3, we get

$$(3.7) \quad a_1 = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_{\alpha}^{\sigma+T} \overline{F}(\sigma + it) dt$$

Since  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} |\overline{F}(\sigma + it)| = +\infty$ ,  $|\arg \overline{F}(\sigma + it)| \leq \vartheta < \frac{\pi}{2}$ , we have

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{cases} (i) & |\overline{F}(\sigma + it)| > K \quad \text{for } t > T_0(K) \\ & \text{where } K : \text{an arbitrary positive constant.} \\ (ii) & \mathcal{R}\{\overline{F}(\sigma + it)\} \geq \cos \vartheta |\overline{F}(\sigma + it)| \end{cases}$$

By (3.7), (3.8)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(a_1) &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_{\alpha}^{\sigma+T} \mathcal{R}\{\overline{F}(\sigma + it)\} dt \\ &\geq \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\cos \vartheta}{T} \int_{\alpha}^{\sigma+T} |\overline{F}(\sigma + it)| dt \\ &= \cos \vartheta \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \frac{1}{T} \int_{\alpha}^{T_0} + \frac{1}{T} \int_{T_0}^{\sigma+T} \right\} \\ &\geq \cos \vartheta \left\{ \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(T_0 - \alpha)}{T} \min_{\alpha \leq t \leq T_0} |\overline{F}(\sigma + it)| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T + \alpha - T_0}{T} K \right\} = K \cos \vartheta \end{aligned}$$

Letting  $K \rightarrow +\infty$ ,  $\mathcal{R}(a_1) = +\infty$ , which is impossible. Thus (c) of our theorem is proved.

(\*) Received September 25, 1951.

- [1] G. Valiron: "Théorie générale des séries de Dirichlet," Mémorial des sciences mathématiques, Fasc. XVII, (1926).
- [2] H. Bohr: "Über eine quasi-periodische Eigenschaft Dirichletscher Reihen mit Anwendung auf die Dirichletschen L-Funktionen," Math. Ann. Bd. 85. (1921).
- [3] K. Ananda-Rau: "Note on a property of Dirichlet's series," Lond. Math. Soc. Bd. 19 (1920).
- [4] R. Nevanlinna: "Eindeutige analytische Funktionen," Berlin (1936).
- [5] N. Wiener: "The Fourier integral and certain of its applications," Cambridge (1933).

Mathematical Institute,  
Waseda University, Tokyo.