# NORMAL FUNCTIONS AND A CLASS OF ASSOCIATED BOUNDARY FUNCTIONS

### BY

## J. A. CIMA AND D. C. RUNG

#### ABSTRACT

Let  $\mu'$  be the family of non-empty closed subsets of the Riemann sphere and  $\Lambda$  the family of continuous curves  $\lambda$  with values in the unit disk and  $\lim_{t\to 1} |\lambda(t)| = 1$ . A meromorphic function f in |z| < 1 induces a mapping  $\hat{f}$  from  $\Lambda$  into  $\mu'$  by setting  $\hat{f}(\lambda)$  equal to the cluster set of f on  $\lambda$ . The authors show that if  $\hat{f}$  is continuous then existence of an asymptotic value at  $e^{i\theta}$  implies the existence of an angular limit. Further if the spherical derivative of f is o(1/(1-|z|)) then  $\hat{f}$  is constant on every open disk in the space  $\Lambda$ .

1. Introduction and notation. Let  $D = \{z \mid |z| < 1\}$  denote the unit disk and  $C = \{z \mid |z| = 1\}$  its boundary. For points  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  in D the non-Euclidean (hyperbolic) distance between  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  is given by the formula

$$\rho(z_1, z_2) = \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{\left|\bar{z}_1 z_2 - 1\right| + \left|z_1 - z_2\right|}{\left|\bar{z}_1 z_2 - 1\right| - \left|z_1 - z_2\right|}$$

We designate the extended complex plane by W and the chordal distance between  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  in W by

$$\chi(w_1, w_2) = \frac{|w_1 - w_2|}{\sqrt{(1 + |w_1|^2)}\sqrt{(1 + |w_2|^2)}}$$

Let u' denote the family of non-empty closed subsets of W with the standard Hausdorff topology generated by  $\chi$  [4, pp 20-32], where the distance between two sets  $A, B \in u'$  will be denoted by dist (A, B). The set  $\Lambda$  will be the family of all continuous curves  $\lambda(t)$  in D with  $\lambda(0) = 0$  and  $\lim_{t\to 1} |\lambda(t)| = 1$ . The symbol  $\Lambda^*(\theta)$ indicates the subset of curves of  $\Lambda$  which approach  $e^{i\theta}$  nontangentially, i.e.,  $\lambda(t) \in \Lambda^*(\theta)$  if  $\limsup_{t\to 1} |\arg(z(t) - e^{i\theta}) - \theta| < \pi/2$ . The cluster set of a complexvalued function f along the path  $\lambda(t)$  in D\_terminating in C is defined as follows

$$C_{\lambda}(f) = \{w \mid \text{ there is } \{z_n\}, z_n \in \lambda$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} |z_n| = 1 \text{ with } \lim_{n\to\infty} f(z_n) = w \}.$$

Received February 15, 1966, and in revised form, July 21, 1966.

In this paper we define a metric  $\hat{\rho}$  on  $\Lambda$  and show that with this metric topology  $\Lambda^*(\theta)$  is an arcwise connected Hausdorff subspace of  $\Lambda$ . There is the usual geometric interpretation of  $\varepsilon$ -spheres in this metric topology. That is two Jordan curves  $\lambda_1(t)$  and  $\lambda_2(t)$  in  $\Lambda$  lie in the same  $\varepsilon$ -sphere if the curve  $\lambda_2(t)$  lies in the non-Euclidean  $\varepsilon$ -"envelope" about  $\lambda_1(t)$  and if  $\lambda_1(t)$  lies in the non-Euclidean  $\varepsilon$ -"envelope" about  $\lambda_2$ .

We shall need the following definitions and results.

DEFINITION 1. A function f defined in D with vaues in W is said to e normal if and only if whenever  $\{S_{\alpha}(z)\}$  denotes the family of 1:1 conformal mappings of D onto D, the family  $\{f(S_{\alpha}(Z))\}$  is normal in the sense of Montel. For meromorphic functions this definition is due to Lehto and Virtanen [6, p. 53]. Each function f in D determines a natural map  $\hat{f}$  of the space  $\Lambda$  into the space  $\mu'$ . This map is defined as follows

$$\hat{f}(\lambda) = C_{\lambda}(f)$$

It is shown in §3 that for a continuous normal function f,  $\hat{f}$  is a continuous function.

Lehto and Virtanen [6, pp 59-62] have shown that if a meromorphic function f is normal and has asymptotic value  $\alpha$  at  $e^{i\theta}$  then f has angular limit  $\alpha$  at  $e^{i\theta}$ .

DEFINITION 2. A continuous function f mapping D into W is said to have the Lindelöf property at  $e^{i\theta}$  if whenever f has asymptotic value  $\alpha$  at  $e^{i\theta}$  then fhas angular limit  $\alpha$  at  $e^{i\theta}$ .

Using the results of Lehto and Virtanen we will prove the following theorem;

THEOREM. If f is meromorphic and  $\hat{f}$  is continuous then f has the Lindelöf property at each  $e^{i\theta}$ .

Finally, in 4 it is shown that if  $\rho(f)(z) = o(1/1 - |z|)$  where  $\rho(f)$  denotes the spherical derivative of f then  $\hat{f}$  is a constant value on every open disk in  $\Lambda$ .

2. The  $\rho^*$  function. Bagemihl and Seidel [2, p. 263] have used the non-Euclidean Fréchet distance to define a metric on the family of boundary paths in D. However, this metric is defined in terms of topological correspondences between the two given boundary paths. The  $\hat{\rho}$  function is patterned after that of the metric function used in the Hausdorff topology with the non-Euclidean metric as the defining tool. For any set  $A \subset D$  and any point  $z \in D$  set

$$\rho(z,A) = \underset{\substack{y \in A}}{\text{g.l.b.}} \rho(z,y).$$

LEMMA 1. The function (possibly infinite-valued)

$$\rho^*(\lambda_1,\lambda_2) = \max(\sup_{\substack{x \in \lambda_1 \\ y \in \lambda_2}} \rho(x,\lambda_2), \sup_{\substack{y \in \lambda_2 \\ y \in \lambda_2}} \rho(y,\lambda_1))$$

satisfies the metric properties for any three curves  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$  such that  $\rho^*(\lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ and  $\rho^*(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$  are finite.

**Proof.** (This is the standard proof which we give for the sake of completeness only.) If  $\rho^*(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = 0$  then  $\rho(x, \lambda_2) = 0$  for each  $x \in \lambda_1$ .

Since there is a point  $y = y(x) \in \lambda_2$  with  $\rho(\lambda_2) = \rho(x, y(x))$  we have  $\lambda_1 \subseteq \lambda_2$ . The reverse inclusion is similarly verified so that  $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$ . The symmetry is clear.

If  $\rho^*(\lambda_2, \lambda_3)$  and  $\rho^*(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$  are finite we show that  $\rho^*(\lambda_1, \lambda_3) \leq \rho^*(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + \rho^*(\lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ . For if  $x \in \lambda_1, y \in \lambda_2, z \in \lambda_3$  then

(2.0) 
$$\rho(x,z) \leq \rho(x,y) + \rho(y,z).$$

Assume  $\rho^*(\lambda_1, \lambda_3) = \sup_{x \in \lambda_1} \rho(x, \lambda_3)$ . Taking the greatest lower bound of both sides of (2.0) for  $z \in \lambda_3$  we obtain

(2.1) 
$$\rho(x,\lambda_3) \leq \rho(x,y) + \rho(y,\lambda_3).$$

Now for  $x \in \lambda_1$  let y = y(x) be a point of  $\lambda_2$  such that

(2.2) 
$$\rho(x, y(x)) = \rho(x, \lambda_2).$$

Combining (2.1) and (2.2)

$$\sup_{x \in \lambda_1} \rho(x, \lambda_3) \leq \sup_{x \in \lambda_1} \rho(x, \lambda_2) + \sup_{x \in \lambda_1} \rho(y(x), \lambda_3).$$

Thus

$$\rho^{*}(\lambda_{1},\lambda_{3}) \leq \sup_{x \in \lambda_{1}} \rho(x,\lambda_{2}) + \sup_{x \in \lambda_{1}} \rho(y,\lambda_{3})$$
$$\leq \rho^{*}(\lambda_{1},\lambda_{2}) + \rho^{*}(\lambda_{2},\lambda_{3}).$$

If  $\rho^*(\lambda_1, \lambda_3) = \sup_{z \in \lambda_3} \rho(z, \lambda_1)$  a similar argument gives also the above inequality. It is convenient to define a metric for  $\Lambda$  in the usual fashion. For  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda$  let

$$\hat{\rho}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2) = \begin{cases} \frac{\rho^*(\lambda_1,\lambda_2)}{1+\rho^*(\lambda_1,\lambda_2)} & \text{, if } \rho^*(\lambda_1,\lambda_2) < +\infty; \\ 1 & \text{, if } \rho^*(\lambda_1,\lambda_2) = +\infty; \end{cases}$$

then  $\hat{\rho}$  is a metric for  $\Lambda$ . It is only necessary to observe that the inequalities of Lemma 1 show that if  $\rho^*(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$  and  $\rho^*(\lambda_2, \lambda_3)$  are finite then  $\rho^*(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$  is also finite and the triangle inequality is valid. If  $\rho^*(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = +\infty$  then at least one of  $\rho^*(\lambda_1, \lambda_3)$  or  $\rho^*(\lambda_3, \lambda_2)$  also equals infinity.

We remark that if  $\alpha$  is the radius terminating at  $e^{i\theta}$  then the set of curves  $\lambda$  such that  $\hat{\rho}(\alpha, \lambda) < 1$  is just  $\Lambda^*(\theta)$ .

We prove that  $\Lambda^*(\theta)$  is an arcwise connected space in the  $\hat{\rho}$  metric. For notational clarity and without loss of generality we prove this result in the case in which

 $\theta = 0$ . In order to prove the theorem we utilize a distinguished class of points in  $\Lambda^*(0)$ . Let  $H(\beta)$  be the hypercycle joining +1 to -1 and making angle  $(-\pi/2 < \beta < \pi/2)$  with the diameter  $\alpha = \text{Im}(z) = 0$ . For interior points  $z^*$  of  $\alpha$ , since  $H(\beta)$  is parallel to  $\alpha$ , the non-Euclidean distance of the hypercycle  $H(\beta)$  to  $z^*$  is given by

(1) 
$$M = \frac{1}{2} \log \cot \left( \frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{\beta}{2} \right).$$

**THEOREM 1.** Each subspace  $\Lambda^*(\theta)$  is arcwise connected.

**Proof.** Clearly we need only prove the case  $\Lambda(0)$ . It suffices to show that each  $\lambda(t) \in \Lambda^*(0)$  can be continuously deformed in the  $\hat{\rho}$  metric to the diameter  $\alpha$ . To this end let  $\lambda(t)$  be given. There is a number  $M = M(\lambda)$  such that  $\lambda(t)$  is contained in the symmetric Stolz domain formed at z = 1 by hypercycles  $H(\beta)$  and  $H(-\beta)$  where  $\beta$  is the solution of (1) for  $M(\lambda)$ . For each  $z \in D$ , let  $F_z$  denote the non-Euclidean straight line through z perpendicular to  $\alpha$ . If we denote by M, the non-Euclidean distance of the hypercycles  $H(r\beta)$  from  $\alpha$  then it is clear that  $M_r$  tends to zero as r tends to zero. Now if  $z' = \lambda(t)$  is a point of  $\lambda$ , Im z' > 0,  $H(r\beta)$  is a hypercycle and if  $\rho(z'; \alpha) \ge M_r$  then define the projection of z' on  $H(r\beta)$  to be the unique point  $\xi \in H(r\beta) \cap F_z$ . For points z' with Im z' < 0 we make a similar arrangement.

Define the map  $\sigma$  of (0,1) into  $\Lambda^*(0)$  as follows:  $\sigma(r) = \lambda_r(t)$  where

$$\lambda_r(t) = \begin{cases} \lambda(t) = z \text{ if } \rho(z, \alpha) < M_r; \\ \xi = \text{ projection } \lambda(t) \text{ on } H(r\beta) \text{ if } \\ \rho(\lambda(t), \alpha) \ge M_r. \end{cases}$$

If  $r_0 \in (0, 1)$  then  $\rho(x, \lambda_{r_0}(t)) \leq |M_r - M_{r_0}|$  for  $x \in \lambda_r$ . Thus  $\rho^*(\lambda_r, \lambda_{r_0})$  tends to zero as r tends to  $r_0$  and the theorem is proven. We might remark that one could show in a similar manner that given any  $\lambda_1 \in \Lambda$  the subspaces for which  $\hat{\rho}(\lambda_1, \lambda) < 1$ are all arcwise connected. For, if  $\hat{\rho}(\lambda_1, \lambda) < d < 1$ , then consider the envelop about  $\lambda_1$  formed by disks of non-Euclidean radii  $r, 0 \leq r \leq d$ , with centers on  $\lambda_1$ . Now  $\lambda$  is contained in this envelop. Let  $\lambda_r$  and  $\overline{\lambda}_r$  denote the two boundary curves of the envelop. Letting  $\lambda_r$  and  $\overline{\lambda}_r$  play the roles of  $H(r\beta)$  and  $H(-r\beta)$  we deform the curve  $\lambda$  into  $\lambda_1$  by allowing  $r \to 0$ .

3. The natural map  $\hat{f}$ . It is a characterizing property of continuous normal functions f that for  $\eta > 0$  there exists a  $\delta = \delta(\eta)$  such that for any z' and z'' in D with  $\rho(z', z'') < \delta$  then  $\chi(f(z'), f(z'')) < \eta$ . This is a direct consequence of the condition that a family of continuous functions is normal in a domain D if and only if it is spherically equicontinuous on compact subsets of D[3, pp. 244-246]. (This was noted by Lappan [5].)

LEMMA 2. Bet  $A, B \in \Lambda$ . If for each point  $a \in A$  there exists  $b = b(a) \in B$ with  $\chi(a, b) < \varepsilon$  and if for each  $b \in B$  there exists an  $a = a(b) \in A$  with  $\chi(a, b) < \varepsilon$ then dist  $(A, B) < \varepsilon$ .

**Proof.** This is an obvious consequence of the inequality

$$\chi(a, A) \leq \chi(a, b(a)) < \varepsilon$$
  
 $\chi(b, B) \leq \chi(b, a)) < \varepsilon$ 

**THEOREM 2.** If f is a normal function then  $\hat{f}$  is continuous from  $\Lambda$  into  $\mu'$ .

**Proof.** Let  $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . By the normality of f there exists  $0 < \delta < 1$  such that if  $z', z'' \in D$  with  $\rho(z', z'') < \delta$  then  $\chi(f(z'), f(z'')) < \varepsilon/2$ . Let  $a \in \hat{f}(\lambda_0)$  and  $\{z_m\}, z_m \in \lambda_0, \lim_{m \to \infty} z_m = 1$  and  $\lim_{m \to \infty} f(z_m) = a$ . Let  $\lambda$  be any point of  $\Lambda$  which is in the  $\hat{\rho}$  sphere with center  $\lambda_0$  and radius  $\delta$ . About each point  $z_m$  construct the non-Euclidean disk  $D_m$  with center  $z_m$  and radius  $\delta$ . Choose a sequence of points  $\{z'_m\}$  where  $z'_m \in D_m \cap \lambda$ . There is a subsequence  $z'_{m_k}$  with  $\lim_{k \to \infty} z_{m_k} = 1$  and  $\lim_{k \to \infty} f(z'_{m_k}) = b \in \hat{f}(\lambda)$ .

Choosing the associated  $z_{m_k}$  we have  $\rho(z_{m_k}, z'_{m_k}) < \delta$  and referring to the above  $\chi(f(z_{m_k}), f(z_{m_k})) < \varepsilon/2$ . Passing to the limit we have  $\chi(a, b) \leq \varepsilon/2$ . Interchanging the role of  $\{z_n\}$  and  $\{z'_n\}$  and referring to Lemma 2 we have that

$$\operatorname{dist}(\tilde{f}(\lambda_0),\tilde{f}(\lambda))<\varepsilon.$$

Thus the sphere  $S(\lambda_0, \delta)$  is mapped into the sphere  $S(\hat{f}(\lambda_0), \varepsilon)$  which is the theorem.

4. The Lindelöf property. Lehto and Virtanen [6, pp 49-52] have proven the following theorem.

**THEOREM.** Let f(z) be meromorphic in D and have asymptotic value  $\alpha$  at a point  $e^{i\theta} \in C$ . If f has not angular limit at  $e^{i\theta}$ , there is a Jordan curve  $\gamma_0$  such that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is an associated Jordan curve  $\gamma_{\varepsilon}$  in D, terminating at  $e^{i\theta}$ , with  $\rho(\gamma_0, \gamma_{\varepsilon}) < \varepsilon$ , such that f tends to  $\alpha$  on  $\gamma_{\varepsilon}$  but not on  $\gamma_0$ .

NOTE: This is not the exact statement of the theorem of Lehto and Virtanen but is a restatement of the theorem in our notation. Hence we have

**THEOREM 3.** If f is meromorphic in D and the function  $\hat{f}$  is continuous then f has the Lindelöf property at  $e^{i\theta}$ .

**Proof.** If f does not have the Lindelöf property then there is a continuous curve such that f has limit  $\alpha$  on  $\gamma$  but does not have angular limit. The result of Lehto and Virtanen clearly imply that f is not continuous. We might note that a direct application of a theorem of Seidel and Bagemihl [1, p 266] gives that for normal function f, if  $\hat{f}(\lambda_1) = \{a\}$  for some  $\lambda_1 \in \Lambda$ , then  $\hat{f} \equiv \{a\}$  on the subspace  $\hat{\rho}(\lambda_1, \lambda) < 1$ . If we partial order the elements of  $\mu'$  by set inclusion we then have that if  $\hat{f}$  is "smallest" for some value it is constant in some neighborhood.

It would be nice to have a type of maximum property, to wit, if  $\hat{f}(\lambda_1) = W$  then  $\hat{f}$  is constant for  $\hat{\rho}(\lambda_1, \lambda) < 1$ . But this is not so. The elliptic modular function is the counter-example. Details can be found in [7, p. 262].

We might also note that the set of right (and left) horocycles at a point  $e^{i\theta}$  all lie inside a  $\hat{\rho}$  disk of radius 1. Bagemihl has recently investigated the behavior of  $\hat{f}$  on these disks [1], investigating such problems as under what conditions  $\hat{f} \equiv \{a\}$  on the  $\hat{\rho}$ -disks of left and right horocycles.

Lehto and Virtanen [6, pp. 54-56] have shown that a necessary and sufficient condition that a function f be normal is that  $\rho(f)(z) < C/(1-|z|)$ , where C is a finite constant and  $\rho(f)$  is the spherical derivative of f. The spherical derivative also enables us to establish a sufficient condition that  $\chi(f(z'), f(z''))$  shall be arbitrarily small.

We now proceed to Lemma 3.

LEMMA 3. Let  $\rho(f)(z) = o(1/1 - |z|)$  for  $z \in D$ , and  $\{z_m\}, \{z'_m\}$  two sequences D,  $\lim_{m\to\infty} |z'_m| = \lim_{m\to\infty} |z_m| = 1$ ,  $\rho(z'_m, z_m) < K$ ,  $m = 1, 2, \cdots$  then  $\chi(f(z_m), f(z'_m))$  tends to zero as m tends to infinity.

**Proof.** Assume  $\{z_m\}$  and  $\{z'_m\}$  are two sequences in D with the properties stated in the theorem. Construct a sequence of non-Euclidean disks  $\{N(z_m, K)\}$  with centers  $z_m$  and radius K. We know there is a Euclidean disk  $D(\zeta_m, (1 - |\zeta_m|)t_m)$  with center  $\zeta_m$  and radius  $(1 - |\zeta_m|t_m)(0 < t_m < 1)$  which coincides as a point set with  $N(z_m, K)$ . For each m let  $R_m$  be the rectilinear segment joining  $z_m$  to  $z'_m$  and  $C_m$  the image of  $R_m$  under f.

Now

$$\chi(f(z_m), f(z'_m),) \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{C'_m} \frac{|dw|}{1+|w^2|}$$

where  $C'_m$  is the projection of the great circle joining  $w_m = f(z_m)$  to  $w'_m = f(z'_m)$ . By definition of  $C_m$  and  $C'_m$ 

$$\chi(f(z_m), f(z'_m)) \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{C_m} \frac{|dw|}{1 + |w^2|} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{R_m} \frac{|f'(z)| |dz|}{1 + |f(z)|^2}$$

The condition on the spherical derivative that  $\rho(f)(z) = o(1/1 - |z|)$  is equivalent to the statement that

$$\rho(f)(z) \leq \frac{A_r}{1-r}, \quad \left|z\right| \leq r, \quad \lim_{r \to 1} A_r = 0.$$

If  $r_m = |\zeta_m| + (1 - |\zeta_m|)t_m$  then

$$\chi(f(z_m), f(z'_m)) \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{A_{r_m}}{1 - r_m} \int_{R_m} |dz| \leq \frac{A_{r_m}(1 - |\zeta_m|)t_m}{(1 - r_m)}.$$

It is easy to show that  $\lim_{m\to\infty} t_m = 2L/1 + L^2$ ,  $L = e^{2K} - 1/e^{2K} + 1$ . (For details see [9].) From this result and the equality

$$1 - r_m = (1 - |\zeta_m|)(1 - t_m)$$

we have

$$\chi(f(z_m), \quad f(z'_m)) \leq \frac{A_{\mathbf{r}_m} t_m}{(1-t_m)}.$$

In the limit  $t_m/1 - t_m$  is bounded so that  $\lim \chi(f(z_m), f(z'_m)) = 0$  With this lemma we now state

THEOREM 4. Given f(z) defined in D such that  $\rho(f)(z) = o(1/1 - |z|)$ . Then  $\hat{f}(\gamma^*) = \hat{f}(\gamma)$  for all  $\gamma^*$  such that  $\rho(\gamma^*, \gamma) < 1$ , i.e.  $\hat{f}$  is constant on each disk of radius one.

**Proof.** For a value  $\alpha \in C_{\gamma}(f)$  there is a sequence  $\{z_m\}, z_m \in \gamma, |z_m| \to 1$  with  $f(z_m) \to \alpha$ . Since  $\hat{\rho}(\gamma^*, \gamma) < 1$  implies  $\rho^*(\gamma^*, \gamma) < +\infty$  there is a corresponding sequence  $\{z'_m\}, z'_m \in \gamma, |z'_m| \to 1$  and  $\rho(z_m, z'_m) < K$  for all *m*. We infer then by Lemma 3 that  $\alpha \in C_{\gamma}(f)$ . The symmetry of the argument implies the result.

As an example of a holomorphic function f(z) satisfying  $\rho(f)(z) = o(1/1 - |z|)$ we may consider a spiral domain bounded by Jordan curves  $\lambda_1(t)$  and  $\lambda_2(t)$  which are spirals in D tending to C with  $\lambda_1(0) = \lambda_2(0) = 0$  but otherwise disjoint. Parametrize  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  so that  $\lambda_1(t) = r_1(t)e^{i\theta(t)}$ ,  $\lambda_2(t) = r_2(t)e^{i\theta(t)}$  where  $r_1(t) < r_2(t)$  and  $\lim_{t \to 1} r_1(t) = \lim_{t \to 1} r_2(t) = 1$ . If  $\Delta$  is the simply connected region bounded by  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  then by Riemann mapping theorem there is a univalent function f mapping D onto  $\Delta$ .

A result of Seidel and Walsh [10, p 124] is that

$$|f'(z_0)|(1-|z_0|) \le 4D_1(w_0)$$

where  $D_1(w_0)$  is the radius of univalence of  $f^{-1}$  at  $w_0 = f(z_0)$ . For any sequence  $\{z_m\} \in D$  with  $|z_m| \to 1$  we note  $D_1(w_m) = D_1(f(z_m)) \to 0$ . This implies  $\rho(f)(z) = 0(1/1 - |z|)$ .

From the theory of prime ends it is clear that for this function f there is a point  $e^{i\theta}$  such that  $\hat{f}(\tau) = C$  for every path ending at  $e^{i\theta}$ .

There is a further condition under which Theorem 4 also holds. The notation  $R(f,e^{i\theta})$  is used for the range of f where

$$R(f, e^{i\theta}) = \{ w \in W | \text{ there is } \{z_m\}, z_m \in D, z_m \to e^{i\theta}, m \to \infty \text{ and } f(z_m) = w \}$$

THEOREM 5. If f is a meromorphic function in D such that interior  $R(f,e^{i\theta}) = \emptyset$ then given any curve  $\gamma$  we have  $\hat{f}(\gamma') = \hat{f}(\gamma)$  for all curves  $\gamma' \in \Lambda$  such that  $\hat{\rho}(\gamma',\gamma) < 1$ . **Proof.** We refer the reader to a paper of Rung [8, pp 48-49] which proves the result in the case of curves  $\gamma \in \Lambda^*(\theta)$  and note that the argument is easily extended to cover the other cases.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

1. F. Bagemihl, Horocyclic boundary properties of meromorphic functions, Ann. Acad. Scient. Fenn, A-1 (385) (1966), 1-18.

2. F. Bagemihl and W. Seidel, Behavior of meromorphic functions on boundary paths with applications to normal functions. Arch. Math. 11 (1960), 263-269.

3. E. Hille, Analytic Function Theory, Vol. II, 1963.

4. C. Kuratowski, Topologie, Vol. II. Monografie Matematyczne, Warszawa, 1961.

5. P. Lappan, Thesis, Notre Dame, 1963.

6. O. Lehto and K. I. Virtanen, Boundary behavior and normal meromorphic functions, Acta Math. 97 (1957), 47-65.

7. P. Lappan and D. C. Rung, Normal functions and non-tangential boundary arcs, Canadian J. Math. 18 (1966), 256-264.

8. D. C. Rung, Boundary behavior of normal functions defined in the unit disk, Michigan Math. J. 10 (1963), 43-51.

9. D. C. Rung, The order of certain classes of functions defined in the unit disk. Nagoya Math. J. 26 (1966), 39-52.

10. W. Seidel and J. L. Walsh, On the derivatives of functions analytic in the unit circle and their radii of univalence and of p-valence, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 52 (1942), 128-216.

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA, TUCSON UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA