ANNALES DE L'INSTITUT FOURIER

TAKAFUMI MURAI

The value-distribution of lacunary series and a conjecture of Paley

Annales de l'institut Fourier, tome 31, nº 1 (1981), p. 135-156

<http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AIF_1981__31_1_135_0>

© Annales de l'institut Fourier, 1981, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Annales de l'institut Fourier » (http://annalif.ujf-grenoble.fr/) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (http://www.numdam.org/conditions). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques

http://www.numdam.org/

Ann. Inst. Fourier, Grenoble
31, 1 (1981), 135-156

THE VALUE-DISTRIBUTION OF LACUNARY SERIES AND A CONJECTURE OF PALEY

by Takafumi MURAI

1. Introduction.

The purpose of this paper is to establish the following

THEOREM 1. – *For any real number* $q > 1$, *there exist two positive numbers* ϵ *and* ρ, *depending only on* q, *with the following property: For every convergent (Hadamard) lacunary power series*

$$f(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_k z^{n_k}\ ,\ n_{k+1}/n_k \geqslant q \tag{1}$$

in the open unit disk $\mathbf{D} = \{z\ ;\ |z| < 1\}$ *satisfying*

$$|c_k| < \epsilon \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} |c_j| \quad (k \geqslant 1) \tag{2}$$

and every complex number α *satisfying*

$$|\alpha| < \rho \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |c_k|\ , \tag{3}$$

$f(z)$ *takes* α *infinitely often in* $\mathbf{D}$, *where* $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |c_k|$ *need not be convergent.*

As immediate consequence, we have the following two corollaries.

COROLLARY 2. – *An unbounded lacunary power series in* $\mathbf{D}$ (*) *takes every complex value infinitely often.*

(*) A lacunary series $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_k z^{n_k}$, $n_{k+1}/n_k \geqslant q > 1$ in $\mathbf{D}$ is unbounded if and only if $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |c_k| = +\infty$.

COROLLARY 3. – *Let* $f(z)$ *be as in Theorem 1. If* $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |c_k| < +\infty$, *then* $f(e^{it})$, $0 \leqslant t < 2\pi$, *is a Peano curve, that is,* $\{f(e^{it}); 0 \leqslant t < 2\pi\}$ *contains an open set.*

The problem whether Corollary 2 is valid or not was raised by R.E.A.C. Paley in [10]. G. Weiss and M. Weiss showed that a lacunary power series $f(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_k z^{n_k}$, $n_{k+1}/n_k \geqslant q > 1$ takes every complex value infinitely often in $\mathbf{D}$, if $f(z)$ is unbounded and $q \geqslant q_0$ (= about 100) ([13]). W.H.J. Fuchs showed that the assertion holds if $\limsup_{k\to\infty} |c_k| > 0$ ([4], [5]). I.L. Chang showed that the assertion holds, with $\mathbf{D}$ replaced by a sector $\{z \in \mathbf{D}; \alpha < \arg z < \beta\}$, if $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |c_k|^{2+\eta} = +\infty$ for some $\eta > 0$ ([3]). (See Remark 21 in this paper.) Other approaches to this problem are given in [1] and [2]. The first part of this paper gives a detailed proof of the result announced in [9].

A function $f(z)$ is said to possess the Peano curve property, if it has the property stated in Corollary 3. The Peano curve property was first discussed by R. Salem and A. Zygmund in [11]. Corollary 3 is not new. (See [7].) Our theorem is a solution to the above problem and useful to discuss the Peano curve property of lacunary power series.

2. Preliminaries.

We denote by $D(\omega, r)$ the open disk with center ω and radius r.

LEMMA 4 ([4]). – *Let* ℓ *be a positive integer and* $g(\zeta)$ *an analytic function in* $D(\omega, r)$ *such that* $|g^{(\ell)}(\omega)| \geqslant y_1$ *and* $|g^{(\ell)}(\zeta)| \leqslant y_2$ $(\zeta \in D(\omega, r))$. *Then*

$$g(D(\omega, r)) \supset D(g(\omega), \overline{\eta}(\ell)\, r^{\ell} y_1^{\ell+1} y_2^{-\ell}),$$

where $\overline{\eta}(\ell)$ *is a constant depending only on* ℓ.

LEMMA 5 ([12]). – *If a lacunary power series*

$$h(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k z^{m_k}, \ m_{k+1}/m_k \geqslant q > 1$$

satisfies the conditions $\lim_{k\to\infty} a_k = 0$ *and* $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |a_k| = +\infty$, *then, for every complex number* α, *there exists a point* t_α *in* $[0, 2\pi)$ *such that* $\lim_{r\uparrow 1} h(re^{it_\alpha}) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{k} a_j e^{im_j t_\alpha} = \alpha$.

Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a straight line not passing through the origin. We say that a point ζ is situated to the right of $\mathcal{L}$ if it is contained in the closed half-plane limited by $\mathcal{L}$ which does not contain the origin. We denote by $\mathcal{L}(\zeta, r)$ the straight line of distance (from the origin) r, which is perpendicular to the ray $\{\zeta x\ ;\ x \geqslant 0\}$.

LEMMA 6 (Lemma 4 in [12]). – *There exist two constants* $0 < A = A_q \leqslant 1$ *and* $B = B_q \geqslant 1$ *depending only on* $q > 1$ *with the following property: For every lacunary polynomial*

$$Q(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k e^{im_k t},\quad m_{k+1}/m_k \geqslant q,$$

every straight line $\mathcal{L}$ *of distance (from the origin)* $A \sum_{k=1}^{n} |a_k|$ *and every interval* I *in* $[0, 2\pi)$ *of length* B/m_1, *there exists a point* ξ *in* I *such that* $Q(\xi)$ *is situated to the right of* $\mathcal{L}$.

LEMMA 7. – *Let* d, d', r, A *be as in (Fig.). If* $0 < A \leqslant 1$ *and* $d \geqslant \{(A^2 + 1)/A\}r$, *then* $d' \leqslant d - (A/2)r$.

(Fig.)



Proof. – This lemma is analogous to Lemma 6 in [12]. Since $d'^2 \leqslant (d - Ar)^2 + r^2$, we have

$$d^2 - d'^2 \geqslant 2Ard - (A^2 + 1)r^2 = Ar\{2d - (A^2 + 1)/A \cdot r\} \geqslant 0,$$

and hence

$$d - d' \geqslant Ar\{2d - (A^2 + 1)/A \cdot r\}/2d = Ar\{1 - (A^2 + 1)/A \cdot (r/2d)\} \geqslant (A/2)r,$$

and the lemma follows.

LEMMA 8. – *Let* $P(\zeta) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k \exp(m_k \zeta)$ *be an analytic function satisfying* $m_{k+1}/m_k \geqslant q > 1$. *Then, for every complex number* ω, *there exists a non-negative integer* $\ell = \ell(\omega; P)$ *with* $\ell \leqslant \sigma n \log n$ $(\sigma = \sigma_q = 10(1 + 2/\log q))$ *such that*

$$|P^{(\ell)}(\omega)| \geqslant 1/2 \cdot m_k^{\ell} \, |a_k| \exp(m_k \mathrm{Re}\,\omega) \quad (1 \leqslant k \leqslant n). \tag{4}$$

Proof. – In the case where $n = 1$, (4) evidently holds with $\ell = 0$. Suppose $n \geqslant 2$ and set

$$\begin{cases} P_\ell = \sum_{k=1}^{n} m_k^{\ell} a_k \exp(m_k \omega) \\ \alpha_{\ell,k} = m_k^{\ell} \, |a_k| \exp(m_k \mathrm{Re}\,\omega) \quad (1 \leqslant k \leqslant n) \\ \alpha_{\ell,n+1} = 0 \\ \nabla_\ell = \max_{1 \leqslant k \leqslant n+1} \alpha_{\ell,k} \quad (\ell \geqslant 0). \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

Let λ be the first integer such that $q^k \geqslant 5n$ $(k \geqslant 1)$. Then $2\lambda n \leqslant \sigma n \log n$. Hence it is sufficient to show that, for some μ $(0 \leqslant \mu \leqslant n)$, $(\S)_\mu$: $|P_{2\lambda\mu}| \geqslant 1/2 \cdot \nabla_{2\lambda\mu}$.

Put $j_0 = 1$. Then the following two cases are possible:

$$(*)_0 \; \alpha_{0,j_0} > 5n\alpha_{0,k} \quad (j_0 < k \leqslant n + 1)$$

$$(*)_0' \; \alpha_{0,j_0} \leqslant 5n\alpha_{0,k} \quad \text{for some } j_0 < k \leqslant n + 1.$$

If $(*)_0$, then $(\S)_0$ evidently holds. If $(*)_0'$, then a set $\{k > j_0 ; \alpha_{\lambda,k} \geqslant \alpha_{\lambda,j_0}\}$ is not empty, according to $q^\lambda \geqslant 5n$. Let j_1 be the first integer in this set. Then the following two cases are possible:

$$(*)_1 \; \alpha_{2\lambda,j_1} > 5n\alpha_{2\lambda,k} \quad (j_1 < k \leqslant n + 1)$$

$$(*)_1' \; \alpha_{2\lambda,j_1} \leqslant 5n\alpha_{2\lambda,k} \quad \text{for some } j_1 < k \leqslant n + 1.$$

If $(*)_1$, then $(\S)_1$ holds, since

$$\begin{aligned} |P_{2\lambda}| &\geqslant \alpha_{2\lambda,j_1} - \sum_{k>j_1} \alpha_{2\lambda,k} - \sum_{k<j_1} \alpha_{\lambda,k} m_k^{\lambda} \\ &\geqslant 4/5 \cdot \alpha_{2\lambda,j_1} - \alpha_{\lambda,j_1} \sum_{k<j_1} m_k^{\lambda} = 4/5 \cdot \alpha_{2\lambda,j_1} - \alpha_{2\lambda,j_1} \sum_{k<j_1} (m_k/m_{j_1})^{\lambda} \\ &\geqslant 4/5 \cdot \alpha_{2\lambda,j_1} - (q^\lambda - 1)^{-1} \alpha_{2\lambda,j_1} \geqslant 1/2 \cdot \alpha_{2\lambda,j_1} = 1/2 \cdot \nabla_{2\lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

If $(*)'_1$, then a set $\{k > j_1 \,;\, \alpha_{3\lambda,k} \geqslant \alpha_{3\lambda,j_1}\}$ is not empty. Let j_2 be the first integer in this set. Then the following two cases are possible :

$$(*)_2 \;\; \alpha_{4\lambda,j_2} > 5n\alpha_{4\lambda,k} \quad (j_2 < k \leqslant n+1)$$

$$(*)'_2 \;\; \alpha_{4\lambda,j_2} \leqslant 5n\alpha_{4\lambda,k} \quad \text{for some } j_2 < k \leqslant n+1 .$$

If $(*)_2$, then $(\S)_2$ holds. If $(*)'_2$, then we define j_3 and consider corresponding two cases $(*)_3$, $(*)'_3$ by the same manner as above. If $(*)_3$, then $(\S)_3$ holds. We repeat this discussion.

Since $j_0 < j_1 < \cdots \leqslant n$, there exists $0 \leqslant \nu \leqslant n$ such that $(*)'_\nu$ does not occur. This signifies that $(\S)_\mu$ holds for some $0 \leqslant \mu \leqslant n$.

LEMMA 9. – *Let* $(m_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ *be a sequence of positive integers satisfying* $m_{k+1}/m_k \geqslant q > 1$ *and* $(b_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ *a sequence of non-negative numbers satisfying*

$$b_k < 1/2 \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} b_j \quad (k \geqslant 1), \; \lim_{k\to\infty} b_k = 0, \tag{6}$$

where $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k$ need not be convergent. For every positive integer Γ, we put

$$\begin{cases} u_k = m_k^\Gamma b_k , & U_k = \max\{u_j \,;\, j < k\}, \; U_1 = 0 \\ v_k = m_k^{-\Gamma} b_k , & V_k = \sum_{j>k} v_j = \sum_{j>k} m_j^{-\Gamma} b_j \quad (k \geqslant 1). \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

We denote by $\mathfrak{K} = \{k_\nu\}_{\nu=1}^\infty$ $(k_{\nu+1} > k_\nu)$ the totality of all integers k for which $u_k \geqslant U_k$ and $v_k \geqslant V_k$.

If Γ satisfies

$$1 - q^{-\Gamma} - (q^\Gamma - 1)^{-1} \geqslant 3/4 , \tag{8}$$

then

$$\sum_{\mu=\nu}^{\infty} b_{k_\mu} \geqslant 1/2 \sum_{k=k_\nu}^{\infty} b_k \quad (\nu \geqslant 1), \tag{9}$$

where (9) signifies $\sum_{\mu=1}^{\infty} b_{k_\mu} = +\infty$, if $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k = +\infty$.

Proof. – We first show $\limsup_{k\to\infty} u_k = +\infty$. If $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k = +\infty$, then $\left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} m_k^{-\Gamma}\right) \sup_k u_k \geqslant \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k = +\infty$, and hence $\limsup_{k\to\infty} u_k = +\infty$.

If $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k < +\infty$, then, for every $k \geqslant 1$,

$$b_k \leqslant 1/2 \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} b_j \leqslant 1/2 \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} b_j = 1/2 \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} m_j^{-\Gamma} m_j^{\Gamma} b_j$$
$$\leqslant 1/2 \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} m_j^{-\Gamma} \sup_{j\geqslant k} u_j = 1/2 \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} (m_k/m_j)^{\Gamma} m_k^{-\Gamma} \sup_{j\geqslant k} u_j$$
$$\leqslant \{2(1-q^{-\Gamma})\}^{-1} m_k^{-\Gamma} \sup_{j\geqslant k} u_j ,$$

and hence $u_k \leqslant \{2(1-q^{-\Gamma})\}^{-1} \sup_{j\geqslant k} u_j \leqslant 2/3 \cdot \sup_{j\geqslant k} u_j$, which gives $\limsup_{k\to\infty} u_k = +\infty$.

Let $\{K_\nu\}_{\nu=1}^{\infty}$ $(K_{\nu+1} > K_\nu)$ be the totality of all integers k for which $u_k \geqslant U_k$. Then $\mathfrak{K} \subset \{K_\nu\}_{\nu=1}^{\infty}$. For every k satisfying $K_n \leqslant k < K_{n+1}$, we have $u_k \leqslant u_{K_n}$, and hence

$$b_k \leqslant (m_{K_n}/m_k)^{\Gamma} b_{K_n} \leqslant q^{\Gamma(K_n-k)} b_{K_n} .$$

Therefore

$$\sum_{k=K_\nu}^{K_\mu} b_k = \sum_{n=\nu}^{\mu-1} \sum_{K_n\leqslant k<K_{n+1}} b_k + b_{K_\mu} \leqslant \sum_{n=\nu}^{\mu-1} b_{K_n} \sum_{K_n\leqslant k<K_{n+1}} q^{\Gamma(K_n-k)} + b_{K_\mu} \leqslant (1-q^{-\Gamma})^{-1} \sum_{n=\nu}^{\mu} b_{K_n} \quad (\nu \leqslant \mu) . \tag{10}$$

Let $\mathfrak{K}'$ denote the totality of all integers k for which $v_k < V_k$. If $\mathfrak{K}'$ is empty, then $\{K_\nu\}_{\nu=1}^{\infty} = \mathfrak{K}$ and (9) follows from (10).

Suppose $\mathfrak{K}' \neq \Phi$. We have, for every $k \in \mathfrak{K}'$,

$$b_k \leqslant \sum_{j>k} (m_k/m_j)^{\Gamma} b_j \leqslant \sum_{j>k} q^{\Gamma(k-j)} b_j ,$$

and hence

$$\sum_{K_\nu\leqslant k\leqslant K_\mu, k\in\mathfrak{K}'} b_k \leqslant \sum_{k=K_\nu}^{K_\mu} \sum_{j>k} q^{\Gamma(k-j)} b_j$$
$$\leqslant (q^{\Gamma}-1)^{-1} \left\{ \sum_{k=K_\nu}^{K_\mu} b_k + \sum_{k>K_\mu} q^{\Gamma(K_\mu+1-k)} b_k \right\} \tag{11}$$
$$= (q^{\Gamma}-1)^{-1} \sum_{k=K_\nu}^{K_\mu} b_k + o(1) \quad (\nu \leqslant \mu).$$

Remove $\mathfrak{K}'$ from $\{K_\nu\}_{\nu=1}^{\infty}$. Then the resulting set equals $\mathfrak{K}$. By (10) and (11), we have

$$\sum_{\nu\leqslant n\leqslant\mu,\,K_n\notin\mathfrak{K}'} b_{K_n} \geqslant \sum_{n=\nu}^{\mu} b_{K_n} - \sum_{K_\nu\leqslant k\leqslant K_\mu,\,k\in\mathfrak{K}'} b_k$$

$$\geqslant \{1 - q^{-\Gamma} - (q^{\Gamma}-1)^{-1}\} \sum_{k=K_\nu}^{K_\mu} b_k + o(1)$$

$$\geqslant 1/2 \sum_{k=K_\nu}^{K_\mu} b_k + o(1) \quad (\nu \leqslant \mu).$$

Letting μ tend to infinity, we have (9).

3. The case where $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |c_k| = +\infty$.

Let $f(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_k z^{n_k}$, $n_{k+1}/n_k \geqslant q > 1$ be a lacunary power series in **D** satisfying $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |c_k| = +\infty$. By the Fuchs result in [4], we may assume the condition $\lim_{k\to\infty} c_k = 0$. We consider an analytic function

$$F(\zeta) = f(e^{\zeta}) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_k \exp(n_k\zeta)\,(*) \tag{12}$$

in a domain $U = \{\zeta\,;\, \mathrm{Re}\zeta < 0\}$ and shall show that it takes every complex value infinitely often in $U^* = U \cap \{\zeta\,;\, 0 \leqslant \mathrm{Im}\zeta < 2\pi\}$. We use two fixed integers γ, N, depending only on q, which are defined as follows.

DEFINITION 10. – Let $\gamma = \gamma_q$ *be an integer satisfying (8)* $(\Gamma = \gamma)$ *and* $N = N_q$ an integer satisfying

$$q^{-N+1}(q-1)^{-1} \leqslant 1/8e \tag{13}$$

$$H(x, N; \gamma, \sigma) = \exp\{(2\gamma + 1 + 4\sigma N^2)\log x - x\} \leqslant 1/8e \tag{14}$$

for all $x \geqslant q^N$, *where* $\sigma = \sigma_q$ *is the constant in Lemma 8.*

Now we define $u_k, U_k, v_k, V_k, \mathfrak{K} = \{k_\nu\}_{\nu=1}^{\infty}$ by $m_k = n_k$, $b_k = |c_k|$, $\Gamma = \gamma$ in Lemma 9. Then we have the following

(*) The author expresses the thanks to Prof. W.H.J. Fuchs, who suggested to use this transform.

LEMMA 11. – *For every complex number* ω *with* $\mathrm{Re}\,\omega = -1/n_k$, *there exists an integer* $L = L(\omega\,;F)$ *with* $\gamma+1 \leqslant L \leqslant \gamma+1+4\sigma N^2$ *such that*

$$|F^{(L)}(\omega)| \geqslant 1/2e\cdot\{n_k^L\,|c_k| - 1/4\cdot n_k^{L-\gamma}U_k - 1/4\cdot n_k^{L+\gamma}V_k\} \qquad (15)$$

$$|F^{(L)}(\zeta)| \leqslant C\{n_k^L\,|c_k| + n_k^{L-\gamma}U_k + n_k^{L+\gamma}V_k\}$$
$$(\zeta \in D(\omega\,,(1-q^{-1})/n_k))\,, \qquad (16)$$

where $C = 1/(q-1) + w!\,q^w \quad (w = 2\gamma+1+4\sigma N^2)$.

Proof. – To define $L(\omega\,;F)$, we consider an analytic function $P_k(\zeta) = \Sigma_j^0\ n_j^{\gamma+1}c_j\ \exp(n_j\zeta)$, where Σ_j^0 denotes the summation over all j satisfying $q^{-N} < n_j/n_k < q^N$. Then the number of terms of $P_k(\zeta)$ is at most $2N$. By Lemma 8, there exists a non-negative integer $\ell = \ell(\omega\,;P_k)$ with $\ell \leqslant \sigma(2N)\log(2N) \leqslant 4\sigma N^2$ such that

$$|P_k^{(\ell)}(\omega)| \geqslant 1/2\cdot n_k^\ell\,\{n_k^{\gamma+1}\,|c_k|\}\exp(n_k\mathrm{Re}\,\omega) = 1/2e\cdot n_k^{\gamma+1+\ell}\,|c_k|\,. \ (17)$$

Then we put $L = \gamma+1+\ell(\omega\,;P_k)$. Evidently

$$\gamma+1 \leqslant L \leqslant \gamma+1+4\sigma N^2\,.$$

(15): Put $\phi_k(\zeta) = \Sigma_j'\,c_j\exp(n_j\zeta)$ and $\Phi_k(\zeta) = \Sigma_j''\,c_j\exp(n_j\zeta)$, where Σ_j' denotes the summation over all j satisfying $n_j/n_k \leqslant q^{-N}$ (; if such j's do not exist, $\phi_k(\zeta)\equiv 0$,) and Σ_j'' the summation over all j satisfying $n_j/n_k \geqslant q^N$. Then

$$F^{(L)}(\zeta) = \phi_k^{(L)}(\zeta) + P_k^{(\ell)}(\zeta) + \Phi_k^{(L)}(\zeta)\,.$$

We have

$$|\phi_k^{(L)}(\omega)| \leqslant \Sigma_j'\,n_j^L\,|c_j| \leqslant \Sigma_j'\,n_j^{L-\gamma}U_k = \Sigma_j'(n_j/n_k)^{L-\gamma}\,n_k^{L-\gamma}U_k \qquad (18)$$
$$\leqslant \Sigma_j'(n_j/n_k)\,n_k^{L-\gamma}U_k \leqslant q^{-N+1}(q-1)^{-1}n_k^{L-\gamma}U_k \leqslant 1/8e\cdot n_k^{L-\gamma}U_k\,,$$

according to (13). We have

$$|\Phi_k^{(L)}(\omega)| \leqslant \Sigma_j''\,n_j^L\,|c_j|\exp(n_j\mathrm{Re}\,\omega)$$
$$= n_k^L\,\Sigma_j''\,\{(n_k/n_j)^\gamma\,|c_j|\}\,\{(n_j/n_k)^{L+\gamma}\exp(-n_j/n_k)\} \qquad (19)$$
$$\leqslant n_k^L\{\Sigma_j''(n_k/n_j)^\gamma\,|c_j|\}\sup\{H(n_j/n_k\,,N\,;\gamma\,,\sigma)\ ;\ n_j/n_k \geqslant q^N\}$$
$$\leqslant 1/8e\cdot n_k^{L+\gamma}V_k\,,$$

according to (14). Thus we have, from (17), (18) and (19),

$$|F^{(L)}(\omega)| \geqslant |P_k^{(\ell)}(\omega)| - |\phi_k^{(L)}(\omega)| - |\Phi_k^{(L)}(\omega)|$$
$$\geqslant 1/2e\cdot\{n_k^L\,|c_k| - 1/4\cdot n_k^{L-\gamma}U_k - 1/4\cdot n_k^{L+\gamma}V_k\}\,.$$

(16): Put $\psi_k(\zeta) = \sum_{j<k} c_j \exp(n_j \zeta)$ and $\Psi_k(\zeta) = \sum_{j>k} c_j \exp(n_j \zeta)$, where $\psi_k(\zeta) \equiv 0$ if $k = 1$. Then $F(\zeta) = \psi_k(\zeta) + c_k \exp(n_k \zeta) + \Psi_k(\zeta)$. Let $\zeta \in D(\omega, (1 - q^{-1})/n_k)$. We have evidently

$$|\{c_k \exp(n_k \zeta)\}^{(L)}| \leqslant n_k^L |c_k| \leqslant C n_k^L |c_k|.$$

By the same manner as in (18), we have $|\psi_k^{(L)}(\zeta)| \leqslant \sum_{j<k} (n_j/n_k)\, n_k^{L-\gamma} U_k$. The right-hand side is dominated by $(q-1)^{-1} n_k^{L-\gamma} U_k \leqslant C n_k^{L-\gamma} U_k$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_k^{(L)}(\zeta)| &\leqslant \sum_{j>k} n_j^L |c_j| \exp(-n_j/qn_k) \\ &= n_k^L \sum_{j>k} \{(n_k/n_j)^\gamma |c_j|\} \{(n_j/n_k)^{L+\gamma} \exp(-n_j/qn_k)\} \\ &\leqslant (L+\gamma)!\; q^{L+\gamma} n_k^L \sum_{j>k} (n_k/n_j)^\gamma |c_j| \leqslant C n_k^{L+\gamma} V_k . \end{aligned}$$

These estimates give (16).

LEMMA 12. – *For every complex number* ω *with* $\operatorname{Re}\omega = -1/n_{k_\nu}$, *we have* $F(D(\omega, (1-q^{-1})/n_{k_\nu})) \supset D(F(\omega), \eta |c_{k_\nu}|)$, *where* $\eta = \eta_q$ *is a constant depending only on* q.

Proof. – Let $L = L(\omega ; F)$ be the integer in Lemma 11. Since $u_{k_\nu} \geqslant U_{k_\nu}$ and $v_{k_\nu} \geqslant V_{k_\nu}$, we have $|F^{(L)}(\omega)| \geqslant 1/4e \cdot n_{k_\nu}^L |c_{k_\nu}|$ and $|F^{(L)}(\zeta)| \leqslant 3C n_{k_\nu}^L |c_{k_\nu}|$ $(\zeta \in D(\omega, (1-q^{-1})/n_{k_\nu}))$. Hence Lemma 4 shows that $F(D(\omega, (1-q^{-1})/n_{k_\nu}))$ contains the open disk with center $F(\omega)$ and radius

$$\begin{aligned} &\overline{\eta}(L) \{(1-q^{-1})/n_{k_\nu}\}^L \{1/4e \cdot n_{k_\nu}^L |c_{k_\nu}|\}^{L+1} \{3C n_{k_\nu}^L |c_{k_\nu}|\}^{-L} \\ &\qquad = \overline{\eta}(L) \{(1-q^{-1})/12eC\}^L (4e)^{-1} |c_{k_\nu}| (= \eta'(L) |c_{k_\nu}|, \text{ say}). \end{aligned}$$

Putting $\eta = \min\{\eta'(\overline{\ell}) ; \gamma + 1 \leqslant \overline{\ell} \leqslant \gamma + 1 + 4\sigma N^2\}$, we have the required inclusion.

Now we show that, for a given complex number α, $F(\zeta)$ takes α infinitely often in U^*. For the sake of simplicity, we assume $\alpha = 0$; in fact, the following discussion will be independent of the given number α. Let us remember the notation $\mathfrak{K} = \{k_\nu\}_{\nu=1}^\infty$. By Lemma 9, we have $\sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} |c_{k_\nu}| = +\infty$. Put

$r_\nu = -1/n_{k_\nu}$, $O_\nu = \{\zeta ; \mathrm{Re}\zeta < r_\nu\}$, $O_\nu^* = O_\nu \cap \{\zeta ; 0 \leqslant \mathrm{Im}\zeta < 2\pi\}$ $(\nu \geqslant 1)$. For a given $\nu' \geqslant 1$, we assume that $F(\zeta)$ does not take 0 in $U^* - O_{\nu'}^*$. (Since $F(\zeta) = F(\zeta + 2\pi i)$ $(\zeta \in U)$, this equals $F(\zeta) \neq 0$ in $U - O_{\nu'}$.) If this assumption leads to a contradiction, it yields that $F(\zeta)$ takes 0 in $U^* - O_\nu$.

To show a contradiction, we put

$\delta = \min\{|F(\zeta)| ; \mathrm{Re}\zeta = r_{\nu'}\} = \min\{|f(z)| ; |z| = e^{r_{\nu'}}\}$, $R_\nu = \overline{O}_\nu - O_{\nu'}$,

$\delta_\nu = \min\{|F(\zeta)| ; \zeta \in R_\nu\} = \min\{|f(z)| ; e^{r_{\nu'}} \leqslant |z| \leqslant e^{r_\nu}\}$ $(\nu > \nu')$. Then δ, δ_ν are positive, according to our hypothesis. By Lemma 5, $\lim_{\nu\to\infty} \delta_\nu = 0$, and hence there exists $\nu'' > \nu'$ such that $\delta_\nu < \delta$ $(\nu \geqslant \nu'')$. Choose a sequence $(\omega_\nu)_{\nu=\nu''}^{\infty}$ $(\omega_\nu \in R_\nu)$ such that $\delta_\nu = |F(\omega_\nu)|$. Let $\nu \geqslant \nu''$. By the minimum modulus principle, $\mathrm{Re}\omega_\nu = r_\nu$. By Lemma 12,

$$F(D(\omega_\nu, (1-q^{-1})/n_{k_\nu})) \supset D(F(\omega_\nu), \eta\,|c_{k_\nu}|).$$

Note that $r_\nu + (1-q^{-1})/n_{k_\nu} = -1/qn_{k_\nu} \leqslant r_{\nu+1}$. Since $F(\zeta)$ does not take 0 in $R_{\nu+1}$, we have

$$\delta_{\nu+1} \leqslant \min\{|F(\zeta)| ; \zeta \in D(\omega_\nu, (1-q^{-1})/n_{k_\nu})\} \leqslant \delta_\nu - \eta\,|c_{k_\nu}|,$$

that is, $\delta_\nu - \delta_{\nu+1} \geqslant \eta\,|c_{k_\nu}|$. Therefore

$$\delta_{\nu''} = \sum_{\nu=\nu''}^{\infty} (\delta_\nu - \delta_{\nu+1}) \geqslant \eta \sum_{\nu=\nu''}^{\infty} |c_{k_\nu}| = +\infty,$$

which is a contradiction. Hence $F(\zeta)$ takes 0 in $U^* - O_{\nu'}^*$. Since $\nu' \geqslant 1$ is arbitrary, the proof is completed.

4. The cas where $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |c_k| < +\infty$.

We need the following

LEMMA 13. – *There exist three constants* $\overline{\epsilon} = \overline{\epsilon}_q$ $(0 < \overline{\epsilon} \leqslant 1/2)$, $\rho = \rho_q$, $W = W_q$ *depending only on* $q > 1$ *with the following property: For every lacunary power series* $S(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k e^{im_k t}$, $m_{k+1}/m_k \geqslant q$ *satisfying*

$$|a_k| \leqslant \overline{\epsilon} \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} |a_j| < +\infty \quad (k \geqslant 1) \tag{20}$$

and every complex number α *satisfying*

$$|\alpha| \leqslant \rho \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |a_k|, \tag{21}$$

there exist a sufficiently large integer E *and a corresponding point* θ_E *in* $[0, 2\pi)$ *such that*

$$|\alpha - S_E(\theta_E)| \leqslant W|a_E|, \quad \textit{where} \quad S_E(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{E} a_k e^{im_k t} \tag{22}$$

$$|a_k| \leqslant W|a_E| \quad (k \geqslant E) \tag{23}$$

$$G_{E-1} = \sum_{k=1}^{E-1} |a_k| q^{k-(E-1)} \leqslant W|a_E|. \tag{24}$$

We postpone the proof of this lemma to the next section. In this section, we show that Theorem 1 follows from this lemma.

Let $f(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_k z^{n_k}$, $n_{k+1}/n_k \geqslant q > 1$ be a lacunary power series in **D**. For a while, we assume the condition (20), replacing a_k by c_k, where $\overline{\epsilon}$ is not a required constant in (2) and ϵ will be determined later.

As in the preceding section, we deal with $F(\zeta) = f(e^\zeta)$ and use two fixed integers $\widetilde{\gamma}, \widetilde{N}$, depending only on q, which are defined as follows.

DEFINITION 14. – *Let* $\widetilde{\gamma} = \widetilde{\gamma}_q$ *be an integer satisfying (8)* $(\Gamma = \widetilde{\gamma})$ *and* $W(q^{\widetilde{\gamma}} - 1)^{-1} \leqslant 1$. *Let* $\widetilde{N} = \widetilde{N}_q$ *be an integer satisfying (13) and (14), with* γ *replaced by* $\widetilde{\gamma}$.

Now we define $u_k, U_k, v_k, V_k, \mathcal{R} = \{k_\nu\}_{\nu=1}^{\infty}$ by $m_k = n_k$, $b_k = |c_k|$, $\Gamma = \widetilde{\gamma}$ in Lemma 9. Then Lemma 11 holds, with γ, N replaced by $\widetilde{\gamma}, \widetilde{N}$. Hence Lemma 4 gives

LEMMA 15. – *For every complex number* ω *with* $\mathrm{Re}\,\omega = -1/n_{k_\nu}$, *we have* $F(D(\omega, (1 - q^{-1})/n_{k_\nu})) \supset D(F(\omega), \widetilde{\eta}|c_{k_\nu}|)$, *where* $\widetilde{\eta} = \widetilde{\eta}_q$ *is a constant depending only on* q.

Let α be a complex number satisfying $|\alpha| \leqslant \rho \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |c_k|$. We define r_ν, O_ν, O_ν^* $(\nu \geqslant 1)$ as above. For a given $\nu' \geqslant 1$, we assume that $F(\zeta)$ does not take α in $U^* - O_{\nu'}^*$ (, that is, $F(\zeta) \neq \alpha$ in

$U - O_{\nu'})$. Under this assumption, we shall show an inequality, which will contradict (2) for a sufficiently small ϵ.

To show such an inequality, we shall apply Lemma 13 to $S(t) = f(e^{it})$. Put $\delta = \min\{|F(\zeta) - a|\,;\ \mathrm{Re}\zeta = r_{\nu'}\}$, $R_\nu = \overline{O}_\nu - O_{\nu'}$, $\delta_\nu = \min\{|F(\zeta) - a|\,;\ \zeta \in R_\nu\}$ $(\nu > \nu')$. Then δ, δ_ν are positive. Note that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \max_t |F(-1/n_k + it) - S_k(t)| = \lim_{k\to\infty} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{k} (n_j/n_k)\,|c_j| + \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} |c_j| \right\} = 0.$$

By Lemma 13, $\lim_{\nu\to\infty} \delta_\nu = 0$. For every integer E in Lemma 13, we have $E \in \mathcal{R}$, since

$$U_E = \max\{n_k^{\tilde\gamma}|c_k|\,;\ 1 \leqslant k \leqslant E-1\} \leqslant \sum_{k=1}^{E-1} n_k^{\tilde\gamma}|c_k|$$
$$= n_E^{\tilde\gamma} \sum_{k=1}^{E-1} (n_k/n_E)^{\tilde\gamma}|c_k| \leqslant n_E^{\tilde\gamma} \sum_{k=1}^{E-1} |c_k|\, q^{\tilde\gamma(k-E)}$$
$$\leqslant q^{-\tilde\gamma} n_E^{\tilde\gamma} G_{E-1} \leqslant W q^{-\tilde\gamma} n_E^{\tilde\gamma} |c_E| = W q^{-\tilde\gamma} u_E \leqslant u_E$$

and

$$V_E = \sum_{k=E+1}^{\infty} n_k^{-\tilde\gamma}|c_k| \leqslant W|c_E| \sum_{k=E+1}^{\infty} n_k^{-\tilde\gamma}$$
$$= W v_E \sum_{k=E+1}^{\infty} (n_E/n_k)^{\tilde\gamma} \leqslant W(q^{\tilde\gamma} - 1)^{-1} v_E \leqslant v_E.$$

Hence there exists ν'' such that $E = k_{\nu''}$ is an integer in Lemma 13 and $\delta_\nu < \delta$ $(\nu \geqslant \nu'')$. By the same discussion as in the preceding section, we have $\delta_{\nu''} \geqslant \tilde\eta \sum_{\nu=\nu''}^{\infty} |c_{k_\nu}|$. By Lemma 9, we have

$$\sum_{\nu=\nu''}^{\infty} |c_{k_\nu}| \geqslant 1/2 \sum_{k=E}^{\infty} |c_k| \geqslant 1/2 \sum_{k=E+1}^{\infty} |c_k|.$$

Let θ_E denote the corresponding point with $E = k_{\nu''}$ in Lemma 13. Then we have, with $W' = 2W + 1 + W/(q-1)$,

$$\delta_{\nu''} \leqslant |a - F(-1/n_E + i\theta_E)|$$
$$\leqslant |a - S_E(\theta_E)| + \sum_{k=1}^{E} |c_k|(1 - e^{-n_k/n_E}) + \sum_{k=E+1}^{\infty} |c_k|\, e^{-n_k/n_E}$$
$$\leqslant W|c_E| + \sum_{k=1}^{E} (n_k/n_E)|c_k| + W|c_E| \sum_{k=E+1}^{\infty} e^{-n_k/n_E}$$
$$\leqslant W|c_E| + \{G_{E-1} + |c_E|\} + W/(q-1)\cdot|c_E|$$
$$\leqslant \{2W + 1 + W/(q-1)\}|c_E| = W'|c_E|.$$

Hence we have

$$W' \mid c_E \mid \geq \tilde{\eta}/2 \sum_{k=E+1}^{\infty} \mid c_k \mid . \tag{25}$$

Now we put $\epsilon = \min\{\bar{\epsilon}, \tilde{\eta}/3W'\}$ and, in addition to the above assumption, we suppose that $f(z)$ satisfies (2). Then (25) shows a contradiction, and hence $F(\zeta)$ takes a in $U^* - O^*_{\nu'}$. Since $\nu' \geq 1$ is arbitrary, $F(\zeta)$ takes a infinitely often in U^*. Since a is arbitrary as long as $|a| \leq \rho \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |c_k|$, the proof is completed.

5. Proof of Lemma 13.

It remains only to prove Lemma 13. For the proof of this lemma, we use fixed constants $A, B, K, Z, \bar{\epsilon}$, depending only on q, which are defined as follows.

DEFINITION 16. – *Let* $A = A_q$ *and* $B = B_q$ *be the constants in Lemma 6. Let* $K = K_q$, $Z = Z_q$ *be two positive integers and* $\bar{\epsilon} = \bar{\epsilon}_q$ *a positive number such that*

$$2\bar{\epsilon}KZ(A^2 + 1)/A \leq \min\{A/8, A^2/16B\} \tag{26}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Y_q &= 3A/16 + (A/8 + 2\bar{\epsilon}KZ) + Bq^{-K+1}(q-1)^{-1}(A^2/16B + 1) \\ &\quad - \{A/2 \cdot (1 - \bar{\epsilon}K - 2/Z) - (\bar{\epsilon}K + 2/Z)\}\{1 - (A/8 + 2\bar{\epsilon}KZ)\} < 0 \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

$$A/2 - 2/Z - Bq^{-K+1}(q-1)^{-1}(1 + 2/Z) > 0. \tag{28}$$

Such a 3-tuple $(K, Z, \bar{\epsilon})$ exists, since we can choose K, Z such that (27) and (28) are valid, with $\bar{\epsilon}$ replaced by 0, and after the choice of K, Z, we can choose $\bar{\epsilon}$ in such a way that the required inequalities are valid.

Now let $S(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k e^{im_k t}$, $m_{k+1}/m_k \geq q > 1$ be a lacunary power series satisfying (20), where $\bar{\epsilon}$ is the constant given above. For the sake of simplicity, we write, for a power series $R(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \hat{R}(n) e^{int}$, $\|R\| = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\hat{R}(n)|$. We shall divide $S(t)$ into polynomials $\bar{\Delta}_1(t), \bar{\Delta}_2(t), \cdots; \Delta_1(t), \Delta_2(t), \cdots$, where the number of terms of each $\bar{\Delta}_m(t)$ is K and that of each $\Delta_m(t)$ is less than or equal to $K(2Z-2)$. Let $\widetilde{\Delta}_{\ell}(t) = \sum_{K(\ell-1)<k\leqslant K\ell} a_k e^{im_k t}$ $(\ell \geqslant 1)$. Choose a sequence $(\ell_m)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ of positive integers such that $\|\widetilde{\Delta}_{\ell_m}\| = \min\{\|\widetilde{\Delta}_{\ell}\| \; ; \; Z(m-1) < \ell \leqslant Zm\}$. We put

$$\overline{\Delta}_m(t) = \widetilde{\Delta}_{\ell_m}(t), \; \Delta_m(t) = \sum_{\ell_{m-1}<\ell<\ell_m} \widetilde{\Delta}_{\ell}(t) \quad (m \geqslant 1, \; \ell_0 = 0),$$

where $\Delta_1(t) \equiv 0$, if $\ell_1 = 1$. Note that

$$\|\overline{\Delta}_m\| \leqslant 1/Z \cdot (\|\Delta_m\| + \|\Delta_{m+1}\|) \quad (m \geqslant 1). \tag{29}$$

We put

$$\begin{cases} \nu_m = (\text{the largest exponent occurring in } \Delta_m(t)) \\ T_m(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{\nu_m} a_k e^{im_k t}, \quad T_0(t) \equiv 0 \\ g_m = \sum_{k=1}^{\nu_m} |a_k| \, q^{k-\nu_m}, \quad g_0 = 0 \quad (m \geqslant 1), \end{cases} \tag{30}$$

where $\nu_1 = g_1 = 0$, $T_1(t) \equiv 0$, if $\Delta_1(t) \equiv 0$. Now we break up the proof of Lemma 13 into several steps.

LEMMA 17. – *For any* $m \geqslant 1$,

$$\|\overline{\Delta}_m\| + \|\Delta_{m+1}\| \leqslant 2\overline{\epsilon}KZ\,\|S - T_m\| \tag{31}$$

$$\sum_{r=m}^{\infty} \|\overline{\Delta}_r\| \leqslant (\overline{\epsilon}K + 2/Z)\,\|S - T_m\| \tag{32}$$

$$\sum_{r=m+1}^{\infty} \|\Delta_r\| \geqslant (1 - \overline{\epsilon}K - 2/Z)\,\|S - T_m\| \tag{33}$$

$$\sum_{r=m}^{\infty} g_r \leqslant q(q-1)^{-1}\,\{g_m + \|S - T_m\|\}. \tag{34}$$

Proof. – (31): By (20), we have, for every $k \geqslant \nu_m$, $|a_k| \leqslant \overline{\epsilon}\,\|S - T_m\|$. Since the number of terms of $\overline{\Delta}_m + \Delta_{m+1}$ is less than $2KZ$, we have (31).

(32): By (29), we have

$$\sum_{r=m+1}^{\infty} \|\overline{\Delta}_r\| \leqslant 1/Z \sum_{r=m+1}^{\infty} (\|\Delta_r\| + \|\Delta_{r+1}\|) \leqslant 2/Z \cdot \|S - T_m\|.$$

Since the number of terms of $\overline{\Delta}_m$ is K, we have

$$\|\overline{\Delta}_m\| \leqslant \bar{\epsilon}\mathrm{K}\,\|\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{T}_m\|,$$

according to (20). From these inequalities (32) follows.

(33): Since $\|\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{T}_m\| = \sum_{r=m+1}^{\infty} \|\Delta_r\| + \sum_{r=m}^{\infty} \|\overline{\Delta}_r\|$, (33) follows from (32).

(34): Suppose $\nu_m \neq 0$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{r=m}^{\infty} g_r &= \sum_{r=m}^{\infty}\sum_{k=1}^{\nu_r} |a_k|\, q^{k-\nu_r} \leqslant \sum_{n=\nu_m}^{\infty}\sum_{k=1}^{n} |a_k|\, q^{k-n} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\nu_m} |a_k| \sum_{n=\nu_m}^{\infty} q^{k-n} + \sum_{k=\nu_m+1}^{\infty} |a_k| \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} q^{k-n} \\ &= q(q-1)^{-1}\left\{\sum_{k=1}^{\nu_m} |a_k|\, q^{k-\nu_m} + \sum_{k=\nu_m+1}^{\infty} |a_k|\right\} \\ &= q(q-1)^{-1}\,\{g_m + \|\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{T}_m\|\}.\end{aligned}$$

Suppose $\nu_m = 0$. Then $m = 1$ and $\nu_1 = 0$. Since $g_1 = 0$, $\mathrm{T}_1(t) \equiv 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{r=1}^{\infty} g_r = \sum_{r=2}^{\infty} g_r &\leqslant q(q-1)^{-1}\,\{g_2 + \|\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{T}_2\|\} \\ &\leqslant q(q-1)^{-1}\,\{g_1 + \|\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{T}_1\|\}.\end{aligned}$$

LEMMA 18. – *Suppose that there exist a non-negative integer* J *and a corresponding point* s_{J} *in* $[0, 2\pi)$ *such that*

$$|\alpha - \mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{J}}(s_{\mathrm{J}})| \leqslant \mathrm{A}/8 \cdot \|\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{J}}\|$$

and $g_{\mathrm{J}} \leqslant \mathrm{A}^2/16\mathrm{B}\cdot\|\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{J}}\|$. *Then there exist a pair* (j', J'), $\mathrm{J} < j' < \mathrm{J}'$ *of integers and corresponding points* $s_{j'}, \cdots, s_{\mathrm{J}'}$ *in* $[0, 2\pi)$ *verifying the following conditions: with* $\lambda_m = |\alpha - \mathrm{T}_m(s_m)|$ $(j' \leqslant m \leqslant \mathrm{J}')$,

$$\lambda_m \geqslant (\mathrm{A}^2+1)/\mathrm{A}\cdot\|\Delta_{m+1}\| \quad (j' \leqslant m < \mathrm{J}') \tag{35}$$

$$\lambda_m \leqslant \lambda_{m-1} - \mathrm{A}/2\cdot\|\Delta_m\| + \|\overline{\Delta}_{m-1}\| + \mathrm{B}q^{-\mathrm{K}}g_{m-1} \quad (j' < m < \mathrm{J}') \tag{36}$$

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathrm{A}^2+1)/\mathrm{A}\cdot\|\Delta_{\mathrm{J}'+1}\| > \lambda_{\mathrm{J}'} = \lambda_{\mathrm{J}'-1} &- \mathrm{A}/2\cdot\|\Delta_{\mathrm{J}'}\| \\ &+ \|\overline{\Delta}_{\mathrm{J}'-1}\| + \mathrm{B}q^{-\mathrm{K}}g_{\mathrm{J}'-1}\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

$$g_{\mathrm{J}'} \leqslant (\mathrm{A}^2+1)/\mathrm{A}\cdot\|\Delta_{\mathrm{J}'+1}\|. \tag{38}$$

Proof. – (Definition of j') : Let j' be the first integer satisfying $\|T_m - T_J\| \geqslant A/8 \cdot \|S - T_J\|$ $(m \geqslant J)$. We show the following inequalities

$$X_m = A\|T_m - T_J\| - Bg_J \geqslant (A^2+1)/A \cdot \|\Delta_{m+1}\| \quad (m \geqslant j') \tag{39}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{Y} = \{&3A/16 \cdot \|S - T_J\| + \|T_{j'} - T_J\|\} \\ &- \{A/2 \cdot (1 - \overline{\epsilon}K - 2/Z) - (\overline{\epsilon}K + 2/Z)\} \|S - T_{j'}\| \\ &+ Bq^{-K+1}(q-1)^{-1}\{g_{j'} + \|S - T_{j'}\|\} < 0 .\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

Let $m \geqslant j'$. Since $\|T_m - T_J\| \geqslant \|T_{j'} - T_J\| \geqslant A/8 \cdot \|S - T_J\|$ and $Bg_J \leqslant A^2/16 \cdot \|S - T_J\|$, we have, from (26) and (31),

$$\begin{aligned}X_m \geqslant A^2/16 \cdot \|S - T_J\| \geqslant A^2/16 \cdot \|S - T_m\| &\geqslant A^2/32\overline{\epsilon}KZ \cdot \|\Delta_{m+1}\| \\ &\geqslant (A^2+1)/A \cdot \|\Delta_{m+1}\| ,\end{aligned}$$

and hence (39).

Since

$$\begin{aligned}\|T_{j'} - T_J\| &= \|T_{j'-1} - T_J\| + \|\overline{\Delta}_{j'-1}\| + \|\Delta_{j'}\| \\ &\leqslant A/8 \cdot \|S - T_J\| + 2\overline{\epsilon}KZ\,\|S - T_{j'-1}\| \leqslant (A/8 + 2\overline{\epsilon}KZ)\,\|S - T_J\| ,\end{aligned}$$

$$\|S - T_{j'}\| = \|S - T_J\| - \|T_{j'} - T_J\| \geqslant \{1 - (A/8 + 2\overline{\epsilon}KZ)\}\,\|S - T_J\|$$

and

$$g_{j'} + \|S - T_{j'}\| \leqslant g_J + \|S - T_J\| \leqslant (A^2/16B + 1)\,\|S - T_J\| ,$$

we have $\overline{Y}/\|S - T_J\|$

$$\begin{aligned}&\leqslant 3A/16 + (A/8 + 2\overline{\epsilon}KZ) + Bq^{-K+1}(q-1)^{-1}(A^2/16B + 1) \\ &- \{A/2 \cdot (1 - \overline{\epsilon}K - 2/Z) - (\overline{\epsilon}K + 2/Z)\}\{1 - (A/8 + 2\overline{\epsilon}KZ)\} \\ &= Y_q < 0 .\end{aligned}$$

(Definition of $s_{j'}$): Applying Lemma 6 to $Q(t) = T_{j'}(t) - T_J(t)$, $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(-\alpha + T_J(s_J), A\|Q\|)$ and $I = (s_J - B/\mu, s_J + B/\mu)$ (μ: the smallest exponent in $Q(t)$), we choose $s_{j'}$ in I so that

$$|\{\alpha - T_J(s_J)\} - \{T_{j'}(s_{j'}) - T_J(s_{j'})\}| \geqslant A\|T_{j'} - T_J\| .$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_{j'} &= |\alpha - T_{j'}(s_{j'})| \\ &= |\{\alpha - T_J(s_J)\} - \{T_{j'}(s_{j'}) - T_J(s_{j'})\} - \{T_J(s_{j'}) - T_J(s_J)\}| \\ &\geqslant A\|T_{j'} - T_J\| - |s_{j'} - s_J| \left\| \frac{d}{dt} T_J(\cdot) \right\| \\ &\geqslant A\|T_{j'} - T_J\| - B/\mu \sum_{k=1}^{\nu_J} m_k |a_k| \geqslant A\|T_{j'} - T_J\| - Bg_J \\ &= X_{j'} \geqslant (A^2+1)/A \cdot \|\Delta_{j'+1}\| ,\end{aligned}$$

(35) holds for $m = j'$. Let us remark

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_{j'} &= |\{\alpha - T_J(s_J)\} - \{T_{j'}(s_{j'}) - T_J(s_{j'})\} - \{T_J(s_{j'}) - T_J(s_J)\}| \\ &\leqslant |\alpha - T_J(s_J)| + \|T_{j'} - T_J\| + |s_{j'} - s_J| \left\| \frac{d}{dt} T_J(\cdot) \right\| \\ &\leqslant A/8 \cdot \|S - T_J\| + \|T_{j'} - T_J\| + Bg_J \\ &\leqslant 3A/16 \cdot \|S - T_J\| + \|T_{j'} - T_J\| .\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

(Definition of J'): Applying first Lemma 6 to $Q(t) = \Delta_{j'+1}(t)$, $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(\alpha - T_{j'}(s_{j'}), A\|Q\|)$ and $I = (s_{j'} - B/\overline{\mu}, s_{j'} + B/\overline{\mu})$ ($\overline{\mu}$: the smallest exponent in $Q(t)$) and using next Lemma 7, we choose θ' in I so that $|\{\alpha - T_{j'}(s_{j'})\} - \Delta_{j'+1}(\theta')| \leqslant \lambda_{j'} - A/2 \cdot \|\Delta_{j'+1}\|$. Then $|\alpha - T_{j'+1}(\theta')|$

$$\begin{aligned}&= |\{\alpha - T_{j'}(s_{j'}) - \Delta_{j'+1}(\theta')\} - \overline{\Delta}_{j'}(\theta') - \{T_{j'}(\theta') - T_{j'}(s_{j'})\}| \\ &\leqslant \lambda_{j'} - A/2 \cdot \|\Delta_{j'+1}\| + \|\overline{\Delta}_{j'}\| + |\theta' - s_{j'}| \left\| \frac{d}{dt} T_{j'}(\cdot) \right\| \\ &\leqslant \lambda_{j'} - A/2 \cdot \|\Delta_{j'+1}\| + \|\overline{\Delta}_{j'}\| + Bq^{-K} g_{j'} \quad (= \widetilde{T}, \text{ say}).\end{aligned}$$

We distinguish the following two cases:

(a) $\max_\theta |\alpha - T_{j'+1}(\theta)| < \widetilde{T}$,

(b) $\max_\theta |\alpha - T_{j'+1}(\theta)| \geqslant \widetilde{T}$.

If (a), we choose $s_{j'+1}$, with the aid of Lemma 6, so that $|\alpha - T_{j'+1}(s_{j'+1})| \geqslant A\|T_{j'+1}\|$. Then we have, from (39),

$$\begin{aligned}|\alpha - T_{j'+1}(s_{j'+1})| \geqslant A\|T_{j'+1}\| &\geqslant A\|T_{j'+1} - T_J\| \\ &\geqslant X_{j'+1} \geqslant (A^2 + 1)/A \cdot \|\Delta_{j'+2}\|,\end{aligned}$$

and hence (35) and (36) hold for $m = j' + 1$. If (b), we choose $s_{j'+1}$, by the continuity of $|\alpha - T_{j'+1}(\cdot)|$, so that $|\alpha - T_{j'+1}(s_{j'+1})| = \widetilde{T}$. Then (36) holds for $m = j' + 1$.

If $\lambda_{j'+1} < (A^2 + 1)/A \cdot \|\Delta_{j'+2}\|$, then we put $J' = j' + 1$. If $\lambda_{j'+1} \geqslant (A^2 + 1)/A \cdot \|\Delta_{j'+2}\|$, we find $s_{j'+2}$ in the same manner as we found $s_{j'+1}$. We continue this process until we reach an integer J' satisfying (37). Such an integer exists; otherwise, we have, from Lemma 17, (36), (40) and (41),

$$0 \leqslant \liminf_{r\to\infty} \lambda_r \leqslant \liminf_{r\to\infty} (\lambda_{r-1} - A/2 \cdot \|\Delta_r\| + \|\overline{\Delta}_{r-1}\| + Bq^{-K} g_{r-1})$$
$$\leqslant \liminf_{r\to\infty} \{\lambda_{r-2} - A/2 \cdot (\|\Delta_{r-1}\| + \|\Delta_r\|)$$
$$+ (\|\overline{\Delta}_{r-2}\| + \|\overline{\Delta}_{r-1}\|) + Bq^{-K}(g_{r-2} + g_{r-1})\}$$
$$\leqslant \cdots \leqslant \lambda_{j'} - A/2 \sum_{r=j'+1}^{\infty} \|\Delta_r\| + \sum_{r=j'}^{\infty} \|\overline{\Delta}_r\| + Bq^{-K} \sum_{r=j'}^{\infty} g_r$$
$$\leqslant \{3A/16 \cdot \|S - T_J\| + \|T_{j'} - T_J\|\} - A/2 \cdot (1 - \overline{\epsilon}K - 1/Z)\|S - T_{j'}\|\}$$
$$+ (\overline{\epsilon}K + 2/Z)\|S - T_{j'}\| + Bq^{-K+1}(q-1)^{-1}\{g_{j'} + \|S - T_{j'}\|\}$$
$$= \overline{Y} < 0,$$

which is a contradiction.

(Proof of (38)): Since $\lambda_{J'-1} \geqslant (A^2+1)/A \cdot \|\Delta_{J'}\|$ $(0 < A \leqslant 1)$, we have $\lambda_{J'-1} - A/2 \cdot \|\Delta_{J'}\| \geqslant \|\Delta_{J'}\|$. Hence we have, from (37),

$$g_{J'} = \sum_{k=1}^{\nu_{J'}} |a_k| \, q^{k-\nu_{J'}} \leqslant \|\Delta_{J'}\| + \|\overline{\Delta}_{J'-1}\| + q^{-K} g_{J'-1}$$
$$\leqslant \{\lambda_{J'-1} - A/2 \cdot \|\Delta_{J'}\|\} + \|\overline{\Delta}_{J'-1}\| + Bq^{-K} g_{J'-1} = \lambda_{J'}$$
$$\leqslant (A^2+1)/A \cdot \|\Delta_{J'+1}\|.$$

LEMMA 19. – *Let* $|\alpha| \leqslant A/8 \cdot \|S\|$. *Then there exist a sufficiently large integer* J'' *and a corresponding point* $s_{J''}$ *in* $[0, 2\pi)$ *such that* $|\alpha - T_{J''}(s_{J''})| \leqslant (A^2+1)/A \cdot \|\Delta_{J''+1}\|$ *and*

$$g_{J''} \leqslant (A^2+1)/A \cdot \|\Delta_{J''+1}\|.$$

Proof. – Since $|\alpha| \leqslant A/8 \cdot \|S\|$ and $g_0 = 0$, the integer $J = 0$ satisfies the conditions in Lemma 18 (, where $s_J = 0$). Hence there exist J' and a corresponding point $s_{J'}$ such that $\lambda_{J'} \leqslant (A^2+1)/A \cdot \|\Delta_{J'+1}\|$ and $g_{J'} \leqslant (A^2+1)/A \cdot \|\Delta_{J'+1}\|$. By (26) and (31), we have

$$(A^2+1)/A \cdot \|\Delta_{J'+1}\| \leqslant 2\overline{\epsilon}KZ(A^2+1)/A \cdot \|S - T_{J'}\| \leqslant \begin{cases} A/8 \cdot \|S - T_{J'}\| \\ A^2/16B \cdot \|S - T_{J'}\|, \end{cases}$$

and hence $\lambda_{J'} \leqslant A/8 \cdot \|S - T_{J'}\|$ and $g_{J'} \leqslant A^2/16B \cdot \|S - T_{J'}\|$. This implies that $(J', s_{J'})$ also satisfies the conditions in Lemma 18. Repeating this discussion, we obtain a required $(J'', s_{J''})$.

LEMMA 20. – *There exists a constant* $\overline{W} = \overline{W}(q, A, B, K, Z)$ *with the following property: For every complex number* α ($|\alpha| \leqslant A/8 \cdot \|S\|$) *and the associated integer* J'' *with* α *in Lemma 19, there exists a point* t_F *in* $[0, 2\pi)$ *such that* $|\alpha - T_F(t_F)| \leqslant \overline{W} \|\Delta_F\|$ *and* $g_F \leqslant \overline{W} \|\Delta_F\|$, *where* F *is the first integer satisfying* $\|\Delta_m\| = \max_{r \geqslant J''} \|\Delta_r\|$ $(m \geqslant J'')$.

Proof. – Set $\overline{W}' = (A^2 + 1)/A + (1 + 2/Z) q(q-1)^{-1}$ and $\overline{W} = \max\{\overline{W}', (A^2+1)/A + 1 + 3/Z + Bq^{-K+1}(q-1)^{-1}(\overline{W}' + 1/Z)\}$.

We shall show that $\overline{W}$ is a required constant. If $F = J''$, we put $t_F = s_{J''}$, where $s_{J''}$ is a point corresponding to J''. Then the required inequalities evidently hold. Suppose $F \neq J''$. We have, for every $J'' \leqslant m \leqslant F$,

$$\begin{aligned} g_m &= \sum_{k=1}^{\nu_m} |a_k| q^{k-\nu_m} \leqslant g_{J''} + \sum_{r=J''+1}^{m} \|\Delta_r\| q^{r-m} + \sum_{r=J''}^{m-1} \|\overline{\Delta}_r\| q^{r-m} \\ &\leqslant g_{J''} + q(q-1)^{-1} \|\Delta_F\| + 1/Z \sum_{r=J''}^{m-1} (\|\Delta_r\| + \|\Delta_{r+1}\|) q^{r-m} \qquad (42) \\ &\leqslant g_{J''} + (1 + 2/Z) q(q-1)^{-1} \|\Delta_F\| \leqslant (A^2+1)/A \cdot \|\Delta_{J''+1}\| \\ &\quad + (1 + 2/Z) q(q-1)^{-1} \|\Delta_F\| \leqslant \overline{W}' \|\Delta_F\|. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $g_F \leqslant \overline{W}' \|\Delta_F\| \leqslant \overline{W} \|\Delta_F\|$.

For the choice of t_F, we define inductively points $\{t_m\}_{m=J''+1}^{F}$ in $[0, 2\pi)$ such that, with $\overline{\lambda}_m = |\alpha - T_m(t_m)|$ $(J''+1 \leqslant m \leqslant F)$,

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} &\overline{\lambda}_m \leqslant \{(A^2+1)/A + 1\} \|\Delta_m\| + \|\overline{\Delta}_{m-1}\| \quad \text{or} \\ &\overline{\lambda}_m \leqslant \overline{\lambda}_{m-1} - A/2 \cdot \|\Delta_m\| + \|\overline{\Delta}_{m-1}\| + Bq^{-K} g_{m-1}. \end{aligned} \right. \qquad (43)$$

Set $t_{J''+1} = s_{J''}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\lambda}_{J''+1} = |\alpha - T_{J''+1}(s_{J''})| &\leqslant |\alpha - T_{J''}(s_{J''})| + \|\overline{\Delta}_{J''}\| + \|\Delta_{J''+1}\| \\ &\leqslant \{(A^2+1)/A + 1\} \|\Delta_{J''+1}\| + \|\overline{\Delta}_{J''}\|. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that $t_{J''+1}, \cdots, t_{m-1}$ have been defined. If

$$\overline{\lambda}_{m-1} < (A^2+1)/A \cdot \|\Delta_m\|,$$

we put $t_m = t_{m-1}$. Then

$$\overline{\lambda}_m \leqslant \overline{\lambda}_{m-1} + \|\overline{\Delta}_{m-1}\| + \|\Delta_m\| \leqslant \{(A^2+1)/A + 1\} \|\Delta_m\| + \|\overline{\Delta}_{m-1}\|.$$

If $\overline{\lambda}_{m-1} \geqslant (A^2+1)/A \cdot \|\Delta_m\|$, then, using Lemma 6 and 7, we choose a point t_m in $(t_{m-1} - B/\widetilde{\mu}, t_{m-1} + B/\widetilde{\mu})$ ($\widetilde{\mu}$: the smallest exponent in Δ_m) so that

$$|\{a - T_{m-1}(t_{m-1})\} - \Delta_m(t_m)| \leqslant \overline{\lambda}_{m-1} - A/2 \cdot \|\Delta_m\| .$$

Then $\overline{\lambda}_m \leqslant \overline{\lambda}_{m-1} - A/2 \cdot \|\Delta_m\| + \|\overline{\Delta}_{m-1}\| + Bq^{-K} g_{m-1}$. Thus $\{t_m\}_{m=J''+1}^{F}$ are defined.

Next we show that t_F is a required point. Let j'' be the last integer satisfying $\overline{\lambda}_m \leqslant \{(A^2+1)/A + 1\} \|\Delta_m\| + \|\overline{\Delta}_{m-1}\|$ $(J''+1 \leqslant m \leqslant F)$. If $j'' = F$, then

$$\overline{\lambda}_F \leqslant \{(A^2+1)/A+1\} \|\Delta_F\| + \|\overline{\Delta}_{F-1}\| \leqslant \{(A^2+1)/A+1\} \|\Delta_F\| + 1/Z \cdot (\|\Delta_{F-1}\| + \|\Delta_F\|) \leqslant \{(A^2+1)/A + 1 + 2/Z\} \|\Delta_F\| \leqslant \overline{W} \|\Delta_F\| .$$

Hence the required inequality holds. Suppose $j'' \neq F$. Put $d = \sum_{m=j''+1}^{F} \|\Delta_m\|$, $\overline{d} = \sum_{m=j''}^{F-1} \|\overline{\Delta}_m\|$ and $\overline{g} = \sum_{m=j''}^{F-1} g_m$. Then

$$\overline{d} \leqslant 1/Z \sum_{m=j''}^{F-1} (\|\Delta_m\| + \|\Delta_{m+1}\|) \leqslant 2/Z \cdot d + 1/Z \cdot \|\Delta_{j''}\| \leqslant 2/Z \cdot d + 1/Z \cdot \|\Delta_F\|$$

and

$$\overline{g} \leqslant q(q-1)^{-1} \{g_{j''} + \|T_{F-1} - T_{j''}\|\} \leqslant q(q-1)^{-1} \{\overline{W}' \|\Delta_F\| + d + \overline{d}\} \leqslant q(q-1)^{-1} (1+2/Z) d + q(q-1)^{-1} (\overline{W}' + 1/Z) \|\Delta_F\| .$$

By these inequalities and (28), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\lambda}_F &\leqslant \overline{\lambda}_{F-1} - A/2 \cdot \|\Delta_F\| + \|\overline{\Delta}_{F-1}\| + Bq^{-K} g_{F-1} \\ &\leqslant \cdots \leqslant \overline{\lambda}_{j''} - A/2 \cdot d + \overline{d} + Bq^{-K} \overline{g} \\ &\leqslant \overline{\lambda}_{j''} - A/2 \cdot d + (2/Z \cdot d + 1/Z \cdot \|\Delta_F\|) \\ &\qquad + Bq^{-K+1}(q-1)^{-1} \{(1+2/Z) d + (\overline{W}' + 1/Z) \|\Delta_F\|\} \\ &\leqslant \overline{\lambda}_{j''} + \{1/Z + Bq^{-K+1}(q-1)^{-1}(\overline{W}' + 1/Z)\} \|\Delta_F\| \\ &\leqslant \{(A^2+1)/A + 1\} \|\Delta_{j''}\| + \|\overline{\Delta}_{j''-1}\| \\ &\qquad + \{1/Z + Bq^{-K+1}(q-1)^{-1}(\overline{W}' + 1/Z)\} \|\Delta_F\| \\ &\leqslant \{(A^2+1)/A + 1\} \|\Delta_{j''}\| + 1/Z \cdot (\|\Delta_{j''-1}\| + \|\Delta_{j''}\|) \\ &\qquad + \{1/Z + Bq^{-K+1}(q-1)^{-1}(\overline{W}' + 1/Z)\} \|\Delta_F\| \\ &\leqslant \{(A^2+1)/A + 1 + 3/Z + Bq^{-K+1}(q-1)^{-1}(\overline{W}' + 1/Z)\} \|\Delta_F\| \\ &\leqslant \overline{W} \|\Delta_F\| . \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of this lemma.

Now we give three constants $\overline{\epsilon}$, ρ, W in Lemma 13. Let $\overline{\epsilon}$ be the constant given in Definition 16. Put $\rho = A/8$ and $W = \max\{2KZ(\overline{W}+1), q^{2KZ}\overline{W}2KZ\}$.

Let $|\alpha| \leqslant \rho \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |a_k| = A/8 \cdot \|S\|$ and (F, t_F) be as in Lemma 20. We choose an integer E such that a_E is one of coefficients having the largest modulus in Δ_F. Then $\|\Delta_F\| \leqslant 2KZ\,|a_E|$. Put $\theta_E = t_F$. Then (E, θ_E) is a required pair, since

$$\begin{cases} |\alpha - S_E(\theta_E)| \leqslant |\alpha - T_F(t_F)| + \|T_F - S_E\| \leqslant (\overline{W}+1)\,\|\Delta_F\| \\ \qquad\qquad \leqslant 2KZ(\overline{W}+1)\,|a_E| \leqslant W\,|a_E| \\ \sup_{k>E} |a_k| \leqslant \sup_{m>F} \|\Delta_m\| = \|\Delta_F\| \leqslant 2KZ\,|a_E| \leqslant W\,|a_E| \\ G_{E-1} = \sum_{k=1}^{E-1} |a_k|\, q^{k-(E-1)} \leqslant q^{\nu_F - E+1} g_F \leqslant q^{2KZ}\,\overline{W}\,\|\Delta_F\| \\ \qquad\qquad \leqslant q^{2KZ}\,\overline{W}2KZ\,|a_E| \leqslant W\,|a_E|. \end{cases}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 13.

Remark 21. – We also know that an unbounded lacunary power series $f(z)$ takes every complex value infinitely often in every sector $\{z \in \mathbf{D} ; \alpha < \arg z < \beta\}$. In fact, let us note that a set $\{t \in [0, 2\pi) ; \lim_{r\to 1} |f(re^{it})| = +\infty\}$ is dense in $[0, 2\pi)$, if $\lim_{k\to\infty} c_k = 0$ ([12]). Hence we may assume

$$\lim_{r\to 1} |f(re^{i\alpha})| = \lim_{r\to 1} |f(re^{i\beta})| = +\infty.$$

The proof is now along the same line as the proof of Theorem 1.

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

[1] J.M. Anderson, Boundary properties of analytic functions with gap power series, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford*, (2) 21 (1970), 247-256.

[2] K.G. Binmore, R. Hornblower, Boundary behaviour of functions with Hadamard gaps, *Nagoya Math. J.*, 48 (1972), 173-181.

[3] I.L. CHANG, On the zeros of power series with Hadamard Gaps-Distribution in sectors, *Trans. of the Amer. Math. Soc.*, 178 (1973), 393-400.

[4] W.H.J. FUCHS, On the zeros of power series with Hadamard gaps, *Nagoya Math. J.*, 29 (1967), 167-174.

[5] W.H.J. FUCHS, Topics in Nevanlinna theory, *Proc. NRL Conference on classical function theory*, Math. Rec. Center, Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D.C., 1970, 1-32.

[6] J.P. KAHANE, Lacunary Taylor and Fourier series, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 70 (1964), 199-213.

[7] J.P. KAHANE, G. WEISS, M. WEISS, On lacunary power series, *Arkiv för Math.*, B.5 No 1 (1963), 1-26.

[8] T. MURAI, Sur la distribution des valeurs des séries lacunaires, *J. of the London Math. Soc.* (2), 21 (1980), 93-110.

[9] T. MURAI, Une conjecture de Paley sur séries de Taylor lacunaires, *C.R.A.S.*, Paris, t. 290 (2 juin 1980), 947-948.

[10] R.E.A.C. PALEY, On lacunary power series, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 19 (1933), 271-272.

[11] R. SALEM, A. ZYGMUND, Lacunary power series and Peano curves, *Duke J. of Math.*, 12 (1945), 569-578.

[12] M. WEISS, Concerning a theorem of Paley on lacunary trigonometric series, *Acta Math.*, 102 (1959), 225-238.

[13] G. WEISS, M. WEISS, On the Picard property of lacunary power series, *Studia Math.*, 22 (1963), 221-245.

[14] A. ZYGMUND, Trigonometric series I, II, Cambridge, 1959.

Manuscrit reçu le 22 août 1980.

Takafumi MURAI,
Department of Mathematics
Faculty of Science
Nagoya University
Chikusa-Ku
Nagoya, 464 (Japan).