

COMPOSITIO MATHEMATICA

S. M. SHAH

On exceptional values of entire functions

Compositio Mathematica, tome 9 (1951), p. 227-238

http://www.numdam.org/item?id=CM_1951__9__227_0

© Foundation Compositio Mathematica, 1951, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Compositio Mathematica » (<http://www.compositio.nl/>) 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/>

On Exceptional Values of Entire Functions

by

S. M. Shah.

1. Let $f(z)$ be an entire function of finite order ρ . A value α is said to be an exceptional value (e.v.) B if ¹⁾

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log^+ n(r, \alpha)}{\log r} = \varrho_1(\alpha) < \rho$$

e.v. N if [1, 78—107; 2, 254—269]

$$\delta(\alpha) = 1 - \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(r, \alpha)}{T(r)} > 0,$$

and e.v. V (in the sense of Valiron ²⁾) if

$$\Delta(\alpha) = 1 - \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(r, \alpha)}{T(r)} > 0.$$

2. Let E denote the set of positive non-decreasing functions $\varphi(x)$ such that ³⁾

$$\int_A^\infty \frac{dx}{x\varphi(x)}$$

is convergent. It is known that for functions of non-integral and zero order and for a class of functions of integral order, including all functions of maximum or minimum type, we have [4 (i), (ii)]

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log M(r)}{n(r, \alpha)\varphi(r)} = 0$$

where $\varphi(x)$ is any function of E , for every α . Hence it is natural to define a value α ($0 \leq |\alpha| < \infty$) e. E for $f(z)$ if

$$(1) \quad \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log M(r)}{n(r, \alpha)\varphi(r)} > 0$$

¹⁾ For notations see [1] chapter 1.

²⁾ See [9] where further references will be found. It is known that $\delta(\alpha)$ is not invariant with respect to a change of the origin [12]. To overcome this difficulty Valiron has suggested another definition for $\delta(\alpha)$ [13].

³⁾ In what follows, A denotes a positive constant not necessarily the same at each occurrence.

for some $\varphi \subset E$. Let $n_1(r, \alpha)$ denote the number of simple zeros of $f - \alpha$ in $|z| \leq r$. We define α to be an e.v. E for simple zeros if

$$R_1(\alpha) = \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log M(r)}{n_1(r, \alpha)\varphi(r)} > 0$$

for some $\varphi \subset E$, and normal E for simple zeros if $R_1(\alpha) = 0$ for every $\varphi \subset E$.

3. We prove the following results. Theorem 1 generalises a well known result of Borel [5,279]. Theorems 2,3 and 4 give results analogous to those [3,75—78] for a v.e. B for simple zeros. We note however that a v.e. B for simple zeros may not be a v.e. E for simple zeros¹⁾.

THEOREM 1. (i) *If α is a v.e. B then it is also a v.e. E but the converse is not true.*

(ii) *If α is a v.e. E , then it is also a v.e. N but the converse is not true.*

(iii) *If $f(z)$ has a v.e. E , then ρ is necessarily an integer and $f(z)$ is of perfectly regular growth order ρ ; also $f(z)$ can have no other v.e. E or N .*

THEOREM 2. *If for a function, the deficiency sum (excluding $\alpha = \infty$) $\Sigma \delta(\alpha) = 1$, then there cannot be two values e. E for simple zeros.*

COROLLARY. *If a function has a v.e. E for the whole aggregate of zeros, then there can be no other v.e. E for simple zeros.*

THEOREM 3. *Let $f(z)$ be of order ρ and suppose that either ρ is non-integer, or when ρ is integer or zero then $f(z)$ satisfies the condition*

$$(2) \quad \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log M(r)}{r^\rho L(r)} = 1,$$

where $L(r)$ is any positive continuous and monotone function for all large r and satisfies the condition $L(kr) \sim L(r)$, as $r \rightarrow \infty$, for any fixed positive k . If $\rho = 0$, suppose further that $\log r = o(L(r))$. Then there cannot be more than two values e. E for simple zeros.

THEOREM 4. *Let $f(z)$ satisfy the conditions of Theorem 3. Then there cannot be more than one v.e. E for the joint sequence of simple and double zeros and if such a value exists, the sequence of simple zeros is normal E for every other value.*

It is known that a v.e. N for a proper meromorphic function $f(z)$ (that is, $n(r, \infty) > 0$) may not be an asymptotic value of

¹⁾ See § 7 below.

$f(z)$ [14]. If $f(z)$ be an entire function and $\delta(\alpha) > 0$ for $f(z)$, then it is not known whether α is necessarily an asymptotic value of $f(z)$. For a v.e. E we have

THEOREM 5. (i) *If α is a v.e. E for an entire function $f(z)$, then it is also an asymptotic value but the converse is not true.*

(ii) *A v.e. E is 'invariant' with respect to the displacement of the origin; that is, if*

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log M(r)}{n(r, \alpha)\varphi(r)} > 0$$

for some $\varphi \in E$, and if $M_A(r)$, $n_A(r, \alpha)$ refer to another 'origin' A then

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log M_A(r)}{n_A(r, \alpha)\varphi(r)} > 0.$$

We now give two theorems of a different type. Theorem 6 extends a result of Polya and Pfluger [7].

THEOREM 6. *If a function of finite order ρ has a v.e. E , its power series has a density equal to one of the fractions*

$$\frac{1}{\rho}, \frac{2}{\rho}, \dots, \frac{\rho}{\rho}.$$

THEOREM 7. *Suppose $f(z)$ is of order 1 and has a v.e. E . If ¹⁾ $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \log M(r)/r = T$ and if $f(z)$ has an asymptotic period β then $|\beta| \geq 2\pi/T$.*

We suppose here β to be Whittaker [6,84] period. If we follow the definition of an asymptotic period as given by S. S. Macintyre [15] then $|\beta| \geq \pi/T$.

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1. (i) If α is a v.e. B then $\log M(r) \sim Tr^\rho$ ($0 < T < \infty$) and $e_1(\alpha) < \rho$. Hence

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log M(r)}{n(r, \alpha)r^\beta} = \infty, \quad 0 < \beta < \rho - e_1(\alpha).$$

To show that the converse is not true, we consider

$$(3) \quad f(z) = e^z P(z) = e^z \prod_2 \left\{ 1 + \frac{z}{n(\log n)^2} \right\}; \quad \alpha = 0.$$

(ii) If $\rho > 0$ is non-integer then [3,69]

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log M(r)}{n(r, \alpha)} < A$$

¹⁾ This limit exists. See Theorem 1 (iii) above.

for every α . If $\varrho = 0$ then [4(i), 29—30]

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log M(r, f)}{n(r, 0)\varphi(r)} = 0$$

and hence

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log M(r, f)}{n(r, \alpha)\varphi(r)} = 0.$$

Hence if α is a v.e. E , ϱ must be integer and we will have

$$(4) \quad f(z) - \alpha = z^n \exp \{Q(z, \alpha)\} P(z, \alpha)$$

where $Q(z, \alpha)$ is a polynomial of degree $q(\alpha)$ (say) and $P(z, \alpha)$ is the canonical product (c.p.) of genus $p(\alpha)$ (say). We have either [4 (ii) 186—187] $\varrho_1(\alpha) < \varrho$ or $\varrho_1(\alpha) = q(\alpha) = \varrho$; $p(\alpha) = \varrho - 1$. In either case we have $\log M(r) \sim Tr^\varrho$ ($0 < T < \infty$) for we have

LEMMA. If $f(z) = z^N e^{Q(z)} P(z)$ is of order ϱ , ϱ integer and $q = \varrho$, $p \leq \varrho - 1$, then

$$(5) \quad \log M(r, f) \sim Tr^\varrho \quad (0 < T < \infty)$$

PROOF. Let $Q(z) = az^\varrho + \dots$, $|a| = T$. Then

$$\log M(r, f) < O(\log r) + (T + o(1))r^\varrho + o(r^\varrho) \sim Tr^\varrho.$$

Suppose if possible

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log M(r, f)}{r^\varrho} = l < T$$

and let $l < L < T$, $1 < k < (T/L)^{1/\epsilon}$. Then for a sequence of values of $r = r_n$ ($n = 1, 2, \dots$), $\log M(r, f) < Lr^\varrho$.

For any R_n ($n = 1, 2, \dots$) such that $r_n/k \leq R_n \leq r_n$ we have

$$\log M(R_n, f) \leq \log M(r_n, f) < Lr_n^\varrho \leq Lk^\epsilon R_n^\varrho.$$

Further $\log M(r, P) = o(r^\varrho)$ and there is always a circle $|z| = R_n$ in the annulus $r_n/k \leq |z| \leq r_n$ on which [3,89]

$$|P(z)| > \{M(kr, P)\}^{-H}.$$

Hence for $r = R_n$ ($n > N_0$)

$$\log \left| \frac{1}{P(z)} \right| < H \log M(kr, P) < H \epsilon k^\epsilon r^\varrho$$

$$e^{\{RQ(z)\}} = \left| \frac{f(z)}{z^N P(z)} \right| < \exp \{Lk^\epsilon R_n^\varrho + 2H \epsilon k^\epsilon R_n^\varrho\}.$$

Hence

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\max_{|z|=R_n} R\{Q(z)\}}{R_n^{\rho}} \leq Lk^{\rho}.$$

But the left hand expression has the limit $T > k^{\rho}L$.

Hence we have a contradiction and so $l = T$ which proves the lemma.

If α is a v.e. E , then $\log M(r) \sim Tr^{\rho}$ and so

$$T(r) > A \log M(r) > An(r, \alpha)\varphi(r)$$

and since $\log r = o(\varphi(r))$ we have

$$(6) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} T(r)/N(r, \alpha) = \infty; \delta(\alpha) = \Delta(\alpha) = 1.$$

To show that $\delta(\alpha)$ may be equal to unity but α may not be a v.e. E we need consider the c.p. $P(z)$ defined in (3). For this c.p. $\delta(0) = 1$ and

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log M(r)}{n(r, 0)\varphi(r)} = 0.$$

(iii) To complete the proof of (iii) we note that $\sum \delta(\alpha) \leq 1$ the summation being over all finite values of α . Since $\delta(\alpha) = 1$ there can be no other v.e. N and a fortiori E .

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 2. Since $\sum \delta(\alpha) = 1$, ρ is integer [8,92—94] Let $\rho(r)$ be a proximate order. Then

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \rho(r) = \rho, \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r\rho'(r) \log r = 0$$

$$\log M(r) \leq r^{\rho(r)} \text{ for all } r > r_0 \\ = r^{\rho(r)} \text{ for an infinity of } r.$$

Further [8,94] $N(r, f') = o(r^{\rho(r)})$.

If α and β ($\alpha \neq \beta$) be v.e. E for simple zeros then

$$N(r, \alpha) + N(r, \beta) > A(k) \log M(r/k) > Ar^{\rho(r)}$$

for an infinity of r , say $r = r_n$. Also if N_1 refers to simple zeros then

$$N_1(r, \alpha) + N_1(r, \beta) + 4N(r, f') + O(\log r) > N(r, \alpha) + N(r, \beta)$$

and so for $r = r_n$ ($n > n_0$)

$$N_1(r, \alpha) + N_1(r, \beta) > Ar^{\rho(r)}.$$

Now

$$\log M(r) > An_1(r, \alpha)\varphi_1(r), \quad \varphi_1(r) \subset E, \quad r > R_0$$

$$\log M(r) > An_1(r, \beta)\varphi_2(r), \quad \varphi_2(r) \subset E, \quad r > R_0.$$

Let $\varphi(x) = \min \{\varphi_1(x), \varphi_2(x)\}$. Then it is easily seen that $\varphi(x) \subset E$ and we have for $r > R_0$

$$\log M(r) > A\{n_1(r, \alpha) + n_1(r, \beta)\}\varphi(r).$$

Hence for $r = r_n$ ($n > N_2 > n_0$)

$$\begin{aligned} r^{\varrho(r)} &\geq \log M(r) > A\{n_1(r, \alpha) + n_1(r, \beta)\}\varphi(r) \\ &> \frac{A\varphi(r)}{\log r}\{N_1(r, \alpha) + N_1(r, \beta)\} > \frac{A\varphi(r)}{\log r}r^{\varrho(r)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have a contradiction and so the theorem is proved.

PROOF OF COROLLARY. Let α be a value exceptional E for the whole aggregate of zeros. Then $\delta(\alpha) = 1$ and so by the theorem there cannot be two values e, E for simple zeros. Since α is a fortiori a v.e. E for simple zeros, there can be no other v.e. E for simple zeros.

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 3. Suppose if possible there are three such values a, b, c ($a \neq b \neq c$). Let $P(z, a) = P_a$ denote the c.p. formed with the simple zeros of $f(z) - a$ and denote by $p_1(a)$ its genus and by $\varrho_{11}(a)$ its order. Similarly for $P(z, b)$ and $P(z, c)$. Then

$$\theta(z) = \frac{P(z, a)P(z, b)P(z, c)\{f'(z)\}^2}{\{f(z) - a\}\{f(z) - b\}\{f(z) - c\}}$$

is an entire function. [3,76].

(i) Consider first when $\varrho > 0$ is non-integer. We have

$$(7) \quad n_1(r, a) < \frac{A \log M(r, f)}{\varphi(r)} \leq \frac{Ar^{\varrho(r)}}{\varphi(r)}, \quad r > r_0.$$

We prove that

$$(8) \quad \log M(r, P_a) = o(r^{\varrho(r)}).$$

If $\varrho_{11}(a) < \varrho$ then (8) follows. Suppose therefore $\varrho_{11}(a) = \varrho$, $p_1(a) < \varrho < 1 + p_1(a)$. Writing $p_1(a) = p$ and $n_1(x, a) = n(x)$ we have

$$(9) \quad \log M(r, P_a) < A \left\{ r^p \int_0^r \frac{n(t) dt}{t^{p+1}} + r^{p+1} \int_r^\infty \frac{n(t) dt}{t^{p+2}} \right\}.$$

Now for all $x > x_0$, $p < \varrho(x) < 1 + p$ and so $x^{\varrho(x)-p}$ is increasing and $x^{\varrho(x)-p-1}$ is decreasing for $x > x_1$. Hence from (7) and (9) we obtain (8). Similarly for P_b and P_c . Let the zeros of $f - a$, $f - b$, $f - c$ be respectively

$$(a_n)_1^\infty, (b_n)_1^\infty, (c_n)_1^\infty;$$

and denote by S the set of circles

$$|z - a_n| = |a_n|^{-h}, \quad |z - b_n| = |b_n|^{-h}, \quad |z - c_n| = |c_n|^{-h};$$

$$(|a_n| \geq 1, \quad |b_n| \geq 1, \quad |c_n| \geq 1, \quad h > \varrho)$$

Then in the domain D exterior to the circles S we have [3,74] for $r > r_0$

$$\left| \frac{f'(z)}{f(z) - a} \right| \left| \frac{f'(z)}{f(z) - b} \right| < r^{2K}$$

and hence in D

$$\log M\{r, (f - c)\theta\} = o(r^{\varrho(r)}) + O(\log r) = o(r^{\varrho(r)}).$$

Similarly for $(f - b)\theta$ and hence in D

$$\log M(r, \theta) = o(r^{\varrho(r)}).$$

Now

$$\log M(r, f - c) > Ar^{\varrho(r)}$$

for a sequence of values of $r = r_n \rightarrow \infty$. Let $k > 1$ be a fixed positive constant and let $r_n \leq r \leq kr_n$. Then for $n > n_0$

$$\log M(r, f - c) \geq \log M(r_n, f - c) > A_1 r_n^{\varrho(r_n)} > Ar^{\varrho(r)}.$$

Further

$$\begin{aligned} \log M(r, f - c) &\leq AT(2r, f - c) \\ &\leq A \left[T\{2r, (f - c)\theta\} + T \left\{ 2r, \frac{1}{\theta} \right\} \right] \\ &\leq A [\log M\{2r, (f - c)\theta\} + \log M(2r, \theta) + O(1)] \\ &< \epsilon r^{\varrho(r)} \end{aligned}$$

for all $r > R_1$, such that $2r \subset D$. Let $r_n > R_1$, $n > n_0$. Since we can always draw a circle $|z| = r$ in the annulus $r_n \leq |z| \leq kr_n$ such that $2r \subset D$, we have for a sequence of values of $r \rightarrow \infty$,

$$Ar^{\varrho(r)} < \log M(r, f - c) < \epsilon r^{\varrho(r)}$$

which leads to a contradiction and so the theorem is proved.

(ii) ϱ integer. We prove first that

$$(10) \quad \log M(r, P_a) = o(r^{\varrho} L(r)).$$

We have

$$n_1(r, a) = n(r) \text{ (say) } < \frac{Ar^{\varrho} L(r)}{\varphi(r)}.$$

It is known that [10] $r^c L(r) \rightarrow \infty, r^{-c} L(r) \rightarrow 0$, for every constant $c > 0$, as $r \rightarrow \infty$. Further

$$\int_1^r L(t)dt \sim rL(r), \quad \int_r^\infty \gamma^{-2}L(t)dt \sim r^{-1}L(r).$$

If $\varrho_{11}(a) < \varrho$ then (10) is obvious. Suppose therefore

$$\varrho_{11}(a) = \varrho, \quad p_1(a) = p \text{ (say)} = \varrho - 1 \text{ or } \varrho.$$

(a) Consider first when $p = \varrho - 1$ and $L(r) \downarrow$. We divide the interval of integration $(0, r)$ of the first integral on the right hand side of (9) in the intervals $(0, \sqrt{r}), (\sqrt{r}, r)$. Then each of these three integrals is $o(r^\varrho L(r))$.

(b) $p = \varrho - 1, L(r) \uparrow$.

Here $\log M(r, P_a) = o(r^\varrho) = o(r^\varrho L(r))$

(c) $p = \varrho, L(r) \uparrow$. We choose $\lambda = \lambda(r), (0 < \lambda < r)$ tending to infinity with r so slowly that $L(\lambda(r)) = o(L(r))$ and divide the interval of integration $(0, r)$ in the intervals $(0, \lambda), (\lambda, r)$. Then each of these three integrals is $o(r^\varrho L(r))$.

(d) $p = \varrho, L(r) \uparrow$ or \downarrow . This alternative is not possible since it would make the integral $\int_1^\infty \{n(x/x^{p+1})\}dx$ convergent.

Hence in all cases (10) holds and the rest of the argument is similar to that given in (i).

(iii) $\varrho = 0$. The proof is similar to that given in (i). The proof of Theorem 4 is similar to that of Theorem 3.

7. Example. Let $G(z)$ be any entire function of order $\varrho > 1$ and lower order $\lambda < 1$ and let

$$f(z) = \{G(z)\}^2 P(z)$$

where $P(z)$ is c.p. defined in (3). Then it is easily seen that 0 is a v.e. B for the simple zeros of $f(z)$. But

$$n_1(r, 0) \sim r/\log^2 r$$

$$\log M(r, f) \leq 2 \log M(r, G) + \log M(r, P).$$

Hence for a sequence of values of r tending to infinity we have

$$\log M(r, f) < Ar/\log r,$$

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log M(r, f)}{n_1(r, 0)\varphi(r)} = 0.$$

Hence 0 is not a v.e. E for simple zeros of $f(z)$.

8. PROOF OF THEOREM 5. (i) From (4) we have

$$|f(z) - \alpha| = r^n e^{RQ(z, \alpha)} |P(z, \alpha)|$$

Let $Q(z, \alpha) = az^\varrho + Q_1(z)$; $a = Te^{i\beta}$, $Q_1(z)$ a polynomial of degree $\leq \varrho - 1$. Then

$$\log |f(z) - \alpha| = Tr^\varrho \cos(\varrho\theta + \beta) + RQ_1(z) + \log |P(z, \alpha)|$$

Let $0 < \delta < \pi/10$ and θ_0 be such that

$$\frac{\pi}{2} + \delta \leq \varrho\theta_0 + \beta + 2k\pi \leq \pi + \frac{\pi}{2} - \delta$$

(k integer or zero); and let $0 < \epsilon < -(T/4) \cos(\varrho\theta_0 + \beta)$, $z = re^{i\theta_0}$. Choose r_0 so large that for all $r > r_0$ and all θ

$$RQ_1(z) < \epsilon r^\varrho, \quad n \log r < \epsilon r^\varrho, \quad \log |P(z, \alpha)| < \epsilon r^\varrho.$$

Then for $z = re^{i\theta_0}$, $r > r_0$.

$$\log |f(z) - \alpha| < r^\varrho \{T \cos(\varrho\theta_0 + \beta) + 3\epsilon\} \rightarrow -\infty \text{ as } r \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence $f(z) \rightarrow \alpha$ as $z = re^{i\theta_0} \rightarrow \infty$; that is α is an asymptotic value.

To show that the converse is not true, we consider [2,160—161]

$$f(z) = \int_0^z e^{-t^\varrho} dt \quad \varrho \text{ integer, } 2 \leq \varrho < \infty.$$

Let

$$a_\mu = \exp\left(\frac{2\mu\pi i}{\varrho}\right) \int_0^\infty e^{-r^\varrho} dr, \quad \mu = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \varrho - 1.$$

Then for $a = a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{\varrho-1}$.

$$T(r) \sim \frac{r^\varrho}{\pi}; \quad n(r, a) > \frac{A_1 r^\varrho}{\log r}; \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log M(r)}{n(r, a)\varphi(r)} = 0.$$

Hence each of these numbers $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{\varrho-1}$ is an asymptotic value but not a value exceptional E .

(ii) We may suppose that the new ‘origin’ A is on the real positive axis at a distance h from 0. Then since

$$\log M(r) \sim Tr^\varrho \quad (0 < T < \infty)$$

$$M(r - h) \leq M_A(r) \leq M(r + h)$$

it follows that $\log M_A(r)$ lies between $A_1 r^\varrho$ and $A_2 r^\varrho$ for all

$r > r_0(h)$. Further

$$\begin{aligned} n(r-h, \alpha) &\leq n_A(r, \alpha) \leq n(r+h, \alpha) \\ n(r+h, \alpha)\varphi(r+h) &< A_3 r^{\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$n_A(r, \alpha)\varphi(r) \leq n(r+h, \alpha)\varphi(r+h) < A_3 r^{\rho} < A_4 \log M_A(r).$$

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log M_A(r)}{n_A(r, \alpha)\varphi(r)} > 0.$$

We omit the proofs of Theorems 6 and 7 which can be proved by following the argument given by Whittaker [6, 61—62; 84—87].

9. Meromorphic Functions. Let $F(z)$ be a meromorphic function of finite order ρ . We define a number α ($0 \leq |\alpha| \leq \infty$) to be an e.v. E for $F(z)$ if

$$(11) \quad \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(r)}{\{n(r, \alpha)\varphi(r)\}} > 0$$

for some $\varphi \subset E$. It is easily seen that the two definitions of values e. E for entire functions are equivalent. Obviously ∞ is a v.e. E for entire functions according to (1) or (11). We can also prove that if α is a v.e. E for a meromorphic function $F(z)$ then it is a v.e. N , with deficiency $\delta(\alpha) = 1$ and $\Delta(\alpha) = 1$. To see that the converse is not true we consider the meromorphic function [1, 91—93]

$$f_{\lambda}(z) = \sum_{\nu=0}^{2\lambda-1} \eta^{\nu} f(\eta^{\nu} z)$$

where $\lambda > 1$ is an odd integer, $\eta = \exp.(\pi i/\lambda)$ and $f(z) = e^z/(e^z - 1)$. This function $f_{\lambda}(z)$ is a meromorphic function of order 1 and has 2λ values e. N ; $\eta^{\nu}\alpha$ ($\nu = 0, 1, 2, \dots, 2\lambda - 1$) each with deficiency $\frac{1}{\lambda} \left(1 - \cos \frac{\pi}{2\lambda}\right) < 1$.

Hence none of these 2λ values can be a v.e. E .

We note also that if α be a v.e. B for a meromorphic function $F(z)$ then it may not be a v.e. E . In fact Valiron has shown that [13] a value α e. B may have deficiency $\delta(\alpha) = 0$.

THEOREM 8. *If $F(z)$ is a meromorphic function of finite order ρ , then there cannot be more than two values e. E for $F(z)$ and if $F(z)$ has two values e. E then ρ is necessarily an integer and $T(r, F)/r^{\rho}$ tends to a finite non-zero limit as r tends to infinity.*

PROOF. If α be a v.e. E then $\delta(\alpha) = 1$. Since $\Sigma \delta(\alpha) \leq 2$ there cannot be more than two values e. E . Suppose then α, β ($\alpha \neq \beta$,

$0 \leq |\alpha| \leq \infty, 0 \leq |\beta| \leq \infty$) be two values e. *E*. Then for all $r > r_0$

$$T(r) > \delta\{n(r, \alpha) + n(r, \beta)\}\varphi(r) > \delta_1\{N(r, \alpha) + N(r, \beta)\} \frac{\varphi(r)}{\log r},$$

$$\frac{N(r, \alpha) + N(r, \beta)}{T(r)} < \frac{\log r}{\delta_1\varphi(r)}.$$

But if $\varrho > 0$ is non-integer then [1,51—54]

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(r, \alpha) + N(r, \beta)}{T(r)} > 0$$

and if $\varrho = 0$ then [11,67—69]

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(r, \alpha) + N(r, \beta)}{T(r)} \geq 1.$$

Hence ϱ must be integer. Further since

$$T\left(r, \frac{AF + B}{CF + D}\right) = T(r) + O(1),$$

we may suppose that 0 and ∞ are values e.*E*. Write

$$F(z) = z^k e^{Q(z)} P_1(z) / P_2(z)$$

where P_1 is c.p. of genus p_1 (say) formed with zeros a_n ($|a_n| > 0$) of $F(z)$ and P_2 is c.p. of genus p_2 (say) formed with poles b_n ($|b_n| > 0$) of $F(z)$. $Q(z)$ is a polynomial of degree q (say). We know that [4 (ii) 188]

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(r, F)}{\{n(r, 0) + n(r, \infty)\}\varphi(r)} = 0$$

for every $\varphi \in E$, except when $q > \max(p_1, p_2)$. Hence $q = \varrho, p_1 < \varrho, p_2 < \varrho$. So

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(r, P_a)}{r^\varrho} \leq \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{lg} M(r, P_a)}{r^\varrho} = 0; \quad a = 1, 2.$$

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(r, F)}{r^\varrho} = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(r, e^{Q(z)})}{r^\varrho}.$$

Now $T(r) \sim \text{Max}_a N(r, a)$. Hence if $Q(z) = bz^\varrho + \dots$

then

$$T(r, e^{Q(z)}) \sim \frac{r^\varrho |b|}{\pi}; \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(r, F)}{r^\varrho} = \frac{|b|}{\pi}$$

and the theorem is proved.

REFERENCES

R. NEVANLINNA

[1] *Le Théorème de Picard-Borel et la Théorie des fonctions Méromorphes* (Paris 1929).

[2] *Eindeutige Analytische Funktionen* (Berlin 1936).

G. VALIRON

[3] *Lectures on the General Theory of Integral Functions* (Toulouse 1923).

S. M. SHAH

[4] (i) *J. London Math. Soc.* 15 (1940), 23—31.

(ii) *J. Indian Math. Soc.* 5 (1942), 179—188.

E. C. TITCHMARSH

[5] *Theory of Functions* (Oxford, 1939).

J. M. WHITTAKER

[6] *Interpolatory Function Theory* (Cambridge, 1935).

A. PFLUGER and G. POLYA

[7] *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.*, 31 (1935) 153—155.

A. PFLUGER

[8] *Comment Math. Helv.* 19 (1946—47), 91—104.

E. F. COLLINGWOOD

[9] *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 66 (1949) 308—346

G. H. HARDY and W. W. ROGOSINKI

[10] *Quart.-J. of Maths.* (Oxford series) 16 (1945), 49—58.

S. M. SHAH

[11] *Math. Student*, 12 (1944), 67—70.

D. DUGUE

[12] *Comptes Rendus, Acad. Sc. Paris*, 225 (1947), 555—556.

G. VALIRON

[13] *Ibid*, 556—558.

M. LAURENT SCHWARTZ

[14] *Ibid*, 212 (1941), 382—384.

S. S. MACINTYRE

[15] *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.*, 31 (1935), 543—554.

Muslim University Aligarh (India) and Cambridge (England).

(Oblatum 12-4-51).