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## 1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to prove the following theorem.
Theorem 1.1 (Main Theorem). Let $x: M \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{m}$ be a minimal surface immersed in $\mathbf{R}^{m}$. Suppose that its generalized Gauss map $g$ omits more than $\frac{m(m+1)}{2}$ hyperplanes in $\mathbf{P}^{m-1}(\mathbf{C})$, located in general position. Then there exists a constant $C$, depending on the set of omitted hyperplanes, but not the surface, such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
|K(p)|^{1 / 2} d(p) \leq C, \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $K(p)$ is the Gauss curvature of the surface at $p$, and $d(p)$ is the geodesic distance from $p$ to the boundary of $M$.

This theorem provides a considerable sharpening of an earlier result of the same type:

Theorem 1.2 (Osserman [12]). An inequality of the form (1) holds for all minimal surfaces in $\mathbf{R}^{m}$ whose Gauss map omits a neighborhood of some hyperplane in $\mathbf{P}^{m-1}(\mathbf{C})$.

Also, Theorem 1.1 implies the earlier result:

[^0]Theorem $1.3(\mathrm{Ru}[15])$. Let $x: M \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{m}$ be a complete minimal surface immersed in $\mathbf{R}^{m}$. Suppose that its generalized Gauss map $g$ omits more than $\frac{m(m+1)}{2}$ hyperplanes in $\mathbf{P}^{m-1}(\mathbf{C})$, located in general position. Then $g$ is constant and the minimal surface must be a plane.

In fact, given any point $p$ on a complete surface satisfying the hypotheses, inequality (1) must hold with $d(p)$ arbitrarily large, so that $K(p)=0$. But a minimal surface in $\mathbf{R}^{m}$ with $K \equiv 0$ must lie on a plane (see $[10]$ ) and hence its Gauss map $g$ is constant.

Theorem 1.3 had been proved earlier by Fujimoto [5] in the case where the Gauss map $g$ was assumed nondegenerate. Fujimoto (see [7]) also showed that the number $m(m+1) / 2$ was optimal in that for every odd dimension $m$, there exist complete minimal surfaces whose Gauss map omits $m(m+1) / 2$ hyperplanes in general position. It follows that Theorem 1.1 is also an optimal result of its type, since with any smaller number of omitted hyperplanes, a universal inequality of the form (1) cannot be valid, at least in odd dimensions.

When $m=3$, we may consider the classical Gauss map into the unit sphere. Fujimoto [4] showed that an inequality of type (1) holds whenever the Gauss map omits 5 given points. Later [6] he obtained an expression for $C$ that makes more explicit its dependence on the given points. Ros [14] gave a different proof which does not yield an explicit value for the constant $C$, but allows the extension to higher dimension that we give here.

## 2. Some theorems and lemmas

In this section, we recall some results which will be used later.
We first recall the following construction theorem of minimal surfaces.

Theorem 2.1 (see [3]). Let $M$ be an open Riemann surface and let $\omega_{1}, \omega_{2}, \ldots, \omega_{m}$ be holomorphic forms on $M$ having no common zero and no real periods, and locally satisfying the identity

$$
f_{1}^{2}+f_{2}^{2}+\cdots+f_{m}^{2}=0
$$

for holomorphic functions $f_{i}$ with $\omega_{i}=f_{i} d z$. Set

$$
x_{i}=2 \operatorname{Re} \int_{z_{0}}^{z} \omega_{i},
$$

for an arbitrary fixed point $z_{0}$ of $M$. Then the surface $x=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}\right)$ : $M \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{m}$ is a minimal surface immersed in $\mathbf{R}^{m}$ such that the Gauss map is the map $g=\left[\omega_{1}: \cdots: \omega_{m}\right]: M \rightarrow Q_{m-2}(\mathbf{C})$ and the induced metric is given by

$$
d s^{2}=2\left(\left|\omega_{1}\right|^{2}+\cdots+\left|\omega_{m}\right|^{2}\right)
$$

The following is the general version of Hurwitz's theorem:
Theorem 2.2 (Hurwitz's theorem). Let $f_{j}: M \rightarrow N$ be a sequence of holomorphic maps between two connected complex manifolds converging uniformly on every compact subset of $M$ to a holomorphic map $f$. If the image of each map $f_{j}$ misses a divisor $D$ of $N$, then either the image of $f$ misses $D$ or it lies entirely in $D$.

Proof. Assume first that $D=\{z \mid g(z)=0\}$ for some holomorphic function $g$. Then $g \circ f_{j}$ is a sequence of holomorphic functions converging to the holomorphic function $g \circ f$. Since $g \circ f_{j}$ is non-vanishing, by the classical Hurwitz theorem the limit function is either identically zero or non-vanishing. In other words the image of $f$ either lies entirely in $D$ or misses $D$ completely.

In the general case, if $f$ does not miss $D$ entirely, then there exist a point $q$ in $D$ and a point $p$ in $M$ such that $f(p)=q$. There exist a neighborhood $U$ of $q$ and a holomorphic function $g$ on $U$ so that $D \cap U=\{z \mid g(z)=0\}$. Applying the previous argument to the restriction of the sequence of maps to the open set $V=f^{-1}(U)$ in $U$, we conclude that $f(V)$ is contained in $D \cap U$. Since $M$ is connected, the principle of analytic continuation implies that the image $f(M)$ is contained in $D$.
q.e.d.

Lemma 2.1. Let $D_{r}$ be the disk of radius $r, 0<r<1$, and let $R$ be the hyperbolic radius of $D_{r}$ in the unit disc. Let

$$
d s^{2}=\lambda(z)^{2}|d z|^{2}
$$

be any conformal metric on $D_{r}$ with the property that the geodesic distance from $z=0$ to $|z|=r$ is greater than or equal to $R$. If the Gauss curvature $K$ of the metric ds ${ }^{2}$ satisfies

$$
-1 \leq K \leq 0
$$

then the distance of any point to the origin in the metric $d s^{2}$ is greater than or equal to the hyperbolic distance.

Remark 2.1. The hyperbolic metric in the unit disk is given by

$$
d \hat{s}^{2}=\hat{\lambda}(z)^{2}|d z|^{2}, \quad \hat{\lambda}(z)=\frac{2}{1-|z|^{2}},
$$

and has curvature $\hat{K} \equiv-1$. The relation between the quantities $R$ and $r$ is therefore given by

$$
R=\int_{0}^{r} \hat{\lambda}(z)|d z|=\int_{0}^{r} \frac{2}{1-t^{2}} d t=\log \frac{1+r}{1-r},
$$

and the conclusion of Lemma 2.1 is that

$$
\rho(z) \geq \hat{\rho}(z)=\log \frac{1+|z|}{1-|z|},
$$

where $\rho$ and $\hat{\rho}$ represent the distances from the point $z$ to the origin in the metric $d s^{2}$ and the hyperbolic metric, respectively.

Remark 2.2. Lemma 2.1 and its proof are basically geometric reformulations of Lemma 6 of Ros[14]. The lemma may be viewed as a kind of dual to the Ahlfors form of the Schwarz-Pick lemma [1].

Proof of Lemma 2.1. Note first that in the relation above between $R$ and $r$, we have

$$
\frac{d R}{d r}=\frac{2}{1-r^{2}}>0
$$

and we may solve for $r$ in terms of $R$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
r=\frac{e^{R}-1}{e^{R}+1}, \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

or in general

$$
\begin{equation*}
|z|=\frac{e^{\hat{\rho}(z)}-1}{e^{\hat{\rho}(z)}+1}, \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the right-hand side is monotone increasing in $\hat{\rho}(z)$. We may apply a comparison theorem of Greene and Wu ([9, Prop. 2.1, p.26]) to the two metrics, $d s^{2}$ and the hyperbolic metric $d \hat{s}^{2}$, on the disk $|z| \leq r$. The comparison theorem states that for any smooth monotone increasing function $f$, one has

$$
\triangle(f \circ \rho) \leq \hat{\triangle}(f \circ \hat{\rho}),
$$

where $\rho$ and $\hat{\rho}$ are the distances to the origin in the metrics $d s^{2}$ and $d \hat{s}^{2}$ respectively, $\triangle$ and $\hat{\Delta}$ are the Laplacians with respect to the two metrics, and the two sides are evaluated at points of the same level sets of the two metrics, i.e., $\rho=c$ on the left and $\hat{\rho}=c$ on the right, provided in two dimensions that the Gauss curvatures $K$ and $\hat{K}$ satisfy $0 \geq K \geq \hat{K}$, with a similar condition on Ricci curvature in higher dimension. In our case we have $0 \geq K \geq-1=\hat{K}$, and so we may apply the theorem. We note that the function

$$
\log |z|=\log \frac{e^{\hat{\rho}(z)}-1}{e^{\hat{\rho}(z)}+1}
$$

is harmonic with respect to $z$ and is therefore also harmonic with respect to any conformal metric on $0<|z|<1$. In other words, if we set

$$
f(t)=\log \frac{e^{t}-1}{e^{t}+1}
$$

we have

$$
\hat{\triangle}(f \circ \hat{\rho}) \equiv 0
$$

for $0<|z|<1$. Since $f$ is monotone increasing, we may apply the Greene-Wu comparison theorem to conclude that

$$
\triangle(f \circ \rho) \leq 0
$$

for $0<|z|<r$, i.e., $f \circ \rho$ is superharmonic. For $z$ near 0 , we have $\rho(z) \sim \lambda(0)|z|$, and we may apply the minimum principle to the function

$$
f \circ \rho-\log |z|=\log \frac{1}{|z|} \frac{e^{\rho(z)}-1}{e^{\rho(z)}+1},
$$

which is superharmonic in $0<|z|<r$ and bounded near the origin, to conclude that it takes on its minimum on the boundary $|z|=r$. But since $\rho(z) \geq R$ on $|z|=r$, we have for $|z|<r$ that

$$
\log \frac{1}{|z|} \frac{e^{\rho(z)}-1}{e^{\rho(z)}+1} \geq \log \frac{1}{r} \frac{e^{R}-1}{e^{R}+1}=0,
$$

by (2). Hence

$$
\frac{e^{\rho(z)}-1}{e^{\rho(z)}+1} \geq|z|=\frac{e^{\hat{\rho}(z)}-1}{e^{\hat{\rho}(z)}+1},
$$

by (3), which implies $\rho(z) \geq \hat{\rho}(z)$, proving the lemma. q.e.d.
As an application of Lemma 2.1, we have the following lemma:

Lemma 2.2. Let $d s_{n}^{2}$ be a sequence of conformal metrics on the unit disk $D$ whose curvatures satisfy $-1 \leq K_{n} \leq 0$. Suppose that $D$ is a geodesic disk of radius $R_{n}$ with respect to the metric ds ${ }_{n}^{2}$, where $R_{n} \rightarrow \infty$, and that the metrics $d s_{n}^{2}$ converge, uniformly on compact sets, to a metric $d s^{2}$. Then all distances to the origin with respect to $d s^{2}$ are greater than or equal to the corresponding hyperbolic distances in $D$. In particular, $d s^{2}$ is complete.

Proof. For any point $z$ in $D$, let $\rho_{n}(z)$ be the distance from 0 to $z$ in the metric $d s_{n}^{2}$, and let $\rho(z)$ be the distance in the limit metric $d s^{2}$. Let $|z|=r_{n}$ be the circle in $D$ of hyperbolic radius $R_{n}$. Explicitly, by Remark 2.1 above,

$$
R_{n}=\log \frac{1+r_{n}}{1-r_{n}}
$$

If we make the change of parameter $w=r_{n} z$, we may apply Lemma 2.1 to the induced metric in $|w|<r_{n}$ and conclude that

$$
\rho_{n}(z) \geq \log \frac{1+|w|}{1-|w|}=\log \frac{1+r_{n}|z|}{1-r_{n}|z|}
$$

As $n \rightarrow \infty$ we have $R_{n} \rightarrow \infty$ and $r_{n} \rightarrow 1$. Hence, by uniform convergence on compact sets, we have

$$
\rho(z)=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{n}(z) \geq \lim _{r_{n} \rightarrow 1} \log \frac{1+r_{n}|z|}{1-r_{n}|z|}=\log \frac{1+|z|}{1-|z|}
$$

which proves the lemma. q.e.d.
Note. Although we shall not make use of it, we remark that Lemma 2.1 also implies another dual form of the Ahlfors-Schwarz-Pick lemma, closer in form to the original:

Lemma 2.3. Let $S$ be a simply-connected surface with a complete metric ds ${ }^{2}$ whose Gauss curvature satisfies $-1 \leq K \leq 0$. If $S$ is mapped conformally onto the unit disc, then the distance between any two points of $S$ is greater than or equal to the hyperbolic distance between the corresponding points in the disk.

Proof. Given two points $p, q$ of $S$, we may map $p$ onto the origin, and let $z$ be the image of the point $q$. Then the distance between $p$ and $q$ on $S$ is given by $\rho(z)$ in terms of the pull-back of the metric on $S$ onto the disk. For any $r$ such that $|z|<r<1$, let $\hat{\rho}(z)$ be the hyperbolic distance from 0 to $z$, and let $\rho_{r}(w)$ be the pullback of the metric on $S$
to $|w|<r$ under the map $z=w / r$. Then, since $S$ is complete, we may apply Lemma 2.1 to conclude that

$$
\hat{\rho}(z) \leq \rho_{r}(w)=\rho_{r}(r z) .
$$

But as $r \rightarrow 1, \rho_{r}(r z) \rightarrow \rho(z)$, which proves the lemma. q.e.d.
Note that Lemma 2.3 combined with the standard Ahlfors-SchwarzPick lemma implies a generalization of Ahlfors' lemma due to Yau ([17]; see also Troyanov [16]): Let $S_{1}$ be a simply-connected Riemann surface with a complete metric $d s^{2}$ whose Gauss curvature satisfies $-1 \leq K \leq 0$, and let $S_{2}$ be a Riemann surface with Gauss curvature bounded above by -1 . Let $f: S_{1} \rightarrow S_{2}$ be a holomorphic map. Then $f$ is distance decreasing.

We also need the following more precise version of Theorem 1.3; the proof follows exactly as in [15].

Theorem 2.3 (cf. Ru [15]). Let $x: M \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{m}$ be a complete minimal surface immersed in $\mathbf{R}^{m}$. Suppose that its generalized Gauss map $g$ omits the hyperplanes $H_{1}, \ldots, H_{q}$ in $\mathbf{P}^{m-1}(\mathbf{C})$ and $g(M)$ is contained in some $\mathbf{P}(V)$, where $V$ is a subspace of $\mathbf{C}^{m}$ of dimension $k$. Assume that $H_{1} \cap \mathbf{P}(V), \ldots, H_{q} \cap \mathbf{P}(V)$ are in general position in $\mathbf{P}(V)$ and $q>k(k+1) / 2$. Then $g$ must be constant.

The following theorem due to M . Green (see [8]) shows that the complement of $2 m+1$ hyperplanes in general position in $\mathbf{P}^{m}(\mathbf{C})$ is complete Kobayashi hyperbolic.

Theorem 2.4. Let $H_{1}, \ldots, H_{q}$ be hyperplanes in $\mathbf{P}^{m}(\mathbf{C})$, located in general position. If $q \geq 2 m+1$, then $X=\mathbf{P}^{m}(\mathbf{C})-\cup_{j=1}^{q} H_{j}$ is complete hyperbolic and hyperbolically imbedded in $\mathbf{P}^{m}(\mathbf{C})$. Hence, if $D \subset \mathbf{C}$ is the unit disc, and $\Phi$ is a subset of $\operatorname{Hol}(D, X)$, then $\Phi$ is relatively locally compact in $\operatorname{Hol}\left(D, \mathbf{P}^{m}(\mathbf{C})\right)$, i.e., given a sequence $\left\{f_{n}\right\}$ in $\Phi$ there exists a subsequence which converges uniformly on every compact subset of $D$ to an element of $\operatorname{Hol}\left(D, \mathbf{P}^{m}(\mathbf{C})\right)$.

For the notions of "complete Kobayashi hyperbolicity" and "hyperbolically imbedded in $\mathbf{P}^{m}(\mathbf{C})$ ", see Lang [11].

Before going to the next section, we recall here a standard definition.
Definition 2.1. Let $f: M \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^{n}(\mathbf{C})$ be a holomorphic map. Let $p \in M$. A local reduced representation of $f$ around $p$ is a holomorphic map $\tilde{f}: U \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^{n+1}-\{\mathbf{0}\}$, such that $\mathbf{P}(\tilde{f})=f$, where $U$ is
a neighborhood of $p$, and $\mathbf{P}$ is the projection map of $\mathbf{C}^{n+1}-\{0\}$ onto $\mathbf{P}^{n}(\mathbf{C})$.

## 3. Proof of the Main Theorem

Let $x: M \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{m}$ be a minimal surface, where $M$ is a connected, oriented, real-dimension 2 manifold without boundary, and

$$
x=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}\right)
$$

is an immersion. Then $M$ is a Riemann surface in the induced structure defined by local isothermal coordinates $(u, v)$. The generalized Gauss map of the minimal surface,

$$
g=\left[\frac{\partial x_{1}}{\partial z}: \cdots: \frac{\partial x_{m}}{\partial z}\right]: M \rightarrow Q_{m-2}(\mathbf{C}) \subset \mathbf{P}^{m-1}(\mathbf{C})
$$

is a holomorphic map, where $z=u+i v$. The metric $d s^{2}$ on $M$, induced from the standard metric in $\mathbf{R}^{m}$, is $d s^{2}=\sum_{j=1}^{m}\left|\frac{\partial x_{j}}{\partial z}\right|^{2} d z d \bar{z}$, and the Gauss curvature $K$ is given by ([10, p.37])

$$
\begin{equation*}
K=-4 \frac{\left|\tilde{g} \wedge \tilde{g}^{\prime}\right|^{2}}{|\tilde{g}|^{6}}=-4 \frac{\sum_{j<k}\left|g_{j} g_{k}^{\prime}-g_{k} g_{j}^{\prime}\right|^{2}}{\left(\sum_{j=1}^{m}\left|g_{j}\right|^{2}\right)^{3}} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\tilde{g}=\left(g_{1}, \ldots, g_{m}\right), g_{j}=\frac{\partial x_{j}}{\partial z}, 1 \leq j \leq m$.
We will need the following lemma:
Lemma 3.1. Let $M$ be a Riemann surface. Let $f_{n}: M \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^{m}(\mathbf{C})$ be a sequence of holomorphic maps converging uniformly on every compact subset of $M$ to a holomorphic map $f: M \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^{m}(\mathbf{C})$. Given $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{P}^{m}\left(\mathbf{C}^{*}\right)$, let $f_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}}$ be the meromorphic function (called coordinate function) defined by

$$
\left.f_{\mathrm{a}, \mathbf{b}}\right|_{U}=\frac{\alpha(\tilde{f})}{\beta(\tilde{f})}
$$

where $\tilde{f}$ is a reduced representation of $f$ on $U$, and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbf{C}^{m+1^{*}}$ such that $\mathbf{a}=\mathbf{P}(\alpha), \mathbf{b}=\mathbf{P}(\beta)$. Assume that $\beta(\tilde{f}) \not \equiv 0$ on some $U$ (i.e., the image of $f$ is not contained in the hyperplane defined by $\mathbf{b}$ ). Let $p \in M$ be such that $\beta(\tilde{f})(p) \neq 0$, and $U_{p}$ be a neighborhood of $p$ such that $\beta(\tilde{f})(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in U_{p}$; then $\left\{f_{n_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}}}\right\}$ converges uniformly on $U_{p}$ to the meromorphic function $f_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}}$.

Proof. Since the image of $f$ is not contained in the hyperplane defined by $\mathbf{b}$, the image of $f_{n}$ is also not contained in the hyperplane defined by b for $n$ large enough. Since $\frac{\mathbf{a}(\mathrm{x})}{\mathbf{b ( x )}}$ is a rational function on $\mathbf{P}^{m}(\mathbf{C})$ and $f_{n}$ converges uniformly on every compact subset of $M$ to $f$, the composition functions also converge compactly. This concludes the proof. q.e.d.

Lemma 3.2. Let $x^{(n)}=\left(x_{1}^{(n)}, \ldots, x_{m}^{(n)}\right): M \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{m}$ be a sequence of minimal immersions, and $g^{(n)}: M \rightarrow Q_{m-2}(\mathbf{C}) \subset \mathbf{P}^{m-1}(\mathbf{C})$ the sequence of their (generalized) Gauss maps. Suppose that $\left\{g^{(n)}\right\}$ converges uniformly on every compact subset of $M$ to a non-constant holomorphic map $g: M \rightarrow Q_{m-2}(\mathbf{C}) \subset \mathbf{P}^{m-1}(\mathbf{C})$ and that there is some $p_{0} \in M$ such that for each $j, 1 \leq j \leq m,\left\{x_{j}^{(n)}\left(p_{0}\right)\right\}$ converges. Assume also that $\left\{\left|K_{n}\right|\right\}$ is uniformly bounded, where $K_{n}$ is the Gauss curvalure of the minimal surface $x^{(n)}$. Then
(i) either a subsequence $\left\{K_{n^{\prime}}\right\}$ of $\left\{K_{n}\right\}$ converges to zero or
(ii) a subsequence $\left\{x^{\left(n^{\prime}\right)}\right\}$ of $\left\{x^{(n)}\right\}$ converges to a minimal immersion, $x: M \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{m}$, whose Gauss map is $g$.

Proof. By assumption, $g$ is not constant and we may assume that $\left|K_{n}\right| \leq 1$ in $M$, for each $n \in \mathbf{N}$. For every point $p \in M$ let $\left(U_{p}, z\right)$ be a complex local coordinate centered at $p$. Let $\tilde{g}^{(n)}=\left(g_{1}^{(n)}, \ldots, g_{m}^{(n)}\right)$ where $g_{i}^{(n)}=\frac{\partial x_{i}^{(n)}}{\partial z}, 1 \leq i \leq m$, and let $\tilde{g}=\left(g_{1}, \ldots, g_{m}\right)$ be a local reduced representation of $g$ on $U_{p}$. Since some $g_{i}(z)$ is non-zero for each $z$, we know that $g(M)$ is not contained in some coordinate hyperplane. Without loss of generality, we assume that $g(M)$ is not contained in the first coordinate hyperplane $H_{1}=\left\{\left[y_{1}: \cdots: y_{m}\right] \in \mathbf{P}^{m-1}(\mathbf{C}) \mid y_{1}=0\right\}$. Let

$$
M_{1}=\left\{p \in M \mid g(p) \notin H_{1}, \tilde{g}(p) \wedge \tilde{g}^{\prime}(p) \neq 0\right\} .
$$

Note that $M-M_{1}$ is a discrete set: namely, it consists of the zeros of $g_{1}$ (which are isolated, since $g(M) \not \subset H_{1}$, which is equivalent to $g_{1} \not \equiv 0$ ) together with the common zeros of the components of $\tilde{g} \wedge \tilde{g}^{\prime}$, which are the holomorphic functions $g_{j} g_{k}^{\prime}-g_{k} g_{j}^{\prime}$. In particular,

$$
g_{1} g_{k}^{\prime}-g_{k} g_{1}^{\prime}=g_{1}^{2}\left(\frac{g_{k}}{g_{1}}\right)^{\prime}
$$

so that $\tilde{g} \wedge \tilde{g}^{\prime} \equiv 0$ implies that $g_{k} / g_{1}=c_{k}$, a constant for each $k$, so that $\tilde{g}=g_{1}\left(1, c_{2}, \ldots, c_{m}\right)$ and the map $g$ would be constant, contrary
to assumption. Thus, the zeros of $\tilde{g} \wedge \tilde{g}^{\prime}$ are isolated and the points of $M-M_{1}$ are also isolated.

Let $p \in M_{1}$. Since $g(p) \notin H_{1}$, there is a neighborhood $U_{p}$ of $p$ such that $g(z) \notin H_{1}$, and $g^{(n)}(z) \notin H_{1}$ for $n$ large enough and every $z \in U_{p}$. Choosing $U_{p}$ sufficiently small, we have that $g_{2} / g_{1}, \ldots, g_{n} / g_{1}$ are holomorphic and

$$
4 \frac{\left|\tilde{g} \wedge \tilde{g}^{\prime}\right|^{2} /\left|g_{1}\right|^{4}}{\left(1+\sum_{j=2}^{m}\left|g_{j} / g_{1}\right|^{2}\right)^{3}}=4 \frac{\sum_{j<k}\left|\frac{g_{j}}{g_{1}}\left(\frac{g_{k}}{g_{1}}\right)^{\prime}-\frac{g_{k}}{g_{1}}\left(\frac{g_{j}}{g_{1}}\right)^{\prime}\right|^{2}}{\left(1+\sum_{j=2}^{m}\left|g_{j} / g_{1}\right|^{2}\right)^{3}} \geq 2 c_{1},
$$

in $U_{p}$, where $c_{1}$ is some positive constant. Since $g^{(n)} \rightarrow g$ uniformly, by Lemma 3.1, $\left\{g_{j}^{(n)} / g_{1}^{(n)}\right\}$ converges uniformly to $g_{j} / g_{1}$ on $U_{p}, 1 \leq j \leq m$. So we have
in $U_{p}$, and by (4),

$$
\frac{c_{1}}{\left|g_{1}^{(n)}\right|^{2}} \leq 4 \frac{\sum_{l<k}\left|\frac{g_{l}^{(n)}}{g_{1}^{(n)}}\left(\frac{g_{k}^{(n)}}{g_{1}^{(n)}}\right)^{\prime}-\frac{g_{k}^{(n)}}{g_{1}^{(n)}}\left(\frac{g_{l}^{(n)}}{g_{1}^{(n)}}\right)^{\prime}\right|^{2}}{\left|g_{1}^{(n)}\right|^{2}\left(1+\sum_{j=2}^{m}\left|g_{j}^{(n)} / g_{1}^{(n)}\right|^{2}\right)^{3}}=\left|K_{n}\right| \leq 1,
$$

in $U_{p}$. Therefore

$$
c_{1} \leq\left|g_{1}^{(n)}\right|^{2}
$$

in $U_{p}$, for large $n$. Then $\left\{g_{1}^{(n)}\right\}$ is relatively compact in $\mathcal{M}\left(U_{p}\right)$. Noticing that $M-M_{1}$ is discrete, by taking a subsequence, if necessary, we can assume that the globally defined holomorphic 1-forms $\left\{g_{1}^{(n)} d z\right\}$ converge on $M_{1}$, to a holomorphic 1-form $h_{1} d z$ or to infinity, uniformly on every compact subset of $M_{1}$. We consider each case below:

Case 1. $\left\{g_{1}^{(n)} d z\right\}$ converges to infinity uniformly on every compact subset of $M_{1}$.

For $p \in M_{1}$, we have, by (4),

$$
\begin{equation*}
K_{n}(p)=-4 \frac{\sum_{j<k}\left|\frac{g_{j}^{(n)}(p)}{g_{1}^{(n)}(p)}\left(\frac{g_{n}^{(n)}}{g_{1}^{(n)}}\right)^{\prime}(p)-\frac{g_{1}^{(n)}(p)}{g_{1}^{(n)}(p)}\left(\frac{g_{j}^{(n)}}{g_{1}^{(n)}}\right)^{\prime}(p)\right|^{2}}{\left|g_{1}^{(n)}(p)\right|^{2}\left(1+\sum_{j=2}^{m}\left|g_{j}^{(n)}(p) / g_{1}^{(n)}(p)\right|^{2}\right)^{3}} \rightarrow 0 . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $p$ be a point such that $p \notin M_{1}$ but also $g(p) \notin H_{1}$; then in a small disc of $U_{p}, D(2 \epsilon), g^{(n)}(z) \notin H_{1}$ for $n$ large enough, $z \in D(2 \epsilon)$. This means that $g_{1}^{(n)}$ is non-vanishing on $D(2 \epsilon)$ and $g_{1}^{(n)}$ converges to infinity on $\partial D(\epsilon)$. From the maximum principle we conclude that $\left\{g_{1}^{(n)}\right\}$ converges to infinity on $D(\epsilon)$. Therefore we again have $K_{n}(p) \rightarrow 0$ by (4).

Finally suppose that $g(p) \in H_{1}$, i.e., $g_{1}(p)=0$. Since $g(p)$ is not contained in some coordinate hyperplane, we assume that $g(p) \notin H_{2}$, where $H_{2}$ is the second coordinate hyperplane, $H_{2}=\left\{\left[y_{1}: \cdots: y_{n}\right] \in\right.$ $\left.\mathbf{P}^{n-1}(\mathbf{C}) \mid y_{2}=0\right\}$. Therefore, on a small disc, $D(2 \epsilon), g^{(n)}(z) \notin H_{2}$ for $n$ large enough, i.e., $g_{2}^{(n)}(z) \neq 0$, for $z \in D(2 \epsilon)$, and $g_{1}^{(n)}, g_{1}$ have no zeros on a neighborhood of $\partial D(\epsilon)$ for $n$ large enough. By Lemma 3.1, $\left\{\frac{g_{2}^{(n)}}{g_{1}^{(n)}}\right\}$, as a sequence of non-vanishing holomorphic functions, converges uniformly on $\partial D(\epsilon)$. Clearly, $\left\{\frac{g_{2}^{(n)}}{g_{1}^{(n)}} g_{1}^{(n)}\right\}$ converges uniformly to infinity on $\partial D(\epsilon)$, and therefore $g_{2}^{(n)}$ converges uniformly to infinity on $\partial D(\epsilon)$. Again from the maximum principle, we conclude that $g_{2}^{(n)}$ converges to infinity on $D(\epsilon)$. By (4), noticing that

$$
\left|\tilde{g}^{(n)} \wedge \tilde{g}^{(n)^{\prime}}\right|^{2} /\left|g_{2}^{(n)}\right|^{4}=\sum_{j<k} \left\lvert\, \frac{g_{j}^{(n)}}{g_{2}^{(n)}}\left(\frac{g_{k}^{(n)}}{g_{2}^{(n)}}\right)^{\prime}-\frac{g_{k}^{(n)}}{g_{2}^{(n)}}\left(\left.\left.\frac{g_{j}^{(n)}}{g_{2}^{(n)}}\right|^{\prime}\right|^{2},\right.\right.
$$

we have

$$
K_{n}(p)=-4 \frac{\left.\sum_{j<k} \left\lvert\, \frac{g_{j}^{(n)}}{g_{2}^{(n)}} \frac{g_{k}^{(n)}}{g_{2}^{(n)}}\right.\right)^{\prime}-\left.\frac{g_{k}^{(n)}}{g_{2}^{(n)}}\left(\frac{g_{j}^{(n)}}{g_{2}^{(n)}}\right)^{\prime}\right|^{2}}{\left|g_{2}^{(n)}\right|^{2}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left|g_{j}^{(n)} / g_{2}^{(n)}\right|^{2}\right)^{3}} \rightarrow 0 .
$$

Thus, we have proved that $K_{n}(p) \rightarrow 0$ for all $p \in M$. This corresponds to case (i) of the lemma.

Case 2. $\left\{g_{1}^{(n)} d z\right\}$ converges to a holomorphic 1-form, $h_{1} d z$, on $M_{1}$.
Let $p \in M-M_{1}$. If $D(2 \epsilon)$ is a small disc contained in $U_{p}$, as $\left\{g_{1}^{(n)}\right\} \rightarrow h_{1}$ uniformly on $\partial D(\epsilon)$ and $g_{1}^{(n)}$ are holomorphic, using the maximum principle, we see that $\left\{g_{1}^{(n)}\right\}$ is relatively compact on $D(\epsilon)$. Therefore $h_{1} d z$ extends to a holomorphic 1-form on $M$ and the global 1-forms $\left\{g_{1}^{(n)} d z\right\}$ converge to $h_{1} d z$ on $M$.

We now prove that, for every integer $j, 2 \leq j \leq m$, the global 1-forms $\left\{g_{j}^{(n)} d z\right\}$ converge to a holomorphic form $h_{j} d z$ on $M$. Let $p \in M$ such that $g(p) \notin H_{1}$; then there is a neighborhood $U_{p}$ of $p$ such that $g_{1}, g_{1}^{(n)}$ have no zeros for $n$ large enough, $z \in U_{p}$. Since $g_{j}^{(n)}=\frac{g_{j}^{(n)}}{g_{1}^{(n)}} g_{1}^{(n)}$, and by Lemma 3.1, $\left\{\frac{g_{j}^{(n)}}{g_{1}^{(n)}}\right\}$ converges uniformly on $U_{p}$, and $g_{1}^{(n)}$ also converges uniformly on $U_{p},\left\{g_{j}^{(n)}\right\}$ must converge uniformly on $U_{p}$. For the points $p$ such that $g(p) \in H_{1}$, if $D(2 \epsilon) \subset U_{p}$ is small enough so that $g_{1}, g_{1}^{(n)}$ have no zeros on a neighborhood of $\partial D(\epsilon)$ for $n$ large enough, then we just proved that $\left\{g_{j}^{(n)}\right\}$ is uniformly convergent on $\partial D(\epsilon)$. Since $g_{j}^{(n)}$ are holomorphic, by the maximum principle, we have that $g_{j}^{(n)}$ converges uniformly on $D(\epsilon)$. Therefore the globally defined holomorphic 1-forms $g_{j}^{(n)} d z$ converge to $\omega_{j}=h_{j} d z, 1 \leq j \leq m$.

We now check that the conditions in Theorem 2.1 are satisfied. Obviously we only need check that $\omega_{j}, 1 \leq j \leq m$, have no common zero. Take an arbitrary point $p \in M$; since $\tilde{g}=\left(g_{1}, \ldots, g_{m}\right)$ is a reduced representation of $g$, there is some integer $1 \leq k \leq m$, such that $g_{k}(p) \neq 0$. So there is some neighborhood $U_{p}$, such that $g_{k}$ is non-vanishing on $U_{p}$, i.e., $g\left(U_{p}\right)$ omits $k$-th coordinate hyperplane $H_{k}$. Since $g^{(n)}$ converges to $g$ uniformly on every compact subset of $M$, for $n$ large enough, $g^{(n)}\left(U_{p}\right)$ also omits $H_{k}$. So $g_{k}^{(n)}$ is non-vanishing on $U_{p}$. By Hurwitz's theorem, since $g_{k}^{(n)}$ converges uniformly on $U_{p}$ to $h_{k}$, either $h_{k}$ is non-vanishing on $U_{p}$ or $h_{k} \equiv 0$ on $U_{p}$. If $h_{k}$ is non-vanishing on $U_{p}$, then we are done. Otherwise, $h_{k} \equiv 0$ on $U_{p}$, so $g_{k}^{(n)} \rightarrow 0$ on $U_{p}$. Pick a point $q \in U_{p}$ such that $q \in M_{1}$, then, by (4),

$$
K_{n}(q)=-\left.4 \frac{\left|g_{k}(q)\right|^{2}}{\left|g_{k}^{(n)}(q)\right|^{2}} \frac{\sum_{i<j}\left|\frac{g_{k}^{(n)}(q)}{g_{k}^{(n)}(q)}\left(\frac{g_{g}^{(n)}}{g_{k}^{(n)}}\right)^{\prime}(q)\right|^{2}\left(1+\sum_{j=1, j \neq k}^{m}\left|g_{j}^{(n)}(q) / g_{k}^{(n)}(q)\right|^{2}\right)^{3}}{g_{k}^{(n)}(q)}\left(\frac{g_{n}^{(n)}}{g_{k}^{(n)}}\right)^{\prime}(q)\right|^{2} .
$$

But

$$
\frac{\left.\sum_{i<j} \left\lvert\, \frac{g_{i}^{(n)}(q)}{g_{k}^{(n)}(q)}\left(\frac{g_{j}^{(n)}}{g_{k}^{(n)}}\right)^{\prime}(q)-\frac{g_{j}^{(n)}(q)}{g_{k}^{(n)}(q)}\left(\frac{g_{i}^{(n)}}{g_{k}^{(n)}}\right)^{\prime}(q)\right.\right)\left.\right|^{2}}{\left|g_{k}(q)\right|^{2}\left(1+\sum_{j=2, j \neq k}^{m}\left|g_{j}^{(n)}(q) / g_{k}^{(n)}(q)\right|^{2}\right)^{3}} \rightarrow \frac{\left|\tilde{g} \wedge \tilde{g}^{\prime}\right|^{2}}{|\tilde{g}|^{6}}(q) \neq 0,
$$

and $g_{k}(q) \neq 0, g_{k}^{(n)}(q) \rightarrow 0$. So $\left|K_{n}(q)\right| \rightarrow \infty$, which contradicts the assumption that $\left\{\left|K_{n}\right|\right\}$ is uniformly bounded. Therefore, the conditions
in Theorem 2.1 are satisfied. So they define a minimal surface $x: M \rightarrow$ $\mathbf{R}^{m}$ whose Gauss map is $g$. q.e.d.

We now prove the main theorem.

## Proof of the Main Theorem.

Suppose the theorem is not true. We will construct a nonflat complete minimal surface whose Gauss map omits a set of hyperplanes in general position, thus getting a contradiction with Theorem 2.3. So suppose the conclusion of the theorem is not true; then there is a sequence of (non complete) minimal surfaces $x^{(n)}: M_{n} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{m}$ and points $p_{n} \in M_{n}$ such that $\left|K_{n}\left(p_{n}\right)\right| d_{n}^{2}\left(p_{n}\right) \rightarrow \infty$, and such that the Gauss map $g^{(n)}$ of $x^{(n)}$ omits a fixed set of $q$ hyperplanes in general position, with $q>m(m+1) / 2$.

We claim that the surfaces $M_{n}$ can be chosen so that

$$
\begin{equation*}
K_{n}\left(p_{n}\right)=-1, \quad-4 \leq K_{n} \leq 0 \quad \text { on } M_{n} \text { for all } n \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

We now prove the claim. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $M_{n}$ is a geodesic disk centered at $p_{n}$. Let

$$
M_{n}^{\prime}=\left\{p \in M_{n}: d_{n}\left(p, p_{n}\right) \leq d_{n}\left(p_{n}\right) / 2\right\}
$$

Then $K_{n}$ is uniformly bounded on $M_{n}^{\prime}$ and $d_{n}^{\prime}(p)=$ distance of $p$ to the boundary of $M_{n}^{\prime}$ tends to zero as $p \rightarrow \partial M_{n}^{\prime}$. Hence $\left|K_{n}(p)\right|\left(d_{n}^{\prime}(p)\right)^{2}$ has a maximum at a point $p_{n}^{\prime}$ interior to $M_{n}^{\prime}$. Therefore

$$
\left|K_{n}\left(p_{n}^{\prime}\right)\right| d_{n}^{\prime}\left(p_{n}^{\prime}\right)^{2} \geq\left|K_{n}\left(p_{n}\right)\right| d_{n}^{\prime}\left(p_{n}\right)^{2}=\frac{1}{4}\left|K_{n}\left(p_{n}\right)\right| d_{n}^{2}\left(p_{n}\right) \rightarrow \infty
$$

So we can replace the $M_{n}$ by the $M_{n}^{\prime}$, with $\left|K_{n}\left(p_{n}^{\prime}\right)\right| d_{n}^{\prime}\left(p_{n}^{\prime}\right)^{2} \rightarrow \infty$. We rescale $M_{n}^{\prime}$ to make $K_{n}\left(p_{n}^{\prime}\right)=-1$. By the invariance under scaling of the quantity $K(p) d(p)^{2}$, we will have $d_{n}^{\prime}\left(p_{n}^{\prime}\right) \rightarrow \infty$; here, without causing confusion, we use the same notation $d_{n}^{\prime}$ to denote the geodesic distance with respect to the rescaled metric. Again we can assume that $M_{n}^{\prime}$ is a geodesic disc centered at $p_{n}^{\prime}$, and let

$$
M_{n}^{\prime \prime}=\left\{p \in M_{n}^{\prime} \left\lvert\, d_{n}\left(p, p_{n}^{\prime}\right)<\frac{d_{n}^{\prime}\left(p_{n}^{\prime}\right)}{2}\right.\right\}
$$

Then $p \in M_{n}^{\prime \prime}$ implies that $d_{n}^{\prime}(p) \geq \frac{d_{n}^{\prime}\left(p_{n}^{\prime}\right)}{2}$ and

$$
\left|K_{n}(p)\right| \frac{d_{n}^{\prime}\left(p_{n}^{\prime}\right)^{2}}{4} \leq\left|K_{n}(p)\right| d_{n}^{\prime}(p)^{2} \leq\left|K_{n}\left(p_{n}^{\prime}\right)\right| d_{n}^{\prime}\left(p_{n}^{\prime}\right)^{2}=d_{n}^{\prime}\left(p_{n}^{\prime}\right)^{2}
$$

Therefore $\left|K_{n}(p)\right| \leq 4$ on $M_{n}^{\prime \prime}$. Furthermore,

$$
d_{n}^{\prime \prime}\left(p_{n}^{\prime}\right)=d\left(p_{n}^{\prime}, \partial M_{n}^{\prime \prime}\right)=d_{n}^{\prime}\left(p_{n}^{\prime}\right) / 2 \rightarrow \infty
$$

This proves the claim.
By translations of $\mathbf{R}^{m}$ we can assume that $x^{(n)}\left(p_{n}\right)=\mathbf{0}$. We can also assume that $M_{n}$ is simply connected, by taking its universal covering, if necessary. By the uniformization theorem, $M_{n}$ is conformally equivalent to either the unit disc $D$ or the complex plane $\mathbf{C}$, and we can suppose that $p_{n}$ maps onto 0 for each $n$. But the case that $M_{n}$ is conformally equivalent to $\mathbf{C}$ is impossible because the condition that $g^{(n)}$ misses more than $m(m+1) / 2$ hyperplanes in general position in $\mathbf{P}^{m-1}(\mathbf{C})$, implies, by Picard's theorem, that $g^{(n)}$ is constant, so $K_{n} \equiv 0$, which contradicts the condition that $\left|K_{n}(0)\right|=1$. So we have constructed a sequence of minimal surfaces, $x^{(n)}: D \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{m}$, satisfying (6). Since, by Theorem 2.4, $\mathbf{P}^{m-1}(\mathbf{C})$ minus $2 m-1$ hyperplanes is complete Kobayashi hyperbolic, and $m(m+1) / 2 \geq 2 m-1$, a subsequence of generalized Gauss maps $g^{(n)}$ of $x^{(n)}$ exists-without loss of generality we assume $g^{(n)}$ itself-such that $g^{(n)}: D \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^{m-1}(\mathbf{C})$ converges uniformly on every compact subset of $D$ to a map $g: D \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^{m-1}(\mathbf{C})$.

We now claim that $g$ is non-constant. Suppose not, i.e., $g$ is a constant map, and $g$ maps the disk $D$ onto a single point $P$. Let $H$ be any hyperplane not containing the point $P$, and let $U, V$ be disjoint neighborhoods of $H$ and $P$ respectively. Let $C$ be the constant in Theorem 1.2 such that

$$
|K(p)|^{1 / 2} d(p) \leq C
$$

for any minimal surface in $\mathbf{R}^{m}$ whose Gauss map omits the neighborhood $U$ of $H$, where $p$ is a point of $S$ and $d(p)$ is the geodesic distance of $p$ to the boundary of $S$. Choose $r<1$ such that the hyperbolic distance $R$ of $z=0$ to $|z|=r$ satisfies $R>C$. Since $g^{(n)}$ converges uniformly to $g$ on $|z| \leq r$, the image of $|z|=r$ lies in the neighborhood $V$ of $P$ for sufficiently large $n$, say $n \geq n_{0}$. It follows that for $n \geq n_{0}$, the image of the disk $|z| \leq r$ under $g^{(n)}$ omits the neighborhood $U$ of $H$ and we may therefore apply the above inequality to conclude

$$
\left|K_{n}(0)\right|^{1 / 2} d_{n}(r) \leq C,
$$

where $d_{n}(r)$ is the geodesic distance from the origin to the boundary of the surface $x^{(n)}: D(r) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{m}$. But $\left|K_{n}(0)\right|=1$ for all $n$, and hence
$d_{n}(r) \leq C$ for $n \geq n_{0}$. On the other hand, we get a lower bound for $d_{n}(r)$ from Lemma 2.1. The surface $x^{(n)}:\{|z|<1\} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{m}$ is a geodesic disk of radius $R_{n}$. If we reparametrize by $w=r_{n} z$ where the subset $\left\{w\left||w|<r_{n}\right\}\right.$ has hyperbolic radius $R_{n}$, then the circle $|z|=r$ corresponds to $|w|=r_{n} r$, and by Lemma 2.1, the distance in the surface metric from the origin to any point on the circle $|z|=r$, or equivalently, $|w|=r_{n} r$, is greater than or equal to the hyperbolic distance from 0 to $|w|=r_{n} r$. But as $n \rightarrow \infty, R_{n} \rightarrow \infty$ and $r_{n} \rightarrow 1$, so that the hyperbolic radius of $|w|=r_{n} r$ tends to the hyperbolic radius of $|w|=r$, which is $R$. Since by assumption $R>C$ we have for $n$ sufficiently large that the surface distance from $z=0$ to $|z|=r$ is greater than $C$, contradicting the earlier bound $d_{n}(r) \leq C$. Thus we conclude that the limit function $g$ can not be constant.

Therefore the hypotheses of Lemma 3.2 are satisfied. Since $\left|K_{n}(0)\right|=$ 1 , the possibility (i) of Lemma 3.2 cannot happen. Thus, a subsequence $\left\{x^{\left(n^{\prime}\right)}\right\}$ of $\left\{x^{(n)}\right\}$ converges to a minimal immersion $x: D \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{m}$, whose Gauss map is $g$. By (6) and Lemma 2.2, $x$ is complete. By assumption, $g^{(n)}$ omits hyperplanes $H_{1}, \ldots, H_{q}$ in $\mathbf{P}^{m-1}(\mathbf{C})$, located in general position, $q>m(m+1) / 2$. By Hurwitz's theorem(Theorem 2.2), either $g$ omits these hyperplanes, or the image of $g$ lies in some of these hyperplanes. Say $g(M) \subset \cap_{j=1}^{k} H_{j}=\mathbf{P}(V)$, where $V$ is a subspace of $\mathbf{C}^{m}$ of dimension $m-k$, and $g: M \rightarrow \mathbf{P}(V)$ omits the hyperplanes $H_{k+1} \cap\left(\cap_{j=1}^{k} H_{j}\right), \ldots, H_{q} \cap\left(\cap_{j=1}^{k} H_{j}\right)$ in $\mathbf{P}(V)$. Since the hyperplanes $H_{k+1} \cap\left(\cap_{j=1}^{k} H_{j}\right), \ldots, H_{q} \cap\left(\cap_{j=1}^{k} H_{j}\right)$ in $\mathbf{P}(V)$ are still in general position in $\mathbf{P}(V)$ because $H_{1}, \ldots, H_{q}$ are in general position in $\mathbf{P}^{m-1}(\mathbf{C})$, and $q-k>m(m+1) / 2-k \geq(m-k)(m-k+1) / 2$, it follows from Theorem 2.3 that $g$ is constant. But we have just proved that $g$ is not constant. This leads to a contradiction. Therefore the main theorem is proved.
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