# REMARKS ON THE EXISTENCE OF ANALYTIC MAPPINGS 

By Mitsuru Ozawa

§ 1. Introduction. Let $R$ be an ultrahyperelliptic surface defined by $y^{2}=g(x)$, $g(x)=\left(e^{K}-\gamma\right)\left(e^{K}-\delta\right), \gamma \delta(\gamma-\delta) \neq 0, K(0)=0$ with a non-constant entire function $K$. We already proved that the Picard constant $P(R)$ of $R$ is four and vice versa.

Let $S$ be an ultrahyperelliptic surface defined by $y^{2}=G(x)$,

$$
\begin{gathered}
G(x) \equiv 1-2 \beta_{1} e^{H}-2 \beta_{2} e^{L}+\beta_{1}{ }^{2} e^{2 H}-2 \beta_{1} \beta_{2} e^{H+L}+\beta_{2}^{2} e^{2 L} \\
\beta_{1} \beta_{2} \neq 0, \quad H(0)=L(0)=0
\end{gathered}
$$

with two non-constant entire functions $H$ and $L$. We already proved that the Picard constant $P(S)$ of $S$ is at least three. If $K$ is a polynomial, then $R$ is called to be of finite order. If $H$ and $L$ are polynomials, then $S$ is called to be of finite order.

In our previous paper [5] we proved that if $S$ is of finite order then $P(S)$ is equal to three with four exceptional cases for which $P(S)=4$. As an easy corrollary of the above result we proved the following fact:

Let $R$ and $S$ be ultrahyperelliptic surfaces of finite order in the above sense. Assume that $P(S)=3$. Then there is no non-trivial analytic mapping of $R$ into $S$.

The first purpose of this paper is to prove the following improvement of the above result:

Theorem 1. Let $R$ be an ultrahyperelliptic surface of finite order in the above sense with $P(R)=4$. Let $S$ be an ultrahyperelliptic surface defined above without any assumption on its order. Assume that $P(S)=3$. Then there is no non-trivial analytic mapping of $R$ into $S$.

Hiromi-Mutō [1] proved the following result: Let $R$ and $S$ be two ultrahyperelliptic surfaces defined by $y^{2}=g(x)$ and $w^{2}=G(z)$, respectively, where $G$ and $g$ are entire functions having no zero other than an infinite number of simple zeros. Let $g_{c}$ and $G_{c}$ be the canonical products formed by the zeros of $g$ and $G$, respectively. Assume that the order $\rho_{g_{c}}<\infty$ and $0<\rho_{G_{c}}<\infty$ and that there is a non-trivial analytic mapping of $R$ into $S$. Then $\rho_{g_{c}}$ is a positive integral multiple of $\rho_{G c}$.

We shall prove the following fact, which is the second purpose of this paper:
Theorem 2. Under the same assumplions in Hiromi-Mutō's theorem and

[^0]denoting the lower order of $X$ by $\mu_{X}$ we have that $\mu_{N(r, 0, g)}$ is a positive integral multiple of $\mu_{N(r, 0, G)}$.

This theorem 2 gives a powerful criterion for the non-existence of non-trivial analytic mappings.

Niino [3] posed the following problem: Is there any relation between two non-trivial analytic mappings $\varphi_{1}$ and $\varphi_{2}$ which map analytically the same $R$ into the same $S$ ?

His formulation of this problem is somewhat restrictive.
The third and final purpose of this paper is to give some informations on this problem and to give an interesting example.

## § 2.

Lemma. Let $G(x) b e$

$$
\begin{gathered}
1-2 \beta_{1} e^{H}-2 \beta_{2} e^{L}+\beta_{1}{ }^{2} e^{2 H}-2 \beta_{1} \beta_{2} e^{H+L}+\beta_{2}{ }^{2} e^{2 L} \\
\beta_{1} \beta_{2} \neq 0, \quad H(0)=L(0)=0 .
\end{gathered}
$$

Then for an arbitrary given $\varepsilon>0$ and for a sufficiently large $r \geqq r_{0}$

$$
(2-\varepsilon) \max \left(m\left(r, e^{H}\right), m\left(r, e^{L}\right)\right) \leqq N_{2}(r ; 0, G),
$$

where $N_{2}(r ; 0, G)$ indicates the $N$-function of the simple zeros of $G$.
Proof. The last part of this method was suggested by Niino [2]. First of all we shall prove that the equation $y^{2}=G(x)$ defines an ultrahyperelliptic surface $S$. Let $f(x)$ be

$$
\frac{1}{2}\left(1+\beta_{1} e^{2 H}-\beta_{2} e^{2 L}\right)+\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{G(x) .}
$$

Then $f$ satisfies

$$
F(x, f)=f^{2}-\left(1+\beta_{1} e^{2 H}-\beta_{2} e^{2 L}\right) f+\beta_{1} e^{2 H} .
$$

Now $F(x, 0)=\beta_{1} e^{2 H}$ and $F(x, 1)=\beta_{2} e^{2 L}$. Thus $f$ is an entire algebroid function, which is at most two-valued and $f \neq 0,1, \infty$ in $S$. Assume that $S$ is not ultrahyperelliptic. Then either $S$ splits into two punctured discs $D_{1}$ and $D_{2}$ over $r^{*} \leqq|x|<\infty$ or $S$ is two-sheeted but one punctured disc over there. If the latter case occurs, then the big Picard theorem implies that the exceptional values are at most two in number when $f$ is transcendental there. When $f$ is not transcendental there, then $f$ can be continued analytically onto $x=\infty$, which shows that $f$ reduces to an algebraic function. Then $f$ takes every value in $S$ at least once excepting $\infty$. Anyway we arrive at a contradiction. If the former case occurs, we put $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$ as two determinations of $f$ in $D_{1}$ and $D_{2}$, respectively. Assume that both of $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$ are transcendental. Then $f_{1}, f_{2}$ have at most two exceptional values $\infty, a_{1}$ in $D_{1}$ and $\infty, a_{2}$ in $D_{2}$, respectively. If $a_{1} \neq a_{2}$, then $a_{1}$
is taken by $f_{2}$ in $D_{2}$ infinitely often. If $a_{1}=a_{2}$, then $f$ has two exceptional values $\infty, a_{1}$ in $D_{1} \cup D_{2}$. Anyway $f$ has at most two exceptional values in $D_{1} \cup D_{2}$, which is a contradiction. If one of $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$ is not transcendental, we have similarly a contradiction. Thus we have the desired result.

Now we can make use of Selberg's theory on algebroid functions [7]. Since $f$ has two finite exceptional values 0 and 1 and $f$ is regular in $S$, we have

$$
3 \leqq \sum \delta(a) \leqq 2+\xi,
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\delta(a) & =1-\limsup _{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(r ; a, f)}{T(r, f)}, \\
\xi & =\liminf _{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(r, S)}{T(r, f)}, \\
2 N(r, S) & =N_{2}(r ; 0, G)+O(\log r) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence $\xi \geqq 1$. Further by Valiron's theorem [8] or [7]

$$
\begin{aligned}
T(r, f) & =\frac{1}{4 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} \log \max \left(1,\left|\beta_{1} e^{2 H}\right|,\left|1+\beta_{1} e^{2 H}-\beta_{2} e^{2 L}\right|\right) d \theta+O(1) \\
& \geqq \frac{1}{2} m\left(r, \beta_{1} e^{2 H}\right)+O(1) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore $T(r, f) \geqq m\left(r, e^{H}\right)+O(1)$. Thus

$$
N(r, S) \geqq\left(\xi-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) T(r, f) \geqq\left(\xi-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) m\left(r, e^{H}\right)+O(1)
$$

for $r \geqq r_{0}$. This implies

$$
(2-\varepsilon) m\left(r, e^{H}\right) \leqq N_{2}(r ; 0, G) .
$$

By symmetry we have

$$
(2-\varepsilon) m\left(r, e^{L}\right) \leqq N_{2}(r ; 0, G) .
$$

Thus we have the desired result.
This Lemma is best possible. Consider the case $2 H=L, \beta_{1}{ }^{2}=16 \beta_{2}$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& G=\left(1+\sqrt[4]{\beta_{2}} e^{H / 2}\right)^{2}\left(1-\sqrt[4]{\beta_{2}} e^{H / 2}\right)^{2}\left(\sqrt{2}-1-\sqrt[4]{\beta_{2}} e^{H / 2}\right) \\
& \cdot\left(\sqrt{2}+1+\sqrt[4]{\beta_{2}} e^{H / 2}\right. \\
&\left(\sqrt{2}-1+\sqrt[4]{\beta_{2}} e^{H / 2}\right)\left(\sqrt{2}+1-\sqrt[4]{\beta_{2}} e^{H / 2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

This implies that

$$
N_{2}(r ; 0, G) \sim 4 m\left(r, e^{H / 2}\right)=2 m\left(r, e^{H}\right) .
$$

§ 3. Proof of Theorem 1. By our earlier result in [4] we may consider the
possibility of the following functional equation

$$
f(x)^{2} g(x)=G \circ h(x) .
$$

By the above Lemma we have

$$
(2-\varepsilon) \max \left(m\left(r, e^{H \circ h}\right), m\left(r, e^{L \circ h}\right)\right) \leqq N_{2}(r ; 0, G \circ h) .
$$

Further we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
N_{2}(r ; 0, G \circ h) & \leqq N_{2}(r ; 0, g) \sim 2 m\left(r, e^{K}\right) \\
& =\frac{\left|k_{n}\right|}{\pi} r^{n}\left(1+O\left(\frac{1}{r}\right)\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $K(x)=k_{n} x^{n}+\cdots+k_{1} x, k_{n} \neq 0$. Thus $H \circ h$ and $L \circ h$ must be polynomials. By Pólya's theorem again $H, L$ and $h$ must be polynomials. Now we can make use of our earlier result in [5] and then we have the desired result.
§4. Proof of Theorem 2. We may change the last past of Hiromi-Mutō's proof of their theorem. Let $h(x)$ be a polynomial of the form $a_{0} x^{\nu}+a_{1} x^{\nu-1}+\cdots+a_{\nu}$. Then we have for an arbitrary positive number $\varepsilon(<1)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \nu n\left(\left|a_{0}\right| r^{\nu}(1+\varepsilon) ; 0, G_{c}\right)+O(1) \\
\geqq & n\left(r ; 0, G_{c} \circ h\right) \geqq \nu n\left(\left|a_{0}\right| r^{\circ}(1-\varepsilon) ; 0, G_{c}\right)-O(1)
\end{aligned}
$$

for $r \geqq r_{0}$. Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
& N\left(\left|a_{0}\right| r^{\nu}(1+\varepsilon) ; 0, G_{c}\right)+O(\log r) \\
\geqq & N\left(r ; 0, G_{c} \circ h\right) \geqq N\left(\left|a_{0}\right| r^{\nu}(1-\varepsilon) ; 0, G_{c}\right)-O(\log r) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $G_{c}$ is transcendental and is a canonical product, we have

$$
(1+\delta) N\left(\left|a_{0}\right| r^{\nu}(1+\varepsilon) ; 0, G\right) \geqq N\left(r ; 0, G_{c^{\circ}} h\right) \geqq(1-\delta) N\left(\left|a_{0}\right| r^{\nu}(1-\varepsilon) ; 0, G\right) .
$$

Hence

$$
\nu \mu_{N(r, 0, G)} \geqq \mu_{N\left(r, 0, G_{c} \circ h\right)} \geqq \nu \mu_{N(r ;, 0, G)} .
$$

Further

$$
N_{2}\left(r ; 0, G_{c} \circ h\right) \leqq N\left(r ; 0, g_{c}\right)=N(r ; 0, g)
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& N\left(r ; 0, g_{c}\right)=N\left(r ; 0, G_{c} \circ h\right)-2 N(r ; 0, f) \\
& N(r ; 0, f) \leqq 2 T(r, h)=O(\log r) \\
& N\left(r ; 0, G_{c} \circ h\right)=N_{2}\left(r ; 0, G_{c} \circ h\right)+O(\log r)
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence we have

$$
\mu_{N(r ; 0, g)}=\mu_{N\left(r ; 0, G_{c} \circ h\right)}
$$

Thus we have the desired result:

$$
\mu_{N(r ; 0, g)}=\nu \mu_{N(r ; 0, G)}
$$

By Theorem 2 together with Hiromi-Muto’s theorem the regularity of growth is preserved by non-trivial analytic mappings under our assumptions.
§ 5. Let $\varphi_{1}$ and $\varphi_{2}$ be non-trivial analytic mappings of $R$ into $S$. Let $h_{1}$ and $h_{2}$ be their projections. Assume that there is an algebraic relation between $h_{1}$ and $h_{2}$, that is, there is an irreducible algebraic equation $F(x, y)=0$ satisfying $F\left(h_{1}, h_{2}\right)$ $\equiv 0$. Then if one of $h_{1}, h_{2}$ is transcendental the Riemann surface $W$ defined by $F(x, y)=0$ must be of genus at most one by Picard's uniformization theorem, since $h_{1}, h_{2}$ are defined in $|z|<\infty$. Assume that $W$ is of genus one. Then $h_{\jmath}$ must be doubly periodic. Hence $h_{\jmath}$ must have poles, which contradicts the regularity. Thus $W$ must be of genus zero.

Theorem 3. Suppose that two non-trivial analytic mappings of an ultrahyperelliptic surface $R$ into another such surface $S$ satisfies an algebraic relation. Then the surface defined by the algebraic relation is of genus zero, if at least one of the two projections is transcendental.

Next we shall give an example. Let $G(z)$ be an entire function whose zeros are $\pm p_{n} i$, $\pm \sqrt{1+p_{n}^{2}}$, where $p_{n}$ is real positive $\geqq 1$ and $p_{n}<p_{n+1}, p_{n} \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let $g(z)$ be $G \circ \sin z$. Then $g(z)$ has no zeros other than an infinite number of simple zeros. On the other hand $G \circ \cos z \equiv g^{*}(z)$ has the same zeros as $g(z)$. Hence $g^{*}(z)=e^{L(z)} g(z)$. Let $R$ and $S$ be two surfaces defined by $y^{2}=g(z), w^{2}=G(z)$, respectively. Then there are two analytic mappings whose projections are $\cos z, \sin z$, respectively.

Hence

$$
x^{2}+y^{2}=1
$$

is satisfied by $x=\cos z, y=\sin z$. This is really a circle.
Niino has given an example of parabola recently. Following is an open problem. Is there any example of $y=a x^{n}, n=3$ ?
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