# A NORMALITY CRITERION FOR MEROMORPHIC FUNCTIONS

Shanpeng Zeng and Indrajit Lahiri

#### Abstract

In the paper we prove a normality criterion for a family of meromorphic functions which involves sharing of a non-zero finite value by certain differential polynomials generated by the members of the family.

### 1. Introduction and results

Let  $\mathfrak{D}$  be a domain in the open complex plane  $\mathbb{C}$  and  $\mathfrak{F}$  be a family of meromorphic functions defined in  $\mathfrak{D}$ . The family  $\mathfrak{F}$  is said to be normal in  $\mathfrak{D}$ , in the sense of Montel, if for any sequence  $\{f_n\} \subset \mathfrak{F}$ , there exists a subsequece  $\{f_{n_j}\}$  converging spherically locally uniformly to a meromorphic function or  $\infty$ .

Let f and g be two meromorphic functions and  $a \in \mathbb{C}$ . If f and g have the same set of a-points, then we say that f and g share the value a IM (ignoring multiplicities).

In 1998 Y. F. Wang and M. L. Fang [9] proved the following result.

THEOREM A [9]. Let  $k, n (\geq k + 1)$  be positive integers and f be a transcendental meromorphic function. Then  $(f^n)^{(k)}$  assumes every finite non-zero value infinitely often.

Following normality criterion corresponds to Theorem A.

THEOREM B [8]. Let  $\mathfrak{F}$  be a family of meromorphic functions defined in a domain  $\mathfrak{D}$  and  $k, n(\geq k+3)$  be positive integers. If  $(f^n)^{(k)} \neq 1$  for every  $f \in \mathfrak{F}$ , then  $\mathfrak{F}$  is normal.

In 2009 Y. T. Li and Y. X. Gu [4] improved Theorem B in the following manner.

<sup>2010</sup> Mathematics Subject Classification. 30D35.

*Key words and phrases.* Meromorphic function, Normal family, Value sharing. Received February 23, 2011; revised May 18, 2011.

THEOREM C [4]. Let  $\mathfrak{F}$  be a family of meromorphic functions in a domain  $\mathfrak{D}$ ,  $k, n(\geq k+2)$  be positive integers and  $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ . If  $(f^n)^{(k)}$  and  $(g^n)^{(k)}$  share the value a IM in  $\mathfrak{D}$  for each pair of functions  $f, g \in \mathfrak{F}$ , then  $\mathfrak{F}$  is normal.

In [4] it is shown that Theorem C does not hold for n = k + 1. So it is an interesting problem to investigate the situation under which the condition n = k + 1 can be accommodated. In this direction we prove the following theorem.

THEOREM 1.1. Let  $\mathfrak{F}$  be a family of meromorphic functions defined in a domain  $\mathfrak{D}$ ,  $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  and k, n be positive integers such that  $n \ge 1$  if k = 1 and  $n \ge 2$  if  $k \ge 2$ . If  $f^n(f^{k+1})^{(k)}$  and  $g^n(g^{k+1})^{(k)}$  share the value a IM in  $\mathfrak{D}$  for each pair of functions  $f, g \in \mathfrak{F}$ , then  $\mathfrak{F}$  is normal.

Following corollary immediately follows from Theorem 1.1.

COROLLARY 1.1. Let  $\mathfrak{F}$  be a family of meromorphic functions defined in a domain  $\mathfrak{D}$ ,  $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  and k, n be positive integers such that  $n \ge 1$  if k = 1 and  $n \ge 2$  if  $k \ge 2$ . If  $f^n(f^{k+1})^{(k)} \ne a$  for every  $f \in \mathfrak{F}$ , then  $\mathfrak{F}$  is normal.

Remark 1.1. If the members of  $\mathfrak{F}$  have no simple zero, then Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.1 hold for n = 1 and  $k \ge 2$ .

Remark 1.2. Considering the family  $\mathfrak{F} = \{e^{mz} : m = 1, 2, 3, ...\}$  and the domain  $\mathfrak{D} = \{z : |z| < 1\}$  we can verify that  $a \neq 0$  is essential for Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.1.

# 2. Lemmas

In this section we present some necessary lemmas.

LEMMA 2.1 {p. 101 [7], [6]}. Let  $\mathfrak{F}$  be a family of meromorphic functions in a domain  $\mathfrak{D} \subset \mathbb{C}$ . If  $\mathfrak{F}$  is not normal in  $\mathfrak{D}$ , then there exist

- (i) a number r with 0 < r < 1,
- (ii) points  $z_i$  satisfying  $|z_i| < r$ ,
- (iii) functions  $f_i \in \mathfrak{F}$ ,

(iv) positive numbers  $\rho_j \to 0$  as  $j \to \infty$ ,

such that  $f_j(z_j + \rho_j \zeta) \to g(\zeta)$  as  $j \to \infty$  locally spherically uniformly, where g is a non-constant meromorphic function in **C** with  $g^{\#}(\zeta) \leq g^{\#}(0) = 1$ . In particular, g has order at most 2.

A differential polynomial *P* of a meromorphic function *f* is defined by  $P(z) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \phi_i(z)$ , where  $\phi_i(z) = \alpha_i(z) \prod_{j=0}^{p} (f^{(j)}(z))^{S_{ij}}$ , where  $\alpha_i(z) \neq 0$  are small functions of *f* and  $S_{ij}$ 's are non-negative integers. The numbers  $\overline{d}(P) = \max_{1 \le i \le n} \sum_{j=0}^{p} S_{ij}$  and  $\underline{d}(P) = \min_{1 \le i \le n} \sum_{j=0}^{p} S_{ij}$  are respectively called the degree and the lower degree of the differential polynomial *P*.

LEMMA 2.2 [3]. Let f be transcendental and meromorphic and P be a nonconstant differential polynomial of f such that  $\underline{d}(P) > 1$ . Then

A NORMALITY CRITERION FOR MEROMORPHIC FUNCTIONS

$$T(r,f) \leq \frac{Q+1}{\underline{d}(P)-1}\overline{N}(r,0;f) + \frac{1}{\underline{d}(P)-1}\overline{N}(r,a;P) + S(r,f),$$

where  $Q = \max_{1 \le i \le n} \sum_{j=1}^{p} jS_{ij}$ .

LEMMA 2.3 [2, 5]. Let f be a transcendental meromorphic function and  $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ . Then  $f^n f'$  has infinitely many *a*-points, where  $n \geq 2$  is an integer.

LEMMA 2.4. Let f be a transcendental meromorphic function and k, n be positive integers such that  $n \ge 1$  if k = 1 and  $n \ge 2$  if  $k \ge 2$ . Then  $f^n(f^{k+1})^{(k)}$  assumes every value  $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  infinitly often.

*Proof.* Without loss of generality we may choose a = 1. Let  $P = f^n(f^{k+1})^{(k)}$ . If k = 1, then  $P = 2f^{n+1}f'$  assumes the value 1 infinitely often by Lemma 2.3.

Let  $k \ge 2$ . Then  $\underline{d}(P) = n + k + 1$  and Q = k in Lemma 2.2. So by Lemma 2.2 we get

$$T(r,f) \leq \frac{k+1}{n+k}\overline{N}(r,0;f) + \frac{1}{n+k}\overline{N}(r,1;P) + S(r,f)$$

and so

$$\frac{n-1}{n+k}T(r,f)\leq \frac{1}{n+k}\overline{N}(r,1;P)+S(r,f),$$

which shows that P assumes the value 1 infinitely often. This proves the lemma.

Let  $R = \frac{A}{B}$  be a rational function. We denote by  $(R)_{\infty}$  the number  $\deg(A) - \deg(B)$ . Using the Laurent expansion around  $\infty$  we can easily obtain the following lemma (or see the proof of Lemma 6 of [10]).

Lemma 2.5. If  $(R)_{\infty} < 0$ , then  $(R^{(k)})_{\infty} = (R)_{\infty} - k$ .

LEMMA 2.6. Let  $R = \frac{A}{B}$  be rational and B be non-constant. Then  $(R^{(k)})_{\infty} \leq (R)_{\infty} - k$ .

Proof. We consider the following cases.

CASE 1. Let  $(R)_{\infty} < 0$ . Then the lemma follows from Lemma 2.5.

CASE 2. Let  $(R)_{\infty} = 0$ . Then we can write

$$(2.1) R = c + \frac{p}{B},$$

where c is a non-zero constant and p is a polynomial with deg(p) < deg(B).

Since deg(A) = deg(B) > deg(p), we get

(2.2) 
$$\left(\frac{p}{B}\right)_{\infty} < \left(\frac{A}{B}\right)_{\infty}.$$

So from (2.1), (2.2) and Lemma 2.5 we obtain  $(1 + 1)^{(k)}$ 

$$(R^{(k)})_{\infty} = \left(\left(\frac{p}{B}\right)^{(k)}\right)_{\infty} = \left(\frac{p}{B}\right)_{\infty} - k < \left(\frac{A}{B}\right)_{\infty} - k = (R)_{\infty} - k.$$

CASE 3. Let  $(R)_{\infty} > 0$ . Then we can express R as follows

(2.3) 
$$R = a_m z^m + \dots + a_1 z + a_0 + \frac{p}{B}$$

where  $a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_{m-1}, a_m \neq 0$  are constants, *m* is a positive integer and *p* is a polynomial with deg(*p*) < deg(*B*).

We now further consider the following subcases.

SUBCASE 3.1. Let 
$$k > m$$
. Since  $\left(\frac{p}{B}\right)_{\infty} < 0$ , by Lemma 2.5 we get from (2.3)  
 $(R^{(k)})_{\infty} = \left(\left(\frac{p}{B}\right)^{(k)}\right)_{\infty} = \left(\frac{p}{B}\right)_{\infty} - k < (R)_{\infty} - k.$ 

SUBCASE 3.2. Let k = m. Then  $(R)_{\infty} = m = k$ . By Lemma 2.5 we get

(2.4) 
$$\left(\left(\frac{p}{B}\right)^{(k)}\right)_{\infty} = \left(\frac{p}{B}\right)_{\infty} - k < -k < 0.$$

We put  $\left(\frac{p}{B}\right)^{(\kappa)} = \frac{P}{Q}$ , where P, Q are polynomials. From (2.4) we get  $\deg(P) < \deg(Q)$  and so  $\deg(a_mQm! + P) = \deg(Q)$ . Hence

$$(R^{(k)})_{\infty} = \left(a_m m! + \left(\frac{p}{B}\right)^{(k)}\right)_{\infty} = \left(a_m m! + \frac{P}{Q}\right)_{\infty} = \left(\frac{a_m Q m! + P}{Q}\right)_{\infty}$$
$$= 0 = k - k = (R)_{\infty} - k.$$

SUBCASE 3.3. Let k < m. Then  $(R)_{\infty} = m$  and by Lemma 2.5 we get

(2.5) 
$$\left(\left(\frac{p}{B}\right)^{(k)}\right)_{\infty} = \left(\frac{p}{B}\right)_{\infty} - k < -k < 0.$$

We put  $\left(\frac{p}{B}\right)^{(\kappa)} = \frac{P}{Q}$ , where *P*, *Q* are polynomials. From (2.5) we see that  $\deg(P) < \deg(Q)$  and so

$$\deg\left[\left(\frac{a_m m!}{(m-k)!}z^{m-k}+\cdots+k!\right)Q+P\right] = \deg\left[\left(\frac{a_m m!}{(m-k)!}z^{m-k}+\cdots+k!\right)Q\right].$$

Therefore

$$(\mathbf{R}^{(k)})_{\infty} = \left(\frac{a_m m!}{(m-k)!} z^{m-k} + \dots + k! + \left(\frac{p}{B}\right)^{(k)}\right)_{\infty}$$
$$= \left(\frac{\left(\frac{a_m m!}{(m-k)!} z^{m-k} + \dots + k!\right) Q + P}{Q}\right)_{\infty}$$
$$= m - k$$
$$= (\mathbf{R})_{\infty} - k.$$

This proves the lemma.

**LEMMA** 2.7. Let f be a non-constant rational function, k, n be positive integers and  $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ . Then  $f^n(f^{k+1})^{(k)}$  has at least two distinct a-points.

Proof. We consider the following cases.

CASE 1. Suppose  $f^n(f^{k+1})^{(k)}$  has exactly one *a*-point.

First we suppose that f is a non-constant polynomial. We set  $f^n(f^{k+1})^{(k)} - a = A(z-z_0)^l$ , where A is a non-zero constant and l is a positive integer satisfying  $l \ge n + (k+1-k) = n+1 \ge 2$ . Then  $[f^n(f^{k+1})^{(k)}]' = Al(z-z_0)^{l-1}$ . Since a zero of f is a zero of  $f^n(f^{k+1})^{(k)}$  of multiplicity at least 2, it is also a zero of  $[f^n(f^{k+1})^{(k)}]'$ . Since  $[f^n(f^{k+1})^{(k)}]'$  has exactly one zero at  $z_0$  and f is a non-constant polynomial, it follows that  $z_0$  is a zero of f and so is a zero of  $f^n(f^{k+1})^{(k)}$ , which is a contradiction. Therefore f is a non-polynomial rational function. We set

(2.6) 
$$f(z) = A \frac{(z-\alpha_1)^{m_1}(z-\alpha_2)^{m_2}\cdots(z-\alpha_s)^{m_s}}{(z-\beta_1)^{n_1}(z-\beta_2)^{n_2}\cdots(z-\beta_t)^{n_t}},$$

where  $A(\neq 0)$  is a constant and  $m_1, m_2, \dots, m_s, n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t$  are positive integers. We put

$$M = (k+1)\sum_{j=1}^{s} m_j, \quad M' = n\sum_{j=1}^{s} m_j, \quad N = (k+1)\sum_{i=1}^{t} n_i \text{ and } N' = n\sum_{i=1}^{t} n_i.$$

From (2.6) we get

(2.7) 
$$f^{k+1}(z) = A^{k+1} \frac{(z-\alpha_1)^{m_1(k+1)}(z-\alpha_2)^{m_2(k+1)}\cdots(z-\alpha_s)^{m_s(k+1)}}{(z-\beta_1)^{n_1(k+1)}(z-\beta_2)^{n_2(k+1)}\cdots(z-\beta_t)^{n_t(k+1)}}$$

and so

$$(2.8) \quad (f^{k+1})^{(k)} = \frac{(z-\alpha_1)^{m_1(k+1)-k}(z-\alpha_2)^{m_2(k+1)-k}\cdots(z-\alpha_s)^{m_s(k+1)-k}}{(z-\beta_1)^{n_1(k+1)+k}(z-\beta_2)^{n_2(k+1)+k}\cdots(z-\beta_t)^{n_t(k+1)+k}}g(z),$$

where g is a polynomial.

From (2.6) and (2.8) we get

(2.9) 
$$f^{n}(f^{k+1})^{(k)} = A^{n} \frac{(z-\alpha_{1})^{m_{1}(n+k+1)-k}(z-\alpha_{2})^{m_{2}(n+k+1)-k}\cdots(z-\alpha_{s})^{m_{s}(n+k+1)-k}}{(z-\beta_{1})^{n_{1}(n+k+1)+k}(z-\beta_{2})^{n_{2}(n+k+1)+k}\cdots(z-\beta_{t})^{n_{t}(n+k+1)+k}}g(z)$$
$$= \frac{p_{1}}{q_{1}}, \quad \text{say},$$

where  $p_1$ ,  $q_1$  are polynomials. Since  $f^n(f^{k+1})^{(k)}$  has exactly one *a*-point at  $z_0$ , say, we get from (2.9)  $(2.10) \qquad f^n (f^{k+1})^{(k)}$ 

$$= a + \frac{B(z - z_0)^l}{(z - \beta_1)^{n_1(n+k+1)+k}(z - \beta_2)^{n_2(n+k+1)+k}\cdots(z - \beta_t)^{n_t(n+k+1)+k}}$$
  
=  $\frac{p_1}{q_1}$ ,

where B is a non-zero constant and l is a positive integer.

From (2.9) and (2.10) we obtain respectively

(2.11) 
$$[f^{n}(f^{k+1})^{(k)}]' = \frac{(z-\alpha_{1})^{m_{1}(n+k+1)-k-1}(z-\alpha_{2})^{m_{2}(n+k+1)-k-1}\cdots(z-\alpha_{s})^{m_{s}(n+k+1)-k-1}}{(z-\beta_{1})^{n_{1}(n+k+1)+k+1}(z-\beta_{2})^{n_{2}(n+k+1)+k+1}\cdots(z-\beta_{t})^{n_{t}(n+k+1)+k+1}} \times g_{1}(z)$$

and

(2.12) 
$$[f^{n}(f^{k+1})^{(k)}]' = \frac{(z-z_{0})^{l-1}g_{2}(z)}{(z-\beta_{1})^{n_{1}(n+k+1)+k+1}(z-\beta_{2})^{n_{2}(n+k+1)+k+1}\cdots(z-\beta_{t})^{n_{t}(n+k+1)+k+1}},$$

where  $g_1$ ,  $g_2$  are polynomials.

From (2.7) and (2.8) we get

$$(f^{k+1})_{\infty} = M - N$$
 and  $((f^{k+1})^{(k)})_{\infty} = M - N - (s+t)k + \deg(g).$ 

Since by Lemms 2.6  $((f^{k+1})^{(k)})_{\infty} \leq (f^{k+1})_{\infty} - k,$  we get

$$(2.13) deg(g) \le k(s+t-1).$$

From (2.9) and (2.11) we obtain

(2.14) 
$$(f^n(f^{k+1})^{(k)})_{\infty} = M + M' - ks + \deg(g) - (N + N' + kt)$$

(2.15) 
$$(f^n(f^{k+1})^{(k)})'_{\infty} = M + M' - (k+1)s + \deg(g_1) - \{N + N' + (k+1)t\}.$$

(2.16) 
$$(f^n (f^{k+1})^{(k)})'_{\infty} \le (f^n (f^{k+1})^{(k)})_{\infty} - 1.$$

Hence from (2.13)–(2.16) we get

(2.17) 
$$\deg(g_1) \le \deg(g) + t + s - 1 \le k(s+t-1) + s + t - 1$$
$$= (k+1)(s+t-1).$$

Now we consider the following sub-cases.

SUBCASE 1.1. Let l < N + N' + kt. From (2.10) we see that  $deg(p_1) = deg(q_1)$ . From (2.9) and (2.13) we get

$$deg(q_1) = N + N' + kt = deg(p_1) = M + M' - ks + deg(g)$$
  
$$\leq M + M' - ks + k(s + t - 1) = M + M' + kt - k.$$

Hence  $(M + M') - (N + N') \ge k$  and so  $(n + k + 1)[(m_1 + m_2 + \dots + m_s) - (n_1 + n_2 + \dots + n_t)] \ge k$ . This implies  $(m_1 + m_2 + \dots + m_s) - (n_1 + n_2 + \dots + n_t) \ge 1$ . So  $(f)_{\infty} \ge 1$  and hence  $(f^{k+1})_{\infty} \ge k + 1$ . Therefore we can express  $f^{k+1}$  as follows

$$f^{k+1} = a_m z^m + \dots + a_1 z + a_0 + \frac{p}{B},$$

where  $a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_{m-1}, a_m \neq 0$  are constants,  $m \geq k + 1$  is an integer, p and B are polynomials with  $\deg(p) < \deg(B)$ . Since m > k, by Subcase 3.3 of the proof of Lemma 2.6 we get

(2.18) 
$$((f^{k+1})^{(k)})_{\infty} = (f^{k+1})_{\infty} - k \ge k + 1 - k = 1.$$

Since  $(f)_{\infty} \ge 1$ , from (2.18) we see that  $(f^n(f^{k+1})^{(k)})_{\infty} \ge n+1$ , which by (2.9) contradicts the fact that  $\deg(p_1) = \deg(q_1)$ .

SUBCASE 1.2. Let l > N + N' + kt. Then from (2.10) we see that  $(f^n(f^{k+1})^{(k)})_{\infty} > 0$ . We now verify that  $m_1 + m_2 + \cdots + m_s > n_1 + n_2 + \cdots + n_t$  and so

$$(2.19) M > N and M' > N'.$$

If  $m_1 + m_2 + \dots + m_s \le n_1 + n_2 + \dots + n_t$ , then  $(f)_{\infty} \le 0$ ,  $(f^n)_{\infty} \le 0$  and  $(f^{k+1})_{\infty} \le 0$ .

Hence by Lemma 2.6 we get

$$(f^n(f^{k+1})^{(k)})_{\infty} = (f^n)_{\infty} + ((f^{k+1})^{(k)})_{\infty} \le 0 + (f^{k+1})_{\infty} - k = -k < 0,$$

a contradiction.

From (2.10) and (2.12) we respectively get

$$(f^n(f^{k+1})^{(k)})_{\infty} = l - (N + N' + kt)$$
 and  
 $(f^n(f^{k+1})^{(k)})'_{\infty} = l - 1 + \deg(g_2) - (N + N' + kt) - t.$ 

So by Lemma 2.6 we obtain  $l-1 + \deg(g_2) - (N+N'+kt) - t \le l - (N+N'+kt) - 1$  and so  $\deg(g_2) \le t$ .

Since 
$$\alpha_i \neq z_0$$
 for  $i = 1, 2, ..., s$ , from (2.11) and (2.12) we see that  $(z - \alpha_1)^{m_1(n+k+1)-k-1} (z - \alpha_2)^{m_2(n+k+1)-k-1} \cdots (z - \alpha_s)^{m_s(n+k+1)-k-1}$ 

is a factor of  $g_2$ . Therefore

(2.20) 
$$M + M' - (k+1)s \le \deg(g_2) \le t.$$

From (2.19) and (2.20) we get

$$\begin{split} M + M' &\leq t + (k+1)s \\ &\leq (n_1 + n_2 + \dots + n_t) + (k+1)(m_1 + m_2 + \dots + m_s) \\ &= \frac{N'}{n} + M \\ &< M + \frac{M'}{n} \\ &\leq M + M', \end{split}$$

a contradiction.

SUBCASE 1.3. Let l = N + N' + kt. Then from (2.10) we see that  $(f^n(f^{k+1})^{(k)})_{\infty} \leq 0$ . We now show that  $m_1 + m_2 + \cdots + m_s \leq n_1 + n_2 + \cdots + n_t$ . If  $m_1 + m_2 + \cdots + m_s > n_1 + n_2 + \cdots + n_t$ , then  $(f^n)_{\infty} = M' - N' \geq n$  and  $(f^{k+1})_{\infty} = M - N \geq k + 1$ . So following the reasoning of Subcase 1.1 and using the proof of Subcase 3.3 of Lemma 2.6 we get  $((f^{k+1})^{(k)})_{\infty} = (f^{k+1})_{\infty} - k \geq k + 1 - k = 1$  and so  $(f^n(f^{k+1})^{(k)})_{\infty} \geq n + 1$ , which is a contradiction.

Since  $\alpha_j \neq z_0$  for j = 1, 2, ..., s, from (2.11) and (2.12) we see that  $(z - z_0)^{l-1}$  is a factor of  $g_1$ . So by (2.17) we get  $l - 1 \leq \deg(g_1) \leq (k+1)(s+t-1)$ . Now

$$N + N' = l - kt$$
  

$$\leq (k + 1)(s + t - 1) + 1 - kt$$
  

$$= (k + 1)s + t - k$$
  

$$\leq (k + 1)(m_1 + m_2 + \dots + m_s) + (n_1 + n_2 + \dots + n_t) - k$$
  

$$= M + \frac{N'}{n} - k$$
  

$$\leq N + N' - k,$$

which is a contradiction.

CASE 2. Suppose  $f^n(f^{k+1})^{(k)}$  has no *a*-point. Then *f* cannot be a polynomial because in this case  $f^n(f^{k+1})^{(k)}$  becomes a polynomial of degree at least n+1. Hence *f* is a non-polynomial rational function. Now putting l = 0 in (2.10) and proceeding as Subcase 1.1 we arrive at a contradiction. This proves the lemma.

LEMMA 2.8 [1]. Let f be an entire function. If the spherical derivative  $f^{\#}$  is bounded in C, then the order of f is at most 1.

#### 3. Proof of Theorem 1.1

*Proof.* We suppose that  $\mathfrak{F}$  is not normal in  $\mathfrak{D}$ . Then by Lemma 2.1 there exist

(i) a number r with 0 < r < 1,

(ii) points  $z_j$  satisfying  $|z_j| < r$ ,

(iii) functions  $f_i \in \mathfrak{F}$ ,

(iv) positive numbers  $\rho_j \rightarrow 0$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ ,

such that  $f_j(z_j + \rho_j \zeta) \to g(\zeta)$  as  $j \to \infty$  locally spherically uniformly, where g is a non-constant meromorphic function in **C** with  $g^{\#}(\zeta) \leq g^{\#}(0) = 1$ . In particular, g has order at most 2.

We put  $g_j(\zeta) = f_j(z_j + \rho_j \zeta)$ . Then  $g_j^n(\zeta)(g_j^{k+1}(\zeta))^{(k)} \to g^n(\zeta)(g^{k+1}(\zeta))^{(k)}$  as  $j \to \infty$  locally spherically uniformly.

Let

(3.1) 
$$g^{n}(\zeta)(g^{k+1}(\zeta))^{(k)} \equiv a.$$

Then g is entire having no zero. So in view of Lemma 2.8 we put  $g(\zeta) = \exp(c\zeta + d)$ , where  $c(\neq 0)$  and d are constants. Therefore from (3.1) we get

$$(k+1)^{k}c^{k} \exp\{(n+k+1)c\zeta + (n+k+1)d\} \equiv a_{k}$$

which is impossible unless (n+k+1)c = 0, a contradiction. Hence  $g^n(\zeta)(g^{k+1}(\zeta))^{(k)} \neq a$ .

So by Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 2.7 the function  $g^n(\zeta)(g^{k+1}(\zeta))^{(k)}$  has at least two distinct *a*-points  $\zeta_0$  and  $\zeta_0^*$ , say. We now choose two circular neighbourhoods  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  of  $\zeta_0$  and  $\zeta_0^*$  respectively such that  $D_1 \cap D_2 = \emptyset$  and  $D_1 \cup D_2$ does not contain any *a*-point of  $g^n(\zeta)(g^{k+1}(\zeta))^{(k)}$  other than  $\zeta_0$  and  $\zeta_0^*$ . Now by Hurwitz's theorem there exist two sequences of points  $\{\zeta_j\} \subset D_1$ 

Now by Hurwitz's theorem there exist two sequences of points  $\{\zeta_j\} \subset D_1$ and  $\{\zeta_j^*\} \subset D_2$  converging to  $\zeta_0$  and  $\zeta_0^*$  respectively such that  $g_j^n(\zeta_j)(g_j^{k+1}(\zeta_j))^{(k)} = a$  and  $g_j^n(\zeta_j^*)(g_j^{k+1}(\zeta_j^*))^{(k)} = a$ .

By the given condition for any integer *m* and for all *j* we get  $g_m^n(\zeta_j)(g_m^{k+1}(\zeta_j))^{(k)} = a$  and  $g_m^n(\zeta_j^*)(g_m^{k+1}(\zeta_j^*))^{(k)} = a$ . By (ii) and (iv), if necessary considering a subsequence, we see that there exists a point  $\xi$ ,  $|\xi| \leq r$ , such that  $z_j + \rho_j \zeta_j \to \xi$  and  $z_j + \rho_j \zeta_j^* \to \xi$  as  $j \to \infty$ . So  $f_m^n(\xi)(f_m^{k+1}(\xi))^{(k)} = a$  and since *a*-points are isolated, for sufficiently large *j* we get  $z_j + \rho_j \zeta_j = \xi$  and  $z_j + \rho_j \zeta_j^* = \xi$ .

Hence  $\zeta_j = \frac{\zeta - z_j}{\rho_j} = \zeta_j^*$ , which is impossible as  $D_1 \cap D_2 = \emptyset$ . This proves the theorem.

### References

- J. CLUNIE AND W. K. HAYMAN, The spherical derivative of integral and meromorphic functions, Comment. Math. Helv. 40 (1966), 117–148.
- [2] W. K. HAYMAN, Picard values of meromorphic functions and their derivatives, Ann. of Math. 70 (1959), 9–42.
- [3] J. D. HINCHLIFFE, On a result of Chuang related to Hayman's alternative, Computational Methods and Function Theory 2 (2002), 293-297.
- [4] Y. T. LI AND Y. X. GU, On normal families of meromorphic functions, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 354 (2009), 421–425.
- [5] E. MUES, Über ein problem von Hayman, Math. Z. 164 (1979), 239-259.
- [6] X. C. PANG AND L. ZALCMAN, Normal families and shared values, Bull. London Math. Soc. 32 (2000), 325–331.
- [7] J. SCHIFF, Normal families, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993.
- [8] W. SCHWICK, Normality criteria for normal families of meromorphic function, J. Anal. Math. 52 (1989), 241–289.
- [9] Y. F. WANG AND M. L. FANG, Picard values and normal families of meromorphic functions with multiple zeros, Acta Math. Sinica (Chin. Ser.) 41 (1998), 743–748.
- [10] Y. Xu, Normal families and exceptional functions, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 329 (2007), 1343– 1354.

Shanpeng Zeng DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS SCIENCE NANJING NORMAL UNIVERSITY NANJING, JIANGSU 210046 P. R. CHINA E-mail: zengshanpeng@163.com

CURRENT ADDRESS: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS HANGZHOU ELECTRONIC INFORMATION VOCATIONAL SCHOOL (DINGQIAO CAMPUS) HANGZHOU, ZHEIANG 310021 P. R. CHINA

Indrajit Lahiri Department of Mathematics University of Kalyani West Bengal 741235 India E-mail: indr9431@dataone.in ilahiri@hotmail.com