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#### Abstract

The object in this paper is to examine the value distribution of functions $f(z)$ nonconstant and meromorphic in the unit disk which have an asymptotic value $\alpha$, finite or infinite, along a spiral boundary path. The main result which we prove is that if $\Delta(r)$ is a component of the set of values $z$ such that $|f(z)-\alpha|<r, r>0$, which contains a boundary path on which $f(z)$ tends to $\alpha$ as $|z| \rightarrow 1$, then $f(z)$ assumes every value in $|w-\alpha|<r$ infinitely often in $\Delta(r)$ except for at most two values (if $\Delta(r)$ is simply-connected, then there is at most one exceptional value).


1. Introduction. A boundary path $S: z=s(t), 0 \leqq t<1$, in $|z|<1$ shall be called a spiral if arg $s(t) \rightarrow+\infty$ as $t \rightarrow 1$ or arg $s(t) \rightarrow-\infty$ as $t \rightarrow 1$. We shall denote by $(S)$ the class of functions, nonconstant and meromorphic in $|z|<1$, which have an asymptotic value $\alpha$, finite or infinite, along a spiral $S$. The object in this paper is to examine the value distribution of the functions in class ( $S$ ). In § 3 we have the main result which is a version of Picard's theorem localized to a neighborhood of a transcendental singularity for functions of class ( $S$ ). This result is applied in $\S 4$ to show that, in some sense, the number of direct transcendental singularities of functions of class $(S)$ cannot be too large. These results extend some earlier work of K. Noshiro [7] (see also [9, p. 163-167]).
2. Components of functions of class $(S)$. Let $f(z) \in(S)$. Then there is a complex value $\alpha$, finite or infinite, and a spiral $S: z=s(t)$, $0 \leqq t<1$, in $|z|<1$ such that $\lim _{t \rightarrow 1} f(s(t))=\alpha$. Let $r>0$ and $\omega$ be a complex number. We form the open set

$$
G=\{z| | f(z)-\omega \mid<r\}
$$

if $\omega$ is finite, and

$$
G=\{z| | f(z) \mid>r\}
$$

if $\omega$ is infinite. Since functions of class $(S)$ are of unbounded characteristic [5, p. 172], the global cluster set $C(f)$ of $f(z)$ in $|z|<1$ is total; hence, $G \neq \varnothing$. We denote by $\Delta(r)$ a nonempty open component of $G$. If $\operatorname{Fr}(\Delta(r)) \cap\{|z|=1\}=\varnothing$, where $\operatorname{Fr}(A)$ denotes the set of frontier points of the set $A$, we shall call $\Delta(r)$ a finite domain.

If, however, $\operatorname{Fr}(\Delta(r)) \cap\{|z|=1\} \neq \varnothing$, we shall call $\Delta(r)$ an infinite domain.

By the minimum principle, each finite domain $\Delta(r)$ contains a zero of $f(z)-\omega$. Also, by Rouche's theorem, a finite domain $\Delta(r)$ contains the same number of roots, counting multiplicities, for $f(z)-\beta$ for each value $\beta,|\beta-\omega|<r$.

If $\Delta(r)$ is an infinite domain, then $\Delta(r)$ is not, in general, simplyconnected. However, an easy application of the maximum principle shows $\Delta(r)$ to be simply-connected if either $\omega \neq \infty$ and $f(z)$ is holomorphic in $|z|<1$, i.e., $f(z)$ omits $\infty$ in $|z|<1$, or $\omega=\infty$ and $f(z)$ omits 0 in $|z|<1$. An infinite domain $\Delta(r)$ with the property that the portion of its boundary $\operatorname{Fr}(\Delta(r))$ which lies within $|\boldsymbol{z}|<1$ consists entirely of closed analytic curves shall be called an annular domain. An infinite domain $\Delta(r)$ with the property that there exists a spiral $S^{*}$ in $|z|<1$ such that $\Delta(r) \subseteq\{|z|<1\}-S^{*}$ shall be called a spiral domain.

Theorem 1. If $\Delta(r)$ is an infinite domain for $f(z) \in(S)$, then $\Delta(r)$ is one of the following: (i) a spiral domain, (ii) an annular domain, or (iii) a subset of an annular domain.

Proof. Suppose $\Delta(r)$ is neither annular domain nor a spiral domain. Let $r_{1}>r$. Let $\Delta\left(r_{1}\right)$ be the component of the open set $\left\{z\left||f(z)-\omega|<r_{1}\right\}\right.$ such that $\Delta(r) \subseteq \Delta\left(r_{1}\right)$. Suppose $\Delta\left(r_{1}\right)$ is not an annular domain. Then, applying methods found in [3], we can find a boundary path $L^{\prime}$ in $|z|<1$ on which $|f(z)-\omega|=r_{1}$. Since $\Delta(r)$ is not a spiral domain, the spiral $S$ intersects $\Delta(r)$ in $1-\delta<|z|<1$ for each $\delta>0$. Thus, $|\alpha-\omega| \leqq r$, and there exists $t_{0}, 0<t_{0}<1$, such that the spiral $S^{*}: z=s(t), t_{0} \leqq t<1$, is disjoint from $L^{\prime}$. Thus, $L^{\prime}$ is also a spiral and $\Delta(r) \subseteq \Delta\left(r_{1}\right) \subseteq\{|z|<1\}-L^{\prime}$. But this implies that $\Delta(r)$ is a spiral domain, contrary to our assumption. Therefore, $\Delta\left(r_{1}\right)$ is an annular domain.

Theorem 2. If $\Delta(r)$ is an infinite domain for $f(z) \in(S)$ and if $L$ is a boundary path in $\Delta(r)$ on which $f(z) \rightarrow \omega$ as $|z| \rightarrow 1$, then $\Delta(r)$ is either a spiral domain or an annular domain.

Proof. Recall that $\alpha$ is the asymptotic value of $f(z)$ along the spiral $S$. Suppose $\omega \neq \alpha$. Then, in this case, the boundary path $L$ must be a spiral. Suppose $\Delta(r)$ is not an annular domain. As in the proof above we apply the methods found in [3] to find a boundary path $L^{\prime}$ in $|z|<1$ on which $|f(z)-\omega|=r$. Since $L$ is a spiral, $L^{\prime}$ is a spiral and $\Delta(r) \subseteq\{|\boldsymbol{z}|<1\}-L^{\prime}$.

Suppose $\omega=\alpha$. Then, there exists $t_{0}, 0<t_{0}<1$, such that
$|f(s(t))-\alpha|<r$ for all $t, t_{0} \leqq t<1$. Let $S^{*}: z=s(t), t_{0}<t<1$. Clearly, either $S^{*} \cong \Delta(r)$ or $\Delta(r) \subseteq\{|z|<1\}-S^{*}$. If $S^{*} \subseteq \Delta(r)$, then we can argue as above to show that $\Delta(r)$ is a spiral domain.

Let $z=\phi(w)$ denote the inverse function of $w=f(z) \in(S)$. The damain of $z=\phi(w)$ is a Riemann surface $\Phi$. We shall write $Q\left(w ; w_{0}\right)$ to denote a functional element with center $w=w_{0}$ for $z=\phi(w)$. Let

$$
\Lambda: q(t)=Q(w ; w(t)), \quad 0 \leqq t<1
$$

with $\lim _{t \rightarrow 1} w(t)=\omega$, be a curve on the Riemann surface $\Phi$. This curve $\Lambda$ is said to define a transcendental singularity $\Omega$ for $z=\phi(w)$ on $\Phi$, with projection $w=\omega$, if (i) for every positive number $\delta, \delta<$ 1 , the system of functional elements $Q(w ; w(t)), 0 \leqq t \leqq \delta$, defines an analytic continuation (possibly, of algebraic character), but (ii) for any functional element $Q(w ; \omega)$, rational or algebraic, with center at $w=\omega$, the system $Q(w ; w(t)), 0 \leqq t \leqq 1$, where $w(1)=\omega$, never defines an analytic continuation. A theorem due to the work of Iversen [6, p. 13] and Noshiro [7, p. 53] states that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the asymptotic paths of $w=f(z)$ and the transcendental singularities of $z=\phi(w)$, the inverse function of $w=f(z)$. In view of this result, we shall say that two asymptotic boundary paths $L_{1}$ and $L_{2}$ for $f(z) \in(S)$ are equivalent if $L_{1}$ and $L_{2}$ both correspond (in the sense of the Iversen-Noshiro theorem) to the same transcendental singularity $\Omega$ on the Riemann surface $\Phi$ of $z=\phi(w)$, and, we shall indicate this equivalence by the notation $\left[L_{1}\right]=\left[L_{2}\right]$. We refer the reader to [2] and [3] where the notions of equivalent and nonequivalent asymptotic paths are analyzed in greater detail.

Theorem 3. If $f(z) \in(S)$ and $\Delta(r)$ is an annular domain for all $r>0$, then the inverse function $z=\phi(w)$ of $w=f(z)$ has exactly one transcendental singularity and it lies above $w=\omega$.

Proof. Suppose $z=\phi(w)$ has at least two transcendental singularities $\Omega_{1}$ and $\Omega_{2}$. Let $S_{1}$ and $S_{2}$ be the asymptotic boundary paths in $|z|<1$ for $f(z)$ which correspond to $\Omega_{1}$ and $\Omega_{2}$, respectively. Since $f(z) \in(S), S_{1}$ and $S_{2}$ are spirals. Let $r>0$. Since $\Delta(r)$ is an annular domain, $S_{1}$ and $S_{2}$ intersect $\Delta(r) \cap\{\delta<|z|<1\}$ for each $\delta, 0<\delta<1$. Since $r$ is an arbitrary positive number, we have that $\omega$ is the asymptotic value on $S_{1}$ and $S_{2}$. By [3, Theorem 1], $\left[S_{1}\right] \neq\left[S_{2}\right]$ implies that there exists $b>0$ and a boundary path $L^{\prime}$, necessarily a spiral, on which $|f(z)-\omega|=b$. But, then $\Delta\left(r_{0}\right) \subseteq\{|z|<1\}-L^{\prime}$ for $r_{0}, 0<r_{0}<b$, which contradicts our hypothesis that $\Delta\left(r_{0}\right)$ is an
annular domain. Hence, $z=\phi(w)$ has exactly one transcendental singularity.

In [10] Valiron offers a construction of a function which shows that the converse of Theorem 3 is false. Valiron's construction is very difficult to follow and prompts the need for another approach to the construction of such a function.
3. Value distribution of functions of class $(S)$ in $\Delta(r)$. We denote by $n(\phi, a)$ the number of functional elements $Q(w ; a)$, with center $w=a$, for $z=\phi(w)$ the inverse of $f(z) \in(S)$, where an algebraic functional element is counted $k$ times if its order of ramification is $k-1$. Noshiro [7, p. 60] proved the following: Let $z=\phi_{D}(w)$ denote the branch of $z=\phi(w)$ obtained by continuing $Q(w ; a), a \in D$, inside $D$ with algebraic elements, where $D$ is an arbitrary domain of the $w$-plane. If $z=\phi_{D}(w)$ has no transcendental singularity with projection inside $D$, then $n\left(\phi_{D}, w\right)$ is a finite or infinite constant in $D$.

Theorem 4. If $\Delta(r)$ is an annular domain for $f(z) \in(S)$ and if the transcendental singularities of $z=\phi(w)$ lying above $|w-\omega|<$ $r$ have the property that they lie above at most a finite set of points $w_{1}, w_{2}, \cdots, w_{k}$ in $|w-\omega|<r$, then every value of $|w-\omega|<r$ is assumed infinitely often by $f(z)$ in $\Delta(r)$, except possibly the values $w_{1}, w_{2}, \cdots, w_{k}$.

Proof. Let $D^{\prime}=\{|w-\omega|<r\}-\bigcup_{j=1}^{k}\left\{w_{j}\right\}$. Then, the branch $z=\phi_{D^{\prime}}(w)$ of $z=\phi(w)$ has no transcendental singularity with projection inside $D^{\prime}$. By Noshiro's theorem above, the function $n\left(\phi_{D^{\prime}}, w\right)$ is constant throughout $D^{\prime}$. If $\Delta(r)$ had at most finitely many holes, then, since $\Delta(r)$ is an annular domain, the global cluster set $C(f)$ of $f(z)$ would be contained in the closed disk $|w-\omega| \leqq r$. But this contradicts functions of class ( $S$ ) having total global cluster sets. Thus, $\Delta(r)$ has infinitely many holes. Each hole is bounded by a closed analytic curve whose image under $f(z)$ covers the circumference $|w-\omega|=r$ completely. Thus, $n\left(\phi_{D^{\prime}}, w\right)=+\infty$ throughout $D^{\prime}$ and we are done.

Theorem 5. If $\Delta(r)$ is a spiral domain for $f(z) \in(S)$, then each value $\beta,|\beta-\omega|<r$, omitted by $f(z)$ in $\Delta(r)$ is an asymptotic value along a spiral contained in $\Delta(r)$.

Proof. Since $\Delta(r)$ is a spiral domain, there exists a spiral $S^{\prime}$ in $|z|<1$ such that $\Delta(r) \cong\{|z|<1\}-S^{\prime}$. Let $\zeta=\zeta(z)$ be a one-to-one conformal map of the simply-connected region $\{|z|<1\}-S^{\prime \prime}$ onto
$|\zeta|<1$ such that the prime end $P$ of $\{|z|<1\}-S^{\prime}$ whose impression $I(P)$ is $|z|=1$ corresponds to $\zeta=1$. We use $z=z(\zeta)$ to denote the inverse map of $\zeta=\zeta(z)$. Let $\Delta^{\prime}(r)$ be the image of $\Delta(r)$ in $|\zeta|<1$ under $\zeta=\zeta(z)$. Since $\Delta(r)$ is a spiral domain, we have that $1 \in$ $\operatorname{Fr}\left(\Delta^{\prime}(r)\right)$.

The function $F(\zeta)=f(z(\zeta))$ is holomorphic in $\Delta^{\prime}(r)$ and continuous in $\overline{\Delta^{\prime}(r)}$, with the exception of $\zeta=1$. In fact, $|F(\zeta)-\omega|<r$ for $\zeta \in \Delta^{\prime}(r)$ and $|F(\zeta)-\omega|=r$ for $\zeta \in \operatorname{Fr}\left(\Delta^{\prime}(r)\right), \zeta \neq 1$.

Suppose $f(z)$ omits $\beta$ in $\Delta(r),|\beta-\omega|<r$. Then, $F(\zeta)$ omits $\beta$ in $\Delta^{\prime}(r)$. Let

$$
F_{2}(\zeta)=\frac{F_{1}(\zeta)-\beta^{*}}{1-\overline{\beta^{*}} F_{1}(\zeta)}
$$

where $F_{1}(\zeta)=1 / r(F(\zeta)-\omega)$ and $\beta^{*}=1 / r(\beta-\omega)$. Then, $F_{2}(\zeta)$ is holomorphic in $\Delta^{\prime}(r)$ with $\left|F_{2}(\zeta)\right|<1$ in $\Delta^{\prime}(r),\left|F_{2}(\zeta)\right|=1$ for $\zeta \epsilon$ $\operatorname{Fr}\left(\Delta^{\prime}(r)\right), \zeta \neq 1$, and $F_{2}(\zeta) \neq 0$ in $\Delta^{\prime}(r)$. If $\Delta(r)$ were simply-connected, then $\Delta^{\prime}(r)$ would be simply-connected and we could, then, apply results of functions belonging to Seidel's class ( $U$ ) [8, p. 32] to prove our theorem. Unfortunately, $\Delta(r)$ may not be simplyconnected, in general. An argument of Doob [4] helps to surmount this difficulty.

Since $F_{2}(\zeta)$ omits 0 in $\Delta^{\prime}(r), 1 / F_{2}(\zeta)$ is holomorphic in $\Delta^{\prime}(r)$. Suppose $1 / F_{2}(\zeta)$ is bounded in $\Delta^{\prime}(r)$. Then there exists a number $K>0$ such that $1 /\left|F_{2}(\zeta)\right|<K$ in $\Delta^{\prime}(r)$. Let $\sigma$ be a number such that $0<$ $\sigma<1$. Choose a definite branch of the function $(1 / 2(\zeta-1))^{\sigma}$ in $\Delta^{\prime}(r)$. This branch is holomorphic in $\Delta^{\prime}(r)$ with $|1 / 2(\zeta-1)| \leqq 1$ in $\Delta^{\prime}(r)$. The function

$$
\dot{\phi}_{\sigma}(\zeta)=\frac{\left(\frac{1}{2}(\zeta-1)\right)^{\sigma}}{F_{2}(\zeta)}
$$

is holomorphic and bounded in $\Delta^{\prime}(r)$. Furthermore,

$$
\left|\phi_{\sigma}(\zeta)\right| \leqq \frac{1}{\left|F_{2}(\zeta)\right|}=1
$$

for $\zeta \in \operatorname{Fr}\left(\Delta^{\prime}(r)\right), \zeta \neq 1$. Also,

$$
\lim _{\substack{\zeta \rightarrow 1 \\ \zeta \in \mathcal{A}^{\prime}(r)}} \phi_{o}(\zeta)=0
$$

By the maximum principle, $\left|\dot{\phi}_{\sigma}(\zeta)\right| \leqq 1$ for $\zeta \in \Delta^{\prime}(r)$, for every $\sigma>0$. If we let $\sigma \rightarrow 0$, we have that $\left|F_{2}(\zeta)\right| \geqq 1$ in $\Delta^{\prime}(r)$, and this is a contradiction. Thus, we have that 0 is a cluster value for $F_{2}$ at $\zeta=1$ in $\Delta^{\prime}(r)$. But, clearly, 0 does not belong to the set of boundary cluster values for $F_{2}$ at $\zeta=1$ in $\Delta^{\prime}(r)$. Since 0 is omitted by $F_{2}$ in
$\Delta^{\prime}(r)$, by the Gross-Iversen theorem [8, p. 23-24], there exists a path $L$ in $\Delta^{\prime}(r)$ terminating at $\zeta=1$ on which $F_{2}(\zeta) \rightarrow 0$ as $|\zeta| \rightarrow 1$. Thus, on $L f(z(\zeta)) \rightarrow \beta$ as $|\zeta| \rightarrow 1$. We simply notice that the image of $L$ is a spiral lying in $\Delta(r)$ on which $f(z) \rightarrow \beta$ as $|z| \rightarrow 1$.

THEOREM 6. Let $\Delta(r)$ be an infinite domain for $f(z) \in(S)$ such that $\Delta(r)$ contains a boundary path $L$ on which $f(z) \rightarrow \omega$ as $|z| \rightarrow 1$. Let $\Delta_{\tau}=\Delta(r) \cap\{|z|<\tau\}, 0<\tau<1$, and let $A(\tau)$ denote the area of the Riemannian image of $\Delta_{\tau}$ under $w=f(z)$. Then

$$
\lim _{\tau \rightarrow 1} A(\tau)=+\infty
$$

Proof. Suppose for all $r_{1}, 0<r_{1}<r, \Delta\left(r_{1}\right)$ is an annular domain (here it is understood, of course, that $\Delta\left(r_{1}\right)$ is that component which contains the end part of $L$ ). Then, by Theorem 3, the inverse $z=$ $\phi(w)$ has exactly one transcendental singularity which lies above $w=\omega$. By Theorem 4, every value in the disk $|w-\omega|<r$, except possibly $w=\omega$, is assumed infinitely often by $f(z)$ in $\Delta(r)$. Thus, in this case,

$$
\lim _{\tau \rightarrow 1} A(\tau)=+\infty
$$

Let us, next, consider the case that for some $r_{0}, 0<r_{0}<r, \Delta\left(r_{0}\right)$ is a spiral domain. Let $\Delta_{\tau}^{0}=\Delta\left(r_{0}\right) \cap\{|z|<\tau\}, 0<\tau<1$, and let $A_{0}(\tau)$ denote the area of the Riemannian image of $\Delta_{\tau}^{0}$ under $f(z)$. Since $\Delta\left(r_{0}\right) \leqq \Delta(r)$, it follows that $A_{0}(\tau) \leqq A(\tau)$. In view of this, it suffices to assume that $\Delta(r)$ is a spiral domain. Since $\Delta(r) \cong\{|z|<1\}-S^{\prime}$ for some spiral $S^{\prime}$ in $|z|<1$, we again map $\Delta(r)$ onto $\Delta^{\prime}(r)$ using the one-to-one conformal $\operatorname{map} \zeta=\zeta(z)$ of $\{|z|<1\}-S^{\prime}$ onto $|\zeta|<1$ that we used in the proof of Theorem 5. Then, the image $L^{\prime}$ of the spiral $L$ is a path in $\Delta^{\prime}(r)$ which terminates at $\zeta=1$.

Let $\Delta^{\prime \prime}(r)$ denote the image of $\Delta^{\prime}(r)$ in the $t$-plane under the $\operatorname{map} t=\left(\zeta-\zeta_{0}\right) /(\zeta-1)$, where $\zeta_{0}$ is the initial point of the path $L^{\prime}$. The image $L^{\prime \prime}$ of $L^{\prime}$ under this map is a path which begins at the interior point $t=0$ of $\Delta^{\prime \prime}(r)$ and terminates at the boundary point $t=\infty$ of ${A^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}(r)$. We define

$$
G(t)=f\left(z\left(\frac{t-\zeta_{0}}{t-1}\right)\right)
$$

in $\Delta^{\prime \prime}(r)$. Let $\Delta_{\tau}^{\prime \prime}=\Delta^{\prime \prime}(r) \cap\{|t|<\tau\}, 0<\tau<+\infty$. Let $A^{\prime \prime}(\tau)$ denote the area of the Riemannian image of the open set $\Delta_{\tau}^{\prime \prime}$ under $G(t)$. Since the range of $G(t)$ in $\Delta^{\prime \prime}(r)$ is identical to that of $f(z)$ in $\Delta(r)$ and since $\Delta^{\prime \prime}(r)$ is linked to $\Delta(r)$ by means of a one-to-one conformal map, it suffices to show that

$$
\lim _{\tau \rightarrow+\infty} A^{\prime \prime}(\tau)=+\infty
$$

Let $\tau_{0}>0$ be fixed so that $|t|<\tau_{0}$ contains at least one boundary point of $\|^{\prime \prime}(r)$. Denote by $L_{\tau}^{\prime \prime}$ the part of the path $L^{\prime \prime}$ which runs from the last point of intersection $t_{\tau}$ of $L^{\prime \prime}$ with $|t|=\tau$, counting from $t=0$. Since $G(t) \rightarrow \omega$ on $L^{\prime \prime}$ as $|t| \rightarrow+\infty$, there exists a number $\tau_{1}, \tau_{1}>\tau_{0}>0$, such that (i) $|G(t)-\omega|<(1 / 2) r$ for all $t \in L_{\tau_{1}}^{\prime \prime}$, and (ii) for any $\tau>\tau_{1}$, if $\gamma_{\tau}$ denotes the collection of component arcs of $|t|=\tau$ which fall into $4^{\prime \prime}(r)$ (there can be at most finitely many such arcs since the boundary of $\Delta^{\prime \prime}(r)$ is an analytic curve), then $\gamma_{\tau}$ contains a crosscut of $\Delta^{\prime \prime}(r)$, call it $\lambda_{\tau}$, such that the point $t_{\tau} \in \lambda_{\tau}$ and the endpoints of $\lambda_{\tau}$ lie on $\operatorname{Fr}\left(4^{\prime \prime}(r)\right)$. Since the image of the arc $\lambda_{\tau}$ under $G(t)$ is a curve which starts from a point on $|w-\omega|=r$, passes through a point lying in $|w-\omega|<(1 / 2) r$, and, finally, terminates at a point on $|w-\omega|=r$, we have that the length of the image of $\lambda_{\tau}$ under $G(t)$ is greater than or equal to $r$.

Let $L(\tau)$ be the total length of the image of $\gamma_{\tau}$ under $G(t)$; let $l(\tau)$ be the total length of $\gamma_{\tau}$. Then for $t=\tau e^{i \theta}$,

$$
L(\tau)=\int_{\tau_{\tau}}\left|G^{\prime}(t)\right| \tau d \theta
$$

By the Schwarz inequality,

$$
(L(\tau))^{2} \leqq\left(\int_{\gamma_{\tau}}\left|G^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2} \tau d \theta\right)\left(\int_{\gamma_{\tau}} \tau d \theta\right)=l(\tau) \int_{\gamma_{\tau}}\left|G^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2} \tau d \theta .
$$

Hence,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{(L(\tau))^{2}}{l(\tau)} \leqq \int_{\tau_{\tau}}\left|G^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2} \tau d \theta, \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and, for $\tau>\tau_{1}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\tau_{1}}^{\tau} \frac{(L(\tau))^{2}}{l(\tau)} d \tau \leqq \int_{\tau_{1}}^{\tau} \int_{\tau_{\tau}}\left|G^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2} \tau d \tau d \theta \leqq A^{\prime \prime}(\tau)-A^{\prime \prime}\left(\tau_{1}\right) . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $l(\tau) \leqq 2 \pi \tau$ and $L(\tau) \geqq r$ for all $\tau, \tau_{1} \leqq \tau \leqq+\infty$,

$$
\int_{\tau_{1}}^{\tau} \frac{(L(\tau))^{2}}{l(\tau)} d \tau \geqq \frac{r^{2}}{2 \pi} \int_{\tau_{1}}^{\tau} \frac{d \tau}{\tau} \longrightarrow+\infty
$$

as $\tau \rightarrow+\infty$. Therefore,

$$
\lim _{\tau \rightarrow+\infty} A^{\prime \prime}(\tau)=+\infty .
$$

Theorem 7. Under the hypothesis of Theorem 6,

$$
\liminf _{t \rightarrow 1} \frac{L(\tau)}{A(\tau)}=0
$$

where $L(\tau)$ denotes the length of the images of the collection of arcs of $|z|=\tau$ which fall into $\Delta(r)$ under $f(z)$.

Proof. By (2)

$$
\frac{(L(\tau))^{2}}{l(\tau)} \leqq \frac{d A^{\prime \prime}(\tau)}{d \tau}
$$

Hence,

$$
\frac{d \tau}{l(\tau)} \leqq \frac{d A^{\prime \prime}(\tau)}{(L(\tau))^{2}}
$$

Let $E=\left\{\tau \mid \tau>\tau_{0}, L(\tau) \geqq A^{\prime \prime}(\tau)^{1 / 2+\varepsilon}\right\}, 0<\varepsilon<1 / 2$. Since $l(\tau) \leqq 2 \pi \tau$,

$$
\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{E} \frac{d \tau}{\tau} \leqq \int_{E} \frac{d \tau}{l(\tau)}
$$

Thus,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{E} \frac{d \tau}{\tau} & \leqq \int_{E} \frac{d A^{\prime \prime}(\tau)}{(L(\tau))^{2}} \leqq \int_{E} \frac{d A^{\prime \prime}(\tau)}{\left(A^{\prime \prime}(\tau)^{1 / 2+\delta}\right)^{2}} \\
& \leqq \int_{A^{\prime \prime}\left(\left(_{0}\right)\right.}^{\infty} \frac{d t}{t^{1+2 \varepsilon}}<+\infty
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, there exists a sequence of positive numbers $\left\{\tau_{n}\right\}$ such that $\tau_{n} \rightarrow+\infty$ as $n \rightarrow+\infty$ with $\tau_{n} \notin E$ for all $n$. Therefore,

$$
\frac{L\left(\tau_{n}\right)}{A^{\prime \prime}\left(\tau_{n}\right)} \leqq \frac{A^{\prime \prime}\left(\tau_{n}\right)^{1 / 2+\varepsilon}}{A^{\prime \prime}\left(\tau_{n}\right)}=\frac{1}{A^{\prime \prime}\left(\tau_{n}\right)^{1 / 2-\varepsilon}}
$$

and, by Theorem 6, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\liminf _{\tau \rightarrow+\infty} \frac{L(\tau)}{A^{\prime \prime}(\tau)}=0 \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $f(z) \in(S)$, the Riemannian image $\Phi_{r}$ of the disk $|z|<r$, $0<r<1$, under $f(z)$ is a finite covering of the Riemann sphere of diameter 1 and tangent to the $w$-plane endowed with the spherical distance as metric. The Riemann images $\Phi_{r}$ exhaust the surface $\Phi$ of the inverse $z=\phi(w)$ of $w=f(z)$ [8, p. 90]. Let $A(r)$ denote the spherical area of $\Phi_{r}$ and let $L(r)$ denote the spherical length of the boundary of $\Phi_{r}$.

Corollary. For $f(z) \in(S)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{r \rightarrow 1} A(r)=+\infty \tag{i}
\end{equation*}
$$

and
(ii)

$$
\liminf _{r \rightarrow 1} \frac{L(r)}{A(r)}=0
$$

Proof. Follows immediately from Theorems 6 and 7.
A Riemann surface $\Phi$ which satisfies condition (ii) in the above corollary is called regularly exhaustible. For a thorough discussion of regularly exhaustible surfaces and the value distribution theory connected with them we refer the reader to [9, p. 152-170]. In view of this, it is appropriate to state the following corollary.

Corollary. The Riemannian image of a function of class (S) is regularly exhaustible.

The next theorem is a Picard theorem localized to a transcendental singularity of the inverse function $z=\phi(w)$ of $f(z) \in(S)$. The idea behind the proof comes from the work of K. Noshiro [7].

Theorem 8. Let $\Delta(r)$ be an infinite domain for $f(z) \in(S)$ such that $\Delta(r)$ contains a boundary path $L$ on which $f(z) \rightarrow \omega$ as $|z| \rightarrow 1$. Then, the function takes every value of $|\omega-\omega|<r$ infinitely often in $\Delta(r)$, except for at most two values. In particular, if $\Delta(r)$ is simply-connected, then $f(z)$ assumes every value of $|w-\omega|<r$ infinitely often in $\Delta(r)$ with one possible exception.

Proof. We assume, first, that $\Delta(r)$ is simply-connected. Let $\Delta^{\prime \prime}(\tau), A^{\prime \prime}(\tau), \gamma_{\tau}, L(\tau)$, and $G(t)$ be as found in the proof of Theorem 6. Suppose that $w_{1}$ and $w_{2}$ are distinct values in $|w-\omega|<r$ such that $G(t)$ omits $w_{1}$ and $w_{2}$ in $\Delta^{\prime \prime}(r) \cap\left\{|t|>\tau_{0}\right\}$ for some $\tau_{0}>0$. Consider the open set $\Delta_{\tau}^{\prime \prime}=\Delta^{\prime \prime}(r) \cap\left\{\tau_{0}<|t|<\tau\right\}$. Since each component of $\Delta_{\tau}^{\prime \prime}$ contains at least one arc of either $\gamma_{\tau_{0}}$ or $\gamma_{\tau}$, we must have that $\Delta_{\tau}^{\prime \prime}$ consists of finitely many simply-connected components

$$
\Delta_{\tau}^{\prime \prime}(1), \Delta_{\tau}^{\prime \prime}(2), \cdots, \Delta_{:}^{\prime \prime}(m), m=m(\tau) .
$$

The Riemannian image of $\Delta_{\tau}^{\prime \prime}$ under $G(t)$ consists of $m$ simply-connected covering surfaces $\Phi_{:}^{\prime \prime}(j)$ corresponding to $\Delta_{:}^{\prime \prime}(j), j=1,2, \cdots, m$, of the base surface

$$
B=\{|w-\omega|<r\}-\left\{w_{1}, w_{2}\right\}
$$

The Euler characteristic of $B$ is 1 [5, p. 136].
Applying Ahlfors' theorem of covering surfaces [5, p. 137] to $\Delta_{\tau}^{\prime \prime}(j)$ and $\Phi_{\tau}^{\prime \prime}(j)$, we have $S^{j} \leqq h L^{j}, j=1,2, \cdots, m$, where $S^{j}$ denotes the ratio between the area of $\Phi_{\tau}^{\prime \prime}(j)$ and the area of $B$, and $L^{j}$
denotes the length of the boundary of $\bar{\Phi}_{\tau}^{\prime \prime}(j)$ relative to $B, h$ being a constant dependent on $B$. Thus,

$$
\sum_{j=1}^{m} S^{j} \leqq h \sum_{j=1}^{m} L^{j},
$$

and

$$
S(\tau) \leqq h\left(L(\tau)+L\left(\tau_{0}\right)\right)
$$

where $S(\tau)=A^{\prime \prime}(\tau) / \pi r^{2}$. Thus, $\left(L(\tau)+L\left(\tau_{0}\right)\right) / S(\tau) \geqq 1 / h$ for all $\tau$, $\tau>\tau_{0}$. Therefore,

$$
\lim _{=\rightarrow+\infty} \frac{L(\tau)}{A^{\prime \prime}(\tau)} \geqq \frac{\pi r^{2}}{h}>0
$$

But this contradicts (3). Thus, $G(t)$ in $\Delta^{\prime \prime}(r)$ and, clearly, $f(z)$ in $\Delta(r)$ assumes all values of $|w-\omega|<r$, except possibly one, infinitely many times.

Suppose $\Delta(r)$ is an arbitrary infinite domain which contains $L$; $\Delta(r)$ may not be simply-connected. Assume that there are three distinct values $w_{1}, w_{2}, w_{3}$ of $|w-\omega|<r$ which are assumed only finitely many times by $f(z)$ in $\Delta(r)$. We draw a simple closed analytic curve $L$ in $|w-\omega|<r$ which encloses $\omega, w_{1}, w_{2}$, and passes through $w_{3}$. Since $f(z) \rightarrow \omega$ on $L$ as $|z| \rightarrow 1$, we may assume that the image of $L$ under $f(z)$ lies entirely in the interior $H$ of $L$.

Let $A_{H}$ be the component of $\{z \mid f(z) \in H\}$ which contains the path $L$. Then, clearly, $\Delta_{H} \subseteq \Delta(r)$. Choose $r_{0}, 0<r_{0}<1$, such that $f(z)$ omits $w_{1}, w_{2}$, and $w_{3}$ in $\Delta(r) \cap\left\{r_{0}<|z|<1\right\}$. Let $\Delta_{H}^{*}$ be the component of $\Delta_{H} \cap\left\{r_{0}<|z|<1\right\}$ which contains the end part of $L$. Then, $\Delta_{H}^{*} \subseteq \Delta_{H}$, and $\Delta_{H}^{*}$ is simply-connected. Indeed, if it were not, then on the boundary of each hole $f(z)$ would assume the value $w_{3}$. But by the construction of $\Delta_{H}^{*}$ this is impossible. Also, $\Delta_{H}^{*}$ is clearly a spiral domain.

We can, now, apply the above argument to the simply-connected spiral domain $\Delta_{H}^{*}$ to show that it cannot omit two values. Thus, our theorem is proved.

Theorem 9. Each exceptional value of Theorem 8 is an asymptotic value for $f(z)$ along a spiral contained in $\Delta(r)$.

Proof. Suppose $\beta \neq \omega$ is assumed by $f(z)$ in $\Delta(r)$ only finitely many times. Then, there exists $\delta, 0<\delta<1$, such that $f(z)$ omits $\beta$ in $\Delta(r) \cap\{\delta<|z|<1\}$. Choose $\delta_{1}, \delta<\delta_{1}<1$, so that $f(z) \neq \beta$ on $|z|=\delta_{1}$. Let

$$
\varepsilon=\min |f(z)-\beta| \quad \text { for } \quad|z|=\delta_{1},
$$

and, let $\rho=1 / 4 \min (\varepsilon, r-|\beta-\omega|,|\beta-\omega|)$. Clearly, $\rho>0$. By Theorem 8, there exists a value $z_{0}$ such that $z_{0} \in \Delta(r) \cap\left\{\delta_{1}<|z|<1\right\}$ and $\left|f\left(z_{0}\right)-\beta\right|<\rho$. Let $\Delta_{\beta}(\rho)$ be that component of $\{z \| f(z)-\beta \mid<\rho\}$ which contains $z_{0}$. By the choice of $\rho$, we have $\Delta_{\beta}(\rho) \subseteq\left\{\delta_{1}<|z|<1\right\}$ and $\Delta_{\beta}(\rho) \subseteq \Delta(r)$. Since $f(z)$ omits $\beta$ in $\Delta_{\beta}(\rho)$, we have that $\Delta_{\beta}(\rho)$ is an infinite domain. We, also, point out that the end part of the spiral on which $f(z) \rightarrow \omega$ as $|z| \rightarrow 1$ is disjoint from $\Delta_{\beta}(\rho)$. Thus, $\Delta_{\beta}(\rho)$ is a spiral domain in which $\beta$ is an omitted value of $f(z)$. By Theorem 5, $\beta$ is an asymptotic value along a spiral contained in $\Delta_{\beta}(\rho)$.
4. Direct transcendental singularities. Let $f(z) \in(S)$ and $\Delta(r)$ be an infinite domain in $|\boldsymbol{z}|<1$ such that $\Delta(r)$ contains a boundary path $L$ on which $f(z) \rightarrow \omega$. If $f(z)$ omits $\omega$ in $\Delta(r)$ for $r>0$ sufficiently small, then the transcendental singularity $\Omega$ of $z=\phi(w)$ which corresponds to $L$ is said to be a direct transcendental singularity.

Theorem 10. Let $f(z) \in(S)$ and let $z=\phi(w)$ be its inverse function. Then, the set of values $\omega$ in the w-plane which are projections of direct transcendental singularities of $z=\phi(w)$ is at most countable.

Proof. Let $\left\{\omega_{n}\right\}$ be the rational points in the $w$-plane and let $\left\{r_{n}\right\}$ be the rationals of the interval ( 0,1 ). Let $G_{n}=\left\{z| | f(z)-\omega_{n} \mid<r_{n}\right\}$. We set $H=\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} H_{n}$, where $H_{n}$ is the set of points of $\left|w-\omega_{n}\right|<r_{n}$ which are not covered by the image of at least one component of $G_{n}$ under $f(z)$. By Theorem 9, $H_{n}$ is at most countable, and, hence, so is $H$.

Suppose $f(z) \rightarrow \omega$ on a spiral $S$ and $S$ corresponds to a direct transcendental singularity for $z=\phi(w)$. Then, there exists $r>0$ such that $S \subset \Delta(r)$ and $f(z)$ omits $\omega$ in $\Delta(r)$. But there exists an integer $n$ such that a component $\Delta_{n}$ of $G_{n}$ is contained in $\Delta(r)$ with $\left|\omega-\omega_{n}\right|<r_{n}$. Therefore, $\omega \in H_{n}$ and the theorem is proven.

We, next, present an example of a holomorphic function $f(z) \in(S)$ such that its inverse function has uncountably many transcendental singularities above $w=\infty$, and we note that since $f(z)$ is holomorphic these are direct transcendental singularities. This example places the last result in clearer perspective.

Let $A$ be the extended complex plane and let $M$ be the Cantor set on the interval $0 \leqq \theta \leqq 2 \pi$ with $\left\{I_{n}\right\}$ denoting the sequence of the open middle-third intervals of $0 \leqq \theta \leqq 2 \pi$ which are deleted to construct $M$. The order of the sequence $\left\{I_{n}\right\}$ is as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& I_{1}=\left(\frac{2 \pi}{3}, \frac{4 \pi}{3}\right), \quad I_{2}=\left(\frac{2 \pi}{9}, \frac{4 \pi}{9}\right), \\
& I_{3}=\left(\frac{14 \pi}{9}, \frac{16 \pi}{9}\right), \quad I_{4}=\left(\frac{2 \pi}{27}, \frac{4 \pi}{27}\right), \cdots
\end{aligned}
$$

Let $\left\{J_{n}\right\}$ be the sequence of open intervals of the sequence of open sets $[0,2 \pi]-\bar{I}_{1},[0,2 \pi]-\overline{I_{1} \cup I_{2}}, \cdots$, with the ordering

$$
\begin{aligned}
& J_{1}=\left(0, \frac{2 \pi}{3}\right), \quad J_{2}=\left(\frac{4 \pi}{3}, 2 \pi\right), \quad J_{3}=\left(0, \frac{2 \pi}{9}\right), \\
& J_{4}=\left(\frac{4 \pi}{9}, \frac{2 \pi}{3}\right), \quad J_{5}=\left(\frac{4 \pi}{3}, \frac{14 \pi}{9}\right), \cdots
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $A$ is an analytic set and $M$ is a closed nowhere dense set we can apply a theorem of Bagemihl and Seidel [1, p. 198-199] to claim the existence of a function $f(z)$, holomorphic in $|z|<1$, with the following properties:
(i) for every $\theta \in M, \lim _{r \rightarrow 1} f\left(\mathrm{re}^{i(\theta+1 /(1-r))}\right)=w_{\theta}$ exists (possibly infinite);
(ii) if $I$ is any subinterval of $0 \leqq \theta \leqq 2 \pi$ such that $I \cap M \neq \varnothing$, then $A=\left\{w_{\theta} \mid \theta \in I \cap M\right\}$, and for every $a \in A$, there are uncountably many values of $\theta \in I \cap M$ for which $w_{\theta}=a$.

By (ii) every value of the extended complex plane is an asymptotic value on uncountably many spiral paths $\left.S_{\theta}: z=s_{\theta}(r)=\mathrm{re}^{i(\theta+1 /(1-r))}\right)$, $0 \leqq r<1$, for $\theta \in M$. Let $\theta_{1}, \theta_{2} \in M, \theta_{1}<\theta_{2}$ such that $f(z) \rightarrow \omega$ on $S_{\theta_{1}}$ and $S_{\theta_{2}}$ as $|z| \rightarrow 1$. We can find two intervals $I_{n_{1}}$ and $I_{n_{2}}$ of $\left\{I_{n}\right\}$ such that $I_{n_{1}} \subseteq\left(\theta_{1}, \theta_{2}\right)$ and $I_{n_{2}} \subseteq[0,2 \pi]-\left[\theta_{1}, \theta_{2}\right]$. Thus, for $n_{1}^{\prime}, n_{2}^{\prime}$ sufficiently large, there exist intervals $J_{n_{1}^{\prime}}$ abutting $I_{n_{1}}$ and $J_{n_{2}^{\prime}}$ abutting $I_{n_{2}}$ such that $J_{n_{1}^{\prime}} \subseteq\left(\theta_{1}, \theta_{2}\right)$ and $J_{n_{2}^{\prime}} \subseteq[0,2 \pi]-\left[\theta_{1}, \theta_{2}\right]$. But since $J_{n_{1}^{\prime}} \cap M \neq \varnothing$ and $J_{n_{2}^{\prime}} \cap M \neq \varnothing$, by (ii), there exist spirals separating $S_{\theta_{1}}$ and $S_{\theta_{2}}$ on which $f(z)$ has asymptotic values different from $w=\omega$. Thus $\left[S_{\theta_{1}}\right] \neq\left[S_{\theta_{2}}\right]$. Since $\omega$ is an arbitrary value of the extended complex plane, we see that the inverse $z=\phi(w)$ has uncountably many transcendental singularities above every value of the extended $w$-plane. In particular, since $f(z)$ omits $w=\infty, z=$ $\phi(w)$ has uncountably many direct transcendental singularities above $w=\infty$.
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