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$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ABSTRACT. Suppose that } c \text { is an isolated boundary point } \\
& \text { of a hyperbolic domain } \Omega \text { in the complex plane, and let } \lambda_{\Omega} \\
& \text { denote the density of the hyperbolic metric on } \Omega \text {. We show } \\
& \text { that for each pair of nonnegative integers } n \text { and } m \\
& \qquad \lim _{w \rightarrow c}(w-c)^{n} \overline{(w-c)}^{m}|w-c| \log \frac{1}{|w-c|} \frac{\partial^{m+n} \lambda_{\Omega}(w)}{\partial \bar{w}^{m} \partial w^{n}} \\
& \qquad=\frac{1}{2} c_{n} c_{m}, \\
& \text { where } c_{0}=1 \text { and } c_{n}=\left((-1)^{n} / 2^{n}\right) 1 \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdots(2 n-1) \\
& \text { for } n=1,2,3, \ldots \text { Also we find the asymptotic limit of } \\
& \partial^{m+n} \lambda_{\Omega}(w) / \partial \bar{w}^{m} \partial w^{n} \text { as } w \rightarrow \infty \text { when } \Omega \text { is a hyperbolic } \\
& \text { domain containing a neighborhood of } \infty \text {. }
\end{aligned}
$$

1. Introduction. Let $\Omega$ be a hyperbolic domain in the complex plane $\mathcal{C}$, and let $\lambda_{\Omega}$ denote the density of the hyperbolic metric on $\Omega$ normalized so that the curvature is -4 . Suppose that $c$ is an isolated boundary point of $\Omega$. In [4] Yamada proved that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{w \rightarrow c}|w-c| \log \frac{1}{|w-c|} \lambda_{\Omega}(w)=\frac{1}{2} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

This also was shown by Yamashita in [5] and by Minda in [3] using different arguments. Yamashita found the order of the growth of $\left(\partial \lambda_{\Omega}(w) / \partial w\right),\left(\partial^{2} \lambda_{\Omega}(w) / \partial w^{2}\right)$ and $\left(\partial^{2} \lambda_{\Omega}(w) / \partial \bar{w} \partial w\right)$ as $w \rightarrow c$. This was improved by Minda who determined the asymptotic limits of these three derivatives as $w \rightarrow c$. For example, Minda proved that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{w \rightarrow c}(w-c)|w-c| \log \frac{1}{|w-c|} \frac{\partial \lambda_{\Omega}(w)}{\partial w}=-\frac{1}{4} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^0]These results are extended in this paper to partial derivatives of all orders. The main theorem asserts that

$$
\lim _{w \rightarrow c}(w-c)^{n} \overline{(w-c)}^{m}|w-c| \log \frac{1}{|w-c|} \frac{\partial^{m+n} \lambda_{\Omega}(w)}{\partial \bar{w}^{m} \partial w^{n}}=c_{n, m}
$$

for each pair of nonnegative integers $n$ and $m$, where $c_{n, m}$ are explicit constants. Similar asymptotic limits are obtained for derivatives of $\lambda_{\Omega}(w)$ as $w \rightarrow \infty$ when $\Omega$ is a hyperbolic domain containing a neighborhood of $\infty$.

Our approach is the one used by Minda. It depends on a result of Marden, Richards and Rodin in [2]. Namely, there exists an analytic covering projection $f$ from $\Delta_{0}=\{z \in \mathcal{C}: 0<|z|<1\}$ onto $\Omega$ which extends to an analytic function from $\Delta=\{z \in \mathcal{C}:|z|<1\}$ onto $\Omega \cup\{c\}$ with $f(0)=c$ and $f^{\prime}(0) \neq 0$. Further, the condition $f^{\prime}(0)>0$ determines a unique covering. The conformal invariance of the hyperbolic metric implies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{\Omega}(w)=\frac{\lambda_{\Delta_{0}}(z)}{\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right|} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $w=f(z)$ and $z \in \Delta_{0}$.
Equation (3) and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{\Delta_{0}}(z)=\frac{1}{2|z| \log (1 /|z|)} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $z \in \Delta_{0}$ form the starting point for our arguments. First we obtain the asymptotic limits of derivatives of $\log \lambda_{\Omega}(w)$ as $w$ approaches an isolated boundary point of $\Omega$. Those limits are then used to derive asymptotic limits of derivatives of $\lambda_{\Omega}$. Finally, the asymptotic limits at $\infty$ are deduced from the facts about limits at an isolated boundary point.

## 2. Asymptotic limits at an isolated boundary point.

Lemma 2.1. Suppose that $\Omega$ is a hyperbolic domain and $c$ is an isolated boundary point of $\Omega$. Let $\lambda=\lambda_{\Omega}$. Then for all positive integers
$n$ and $m$

$$
\begin{align*}
\lim _{w \rightarrow c}(w-c)^{n} \frac{\partial^{n} \log \lambda(w)}{\partial w^{n}} & =\frac{(-1)^{n}(n-1)!}{2}  \tag{5}\\
\lim _{w \rightarrow c}(\overline{w-c})^{n} \frac{\partial^{n} \log \lambda(w)}{\partial \bar{w}^{n}} & =\frac{(-1)^{n}(n-1)!}{2} \tag{6}
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{w \rightarrow c}(w-c)^{n}(\overline{w-c})^{m} \frac{\partial^{n+m} \log \lambda(w)}{\partial \bar{w}^{m} \partial w^{n}}=0 \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Let $f$ be the unique analytic covering projection from $\Delta_{0}$ onto $\Omega$ which extends analytically to $\Delta$ and satisfies $f(0)=c$ and $f^{\prime}(0)>0$. Then (3) and (4) imply
$\log \lambda(w)+\frac{1}{2} \log f^{\prime}(z)+\frac{1}{2} \log \overline{f^{\prime}(z)}=-\log 2-\log |z|-\log \left(\log \frac{1}{|z|}\right)$
where $w=f(z)$ and $0<|z|<1$. If we differentiate both sides of (8) with respect to $z$ and use $\partial w / \partial z=f^{\prime}(z)$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\partial \log \lambda(w)}{\partial w}=\frac{1}{z f^{\prime}(z)}\left\{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}+\frac{1}{2 \log (1 /|z|)}\right\} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

We claim that for each positive integer $n$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\partial^{n} \log \lambda(w)}{\partial w^{n}}=\frac{1}{\left[z f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n}} \sum_{j=0}^{n} g_{j, n}(z) \frac{1}{[\log (1 /|z|)]^{j}} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where each function $g_{j, n}$ is analytic in $\Delta$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{0, n}(0)=\frac{(-1)^{n}(n-1)!}{2} \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

When $n=1$ this claim follows from (9) and the fact that $f^{\prime}(z) \neq 0$ for $|z|<1$. Suppose that (10) and (11) hold for some positive integer $n$ and each function $g_{j, n}$ is analytic in $\Delta$. Differentiating (10) with respect to $z$ yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\partial^{n+1} \log \lambda(w)}{\partial w^{n+1}}=\frac{1}{\left[z f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n+1}} \sum_{j=0}^{n+1} g_{j, n+1}(z) \frac{1}{[\log (1 /|z|)]^{j}} \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { (13) } g_{0, n+1}(z)=-n\left[1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right] g_{0, n}(z)+z g_{0, n}^{\prime}(z)  \tag{13}\\
& \text { (14) } g_{j, n+1}(z)=-n\left[1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right] g_{j, n}(z)+z g_{j, n}^{\prime}(z)+\frac{j-1}{2} g_{j-1, n}(z)
\end{align*}
$$

for $j=1,2, \ldots, n$, and

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{n+1, n+1}(z)=\frac{n}{2} g_{n, n}(z) \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since each function $g_{j, n}$ is analytic in $\Delta$ and $f^{\prime}(z) \neq 0$ for $|z|<1$, equations (13), (14) and (15) show that each function $g_{j, n+1}$ is welldefined and analytic in $\Delta$. Equations (13) and (11) yield $g_{0, n+1}(0)=$ $\left((-1)^{n+1} n!\right) / 2$. This completes an inductive proof of our claim.

Equations (10) and (11) imply that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \lim _{w \rightarrow c}(w-c)^{n} \frac{\partial^{n} \log \lambda(w)}{\partial w^{n}} \\
& \quad=\lim _{z \rightarrow 0}\left\{\left[\frac{f(z)-f(0)}{z f^{\prime}(z)}\right]^{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n} g_{j, n}(z) \frac{1}{[\log (1 /|z|)]^{j}}\right\} \\
& \quad=g_{0, n}(0)=\frac{(-1)^{n}(n-1)!}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

This proves (5).
Since $\log \lambda$ is real-valued and infinitely differentiable,

$$
\frac{\partial^{n} \log \lambda(w)}{\partial \bar{w}^{n}}=\overline{\left[\frac{\partial^{n} \log \lambda(w)}{\partial w^{n}}\right]}
$$

for $n=1,2, \ldots$. Hence (5) implies (6).
We claim that for each pair of positive integers $m$ and $n$,
(16) $\frac{\partial^{n+m} \log \lambda(w)}{\partial \bar{w}^{m} \partial w^{n}}$

$$
=\frac{1}{\left[z f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n}} \frac{1}{\left[\overline{z f^{\prime}(z)}\right]^{m}} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \sum_{k=1}^{m} \overline{h_{j, k, m}(z)} g_{j, n}(z) \frac{1}{[\log (1 /|z|)]^{j+k}},
$$

where each function $h_{j, k, m}$ is analytic in $\Delta$. To prove this we give an inductive argument on $m$ with $n$ a fixed positive integer. Differentiation of (10) with respect to $\bar{z}$ shows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\partial^{n+1} \log \lambda(w)}{\partial \bar{w} \partial w^{n}}=\frac{1}{\left[z f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n}} \frac{1}{\overline{z f^{\prime}(z)}} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \frac{j}{2} g_{j, n}(z) \frac{1}{[\log (1 /|z|)]^{j+1}} \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

This verifies (16) in the case $m=1$ with $h_{j, 1,1}(z)=j / 2$. Suppose that our claim holds for a positive integer $m$. Differentiation of (16) with respect to $\bar{z}$ yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\partial^{n+m+1} \log \lambda(w)}{\partial \bar{w}^{m+1} \partial w^{n}}=\frac{1}{\left[z f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n}} \frac{1}{\left[\overline{f^{\prime}(z)}\right]^{m+1}} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \sum_{k=1}^{m+1} \frac{\overline{h_{j, k, m+1}(z)} g_{j, n}(z)}{[\log (1 /|z|)]^{j+k}}, \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{align*}
h_{j, 1, m+1}(z)= & -m\left[1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right] h_{j, 1, m}(z)+z h_{j, 1, m}^{\prime}(z),  \tag{19}\\
h_{j, k, m+1}(z)= & -m\left[1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right] h_{j, k, m}(z)+z h_{j, k, m}^{\prime}(z) \\
& +\frac{j+k-1}{2} h_{j, k-1, m}(z),
\end{align*}
$$

for $k=2,3, \ldots, m$, and

$$
\begin{equation*}
h_{j, m+1, m+1}(z)=\frac{j+m}{2} h_{j, m, m}(z) . \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

The inductive hypothesis and $f^{\prime}(z) \neq 0$ for $|z|<1$ show that each function $h_{j, k, m+1}, j=0,1, \ldots, n, k=1,2, \ldots, m+1$, is analytic in $\Delta$. This proves our claim.

Equation (16) implies that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \lim _{w \rightarrow c}(w-c)^{n}(\overline{w-c})^{m} \frac{\partial^{n+m} \log \lambda(w)}{\partial \bar{w}^{m} \partial w^{n}} \\
& =\lim _{z \rightarrow 0}\left[\frac{f(z)-f(0)}{z f^{\prime}(z)}\right]^{n}\left[\overline{\left(\frac{f(z)-f(0)}{z f^{\prime}(z)}\right)}\right]^{m} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \sum_{k=1}^{m} \frac{\overline{h_{j, k, m}(z)} g_{j, n}(z)}{[\log (1 /|z|)]^{j+k}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Because $j+k \geqslant 1$ each limit in the sum is zero. This proves (7).

Theorem 2.2. Suppose that $\Omega$ is a hyperbolic domain and $c$ is an isolated boundary point of $\Omega$. Let $\lambda=\lambda_{\Omega}$. Then for each pair of nonnegative integers $m$ and $n$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{w \rightarrow c}(w-c)^{n} \overline{(w-c)}^{m}|w-c| \log \frac{1}{|w-c|} \frac{\partial^{m+n} \lambda(w)}{\partial \bar{w}^{m} \partial w^{n}}=\frac{1}{2} c_{n} c_{m} \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
c_{n}= \begin{cases}1 & \text { if } n=0  \tag{23}\\ \frac{(-1)^{n}}{2^{n}} 1 \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdots(2 n-1) & \text { if } n=1,2,3, \ldots\end{cases}
$$

Proof. An inductive argument, depending only on the existence of derivatives of $\lambda$ and $\lambda(w) \neq 0$, shows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\partial^{p} \lambda(w)}{\partial w^{p}}=\sum_{j=1}^{p}\binom{p-1}{j-1} \frac{\partial^{j} \log \lambda(w)}{\partial w^{j}} \frac{\partial^{p-j} \lambda(w)}{\partial w^{p-j}} \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $w \in \Omega$ and for every positive integer $p$. The inductive step from $p$ to $p+1$ is obtained by differentiation of $(24)$ with respect to $w$, which gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\partial^{p+1} \lambda(w)}{\partial w^{p+1}}= \sum_{j=1}^{p}\binom{p-1}{j-1}\left[\frac{\partial^{j} \log \lambda(w)}{\partial w^{j}} \frac{\partial^{p-j+1} \lambda(w)}{\partial w^{p-j+1}}\right. \\
&\left.\quad+\frac{\partial^{j+1} \log \lambda(w)}{\partial w^{j+1}} \frac{\partial^{p-j} \lambda(w)}{\partial w^{p-j}}\right] \\
&= \frac{\partial \log \lambda(w)}{\partial w} \frac{\partial^{p} \lambda(w)}{\partial w^{p}}+\frac{\partial^{p+1} \log \lambda(w)}{\partial w^{p+1}} \lambda(w) \\
&+\sum_{j=2}^{p}\left\{\left[\binom{p-1}{j-1}+\binom{p-1}{j-2}\right] \frac{\partial^{j} \log \lambda(w)}{\partial w^{j}} \frac{\partial^{p-j+1} \lambda(w)}{\partial w^{p-j+1}}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Then we use $\binom{p-1}{j-1}+\binom{p-1}{j-2}=\binom{p}{j-1}$.
The case $n=m=0$ of the theorem corresponds to (1). Assume that $m=0$ and (22) holds for $n=0,1,2, \ldots, k$ where $k$ is a nonnegative
integer. From (5), (24) and our assumption, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \lim _{w \rightarrow c}(w-c)^{k+1}|w-c| \log \frac{1}{|w-c|} \frac{\partial^{k+1} \lambda(w)}{\partial w^{k+1}} \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{k+1}\left\{\binom{k}{j-1}\left[\lim _{w \rightarrow c}(w-c)^{j} \frac{\partial^{j} \log \lambda(w)}{\partial w^{j}}\right]\right. \\
&\left.\times\left[\lim _{w \rightarrow c}(w-c)^{k+1-j}|w-c| \log \frac{1}{|w-c|} \frac{\partial^{k+1-j} \lambda(w)}{\partial w^{k+1-j}}\right]\right\} \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{k+1}\binom{k}{j-1} \frac{(-1)^{j}(j-1)!}{2} \frac{c_{k+1-j}}{2} \\
&= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \frac{k!}{(k+1-j)!}(-1)^{j} c_{k+1-j}
\end{aligned}
$$

A straightforward inductive argument shows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{j=1}^{l} \frac{(l-1)!}{(l-j)!}(-1)^{j} c_{l-j}=2 c_{l} \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$

for every positive integer $l$. Therefore

$$
\lim _{w \rightarrow c}(w-c)^{k+1}|w-c| \log \frac{1}{|w-c|} \frac{\partial^{k+1} \lambda(w)}{\partial w^{k+1}}=\frac{c_{k+1}}{2}
$$

This completes the inductive argument that (22) holds when $m=0$ and $n$ is any nonnegative integer.

If $p$ is a positive integer and $q$ is a nonnegative integer, then we will show that
(26) $\frac{\partial^{p+q} \lambda(w)}{\partial \bar{w}^{p} \partial w^{q}}=\sum_{j=1}^{p} \sum_{k=0}^{q}\binom{q}{k}\binom{p-1}{j-1} \frac{\partial^{j+k} \log \lambda(w)}{\partial \bar{w}^{j} \partial w^{k}} \frac{\partial^{q-k+p-j} \lambda(w)}{\partial \bar{w}^{p-j} \partial w^{q-k}}$
for $w \in \Omega$. Since $\lambda$ is real-valued and infinitely differentiable,

$$
\frac{\partial^{p} \lambda(w)}{\partial \bar{w}^{p}}=\overline{\left(\frac{\partial^{p} \lambda(w)}{\partial w^{p}}\right)}
$$

and hence (24) yields

$$
\frac{\partial^{p} \lambda(w)}{\partial \bar{w}^{p}}=\sum_{j=1}^{p}\binom{p-1}{j-1} \frac{\partial^{j} \log \lambda(w)}{\partial \bar{w}^{j}} \frac{\partial^{p-j} \lambda(w)}{\partial \bar{w}^{p-j}}
$$

for all positive integers $p$. This proves that (26) holds for all positive integers $p$ when $q=0$. We complete the proof of (26) by induction on $q$ with $p$ fixed. The inductive step from $q$ to $q+1$ follows by differentiation of (26) with respect to $w$. The remaining details are similar to those used to prove (24).

Let $n$ be a fixed nonnegative integer. For each nonnegative integer $l$ let $P_{l}$ denote the statement that

$$
\lim _{w \rightarrow c}(w-c)^{r}(\overline{w-c})^{l}|w-c| \log \frac{1}{|w-c|} \frac{\partial^{r+l} \lambda(w)}{\partial \bar{w}^{l} \partial w^{r}}=\frac{1}{2} c_{r} c_{l}
$$

for $r=0,1, \ldots, n$. We already showed that $P_{0}$ holds. Suppose that $m$ is a nonnegative integer and assume $P_{l}$ for $l=0,1, \ldots, m$. Let $s$ be an integer satisfying $0 \leqslant s \leqslant n$. With $q=s$ and $p=m+1$, (26) yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
& (w-c)^{s}(\overline{w-c})^{m+1}|w-c| \log \frac{1}{|w-c|} \frac{\partial^{s+m+1} \lambda(w)}{\partial \bar{w}^{m+1} \partial w^{s}} \\
& \quad=\sum_{j=1}^{m+1} \sum_{k=0}^{s}\binom{s}{k}\binom{m}{j-1}\left\{(w-c)^{k}(\overline{w-c})^{j} \frac{\partial^{j+k} \log \lambda(w)}{\partial \bar{w}^{j} \partial w^{k}}\right\} \\
& \quad \times\left\{(w-c)^{s-k}(\overline{w-c})^{m+1-j}|w-c| \log \frac{1}{|w-c|} \frac{\partial^{s-k+m+1-j} \lambda(w)}{\partial \bar{w}^{m+1-j} \partial w^{s-k}}\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

By using (7) and then (6) and our inductive assumption we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lim _{w \rightarrow c}(w-c)^{s} & (\overline{w-c})^{m+1}|w-c| \log \frac{1}{|w-c|} \frac{\partial^{s+m+1} \lambda(w)}{\partial \bar{w}^{m+1} \partial w^{s}} \\
& =\sum_{j=1}^{m+1}\binom{m}{j-1} \frac{(-1)^{j}(j-1)!}{2} \frac{1}{2} c_{s} c_{m+1-j} \\
& =\frac{1}{4} c_{s} \sum_{j=1}^{m+1} \frac{m!}{(m+1-j)!}(-1)^{j} c_{m+1-j}
\end{aligned}
$$

Equation (25) implies that this last expression equals $(1 / 2) c_{s} c_{m+1}$. This yields the statement $P_{m+1}$. Therefore $P_{m}$ holds for all nonnegative integers $m$ 。 $\quad$

## 3. Asymptotic limits at infinity.

Lemma 3.1. Suppose that $\Omega$ is a hyperbolic domain and $w_{0} \in \mathcal{C} \backslash \Omega$. For $w \in \Omega \operatorname{let} g(w)=1 /\left(w-w_{0}\right)$. Let $\lambda=\lambda_{\Omega}, \widetilde{\Omega}=g(\Omega)$, and $\widetilde{\lambda}=\lambda_{\widetilde{\Omega}}$. Then, for each pair of nonnegative integers $m$ and $n$,
(27) $\frac{\partial^{n+m} \lambda(w)}{\partial \bar{w}^{m} \partial w^{n}}$

$$
=(-1)^{n+m} \sum_{k=0}^{n} \sum_{j=0}^{m}\binom{n}{k} \frac{n!}{k!}\binom{m}{j} \frac{m!}{j!} \zeta^{n+k+1} \bar{\zeta}^{m+j+1} \frac{\partial^{j+k} \tilde{\lambda}(\zeta)}{\partial \bar{\zeta}^{j} \partial \zeta^{k}}
$$

where $\zeta=1 /\left(w-w_{0}\right)$ and $w \in \Omega$.

Proof. Since $g \underset{\widetilde{\Omega}}{ }$ maps open sets onto open sets and connected sets onto connected sets, $\widetilde{\Omega}$ is a domain. Because $\Omega$ is hyperbolic, there exists $w_{1}$ such that $w_{1} \in \mathcal{C} \backslash \Omega$ and $w_{1} \neq w_{0}$. Thus $1 /\left(w_{1}-w_{0}\right) \in \mathcal{C} \backslash \widetilde{\Omega}$ and $0 \in \mathcal{C} \backslash \widetilde{\Omega}$ and therefore $\widetilde{\Omega}$ is hyperbolic.

The conformal invariance of the hyperbolic metric implies $\lambda(w)=$ $\left|g^{\prime}(w)\right| \widetilde{\lambda}(g(\underset{\sim}{w}))$. Let $\zeta=g(w)$. Then $(\partial \zeta / \partial w)=-\zeta^{2}$ and hence $\lambda(w)=\zeta \widetilde{\zeta} \widetilde{\lambda}(\zeta)$. This verifies (27) when $n=m=0$. Assume that (27) holds when $m=0$ and $n$ is some nonnegative integer. Since $\left(\partial^{n+1} \lambda(w)\right) /\left(\partial w^{n+1}\right)=-\zeta^{2}(\partial / \partial \zeta)\left(\partial^{n} \lambda(w) / \partial w^{n}\right)$, this yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial^{n+1} \lambda(w)}{\partial w^{n+1}}=(-1)^{n+1}\{ & (n+1)!\zeta^{n+2} \bar{\zeta} \widetilde{\lambda}(\zeta) \\
& +\sum_{k=1}^{n}\left[\binom{n}{k} \frac{n!}{k!}(n+k+1)+\binom{n}{k-1} \frac{n!}{(k-1)!}\right] \\
& \left.\times \zeta^{n+k+2} \bar{\zeta} \frac{\partial^{k} \widetilde{\lambda}(\zeta)}{\partial \zeta^{k}}+\zeta^{2 n+3} \bar{\zeta} \frac{\partial^{n+1} \widetilde{\lambda}(\zeta)}{\partial \zeta^{n+1}}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Because $\binom{n}{k} n!/ k!(n+k+1)+\binom{n}{k-1} n!/(k-1)!=(n+1)!/ k!\binom{n+1}{k}$, this gives (27) with $m=0$ and $n$ replaced by $n+1$. Thus (27) holds when $m=0$ and $n$ is any nonnegative integer.

Let $n$ be a fixed nonnegative integer. Assume that (27) holds for some nonnegative integer $m$. Differentiating (27) with respect to $\bar{w}$ we find that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\partial^{m+n+1} \lambda(w)}{\partial \bar{w}^{m+1} \partial w^{n}} \\
& =(-1)^{n+m+1} \sum_{k=0}^{n}\binom{n}{k} \frac{n!}{k!} \zeta^{n+k+1}\left\{(m+1)!\bar{\zeta}^{m+2} \frac{\partial^{k} \widetilde{\lambda}(\zeta)}{\partial \zeta^{k}}\right. \\
& \quad+\sum_{j=1}^{m}\left[\binom{m}{j} \frac{m!}{j!}(m+1+j)+\binom{m}{j-1} \frac{m!}{(j-1)!}\right] \\
& \left.\quad \times \bar{\zeta}^{m+j+2} \frac{\partial^{j+k} \widetilde{\lambda}(\zeta)}{\partial \bar{\zeta}^{j} \partial \zeta^{k}}+\bar{\zeta}^{2 m+3} \frac{\partial^{k+m+1} \widetilde{\lambda}(\zeta)}{\partial \bar{\zeta}^{m+1} \partial \zeta^{k}}\right\} \\
& = \\
& \quad(-1)^{n+m+1} \sum_{k=0}^{n}\binom{n}{k} \frac{n!}{k!} \zeta^{n+k+1} \\
& \quad \times \sum_{j=0}^{m+1}\binom{m+1}{j} \frac{(m+1)!}{j!} \bar{\zeta}^{m+j+2} \frac{\partial^{j+k} \widetilde{\lambda}(\zeta)}{\partial \bar{\zeta}^{j} \partial \zeta^{k}}
\end{aligned}
$$

This provides the inductive step.

Lemma 3.2. Let $c_{n}$ be defined by (23). For each nonnegative integer $n$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{k=0}^{n}\binom{n}{k} \frac{1}{k!} c_{k}=\frac{(-1)^{n}}{n!} c_{n} \tag{28}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Let $\Gamma$ denote the Gamma function. Then $\Gamma(z+1)=z \Gamma(z)$ implies that $\Gamma(k+(1 / 2))=(k-(1 / 2))(k-(3 / 2)) \cdots(3 / 2) \cdot(1 / 2)$. $\Gamma(1 / 2)$ for each nonnegative integer $k$. Hence (23) can be expressed

$$
\begin{equation*}
c_{k}=(-1)^{k} \frac{\Gamma(k+(1 / 2))}{\Gamma(1 / 2)} \tag{29}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $k=0,1,2, \ldots$. The Beta function is defined by $B(z, w)=$ $\int_{0}^{1} t^{z-1}(1-t)^{w-1} d t$ for $\mathbf{R} z>0$ and $\mathbf{R} w>0$. Then $B(z, w)=$
$(\Gamma(z) \Gamma(w)) /(\Gamma(z+w))[\mathbf{1}$, p. 213] and $B(z, w)=B(w, z)$. Hence (29) yields $c_{k}=\left((-1)^{k} k!\right) /\left(\Gamma^{2}(1 / 2)\right) B(k+(1 / 2),(1 / 2))$. Therefore

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=0}^{n}\binom{n}{k} \frac{1}{k!} c_{k} & =\sum_{k=0}^{n}\binom{n}{k} \frac{(-1)^{k}}{\Gamma^{2}(1 / 2)} \int_{0}^{1} t^{k-1 / 2}(1-t)^{-1 / 2} d t \\
& =\frac{1}{\Gamma^{2}(1 / 2)} \int_{0}^{1}\left\{\sum_{k=0}^{n}\binom{n}{k}(-t)^{k}\right\} t^{-1 / 2}(1-t)^{-1 / 2} d t \\
& =\frac{1}{\Gamma^{2}(1 / 2)} \int_{0}^{1}(1-t)^{n} t^{-1 / 2}(1-t)^{-1 / 2} d t \\
& =\frac{1}{\Gamma^{2}(1 / 2)} B((1 / 2), n+(1 / 2)) \\
& =\frac{1}{\Gamma^{2}(1 / 2)} B(n+(1 / 2),(1 / 2))=\frac{(-1)^{n}}{n!} c_{n}
\end{aligned}
$$

Theorem 3.3. Suppose that $\Omega$ is a hyperbolic domain which contains a neighborhood of $\infty$. Let $\lambda=\lambda_{\Omega}$. Then, for each pair of nonnegative integers $m$ and $n$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{w \rightarrow \infty} w^{n} \bar{w}^{m}|w| \log |w| \frac{\partial^{n+m} \lambda(w)}{\partial \bar{w}^{m} \partial w^{n}}=\frac{1}{2} c_{n} c_{m} \tag{30}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the sequence $\left\{c_{n}\right\}$ is defined by (23).

Proof. Choose $w_{0} \in \mathcal{C} \backslash \Omega$. Let $\zeta=g(w)=1 /\left(w-w_{0}\right)$ and $\widetilde{\Omega}=g(\Omega)$. Then $\widetilde{\Omega}$ is a hyperbolic domain and 0 is an isolated boundary point of $\Omega$. Lemma 3.1 yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
w^{n} \bar{w}^{m}|w| & \log |w| \frac{\partial^{n+m} \lambda(w)}{\partial \bar{w}^{m} \partial w^{n}} \\
= & (-1)^{n+m} \sum_{k=0}^{n} \sum_{j=0}^{m}\binom{n}{k} \frac{n!}{k!}\binom{m}{j} \frac{m!}{j!}\left[1+w_{0} \zeta\right]^{n}\left[\overline{1+w_{0} \zeta}\right]^{m} \\
& \times\left|\frac{1}{\zeta}\left(1+w_{0} \zeta\right)\right| \log \left|\frac{1}{\zeta}\left(1+w_{0} \zeta\right)\right| \zeta^{k+1} \bar{\zeta}^{j+1} \frac{\partial^{j+k} \widetilde{\lambda}(\zeta)}{\partial \bar{\zeta}^{j} \partial \zeta^{k}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\zeta \rightarrow 0$ as $w \rightarrow \infty$, an application of Theorem 2.2 to $\widetilde{\Omega}$ with $c=0$ implies that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \lim _{w \rightarrow \infty} w^{n} \bar{w}^{m}|w| \log |w| \frac{\partial^{n+m} \lambda(w)}{\partial \bar{w}^{m} \partial w^{n}} \\
& \quad=(-1)^{n+m} \sum_{k=0}^{n} \sum_{j=0}^{m}\binom{n}{k} \frac{n!}{k!}\binom{m}{j} \frac{m!}{j!}\left\{\lim _{\zeta \rightarrow 0} \zeta^{k} \bar{\zeta}^{j}|\zeta| \log \frac{1}{|\zeta|} \frac{\partial^{j+k} \widetilde{\lambda}(\zeta)}{\partial \bar{\zeta}^{j} \partial \zeta^{k}}\right\} \\
& \quad=(-1)^{n+m} \sum_{k=0}^{n} \sum_{j=0}^{m}\binom{n}{k} \frac{n!}{k!}\binom{m}{j} \frac{m!}{j!} \frac{1}{2} c_{k} c_{j} \\
& \quad=\frac{1}{2}\left\{n!(-1)^{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n}\binom{n}{k} \frac{1}{k!} c_{k}\right\}\left\{m!(-1)^{m} \sum_{j=0}^{m}\binom{m}{j} \frac{1}{j!} c_{j}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Lemma 3.2 yields (30).

Acknowledgment. The authors thank Richard O'Neil for useful suggestions about this paper.

## REFERENCES

1. E.T. Copson, An introduction to the theory of functions of a complex variable, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1955.
2. A. Marden, I. Richards and B. Rodin, Analytic self-mappings of Riemann surfaces, J. Analyse Math. 18 (1967), 197-225.
3. D. Minda, The density of the hyperbolic metric near an isolated boundary point, Complex Variables Theory Appl. 32 (1997), 331-340.
4. A. Yamada, Bounded analytic functions and metrics of constant curvature on Riemann surfaces, Kodai Math. J. 11 (1988), 317-324.
5. S. Yamashita, Sur allures de la densité de Poincaré et ses dérivées au voisinage d'un point frontière, Kodai Math. J. 16 (1993), 235-243.

Department of Mathematics, Seattle Pacific University, 3307 Third Avenue West, Seattle, WA 98119
E-mail address: bgill@spu.edu
Indian Point Farm, Pemaquid, ME 04558
E-mail address: pemaquid@lincoln.midcoast.com


[^0]:    2000 AMS Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 30F45.
    Key words and phrases. Hyperbolic domain, hyperbolic density, isolated boundary point, partial derivatives, asymptotic limits.

    Received by the editors on Nov. 21, 2003, and in revised form on July 29, 2004.

