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In this paper we shall prove the theorems of Beurling-Kunugui ${ }^{1)}$, Kunugui ${ }^{2}$, and Iversen-Gross ${ }^{3)}$ using L. Ahlfors' principal theorem on covering surfaces ${ }^{4}$.

Suppose that $f(z)$ is uniform, meromorphic in a connected domain $D$. Let $z_{0}$ be a point on the boundary $\Gamma$ of $D$. We associate with $z_{0}$ three sets of values:
(1) The cluster set $S_{z_{0}}^{(D)}$. This is the set of all values $\alpha$ such that $\lim _{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f\left(z_{\nu}\right)=\alpha$ where $z_{\nu}(\nu=1,2, \ldots)$ is a sequence of points tending to $z_{0}$ within $D$. It is obvious that $S_{z_{0}}^{(D)}$ is a closed set.
(2) The cluster set $S_{z_{0}}^{(r)}$. This is the product $\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} M_{n}$, where $M_{n}$ denotes the closure of the sum $\sum_{0<\left|z^{\prime}-z_{0}\right|<\frac{1}{n}} S_{z^{\prime}}^{(D)}, z^{\prime}$ belonging to $\Gamma$. This set is also a closed set and $S_{z_{0}}^{(D)}$ includes $S_{z_{0}}^{(\Gamma)}$.
(3) The range of values $R_{z_{0}}^{(D)}$. A value $\alpha$ belongs to $R_{z^{0}}^{(D)}$ if, and only if, $f(z)$ takes the value $\alpha$ an infinity of times near $z_{0}$ inside $D$. It is obvious that $S_{z_{0}}^{(D)}$ includes $R_{z_{0}}^{(D)}$.

Suppose that $d\left(S_{1}, S_{2}\right)$ denotes the distance between a set $S_{1}$ and a set $S_{2}, C S$ the complement of a set $S$ with respect to the $w$-plane, $\bar{S}$ the closure of $S, B(S)$ the boundary of $S$, and $K(r)$ and $k(r)$ denote the circular disc $\left|z-z_{0}\right|<r$ and circumference $\left|z-z_{0}\right|=r$ respectively.

Lemma $1^{5}$. Let $w=f(z)$ be uniform and meromorphic in a domain $D$, and $z_{0}$ be a point on the boundary $\Gamma$ of $D$. Suppose that $\alpha$ is a value belonging to $S_{z_{0}}^{(D)}-S_{z_{0}}^{(\Gamma)}$ but not belonging to $R_{z_{0}}^{(D)}$. Then $\alpha$ is an asymptotic value of $f(z)$ at $z_{0}$ and the length of the image of its asymptotic path by $w=f(z)$ on the Riemann sphere is finite.

Proof. We may assume that $\alpha$ is finite by rotating the Riemann sphere, if necessary. Since $\alpha \bar{\in} S_{z_{0}}^{(\Gamma)}, \alpha \bar{\in} R_{z_{0}}^{(D)}$, there exists a positive number $r$ such that $\alpha \bar{\epsilon} \sum_{0<\left|z^{\prime}-z_{0}\right| \leq r} S_{z^{\prime}}^{(D)}$ where $z^{\prime}$ varies on $\Gamma$, and $f(z) \neq \alpha$ for $\left|z-z_{0}\right| \leqq r$ within $D$. Consequently there exist positive numbers

[^0]$\rho_{1}$ and $\rho_{2}$, such as $\rho_{1}=d\left(\alpha, \sum_{0<|z\rangle=z_{0} \mid \leq r} S_{z^{\prime}}^{(D)}\right), \quad \rho_{2}=d\left(\alpha, \sum_{z \in k(r) \cdot D} f(z)\right)$. We can find a positive number $\rho$ such that $\rho<\min \left(\frac{\rho_{1}}{2}, \frac{\rho_{2}}{2}\right)$. Then the condition (A) is satisfied.
(A): The sets $\sum_{0<\left|z<z_{0}\right| \leq r} S_{z}^{(\bar{D})}$ and $\sum_{z \in k(r) \cdot D} f(z)$ both lie outside the circle (c): $|w-\alpha|<\rho$.
Remember that $\alpha$ belongs to $S_{z_{0}}^{(D)}$. Then there is a sequence $\left\{z_{\nu}\right\}$ $(\nu=1,2, \ldots)$ of points within $D$ such that $z_{\nu} \rightarrow z_{0}$ and $f\left(z_{\nu}\right) \rightarrow \alpha$. Accordingly we may find a point $\zeta_{0}$ in $K(r) \cdot D$, whose image $w_{0}=f\left(\zeta_{0}\right)$ lies within the circle (c), and denote by $e_{5_{0}}$ an inverse element of $w=f(z)$ corresponding to $z=\zeta_{0}$.

Continuing analytically the element $e_{5_{0}}$ within the circle (c) with algebraic characters, we obtain a branch $z=\varphi_{\Delta_{0}}(w)$ of the inverse function of $w=f(z)$; the set of values taken by $z=\varphi_{\Lambda_{0}}(w)$ is a connected domain $\Delta_{0}$. By (A) $\Delta_{0}$ satisfies the condition (B).
(B) : $\quad B\left(4_{0}\right)$ has a point $z_{0}$ and $f(z)$ is regular in the closed domain $\bar{U}_{0}$ except at $z_{0}$ and the image of $B\left(\Delta_{0}\right)$ except at $z_{0}$ is arcs on the circumference $|w-\alpha|=\rho$.
Consequently we can find an angle $\theta(0<\theta<2 \pi)$ such that the length of the image of a curve $\Gamma^{\prime}$ by $w=f(z)$, where $\Gamma^{\prime}$ is a part of $B\left(\Lambda_{0}\right)$ exclusive of $z_{0}$, is $\rho \theta$ on the circumference $|w-\alpha|=\rho$.

If we can find a point $\zeta$ on $\Gamma^{\prime}$ with its inverse element $e_{\zeta}$ such that we can continue analytically the element $e_{\xi}$ along a radius of the circle (c) except at $w=\alpha$ with no algebraic character, we obtain a simple analytical curve $I$ having two end points $\zeta$ and $z_{0}$ such that the length of image of $I$ by $w=f(z)$ is $\rho$, and lemma 1 is proved.

If such a path $I I$ never exists, there exists a positive number $\rho_{0}$ ( $\rho_{0}<\rho$ ) such that the projection of $\Omega$ to the $w$-plane lies outside the circle (c): $|w-\alpha|<\rho_{0}$, where $\Omega$ is the sum of all open segments on the radii of the circle (c) along which except at the end points we can continue analytically (with no algebraic character) each inverse element $e_{z}$ corresponding to $z$ on $\Gamma^{\prime}$. Let $\Delta^{\prime}$ is the image of the set $\Omega$ by $z=\varphi_{\Delta_{0}}(w)$ whose boundary includes $\Gamma^{\prime}$, it is obvious by (B) that $B\left(\Lambda^{\prime}\right)$ includes $z_{0}$. We can find a positive number $r_{0}$ such that $k\left(r_{0}\right)$ is cut off by $\Delta^{\prime}$. Let $L(r)$ be the length of the image of the cross-cuts $k(r) \cdot \Delta^{\prime}$ ( $0<r<r_{0}$ ) by the function $w=f(z)$, it is longer than $\rho_{0} \theta$. Let $A(r)$ denote the area of the image of the open set $\Delta^{\prime}(r)$ by the function $w=f(z)$ where $\Delta^{\prime}(r)$ means the subset of $\Delta^{\prime}$ lying between $k\left(r_{0}\right)$ and $k(r)$. Then the well-known inequality $\log \frac{r_{0}}{r} \leqq-2 \pi \int_{r}^{r_{0}} \frac{d A(r)}{L^{2}(r)}$ is satisfied. Also $L(r) \geqq \rho_{0} \theta>0$,
hence

$$
\log \frac{r_{0}}{r} \leqq \frac{2 \pi}{\rho_{0} \theta} A(r),
$$

whence it follows that

$$
\lim _{r \rightarrow 0} A(r)=\infty
$$

On the other hand $A(r)<\frac{1}{2} \rho^{2} \theta<\infty$. Thus we arrive at a contradiction.

Lemma 2. Let $w=f(z)$ be uniform and meromorphic in a domain $D$ and $z_{0}$ be a point on the boundary $\Gamma$ of $D$. Suppose that a domain $\Omega$ belongs to the open set $C S_{z_{0}}^{(\Gamma)}$. If a value a belongs to $S_{z_{0}}^{(D)}$ and to $\Omega$, and another value $\beta$ belongs to $\Omega$ but not to $R_{z_{0}}^{(D)}$, then $\Omega$ has at least an asymptotic value.

Proof. i) Suppose that $\alpha$ does not belong to $R_{z_{0}}^{(D)}$. Then $\alpha$ is an asymptotic value by the Lemma 1 or Noshiro's theorem ${ }^{11}$.
ii) Suppose that $\alpha$ belongs to $R_{z_{0}}^{(D)}$. Now let $z=\varphi(w)$ be the inverse function of $w=f(z)$, and $z=\varphi(w)$ may contain at most an enumerable infinity of ramified elements. Consequently a path $L$ (consisting of a finite number of segments) may be drawn in $\Omega$, running from $w=\alpha$ to $w=\beta$, such that there exists no centre of ramified element of the invers function $z=\varphi(w)$ on $L$ excluding the end-points $w=\alpha$ and $w=\beta$.

Let $r$ is a sufficiently small positive number, then $f(z) \neq \beta$ for $\left|z-z_{0}\right|<r$ within $D$ and $d\left(L, \sum_{0<\left|z^{\prime}-z_{0}\right| \leq r} S_{z^{\prime}}^{(D)}\right)>0$ where $z^{\prime}$ varies on $\Gamma$, for $\beta \bar{\epsilon} R_{z_{0}}^{(D)}$ and $\Omega \cdot S_{z_{0}}^{(\Gamma)}=0$. Let $z_{1}, z_{2}, \ldots, z_{\nu}, \ldots$ denote all the $\alpha$-points within $K(r) \cdot D$ and $e_{z_{1}}, e_{z_{2}}, \ldots, e_{z_{\nu}}, \ldots$ all the corresponding inverse elements with centres at $w=\alpha$.

We obtain an infinite number of paths $\sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} \Pi_{\nu}$ on the $z$-plane, where $\Pi_{\nu}$ is the image corresponding to the path of the analytic continuation of the element $e_{z_{1}}$ by $z=\varphi(w)$ along $L$ with no algebraic character.

Since $d\left(L, \sum_{0<\left|z^{\prime}-z_{0}\right| \leq r} S_{z^{\prime}}^{(D)}\right)$ is positive, $k(r)$ may cross at most a finite number of paths $\sum_{n} I_{\nu_{n}}$. Since there exists no $\beta$-point within $K(r) \cdot D$, the paths $\sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} \Pi_{\nu}$ are the asymptotic paths excepting the finite number of paths $\sum_{n} \Pi_{\nu_{n}}$.

Thus Lemma 2 has proved.
Theorem. Let $w=f(z)$ be uniform and meromorphic in the domain $D$ whose boundary is denoted by $\Gamma$. Suppose that $z_{0}$ is a nonisolated boundary point and $\Omega$ is an arbitrary domain including at least one value of $S_{z_{0}}^{(D)}$ and belongs to the open set $C S_{z_{0}}^{(\Gamma)}$. Then $R_{z_{0}}^{(D)}$ includes every value of $\Omega$ except at most two values.

Proof ${ }^{2)}$. We will prove that if $\Omega$ includes three distinct values $\alpha_{1}$, $\alpha_{2}, \alpha_{3}$ not belonging to $R_{z_{0}}^{(D)}$, then we arrive at a contradiction. By Lemma 2 there exists at least one asymptotic value $\alpha_{0}$ belonging to $\Omega$.

Let its asymptotic path be denoted by $\Pi$, and let $\alpha_{0} \neq \alpha_{1}$. Then there exists a simply connected domain $\Omega^{\prime}$ included $\Omega$ and satisfying following conditions.
i) $\alpha_{0}, \alpha_{2}, \alpha_{3} \in \Omega^{\prime}$.
ii) $a_{1} \in B\left(\Omega^{\prime}\right)$ and $B\left(\Omega^{\prime}\right)$ consists of a finite number of segments.
iii) $d\left(B(\Omega), B\left(\Omega^{\prime}\right)\right)>0, \quad d\left(\alpha_{0}, B\left(\Omega^{\prime}\right)\right)>\varepsilon$ for a sufficiently small positive number $\varepsilon$, where $d$ is a spherical distance.

[^1]Then
iv) $d\left(\Omega^{\prime}, \sum_{0<\left|z^{\prime}-z_{0}\right| \leq r_{0}} S_{z^{\prime}}^{(D)}\right)>0, \quad z^{\prime} \in \Gamma$, and $f(z) \neq \alpha_{2}, \alpha_{3}, z \in K\left(r_{0}\right) \cdot D$ for a sufficiently small positive number $r_{0}$.
Let $p$ be a point sufficently near $z_{0}$ on $I I$ such that the image of the path $\Pi$ from $p$ on by $w=f(z)$ lies in $\Omega^{\prime}$. Continuing analytically the inverse element $e_{p}$ of $p$ within $\Omega^{\prime}$ with the algebraic characters, we obtain a branch $z=\varphi_{\Delta}(w)$ of inverse function of $w=f(z)$; the set of values taken by $z=\varphi_{\Delta}(w)$ in $\Omega^{\prime}$ is a connected domaim $\Delta$ and its boundary $B(\Delta)$ includes $z_{0}$.

From iv) and $\alpha_{1} \in B\left(\Omega^{\prime}\right)$, it is obvious that the image of $B(\Delta)$ within $K\left(r_{0}\right)$ except at $z_{0}$ by $w=f(z)$ lies on $B\left(\Omega^{\prime}\right)$, and at most a finite number of boundaries may cross $k\left(r_{0}\right)$, and $B(\Delta)$ within $K\left(r_{0}\right)$ has no closed contour on which $z_{0}$ does not lie. Remember that $z_{0}$ is the nonisolated boundary point, it is evident that there exists a continuous boundary curve $\Gamma^{\prime}$ of $\Delta$ on which $z_{0}$ lies and $K\left(r_{0}\right) \cdot \Delta$ is a finite number of simply connected domains. Accordingly the set of $\Delta$ lying between $k\left(r_{0}\right)$ and $k(r)\left(r<r_{0}\right)$ is the sum of simply connected domains denoted by $\Delta_{i}(r)(i=1,2, \ldots, n)$.

Now let us introduce some notations to apply Ahlfors' theorem. Let $\Omega_{0}$, which coincides with $\Omega^{\prime}$ excluding $\alpha_{2}$ and $\alpha_{2}$, be the basic surface (Grundfläche), $\Delta_{i}(r)(i=1,2, \ldots, n)$ covering surfaces (Überlagerungsfläche) of $\Omega_{0}$, and $L_{i}(r)$ the length (on the Riemann sphere) of the boundary of $\Delta_{i}(r)$ relative to $\Omega_{0}$, and $S_{i}(r)$ the average number of sheets (mittlere Blätteranzahl) of $\Delta_{i}(r)$ (on the Riemann sphere).

Apply Ahlfors' principal theorem to each covering surface $\Delta_{i}(r)$ (Euler characteristic -1 ) of basic surface $\Omega_{0}($ Euler characteristic +1$)$.

$$
0 \geq S_{i}(r)-h L_{i}(r)
$$

where $h$ is a constant only depending on $\Omega_{0}$.
Hence

$$
0 \geq S(r)-h L(r)
$$

where

$$
S(r)=\sum_{i=1}^{n} S_{i}(r), \quad L(r)=\sum_{=1}^{n} L_{i}(r), \quad \text { then }
$$

v)

$$
0 \geq 1-h \frac{L(r)}{S(r)}
$$

On the other hand $k(r)$ necessarily crosses $\Pi$ and $\Gamma^{\prime}$, so $L(r)>\varepsilon>0$ for sufficiently small positive number $r$. Accordingly $\lim _{r \rightarrow 0} S(r)=\infty$ as the proof of Lemma 1, from which we can easily prove that there exists a sequence $r_{\nu}(\nu=1,2, \ldots)$ tending to zero, and $\lim _{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L\left(r_{\nu}\right)}{S\left(r_{\nu}\right)}=0^{11}$. Therefore v) becomes

$$
0 \geq 1
$$

Thus we arrive at a contradiction. (Q. E. D.)
This theorem shows that any one of components of the complementary set of $S_{z_{0}}^{(\Gamma)}$ with respect to the $w$-plane is entirely included in

[^2]$S_{z_{0}}^{(D)}$ or never contains any point lying in $S_{z_{0}}^{(D)}$. Accordingly $S_{z_{0}}^{(D)}-S_{z_{0}}^{(\Gamma)}$ is an open set. Then we have at once next two theorems.

Theorem. (Beuling-Kunugui.) Let $D$ be an arbitrary connected domain and $z_{0}$ be a non-isolated boundary point. If $w=f(z)$ is uniform and holomorphic and bounded in the neighbourhood of $z_{0}$ within $D$, then it follows

$$
\varlimsup_{z \rightarrow z_{0}}|f(z)|=\varlimsup_{z \rightarrow z_{0}}\left(\varlimsup_{\substack{z \\ z \rightarrow z_{0}}}|f(z)|\right),
$$

denoting any boundary point by $z^{\prime}$.
Theorem. (Kunugui). Let $f(z)$ be uniform and meromorphic in a domain $D$ whose boundary is denoted by $\Gamma$, and $z_{0}$ be a non-isolated point. If $\Omega$ is an arbitary domain included in $S_{z_{0}}^{(D)}-S_{z_{0}}^{(T)}$, then $R_{z_{0}}^{(D)}$ includes every value of $\Omega$ except at most two values.

Now we shall prove Iversen-Gross' theorem extended by K. Noshiro.
Theorem. (Iversen-Gross-Noshiro.) Let $w=f(z)$ be uniform and meromorphic in a simply connected domain $D$ whose boundary is denoted by $\Gamma$, and $z_{0}$ is a simply accessible boundary point ${ }^{1}$. Then $R_{z_{0}}^{(D)}$ includes every value of $S_{x_{0}}^{(D)}-S_{x_{0}}^{(T)}$ except at most two values, and, if there are two such exceptional values, then $R_{z_{0}}^{(D)}$ must coincide with the $w$ plane excluding these two points.

Proof. We will prove that if there exist three distinct points $a_{1}$, $\alpha_{2}, \alpha_{3}$ not belonging to $R_{z_{0}}^{(D)}$ and $a_{1}, \alpha_{2} \in S_{z_{0}}^{(D)}-S_{z_{0}}^{(\Gamma)}$, we arrive at a contradiction. By Lemma $1 a_{1}$ and $\alpha_{2}$ are asymptotic values at $z_{0}$ and the length of images of their asymptotic paths $\Pi_{1}$ and $\Pi_{2}$ are finite. There exists a positive number $r_{0}$ such that $k\left(r_{0}\right)$ necessarily cross $\Pi_{1}$ and $\Pi_{2}$. Let $\Delta$ denote a simply connected domain surrounded by $\Pi_{1}, \Pi_{2}$, and $k\left(r_{0}\right)$. The set of $\Delta$ lying between $k\left(r_{0}\right)$ and $k(r)\left(r<r_{0}\right)$ is the sum of simply connected domains $a_{i}(r)(i=1,2, \ldots, n)$. Let the $w$-plane excluding three points: $\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}, a_{3}$, be the basic surface and $\Delta_{i}(r)$ be the covering surface.

Apply Ahlfors' principal theorem to each $\Delta_{i}(r)$. We shall arrive at a contradiction as the proof of previous theorem using that the length of the images (on the Riemann sphere) of $\Pi_{1}$ and $\Pi_{2}$ are finite.
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