

# THE BOUNDARY BEHAVIOR OF BLOCH FUNCTIONS AND UNIVALENT FUNCTIONS

J. M. Anderson and L. D. Pitt

**1. Introduction.** The function  $f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n$ , analytic for  $z \in D = \{z: |z| < 1\}$ , is called a Bloch function if the norm

$$\|f\| = \sup\{(1 - |z|^2)|f'(z)|: z \in D\} + |f(0)|$$

is finite. The set of such functions forms a Banach space  $B$  and the subspace of  $B$  consisting of those  $f \in B$  for which  $(1 - |z|^2)|f'(z)| \rightarrow 0$  as  $|z| \rightarrow 1^-$  is denoted by  $B_0$ . The Zygmund class  $\Lambda^*$  consists of those (complex-valued) continuous functions  $F(t)$  of period  $2\pi$  for which

$$F(t+h) + F(t-h) - 2F(t) = O(|h|)$$

uniformly in  $t$ . If the above second difference is  $o(|h|)$  as  $|h| \rightarrow 0$  then we say that  $f \in \lambda^*$ .

The spaces  $\Lambda^*$  and  $\lambda^*$  are also Banach spaces with the obvious norm. Moreover,

$$(1) \quad f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n \in B \Leftrightarrow F(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{n} e^{int} \in \Lambda^*$$

and similarly  $f \in B_0$  if and only if  $F \in \lambda^*$ . Thus the space  $B$  is isomorphic under the operation of integration to that subspace of  $\Lambda^*$  consisting of functions whose negative Fourier coefficients vanish. In [2] we considered the spaces of real-valued functions in  $\Lambda^*$  and  $\lambda^*$ , but in the present paper we study the complex case. This eventually resolves itself into a consideration of the radial or boundary behavior of Bloch functions and univalent functions.

As in [1], an important class of examples is given by lacunary series

$$f(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k z^{n_k},$$

where  $n_{k+1}/n_k \geq q > 1$  for all  $k$ , and

$$\|(a_k)\|_{\infty} = \sup\{|a_k|: k \geq 0\}$$

is finite. Such functions belong to  $B$  and also to  $B_0$  if  $a_k \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . If, moreover,

$$(2) \quad \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |a_k|^2 = \infty,$$

then such functions  $f(z)$  have finite radial limits  $\lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} f(re^{i\theta})$  only for a set  $E$  of values of  $\theta$  of measure zero. Also the corresponding functions  $F(t)$  have finite derivatives only in such a set  $E$ .

Received October 30, 1987.

The second author's research was supported by National Science Foundation Grants DMS-8500882 and DMS-8701212.

Michigan Math. J. 35 (1988).

We introduced in [2] the concept of dyadic  $\Lambda^*$ , denoted by  $\Lambda_d^*$  for real-valued functions. Although this can be extended in an obvious way to complex-valued functions, it seems less natural when viewed in the context of analytic functions and so we shall here consider only  $\Lambda^*$  and  $\lambda^*$ .

For a real-valued function  $F(t) \in \Lambda^*$  we let  $E, J_1, J_2$  denote the sets

$$E = \{t: F'(t) \text{ exists and is finite}\},$$

$$J_1 = \{t: F'(t) \text{ exists and is } +\infty\},$$

$$J_2 = \{t: F'(t) \text{ exists and is } -\infty\}.$$

If  $\phi(t) \downarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow 0+$  we denote by  $m_\phi(E)$  the Hausdorff measure of a set  $E$  with respect to the function  $\phi$ . Of particular importance in what follows is the function

$$h(t) = t \log \frac{1}{t},$$

and the symbol  $m_h(E)$  will always refer to Hausdorff measure with respect to this function.

In §2 we state our results for functions in  $\Lambda^*$  for which  $|E| = 0$ , that is, for which  $E$  has Lebesgue measure zero. We show in particular (Theorem 1) that, in this case,  $m_h(J_1) = m_h(J_2) = \infty$ . An application of these results is given in §3, leading to a proof of a conjecture of McMillan and Pommerenke [16, Problem 3.4] on univalent functions. Sections 4 and 5 are devoted to proofs; §6 presents various other related problems which we believe to be of interest.

*Added in proof* (May 6, 1988). In a recent preprint entitled "LIL for smooth measures" [LOMI preprints E-3-88], N. G. Makarov has shown that for every univalent function  $g(z)$  we have  $m_\phi(J) > 0$ , where  $J$  is the set where  $g'(z)$  has a finite radial limit and  $\phi(t) = t(\log(1/t) \log \log \log(1/t))^{1/2}$ , and that this result is essentially best possible. It seems likely, as suggested above, that Theorem 1 remains true with  $h(t)$  replaced by  $\phi(t)$ . It is also interesting to determine whether the standard Weierstrass functions have  $\sigma$ -finite  $\phi$ -measure for the sets  $J_1$  and  $J_2$ .

## 2. Functions in $\Lambda^*$ and $\lambda^*$ with $|E| = 0$ . We first state

**THEOREM 1.** *Let  $F(t)$  be a real-valued function in  $\Lambda^*$  for which  $|E| = 0$ . Then, for every subinterval  $I$  of  $(0, 2\pi)$  we have  $m_h(J_1 \cap I) = m_h(J_2 \cap I) = \infty$ .*

Theorem 1 can be thought of as saying that a function in  $\Lambda^*$  must possess derivatives, finite or infinite, on a set  $J$  which is of Hausdorff dimension 1 on each subinterval  $I$ . In particular, the well-known example of a nowhere (finitely) differentiable function with lacunary Fourier series

$$F(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k n_k^{-1} \cos(n_k t)$$

with  $\|(a_k)\|_\infty < \infty$  and  $a_k \not\rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  must have the derivatives  $+\infty$  or  $-\infty$  on sets  $J_1, J_2$  with  $m_h(J_i \cap I) = \infty$  for each interval  $I$ .

As in [2], however, the main thrust of our work is that the class of functions  $F(t) \in \Lambda^*$  to which our methods naturally apply consists of those  $F \in \Lambda^*$  which are nondifferentiable almost everywhere, and that (2) is of importance only insofar as it ensures this. We remark that, for lacunary series, Theorem 1 has the following corollary.

COROLLARY 1. *If  $\{n_k\}$  is a lacunary sequence and if*

$$F(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k n_k^{-1} \cos n_k(t + t_k)$$

*is in  $\Lambda^*$  with  $|E| = 0$ , then the partial sums of  $F'(t)$ ,*

$$S_N(t) = - \sum_{k=1}^N a_k \sin n_k(t + t_k)$$

*tend to  $-\infty$  on  $J_1$  and  $+\infty$  on  $J_2$ , where (as before)  $m_h(J_1 \cap I) = m_h(J_2 \cap I) = \infty$  for every subinterval  $I$ .*

The corollary follows from the fact, observed by Freud ([6], see also [10]), that

$$\frac{F(t+h) - F(t)}{h} = - \sum_{k=1}^N a_k \sin n_h(t + t_k) + O(1)$$

as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $N \approx \log(1/|h|)$ .

Theorem 1 will follow from more general theorems, for which we need some further notation. A real-valued function  $F$  is said to satisfy the Banach  $T_2$ -condition on an interval  $I$  if almost every value in its range is assumed at most countably often in  $I$ . For a discussion of this see [4] or, more importantly, [17, p. 277]. It has been shown in [2, §7] that if  $F \in \Lambda^*$  then  $F$  satisfies the  $T_2$ -condition. This result is implicit in the work of Mauldin and Williams [13], whose methods of proof were used in [2]. We do not know of any precise determination of those functions satisfying the  $T_2$ -condition, but point out that it follows from the consideration of [11, Thm. 5, p. 274] that if  $0 < \alpha < 1$  then there are functions  $F \in \text{Lip } \alpha$  which do not have the  $T_2$ -property.

The modulus of continuity  $\omega(\delta)$  and the modulus of smoothness  $\omega_2(\delta)$  of a continuous function  $F(t)$  on an interval  $I$  are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(\delta) &= \omega(\delta, F) = \sup\{|F(t+h) - F(t)| : 0 < h \leq \delta, t \in I\} \quad \text{and} \\ \omega_2(\delta) &= \omega_2(\delta, F) = \sup\{|F(t+h) + F(t-h) - 2F(t)| : 0 < h \leq \delta, t \in I\}, \end{aligned}$$

respectively. We also define, in analogy to  $J_1$  and  $J_2$ ,

$$E_1 = \{t : 0 \leq F'(t) < \infty\}, \quad E_2 = \{t : -\infty < F'(t) \leq 0\}.$$

Theorem 1 follows from the following more general theorem.

**THEOREM 2.** *Let  $F(t)$  be a continuous real-valued function satisfying the  $T_2$ -condition and suppose that  $\omega(\delta, f) = O(\phi(\delta))$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$  for some function  $\phi(t)$ . Let  $I$  be an interval on which  $F$  has unbounded variation and suppose that  $|E_1 \cap I| = 0$ . Then  $m_\phi(J_1 \cap I) = \infty$ . Similarly, if  $|E_2 \cap I| = 0$  then  $m_\phi(J_2 \cap I) = \infty$ .*

To deduce Theorem 1 we note that if  $|E| = 0$  then  $|E_1| = |E_2| = 0$  and  $F(t)$  is of unbounded variation in every interval. Moreover, it is an exercise to show (see [12, p. 53, Problem 5]) that

$$(3) \quad \omega(\delta) = O\left(\delta \int_{\delta}^{\pi} t^{-2} \omega_2(t) dt\right) + O(\delta)$$

as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ . Thus, in particular, it follows that for  $F \in \Lambda^*$  we have  $\omega(\delta) = O(h(\delta))$ , and for  $f \in \lambda^*$  we have  $\omega(\delta) = O(\phi(\delta))$  for some suitable function  $\phi$  with  $\phi(t) = o(t \log(1/t))$  as  $t \rightarrow 0+$ .

Theorem 2 is itself a consequence of the following theorem.

**THEOREM 3.** *Let  $F(t)$  be a real-valued continuous function satisfying the  $T_2$ -condition, and suppose that  $\omega(\delta, F) = O(\phi(\delta))$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0+$  for some function  $\phi(t)$ . Let  $I$  be an interval on which  $F$  has unbounded variation and suppose that*

$$(4) \quad \int_{E_1 \cap I} F'(t) dt < \infty;$$

then  $m_{\phi}(J_1 \cap I) = \infty$ . Similarly, if

$$(5) \quad \int_{E_2 \cap I} F'(t) dt > -\infty$$

then  $m_{\phi}(J_2 \cap I) = \infty$ .

Clearly (4) or (5) will hold if  $|E_1| = 0$  or  $|E_2| = 0$ , and we note that if

$$E_1(\lambda) = \{t: t \in E_1, F'(t) \geq \lambda\} \quad \text{and} \quad E_2(\lambda) = \{t: t \in E_2, F'(t) \leq -\lambda\}$$

then (4) and (5) can, respectively, be written as

$$\int_0^{\infty} \lambda |E_1(\lambda)| d\lambda < \infty, \quad \int_0^{\infty} \lambda |E_2(\lambda)| d\lambda < \infty.$$

**3. Bloch functions and univalent functions.** The connection between Theorem 1 and the radial behavior of Bloch functions is provided by the following two results. The first of these is elementary (see e.g. [9, p. 34]). Let  $f(z) \in B$  and  $F(t) \in \Lambda^*$  be related by (1) and write

$$f(z) = u(z) + iv(z), \quad F(t) = U(t) + iV(t),$$

where  $U(t)$  and  $V(t)$  are real-valued and in  $\Lambda^*$ . We set

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{E} &= \{t: \lim_{r \rightarrow 1-} f(re^{it}) \text{ exists and is finite}\} \\ \tilde{E}_1 &= \{t: \lim_{r \rightarrow 1-} u(re^{it}) \text{ exists and is finite}\} \\ \tilde{E}_2 &= \{t: \lim_{r \rightarrow 1-} v(re^{it}) \text{ exists and is finite}\}. \end{aligned}$$

**LEMMA 1.** *If  $U'(t) = a$  for  $-\infty \leq a \leq \infty$ , then  $\lim_{r \rightarrow 1-} u(re^{it}) = a$ . Similarly, if  $V'(t) = b$  for  $-\infty \leq b \leq \infty$ , then  $\lim_{r \rightarrow 1-} v(re^{it}) = b$ .*

The second result is less elementary.

**THEOREM 4.** *Suppose that  $f(z) \in B$  and that  $|\tilde{E}| = 0$ . Then  $|\tilde{E}_1| = |\tilde{E}_2| = 0$ .*

This theorem is not true in general—that is, if the condition that  $f(z) \in B$  is omitted. An example showing this is readily constructed from [3, Thm. 6, p. 195]. It may be, however, that Theorem 4 remains true for a substantially wider class of functions than  $B$ . The following theorem for Bloch functions is now an immediate consequence of Theorem 1 and Theorem 4.

**THEOREM 5.** *Suppose that  $f(z) = u(z) + iv(z)$  belongs to  $B$  and that  $|\tilde{E}| = 0$ , where  $\tilde{E}$  is defined by (6). Then there are four sets  $J_1(u), J_2(u), J_1(v), J_2(v)$  defined by*

$$\begin{aligned} J_1(u) &= \{t : \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} u(re^{it}) = +\infty\}, \\ J_2(u) &= \{t : \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} u(re^{it}) = -\infty\}, \\ J_1(v) &= \{t : \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} v(re^{it}) = +\infty\}, \\ J_2(v) &= \{t : \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} v(re^{it}) = -\infty\}, \end{aligned}$$

such that, for each interval  $I \subset (0, 2\pi)$ ,  $m_h(J \cap I) = \infty$  for  $J = J_1(u), J_2(u), J_1(v), J_2(v)$ .

If the function  $g(z)$  is univalent in  $D$  and we set  $f(z) = \log g'(z)$ , then  $f(z)$  is a Bloch function [15]. If we apply Theorem 5 to the function  $f(z)$  and consider only the set  $J_2(u)$  we obtain

**THEOREM 6.** *Let  $g(z)$  be univalent in  $D$  and suppose that  $|\tilde{E}(g')| = 0$ . Then there is a set  $J_2$  with  $\lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} g'(re^{it}) = 0$  for  $t \in J_2$  and  $m_h(J_2 \cap I) = \infty$  for every interval  $I \subset (0, 2\pi)$ .*

This theorem gives a strong affirmative answer to the following question of McMillan and Pommerenke [16, Problem 3.4]: Is the logarithmic capacity  $\text{Cap}(\tilde{E}(g')) > 0$  for each univalent function  $g$ ? The much stronger statement  $m_h(\tilde{E}(g')) = +\infty$  is true since  $J_2 \subseteq \tilde{E}(g')$  and either  $|\tilde{E}(g')| > 0$  or  $m_h(J_2) = +\infty$ . A similar theorem, whose proof we omit, follows from Theorem 3 by considering the set  $E_2(\lambda)$  defined after that theorem. For  $0 \leq \lambda < \infty$  we set

$$\tilde{E}(g', \lambda) = \{t : \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} g'(re^{it}) = l \text{ exists and } |l| \leq \exp(-\lambda)\}.$$

**THEOREM 7.** *Suppose that  $g(z)$  is univalent in  $D$  and that, for some interval  $I$ ,  $|\tilde{E}(g_1) \cap I| < |I|$ . If further,*

$$(7) \quad \int_0^\infty \lambda |\tilde{E}(g', \lambda) \cap I| d\lambda < \infty,$$

then  $m_h(J_2 \cap I) = \infty$ .

Theorem 7 states, in other words, that if the set where the derivative of a univalent function  $g(z)$  has a finite radial limit is of less than full measure in some interval  $I$  and if (7) is satisfied, then  $g'(z)$  possesses the radial limit zero on a set  $J_2$  with  $m_h(J_2 \cap I) = \infty$ . It is possible that Theorem 7 remains valid without condition (7), but we are unable to show this.

**4. Proof of Theorem 3.** We prove the first part of Theorem 3. The proof of the second part is similar and, as indicated previously, Theorems 1 and 2 then follow.

What is important for the proof is that  $F$  satisfies the  $T_2$ -condition of Banach so that we may apply Theorem 6.6 of [17, p. 280]. We pick  $a, b \in I$  with  $b > a$  and  $F(b) > F(a)$ . It then follows from (6.7) of [17] that

$$|F([a, b] \cap (J_1 \cup E_1))| \geq F(b) - F(a)$$

and hence

$$|F([a, b] \cap J_1)| \geq F(b) - F(a) - |F([a, b] \cap E_1)|.$$

But, by Denjoy's theorem (see, e.g., the remark on p. 272 or Theorem 6.5 on p. 227 of [17]),

$$|F([a, b] \cap E_1)| \leq \int_{[a, b] \cap E_1} |F'(t)| dt.$$

Since  $F'(t) \geq 0$  on  $E_1$  we have

$$|F([a, b] \cap J_1)| \geq F(b) - F(a) - \int_{[a, b] \cap E_1} F'(t) dt.$$

Thus, for any covering  $\{I_n\}_1^\infty$  of  $[a, b] \cap J_1$  by intervals,

$$\sum_{n=1}^\infty |F(I_n)| \geq F(b) - F(a) - \int_{[a, b] \cap E_1} F'(t) dt.$$

But  $F(t)$  has modulus of continuity  $O(\phi(\delta))$  and so, since  $I_n$  is an interval, there exists a constant  $K > 0$  such that

$$|F(I_n)| \leq K\phi(|I_n|), \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

Thus, passing to a suitable covering of  $[a, b] \cap J_1$  and taking the infimum we have

$$Km_\phi([a, b] \cap J_1) \geq F(b) - F(a) - \int_{[a, b] \cap E_1} F'(t) dt.$$

Since  $F(t)$  is of unbounded variation in  $I$ , given any  $N > 0$  we may choose *disjoint* subintervals  $[a_n, b_n] \subset I$  with  $F(b_n) > F(a_n)$  and such that

$$\sum_{n=1}^l [F(b_n) - F(a_n)] \geq N.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} Km_\phi(I \cap J_1) &\geq K \sum_{n=1}^l m_\phi([a_n, b_n] \cap J_1) \\ &\geq \sum_{n=1}^l [F(b_n) - F(a_n)] - \sum_{n=1}^l \int_{[a_n, b_n] \cap E_1} F'(t) dt \\ &\geq \sum_{n=1}^l [F(b_n) - F(a_n)] - \int_{I \cap E_1} F'(t) dt, \end{aligned}$$

since the intervals  $[a_n, b_n]$  are disjoint. The last term above is bounded by hypothesis and the first is at least  $N$ . Since  $K$  is fixed and  $N$  is arbitrary we obtain  $m_\phi(I \cap J_1) = \infty$  as required.  $\square$

**5. Proof of Theorem 4.** Theorem 4 follows readily from known results. The classical theorem of Plessner [5, Thm. 8.2, p. 147] can be sharpened, in the case of Bloch functions (see e.g. [1, Prop. 2.2]), to yield that for almost every  $t$  either

$\lim_{r \rightarrow 1-} f(re^{it})$  exists (finite or infinite) or the radial cluster set  $\{f(re^{it}) : 0 < r < 1\}$  is dense in  $\mathbf{C}$ . The set  $\tilde{E}$  has  $|\tilde{E}| = 0$  by hypothesis; the set where  $\lim_{r \rightarrow 1-} f(re^{it}) = \infty$  has measure zero by Privalov's theorem (see [5, Cor. 1, p. 146]). We are using here the fact that  $f(z)$  is a Bloch function to infer that a radial limit of  $\infty$  will, in fact, be an angular limit of  $\infty$ .

We conclude that the set of values of  $t$  for which  $\{f(re^{it}) : 0 < r < 1\}$  is dense in  $\mathbf{C}$  is of measure  $2\pi$ . Since  $\tilde{E}_1$  and  $\tilde{E}_2$  are clearly both contained in the complement of this set we have  $|\tilde{E}_1| = |\tilde{E}_2|$  as required.  $\square$

**6. Concluding remarks.** It is interesting to compare the results of Hawkes [8] on lacunary series to Theorem 5. For example, Hawkes has shown [8, Thm. 6] that if  $f(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} z^{2^n}$  and  $M(r, f) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} r^{2^n}$ , then the set

$$(8) \quad G(f) = \{t : f(re^{it}) \sim \lambda M(r, f) \text{ as } r \rightarrow 1- \text{ for some } \lambda > 0\}$$

has Hausdorff dimension 1. For related results see also [7]. Although it deals with more general series, Theorem 5 makes no assertion about the rate at which  $f(re^{it})$  tends to infinity. On the other hand, if  $F(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n \lambda_n^{-1} e^{i\lambda_n t}$ , where  $a_n = O(1)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\lambda_{n+1}/\lambda_n \geq q > 1$  for all  $n$ , then it follows from [6, Satz IV, Formula 23] that for a.e.  $t$ ,

$$\limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{|F(t+h) - F(t)|}{|h|S(h)} > 0,$$

where

$$S(h) = \left( \sum_{\lambda_n \leq 1/|h|} |a_n|^2 \right)^2,$$

and we assume that  $S(h) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $h \rightarrow 0+$ .

It therefore seems that points  $t$  in  $G(f)$  defined by (8) might reasonably be called "fast points" of the function  $f(z)$  (cf. [10, p. 55]). An interesting question would thus be to give a suitable definition of fast points for general functions in  $\Lambda^*$  and to show that if  $|E| = 0$  then the set of fast points is large. Of particular interest here would be find analogies with the results of [14] for the Wiener function of standard Brownian motion in one dimension.

We are unable to determine whether or not Theorem 1 is sharp with regard to the function  $h(t) = t \log(1/t)$ . This function  $h(t)$  arises from the global estimate for  $\omega(\delta, F)$  for  $F \in \Lambda^*$  and sometimes a better function  $\phi(t)$  is immediately available. For example, the function

$$(9) \quad F_1(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-n} n^{-1/2} \cos(2^n t)$$

belongs to  $\Lambda^*$ , and so has the  $T_2$ -property and, moreover,  $|E| = 0$ . Also  $\omega_2(\delta, F_1) = O(\delta(\log(1/\delta))^{-1/2})$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0+$ . Thus, from (3),  $\omega(\delta, F_1) = O(\delta(\log(1/\delta))^{1/2})$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0+$ . Hence  $m_\phi(J_1) = m_\phi(J_2) = \infty$  for  $\phi(t) = t(\log(1/t))^{1/2}$ .

A natural candidate for discussion in this context is the standard Weierstrass function  $G(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-n} \cos(2^n t)$ . However, using other considerations (to which we hope to return at a later date) we can show that all such lacunary functions in  $\Lambda^*$  must have  $m_\phi(J_1) = m_\phi(J_2) = \infty$  for the function  $\phi(t) = t(\log(1/t) \log \log(1/t))^{1/2}$ .

Indeed, for the function  $F_1(t)$  of (9) we may take  $\phi(t) = t(\log \log(1/t))$ . The methods of proof depend strongly in the lacunarity. Nevertheless, a reasonable first guess would be that such functions  $G(t)$  are extremal in the context of Theorem 1, and thus it is possible that Theorem 1 is susceptible to improvement regarding the size of the sets  $J_1$  and  $J_2$ . However, we have not been able to prove this, and it is possible that there is a non-lacunary function  $F(t)$  in  $\Lambda^*$  satisfying the hypothesis of Theorem 1 for which  $J_1$  and  $J_2$  have  $\sigma$ -finite  $h$ -measure.

## REFERENCES

1. J. M. Anderson and L. D. Pitt, *On recurrence properties of certain lacunary series I. General results*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 377 (1987), 65–82.
2. ———, *Probabilistic behaviour of functions in the Zygmund spaces  $\Lambda^*$  and  $\lambda^*$* , to appear.
3. F. Bagemihl and W. Seidel, *Some boundary properties of analytic functions*, Math. Z. 61 (1954), 186–199.
4. S. Banach, *Sur une classe de fonctions continues*, Fund. Math. 8 (1926), 166–173.
5. E. F. Collingwood and A. J. Lohwater, *The theory of cluster sets*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1966.
6. G. Freud, *Über trigonometrische Approximation und Fouriersche Reihen*, Math. Z. 78 (1962), 252–262.
7. D. Gnuschke and Ch. Pommerenke, *On the radial limits of functions with Hadamard gaps*, Michigan Math. J. 32 (1985), 21–31.
8. J. Hawkes, *Probabilistic behaviour of some lacunary series*, Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete 53 (1980), 21–33.
9. K. Hoffman, *Banach spaces of analytic functions*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1962.
10. J-P. Kahane, *Géza Freud and lacunary Fourier series*, J. Approx. Theory 46 (1986), 51–57.
11. ———, *Some random series of functions*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1985.
12. G. G. Lorentz, *Approximation of functions*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1966.
13. R. D. Mauldin and S. C. Williams, *On the Hausdorff dimension of some graphs*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 298 (1986), 793–803.
14. S. Orey and S. J. Taylor, *How often on a Brownian path does the law of the iterated logarithm fail?*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) 28 (1974), 174–192.
15. Ch. Pommerenke, *On Bloch functions*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) 2 (1970), 689–695.
16. ———, *Probleme aus der Funktionentheorie*, Jber. Deutsch. Math.-Verein 73 (1971), 1–5.
17. S. Saks, *Theory of the integral*, Monografie Matematyczne, Vol. 7, Warsaw-Lwow, 1937.

Mathematics Department  
University College  
London WC1E 6BT  
United Kingdom

Mathematics Department  
University of Virginia  
Charlottesville, VA 22903