

## Solution for 'Topics in complex analysis'

(19/11/2025)

### H 10.1 (On Picard's little theorem)

a) Use Proposition 6.12 to prove Picard's little theorem without using Picard's great theorem.

b) Show that Picard's little theorem is equivalent to the following statement: if  $f, g : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  are entire functions such that  $e^f + e^g = 1$ , then  $f$  and  $g$  are constant.

#### Solution H 10.1:

a) Let  $f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be non-constant and holomorphic. Assume that there exist two elements  $w_1, w_2 \in \mathbb{C}$  such that  $\{w_1, w_2\} \cap f(\mathbb{C}) = \emptyset$ . Then the entire function  $g(z) = \frac{f(z)-w_1}{w_2-w_1}$  is again non-constant and omits the values  $\{0, 1\}$ . By Proposition 6.12 we find a holomorphic function  $h : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  such that

$$g = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \cos(\pi \cos(\pi h)))$$

and  $h(\mathbb{C})$  does not contain any open ball of radius 1. From the general version of Bloch's theorem (Corollary 6.7), we infer that  $h$  is constant, which shows that  $g$  and therefore also  $f$  is constant. This yields a contradiction.

b) We have seen in the proof of a) that Picard's little theorem is equivalent to the statement that every entire function that omits the two values  $\{0, 1\}$  is constant.

Assume that this statement is true. If  $1 = e^f + e^g$  for some entire functions  $f, g : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ , then the function  $e^g$  omits the values 0 and 1, so that  $e^g$  is constant. Taking the derivative we see that  $e^g g' = 0$ , so that  $g' = 0$ . Thus  $g$  is constant. Repeating the argument we conclude that  $f$  is also constant.

Conversely, assume that for all entire functions  $f, g : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  the equality  $1 = e^f + e^g$  implies that  $f$  and  $g$  are constant. Suppose that  $h : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is entire and omits the values  $\{0, 1\}$ . Then  $h = e^g$  for some entire function  $g : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ . Moreover, there exists an entire function  $f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  such that  $1 - h = e^f$ . Thus  $1 = e^f + e^g$ , so  $f$  and  $g$  are constant. This implies that  $h$  is constant.  $\square$

### H 10.2 (Landau's improvement of Picard's little theorem)

a) Show that there exists a function  $R : \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\} \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$  such that for any  $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\}$  we have

$$\left\{ f \in \mathcal{H}(\overline{B_{R(a)}(0)}) : f(0) = a, f'(0) = 1, f \text{ omits } \{0, 1\} \right\} = \emptyset.$$

**Hint:** Set  $R(a) = 3L(\frac{1}{2}, |a|)$ , where  $L$  is given by Schottky's theorem.

b) Show that the statement in a) implies Picard's little theorem.

#### Solution H 10.2:

a) Following the hint, we set  $R(a) = 3L(\frac{1}{2}, |a|)$ , which is defined for all  $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ . Now fix  $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\}$  and assume by contradiction that there exists a function  $f \in \mathcal{H}(\overline{B_{R(a)}(0)})$  such that  $f(0) = a$ ,  $f'(0) = 1$ , and  $f$  omits the values  $\{0, 1\}$ . Note that the Taylor series of  $f$  is of the form

$$f(z) = a + z + \sum_{k \geq 2} a_k z^k$$

in an open neighborhood of  $\overline{B_{R(a)}(0)}$ . Consider then the function  $g \in \mathcal{H}(\overline{B_1(0)})$  defined by  $g(z) = f(R(a)z)$ . It satisfies  $g(0) = a$  and omits the values 0 and 1, so that Schottky's theorem implies that

$$\sup_{z \in B_{1/2}(0)} |g(z)| \leq L(1/2, |a|) = \frac{1}{3}R(a).$$

However, by Cauchy's formula for derivatives we have

$$R(a) = |g'(0)| = \left| \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial B_{1/2}(0)} \frac{g(z)}{z^2} dz \right| \leq 2 \sup_{z \in B_{1/2}(0)} |g(z)| \leq \frac{2}{3}R(a).$$

This yields a contradiction.

b) Let  $f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be entire and non-constant. Assume by contradiction that  $f(\mathbb{C}) \cap \{0, 1\} = \emptyset$ . Choose  $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$  such that  $f'(z_0) \neq 0$  and set  $a = f(z_0) \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ . Then the function

$$h(z) := f(z_0 + z/f'(z_0))$$

is entire, satisfies  $h(0) = a$  and  $h'(0) = 1$ , but omits the values  $\{0, 1\}$ . This contradicts a). □

### H 10.3 (Equivalent version of Picard's great theorem)

Prove that Picard's great theorem (Theorem 6.2) is equivalent to the following statement: for any holomorphic function  $f : B_1(0) \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ , either  $f$  or  $1/f$  is bounded in a neighborhood of 0.

#### Solution H 10.3:

Assuming Picard's great theorem, any holomorphic function  $f : B_1(0) \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  that omits the values  $\{0, 1\}$  cannot have an essential singularity at 0. If the singularity is removable, then  $f$  is bounded in a neighborhood of 0. Otherwise,  $f$  has a pole at 0, so  $1/f$  has a removable singularity (in fact a zero) at 0 and we conclude that  $1/f$  is bounded in a neighborhood of 0. In order to prove the converse statement, we argue by contradiction. Assume that there exist a function  $f : B_r(z_0) \setminus \{z_0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  with an essential singularity at  $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ , and two distinct values  $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$  such that on  $B_r(z_0) \setminus \{z_0\}$  the function  $f$  assumes the values  $a$  and  $b$  only finitely many times. After shrinking  $r > 0$  we can assume that  $f$  omits the values  $a$  and  $b$ , and by considering

$$z \mapsto \frac{f(rz + z_0) - a}{b - a}$$

we may assume that  $r = 1$ ,  $z_0 = 0$ ,  $a = 0$ , and  $b = 1$ . Then by assumption either  $f$  or  $1/f$  is bounded in a neighborhood of 0. If this is the case for  $f$ , then  $f$  has a removable singularity at 0, which yields a contradiction. Thus  $g = 1/f$  has a removable singularity at 0. Denote the holomorphic extension still by  $g$ . If  $g(0) \neq 0$ , then  $f = 1/g$  is also bounded near 0 and we get a contradiction as before. If  $g(0) = 0$  then  $\lim_{z \rightarrow 0} |f(z)| = +\infty$  and we conclude that  $f$  has a pole at 0. Hence in both cases we obtain a contradiction. □

### H 10.4 (An even sharper version of Montel's theorem)

Let  $G \subset \mathbb{C}$  be a simply connected domain and for  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  define

$$\mathcal{F}_m := \{f : G \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \text{ holomorphic with } f(G) \cap \{0\} = \emptyset \text{ and } \#\{f = 1\} \leq m\},$$

where  $\#$  denotes the cardinality of a set. Show that for any sequence  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{F}_m$ , either the whole sequence  $|f_n|$  converges locally uniformly to  $+\infty$ , or there exists a subsequence  $\{f_{n_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$

that converges locally uniformly to a holomorphic function  $f : G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ .

**Hint:** Consider a suitable root  $\sqrt[m+1]{f}$  for  $f \in \mathcal{F}_m$ .

**Solution H 10.4:**

Since  $f(G) \cap \{0\} = \emptyset$  for every  $f \in \mathcal{F}_m$  and  $G$  is simply connected, we can define the holomorphic function  $\sqrt[m+1]{f} : G \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ . Note that there exists  $s_f \in \{0, \dots, m\}$  such that

$$\sqrt[m+1]{f(z)} \neq \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i s_f}{m+1}\right) \quad \forall z \in G.$$

Indeed, otherwise the equation  $f(z) = 1$  would have at least  $m+1$  distinct solutions, which contradicts the fact that  $f \in \mathcal{F}_m$ . Set  $z_f = \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i s_f}{m+1}\right) \in \partial B_1(0)$  and consider the rescaled functions  $\tilde{f} = \sqrt[m+1]{f}/z_f : G \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ . Given a sequence  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{F}_m$ , we can apply the sharpened version of Montel's theorem (Theorem 6.14) to the sequence  $\{\tilde{f}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and deduce that either  $|\tilde{f}_n| \rightarrow +\infty$  locally uniformly, or that a subsequence  $\{\tilde{f}_{n_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges locally uniformly to a holomorphic function  $\tilde{f} : G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ . After passing to a further subsequence, in this second case we can also assume that  $z_{f_{n_j}}$  converges to some  $z_\infty \in \partial B_1(0)$ . This yields the claim once we unfold the definitions. □