# BOUNDARY BEHAVIOR OF SUBHARMONIC FUNCTIONS ON THE UNIT DISK

## Žarko Pavićević and Jela Šušić

**Abstract**. In this paper, we prove some boundary properties of subharmonic functions in the open unit disk of the complex plane.

## 1. Introduction, preliminary notations and definitions

In this paper we investigate boundary properties of harmonic and subharmonic functions. These functions were firstly investigated by I. I. Privalov [1], and later by E. D. Solomencev ([2], [3]) and M. Tsuji [4] and by many other mathematicians. The results obtained show that the investigation of boundary properties of subharmonic functions is more complicated than that of harmonic and meromorphic functions. This shows a function u(z) subharmonic on the disk  $\Delta = \{z \mid |z| < 1\}$  satisfies the condition ([4])

$$\int_{0}^{2\pi} \left| u(r \exp(i\theta)) \right| d\theta = \mathcal{O}(1), \quad r \to 1.$$
 (1)

According to the classical result of J. E. Littlewood, for a function u(z) there holds

$$u(z) = \nu(z) + \omega(z),$$

where  $\nu(z)$  is a harmonic function on  $\Delta$  which satisfies (1), and

$$\omega(z) = \iint_{|a| < 1} \ln \left| \frac{1 - \bar{a}z}{z - a} \right| d\mu(a)$$

is the Green potential of measure  $d\mu(a)$  satisfying the condition

$$\iint_{|a|<1} \left(1-|a|\right) d\mu(a) < +\infty.$$

The harmonic function  $\nu(z)$  has the angular boundary values almost everywhere on  $\partial \Delta = \{z \mid |z| = 1\}$ , while the Green potential  $\omega(z)$  has the radial limits

 $AMS\ Subject\ Classification\colon 30\to 25,\ 30\to 40,\ 31\to 05$ 

Communicated at the 4th Symposium on Mathematical Analysis and Its Applications, Arandelovac 1997.

almost everywhere on  $\partial \Delta$ , but does not necessarily have angular boundary values on  $\partial \Delta$  (see [4]).

The property of the normality in the sense of Montel, with respect to the group of all conformal automorphisms of the disk  $\Delta$ , gives interesting boundary properties of meromorphic functions, while this is not the case for subharmonic functions. For more information about these questions, see [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7].

In this paper, we investigate locally boundary properties of harmonic and subharmonic functions on the open unit disk D of the complex plane. Statements which we will formulate in this paper are related to some results of Berberian ([5]).

### Notations

C — complex plane;

 $\overline{\mathbf{C}} = \Omega$  — extended complex plane,  $\mathbf{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ , identified with the Riemann sphere;

 $D = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z| < 1\}$  — the open unit disk;  $\partial D = \{z \mid |z| = 1\}$  — unit circle;

 $h(\xi,\varphi)$  — chord at  $\xi = \exp(i\theta) \in \partial D$  that makes the angle  $\varphi, -\pi/2 < \varphi < \pi/2$ with the radius  $h(\xi, 0)$ ;

 $\Delta(\xi, \varphi_1, \varphi_2)$  — Stolz angle at  $\xi = \exp(i\theta)$ , between the chords  $h(\xi, \varphi_1)$  and  $h(\xi,\varphi_2);$ 

G — group of all conformal automorphisms of the disk D;

$$g \in G, g^n(z) = \underbrace{(g \circ g \circ \cdots \circ g)}_{n}(z)$$

$$T_H^\theta \ = \ \left\{ S_H^\theta \ \middle| \ S_H^\theta = \frac{z + a \exp(i\theta)}{1 + a \exp(-i\theta)z}, \ a \in (-1,1) \right\}, \ \theta \ \text{fixed}, \ 0 \ \leqslant \ \theta \ < \ \pi, \ -- \text{hyperbolic subgroup of the group } G \ \text{with two fixed points } \exp(i\theta) \ \text{and} \ - \exp(i\theta);$$

$$\Delta(\omega, r) = \left\{ z \in D \mid \left| \frac{z - \omega}{1 - \bar{\omega}z} \right| < r \right\}, \, \omega \in D;$$

$$\Delta_H^\theta = \bigcup_{a \in (-1,1)} \Delta \big( a \exp(i\theta), r \big);$$

 $\sigma(z_1, z_2)$  — hyperbolic distance in D;

 $\psi(z_1, z_2)$  — pseudohyperbolic distance in D

$$\psi(z_1, z_2) = \left| \frac{z_1 - z_2}{1 - \bar{z}_1 z_2} \right| = \tanh \left( \sigma(z_1, z_2) \right);$$

$$N_{\delta}(\xi) = \{ z \in \mathbf{C} \mid |z - \xi| < \delta \}, \ \delta > 0.$$

DEFINITION 1. A function f defined in D is said to be normal in D if the family  $\{f \circ S \mid S \in G\}$  is a normal family in the sense of Montel.

DEFINITION 2. A function f defined in D belongs to the class N if f is normal in D.

DEFINITION 3. A function f defined in D belongs to the class  $N^{\theta}$ ,  $0 \leq \theta < \pi$ , if the family  $\{ f \circ S \mid S \in T_H^{\theta} \}$  is normal in the sense of Montel.

DEFINITION 4. Let  $K \subset D$  such that  $K \cap \partial D = \exp(i\theta) \in \partial D$ . Then the set  $C(f, K, \exp(i\theta)) = \{ a \in \Omega \mid \exists (z_n) \subset K \text{ with } \lim_{n \to \infty} z_n = \exp(i\theta) \text{ and } \lim_{n \to \infty} f(z_n) = a \}$  is said to be the cluster set for a function f with respect to the set K in  $\exp(i\theta)$ .

DEFINITION 5. A point  $\exp(i\theta) \in \partial D$  is said to be a Fatou's point of f if the set  $\bigcup C(f, \Delta(\exp(i\theta), \varphi_1, \varphi_2), \exp(i\theta))$  consists of a single value  $a = f(\exp(i\theta)) \in \Omega$ , where the union is taken over all angles  $\Delta(\exp(i\theta), \varphi_1, \varphi_2)$  at  $\exp(i\theta)$ . Then  $a = f(\exp(i\theta))$  is an angular limit of f at point  $\exp(i\theta)$ .

We denote by F(f) the set of all Fatou's points of f.

### 2. Preliminary results

THEOREM A. (Berberian [5]) Let  $\xi = \exp(i\theta)$  with  $0 \le \theta < \pi$ , and let u be a subharmonic function in D satisfying the following conditions:

- (i)  $u \in N^{\theta}$ ;
- (ii) there is a  $\delta > 0$  such that for all  $z \in N_{\delta}(\xi) \cap D$  there holds  $u(z) \leq \alpha < +\infty$ ;
- (iii) there is a sequence  $(z_n) \subset \Delta_H^{\theta}(r)$  such that  $\lim_{n \to \infty} z_n = \xi = \exp(i\theta)$ ,  $\lim_{n \to \infty} \sigma(z_n, z_{n+1}) = M < +\infty$ , and  $\lim_{n \to \infty} u(z_n) = \alpha$ .

Then 
$$\xi = \exp(i\theta) \in F(u)$$
 and  $u(\exp(i\theta)) = \alpha$ .

REMARK 1. Replacing in Theorem A the sequence  $(z_n)$  by a curve in  $\Delta_H^{\theta}(r)$ , we obtain the same statement proved by J. Meek [6] for the class N. J. Meek showed also that the condition (ii) of locally boundedness of u cannot be omitted.

REMARK 2. An example of the modular function given by Berberian shows that the condition (iii) from Theorem A also cannot be omitted.

Theorem B. (Berberian [5]) Suppose that u is a harmonic function in D satisfying the following conditions:

- (i)  $u \in N^{\theta}$  with fixed  $0 \leq \theta < \pi$ ;
- (ii)  $\alpha$  is an exceptional point for u in the sense of Picard;
- (iii) there exists a sequence  $(z_n) \subset \Delta_H^{\theta}(r)$  such that  $\overline{\lim}_{n \to \infty} \sigma(z_n, z_{n+1}) = M < +\infty$ ,  $\lim_{n \to \infty} z_n = \xi = \exp(i\theta)$  and  $\lim_{n \to \infty} u(z_n) = \alpha$ .

Then 
$$\xi = \exp(i\theta) \in F(u)$$
 and  $u(\exp(i\theta)) = \alpha$ .

Theorem C. (Berberian [5]) Let u be a subharmonic function on D which belongs to  $N^{\theta}$  with fixed  $0 \le \theta < \pi$ , and suppose that for some sequence  $(z_n) \subset \Delta_H^{\theta}(r)$  with  $\overline{\lim}_{n\to\infty} \sigma(z_n,z_{n+1}) = M < +\infty$  and  $\lim_{n\to\infty} z_n = \xi = \exp(i\theta)$ , u has a bounded above cluster set  $C(u,(z_n))$ . Then a function u is bounded above on each angle  $\Delta(\exp(i\theta),\varphi_1,\varphi_2) \subset D$ .

Theorem D. (Berberian [5]) Let u be a continuous function on D belonging to  $N^{\theta}$  with fixed  $0 \leqslant \theta \pi$ . Suppose that for some sequence  $(z_n) \subset \Delta_H^{\theta}(r)$  with  $\overline{\lim}_{n \to \infty} \sigma(z_n, z_{n+1}) = M < +\infty$  and  $\lim_{n \to \infty} z_n = \xi = \exp(i\theta)$ , u has a bounded cluster set  $C(u, (z_n))$ . Then the function u is bounded on each angle  $\Delta(\exp(i\theta), \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \subset D$ .

Lemma. There exists an element  $g \in T_H^{\theta}$  with fixed  $0 \leq \theta < \pi$ , such that for each  $z \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}$  there holds:

- (i)  $\lim_{n\to\infty} g^n(z) = \exp(i\theta);$
- (ii)  $\lim_{n\to\infty} (g^{-1})^n(z) = \exp(i\theta)$ .

*Proof.* The assertion of our Lemma follows immediately from Theorem 4.3.10 in [8].  $\blacksquare$ 

The points  $\exp(i\theta)$  and  $-\exp(i\theta)$  from the above lemma are called attractive points for the elements g and  $g^{-1}$  of the group  $T_H^{\theta}$ , respectively.

Every element from  $T_H^{\theta}$ , except the identity, has either  $\exp(i\theta)$  or  $-\exp(i\theta)$  as an attractive point. If  $\exp(i\theta)$  is an attractive point for  $g \in T_H^{\theta}$ , then  $-\exp(i\theta)$  is an attractive point for  $g^{-1}$ .

#### 3. Main results and their proofs

THEOREM 1. Suppose that a function u subharmonic in D belongs to  $N^{\theta}$ ,  $0 \le \theta < \pi$ , and  $u(z) \le \alpha < +\infty$  for all  $z \in N_{\delta}(\xi) \cap D$ ,  $\xi = \exp(i\theta)$ . Then the following statements are equivalent.

- (i)  $\xi = \exp(i\theta) \in F(u)$  and  $u(\exp(i\theta)) = \alpha$ ;
- (ii) there exist  $g \in T_H^{\theta}$  and  $z \in D$  so that  $\exp(i\theta)$  is an attractive point for g, and  $\lim_{n\to\infty} u(g^n(z)) = \alpha$ ;
- (iii) for any  $g \in T_H^{\theta}$ ,  $\exp(i\theta)$  is an attractive point for g, and for each  $z \in D$  there holds  $\lim_{n \to \infty} u(g^n(z)) = \alpha$ .

Theorem 2. Suppose that a function u harmonic in D satisfies the following conditions:

- (i)  $u \in N^{\theta}$  with fixed  $0 \leq \theta < \pi$ ;
- (ii)  $\alpha$  is an exceptional value for u in the sense of Picard.

Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (i)  $\xi = \exp(i\theta) \in F(u)$  and  $u(\exp(i\theta)) = \alpha$ ;
- (ii) there exist  $g \in T_H^{\theta}$  and  $z \in D$ , such that  $\exp(i\theta)$  is an attractive point for g and  $\lim_{n\to\infty} u(g^n(u)) = \alpha$ ;
- (iii) for each  $g \in T_H^{\theta}$ , such that  $\exp(i\theta)$  is an attractive point for g, and  $\lim_{n\to\infty} u(g^n(z)) = \alpha$  for each  $z \in D$ .

Theorem 3 Suppose that a function u subharmonic in D belongs to  $N^{\theta}$  for a fixed  $0 \le \theta < \pi$ . Then the following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) u is bounded above on each angle  $\Delta(\xi, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \subset D$ ,  $\xi = \exp(i\theta)$ ;
- (ii) there exist  $g \in T_H^{\theta}$  and  $z \in D$ , such that  $\xi = \exp(i\theta)$  is an attractive point for g, and  $C(u, g^n(z))$  is a bounded above set;
- (iii) for any  $g \in T_H^{\theta}$ , such that  $\xi = \exp(i\theta)$  is an attractive point for g,  $C(u, g^n(z))$  is a bounded above set for each  $z \in D$ .

Theorem 4. Suppose that a function  $u \in N^{\theta}$ ,  $0 \leq \theta < \pi$ , is continuous on D. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) u is bounded on each angle  $\Delta(\xi, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \subset D$ ,  $\xi = \exp(i\theta)$ ;
- (ii) there exist  $g \in T_H^{\theta}$  and  $z \in D$  such that  $\xi = \exp(i\theta)$  is an attractive point for g, and  $C(u, g^n(z))$  is a bounded set;
- (iii) for any  $g \in T_H^{\theta}$ , such that  $\xi = \exp(i\theta)$  is an attractive point for g,  $C(u, g^n(z))$  is a bounded set for each  $z \in D$ .

Proofs of Theorems 1, 2, 3 and 4. Since the hyperbolic and pseudohyperbolic distances in D are invariant with respect to the elements of the group G, it follows that for sequences  $(g^n(z)), z \in D$  is fixed, there holds

$$\sigma(g^n(z), g^{n+1}(z)) = \sigma(z, g(z)) = M < +\infty \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

For any fixed  $z \in D$  we can find an r, |z| < r < 1 such that  $g^n(z) \in \Delta_H^{\theta}(r)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . From this fact and our Lemma, it follows that every sequence  $\left(g^n(z)\right)$  satisfies all conditions of Theorems A, B, C and D, which implies the implications (ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i) and (iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i) of Theorems 1, 2, 3 and 4, respectively. The implications (iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii), (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii) and (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii) are trivial. This completes the proof.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] I. I. Privalov, Subharmonic Functions, Moscow, 1937 (in Russian).
- [2] E. D. Solomencev, On boundary values of subharmonic functions, Ch. Math. J. 8 (1958), 520-536 (in Russian).
- [3] E. D. Solomencev, An example of a bounded and continuous subharmonic function which does not have angular boundary values, Sib. Math. J. 1 (1960), 488-491 (in Russian).
- [4] M. Tsuji, Littlewood theorem on subharmonic functions in a unit circle, Comment. Math. Univ. St. Pauli 5 (1956), 3-16.
- [5] S. L. Berberian, Boundary behavior of subharmonic and meromorphic functions, Kandidat. Dissertation, Moscow State University, Moscow, 1979 (in Russian).
  [6] J. Meek, On Fatou's points of normal subharmonic functions, Math. Japonica 22, 3 (1977).
- 309-314.
- [7] J. Meek, Subharmonic versions of Fatou's theorem, Proc. Amer. math. Soc. 30 (1971), 313–317.
- [8] A. F. Berdon, The Geometry of Discrete Groups, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg-Berlin, 1983.

(received 01.08.1997, in revised form 09.03.1998.)

University of Montenegro, Faculty of Mathematical and Natural Sciences, P. O. Box 211, 81000 Podgorica, Yugoslavia

 $E ext{-}mail$ : zarko@rc.pmf.cg.ac.yu