# 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])

$$
\int_0^{2\pi} \left| u(r \exp(i\theta)) \right| d\theta = \mathcal{O}(1), \quad r \to 1. \tag{1}
$$

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: 30 E 25, 30 D 40, 31 A 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;

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

 $D = \{z \in \mathbf{C} \mid |z| < 1\}$  — 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  $h(\xi, \varphi_2);$ 

 $\alpha$  , and all conformal automorphisms of the disk D;  $\alpha$ 

$$
g \in G, g^{n}(z) = \underbrace{(g \circ g \circ \cdots \circ g)}_{n}(z)
$$
\n
$$
T_{H}^{\theta} = \left\{ S_{H}^{\theta} \middle| S_{H}^{\theta} = \frac{z + a \exp(i\theta)}{1 + a \exp(-i\theta)z}, a \in (-1, 1) \right\}, \theta \text{ fixed}, 0 \le \theta < \pi, -1
$$

hyperbolic subgroup of the group G with two fixed points  $\exp(i\theta)$  and  $-\exp(i\theta)$ ;

$$
\Delta(\omega, r) = \left\{ z \in D \mid \left| \frac{z - \omega}{1 - \bar{\omega}z} \right| < r \right\}, \, \omega \in D; \\
\Delta_H^{\theta} = \bigcup_{a \in (-1, 1)} \Delta(a \exp(i\theta), r);
$$

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

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

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

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

the contract of the contract of the contract of the contract of the contract of

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.

the contract of the contract of the contract of the contract of the contract of

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

DEFINITION 5. A function f defined in D belongs to the class  $N^+$ ,  $0 \le \sigma \le \pi$ , if the family  $\{\,f\circ S\mid S\in T^\theta_H\,\}$  is norma **Service Contract Contra** 

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  $a = f(\exp(i\theta)) \in$  , where the union is taken over all angles  $(\exp(i\theta), \varphi_1, \varphi_2)$  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  $s$ ubharmonic function in  $D$  subsfund the following conditions.

(1)  $u \in N^{\circ}$ ;

(ii) there is a  $\delta > 0$  such that for all  $z \in N_{\delta}(\xi) \cap D$  there holds  $u(z) \le \alpha < +\infty$ ;

(iii) there is a sequence  $(z_n) \subset \Delta_H^{\nu}(r)$  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  $u(\exp(i\theta)) = \alpha$ .

**KEMARK 1. Replacing in Theorem A** the sequence  $(z_n)$  by a curve in  $\Delta_H^2(r)$ , 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  $0 \le \theta \le \pi$ ;

(ii)  $\alpha$  is an exceptional point for u in the sense of Picard;

(iii) there exists a sequence  $(z_n) \subset \Delta_H^q(r)$  such that  $\lim_{n\to\infty} \sigma(z_n, z_{n+1}) =$  $M < +\infty$ ,  $\lim_{n\to\infty} z_n = \xi = \exp(i\theta)$  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  $N^{\nu}$  with fixed  $0 \le \theta < \pi$ , and suppose that for some sequence  $(z_n) \subset$  $\Delta_H^{\vee}(r)$  with  $\lim_{n\to\infty} \sigma(z_n, z_{n+1}) = M < +\infty$  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  $\sim$  $(\exp(i\theta), \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \subset D$ .

THEOREM D. (Berberian [5]) Let u be a continuous function on D belonging to  $N^{\nu}$  with fixed  $0 \le \theta \pi$ . Suppose that for some sequence  $(z_n) \subset \Delta^{\nu}_H(r)$ with  $\lim_{n\to\infty} \sigma(z_n, z_{n+1}) = M < +\infty$  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 . . . . . . . . .  $(\exp(i\theta), \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \subset D$ .

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

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

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

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

Every element from  $T_H$ , 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  $g \in T_H^r$ , then  $-\exp(i\theta)$  is an attractive point for  $g^{-1}$ .

#### 3. Main results and their proofs

**THEOREM 1.** Suppose that a function a subharmonic in D belongs to N .  $0 \leq \theta < \pi$ , and  $u(z) \leq \alpha < +\infty$  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  $g \in T_H^v$  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  $g \in T_H^v$ ,  $\exp(i\theta)$  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  $0 \le \theta < \pi$ ;

(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  $g \in T_H^v$  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  $g \in T_H^g$ , 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 Tor a**  $\mu$ ius  $0 \leq v \leq \pi$ . 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  $g \in T_H^v$  and  $z \in D$ , such that  $\xi = \exp(i\theta)$  is an attractive point for q, and  $C(u, q^n(z))$  is a bounded above set;

(iii) for any  $g \in T_H^{\nu}$ , such that  $\xi = \exp(i\theta)$  is an attractive point for g,  $C(u, q^n(z))$  is a bounded above set for each  $z \in D$ .

THEOREM 4. Suppose that a function  $u \in N^{\nu}$ ,  $0 \le \theta < \pi$ , 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  $g \in T_H^{\nu}$  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  $g \in T_H^{\nu}$ , 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

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

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

- [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

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