## ON THE BOUNDARY VALUES OF BLASCHKE PRODUCTS AND THEIR QUOTIENTS <br> CHUJI TANAKA

1. Introduction. Let $B(z)$ be the infinite Blaschke product:

$$
e^{i \lambda} z^{m} \prod_{n=1}^{+\infty} \bar{a}_{n}\left(a_{n}-z\right) /\left|a_{n}\right|\left(1-\bar{a}_{n} z\right),
$$

where $\lambda$ is a real constant, and $m$ is a non-negative integer, $0<\left|a_{n}\right|$ $<1, \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty}\left(1-\left|a_{n}\right|\right)<+\infty$. The object of this note is to establish the following two theorems.

Theorem 1. (A) If the subsequence $\left\{a_{n_{k}}\right\}$ tends to $z=e^{i \phi}$ within the Stolz domain in such a manner that

$$
\lim _{k \rightarrow+\infty}\left|\left(a_{n_{k}}-a_{n_{k+1}}\right)\right| /\left|a_{n_{k}}-e^{i \phi}\right|=0
$$

then the angular limit at $e^{i \phi}$ of $B(z)$ is 0 .
(B) If the subsequence $\left\{a_{n_{k}}\right\}$ tends to $z=e^{i \phi}$ within the circle: $\left|z-a e^{i \phi}\right| \leqq 1-a(0<a<1)$, in such a manner that

$$
\lim _{k \rightarrow+\infty} 1 / x_{k}^{2} \cdot\left|a_{n_{k}}-a_{n_{k+1}}\right|=0
$$

where $x_{k}=\min \left\{\left|a_{n_{k}}-e^{i \phi}\right|,\left|a_{n_{k+1}}-e^{i \phi}\right|\right\}$, then the angular limit at $e^{i \phi}$ of $B(z)$ is 0 .

As an application of Theorem 1 (A), we prove
Theorem 2. There exists a meromorphic function $f(z)$ of bounded characteristic in $|z|<1$ represented by the quotient of two infinite Blaschke products such that
(1) $f(z)$ has infinite number of zeros and poles on $\arg (1-z)=-\vartheta$ and $\arg (1-z)=+\vartheta$ respectively $(0<\vartheta<\pi / 2)$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{z \rightarrow 1 ; \arg (1-z)=-\vartheta} f(z)=0, \quad \text { and } \quad \lim _{z \rightarrow 1 ; \arg (1-z)=+\vartheta} f(z)=\infty . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Remark. (1) O. Frostman [1, p. 109] was the first to construct an example of Blaschke product with the boundary value 0 , i.e.,
$B(z)=\prod_{n=1}^{+\infty}\left\{\left(1-1 / n^{2}\right)-z\right\} /\left\{1-\left(1-1 / n^{2}\right) z\right\}$, where $\lim _{r \rightarrow 1} B(r)=0$.
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(2) By the well-known Iversen-Lindelöf theorem on asymptotic values, $f(z)$ of Theorem 2 has Picard's property in the sector $S:|\arg (1-z)| \leqq \vartheta<\pi / 2 ; w=f(z)$ takes every value $w$, except perhaps two, infinitely many times in $S$. On the other hand, $f\left(e^{i \theta}\right)$ is of modulus one almost everywhere on $|z|=1$.
(3) D. A. Storvick [3, p. 37] constructed a meromorphic function $f(z)$ defined by the quotient of two infinite Blaschke products such that $f(z) \rightarrow 0$ and $\infty$ as $z \rightarrow 1$ along the upper and lower oricycle: $r=\cos \theta$ respectively, $z=r e^{i \theta}$.
2. Proof of Theorem 1. (A) We decompose $B(z)$ as follows:

$$
B(z)=B_{1}(z) \cdot B_{2}(z),
$$

where $B_{1}(z)=\prod_{k=1}^{+\infty} \bar{a}_{n_{k}}\left(a_{n_{k}}-z\right) /\left|a_{n_{k}}\right|\left(1-\bar{a}_{n_{k}} z\right), \quad B_{2}(z)=B(z) / B_{1}(z)$. Since $|B(z)|<\left|B_{1}(z)\right|$ for $|z|<1$, it is sufficient to prove that the angular limit at $e^{i \phi}$ of $B_{1}(z)$ is 0 .

Without any loss of generality, we can assume that $\phi=0$. Put $z=1-r e^{i \theta}, a_{n_{k}}=b_{k}=1-r_{k} e^{i \theta_{k}}$. By a simple calculation,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left(b_{k}-z\right) /\left(1-\bar{b}_{k} z\right) \\
& =\left(b_{k}-z\right) / r_{k} e^{-i \theta_{k}} \cdot\left\{\left(e^{i 2 \theta_{k}}+1\right)-r e^{i \theta}+\left(b_{k}-z\right) / r_{k} e^{i \theta_{k}} \cdot e^{i 2 \theta_{k}}\right\}^{-1} . \tag{2.1}
\end{align*}
$$

Let us denote by $l_{k}$ the segment connecting two points $b_{k}$ and $b_{k+1}$. If $z$ lies on $l_{k}$, we have evidently

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|b_{k}-z\right| \leqq\left|b_{k}-b_{k+1}\right|, \quad r \leqq \max \left(r_{k}, r_{k+1}\right) \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

By $\left|\theta_{k}\right| \leqq \vartheta<\pi / 2$, we get easily

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|e^{i 2 \theta_{k}}+1\right|>\sin (2 \vartheta) .{ }^{1} \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

By (2.1), (2.2) and (2.3)

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\left(b_{k}-z\right) /\left(1-b_{k} z\right)\right| & \leqq\left|\left(b_{k}-b_{k+1}\right)\right| /\left|1-b_{k}\right| \\
\cdot\{\sin (2 \vartheta) & \left.-\max \left(r_{k}, r_{k+1}\right)-\left|\left(b_{k}-b_{k+1}\right)\right| /\left|1-b_{k}\right|\right\}^{-1}
\end{aligned}
$$

so that, by the assumptions:

$$
\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty}\left|\left(b_{k}-b_{k+1}\right)\right| /\left|1-b_{k}\right|=0, \quad \lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} \max \left(r_{k}, r_{k+1}\right)=0,
$$

we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{x \rightarrow \infty}\left(b_{k}-z\right) /\left(1-b_{k} z\right)=0 \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $z \in l_{k}$. Since

[^0]$$
\left|B_{1}(z)\right|<\left|\left(b_{k}-z\right) /\left(1-b_{k} z\right)\right| \quad \text { for any } k \text { and }|z|<1
$$
by (2.4)
$$
\lim B_{1}(z)=0
$$
as $z \rightarrow 1$ along $C=\mathrm{U}_{k} l_{k}$. Hence, by Lindelöf's theorem [2, p. 5]
$$
\lim _{z \rightarrow 1} B_{1}(z)=0
$$
as $z \rightarrow 1$ inside a Stolz domain with vertex at $z=1$, as was to be proved.
(B) Using the same notations as above, we get
(2.5) $\left(b_{k}-z\right) /\left(1-b_{k} z\right)=\left(b_{k}-z\right) / r r_{k} e^{i\left(\theta-\theta_{k}\right)} \cdot\left\{e^{i \theta_{k} / r_{k}}+e^{-i \theta / r-1}\right\}^{-1}$.

In the circle: $|z-a| \leqq 1-a\left(0<a<1, z=1-r e^{i \theta}\right)$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{2(1-a)} \leqq \cos \theta / r . \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $z$ lies on $l_{k}$, by (2.5) and (2.6),

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\left(b_{k}-z\right) /\left(1-b_{k} z\right)\right| & \leqq\left|\left(b_{k}-z\right)\right| / r r_{k} \cdot\left\{\cos \theta_{k} / r_{k}+\cos \theta / r-1\right\}^{-1} \\
& \leqq(1 / a-1) \cdot y_{k} /\left(\min (r) \cdot x_{k}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $y_{k}=\left|b_{k}-b_{k+1}\right|, x_{k}=\min \left(r_{k}, r_{k+1}\right), \min (r)=\min _{z \in l_{k}}|z-1|$. If $\min (r)=x_{k}$, we have

$$
\left|\left(b_{k}-z\right) /\left(1-\bar{b}_{k} z\right)\right| \leqq(1 / a-1) \cdot y_{k} / x_{k}^{2} .
$$

If $\min (r)<x_{k}$, we have easily

$$
\min (r) \geqq\left(x_{k}^{2}-\left(y_{k} / 2\right)^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}
$$

so that

$$
\left|\left(b_{k}-z\right) /\left(1-b_{k} z\right)\right| \leqq(1 / a-1) \cdot y_{k} / x_{k}^{2} \cdot\left\{1-\left(y_{k} / 2 x_{k}\right)^{2}\right\}^{-1 / 2}
$$

In any case, by the assumption: $\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} y_{k} / x_{k}^{2}=0$, we have

$$
\lim _{x \rightarrow \infty}\left(b_{k}-z\right) /\left(1-b_{k} z\right)=0
$$

as $z$ on $l_{k}$. Hence, by entirely similar arguments as in (A),

$$
\lim _{z \rightarrow 1} B(z)=0
$$

as $z \rightarrow 1$ inside the Stol $z$ domain with vertex at $z=1$.
3. Lemmas. To prove Theorem 2, we need two lemmas.

Lemma 1. Put

$$
w(z)=(a-z)(1-a z) /(1-\bar{a} z)(\bar{a}-z),
$$

where $|a|<1, I(a)>0 .{ }^{2}$ Then

$$
|w(z)|<1 \quad \text { for }|z|<1, I(z)>0 .
$$

Proof. $w(z)$ is regular in the upper semi-circle $D:|z| \leqq 1, I(z) \geqq 0$. On the boundary of $D$, we have evidently $|w|=1$. Hence, by the maximum-modulus principle, $|w(z)|<1$ for $|z|<1, I(z)>0$.

Lemma 2. In the domain $D:|z|<1, I(z) \geqq 0,|z-1| \leqq|a-1|$, where $|a|<1, I(a)>0$, we have

$$
|(1-a z) /(z-\bar{a})|<\exp \left(2 / \sin ^{2} \vartheta\right)
$$

where $\arg (1-a)=-\vartheta(0<\vartheta<\pi / 2)$.
Proof. By the inequality: $\log (1+x) \leqq x$ for $x \geqq 0$, for $|a|<1$, $|z| \leqq 1$ we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\log |(1-a z) /(z-\bar{a})| & =\frac{1}{2} \log \left\{1+\left(1-|a|^{2}\right)\left(1-|z|^{2}\right) /|(z-\bar{a})|^{2}\right\} \\
& \leqq \frac{1}{2}\left(1-|a|^{2}\right)\left(1-|z|^{2}\right) /|(z-\bar{a})|^{2} \\
& <2|(1-a)(1-z)| /|(z-\bar{a})|^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence
$\log |(1-a z) /(z-\bar{a})|<2|1-a|^{2} /|I(a)|^{2}=2 / \sin ^{2} \vartheta \quad$ for $z \in D$, because $|z-1| \leqq|a-1|,|z-\bar{a}| \geqq I(a)$ in $D$. Thus Lemma 2 is proved.
4. Proof of Theorem 2. Let the sequence $\left\{\epsilon_{n}\right\}$ be such that

$$
\begin{gather*}
\cos \vartheta>\epsilon_{1}>\epsilon_{2}>\cdots>\epsilon_{n}>\rightarrow 0 \\
\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \epsilon_{n}<+\infty  \tag{4.1}\\
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_{n+1} / \epsilon_{n}=1
\end{gather*}
$$

Put $a_{n}=1-\epsilon_{n} \cdot e^{-i \vartheta}(0<\vartheta<\pi / 2)$. Then

$$
\left|a_{n}\right|<1, \quad I\left(a_{n}\right)>0 \quad \text { for } n \geqq 1 .
$$

The desired function $f(z)$ is given by $f(z)=B_{1}(z) / B_{2}(z)$, where

[^1]\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& B_{1}(z)=\prod_{n=1}^{+\infty} \bar{a}_{n}\left(a_{n}-z\right) /\left|a_{n}\right|\left(1-\bar{a}_{n} z\right) \\
& B_{2}(z)=\prod_{n=1}^{+\infty} a_{n}\left(\bar{a}_{n}-z\right) /\left|a_{n}\right|\left(1-a_{n} z\right)
\end{aligned}
$$
\]

Since $\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} 1-\left|a_{n}\right|<\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty}\left|1-a_{n}\right|=\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \epsilon_{n}<+\infty$, the Blaschke products $B_{i}(z)(i=1,2)$ are convergent.

We can put

$$
f(z)=\prod_{n=1}^{+\infty} \bar{a}_{n} / a_{n} \cdot\left(a_{n}-z\right)\left(1-a_{n} z\right) /\left(1-\bar{a}_{n} z\right)\left(\bar{a}_{n}-z\right)
$$

so that, by Lemmas 1 and 2, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
|f(z)|<\left|\left(a_{k}-z\right) /\left(1-\bar{a}_{k} z\right)\right| \cdot \exp \left(2 / \sin ^{2} \vartheta\right) \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

on the segment: $\arg (1-z)=-\vartheta,|1-z| \leqq \epsilon_{k}$. By (4.1)

$$
\left|\left(a_{k}-a_{k+1}\right) /\left(1-a_{k}\right)\right|=1-\epsilon_{k+1} / \epsilon_{k} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text { as } k \rightarrow+\infty .
$$

Hence, by (4.2) and arguments similar to those in the proof of Theorem 1 (A),

$$
\lim _{z \rightarrow 1 ; \arg (1-z)=-\theta} f(z)=0 .
$$

Similarly

$$
\lim _{z \rightarrow 1 ; \arg (1-z)=+v} 1 / f(z)=0 .
$$

Thus Theorem 2 is completely established.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}\left|e^{i 2 \theta_{k}+1}\right|=2 \cos \theta_{k} \geqq 2 \cos \vartheta>\sin (2 \vartheta)$.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2} I(a)$ is the imaginary part of $a$.

