

## ON GROWTH $k$ -ORDER OF SOLUTIONS OF A COMPLEX HOMOGENEOUS LINEAR DIFFERENTIAL EQUATION

LUIS G. BERNAL

**ABSTRACT.** In this paper, we give several results about growth  $k$ -order of solutions of a complex homogeneous linear differential equation with variable coefficients, provided that the coefficients are entire functions.

Denote by  $C$  the complex field. Let  $f: C \rightarrow C$  be an entire function. If  $r > 0$ , we define  $\exp_1 r = \exp r$ ,  $\exp_{k+1} r = \exp(\exp_k r)$  ( $k = 1, 2, \dots$ ), and  $M(r) = \max\{|f(z)|: |z| = r\}$ . For  $r > 0$  large enough, we denote  $\log_1 r = \log r$ ,  $\log_{k+1} r = \log(\log_k r)$  ( $k = 1, 2, \dots$ ). The following definitions can be found in [7, 8]. The growth  $k$ -order  $\rho_k = \rho_k(f)$  of  $f(z)$  is

$$\rho_k = \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} (\log_{k+1} M(r) / \log r).$$

If  $k = 1$ , then  $\rho_k$  is called the order of  $f(z)$ , and we shall denote it by  $\rho(f)$ . We define the growth index  $i(f)$  of  $f(z)$  as  $i(f) = 0$  if  $f(z)$  is polynomial, and  $i(f) = \min\{k \in \{1, 2, \dots\}: \rho_k(f) < \infty\}$  if  $f(z)$  is transcendental, where we set  $i(f) = \infty$  when  $\rho_k(f) = \infty$  for all  $k$ .

Furthermore, we shall use some notations taken from Nevanlinna theory. If  $g(z)$  is a meromorphic function on  $C$ , one defines

$$m(r, g) = (1/2\pi) \int_0^{2\pi} \log^+ |g(re^{it})| dt,$$

$$N(r, g) = \int_0^r (n(t) - n(0))/t dt + n(0) \log r,$$

and  $T(r, g) = m(r, g) + N(r, g)$  ( $r > 0$ ), where  $\log^+ x = \max(0, \log x)$  for  $x \geq 0$  and  $n(t)$  is the number of the poles of  $g(z)$  lying in  $|z| \leq t$ , counting according to their multiplicity.  $T(r, g)$  is an increasing function of  $r$ . If  $f(z)$  is entire, then  $T(r, f) = m(r, f)$  and

$$T(r, f) \leq \log^+ M(r) \leq (R + r/R - r) \cdot T(R, f) \quad (0 < r < R)$$

(see [5, p. 174]). From these inequalities it is easily derived that

$$\rho_k(f) = \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} (\log_k T(r, f) / \log r).$$

Accordingly, the  $k$ -order of a meromorphic function  $g(z)$  is defined as  $\rho_k(g) = \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} (\log_k T(r, g) / \log r)$ . If  $k = 1$ , one obtains  $\rho_1 = \rho$ , the order of  $g(z)$ .

Received by the editors June 23, 1986.

1980 *Mathematics Subject Classification* (1985 *Revision*). Primary 34A20; Secondary 30D05, 30D15.

*Key words and phrases.* Growth  $k$ -order, linear differential equation, entire function, Nevanlinna theory.

Let  $G \subset C$  be a simply connected domain and

$$(1) \quad L(w) = 0$$

be a complex homogeneous linear differential equation of order  $n$ , where

$$L(w) = w^{(n)} + a_1(z)w^{(n-1)} + \dots + a_n(z)w$$

and the  $a_j$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n$ ) are analytic functions on  $G$ , and at least one of them is not constant. We exclude the case  $a_j = \text{constant}$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n$ ) because it is very well known. Each solution of (1) is analytic on  $G$ . In particular, if  $G = C$ , then each solution is entire.

In this paper, we give several bounds for the growth of solutions of (1), assuming that the functions  $a_j$  are entire. Some particular cases can be found in [2, pp. 363–366; and 4, pp. 162–169 and 340–341]. We give some sharper results when  $n = 2$ .

We shall define the  $k$ -grade of the singularity of (1) as

$$\gamma_k = \sup\{\rho_k(w) : L(w) = 0\} \quad (k = 1, 2, \dots),$$

and the growth index of (1) as

$$\delta = \sup\{i(w) : L(w) = 0\},$$

if  $G = C$ .

The following lemma is known for the real case (see [3, p. 105]).

LEMMA 1. Assume that  $G = I \times J \subset C$  is an open rectangle and  $|a_j(z)| < b_j$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n$ ) for all  $z \in G$ . Define

$$M = \frac{1}{2} \cdot (1 + \max(2b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_n, 1 + b_2, 1 + b_3, \dots, 1 + b_{n-1})).$$

Let  $z_0$  be a point in  $G$  and  $f(z)$  be a solution for (1). Let

$$\|f(z)\| = (|f(z)|^2 + |f'(z)|^2 + \dots + |f^{(n-1)}(z)|^2)^{1/2}$$

and  $h(z) = \exp(M(|\text{Re } z - \text{Re } z_0| + |\text{Im } z - \text{Im } z_0|))$ . Then

$$\|f(z_0)\| \cdot (h(z))^{-1} \leq \|f(z)\| \leq \|f(z_0)\| \cdot h(z)$$

for every  $z \in G$ .

PROOF. Let  $z = x + iy \in G$  and  $z_0 = x_0 + iy_0$ . Then  $x, x_0 \in I$  and  $y, y_0 \in J$ . We have  $L(f) = 0$  and  $f = u + iv$ , where  $u, v: G \rightarrow R$ . The Cauchy-Riemann equations  $D_1u = D_2v$  and  $D_xu = -D_1v$  hold. Since  $L(f) = 0$ , one has  $f^{(n)} = -a_1f^{(n-1)} - \dots - a_nf$ , hence

$$(3) \quad |f^{(n)}| \leq b_1|f^{(n-1)}| + \dots + b_n|f|$$

in  $G$ . Call  $g(z) = \|f(z)\|^2$ . Then  $g = f\bar{f} + f'\bar{f}' + \dots + f^{(n-1)}\overline{f^{(n-1)}}$ . By partial differentiation we obtain  $D_1g = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (f^{(j)} \cdot D_1f^{(j)} + f^{(j)} \cdot D_1\overline{f^{(j)}})$ . Since each  $f^{(j)}$  is analytic on  $G$ , we know that  $D_1f^{(j)} = f^{(j+1)}$  and  $D_1\overline{f^{(j)}} = D_1(D_1^j u - iD_1^j v) = \overline{D_1f^{(j)}} = \overline{f^{(j+1)}}$ . Then  $D_1g = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (\overline{f^{(j)}} f^{(j+1)} + f^{(j)} \overline{f^{(j+1)}})$ . Thus

$$(4) \quad |D_1g| \leq 2 \cdot \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} |f^{(j)}| \cdot |f^{(j+1)}|.$$

By (3),

$$\begin{aligned}
 |D_1g| &\leq 2 \cdot \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} |f^{(j)}| \cdot |f^{(j+1)}| + 2|f^{(n-1)}| \cdot \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} b_{n-j}|f^{(j)}| \\
 &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} (|f^{(j)}|^2 + |f^{(j+1)}|^2) + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (b_{n-j}|f^{(n-1)}|^2 + |f^{(j)}|^2) \\
 &= (1 + b_n)|f|^2 + (2 + b_{n-1})|f'|^2 + (2 + b_{n-2}) \cdot |f''|^2 \\
 &\quad + \dots + (2 + b_2)|f^{(n-2)}|^2 + (1 + 2b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_n)|f^{(n-1)}|^2 \\
 &\leq 2M(|f|^2 + \dots + |f^{(n-1)}|^2),
 \end{aligned}$$

and so  $|D_1g| \leq 2Mg$ , or  $-2Mg \leq D_1g \leq 2Mg$ . From the right inequality, we deduce

$$\exp(-2Mx) \cdot (D_1g(x, y) - 2Mg(x, y)) = D_1(\exp(-2Mx) \cdot g(x, y)) \leq 0.$$

Fix  $y \in J$ . If  $x > x_0$ , we integrate from  $x_0$  to  $x$  obtaining  $\exp(-2Mx)g(x, y) - \exp(-2Mx_0)g(x_0, y) \leq 0$ , whence  $g(x, y) \leq g(x_0, y) \cdot \exp(2M(x - x_0))$ . If  $x < x_0$ , we integrate from  $x$  to  $x_0$  to get  $\exp(-2M(x_0 - x)) \cdot g(x_0, y) \leq g(x, y)$ . If we now use the left inequality  $-2Mg \leq D_1g$  in the same way we get  $g(x, y) \leq \exp(2M(x_0 - x)) \cdot g(x_0, y)$  for  $x < x_0$  and  $\exp(-2M(x - x_0)) \cdot g(x_0, y) \leq g(x, y)$  for  $x_0 < x$ . We can now write this as

$$(5) \quad \exp(-2M|x - x_0|) \cdot g(x_0, y) \leq g(x, y) \leq \exp(2M|x - x_0|) \cdot g(x_0, y).$$

By partial differentiation with respect to  $y$  we obtain

$$D_2g = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \overline{f^{(j)}} \cdot D_2f^{(j)} + f^{(j)} \cdot D_2\overline{f^{(j)}}.$$

From the Cauchy-Riemann equations,

$$\begin{aligned}
 D_2f^{(j)} &= D_2(D_1^j u + iD_1^j v) = -D_1^{j+1} v + iD_1^{j+1} u \\
 &= i(D_1^{j+1} u + iD_1^{j+1} v) = if^{(j+1)}
 \end{aligned}$$

and  $D_2\overline{f^{(j)}} = -i\overline{f^{(j+1)}}$ . Then (4) works equally well for  $D_2g$ . Consequently,  $|D_2g| \leq 2Mg$ , i.e.,  $-2Mg(x, y) \leq D_2g(x, y) \leq 2Mg(x, y)$ . In particular

$$-2Mg(x_0, y) \leq D_2g(x_0, y) \leq 2Mg(x_0, y)$$

and by repeating the derivation of (5) above in  $y$  instead of  $x$  we obtain

$$\exp(-2M|y - y_0|) \cdot g(x_0, y_0) \leq g(x_0, y) \leq \exp(2M|y - y_0|) \cdot g(x_0, y_0).$$

Combining with (5), one derives that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \exp(-2M(|x - x_0| + |y - y_0|)) \cdot g(x_0, y_0) &\leq g(x, y) \\
 &\leq \exp(2M(|x - x_0| + |y - y_0|)) \cdot g(x_0, y_0)
 \end{aligned}$$

or

$$\|f(z_0)\| \cdot (h(z))^{-1} \leq \|f(z)\| \leq \|f(z_0)\| \cdot h(z). \quad \square$$

LEMMA 2. Let  $f(z)$  be a nonconstant meromorphic function on the plane. Then

$$(6) \quad m(r, f'/f) = O(\log(rT(r, f)))$$

as  $r \rightarrow \infty$  outside an exceptional set of finite linear measure. If  $f(z)$  has finite order  $\rho$ , then (6) holds as  $r \rightarrow \infty$  through all positive real values; if  $c$  is any number  $c > 1 + 3\rho$  and  $r = |z|$ , then

$$(7) \quad |f'(z)/f(z)| < 18r^c$$

for  $r$  outside of intervals of finite total length.

The first part can be found in [6] and the second part is proved in [4, pp. 121–123].

LEMMA 3. Let  $E$  be a subset of  $(0, \infty)$  with finite linear measure. If  $F, G: (0, \infty) \rightarrow R$  are functions satisfying

(a)  $F$  is nondecreasing and  $G$  is positive,

(b)  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} G(s(r))/G(r) = 1$  for all functions  $s: (0, \infty) \rightarrow R$  such that  $0 < s(r) - r < 1$  ( $r > 0$ ), then

$$(8) \quad \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} F(r)/G(r) = \sup \left\{ \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(r_n)/G(r_n) : r_1 < r_2 < \dots < r_n < \dots, \right. \\ \left. r_n \rightarrow \infty \text{ and } r_n \notin E \text{ (} n = 1, 2, \dots \text{)} \right\}.$$

PROOF. We have

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} F(r)/G(r) = \sup \left\{ \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(r_n)/G(r_n) : \{r_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \in D \right\},$$

where  $D = \{\{r_n\}_{n=1}^\infty : r_1 < r_2 < \dots \text{ and } r_n \rightarrow \infty\}$ . Take  $\{r_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \in D$  such that  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(r_n)/G(r_n) = \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} F(r)/G(r)$ . One can find a sequence  $\{s_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  and an integer  $n_0$  with  $s_1 < s_2 < \dots < s_n < \dots$ ,  $s_n \notin E$  for every  $n$ , and  $0 < s_n - r_n < 1$  ( $n > n_0$ ), because  $E$  has finite measure. Then  $\{s_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \in D$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G(s_n)/G(r_n) = 1$ , so

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(r_n)/G(r_n) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(r_n)/G(s_n) \\ \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(s_n)/G(s_n) \leq \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} F(r)/G(r),$$

and (8) follows.  $\square$

Now, we state our result on growth. Note that part (iv) generalizes a theorem of Wittich (1948): If all solutions are of finite order, then the coefficients are polynomials. For this, see [4, pp. 167–168].

THEOREM 4. Assume that  $G = C$  in (1). Let  $p = \max\{i(a_j) : j = 1, \dots, n\}$ . If  $p$  is finite and  $p > 0$ , then we call  $\alpha = \max\{\rho_p(a_j) : j = 1, \dots, n\}$ . Then the following conditions are satisfied:

(i)  $\delta \leq 1 + p$ .

(ii) If  $p$  is finite and  $p > 0$ , then  $\gamma_{p+1} \leq \alpha$ .

(iii) If every  $a_j(z)$  is a polynomial, let  $m = \max\{\text{degree}(a_j) : j = 1, \dots, n\}$ . Then

$$(9) \quad \gamma_1 \leq 1 + m.$$

(iv) Let  $n = 2$ . Then  $\delta = 1 + p$ . In addition,  $\gamma_{p+1} = \alpha$  if  $p > 0$ , and  $\gamma_1 \geq \frac{1}{3}(\text{degree}(a_1) - 1)$  if  $p = 0$ .

PROOF. Let  $f(z)$  be a solution for (1). Call  $M(r) = \max\{|f(z)|: |z| = r\}$ ,  $M_j(r) = \max\{|a_j(z)|: |z| = r\}$ ,  $N(r) = \sup\{|f(z)|: z \in G_r\}$  and  $N_j(r) = \sup\{|a_j(z)|: z \in G_r\}$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n$ ),  $G_r$  being  $G_r = (-r, r) \times (-r, r) \subset C$ . From the inequalities  $N(r/2) \leq M(r) \leq N(2r)$  and  $N_j(r/2) \leq M_j(r) \leq N_j(2r)$ , it is obvious that one can replace  $M(r)$  by  $N(r)$  and  $M_j(r)$  by  $N_j(r)$  in the respective expressions of  $k$ -order.

If  $p = \infty$ , then (i) is trivial. Otherwise, there exist real numbers  $r_0, d_1, \dots, d_n > 0$  such that  $N_j(r) < \exp_p(r^{d_j})$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n; r > r_0$ ). Apply Lemma 1 for  $z_0 = 0$  and  $G_r$ . We obtain  $|f(z)| \leq \|f(z)\| \leq \|f(0)\| \cdot \exp(2r + 2rN_1(r) + \dots + 2rN_n(r))$  if  $z \in G_r$  and  $r > r_0$ , because  $M \leq 1 + N_1(r) + \dots + N_n(r)$ . If  $d \in (1 + \max(d_1, \dots, d_n), \infty)$ , one can find  $r_1 > r_0$  with  $2r + \dots + 2rN_n(r) < \exp_p(r^d)$  when  $r > r_1$ . If  $s \in (d, \infty)$ , there is an  $r_2 > r_1$  such that  $\|f(0)\| \cdot \exp(2r + \dots + 2rN_n(r)) < \exp_{p+1}(r^s)$  when  $r > r_2$ . Thus  $N(r) < \exp_{p+1}(r^s)$  and  $(\log_{p+2} N(r))/\log r < s$  asymptotically (asympt.). Hence  $\rho_{p+1}(f)$  is finite and  $i(f) \leq 1 + p$ , so  $\delta \leq 1 + p$ .

(ii) From the definition of  $\alpha$ , it is clear that, given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , one has  $N_j(r) < \exp_p(r^{\alpha+\varepsilon})$  for  $r > r_0$ . But it is easily derived that there is  $r_1 > r_0$  with  $\|f(0)\| \cdot \exp(2r + \dots + 2rN_n(r)) < \exp_{p+1}(r^{\alpha+2\varepsilon})$ , whence  $N(r) < \exp_{p+1}(r^{\alpha+2\varepsilon})$  asymptotically. Hence,  $(\log_{p+2} N(r))/\log r < \alpha + 2\varepsilon$  asymptotically and  $\rho_{p+1}(f) \leq \alpha + 2\varepsilon$  for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , i.e.,  $\rho_{p+1}(f) \leq \alpha$  and  $\delta_{p+1} \leq \alpha$ .

Similar arguments to those of (ii) let us prove (iii), taking into account that  $2r + 2rN_1(r) + \dots + 2rN_n(r) < r^{m+1+\varepsilon}$  for all  $r > r_0(\varepsilon) > 0$ . Hence, (9) holds.

(iv) In this case,  $L(w) = w'' + a_1(z)w' + a_2(z)w$ . Let  $\{w_1, w_2\}$  be a fundamental system of solutions. The wronskian  $W = w_1w_2' - w_1'w_2$  is entire and  $\rho_k(W) \leq \max(\rho_k(w_1), \rho_k(w_2))$ , because  $\max(\rho_k(gh), \rho_k(g+h)) \leq \max(\rho_k(g), \rho_k(h))$  and  $\rho_k(g') = \rho_k(g)$  if  $g, h$  are entire (see, for instance, [1, pp. 28, 37, and 43]).

Then  $a_1(z) = -W'/W$  and  $a_2(z) = -(w''/w) - a_1(w'/w) = -(w''/w') \cdot (w'/w) - a_1(w'/w)$  if  $L(w) = 0$ . Furthermore,  $\gamma_k = \max(\rho_k(w_1), \rho_k(w_2))$ , because  $w = aw_1 + bw_2$  if  $L(w) = 0$  ( $a, b \in C$ , depending on  $w$ ). From Nevanlinna theory,  $m(r, a_2) = m(r, w''/w') + 2m(r, w'/w) + m(r, a_1) + O(\log r)$ .

If  $\delta = 0$ , then  $i(w) = 0$  for all solutions  $w$ , that is, every solution is a polynomial. But it is well known that this is possible only if  $L(w) = w''$  and this case is excluded. Then  $\delta = 1 + p$  is trivial if  $p = 0$ .

Let  $p > 0$ . By contradiction, assume  $0 < \delta < 1 + p$ . then  $\delta \leq p$  and  $i(w) \leq p$  if  $L(w) = 0$ . Hence  $\rho_p(w_j)$  is finite ( $j = 1, 2$ ) so  $\rho_p(W)$  is finite. Then  $m(r, a_1) = m(r, W'/W) = O(\log(r \cdot T(r, W)))$  outside  $E$  with finite measure by Lemma 2. We have

$$\log_{p-1} m(r, a_1) = O(\log_p(r \cdot T(r, W))) = O(\log_p r + \log_p T(r, W)) = O(\log r)$$

outside  $E$ , because  $\log_p T(r, W) = O(\log r)$ . By using Lemma 3, with  $F(r) = \log_{p-1} m(r, a_1)$  and  $G(r) = \log r$ , we conclude that  $\rho_{p-1}(a_1)$  is finite if  $p > 1$ , and  $a_1$  is a polynomial if  $p = 1$ . But, again from Lemma 2, outside a set  $E$  as above,

$$(10) \quad \begin{aligned} m(r, a_2) &= O(\log(rT(r, w))) + O(\log(rT(r, w'))) \\ &\quad + O(\log(rT(r, a_1))) + O(\log r). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\rho_p(w) = \rho_p(w')$ , we reason as above that  $\rho_{p-1}(a_2)$  is finite if  $p > 1$  or  $a_2$  is a polynomial if  $p = 1$ . Thus  $p = \max(i(a_1), i(a_2)) \leq p - 1$ , a contradiction. Then  $\delta = 1 + p$ .

If  $p > 0$ , assume  $\gamma_{p+1} < \alpha$ . Then  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $\rho_{p+1}(w) < c$  if  $L(w) = 0$ , and  $\rho_{p+1}(W) < c$  for some  $c \in (0, \alpha)$ . Given  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\log_{p+1} T(r, W) < (c + \varepsilon) \log r$  asymp. for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then

$$\log_p m(r, a_1) = \log_p(O(\log(rT(r, W)))) < (c + 2\varepsilon) \log r$$

outside  $E = E(\varepsilon)$  with finite measure. From Lemma 3,

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} (\log_p m(r, a) / \log r) < c + 2\varepsilon$$

for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , i.e.,  $\rho_p(a_1) \leq c$ . From (10), one obtains similarly  $\rho_p(a_2) \leq c$ . Hence  $\alpha = \max(\rho_p(a_1), \rho_p(a_2)) < \alpha$ , a contradiction, so  $\gamma_{p+1} = \alpha$ .

If  $p = 0$ , assume  $\gamma_1 < L$ , where  $L = \frac{1}{3}(\text{degree}(a_1) - 1)$ . then  $\text{degree}(a_1) > 1$ ,  $\rho(w) < d$  if  $L(w) = 0$ , and  $\rho(W) < d$  for some  $d \in (0, L)$ . Let  $c > 1 + 3\rho(W)$ . By Lemma 2 and (7), we have

$$m(r, a_1) = m(r, W'/W) = (1/2\pi) \cdot \int_0^{2\pi} \log^+ |W'(re^{it})/W(re^{it})| dt < c \cdot \log r$$

for  $r$  outside  $E = E(c)$  of finite linear measure. By Lemma 3,

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} m(r, a_1) / \log r \leq c,$$

whence  $\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} m(r, a_1) / \log r \leq 1 + 3\rho(W)$ . From Nevanlinna theory,

$$\text{degree}(a_1) \leq 1 + 3\rho(W) < 1 + 3d < 1 + 3L = \text{degree}(a_1),$$

a contradiction. Thus  $\gamma_1 \geq L$ . The theorem is proved.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

1. L. Bernal, Tesis, Facultad de Matemáticas, Universidad de Sevilla, Spain, 1984.
2. L. Bieberbach, *Theorie der gewöhnlichen differentialgleichungen*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York, 1965.
3. E. A. Coddington, *An introduction to ordinary differential equations*, 5th printing, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1964.
4. E. Hille, *Ordinary differential equations in the complex domain*, Wiley, New York, 1984.
5. A. S. B. Holland, *Introduction to the theory of entire functions*, Academic Press, New York and London, 1973.
6. R. Nevanlinna, *Analytic functions*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York, 1970.
7. A. R. Reddy, *On entire Dirichlet series of infinite order*, Rev. Mat. Hisp.-Amer. **27** (1967), 120-131.
8. D. Sato, *On the rate of growth of entire functions of fast growth*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **69** (1963), 410-414.

DEPARTAMENTO DE TEORÍA DE FUNCIONES, FACULTAD DE MATEMÁTICAS, C./TARFIA S.N., SEVILLA 41012, SPAIN