

# ON INCLUSION RELATIONS FOR SPACES OF AUTOMORPHIC FORMS

CH. POMMERENKE

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $\Gamma$  be a Fuchsian group, that is a discontinuous group of Moebius transformations of the unit disk  $D$  onto itself, and let  $F$  be a fundamental domain of  $\Gamma$  with area  $\partial F = 0$ . For  $q = 1, 2, \dots$  and  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ , let  $A_q^p(\Gamma)$  denote the space of functions  $g(z)$  analytic in  $D$  that satisfy

$$(1.1) \quad g(\phi(z))\phi'(z)^q = g(z) \quad (\phi \in \Gamma)$$

and

$$(1.2) \quad \iint_F (1 - |z|^2)^{pq-2} |g(z)|^p dx dy < \infty \quad \text{if } 1 \leq p < \infty,$$
$$\sup_{z \in F} (1 - |z|^2)^q |g(z)| < \infty \quad \text{if } p = \infty.$$

The integral is independent of the choice of the fundamental domain  $F$ ; the supremum is not changed if we replace  $F$  by  $D$ . The spaces  $A_q^1(\Gamma)$  and  $A_q^\infty(\Gamma)$  ( $q = 2, 3, \dots$ ) are of particular interest in the theory of Fuchsian and Kleinian groups [1],[2],[4].

Several authors (for instance [3],[8],[10],[6]) have considered the problem whether

$$(1.3) \quad A_q^p(\Gamma) \subset A_q^\infty(\Gamma) \quad (1 \leq p < \infty).$$

Rajeswara Rao [10] has shown that, for  $q > 1$ ,

$$(1.4) \quad A_q^p(\Gamma) \subset A_q^\infty(\Gamma) \text{ for some } p < \infty \Rightarrow A_q^{p_1}(\Gamma) \subset A_q^{p_2}(\Gamma) \text{ for } 1 \leq p_1 < p_2 \leq \infty.$$

Hence it suffices to consider the case  $p = 1$ .

J. Lehner [5] has recently proved (1.3) for the case that there exists a constant  $\gamma = \gamma(\Gamma) > 0$  such that

$$\inf_{z \in D} d(z, \phi(z)) \geq \gamma \quad \text{for all hyperbolic } \phi \in \Gamma,$$

where  $d$  denotes the non-euclidean distance. He uses A. Marden's results on universal properties of Fuchsian groups [7]. In particular, it follows that (1.3) holds if  $\Gamma$  is any subgroup of a finitely generated group.

We shall show that (1.3) is not true without some restriction on  $\Gamma$ .

THEOREM 1. *There exists a Fuchsian group  $\Gamma$  such that*

$$(1.5) \quad A_1^2(\Gamma) \not\subset A_1^\infty(\Gamma)$$

*and therefore that*

$$(1.6) \quad A_2^p(\Gamma) \not\subset A_2^\infty(\Gamma) \quad (1 \leq p < \infty).$$

To see that (1.5) implies (1.6) we choose a function  $g \in A_1^2(\Gamma) \setminus A_1^\infty(\Gamma)$ . Then  $g^2 \in A_2^1(\Gamma) \setminus A_2^\infty(\Gamma)$ , and (1.6) follows from (1.4). It is a pleasure to acknowledge conversations with A. Marden and L. Greenberg on this counterexample.

In the last section we establish a generally valid inclusion relation (with  $q = 1$ ) in which  $A_1^2(\Gamma)$  is replaced by a somewhat different space.

## 2. THE COUNTEREXAMPLE

The function  $f(z)$  is called a Bloch function if it is analytic in  $D$  and satisfies

$$(2.1) \quad \sup_{z \in D} (1 - |z|^2) |f'(z)| < \infty.$$

We shall need the classical characterization in terms of schlicht disks on the Riemann image surface (see, e.g., [9]):

LEMMA. *An analytic function is not a Bloch function if and only if, for every  $\rho < +\infty$ , it maps some domain in  $D$  one-to-one onto a disk of radius  $\rho$ .*

It will be convenient to integrate condition (1.1) which, for  $q = 1$ , becomes  $g(\phi(z))\phi'(z) = g(z)$ . The function

$$(2.2) \quad f(z) = \int_0^z g(\zeta) d\zeta \quad (z \in D)$$

is not, in general, automorphic but has periods  $c(\phi)$  that satisfy

$$(2.3) \quad f(\phi(z)) = f(z) + c(\phi) \quad (\phi \in \Gamma).$$

It follows from (1.2) and (2.1) that  $A_1^\infty(\Gamma)$  consists of the derivatives of the Bloch functions for which (2.3) holds. Hence Theorem 1 is contained in the following theorem.

THEOREM 2. *There exists a Fuchsian group of the second kind and a non-Bloch function  $f(z)$  satisfying (2.3) for which*

$$(2.4) \quad \iint_{\mathbb{F}} |f'(z)|^2 dx dy < \infty.$$

The Fuchsian group  $\Gamma$  is of the second kind if the set of limit points on  $\partial D$  is of measure zero; this is true if and only if  $D/\Gamma$  is a bordered Riemann surface. In particular, our group is of convergence type.

We give first an outline of our construction. Let

$$(2.5) \quad B = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \{0 \leq \text{Re} w < 3^{-n}, 2^n < \text{Im} w < 2^{n+1}\} \cup \bigcup_{n=2}^{\infty} \{0 < \text{Re} w < 3^{-n}, \text{Im} w = 2^n\}.$$

We attach a different copy of  $B$  suitably translated to each

vertical side of  $B$ . Then we attach a new translated copy to each free vertical side of the resulting surface, and so on. We obtain a simply connected Riemann surface  $R$  that contains schlicht domains over each horizontal strip

$$(2.6) \quad V_n = \{2^n < \operatorname{Im} w < 2^{n+1}\} \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots)$$

of width  $2^n$ . Hence the Lemma shows that the function  $f(z)$  mapping  $D$  onto  $R$  is not a Bloch function. Furthermore  $R$  is invariant under a group of "translations" which corresponds to a Fuchsian group  $\Gamma$  in  $D$ , and some fundamental domain  $F$  of  $\Gamma$  is mapped one-to-one onto  $B$ . Hence (2.4) is satisfied because  $\operatorname{area} B < \infty$ .

Proof. Let  $T$  be the free group generated by  $(\sigma_n)_{n=1, 2, \dots}$ . Thus each element of  $T$  can be uniquely written as a reduced word

$$(2.7) \quad \tau = \sigma_{n_1}^{k_1} \dots \sigma_{n_t}^{k_t} \quad (k_\nu = \pm 1; \quad k_{\nu+1} \neq -k_\nu \quad \text{if } n_\nu = n_{\nu+1})$$

where  $t$  is the length of  $\tau$ . We define  $R$  as the disjoint union

$$(2.8) \quad R = \bigcup_{\tau \in T} (B, \tau)$$

of "copies" of  $B$ . Every element  $\tilde{w} \in R$  can be uniquely written as  $\tilde{w} = (w, \tau)$  with  $w \in B$  and  $\tau$  of the form (2.7), and we define

$$(2.9) \quad p(\tilde{w}) = w + \sum_{\nu=1}^t k_\nu 3^{-n_\nu} \quad (\tilde{w} \in R).$$

Given  $\tilde{w}_0 = (w_0, \tau) \in R$ , we set  $D_0 = \{|w - w_0| < \delta\}$  ( $\delta > 0$  sufficiently small) and define a neighbourhood of  $\tilde{w}_0$  by  $(D_0, \tau)$  if  $\operatorname{Re} w_0 \neq 0$ , and by

$$(2.10) \quad (D_0 \cap B, \tau) \cup ([D_0 + 3^{-n}] \cap B, \tau \sigma_n^{-1})$$

if  $\operatorname{Re} w_0 = 0$ ,  $2^n < \operatorname{Im} w_0 < 2^{n+1}$ . Then  $p(\tilde{w})$  maps each of our neighbourhoods one-to-one onto a disk in  $\mathbb{C}$ , and  $R$  together with

the global parameter  $p$  is a Riemann surface which we denote again by  $R$ .

We show now that  $R$  is simply connected. Let  $C$  be a (piecewise smooth) closed curve on  $R$ ; we may assume that  $C$  intersects  $(B, id)$ . Let  $\tau$  be a reduced word (of the form (2.7)) of maximal length such that  $C$  crosses the boundary  $\partial(B, \tau)$  of  $(B, \tau)$ . Then  $C$  crosses  $\partial(B, \tau)$  only on points on  $\partial(B, \tau')$  where  $\tau' = \sigma_{n_1}^{k_1} \dots \sigma_{n_{t-1}}^{k_{t-1}}$ . Since  $B$  is simply connected and  $\partial(B, \tau) \cap \partial(B, \tau')$  is connected we can find a curve  $C'$  homotopic to  $C$  that does not cross  $\partial(B, \tau)$ . Now the reduced word  $\tau'$  has length  $t-1$ . Repeating this process we see that  $C$  is homotopic to a curve in  $(B, id)$  and therefore to a point.

Given  $\lambda \in T$  we define a conformal selfmapping  $\lambda^*$  of  $R$  by

$$\tilde{w} = (w, \tau) \rightarrow \lambda^*(\tilde{w}) = (w, \lambda\tau).$$

These mappings form a group  $T^*$  isomorphic to  $T$ . Also, by (2.9),

$$(2.11) \quad p \circ \lambda^*(\tilde{w}) = p(w) + \sum_{\nu=1}^{\ell} j_{\nu} 3^{-m_{\nu}} \quad (\lambda = \sigma_{m_1}^{j_1} \dots \sigma_{m_{\ell}}^{j_{\ell}}).$$

Since  $R$  is simply connected and has free boundary arcs there is a function  $h(z)$  that maps  $D$  conformally and one-to-one onto  $R$ . If  $\lambda^* \in T^*$  then

$$(2.12) \quad \phi = h^{-1} \circ \lambda^* \circ h$$

maps  $D$  one-to-one onto  $D$  and is analytic, hence a Moebius transformation. Thus

$$\Gamma = \{\phi : \lambda^* \in T^*\}$$

is a Fuchsian group with fundamental domain  $F = h^{-1}(B, id)$ . Since  $F$  has free boundary arcs on  $\partial D$  the group  $\Gamma$  is of the second kind.

The complex-valued function  $f = p \circ h$  is analytic in  $D$  and satisfies, by (2.12) and (2.11),

$$f \circ \phi = p \circ \lambda^* \circ h = p \circ h + c = f + c$$

where  $c = c(\phi)$  is a constant. Thus (2.3) is satisfied. By (2.9),  $f(z)$  maps some domain in  $D$  one-to-one onto the strip  $V_n$  defined in (2.6). Since width  $V_n = 2^n + \infty$ , the Lemma shows that  $f(z)$  is not a Bloch function. Finally  $f(z)$  maps  $F$  one-to-one onto  $B$ , and it follows that

$$\iint_F |f'(z)|^2 dx dy = \text{area } B = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^n < \infty.$$

### 3. AN INCLUSION RELATION

We prove now a different version of (1.3) (with  $q = 1$ ). I want to thank the referee for his helpful comments.

**THEOREM 3.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a Fuchsian group. Let  $f(z)$  be analytic in  $D$  and*

$$(3.1) \quad f(\phi(z)) = f(z) + c(\phi) \quad (\phi \in \Gamma).$$

*If, for some fundamental domain  $F$ ,*

$$(3.2) \quad d = \text{diam } f(F) < \infty$$

*then  $f(z)$  is a Bloch function.*

Our new condition (3.2) neither implies nor is implied by condition (2.4). It is not clear whether Theorem 3 has an analogue for  $q \geq 2$ . The quantity  $\text{diam } f(F)$  depends on the choice of  $F$  but remains unchanged if we replace  $F$  by  $\phi(F)$  ( $\phi \in \Gamma$ ).

Proof. Suppose that  $f(z)$  is not a Bloch function. Then, by the Lemma, there exists a domain  $\tilde{H} \subset D$  mapped homeomorphically by

$f(z)$  onto a disk  $\{|w - w_0| < 5d\}$ . Let

$$H = f^{-1}(\{|w - w_0| < 4d\}) \cap \tilde{H}.$$

Note that  $\bar{H}$ , the relative closure of  $H$  in  $D$ , is compact and homeomorphic to  $\{|w - w_0| \leq 4d\}$  under  $f(z)$ . Also, if  $K \subset D$  is connected and satisfies

$$(3.3) \quad K \cap H \neq \emptyset \quad f(K) \subset \{|w - w_0| \leq 3d\}$$

then  $K \subset H$ . For otherwise,  $K$  must contain a boundary point of  $H$ , and so  $f(K)$  contains a point of  $\partial f(H) = \{|w - w_0| = 4d\}$ , contradicting (3.3).

Let  $z_0$  be the preimage of  $w_0$  in  $H$ , and let  $F$  be a fundamental domain for  $\Gamma$  which satisfies (3.2) and  $z_0 \in \bar{F}$ . Clearly

$$(3.4) \quad f(\bar{F}) \subset \{|w - w_0| \leq d\}.$$

Thus  $\bar{F}$  satisfies (3.3), and we conclude that  $\bar{F} \subset H$ .

Let  $\phi_1(F)$  ( $\phi_1 \in \Gamma$ ) be a fundamental domain adjoining  $F$ . By (3.1), (3.2), and (3.4) we see that  $f(\phi_1(\bar{F})) \subset \{|w - w_0| \leq 2d\}$ ; and (3.3) then yields  $\phi_1(\bar{F}) \subset H$ . Since  $f(z)$  is univalent on  $H$ , we must have  $c(\phi_1) \neq 0$ . Let

$$S = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f(\phi_1^n(\bar{F})) = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} [f(\bar{F}) + nc(\phi_1)].$$

Then  $S$  lies within an infinite strip of width at most  $d$  and so cannot cover  $\{|w - w_0| < 4d\} = f(H)$ . Since  $f(z)$  is a homeomorphism on  $H$ , we can find another fundamental domain  $\phi_2(F)$  ( $\phi_2 \in \Gamma$ ) adjoining  $F$  for which  $f(\phi_2(\bar{F})) \not\subset S$ . As before,  $c(\phi_2) \neq 0$ ; and we clearly have

$$(3.5) \quad \text{Im} [c(\phi_1) / c(\phi_2)] \neq 0.$$

Because  $\phi_1(F)$  and  $\phi_2(F)$  adjoin  $F$ , the set

$$A = \bar{F} \cup \phi_1(\bar{F}) \cup \phi_2(\bar{F}) \cup \phi_1 \circ \phi_2(\bar{F}) \cup \phi_2 \circ \phi_1(\bar{F})$$

is connected. A moment's thought reveals that  $f(A) \subset \{ |w - w_0| \leq 3d \}$ . Thus, by (3.3),  $A \subset H$ . Since  $f(z)$  is univalent in  $H$ , we conclude from

$$f(\phi_1 \circ \phi_2(z)) = f(z) + c(\phi_1) + c(\phi_2) = f(\phi_2 \circ \phi_1(z)) \quad (z \in H)$$

that  $\phi_1 \circ \phi_2(z) = \phi_2 \circ \phi_1(z)$  for  $z \in H$ . But then  $\phi_1 \circ \phi_2 = \phi_2 \circ \phi_1$  by the identity theorem.

Thus the subgroup of  $\Gamma$  generated by  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  is abelian, hence cyclic [6; p.14]. It follows that its homomorphic image  $\{n_1 c(\phi_1) + n_2 c(\phi_2) : n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  is also cyclic, and thus contradicts (3.5).



## REFERENCES

1. L. Bers, *Automorphic forms and Poincaré series for infinitely generated Fuchsian groups*, Amer. J. Math. 87 (1965), 196-214.
2. L. Bers, *Uniformization, moduli, and Kleinian groups*, Bull. London Math. Soc. 4 (1972), 257-300.
3. D. Drasin and C.J. Earle, *On the boundedness of automorphic forms*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 19 (1968), 1039-1042.
4. I. Kra, Automorphic Forms and Kleinian Groups, W.A. Benjamin, Reading, Mass., 1972.
5. J. Lehner, *On the boundedness of integrable automorphic forms*, Ill. J. Math. 18 (1974), 575-584.
6. J. Lehner, A Short Course on Automorphic Functions, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1966.
7. A. Marden, *Universal properties of Fuchsian groups in the Poincaré metric*, Annals of Math. Studies 79 (1974), 315-339.
8. T.A. Metzger and K.V. Rajeswara Rao, *On integrable and bounded automorphic forms II*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 32 (1972), 201-204.
9. Ch. Pommerenke, *On Bloch functions*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) 2 (1970), 689-695.
10. K.V. Rajeswara Rao, *On the boundedness of  $p$ -integrable automorphic forms*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 44 (1974), 278-282.