

# Some entire functions with multiply-connected wandering domains

I. N. BAKER

*Department of Mathematics, Imperial College of Science and Technology,  
University of London, London SW7 2BZ, England*

(Received 27 September 1984 and revised 26 November 1984)

*Abstract.* A component  $U$  of the complement of the Julia set of an entire function  $f$  is a wandering domain if the sets  $f^n(U)$  are mutually disjoint, where  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $f^n$  is the  $n$ -th iterate of  $f$ . Examples are given of entire  $f$  of order  $\rho$ ,  $0 \leq \rho \leq \infty$ , which have multiply-connected wandering domains. An example is given where the connectivity is infinite.

## 1. Introduction

If  $f$  is a rational function of degree at least two or, alternatively, a non-linear entire function, denote by  $f^n$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the  $n$ th iterate of  $f$ ; further, by  $N(f)$  the set

$$N(f) = \{z; (f^n) \text{ is normal in some neighbourhood of } z\},$$

and by  $J(f)$ , often called the Julia set of  $f$ , the complement of  $N(f)$ . The set  $J(f)$  is non-empty and perfect.  $J(f)$  is also completely invariant, meaning that  $J(f)$  is mapped to itself both by  $z \rightarrow f(z)$  and by  $z \rightarrow f^{-1}(z)$ . For proofs of these properties see e.g. [5], [6].

If  $U$  is a component of  $N(f)$  then  $f(U)$  lies in some component  $V$  of  $N(f)$  and  $f(U) = V$ , except in the case when  $f$  is transcendental entire with a Picard-exceptional (omitted) value  $c$  such that  $c \in V$ , when  $f(U) = V - \{c\}$ . Suppose that  $f^{n+k}(U) \cap f^n(U) \neq \emptyset$  for some non-negative integers  $n$  and  $k$ . Then  $f^n(U)$  is a periodic component and the limiting behaviour of the sequence of iterates in this component can be classified completely. In the converse case, when all  $f^n(U)$  are different components of  $N(f)$ ,  $U$  is called a wandering domain of  $f$ . Rational functions have no wandering domains [7], but entire functions may do so [2], [3], [4], [7].

It was shown in [3, theorem 5.2] that for any  $\rho$  such that  $1 \leq \rho \leq \infty$ , there exists an entire function of order  $\rho$  which has wandering domains. The domains constructed in this proof are simply-connected. However, it is known [2] that multiply-connected wandering domains can occur. Indeed one has the stronger result, proved in § 2:

**THEOREM 1.** *For any  $\rho$  such that  $0 \leq \rho \leq \infty$  there is an entire function of order  $\rho$ , which has multiply-connected wandering domains.*

The proof of theorem 1 involves the construction of an entire function  $g$  and concentric rings  $A_n, n \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that  $A_{n+1}$  lies outside  $A_n, g(A_n) \subset A_{n+1}$  and  $A_n \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Further, each  $A_n$  lies in a wandering component  $U_n$  of  $N(g)$ . Although each  $U_n$  is clearly multiply-connected, the exact value of the connectivity does not seem to be clear. However, by modifying the construction one can obtain some cases where the connectivity of the wandering domain is known.

**THEOREM 2.** *There exists an entire function which has wandering domains of infinite connectivity.*

2. *Proof of theorem 1*

Let  $k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}$ , denote any sequence of positive integers and  $C$  a constant, such that

$$0 < C < \frac{1}{4e^2}. \tag{1}$$

Suppose further that  $n_0$  is a positive integer and  $r_1$  a number such that

$$r_1 > 1, \quad 2^{n_0-1}C > 2r_1^{k_1}. \tag{2}$$

Denote by  $r_n, n \in \mathbb{N}$ , numbers such that

$$r_{n+1} > 2r_n, \quad 1 \leq n < n_0, \tag{3}$$

and

$$r_{n+1} = C \left\{ 1 + \left( \frac{r_n}{r_1} \right)^{k_1} \right\} \left\{ 1 + \left( \frac{r_n}{r_2} \right)^{k_2} \right\} \cdots \left\{ 1 + \left( \frac{r_n}{r_n} \right)^{k_n} \right\} \tag{4}$$

for  $n \geq n_0$ . By induction it follows from (1) to (4) that

$$r_{n+1} > 2r_n, \quad n \geq n_0. \tag{5}$$

For we may take any  $n \geq n_0$  and assume in the induction that  $r_n > 2r_{n-1} > 2^2r_{n-2}, \dots$ , so that (4) gives

$$r_{n+1} > C \left( \frac{r_n}{r_1} \right)^{k_1} 2^{n-1} > 2r_n^{k_1} > 2r_n.$$

Define the entire function  $g$  by

$$g(z) = C \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \left\{ 1 + \left( \frac{z}{r_j} \right)^{k_j} \right\},$$

where the product converges uniformly in any compact region of the plane, since  $r_j > r_1 \cdot 2^{j-1}$ . Now

$$r_{n+1} < g(r_n) < er_{n+1}, \quad n \geq n_0, \tag{6}$$

since

$$\frac{g(r_n)}{r_{n+1}} = \prod_{j=n+1}^{\infty} \left\{ 1 + \left( \frac{r}{r_j} \right)^{k_n} \right\} < (1 + \frac{1}{2})(1 + \frac{1}{4}) \cdots < e.$$

Note that for all  $|z| \leq 1$  we have by (1), since  $r_j > 2^{j-1}$ , that

$$|g(z)| \leq g(1) \leq C\pi(1 + r_j^{-1}) < e^2C < \frac{1}{4}. \tag{7}$$

LEMMA 1. For  $n > n_0$  we have:

$$g(r_n^{1/2}) < r_{n+1}^{1/2}; \tag{8}$$

$$\frac{1}{4}g(r_n^2) > r_{n+1}^2. \tag{9}$$

*Proof of the lemma.* Since  $g(r)$  is  $\max |g(z)|$  for  $|z| = r$ , it follows that  $V(s) = \log g(e^s)$  is convex and for  $s > 0$  we have

$$V(2s) - V(0) \geq 2(V(s) - V(0)).$$

Hence  $V(2s) \geq 2V(s) - V(0)$ , which gives, using (7),

$$g(r^2) \geq \frac{(g(r))^2}{g(1)} > 4(g(r))^2.$$

Putting  $r = r_n$  and noting (6) gives (9); putting  $r = r_n^{1/2}$  gives (8). □

We remark that there is an integer  $n_1$  such that  $r_{n+1} > r_n^4$  for  $n > n_1$ . Set

$$A_n = \{z; r_n^2 \leq |z| \leq r_{n+1}^{1/2}\}, \quad n > n_1.$$

LEMMA 2. There is an integer  $n_2 > n_1$  such that for  $z$  in  $A_n$

$$|g(z)| > \frac{1}{4}g(|z|). \tag{10}$$

Further  $g(A_n) \subset A_{n+1}$ ,  $n > n_2$ .

*Proof of the lemma.* For  $z \in A_n$ , putting  $|z| = r$ ,

$$\frac{g(r)}{|g(z)|} \leq \prod_{j>n} \left( \frac{1+(r/r_j)}{1-(r/r_j)} \right) \cdot \prod_{j \leq n} \left( \frac{1+(r_1/r)}{1-(r_j/r)} \right).$$

For  $n > n_2$  both  $x = (r/r_j) \leq r/r_{n+1} < r_{n+1}^{-1/2}$ ,  $j > n$ , and  $y = r_j/r < r_n^{-1}$ ,  $j \leq n$ , are so small that  $\log \{(1+x)/(1-x)\} < 3x$  and  $\log \{(1+y)/(1-y)\} < 3y$ . Thus for  $n > n_2$  we have

$$\log \frac{g(r)}{|g(z)|} \leq 3 \sum_{j>n} \frac{r}{r_j} + 3 \sum_{j \leq n} \frac{r_j}{r} < 6 \left( \frac{r}{r_{n+1}} + \frac{r_n}{r} \right) < \log 4,$$

if  $n_2$  is large enough. This proves (10).

For  $z$  in  $A_n$  the maximum modulus theorem and (8) give  $|g(z)| \leq g(r_{n+1}^{1/2}) < r_{n+2}^{1/2}$ , while the minimum modulus theorem and (9), (10) give

$$|g(z)| \geq \min \left( \frac{1}{4}g(r_n^2), \frac{1}{4}g(r_{n+1}^{1/2}) \right) = \frac{1}{4}g(r_n^2) > r_{n+1}^2.$$

Hence  $g(A_n) \subset A_{n+1}$ . □

LEMMA 3. For  $n > n_3$  each  $A_n$  belongs to a multiply-connected wandering domain component of  $N(g)$ .

*Proof of the lemma.* From lemma 2 it follows that  $g^k(z) \rightarrow \infty$  uniformly in each  $A_n$ ,  $n > n_2$ , as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus  $A_n$  belongs to  $N(g)$ . Since  $J(g)$  is not empty, the bounded component of the complement of  $A_n$  meets  $J(g)$  for all large  $n$ . Hence the component  $U_n$  of  $N(g)$  which contains such an  $A_n$  is not simply-connected. It was shown in [1] that if  $g$  is entire transcendental and  $N(g)$  has a multiply-connected component, then every component of  $N(g)$  is bounded. Thus for  $n > n_3$ , say,  $U_n$  is bounded and this implies that  $U_n$  is disjoint from  $U_{n+1}$ . It follows that each  $U_n$ ,  $n > n_3$ , is a wandering domain.

To complete the proof of theorem 1 it remains to show that  $g$  can be made to have any prescribed order of growth. The maximum modulus function of  $g$  is  $g(r)$  and we have

$$\log g(r) = \log C + \sum_{j \leq n} \log \left\{ 1 + \left( \frac{r}{r_j} \right)^{k_j} \right\} + \sum_{j > n} \log \left\{ 1 + \left( \frac{r}{r_j} \right)^{k_j} \right\},$$

where  $n$  is chosen so that  $r_n \leq r < r_{n+1}$ . But estimates like those of lemma 2 show that

$$\begin{aligned} \log g(r) &= \sum_{j \leq n} \left[ \log \left( \frac{r}{r_j} \right)^{k_j} + \log \left\{ 1 + \left( \frac{r_j}{r} \right)^{k_j} \right\} \right] + O(1) \\ &= \sum_{j \leq n} k_j \log \left( \frac{r}{r_j} \right) + O(1) \\ &= \int_0^r \frac{n(t)}{t} dt + O(1), \end{aligned}$$

where  $n(t)$  is the number of zeros of  $g(z)$  in  $|z| \leq t$ . The term  $O(1)$  is bounded as  $r$  (and hence  $n$ )  $\rightarrow \infty$ . We have  $n(t) = k_1 + \dots + k_j$  in  $r_j \leq t < r_{j+1}$ . In the construction  $r_n$  depends only on  $r_1, \dots, r_{n-1}, k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}$ . Thus we can prescribe  $k_n$  as a function of  $r_n$ , e.g.  $k_n = [r_n^\alpha]$ , for a given positive constant  $\alpha$ . This makes  $k_1 + \dots + k_n = O(r_n^\alpha)$  and  $n(t) = O(t^\alpha)$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  and so  $\log g(r) = O(r^\alpha)$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ . Since  $\log g(2r_n) > k_n \log 2 > [r_n^\alpha] \log 2$  we see that  $g$  is indeed exactly of order  $\alpha$ . The cases  $\alpha = 0$  and  $\infty$  are easily dealt with by similar arguments.

### 3. Proof of theorem 2

The exact connectivity of the wandering domains  $U_n$  in the preceding example was not determined. In this section the construction is modified in such a way that the corresponding domains  $U_n$  each contain exactly one critical point of the entire function. This is shown to ensure the infinite connectivity of  $U_n$ . The function constructed below is of very small growth, certainly of order 0.

Begin the construction by taking  $C, n_0, r_1, \dots, r_{n_0}$  to satisfy (1), (2), (3) as in the proof of theorem 1, with  $k_1 = 1$ , but define  $r_n, n > n_0$ , by

$$r_{n+1} = C^2 \left( 1 + \frac{r_n}{r_1} \right)^2 \cdots \left( 1 + \frac{r_n}{r_n} \right)^2. \tag{11}$$

By induction it follows from (1), (2), (3) and (11) that

$$r_{n+1} > 2r_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{12}$$

and indeed

$$r_{n+1} > 4r_n^2, \quad n > n_0. \tag{13}$$

Define the entire function

$$f(z) = C^2 \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \left( 1 + \frac{z}{r_j} \right)^2. \tag{14}$$

Set

$$s_n = \left( \frac{n+1}{n+2} \right) r_{n+1}. \tag{15}$$

LEMMA 4. The zeros of  $f'$  are at the points  $-r_n$  and  $t_n$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , where  $t_n \in (-r_{n+1}, -r_n)$ . For large  $n$  the point  $t_n$  lies in  $(-s_n, -r_n^2)$ .

*Proof of the lemma.* Since  $h(z) = (f'/f)(z) = 2 \sum_j \{1/(z + r_j)\}$ , it is easily seen that all zeros of  $h$  are real and negative. Further  $h$  is decreasing, except for discontinuities at  $-r_n$ . The first statement of the lemma is now clear. The rest will follow if we show that  $h(-s_n) > 0$ , or equivalently,  $h(-s_{n-1}) > 0$ , and  $h(-r_n^2) < 0$  for large  $n$ . Now

$$h(-s_{n-1}) > 2(n+1)r_n^{-1} + 2 \sum_{j < n} \frac{1}{(r_j - s_{n-1})}. \tag{16}$$

But if  $\alpha_j = 1/(r_j - s_{n-1})$ , then for  $j < n$ ,

$$-\alpha_j \leq -\alpha_{n-1} = \frac{(n+1)}{[nr_n - (n+1)r_{n-1}]}.$$

By (13) we have for large  $n$  that

$$r_n > 4r_{n-1}^2 > 2^n r_{n-1} > (n+1)r_{n-1},$$

and so  $-\alpha_{n-1} < (n+1)/\{(n-1)r_n\}$ , whence  $h(-s_{n-1}) > 0$ , using (16).

Further, using (12), (13) we have for large  $n$  that

$$\begin{aligned} h(-r_n^2) &< 2 \left( \frac{1}{r_n - r_n^2} \right) + 2 \left( \frac{1}{r_{n+1}^2 - r_n^2} + \frac{1}{r_{n+2}^2 - r_n^2} + \dots \right) \\ &< \frac{-2}{r_n^2} + \frac{2}{r_n^2} \left( \frac{1}{2^2 - 1} + \frac{1}{2^4 - 1} + \dots \right) < 0. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

LEMMA 5. Denote by  $B_n$  the annulus  $B_n = \{z; r_n^2 < |z| < s_n\}$ . Then for large  $n$  we have  $f(B_n) \subset B_{n+1}$ .

*Proof of the lemma.* By the maximum and minimum modulus principles it is sufficient to show for large  $n$

$$f(s_n) \leq s_{n+1}, \tag{17}$$

$$f(-s_n) > r_{n+1}^2, \tag{18}$$

$$f(-r_n^2) > r_{n+1}^2. \tag{19}$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{f(s_{n-1})}{s_n} &= \frac{n+2}{n+1} \cdot \prod_{j < n} \frac{(1 + (s_{n-1}/r_j))^2}{(1 + (r_n/r_j))^2} \cdot \frac{(2n+1)^2}{4(n+1)^2} \cdot P \\ &< \frac{(n+2)(2n+3)^2 P}{\{4(n+1)^3\}}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} P &= \prod_{j > n} \left( 1 + \frac{n}{n+1} \cdot \frac{r_n}{r_j} \right)^2 < \left( 1 + \frac{1}{(4r_n)} \right)^2 \left( 1 + \frac{1}{(8r_n)} \right)^2 \dots \\ &< \exp \{(r_n)^{-1}\} = 1 + O(2^{-n}) \end{aligned}$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , by (13). Thus

$$\frac{f(s_{n-1})}{s_n} = 1 - \frac{3}{4n^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{n^3}\right) < 1$$

for large  $n$ , which proves (17).

Further  $f(-s_{n-1}) = C^2 P_1 P_2 / (n + 1)^2$ , where

$$P_1 = \prod_{j < n} \left( \frac{n}{n+1} \cdot \frac{r_n}{r_j} - 1 \right)^2,$$

and

$$P_2 = \prod_{j > n} \left( 1 - \frac{n}{n+1} \cdot \frac{r_n}{r_j} \right)^2 = 1 - O(2^{-n}) > \frac{1}{2},$$

for large  $n$ . Since, by (13) the bracket on the right-hand side of  $P_1$  is at least  $r_n/4r_j$  we have for large  $n$  that  $P_1 > r_n^4/16r_1r_2 > 2r_n^3/C^2$ , whence  $f(-s_{n-1}) > r_n^3/(n+1)^2 > r_n^2$ . Thus (18) holds.

To prove (19) note that we have from (1), (14) that

$$\frac{f(-r_n^2)}{r_{n+1}^2} = \frac{r_1^2 \cdots r_{n-1}^2 (r_n - 1)^2 P_1^2 P_2^2}{4C^2 P_3^4}$$

where

$$P_1 = \prod_{j < n} \left( 1 - \frac{r_j}{r_n^2} \right), \quad P_2 = \prod_{j > n} \left( 1 - \frac{r_n^2}{r_j} \right), \quad P_3 = \prod_{j < n} \left( 1 + \frac{r_j}{r_n} \right).$$

Using (13) we see that  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are at least as big as  $\alpha = (1 - \frac{1}{4})(1 - \frac{1}{8}) \cdots$ , while  $P_3 < (1 + \frac{1}{2})(1 + \frac{1}{4}) \cdots$ . Hence  $f(-r_n^2)/r_{n+1}^2 > 1$  for all sufficiently large  $n$ . □

**LEMMA 6.** *If  $h$  is a transcendental entire function, then no doubly-connected component of  $N(h)$  contains a critical point of  $h$ .*

*Proof of the lemma.* Suppose that  $U$  is a doubly-connected component of  $N(h)$ . By [1] and [3] every component of  $N(h)$  is bounded and  $U$  is a wandering domain for  $h$ . Denote by  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  the outer and inner boundary components of  $U$ . Write  $U_1 = h(U)$ ,  $\beta_1 = h(\beta)$ ,  $\alpha_1 = h(\alpha)$ . The complete invariance of  $J(h)$  implies that  $\partial U_1 = f(\partial U) = \alpha_1 \cup \beta_1$ , which has at most two components. Suppose that  $\partial U_1$  is connected. If  $U_n = h^n(U)$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , it then follows from the complete invariance of  $J(h)$  that each  $\partial U_n$  is connected. For large  $n$  this conflicts with theorem 3.1 of [3], where it is shown that for such  $n$  the domain  $f^n(U)$  contains a closed curve  $\gamma_n$  whose distance from 0 is large and whose winding number about 0 is not zero; that is,  $\gamma_n$  must separate some points of  $J(h)$  and in particular boundary points of  $U_n$ .

Thus  $\partial U_1$  has two distinct components  $\alpha_1, \beta_1$  and by the maximum principle  $\alpha_1$  is the outer and  $\beta_1$  is the inner component. Denote by  $\psi$  and  $\psi_1$ , respectively, 1-1 conformal maps of the annuli  $K = \{z; 1 < |z| < R\}$  and  $K_1 = \{z; 1 < |z| < R_1\}$  to  $U$  and  $U_1$ . It is assumed that  $\psi$  ( $\psi_1$ ) approaches  $\alpha$  ( $\alpha_1$ ) or  $\beta$  ( $\beta_1$ ), respectively, according as  $|z|$  approaches  $R$  ( $R_k$ ) or 1. Then  $F = \psi_1^{-1} \psi$  maps  $K$  onto  $K_1$ , and as  $z \rightarrow \partial K$  so  $F(z) \rightarrow \partial K_1$ . Thus  $F$  extends analytically to  $\bar{K}$  and  $|F(z)| = 1$  on  $|z| = 1$ ,  $|F(z)| = R_1$  on  $|z| = R$ . Repeated application of the reflection principle shows that  $F$  can be continued to give an analytic map  $\mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  such that the only solution of  $F(z) = 0$  is  $z = 0$ . Further, for  $w$  in  $K_1$  all solutions of  $F(z) = w$  are in  $K$ . Hence  $F$  is a polynomial of the form  $cz^m$ ,  $|c| = 1$ , in a positive integer. It follows that  $F' = 0$  has no solution in  $K$ , whence  $h' = 0$  has no solution in  $U$ . □

*Conclusion of the proof of theorem 2.* The preceding lemmas show, as in the proof of theorem 1, that for large  $n$  the annulus  $B_n$  belongs to a multiply-connected component  $U_n$  of  $N(f)$ , that  $f^k(z) \rightarrow \infty$  locally uniformly in  $U_n$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , and that  $U_n, U_{n+1}$  are disjoint, so that  $U_n$  is wandering.

Note that for the critical points  $-r_n$  and  $t_n$  of  $f$ , described in lemma 4, we have  $f(-r_n) = 0$ , so that for large  $n$ ,  $f(-r_n)$  is not in  $U_{n+1}$  and so  $-r_n$  is not in  $U_n$ , (or indeed in any  $U_k$ ,  $k$  large). Thus  $U_n$  contains one critical point of  $f$ , namely  $t_n$ . By lemma 6  $U_n$  is not doubly-connected.

Suppose that the connectivity of  $U_n$  is finite, say that  $U_n$  has  $d_n$  boundary components. It follows that  $d_{n+1} \leq d_n$  and since  $d_k \geq 3$  for all  $k$  we may assume that all  $d_n$  have the same value,  $d$ , for  $n \geq n_0$ . Then we may denote the boundary components of  $U_n$  by  $\alpha_n$  (outer),  $\beta_n$  (the boundary of that component of  $\mathbb{C} \setminus U_n$  which contains 0), and  $\gamma_j^n$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq d-2$ . Since  $f$  maps  $\alpha_n$  to  $\alpha_{n+1}$ ,  $\beta_n$  to  $\beta_{n+1}$  it follows from the complete invariance of  $J(f)$  that  $f$  maps each  $\gamma_j^n$  to a  $\gamma_k^{n+1}$  and we may number the components so that  $f(\gamma_j^n) = \gamma_j^{n+1}$ .

For a fixed  $n$  take a neighbourhood  $V$  of  $\gamma_1^n$  which meets no other boundary component of  $U_n$ . Since  $\gamma_1^n \subset J(f)$  there is some  $k > 0$  and  $\xi \in V$  such that  $f^k(\xi) \in U_n$ . Then  $\xi \in N(f)$  but  $\xi \notin U_n$  since  $U_n$  is a wandering domain of  $f$ . Denote by  $W$  the component of  $\mathbb{C} \setminus \gamma_1^n$  which contains  $\xi$ . Clearly  $W$  is bounded. Thus we have  $\partial W \subset \gamma_1^n$  and  $f^k(W)$  meets  $U_n$ . But  $\partial f^k(W) \subset f^k(\partial W) \subset \gamma_1^{n+k}$ . Now the domain  $U_n$  is in the unbounded component of the complement of  $\gamma_1^{n+k}$  and hence  $f^k(W)$  must be unbounded. This contradicts the boundedness of  $W$ . We have shown that the connectivity of  $U_n$  is indeed infinite.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] I. N. Baker. The domains of normality of an entire function. *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. AI. Math.* **1** (1975), 277–283.
- [2] I. N. Baker. An entire function which has wandering domains. *J. Australian Math. Soc. (Ser. A)* **22** (1976), 173–176.
- [3] I. N. Baker. Wandering domains in the iteration of entire functions. (a) Institut Mittag-Leffler Report No. 20, 1983. (b) *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (3), **49** (1984), 563–576.
- [4] A. E. Eremenko & M. Yu. Ljubič. Iterates of entire functions (Russian). Preprint, Physico-Tech. Inst. Low Temperatures, Ukr SSR Academy of Sciences, Kharkov, 1984, No. 6.
- [5] P. Fatou. Sur les équations fonctionnelles. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, **47** (1919), 161–271; **48** (1920), 33–94 and 208–314.
- [6] P. Fatou. Sur l'itération des fonctions transcendentes entières. *Acta Math.* **47** (1926), 337–370.
- [7] D. Sullivan. Quasiconformal homeomorphisms and dynamics I. Solution of the Fatou–Julia problem on wandering domains. *I.H.E.S. preprint M/82/59* November 1982.