

## A COVERING PROPERTY OF THE RIEMANN ZETA-FUNCTION

P. M. GAUTHIER AND N. TARKHANOV

(Communicated by XXX)

ABSTRACT. For each compact subset  $K$  of the complex plane  $\mathbb{C}$  which does not surround zero, the Riemann surface  $S_\zeta$  of the Riemann zeta function restricted to the critical half-strip  $0 < \Re s < 1/2$  contains infinitely many schlicht copies of  $K$  lying ‘over’  $K$ . If  $S_\zeta$  also contains at least one such copy, for some  $K$  which surrounds zero, then the Riemann hypothesis fails.

### CONTENTS

1. An universality theorem	1
2. Schlicht copies	2
3. A covering property	3
4. Domains with ramification	5
5. Compact sets not capturing zero	7
6. Bloch radius	9
7. Cyclicity of the Riemann zeta-function	10
References	11

### 1. AN UNIVERSALITY THEOREM

The critical strip for the Riemann zeta-function is the strip  $0 < \Re s < 1$ . Because of the symmetry properties of the zeta-function, one often restricts one’s attention to the strip  $S = \{s \in \mathbb{C} : 1/2 < \Re s < 1\}$ , which we shall call the critical half-strip. If  $f$  is a function defined on  $S$  and  $\tau$  is a real number, we denote by  $f_\tau$  the vertical translate of  $f$  given by  $f_\tau(s) = f(s + i\tau)$ . Let  $K$  be a closed disc centered at  $3/4$  and contained in the half-strip  $S$ . Voronin has shown that the Riemann zeta-function has the following remarkable universality property: the vertical translates of  $\zeta$  are dense in the space of functions holomorphic on  $K$  which have no zeros.

Recently [1] it has been shown that most holomorphic functions have a similar universality property (without the restriction on zeros). However, it is difficult to provide other explicit examples than the Riemann zeta function.

---

Received by the editors February 17, 2004.  
2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 11M26; Secondary 11Mxx.  
*Key words and phrases*. The Riemann zeta-function.

It is not known whether one can remove the restrictions on zeros in Voronin's theorem, but doing so would negate the Riemann hypothesis. Indeed, suppose the function  $s - 3/4$  could be uniformly approximated on the disc  $K$  by vertical translates  $\zeta_\tau$  of the Riemann zeta-function. Then, by Rouché's theorem, some such translate would have a zero in  $K$ . Thus, the zeta-function would have a zero in the translate  $K_\tau = K + i\tau$  of  $K$ . Since  $K_\tau$  is disjoint from the critical line  $\Re s = 1/2$ , this would violate the Riemann hypothesis.

The following universality theorem of Bagchi improves Voronin's theorem.

**Theorem 1.1** (Bagchi). *For each compact subset  $K$  of the critical half-strip  $S$  with  $\mathbb{C} \setminus K$  connected, for each function  $f$  holomorphic on  $K$  and having no zeros, and for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is a vertical translate  $\zeta_\tau$  of the Riemann zeta-function, such that  $|\zeta_\tau - f| < \varepsilon$  on  $K$ .*

For references to these and other results regarding the universality property of the Riemann zeta-function, we refer to [4].

The following universality theorem is essentially a reformulation of the theorem of Bagchi.

**Theorem 1.2.** *For each function  $f$  holomorphic on the critical half-strip  $S$  and having no zeros, there is a sequence of vertical translates of the Riemann zeta-function which converges to  $f$ . That is, there is a sequence  $\{\tau_j\}$  of real numbers, such that  $\zeta_{\tau_j} \rightarrow f$  uniformly on compact subsets of  $S$ .*

Of course, this follows immediately from Bagchi's theorem, since each compact subset of  $S$  is contained in one whose complement is connected. The converse implication also holds. That is, Bagchi's theorem follows from Theorem 1.1 and the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.3.** *Let  $K$  be a compact subset of  $\mathbb{C}$  with connected complement. Then, each function holomorphic and having no zeros on  $K$  can be uniformly approximated by entire functions having no zeros.*

*Proof.* Let  $f$  be holomorphic on  $K$  and without zeros. Then,  $f$  is an exponential. That is,  $f = \exp F$  for some function  $F$  holomorphic on  $K$ . By Runge's theorem, there is a sequence of polynomials  $P_n$ , such that  $P_n \rightarrow F$  uniformly on  $K$ . Set  $g_n = \exp P_n$ . Then,  $g_n \rightarrow f$  uniformly on  $K$ .  $\square$

## 2. SCHLICHT COPIES

If  $Y_1$  and  $Y_2$  are two Riemann surfaces, we shall use the expressions 'Y<sub>1</sub> and Y<sub>2</sub> are conformally equivalent' and 'Y<sub>1</sub> and Y<sub>2</sub> are biholomorphic' interchangeably.

Let us use the notation  $\rho : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  to signify a Riemann surface spread (with possible branching) over  $\mathbb{C}$ . That is,  $Y$  is a Riemann surface and  $\rho$  is a holomorphic function on  $Y$ . We say that a point  $p \in Y$  lies 'over'  $\rho(p)$  and we think of  $\rho$  as a projection. The Riemann surface  $Y$  has a natural metric which is the pullback by  $\rho$  of the euclidean metric on the target space  $\mathbb{C}$ . Let  $A$  be a subset of the target  $\mathbb{C}$ . We say that a subset  $\tilde{A}$  of  $Y$  is a schlicht copy of  $A$  lying over  $A$ , if  $\rho$  restricted to  $\tilde{A}$  is a homeomorphism of  $\tilde{A}$  onto  $A$ . If moreover  $A$  is open, then  $\tilde{A}$  is a sheet of  $Y$  and it is not only homeomorphic but in fact conformally isometric to  $A$ . In general, we shall say that  $\tilde{A}$  is a conformally isometric copy of  $A$  lying over  $A$ , if some open neighborhood of  $\tilde{A}$  is a conformally isometric copy of  $A$  lying over  $A$ .

The most important example of a Riemann surface spread over  $\mathbb{C}$  is the Riemann surface  $G_f$  of a holomorphic function  $f$  defined on a domain  $G$  of  $\mathbb{C}$ . In this case, the function  $f$  lifts to a biholomorphic mapping  $\tilde{f} : G \rightarrow G_f$  and  $f = \rho \circ \tilde{f}$ . Although the domain  $G$  and the Riemann surface  $G_f$  are equivalent as Riemann surfaces, they are usually different as metric spaces, where  $G_f$  has the natural metric defined above and  $G$  has the natural euclidean metric which it inherits as a subset of  $\mathbb{C}$ .

Suppose, for  $j = 1, 2$ , that  $\rho_j : Y_j \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  are Riemann surfaces spread over  $\mathbb{C}$ . If  $A_j$  are respectively compact subsets of  $Y_j$ , we shall say that  $A_1$  lies *schlicht* over  $A_2$  if there is a homeomorphism  $\varphi : A_1 \rightarrow A_2$  such that  $\rho_1 = \rho_2 \circ \varphi$ . Of course, this relation is symmetric. That is,  $A_1$  lies *schlicht* over  $A_2$  if and only if  $A_2$  lies *schlicht* over  $A_1$ . If  $A_1$  is *schlicht* over  $A_2$ , then, by the Brouwer theorem,  $A_1$  is open in  $Y_1$  if and only if  $A_2$  is open in  $Y_2$ . In this case,  $\varphi$  is biholomorphic and  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  are conformally isometric. For general sets  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ , we say that they are conformally isometric if they are respectively contained in open subsets of  $Y_1$  and  $Y_2$  which are conformally isometric.

### 3. A COVERING PROPERTY

Let  $Y$  be any simply connected Riemann surface endowed with a conformal metric. For example, the Riemann surface  $G_g$  of a holomorphic function  $g$  defined on a simply connected domain  $G$  is conformally equivalent to  $G$  and hence is also simply connected. If  $Y$  is hyperbolic,  $S_\zeta$  and  $Y$  are conformally equivalent, and if we take the conformal metric on  $S_\zeta$  induced by the conformal metric on  $Y$ , then  $S_\zeta$  and  $Y$  are conformally isometric. On the other hand, if  $Y$  is not hyperbolic, and  $K$  is a compact proper subset of  $Y$ , let  $Y_K$  be any simply connected neighborhood of  $K$ , which is not all of  $Y$ . Then,  $Y_K$  is hyperbolic and hence conformally equivalent to  $S_\zeta$ . With respect to the conformal metric induced on  $S_\zeta$  by the conformal metric on  $Y_K$  inherited from  $Y$ ,  $S_\zeta$  is conformally isometric to  $Y_K$  and, in particular, contains a conformally isometric copy of  $K$ . But now, the metric on  $S_\zeta$  depends not only on  $Y$ , but even on  $K$ . Moreover, we are only assured that  $S_\zeta$  contains *one* conformally isometric copy of  $K$  in this manner. We wish to find *infinitely many* conformally isometric copies of  $K$  in  $S_\zeta$ , and moreover we wish to always use the *same* metric on  $S_\zeta$ , namely, the natural metric of  $S_\zeta$  as a surface spread over  $\mathbb{C}$ .

If  $Y$  is a Riemann surface spread over  $\mathbb{C}$  and  $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$ , we can define in an obvious manner the translate  $Y + \mu$  of  $Y$ , which is also a Riemann surface spread over  $\mathbb{C}$  and there is a natural biholomorphism from  $Y$  to  $Y + \mu$ . For each subset  $K \subset Y$  we denote by  $K + \mu$  the subset of  $Y + \mu$  which corresponds to  $K$  by this biholomorphism and we call  $K + \mu$  the translate of  $K$  in  $Y + \mu$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *For each Riemann surface  $Y$  spread without ramification over  $\mathbb{C}$  and for each closed Jordan domain  $K \subset Y$ , there is a  $\mu_K \in \mathbb{C}$  such that, for each  $|\mu| > |\mu_K|$ , the Riemann surface  $S_\zeta$  of the Riemann zeta-function restricted to the critical half-strip  $S$  contains infinitely many conformally isometric copies over the translate  $K + \mu$  of  $K$  in the translated Riemann surface  $Y + \mu$  of  $Y$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose, first, that  $Y \subset \mathbb{C}$ , that is, that  $\rho$  is just the inclusion mapping. Suppose, moreover, that  $0 \notin K$ . Let  $W_0$  be a Jordan domain such that

$$K \subset W_0 \subset \overline{W_0} \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}.$$

Choose  $0 < r_0 < 1/4$  and let  $D_0$  be the disc centered at  $3/4$  of radius  $r_0$ . By the Riemann mapping theorem, there is a biholomorphic mapping  $f$  from  $D_0$  onto  $W$  and by the Osgood-Carathéodory theorem,  $f$  extends to a homeomorphism of  $\overline{D_0}$  onto  $\overline{W_0}$ . Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be the inverse image of  $K$  and choose  $0 < r_3 < r_2 < r_1 < r_0$ , such that  $\mathcal{K} \subset D_3$ , where  $D_j$  denotes the disc centered at  $3/4$  of radius  $r_j$ . Denote by  $W_j$  the image  $f(D_j)$  of  $D_j$ .

The function  $f$  is the uniform limit on  $\overline{D_0}$  of functions holomorphic on  $\overline{D_0}$  and so by Voronin's universality theorem,  $f$  is the uniform limit on  $\overline{D_0}$  of vertical translates of the Riemann zeta-function. In particular, setting  $m$  equal to the distance between  $\partial W_2$  and  $\partial W_1$ , there is a vertical translate  $\zeta_\tau$  of the zeta-function, such that  $|f - \zeta_\tau| < m$  on  $\overline{D_0}$ . By Rouché's theorem, for each  $w \in W_2$ , the functions  $f - w$  and  $\zeta_\tau - w$  have the same number of zeros (counting multiplicities) in  $D_1$ . But, for each  $w \in W_2$ , the function  $f - w$  has precisely one zero in  $D_1$ . Thus, the function  $\zeta_\tau$  assumes each value  $w \in W_2$  precisely once in  $D_1$ . Let  $h$  denote the restriction of  $\zeta_\tau$  to  $D_1$ . Then,  $\zeta_\tau$  maps  $h^{-1}(W_2)$  biholomorphically onto  $W_2$ . Now denote by  $W_2^{-1}$  the vertical translate of  $h^{-1}(W_2)$  by  $i\tau$ . Then,  $\zeta$  maps  $W_2^{-1}$  biholomorphically onto  $W_2$ . Denote by  $\widetilde{W_2}$  the biholomorphic copy of  $W_2^{-1}$  in the Riemann surface  $S_\zeta$  of the function  $\zeta$  restricted to the critical half-strip  $S$ . Then,  $\widetilde{W_2}$  is a conformally isometric copy of  $W_2$  lying over  $W_2$ . Of course, since  $K \subset W_2$ , the set  $\widetilde{W_2}$  contains a conformally isometric copy  $\widetilde{K}$  of  $K$  lying over  $K$ . We have assumed that  $Y$  is a plane domain and that  $0 \notin K$ .

Now let  $\rho : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be a Riemann surface spread over  $\mathbb{C}$  without ramification and let  $K$  be a closed Jordan domain in  $Y$ . Suppose, moreover, that  $0 \notin \rho(K)$ . Let  $\overline{W_0}$  be a closed Jordan domain in  $Y$  with interior  $W_0$  such that  $K \subset W_0$  and  $0 \notin \rho(\overline{W_0})$ . By the uniformization theorem, there is a biholomorphic mapping  $f$  from  $D_0$  onto  $W_0$  and by (a generalization of) the Osgood-Carathéodory theorem,  $f$  extends to a homeomorphism of  $\overline{D_0}$  onto  $\overline{W_0}$ . Define  $D_j$  as before.

In order to adapt the proof we gave for  $Y$ , a plane domain, to the present situation, where  $Y$  is a Riemann surface, we should require a Rouché theorem for holomorphic mappings taking their values in a Riemann surface. This problem can be circumvented in the following way. By the universality theorem, we can obtain a translate  $\zeta_\tau$  of the Riemann zeta-function which approximates  $\rho \circ f$  so well on  $\overline{D_0}$  that for each  $s \in \overline{D_1}$ , there is an open neighborhood  $N_s$  of  $s$  in  $D_0$  on which  $\rho \circ f$  is injective and such that  $\zeta_\tau(s)$  lies in  $(\rho \circ f)(N_s)$ . Now fix a point  $s \in D_2$ . Let  $\rho^{-1}$  be the germ at  $\zeta_\tau(s)$  of the inverse of  $\rho$  restricted to  $f(N_s)$ . The germ  $f^{-1} \circ \rho^{-1} \circ \zeta_\tau$  can be continued holomorphically along all paths in  $D_1$  and, by the Monodromy Theorem, gives rise to a holomorphic function on  $D_1$  which, by abuse of notation, we denote by  $f^{-1} \circ \rho^{-1} \circ \zeta_\tau$ . By approximating  $\rho \circ f$  sufficiently well on  $W_0$  by translates  $\zeta_\tau$  of the Riemann zeta-function, we may approximate the identity  $f^{-1} \circ f$  as well as we please on  $W_2$  by functions  $f^{-1} \circ \rho^{-1} \circ \zeta_\tau$ . By Rouché's theorem, if the approximations are sufficiently good, then for each  $w \in \overline{D_3}$ , the identity function and  $f^{-1} \circ \rho^{-1} \circ \zeta_\tau$  assume the value  $w$  the same number of times in  $D_2$ . Thus,  $f^{-1} \circ \rho^{-1} \circ \zeta_\tau$  assumes each value in  $\overline{D_3}$  precisely once in  $D_2$ . Denote by  $W_3^{-1}$  the image of  $D_3$  by the inverse of  $f^{-1} \circ \rho^{-1} \circ \zeta_\tau$  restricted to  $D_2$ . Then,  $f^{-1} \circ \rho^{-1} \circ \zeta_\tau$  maps  $W_3^{-1}$  biholomorphically onto  $D_3$ . We conclude from this that the holomorphic continuation  $\rho^{-1} \circ \zeta_\tau$  is well defined and maps  $W_3^{-1}$  biholomorphically onto  $W_3$ . Writing

$$\rho_\zeta(\tilde{\zeta}(s + i\tau)) = \zeta(s + i\tau) = \zeta_\tau(s),$$

we have that  $\rho^{-1} \circ \rho_\zeta \circ \tilde{\zeta}$  maps  $W_3^{-1} + i\tau$  biholomorphically onto  $W_3$ . Denote by  $\widetilde{W}_3$  the image of  $W_3^{-1} + i\tau$  in  $S_\zeta$  by the biholomorphic mapping  $\tilde{\zeta}$ . Then  $\widetilde{W}_3$  is a conformally isometric copy of  $W_3$  lying over  $W_3$  in the Riemann surface  $S_\zeta$  of the Riemann zeta-function restricted to  $S$ . Since  $S_\zeta$  has a conformally isometric copy  $\widetilde{W}_3$  of  $W_3$  over  $W_3$ , of course  $\widetilde{W}_3$  contains a conformally isometric copy  $\widetilde{K}$  of  $K$  over  $K$ .

One can revisit the above proof, to obtain, not only one, but in fact infinitely many conformally isometric copies  $\widetilde{K}_j$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots$ , of  $K$  lying over  $K$ . In fact, by the universality Theorem 1.2, there is a sequence  $\zeta_{\tau_j}$  of translates of the zeta-function which converges to  $\rho \circ f$  on  $\overline{D}_0$ . Obviously, we can suppose that  $\rho \circ f$  is not itself the Riemann zeta-function, for example, by choosing  $W_0$  with non-analytic boundary. Since  $\rho \circ f$  is not the Riemann zeta-function, it follows that  $\tau_j \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence, we may suppose that the vertical translates of  $\overline{D}_0$  by  $i\tau_j$  are disjoint. Thus, the  $\tau_j$  give rise to disjoint conformally isometric copies of  $W_3$  lying over  $W_3$ . These contain respectively infinitely many conformally isometric copies of  $K$  over  $K$ .

We have assumed that  $0 \notin \rho(K)$ . To conclude the proof, we merely note that if  $0 \in \rho(K)$ , we may choose  $\mu_K \in \mathbb{C}$  such that, for each  $|\mu| > |\mu_K|$ , the projection of  $K + \mu$  does include 0. We then apply the previous arguments to the new set  $K + \mu$  in the Riemann surface  $Y + \mu$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.2.** *For each Riemann surface  $Y$  spread without ramification over  $\mathbb{C}$  and for each closed Jordan domain  $K \subset Y$  having no points over 0, the Riemann surface  $S_\zeta$  of the Riemann zeta-function restricted to the critical half-strip  $S$  contains infinitely many conformally isometric copies of  $K$  over  $K$ .*

*Proof.* In proving the theorem, this is precisely what we showed, before the last paragraph of the proof, since, up to that point, we were working under the assumption that  $0 \notin \rho(K)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.3.** *For each Riemann surface  $Y$  spread without ramification over  $\mathbb{C}$  and for each closed Jordan domain  $K \subset Y$ , the Riemann surface  $S_\zeta$  of the Riemann zeta-function restricted to the critical half-strip  $S$  contains infinitely many conformally isometric copies of  $K$ .*

*Proof.* Choose an admissible  $\mu$ . Then, the Riemann surface  $S_\zeta$  contains infinitely many conformally isometric copies of  $K + \mu$  over  $K + \mu$ . Now these copies may not be over  $K$ , but they are still conformally isometric to  $K$  since  $K + \mu$  is conformally isometric to  $K$ .  $\square$

#### 4. DOMAINS WITH RAMIFICATION

Let us say that  $K$  is a closed Jordan domain spread over  $\mathbb{C}$  if  $K$  is a closed Jordan domain in some Riemann surface spread over  $\mathbb{C}$ . In the above covering theorem, we have considered only Jordan domains spread over  $\mathbb{C}$  without ramification. Let us now consider the situation when ramification is present. The following theorem shows that we cannot always cover Jordan domains having a simple ramification, but we can always cover certain translates thereof.

**Theorem 4.1.** *For each Riemann surface  $X$  spread over  $\mathbb{C}$ , in particular for the Riemann surface  $S_\zeta$  of the Riemann zeta-function restricted to the critical half-strip  $S$ , there exists a closed Jordan domain  $K$  over  $\mathbb{C}$  having precisely one ramification*

point which moreover is simple, and  $X$  contains no conformally isometric copy of  $K$  over  $K$  itself.

*Proof.* Consider the Riemann surface  $\mathbb{C}_a$  of the function  $h(z) = a + z^2$ , defined on  $\mathbb{C}$ . This is a two-sheeted surface spread over  $\mathbb{C}$  and having a simple ramification point over the point  $a$ . This surface is simply connected, since it is biholomorphic to the domain of  $h$ , namely  $\mathbb{C}$ . We denote the projection which spreads  $\mathbb{C}_a$  over  $\mathbb{C}$  by  $\rho_a$ . Let  $Q$  be a closed disc in the domain  $\mathbb{C}$ , and  $\tilde{h}(Q) = K_a$  the closed Jordan domain in the surface  $\mathbb{C}_a$ . Then  $\rho(K_a) = h(Q)$  is a closed disc of center  $a$ .

Let  $\rho : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be any Riemann surface spread over  $\mathbb{C}$ , and suppose  $X$  contains a conformally isometric copy  $\tilde{K}_a$  of  $K_a$  over  $K_a$ . Then, since  $\rho^{-1} \circ \rho_a$  maps  $\tilde{K}_a$  onto  $K_a$  bijectively,  $K_a$  is also a two-sheeted covering of the same disc  $\overline{D}_a$ , having a ramification point  $x_a$  over  $a$ . Thus  $\rho(x_a) = a$ . Since ramification points are isolated, the set  $R_X$  of ramification points of the surface  $X$  is at most countable. These lie over the countable set  $\rho(R_X)$ . Choose  $a \notin \rho(R_X)$ . Then, the above discussion shows that the Riemann surface  $X$  does not contain a conformally isometric copy of  $K_a$  over  $K_a$ . This proves the theorem.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.2.** *For each closed Jordan domain  $K$  over  $\mathbb{C}$ , having precisely one ramification point which moreover is simple, the surface  $S_\zeta$  contains infinitely many conformally isometric copies of  $K$  over translates of  $K$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $K$  be any Jordan domain over  $\mathbb{C}$  having precisely one ramification point which moreover is simple. In order to prove that  $S_\zeta$  contains conformally isometric copies of  $K$  over translates of  $K$ , we need only make a slight modification of the proof of Theorem 3.1. We may assume (by translation of  $K$ ) that  $0 \notin \rho(K)$ . From our definition of a Jordan domain spread over  $\mathbb{C}$ , we know that  $K$  lies in some Riemann surface  $Y$  spread over  $\mathbb{C}$ . Let  $\overline{W}_0$  be a closed Jordan domain in  $Y$  with interior  $W_0$ , such that  $K \subset W_0$  and  $0 \notin \rho(\overline{W}_0)$ . We may assume that the unique ramification point of  $K$  is also the unique ramification point of  $\overline{W}_0$ . Following the notation in the proof of Theorem 3.1, we may assume that  $\zeta_\tau$  approximates  $\rho \circ f$  so well on  $\overline{D}_0$  that the derivative of  $\zeta_\tau$  has only one simple zero in  $\overline{D}_0$  and that it is as near as we wish to the unique zero of  $(\rho \circ f)'$  in  $\overline{D}_0$ . We may also assume that not only these critical points are closed, but also that the corresponding critical values are close. Thus, by post-composing with a small shift by  $\mu$ , we may obtain that  $\rho \circ f + \mu$  and  $\zeta_\tau$  have the same unique critical value. This means that  $\tilde{\zeta}_\tau(D_0)$  has a unique ramification point which is precisely over the unique ramification point of  $K + \mu$  and of the same order.

Let  $a$  be the unique zero of  $(\rho \circ f)'$  in  $D_0$ . For some  $\epsilon > 0$ , the portion of  $W_0$  lying over the disc  $|w - f(a)| < \epsilon$  is the two sheeted covering of this disc with ramification point over the branch point  $f(a)$ . Let  $N_a$  be  $f^{-1}$  of the disc  $|w - f(a)| < \epsilon/2$ . Since both  $f(D_0)$  and  $\tilde{\zeta}_\tau(D_0)$  have simple ramification points over  $(\rho \circ f)(a) = \zeta_\tau(a)$ , we may assume that the approximation is so good that the composition  $\rho^{-1} \circ \rho_\zeta$  is biholomorphic on  $\tilde{\zeta}_\tau(N_a)$ .

We may also assume that the approximation is so good that for each  $s \in \overline{D}_1 \setminus N_a$  there is an open neighbourhood  $N_s$  of  $s$  in  $D_0$  on which  $\rho \circ f$  is injective and such that  $\zeta_\tau(s)$  lies in  $(\rho \circ f)(N_s)$ . Now fix a point  $s \in D_2 \setminus N_a$ . Let  $\rho^{-1}$  be the germ at  $\zeta_\tau(s)$  of the inverse of  $\rho$  restricted to  $\tilde{f}(N_s)$ . The germ  $f^{-1} \circ \rho^{-1} \circ \zeta_\tau$  can be continued holomorphically along all paths in  $D_1$  and by the Monodromy Theorem gives rise to a holomorphic function on  $D_1$  which, by abuse of notation, we denote

by  $f^{-1} \circ \rho^{-1} \circ \zeta_\tau$ . By approximating  $\rho \circ f$  sufficiently well on  $\overline{D}_0$  by translates  $\zeta_\tau$  of the Riemann zeta-function, we may approximate the identity  $f^{-1} \circ f$  as well as we please on  $\overline{D}_2 \setminus N_a$  by functions  $f^{-1} \circ \rho^{-1} \circ \zeta_\tau$ . Since  $\rho^{-1} \circ \rho_\zeta$  is an isometry near the ramification point and in particular on  $\zeta_\tau(N_a)$ , we may thus approximate the identity function as well as we please on all of  $\overline{D}_2$  by functions  $f^{-1} \circ \rho^{-1} \circ \zeta_\tau$ .

The rest of the proof that  $S_\zeta$  contains a conformally isometric copy of  $K$  over  $K + \tau$  is the same as in the proof of Theorem 3.1. We omit the details. This proves the theorem.  $\square$

Moreover, there exist Jordan domains with two simple ramification points, for which even translates cannot be covered.

**Theorem 4.3.** *For each Riemann surface  $X$  spread over  $\mathbb{C}$ , in particular for  $S_\zeta$ , there exists a closed Jordan domain  $K$  over  $\mathbb{C}$  having precisely two ramification points which moreover are simple and  $X$  contains no conformally isometric copy of  $K$  (not even over translates of  $K$ ).*

*Proof.* Let  $X$  be any Riemann surface spread over  $\mathbb{C}$ . Since  $X$  has at most countably many ramification points, the distance between any two such ramification points can only assume countably many values. Now let  $K$  be a Jordan domain over  $\mathbb{C}$  with two ramification points, such that the distance between these two points is different from these countably many values. Then,  $X$  cannot contain a conformally isometric copy of  $K$ .  $\square$

## 5. COMPACT SETS NOT CAPTURING ZERO

The topological hull of a set  $A \subset \mathbb{C}$  is the union of  $A$  with the bounded complementary components. Let us say that a subset  $A$  of  $\mathbb{C}$  *captures* zero, if zero is contained in the hull of  $A$ . A compact set  $K$  fails to capture zero if and only if there is a path from zero to infinity in the complement of  $K$ .

**Theorem 5.1.** *Over each compact subset  $K$  of  $\mathbb{C}$  which does not capture zero, the Riemann surface  $S_\zeta$  of the Riemann zeta-function restricted to the critical half-strip  $S$  contains infinitely many conformally isometric copies of  $K$ . Moreover, if the Riemann surface  $S_\zeta$  contains a schlicht copy of some compact set which does capture zero, then the Riemann hypothesis fails.*

*Proof.* Let  $K$  be a compact subset of  $\mathbb{C}$  which does not capture zero. There exist a Jordan domain  $J$  such that

$$K \subset J \subset \overline{J} \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}.$$

The first part of the theorem follows immediately by applying the previous theorem to the closed Jordan domain  $\overline{J}$ , noting that in the proof translations of  $\overline{J}$  are not required, since  $0 \notin \rho(\overline{J})$ .

The second assertion follows from the following claim. Let  $f$  be a holomorphic function in a simply connected domain  $G$ , whose restriction to some compact subset  $Q$  of  $G$  is a homeomorphism of  $Q$  onto its image, which we denote by  $K$ . Then  $f(G)$  contains the topological hull  $\widehat{K}$  of  $K$ . Now we have only to verify the claim.

*Fact 1:* Homeomorphic compact subsets of  $\mathbb{C}$  have the same number of complementary components. This follows from the following observations (see [2]). Firstly, if  $K$  is a compact subset of  $\mathbb{C}$ , then, for any cohomology theory, the number of complementary components of  $K$  is given by the zeroth cohomology group of  $\mathbb{C} \setminus K$

with real coefficients. Namely,  $H^0(\mathbb{C} \setminus K, \mathbb{R}) = \oplus_1^n \mathbb{R}$ , where  $n$  is the number of components of  $\mathbb{C} \setminus K$ . Secondly, by Alexander duality,  $H^0(\mathbb{C} \setminus K, \mathbb{R}) = H_1(K, \mathbb{R}) \oplus \mathbb{R}$ . Thirdly,  $H_1(K, \mathbb{R})$  is a topological invariant.

Let us define a *Jordan set*  $\Gamma$  in  $\mathbb{C}$  to be a compact subset which satisfies the conclusion of the Jordan curve theorem. That is,  $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Gamma$  has precisely two components and each point of  $\Gamma$  lies on the boundary of each of these components.

*Fact 2:* If  $K$  is a compact subset of  $\mathbb{C}$  whose complement is not connected, then  $K$  contains a Jordan set  $\Gamma$ . We can prove this in the following way. Let  $V$  be a bounded complementary component of  $K$ . Let  $K_1 = \overline{V}$  and let  $\Gamma = \partial \widehat{K}_1$ . We show that  $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Gamma$  has precisely two complementary components. The complement of  $\Gamma$  consists of the complement  $W$  of  $\widehat{K}_1$  and the interior  $\widehat{K}_1^\circ$  of  $\widehat{K}_1$ . From the definition of the topological hull, it follows that  $W$  is connected. We show that  $\widehat{K}_1^\circ$  is also connected. Any component of the interior of a compact set having connected complement also has connected complement. In particular, if  $U$  is the component of  $\widehat{K}_1^\circ$  which contains  $V$ , then, the complement of  $U$  is connected from which it follows that the complement of  $\overline{V}$  is also connected. Since  $\overline{V} \subset \overline{U} \subset \widehat{K}_1$ , it follows that  $\overline{U}$  is the topological hull  $\widehat{K}_1$  of  $K_1 = \overline{V}$ . Thus,  $U$  is dense in  $\widehat{K}_1$  and so  $U$  is the unique component of  $\widehat{K}_1^\circ$ . Hence, the complement of the boundary  $\Gamma$  of  $\widehat{K}_1$  has precisely two components,  $U$  and  $W$ . Since  $U$  is dense in  $\widehat{K}_1$ , we have  $\partial U = \Gamma$ . The boundary of any set is the same as the boundary of its complement. Hence,  $\Gamma = \partial W$ . We have established that  $\Gamma$  is a Jordan set.

*Fact 3:* Let  $f$  be a homeomorphism of a compact subset  $Q \subset \mathbb{C}$  onto the compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{C}$ . Then,  $Q$  is a Jordan set if and only if  $K$  is a Jordan set. Indeed, suppose  $K$  is a Jordan set and let  $U$  and  $W$  be the complementary components of  $K$ . By Fact 1, the complement of  $Q$  has two components and so, by Fact 2,  $Q$  contains a Jordan set  $Q_0$ . Set  $K_0 = f(Q_0)$ . We wish to show that  $K_0 = K$ . Clearly  $K_0 \subset K$ . We have only to show that if  $w \notin K_0$  then  $w \notin K$ . By Fact 1,  $K_0$  has precisely two complementary components, say  $U_0$  and  $W_0$ . Each of these contains a complementary component of  $K$  and so they must contain different complementary components of  $K$ . We may assume that  $U \subset U_0$  and  $W \subset W_0$ . If  $w \notin K_0$ , then  $w$  has an open neighborhood  $N$  disjoint from  $K_0$ . Thus,  $N$  lies entirely in  $U_0$  or  $W_0$  and consequently  $N$  is disjoint from  $W$  or from  $U$ . Thus,  $w \notin \partial W$  or  $w \notin \partial U$ . Since  $K$  is a Jordan set, this means that  $w \notin K$ . This completes the proof that  $K = K_0$  and consequently,  $Q = Q_0$ . Therefore,  $Q$  is a Jordan set. We have shown that if  $K$  is a Jordan set then so is  $Q$ . The argument also goes the other way, since  $f^{-1}$  too is a homeomorphism.

Let  $f$  be a function holomorphic in a simply connected domain  $G$  and let  $f$  map a Jordan subset  $\Gamma'$  of  $G$  homeomorphically onto (the Jordan set)  $\Gamma$ . Let  $U'$  and  $W'$  be respectively the bounded and the unbounded complementary components of  $\Gamma'$ . Similarly, let  $U$  and  $W$  be respectively the bounded and the unbounded complementary components of  $\Gamma$ . Since  $G$  is simply connected, it is not hard to see that  $U' \subset G$ .

*Fact 4:*  $f(U') \cap U \neq \emptyset$ . To prove this conjecture, suppose  $f(U') \cap U = \emptyset$ . Then  $f(U') \subset W$ . Choose a point in  $f(U')$ . There is a path  $\sigma$  from this point to  $\infty$  in  $W$ . Since  $f(U')$  is bounded,  $\sigma$  must contain a boundary point of  $f(U')$ . Now,

$$\partial f(U') \subset f(\partial U') = f(\Gamma') = \Gamma = \partial W,$$



where the first inclusion is because  $f$  is an open mapping. This contradicts the fact that  $\sigma$  lies in  $W$ .

We now show that  $f(G)$  contains every point of  $U$ . Let  $b$  be a point of  $U$ . By Fact 4, there is a point  $a$  in  $U$  which is the image by  $f$  of some point  $\alpha$  in  $U'$ . Since  $f$  is open, we may assume that  $a \neq b$ . Let  $U_j$  be a decreasing sequence of Jordan domains which contain  $\bar{U}$  and which converge to  $\bar{U}$ . Also, let  $U_\infty$  be a Jordan domain which contains the points  $a$  and  $b$  and whose closure is contained in  $U$ . By the Riemann mapping theorem, there is a biholomorphic mapping  $h_j$  of the unit disc onto  $U_j$  such that  $h_j(0) = b$  and  $h_j'(0) > 0$ . By Montel's theorem, the family  $h_j$  is normal and so we may assume that  $h_j$  converges to a holomorphic mapping  $h$  of the unit disc into  $\bar{U}$  with  $h(0) = b$ . By the Schwarz lemma,  $h_j'(0) > h_\infty'(0)$ . Thus  $h$  is non-constant and in fact biholomorphic onto its image  $V$ . Since  $V \subset \bar{U}$  and  $h$  is non-constant,  $V$  contains no point of  $\partial\bar{U}$ . Now,  $\partial\bar{U} = \partial U$ , since  $K$  is a Jordan set. This implies that  $|h_j^{-1}(w)| \rightarrow 1$  uniformly on  $\partial U$ . On the other hand, by Pick's lemma applied to  $h_j^{-1} \circ h_\infty$ , we see that  $h_j^{-1}$  is bounded away from 1 on  $U_\infty$ . Thus,  $U_\infty$  is contained in  $V$ . In particular,  $a \in V$ . We may fix  $j$  so large that  $|h_j^{-1}(a)| < |h_j^{-1}(w)|$  for each  $w \in \partial U$ . By Rouché's theorem (which holds even though  $U'$  may not be smoothly bounded [1]), the functions  $h_j^{-1} \circ f$  and  $(h_j^{-1} \circ f) - h_j^{-1}(a)$  have the same number of zeros in  $U'$ . Now  $(h_j^{-1} \circ f) - h_j^{-1}(a)$  has a zero at the point  $\alpha \in U'$  and hence  $h_j^{-1} \circ f$  assumes the value 0 at some point  $\beta \in U'$ . Thus,  $f(\beta) = h(0) = b$ , which completes the proof of the claim.

The previous paragraph can perhaps be slightly simplified by invoking the Carathéodory kernel theorem.  $\square$

## 6. BLOCH RADIUS

Let  $X$  be a Riemann surface, let  $f$  be a holomorphic function on  $X$ , and let  $G_f$  be the Riemann surface of  $f$  (possibly branched) over  $\mathbb{C}$ . We say that  $G_f$  contains a schlicht disc of radius  $r$  over a point  $w \in \mathbb{C}$  if there is a domain in  $X$  which is mapped by  $f$  biholomorphically onto the disc of radius  $r$  centered at  $w$ . We define the Bloch radius of  $f$  over  $w$ , denoted by  $b(w)$  to be the radius of the 'largest' schlicht disc over  $w$ . More precisely,

$$b(w) := \sup\{r : \text{there is a schlicht disc of radius } r \text{ over } w\}.$$

If there is no schlicht disc over  $w$ , we set  $b(w) = 0$ .

For the Riemann zeta-function we get the following covering theorem.

**Theorem 6.1.** *For each  $w \in \mathbb{C}$  the Bloch radius  $b(w)$  of the Riemann zeta-function over  $w$  has the following lower bound:*

$$b(w) \geq |w|.$$

*Moreover, if the Riemann hypothesis holds, we have equality.*

*Proof.* The first part is an immediate consequence of Theorem 5.1. Indeed, for  $w = 0$  the theorem is trivial. For  $w \neq 0$ , let  $K$  be an arbitrary closed disc centered at  $w$  and of radius  $r < |w|$ . Then  $K$  does not capture zero, and so by Theorem 5.1 there is a schlicht copy  $\tilde{K}$  of  $K$  lying over  $K$  in the Riemann surface  $S_\zeta$ . The set  $\tilde{K}$  is a schlicht disc of radius  $r$  over  $w$ . This gives the first part.

The Riemann hypothesis would imply  $b(w) \leq |w|$ , which together with the first part yields the second part.  $\square$

## 7. CYCLICITY OF THE RIEMANN ZETA-FUNCTION

The remarkable universality theorem of Voronin improved by Bagchi (Theorem 1.1) yields approximation by translates of the Riemann zeta-function. If we allow not only translates but also linear combinations thereof, we obtain much more with much less effort. In fact, as the following theorem shows, we can approximate on arbitrary compact subsets, not just compact subsets of the fundamental half-strip having connected complement. Nor do we need to assume that the functions to be approximated have no zeros. We can approximate any holomorphic function on any compact set.

**Theorem 7.1** (Runge type). *For each compact subset  $K$  of  $\mathbb{C}$ , for each function  $f$  holomorphic on  $K$  and for each  $\epsilon$ , there are finitely many values  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n$  and  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n$ , such that*

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \zeta_{a_j} - f \right| < \epsilon$$

on  $K$ .

In functional analytic terminology, the previous theorem implies that the Riemann zeta-function is a *cyclic vector* for the translation operator in the space of entire functions.

*Proof.* Let  $f$  be holomorphic on  $K$ . We may assume that  $f \in C_0^\infty$ . Since the function  $\Phi(s) = \pi^{-1}\zeta(s+1)$  is a fundamental solution for the Cauchy-Riemann operator,

$$\begin{aligned} f(s) &= (\bar{\partial}f * \Phi)(s) \\ &= \iint (\bar{\partial}f)(v) \Phi(s-v) dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

If  $s$  lies outside the support of  $\bar{\partial}f$ , then  $f(s)$  can be approximated by Riemann sums. Such sums have the form

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \zeta_{a_j}.$$

Moreover, the approximation is uniform on compact subsets disjoint from the support of  $\bar{\partial}f$ , in particular on  $K$ .  $\square$

More refined approximations are possible. For example, we have the following result.

**Theorem 7.2.** *Let  $K \subset \mathbb{C}$  be a compact set and  $\sigma$  a subset of  $\mathbb{C} \setminus K$ , such that any holomorphic function on  $\mathbb{C} \setminus K$  vanishing up to order  $A$  on  $\sigma$  is identically 0. Then for each function  $f$  holomorphic on  $K$  and for each  $\epsilon$ , there are finitely many  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n \in \sigma$  and  $\lambda_{1,k}, \lambda_{2,k}, \dots, \lambda_{n,k} \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $0 \leq k \leq N < A$ , such that*

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=0}^N \lambda_{j,k} \zeta^{(k)}(\cdot - a_j + 1) - f \right| < \epsilon$$

on  $K$ .

*Proof.* This is a particular case of Theorem 5.3.2 in [3].  $\square$

*Acknowledgements* Research supported by NSERC (Canada) and DFG (Deutschland).

## REFERENCES

1. GAUTHIER, P. M., and POURYAYEVALI, M. R., *A universality property of most entire functions on Stein manifolds*, submitted.
2. MASSEY, W., *Homology and Cohomology Theory*, Marcel Decker, New York-Basel, 1975.
3. TARKHANOV, N., *The Cauchy Problem for Solutions of Elliptic Equations*, Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 1995.
4. TITCHMARSH, E. C., *The Theory of the Riemann Zeta Function*, 2nd ed., rev. by D. R. Heath-Brown, Oxford Science Publications, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1986.

(Paul M. Gauthier) DÉPARTEMENT DE MATHÉMATIQUES ET DE STATISTIQUE, UNIVERSITÉ DE MONTRÉAL, CP 6128 CENTRE VILLE, MONTRÉAL, QUÉBEC H3C 3J7, CANADA  
*E-mail address:* `gauthier@dms.umontreal.ca`

(Nikolai Tarkhanov) UNIVERSITÄT POTSDAM, INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK, POSTFACH 60 15 53, 14415 POTSDAM, GERMANY  
*E-mail address:* `tarkhanov@math.uni-potsdam.de`