

## Q1)

### Q1.a)

First, we argue that  $f^*$  is well-defined. Let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  be a holomorphic map, and let  $\phi \in \mathcal{O}(Y)$ , such that  $\phi : Y \xrightarrow{\text{hol}} \mathbb{C}$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} f^*(\phi) &= \phi \circ f \\ \Rightarrow f^*(\phi) : X &\xrightarrow{\text{hol}} Y \xrightarrow{\text{hol}} \mathbb{C} \\ \Rightarrow f^*(\phi) &\in \mathcal{O}(X) \end{aligned}$$

Since  $f, \phi$  are well-defined holomorphic maps, so is their composition. It remains to show  $f^*$  is a ring homomorphism. Let  $\phi, \psi \in \mathcal{O}(Y)$ , so we get distribution over addition:

$$\begin{aligned} f^*(\phi + \psi) &= (\phi + \psi) \circ f \\ &= \phi \circ f + \psi \circ f \\ &= f^*(\phi) + f^*(\psi) \end{aligned}$$

and multiplication:

$$\begin{aligned} f^*(\phi\psi) &= (\phi\psi) \circ f \\ &= (\phi \circ f)(\psi \circ f) \\ &= f^*(\phi)f^*(\psi) \end{aligned}$$

Also,  $f^*$  preserves the identity:

$$\begin{aligned} f^*(1_Y) &= 1_Y \circ f \\ &= 1_X \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $f^*$  is a ring homomorphism. Suppose  $f$  is non-constant (so that  $f(X)$  is open), and that  $f^*(\phi) = \phi \circ f = f^*(\psi) = \psi \circ f$ . Hence,  $f^*(\phi - \psi) = f^*(\phi) - f^*(\psi) = 0$ , but since  $f$  is non-constant and holomorphic, if  $\phi - \psi$  is nonconstant then  $f^*(\phi - \psi)$  is an open mapping. However, since this is not true,  $\phi - \psi = 0 \Rightarrow \phi = \psi$ , thus  $f$  is an injective homomorphism. We have shown that  $f^*$  is a monomorphism when  $f$  is non-constant. ■

### **Q1.b)**

Let  $X, Y$  be connected Riemann surfaces, with  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  a holomorphic map. Suppose  $f$  is non-constant and proper, and  $A$  the set of all branch points of  $f$ . We argue that  $B := f(A)$  is closed and discrete. Let  $S$  be a closed and discrete set.

#### **Q1.b.i) Firstly, $f$ is closed**

Since  $X, Y$  are Riemann surfaces, they are locally compact and Hausdorff.

Let  $C \subseteq X$  be closed, and consider  $y \in Y \setminus f(C)$ . Then,  $y$  admits an open neighborhood  $U$  with compact closure, so  $f^{-1}(\overline{U})$  is compact. Then,  $C \cap f^{-1}(\overline{U})$  is compact, hence  $f(C \cap f^{-1}(\overline{U}))$  is also compact (therefore closed). Then, we have an open neighborhood  $U \setminus f(C \cap f^{-1}(\overline{U}))$  of  $y$  disjoint from  $f(C)$ , so  $Y \setminus f(C)$  is open. Therefore,  $f(C)$  is closed. Hence  $f$  is closed.

#### **Q1.b.ii) Also, $f$ preserves discreteness**

Let  $K$  be a compact set in  $Y$ . If we can show  $f(S) \cap K$  is always finite, then we have that  $f(S)$  is discrete. Note that:

$$f(S) \cap K = f(S \cap f^{-1}(K))$$

Since  $f$  is proper,  $f^{-1}(K)$  is compact. Since  $S$  is discrete, we have that  $S \cap f^{-1}(K)$  is finite. Hence, the image  $f(S) \cap K$  is finite. Therefore,  $f(S)$  is discrete.

#### **Q1.b.iii) Hence, $B$ is a closed, discrete subset of $X$**

Since the set of branch points is closed and discrete,  $B$  is discrete. ■

## Q2)

### Q2.a)

Recall from PMATH 352 that:

$$\tan(z) = \frac{\sin(z)}{\cos(z)} = \frac{e^{iz} - e^{-iz}}{i(e^{iz} + e^{-iz})} = \frac{e^{2iz} - 1}{i(e^{2iz} + 1)}$$

Now, observe that  $\tan(z) = \mu \circ \psi \circ \phi(z)$ , where:

$$\phi(z) = 2iz \quad \psi(z) = e^z \quad \mu(z) = \frac{z - 1}{i(z + 1)}$$

Firstly,  $\phi$  is a linear function, hence trivially a local homeomorphism. Next,  $\psi(z) = e^z \Rightarrow \psi'(z) = e^z$ , so by the inverse function theorem,  $\psi$  is a local homeomorphism. Finally, because  $\mu$  is a Möbius map,  $\det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ i & i \end{pmatrix} = 2i$  implies  $\mu$  is bijective, hence a local homeomorphism.

We have shown that  $\tan(z)$  is the composition of local homeomorphisms, so  $\tan(z)$  must be a local homeomorphism. ■

### Q2.b)

Again, consider  $\tan(z) = \mu \circ \psi \circ \phi(z)$ . First note that  $\phi$  is a linear map, and hence is a covering map of  $\mathbb{C}$ .

Next, we wish to show that  $\psi$  is a covering map of  $\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0, \infty\} \cong \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ . Let  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  such that  $z \neq 0$ . Thus, we have that  $\psi^{-1}(z) = \{\log(|z|) + \arg(z) + 2\pi ik \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ . Thus, we can easily take disjoint open neighborhoods around each point in  $\psi^{-1}(z)$  (e.g. balls of radius  $\pi$ ). Furthermore, we have already shown that  $\psi$  is a local homeomorphism. Hence,  $\psi$  is a covering map of  $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\} \cong \mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0, \infty\}$ .

Finally, we know that  $\mu$  is an automorphism of  $\mathbb{C}$ . Using PMATH 352, we have that  $\mu(\{0, \infty\}) = \{\pm i\}$ .

Therefore,

$$\tan(z) : \mathbb{C} \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathbb{C} \xrightarrow{\psi} \mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0, \infty\} \xrightarrow{\mu} \mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{\pm i\}$$

is a composition of covering maps. ■

### Q2.c)

In the previous parts of this question, we expressed  $\tan(z)$  as a composition of three functions,  $\mu$ ,  $\psi$ , and  $\phi$ . We argued that  $\phi$  is a linear map, hence bijective, and  $\phi$  is a Möbius map induced from an invertible matrix, hence bijective as well. Furthermore, these functions are holomorphic.

However, to deal with  $\psi(z) = e^z$ , we remark that this function is unique on the strip  $S_k := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \text{Im}(z) \in (-k\pi, k\pi), k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ , which is the image of the set  $S'_k := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \text{Re}(z) \in (-\frac{k\pi}{2}, \frac{k\pi}{2})\}$  under  $\phi$ . However, note that  $\tan(S'_k) = X$ , so  $\psi$  is effectively bijective.

Therefore,  $\tan$  has a unique holomorphic inverse  $\arctan_k : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  such that  $\tan \circ \arctan_k = \text{id}_X$ .

Note that  $\tan^{-1}(0) = k\pi, k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Thus, since  $\tan(z)$  is a covering map of  $\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{\pm i\}$ , we have that  $\tan(z)$  is a local homeomorphism sending  $k\pi$  to 0 with the curve lifting property. Therefore, for  $\tan \circ \arctan_k = \text{id}_X$ , we have that  $\arctan(0) = k\pi$ . ■

### Q3)

#### Q3.a)

We will show that  $\mathcal{B}$ , defined as follows, is a basis for a topology on  $R$ :

$$\mathcal{S} := \{D((z_0, k), r) \mid z_0 \in \mathbb{C}^* \setminus \mathbb{R}^+, r < d(z, \mathbb{R}^+)\}$$

$$\mathcal{T} := \{A((z_0, k), r) \mid z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^+\}$$

$$\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{T}$$

Let  $x := (z, k) \in R$ . Suppose  $z \notin \mathbb{R}^+$ . Then, since  $\mathbb{C}^*$  is Hausdorff, we have that  $r := d(x, \mathbb{R}^+) > 0$ , so there is a disc  $D(x, \frac{r}{2})$  containing  $x$ . Next, if  $z \in \mathbb{R}^+$ , then we have that  $A(x, \frac{z}{2})$  contains  $x$ . Therefore, each point in  $R$  is contained in an element of  $\mathcal{B}$ .

Next, we will show that for  $B, B' \in \mathcal{B}$  where  $B \cap B' \neq \emptyset$ , there exists a  $B'' \subseteq B \cap B'$ .

*Case 1:* Suppose  $B, B' \in \mathcal{S}$ . Since  $B \cap B' \neq \emptyset$ , they must be at the same “ $k$ ”, so  $B = D((z_0, k), r)$  and  $B' = D((z'_0, k), r')$ . Let  $p \in B \cap B'$  and let  $r'' < \min(r - |p - z_0|, r' - |p - z'_0|)$ , so that  $D(p, r'') \subseteq B \cap B'$ .

*Case 2:* Suppose  $B, B' \in \mathcal{T}$ . Again, since  $B \cap B' \neq \emptyset$ , they must be at the same “ $k$ ”, so  $B = A((z_0, k), r)$  and  $B' = A((z'_0, k), r')$ . We use the same trick as before to obtain  $r''$  such that  $D(p, r'') \subseteq B \cap B'$ .

*Case 3:* Suppose  $B \in \mathcal{S}, B' \in \mathcal{T}$ . This splits into two more cases, where if  $B = A((z_0, k), r)$ , then  $B'$  can either be of the form  $D((z'_0, k), r')$  or  $D((z'_0, k - 1), r')$ . In either case, let  $p \in B \cap B'$ , and let  $r'' = \min(r - |p - z_0|, r' - |p - z'_0|)$  such that  $D(p, r'') \subseteq B \cap B'$ .

Therefore, we have shown that  $\mathcal{B}$  is a basis for the topology  $\tau$ . ■

### Q3.b)

We proceed by showing  $R$  is Hausdorff and locally homeomorphic to  $\mathbb{C}$  with a holomorphic atlas.

(Hausdorff) Suppose  $x, y \in \mathbb{C}$  such that  $x \neq y$ . In our first case, we have  $x, y \in \mathcal{S}$ , such that  $x, y \neq \mathbb{R}^+$ . Therefore, if we let  $r < |x - y|$ , then we have open sets  $D((x, k_1), \frac{r}{2})$  and  $D((y, k_2), \frac{r}{2})$  such that  $D((x, k_1), \frac{r}{2}) \cap D((y, k_2), \frac{r}{2}) = \emptyset$ . Alternatively, if  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^+$ , then if we let  $r < |x - y|$ , we again have open neighbourhoods  $A((x, k_1), \frac{r}{2})$  and  $A((y, k_2), \frac{r}{2})$  of  $x$  and  $y$ , respectively, such that  $A((x, k_1), \frac{r}{2}) \cap A((y, k_2), \frac{r}{2}) = \emptyset$ . Finally, if  $x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}^+$  and  $y \in \mathbb{R}^+$ , then again we may have  $r < \min(|x - y|, y)$  such that  $D((x, k_1), \frac{r}{2}) \cap A((y, k_2), \frac{r}{2}) = \emptyset$ . Hence, in every case, we may find disjoint open neighbourhoods of  $x, y$ , so  $R$  is Hausdorff with respect to  $\tau$ .

(Locally Homeomorphic to  $\mathbb{C}$ ) Now, we claim that  $R$  is locally homeomorphic to  $\mathbb{C}$  by finding homeomorphisms from  $\mathcal{B}$  to  $\mathbb{C}$ . Let  $B \in \mathcal{S}$ , so  $B$  is of the form  $D((z_0, k), r)$ . Then, the map  $\phi : D((z_0, k), r) \rightarrow D(z_0, r), (z, k) \mapsto z$  is a continuous projection map. Likewise, for  $B \in \mathcal{T}$ , where  $B$  is of the form  $A((z_0, k), r)$ , we have the map  $\psi : A((z_0, k), r) \rightarrow D(z_0, r)$  where if  $\text{"}\mathcal{I}\text{"}(z) \geq 0$ , then  $\psi((z, k)) = z$  and if  $\text{"}\mathcal{I}\text{"}(z) < 0$ , then  $\psi((z, k - 1)) = z$ . This is clearly continuous. Hence, we have homeomorphisms sending  $\mathcal{B}$  to the topology of  $\mathbb{C}$ , so  $R$  is locally homeomorphic to  $\mathbb{C}$  since  $\mathcal{B}$  is a basis for  $R$ .

It remains to check that the atlas is holomorphic. Consider the atlas  $(\mathcal{B}, \{\phi, \psi\})$ , defined previously. Then, for  $B, B' \in \mathcal{B}$ , such that  $B \cap B' \neq \emptyset$ , we can split it up into cases.

If  $B, B' \in \mathcal{S}$ , then we have that  $B = D((z_0, k), r), B' = D((z'_0, k), r')$ , and so  $\phi \circ \phi^{-1} = \text{id}$ . Likewise, if  $B, B' \in \mathcal{T}$ , then  $B = A((z_0, k), r), B' = A((z'_0, k), r')$ , and  $\psi \circ \psi^{-1} = \text{id}$ . There are two cases for if  $B \in \mathcal{S}, B' \in \mathcal{T}$ :  $B$  can either be of the form  $D((z_0, k), r)$  or  $D((z_0, k - 1), r)$  if  $B'$  is of the form  $A((z'_0, k), r')$ . In the first case,  $\psi \circ \phi^{-1}(z) = \psi(z, k) = z$ , and in the second,  $\psi \circ \phi^{-1}(z) = \psi(z, k -$

1) =  $z$ , so  $\psi \circ \phi^{-1} = \text{id}$ . Therefore, we have verified that the atlas is holomorphic. ■

### Q3.c)

To show that  $\hat{f}$  is single-valued, we first note that  $\hat{f}$  is clearly single-valued for some fixed  $k$ , since it's just one branch of the complex logarithm function. Then, since varying  $k$  shifts the image by  $2\pi i$ , there is no overlap between  $\hat{f}(R, k_1)$  and  $\hat{f}(R, k_2)$  if  $k_1 \neq k_2$ . Hence,  $\hat{f}$  is single-valued.

Next, we claim that  $\hat{f}$  is holomorphic. We verify that each of the charts of the form  $\hat{f} \circ \phi^{-1} : \phi(B) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  and  $\hat{f} \circ \psi^{-1} : \psi(B') \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  are holomorphic, for  $B \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $B' \in \mathcal{T}$ . (Recall that  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{T}$  is the basis for the topology  $\tau$ .)

If  $z \notin \mathbb{R}^+$ , then  $z \in D((z, k), r) \in \mathcal{S}$ , so  $\hat{f} \circ \phi^{-1}(z) = \hat{f}(z, k) = \ln|z| + i(\arg_0 z + 2\pi k)$ , which is holomorphic as it coincides with the complex logarithm function shifted by  $2\pi i k$ . Furthermore, notice that  $\arg_0(z) \in [0, 2\pi)$ , so it follows that  $i(\arg_0 z + 2\pi k) \in [2\pi i k, 2\pi i(k + 1))$ , hence:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{f} \circ \phi^{-1}(z) &= \ln|z| + i(\arg_0 z + 2\pi k) \\ &= \ln|z| + i(\arg_{2\pi k} z) \\ &= L_{2\pi k}(z)\end{aligned}$$

In the other case,  $z \in A((z, k), r)$ , so

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{f} \circ \psi^{-1}(z) &= \begin{cases} \hat{f}(z, k) & \text{if } \text{Im}(z) \geq 0 \\ \hat{f}(z, k-1) & \text{if } \text{Im}(z) < 0 \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} L_{2\pi k}(z) & \text{if } \text{Im}(z) \geq 0 \\ L_{2\pi(k-1)}(z) & \text{if } \text{Im}(z) < 0 \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \ln|z| + i(\arg_{2\pi k} z) & \text{if } \text{Im}(z) \geq 0 \\ \ln|z| + i(\arg_{2\pi(k-1)} z) & \text{if } \text{Im}(z) < 0 \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

We remark that this function is continuous along  $\mathbb{R}^+$ . (As soon as you cross the positive real line,  $\arg_0 z$  gets sent to  $2\pi$ , but our function now

adds  $2\pi(k-1)$  instead of  $2\pi k$ , so it balances out.) Hence,  $\hat{f} \circ \psi^{-1}(z)$  is holomorphic, and we have shown that  $\hat{f}$  is holomorphic with respect to an atlas of  $R$  and equal to  $L_{2\pi k}(z)$  for  $z \in [2\pi k, 2\pi(k+1))$ . ■



## Q4)

Let  $\Gamma = \{m\omega_1 + n\omega_2 \mid m, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  be a lattice in  $\mathbb{C}$  and let  $f$  be a non-constant, elliptic function relative to  $\Gamma$ .

First, we will show that  $f$  must have a pole. Suppose for contradiction  $f$  has no poles in  $\mathbb{C}/\Gamma$ , hence  $f$  is holomorphic over  $\mathbb{C}/\Gamma$ . This implies that over  $\mathbb{C}/\Gamma$ ,  $|f|$  is bounded by a constant  $B$ . However, by periodicity, this implies  $|f|$  is bounded over  $\mathbb{C}$ , and by Liouville's theorem,  $f$  is therefore constant. Contradiction —  $f$  must have a pole!

Now, we will show that  $f$  must have at least two poles, counting multiplicity. Let  $C$  be the contour along the perimeter of a translated fundamental parallelogram, along the path  $[k, k + \omega_1, k + \omega_1 + \omega_2, k + \omega_2]$ . (If the poles of  $f$  lie in  $\Gamma$ , we may choose  $k$  without loss of generality such that this is no longer the case.) Hence, we compute the integral along  $C$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\int_C f(z) dz &= \left( \int_k^{k+\omega_1} + \int_{k+\omega_1}^{k+\omega_1+\omega_2} + \int_{k+\omega_1+\omega_2}^{k+\omega_2} + \int_{k+\omega_2}^k \right) f(z) dz \\ &= \int_k^{k+\omega_1} f(z) - f(z + \omega_2) dz - \int_k^{k+\omega_2} f(z) - f(z + \omega_1) dz \\ &= 0, \text{ because } f(z) = f(z + \omega_1) = f(z + \omega_2)\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by the residue theorem, the sum of the residues of  $f$  equals 0. If  $f$  has a simple pole at  $z_0$ , then  $f = \frac{c}{z-z_0} + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_i (z - z_0)^i$ . However, notice that if  $\text{Res}(f, z_0) = 0$ , then  $c = 0$ , so the simple pole isn't a pole at all. Hence, the order of  $f$  must be at least two. ■

## Q5)

### Q5.a)

Let  $X$  be a compact Riemann surface, and let  $f$  be a non-constant meromorphic function on  $X$ . Hence,  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\} \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ . We argue that  $f$  is proper.

Let  $z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n$  be poles of  $f$  (there are finitely many since  $\mathbb{P}^1$  is compact). Then, since  $f$  is holomorphic on  $X \setminus \{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n\}$ , we have that  $f^{-1}(K)$  is compact, for compact  $K \subset \mathbb{C}$ . Then, for any compact  $K \subseteq \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$  containing  $\infty$ , we have that  $f^{-1}(K) = \{\text{some compact set}\} \cup \{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n\}$ , which is compact. Since  $f$  is meromorphic, it can be thought of as a holomorphic mapping onto  $\mathbb{P}^1$ . Therefore,  $f$  is proper.

Since  $f$  is a proper non-constant holomorphic map from  $X$  to  $\mathbb{P}^1$ , we know that  $\exists n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for  $p \in \mathbb{P}^1$ ,  $|f^{-1}(p)| = n$ , counting multiplicity. Hence,  $|f^{-1}(\infty)| = |f^{-1}(0)|$ , as desired. ■

### Q5.b)

( $\Rightarrow$ ) Let  $f$  be a meromorphic function on  $X$  with a pole of multiplicity one.

First, we will show  $f$  is injective. Let  $x_1, x_2 \in X$  such that  $x_1 \neq x_2$  and  $f(x_1) = f(x_2) = c$ . However, if we let  $g(z) = f(z) - c$ ,  $g$  would be a meromorphic function on  $X$  with one pole and two zeroes, contradicting (a). Hence,  $f$  must be injective.

Next, we show that  $f$  is surjective. Using (a), we get that  $f$  has a single zero (of multiplicity one) at some  $x_0 \in X$ . Hence, we see that  $|f^{-1}(0)| = 1$ , so  $f$  is an unbranched map. In (a), we established that  $f$  is a proper map from  $X$  to  $\mathbb{P}^1$ , so  $f$  is an unbranched proper non-constant holomorphic mapping. Hence, via a theorem proved in class,  $f$  is a covering map of  $\mathbb{P}^1$ , implying  $f$  is surjective.

Therefore,  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$  is a bijective holomorphism, so the two surfaces are isomorphic.

( $\Leftarrow$ ) Now, suppose  $X$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{P}^1$ . Hence, there exists a biholomorphism  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1 \cong \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ . Since  $f$  is injective,  $|f^{-1}(\infty)| = 1$ , i.e. there is one point in  $X$  which maps to  $\infty$ . Also,  $f$  is unbranched. Therefore,  $f$  has a biholomorphism from  $X$  to  $\mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ , where there is only one  $x \in X$  such that  $f(x) = \infty$ . It follows that  $f$  is a meromorphic function with a single simple pole. ■

### **Q5.c)**

Let  $f$  be a meromorphic function on  $\mathbb{C}/\Gamma$ . Hence,  $f$  is elliptic with respect to  $\Gamma$ . In a previous question, we showed that  $f$  must either be constant or admit at least two poles (counting multiplicity). Hence,  $\mathbb{C}/\Gamma$  cannot admit a meromorphic function with a simple pole, so  $\mathbb{C}/\Gamma \not\cong \mathbb{P}^1$ . ■