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#### Abstract

We consider maps in the tangent family for which the asymptotic values are eventually mapped onto poles. For such functions the Julia set $J(f)=\overline{\mathbb{C}}$. We prove that for almost all $z \in J(f)$ the limit set $\omega(z)$ is the post-singular set and $f$ is non-ergodic on $J(f)$. We also prove that for such $f$ does not exist a $f$-invariant measure absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure finite on compact subsets of $\mathbb{C}$.


## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Fatou set $F(f)$ of a meromorphic function $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ is defined in exactly the same manner as for rational functions; $F(f)$ is the set of points $z \in \mathbb{C}$ such that all the iterates are defined and form a normal family on a neighborhood of $z$. The Julia set $J(f)$ is the complement of $F(f)$ in $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$. Thus, $F(f)$ is open, $J(f)$ is closed, $F(f)$ is completely invariant while $f^{-1}(J(f))=J(f) \backslash\{\infty\}$ and $f(J(f) \backslash\{\infty\}) \subset J(f)$. For a general description of the dynamics of meromorphic functions see e.g. [1]. We would however like to note that it easily follows from Montel's criterion of normality that if $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ has at least one pole which is not an omitted value then

$$
\begin{equation*}
J(f)=\overline{\bigcup_{n \geq 0} f^{-n}(\infty)} \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The post-singular set of $f$ i.e. the closure in $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$ of the forward orbit of the set of singularities of $f^{-1}$, is denoted by $P(f)$. If $z$ is a point which belongs to the do-
main of the definition of each iterate of $f$ we denote by $\omega(z)$ the set of cluster points of the sequence $\left(f^{n}(z)\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$. Let dist $_{\chi}(z, A)$ denote the distance of the point $z$ to the set $A \subset \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ with respect to the chordal metric $\chi$. In ([3], Theorem 6.2) there is proved a very important characterization.

Theorem 1.1. If $f$ is a rational function of degree $\geq 2$ or a transcendental meromorphic function then at least one of the following statements holds:
(i) $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}$ dist $_{\chi}\left(f^{n}(z), P(f)\right)=0$ for almost all $z \in J(f)$;
(ii) $J(f)=\overline{\mathbb{C}}$ and for all $A \subset \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ of positive measure the set $\left\{n \in \mathbb{N}: f^{n}(z) \in A\right\}$ is infinite for almost all $z \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}$.

It may be difficult to decide which of statements (i) or (ii) applies to a given meromorphic function. It can also occur that both statements hold for a meromorphic function. Note that in the case (ii) $f$ is ergodic and recurrent. For example if the set of singularities of $f^{-1}$ is finite and each singularity is preperiodic but not periodic then statement (ii) holds for $f$ and $\omega(z)=\overline{\mathbb{C}}$ for almost all $z \in \mathbb{C}$. The more general results giving sufficient conditions for maps to be ergodic is proved in [6] (see Theorem 1, p.133).

We consider a holomorphic family

$$
\mathcal{F}=\left\{f_{\lambda}(z)=\lambda \tan z, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}^{*}, z \in \mathbb{C}\right\},
$$

where $\mathbb{C}^{*}:=\mathbb{C}-\{0\}$, which is called the tangent family. The singular sets $S_{f_{\lambda}}$ contain exactly two asymptotic values, the omitted values $\pm \lambda i$. The pre-image of a punctured neighborhood of $\lambda i$ (resp. $-\lambda i$ ) is an upper (resp. lower) half plane. It follows from the symmetry of the tangent function that the forward orbits of these asymptotic values are symmetric with respect to origin.

To simplify notation we write $F_{\lambda}, J_{\lambda}, \omega_{\lambda}$ for objects associated to functions in $\mathcal{F}$. All functions in the family have the same poles; we use the notation $p_{k}=\frac{\pi}{2}+k \pi, k \geq 0$ for the poles on the positive axis and $-p_{k}$ for the poles on the negative axis.

The symmetry of the maps with respect to 0 implies that the Fatou set $F_{\lambda}$ and the Julia set $J_{\lambda}$ are symmetric with respect to the origin. In [5], the stable behavior of functions in $\mathcal{F}$ was completely characterized. We define the sets:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{C}_{0}=\{\infty\}, \quad \mathcal{C}_{p}=\left\{\lambda: f_{\lambda}^{p}(\lambda i)=\infty\right\}, p>0, \quad \mathcal{C}=\bigcup_{0}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}_{p} \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Points in $\mathcal{C}_{p}$ are called virtual centers of order $p$. The hyperbolic maps form a natural and important subset of $\mathcal{F}$. In this family these maps can be characterized as

$$
\mathcal{H}=\left\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^{*}: f_{\lambda} \text { has an attracting periodic cycle }\right\}
$$

We denote a connected component of $\mathcal{H}$ by $\Omega$. In [5] section 8 , the hyperbolic components are enumerated in terms of the sets defined in (1.2). We recall the following results proved in ([5], Proposition 8.11, Theorem 8.12)

Theorem 1.2. The virtual centers $c_{p} \in C_{p-1}$ are in one to one correspondence with pairs of hyperbolic components $\left(\Omega_{p}, \Omega_{p}^{\prime}\right)$. In $\Omega_{p}$ each function has a pair of periodic cycles of period $p$ and each attracts the orbit of an asymptotic value whereas in $\Omega_{p}^{\prime}$ each function has a single attracting cycle of period $2 p$ which attracts both asymptotic values. The virtual center $c_{p} \in C_{p-1}$ is a common boundary point of $\left(\Omega_{p}, \Omega_{p}^{\prime}\right)$. The virtual center $c_{0}$ is the point at infinity and it corresponds to the unique pair of components $\left(\Omega_{1}, \Omega_{1}^{\prime}\right)$; these are the only unbounded components and they are linked by hyperbolic components of period 2 .

Thus the parameters $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}$ play a very special role in the family $\mathcal{F}$. The other motivation to study maps corresponding to these parameters follows from [7], where it is shown that if $\lambda_{0} \in \mathcal{C}_{p}, p \geq 1$, then some repelling periodic points of period $p+1$ of $f_{\lambda}$ tend to a pole for $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_{0}$ and for $\lambda=\lambda_{0}$ these cycles dissappear.

In this paper we describe the metric properties of the Julia set $J_{\lambda}$ for these $\lambda^{\prime} s$. For $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}_{p}, p \geq 1$, the post-singular set $P_{\lambda}=\left\{ \pm \lambda i, f_{\lambda}( \pm \lambda i), \ldots, f_{\lambda}^{p-1}( \pm \lambda i)\right.$, $\left.f_{\lambda}^{p}( \pm \lambda i)=\infty\right\}$ and $J_{\lambda}=\overline{\mathbb{C}}$. Sct

$$
I_{n}(f):=\left\{z \in \mathbb{C}: \lim _{m \rightarrow \infty} f^{m n}(z)=\infty\right\}, \quad n \geq 1
$$

It follows from Theorem 1.1 that, if $I_{n}(f)$ has positive measure, then (i) holds. One can check that for $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}_{p}, p \geq 1, f_{\lambda}$ satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 8.1 and Theorem 8.2 in [3], so

$$
\operatorname{meas}\left(I_{1}\left(f_{\lambda}\right)\right)=0 \quad \text { and } \quad \operatorname{meas}\left(I_{p+1}\left(f_{\lambda}\right)\right)>0
$$

where meas denotes 2-dimensional Lebesgue measure. Thus by Theorem 1.1 $\omega(z) \subset P_{\lambda}$ for almost all $z \in \mathbb{C}$. We prove that for these maps a stronger property holds, namely,

Theorem A. Let $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}_{p}, p \geq 1$. Then $\omega(z)=P_{\lambda}$ for almost all $z \in \mathbb{C}$.
To prove ergodicity of transcendental function on its Julia set one assumes that post-singular set is a compact repeller. If this assumption is not satisfied the map does not have to be ergodic. For example, for $f(z)=e^{z}$ the post-singular set is unbounded. In [9] it is proved that the post-singular set is a metric attractor for almost all $z \in J(f)=\mathbb{C}$ and $f$ is not ergodic. One of the other possibility when the post-singular sets is not a compact repeller is the case when the singular values are prepoles i.e. some their iterates are equal to $\infty$. The considered maps satisfied this property. Our second main result is

Theorem B. Let $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}_{p}, p \geq 1$, then $f_{\lambda}$ is not ergodic on $J_{\lambda}$. There is a wandering set of positive measure in $J_{\lambda}$.

Theorem 1 in [8] provide the sufficient conditions for existence of $\sigma$-finite ergodic conservative $f$-invariant measure $\mu$ equivalent with the Lebesgue measure. In our case the assumptions of that Theorem are not satisfied. We also show that

Theorem C. Let $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}_{p}, p \geq 1$. Then for $f_{\lambda}$ does not exist a $f$-invariant measure absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure finite on compact subsets of $\mathbb{C}$.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

We need the following version of Koebe's Theorem (compare [4])
Theorem 2.1. Let $f: B\left(z_{0}, \varrho\right) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a holomorphic univalent map, $0<\eta<1$. Then for $z \in S\left(z_{0}, \eta \varrho\right)=\left\{z \in \mathbb{C}:\left|z-z_{0}\right|=\eta \varrho\right\}$
(i) $\frac{\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right| \eta \rho}{(1+\eta)^{2}}<\left|f(z)-f\left(z_{0}\right)\right|<\frac{\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right| \eta \rho}{(1-\eta)^{2}}$
(ii) $\frac{1-\eta}{\{1+\eta)^{3}}<\frac{\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right|}{\left|f^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)\right|}<\frac{1+\eta}{(1-\eta)^{3}}$
(iii) $\left|\arg \left(\frac{f^{\prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}\right)\right| \leq 2 \ln \left(\frac{1+\eta}{1-\eta}\right)$
and its straightforward corollaries.
Lemma 2.2. Let $f: B\left(z_{0}, \varrho\right) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a holomorphic univalent map, $0<\eta<1$.
Then for all $A \subset B \subset B\left(z_{0}, \eta \varrho\right)$ holds

$$
L^{-2} \frac{\operatorname{meas}(A)}{\operatorname{meas}(B)} \leq \frac{\operatorname{meas}(f(A))}{\operatorname{meas}(f(B))} \leq L^{2} \frac{\operatorname{meas}(A)}{\operatorname{meas}(B)}
$$

where $\left.L=\frac{\sup _{z \in B}\left(z_{0}, \eta\right)}{\inf _{z \in B\left(\eta_{0}\right)}\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right|}\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right| \right\rvert\,\left(\frac{1+\eta}{1-\eta}\right)^{4}$.
Lemma 2.3. Letf $: B\left(z_{0}, \varrho\right) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a holomorphic univalent map. Then

$$
B\left(f\left(z_{0}\right),\left|f^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)\right| \varrho / 8\right) \subset f\left(B\left(z_{0}, \varrho / 2\right)\right) \subset B\left(f\left(z_{0}\right), 2\left|f^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)\right| \varrho\right)
$$

We recall lemma stated in [10]
Lemma 2.4. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ let $E_{k}$ be a finite collection of disjoint compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}^{2}$, each of them has positive 2-dimensional measure, and define

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \bar{E}_{k}=\bigcup_{F \in F_{k}} E_{k}, \quad E=\bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \bar{E}_{k} \\
& \operatorname{density}\left(\bar{E}_{k+1}, F\right):=\frac{\operatorname{meas}\left(\bar{E}_{k+1} \cap F\right)}{\operatorname{meas}(F)} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Suppose also that for each $F \in E_{k}$, there exists $F^{\prime} \in E_{k+1}$, and a unique $F^{\prime \prime} \in E_{k-1}$ such that $F^{\prime} \subset F \subset F^{\prime \prime}$ then
(1) if for every $F \in E_{k}$, density $\left(\bar{E}_{k+1}, F\right) \geq \Delta_{k}^{\prime}$, then $\operatorname{density}\left(\bar{E}, \bar{E}_{1}\right) \geq$ $\prod_{k=0}^{\infty} \Delta_{k}^{\prime}$
(2) if for every $F \in E_{k}$, density $\left(\bar{E}_{k+1}, F\right) \leq \Delta_{k}^{\prime \prime}$, then $\operatorname{density}\left(\bar{E}, \bar{E}_{1}\right) \leq$ $\prod_{k=0}^{\infty} \Delta_{k}^{\prime \prime}$

We will use the following property of infinite products.
Lemma 2.5. Let $a_{i}>0, i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_{i}=s<1 / 2$. Then

$$
\prod_{i=0}^{\infty}\left(1-a_{i}\right)>(1-2 s)
$$

Proof. Define $b_{n}:=\prod_{i=0}^{n}\left(1-a_{i}\right)$. Then

$$
-\ln b_{n}=\sum_{i=0}^{n}-\ln \left(1-a_{i}\right)<2 \sum_{i=0}^{n} a_{n}
$$

The last inequality is a consequence of the property $-\ln (1-x)<2 x$ which holds for $x \in\left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right)$. Since the sequence $-\ln b_{n}, n \in \mathbb{N}$, is increasing there exists $b=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} b_{n}$ and $b<2 s$. Consequently $e^{-b}>e^{-2 s}$. To finish the proof it is enough to observe that $e^{-2 s}>1-2 s$ for $s \in\left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right)$.

Assume $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}_{p}, p \geq 1$, and for readability omit the subscript $\lambda$. Then $J(f)=\overline{\mathbb{C}}$. We consider a new map $S(z):=f^{p+1}(z)$ defined on $J \backslash \bigcup_{k=0}^{p} f^{-k}(\infty)$. Set

$$
g_{1}(z):=-\lambda i\left(\frac{z-1}{z+1}\right), \quad g_{2}(z):=e^{2 i z} \quad \text { and } \quad \varphi(z)=g_{2} \circ f^{p-1} \circ g_{1}(z)
$$

Then $\varphi(0)=-1$, since $f^{p-1}(\lambda i)$ is a pole $p_{k}=\frac{\pi}{2}+k \pi$, and also $f^{p+1}(z)=$ $g_{1} \circ \varphi \circ g_{2}(z)$. Let $c>0$ be large enough such that $S(z)$ is well defined for $z$ satisfying $|\operatorname{Im} z|>c$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\forall_{k=0, \ldots, p-1}\left|\operatorname{Im}\left(f_{\lambda}^{k}(\lambda i)\right)\right|<c \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $\varphi$ is univalent on the disk $B\left(0, e^{-2 c}\right)$. Let $\varrho:=e^{-2 c}$, and $M:=\frac{2|\lambda|}{\left|\varphi^{\prime}(0)\right|}$. Choose $y_{0}$ such that
(2.2) $y_{0}>c$,
(2.3) $y_{0}>1+\frac{3}{M}$,

$$
\begin{align*}
& y_{0}>\frac{4 M}{\varrho}+2|\lambda|+\frac{1}{\varrho^{2}}  \tag{2.4}\\
& y_{0}>4 M  \tag{2.5}\\
& y_{0}>32 \sqrt{ } 2 \pi^{3} \tag{2.6}
\end{align*}
$$

and define the sequence of real numbers $y_{k}=e^{2 y_{k-1}}, y_{-k}=-e^{2 y_{k-1}}$ for $k \geq 1$. We also define for $k \neq 0$ the families of sets.

$$
\begin{aligned}
V_{k}:= & \left\{z=x\left|i y ; y_{|k|}\right| 2 y_{|k|-1} \leq|y| \leq y_{|k|+1}-2 y_{|k|}, \operatorname{sgn} y=\operatorname{sgn} k\right\} \\
V_{k}^{+}:= & \left\{z=x+i y \in V_{k} ;(\operatorname{sgn} k) s+n \pi+3 / y_{|k|} \leq x\right. \\
& \left.\leq(\operatorname{sgn} k) s+\pi / 2+n \pi-3 / y_{|k|}\right\} \\
V_{k}^{-}:= & \left\{z=x+i y \in V_{k} ;(\operatorname{sgn} k) s+\pi / 2+n \pi+3 / y_{|k|} \leq x\right. \\
& \left.\leq(\operatorname{sgn} k) s+(n+1) \pi-3 / y_{|k|}\right\},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $s=\frac{\pi}{4}$ if

$$
-\operatorname{Im} \lambda \operatorname{Re} \varphi^{\prime}(0)+\operatorname{Re} \lambda \operatorname{Im} \varphi^{\prime}(0)=0 \quad \text { and } \quad \operatorname{Re} \lambda \operatorname{Re} \varphi^{\prime}(0)+\operatorname{Im} \lambda \operatorname{Im} \varphi^{\prime}(0)>0
$$

or $s=\frac{3 \pi}{4}$ if
$-\operatorname{Im} \lambda \operatorname{Re} \varphi^{\prime}(0)+\operatorname{Re} \lambda \operatorname{Im} \varphi^{\prime}(0)=0 \quad$ and $\quad \operatorname{Re} \lambda \operatorname{Re} \varphi^{\prime}(0)+\operatorname{Im} \lambda \operatorname{Im} \varphi^{\prime}(0)<0$.
Otherwise $s$ is chosen such that

$$
\tan (2 s)=\frac{\operatorname{Re} \lambda \operatorname{Re} \varphi^{\prime}(0)+\operatorname{Im} \lambda \operatorname{Im} \varphi^{\prime}(0)}{-\operatorname{Im} \lambda \operatorname{Re} \varphi^{\prime}(0)+\operatorname{Re} \lambda \operatorname{Im} \varphi^{\prime}(0)}
$$

and $s \in(0, \pi / 4) \cup(3 \pi / 4, \pi)$ if $-\operatorname{Im} \lambda \operatorname{Re} \varphi^{\prime}(0)+\operatorname{Re} \lambda \operatorname{Im} \varphi^{\prime}(0)>0$, and $s \in$ $(\pi / 4,3 \pi / 4)$ if $-\operatorname{Im} \lambda \operatorname{Re} \varphi^{\prime}(0)+\operatorname{Re} \lambda \operatorname{Im} \varphi^{\prime}(0)<0$.

Theorem 2.6. For $k>0$
(i) if $z \in V_{k}^{+}$then $S(z) \in V_{k+1}$ and if $z \in V_{k}^{-}$then $S(z) \in V_{-(k+1)}$,
(ii) if $z \in V_{-k}^{+}$then $S(z) \in V_{-(k+1)}$ and if $z \in V_{-k}^{-}$then $S(z) \in V_{k+1}$.

To prove Theorem 2.6 we need the following Lemmas.
Lemma 2.7. For $z \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $y=\operatorname{Im}(z)>y_{0}$ the following inequalities are satisfied:

$$
\begin{align*}
& |S(z)+\lambda i| \geq M\left(e^{2 y}-\frac{2}{\varrho}+\frac{1}{\varrho^{2} e^{y}}\right)  \tag{2.7}\\
& |S(z)+\lambda i| \leq M\left(e^{2 y}+\frac{2}{\varrho}+\frac{1}{\varrho^{2} e^{y}}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

Proof. Let $\eta=e^{-2 y} / \varrho$ then $\eta \in(0,1)$. Since $\varphi$ is univalent on $B(0, \varrho)$, we can apply Theorem 2.1 to $\varphi$. Then for $|\xi-0|=\eta \varrho$ we get

$$
\frac{\left|\varphi^{\prime}(0)\right| \eta \varrho}{(1+\eta)^{2}} \leq|\varphi(\xi)+1| \leq \frac{\left|\varphi^{\prime}(0)\right| \eta \varrho}{(1-\eta)^{2}}
$$

where $\varphi(0)=-1$. Thus

$$
\left|g_{1}(\varphi(\xi))+\lambda i\right|=2|\lambda| \frac{1}{|\varphi(\xi)+1|}
$$

and if $\xi=g_{2}(z)$ it follows

$$
M\left(\frac{1-2 \eta+\eta^{2}}{\eta \varrho}\right) \leq|S(z)+\lambda i| \leq M\left(\frac{1+2 \eta+\eta^{2}}{\eta \varrho}\right)
$$

Lemma 2.8. Let $z=x \mid i y, z^{\prime}=x^{\prime}+i y^{\prime}$. Suppose $|y| \geq y_{k}, \quad\left|y^{\prime}\right| \geq|y|+$ $2 y_{k-1}, k \geq 1$ and
(2.9) $\left|\sin \left(\arg \left(S z^{\prime}+\lambda i\right)\right)\right|>1 / y_{k}$
then

$$
\left|\operatorname{Im} S z^{\prime}\right| \geq|\operatorname{Im} S z|+2 y_{k+1} .
$$

Proof. We only will consider the case when $y, y^{\prime}>0$. Otherwise one can use property

$$
|\operatorname{Im}(S z)|=|\operatorname{Im}(S(-z))|
$$

which holds as $S$ is an odd function. Using (2.8) and (2.5), we can estimate as follows

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\operatorname{Im} S z| & \leq|S z| \leq|S z+\lambda i|+|\lambda| \leq M\left(e^{2 y}+2 / \varrho+1 /\left(\varrho^{2} e^{y}\right)\right)+|\lambda| \\
& \leq M e^{2 y}+2 M / \varrho+1 / \varrho^{2}+|\lambda| .
\end{aligned}
$$

Analogously, using (2.9) and (2.3) along with (2.4) we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\operatorname{Im} S z^{\prime}\right| & \geq\left|\operatorname{Im}\left(S z^{\prime}+\lambda i\right)\right|-|\lambda|=\left|\sin \left(\arg \left(S z^{\prime}+\lambda i\right)\right)\right| \cdot\left|S z^{\prime}+\lambda i\right|-|\lambda| \\
& \geq \frac{1}{y_{k}} M\left(e^{2 y^{\prime}}-2 / \varrho+1 /\left(\varrho^{2} e^{y^{\prime}}\right)\right)-|\lambda| \geq \frac{1}{y_{k}} M e^{2\left(y+2 y_{k-1}\right)}-2 M / \varrho-|\lambda| \\
& \geq M e^{2 y} y_{k}-2 M / \varrho-|\lambda| \geq M e^{2 y}(1+3 / M)-2 M / \varrho-|\lambda| \\
& \geq M e^{2 y}+2 y_{k+1}+y_{0}-2 M / \varrho-|\lambda| \geq M e^{2 y}+2 M / \varrho+1 / \varrho^{2}+|\lambda|+2 y_{k+1} \\
& \geq|\operatorname{Im} S z|+2 y_{k+1} . \quad \square
\end{aligned}
$$

Lemma 2.9. There is a constant $b$ such that for all $k>0$ and $y_{0}>b$ it holds:
(i) if $z \in V_{k}^{+}$then $\operatorname{Im}(S z)>0$ and $\arg (S(z)+\lambda i) \in\left(2 / y_{k}, \pi-2 / y_{k}\right)$,
(ii) if $z \in V_{k}^{-}$then $\operatorname{Im}(S z)<0$ and $\arg (S(z)+\lambda i) \in\left(\pi+2 / y_{k}, 2 \pi-2 / y_{k}\right)$.

Proof. Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. We will show that each point $z$ which belongs to the half-line

$$
L_{k}=\left\{z=\left(s+n \pi+3 / y_{k}\right)+i y ; y \in \mathbb{R}, y \geq y_{0}\right\}
$$

has the property that

$$
\arg (S z+\lambda i)>2 / y_{k}
$$

We also consider a half-line

$$
L=\left\{z=s+n \pi+i y ; y \in R, y \geq y_{0}\right\} .
$$

Then $g_{2}(z)=e^{(2 i z)}=e^{-2 y} e^{i 2 x}$ maps these straight-lines onto rays starting at 0 i.e. $g_{2}(L)=e^{-2 y} e^{i 2 s}$ and $g_{2}\left(L_{k}\right)=e^{-2 y} e^{i 2\left(s+\frac{3}{y_{k}}\right)}, y \geq y_{0}$. Since $|x-(s+n \pi)|=\frac{3}{y_{k}}$, we get

$$
\left|\arg \left(g_{2}(L)\right)-\arg \left(g_{2}\left(L_{k}\right)\right)\right|=\frac{6}{y_{k}} .
$$

The function $\varphi: B(0, \varrho) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ maps the rays $g_{2}(L)$ and $g_{2}\left(L_{k}\right)$ onto curves starting at $\varphi(0)=-1$. Let $L^{\prime}$ and $L_{k}^{\prime}$ be the half-lines tangent respectively to the curves $\varphi\left(g_{2}(L)\right)$ and $\varphi\left(g_{2}\left(L_{k}\right)\right)$ at $z_{0}=-1$. Hence

$$
\begin{align*}
& L^{\prime}(t)=-1+t e^{\left.i\left[\arg _{\left(\varphi^{\prime}\right.}(0)\right)+2 s\right]}, \quad t \geq 0 \\
& L_{k}^{\prime}(t)=-1+t e^{\left.i\left[\arg _{\left(\varphi^{\prime}\right.}(0)\right)+2 s+6 / y_{k}\right]}, \quad t \geq 0 \tag{2.10}
\end{align*}
$$

Since $\varphi$ is a univalent holomorphic map in $B(0, \rho)$, the angle between $L^{\prime}$ and $L_{k}^{\prime}$ is the same as the angle between $g_{2}(L)$ and $g_{2}\left(L_{k}\right)$ and is equal to $6 / y_{k}$. Fix $z \in L_{k}$ and define $z_{1}=g_{2}(z)$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi\left(z_{1}\right)=-1+r_{1} e^{i \theta}, \quad r>0 \tag{2.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Define $\quad \arg \left(L^{\prime}\right):=\arg \left(\varphi^{\prime}(0)\right)+2 s, \arg \left(L_{k}^{\prime}\right):=\arg \left(\varphi^{\prime}(0)\right)+2 s+6 / y_{k}$. We claim that there exists $b$ such that if $y_{0}>b$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\theta-\arg \left(L_{k}^{\prime}\right)\right|<2 / y_{k} \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

It implies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|0-\arg \left(L^{\prime}\right)\right|>2 / y_{k} \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

since

$$
\frac{6}{y_{k}}=\left|\arg \left(L_{k}^{\prime}\right)-\arg \left(L^{\prime}\right)\right|=\left|\arg \left(L_{k}^{\prime}\right)-\theta+\theta-\arg \left(L^{\prime}\right)\right| .
$$

The half-line $L^{\prime}$ is mapped by $g_{1}(z):=-\lambda i\left(\frac{z-1}{z+1}\right)$ onto half-line starting from $-\lambda i$. We choose $s$ such that $g_{1}\left(L^{\prime}\right)$ is parallel to the real axis $\mathbb{R}$, i.e. $\operatorname{Im}\left(g_{1}\left(L^{\prime}\right)\right)=$ $\operatorname{Im}(-\lambda i)$. One may check that $s=\frac{\pi}{4}$ if

$$
-\operatorname{Im} \lambda \operatorname{Re} \varphi^{\prime}(0)+\operatorname{Re} \lambda \operatorname{Im} \varphi^{\prime}(0)=0 \quad \text { and } \quad \operatorname{Re} \lambda \operatorname{Re} \varphi^{\prime}(0) \mid \operatorname{Im} \lambda \operatorname{Im} \varphi^{\prime}(0)>0
$$

or $s=\frac{3 \pi}{4}$ if

$$
-\operatorname{Im} \lambda \operatorname{Re} \varphi^{\prime}(0)+\operatorname{Re} \lambda \operatorname{Im} \varphi^{\prime}(0)=0 \quad \text { and } \quad \operatorname{Re} \lambda \operatorname{Re} \varphi^{\prime}(0)+\operatorname{Im} \lambda \operatorname{Im} \varphi^{\prime}(0)<0
$$

Otherwise $s$ is chosen such that

$$
\tan (2 s)=\frac{\operatorname{Re} \lambda \operatorname{Re} \varphi^{\prime}(0)+\operatorname{Im} \lambda \operatorname{Im} \varphi^{\prime}(0)}{-\operatorname{Im} \lambda \operatorname{Re} \varphi^{\prime}(0)+\operatorname{Re} \lambda \operatorname{Im} \varphi^{\prime}(0)}
$$

and $s \in(0, \pi / 4) \cup(3 \pi / 4, \pi)$ if $-\operatorname{Im} \lambda \operatorname{Re} \varphi^{\prime}(0)+\operatorname{Re} \lambda \operatorname{Im} \varphi^{\prime}(0)>0$, and $s \in$ $(\pi / 4,3 \pi / 4)$ if $-\operatorname{Im} \lambda \operatorname{Re} \varphi^{\prime}(0)+\operatorname{Re} \lambda \operatorname{Im} \varphi^{\prime}(0)<0$. Consequently for $S(z)=$ $g_{1}\left(\varphi\left(z_{1}\right)\right)$ we get $S(z)=-\lambda i+t e^{i \psi}$ for some $t>0$ and $0<\psi<2 \pi$. Then by (2.13)
(2.14) $\arg (S(z)+\lambda i)>2 / y_{k}$
and we are done. One can check, using similar arguments, that each point $z$ which belongs to the half-line

$$
L_{k}^{1}=\left\{z=\left(s+(n+1 / 2) \pi-\frac{3}{y_{k}}\right)+i y ; y \in R, y \geq y_{0}\right\}
$$

has property

$$
\begin{equation*}
\arg (S(z)+\lambda i)<\pi-2 / y_{k} \tag{2.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

We choose $b$ such that for $y_{0}>b$ the images $S\left(L_{k}\right), S\left(L_{k}^{1}\right)$ are above the line parallel to the real axis, passing trough $-\lambda i$. Also the images of the points belonging to $V_{k}^{+}$and contained in the strip bounded by lines $L_{k}, L_{k}^{1}$ and the line
$y=y_{0}$ have the same property, i.e. $\operatorname{Im}(S(z)+\lambda i)>0$. It follows from (2.14) and (2.15) that these points satisfy the assumption (2.9) of Lemma 2.8. Since $y_{0}>|\operatorname{Im}(\lambda i)|$ by the assumption (2.1), Lemma 2.8 implies that $\operatorname{Im}(S(z))>0$.

Now we prove the claim. Choose $r$ such that $1 / e^{r}<\varrho$. Set $\eta=\frac{1}{e^{r} \varrho}$. Then by Theorem 2.1 (iii) for $\xi \in B\left(0,1 / e^{r}\right)$ we obtain

$$
\left|\arg \left(\frac{\varphi^{\prime}(\xi)}{\varphi^{\prime}(0)}\right)\right| \leq 2 \ln \frac{1+\eta}{1-\eta}=o(1 / r)
$$

where $\ln \frac{1+\eta}{1-\eta}=o(1 / r)$ since $\lim _{\eta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\ln \frac{1+\eta}{1-\eta}}{\eta}=2$. Hence, enlarging $b$ if it is necessary, for $r>b$ and for all $\xi \in B\left(0,1 / e^{2 r}\right)$ we get inequality
(2.16) $\left|\arg \left(\frac{\varphi^{\prime}(\xi)}{\varphi^{\prime}(0)}\right)\right| \leq 1 / r$.

Set

$$
\beta_{1}(t)=z_{1} \cdot t, t \in[0,1],
$$

where $z_{1}$ was defined above and consider the curve $\beta_{2}(t)=\frac{\varphi\left(\beta_{1}(t)\right)}{\varphi^{\prime}(0) z_{1}}, t \in[0,1]$.
Since $\beta_{2}(1)=\frac{\varphi\left(z_{1}\right)}{\varphi^{\prime}(0) z_{1}} \quad$ and $\quad \beta_{2}(0)=\frac{-1}{\varphi^{\prime}(0) z_{1}}$ then $\beta_{2}(1)-\beta_{2}(0)=\frac{\varphi\left(e^{2 i}\right)+1}{\varphi^{\prime}(0) z_{1}}$, and consequently

$$
\begin{equation*}
\arg \left(\beta_{2}(1)-\beta_{2}(0)\right)=\arg \left(\frac{\varphi\left(e^{2 i z}\right)+1}{\varphi^{\prime}(0) z_{1}}\right)=\arg \left(\varphi\left(z_{1}\right)+1\right)-\arg \left(L_{k}^{\prime}\right), \tag{2.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\arg \left(L_{k}^{\prime}\right)$ was defined above. By (2.16)

$$
\left|\arg \left(\varphi^{\prime}\left(\beta_{1}(t)\right) / \varphi^{\prime}(0)\right)\right| \leq 1 / y_{k}
$$

Using (2.17) and the following inequality

$$
\left|\arg \left(\beta_{2}(1)-\beta_{2}(0)\right)\right| \leq \max _{t \in[0,1]}\left|\arg \left(\beta_{2}^{\prime}(t)\right)\right|
$$

we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\arg \left(\frac{\varphi\left(e^{2 i z}\right)+1}{\varphi^{\prime}(0) z_{1}}\right)\right| \leq \max _{t \in[0,1]}\left|\arg \left(\beta_{2}^{\prime}(t)\right)\right|= \\
& \max _{t \in[0,1]}\left|\arg \left(\varphi^{\prime}\left(\beta_{1}(t)\right) / \varphi^{\prime}(0)\right)\right| \leq 2 / y_{k}
\end{aligned}
$$

This proves (2.12) and finishes the proof of part (i). The proof of part (ii) is analogous.

From now we will assume that
(2.18) $y_{0}>b$.

## Proof of Theorem.

Case (i). Suppose $z \in V_{k}^{+} \cup V_{k}^{-}$, for $k>0$, then $|y| \leq y_{k+1}-2 y_{k}$. We must show that

$$
|\operatorname{Im}(S z)|<y_{k+2}-2 y_{k+1} .
$$

Since

$$
|\operatorname{Im} S z| \leq|S z| \leq|S z+\lambda i|+|\lambda|,
$$

and using (2.8) together with (2.5) and (2.4) we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\operatorname{Im} S z| & \leq y_{k+2} M /\left(y_{k+1}\right)^{2}+2 M / \varrho+1 / \varrho^{2}+|\lambda| \\
& \leq y_{k+2} / 2-y_{k+2} / 4+2 M / \varrho+1 / \varrho^{2}+|\lambda| \\
& \leq y_{k+2} / 2 \leq y_{k+2}-2 y_{k+1} .
\end{aligned}
$$

If $z \in V_{k}^{+} \cup V_{k}^{-}$, then $|y| \geq y_{k}+2 y_{k-1}$. It follows from the proof of Lemma 2.9 that if $y_{0}>b$ then Property (2.9) holds for $S(z)$. Then the assumption of Lemma 2.8 are satisfied. So

$$
|\operatorname{Im}(S z)|>2 y_{k+1}>y_{k+1}+2 y_{k}
$$

and consequently $S(z) \in V_{k+1} \cup V_{-(k+1)}$. The proof of case (ii) follows from (i) and the property that $S(z)$ is an odd function.

## 3. PROOF OF THEOREM B

We define a family $\mathcal{G}=\left\{Q_{(n, m)} ; m, n \in \mathbb{Z}\right\}$, where $Q_{(n, m)}$ is a square bounded by straight-lines

$$
x=s+n \pi, \quad x=s+(n+1) \pi, \quad y=m \pi, \quad y=(m+1) \pi
$$

if $m \geq 0$ or

$$
x=-s+n \pi, \quad x=-s+(n+1) \pi, \quad y=m \pi, \quad y=(m+1) \pi
$$

if $m<0$. Let $Q \in \mathcal{G}$ be such that $Q \subset V_{k} \cup V_{-k}$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}, k \neq 0$. Let $\mu \in\{-1,1\}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{Z}^{\mu}(Q):=\left\{Q^{\prime} \in \mathcal{G}: Q^{\prime} \subset \operatorname{Int} S\left(Q \cap V_{k}^{\mu}\right)\right\} \\
& P^{\mu}(Q):=\left\{z \in Q: S z \in \bigcup \mathcal{Z}^{\mu}(Q)\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

For each $i \geq 1$ define

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \bar{\sigma}=\left(\sigma_{0}, \ldots, \sigma_{i-1}\right), \sigma_{j} \in \mathbb{Z}^{2}, j=0, \ldots, i-1 \\
& \bar{\mu}=\left(\mu_{0}, \ldots, \mu_{i-1}\right), \mu_{j} \in\{-1,1\}, j=0, \ldots, i-1, \\
& P_{\bar{\mu}}^{\bar{\sigma}}(Q):=\left\{z \in Q: S^{j_{z}} \in P^{\mu_{j}}\left(Q_{\sigma_{j}}\right), j=0, \ldots, i-1\right\}, \\
& E_{0}(Q):=\{Q\}, \\
& E_{i}(Q):=\left\{P_{\bar{\mu}}^{\bar{\sigma}}(Q): \bar{\mu}, \bar{\sigma} \text { have a length } i\right\}, \\
& E(Q):=\bigcap_{i=0}^{\infty} \overline{E_{i}(Q)}
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\overline{E_{i}(Q)}:=\bigcup E_{i}(Q)
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
E & :=\bigcup\left\{E(Q): Q \in \mathcal{G}, \exists_{k} Q \subset V_{k}\right\} . \\
G & :=\bigcup_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} f^{i}(E) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Lemma 3.1. Let $z \in \mathbb{C}$ be such that $\left|\operatorname{Im} f^{n}(z)\right|>y_{k}-2 y_{k-1}, k \geq 1$. Then

$$
\left|\left(f^{n}\right)^{\prime}(z)\right| \geq \frac{y_{k}}{8 \pi}
$$

Proof. Let $\phi$ be a holomorphic branch of the inverse map $\left(f^{n}\right)^{-1}$ mapping $f^{n}(z)$ onto $z$. Then $\phi$ is univalent in a ball $B\left(f^{n}(z), \frac{y_{k}}{4}\right)$. By Koebe $\frac{1}{4}$-Theorem $\phi\left(B\left(f^{n}(z), \frac{y_{k}}{4}\right)\right) \supset B\left(z, \frac{y_{k}}{16}\left|\phi^{\prime}\left(f^{n}(z)\right)\right|\right)$. Since $\phi\left(B\left(f^{n}(z), \frac{y_{k}}{4}\right)\right)$ is contained in the strip of width $\pi$ we obtain that $\frac{y_{k}}{16}\left|\phi^{\prime}\left(f^{n}(z)\right)\right|<\pi / 2$. It implies that
(3.1) $\left|\phi^{\prime}\left(f^{n}(z)\right)\right|<\frac{8 \pi}{y_{k}}$
and consequently $\left|\left(f^{n}\right)^{\prime}(z)\right| \geq \frac{y_{k}}{8 \pi}$.
Lemma 3.2. For every $Q \in \mathcal{G}$ contained in $V_{k}$

$$
\operatorname{meas}\left(Q \backslash\left(P^{+}(Q) \cup P^{-}(Q)\right)\right) \leq \frac{13 \pi}{y_{k}}
$$

Proof. It follows directly from the definition that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{meas}\left(Q \backslash\left(V_{k}^{+} \cup V_{k}\right)\right) \leq 4 \frac{3 \pi}{y_{k}}=\frac{12 \pi}{y_{k}} \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $S\left(Q \cap V_{k}^{\mu}\right) \backslash \bigcup Z^{\mu}(Q)$ is contained in $\sqrt{2} \pi$-neighborhood of $\partial S\left(Q \cap V_{k}^{\mu}\right)$ then $\left(Q \cap V_{k}^{\mu}\right) \backslash P^{\mu}(Q)$ is a subset of $\sqrt{2} \pi K$-neighbourhood of $\partial\left(Q \cap V_{k}^{\mu}\right)$, where

$$
K:=\max _{z \in S\left(Q \cap v_{k}^{\mu}\right) \backslash \bigcup z^{\mu}(Q)}\left|\left(S^{-1}\right)^{\prime}(z)\right|
$$

and $S^{-1}$ means a holomorphic branch of the inverse function mapping $S\left(Q \cap V_{k}^{\mu}\right)$ onto $Q \cap V_{k}^{\mu}$. It together with (3.1) implies that $\left(Q \cap V_{k}^{\mu}\right) \backslash P^{\mu}(Q)$ is contained in $\frac{8 \sqrt{2} \pi^{2}}{y_{k+1}}$ neighborhood of $\partial\left(Q \cap V_{k}^{\mu}\right)$. Therefore

$$
\operatorname{meas}\left(\left(Q \cap V_{k}^{\mu}\right) \backslash P^{\mu}(Q)\right)<4 \pi \frac{8 \sqrt{2} \pi^{2}}{y_{k+1}}=\frac{32 \sqrt{2} \pi^{3}}{y_{k+1}}
$$

Thus by (3.2) and (2.6) we get

$$
\operatorname{meas}\left(Q \backslash\left(P^{+}(Q) \cup P^{-}(Q)\right)\right) \leq \frac{12 \pi}{y_{k}}+\frac{32 \sqrt{2} \pi^{3}}{y_{k+1}}<\frac{13 \pi}{y_{k}}
$$

Lemma 3.3. There exists a constant $D_{1}>0$ such that for $y_{0}>D_{1}, Q \in \mathcal{G}, Q \subset V_{k}$, $F \in E_{i}(Q)$ and $i \geq 0$ holds

$$
\operatorname{density}\left(\widetilde{E}_{i+1}(Q), F\right):=\frac{\operatorname{meas}\left(\bar{E}_{i+1}(Q) \cap F\right)}{\operatorname{meas}(F)} \geq 1-\frac{5}{y_{|k|+i}}
$$

Proof. Suppose $F \in E_{i}(Q)$ then $S^{i}(F)$ is a square contained in $V_{l}$ with sides of lenght $\pi$, where $|\eta|=|k|+i$. By Lemma 3.2

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{meas}\left(S^{i}(F) \backslash S^{i}\left(\bar{E}_{i+1}(Q)\right)\right) \leq \frac{13 \pi}{y_{|k|+i}} \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Lel $\phi$ be a holomorphic branch of $S^{-i}$ mapping $S^{i}(F)$ onto $F$. Let $z_{i}$ be a center of $S^{i}(F)$. We consider a ball with center at $z_{i} \in S^{i}(F)$ and radius $r=\frac{y_{l I I}}{2}$. Then

$$
S^{i}(F) \subset \bar{B}\left(z_{i}, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \pi\right) \subset B\left(z_{i}, 5\right)
$$

Since $\phi$ is univalent on $B\left(z_{i}, r\right)$ it has a bounded distortion on $B\left(z_{i}, 5\right)$. It follows from Lemma 2.2 and (3.3) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\operatorname{meas}\left(\phi\left(S^{i}(F) \backslash S^{i}\left(\bar{E}_{i+1}(Q)\right)\right)\right)}{\operatorname{meas}\left(\phi\left(S^{i}(F)\right)\right)} & \leq\left(\frac{1+\eta}{1-\eta}\right)^{8} \frac{\operatorname{meas}\left(S^{i}(F) \backslash S^{i}\left(\bar{E}_{i+1}(Q)\right)\right)}{\operatorname{meas}\left(S^{i}(F)\right)} \\
& \leq\left(\frac{1+\eta}{1-\eta}\right)^{8} \frac{13 \pi}{\pi^{2} y_{|k|+i}}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\eta:=\frac{10}{y_{|k|}+i}$. So we can choose $D_{1}$ such that for $y_{0}>D_{1}$ thesis holds.
Lemma 3.4. There exists a constant $D>D_{1}$ such that for $y_{0}>D, Q \in \mathcal{G}, Q \subset V_{k}$ holds

$$
\operatorname{density}(E(Q), Q):=\frac{\operatorname{meas}(E(Q) \cap Q)}{\operatorname{meas}(Q)} \geq 1-\frac{12}{y_{[k]}}
$$

Proof. Fix $k \neq 0$ and assume that $y_{0}>D_{1}$. It follows from Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 3.3 that

$$
\operatorname{density}(E(Q), Q) \geq \prod_{i=0}^{\infty}\left(1-\frac{5}{y_{|k|+i}}\right)
$$

To get a lower bound on $\prod_{i=0}^{\infty}\left(1-\frac{5}{y_{|k|+i}}\right)$ it is enough to find an upper bound on $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{5}{y_{|k|+i}}$. Since

$$
\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{5}{y_{|k|+i}}<\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{5}{y_{|k|}^{i+1}} \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{5}{y_{|k|}^{i+1}}<\frac{5}{y_{|k|}} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{y_{0}^{i}}=\frac{5 y_{0}}{y_{0}-1} \frac{1}{y_{|k|}},
$$

there exists $D>D_{1}$ such that $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{5}{y_{|k|+i}} \leq \frac{6}{y_{|| |}}$for $y_{0}>D$. It follows from (2.6) that $\frac{6}{y_{|k|}}<1 / 2$. Hence by Lemma 2.5 we get

$$
\prod_{i=0}^{\infty}\left(1-\frac{5}{y_{|k|}+i}\right)>1-\frac{12}{y_{|k|}} .
$$

As a consequence of this Lemma we get the following Proposition.
$\operatorname{Proposition~3.5.} \operatorname{meas}(E)>0$.
Further we will assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{0}>D . \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Theorem B. Let $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}_{p}, p \geq 1$, then $f_{\lambda}$ is not ergodic on $J_{\lambda}$. There is a wandering set of positive measure in $J_{\lambda}$.

Proof. We will show that there exist two sets $Q_{1}^{\prime}, Q_{2}^{\prime}$ contained in $E$ which forward trajectories are disjoint. Fix $k>0$ and choose two squares $Q_{1}, Q_{2} \subset$ $V_{k} \cup V_{-k}$ such that
(i) $\operatorname{meas}\left(Q_{i} \cap E\right)>0$,
(ii) for all $z_{1} \in Q_{1}, z_{2} \in Q_{2}$ holds $\left|\operatorname{Im}\left(z_{1}\right)\right|-\left|\operatorname{Im}\left(z_{2}\right)\right|>2 y_{k-1}$.

Denote $Q_{i}^{\prime}:=Q_{i} \cap E, i=1,2$. We will show that for all integers $j \subset N$ the following conditions are satsfied
(a) $S^{j} z_{i} \in V_{k+j} \cup V_{-(k+j)}, i=1,2$,
(b) $\left|\operatorname{Im}\left(S^{j}\left(z_{1}\right)\right)\right|-\left|\operatorname{Im}\left(S^{j}\left(z_{2}\right)\right)\right|>2 y_{k+j-1}$.

The proof is by induction. For $j=0$ the conditions (a) and (b) are just the assumptions (i) and (ii). Let now assume that a), b) holds for $j=n$. Since $E$ is forward invariant for $S$ thus $S^{n}\left(z_{i}\right) \in E$ and by the assumption $S^{n}\left(z_{i}\right) \in$ $V_{k+n} \cup V_{-(k+n)}$. Theorem 2.6 implies that $S^{n+1}\left(z_{i}\right) \in V_{k+n+1} \cup V_{-(k+n+1)}$. For $j=n$ it follows from (b) that

$$
\left|\operatorname{Im}\left(S^{n}\left(z_{1}\right)\right)\right|-\left|\operatorname{Im}\left(S^{n}\left(z_{2}\right)\right)\right|>2 y_{k+n-1}
$$

Since $S^{n}\left(z_{i}\right) \in V_{k+n} \cup V_{-(k+n)}$ thus analogously as in the proof of Lemma 2.9 we can show that

$$
\left|\sin \left(\arg \left(S^{k+n+1}\left(z_{i}\right)+\lambda i\right)\right)\right|>\frac{1}{y_{k+n}} .
$$

Thus the assumption (2.9) of Lemma 2.8 is satisfied. Therefore

$$
\left|\operatorname{Im}\left(S^{n+1}\left(z_{1}\right)\right)\right|-\left|\operatorname{Im}\left(S^{n+1}\left(z_{2}\right)\right)\right|>2 y_{k+n+1}>2 y_{k+n}
$$

what gives the condition (b) for $j=n+1$. Therefore the forward trajectories of $Q_{1}^{\prime}$ and $Q_{2}^{\prime}$ are disjoint. Their great orbits are also disjoint. So $Q_{1}^{\prime}$ and $Q_{2}^{\prime}$ are wandering subsets of $J_{\lambda}$ of positive measure. Define $Q^{\prime}:=\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} S^{j}\left(Q_{1}^{\prime}\right)$, $Q^{\prime \prime}:=\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} S^{j}\left(Q_{2}^{\prime}\right)$. They are invariant, disjoint sets of positive measure. It implies that $f_{\lambda}$ is not ergodic on $J\left(f_{\lambda}\right)=\overline{\mathbb{C}}$.
4. PROOF OF THEOREM A

Lemma 4.1. For almost $z \in \mathbb{C}$ there is a sequence of integers $n_{k} \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$
\left|\operatorname{Im} f^{n_{k}}(z)\right| \rightarrow \infty
$$

Proof. By Theorem 1.1 (i) for almost all $z \in \mathbb{C}$ there is an asymptotic value $\alpha \in\{\lambda i,-\lambda i\}$ and a sequence of integers $n_{1}+1, n_{2}+1, \ldots,\left(n_{k}+1\right), \ldots$ such that $\left|f^{n_{k}+1}(z)-\alpha\right| \rightarrow 0$ and consequently $\left|\operatorname{Im} f^{n_{k}}(z)\right| \rightarrow \infty$.

## Lemma 4.2.

$$
\operatorname{meas}(\mathbb{C} \backslash G)=0
$$

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that meas $(\mathbb{C} \backslash G)>0$. So there exists a density point $z$ of $\mathbb{C} \backslash G$. By Lemma 4.1 there are two sequences of integers $n_{k} \in \mathbb{N}, n_{k} \rightarrow \infty$ and $l_{k} \in \mathbb{Z}, l_{k} \rightarrow \infty$ satisfying

$$
y_{l_{k}}-2 y_{l_{k}-1} \leq\left|\operatorname{Im} f^{n_{k}}(z)\right|<y_{l_{k}+1}-2 y_{l_{k}}
$$

$l_{k} \rightarrow \infty$. Let $\phi_{n_{k}}$ denote the a holomorphic branch of the inverse map $f^{-n_{k}}$ sending $z_{n_{k}}=f^{n_{k}}(z)$ to $z$. Let $K_{n_{k}}$ be a square with center at $z_{n_{k}}$ and sides of lengh $8 y_{l_{k}-1}$. Then

$$
\operatorname{meas}\left(K_{n_{k}} \cap \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{*}} V_{i}\right) \geq \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{meas}\left(K_{n_{k}}\right),
$$

where $\mathbb{Z}_{*}:=\mathbb{Z} \backslash\{0\}$. It implies that for

$$
K_{n_{k}}^{\prime}:=\left\{z \in K_{n_{k}}: \exists Q \in \mathcal{G}, z \in Q \subset K_{n_{k}} \cap \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{*}} V_{i}\right\}
$$

the following inequality is true

$$
\operatorname{meas}\left(K_{n_{k}}^{\prime}\right) \geq \frac{1}{4} \operatorname{meas}\left(K_{n_{k}}\right)
$$

From Lemma 3.4 we have that for $Q \subset \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{*}} V_{i}$

$$
\operatorname{meas}(Q \cap E) \geq \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{meas}(Q)
$$

Hence

$$
\operatorname{meas}\left(K_{n_{k}}^{\prime} \cap E\right) \geq \frac{1}{8} \operatorname{meas}\left(K_{n_{k}}\right) .
$$

The map $\phi_{n_{k}}$ is univalent on the disc $B\left(z_{n_{k}}, 2 r_{n_{k}}\right)$ where $r_{n_{k}}=\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{diam}\left(K_{n_{k}}\right)=$ $4 \sqrt{2} y_{l_{k}-1}$. Also the distortion of $\phi_{n_{k}}$ on disc $B\left(z_{n_{k}}, r_{n_{k}}\right)$ is universally bounded. By Lemma 2.3

$$
B\left(z, \rho_{n_{k}} / 4\right) \subset \phi\left(B\left(z_{n_{k}}, r_{n_{k}}\right)\right) \subset B\left(z, 4 \rho_{n_{k}}\right),
$$

where $\rho_{n_{k}}=\left|\phi_{n_{k}}^{\prime}\left(z_{n_{k}}\right)\right| r_{n_{k}}$. Then, using Lemma 2.2,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\operatorname{meas}\left(B\left(z, 4 \rho_{n_{k}}\right) \cap G\right)}{\operatorname{meas}\left(B\left(z, 4 \rho_{n_{k}}\right)\right)} \geq \frac{\operatorname{meas}\left(B\left(z, 4 \rho_{n_{k}}\right) \cap G\right)}{16^{2} \operatorname{meas}\left(B\left(z, \rho_{n_{k}} / 4\right)\right)} \geq \frac{\operatorname{meas}\left(\phi\left(B\left(z_{n_{k}}, r_{n_{k}}\right)\right) \cap G\right)}{16^{2} \operatorname{meas}\left(\phi\left(B\left(z_{n_{k}}, r_{n_{k}}\right)\right)\right)} \\
& \geq \frac{\operatorname{meas}\left(B\left(z_{n_{k}}, r_{n_{k}}\right) \cap G\right)}{81^{2} 16^{2} \operatorname{meas}\left(B\left(z_{n_{k}}, r_{n_{k}}\right)\right)} \geq \frac{\operatorname{meas}\left(K_{n_{k}}^{\prime} \cap E\right)}{81^{2} 16^{2}(\pi / 2) \operatorname{meas}\left(K_{n_{k}}\right)} \geq \frac{1}{8 \cdot 81^{2} 16^{2}(\pi / 2)}>0
\end{aligned}
$$

Moreover by Lemma 3.1 we get

$$
\rho_{n_{k}}<\frac{4 \sqrt{2} y_{l_{k}-1}}{y_{l_{k}} / 8 \pi} \rightarrow 0 \text { for } k \rightarrow \infty
$$

Since $z$ is a density point of $\mathbb{C} \backslash F$ this leads to a contradiction.
Theorem A. Let $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}_{p}, p \geq 1$. Then $\omega(z)=P_{\lambda}$ for almost all $z \in \mathbb{C}$.
Proof. We will show that

$$
\operatorname{meas}\left(\left\{z \in E: \omega_{S}(z) \neq P_{\lambda}\right\}\right)=0
$$

Let $Q$ be a square in $\mathcal{G}$ such that $Q \subset V_{k}$. Denote:

$$
\begin{aligned}
E_{0}^{\prime} & =\{Q\} \\
E_{i}^{+} & =\left\{P_{\overline{\bar{\sigma}}}^{\bar{\sigma}}(Q): \bar{\mu}, \bar{\sigma}, \text { have length } \mathrm{i}, \mu_{j}=1, j=1, \ldots, i-1\right\} \\
E_{i}^{-} & =\left\{P_{\bar{\mu}}^{\bar{\sigma}}(Q): \bar{\mu}, \bar{\sigma}, \text { have length } \mathrm{i}, \mu_{j}=-1, j=1, \ldots, i-1\right\},
\end{aligned}
$$

Analogously as in Lemma 3.3 we can control distortion of $S^{-n}$. Since for every $Q^{\prime} \subset V_{l}$ and each $\mu \in\{-1,1\}$

$$
\frac{\operatorname{meas}\left(Q^{\prime} \cap V_{l}^{\mu}\right)}{\operatorname{meas}\left(Q^{\prime}\right)} \leq \frac{1}{2}
$$

we obtain for every $F \in E_{i}^{\mu}$

$$
\operatorname{density}\left(\bar{E}_{i+1}^{\mu}, F\right) \leq L_{3} \operatorname{density}\left(Q^{\prime} \cap V_{l}^{\mu}, Q^{\prime}\right) \leq \frac{L_{3}}{2}
$$

for some $L_{3}>0$ and $|l|=|k|+i$. We can assume that the constant $L_{3}$ is less then 1.5. So

$$
\operatorname{density}\left(\bar{E}_{i+1}^{\mu}, F\right)<3 / 4
$$

Consequently by Lemma 2.4
(4.1) $\operatorname{density}\left(\bigcap_{i=0}^{\infty} \bar{E}_{i}^{\mu}, \bar{E}_{0}^{\prime}\right)=0$.

Set $Z:=\left\{z \in G: \omega(z) \neq P_{\lambda}\right\}, W(Q):=\bigcap \bar{E}_{k}^{+} \cup \bigcap \bar{E}_{k}^{-}$. Then

$$
Z \subset \bigcup\left\{\bigcup_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} f^{-i}(W(Q)): Q \in \mathcal{G}, Q \subset V_{k} \text { for some } k\right\}
$$

Since $\operatorname{meas}(W(Q))=0$ by (4.1) then also meas $(Z)=0$.

## 5. PROOF OF THEOREM C

Suppose there exists an invariant measure $\mu$ absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure. It follows from Lemma 4.2 that meas $(\mathbb{C} \backslash G)=0$. Thus also $\mu(\mathbb{C} \backslash G)=0$, so $\mu(G) \neq 0$. Since $G=\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} f^{k}(E)$, then $\mu\left(\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} f^{k}(E)\right) \neq 0$. It implies that $\mu(E) \neq 0$. Suppose to the contrary that $\mu(E)=0$. Since $\mu$ is $f$-invariant, then $\mu\left(f^{k}(E)\right)=\mu(E)=0$ for all $k<0$. For $k \geq 0$ we have $S(E)=f^{(p+1) k}(E) \subset E$, so $\mu\left(f^{(p+1) k}(E)\right)=0$. Now we consider $f^{(p+1) k-q}(E) \subset f^{-q}\left(f^{(p+1) k}((E))=f^{-q}\left(S^{k}(E)\right)\right.$ for $q=1, \ldots, p$. Again since $\mu$ is $f$ invariant, $\mu\left(f^{(p+1) k-q}(E)\right)=0$. Thus $\mu\left(\bigcup_{k \in \sharp} f^{k}(E)\right)=0$ and we get a contradiction.

Denote $A_{k}=\left\{z:|\operatorname{Im}(z)|>y_{k}\right\}, k \geq 1$. Then $E \subset A_{1}$ and $S^{j}(E) \subset A_{j}$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that $S^{-k}\left(S^{k}(E)\right) \supset E$ so $\mu\left(A_{k}\right) \geq \mu(E)$. Since $f\left(A_{k}\right)$ is contained in a union of two balls $B\left(\lambda i, \rho_{k}\right) \cup B\left(-\lambda i, \rho_{k}\right)$, where $\rho_{1}>\rho_{1}>\ldots$ and $\rho_{k} \rightarrow 0$ for $k \rightarrow \infty$, then $\{\lambda i,-\lambda i\}=\bigcap_{k \geq 1} B\left(\lambda i, \rho_{k}\right) \cup B\left(-\lambda i, \rho_{k}\right)$ and $\mu(\{\lambda i,-\lambda i\})=$ $\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu\left(B\left(\lambda i, \rho_{k}\right) \cup B\left(-\lambda i, \rho_{k}\right)\right) \geq \mu(E)$. It leads to a contradiction with the definition of absolutely continouos measure with respect to the Lebesgue measure.
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