

# SWEEPING AND THE DIRICHLET PROBLEM AT THE MARTIN BOUNDARY OF A FINE DOMAIN

MOHAMED EL KADIRI AND BENT FUGLEDE

ABSTRACT. We study sweeping in the Martin compactification  $\overline{U}$  of a fine domain  $U$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $n \geq 2$ , and solve the Dirichlet problem at the Martin boundary of  $U$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The fine topology on an open set  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  was introduced by H. Cartan in classical potential theory. It is defined as the smallest topology on  $\Omega$  in which every superharmonic function on  $\Omega$  is continuous. Potential theory on a finely open set, for example in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , was introduced and studied in the 1970's by the second named author [11]. The harmonic and superharmonic functions and the potentials in this theory are termed finely [super]harmonic functions and fine potentials. Generally one distinguishes by the prefix 'fine(ly)' notions in fine potential theory from those in classical potential theory on a usual (Euclidean) open set. Large parts of classical potential theory have been extended to fine potential theory.

The integral representation of nonnegative finely superharmonic functions by using Choquet's method of extreme points was studied by the first named author in [8], where it was shown that the cone of nonnegative superharmonic functions equipped with the natural topology has a compact base. This allowed the present authors in [10] to define the Martin compactification and the Martin boundary of a fine domain  $U$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . The Martin compactification  $\overline{U}$  of  $U$  was defined by injection of  $U$  in a compact base of the cone  $\mathcal{S}(U)$  of nonnegative finely superharmonic functions on  $U$ . While the Martin boundary of a usual domain is closed and hence compact, all we can say in the present setup is that the Martin boundary  $\Delta(U)$  of  $U$  is a  $G_\delta$  subset of the compact Riesz-Martin space  $\overline{U} = U \cup \Delta(U)$  endowed with the natural topology. Nevertheless we can define a suitably measurable Riesz-Martin kernel  $K : U \times \overline{U} \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ . Every function  $u \in \mathcal{S}(U)$  has an integral representation  $u(x) = \int_{\overline{U}} K(x, Y) d\mu(Y)$  in terms of a Radon measure  $\mu$  on  $\overline{U}$ . This representation is unique if it is required that  $\mu$  be carried by  $U \cup \Delta_1(U)$ , where  $\Delta_1(U)$  denotes the minimal Martin boundary of  $U$ , which likewise is a  $G_\delta$  in  $\overline{U}$ . In this case of uniqueness we write  $\mu = \mu_u$ . We show that  $u$  is a fine potential,

resp. an invariant function, if and only if  $\mu_u$  is carried by  $U$ , resp. by  $\Delta(U)$ . The invariant functions, likewise studied in [10], generalize the non-negative harmonic functions in the classical Riesz decomposition theorem.

There is a notion of minimal thinness of a set  $E \subset U$  at a point  $Y \in \Delta_1(U)$ , and an associated minimal-fine filter  $\mathcal{F}(Y)$ , which allowed the authors in [10] to obtain a generalization of the classical Fatou-Naïm-Doob theorem. We showed that, for any finely superharmonic function  $u \geq 0$  on  $U$  and for  $\mu_1$ -almost every point  $Y \in \Delta_1(U)$ ,  $u(x)$  has the limit  $(d\mu_u/d\mu_1)(Y)$  as  $x \rightarrow Y$  along the minimal-fine filter  $\mathcal{F}(Y)$ . Here  $d\mu_u/d\mu_1$  denotes the Radon-Nikodým derivative of the absolutely continuous component of  $\mu_u$  with respect to the absolutely continuous component of the measure  $\mu_1$  representing the constant function 1, which is finely harmonic and hence invariant.

In the present continuation of [10] we study sweeping on a subset of the Riesz-Martin space, and the Dirichlet problem at the Martin boundary. An important integral representation of suitable swept functions (Theorem 3.9) seems to be new even in the case where  $U$  is a Euclidean domain. Furthermore we define the notion of minimal thinness of a subset of  $U$  at a point of  $\Delta_1(U)$ , and the associated minimal-fine topology on  $\bar{U}$ . This mf-topology is finer than the natural topology on  $\bar{U}$ , and induces on  $U$  the fine topology there. For the study of the Dirichlet problem at the Martin boundary in the last section we use the natural topology because it gives the stronger results. Concerning resolutivity we also consider a more general concept of quasiresolutivity which does not seem to have been considered before in the literature in the classical case where  $U$  is Euclidean open.

**Notations:** For a Green domain  $\Omega$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $n \geq 2$ , we denote by  $G_\Omega$  the Green kernel for  $\Omega$ . If  $U$  is a fine domain in  $\Omega$  we denote by  $\mathcal{S}(U)$  the convex cone of non-negative finely superharmonic functions on  $U$  in the sense of [11]. The convex cone of fine potentials on  $U$  (that is, the functions in  $\mathcal{S}(U)$  for which every finely subharmonic minorant is  $\leq 0$ ) is denoted by  $\mathcal{P}(U)$ . The cone of invariant functions on  $U$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{H}_i(U)$ ; it is the orthogonal band to  $\mathcal{P}(U)$  relative to  $\mathcal{S}(U)$ . By  $G_U$  we denote the (fine) Green kernel for  $U$ , cf. [12], [15]. If  $A \subset U$  and  $f : A \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  one denotes by  $R_f^A$ , resp.  $\widehat{R}_f^A$ , the reduced function, resp. the swept function, of  $f$  on  $A$  relative to  $U$ , cf. [11, Section 11]. If  $u \in \mathcal{S}(U)$  and  $A \subset \bar{U}$  we may write  $\widehat{R}_u^A$  for  $\widehat{R}_f^A$  with  $f := 1_A u$ . For any set  $A \subset \Omega$  we denote by  $\widetilde{A}$  the fine closure of  $A$  in  $\Omega$ , and by  $b(A)$  the base of  $A$  in  $\Omega$ , that is, the set of points of  $\Omega$  at which  $A$  is not thin, in other words the set of all fine limit points of  $A$  in  $\Omega$ .

## 2. SWEEPING ON SUBSETS OF $\bar{U}$

We shall need an ad hoc concept of a (fine) Perron family. Recall from [10, Section 3] the continuous affine form  $\Phi \geq 0$  on  $\mathcal{S}(U)$  such that the chosen

compact base  $B$  of the cone  $\mathcal{S}(U)$  consists of all  $u \in \mathcal{S}(U)$  with  $\Phi(u) = 1$ . Cover  $\Omega$  by a sequence of Euclidean open balls  $B_k$  with closures  $\overline{B}_k$  contained in  $\Omega$ . We refer to [10, Lemma 3.14] for the proof of the following lemma:

**Lemma 2.1.** (a) *The mapping  $U \ni y \mapsto G_U(\cdot, y) \in \mathcal{S}(U)$  is continuous from  $U$  with the fine topology into  $\mathcal{S}(U)$  with the natural topology.*

(b) *The function  $U \ni y \mapsto \Phi(G_U(\cdot, y)) \in ]0, +\infty[$  is finely continuous on  $U$ .*

(c) *The sets*

$$V_k = \{y \in U : \Phi(G_U(\cdot, y)) > 1/k\} \cap B_k$$

*form a countable cover of  $U$  by finely open sets which are relatively naturally compact in  $U$ .*

**Definition 2.2.** A nonvoid lower directed family  $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{S}(U)$  is called a (fine) Perron family if  $\widehat{R}_u^{U \setminus V_k} \in \mathcal{F}$  for every  $k$  and every  $u \in \mathcal{F}$ .

**Theorem 2.3.** *If  $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{S}(U)$  is a Perron family then  $\widehat{\inf} \mathcal{F}$  is an invariant function.*

*Proof.* Fix  $k$ . Clearly

$$\widehat{\inf} \mathcal{F} = \widehat{\inf} \{\widehat{R}_u^{U \setminus V_k} : u \in \mathcal{F}\},$$

and the family  $\{\widehat{R}_u^{U \setminus V_k} : u \in \mathcal{F}\}$  is lower directed in  $U$ . By [10, Lemma 2.4] each  $\widehat{R}_u^{U \setminus V_k}$  is invariant in  $V_k$ , and so is therefore  $\widehat{\inf} \mathcal{F}|_{V_k}$  according to [10, Theorem 2.6 (c)]. Consequently,  $\widehat{\inf} \mathcal{F}$  is likewise invariant, by [10, Theorem 2.6 (b)].  $\square$

We are now prepared to study sweeping on  $\overline{U}$ , following in part the classical procedure, cf. [6], [3, Section 8.2], the main deviations being caused by the non-compactness of  $\Delta(U)$ . See also Definition 3.15 and Theorem 3.17 below for the analogous and actually identical notion of sweeping relative to the minimal-fine topology on  $\overline{U}$ .

**Definition 2.4.** Let  $A \subset \overline{U}$ . For any function  $u \in \mathcal{S}(U)$  the reduction of  $u$  on  $A$  is defined by

$$R_u^A = \inf\{v \in \mathcal{S}(U) : v \geq u \text{ on } A \cap U \text{ and on } W \cap U \text{ for some } W \in \mathcal{W}(A)\},$$

where  $\mathcal{W}(A)$  denotes the family of all open sets  $W \subset \overline{U}$  with the natural topology such that  $W \supset A \cap \Delta(U)$ . The sweeping  $\widehat{R}_u^A$  of  $u$  on  $A$  is defined as the greatest finely l.s.c. minorant of  $R_u^A$ .

Thus  $\widehat{R}_u^A$  is of class  $\mathcal{S}(U)$ . It is convenient to express  $R_u^A$  and  $\widehat{R}_u^A$  in terms of reduction and sweeping on subsets of  $U$ , cf. [6, 1.III.5]:

$$R_u^A = \inf\{R_u^{(A \cup W) \cap U} : W \in \mathcal{W}(A)\},$$

$$\widehat{R}_u^A = \widehat{\inf} \{ \widehat{R}_u^{(A \cup W) \cap U} : W \in \mathcal{W}(A) \}.$$

In particular, for any subset  $A$  of  $U$ , the present reduction  $R_u^A$  and sweeping  $\widehat{R}_u^A$  relative to  $\overline{U}$  reduce to the similarly denoted usual reduction and sweeping on  $A$  relative to  $U$ . Note that if  $A \subset \Delta(U)$  we may replace  $A \cup W$  by  $W$  in the above expressions for  $R_u^A$  and  $\widehat{R}_u^A$ .

By the fundamental convergence theorem [11, Theorem 11.8] and the quasi-Lindelöf property for finely u.s.c. functions (cf. [11, §3.9] for finely l.s.c. functions), there is a decreasing sequence  $(W_j)$  of sets  $W_j \in \mathcal{W}(A)$  (depending on  $u$ ) such that it suffices to take for  $W$  the sets  $W_j$ , in the above definitions and alternative expressions.

*Remark 2.5.* If  $A \subset \Delta(U)$  then  $\mathcal{W}(A)$  is the family of all open sets  $W \subset \overline{U}$  containing  $A$ , and it then suffices to take for  $W$  a decreasing sequence of open sets  $W_j \supset A$  (depending on  $u$ ) such that  $\bigcap_j \overline{W}_j \subset \overline{A}$ . In fact,  $\overline{A}$  is the intersection of a decreasing sequence of open sets  $V_j \subset \overline{U}$ , and we merely have to replace the above  $(W_j)$  by the decreasing sequence of open sets  $W_j \cap V_j \in \mathcal{W}(A)$  whose intersection clearly is contained in  $\overline{A}$ . If  $A$  is a compact subset of  $\Delta(U)$  we may therefore take  $W_j = V_j$  (independently of  $u$ ).

**Proposition 2.6.** *Let  $A$  and  $B$  be two subsets of  $\overline{U}$  and let  $u, v \in \mathcal{S}(U)$  and  $0 < \alpha < +\infty$ . Then*

1.  $\widehat{R}_u^{A \cup B} \leq \widehat{R}_u^A + \widehat{R}_u^B$ .
2. If  $A \subset B$  then  $\widehat{R}_u^A \leq \widehat{R}_u^B$ .
3. If 0 times  $+\infty$  is defined to be 0 then  $\widehat{R}_{\alpha u}^A = \alpha \widehat{R}_u^A$ .
4.  $\widehat{R}_{u+v}^A = \widehat{R}_u^A + \widehat{R}_v^A$ .
5. For any decreasing sequence of functions  $u_j \in \mathcal{S}(U)$  we have  $\widehat{\inf}_j \widehat{R}_{u_j}^A = \widehat{R}_{\widehat{\inf}_j u_j}^A$ .
6. If  $A \subset B$  then  $\widehat{R}_{\widehat{R}_u^A}^B = \widehat{R}_{\widehat{R}_u^A}^A = \widehat{R}_u^A$ .

*Proof.* Property 1. is established just as in [6, (4.1), p. 39] (with  $v = 0$ ): For  $u_A \in \mathcal{S}(U)$  with  $u_A \geq u$  on some  $W_A \in \mathcal{W}(A)$  and an analogous  $u_B$  we have  $u_A + u_B \in \mathcal{S}(U)$  and  $u_A + u_B \geq u$  on  $A \cup B$ . This implies  $R_u^{A \cup B} \leq R_u^A + R_u^B$ . The asserted inequality therefore holds quasieverywhere and hence everywhere on  $U$ , by fine continuity. Property 2. follows from  $\mathcal{W}(A) \subset \mathcal{W}(B)$ . Property 3. follows from  $\widehat{R}_{\alpha u}^{(A \cup W)} = \alpha \widehat{R}_u^{(A \cup W)}$  by taking  $\widehat{\inf}$  over  $W \in \mathcal{W}(A)$ . As to 4. we have for any  $W \in \mathcal{W}(A)$   $\widehat{R}_{u+v}^{(A \cup W) \cap U} = \widehat{R}_u^{(A \cup W) \cap U} + \widehat{R}_v^{(A \cup W) \cap U}$ , whence the asserted equation by taking the natural limits of the decreasing nets on  $\mathcal{S}(U)$  in question as the index  $W$  ranges over the lower directed family  $\mathcal{W}(A)$ , cf. [10, Theorem 2.9].

Concerning 5., according to [10, Lemmas 2.1 and 2.3],  $u_j$  is Euclidean Borel measurable and

$$R_{u_j}^{(A \cup W) \cap U}(x) = \int_U u_j d\varepsilon_x^{\mathcal{C}(U \setminus (A \cup W))} \leq u_j(x) \leq u_1(x)$$

(complements relative to  $\Omega$ ). For given  $x \in U$  with  $u_1(x) < +\infty$  and  $W \in \mathcal{W}(A)$  consider the equalities

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_j R_{u_j}^{(A \cup W) \cap U}(x) &= \inf_j \int_U u_j d\varepsilon_x^{\mathcal{C}(U \setminus (A \cup W))} = \int_U \inf_j u_j d\varepsilon_x^{\mathcal{C}(U \setminus (A \cup W))} \\ &= \int_U \widehat{\inf_j u_j} d\varepsilon_x^{\mathcal{C}(U \setminus (A \cup W))} = R_{\widehat{\inf_j u_j}}^{(A \cup W) \cap U}(x). \end{aligned}$$

The first and the last equalities hold by [10, Lemma 2.1]. The second equality is obvious (Lebesgue), the integrals being finite by hypothesis. The third equality holds if  $\widehat{\inf_j u_j}(x) = \inf_j u_j(x)$ , for either  $x \in U \cap b((A \cup W) \cap U)$ , and then  $\varepsilon_x^{\mathcal{C}(U \setminus (A \cup W))} = \varepsilon_x$ ; or else  $x \in U \setminus b((A \cup W) \cap U)$ , and then  $\varepsilon_x^{\mathcal{C}(U \setminus (A \cup W))}$  does not charge the polar set  $\{\inf_j u_j \neq \widehat{\inf_j u_j}\}$ . The resulting equality in the above display thus holds q.e. for  $x \in U$ , and hence also everywhere on  $U$  after finely l.s.c. regularization of both members.

Property 6. is known for  $A, B \subset U$ . For general  $A, B \subset \overline{U}$  the first and the second member of the equalities in 6. lie between  $\widehat{R}_{\widehat{R}_u^A}^A$  and  $\widehat{R}_u^A$  in view of 2., and it therefore suffices to consider the case where  $A = B$ . For given  $W \in \mathcal{W}(A)$  consider a decreasing sequence  $(W_j) \subset \mathcal{W}(A)$  such that  $\widehat{R}_u^A = \widehat{\inf_j R_{u_j}^{(A \cup W_j) \cap U}}$ . Replacing  $W_j$  by  $W_j \cap W$  we achieve that  $W_j \subset W$ , and hence

$$\widehat{R}_{\widehat{R}_u^{(A \cup W_j) \cap U}}^{(A \cup W) \cap U} = \widehat{R}_u^{(A \cup W_j) \cap U}.$$

According to 5. this implies 6. by taking  $\widehat{\inf_j}$  and next taking  $\widehat{\inf}_{W \in \mathcal{W}(A)}$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 2.7.** *Let  $u \in \mathcal{S}(U)$ . For any subset  $A$  of  $\Delta(U)$  the function  $\widehat{R}_u^A$  is invariant, and we have  $\widehat{R}_u^A \preceq u$ .*

*Proof.* Consider the family

$$\mathcal{F} := \{\widehat{R}_u^{W \cap U} : W \in \mathcal{W}(A)\}.$$

Clearly,  $\mathcal{F}$  is lower directed. Consider the compact sets  $A_{kl} \subset U$  in the proof of [10, Proposition 3.10]. Fix  $k$  and  $V_k$  from Lemma 2.1. In view of that lemma and the text preceding it,  $\overline{U} \setminus A_{kk}$  is open in  $\overline{U}$  and contains  $\Delta(U)$ . In Definition 2.4 of  $\widehat{R}_u^A$  it therefore suffices to consider open sets  $W \supset A$  such that  $W \subset \overline{U} \setminus A_{kk}$ , whereby  $W \cap U \subset U \setminus A_{kk} \subset U \setminus V_k$ . By 6. in Proposition 2.6 we then have  $\widehat{R}_{\widehat{R}_u^{W \cap U}}^{U \setminus V_k} = \widehat{R}_u^{W \cap U}$ . The lower directed family  $\mathcal{F} := \{\widehat{R}_u^{W \cap U} : W \in \mathcal{W}(A)\}$  is therefore a Perron family in the sense of

Definition 2.2. By Definition 2.4 we have  $\widehat{R}_u^A = \inf \mathcal{F}$ , and it therefore follows by Theorem 2.3 that  $\widehat{R}_u^A$  indeed is invariant. Consequently,  $\widehat{R}_u^A \preceq u$  in view of [10, Lemma 2.2].  $\square$

**Proposition 2.8.** *Let  $u \in \mathcal{S}(U)$ . (a) For any increasing sequence  $(A_j)$  of subsets of  $\overline{U}$  we have  $\widehat{R}_u^{\bigcup_j A_j} = \sup_j \widehat{R}_u^{A_j}$ .*

(b) *For any sequence  $(A_j)$  of subsets of  $\overline{U}$  we have  $\widehat{R}_u^{\bigcup_j A_j} \leq \sum_j \widehat{R}_u^{A_j}$ .*

*Proof.* For (a) we proceed much as in [6, p. 74, Proof of (e)] (where  $U$  is a Euclidean Green domain). Writing  $A = \bigcup_j A_j$  and  $v = \sup_j \widehat{R}_u^{A_j}$  the inequality  $v \leq \widehat{R}_u^A$  is obvious. For the opposite inequality we shall also consider  $\widehat{R}_u^{A_j \cap \Delta(U)}$ . Consider a point  $x \in U$  for which  $u(x) < +\infty$  and  $\widehat{R}_u^{A_j \cap \Delta(U)}(x) = R_u^{A_j \cap \Delta(U)}(x)$ . For any integer  $j > 0$  there exists  $W_j \in \mathcal{W}(A_j \cap \Delta(U)) = \mathcal{W}(A_j)$  and  $v_j \in \mathcal{S}(U)$  such that  $v_j \geq u$  on  $W_j \cap U$  and

$$v_j(x) \leq R_u^{A_j \cap \Delta(U)}(x) + 2^{-j} = \widehat{R}_u^{A_j \cap \Delta(U)}(x) + 2^{-j}.$$

The swept function  $\widehat{R}_u^{A_j \cap \Delta(U)}$  is invariant by Proposition 2.7, and  $\widehat{R}_u^{A_j \cap \Delta(U)} \leq \widehat{R}_u^{W_j \cap U} \leq R_u^{W_j \cap U} \leq v_j$ . Hence  $\widehat{R}_u^{A_j \cap \Delta(U)} \preceq v_j$ . We show that for any integer  $k > 0$  the function

$$(2.1) \quad u'_k := v + \sum_{j \geq k} (v_j - \widehat{R}_u^{A_j \cap \Delta(U)})$$

is of class  $\mathcal{S}(U)$ . In the first place, each term in the sum is of class  $\mathcal{S}(U)$ . Because  $v_j$  is finely continuous and  $\widehat{R}_u^{A_j \cap \Delta(U)}$  is finely u.s.c. there is a fine neighborhood  $V$  of  $x$  with Euclidean compact closure  $\overline{V}$  in  $\Omega$  contained in  $U$  and such that  $v_j \leq R_u^{A_j \cap \Delta(U)} + 2^{1-j}$  on  $V$  and hence on  $\overline{V}$ , by fine continuity. We may further arrange that  $u$  is bounded on  $\overline{V}$  and that  $\widehat{R}_u^{A_j \cap \Delta(U)} = \widehat{R}_u^{W_j \cap U}$  on  $\overline{V}$ . Then

$$\int (v_j - \widehat{R}_u^{A_j \cap \Delta(U)}) d\varepsilon_x^{\Omega \setminus V} \leq v_j(x) - \widehat{R}_u^{A_j \cap \Delta(U)}(x) \leq 2^{1-j},$$

since  $\varepsilon_x^{\Omega \setminus V}$  is carried by  $\overline{V}$  and does not charge any polar set. See also [11, Section 8.4]. It follows that the finely hyperharmonic sum in (2.1) is of class  $\mathcal{S}(U)$ , having a finite integral with respect to  $\varepsilon_x^{\Omega \setminus V}$ . For any  $W \in \mathcal{W}(A_j)$  we have  $\widehat{R}_u^{(A_j \cup W) \cap U} = u$  q.e. on  $(A_j \cup W) \cap U$ , in particular q.e. on  $A_j \cap U$ . By Definition 2.4 we have  $\widehat{R}_u^{A_j} = u$  q.e. on  $A_j \cap U$  (because it suffices to consider a suitable sequence of sets  $W$ ). It follows that  $v = u$  q.e. on each  $A_j \cap U$  and hence also q.e. on  $A \cap U$ . Choose a superharmonic function  $s > 0$  on  $\Omega$  such that  $s(y) = +\infty$  for every  $y$  in the polar set  $\{y \in A \cap U : v(y) \neq u(y)\} \cup \{y \in$

$A \cap U : \widehat{R}_u^{A_j \cap \Delta(U)} \neq R_u^{A_j \cap \Delta(U)}$ . For any  $\delta > 0$  we then have  $u'_k + \delta s \geq v + \delta s \geq u$  on  $A \cap U$ . Because  $v \geq \widehat{R}_u^{A_j} \geq \widehat{R}_u^{A_j \cap \Delta(U)}$  we obtain for  $j \geq k$

$$u'_k \geq \widehat{R}_u^{A_j \cap \Delta(U)} + (v_j - \widehat{R}_u^{A_j \cap \Delta(U)}) = v_j,$$

and hence  $u'_k \geq v_j \geq u$  on  $W_j \cap U$  for  $j \geq k$ . Altogether,  $u'_k + \delta s \geq u$  on  $A \cap U$  and on  $W_j \cap U$ . It follows by Definition 2.4 that  $u'_k + \delta s \geq \widehat{R}_u^A$ , and hence for  $\delta \rightarrow 0$  that  $u'_k \geq \widehat{R}_u^A$  q.e. and actually everywhere on  $U$ . But  $u'_k \searrow v$  q.e. (namely at each point where  $u'_1$  is finite). Consequently  $v \geq \widehat{R}_u^A$  q.e. on  $U$  and so indeed everywhere on  $U$ .

(b) is easily deduced from (a) applied with  $A_j$  replaced by  $A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_j$ , in view of 1. in Proposition 2.6 (extended to finite unions). There is also a simple direct proof, cf. [3, Lemma 8.2.2 (i)] for the case of a Euclidean Green domain  $U$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 2.9.** *For any  $A \subset \overline{U}$  we have  $\widehat{R}_u^A = \widehat{R}_u^{A \cap \Delta(U)} + \widehat{R}_v^{A \cap U}$ , where  $v := u - \widehat{R}_u^{A \cap \Delta(U)}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $s \in \mathcal{S}(U)$ ,  $s \geq u$  on  $A \cap U$  and on a neighborhood of  $A \cap \Delta(U)$ . Then  $s \geq \widehat{R}_u^{A \cap \Delta(U)}$ , which is invariant by Proposition 2.7, and so  $\widehat{R}_u^{A \cap \Delta(U)} \preceq s$ . Furthermore,  $s - \widehat{R}_u^{A \cap \Delta(U)} \geq u - \widehat{R}_u^{A \cap \Delta(U)} = v$  on  $A \cap U$ . It follows that  $s - \widehat{R}_u^{A \cap \Delta(U)} \geq \widehat{R}_v^{A \cap U}$ , and so  $s \geq \widehat{R}_u^{A \cap \Delta(U)} + \widehat{R}_v^{A \cap U}$ . This shows that  $\widehat{R}_u^A \geq \widehat{R}_u^{A \cap \Delta(U)} + \widehat{R}_v^{A \cap U}$ . For the opposite inequality let  $w \in \mathcal{S}(U)$ ,  $w \geq u$  on  $A \cap U$  and on a neighborhood of  $A \cap \Delta(U)$ . Then  $w \geq \widehat{R}_u^{A \cap \Delta(U)}$  on  $A \cap U$ , and since  $\widehat{R}_u^{A \cap \Delta(U)}$  is invariant as noted above, we have  $w - \widehat{R}_u^{A \cap \Delta(U)} \in \mathcal{S}(U)$ . By hypothesis this function majorizes  $v$  on  $A \cap U$ , and we therefore get  $w \geq \widehat{R}_u^{A \cap \Delta(U)} + \widehat{R}_v^{A \cap U}$ . By varying  $w$  this leads to the remaining inequality  $\widehat{R}_u^A \geq \widehat{R}_u^{A \cap \Delta(U)} + \widehat{R}_v^{A \cap U}$ .  $\square$

For any (positive Radon) measure  $\mu$  on  $\overline{U}$  we write for brevity  $K\mu = \int_{\overline{U}} K(\cdot, Y) d\mu(Y)$ . We say that a measure  $\mu$  represents a function  $u \in \mathcal{S}(U)$  if  $u = K\mu$ .

**Corollary 2.10.** *Let  $H$  be a compact subset of  $\overline{U}$  and  $\mu$  a Radon measure on  $\overline{U}$  carried by  $H$ . Then  $K\mu$  is invariant on  $U \setminus H$ .*

*Proof.* By Proposition 2.9 there is a function  $v \in \mathcal{S}(U)$  such that  $\widehat{R}_{K\mu}^H = \widehat{R}_{K\mu}^{H \cap \Delta(U)} + \widehat{R}_v^{H \cap U}$ . By Proposition 2.7 the former term on the right is invariant, and the latter term is invariant on  $U \setminus H$  according to [10, Lemma 2.4].  $\square$

**Corollary 2.11.** *Let  $A \subset \overline{U}$  and  $u \in \mathcal{S}(U)$ . Then  $\widehat{R}_u^A$  from Definition 2.4 is invariant on  $U \setminus \overline{A}$ .*

*Proof.* For  $A \subset U$  this follows from [10, Lemma 2.4], and for  $A \subset \Delta(U)$  it follows from Proposition 2.7. For general  $A \subset \overline{U}$  it therefore follows by application of Proposition 2.9.  $\square$



For a (positive) Borel measure  $\mu$  on  $U$  we denote by  $\mu$  the outer  $\mu$ -measure.

**Proposition 2.12.** *Let  $p = G_U\mu$  be a fine potential on  $U$  and let  $V$  be a finely open subset of  $U$ . Then  $p|_V$  is invariant if and only if  $\mu(V) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $p|_V$  is invariant. According to [15, Lemma 2.6] we have

$$p = G_V\mu + \widehat{R}_p^{U \setminus V} \quad \text{on } U.$$

By [10, Lemma 2.4]  $\widehat{R}_p^{U \setminus V}$  is invariant on  $V$ , and by hypothesis  $p$  is invariant on  $V$ . So is therefore the difference  $G_V\mu$ , the invariant functions on  $V$  forming a band in  $\mathcal{S}(V)$ . But  $G_V\mu$  is a fine potential on  $V$ , so we must have  $G_V\mu = 0$  on  $V$ , hence on the regularization  $r(V)$ , that is,  $\mu(V) \leq \mu(r(V)) = 0$ . Conversely, suppose that  $\mu(V) = 0$ . Then  $\mu(r(V)) = 0$ , hence  $G_V\mu = 0$  and  $p = \widehat{R}_p^{U \setminus V}$ , which is invariant on  $V$ , as just noted.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.13.** *Let  $A \subset \overline{U}$  and  $u \in \mathcal{S}(U)$ . Then there exists a measure on  $\overline{U}$  representing  $\widehat{R}_u^A$  and carried by  $\overline{A}$ .*

*Proof.* We may suppose that  $\widehat{R}_u^A \neq 0$ , in particular  $u > 0$ , the case  $\widehat{R}_u^A = 0$  being trivial. For any probability measure  $\nu$  on  $B$  we denote in this proof by  $b(\nu)$  the barycenter of  $\nu$ .

Suppose first that  $A \subset U$ . Let  $p$  be a fine potential  $> 0$  on  $U$ . For any natural number  $k$  there exists a non-zero Radon measure  $\sigma_k$  on  $\overline{U}$  representing the fine potential  $\widehat{R}_{u \wedge kp}^A > 0$  on  $U$ , and  $\sigma_k$  is carried by  $U$  according to [10, Corollary 3.25]. In view of the first paragraph of [10, Section 3] we have

$$\widehat{R}_{u \wedge kp}^A = K\sigma_k = \int_U K(\cdot, y)d\sigma_k(y) = \int_U G_U(\cdot, y)d\tau_k(y)$$

with  $d\tau_k(y) = \Phi(G_U(\cdot, y))^{-1}d\sigma_k(y)$ . Here we use that the finite non-zero function  $y \mapsto \Phi(G_U(\cdot, y))$  on  $U$  is finely continuous by Lemma 2.1 (b) and hence Borel measurable by [10, Lemma 2.1]. Thus there is indeed a non-zero Borel measure  $\tau_k$  on  $U$  as stated. By Corollary 2.11  $\widehat{R}_{u \wedge kp}^A$  is invariant on  $U \setminus \overline{A}$ , and hence  $\tau_k$  is carried by  $\overline{A}$  according to Proposition 2.12. It follows that  $\sigma_k$  likewise is carried by  $\overline{A}$ .

Consider for each  $k$  the probability measure  $\nu_k$  on  $B$  defined by  $\nu_k(E) = \sigma_k(E \cap U)/\sigma_k(U)$  for any Borel subset  $E$  of  $\overline{U}$ . Clearly,  $\nu_k$  is carried by  $\overline{A}$  along with  $\sigma_k$ . The sequence  $(\nu_k)$  has a subsequence  $(\nu_{k_j})$  which converges vaguely to a probability measure  $\nu$  on  $\overline{U}$ , necessarily carried by  $\overline{A}$ . On the other hand,  $\widehat{R}_{u \wedge kp}^A \rightarrow \widehat{R}_u^A$  pointwise and increasingly for  $k \rightarrow +\infty$ . It follows by [10, Theorem 2.10] that  $\widehat{R}_{u \wedge kp}^A \rightarrow \widehat{R}_u^A$  in the natural topology on  $\mathcal{S}(U)$  as  $k \rightarrow +\infty$ , and hence  $\Phi(\widehat{R}_{u \wedge kp}^A) \rightarrow \Phi(\widehat{R}_u^A) \in ]0, +\infty[$  because  $\Phi$  is naturally



continuous on  $\mathcal{S}(U)$ . Identifying as usual  $\nu_k$  and  $\nu$  with probability measures on  $B$  we infer that

$$\frac{1}{\Phi(\widehat{R}_u^A)} \widehat{R}_u^A = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\Phi(\widehat{R}_{u \wedge k_j p}^A)} \widehat{R}_{u \wedge k_j p}^A = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} b(\nu_{k_j}) = b(\nu) = K\nu.$$

Hence  $\widehat{R}_u^A = K\mu$ , where  $\mu := \Phi(\widehat{R}_u^A)\nu$  (now again considered as a measure on  $\overline{U}$ ) is carried by  $\overline{A}$  along with  $\nu$ .

Next, let  $A \subset \Delta(U)$ . According to Remark 2.5 there is a decreasing sequence of open sets  $W_j$  (depending on  $u$ ) such that  $A \subset \bigcap_j W_j \subset \bigcap_j \overline{W}_j \subset \overline{A}$  and  $\widehat{R}_u^A = \widehat{\inf}_j \widehat{R}_u^{W_j \cap U} = \lim_j \widehat{R}_u^{W_j \cap U}$  (natural limit, again by [10, Theorem 2.10]). There is a sequence of reals  $\alpha_j > 0$  and a real  $\alpha > 0$  such that  $\alpha_j \widehat{R}_u^{W_j \cap U} \in B$  and  $\alpha \widehat{R}_u^A \in B$ . The sequence  $(\alpha_j)$  converges to  $\alpha$  because the sequence  $(\widehat{R}_u^{W_j \cap U})$  converges naturally to  $\widehat{R}_u^A$ . For any index  $j$  there exists, as shown in the preceding paragraph, a probability measure  $\mu_j$  on  $B$  with the barycenter  $\alpha_j \widehat{R}_u^{W_j \cap U}$  such that  $\mu_j$  (when viewed as a measure on  $\overline{U}$ ) is carried by  $\overline{W}_j$ . After passing to a subsequence we may suppose that  $\mu_j$  converges to a probability measure  $\mu$  on  $B$  which (again when viewed as a measure on  $\overline{U}$ ) necessarily is carried by  $\bigcap_j \overline{W}_j \subset \overline{A}$ . The sequence  $(b(\mu_j)) = (\alpha_j \widehat{R}_u^{W_j})$  of barycenters of the  $\mu_j$  therefore converges to the barycenter  $b(\mu)$  of  $\mu$ , whence  $K\mu = b(\mu) = \alpha \widehat{R}_u^A$ , and  $\widehat{R}_u^A$  is represented by the measure  $\frac{1}{\alpha}\mu$  carried by  $\overline{A}$ .

In the general case where just  $A \subset \overline{U}$  we have by Proposition 2.9  $\widehat{R}_u^A = \widehat{R}_u^{A \cap \Delta(U)} + \widehat{R}_v^{A \cap U}$ , where  $v \in \mathcal{S}(U)$ . As shown in the third paragraph of the present proof there exists a measure  $\mu_1$  on  $\overline{U}$  representing  $\widehat{R}_v^{A \cap U}$  and carried by  $\overline{A}$ . And as shown in the preceding paragraph there exists a measure  $\mu_2$  on  $\overline{U}$  representing  $\widehat{R}_u^{A \cap \Delta(U)}$  and likewise carried by  $\overline{A}$ . The measure  $\mu = \mu_1 + \mu_2$  therefore represents  $\widehat{R}_u^A$  and is carried by  $\overline{A}$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 2.14.** *Let  $A \subset \Delta(U)$ . Then*

(i)  $\widehat{R}_p^A = 0$  for any  $p \in \mathcal{P}(U)$ .

(ii) For any  $Y \in U \cup \Delta_1(U)$  we have either  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A = 0$  or  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A = K(\cdot, Y)$ .

If moreover  $Y \notin A$  then  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A = 0$ .

*Proof.* It follows from Proposition 2.7 that  $\widehat{R}_p^A$  and  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A$  are invariant. This establishes (i) because  $\widehat{R}_p^A$  is also a fine potential (along with  $p$ ).

For the former assertion (ii) we have  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A \preceq K(\cdot, Y)$ , again by Proposition 2.7, and since  $K(\cdot, Y)$  is extreme there is a constant  $c \geq 0$  such that  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A = cK(\cdot, Y)$ . Hence it follows from 6. in Proposition 2.6 with  $A = B$  that  $c = 0$  or  $c = 1$ .

For the latter assertion (ii) suppose first that  $Y \notin \overline{A}$  (the natural closure of  $A$  in  $\overline{U}$ ). Suppose by contradiction that  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A = K(\cdot, Y)$ . According to Proposition 2.13 there exists a measure  $\lambda$  on  $\overline{U}$  carried by  $\overline{A}$  such that

$$\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A = \int_{\overline{U}} K(\cdot, Z) d\lambda(Z).$$

It follows that  $K(\cdot, Y) = \int_{\overline{U}} K(\cdot, Z) d\lambda(Z)$ , and so  $\lambda$  is a probability measure. Denote  $\mu$  the probability measure on  $B$  corresponding to  $\lambda$  under the identification of  $B$  with  $\{K(\cdot, Z) : Z \in \overline{U}\}$ . Then  $\mu$  has the barycenter  $K(\cdot, Y)$ . Since  $K(\cdot, Y)$  is an extreme point of  $B$  we infer by [2, Corollary I.2.4, p.15] that  $\mu = \varepsilon_Y$ , and hence  $Y \in \overline{A}$ , which is contradictory. Thus  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A \neq K(\cdot, Y)$ , and consequently  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A = 0$  according to the former assertion (ii) in Proposition 2.14.

It remains to consider the case where we just have  $Y \notin A$ . In this case  $A$  may be written as the union of an increasing sequence of subsets  $A_j$  of  $A$  with  $Y \notin \overline{A_j}$  for any  $j$ . By Proposition 2.8 (b) we then have  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A \leq \sum_j \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{A_j} = 0$ , and hence  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A = 0$ , as claimed.  $\square$

Actually, in Proposition 2.14 (ii), if  $Y \in A$  and hence  $Y \notin U$  then  $Y \in \Delta_1(U)$ , and it follows that  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A = K(\cdot, Y)$ , see Proposition 3.8 below.

*Remark 2.15.* Even in the classical case  $U = \Omega$ , sweeping (and reduction) of a function  $u \in \mathcal{S}(U)$  on an arbitrary set  $A \subset \Delta(U)$  lacks the following two properties valid when  $A \subset U$ . Fix a point  $Y \in A \cap \Delta_1(U)$  and note that  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A = K(\cdot, Y)$  as noted above. In the classical case,  $K(\cdot, Y) \wedge c$  is a potential (hence a fine potential) for any constant  $c > 0$ , as noted in [6, Observation, p. 74] for the purpose of showing that the following Property 1. fails when  $A = \Delta(U)$ :

1. For any increasing sequence of functions  $u_j \in \mathcal{S}(U)$  with pointwise supremum  $u \in \mathcal{S}(U)$ ,

$$\widehat{R}_u^A = \sup_j \widehat{R}_{u_j}^A.$$

This holds when  $A \subset U$ , by [11, Theorem 11.12], but fails (classically) for  $A = \Delta(U)$  and  $u_j = K(\cdot, Y) \wedge j$  in view of the above.

2. For any  $x \in U$ , the affine function  $u \mapsto \widehat{R}_u^A(x)$  on  $\mathcal{S}(U)$  is (naturally) l.s.c. For the proof that this holds for  $A \subset U$  we may assume that  $A$  is a base relative to  $U$ , and hence  $\widehat{R}_u^A = R_u^A$  and  $\varepsilon_x^A$  is carried by  $A$  for any  $u \in \mathcal{S}(U)$ . Consider a sequence of functions  $u_j \in \mathcal{S}(U)$  converging (naturally)

to  $u \in \mathcal{S}(U)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{R}_u^A(x) &= \int_U u d\varepsilon_x^{A \cup (\Omega \setminus U)} = \int_U \liminf_j \widehat{u}_j d\varepsilon_x^{A \cup (\Omega \setminus U)} \\ &\leq \int_U \liminf_j u_j d\varepsilon_x^{A \cup (\Omega \setminus U)} \leq \liminf_j \int_U u_j d\varepsilon_x^{A \cup (\Omega \setminus U)} = \liminf_j \widehat{R}_{u_j}^A(x) \end{aligned}$$

by [10, Lemmas 2.1 and 2.3, and Theorem 2.10] and Fatou's lemma. But Property 2. fails (classically) for  $A = \Delta(U)$  and  $u_j = K(\cdot, Y) \wedge j$ , hence  $u = K(\cdot, Y)$ , in view of the above.

### 3. MINIMAL THINNESS AND THE MINIMAL-FINE TOPOLOGY

The following lemma extends [10, Lemma 4.2], in which  $E \subset U$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *For any set  $E \subset \overline{U}$  and any point  $Y \in \Delta_1(U)$  we have  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^E \neq K(\cdot, Y)$  if and only if  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^E \in \mathcal{P}(U)$  (the fine potentials on  $U$ ).*

*Proof.* If  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^E$  is a fine potential then  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^E \neq K(\cdot, Y)$  because  $K(\cdot, Y)$  is invariant. Conversely, suppose that  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^E \neq K(\cdot, Y)$ , and write  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^E = p + h$  with  $p$  a fine potential and  $h$  invariant. Then  $h \leq \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^E \leq K(\cdot, Y)$  and hence by [10, Lemma 2.2]  $h \preceq K(\cdot, Y)$ , which shows that  $h = \alpha K(\cdot, Y)$  for some  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ . Here  $\alpha \neq 1$ , for otherwise ( $h =$ )  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^E = K(\cdot, Y)$  contrary to hypothesis. On the other hand it follows by 6. (with  $A = B$ ) and 4. in Proposition 2.6 that

$$\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^E = \widehat{R}_{\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^E}^E = \widehat{R}_{p+h}^E = \widehat{R}_p^E + \widehat{R}_h^E = p + h,$$

whence  $\widehat{R}_p^E = p$  and  $\widehat{R}_h^E = h$ . If  $h \neq 0$  then  $\alpha \neq 0$  because  $h = \alpha K(\cdot, Y)$ . Since  $h = \widehat{R}_h^E = \alpha \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^E = \alpha p + \alpha h$  we would obtain  $(1 - \alpha)h = \alpha p$  with  $0 < \alpha < 1$ , which is impossible. Thus actually  $h = 0$ , and so indeed  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^E = p \in \mathcal{P}(U)$ .  $\square$

**Definition 3.2.** A set  $E \subset U$  is said to be minimal-thin at a point  $Y \in \Delta_1(U)$  if  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^E \neq K(\cdot, Y)$ , or equivalently if  $R_{K(\cdot, Y)}^E \neq K(\cdot, Y)$ , that is (by the preceding lemma) if  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^E \in \mathcal{P}(U)$ .

**Corollary 3.3.** *For any  $Y \in \Delta_1(U)$  the sets  $E \subset U$  which are minimal-thin at  $Y$  form a filter  $\mathcal{F}(Y)$  on  $U$ .*

This follows from Lemma 3.1 which easily implies that for any  $E_1, E_2 \subset U$  such that  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{U \setminus E_i} \neq K(\cdot, Y)$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , we have  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{U \setminus (E_1 \cup E_2)} \neq K(\cdot, Y)$ .

Like in classical potential theory we define the minimal-fine (mf) topology on  $\overline{U}$  as follows:

**Definition 3.4.** A set  $W \subset \overline{U}$  is said to be a minimal-fine neighborhood of a point  $Y \in \overline{U}$  if

- (a)  $W \cap U$  is a fine neighborhood of  $Y$  in the usual sense, in case  $Y \in U$ ,
- (b)  $W$  contains the point  $Y$  and  $U \setminus W$  is minimal-thin at  $Y$ , in case  $Y \in \Delta_1(U)$ ,
- (c)  $W$  contains the point  $Y$ , in case  $Y \in \Delta(U) \setminus \Delta_1(U)$ .

In the sequel we will denote by  $\text{mf-lim}$  and  $\text{mf-liminf}$  the limit and the  $\text{liminf}$  in the sense of the  $\text{mf-topology}$ .

According to (a) above, the minimal-fine topology on  $\overline{U}$  induces on  $U$  the fine topology there, and  $U$  is  $\text{mf-open}$  in  $\overline{U}$ , that is,  $\Delta(U)$  is  $\text{mf-closed}$  in  $\overline{U}$  (since  $\emptyset$  is minimal-thin at any point  $Y \in \Delta_1(U)$ ).

**Definition 3.5.** Let  $h$  be a non-zero minimal invariant function. A point  $Y \in \overline{U}$  is termed a pole of  $h$  if  $\widehat{R}_h^{\{Y\}} = h$ .

*Remark 3.6.* Any pole  $Y$  of  $h$  belongs to  $\Delta(U)$ , for if  $Y \in U$  then  $\widehat{R}_h^{\{Y\}} = 0$  because  $\{Y\}$  is polar.

**Theorem 3.7.** *Every non-zero minimal invariant function on  $U$  has precisely one pole. For any  $Y \in \Delta_1(U)$  the pole of  $K(\cdot, Y)$  is  $Y$ .*

*Proof.* Recall from [10, Proposition 3.6] (and the beginning of [10, Section 3]) that the non-zero minimal invariant functions on  $U$  are precisely the functions of the form  $K(\cdot, Y)$  for a (unique)  $Y \in \Delta_1(U)$ . Consider the family  $\mathcal{C}$  of all (necessarily nonvoid) compact subsets  $C$  of  $\overline{A}$  such that  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^C = K(\cdot, Y)$ , and note that  $\mathcal{C}$  is nonvoid, for  $\overline{U} \in \mathcal{C}$  because  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{\overline{U}} = K(\cdot, Y)$ . Equip  $\mathcal{C}$  with the order defined by the inverse inclusion ‘ $\supset$ ’. For any totally ordered subfamily  $\mathcal{C}'$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  the intersection  $C'$  of  $\mathcal{C}'$  satisfies  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{C'} = K(\cdot, Y)$  in view of the fundamental convergence theorem, and hence  $\mathcal{C}$  has a minimal element  $C_0$  according to Zorn’s lemma. The natural topology is Hausdorff, so if  $C_0$  contains two distinct points  $Z_1$  and  $Z_2$  then there are compact subsets  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  of  $C_0$  such that  $C_0 = C_1 \cup C_2$ ,  $Z_1 \in C_0 \setminus C_2$  and  $Z_2 \in C_0 \setminus C_1$ . Since  $K(\cdot, Y)$  is extreme it then follows by Riesz decomposition that either  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{C_1} = K(\cdot, Y)$  or  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{C_2} = K(\cdot, Y)$ . In other words, either  $C_1$  or  $C_2$  belongs to  $\mathcal{C}$ , say  $C_1 \in \mathcal{C}$ . By minimality of  $C_0$  we would then have  $C_1 = C_0$  which contradicts  $Z_2 \in C_0 \setminus C_1$ . This shows that indeed  $C_0 = \{Z\} \in \mathcal{C}$  for a certain  $Z \in \overline{U}$ , that is  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{\{Z\}} = K(\cdot, Y)$ . Thus  $Z$  is a pole of  $K(\cdot, Y)$ . Since  $\{Z\}$  is a closed set it follows by Proposition 2.13 and Choquet’s theorem that  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{\{Z\}} = K\mu$  for some probability measure  $\mu$  on  $B$  carried by  $\{Z\}$ , that is, for  $\mu = \varepsilon_Z$ . Thus  $K(\cdot, Y) = K\mu = K(\cdot, Z)$ , and so indeed  $Y = Z$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.8.** *Let  $h$  be a non-zero minimal invariant function on  $U$  with pole  $Y \in \Delta_1(U)$  and let  $A \subset \Delta(U)$ . Then  $\widehat{R}_h^A = h$  or 0 if  $Y \in A$  or  $Y \notin A$ , respectively.*

*Proof.* By Proposition 2.7 the function  $\widehat{R}_h^A$  is invariant and  $\preceq K(\cdot, Y)$ , hence of the form  $cK(\cdot, Y)$  for some constant  $c$ . It follows by 6. in Proposition 2.6 with  $A = B$  that  $c = 0$  or  $c = 1$ . If  $A \subset \Delta(U)$  contains the pole  $Y$  of  $h$  then  $h \geq \widehat{R}_h^A \geq \widehat{R}_h^{\{Y\}} = h$ , and so  $\widehat{R}_h^A = h$ . The rest follows easily from Proposition 2.14.  $\square$

The following integral representation of the sweeping of an arbitrary function of class  $\mathcal{S}(U)$  on suitable sets  $A \subset \overline{U}$  is based on Proposition 3.8, which in turn depended on Proposition 2.7.

**Theorem 3.9.** *For any set  $A \subset \overline{U}$  and any Radon measure  $\mu$  on  $\overline{U}$  carried by  $U \cup \Delta_1(U)$  and such that  $K\mu \not\equiv +\infty$ , we have the inequality  $\widehat{R}_{K\mu}^A \geq \int^* \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A d\mu(Y)$ . If  $A \cap \Delta(U)$  is a  $K_\sigma$  set then equality prevails and the upper integral becomes a true integral.*

*Proof.* For any subset  $A$  of  $U$  this integral representation was established in [10, Lemma 3.21] with the upper integral replaced by the integral. For  $A \subset \Delta(U)$  it suffices to consider the case where  $\mu$  is carried by  $\Delta_1(U)$ , for if  $\nu$  denotes the restriction of  $\mu$  to  $U$  then  $K\nu$  is a fine potential according to [10, Corollary 3.25], and so  $\widehat{R}_{K\nu}^A = 0$  by Proposition 2.14 (i). By Remark 2.5 there is a decreasing sequence  $(W_j)$  of sets of class  $\mathcal{W}(A)$  such that it suffices in Definition 2.4 to take for  $W \in \mathcal{W}(A)$  the sets  $W_j$ . We show that the following equations and inequality hold q.e. on  $U$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{R}_{K\mu}^A &= \widehat{\inf}_j \widehat{R}_{K\mu}^{W_j \cap U} = \widehat{\inf}_j \widehat{R}_{K\mu}^{W_j \cap U} = \widehat{\inf}_j \int \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{W_j \cap U} d\mu(Y) \\ &= \int \widehat{\inf}_j \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{W_j \cap U} d\mu(Y) = \int \widehat{\inf}_j \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{W_j \cap U} d\mu(Y) \geq \int^* \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A d\mu(Y). \end{aligned}$$

When these relations have been established quasieverywhere on  $U$ , the desired resulting inequality holds everywhere on  $U$ . In fact,  $\widehat{R}_{K\mu}^A \in \mathcal{S}(U)$  along with  $K\mu$ ; and by Proposition 3.8 we have since  $\mu$  is carried by  $\Delta_1(U)$

$$\begin{aligned} \int^* \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A d\mu(Y) &= \int^* K(\cdot, Y) 1_A(Y) d\mu(Y) \\ &= \int K(\cdot, Y) 1_{A^*}(Y) d\mu(Y) = K(1_{A^*}\mu) \in \mathcal{S}(U), \end{aligned}$$

where  $A^*$  denotes a  $G_\delta$  set containing  $A$  such that  $\mu^*(A^* \setminus A) = 0$ , cf. [10, Theorem 3.20]. Equation 1 and inequality 6 hold everywhere on  $U$  by Definition 2.4. Eq. 2 holds quasieverywhere by the fundamental convergence

theorem [11, Theorem 11.8]. Eq. 3 holds at any point  $x \in U$  at which  $K\mu(x) < +\infty$  and hence  $\widehat{R}_{K\mu}^A(x) < +\infty$ , for there we have by [10, Lemma 3.21]  $\widehat{R}_{K\mu}^{W_j \cap U}(x) = \int \widehat{R}_{K(.,Y)}^{W_j \cap U}(x) d\mu(Y)$ , which is finite for large  $j$  (depending on  $x$ ). Eq. 4 is obvious (Lebesgue) at points  $x$  as stated for eq. 3. In the first place,  $\widehat{R}_{K(.,Y)}^{W_j \cap U}$  is of class  $\mathcal{S}(U)$  for each  $Y \in \Delta_1(U)$ , hence finely continuous and in particular Borel measurable on  $U$  according to [10, Lemma 2.1]. Secondly, the integrals are finite, being majorized by  $\int K(.,Y) d\mu(Y) = K\mu < +\infty$  at points  $x$  as stated. Concerning the remaining eq. 5, note that for each  $k$  the function  $\widehat{R}_{K(.,Y)}^{W_k \cap U}$  is invariant on  $U \setminus \widetilde{W}_k$  according to [10, Lemma 2.4]. For any  $j$  and any  $k \geq j$  we have  $W_k \subset W_j$ , and  $\widehat{R}_{K(.,Y)}^{W_k \cap U}$  is therefore invariant on each  $U \setminus \widetilde{W}_j$ , and hence on their union according to [10, Theorem 2.6 (a), (b)]. It follows by [10, Theorem 2.6 (c)] that  $\widehat{R}_{K(.,Y)}^{W_j \cap U}$  is invariant on the finely open set  $U$ . For any point  $x \in U$  such that  $K\mu(x) < +\infty$  the set

$$E_x : \{Y \in \overline{U} : \widehat{R}_{K(.,Y)}^A(x) = +\infty\}$$

is  $\mu$ -null. According to [10, Theorem 2.6 (c)] we obtain

$$\widehat{\inf}_j \widehat{R}_{K(.,Y)}^{W_j \cap U}(x) = \inf_j \widehat{R}_{K(.,Y)}^{W_j \cap U}(x) \quad \mu\text{-a.e. for } Y \in \overline{U},$$

which implies eq. 5 at points  $x \in U$  with  $K\mu(x) < \infty$ .

In the particular case where  $A \subset \Delta(U)$  is compact the decreasing sequence  $(W_j) \subset \mathcal{W}(A)$  in Remark 2.5 can be chosen independently of the function  $u \in \mathcal{S}(U)$ , and the inequality 6 therefore becomes an equality, and the upper integral at the end of the display becomes a true integral. If  $A$  is just the union of an increasing sequence of compact sets  $A_j \subset \Delta(U)$ , then

$$\widehat{R}_{K\mu}^{A_j} = \int \widehat{R}_{K(.,Y)}^{A_j} d\mu(Y) \leq \int_* \widehat{R}_{K(.,Y)}^A d\mu(Y).$$

For  $j \rightarrow \infty$  it follows by (a) in Proposition 2.8 that  $\widehat{R}_{K\mu}^A \leq \int_* \widehat{R}_{K(.,Y)}^A d\mu(Y)$ . Together with the opposite inequality obtained above (with an upper integral) this leads to the asserted integral representation of  $\widehat{R}_{K\mu}^A$  for any  $K_\sigma$  set  $A \subset \Delta(U)$ .

It remains to settle the case of a subset  $A$  of  $\overline{U}$  such that  $A \cap \Delta(U)$  is a  $K_\sigma$ . By Propositions 2.9 and 3.8 we have

$$\widehat{R}_{K\mu}^A = \widehat{R}_{K\mu}^{A \cap \Delta(U)} + \widehat{R}_v^{A \cap U} = \int \widehat{R}_{K(.,Y)}^{A \cap \Delta(U)} d\mu(Y) + \widehat{R}_v^{A \cap U},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} v &:= K\mu - \widehat{R}_{K\mu}^{A\cap\Delta(U)} = \int K(\cdot, Y)d\mu(Y) - \int \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{A\cap\Delta(U)} d\mu(Y) \\ &= \int K(\cdot, Y)(1 - 1_{A\cap\Delta_1(U)}(Y))d\mu(Y) = K\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

with  $\lambda := (1 - 1_{A\cap\Delta_1(U)})\mu$ . Since  $\lambda \leq \mu$ ,  $\lambda$  is carried by  $\Delta_1(U)$ . It follows that

$$\widehat{R}_v^{A\cap U} = \int \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{A\cap U} d\lambda(Y) = \int \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{A\cap U} (1 - 1_{A\cap\Delta_1(U)}(Y))d\mu(Y),$$

$$(3.1) \quad \widehat{R}_{K\mu}^A = \int (K(\cdot, Y)1_{A\cap\Delta_1(U)}(Y) + \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{A\cap U}(1 - 1_{A\cap\Delta_1(U)}(Y)))d\mu(Y).$$

Similarly, for any  $Y \in \Delta_1(U)$ ,

$$\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A = \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{A\cap\Delta(U)} + \widehat{R}_{v_Y}^{A\cap U} = 1_{A\cap\Delta_1(U)}(Y)K(\cdot, Y) + \widehat{R}_{v_Y}^{A\cap U},$$

$$v_Y := K(\cdot, Y) - \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{A\cap\Delta(U)} = (1 - 1_{A\cap\Delta_1(U)}(Y))K(\cdot, Y) = K\lambda_Y$$

with  $\lambda_Y := (1 - 1_{A\cap\Delta_1(U)}(Y))\mu$  carried by  $\Delta_1(U)$ . It follows that

$$\widehat{R}_{v_Y}^{A\cap U} = \int \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Z)}^{A\cap U} d\lambda_Y(Z) = (1 - 1_{A\cap\Delta_1(U)}(Y))\widehat{R}_{K\mu}^{A\cap U},$$

$$\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A = 1_{A\cap\Delta_1(U)}(Y)K(\cdot, Y) + (1 - 1_{A\cap\Delta_1(U)}(Y))\widehat{R}_{K\mu}^{A\cap U}.$$

The integral of this expression for  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A$  with respect to  $d\mu(Y)$  is just the right hand member of (3.1).  $\square$

*Remark 3.10.* Equality will prevail in the former assertion in Theorem 3.9 for arbitrary sets  $A \subset \overline{U}$  provided that equality prevails there for any  $G_\delta$  subset of  $\overline{U}$  (because any set  $A \subset \overline{U}$  can be extended by a  $\mu$ -nullset to a larger  $G_\delta$  subset of  $\overline{U}$ ). And for that it remains to prove that there is equality in inequality 6 (in the first display in the proof of Theorem 3.9) for an arbitrary  $G_\delta$  set  $A \subset \Delta_1(U)$ . An attempt to establish that would be to show that every open set  $W \supset A$  contains  $W_j$  for some  $j$ . More generally one may ask, for any compact metric space  $X$  and any  $G_\delta$  set  $A \subset X$  (say  $A = \bigcap_j A_j$  with  $A_j$  open in  $X$ ), whether every open subset  $G$  of  $X$  containing  $A$  would even contain  $A_j$  for some  $j$ . But that is false, as we show for  $X = [0, 1]$ , arguing instead with the complements  $C := \mathbb{C}A$ ,  $C_j := \mathbb{C}A_j$ , and  $F := \mathbb{C}G$ . Denote by  $C_0 \subset [0, 1]$  the usual Cantor set obtained by removing successively the middle thirds. Denote  $C_1$  the image of  $C_0$  under the affine map of  $[0, 1]$  onto  $[\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}]$ . Next let  $C_2$  be the union of the images of  $C_0$  under the affine maps of  $[0, 1]$  onto  $[\frac{1}{3^2}, \frac{2}{3^2}]$  and  $[\frac{7}{3^2}, \frac{8}{3^2}]$ , and so on. Then  $C := \bigcup_{k \geq 0} C_k$  is an  $F_\sigma$ . However, there exists a closed set  $F$  contained in  $C$ , but not in any  $C_k$  ( $k \geq 0$ ), for example



$F := \{x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots\}$  with  $x_0 = 0$ ,  $x_j := \frac{1}{2 \cdot 3^{j-1}}$  for  $j > 0$ . In fact, for any  $j \geq 0$  we have  $x_j \in C_j \setminus C_k \subset C$  for  $k > j$ . This example is an indication that the latter assertion in Theorem 3.9 does not extend to arbitrary  $G_\delta$  subsets of  $\Delta(U)$ , but we have no counterexample to prove that.

**Corollary 3.11.** *Let  $u \in \mathcal{S}(U)$ , let  $A$  be a  $K_\sigma$  subset of  $\Delta(U)$ , and let  $\mu$  denote the (unique) representing measure for the invariant function  $\widehat{R}_u^A$  carried by  $\Delta_1(U)$ . Then  $\mu$  is carried by  $A$  (in the sense that  $\mu^*(\mathbb{C}A) = 0$ ) if and only if  $\widehat{R}_u^A = u$ .*

*Proof.* By the latter assertion in the above theorem together with Proposition 2.9 we have

$$\widehat{R}_u^A = \int \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A d\mu(Y) = \int 1_A(Y) K(\cdot, Y) d\mu(Y) = K(1_A \mu),$$

and by uniqueness this equals  $u = K\mu$  if and only if  $1_A \mu = \mu$ , which means that  $\mu$  shall be carried by  $A$ .  $\square$

The above corollary, sharpening Proposition 2.13 (in the present setting) is an analogue of [10, Proposition 3.13], where  $\mu$  is carried only by the closure  $\overline{A}$  of  $A$ ,  $\overline{A}$  supposed to be contained in  $U$ . As in the Euclidean case [3, Theorem 8.3.1] we also have the following

**Corollary 3.12.** *Suppose that  $\Delta(U)$  is compact. For any invariant function  $h$  on  $U$  we have  $\widehat{R}_h^{\Delta(U) \setminus \Delta_1(U)} = 0$ .*

*Proof.* Write  $h = K\mu$  with  $\mu$  carried by  $\Delta_1(U)$  (cf. [10, Corollary 3.25]). Since  $\Delta(U) \setminus \Delta_1(U)$  is a  $K_\sigma$  in  $\Delta(U)$  we have by the latter assertion in Theorem 3.9

$$\widehat{R}_{K\mu}^{\Delta(U) \setminus \Delta_1(U)} = \int_{\Delta_1(U)} \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{\Delta(U) \setminus \Delta_1(U)} d\mu(Y) = 0$$

according to (ii) in Proposition 2.14.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.13.** *The mf-topology on  $\overline{U}$  is finer than the natural topology (and is therefore Hausdorff).*

*Proof.* Let  $W$  be a naturally open set containing a point  $Y \in \overline{U}$ . If  $Y \in U$  then  $W \cap U$  is a usual fine neighborhood of  $Y$  in  $U$  according to Lemma 2.1 (c), and hence an mf-neighborhood of  $Y$  in  $\overline{U}$  by (a) in Definition 3.4 above. If  $Y \in \Delta(U) \setminus \Delta_1(U)$  there is nothing to prove in view of (c) in that definition. In the remaining case where  $Y \in \Delta_1(U)$  we show that  $U \setminus W$  is minimal-thin at  $Y$ , cf. (b) in Definition 3.4, which by Lemma 3.1 means that  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{U \setminus W} \neq K(\cdot, Y)$ . Suppose that, on the contrary,  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{U \setminus W} = K(\cdot, Y)$ , and note that  $K(\cdot, Y) = K\varepsilon_Y$  in terms of  $\varepsilon_Y$ . According to Corollary 3.11  $\varepsilon_Y$  is carried by  $U \setminus W$ , that is,  $Y \in U \setminus W$ , in contradiction with  $Y \in W$ .  $\square$

Here is a minimal-fine boundary minimum property:

**Proposition 3.14.** *Let  $u$  be finely superharmonic on  $U$ , and suppose that*

$$\text{mf-lim inf}_{x \rightarrow Y, x \in U} u(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{for every } Y \in \Delta(U).$$

*If moreover  $u \geq -s$  on  $U$  for some  $s \in \mathcal{S}(U)$  then  $u \geq 0$  on  $U$ .*

*Proof.* For given  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $Y \in \Delta(U)$  there exists by the above boundary inequality an mf-fine open mf-neighborhood  $W_Y \subset \overline{U}$  of  $Y$  such that  $u > -\varepsilon$  on  $W_Y \cap U$ . In terms of the mf-open set  $W := \bigcup \{W_Y : Y \in \Delta(U)\}$  containing  $\Delta(U)$  we infer that  $u > -\varepsilon$  on  $W \cap U = \bigcup \{W_Y \cap U : Y \in \Delta(U)\}$ . The set  $E := \overline{U} \setminus W$  is mf-closed and contained in  $U$ , and so  $E$  is finely closed, as noted before Proposition 3.13. Furthermore,  $E$  is minimal-thin at  $Y$  in view of Definition 3.4 (b), and hence  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^E$  is a fine potential on  $U$  for each  $Y \in \Delta(U)$ . It follows that  $\widehat{R}_s^E$  likewise is a fine potential. To see this, write  $s = K\sigma$  and  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^E = K\lambda_Y$  with unique representing measures  $\sigma$  on  $U \cup \Delta(U)$  and  $\lambda_Y$  on  $U$ , respectively, cf. [10, Corollary 3.25]. By Lemma [10, Lemma 3.21] we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{R}_s^E &= \int_{U \cup \Delta_1(U)} \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^E d\sigma(Y) = \int_{U \cup \Delta_1(U)} K\lambda_Y d\sigma(Y) \\ &= \int_{U \cup \Delta_1(U)} \left( \int_U K(\cdot, z) d\lambda_Y(z) \right) d\sigma(Y) = \int_U K(\cdot, z) d\nu(z), \end{aligned}$$

where the measure  $\nu = \int_{U \cup \Delta_1(U)} \lambda_Y d\sigma(Y)$  on  $U$  is the integral with respect to  $\sigma$  of the family  $(\lambda_Y)_{Y \in U \cup \Delta_1(U)}$  of measures on  $U$ , cf. [5, 3, proposition 1]. In particular,  $\nu$  is carried by  $U$  along with each  $\lambda_Y$ . Hence  $\widehat{R}_s^E$  is indeed a fine potential according to [10, Corollary 3.26]. The (possibly empty) fine interior  $V$  of  $E$  has relative fine boundary  $U \cap \partial_f V \subset U \setminus V \subset U \cap \widetilde{W}$ . We have  $u + \varepsilon \geq 0$  on  $U \cap W$  and hence by fine continuity on  $U \cap \widetilde{W} \supset U \cap \partial_f V$ . Furthermore,  $u + \widehat{R}_s^E = u + s$  on  $U \cap b(E) \supset V$  ( $b(E)$  denoting the base of  $E$  in  $\Omega$ ), and so  $u + \varepsilon \geq -\widehat{R}_s^E$  on  $V$ . Altogether, it follows by the relative fine boundary minimum property [11, Theorem 10.8] applied to the fine potential  $p = \widehat{R}_s^E$  that  $u + \varepsilon \geq 0$  on  $V$ . As noted above, the same inequality holds on  $U \cap \widetilde{W} \supset U \setminus V$  and thus on all of  $U$ . By varying  $\varepsilon$  we conclude that indeed  $u \geq 0$  on all of  $U$ .  $\square$

We proceed to define sweeping on subsets of  $\overline{U}$  relative to the minimal-fine topology, and to show that, at least for sets  $A$  as in the latter part of Theorem 3.9, sweeping on  $A$  relative to the mf-topology coincides with sweeping on  $A$  relative to the natural topology as defined in Definition 2.4.

**Definition 3.15.** Let  $A \subset \overline{U}$ . For any function  $u \in \mathcal{S}(U)$  the reduction of  $u$  on  $A$  relative to the mf-topology is defined by

$${}^1R_u^A = \inf\{v \in \mathcal{S}(U) : v \geq u \text{ on } A \cap U \text{ and on } W \cap U \text{ for some } W \in {}^1\mathcal{W}(A)\},$$

where  ${}^1\mathcal{W}(A)$  denotes the family of all mf-open sets  $W \subset \overline{U}$  such that  $W \supset A \cap \Delta(U)$ . The sweeping of  $u$  on  $A$  is defined as the greatest finely l.s.c. minorant of  ${}^1R_u^A$  and is denoted by  ${}^1\widehat{R}_u^A$ .

The function  ${}^1\widehat{R}_u^A$  is of class  $\mathcal{S}(U)$ . Similarly to reduction and sweeping relative to the natural topology we have

$${}^1R_u^A = \inf\{R_u^{(AUW) \cap U} : W \in {}^1\mathcal{W}(A)\},$$

$${}^1\widehat{R}_u^A = \widehat{\inf}\{\widehat{R}_u^{(AUW) \cap U} : W \in {}^1\mathcal{W}(A)\}.$$

Furthermore, there is a decreasing sequence  $(W_j)$  of sets  $W_j \in {}^1\mathcal{W}(A)$  (depending on  $u$ ) such that it suffices to take for  $W$  the sets  $W_j$ , in the above definitions and alternative expressions (this is shown in the same way as in the case of sweeping relative to the natural topology by application of the fundamental convergence theorem and the quasi-Lindelöf property for finely u.s.c. functions). For any subset  $A$  of  $U$ , the present reduction  ${}^1R_u^A$  and sweeping  ${}^1\widehat{R}_u^A$  on  $A$  relative to  $\overline{U}$  clearly reduce to the usual reduction and sweeping on  $A$  relative to  $U$ . Since the mf-topology is finer than the natural topology (Proposition 3.13), we clearly have  ${}^1R_u^A \leq R_u^A$  and  ${}^1\widehat{R}_u^A \leq \widehat{R}_u^A$ .

We shall need the following analogue of Proposition 3.8:

**Lemma 3.16.** *For any  $A \subset \Delta(U)$  and  $Y \in U \cup \Delta_1(U)$  we have  ${}^1\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A = K(\cdot, Y)$  if  $Y \in A$ , and  ${}^1\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A = 0$  if  $Y \notin A$ .*

*Proof.* If  $Y \notin A$  then  ${}^1\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A \leq \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A = 0$  by Proposition 2.14 (ii). If  $Y \in A$  and hence  $Y \notin U$ , then  $Y \in \Delta_1(U)$ , and  ${}^1\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A = K(\cdot, Y)$  because we even have  ${}^1\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{\{Y\}} = K(\cdot, Y)$ . In fact, for any  $W \in {}^1\mathcal{W}(\{Y\})$ ,

$$K(\cdot, Y) = \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^U \leq \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{U \cap W} + \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{U \setminus W},$$

where the latter term on the right is a fine potential on  $U$  by Definition 3.2,  $U \setminus W$  being minimal-thin at  $Y$  in view of Definition 3.4 (b). By the Riesz decomposition property we obtain  $K(\cdot, Y) = u + v$  with  $u \leq \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{U \cap W}$  and  $v \leq \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{U \setminus W}$ . This shows that  $v \preccurlyeq K(\cdot, Y)$  and hence  $v = 0$ ,  $v$  being a fine potential along with  $\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{U \setminus W}$ , and  $K(\cdot, Y)$  being invariant since  $Y \in \Delta_1(U)$ . Thus  $K(\cdot, Y) = u \leq \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{U \cap W}$ , obviously with equality. By varying  $W$  we infer by Definition 3.15 that indeed  ${}^1\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{\{Y\}} = K(\cdot, Y)$ .  $\square$

The six assertions of Proposition 2.6 carry over along with their proofs when reductions and sweepings are taken with respect to the minimal-fine topology on  $U$  instead of the smaller natural topology, and of course  $\mathcal{W}(A)$  is replaced by  ${}^1\mathcal{W}(A)$  for  $A \subset \overline{A}$ . The same applies to Propositions 2.7, 2.8, and 2.9.

**Theorem 3.17.** *Let  $A \subset \overline{U}$  and  $u \in \mathcal{S}(U)$ . For any set  $A$  as in the latter part of Theorem 3.9 we have  ${}^1\widehat{R}_u^A = \widehat{R}_u^A$ .*

*Proof.* This is obvious if  $A \subset U$ . Next, for  $A \subset \Delta(U)$ , write  $u = K\mu$  with  $\mu$  carried by  $U \cup \Delta_1(U)$ . For any  $W \in {}^1\mathcal{W}(A)$  we have by [10, Lemma 3.21]

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{R}_{K\mu}^{W \cap U} &= \int \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^{W \cap U} d\mu(Y) \geq \int {}^1\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A d\mu(Y) \\ &= \int \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A d\mu(Y) = \widehat{R}_{K\mu}^A, \end{aligned}$$

the second equality because  ${}^1\widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A = \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A = 1_A(Y)K(\cdot, Y)$  for  $Y \in U \cup \Delta_1(U)$  according to Lemma 3.16 and Proposition 3.8, respectively; and the third equality follows by the latter assertion in Theorem 3.9. By varying  $W \in {}^1\mathcal{W}(A)$  this yields  ${}^1\widehat{R}_{K\mu}^A \geq \widehat{R}_{K\mu}^A$ , actually with equality. For arbitrary  $A \subset \overline{U}$  such that  $A \cap \Delta(U)$  is a  $K_\sigma$ , it follows by Proposition 2.9 and its mf-version that indeed  ${}^1\widehat{R}_u^A = \widehat{R}_u^A$  because  $v$  is the same in either case (by what has just been shown), and hence  ${}^1\widehat{R}_v^{A \cap U} = \widehat{R}_v^{A \cap U}$  since  $A \cap U \subset U$ .  $\square$

#### 4. THE DIRICHLET PROBLEM AT THE MARTIN BOUNDARY OF $U$

We shall study the Dirichlet problem at  $\Delta(U)$  relative to a fixed finely harmonic function  $h > 0$  on  $U$ . We denote by  $\mu_h$  the measure on  $\Delta(U)$  carried by  $\Delta_1(U)$  and representing  $h$ , that is  $h = \int K(\cdot, Y) d\mu_h(Y) = K\mu_h$ . A function  $u$  on  $U$  (or on some finely open subset of  $U$ ) is said to be finely  $u$ -hyperharmonic, finely  $h$ -superharmonic,  $h$ -invariant, or a fine  $h$ -potential, respectively, if it has the form  $u = \frac{v}{h}$ , where  $v$  is finely hyperharmonic, finely superharmonic, invariant, or a fine potential, respectively.

Let  $f$  be a function on  $\Delta(U)$  with values in  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ . A finely  $h$ -hyperharmonic function  $u = \frac{v}{h}$  on  $U$  is said to belong to the upper  $\text{PWB}^h$  class, denoted by  $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_f^h$ , if  $u$  is lower bounded and if

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow Y, x \in U} u(x) \geq f(Y) \quad \text{for every } Y \in \Delta(U).$$

We define

$$\dot{H}_f^h = \inf \overline{\mathcal{U}}_f^h, \quad \overline{H}_f^h = \widehat{H}_f^h.$$

The lower  $\text{PWB}^h$  class  $\underline{\mathcal{U}}_f^h$  is defined by  $\underline{\mathcal{U}}_f^h = -\overline{\mathcal{U}}_{-f}^h$ , and we define  $\dot{H}_f^h = -\dot{H}_{-f}^h$  and  $\underline{H}_f^h = -\overline{H}_{-f}^h$ . The functions  $\overline{H}_f^h$  and  $\underline{H}_f^h$  are called the  $h$ -supersolution and

the  $h$ -subsolution, respectively, of the Dirichlet problem for  $U$  (with the given function  $f$  on the Martin boundary  $\Delta(U)$ ). Clearly,  $\overline{H}_f^h$  is finely l.s.c. and  $\underline{H}_f^h$  is finely u.s.c.

Henceforth we fix the finely harmonic function  $h > 0$  on  $U$ , relative to which we shall study the Dirichlet problem at  $\Delta(U)$ .

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $f$  be a function on  $\Delta(U)$  with values in  $[-\infty, +\infty]$ .*

(a) *The function  $\overline{H}_f^h$  on  $U$  is finely  $h$ -hyperharmonic on the finely open set  $\{\overline{H}_f^h > -\infty\}$ , and  $\overline{H}_f^h = \dot{H}_f^h$  q.e. on that set.*

(b)  *$\dot{H}_f^h \geq \underline{H}_f^h$  and hence  $\overline{H}_f^h \geq \underline{H}_f^h$  and  $\dot{H}_f^h \geq \underline{H}_f^h$ .*

(c)  *$\overline{H}_f^h \geq \underline{H}_f^h$  on  $\{\overline{H}_f^h > -\infty\} \cap \{\underline{H}_f^h < \infty\}$ .*

(d) *If  $f \geq 0$  on  $\Delta(U)$  then  $\overline{H}_f^h \geq 0$  on  $U$ , and  $\overline{H}_f^h$  is then either identically  $+\infty$  or  $h$ -invariant on  $U$ .*

*Proof.* Clearly,  $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_f^h$  is lower directed and  $\underline{\mathcal{U}}_f^h$  is upper directed. The constant function  $+\infty$  belongs to  $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_f^h$ . If  $+\infty$  is the only function of class  $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_f^h$  then obviously  $\dot{H}_f^h = +\infty$  and hence  $\overline{H}_f^h = +\infty$ . In the remaining case it suffices to consider finely  $h$ -superharmonic functions in the definition of  $\dot{H}_f^h$  and hence of  $\overline{H}_f^h$ .

(a) follows by the fundamental convergence theorem [11, Theorem 11.8].

(b) Let  $u \in \overline{\mathcal{U}}_f^h$  and  $v \in \underline{\mathcal{U}}_f^h$ . Then  $u - v$  is well defined and finely  $h$ -hyperharmonic and lower bounded on  $U$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{x \rightarrow Y, x \in U} (u(x) - v(x)) &\geq \liminf_{x \rightarrow Y, x \in U} u(x) - \limsup_{x \rightarrow Y, x \in U} v(x) \\ &\geq f(Y) - f(Y) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

if  $f(Y)$  is finite; otherwise  $\liminf u(x) - \limsup v(x) = +\infty \geq 0$ , for if for example  $f(Y) = +\infty$  then  $\liminf u = +\infty$  whereas  $\limsup v < +\infty$  since  $v$  is upper bounded. By the Martin boundary minimum property given in Proposition 3.14 together with Proposition 3.13 applied to the finely superharmonic function  $hu - hv$  (if  $hu - hv \neq +\infty$ ) it then follows that  $u - v \geq 0$ , and hence  $u \geq v$ . By varying  $u$  and  $v$  in either order we obtain  $\dot{H}_f^h \geq \underline{H}_f^h$ . Since  $\dot{H}_f^h = \sup \underline{\mathcal{U}}_f^h$  is finely l.s.c. it follows that  $\overline{H}_f^h \geq \underline{H}_f^h$ , and similarly  $\dot{H}_f^h \geq \underline{H}_f^h$ .

(c) Consider any point  $x_0 \in U$  such that  $\overline{H}_f^h(x_0) > -\infty$  and  $\underline{H}_f^h(x_0) < +\infty$ . By (a),  $\overline{H}_f^h$  is finely  $h$ -hyperharmonic and similarly  $\underline{H}_f^h$  is finely  $h$ -hypoharmonic on some finely open fine neighborhood  $V$  of  $x_0$  and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{H}_f^h(x_0) &= \text{fine lim}_{x \rightarrow x_0, x \in V \setminus E} \overline{H}_f^h(x) = \text{fine lim}_{x \rightarrow x_0, x \in V \setminus E} \dot{H}_f^h(x) \\ &\geq \text{fine lim sup}_{x \rightarrow x_0, x \in V \setminus E} \underline{H}_f^h(x) = \underline{H}_f^h(x_0), \end{aligned}$$

the latter equality by fine continuity of  $\underline{H}_f^h$  on  $V$ .

(d) Suppose that  $f \geq 0$  and  $\overline{H}_f^h \not\equiv +\infty$ . It follows by Propositions 3.13 and 3.14 applied to the finely superharmonic function  $hu$  that every function of class  $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_f^h$  is non-negative and hence  $\overline{H}_f^h \geq 0$ , and by (a) that  $\overline{H}_f^h$  is finely  $h$ -superharmonic. Consider the cover of  $U$  by the finely open sets  $V_k \subset U$  from Lemma 2.1. Then  $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_f^h$  is a Perron family in the sense of Definition 2.2, and hence  $\widehat{\inf} \overline{\mathcal{U}}_f^h$  is  $h$ -invariant according to Theorem 2.3  $\square$

**Proposition 4.2.** *Let  $f, g$  be two functions on  $\Delta(U)$  with values in  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ .*

1. *If  $f \leq g$  then  $\overline{H}_f^h \leq \overline{H}_g^h$  and  $\underline{H}_f^h \leq \underline{H}_g^h$ .*
2. *If  $\overline{H}_f^h < +\infty$ ,  $\overline{H}_g^h < +\infty$ , and if  $(f+g)(Y)$  is defined arbitrarily at points  $Y$  of undetermination then  $\overline{H}_{f+g}^h \leq \overline{H}_f^h + \overline{H}_g^h$ .*
3. *If 0 times  $+\infty$  is defined to be 0, then we have for any  $\alpha \in [0, +\infty[$   $\overline{H}_{\alpha f}^h = \alpha \overline{H}_f^h$  and  $\underline{H}_{\alpha f}^h = \alpha \underline{H}_f^h$ .*
4. *For any point  $x \in U$  we have  $\dot{H}_f^h(x) < +\infty$  if and only if  $\dot{H}_{f \vee 0}^h(x) < +\infty$ .*
5. *Let  $(f_j)$  be an increasing sequence of functions  $\Delta(U) \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ . Writing  $f = \sup_j f_j$  we have  $\overline{H}_f^h = \sup_j \overline{H}_{f_j}^h$ .*

*Proof.* Properties 1. and 3. follow right away from the definitions. For 2., 4., and 5. we proceed as in [6, 1.VIII.7, Proof of (d), (b), and (e)]. Concerning 4., if  $\overline{H}_f^h(x) < +\infty$  there exists a function  $u \in \overline{\mathcal{U}}_f^h$  with  $u(x) < +\infty$ ; then  $u \geq c$  for some constant  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , and hence  $u + |c| \in \mathcal{U}_{f \vee 0}^h$  because  $|c| + c \geq 0$ . Conversely, if  $\dot{H}_{f \vee 0}^h(x) < +\infty$  then  $\dot{H}_f^h(x) < +\infty$  by 1. because  $f \leq f \vee 0$ . Concerning 5. we have  $\sup_j \overline{H}_{f_j}^h \leq \overline{H}_f^h$  according to 1. We may suppose that there exists  $x_0 \in U$  such that  $\sup_j \overline{H}_{f_j}^h(x_0) < +\infty$ . For given  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists for every  $j$  a function  $\frac{u_j}{h} \in \overline{\mathcal{U}}_{f_j}^h$  such that

$$(4.1) \quad \frac{u_j}{h}(x_0) - \overline{H}_{f_j}^h(x_0) < \varepsilon 2^{-j}.$$

By Proposition 4.1 (d),  $\overline{H}_{f_j}^h$  is  $h$ -invariant, hence finely  $h$ -harmonic on  $U$  off some polar set  $E$ . The  $h$ -superharmonic function  $\overline{H}_{f_j}^h$  is majorized by  $\dot{H}_{f_j}^h \leq \frac{u_j}{h} \in \mathcal{U}_{f_j}^h$ , and the non-negative finely  $h$ -superharmonic function  $\frac{u_j}{h} - \overline{H}_{f_j}^h$  on  $U \setminus E$  therefore extends by fine continuity to a finely  $h$ -superharmonic function  $\geq 0$  on  $U$  which we likewise denote by  $\frac{u_j}{h} - \overline{H}_{f_j}^h$ . (Alternatively, apply [10, Lemma 2.2].) Define a finely  $h$ -hyperharmonic function  $\frac{u}{h}$  by

$$(4.2) \quad \frac{u}{h} = \sup_j \overline{H}_{f_j}^h + \sum_j \left( \frac{u_j}{h} - \overline{H}_{f_j}^h \right) \geq \overline{H}_{f_k}^h + \left( \frac{u_k}{h} - \overline{H}_{f_k}^h \right) = \frac{u_k}{h}$$

for any index  $k$ . Then

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow Y, x \in U} \frac{u}{h}(x) \geq \liminf_{x \rightarrow Y, x \in U} \frac{u_k}{h}(x) \geq f_k(Y)$$

for every  $Y \in \Delta(U)$  and every index  $k$ . Thus  $\frac{u}{h} \in \overline{U}_f^h$  and hence  $\overline{H}_f^h \leq \frac{u}{h}$ . In particular, by the former equality (4.2) and by (4.1),

$$(4.3) \quad \overline{H}_f^h(x_0) \leq \frac{u}{h}(x_0) \leq \sup_j \overline{H}_{f_j}^h(x_0) + \varepsilon.$$

From (4.2) it also follows that the function  $\overline{H}_f^h - \sup_j \overline{H}_{f_j}^h$  becomes finely  $h$ -superharmonic  $\geq 0$  after extension by fine continuity to the polar set of points at which the difference is not well defined. We conclude by (4.3) for  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  that indeed  $\overline{H}_f^h = \sup_j \overline{H}_{f_j}^h$ .  $\square$

**Definition 4.3.** A function  $f$  on  $\Delta(U)$  with values in  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$  is said to be  $h$ -resolutive if  $\overline{H}_f^h > -\infty$ ,  $\underline{H}_f^h < +\infty$ , and  $\overline{H}_f^h = \underline{H}_f^h$  on  $U$ , in other words: if  $\overline{H}_f^h = \underline{H}_f^h$  and this function on  $U$  is finite valued.

**Definition 4.4.** A function  $f$  on  $\Delta(U)$  with values in  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$  is said to be  $h$ -quasiresolutive if the relations  $\overline{H}_f^h > -\infty$ ,  $\underline{H}_f^h < +\infty$ , and  $\overline{H}_f^h = \underline{H}_f^h$  hold quasieverywhere on  $U$ .

Clearly, every  $h$ -resolutive function  $f$  is  $h$ -quasiresolutive. When  $f$  is  $h$ -quasiresolutive we denote by  $E_f$  the polar subset

$$E_f = \{\overline{H}_f^h = -\infty\} \cup \{\underline{H}_f^h = +\infty\} \cup \{\overline{H}_f^h \neq \underline{H}_f^h\}$$

of  $U$ , and by  $H_f^h$  the common restriction of  $\overline{H}_f^h$  and  $\underline{H}_f^h$  to  $U \setminus E_f$ . Then  $H_f^h$  is finely harmonic (on  $U \setminus E_f$ ) according to Proposition 4.1 (a) applied to  $f$  and  $-f$ . If  $f$  is  $h$ -resolutive then  $H_f^h$  is defined and finely harmonic on all of  $U$ , and is called the  $h$ -solution of the Dirichlet problem on  $\overline{U}$ .

*Remark 4.5.* In Definitions 4.4 and 4.3 one may equivalently replace  $\overline{H}_f^h$  by  $\dot{H}_f^h$  and  $\underline{H}_f^h$  by  $\dot{H}_f^h$  everywhere on  $U$ . Assuming first that  $f$  is as in Definition 4.4 as it stands. Then  $\dot{H}_f^h \geq \overline{H}_f^h > -\infty$ , the inequality ‘>’ being understood to hold q.e. And by Proposition 4.1 (a) we have  $\dot{H}_f^h = \overline{H}_f^h$  q.e. on  $\{\overline{H}_f^h > -\infty\}$ , hence q.e. on  $U$ . Next, apply this to  $-f$ . For the converse we have  $\overline{H}_f^h \leq \dot{H}_f^h = \dot{H}_f^h \leq \underline{H}_f^h$  with the equality holding quasieverywhere, and by Proposition 4.1 (b)  $\underline{H}_f^h \leq \dot{H}_f^h = \dot{H}_f^h \leq \overline{H}_f^h$ , again with equality q.e.. It follows that  $\overline{H}_f^h = \underline{H}_f^h$  q.e., and  $\underline{H}_f^h \leq \dot{H}_f^h < +\infty$  with  $\geq$  holding q.e. Similarly (or by replacing  $f$  with  $-f$ ) we have  $\overline{H}_f^h \geq \dot{H}_f^h > -\infty$  with ‘ $\geq$ ’ holding q.e. The case of Definition 4.3 is handled similarly, omitting ‘q.e.’ and taking into account that the set  $\{\dot{H}_f^h < \overline{H}_f^h\}$  is finely open and polar, hence void, and so  $\dot{H}_f^h \geq \overline{H}_f^h$ , actually with equality.

*Remark 4.6.* If  $f$  is  $h$ -quasiresolutive, resp.  $h$ -resolutive, then  $\overline{H}_f^h = \dot{H}_f^h$  q.e., resp. everywhere on  $U$ , and  $\underline{H}_f^h = \dot{H}_f^h$  q.e., resp. everywhere on  $U$ . In fact, if  $f$



is  $h$ -quasiresolutive then by Proposition 4.1 (a)  $\overline{H}_f^h = \dot{H}_f^h$  q.e. on  $\{\overline{H}_f^h > -\infty\}$ , and hence q.e. on  $U$  according to Definition 4.4; next, apply this to  $-f$ . If  $f$  is  $h$ -resolutive then by Proposition 4.1 (a)  $\overline{H}_f^h = \dot{H}_f^h$  q.e. on  $\{\overline{H}_f^h > -\infty\} = U$ . By Proposition 4.1 (b),  $\overline{H}_f^h \geq \dot{H}_f^h$  and hence  $\{\overline{H}_f^h < \dot{H}_f^h\} \subset \{\dot{H}_f^h < \dot{H}_f^h\} = \emptyset$  as shown above. Next, apply this to  $-f$ .

**Corollary 4.7.** *If  $f, g : \Delta(U) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  are  $h$ -resolutive, resp.  $h$ -quasiresolutive, and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ , then (with the same proviso concerning undetermined expressions as in Proposition 4.2)*

1.  $H_f^h$  is finely  $h$ -harmonic on  $U$ , resp. on  $U \setminus E_f$ . In particular,  $\overline{H}_f^h$  and  $\underline{H}_f^h$  are finite on  $U$ , resp. on  $U$ .
2.  $\alpha f$  is  $h$ -resolutive, resp.  $h$ -quasiresolutive, and  $H_{\alpha f}^h = \alpha H_f^h$  on  $U$ , resp. on  $U \setminus E_f$ .
3.  $f + g$  is  $h$ -resolutive, resp.  $h$ -quasiresolutive, and  $H_{f+g}^h = H_f^h + H_g^h$  on  $U$ , resp. on  $U \setminus E_{f+g}$ .
4.  $f \vee g$  and  $f \wedge g$  are  $h$ -resolutive, resp.  $h$ -quasiresolutive, and if for example  $H_f^h \vee H_g^h \geq 0$  then  $H_{f \vee g}^h = (1/h)\widehat{R}_{h(H_f^h \vee H_g^h)}$  on  $U$ , resp. on  $U \setminus E_{f \vee g}$ .

*Proof.* We give the proof in the case of  $h$ -quasiresolutivity, the case of  $h$ -resolutivity being established similarly.

1. Follows from Proposition 4.1 (a). Of the remaining assertions, only 4. requires explanation, inspired by [6, 1.VIII.7 (d)]. For the notation in the stated equation in 4. see [11, Definition 11.4]. Since  $f \wedge g = -[(-f) \vee (-g)]$  and  $f \vee g = [(f - g) \vee 0] + g$  it follows by 2. and 3. that 4. reduces to  $h$ -quasiresolutivity of  $f^+ = f \vee 0$  and the stated expression for  $H_{f \vee g}^h$  with  $g = 0$ . By 1. in Proposition 4.2

$$(4.4) \quad \overline{H}_{f \vee 0}^h \geq \overline{H}_f^h > -\infty$$

on  $U \setminus E_f$  and hence q.e. on  $U$  by Definition 4.4. By 4. in Proposition 4.2 we have

$$(4.5) \quad \overline{H}_{f \vee 0}^h \leq \widehat{H}_{f \vee 0}^h < +\infty$$

q.e. on  $U$  because  $\dot{H}_f^h = \overline{H}_f^h < +\infty$  on  $U \setminus E_f$  in view of 1. From Proposition 4.1 (a), (b) with  $f$  replaced by  $-(f \vee 0)$  we therefore obtain

$$(4.6) \quad \underline{H}_{f \vee 0}^h = \dot{H}_{f \vee 0}^h \leq \overline{H}_{f \vee 0}^h < +\infty$$

with the inequality holding q.e. on  $U$  by (4.5). For  $h$ -quasiresolutivity of  $f \vee 0$  it remains after (4.4) and (4.6) to show that  $\overline{H}_{f \vee 0}^h = \underline{H}_{f \vee 0}^h$  q.e. on  $U$ . With  $E_f$  as defined after Definition 4.4 we consider the finely open subset  $V = U \cap \{\dot{H}_f^h(x) = \overline{H}_f^h(x)\} \setminus E_f$  of  $U$ , cf. Proposition 4.1 (a). For given  $x \in V$  and integers  $j > 0$  choose  $u_j \in \overline{U}_f^h$  with  $u_j(x) \leq \overline{H}_f^h(x) + 2^{-j}$  ( $= \dot{H}_f^h(x) + 2^{-j}$ ). The series  $\sum_{j=k}^{\infty} (u_j - H_f^h)$  of non-negative finely  $h$ -superharmonic functions on

$V$  ( $u_j$  and  $H_f^h$  being restricted to  $V$ ) has a non-negative finely  $h$ -superharmonic sum, finite at  $x$ . Since  $H_f^h$  is finely  $h$ -harmonic on  $V$ ,  $H_f^h \vee 0$  ( $= \dot{H}_f^h \vee 0$ ) is finely  $h$ -subharmonic (and non-negative) on  $V$  and majorized there by  $\dot{H}_{f \vee 0}^h$ , which is finite valued on  $V$  by 4. in Proposition 4.2 since  $\dot{H}_f^h < +\infty$  on  $V$ . It follows by [11, Theorem 11.13], applied with  $f$  replaced by  $h\overline{H}_f \vee 0$ , that  $\frac{1}{h}\widehat{R}_{h\overline{H}_f \vee 0}^h$  (sweeping relative to  $U$ ) is finely  $h$ -harmonic on  $V$ , being majorized there by  $\overline{H}_f^h \vee 0 \leq \overline{H}_{f \vee 0}^h \leq \dot{H}_{f \vee 0}^h < +\infty$ . The non-negative function

$$(4.7) \quad \frac{1}{h}\widehat{R}_{h\overline{H}_f \vee 0}^h + \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} (u_j - H_f^h)$$

restricted on  $V$  is therefore finely  $h$ -superharmonic and Moreover, this non-negative finely superharmonic function on  $V$  majorizes  $u_k \in \overline{\mathcal{U}}_f^h$  on  $V$  (being  $\geq \frac{1}{h}\widehat{R}_{h\overline{H}_f \vee 0}^h + (u_k - H_f^h) \geq u_k$  there), and this majorization remains in force after extension by fine continuity to  $U$ , cf. [11, Theorem 9.14]. Thus the extended function (4.7) belongs to  $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_{f \vee 0}^h$ . For  $k \rightarrow \infty$  it follows that  $\overline{H}_{f \vee 0}^h \leq \dot{H}_{f \vee 0}^h \leq \frac{1}{h}\widehat{R}_{h\overline{H}_{f \vee 0}^h} < +\infty$  on  $U$ . On the other hand,  $\underline{H}_{f \vee 0}^h$  majorizes both  $H_f^h$  and 0 on  $V$  (by 1. in Proposition 4.2); so  $\underline{H}_{f \vee 0}^h \geq \frac{1}{h}\widehat{R}_{h\overline{H}_{f \vee 0}^h}$  on  $U$ . It follows that

$$\overline{H}_{f \vee 0}^h \leq \frac{1}{h}\widehat{R}_{h\overline{H}_{f \vee 0}^h} \leq \underline{H}_{f \vee 0}^h \leq \overline{H}_{f \vee 0}^h$$

on  $U \setminus E_f$  and hence q.e. on  $U$ . Together with (4.4) and (4.6) this shows that  $f \vee 0$  indeed is  $h$ -quasiresolutive according to Definition 4.4, and that  $H_f^h = \frac{1}{h}\widehat{R}_{h\overline{H}_{f \vee 0}^h}$ , the latter restricted to  $U \setminus E_f$ .  $\square$

Recall that  $\mu_h$  denotes the unique measure on  $\Delta(U)$  carried by  $\Delta_1(U)$  and representing  $h$ , that is,  $h = K\mu_h = \int K(\cdot, Y)d\mu_h(Y)$ .

**Proposition 4.8.** *For any  $\mu_h$ -measurable subset  $A$  of  $\Delta(U)$  the indicator function  $1_A$  is  $h$ -resolutive and*

$$(4.8) \quad H_{1_A}^h = \frac{1}{h} \int_A K(\cdot, Y)d\mu_h(Y) = \widehat{R}_h^A.$$

*In particular, the constant function 1 on  $\Delta(U)$  is  $h$ -resolutive and  $H_1^h = 1$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose first that  $A$  is compact. Because  $h = K\mu_h$  and because  $\mu_h$  is carried by  $\Delta_1(U)$  we have by the latter assertion in Theorem 3.9 and Proposition 3.8

$$\widehat{R}_h^A = \widehat{R}_{K\mu_h}^A = \int_{\Delta_1(U)} \widehat{R}_{K(\cdot, Y)}^A d\mu_h(Y).$$

Consider any finely  $h$ -hyperharmonic function  $u = v/h \geq 0$  on  $U$  such that  $u \geq 1$  on some open set  $W$  in  $\overline{U}$  with  $W \supset A$ . Then  $u \in \mathcal{U}_{1_A}^h$  and hence

$u \geq \dot{H}_{1_A}^h \geq \overline{H}_{1_A}^h$ . By varying  $W$  it follows by Definition 2.4 that  $\frac{1}{h}\widehat{R}_h^A \geq \overline{H}_{1_A}^h$ . According to this inequality we have

$$(4.9) \quad \frac{1}{h} \int K(\cdot, Y) 1_A(Y) d\mu_h(Y) \geq \frac{1}{h} \widehat{R}_h^A \geq \overline{H}_{1_A}^h.$$

Applying this inequality to  $\Delta(U) \setminus A$  in place of  $A$  we obtain

$$(4.10) \quad \frac{1}{h} \int K(\cdot, Y) 1_{\Delta(U) \setminus A}(Y) d\mu_h(Y) \geq \overline{H}_{1_{\Delta(U) \setminus A}}^h.$$

By adding the left hand, resp. right hand, members of (4.9) and (4.10) this leads by 2. in Proposition 4.2 to

$$(4.11) \quad 1 = \frac{1}{h} \int K(\cdot, Y) d\mu_h(Y) \geq \overline{H}_{1_A}^h + \overline{H}_{1_{\Delta(U) \setminus A}}^h \geq \overline{H}_1^h.$$

On the other hand, for any  $u = v/h \in \overline{U}_1^h$  we have  $u \geq \overline{H}_1^h \geq 0$  by Proposition 4.1 (d), and it follows by Propositions 3.13 and 3.14 applied to the finely superharmonic function  $v - h \geq 0$  that  $v \geq h$ , that is  $u \geq 1$  on  $U$ . By varying  $u$  this shows that  $\overline{H}_1^h \geq 1$ , so actually  $\overline{H}_1^h = 1$ . Altogether, we therefore obtain from the relations (4.9) through (4.11)

$$\frac{1}{h} \int_A K(\cdot, Y) d\mu_h(Y) = \frac{1}{h} \widehat{R}_h^A = \overline{H}_{1_A}^h.$$

For the case of an arbitrary  $\mu_h$ -measurable set  $A \subset \Delta(U)$  we denote by  $\mathcal{A}$  the family of all  $\mu_h$ -measurable sets  $A \subset \Delta(U)$  for which the former equality (4.8) holds. According to 5. in Proposition 4.2 the union, resp. intersection, of any increasing, resp. decreasing, sequence of sets from  $\mathcal{A}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{A}$ . As shown above,  $\mathcal{A}$  includes all compact subsets of  $\Delta(U)$ , and therefore all Borel sets, and indeed all  $\mu_h$ -measurable sets  $A \subset \Delta(U)$ . In fact, there are Borel sets  $B, C$  such that  $B \subset A \subset C$  and  $\mu_h(B) = \mu_h(C)$ , and hence

$$H_{1_B}^h \leq \underline{H}_{1_A}^h \leq \overline{H}_{1_A}^h \leq H_{1_C}^h,$$

actually with equality because

$$H_{1_B}^h = \frac{1}{h} \int_B K(\cdot, Y) d\mu_h(Y) = \frac{1}{h} \int_C K(\cdot, Y) d\mu_h(Y) = H_{1_C}^h$$

and  $\mu_h(C \setminus B) = 0$ . □

For any function  $f : \Delta(U) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  we define  $f(Y)K(x, Y) = 0$  at points  $(x, Y)$  where  $f(Y) = 0$  and  $K(x, Y) = +\infty$ . If  $f$  is  $\mu_h$ -measurable then so is  $Y \mapsto f(Y)K(x, Y)$  for each  $x \in U$  because  $K(x, Y) > 0$  is  $\mu_h$ -measurable (even l.s.c.) as a function of  $Y \in \Delta(U)$  according to [10, Proposition 3.2 (i)].

**Theorem 4.9.** *For any  $\mu_h$ -measurable lower bounded function  $f : \Delta(U) \rightarrow ]-\infty, +\infty]$ , the upper solution  $\overline{H}_f^h$  is given by*

$$\overline{H}_f^h = \frac{1}{h} \int f(Y)K(., Y)d\mu_h(Y) > -\infty.$$

*Proof.* Consider first the case where  $f \geq 0$ . Being  $\mu_h$ -measurable,  $f$  is then the upper envelope of an increasing sequence of non-negative  $\mu_h$ -measurable step functions  $f_j$  (that is, finite valued functions  $f_j$  taking only finitely many values, each on some  $\mu_h$ -measurable set; in other words: affine combinations of indicator functions of  $\mu_h$ -measurable sets). For any index  $j$  it follows by Proposition 4.8 and by 2., 3. in Corollary 4.7 that each  $f_j$  is  $h$ -quasiresolutive and that

$$H_{f_j}^h = \frac{1}{h} \int f_j(Y)K(., Y)d\mu_h(Y),$$

and hence by 5. in Proposition 4.2 that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \frac{1}{h} \int f(Y)K(., Y)d\mu_h(Y) \\ &= \frac{1}{h} \sup_j \int f_j(Y)K(., Y)d\mu_h(Y) = \sup_j H_{f_j}^h = \overline{H}_f^h. \end{aligned}$$

For general  $f$  there is a constant  $c \geq 0$  such that  $g := f + c \geq 0$ . Since  $H_c^h = c$  by Corollary 4.7 and Proposition 4.8 it follows by 2. in Proposition 4.2 that  $\overline{H}_f^h \leq \overline{H}_g^h - c$  and  $\overline{H}_g^h \leq \overline{H}_f^h + c$ , whence  $\overline{H}_f^h = \overline{H}_g^h - c \geq -c > -\infty$  and

$$\overline{H}_f^h = \frac{1}{h} \int g(Y)K(., Y)d\mu_h(Y) - c = \frac{1}{h} \int f(Y)K(., Y)d\mu_h(Y).$$

□

**Corollary 4.10.** (a) *Every bounded  $\mu_h$ -measurable function  $f$  on  $\Delta(U)$  is  $h$ -resolutive, and*

$$H_f^h = \frac{1}{h} \int f(Y)K(., Y)d\mu_h(Y).$$

(b) *Let  $f$  be a lower bounded  $\mu_h$ -measurable function on  $\Delta(U)$ . Then  $\overline{H}_f^h$  is either identically  $+\infty$  or else the sum of an  $h$ -invariant function and a constant  $\leq 0$ . Furthermore,  $\overline{H}_f^h = \underline{H}_f^h$ .*

*Proof.* (a) By Theorem 4.9,

$$\overline{H}_f^h = \frac{1}{h} \int fK(., Y)d\mu_h(Y)$$

and the same with  $f$  replaced by  $-f$ , whence  $\overline{H}_f^h = \underline{H}_f^h$ , finite valued because  $f$  is bounded, so  $f$  is  $h$ -resolutive. Let  $c \geq 0$  be a constant such that  $|f| \leq c$ . As shown at the end of the proof of Theorem 4.9,  $\overline{H}_f^h = c - \underline{H}_{c-f}^h$  which is

finely  $h$ -harmonic because  $H_{c-f}^h$  is  $h$ -invariant by Proposition 4.1 (d) (applied to  $c - f \geq 0$ ) and hence finely  $h$ -harmonic, being finite valued.

(b) We have  $f \geq -c$  for some constant  $c \geq 0$  and hence again  $\overline{H}_f^h = \overline{H}_{f+c}^h - c$ , whence the former assertion in view of Proposition 4.1 (d) applied to  $f+c \geq 0$ . For any integer  $j > 0$  it follows from (a) applied to the bounded measurable  $h$ -resolutive function  $f \wedge j$  that  $H_{f \wedge j}^h$  is finely  $h$ -harmonic and of course  $\leq H_f^h$ . For  $j \rightarrow \infty$  we obtain by 5. in Proposition 4.2 that  $\overline{H}_f^h \leq H_f^h$ . By Proposition 4.1 (b) we actually have  $\overline{H}_f^h = H_f^h$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 4.11.** *Let  $(f_j)$  be an increasing sequence of  $h$ -resolutive, resp.  $h$ -quasiresolutive functions on  $\Delta(U)$  with values in  $[0, +\infty]$ , and let  $f = \sup_j f_j$ . If  $\overline{H}_f^h < +\infty$  then  $f$  is  $h$ -resolutive, resp.  $h$ -quasiresolutive.*

*Proof.* We consider the case of  $h$ -quasiresolutivity, the case of  $h$ -resolutivity being settled by replacing ‘q.e.’ with ‘everywhere’. For every  $j$  we have  $\underline{H}_f^h \geq \underline{H}_{f_j}^h = \overline{H}_{f_j}^h$  q.e., and hence by 5. in Proposition 4.2  $\underline{H}_f^h \geq \sup_j \underline{H}_{f_j}^h = \sup_j \overline{H}_{f_j}^h = \overline{H}_f^h$  q.e., actually with equality q.e. in view of Proposition 4.1 (c).  $\square$

**Corollary 4.12.** *Let  $f : \Delta(U) \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  be  $\mu_h$ -measurable. Then  $f$  is  $h$ -resolutive, resp.  $h$ -quasiresolutive, if and only if  $\int f(Y)K(x, Y)d\mu_h(Y) < +\infty$  for quasievery, resp. every,  $x \in U$ . In the affirmative case we have  $H_f^h(x) = \int f(Y)K(x, Y)d\mu_h(Y)$  for every  $x \in U$ , resp. for every  $x \in U$  at which this integral is finite.*

*Proof.* This follows from Corollaries 4.10 and 4.11, taking  $f_j = f \wedge j$  for any  $j$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 4.13.** *Let  $f : \Delta(U) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  be  $\mu_h$ -measurable. Then  $f$  is  $h$ -resolutive, resp.  $h$ -quasiresolutive, if and only if  $|f|$  is  $h$ -resolutive, resp.  $h$ -quasiresolutive.*

*Proof.* If  $f$  is  $h$ -resolutive, resp.  $h$ -quasiresolutive, then so is  $|f| = f \vee -f$  according to 4. and 2. in Corollary 4.7. Conversely, if  $|f|$  is  $h$ -resolutive, resp.  $h$ -quasiresolutive, then by Corollary 4.12  $|f|K(x, \cdot)$  is  $\mu_h(Y)$ -integrable for every  $x \in U$ , resp. for quasievery  $x \in U$ , and so are therefore  $f^+K(x, \cdot)$  and  $f^-K(x, \cdot)$ . Hence  $f^+$  and  $f^-$  are  $h$ -resolutive, resp.  $h$ -quasiresolutive, again by Corollary 4.12, and so is  $f = f^+ - f^-$  by 2. and 3. in Corollary 4.7.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.14.** *Every  $h$ -quasiresolutive function  $f : \Delta(U) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  is  $\mu_h$ -measurable.*

*Proof.* We begin by proving this for  $f = 1_A$ , the indicator function of a subset  $A$  of  $\Delta(U)$ , cf. [6, p. 113]. By the fundamental convergence theorem there is a decreasing sequence of functions  $u_j \in \overline{\mathcal{U}}_f^h$  such that  $\overline{H}_f^h = \widehat{\inf}_j u_j$ . Replacing

$u_j$  by  $u_j \wedge 1 \in \overline{\mathcal{U}}_f^h$  we arrange that  $u_j \leq 1$ . Denote by  $g_j$  the function defined on  $\overline{U}$  by

$$g_j(Y) = \liminf_{z \rightarrow Y, z \in U} u_j(z)$$

for any  $Y \in \overline{U}$ . Clearly,  $g_j$  is l.s.c. on  $\overline{U}$  and  $1_A \leq g_j \leq 1$  on  $\Delta(U)$ . Write  $f_2 = \inf_j g_j$ . Then  $f_2$  is Borel measurable and  $f_2 \geq f = 1_A$ , hence  $\overline{H}_{f_2}^h \geq \overline{H}_f^h$ . For the opposite inequality note that  $u_j \in \overline{\mathcal{U}}_{f_2}^h$  because  $g_j \geq f_2$ . Hence  $\overline{H}_f^h = \widehat{\inf}_j u_j \geq \overline{H}_{f_2}^h$  and altogether  $\overline{H}_{f_2}^h = \overline{H}_f^h$ . Similarly there is a non-negative Borel measurable function  $f_1 \leq f$  such that  $\underline{H}_{f_1}^h = \underline{H}_f^h$ . Since  $f$  is  $h$ -quasiresolutive we obtain

$$H_f = \underline{H}_{f_1}^h \leq \overline{H}_{f_1}^h \leq H_f^h \leq \underline{H}_{f_2}^h \leq \overline{H}_{f_2}^h = H_f^h$$

q.e. on  $U$ , thus with equality q.e. all through. Hence  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  are  $h$ -quasiresolutive, and so is therefore  $f_2 - f_1$  by 2. and 3. in Corollary 4.7, which also shows that  $H_{f_2-f_1}^h = H_{f_2}^h - H_{f_1}^h = 0$  q.e. Because  $f_2 - f_1$  is non-negative and Borel measurable it follows by Theorem 4.9 that  $\frac{1}{h} \int (f_1(Y) - f_2(Y))K(\cdot, Y)d\mu_h(Y) = 0$  q.e., and hence  $f_1 = f_2$   $\mu_h$ -a.e. It follows that  $f = 1_A$  is  $\mu_h$ -measurable, and so is therefore  $A$ .

Next we treat the case of a finite valued  $h$ -quasiresolutive function  $f$ . Adapting the proof given in [6, p. 115] in the classical setting we consider the space  $\mathcal{C}(\overline{\mathbb{R}})$  of continuous functions  $\overline{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and denote by  $\Phi$  the space of functions  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{\mathbb{R}})$  such that  $\varphi \circ f$  is  $h$ -quasiresolutive with  $E_{\varphi \circ f} \subset E_f$ . By Corollary 4.7  $\Phi$  is a vector lattice, closed under uniform convergence because  $|\varphi_j - \varphi| < \varepsilon$  implies  $|H_{\varphi_j \circ f}^h - \overline{H}_{\varphi \circ f}^h| \leq \varepsilon$  and  $|H_{\varphi_j \circ f}^h - H_{\varphi \circ f}^h| \leq \varepsilon$  on  $U \setminus E_f$ , and so  $|\overline{H}_{\varphi \circ f}^h - \underline{H}_{\varphi \circ f}^h| \leq 2\varepsilon$  on  $U \setminus E_f$ . We infer that  $\overline{H}_{\varphi \circ f}^h = \underline{H}_{\varphi \circ f}^h$  on  $U \setminus E_f$ , and so  $\varphi \circ f$  is indeed quasiresolutive. Furthermore,  $\Phi$  includes the functions  $\varphi_n : t \mapsto (1 - |t - n|) \vee 0$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  for integers  $n \geq 1$ , again by Corollary 4.7. These functions separate points of  $\mathbb{R}$ . In fact, for distinct  $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$ , say  $s < t$ , take  $n = [s]$  (that is,  $n \leq s < n + 1$ ). If also  $n \leq t < n + 1$  then clearly  $\varphi_n(t) < \varphi_n(s) \leq 1$ , and in the remaining case  $t \geq n + 1$  we have  $\varphi_n(t) = 0 < \varphi_n(s)$ . It therefore follows by the lattice version of the Stone-Weierstrass theorem that  $\Phi = \mathcal{C}(\overline{\mathbb{R}})$ . The class  $\Psi$  of functions  $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  for which  $\psi \circ f$  is  $h$ -quasiresolutive with  $E_{\psi \circ f} \subset E_f$  is a class closed under bounded monotone convergence, by 5. in Proposition 4.2 (adapted to a bounded monotone convergent sequence of functions  $f_j$ ). Along with  $\mathcal{C}(\overline{\mathbb{R}})$ ,  $\Psi$  therefore includes every bounded Borel measurable function  $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . In particular, the indicator function  $1_J$  of an interval  $J \subset \mathbb{R}$  belongs to  $\Psi$ , and hence  $1_J \circ f$  is  $h$ -quasiresolutive. We conclude by the first part of the proof that the function  $1_J \circ f$  is  $\mu_h$ -measurable, being the indicator function  $1_{f^{-1}(J)}$  of the quasiresolutive function  $1_J \circ f$ .

Finally, for an arbitrary  $h$ -quasiresolutive function  $f : \Delta(U) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , write  $A_+ := \{f = +\infty\}$  and  $A_- := \{f = -\infty\}$ . By Proposition 4.2 and 4. in Corollary 4.7 we have

$$\overline{H}_{(+\infty)1_{A_+}}^h = \overline{H}_{f1_{A_+}}^h \leq \overline{H}_{f \vee 0}^h < +\infty$$

on  $U \setminus E_f$ . It follows that  $\overline{H}_{1_{A_+}}^h = 0$  q.e. on  $U$  and hence  $\overline{H}_{(+\infty)1_{A_+}}^h = 0$  q.e. Since  $-f$  likewise is  $h$ -quasiresolutive we have  $\underline{H}_{(+\infty)1_{A_-}}^h = 0$  q.e. Furthermore,  $0 \leq \underline{H}_{(+\infty)1_{A_+}}^h \leq \overline{H}_{(+\infty)1_{A_+}}^h = 0$  q.e. by Corollary 4.7, and similarly  $\underline{H}_{(+\infty)1_{A_-}}^h = 0$  q.e. Writing  $A = A_+ \cup A_- = \{|f| = +\infty\}$  we infer that  $\underline{H}_{1_A}^h = \overline{H}_{1_A}^h = 0$  q.e. and hence  $1_A$  and  $(+\infty)1_A$  are  $h$ -quasiresolutive. As shown above it follows that  $A$  is  $\mu_h$ -measurable. Define  $g : \Delta(U) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $g = f$  except that  $g = 0$  on  $\{|f| = +\infty\}$ . Then  $g \leq f + (+\infty)1_A$  and  $f \leq g + (+\infty)1_A$ , and hence by Proposition 4.2

$$\overline{H}_g^h \leq H_f^h + \overline{H}_{(+\infty)1_A}^h = H_f^h \leq \underline{H}_g^h + \underline{H}_{(+\infty)1_A}^h = \underline{H}_g^h$$

q.e., actually with equality q.e., and hence  $g$  is  $h$ -quasiresolutive. If  $g$  is  $\mu_h$ -measurable then so is  $f = g + (+\infty)1_A$  since we have shown that  $A$  is  $\mu_h$ -measurable.  $\square$

The main results of the present section are the following two theorems.

**Theorem 4.15.** *A function  $f : \Delta(U) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  is  $h$ -resolutive if and only if the function  $Y \mapsto f(Y)K(x, Y)$  on  $\Delta(U)$  is  $\mu_h$ -integrable for every  $x \in U$ . In the affirmative case we have*

$$(4.12) \quad H_f^h = \frac{1}{h} \int f(Y)K(\cdot, Y)d\mu_h(Y).$$

*Proof.* The proof of this theorem is derived in the usual way from that of the following more general  $h$ -quasiresolutivity version.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.16.** *A function  $f : \Delta(U) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  is  $h$ -quasiresolutive if and only if the function  $Y \mapsto f(Y)K(x, Y)$  on  $\Delta(U)$  is  $\mu_h$ -integrable for quasievery  $x \in U$ . In the affirmative case  $H_f^h(x)$  is defined precisely at those points  $x \in U$  for which  $Y \mapsto f(Y)K(x, Y)$  is  $\mu_h$ -integrable. For such  $x$  the equation (4.12) holds.*

*Proof.* Suppose first that there is a polar set  $E \subset U$  such that  $fK(x, \cdot)$  is  $\mu_h$ -integrable for every  $x \in U \setminus E$ . Then  $f^+$  and  $f^-$  are  $h$ -quasiresolutive by Corollary 4.12, and so is therefore  $f = f^+ - f^-$  by 4. and 2. in Corollary 4.7. Furthermore, we have  $H_f^h = \frac{1}{h} \int f(Y)K(\cdot, Y)d\mu_h(Y)$  on  $U \setminus E$  by Corollary 4.12 applied with  $f$  replaced by  $f^+$  and  $f^-$ , cf. 4. and 2. in Proposition 4.2. Consequently,  $f$  is  $h$ -quasiresolutive according to Corollary 4.13, and (4.12) holds on  $U \setminus E$  by Corollary 4.12.



Conversely, suppose that  $f$  is  $h$ -quasiresolutive, and let us establish the stated integral representation of  $H_f^h$  q.e. on  $U$ , using that  $f$  is  $\mu_h$ -measurable by Proposition 4.14. According to 4. in Corollary 4.7 the function  $|f|$  is  $h$ -quasiresolutive, and hence  $\overline{H}_f^h(x) < +\infty$  for every  $x \in U \setminus E_f$ , that is,  $\int |f(y)|K(x, Y)d\mu_h(Y) < +\infty$  for  $x \in U \setminus E_f$  in view of Theorem 4.9. Thus the function  $Y \mapsto f(Y)K(x, Y)$  is  $\mu_h$ -integrable for each  $x \in U \setminus E_f$ .  $\square$

*Remark 4.17.* In the case where  $U$  is Euclidean open it follows by the Harnack convergence theorem for harmonic functions (not extendable to finely harmonic functions) that  $\dot{H}_f^h = \overline{H}_f^h$ , and that this function is  $h$ -hyperharmonic and thus in particular  $> -\infty$  (except if it is identically  $-\infty$ ). Similarly with  $f$  replaced by  $-f$ . In this Euclidean case the results about  $h$ -resolutivity obtained in the present section therefore imply the corresponding classical results.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Aikawa, H.: *Potential Analysis on non-smooth domains – Martin boundary and boundary Harnack principle*, Complex Analysis and Potential Theory, 235–253, CRM Proc. Lecture Notes 55, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2012.
- [2] Alfsen, E.M.: *Compact Convex Sets and Boundary Integrals*, Ergebnisse der Math., Vol. 57, Springer, Berlin, 2001.
- [3] Armitage, D.H., Gardiner, S.J.: *Classical Potential Theory*, Springer, London, 2001.
- [4] Boboc, N., Bucur, Gh., Cornea, A.: *Order and Convexity in Potential Theory: H-Cones*, Lecture Notes in Math. 853, Springer, Berlin, 1981.
- [5] Bourbaki, N.: Livre VI: Intégration, chap. 5: Intégration des mesures, Paris, 1956.
- [6] Doob, J.L.: *Classical Potential Theory and Its Probabilistic Counterpart*, Grundlehren Vol. 262, Springer, New York, 1984.
- [7] Dellacherie, C., Meyer, P.A.: *Probabilités et Potentiel*, Hermann, Paris 1987, Chap. XII–XVI.
- [8] El Kadiri, M.: *Sur la décomposition de Riesz et la représentation intégrale des fonctions finement surharmoniques*, Positivity **4** (2000), no. 2, 105–114.
- [9] El Kadiri, M.: *Sur les suites de fonctions finement harmoniques*, Rivista Univ. Parma. **72** (2003), 63–68.
- [10] El Kadiri, M., Fuglede, B.: *Martin boundary of a fine domain and a Fatou-Naim-Doob theorem for finely superharmonic functions*, Manuscript (2013).
- [11] Fuglede, B.: *Finely Harmonic Functions*, Lecture Notes in Math. 289, Springer, Berlin, 1972.
- [12] Fuglede, B.: *Sur la fonction de Green pour un domaine fin*, Ann. Inst. Fourier **25**, 3–4 (1975), 201–206.
- [13] Fuglede, B.: *Finely harmonic mappings and finely holomorphic functions*, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fennicae, Ser. A.I. **10** (1976), 113–127.
- [14] Fuglede, B.: *Localization in fine potential theory and uniform approximation by subharmonic functions*, J. Funct. Anal. **49** (1982) 52–72.
- [15] Fuglede, B.: *Integral representation of fine potentials*, Math. Ann. **262** (1983), 191–214.
- [16] Fuglede, B.: *Représentation intégrale des potentiels fins*, C.R. Acad. Sc. Paris **300**, Ser. I, 5 (1985), 129–132.

- [17] Gardiner, S.J., Hansen, W.: *The Riesz decomposition of finely superharmonic functions*, Adv. Math. **214**, 1 (2007), 417-436.
- [18] Gowrisankaran, K.: *Extreme harmonic functions and boundary value problems*, Ann. Inst. Fourier **13**, 2 (1963), 307–356.
- [19] Hervé, R.-M.: *Recherches axiomatiques sur la théorie des fonctions surharmoniques et du potentiel*, Ann. Inst. Fourier **12** (1962), 415–571.
- [20] Lyons, T.J.: *Cones of lower semicontinuous functions and a characterisation of finely hyperharmonic functions*, Math. Ann. **261** (1982), 293–297.
- [21] Mokobodzki, G.: *Représentation intégrale des fonctions surharmoniques au moyen des réduites*, Ann. Inst. Fourier **15**, 1 (1965), 103–112.
- [22] Taylor, J.C.: *An elementary proof of the theorem of Fatou-Naïm-Doob*, Canadian Mathematical Society Conference Proceedings, Vol. 1, 1981.

UNIVERSITÉ MOHAMMED V, FACULTÉ DES SCIENCES, FACULTÉ DES SCIENCES, B.P.  
1014, RABAT, MOROCCO  
*E-mail address:* `elkadiri@fsr.ac.ma`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITETSPARKEN 5, 2100 COPEN-  
HAGEN, DANMARK  
*E-mail address:* `fuglede@math.ku.dk`