

# On the Kuramochi boundary of a subsurface of a Riemann surface

By Yukio NAGASAKA

## Introduction

Z. Kuramochi [4] considered a compactification of a subsurface  $G$  of a Riemann surface  $R$ , which is similar to the Kuramochi compactification of  $R$ . In [4], he introduced the function-theoretic mass for  $F_0SH$  functions on  $G$  and showed that it is important to investigate the properties of the compactification of  $G$ . Then, on the subsurface  $G$ , there are two topologies: one of them is the topology on the compactification of  $G$  and the other is the induced topology on  $G$  by the Kuramochi compactification of  $R$ . Z. Kuramochi [3] investigated the relations of these two topologies (Theorem A and B).

In this paper, we shall give some properties of the function-theoretic mass (Proposition 2 and Theorem 1) and that the  $F_0H$  function with finite function-theoretic mass is represented by the canonical measure (Theorem 2). In §5, we shall study the relation of the above two topologies (Theorem 4, 5 and 6).

## § 1. Notation and terminology

Let  $R$  be a hyperbolic Riemann surface. We call a closed or open subset  $A$  of  $R$  regular if the relative boundary  $\partial A$  of  $A$  consists of at most a countable number of analytic arcs clustering nowhere in  $R$ . We fix a closed disk  $K_0$  in  $R$  and a regular subdomain  $G$  of  $R$  such that  $K_0 \cap G = \emptyset$ . Let  $R_0 = R - K_0$ . An exhaustion of  $R$  will mean an increasing sequence  $\{R_n\}$  of relatively compact domains on  $R$  such that  $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} R_n = R$  and each  $\partial R_n$  consists of finite number of closed analytic Jordan curves. We denote by  $\{G_n\}$  an exhaustion of  $G$ .

## § 2. $G$ - $F_0SH$ function

We follow [1] for the definition and properties of Dirichlet functions. Let  $f$  be a continuous Dirichlet function on  $R$  with  $f=0$  on  $R-G$  and  $F$  be a regular closed subset of  $G$ . Then there is a uniquely determined Dirichlet function  $f^F$  on  $R$  which minimizes the Dirichlet norm  $\|g\|$  among Dirichlet

chlet functions  $g$  such that  $g=f$  on  $F \cup (R-G)$  and which is equal to  $f$  on  $F \cup (R-G)$  and is harmonic in  $G-F$  (Dirichlet principle). If there is a Dirichlet function  $f$  on  $R$  such that  $f=0$  on  $R-G$  and  $=1$  on  $F$ , then  $f^F$  exists and does not depend on the choice of such  $f$ . Thus we denote it by  $\omega_F = \omega(\partial F, z, G-F)$ .

There exists a uniquely determined function  $N(z, p)$  ( $z, p \in G$ ) which has the following conditions (cf. [4]):

a)  $N(z, p) - G(z, p)$  is harmonic in  $z \in G$  for each  $p \in G$ , where  $G(z, p)$  is the Green function of  $G$ .

b)  $N(z, p) = N(p, z)$ .

c)  $\lim_{z \rightarrow \partial G} N(z, p) = 0$ .

d) If  $K$  be a regular compact set in  $G$  which contains  $p$  in its interior, then  $N(\cdot, p)^K(z) = N(z, p)$ . (We set  $N(z, p) = 0$  on  $R-G$ ).

e)  $\|\min(N(z, p), M)\|^2 = 2\pi M$  for any  $M > 0$ .

We call  $N(z, p)$  the  $N$ -function of  $G$ . We denote by  $L(z, p)$  the  $N$ -function of  $R_0 = R - K_0$ . As a usual manner in [4], we have the Kuramochi compactification  $G^*$  of  $G$  and  $(z, p) \rightarrow N(z, p)$  is extended continuously over  $G \times G^*$ . In  $\Delta^G = G^* - G$ , there is only one point  $p_0$  such that  $N(z, p_0) \equiv 0$ . We note that  $G^*$  is metrizable. The properties of the Kuramochi compactification  $R^*$  of  $R$  are found in [1], [2] and [5]. For any non-negative measure  $\mu$  on  $G^*$  (resp.  $R_0^* = R^* - K_0$ ), we define  $N$ -potential (resp.  $L$ -potential) by  $N_\mu(z) = \int N(z, p) d\mu(p)$  (resp.  $L_\mu(z) = \int L(z, p) d\mu(p)$ ).

Let  $V(z)$  be a non-negative continuous function in  $R$  with  $V > 0$  on  $G$  and  $V = 0$  on  $R-G$  such that  $V_M(z) = \min(V(z), M)$  is a Dirichlet function for any  $M > 0$ . For any regular compact set  $K$  in  $G$ , we define  $V_K(z) = V_K^G(z)$  by increasing limit of  $(V_M)^K(z)$  as  $M \rightarrow \infty$ . If  $V_K(z) \leq V(z)$  for any regular compact set  $K$ , then  $V(z)$  is called a  $G-F_0$ SH function. Any  $G-F_0$ SH function is superharmonic in  $G$ . If, in addition,  $G-F_0$ SH function is harmonic in  $G$ , it is called a  $G-F_0$ H function. Let  $N_\mu$  be a continuous  $N$ -potential which  $\min(N_\mu(z), M)$  is Dirichlet function for any  $M > 0$ . Then  $N_\mu$  is a  $G-F_0$ SH function (cf. [5]).

Let  $V$  be a  $G-F_0$ H function. For any regular closed subset  $F$  of  $G$ , we define  $V_F$  by an increasing limit of  $V_{K_n}$ , where  $K_n = F \cap (R_n \cup \partial R_n)$ . Let  $F \subset F'$ . Then  $V_F \leq V_{F'}$  and  $(V_F)_F = V_{F'}$ . For any closed subset  $A$  of  $\Delta^G$ , we set  $A(m) = \left\{ z \in G \mid d(z, A) \leq \frac{1}{m} \right\}$ , where  $d$  is a metric on  $G^*$ . Then there exist a decreasing sequence of closed neighbourhoods of  $A$  in  $G^*$  such that each of their intersection  $\{A^{(m)}\}$  with  $G$  is a regular closed set in  $G$  and  $A(m) \subset A^{(m)} \subset A(m-1)$  for each  $m$ . We define  $V_A$  by decreasing limit of

$V_{A^{(n)}}$ . Let  $V(z)$  be a Dirichlet finite  $G-F_0H$  function. If  $\bar{F} \ni p_0$  ( $\bar{F}$  is the closure of  $F$  on  $G^*$ ) and  $A \ni p_0$ , then  $\|V_{x_n} - V_F\| \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $V_F(z) = V^F(z)$  and  $\|V_{A^{(n)}} - V_A\| \rightarrow 0$  and  $n \rightarrow \infty$  respectively. (cf. [5])

LEMMA 1. ([2], cf. Fuglede's lemma). Let  $f$  be a non-negative Dirichlet function on  $R$  such that  $f=0$  on  $R-G$ , and  $f_n$  be the harmonic function in  $G \cap R_n - F$ , which is equal to zero on  $\partial G \cap (R_n \cup \partial R_n)$  and to  $f$  on  $\partial F \cap (R_n \cup \partial R_n)$  and whose normal derivative vanishes everywhere on the rest of the boundary. If  $\inf_{z \in F} f(z) > 0$ , then there is a subsequence  $\{f_{n_k}\}$  of  $\{f_n\}$  such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\partial F_M \cap R_{n_k}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} f_{n_k} ds = \int_{\partial F_M} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} f^F ds$$

for almost all  $M$ , where  $F_M = \{z \in G \mid f^F(z) \geq M\}$  ( $0 < M < \inf_{z \in F} f(z)$ ).

COROLLARY 1. ([2], [6]). Let  $F$  be a regular closed set of  $G$ . If  $\omega_F$  exist, then  $\int_{\partial F_\alpha} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} \omega_F ds = \|\omega_F\|^2$  for almost all  $\alpha$ , where  $F_\alpha = \{z \in G \mid \omega_F(z) \geq \alpha\}$  ( $0 < \alpha < 1$ ).

COROLLARY 2. ([4]). Let  $V$  be a  $G-F_0SH$  function and  $F_M = \{z \in G \mid V(z) \geq M\}$ . If  $M_1 > M_2$ , then  $M_1 \|\omega_{F_{M_1}}\|^2 \leq M_2 \|\omega_{F_{M_2}}\|^2$ . If  $V = V_{F_{M_1}}$ , then  $M_1 \|\omega_{F_{M_1}}\|^2 = M \|\omega_{F_M}\|^2$  for any  $M: 0 < M < M_1$ .

PROOF. Let  $M_1 > M_2$ . Set  $F' = \{z \in G \mid V_{F_{M_1}}(z) \geq M_2\}$ . Then  $\omega_{F_{M_1}} = \frac{M_2}{M_1} \omega_{F'}$  on  $G - F'$  and  $\omega_{F'} \leq \omega_{F_{M_2}}$ . By COROLLARY 1, there is a  $t_0: 0 < t_0 < \frac{M_2}{M_1}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} M_1 \|\omega_{F_{M_1}}\|^2 &= M_1 \int_{\{\omega_{F_{M_1}} = t_0\}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} \omega_{F_{M_1}} ds = M_2 \int_{\{\omega_{F_{M_1}} = t_0\}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} \omega_{F'} ds \\ &= M_2 \int_{\{\omega_{F'} = \frac{M_1}{M_2} t_0\}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} \omega_{F'} ds = M_2 \|\omega_{F'}\|^2 \geq M_2 \|\omega_{F_{M_2}}\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

If  $V = V_{F_{M_1}}$  then  $\omega_{F'} = \omega_{F_{M_2}}$ . Hence we have  $M_1 \|\omega_{F_{M_1}}\|^2 = M_2 \|\omega_{F_{M_2}}\|^2$  for any  $M_2: 0 < M_2 < M_1$ .

### § 3. Function-theoretic mass

Let  $V(z)$  be  $G-F_0SH$  function. Set  $F_M = \{z \in G \mid V(z) \geq M\}$  for any  $M > 0$ . By COROLLARY 2 of LEMMA 1,  $M \|\omega_{F_M}\|^2$  increases as  $M \rightarrow 0$ . We define

$\mathfrak{M}(V) = \mathfrak{M}^q(V) = \lim_{M \rightarrow 0} \frac{M}{2\pi} \|\omega_{F_M}\|^2$ , and call it the function-theoretic mass of  $V(z)$  ([4]). If a  $G-F_0SH$  function  $V$  satisfies  $\mathfrak{M}(V) < \infty$ , then we say that  $V$  is of potential type.

PROPOSITION 1. (i) Let  $V_i$  ( $i=1, 2$ ) be  $G-F_0SH$  functions. If  $V_1 \leq V_2$  on  $G$ , then  $\mathfrak{M}(V_1) \leq \mathfrak{M}(V_2)$ .

(ii) Let  $V$  be a  $G-F_0H$  function and  $F$  be a regular closed set in  $G$  such that  $\bar{F} \not\ni p_0$ . Then  $\inf_{z \in F} V(z) > 0$  and  $\mathfrak{M}(V_F) = \frac{M}{2\pi} \|\omega_{F_M}\|_{G-F_M}^2 < \infty$  for any  $0 < M < \inf_{z \in F} V(z)$ .

PROOF. (i) Obvious from the definition.

(ii) If  $p_0 \notin F$ , then there is a  $q \in G$  and  $\delta > 0$  such that  $F \subset \{z \in G \mid N(z, q) > \delta\}$ . Then  $\omega_F$  exists. Let  $K$  be a regular compact set in  $G$  which contains  $q$  in its interior, and set  $\min_{z \in \partial K} V_F(z) = \alpha > 0$ ,  $\max_{z \in \partial K} N(z, q) = \beta < +\infty$ . By  $\frac{\alpha}{\beta} N(z, q) \leq V_F(z)$  on  $\partial K$ , we have  $\frac{\alpha}{\beta} N(z, q) = \frac{\alpha}{\beta} N(\cdot, q)_K(z) \leq (V_F)_K(z) \leq V_F(z)$  on  $G - K$ . Hence  $V_F(z) \geq \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \min(\delta, \alpha) > 0$  on  $F$ . Set  $\inf_{z \in F} V(z) = M_0 > 0$ . Then  $V_F(z) = (V_F)_{F_{M_0}}(z)$ . By COROLLARY of LEMMA 1, we have  $M \|\omega_{F_M}\|^2 = M_0 \|\omega_{F_{M_0}}\|^2$  for any  $M: 0 < M \leq M_0$ . Hence we obtain  $\mathfrak{M}(V_F) = \lim_{M \rightarrow 0} M \|\omega_{F_M}\|^2 = \frac{M}{2\pi} \|\omega_{F_M}\|^2$  for any  $M$  ( $0 < M \leq M_0$ ).

COROLLARY. Let  $K$  be a regular compact set in  $G$ . Then  $\mathfrak{M}(V_K) = \frac{M}{2\pi} \|\omega_{F_M}\|^2 < \infty$  for any  $M: 0 < M \leq \min_{z \in \partial K} V(z)$ .

LEMMA 2. Let  $V$  be a  $G-F_0H$  function and  $K$  be a regular compact set in  $G$ . Then  $\mathfrak{M}(V_K) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial K} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} V_K ds$ .

PROOF. We may assume  $K \subset G \cap R_1$ . Let  $V_n$  be the harmonic function in  $G \cap R_n - K$ , which is equal to zero on  $\partial G \cap (R_n \cup \partial R_n)$ , to  $V$  on  $\partial K$  and whose normal derivative vanishes everywhere of the rest of the boundary. Fix  $M_1: 0 < M_1 < \min_{z \in \partial K} V(z)$ . By the COROLLARY of PROPOSITION 1, COROLLARY 1 of LEMMA 1 and LEMMA 1, there is a subsequence  $\{V_{n_k}\}$  of  $\{V_n\}$  and some  $M_0: 0 < M_0 < M_1$  such that

$$\mathfrak{M}(V_K) = \frac{M_1}{2\pi} \|\omega_{F_{M_1}}\|^2 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial F_{M_0}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} V_K ds = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial F_{M_0} \cap R_{n_k}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} V_{n_k} ds.$$

By Green's formula, 
$$\int_{\partial F_{M_0} \cap R_{n_k}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} V_{n_k} ds = \int_{\partial K} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} V_{n_k} ds.$$

Then we have 
$$\mathfrak{M}(V_K) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial K} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} V_{n_k} ds = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial K} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} V_K ds.$$

LEMMA 3. *Let  $V$  be a  $G-F_0H$  function. Then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{M}(V_{\bar{G}_n}) = \mathfrak{M}(V)$ .*

PROOF. Since  $V_{\bar{G}_n} \leq V$ , we have  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{M}(V_{\bar{G}_n}) \leq \mathfrak{M}(V)$  by (i) of PROPOSITION 1. Then we have to prove inverse inequality. For any given  $T$ :  $0 < T < \mathfrak{M}(V)$ , there exists  $M > 0$  such that  $T < \frac{1}{2\pi M} \|V_{F_M}\|_{G-F_M}^2$ , where  $F_M = \{z \in G \mid V(z) \geq M\}$ . Set  $K_n = F_M \cap \bar{G}_n$  and  $F_M^{(n)} = \{z \in G \mid V_{K_n}(z) \geq M\}$ . Then  $\inf_{z \in K_n} V(z) \geq M$  and  $K_n \subset F_M^{(n)} \subset F_M$ . By COROLLARY of PROPOSITION 1, we have 
$$\mathfrak{M}(V_{K_n}) = \frac{1}{2\pi M} \|V_{K_n}\|_{G-F_M^{(n)}}^2 \geq \frac{1}{2\pi M} \|V_{K_n}\|_{G-F_M}^2.$$
 Since  $V_{K_n}$  converges to  $V_{F_M}$  locally uniformly on  $G-F_M$ , we have 
$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|V_{K_n}\|_{G-F_M}^2 \geq \|V_{F_M}\|_{G-F_M}^2 > 2\pi MT.$$
 Then 
$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{M}(V_{\bar{G}_n}) \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{M}(V_{K_n}) > T.$$
 Hence 
$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{M}(V_{\bar{G}_n}) \geq \mathfrak{M}(V).$$

PROPOSITION 2. *Let  $V_n$  ( $n=1, 2, \dots$ ) and  $V$  be  $G-F_0H$  functions.*

- (i)  $\mathfrak{M}(aV_1 + V_2) = a\mathfrak{M}(V_1) + \mathfrak{M}(V_2)$  for any positive constant  $a > 0$ .
- (ii) If  $V_n$  converges to  $V$  locally uniformly, then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{M}(V_n) \geq \mathfrak{M}(V)$ .
- (iii) If  $\{V_n\}$  be increasing sequence and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} V_n(z) = V(z)$ , then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{M}(V_n) = \mathfrak{M}(V)$ .
- (iv) If  $p \in G$ , then  $\mathfrak{M}(N(\cdot, p)) = 1$ . If  $q \in \Delta^G$ , then  $\mathfrak{M}(N(\cdot, q)) \leq 1$ .
- (v)  $\mathfrak{M}(N(\cdot, q))$  is lower semi-continuous on  $G^*$ .

PROOF. (i) By LEMMA 2,  $\mathfrak{M}((aV_1 + V_2)_{\bar{G}_n}) = a\mathfrak{M}((V_1)_{\bar{G}_n}) + \mathfrak{M}(V_2)$ . By LEMMA 3, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we have  $\mathfrak{M}(aV_1 + V_2) = a\mathfrak{M}(V_1) + \mathfrak{M}(V_2)$ .

(ii) Since  $V_n$  converges to  $V$  uniformly on  $\partial G_k$ , we have  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{M}((V_n)_{\bar{G}_k}) = \mathfrak{M}(V_{\bar{G}_k})$  by LEMMA 2. Then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{M}(V_n) \geq \mathfrak{M}(V_{\bar{G}_k})$  for any  $k$ . As  $k \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{M}(V_n) \geq \mathfrak{M}(V)$  by LEMMA 3.

(iii) Since  $V_n$  are harmonic in  $G$ ,  $V_n$  converges to  $V$  locally uniformly. Then, by above (ii) and (i) of PROPOSITION 1,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{M}(V_n) = \mathfrak{M}(V)$ .

(iv) Use properties (e) and (d) of  $N$ -function and above (ii).

(v) Obvious from (iv).

REMARK 1. (i) *Let  $V$  be a  $G-F_0H$  function and  $K$  be a regular compact set in  $G$ . Then there is a unique measure  $\mu$  supported by  $K$  such that  $V_K = N_\mu$  ([1], [2] and [5]). By LEMMA 2 we have  $\mathfrak{M}(V_K) = \mu(K)$ .*

(ii) Let  $G=R_0$ . Then any  $R_0-F_0H$  function  $V(z)$  has an  $L$ -potential representation (i.e. there is a measure  $\mu$  on  $\Delta(=\Delta^{R_0})$  such that  $V=L_\mu$ ) and furthermore  $V$  satisfies  $\mathfrak{M}^{R_0}(V)=\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\partial K_0}\frac{\partial}{\partial\nu}Vds=\mu(\Delta)<\infty$ .

PROPOSITION 3 ([4]). If  $V$  is of potential type, then  $V$  is  $N$ -potential.

PROOF. Let  $\mu_n$  be the associated measure on  $\partial G_n$  with  $V_{\bar{G}_n}=N_{\mu_n}$ . By REMARK 1,  $\mu_n(\partial G_n)=\mathfrak{M}(V_{\bar{G}_n})\leq\mathfrak{M}(V)<\infty$  for any  $n$ . Then there is a subsequence  $\{\mu_{n_k}\}$  of  $\{\mu_n\}$  and some measure  $\mu$  on  $\Delta$  such that  $\mu_{n_k}\rightarrow\mu$  (vague) as  $k\rightarrow\infty$ . Then  $V(z)=N_\mu(z)$  and  $\mu(\Delta^G)=\lim_{k\rightarrow\infty}\mu_{n_k}(\partial G_{n_k})=\lim_{n\rightarrow\infty}\mathfrak{M}(V_{\bar{G}_n})=\mathfrak{M}(V)$  by LEMMA 3.

COROLLARY 1. Let  $V$  be a  $G-F_0H$  function and  $F$  be a regular closed subset of  $G$ . If  $\inf_{z\in F}V(z)>0$ , then there is a measure  $\mu$  on  $\bar{F}$  such that  $V_F=N_\mu$  and  $\mathfrak{M}(V_F)=\mu(\bar{F})$ .

PROOF. By Proposition 1,  $\mathfrak{M}(V_F)<\infty$ . Then use Theorem 14 in [5] and (iii) of PROPOSITION 2.

COROLLARY 2. Let  $V$  be a  $G-F_0H$  function and  $A$  be a closed set in  $\Delta^G$  with  $p_0\notin A$ . Then there is a measure  $\mu$  on  $A$  such that  $V_A=N_\mu$  and  $\mu(A)=\lim_{n\rightarrow\infty}\mathfrak{M}(V_{A^{(n)}})$ .

PROOF. By  $A\ni p_0$ , we may assume  $A^{(1)}\ni p_0$ . Then  $\mathfrak{M}(V_{A^{(1)}})<\infty$  by PROPOSITION 1. Since  $V_A\leq V_{A^{(1)}}$ , we obtain  $\mathfrak{M}(V_A)<\infty$ . Then, by same method of the proof of PROPOSITION 3, we see  $\mu(A)=\lim_{n\rightarrow\infty}\mathfrak{M}(V_{\bar{G}_n})$ .

THEOREM 1. Let  $N_\mu$  a  $G-F_0H$  function. Then

$$\mathfrak{M}(N_\mu)=\int_{\Delta^G}(N(\cdot,p))d\mu(p).$$

PROOF. Let  $\mu_{p,n}$  be the associated measure on  $\partial G_n$  with  $N(\cdot,p)_{\bar{G}_n}(z)=N_{\mu_{p,n}}(z)$  for any  $p\in\Delta^G$  and  $G_n$ . Then there is a measure  $\nu_n$  on  $\partial G_n$  such that  $\nu_n=\int\mu_{p,n}d\mu(p)$  (i.e.  $\int fd\nu_n=\int\int fd\mu_{p,n}d\mu(p)$  for any  $f\in C(\Delta)$  (see p 297 in [5]). Then  $(N_\mu)_{\bar{G}_n}(z)=N_{\nu_n}(z)$ . By REMARK 1, we have  $\mathfrak{M}((N_\mu)_{\bar{G}_n})=\nu_n(\partial G_n)=\int\int 1d\mu_{p,n}d\mu(p)=\int\mathfrak{M}(N(\cdot,p)_{\bar{G}_n})d\mu(p)$ . As  $n\rightarrow\infty$ , we obtain  $\mathfrak{M}(N_\mu)=\int\mathfrak{M}(N(\cdot,p))d\mu(p)$  by LEMMA 3.

COROLLARY 1. For any regular closed subset  $F$  of  $G$ ,

$$\mathfrak{M}((N_\mu)_F)=\int\mathfrak{M}(N(\cdot,p)_F)d\mu(p)$$

PROOF. By Theorem 15, in [5],  $(N_\mu)_F(z)=\int N(\cdot,p)_F(z)d\mu(p)$ . Set  $F_n=F\cap\bar{G}_n$ . Let  $\nu_{p,n}$  be the associated measure with  $N(\cdot,p)_{F_n}=N_{\nu_{p,n}}$ . By a way

similar to the proof of THEOREM 1, we have  $\mathfrak{M}((N_\mu)_{F_n}) = \int \int 1 d\nu_{p,n} d\mu(p) = \int \mathfrak{M}(N(\cdot, p)_{F_n}) d\mu(p)$ . Then, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\mathfrak{M}((N_\mu)_F) = \int \mathfrak{M}(N(\cdot, p)_F) d\mu(p)$  by LEMMA 3.

COROLLARY 2.  $\mathfrak{M}(N_\mu) \leq \mu(A)$ .

PROOF. By (iv) of PROPOSITION 2,  $\mathfrak{M}(N_\mu) = \int_A \mathfrak{M}(N(\cdot, p)) d\mu(p) \leq \mu(A)$ .

LEMMA 4. Let  $V$  be a  $G-F_0H$  function and  $A$  be a closed set in  $\Delta^g$  with  $A \ni p_0$ . If  $(V_A)_A = V_A$ , then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{M}(V_{A^{(n)}}) = \mathfrak{M}(V_A)$ .

PROOF. By  $(V_A)_A = V_A$ , we see  $(V_A)_{A^{(n)}} = V_A$  for any  $n$ . We may assume  $A_1 \ni p$ . Then  $\inf_{z \in A^{(1)}} V_A(z) > 0$  by PROPOSITION 1. Fix  $M: 0 < M < \inf_{z \in A^{(1)}} V_A(z)$  and set  $F_M = \{z \in G \mid V_A(z) \geq M\}$ ,  $F_M^{(n)} = \{z \in G \mid V_{A^{(n)}}(z) \geq M\}$  and  $V_n(z) = \min(V_{A^{(n)}}(z), M)$ . Then, by PROPOSITION 1,  $\mathfrak{M}(V_{A^{(n)}}) = \frac{1}{2\pi M} \|V_{A^{(n)}}\|_{G-F_M^{(n)}}^2$  and  $\mathfrak{M}(V_A) = \mathfrak{M}((V_A)_{A^{(1)}}) = \frac{1}{2\pi M} \|V_A\|_{G-F_M}^2$ . Let  $n > m$ . Since  $V_n - V_{A^{(n)}} = 0$  on  $\partial F_M^{(n)}$ ,  $(V_{A^{(n)}}, V_n - V_{A^{(n)}}) = 0$  by Dirichlet principle. (For Dirichlet function  $f, g$ , we denote by  $(f, g)$  the mixed Dirichlet integral). Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|V_n - V_m\|_{G-F_M}^2 &= \|V_{A^{(n)}} - V_m\|_{G-F_M^{(n)}}^2 \\ &= \|V_{A^{(m)}}\|_{G-F_M^{(m)}}^2 - \|V_{A^{(n)}}\|_{G-F_M^{(n)}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\{\|V_{A^{(n)}}\|_{G-F_M^{(n)}}^2\}_{n=1}^\infty$  are decreasing, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|V_n - V_A\|_{G-F_M^{(n)}}^2 = 0.$$

Hence

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|V_{A^{(n)}}\|_{G-F_M^{(n)}}^2 = \|V_A\|_{G-F_M}^2,$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{M}(V_{A^{(n)}}) = \mathfrak{M}(V_A).$$

COROLLARY. For the above  $V$  and  $A$ , there is a measure  $\mu$  on  $A$  such that  $V_A(z) = N_\mu(z)$  and  $\mathfrak{M}(V_A) = \mu(A)$ .

PROOF. By the above LEMMA and COROLLARY 2 of PROPOSITION 3, we have

$$u(A) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{M}(V_{A^{(n)}}) = \mathfrak{M}(V_A).$$

REMARK 2. By Theorem 19 and 20 in [5], we see that  $(N(\cdot, p)_{(p)})_{(p)} = N(\cdot, p)_{(p)}$  for any  $p \in \Delta^g - \{p_0\}$ .

#### § 4. Classification of the boundary

We set  $\alpha(p) = \mathfrak{M}(N(\cdot, p)_{(p)})$  for any  $p \in \Delta^g - \{p_0\}$ . Then we have  $\alpha(p) = 1$  or 0 (See Theorem 21 in [5] and Theorem 4 in [4]). We set  $\Delta_0^g = \{p \in \Delta^g - \{p_0\} | \alpha(p) = 0\}$  and  $\Delta_1^g = \Delta^g - \{p_0\} - \Delta_0^g$ . We call point in  $\Delta_1^g$  a minimal point. Let  $\mu$  be a measure on  $\Delta^g$ . If  $\mu(\Delta_0^g \cup \{p_0\}) = 0$ , then we call  $\mu$  a canonical measure. We note  $\mathfrak{M}(N(\cdot, p)) = 1$  for any  $p \in \Delta_1^g$ . Because  $1 \geq \mathfrak{M}(N(\cdot, p)) \geq \mathfrak{M}(N(\cdot, p)_{(p)}) = 1$ .

PROPOSITION 4. (i)  $\Delta_0^g \cup \{p_0\}$  is an  $F_\sigma$ -set.

(ii) Let  $V$  be a  $G-F_0H$  function, and  $E$  be a closed set of  $\Delta_0^g$ . Then  $V_E = 0$ .

The proof of PROPOSITION 4 is similar to the proofs of Theorem 22 and Theorem 23 in [5], where we replace  $\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial K_0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} V ds$  with  $\mathfrak{M}(V)$  and use PROPOSITION 2, COROLLARY of THEOREM 1 and COROLLARY of LEMMA 4. By PROPOSITION 4, we have

PROPOSITION 5. (cf. Theorem 24 and 25 in [5]).

(i) The measure  $\mu$  which is defined in COROLLARY 2 of PROPOSITION 3 is canonical.

(ii) For any closed set  $A$  in  $\Delta^g - \{p_0\}$  and any  $G-F_0H$  function  $V(z)$ ,  $(V_A)_A(z) = V_A(z)$ .

THEOREM 2. Let  $V(z)$  be a  $G-F_0H$  function with  $\mathfrak{M}(V) < \infty$ . Then there exist a canonical measure  $\mu$  such that  $V = N_\mu$ .

PROOF. We shall show that the measure  $\mu$  in Proposition 3 is canonical. Let  $A$  be a closed subset of  $\Delta_0^g$ . Fix  $m$  and an open set  $O$  of  $G^*$  such that  $A \subset O \subset A^{(m)}$ . Let  $\nu_k$  be the restriction of  $\mu_{n_k}$  to  $O$ . Then  $\mathfrak{M}(N_{\nu_k}) = \nu_k(G)$ . By  $(N_{\nu_k})_{A^{(m)}} = N_{\nu_k}$ ,  $N_{\nu_k} \leq V_{A^{(m)}}$ .

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(A) \leq \mu(0) &\leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{n_k}(0) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \nu_k(0) \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{M}(N_{\nu_k}) \leq \mathfrak{M}(V_{A^{(m)}}). \end{aligned}$$

Then by LEMMA 4 and PROPOSITION 4, we have  $\mu(A) \leq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{M}(V_{A^{(m)}}) = \mathfrak{M}(V_A) = 0$ . Hence  $\mu(\Delta_0^g) = 0$ .

COROLLARY. ([4]). If  $\mu$  is canonical, then  $\mathfrak{M}(N_\mu) = \mu(\Delta_1^g)$ .

#### § 5. Relation between $\Delta^g$ and $\Delta^{R_0}$

In this section, we denote by  $\Delta$  the Kuramochi boundary of  $R_0$  and by



$\Delta_1$  the set of all minimal points of  $\Delta$ . Let  $F$  be a closed set of  $R$ . When  $L(\cdot, p)_F(z) \neq L(z, p)$ , we call that  $F$  is thin at  $p$  (cf. p 221 in [1]). We set  $\Delta_1(G) = \{p \in \Delta_1 \mid R-G \text{ is thin at } p\}$ . We shall study the relation between  $G \cup \Delta_1^q$  and  $G \cup \Delta_1(G)$ .

**THEOREM A** (Kuramochi [3]). *Let  $q \in \Delta_1^q$  and  $B(q; R_0) = \{p \in \Delta \mid \text{There is a sequence } \{z_n\} \subset G \text{ such that } z_n \rightarrow p \text{ (L-top.) and } z_n \rightarrow q \text{ (N-top.)}\}$ . Then  $B(q; R_0)$  consists of only one point and  $B(q; R_0) \in \Delta_1(G)$ . We define a mapping  $j: G \cup \Delta_1^q \rightarrow G \cup \Delta_1(G)$  by  $j(z) = z$  for any  $z \in G$  and  $j(q) = B(q; R_0)$  for any  $q \in \Delta_1^q$ . Then  $j$  is a one to one continuous mapping of  $G \cup \Delta_1^q$  onto  $G \cup \Delta_1(G)$  and furthermore  $j$  satisfies*

$$N(z, q) = L(z, j(q)) - L(\cdot, j(q))_{R-G}(z)$$

for any  $q \in G \cup \Delta_1^q$ .

**THEOREM B** (Kuramochi [3]). *Let  $V(z)$  be a  $G-F_0H$  function with  $\mathfrak{M}(V) < \infty$ . Then there exists a  $R_0-F_0H$  function  $U(z)$  such that  $V(z) = U(z) - U_{R-G}(z)$ .*

For continuity of  $j^{-1}$ , we have THEOREM 3 and 4.

**THEOREM 3.** *If  $G$  satisfies*

$$\text{Condition (I): } \overline{G} \cap \overline{R-G} \cap \Delta_0 = \phi,$$

then  $j^{-1}$  is continuous on  $(\overline{G} - \partial G) \cap \Delta_1$ .

**PROOF.** Let  $p \in (\overline{G} - \partial G) \cap \Delta_1$ . Set  $B(p, G) = \{q \in \Delta^q \mid \text{There is a sequence } \{z_n\} \subset G \text{ such that } z_n \rightarrow p \text{ (L-top.) and } z_n \rightarrow q \text{ (N-top.)}\}$ . By LEMMA 3 of [3],  $B(p; G) \cap \Delta_1^q$  consists of only one point. Let  $z_n \rightarrow p$  (L-top.),  $z_n \rightarrow q$  (N-top.) and  $\mu_n$  be the canonical measure such that  $L(\cdot, z_n)_{R-G}(z) = L_{\mu_n}(z)$ . Since the support  $S_{\mu_n}$  of  $\mu_n$  contains  $\overline{G} \cap \overline{R-G}$  (Theorem 1 in [7]) and  $\mu_n(\overline{G} \cap \overline{R-G}) \leq 1$ , there is a subsequence  $\{\mu_{n_k}\}_{k=1}^\infty$  and some measure  $\mu$  on  $\overline{G} \cap \overline{R-G}$  such that  $\mu_{n_k} \rightarrow \mu$  (vague) as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L(\cdot, z_n)_{R-G}(z)$  and  $L_\mu(z)$  are superharmonic in  $G$ . Since  $R \cap \overline{G} \cap \overline{R-G} = \partial G$  and  $\partial G$  is locally Lebesgue measure 0, we have  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L(\cdot, z_n)_{R-G}(z) = L_\mu(z)$  except for of locally Lebesgue measure 0. Hence we have  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L(\cdot, z_n)_{R-G}(z) = L_\mu(z)$ . By Lemma 1 of [3], there is a constant  $c$  ( $0 \leq c \leq 1$ ) such that  $L_\mu(z) = cL(z, p) + (1-c)L(\cdot, p)_{R-G}(z)$ . By assumption,  $S_\mu \subset \overline{G} \cap \overline{R-G} \subset R_0 \cup \Delta_1$  and  $\mu$  is canonical. Then, by the uniqueness of the canonical measure and  $\{p\} \cap \overline{R-G} = \phi$ , we have  $\mu(\{p\}) = c = 0$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L(\cdot, z_n)_{R-G}(z) = L(\cdot, p)_{R-G}(z)$ . Hence  $N(z, q) = L(z, p) - L(\cdot, p)_{R-G}(z)$  for any  $q \in B(p; G)$ . Then  $B(p; G)$  consists of only one point and  $B(p; G) \in \Delta_1^q$ . Then we have  $j^{-1}(p) = B(p; G)$  for any  $p \in (\overline{G} - \partial G) \cap \Delta_1$  and  $j^{-1}$  is con-

tinuous on  $(\bar{G} - \partial\bar{G}) \cap \Delta_1$ .

THEOREM 4. Let  $p \in (\bar{G} - \partial\bar{G}) \cap \Delta_1$ . If

Condition (II):  $\overline{\lim}_{z \rightarrow p} L(\cdot, z)_{R-G}(z) < \infty$

is satisfied, then  $j^{-1}$  is continuous at  $p$ .

PROOF. We show that the  $\mu$  in THEOREM 3 is canonical. We denote by  $\|\mu_n\|$  the energy of  $\mu_n$ . ( $\|\mu_n\|^2 = \int L_{\mu_n} d\mu_n$ )

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mu_n\|^2 &= \int L_{\mu_n} d\mu_n = \int L(\cdot, z_n)_{R-G}(z) d\mu_n(z) \\ &\leq \int L(z, z_n) d\mu_n(z) = L_{\mu_n}(z_n) = L(\cdot, z_n)_{R-G}(z_n). \end{aligned}$$

By assumption,  $\{\|\mu_n\|\}$  are bounded. Then, by Satz 17. 4 in [1], we have that  $\mu$  is canonical measure. Hence, on the analogy of the proof of THEOREM 3, we complete the proof.

Let  $V(z)$  be a  $G - F_0H$  function and  $K$  be a regular compact set in  $G$ . Then  $V_K$  is extended continuously on  $G \cup \Delta^G$ . C. Constantinescu and A. Cornea [1] defined the value of  $V$  on  $\Delta^G$  by  $V(p) = \sup_K V(p) = \lim_{K \nearrow G} V_K(p)$  for any  $p \in \Delta^G$ . Then, by Satz 17.2 of [1], we have  $V(p) = \lim_{G \ni z \rightarrow p} V(z)$  for any  $p \in \Delta_1^G$ .

THEOREM 5. Let  $V$  be a  $G - F_0H$  function with  $\mathfrak{M}(V) < \infty$  and  $p \in (\bar{G} - \partial\bar{G}) \cap \Delta_1$ . If  $j^{-1}$  is continuous at  $p$ , then for  $U(z)$  which satisfies the condition in THEOREM B and  $U_{R-G}(p) < \infty$ , we have  $V(j^{-1}(p)) = U(p) - U_{R-G}(p)$ .

PROOF. By [3],  $V_{\bar{G}_n}(z) + U_{R-G}(z) = U_{G_n \cup (R-G)}(z)$ . Let  $p \in (\bar{G} - \partial\bar{G}) \cap \Delta_1$ .  $j$  and  $j^{-1}$  are continuous at  $p$  and  $j^{-1}(p)$  respectively. Then for any  $\frac{1}{n}$ -neighbourhood  $D(j(p), \frac{1}{n})$  of  $j(p)$  (resp.  $\frac{1}{n}$ -neighbourhood  $D(p, \frac{1}{n})$  of  $p$ ), there is a  $\frac{1}{m}$ -neighbourhood  $D(p, \frac{1}{m})$  of  $p$  (resp.  $\frac{1}{m}$ -neighbourhood  $D(j^{-1}(p), \frac{1}{m})$  such that  $D(p, \frac{1}{m}) \cap G \subset D(j(p), \frac{1}{n}) \cap G$  (resp.  $D(j^{-1}(p), \frac{1}{m}) \cap G \subset D(p, \frac{1}{n}) \cap G$ ). Then

$$\lim_{G \ni z \rightarrow j^{-1}(p)} (V_{\bar{G}_n}^G(z) + U_{R-G}(z)) = \lim_{G \ni z \rightarrow p} U_{G_n \cup (R-G)}(z).$$

By

$$\lim_{G\partial z \rightarrow j^{-1}(p)} V_{\bar{G}_n}^G(z) = \lim_{G\partial z \rightarrow j^{-1}(p)} V_{\bar{G}_n}^G(z) = V_{\bar{G}_n}^G(j^{-1}(p))$$

and

$$\lim_{G\partial z \rightarrow j^{-1}(p)} V_{R-G}(z) = \lim_{G\partial z \rightarrow p} V_{R-G}(z) = V_{R-G}(p),$$

we have

$$V_{\bar{G}_n}^G(j^{-1}(p)) + U_{R-G}(p) = U_{\bar{G}_n \cup (R-G)}(p).$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain  $V(j^{-1}(p)) = U(p) - U_{R-G}(p)$ .

COROLLARY. Let  $p \in (\bar{G} - \partial\bar{G}) \cap \Delta_1$ . If Condition (I) or (II) is satisfied, we have  $V(j^{-1}(p)) = U(p) - U_{R-G}(p)$ .

The function  $V$  in Theorem B is not necessary uniquely determined. But  $V$  is uniquely determined in the sense of the following theorem.

THEOREM 6. Let  $V(z)$  be a  $G-F_0H$  function and  $\mu_i$  ( $i=1, 2$ ) be canonical measures. If  $V(z) = L_{\mu_i}(z) - (L_{\mu_i})_{R-G}(z)$  ( $i=1, 2$ ), then  $\mu_1|_{\Delta_1(G)} = \mu_2|_{\Delta_1(G)}$ . ( $\mu_i|_{\Delta_1(G)}$  means the restriction of  $\mu$  to  $\Delta_1(G)$  of  $\mu$ ). And furthermore  $V(z) = L_\nu(z) - (L_\nu)_{R-G}(z)$  on  $G$  where  $\nu = \mu_i|_G$ .

PROOF. Let  $\mu_{i,R-G}$  be a canonical measure of  $(L_{\mu_i})_{R-G}(z)$ . By Folgesatz 16.4 of [1],  $\mu_{i,R-G}$  is a measure on  $\{p \in R_0 \cup \Delta_1 | L(\cdot, p)_{R-G}(z) \equiv L(z, p)\}$ . Hence  $\mu_{i,R-G}(G \cup \Delta_1(G)) = 0$ . Since  $L_{\mu_1}(z) + L_{\mu_{2,R-G}}(z) = L_{\mu_2}(z) + L_{\mu_{1,R-G}}(z)$ , we have  $\mu_1 + \mu_{2,R-G} = \mu_2 + \mu_{1,R-G}$  by the uniqueness of a canonical measure. Then we see  $\mu_1|_{\Delta_1(G)} = \mu_2|_{\Delta_1(G)}$ . Let  $\mu_1|_{\Delta_1(G)} = \nu$  and  $\mu_1 - \nu = \nu'$ . Then  $L_{\mu_1}(z) - (L_{\mu_1})_{R-G}(z) = (L_\nu + L_{\nu'})(z) - (L_\nu + L_{\nu'})_{R-G}(z) = L_\nu(z) - (L_\nu)_{R-G}(z)$ .

Department of Mathematics  
Hokkaido University

### References

- [1] C. CONSTANTINESCU and A. CORNEA: Ideale Ränder Riemannscher Flächen, Springer-Verlag, 1963.
- [2] Z. KURAMOCHI: Potentials on Riemann surfaces, J. Fac. Sci. Hokkaido Univ. Ser I, 16 (1962), 5-79.
- [3] Z. KURAMOCHI: Relations between two Martin topologies on Riemann surface, Ibid. 19 (1966), 146-153.
- [4] Z. KURAMOCHI: Superharmonic functions in a domain of a Riemann surface, Nagoya Math. J. 31 (1968), 41-55.
- [5] M. OHTSUKA: An elementary introduction of Kuramochi boundary, J. Sci. Hiroshima Univ, Ser A-I, 28 (1964), 271-299.

- [6] M. OHTSUKA: On Kuramochi's paper "Potentials on Riemann surfaces", *Lecture Note in Mathematics*, 58, Springer-Verlag, (1968).
- [7] H. TANAKA: Some properties of Kuramochi boundaries of hyperbolic Riemann surface, *J. Fac. Sci. Hokkaido Univ. Ser I*, 21 (1970), 129-132.

(Received August 31, 1972)