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Proof of Lemma 4. We can suppose without loss of generality that $\partial E^{i}$ and $\partial F^{i}$ are regular for the Dirichlet problem. By $E^{1} \supset E^{2}$ $G_{B 2}^{F^{i}}\left(z, z_{0}\right)-G_{B 1}^{F^{i}}\left(z, z_{0}\right) \geqq 0$ is clear. Since $G_{B 2}^{F^{2}}\left(z, z_{0}\right)-G_{B 1}^{F i}\left(z, z_{0}\right)=0$ on $\partial F^{2}$, by the minimum principle we have $G_{E 2}^{F 2}\left(z, z_{0}\right)-G_{E 1}^{F 2}\left(z, z_{0}\right) \geqq 0$ on $\partial F^{1}$. On the other hand, $G_{B 2}^{F_{1}}\left(z, z_{0}\right)-G_{B 1}^{F_{1}}\left(z, z_{0}\right)=0$ on $\partial F^{1}$. Next $G_{F 2}^{F_{2}^{2}}\left(z, z_{0}\right)$ $-G_{E 1}^{F 2}\left(z, z_{0}\right)=G_{E 2}^{F_{2}^{2}}\left(z, z_{0}\right) \geqq G_{E 2}^{F_{1}^{1}}\left(z, z_{0}\right)=G_{E 2}^{F_{1}^{1}}\left(z, z_{0}\right)-G_{E 1}^{F_{1}^{1}}\left(z, z_{0}\right)$ on $\partial E^{1}$. Thus we have by the maximum principle

$$
\begin{equation*}
G_{\# 2}^{F_{2}^{2}}\left(z, z_{0}\right)-G_{F 2}^{F_{1}^{1}}\left(z, z_{0}\right) \geqq G_{E 1}^{F_{2}^{2}}\left(z, z_{0}\right)-G_{E 1}^{F_{1}}\left(z, z_{0}\right) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

By definition we have $G_{K}^{L}\left(z, z_{0}\right)=G^{L+K}\left(z, z_{0}\right)=G_{L}^{K}\left(z, z_{0}\right)$. Put $F^{1}$ $=F_{1}^{1}, F^{2}=F_{1}^{2}, E^{1}=\sum_{i=2}^{n} F_{i}^{1}$ and $E^{2}=\sum_{i=2}^{n} F_{i}^{2}$. Then $G^{E 2+F^{2}}\left(z, z_{0}\right)-G^{E 1+F^{2}}(z$, $\left.z_{0}\right)=\left(G_{B 2}^{F_{2}^{2}}\left(z, z_{0}\right)-G_{F 2}^{F 1}\left(z, z_{0}\right)\right)+\left(G_{F i}^{F^{2}}\left(z, z_{0}\right)-G^{E 1+F 1}\left(z, z_{0}\right)\right)=\left(G_{F 2}^{F 2}\left(z, z_{0}\right)-G_{F 2}^{F 1}(z\right.$, $\left.\left.z_{0}\right)\right)+\left(G_{F_{1}}^{F^{2}}\left(z, z_{0}\right)-G_{F_{1}^{1}}^{T_{1}}\left(z, z_{0}\right)\right) \leqq\left(G^{F^{2}}\left(z, z_{0}\right)-G^{F^{1}}\left(z, z_{0}\right)\right)+\left(G^{E^{2}}\left(z, z_{0}\right)-G^{E^{1}}\left(z, z_{0}\right)\right)$ by (2). In this way proceed, then we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
G^{\frac{F^{F_{i}^{2}}}{i}}\left(z, z_{0}\right)-G_{i}^{\Sigma F_{i}^{1}}\left(z, z_{0}\right) \leqq \sum_{i}\left(G^{F_{i}^{2}}\left(z, z_{0}\right)-G^{F_{i}^{1}}\left(z, z_{0}\right)\right) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Lemma 5. Let $D$ be a simply connected domain and let $L$ $=E[z: 0 \leqq R e z \leqq a$, Im $z=0]$ be a segment and let $R$ be a closed set such that $D-L-R$ is simply connected.

Let $\Lambda_{i}^{\delta}$ be a closed segment on $L-R$


Fig. 1 such that $\Lambda_{i}^{\delta}=E\left[z:\left|z-a_{i}\right|<\delta, \operatorname{Im} z=0\right]$ and $0<a_{1}<a_{2} \cdots<a_{n}<a$. Put $\Lambda^{\delta}$ $=\sum \Lambda_{i}^{\delta}$. Let $D^{\prime}$ and $\Gamma$ be simply connected domains such that $D \supset D^{\prime} \supset\left(\Lambda^{\delta}\right.$ $+R$ ), dist $\left(\partial \Gamma, \Lambda^{\delta}\right)>0$ for $\dot{o}<\delta_{0}$, dist $(\partial \Gamma$, $\left.\partial D^{\prime}\right)>0$ and $D^{\prime}-L-R$ is also simply connected. Let $D_{0}$ be a compact domain in $D^{\prime}$ such that dist $\left(\Gamma, D_{0}\right)>0$. Let $w\left(z, \Lambda^{\delta}, D-L-R\right)$ be the harmonic measure of $\Lambda^{\delta}$ relative to $D-L-R$ and let $G\left(z, z_{0}, D^{\prime}\right)$ be the Green's function of $D^{\prime}$. Then for any given positive number $\varepsilon$ we can find a constant $\delta(\varepsilon)$ such that

$$
\frac{w\left(z, \Lambda^{\delta}, D-L-R\right)}{G\left(z, z_{0}, D^{\prime}\right)}<\varepsilon \text { on } \partial \Gamma \text { for } \delta<\delta(\varepsilon) .
$$

Let $z_{0}$ be a fixed point in $D$. Map $D-L$ conformally onto $|\xi|$ $<1$ by $\xi=f(z)$ so that $z_{0} \rightarrow \xi=0$. Let $L^{\prime}$ be a closed subset of $(L-R)$
$\cap D^{\prime}$ such that $L^{\prime}$ is contained completely in $D^{\prime}$ and containing $\partial \Gamma \cap L$. Then $\xi=f(z)$ is analytic on $L^{\prime}$. Hence there exist constants $N_{1}$ and $M_{1}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
0<N_{1}<\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right|<M_{1}<\infty \text { in a neighbourhood of } L^{\prime} . \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\operatorname{dist}\left(\partial \Gamma, \Lambda^{\delta}\right)>0$ implies dist $\left(\partial \Gamma_{\xi}, \Lambda_{\xi}^{\delta}\right)>0, \lim _{\substack{\mid \xi_{1} 1-1 \\ \xi_{2} \in \Lambda_{\xi}^{\delta}}}\left|\arg \xi_{1}-\arg \xi_{2}\right|>0$ : $\xi_{1} \in \partial \Gamma_{\xi}$, where $\Gamma_{\xi}$ and $\Lambda_{\xi}^{\delta}$ are the images of $\Gamma$ and $\Lambda^{\delta}$. On the other hand, $w\left(z, \Lambda^{\delta}, D-R-L\right)=w\left(\xi, \Lambda_{\xi}^{\delta}\right)=\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{\Lambda_{\xi}^{\delta}} \frac{\left(1-r^{2}\right)}{\left(1-2 r \cos (\theta-\varphi)+r^{2}\right)} d \varphi: r e^{i \theta}$
$=\xi$. Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
w\left(z, \Lambda^{\delta}, D-L-R\right) \leqq \frac{\text { length of } \Lambda_{\xi}^{\delta}}{2 \pi} \times\left(1-r^{2}\right) \text { as } z \rightarrow L \text { and } z \in \Gamma . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Denote $E[z \in \partial \Gamma$ : dist $(z, L)<h]$ by $\partial \Gamma^{h}$. Then by (4) there exist constants $\delta_{3}, M_{2}$ and $\delta_{4}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
w\left(z, \Lambda^{\delta}, D-L-R\right) \leqq M_{2}\left(\text { length of } \Lambda_{\delta}\right) h \text { for } z \in \partial \Gamma^{h}, \delta<\delta_{3}, h<\delta_{4}, \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$ where $h=\operatorname{dist}(z, L))$.

Map $D^{\prime}$ onto $|\zeta|<1$ by $\zeta=g(z)$ so that $z_{0} \rightarrow \zeta=0$. Then $g(z)$ is analytic on $L^{\prime}$ and $g^{\prime}(z)$ is continuous in a neighbourhood of $L^{\prime}$ with respect to $z_{0}$, because $D_{0}$ is compact. Hence there exist constants $N_{3}, M_{3}$ and $\delta_{5}$ such that $0<N_{3}<g^{\prime}(z)<M_{3}$ for $z \in \Gamma$ and dist $\left(z, L^{\prime}\right)$ $<\delta_{5}$. Now $G\left(z, z_{0}, D^{\prime}\right)=\log \frac{1}{|\zeta|}$. Hence there exist constants and $N_{4}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
G\left(z, z_{0}, D^{\prime}\right) \geqq h N_{4} \text { in } \partial \Gamma^{\delta_{5}} \text { for } h<\delta_{6}, \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

because $\frac{\partial}{\partial n} G(\zeta, O, D)=1$ at $|\zeta|=1$. On the other hand,

$$
\begin{equation*}
G\left(z, z_{0}, D^{\prime}\right)>N_{4}>0 \text { for } z \in\left(\partial \Gamma-\partial \Gamma^{\delta_{5}}\right) \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence by (6), (7) and (8) we can choose $\delta(\varepsilon)$ such that

$$
\frac{w\left(z, \Lambda^{\delta}, D-L-R\right)}{G\left(z, z_{0}, D^{\prime}\right)}<\varepsilon \text { on } \partial \Gamma \text { for } \delta<\delta(\varepsilon) \text { and for any } z_{0} \in D_{0}
$$

Lemma 6. Let $D_{n}(n=1,2, \cdots)$ be a domain such that $D_{n} \uparrow D$. Let $D_{0}$ be a compact domain in $D_{1}$. Let $\left\{p_{m}^{i}\right\}(i=1,2, m=1,2, \cdots)$ be a sequence such that $\left\{p_{m}^{i}\right\}$ determine the same $K$-Martin's point relative to $D_{n}$ for every $n$, in other words, $\lim _{m} K\left(z, p_{m}^{1}, D_{n}\right)=\lim _{m} K(z$, $\left.p_{m}^{2}, D_{n}\right), K\left(z, p_{m}^{i}, D_{n}\right)=\frac{G\left(z, p_{m}^{i}, D_{n}\right)}{G\left(p_{0}, p_{m}^{i}, D_{n}\right)}$ and $p_{0} i^{m}$ a fixed point in $D_{0}$. Let $\left(z, z_{0}, D_{n}\right)$ and $G\left(z, z_{0}, D\right)$ be Green's functions of $D_{n}$ and $D$ respectively. If $\frac{G\left(p_{m}^{i}, z, D\right)-G\left(p_{m}^{i}, z, D_{n}\right)}{G\left(p_{m}^{i}, z, D\right)}<\varepsilon_{n}$ for any $z \in D_{0}$ and $\lim _{n} \varepsilon_{n}$ $=0(i=1,2)$, then $\left\{p_{m}^{1}\right\}$ and $\left\{p_{m}^{2}\right\}$ determine the same $K$-Martin's point relative to $D$.

In fact, from the above inequality we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\lim _{m} \frac{G\left(p_{m}^{i}, z, D_{n}\right)}{G\left(p_{m}^{i}, p_{0}, D_{n}\right)}-\lim _{m} \frac{G\left(p_{m}^{i}, z, D\right)}{G\left(p_{m}^{i}, p_{0}, D\right)}\right|<\frac{\varepsilon_{n}}{\left(1-\varepsilon_{n}\right)} \varlimsup_{m} \frac{G\left(p_{m}^{i}, z, D\right)}{G\left(p_{m}^{i}, p_{0}, D\right)} \\
& =\frac{\varepsilon_{n}}{\left(1-\varepsilon_{n}\right)} \varlimsup_{m} K\left(p_{m}^{i}, z, D\right)<\frac{\varepsilon_{n}}{\left(1-\varepsilon_{n}\right)} M\left(D_{0}\right) \text { in } D_{0},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $M\left(D_{0}\right)=\sup _{z \in D_{0}}\left(\varlimsup_{m} K\left(p_{m}^{i}, z, D\right)\right)<\infty$. Since $p\left\{\begin{array}{l}1 \\ m\end{array}\right\}$ and $\left\{p_{m}^{2}\right\}$ determine the same point, we have by $\frac{G\left(p_{m}^{i}, z, D_{n}\right)}{G\left(p_{m}^{i}, p_{0}, D_{n}\right)}=K\left(p_{m}^{i}, z, D_{n}\right)$

$$
\left|\lim _{m} K\left(p_{m}^{1}, z, D\right)-\lim _{m} K\left(p_{m}^{2}, z, D\right)\right|<\frac{2 \varepsilon_{n} M\left(D_{0}\right)}{1-\varepsilon_{n}} \text { in } D_{0}
$$

Let $\varepsilon_{n} \rightarrow 0$. Then $\lim K\left(p_{m}^{1}, z, D\right)=\lim K\left(p_{m}^{2}, z, D\right)$ in $D_{0}$, whence $\lim _{m} K\left(p_{m}^{1}, z, D\right)=\lim _{m} K\left(p_{m}^{2}, z, D\right)$ for $z \in D$. Thus $\left\{p_{m}^{1}\right\}$ and $\left\{p_{m}^{2}\right\}$ determine the same $K$-Martin's point relative to $D$.

Example 3. Domain $D^{*}$. Let $m_{n}(n=1,2,3, \cdots)$ be a positive number such that

$$
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m_{n}} \leqq \frac{1}{72 \pi}
$$

and put $a_{n}=\frac{6}{2^{n+2}} e^{-m_{n}}$. Then $\log \frac{\left(6 / 2^{n+2}\right)}{a^{n}}=m_{n}$.
Let $\mathfrak{R}$ be a square, $\tilde{s}_{n}, t_{n}, s_{n}^{1}, s_{n}^{2}$ and $s_{n}^{3}$ be slits and $R_{n}$ be a rectangle as follows:

丹: $0<R e z<6,0<\operatorname{Im} z<6$.
$\tilde{s}_{n}: R e z=3,6 \geqq \operatorname{Im} z \geqq 4.5+a_{1}$ for $n=0$ and
$\tilde{s}_{n}: \operatorname{Re} z=3,3\left(\frac{1}{2^{n-1}}+\frac{1}{2^{n}}\right)-a_{n} \geqq \operatorname{Im} z \geqq 3\left(\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}+\frac{1}{2^{n}}\right)+a_{n+1}: n \geqq 1$.
$t_{n}: R e z=3,3\left(\frac{1}{2^{n-1}}+\frac{1}{2^{n}}\right)+a_{n} \geqq \operatorname{Im} z \geqq 3\left(\frac{1}{2^{n-1}}+\frac{1}{2^{n}}\right)-a_{n}: n \geqq 1$.
$R_{n}: \alpha \leqq R e z \leqq \alpha+1, \frac{6}{2^{n}}+\frac{6}{2^{n+4}} \geqq \operatorname{Im} z \geqq \frac{6}{2^{n}}-\frac{6}{2^{n+4}}$, where $\alpha$ is 1 or 4 according as $n$ is odd or even.
$s_{n}^{1}: 0 \leqq R e z \leqq 1$, Im $z=\frac{6}{2^{n}} . \quad s_{n}^{2}: 2 \leqq R e z \leqq 4$, Im $z=\frac{6}{2^{n}}$.
$s_{n}^{3}: 5 \leqq R e z \leqq 6$, Im $z=\frac{6}{2^{n}}$.
Put $D^{*}=\Re-\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(\tilde{s}_{n}+R_{n}+s_{n}^{1}+s_{n}^{2}+s_{n}^{3}\right)-\tilde{s}_{0}$.
Domain ${ }_{e} \mathfrak{D}_{m}, l<m$. Slits $\Lambda_{n}$ and domains $\Delta_{0}$ and $\Delta_{0}^{\prime}$. Let $\Delta_{0}^{i}(i=1,2)$ as follows:

$$
\Delta_{0}^{i}=E[z: \alpha \leqq R e z \leqq \alpha+1,4 \leqq \operatorname{Im} z \leqq 5],
$$

where $\alpha=1$ or 4 according as $i=1$ or 2. Put $\Delta_{0}=\Delta_{0}^{1}+\Delta_{0}^{2}$ and $\Delta_{0}^{\prime}=$ $E\left[z: \operatorname{dist}\left(z, \Delta_{0}\right) \leqq \frac{1}{2}\right]$.
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Let $\Gamma_{n}$ be a simply connected domain containing $R_{n}$ as follows:
$\Gamma_{n}: \alpha-1 \leqq R e z \leqq \alpha+1, \frac{6}{2^{n}}-\frac{6}{2^{n+8}} \leqq \operatorname{Im} z \leqq \frac{6}{2^{n}}-\frac{6}{2^{n+3}}$ and let $\Lambda_{n}^{1}$ and $\Lambda_{n}^{2}$ be segments on $s_{n}^{1}+s_{n}^{2}$ (for odd $n$ ) or on $s_{n}^{2}+s_{n}^{3}$ (for even $n$ ) such that $\quad \Lambda_{n}^{1}: \alpha-0.75-\alpha_{n} \leqq R e z \leqq \alpha-0.75+\alpha_{n}$,

$$
\Lambda_{n}^{2}: \alpha+0.75-\alpha_{n} \leqq R e z \leqq \alpha+0.75+\alpha_{n}, \quad\left(0<\alpha_{n}<0.2\right)
$$

where $\alpha=1.5$ or 4.5 according as $n$ is odd or even. Put $\Lambda_{n}=\Lambda_{n}^{1}+\Lambda_{n}^{2}$.
Put $D^{s_{n}}=\Re-s_{n}^{1}-R_{n}-s_{n}^{2}(f o r ~ o d d ~ n)$ and $=\Re-s_{n}^{2}-R_{n}-s_{n}^{3}$ (for even $n$ ). Let $w\left(z, \Lambda_{n}, D^{s_{n}}\right)$ be the harmonic measure of $\Lambda_{n}$ relative to $D^{s_{n}}$. Let $G\left(z, z_{0}, \mathfrak{R}\right)$ be the Green's function of $\Re$. Put $M_{n}=\max G\left(z, z_{0}, \mathfrak{R}\right)$ on $\partial \Gamma_{n}$ as $z_{0}$ varies in $\Delta_{0}$. Then $M_{n}<\infty$. Let $G\left(z, z_{0}, D^{*}\right)$ be the Green's function of $D^{*}: z_{0} \in \Delta_{0}$. Now $D^{s_{n}}$ and $D^{*}$ are simply connected. Hence by Lemma 5 we can find $\alpha_{n}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
M_{n} w\left(z, \Lambda_{n}, D^{s_{n}}\right) \leqq \frac{1}{4^{n}} G\left(z, z_{0}, D^{*}\right) \text { on } \partial \Gamma_{n} \text { for any } z_{0} \in \Delta_{0} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

We suppose that $\alpha_{n}$ is determined as (8) and $\Lambda_{n}$ is defined for every $n$.

Let ' $s_{n}^{1}$ and ' $s_{n}^{3}$ be segments on $s_{n}^{1}$ and $s_{n}^{3}$ such that ' $s_{n}^{1}: 0 \leqq R e z \leqq 0.75-\alpha_{n}$ and ' $s_{n}^{3}=s_{n}^{3}$ for odd number $n$, ' $s_{n}^{1}=s_{n}^{1}$ and ' $s_{n}^{3}: 5.25+\alpha_{n} \leqq R e z \leqq 6$ for even number $n$. Then ${ }^{\prime} s_{n}^{1} \subset s_{n}^{1}$ and ${ }^{\prime} s_{n}^{3} \subset s_{n}^{3}$.

Let $p_{n}^{i}(i=1,2$ and $n=1,2,3, \cdots)$ be a sequence such that $p_{n}^{i}$ : $c_{n}^{i}+\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{6}{2^{n}}+\frac{6}{2^{n+1}}\right) i$, where $1<c_{n}^{1}<2$ for $i=1$ and $4<c_{n}^{2}<5$ for $i=2$. Put $D_{m}=\Re-\tilde{s}_{0}-\sum_{i}^{m}\left({ }^{\prime} s_{n}^{1}+s_{n}^{3}\right)-\sum_{m+1}^{\infty}\left(\tilde{s}_{n}+R_{n}+s_{n}^{1}+s_{n}^{2}+s_{n}^{3}\right)$. Then $D_{m}$ is simply connected. Map $D_{m}$ onto $|\zeta|<1$. Then since $\left\{t_{n}\right\}: n>m+2$ is a fundamental sequence determining a prim Ende, the images of $\left\{p_{n}^{1}\right\}$
and $\left\{p_{n}^{2}\right\}$ tend to the same point for any $c_{n}^{i}$. Hence we have the following
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Proposition 1. $\left\{p_{n}^{1}\right\}$ and $\left\{p_{n}^{2}\right\}$ determine the same $K$-Martin's point relative to $D_{m}$ for any $m$.

Put ${ }_{l} \mathfrak{D}_{m}=D_{m}-\sum_{l+1}^{m}\left(s_{n}^{1}+s_{n}^{2}+s_{n}^{3}+R_{n}+\tilde{s}_{n}-\Lambda_{n}\right)=\Re-\tilde{s}_{0}-\sum_{i}^{l}\left({ }^{\prime} s_{n}^{1}+{ }^{\prime} s_{n}^{3}\right)-$ $\sum_{l+1}^{m}\left(s_{n}^{1}+s_{n}^{2}+s_{n}^{3}+\tilde{s}_{n}+R_{n}-\Lambda_{n}\right)-\sum_{m+1}^{\infty}\left(s_{n}^{1}+s_{n}^{2}+s_{n}^{3}+R_{n}+\tilde{s}_{n}\right)$. Then $D_{m}-{ }_{l} \mathfrak{D}_{m}$ is compact in $D_{m}$. Hence by Lemma 1 and Proposition 1 we have the following

Proposition 2. $\left\{p_{n}^{1}\right\}$ and $\left\{p_{n}^{2}\right\}$ determine the same $K$-Martin's point relative to ${ }_{l} \mathfrak{D}_{m}$, i.e. $\lim K^{\mathscr{D}_{m}}\left(p_{n}^{1}, z\right)=\lim K^{\mathscr{D}_{m}}\left(p_{n}^{2}, z\right): K^{\mathscr{D}_{m}}\left(p_{n}^{t}, z\right)$ $=\frac{G\left(z, p_{n}^{i}, l \mathfrak{D}_{m}\right)}{G\left(p_{0}, p_{n}^{i}, \mathfrak{D}_{m}\right)}$ and $p_{0}$ is a fixed point in ${ }^{n} \Delta_{0}$.

The domain $\mathfrak{D}_{m} \uparrow \mathfrak{D}_{\infty}=\Re-\tilde{s}_{0}-\sum_{1}^{l}\left({ }^{\prime} s_{n}^{1}+{ }^{\prime} s_{n}^{3}\right)-\sum_{l+1}^{\infty}\left(s_{n}^{1}+s_{n}^{2}+s_{n}^{3}+\tilde{s}_{n}+R_{n}\right.$ $-\Lambda_{n}$ ) as $m \rightarrow \infty$. By $D^{s_{n}}+\Lambda_{n} \supset_{\mathfrak{D}} \mathfrak{D}_{m} \supset D^{*}$ for any $n$ we have $w\left(z, \Lambda_{n}\right.$, $\left.\mathfrak{D}_{m}\right) \leqq w\left(z, \Lambda_{n}, D^{s_{n}}\right)$ and $G\left(z, z_{0}, \mathfrak{D}_{m}\right) \geqq G\left(z, z_{0}, D^{*}\right)$. Consider $G\left(z, z_{0}, \mathfrak{D}_{\infty}\right)$ and $G\left(z, z_{0}, \mathfrak{D}_{m}\right)$ in $\mathfrak{D}_{m}$. Then $G\left(z, z_{0}, \mathfrak{D}_{\infty}\right) \geqq G\left(z, z_{0}, \mathfrak{D}_{m}\right)=0$ on $\partial_{l} \mathfrak{D}_{m}$
and $M_{n} w\left(z, \Lambda_{n}, \mathfrak{D}_{m}\right) \geqq G\left(z, z_{0}, \mathfrak{\Re}\right) \geqq G\left(z, z_{0}, \mathfrak{D}_{\infty}\right) \geqq G\left(z, z_{0}, \mathfrak{D}_{m}\right)=0$ on $\sum_{m+1}^{\infty} \Lambda_{n}$ for any $z_{0} \in \Delta_{0}$. Hence by the maximum principle

$$
\begin{align*}
\sum_{m+1}^{\infty} M_{n} w\left(z, \Lambda_{n}, l \mathfrak{D}_{m}\right)+G\left(z, z_{0}, \mathfrak{D}_{m}\right) & \geqq G\left(z, z_{0}, \mathfrak{D}_{\infty}\right) \\
& \geqq G\left(z, z_{0}, l \mathfrak{D}_{m}\right) \text { in } \mathfrak{D}_{m}: z_{0} \in \Delta_{0} . \tag{10}
\end{align*}
$$
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By (8) $\frac{1}{4^{n}} G\left(z, z_{0}, \mathfrak{D}_{m}\right) \geqq \frac{1}{4^{n}} G\left(z, z_{0}, D^{*}\right) \geqq M_{n} w\left(z, \Lambda_{n}, D^{s_{n}}\right) \geqq M_{n} w(z$, $\left.\Lambda_{n}, \mathfrak{D}_{m}\right)$ on $\partial \Gamma_{n}$. On the other hand, $\frac{1}{4^{n}} G\left(z, z_{0}, \mathfrak{D}_{m}\right)=0=M_{n} w\left(z, \Lambda_{n}\right.$, $\left.\mathfrak{D}_{m}\right)$ on $\partial_{l} \mathfrak{D}_{m}-\Gamma_{n}$, whence by the maximum principle $\frac{1}{4^{n}} G\left(z, z_{0}, \mathfrak{D}_{m}\right)$ $\geqq M_{n} w\left(z, \Lambda_{n}, \mathfrak{D}_{m}\right)$ in $\mathfrak{D}_{m}-\Gamma_{n}$. Hence

$$
\begin{gather*}
\left(\sum_{m+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{4^{n}} G\left(z, z_{0}, \mathfrak{D}_{\infty}\right) \geqq\right) \sum_{m+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{4^{n}} G\left(z, z_{0}, l \mathfrak{D}_{m}\right) \geqq \sum_{m+1}^{\infty} M_{n} w\left(z, \Lambda_{n}, \mathfrak{D}_{m}\right) \\
\text { in } \mathfrak{D}_{m}-\sum_{m+1}^{\infty} \Gamma_{n}: z_{0} \in \Delta_{0} . \tag{11}
\end{gather*}
$$

Thus by (10) and (11) $\sum_{m+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{4^{n}} G\left(z, z_{0},{ }_{l} \mathfrak{D}_{m}\right)+G\left(z, z_{0}, \mathfrak{D}_{m}\right) \geqq G\left(z, z_{0}\right.$, $\left.{ }_{\imath} \mathfrak{D}_{\infty}\right) \geqq G\left(z, z_{0}, \mathfrak{D}_{m}\right)$ in ${ }_{l} \mathfrak{D}_{m}-\sum_{m+1}^{\infty} \Gamma_{n}$. Now $\left\{p_{n}^{i}\right\} \in \mathfrak{D}_{m}-\sum_{m+1}^{\infty} \Gamma_{n}$. Put $\varepsilon_{m}=\sum_{m+1} \frac{{ }^{*}}{4^{*}}$. Then $\lim _{m} \varepsilon_{m}=0$. Hence $G\left(p_{n}^{i}, z_{0}, \mathfrak{D}_{\infty}\right)-G\left(p_{n}^{i}, z_{0}, \mathfrak{D}_{m}\right)<\varepsilon_{m} G\left(p_{n}^{i}, z_{0}, \mathfrak{D}_{m}\right)$ $\leqq \varepsilon_{m} G\left(p_{n}^{i}, z_{0},{ }_{l} \mathfrak{D}_{\infty}\right)$. Hence by Proposition 2 and by Lemma 6 we have the following proposition which is given in the following paper.

