

CONTINUOUS FUNCTIONS ON MULTIPOLAR SETS

RAMASAMY JESURAJ

ABSTRACT. Let $\Omega = \Omega_1 \times \cdots \times \Omega_n$ ($n > 1$) be a product of n Brelot harmonic spaces each of which has a bounded potential, and let K be a compact subset of Ω . Then, K is an n -polar set with the property that every i -section ($1 \leq i < n$) of K through any point in Ω is $(n - i)$ polar if and only if every positive continuous function on K can be extended to a continuous potential on Ω . Further, it has been shown that if f is a nonnegative continuous function on Ω with compact support, then MRf , the multireduced function of f over Ω , is also a continuous function on Ω .

1. Introduction. Let Ω_j for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ be locally compact spaces with countable basis for the topology and be Brelot spaces [5]. The principal results of this paper (cf. Theorem 3 and Theorem 12) characterize certain exceptional compact sets K contained in the product space $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \times \cdots \times \Omega_n$ in terms of extendibility of positive continuous functions on K , to a positive n -potential on the entire space. This is a natural generalization of the corresponding results in [7] in the case of a single harmonic space. A key result, independent of interest, needed in the proof of the main results in Theorem 5 shows that the multireduced function of a continuous function is continuous. The results of this paper formed a part of my Ph. D. thesis submitted to McGill University [6]. I would like to thank Professor Gowrisankaran for his help in preparation of this work.

We shall use the notation and results from [3, 4 and 8] concerning n -harmonic, n -superharmonic functions, and n -potentials. We assume that there is a bounded n -superharmonic function on $\Omega_1 \times \cdots \times \Omega_n$. Notice that it is equivalent to the assumption that each Ω_j ($j = 1, \dots, n$) has a bounded potential. If constants are superharmonic, then this assumption trivially holds. Throughout this paper, unless it is explicitly mentioned, n is an integer ≥ 2 , and we denote $\Omega_1 \times \cdots \times \Omega_n$ by Ω .

In the course of proving our main results we need a number of results that are routine generalizations of similar ones in the single variable case. The proofs of some of them are not quite obvious, and can be found in [6].

DEFINITION 1. Let f be an extended real-valued function on Ω . Define $MRf(x) = \inf\{u(x) : u \text{ is } n\text{-superharmonic, and } u \geq f \text{ on } \Omega\}$. For each subset E of Ω , let X_E be the characteristic function of E , and let $X_E \cdot f$ be the pointwise product function on Ω . The function $MR(X_E \cdot f)$ is called the multireduced function of f over E .

Received by the editors September 11, 1984 and, in revised form, November 1, 1985.
1980 *Mathematics Subject Classification* (1985 Revision). Primary 31D05.

©1987 American Mathematical Society
0002-9939/87 \$1.00 + \$.25 per page

Observe that $(MR(X_E \cdot f))^\dagger$, the lower semicontinuous regularization (see [1]) of $MR(X_E \cdot f)$, is an n -hyperharmonic function on Ω .

Let us recall the definition of a section from [8].

DEFINITION 2. Let E be a subset of Ω , $n > 1$, and i an integer such that $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$. Let r_1, \dots, r_i be integers with $1 \leq r_1 < r_2 < \dots < r_i \leq n$. Let $t = (x_{s_1}, \dots, x_{s_j})$ be a point in $\Omega_{s_1} \times \dots \times \Omega_{s_j}$ ($1 \leq j \leq n$) with $\{r_1, \dots, r_i\} \subseteq \{s_1, \dots, s_j\} \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Then the (r_1, \dots, r_i) -section of E through t is defined as

$$z \text{ in } \prod_{k=1}^n \Omega_k, \quad (y_1, \dots, y_n) \text{ is in } E, \text{ whenever } y_k = x_k \text{ for } k \text{ in } \{r_1, \dots, r_i\},$$

$$k \text{ not in } \{r_1, \dots, r_i\}, \quad y_k = z_k \text{ for } k \text{ not in } \{r_1, \dots, r_i\},$$

which would be denoted by $E[(r_1, \dots, r_i), t]$. For x in Ω , an i -section of E through x is always denoted by $E[(r_1, \dots, r_i), x]$ for some (r_1, \dots, r_i) .

2. A characterization of a class of multipolar sets. The following theorem gives a necessary condition for a compact set to be n -polar. We recall that a set E is n -polar if there exists a positive n -superharmonic function which is identically infinity on E .

THEOREM 3. Let K be a compact subset of Ω such that every positive continuous function on K can be uniformly approximated on K by positive n -superharmonic functions on Ω . Then,

- (1) If K has more than one point, then K is an n -polar set.
- (2) In addition, if point sets are polar in Ω_j for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$, then
 - (a) Every i -section of K through any point in Ω is $(n - i)$ -polar for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n - 1$.
 - (b) Given z in Ω such that z not in K , there is a positive n -superharmonic function u on Ω such that $u(z) < \infty$ and $u(x) = \infty$ for all x in K .

PROOF. (1) The proof of the fact that the hypothesis implies the n -polarity of K is very similar to the proof of Theorem 1 of [7].

(2.a) This part is proved by induction on n . Let us make the induction assumption that for all products of Brelot spaces $\Omega_1 \times \dots \times \Omega_m$ with $m < n$, the hypothesis of the theorem implies the property (a).

Let us now consider a compact set K contained in Ω satisfying the hypothesis. Fix z in Ω , and i such that $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$. By a suitable rearrangement, if necessary, we may consider the i -section $K[(1, 2, \dots, i), z]$ to be the general i -section of K . This set is compact and contained in $\Omega_{i+1} \times \dots \times \Omega_n$. Let us consider further the nontrivial case when $K[(1, 2, \dots, i), z]$ contains more than one point. We shall show that this set is $(n - i)$ -polar. By the induction hypothesis, it suffices to prove that an arbitrary positive continuous function f on $K[(1, 2, \dots, i), z]$ can be uniformly approximated on $K[(1, 2, \dots, i), z]$ by positive $(n - i)$ -superharmonic functions.

Let us consider the copy $L[i, z]$ of the above compact set in K , viz., $L[i, z] = \{(z_1, \dots, z_i, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_n) \text{ in } K\}$. $L[i, z]$ is a compact subset of K , and f can be considered as a positive continuous function on this set. By the Tietze extension theorem, there exists a positive continuous function g on K which extends f . By

hypothesis, for $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a positive n -superharmonic function u on Ω such that $|u - g| < \epsilon$ on K uniformly. Set

$$v(y_{i+1}, \dots, y_n) = u(z_1, \dots, z_i, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_n).$$

This function is $(n - i)$ superharmonic on $\Omega_{i+1} \times \dots \times \Omega_n$, and clearly $|f - v| < \epsilon$ uniformly on $K[(1, 2, \dots, i), z]$. Hence, by the induction assumption we conclude that $K[(1, 2, \dots, i), z]$ is $(n - i)$ -polar. This concludes the proof of (2.a).

(2.b) By Theorem 2.4 of [8], for n -polar sets, the properties (2.a) and (2.b) are equivalent. This completes the proof of the theorem.

Using the results of [3], it is easy to prove the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 4. *Let v be an n -superharmonic function on Ω , and let δ_i be a regular domain in Ω_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. For $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n$, define v_j on Ω as follows.*

$$v_0(x_1, \dots, x_n) = v(x_1, \dots, x_n),$$

and for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$, let

$$v'_j(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \begin{cases} \int v_{j-1}(x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, z, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_n) d\rho_{x_j}^{\delta_j}(z) & \text{if } x_j \text{ in } \delta_j, \\ v_{j-1}(x_1, \dots, x_n) & \text{if } x_j \text{ not in } \delta_j. \end{cases}$$

Then,

- (1) v_j is an n -superharmonic function on Ω , and $v_j(x) \leq v_{j-1}(x)$ for all x in Ω .
- (2) v_n is an n -harmonic function on $\delta_1 \times \dots \times \delta_n$.
- (3) $v_n(x) = v(x)$ for every x in $(\Omega_1 \setminus \delta_1) \times \dots \times (\Omega_n \setminus \delta_n)$.

The following theorem is a generalization, to product of harmonic spaces, of a similar result in a single harmonic space (see Proposition 2.2.3 of [2]).

THEOREM 5. *If f is a nonnegative continuous function on Ω with compact support, then MRf is a continuous function on Ω .*

Recall that the support of a real-valued function is the smallest closed set outside which the function is identically zero.

To prove this theorem we need several lemmas.

LEMMA 6. *Let I be an indexing set, and $\{g_i: i \text{ in } I\}$ a family of continuous functions on Ω with compact supports. Let there be an $\epsilon > 0$ such that $|g_i(x) - g_j(x)| \leq \epsilon$ for all x in Ω , and for all i and j in I . Further, let us suppose that one of the following two holds:*

- (1) *The constant function 1 is n -superharmonic on Ω .*
- (2) *There is a relatively compact open set U of Ω such that support of g_i is contained in U for every i in I .*

Then, there is a constant $c > 0$ such that $|MRg_i(x) - MRg_j(x)| < c\epsilon$ for x in Ω , and for i and j in I . In case (1) holds, c can be chosen to be 1, and in the case where (2) holds, c depends only upon U (not on the functions g_i).

PROOF. If condition (1) holds the proof is trivial. Suppose that (2) holds. Choose a nonnegative continuous function f on Ω with compact support and $f = 1$ on U . Then, MRf is a bounded n -potential on Ω , and hence there is a $c > 0$ such that

$MRf \leq c$ on Ω . Observing the fact that $g_i \leq g_j + \epsilon f$ on Ω for i and j , the result follows, and the proof is complete.

LEMMA 7. *Let f be a continuous function on Ω with compact support. Let $1 \leq j < n$ be fixed. Further, let d be a metric on $\Omega_1 \times \dots \times \Omega_j$. For x' in $\Omega_1 \times \dots \times \Omega_j$, define $f_{x'}$ on $\Omega_{j+1} \times \dots \times \Omega_n$ as $x'' \mapsto f(x', x'')$. Then given $\epsilon > 0$, there is an $\eta > 0$ such that $|MRf_{x'}(z) - MRf_{y'}(z)| < \epsilon$, for every z in $\Omega_{j+1} \times \dots \times \Omega_n$ and for all x', y' in $\Omega_1 \times \dots \times \Omega_j$, with $d(x', y') < \eta$. (Note that the multireduced functions $MRf_{x'}$ and $MRf_{y'}$ are defined with respect to the space $\Omega_{j+1} \times \dots \times \Omega_n$.)*

PROOF OF THEOREM 5. The proof is by induction on n . For $n = 1$, the result is true (see Proposition 2.2.3 of [2]). Let us prove the result for the case $n = 2$. Set $v = MRf$. Then, it is obvious that v is lower semicontinuous on Ω . Therefore, it suffices to prove the upper semicontinuity of v by proving that for any (z_1, z_2) in $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$

$$\limsup_{\substack{(x_1, x_2) \rightarrow (z_1, z_2) \\ (x_1, x_2) \text{ in } \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2}} v(x_1, x_2) \leq v(z_1, z_2).$$

Let (z_1, z_2) in $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$ be fixed, and let $\epsilon > 0$. Since f is continuous, and v is lower semicontinuous, there are relatively compact open neighborhoods U_1 and U_2 of (z_1, z_2) with $\bar{U}_1 \subset U_2$, and there is a 2-harmonic function h on $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$ satisfying the following conditions.

1. $h(z_1, z_2) = 1$.
2. For all (x_1, x_2) in $\bar{U}_1 \subset U_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad & h(x_1, x_2) \geq 1 - \epsilon, \\ (2) \quad & f(x_1, x_2) \leq (f(z_1, z_2) + \epsilon)h(x_1, x_2), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(3) \quad v(x_1, x_2) \geq (v(z_1, z_2) - \epsilon)h(x_1, x_2).$$

Let d_i be a metric in Ω_i ($i = 1, 2$). Then, by Lemma 7, there is an $\eta > 0$ such that, $Rf_x(s) - \epsilon < Rf_y(s) < Rf_x(s) + \epsilon$ for all s in Ω_1 , and

$$(4) \quad \begin{aligned} Rf_x(t) - \epsilon < Rf_y(t) < Rf_x(t) + \epsilon \quad \text{for all } t \text{ in } \Omega_2, \\ \text{if } d_1(x_1, y_1) < \eta, \text{ and } d_2(x_2, y_2) < \eta. \end{aligned}$$

Now, choose δ_i , a regular domain in Ω_i , $i = 1, 2$, such that (z_1, z_2) is in $\delta_1 \times \delta_2 \subset \bar{\delta}_1 \times \bar{\delta}_2 \subset U_2$. We may assume that the diameter of δ_i is small enough and it satisfies

$$(5) \quad \int d\rho_{x_i}^{\delta_i}(t) \geq 1 - \epsilon \quad \text{for every } x_i \text{ in } \delta_i, i = 1, 2.$$

Put $w = v + 2h$. Then, w is a 2-superharmonic function on $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$. Define a function u as follows.

$$u(x_1, x_2) = \begin{cases} \iint w(y_1, y_2) d\rho_{x_1}^{\delta_1}(y_1) d\rho_{x_2}^{\delta_2}(y_2) & \text{if } (x_1, x_2) \text{ in } \delta_1 \times \delta_2, \\ \int w(x_1, y_2) d\rho_{x_2}^{\delta_2}(y_2) & \text{if } x_1 \text{ not in } \delta_1, \text{ and } x_2 \text{ in } \delta_2, \\ \int w(y_1, x_2) d\rho_{x_1}^{\delta_1}(y_1) & \text{if } x_1 \text{ in } \delta_1, \text{ and } x_2 \text{ not in } \delta_2, \\ w(x_1, x_2) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is clear that u is a 2-superharmonic function on $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$, $u \leq w$, and u is 2-harmonic on $\delta_1 \times \delta_2$.

We claim that $u \geq (1 - \varepsilon)f$ on $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$. The proof of this claim is given by splitting into four cases, according to whether x_1 is in δ_1 or not, and x_2 is in δ_2 or not.

Case (i). Let (x_1, x_2) be in $\delta_1 \times \delta_2$. Then from the definition of u and w , we have

$$\begin{aligned} u(x_1, x_2) &= \iint (v(y_1, y_2) + 2h(y_1, y_2)) d\rho_{x_1}^{\delta_1}(y_1) d\rho_{x_2}^{\delta_2}(y_2) \\ &\geq \iint (v(z_1, z_2) + \varepsilon)h(y_1, y_2) d\rho_{x_1}^{\delta_1}(y_1) d\rho_{x_2}^{\delta_2}(y_2) \\ &\hspace{15em} \text{(using (3) as } \bar{\delta}_1 \times \bar{\delta}_2 \subset U) \\ &= (v(z_1, z_2) + \varepsilon)h(x_1, x_2) \quad \text{(as } h \text{ is 2-harmonic)} \\ &\geq (f(z_1, z_2) + \varepsilon)h(x_1, x_2) \\ &> f(x_1, x_2) \quad \text{(using (2))} \\ &> (1 - \varepsilon)f(x_1, x_2) \quad \text{(as } f > 0), \end{aligned}$$

Case (ii). Let x_1 be in δ_1 and x_2 not in δ_2 . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} u(x_1, x_2) &= \int w(y_1, x_2) d\rho_{x_1}^{\delta_1}(y_1) \\ &= \int (v(y_1, x_2) + 2\varepsilon h(y_1, x_2)) d\rho_{x_1}^{\delta_1}(y_1) \\ &\geq \int (Rf_{y_1}(x_2) + 2\varepsilon h(y_1, x_2)) d\rho_{x_1}^{\delta_1}(y_1) \\ &\geq \int (Rf_{x_1}(x_2) - \varepsilon + 2\varepsilon h(y_1, x_2)) d\rho_{x_1}^{\delta_1}(y_1) \quad \text{(using (4))} \\ &= (Rf_{x_1}(x_2) - \varepsilon) \int d\rho_{x_1}^{\delta_1}(y_1) + 2\varepsilon h(x_1, x_2) \\ &> (Rf_{x_1}(x_2) - \varepsilon)(1 - \varepsilon) + 2\varepsilon h(x_1, x_2) \quad \text{(using (5))} \\ &> (f_{x_1}(x_2) - \varepsilon)(1 - \varepsilon) + 2\varepsilon h(x_1, x_2) \quad \text{(as } Rf_{x_1} > f_{x_1} \text{ on } \Omega_2) \\ &= (f(x_1, x_2) - \varepsilon)(1 - \varepsilon) + 2\varepsilon(1 - \varepsilon) \quad \text{(using (1))} \\ &> (1 - \varepsilon)f(x_1, x_2) \quad \text{(as } f > 0). \end{aligned}$$

Case (iii). Let x_1 not be in δ_1 and x_2 in δ_2 . The proof is similar to the previous case.

Case (iv). Let x_1 not be in δ_1 and x_2 not in δ_2 . Then the proof trivially follows from the definitions of u, v and w . Thus, the claim is proved.

Now, $u \geq (1 - \epsilon)f$ on $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$ gives that $u \geq (1 - \epsilon)v$ on $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$. In particular, if (x_1, x_2) is in $\delta_1 \times \delta_2$ then

$$(1 - \epsilon)v(x_1, x_2) \leq \iint v(y_1, y_2) d\rho_{x_1}^{\delta_1}(y_1) d\rho_{x_2}^{\delta_2}(y_2) + 2h(x_1, x_2).$$

The right-hand side of the above inequality is a 2-harmonic function on $\delta_1 \times \delta_2$, hence is a continuous function on $\delta_1 \times \delta_2$. Taking \limsup as $(x_1, x_2) \rightarrow (z_1, z_2)$ in $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$, and noticing that v is a 2-superharmonic function we get

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \epsilon) \limsup_{\substack{(x_1, x_2) \rightarrow (z_1, z_2) \\ (x_1, x_1) \text{ in } \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2}} v(x_1, x_2) &\leq v(z_1, z_2) + 2\epsilon h(z_1, z_2) \\ &\leq v(z_1, z_2) + 2\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

As $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, we have

$$\limsup_{(x_1, x_2) \rightarrow (z_1, z_2)} v(x_1, x_2) \leq v(z_1, z_2).$$

Since (z_1, z_2) is an arbitrary point in $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$, it follows that v is upper semicontinuous on $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$. Hence, v is continuous on $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$, and this concludes the proof for the case $n = 2$.

To complete the proof of the induction, we proceed from the case of functions of $n - 1$ variables to functions of n variables in exactly the same way. We remark that the choice of u in the above proof is replaced by w_n as defined in Proposition 4. The rest of the details are absolutely the same. This allows us to conclude that MRf is in general a continuous function whenever f is a nonnegative continuous function with compact support, completing the proof of the theorem.

As an immediate consequence, we have the following corollary.

COROLLARY 8. *If f is a nonnegative continuous function on Ω with compact support, then MRf is a continuous n -potential on Ω .*

Though the following result is essentially a corollary to the above theorem, we will state it as a theorem due to its importance. We omit the proof.

THEOREM 9. *Let v be a positive n -superharmonic function on Ω . Then, there is a sequence v_j of continuous n -potentials such that v_j increases pointwise to v on Ω as $j \rightarrow \infty$.*

From now on K is a compact n -polar subset of Ω , such that every i -section of K through any point of Ω is $(n - i)$ -polar, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n - 1$.

The next theorem is the converse of Theorem 3.

THEOREM 10. *Given a positive continuous function f on K and an $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a continuous n -potential p on Ω such that $|f - p| < \epsilon$ on K .*

PROOF. Let $\{U_j\}$, $j = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, be a decreasing sequence of relatively compact subsets of Ω such that $U_j \supset \bar{U}_{j+1} \supset U_{j+1}$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots$, and $K = \bigcap \{U_j: j = 1, 2, 3, \dots\}$. For each j , let f_j be a nonnegative continuous extension of f to Ω with support of $f_j \subset U_j$. By taking infimum at each stage, we may assume that $\{f_j\}$ is a decreasing sequence of functions on Ω .

Put $p_j = MRf_j$. Then, by Corollary 8, p_j is a continuous n -potential, for each j . Following the proof Theorem 4 of [7], we can show that p_j decreases pointwise to f on K as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Using Dini's Theorem, we conclude that p_j converges to f uniformly on K . Thus, there is an m such that $|f(x) - p_j(x)| < \varepsilon$ if $j \geq m$, for all x in K . The choice $p = p_m$ meets the requirement of the theorem, completing the proof.

The following result is an analogue of Theorem 5 of [7], and can be proved analogously with the help of Theorem 10.

PROPOSITION 11. *Let f_0 be a positive continuous function on K , and F_0 be a relatively compact open neighborhood of K . Put $F = \bar{F}_0$, and let f be a nonnegative continuous extension of f_0 to Ω , such that $f > 0$ on F . Then, given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a continuous potential p on Ω such that $p < f$ on F , and $p \geq f_0 - \varepsilon$ on K .*

Our ultimate aim is the following theorem, for the case $n \geq 2$.

THEOREM 12. *Given a positive continuous function f_0 on K , there is a continuous n -potential p on Ω such that $p = f_0$ on K .*

PROOF. The existence of an n -potential p such that $p = f_0$ on K can be proved as in the case $n = 1$. (See Theorem 2 of [7].) However, in proving the continuity of p , in the case $n = 1$, we have explicitly used the fact that Rg is harmonic outside the support of g . This result is no longer valid for MRg when $n > 1$. Hence, we modify the proof as follows. We also note that the same method works in the case $n = 1$.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$. For a continuous function g on K , define

$$\|g\|_K = \sup\{|g(x)|: x \text{ in } K\},$$

and if g is a bounded continuous function on Ω , then define

$$\|g\|_\infty = \sup\{|g(x)|: x \text{ in } \Omega\}.$$

Let q be a bounded continuous n -potential on Ω . We may assume that $q \geq 1$ on K .

Let F_0 be a relatively compact open set containing K and let $F = \bar{F}_0$. Choose f a nonnegative continuous extension of f_0 to Ω with $f > 0$ on F , and $\|f\|_\infty = \|f_0\|_K$. Then, by the previous theorem, there is a continuous n -potential q_0 on Ω such that $q_0 < f$ on F and $q_0 > f_0 - \varepsilon$ on K . Let $p_0 = \inf\{\|f_0\|_K q, q_0\}$ on Ω . Then, p_0 is a bounded continuous n -potential on Ω . Further, $p_0 \leq q_0 < f$ on F . If x is in K , then $q(x) \geq 1$, and hence,

$$\|f_0\|_K q(x) \geq \|f_0\|_K = \|f\|_\infty \geq f(x) > q_0(x).$$

Therefore, $p_0 = q_0$ on K and hence, $p_0 \geq f_0 - \varepsilon$ on K . Thus, there is a bounded continuous n -potential p_0 such that

1. $p_0(x) < f(x)$ for all x in F ,
2. $p_0(x) \geq f_0(x) - \varepsilon$ for all x in K ,
3. $\|p_0\|_\infty < \|f_0\|_K \|q\|_\infty$.

Put $g_1 = \max(f - p_0, 0)$ on Ω . Then, g_1 is a nonnegative continuous function and $g_1 > 0$ on F . Let g_2 be a nonnegative continuous on Ω such that $g_2 = g_1$ on K and $g_2 > 0$ on F . Since $g_2 = g_1 = f - p_0$ on K , we may even choose g_2 such that $\|g_2\|_\infty = \|f - p_0\|_K$. Set $f_1 = \inf\{g_1, g_2\}$. Then, f_1 is a nonnegative continuous function on Ω with $f_1 > 0$ on F and $f_1 = f - p_0$ on K . As before, there is a continuous n -potential p_1 such that

1. $p_1(x) < f_1(x)$ for every x in F ,
2. $p_1(x) \geq f_1(x) - \varepsilon/2$ for every x in K ,
3. $\|p_1\|_\infty \leq \|f_1\|_K \|q\|_\infty$.

Now, $f_1(x) \leq g_1(x) \leq f(x) - p_0(x)$ on F , and $f_1(x) = g_1(x) = f(x) - p_0(x)$ on K .

Therefore, the above inequalities can be rewritten as follows.

1. $p_0(x) + p_1(x) < f(x)$ for all x in F ,
2. $p_0(x) + p_1(x) \geq f_0(x) - \varepsilon/2$ for all x in K ,
3. $\|p_0\|_\infty \leq \|f_0\|_K \|q\|_\infty$ and $\|p_1\|_\infty \leq \|f_1\|_K \|q\|_\infty$.

Note that $\|f_1\|_K \leq \varepsilon/2$.

Proceeding by induction, we get the sequence $\{p_m\}$, $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, of bounded continuous n -potentials and a sequence $\{f_m\}$, $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, of continuous functions such that

1. $\sum_{i=0}^m p_i < f$ on F for every m ,
2. $\sum_{i=0}^m p_i > f_0 - \varepsilon/2^m$ on K for every m ,
3. $\|p_m\|_\infty \leq \|f_m\|_K \|q\|_\infty$ for $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$.

Note that $\|f_m\|_K < \varepsilon/2^m$ for $m = 1, 2, 3, \dots$.

Set $p = \sum_{i=0}^\infty p_i$ on Ω . Then, it is clear that p is an n -superharmonic function and that $p \leq f$ on F and $p = f_0$ on K . By an analogue of Proposition 2.2.2 of [2], p is an n -potential on Ω . As $\|p_m\|_\infty \leq \|f_m\|_K \|q\|_\infty \leq (\varepsilon/2^m) \|q\|_\infty$ for $m \geq 1$, $\sum_{m=0}^\infty p_m(x)$ converges uniformly on Ω . Since each p_m is a continuous function, p is continuous on Ω , completing the proof.

The following corollary is an immediate consequence of the above theorem.

COROLLARY 13. (1) *Every real-valued continuous function on K is the restriction to K of the difference of two positive continuous n -potentials on Ω .*

(2) *Every positive lower semicontinuous function on K is the restriction to K of an n -potential.*

(3) *If the constant function 1 is n -superharmonic on Ω , then every real-valued continuous function on K is the restriction to K of an n -superharmonic function on Ω .*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. M. Brelot, *Lectures on potential theory*, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Bombay, 1960, re-issued 1967.
2. C. Constantinescu and A. Cornea, *Potential theory on harmonic spaces*, Springer-Verlag, 1972.

3. K. Gowrisankaran, *Multiply harmonic functions*, Nagoya Math. J. **28** (1966), 27–48.
4. _____, *Multiply superharmonic functions*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **4** (1975), 235–244.
5. R. M. Herve, *Recherches axiomatiques sur la théorie de fonctions surharmoniques et du potentiel*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **12** (1962), 415–571.
6. R. Jesuraj, *Continuous functions and exceptional sets in potential theory*, Ph.D. Thesis, McGill Univ., Montreal, Quebec, 1981.
7. _____, *Continuous functions on polar sets*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **93** (1985), 262–266.
8. D. Singman, *Exceptional sets in a product of harmonic spaces*, Math. Ann. **262** (1983), 29–43.

PRIME COMPUTERS, 500 OLD CONNECTICUT PATH, FRAMINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 01701

Current address: Digital Equipment Corporation, 550 King Street, LKG1-3/A06, Littleton, Massachusetts 01460-1289