

ANNALES DE L'INSTITUT FOURIER

MASANORI KISHI

A remark on a lower envelope principle

Annales de l'institut Fourier, tome 14, n° 2 (1964), p. 473-484

http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AIF_1964__14_2_473_0

© Annales de l'institut Fourier, 1964, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Annales de l'institut Fourier » (<http://annalif.ujf-grenoble.fr/>) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (<http://www.numdam.org/conditions>). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques

<http://www.numdam.org/>

A REMARK ON A LOWER ENVELOPE PRINCIPLE

by Masanori KISHI

Introduction.

Let Ω be a locally compact Hausdorff space, every compact subset of which is separable, and let $G(x, y)$ be a positive continuous (in the extended sense) function defined on $\Omega \times \Omega$, which is finite at any point $(x, y) \in \Omega \times \Omega$ with $x \neq y$. This function G is called a positive continuous kernel on Ω . The kernel \check{G} defined by $\check{G}(x, y) = G(y, x)$ is called the adjoint kernel of G . For a given positive measure μ , the potential $G\mu(x)$ and the adjoint potential $\check{G}\mu(x)$ are defined by

$$G\mu(x) = \int G(x, y) d\mu(y) \quad \text{and} \quad \check{G}\mu(x) = \int \check{G}(x, y) d\mu(y)$$

respectively. The G -energy of μ is defined by $\int G\mu(x) d\mu(x)$. Evidently this is equal to $\int \check{G}\mu(x) d\mu(x)$.

We shall say that G satisfies the *compact lower envelope principle* when for any compact subset K of Ω and for any $\mu \in \mathcal{E}_0$ and $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_0^{(1)}$, the lower envelope $G\mu \wedge G\nu$ ⁽²⁾ coincides G -p.p.p. on K with a potential $G\lambda$ of a positive measure λ supported by K ⁽³⁾. It is seen by an existence theorem obtained in [4] that if the adjoint kernel \check{G} satisfies the continuity

(1) \mathcal{M}_0 is the totality of positive measures with compact support and \mathcal{E}_0 is the totality of positive measures in \mathcal{M}_0 with finite G -energy.

(2) $(G\mu \wedge G\nu)(x) = \inf \{ G\mu(x), G\nu(x) \}$.

(3) We say that a property holds G -p.p.p. on K when it holds on K almost everywhere with respect to any μ in \mathcal{E}_0 .

principle ⁽⁴⁾ and G satisfies the ordinary domination principle ⁽⁵⁾, then G satisfies the compact lower envelope principle (cf. [6]). In this paper we examine what we can say about the converse.

We consider a positive continuous kernel G satisfying the continuity principle and we assume that any open subset of Ω is of positive G -capacity ⁽⁶⁾. We shall show that such a kernel satisfies the ordinary domination principle if it is not a finite-valued kernel on a discrete space, provided that G or \check{G} is non-degenerate ⁽⁷⁾ and G satisfies the compact lower envelope principle. The exceptional kernel G satisfies the inverse domination principle ⁽⁸⁾.

1. Elementary weak balayage principle.

1. We say that G satisfies the elementary weak balayage principle, if for any compact set K and any point $x_0 \notin K$, there exists $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_0$, supported by K , such that

$$G\mu = G\varepsilon_{x_0} \quad G\text{-p.p. on } K,$$

where ε_{x_0} is the unit measure at x_0 .

First we show that the compact lower envelope principle is stronger than the elementary weak balayage principle.

LEMMA. — *If a positive continuous kernel G satisfies the compact lower envelope principle, then it satisfies the elementary weak balayage principle.*

Proof. — Without loss of generality, we may suppose that \mathcal{E}_0 is not empty. Let K be a compact set and x_0 be a point not on K . Since $G\varepsilon_{x_0}$ is bounded on K and $\mathcal{E}_0 \neq \emptyset$, there exists a positive measure λ in \mathcal{E}_0 such that $G\lambda \geq G\varepsilon_{x_0}$ on K .

⁽⁴⁾ This means that if $\check{G}\mu$ is finite continuous as a function on the support $S\mu$ of μ , then $\check{G}\mu$ is finite continuous in Ω .

⁽⁵⁾ Namely the following implication is true for G : $G\mu \leq G\nu$ on $S\mu$ with $\mu \in \mathcal{E}_0$ and $\nu \in \mathfrak{M}_0 \implies G\mu \leq G\nu$ in Ω .

⁽⁶⁾ This means that for any non-empty open subset ω of Ω there exists $\lambda \neq 0$ in \mathcal{E}_0 such that $S\lambda \subset \omega$.

⁽⁷⁾ We say that G is non-degenerate when for any two different points x_1 and x_2 , $G\varepsilon_{x_1}/G\varepsilon_{x_2} \neq$ any constant in Ω , where ε_{x_i} is the unit measure at x_i , ($i = 1, 2$).

⁽⁸⁾ Namely the following implication is true for G : $G\mu \leq G\nu$ on $S\nu$ with $\mu \in \mathcal{E}_0$ and $\nu \in \mathfrak{M}_0 \implies G\mu \leq G\nu$ in Ω .

Then, by the compact lower envelope principle, there exists a positive measure μ , supported by K , such that

$$G\mu = G\lambda \wedge G\epsilon_{x_0} \quad G\text{-p.p. on } K.$$

Hence $G\mu = G\epsilon_{x_0}$ G -p.p. on K and G satisfies the elementary weak balayage principle.

2. In [5] we obtained the following results concerning the elementary weak balayage principle.

PROPOSITION 1. — *Let G be a positive continuous kernel on Ω such that G or \check{G} is non-degenerate and G satisfies the continuity principle. Assume that every open subset of Ω is of positive G -capacity. If G satisfies the elementary weak balayage principle, then it satisfies the ordinary domination principle or the inverse domination principle.*

PROPOSITION 2. — *Under the same assumption as above, G satisfies the ordinary domination principle, if it satisfies the elementary weak balayage principle and there exists a point x_0 in Ω such that $G(x_0, x_0) = +\infty$.*

By these propositions and Lemma 1 we have

THEOREM 1. — *Assume that a positive continuous kernel G on Ω satisfies the continuity principle and that every open subset of Ω is of positive G -capacity. If G satisfies the compact lower envelope principle and G or \check{G} is non-degenerate, then it satisfies the ordinary domination principle or the inverse domination principle.*

THEOREM 2. — *Assume the same as above. If G satisfies the compact lower envelope principle, G or \check{G} is non-degenerate and there exists a point x_0 in Ω such that $G(x_0, x_0) = +\infty$, then G satisfies the ordinary domination principle.*

From these theorems follows

COROLLARY. — *Assume the same as above. If G satisfies the compact envelope principle and does not satisfy the ordinary domination principle, then it is a finite continuous kernel ⁽⁹⁾ satisfying the inverse domination principle.*

(9) Namely it is a finite-valued and continuous kernel.

2. Finite continuous kernels.

3. Throughout this section we consider a finite continuous kernel G on Ω . We shall prove several lemmas on G .

LEMMA 2. — *Let G satisfy the inverse domination principle. Then it is non-degenerate if and only if*

$$\Gamma(x_1, x_2) = G(x_1, x_1)G(x_2, x_2) - G(x_1, x_2)G(x_2, x_1) < 0$$

for any two different points x_1 and x_2 in Ω .

Proof. — Since G satisfies the inverse domination principle, $\Gamma(x_1, x_2) \leq 0$ for any two different points x_1 and x_2 in Ω . In fact, the identity $G\varepsilon_{x_1}(x_1) = aG\varepsilon_{x_2}(x_1)$ with

$$a = G(x_1, x_1)/G(x_1, x_2)$$

and the inverse domination principle yield

$$(1) \quad G\varepsilon_{x_1}(x) \geq aG\varepsilon_{x_2}(x)$$

for any x in Ω . Therefore $G\varepsilon_{x_1}(x_2) \geq aG\varepsilon_{x_2}(x_2)$ and hence $\Gamma(x_1, x_2) \leq 0$.

Now suppose that $\Gamma(x_1, x_2) = 0$. Then

$$G\varepsilon_{x_1}(x_2) = aG\varepsilon_{x_2}(x_2).$$

Hence by the inverse domination principle

$$G\varepsilon_{x_1}(x) \leq aG\varepsilon_{x_2}(x)$$

for any x in Ω . This together with (1) shows that G is degenerate. Consequently $\Gamma(x_1, x_2) < 0$ if G is non-degenerate. The converse is evidently true.

COROLLARY. — *Under the same assumption as above G is non-degenerate if and only if its adjoint kernel \check{G} is non degenerate.*

Proof. — This is an immediate consequence of Lemma 2, since G satisfies the inverse domination principle when and only when \check{G} satisfies the principle (see Theorem 2' in [5]).

LEMMA 3. — *If G satisfies the inverse domination principle, then G satisfies the compact upper envelope principle, i.e., for any $\mu, \nu \in \mathfrak{M}_0$ and any compact subset K of Ω , there exists $\tau \in \mathfrak{M}_0$, supported by K , such that*

$$G\tau = G\mu \vee G\nu \quad \text{on } K^{(10)}.$$

Proof. — Put $u = G\mu \vee G\nu$. Then by the inverse existence theorem (cf. Theorem 4' in [5]) there exists a positive measure τ , supported by K , such that

$$\begin{aligned} G\tau &\leq u && \text{on } K, \\ G\tau &= u && \text{on } S\tau. \end{aligned}$$

By these inequalities and the inverse domination principle we obtain

$$G\tau = u \quad \text{on } K.$$

COROLLARY. — *If G satisfies the inverse domination principle, then its adjoint \check{G} satisfies the compact upper envelope principle.*

LEMMA 4. — *If G is non-degenerate and satisfies the inverse domination principle, then it satisfies the unicity principle ⁽¹¹⁾.*

Proof ⁽¹²⁾. — Let K be a compact subset of Ω and \mathcal{C} be the space of all finite continuous functions on K with the uniform convergence topology. We put

$$\mathfrak{D} = \{f \in \mathcal{C}; f = \check{G}\mu_1 - \check{G}\mu_2 \text{ on } K \text{ with } \mu_i \in \mathfrak{M}_0\}.$$

First we show that \mathfrak{D} is dense in \mathcal{C} . By the corollary of Lemma 3 we easily see that \mathfrak{D} is closed with respect to the operations \vee and \wedge , i.e., if $f_i \in \mathfrak{D}$ ($i = 1, 2$), then $f_1 \vee f_2$ and $f_1 \wedge f_2$ belong to \mathfrak{D} . Let x_1 and x_2 be different points on K . Since G is non-degenerate, $\Gamma(x_1, x_2) \neq 0$ by Lemma 2. Hence for any given real numbers a_1 and a_2 , there exists f in \mathfrak{D} such that

$$\begin{aligned} f &= t_1 \check{G}\varepsilon_{x_1} + t_2 \check{G}\varepsilon_{x_2} \quad (t_i, \text{ real}) \\ f(x_i) &= a_i \quad (i = 1, 2). \end{aligned}$$

⁽¹⁰⁾ $(G\mu \vee G\nu)(x) = \max \{G\mu(x), G\nu(x)\}$.

⁽¹¹⁾ Namely the equality $G\mu = G\nu$ in Ω with $\mu, \nu \in \mathfrak{M}_0$ implies $\mu = \nu$.

⁽¹²⁾ Cf. [3] and [6].

Thus we can apply the theorem of Weierstrass and Stone (cf. [1], p. 53) and we obtain that \mathfrak{D} is dense in \mathfrak{C} .

Now let $G\mu_1 = G\mu_2$ in Ω with $\mu_i \in \mathfrak{M}_0$ and take a compact set K which contains $S\mu_1 \cup S\mu_2$. We shall show that

$$\int f d\mu_1 = \int f d\mu_2$$

for any f in \mathfrak{C} . By the above remark there exists, for any positive number ε , a function g in \mathfrak{D} such that $|f(x) - g(x)| < \varepsilon$ on K . Then

$$\left| \int f d\mu_i - \int g d\mu_i \right| < \varepsilon \int d\mu_i \quad (i = 1, 2).$$

Since $\int g d\mu_1 = \int g d\mu_2$,

$$\left| \int f d\mu_1 - \int f d\mu_2 \right| < 2\varepsilon \max \left(\int d\mu_1, \int d\mu_2 \right).$$

Consequently $\int f d\mu_1 = \int f d\mu_2$. This completes the proof.

LEMMA 5. — *Assume that G is non-degenerate and satisfies the compact lower envelope principle and the inverse domination principle, Let λ_0 be a positive measure such that*

$$\begin{aligned} G\lambda_0 &= G\mu \wedge G\nu \quad \text{on } S\mu \cup S\nu, \\ S\lambda_0 &\subset S\mu \cup S\nu. \end{aligned}$$

Then for any x in Ω

$$G\lambda_0(x) = (G\mu \wedge G\nu)(x).$$

Proof. — Let K be a compact set containing $S\mu \cup S\nu$ and λ be a positive measure supported by K such that

$$G\lambda = G\mu \wedge G\nu \quad \text{on } K.$$

By Lemma 3, there exists a positive measure τ , supported by K , such that

$$G\tau = G\mu \vee G\nu \quad \text{on } K.$$

Then

$$G\lambda + G\tau = G\mu \wedge G\nu + G\mu \vee G\nu = G\mu + G\nu$$

on K . Since $\lambda + \tau$ and $\mu + \nu$ are supported by K , we obtain by the inverse domination principle that

$$G(\lambda + \tau) = G(\mu + \nu) \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Hence by Lemma 4, $\lambda + \tau = \mu + \nu$ and λ is supported by $S_\mu \cup S_\nu$. Consequently again by the inverse domination principle, we have $G\lambda = G\lambda_0$ and hence $\lambda = \lambda_0$. This shows that

$$G\lambda_0 = G\mu \wedge G\nu \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

LEMMA 6. — Assume that G is non-degenerate and satisfies the compact lower envelope principle and the inverse domination principle. Then for any points x_1, x_2 and x in Ω either

$$\frac{G(x, x_1)}{G(x, x_2)} = \frac{G(x_1, x_1)}{G(x_1, x_2)}$$

or

$$\frac{G(x, x_1)}{G(x, x_2)} = \frac{G(x_2, x_1)}{G(x_2, x_2)}.$$

Proof. — Without loss of generality we may assume that $G(x, x) = 1$ for any x in Ω , since $G'(x, y) = G(x, y)/G(x, x)$ is a non-degenerate finite continuous kernel which satisfies the compact lower envelope principle and the inverse domination principle. We take three different points x_1, x_2 and x_3 in Ω and put

$$g_{ij} = G(x_i, x_j).$$

By Lemma 2

$$(2) \quad g_{12}g_{21} > 1.$$

Hence we can take positive measures $\mu = a_1\varepsilon_1 + a_2\varepsilon_2$, $\nu = b_1\varepsilon_1 + b_2\varepsilon_2$ such that

$$(3) \quad G\mu(x_1) < G\nu(x_1) \quad \text{and} \quad G\mu(x_2) > G\nu(x_2),$$

where ε_i is the unit measure at x_i . Then by our assumption there exists a positive measure $\lambda = c_1\varepsilon_1 + c_2\varepsilon_2$ such that

$$G\lambda(x_i) = (G\mu \wedge G\nu)(x_i) \quad i = 1, 2.$$

By Lemma 5 this equality holds at x_3 . Suppose that

$$G\lambda(x_3) = G\mu(x_3).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 + c_2g_{12} &= a_1 + a_2g_{12}, \\ c_1g_{21} + c_2 &= b_1g_{21} + b_2, \\ c_1g_{31} + c_2g_{32} &= a_1g_{31} + a_2g_{32}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the following determinant vanishes;

$$\begin{vmatrix} 1 & g_{12} & a_1 + a_2 g_{12} \\ g_{21} & 1 & b_1 g_{21} + b_2 \\ g_{31} & g_{32} & a_1 g_{31} + a_2 g_{32} \end{vmatrix} = 0.$$

Hence

$$(g_{32} - g_{12}g_{31})\{(a_1 g_{21} + a_2) - (b_1 g_{21} + b_2)\} = 0,$$

namely $(g_{32} - g_{12}g_{31})(G\mu(x_2) - G\nu(x_2)) = 0$. Hence by (3), $g_{32} = g_{12}g_{31}$, that is,

$$G(x_1, x_1)G(x_3, x_2) = G(x_1, x_2)G(x_3, x_1).$$

Similarly we obtain

$$G(x_2, x_2)G(x_3, x_1) = G(x_2, x_1)G(x_3, x_2)$$

if $G\lambda(x_3) = G\nu(x_3)$. This completes the proof.

4. We are still making preparations.

LEMMA 7. — *Let K be a compact subset of Ω , x_0 a point on K and put*

$$h(z) = \inf \{G\mu(z); \mu \in \mathfrak{M}_0, S\mu \subset K, G\mu(x_0) \geq 1\}$$

for any $z \in \Omega$. If G satisfies the compact lower envelope principle, there exists a positive measure μ , supported by K , such that

$$h = G\mu \text{ on } K.$$

Proof ⁽¹³⁾. — Put

$$\Phi = \{G\mu; \mu \in \mathfrak{M}_0, S\mu \subset K, G\mu(x_0) \geq 1\}.$$

We first show that for any n given points x_1, \dots, x_n on K , there exists a potential $G\mu \in \Phi$ such that

$$G\mu(x_i) = h(x_i) \quad (1 \leq i \leq n).$$

By the definition of $h(z)$, to each x_i corresponds a sequence $\{G\mu_k^{(i)}\}$ of potentials in Φ in such a way that $G\mu_k^{(i)}(x_i) \rightarrow h(x_i)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. We may assume that $G\mu_k^{(i)}(x_0) = 1$ and hence the total masses of $\mu_k^{(i)}$ are bounded. Therefore a subsequence $\{\mu_{k_p}^{(i)}\}$ converges vaguely to $\mu^{(i)}$. Then $G\mu^{(i)} \in \Phi$ and

⁽¹³⁾ We assume the separability of K in the proof. However this assumption is not essential. We can verify our lemma without the separability (cf. Lemma 3 in [7]).

$G\mu^{(i)}(x_i) = h(x_i)$. By the compact lower envelope principle, $G\mu^{(1)} \wedge G\mu^{(2)} \wedge \dots \wedge G\mu^{(n)}$ coincides with a potential $G\mu$ on K . This potential fulfills our requirements.

Now let $\{x_i\} (i = 1, 2, \dots)$ be a dense subset of K . By the above remark there exists a positive measure μ_n , for each n , such that

$$\begin{aligned} G\mu_n &\in \Phi \\ G\mu_n(x_0) &= 1 \\ G\mu_n(x_i) &= h(x_i) \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n. \end{aligned}$$

Then a subsequence $\{\mu_{n_k}\}$ of $\{\mu_n\}$ converges vaguely to a positive measure μ , supported by K . Evidently $G\mu$ belongs to Φ and $G\mu(x_i) = h(x_i) (i = 1, 2, \dots)$. By the upper semi-continuity of h , $G\mu(z) \leq h(z)$ for any $z \in K$. Therefore $G\mu = h$ on K .

LEMMA 8. — *Let G be a non-degenerate kernel on Ω which satisfies the compact lower envelope principle and the inverse domination principle, and let Ω_0 be a compact subset of Ω . Then there exists a mapping φ from Ω_0 into Ω_0 such that*

$$\begin{aligned} (4) \quad & \varphi(x) \neq x \quad \text{for any } x \text{ in } \Omega_0, \\ (5) \quad & G(y, \varphi(x))G(\varphi(x), x) = G(y, x)G(\varphi(x), \varphi(x)) \end{aligned}$$

for any

$$x \neq y \text{ in } \Omega_0.$$

Proof. — Without loss of generality we may assume that $G(x, x) = 1$ for any x in Ω . We take an arbitrary fixed point x in Ω_0 , and we put

$$(6) \quad h_x(z) = \inf \{G\mu(z); \mu \in \mathfrak{M}_0, S\mu \subset \Omega_0, G\mu(x) \geq 1\}$$

for any z in Ω . Then by Lemma 7 there exists $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_0$, supported by Ω_0 , such that

$$h_x(z) = G\mu(z) \quad \text{for any } z \text{ in } \Omega_0.$$

By Lemma 4, μ is uniquely determined by a given point x . We shall show that there exists a unique point x' in Ω_0 such that $\mu = a\varepsilon_{x'}$, with $a^{-1} = G(x, x')$. If the assertion is false, $S\mu$ contains different points x' and x'' ; take a compact neighborhood K of x' such that $K \not\ni x''$. We put $\mu = \mu_K + \mu_k$,

where μ_K is the restriction of μ to K and $\mu'_K = \mu - \mu_K$. Then we can put

$$(7) \quad G\mu_K(x) = \theta \quad \text{and} \quad G\mu'_K(x) = 1 - \theta$$

with $0 < \theta < 1$. By (6) and (7)

$$\begin{aligned} G\mu_K(z) &\geq \theta h_x(z) && \text{for any } z \in \Omega \\ G\mu'_K(z) &\geq (1 - \theta)h_x(z) && \text{for any } z \in \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Since $G\mu(z) = G\mu_K(z) + G\mu'_K(z) = h_x(z)$, it follows from the above inequalities that

$$G\mu_K = \theta h_x \quad \text{and} \quad G\mu'_K = (1 - \theta)h_x$$

in Ω . Hence $\theta^{-1}G\mu_K = (1 - \theta)^{-1}G\mu'_K$ in Ω , which contradicts the unicity principle. Therefore there exists a unique point x' in Ω_0 such that

$$(8) \quad h_x(z) = aG\varepsilon_{x'}(z) \quad \text{for any } z \text{ on } \Omega_0,$$

with $a^{-1} = G(x, x')$. Thus we define a mapping $\varphi: \Omega_0 \rightarrow \Omega_0$ by $\varphi(x) = x'$ ⁽¹⁴⁾.

Now we shall show the validity of (4). Contrary suppose that $\varphi(x) = x$, and take a point $x'' \neq x$ in Ω_0 . Then by (6)

$$G\varepsilon_x \leq G(x, x'')^{-1}G\varepsilon_{x''} \text{ on } \Omega_0.$$

On the other hand by the inverse domination principle

$$G\varepsilon_x \geq G(x, x'')^{-1}G\varepsilon_{x''} \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Therefore G is degenerate. This is a contradiction.

Next we shall show the equality (5). Take different points x and y in Ω_0 . Then by (6)

$$G(x, \varphi(x))^{-1}G\varepsilon_{\varphi(x)}(y) \leq G(x, y)^{-1}G\varepsilon_y(y),$$

that is

$$G(y, \varphi(x))G(x, y) \leq G(x, \varphi(x)).$$

Hence by (2)

$$\frac{G(y, \varphi(x))}{G(y, x)} < G(x, \varphi(x)).$$

⁽¹⁴⁾ This mapping was first defined by Choquet-Deny [2].

Therefore Lemma 3 yields

$$\frac{G(y, \varphi(x))}{G(y, x)} = \frac{1}{G(\varphi(x), x)}.$$

This completes the proof.

Remark. — Just as Choquet and Deny did in [2], we can show that $\varphi^{-1}(x)$ is uniquely determined.

3. Main theorem.

5. We now prove the following main theorem.

THEOREM 3. — *Let G satisfy the continuity principle and the compact lower envelope principle. Assume that Ω is not discrete that any open subset of Ω is of positive G -capacity and that G or \check{G} is non-degenerate. Then G satisfies the ordinary domination principle.*

Proof. — By the corollary of Theorems 1 and 2 it is sufficient to show that if G is a non-degenerate finite continuous kernel which satisfies the compact lower envelope principle and the inverse domination principle, then Ω is discrete. We take an arbitrary fixed point x_0 and its compact neighborhood Ω_0 . Then by Lemma 8 we have a mapping $\varphi: \Omega_0 \rightarrow \Omega_0$ such that

$$G(y, \varphi(x))G(\varphi(x), x) = G(y, x)G(\varphi(x), \varphi(x))$$

for any $x \neq y$ in Ω_0 . Then x_0 is an isolated point of Ω_0 . In fact, if $\{y_n\}$ converges to x_0 , then

$$\begin{aligned} G(x_0, \varphi(x_0))G(\varphi(x_0), x_0) &= \lim G(y_n, \varphi(x_0))G(\varphi(x_0), x_0) \\ &= \lim G(y_n, x_0)G(\varphi(x_0), \varphi(x_0)) = G(x_0, x_0)G(\varphi(x_0), \varphi(x_0)). \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts the non-degeneracy of G . Therefore Ω is discrete.

6. *Remark 1.* — When G is a non-degenerate finite continuous kernel satisfying the compact lower envelope principle and the inverse domination principle, so that Ω is discrete,

the mapping φ in Lemma 8 maps Ω_0 onto Ω_0 and the kernel G^φ on Ω_0 defined by

$$G^\varphi(x, y) = G(x, \varphi(y))$$

satisfies the ordinary domination principle. This corresponds to Choquet-Deny's theorem on « Modeles finis » (cf. Theoreme 3 in [2]).

Remark 2. — Let Ω be discrete. Then there always exists a non-degenerate finite continuous kernel G on Ω which satisfies the compact lower envelope principle and the inverse domination principle. For example, G defined by

$$G(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } x = y \\ 2 & \text{for } x \neq y \end{cases}$$

fulfills all the requirements.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] N. BOURBAKI, *Topologie générale*, chap. X, Paris, 1949.
- [2] G. CHOQUET and J. DENY, Modèles finis en théorie du potentiel, *Jour. Anal. Math.*, 5, 1956-1957, pp. 77-135.
- [3] M. KISHI, Unicity principles in the potential theory, *Osaka Math. Jour.*, 13, 1961, pp. 41-74.
- [4] M. KISHI, Maximum principles in the potential theory, *Nagoya Math. Jour.*, 23, 1963, pp. 165-187.
- [5] M. KISHI, Weak domination principle, *Jour. Sci. Hiroshima Univ. Ser. A-I*, 28, 1964, pp. 1-17.
- [6] M. KISHI, On the uniqueness of balayaged measures, *Proc. Japan Acad.*, 39, 1963, pp. 749-752.
- [7] M. NAKAI, On the fundamental existence theorem of Kishi, *Nagoya Math. Jour.* 23, 1963, pp. 189-198.

Masanori KISHI,
Mathematical Institute
Nagoya University
Chikusa-ku,
Nagoya (Japan).