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Abstract. A necessary and sufficient condition for the boundedness of a solution of the third problem for the Laplace equation is given. As an application a similar result is given for the third problem for the Poisson equation on domains with Lipschitz boundary.

Keywords: third problem, Laplace equation
MSC 2000: 35B65, 35J05, 35J25, 31B10

## 1. General open sets

For $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{m}, m>2$, denote

$$
h_{x}(y)= \begin{cases}(m-2)^{-1} A^{-1}|x-y|^{2-m} & \text { for } x \neq y \\ \infty & \text { for } x=y\end{cases}
$$

where $A$ is the area of the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^{m}$. For the finite real Borel measure $\nu$ denote

$$
\mathscr{U} \nu(x)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{m}} h_{x}(y) \mathrm{d} \nu(y),
$$

the single layer potential corresponding to $\nu$, for each $x$ for which this integral has sense.

Suppose that $G \subset \mathbb{R}^{m}(m>2)$ is an open set with a non-void compact boundary $\partial G$ such that $\partial G=\partial\left(\mathbb{R}^{m} \backslash G\right)$. Fix a nonnegative element $\lambda$ of $\mathscr{C}^{\prime}(\partial G)(=$ the Banach space of all finite signed Borel measures with support in $\partial G$ with the total variation as a norm) and suppose that the single layer potential $\mathscr{U} \lambda$ is bounded and
continuous on $\partial G$. It was shown in [26] that $\mathscr{U} \lambda$ is bounded and continuous on $\partial G$ if and only if

$$
\lim _{r \rightarrow 0_{+}} \sup _{y \in \partial G} \int_{\Omega_{r}(y)} h_{y}(x) \mathrm{d} \lambda(x)=0 .
$$

According to [12], Lemma 2.18 this is true if there are constants $\alpha>m-2$ and $k>0$ such that $\lambda\left(\Omega_{r}(x)\right) \leqslant k r^{\alpha}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{m}$ and all $r>0$.

Suppose that for $\lambda$-a.a. $x \in \partial G$ there is

$$
d_{G}(x)=\lim _{r \backslash 0} \frac{\mathscr{H}_{m}\left(G \cap \Omega_{r}(x)\right)}{\mathscr{H}_{m}\left(\Omega_{r}(x)\right)}>0 .
$$

Here $\Omega_{r}(x)$ is the open ball with the centre $x$ and the diameter $r, \mathscr{H}_{k}$ is the $k$-dimensional Hausdorff measure normalized so that $\mathscr{H}_{k}$ is the Lebesgue measure in $\mathbb{R}^{k}$.

For a Lebesgue measurable function $u$ on a Borel set $M$ and $x$ with $d_{M}(x)>0$ define

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \underset{\substack{y \rightarrow x \\
y \in M}}{\operatorname{aplimsup}} u(y)=\inf \left\{t ; d_{\{z \in M ; u(z)>t\}}(x)=0\right\}, \\
& \underset{\substack{y \rightarrow x \\
y \in M}}{\operatorname{apliminf}} u(y)=\sup \left\{t ; d_{\{z \in M ; u(z)<t\}}(x)=0\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

We speak of the approximate limit of $u$ at $x$ over $M$ in case

$$
\underset{\substack{y \rightarrow x \\ y \in M}}{\operatorname{aplimsup}} u(y)=\underset{\substack{y \rightarrow x \\ y \in M}}{\operatorname{ap} \liminf _{2}} u(y),
$$

and $u$ is said to be approximately continuous at $x$ with respect to $M$ if

$$
\operatorname{aplim}_{\substack{y \rightarrow x \\ y \in M}} u(y)=u(x)
$$

If $h$ is a harmonic function on $G$ such that

$$
\int_{H}|\nabla h| \mathrm{d} \mathscr{H}_{m}<\infty
$$

for all bounded open subsets $H$ of $G$ we define the weak normal derivative $N^{G} h$ of $h$ as the distribution

$$
\left\langle\varphi, N^{G} h\right\rangle=\int_{G} \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla h \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m}
$$

for $\varphi \in \mathscr{D}$ ( $=$ the space of all compactly supported infinitely differentiable functions in $\mathbb{R}^{m}$ ).

If $H \subset \mathbb{R}^{m}$ is an open set with a compact smooth boundary, $u \in \mathscr{C}^{1}(\mathrm{cl} H)$ is a harmonic function on $H$ and

$$
\frac{\partial u}{\partial n}+f u=g \quad \text { on } \quad \partial H
$$

where $f, g \in \mathscr{C}(\partial H)$ ( $=$ the space of all bounded continuous functions on $\partial H$ equipped with the maximum norm) and $n$ is the exterior unit normal of $H$, then for $\varphi \in \mathscr{D}$ we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\partial H} \varphi g \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m-1}=\int_{H} \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla u \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m}+\int_{\partial H} \varphi f u \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m-1} . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

(Here cl $H$ denotes the closure of $H$.) If we denote by $\mathscr{H}$ the restriction of $\mathscr{H}_{m-1}$ to $\partial H$ then (1) has the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
N^{H} u+f u \mathscr{H}=g \mathscr{H} . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The formula (2) motivates our definition of the solution of the third problem for the Laplace equation

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Delta u=0 \quad \text { in } G,  \tag{3}\\
& N^{G} u+u \lambda=\mu,
\end{align*}
$$

where $\mu \in \mathscr{C}^{\prime}(\partial G)$ (compare [12], [25]).
Let $\mu \in \mathscr{C}^{\prime}(\partial G)$. We say that a function $u$ on $\operatorname{cl} G$ is a weak solution of the third problem for the Laplace equation (3) if $u \in L_{1}(\lambda), u$ is harmonic on $G,|\nabla u|$ is integrable over all bounded open subsets of $G, u(x)$ is the approximmative limit of $u$ over $G$ for $\lambda$-a.a. $x \in \partial G$, and $N^{G} u+u \lambda=\mu$. (If $\lambda=0$ we say that $u$ is a weak solution of the Neumann problem for the Laplace equation.)

Notation. Let $V \subset \mathbb{R}^{m}$ be an open set. For $p \geqslant 1$ denote by $W^{1, p}(V)$ the collection of all functions $f \in L_{p}(V)$ the distributional gradient of which belongs to $\left[L_{p}(V)\right]^{m}$. By $W_{\text {loc }}^{1, p}(V)$ denote the collection of all functions $f$ such that $f \in W^{1, p}(U)$ for each bounded open set $U$ with $\operatorname{cl} U \subset V$.

Suppose that $G$ has a locally Lipschitz boundary and $u \in W^{1, p}(G), 1<p<\infty$. It is well-known that we can even suppose that $u \in W^{1, p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$ (see [30], Remark 2.5.2). We can choose such a representation of $u$ that $u$ is approximately continuous at $\mathscr{H}_{m-1}$-a.a. points of $\mathbb{R}^{m}$ (see [30], Theorem 3.3.3, Theorem 2.6.16 and Remark 3.3.5). The restriction of $u$ to $\partial G$ is the trace of $u$ (see [30], p. 190). If $\mathscr{H}$ denotes the restriction of $\mathscr{H}_{m-1}$ to $\partial G$, then $u \in L_{p}(\mathscr{H})$ (see [22], Theorem 1.2). If $f$ is a
nonnegative bounded Baire function on $\partial G$ and $g \in L_{p}(\mathscr{H})$, then $u$ is called a weak solution in $W^{1, p}(G)$ of the problem $\Delta u=0$ in $G, \partial u / \partial n+f u=g$ on $\partial G$ if

$$
\int_{\partial G} v g \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m-1}=\int_{G} \nabla v \cdot \nabla u \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m}+\int_{\partial G} f v u \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m-1}
$$

for each $v \in W^{1, q}(G)$, where $q=p /(p-1)$ (compare [22], Example 2.12). Put $\lambda=f \mathscr{H}, \mu=g \mathscr{H}$. Using Hölder's inequality we see that $|\nabla u|$ is integrable over all bounded open subsets of $G$. Since $u$ is approximately continuous at $\mathscr{H}_{m-1}$-a.a. points of $\mathbb{R}^{m}$ and $\lambda$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathscr{H}_{m-1}$, we obtain that $u(x)$ is the approximative limit of $u$ at $x$ over $G$ for $\lambda$-a.a. $x \in \partial G$. If $u$ is a weak solution in $W^{1, p}(G)$ of the problem $\Delta u=0$ in $G, \partial u / \partial n+f u=g$ on $\partial G$, then $u$ is a weak solution of (3) because $\mathscr{D} \subset W^{1, q}(G)$. Since $\mathscr{D}$ is a dense subset of $W^{1, q}(G), u$ is a weak solution of the third problem for the Laplace equation (3) if and only if $u$ is a weak solution in $W^{1, p}(G)$ of the problem $\Delta u=0$ in $G, \partial u / \partial n+f u=g$ on $\partial G$.

It is usual to look for a solution $u$ in the form of the single layer potential $\mathscr{U} \nu$, where $\nu \in \mathscr{C}^{\prime}(\partial G)$. It was shown in [17] that $\mathscr{U} \nu$ has all the properties of the solution of the third problem with some boundary condition, but our "continuity" on the boundary is replaced by the fine continuity at $\lambda$-a.a. points of the boundary. If $\mathscr{U} \nu$ is fine-continuous in $x \in \partial G$ with respect to $\operatorname{cl} G$ then $u(x)$ is the approximative limit of $u$ at $x$ over $G$ (see [11], Theorem 10.15, Corollary 10.5). If $\mathscr{U} \nu$ is a solution of the third problem in the sense of [17] then it is a weak solution of the third problem.

The operator $\tau: \nu \mapsto N^{G} \mathscr{U} \nu+(\mathscr{U} \nu) \lambda$ is a bounded linear operator on $\mathscr{C}^{\prime}(\partial G)$ if and only if $V^{G}<\infty$, where

$$
\begin{aligned}
V^{G} & =\sup _{x \in \partial G} v^{G}(x), \\
v^{G}(x) & =\sup \left\{\int_{G} \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla h_{x} \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m} ; \varphi \in \mathscr{D},|\varphi| \leqslant 1, \operatorname{spt} \varphi \subset \mathbb{R}^{m}-\{x\}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

(see [12]). There are more geometrical characterizations of $v^{G}(x)$ in [12] which ensure that $V^{G}<\infty$ for $G$ convex or for $G$ with $\partial G \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} L_{i}$, where $L_{i}$ are $(m-1)$ dimensional Ljapunov surfaces i.e. of class $C^{1+\alpha}$.

If $z \in \mathbb{R}^{m}$ and $\theta$ is a unit vector such that the symmetric difference of $G$ and the half-space $\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{m} ;(x-z) \cdot \theta<0\right\}$ has $m$-dimensional density zero at $z$ then $n^{G}(z)=\theta$ is termed the exterior normal of $G$ at $z$ in Federer's sense. If there is no exterior normal of $G$ at $z$ in this sense, we denote by $n^{G}(z)$ the zero vector in $\mathbb{R}^{m}$. The set $\left\{y \in \mathbb{R}^{m} ;\left|n^{G}(y)\right|>0\right\}$ is called the reduced boundary of $G$ and will be denoted by $\widehat{\partial} G$.

If $G$ has a finite perimeter (which is fulfilled if $\left.V^{G}<\infty\right)$ then $\mathscr{H}_{m-1}(\widehat{\partial} G)<\infty$ and

$$
v^{G}(x)=\int_{\widehat{\partial} G}\left|n^{G}(y) \cdot \nabla h_{x}(y)\right| \mathrm{d} \mathscr{H}_{m-1}(y)
$$

for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^{m}$. Throughout the paper we shall assume that $V^{G}<\infty$.
If $L$ is a bounded linear operator on the Banach space $X$ we denote by $\|L\|_{\text {ess }}$ the essential norm of $L$, i.e. the distance of $L$ from the space of all compact linear operators on $X$. The essential spectral radius of $L$ is defined by

$$
r_{\mathrm{ess}} L=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left(\left\|L^{n}\right\|_{\mathrm{ess}}\right)^{1 / n}
$$

Theorem ([17]). Let $r_{\text {ess }}\left(\tau-\frac{1}{2} I\right)<\frac{1}{2}$, where $I$ is the identity operator, $\mu \in$ $\mathscr{C}^{\prime}(\partial G)$. Then there is a harmonic function $u$ on $G$, which is a weak solution of the third problem

$$
N^{G} u+u \lambda=\mu,
$$

if and only if $\mu \in \mathscr{C}_{0}^{\prime}(\partial G)$ (= the space of such $\nu \in \mathscr{C}^{\prime}(\partial G)$ that $\nu(\partial H)=0$ for each bounded component $H$ of $\mathrm{cl} G$ for which $\lambda(\partial H)=0$ ). Moreover, if $\mu \in \mathscr{C}_{0}^{\prime}(\partial G)$ then there is a solution of this problem in the form of the single layer potential $\mathscr{U} \nu$, where $\nu \in \mathscr{C}^{\prime}(\partial G)$.

Remark 1. It is well-known that the condition $r_{\text {ess }}\left(\tau-\frac{1}{2} I\right)<\frac{1}{2}$ is fulfilled for sets with a smooth boundary (of class $C^{1+\alpha}$ ) (see [13]) and for convex sets (see [23]). R. S. Angell, R.E. Kleinman, J. Král and W. L. Wendland proved that rectangular domains (i.e. formed from rectangular parallelepipeds) in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ have this property (see [1], [14]). A. Rathsfeld showed in [27], [28] that polyhedral cones in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ have this property. (By a polyhedral cone in $R^{3}$ we mean an open set $\Omega$ whose boundary is locally a hypersurface (i.e. every point of $\partial \Omega$ has a neighbourhood in $\partial \Omega$ which is homeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^{2}$ ) and $\partial \Omega$ is formed by a finite number of plane angles. By a polyhedral open set with bounded boundary in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ we mean an open set $\Omega$ whose boundary is locally a hypersurface and $\partial \Omega$ is formed by a finite number of polygons). N. V. Grachev and V. G. Maz'ya obtained independently an analogous result for polyhedral open sets with bounded boundary in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ (see [9]). (Let us note that there is a polyhedral set in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ which does not have a locally Lipschitz boundary.) In [16] it was shown that the condition $r_{\text {ess }}\left(\tau-\frac{1}{2} I\right)<\frac{1}{2}$ has a local character. As a conclusion we obtain that this condition is fullfiled for $G \subset \mathbb{R}^{3}$ such that for each $x \in \partial G$ there are $r(x)>0$, a domain $D_{x}$ which is polyhedral or smooth or convex or a complement of a convex domain and a diffeomorphism $\psi_{x}: \mathscr{U}(x ; r(x)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3}$ of class $C^{1+\alpha}$, where $\alpha>0$, such that $\psi_{x}(G \cap \mathscr{U}(x ; r(x)))=D_{x} \cap \psi_{x}(\mathscr{U}(x ; r(x)))$. V. G. Maz'ya and N. V. Grachev proved this condition for several types of sets with "piecewise-smooth" boundary in the general Euclidean space (see [7], [8], [10]).

In the rest of the paper we will suppose that $r_{\text {ess }}\left(\tau-\frac{1}{2} I\right)<\frac{1}{2}$. Since $\tau-N^{G} \mathscr{U}$ is a compact operator (see [17], Remark 5), this condition is equivalent to the condition $r_{\text {ess }}\left(N^{G} \mathscr{U}-\frac{1}{2} I\right)<\frac{1}{2}$. Denote by $\mathscr{H}$ the restriction of $\mathscr{H}_{m-1}$ onto $\partial G$. Then $\mathscr{H}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)<\infty$ (see [18], Lemma 2). If $x \in \partial G$ then $d_{G}(x)$ exists and is strictly positive (see [17], Lemma 14).

Notation. Let us denote by $\mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$ the set of all $\mu \in \mathscr{C}^{\prime}(\partial G)$ for which $\mathscr{U} \mu$ is bounded on $\mathbb{R}^{m} \backslash \partial G$.

Note that $\mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$ is the set of all $\mu \in \mathscr{C}^{\prime}(\partial G)$ for which there is a polar set $M$ such that $\mathscr{U} \mu(x)$ is meaningful and bounded on $\mathbb{R}^{m} \backslash M$, because $\mathscr{H}_{m}(\partial G)=0$ by [17], Corollary 1 and therefore $\mathbb{R}^{m} \backslash \partial G$ is finely dense in $\mathbb{R}^{m}$ (see [2], Chap. VII, $\S \S 2,6,[15]$, Theorem 5.11, Theorem 5.10) and $\mathscr{U} \mu=\mathscr{U} \mu^{+}-\mathscr{U} \mu^{-}$is finite and fine-continuous outside of a polar set.

Remark 2. Let $m-1<p<\infty, f \in L_{p}(\mathscr{H})$. Then $\mu=f \mathscr{H} \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$ (see [17], Remark 6).

Theorem 1. Let $\nu, \mu \in \mathscr{C}^{\prime}(\partial G), N^{G} \mathscr{U} \nu+(\mathscr{U} \nu) \lambda=\mu$. Then the following assertions are equivalent:
a) $\nu \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$.
b) $\mu \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$.
c) $\mathscr{U} \nu$ is bounded on $G$.
d) $\mathscr{U} \mu$ is bounded on $G$.
e) There are a polar set $K$ and a bounded function $f$ on $\partial G$ such that $\mathscr{U} \nu=f$ on $\partial G \backslash K$.
f) There are a polar set $K$ and a bounded function $f$ on $\partial G$ such that $\mathscr{U} \mu=f$ on $\partial G \backslash K$.

Proof. a) $\Rightarrow$ c) Since $\mathscr{U} \nu$ is bounded in $\mathbb{R}^{m} \backslash \partial G$ it is bounded in $G$.
c) $\Rightarrow$ e) Denote $K=\{x \in \partial G ; \mathscr{U}|\nu|(x)=\infty\}$. Then $K$ is polar and $\mathscr{U} \nu(x)$ is the fine limit of $\mathscr{U} \nu$ for each $x \in \partial G \backslash K$. Put $f(x)=\mathscr{U} \nu(x)$ for each $x \in \partial G \backslash K$, $f(x)=0$ for $x \in K$. Since the density of $G$ is positive at each point of $\partial G$ by [17], Corollary 1, every fine neighbourhood of $x \in \partial G$ intersects $G$ (see [2], Chap. VII, § 2, $\S 6,[15]$, Theorem 5.11, Theorem 5.10), and $\mathscr{U} \nu$ is bounded on $G, f$ is a bounded function.
e) $\Rightarrow$ a) Fix $R>0$ such that $\partial G \subset\{x ;|x|<R\}$. Put $H=\{x \in G ;|x|<R\}$, $M=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{m} \backslash \operatorname{cl} G ;|x|<R\right\}$. Using [19], Lemma 1 and [19], Lemma 2 for $H$ and $M$ we get

$$
\sup _{x \in H}|\mathscr{U} \nu(x)| \leqslant \sup _{x \in \partial H}|f(x)|, \quad \sup _{x \in M}|\mathscr{U} \nu(x)| \leqslant \sup _{x \in \partial M}|f(x)| .
$$

Since

$$
\lim _{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \mathscr{U} \nu(x)=0,
$$

we get for $R \rightarrow \infty$

$$
\sup _{x \in \mathbb{R}^{m} \backslash G}|\mathscr{U} \nu(x)| \leqslant \sup _{x \in \partial G}|f(x)|<\infty .
$$

b) $\Leftrightarrow$ d) $\Leftrightarrow$ f) We have proved a) $\Leftrightarrow$ c) $\Leftrightarrow$ e). Since we can take arbitrary $\nu$ we obtain b) $\Leftrightarrow \mathrm{d}) \Leftrightarrow \mathrm{f})$.
a) $\Rightarrow$ b) See [17], Lemma 4.
b) $\Rightarrow$ a) Let $\mathscr{B}$ denote the Banach space of all bounded Baire functions defined on $\partial G$ with the usual supremum norm. The symbol $\mathscr{B}^{\prime}$ stands for the dual space of $\mathscr{B}$. According to [24], Proposition 8, [13] we may define on $\mathscr{B}$ continuous operators $V$, $W$ by

$$
\begin{aligned}
V f(y) & =\mathscr{U}(f \lambda)(y), \\
W f(y) & =d_{G}(y) f(y)+\frac{1}{A} \int_{\partial G} \frac{n^{G}(x) \cdot(y-x)}{|x-y|^{m}} \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m-1}(x) .
\end{aligned}
$$

According to [24], Proposition 8 the operator $\tau$ is the restiction of $(W+V)^{\prime}$ (i.e. the adjoint operator of $W+V)$ onto $\mathscr{C}^{\prime}(\partial G)$. Since b) $\Rightarrow \mathrm{f}$ ), there is $\mathscr{U}_{\mathscr{B}} \mu \in \mathscr{B}$ and a polar set $K$ such that $\mathscr{U} \mu=\mathscr{U}_{\mathscr{B}} \mu$ in $\partial G \backslash K$. We show that $\mathscr{U}_{\mathscr{B}} \mu \in(W+V)(\mathscr{B})$. Let $\sigma \in \operatorname{Ker}(W+V)^{\prime}$. Since $d_{G}(x)>0$ for each $x \in \partial G$, there exists a continuous function $\mathscr{U}_{c} \sigma$ on $\mathbb{R}^{m}$ coinciding with $\mathscr{U} \sigma$ on $\mathbb{R}^{m} \backslash \partial G$ (see [16], Theorem 1.11, [17], Lemma 13). According to [19], Lemma 3 the set $G$ has finitely many components $G_{1}, \ldots, G_{n}$ and $\mathrm{cl} G_{j} \cap \mathrm{cl} G_{k}=\emptyset$ for $j \neq k$. According to [18], Lemma 2 and [17], Lemma 11 there are $c_{1}, \ldots, c_{n} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathscr{U}_{c} \sigma=c_{j}$ on $\mathrm{cl} G_{j}$ for $j=1, \ldots, n$ and $c_{j}=0$ for each $j$ such that $\lambda\left(\partial G_{j}\right) \neq 0$. Since $\mathscr{U} \sigma(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$, we have $c_{j}=0$ for $G_{j}$ unbounded. Since $\mu, \sigma$ have a finite energy (see [18], Lemma 2, [24], Proposition 23, [15], Chapter I, Theorem 1.20), $\sigma, \mu$ do not charge polar sets (see [15], Theorem 2.1, p. 222). Therefore

$$
\int_{\partial G} \mathscr{U}_{\mathscr{B}} \mu \mathrm{d} \sigma=\int_{\partial G} \mathscr{U} \mu \mathrm{~d} \sigma=\int_{\partial G} \mathscr{U} \sigma \mathrm{~d} \mu=\int_{\partial G} \mathscr{U}_{c} \sigma \mathrm{~d} \mu=\sum_{j=1}^{n} c_{j} \mu\left(\partial G_{j}\right) .
$$

Fix $j$ such that $c_{j} \neq 0$. Then $G_{j}$ is bounded. Choose $\varphi \in \mathscr{D}$ such that $\varphi=1$ on $G_{j}$ and $\varphi=0$ on $G \backslash G_{j}$. Since $\lambda\left(\partial G_{j}\right)=0$ we have

$$
\mu\left(\partial G_{j}\right)=\langle\tau \nu, \varphi\rangle=\int_{G} \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla \mathscr{U} \nu \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m}=0 .
$$

Since $r_{\text {ess }}\left(W^{\prime}+V^{\prime}-\frac{1}{2} I\right)=r_{\text {ess }}\left(\tau-\frac{1}{2} I\right)<\frac{1}{2}$ by [16], Lemma 1.5, the operator $W^{\prime}+V^{\prime}$ is Fredholm. Since $\left\langle\sigma, \mathscr{U}_{\mathscr{B}} \mu\right\rangle=0$, we conclude that $\mathscr{U}_{\mathscr{B}} \mu \in(W+V)(\mathscr{B})$ by [29], Chapter VII, Theorem 3.1.

Fix $\alpha>V^{G}+1+\sup \mathscr{U} \lambda$. Put

$$
\mu_{k}=\left(-\frac{\tau-\alpha I}{\alpha}\right)^{k} \frac{\mu}{\alpha}
$$

According to [17], Theorem 2 the series

$$
\nu_{0}=\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mu_{k}
$$

converges and $N^{G} \mathscr{U} \nu_{0}+\left(\mathscr{U} \nu_{0}\right) \lambda=\mu$. According to [26], Lemma 4 the measures $\mu_{n} \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$ and $\mathscr{U}_{\mathscr{B}} \mu_{k}=\left[-\alpha^{-1}(W+V)+I\right]^{k} \alpha^{-1} \mathscr{U}_{\mathscr{B}} \mu$.

Since $\left\{\beta \in \mathbb{C} ;\left|\beta-\frac{1}{2}\right|<\frac{1}{2}\right\} \subset\left\{\beta \in \mathbb{C} ;\left|\beta-\frac{1}{\alpha}\right|<\alpha\right\}, r_{\text {ess }}(\tau-\alpha I)<\alpha$. Moreover, if $\beta \in \mathbb{C}$ is an eigenvalue of $\tau,|\beta-\alpha| \geqslant \alpha$ then $\beta \geqslant 0$ by [17], Lemma 4, Lemma 11 . Since $\|\tau\|<\alpha$ by [17], Lemma 2, there is no eigenvalue $\beta \neq 0$ of $\tau$ such that $|\alpha-\beta| \geqslant \alpha$. According to [16], Lemma 1.2, Lemma 1.5 we have $r_{\text {ess }}(W+V-\alpha I)=$ $r_{\text {ess }}\left(W^{\prime}+V^{\prime}-\alpha I\right)=r_{\text {ess }}(\tau-\alpha I)<\alpha$. If $\beta$ is an eigenvalue of $W+V$ then $\beta$ is an eigenvalue of $\tau^{\prime}$, because $W+V$ is the restriction of $\tau^{\prime}$ to $\mathscr{B}$. If $|\alpha-\beta| \geqslant \alpha$ then $\beta$ is an eigenvalue of $\tau$, because $\tau-\beta I, \tau^{\prime}-\beta I$ are Fredholm operators with index zero. Therefore $\beta=0$. If 0 is not an eigenvalue of $W+V$ then the spectral radius of $W+V-\alpha I$ is smaller than $\alpha$ (i.e. the spectral radius of $\alpha^{-1}(W+V)-I$ is smaller than 1$)$ and there are constants $M \geqslant 1, q \in(0,1)$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\left[\alpha^{-1}(W+V)-I\right]^{k} f\right\|_{\mathscr{B}} \leqslant M q^{k}\|f\|_{\mathscr{B}} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

for each $f \in \mathscr{B}$ and nonnegative integer $k$. If 0 is an eigenvalue of $W+V$ then there are constants $M \geqslant 1, q \in(0,1)$ such that (4) holds for each $f \in(W+V)(\mathscr{B})$ (see [18], Proposition 3). Since $\mathscr{U}_{\mathscr{B}} \mu \in(W+V)(\mathscr{B})$ and $\mathscr{U}_{\mathscr{B}} \mu_{k}=\left[-\alpha^{-1}(W+\right.$ $V)+I]^{k} \alpha^{-1} \mathscr{U}_{\mathscr{B}} \mu$, (4) gives that $\sum\left\|\mathscr{U}_{\mathscr{B}} \mu_{k}\right\|_{\mathscr{B}}<\infty$. Since moreover $\sum\left\|\mu_{k}\right\|<\infty$, [26], Lemma 3 yields that $\nu_{0} \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$. Since $\tau\left(\nu-\nu_{0}\right)=0$, there is a continuous function $\mathscr{U}_{c}\left(\nu-\nu_{0}\right)$ on $\mathbb{R}^{m}$ coinciding with $\mathscr{U}\left(\nu-\nu_{0}\right)$ on $\mathbb{R}^{m} \backslash \partial G$ (see [17], Lemma 4, Lemma 5, Lemma 10). Therefore $\nu \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$.

Lemma 1. Let $G$ be bounded, $\mu \in \mathscr{C}^{\prime}(\partial G), u \in W^{1,1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$ be a weak solution of the Neumann problem for the Laplace equation with the boundary condition $\mu$. Then there is the approximate limit of $u$ at $\mathscr{H}_{m-1}$-a.a. points of $\partial G$. Suppose moreover that

$$
u(x)=\underset{y \rightarrow x}{\operatorname{aplim}} u(y)
$$

at any point $x \in \partial G$ where the right-hand side is defined. Then $u \in L_{1}(\mathscr{H})$ and for each $x \in G$

$$
\begin{equation*}
u(x)=\mathscr{U} \mu(x)-\mathscr{D} u(x), \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\mathscr{D} u=\int_{\partial G} u(y) n^{G}(y) \cdot \nabla h_{x}(y) \mathrm{d} \mathscr{H}_{m-1}(y)
$$

is the double layer potential corresponding to the density $u$.
Proof. According to [4] there is a set $E \subset \partial G$ with zero functional capacity of degree 1 such that the approximate limit of $u$ exists at each point of $\partial G \backslash E$. Since $\mathscr{H}_{m-1}(E)=0$ by [5], Theorem 4.3, the approximate limit of $u$ exists at $\mathscr{H}_{m-1^{-}}$ a.a. points of $\partial G$.

Define $u^{+}(x)=\max (u(x), 0), u^{-}(x)=\max (-u(x), 0)$. Acoording to [30], Corollary 2.1.8 the functions $u^{+}, u^{-} \in W^{1,1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$. Since there is a positive constant $M$ such that $\mathscr{H}\left(\Omega_{r}(x)\right) \leqslant M r^{m-1}$ for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^{m}, r>0$ (see [12], Corollary 2.17 and [17], Corollary 1), [30], Theorem 5.12 .4 yields that $u^{+}, u^{-} \in L_{1}(\mathscr{H})$. Since $u(y)=u^{+}(y)-u^{-}(y)$ for $\mathscr{H}$-a.a. $y$ (see [30], Theorem 5.9.6) we have $u \in L_{1}(\mathscr{H})$.

Fix $x \in G$. Choose a sequence $G_{j}$ of open sets with $C^{\infty}$ boundary such that $\operatorname{cl} G_{j} \subset G_{j+1} \subset G, x \in G_{1}$ and $\bigcup G_{j}=G$. Fix $r>0$ such that $\Omega_{2 r}(x) \subset G_{1}$. Choose infinitely differentiable function $\psi$ such that $\psi=0$ on $\Omega_{r}(x)$ and $\psi=1$ on $\mathbb{R}^{m} \backslash \Omega_{2 r}(x)$. According to Green's identity

$$
\begin{aligned}
u(x)= & \lim _{j \rightarrow \infty}\left[\int_{\partial G_{j}} h_{x}(y) \frac{\partial u(y)}{\partial n} \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m-1}(y)-\int_{\partial G_{j}} u(y) n(y) \cdot \nabla h_{x}(y) \mathrm{d} \mathscr{H}_{m-1}(y)\right] \\
= & \lim _{j \rightarrow \infty}\left[\int_{G_{j}} \nabla u(y) \cdot \nabla\left(h_{x}(y) \psi(y)\right) \mathrm{d} \mathscr{H}_{m}(y)\right. \\
& \left.-\int_{G_{j}} \nabla(u(y) \psi(y)) \cdot \nabla h_{x}(y) \mathrm{d} \mathscr{H}_{m}(y)\right] \\
= & \int_{G} \nabla u(y) \cdot \nabla\left(h_{x}(y) \psi(y)\right) \mathrm{d} \mathscr{H}_{m}(y)-\int_{G} \nabla(u(y) \psi(y)) \cdot \nabla h_{x}(y) \mathrm{d} \mathscr{H}_{m}(y) \\
= & \mathscr{U} \mu(x)-\int_{G} \nabla(u(y) \psi(y)) \cdot \nabla h_{x}(y) \mathrm{d} \mathscr{H}_{m}(y) .
\end{aligned}
$$

According to [30], Theorem 2.3.2 there is a sequence of infinitely differentiable functions $u_{n} \in W^{1,1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$ such that $u_{n} \rightarrow u \psi$ in $W^{1,1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$. According to [12], § 2

$$
u(x)=\mathscr{U} \mu(x)-\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{G} \nabla u_{n}(y) \cdot \nabla h_{x}(y) \mathrm{d} \mathscr{H}_{m}(y)=\mathscr{U} \mu(x)-\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathscr{D} u_{n}(x)
$$

For a Borel set $M \subset \mathbb{R}^{m}$ put

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \nu_{1}(M)=\int_{\partial G \cap M} \max \left(0, n^{G}(y) \cdot \nabla h_{x}(y)\right) \mathrm{d} \mathscr{H}_{m-1}(y), \\
& \nu_{2}(M)=\int_{\partial G \cap M} \min \left(0, n^{G}(y) \cdot \nabla h_{x}(y)\right) \mathrm{d} \mathscr{H}_{m-1}(y) .
\end{aligned}
$$

According to [30], Theorem 5.12.4 there is a positive constant $K$ such that

$$
\left|\int\left(u \psi-u_{n}\right) \mathrm{d} \nu_{j}\right| \leqslant K\left|u \psi-u_{n}\right|_{W^{1,1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)},
$$

for $j=1,2$. Since $u_{n} \rightarrow u \psi$ in $W^{1,1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$, we have

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathscr{D} u_{n}(x)=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int u_{n} \mathrm{~d} \nu_{1}+\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int u_{n} \mathrm{~d} \nu_{2}=\int u \mathrm{~d} \nu_{1}+\int u \mathrm{~d} \nu_{2}=\mathscr{D} u(x) .
$$

Lemma 2. Let $G$ be unbounded, $\mu \in \mathscr{C}^{\prime}(\partial G), u \in W_{\text {loc }}^{1,1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$ be a weak solution of the Neumann problem for the Laplace equation with the boundary condition $\mu$. Suppose moreover that

$$
u(x)=\underset{y \rightarrow x}{\operatorname{aplim}} u(y)
$$

at any point $x \in \partial G$ where the right-hand side is defined. Then $u \in L_{1}(\mathscr{H})$. If $|u(x)|=O(1)$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ then there exists

$$
u(\infty)=\lim _{|x| \rightarrow \infty} u(x)
$$

and for each $x \in G$

$$
\begin{equation*}
u(x)=u(\infty)+\mathscr{U} \mu(x)-\mathscr{D} u(x) . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Since $u(y)=o(|y|)$ as $|y| \rightarrow \infty,[20]$, Lemma 3 yields that there exists

$$
u(\infty)=\lim _{|y| \rightarrow \infty} u(y)
$$

Choose $r>0$ such that $\partial G \subset \Omega_{r}(x)$. Put $G_{r}=G \cap \Omega_{r}(x)$,

$$
\mu_{r}(M)=\mu(M)+\int_{M \cap \partial G_{r}} \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m-1}
$$

for each Borel set $M$. Then $u$ is a weak solution of the Neumann problem for the Laplace equation on $G_{r}$ with the boundary condition $\mu_{r}$. According to Lemma 1

$$
\begin{aligned}
u(x)= & \mathscr{U} \mu_{r}(x)-\int_{\partial G_{r}} u(y) n(y) \cdot \nabla h_{x}(y) \mathrm{d} \mathscr{H}_{m-1}(y) \\
= & \mathscr{U} \mu(x)-\mathscr{D} u(x)+\frac{1}{A(m-2)} \int_{\partial \Omega_{r}(x)} \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} r^{2-m} \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m-1} \\
& +\frac{1}{A} \int_{\partial \Omega_{r}(x)}[u(y)-u(\infty)] r^{1-m} \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m-1}+\frac{1}{A} \int_{\partial \Omega_{r}(x)} u(\infty) r^{1-m} \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m-1} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $|u(y)-u(\infty)|=o(1)$ as $|y| \rightarrow \infty,[20]$, Lemma 3 yields that $\partial u(y) / \partial n=$ $O\left(|y|^{1-m}\right)$. For $r \rightarrow \infty$ we get

$$
u(x)=\mathscr{U} \mu(x)-\mathscr{D} u(x)+u(\infty) .
$$

Definition. Let $H \subset \mathbb{R}^{m}$ be an open set, $1 \leqslant p<\infty$. We say that $H$ is $W^{1, p_{-}}$ extendible if there is a bounded linear operator $P: W^{1, p}(H) \rightarrow W^{1, p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$ such that $P f=f$ on $H$ for each $f \in W^{1, p}(H)$.

Remark that $G$ is $W^{1,1}$-extendible if $\partial G$ is locally a graph of a Lipschitz function. (See [30], Remark 2.5.2.)

Theorem 2. Let $\mu \in \mathscr{C}_{0}^{\prime}(\partial G)$. Then the following assertions are equivalent:
a) $\mu \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$.
b) There is $u \in W_{\text {loc }}^{1,1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$, bounded in $G$, which is a weak solution of the third problem for the Laplace equation (3).
If $G$ is $W^{1,1}$-extendible then these assertions are equivalent to
c) There is a bounded function on $G$ which is a weak solution of the third problem for the Laplace equation (3).

Proof. a) $\Rightarrow$ b) According to Theorem 1 there is $\nu \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$ such that $\mathscr{U} \nu$ is a solution of (3). But $\mathscr{U} \nu \in W_{\text {loc }}^{1,1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$ and bounded on $G$.
b) $\Rightarrow$ a) Let $u \in W_{\text {loc }}^{1,1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$, bounded in $G$, be a weak solution of the third problem for the Laplace equation (3). Put $\tilde{\mu}=\mu-u \lambda$. Then $u$ is a weak solution of the Neumann problem for the Laplace equation on $G$ with the boundary condition $\tilde{\mu}$. Fix a constant $K$ such that $|u| \leqslant K$ in $G$. Put $v(x)=\max (\min (K, u(x)),-K)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^{m} \backslash \partial G$,

$$
v(x)=\underset{y \rightarrow x}{\operatorname{aplim}} v(y) \quad \text { for } x \in \partial G
$$

Then $v \in W_{\text {loc }}^{1,1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$ (see [30], Corollary 2.1.8). According to Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 there is a constant $c$ such that

$$
\mathscr{U} \tilde{\mu}(x)=v(x)+\mathscr{D} v(x)+c
$$

for each $x \in G$. Since

$$
|\mathscr{U} \tilde{\mu}(x)| \leqslant K+K v^{G}(x)+|c| \leqslant K+K\left(V^{G}+\frac{1}{2}\right)+|c|
$$

for $x \in G$ by [12], Theorem 2.16, we have $\tilde{\mu} \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$ by Theorem 1 . Since $|u| \leqslant K$ $\lambda$-a.e., $u^{+} \lambda, u^{-} \lambda \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$ by [25], Proposition 6 and $\mu=\tilde{\mu}+u^{+} \lambda-u^{-} \lambda \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$.
c) $\Rightarrow \mathrm{b})$ Let $u$ be a weak solution of the third problem for the Laplace equation (3), bounded in $G$. Then $u \varphi \in W^{1,1}(G)$ for each $\varphi \in \mathscr{D}$. Since $G$ is $W^{1,1}$-extendible we can extend $u$ to $\mathbb{R}^{m}$ so that $u \in W_{\text {loc }}^{1,1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$.

Theorem 3. Let $G$ be unbounded, $\lambda(\partial H)>0$ for the unbounded component $H$ of G. Put

$$
\begin{equation*}
\nu_{0}=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left(-\frac{\tau-\alpha I}{\alpha}\right)^{n} \frac{\lambda}{\alpha}, \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\alpha>\frac{1}{2}\left(V^{G}+1+\sup _{x \in \partial G} \mathscr{U} \lambda(x)\right) .
$$

Then $u=\left(\mathscr{U} \nu_{0}-1\right) \in W_{\text {loc }}^{1,1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$ is a bounded weak solution of the third problem for the Laplace equation with zero boundary condition, which is nonconstant on $H$.

Proof. According to [17], Theorem 2 the function $\mathscr{U} \nu_{0}$ is a weak solution of the third problem for the Laplace equation with the boundary condition $\lambda$. Since $\lambda \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$, the function $\mathscr{U} \nu_{0}$ is bounded by Theorem 1 . Therefore $u$ is a bounded weak solution of the third problem for the Laplace equation with zero boundary condition. Suppose now that $u$ is constant on $H$. Since $u(x) \rightarrow-1$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ we have $u=-1$ on $H$. Since $\operatorname{cl} H \cap \operatorname{cl}(G \backslash H)=\emptyset$ by [19], Lemma 3 we can choose $\varphi \in \mathscr{D}$ such that $\varphi=0$ on $G \backslash H$ and $\varphi=1$ on $\partial H$. Then

$$
0=\int_{G} \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla u \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m}+\int_{\partial G} \varphi u \mathrm{~d} \lambda=-\lambda(\partial H)<0
$$

what is a contradiction.

## 2. LIPSChitz DOMAINS

In the rest of the paper we will suppose that $\partial G$ is locally a graph of a Lipschitz function.

Theorem 4. Denote by $G_{1}, \ldots, G_{k}$ all components of $G$. Let $\mu \in \mathscr{C}_{0}^{\prime}(\partial G)$. Then there is a bounded weak solution of the Neumann problem for the Laplace equation with the boundary condition $\mu$ if and only if $\mu \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$. The general form of this solution is

$$
\begin{equation*}
u=\mathscr{U} \nu+\sum_{j=1}^{k} c_{j} \chi_{G_{j}}, \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\nu=\mu+2 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\left(I-2 N^{G} \mathscr{U}\right)^{j}\left(I-N^{G} \mathscr{U}\right) \mu, \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\chi_{G_{j}}$ are characteristic functions of $G_{j}$, and $c_{j}$ are arbitrary constants.
Proof. According to Theorem 2 there is a bounded function on $G$ which is a weak solution of the Neumann problem for the Laplace equation with the boundary condition $\mu$ if and only if $\mu \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$.

Suppose now that $\mu \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$. According to Theorem 1 and [16], Theorem 1 the function $u$ given by (8) is a bounded weak solution of the Neumann problem for the Laplace equation with the boundary condition $\mu$, which is in $W^{1,1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$. Let $v$ be a bounded weak solution of the Neumann problem for the Laplace equation with the boundary condition $\mu$. Since $v \in W^{1,1}(H)$ for each bounded open subset $H$ of $G$ and $G$ is $W^{1,1}$ extendible, we can suppose that $v \in W_{\mathrm{loc}}^{1,1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$. The function $w=v-\mathscr{U} \nu$ is a bounded weak solution of the Neumann problem for the Laplace equation with zero boundary condition. Put $\tilde{w}=w$ for $G$ bounded and $\tilde{w}=w-w(\infty)$ for $G$ unbounded (see Lemma 2). According to Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 we have $\tilde{w}=-\mathscr{D} \tilde{w}$ in $G$. Put

$$
\begin{aligned}
W^{G} f(x) & =d_{G}(x) f(x)+\int_{\partial G} f(y) n^{G}(y) \cdot \nabla h_{x}(y) \mathrm{d} \mathscr{H}_{m-1}(y), \\
W^{\mathbb{R}^{m} \backslash G} f(x) & =d_{\mathbb{R}^{m} \backslash G}(x) f(x)-\int_{\partial G} f(y) n^{G}(y) \cdot \nabla h_{x}(y) \mathrm{d} \mathscr{H}_{m-1}(y)
\end{aligned}
$$

for $x \in \partial G$ and $f \in \mathscr{B}$, the space of all bounded Baire functions on $\partial G$. Since $\tilde{w}=-\mathscr{D} \tilde{w}$ in $G$ we obtain $\tilde{w}=W^{\mathbb{R}^{m} \backslash G} \tilde{w}$ on $\partial G$ (see [21], Lemma 3) and therefore $W^{G} \tilde{w}=0$. Let $G_{1}, \ldots, G_{n}$ be all bounded components of $G$. Then $W^{G} \chi_{\partial G_{j}}=0$ for $j=1, \ldots, n$ (see [16], Lemma 1.13). (Here $\chi_{\partial G_{j}}$ denotes the characteristic function of $\partial G_{j}$.) According to [16], Lemma 1.5 the operator $W^{G}$ is a bounded Fredholm operator with index 0 on $\mathscr{B}$. Since $N^{G} \mathscr{U}$ is the restriction of the adjoint operator of $W^{G}$ to $\mathscr{C}^{\prime}(\partial G)$ (see [24], Proposition 8) and the kernel of the adjoint
operator of $W^{G}$ is a subset of $\mathscr{C}^{\prime}(\partial G)$ (see [16], Theorem 1.12), the dimension of the kernel of $W^{G}$ is equal to the dimension of the kernel of $N^{G} \mathscr{U}$. Since $N^{G} \mathscr{U}$ is a Fredholm operator with index 0 , the dimension of the kernel of $W^{G}$ is equal to the codimension of the range of $N^{G} \mathscr{U}$. Since the codimension of the range of $N^{G} \mathscr{U}$ is equal to $n$ by [16], Theorem 1.14, the functions $\chi_{\partial G_{1}}, \ldots, \chi_{\partial G_{n}}$ form a basis of the kernel of $W^{G}$. Since $W^{G} \tilde{w}=0$ and $\tilde{w}=-\mathscr{D} \tilde{w}$ in $G$, there are constants $a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}$ such that $\tilde{w}=-a_{1} \mathscr{D} \chi_{\partial G_{1}}-\ldots-a_{n} \mathscr{D} \chi_{\partial G_{n}}$ in $G$. Since $\chi_{G_{j}}=-\mathscr{D} \chi_{\partial G_{j}}$ for $j=1, \ldots, n$ by Lemma 1 and Lemma 2, we obtain $\tilde{w}=a_{1} \chi_{G_{1}}+\ldots a_{n} \chi_{G_{n}}$ in $G$.

Theorem 5. Denote by $G_{1}, \ldots, G_{k}$ all components of $G$ such that $\lambda\left(\partial G_{j}\right)=0$. Let $\mu \in \mathscr{C}_{0}^{\prime}(\partial G)$. Then there is a bounded weak solution of the third problem for the Laplace equation (3) if and only if $\mu \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$.
a) If $G \backslash\left(G_{1} \cup \ldots \cup G_{k}\right)$ is bounded then the general form of this solution is

$$
\begin{equation*}
u=\mathscr{U} \nu+\sum_{j=1}^{k} c_{j} \chi_{G_{j}}, \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{gather*}
\nu=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left(-\frac{\tau-\alpha I}{\alpha}\right)^{n} \frac{\mu}{\alpha},  \tag{11}\\
\alpha>\frac{1}{2}\left(V^{G}+1+\sup _{x \in \partial G} \mathscr{U} \lambda(x)\right), \tag{12}
\end{gather*}
$$

and $c_{j}$ are arbitrary constants.
b) If $G \backslash\left(G_{1} \cup \ldots \cup G_{k}\right)$ is unbounded then the general form of this solution is

$$
\begin{equation*}
u=\mathscr{U} \nu+\sum_{j=1}^{k} c_{j} \chi_{G_{j}}+c_{k+1}\left(\mathscr{U} \nu_{0}-1\right) \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\nu$ is given by (11), $\nu_{0}$ is given by (7) and $c_{j}$ are arbitrary constants; (10) is a general form of a bounded weak solution $v$ of the third problem for the Laplace equation with the boundary condition $\mu$ for which $v(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. Since $G$ is $W^{1,1}$-extendible by [30], Remark 2.5.2, there is a bounded function on $G$ which is a weak solution of the third problem for the Laplace equation (3) if and only if $\mu \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$. (See Theorem 2.)

Suppose now that $\mu \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$. According to Theorem 1, Theorem 3 and [17], Theorem 2 the function $u$ given by (10) or (13) is a bounded weak solution of the third
problem for the Laplace equation with the boundary condition $\mu$. If $G \backslash\left(G_{1} \cup \ldots \cup G_{k}\right)$ is unbounded and $u$ is given by (10) then $u(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$.

Let $v$ be a bounded weak solution of the third problem for the Laplace equation with the boundary condition $\mu$. Then $w=v-\mathscr{U} \nu$ is a bounded weak solution of the third problem for the Laplace equation with zero boundary condition. Then $w$ is a bounded weak solution of the Neumann problem for the Laplace equation with the boundary condition $-w \lambda$. Let $G_{1}, \ldots, G_{n}$ be all components of $G$. According to Theorem 4 there are $\tilde{\nu} \in \mathscr{C}^{\prime}(\partial G)$ and constants $c_{1}, \ldots, c_{n}$ such that $w=\mathscr{U} \tilde{\nu}+c_{1} \chi_{\partial G_{1}}+\ldots+c_{n} \chi_{\partial G_{n}}$. Let $f$ be the characteristic function of the unbounded component of $G$ for $G$ unbounded; $f \equiv 0$ for $G$ bounded. Since for each bounded component $H$ of $G$ there is $\nu_{H} \in \mathscr{C}^{\prime}(\partial G)$ such that $\mathscr{U} \nu_{H}=1$ on $H$ and $\mathscr{U} \nu_{H}=0$ on $G \backslash H$ (see [20], Lemma 1), there are $\nu^{\prime} \in \mathscr{C}^{\prime}(\partial G)$ and a constant $a$ such that $w=\mathscr{U} \nu^{\prime}+a f$. If $G \backslash\left(G_{1} \cup \ldots \cup G_{k}\right)$ is bounded then $\mathscr{U} \nu^{\prime}=w-a f$ is a weak solution of the third problem for the Laplace equation with zero boundary condition. Then $\mathscr{U} \nu^{\prime}=a_{1} \chi_{\partial G_{1}}+\ldots+a_{k} \chi_{\partial G_{k}}$ for some constants $a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k}$ by [16], Theorem 1.12. Suppose now that $G \backslash\left(G_{1} \cup \ldots \cup G_{k}\right)$ is unbounded. Theorem 3 yields that $\tilde{w}=w+a\left(\mathscr{U} \nu_{0}-1\right)$ is a bounded weak solution of the third boundary problem with zero boundary condition and $\tilde{w}(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$. As was shown there are $\nu^{\prime \prime} \in \mathscr{C}^{\prime}(\partial G)$ and a constant $b$ such that $\tilde{w}=\mathscr{U} \nu^{\prime \prime}+b f$. Since $\tilde{w}(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain $b=0$. Therefore $\mathscr{U} \nu^{\prime \prime}=a_{1} \chi_{\partial G_{1}}+\ldots+a_{k} \chi_{\partial G_{k}}$ for some constants $a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k}$ by [16], Theorem 1.12.

Lemma 3. Let $u$ be a bounded weak solution of the third problem for the Laplace equation with the boundary condition $\mu \in \mathscr{C}^{\prime}(\partial G)$. Then $|\nabla u| \in L_{2}(G)$. If $G$ is bounded then $u \in W^{1,2}(G)$. If $G$ is unbounded and $m>4$ then $u \in W^{1,2}(G)$ if and only if $u(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$. Let now $m \leqslant 4$ and $H$ be an unbounded component of $G$. Denote by $\tilde{\lambda}$ the restriction of $\lambda$ to $\partial G$. If $\mathscr{U} \tilde{\lambda}$ is constant on $\partial H$ (for example if $\tilde{\lambda}=0$ ) then $u \in W^{1,2}(G)$ if and only if $u(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ and $\mu(\partial H)=0$.

Proof. According to Theorem 5 the function $u$ has the form (10) or (13). Since $\nu, \nu_{0} \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$ by Theorem 1 and Theorem $3,|\nabla \mathscr{U} \nu|,\left|\nabla \mathscr{U} \nu_{0}\right| \in L_{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$ by [26], Proposition 23. Therefore $|\nabla u| \in L_{2}(G)$. If $G$ is bounded then $u \in W^{1,2}(G)$, because $u$ is bounded. If $G$ is unbounded and $m>4$ then $u \in L_{2}(G)$ if and only if $u(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ by [20], Lemma 3. Suppose now that $H$ is an unbounded component of $G, m \leqslant 4$ and $\mathscr{U} \tilde{\lambda}$ is equal to a constant $c$ on $\partial H$. If $u \in W^{1,2}(G)$ then $u(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ by [20], Lemma 3. Suppose now that $u(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$. Denote by $\tilde{\mu}$ the restriction of $\mu$ to $\partial H$. Then $N^{H} u+u \tilde{\lambda}=\tilde{\mu}$. Since $V^{H}<\infty, r_{\text {ess }}\left(N^{H} \mathscr{U}-\frac{1}{2} I\right)<\frac{1}{2}$
(see [16], Theorem 2.3), Theorem 5 yields that $u=\mathscr{U} \tilde{\nu}$ on $H$, where

$$
\tilde{\nu}=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left(-\frac{\tau^{H}-\alpha I}{\alpha}\right)^{n} \frac{\tilde{\mu}}{\alpha} .
$$

$u \in W^{1,2}(H)$ if and only if $\tilde{\nu}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)=0$, because $\mathscr{U} \tilde{\nu}(x)=\tilde{\nu}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)|x|^{2-m}+O\left(|x|^{1-m}\right)$ for $|x| \rightarrow \infty$. If $\tilde{\nu}(\partial H)=0$ then Fubini's theorem and [18], Lemma 9 yield $\mu(\partial H)=$ $\tilde{\mu}(\partial H)=\tau^{H} \tilde{\nu}(\partial H)=N^{H} \mathscr{U} \tilde{\nu}(\partial H)+\int \mathscr{U} \tilde{\nu} \mathrm{d} \tilde{\lambda}=0+\int \mathscr{U} \tilde{\lambda} \mathrm{d} \tilde{\nu}=c \tilde{\nu}(\partial H)=0$. On the other hand, if $\mu(\partial H)=0$ we get by induction $\left(I-\alpha^{-1} \tau^{H}\right)^{n} \tilde{\mu}(\partial H)=0$ and therefore $\tilde{\nu}(\partial H)=\alpha^{-1} \sum\left(I-\alpha^{-1} \tau^{H}\right)^{n} \tilde{\mu}(\partial H)=0$.

Example 1. Let $G=\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash \operatorname{cl} \Omega_{1}([2,0,0]) \backslash \operatorname{cl} \Omega_{1}([-2,0,0])$. For fixed constants $c \in(1 / 2,1\rangle, a \in(0, \infty)$ put $u(x)=1 /|x-[2,0,0]|-c /|x-[-2,0,0]|$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lambda(M) & =\int_{\partial \Omega_{1}([-2,0,0]) \cap M} a /|u| \mathrm{d} \mathscr{H}_{2}, \\
\mu(M) & =\int_{\partial G \cap M} \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{2}-a \mathscr{H}_{2}\left(M \cap \partial \Omega_{1}([-2,0,0])\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

for any Borel set $M$. Then $u$ is a weak bounded solution of the third problem for the Laplace equation with the boundary condition $\mu$. If $c<1$ and $a=1-c$ then $u \notin W^{1,2}(G)$ but $\mu(\partial G)=\mathscr{H}_{2}\left(\Omega_{1}(0)\right)[1-c-(1-c)]=0$. If $c=1$ then $u \in W^{1,2}(G)$ but $\mu(\partial G)=-a \mathscr{H}_{2}\left(\Omega_{1}(0)\right) \neq 0$.

Definition. Let $f \in L_{\infty}(\mathscr{H})$ be a nonnegative function. Let $L$ be a bounded linear functional on $W^{1,2}(G)$ such that $L(\varphi)=0$ for each $\varphi \in \mathscr{D}(G)=\{\varphi \in$ $\mathscr{D} ; \operatorname{spt} \varphi \subset G\}$. We say that $u \in W^{1,2}(G)$ is a weak solution in $W^{1,2}(G)$ of the third problem

$$
\begin{gather*}
\Delta u=0 \quad \text { on } G  \tag{14}\\
\frac{\partial u}{\partial n}+u f=L \quad \text { on } \partial G
\end{gather*}
$$

if

$$
\int_{G} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m}+\int_{\partial G} u f v \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}=L(v)
$$

for each $v \in W^{1,2}(G)$.
Remark 3. Let $u$ be a weak solution in $W^{1,2}(G)$ of (14). If there is $\mu \in \mathscr{C}^{\prime}(G)$ such that $L(\varphi)=\int \varphi \mathrm{d} \mu$ for each $\varphi \in \mathscr{D}$ then $u$ is a weak solution of (3) with $\lambda=f \mathscr{H}$.

Lemma 4. Let $\mu \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$. Then there is a unique bounded linear functional $L_{\mu}$ on $W^{1,2}(G)$ such that

$$
L_{\mu}(\varphi)=\int_{\partial G} \varphi \mathrm{~d} \mu
$$

for each $\varphi \in \mathscr{D}$.
Proof. Let $G_{1}, \ldots, G_{n}$ are all components of $G$. Fix real numbers $c_{1}, \ldots, c_{n}$ such that $\mu\left(\partial G_{j}\right)-c_{j} \mathscr{H}\left(\partial G_{j}\right)=0$ for $j=1, \ldots, n$. Put

$$
\tilde{\mu}(M)=\mu-\sum_{j=1}^{n} c_{j} \mathscr{H}\left(M \cap \partial G_{j}\right)
$$

for each Borel set $M$. Since $\tilde{\mu} \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$ by [17], Remark 6 , there is $\nu \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$ such that $N^{G} \mathscr{U} \nu=\tilde{\mu}$ by Theorem 5 and Theorem 1. Fix $\psi \in \mathscr{D}$ such that $\psi=1$ in a neighbourhood of $\partial G$. If $\varphi \in \mathscr{D}$ then Hölder's inequality yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{\partial G} \varphi \mathrm{~d} \tilde{\mu}= & \int_{\partial G} \psi \varphi \mathrm{~d} N^{G} \mathscr{U} \nu=\int_{G} \nabla(\psi \varphi) \cdot \nabla \mathscr{U} \nu \mathrm{d} \mathscr{H}_{m} \\
\leqslant & \sup |\psi|\left(\int_{G \cap \operatorname{spt} \psi}|\nabla \varphi|^{2} \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m}\right)^{1 / 2}\left(\int_{G \cap \operatorname{spt} \psi}|\nabla \mathscr{U} \nu|^{2} \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m}\right)^{1 / 2} \\
& +\sup |\nabla \psi|\left(\int_{G \cap \mathrm{spt} \psi}|\varphi|^{2} \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m}\right)^{1 / 2}\left(\int_{G \cap \operatorname{spt} \psi}|\nabla \mathscr{U} \nu|^{2} \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m}\right)^{1 / 2} \\
\leqslant & C\|\varphi\|_{W^{1,2}(G)},
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
C=2(\sup |\psi|+\sup |\nabla \psi|)\left(\int_{G \cap \operatorname{spt} \psi}|\nabla \mathscr{U} \nu|^{2} \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m}\right)^{1 / 2}<\infty
$$

by Lemma 3. According to the Hahn-Banach theorem there is a bounded linear functional $L_{\tilde{\mu}}$ on $W^{1,2}(G)$ such that

$$
L_{\tilde{\mu}}(\varphi)=\int_{\partial G} \varphi \mathrm{~d} \tilde{\mu}
$$

for each $\varphi \in \mathscr{D}$. If we define

$$
L_{\mu}(v)=L_{\tilde{\mu}}(v)+\sum_{j=1}^{n} c_{j} \int_{G_{j}} v \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}
$$

for $v \in W^{1,2}(G)$, then $L_{\mu}$ is a bounded linear operator on $W^{1,2}(G)$ satisfying $L_{\mu}(\varphi)=$ $\int \varphi \mathrm{d} \mu$ for each $\varphi \in \mathscr{D}$. Since $\mathscr{D}$ is dense in $W^{1,2}(G)$ by [30], Remark 2.5.2 and [30], Lemma 2.1.3, the functional $L_{\mu}$ is unique.

Lemma 5. Let $f \in L_{\infty}(\mathscr{H})$ be a nonnegative function, $\lambda=f \mathscr{H}$. Let $\mu \in$ $\mathscr{C}_{0}^{\prime}(\partial G)$. If $u, v \in W^{1,2}(G)$ are weak solutions of (3) then $w \equiv u-v$ is locally constant in $G$ and $w=0$ on the unbounded component of $G$ and on each component $H$ of $G$ for which $\lambda(\partial H)>0$.

Proof. Fix a sequence $\varphi_{n} \in \mathscr{D}$ such that $\varphi_{n} \rightarrow w$ in $W^{1,2}(G)$ (see [30], Remark 2.5.2 and [30], Lemma 2.1.3). Then

$$
0=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left[\int_{G} \nabla w \cdot \nabla \varphi_{n} \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m}+\int_{\partial G} w f \varphi_{n} \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}\right]=\int_{G}|\nabla w|^{2} \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m}+\int_{\partial G} w^{2} f \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H} .
$$

Since $\int|\nabla w|^{2} \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m} \geqslant 0, \int f w^{2} \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H} \geqslant 0$, we have $\int|\nabla w|^{2} \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m}=0$ and therefore $w$ is locally constant on $G$. Since $\int f w^{2} \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}=0$ we obtain that $w=0$ on each component $H$ of $G$ for which $\lambda(\partial H)>0$. Since $w \in W^{1,2}(G)$ and $w$ is constant on the unbounded component of $G, w=0$ on this component.

Theorem 6. Let $f \in L_{\infty}(\mathscr{H})$ be a nonnegative function, $\lambda=f \mathscr{H}$. Let $\mu \in$ $\mathscr{C}_{0}^{\prime}(\partial G) \cap \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$, and let $L$ be a bounded linear functional on $W^{1,2}(G)$ such that $L(\varphi)=\int \varphi \mathrm{d} \mu$ for each $\varphi \in \mathscr{D}$. If $G$ is unbounded and $m \leqslant 4$ suppose moreover that $\mu(\partial H)=0$ and $f=0$ on $\partial H$, where $H$ is the unbounded component of $G$. Then there is a bounded weak solution $u$ in $W^{1,2}(G)$ of the third problem for the Laplace equation (14). If $G_{1}, \ldots, G_{k}$ are all components of $G$ such that $\lambda\left(\partial G_{j}\right)=0$, then the general solution of this problem has the form (10), where $\nu$ is given by (11) and $c_{j}=0$ for $G_{j}$ unbounded and $c_{j}$ is an arbitrary constant for $G_{j}$ bounded.

Proof. Let $\nu$ be given by (11). Then $\mathscr{U} \nu$ is a bounded weak solution of (3) by Theorem 5. According to Lemma 3 we have $\mathscr{U} \nu \in W^{1,2}(G)$. For fixed $v \in W^{1,2}(G)$ choose $\varphi_{n} \in \mathscr{D}$ such that $\varphi_{n} \rightarrow v$ in $W^{1,2}(G)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (see [30], Remark 2.5.2 and [30], Lemma 2.1.3). Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
L(v) & =\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \varphi_{n} \mathrm{~d} \mu=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left[\int_{G} \nabla \varphi_{n} \cdot \nabla \mathscr{U} \nu \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m}+\int_{\partial G} \varphi_{n} f \mathscr{U} \nu \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}\right] \\
& =\int_{G} \nabla v \cdot \nabla \mathscr{U} \nu \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m}+\int_{\partial G} v f \mathscr{U} \nu \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H} .
\end{aligned}
$$

$\mathscr{U} \nu$ is a weak solution in $W^{1,2}(G)$ of the third problem (14). If $u$ has the form (10), where $c_{j}=0$ for $G_{j}$ unbounded, then $u$ is a weak solution of this third problem.

Let $u \in W^{1,2}(G)$ be a weak solution in $W^{1,2}(G)$ of the third problem (14). Lemma 5 yields that $u$ has the form (10) with $c_{j}=0$ for $G_{j}$ unbounded.

Theorem 7. Let $f \in L_{\infty}(\mathscr{H})$ be a nonnegative function. Let $L$ be a bounded linear functional on $W^{1,2}(G)$ and $\mu \in \mathscr{C}^{\prime}(\partial G)$ be such that $L(\varphi)=\int \varphi \mathrm{d} \mu$ for each $\varphi \in \mathscr{D}$. If $u \in W^{1,2}(G)$ is a weak solution in $W^{1,2}(G)$ of the third problem for the Laplace equation (14) then $u$ is bounded in $G$ if and only if $\mu \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$.

Proof. Put $\lambda=f \mathscr{H}$. Since $N^{G} u+u \lambda=\mu$, [17], Theorem 1 yields that $\mu \in \mathscr{C}_{0}^{\prime}(\partial G)$. If the function $u$ is bounded then $\mu \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$ by Theorem 2 , because $G$ is $W^{1,1}$-extendible by [30], Remark 2.5.2. Suppose now that $\mu \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$. If $G$ is bounded put $\tilde{G}=G$. If $G$ is unbounded fix $R>0$ such that $\partial G \subset \Omega_{R}(0)$ and put $\tilde{G}=G \cap \Omega_{R}(0), \tilde{\mu}=\mu+\partial u / \partial n\left(\mathscr{H}_{m-1} / \partial \Omega_{R}(0)\right), f=0$ on $\partial \Omega_{R}(0)$. Since $V^{G}<\infty$ we have $V^{\tilde{G}}<\infty$. Since $r_{\text {ess }}\left(N^{G} \mathscr{U}-\frac{1}{2} I\right)<\frac{1}{2}$ and $\left(N^{H} \mathscr{U}-\frac{1}{2} I\right)$ is compact for each bounded open set $H$ with a smooth boundary (see [12], Theorem 4.1, Proposition 2.20, [29], Theorem 4.1), [16], Theorem 2.3 yields that $r_{\text {ess }}\left(N^{\tilde{G}} \mathscr{U}-\frac{1}{2} I\right)<\frac{1}{2}$. Since $N^{\tilde{G}} u+u \lambda=\tilde{\mu},[17]$, Theorem 1 yields that $\tilde{\mu} \in \mathscr{C}_{0}^{\prime}(\partial G)$. If $G$ is unbounded then $\partial u / \partial n\left(\mathscr{H}_{m-1} / \partial \Omega_{R}(0)\right) \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial \tilde{G})$ by [17], Remark 6 and therefore $\tilde{\mu} \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial \tilde{G})$. According to Theorem 6 there is a bounded $v \in W^{1,2}(G)$ which is a weak solution in $W^{1,2}(G)$ of the third problem for the Laplace equation on $\tilde{G}$ with the boundary condition $L_{\tilde{\mu}}$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\Delta v=0 \quad \text { in } \tilde{G} \\
\frac{\partial v}{\partial n}+f v=L_{\tilde{\mu}} \quad \text { on } \partial \tilde{G}
\end{gathered}
$$

Since $u-v$ is locally constant in $\tilde{G}$ by Lemma 5 , the function $u$ is bounded in $\tilde{G}$. Since $u \in W^{1,2}(G), u(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ (see [20], Lemma 3). Therefore $u$ is bounded in $G$.

Definition. Let $f \in L_{\infty}(\mathscr{H})$ be a nonnegative function. Let $g \in L_{2}(G)$ and let $L$ be a bounded linear functional on $W^{1,2}(G)$ such that $L(\varphi)=0$ for each $\varphi \in \mathscr{D}(G)$. We say that $u \in W^{1,2}(G)$ is a weak solution in $W^{1,2}(G)$ of the third problem for the Poisson equation

$$
\begin{gather*}
\Delta u=g \quad \text { on } G  \tag{15}\\
\frac{\partial u}{\partial n}+u f=L \quad \text { on } \partial G
\end{gather*}
$$

if

$$
\int_{G} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m}+\int_{\partial G} u f v \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}=L(v)-\int_{G} g v \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m}
$$

for each $v \in W^{1,2}(G)$.

Theorem 8. Let $f \in L_{\infty}(\mathscr{H})$ be a nonnegative function. Let $g \in L_{p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$, where $p>m$, be a compactly supported function. Put $\lambda=f \mathscr{H}$. Denote by $G_{1}, \ldots, G_{k}$ all bounded components of $G$ such that $\lambda\left(\partial G_{j}\right)=0$. Let $\mu \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$ be such that

$$
\mu\left(\partial G_{j}\right)=\int_{G_{j}} g \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m}
$$

for $j=1, \ldots, k$. If $G$ is unbounded and $m \leqslant 4$ suppose moreover that

$$
\begin{gathered}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{m}} g \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m}=0 \\
\mu(\partial H)=\int_{H} g \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m},
\end{gathered}
$$

$\lambda(\partial H)=0$ for the unbounded component $H$ of $G$. Then there is $u \in W^{1,2}(G)$ which is a weak solution in $W^{1,2}(G)$ of the third problem for the Poisson equation (15) with the boundary condition $L \equiv L_{\mu}$. The general form of this solution is

$$
\begin{equation*}
u=\mathscr{U} \nu-\mathscr{U}\left(g \mathscr{H}_{m}\right)+\sum_{j=1}^{k} c_{j} \chi_{G_{j}}, \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{gather*}
\nu=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left(-\frac{\tau-\alpha I}{\alpha}\right)^{n} \frac{\tilde{\mu}}{\alpha}  \tag{17}\\
\tilde{\mu}=\mu+\left[n^{G} \cdot \nabla \mathscr{U}\left(g \mathscr{H}_{m}\right)\right] \mathscr{H}+\mathscr{U}\left(g \mathscr{H}_{m}\right) \lambda,  \tag{18}\\
\alpha>\frac{1}{2}\left(V^{G}+1+\sup _{x \in \partial G} \mathscr{U} \lambda(x)\right) .
\end{gather*}
$$

Proof. Put

$$
\varphi(x)= \begin{cases}C \exp \left[-1 /\left(1-|x|^{2}\right)\right] & \text { for }|x|<1 \\ 0 & \text { for }|x| \geqslant 1\end{cases}
$$

where $C$ is chosen so that $\int \varphi=1$. For $\varepsilon>0$ put $\varphi_{\varepsilon}(x)=\varepsilon^{-m} \varphi(x \varepsilon)$. Since $\mathscr{U}\left(g \mathscr{H}_{m}\right) \in \mathscr{C}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$ (see [6], Theorem A.6, Theorem A.11), $\varphi_{\varepsilon} * \mathscr{U}\left(g \mathscr{H}_{m}\right) \rightarrow$ $\mathscr{U}\left(g \mathscr{H}_{m}\right), \varphi_{\varepsilon} * \nabla \mathscr{U}\left(g \mathscr{H}_{m}\right) \rightarrow \nabla \mathscr{U}\left(g \mathscr{H}_{m}\right)$ locally uniformly as $\varepsilon \searrow 0$ (see [30],

Theorem 1.6.1, [27], § 12). The Divergence Theorem (see [12], p. 49) and [6], Theorem A. 16 yield for $j \in\{1, \ldots, k\}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mu}\left(\partial G_{j}\right) & =\mu\left(\partial G_{j}\right)+\int_{\partial G_{j}} n^{G}(y) \cdot \nabla \mathscr{U}\left(g \mathscr{H}_{m}\right)(y) \mathrm{d} \mathscr{H}(y) \\
& =\mu\left(\partial G_{j}\right)+\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0_{+}} \int_{\partial G_{j}} n^{G}(y) \cdot\left(\varphi_{\varepsilon} * \nabla \mathscr{U}\left(g \mathscr{H}_{m}\right)\right)(y) \mathrm{d} \mathscr{H}(y) \\
& =\mu\left(\partial G_{j}\right)+\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0_{+}} \int_{\partial G_{j}} n^{G}(y) \cdot \nabla\left[\varphi_{\varepsilon} *\left(h_{0} * g\right)\right](y) \mathrm{d} \mathscr{H}(y) \\
& =\mu\left(\partial G_{j}\right)+\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0_{+}} \int_{\partial G_{j}} n^{G}(y) \cdot \nabla\left[h_{0} *\left(\varphi_{\varepsilon} * g\right)\right](y) \mathrm{d} \mathscr{H}(y) \\
& =\mu\left(\partial G_{j}\right)+\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0_{+}} \int_{G_{j}} \Delta \mathscr{U}\left[\left(\varphi_{\varepsilon} * g\right) \mathscr{H}_{m}\right] \mathrm{d} \mathscr{H}_{m} \\
& =\mu\left(\partial G_{j}\right)-\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0_{+}} \int_{G_{j}}\left(\varphi_{\varepsilon} * g\right) \mathrm{d} \mathscr{H}_{m}=\mu\left(\partial G_{j}\right)-\int_{G_{j}} g \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m}=0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

If $G$ is unbounded and $m \leqslant 4$ then [6], Theorem A. 16 and the Divergence Theorem (see [12], p. 49) yield

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mu}(\partial H)= & \lim _{R \rightarrow \infty}\left\{\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0_{+}} \int_{\partial\left(H \cap \Omega_{R}(0)\right)} n^{H \cap \Omega_{R}(0)} \cdot\left[\varphi_{\varepsilon} * \nabla \mathscr{U}\left(g \mathscr{H}_{m}\right)\right] \mathrm{d} \mathscr{H}_{m-1}\right. \\
& \left.-\int_{\partial \Omega_{R}(0)} n^{\Omega_{R}(0)}(y) \cdot \nabla \mathscr{U}\left(g \mathscr{H}_{m}\right)(y) \mathrm{d} \mathscr{H}_{m-1}(y)\right\}+\mu(\partial H) \\
= & \lim _{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0_{+}} \int_{\partial\left(H \cap \Omega_{R}(0)\right)} n^{H \cap \Omega_{R}(0)} \cdot \nabla\left[h_{0} *\left(\varphi_{\varepsilon} * g\right)\right] \mathrm{d} \mathscr{H}_{m-1}+\mu(\partial H) \\
= & \lim _{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0_{+}} \int_{H \cap \Omega_{R}(0)} \Delta \mathscr{U}\left[\left(\varphi_{\varepsilon} * g\right) \mathscr{H}_{m}\right] \mathrm{d} \mathscr{H}_{m}+\mu(\partial H) \\
= & -\lim _{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0_{+}} \int_{H \cap \Omega_{R}(0)}\left(\varphi_{\varepsilon} * g\right) \mathrm{d} \mathscr{H}_{m}+\mu(\partial H) \\
= & -\int_{H} g \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m}+\mu(\partial H)=0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

According to Theorem 6,

$$
\mathscr{U} \nu+\sum_{j=1}^{k} c_{j} \chi_{G_{j}}
$$

is a weak solution in $W^{1,2}(G)$ of the third problem for the Laplace equation (14) with the boundary condition $L \equiv L_{\tilde{\mu}}$. If $u$ has the form (16) then [20], Lemma 5 yields that $u$ is a weak solution in $W^{1,2}(G)$ of the third problem for the Poisson equation (15) with the boundary condition $L \equiv L_{\mu}$.

Let now $u \in W^{1,2}(G)$ be a weak solution of the third problem for the Poisson equation (15) with the boundary condition $L \equiv L_{\mu}$. Then

$$
w=u-\mathscr{U} \nu+\mathscr{U}\left(g \mathscr{H}_{m}\right)
$$

is a weak solution in $W^{1,2}(G)$ of the third problem for the Laplace equation with the zero boundary condition. According to Lemma 5 the function $w$ is locally constant and vanishes on $G \backslash\left(G_{1} \cup \ldots \cup G_{k}\right)$.

Theorem 9. Let $f \in L_{\infty}(\mathscr{H})$ be a nonnegative function. Let $g \in L_{p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$, where $p>m$, be a compactly supported function. Let $L$ be a bounded linear functional on $W^{1,2}(G)$ and $\mu \in \mathscr{C}^{\prime}(\partial G)$ be such that $L(\varphi)=\int \varphi \mathrm{d} \mu$ for each $\varphi \in \mathscr{D}$. If $u \in W^{1,2}(G)$ is a weak solution in $W^{1,2}(G)$ of the third problem for the Poisson equation (15) then $u$ is bounded in $G$ if and only if $\mu \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$.

Proof. Changing $g$ on $\mathbb{R}^{m} \backslash G$ we can suppose that

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{m}} g \mathrm{~d} \mathscr{H}_{m}=0 .
$$

Put $\lambda=f \mathscr{H}, \varrho \equiv-\left[n^{G} \cdot \nabla \mathscr{U}\left(g \mathscr{H}_{m}\right)\right] \mathscr{H}-\mathscr{U}\left(g \mathscr{H}_{m}\right) \lambda$. Then [20], Lemma 5 yields that $u+\mathscr{U}\left(g \mathscr{H}_{m}\right)$ is a weak solution in $W^{1,2}(G)$ of the Neumann problem for the Laplace equation with the boundary condition $L-L_{\varrho}$. Since $\mathscr{U}\left(g \mathscr{H}_{m}\right) \in C^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$ (see [6], Theorem A. 6 and Theorem A.11) and $\mathscr{U}\left(g \mathscr{H}_{m}\right)(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$, the function $\mathscr{U}\left(g \mathscr{H}_{m}\right)$ is bounded. Therefore $u$ is bounded if and only if $u+\mathscr{U}\left(g \mathscr{H}_{m}\right)$ is bounded. According to Theorem 7 the function $u+\mathscr{U}\left(g \mathscr{H}_{m}\right)$ is bounded if and only if $\mu-\varrho \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$. Since $\varrho \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$ by [20], Lemma 5 , the function $u$ is bounded in $G$ if and only if $\mu \in \mathscr{C}_{b}^{\prime}(\partial G)$.
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