# On Principally Linear Elliptic Differential Equations of the Second Order. 

By Mitio Nagumo

## § 0 Introduction

We use the notations $\underset{x_{i}}{ } u$ or ${\underset{i}{i}} u$ for $\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}}$ and $\partial_{x_{i} x_{j}}{ }^{2} u$ or $\partial_{i j}^{2} u$ for $\frac{\partial^{2} u}{\partial x_{i} \partial x_{j}}$.
 $(i, j=1, \cdots, m)$.

In this note we shall consider principally linear partial differential equation ${ }^{1)}$ of elliptic type

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i, j=1}^{m} a_{i j}(x)_{i j}^{2} u=f\left(x, u, \partial_{x} u\right) . \tag{0}
\end{equation*}
$$

We assume once for all that the quadratic form $\sum_{i, j=1}^{m} a_{i j}(x) \xi_{i} \xi_{j}$ is positive definite. We denote by $\mathrm{C}[A]$ the set of all continuous functions on $A$, and by $\mathrm{C}^{p}[A]$ the set of all functions whose partial derivatives up to the $p$-th order are all continuous on $A$. Under a solution of ( 0 ) in the domain $D$ we understand a function of $\mathrm{C}^{2}[D]$ which satisfies (0) for $x \in D .{ }^{2)}$ We say that a solution $u(x)$ of (0) in $D$ takes the boundary value $\beta(x)$, when $u(x) \in \mathrm{C}[\bar{D}]$ and $u(x)=\beta(x)$ for $x \in \dot{D}$. ${ }^{3)}$

We say a function $\omega(x)$ is a quasi-supersolution (-subsolution) of (0) in a domain $D$, if for every point $x_{0} \in D$, there exist a neighborhood $U$ of $x_{0}$ and a finite number of functions $\omega_{\nu}(x) \in \mathbb{C}^{2}[U](\nu=1, \cdots, n)$ such that

$$
\omega(x)=\operatorname{Min}_{1 \leqq \nu \leqq n} \omega_{\nu}(x)\left(\operatorname{Max}_{1 \leqq \nu \leqq n} \omega_{\nu}(x)\right) \quad \text { for } \quad x \in U
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i, j=1}^{n} a_{i j}(x) \partial_{i j}^{2} \omega_{\nu} \leqq f\left(x, \omega_{\nu},{\underset{x}{ }}_{\partial} \omega_{\nu}\right)\left(\geqq f\left(x, \omega_{\nu},{\underset{x}{x}} \omega_{\nu}\right)\right) . \tag{0.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^0]The purpose of this note is to give an existence theorem for the solution of the boundary value problem of the first kind regarding the equation ( 0 ), under adequate supplementary conditions, in such a way that the solution $u(x)$ is limited by the inequalities

$$
\underline{\omega}(x) \leqq u(x) \leqq \bar{\omega}(x),
$$

where $\bar{\omega}(x)$ and $\underline{\omega}(x)$ are quasi-supersolution and quasi-subsolution of ( 0 ) respectively. The main result of this note is given in $\S 6$.

The argument of this note is based on the work of J. Schauder: Über lineare elliptische Differentialgleichungen zweiter Ordung. ${ }^{4}$ We define the distance of two points $x$ and $x^{\prime}$ by $\left.\left|x-x^{\prime}\right|=\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(x_{i}-x_{i}\right)^{\prime}\right)^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}$. We also define $\left|\partial_{x} f\right|$ and $\left|\partial_{x}^{2} f\right|$ by

$$
\left|\partial_{x} f\right|=\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\partial_{i} f\right)^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}, \quad\left|\partial_{x}^{2} f\right|=\left(\sum_{i, j=1}^{m}\left(\partial_{i j}^{2} f\right)^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}
$$

A function $f(x)$ is said to be $H_{a}$-continuous $(0<\alpha \leqq 1)$ on $A$, if there exists a constant $C$ such that

$$
\left|f(x)-f\left(x^{\prime}\right)\right| \leqq C\left|x-x^{\prime}\right|^{\infty} \quad \text { for all } \quad x, x^{\prime} \in A
$$

Then we define $H_{\Delta}^{\alpha}(f)$ (the Hölder constant of $f$ on $A$ ) as the least value of such $C$. We also use the notation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|f\|_{A}^{\alpha}=\operatorname{Max}_{x \in A}|f(x)|+H_{A}^{\alpha}(f) \tag{0.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

and, if $f \in \mathrm{C}^{2}(A)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|f\|_{A}^{\alpha, 2}=\|f\|_{A}^{\alpha}+\left\|\partial{ }_{x} f\right\|_{A}^{\alpha}+\left\|\partial_{x}^{2} f\right\|_{A}^{\alpha} . \tag{0.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Schauder proved the following theorems:
Theorem A. Let $D$ be a bounded domain, and let $a_{i j}(x)$ be $H_{a+\mathrm{e}^{-}}$ continuous in $D$ and subjected to the condition
(0.5) $\quad \operatorname{det}\left(a_{i j}\right)=1$ and $\quad\left\|a_{i j}(x)\right\|_{D}^{\alpha+\varepsilon} \leqq \Lambda \quad(0<\alpha<1, \varepsilon>0)$.

Then there exists a constant $C_{\Lambda}$ depending only on $\alpha, \varepsilon$ and $\Lambda$ such that, for any compact set $K$ in $D$ and any solution $u(x)$ of

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i, j=1}^{m} a_{i j}(x) \partial_{i j}^{2} u=f(x) \tag{0.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

such that $\|u\|_{D}^{\alpha, 2}<+\infty$, holds the inequality

$$
\|u(x)\|_{K}^{\alpha, 2} \leqq C_{\Lambda} \delta^{-4}\left(\|f\|_{D}^{\alpha}+\operatorname{Max}_{D}|u(x)|\right)
$$

where $\delta=\operatorname{dist}(K, \dot{D})$.

[^1]Theorem B. Let $D$ be a bounded domain whose boundary $\dot{D}$ is of type Bh. ${ }^{5}$ Let $a_{i j}(x)$ satisfy (0.5) and let $\beta(x)$ be a function of $\mathrm{C}^{2}[\bar{D}]$ such that $\|\beta\|_{D}^{\alpha, 2}<_{-}+\infty$. Then there exists a solution $u(x)$ of ( 0.6 ) in $D$ with the boundary value $\beta(x)$ such that

$$
\|u\|_{D}^{\alpha, 2} \leqq C\left(\|f\|_{D}^{\alpha}+\|\beta\|_{D}^{\alpha, 2}\right),
$$

where $C$ is a constant depending only on $D, \alpha, \varepsilon$ and $\Lambda$.
REmark. We can easily prove that there exists a constant $\Lambda$ depending only on $A$ and $L$ such that ( 0.5 ) holds, if $a_{i j}(x)$ satisfies

$$
A^{-1} \leqq \sum_{i, j=1}^{m} a_{i j}(x) \xi_{i} \xi_{j} \leqq A \quad \text { for } \quad \sum_{i=1}^{m} \xi_{i}^{2}=1 \quad(A \leqq 1)
$$

and

$$
\left\{\sum_{i, j=1}^{m}\left(a_{i j}\left(x^{\prime}\right)-a_{i j}(x)\right)^{2}\right\}^{1 / 2} \leqq L\left|x^{\prime}-x\right|^{\alpha+\varepsilon}
$$

where $A$ and $L$ are positive constants.

## § 1 Limitation of $\boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{x})$

1. Theorem 1. Let $\omega(x)$ be a quasi-supersolution (-subsolution) of the equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Phi[u] \equiv \sum_{i, j=1}^{m} a_{i j}(x){ }_{x} \partial^{2} u-F\left(x,{ }_{x} u\right)=0 \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

in the domain $D$, and let $v(x)$ be a function of $\mathrm{C}^{2}[D]$ with the following properties:
(1.2) $\quad \Phi[v]>0(<0)$ for $x$ such that $v(x)>\omega(x)(<\omega(x))$
and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{x \rightarrow \dot{x}}\{v(x)-\omega(x)\} \leqq 0(\geq 0) \quad \text { for } \quad \dot{x} \in \dot{D} \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then

$$
v(x) \leqq \omega(x)(\geqq \omega(x)) \quad \text { for } \quad x \in D .
$$

Proof. If the conclusion was not true, there exist by (1.3) a positive constant $\alpha$ and a point $x_{0} \in D$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
v\left(x_{0}\right)=\omega\left(x_{0}\right)+\alpha \quad \text { and } \quad v(x) \leqq \omega(x)+\alpha \quad \text { in } D . .^{6)} \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then there exist a neighborhood $U$ and a function $\omega_{\nu}(x) \in C^{2}[D]$ such that

[^2]\[

$$
\begin{equation*}
\omega_{\nu}\left(x_{0}\right)=\omega\left(x_{0}\right), \quad \omega_{\nu}(x) \geqq \omega(x) \quad \text { in } U \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

\]

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Phi\left[\omega_{\nu}\right] \leqq 0 \quad \text { in } U \tag{1.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\omega_{\nu}\left(x_{0}\right)<v\left(x_{0}\right) \tag{1.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

and, as $\omega_{\nu}(x)-v(x)$ is minimum for $x=x_{0}$ by (1.4) and (1.5), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial_{x} \omega_{\nu}\left(x_{0}\right)={ }_{x} \partial v\left(x_{0}\right) \tag{1.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i, j=1}^{m} a_{i j}\left(x_{0}\right) \partial_{i j}^{2} \omega_{\nu}\left(x_{0}\right) \geqq \sum_{i, j=1}^{m} a_{i j}\left(x_{0}\right) \partial_{i j}^{2} v\left(x_{0}\right) .^{7)} \tag{1.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence, from (1.8) and (1.9)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Phi[v]_{x=x_{0}} \leqq \Phi\left[\omega_{\nu}\right]_{x=x_{0}} \tag{1.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

On the other hand, from (1.7), (1.2) and (1.6) we get

$$
\Phi[v]_{x=x_{0}}>0 \geqq \Phi\left[\omega_{\nu}\right]_{x=x_{0}}
$$

which contradicts (1.10), q.e.d.
2. We say that a domain $D$ has the property $((\sigma))$, when there exists a constant $\sigma>0$ with the following property: To any point $p$ of $\dot{D}$ there corresponds a closed sphere $S_{p}$ with radius $\sigma$ such that $\bar{D} \cap S_{p}=(p)$.

Lemma 1. Let $D$ be a bounded domain with the property $((\sigma))$, and let $d$ be the diameter of $D$. Let $a_{i j}(x)$ be subjected to the condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
A^{-1} \leqq \sum_{i, j=1}^{m} a_{i j}(x) \xi_{i} \xi_{j} \leqq A \quad \text { for } \sum_{i=1}^{m} \xi_{i}^{2}=1 \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $A$ is a constant $\geqq 1$. Then there exists a constant $C_{A, \sigma, a}$ depending only on $m, A, \sigma$ and $d$ such that for the solution $u(x)$ of

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i, j=1}^{m} a_{i j}(x) \partial_{i j}^{2} u=f(x) \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

with the boundary value $u=0(x \in \dot{D})$, where $f(x)$ is bounded on $D$, holds the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
|u(x)| \leqq C_{A, \sigma, a} \operatorname{dist}(x, \dot{D}) \sup _{D}|f(x)| \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^3]Proof. Let $x_{0}$ be any point of $D$ and let $p$ be a point of $\dot{D}$ such that dist $\left(x_{0}, \dot{D}\right)=\left|x_{0}-p\right|$. Let $S_{p}$ be the closed sphere with radius $\sigma$ such that $\bar{D}_{\cap} S_{p}=(p)$, and let $c$ be the center of $S_{p}$. If we put $\omega(x)=\varphi(r)$, where $r=|x-c|$, then
(2.4) $\quad \sum_{i, j=1}^{m} a_{i j}(x) \partial_{i j}^{2} \omega=\alpha(x) \varphi^{\prime \prime}+r^{-1}\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_{i i}-\alpha(x)\right\} \varphi^{\prime}$,
where

$$
\alpha(x)=r^{-2} \sum_{i, j=1}^{m} a_{i j}(x)\left(x_{i}-c_{i}\right)\left(x_{j}-c_{j}\right)
$$

Thus, if we define $\varphi(r)$ by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi(r)=(m A)^{-1} F \int_{\sigma}^{r}\left\{(d+\sigma)^{m A^{2}} r^{-m A^{2}+1}-r\right\} d r \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $F$ is a constant $>\sup |f(x)|$, and as $\varphi^{\prime}(r)>0, \varphi^{\prime \prime}(r)<0$ for $\sigma \leqq r<\delta+d$ and

$$
\left.\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_{i i}(x) \leqq m A, \quad \alpha(x) \geqq A^{-1} \quad \text { (by }(2.1)\right)
$$

we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i, j=1}^{m} a_{i j}(x)_{i j}^{2} \omega+F \leqq 0 \quad \text { in } D \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $\omega(x) \geqq 0$ for $x \in \dot{D}$.
On the other hand, as $F>|f(x)|$ in $D$, we get from (2.2)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i, j=1}^{m} a_{i j}(x)_{i j}^{\partial^{2}} u+F>0 \quad \text { in } D \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $u(x)=0 \leqq \omega(x)$ for $x \in \dot{D}$. Thus, by Theorem 1 ,

$$
u(x) \leqq \omega(x)=\varphi(r) \quad \text { in } D
$$

Then, as $\omega(p)=\varphi(\sigma)=0$ and $\varphi^{\prime \prime}<0$,

$$
u\left(x_{0}\right) \leqq \rho^{\prime}(\sigma)\left|x_{0}-p\right|
$$

or from (2.5)
where

$$
\begin{gathered}
u\left(x_{0}\right) \leqq C_{A, \sigma, a} \operatorname{dist}\left(x_{0}, \dot{D}\right) F \\
C_{A, \sigma, a}=(m A)^{-1}\left\{(d+\sigma)^{m A^{2}} \sigma^{-m A^{2}+1}-\sigma\right\}
\end{gathered}
$$

Similarly we obtain

$$
u\left(x_{0}\right) \geqq-C_{A, \sigma, a} \operatorname{dist}\left(x_{0}, \dot{D}\right) F
$$

Letting $F$ tend to $\sup |f(x)|$ we get (2.3).

## $\S 2$ Estimation of ${ }_{x} \boldsymbol{u}$

3. Theorem 2. Let $D$ be a bounded domain, whose diameter is $d$. Let $a_{i j}(x)$ be subjected to the conditions (2.1) and
(3.1) $\quad\left(\sum_{i, j=1}^{m}\left\{a_{i j}\left(x^{\prime}\right)-a_{i j}(x)\right\}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} \leqq L\left|x^{\prime}-x\right| \quad$ for any $x, x^{\prime} \in D$,
$\Gamma$ and $f(x, u, p)\left(p=\left(p_{1}, \cdots, p_{m}\right)\right)$ satisfy the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
|f(x, u, p)| \leqq B|p|^{2}+\Gamma \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $x \in D, \underline{\omega}(x) \leqq u \leqq \bar{\omega}(x)$ and $|p|<+\infty$. Let $u(x)$ be any solution of (0) such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
|u(x)| \leqq M \quad \text { in } D, \text { where } 16 A B M<1 \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then there exist constants $C^{(1)}$ and $C^{(2)}$, depending only on $m, A, L, B, M$ $\Gamma$ and d, such that

$$
\left|\partial_{x} u(x)\right| \leqq C^{(1)} / \rho(x)^{-1} \operatorname{Max}_{\left|x^{\prime}-x\right| \leqq \rho(x)}\left\{\left|u\left(x^{\prime}\right)\right|\right\}+C^{(2)}
$$

where $\rho(x)=\operatorname{dist}(x, \dot{D})$.
Proof. Let $a$ be any point of $D$, and let $\sum_{\kappa}$ be a closed sphere defined by

$$
\sum_{\mathrm{\kappa}}=\{x ;|x-a| \leqq \kappa \operatorname{dist}(a, \dot{D})\} \quad(0<\kappa<1)
$$

We put also

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu_{\kappa}=\operatorname{Max}_{x \in \Sigma_{\kappa}}\left\{|\partial u| \rho_{\kappa}(x)\right\} \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\rho_{\kappa}(x)=\operatorname{dist}\left(x, \dot{\Sigma}_{\kappa}\right)$. Then there exists a point $x_{0} \in \sum_{\kappa}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\partial_{x} u\left(x_{0}\right)\right| \rho_{\kappa}\left(x_{0}\right)=\mu_{\kappa} \quad\left(x_{0} \in \sum_{\kappa}\right) \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now let $T x=x^{\prime}$ be a linear transformation of coordinates such that

$$
\left.\sum_{i, j=1}^{m} a_{i j}\left(x_{0}\right) \partial_{i j}^{2} u=\sum_{i=1}^{m} \partial_{i i}^{2} u^{\prime},{ }^{8}\right)
$$

where

$$
u^{\prime}\left(x^{\prime}\right)=u(x) \quad \text { and } \quad f\left(x, u, \partial_{x} u\right)=f^{\prime}\left(x^{\prime}, u^{\prime}, \partial_{x^{\prime}} u^{\prime}\right)
$$

Then we have for (0)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta u^{\prime}=\sum_{i, j=1}^{m}\left(\delta_{i j}-a_{i j}^{\prime}\left(x^{\prime}\right)\right) \partial_{i j}^{2} u^{\prime}+f^{\prime}\left(x^{\prime}, u^{\prime},{ }_{x^{\prime}} u^{\prime}\right) \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $S_{\lambda}$ be a closed sphere in $T(D)=D^{\prime}$ with the center $x_{0}{ }^{\prime}=T\left(x_{0}\right)$ and the radius $\lambda \rho_{\mathrm{k}}\left(x_{0}\right)$, where $\lambda$ is a constant such that $0<\lambda<A^{-1 / 2} / 2$ and $S_{\lambda} \subset T\left(\sum_{k}\right)$. Let $G\left(x^{\prime}, \xi\right)$ be the Green's function of the equation $\Delta u^{\prime}=0$ with respect to the domain $S_{\lambda}$ so that from (3.6)
8) $\underset{i}{\partial u^{\prime}}$ means $\underset{x_{i}}{\partial} u^{\prime}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
u^{\prime}= & -\omega_{m}^{-1} \int_{S_{\lambda}} G\left(x^{\prime}, \xi\right)\left\{\sum_{i, j=1}^{m}\left(\delta_{i j}-a_{i j}^{\prime}(\xi)\right) \underset{i j}{\left.\left.\partial^{2} u^{\prime}(\xi)\right\} d^{m} \xi^{9}\right)}\right. \\
& -\omega_{m}^{-1} \int_{S_{\lambda}} G\left(x^{\prime}, \xi\right) f^{\prime}\left(\xi, u^{\prime}(\xi), \underset{\xi}{\partial} u^{\prime}(\xi)\right) d^{m} \xi+h\left(x^{\prime}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $h\left(x^{\prime}\right)$ is the harmonic function which takes the same value as $u^{\prime}\left(x^{\prime}\right)$ for $x^{\prime} \in \dot{S}_{\lambda}$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\partial_{x^{\prime}} u^{\prime}\left(x_{0}{ }^{\prime}\right)\right| \leqq(\mathrm{I})+(\mathrm{II})+(\mathrm{III}), \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

Since by $T$ the distance will be changed by the ratio between $A^{-1 / 2}$ and $A^{1 / 2}$, we have
(3.8) $\quad\left(\sum_{i, j=1}^{m}\left\{a_{i j}^{\prime}(\xi)-\delta_{i j}\right\}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} \leqq A^{3 / 2} L\left|\xi-x_{0}{ }^{\prime}\right|, \quad\left(\sum_{i j}\left(\partial_{\xi} a_{i j}^{\prime}\right)^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} \leqq A^{3 / 2} L$. As $\left|\partial_{x} u(x)\right| \leqq\left(1-\lambda A^{1 / 2}\right)^{-1} \rho_{\kappa}\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} \mu_{\kappa}$ in $T^{-1} S_{\lambda}\left(\subset \sum_{\kappa}\right)$, we have, taking $\lambda$ so small that $\left(1-\lambda A^{1 / 2}\right)^{-2}<2$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\partial_{\xi} u^{\prime}(\xi)\right| \leqq \sqrt{ } 2 A^{1 / 2} \rho_{\kappa}\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} \mu_{\kappa} \quad \text { for } \quad \xi \in S_{\lambda} \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

and from (3.2)
(3. 10) $\left|f^{\prime}\left(\xi, u^{\prime}(\xi),{ }_{\xi}^{\partial} u^{\prime}(\xi)\right)\right|=\left|f\left(x, u, \partial_{x} u\right)\right| \leqq 2 B \rho_{\kappa}\left(x_{0}\right)^{-2} \mu_{\kappa}^{2}+\Gamma$.

Then regarding (3.8), (3.9), (3.10), $\left|\partial x_{x^{\prime}} G\left(x_{0}{ }^{\prime}, \xi\right)\right| \leqq 2\left|\xi-x_{0}{ }^{\prime}\right|^{-m+1} \quad$ and $\left|{ }_{x^{\prime} \xi}^{2} G\left(x_{0}{ }^{\prime}, \xi\right)\right| \leqq(m+2)\left|\xi-x_{0}\right|^{-m}$, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
(\mathrm{I}) \leqq 4 \lambda \rho_{\kappa}\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} B \mu_{\kappa}^{2}+2 \lambda \rho_{\kappa}\left(x_{0}\right) \Gamma, \tag{3.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
+\left|\omega_{m}^{-1} \int_{S_{\lambda}} \underset{x^{\prime}}{ } G\left(x_{0}^{\prime}, \xi\right) \sum_{\imath}, \partial_{\xi_{j}} \partial a_{i j}^{\prime}(\xi) \partial_{i} u^{\prime}(\xi) d^{m} \xi\right|
$$

$$
+\left|\omega_{m}^{-1} \int_{S_{\lambda}} \sum_{i, j_{x^{\prime} \xi_{j}}} \partial^{2} G\left(x_{0}^{\prime}, \xi\right)\left(\delta_{i j}-a_{i j}^{\prime}(\xi)\right) \partial_{i}^{\prime}(\xi) d^{m} \xi\right|
$$

or

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { (II) } \leqq(m+6) \sqrt{ } 2 A L \lambda \mu_{\kappa} \tag{3.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

9) $\omega_{m}$ means the surface measure of the $m$-dimensional unit sphere, and $d^{m} \xi=d \xi_{1} \cdots d \xi_{m}$.
10) $d \sigma$ means the infinitesimal surface element of $S_{\lambda}$ and $n$ is the normal of $S_{\lambda}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ( } \mathrm{I})=\left|\omega_{m}^{-1} \int_{S_{\lambda}} \underset{w^{\prime}}{ } \partial G\left(x_{0}{ }^{\prime}, \xi\right) f^{\prime} d^{m} \xi\right|, \\
& \text { ( II ) }=\left|\omega_{m}^{-1} \int_{S_{\lambda}} \underset{x^{\prime}}{ } \partial\left(x_{0}{ }^{\prime}, \xi\right) \sum_{i j}\left(\delta_{i j}-a_{i j}^{\prime}(\xi)\right) \partial_{i j}^{2} u^{\prime}(\xi) d^{m} \xi\right|, \\
& \text { (III) }=\left|\partial_{x} h\left(x_{0}{ }^{\prime}\right)\right| \text {. }
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\text { (III) } \leqq \lambda^{-1} \rho_{\kappa}\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} \operatorname{Max}\left\{\left|u^{\prime}\left(x^{\prime}\right)\right| ;\left|x^{\prime}-x_{0}{ }^{\prime}\right| \leqq \lambda \rho_{\kappa}\left(x_{0}\right)\right\},
$$

hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { (III) } \leqq \lambda^{-1} \rho_{\kappa}\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} \sup _{|x-a| \leqq \leqq^{\rho}(a)}|u(x)| . \tag{3.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

As

$$
\left|{ }_{x^{\prime}}^{\partial} u^{\prime}(x)\right| \geqq A^{-1 / 2}\left|\partial_{x} u\left(x_{0}\right)\right|=A^{-1 / 2} \rho_{\kappa}\left(x_{0}\right)^{-1} \mu_{\kappa}
$$

and $\rho_{\kappa}\left(x_{0}\right)<2 \rho(a) \leqq d$, we get from (3.7), (3.11), (3.12) and (3.13),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda C_{0} \mu_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}-\left(1-\lambda C_{1}\right) \mu_{\mathrm{k}}+\lambda^{-1} C_{2} \geq 0, \tag{3.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
C_{0}=4 A^{1 / 2} B, \quad C_{1}=\sqrt{ } 2(m+6) A^{5 / 2} L d
$$

and

$$
C_{2}=A^{1 / 2} \sup _{|x-a| \leqq \rho(a)}|u(x)|+8 \lambda \rho(a)^{2} A^{1 / 2} \Gamma .
$$

Since $C_{0} C_{2} \leqq 4 A B M+8 \lambda d^{2} A B \Gamma$, by (3.3) we can take $\lambda>0$, depending only on $m, A, L, B, \Gamma$ and $d$, so small that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda C_{1}<1 / 2 \quad \text { and } \quad\left(1-\lambda C_{1}\right)^{2}>4\left(\lambda C_{0}\right)\left(\lambda^{-1} C_{2}\right) . \tag{3.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $R_{1}$ and $R_{2}\left(R_{1}<R_{2}\right)$ be the distinct real roots of the equation in $X$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda C_{0} X^{2}-\left(1-\lambda C_{1}\right) X+\lambda^{-1} C_{2}=0 . \tag{3.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then we have from (3.14)

$$
\mu_{\mathrm{\kappa}} \leqq R_{1} \quad \text { or } \quad \mu_{\mathrm{\kappa}} \geqq R_{2}\left(R_{1}<R_{2}\right) .
$$

But we can easily see from (3.4) that $\mu_{\kappa}$ depends on $\kappa$ continuously for $0<\kappa<1$ and $\lim _{\kappa \rightarrow 0} \mu_{\kappa}=0$. Then we have only $\mu_{\kappa} \leqq R_{1}$. And, letting $\kappa$ tend to 1 , by the definition of $\mu_{\kappa}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\partial_{x} u(a)\right| \leqq R_{1} \rho(a)^{-1} . \tag{3.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

As $R_{1}$ is the smaller root of (3.16) and $\lambda C_{1}<1 / 2$,

$$
R_{1}<\frac{4 C_{2}}{2 \lambda\left(1-\lambda C_{1}\right)}<4 \lambda^{-1} C_{2} .
$$

Thus from (3.17)

$$
\left|\partial_{x} u(a)\right| \leqq C^{(1)} \rho(a)^{-1} \sup _{|x-a| \leqq \leqq^{\rho}(a)}|u(x)|+C^{(2)},
$$

where $C^{(1)}=4 \lambda^{-1} A^{1 / 2}$ and $C^{(2)}=16 d A^{1 / 2} \Gamma^{\prime}$ depend only on $m, A, L, B, M$, $\Gamma$ and $d$, q.e.d,

Corollary. If we replace the condition (3.2) in Theorem 2 by

$$
\begin{equation*}
|f(x, u, p)| \leqq \Gamma \tag{3.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

and omit (3.3), then there exists a constant $C_{A, L, a}$ depending only on $m, A, L$ and $d$, such that

$$
|\partial u(x)| \leqq C_{A, L, d} \rho(x)^{-1} \sup _{\left|x^{\prime}-x\right| \leqq \rho(x)}\left|u\left(x^{\prime}\right)\right|+8 A^{1 / 2} \rho(x) \Gamma .
$$

where $\rho(x)=\operatorname{dist}(x, \dot{D})$.
Proof. We have instead of (3.14)

$$
\left(1-\lambda C_{1}\right) \mu_{\mathrm{k}} \leqq \lambda^{-1} C_{2} .
$$

Then, putting $\lambda=C_{1} / 2$, we get

$$
\mu_{\kappa} \leqq 2 C_{1}^{-1} A^{1 / 2} \sup _{|x-a| \leqq^{\rho}(a)}|u(x)|+8 A^{1 / 2} \rho(a)^{2} \Gamma
$$

Thus we have from (3.4), letting $\kappa$ tend to 1 ,

$$
\left|\partial_{x}^{\partial} u(a)\right| \leqq C_{A, L, a} \rho(a)^{-1} \sup _{|x-a| \leqq \rho(a)}|u(x)|+8 A^{1 / 2} \rho(a) \Gamma,
$$

where $C_{A, L, d}=\sqrt{ } 2(m+6) A^{3} L d$, q. e. d.

## § 3 Existence theorem for bounded $\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{p})$

4. We say that $f(x, u, p)$ is $H_{\alpha}$-continuous in the finite part of a $2 m+1$-dimensional domain $D^{*}$, when there exists a constant $H_{M, N}$ depending on arbitrary positive numbers $M$ and $N$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|f\left(x^{\prime}, u^{\prime}, p^{\prime}\right)-f(x, u, p)\right| \leqq H_{3, N}\left\{\left|x^{\prime}-x\right|^{\alpha}+\left|u^{\prime}-u\right|^{\alpha}+\left|p^{\prime}-p\right|^{\alpha}\right\} \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

for any $(x, u, p),\left(x^{\prime}, u^{\prime}, p^{\prime}\right)$ with the restriction $|u|,\left|u^{\prime}\right| \leqq M$ and $|p|,\left|p^{\prime}\right| \leqq N$.

Theorem 3. Let $D$ be a bounded domain with the diameter $d$, the boundary $\dot{D}$ being a hypersurface of type $B h$, and let $a_{i j}(x)$ be $H_{1}-$ continuous in $\bar{D}$. Let $f(x, u, p)$ be $H_{a}$-continuous $(0<\alpha<1)$ in the finite part of

$$
D^{*}=\{(x, u, p) ; x \in \bar{D},|u|<+\infty,|p|<+\infty\}
$$

and bounded:

$$
\begin{equation*}
|f(x, u, p)| \leqq \Gamma \quad \text { in } D^{*} . \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then there exists a solution $u(x)$ of (0) with the boundary value $u=0$ ( $x \in \dot{D}$ ) such that $\|u(x)\|_{D}^{\alpha, 2}<+\infty$.

Proof. For fixed positive constants $N$ and $\Lambda$, let $\mathfrak{F}_{N, \Lambda}$ be the set of functions $v(x) \in C^{1}[\bar{D}]$ with the following properties:

$$
\begin{equation*}
v(x)=0 \quad \text { for } x \in \dot{D} \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
|\partial v(x)| \leqq N \quad \text { in } D, \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\partial_{x} v\left(x^{\prime}\right)-\partial_{x} v(x)\right| \leqq \Lambda\left|x^{\prime}-x\right| \quad \text { for } x, x^{\prime} \in D . \tag{4.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
|v(x)| \leqq N d \quad \text { for all } v(x) \in \mathfrak{F}_{N, \Lambda} \tag{4.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\mathfrak{F}_{N, \Lambda}$ is a compact convex set in $\mathrm{C}^{1}[\bar{D}]$, where $\mathrm{C}^{1}[\bar{D}]$ is a Banach space with the norm

$$
\|v\|=\operatorname{Max}_{\bar{D}}|v(x)|+\underset{\bar{D}}{\operatorname{Max}}\left|\partial_{x} v(x)\right|
$$

For convenience we write $f_{[v\}}(x)=f\left(x, v(x),{\underset{x}{x}}_{\partial v}(x)\right)$, then $f_{\{v]}$ is $H_{\alpha^{-}}$ continuous in $D$ for $v \in \mathfrak{F}_{N \Lambda}$. Because, there exists a constant $\kappa \geq 1$ such that any pair of points $x$ and $x^{\prime}$ in $D$ can be joined by a curve in $D$ with length $\leqq \kappa\left|x-x^{\prime}\right|$, hence from (4.4)

$$
\left|v\left(x^{\prime}\right)-v(x)\right| \leqq \kappa N\left|x^{\prime}-x\right| \quad \text { for all } v \in \mathfrak{F}_{N, \Lambda}
$$

Thus by (4.1), (4.5) and (4.6)

$$
\begin{equation*}
H_{D}^{\alpha}\left(f_{(v)}\right) \leqq H_{N a, N}\left(1+(\kappa N)^{\alpha}+\Lambda^{\alpha}\right) . \tag{4.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now by Schauder's Theorem B, for any $v \in \mathscr{F}_{N \Lambda}$, there exists the solution $u(x)$ of

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i, j=1}^{m} a_{i j}(x) \partial_{i j}^{2} u=f_{!v j}(x) \tag{4.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

with the boundary value $u=0(x \in \dot{D})$, which satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\partial_{x}^{2} u\right|+H_{D}^{\alpha}\left(\partial_{x}^{2} u\right) \leqq C^{(1)}\left\{\underset{\bar{D}}{ }\left|\operatorname{Max}_{\lceil v]}\right|+H_{D}^{\alpha}\left(f_{[v)}\right)\right\}, \tag{4.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $C^{(1)}$ depend only on $D, A$ and $L$, as there exist constants $A$ and $L$ such that (2.1) and (3.1) hold.

Since $D$ has the property $((\sigma))$ for certain $\sigma>0$, we have by (4.2) and Lemma 1,
(4.10) $\quad|u(x)| \leqq C_{A, \sigma, a} \rho(x) \Gamma, \quad$ where $\quad \rho(x)=\operatorname{dist}(x, \dot{D})$.

Then from Corollary in $\S 3$, by (4.10),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\partial_{x} u(x)\right| \leqq C^{*} \Gamma \tag{4.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $C^{*}$ is a constant depending only on $m, A, L, \sigma$ and $d$. Now we put

$$
\begin{equation*}
N=C * \Gamma=N_{0} . \tag{4.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then from (4.7) and (4.9), for any $v \in \mathfrak{F} N_{0}, \Lambda$,

$$
\left|\partial_{x}^{2} u\right| \leqq C^{(1)}\left\{\Gamma+H_{0}\left(1+\left(\kappa N_{0}\right)^{\alpha}+\Lambda^{\alpha}\right)\right\} \quad\left(H_{0}=H_{N_{0} d, N_{0}}\right),
$$

hence
(4.13) $\quad\left|\partial_{x} u\left(x^{\prime}\right)-{\underset{x}{x}} u(x)\right| \leqq \kappa C^{(1)}\left\{\Gamma+H_{0}\left(1+\left(\kappa N_{0}\right)^{\alpha}+\Lambda^{\alpha}\right)\right\}\left|x^{\prime}-x\right|$.

Since $0<\alpha<1$, we can choose $\Lambda_{0}$ so large that

$$
\kappa C^{(1)}\left\{\Gamma+H_{0}\left(1+\left(\kappa N_{0}\right)^{\alpha}+\Lambda_{0}^{\alpha}\right)\right\} \leqq \Lambda_{0} .
$$

Then by (4.13)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\partial_{x} u\left(x^{\prime}\right)-{ }_{x} u(x)\right| \leqq \Lambda_{0}\left|x^{\prime}-x\right| . \tag{4.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

If we denote by $\Phi$ the transformation of $v \in \mathfrak{F}_{N_{0}, \Lambda_{0}}$ into the solution $u$ of (4.8) with the boundary value $u=0(x \in \dot{D})$ :

$$
u=\Phi[v]
$$

such that $\|u\|_{D}^{\alpha, 2}<+\infty$, then (4.11), (4.12) and (4.14) show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Phi\left(\mathfrak{F}_{N_{0}, \Lambda_{0}}\right) \subset \mathfrak{F}_{N_{0}, \Lambda_{0}} \tag{4.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

The mapping $\Phi$ of $\mathfrak{F}_{N_{0}, \Lambda_{0}}$ into itself is continuous in $\mathrm{C}^{1}[\bar{D}]$. Because, if $v, v^{\prime} \in \mathfrak{F}_{N_{0}, \Lambda_{0}}$
(4. 16) $\quad\left|f_{[v]}-f_{[v, \prime}\right| \leqq H_{0}\left(\left|v^{\prime}-v\right|^{\alpha}+\left|\partial_{x} v^{\prime}-{\underset{x}{x}} v\right|^{\alpha}\right) \leqq 2 H_{0}\left(\left\|v^{\prime}-v\right\|\right)^{\alpha}$.

And for $u=\Phi[v]$ and $u^{\prime}=\Phi\left[v^{\prime}\right]$

$$
\sum_{i, j=1}^{m} a_{i j}(x) \partial_{i j}^{2}\left(u-u^{\prime}\right)=f_{\{v\}}(x)-f_{\left[v^{\prime}\right\}}(x) \quad \text { in } D
$$

and $u(x)-u^{\prime}(x)=0$ for $x \in \dot{D}$. Thus by Lemma 1 and Corollary in $\S 2$, replacing $\Gamma$ by $2 H_{0}\left(\left\|v^{\prime}-v\right\|\right)^{\infty}$ in (4.10) and (4.11), we get

$$
\left|u(x)-u^{\prime}(x)\right| \leqq 2 C_{A, \sigma, a} d H_{0}\left(\left\|v-v^{\prime}\right\|\right)^{\alpha}
$$

and

$$
\left|\partial_{x} u-{ }_{x}^{\partial} u^{\prime}\right| \leqq 2 C^{*} H_{0}\left(\left\|v-v^{\prime}\right\|\right)^{\infty}
$$

These show the continuity of $\Phi$. Then from (4.15), by the fixed point theorem in functional space, ${ }^{11)}$ there exists a $u_{0} \in \mathfrak{F}_{N_{0}, \Delta_{0}}$ such that

$$
\Phi\left[u_{0}\right]=u_{0}
$$

[^4]Then $u_{0}(x)$ is a solution of ( 0 ) with the boundary value $u=0$, q.e.d.

## §4 Existence theorem for regular boundary condition

5. Lemma 2. Let $D$ be a bounded domain with the property $((\sigma))$ and the diameter $d$. Let $a_{i j}(x)$ be subjected to the conditions (2.1) and (3.1), and $f(x, u, p)$ to the condition (3.2) Let $u(x)$ be a solution of ( 0 ) with the boundary value $u=0(x \in \dot{D})$ and satisfy (3.3). Then there exists a constant $C$ \# depending only on $m, A, L, B, \Gamma, M, \sigma$ and d, such that

$$
\left|\partial_{x} u(x)\right| \leqq C^{\#} .
$$

Proof. First we shall prove the existence of a constant $C^{*}$ depending only on $m, A, L, B, \Gamma, M$ and $\sigma$ such that for the solution of ( 0 ), which vanishes on $D$ and satisfy (3.3), holds the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
|u(x)| \leqq C^{*} \operatorname{dist}(x, \dot{D}) . \tag{5.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $x_{0}$ be any point of $D$ and let $p$ be a point of $\dot{D}$ such that $\left|x_{0}-p\right|=\operatorname{dist}\left(x_{0}, \dot{D}\right)$. Let $S_{p}$ be a closed sphere with the radius $\sigma$ such that $S_{p} \cap \bar{D}=(p)$, and $c$ be the center of $S_{p}$. Then the function

$$
\begin{equation*}
\omega(x)=M \log \left[\left(r-\sigma^{\prime}\right) /\left(\sigma-\sigma^{\prime}\right)\right], \tag{5.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
r=|x-c|, \quad \sigma^{\prime}=\left(1-\varepsilon^{2}\right) \sigma,
$$

satisfies the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Phi[\omega] \equiv \sum_{i, j=1}^{m} a_{i j}(x)_{i j}^{\partial^{2}} \omega+B\left|{ }_{x} \omega\right|^{2}+\mathrm{\Gamma}^{\prime} \leqq 0 \tag{5.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $\sigma \leqq|x-c| \leqq \sigma(1+\varepsilon)$, where $\Gamma^{\prime}>\Gamma>0$ (for example $\Gamma^{\prime \prime}=\Gamma+1$ ) and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon=\operatorname{Min}\left\{\left(2 m A^{2}\right)^{-1}, \quad \sigma^{-1}\left(M / 8 A \Gamma^{\prime}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\} . \tag{5.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

In fact, as $\left(r-\sigma^{\prime}\right) r^{-1} \leqq \varepsilon<1 / 4$ for $\sigma \leqq r \leqq \sigma(1+\varepsilon), 2 A B M<1 / 2$, $\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_{i i} \leqq m A$ and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& r^{-2} \sum_{i, j=1}^{m} a_{i j}(x)\left(x_{i}-c_{i}\right)\left(x_{j}-c_{j}\right) \equiv \alpha(x) \leqq A^{-1}, \\
\Phi[\omega]= & M\left(r-\sigma^{\prime}\right)^{-2}\left\{\left(r-\sigma^{\prime}\right) r^{-1} \sum_{i} a_{i i}-\left(1+\left(r-\sigma^{\prime}\right) r^{-1}\right) \alpha(x)\right\} \\
& +B M^{2}\left(r-\sigma^{\prime}\right)^{-2}+\Gamma^{\prime} \\
\leqq & M\left(r-\sigma^{\prime}\right)^{-2}\left(\varepsilon m A-A^{-1}+B M\right)+\Gamma^{\prime} \\
\leqq & \Gamma^{\prime}-M(1-2 A B M) / 2 A\left(r-\sigma^{\prime}\right)^{2} \\
< & \Gamma^{\prime}-M / 8 A \varepsilon^{2} \sigma^{2} \leqq 0 \quad \text { (by (5.4)). }
\end{aligned}
$$

We have also, as $\log \left(1+\varepsilon^{-1}\right)>\log 5>1$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\omega(x)>M \quad \text { for } \quad|x-c|=(1+\varepsilon) \sigma . \tag{5.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $D_{\mathrm{\varepsilon}}$ be the part of $D$ defined by

$$
D_{\varepsilon}=\{x ; x \in D,|x-c|<(1+\varepsilon) \sigma\}
$$

then $\omega(x)$ is a quasi-supersolution of $\Phi=0$ in $D_{\varepsilon}$. But $u(x)$ satisfies the inequalities

$$
\Phi[u]<0 \quad \text { in } D_{\varepsilon}, \quad u(x) \leqq \omega(x) \text { for } x \in \dot{D}_{\varepsilon}
$$

Thus, by Theorem 1,

$$
u(x) \leqq \omega(x)=M \log \left[\left(|x-c|-\sigma^{\prime}\right) /\left(\sigma-\sigma^{\prime}\right)\right] \quad \text { for } x \in D_{\varepsilon}
$$

We get a similar inequality, if we replace $u(x)$ by $-u(x)$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
|u(x)| \leqq M \log \left[\left(|x-c|-\sigma^{\prime}\right) /\left(\sigma-\sigma^{\prime}\right)\right] \quad \text { for } x \in D_{\varepsilon} \tag{5.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

As $\log \left[\left(r-\sigma^{\prime}\right) /\left(\sigma-\sigma^{\prime}\right)\right] \leqq\left(\sigma-\sigma^{\prime}\right)^{-1}(r-\sigma)=\left(\sigma \varepsilon^{2}\right)^{-1}(r-\sigma)$ for $r \geqq \sigma$ and $r-\sigma=\operatorname{dist}\left(x_{0}, \dot{D}\right)$ for $x=x_{0}$, we get from (5.6)

$$
\left|u\left(x_{0}\right)\right| \leqq\left(\sigma \varepsilon^{2}\right)^{-1} M \operatorname{dist}\left(x_{0}, D\right) \quad \text { for } x_{0} \in D_{z}
$$

But this inequality holds also for $x_{0} \in D-D_{\varepsilon}$. (5.1) is thus proved.
Now by Theorem 2 we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
|\partial u(x)| \leqq C^{(1)} \rho(x)^{-1} \operatorname{Max}_{\left|x^{\prime}-x\right| \leqq \rho(x)}\left|u\left(x^{\prime}\right)\right|+C^{(2)} \tag{5.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\rho(x)=\operatorname{dist}(x, \dot{D})$, and $C^{(1)}$ and $C^{(2)}$ depend only on $m, A, L, B, \Gamma$, $M$ and $d$. And, as by (5.1)

$$
\left|u\left(x^{\prime}\right)\right| \leqq 2 C^{*} \rho(x) \quad \text { for } \quad\left|x^{\prime}-x\right| \leqq \rho(x)
$$

we get from (5.7)

$$
\left|{ }_{x} u(x)\right| \leqq 2 C^{*} C^{(1)}+C^{(2)}=C^{\#}, \quad \text { q. e. d. }
$$

6. Theorem 4. Let $D$ be a bounded domain with the boundary of type Bh. Let $a_{i j}(x)$ be $H_{1}$-continuous in $\bar{D}$, and let $f(x, u, p)$ be $H_{\alpha^{-}}$ continuous $(0<a<1)$ in the finite part of

$$
D^{*}=\{(x, u, p) ; x \in \bar{D}, \quad \underline{\omega}(x) \leqq u \leqq \bar{\omega}(x),|p|<+\infty\}
$$

where $\bar{\omega}(x)$ and $\underline{\omega}(x)$ are quasi-supersolution and quasi-subsolution of $(0)$ respectively such that

$$
|\underline{\omega}(x)| \leqq M, \quad|\bar{\omega}(x)| \leqq M, \quad \underline{\omega}(x)<\bar{\omega}(x) .
$$

And there is a finite set $\left\{U_{j}\right\}_{j=1}^{n}$ such that (0.1) and (0.2) hold in each $U=U_{j}$ and $\bigcup_{j=1}^{n} U_{j} \supset \bar{D}$. Let $a_{i j}(x)$ be also subjected to the condition (2.1) and $f(x, u, p)$ to the condition (3.2), where (3.3) holds. Then there exists $a$ solution of $(0)$ with the boundary value $\beta(x)(x \in \dot{D})$ such that

$$
\underline{\omega}(x) \leqq u(x) \leqq \bar{\omega}(x) \quad \text { and } \quad\|u(x)\|_{D}^{\alpha, 2}<+\infty
$$

where $\beta(x)$ is a given function of $\mathrm{C}^{3}[\bar{D}]$ such that

$$
\underline{\omega}(x)<\beta(x)<\bar{\omega}(x) \quad \text { in } D .
$$

Proof. Without loss of generality we can assume that $\beta(x)=0$. Then we put

$$
\begin{equation*}
N_{0}=\operatorname{Max}\left\{\operatorname{Max}_{U_{j}}\left|{\underset{x}{x}}_{\partial_{\nu}}\right|, \quad \operatorname{Max}_{U_{j}}\left|\partial_{x} \omega_{\nu}\right|, \quad C \#_{(\Gamma+1)}\right\},,^{12)} \tag{6.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $C \#_{(\Gamma+1)}$ is the constant given in Lemma 2 but $\Gamma$ is replaced by $\Gamma+1$. We define $f^{*}(x, u, p)$ by
(6.2) $f^{*}(x, u, p)= \begin{cases}f(x, u, p) & \text { if }|p| \leqq N_{0}, \\ f\left(x, u, N_{0}|p|^{-1} p\right) & \text { if }|p|>N_{0},\end{cases}$
and then $f \#(x, u, p)$ by
(6.3) $f \#(x, u, p)=\left\{\begin{array}{l}f^{*}(x, \bar{\omega}(x), p)+\frac{u-\bar{\omega}(x)}{1+u-\bar{\omega}(x)} \quad \text { for } u>\bar{\omega}(x), \\ f^{*}(x, u, p) \quad \text { for } \underline{\omega}(x) \leqq u \leqq \bar{\omega}(x), \\ f^{*}(x, \underline{\omega}(x), p)+\frac{u-\underline{\omega}(x)}{1+\underline{\omega}(x)-u} \quad \text { for } u<\underline{\omega}(x) .\end{array}\right.$

We can easily prove that $f \#(x, u, p)$ is bounded and $H_{a}$-continuous in

$$
D_{\#}^{\#}=\{(x, u, p) ; x \in \bar{D}, \quad|u|<+\infty,|p|<+\infty\}
$$

Then by Theorem 3 there exists a solution $u(x)$ of

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i, j=1}^{m} a_{i j}(x)_{i j}^{2} u=f \#\left(x, u, \partial_{x} u\right) \tag{6.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

vanishing on $\dot{D}$ such that $\|u(x)\|_{D}^{\alpha, 2}<+\infty . u(x)$ must satisfy the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\underline{\omega}(x) \leqq u(x) \leqq \bar{\omega}(x) . \tag{6.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

In fact, as $f \#\left(x, \bar{\omega}_{\nu}(x),{\underset{x}{x}}_{\partial} \bar{\omega}_{\nu}(x)\right)=f\left(x, \bar{\omega}_{\nu}(x),{\underset{x}{x}}^{\partial} \bar{\omega}_{\nu}(x)\right)$ for $x$ and $\nu$ such that $\bar{\omega}(x)=\bar{\omega}_{\nu}(x), \bar{\omega}(x)$ is a quasi-supersolution of the equation

[^5]$$
\Phi[u] \equiv \sum_{i, j=1}^{m} a_{i j}(x) \partial_{i j}^{2} u-f \#\left(x, \bar{\omega}(x), \partial_{x} u\right)=0 .
$$

But, as $f \#(x, \bar{\omega}(x), p)=f^{*}(x, \bar{\omega}(x), p), u(x)$ satisfies

$$
\Phi[u]=\frac{u-\bar{\omega}(x)}{1+u-\bar{\omega}(x)}>0
$$

for $x$ such that $u(x)>\bar{\omega}(x)$, and $u(x)=0 \leqq \bar{\omega}(x)$ for $x \in \dot{D}$. Then by Theorem 1 we get

$$
u(x) \leqq \bar{\omega}(x) \quad \text { in } D
$$

Similarly we obtain $u(x) \geqq \underline{\omega}(x)$ in $D$.
Now $f$ \# satisfies the condition

$$
|f \#(x, u, p)| \leqq B|p|^{2}+\Gamma+1,
$$

and for $u(x)$ holds $|u(x)| \leqq M$, and $16 A B M<1$. Then by Lemma 2 we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|{ }_{x} u(x)\right| \leqq C \#_{(\Gamma+1)} \leqq N_{0} . \tag{6.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

(6.5) and (6.6) show that $u(x)$ is a solution of (0), q.e.d.

## §5 Preparation for the general boundary condition.

7. Lemma 3. Let $D$ be a bounded domain. Let $a_{i j}(x)$ be subjected to the conditions (2.1) and (3.1), and $f(x, u, p)$ to the conditions (3.2) and (4.1) in

$$
D^{*}=\{(x, u, p) ; x \in \bar{D}, \underline{\omega}(x) \leqq u \leqq \bar{\omega}(x), \quad|p|<+\infty\}
$$

where $\omega(x)$ and $\bar{\omega}(x)$ are continuous functions on $D$ such that

$$
|\underline{\omega}(x)| \leqq M,|\bar{\omega}(x)| \leqq M \quad \text { and } 16 A B M<1 .
$$

Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be the set of all solutions $u(x)$ of $(0)$ such that

$$
\underline{\omega}(x) \leqq u(x) \leqq \bar{\omega}(x) \quad \text { and }\|u\|_{D}^{\alpha, 2}<+\infty .
$$

Then, for any closed sphere $S$ in $D$, there exist constants $C_{S}^{i}, C_{S}^{\mathrm{ii}}$ and $C_{s}^{\text {iii }}$ such that for all $u \in \mathfrak{F}$

$$
\left|\partial_{x} u(x)\right| \leqq C_{S}^{\mathrm{i}},\left|\partial_{x}^{2} u(x)\right| \leqq C_{S}^{\mathrm{ii}} \quad \text { for } x \in S
$$

and

$$
H_{S}^{\alpha}(u) \leqq C_{S}^{\mathrm{iii}} .
$$

Proof. Let $\delta$ be the distance between $S$ and $\dot{D}$. Then by Theorem 3

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\partial_{\not x} u(x)\right| \leqq C^{(1)} M \delta^{-1}+C^{(2)} \equiv C_{S}^{\mathrm{i}} \quad \text { for } \quad x \in S, \tag{7.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now let $S^{\prime}$ be the sphere concentric with $S$ such that $\operatorname{rad}\left(S^{\prime}\right)=\operatorname{rad}(S)$ $+\delta / 2$. We put

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu=\operatorname{Max}_{x \in S^{\prime}}\left\{\left|{ }_{x}^{2} u(x)\right| \cdot \rho(x)^{k}\right\} \tag{7.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\rho(x)=\operatorname{dist}\left(x, \dot{S}^{\prime}\right)$ and $k$ is a positive constant to be defined afterwards. Then there exists a point $x_{0} \in S^{\prime}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\partial_{x}^{2} u\left(x_{0}\right)\right| \cdot \rho\left(x_{0}\right)^{k}=\mu \tag{7.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $\Sigma$ be the closed sphere with the center $x_{0}$ and the radius $\rho\left(x_{0}\right) / 2$. Then, as $\rho(x) \geq \rho\left(x_{0}\right) / 2$ for $x \in \Sigma$, we have from (7.2)

$$
\left|\partial_{x}^{2} u(x)\right| \leqq 2^{k} \rho\left(x_{0}\right)^{-k} \mu \quad \text { for } \quad x \in \Sigma .
$$

Hence
(7.4) $\quad\left|{ }_{x} u\left(x^{\prime}\right)-{ }_{x}^{\partial} u(x)\right| \leqq 2^{k} \rho\left(x_{0}\right)^{-k} \mu\left|x^{\prime}-x\right| \quad$ for $\quad x, x^{\prime} \in \sum$.

From (7.1) we get also

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|u\left(x^{\prime}\right)-u(x)\right| \leqq C_{S^{\prime}}^{\mathrm{i}}\left|x^{\prime}-x\right| \quad \text { for } \quad x, x^{\prime} \in \sum\left(\subset S^{\prime}\right) . \tag{7.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then by (4.1) we obtain for $x, x^{\prime} \in \Sigma$

$$
\left|f_{〔 u\rfloor}\left(x^{\prime}\right)-f_{\lceil u, 3}(x)\right| \leqq H_{1}\left(1+\left(C_{s^{\prime}}^{\mathrm{i}}\right)^{\alpha}+2^{\alpha k} \rho_{0}{ }^{-\alpha k} \mu^{\alpha}\right)\left|x^{\prime}-x\right|^{\alpha}
$$



$$
\begin{equation*}
H_{\frac{2}{\alpha}}^{\alpha}\left(f_{[u]}\right) \leqq C_{S}^{(1)}+C_{S}^{(2)} \rho_{0}{ }^{-\alpha k} \mu^{\alpha} \tag{7.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
C_{S}^{(1)}=H_{1}\left(1+\left(C_{S^{\prime}}^{\mathrm{i}}\right)^{\alpha}\right), C_{S}^{(2)}=2^{\alpha k} H_{1}
$$

By Schauder's Theorem A we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\partial_{x}^{2} u\left(x_{0}\right)\right| & \leqq C_{(A, L)}\left(\rho_{0} / 2\right)^{-4}\left\{H_{\Sigma}^{\alpha}\left(f_{[u]}\right)+\operatorname{Max}_{\Sigma}\left|f_{[u]}\right|+\underset{\Sigma}{\operatorname{Max}}|u|\right\} \\
& \leqq 16 C_{(A, L)} \rho_{0}^{-4}\left\{H_{\Sigma}^{\alpha}\left(f_{[u]}\right)+B\left(C_{S^{\prime}}^{\mathrm{i}}\right)^{2}+\Gamma+M\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Then by (7.6), putting $k=4(1-\alpha)^{-1}$, we get

$$
\rho_{0}^{k}\left|\partial_{x}^{2} u\left(x_{0}\right)\right| \leqq C_{S}^{(3)} \rho_{0}^{k-4}+C_{S}^{(4)} \mu^{\alpha}
$$

where $C_{S}^{(3)}$ and $C_{S}^{(4)}$ are positive constants depending on $S$. Thus from (7.3), as $k<4$ and $\rho_{0} \leqq \operatorname{rad}\left(S^{\prime}\right)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu \leqq C_{S}^{(3)} \operatorname{rad}\left(S^{\prime}\right)^{k-4}+C_{s}^{(4)} \mu^{\alpha} \tag{7.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

But, since $0<\alpha<1$, we obtain from (7.7)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu \leqq C_{s}^{(5)} \tag{7.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $C_{S}^{(5)}$ is a positive constant depending on $S$. Then, as $\rho(x) \geqq \delta / 2$ for $x \in S$, from (7.2) and (7.8)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mid{ }_{x}^{\partial^{2} u(x) \mid \leqq 2^{k} C_{S}^{(5)} \delta^{-k} \equiv C_{S}^{\mathrm{ii}} \text { in } S \text { for all } u \in \mathfrak{F} . . . \text {. }{ }^{2} .} \tag{7.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now we get easily from (4.1), (7.5) and (7.9), replacing $S$ by $S^{\prime}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
H_{s^{\prime}}^{\alpha}\left(f_{〔 u\}}\right) \leqq H_{1}\left\{1+\left(C_{s^{\prime}}^{\mathrm{i}}\right)^{\alpha}+\left(C_{S^{\prime}}^{\mathrm{ii}}\right)^{\alpha}\right\} . \tag{7.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

But by Schauder's Theorem A

$$
\begin{aligned}
H_{S}^{\alpha}\left(\partial_{x}^{2} u\right) & \leqq C_{(A, L)}(\delta / 2)^{-4}\left\{H_{S^{\prime}}^{\alpha}\left(f_{[u u)}\right)+\operatorname{Max}_{S^{\prime}}\left|f_{[u]}\right|+\operatorname{Max}_{S^{\prime}}|u|\right\} \\
& \leqq 16 C_{(A, L)} \delta^{-4}\left\{H_{S^{\prime}}^{\alpha}\left(f_{\lceil u]}\right)+B\left(C_{S^{\prime}}^{\mathrm{i}}\right)^{2}+\Gamma+M\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus by (7.10) there exists a constant $C_{S}^{\mathrm{iii}}$ such that

$$
H_{s}^{\alpha}\left(\partial_{x}^{2} u\right) \leqq C_{s}^{\mathrm{iii}} \quad \text { for all } \quad u \in \mathfrak{F}, \quad \text { q.e. d. }
$$

8. Now we assume the existence of a sequence of domains $\left\{D_{n}\right\}$ such that $\bar{D}_{n-1} \subset D_{n}, \bigvee_{x=1}^{\infty} D_{n}=D$ and $\dot{D}_{n}$ is of type $B h$. We can prove the existence of such sequence $\left\{D_{n}\right\}$ for any open domain $D$, but we will not enter into it here.

Theorem 5. Let $a_{i j}(x)$ be $H_{1}$-continuous in each $\bar{D}_{n}$ and satisfy (2.1) in D. Let $f(x, u, p)$ be $H_{a}$-continuous $(0<\alpha<1)$ in the finite part of each

$$
D_{n}^{*}=\left\{(x, u, p) ; x \in \bar{D}_{n}, \underline{\omega}(x) \leqq u \leqq \bar{\omega}(x), \quad|p|<+\infty\right\},
$$

where $\underline{\omega}(x)$ and $\bar{\omega}(x)$ are bounded continuous functions such that

$$
|\underline{\omega}(x)| \leqq M,|\bar{\omega}(x)| \leqq M,
$$

and

$$
|f(x, u, p)| \leqq B|p|^{2}+\Gamma_{n} \quad \text { in } D_{n}^{*},
$$

where $B$ and $\Gamma_{n}$ are positive constants such that $16 A B M<1$. Let $\left\{\ddot{\omega}_{\gamma}(x)\right\}$ and $\left\{\underline{\omega}_{\gamma}(x)\right\}(\gamma \in \Omega)$ be systems of quasi-supersolutions and quasisubsolutions of $(0)$ respectively such that

$$
\underline{\omega}(x) \leqq \underline{\omega}_{\gamma}(x)<\bar{\omega}_{\gamma^{\prime}}(x) \leqq \bar{\omega}(x) \text { in } D \quad\left(\gamma, \gamma^{\prime} \in \Omega\right) .
$$

Then there exists a solution $u(x)$ of $(0)$ such that

$$
\sup _{\gamma \in \Omega} \omega_{\gamma}(x) \leqq u(x) \leqq \inf _{\gamma \in \Omega} \bar{\omega}_{\gamma}(x) \quad \text { in } D .
$$

Proof. First we consider a fixed $\gamma \in \Omega$. Let $\beta_{n}(x)$ be a function of $\mathrm{C}^{3}[\bar{D}]$ such that $\underline{\omega}_{\gamma}(x)<\beta_{n}(x)<\bar{\omega}_{\gamma}(x)$ in $D_{n}$. Then by Theorem 3
there exists a solution $u_{n}(x)$ of $(0)$ such that $u_{n}(x)=\beta_{n}(x)$ for $x \in \dot{D}_{n}$,

$$
\underline{\omega}_{\gamma}(x) \leqq u_{n}(x) \leqq \bar{\omega}_{\gamma}(x) \quad \text { in } D_{n}, \quad \text { and }\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{D_{n}}^{\alpha, 2}<+\infty .
$$

Let $S$ be any closed sphere in $D$, then $S \subset D_{i}$ for sufficiently large $i$. By Lemma 3 the sequences $\left\{u_{n}(x)\right\},\left\{\partial u_{n}(x)\right\}$ and $\left\{\partial_{x}^{2} u_{n}(x)\right\}$ are all uniformly bounded and equi-continuous in $S$. Then, as $S$ is an arbitrary closed sphere in $D$, we can choose a sequence of natural numbers $\{n(\nu)\}(n(\nu+1)>n(\nu))$ in such a way that the sequences

$$
\left\{u_{n(\nu)}(x)\right\},\left\{Э_{x} u_{n(\nu)}(x)\right\} \text { and }\left\{\partial_{x}^{2} u_{n(\nu)}(x)\right\}
$$

converge uniformly in $D$ in the generalised sense. Then we can easily see that

$$
\lim _{\nu \rightarrow \infty} u_{n(\nu)}(x)=u(x)
$$

is also a solution of ( 0 ) such that

$$
\underline{\omega}_{\gamma}(x) \leqq u(x) \leqq \bar{\omega}_{\gamma}(x) \quad \text { in } \quad D .
$$

Now let $\mathfrak{F}_{\gamma}$ be the set of all solutions of (0) such that

$$
\underline{\omega}_{\gamma}(x) \leqq u(x) \leqq \bar{\omega}_{\gamma}(x) \quad \text { in } D \quad \text { and }\|u\|_{D_{n}}^{\alpha, 2}<+\infty .
$$

By Lemma $3 \mathfrak{F}_{\gamma}$ is compact in $\mathrm{C}^{2}[D]$, where $\mathrm{C}^{2}[D]$ is a linear topological space with the pseudo-norm

$$
\|u\|_{n}=\underset{D_{n}}{\operatorname{Max}}|u(x)|+\underset{D_{n}}{\operatorname{Max}}\left|\partial_{x} u\right|+\underset{D_{n}}{\operatorname{Max}}\left|\partial_{x}{ }^{2} u\right| .
$$

If $\gamma_{1}, \ldots, \gamma_{n}$ are any finite number of $\gamma \in \Omega$, we see easily that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{Min}_{1 \leq i \leqq n}\left\{\bar{\omega}_{y_{i}}(x)\right\}=\bar{\omega}_{*}(x) \text { is a quasi-supersolution of }(0) \\
& \operatorname{Max}_{1 \leqq^{i} \leqq n}\left\{\underline{\varrho^{n}}(x)\right\}=\omega_{*}(x) \text { is a quasi-subsolution of }(0),
\end{aligned}
$$

such that $\underline{\omega}(x) \leqq \underline{\omega}_{*}(x)<\bar{\omega}_{*}(x) \leqq \bar{\omega}(x)$ in $D$, and $\bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \mathfrak{F}_{\gamma_{i}}$ is the set of all solutions of ( 0 ) such that

$$
\underline{\omega}_{*}(x) \leqq u(x) \leqq \bar{\omega}_{*}(x) \quad \text { in } \quad D, \quad\|u\|_{\nu_{n}}^{\alpha, 2}<+\infty
$$

Then by the first part of the proof $\bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \mathscr{F}_{\gamma_{i}}$ is not empty. Thus

$$
\bigcap_{\gamma \in \Omega} \mathscr{F}_{\gamma} \neq 0
$$

by the intersection property of compact sets, q.e.d.

## §6 Main existence theorem.

9. We say that a domain $D$ satisfies the condition of Poincaré, if
for each point $c$ of $\dot{D}$ there exists a cone of one nappe $K$ with the vertex $c$ such that, in a sufficiently small neighbourhood of $c, K$ lies outside of $D$. Now we shall prove the main existence theorem :

Theorem 6. Let $D$ be a bounded domain satisfying the condition of Poincaré. Let $a_{i j}(x)$ be $H_{1}-$ continuous in $\bar{D}$ and satisfy
(9.1) $\quad A^{-1} \leqq \sum_{i j=1}^{m} a_{i j}(x) \xi_{i} \xi_{j} \leqq A \quad$ for $\sum_{i=1}^{m} \xi_{i}^{2}=1(A \geqq 1)$.

Let $f(x, u, p)$ be $H_{a}$-continuous $(0<\alpha<1)$ in the finite part of

$$
D^{*}=\{(x, u, p) ; x \in \bar{D}, \underline{\omega}(x) \leqq u \leqq \bar{\omega}(x),|p|<+\infty\}
$$

where $\bar{\omega}(x)$ and $\underline{\omega}(x)$ are quasi-supersolution and quasi-subsolution of (0) respectively such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
|\bar{\omega}(x)| \leqq M, \quad|\underline{\omega}(x)| \leqq M \quad \text { in } D . \tag{9.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

$f(x, u, p)$ satisfies also

$$
\begin{equation*}
|f(x, u, p)| \leqq B|p|^{2}+\mathbf{\Gamma} \tag{9.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $B$ and $\Gamma$ are positive constants such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
16 A B M<1 \tag{9.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then there exists a solution $u(x)$ of $(0)$ such that

$$
\mid \underline{\omega}(x) \leqq u(x) \leqq \bar{\omega}(x) \quad \text { in } D
$$

with the boundary value $\beta(x)(x \in \dot{D})$, where $\beta(x)$ is a given continuous function on $\bar{D}$ such that $\underline{\omega}(x)<\beta(x)<\bar{\omega}(x)$ in $D$.

Proof. Let $c$ be any point of $\dot{D}$, and $K$ be a cone of one nappe with the vertex $c$, which lies outside of $D$ for $|x-c| \leqq \delta_{0}\left(\delta_{0}>0\right)$. By a suitable linear transformation of coordinates, we can assume

$$
\sum_{i, j=1}^{m} a_{i j}(c) \partial_{i j}^{2} u(c)=\sum_{i=1}^{m} \partial_{i i}^{2} u(c)
$$

But (9.3) must be replaced by

$$
|f(x, u, p)| \leqq A B|p|^{2}+\Gamma .
$$

We assume also that the axis of the cone $K$ is the $x_{1}$-axis with the positive sence directed into $D$. Let us introduce the new coordinates $r, \theta, \xi_{2}, \ldots, \xi_{m}$ by

$$
|x-c|=r, \quad x_{1}-c_{1}=r \cos \theta, \quad x_{i}-c_{i}=r \sin \theta \cdot \xi_{i} \quad(i \geqq 2)
$$

And we assume that $K$ is represented by
(K)

$$
\pi-\varepsilon_{0} \leqq \theta \leqq \pi \quad\left(0<\varepsilon_{0}<\pi / 2\right)
$$

Now we shall construct a quasi-supersolution $\omega_{c}(x)$ of ( 0 ) of the form

$$
\omega_{c}(x)=r^{\gamma} \varphi(\theta)+\beta(c)+\varepsilon \quad(\varepsilon>0)
$$

in a neighbourhood of $c$. Then we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\partial_{i} \omega_{c}= & \gamma r^{\gamma-2}\left(x_{i}-c_{i}\right) \mathcal{P}(\theta)+r_{i}^{\gamma} \partial \varphi^{\prime}(\theta), \\
\partial_{i j}^{2} \omega_{c}= & r^{\gamma-2}\left\{\left(\gamma(\gamma-2) r^{-2}\left(x_{i}-c_{i}\right)\left(x_{j}-c_{j}\right)+\delta_{i j}\right) \mathcal{P}\right. \\
& \left.+\left(\gamma\left(x_{i}-c_{i}\right)_{j} \theta+\gamma\left(x_{j}-c_{j}\right) \partial_{i} \theta+r_{i j}^{2} \partial_{i j}^{2} \theta\right) \mathcal{P}^{\prime}+r_{i}^{2} \partial_{j} \partial_{j} \theta \mathcal{P}^{\prime \prime}\right\},
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\partial \theta & = \begin{cases}-r^{-1} \sin \theta & \text { if } i=1 \\
r^{-1} \cos \theta \cdot \xi_{i} & \text { if } i \geqq 2,\end{cases} \\
{ }_{i j}^{2} \theta & =\left\{\begin{array}{lll}
r^{-2} \sin 2 \theta & \text { if } i=j=1 \\
-r^{-2} \cos 2 \theta \cdot \xi_{i} & \text { if } i=1, j \geqq 2, \\
r^{-2}\left[\cot \theta \cdot\left(\delta_{i j}-\xi_{i} \xi_{j}\right)-\sin 2 \theta\right] & \text { if } \quad i, j \geq 2
\end{array}\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, assuming $0<\gamma<1$ and $0<\delta<1$, we get for $r=|x-c|<\delta$

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\Delta \omega_{c} \leqq r^{\gamma-2}\left\{\varphi^{\prime \prime}+(m-2) \cot \theta \cdot \varphi^{\prime}+\gamma(m-1)|+|\varphi|\}\right.  \tag{9.5}\\
\left|\partial_{x_{c}}\right|^{2} \leqq r^{\gamma-2}\left(\left|\varphi^{\prime}\right|+\gamma|\varphi|\right)^{2} \\
\sum_{i, j=1}^{m}\left(a_{i j}-\delta_{i j}\right) \partial_{i j}^{2} \omega_{c} \leqq k r^{\gamma-2} \delta\left\{\gamma|\varphi|+(1+|\cot \theta|)\left|\mathcal{P}^{\prime}\right|+\left|\varphi^{\prime \prime}\right|\right\}
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $k$ is a fixed constant. Then, assuming $0<\delta<\operatorname{Min}\left\{1, k^{-1}\right\}$, we get from (9.5) for $r<\delta$

$$
\begin{align*}
\Phi\left[\omega_{c}\right] & \equiv \sum_{i, j=1}^{m} a_{i j}(x)_{i j}^{2} \omega_{c}+A B\left|\partial_{x} \omega_{c}\right|^{2}+\Gamma  \tag{9.6}\\
& \leqq r^{\gamma-2}\left\{\left(\left(\mathcal{P}^{\prime \prime}+k \delta\left|\varphi^{\prime \prime}\right|\right)+(m-2) \cot \theta \cdot \mathscr{Q}^{\prime}\right.\right. \\
& \left.+(2 A B|\mathcal{P}|+1+|\cot \theta|)\left|\varphi^{\prime}\right|+m_{\gamma}|\varphi|+\delta \Gamma\right\}
\end{align*}
$$

Now we put

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi(\theta)=\lambda^{-1} \mu|\theta|+(2 A B)^{-1} \log \left\{\left(1+\lambda^{2} / 2 A B \mu\right)-e^{\lambda|\theta|}\right\}+C \tag{9.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
C=6 M-(2 A B)^{-1} \log \left(\lambda^{2} / 2 A B \mu\right)
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda=2\left((m-1) \cot \varepsilon_{0}+12 A B M+1\right) \tag{9.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\mu=\lambda^{2}(2 A B)^{-1}\left(1-e^{-4 A B M}\right)\left(e^{\lambda \pi}-1\right)^{-1}
$$

Then $\varphi(\theta)\left(\in C^{2}[|\theta| \leqq \pi]\right)$ satisfies, for $|\theta| \leqq \pi$, the inequalities

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi^{\prime}(\theta) \cdot \theta \leqq 0, \quad \varphi^{\prime \prime}(\theta)<0, \quad 4 M \leqq \varphi(\theta) \leqq 6 M \tag{9.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

and
(9.10)

$$
\mathcal{P}^{\prime \prime}+\lambda\left|\mathcal{P}^{\prime}\right|+2 A B \mathcal{Q}^{\prime 2}+\mu<0 .
$$

Thus, assuming

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
0<\delta<\operatorname{Min}\left\{\delta_{0}, 1,(2 k)^{-1}, \mu / 4 \Gamma\right\}  \tag{9.11}\\
0<\gamma<\operatorname{Min}\{1, \mu / 24 m M, \log 2 / \log (1 / \delta)\}
\end{array}\right.
$$

from (9.6), (9.8), (9.9) and (9.10) we obtain
(9.12) $\Phi\left[\omega_{c}\right]<0$ for $0<|x-c|=r \leqq \delta, \quad|\theta| \leqq \pi-\varepsilon_{0}$
and, as $\quad \delta^{\gamma}>1 / 2, \quad \varphi(\theta) \geqq 4 M$ and $\beta(c) \geqq-M$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\omega_{c}(x)>M \text { for }|x-c|=\delta,|\theta| \leqq \pi-\varepsilon_{0} . \tag{9.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence $\omega_{c}=r^{\gamma} \varphi(\theta)+\beta(c)+\varepsilon$ is a quasi-supersolution of ( 0 ) in $D_{\cap}\{x$; $|x-c| \leqq \delta\}$. Then

$$
\bar{\omega}_{(c, \delta)}(x)= \begin{cases}\bar{\omega}(x) & \text { for }|x-c|>\delta, \\ \operatorname{Min}\left\{\bar{\omega}(x), \omega_{c}(x)\right\} & \text { for }|x-c| \leqq \delta,\end{cases}
$$

is a quasi-supersolution of ( 0 ) such that

$$
\bar{\omega}_{(c, e)}(x)>\beta(x) \quad \text { in } \quad D,
$$

if we take $\delta=\delta(\varepsilon)>0$ so small that (9.11) and $|\beta(x)-\beta(c)|<\varepsilon$ for $|x-c| \leqq \delta$. Similarly

$$
\underline{\omega}_{(c, \varepsilon)}(x)=\left\{\begin{array}{lrr}
\underline{\omega}(x) & |x-c|>\delta, \\
\operatorname{Max}\left\{\underline{\omega}(x) \omega_{c}^{\prime}(x)\right\} & \text { for } & |x-c| \leqq \delta,
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $\omega_{c}^{\prime}=-r^{\gamma} \varphi(\theta)+\beta(c)-\varepsilon$, is a quasi-subsolution of ( 0 ) such that

$$
\bar{\omega}_{(c, 8)}(x)<\beta(x) \quad \text { in } D .
$$

Then by Theorem 5 there exists a solution $u(x)$ of (0) such that, for all $c \in \dot{D}$ and $\varepsilon>0$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\underline{\omega}_{(c, \varepsilon)}(x) \leqq u(x) \leqq \bar{\omega}_{(c, \ell)}(x) \quad \text { in } D . \tag{9.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Letting $\varepsilon$ tend to 0 , we obtain from (9.14)

$$
\begin{gathered}
\lim _{x-c} u(x)=\beta(c) \quad \text { for any } \quad c \in \dot{D} \\
\underline{\omega}(x) \leqq u(x) \leqq \bar{\omega}(x) \quad \text { in } \quad D, \quad \text { q. e. d. }
\end{gathered}
$$

and
REMARK. The condition imposed on the boundary of $D$ can be
weakened for the case $m=2$, while the calculations in the proof will be much simplified.
10. Really we have the conjecture : the restriction (9.4) in Theorem 6 may be removed. But now we shall only show that the condition (9.3) can not be replaced by

$$
|f(x, u, p)| \leqq B|p|^{\kappa}+\Gamma
$$

where $\kappa$ is any constant $>2$. For this, we consider the following example:
(10.1) $\Delta u=-(m-1) \sum_{i=1}^{m} x_{i} \partial u /\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} x_{i}^{2}\right)+u\left\{1+\sum_{i=1}^{m}(\partial i u)^{2}\right\}^{1+\varepsilon}(\varepsilon>0)$, and $D$ is the domain
(D)

$$
a^{2}<\sum_{i=1}^{m} x<b^{2} \quad(0<a<b)
$$

(10.1) has the form $\Delta u=f(x, u, \partial u)$, where $f$ is strictly increasing with $u$. Then, as we can easily prove, (10.1) has at most one solution under the boundary condition
(10.2) $\quad u=0$ for $\sum x_{i}^{2}=a^{2}, \quad u=h(h>0)$ for $\sum x_{i}^{2}=b^{2}$.

Since (10.1) is invariant under any orthogonal transformation of independent variables (rotation about the origin), the unique solution of (10.1) under (10.2) is a function of $r=\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} x_{i}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}$ only : $u=u(r)$. Hence $u(r)$ satisfies the ordinary differential equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime \prime}=u\left(+u^{\prime 2}\right)^{1+\varepsilon} \tag{10.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The solution $u$ of (10.3) satisfies

$$
\left(1+u^{\prime 2}\right)^{-\varepsilon}=\varepsilon\left(C-u^{2}\right) \quad(C=\text { const. }) .
$$

Then $0 \leqq u^{2}<C=c^{2}$ for $a<x<b$, and

$$
-<\varepsilon^{1 / 2 \varepsilon}\left(c^{2}-u^{2}\right)^{1 / 2 \mathrm{e}} u^{\prime}<1
$$

Thus, as $u(a)=0 \quad$ and $\quad u(b)=h \leqq c$,
or

$$
\begin{gathered}
\varepsilon^{1 / 2 \varepsilon} \int_{0}^{c}\left(c^{2}-u^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} d u<b-a, \\
\gamma(\varepsilon) c^{1+1 / \varepsilon}<b-a
\end{gathered}
$$

where

$$
\gamma(\varepsilon)=2^{1 / \varepsilon} \Gamma(1 / 2 \varepsilon+1)^{2} / \Gamma(1 / \varepsilon+2) .
$$

Hence

$$
0<h \leqq c<\gamma_{1}(\varepsilon)(b-a)^{\varepsilon /(1+\varepsilon)}
$$

where $\gamma_{1}(\varepsilon)$ is a constant depending only on $\varepsilon$.
Therefore, if

$$
\begin{equation*}
h \geqq \gamma_{1}(\varepsilon)(b-a)^{8 /(1+\varepsilon)}, \tag{10.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

there exists no solution of (10.1) under (10.2), although

$$
\bar{\omega}(x)=M \leqq h(>0) \text { and } \omega(x)=0
$$

are quasi-supersolution and quasi-subsolution of (10.1) respectively in $D$. And for $x \in D$ and $0 \leqq u \leqq M$ holds the inequality

$$
|f(x, u, p)| \leqq B|p|^{2(1+\varepsilon)}+\Gamma,
$$

only if $B=(1+\varepsilon) h$, and $\Gamma$ is sufficiently large. $A B M=(1+\varepsilon) h^{2}$ may also be arbitrarily small, if $b-a$ is so small that (10.4) holds.
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[^0]:    1) We say that a partial differential equation is principally linear, if it is linear in the terms of the highest derivatives with coeficients containing only independent variables.
    2) $D$ is a connected open set in the $m$-dimensional Euclidean space.
    3) $\bar{D}$ means the closure of $D$, and $\dot{D}$ the boundary of $D$.
[^1]:    4) Math. Zeit. 38 (1938), 257-282.
[^2]:    5) A $l$-dimentional manifold is said of type $B h$, if it is locally representable in the form $x_{i}=\varphi_{i}\left(s_{1}, \ldots, s_{l}\right)$ in such way that $\operatorname{Rank} \underset{s}{\partial}(\varphi)=l$ and $\partial_{s}^{2} \varphi$ is $H_{\alpha}$-continuous $(0<\alpha<1)$.
    6) $\quad \alpha=\inf \{\lambda: \omega(x)+\lambda>v(x)$ for all $x \in D\}$.
[^3]:    7) By a linear transformation of coordinates we can bring the matrix $\left(a_{i j}\left(x_{0}\right)\right)$ into the diagonal form $\left(\lambda_{i} \delta_{i j}\right)$, where $\lambda_{i}>0$. Then $\sum \lambda_{i}{ }_{i i}^{\partial_{i}^{2}} \omega\left(x_{0}\right) \geqq \sum \lambda_{i}{ }_{i i}^{2} u\left(x_{0}\right)$, which is epuivalent to (1.9).
[^4]:    11) Tychonoff: Ueber einen Fixpuktsatz, Math. Ann. 111.
[^5]:    12) We can assume that $U_{j}$ are bounded and closed.
