

AD-A158 137

HAMILTON-JACOBI EQUATIONS IN INFINITE DIMENSIONS PART 2 1/1  
EXISTENCE OF VISC. (U) WISCONSIN UNIV-MADISON  
MATHEMATICS RESEARCH CENTER M G CRANDALL ET AL. JUN 85


UNCLASSIFIED

MRC-TSR-2826 DAAG29-80-C-0041

F/G 12/1

NL





NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS  
MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART

2

AD-A158 137

MRC Technical Summary Report #2826

HAMILTON-JACOBI EQUATIONS IN INFINITE  
DIMENSIONS, PART II. EXISTENCE OF  
VISCOSITY SOLUTIONS

Michael G. Crandall and  
Pierre-Louis Lions

Mathematics Research Center  
University of Wisconsin—Madison  
610 Walnut Street  
Madison, Wisconsin 53705

June 1985

(Received May 15, 1985)

DTIC  
ELECTE  
AUG 20 1985  
S B D

DTIC FILE COPY

Approved for public release  
Distribution unlimited

Sponsored by

U. S. Army Research Office  
P. O. Box 12211  
Research Triangle Park  
North Carolina 27709

85 8 9 118

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON  
MATHEMATICS RESEARCH CENTER

HAMILTON-JACOBI EQUATIONS IN INFINITE DIMENSIONS, PART II.  
EXISTENCE OF VISCOSITY SOLUTIONS

Michael G. Crandall and Pierre-Louis Lions<sup>1</sup>

Technical Summary Report #2826  
June 1985

ABSTRACT

This paper is the second in a series by the authors concerned with the theory of viscosity solutions Hamilton-Jacobi equations in infinite dimensional spaces. The first paper introduced a notion of viscosity solution appropriate for the study of Hamilton-Jacobi equations in spaces with the so-called Radon-Nikodym property and obtained uniqueness theorems under assumptions paralleling the finite dimensional theory. The main results of the current paper concern existence of solutions of stationary and time-dependent Hamilton-Jacobi equations. In order to establish these results it is necessary to overcome the difficulties associated with the fact that bounded sets are not precompact in infinite dimensions and this is done by sharp constructive estimates coupled with the use of differential games to solve regularized problems. *nonlinear*

Interest in this subject arises on the abstract side from the desire to contribute to the theory of partial differential equations in infinite dimensional spaces to treat natural questions raised by the finite dimensional theory. Interest also arises from potential applications to the theory of control of partial differential equations. However, the results herein do not apply directly to problems of the form arising in the control of partial differential equations, a question which will be treated in the next paper of the series. *Additional Remarks: Based upon existing theory.*

AMS (MOS) Subject Classifications: 35F30, 49C99

Key Words: Hamilton-Jacobi Equations, equations in Banach spaces, viscosity solutions, differential games, nonlinear first-order partial differential equations, existence theory.

Work Unit Number 1 (Applied Analysis)

---

<sup>1</sup>Université de Paris IX, place de Lattre-de-Tassigny, 75775 Paris Cedex 16, France.

# HAMILTON-JACOBI EQUATIONS IN INFINITE DIMENSIONS, PART II.

## EXISTENCE OF VISCOSITY SOLUTIONS

Michael G. Crandall and Pierre-Louis Lions<sup>1</sup>

### Introduction:

This is the second paper of a series devoted to the study of Hamilton-Jacobi equations in infinite dimensions. Part I ([10]) was concerned with the uniqueness of viscosity solutions of general first order equations of the form

$$(HJ) \quad F(x, u, Du) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega$$

in which  $\Omega$  is an open subset of some (real) Banach space  $V$ , the unknown function  $u: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is continuous and  $Du(x)$  denotes the Fréchet derivative of  $u$  at  $x$ ; thus  $Du(x) \in V^*$  where  $V^*$  is the dual of  $V$ . The nonlinear function  $F$  defining the equation is a continuous mapping  $F: \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times V^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . The notion of a viscosity solution for (HJ) considered in [10] is a straightforward adaptation of the notion of a viscosity solution first used in obtaining existence and uniqueness results in the finite dimensional case (i.e.,  $V = \mathbb{R}^n$ ) in M. G. Crandall and P. L. Lions [7] (see also M. G. Crandall, P. L. Lions and L. C. Evans [5]). One of the equivalent forms of this notion is recalled in Section 1 below.

Here we prove general existence results for two typical problems, namely, the Cauchy problem

$$(CP) \quad u_t + H(x, t, u, Du) = 0 \text{ in } V \times ]0, T[,$$

$$u(x, 0) = \varphi(x) \text{ in } V$$

and the stationary problem

$$(SP) \quad u + H(x, u, Du) = 0 \text{ in } V$$

where the functions  $H$  and  $\varphi$  are given and satisfy conditions detailed in Section 1. In

<sup>1</sup>Université de Paris IX, place de Lattre-de-Tassigny, 75775 Paris Cedex 16, France.

Sponsored by the United States Army under Contract No. DAAG29-80-C-0041.



Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

either case we call  $H$  the "Hamiltonian". Here the  $Du$  in (CP) denotes the derivative of the map  $x \mapsto u(x,t)$ ; i.e.,  $D$  is the gradient in the "space variable"  $x$ . The equation in (CP) is regarded as a special case of (HJ) by regarding the pair  $(x,t)$  in (CP) as  $x$  in (HJ) and  $V \times R$  as  $V$ .

The existence results established here are precisely formulated in Section 1. It is quite striking that these results are obtained under much the same assumptions used to obtain the corresponding results in the finite dimensional case in H. Ishii [16], [17] and M. G. Crandall and P. L. Lions [9]. (See [3], [7], [18], [19], [21] for earlier existence results.) However, even though the finite and infinite dimensional theories have similar formulations, the proofs must be modified substantially in the infinite dimensional case.

There are three main difficulties in the passage from finite to infinite dimensions. First, the finite dimensional theory relies everywhere on the fact that continuous functions on closed and bounded sets attain maximum and minimum values, and this is false in infinite dimensions. A way to deal with this in infinite dimensions was demonstrated in [10] in the course of proving uniqueness. Next, in finite dimensions the method of vanishing viscosity can be used to solve (CP) or (SP) in a simple way if the data  $H$  and  $\varphi$  are "nice". That is, a term  $-\epsilon \Delta$  is added to the equations, the resulting problem is solved and then  $\epsilon$  is sent to zero using a priori estimates, the Arzela-Ascoli (or AA) theorem and properties of viscosity solutions to pass to a limit. Having obtained existence for a restricted class of  $H$  and  $\varphi$ , a priori estimates and the AA theorem are used again to obtain solutions for  $H$  and  $\varphi$  of the generality desired. In infinite dimensions we have neither the  $\Delta$  nor the AA theorem available to us. This first difficulty is circumvented by the use of explicit formulas from the theory of differential games. We obtain solutions for a restricted class of Hamiltonians by forming ad hoc differential games (following the finite dimensional discussion in L. C. Evans and P. E. Souganidis [14]) whose value functions are shown to provide the desired solutions. Next, to deal with less regular Hamiltonians by limiting arguments in the absence of the AA

## SECTION 1.

## PRELIMINARIES AND STATEMENTS OF RESULTS

In all that follows, unless otherwise stated,  $V$  is a real Banach space with the Radon-Nikodym property (or " $V$  is RN"),  $V^*$  is its dual space and  $\Omega$  is an open subset of  $V$ . We will use the same notation  $\|\cdot\|$  for the norm of  $V$ , the dual norm on  $V^*$  and the absolute value on  $\mathbb{R}$ . The value of  $p \in V^*$  at  $x \in V$  will be written  $\langle p, x \rangle$ .

There are many equivalent ways to say that  $V$  has the Radon-Nikodym property - see, for example, [4]. We will use the following form:  $V$  is RN if and only if whenever  $\phi$  is a continuous mapping of a closed ball  $B$  in  $V$  into  $\mathbb{R}$  which is bounded below (above) and  $\epsilon > 0$ , then there is an element  $x^*$  of  $V^*$  such that  $\|x^*\| < \epsilon$  and  $\phi + x^*$  attains its minimum (respectively, maximum) value over  $B$ .

Both (SP) and (CP) may be regarded as equations of the general form  $H(x, u, Du) = 0$  by using  $V \times \mathbb{R}$  in place of  $V$  in the case of (CP). Let  $H \in C(V \times \mathbb{R} \times V^*)$ . The notion of viscosity sub- and supersolutions of an equation  $H = 0$  in a set  $\Omega$  were defined in [10]. One of the equivalent forms of this definition is:

**Definition 1.1.** Let  $u \in C(\Omega)$ . Then  $u$  is a viscosity subsolution  $H = 0$  in  $\Omega$  if

- (1.1) Whenever  $\phi \in C(\Omega)$ ,  $y \in \Omega$ ,  $\phi$  is differentiable at  $y$  and  $u - \phi$  has a local maximum at  $y$ , then  $H(y, u(y), D\phi(y)) \leq 0$ .

Similarly,  $u$  is a viscosity supersolution of  $H = 0$  in  $\Omega$  if

- (1.2) Whenever  $\phi \in C(\Omega)$ ,  $y \in \Omega$ ,  $\phi$  is differentiable at  $y$  and  $u - \phi$  has a local minimum at  $y$ , then  $H(y, u(y), D\phi(y)) \geq 0$ .

Finally,  $u$  is a viscosity solution of  $H = 0$  if it is both a viscosity subsolution and a viscosity supersolution.

We will also refer to a viscosity subsolution of  $H = 0$  as a viscosity solution of  $H \leq 0$ , etc. We next formulate conditions on the Hamiltonians  $H$  in (SP) and (CP) which will be among the hypotheses under which we will prove the existence of solutions. These conditions will involve two auxiliary functions  $v: V \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  and  $d: V \times V \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  which are required to satisfy the following conditions (C):

(C) For every  $y \in V$  the nonnegative function  $x \mapsto d(x,y)$  is Fréchet differentiable at every point except  $y$  and the derivative is denoted by  $d_x(x,y)$ . Similarly,  $y \mapsto d(x,y)$  is differentiable except at  $x$  and its derivative is  $d_y(x,y)$ . The function  $v$  is nonnegative and differentiable everywhere. Moreover, there is a constant  $K > 0$  such that

$$(1.3) \quad |d_x(x,y)|, |d_y(x,y)|, |Dv(x)| < K$$

whenever the quantities on the left are defined,

$$(1.4) \quad \liminf_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{v(x)}{|x|} > 1,$$

and

$$(1.5) \quad |x - y| < d(x,y) < K|x - y| \text{ for } x, y \in V.$$

We continue. A function  $m: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  will be called a modulus if it is continuous, nondecreasing, nonnegative, subadditive and satisfies  $m(0) = 0$ . We will use  $m, m_H$ , etc., to denote such functions. We will also say that a function  $\sigma: [0, \infty) \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is a local modulus if  $r \mapsto \sigma(r, R)$  is a modulus for each  $R > 0$  and  $\sigma(r, R)$  is continuous and nondecreasing in both variables. We next formulate conditions on the Hamiltonian  $H: V \times [0, T] \times R \times V^* \rightarrow R$  in (CP). These conditions are interpreted in the obvious way for time independent Hamiltonians  $H: V \times R \times V^* \rightarrow R$  as in (SP). Throughout the statements it is assumed that conditions (C) hold and  $d, v$  are the functions in (C). We also let  $B_R(x) = \{z \in V: |z - x| < R\}$  be the closed ball centered at  $x$  of radius  $R$  in  $V$ ,  $B_R^*(p)$  be the ball of radius  $R$  in  $V^*$  centered at  $p \in V^*$  and  $B_R = B_R(0)$ ,  $B_R^*(0) = B_R^*$ .

(H0) There is a local modulus  $\sigma_0$  such that

$$|H(x, t, r, p) - H(y, s, v, q)| < \sigma_0(|x - y| + |t - s| + |r - v| + |p - q|, R)$$

for  $R > 0$ ,  $x, y \in B_R$ ,  $t, s \in [0, T]$ ,  $|r|, |v| < R$  and  $p, q \in B_R^*$ .

(H1) For each  $(x, t, p) \in V \times [0, T] \times V^*$  the map  $r \mapsto H(x, t, r, p)$  is nondecreasing.



## SECTION 1.

## PRELIMINARIES AND STATEMENTS OF RESULTS

In all that follows, unless otherwise stated,  $V$  is a real Banach space with the Radon-Nikodym property (or " $V$  is RN"),  $V^*$  is its dual space and  $\Omega$  is an open subset of  $V$ . We will use the same notation  $\|\cdot\|$  for the norm of  $V$ , the dual norm on  $V^*$  and the absolute value on  $\mathbb{R}$ . The value of  $p \in V^*$  at  $x \in V$  will be written  $(p, x)$ .

There are many equivalent ways to say that  $V$  has the Radon-Nikodym property - see, for example, [4]. We will use the following form:  $V$  is RN if and only if whenever  $\varphi$  is a continuous mapping of a closed ball  $B$  in  $V$  into  $\mathbb{R}$  which is bounded below (above) and  $\epsilon > 0$ , then there is an element  $x^*$  of  $V^*$  such that  $\|x^*\| < \epsilon$  and  $\varphi + x^*$  attains its minimum (respectively, maximum) value over  $B$ .

Both (SP) and (CP) may be regarded as equations of the general form  $H(x, u, Du) = 0$  by using  $V \times \mathbb{R}$  in place of  $V$  in the case of (CP). Let  $H \in C(V \times \mathbb{R} \times V^*)$ . The notion of viscosity sub- and supersolutions of an equation  $H = 0$  in a set  $\Omega$  were defined in [10]. One of the equivalent forms of this definition is:

**Definition 1.1.** Let  $u \in C(\Omega)$ . Then  $u$  is a viscosity subsolution  $H = 0$  in  $\Omega$  if

- (1.1) Whenever  $\varphi \in C(\Omega)$ ,  $y \in \Omega$ ,  $\varphi$  is differentiable at  $y$  and  $u - \varphi$  has a local maximum at  $y$ , then  $H(y, u(y), D\varphi(y)) \leq 0$ .

Similarly,  $u$  is a viscosity supersolution of  $H = 0$  in  $\Omega$  if

- (1.2) Whenever  $\varphi \in C(\Omega)$ ,  $y \in \Omega$ ,  $\varphi$  is differentiable at  $y$  and  $u - \varphi$  has a local minimum at  $y$ , then  $H(y, u(y), D\varphi(y)) \geq 0$ .

Finally,  $u$  is a viscosity solution of  $H = 0$  if it is both a viscosity subsolution and a viscosity supersolution.

We will also refer to a viscosity subsolution of  $H = 0$  as a viscosity solution of  $H < 0$ , etc. We next formulate conditions on the Hamiltonians  $H$  in (SP) and (CP) which will be among the hypotheses under which we will prove the existence of solutions. These conditions will involve two auxiliary functions  $v: V \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  and  $d: V \times V \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  which are required to satisfy the following conditions (C):

(C) For every  $y \in V$  the nonnegative function  $x \rightarrow d(x,y)$  is Fréchet differentiable at every point except  $y$  and the derivative is denoted by  $d_x(x,y)$ . Similarly,  $y \rightarrow d(x,y)$  is differentiable except at  $x$  and its derivative is  $d_y(x,y)$ . The function  $v$  is nonnegative and differentiable everywhere. Moreover, there is a constant  $K > 0$  such that

$$(1.3) \quad |d_x(x,y)|, |d_y(x,y)|, |Dv(x)| < K$$

whenever the quantities on the left are defined,

$$(1.4) \quad \liminf_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{v(x)}{|x|} > 1,$$

and

$$(1.5) \quad |x - y| < d(x,y) < K|x - y| \text{ for } x, y \in V.$$

We continue. A function  $m: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  will be called a modulus if it is continuous, nondecreasing, nonnegative, subadditive and satisfies  $m(0) = 0$ . We will use  $m, m_H$ , etc., to denote such functions. We will also say that a function  $\sigma: [0, \infty) \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is a local modulus if  $r \rightarrow \sigma(r, R)$  is a modulus for each  $R > 0$  and  $\sigma(r, R)$  is continuous and nondecreasing in both variables. We next formulate conditions on the Hamiltonian  $H: V \times [0, T] \times R \times V^* \rightarrow R$  in (CP). These conditions are interpreted in the obvious way for time independent Hamiltonians  $H: V \times R \times V^* \rightarrow R$  as in (SP). Throughout the statements it is assumed that conditions (C) hold and  $d, v$  are the functions in (C). We also let  $B_R(x) = \{z \in V: |z - x| < R\}$  be the closed ball centered at  $x$  of radius  $R$  in  $V$ ,  $B_R^*(p)$  be the ball of radius  $R$  in  $V^*$  centered at  $p \in V^*$  and  $B_R = B_R(0)$ ,  $B_R^*(0) = B_R^*$ .

(H0) There is a local modulus  $\sigma_0$  such that

$$|H(x, t, r, p) - H(y, s, v, q)| < \sigma_0(|x - y| + |t - s| + |r - v| + |p - q|, R)$$

for  $R > 0$ ,  $x, y \in B_R$ ,  $t, s \in [0, T]$ ,  $|r|, |v| < R$  and  $p, q \in B_R^*$ .

(H1) For each  $(x, t, p) \in V \times [0, T] \times V^*$  the map  $r \rightarrow H(x, t, r, p)$  is nondecreasing.

(H2) There is a local modulus  $\sigma_H$  such that

$$H(x, t, r, p) - H(x, t, r, p + \lambda Dv(x)) < \sigma_H(\lambda, |p| + \lambda)$$

whenever  $0 < \lambda, (x, r, t, p) \in V \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \times V^*$ .

and

(H3) There is a modulus  $m_H$  such that

$$H(y, t, r, -\lambda d_y(x, y)) - H(x, t, r, \lambda d_x(x, y)) < m_H(\lambda d(x, y) + d(x, y))$$

for  $x, y \in V$  with  $x \neq y$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $r \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\lambda > 0$ .

The existence results will be proved for (CP) under (H0) - (H3). For (SP), (H3) will need to be augmented and sometimes we will invoke the additional condition:

(H4) There is a function  $F: [0, \infty) \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  nondecreasing in its arguments such that

$$H(y, r, -\lambda d_y(x, y)) - H(x, r, \lambda d_x(x, y)) < F(\lambda, d) \text{ for } x, y \in V, r \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } \lambda > 0$$

and a nonnegative nondecreasing uniformly continuous map  $G: [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  which is continuously differentiable on  $(0, \infty)$  and satisfies

$$G(r) > F(G'(r), r) \text{ on } r > 0.$$

In order to appreciate the need for (H4) for (SP), as well as for further insight into the nature of the other conditions above, we invite the reader to refer ahead to Section 5 at this time and to see the discussion in [10, Remarks 2]. The reader will observe some differences in the formulations of (C) (in which, for example, a constant called  $k$  in [10] has been put equal to 1 here, as can be done without loss of generality) and (H0) - (H3) from the corresponding formulations in [10]. In particular, (H0) is stronger in several respects than its analogue due to the more stringent requirements of the existence theory. We also recall that for (CP) (H1) can be weakened to the monotonicity of  $r + H(x, t, r, p) + \lambda r$  for some  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  by means of the change of variable  $u \rightarrow e^{-\lambda t} u$ .

Finally we introduce various function classes. If  $X$  is any metric space, the space of uniformly continuous real-valued functions on  $X$  is  $UC(X)$  and the subspace of bounded

functions in  $UC(X)$  is  $BUC(X)$ . The space  $UC_g(V \times [0, T])$  consists of those functions  $u: V \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  which are uniformly continuous in  $x$  uniformly in  $t$  and uniformly continuous on bounded sets. This amounts to asking that there are a modulus  $m$  and a local modulus  $\sigma$  such that

$$|u(x, t) - u(y, s)| \leq m(|x - y|) + \sigma(|t - s|, |y|).$$

$BUC_g(V \times [0, T])$  is the subspace of  $UC_g(V \times [0, T])$  consisting of bounded functions.

Existence Theorem 1.1.

- (i) Let (H0) - (H3) hold and  $\varphi \in UC(V)$ . Then there is a unique  $u \in UC_g(V \times [0, T])$  which is a viscosity solution of  $u_t + H(x, t, u, Du) = 0$  on  $V \times (0, T)$  and satisfies  $u(x, 0) = \varphi(x)$ .
- (ii) Let (H0) - (H4) hold. Then there is a unique viscosity solution  $u \in UC(V)$  of  $u + H(x, u, Du) = 0$  on  $V$ .

The program of proof of the existence theorem is quite long and involved and will occupy the next three sections. There are infinitely many variants of this result and we discuss some of them in Section 5. This section concludes with some results of general interest concerning viscosity solutions which will be used in various parts of the proof of the Existence Theorem. In the statements of these results the reader should think of the equations  $H = 0$ , etc., which are involved as including both (SP) and (CP).

In what follows we will assume the existence of a function  $N: V \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  with the following properties:

- (1.6) The nonnegative function  $N$  is Lipschitz continuous on  $V$  and differentiable on  $V \setminus \{0\}$ . Moreover,  $N(0) = 0$  and  $N(x) > |x|$  in some neighborhood of 0 in  $V$ .

For example, if the conditions (C) hold, then  $N(x) = d(x, 0)$  has the desired properties. In addition, if  $X$  is reflexive, then it has an equivalent norm which may serve as a function  $N$  satisfying (1.6). When (1.6) holds, then the requirements defining viscosity sub- and supersolutions may be weakened without modifying the notion. We formulate and prove a result to this effect (see also [10, Remarks 1]).

Proposition 1.2. Let (1.6) hold. Let  $u \in C(\Omega)$ . Then  $u$  is a viscosity solution of  $H < 0$  ( $H > 0$ ) in  $\Omega$  if and only if whenever  $\varphi \in C(\Omega)$  is everywhere differentiable,  $y \in \Omega$  is a point of continuity of  $D\varphi$  and there is an  $r > 0$  such that  $u(x) - \varphi(x) < u(y) - \varphi(y) - |x - y|^2$  for  $|x - y| < r$  (respectively,  $u(y) - \varphi(y) < u(x) - \varphi(x) - |x - y|^2$  for  $|x - y| < r$ ), then  $H(y, u(y), D\varphi(y)) < 0$  (respectively,  $H(y, u(y), D\varphi(y)) > 0$ ).

Sketch of Proof: Assume that  $u$  satisfies the conditions the proposition asserts are equivalent to being a viscosity solution of  $H < 0$ ,  $\varphi \in C(\Omega)$  and  $y \in \Omega$  is both a local maximum point of  $u - \varphi$  and a point of differentiability of  $\varphi$ . In order to deduce that  $H(y, u(y), D\varphi(y)) < 0$  we first remark that:

Lemma 1.3. Let (1.6) hold. Let  $\varphi \in C(\Omega)$  be differentiable at  $y \in \Omega$ . Then there is a function  $\psi \in C(\Omega)$  which is everywhere differentiable on  $\Omega$  and an  $r > 0$  such that  $\psi(y) = \varphi(y)$ ,  $D\psi(y) = D\varphi(y)$ ,  $D\psi$  is continuous at  $y$  and  $\psi(x) + |x - y|^2 < \varphi(x)$  for  $|x - y| < r$ .

Proof of Lemma 1.3: Set  $p = D\varphi(y)$ . By assumption and (1.6) there is a  $r > 0$  and an  $h \in C(\mathbb{R})$  satisfying  $h(0) = h'(0) = 0$  and

$$\varphi(x) > \varphi(y) + \langle p, y - x \rangle + h(N(x - y)) \text{ for } |x - y| < r.$$

Lemma I.4 of [7] (due to Evans) provides us with a continuously differentiable function  $g$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  which satisfies  $g(0) = g'(0) = 0$  and  $g(s) < h(s)$  for small  $s$ . Clearly  $\psi(x) = \varphi(y) + \langle p, y - x \rangle + g(N(x - y)) - N(x - y)^2$  has the desired properties.

End of proof of Proposition 1.2: Since  $y$  is a maximum point of  $u - \varphi$ , if  $\psi$  is related to  $\varphi$  as in the lemma,  $y$  is also a strict maximum point of  $u - \psi$  in the sense of the assumptions. But then, by the assumption on  $u$  and the properties of  $\psi$ ,  $H(y, u(y), D\varphi(y)) = H(y, u(y), D\psi(y)) < 0$ , completing the proof. The case of supersolutions is treated in a parallel way.

The next result presents a key stability property of viscosity solutions.

As mentioned above, conditions much like  $(H_0)$ - $(H_3)$  were introduced in [10] where the question of uniqueness was studied and some continuity of solutions with respect to the equations was proved. We will in fact need to supplement these results of [10] somewhat to achieve full generality below. This task is taken up in the next section.

## SECTION 2:

## CONVERGENCE THEOREMS AND MODULI OF CONTINUITY

The results of this section, which are both technical and general, concern the continuity of solutions of Hamilton - Jacobi equations in the data of the problem. These data are here taken to be the equation and, in the case of (CP), the initial-value. Results of this sort were given in [10], however they have proven to be inadequate for the full existence program treated in this paper. Roughly speaking, the results of [10] were formulated to correspond to uniform estimates on all of  $V$ , while we will need to deal with estimates uniform on bounded sets, but not on  $V$ . We will, however, make full use of the proofs in [10] by referring to them rather than repeating arguments when appropriate. This minimizes repetition and shortens the presentation. We ask the reader's forbearance as we launch ourselves into the discussion.

We consider sequences of Cauchy problems

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(CP)}_n \quad & u_{nt} + H_n(x, t, u_n, Du_n) = 0 \text{ in } V \times (0, T], \\ & u_n(x, 0) = \varphi_n(x) \text{ in } V, \end{aligned}$$

and stationary problems

$$\text{(SP)}_n \quad u_n + H_n(x, u_n, Du_n) = 0 \text{ in } V$$

indexed by  $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ . In each case the Hamiltonians will converge to a limit  $H$  in the sense that

$$\begin{aligned} (2.1) \quad & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_n(x, t, r, p) = H(x, t, r, p) \text{ uniformly} \\ & \text{on bounded subsets of } V \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \times V^* \end{aligned}$$

(interpreted in the obvious way if  $H_n$  is independent of  $t$ ). When a sequence of functions  $f_n$  converges to a limit  $f$  uniformly on bounded subsets of its domain we will simply write

$$f_n \rightarrow f \text{ UB},$$

and say  $f_n$  converges UB to  $f$ . The point of the main convergence result is that if  $H_n$  (and  $\varphi_n$  for (SP)) converge UB to a limit  $H$  (and  $\varphi$ ) which obeys (H0) - (H3) and we have some additional information like (but not exactly) a uniform modulus of continuity of the  $u_n$ , then the  $u_n$  converge UB to a viscosity solution  $u$  of the limit problem. The convergence theorem will be invoked later to assert that solutions of approximate problems converge to

solutions of limit problems. In order to verify the hypotheses in these applications, we will need to obtain something like uniform moduli of continuity. Results in this direction are given in Theorems 2.2 and 2.3 below.

Convergence Theorem 2.1. Let  $H_n$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  be Hamiltonians which are uniformly continuous on bounded sets and satisfy (H0) and  $H$  be a Hamiltonian which satisfies (H0) - (H3). Let  $H_n$  converge UB to  $H$ .

(i) Let  $u_n \in UC_S(V \times [0, T])$  be a viscosity solution of  $(CP)_n$  for  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ . Assume that there are constants  $A$  and  $B$  such that

$$(2.2) \quad |u_n(x, t)| \leq A_0 + B_0 v(x) \text{ for } (x, t) \in V \times [0, T]$$

for  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ . Assume, moreover, that

$$(2.3) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \{|u_n(x, t) - u_n(y, t)| : d(x, y) \leq r, 0 \leq t \leq T\} = 0.$$

Then there is a  $u \in UC_S(V \times [0, T])$  such that  $u_n \rightarrow u$  UB.

(ii) Let the above assumptions hold. Let  $u_n \in UC(V)$  be viscosity solutions of  $(SP)_n$  for  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , and (2.2) - (2.3) hold (where the  $u_n$  are now independent of  $t$ ). Then there exists a  $u \in UC(V)$  such that  $u_n \rightarrow u$  UB.

Of course, it follows from Theorem 1.4 that in both cases (i) and (ii) above  $u$  is a viscosity solution of the limiting problem. Before beginning the proof of the Convergence Theorem we will formulate two theorems which provide, by giving estimates on viscosity solutions and their moduli of continuity, a way to verify its hypotheses. Later we will need to expand the range of application still further.

The following "data" of  $(CP)$  or  $(SP)$  will be referred to in addition to the data in (C) and (H0) - (H4): A modulus  $m_0$  such that

$$(2.4) \quad |\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| \leq m_0(d(x, y)) \text{ for } x, y \in V$$

and positive constants  $A_H, B_H, A_0, B_0$  such that

$$(2.5) \quad |H(x, t, 0, 0)| \leq A_H + B_H v(x) \text{ for } (x, t) \in V \times [0, T]$$

and

$$(2.6) \quad |\varphi(x)| \leq A_0 + B_0 v(x),$$



and the function

$$(2.7) \quad b_H(R) = \sup\{|H(x,t,r,p)| : v(x), |p|, |r| < R \text{ and } t \in [0,T]\}.$$

We begin with (CP) since the hypotheses needed for (SP) are more restrictive.

Theorem 2.2. (i) Let  $H$  in (CP) satisfy (H0)-(H3) and  $\varphi \in UC(V)$  satisfy (2.4) - (2.7).

Let  $u \in UC_g(V \times [0,T])$  be a viscosity solution of (CP). Then there are constants  $A, B$  depending on  $\Lambda_0, B_0, A_H, B_H, \alpha_H$  such that

$$(2.8) \quad |u(x,t)| < (A + Bv(x)), \quad (x,t) \in V \times [0,T],$$

and a modulus  $m$  depending on  $m_0$  and  $m_H$  such that

$$(2.9) \quad |u(x,t) - u(y,t)| < m(d(x,y)) \text{ for } x, y \in V \text{ and } t \in [0,T].$$

Moreover, there is a local modulus  $\sigma$  depending on  $A, B$  in (2.8),  $m$  in (2.9),  $b_H, v$  and  $d$  such

$$(2.10) \quad |u(x,t) - u(x,s)| < \sigma(|t - s|, |x|) \text{ for } t, s \in [0,T].$$

(ii) Let  $H$  in (SP) satisfy (H0) - (H4) and  $u \in UC(V)$  be a viscosity solution of (SP).

Then there are constants  $A$  and  $B$  depending on  $\Lambda_H, B_H$  and  $\alpha_H$  such that

$$(2.11) \quad |u(x)| < A + Bv(x) \text{ for } x \in V,$$

and a modulus  $m$ , depending on  $G$  in (H4),  $A$  and  $B$  in (2.11) and  $m_H$ , such that

$$(2.12) \quad |u(x) - u(y)| < m(d(x,y)).$$

As a simple example of the use of these results, observe that by combining the Convergence Theorem and Theorem 2.2 we learn, in particular, that if  $H$  satisfies (H0) - (H3) and  $u_n$  is a solution of (CP) with the initial data  $\varphi_n \in UC(V)$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , the  $\varphi_n$  admit a common modulus of continuity,  $\varphi_n(0)$  is bounded and  $\varphi_n \rightarrow \varphi$  UB, then  $u_n \rightarrow u$  UB and  $u \in UC_g(V \times [0,T])$  is the viscosity solution of (CP) for the initial-value  $\varphi$ . This result employs only the special case of the convergence theorem in which the modulus is uniform in the  $u_n$  and is interesting and new even in the classical finite dimensional theory.

We remark that the additional assumption (H4) (or some variant) is necessary for (SP) in the sense that it is possible to give examples (there is one in Section 5) of stationary problems  $u + H(x, Du) = 0$  in  $V = \mathbb{R}$  in which  $H$  satisfies (H0) - (H3) but there are no uniformly continuous viscosity solutions.

We next sketch the proof of the Convergence Theorem. After this is complete we establish Theorems 2.2.

Proof of the Convergence Theorem 2.1: We begin with the case (i). As a first step we replace  $u_n$  by  $e^{-t}u_n$  in the usual way, the effect being that we may assume that  $u_n$  is a viscosity solution of the problem

$$(2.13) \quad u_{nt} + u_n + H_n(x, t, u_n, Du_n) = 0,$$

and the remaining assumptions are still satisfied. We seek to estimate the difference  $u_n(x, t) - u_m(x, t)$  on the set  $v(x) < R$ . To this end, let  $G: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be continuously differentiable and satisfy

$$(2.14) \quad G(r) = 0 \text{ if } r < 0, \quad G(1) = 1 \text{ and } 0 < G'(r) < 2.$$

Let  $R, R', \alpha, \beta > 0$ , and put

$$(2.15) \quad \phi(x, y, t) = u_n(x, t) - u_m(y, t) - \left( \frac{d(x, y)^2}{\alpha} + \beta G\left(\frac{v(x) - R}{R}\right) \right).$$

The parameters will be chosen for various purposes later. Roughly speaking, we will first produce a bound on  $u_n - u_m$  on  $v(x) < R$  which is independent of  $R$  and then we will use this to sharpen the estimates and show the convergence. Let

$$(2.16) \quad M_{nm} = \sup\{\phi(x, y, t) : (x, y, t) \in S\} \text{ where}$$

$$S = \{(x, y, t) \in V \times V \times [0, T] : v(x), v(y) < R + R' \text{ and } d(x, y) < 1\}$$

and  $(x_k, y_k, t_k) \in S$  be such that

$$(i) \quad \phi(x_k, y_k, t_k) \uparrow M_{nm}$$

$$(2.17) \quad \text{and}$$

$$(ii) \quad \phi(x_k, y_k, t_k) > \phi(x_k, x_k, t_k).$$

Notice that, by (2.14),

$$(2.18) \quad M_{nm} > \sup \{u_n(x, t) - u_m(x, t) : v(x) < R, t \in [0, T]\}.$$

The relation (ii) implies that

$$(2.19) \quad d(x_k, y_k)^2 / \alpha < u_m(x_k, t_k) - u_m(y_k, t_k).$$

Now we set

$$(2.20) \quad \omega_n(r) = \sup \{|u_n(x, t) - u_n(y, t)| : d(x, y) < r, 0 < t < T\},$$

$$\omega(r) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega_n(r) \text{ for } 0 < r.$$

Using (2.19) and (2.20) we have

$$(2.21) \quad d(x_k, y_k)^2 < \alpha \omega_m(d(x_k, y_k)).$$

We consider three possible situations: Either

$$(I) \quad t_k \rightarrow 0$$

or

$$(II) \quad \max(v(x_k), v(y_k)) \rightarrow R + \epsilon.$$

or

$$(III) \quad \text{For some } \eta > 0, t_k > \eta \text{ and } v(x_k), v(y_k) < R + R' - \eta \text{ for large } k.$$

By passing to a subsequence of  $\{d(x_k, y_k, t_k)\}$  if necessary, we can always reduce to a case in which one of (I) - (III) holds. Using the bound (2.21) and  $d(x_k, y_k) < 1$  we find

$$(2.22) \quad d(x_k, y_k) < (\alpha \omega_m(1))^{1/2}$$

and so

$$(2.23) \quad d(x_k, y_k) / \alpha < (\omega_m(1) / \alpha)^{1/2}.$$

Using (2.22) in (2.21)

$$(2.24) \quad d(x_k, y_k)^2 / \alpha < \omega_m((\alpha \omega_m(1))^{1/2}).$$

Let us now assume we are in case (I). In this event, (2.17), (2.22) and

$u_n(x, 0) = \varphi_n(x)$ , etc., imply that

$$(2.25) \quad M_{nm} < \sup \{|\varphi_n(x) - \varphi_m(x)| : v(x) < R + R'\} + \omega_m((\alpha \omega_m(1))^{1/2}).$$

If we are in case (II), we use (2.2) to conclude that

$$(2.26) \quad M_{nm} \leq 2(A_0 + B_0(R + R')) - \beta \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} G((v(x_k) - R)/R').$$

Now either  $v(x_k) \rightarrow R + R'$  or  $v(y_k) \rightarrow R + R'$ . Since  $v(x_k) > v(y_k) - K|x_k - y_k| > v(y_k) - Kd(x_k, y_k)$  and  $G'$  is bounded by 2, in both cases we conclude that

$$(2.27) \quad M_{nm} \leq 2(A + B(R + R')) - \beta(1 - 2(K/R')(\alpha\omega_m(1))^{1/2}).$$

In case (III) we may use the arguments of [10] to conclude that the estimates we arrive at below by assuming that in fact  $\phi(x_k, y_k, t) = M_{nm}$  and using the equations satisfied by  $u_n$  and  $u_m$  are valid if we keep the parameters in the range where (2.22) guarantees  $d(x_k, y_k)$  remains strictly away from 1 (as we will). Hence we simply assume  $(x_k, y_k, t_k)$  is a maximum point of  $\phi$  on  $S$ . We write  $(x_k, y_k, t_k) = (\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{t})$  to have a nicer appearance. Recall ([10]) that the function  $z(x, y, t) = u_n(x, t) - u_m(y, t)$  satisfies the equation

$$z_t + z + H_n(x, t, u_n(x, t), D_x z) - H_m(y, t, u_m(y, t), -D_y z) = 0$$

on  $V \times V \times (0, T]$  in the viscosity sense. Therefore we have

$$(2.28) \quad u_n(\bar{x}, \bar{t}) - u_m(\bar{y}, \bar{t}) \leq H_m(\bar{y}, \bar{t}, u_m(\bar{y}, \bar{t}), 2dd_y/\alpha) - \\ H_n(\bar{x}, \bar{t}, u_n(\bar{x}, \bar{t}), 2dd_x/\alpha + (\beta/R')G'((v(\bar{x}) - R)/R')Dv(\bar{x}))$$

where  $d = d(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ , etc. We also have

$$(2.29) \quad -H_n(\bar{x}, \bar{t}, u_n(\bar{x}, \bar{t}), 2dd_x/\alpha + (\beta/R')G'((v(\bar{x}) - R)/R')Dv(\bar{x})) = \\ H(\bar{x}, \bar{t}, u_n(\bar{x}, \bar{t}), 2dd_x/\alpha + (\beta/R')G'((v(\bar{x}) - R)/R')Dv(\bar{x})) - \\ H_n(\bar{x}, \bar{t}, u_n(\bar{x}, \bar{t}), 2dd_x/\alpha + (\beta/R')G'((v(\bar{x}) - R)/R')Dv(\bar{x})) \\ - H(\bar{x}, \bar{t}, u_n(\bar{x}, \bar{t}), 2dd_x/\alpha + (\beta/R')G'((v(\bar{x}) - R)/R')Dv(\bar{x})) + H(\bar{x}, \bar{t}, u_n(\bar{x}, \bar{t}), 2dd_x/\alpha) + \\ - H(\bar{x}, \bar{t}, u_n(\bar{x}, \bar{t}), 2dd_x/\alpha).$$

Let us introduce the functions

$$k_n(R) = \sup\{|H_n(x, t, r, p) - H(x, t, r, p)| : v(x), |r|, |p| \leq R\}.$$

Using (2.22) - (2.24), (2.29) and (H2) we deduce that

$$(2.30) \quad -H_n(\bar{x}, \bar{\epsilon}, u_n(\bar{x}, \bar{\epsilon}), 2dd_x/\alpha + (\beta/R')G'((v(\bar{x}) - R)/R')Dv(\bar{x})) < \\ k_n(A + (1+B)(R+R') + 2K((\omega_m(1)/\alpha)^{1/2} + \beta/R')) \\ + \alpha_H(2K\beta/R', 2K((\omega_m(1)/\alpha)^{1/2} + \beta/R')) - H(\bar{x}, \bar{\epsilon}, u_n(\bar{x}, \bar{\epsilon}), 2dd_x/\alpha).$$

In a similar way we find that

$$(2.31) \quad H_m(\bar{y}, \bar{\epsilon}, u_m(\bar{y}, \bar{\epsilon}), 2dd_y/\alpha) < \\ k_m(A + (1+B)(R+R') + 2K((\omega_m(1)/\alpha)^{1/2})) \\ + H(\bar{y}, \bar{\epsilon}, u_m(\bar{y}, \bar{\epsilon}), -2dd_y/\alpha).$$

Putting (2.30) and (2.31) together with (2.28) and using (H1) and (H3) yields

$$(2.32) \quad u_n(\bar{x}, \bar{\epsilon}) - u_m(\bar{y}, \bar{\epsilon}) < \\ (k_m + k_n)(A_0 + (1+B_0)(R+R') + 2K((\omega_m(1)/\alpha)^{1/2} + \beta/R') + \\ \alpha_H(2K\beta/R', 2K((\omega_m(1)/\alpha)^{1/2} + \beta/R')) + \\ m_H(2K(\omega_m((\alpha\omega_m(1))^{1/2} + (\alpha\omega_m(1))^{1/2})))$$

and so

$$(2.33) \quad M_{nm} < (k_m + k_n)(A_0 + (1+B_0)(R+R') + 2K((\omega_m(1)/\alpha)^{1/2} + (\beta/R')) + \\ + \alpha_H(2K\beta/R', 2K((\omega_m(1)/\alpha)^{1/2} + \beta/R')) + \\ + m_H(2K(\omega_m((\alpha\omega_m(1))^{1/2} + (\alpha\omega_m(1))^{1/2}))).$$

Let

$$(2.34) \quad L = \omega(1)^{1/2}.$$

To estimate  $\limsup_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} M_{nm}$  we can assume that we are in one of the cases (I) - (III) for each  $n, m$ . In case (I) we use (2.3), (2.20), (2.25), (2.34) and the assumed UB convergence of the  $\phi_n$  to conclude that

$$(2.35) \quad \limsup_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} M_{nm} < \omega(\alpha^{1/2}L)$$

(where we should write  $\omega(\alpha^{1/2}L+)$  on the right but won't).

In case (II) we use (2.27) and (2.34) to conclude

$$(2.36) \quad \limsup_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} M_{nm} < 2(A+B(R+R')) - \beta(1-2(K/R')\alpha^{1/2}L).$$

Letting

$$(2.37) \quad R' = R > 1$$

and assuming hereafter that  $\alpha$  is so small that

$$(2.38) \quad \alpha^{1/2} L < \min\{1/2, 1/(4K)\}$$

we see that the right-hand side of (2.36) is negative if

$$(2.39) \quad \beta = 4(A + 2BR) + 1,$$

and we may therefore disregard case (II) when (2.37) - (2.39) hold.

In case (III) we use (2.33) and (2.37) - (2.39) together with  $k_n \rightarrow 0$  UB to conclude that when these conditions hold

$$(2.40) \quad \limsup_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} M_{nm} < m_H(2K\omega((\alpha L)^{1/2}) + 1/2) \\ + \alpha_H(2K(4(A + 2B) + 1), 2K(L\alpha^{-1/2} + 4(A + 2B) + 1)).$$

Notice that the right-hand sides of (2.35) and (2.40) are independent of  $R$ , so from (2.18) we deduce that for all  $R > 0$

$$(2.41) \quad \sup\{u_n(x,t) - u_m(x,t) : v(x) < R, t \in [0, T]\} < \epsilon_{nm} + B_1$$

where

$$(2.42) \quad \epsilon_{nm} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n, m \rightarrow \infty$$

and  $B_1$  is some constant independent of  $R$ .

The estimate (2.35) is sufficient for our purposes in case (I), but we need to use the above information to sharpen the bounds in cases (II), (III). First of all, we argue that (2.41) holds with a constant  $B_1$  independent of  $R$  in general. This follows from the above by choosing  $R = R'$  and  $\beta$  as in (2.39) to reduce to either case (I) or (III) so that (2.41) or (2.35) hold. Since (2.35) implies (2.41), we conclude that (2.41) holds for all  $R$ . Since (2.41) is independent of  $\beta$ ,  $\alpha$  we are free to assume (2.41) holds and to choose  $\beta$ ,  $\alpha$  anew in further analysis.

To analyze case (II) further, we now use (2.41) (with  $R + R'$  in place of  $R$ ) to deduce

$$u_n(x_k, t_k) - u_m(y_k, t_k) < \epsilon_{nm} + B_1 + \omega_m((\alpha\omega_m(1))^{1/2})$$

and so in case (II) (2.27) can be replaced by

$$(2.43) \quad M_{nm} < \epsilon_{nm} + B_1 + \omega_m((\alpha\omega_m(1))^{1/2}) - \beta(1 - 2(K/R')(\alpha\omega_m(1))^{1/2}).$$

Hence, by (2.42),

$$(2.44) \quad \limsup_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} M_{nm} < B_1 + L^2 - \beta(1 - 2(K/R')\alpha^{1/2}L).$$

We see that we may fix  $\beta$  sufficiently large and independent of  $R$ ,  $R' > 1$  in such a way that the right-hand side of (2.44) is negative for all sufficiently small  $\alpha > 0$ . With  $\beta$  so fixed, we may disregard case (II). The estimate (2.35) is still sufficient for our purposes in case (I). In case (III) we use (2.33) with the  $\beta$  just fixed by case (II) to conclude that

$$(2.45) \quad \limsup_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} M_{nm} < \sigma_H(2K\beta/R', 2K(L\alpha^{-1/2} + \beta/R')) \\ + m_H(2K\omega(\alpha^{1/2}L) + \alpha^{1/2}L).$$

By (2.3), the right-hand side of (2.35) can be made as small as desired by taking the choosing  $\alpha$  small. Similarly, the right-hand side of (2.45) yields 0 in the iterated limit  $R' \rightarrow \infty$  and then  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ . In view of (2.18) we conclude the UB convergence of the  $u_n$  to a limit  $u$ . It follows easily from (2.3) that  $u$  is uniformly continuous in  $x$  uniformly in  $t$ . Since each  $u_n$  is uniformly continuous on bounded sets, their UB limit  $u$  also has the property and we conclude that  $u \in UC_g(V \times [0, T])$ .

The proof in the case (ii) of (SP) is given in an entirely analogous way. One still uses (2.17) (now independent of  $t$ ) and proceeds through the same steps. We leave it to the reader.

We turn now to the proofs of Theorems 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.2: We adapt the comparison function technique of Ishii [16], [17] to the current case. First of all, we bound  $u$ . Let  $A, B > 0$ . Using (H1) and (H2) we have

$$(2.46) \quad -H(x, t, v, (1+t)BDv) < -H(x, t, 0, 0) + \sigma_H((1+T)B, (1+T)B),$$

for  $v > 0$  and so we see that the function  $v(x, t) = (A + Bv(x))(1+t)$  is a viscosity solution of  $v_t + H(x, t, v, Dv) > 0$  if

$$(2.47) \quad A + Bv(x) > H(x, t, 0, 0) + \sigma_H(1+T)B, (1+T)B.$$

In making this claim, we are using the obvious remark that inequations in the viscosity sense for everywhere differentiable functions are equivalent to the corresponding pointwise statements. If also  $A + Bv(x) > A_0 + B_0v(x)$ , then  $v(x, 0) > u(x, 0) = \phi(x)$  and we conclude, using [10, Theorem 2] (the global nature of the assumption (H0) in  $r$  there is not necessary in  $\Omega = V$ ) that if

$$(2.48) \quad B = \max(B_0, B_H) \text{ and}$$

$$A = \max\{A_0, A_H\} + \sigma_H((1+T)B, (1+T)B)$$

then

$$u(x, t) \leq (A + Bv(x))(1 + t).$$

To begin the estimate on the modulus, we use again the fact that the function  $z(x, y, t) = u(x, t) - u(y, t)$  on  $V \times V \times [0, T]$  satisfies the equation

$$(2.49) \quad z_t + H(x, t, u(x, t), D_x z) - H(y, t, u(y, t), -D_y z) = 0$$

in the viscosity sense. Therefore, by (H1), on the set

$\{(x, y, t) \in V \times V \times (0, T]: z(x, y, t) > 0\}$ ,  $z$  is a viscosity solution of

$$(2.50) \quad z_t + \bar{H}(x, y, t, u(y, t), D_x z, D_y z) \leq 0$$

where

$$(2.51) \quad \bar{H}(x, y, t, r, p, q) = H(x, t, r, p) - H(y, t, r, -q).$$

We seek a function  $w(x, y, t)$  of the form

$$(2.52) \quad w(x, y, t) = (E_0 + F_0 d(x, y))e^{\lambda t}$$

which is a viscosity solution of

$$(2.53) \quad w_t + \bar{H}(x, y, t, r, D_x w, D_y w) > 0$$

for all  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ . To this end, we make the following simplifying remark:

**Remark 2.4:** Even though  $d(x, y)$  is not differentiable with respect to  $x$  or  $y$  on the diagonal  $x = y$ , all of the formal calculations below with trial subsolutions and supersolutions involving  $d(x, y)$  can be made rigorous by first doing the calculations with  $d_\epsilon(x, y) = (\epsilon + d(x, y)^2)^{1/2}$  for  $\epsilon > 0$ , then letting  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  and invoking Theorem 1.4. Observe that  $d_\epsilon(x, y)$  is everywhere differentiable with respect to  $x$  and  $y$  and, for example,

$$d_{\epsilon x}(x, y) = (\epsilon + d(x, y)^2)^{-1/2} d(x, y) d_x(x, y)$$

(interpreted as zero on  $x = y$ ) and  $(\epsilon + d(x, y)^2)^{-1/2} d(x, y) \leq 1$ . For everywhere differentiable functions the pointwise and viscosity notions of solutions obviously coincide.



In order that (2.52) solve (2.53) we need that

$$(2.54) \quad \lambda(E_0 + F_0 d(x,y))e^{\lambda t} > H(y,t,r, -e^{\lambda t} F_0 d_y) - H(x,t,r, e^{\lambda t} F_0 d_x)$$

for all  $r$ . In view of (H3), it suffices to have

$$\lambda(E_0 + F_0 d(x,y)) > e^{-\lambda t} m_H(e^{\lambda t} F_0 d + d).$$

Because  $m_H$  is a modulus,  $m_H(r) < m_H(1) + m_H(1)r$ , and it follows that (2.54) holds as soon as  $\lambda$  is large enough. Moreover, by (2.4), for  $E_0, F_0 > m_0(1)$

$$w(x,y,0) = E_0 + F_0 d(x,y) > u(x,0) - u(y,0) = \psi(x) - \psi(y).$$

We claim that then  $z(x,y,t) < w(x,y,t)$ . This follows from the proof of [10, Theorem 1]

(but not quite from the theorem itself). To see this, observe that for fixed

$r$   $H(x,y,t,r,p,q)$  satisfies conditions (H0) - (H3) of [10] (while  $H(x,t,u(x,t),p,q)$  may not). In checking that this is so, one uses

$$\bar{v}(x,y) = v(x) + v(y) \text{ and } \bar{d}((x,y), (\bar{x}, \bar{y})) = (d(x, \bar{x})^2 + d(\bar{y}, y)^2)^{1/2}$$

as the functions for conditions (C) on  $V \times V$  and in (H2) - (H3) for  $H$ . In order

to prove  $z < w$  we will only need to discuss  $z$  where it is nonnegative. Then proceeding as in the proof of the comparison theorem and using (2.50) and (2.53) one encounters an upper bound roughly of the form

$$H(x,y,t,r,p,q) - H(x,y,t,u(y,t),p,q) + \text{terms which go to zero}$$

where  $(x,y,t)$  is chosen to maximize a certain functional. Since  $r$  is at our disposal, we may use  $r = u(y,t)$  and the comparison argument succeeds. Fixing  $1 > \alpha, \gamma > 0$ , we next seek a supersolution  $w$  of (2.53) on the set

$$S = \{(x,y,t) \in V \times V \times [0,T] : d(x,y) < 1\}$$

of the form

$$(2.55) \quad w = (E + F(\alpha + d(x,y))^\gamma)(1 + t)$$

where  $E > 0$  and  $F$  satisfies

$$(2.56) \quad F > e^{\lambda T}(E_0 + F_0)$$

with  $\lambda, E_0, F_0$  from above. This guarantees that  $w(x,y,t) > u(x,t) - u(y,t)$  on

$d(x,y) = 1$  and on  $t = 0, d(x,y) < 1$ . A calculation reveals that (2.55) is a viscosity supersolution on  $S$  if

$$(2.57) \quad E + F(\alpha + d(x,y))^\gamma > m_H((1+T)\gamma F(\alpha + d)^\gamma + d).$$

Fix

$$(2.58) \quad F = \max(m_H(1) + 1, e^{\lambda T}(E_0 + F_0))$$

so that (2.56) holds and put

$$(2.59) \quad E(\gamma) = \max\{m_H((1+T)\gamma F(\alpha + r)^\gamma + r) - F(\alpha + r)^\gamma: 0 < r, \alpha < 1\}.$$

One easily shows that  $E(0+) = 0$  (see, e.g., [9, Lemma 1]). As above, comparison implies that for  $0 < \alpha, \gamma < 1$

$$|u(x,t) - u(y,t)| < (E(\gamma) + F(\alpha + d(x,y))^\gamma)(1+t)$$

and sending  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$  and taking the infimum over  $\gamma$  on the right produces the modulus  $m(d(x,y))$  on  $d < 1$ .

In order to exhibit the local modulus in time, fix  $\bar{x} \in V$  with  $v(\bar{x}) < R$  and  $\bar{t} \in [0, T]$  and seek a supersolution  $v$  of

$$(2.60) \quad v_t + H(x, t, v, Dv) > 0$$

on  $\{(x, t) \in V \times (\bar{t}, T]\}$  of the form

$$(2.61) \quad v(x, t) = u(\bar{x}, \bar{t}) + A + Bd(x, \bar{x}) + C(t - \bar{t})$$

which further satisfies

$$(2.62) \quad v(x, t) > u(x, t) \text{ if } v(x) = R + 1 \text{ and } t \in [\bar{t}, T]$$

and

$$(2.63) \quad v(x, \bar{t}) > u(x, \bar{t}) \text{ for } v(x) < R + 1.$$

Using (2.8) we see that

$$|u(x, t)| < C_R \text{ if } v(x) < R + 1 \text{ and } t \in [0, T]$$

where  $C_R$  depends only on the data. Let  $d(x, y) > L$  if  $|v(x) - v(y)| > 1$ . We will have

(2.62) provided only that

$$(2.64) \quad BL > 2C_R.$$

Using (2.64) we see that (2.63) holds provided that

$$A + Bd(x, \bar{x}) > m(d(x, \bar{x})) \text{ on } v(x) < R + 1.$$

Since  $m$  is a modulus,

$$m(d) < m(\varepsilon) + (m(\varepsilon)/\varepsilon)d \text{ for } \varepsilon, d > 0,$$

### SECTION 3.

### REDUCTION TO THE CASE OF LIPSCHITZ CONTINUOUS HAMILTONIANS

We will carry out the discussion below for the Cauchy and stationary problems simultaneously. Appropriate distinctions between the cases will be made at those times when it is necessary - otherwise the discussion proceeds as if  $H$  depends on  $t$  and (SP) is understood to be included by allowing  $H$  to be independent of  $t$ .

#### First Reduction - to Lipschitz continuous initial-values:

The first reduction is only relevant for (CP). Let  $H(x, t, r, p)$  satisfy (H0) - (H3) and  $\varphi \in UC(V)$ . We consider (CP):

$$(3.1) \quad u_t + H(x, t, r, Du) = 0, \quad u(x, 0) = \varphi(x).$$

Then  $\varphi$  may be approximated by its "inf convolution"

$$(3.2) \quad \varphi_n(x) = \inf\{\varphi(y) + n|x - y| : y \in V\}$$

for  $n > 0$ . If  $m_0$  is a modulus for  $\varphi$ , i. e.

$$(3.3) \quad |\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| \leq m_0(|x - y|) \text{ for } x, y \in V,$$

then one can easily demonstrate that

$$(3.4) \quad \varphi_n(x) \leq \varphi(x) \leq \varphi_n(x) + \varepsilon_n$$

where

$$\varepsilon_n = \sup\{m_0(r) - nr : 0 < r\}$$

satisfies  $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . (In particular,  $\varepsilon_n$  is finite if  $n > m(1)$ , and  $\varphi_n$  is well-defined in this range.) Moreover,  $m_0$  is a modulus for  $\varphi_n$ . In all,  $\varphi_n$  is Lipschitz continuous for  $n$  large (with  $n$  as a Lipschitz constant) and converges uniformly to  $\varphi$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and has the same modulus of continuity as  $\varphi$ . Using the Convergence Theorem (or the simpler result which bounds the difference of solutions of (CP) by the supremum of the difference of the initial values), we conclude that to prove existence of a solution  $u \in UC_g(V \times [0, T])$  of (CP), we may assume that  $\varphi$  is Lipschitz continuous. We could (but don't need to) further approximate by putting (assuming now that  $\varphi$  is already Lipschitz)  $\varphi_n(x) = (1 - |x|/n)^+ \varphi(x)$  (where  $r^+ = \max(r, 0)$ ). The  $\varphi_n$  have a common modulus and converge UB to  $\varphi$ , so we may use the Convergence Theorem to assert that it is enough to solve (CP) in the case of Lipschitz continuous initial-values of bounded support.

Next we begin a sequence of approximations of the Hamiltonian.

Second Reduction - to bounded Hamiltonians:

For  $n > 0$  set

$$(3.5) \quad H_n = \max(\min(H, n), -n).$$

Since  $H$  is uniformly continuous on bounded sets by (H0), it is bounded on bounded sets and therefore  $H_n \rightarrow H$  UB. Moreover, it is easy to see that  $H_n$  satisfies (H0) - (H3) with the same functions  $q_H, m_H$  as  $H$ . In the stationary case,  $H$  will satisfy (H4) and the  $H_n$ 's do also with the same  $F, G$ . Therefore, if we can establish the existence assertions with  $H$  replaced by  $H_n$ , the Convergence Theorem and Theorem 2.2 can be invoked to establish the existence assertions for  $H$ . We have now reduced our considerations to bounded Hamiltonians satisfying the assumptions.

Third Reduction -  $H(x, t, r, p)$  is also uniformly continuous in  $(x, r)$  for  $p$  bounded:

Now let  $H$  be a bounded Hamiltonian satisfying (H0) - (H3). For  $n > 0$  put

$$(3.6) \quad H_n(x, t, r, p) = (1 - |x|/n)^+ H(x, t, r_n, p)$$

where  $r_n$  denotes  $r$  truncated at the level  $n$  as in (3.5). Then  $H_n$  is supported on the bounded set  $|x| \leq n$  and is independent of  $r$  on  $r > n$  and on  $r < -n$ . In the case of the Cauchy problem, one easily checks that the  $H_n$  converge UB to  $H$  and satisfy (H0) - (H3) uniformly in such a way that the Convergence Theorem and Theorem 2.2 may be invoked to reduce the existence assertions for  $H$  to the case in which  $H$  is bounded, has a bounded support in  $x$  and is independent of large  $r$ . For (SP) we would need to have (H4) satisfied uniformly in  $n$ . This is so, but not because  $H$  in (3.6) satisfies (H4): Instead we use the uniform bound  $C$  on  $|H_n|$  provided by the bound on  $H$  and put  $F = 2C, G = 2C$ . Thus we may assume hereafter that, in addition to (H0) - (H3) (and (H4) for (SP)),  $H(x, t, r, p)$  is now bounded and (jointly) uniformly continuous in  $(x, r)$  uniformly in  $t \in [0, T]$  and bounded  $p$ .

Fourth Reduction -  $H(x, t, r, p)$  is also independent of  $r$ :

We remark that the reader will be better served on an initial reading to assume  $H$  is independent of  $r$  from the beginning, skip this reduction and then return to it when it is

convenient. To begin the reduction to the case in which  $H$  is independent of  $r$ , assume the conditions through the third reduction and put

$$(3.7) \quad H_n(x, t, r, p) = \inf \{ H(x, t, s, p) + n|r - s| : s \in \mathbb{R} \}.$$

If  $H$  has all the properties achieved through the third reduction, then  $H_n$  does as well and uniformly in  $n$ . Moreover,  $H_n$  is Lipschitz continuous in  $r$  and converges to  $H$  UB. Thus it is enough to solve (CP) (or (SP)) with  $H_n$  in order to have the solution in general. To do this we will use a fixed point argument based on the solvability (yet to be established) for the case in which  $H$  is independent of  $r$ . We describe the program in the case of (SP). One begins by verifying that if  $H(x, r, p)$  satisfies the conditions achieved through the third reduction and is Lipschitz continuous in  $r$ , then for  $w \in UC(V)$  the Hamiltonian  $H(x, w(x), p)$  satisfies the same conditions and the solvability of (SP) with this Hamiltonian would be guaranteed if we had settled the case in which  $H$  is independent of  $r$ . If the map  $w \rightarrow u$  is then shown to have a fixed point we would be done. A slight modification of this outline indeed succeeds, as we now establish.

Let  $H$  have all the properties of  $H_n$  above,

$$(3.8) \quad |H(x, r, p) - H(x, s, p)| < L|r - s|,$$

and  $w \in BUC(V)$ . Let  $w, \bar{w} \in UC(V)$  and  $u, \bar{u} \in UC(V)$  be viscosity solutions of

$$u + H(x, w(x), Du) = 0 \text{ and } \bar{u} + H(x, \bar{w}(x), D\bar{u}) = 0.$$

Because  $H$  is bounded, so are  $u$  and  $\bar{u}$ . Using the comparison result of [10] we easily find that

$$|u(x) - \bar{u}(x)| < L \sup \{ |w(z) - \bar{w}(z)| : z \in V \}.$$

Thus the map  $w \rightarrow u$  is a strict contraction of  $BUC(V)$  if  $L < 1$ , and there is a fixed point  $u$  which solves  $u + H(x, u, Du) = 0$ . If  $L > 1$ , we proceed by choosing  $v \in BUC(V)$  and using the result just obtained to uniquely solve

$$u + \lambda H(x, u, Du) - \eta v = 0$$

when  $\lambda L < 1$  (the Hamiltonian now being  $\lambda H(x, r, p) - \eta v(x)$ ). The self-map  $v \rightarrow u$  of  $BUC(V)$  has  $|\eta|$  as a Lipschitz constant and therefore has a fixed point if  $0 < \eta < 1$ . The fixed point  $u$  satisfies  $(1 - \eta)u + \lambda H(x, u, Du) = 0$ . Putting, for example,  $\lambda = 1 - \eta = 1/(2L)$  we

satisfy all the conditions, the fixed point  $u$  therefore exists and it solves

$u + H(x, u, Du) = 0$ , so we are done.

The Cauchy problem is treated in the analogous way, with the details being somewhat more complex. We consider the map  $w \mapsto K(w) = \text{solution } u \text{ of the Cauchy problem}$   
 $u_t + H(x, t, w(x, t), Du) = 0$ ,  $u(x, 0) = \varphi(x)$  as a self-map of  $BUC_g(V \times [0, T])$  under the assumptions to which we now have available on  $H$  and the assumed solvability if  $H$  is independent of  $r$ . Via the arguments of [10] one shows that

$$|K(w)(x, t) - K(\hat{w})(x, t)| < L \int_0^t \sup\{|w(y, s) - \hat{w}(y, s)| : y \in V\} ds$$

where  $L$  is a Lipschitz constant for  $H$  in  $r$  and thus concludes that  $K$  has a fixed point. We leave it to the reader to verify this inequality - it is not quite explicit in [10, Theorem 2 and following remarks]. There is another way to deal with  $u$  dependence of  $H$  as is remarked at the end of Section 4.

Fifth Reduction -  $H$  is also Lipschitz continuous in  $(x, p)$ :

At the next stage, we begin with a bounded Hamiltonian  $H(x, t, p)$  (the  $r$  - dependence having been taken care of by the fourth reduction) which is uniformly continuous in  $x$  uniformly in  $t$  and bounded  $p$  and satisfies (H0) - (H3) (and (H4) for (SP)). We then set

$$(3.8) \quad H_n(x, t, p) = \inf\{H(y, t, q) + (|y-x| + |p-q|)n : (y, q) \in V \times V^*\}$$

and wish to argue that it is enough to solve (CP) of (SP) with  $H_n$  in place of  $H$ .  $H_n$  is well-defined (since  $H$  is bounded) and  $H_n$  is Lipschitz continuous in  $x$  and  $p$ . Moreover,  $H_n$  satisfies (H0) and there is a continuous nondecreasing function  $\epsilon_n$  such that

$$(3.9) \quad |H_n(x, t, p) - H(x, t, p)| < \epsilon_n(|p|)$$

and

$$(3.10) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_n(R) = 0 \text{ for } R > 0.$$

In particular,  $H_n \rightarrow H$  UB. However, it does not follow from the assumptions that  $H_n$  satisfies (H1) - (H3) with  $d, v$  from (C), let alone uniformly in  $n$ . It does, however, satisfy (H4) uniformly in  $n$  since  $H$  is bounded - see the third reduction. We will need the full force of the Convergence Theorem.

We continue the discussion in the context of (CP). Assume that  $u_n \in UC_g(V \times [0, T])$  is a viscosity solution of

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{aligned} u_{nt} + H_n(x, t, Du_n) &= 0, \\ u_n(x, 0) &= \varphi(x). \end{aligned}$$

We seek to estimate  $u_n(x, t) - u_n(y, t) = z(x, y, t)$ . Using the above and (3.9) we find that

$$(3.12) \quad z_t + H(x, t, D_x z) - H(y, t, -D_y z) \leq \epsilon_n(|D_x z|) + \epsilon_n(|D_y z|).$$

We construct some supersolutions of (3.12). First, we observe that if  $w$  as given by (2.52) solves (2.54), then

$$w_n(x, y, t) = (E_0 + F_0 d(x, y))e^{\lambda t} + 2\epsilon_n(e^{\lambda T} K F_0) t$$

is a supersolution of (3.12) since  $e^{\lambda T} K F_0$  is a Lipschitz constant for  $w$  in  $x$  and  $y$ . We claim that  $z < w_n$ . The inequations solved by  $w_n$  and  $z$  do not satisfy the hypotheses of the comparison theorem in [10], but going through the proof given in [10] and regarding the terms involving  $\epsilon_n(\cdot)$  as a perturbation one easily justifies the above claim. We leave the tedious verification to the interested reader.

In particular,  $u_n(x, t) - u_n(y, t)$  is bounded independently of  $n$  on the set  $d(x, y) < 1$ , say by  $M$ . Next let  $w(x, y, t)$  be the supersolution  $E(\gamma) + F(\alpha + d(x, y))^\gamma(1 + t)$  of (2.53) constructed in (2.55) - (2.59) with, however,

$$F > \max(m_H(1) + 1, m_0(1), M)$$

in place of (2.58) (where  $m_0$  is a modulus for  $\varphi$  as in (2.4)) so that  $w > u_n(x, t) - u_n(y, t)$  on  $t = 0$  and  $d < 1$  and on  $d = 1$ . Then, as above, we conclude that

$$(3.13) \quad u_n(x, t) - u_n(y, t) \leq (E(\gamma) + F(\alpha + d(x, y))^\gamma)(1 + T) + 2\epsilon_n(L(\gamma, \alpha))$$

where  $L$  is a Lipschitz constant for  $w$  in  $x$  and  $y$ . It is now clear that the condition

(2.3) in the convergence theorem holds. Our conclusion is that if we can solve (CP) with bounded Lipschitz continuous Hamiltonians, then we have proved the Existence Theorem. This last step is taken up in the next section. The arguments above need only minor adaptations to cover the case of (SP).

## SECTION 4:

## EXISTENCE IN THE LIPSCHITZ CONTINUOUS CASE

We will now prove the existence in the Lipschitz continuous case to which the above considerations have reduced the proof of the Existence Theorem.

Proposition 4.1. (i) Let  $H: V \times [0, T] \times V^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfy (H0) and  $L_1, L_2$  be constants such that

$$(4.1) \quad |H(\bar{x}, t, \bar{p}) - H(x, t, p)| \leq L_1 |\bar{x} - x| + L_2 |\bar{p} - p|$$

for  $x, \bar{x} \in V, p, \bar{p} \in V^*$  and  $t \in [0, T]$ . Assume that  $\varphi \in UC(V)$  is Lipschitz continuous with constant  $L$ . Then there is a viscosity solution  $u$  of  $u_t + H(x, t, Du) = 0$  on  $V \times (0, T)$  which is Lipschitz continuous on bounded sets and satisfies

$$(4.2) \quad |u(\bar{x}, t) - u(x, t)| \leq (L_1 T + L) |\bar{x} - x| \text{ for } x, \bar{x} \in V, t \in [0, T]$$

and  $u(x, 0) = \varphi(x)$  for  $x \in V$ .

(ii) If  $H$  in (SP) satisfies (4.1), then there is a Lipschitz continuous viscosity solution  $u$  of (SP) with  $L_1$  as a Lipschitz constant.

Proof: We will mainly treat the case of (CP) and relegate (SP) to remarks. It follows from (4.1) that

$$(4.3) \quad H(x, t, p) = \min_{q \in B_R} (H(x, t, q) + L_2 |p - q|) \text{ for } R > |p|$$

and so,

$$(4.4) \quad H(x, t, p) = \min_{q \in B_R} \sup_{z \in B_{L_2}} (-(p, z) + (q, z) + H(x, t, q))$$

for  $R > |p|$ . So motivated, we introduce the following Hamiltonians:

$$(4.5) \quad H_M(x, t, p) = \inf_{q \in B_M} \sup_{z \in B_{L_2}} (-(p, z) + (q, z) + H(x, t, q)).$$

Clearly  $H_M(x, p) = H(x, p)$  for  $|p| < M$ . We will produce a viscosity solution  $u_M$  of

$$(4.6) \quad u_{Mt} + H_M(x, t, Du_M) = 0 \text{ in } V \times (0, T], \quad u_M(x, 0) = \varphi(x) \text{ in } V,$$

such that  $u_M$  is Lipschitz continuous in  $x$  with Lipschitz constant  $(L_1 T + L)$  and  $u_M$  is Lipschitz continuous in  $t$  uniformly on bounded sets of  $V$ . In this event, if

$(p, a) \in V^* \times \mathbb{R}$  and  $(p, a) \in D^+ u_M(x, t) \cup D^- u_M(x, t)$  ( $D^+$  and  $D^-$  here taking values in  $V \times \mathbb{R}$ ,



then it is easy to see that  $|p| < (L_1 T + L)$  and so  $u_M$  is also a viscosity solution of  $u_{Mt} + H(x, t, Du_M) = 0$  if  $M > (L_1 T + L)$ .

For  $0 < s < t < T$ , we set  $Q_{s,t} = \{\text{strongly measurable } q: [s, t] \rightarrow B_M^*\}$  and  $Z_{s,t} = \{\text{strongly measurable } z: [s, t] \rightarrow B_{L_2}\}$ . The set of strategies on  $[s, t]$ ,  $\Xi_{s,t}$ , is defined by  $\Xi_{s,t} = \{\text{nonanticipating maps } \xi: Q_{s,t} \rightarrow Z_{s,t}\}$ , where nonanticipating means that if  $p, q \in Q_{s,t}$  agree almost everywhere on an interval  $[a, t]$ ,  $s < a < t$ , then so do  $\xi(p)$  and  $\xi(q)$ .

Let  $0 < s < t < T$ . We define  $U(t, s)\varphi \in UC(V)$  for  $\varphi \in UC(V)$  by

$$(4.7) \quad U(t, s)\varphi(x) = \inf_{\xi \in \Xi_{s,t}} \sup_{q \in Q_{s,t}} \left( \int_s^t f(X(\tau, t, x), \tau, \xi(q)(\tau), q(\tau)) d\tau + \varphi(X(s, t, x)) \right)$$

where the "state process"  $X(t, s, x)$  is given by

$$(4.8) \quad X(t, s, x) = x + \int_s^t \xi(q)(\tau) d\tau,$$

and

$$(4.9) \quad f(x, t, z, q) = -(q, z) - H(x, t, q) \text{ for } x \in V, z \in B_{L_2} \text{ and } q \in B_M^*.$$

It is easy to see that  $U(t, s)$  is in fact a self-map of  $UC(V)$  (see below). We are abusing notation a bit by not expressing the dependence of  $X$  on  $\xi$  and  $q$ , which should be kept in mind. For those without experience with differential games, let us mention that the key relation in what follows is that if  $g(X, t, z, p) = z$  (so that (4.8) amounts to

$X' = g(X, t, \xi(q), q)$ ,  $X(s, x) = x$ ), then (4.5) may be written

$$(4.10) \quad H_M(x, t, p) = \inf_{q \in B_M} \sup_{z \in B_{L_2}} \{-(p, g(x, t, z, q)) - f(x, t, z, q)\}.$$

Indeed, all that follows generalizes to suitable representations of this sort.

**Lemma 4.2:** The value function  $u_M$  given by  $u_M(x, t) = (U(t, 0)\varphi)(x)$  is a viscosity solution of  $u_t + H_M(x, t, Du) = 0$  in  $V \times (0, T)$ . Moreover,  $u_M$  is Lipschitz continuous on bounded sets and is Lipschitz continuous in  $x$  with constant  $(L_1 T + L)$ . Finally,  $u_M(x, 0) = \varphi(x)$ .

Proof: It will simplify the notation if we agree to write  $u$  in place of  $u_M$  hereafter.

With  $\xi$  and  $q$  fixed and  $x, \bar{x} \in V$ ,

$$X(t, s, x) - X(t, s, \bar{x}) = x - \bar{x}.$$

Moreover, from (4.1) and (4.9) we have  $|f(x, t, z, q) - f(\bar{x}, t, z, q)| \leq L_1 |x - \bar{x}|$ . It then follows immediately from the definitions and assumptions that

$$(4.11) \quad |u(x, t) - u(\bar{x}, t)| \leq (L_1 T + L) |x - \bar{x}|$$

for  $x, \bar{x} \in V$  and  $t \in [0, T]$ , and the asserted Lipschitz continuity in  $x$  holds. Moreover,  $u$  is easily seen to be Lipschitz continuous in  $t$  uniformly for bounded  $x$ .

To prove that  $u$  is a viscosity solution of  $u_t + H_M(x, t, Du) = 0$  we will use the optimality conditions of the dynamic programming principle. In this situation, this just amounts to the statement that  $U$  is an evolution operator. That is, if  $0 < r < s < t < T$ , then

$$(4.12) \quad U(t, r) = U(t, s)U(s, r),$$

where juxtaposition denotes composition of mappings. This relation may be verified in the usual way - see [14] for the finite dimensional case. In order to verify that  $u$  is a viscosity supersolution of  $u_t + H(x, t, u, Du) = 0$  we assume the contrary and reach a contradiction. Assume that  $(p, a) \in V^* \times \mathbb{R}$ ,  $(y, b) \in V \times (0, T)$  and

$$(4.13) \quad u(x, t) < u(y, b) + (p, x - y) + a(t - b) + o(|x - y| + |b - t|),$$

i.e.,  $(p, a)$  lies in the superdifferential of  $u$  at  $(y, b)$ . Assume, moreover, that

$$(4.14) \quad 4\gamma = a + H(y, b, p) > 0,$$

where  $\gamma$  is defined by (4.14). Using (4.5) we conclude that

$$(4.15) \quad a + \sup_{z \in B_{L_2}} (-(p, z) + (q, z) + H(y, b, q)) > 4\gamma \text{ for } q \in B_M^*.$$

Using (4.15) and a partition of unity argument, one easily concludes the existence of a continuous function  $\xi: B_M^* \rightarrow B_{L_2}$  such that

$$(4.16) \quad a - (p, \xi(q)) + (q, \xi(q)) + H(y, b, q) > 3\gamma \text{ for } q \in B_M^*.$$

Next choose an arbitrary  $q \in Q_{s, b}$  and  $s < b$ . From the continuity properties of  $H$  and

(4.16), we deduce that if  $s < t < b$  and  $b - s$  is small enough, then

$$(4.17) \quad a - (p, \xi(q(t))) + (q(t), \xi(q(t))) + H(X(t, s, y), t, q(t)) > 2\gamma,$$

where  $X$  is given by (4.8) and  $\xi(q)(t) = \xi(q(t))$  denotes the strategy associated with the mapping of  $B_M^*$  into  $B_{L_2}$  discussed above. Integration of (4.17) with respect to  $t$  over the range  $s < t < b$  and use of the relation

$$(4.18) \quad \int_s^b (p, \xi(q(\tau))) d\tau \approx (p, X(b, s, y) - y)$$

yields

$$(4.19) \quad a(b - s) + (p, y - X(b, s, y)) + \int_s^b (H(X(t, s, y), t, q(t)) + (q(t), \xi(q(t)))) dt > 2\gamma(b - s).$$

Use of (4.13) in conjunction with (4.19) and obvious considerations of continuity yield

$$\begin{aligned} & -u(X(b, s, y), s) + u(y, b) + \int_s^b (H(X(t, s, y), t, q(t)) + (q(t), \xi(q(t)))) dt \\ & > \gamma(b - s) \end{aligned}$$

for  $b - s$  sufficiently small. Hence, using (4.12),

$$u(y, b) >$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\xi \in \Xi_{s,b}} \sup_{q \in Q_{s,b}} (u(X(b, s, y), s) - \int_s^b (H(X(t, s, y), t, \xi(q)(t)) + (q(t), \xi(q)(t)))) dt \\ & = (U(b, s)u(\cdot, s))(y) = (U(b, s)U(s, 0)\phi)(y) = (U(b, 0)\phi)(y) = u(y, b), \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. Thus  $u$  is a subsolution.

The proof that  $u$  is a supersolution is similar. Assume not, so that there is a  $(y, b) \in V \times (0, T]$  and a  $(p, a) \in V^* \times \mathbb{R}$  such that both

$$(4.20) \quad u(x, t) > u(y, b) + (p, x - y) + a(t - b) + o(|x - y| + |t - b|)$$

and there is a  $\gamma > 0$  and a  $\bar{q} \in B_M^*$  such that

$$(4.21) \quad a + H(y, b, \bar{q}) + (\bar{q}, \xi) - (p, \xi) < -3\gamma \text{ for all } \xi \in B_{L_2}.$$

Proceeding as above, we find that for every strategy  $\xi$

$$(4.22) \quad a + H(X(t, s, y), t, \bar{q}) + (\bar{q}, \xi(\bar{q})) - (p, \xi(\bar{q})) < -2\gamma,$$

where  $\bar{q}$  denotes the corresponding constant element of  $Q$ , provided only that  $s < t < b$  and  $b - s$  is sufficiently small. Integration of (4.22) over  $s < t < b$ , use of (4.8), (4.20)

and then (4.12) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 u(y, b) &< \\
 u(X(t, s, y), s) &= \int_s^b (H(X(t, s, y), t, \bar{q}) + (\bar{q}, \xi(\bar{q})(t))) dt - \gamma \\
 &< \inf_{\xi \in \Xi} \sup_{s, b} \sup_{q \in Q_{s, b}} (u(X(b, s, y), s) - \int_s^b (H(X(t, s, y), t, q(t)) + (q(t), \xi(q(t)))) dt) \\
 &= (U(b, s)u(\cdot, s))(y) = (U(b, s)U(s, 0)\varphi)(y) = u(y, b),
 \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. Thus  $u$  is a viscosity solution and has all the claimed properties in the case of (CP).

In the case of (SP), the analogous considerations succeed. One still has (4.4) (independent of  $t$ ) and defines  $H_M$  as in (4.5). The value function

$$u(x) = \inf_{\xi \in \Xi} \sup_{q \in Q} \int_0^\infty e^{-t} f(X(t, x), \xi(q)(t), q(t)) dt$$

now obeys the dynamic programming principle in the form

$$u(x) = \inf_{\xi \in \Xi} \sup_{q \in Q} \left( \int_0^t e^{-\tau} f(X(\tau, x), \xi(q)(\tau), q(\tau)) d\tau + u(X(t, x)) e^{-t} \right),$$

where  $X(t, x) = X(t, 0, x)$ ,  $Q$  is the set of controls on  $[0, \infty)$  and  $\Xi$  is the set of strategies on  $[0, \infty)$  (where  $\xi$  is a strategy if whenever controls  $p$  and  $q$  agree on an interval  $[0, t)$  then so do  $\xi(q)$  and  $\xi(p)$ ). Then one (for example) writes the statement that  $u$  is not a viscosity subsolution, multiplies this by  $e^{-t}$ , integrates over a small interval  $0 < t < b$  and reaches a contradiction as above.

We remark here about the case in which  $H(x, t, r, p)$  depends on  $r$ . If  $H$  is Lipschitz in  $(x, r, p)$  and nondecreasing in  $r$  then

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.23) \quad H(x, t, r, p) &= \inf \{ H(x, t, s, q) + L(r - s)^+ + L|p - q| : s \in R, q \in V^* \} \\
 &= \inf_{(s, q) \in R \times V^*} \sup_{(\theta, z) \in [0, L] \times B_L} \{ H(x, t, s, q) + \theta(t - s) - (z, p - q) \}.
 \end{aligned}$$

One can use this formula to obtain a solution for (CP) and (SP) via differential games as was done above in the  $r$  - independent case, but the complexity becomes unpleasant.

We conclude this section with a variety of comments. All of the above presentation holds in a general Banach space  $V$  - no geometrical assumptions were invoked and conditions (C) played no role. In this generality, however, the value of the results is not clear. No uniqueness results are available. If one wants to pass beyond the context of  $\mathbb{R}^N$  spaces, it seems likely that the notion of strict viscosity solutions ([10, Appendix]) or a variant is appropriate rather than the notion used here. Indeed, in the language of [10],  $D^+u(x)$  and  $D^-u(x)$  may be empty for all  $x$ , hence the simple notion becomes useless. Moreover, the uniqueness of the solutions constructed above even when  $V$  is  $\mathbb{R}^N$  and (C) holds does not follow at once, since (H3) may fail. For example, for  $H(x,p) = |p|$ , (H3) is equivalent to the existence of a constant  $C$  such that  $|d_x + d_y| < C|x - y|$  for  $x, y \in V$ , and this is not implied by the assumptions. However, one can replace  $d$  by  $\bar{d}(x,y) = d(x - y, 0)$ , and  $\bar{d}$  does satisfy this condition. Using the uniform approximability of uniformly continuous  $H(x,p)$  by Lipschitz continuous functions, one can extend existence to the case of uniformly continuous Hamiltonians.

## SECTION 5:

## VARIANTS, EXAMPLES AND REMARKS

In this section we attempt to provide some feeling for the assumptions used in this paper and [10]. Let us begin by reviewing what various assumptions mean in the event that  $V$  is a real Hilbert space,  $d(x,y) = |x - y|$  and

$$(5.1) \quad H(x,p) = (b(x),p) - f(x)$$

is an affine Hamiltonian. Here  $(\cdot, \cdot)$  denotes the inner-product on  $V$  and we have identified  $V$  and  $V^*$ . Note that in this case

$$d_x(x,y) = -d_y(x,y) = |x - y|^{-1}(x - y).$$

With this choice of  $d$  (H3) is equivalent to requiring that  $f \in UC(V)$  and that there be a  $c > 0$  such that

$$(5.2) \quad (b(x) - b(y), x - y) \geq -c|x - y|^2 \text{ for } x, y \in V;$$

that is,  $x \mapsto b(x) + cx$  is monotone. The condition (H1) is automatically satisfied since  $H$  is independent of  $u$ , and (H0) is equivalent to the uniform continuity of  $b$  on bounded sets. Finally, (H2) is equivalent to the existence of a  $c_1 \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$(5.3) \quad (b(x), Dv(x)) \geq -c_1 \text{ for } x \in V$$

where  $v$  is a function satisfying (1.4).

It is easy to see that some condition like (5.3) is necessary for uniqueness even in the linear case. Indeed, set  $b(x) = -\lambda x$  for some  $\lambda > 0$  and  $f = 0$ . Clearly (5.2) holds with  $c = -\lambda$ , the other assumptions hold as well, and (SP) becomes

$$(5.4) \quad -\lambda(x, Du) + u = 0 \text{ in } V.$$

If  $\lambda > 1$ , (5.4) has the distinct uniformly continuous viscosity solutions  $u = 0$  and  $u = |x|^{1/\lambda}$ .

We turn to the condition (H4) and its role in the study of (SP). First, let us give two examples of functions  $F$ . If we take

$$(5.5) \quad F(a,b) = C(1 + b) + \phi(a)$$

where  $C > 0$  and  $b \mapsto \phi(b)$  is continuous and nondecreasing, then we may choose

$$G(r) = C(1 + r) + \phi(C).$$

Observe that this choice of  $F$  is appropriate for the situation in which  $V$  is a Hilbert

space,  $d(x,y) = |x - y|$  and  $H(x,p) \in UC(V \times B_R^*)$  for all  $R > 0$ ; indeed, we then have

$$H(y,0) - H(x,0) \leq C(1 + |x - y|) \text{ and } |H(x,p) - H(x,0)| \leq \phi(|p|) \text{ for } x,y \in V$$

for a suitable constant  $C$  and a nondecreasing function  $\phi$ , and so

$$\begin{aligned} H(y, -\lambda d_y) - H(x, \lambda d_x) &\leq H(y, -\lambda d_y) - H(y, 0) + H(y, 0) - H(x, 0) + \\ &H(x, 0) - H(x, \lambda d_x) \leq C(1 + |x - y|) + 2\phi(K\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

A second  $F$  of interest for which (H4) is verifiable is

$$(5.6) \quad F(a,b) = c_0 ab + c_1 b^\alpha + c_2 \text{ for } a, b > 0$$

where  $\alpha \in ]0,1)$ , and  $c_0, c_2 > 0$ . Then (H4) holds if  $c_0 \alpha < 1$ , for we can then use  $G(r) = c_1(1 - c_0 \alpha)^{-1} r^\alpha + c_2$ . In fact, the curious relation  $c_0 \alpha < 1$ , which was used without further explanation in Ishii [17] (a somewhat related condition also occurs in [8]) is necessary here, as the next example shows. In this example, (H0) - (H3) hold, and the estimate of (H4) holds with  $F(\lambda, d) = \lambda d + d$ , but  $c_0 \alpha = 1$  in this case and there are no uniformly continuous solutions of (SP).

Let  $V = \mathbb{R}$ ,  $H(x,p) = b(x)p - |x|$  and choose  $b$  as follows: set  $x_n = (n+1)(n+2)$  for integral  $n > 0$  and

$$(5.7) \quad \begin{aligned} b(x) &= 0 \text{ if } x \leq 0, \quad b(x) = x - x_n \text{ if } x_n \leq x \leq x_n + (n+1), \\ b(x) &= x_{n+1} - x \text{ if } x_n + n + 1 \leq x \leq x_n + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly (H0) - (H3) hold and the first inequality of (H4) holds with  $F(\lambda, d) = \lambda d + d$ .

Here  $c_0 \alpha = 1$  and we can show that (SP) does not have a uniformly continuous solution.

Indeed, if such a solution exists, it is easy to show that it is given by

$$u(x) = \int_0^\infty |X(t,x)| e^{-t} dt$$

where  $X(t,x)$  is the solution of the Cauchy problem  $\dot{X} = b(X)$ ,  $X(0) = x$ . Obviously

$u(x_n) = 0$  while for  $h \in (0,1)$

$$u(x_n + h) > \int_0^h X(t, x_n + h) e^{-t} dt$$

As is seen from this sketch of proof, it is not (5.8) which is crucial to the existence of bounded solutions, but rather the ability to find suitable bounded sub- and supersolutions.

To illustrate what is gained by replacing (C) by (C)' we consider again the case of the linear Hamiltonian given by (5.1) in a real Hilbert space  $V$ . Let  $b(x)$  be uniformly continuous on bounded sets and satisfy (5.2). As the example of nonuniqueness shows, we cannot deduce from these assumptions that (5.3) holds for some  $v$  satisfying (1.4).

However,  $v(x) = (1/2)\log(1 + |x|^2)$  satisfies (C)' and (5.2) with  $y = 0$  implies

$$(b(x), Dv(x)) = (b(x), x/(1+|x|^2)) > -c + (b(0), x)/(1 + |x|^2)$$

and the right-hand side of this expression is clearly bounded. We conclude that BUC solutions of  $u + (b(x), Du) - f(x) = 0$  are unique whenever  $b$  satisfies the above conditions. This assertion does not contradict the nonuniqueness of solutions of (5.4) exhibited above, since the second solution was unbounded.

We want to examine this situation further. We next present a class of examples that indicate that even in the case of BUC solutions some assumption like (H2)' is needed - indeed, the example shows that this condition is rather sharp. Consider the equation

$$(5.9) \quad -g(x)|u'|^\alpha + u = 0$$

where  $0 < \alpha < 1$  and

$$(5.10) \quad g \in UC(\mathbb{R}) \text{ is odd, nondecreasing, } g(s) > 0 \text{ for } s > 0$$

and

$$(5.11) \quad \int_0^1 \frac{1}{g(s)^{1/\alpha}} ds = \infty.$$

The uniqueness of BUC( $\mathbb{R}$ ) solutions of (5.9) is determined by whether or not

$$(5.12) \quad I = \int_1^\infty \frac{1}{g(s)^{1/\alpha}} ds$$

is finite. Indeed, if  $I$  is finite one easily checks that the odd function given by

$$(5.13) \quad u(x) = \left( \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} \int_x^\infty \frac{1}{g(s)^{1/\alpha}} ds + 1 \right)^{-\alpha/(1-\alpha)} \text{ for } x > 0$$



is a BUC solution together with  $u = 0$ , so BUC solutions are nonunique. For example, if  $g(x) = x$  and  $\alpha = 1/2$ , then  $u(x) = x/(1 + |x|)$  and  $u$  is even Lipschitz continuous. It follows that if  $I$  is finite then there is no  $v$  satisfying (C)' such that (H2) holds for  $H(x,p) = -g(x)|p|^\alpha$ . However, if  $I$  is infinite, then

$$v(x) = \int_1^{|x|} \frac{1}{g(s)^{1/\alpha}} ds \text{ on } |x| > 1$$

satisfies (C)' and (H2) holds. In this class of examples, (H2)' is necessary and sufficient for uniqueness in BUC.

We continue dissecting the role of (H2). As mentioned above, it played a dual role in first obtaining bounds on  $d < 1$  and then again in getting refined estimates in  $d < 1$ . We can split the assumption into pieces designed to handle these tasks separately. To obtain the preliminary bounds it is enough to know that there is a function  $v$  satisfying (C) (in particular, (1.4)) such that

(H2)<sub>a</sub> For each  $R > 0$  there is a constant  $C_R$  such that

$$H(x,t,r,p) - H(x,t,r,p + \lambda Dv) < C_R$$

for  $(x,t,r) \in V \times [0,T] \times R$ ,  $|p| < R$  and  $0 < \lambda < R$

holds. In order to continue to the second stage, one only needs that there is a  $\mu$  which satisfies the requirements of (C)' (in particular, (1.4)' in place of (1.4)) in place of  $v$  such that

(H2)<sub>b</sub> There is a local modulus  $\sigma_H$  such that

$$H(x,t,r,p) - H(x,t,r,p + \lambda D\mu(x)) < \sigma_H(\lambda, |p|)$$

whenever  $0 < \lambda < 1$ ,  $(x,r,t,p) \in \Omega \times [0,T] \times R \times V^*$ .

Then the existence and uniqueness results remain valid with (H2) replaced by (H2)<sub>a</sub> and (H2)<sub>b</sub>. Examples show that this is an interesting generality. Indeed, if  $H$  is bounded on  $V \times [0,T] \times R \times B_R^*$  for each  $R$ , then (H2)<sub>a</sub> is automatically satisfied. Hence  $H(x,p) = \max(\min(-(x,p), |p|), -|p|)$  satisfies (H2)<sub>a</sub>. It also satisfies (H2)<sub>b</sub> with  $\mu(x) = \log(1 + |x|^2)$  when  $V$  is Hilbert. Another example, with the same  $\mu$ , is given by  $H(x,p) = \cos((x,p))$ . Neither satisfy (H2).

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] Barbu, V. and G. Da Prato, Hamilton-Jacobi equations in Hilbert spaces, Pitman, London 1983.
- [2] Barbu, V. and G. Da Prato, Hamilton-Jacobi equations in Hilbert spaces; variational and semigroup approach, Scuola Normale Superiore Report, Pisa, 1984.
- [3] Barles, G., Existence results for first-order Hamilton-Jacobi equations, Annales IHP, Analyse non linéaire 1 (1984), 325-340.
- [4] Bourgain, J., La propriété de Radon-Nikodym, Cours de 3<sup>e</sup> cycle polytechnique no. 36, Université P. et M. Curie, Paris, 1979.
- [5] Crandall, M. G., L. C. Evans and P. L. Lions, Some properties of viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 282 (1984), 487-502.
- [6] Crandall, M. G., and P. L. Lions, Condition d'unicité pour les solutions généralisées des équations de Hamilton-Jacobi du premier ordre, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris 292 (1981), 183-186.
- [7] Crandall, M. G. and P. L. Lions, Viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 277 (1983), 1-42.
- [8] Crandall, M. G. and P. L. Lions, Solutions de viscosité non bornées des équations de Hamilton-Jacobi du premier ordre, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris 298 (1984), 217-220.
- [9] Crandall, M. G., and P. L. Lions, On existence and uniqueness of solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations, to appear in Non. Anal. Theor. Meth. Appl.
- [10] Crandall, M. G. and P. L. Lions, Hamilton-Jacobi equations in infinite dimensions, Part I: Uniqueness of viscosity solutions, to appear in J. Func. Anal.
- [11] Crandall, M. G., and P. L. Lions, Remarks on the existence and uniqueness of unbounded viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations, to appear.
- [12] Crandall, M. G., and P. L. Lions, Solutions de viscosité pour les équations de Hamilton-Jacobi dans des espaces de Banach, C. R. Acad. Sc. Paris 300 (1985), 67-70.
- [13] Crandall, M. G., and R. Newcomb, Viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations at the boundary, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., to appear.

- [14] Evans, L. C. and P. E. Souganidis, Differential games and representation formulas for solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi-Isaacs equations, Indiana J. Math. 33 (1984), 773-797.
- [15] Ishii, H., Uniqueness of unbounded solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 33 (1984), 721-748.
- [16] Ishii, H., Remarks on the existence of viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations, Bull. Facul. Sci. Eng., Chuo University, 26 (1983), 5-24.
- [17] Ishii, H., Existence and uniqueness of solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations, preprint.
- [18] Lions, P. L., Generalized Solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi Equations, Pitman, London, 1982.
- [19] Lions, P. L., Existence results for first-order Hamilton-Jacobi equations, Recherche Mat. Napoli, 32 (1983), 1-23.
- [20] Stegall, C., Optimization of functions on certain subsets of Banach spaces, Math. Annal. 236 (1978), 171-176.
- [21] Souganidis, P. E., Existence of viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations, J. Diff. Eq., to appear.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER 2826	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. <i>A158137</i>	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) HAMILTON-JACOBI EQUATIONS IN INFINITE DIMENSIONS, PART II. EXISTENCE OF VISCOSITY SOLUTIONS		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Summary Report - no specific reporting period
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) Michael G. Crandall and Pierre-Louis Lions		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) DAAG29-80-C-0041
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Mathematics Research Center, University of 610 Walnut Street Wisconsin Madison, Wisconsin 53706		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS Work Unit Number 1 - Applied Analysis
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS U. S. Army Research Office P.O. Box 12211 Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27709		12. REPORT DATE June 1985
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 42
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)  UNCLASSIFIED
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)  Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Hamilton-Jacobi Equations existence theory equations in Banach spaces viscosity solutions differential games nonlinear first-order partial differential equations		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This paper is the second in a series by the authors concerned with the theory of viscosity solutions Hamilton-Jacobi equations in infinite dimensional spaces. The first paper introduced a notion of viscosity solution appropriate for the study of Hamilton-Jacobi equations in spaces with the so-called Radon-Nikodym property and obtained uniqueness theorems under assumptions paralleling the finite dimensional theory. The main results of the current paper concern existence of solutions of stationary and time-dependent Hamilton-Jacobi equations. In order to establish these results it is necessary to overcome the		

20. ABSTRACT - cont'd.

difficulties associated with the fact that bounded sets are not precompact in infinite dimensions and this is done by sharp constructive estimates coupled with the use of differential games to solve regularized problems.

Interest in this subject arises on the abstract side from the desire to contribute to the theory of partial differential equations in infinite dimensional spaces to treat natural questions raised by the finite dimensional theory. Interest also arises from potential applications to the theory of control of partial differential equations. However, the results herein do not apply directly to problems of the form arising in the control of partial differential equations, a question which will be treated in the next paper of the series.

**END**

**FILMED**

**10-85**

**DTIC**