

REMARKS ON SUBLINEAR ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS

HAIM BREZIS and LUC OSWALD

Département de Mathématiques, Université Paris VI, 4 Place Jussieu, 75230 Paris Cedex 05, France

(Received 7 November 1984; received for publication 9 April 1985)

Key words and phrases: Sublinear elliptic equations.

1. INTRODUCTION

Consider the problem

$$\left. \begin{aligned} -\Delta u &= f(x, u) && \text{on } \Omega, \\ u &\geq 0, \quad u \neq 0 && \text{on } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 && \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (1)$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a bounded domain with smooth boundary and $f(x, u): \Omega \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

We make the following assumptions:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} &\text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega \text{ the function } u \mapsto f(x, u) \text{ is continuous on} \\ &[0, \infty) \text{ and the function } u \mapsto f(x, u)/u \text{ is decreasing on } (0, \infty) \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (2)$$

$$\text{for each } u \geq 0 \text{ the function } x \mapsto f(x, u) \text{ belongs to } L^\infty(\Omega); \quad (3)$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} &\text{there is a constant } C > 0 \text{ such that} \\ &f(x, u) \leq C(u + 1) \text{ for a.e. } x \in \Omega, \quad \forall u \geq 0. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (4)$$

Set

$$a_0(x) = \lim_{u \downarrow 0} f(x, u)/u$$

$$a_\infty(x) = \lim_{u \uparrow \infty} f(x, u)/u$$

so that $-\infty < a_0(x) \leq +\infty$ and $-\infty \leq a_\infty(x) < +\infty$. By a solution of (1) we mean a function $u \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfying (1). It follows from (2), (3), (4) that $f(x, u) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$; indeed we have

$$-|f(x, \|u\|_\infty)| \leq f(x, u(x)) \leq C(|u(x)| + 1).$$

Consequently a solution of (1) belongs to $W^{2,p}(\Omega)$ for every $p < \infty$.

Our main result is the following:

THEOREM 1. There is at most one solution of (1). Moreover, a solution of (1) exists if and only if

$$\lambda_1(-\Delta - a_0(x)) < 0 \quad (5)$$

and

$$\lambda_1(-\Delta - a_\infty(x)) > 0. \quad (6)$$

Here $\lambda_1(-\Delta - a(x))$ denotes the first eigenvalue of $-\Delta - a(x)$ with zero Dirichlet condition. Since $a(x)$ may take the values $\pm\infty$ the precise meaning of (5) and (6) will be explained in Section 3. In the special case where $f(x, u) = f(u)$ is independent of x , then (5)–(6) is equivalent to

$$a_\infty < \lambda_1(-\Delta) < a_0.$$

Theorem 1 is closely related to a number of earlier results. We refer in particular to Krasnoselskii [12, theorems 7.14, 7.15], Keller and Cohen [11], Cohen and Laetsch [6], Keller [10], Simpson and Cohen [14], Laetsch [13], Amann [1, 2], Hess [9], DeFigueiredo [7], Berestycki [5], and Smoller and Wasserman [15].

The main novelties in our approach are the following:

(a) Our proof of uniqueness involves a simple "energy" device which is reminiscent of the device used in the theory of monotone operators—in contrast with all the previous proofs based on a comparison argument and on the maximum principle.

(b) Our proof of existence relies on a minimization technique while the earlier works used most often a sub-super-solution method. In addition, we point out that the functional to be minimized, namely

$$E(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla u|^2 - \int F(x, u) \quad \text{where} \quad F(x, u) = \int_0^u f(x, s) dx$$

is convex with respect to the variable $\rho = u^2$. This fact is based on an observation of Benguria [3] (see also [4]).

(c) In most earlier works it has not been noticed—or explicitly stated—that, under assumptions (2)–(4), there is indeed a simple necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a solution of (1).

Our paper is organized as follows: 1. Introduction; 2. Uniqueness; 3. Condition (5)–(6) is necessary; 4. Condition (5)–(6) is sufficient.

2. UNIQUENESS

Here we use only assumptions (2) and (3). We start with the following lemma.

LEMMA 1. Assume (2), (3) and let u be a solution of (1). Then we have

$$u > 0 \quad \text{on } \Omega \quad (7)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial n} < 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \quad (8)$$

(n denotes the outward normal direction).

Proof. Since $u \leq \|u\|_\infty$ it follows that

$$\frac{f(x, u)}{u} \geq \frac{f(x, \|u\|_\infty)}{\|u\|_\infty}$$

and therefore

$$f(x, u) \geq -Mu \quad \text{on } \Omega$$

for some constant $M \geq 0$. Hence u satisfies

$$-\Delta u + Mu \geq 0 \quad \text{on } \Omega$$

and the conclusion follows from the strong maximum principle (see, e.g. Gilbarg and Trudinger [8]).

Proof of uniqueness. Suppose u_1 and u_2 are two solutions of (1). We write

$$-\frac{\Delta u_1}{u_1} + \frac{\Delta u_2}{u_2} = \frac{f(x, u_1)}{u_1} - \frac{f(x, u_2)}{u_2}, \quad (9)$$

multiply (9) through by $u_1^2 - u_2^2$ and integrate over Ω . Note that u_2^2/u_1 and u_1^2/u_2 belong to H_0^1 and

$$\nabla\left(\frac{u_2^2}{u_1}\right) = 2\frac{u_2}{u_1}\nabla u_2 - \frac{u_2^2}{u_1^2}\nabla u_1, \quad \nabla\left(\frac{u_1^2}{u_2}\right) = 2\frac{u_1}{u_2}\nabla u_1 - \frac{u_1^2}{u_2^2}\nabla u_2.$$

(We use here the fact that u_1/u_2 and u_2/u_1 belong to L^∞ , which is a consequence of lemma 1.) After some rearrangements we obtain the identity

$$\int \left(-\frac{\Delta u_1}{u_1} + \frac{\Delta u_2}{u_2} \right) (u_1^2 - u_2^2) = \int \left| \nabla u_1 - \frac{u_1}{u_2} \nabla u_2 \right|^2 + \left| \nabla u_2 - \frac{u_2}{u_1} \nabla u_1 \right|^2 \geq 0. \quad (10)$$

We deduce from (9) and (10) that

$$\int \left(\frac{f(x, u_1)}{u_1} - \frac{f(x, u_2)}{u_2} \right) (u_1^2 - u_2^2) \geq 0$$

and we conclude (using assumption (2)) that $u_1 = u_2$.

Remark 1. If instead of (2) we just assume that the function $u \mapsto f(x, u)/u$ is nonincreasing (for a.e. $x \in \Omega$), uniqueness may fail. However, we obtain

$$\frac{\nabla u_1}{u_1} = \frac{\nabla u_2}{u_2} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{f(x, u_1)}{u_1} = \frac{f(x, u_2)}{u_2},$$

which implies in particular that u_1/u_2 is a constant. In many cases we can still conclude that $u_1 = u_2$.

3. CONDITION (5)–(6) IS NECESSARY

First we observe that

$$a_\infty(x) \leq f(x, 1) \quad \text{and} \quad a_0(x) \geq f(x, 1) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega$$

and hence there is a constant $C \geq 0$ such that

$$a_\infty(x) \leq C \quad \text{and} \quad a_0(x) \geq -C \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega.$$

The precise meaning of $\lambda_1(-\Delta - a(x))$ is

$$\lambda_1(-\Delta - a(x)) = \inf_{\substack{\phi \in H_0^1 \\ \|\phi\|_2 = 1}} \left\{ \int |\nabla \phi|^2 - \int_{\{a \neq 0\}} a \phi^2 \right\}.$$

Note that $\int_{\{a \neq 0\}} a \phi^2$ makes sense if $a(x)$ is any measurable function such that either $a(x) \leq C$ or $a(x) \geq -C$ a.e. on Ω . In the first case $\lambda_1(-\Delta - a(x)) \in (-\infty, +\infty]$ and in the second case $\lambda_1(-\Delta - a(x)) \in [-\infty, +\infty)$.

Proof of (5). By definition of $\lambda_1(-\Delta - a_0(x))$, and since $u > 0$ on Ω , we have

$$\lambda_1(-\Delta - a_0(x)) \leq \frac{\int |\nabla u|^2 - \int a_0 u^2}{\int u^2}.$$

On the other hand we have

$$\int |\nabla u|^2 = \int f(x, u) u < \int a_0(x) u^2$$

and (5) follows.

Proof of (6). Set

$$\bar{a}(x) = \frac{f(x, \|u\|_\infty + 1)}{\|u\|_\infty + 1} \in L^\infty(\Omega)$$

and

$$\mu = \lambda_1(-\Delta - \bar{a}(x)).$$

Let ψ denote the corresponding eigenfunction, that is,

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \psi - \bar{a} \psi = \mu \psi & \text{on } \Omega \\ \psi > 0 & \text{on } \Omega \\ \psi = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Multiplying (1) through by ψ and integrating on Ω we find

$$\int u(\bar{a}(x) \psi + \mu \psi) = \int f(x, u) \psi.$$

On the other hand we have $f(x, u) > \bar{a}(x)u$ and thus we obtain $\mu \int u \psi > 0$; hence $\mu > 0$. Finally we claim that

$$\lambda_1(-\Delta - a_\infty) \geq \mu$$

(since $a_\infty(x) \leq \bar{a}(x)$) and the conclusion follows.

4. EXISTENCE

We shall establish an existence result slightly stronger than announced in theorem 1. Instead of (2) we just assume that

$$\text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega \text{ the function } u \mapsto f(x, u) \text{ is continuous on } [0, \infty). \quad (11)$$

However, we also assume that

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{for each } \delta > 0 \text{ there is a constant } C_\delta \geq 0 \text{ such that } f(x, u) \geq -C_\delta u \\ &\forall u \in [0, \delta], \quad \text{a.e. } x \in \Omega. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

(Note that (12) is a weaker assumption than (2) + (3).)

Set

$$\begin{aligned} a_0(x) &= \liminf_{u \downarrow 0} \frac{f(x, u)}{u} \\ a_\infty(x) &= \limsup_{u \uparrow \infty} \frac{f(x, u)}{u}. \end{aligned}$$

Under assumptions (12) and (4) there is a constant C such that $a_0(x) \geq -C$ and $a_\infty(x) \leq C$.

THEOREM 2. Assume that (3), (4), (11), (12), (5) and (6) hold. Then there is a solution of (1).

Proof. Consider the functional

$$E(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla u|^2 - \int F(x, u), \quad u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$$

where $F(x, u) = \int_0^u f(x, t) dt$ and $f(x, u)$ is extended to be $f(x, 0)$ for $u \leq 0$. Note that $E(u) \in (-\infty, +\infty]$ is well-defined since $F(x, u) \leq C(\frac{1}{2}u^2 + |u|) \forall u \in \mathbb{R}$. We claim that:

$$E \text{ is coercive on } H_0^1, \text{ that is, } \lim_{\|u\|_{H_0^1} \rightarrow \infty} E(u) = \infty; \quad (13)$$

$$E \text{ is l.s.c. for the weak } H_0^1 \text{ topology}; \quad (14)$$

$$\text{there is some } \phi \in H_0^1 \text{ such that } E(\phi) < 0. \quad (15)$$

Proof of (13). Assume, by contradiction, that there is some sequence (u_n) in H_0^1 such that

$$\|u_n\|_{H_0^1} \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{and} \quad E(u_n) \leq C.$$

We have

$$\frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla u_n|^2 \leq \int F(x, u_n) + C \quad (16)$$

and consequently we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla u_n|^2 \leq C \int (u_n^2 + 1). \quad (17)$$

Set

$$t_n = \|u_n\|_2 \quad \text{and} \quad v_n = u_n/t_n.$$

It follows from (17) that

$$t_n \rightarrow \infty, \quad \|v_n\|_2 = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|v_n\|_{H_0^1} \leq C.$$

We may therefore assume that

$$v_n \rightarrow v \text{ weakly in } H_0^1, v_n \rightarrow v \text{ strongly in } L^2 \text{ and a.e. with } \|v\|_2 = 1.$$

We claim that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \frac{F(x, t_n v_n)}{t_n^2} \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{[v>0]} a_x v^2. \quad (18)$$

Indeed we write

$$\int F(x, t_n v_n) = \int_{[v>0]} F(x, t_n v_n^+) + \int_{[v \leq 0]} F(x, t_n v_n^+) + \int_{[v_n \leq 0]} F(x, t_n v_n). \quad (19)$$

We estimate the second integral by

$$\int_{[v \leq 0]} F(x, t_n v_n^+) \leq C \int_{[v \leq 0]} [t_n^2 (v_n^+)^2 + 1]$$

and we deduce that

$$\int_{[v \leq 0]} \frac{F(x, t_n v_n^+)}{t_n^2} \leq o(1) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty \quad (20)$$

since $v_n \rightarrow v$ in L^2 .

We estimate the third integral by

$$\int_{[v_n \leq 0]} F(x, t_n v_n) \leq C \int t_n |v_n|$$

and thus we obtain

$$\int_{[v_n \leq 0]} \frac{F(x, t_n v_n)}{t_n^2} \leq o(1) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (21)$$

We now turn to the first integral. We note that

$$\limsup_{u \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{F(x, u)}{u^2} \leq \frac{1}{2} a_x(x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega$$

and therefore

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{F(x, t_n v_n^+(x))}{t_n^2} \leq \frac{1}{2} a_x(x) v^2(x) \quad \text{a.e. on } [v > 0]. \quad (22)$$

On the other hand we have

$$\frac{F(x, t_n v_n^+)}{t_n^2} \leq C \left[(v_n^+)^2 + \frac{1}{t_n^2} \right]$$

and since $v_n \rightarrow v$ in L^2 we may find a fixed function $h \in L^1$ such that (for some subsequence)

$$\frac{F(x, t_n v_n^+)}{t_n^2} \leq h \quad \text{a.e. on } \Omega, \forall n. \quad (23)$$

From (22), (23) and Fatou's lemma we obtain

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{[v>0]} \frac{F(x, t_n v_n^+)}{t_n^2} \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{[v>0]} a_x v^2. \quad (24)$$

Combining (19), (20), (21) and (24) we see that (18) holds. Passing to the limit in (16) we find (using (18))

$$\frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla v|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{[v>0]} a_x v^2. \quad (25)$$

Finally we have (by definition of α)

$$\int |\nabla v^+|^2 - \int_{[v>0]} a_x v^2 \geq \alpha \|v^+\|_2^2 \quad (26)$$

where $\alpha = \lambda_1(-\Delta - a^+(x)) > 0$.

Combining (25) and (26) we deduce that $v^+ = 0$ and going back to (25) we obtain $v = 0$ —a contradiction since $\|v\|_2 = 1$.

Proof of (14). Suppose $u_n \rightarrow u$ weakly in H_0^1 . Since $F(x, u_n) \leq C(u_n^2 + 1)$ we may apply Fatou's lemma and conclude that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int F(x, u_n) \leq \int F(x, u).$$

Proof of (15). We fix any $\phi \in H_0^1$ satisfying

$$\int |\nabla \phi|^2 - \int_{[\phi \neq 0]} a_0 \phi^2 < 0$$

(such a ϕ exists by assumption (5)).

We may always assume that $\phi > 0$ and that $\phi \in L^\infty$ (otherwise we replace ϕ by $|\phi|$ and truncate ϕ). We note that

$$\liminf_{u \downarrow 0} \frac{F(x, u)}{u^2} \geq \frac{1}{2} a_0(x)$$

and thus

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{F(x, \varepsilon \phi(x))}{\varepsilon^2} \geq \frac{1}{2} a_0(x) \phi^2(x) \quad \text{a.e. on } [\phi \neq 0].$$

On the other hand we deduce from (12) that

$$\frac{F(x, \varepsilon \phi)}{\varepsilon^2} \geq -C \phi^2 \geq -C.$$

We may therefore apply Fatou's lemma and conclude that

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{[\phi \neq 0]} \frac{F(x, \varepsilon \phi)}{\varepsilon^2} \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{[\phi \neq 0]} a_0 \phi^2;$$

thus we have

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int \frac{F(x, \varepsilon \phi)}{\varepsilon^2} \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\{\phi \neq 0\}} a_0 \phi^2.$$

Hence we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla \phi|^2 - \int \frac{F(x, \varepsilon \phi)}{\varepsilon^2} < 0$$

for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough.

Proof of theorem 2 concluded. Using (13), (14) and (15) we see that $\inf_{u \in H_0^1} E(u)$ is achieved by some $u \neq 0$. We may always assume that $u \geq 0$ —otherwise we replace u by u^+ and use the fact that $F(x, u) \leq F(x, u^+)$ (which holds since $F(x, u) = f(x, 0)u \leq 0$ for $u \leq 0$). If we knew in addition that $u \in L^\infty$ we would easily conclude that u is a solution of (1). We claim that indeed we may also assume that

$$u \in L^\infty. \quad (27)$$

For this purpose we introduce a truncated problem. We set, for each integer $k > 0$

$$\begin{cases} f^k(x, u) = \text{Max}\{f(x, u), -ku\} & \text{if } u \geq 0 \\ f^k(x, u) = f^k(x, 0) = f(x, 0) & \text{if } u \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

and

$$a_0^k(x) = \liminf_{u \downarrow 0} \frac{f^k(x, u)}{u}, \quad a_\infty^k(x) = \limsup_{u \uparrow \infty} \frac{f^k(x, u)}{u}.$$

Assumptions (3), (4), (11) and (12) hold for $f^k(x, u)$. Assumption (5) holds for a^k since

$$\lambda_1(-\Delta - a_0^k(x)) \leq \lambda_1(-\Delta - a_0(x)) < 0$$

because $f \leq f^k$ and thus $a_0 \leq a_0^k$. Moreover, assumption (6) holds for a^k provided k is large enough. Indeed, it is easy to check that $\lambda_1(-\Delta - a_\infty^k(x)) \uparrow \lambda_1(-\Delta - a_\infty(x))$ since $a_\infty^k \downarrow a_\infty$ as $k \uparrow \infty$.

Set

$$E_k(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla u|^2 - \int F^k(x, u), \quad u \in H_0^1.$$

It follows from the previous argument that $\inf_{u \in H_0^1} E_k(u)$ is achieved by some u_k . Moreover, u_k satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u_k = f^k(x, u_k) & \text{on } \Omega \\ u_k \geq 0, \quad u_k \neq 0 & \text{on } \Omega \\ u_k = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

(note that E_k is of class C^1 since $|f^k(x, u)| \leq C_k(|u| + 1)$).

A standard bootstrap argument shows that $u_k \in L^\infty$.

Set

$$v = \text{Min}\{u, u_k\}.$$

We claim that

$$E(v) \leq E(u), \quad (28)$$

and this will conclude the proof of (27).

Indeed, we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla u_k|^2 - \int F^k(x, u_k) \leq \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla \phi|^2 - \int F^k(x, \phi) \quad \forall \phi \in H_0^1. \quad (29)$$

In (29) we choose $\phi = \text{Max}\{u, u_k\}$ and we find

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{[u_k < u]} |\nabla u_k|^2 - \int_{[u_k < u]} F^k(x, u_k) \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{[u_k < u]} |\nabla u|^2 - \int_{[u_k < u]} F^k(x, u). \quad (30)$$

On the other hand we have

$$E(v) - E(u) = \int_{[u_k < u]} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u_k|^2 - \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2 - F(x, u_k) + F(x, u) \right\}$$

and using (30) we obtain

$$F^k(x, u_k) - F^k(x, u) - F(x, u_k) + F(x, u) = \int_{u_k}^u [f(x, t) - f^k(x, t)] dt \leq 0$$

on the set $[u_k < u]$. Thus (28) is proved.

Remark 2. We assume again that (2) holds. Then the functional E is convex with respect to the variable $\rho = u^2$. More precisely, the functional $\rho \mapsto E(\sqrt{\rho})$ defined on the convex set

$$K = \{\rho \in L^1; \rho \geq 0 \text{ a.e. and } \sqrt{\rho} \in H_0^1\}$$

is convex. Indeed, it is known (and easy to prove) that the functional $\rho \mapsto \int |\nabla \sqrt{\rho}|^2$ is convex (see [3] and also [4]) while the function $\rho \mapsto -F(x, \sqrt{\rho})$ is convex since its derivative

$$-\frac{1}{2} \frac{f(x, \sqrt{\rho})}{\sqrt{\rho}}$$

is increasing.

REFERENCES

- AMANN H., On the existence of positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic boundary value problems, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **21**, 125–146 (1971).
- AMANN H., Fixed point equations and nonlinear eigenvalue problems in ordered Banach spaces, *SIAM Rev.* **18**, 620–709 (1976).
- BENGURIA R., The von Weizsäcker and exchange corrections in the Thomas–Fermi theory, dissertation, Princeton University, unpublished (1979).
- BENGURIA R., BREZIS H. & LIEB E., The Thomas–Fermi–von Weizsäcker theory of atoms and molecules, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **79**, 167–180 (1981).

5. BERESTYCKI H., Le nombre de solutions de certains problèmes semi-linéaires elliptiques, *J. funct. Analysis* **40**, 1-29 (1981).
6. COHEN D. & LAETSCH T., Nonlinear boundary value problems suggested by chemical reactor theory, *J. diff. Eqns* **7**, 217-226 (1970).
7. DE FIGUEIREDO D., Positive solutions of semilinear elliptic problems, Lecture Notes, São Paulo (1981).
8. GILBARG D. & TRUDINGER N., *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*, Springer, Berlin (1977).
9. HESS P., On uniqueness of positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic boundary value problems, *Math. Z.* **154**, 17-18 (1977).
10. KELLER H., Positive solutions of some nonlinear eigenvalue problems, *J. Math. Mech.* **19**, 279-296 (1969).
11. KELLER H. & COHEN D., Some positive problems suggested by nonlinear heat generation, *J. Math. Mech.* **16**, 1361-1376 (1967).
12. KRASNOSELSKII M., *Positive Solutions of Operator Equations*, Noordhoff, Groningen (1964).
13. LAETSCH T., Uniqueness for sublinear boundary value problems, *J. diff. Eqns* **13**, 13-23 (1973).
14. SIMPSON R. B. & COHEN D., Positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic eigenvalue problems, *J. Math. Mech.* **19**, 895-910 (1970).
15. SMOLLER J. & WASSERMAN A., Existence, uniqueness and nondegeneracy of positive solutions of semilinear elliptic equations, *Communs Math. Phys.* **95**, 129-159 (1984).