

AD-A092 684

WISCONSIN UNIV-MADISON DEPT OF MATHEMATICS
ON NONTRIVIAL SOLUTIONS OF A SEMILINEAR WAVE EQUATION, (U)
1979 P H RABINOWITZ

F/G 12/1

N00014-76-C-0300


ML

UNCLASSIFIED

1 of 1
AD-A092 684



END
DATE
FILMED
1 8h
DTIC



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

LEVEL II

12

AD A 092684

On nontrivial solutions of a semilinear wave equation,

Paul H. Rabinowitz

Mathematics Department

University of Wisconsin

Madison, Wisconsin 53706

DTIC ELECTE
DEC 08 1980
S D E

The question of the existence of nontrivial time periodic solutions of autonomous or forced semilinear wave equations has been the object of considerable recent interest. [1-12]. These papers study the equation ^{following} has been studied as

(1.1) $u_{(tt)} - u_{(xx)} + f(x, u) = 0, \quad 0 < x < l$

(or its analogue where f also depends on t in a time periodic fashion) together with boundary conditions in x and periodicity conditions in t . In particular the following result was proved in [11, Theorem 3.37 and Corollary 4.14]:

Theorem 1.2: Let $f \in C([0, l] \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ and satisfy

- (f₁) $f(x, 0) = 0$ and $f(x, r)$ is strictly monotone increasing in r ,
- (f₂) $f(x, r) = o(|r|)$ at $r = 0$,
- (f₃) There are constants $\bar{r} > 0$ and $\mu > 2$ such that

DDC FILE COPY

This research was sponsored in part by the Office of Naval Research under Contract No. N00014-76-C-0300. ¹⁵ Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

80 10 10 031

$$0 < \mu F(x, r) \leq r f(x, r)$$

for $|r| \geq \bar{r}$ and $x \in [0, l]$ where

$$F(x, r) = \int_0^r f(x, s) ds .$$

Then for any T which is a rational multiple of l , equation (1.1) possesses a nontrivial continuous weak solution u satisfying

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{cases} u(0, t) = 0 = u(l, t) \\ u(x, t+T) = u(x, t) \end{cases} .$$

Furthermore $f \in C^k$ implies $u \in C^k$.

As part of the proof of Theorem 1.2, it was shown that the functional

$$(1.4) \quad I(u) = \int_0^T \int_0^l \left[\frac{1}{2} (u_t^2 - u_x^2) - F(x, u) \right] dx dt$$

defined on the class of functions satisfying (1.3) (and of which (1.1) is formally the Euler equation) has a positive critical value. Therefore (f_1) and the form of I imply that $u_t \neq 0$ for the corresponding critical point u . Thus u is nonconstant and must depend explicitly on t . It was further observed in [11] (Theorem 5.24 and Remark 5.25) that if g satisfies $(f_1) - (f_3)$ the equation

$$(1.5) \quad u_{tt} - u_{xx} - g(x, u) = 0, \quad 0 < x < l$$

together with (1.3), also possesses a nontrivial weak solution. Indeed the arguments of Theorem 1.2 go through with minor modifications to establish this fact. However the functional one studies for this case is

$$(1.6) \quad J(u) = \int_0^T \int_0^l \left[\frac{1}{2}(u_x^2 - u_t^2) - G(x, u) \right] dx dt$$

where G is the primitive of g . Again the positivity of $J(u)$ for a critical point u implies u is nonconstant but we can no longer conclude that u depends explicitly on t . In fact it is known [13, 14] that as a consequence of $(f_2) - (f_3)$, the ordinary differential equation boundary value problem

$$(1.7) \quad -\frac{d^2u}{dx^2} = g(x, u), \quad u(0) = 0 = u(l)$$

has an unbounded sequence of solutions which can be characterized by the number of zeros they possess in $(0, l)$.

Our goal in this paper is to show that if (f_3) is strengthened somewhat, (1.5), (1.3) possesses infinitely many time dependent solutions. More precisely we will prove:

Theorem 1.8: Let $g \in C([0, l] \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ and suppose g satisfies TAB $(f_1) - (f_2)$ and

(\bar{f}_3) There is a constant $\mu > 0$ such that

$$0 < \mu F(x, r) \leq r f(x, r)$$

for all $r \neq 0$.

Then for any $T \in \mathbb{R}^+$ there is a $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $k \geq k_0$,

(1.5), (1.3) possesses a solution u_k which is kT periodic in t and $\frac{\partial u_k}{\partial t} \neq 0$. Moreover infinitely many of the functions u_k are distinct.

Accession For	
General	
Announced	
Justification <i>Letter in File</i>	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist.	Avail and/or special
<i>A</i>	

Remark 1.9: We have no estimate for the size of k_0 and do not know if the result is false in general for $k_0 = 1$. Note also that since (1.5) is an autonomous equation with respect to t , whenever $u(x, t)$ is a solution, so is $u(x, t + \theta)$ for any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. The above statement about the u_k 's being distinct means in particular that they do not differ by merely a translation in time.

The proof of Theorem 1.8 draws on several results from [11] and ideas from [12]. For convenience we will take $l = \pi$ and $T = 2\pi$. Choosing $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we seek a solution u_k of (1.5) which is $2\pi k$ periodic in t and $\frac{\partial u_k}{\partial t} \neq 0$. Making the change of time scale $\tau = t/k$, the period becomes 2π again and the problem to be solved is

$$(1.10) \quad \begin{cases} U_{\tau\tau} - k^2 (U_{xx} + g(x, U)) = 0, & 0 < x < \pi \\ U(0, \tau) = 0 = U(l, \tau) \\ U(x, \tau + 2\pi) = U(x, \tau) \end{cases}$$

with $U(x, \tau) = u(x, t)$.

For the convenience of the reader and to set the stage for a key estimate, the argument used in [11] to establish the existence of nontrivial solutions of (1.10) will be sketched quickly. Solutions are obtained by an approximation argument. To begin (1.10) is modified in two ways. The wave operator $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \tau^2} - k^2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}$ possesses an infinite dimensional null space in the class of functions satisfying the boundary and periodicity conditions of (1.10) and given by

$$N = \text{span} \{ \sin jx \sin kjt, \sin jx \cos kjt \mid j \in \mathbb{N} \} .$$

The fact that N is infinite dimensional complicates the analysis of (1.10) and to introduce some compactness to the problem in N , we perturb (1.10) by adding a βV_{tt} term to the left hand side of the equation. Here $\beta > 0$ and V is the (L^2 orthogonal) projection of U onto N . A second difficulty in treating (1.10) arises due to the unrestricted rate of growth of $g(x, r)$ as $|r| \rightarrow \infty$. We get around this by truncating g . More precisely $g(x, r)$ is replaced by $g_K(x, r)$ which coincides with g for $|r| \leq K$ and grows cubically at ∞ [11]. Thus (1.10) is replaced by the modified problem

$$(1.11) \quad \begin{cases} U_{\tau\tau} + \beta V_{\tau\tau} - k^2 (U_{xx} + g_K(x, U)) = 0, & 0 < x < \pi \\ U(0, \tau) = 0 = U(\ell, \tau) \\ U(x, \tau + 2\pi) = U(x, \tau) \end{cases}$$

where g_K satisfies (f_1) , (f_2) , (\bar{f}_3) with a new constant $\bar{\mu} = \min(\mu, 4)$.

Letting G_K denote the primitive of g_K , in a formal fashion (1.11) can be interpreted as the Euler equation arising from the functional

$$(1.12) \quad J(U; k, \beta, K) = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^\pi \left[\frac{k^2}{2} U_x^2 - \frac{1}{2} U_\tau^2 - \frac{\beta}{2} V_\tau^2 - k^2 G_K(x, U) \right] dx d\tau .$$

Let

$$E_m = \text{span} \{ \sin jx \sin n\tau, \sin jx \cos n\tau \mid 0 \leq j, n \leq m \} .$$

The strategy pursued in [11] was to find a critical point U_{mk} of $J|_{E_m}$, let $m \rightarrow \infty$, and then let $\beta \rightarrow 0$ to get a solution U_k of (1.10) with g replaced by g_K . Then L^∞ bounds for U_k independent of K show if we choose $K(k)$ sufficiently large, $g_K(x, U_k) = g(x, U_k)$ so (1.10) obtains.

A separate comparison argument is required to prove that $U_k \neq 0$.

The first step in carrying out the details of the above argument involves obtaining an upper bound M_k for $c_{mk} \equiv J(U_{mk}; k, \beta, K)$ with M_k independent of m , β , and K . For the current problem which also depends on k , it is crucial to know the behavior of M_k as a function of k . Thus we will take a closer look at c_{mk} and use a variant of an argument of [12]. By Lemma 1.13 of [11], c_{mk} can be characterized in a minimax fashion. We will not write down this characterization explicitly but will note a consequence of it which in turn provides an upper bound for c_{mk} . Set

$$\Phi_{mk} = \text{span} \{ \sin jx \sin n\tau, \sin jx \cos n\tau \mid 0 \leq j, n \leq m \text{ and } n^2 \geq j^2 k^2 \}$$

and

$$\psi_k = a_k \sin x \sin (k-1)\tau$$

where $a_k = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi}$ so $\|\psi_k\|_{L^2} = 1$. Set $\Psi_{mk} = \Phi_{mk} \oplus \text{span } \psi_k$. Then by Lemma 1.13 of [11]

$$(1.13) \quad 0 < c_{mk} \leq \max_{u \in \Psi_{mk}} J(u; k, \beta, K) .$$

Inequality (1.13) will lead to a suitable choice for M_k . Note that by (\bar{f}_3) (or even (f_3)), there are constants $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \geq 0$ such that

$$(1.14) \quad G_k(x, r) \geq a_1 |r|^{\bar{\mu}} - a_2$$

for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $x \in [0, \pi]$. Consequently $J \rightarrow -\infty$ as $u \rightarrow \infty$ in Ψ_{mk} (under $\|\cdot\|_{L^2}$) so there is a point $z \equiv z_{mk}$ at which the maximum in (1.13) is achieved. Writing

$$(1.15) \quad z = \|z\|_{L^2} (\gamma \xi + \delta \psi_k)$$

where $\xi \in \Phi_{mk}$, $\|\xi\|_{L^2} = 1$, and $\gamma^2 + \delta^2 = 1$ and substituting (1.15) into (1.13) gives

$$(1.16) \quad k^2 \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^\pi G_K(x, z) dx dt \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^\pi (k^2 z_x^2 - z_\tau^2) dx d\tau \\ \leq \frac{\delta^2}{2} \|z\|_{L^2}^2 \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^\pi [k^2 (\psi_k)_x^2 - (\psi_k)_\tau^2] dx d\tau \leq k \|z\|_{L^2}^2 .$$

Combining (1.14) and (1.16) shows that

$$(1.17) \quad k^2 (\alpha_1 \|z\|_{L^{\bar{\mu}}}^{\bar{\mu}} - \alpha_3) \leq k \|z\|_{L^2}^2 .$$

Applying the Hölder inequality yields

$$(1.18) \quad \|z\|_{L^2} \leq A$$

where A is a constant independent of m, k, β, K . Hence by (1.13),

(1.18), and the form of J ,

$$(1.19) \quad c_{mk} \leq Mk$$

for a constant M independent of m, k, β, K .

Letting $m \rightarrow \infty$ and then $\beta \rightarrow 0$, and formalizing what we have just shown gives:

Lemma 1.20: Under the hypotheses of Theorem 1.8 (with $l = \pi$ and $T = 2\pi$), for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a solution U_k of (1.10) satisfying

$$(1.21) \quad c_k \equiv J(U_k; k, 0, K) \leq Mk$$

with M independent of $k + K$.

It remains to show that for all k sufficiently large, $\frac{\partial U_k}{\partial t} \neq 0$ and infinitely many of the functions $u_k(x, t) = U_k(x, \tau)$ are distinct. If U_k is independent of τ for any subsequence of k 's tending to ∞ , $U_k = U_k(x)$ is a classical solution of (1.7). Thus by (1.21) with $K = K(k)$ suitably large,

$$(1.22) \quad c_k = 2\pi k^2 \int_0^\pi \left[\frac{1}{2} \left| \frac{dU_k}{dx} \right|^2 - G(x, U_k) \right] dx .$$

By (1.7),

$$(1.23) \quad \int_0^\pi \left| \frac{dU_k}{dx} \right|^2 dx = \int_0^\pi U_k(x) g(x, U_k(x)) dx .$$

Combining (1.21) - (1.23) yields

$$(1.24) \quad \int_0^\pi \left[\frac{1}{2} U_k g(x, U_k) - G(x, U_k) \right] dx \rightarrow 0$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$ along this subsequence. Moreover by (\bar{f}_3) ,

$$(1.25) \quad \int_0^\pi \left[\frac{1}{2} U_k g(x, U_k) - G(x, U_k) \right] dx \geq \int_0^\pi \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\mu} \right) U_k g(x, U_k) dx .$$

Thus $U_k g(x, U_k) \rightarrow 0$ in L^1 . From (1.23) again we conclude that $\frac{dU_k}{dx} \rightarrow 0$ in L^2 which easily implies $U_k \rightarrow 0$ in L^∞ . By (f_2) , for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that $|r| \leq \delta$ implies $|g(x, r)| \leq \varepsilon r$. Choosing $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{\pi}$ and k large enough so that $\|U_k\|_{L^\infty} \leq \delta$, (1.23) then shows

$$(1.26) \quad \left\| \frac{dU_k}{dx} \right\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \varepsilon \|U_k\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \pi \varepsilon \left\| \frac{dU_k}{dx} \right\|_{L^2}^2 < \left\| \frac{dU_k}{dx} \right\|_{L^2}^2,$$

a contradiction. Consequently U_k depends on τ for all large k .

To prove the second assertion of Theorem 1.8, suppose two functions $U_k(x, \tau)$, $U_j(x, \tau)$ correspond to the same function of x, t modulo a translation in time (keeping Remark 1.9 in mind). Thus

$U_k(x, \tau) = U_k(x, \frac{t}{k}) \equiv U(x, t)$ and $U_j(x, \tau) = U_j(x, \frac{t}{j}) = U(x, t + \theta)$ for some $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ or $U_k(x, \tau) = U(x, k\tau)$, $U_j(x, \tau) = U(x, j\tau + \theta)$. Since U must be both $2\pi k$ and $2\pi j$ periodic in t , letting σ denote the greatest common divisor of j and k , we have $j = \sigma \bar{j}$, $k = \sigma \bar{k}$ and U has period $2\pi\sigma$ in t . Furthermore

$$(1.27) \quad \begin{aligned} c_k &= \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^\pi \left[\frac{k^2}{2} U_{kx}^2 - \frac{1}{2} U_{k\tau}^2 - k^2 G(x, U_k) \right] dx d\tau \\ &= k \int_0^{2\pi k} \int_0^\pi \left[\frac{1}{2} (U_x^2 - U_t^2) - G(x, U) \right] dx dt \\ &= \frac{k^2}{\sigma} \int_0^{2\pi\sigma} \int_0^\pi \left[\frac{1}{2} (U_x^2 - U_t^2) - G(x, U) \right] dx dt \equiv \frac{k^2}{\sigma} b \end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$(1.28) \quad c_j = \frac{j^2}{\sigma} b.$$

Consequently if there were a sequence of solutions U_{k_i} of (1.10) corresponding to the same function U (up to a translation in t), by (1.27) - (1.28) we have

$$(1.29) \quad c_{k_i} = \frac{k_i^2}{\sigma} b$$

and $c_{k_i} \rightarrow \infty$ like k_i^2 along this sequence contrary to (1.19). Thus at most

finitely many functions $U_k(x, \tau)$ correspond to the same solution $u_k(x, t)$ of (1.5), (1.3) and infinitely many of the functions u_k must be time dependent solutions of (1.5), (1.3). The proof of Theorem 1.8 is complete.

Remark 1.30. Both the existence assertions from [11] and the arguments given above use hypothesis (f_2) which requires that g vanish more rapidly than linearly at 0. However this condition can be weakened. The simplest such generalization would be to replace $g(x, r)$ by $\alpha r + g(x, r)$ with α a constant and for this case we have:

Theorem 1.31: Let g satisfy (f_1) , (f_2) , (\bar{f}_3) and let $\alpha > 0$. Then for all $T \in \mathbb{R}^+$, there exists a $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $k \geq k_0$, the problem

$$(1.32) \quad \begin{cases} u_{tt} - u_{xx} - \alpha u - g(x, u) = 0 & 0 < x < \ell \\ u(0, t) = 0 = u(\ell, t) \\ u(x, t + kT) = u(x, t) \end{cases}$$

has a continuous weak solution u_k which is kT periodic in t and $\frac{\partial u_k}{\partial t} \neq 0$. Moreover infinitely many of these functions are distinct.

Proof: For convenience we again take $\ell = \pi$, $T = 2\pi$. It was shown in [11] that Theorem 1.2 carries over to (1.32) for $\alpha > 0$. It is also easy to see that the argument of Lemma 1.20 will give (1.21) for this setting. Likewise (1.27) - (1.29) are unaffected by the α term. Thus we get Theorem 1.29 provided that we can show $U_k(x, \tau)$ depends on τ for all large k . If not, the analogues of (1.22) - (1.23) here are

$$(1.33) \quad c_k = 2\pi k^2 \int_0^\pi \left[\frac{1}{2} \left| \frac{dU_k}{dx} \right|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \alpha U_k^2 - G(x, U_k) \right] dx$$

and

$$(1.34) \quad \int_0^\pi \left| \frac{dU_k}{dx} \right|^2 dx = \int_0^\pi (\alpha U_k^2 + U_k g(x, U_k)) dx .$$

Thus (1.19), (1.33) - (1.34), and (\bar{f}_3) show that $U_k g(x, U_k) \rightarrow 0$ in L^1 as $k \rightarrow \infty$ as in (1.24) - (1.25). Since

$$(1.35) \quad \|g(x, U_k)\|_{L^1} \leq \pi \max_{0 \leq x \leq \pi, |r| \leq 1} |g(x, r)| + \|U_k g(x, U_k)\|_{L^1}$$

and the right hand side of (1.35) is uniformly bounded in k , it follows from

(1.7) that the functions $\frac{d^2 U_k}{dx^2}$ are uniformly bounded in L^1 . The boundary

conditions $U_k(0) = 0 = U_k(\pi)$ imply that there is $x_k \in (0, \pi)$ such that

$\frac{dU_k}{dx}(x_k) = 0$. Hence

$$\frac{dU_k}{dx} = \int_{x_k}^x \frac{d^2 U_k(\xi)}{d\xi^2} d\xi$$

which implies that

$$(1.36) \quad \left\| \frac{dU_k}{dx} \right\|_{L^\infty} \leq \left\| \frac{d^2 U_k}{dx^2} \right\|_{L^1} .$$

Thus the functions $U_k, \frac{dU_k}{dx}$ are bounded in L^∞ and by (1.7) again, so

are $\frac{d^2 U_k}{dx^2}$. It follows that a subsequence of U_k converges (in $\|\cdot\|_{C^2}$)

to a solution U of (1.7) as $k \rightarrow \infty$. But (f_1) and $\|U_k g(x, U_k)\|_{L^1} \rightarrow 0$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$ imply $U \equiv 0$.

Next observe that (1.7) can be written as

$$(1.37) \quad U_k(x) = \int_0^\pi H(x, y) (\alpha U_k(y) + G(y, U_k(y))) dy$$

where H is the Green's function for $-\frac{d^2}{dx^2}$ under the boundary condition $U(0) = 0 = U(\pi)$. Dividing (1.37) by $\|U_k\|_{C^1}$ gives

$$(1.38) \quad \frac{U_k(x)}{\|U_k\|_{C^1}} = \int_0^\pi H(x, y) \left(\alpha \frac{U_k(y)}{\|U_k\|_{C^1}} + \frac{G(x, U_k(y))}{\|U_k\|_{C^1}} \right) dy .$$

By (f_2) , the arguments of the integral operator are uniformly bounded in C^1 . Hence since this operator is compact from C^1 to C^2 , by (f_2) again a subsequence of $U_k / \|U_k\|_{C^1}$ converge to V satisfying $\|V\|_{C^1} = 1$ and

$$(1.39) \quad V(x) = \alpha \int_0^\pi H(x, y) V(y) dy$$

or equivalently

$$(1.40) \quad -V'' = \alpha V \quad 0 < x < \pi ; \quad V(0) = 0 = V(\pi) .$$

If α is not an eigenvalue of $-\frac{d^2}{dx^2}$ under these boundary conditions we have a contradiction and the proof is complete. Thus suppose α is an eigenvalue. Consider the eigenvalue problems:

$$(1.41) \quad -z'' = \lambda \alpha z, \quad 0 < x < \pi ; \quad z(0) = 0 = z(\pi)$$

$$(1.42) \quad -y'' = \mu \left(\alpha + \frac{g(x, \varphi)}{\varphi} \right) y, \quad 0 < x < \pi ; \quad y(0) = 0 = y(\pi)$$

where φ is C^1 on $[0, \pi]$. Let λ_j (resp. $\mu_j(\varphi)$) denote the j^{th} eigenvalue of (1.41) (resp. (1.42)), the eigenvalues being ordered according to increasing magnitude. As is well known any eigenfunction corresponding to λ_m or $\mu_m(\varphi)$ belongs to

$$S_m = \{ \varphi \in C^1([0, \pi], \mathbb{R}) \mid \varphi(0) = 0 = \varphi(\pi), \varphi \text{ has exactly } m-1$$

zeros in $(0, \pi)$, and $\varphi' \neq 0$ at all zeros of φ in $[0, \pi]$ } .

(Indeed the eigenvalues of (1.41) are $\lambda_m = m^2 \alpha^{-1}$ and corresponding eigenfunctions are multiples of $\sin mx$). Since $g(x, \varphi) \varphi^{-1} \geq 0$ via (f_1) , we have $\lambda_j \geq \mu_j(\varphi)$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varphi \in C^1$, $\varphi \neq 0$ via a standard comparison theorem [15, Chapter 6]. By (1.40), 1 is an eigenvalue of (1.41), say $1 = \lambda_m$ and $V \in S_m$. Thus $\mu_m(\varphi) \leq 1$ and since S_m is open (in the C^1 topology) and $U_k / \|U_k\|_{C^1} \rightarrow V$ in C^1 along some subsequence, it follows that $U_k / \|U_k\|_{C^1}$ and therefore U_k belongs to S_m for all large k in this subsequence. Writing (1.7) as

$$(1.43) \quad -U_k'' = \left(\alpha + \frac{g(x, U_k)}{U_k} \right) U_k, \quad 0 < x < \pi; \quad U_k(0) = 0 = U_k(\pi),$$

we see $\mu_m(U_k) = 1$. By (f_1) again, $g(x, U_k) U_k^{-1} > 0$ except at the $m+1$ zeros of U_k . An examination of the proof of the Sturm Comparison Theorem [16, p. 208-209] then shows U_k has a zero between each pair of successive zeros of V . Consequently $U_k \in S_{m+1}$, a contradiction. Thus Theorem 1.31 is established.

Remark 1.44: In [5], Brezis, Coron, and Nirenberg study (1.1), (1.3) replacing (f_2) by

$$(f_4) \quad \frac{1}{2} r f(r) - F(r) \geq \beta |f(r)| - \gamma$$

and

$$(f_5) \quad f(r)/r \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as} \quad |r| \rightarrow \infty$$

(and with no analogue of (f_2)). If we use $(f_4) - (f_5)$ with x dependent f in place of (f_3) , it is not difficult to see that the proof of [11] carries over for this case as does Lemma 1.20 and (1.27) - (1.29). Thus we obtain a variant of Theorem 1.8 for this case once it is established that $U_k(x, \tau)$ depends on τ for large k . To do this, we argue as in the proof of Theorem 1.8. Assume (f_4) holds with $\gamma = 0$. Then by (1.25) and (f_4) , $\|g(x, U_k)\|_{L^1} \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. This in turn implies $\|U_k\|_{L^\infty} \rightarrow 0$ via (1.7) and (1.36). Hence (1.26) again provides a contradiction.

It is also possible for us to drop (f_2) and even the requirement that $f(x, 0) = 0$ in (f_1) but then a new existence mechanism is required and we shall not carry out the details here.

References

- [1] Amann, H., Saddle points and multiple solutions of differential equations, *Math. Z.* 169, (1979) 127-166.
- [2] Amann, H. and E. Zehnder, Nontrivial solutions for a class of nonresonance problems and applications to nonlinear differential equations, preprint.
- [3] Bahri, A. and H. Brezis, Periodic solutions of a nonlinear wave equation, to appear *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh*.
- [4] Brezis, H. and J. M. Coron, Periodic solutions of nonlinear wave equations and Hamiltonian systems, preprint.
- [5] Brezis, H., J. M. Coron, and L. Nirenberg, Free vibrations for a nonlinear wave equation and a theorem of P. Rabinowitz, preprint.
- [6] Brezis, H. and L. Nirenberg, Characterizations of the ranges of some nonlinear operators and applications to boundary value problems, *Ann. Sc. Norm. Sup. Pisa, Ser. 4*, 5, (1978), 225-326.
- [7] Brezis, H. and L. Nirenberg, Forced vibrations for a nonlinear wave equation, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 31, (1978), 1-30.
- [8] Coron, J. M., Resolution de l'équation $Au + Bu = f$ où A est linéaire autoadjoint et B déduit d'un potentiel convexe, to appear *Ann. Fac. Sc. Toulouse*.
- [9] Mancini, G., Periodic solutions of some semi-linear autonomous wave equations, *Boll. U.M.I. (5)*, 15-B, (1978), 649-672.
- [10] Rabinowitz, P. H., Some minimax theorems and applications to nonlinear partial differential equations, *Nonlinear Analysis: A collection of papers in honor of Erich H. Rothe*, Academic Press, (1978), 161-177.

- [11] Rabinowitz, P. H., Free vibrations for a semilinear wave equation, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 31, (1978), 31-68.
- [12] Rabinowitz, P. H., Subharmonic solutions of a forced wave equation, to appear Amer. J. Math.
- [13] Turner, R. E. L., Superlinear Sturm-Liouville problems, J. Diff. Eq., 13, (1973), 157-171.
- [14] Rabinowitz, P. H., Some aspects of nonlinear eigenvalue problems. Rocky Mtn. Math. J., 3, (1973), 161-202.
- [15] Courant, R. and D. Hilbert, Methods of Mathematical Physics, V.I., Interscience, (1953).
- [16] Coddington, E. A. and N. Levinson, Theory of Ordinary Differential Equations, McGraw-Hill (1955).

END

DATE
FILMED

8/

DTIC