

RENDICONTI *del* SEMINARIO MATEMATICO *della* UNIVERSITÀ DI PADOVA

LUIGI AMERIO

**Continuous solutions of the problem of a string
vibrating against an obstacle**

Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico della Università di Padova,
tome 59 (1978), p. 67-96

http://www.numdam.org/item?id=RSMUP_1978__59__67_0

© Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico della Università di Padova, 1978, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico della Università di Padova » (<http://rendiconti.math.unipd.it/>) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (<http://www.numdam.org/conditions>). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques
<http://www.numdam.org/>

Continuous Solutions of the Problem of a String Vibrating against an Obstacle.

LUIGI AMERIO (*)

RIASSUNTO - Vengono generalizzati i risultati di un precedente lavoro, di Amerio e Prouse, sullo stesso argomento. La soluzione del problema si ottiene ora con sole ipotesi di continuità sui dati, sulla base di un'analisi del supporto della reazione vincolare (distribuzione) e di un'ampliata formulazione della legge di urto elastico.

1. Introduction.

a) The present paper is a generalisation of a preceding one, by Amerio and Prouse [1], which concerns the motion of a string, not subject to any external force and vibrating against a rigid wall, parallel to the position of the same string, at rest.

The *lines of influence* of the wall play, as in [1], an essential role in the study of the motion. However, they are now defined under much wider hypotheses on the *data* than at [1], on the basis, essentially, of the properties of the *set of impact points*; this set coincides with the *support of a distribution J* : the *reaction of the obstacle*.

Moreover, the *elastic impact law* is now formulated in such a way (a weak form of that of *Mechanics*) to allow a wider mathematical utilisation (see (4.11)).

The solution of the problem of the wall *exists and is unique* (in cor-

(*) Indirizzo dell'A.: Istituto Matematico del Politecnico di Milano.

respondance to given boundary und initial values): if, moreover, the initial energy is *finite*, then, $\forall$ time t , the *energy equality* holds.

b) Assume that the string, at rest, is placed on the x axis. The *displacement* $y(x, t) = y(P)$, in the (x, y) plane, satisfies, in the *free* motion, the *homogeneous vibrating string equation* (in the sense of *distributions*):

$$(1.1) \quad y_{tt} - y_{xx} = 0$$

or, in the *characteristic form*,

$$(1.2) \quad y_{\xi\eta} = 0,$$

where $\xi = (x + t)2^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, $\eta = (-x + t)2^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ are the characteristic coordinates.

Assume now that the free motion of the string is impeded by a rigid wall $y = 0$, that obliges the string to move in the half plane $y \geq 0$. By introducing the (*unknown*) *reaction* J of the obstacle, the displacement $y(P)$ satisfies therefore the *non homogeneous vibrating string equation*:

$$(1.3) \quad y_{\xi\eta} = J.$$

We set now the *initial* and *boundary conditions* (in a slightly different form from the usual). Consider, in the (x, t) plane, a domain Z , which is bounded (inferiorly, to the left and to the right) by three lines $(\sigma_0, \sigma', \sigma'')$ of equations:

$$(1.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \sigma_0) \quad t &= \tau(x) & (a' \leq x \leq a''), \\ \sigma') \quad x &= p(t) & (t \geq t'), \\ \sigma'') \quad x &= q(t) & (t \geq t''), \end{aligned}$$

where $p(t') = a' < q(t'') = a''$.

Assume, moreover, that σ_0 is constituted by a *finite number of characteristic segments*, and that $|p'(t)| \leq 1$, $|q'(t)| \leq 1$, never being $p'(t) = \pm 1$, or $q'(t) = \pm 1$, on an interval: therefore we exclude that σ' and σ'' contain any characteristic interval. It is $\sigma' \cap \sigma'' = \emptyset$, and we assume, lastly, that the intersection of Z with an arbitrary

characteristic straight line r , if $\neq \emptyset$, consists in a segment of *finite* length.

Let now $A(P)$, $P \in \partial Z$, be an arbitrary *continuous* function.




Figure 1

Consider, firstly, the following *problem*: Find a solution of (1.2) such that

$$(1.5) \quad y(P) \in C^0(Z), \quad y|_{\partial Z} = A(P).$$

The *restrictions*

$$A|_{\sigma_0}, \quad A|_{\sigma' \cup \sigma''}$$

define, respectively, the *initial* and the *boundary conditions* for the integral $u(P)$.

It is obvious that the given problem has *one and only one solution* ($\in \mathcal{D}'(\dot{Z})$), $y(P)$; we may calculate it, by a classical scheme, solving successively Darboux and Goursat problems, in the domains $R_0, R_1, S_1, S_2, R_2, \dots$.

Let us consider now the analogous problem, when the motion of the string is *constrained* by the *wall*; we have now to integrate equation (1.3), adding to the boundary condition (1.5) the *unilateral* condition:

$$(1.6) \quad y(P) \geq 0, \quad \forall P \in Z \quad (\Rightarrow A(P) \geq 0),$$

and indicating the *nature of the impact* (elastic, partially elastic, anelastic).

As we shall prove, also *this problem admits one and only one solution, if we assume that*

$$(1.7) \quad A(P) > 0 \quad \forall P \in \partial Z.$$

2. Admissible functions and impact points.

Let us define the functional class Y of the *admissible* functions, to which all solutions $y(P)$ of the problem of the wall must belong, *whatever* is the nature of the impact.

We shall say that $y(P)$ is an *admissible function*, if the following conditions are fulfilled:

- I) $y(P) \in C^0(Z)$,
- II) $y(P) \geq 0 \quad \forall P \in Z$,
- III) $\Gamma = \text{supp } y_{\xi\eta} \subseteq \{P \in Z: y(P) = 0\}$
- IV) $y_{\xi\eta} \geq 0$,

V) (*extension law*, with reference to the « elementary problems » of Darboux and Goursat):

1) let $R = ABCD$ be a *characterist rectangle*, $\subseteq Z$ and of *minimum vertex* A . Let moreover $z(P)$ be the solution, in R , of (1.2) satisfying the *Darboux condition*

$$z|_{\sigma} = y|_{\sigma}.$$

Then, *if on the whole of* R

$$z(P) \geq 0,$$




Figure 2

it is also, on the whole of R ,

$$y(P) = z(P);$$

2) let S be a domain $\subset Z$, bounded to the left by an arc $\widehat{AC} \subset \sigma'$ and to the right by two characteristic segments issuing from a point B




Figure 3

(and analogously for σ''). Let moreover $z(P)$ be the solution, in S , of (1.2) satisfying the *Goursat condition*

$$z|_{\sigma} = y|_{\sigma}.$$

Then, if on the whole of S

$$z(P) \geq 0,$$

it is also, on the whole of S ,

$$y(P) = z(P) .$$

Observe that condition V) imposes, essentially, that *an admissible function $y(P)$ must satisfy the homogeneous vibrating string equation « wherever possible »*: in particular, this occurs on the open set where the string does not touch the wall.

We remark, in comparison with [1], that no reference has been made now to the Cauchy problem.

We shall call *impact points* the points of the set Γ .

Let us indicate some *properties of the admissible functions*.

a) We have $\Gamma \cap \partial Z = \emptyset$; moreover, on $\overset{\circ}{Z} - \Gamma$, $y(P)$ satisfies the homogeneous equation $y_{\xi\eta} = 0$.

b) Let $R = ABCD$ be a characteristic rectangle $\subset Z$ (fig. 2).

Setting

$$\Delta_R y = y(C) - y(B) - y(D) + y(A) ,$$

it follows from I) and IV)

$$(2.1) \quad \Delta_R y > 0 \quad \text{if} \quad \Gamma \cap \overset{\circ}{R} \neq \emptyset , \quad \Delta_R y = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad \Gamma \cap \overset{\circ}{R} = \emptyset .$$

c) Γ is a perfect set. Assume infact that N is an isolated point of Γ . There exists then, by (2.1), a characteristic square $R_\delta \subset Z$, with center N and edge δ ($0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$), such that it is

$$\Delta_{R_\delta} y = \varrho > 0 , \quad \text{independent on } \delta .$$

This is absurd, since, by I),

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \Delta_{R_\delta} y = 0 .$$

d) Taken $N \in \overset{\circ}{Z}$, let $A_1 A_2$ and $B_1 B_2$ be the maximum characteristic segments issuing from N and $\subset Z$.

They determine the sets R_N^+ , R_N^- , S_N^+ , S_N^- (see fig. 4). In particular, R_N^+ is the maximum characteristic rectangle $\subset Z$ and with N as minimum vertex.




Figure 4

Then:

$$N \in \Gamma \Rightarrow \Gamma \cap (\mathring{R}_N^+ \cup \mathring{R}_N^-) = \emptyset.$$

This property follows from the extension law. Let in fact $z(P)$ be the solution, on R_N^+ , of equation (1.2), with the Darboux condition $z|_\sigma = y|_\sigma$, $\sigma = B_1 N A_2$. Since $y(N) = 0$, we have, $\forall P \in R_N^+$, $z(P) = y(P') + y(P'') \geq 0$, $\Rightarrow y(P) = z(P)$ on the whole of R , $\Rightarrow y_{\xi\eta} = 0$ on the open set $\mathring{R}_N^+$. It follows $\Gamma \cap \mathring{R}_N^+ = \emptyset$.

Assume now that there exists an impact point $M \in \mathring{R}_N^-$. Then (as $N \in \mathring{R}_M^+$) $N \notin \Gamma$, which is absurd.

e) Let r be an arbitrary characteristic straight line. There exist then, on r , two impact points, at most. Assume r to be a ξ characteristic; let moreover A and B , $\xi_A < \xi_B$, be two impact points, $\in r$. No impact point $\in \mathring{R}_A^+ \cup \mathring{R}_B^-$: therefore the only impact points $\in R_\delta = UVCD$, are

placed on the segment AB . If $\Gamma \cap (AB)^0 \neq \emptyset$, we have then

$$\Delta_{R_\delta} = \varrho > 0, \quad \text{independent on } \delta,$$

which is absurd, by I).




Figure 5

The thesis follows. Hence, $N \in \Gamma$ implies that N is a limit point for the set $(\mathring{S}_N^+ \cup \mathring{S}_N^-) \cap \Gamma$.

f) Let $R = ABCD$ be a characteristic rectangle $\subset Z$ (see fig. 5). Then, if B and $D \in \Gamma$, neither A nor $C \in \Gamma$. Assume infact, for instance, that $C \in \Gamma$. We have

$$\Gamma \cap \mathring{R}_B^+ = \Gamma \cap \mathring{R}_D^+ = \Gamma \cap \mathring{R}_C^+ = \Gamma \cap \mathring{R}_C^- = \emptyset,$$

and the characteristics through C contain the only impact points D and B . The point C would therefore be an isolated point of Γ , contrary to e).

g) Let $A \in \Gamma$ be a limit point both for $\Gamma \cap S_A^+$ and $\Gamma \cap S_A^-$. Then no other impact point is placed on the characteristics through A . Let infact B be a second impact point (see fig. 5). Since $\Gamma \cap \tilde{K}_B^- = \emptyset$, A cannot then be a limit point of $\Gamma \cap S_A^+$.

h) Setting

$$(2.2) \quad \mu_0 = \inf_{\Gamma} \{\xi\},$$

there exists one and only one point $M_0(\xi_0, \eta_0) \in \Gamma$ such that

$$(2.3) \quad \xi_0 = \mu_0.$$

The existence is obvious, since Γ is closed and inferiorly bounded. In order to prove the uniqueness, assume that there are $M_0(\mu_0, \eta_0)$




Figure 6

and $M'(\mu_0, \eta'), \in \Gamma$ and with $\eta' < \eta_0$. Since $\Gamma \cap \tilde{K}_{M'}^+ = \emptyset$ and, by construction, $\Gamma \cap \tilde{S}_{M_0}^- = \emptyset$, M_0 would be an isolated point of Γ , contrary to c).

In the same way, setting

$$(2.4) \quad \nu_1 = \inf_{\Gamma} \{\eta\},$$

we prove the existence and the uniqueness of a point $M_1(\xi_1, \eta_1) \in \Gamma$, such that

$$(2.5) \quad \eta_1 = v_1.$$

Therefore:

$$(2.6) \quad \xi_0 < \xi_1, \quad \eta_0 > \eta_1, \quad \Rightarrow x_0 < x_1.$$

It follows that $M_0(x_0, t_0)$ and $M_1(x_1, t_1)$ are opposite vertices of a characteristic rectangle $R_1^* = M_0 Q_0 M_1 Q_1$, where the boundary does not contain any impact point, besides M_0 and M_1 (if $M \in \Gamma$, since $\Gamma \cap \dot{R}_M^- = \emptyset$, M_0 would be an isolated impact point). It may occur that $Q_0 \notin Z$,




Figure 7

but $\Gamma \cap \sigma_0 = \emptyset$. Let us now extend the edges $Q_0 M_0$ and $Q_0 M_1$ as far as we meet the lines σ' and σ'' , at the points L_0 and L_1 respectively.

Drawing moreover through L_0 and L_1 the forward half characteristics ξ and η respectively, we obtain a (ξ, η) pair with vertex G_1 . Set $\sigma_1 = L_0 G_1 L_1$ and let W_1 be the domain with boundary $L_0 M_0 Q_1 M_1 L_1 G_1$. Observe that

$$\dot{W}_1 \subset \dot{R}_{M_0}^+ \cup \dot{R}_{M_1}^+ \Rightarrow \Gamma \cap \dot{W}_1 = \emptyset.$$

We prove, more precisely, that M_0 and M_1 are the only impact points $\in W_1$. We have, firstly (by construction and by the property of R_1^* mentioned before):

$$\Gamma \cap \{L_0 M_0 Q_1 M_1 L_1\} = \{M_0\} \cup \{M_1\}.$$

We have afterwards (as $y(M_0) = 0$), $\forall P \in L_0 G_1$,

$$y(P) = y(P') + y(L_0) - y(M_0) \geq y(L_0) = A(L_0) > 0,$$

from what it follows

$$(2.7) \quad y(P) \geq \min \{A(L_0), A(L_1)\} > 0 \quad \forall P \in \sigma_1, \Rightarrow \Gamma \cap \sigma_1 = \emptyset.$$

We conclude that

$$(2.8) \quad \Gamma_1 = \Gamma \cap R_1^*$$

is a perfect set. $\Gamma - \Gamma_1$ is a perfect set too, since Γ_1 and $\Gamma - \Gamma_1$ are separated by $W_1 - (\{M_0\} \cup \{M_1\})$.

Replace now σ_0 by σ_1 and repeat, with respect to $\Gamma - \Gamma_1$, the same construction before made for Γ . We obtain a second rectangle, R_2^* , which contains a perfect set $\Gamma_2 = (\Gamma - \Gamma_1) \cap R_2^*$, and so on, obtaining a sequence of perfect and separated sets $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \dots, \Gamma_n, \dots$, all $\subseteq \Gamma$. Let us now prove that

$$(2.9) \quad \Gamma = \bigcup_n \Gamma_n$$

(as obviously occurs if the Γ_n 's are in a finite number).

Consider, on σ' , the points $L_0(l_0, t_0), L_2(l_2, t_2), \dots, L_{2n}(l_{2n}, t_{2n}), \dots$, that is the left end points of the (ξ, η) pairs

$$\sigma_1 = L_0 G_1 L_1, \quad \sigma_2 = L_2 G_2 L_3, \dots, \sigma_{n+1} = L_{2n} G_{n+1} L_{2n+1}, \dots;$$

consider, analogously, the right end points $L_{2n+1}(l_{2n+1}, t_{2n+1})$, on σ'' . Therefore:

$$l_{2n} = p(t_{2n}), \quad l_{2n+1} = q(t_{2n+1}).$$

Observe that $t_{2n} < t_{2n+2}$, $t_{2n+1} < t_{2n+3}$. For obtaining (2.9), it is suf-

ficient to prove that

$$(2.10) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t_{2n} = +\infty, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t_{2n+1} = +\infty.$$

Assume the contrary, supposing, for instance, that

$$t_{2n} \uparrow \bar{t} < +\infty \quad (\Rightarrow L_{2n} \uparrow \bar{L}(p(\bar{t}), \bar{t})).$$

This implies also that $t_{2n+1} \uparrow t^* < +\infty$; all points L_{2n+1} are in fact beneath the point $\bar{M}$, intersection of σ with the ξ forward half characteristic issuing from $\bar{L}$. Hence $L_{2n+1} \uparrow \tilde{L}(q(\bar{t}), \bar{t}) \in \sigma''$, $G_{n+1} \uparrow G^*$, where G^* is the intersection of the ξ and η forward half characteristics issuing from $\bar{L}$ and $\tilde{L}$ respectively (it may occur that $G^* = \bar{L}$ or $G^* = \tilde{L}$). It follows that $\sigma_n \uparrow \sigma^*$, where $\sigma^* = \bar{L}G^*\tilde{L}$ is a (ξ, η) pair (like every σ_n), or a characteristic segment.

Observe now that M_{2n} belongs, $\forall n$, to that part of Z which is inferiorly bounded by σ_n , and superiorly by σ^* . Therefore every limit point M^* , of the sequence $\{M_{2n}\}$, $\in \sigma^*$. As $y(M_{2n}) = 0$, it follows $y(M^*) = 0$, which is absurd. Denote in fact by $\bar{\sigma}'$ and by $\bar{\sigma}''$ the parts of σ' and of σ'' with end points $0', \bar{L}$ and $0'', \tilde{L}$ respectively. We have

$$\min_{\bar{\sigma}' \cup \bar{\sigma}''} A(P) = a > 0$$

and we deduce from (2.7):

$$y(P) \geq a > 0 \quad \forall P \in \sigma^*.$$

Hence $y(M^*) \geq a$, and (2.10) is proved.

h) Let K_1 be the t -projection, on the x axis, of the set Γ_1 ; we have $K_1 \subseteq m_0 \mapsto m_1$, where m_0 and m_1 are the abscissae of M_0 and M_1 respectively.

Assuming $x_1 \in K_1$, let us prove that *the straight line $x = x_1$ contains only one point of Γ_1* .

Suppose in fact that there exist two such points, $H_1(x_1, t_1)$ and $H_2(x_1, t_2)$, with $t_1 < t_2$. Then $H_2 \in \mathring{R}_{H_1}^+$, which is absurd.

We conclude that Γ_1 can be represented by an equation

$$(2.11) \quad t = t_1(x) \quad (x \in K_1)$$




Figure 8

($\Rightarrow K_1$ perfect set). Moreover, the *Lipschitz condition*

$$(2.12) \quad |t_1(x_2) - t_1(x_1)| \leq |x_2 - x_1| \quad (\forall x_1, x_2 \in K_1)$$

holds. Assume infact, for instance, $t_1(x_2) - t_1(x_1) > x_2 - x_1 > 0$ (for a pair x_1, x_2) and consider the points $H_1(x_1, t(x_1))$, $H_2(x_2, t_1(x_2))$. Then $H_2 \in R_{H_1}^+$, which is absurd.

Observe, lastly, that, by *e*) and *f*), Γ_1 *does not contain any triplet of points* $H_1(x_1, t_1)$, $H_2(x_2, t_2)$, $H_3(x_3, t_3)$, where $x_1 < x_2 < x_3$, *such that*

$$|t_2 - t_1| = x_2 - x_1, \quad |t_3 - t_2| = x_3 - x_2.$$

The same properties hold for the sets $\Gamma_2, \dots, \Gamma_n, \dots$

3. The lines of influence of the wall.

a) Let us *extend*, in the following way, *the definition of the function* $t_1(x)$, *on the whole of the interval* $l_0 \vdash l_1$.

First of all, we define $t_1(x)$ on the intervals $l_0 \vdash m_0$ and $m_1 \vdash l_1$, by making the graph coincide with the characteristic segments $L_0 M_0$ and $M_1 L_1$ (η and ξ respectively).




Figure 9

Setting then $\Delta = m_0 \vdash m_1 - K_1$, we have $\Delta = \bigcup_n \delta_n$, where $\{\delta_n\}$ is a sequence of open and disjoint intervals: *no pair of such intervals can have an end point in common*, since K_1 has no isolated points. Setting then $\delta_n = p_n - q_n$, there occur only two cases:

$$|t_1(q_n) - t_1(p_n)| = q_n - p_n, \quad \text{or} \quad |t_1(q_n) - t_1(p_n)| < q_n - p_n.$$

In the first case we make the graph of $t_1(x)$ coincide, on $p_n - q_n$, with the characteristic segment $P_n Q_n$; in the second case the graph coincides with the (ξ, η) pair $P_n H_n Q_n$.

The function $t_1(x)$ is defined, in such a way, $\forall x \in l_0 \vdash l_1$ and it satisfies, by construction and by (2.12), the Lipschitz condition

$$(3.1) \quad |t_1(x_2) - t_1(x_1)| \leq |x_2 - x_1| \quad (\forall x_1, x_2 \in l_0 \vdash l_1).$$

We shall call the line λ_1 , of equation

$$(3.2) \quad t = t_1(x) \quad (x \in l_0 \vdash l_1),$$

the (first) line of influence of the wall. Observe moreover that the sign $=$ does not occur, at (3.1), for any $x_2 \neq x_1$, if x_1 is a limit point of K_1 , both from the left and from the right.

The physical meaning of the line λ_1 is clear (see [1]). Observe infact that when a point $\bar{x}$ of the string, at the time $\bar{t}$, hits the wall, an impulse is created, which influences the motion of the string in the forward characteristic semicone issuing from the point $\bar{P}(\bar{x}, \bar{t})$.

Therefore, by the construction made, the line λ_1 delimitates, from

above, the largest part of Z , in which the free motion of the string is not influenced by the wall.

In the same way, considering the set Γ_2 , we obtain the *second line of influence*, λ_2 (and, successively, $\lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n, \dots$). The line λ_{n+2} , $n \geq 0$, is above the (ξ, η) pair $\sigma_{n+1} = L_{2n} G_{n+1} L_{2n+1}$.

b) We can *characterize* the lines of influence on the basis of the following considerations.

Let us denote, in correspondance to an arbitrary point $P_0 \in Z$, by Z_{P_0} the intersection of Z with the *backward characteristic semicone* with vertex in P_0 : Z_{P_0} will be still called the *backward characteristic semicone* relative to the point P_0 (see fig. 10).

Let A_1 be the following domain:

$$(3.3) \quad A_1 = \{P \in Z: \Gamma \cap \overset{\circ}{Z}_P = \emptyset\}.$$

One proves that A_1 coincides with that part A of Z which is superiorly bounded by λ_1 .

Assume infact $P_0 \in A$: we have then (by (3.1), see also fig. 9) $\Gamma \cap \overset{\circ}{Z}_{P_0} = \emptyset$, $\Rightarrow P_0 \in A_1$, $\Rightarrow A \subseteq A_1$. Assume now $P_0 \in A_1$; no impact point can then belong to $\overset{\circ}{Z}_{P_0}$: hence P_0 cannot be above $\lambda_1 \Rightarrow A_1 \subseteq A$.

We can also obtain, as in [1], the line λ_1 by the following method. This method has practical importance too, as it refers to the *solution*,




Figure 10

$w(P)$, of the free problem, with the same boundary condition as $y(P)$:

$$(3.4) \quad w(P)|_{\partial Z} = y(P)|_{\partial Z} = A(P).$$

Let A' be the following domain:

$$(5.3) \quad A' = \{P \in Z: w(Q) \geq 0 \quad \forall Q \in Z_P\}.$$

We prove then that $A_1 = A'$.

It is obvious that $\sigma_0 \subset A_1 \cap A'$. Assume now $P_0 \in A_1 - \sigma_0$. We have $y_{\xi\eta} = 0$ on the whole of $\check{Z}_{P_0}$: therefore $y(P)$ is determined, on the whole of Z_{P_0} , by the boundary values $A(P)$ (fig. 10) and necessarily coincides with the solution of the free problem: $y(Q) = w(Q)$, $\forall Q \in Z_{P_0}$. As $y(Q) \geq 0 \quad \forall Q \in Z_{P_0}$, it follows $w(Q) \geq 0 \quad \forall Q \in Z_{P_0} \Rightarrow P_0 \in A'$, $\Rightarrow A_1 \subseteq A'$.

Assume now $P_0 \in A' - \sigma_0$ ($\Rightarrow w(Q) \geq 0, \forall Q \in Z_{P_0}$). Let us observe that the value $w(P_0)$ is obtained from the data, by solving, successively, a finite number of Darboux and Goursat problems, for the equation $w_{\xi\eta} = 0$ (in the domains S_1, R_1, R_2, S_2, R_3 , with reference to fig. 10). By (3.4) and since $w(Q) \geq 0$ on S_1 , it follows from the extension law $y(Q) = w(Q)$ on the whole of S_1 ; the same equality then holds on R_1 and, successively, on R_2, S_2, R_3 . We have therefore $y_{\xi\eta} = w_{\xi\eta} = 0$ on the whole of $\check{Z}_{P_0}$, $\Rightarrow \Gamma \cap \check{Z}_{P_0} = \emptyset, \Rightarrow P_0 \in A_1$. Hence $A' \subseteq A_1$ and the thesis follows.

Quite analogous considerations can be made for the line λ_2 , assuming as initial values the values of $y(P)$ on σ_1 (which is possible as $y(P)|_{\sigma_1} > 0$).

4. Elastic impact law.

a) In order to extend the solution $y(P)$ above λ_1 we have to fix an impact law (in the present paper, we shall consider the *elastic impact*).

Let Z_1 be that part of Z which is superiorly bounded by σ_1 , and inferiorly by σ_0 .

Assume $C \in Z_1 - A_1$. Let us draw from C the ξ and η backward half characteristics and let D and B be their intersections with λ_1 .

Denote, moreover, by A the intersection of the η and ξ backward half characteristics issuing from D and B respectively. Since DAB is a (η, ξ) pair, DAB cannot be a part of λ_1 : the point $A \notin \lambda_1$ and is placed, necessarily, *beneath* λ_1 (it may occur that two segments DD_1 and BB_1 , or one segment, $\subset \lambda_1$).

Assume now that the characteristic rectangle $R = ABCD$, is $\subset Z_1$, and observe that the free solution, $w(P)$, has, on the whole of R , the expression:

$$(4.1) \quad w(P) = \alpha(\xi) + \beta(\eta),$$

where $\alpha(\xi) \in C^0(\xi_A \mapsto \xi_B)$, $\beta(\eta) \in C^0(\eta_A \mapsto \eta_D)$, We have moreover

$$(4.2) \quad y(P) = w(P) \quad \forall P \in R \cap \Lambda_1.$$




Figure 11

b) Assume, firstly, that $\alpha(\xi)$ and $\beta(\eta)$ are *absolutely continuous* functions. Therefore:

$$(4.3) \quad w_{\xi}(P) = \alpha'(\xi) \in L^1(\xi_A \mapsto \xi_B), \quad w_{\eta}(P) = \beta'(\eta) \in L^1(\eta_A \mapsto \eta_D).$$

We shall utilize now the *elastic impact law*. To this purpose, we shall *formulate* it, at every impact point, with respect to the *characteristic directions*, rather than with respect to the *time* t and adding the condition $y(P)|_{\Gamma_1} = 0$ (as it has been done in [1]). Consider now $\bar{P} \in \Gamma_1$, assuming that $\bar{P}$ is a limit point of Γ_1 , both from the left and from the right (see fig. 11). We shall then define the derivatives $y_{\xi}(P)$ and $y_{\eta}(P)$, on the segments $\bar{P}\bar{P}_3$ and $\bar{P}\bar{P}_4$, setting respectively:

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} y_{\xi}(P) &= -w_{\xi}(\bar{P}) = -w_{\xi}(\bar{P}_1) = -\alpha'(\xi) & \forall P \in \bar{P} \rightarrow \bar{P}_3, \\ y_{\eta}(P) &= -w_{\eta}(\bar{P}) = -w_{\eta}(\bar{P}_2) = -\beta'(\eta) & \forall P \in \bar{P} \rightarrow \bar{P}_4 \end{aligned}$$

(in the « regular case », this follows from (3.2), [1]).

Assume now $\bar{P}$ to be *inside* a characteristic segment ξ (or a characteristic segment η). Since, in this case, $\bar{P} \notin \Gamma_1$, we have to set:

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} y_{\xi}(P) &= w_{\xi}(\bar{P}) = w_{\xi}(\bar{P}_1) = \alpha'(\xi) & \forall P \in \bar{P} \rightarrow \bar{P}_3, \\ y_{\eta}(P) &= w_{\eta}(\bar{P}) = w_{\eta}(\bar{P}_2) = \beta'(\eta) & \forall P \in \bar{P} \rightarrow \bar{P}_4. \end{aligned}$$

The derivatives y_{ξ} and y_{η} are therefore a.e. defined on R ; by (4.3) they are defined a.e. on the edges DC and BC too.

Let us calculate now the value $y(C)$, assuming $y(\xi, \eta_D)$ and $y(\xi_B, \eta)$ to be a.c. functions.

Setting $\lambda_1 \cap R = \mu$, let k' be the η -projection of $\Gamma_1 \cap \mu$, on the segment AB_1 . The complementary set, $h' = AB_1 - k'$, consists of a sequence $\{\delta'_m\}$ of open intervals. We prove that, for every such interval, it is (fig. 11):

$$(4.6) \quad w(P'_r) - w(Q'_r) = 0, \quad w(P'_j) - w(Q'_j) = 0.$$

The first of (4.6) is obvious. Since P_r and $Q_r \in \Gamma_1$, we have in fact $w(P_r) = w(Q_r) = 0$, $\Rightarrow w(P'_r) - w(Q'_r) = 0$.

In the second of (4.6), H_j is the vertex of a (ξ, η) pair $P_j H_j Q_j$. Since P_j and $Q_j \in \Gamma_1$, we obtain

$$(4.7) \quad 0 = w(H_j) - w(P_j) - w(Q_j) + w(U_j) = w(H_j) + w(U_j).$$

Moreover, as H_j and $U_j \in R \subset Z$, it is necessarily $w(H_j) \geq 0$, $w(U_j) \geq 0$, which implies, by (4.7), $w(H_j) = w(U_j) = 0$.

The second of (4.6) is therefore proved. It follows

$$\int_{h'} w_\xi d\xi = \sum_m \int_{\delta'_m} w_\xi d\xi = 0,$$

and we have

$$\begin{aligned} w(B) - w(A) &= \int_{\xi_A}^{\xi_B} w_\xi d\xi = w(B) - w(B_1) + \int_{k'} w_\xi d\xi + \int_{h'} w_\xi d\xi = \\ &= w(B) + \int_{k'} w_\xi d\xi, \end{aligned}$$

as $w(B_1) = 0$, since $B_1 \in I_1$. Hence

$$(4.8) \quad \int_{k'} w_\xi d\xi = \int_{k'} \alpha'(\xi) d\xi = -w(A).$$

We obtain moreover, by (4.4) (4.5) and (4.8),

$$\begin{aligned} (4.9) \quad y(C) - y(D) &= \int_{\xi_A}^{\xi_B} y_\xi d\xi = y(C) - y(C_1) + \int_{\xi_A}^{\xi_{B_1}} y_\xi d\xi = \\ &= w(B) - w(B_1) - \int_{k'} w_\xi d\xi + \int_{h'} w_\xi d\xi = w(B) - \int_{k'} w_\xi d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

We deduce from (4.8) and (4.9) the *value*:

$$(4.10) \quad y(C) = w(B) + w(D) + w(A).$$

c) Suppose now $w(P) \in C^0(R)$, $R \subset Z_1$. In this hypothesis, we assume the formula (4.10) to express the definition of the displacement for the elastic impact case.

On this basis, the displacement $y(P)$ is defined, on the whole of R , by the equalities:

$$(4.11) \quad \begin{aligned} y(P) &= w(P) & \forall P \in R \cap \mathcal{A}_1, \\ y(P) &= w(P_1) + w(P_2) + w(P_0) & \forall P \in R - \mathcal{A}_1, \end{aligned}$$

where the characteristic rectangle $R_P = P_0 P_1 P P_2$ is obtained by utilising, for the point P , the same procedure as for C .




Figure 12

Observe, lastly, that (4.11) is *equivalent* to the equality:

$$(4.12) \quad \Delta_{R_P} y = 2w(P_0) .$$

d) Let us prove that *the function $y(P)$, defined by (4.11), is actually endowed with the following properties* (all *necessary*, with respect to the definition of *admissible* functions).

1) *We have*

$$(4.13) \quad w(P_0) > 0 \quad \forall P \in R - A_1 .$$

Therefore, by (4.11) and (4.12),

$$(4.14) \quad \begin{aligned} y(P) &\geq w(P_0) > 0 \\ \Delta_{R_P} y &= 2w(P_0) > 0 \quad \forall P \in R - A_1 . \end{aligned}$$

It is infact $w(P_0) \geq 0$ and it cannot be $w(P_0) = 0$. It would be, infact, in such case, $\forall Q \in R_P$,

$$w(Q) = w(Q') + w(Q'') - w(P_0) = w(Q') + w(Q'') \geq 0.$$

Hence: $w(Q) \geq 0$ on the whole of Z_P , $\Rightarrow P \in A_1$, contrary to $P \in R - A_1$.

2) $y(P) \in C^0(R)$.

The continuity is obvious at the points beneath λ_1 . Assume now P and $Q \in R - A_1$: we have

$$(4.15) \quad y(P) - y(Q) = w(P_1) + w(P_2) + w(P_0) - w(Q_1) - w(Q_2) - w(Q_0).$$

Supposing then Q_1 and Q_2 not to be vertices of (ξ, η) pairs, the right hand side of (4.15) $\rightarrow 0$ as $P \rightarrow Q$. Let now, for example, Q_2 be vertex of a (ξ, η) pair. We have (as in *b*) $w(H_1) = w(Q_1) = 0$, $w(H_0) - w(Q_0) = w(H_1) - w(Q_1) = 0$; it follows then from (4.15):

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{P \rightarrow Q} \{y(P) - y(Q)\} &= \\ &= \lim_{P \rightarrow Q} \{w(P_1) - w(H_1) + w(P_2) - w(Q_2) + w(P_0) - w(H_0)\} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The same equality holds if $Q \in \lambda_1$.

3) *It is*

$$(4.16) \quad \text{supp } y_{\xi\eta} = \Gamma_1 \cap R.$$

Therefore $y(P)$ satisfies the homogeneous equation $y_{\xi\eta} = 0$, on the whole of $\dot{R} - \Gamma_1$.

Since (fig. 12)

$$y(U) = w(P_1) + w(Q_2) + w(U_0),$$

$$y(V) = w(Q_1) + w(P_2) + w(V_0),$$

we have infact

$$\begin{aligned} (4.17) \quad y(P) - y(U) - y(V) + y(Q) &= \\ &= w(P_0) - w(U_0) - w(V_0) + w(Q_0) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Observe now that (4.17) holds even if the edge QU , or QV , of the rectangle $QUPV$ is placed on a characteristic segment $\subset \lambda_1$. It holds, more generally, $\forall$ rectangle $R^* \subset R$, with $\Gamma_1 \cap \dot{R}^* = \emptyset$ (we prove this, by decomposing R^* into two, or four, characteristic rectangles, each of them being contained in A_1 , or in $R - \dot{A}_1$).

We have therefore $y_{\xi\eta} = 0$, on the whole of $\dot{R} - \Gamma_1$. If, lastly, $\bar{P} \in \Gamma_1 \cap \dot{R}$, it follows from (4.14) $\Delta_{R_P} y > 0$, $\forall$ rectangle $R_P \ni \bar{P}$, with $P \in R - A_1$: therefore $\bar{P} \in \text{supp } y_{\xi\eta}$.

OBSERVATION. Assume that *the trace of $w(P)$ on DAB satisfies the conditions set at b)*: assume therefore $\alpha(\xi)$ and $\beta(\eta)$ to be a.c. functions on the intervals $\xi_A \mapsto \xi_B$, $\eta_A \mapsto \eta_D$ respectively. From these hypotheses we can deduce that, if the function $y(P)$ is defined by (4.11), then (4.4) and (4.5) hold. In other words: $y(P)$ satisfies the mechanical law of elastic impact (in the form set at a)).

Consider, for instance, the derivative y_ξ . Observe that, on R , the derivative $w_\xi(\xi, \eta)$ is independent on η .

Setting then

$$(4.18) \quad \varphi(\xi) = \begin{cases} w_\xi(\xi, \eta) = \alpha'(\xi) & \forall \xi \in B_1 \mapsto B \cup h' \\ -w_\xi(\xi, \eta) = -\alpha'(\xi) & \forall \xi \in k' \end{cases}$$

(and bearing in mind that $w(B_1) = 0$ and that, $\forall \eta$, $\int_{h'} w_\xi(\tau, \eta) d\tau = 0$) we obtain (fig. 13):

$$(4.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\xi_A}^{\xi_B} \varphi(\tau) d\tau &= w(B) - \int_{k'} w_\xi(\tau, \eta_A) d\tau = \\ &= w(B) - \left\{ \int_{k'} w_\xi(\tau, \eta_A) d\tau + \int_{h'} w_\xi(\tau, \eta_A) d\tau \right\} = \\ &= w(B) - \int_{\xi_A}^{\xi_{B_1}} w_\xi(\tau, \eta_A) d\tau = w(B) + w(A) = y(C) - w(D), \end{aligned}$$

by (4.10).

We deduce afterwards from (4.18) and (4.19), $\forall P(\xi, \eta_D) \in DC$:

$$\int_{\xi_A}^{\xi} \varphi(\tau) d\tau = \int_{\xi_{P_0}}^{\xi_{P_1}} \varphi(\tau) d\tau = w(P_1) + w(P_0) = y(P) - w(D),$$




Figure 13

by (4.11). The function $y(\xi, \eta_d)$ is therefore a.e. on $\xi_d \mapsto \xi_c$, and it is, a.e.:

$$y_\xi(\xi, \eta_d) = \varphi(\xi) .$$

It follows then (4.4), by (4.18) (and analogously for (4.5)).

5. Solution of the problem.

The *elastic impact law* and the *extension law* allow to extend the solution $y(P)$ from A_1 to that part Z_1 of Z , which is superiorly bounded by the line $\sigma_1 = L_0 G_1 L_1$. Let $m_0 \mapsto m_1$ be the t -projection on the x axis of that part, λ , of λ_1 , with end points M_0 and M_1 . Let us call, moreover, (m) *pair* every (ξ, η) pair, $PUQ \subset \lambda$ ($P, Q \in I$), such that it may be $w(U) > 0$ at its vertex U . This case can occur only when the vertex V , opposite to U in the characteristic rectangle $PUQV$, is placed beneath the polygonal line σ_0 . Let π_0 be the number of the (ξ, η) -vertices of σ_0 : it is then obvious that the number of (m) pairs is finite ($\leq \pi_0$). Let $d > 0$ be the distance of λ from ∂Z (fig. 14).

Let us divide now λ in a finite number of parts, of lengths $\leq d$, by means of the points (with increasing abscissae) $N_0(x_0, t(z_0)), \dots, \dots, N_r(x_r, t(x_r))$, $x_0 = m_0$, $x_r = m_1$ (fig. 15).




Figure 14

All characteristic rectangles (or segments) with left and right vertices N_0 and $N_1, \dots, N_{r-1}$ and N_r , are contained in Z .

It may occur that some group of points $(N_h, \dots, N_{h+i}; i \geq 0)$ belong to the same characteristic segment, or (ξ, η) pair: in such case we shall substitute the group $(N_h, \dots, N_{h+i})$ by the end points of that segment, or (ξ, η) pair. Calling again N_k the points of subdivision, we have now subdivided λ in a finite number of partial arcs, γ_i , the end points of which are, $\forall j$, *impact points*. For every arc γ_i there occurs then *one of the following circumstances*:

- 1) γ_i is a characteristic segment,
- 2) γ_i is a (ξ, η) pair,
- 3) $\gamma_i = \widehat{D_j B_j}$ (where $D_j = N_{k_j}$, $B_j = N_{k_j+1}$) is an arc of length $\leq d$.

The γ_i 's of type 1) or 2) are necessarily *separated*, one from the other, by arcs of type 3); all (m) pairs are among those pairs considered at 2). In the case 3), the characteristic rectangle $R_i = A_j B_j C_j D_j$ is $\subset Z$; moreover, on the edge $D_j C_j$, the only point $D_j \in \gamma_i$ (on the contrary, by the construction made, the segment $D_j U_j$, or the pair $D_j U_j Q_j$, would have been included in the types 1) or 2)). There cannot therefore occur the cases at the fig. 16₁, 16₂. The only possible case corresponds to the fig. 16₃. The same occurs for the edge $B_j C_j$.

Let us assume now that the problem of the wall has a solution, and let us calculate it.




Figure 15




Figure 16₁




Figure 16₂




Figure 16₃

We have $y = w(P)$, $\forall P \in A_1$. We have moreover (cfr. (4.11) and fig. 16₃)

$$(5.1) \quad y(P) \geq w(P_0) > 0 \quad \forall P \in R_j - A_1.$$

The displacement $y(P)$ is now determined at all points of a polygonal characteristic line ϑ (cfr. fig. 15, where $\vartheta = L_0 N_0 U_0 N_1 U_1 N_2 U_2 \cdot N_3 N_4 U_4 N_5 N_6 U_6 N_7 L_1$). Moreover $\vartheta \subset Z_1 - \dot{A}_1$ and all minimum points of ϑ are impact points, $N_k (\Rightarrow y(N_k) = 0)$. By the *elastic impact law* (and with reference to the rectangles R_0, R_2, R_4, R_6), we have:

$$(5.2) \quad y(P) > 0 \quad \forall P \in (R_0 \cup R_2 \cup R_4 \cup R_6) - A_1.$$

The same inequality holds in the remaining part of Z_1 (cf. [1]). Consider in fact, on the rectangle ϱ_0 , the Darboux problem for the equation $z_{\xi\eta} = 0$, with the boundary condition $z|_{L_0 N_0 U_0} = y|_{L_0 N_0 U_0}$. Since $y(N_0) = 0$, we have $z(P) > 0$ on the whole of $\varrho_0 - L_0 - N_0$: this implies (by the extension law) $y(P) = z(P) > 0$ on the same set. We prove, in the same way, that $y(P) > 0$ on the rectangles $\varrho_1, \varrho_2, \varrho_3, \varrho_6, \varrho_7 - L_1 - N_7$, with the only exception of points $\in \vartheta$ (where it can be $y(P) = 0$). We obtain, in particular:

$$(5.2) \quad y(P) > 0 \quad \forall P \in \sigma_1.$$

The uniqueness and the existence of the solution $y(P)$ of our problem, on the whole of Z_1 , is therefore proved.

Assuming now as initial value of $y(P)$, $P \in Z - \dot{Z}_1$, the restriction $y(P)|_{\sigma_1}$, we can proceed in calculating the solution, which *exists and is unique*, on the whole of Z .

OBSERVATION I. The expression of $y(P)$, $P \in Z_1 - A_1$, is very simple. Let firstly be $P = G_1$. We have (with reference to fig. 15, in which $N_1 U_1 N_2$ is an (m) pair):

$$(5.4) \quad \begin{aligned} y(G_1) - y(L_0) &= \\ &= y(U_0) - y(N_0) + y(U_1) - y(N_1) + y(U_2) - y(N_2) + \\ &+ y(U_4) - y(N_3) + y(U_6) - y(N_6) + y(L_1) - y(N_7) = \\ &= y(U_0) + y(U_1) + y(U_2) + y(U_4) + y(U_6) + y(L_1), \end{aligned}$$

that is:

$$(5.5) \quad y(G_1) = w(L_0) + w(L_1) + \\ + w(V_0) + w(V_2) + w(V_4) + w(V_6) + w(U_1) .$$

We have moreover (by extending the free solution $w(P)$ beneath σ_0)

$$w(V_6) - w(A_0) = w(N_5) - w(V_4) + w(N_4) - w(V_2) + w(U_1) - w(V_0) ,$$

that is:

$$(5.6) \quad w(A_0) = w(V_6) + w(V_4) + w(V_2) + w(V_0) - w(U_1) .$$

It follows then from (5.5) and (5.6):

$$y(G_1) = w(L_0) + w(L_1) + w(A_0) + 2w(U_1) .$$

More generally, if $P \in Z_1 - A_1$, the following formula holds (with obvious notations):

$$(5.7) \quad y(P) = w(P_1) + w(P_2) + w(P_0) + 2 \sum_j w(U_j)$$

where the summation must be extended to all vertices of the (m) pairs which are *inside* the characteristic rectangle $P_0P_1PP_2$.

OBSERVATION II. Let us consider, as in [1], the problem of the wall with the classical *initial* and *boundary conditions*:

$$y(p(t), t) = A_1(t) > 0 , \quad y(q(t), t) = A_2(t) > 0 \quad (t \geq 0) \\ y(x, 0) = A_0(x) > 0 , \quad y_t(x, 0) = \psi(x) \quad (p(0) \leq x \leq q(0)) ,$$

assuming

$$A_1(t) , \quad A_2(t) \in C^0(0 \vdash + \infty); \quad A'_0(x) , \quad \psi(x) \in L^1(p(0) \vdash q(0)) .$$

In such hypotheses the solution $w(P)$ of the *free* problem ($P \in Z^* = \{t \geq 0, p(t) \leq x \leq q(t)\}$) is > 0 in a part of Z^* , $Z_0^* = \{0 \leq t \leq \delta, p(t) \leq$

$\leq x \leq q(t); \delta > 0\}$. If the polygonal line $\sigma_0 \subset Z_\delta^*$, and setting

$$y(P)|_{\sigma_0} = w(P)|_{\sigma_0},$$

this case can therefore be reduced to that before treated.

OBSERVATION III. Assume, in observation II, $p(t) \equiv 0$, $q(t) \equiv l > 0$, $A_1(t) \equiv A_2(t) \equiv K > 0$: therefore Z^* reduces to a half strip in the (x, t) plane.

Assume now the *initial energy* of the string to be *finite*, that is:

$$A'_0(x) \in L^2(0 \vdash l), \quad \psi(x) \in L^2(0 \vdash l).$$

We recognize then easily that *energy equality holds*:

$$(5.8) \quad \int_0^l \{y_x^2(x, t) + y_t^2(x, t)\} dx = \int_0^l \{A_0'^2(x) + \psi^2(x)\} dx \quad (\forall t \geq 0).$$

Observe, first of all, that $y_x^2 + y_t^2 = y_\xi^2 + y_\eta^2$. Observe, moreover, that, in crossing the impact points, the ξ and η derivatives change their sign, but not their absolute value. We have lastly (since $y_t(0, t) \equiv y_t(l, t) \equiv 0$): $y_\xi(0, t) = -y_\eta(0, t)$, $\Rightarrow y_\xi^2(0, t) = y_\eta^2(0, t)$; analo-




Figure 17

gously, $y_\xi^2(l, t) = y_\eta^2(l, t)$. Taken an arbitrary $P_0 \in Z^*$, its follows:

$$(5.9) \quad y_\xi^2(P_0) = y_\xi^2(Q_1) = y_\eta^2(Q_2) = \dots \quad y_\eta^2(P_0) = y_\eta^2(P_1) = y_\xi^2(P_2) \dots$$

Assume now $0 < \bar{t} \leq l$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^l y_\eta^2(x, 0) dx &= \int_0^{\bar{t}} y_\eta^2(x, 0) dx + \int_{\bar{t}}^l y_\eta^2(x, 0) dx = \int_{\bar{t}}^l y_\eta^2(x, \bar{t}) dx + \int_{\bar{t}}^l y_\xi^2(x, \bar{t}) dx, \\ \int_0^l y_\xi^2(x, 0) dx &= \int_{\bar{t}}^l y_\xi^2(x, 0) dx + \int_0^{\bar{t}} y_\xi^2(x, 0) dx = \int_0^{\bar{t}} y_\xi^2(x, \bar{t}) dx + \int_0^{\bar{t}} y_\eta^2(x, \bar{t}) dx. \end{aligned}$$

It follows:

$$\int_0^l \{y_\eta^2(x, 0) + y_\xi^2(x, 0)\} dx = \int_0^l \{y_\eta^2(x, \bar{t}) + y_\xi^2(x, \bar{t})\} dx, \quad \forall \bar{t} \in 0 \vdash l.$$

Therefore the same equality holds in the interval $l \vdash 2l$ and, successively, $\forall t \geq 0$.




Figure 18

More generally, assuming $A'_0(x)$ and $\psi(x) \in L^m(0 \vdash l)$, $1 \leq m \leq +\infty$, we obtain the *equality*:

$$\int_0^l \{|y_\xi(x, 0)|^m + |y_\eta(x, 0)|^m\} dx = \int_0^l \{|y_\xi(x, t)|^m + |y_\eta(x, t)|^m\} dx.$$

REFERENCES

- [1] L. AMERIO - G. PROUSE, *Study of the motion of a string vibrating against an obstacle*, Rend. di Mat., (2), vol. **8**, serie VI, 1975.

Manoscritto pervenuto in redazione il 18 maggio 1978.