

Als Typoskript gedruckt

# Technische Universität Dresden

Herausgeber: Der Rektor

## On Some Models for Elastic Solids with Micro-Structure.

**Rainer Picard, Sascha Trostorff & Marcus Waurick**  
Institut für Analysis

MATH-AN-12-2013

arXiv:1312.1863v1 [math.AP] 6 Dec 2013



# On Some Models for Elastic Solids with Micro-Structure.

Rainer Picard, Sascha Trostorff & Marcus Waurick \*

**Abstract.** We review the concept of well-posedness in the context of evolutionary problems from mathematical physics for a particular subclass of problems from elasticity theory. The complexity of physical phenomena appears as encoded in so called material laws. The usefulness of the structural perspective developed is illustrated by showing that many initial boundary value problems in the theory of elastic solids share the same type of solution theory. Moreover, interconnections of the respective models are discussed via a previously introduced mother/descendant mechanism.

**Keywords and phrases:** material laws, elasticity theory, visco-elasticity, coupled systems, causality, evolutionary equations, energy conservation

**Mathematics subject classification 2000:** 35F10 Initial value problems for linear first-order PDE, linear evolution equations, 47B25 Symmetric and selfadjoint operators (unbounded), 47F05 Partial differential operators, 47G20 Integro-differential operators, 35L90 Abstract hyperbolic evolution equations, 74B05 Classical linear elasticity, 74H20 Existence of solutions, 74H25 Uniqueness of solutions, 74M25 Micromechanics.

---

\*Institut für Analysis, Fachrichtung Mathematik, Technische Universität Dresden, Germany, rainer.picard@tu-dresden.de, sascha.trostorff@tu-dresden.de, marcus.waurick@tu-dresden.de

## Contents

<b>0</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>A Hilbert Space Setting for a Class Evolutionary Problems</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>A Well-Posed Problem Class of Autonomous Evolutionary Equations</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Linear Evolutionary Equations Describing Lossless Wave Propagation Phenomena	5
2.2	A Mechanism Deriving Evolutionary Equations from Given Ones . . . . .	9
<b>3</b>	<b>On Some Models of Deformable Solids and their Interconnection</b>	<b>14</b>
3.1	Micromorphic Media . . . . .	15
3.2	Micropolar or Cosserat Media . . . . .	19
3.3	Other Descendants of Micromorphic Media . . . . .	25
<b>4</b>	<b>Microstretch Models</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>31</b>

## 0 Introduction

In more complex considerations of elasticity theory of compound media their internal fine structure needs to be accounted for. The fundamental concept originated with the work of the Cosserat brothers, [2]. At the time, however, their ideas did not receive the immediate widespread attention of the mechanics community. The idea to account for additional degrees of freedom stemming from the fine structure of media was to have an additional set of elastic equations on the micro-level coupling with an elastic equation on the macro-level. Most significantly the particular coupling induces non-symmetry into the strain tensor, which was a standard assumption up to then. In the 60's of the last century such complex media became the focus of attention resulting in rediscovery, revival and further development of the ideas of the Cosserat brothers. We mention here in particular the seminal contributions by Aero and Kuvshinski [9], Mindlin [11], Nowacki [14, 15] and Eringen [5]. For a more detailed historical and bibliographic survey see [1, Chapter I].

The intention of this paper is to investigate some of the models concerned with fine-structural elasticity effects in the framework of a theory which allows for a unified perspective. Indeed, it has been found that many classical equations of mathematical physics share a common form, see e.g. [20]. The general form can be described loosely as follows: we look for  $U$  and  $V$  satisfying

$$\dot{V} + AU = f, \quad (1)$$

where  $\dot{V}$  stands for the time-derivative of  $V$ ,  $f$  is a given forcing term and  $A$  is a (usually unbounded) operator, which in standard situations is skew-selfadjoint in a suitable Hilbert space setting. Of course the latter equation is under-determined and a second equation – the so-called material law or constitutive relation – linking  $U$  and  $V$  via a bounded linear operator  $\mathcal{M}$  acting in space-time has to be supplied:

$$V = \mathcal{M}U. \quad (2)$$

Substituting the material law into the first equation, we arrive at

$$(\mathcal{M}U)' + AU = f.$$

In [17], a well-posedness result for equations of this form has been shown in a space-time Hilbert space setting. This result has been generalized in various directions, [8, 18, 21, 25, 28, 27, 29]. In these references many particular examples for the problem class under consideration have been given. The approach of proving well-posedness consists in establishing the time-derivative as a continuously invertible normal operator and proving strict positive definiteness of both the operator sum and its adjoint in a space-time Hilbert space setting. On the one hand the concept of a solution is rather weak for a solution only belongs to the domain of the closure of the respective operator sum (akin of what is called a mild solution). On the other hand this concept does not rely on the existence of a fundamental solution as utilized in the semi-group approach, allowing for more general material laws.

Temporal processes are distinguish from purely spatial phenomena by causality. In the Hilbert space context causality can conveniently be analyzed with the help of the Paley-Wiener theorem (see e.g. [26, Theorem 19.2]) employing the (vector-valued) Plancherel formula, which is only valid if the functions under consideration attain values in a Hilbert space, [10].

In this article we discuss several models of elasticity (based on considerations in [11, 4, 15, 16, 13, 12]) and prove well-posedness of corresponding initial boundary value problems by assuming positive definiteness conditions on the operators being contained in the material law. The key is to show that the models discussed fit into the general scheme of evolutionary equations. Moreover, rather than proposing an energy from which the equations are derived, based on the above structural observation we approach the equation directly, the “energy” being essentially just the underlying norm. We show, indeed, a particular conservation property for an abstract problem class, suited to cover the models of elastic media considered. Due to the power of the general machinery

## 1 A Hilbert Space Setting for a Class Evolutionary Problems

we are not merely reproducing known results obtained with different approaches but generalizing these models to general inhomogeneous anisotropic media, including spatially non-local media, as considered in [7].

Some of the models are linked by a formal simplification. This idea has found its rigorous justification in terms of a so-called “mother” and “descendant” mechanism, [19]. We will show that several models for elastic solids can be regarded as linked by this mechanism, which may yield further insight in the interconnections between these models.

In Section 1 we briefly recall the functional analytic setting in which we want to establish a solution theory for our problem class. In Section 2 the abstract problem class is described and the solution theory for this class is recalled. In Subsection 2.1 we also prove an energy balance equality by anticipating strategies developed in [23, 22]. We recall the results from [19] in Subsection 2.2 to explain the mechanism of deriving (well-posed) evolutionary equations from given ones. In particular we define what it means for a model to be a “descendant”, “relative” or “mother” of another one. Section 3 contains the description and the well-posedness results for several equations modeling deformable solids. Proving a well-posedness result for the equations for micromorphic media in Subsection 3.1, we show that the equations of Cosserat elasticity (micropolar media) are a descendant of the equations for micromorphic media in Subsection 3.2. Other descendants of the system for micromorphic media are discussed in Subsection 3.3. Before giving some concluding remarks in Section 5, we also describe the so-called microstretch model from [6, 4], which on the one hand fits into the general problem class but is on the other hand not a descendant of the model for micromorphic media.

## 1 A Hilbert Space Setting for a Class Evolutionary Problems

The family of Hilbert spaces  $(H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}, H))_{\rho \in \mathbb{R}}$ ,  $H$  Hilbert space, with  $H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}, H) := L^2(\mathbb{R}, \mu_\rho, H)$ , where the measure  $\mu_\rho$  is defined by  $\mu_\rho(S) := \int_S \exp(-2\rho t) dt$ ,  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  a Borel set,  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$ , provides the desired Hilbert space setting for evolutionary problems (cf. [20, 8]). The sign of  $\rho$  is associated with the direction of causality, where the positive sign is linked to forward causality. Since we have a preference for forward causality, we shall usually assume that  $\rho \in ]0, \infty[$ . By construction of these spaces we can establish

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(-\rho \mathbf{m}_0) : H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}, H) &\rightarrow H_{0,0}(\mathbb{R}, H) (= L^2(\mathbb{R}, H)) \\ \varphi &\mapsto \exp(-\rho \mathbf{m}_0) \varphi \end{aligned}$$

where  $(\exp(-\rho \mathbf{m}_0) \varphi)(t) := \exp(-\rho t) \varphi(t)$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , as a unitary mapping. We use  $\mathbf{m}_0$  as a notation for the multiplication-by-argument operator corresponding to the time parameter.

In this Hilbert space setting the time-derivative operation  $\varphi \mapsto \dot{\varphi}$  generates a normal operator  $\partial_{0,\rho}$  with<sup>1</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} \Re \partial_{0,\rho} &= \rho, \\ \Im \partial_{0,\rho} &= \frac{1}{i} (\partial_{0,\rho} - \rho). \end{aligned}$$

<sup>1</sup>Recall that for normal operators  $N$  in a Hilbert space  $H$

$$\begin{aligned} \Re N &:= \frac{1}{2} \overline{(N + N^*)}, \\ \Im N &:= \frac{1}{2i} \overline{(N - N^*)} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$N = \Re N + i \Im N.$$

It is

$$D(N) = D(\Re N) \cap D(\Im N).$$

The selfadjoint operator  $\Im \partial_{0,\rho}$  is unitarily equivalent to the differentiation operator  $\frac{1}{i}\partial_{0,0}$  in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}, H) = H_0(\mathbb{R}, H)$  with domain  $H^1(\mathbb{R}, H)$  - the space of weakly differentiable functions in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}, H)$  - via

$$\Im \partial_{0,\rho} = \exp(\rho \mathbf{m}_0) \frac{1}{i} \partial_{0,0} \exp(-\rho \mathbf{m}_0)$$

and has the Fourier-Laplace transformation as spectral representation, which is the unitary transformation

$$\mathcal{L}_\rho := \mathcal{F} \exp(-\rho \mathbf{m}_0) : H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}, H) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}, H),$$

where  $\mathcal{F} : L^2(\mathbb{R}, H) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}, H)$  is the Fourier transformation. Indeed, this follows from the well-known fact that  $\mathcal{F}$  is unitary in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}, H)$  and a spectral representation for  $-i$  times the derivative in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}, H)$ . Recall that for continuous functions  $\varphi$  with compact support in  $\mathbb{R}$  we have

$$(\mathcal{F}\varphi)(s) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp(-ist) \varphi(t) dt \quad (s \in \mathbb{R}).$$

In particular, we have

$$\Im \partial_{0,\rho} = \mathcal{L}_\rho^* \mathbf{m}_0 \mathcal{L}_\rho$$

and thus

$$\partial_{0,\rho} = \mathcal{L}_\rho^* (\mathbf{im}_0 + \rho) \mathcal{L}_\rho.$$

It is crucial to note that for  $\rho \neq 0$  we have that  $\partial_{0,\rho}$  has a bounded inverse. If  $\rho > 0$  we find from  $\Re \partial_{0,\rho} = \rho$  that

$$\|\partial_{0,\rho}^{-1}\|_{\rho,0} = |\partial_{0,\rho}^{-1}|_{\rho, \text{Lip}} = \frac{1}{\rho}, \quad (3)$$

where  $|\cdot|_{\rho, \text{Lip}}$  denotes the semi-norm given by associating the smallest Lipschitz constant with a Lipschitz continuous mapping in  $H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}, H)$ , which is for linear operators actually a norm coinciding with the operator norm denoted by  $\|\cdot\|_{\rho,0}$ ,  $\rho \in ]0, \infty[$ . For continuous functions  $\varphi$  with compact support we find

$$(\partial_{0,\rho}^{-1}\varphi)(t) = \int_{-\infty}^t \varphi(s) ds, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \rho \in ]0, \infty[, \quad (4)$$

which shows the causality of  $\partial_{0,\rho}^{-1}$  for  $\rho > 0$ .<sup>2</sup> Since it is usually clear from the context which  $\rho$  has been chosen, we shall, as is customary, drop the index  $\rho$  from the notation for the time derivative and simply use  $\partial_0$  instead of  $\partial_{0,\rho}$ .

## 2 A Well-Posed Problem Class of Autonomous Evolutionary Equations

### 2.1 Linear Evolutionary Equations Describing Lossless Wave Propagation Phenomena

We recall from [17] (and the concluding chapter of [20]) that the common form of standard initial boundary value problems of mathematical physics is given by

$$\overline{(\partial_0 M (\partial_0^{-1}) + A)U} = f, \quad (5)$$

<sup>2</sup>If  $\rho < 0$  the operator  $\partial_{0,\rho}$  is also boundedly invertible and its inverse is given by

$$(\partial_{0,\rho}^{-1}\varphi)(t) = - \int_t^{\infty} \varphi(s) ds \quad (t \in \mathbb{R})$$

for all  $\varphi \in \mathring{C}_\infty(\mathbb{R}, H)$ , the space of indefinitely differentiable, compactly supported  $H$ -valued functions. Thus,  $\rho < 0$  corresponds to the backward causal (or anticausal) case.

## 2 A Well-Posed Problem Class of Autonomous Evolutionary Equations

where for the rest of the paper we restrict our attention to the simple case when  $A$  is the canonical skew-selfadjoint extension to  $H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}, H)$  of an skew-selfadjoint operator<sup>3</sup> in  $H$  and the so-called material law operator  $M(\partial_0^{-1})$  is assumed to be of the simple polynomial form

$$M(\partial_0^{-1}) := M_0 + \partial_0^{-1}M_1 + \partial_0^{-2}M_2 \quad (6)$$

with  $M_0, M_1, M_2 \in L(H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}, H))$  denoting the canonical extensions of bounded linear operators on  $H$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} M_0 &\text{ is selfadjoint and strictly positive definite,} \\ M_1 &\text{ is skew-selfadjoint and} \\ M_2 &\text{ is selfadjoint.} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

As a simplification of notation we shall omit henceforth the closure bar and simply write

$$(\partial_0 M_0 + M_1 + \partial_0^{-1}M_2 + A)U = f \quad (8)$$

to describe problems of the form (5).<sup>4</sup>

We have singled out this rather special case<sup>5</sup> with  $M_0, M_1, M_2$  satisfying (7) and  $A$  being skew-selfadjoint, since it describes wave phenomena with a conservation property, which will be at the heart of this paper. For sake of reference we record the following well-posedness result, adapted to this simplified situation.

**Theorem 2.1** ([17, Solution Theory]). *Let (7) hold. Then, for all sufficiently large<sup>6</sup>  $\rho \in ]0, \infty[$  and every  $f \in H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}, H)$  there is a unique solution  $U \in H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}, H)$  solving problem (5). Moreover,  $(\partial_0 M_0 + M_1 + \partial_0^{-1}M_2 + A)^{-1}$  is a causal, continuous operator, where causality means that if  $f = 0$  on  $]-\infty, a[$  then so is  $U = (\partial_0 M_0 + M_1 + \partial_0^{-1}M_2 + A)^{-1}f$ ,  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ .*

*Remark 2.2.* Using the fact that the solution operator  $(\partial_0 M_0 + M_1 + \partial_0^{-1}M_2 + A)^{-1}$  commutes with  $\partial_0$ , we get that the solution  $U$  is as regular as the given source term  $f$ , i.e. if  $f \in D(\partial_0^k)$  for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  then so is  $U$ .

It is clear that in the even simpler case with  $M_2 = 0$ , the fundamental solution associated with (5) can be given in terms of a function of the skew-selfadjoint operator  $M_0^{-1/2}(M_1 + A)M_0^{-1/2}$  as

$$\left( \chi_{]0, \infty[}(t) M_0^{-1/2} \exp\left(-t M_0^{-1/2}(M_1 + A)M_0^{-1/2}\right) M_0^{1/2} \right)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}.$$

For suitable  $f$  the solution can of course be written as a convolution integral of  $f$  with this fundamental solution (as done in semi-group theory). Although this may be interesting to note, we shall, however, have no reason to use this fact in the following. As we shall see, most of the applications we shall investigate have indeed  $M_2 = 0$ . The only exception is the microstretch model discussed in Section 4, which has indeed a more elaborate conserved norm.

That the material law operator (6) describes a loss-less situation is a consequence of  $M_1$  being skew-selfadjoint and  $M_2$  being selfadjoint.

<sup>3</sup>Since this appears to be a matter of debate, we emphasize here that, as one commonly considers ‘‘adjoint’’ as a binary concept and self-adjoint as a unary notion, we shall treat the ‘‘skew’’ situation analogously. So, we shall say that  $A$  is skew-adjoint to  $B$  (or is the skew-adjoint of  $B$ ) if

$$A = -B^*$$

and we shall call  $A$  skew-selfadjoint if it is its own skew-adjoint, i.e.

$$A = -A^*.$$

<sup>4</sup>This can be justified rigorously by employing the theory of Sobolev-lattices (see [20]).

<sup>5</sup>It should, however, be noted that by considering operator coefficients we include painlessly the case of spatially non-local media, compare e.g. [7], in a unified setting.

<sup>6</sup>If  $M_2$  is non-negative we can choose any  $\rho > 0$ .

## 2.1 Linear Evolutionary Equations Describing Lossless Wave Propagation Phenomena

**Theorem 2.3.** *Let  $U, f \in H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}, H)$  such that*

$$(\partial_0 M_0 + M_1 + \partial_0^{-1} M_2 + A)U = f.$$

*Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \langle U | M_0 U \rangle_0(b) + \frac{1}{2} \langle \partial_0^{-1} U | M_2 \partial_0^{-1} U \rangle_0(b) \\ = \frac{1}{2} \langle U | M_0 U \rangle_0(a) + \frac{1}{2} \langle \partial_0^{-1} U | M_2 \partial_0^{-1} U \rangle_0(a) + \int_a^b \Re \langle U | f \rangle_0 \end{aligned}$$

*for almost every  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ .*

*Proof.* By the spectral theorem for bounded selfadjoint operators, we can assume that  $M_2$  is given as a multiplication operator with a real-valued bounded function  $V$  defined on some measure space. The operators of multiplying with the positive part and negative part of  $V$  will respectively be denoted by  $M_{2,+}$  and  $M_{2,-}$ . It follows that  $M_2 = M_{2,+} - M_{2,-}$ .

We begin to prove the statement for  $f \in D(\partial_0)$ . Then  $U \in D(\partial_0)$  according to Remark 2.2, which in particular implies that  $U$  is continuous by Sobolev's embedding theorem (see [20, Lemma 3.1.59]). Furthermore, since

$$AU = f - \partial_0 M_0 U - M_1 U - \partial_0^{-1} M_2 U \in H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}; H)$$

we deduce that  $U$  attains values in the domain of  $A$ . Thus, for  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$  we compute

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_a^b \Re \langle U(t) | f(t) \rangle dt \\ &= \int_a^b \Re \langle U(t) | \partial_0 M_0 U(t) \rangle dt + \int_a^b \Re \langle U(t) | M_1 U(t) \rangle dt + \int_a^b \Re \langle U(t) | \partial_0^{-1} M_2 U(t) \rangle dt \\ & \quad + \int_a^b \Re \langle U(t) | AU(t) \rangle dt \\ &= \int_a^b \Re \langle U(t) | \partial_0 M_0 U(t) \rangle dt + \int_a^b \Re \langle U(t) | \partial_0^{-1} M_2 U(t) \rangle dt, \\ &= \int_a^b \Re \langle U(t) | \partial_0 M_0 U(t) \rangle dt + \int_a^b \Re \langle U(t) | \partial_0^{-1} M_{2,+} U(t) \rangle dt - \int_a^b \Re \langle U(t) | \partial_0^{-1} M_{2,-} U(t) \rangle dt \end{aligned}$$

since  $M_1$  and  $A$  are skew-selfadjoint. Moreover, using  $\partial_0 \langle W | W \rangle(t) = 2 \Re \langle W(t) | \partial_0 W(t) \rangle$  for  $W \in D(\partial_0)$  we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_a^b \Re \langle U(t) | f(t) \rangle dt \\ &= \int_a^b \Re \langle M_0^{\frac{1}{2}} U(t) | \partial_0 M_0^{\frac{1}{2}} U(t) \rangle dt + \int_a^b \Re \langle M_{2,+}^{\frac{1}{2}} U(t) | \partial_0^{-1} M_{2,+}^{\frac{1}{2}} U(t) \rangle dt \\ & \quad - \int_a^b \Re \langle M_{2,-}^{\frac{1}{2}} U(t) | \partial_0^{-1} M_{2,-}^{\frac{1}{2}} U(t) \rangle dt \end{aligned}$$

## 2 A Well-Posed Problem Class of Autonomous Evolutionary Equations

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_a^b \partial_0 \langle M_0^{\frac{1}{2}} U | M_0^{\frac{1}{2}} U \rangle (t) dt + \frac{1}{2} \int_a^b \partial_0 \langle \partial_0^{-1} M_{2,+}^{\frac{1}{2}} U | \partial_0^{-1} M_{2,+}^{\frac{1}{2}} U \rangle (t) dt \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_a^b \partial_0 \langle \partial_0^{-1} M_{2,-}^{\frac{1}{2}} U | \partial_0^{-1} M_{2,-}^{\frac{1}{2}} U \rangle (t) dt \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left( \langle M_0^{\frac{1}{2}} U | M_0^{\frac{1}{2}} U \rangle (b) - \langle M_0^{\frac{1}{2}} U | M_0^{\frac{1}{2}} U \rangle (a) \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left( \langle \partial_0^{-1} M_{2,+}^{\frac{1}{2}} U | \partial_0^{-1} M_{2,+}^{\frac{1}{2}} U \rangle (b) - \langle \partial_0^{-1} M_{2,+}^{\frac{1}{2}} U | \partial_0^{-1} M_{2,+}^{\frac{1}{2}} U \rangle (a) \right) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \left( \langle \partial_0^{-1} M_{2,-}^{\frac{1}{2}} U | \partial_0^{-1} M_{2,-}^{\frac{1}{2}} U \rangle (b) - \langle \partial_0^{-1} M_{2,-}^{\frac{1}{2}} U | \partial_0^{-1} M_{2,-}^{\frac{1}{2}} U \rangle (a) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

which yields the asserted energy balance equation. If  $f \in H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}, H)$  we can approximate  $f$  by a sequence  $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of functions in  $D(\partial_0)$ . Since the solution operator is continuous, we obtain

$$U_n := (\partial_0 M_0 + M_1 + \partial_0^{-1} M_2 + A)^{-1} f_n \rightarrow U.$$

According to what we have shown above,  $U_n \in D(\partial_0)$  satisfies the energy balance equation

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2} \langle U_n | M_0 U_n \rangle_0 (b) + \frac{1}{2} \langle \partial_0^{-1} U_n | M_2 \partial_0^{-1} U_n \rangle_0 (b) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \langle U_n | M_0 U_n \rangle_0 (a) + \frac{1}{2} \langle \partial_0^{-1} U_n | M_2 \partial_0^{-1} U_n \rangle_0 (a) + \int_a^b \Re \langle U_n | f_n \rangle_0.
\end{aligned}$$

Passing to an almost everywhere convergent subsequence, we derive the energy balance for  $U$  by letting  $n$  tend to infinity in the previous equality.  $\square$

*Remark 2.4.* (a) Note that, if  $f = 0$  on an interval  $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  in the situation of the previous theorem then

$$t \mapsto \frac{1}{2} \langle U | M_0 U \rangle_0 (t) + \frac{1}{2} \langle \partial_0^{-1} U | M_2 \partial_0^{-1} U \rangle_0 (t)$$

is a constant function in  $L^{\infty, \text{loc}}(I)$ . For  $M_1 = M_2 = 0$  this results in  $U = (\partial_0 M_0 + A)^{-1} f$ , and that

$$t \mapsto \frac{1}{2} \langle U | M_0 U \rangle_0 (t) = \frac{1}{2} \left| \sqrt{M_0} U \right|_0^2 (t)$$

is a constant function in  $L^{\infty, \text{loc}}(I)$ .

Using that  $\sqrt{M_0} U$  satisfies the equation

$$\left( \partial_0 + \sqrt{M_0}^{-1} A \sqrt{M_0}^{-1} \right) \sqrt{M_0} U = \sqrt{M_0}^{-1} f,$$

we get that

$$\left( \partial_0 + \sqrt{M_0}^{-1} A \sqrt{M_0}^{-1} \right) \left( \left( \sqrt{M_0}^{-1} A \sqrt{M_0}^{-1} \right) \sqrt{M_0} U \right) = \sqrt{M_0}^{-1} A M_0^{-1} f,$$

provided that  $U$  and  $f$  are regular enough. Using that  $\sqrt{M_0}^{-1} A \sqrt{M_0}^{-1}$  is again skew-selfadjoint, we obtain by Theorem 2.3 the preservation of the norm<sup>7</sup>

$$\frac{1}{2} \left| \left( \sqrt{M_0}^{-1} A \sqrt{M_0}^{-1} \right) \sqrt{M_0} U \right|_0^2$$

<sup>7</sup>Indeed, any Borel function  $f$  of the skew-selfadjoint operator  $\tilde{A} := \sqrt{M_0}^{-1} A \sqrt{M_0}^{-1}$  in the sense of the associated function calculus would yield

$$t \mapsto \frac{1}{2} |f(\tilde{A}) \sqrt{M_0} U|_0^2 (t)$$

as a preserved quantity on  $I$ , provided that  $\sqrt{M_0} U$  is in the domain of  $f(\tilde{A})$ .

## 2.2 A Mechanism Deriving Evolutionary Equations from Given Ones

on the interval  $I$ .

(b) In the situation of (a), we assume for sake of simplicity – in particular with respect to applications – that  $A$  is of the operator block matrix form

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -G^* \\ G & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

where  $G : D(G) \subseteq H_0 \rightarrow H_1$  is a densely defined, closed, linear operator between two Hilbert spaces  $H_0, H_1$ , so that skew-selfadjointness of  $A$  in  $H := H_0 \oplus H_1$  is evident. Assuming in addition that  $M_0$  can be written as a block diagonal operator  $\begin{pmatrix} M_{00} & 0 \\ 0 & M_{11} \end{pmatrix}$  with respect to the block structure induced by  $A$ , we obtain that the function

$$\begin{aligned} t &\mapsto \frac{1}{2} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\sqrt{M_{00}}^{-1} G^* \sqrt{M_{11}}^{-1} \\ \sqrt{M_{11}}^{-1} G \sqrt{M_{00}}^{-1} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{M_{00}} U_0 \\ \sqrt{M_{11}} U_1 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_0^2 (t), \\ &\mapsto \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{M_{00}}^{-1} G^* U_1 \\ \sqrt{M_{11}}^{-1} G U_0 \end{pmatrix} \middle| \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{M_{00}}^{-1} G^* U_1 \\ \sqrt{M_{11}}^{-1} G U_0 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle_0 (t), \\ &\mapsto \frac{1}{2} \langle G^* U_1 | M_{00}^{-1} G^* U_1 \rangle_0 (t) + \frac{1}{2} \langle G U_0 | M_{11}^{-1} G U_0 \rangle_0 (t) \end{aligned}$$

is constant on  $I$ . Since  $U = \begin{pmatrix} U_0 \\ U_1 \end{pmatrix}$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_0 M_{00} U_0 - G^* U_1 &= 0, \\ \partial_0 M_{11} U_1 + G U_0 &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

on  $I$ , this yields

$$\begin{aligned} t &\mapsto \frac{1}{2} \langle \partial_0 M_{00} U_0 | M_{00}^{-1} \partial_0 M_{00} U_0 \rangle_0 (t) + \frac{1}{2} \langle G U_0 | M_{11}^{-1} G U_0 \rangle_0 (t), \\ &\mapsto \frac{1}{2} \langle \partial_0 U_0 | M_{00} \partial_0 U_0 \rangle_0 (t) + \frac{1}{2} \langle G U_0 | M_{11}^{-1} G U_0 \rangle_0 (t), \end{aligned}$$

as a preserved quantity on the interval  $I$ , an expression, which – with the notable exception of Maxwell's system of electrodynamics – is frequently used to state conservation of energy, rather than the simple norm preservation.

## 2.2 A Mechanism Deriving Evolutionary Equations from Given Ones

We start this section by giving a typical example for  $A$  admitting the block structure as stated in Remark 2.4:

**Example 2.5.** In [19] a particular case for the skew-selfadjoint operator  $A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -G^* \\ G & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  has been considered, which, if Dirichlet type boundary conditions are to be imposed, leads to

$$G = \mathring{\nabla}$$

on  $\bigoplus_{q \in \mathbb{N}} L^{2,q}(\Omega)$ , where  $L^{2,q}(\Omega)$  denotes the Hilbert space of covariant tensors of degree  $q \in \mathbb{N}$ , defined on an arbitrary non-empty open subset  $\Omega$  of a Riemannian submanifold  $(M, g)$ . The operator  $\mathring{\nabla}$  is defined as the closure of the covariant derivative acting on smooth covariant tensors with compact support in  $\Omega$ . The inner product of  $L^{2,q}(\Omega)$  is given by

$$(\phi, \psi) \mapsto \int_{\Omega} \langle \phi | \psi \rangle_{\otimes q} dV,$$

## 2 A Well-Posed Problem Class of Autonomous Evolutionary Equations

where  $V$  is the volume element of the Riemannian manifold  $M$  and  $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{\otimes q}$  denotes the inner product for covariant  $q$ -tensors induced by the Riemannian metric tensor  $g$ . The divergence operator  $\nabla \cdot$  (or  $\text{div}$ ) is defined as the skew-adjoint of  $\overset{\circ}{\nabla}$ , i.e.

$$-\nabla \cdot := \left( \overset{\circ}{\nabla} \right)^* = G^*.$$

We shall focus here on the Dirichlet case, although it should be clear that many other boundary conditions can be treated in an analogous way by prescribing a dense domain for  $\nabla$  to establish  $G$  ( $\nabla$  is the skew-adjoint of an analogously defined  $\overset{\circ}{\nabla}$ ). If for example the domain of  $\nabla$  is not constrained at all we have Neumann type boundary conditions induced via  $G^* = \overset{\circ}{\nabla} \cdot$ . However, to make the presentation not unnecessarily difficult to follow, we shall focus on the Dirichlet case throughout.

Considering elements in  $\bigoplus_{q \in \mathbb{N}} L^{2,q}(\Omega)$  as infinite column vectors we see that  $A$  may also be written in the suggestive infinite tridiagonal block operator matrix form

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \nabla \cdot & 0 & \cdots & \cdots \\ \overset{\circ}{\nabla} & 0 & \nabla \cdot & 0 & \\ 0 & \overset{\circ}{\nabla} & 0 & \ddots & \ddots \\ \vdots & 0 & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}.$$

From the associated evolutionary operators

$$(\partial_0 M_0 + M_1 + \partial_0^{-1} M_2 + A)$$

for suitable  $M_0, M_1, M_2$  desired parts may be extracted from this ‘‘mother’’ class of operators by a rigorous mechanism discussed in [19].

**Definition 2.6.** Let  $H, X$  be Hilbert spaces and  $A : D(A) \subseteq H \rightarrow H$  densely defined closed linear. Moreover, let  $B : H \rightarrow X$  be linear and such that:

- $AB^*$  is densely defined (in  $X$ ).

Then we call  $B$  *compatible* with  $A$  and  $\overline{BAB^*}$  the  $(B)$ -*relative* (or simply a *relative*) of  $A$ . If the mapping  $B$  is not a bijection, then we call  $\overline{BAB^*}$  the  $(B)$ -*descendant* (or simply a *descendant*) of  $A$  (and  $A$  the *mother* operator of  $\overline{BAB^*}$ ).

We recall from [19] the following result.

**Theorem 2.7.** Let  $A : D(A) \subseteq H_0 \rightarrow H_1$  a densely defined closed linear operator and  $B \in L(H_0, X)$  such that  $AB^*$  is densely defined. Then

$$(AB^*)^* = \overline{BA^*}.$$

*Proof.* Obviously,  $BA^* \subseteq (AB^*)^*$  which yields  $\overline{BA^*} \subseteq (AB^*)^*$ . Let now  $x \in D((BA^*)^*)$ . Then for each  $y \in D(A^*)$  we compute

$$\langle A^* y | B^* x \rangle = \langle BA^* y | x \rangle = \langle y | (BA^*)^* x \rangle$$

which yields  $x \in D(AB^*)$ , i.e.  $(BA^*)^* \subseteq AB^*$ . The latter gives  $(AB^*)^* \subseteq (BA^*)^{**} = \overline{BA^*}$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.8.** Let  $G : D(G) \subseteq H_0 \rightarrow H_1$  a densely defined closed linear operator. Moreover, let  $B_0 \in L(H_0, X)$  and  $B_1 \in L(H_1, Y)$  such that  $GB_0^*$  and  $G^* B_1^*$  are densely defined. Then

$$\left( \overline{B_1 G B_0^*} \right)^* = \overline{B_0 G^* B_1^*}$$

## 2.2 A Mechanism Deriving Evolutionary Equations from Given Ones

*Proof.* By Theorem 2.7 we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{(B_1 G B_0^*)}^* &= ((G^* B_1^*)^* B_0^*)^* \\ &= (B_0 G^* B_1^*)^{**} \\ &= \overline{B_0 G^* B_1^*}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

As an immediate consequence for the type of equations of interest here, we record for later reference the following corollary.

**Corollary 2.9.** *Let  $G : D(G) \subseteq H_0 \rightarrow H_1$  a densely defined closed linear operator and set  $A := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -G^* \\ G & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $H := H_0 \oplus H_1$ . Moreover, let  $M_0, M_1, M_2 : H \rightarrow H$  be continuous linear operators satisfying (7) and  $S = \begin{pmatrix} B_0 & 0 \\ 0 & B_1 \end{pmatrix} \in L(H, Z)$ , where  $B_0 \in L(H_0, X)$ ,  $B_1(H_1, Y)$  and  $Z := X \oplus Y$  such that  $GB_0^*$  and  $G^*B_1^*$  are densely defined. Then  $A_S := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\overline{B_0 G^* B_1^*} \\ \overline{B_1 G B_0^*} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $M_{1,S} := SM_1S^*$  are skew-selfadjoint, while the operators  $M_{i,S} := SM_iS^* \in L(Z)$ ,  $i \in \{0, 2\}$  are selfadjoint. If  $S^*$  has a bounded left-inverse<sup>8</sup>, i.e. there exists  $(S^*)^{-1} : S^*[Z] \subseteq H \rightarrow Z$  with  $(S^*)^{-1}S^* = 1_Z$ , then  $M_{i,S}$  satisfies the hypotheses (7),  $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ , and in this case the evolutionary problem*

$$(\partial_0 M_{0,S} + M_{1,S} + \partial_0^{-1} M_{2,S} + A_S)U = F$$

*is well-posed in  $H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}, Z)$  for all sufficiently large  $\rho \in ]0, \infty[$  and the corresponding solution operator is causal.*

*Remark 2.10.* (a) Note that, in general, the operator  $A_S$  is not the  $(S)$ -descendant of  $A$ , since  $A_S \neq \overline{SAS^*}$ . In order to replace  $A_S$  by the  $(S)$ -descendant of  $A$  in the previous corollary, we have to guarantee the skew-selfadjointness of

$$\overline{SAS^*} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\overline{B_0 G^* B_1^*} \\ \overline{B_1 G B_0^*} & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

that is, we have to guarantee

$$\overline{B_1 G B_0^*} = \overline{B_1 G B_0^*}. \quad (10)$$

The latter is true, if one for instance requires that  $B_0^* : X \rightarrow H_0$  has a bounded left-inverse, i.e. there exists  $C : \overline{B_0^*[X]} \rightarrow X$  such that  $CB_0^* = 1_X$ , the identity on  $X$ , and that the set  $B_0^*[X] \cap D(G)$  is a core for  $\overline{B_1 G|_{\overline{B_0^*[X]}}}$ . Indeed, let  $x \in D(\overline{B_1 G B_0^*})$ . Then by assumption there exists a sequence  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $X$  such that  $B_0^*x_n \in D(G)$  and

$$\begin{aligned} B_0^*x_n &\rightarrow B_0^*x \\ B_1 G B_0^*x_n &\rightarrow \overline{B_1 G B_0^*}x \end{aligned}$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Using that  $B_0^*$  has a bounded left-inverse, we obtain  $x_n \rightarrow x$ , which yields  $x \in D(\overline{B_1 G B_0^*})$ . Thus,  $\overline{B_1 G B_0^*} \subseteq \overline{B_1 G B_0^*}$  and since the other inclusion holds trivially, we derive the assertion.

(b) Note that (10) is false in general, [3]. The counterexample is based on the following observation made by J. Epperlein and H. Vogt:

We ask the following question: Is there a closable operator  $A$  and a bounded operator  $B$  such that  $\overline{AB} \subsetneq \overline{AB}$ ? Let  $H$  be an infinite dimensional Hilbert space and  $A_0, A_1$  be two closed, densely defined operators on  $H$ , such that  $A_0 \subsetneq A_1$ . Moreover let  $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  a linear independent sequence in  $H$  such that  $y_n \rightarrow 0$ . For a fixed  $x_1 \in D(A_1) \setminus D(A_0)$  we define the operator

$$\begin{aligned} A : D(A) \subseteq H \oplus H &\rightarrow H \\ (x, y) &\mapsto A_1 x, \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>8</sup>This assumption is met for instance if  $S$  is the orthogonal projection onto a closed subspace  $Z$  of  $H$ . In this case  $S^*$  is the canonical embedding of  $Z$  into  $H$  and  $(S^*)^{-1} = S|_{S^*[H]}$ , compare Lemma 2.12.

## 2 A Well-Posed Problem Class of Autonomous Evolutionary Equations

where

$$D(A) := (D(A_0) \times \{0\}) \oplus \text{span} \{ (x_1, y_n) \mid n \in \mathbb{N} \}.$$

Moreover, set

$$\begin{aligned} B : H &\rightarrow H \oplus H \\ x &\mapsto (x, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Then  $AB = A_0$ , while  $x_1 \in D(\overline{AB})$ .

**Example 2.11.** We want to give an illustrative example for the aforementioned mechanism. For this recall the differential geometric setting in Example 2.5. Set  $H_0 := \bigoplus_{q=0}^{\infty} L^{2,q}(\Omega)$  and  $H_1 := \bigoplus_{q=1}^{\infty} L^{2,q}(\Omega)$ . Define  $G := \overset{\circ}{\nabla}$ , which yields  $G^* = -\overset{\circ}{\nabla}$ , which are both densely defined closed linear operators.  $A$  is given by

$$A := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \overset{\circ}{\nabla} \cdot \\ \overset{\circ}{\nabla} & 0 \end{pmatrix} : D(A) \subseteq H \rightarrow H,$$

where  $H := H_0 \oplus H_1$ . Let

$$\begin{aligned} B_0 : H_0 &\rightarrow L^{2,1}(\Omega) \\ \begin{pmatrix} f_0 \\ f_1 \\ f_2 \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix} &\mapsto f_1 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 : H_1 &\rightarrow L^{2,2}(\Omega) \\ \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix} &\mapsto f_2 \end{aligned}$$

be the canonical projections onto the second entries in their respective domain spaces. Then  $B_0^*$  and  $B_1^*$  are just the corresponding canonical embeddings. Thus,  $\overline{B_1 \overset{\circ}{\nabla} B_0^*} \subseteq L^{2,1}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega)$  is just the covariant derivative on 1-tensor fields with Dirichlet boundary conditions<sup>9</sup> and hence,  $\overline{B_0 \overset{\circ}{\nabla} \cdot B_1^*} \subseteq L^{2,2}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,1}(\Omega)$  equals the usual divergence on 2-tensor fields without boundary conditions. Thus, the descendant problem

$$(\partial_0 M_{0,S} + M_{1,S} + \partial_0^{-1} M_{2,S} + A_S) U = F$$

in Corollary 2.9 is just a reduction of the full problem to a closed subspace, namely  $L^{2,1}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega)$ .

Although the example above is trivial, it turns out that in many application this process of dimension reduction occurs, where the operators  $B_0$  and  $B_1$  are given as suitable orthogonal projections. For the purpose of our following considerations we first record the following rather elementary observation, which is just a variant of the projection theorem.

**Lemma 2.12** (see e.g. [24, Lemma 3.2]). *Let  $\iota$  be the canonical (isometric) embedding of a closed subspace  $V \subseteq H$  into  $H$ . Then  $\iota^*$  is the orthogonal projector onto  $V$ . Let  $\kappa$  be the canonical embedding of  $V^\perp$  into  $H$  then we have*

$$\iota^* + \kappa \kappa^* = 1. \tag{11}$$

---

<sup>9</sup>Indeed, in this situation  $\overline{B_1 \overset{\circ}{\nabla} B_0^*} = \overline{B_1 \overset{\circ}{\nabla} B_0^*}$  according to Remark 2.10.

## 2.2 A Mechanism Deriving Evolutionary Equations from Given Ones

*Remark 2.13.* Equality (11) may be written in an intuitive block operator matrix notation as

$$(\iota \ \kappa) \begin{pmatrix} \iota^* \\ \kappa^* \end{pmatrix} = 1.$$

It may also be worth noting that  $\iota^* \iota : V \rightarrow V$  and  $\kappa^* \kappa : V^\perp \rightarrow V^\perp$  are just the identities on  $V$  and  $V^\perp$ , respectively. It is common practice to identify  $H$  and  $V \oplus V^\perp$ , which makes

$$\begin{pmatrix} \iota^* \\ \kappa^* \end{pmatrix} : H \rightarrow V \oplus V^\perp =: \begin{pmatrix} V \\ V^\perp \end{pmatrix}, \quad x \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \iota^* \\ \kappa^* \end{pmatrix} x = \begin{pmatrix} \iota^* x \\ \kappa^* x \end{pmatrix} \quad (12)$$

the identity. However, for our purposes it appears helpful to avoid this identification.

The mapping (12) is obviously unitary, which allows us for example to study an equation of the form

$$NU = F$$

for a bounded linear operator  $N$  in  $H$  via the unitarily equivalent block operator matrix equation

$$\begin{pmatrix} \iota^* \\ \kappa^* \end{pmatrix} N (\iota \ \kappa) \begin{pmatrix} \iota^* \\ \kappa^* \end{pmatrix} U = \begin{pmatrix} \iota^* N \iota & \iota^* N \kappa \\ \kappa^* N \iota & \kappa^* N \kappa \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \iota^* U \\ \kappa^* U \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \iota^* F \\ \kappa^* F \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that

$$(\iota \ \kappa) : \begin{pmatrix} V \\ V^\perp \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow H, \quad \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} \mapsto (\iota \ \kappa) \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} = \iota u + \kappa v$$

is the inverse of (12).

As a general notational convention we shall use that if  $P : H \rightarrow H$  is an orthogonal projector then the canonical embedding of its range into the Hilbert space  $H$  will be denoted by  $\iota_P$  so that

$$P = \iota_P \iota_P^*.$$

*Remark 2.14.* We give another typical example for the reduction process via orthogonal projectors, arising due to singularities in the constitutive relation. In applications one may find a formal equation of the form

$$\partial_0 V + (M_1 + A)U = f,$$

with a corresponding material relation, which is frequently simply given as

$$U = N_0 V,$$

where  $N_0 \in L(H)$  is a selfadjoint, non-negative operator. If  $N_0$  is strictly positive definite then

$$V = M_0 U$$

with  $M_0 = N_0^{-1}$ , in which case we are led to the particular situation of evolutionary equations considered here.

Frequently, however, the operator  $N_0$  may be initially not invertible since  $N_0$  has a non-trivial null space. Let  $Q_0$  be the (non-trivial) orthogonal projector onto the range of  $N_0$  ( $Q_0 \notin \{0, 1\}$ ) then  $1 - Q_0$  is the (non-trivial) orthogonal projector onto the kernel of  $N_0$ . This fact suggests to reduce the material relation to

$$\iota_{Q_0}^* U = (\iota_{Q_0}^* N_0 \iota_{Q_0}) \iota_{Q_0}^* V$$

and assuming that  $N_0$  is strictly positive definite on its own range, i.e.  $\iota_{Q_0}^* N_0 \iota_{Q_0}$  is strictly positive definite. We have

$$\iota_{Q_0}^* V = (\iota_{Q_0}^* N_0 \iota_{Q_0})^{-1} (\iota_{Q_0}^* U).$$

### 3 On Some Models of Deformable Solids and their Interconnection

The resulting evolutionary equation of the form assumed in this paper is now the reduced equation

$$\left( \partial_0 \widetilde{M}_0 + \widetilde{M}_1 + \widetilde{A} \right) \widetilde{U} = \widetilde{f}, \quad (13)$$

where  $\widetilde{U} := \iota_{Q_0}^* U$ ,  $\widetilde{A} := \overline{\iota_{Q_0}^* A} \iota_{Q_0}$ ,  $\widetilde{M}_0 := (\iota_{Q_0}^* N_0 \iota_{Q_0})^{-1}$ ,  $\widetilde{M}_1 := \iota_{Q_0}^* M_1 \iota_{Q_0}$ ,  $\widetilde{f} := \iota_{Q_0}^* f$ , which is a descendant problem in the sense of Corollary 2.9,<sup>10</sup> where  $S = \iota_{Q_0}^*$ , provided that  $\widetilde{A}$  is skew-selfadjoint (compare Remark 2.10). In other words we are led to seek solutions in the smaller space  $H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}, Q_0[H])$ . Note that  $\widetilde{M}_0$  is now by construction and the assumptions on  $N_0$  continuous selfadjoint and strictly positive definite on  $Q_0[H] = N_0[H]$  and with  $M_1$  also  $\widetilde{M}_1$  remains skew-selfadjoint.

## 3 On Some Models of Deformable Solids and their Interconnection

We discuss the equations of elasticity in a 3-dimensional (differentiable) Riemannian submanifold  $M$  and think of  $\Omega \subseteq M$  being an open subset of  $M$  modeling the body under consideration in its non-deformed state. Recall the functional analytic setting of Example 2.5, i.e.,  $\nabla$  denotes the covariant derivative on  $L^{2,s}(\Omega)$  taking values in  $L^{2,s+1}(\Omega)$ ,  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ , with (generalized) Dirichlet boundary conditions and its skew-adjoint  $\nabla \cdot$ . It will be the purpose of the following to discuss several models of elasticity and to describe their interconnection. We show that independent of the physical interpretation of the given quantities, it is possible invoking the mother and descendant mechanism to derive all these models from the model for micromorphic media proposed by R.D. Mindlin, [11]. Anticipating the theory discussed in the previous sections and realizing that in the theory of elasticity, one is confronted with symmetric, skew-symmetric and trace-free parts of 2-tensors, we introduce some projections in  $L^{2,2}(\Omega)$ .

For this let  $\tau \in L^{2,2}(\Omega)$  be a covariant tensor field of order 2. For<sup>11</sup>  $p \in \Omega$ ,  $x, y \in T_p M$ , we define

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{skew}\tau)_p(x, y) &:= \frac{1}{2} (\tau_p(x, y) - \tau_p(y, x)) \\ (\text{sym}\tau)_p(x, y) &:= \frac{1}{2} (\tau_p(x, y) + \tau_p(y, x)) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\text{trace} : L^{2,2}(\Omega) \rightarrow L^{2,0}(\Omega)$$

with

$$(\text{trace}\tau)_p := \left\langle \langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_p \middle| \tau_p \right\rangle_{\otimes 2},$$

where for the Riemannian metric tensor  $g$  at  $p$  we write  $g_p = \langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_p$ . It is

$$(\text{trace}^* \varphi)_p = \varphi(p) g_p$$

for  $\varphi \in L^{2,0}(\Omega)$  and we set

$$\mathbb{P} = \frac{1}{3} \text{trace}^* \text{trace}.$$

<sup>10</sup>In fact this is a well-posed descendant of a possibly ill-posed problem, a situation which was not addressed in Corollary 2.9. However, if one replaces  $N_0$  by the strictly positive definite and selfadjoint operator  $N_0 + \varepsilon(1 - Q_0)$  for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the original problem is well-posed and its descendant problem is actually given by (13) and so Corollary 2.9 applies.

<sup>11</sup>We denote the tangent space at  $p$  by

$$T_p M := \text{span}\{\partial_j \phi(\phi^{-1}(p)); \phi: U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow M \cap \Omega \text{ local parametrization, } j \in \{1, 2, 3\}\}.$$

We define  $\text{sym}_0 := (1 - \mathbb{P}) \text{sym} = \text{sym} (1 - \mathbb{P})$ . The operators  $\text{sym}$ ,  $\text{sym}_0$ ,  $\text{skew}$  and  $\mathbb{P}$  are orthogonal projectors in  $L^{2,2}(\Omega)$ , which satisfy

$$\text{skew} + \text{sym}_0 + \mathbb{P} = 1. \quad (14)$$

The part  $\text{skew} + \text{sym}_0 = 1 - \mathbb{P}$  is frequently referred to as *deviatoric* part and  $\mathbb{P}$  as *volumetric* or pressure part. The symmetric part is given by  $\text{sym} = \text{sym}_0 + \mathbb{P} = 1 - \text{skew}$ . Recall our convention  $\iota_{\text{sym}}: \text{sym}[L^{2,2}(\Omega)] \rightarrow L^{2,2}(\Omega)$ ,  $\phi \mapsto \phi$  to be the canonical injection and similarly for  $\text{skew}$ ,  $\text{sym}_0$  and  $\mathbb{P}$ .

Consider the particular Euclidean case with  $\Omega$  a non-empty open subset of  $M = \mathbb{R}^3$  with the Euclidean inner product. In this case

$$T_p M = \mathbb{R}^3$$

and the matrix representation of  $g_p$  with respect to the canonical basis of  $\mathbb{R}^3$  is simply the unit matrix independent of  $p \in \Omega$ . Thus, in particular trace  $\tau$  is just the matrix trace of the matrix representation  $(\tau_{ij})_{i,j}$  of  $\tau$  and the inner product of 2-tensors is the Frobenius inner product

$$(\tau, \sigma) \mapsto \text{trace} \left( (\tau_{ij})_{i,j}^* (\sigma_{kl})_{k,l} \right).$$

### 3.1 Micromorphic Media

R. D. Mindlin, [11], has proposed modified Cosserat type media, which Eringen, see e.g. [5], in his comprehensive and systematic studies of generalized continuum mechanics labeled as “micromorphic”. We set-up the system properly in  $H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}, H)$  with the underlying Hilbert space  $H$  being

$$H = L^{2,1}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,3}(\Omega) \oplus \text{sym}[L^{2,2}(\Omega)].$$

The dynamic equations read as

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_0 \rho_0 \dot{u} - \nabla \cdot (\iota_{\text{sym}} \tau + \sigma) &= f \\ \partial_0 \rho_2 \dot{\psi} - \nabla \cdot \mu - \sigma &= h, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where  $f \in H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}; L^{2,1}(\Omega))$ ,  $h \in H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}; L^{2,2}(\Omega))$  are given quantities and  $\rho_0, \rho_2$  are the canonical extensions of bounded linear operators within  $L^{2,1}(\Omega)$  and  $L^{2,2}(\Omega)$ , respectively. The unknowns are  $\dot{u} \in H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}; L^{2,1}(\Omega))$ ,  $\dot{\psi}, \sigma \in H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}; L^{2,2}(\Omega))$ ,  $\tau \in H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}; \text{sym}[L^{2,2}(\Omega)])$  and  $\mu \in H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}; L^{2,3}(\Omega))$ . The equations (15) are completed by the relations

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tau \\ \sigma \\ \mu \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} C_0 & G_0 & F_0 \\ G_0^* & C_1 & D_0 \\ F_0^* & D_0^* & C_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon \\ \gamma \\ \kappa \end{pmatrix} \in H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}; \text{sym}[L^{2,2}(\Omega)] \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,3}(\Omega)), \quad (16)$$

with

$$\varepsilon := \iota_{\text{sym}}^* \nabla u, \quad \kappa := \nabla \psi, \quad \gamma := \nabla u - \psi$$

for suitable bounded linear operators  $C_0, G_0, F_0, C_1, D_0, C_2$  only depending on the spatial variables<sup>12</sup> and  $u = \partial_0^{-1} \dot{u}$ ,  $\psi = \partial_0^{-1} \dot{\psi}$ . We want to give well-posedness conditions for the operators

<sup>12</sup>The dynamic equations already indicate that  $\iota_{\text{sym}} \tau + \sigma$  is most likely a more suitable unknown rather than both  $\tau$  and  $\sigma$ . Note that from  $\iota_{\text{sym}} \tau + \sigma$  and  $\iota_{\text{sym}} \sigma$  both can, however, be recovered. Since  $\tau \in \text{sym}[L^{2,2}(\Omega)]$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma &= \iota_{\text{sym}} \iota_{\text{sym}}^* \sigma + \text{skew}(\iota_{\text{sym}} \tau + \sigma), \\ \tau &= \iota_{\text{sym}}^* (\iota_{\text{sym}} \tau + \sigma) - \iota_{\text{sym}}^* \sigma. \end{aligned}$$

### 3 On Some Models of Deformable Solids and their Interconnection

involved of finding  $(\dot{u}, \dot{\psi}) \in H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}; L^{2,1}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega))$  solving (15) subject to (16). In order to do so, we reformulate the problem. For this we consider the block operator matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \iota_{\text{sym}} C_0 \iota_{\text{sym}}^* + G_0^* \iota_{\text{sym}}^* + \iota_{\text{sym}} G_0 + C_1 & \iota_{\text{sym}} F_0 + D_0 & \iota_{\text{sym}} G_0 \iota_{\text{sym}} + C_1 \iota_{\text{sym}} \\ F_0^* \iota_{\text{sym}}^* + D_0^* & C_2 & D_0^* \iota_{\text{sym}} \\ \iota_{\text{sym}} G_0^* \iota_{\text{sym}}^* + \iota_{\text{sym}}^* C_1 & \iota_{\text{sym}}^* D_0 & \iota_{\text{sym}}^* C_1 \iota_{\text{sym}} \end{pmatrix} \in L(L^{2,2}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,3}(\Omega) \oplus \text{sym}[L^{2,2}(\Omega)]),$$

which we assume to be continuously invertible throughout. We denote its inverse by  $W = \begin{pmatrix} W_{00} & W_{01} & W_{02} \\ W_{01}^* & W_{11} & W_{21} \\ W_{02}^* & W_{21}^* & W_{22} \end{pmatrix}$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ . Then  $(\dot{u}, \dot{\psi}) \in H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}; L^{2,1}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega))$  is a solution of (15)*

*subject to (16) if and only if  $\begin{pmatrix} \dot{u} \\ \dot{\psi} \\ \iota_{\text{sym}} \tau + \sigma \\ \mu \\ \iota_{\text{sym}}^* \sigma \end{pmatrix} \in H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}; L^{2,1}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,3}(\Omega) \oplus \text{sym}[L^{2,2}(\Omega)])$  solves*

$$(\partial_0 M_0 + M_1 + A) \begin{pmatrix} \dot{u} \\ \dot{\psi} \\ \iota_{\text{sym}} \tau + \sigma \\ \mu \\ \iota_{\text{sym}}^* \sigma \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} f \\ h \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$M_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \rho_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & & & \\ 0 & 0 & W & & \\ 0 & 0 & & & \end{pmatrix}, \quad M_1 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\text{skew} & 0 & -\iota_{\text{sym}} \\ 0 & \text{skew} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}}^* & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$A := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\nabla \cdot & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\nabla \cdot & 0 \\ -\overset{\circ}{\nabla} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\overset{\circ}{\nabla} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

*Proof.* Before we show the assertion observe that for given

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tau \\ \sigma \\ \mu \end{pmatrix} \in \text{sym}[L^{2,2}(\Omega)] \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,3}(\Omega),$$

we get that

$$\begin{pmatrix} \iota_{\text{sym}} \tau + \sigma \\ \mu \\ \iota_{\text{sym}}^* \sigma \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \iota_{\text{sym}} & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}}^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tau \\ \sigma \\ \mu \end{pmatrix} \in L^{2,2}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,3}(\Omega) \oplus \text{sym}[L^{2,2}(\Omega)].$$

Realizing that  $\begin{pmatrix} \iota_{\text{sym}}^* & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \iota_{\text{sym}} & \text{skew} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & \iota_{\text{sym}}^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} = 1$  and invoking  $\begin{pmatrix} \tau \\ \sigma \\ \mu \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} C_0 & G_0 & F_0 \\ G_0^* & C_1 & D_0 \\ F_0^* & D_0^* & C_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon \\ \gamma \\ \kappa \end{pmatrix}$

for some  $\varepsilon, \gamma$  and  $\kappa$ , we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} \iota_{\text{sym}}\tau + \sigma \\ \mu \\ \iota_{\text{sym}}^*\sigma \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} \iota_{\text{sym}} & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}}^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tau \\ \sigma \\ \mu \end{pmatrix}, \\ &= \left( \begin{pmatrix} \iota_{\text{sym}} & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}}^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} C_0 & G_0 & F_0 \\ G_0^* & C_1 & D_0 \\ F_0^* & D_0^* & C_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \iota_{\text{sym}}^* & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) \left( \begin{pmatrix} \iota_{\text{sym}} & \text{skew} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & \iota_{\text{sym}}^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon \\ \gamma \\ \kappa \end{pmatrix} \right). \end{aligned}$$

From

$$\begin{aligned} &\begin{pmatrix} \iota_{\text{sym}} & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}}^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} C_0 & G_0 & F_0 \\ G_0^* & C_1 & D_0 \\ F_0^* & D_0^* & C_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \iota_{\text{sym}}^* & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \iota_{\text{sym}}C_0 + G_0^* & \iota_{\text{sym}}G_0 + C_1 & \iota_{\text{sym}}F_0 + D_0 \\ F_0^* & D_0^* & C_2 \\ \iota_{\text{sym}}^*G_0^* & \iota_{\text{sym}}^*C_1 & \iota_{\text{sym}}^*D_0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \iota_{\text{sym}}^* & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \iota_{\text{sym}}C_0\iota_{\text{sym}}^* + G_0^*\iota_{\text{sym}}^* + \iota_{\text{sym}}G_0 + C_1 & \iota_{\text{sym}}F_0 + D_0 & \iota_{\text{sym}}G_0\iota_{\text{sym}}^* + C_1\iota_{\text{sym}} \\ F_0^*\iota_{\text{sym}}^* + D_0^* & C_2 & D_0^*\iota_{\text{sym}} \\ \iota_{\text{sym}}^*G_0^*\iota_{\text{sym}}^* + \iota_{\text{sym}}^*C_1 & \iota_{\text{sym}}^*D_0 & \iota_{\text{sym}}^*C_1\iota_{\text{sym}} \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

we get that

$$\begin{aligned} W \begin{pmatrix} \iota_{\text{sym}}\tau + \sigma \\ \mu \\ \iota_{\text{sym}}^*\sigma \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} \iota_{\text{sym}} & \text{skew} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & \iota_{\text{sym}}^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon \\ \gamma \\ \kappa \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \iota_{\text{sym}}\varepsilon + \text{skew}\gamma \\ \kappa \\ \iota_{\text{sym}}^*\gamma - \varepsilon \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Now, let  $(\dot{u}, \dot{\psi}) \in H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}; L^{2,1}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega))$  be a solution of (15) subject to (16). Applying  $\partial_0$  to equation (17), using the time-independence of  $W$  and the definition of  $\varepsilon, \gamma$  and  $\kappa$ , we get that

$$\partial_0 W \begin{pmatrix} \iota_{\text{sym}}\tau + \sigma \\ \mu \\ \iota_{\text{sym}}^*\sigma \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \text{skew}\dot{\psi} \\ 0 \\ \iota_{\text{sym}}^*\dot{\psi} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \nabla\dot{u} \\ \nabla\dot{\psi} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The latter equation together with (15) yields a solution of  $(\partial_0 M_0 + M_1 + A)U = \begin{pmatrix} f \\ h \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ . On the

other hand, a solution of the latter equation gives equation (16) by integrating the last three rows of the system, i.e., by multiplying the last three rows by  $\partial_0^{-1}$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.2.** *Let  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ . The equation (15) subject to (16) is well-posed in the sense that for any  $(f, h) \in H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}; L^{2,1}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega))$  there exists uniquely determined  $(\dot{u}, \dot{\psi}) \in H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}; L^{2,1}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega))$  depending continuously on  $(f, h)$  if  $\rho_0, \rho_2$  and  $W$  are strictly positive definite. Moreover,*

### 3 On Some Models of Deformable Solids and their Interconnection

in this case the energy balance equality

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \left( \begin{array}{c} \dot{u} \\ \dot{\psi} \\ \iota_{\text{sym}} \tau + \sigma \\ \mu \\ \iota_{\text{sym}}^* \sigma \end{array} \right) \middle| \left( \begin{array}{c} \rho_0 \dot{u} \\ \rho_2 \dot{\psi} \\ \iota_{\text{sym}} \varepsilon + \text{skew} \gamma \\ \kappa \\ \iota_{\text{sym}}^* \gamma - \varepsilon \end{array} \right) \right\rangle (b) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \left( \begin{array}{c} \dot{u} \\ \dot{\psi} \\ \iota_{\text{sym}} \tau + \sigma \\ \mu \\ \iota_{\text{sym}}^* \sigma \end{array} \right) \middle| \left( \begin{array}{c} \rho_0 \dot{u} \\ \rho_2 \dot{\psi} \\ \iota_{\text{sym}} \varepsilon + \text{skew} \gamma \\ \kappa \\ \iota_{\text{sym}}^* \gamma - \varepsilon \end{array} \right) \right\rangle (a) + \int_a^b \left\langle \left( \begin{array}{c} \dot{u} \\ \dot{\psi} \end{array} \right) \middle| \left( \begin{array}{c} f \\ h \end{array} \right) \right\rangle \end{aligned}$$

holds for almost every  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ .

*Proof.* With the help of the reformulation done in Theorem 3.1, the proof rests on Theorem 2.1 for the solution theory and Theorem 2.3 for the energy balance.  $\square$

*Remark 3.3.* We elaborate the condition of positive definiteness of  $W$  more closely: First we note that  $W$  is strictly positive definite if and only if  $W^{-1}$  is strictly positive definite. If in particular

$$D_0 = 0, F_0 = 0$$

we merely have to consider the positive definiteness of

$$\begin{pmatrix} \iota_{\text{sym}} C_0 \iota_{\text{sym}}^* + G_0^* \iota_{\text{sym}}^* + \iota_{\text{sym}} G_0 + C_1 & \iota_{\text{sym}} G_0 \iota_{\text{sym}} + C_1 \iota_{\text{sym}} & 0 \\ \iota_{\text{sym}}^* G_0^* \iota_{\text{sym}}^* + \iota_{\text{sym}}^* C_1 & \iota_{\text{sym}}^* C_1 \iota_{\text{sym}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & C_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

which holds if  $C_2$  is strictly positive definite and

$$\begin{pmatrix} \iota_{\text{sym}} C_0 \iota_{\text{sym}}^* + G_0^* \iota_{\text{sym}}^* + \iota_{\text{sym}} G_0 + C_1 & \iota_{\text{sym}} G_0 \iota_{\text{sym}} + C_1 \iota_{\text{sym}} \\ \iota_{\text{sym}}^* G_0^* \iota_{\text{sym}}^* + \iota_{\text{sym}}^* C_1 & \iota_{\text{sym}}^* C_1 \iota_{\text{sym}} \end{pmatrix}$$

is strictly positive definite. The latter holds if  $\iota_{\text{sym}}^* C_1 \iota_{\text{sym}}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} & \iota_{\text{sym}} C_0 \iota_{\text{sym}}^* + G_0^* \iota_{\text{sym}}^* + \iota_{\text{sym}} G_0 + C_1 \\ & - (\iota_{\text{sym}} G_0 \iota_{\text{sym}} + C_1 \iota_{\text{sym}}) (\iota_{\text{sym}}^* C_1 \iota_{\text{sym}})^{-1} (\iota_{\text{sym}}^* G_0^* \iota_{\text{sym}}^* + \iota_{\text{sym}}^* C_1) \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

is strictly positive definite.

In the isotropic case we do have  $D_0 = 0$  and  $F_0 = 0$  and moreover

$$\begin{aligned} C_0 &= \iota_{\text{sym}}^* (2\mu_0 \text{sym}_0 + (3\lambda_0 + 2\mu_0) \mathbb{P}) \iota_{\text{sym}}, \\ C_1 &= 2\mu_1 \text{sym}_0 + 2\alpha_1 \text{skew} + (3\lambda_1 + 2\mu_1) \mathbb{P}, \\ G_0 &= \iota_{\text{sym}}^* (2\omega_0 \text{sym}_0 + (3\beta_0 + 2\omega_0) \mathbb{P}). \end{aligned}$$

for suitable scalars  $\mu_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0, \omega_0, \mu_1, \lambda_1, \alpha_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ . With this we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \iota_{\text{sym}} G_0 &= 2\omega_0 \text{sym}_0 + (3\beta_0 + 2\omega_0) \mathbb{P} = G_0^* \iota_{\text{sym}}^*, \\ \iota_{\text{sym}} G_0 \iota_{\text{sym}} &= (2\omega_0 \text{sym}_0 + (3\beta_0 + 2\omega_0) \mathbb{P}) \iota_{\text{sym}} \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} & \iota_{\text{sym}} C_0 \iota_{\text{sym}}^* + G_0^* \iota_{\text{sym}}^* + \iota_{\text{sym}} G_0 + C_1 \\ &= 2(\mu_0 + \mu_1 + 2\omega_0) \text{sym}_0 + 2\alpha_1 \text{skew} + (3(2\beta_0 + \lambda_0 + \lambda_1) + 2(2\omega_0 + \mu_0 + \mu_1)) \mathbb{P}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, with

$$\mu_1 > 0, \lambda_1 + \frac{2}{3}\mu_1 > 0,$$

we find

$$\begin{aligned} (\iota_{\text{sym}}^* C_1 \iota_{\text{sym}})^{-1} &= \iota_{\text{sym}}^* \left( \frac{1}{2\mu_1} \text{sym}_0 + \frac{1}{3\lambda_1 + 2\mu_1} \mathbb{P} \right) \iota_{\text{sym}}, \\ \iota_{\text{sym}} G_0 \iota_{\text{sym}} + C_1 \iota_{\text{sym}} &= (2(\omega_0 + \mu_1) \text{sym}_0 + (3(\beta_0 + \lambda_1) + 2(\omega_0 + \mu_1)) \mathbb{P}) \iota_{\text{sym}} \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} &(\iota_{\text{sym}} G_0 \iota_{\text{sym}} + C_1 \iota_{\text{sym}}) (\iota_{\text{sym}}^* C_1 \iota_{\text{sym}})^{-1} (\iota_{\text{sym}}^* G_0 \iota_{\text{sym}} + \iota_{\text{sym}}^* C_1) \\ &= 2 \frac{(\omega_0 + \mu_1)^2}{\mu_1} \text{sym}_0 + \frac{(3(\beta_0 + \lambda_1) + 2(\omega_0 + \mu_1))^2}{3\lambda_1 + 2\mu_1} \mathbb{P}. \end{aligned}$$

The positive definiteness of (18) now follows if

$$\begin{aligned} &2 \left( \mu_0 + \mu_1 + 2\omega_0 - \frac{(\omega_0 + \mu_1)^2}{\mu_1} \right) \text{sym}_0 + 2\alpha_1 \text{skew} \\ &+ \left( 3(2\beta_0 + \lambda_0 + \lambda_1) + 2(2\omega_0 + \mu_0 + \mu_1) - \frac{(3(\beta_0 + \lambda_1) + 2(\omega_0 + \mu_1))^2}{3\lambda_1 + 2\mu_1} \right) \mathbb{P} \end{aligned}$$

is positive, which is the case if

$$\alpha_1 > 0,$$

$$\mu_1 (\mu_0 + \mu_1 + 2\omega_0) - (\omega_0 + \mu_1)^2 = \mu_1 \mu_0 - \omega_0^2 > 0$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &(3\lambda_1 + 2\mu_1) (3(2\beta_0 + \lambda_0 + \lambda_1) + 2(2\omega_0 + \mu_0 + \mu_1)) - (3(\beta_0 + \lambda_1) + 2(\omega_0 + \mu_1))^2 = \\ &= (3\lambda_1 + 2\mu_1)^2 + (3\lambda_1 + 2\mu_1) (2(3\beta_0 + 2\omega_0) + (3\lambda_0 + 2\mu_0)) - ((3\lambda_1 + 2\mu_1) + (3\beta_0 + 2\omega_0))^2 \\ &= (3\lambda_1 + 2\mu_1) (3\lambda_0 + 2\mu_0) - (3\beta_0 + 2\omega_0)^2 > 0. \end{aligned}$$

### 3.2 Micropolar or Cosserat Media

The equations for Cosserat elasticity in the case of Dirichlet boundary conditions read as

$$\left( \partial_0 \begin{pmatrix} \varrho_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \varrho_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & C_0^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & C_1^{-1} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\Lambda^* & 0 \\ 0 & \Lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\nabla \cdot & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\nabla \cdot \\ -\nabla \cdot & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\nabla \cdot & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{v} \\ \mathbf{w} \\ \sigma \\ \tau \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{f} \\ \mathbf{g} \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (19)$$

where  $\Lambda := 2\iota_{\wedge}^*$ ,  $\Lambda^* := 2 * \iota_{\wedge}^*$  with  $*$  denoting the Hodge star operator and  $\iota_{\wedge}$  the canonical embedding of alternating differential forms into the space of 2-tensors, i.e.

$$\iota_{\wedge} (dx^i \wedge dx^j) = \frac{1}{2} (dx^i \otimes dx^j - dx^j \otimes dx^i)$$

for  $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ . As underlying Hilbert space we have

$$H = L^{2,1}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,1}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega).$$

### 3 On Some Models of Deformable Solids and their Interconnection

In Cartesian coordinates using an obvious suggestive matrix notation we have

$$\Lambda^* \left( \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{11} & \alpha_{12} & \alpha_{13} \\ \alpha_{21} & \alpha_{22} & \alpha_{23} \\ \alpha_{31} & \alpha_{32} & \alpha_{33} \end{pmatrix} \right) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{23} - \alpha_{32} \\ \alpha_{31} - \alpha_{13} \\ \alpha_{12} - \alpha_{21} \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$-\Lambda \left( \begin{pmatrix} \beta_1 \\ \beta_2 \\ \beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \right) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\beta_3 & \beta_2 \\ \beta_3 & 0 & -\beta_1 \\ -\beta_2 & \beta_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} =: \beta \times$$

for suitable  $\alpha \in L^{2,2}(\Omega)$ ,  $\beta \in L^{2,1}(\Omega)$ .

*Remark 3.4.* On skew-symmetric tensors we have that

$$\Lambda^* \left( \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \alpha_{12} & -\alpha_{31} \\ -\alpha_{12} & 0 & \alpha_{23} \\ \alpha_{31} & \alpha_{-23} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) = 2 \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{23} \\ \alpha_{31} \\ \alpha_{12} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus, we have that  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Lambda^* \iota_{\text{skew}} : \iota_{\text{skew}}^* [L^{2,2}(\Omega)] \rightarrow L^{2,1}(\Omega)$  defines a unitary transformation.

Having stated the model for Cosserat elasticity (19) in the canonical form of Theorem 2.1, we are in the position of formulating the well-posedness result as follows.

**Theorem 3.5.** *Let  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  and let  $\rho_0, \rho_1, C_0, C_1$  be selfadjoint and strictly positive definite operators in the respective Hilbert spaces  $L^{2,1}(\Omega), L^{2,1}(\Omega), L^{2,2}(\Omega)$  and  $L^{2,2}(\Omega)$ . Then for every  $(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) \in H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}; L^{2,1}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,1}(\Omega))$  there exists uniquely determined  $(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}, \sigma, \tau) \in H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}; L^{2,1}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,1}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega))$  satisfying (19) depending continuously on  $(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})$ . Moreover, the energy balance equality*

$$\frac{1}{2} \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{v} \\ \mathbf{w} \\ \sigma \\ \tau \end{pmatrix} \middle| \begin{pmatrix} \rho_0 \mathbf{v} \\ \rho_1 \mathbf{w} \\ C_0^{-1} \sigma \\ C_1^{-1} \tau \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle (b) = \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{v} \\ \mathbf{w} \\ \sigma \\ \tau \end{pmatrix} \middle| \begin{pmatrix} \rho_0 \mathbf{v} \\ \rho_1 \mathbf{w} \\ C_0^{-1} \sigma \\ C_1^{-1} \tau \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle (a) + \int_a^b \Re \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{v} \\ \mathbf{w} \end{pmatrix} \middle| \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{f} \\ \mathbf{g} \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$$

holds for almost every  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ .

*Proof.* The assertion follows easily from the Theorems 2.1 and 2.3.  $\square$

*Remark 3.6.* We briefly discuss the relationship of (19) to a model discussed in [15]. From (19) with  $\partial_0 \phi := \mathbf{w}$  and  $\partial_0 u := \mathbf{v}$  we read off

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho_0 \partial_0^2 u - \nabla \cdot \sigma &= \mathbf{f}, \\ \varrho_1 \partial_0^2 \phi - \Lambda^* \sigma - \nabla \cdot \tau &= \mathbf{g}, \\ \partial_0 \sigma &= C_0 (\nabla \partial_0 u - \partial_0 \Lambda \phi), \\ \partial_0 \tau &= C_1 \nabla \partial_0 \phi. \end{aligned}$$

Applying  $\partial_0^{-1}$  to the third and the fourth equation we get in summary

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho_0 \partial_0^2 u - \nabla \cdot \sigma &= \mathbf{f}, \\ \varrho_1 \partial_0^2 \phi - \Lambda^* \sigma - \nabla \cdot \tau &= \mathbf{g}, \\ \sigma &= C_0 (\nabla u + \phi \times), \\ \tau &= C_1 \nabla \phi. \end{aligned}$$

Comparing with [15, p.1–43] we see that this coincides with the equations formally given there in the isotropic case, where

$$C_0 = 2\alpha_0 \text{skew} + 2\mu_0 \text{sym} + 3\lambda_0 \mathbb{P},$$

$$C_1 = 2\alpha_1 \text{skew} + 2\mu_1 \text{sym} + 3\lambda_1 \mathbb{P}.$$

for  $\alpha_0, \mu_0, \lambda_0, \alpha_1, \mu_1, \lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ . The needed positive definiteness of  $C_0, C_1$  can be conveniently analyzed by the mechanism of Remark 2.13 which yields the unitary equivalence

$$\begin{pmatrix} \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^* \\ \iota_{\text{skew}}^* \\ \iota_{\mathbb{P}}^* \end{pmatrix} C_k \begin{pmatrix} \iota_{\text{sym}_0} & \iota_{\text{skew}} & \iota_{\mathbb{P}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^* C_k \iota_{\text{sym}_0} & \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^* C_k \iota_{\text{skew}} & \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^* C_k \iota_{\mathbb{P}} \\ \iota_{\text{skew}}^* C_k \iota_{\text{sym}_0} & \iota_{\text{skew}}^* C_k \iota_{\text{skew}} & \iota_{\text{skew}}^* C_k \iota_{\mathbb{P}} \\ \iota_{\mathbb{P}}^* C_k \iota_{\text{sym}_0} & \iota_{\mathbb{P}}^* C_k \iota_{\text{skew}} & \iota_{\mathbb{P}}^* C_k \iota_{\mathbb{P}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad k \in \{0, 1\}. \quad (20)$$

In the isotropic case we thus see that positive definiteness is ensured if (and only if)

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2\mu_0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2\alpha_0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 3(\lambda_0 + \frac{2}{3}\mu_0) \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 2\mu_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2\alpha_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 3(\lambda_1 + \frac{2}{3}\mu_1) \end{pmatrix}$$

are positive definite. In other words,

$$\mu_k, \alpha_k, \lambda_k + \frac{2}{3}\mu_k > 0, \quad k \in \{0, 1\}.$$

It appears that the block matrix conversion (20) is easier to use for obtaining positive definiteness conditions than the usually employed Voigt type notation. The latter results from the same mechanism by using the canonical projectors onto the relevant Euclidean components rather than the three projectors used in (20).

In the remainder of this section, we show that the system for micromorphic media (see Theorem 3.1) is a mother of a relative of the equations of Cosserat elasticity (19). For this we discuss a relative of Cosserat elasticity first:

**Theorem 3.7.** *The following equations are the  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{skew}}^* \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \Lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \otimes \iota_{\text{skew}}^* \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \Lambda \end{pmatrix}$ -relative<sup>13</sup> of the model of Cosserat elasticity (19):*

$$(\partial_0 M_0 + M_1 + A) \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{v} \\ \omega \\ \sigma \\ \mu \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{f} \\ \mathbf{h} \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (22)$$

$$\in H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}; L^{2,1}(\Omega) \oplus \text{skew}[L^{2,2}(\Omega)] \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega) \oplus (1 \otimes \text{skew})[L^{2,3}(\Omega)])$$

with

$$M_0 := \begin{pmatrix} \varrho_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \varrho_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & C_0^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & C_2^{-1} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$M_1 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\sqrt{2}\iota_{\text{skew}}^* & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{2}\iota_{\text{skew}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

<sup>13</sup>Here  $1 \otimes \iota_{\text{skew}}^* \Lambda^*$  indicates that  $\iota_{\text{skew}}^* \Lambda^*$  is only to be applied with respect to the last two arguments. More precisely, if  $F$  maps 2-linear forms to 2-linear forms then  $1 \otimes F$  maps 3-tensors to 3-tensors

$$((1 \otimes F)T)(x, y, z) = (FT(x, \cdot, \cdot))(y, z) \quad (21)$$

and we use the notation  $1 \otimes F$  also for the canonical extension to  $L^{2,3}(\Omega)$ , when  $F$  can be canonically extended to  $L^{2,2}(\Omega)$ , currently for  $F = \iota_{\text{skew}}^* \Lambda$  or  $F = \Lambda^* \iota_{\text{skew}}$ .

### 3 On Some Models of Deformable Solids and their Interconnection

and

$$A := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\nabla \cdot & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\overline{\iota_{\text{skew}}^* \nabla \cdot} (1 \otimes \iota_{\text{skew}}) \\ -\overset{\circ}{\nabla} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\overline{(1 \otimes \iota_{\text{skew}}^*) \overset{\circ}{\nabla} \iota_{\text{skew}}} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$\varrho_2 = \frac{1}{2} \iota_{\text{skew}}^* \Lambda \varrho_1 \Lambda^* \iota_{\text{skew}},$$

$$C_2 = \frac{1}{2} (1 \otimes \iota_{\text{skew}}^* \Lambda) C_1 (1 \otimes \Lambda^* \iota_{\text{skew}}).$$

*Proof.* Using Remark 3.4, we see that  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{skew}}^* \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \Lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \otimes \iota_{\text{skew}}^* \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \Lambda \end{pmatrix}$  is indeed a bijection. The compatibility conditions are easily verified. The remaining parts are verified by direct computation.  $\square$

*Remark 3.8.*

- (a) Of course, the relative of the model for Cosserat elasticity has the well-posedness requirements that the operators

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho_0 &: L^{2,1}(\Omega) \rightarrow L^{2,1}(\Omega) \\ \varrho_2 &: \text{skew}[L^{2,2}(\Omega)] \rightarrow \text{skew}[L^{2,2}(\Omega)] \\ C_0 &: L^{2,2}(\Omega) \rightarrow L^{2,2}(\Omega) \\ C_2 &: (1 \otimes \text{skew})[L^{2,3}(\Omega)] \rightarrow (1 \otimes \text{skew})[L^{2,3}(\Omega)] \end{aligned}$$

are strictly positive definite. In view of Remark 3.4, the latter requirements are equivalent to the well-posedness requirements in Theorem 3.5.

- (b) We note that by a suitable scaling of the unknown  $(\mathbf{v}, \omega, \sigma, \mu)$  and of the source term  $(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{h})$ , system (22) can be brought into the form

$$\left( \partial_0 \widetilde{M}_0 + \widetilde{M}_1 + A \right) \begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{\mathbf{v}} \\ \widetilde{\omega} \\ \widetilde{\sigma} \\ \widetilde{\mu} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{\mathbf{f}} \\ \widetilde{\mathbf{h}} \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (23)$$

where  $\widetilde{M}_0$  is unitarily equivalent to  $M_0$  and  $\widetilde{M}_1$  is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\iota_{\text{skew}}^* & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{skew}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Next, we show that the relative of Cosserat elasticity introduced above is a descendant of the model of micromorphic media from Theorem 3.1. It has already been pointed out by R.D. Mindlin ([11]) that the model for micromorphic media contains Cosserat elasticity as a special case. The precise connection is as follows:

**Theorem 3.9.** *The system (23) is a  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{skew}}^* & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \otimes \iota_{\text{skew}}^* & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \iota_0^* \end{pmatrix}$ -descendant of the model discussed*

*in Theorem 3.1, where  $\iota_0: \{0\} \rightarrow L^{2,3}(\Omega), \phi \mapsto 0$ .*

*Proof.* The computations

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{skew}}^* & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \otimes \iota_{\text{skew}}^* & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \iota_0^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\text{skew} & 0 & -\iota_{\text{sym}} \\ 0 & \text{skew} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}}^* & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{skew}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \otimes \iota_{\text{skew}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \iota_0 \end{pmatrix} = \\ & = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\iota_{\text{skew}}^* & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{skew}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{skew}}^* & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \otimes \iota_{\text{skew}}^* & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \iota_0^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \varrho_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \varrho_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & W_{00} & W_{01} & W_{02} \\ 0 & 0 & W_{01}^* & W_{11} & W_{12} \\ 0 & 0 & W_{02}^* & W_{12}^* & W_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{skew}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \otimes \iota_{\text{skew}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \iota_0 \end{pmatrix} = \\ & = \begin{pmatrix} \varrho_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{skew}}^* \varrho_2 \iota_{\text{skew}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & W_{00} & W_{01} (1 \otimes \iota_{\text{skew}}) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & (1 \otimes \iota_{\text{skew}}^*) W_{01}^* & (1 \otimes \iota_{\text{skew}}^*) W_{11} & (1 \otimes \iota_{\text{skew}}^*) W_{12} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & W_{22} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{skew}}^* & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \otimes \iota_{\text{skew}}^* & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \iota_0^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\nabla \cdot & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\nabla \cdot & 0 \\ -\overset{\circ}{\nabla} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\overset{\circ}{\nabla} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{skew}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \otimes \iota_{\text{skew}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \iota_0 \end{pmatrix} = \\ & = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\nabla \cdot & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\overline{\iota_{\text{skew}}^* \nabla \cdot} (1 \otimes \iota_{\text{skew}}) & 0 \\ -\overset{\circ}{\nabla} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\overline{(1 \otimes \iota_{\text{skew}}^*) \overset{\circ}{\nabla} \iota_{\text{skew}}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

show the assertion.  $\square$

*Remark 3.10* (Hemitropic Media). Following the generalizations of the theory of Cosserat media in [9] we are led to consider instead of

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sigma \\ \tau \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} C_0 & 0 \\ 0 & C_1 \end{pmatrix} \left( \begin{pmatrix} \nabla u \\ \nabla \phi \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \phi \times \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right)$$

as in (19) the more general material constraint

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sigma \\ \tau \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} C_0 & E^* \\ E & C_2 \end{pmatrix} \left( \begin{pmatrix} \nabla u \\ \nabla \phi \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \phi \times \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right)$$

or more symmetrically, compare [12],

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sigma \\ \tau \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} C_0 & E^* \\ E & C_2 \end{pmatrix} \left( \begin{pmatrix} \nabla u \\ \nabla \phi \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \phi \times \\ u \times \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

### 3 On Some Models of Deformable Solids and their Interconnection

By a symmetric Gauss elimination we first see that strict positive definiteness of  $\begin{pmatrix} C_0 & E^* \\ E & C_2 \end{pmatrix}$  in  $L^{2,2}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega)$  is equivalent to the strict positive definiteness of

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -EC_0^{-1} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} C_0 & E^* \\ E & C_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -C_0^{-1}E^* \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} C_0 & 0 \\ 0 & C_2 - EC_0^{-1}E^* \end{pmatrix}. \quad (24)$$

Following the construction in (20) we see therefore that in the isotropic case, where we would have

$$C_0 = 2\mu_0 \text{sym} + 2\alpha_0 \text{skew} + 3\lambda_0 \mathbb{P} = 2\mu_0 \text{sym}_0 + 2\alpha_0 \text{skew} + (3\lambda_0 + 2\mu_0) \mathbb{P}$$

as before and

$$\begin{aligned} C_2 &= 2\mu_2 \text{sym} + 2\alpha_2 \text{skew} + 3\lambda_2 \mathbb{P} = 2\mu_2 \text{sym}_0 + 2\alpha_2 \text{skew} + (3\lambda_2 + 2\mu_2) \mathbb{P}, \\ E &= 2\kappa_0 \text{sym} + 2\nu_0 \text{skew} + 3\delta_0 \mathbb{P} = 2\kappa_0 \text{sym}_0 + 2\nu_0 \text{skew} + (3\delta_0 + 2\kappa_0) \mathbb{P}, \end{aligned}$$

for  $\mu_0, \alpha_0, \lambda_0, \mu_2, \alpha_2, \lambda_2, \kappa_0, \nu_0, \delta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ , positive definiteness can be ensured if (and only if)

$$C_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 2\mu_0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2\alpha_0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 3(\lambda_0 + \frac{2}{3}\mu_0) \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} C_2 - EC_0^{-1}E^* &= \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 2\frac{\mu_0\mu_2 - \kappa_0^2}{\mu_0} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2\frac{\alpha_0\alpha_2 - \nu_0^2}{\alpha_0} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 3\frac{(\lambda_2 + \frac{2}{3}\mu_2)(\lambda_0 + \frac{2}{3}\mu_0) - (\delta_0 + \frac{2}{3}\kappa_0)(\delta_0 + \frac{2}{3}\kappa_0)}{(\lambda_0 + \frac{2}{3}\mu_0)} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

are both positive definite. In other words, we must have

$$\mu_0, \alpha_0, \lambda_0 + \frac{2}{3}\mu_0, \mu_0\mu_2 - \kappa_0^2, \alpha_0\alpha_2 - \nu_0^2, \left(\lambda_2 + \frac{2}{3}\mu_2\right) \left(\lambda_0 + \frac{2}{3}\mu_0\right) - \left(\delta_0 + \frac{2}{3}\kappa_0\right) \left(\delta_0 + \frac{2}{3}\kappa_0\right) > 0.$$

For finding  $M_0$  we need to invert  $\begin{pmatrix} C_0 & E^* \\ E & C_2 \end{pmatrix}$ . It is with (24)

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & -C_0^{-1}E^* \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} C_0 & E^* \\ E & C_2 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -EC_0^{-1} & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} C_0^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & (C_2 - EC_0^{-1}E^*)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} C_0 & E^* \\ E & C_2 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -C_0^{-1}E^* \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} C_0^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & (C_2 - EC_0^{-1}E^*)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -EC_0^{-1} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} C_0^{-1} & -C_0^{-1}E^*(C_2 - EC_0^{-1}E^*)^{-1} \\ -(C_2 - EC_0^{-1}E^*)^{-1}EC_0^{-1} & (C_2 - EC_0^{-1}E^*)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

With this and abbreviating

$$C_1 := C_2 - EC_0^{-1}E^*$$

the operator coefficient  $M_0$  becomes

$$M_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \varrho_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \varrho_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & C_0^{-1} + C_0^{-1}E^*C_1^{-1}EC_0^{-1} & -C_0^{-1}E^*C_1^{-1} \\ 0 & 0 & -C_1^{-1}EC_0^{-1} & C_1^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

and for  $M_1$  we get

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & -\Lambda^* \eta_1^* \\ 0 & 0 & -\Lambda^* \eta_0^* & 0 \\ 0 & \eta_0 \Lambda & 0 & 0 \\ \eta_1 \Lambda & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where the parameters  $\eta_0, \eta_1$  have been inserted for flexibility. In [12] we find the case  $\eta_0 = \eta_1 = 1$ . For  $\eta_0 = 1$  and  $\eta_1 = 0$  we recover a variant of the micropolar media case with

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sigma \\ \tau \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} C_0 & E^* \\ E & C_2 \end{pmatrix} \left( \begin{pmatrix} \nabla u \\ \nabla \phi \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \phi \times \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right)$$

as the modified Hooke's law. The case  $E = 0$  corresponds to the case discussed in (19). In any case the resulting evolutionary equation

$$\left( \partial_0 M_0 + M_1 + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\nabla \cdot & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\nabla \cdot \\ -\overset{\circ}{\nabla} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\overset{\circ}{\nabla} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{v} \\ \mathbf{w} \\ \sigma \\ \tau \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{f} \\ \mathbf{g} \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

for hemitropic media fits into the scheme of our solution theory, here with underlying Hilbert space

$$H = L^{2,1}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,1}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega).$$

### 3.3 Other Descendants of Micromorphic Media

Having applied the ‘‘mother’’ and ‘‘descendant’’-mechanism in more involved situations, we only roughly state the connections of the following equations with the model of micromorphic media by stating the operator  $B$ , which transforms the model for micromorphic media to the one under consideration by being a ( $B$ )-descendant.

The system of elastic equations read as follows

$$\partial_0^2 u - \nabla \cdot \sigma = \mathbf{f} \in H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}; L^{2,1}(\Omega))$$

together with Hook's law:

$$\sigma = C \nabla u,$$

$$K = C^{-1}$$

where  $K = C^{-1}$  is the compliance. We abbreviate  $\partial_0 u =: \mathbf{v}$ .

The material properties ( $C_{\text{skew}} = \text{skew} C = 0$ ) usually assumed and encoded in  $C$  suggests to follow the considerations of Remark 2.14 and so to consider only the symmetric part  $T = \iota_{\text{sym}}^* \sigma$  of  $\sigma$  as our actual unknown. With  $C_0 := \iota_{\text{sym}}^* C \iota_{\text{sym}}$  we get

$$T = C_0 (\iota_{\text{sym}}^* \nabla) u.$$

According to Remark 2.14, compare [19], we are therefore rather led to consider the reduced system in  $L^{2,1}(\Omega) \oplus \text{sym} [L^{2,2}(\Omega)]$ :

$$\left( \partial_0 \begin{pmatrix} \varrho_0 & 0 \\ 0 & C_0^{-1} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\text{Div} \\ -\text{Grad} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{v} \\ T \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{f} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

### 3 On Some Models of Deformable Solids and their Interconnection

Here we have utilized the abbreviations  $\text{Div} := (\nabla \cdot) \iota_{\text{sym}}$ ,  $\overset{\circ}{\text{Grad}} := \overline{\iota_{\text{sym}}^* \overset{\circ}{\nabla}}$  in keeping the notation used in [20]. Now, it is easily verified that the system of classical elasticity discussed is a  $(B)$ -descendant of the systems for micromorphic media with

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_0^* & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}}^* & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \iota_0^* & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \iota_0^* \end{pmatrix}$$

such that the underlying Hilbert space becomes  $H = L^{2,1}(\Omega) \oplus \{0\} \oplus \text{sym}[L^{2,2}(\Omega)] \oplus \{0\} \oplus \{0\}$ . Indeed, we only check, whether the operator containing the spatial derivatives admits the form desired:

$$\begin{aligned} & \overline{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_0^* & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}}^* & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \iota_0^* & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \iota_0^* \end{pmatrix}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\nabla \cdot & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\nabla \cdot & 0 \\ -\overset{\circ}{\nabla} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\overset{\circ}{\nabla} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \iota_0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \iota_0 \end{pmatrix} = \\ & = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\nabla \cdot \iota_{\text{sym}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\overline{\iota_{\text{sym}}^* \overset{\circ}{\nabla}} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

*Remark 3.11.* (a) It may be interesting to note that by Korn's inequality we know that in this case the closure bar does not add anything to the domain of  $\overset{\circ}{\text{Grad}}$  in comparison with  $\overset{\circ}{\nabla}$  and so actually

$$\overline{\iota_{\text{sym}}^* \overset{\circ}{\nabla}} = \iota_{\text{sym}}^* \overset{\circ}{\nabla}.$$

(b) For sake of comparison let us consider the simple isotropic case:  $C_0 = 2\mu \text{sym} + 3\lambda \mathbb{P} = 2\mu \text{sym}_0 + (3\lambda + 2\mu) \mathbb{P}$  with  $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{R}$ . Positive definiteness of  $C_0$  (and so of  $C_0^{-1}$ ) is characterized by

$$\mu > 0, \quad \lambda + \frac{2}{3}\mu > 0.$$

In the same spirit as above, we can construct other models stemming from the model of micromorphic media, by assuming additional constraints on the material. As for instance, assume the symmetry of the stress. Then a natural choice for  $B$  is

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{skew}}^* & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}}^* & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \otimes \iota_{\text{skew}}^* & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \iota_0^* \end{pmatrix}.$$

This choice results in the following leading term  $M_0$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \varrho_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{skew}}^* \varrho_2 \iota_{\text{skew}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}}^* W_{00} \iota_{\text{sym}} & \iota_{\text{sym}}^* W_{01} (1 \otimes \iota_{\text{skew}}) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & (1 \otimes \iota_{\text{skew}}^*) (W_{01})^* \iota_{\text{sym}} & (1 \otimes \iota_{\text{skew}}^*) W_{11} (1 \otimes \iota_{\text{skew}}) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and the following operator containing the spatial derivatives

$$\begin{aligned} & \overline{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{skew}}^* & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}}^* & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \otimes \iota_{\text{skew}}^* & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \iota_0^* \end{pmatrix}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\nabla \cdot & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\nabla \cdot & 0 \\ -\overset{\circ}{\nabla} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\overset{\circ}{\nabla} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{skew}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \otimes \iota_{\text{skew}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \iota_0 \end{pmatrix} = \\ & = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\nabla \cdot \iota_{\text{sym}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\iota_{\text{skew}}^* \nabla \cdot (1 \otimes \iota_{\text{skew}}) & 0 \\ -\iota_{\text{sym}}^* \overset{\circ}{\nabla} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -(1 \otimes \iota_{\text{skew}}^*) \overset{\circ}{\nabla} \iota_{\text{skew}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

*Remark 3.12.* If we assume that the coefficients are such that the resulting systems in Section 3 and Section 3.1 are well-posed via the assumption that  $M_0$  is strictly positive definite, we can conclude well-posedness of the descendant model by the general mechanism given in Corollary 2.9. However, it may be that the original system may fail to be well-posed. Only after projecting onto the right Hilbert spaces, the equations become well-posed. In Remark 2.14 we have discussed the general issue of degenerate  $M_0$  and of how to obtain a well-posed equation by assuming that  $M_0$  is strictly positive on its range and projecting via the descendant mechanism onto the orthogonal complement of  $M_0$ .

For deriving a model discussed in [13], we are led to consider the operator

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^* & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \otimes \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^* & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \iota_0^* \end{pmatrix}$$

as the compatible operator giving the descendant mechanism of the micromorphic media model. The underlying Hilbert space of the descendant model is

$$H = L^{2,1}(\Omega) \oplus \text{sym}_0 [L^{2,2}(\Omega)] \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega) \oplus (1 \otimes \text{sym}_0) [L^{2,3}(\Omega)] \oplus \{0\}.$$

In this case  $M_1$  admits the form

$$\begin{aligned} & \overline{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^* & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \otimes \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^* & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \iota_0^* \end{pmatrix}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\text{skew} & 0 & -\iota_{\text{sym}} \\ 0 & \text{skew} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}}^* & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}_0} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \otimes \iota_{\text{sym}_0} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \iota_0 \end{pmatrix} = \\ & = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

The new  $M_0$  is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^* & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \otimes \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^* & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \iota_0^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \varrho_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \varrho_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & W_{00} & W_{01} & W_{02} \\ 0 & 0 & W_{01}^* & W_{11} & W_{12} \\ 0 & 0 & W_{02}^* & W_{12}^* & W_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^* & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \otimes \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^* & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \iota_0^* \end{pmatrix} =$$

### 3 On Some Models of Deformable Solids and their Interconnection

$$= \begin{pmatrix} \varrho_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^* \varrho_2 \iota_{\text{sym}_0} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & W_{00} & W_{01} (1 \otimes \iota_{\text{sym}_0}) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & (1 \otimes \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^*) W_{01}^* & (1 \otimes \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^*) W_{11} (1 \otimes \iota_{\text{sym}_0}) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

whereas the operator containing the spatial derivatives reads as

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^* & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \otimes \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^* & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \iota_0^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\nabla \cdot & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\nabla \cdot & 0 \\ -\overset{\circ}{\nabla} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\overset{\circ}{\nabla} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^* & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \otimes \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^* & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \iota_0^* \end{pmatrix} = \\ = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\nabla \cdot & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\overline{\iota_{\text{sym}_0}^* \nabla \cdot} (1 \otimes \iota_{\text{sym}_0}) & 0 \\ -\overset{\circ}{\nabla} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\overline{(1 \otimes \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^*) \overset{\circ}{\nabla} \iota_{\text{sym}_0}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

A further descendant can be obtained, if, in the previous model, we additionally assume the symmetry of stress. The operator  $B$  in this case reads as

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^* & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}}^* & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \otimes \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^* & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \iota_0^* \end{pmatrix}$$

mapping onto the Hilbert space

$$H = L^{2,1}(\Omega) \oplus \text{sym}_0 [L^{2,2}(\Omega)] \oplus \text{sym} [L^{2,2}(\Omega)] \oplus (1 \otimes \text{sym}_0) [L^{2,3}(\Omega)] \oplus \{0\}.$$

The new  $M_0$  is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \varrho_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^* \varrho_2 \iota_{\text{sym}_0} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}}^* W_{00} \iota_{\text{sym}} & \iota_{\text{sym}}^* W_{01} (1 \otimes \iota_{\text{sym}_0}) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & (1 \otimes \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^*) W_{01}^* \iota_{\text{sym}} & (1 \otimes \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^*) W_{11} (1 \otimes \iota_{\text{sym}_0}) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and the resulting operator containing the spatial derivatives is written as

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^* & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}}^* & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \otimes \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^* & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \iota_0^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\nabla \cdot & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\nabla \cdot & 0 \\ -\overset{\circ}{\nabla} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\overset{\circ}{\nabla} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^* & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \iota_{\text{sym}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \otimes \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^* & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \iota_0^* \end{pmatrix} = \\ = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\nabla \cdot \iota_{\text{sym}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\overline{\iota_{\text{sym}_0}^* \nabla \cdot} (1 \otimes \iota_{\text{sym}_0}) & 0 \\ -\overline{\iota_{\text{sym}}^* \overset{\circ}{\nabla}} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\overline{(1 \otimes \iota_{\text{sym}_0}^*) \overset{\circ}{\nabla} \iota_{\text{sym}_0}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that the resulting model is still a coupled model.

## 4 Microstretch Models

We conclude the article by stating a model differing from the models already discussed in view of the mother and descendant mechanism. The equations, taken from [6, 4], read as follows

$$\partial_0 \begin{pmatrix} \rho_0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \rho_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \rho_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \dot{u} \\ \dot{\psi} \\ \dot{\varphi} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\Lambda^* & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tau \\ \mu \\ \pi \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \sigma \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \nabla \cdot & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \nabla \cdot & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \nabla \cdot \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tau \\ \mu \\ \pi \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{f} \\ \mathbf{g} \\ \mathbf{h} \end{pmatrix} \quad (25)$$

$$\in H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}; L^{2,1}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega))$$

where  $\Lambda := 2\nu_{\wedge}^*$  (see Subsection 3.2),  $\tau, \sigma \in H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}; L^{2,2}(\Omega))$ ,  $\mu, \pi \in H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}; L^{2,3}(\Omega))$  and the  $\rho_i$ 's,  $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ , are bounded selfadjoint operators in the respective spaces  $L^{2,1}(\Omega)$  or  $L^{2,2}(\Omega)$ . We find a constitutive relation of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tau \\ \mu \\ \sigma \\ \pi \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} C_0 & B & D & F \\ B^* & C_1 & E & G \\ D^* & E^* & C_2 & K \\ F^* & G^* & K^* & C_3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e \\ \kappa \\ \varphi \\ \zeta \end{pmatrix}, \quad (26)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} e &= \nabla u - \Lambda \psi = \nabla u + \psi \times, \\ \kappa &= \nabla \psi, \\ \zeta &= \nabla \varphi. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

and suitable bounded linear operators  $C_0, B, D, F, C_1, E, G, C_2, K, C_3$ . In the following, we want to show that the latter model fits into the general scheme of Theorem 2.1. For this we assume continuous invertibility of  $\begin{pmatrix} C_0 & B & F \\ B^* & C_1 & G \\ F^* & G^* & C_3 \end{pmatrix}$  and denote its inverse by  $W$ . We have

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tau - D\varphi \\ \mu - E\varphi \\ \pi - K^*\varphi \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} C_0 & B & F \\ B^* & C_1 & G \\ F^* & G^* & C_3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e \\ \kappa \\ \zeta \end{pmatrix}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} e \\ \kappa \\ \zeta \end{pmatrix} &= W \begin{pmatrix} \tau - D\varphi \\ \mu - E\varphi \\ \pi - K^*\varphi \end{pmatrix} \\ &= W \begin{pmatrix} \tau \\ \mu \\ \pi \end{pmatrix} - W \begin{pmatrix} D \\ E \\ K^* \end{pmatrix} \varphi. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

The latter equations together with the dynamic equations from above result in the canonical form

$$(\partial_0 M_0 + M_1 + \partial_0^{-1} M_2 + A) \begin{pmatrix} \dot{u} \\ \dot{\psi} \\ \dot{\varphi} \\ \tau \\ \mu \\ \pi \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{f} \\ \mathbf{g} \\ \mathbf{h} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (29)$$

#### 4 Microstretch Models

where

$$\begin{aligned}
M_0 &= \begin{pmatrix} \rho_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \rho_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \rho_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & W & & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & & \end{pmatrix}, \\
M_1 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\Lambda^* & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & (D^* & E^* & K) & W \\ 0 & \Lambda & & D & & \\ 0 & 0 & -W & E & & \\ 0 & 0 & & K^* & & \end{pmatrix}, \\
M_2 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & C_2 - (D^* & E^* & K) & W & \begin{pmatrix} D \\ E \\ K^* \end{pmatrix} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & & 0 & & & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & & 0 & & & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & & 0 & & & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\
A &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & -\nabla \cdot & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\nabla \cdot & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\nabla \cdot \\ -\overset{\circ}{\nabla} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\overset{\circ}{\nabla} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\overset{\circ}{\nabla} & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

Indeed, the last three rows in (29) are (28) combined with (27) while the first two rows of (29) are the first two rows of (25). From (26) and (28) we read off that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma &= C_2 \varphi + (D^* \ E^* \ K) \begin{pmatrix} e \\ \kappa \\ \zeta \end{pmatrix} \\
&= C_2 \varphi + (D^* \ E^* \ K) W \begin{pmatrix} \tau \\ \mu \\ \pi \end{pmatrix} - (D^* \ E^* \ K) W \begin{pmatrix} D \\ E \\ K^* \end{pmatrix} \varphi \\
&= (D^* \ E^* \ K) W \begin{pmatrix} \tau \\ \mu \\ \pi \end{pmatrix} + \partial_0^{-1} \left( C_2 - (D^* \ E^* \ K) W \begin{pmatrix} D \\ E \\ K^* \end{pmatrix} \right) \varphi,
\end{aligned}$$

and thus, the third row of (29) gives the third row in (25).

**Theorem 4.1.** *Assume that  $\rho_i$ ,  $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ , and  $W$  are strictly positive definite. Then there exists  $\rho_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  such that for every  $\rho \geq \rho_0$  and  $(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h}) \in H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}; L^{2,1}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega))$  there exists uniquely determined  $(\dot{u}, \dot{\psi}, \dot{\varphi}, \tau, \mu, \pi) \in H_{\rho,0}(\mathbb{R}; L^{2,1}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,2}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,3}(\Omega) \oplus L^{2,3}(\Omega))$  satisfying (29). Moreover, the energy balance*

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \dot{u} \\ \dot{\psi} \\ \dot{\varphi} \\ \tau \\ \mu \\ \pi \end{pmatrix} \middle| \begin{pmatrix} \rho_0 \dot{u} \\ \rho_1 \dot{\psi} \\ \rho_2 \dot{\varphi} \\ W \begin{pmatrix} \tau \\ \mu \\ \pi \end{pmatrix} \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle (b) + \left\langle \varphi \middle| \left( C_2 - (D^* \ E^* \ K) W \begin{pmatrix} D \\ E \\ K^* \end{pmatrix} \right) \varphi \right\rangle (b)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \dot{u} \\ \dot{\psi} \\ \dot{\varphi} \\ \tau \\ \mu \\ \pi \end{pmatrix} \middle| \begin{pmatrix} \rho_0 \dot{u} \\ \rho_1 \dot{\psi} \\ \rho_2 \dot{\varphi} \\ W \begin{pmatrix} \tau \\ \mu \\ \pi \end{pmatrix} \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle (a) + \left\langle \varphi \middle| \left( C_2 - (D^* \ E^* \ K) W \begin{pmatrix} D \\ E \\ K^* \end{pmatrix} \right) \varphi \right\rangle (a) \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad + 2 \Re \int_a^b \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \dot{u} \\ \dot{\psi} \\ \dot{\varphi} \end{pmatrix} \middle| \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{f} \\ \mathbf{g} \\ \mathbf{h} \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle
\end{aligned}$$

holds for almost every  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ .

*Proof.* This is a direct consequence of Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.3.  $\square$

*Remark 4.2.* We note here that only by assuming

$$C_2 = (D^* \ E^* \ K) W \begin{pmatrix} D \\ E \\ K^* \end{pmatrix}$$

we get that

$$M_2 = 0$$

which in turn results in the fact that the latter system of equations is a  $(B)$ -mother of micromorphic media (see Subsection 3.1) for

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \iota_0^* & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \iota_0^* \end{pmatrix}.$$

## 5 Conclusion

We discussed several models from elasticity and have shown that they fit into the same solution scheme given by Theorem 2.1. Moreover, we showed that energy is conserved with the help of Theorem 2.3. Furthermore, we provided a mathematically rigorous concept of deriving models from a given one. We proved that many models of elasticity may be derived from the model for micromorphic media, which under additional constraints on the material parameters is a descendant of a model for microstretch.

## References

- [1] Holm Altenbach; Gérard A. Maugin and Vladimir Erofeev, editors. *Mechanics of generalized continua*. Berlin: Springer, 2011.
- [2] E. Cosserat and F. Cosserat. *Théorie des corps déformables*. 1909.
- [3] J. Epperlein. Personal communication. 2013.
- [4] A.C. Eringen. Micropolar fluid with stretch. *Int. J. Eng. Sci.*, 7:115–127, 1969.
- [5] A. C. Eringen. *Mechanics of continua*. New York-London-Sydney: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. XVIII, 502 p., 1967.

## References

- [6] A. Eringen. Theory of thermo-microstretch elastic solids. *Int. J. Eng. Sci.*, 28(12):1291–1301, 1990.
- [7] A.Cemal Eringen. *Nonlocal continuum field theories*. New York, NY: Springer, 2002.
- [8] A. Kalauch, R. Picard, S. Siegmund, S. Trostorff, and M. Waurick. A Hilbert Space Perspective on Ordinary Differential Equations with Memory Term. *Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations.*, 2013. Accepted, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1204.2924>.
- [9] R. V. Kuvshinskii and É. L. Aéro. Continuum theory of asymmetric elasticity. The problem of internal rotation. *Soviet Physics Solid State*, 5:1892–1897, 1963.
- [10] S. Kwapien. Isomorphic characterizations of inner product spaces by orthogonal series with vector valued coefficients. *Stud. Math.*, 44:583–595, 1972.
- [11] R. Mindlin. Micro-structure in linear elasticity. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 16:51–78, 1964.
- [12] D. Natroshvili, R. Gachechiladze, A. Gachechiladze, and I. G. Stratis. Transmission problems in the theory of elastic hemitropic materials. *Appl. Anal.*, 86(12):1463–1508, 2007.
- [13] P. Neff. The Cosserat couple modulus for continuous solids is zero viz the linearized Cauchy-stress tensor is symmetric. *Z. Angew. Math. Mech.*, 86(11):892–912, 2006.
- [14] W. Nowacki. Theory of micropolar elasticity. Course held at the Department for Mechanics of Deformable Bodies, July 1970, Udine. International Centre for Mechanical Sciences. Courses and Lectures. No.25. Wien - New York: Springer-Verlag. 286 p. , 1972.
- [15] W. Nowacki. Micropolar elasticity. Symposium organized by the Department of Mechanics of Solids, June 1972. Udine 1974. International Centre for Mechanical Sciences. Courses and Lectures. No.151. Wien - New York: Springer-Verlag. IV, 168 p., 1974.
- [16] W. Nowacki. *Theory of asymmetric elasticity. Transl. from the Polish by H. Zorski*. Oxford etc.: Pergamon Press; Warszawa: PWN-Polish Scientific Publishers. VIII, 383 p., 1986.
- [17] R. Picard. A structural observation for linear material laws in classical mathematical physics. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 32(14):1768–1803, 2009.
- [18] R. Picard. A class of evolutionary problems with an application to acoustic waves with impedance type boundary conditions. In W. A. et al, editor, *Spectral theory, mathematical system theory, evolution equations, differential and difference equations. Selected papers of 21st international workshop on operator theory and applications, IWOTA10, Berlin, Germany, July 12–16, 2010.*, volume 221 of *Operator Theory: Advances and Applications*, pages 533–548, Basel, 2012. Birkhäuser.
- [19] R. Picard. Mother Operators and their Descendants. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 403(1):54–62, 2013.
- [20] R. Picard and D. McGhee. *Partial differential equations. A unified Hilbert space approach*. de Gruyter Expositions in Mathematics 55. Berlin: de Gruyter. xviii, 469 p., 2011.
- [21] R. Picard, S. Trostorff, and M. Waurick. A functional analytic perspective to delay differential equations. *Operators and Matrices*, 2012. Special issue for the conference Spectral Theory and Differential Operators, accepted. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1211.3894>.
- [22] R. Picard, S. Trostorff, and M. Waurick. On a comprehensive class of linear control problems. Technical report, TU Dresden, 2012. Submitted, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1208.3140>.
- [23] R. Picard, S. Trostorff, and M. Waurick. A note on a class of conservative, well-posed linear control systems. In M. Reissig and M. Ruzhansky, editors, *Progress in Partial Differential Equations: Asymptotic Profiles, Regularity and Well-Posedness*, volume 44 of *Springer Proceedings in Mathematics and Statistics*, pages 261–286, Heidelberg, 2013. Springer.

- [24] R. Picard, S. Trostorff, and M. Waurick. On evolutionary equations with material laws containing fractional integrals. Technical Report MATH-AN-05-2013, TU Dresden, 2013. Submitted, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1304.7620>.
- [25] R. Picard, S. Trostorff, M. Waurick, and M. Wehowski. On non-autonomous evolutionary problems. *J. Evol. Equ.* 13, no. 4, 751-776. 2013.
- [26] W. Rudin. *Real and complex analysis* Mathematical Series. McGraw-Hill, 1987.
- [27] S. Trostorff. Autonomous evolutionary inclusions with applications to problems with nonlinear boundary conditions. *Int. J. Pure Appl. Math.*, 85(2):303-338, 2013.
- [28] S. Trostorff and M. Wehowski. Well-posedness of non-autonomous evolutionary inclusions. Technical report, TU Dresden, 2013. Submitted, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1307.2074>.
- [29] M. Waurick. On non-autonomous integro-differential-algebraic evolutionary problems. Technical report, TU Dresden, 2013. Submitted, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1307.2429>.