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1. Introduction. In this article I discuss the question of how to give a dynamical
justification of the variational principles of mechanics and physics. For example, in
classical and continuum mechanics it is common to analyse equilibrium problems
by seeking a configuration that minimizes an appropriate energy functional; how
can this procedure be rationalized on the basis of the behaviour of solutions to the
corresponding dynamical equations?

Central to any discussion of these matters is the Second Law of Thermodynamics.
A formulation of the Second Law which has earned a fair measure of acceptance
by practitioners of continuum thermodynamics, on account of its apparently wide
applicability and clear statement, is the Clausius-Duhem inequality (for an interesting
discussion see Ericksen [25]). Assuming the external volumetric heat supply to be zero,
this inequality has the form

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega \rho R \eta \, dx + \int_{\partial \Omega} \frac{q_R \cdot N}{\theta} \, dA \geq 0,$$

(1.1)

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ denotes the region occupied by a material body in a reference con-
figuration, $\eta$ denotes the entropy density, $q_R$ the material heat-flux vector, $\theta$
the absolute temperature, $\rho R = \rho R(x)$ the mass density in the reference configuration,
and $N = N(x)$ the unit outward normal to the boundary $\partial \Omega$. In two important cases
this inequality endows the governing equations of a material body with a Lyapunov
function, i.e. a real-valued function of the state of the system which is nonincreasing
in time for motions of the body. The first case is that of a thermally isolated body,
when $q_R = 0$ on $\partial \Omega$, so that (1.1) implies that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega -\rho R \eta \, dx \leq 0.$$

(1.2)

The second case is that of a body for which part of the boundary $\partial \Omega_1$ is thermally
insulated and the remainder is in contact with a heat-bath at temperature $\theta_0$, where
$\theta_0$ does not depend on $x$ but could depend on $t$. Assume for simplicity that the
mechanical boundary conditions do no work. Then combining (1.1) with the energy
equation
\begin{equation}
\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \rho_R \left( \frac{1}{2} |v|^2 + \varepsilon + \psi \right) \, dx + \int_{\partial \Omega} q_R \cdot N \, dA = 0,
\end{equation}

where \( v \) denotes the velocity, \( \varepsilon \) the internal energy density, and \( \psi \) the potential energy density of the body-forces, we deduce from (1.1) that
\begin{equation}
\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \rho_R \left( \frac{1}{2} |v|^2 + \psi + \varepsilon - \theta_0 \eta \right) \, dx \leq 0,
\end{equation}

(cf. Duhem [21], Ericksen [22], Coleman & Dill [19], for example). Note that the expression \( \varepsilon - \theta_0 \eta \) in (1.4) is not the same as the Helmholtz free energy \( \varepsilon - \theta_0 \).

If \( \theta_0 \) is allowed to depend on \( x \) then in general the existence of a Lyapunov function is in doubt. However, in some special cases when \( \theta_0 = \theta_0(x) \) and \( q_R = \hat{q}_R(x, \theta, \text{Grad} \theta) \) it has been shown by Ball & Knowles [12] that
\begin{equation}
\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \rho_R \left( \frac{1}{2} |v|^2 + \psi + \varepsilon - \varphi(x) \eta \right) \, dx \leq 0,
\end{equation}

where \( \varphi \) is the solution to the steady-state heat problem
\begin{align}
\text{div} \, \hat{q}_R(x, \varphi, \text{Grad} \varphi) &= 0, \quad x \in \Omega, \\
\varphi \mid_{\partial \Omega \setminus \partial N} &= \theta_0, \quad \hat{q}_R(x, \varphi, \text{Grad} \varphi) \cdot N \mid_{\partial \Omega} &= 0.
\end{align}

There seems to be a wide gulf between modern continuum thermodynamics as expressed, for example, by the balance of energy and the Clausius-Duhem inequality, and nonequilibrium statistical physics and kinetic theory. The Clausius-Duhem inequality is systematically applied with apparent success to a wide range of different materials out of equilibrium, leading to the existence of Lyapunov functions as described above. On the other hand statistical physics provides Lyapunov functions only for very special materials, the main example being the H-theorem for the Boltzmann equation, which models a moderately rarefied monatomic gas. One approach to trying to bridge this gulf is to attempt to make precise the idea that in a system of interacting particles local equilibrium is rapidly achieved (cf. Guo, Papanicolaou & Varadhan [28], Varadhan [43]).

With the above as motivation, suppose we are given a dynamical system \( T(t)_{t \geq 0} \) on some (say, topological) space \( X \), i.e. a family of mappings \( T(t) : X \to X \) satisfying (i) \( T(0) = \text{id} \), (ii) \( T(s + t) = T(s)T(t) \) for all \( s, t \geq 0 \), (iii) the mapping \( (t, \varphi) \mapsto T(t)\varphi \) is continuous. Thus \( T(t)\varphi \) represents the state reached by the system after time \( t \) starting with initial data \( \varphi \). Let \( V : X \to \mathbb{R} \) be a continuous Lyapunov function, so that \( V(T(t)\varphi) \) is nonincreasing on \([0, \infty)\) for each \( \varphi \in X \). In order to justify dynamically the variational principle
\begin{equation}
\text{Minimize} \, V
\end{equation}

we would like to show that if \( t_j \to \infty \) then \( T(t_j)\varphi \) will be a local minimizing sequence (appropriately defined) for \( V \). As described in Ball [5] (of which this article is an updated version), there are various obstacles to proving such a result. Some of these are:

(a) Exceptional initial data (such as an unstable rest-point) must be excluded.

(b) There may be constants of motion \( c_i : X \to \mathbb{R} \), so that \( c_i(T(t))\varphi = c_i(\varphi) \) for all \( i \) and \( t \geq 0 \); the traditional remedy is then to change the variational principle to
Minimize $V(\psi)$
$c_i(\psi) = \alpha_i$

(c) Nonhyperbolic rest-points. (For example, $V(x) = -x$ is a Lyapunov function for the ordinary differential equation $\dot{x} = x^2(1 - x^2)$ on $[-1, 1]$. This has the three rest-points $-1, 0, 1$. The rest-point 0 is not hyperbolic and is not a local minimizer of $V$, but $x(t) \to 0$ whenever $-1 < x(0) \leq 0$.)

(d) $V$ may not attain a minimum. As far as I am aware, no sufficiently general theorem for dynamical systems is known that overcomes these obstacles. Some ideas which are of relevance are to be found in the study of prolongational limit sets for dynamical systems (cf. Ura [41, 42], Auslander & Seibert [2], Bhatia & Szego [14]), and the behaviour of solutions to differential equations with small random perturbations (see for the finite-dimensional case Freidlin & Wentzell [26], and for results for parabolic partial differential equations forthcoming work of Freidlin). I intend to discuss this in a future paper. In particular, the infinite-dimensional situation is far from being understood, and the main purpose of this article is to discuss some infinite-dimensional examples arising in models for phase transformations in solids, in which (d) is an issue. In these examples the minimum of $V$ is not attained, minimizing sequences for $V$ tending weakly to a state that is not a minimizer.

In Section 2 I consider systems of coagulation-fragmentation equations, and how they model the phenomenon of condensation. Here it is shown that the dynamics realize an absolute minimizing sequence for the free energy. Section 3 concerns a variational approach to the formation of microstructure arising from displacive phase transformations in crystals, while in Section 4 I outline some attempts to understand how this microstructure forms dynamically. Some model problems are discussed which exhibit surprising differences between the asymptotic behaviour of solutions for rather similar systems.

2. Coagulation-fragmentation dynamics. Coagulation-fragmentation equations occur frequently in applications to fields such as astrophysics, atmospheric physics, biology, colloidal chemistry, polymer science and the kinetics of phase transformations in alloys. They are appropriate for many systems in which the objects of interest are a large number of clusters of particles, and model the time-evolution of the distribution of cluster sizes as the clusters coalesce to form larger clusters and fragment to form smaller ones. In the case of phase transformations in a binary alloy, the clusters consist of atoms of the minority component of the alloy (or, in more complex cases, atoms of both components in a definite proportion corresponding to a particular phase of the alloy), and the interactions between clusters occur by diffusion of atoms on the underlying crystal lattice.

We assume that only binary interactions between clusters occur. For example, a 3-cluster (i.e. a cluster consisting of 3 particles) may coalesce with a 7-cluster to form a 10-cluster, or the reverse may occur, a 10-cluster fragmenting into a 3-cluster and a 7-cluster, but we ignore interactions in which, say, a 4-cluster fragments into a 2-cluster and two 1-clusters. Let $c_j = c_j(t) \geq 0$, $j = 1, 2, ..., n$ denote the expected number per unit volume of $j$-clusters in the system at time $t$. Assuming that the rate at which $j$-clusters coalesce with $k$-clusters to form $(j+k)$-clusters is proportional both to $c_j$ and $c_k$, while the rate at which $(j+k)$-clusters fragment into $j$-clusters and $k$-clusters is proportional to $c_{j+k}$, we are led to the discrete coagulation-fragmentation equations for $c = (c_j)$:
\[ \dot{c}_j = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} (a_{j-k,k} c_j c_k - b_{j-k,k} c_j) - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (a_{j,k} c_j c_k - b_{j,k} c_{j+k}), \]

\[ j = 1, 2, \ldots. \]

The rate coefficients \( a_{j,k}, b_{j,k} \) are assumed to be constant and satisfy the conditions

\[ a_{j,k} = a_{k,j} \geq 0, \]
\[ b_{j,k} = b_{k,j} \geq 0. \]

Because each interaction preserves the number of particles, we expect that density will be conserved, i.e.

\[ \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j c_j(t) = \rho = \text{constant}. \]

While (2.13) holds formally for solutions of (2.10), it is well known that for some rate coefficients \( a_{j,k}, b_{j,k} \) density conservation breaks down after a finite time due to the formation of an infinite cluster or gel. Mathematically, the situation is analogous to that for nonlinear hyperbolic equations, for which various entropies which are conserved for smooth solutions fail to be conserved for solutions containing shock waves. Here we confine attention to solutions conserving density. It is proved in Ball & Carr [7] that at least one density-conserving solution exists provided \( a_{j,k} \leq K(j+k) \) for all \( j, k \geq 1 \), where \( K \) is a constant. Conditions on \( a_{j,k}, b_{j,k} \) are also given in [7] under which all solutions conserve density, and under which solutions are unique.

We now assume that the rate coefficients satisfy the detailed balance condition

\[ a_{j,k} Q_j Q_k = Q_{j+k} b_{j,k}, \]

for positive constants \( Q_j \) with \( Q_1 = 1 \), and we confine attention to the physically interesting case

\[ 0 < z_s < \infty, \]

where

\[ z_s^{-1} = \limsup_{j \to \infty} Q_j^{1/j}. \]

It is easily verified that for each \( z \geq 0 \)

\[ c_j = Q_j z_j^j, \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, \]

is a rest-point of (2.10). In fact, in this case the net rate \( W_{j,k} = a_{j,k} c_j c_k - b_{j,k} c_{j+k} \) of conversion of \( j \)-clusters and \( k \)-clusters to \( (j+k) \)-clusters is zero (this being the physical meaning of detailed balancing). To see whether these rest-points have finite density given by (2.13), note that by (2.16) the radius of convergence of the series \( F(z) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j Q_j z_j^j \) is \( z_s \). Let

\[ \rho_s = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j Q_j z_j^j. \]
Then for $0 \leq \rho \leq \rho_s$, $\rho < \infty$, there is a unique rest-point $c^\rho$ of the form (2.17) of density $\rho$, namely

$$c_j = Q_j z(\rho)^j, \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots,$$

where $F(z(\rho)) = \rho$.

Let

$$V(c) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j \left( \ln \left( \frac{c_j}{Q_j} \right) - 1 \right),$$

where $c = (c_j)$. A formal calculation shows that

$$\frac{dV}{dt} = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k=1}^{\infty} \left( \ln (a_{j,k} c_j c_k) - \ln (b_{j,k} c_j c_{j+k}) \right) (a_{j,k} c_j c_k - b_{j,k} c_{j+k}),$$

so that $V$ is a Liapunov function (the free energy). Note that (2.21) shows formally that all rest-points of (2.10) are of the form (2.17).

Since the density (2.13) is a constant of motion, the appropriate variational principle for $c = (c_j) \geq 0$ is

$$\text{Minimize} \quad V(c) \quad \text{subject to} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j c_j = \rho,$$

where $\rho \geq 0$. If $0 \leq \rho \leq \rho_s$, $\rho < \infty$, then it is easily verified that $c^\rho$ is the unique minimizer of (2.22), and that any minimizing sequence $c^{(k)}$ converges strongly in

$$X \equiv \{ c \geq 0 : \| c \| = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j c_j < \infty \},$$

to $c^\rho$. However, if $\rho_s < \rho < \infty$ then the minimum of $V$ subject to $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j c_j = \rho$ is not attained. In fact, in this case minimizing sequences $c^{(k)}$ for (2.22) converge weak* to $c^\rho$ in $X$ i.e. $c_j^{(k)} \rightharpoonup c_j^\rho$ as $k \to \infty$ for all $j$. There is therefore a difference $\rho - \rho_s$ between the density of elements $c^{(k)}$ of the minimizing sequence and the density of the limit $c^\rho$. This difference corresponds to the formation as $k$ increases of clusters of arbitrarily large size. In this way the variational principle (2.22) predicts the macroscopic phenomenon of condensation. It is of interest to note (see Ball [4]) that this same variational structure occurs in a number of other problems, for example the Thomas-Fermi model of atoms and molecules, the equilibrium of an incompressible fluid above a surface, and an adiabatic model predicting a finite height for the atmosphere. In each case there is a critical parameter value $\rho_s$ such that for $0 < \rho \leq \rho_s$ the minimum of the energy is attained, while for $\rho > \rho_s$ the minimum is not attained, minimizing sequences converging weakly to the minimizer of maximal parameter value $\rho_s$.

In order to provide a dynamical description of condensation one must show that given initial data $c_0 = (c_{0j})$ of density $\rho$, the solution $c$ of (2.10) with $c(0) = c_0$ generates a minimizing sequence for (2.22), that is that if $0 \leq \rho \leq \rho_s$, $\rho < \infty$ then $c(t) \to c^\rho$ strongly in $X$ as $t \to \infty$, while if $\rho_s < \rho < \infty$ then $c(t) \rightharpoonup c^\rho$ in $X$ as $t \to \infty$. This has so far only been established in some special cases. For the Becker-Döring equations, for which
(2.24) \[ a_{j,k} = b_{j,k} = 0 \quad \text{if both } j > 1, k > 1, \]

the result was proved by Ball, Carr & Penrose [8] (for technical refinements see Ball & Carr [6], Slemrod [38]). When all the \( a_{j,k}, b_{j,k} \) are nonzero the only result known is that of Carr [17] under hypotheses which imply that \( \rho_s = \infty \), so that condensation does not occur. For the general case, parts of the argument for proving the result are available in [7] (for the continuous a analogue of (2.10) see Stewart [39]); what is missing is an analogue or substitute for the maximum principle technique used in [8].

3. A variational approach to the formation of fine microstructure in crystals. When cooled below a critical temperature at which a phase transformation involving a change of symmetry occurs, crystals typically develop characteristic patterns of microstructure. In the simplest case this consists of many fine parallel bands, in each of which the deformation of the crystal is affine with respect to its original configuration. In some materials (e.g. InTl [13,16]) this microstructure can be observed in optical microscopes, but in others (e.g. NiMn [3]) high resolution electron microscopy is required, and reveals that the bands are sometimes only a few atomic spacings thick.

Why does such microstructure form, and how can its geometric features be predicted? I describe briefly here a variational approach to this question due to Ball & James [10,11] (for related work on the same model see, for example, [18,24,20]). Following Ericksen [23] the crystal is modelled using nonlinear (thermo)elasticity, which allows both for large deformations and nonlinear stress-strain behaviour. While rarely used by metallurgists, this theory is ideally suited to the study of the mechanical properties of crystals since it incorporates in a natural way, and without the inappropriate approximations of linear elasticity, the symmetries arising from the underlying lattice structure of the crystal and invariance to rigid-body rotations. (There is an earlier ‘linearized’ version of the theory in [10,11], due to Khachaturyan [29,30], Khachaturyan & Shatalov [31] and Roitburd [35,36], which is still nonlinear; for discussions of the relationship between the two theories see Bhattacharya [15], Kohn [32] and [11].)

Configurations of the crystal are described by invertible mappings \( y : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^3 \), where \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \) is the region occupied by the crystal in a reference configuration. We suppose that \( \Omega \) is bounded and open with sufficiently smooth boundary \( \partial \Omega \). The total elastic energy is given by

(3.25) \[ I(y) = \int_{\Omega} W(Dy(z)) \, dx, \]

where \( Dy \) denotes the gradient of \( y \), and \( W \) is the free-energy function of the crystal. In order to describe phase transformations it is important to allow \( W \) to depend on temperature, but here we assume that the temperature is held constant, and so we suppress this dependence. We temporarily ignore all other contributions to the energy, in particular any energy associated with interfaces across which \( Dy \) jumps. For simplicity, consider a problem in which the deformed position of every point of \( \partial \Omega \) is specified, so that

(3.26) \[ y |_{\partial \Omega} = \tilde{y}(\cdot), \]

for a given mapping \( \tilde{y} : \partial \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^3 \). We now consider the variational principle

(3.27) \[ \text{Minimize } I(y) \text{ subject to (3.26)}. \]
The key result of the theory is then that for $W$ appropriate for crystals the minimum is in general not attained, finer and finer microstructure being needed to get closer and closer to the infimum of $I$. In this way the static theory explains the occurrence of microstructure as being a natural consequence of the behaviour of minimizing sequences for a problem of the calculus of variations with a non-attained minimum.

To give some insight into why the minimum of (3.27) need not be attained, consider the case of a cubic to tetragonal phase transformation, such as occurs for InTl or NiMn. We suppose that the temperature is less than the transformation temperature, but take for the reference configuration the undistorted high-temperature cubic phase. Then it is natural to assume that the set $M$ of $3 \times 3$ matrices $A$ which minimize $W = W(A)$ is given by

$$M = SO(3)U_1 \cup SO(3)U_2 \cup SO(3)U_3,$$

where

$$U_1 = \text{diag}(\eta_2, \eta_1, \eta_1), \quad U_2 = \text{diag}(\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_1), \quad U_3 = \text{diag}(\eta_1, \eta_1, \eta_2),$$

and $\eta_1 > 0, \eta_2 > 0$ are the lattice parameters of the transformation. The matrices $U_i$ represent linear transformations of a cube into tetragons with sides parallel to the cubic axes, while the factors $SO(3)$ reflect the invariance of $W$ to rigid-body rotations. We suppose without loss of generality that $W(A) = 0$ for $A \in M$. An elementary (but slightly tricky) calculation shows that given any matrix $A \in SO(3)U_1$, say, there are precisely 2 matrices $B \in SO(3)U_2$ and 2 matrices $B \in SO(3)U_3$ which differ from $A$ by a matrix of rank one. Picking one of these 4 matrices we have

$$B - A = a \otimes n$$

for some non-zero vectors $a, n \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Thus we can construct a sequence $\gamma^\varepsilon$ of deformations whose gradients $D\gamma^\varepsilon$ take the values $A$ and $B$ alternately in layers normal to $n$ of thicknesses $\lambda \varepsilon$ and $(1 - \lambda)\varepsilon$ respectively, where $0 < \lambda < 1$. Clearly $W(D\gamma^\varepsilon(x)) = 0$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$. Let $0 \in \Omega$. By adding a suitable constant vector to each $\gamma^\varepsilon$ we can assume without loss of generality that $\gamma^\varepsilon(0) = 0$. Then as $\varepsilon \to 0$, $\gamma^\varepsilon \to (\lambda A + (1 - \lambda)B)x$ uniformly in $\Omega$, but $D\gamma^\varepsilon$ oscillates, converging only weak* in $L^\infty$ to $\lambda A + (1 - \lambda)B$. Suppose now that the boundary data is given by $\bar{y}(x) = (\lambda A + (1 - \lambda)B)x$. Of course $\gamma^\varepsilon$ does not satisfy (3.26), but by modifying $\gamma^\varepsilon$ in a thin boundary layer near $\partial \Omega$ it is easy to arrange that the modified sequence $\tilde{\gamma}^\varepsilon$ satisfies (3.26) and that the energy in the boundary-layer tends to zero as $\varepsilon \to 0$, so that $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} I(\tilde{\gamma}^\varepsilon) = 0$ and $\tilde{\gamma}^\varepsilon$ is a minimizing sequence. Hence for these boundary conditions $\inf I = 0$. The nontrivial part of the analysis is to show that any minimizing sequence must behave like $\tilde{\gamma}^\varepsilon$. In fact, it is proved in [11], using the weak continuity properties of Jacobians, that the gradient $D\gamma^\varepsilon$ of every minimizing sequence $\gamma^\varepsilon$ has the same Young measure $(\nu^\varepsilon)_{x \in \Omega}$, namely the constant measure

$$\nu^\varepsilon = \lambda \delta_A + (1 - \lambda)\delta_B.$$ 

Said differently, the values of $D\gamma^\varepsilon(x)$ converge in measure to the set $\{A, B\}$ in such a way that the local volume fractions of points having gradient near $A$ (resp. near $B$) tends to $\lambda$ (resp. $1 - \lambda$).
For general boundary conditions any more complicated microstructure than simple layering seems to be necessary in order to get a minimizing sequence. The constructions in [11] use 'layers within layers'. For example, a minimizing sequence with Young measure

\[ \nu_{\varepsilon} = \lambda [\nu_{\delta_{A}} + (1 - \nu)\delta_{B}] + (1 - \lambda) [\mu_{\delta_{C}} + (1 - \mu)\delta_{D}] \]

can be constructed by having alternate layers of thicknesses \( \lambda \varepsilon \) and \( (1 - \lambda)\varepsilon \) respectively, the layers of thickness \( \lambda \varepsilon \) consisting of sublayers of thicknesses \( \nu \varepsilon^{2} \), \( (1 - \nu)\varepsilon^{2} \) in which \( Dy_{\varepsilon}(x) \) takes the values \( A \) and \( B \), and the layers of thickness \( (1 - \lambda)\varepsilon \) consisting of sublayers of thicknesses \( \mu \varepsilon^{2} \), \( (1 - \mu)\varepsilon^{2} \) in which \( Dy_{\varepsilon}(x) \) takes the values \( C \) and \( D \). In order to achieve compatibility, the matrices \( A, B, C, D \in M \) must satisfy the relations

\[ B - A = a \otimes n, \quad D - C = b \otimes l, \]

\[ \nu_{A} + (1 - \nu)B - [\mu_{C} + (1 - \mu)D] = c \otimes m \]

for nonzero vectors \( a, b, c, l, m, n \). Boundary layers are needed near the interfaces between the larger layers. Such microstructures are observed; see, for example, Ailt [1].

The above theory is quite successful, predicting the correct interface orientations in a variety of observed microstructures. It also illuminates some central questions concerning lower-semicontinuity and regularity in the calculus of variations. The theory predicts infinitely fine microstructures. This is both a good and a bad feature, good because extremely fine microstructures are commonly observed, and bad because these microstructures are of course not infinitely fine. The conventional explanation for limited fineness is that there is a small amount of interfacial energy which contributes significantly to the total energy of a fine microstructure. Model I in the next section suggests the interesting possibility that there could be additional dynamic effects that limit fineness.

4. Dynamics and crystal microstructure. In this section I explore the question of whether appropriate dynamical equations for crystals have the property that solutions produce finer and finer microstructure as time \( t \) increases, thus providing a dynamical justification of the variational principle (3.27). This is a difficult question both from the point of view of modelling and of analysis. As regards modelling, it is not clear what dynamics should be assumed (and in particular what dissipation should be associated with the propagation of interfaces), while the analysis of even the simplest models seems to be beyond the scope of existing methods. For example, a simple viscoelastic model, ignoring thermal effects and the influence of anisotropy on dissipation, is given by the system

\[ \rho_{H}y_{tt} = \text{div} \, DAW(Dy) + \beta \Delta y_{t}, \]

\[ y |_{\partial \Omega} = \bar{y}, \]

with initial data

\[ y(x, 0) = y_{0}(x), \quad y_{t}(x, 0) = y_{1}(x), \]
where $\rho_R > 0$ is the density in the reference configuration, $\beta > 0$ is constant, and $y_0, y_1$ are given functions with $|y_0| = y$. Under hypotheses on $W$ appropriate for crystals, Rybka [37] has proved the existence of solutions for the corresponding problem with zero-traction boundary conditions, and his techniques can probably be adapted for (4.36). However, I am not aware of any results concerning the asymptotic behaviour of solutions. A very interesting video of numerical computations of Swart & Holmes [40] for the case when $\Omega = (0, 1)^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, $y$ is a scalar, and $W$ has only a finite number of minimizers, shows in a striking way how microstructure is rapidly generated by solutions.

With a view to gaining insight into models such as (4.35)-(4.37), a study of some prototype one-dimensional models was carried out by Ball, Holmes, James, Pego & Swart [9]. A surprising difference was found between the asymptotic behaviour of solutions in two closely related models. In both models the unknown is a scalar $u = u(x, t)$ defined for $0 \leq x \leq \pi, \ t \geq 0$.

Model 1 consists of the system

\begin{align}
(4.38) & \quad u_{tt} = (u_0^2 - u_x)u_x - \alpha u + \beta u_{xxt}, \\
(4.39) & \quad u(0, t) = u(\pi, t) = 0
\end{align}

where $\alpha > 0, \beta > 0$ are constants, with initial conditions

\begin{equation}
(4.40) \quad u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \ u_t(x, 0) = u_1(x).
\end{equation}

Writing $w = u_t$, and

\begin{equation}
(4.41) \quad V_1(u, w) = \int_0^\pi \left[ \frac{1}{2} w^2 + \frac{1}{4} (u_x^2 - 1)^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} u^2 \right] \, dx,
\end{equation}

a formal calculation shows that solutions to (4.38),(4.39) satisfy

\begin{equation}
(4.42) \quad \frac{d}{dt} V_1(u, u_t) = -\beta \int_0^\pi |u_{xxt}|^2 \, dx \leq 0,
\end{equation}

so that $V_1$ is a Lyapunov function. A phase-plane analysis shows that there are uncountably many rest points for (4.38),(4.39). Uncountably many of these are weak relative minimizers of $V_1$ in $X = W_0^{1,\infty}(0, \pi) \times L^2(0, \pi)$, but none of them are strong relative minimizers, i.e. local minimizers in the energy space $W_0^{1,4}(0, \pi) \times L^2(0, \pi)$. Furthermore, $\inf_{(u, w) \in X} V_1(u, w) = 0$ but the minimum is not attained. The following theorem is proved in [9] (together with related existence, uniqueness and regularity theorems for (4.38),(4.39)):

**Theorem 4.1.** There is no solution of (4.38),(4.39) with initial data $(u_0, u_1) \in X$ such that

\begin{equation}
(4.43) \quad \lim_{t \to \infty} V_1(u, u_t) = 0.
\end{equation}

Thus there is no solution of (4.38),(4.39) which realizes an absolute minimizing sequence for $V_1$! It is conjectured in [9] that in fact every solution converges to a rest point as $t \to \infty$. Theorem 4.1 and the conjecture are not inconsistent with the possibility that almost every solution converges to a weak relative minimizer of $V_1$; thus a result of the type discussed in the introduction could hold.

In the simpler case when $\alpha = 0$, Pego [33] proved that every solution to (4.38) converges to a rest-point as $t \to \infty$ when the boundary condition at $x = \pi$ is changed...
to that of zero traction, i.e. $\sigma(u_x) + \beta u_{xt} = 0$ at $x = \pi$, where $\sigma(z) = z^3 - z$. However, for this $\sigma$ and the zero displacement boundary conditions (4.39) it is not known whether every solution converges to a rest-point. If $\alpha = 0$ and we drop the $u_{xt}$ term in (4.38) then (4.38),(4.39) are seen to be equivalent to the equation

$$
\beta z_t = -\sigma(z) + \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\pi \sigma(z) \, dz
$$

for $z = u_x$. Recently, Frieselke [27], following earlier work on a finite-dimensional version of (4.44) by Pego [34], has shown that each solution of (4.44) that is bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ converges boundedly a.e. to a rest-point, provided that $\sigma$ is $C^1$ and is not constant on any interval. It remains to be seen whether these methods can be adapted to handle the case of (4.38),(4.39) with $\alpha > 0$.

Model 2 consists of the system

$$
u_{xt} = \left( \| u_x \|^{2} u_x - u_x \right)_x - \alpha u + \beta u_{xt},$$
$$u(0, t) = u(x, t) = 0$$

where $\alpha > 0, \beta > 0$ are constants, with initial conditions

$$u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \quad u_t(x, 0) = u_1(x),$$

which is obtained from (4.38)-(4.40) by replacing the term $u_x^2$ with the nonlocal expression $\| u_x \|^2 u_x$, where $\| u_x \| = (\int_0^\pi u_x^2 \, dx)^{1/2}$. Defining

$$V_2(u, w) = \int_0^\pi \left( \frac{1}{2} w^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} u^2 \right) \, dx + \frac{1}{4} (\| u_x \|^2 - 1)^2,$$

we find that solutions of (4.45),(4.46) satisfy

$$\frac{d}{dt} V_2(u, u_t) = -\beta \int_0^\pi |u_{xt}|^2 \, dx \leq 0.$$

An elementary Fourier analysis shows that there are a countable number of rest-points $\{\psi_k, 0\}$ for (4.45),(4.46). Also $\inf_{\{u, w\} \in X} V_2(u, w) = 0$, where $X = W_0^{1,2}(0, \pi) \times L^2(0, \pi)$ but the minimum is not attained. The following theorem is proved in [9]:

**Theorem 4.2.** $X$ can be written as the disjoint union of two dense sets $A_1, A_2$ of first and second category respectively. For initial data $\{u_0, u_1\} \in A_1$, $\{u, u_t\}$ converges in $X$ to a rest-point $\{\psi_k, 0\}$ as $t \to \infty$. For initial data $\{u_0, u_1\} \in A_2$,

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} V_2(u, u_t) = 0.$$

Thus in contrast to Model 1, the dynamics of Model 2 generically realize an absolute minimizing sequence for $V_2$.
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