

Non-convex potentials and microstructures in finite-strain plasticity

BY CARSTEN CARSTENSEN^{1†}, KLAUS HACKL² AND
ALEXANDER MIELKE³

¹*Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences,
Inselstr. 22–26, D-04103 Leipzig, Germany*

²*Lehrstuhl für allgemeine Mechanik, Ruhr-Universität, Bochum,
D-44780 Bochum, Germany (hackl@am.bi.ruhr-uni-bochum.de)*

³*Mathematisches Institut A, Universität Stuttgart, D-70569 Stuttgart,
Germany (mielke@mathematik.uni-stuttgart.de)*

*Received 1 November 2000; revised 28 February 2001; accepted 18 June 2001;
published online 19 December 2001*

A mathematical model for a finite-strain elastoplastic evolution problem is proposed in which one time-step of an implicit time-discretization leads to generally non-convex minimization problems. The elimination of all internal variables enables a mathematical and numerical analysis of a reduced problem within the general framework of calculus of variations and nonlinear partial differential equations. The results for a single slip-system and von Mises plasticity illustrate that finite-strain elastoplasticity generates reduced problems with non-quasiconvex energy densities and so allows for non-attainment of energy minimizers and microstructures.

Keywords: finite elastoplasticity; incremental formulation; variational problems; continuum mechanics; quasi-convexity; relaxation

1. Introduction

This paper is devoted to questions of well-posedness of problems that arise in the numerical and mathematical modelling of finite elastoplasticity; it aims to design (classes of) constitutive models (by specifying energy densities, yield functions, and hardening laws) which allow for a mathematical existence theory and, hence, for a reliable and efficient finite element approximation. The main concern is on the mathematical investigation of the variational problem in one time-increment using state-of-the-art methods from the calculus of variations and, for example, the notions rank-one convexity and quasiconvexity.

The incremental problem for elastoplasticity is a variational problem with respect to the elastic deformation as well as the plastic parameters (\mathbf{F}_p and the hardening parameters p). One key assumption is the design of a dissipation function which encodes the information on the yield function and depends on the new and the old plastic parameters. The functional to be minimized is the increment in the elastic (bulk) energy plus the dissipated energy.

† Present address: Institute for Applied Mathematics and Numerical Analysis, Vienna University of Technology, Wiedner Hauptstraße 8–10, A-1040 Vienna, Austria (cc@numerik.uni-kiel.de).

This paper results from the authors' long-time research; models with similar ingredients have been proposed in Lee (1969), Simo (1988*a,b*), Simo & Ortiz (1985), Miehe & Stein (1992), Miehe (1994) and Ortiz & Repetto (1999). As its main advantage, the proposed model allows for a mathematical and numerical analysis and so facilitates a theory that predicts microstructures. It appears that shear bands, cracks and inclusions are not bifurcation phenomena, but arise as different aspects of the same general variational model.

A brief discussion of the model introduced in §2 requires further notation. Let $\phi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ be the deformation of a body $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ with a deformation gradient $\mathbf{F} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{D}\phi$. Its multiplicative split $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}_e \mathbf{F}_p$ into an elastic part \mathbf{F}_e and an irreversible, plastic part \mathbf{F}_p introduces the plastic parameter $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{F}_p^{-1}$. With an additional m -dimensional internal hardening parameter p , the stored energy density W is assumed to depend only on $\mathbf{F}_e = \mathbf{F}\mathbf{P}$ and p , i.e. $W(\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{F}_p, p) = \bar{W}(\mathbf{F}\mathbf{P}, p)$. The resulting thermomechanically conjugated variables (Coleman & Gurtin 1967; Hackl 1997; Halphen & Nguyen 1975; Maugin 1992; Moreau 1970, 1976; Rice 1971; Ziegler & Wehrli 1987) are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{T} &= \frac{\partial W}{\partial \mathbf{F}}(\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{P}, p) = \text{D}_{\mathbf{F}_e} \bar{W}(\mathbf{F}\mathbf{P}, p) \mathbf{P}^T && \text{(first Piola–Kirchhoff stress tensor),} \\ \mathbf{Q} &= -\frac{\partial W}{\partial \mathbf{P}}(\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{P}, p) = -\mathbf{F}^T \text{D}_{\mathbf{F}_e} \bar{W}(\mathbf{F}\mathbf{P}, p) && \text{(conjugate plastic stresses),} \\ q &= -\frac{\partial W}{\partial p}(\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{P}, p) = -\text{D}_p \bar{W}(\mathbf{F}\mathbf{P}, p) && \text{(conjugate hardening forces).} \end{aligned}$$

One key point in the ansatz below is to write the variational inequalities for the irreversible deformations in terms of the mixed variant tensor $\bar{\mathbf{Q}}$,

$$\bar{\mathbf{Q}} = \mathbf{P}^T \mathbf{Q} = -\mathbf{F}_e^T \text{D}_{\mathbf{F}_e} \bar{W}(\mathbf{F}_e, p).$$

The yield function φ depends on q and $\bar{\mathbf{Q}}$ and so is invariant under plastic deformations (i.e. φ does not depend on $\mathbf{F}_p = \mathbf{P}^{-1}$). The principle of maximal dissipation results in the associated flow rule (which first appeared in Moreau (1970)) for the time derivatives $\dot{\mathbf{P}} = \partial \mathbf{P} / \partial t$ and $\dot{p} = \partial p / \partial t$,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{P}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{P}} \\ \dot{p} \end{pmatrix} = \lambda \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \bar{\mathbf{Q}}}(\bar{\mathbf{Q}}, q) \\ \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial q}(\bar{\mathbf{Q}}, q) \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for } \varphi \leq 0 \leq \lambda \text{ with } \lambda \varphi = 0. \tag{1.1}$$

Using the indicator function J with $J(\bar{\mathbf{Q}}, q) = 0$ for $\varphi(\bar{\mathbf{Q}}, q) \leq 0$ and otherwise $J = \infty$, (1.1) reads $(\mathbf{P}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{P}}, \dot{p}) \in \partial J(\bar{\mathbf{Q}}, q)$ with the subdifferential ∂J of the convex function J .

A time-discretization of the problem at hand leads typically to an elastic-plastic interaction which we aim to model as a variational problem. Given a time-discretization $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_N = T$ and data $(\mathbf{P}_{j-1}, p_{j-1})$, in §4 we seek the state variables (ϕ, \mathbf{P}, p) at time t_j as minimizers of the functional $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{f}(t_j), \mathbf{P}_{j-1}, p_{j-1}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{f}(t_j), \mathbf{P}_{j-1}, p_{j-1}}(\phi, \mathbf{P}, p) &= \int_{\Omega} \{ \Psi(\text{D}\phi, \mathbf{P}, p; \mathbf{P}_{j-1}, p_{j-1}) - \mathbf{f}(t_j) \cdot \phi \} \, \text{d}\mathbf{x} \\ &\text{with } \Psi(\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{P}, p; \mathbf{P}_{j-1}, p_{j-1}) = \bar{W}(\mathbf{F}\mathbf{P}, p) + J^*(\Delta(\mathbf{P}_{j-1}, \mathbf{P}), p - p_{j-1}), \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

the volume force $\mathbf{f}(t_j)$ at time t_j , and the Legendre transform J^* of J (cf. (4.1)); the dissipation reads $\bar{Q} : (\mathbf{P}^{-1}\dot{\mathbf{P}}) + q \cdot \dot{p} = J^*(\mathbf{P}^{-1}\dot{\mathbf{P}}, \dot{p})$ and $\Delta(\mathbf{P}_{j-1}, \mathbf{P})$ approximates $\mathbf{P}(t_j)^{-1}\dot{\mathbf{P}}(t_j)$.

Amongst the main advantages of the incremental problem (1.2) we stress the availability of highly developed mathematical tools for its analysis within the calculus of variations and the convenient numerical solution of a space-discretized version of (1.2). Another key advantage is the observation in (1.2) that $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{f}(t_j), \mathbf{P}_{j-1}, p_{j-1}}$ depends locally on the plastic variables, i.e. given $\mathbf{P}_{j-1}, p_{j-1}$ and a deformation gradient \mathbf{F} and a material point \mathbf{x} we can compute the reduced density function

$$\Psi_{\mathbf{P}_{j-1}, p_{j-1}}^{\text{red}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{F}) = \min_{\mathbf{P}, p} \Psi(\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{P}, p; \mathbf{P}_{j-1}(\mathbf{x}), p_{j-1}(\mathbf{x})) \tag{1.3}$$

(where minimization is over $(\mathbf{P}, p) \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \times \mathbb{R}^m$). Thus, (1.2) is recast into

$$\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{f}(t_j), \mathbf{P}_{j-1}, p_{j-1}}^{\text{red}}(\phi) = \int_{\Omega} \{ \Psi_{\mathbf{P}_{j-1}, p_{j-1}}^{\text{red}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{D}\phi) - \mathbf{f}(t_j) \cdot \phi \} \, d\mathbf{x}. \tag{1.4}$$

The proposed model (1.4) focuses the analysis on the reduced functional \mathcal{I}^{red} of the form as in nonlinear elasticity. This leads us (as in nonlinear elasticity (see, for example, Ball 1977)) to analyse the rank-one convexity of the reduced density function $\bar{\Psi}_{\mathbf{P}_0, p_0}^{\text{red}}(\mathbf{x}, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, which depends via \bar{W} and J^* simultaneously on the elastic and the plastic properties of the material. The present work does not provide an existence result for this incremental problem, it rather shows that in general we cannot expect existence of minimizers due to formation of microstructure. Hence, there is no need to introduce function spaces, as the missing rank-one convexity indicates non-existence in any reasonable function space.

Two particular examples illustrate consequences of the theory proposed; both represent typical models used in the mechanics of materials. The first describes an elastoplastic single crystal with one active slip-system, the second is the finite-strain version of the well-known von Mises model for polycrystalline metals. In both cases, the reduced density function is not quasiconvex, which indicates the occurrence of microstructures in the associated plasticity models. Indeed such microstructures have been observed experimentally (Korbel 1998; Ortiz & Repetto 1999; Perzyna 1998). The common formulations based on evolution equations for the internal variables (flow rules), however, have only been able to explain the occurrence of shear bands (singularities of the deformation field) but have failed to predict more complex structures (Ortiz & Repetto (1999) make an attempt in this direction for crystal plasticity). The theory presented here is in principle able to describe microstructures in their full complexity by transforming evolution equations into an optimization problem. Two further results might be worth mentioning here as they are contradictory to common belief: (a) finite-strain von Mises plasticity does not reduce to the Prandtl–Reuss model in the small-strain limit; (b) a substantial amount of hardening is required in order to render the model quasiconvex.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 recalls standard concepts in finite-strain continuum mechanics and introduces the time-continuous model for elastoplastic evolution. The incremental problem is established in §3 for a class of implicit time-discretizations and then recast into an incremental minimization problem in §4. Eventually, the internal variables are eliminated and so the reduced problem is established in §5. The final two sections illustrate this reduction procedure for two specific plasticity models, a single slip-system and von Mises

elastoplasticity. In both cases, the reduced density function is not quasiconvex, which predicts microstructure in the associated plasticity models.

2. Rate-independent elastoplasticity

This section establishes the (time-continuous) model of elastoplastic evolution in continuum mechanics. The deformation $\phi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ of a body $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ (where $d = 1, 2$ or 3) is a mapping with a (distributional) gradient $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{x}}\phi(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ of positive determinant for (almost each) $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$. We use italics to denote scalar functions, or n -tuples, lower-case boldface letters to indicate vectors and co-vectors $(\mathbf{x}, \phi, \dots)$, and upper-case boldface letters describe tensors $(\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{T}, \dots)$. All the subsequent notation is consistent with the general notions of the analysis on manifolds, but we do not employ these concepts and regard tensors as matrices and so use standard matrix algebra.

Our model of quasi-static elastoplasticity is deduced from two basic principles: the *equilibrium equation* is derived by energy minimization (or stationary states) with respect to variations of ϕ and the plastic flow rule is derived from the *principle of maximum plastic dissipation*. Certain options of relevant plastic strains are possible and amongst several options of relevant plastic strains, our choice reflects invariance properties and is based on the hypothesis that the elastic energy and the yield stresses are independent of the plastic deformation.

The plastic behaviour is given through the multiplicative split $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}_e \mathbf{F}_p$ of \mathbf{F} into an elastic part \mathbf{F}_e and the plastic part \mathbf{F}_p ; \mathbf{F}_e and \mathbf{F}_p are invertible with their product \mathbf{F} , written $\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{F}_e, \mathbf{F}_p \in \text{GL}(d)$. The material properties may depend on internal plastic variables $p \in \mathbb{R}^m$ (such as hardening parameters) and so the internal stored energy is postulated in the form,

$$W(\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{F}_p, p) = \overline{W}(\mathbf{F}\mathbf{F}_p^{-1}, p) = \overline{W}(\mathbf{F}_e, p). \quad (2.1)$$

In the sequel, we will use the plastic variables (\mathbf{P}, p) with the plastic configuration change $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{F}_p^{-1}$. The assumption that the elastic energy depends only on the elastic part of the deformation gradient is essential in our analysis and is motivated by the observation that plastic deformation results from a configurational change of the material body (dislocation movements in the case of metal plasticity). Plastic deformation simply recasts the reference configuration into another one and so does not affect the elastic deformation. For details see, for example, Hackl (1997), Maugin (1992), Simo (1988a,b) and Miehe (1994).

Material objectivity requires $\overline{W}(\mathbf{R}\mathbf{F}_e, p) = \overline{W}(\mathbf{F}_e, p)$ for all $\mathbf{R} \in \text{SO}(d)$ or, equivalently,

$$\overline{W}(\mathbf{F}_e, p) = \widehat{W}(\mathbf{F}_e^{\text{T}} \mathbf{F}_e, p),$$

where the superscript ‘T’ denotes the transposed matrix (as we use Cartesian coordinates). Throughout we assume that $\overline{W} : \text{GL}(d) \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is continuous and that it satisfies the coercivity assumptions

$$\overline{W}(\mathbf{F}_e, p) \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{for } |\mathbf{F}_e| + |\mathbf{F}_e^{-1}| + |p| \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.2)$$

In rate-independent elastoplasticity, the body is in equilibrium for each instant (of the process time) $t \in [0, T]$. This specifies the deformation ϕ as soon as the

evolution of the plastic variables $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{F}_p^{-1}$ and p is given. The thermomechanical dual variables read

$$\mathbf{T} = \frac{\partial W}{\partial \mathbf{F}}, \quad \mathbf{Q} = -\frac{\partial W}{\partial \mathbf{F}_p^{-1}}, \quad q = -\frac{\partial W}{\partial p}.$$

Here \mathbf{T} is the first Piola–Kirchhoff stress tensor and \mathbf{Q} contains the plastic (back-) stresses. The minus sign in the definitions of \mathbf{Q} and q follows standard conventions, in particular in elastoplasticity using the linearized strain tensor (see Han & Reddy 1995; Suquet 1981, 1988). For the special ansatz (2.1) we obtain

$$\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{F}_e} \overline{W}(\mathbf{F}_e, p) \mathbf{P}^T, \quad \mathbf{Q} = -\mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{F}_e} \overline{W}(\mathbf{F}_e, p), \quad q = -\mathbf{D}_p \overline{W}(\mathbf{F}_e, p). \quad (2.3)$$

The evolution of (\mathbf{P}, p) is governed by a flow rule associated with the yield function φ via the principle of maximum plastic dissipation. In general, φ depends on the stresses \mathbf{T} , \mathbf{Q} and q . However, our second postulate (in addition to (2.1)) is that the yield function φ is independent of the plastic deformation $\mathbf{F}_p = \mathbf{P}^{-1}$. From (2.3) we see that the tensor

$$\overline{\mathbf{Q}} = \mathbf{P}^T \mathbf{Q} = -\mathbf{F}_e^T \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{F}_e} \overline{W}(\mathbf{F}_e, p)$$

is invariant under all plastic deformations and hence we postulate that the yield function depends on $\overline{\mathbf{Q}}$ and q only,

$$\varphi(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{Q}, q) = \overline{\varphi}(\overline{\mathbf{Q}}, q) = \overline{\varphi}(\mathbf{P}^T \mathbf{Q}, q). \quad (2.4)$$

The yield function defines the set of admissible stresses

$$\mathbb{Q} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(\overline{\mathbf{Q}}, q) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^m : \overline{\varphi}(\overline{\mathbf{Q}}, q) \leq 0\}$$

and we assume that \mathbb{Q} is closed, convex and contains $(\mathbf{0}, 0)$. The indicator function J of the set \mathbb{Q} (in the sense of convex analysis (cf. Ekeland & Temam 1976; Zeidler 1985, 1988)) is

$$J(\mathbf{Q}, q) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } (\mathbf{Q}, q) \in \mathbb{Q}, \\ \infty & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

The principle of *maximal plastic dissipation* (Simo 1988a,b) postulates that the plastic dissipation

$$-\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{P}} W(\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{P}, p) : \dot{\mathbf{P}} - \mathbf{D}_p W(\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{P}, p) \cdot \dot{p} = \mathbf{Q} : \dot{\mathbf{P}} + q \cdot \dot{p} = \overline{\mathbf{Q}} : (\mathbf{P}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{P}}) + q \cdot \dot{p}$$

is maximal when the rates $\mathbf{P}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{P}}$ and \dot{p} are kept fixed and the stresses (\mathbf{Q}, q) are varied in \mathbb{Q} . This leads to

$$\overline{\mathbf{Q}} : (\mathbf{P}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{P}}) + q \cdot \dot{p} \geq \mathbf{S} : (\mathbf{P}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{P}}) + s \cdot \dot{p} \quad \text{for all } (\mathbf{S}, s) \in \mathbb{Q}. \quad (2.5)$$

Using the definition of J and its subdifferential

$$\partial J(\overline{\mathbf{Q}}, q) = \{(\overline{\mathbf{P}}, \overline{p}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^m :$$

$$J(\overline{\mathbf{Q}} + \mathbf{S}, q + s) \geq J(\overline{\mathbf{Q}}, q) + \overline{\mathbf{P}} : \mathbf{S} + \overline{p} \cdot s \text{ for all } (\mathbf{S}, s) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^m\},$$

the principle of maximum dissipation (2.5) reads

$$(\mathbf{P}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{P}}, \dot{p}) \in \partial J(\overline{\mathbf{Q}}, q). \quad (2.6)$$

The above constitutive assumptions imposed on the functions \overline{W} and $\overline{\varphi}$ result in a total elastoplastic problem we only formulate for pure displacement boundary conditions (changes necessary for traction boundary conditions are standard).

Elastoplastic problem. Given the (volume) forces $\mathbf{f} : [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, the boundary data $\phi_{bc} : [0, T] \times \partial\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, and the initial conditions for the plastic variables $(\mathbf{P}_0, p_0) : \Omega \rightarrow \text{GL}(d) \times \mathbb{R}^m$ find a deformation $\phi : [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and plastic variables $(\mathbf{P}, p) : [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow \text{GL}(d) \times \mathbb{R}^m$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{(equilibrium)} \quad \text{div } \mathbf{T} + \mathbf{f} = 0 \quad \text{for } (t, \mathbf{x}) \in [0, T] \times \Omega, \\
 & \text{(flow rule)} \quad (\mathbf{P}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{P}}, \dot{p}) \in \partial J(\overline{\mathbf{Q}}, q) \quad \text{for } (t, \mathbf{x}) \in [0, T] \times \Omega, \\
 & \text{(deformation gradient)} \quad \mathbf{F} = D_{\mathbf{x}} \phi, \\
 & \text{(constitutive laws)} \quad \mathbf{T} = D_{\mathbf{F}_e} \overline{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{F}\mathbf{P}, p) \mathbf{P}^T, \\
 & \quad \quad \quad \overline{\mathbf{Q}} = -(\mathbf{F}\mathbf{P})^T D_{\mathbf{F}_e} \overline{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{F}\mathbf{P}, p), \quad q = -D_{\mathbf{F}_e} \overline{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{F}\mathbf{P}, p), \\
 & \text{(initial conditions)} \quad \mathbf{P}(0, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{P}_0(\mathbf{x}), \quad p(0, \mathbf{x}) = p_0(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \\
 & \text{(boundary conditions)} \quad \phi(t, \mathbf{x}) = \phi_{bc}(t, \mathbf{x}) \quad \text{for } (t, \mathbf{x}) \in [0, T] \times \partial\Omega.
 \end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.1. Note that $\overline{\mathbf{Q}}$ can be understood as a linear operator from the cotangent bundle of the intermediate configuration into itself and thus the invariants like eigenvalues, determinant and the trace are well defined (Hackl 1997).

Remark 2.2. Formulations of the type (2.4) and (2.6) were first used in the context of small-strain elastoplasticity by Moreau (1970) and Halphen & Nguyen (1975).

3. Time-discrete formulation

This section concerns two time-discretizations that serve to emphasize that their choice within the flow-rule is non-unique. Mathematical proofs of existence of solutions or their numerical approximation are based on the understanding of one time-increment. Assume that the time-interval $[0, T]$ is discretized into $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_{n-1} < t_n = T$ and that approximations $(\phi_j, \mathbf{P}_j, p_j)$ for $(\phi(t_j, \cdot), \mathbf{P}(t_j, \cdot), p(t_j, \cdot))$ are known for $j = 1, \dots, k$. The incremental problem is to find approximations at the time level t_{k+1} . Since this problem is of the same type for all $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, we will restrict the notation to the first step, i.e. $k = 0$, and so (\mathbf{P}_0, p_0) , $(\mathbf{P}, p) = (\mathbf{P}_1, p_1)$ and $\tau = t_1 - t_0$. As the only link between the time levels are the derivatives in the flow rule we have to discretize these derivatives.

In contrast to the straightforward discretization of the derivative

$$\dot{p} \approx \frac{1}{\tau}(p - p_0),$$

the discretization $(1/\tau)\Delta(\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{P})$ of $\mathbf{P}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{P}}$ at $t = t_1$ offers various possible realizations, for instance,

$$\Delta(\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{P}) = (\theta \mathbf{P}_0 + (1-\theta)\mathbf{P})^{-1}(\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{P}_0)$$

or

$$\Delta(\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{P}) = (\theta \mathbf{P}_0^{-1} + (1-\theta)\mathbf{P}^{-1})(\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{P}_0).$$

Both cases coincide for $\theta = 0$ or 1 . For $\theta = 0$ the approximation is linear in \mathbf{P} , and for $\theta = 1$ it is linear in \mathbf{P}^{-1} . Another possibility is $\Delta(\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{P}) = \log(\mathbf{P}_0^{-1} \mathbf{P})$, which rather corresponds to the multiplicative decomposition (where $\log(\mathbf{A})$ is defined via

the matrix-valued power series expansion for $|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{1}|$ small). For consistency we only need

$$\Delta(\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{P}_0(\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{A})) = \mathbf{A} + \mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{A}|^2) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}. \tag{3.1}$$

Incremental problem. Given the (volume) forces $\mathbf{f} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, the boundary data $\phi_{bc} : \partial\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and the initial conditions for the plastic variables $(\mathbf{P}_0, p_0) : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{GL}(d) \times \mathbb{R}^m$, find the deformation $\phi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, the plastic variables $(\mathbf{P}, p) : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{GL}(d) \times \mathbb{R}^m$ such that the following hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(equilibrium)} \quad & \operatorname{div} \mathbf{T} + \mathbf{f} = 0 \quad \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \\ \text{(discretized flow rule)} \quad & (\Delta(\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{P}), p - p_0) \in \partial J(\overline{\mathbf{Q}}, q) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \\ \text{(deformation gradient)} \quad & \mathbf{F} = \mathbf{D}_x \phi, \\ \text{(constitutive laws)} \quad & \mathbf{T} = \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{F}_e} \overline{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{F}\mathbf{P}, p) \mathbf{P}^T, \\ & \overline{\mathbf{Q}} = -(\mathbf{F}\mathbf{P})^T \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{F}_e} \overline{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{F}\mathbf{P}, p), \quad q = -\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{F}_e} \overline{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{F}\mathbf{P}, p), \\ \text{(boundary conditions)} \quad & \phi(\mathbf{x}) = \phi_{bc}(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.1. This paper focuses on the solvability of the incremental step in the time-discretization of the time continuous problem; convergence questions for smaller and smaller increments are beyond this paper. A result in this direction was obtained in Mielke *et al.* (2002) for a rate-independent flow-rule model for phase transformations in shape memory alloys.

4. Variational formulation

This section is devoted to recasting the incremental problem with time-step τ into a minimization problem. Given ϕ_{bc} , \mathbf{f} , \mathbf{P}_0 , and p_0 we associate the functional

$$I(\phi, \mathbf{P}, p, \overline{\mathbf{Q}}, q) = \int_{\Omega} [\overline{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{D}_x \phi \mathbf{P}, p) - \mathbf{f} \cdot \phi + \overline{\mathbf{Q}} : \Delta(\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{P}) + q \cdot (p - p_0) - \tau J(\overline{\mathbf{Q}}, q)] \, d\mathbf{x}$$

and study its derivatives. A variation with respect to ϕ (under the given boundary conditions) yields

$$\operatorname{div} \mathbf{T} + \mathbf{f} = 0 \quad \text{with } \mathbf{T} = \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{F}_e} \overline{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{D}_x \phi \mathbf{P}, p) \mathbf{P}^T,$$

i.e. the equilibrium and the constitutive law for the kinematic stress tensor. A variation with respect to the dual variables $(\overline{\mathbf{Q}}, q)$ gives exactly the discretized flow rule

$$\frac{1}{\tau} (\Delta(\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{P}), p - p_0) \in \partial J(\overline{\mathbf{Q}}, q).$$

A variation with respect to the plastic hardening variables p yields the constitutive relation for q ,

$$\mathbf{D}_p \overline{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{D}_x \phi \mathbf{P}, p) + q = 0.$$

A variation of I with respect to \mathbf{P} depends on the choice in (3.1) and we discuss two cases

$$\Delta_1(\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{P}) = \mathbf{P}_0^{-1} \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{1}, \quad \text{respectively,} \quad \Delta_2(\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{P}) = \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{P}^{-1} \mathbf{P}_0,$$

which are linear in \mathbf{P} , respectively, \mathbf{P}^{-1} . A variation of I with respect to \mathbf{P} yields

$$-\mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{F}_e} \overline{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{F}_e, p) = \begin{cases} (\mathbf{P}_0^{-1})^T \overline{\mathbf{Q}} & \text{for } \Delta_1, \\ (\mathbf{P}_0^{-1})^T \overline{\mathbf{Q}} (\mathbf{P}^{-1} \mathbf{P}_0)^T & \text{for } \Delta_2, \end{cases}$$

as an approximation of the constitutive relation of $\overline{\mathbf{Q}}$. Hence the preceding incremental problem has essentially the structure of a constitutive relation for $\overline{\mathbf{Q}}$.

In summary, stationary points of I can be obtained by maximizing with respect to $(\overline{\mathbf{Q}}, q)$ and minimization with respect to the remaining variables.

Proposition 4.1. *A stationary point of the functional I solves the incremental problem of § 3.*

The task to find stationary points of I is rewritten by using the Legendre transform J^* ,

$$\begin{aligned} J^*(\mathbf{S}, s) &= \sup\{\overline{\mathbf{Q}} : \mathbf{S} + q \cdot s - J(\overline{\mathbf{Q}}, q) : (\overline{\mathbf{Q}}, q) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^m\} \\ &= \sup\{\overline{\mathbf{Q}} : \mathbf{S} + q \cdot s : (\overline{\mathbf{Q}}, q) \in \mathbb{Q}\}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

of J . Recall from convex analysis (Zeidler 1985, 1988) that the subgradients of J and J^* are linked,

$$(\mathbf{S}, s) \in \partial J(\overline{\mathbf{Q}}, q) \iff (\overline{\mathbf{Q}}, q) \in \partial J^*(\mathbf{S}, s).$$

Since J assumes only the values 0 and ∞ , the function J^* is homogeneous of degree 1, that is $J^*(\alpha(\mathbf{S}, s)) = \alpha J^*(\mathbf{S}, s)$ for all $\alpha \geq 0$. Moreover, $J^*(\mathbf{S}, s) \geq 0$ because of $(\mathbf{0}, 0) \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $\partial J^*((\mathbf{0}, 0)) = \mathbb{Q}$. Hence a maximization of I with respect to $(\overline{\mathbf{Q}}, q)$ leads to the functional

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{P}_0, p_0}(\phi, \mathbf{P}, p) &= \int_{\Omega} \Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{D}\phi(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{x}), p(\mathbf{x}); \mathbf{P}_0(\mathbf{x}), p_0(\mathbf{x})) \, d\mathbf{x} - \ell(\phi), \\ \text{where } \Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{P}, p; \mathbf{P}_0, p_0) &= \overline{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{F}\mathbf{P}, p) + J^*(\Delta(\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{P}), p - p_0) \\ \text{and } \ell(\phi) &= \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \phi(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x}. \end{aligned} \right\} \tag{4.2}$$

The incremental problem can be recast into a (equivalent) minimization problem.

Incremental minimization problem. Given the (volume) forces $\mathbf{f} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, the boundary data $\phi_{bc} : \partial\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and the initial conditions for the plastic variables $(\mathbf{P}_0, p_0) : \Omega \rightarrow \text{GL}(d) \times \mathbb{R}^m$, find a deformation $\phi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and plastic variables $(\mathbf{P}, p) : \Omega \rightarrow \text{GL}(d) \times \mathbb{R}^m$ which satisfy

$$\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{P}_0, p_0}(\phi, \mathbf{P}, p) = \inf\{\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{P}_0, p_0}(\tilde{\phi}, \tilde{\mathbf{P}}, \tilde{p}) : \tilde{\phi}, \tilde{\mathbf{P}}, \tilde{p} \text{ admissible}\}. \tag{4.3}$$

Proposition 4.2. *If (ϕ, \mathbf{P}, p) solves the incremental minimization problem (4.3), then there exists $(\overline{\mathbf{Q}}, q)$ in $\partial J^*(\Delta(\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{P}), p - p_0)$ such that $(\phi, \mathbf{P}, p, \overline{\mathbf{Q}}, q)$ is a stationary point of I .*

Remark 4.3. This minimization formulation of the incremental problem is the basis of our subsequent analysis. It allows an instructive interpretation within the realm of *material* or *Eshelbyan mechanics* (Mauguin 1993). Here \mathbf{P} and p play the role of a material configurational change, in our case of a dislocation movement, whereas J^* specifies an incremental energy release caused by configurational changes

enforced by an energy release higher than the invested elastic energy. The stress $\mathbf{Q} = -\partial W/\partial \mathbf{P}$ is a thermodynamic driving force for configurational change called the Eshelby tensor. Similar interpretations are also possible for models involving material damage and phase transformations (Mielke & Theil 1999; Mielke *et al.* 2002). In Mielke (2002) perfect elastoplasticity (without hardening parameters p) is considered and the energy release $J^*(\Delta(\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{P}), p-p_0)$ is replaced by a left-invariant dissipation metric $D(\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{P}) = \hat{D}(\mathbf{P}_0^{-1}\mathbf{P})$ on the Lie group $\text{GL}(d)$.

5. Reduction via pointwise minimization

This section is devoted to a further reduction of the incremental minimization problem owing to its structure. The internal variables \mathbf{P} and p appear locally under the integral such that the minimization with respect to these variables can be performed pointwise. This defines the reduced density and the reduced density functional:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \Psi_{\mathbf{P}_0, p_0}^{\text{red}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{F}) &= \inf \{ \Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{P}, p; \mathbf{P}_0(\mathbf{x}), p_0(\mathbf{x})) \mid (\mathbf{P}, p) \in \text{GL}(d) \times \mathbb{R}^m \}, \\ \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{P}_0, p_0}^{\text{red}}(\phi) &= \int_{\Omega} \Psi_{\mathbf{P}_0, p_0}^{\text{red}}(\mathbf{x}, D\phi(\mathbf{x})) \, d\mathbf{x} - \ell(\phi). \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (5.1)$$

Reduced incremental minimization problem. Given the (volume) forces $\mathbf{f} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, the boundary data $\phi_{\text{bc}} : \partial\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and the initial conditions for the plastic variables $(\mathbf{P}_0, p_0) : \Omega \rightarrow \text{GL}(d) \times \mathbb{R}^m$, find a deformation $\phi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ which satisfies

$$\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{P}_0, p_0}^{\text{red}}(\phi) = \inf \{ \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{P}_0, p_0}^{\text{red}}(\tilde{\phi}) : \tilde{\phi} \text{ admissible} \}. \quad (5.2)$$

Proposition 5.1. *Suppose (ϕ, \mathbf{P}, p) is a minimizer of the functional $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{P}_0, p_0}$ in (4.3). Then, the first component ϕ is a minimizer of the reduced functional $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{P}_0, p_0}^{\text{red}}$. Conversely, for every minimizer ϕ of the reduced functional there exists (\mathbf{P}, p) such that (ϕ, \mathbf{P}, p) minimizes $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{P}_0, p_0}$.*

Proof. The first inclusion is a direct consequence of the preceding construction and, for the second, consider $(\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{x}), p(\mathbf{x}))$ such that the minimum in (5.1) is attained when \mathbf{F} is replaced by $D\phi(\mathbf{x})$. The attainment of the minimum follows by the continuity and coercivity of $\overline{W}(\mathbf{F}\cdot, \cdot)$ and the nonnegativity of J^* . Under natural measurability conditions on Ψ , \mathbf{P}_0 and p_0 the theory in Ekeland & Temam (1976, ch. VIII, §1.4) allows us to find a selection $\mathbf{x} \mapsto (\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{x}), p(\mathbf{x}))$ which is measurable. ■

The minimization problem (5.2) is of the form well-analysed in nonlinear elasticity (Ball 1977; Dacorogna 1989). The question of the existence of minimizers is in general non-trivial, as the functionals are non-convex.

Sufficient conditions for the existence of minimizers are the weak lower semi-continuity and the coercivity (growth conditions) of the functional. The appendix gives their precise definitions and discusses the relation to the notion of cross-quasiconvexity. It turns out that the reduction step (elimination of the local plastic variables) is indeed necessary (in the sense that the detection of non-attainment is otherwise unclear).

In the following sections, two illustrative examples are addressed, where the functional (5.2) is explicitly constructed. In both cases, the essential condition is rank-one convexity which is violated and so microstructure cannot be excluded.

Definition 5.2 (rank-one convexity). The function $\psi : \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called rank-one convex if for every $\mathbf{F} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the function $t \mapsto \psi(\mathbf{F} + t\mathbf{n} \otimes \mathbf{m})$ is convex on \mathbb{R} .

Every quasiconvex function is rank-one convex (Dacorogna 1989) and attainment of minimizers is (for the examples below) equivalent to quasiconvexity. Hence, the next sections are concerned with examples and the question whether (and for which parameters) the reduced density function is rank-one convex.

6. A single slip-system

This section investigates the presented framework in the particular example of a single slip-system which models elastoplastic single crystals (Asaro 1983), but also describes the material behaviour of ice and snow (Gödert & Hutter 1998), or can be applied to problems in soil mechanics.

Let $U : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be convex and $a > 0$ be a hardening modulus. Then, the energy density for compressible neo-Hookean material (Ciarlet 1988) reads

$$\overline{W}(\mathbf{F}_e, p) = U(\det \mathbf{F}_e) + \frac{1}{2}\mu \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{F}_e^T \mathbf{F}_e + \frac{1}{2}ap^2, \tag{6.1}$$

where $\mu > 0$ is a Lamé parameter.

Two orthogonal unit vectors \mathbf{m} and \mathbf{n} ($|\mathbf{m}| = 1 = |\mathbf{n}|$, $\mathbf{m} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0$) characterize the yield function,

$$\overline{\varphi}(\overline{\mathbf{Q}}, q) = |\mathbf{m} \cdot \overline{\mathbf{Q}}\mathbf{n}| - r - q. \tag{6.2}$$

With a non-negative plastic consistency (slip-rate) parameter $\dot{\lambda} \geq 0$, the flow rule reads

$$(\mathbf{P}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{P}}, \dot{p}) = \dot{\lambda}(\operatorname{sgn}(\mathbf{m} \cdot \overline{\mathbf{Q}}\mathbf{n})\mathbf{m} \otimes \mathbf{n}, -1). \tag{6.3}$$

Let $\dot{\gamma} = \dot{\lambda} \operatorname{sgn}(\mathbf{m} \cdot \overline{\mathbf{Q}}\mathbf{n})$ with $\gamma(0) = 0$. Notice that, by (6.3), $\dot{p} = -|\dot{\gamma}|$. From (6.3), $\dot{\mathbf{P}} = \dot{\gamma}(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{m}) \otimes \mathbf{n}$ and so $\mathbf{m} \perp \mathbf{n}$ yields $\dot{\mathbf{P}}\mathbf{m} = 0$. This, the initial condition $\mathbf{P}_0 = \mathbf{1}$, and a time-integration show that $\mathbf{P}\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{m}$ and so $\dot{\mathbf{P}} = \dot{\gamma}\mathbf{m} \otimes \mathbf{n}$. From this, the initial condition $\mathbf{P}_0 = \mathbf{1}$, and by time-integration we infer

$$\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{1} + \gamma\mathbf{m} \otimes \mathbf{n}. \tag{6.4}$$

Therefore, the evolution of the internal variables \mathbf{P} and p can essentially be described in terms of the single parameter γ . The kinematics of plastic flow is a simple shear in the plane spanned by \mathbf{m} and \mathbf{n} . For this reason \mathbf{m} and \mathbf{n} are called the *slip-system*.

Direct calculations provide the Legendre-transform J^* of J ,

$$\begin{aligned} J^*(\sigma, s) &= \sup\{\overline{\mathbf{Q}} : (\sigma\mathbf{m} \otimes \mathbf{n}) + qs : |\mathbf{m} \cdot \overline{\mathbf{Q}}\mathbf{n}| - q \leq r, q \geq 0\} \\ &= \sup\{Q\sigma + qs : |Q| - q \leq r, q \geq 0\} \\ &= \sup\{|Q||\sigma| + qs : |Q| - q \leq r, q \geq 0\} \\ &= \sup\{(|Q| - q)|\sigma| + q(|\sigma| + s) : |Q| - q \leq r, q \geq 0\} \\ &= \sup\{r|\sigma| + q(|\sigma| + s) : q \geq 0\} \\ &= \begin{cases} r|\sigma| & \text{if } |\sigma| + s \leq 0, \\ \infty & \text{else.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

By substituting (6.4) with $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}_e \mathbf{P}^{-1}$ into (6.1) and making use of $\det \mathbf{P} = 1$ (an immediate consequence of (6.4)) we obtain a reduced functional

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathbf{f}, \gamma_0, p_0}(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \gamma, p) &= \int_{\Omega} \{U(\det \mathbf{F}) + \frac{1}{2}\mu(\text{tr } \mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{F} + 2\gamma C_{mn} + \gamma^2 C_{mm}) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}ap^2 + r|\gamma - \gamma_0| - \mathbf{f} \cdot \boldsymbol{\phi}\} \, d\mathbf{x}, \end{aligned}$$

under the constraint

$$|\gamma - \gamma_0| + p - p_0 \leq 0.$$

Here, $C_{mm} = \mathbf{m} \cdot \mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{F} \mathbf{m}$ and $C_{mn} = \mathbf{m} \cdot \mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{F} \mathbf{n}$ denote the components of the Cauchy–Green strain tensor $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{F}$ in the directions given by \mathbf{m} and \mathbf{n} .

Minimization with respect to p gives $p = p_0 - |\gamma - \gamma_0|$ and we can eliminate p from the minimization problem, which leads to the unconstrained functional,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{f}, \gamma_0, p_0}(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \gamma) &= \int_{\Omega} \{U(\det \mathbf{F}) + \frac{1}{2}\mu(\text{tr } \mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{F} + 2\gamma C_{mn} + \gamma^2 C_{mm}) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}a(\gamma - \gamma_0)^2 + (r - ap_0)|\gamma - \gamma_0| - \mathbf{f} \cdot \boldsymbol{\phi}\} \, d\mathbf{x}. \end{aligned}$$

To eliminate γ from the minimization process, we perform a variation of $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{f}, \gamma_0, p_0}$ with respect to γ to see

$$0 \in \mu C_{mn} + \mu\gamma C_{mm} + a(\gamma - \gamma_0) + (r - ap_0) \text{sgn}(\gamma - \gamma_0). \tag{6.5}$$

By inspection it can be shown that (6.5) has the unique solution (writing $(\cdot)_+ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max\{0, \cdot\}$)

$$\gamma \in \gamma_0 - \frac{(\mu|C_{mn} + \gamma_0 C_{mm}| - r + ap_0)_+}{\mu C_{mm} + a} \text{sgn}(C_{mn} + \gamma_0 C_{mm}).$$

A substitution into $\bar{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathbf{f}, \gamma_0, p_0}(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \gamma)$ leads to the reduced functional

$$\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{f}, \gamma_0, p_0}^{\text{red}}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \int_{\Omega} \{\Psi_{\gamma_0, p_0}^{\text{red}}(\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\phi}) - \mathbf{f} \cdot \boldsymbol{\phi}\} \, d\mathbf{x}$$

with corresponding reduced density function (where $(\cdot)_+^2$ means $((\cdot)_+)^2$)

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\gamma_0, p_0}^{\text{red}}(\mathbf{F}) &= U(\det \mathbf{F}) + \frac{1}{2}\mu(\text{tr } \mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{F} + 2\gamma_0 C_{mn} + \gamma_0^2 C_{mm}) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2(\mu C_{mm} + a)}(\mu|C_{mn} + \gamma_0 C_{mm}| - r + ap_0)_+^2. \end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

To investigate the convexity properties of the potential $\Psi_{\gamma_0, p_0}^{\text{red}}$, consider first $\gamma_0 = 0$, $p_0 = 0$, i.e. we look at a time-increment at the beginning of which the body is completely elastic. Let us specify \mathbf{F} as

$$\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{1} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha(\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{n}) \otimes (\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{m}). \tag{6.7}$$

Note that (6.7) constitutes a rank-one family of matrices parametrized by α ; \mathbf{F} represents a simple shear under an angle of 45° with respect to the plastic slip-system given. Substitution of (6.7) into $\Psi_{\gamma_0, p_0}^{\text{red}}$ yields

$$\tilde{\Psi}(\alpha) = \mu + \frac{1}{2}\mu\alpha^2 - \frac{(\frac{1}{2}\mu\alpha^2 - r)_+^2}{2a + \mu(2 - 2\alpha + \alpha^2)}. \tag{6.8}$$




Figure 1. $\tilde{\Psi}(\alpha)$ for $\mu = 2, a = 0, r = 1$.

Since $\tilde{\Psi}(\alpha)$ is continuously differentiable, convexity can be studied by means of the sign of the second derivative. A straightforward calculation yields that $\tilde{\Psi}''(\alpha) \geq 0$ everywhere provided a is large enough. So in this case $\tilde{\Psi}(\alpha)$ is convex. This supports the expectation that the presence of hardening should have a regularizing effect on the problem at hand.

Let us now consider the opposite case $a = 0$. Then, for r small enough, $\tilde{\Psi}(\alpha)$ is clearly non-convex. For instance,

$$\tilde{\Psi}''(\alpha) = \frac{1}{2}\mu \left(\left(\frac{2r}{\mu} \right)^2 - 3 \right) < 0 \quad \text{for } \alpha = 1 > \frac{2r}{\mu}.$$

By continuity, this holds if $|\gamma_0|, |p_0|$, or a remain small.

Proposition 6.1. *There exist positive constants c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 , such that for all $|\gamma_0| < c_1, |p_0| < c_2, r < c_3$ and $a < c_4$ the potential $\Psi_{\gamma_0, p_0}^{\text{red}}(\mathbf{F})$ given in (6.6) is not rank-one convex.*

This result implies especially that $\Psi_{\gamma_0, p_0}^{\text{red}}(\mathbf{F})$ is not quasiconvex and so suggests the occurrence of microstructures as minimizers of energy (see Ball & James 1987, 1992). To illustrate the possibility of microstructures, let us consider the case $\mu = 2, a = 0$ and $r = 1$ with $\tilde{\Psi}(\alpha)$ displayed in figure 1.

It is easy to show that there exist exactly two values α_1, α_2 such that

$$\tilde{\Psi}'(\alpha_1) = \tilde{\Psi}'(\alpha_2) \frac{\tilde{\Psi}(\alpha_2) - \tilde{\Psi}(\alpha_1)}{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}.$$

A numerical calculation yields $\alpha_1 = 0.44061$ and $\alpha_2 = 2.53198$. This means there exists a common tangent of the points $(\alpha_1, \tilde{\Psi}(\alpha_1))$ and $(\alpha_2, \tilde{\Psi}(\alpha_2))$ as depicted in figure 1.

The interpretation is that any macroscopic deformation gradient (6.7) with parameter $\alpha_1 < \alpha < \alpha_2$ yields a microstructure to lower the macroscopic energy from $\tilde{\Psi}(\alpha)$ to the smaller energy described by the tangent in figure 1. This is achieved by finer and finer layers of alternating constant gradients $\mathbf{1} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha_j(\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{n}) \otimes (\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{m})$ with probability $|\alpha_j - \alpha|/|\alpha_2 - \alpha_1|$. The corresponding microscopic displacement is shown in figure 2.




Figure 2. Microscopic displacement for single slip-system with parameter $\alpha_1 < \alpha < \alpha_2$.

Remark 6.2 (Infinitesimal elastoplasticity). In the case of infinitesimal (small-strain) elastoplasticity, (6.1) would be replaced by the linear, isotropic energy density function

$$\bar{\Psi}(\epsilon_e, p) = \frac{1}{2}\lambda(\text{tr } \epsilon_e)^2 + \mu \text{tr } \epsilon_e^2 + \frac{1}{2}ap^2,$$

where λ, μ are Lamé parameters and ϵ_e denotes elastic strain given by the additive decomposition $\epsilon_e = \epsilon - \epsilon_p$. Here ϵ_p is the plastic strain and ϵ the total strain given by

$$\epsilon = \text{sym } \mathbf{F} - \mathbf{1} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathbf{F} + \mathbf{F}^T)/2 - \mathbf{1}.$$

Choosing $\mathbf{P} = -\epsilon_p$ and considering $\mathbf{F}_p \approx \mathbf{1}$ for infinitesimal strains we obtain $\mathbf{Q} = \bar{\mathbf{Q}} = \boldsymbol{\sigma}$, the linearized stress tensor. The flow rule asserts

$$(\dot{\mathbf{P}}, \dot{p}) = \dot{\lambda}(\text{sgn}(\mathbf{m} \cdot \bar{\mathbf{Q}}\mathbf{n}) \text{sym } \mathbf{m} \otimes \mathbf{n}, -1),$$

from which we obtain

$$\mathbf{P} = \gamma \text{sym } \mathbf{m} \otimes \mathbf{n}.$$

The same reasoning as before leads to the internal energy function

$$\Psi_{\gamma_0, p_0}^{\text{red}}(\mathbf{F}) = \frac{1}{2}\lambda(\text{tr } \boldsymbol{\epsilon})^2 + \mu \text{tr } \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^2 + 2\mu\gamma_0\epsilon_{mn} - \frac{1}{2(\mu+a)}(\mu|2\epsilon_{mn} + \gamma_0| - r + ap_0)_+^2, \quad (6.9)$$

with $\epsilon_{mn} = \mathbf{m} \cdot \boldsymbol{\epsilon}\mathbf{n}$.

The density function (6.9) is convex in $(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ and so in) \mathbf{F} (see Alberty *et al.* 1999). This also indicates that the infinitesimal model is different from that which may be obtained by expansion of the finite model with respect to small quantities.

7. von Mises plasticity

The von Mises yield criterion is commonly accepted for modelling the plastic behaviour of polycrystalline metals and other isotropic materials such as various polymers. We consider once again the compressible neo-Hookean material defined by equation (6.1). The yield function will now be given by

$$\bar{\varphi}(\bar{\mathbf{Q}}, q) = |\text{dev sym } \bar{\mathbf{Q}}| - r - q. \quad (7.1)$$

Here $\text{dev } \mathbf{T} = \mathbf{T} - (1/d)\text{tr } \mathbf{T}$ denotes the deviator of a tensor \mathbf{T} and $|\mathbf{T}| = \sqrt{\text{tr}(\mathbf{T}^2)}$. We still have $p, q \in \mathbb{R}, q \geq 0$. This constitutes the finite strain version of the von

Mises yield function with isotropic hardening as derived in Miehe (1994) or Hackl (1997). The flow rule (2.6) can now be put in the form,

$$\mathbf{P}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{P}} = \dot{\lambda} \operatorname{sgn}(\operatorname{dev} \operatorname{sym} \overline{\mathbf{Q}}), \quad \dot{p} = \dot{\lambda}. \tag{7.2}$$

Here $\operatorname{sgn}(\mathbf{A}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{A}/|\mathbf{A}|$ if $\mathbf{A} \neq 0$ and $\operatorname{sgn}(\mathbf{0})$ constitutes the closed unit ball of matrices intersected with the symmetric, trace-free matrices. Hence $\operatorname{tr} \mathbf{P}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{P}} = 0$, which, together with the initial condition $\mathbf{P}(0) = \mathbf{1}$, implies $\det \mathbf{P} = 1$. Although this relation is not assumed to hold *a priori* we use it to eliminate $\det \mathbf{P}$ from \overline{W} further on.

The corresponding Legendre-transformed potential is (similar to Alberty *et al.* (1999)) given as

$$\begin{aligned} J^*(\mathbf{S}, s) &= \sup\{\overline{Q} : \mathbf{S} + qs : |\operatorname{dev} \operatorname{sym} \overline{Q}| - q \leq r, q \geq 0\} \\ &= \begin{cases} r|\mathbf{S}| & \text{if } \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{S} = 0, \mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}^T \text{ and } |\mathbf{S}| + s \leq 0, \\ \infty & \text{else.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

In this example, the choice of the increment $\Delta(\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{P})$ of plastic deformation is of particular importance. Volume preservation of plastic flow can either be expressed in direct form as $\det \mathbf{P} = 1$ or in rate form as $\operatorname{tr} \mathbf{P}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{P}} = 0$. The specific form of the potential J^* implies that the latter condition is carried over to the time-incremental problem as $\operatorname{tr} \Delta(\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{P}) = 0$. This condition, however, does not automatically imply $\det \mathbf{P} = 1$ (here von Mises plasticity differs from the model discussed in the previous section), which means we have to construct the time increment $\Delta(\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{P})$ in such a way as to ensure $\det \mathbf{P} = 1$. There is no obvious way to achieve this. One possible solution is

$$\Delta(\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{P}) = \log(\mathbf{P}_0^{-1} \mathbf{P}). \tag{7.3}$$

For $\mathbf{P}_0^{-1} \mathbf{P}$ symmetric and positive definite the logarithm can be calculated via a spectral decomposition. On the other hand for given symmetric $\mathbf{S} = \Delta(\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{P})$ we have $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}_0 \exp \mathbf{S}$, hence $\det \mathbf{P}_0 = 1$ and $\operatorname{tr} \mathbf{S} = 0$ imply $\det \mathbf{P} = 1$. Numerical time-integration algorithms based on such formulations are quite common in finite-strain elastoplasticity (Miehe 1994; Miehe & Stein 1992).

Substitution of the specific forms of J^* and $\Delta(\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{P})$ leads to the reduced functional

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{I}_{\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{P}_0, p_0}(\phi, \mathbf{P}, p) &= \int_{\Omega} \{U((\det \mathbf{C})^{1/2}) + \frac{1}{2} \mu \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{P}^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{P}) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} a p^2 + r |\log(\mathbf{P}_0^{-1} \mathbf{P})| - \mathbf{f} \cdot \phi\} \, d\mathbf{x}, \end{aligned} \tag{7.4}$$

with the three constraints

$$\operatorname{tr} \log(\mathbf{P}_0^{-1} \mathbf{P}) = 0, \quad \mathbf{P}_0^{-1} \mathbf{P} = (\mathbf{P}_0^{-1} \mathbf{P})^T, \quad |\log(\mathbf{P}_0^{-1} \mathbf{P})| + p - p_0 \leq 0.$$

The second and third constraint can be eliminated. Minimizing with respect to p gives

$$p = p_0 - |\log(\mathbf{P}_0^{-1} \mathbf{P})|. \tag{7.5}$$




Figure 3. (a) $\tilde{\Psi}(\alpha)$, (b) $\tilde{\Psi}''(\alpha)$ for $\lambda = 0, \mu = 2, a = 1, r = 5$.

We introduce the symmetric tensor \mathbf{S} as a new independent variable via the substitution $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}_0 \exp \mathbf{S}$. The substitution of (7.5) into (7.4) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{P}_0, p_0}(\phi, \mathbf{S}, p) = & \int_{\Omega} (U((\det \mathbf{C})^{1/2}) + \frac{1}{2}\mu \operatorname{tr}((\exp \mathbf{S})\mathbf{P}_0^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{P}_0(\exp \mathbf{S}))) \\ & + \frac{1}{2}a|\mathbf{S}|^2 + (r - ap_0)|\mathbf{S}| - \mathbf{f} \cdot \phi \, d\mathbf{x} \end{aligned} \quad (7.6)$$

up to a fixed additive constant. There is one remaining constraint:

$$\operatorname{tr} \mathbf{S} = 0.$$

The reduced internal energy reads

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\mathbf{P}_0, p_0}^{\text{red}}(\mathbf{F}) = & \inf \{ U((\det \mathbf{C})^{1/2}) + \frac{1}{2}\mu \operatorname{tr}((\exp \mathbf{S})\mathbf{P}_0^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{P}_0(\exp \mathbf{S})) \\ & + \frac{1}{2}a|\mathbf{S}|^2 + (r - ap_0)|\mathbf{S}| \mid \mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}^T, \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{S} = 0 \}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.7)$$

There is no analytical expression for $\Psi_{\mathbf{P}_0, p_0}^{\text{red}}(\mathbf{F})$, but we can still study its convexity properties by performing the minimization in (7.7) numerically. In order to do this we have to specify the function $U(j)$. A common choice is

$$U(j) = \frac{1}{4}\lambda j^2 - \frac{1}{2}(\lambda + 2\mu) \log j. \quad (7.8)$$

We have $U(j) \rightarrow \infty$ for $j \rightarrow 0$, which prohibits the compression to zero volume with finite force. Also (7.8) reduces to isotropic elastic material in the infinitesimal case with Lamé parameters λ and μ .

Once again $\Psi_{\mathbf{P}_0, p_0}^{\text{red}}$ is not rank-one convex. In order to show this let us define

$$\tilde{\Psi}(\alpha) = \Psi_{1,0}^{\text{red}}(\mathbf{1} + \alpha \mathbf{n} \otimes \mathbf{n}),$$

where \mathbf{n} is an arbitrary unit vector. (Because of isotropy of $\Psi_{\mathbf{P}_0, p_0}^{\text{red}}$ the definition is independent from the choice of \mathbf{n} .) Figure 3 shows the graphs of $\tilde{\Psi}(\alpha)$ and $\tilde{\Psi}''(\alpha)$ and gives a clear indication of non-convex behaviour. (Note that for $\lambda > 0$ but small enough we have $\tilde{\Psi}''(\alpha) > 0$ for large α while $\tilde{\Psi}(\alpha)$ still remains non-convex.)

A remarkable feature of this example is that, surprisingly and opposite from what is found in classical elastoplasticity, even a substantial amount of hardening does not prevent the loss of (rank-one) convexity.

Remark 7.1 (Infinitesimal elastoplasticity). In the same way as in remark 6.2 we can perform the transition to the infinitesimal case. This results in an internal energy

$$\Psi_{\mathbf{P}_0, p_0}^{\text{red}}(\mathbf{F}) = \frac{1}{2}\lambda(\operatorname{tr} \boldsymbol{\epsilon})^2 + \mu \operatorname{tr} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^2 + 2\mu \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{P}_0 \boldsymbol{\epsilon}) - \frac{1}{2(2\mu+a)}(2\mu|\operatorname{dev}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon} + \mathbf{P}_0)| - r + ap_0)_+^2,$$

which once again turns out to be convex in \mathbf{F} (Alberty *et al.* 1999). Consequently, the infinitesimal model differs fundamentally from the finite one.

Appendix A. Discussion and additional mathematical theory

This appendix provides some mathematical concepts employed in the preceding three sections. Besides notions of quasiconvexity (Dacorogna 1989) we discuss cross-quasiconvexity and motivate the necessity (not only the convenience) of the reduced problem in order to detect microstructure.

Definition A 1 (quasiconvexity). A function $\psi : \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called quasi-convex if it satisfies

$$\psi(\mathbf{F}) \leq \frac{1}{\text{vol}(B)} \int_{\mathbf{y} \in B} \psi(\mathbf{F} + \mathbf{D}\tilde{\phi}(\mathbf{y})) \, d\mathbf{y} \quad (\text{A } 1)$$

for all $\tilde{\phi} \in W_0^{1,\infty}(B, \mathbb{R}^d)$ ($_0$ denotes homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions on ∂B). Here the set $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is any open domain in \mathbb{R}^d (with $|\partial B| = 0$); however, it suffices to consider the unit ball.

It is well established that the loss of quasiconvexity gives rise to non-existence of minimizers and hence to the formation of microstructure in infimizing sequences (cf. Ball & James 1987, 1992). The above examples show that Ψ^{red} is not quasiconvex (indeed not even rank-one convex) for typical examples of finite-strain plasticity. This is to some extent surprising, since infinitesimal plasticity is, at least in the presence of hardening, well posed (see remark 7.1 above). The lack of convexity of the corresponding potentials should coincide with the occurrence of microstructures in the associated material models.

Such microstructures are indeed observed experimentally in the form of localization zones or shear bands, especially in the plasticity of metals or geomaterials (Korbel 1998; Perzyna 1998). They effectively are first-order laminates consisting of alternating bands with high and small or no plastic deformation. Such shear bands are usually attributed to loss of ellipticity of the corresponding model, i.e. the Cauchy–Hadamard condition is violated (this is equivalent to the loss of rank-one convexity). But even higher-order laminates should be expected. These are generally not attributed to plastic materials, but even here experimental evidence can be found (Korbel 1998; Ortiz & Repetto 1999).

So far our theoretical findings are in agreement with experimental results. There are, however, new insights to be gained in the field of mechanics of materials as well. Up to now localization phenomena have always been believed to be associated with the presence of material softening, usually caused by some sort of material damage. Hence any description of shear bands had to involve some sort of damage model or at least some phenomenological softening model. Our results show that finite-strain plasticity in itself is already capable of exhibiting localization effects of this kind without invoking any additional models, thus allowing us to explain those phenomena using fewer and maybe better justified constitutive assumptions.

Comments on the associated mathematical structures behind of our theory conclude the appendix. The question we want to follow here is why the reduced incremental minimization problem (5.2) is more tractable than the full incremental minimization problem (4.3). The basic source is that all our existence theory of the

minimization problems relies on showing coerciveness and weak lower semicontinuity of the functional on suitable function spaces. However, weak lower semicontinuity is only sufficient but not necessary for the existence of minimizers.

The full functional has the general structure

$$\mathcal{I}(\phi, z) = \int_{\Omega} \psi(\mathbf{x}, D\phi(\mathbf{x}), z(\mathbf{x})) \, d\mathbf{x} - \ell(\phi), \tag{A 2}$$

where the integral density $\psi : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ depends only locally on the internal variable $z \in \mathbb{R}^k$ not involving any derivatives. Such a structure occurs in many continuum mechanical problems, such as elastic bodies with chemical phases (Fonseca *et al.* 1994), phase transformations problems (where z describes the volume fractions of the different phases (cf. Govindjee *et al.* 2002; Mielke *et al.* 2002)), or in shell-models (Le Dret & Raoult 2000)). Up to technical details (like growth conditions and continuity) the weak lower semi-continuity of the functional \mathcal{I} on $W^{1,q_1}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^{q_2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^k)$ (with suitable $q_1, q_2 \in (1, \infty)$) is equivalent to the *cross-quasiconvexity* (see Fonseca *et al.* 1994; Le Dret & Raoult 2000) and the references therein where also the relation to the more general notion of A -quasiconvexity (Dacorogna 1982; Fonseca & Müller 1999) is discussed.

Definition A 2 (cross-quasiconvexity). The function $\psi : \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called cross-quasiconvex, if for all $(\mathbf{F}^*, z^*) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^k$ we have

$$\psi(\mathbf{F}^*, z^*) \leq \frac{1}{\text{vol}(B)} \int_{\mathbf{y} \in B} \psi(\mathbf{F}^* + D\tilde{\phi}(\mathbf{y}), z^* + \tilde{z}(\mathbf{y})) \, d\mathbf{y} \tag{A 3}$$

for all $\tilde{\phi} \in W_0^{1,\infty}(B, \mathbb{R}^d)$ and all $\tilde{z} \in L^\infty(B, \mathbb{R}^k)$ with $\int_B \tilde{z}(\mathbf{y}) \, d\mathbf{y} = 0$.

Immediate consequences of cross-quasiconvexity are the quasiconvexity (see (A 1)) of $\psi(\mathbf{x}, \cdot, z) : \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (choose $\tilde{z} \equiv 0$ in (A 3)) and the convexity of $\psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{F}, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (choose $\tilde{\phi} \equiv 0$ in (A 3)). In general, these two conditions are not sufficient to guarantee cross-quasiconvexity.

The situation in finite plasticity is even worse. We cannot have convexity in the internal variable $z = (\mathbf{P}, p)$ as Ψ is defined via (4.2), frame indifference implies non-convexity of $\overline{W}(\cdot, p)$ and the convexity of J^* will not restore convexity of $\mathbf{P} \mapsto \Psi(\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{P}, p; \mathbf{P}_0, p_0) = \overline{W}(\mathbf{F}\mathbf{P}, p) + J^*(\Delta(\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{P}), p - p_0)$.

We are thus forced to study the reduced functional \mathcal{I}^{red} with the reduced density

$$\psi^{\text{red}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{F}) = \inf\{\psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{F}, z) \mid z \in \mathbb{R}^k\}.$$

Under very weak assumptions (like continuity of $\psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{F}, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and growth at infinity) we obtain that the infimum in this definition is really a minimum and we may construct a map $Z : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ (which is measurable (cf. Ekeland & Temam 1976, ch. VIII, § 1.4)) such that $\psi^{\text{red}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{F}) = \psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{F}, Z(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{F}))$. The incremental minimization problem for \mathcal{I} in (A 2) is solved as soon as we find the minimizer ϕ of the reduced functional \mathcal{I}^{red} on $W^{1,p_1}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$. In fact, we only let $z(x) = Z(x, D\phi(x))$.

To obtain a minimizer for \mathcal{I}^{red} it is sufficient to have quasiconvexity of ψ^{red} which is much weaker than cross-quasiconvexity of ψ . In fact, cross-quasiconvexity of ψ immediately implies the quasiconvexity of ψ^{red} . However, the hope for finite elastoplasticity is that under suitable assumptions we may have quasiconvexity of ψ^{red} without cross-quasiconvexity of ψ .

References

- Alberty, J., Carstensen, C. & Zarrabi, D. 1999 Adaptive numerical analysis in primal elasto-plasticity with hardening. *Comput. Meth. Appl. Mech. Engng* **171**, 175–204.
- Asaro, R. J. 1983 Crystal plasticity. *J. Appl. Mech.* **50**, 921–934.
- Ball, J. M. 1977 Convexity conditions and existence theorems in nonlinear elasticity. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Analysis* **63**, 337–403.
- Ball, J. M. & James, R. D. 1987 Fine phase mixtures as minimisers of energy. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Analysis* **100**, 13–52.
- Ball, J. M. & James, R. D. 1992 Proposed experimental tests of a theory of fine microstructure and the two-well problem. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. A* **338**, 389–450.
- Ciarlet, P. G. 1988 *Mathematical elasticity. I. Three-dimensional elasticity*. North-Holland.
- Coleman, B. D. & Gurtin, M. E. 1967 Thermodynamics with internal state variables. *J. Chem. Phys.* **47**, 597–613.
- Dacorogna, B. 1982 *Weak continuity and weak lower semicontinuity for nonlinear functionals*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 922. Springer.
- Dacorogna, B. 1989 *Direct methods in the calculus of variations*. Springer.
- Ekeland, I. & Temam, R. 1976 *Convex analysis and variational problems*. North-Holland.
- Fonseca, I. & Müller, S. 1999 A -quasiconvexity: a necessary and sufficient condition for lower semicontinuity under PDE constraints. *SIAM J. Math. Analysis* **30**, 1355–1390.
- Fonseca, I., Kinderlehrer, D. & Pedregal, P. 1994 Energy functionals depending on elastic strain and chemical deposition. *Calc. Var. PDEs* **2**, 283–313.
- Gödert, G. & Hutter, K. 1998 Induced anisotropy in large ice shields: theory and its homogenization. *Continuum Mech. Thermodyn.* **10**, 293–318.
- Govindjee, S., Mielke, A. & Hall, G. J. 2002 The free energy of mixing for n -variant martensitic phase transformations using quasi-convex analysis. (Submitted.)
- Hackl, K. 1997 Generalized standard media and variational principles in classical and finite strain elastoplasticity. *J. Mech. Phys. Solids* **45**, 667–688.
- Halphen, B. & Nguyen, Q. S. 1975 Sur les matériaux standards généralisés. *J. Méc.* **14**, 39–63.
- Han, W. & Reddy, D. 1995 Computational plasticity and numerical analysis. *Comput. Mech. Adv.* **2**, 283–400.
- Korbel, A. 1998 *Structural and mechanical aspects of homogeneous and non-homogeneous deformation in solids* (ed. P. Perzyna), pp. 21–98. CISM Courses, no. 386. Springer.
- Le Dret, H. & Raoult, A. 2000 Variational convergence for nonlinear shell models with directors and related semicontinuity and relaxation results. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Analysis* **154**, 101–134.
- Lee, E. H. 1969 Elastic-plastic deformation at finite strains. *J. Appl. Mech.* **36**, 1–6.
- Maugin, G. A. 1992 *The thermomechanics of plasticity and fracture*. Cambridge University Press.
- Maugin, G. A. 1993 *Material inhomogeneities in elasticity*. Applied Mathematics and Mathematical Computation, vol. 3. Chapman & Hall.
- Miehe, C. 1994 On the representation of Prandtl–Reuß tensors within the framework of multiplicative elasto-plasticity. *Int. J. Plasticity* **10**, 609–621.
- Miehe, C. & Stein, E. 1992 A canonical model of multiplicative elasto-plasticity. formulation and aspects of the numerical implementation. *Eur. J. Mech. A* **11**, 25–43.
- Mielke, A. 2002 Finite elastoplasticity, Lie groups and geodesics on $SL(d)$. In *Geometry, dynamics, mechanics* (ed. P. Newton, A. Weinstein & P. Holmes). Springer. (In the press.)
- Mielke, A. & Theil, F. 1999 A mathematical model for rate-independent phase transformations with hysteresis. In *Proc. Workshop Models Continuum Mech. Analysis Engng* (ed. H.-D. Alber, R. M. Balean & R. Farwig), pp. 117–129. Aachen, Germany: Shaker.
- Mielke, A., Theil, F. & Levitas, V. I. 2002 A variational formulation of rate-independent phase transformations using an extremum principle. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Analysis*. (In the press.)

- Moreau, J. J. 1970 Sur les lois de frottement, de plasticité et de viscosité. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I* **271**, 608–611.
- Moreau, J. J. 1976 Application of convex analysis to the treatment of elastoplastic systems. In *Applications of methods of functional analysis to problems in mechanics*. Springer.
- Ortiz, M. & Repetto, E. A. 1999 Nonconvex energy minimisation and dislocation in ductile single crystals. *J. Mech. Phys. Solids* **47**, 397–462.
- Perzyna, P. 1998 *Constitutive modelling of dissipative solids for localization and fracture* (ed. P. Perzyna), pp. 99–242. CISM Courses, no. 386. Springer.
- Rice, J. R. 1971 Inelastic constitutive relations for solids: an internal-variable theory and its application to metal plasticity. *J. Mech. Phys. Solids* **19**, 433–455.
- Simo, J. C. 1988a A framework for finite strain elastoplasticity based on maximum plastic dissipation and the multiplicative decomposition. I. Continuum formulation. *Comput. Meth. Appl. Mech. Engng* **66**, 199–219.
- Simo, J. C. 1988b A framework for finite strain elastoplasticity based on maximum plastic dissipation and the multiplicative decomposition. II. Computational aspects. *Comput. Meth. Appl. Mech. Engng* **68**, 1–31.
- Simo, J. C. & Ortiz, M. 1985 A unified approach to finite deformation elastoplastic analysis based on the use of hyperelastic constitutive equations. *Comput. Meth. Appl. Mech. Engng* **49**, 221–245.
- Suquet, P.-M. 1981 Sur les équations de la plasticité: existence et régularité des solutions. *J. Méc.* **20**, 3–39.
- Suquet, P.-M. 1988 Discontinuities and plasticity. In *Nonsmooth mechanics and applications* (ed. J. J. Moreau & P. D. Panagiotopoulos), pp. 279–341. CISM Courses no. 302. Springer.
- Zeidler, E. 1985 *Nonlinear functional analysis and its applications*, vol. III. Springer.
- Zeidler, E. 1988 *Nonlinear functional analysis and its applications*, vol. IV. Springer.
- Ziegler, H. & Wehrli, C. 1987 The derivation of constitutive relations from the free energy and the dissipation function. In *Advances in applied mechanics* (ed. Th. Y. Wu & J. W. Hutchinson), vol. 25, pp. 183–237. Academic.