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#### Abstract

There is established the equivalence of methods of computing the effective elastic moduli for potential and bivortical tensor fields. It is shown that in these cases the exact solutions agree and the agreement of the solutions found in a singular approximation is possible only under definite constraints imposed on the parameters of the comparison body.


1. It is known [1] that any symmetric tensor of the second rank can be decomposed into potential and bivortical components. The potential component of elastic fields is found from the equations

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{div} \sigma=-f, \quad \operatorname{Rot} \varepsilon=0, \quad \sigma=\lambda \varepsilon \quad(\operatorname{Rot}=\operatorname{rot} \oplus \operatorname{rot}) \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\sigma, \varepsilon$ are the stress and strain tensors, $\lambda$ is the tensor of the elastic moduli, $f$ is the vector of the volume density of the external forces. (Here and throughout wherever possible, the tensor indices are omitted). In turn, the bivortical component is determined by using the equations

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { Rot } \varepsilon=-\eta, \quad \operatorname{div} \sigma=0, \quad \sigma=\lambda \varepsilon \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\eta$ is the tensor of incompatibility which describes the distribution of the internal stress sources.

Equations (1.1) and (1.2) are used below to compute the effective elastic moduli and the elastic fields of inhomogeneous media for which the material characteristics (the density, elastic moduli, compliances, etc.) are random fields, and $f, \eta$ are regular functions of the coordinates.

Let us first examine potential fields. Together with the field $\lambda(\mathbf{r})$ we introduce the homogeneous comparison field $\lambda_{c}$. The displacement fields $u$ and $u_{c}$ corresponding to the tensors $\lambda$ and $\lambda_{c}$ satisfy the equations

$$
\begin{align*}
& L u=-f, \quad L=\operatorname{div} \lambda \operatorname{def},\left.\quad u\right|_{S}=u_{0}  \tag{1.3}\\
& L_{c} u_{c}=-f, \quad L_{c}=\operatorname{div} \lambda_{c} \operatorname{def},\left.\quad u_{c}\right|_{S}=u_{0} \tag{1.4}
\end{align*}
$$

Here $S$ is the surface bounding the medium, $u_{0}$ is the value of the displacement on the boundary, and because of potentiality the strains $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{a}$ are connected with the displacements $u, u_{c}$ by the relations $\varepsilon=\operatorname{def} u, \quad \varepsilon_{c}=\operatorname{def} u_{c}$. A medium for which the solution of (1.4) is known is selected as the comparison medium.

The problem is to find the strain $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ and the tensor of the effective elastic moduli $\lambda_{*}$ defining the mean strain $\langle\varepsilon\rangle=\operatorname{def}\langle u\rangle$ by the equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
L_{*}\langle u\rangle=-f, \quad L_{*}=\operatorname{div} \lambda_{*} \operatorname{def},\left.\langle u\rangle\right|_{s}=u_{0} \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the angular brackets denote the statistical average.
It can be shown [2] the the equalities

$$
\begin{equation*}
\langle\varepsilon\rangle=\varepsilon_{c}=\operatorname{def} u_{0}, \quad f=0 \tag{1.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

hold in the absence of external forces, and the average taken over the volume agrees with the statistical average.

Denoting the excess fields relative to the comparison body and the operators by primes, we have from (1.3) and (1.4)

$$
\begin{equation*}
L_{\mathrm{c}} u^{\prime}=-L^{\prime} u,\left.\quad u^{\prime}\right|_{s}=0 \quad\left(L^{\prime}=L-L_{c}, \quad u^{\prime}=u-u_{\mathrm{e}}\right) \tag{1.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let us introduce the Green's tensor of the operator $L_{c}$ which satisfies the equation

$$
L_{\mathrm{c}} G=-I \delta,\left.\quad G\right|_{\mathrm{s}}=0
$$

where $I$ is the unit tensor of the second rank, and $\delta$ is the delta function.
We then have from (1.7)

$$
\begin{equation*}
u=u_{c}+G * L^{\prime} u \tag{1.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the asterisk denotes the integral convolution operation. The integral equation (1.8) permits expressing the field $u$ in terms of the known field $u_{c}$. Letting the operator def act on both sides of (1.8), we obtain an equation for the strain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon=\varepsilon_{c}+Q \lambda^{\prime} \varepsilon, \quad Q=\operatorname{def} G * \operatorname{div} \tag{1.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Solving (1.9) for $\varepsilon$, we find

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon=a \varepsilon_{c}, \quad a=\left(I-Q \lambda^{\prime}\right)^{-1} \tag{1.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

In general, the operator $a$ has the meaning of an infinite series

$$
a=\sum_{0}^{\infty} y^{n}, \quad y=Q \lambda^{\prime}
$$

which is obtained in solving (1.9) by the method of iteration,
We now eliminate the field $\varepsilon_{c}$ from (1.10). To do this, we take its average andexpress $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{c}}$ in terms of $\langle\varepsilon\rangle$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon_{c}=\langle a\rangle^{-1}\langle\varepsilon\rangle \tag{1.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Substituting (1.11) into (1.10) yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon=A\langle\varepsilon\rangle, \quad A=a\langle a\rangle^{-1} \tag{1,12}
\end{equation*}
$$

The operator $A$ also has a representation in the form of a series

$$
\begin{equation*}
A=\sum_{0}^{\infty} Y^{n}, \quad Y=t y, \quad t F \equiv F-\langle F\rangle \tag{1.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

The solution (1.12) permits finding the tensor of the effective elastic moduli in the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{*}=\langle\lambda A\rangle, \quad\langle A\rangle=I, \quad\langle\sigma\rangle=\lambda_{*}\langle\varepsilon\rangle \tag{1.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

The expressions (1.12) and (1.14) therefore solve the problem about describing an inhomogeneous deformable medium completely. However, the exact solutions found in the form of operator series are not of formal nature only in rare cases. This is related to the fact that available information about the statistical properties of an arbitrary inhomogeneous medium is insufficient for the computation of $\lambda_{*}$ and $\varepsilon$ according to (1.12) and (1.14). Moreover, the mathematical difficulties of such a computation are still quite great. In this connection it is often necessary to limit oneself to the consideration of approximate solutions [3-7]. One of them is the singular approximation (the $S$-approximation) $[5-7]$ based on extracting the singular component of the Green's tensor $G$, and therefore the operator $Q$ as well. In the general case, the Green's tensor $G$ can be
represented as the difference between two terms $G=G_{\infty}-G_{1}$, one of which $G_{\infty}$ corresponds to an unbounded medium, while the other takes account of the presence of the surface bounding the medium under consideration. Singularities of $\delta$-function type originated in taking the second derivative of the tensor $G$. Introducing the notation [6, 7]

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left(\operatorname{def} \operatorname{div}^{T}\right)^{s} G_{\infty}=g \delta, \quad \operatorname{div}^{T} G * \equiv G * \operatorname{div}  \tag{1.15}\\
& \left(\operatorname{def} \operatorname{div}^{T}\right)^{f} G * F=h F
\end{align*}
$$

where $s$ and $f$ denote the singular and formal parts, and $T$ the transpose, we rewrite (1.12) in the form

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A=\left(I-g \lambda^{\prime}\right)^{-1} R\left\langle\left(I-g \lambda^{\prime}\right)^{-1} R\right\rangle^{-1} \\
& R=\left(I-h \lambda^{\prime}\right)^{-1}\left\langle\left(I-h \lambda^{\prime}\right)^{-1}\right\rangle^{-1}=\sum_{0}^{\infty}\left(t h \lambda^{\prime}\right)^{n}
\end{aligned}
$$

Here $g$ is an ordinary tensor whose properties are determined by the structure of an inhomogeneous medium, $I$ is the unit symmetric tensor of the fourth rank, and the operator $R$ describes the nonlocal part of the interaction.

Since only local interactions are taken into account in the $S$-approximation, only the first member should be retained in the operator $R$. Consequently, the solution of the problem has the following form in place of (1.12) and (1.14)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon=A_{\mathrm{s}}\langle\varepsilon\rangle, \quad \lambda_{*}=\left\langle\lambda A_{8}\right\rangle, \quad A_{s}=\left(I-g \lambda^{\prime}\right)^{-1}\left\langle\left(I-g \lambda^{\prime}\right)^{-1}\right\rangle^{-1} \tag{1.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

Introducing the auxiliary tensor $b_{c}$ by means of the equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
g\left(\lambda_{c}+b_{c}\right)=-I \tag{1,17}
\end{equation*}
$$

we obtain the following equations for $A_{S}$ and $\lambda_{*}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{s}=\left(\lambda+b_{c}\right)^{-1}\left(\lambda_{*}+b_{c}\right), \quad \lambda_{*}+b_{c}=\left\langle\left(\lambda+b_{c}\right)^{-1}\right\rangle^{-1} \tag{1.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

The expressions $(1,18)$ depend on the tensor $\lambda_{c}$, which is governing for both $g$ and $b_{c}$. Depending on the selection of the comparison field $\lambda_{c}$, the upper $\lambda^{+}$and lower $\lambda^{-}$ boundaries for $\lambda_{*}$ [7] can hence be obtained.
2. Let us turn to a computation of the fields and the effective elastic moduli in the case of bivortical fields. The stress fields $\sigma$ and $\sigma_{c}$ corresponding to the tensors $s=\lambda^{-1}$ and $s_{c}=\lambda_{c}{ }^{-1}$ satisfy the equations

$$
\begin{align*}
& L \sigma=-\eta, \quad \operatorname{div} \sigma=0, \quad L=\operatorname{Rot} s, \quad \sigma_{n} \mid s=\sigma_{n}^{\circ}  \tag{2.1}\\
& L_{c} \sigma_{c}=-\eta, \quad \operatorname{div} \sigma_{c}=0, \quad L_{c}=\operatorname{Rot} s_{c y} \quad \sigma_{n}{ }^{c} \mid s=\sigma_{n}{ }^{\circ} \tag{2.2}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\sigma_{n}$ is the stress vector with components $\sigma_{k i} n_{k}$, and $n_{i}$ is the unit vector of the external normal to the surface $S$ bounding the medium. The tensor $s_{*}$ defines the mean stress by using the equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
L_{*}\langle\sigma\rangle=-\eta, \quad \operatorname{div}\langle\sigma\rangle=0, \quad L_{*}=\operatorname{Rot} s_{*},\left.\quad\left\langle\sigma_{n}\right\rangle\right|_{s}=\sigma_{n}^{\circ} \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

As for (1.6), we have for the case $\eta=0$

$$
\langle\sigma\rangle=\sigma_{c}=\sigma_{0}, \quad \eta=0
$$

Let us write the solution (2.1) in the form (1.9). For this, we introduce the Green's tensor $Z$ of the operator $L_{c}$ from (2.2), which satisfies the equation [1]

$$
\begin{aligned}
& L_{c} Z=-\theta^{0}, \quad \operatorname{div} Z=0, \quad \theta^{0}=-\operatorname{Rot} \operatorname{Rot} \zeta, \quad Z_{n} \mid s=0 \\
& \Delta^{2} \zeta=-\delta, \quad \zeta \mid \mathrm{s}=0
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\theta^{0}$ is the unit operator in the subspace of bivortical tensors, $\Delta$ is the Laplace operator, and the tensor components $Z_{n}$ equal $Z_{l i j k} n_{l}$. Then, as for (1.7) we obtain an equation from (2.1) and (2.2)

$$
L_{c} \sigma^{\prime}=-L^{\prime} \sigma, \quad \operatorname{div} \sigma^{\prime}=0, \quad \sigma_{n}^{\prime} \mid s=0
$$

which yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma=\sigma_{c}+P s^{\prime} \sigma, \quad P=Z * \operatorname{Rot} \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Solving (2.4) for $\sigma$, we find

$$
\sigma=b \sigma_{c}, \quad b=\left(I-P s^{\prime}\right)^{-1}=\sum_{0}^{\infty}\left(P s^{\prime}\right)^{n}
$$

Hence, after eliminating the field $\sigma_{\sigma}$, we find the connection between $\sigma$ and $\langle\sigma\rangle$ in the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma=B\langle\sigma\rangle, \quad B=b\langle b\rangle^{-1}=\sum_{0}^{\infty}\left(t P s^{\prime}\right)^{n} \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

The solution (2.5) permits finding the tensor of the effective compliances $s_{*}$ in the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
s_{*}=\langle s B\rangle, \quad\langle B\rangle=I, \quad\langle\varepsilon\rangle=s_{*}\langle\sigma\rangle \tag{2,6}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the $S$-approximation, the field $\sigma$ and the effective compliances $s_{*}$ satisfy the relationships

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma=B_{\mathrm{s}}\langle\sigma\rangle, \quad s_{*}=\left\langle s B_{8}\right\rangle, \quad B_{\mathrm{s}}=\left(I-z s^{\prime}\right)^{-1}\left\langle\left(I-z s^{\prime}\right)^{-1}\right\rangle^{-1} \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the tensor $z$ is defined as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\operatorname{Rot}^{T}\right)^{s} Z_{\infty}=z \theta^{0}, \quad Z=Z_{\infty}-Z_{1} \tag{2,8}
\end{equation*}
$$

The tensors $B_{s}$ and $s_{*}$ can be simplified by using an auxiliary tensor $a_{c}$ introduced according to the equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
z\left(s_{c}+a_{c}\right)=-I \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using (2.9), we obtain equations for $B_{z}$ and $s_{*}$ from (2.8)

$$
\begin{equation*}
B_{*}=\left(s+a_{c}\right)^{-1}\left(s_{*}+a_{c}\right), \quad s_{*}+a_{*}=\left\langle\left(s+a_{c}\right)^{-1}\right\rangle^{-1} \tag{2,10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Exactly as in the case of potential fields, the solution of the problem for the bivortical fields in the $S$-approximation will depend on the parameter $s_{c}$ of the comparison body. We obtain the upper $s^{+}$and lower $s^{-}$boundary of the field $s_{*}[7]$ from (2.10) depending on the choice of the comparison field $s_{c}$.
3. Let us show that the solutions (1.12) and (1.4) for the potential fields are equivalent to the solutions (2.5) and (2.6) for the bivortical fields.

We first prove that the Green's tensor $Z$ which has the form [1]

$$
\begin{equation*}
Z=\lambda_{c}\left[I+\operatorname{def} G * \operatorname{div} \lambda_{c}\right] \operatorname{Rot} \zeta * \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

satisfies the relationship

$$
\begin{equation*}
P=-\lambda_{c}-\lambda_{c} Q \lambda_{c} \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the definitions (1.9) and (2.4) have been taken into account. Indeed, the equation

$$
Z * \operatorname{Rot}=\lambda_{c}\left[I+\operatorname{def} G * \operatorname{div} \lambda_{c}\right] \operatorname{Rot} \operatorname{Rot} \zeta *
$$

together with the identity [1]

$$
\Delta^{2}=\operatorname{Rot} \operatorname{Rot}+\operatorname{def} \pi, \quad \pi=(2 \Delta-\operatorname{grad} \operatorname{div}) \operatorname{div}
$$

and the equation

$$
G * \operatorname{div} \lambda_{c} \operatorname{def}=-I
$$

obtained from (1.4), yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
& P=\lambda_{c} \operatorname{Rot} \operatorname{Rot} \zeta *+\lambda_{c} \operatorname{def} G * \operatorname{div} \lambda_{c}\left(\Delta^{2}-\operatorname{def} \pi\right) \zeta *= \\
& \lambda_{c} \dot{\operatorname{Rot} \operatorname{Rot} \zeta *+\lambda_{c} \operatorname{def} G * \operatorname{div} \lambda_{c} \Delta^{2 \zeta} \zeta+\lambda_{c}\left(\Delta^{2}\right)-} \\
& \quad \operatorname{Rot} \operatorname{Rot}) \zeta *=\lambda_{c}\left(I+Q \lambda_{c}\right) \Delta^{2} \zeta *
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence, (3.2) obviously results (because of the equation $\Delta^{2} \zeta=-\delta$ ). Using (3.2), we find for the operator $b$ in $(2,5)$

$$
b^{-1}=I-P s^{\prime}=\lambda_{c} s+\lambda_{c} Q \lambda_{c} s^{\prime}
$$

Hence, after substituting $\lambda_{c} s^{\prime}=-\lambda^{\prime} s$ and taking account of (1.10) we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
b^{-1}=\lambda_{c}\left(I-Q \lambda^{\prime}\right) s, \quad b=\lambda a s_{c} \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The relationship (3.3) interrelating the operators $a$ and $b$ also permits establishment of a connection between the operators $A$ and $B$ as well. Substituting (3.3) into (2.5), we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
B=\lambda A \lambda_{*}^{-1} \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here the definitions (1.12) and (1.14) of the operator $A$ and the tensor $\lambda_{*}$ have been taken into account.

We now find the connection between $\lambda_{*}$, obtained by using ( 1.14 ), and $s_{*}$, computed according to (2.6). For this, we substitute (3.4) into (2.6), which yields (since $\langle A\rangle=I$ )

$$
\begin{equation*}
s_{*}=\langle s B\rangle=\left\langle A \lambda_{*}^{-1}\right\rangle=\lambda_{*}^{-1} \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore, the tensors of the effective elastic moduli agree in both cases and are independent of the nature of the fields being considered. According to (2.5), (3.4) and (3.5), we write for the strain field $\varepsilon$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon=s B\langle\sigma\rangle=s B \lambda_{*}\langle\varepsilon\rangle=A\langle\varepsilon\rangle \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

which agrees with (1.12). However, despite the fact that the operator $A$ in (1.12) and (3.6) is the same, the strains $\varepsilon$. computed by means of these formulas are distinct. This is explained by the fact that the strain tensor $\langle\varepsilon\rangle$ in (1.12) and (3.6) satisfies different equations. In the first case it is found according to (1.5) and in the second by using (2.3) and (2.6). The solutions (1.12) and (3.6) agree only in the case $\varphi=0, \eta=0$.
4. Let us consider the solutions (1.17) and (2.10) obtained in the $S$-approximation for the potential and bivortical fields.

Only the tensors $g$ and $z$, defined in terms of the Green's tensors $G_{\infty}$ and $Z_{\infty}$ for an inhomogeneous medium according to $(1,15)$ and $(2,8)$ are used in the $S$-approximation, hence it is expedient first to establish a connection analogous to (3.2) between them. It can be shown that all the calculations in Sect. 3, associated with the derivation of (3.2), remain valid also in the examination of the operators $Q_{\infty}$ and $P_{\infty}$ in $\zeta$ is understood to be a Green's function of the operator $\Delta^{2}$ for an unbounded medium which has the form $\zeta=r /(8 \pi)$.

Performing the replacements $P \rightarrow P_{\infty}$ and $Q \rightarrow Q_{\infty}$ in (3.2) and taking the singular component from both sides of the equality, we write

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{\infty}{ }^{\mathrm{s}}=-\lambda_{c}-\lambda_{c} Q_{\infty}{ }^{s} \lambda_{c} \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

But the operators $Q_{\infty}{ }^{s}$ and $P_{\infty}{ }^{s}$ degenerate, according to (1.15) and (2.8), into the tensors $g$ and $z$, respectively. Taking account of the definitions (1.17) and (2.9) and ex pressing $Q_{\infty}{ }^{s}$ and $P_{\infty}{ }^{s}$ in terms of the tensors $b_{c}$ and $a_{\varepsilon}$

$$
Q_{\infty}{ }^{5}=-\left(\lambda_{c}+b_{c}\right)^{-1}, \quad P_{\infty}^{3}=-\left(s_{c}+a_{c}\right)^{-1}
$$

we obtain from (4.1) after simple manipulations

$$
\left(s_{c}+a_{c}\right)^{-1}=\left(\lambda_{c}^{-1}+b_{c}^{-1}\right)^{-1}
$$

which reduces to the relationship

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{\mathrm{e}} b_{c}=I, \quad \lambda_{c} s_{c}=I \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

because of the equality $\lambda_{e} s_{e}=I$.
Now, let us transform the expression for the tensor $s_{*}$ from (2.10) found in the $S$-approximation. Using (4.2) and the equality $\lambda s=I$, we obtain from (2.10) and (1.18)

$$
\begin{gathered}
s_{*}+a_{c}=\left\langle\left(\lambda^{-1}+b_{c}^{-1}\right)^{-1}\right\rangle^{-1}=a_{c}\left\langle I-b_{c}\left(\lambda+b_{c}\right)^{-1}\right\rangle^{-1}= \\
a_{c}\left[I-b_{c}\left(\lambda_{*}+b_{c}\right)^{-1}\right]^{-1}=\lambda_{*}{ }^{-1}+a_{c}
\end{gathered}
$$

Therefore, the relationship (3.5) is also satisfied in the $S$-approximation, however, under the additional condition (4.2).

Let us transform the tensor $B_{8}$. It is seen that by taking account of (4.2) and (4.3), the tensors $B_{s}$ from (2.10) and $A_{s}$ from (1.18) satisfy the equality

$$
\begin{equation*}
B_{z}=\lambda A_{s} \lambda_{*}^{-1} \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Substituting (4.4) into (2.7), we find for the strains

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon=s B_{s}\langle\sigma\rangle=A_{s} \lambda_{*}-1 \lambda_{*}\langle\varepsilon\rangle=A_{*}\langle\varepsilon\rangle \tag{4.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

This establishes the equivalence of computing the potential (1.16) and the bivortical (4.5) fields in the $S$-approximation. However, as in the case of the exact solutions(see Sect. 3), this does not mean equality of the field (1.16) to field (4.5).

In conclusion, let us note that using the mean values $\langle\lambda\rangle$ and $\langle s\rangle$ as $\lambda_{c}$ and $s_{c}$ does not satisfy the relationship (4.2), and therefore, does not lead to (4.3) - (4.5).

Both computation schemes lead to identical results for both the tensor of the effective elastic moduli and for the fields in the solution of (1.1) and (1.2) without right sides, i. e., for $f=0$ and $\eta=0$,
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