SOLVING LINEAR ELASTICITY BY RENOVATED BERNARDI-RAUGEL ELEMENTS ON SIMPLICIAL MESHES

RUISHU WANG *, GRAHAM HARPER †, JIANGGUO LIU ‡, SIMON TAVENER §, AND RAN ZHANG ¶

Abstract. This paper presents new numerical methods for solving linear elasticity on simplicial meshes based on renovation of the Bernardi-Raugel finite elements, which were originally designed for Stokes flow. The reduced integration technique (or a projection to the constant space) is utilized for handling the dilation term (divergence of displacement). These new methods are locking-free, as supported by rigorous analysis and numerical experiments. Renovation of other Stokes element pairs to linear elasticity is also briefly examined.

Key words. Bernardi-Raugel elements, linear elasticity, locking-free, tetrahedral meshes, triangular meshes

AMS subject classifications. 65N30, 74B05

1. Introduction.

This paper is concerned with finite element methods for linear elasticity in its usual form

$$\begin{cases} -\nabla\cdot\sigma = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{x}\in\Omega, \\ \mathbf{u}|_{\Gamma^D} = \mathbf{u}_D, \quad (-\sigma\mathbf{n})|_{\Gamma^N} = \mathbf{t}_N, \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where Ω is a two- or three-dimensional bounded domain occupied by a homogeneous and isotropic elastic material, $\mathbf{f}$ is a body force, $\mathbf{u}_D, \mathbf{t}_N$ are respectively Dirichlet and Neumann data, $\mathbf{n}$ is the outward unit normal vector on the domain boundary $\partial\Omega = \Gamma^D \cup \Gamma^N$. As usual, $\mathbf{u}$ is the solid displacement,

$$\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\nabla\mathbf{u} + (\nabla\mathbf{u})^T\right)$$

is the strain tensor, and

$$\sigma = 2\mu\,\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}) + \lambda(\nabla\cdot\mathbf{u})\mathbf{I}$$

is the Cauchy stress tensor, where $\mathbf{I}$ is the order two or three identity matrix.

Note that the Lamé constants λ, μ are given by

$$\lambda = \frac{E\nu}{(1+\nu)(1-2\nu)}, \qquad \mu = \frac{E}{2(1+\nu)}, \tag{2}$$

where E is the elasticity modulus and ν is the Poisson's ratio.

*School of Mathematical Sciences, Jilin University, Changchun, Jilin 130012, China (wangrs16@mails.jlu.edu.cn)

†Department of Mathematics, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523-1874, USA harper@math.colostate.edu)

‡Department of Mathematics, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523-1874, USA (liu@math.colostate.edu)

§Department of Mathematics, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523-1874, USA tavener@math.colostate.edu)

¶School of Mathematical Sciences, Jilin University, Changchun, Jilin 130012, China, zhangran@jlu.edu.cn)

A main issue in the development of finite element methods for linear elasticity is the so-called *Poisson-locking*, which is often manifested as loss of convergence rates in displacement and/or other quantities when $\lambda \to \infty$ or $\nu \to \frac{1}{2}$, that is, the material is nearly incompressible. It is well known that the linear Lagrangian P_1^2 element suffers Poisson-locking [9].

Mixed finite element methods (MFEMs) based on the Hellinger-Reissner formulation overcome Poisson-locking by design. Various types of MFEMs can be found in the literature, e.g., [3, 4, 14, 19, 21]. However, MFEMs involve more unknowns and result in saddle-point problems that are usually not easy to solve.

Recently, novel weak Galerkin (WG) finite element methods have been developed for linear elasticity. These include (i) The lowest-order methods on various types of meshes that use constant vector approximants both in element interiors and on inter-element boundaries [20, 32]; (ii) Higher order methods using polynomial approximants (degree 1 or higher) for general polygonal or polyhedral meshes [30]. These WG methods are developed based on the primal formulation but have been proved to be locking-free.

It is known that there are similarities between linear elasticity and Stokes flow, when a pseudo-pressure is introduced to elasticity based on the divergence of displacement (dilation). There are efforts on reusing the Stokes elements for linear elasticity, e.g., [22, 23]. These locking-free finite element methods are developed based on the displacement-pressure mixed formulation, but a biorthogonal system can be established so that the pressure degrees of freedom can be statically condensed and the mixed finite element methods become much more efficient.

Therefore, it is natural to consider reusing stable Stokes element pairs for solving linear elasticity in the primal formulation. In [31], the Bernardi-Raugel elements for Stokes flow [7] were reused for the elasticity part in poroelasticity problems on triangular and tetrahedral meshes. The Darcy part was solved in [31] by a mixed method based on the Raviart-Thomas element. But the error analysis was conducted for the whole Biot system (poroelasticity).

This paper intends to provide an independent and rigorous analysis on reusing Bernardi-Raugel elements and other Stokes elements to develop locking-free finite element solvers for linear elasticity on simplicial meshes. Our investigation reveals that to reuse a Stokes element for linear elasticity as presented in Scheme (14), the approximation space for Stokes velocity or elasticity displacement needs to satisfy the following property elementwise:

$$\overline{\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \Pi_h \mathbf{v})} = 0, \tag{3}$$

where $\mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Omega)^d$, Π_h is the global projection operator from $H^1(\Omega)^d$ to the aforementioned approximation space, and the overline is the elementwise average for the divergence of a vector-valued function. This will be further elaborated in Sections 2, 3, and 6.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 briefly reviews the definitions and properties of the first order Bernardi-Raugel elements that were originally designed for Stokes flow [7]. Section 3 presents finite element schemes for linear elasticity based on renovation of the first order Bernardi-Raugel elements on simplicial meshes. These schemes involve only the displacement unknowns and are in the general strain-div formulation. Section 4 presents rigorous error estimation in the energy-norm and L^2-norm for the finite element schemes. Section 5 performs numerical experiments on three widely tested examples to illustrate the theoretical estimates.

Section 6 examines reuse of other Stokes element pairs for linear elasticity. Section 7 concludes the paper with some remarks.

2. Bernardi-Raugel Elements on Triangles and Tetrahedra. This section briefly reviews the definitions and properties of the first order Bernardi-Raugel elements (BR_1) constructed in the original paper [7] for triangles and tetrahedra.

BR_1 Elements for Triangles. Let T be a triangle with vertices $a_i = (x_i, y_i), i = 1, 2, 3$. Let $e_i (i = 1, 2, 3)$ be the edge opposite to vertex a_i and $\mathbf{n}_i$ be the outward unit normal vector on e_i. Let $\lambda_i\,(i = 1, 2, 3)$ be the barycentric coordinates. We consider three edge-based bubble functions

$$\mathbf{b}_1 = \mathbf{n}_1\lambda_2\lambda_3, \quad \mathbf{b}_2 = \mathbf{n}_2\lambda_3\lambda_1, \quad \mathbf{b}_3 = \mathbf{n}_3\lambda_1\lambda_2. \tag{4}$$

Let $P_1(T)^2$ be the space of vector-valued linear polynomials defined on T. We define

$$\mathrm{BR}_1(T) = P_1(T)^2 + \mathrm{Span}(\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{b}_3). \tag{5}$$

This definition is extended to a triangular mesh with considerations on (i) continuous piecewise linear polynomials on the whole mesh; (ii) consistency in edge normal vectors for two adjacent elements and domain boundaries.

It was shown in [7] that BR_1 together with the piecewise constant space form a stable element pair for Stokes flow. We usually denote this pair as (BR_1, P_0).

BR_1 Elements for Tetrahedra. This is very similar to that discussed in the previous paragraphs. Now let T be a tetrahedron with vertices $a_i = (x_i, y_i, z_i), i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Let $e_i\,(i = 1, 2, 3, 4)$ be the face opposite to vertex a_i and $\mathbf{n}_i$ be the outward unit normal vector on face e_i. Let $\lambda_i\,(i = 1, 2, 3, 4)$ be the barycentric coordinates. We consider four face-based bubble functions

$$\mathbf{b}_1 = \mathbf{n}_1\lambda_2\lambda_3\lambda_4, \quad \mathbf{b}_2 = \mathbf{n}_2\lambda_3\lambda_4\lambda_1, \quad \mathbf{b}_3 = \mathbf{n}_3\lambda_4\lambda_1\lambda_2, \quad \mathbf{b}_4 = \mathbf{n}_4\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3. \tag{6}$$

Let $P_1(T)^3$ be the space of vector-valued linear polynomials on tetrahedron T. Then the BR_1 space on this tetrahedron is defined as

$$\mathrm{BR}_1(T) = P_1(T)^3 + \mathrm{Span}(\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{b}_3, \mathbf{b}_4). \tag{7}$$

For the rest of this paper, we unify the treatments for BR_1 on triangles and tetrahedra. Distinction is made only when necessary.

Let $\mathcal{T}_h$ be a partition of the given domain Ω consisting of d-simplexes ($d = 2$ for triangles and $d = 3$ for tetrahedra). We use Γ_h^D to denote the set of all edges or faces of $\mathcal{T}_h$ that are on the Dirichelt boundary Γ^D. We define approximation spaces

$$V_h = \{\mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Omega)^d : \mathbf{v}|_T \in \mathrm{BR}_1(T), \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h\}, \tag{8}$$

$$V_h^{0,D} = \{\mathbf{v} \in V_h : \mathbf{v}|_{\Gamma_h^D} = \mathbf{0}\}, \tag{9}$$

where

$$\mathrm{BR}_1(T) = P_1(T)^d \oplus \mathrm{Span}\{\mathbf{b}_i, 1 \le i \le d+1\},$$

$$\mathbf{b}_i = \mathbf{n}_i \prod_{j=1, j\neq i}^{d+1} \lambda_j.$$

Now we consider the local and global projection operators defined in [7]. For $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, $\mathbf{v} \in H^1(T)^d$, the projection operator $\Pi_T : H^1(T)^d \to \mathrm{BR}_1(T)$ is defined as

$$\Pi_T \mathbf{v} = \tilde{\Pi}_T \mathbf{v} + \sum_{i=1}^{d+1} \alpha_i \mathbf{b}_i,$$

where $\tilde{\Pi}_T$ is actually the interpolation operator

$$\tilde{\Pi}_T \mathbf{v} = \sum_{i=1}^{d+1} \mathbf{v}(a_i)\lambda_i$$

and

$$\alpha_i = \left(\int_{e_i} (\mathbf{v} - \tilde{\Pi}_T \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{n} \right) \Big/ \int_{e_i} \prod_{j=1, j\neq i}^{d+1} \lambda_j, \qquad 1 \le i \le d+1.$$

The projection operator Π_T satisfies

$$(\Pi_T \mathbf{v})(a_i) = \mathbf{v}(a_i), \quad 1 \le i \le d+1, \tag{10}$$

$$\int_{e_i} (\mathbf{v} - \Pi_T \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0, \quad 1 \le i \le d+1. \tag{11}$$

The global projection operator $\Pi_h : H^1(\Omega)^d \to V_h$ is defined as

$$(\Pi_h \mathbf{v})|_T = \Pi_T(\mathbf{v}|_T).$$

From (11), we have, for any $\mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Omega)^d$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\overline{\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \Pi_h \mathbf{v})}\|^2 &= \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_T \overline{\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \Pi_h \mathbf{v})}\ \overline{\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \Pi_h \mathbf{v})} \\
&= \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \overline{\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \Pi_h \mathbf{v})} \int_T \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \Pi_h \mathbf{v}) \\
&= \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \overline{\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \Pi_h \mathbf{v})} \int_{\partial T} (\mathbf{v} - \Pi_h \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{n} \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

This is to say that on each element we have

$$\overline{\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \Pi_h \mathbf{v})} = 0. \tag{12}$$

3. Solving Linear Elasticity by Renovated Bernardi-Raugel Elements.

Combined with the reduced integration technique [10, 15, 25], the Bernardi-Raugel elements discussed in the previous section can be utilized to solve linear elasticity on simplicial meshes. For ease of presentation, we focus on triangular meshes.

Let Ω be a polygonal domain equipped with a triangular mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$. Let $\mathbf{v}_h \in V_h$, as defined in (8). For a triangle $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, it is known that in general $\mathrm{div}(\mathbf{v}_h)$ is not a constant on T. We consider its average $\overline{\mathrm{div}(\mathbf{v}_h)}$ on T, namely, the local projection into the space of constant scalars. This technique is also called *reduced integration* [25].

For a triangle $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ satisfying $T \cap \Gamma^D \neq \emptyset$ and an edge $e = \partial T \cap \Gamma_h^D$, we define $\mathbf{u}_{D,h} \in V_h|_{\Gamma_h^D}$ on e by

$$(\mathbf{u}_{D,h})|_e = \tilde{\Pi}_e(\mathbf{u}_D) + \left(\int_e (\mathbf{u}_D - \tilde{\Pi}_e \mathbf{u}_D) \cdot \mathbf{n} \Big/ \int_e \mathbf{b}_e \cdot \mathbf{n} \right) \mathbf{b}_e, \tag{13}$$

where $\tilde{\Pi}_e$ is the interpolation operator onto $P_1(e)^d$, $\mathbf{n}$ is the outward unit normal vector on e, and $\mathbf{b}_e$ is the bubble function associated with edge e such that $(\mathbf{b}_e)|_e \neq \mathbf{0}$. It is easy to see that

$$(\Pi_h \mathbf{u})|_{\Gamma_h^D} = \mathbf{u}_{D,h}.$$

We consider a finite element scheme in the strain-div formulation: Find $\mathbf{u}_h \in V_h$ such that $\mathbf{u}_h|_{\Gamma_h^D} = \mathbf{u}_{D,h}$ and

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) = \mathcal{F}_h(\mathbf{v}_h), \qquad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in V_{h,D}^0, \tag{14}$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) = 2\mu \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_h), \varepsilon(\mathbf{v}_h))_T + \lambda \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\overline{\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_h}, \overline{\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h})_T \tag{15}$$

and

$$\mathcal{F}_h(\mathbf{v}_h) = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v}_h)_T - \sum_{e \in \Gamma_h^N} \langle \mathbf{t}_N, \mathbf{v}_h \rangle_e. \tag{16}$$

Enforcing boundary conditions. It is clear that there are two sets of basis functions for the displacement: node-based and edge-based. Compatibility among these two types of functions needs to be maintained in enforcement or incorporation of boundary conditions. Here we discuss the treatments for 2-dim problems only, since 3-dim treatments are very similar.

(i) For a Dirichlet edge, one can enforce the Dirichlet condition at the two end nodes by a direct evaluation (interpolation) of the Dirichlet data. Then the difference between the original Dirichlet data and the interpolant is utilized to calculate the coefficient for the edge bubble function. See (13).

(ii) For a Neumann edge, integrals of the Neumann data against the three basis functions (two linear polynomials for the end nodes, one quadratic for the edge) are computed directly and assembled into the global right-hand side of the sparse discrete linear system. See the 2nd term in (16).

4. Analysis.

This section presents error analysis for the proposed finite element scheme. In [9, 10], similar estimates were established for pure displacement problems in the grad-div formulation. In this paper, we consider more generally the mixed boundary conditions, for which we need to use the strain-div formulation. For convenience, we use $A \lesssim B$ to simplify an inequality $A \leq CB$, where $C > 0$ is a constant that may take different values at different occasions but is independent of λ and h.

4.1. Regularity Estimates.

In this subsection, we establish regularity results (mainly Theorem 2) that will be used later in analysis for finite element solutions.

For the rest of this paper, we assume that the boundary data $\mathbf{u}_D \in H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Gamma^D)$ and $\mathbf{t}_N \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma^N)$ satisfy the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis 4.1. *There exists* $\mathbf{z} \in H^3(\Omega)^d$ $(d = 2, 3)$ *such that*

$$(\nabla \times \mathbf{z})|_{\Gamma^D} = \mathbf{u}_D, \tag{17}$$

$$\|\mathbf{z}\|_{H^3(\Omega)} \lesssim \left(\|\mathbf{u}_D\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Gamma^D)} + \|\mathbf{t}_N\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma^N)} \right). \tag{18}$$

Lemma 1. *Let* $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ $(d = 2, 3)$ *be a bounded polygonal or polyhedral domain. Let* $\ell = 1$ *or* 2. *For any* $\mathbf{v} \in H^\ell(\Omega)^d$, *there exists* $\mathbf{w} \in H^\ell(\Omega)^d$ *such that*

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{w} = \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \|\mathbf{w}\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}\|_{H^{\ell-1}(\Omega)}.$$

Proof. Let D be a disc that contains $\bar{\Omega}$. It is known from [10] that there exists an operator $E : H^{\ell-1}(\Omega) \to H^{\ell-1}(D)$ such that for any $q \in H^{\ell-1}(\Omega)$,

$$\|E(q)\|_{H^{\ell-1}(D)} \lesssim \|q\|_{H^{\ell-1}(\Omega)} \qquad \text{and} \qquad E(q)|_\Omega = q. \tag{19}$$

Let $\zeta \in H^{\ell+1}(D)$ be the solution of the following elliptic boundary value problem

$$\Delta \zeta = E(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}) \quad \text{in } D,$$
$$\zeta = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial D.$$

From the theory on elliptic regularity [10] and (19), we have

$$\|\zeta\|_{H^{\ell+1}(D)} \lesssim \|E(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})\|_{H^{\ell-1}(D)} \lesssim \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}\|_{H^{\ell-1}(\Omega)}.$$

Let $\mathbf{w} = \nabla \zeta$. Then we have $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{w} = \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}$ and

$$\|\mathbf{w}\|_{H^\ell(\Omega)} \le \|\mathbf{w}\|_{H^\ell(D)} \le \|\zeta\|_{H^{\ell+1}(D)} \lesssim \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}\|_{H^{\ell-1}(\Omega)},$$

which completes the proof. □

Theorem 2. *Let* $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ $(d = 2, 3)$ *be a bounded convex polygonal or polyhedral domain and* $\mathbf{f} \in L^2(\Omega)^d$. *Then the elasticity boundary value problem (1) has a unique solution* $\mathbf{u} \in H^2(\Omega)$ *such that*

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \lambda \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{u}_D\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Gamma^D)} + \|\mathbf{t}_N\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma^N)}. \tag{20}$$

Proof. The existence and uniqueness of the elasticity problem (1) was established in [29]. By Hypothesis 4.1, there exists $\mathbf{z} \in H^3(\Omega)^d$ satisfying (17) and (18). Then $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{u} - \nabla \times \mathbf{z} \in H^2(\Omega)^d$ satisfies

$$-\nabla \cdot (2\mu\varepsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}) + \lambda(\nabla \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{u}})\mathbf{I}) = \tilde{\mathbf{f}} \quad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{21}$$
$$\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{on } \Gamma^D, \tag{22}$$
$$-(2\mu\varepsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}) + \lambda(\nabla \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{u}})\mathbf{I})\mathbf{n} = \tilde{\mathbf{t}}_N \quad \text{on } \Gamma^N, \tag{23}$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathbf{f}} = \mathbf{f} + \nabla \cdot \big(2\mu\varepsilon(\nabla \times \mathbf{z}) + \lambda(\nabla \cdot (\nabla \times \mathbf{z}))\mathbf{I}\big),$$
$$\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_N = \mathbf{t}_N + \big(2\mu\varepsilon(\nabla \times \mathbf{z}) + \lambda \nabla \cdot (\nabla \times \mathbf{z})\mathbf{I}\big)\,\mathbf{n}.$$

By (18) and the triangle inequality, we have

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{z}\|_{H^3(\Omega)}$$
$$\lesssim \|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{u}_D\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Gamma^D)} + \|\mathbf{t}_N\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma^N)}. \tag{24}$$

By (18), the trace inequality, and the triangle inequality, we have

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_N\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma^N)} \le \|\mathbf{t}_N\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma^N)} + \|\mathbf{z}\|_{H^3(\Omega)}$$

$$\lesssim \|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{u}_D\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Gamma^D)} + \|\mathbf{t}_N\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma^N)}. \tag{25}$$

Another round use of the triangle inequality yields

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \lambda\|\nabla\cdot\mathbf{u}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$$

$$\le \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \lambda\|\nabla\cdot\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|(\nabla\times\mathbf{z})\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \lambda\|\nabla\cdot(\nabla\times\mathbf{z})\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$$

$$\le \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \lambda\|\nabla\cdot\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{z}\|_{H^3(\Omega)}, \tag{26}$$

where we have used the fact that $\nabla\cdot(\nabla\times\mathbf{z}) = 0$.

It is now clear that the claimed result of the theorem can be derived from (18), (26), and the following regularity estimate about $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$:

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \lambda\|\nabla\cdot\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{u}_D\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Gamma^D)} + \|\mathbf{t}_N\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma^N)}. \tag{27}$$

The rest of the proof is devoted to a derivation of (27).

Let $H^1_D(\Omega) = \{\mathbf{w} \in H^1(\Omega) : \mathbf{w}|_{\Gamma^D} = \mathbf{0}\}$. Multiplying both sides of (21) by $\mathbf{w} \in H^1_D(\Omega)$, we obtain

$$2\mu(\varepsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}), \varepsilon(\mathbf{w})) + \lambda(\nabla\cdot\tilde{\mathbf{u}}, \nabla\cdot\mathbf{w}) = (\tilde{\mathbf{f}}, \mathbf{w}) - \langle\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_N, \mathbf{w}\rangle_{\Gamma^N}. \tag{28}$$

Then we take $\mathbf{w} = \tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ and apply the trace inequality to obtain

$$2\mu\|\varepsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{u}})\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_N\|_{L^2(\Gamma^N)}\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Gamma^N)}$$

$$\lesssim \|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_N\|_{L^2(\Gamma^N)}\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}.$$

Since $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in H^1_D(\Omega)$, the Korn's inequality [8] implies that

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\varepsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{u}})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_N\|_{L^2(\Gamma^N)}. \tag{29}$$

By Lemma 1, there exists $\mathbf{w}^* \in H^1(\Omega)^d$ such that

$$\nabla\cdot\mathbf{w}^* = \nabla\cdot\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \|\mathbf{w}^*\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\nabla\cdot\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \tag{30}$$

Then we multiply both sides of (21) by the above $\mathbf{w}^*$ to obtain

$$2\mu(\varepsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}), \varepsilon(\mathbf{w}^*)) + \lambda(\nabla\cdot\tilde{\mathbf{u}}, \nabla\cdot\mathbf{w}^*)$$

$$= (\tilde{\mathbf{f}}, \mathbf{w}^*) + \langle 2\mu(\varepsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}) + \lambda(\nabla\cdot\tilde{\mathbf{u}})\mathbf{I})\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{w}^*\rangle_{\Gamma^D} - \langle\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_N, \mathbf{w}^*\rangle_{\Gamma^N}.$$

If follows from (30) that

$$\lambda\|\nabla\cdot\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\mathbf{w}^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_N\|_{L^2(\Gamma^N)}\|\mathbf{w}^*\|_{L^2(\Gamma^N)}$$

$$+(2\mu\|\varepsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{u}})\|_{L^2(\Gamma^D)} + \lambda\|\nabla\cdot\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Gamma^D)})\|\mathbf{w}^*\|_{L^2(\Gamma^D)}.$$

Consider the case $\lambda \to \infty$. We apply the Young's inequality, (30), and (29) to obtain

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|^2_{H^1(\Omega)} + \lambda\|\nabla\cdot\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_N\|^2_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma^N)}$$

$$+\frac{1}{9}\left(2\mu\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \lambda\|\nabla\cdot\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\right)^2. \tag{31}$$

Again by Lemma 1, there exists $\boldsymbol{\psi} \in H^2(\Omega)$ such that

$$\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\psi} = \nabla \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \|\boldsymbol{\psi}\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\nabla \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}.$$

Together with (31), this implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\boldsymbol{\psi}\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \lesssim |\nabla \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{u}}|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \left(\|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_N\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma^N)} \right) \\ + \frac{1}{3\sqrt{\lambda}} \left(2\mu \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \lambda \|\nabla \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Note that Equation (21)-(23) can be rewritten as

$$-\mu\Delta\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - (\mu+\lambda)\nabla(\nabla\cdot\tilde{\mathbf{u}}) = \tilde{\mathbf{f}} \quad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{33}$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{on } \Gamma^D, \tag{34}$$

$$-2\mu(\varepsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}) + \lambda\nabla\cdot\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{I})\mathbf{n} = \tilde{\mathbf{t}}_N \quad \text{on } \Gamma^N. \tag{35}$$

We set

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}} = \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \boldsymbol{\psi}, \tag{36}$$

$$p = -\left(\frac{\mu+\lambda}{\mu}\right) \nabla \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{u}}. \tag{37}$$

Then $(\hat{\mathbf{u}}, p) \in H^2(\Omega)^d \times H^1(\Omega)$ is the solution of the following Stokes problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta\hat{\mathbf{u}} + \nabla p = \frac{1}{\mu}\tilde{\mathbf{f}} + \Delta\boldsymbol{\psi} \quad &\text{in } \Omega, \\ \nabla\cdot\hat{\mathbf{u}} = 0 \quad &\text{in } \Omega, \\ \hat{\mathbf{u}} = -\boldsymbol{\psi} \quad &\text{on } \Gamma^D, \\ -\left(2\mu\varepsilon(\hat{\mathbf{u}}) + \frac{\mu\lambda}{\mu+\lambda}p\right)\mathbf{n} = \tilde{\mathbf{t}}_N + 2\mu\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{\psi})\mathbf{n} \quad &\text{on } \Gamma^N. \end{aligned}$$

By the regularity of Stokes problems [11], we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\hat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \|p\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ \lesssim &\|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\Delta\boldsymbol{\psi}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\boldsymbol{\psi}\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Gamma^D)} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_N\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma^N)} + \|\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{\psi})\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma^N)}. \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Substituting (36) and (37) into (38) and using the trace inequality and (32), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \frac{\mu+\lambda}{\mu}\|\nabla\cdot\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ \lesssim &\|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\boldsymbol{\psi}\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_N\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma^N)} \\ \lesssim &\|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_N\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma^N)} + |\nabla\cdot\tilde{\mathbf{u}}|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ &+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}\left(\|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_N\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma^N)}\right) \\ &+ \frac{1}{3\sqrt{\lambda}}\left(2\mu\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \lambda\|\nabla\cdot\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Together with the fact that $\lambda \to \infty$, we get

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \lambda\|\nabla\cdot\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_N\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma^N)}. \tag{39}$$

This estimate combined with (24) and (25) produces the desired inequality (27). ∎

4.2. Energy Norm Error Estimate. Since $V_h^{0,D} \subset H^1(\Omega)^d$ and $\mathbf{v}_h|_{\Gamma_h^D} = \mathbf{0}$, $\forall \mathbf{v}_h \in V_h^{0,D}$, it follows from [8] that

$$\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \le \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h^2 := \mathcal{A}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{v}_h).$$

In other words, $\|\cdot\|_h$ is a norm on $V_h^{0,D}$.

THEOREM 3. *Let $\mathbf{u} \in H^2(\Omega)^d$ be the exact solution of (1) and $\mathbf{u}_h \in V_h$ be the finite element solution obtained from (14). There holds*

$$\|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_h\|_h \lesssim h\left(\|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{u}_D\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Gamma^D)} + \|\mathbf{t}_N\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma^N)}\right). \tag{40}$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{u}_h^* \in V_h$ be the $\mathcal{A}_h(\cdot,\cdot)$-orthogonal projection of $\mathbf{u}$ [10, 16, 28] such that $\mathbf{u}_h^*|_{\Gamma_h^D} = \mathbf{u}_{D,h}$ and

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_h^*, \mathbf{v}_h) = 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in V_h^{0,D}. \tag{41}$$

For any $\mathbf{v}_h \in V_h$, it follows from the definition of $\|\cdot\|_h$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_h^*\|_h^2 &= \mathcal{A}_h(\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_h^*, \mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_h^*)\\ &= \mathcal{A}_h(\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_h^*, \mathbf{u}-\mathbf{v}_h) + \mathcal{A}_h(\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_h^*, \mathbf{v}_h-\mathbf{u}_h^*).\end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathbf{v}_h|_{\Gamma_h^D} = \mathbf{u}_h^*|_{\Gamma_h^D} = \mathbf{u}_{D,h}$. Since $\mathbf{v}_h - \mathbf{u}_h^* \in V_h^{0,D}$, we derive from (41) that

$$\|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_h^*\|_h \le \inf_{\mathbf{v}_h \in V_h, \mathbf{v}_h|_{\Gamma_h^D} = \mathbf{u}_{D,h}} \|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{v}_h\|_h.$$

It is clear that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_h\|_h &\le \|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_h^*\|_h + \|\mathbf{u}_h^*-\mathbf{u}_h\|_h\\ &\le \inf_{\mathbf{v}_h \in V_h, \mathbf{v}_h|_{\Gamma_h^D} = \mathbf{u}_{D,h}} \|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{v}_h\|_h + \sup_{\mathbf{w}_h \in V_h^{0,D}\backslash\{\mathbf{0}\}} \frac{|\mathcal{A}_h(\mathbf{u}_h^*-\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{w}_h)|}{\|\mathbf{w}_h\|_h}\\ &\le \inf_{\mathbf{v}_h \in V_h, \mathbf{v}_h|_{\Gamma_h^D} = \mathbf{u}_{D,h}} \|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{v}_h\|_h + \sup_{\mathbf{w}_h \in V_h^{0,D}\backslash\{\mathbf{0}\}} \frac{|\mathcal{A}_h(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w}_h) - \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{w}_h)|}{\|\mathbf{w}_h\|_h}.\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

To estimate the first term, we utilize the nice property stated in (12) about the interpolant $\Pi_h \mathbf{u}$ and the approximation property

$$\|\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}-\Pi_h\mathbf{u})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h\|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^2(\Omega)}$$

to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\mathbf{u}-\Pi_h\mathbf{u}\|_h^2\\ &= 2\mu\|\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}-\Pi_h\mathbf{u})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \lambda\|\overline{\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{u}-\Pi_h\mathbf{u})}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2\\ &= 2\mu\|\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}-\Pi_h\mathbf{u})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \lesssim h^2\|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^2(\Omega)}^2.\end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\inf_{\mathbf{v}_h \in V_h, \mathbf{v}_h|_{\Gamma_h^D} = \mathbf{u}_{D,h}} \|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{v}_h\|_h &\le \|\mathbf{u}-\Pi_h\mathbf{u}\|_h \lesssim h\|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^2(\Omega)}\\ &\lesssim h\left(\|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{u}_D\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Gamma^D)} + \|\mathbf{t}_N\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma^N)}\right).\end{aligned}$$

For the second term, we proceed as follows. By integration by parts, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}_h(\mathbf{w}) &= (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{w})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \text{Neumann boundary condition} \\
&= (-\nabla \cdot \sigma(\mathbf{u}), \mathbf{w})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \text{Neumann boundary condition} \\
&= (\sigma(\mathbf{u}), \nabla \mathbf{w})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \text{More boundary terms} \\
&= 2\mu(\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}), \varepsilon(\mathbf{w}))_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \lambda(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{w})_{\mathcal{T}_h}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Applying the fact that $\overline{\nabla \cdot \mathbf{w}}$ is an elementwise constant, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|\mathcal{A}_h(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w}) - \mathcal{F}_h(\mathbf{w})| \\
&= \left|\lambda(\overline{\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}}, \overline{\nabla \cdot \mathbf{w}}) - \lambda(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{w})\right| \\
&= \lambda \left|(\overline{\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}} - \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{w})\right| \\
&\le \lambda \|\overline{\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}} - \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\lesssim \lambda h \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Here for the last two lines, we have used the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the approximation property

$$\|\overline{\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}} - \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}.$$

Since

$$\sqrt{\lambda} \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \|\mathbf{w}\|_h,$$

we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in V_h^{0,D} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \frac{|\mathcal{A}_h(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w}) - \mathcal{F}_h(\mathbf{w})|}{\|\mathbf{w}\|_h} &\lesssim \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in V_h^{0,D} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \frac{\lambda h \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}}{\|\mathbf{w}\|_h} \\
&\le h\sqrt{\lambda} \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \lesssim h \left(\|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{u}_D\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Gamma^D)} + \|\mathbf{t}_N\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma^N)} \right).
\end{aligned}
$$

Here for the last step, we have used Theorem 2 (regularity of the exact solution).

Combining the estimates for these two terms gives the result in the theorem. ∎

4.3. L^2-norm Error Estimate. This subsection presents an L^2-norm error estimate for the numerical displacement based on a duality argument. We conduct a complete analysis for a general elasticity boundary value problem that has both Dirichlet and Neumann conditions. This involves details that are usually not found in the literature.

THEOREM 4. *Let $\mathbf{u} \in H^2(\Omega)^d$ be the exact solution of (1) and $\mathbf{u}_h \in V_h$ be the finite element solution obtained from (14). There holds*

$$\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h^2 \left(\|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{u}_D\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Gamma^D)} + \|\mathbf{t}_N\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma^N)} \right).$$

Proof. Assume that $\mathbf{u}_D$ and $\mathbf{t}_N$ satisfy Hypothesis 4.1, that is, there exists a function $\mathbf{z} \in H^3(\Omega)^d$ satisfying (17) and (18). It is obvious that $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{u} - \nabla \times \mathbf{z}$ is the solution to the boundary value problem (21)-(23), which involves a homogeneous Dirichlet condition. We consider also $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h = \mathbf{u}_h - \Pi_h(\nabla \times \mathbf{z})$. It is clear that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla \times \mathbf{z} - \Pi_h(\nabla \times \mathbf{z})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\lesssim \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + h^2\|\mathbf{z}\|_{H^3(\Omega)}. \qquad (43)
\end{aligned}
$$

On the other hand, by (12), Theorem 3, and (18), we have,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h\|_h \\
&\leq \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\|_h + \|\nabla \times \mathbf{z} - \Pi_h(\nabla \times \mathbf{z})\|_h \\
&\lesssim \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\|_h + \|\varepsilon(\nabla \times \mathbf{z} - \Pi_h(\nabla \times \mathbf{z}))\| + \sqrt{\lambda}\|\overline{\nabla \cdot (\nabla \times \mathbf{z} - \Pi_h(\nabla \times \mathbf{z}))}\| \\
&\lesssim \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\|_h + h\|\mathbf{z}\|_{H^3(\Omega)} \\
&\lesssim h\left(\|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{u}_D\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Gamma^D)} + \|\mathbf{t}_N\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma^N)}\right). \qquad (44)
\end{aligned}
$$

Assume that $\zeta \in H^2(\Omega)^d$ is the solution of the following dual problem

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\nabla \cdot (2\mu\varepsilon(\zeta) + \lambda(\nabla \cdot \zeta)\mathbf{I}) &= \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\
\zeta &= \mathbf{0} \quad \text{on } \Gamma^D, \\
(2\mu\varepsilon(\zeta) + \lambda\nabla \cdot \zeta\mathbf{I})\mathbf{n} &= \mathbf{0} \quad \text{on } \Gamma^N
\end{aligned}
$$

with dual regularity

$$
\|\zeta\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \lambda\|\nabla \cdot \zeta\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \qquad (45)
$$

For convenience, we define

$$
\mathcal{A}(\zeta, \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h) = 2\mu(\varepsilon(\zeta), \varepsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h)) + \lambda(\nabla \cdot \zeta, \nabla \cdot (\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h)).
$$

We use the fact that $(\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h)|_{\Gamma_h^D} = \mathbf{0}$ to obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} &= (-\nabla \cdot (2\mu\varepsilon(\zeta) + \lambda(\nabla \cdot \zeta)\mathbf{I}), \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h) \\
&= \mathcal{A}(\zeta, \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h).
\end{aligned}
$$

Accordingly, we split the latter into three parts as follows

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \;=\; & \left(\mathcal{A}(\zeta, \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h) - \mathcal{A}_h(\zeta, \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h)\right) \\
& + \mathcal{A}_h(\zeta - \Pi_h(\zeta), \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h) + \mathcal{A}_h(\Pi_h(\zeta), \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h) \\
=: \; & I + II + III. \qquad (46)
\end{aligned}
$$

Next we estimate each of these three terms.

For Term I, it follows from the projection inequality, (44), and (45) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{A}(\zeta, \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h) - \mathcal{A}_h(\zeta, \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h) \\
&= 2\mu(\varepsilon(\zeta), \varepsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h)) + \lambda(\nabla \cdot \zeta, \nabla \cdot (\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h)) \\
&\quad -2\mu(\varepsilon(\zeta), \varepsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h)) - \lambda(\overline{\nabla \cdot \zeta}, \overline{\nabla \cdot (\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h)}) \\
&= \lambda(\nabla \cdot \zeta - \overline{\nabla \cdot \zeta}, \nabla \cdot (\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h)) \\
&\lesssim \lambda\, h\|\nabla \cdot \zeta\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\|\varepsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\lesssim \lambda\, h\|\nabla \cdot \zeta\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h\|_h \\
&\lesssim h^2\left(\|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{u}_D\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Gamma^D)} + \|\mathbf{t}_N\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma^N)}\right)\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \qquad (47)
\end{aligned}
$$

For Term II, we use (12), the projection inequality, (44), and (45) to obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{A}_h(\zeta - \Pi_h\zeta, \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h) \\
&= 2\mu(\varepsilon(\zeta - \Pi_h\zeta), \varepsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h)) + \lambda(\overline{\nabla\cdot(\zeta - \Pi_h\zeta)}, \overline{\nabla\cdot(\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h)}) \\
&\lesssim h\,\|\zeta\|_{H^2(\Omega)}\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h\|_h \\
&\lesssim h^2\left(\|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{u}_D\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Gamma^D)} + \|\mathbf{t}_N\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma^N)}\right)\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \qquad (48)
\end{aligned}
$$

For Term III, we test (1) with $\Pi_h\zeta$ and use the fact $(\Pi_h\zeta)|_{\Gamma^D} = \mathbf{0}$ to obtain

$$
\mathcal{F}_h(\Pi_h\zeta) = 2\mu(\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}), \varepsilon(\Pi_h\zeta)) + \lambda(\nabla\cdot\mathbf{u}, \nabla\cdot(\Pi_h\zeta)).
$$

Then we use (12), (18), the projection inequality, Theorem 2, and (45) to derive

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{A}_h(\Pi_h\zeta, \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h) \\
&= \mathcal{A}_h(\Pi_h\zeta, \mathbf{u}) - \mathcal{F}_h(\Pi_h\zeta) + \mathcal{A}_h(\Pi_h\zeta, \Pi_h(\nabla\times\mathbf{z}) - \nabla\times\mathbf{z}) \\
&= \lambda(\overline{\nabla\cdot\mathbf{u}}, \overline{\nabla\cdot(\Pi_h\zeta)}) - \lambda(\nabla\cdot\mathbf{u}, \nabla\cdot(\Pi_h\zeta)) \\
&\quad + 2\mu(\varepsilon(\Pi_h\zeta), \varepsilon(\Pi_h(\nabla\times\mathbf{z}) - \nabla\times\mathbf{z})) \\
&= \lambda(\overline{\nabla\cdot\mathbf{u}} - \nabla\cdot\mathbf{u}, \nabla\cdot(\Pi_h\zeta) - \overline{\nabla\cdot(\Pi_h\zeta)}) \\
&\quad + 2\mu(\varepsilon(\Pi_h\zeta - \overline{\Pi_h\zeta}), \varepsilon(\Pi_h(\nabla\times\mathbf{z}) - \nabla\times\mathbf{z})) \\
&\lesssim \lambda\, h^2\|\nabla\cdot\mathbf{u}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\|\zeta\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + h^2\|\mathbf{z}\|_{H^3(\Omega)}\|\zeta\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \\
&\lesssim h^2\left(\|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{u}_D\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Gamma^D)} + \|\mathbf{t}_N\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma^N)}\right)\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \qquad (49)
\end{aligned}
$$

Finally, the result of this theorem follows from (18), (43), and (46)-(49). □

5. Numerical Experiments.

This section presents numerical experiments on three frequently tested examples to illustrate the theoretical estimates established in the previous section and demonstrate the *locking-free* property of the new finite element methods. These methods have been implemented respectively in our code packages `DarcyLite` (Matlab code for 2-dim problems) and `Darcy+` (C++ code for 3-dim problems). For Matlab implementation, we use those data structures and techniques discussed in [24] and `iFEM` [13].

Example 1 (Locking-free). This example is adopted from Example 1 in [12] with some modifications for the divergence of displacement. It was tested in [20] by weak Galerkin finite element methods. A similar example was also tested in [26].

Here the domain is $\Omega = (0,1)^2$. We set $E = 1$ and test the example with different ν or λ values to show that the convergence rates do not deteriorate as λ gets larger. A Neumann condition is posed on the right boundary of the domain and a Dirichlet boundary condition is specified on the other three sides. A known exact solution for the displacement is

$$
\mathbf{u}(x,y) = \begin{bmatrix} (\pi/2)\sin^2(\pi x)\sin(2\pi y) \\ -(\pi/2)\sin(2\pi x)\sin^2(\pi y) \end{bmatrix} + \frac{1}{\lambda}\begin{bmatrix} \sin(\pi x)\sin(\pi y) \\ \sin(\pi x)\sin(\pi y) \end{bmatrix}.
$$

It was discussed in [20] that

$$
\nabla\cdot\mathbf{u} = \frac{\pi}{\lambda}\cos(\pi(x+y)) = \frac{(1+\nu)(1-2\nu)}{E\nu}\pi\cos(\pi(x+y)).
$$

Table 1
Example 1: Errors of renovated BR_1 elements applied on uniform triangular meshes

h	$\|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_h\|_h$	Rate	$\|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_h\|$	Rate	$\|\sigma-\sigma_h\|$	Rate
$\nu = 0.5 - 10^{-3}$ or $\lambda = 1.6644 * 10^2$						
1/8	7.2481e-01	—	3.1416e-02	—	1.3645e+02	—
1/16	3.6185e-01	1.002	7.8010e-03	2.009	6.9662e+01	0.969
1/32	1.8095e-01	0.999	1.9474e-03	2.002	3.5026e+01	0.991
1/64	9.0507e-02	0.999	4.8677e-04	2.000	1.7542e+01	0.997
1/128	4.5265e-02	0.999	1.2170e-04	1.999	8.7757e+00	0.999
$\nu = 0.5 - 10^{-9}$ or $\lambda = 1.6667 * 10^8$						
1/8	7.2468e-01	—	3.1441e-02	—	1.3651e+08	—
1/16	3.6179e-01	1.002	7.8073e-03	2.009	6.9697e+07	0.969
1/32	1.8092e-01	0.999	1.9485e-03	2.002	3.5044e+07	0.991
1/64	9.0492e-02	0.999	4.8535e-04	2.005	1.7551e+07	0.997
1/128	4.5258e-02	0.999	1.1692e-04	2.053	8.7803e+06	0.999

Therefore, $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} \to 0$ as $\nu \to \frac{1}{2}$.

Table 1 reports the numerical results for the renovated BR_1 finite element schemes on a sequence of uniform triangular meshes. It is clear that the energy norm $\|\cdot\|_h$ exhibits 1st order convergence. The L^2-norm of the displacement error exhibits 2nd order convergence. In addition, the L^2-norm of the stress error exhibits 1st order convergence. It is also clear that these convergence rates do not deteriorate as λ gets larger.

Table 2
Example 2 with $\nu = 0.3$: Errors of renovated BR_1 elements applied on uniform triangular meshes

h	$\|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_h\|_h$	Rate	$\|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_h\|$	Rate	$\|\sigma-\sigma_h\|$	Rate
1/16	1.5234e-03	—	2.1148e-07	—	5.4367e-01	—
1/32	1.0458e-03	0.542	8.8854e-08	1.250	3.7339e-01	0.542
1/64	7.1765e-04	0.543	3.7856e-08	1.230	2.5627e-01	0.543
1/128	4.9228e-04	0.543	1.6312e-08	1.214	1.7582e-01	0.543
1/256	3.3762e-04	0.544	7.0937e-09	1.201	1.2059e-01	0.543

Example 2 (Low regularity). This example is the same as Example 2 in our recent work [20]. It is derived from [2]. This example is similar to the example posed in [1] and tested in [32] (Section 9.3 therein). In particular, we consider a Γ-shaped domain $\Omega = (-1,1)^2 \setminus ([0,1]\times[-1,0])$. The physical parameters are $E = 10^5$, $\nu = 0.3$, and hence $\lambda = 57692$. The body force is $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{0}$. A known analytical solution for the displacement is

$$\mathbf{u} = \Big[A\cos\theta - B\sin\theta,\ A\sin\theta + B\cos\theta\Big]^T, \tag{50}$$

where (r,θ) are the polar coordinates and

$$\begin{cases} A = \dfrac{r^\alpha}{2\mu}\Big(-(1+\alpha)\cos((1+\alpha)\theta) + C_1(C_2-1-\alpha)\cos((1-\alpha)\theta)\Big), \\ B = \dfrac{r^\alpha}{2\mu}\Big((1+\alpha)\sin((1+\alpha)\theta) - C_1(C_2-1+\alpha)\sin((1-\alpha)\theta)\Big). \end{cases} \tag{51}$$

Here $\alpha \approx 0.544483737$ is the so-called *critical exponent*. A Dirichlet boundary condition is posed on the whole boundary using the data derived from the exact solution.

It is known from [6, 32] that the exact solution has low regularity

$$\mathbf{u} \in H^{1+\alpha-\varepsilon}(\Omega)^2, \qquad \sigma \in H^{\alpha-\varepsilon}(\Omega)^{2\times 2}$$

for any small $\varepsilon > 0$. Furthermore, we have (for the same small $\varepsilon > 0$)

$$\mathbf{u}_D \in H^{\alpha+\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}(\partial\Omega)^2.$$

It can be clearly observed from Table 2 that the stress errors measured in the L^2-norm and the errors in the h-norm both have convergence order about 0.544, which is close to α. But the displacement errors measured in the L^2-norm has convergence order about 1.20. This is because the domain is not convex and the solution does not have full regularity.

TABLE 3
Example 3 with $\lambda = 1$: Errors of renovated BR_1 elements applied on uniform tetrahedral meshes

h	$\|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_h\|$	Rate	$\|\nabla\cdot\mathbf{u}-\nabla\cdot\mathbf{u}_h\|$	Rate	$\|\sigma-\sigma_h\|$	Rate
1/4	9.854E-4	—	2.390E-3	—	1.984E-2	—
1/5	7.418E-4	1.272	2.174E-3	0.424	1.729E-2	0.616
1/8	3.541E-4	1.573	1.570E-3	0.692	1.195E-2	0.785
1/10	2.386E-4	1.769	1.295E-3	0.862	9.800E-3	0.888
1/16	9.878E-5	1.876	8.336E-4	0.937	6.289E-3	0.943
1/20	6.409E-5	1.938	6.702E-4	0.977	5.060E-3	0.974
1/32	2.540E-5	1.969	4.203E-4	0.992	3.182E-3	0.986
1/40	1.631E-5	1.985	3.363E-4	0.999	2.548E-3	0.995

TABLE 4
Example 3 with $\lambda = 10^3$: Errors of renovated BR_1 elements applied on uniform tetrahedral meshes

h	$\|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_h\|$	Rate	$\|\nabla\cdot\mathbf{u}-\nabla\cdot\mathbf{u}_h\|$	Rate	$\|\sigma-\sigma_h\|$	Rate
1/4	9.905E-4	—	2.460E-3	—	4.264E-0	—
1/5	7.473E-4	1.262	2.296E-3	0.309	3.979E-0	0.310
1/8	3.557E-4	1.579	1.688E-3	0.654	2.926E-0	0.654
1/10	2.389E-4	1.783	1.394E-3	0.857	2.417E-0	0.856
1/16	9.840E-5	1.887	8.954E-3	0.941	1.551E-0	0.943
1/20	6.373E-5	1.946	7.188E-4	0.984	1.246E-0	0.981
1/32	2.520E-5	1.974	4.495E-4	0.998	7.791E-1	0.999
1/40	1.617E-5	1.988	3.592E-4	1.005	6.226E-1	1.004

Example 3 (A 3-dim problem). This example is adopted from [27] with some interesting modifications. Here we consider the unit cube $\Omega = (0,1)^3$. For convenience, we introduce three auxiliary functions:

$$b_0(s) = (1-s)^2 s^2, \qquad b_1(s) = b_0'(s) = 2(1-s)s(1-2s),$$

and

$$c(x,y,z) = (1-6x+6x^2)(1-y)y(1-z)z - 3(1-x)^2x^2\Big((1-y)y + (1-z)z\Big).$$

Then we specify the displacement as

$$\mathbf{u}(x,y,z) = A \begin{bmatrix} 2\, b_0(x)\, b_1(y)\, b_1(z) \\ -\, b_1(x)\, b_0(y)\, b_1(z) \\ -\, b_1(x)\, b_1(y)\, b_0(z) \end{bmatrix} + \frac{B}{\lambda} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \\ z \end{bmatrix}, \tag{52}$$

where A, B are parameters for adjusting the magnitudes of the two parts in the displacement expression. Clearly, the first part is divergence-free. The second part generates a constant divergence that decays to zero as $\lambda \to \infty$. Accordingly, the body force is

$$\mathbf{f}(x,y,z) = \mu A \begin{bmatrix} -16\, c(x,y,z)(1-2y)(1-2z) \\ 8\, c(y,z,x)(1-2z)(1-2x) \\ 8\, c(z,x,y)(1-2x)(1-2y) \end{bmatrix}. \tag{53}$$

In our numerical experiments, we set $\mu = 1$ and consider $\lambda = 1$ and $\lambda = 10^3$, respectively. We set $A = B = 1$ for simplicity. A Dirichlet boundary condition is specified on the whole boundary using the known exact solution for displacement. Uniform tetrahedral meshes are used for tests. Shown in Table 3 and Table 4 are the numerical results obtained from using the renovated BR_1 elements. By enforcing the Dirichlet boundary conditions in a certain way, we can maintain the symmetry in the large-size sparse linear systems, so a conjugate gradient type linear solver can still be used. For simplicity, we set the maximal number of iterations as 10000 and both threshold and tolerance as 10^{-18}. In Table 3 and Table 4, for two consecutive rows with step sizes h_1, h_2 and corresponding errors E_1, E_2, we use

$$\alpha = \log_2(E_1/E_2)\, /\, \log_2(h_1/h_2)$$

to calculate the convergence rate. As we refine the tetrahedral meshes, it can be observed from Table 3 and Table 4 that the convergence rates for numerical displacement, dilation (divergence of displacement), and stress are close to $2, 1, 1$, respectively. These rates are maintained as λ is increased from 1 to 10^3.

We also want to point out that as λ gets larger, the condition number of the sparse discrete linear system gets larger and hence more iterations are needed to reach a specified accuracy. Design of efficient linear solvers and preconditioners for 3-dim nearly incompressible elasticity problems will be an interesting topic for further research.

6. Renovation of Other Stokes Elements for Linear Elasticity. This section briefly examines applicability of the renovation approach developed in Section 3 to other Stokes elements. We consider four cases for triangular meshes. This allows us to put (BR_1, P_0) in perspective.

(I). The simple pair (P_1^2, P_0) is unstable for Stokes problems and hence not considered for renovation. This pair uses continuous piecewise linear vector-valued polynomials for approximation of velocity and (discontinuous) piecewise constants for approximation of pressure. This pair is known to be unstable [18] but also serves as a starting point for various enrichments.

(II). The 1st order Bernardi-Raugel element pair (BR_1, P_0) is stable for Stokes problems and its renovation for linear elasticity is the main topic of this paper. By enriching the P_1^2 space with vector-valued edge bubble functions (quadratics), we

obtain BR_1. The corresponding approximation space for pressure is still P_0. The increment in degrees of freedom is just the number of edges in the mesh, but we get a stable pair. After renovation, it works well for linear elasticity (Theorems 3 and 4).

TABLE 5
Convergent numerical results obtained from applying Scheme (14) with Crouzeix-Raviart (P_2^2, P_0) elements to Example 1 (with Dirichlet boundary conditions) on uniform triangular meshes

h	$\|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_h\|_h$	Rate	$\|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_h\|$	Rate
$\nu = 0.5 - 10^{-3}$ or $\lambda = 1.6644 * 10^2$				
1/8	4.6164e-01	—	2.0411e-02	—
1/16	2.1957e-01	1.072	5.2398e-03	1.961
1/32	1.0869e-01	1.014	1.3346e-03	1.973
1/64	5.4336e-02	1.000	3.3687e-04	1.986
1/128	2.7199e-02	0.998	8.4618e-05	1.993
$\nu = 0.5 - 10^{-9}$ or $\lambda = 1.6667 * 10^8$				
1/8	4.6173e-01	—	2.0420e-02	—
1/16	2.1963e-01	1.072	5.2434e-03	1.961
1/32	1.0872e-01	1.014	1.3357e-03	1.972
1/64	5.4354e-02	1.000	3.3717e-04	1.986
1/128	2.7208e-02	0.998	8.5772e-05	1.974

(III). The Crouzeiz-Raviart element pair (P_2^2, P_0) is stable for Stokes problems and its renovation also works for linear elasticity. This pair was discussed in [16] (p. 48). Continuous elementwise quadratic polynomials are used for approximating velocity, whereas discontinuous piecewise constants are used for approximating pressure. As derscribed in Section 3, one takes the elementwise averages for the divergences of the twelve P_2^2 basis functions and applies the finite element scheme (14) to linear elasticity.

Note that the displacement is approximated by quadratic polynomials but the dilation is approximated by piecewise constants, one can expect only a 1st order convergence in the energy norm and a 2nd order convergence in the L^2-norm. This is reflected in Table 5 by the numerical results obtained from testing this renovated pair on Example 1.

Next we provide a brief theoretical explanation why the renovated Crouzeix-Raviart pair (P_2^2, P_0) works for linear elasticity. Let T be a triangle with vertices $a_i\,(i=1,2,3)$ and $a_{i,j}$, $1 \le i < j \le 3$ be the midpoints of the edges connecting vertices a_i and a_j. Let $\lambda_i\,(i=1,2,3)$ be the barycentric coordinates. We can choose the following $P_2(T)^2$ basis functions for vertices and edges, respectively,

$$\mathbf{p}_i = \lambda_i(2\lambda_i - 1), \qquad 1 \le i \le 3,$$
$$\mathbf{p}_{i,j} = 4\lambda_i\lambda_j, \qquad 1 \le i < j \le 3.$$

A local projection operator $\Pi_T : H^2(T)^2 \to P_2(T)^2$ is given by

$$(\Pi_T \mathbf{v})(a_i) = \mathbf{v}(a_i), \qquad i = 1,2,3, \tag{54}$$

$$\int_{[a_i,a_j]} \Pi_T \mathbf{v} = \int_{[a_i,a_j]} \mathbf{v}, \qquad 1 \le i < j \le 3. \tag{55}$$

For a triangular mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$, we define

$$V_h = \{\mathbf{v}_h \in C^0(\Omega) : \mathbf{v}_h|_T \in P_2(T)^2,\ \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h\}.$$

Accordingly, the global projection operator $\Pi_h : H^2(\Omega)^2 \to V_h$ is defined by

$$(\Pi_h \mathbf{v})|_T = \Pi_T \mathbf{v}, \qquad \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h.$$

Applying (55) and Green's formula, we obtain

$$\int_T \nabla\cdot(\Pi_h \mathbf{v}) = \int_{\partial T} (\Pi_h \mathbf{v})\cdot\mathbf{n} = \int_{\partial T} \mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{n} = \int_T (\nabla\cdot\mathbf{v}).$$

For any $\mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Omega)^2$, it follows from the above identity that

$$\|\overline{\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{v}-\Pi_h\mathbf{v})}\|^2 = \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_T \overline{\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{v}-\Pi_h\mathbf{v})}\;\overline{\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{v}-\Pi_h\mathbf{v})}\,dT$$

$$= \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \overline{\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{v}-\Pi_h\mathbf{v})} \int_T \nabla\cdot(\mathbf{v}-\Pi_h\mathbf{v})\,dT = 0.$$

Based on this, Theorems 3 and 4 can be derived in a similar way for this renovated Crouzeix-Raviart element pair.

TABLE 6

Abnormal numerical results obtained from applying Scheme (14) with the MINI elements to Example 1 (with Dirichlet boundary conditions) on uniform triangular meshes

h	$\|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_h\|_h$	$\|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_h\|$	$\|\sigma-\sigma_h\|$	$\|\nabla\cdot\mathbf{u}-\nabla\cdot\mathbf{u}_h\|$
$\nu = 0.5 - 10^{-3}$ or $\lambda = 1.6644 * 10^2$				
1/8	3.8607e+00	8.8190e-01	8.9388e+01	3.7877e-01
1/16	3.4943e+00	7.2828e-01	5.3657e+01	2.2725e-01
1/32	2.7441e+00	4.5979e-01	4.0901e+01	1.7328e-01
1/64	1.8139e+00	2.1059e-01	3.0005e+01	1.2717e-01
1/128	1.0376e+00	7.2192e-02	1.8613e+01	7.8906e-02
$\nu = 0.5 - 10^{-9}$ or $\lambda = 1.6667 * 10^8$				
1/8	4.0193e+00	9.5535e-01	8.7270e+07	3.7026e-01
1/16	4.0267e+00	9.6023e-01	4.4149e+07	1.8731e-01
1/32	4.0286e+00	9.6149e-01	2.2139e+07	9.3929e-02
1/64	4.0291e+00	9.6180e-01	1.1078e+07	4.6999e-02
1/128	4.0292e+00	9.6186e-01	5.5399e+06	2.3504e-02

(IV). The MINI pair $((P_1 + B_3)^2, P_1)$ is stable for Stokes problems but cannot be reused with Scheme (14) for linear elasticity. Different than BR_1, the MINI element enriches the P_1^2 space by cubic bubble functions ($B_3 = \mathrm{Span}(\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3)$) for element interiors [5, 17]. The matching space for pressure approximation consists of continuous piecewise linear polynomials.

It is not a surprise to see the abnormal numerical results in Table 6, which are obtained from using Scheme (14) with the MINI space to Example 1. Especially, for a large λ value ($\lambda = 1.6667 * 10^8$), there is no convergence in the energy norm or L^2-norm.

Theoretically, we can also see why Scheme (14) cannot be used with the MINI space for linear elasticity. For a triangle T, a local projection operator $\Pi_T : H^1(T)^2 \to (P_1(T) + B_3)^2$ is defined as

$$\Pi_T \mathbf{v} = \widetilde{\Pi}_T \mathbf{v} + \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_1 \\ \alpha_2 \end{bmatrix} \lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3,$$

where $\widetilde{\Pi}_T : H^1(T)^2 \to P_1(T)^2$ is the interpolation operator, $B_3 = \text{Span}\{\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3\}$, and

$$\begin{bmatrix} \alpha_1 \\ \alpha_2 \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{\int_T \lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3 dT} \int_T (\mathbf{v} - \widetilde{\Pi}_h \mathbf{v})\, dT.$$

For a triangular mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$, we define

$$V_h = \{\mathbf{v}_h \in C^0(\Omega)^2 : \mathbf{v}_h|_T \in (P_1(T) + B_3)^2,\ \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h\}.$$

The global projection operator $\Pi_h : H_0^1(\Omega)^2 \to V_h$ is given by

$$(\Pi_h \mathbf{v})_T = \Pi_T(\mathbf{v}|_T), \qquad \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h.$$

The MINI element is designed with the following property

$$\int_T (\mathbf{v} - \Pi_h \mathbf{v}) dT = 0, \quad \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h, \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in H_0^1(\Omega)^2.$$

What we need for the analysis in this paper to apply is rather

$$\int_T \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \Pi_h \mathbf{v}) dT = 0.$$

Therefore, the MINI element is not to be used with Scheme (14) for linear elasticity, which is based on the primal formulation for displacement.

However, we want to point out that the MINI element works for elasticity in the mixed method investigated in [23].

7. Concluding Remarks. This paper presents new finite element solvers for linear elasticity on triangular and tetrahedral meshes based on renovated Bernardi-Raugel elements. These methods provide essential enrichments to the classical linear Lagrangian elements to render them *locking-free*. The new methods have 2nd order convergence in displacement and 1st order convergence in stress and dilation (divergence of displacement), when the exact solution has full regularity. Three frequently tested examples (in 2-dim and 3-dim) are presented to demonstrate the accuracy and robustness of these new solvers.

There are many other higher order stable element pairs for Stokes flow, e.g., Taylor-Hood (P_2^2, P_1) for triangles. It is interesting to know whether and how these element pairs can be reused for linear elasticity. This is currently under our investigation and will be reported in our future work.

The methodology presented in this paper can also be extended to quadrilateral and hexahedral meshes (assuming the faces are flat or close to being flat). This is currently under our investigation and will be reported in our future work.

Acknowledgments. G. Harper and J. Liu were partially supported by US National Science Foundation under grant DMS-1819252. S. Tavener was partially supported by US National Science Foundation under grant DMS-1720473/1720402. R. Zhang was partially supported by Natural National Science Foundation of China (91630201, U1530116, 11726102, 11771179), and by the Program for Cheung Kong Scholars of Ministry of Education of China, Key Laboratory of Symbolic Computation and Knowledge Engineering of Ministry of Education, Jilin University, Changchun, 130012, P.R. China.

REFERENCES

[1] M. Ainsworth and B. Senior, *Aspects of an adaptive hp-finite element method: Adaptive strategy, conforming approximation and efficient solvers*, Comput. Meth. Appl. Mech. Engrg., 150 (1997), pp. 65–87.

[2] J. Alberty, C. Carstensen, S. Funken, and R. Klose, *Matlab implementation of the finite element method in elasticity*, Comupting, 69 (2002), pp. 239–263.

[3] D. Arnold, G. Awanou, and R. Winther, *Nonconforming tetrahedral mixed finite elements for elasticity*, Math. Model. Meth. Appl. Sci., 24 (2014), pp. 783–796.

[4] D. Arnold and R. Winther, *Mixed finite elements for elasticity*, Numer. Math., 92 (2002), pp. 401–419.

[5] D. N. Arnold, F. Brezzi, and M. Fortin, *A stable finite element for the Stokes equations*, Calcolo, 21 (1984), pp. 337–344.

[6] I. Babuska and M. Suli, *The h-p version of the finite element method with quasiuniform meshes*, Math. Model. Numer. Anal., 21 (1987), pp. 199–238.

[7] C. Bernardi and G. Raugel, *Analysis of some finite elements for the Stokes problem*, Math. Comput., 44 (1985), pp. 71–79.

[8] S. Brenner, *Korn's inequalities for piecewise H1 vector fields*, Math. Comput., 73 (2004), pp. 1067–1087.

[9] S. Brenner and L. Scott, *The mathematical theory of finite element methods*, vol. 15 of Texts in Applied Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York, third ed., 2008.

[10] S. Brenner and L.-Y. Sung, *Linear finite element methods for planar linear elasticity*, Math. Comput., 59 (1992), pp. 321–338.

[11] R. Brown, I. Mitrea, and M. Mitrea, *Mixed boundary value problems for the Stokes system*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, 362 (2009), pp. 1211–1230.

[12] C. Carstensen and M. Schedensack, *Medius analysis and comparison results for first-order finite element methods in linear elasticity*, IMA J. Numer. Anal., 35 (2015), pp. 1591–1621.

[13] L. Chen, *iFEM: an integrated finite element methods package in Matlab*, Technical Report, Department of Mathematics, University of California at Irvine, (2009).

[14] L. Chen, J. Hu, and X. Huang, *Stabilized mixed finite element methods for linear elasticity on simplicial grids in* $\mathbb{R}^n$, Comput. Meth. Appl. Math., (2016).

[15] Z. Chen, Q. Jiang, and Y. Cui, *Locking-free nonconforming finite elements for planar linear elasticity*, Disc. Cont. Dyn. Sys. suppl, (2005), pp. 181–189.

[16] M. Crouzeix and P. Raviart, *Conforming and nonconforming finite element methods for solving the stationary Stokes equations I*, RAIRO, 7 (1973), pp. 33–75.

[17] J. Donea and A. Huerta, *Finite element methods for flow problems*, Wiley, 2003.

[18] H. Elman, D. Silverster, and A. Wathen, *Finite elements and fast iterative solvers*, Oxford University Press, 2005.

[19] J. Gopalakrishnan and J. Guzman, *Symmetric nonconforming mixed finite elements for linear elasticity*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 49 (2011), pp. 1504–1520.

[20] G. Harper, J. Liu, S. Tavener, and B. Zheng, *Lowest-order weak Galerkin finite flement methods for elasticity on quadrilateral and hexahedral meshes*, J. Sci. Comput., (2018), p. (Available online).

[21] J. Hu and S. Zhang, *A family of symmetric mixed finite elements for linear elasticity on tetrahedral grids*, Sci. China Math., 58 (2015), pp. 297–307.

[22] B. P. Lamichhane, *A mixed finite element method for nearly incompressible elasticity and Stokes equations using primal and dual meshes with quadrilateral and hexahedral grids*, J. Comput. Appl. Math., 260 (2014), pp. 356–363.

[23] B. P. Lamichhane and E. P. Stephan, *A symmetric mixed finite element method for nearly incompressible elasticity based on biorthogonal systems*, Numer. Meth. PDEs, 28 (2012), pp. 1336–1353.

[24] J. Liu, F. Sadre-Marandi, and Z. Wang, *DarcyLite: A Matlab toolbox for Darcy flow computation*, Procedia Computer Science, 80 (2016), pp. 1301–1312.

[25] D. S. Malkus and T. Hughes, *Mixed finite element methods - reduced and selective integration techniques: A unification of concepts*, Comput. Meth. Appl. Mech. Engrg., 15 (1978), pp. 63 – 81.

[26] S. Mao and S. Chen, *A quadrilateral nonconforming finite element for linear elasticity problem*, Adv. Comput. Math., 28 (2008), pp. 81–100.

[27] H. Qi, L.-H. Wang, and W.-Y. Zheng, *On locking-free finite element schemes for three-dimensional elasticity*, J. Comput. Math., 23 (2005), pp. 101–112.

[28] L. R. Scott, *Interpolated boundary conditions in the finite element method*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 12 (1975), pp. 404–427.

[29] T. Valent, *Boundary value problems of finite elasticity: Local theorems on existence, uniqueness, and analytic dependence on data*, Springer, 1988.
[30] C. Wang, J. Wang, R. Wang, and R. Zhang, *A locking-free weak Galerkin finite element method for elasticity problems in the primal formulation*, J. Comput. Appl. Math., 307 (2016), pp. 346–366.
[31] S.-Y. Yi, *A study of two modes of locking in poroelasticity*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 55 (2017), pp. 1915–1936.
[32] S.-Y. Yi, *A lowest-order weak Galerkin method for linear elasticity*, J. Comput. Appl. Math., 350 (2019), pp. 286–298.