

FINITE ELEMENT APPROXIMATIONS OF WAVE MAPS INTO SPHERES

SÖREN BARTELS*, XIAOBING FENG[†], AND ANDREAS PROHL[‡]

Abstract. Three fully discrete finite element methods are developed for approximating wave maps into the sphere based on two different approaches. The first method is an explicit scheme and the numerical solution satisfies the sphere-constraint exactly at every node. The second and third methods are implicit schemes which are based on a penalization approach, their numerical solutions satisfy the sphere-constraint approximately, and the quality of approximations is controlled by a small penalization parameter. Discrete energy conservation laws which mimic the underlying differential conservation law are established, and convergence of all proposed methods is proved. Computational experiments are also provided to compare the three methods and to study possible finite-time blow-ups of the wave maps.

Key words. wave maps, penalization, finite element method, fully discrete scheme, convergence analysis.

AMS subject classifications. 65M12, 65M60, 83C35

1. Introduction. Let $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}^m$ for $m \geq 1$ denote the $(m + 1)$ -dimensional Minkowski space endowed with the Minkowski metric $\eta = (\eta_{\alpha\beta}) = \eta^{-1} = (\eta^{\alpha\beta}) = \text{diag}(-1, 1, 1, \dots, 1)$, and (\mathbf{N}, g) be an n -dimensional Riemannian manifold. A map $\mathbf{u} : (t, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbf{u}(t, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbf{N}$ is called a *wave map* if it satisfies the following *wave map equation* (cf. [20, 25])

$$\square \mathbf{u} = A(\mathbf{u})(\partial_\alpha \mathbf{u}, \partial^\alpha \mathbf{u}) \perp T_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{N}, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\partial^\alpha \mathbf{u} = \eta^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\beta \mathbf{u}$, and \square is the d'Alembert operator, $\square = \partial_\alpha \partial^\alpha$. Moreover, $A(\mathbf{u})(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes the second fundamental form of the manifold \mathbf{N} , and $T_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{N}$ denotes the tangent space of \mathbf{N} at \mathbf{u} .

It is well-known (cf. [20]) that equation (1.1) can also be interpreted as the Euler-Lagrange equation for the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{u}) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}^m} \langle \partial_\alpha \mathbf{u}, \partial^\alpha \mathbf{u} \rangle_g dx dt, \quad (1.2)$$

where all the first order derivatives of \mathbf{u} take values in the tangent space $T\mathbf{N}$ of \mathbf{N} , that is,

$$\partial_\alpha \mathbf{u} : \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}^m \rightarrow T_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{N}, \quad \alpha = t, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m.$$

The wave map equation is the simplest geometric nonlinear wave equation, thus providing a good setup to study nonlinear wave interactions. Wave maps have many applications in physics, they arise as harmonic gauges in general relativity (cf. [10]), and as the nonlinear σ -models in particle physics (cf. [1]); under suitable hypotheses,

*Department of Mathematics, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Unter den Linden 6, D-10099 Berlin, Germany. (sba@math.hu-berlin.de) The author is supported by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft through the DFG Research Center MATHEON 'Mathematics for key technologies' in Berlin.

[†]Department of Mathematics, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996, U.S.A. (xfeng@math.utk.edu). The work of this author is partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-0410266.

[‡]Department of Mathematics, ETH Zurich, CH-8092 Zurich, Switzerland. (apr@math.ethz.ch)

the Einstein vacuum equations with cylindrical symmetry reduce to a wave map system on $(2+1)$ -dimensional Minkowski space-time (cf. [7]). Moreover, wave maps also arise in the analysis of the more difficult hyperbolic Yang-Mills equations either as special cases or as equations for certain families of gauge transformations (cf. [11]).

In this paper we consider wave maps in the case when the target manifold \mathbf{N} is an $(n-1)$ -sphere, i.e., $\mathbf{N} = \mathbf{S}^{n-1} \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ ($n \geq 1$). In this case, we have (cf. [20])

$$\begin{aligned} \square &= \partial_t^2 - \Delta, \\ \langle \partial_\alpha \mathbf{u}, \partial^\alpha \mathbf{u} \rangle_g &= |\nabla \mathbf{u}|^2 - |\partial_t \mathbf{u}|^2, \\ A(\mathbf{u})(\partial_\alpha \mathbf{u}, \partial^\alpha \mathbf{u}) &= (|\nabla \mathbf{u}|^2 - |\partial_t \mathbf{u}|^2) \mathbf{u}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\nabla \mathbf{u} = (\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_m})$, and Δ is the (spatial) Laplacian. Specifically, we shall study the following initial-boundary value problem:

Given $T > 0$ and $(\mathbf{u}_0(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{u}_1(\mathbf{x})) \in \mathbf{S}^{n-1} \times T_{\mathbf{u}_0(\mathbf{x})} \mathbf{S}^{n-1}$, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$, find a wave map $\mathbf{u} : \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbf{S}^{n-1}$ such that

$$\square \mathbf{u} = (|\nabla \mathbf{u}|^2 - |\partial_t \mathbf{u}|^2) \mathbf{u} \quad \text{in } \Omega_T := (0, T) \times \Omega, \quad (1.3)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial \mathbf{n}} = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial \Omega_T := (0, T) \times \partial \Omega, \quad (1.4)$$

$$\mathbf{u}(0, \cdot) = \mathbf{u}_0, \quad \partial_t \mathbf{u}(0, \cdot) = \mathbf{u}_1 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad (1.5)$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}^m$ is a bounded domain. Here, \mathbf{n} and $\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial \mathbf{n}}$ denote the outward unit normal to, and the normal derivative of \mathbf{u} on the boundary $\partial \Omega$ of Ω .

It is well known that the wave map equation (1.1) is *integrable* (so are many other wave equations), which implies that the solutions of (1.1) satisfy some conservation law, which is, for wave maps with the sphere target manifold (cf. [20])

$$E(\partial_t \mathbf{u}(t, \cdot), \mathbf{u}(t, \cdot)) = E(\mathbf{u}_1(\cdot), \mathbf{u}_0(\cdot)) \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad (1.6)$$

where

$$E(\partial_t \mathbf{u}(t, \cdot), \mathbf{u}(t, \cdot)) := \frac{1}{2} \left[\|\partial_t \mathbf{u}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{u}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2 \right]. \quad (1.7)$$

Wave map equation (1.1) has been extensively studied in the past twenty years from a theoretical point of view. It was shown that on a $(1+1)$ -dimensional Minkowski space-time base the equation has global in time smooth solutions if the initial data are smooth. It has also been known that for $m \geq 3$ the wave maps on an $(m+1)$ -dimensional Minkowski space-time base can blow up in finite time. On the other hand, whether the wave map equation has global in time smooth solutions on a $(2+1)$ -dimensional Minkowski space-time base remains as an open problem, see ‘Open Problems 5, 6’ in [25]. The dimension analysis identifies $(2+1)$ as the critical dimension for wave maps, so there has been a considerable amount of interest in determining whether $(2+1)$ -dimensional wave maps develop singularities in finite time for smooth initial data. Numerical experiments of [8, 17] suggest that finite time collapses, which are identified as local concentration of energy, may occur for the special class of spherically equivariant wave maps in the case of large, smooth initial data with the spheres as target manifolds. For more discussions and up-to-date analytical results for wave maps, we refer to the recent monograph of Shatah and Struwe [20] and the survey paper of Tataru [25].

Numerically, besides the works of [8, 17], no other results are known in the literature. However, despite the strong evidence of finite time singularities in [8, 17],

the numerical schemes proposed there are straightforward discretizations of reduced models and are not supported by rigorous numerical analysis, so unphysical numerical artifacts can not be completely ruled out. The primary goal of this paper is to develop various finite element methods for approximating the initial-boundary value problem (1.3)–(1.5) based on two different approaches (see below and Section 3). Rigorous convergence analysis will be provided so our numerical solutions are guaranteed to converge to weak solutions of (1.3)–(1.5).

Like other well-known maps such as harmonic maps (cf. [4, 5, 22] and references therein), the main difficulty for analyzing and approximating wave maps is caused by the non-flatness of the target manifold \mathbf{N} which is equivalent to imposing some (usually, nonconvex) constraints on the solutions of the wave map equation, and is the reason for the nonlinearities. For example, when $\mathbf{N} = \mathbf{S}^{n-1}$, which is the focus of this paper, the constraint is $|\mathbf{u}| = 1$. Recall that the wave map equation (1.1) can be regarded as the Euler-Lagrange equation for the Lagrangian \mathcal{L} defined in (1.2), interpreting this difficulty in the calculus of variation context, which means that the wave map problem is a variation problem with a holonomic constraint (cf. [16]).

The strong nonlinearity and nonconvex constraint make it very difficult to develop convergent numerical methods for (1.3)–(1.5). To the best of our knowledge, no such a numerical method is known in the literature up to now. To overcome the difficulty, there are two approaches one can try. On the one hand, one may want to approximate (1.3)–(1.5) directly. To this end, one has to maintain the constraint $|\mathbf{u}| = 1$ at the discrete level, which is difficult to accomplish. Usually, a projection technique is employed for this purpose, unfortunately, straightforward strategies do not give (discrete) energy conservation laws, consequently, the methods may not be convergent. On the other hand, one can approximate (1.3)–(1.5) indirectly. This approach often involves two steps: first, the wave map equation is penalized and the nonconvex constraint is relaxed by a singular perturbation technique; second, the penalized and non-constrained problem is approximated by various numerical methods such as finite element, finite difference, and spectral methods. The trade-off is that one now needs to approximate singularly perturbed equations and to resolve the solutions on a very small scale introduced by the penalization parameter and to control numerical parameters according to the penalization parameter for both stability and convergence concerns.

In this paper, we shall develop numerical methods using both direct and indirect approaches. Our direct methods are inspired by the works of [2, 4, 6] where constraint-preserving finite element methods were developed respectively for the Landau-Lifshitz equation and the p -harmonic map heat flow. The direct methods are constructed based on the following equivalent reformulation of (1.3): find $\mathbf{u} : \Omega_T \rightarrow \mathbf{S}^{n-1}$ such that for all $\mathbf{w} \in C_0^\infty([0, T] \times \Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)$ with $\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w} \rangle = 0$ a.e. in Ω_T there holds

$$\int_0^T (\partial_t^2 \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w}) dt + \int_0^T (\nabla \mathbf{u}, \nabla \mathbf{w}) dt = 0. \quad (1.8)$$

Our indirect methods are based on the following Ginzburg-Landau type penalization ansatz (cf. [20]):

$$\square \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (|\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon|^2 - 1) \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_T, \quad (1.9)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon}{\partial \mathbf{n}} = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial \Omega_T, \quad (1.10)$$

$$\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(0, \cdot) = \mathbf{u}_0, \quad \partial_t \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(0, \cdot) = \mathbf{u}_1 \quad \text{in } \Omega \quad (1.11)$$

for $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$. It was shown that for each $\varepsilon > 0$ the regularized problem (1.9)-(1.11) has a weak solution $\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon : \Omega_T \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$, which satisfies the following conservation law (hence, (1.9)-(1.11) is also integrable)

$$E(\partial_t \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(t, \cdot), \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(t, \cdot)) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} F(\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(t, \cdot)) = E(\mathbf{u}_1(\cdot), \mathbf{u}_0(\cdot)) \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \quad (1.12)$$

where

$$F(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{4} \int_{\Omega} (|\mathbf{w}|^2 - 1)^2 \, d\mathbf{x}. \quad (1.13)$$

Moreover, there exists a subsequence of $\{\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon\}$ which converges to a map \mathbf{u} which turns out to be a weak solution of (1.3)-(1.5) as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce some notations and a weak formulation of (1.3)-(1.5). In Section 3 we present our fully discrete finite element methods based on both direct and indirect approaches. The convergence analysis of the proposed numerical methods is given in Sections 4 and 5. In Section 6 we present several numerical experiment results and provide numerical evidences for finite time (finite energy) blow-ups of wave maps in the critical dimension $(2+1)$. Finally, we finish the paper with a few concluding remarks.

2. Preliminaries. Standard notations are adopted throughout this paper. $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the standard inner product of the Euclidean space \mathbf{R}^m , $(\cdot, \cdot) := (\cdot, \cdot)_{\Omega}$ is the standard L^2 -inner product over the domain Ω . $W^{m,p}(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)$ denotes the (m, p) -Sobolev space of vector-valued functions, and $\|\cdot\|_{W^{m,p}}$ denotes its norm. Note that $W^{0,p}(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n) = L^p(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)$. Throughout this paper, $C > 0$ is used to denote a generic positive (h, τ, ε) -independent constant which may take different values at different locations. We also introduce $\mathbf{u}_t := \partial_t \mathbf{u}$, $\nabla \mathbf{u} := (\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_m})$, $D := (\partial_t, \nabla)$, and define the nonlinear Sobolev space

$$W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathbf{S}^{n-1}) = \{\mathbf{v} \in W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n); \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{S}^{n-1} \text{ a.e. in } \Omega\},$$

We now give a definition of weak solutions to (1.3)-(1.5).

DEFINITION 2.1. *Given $T > 0$ and $(\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{u}_1) \in W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathbf{S}^{n-1}) \times L^2(\Omega, T\mathbf{S}^{n-1})$, we call $\mathbf{u} : \Omega_T \rightarrow \mathbf{S}^{n-1}$ a weak solution of (1.3)-(1.5) if*

- (1) $D\mathbf{u} \in L^2(\Omega_T, \mathbf{R}^n)$,
- (2) $|\mathbf{u}| = 1$ a.e. in Ω_T ,
- (3) (1.3) holds (in wedged form) in the distributional sense, i.e., for all $\phi \in C_0^\infty([0, T]; W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n))$ we have

$$-\int_0^T (\mathbf{u}_t \wedge \mathbf{u}, \phi_t) \, dt + \int_0^T (\nabla \mathbf{u} \wedge \mathbf{u}, \nabla \phi) \, dt = (\mathbf{u}_1 \wedge \mathbf{u}_0, \phi(0, \cdot)). \quad (2.1)$$

- (4) The initial conditions \mathbf{u}_0 and \mathbf{u}_1 are continuously attained by \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{u}_t in $W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbf{R}^n)$ and $L^2(\Omega; \mathbf{R}^n)$, i.e., there holds as $t \rightarrow 0$

$$\mathbf{u}(t, \cdot) \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_0 \quad \text{in } W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbf{R}^n), \quad \mathbf{u}_t(t, \cdot) \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_1 \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbf{R}^n).$$

- (5) The following energy inequality holds

$$E(\mathbf{u}_t(t, \cdot), \mathbf{u}(t, \cdot)) \leq E(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_0) \quad \forall t \in [0, T]. \quad (2.2)$$

Existence of weak solutions to (1.3)–(1.5) for $m \geq 1$ was proved in [19] by the Ginzburg-Landau penalization technique, and weak solutions were constructed as proper limits of $\{\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\}$ which solve (1.9)–(1.11). Another method, which was proposed in [18], constructs weak solutions for general targets \mathbf{N} as limits of convergent sequences of spatially discrete wave maps. The semi-discrete maps are direct approximations of the original wave maps and are constructed by (abstract) finite difference methods, so no penalization is involved. We remark that weak solutions to (1.3)–(1.5) are not unique in general (cf. [20]).

3. Fully discrete finite element methods.

3.1. Notations. For simplicity, let Ω be a bounded polygonal (when $m = 2$) or polyhedral (when $m = 3$) domain. Let \mathcal{T}_h denote a quasiuniform triangulation of Ω into triangles or tetrahedrons with mesh size $h > 0$ for $m = 2$ or $m = 3$, respectively. For a domain $A \subset \mathbf{R}^m$, let $\mathcal{P}(A, \mathbf{R}^n)$ stand for the set of all polynomials on A of degree ≥ 1 . We define the Lagrange finite element space

$$\mathcal{V}_h := \{\mathbf{w} \in C(\overline{\Omega}, \mathbf{R}^n); \mathbf{w}|_K \in \mathcal{P}(K, \mathbf{R}^n), \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h\}.$$

Let \mathcal{N}_h denote the set of all nodes associated with the finite element space \mathcal{V}_h , and $\{\varphi_{\mathbf{q}_i}; \mathbf{q}_i \in \mathcal{N}_h\}$ the nodal basis for \mathcal{V}_h ; we define the following nodal interpolation operator $I_h : C(\overline{\Omega}, \mathbf{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_h$ by

$$I_h \mathbf{w} := \sum_{\mathbf{q}_i \in \mathcal{N}_h} \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{q}_i) \varphi_{\mathbf{q}_i} \quad \forall \mathbf{w} \in C(\overline{\Omega}, \mathbf{R}^n).$$

For any two functions $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \in C(\overline{\Omega}, \mathbf{R}^n)$ we define a discrete L^2 -inner product by

$$(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})_h := \int_{\Omega} I_h(\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \rangle) \, d\mathbf{x} = \sum_{\mathbf{q}_i \in \mathcal{N}_h} \beta_{\mathbf{q}_i} \langle \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}_i), \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{q}_i) \rangle,$$

where $\beta_{\mathbf{q}_i} = \int_{\Omega} \varphi_{\mathbf{q}_i} \, d\mathbf{x}$, for all $\mathbf{q}_i \in \mathcal{N}_h$. We also define $\|\mathbf{w}\|_h := (\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w})_h^{\frac{1}{2}}$. It is easy to check that there holds for all $\mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{w}_h \in \mathcal{V}_h$

$$\|\mathbf{w}_h\|_{L^2} \leq \|\mathbf{w}_h\|_h \leq (m+2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\mathbf{w}_h\|_{L^2}, \quad (3.1)$$

$$|(\mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{w}_h)_h - (\mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{w}_h)| \leq Ch \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}_h\|_{L^2}. \quad (3.2)$$

Let τ_1 and τ be two (small) positive numbers, and

$$t_0 := 0, \quad t_1 := \tau_1, \quad t_j := t_1 + (j-1)\tau, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, J := \left\lceil \frac{T - t_1}{\tau} \right\rceil.$$

Then $\{t_j\}$ forms a partition of the interval $[0, T]$. We introduce the following difference operators (cf. [13, 14])

$$\begin{aligned} d_t \mathbf{v}^1 &:= \frac{\mathbf{v}^1 - \mathbf{v}^0}{\tau_1}, & \delta_t \mathbf{v}^1 &:= \frac{\mathbf{v}^2 - \mathbf{v}^0}{\tau_1 + \tau}, \\ d_t \mathbf{v}^j &:= \frac{\mathbf{v}^j - \mathbf{v}^{j-1}}{\tau}, & \delta_t \mathbf{v}^j &:= \frac{\mathbf{v}^{j+1} - \mathbf{v}^{j-1}}{2\tau}, \quad j \geq 1 \\ \mathbf{v}^{j \pm \frac{1}{2}} &:= \frac{\mathbf{v}^{j \pm 1} + \mathbf{v}^j}{2}, & \mathbf{v}^{j, \theta} &:= \theta \mathbf{v}^{j+1} + (1 - 2\theta) \mathbf{v}^j + \theta \mathbf{v}^{j-1} \quad \forall \theta \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]. \end{aligned}$$

Given a sequence $\{\mathbf{w}^j\}_{1 \leq j \leq J} \in \ell^\infty(0, J; \mathcal{V}_h)$, we define the following constant and linear interpolations of the sequence in time: for every $t \in (t_{j-1}, t_j]$ set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{w}^-(t, \cdot) &:= \mathbf{w}^{j-1}(\cdot), & \mathbf{w}^+(t, \cdot) &:= \mathbf{w}^j(\cdot), \\ \overline{\mathbf{w}}(t, \cdot) &:= \frac{1}{2}[\mathbf{w}^{j-1}(\cdot) + \mathbf{w}^j(\cdot)], & \mathbf{w}(t, \cdot) &:= \frac{t - t_{j-1}}{\tau} \mathbf{w}^j(\cdot) + \frac{t_j - t}{\tau} \mathbf{w}^{j-1}(\cdot). \end{aligned}$$

We note that τ needs to be replaced by τ_1 in the definition of $\mathbf{w}(t, \cdot)$ when $j = 1$. It is easy to check that

$$\|\mathbf{w}^\pm - \mathbf{w}\| + \|\overline{\mathbf{w}} - \mathbf{w}\| \leq 3\tau \|d_t \mathbf{w}\|. \quad (3.3)$$

Hence, $\mathbf{w}^\pm, \overline{\mathbf{w}}$ and \mathbf{w} converge simultaneously to the same limit provided that $\|d_t \mathbf{w}\|$ is bounded and one of the sequences converges. Finally, we introduce the following subsets of \mathcal{V}_h ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_h &:= \{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{V}_h; |\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{q}_i)| = 1 \ \forall \mathbf{q}_i \in \mathcal{N}_h\}, \\ \mathcal{F}_h(\boldsymbol{\chi}) &:= \{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{V}_h; \langle \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{q}_i), \boldsymbol{\chi}(\mathbf{q}_i) \rangle = 0 \ \forall \mathbf{q}_i \in \mathcal{N}_h\}, \quad \text{where } \boldsymbol{\chi} \in \mathcal{M}_h. \end{aligned}$$

3.2. Fully discrete methods for (1.3)–(1.5). We introduce a family of fully discrete *explicit* finite element methods for (1.3)–(1.5). The starting point is the weak formulation (1.8). To discretize (1.8), the following fully discrete semi-implicit approximation of (1.8) is immediate: For $j = 1 \rightarrow (J - 1)$, given $\hat{\mathbf{U}}^{j-1}, \hat{\mathbf{U}}^j \in \mathcal{M}_h$, find $\hat{\mathbf{U}}^{j+1} \in \mathcal{M}_h$ such that

$$(d_t^2 \hat{\mathbf{U}}^{j+1}, \mathbf{w}) + (\nabla \hat{\mathbf{U}}^{j+1}, \nabla \mathbf{w}) = 0 \quad \forall \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{F}_h(\hat{\mathbf{U}}^j), \quad (3.4)$$

and $\hat{\mathbf{U}}^0, \hat{\mathbf{U}}^1 \in \mathcal{M}_h$. Where $d_t^2 \varphi^j = d_t(d_t \varphi^j)$. However, (3.4) is difficult to solve because of the nonconvex constraint on \mathcal{M}_h . To overcome the difficulty, on noting $\langle \mathbf{u}_t, \mathbf{u} \rangle = 0$ we may assume that $d_t \hat{\mathbf{U}}^{j+1}$ is almost an element of $\mathcal{F}_h(\hat{\mathbf{U}}^j)$. This motivates the following explicit scheme for (1.8).

ALGORITHM 3.1.

- (i) Choose $(\mathbf{U}^0, \mathbf{V}^0) \in \mathcal{M}_h \times \mathcal{V}_h$ as a suitable approximation to $(\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{u}_1)$.
- (ii) For $j = 0 \rightarrow (J - 1)$, given $(\mathbf{U}^j, \mathbf{V}^j) \in \mathcal{M}_h \times \mathcal{V}_h$, find $\mathbf{V}^{j+1} \in \mathcal{F}_h(\mathbf{U}^j)$ such that

$$(d_t \mathbf{V}^{j+1}, \mathbf{w})_h = (\nabla \mathbf{U}^j, \nabla \mathbf{w}) \quad \forall \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{F}_h(\mathbf{U}^j),$$

and define $\mathbf{U}^{j+1} \in \mathcal{M}_h$ by

$$\mathbf{U}^{j+1}(\mathbf{q}_i) = \frac{\mathbf{U}^j(\mathbf{q}_i) + \tau \mathbf{V}^{j+1}(\mathbf{q}_i)}{|\mathbf{U}^j(\mathbf{q}_i) + \tau \mathbf{V}^{j+1}(\mathbf{q}_i)|} \quad \forall \mathbf{q}_i \in \mathcal{N}_h.$$

Convergence analysis of Algorithm 3.1 will be given in Section 4.

REMARK 3.1. (a). The auxiliary function \mathbf{V}^j is an approximation to $\mathbf{u}_t(t_j, \cdot)$, so the algorithm may be viewed as a mixed method which approximates \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{u}_t simultaneously.

(b). The last equation in the algorithm combines a discretization of $\mathbf{u}_t = \mathbf{v}$ with a projection to the sphere at the nodes.

(c). Note that owing to $\mathbf{U}^j(\mathbf{q}_i) \cdot \mathbf{V}^{j+1}(\mathbf{q}_i) = 0$ and $|\mathbf{U}^j(\mathbf{q}_i)| = 1$ for all $\mathbf{q}_i \in \mathcal{N}_h$ the projection step is well defined.

3.3. Fully discrete methods for (1.9)–(1.11). We construct two families of fully discrete *implicit* finite element methods for (1.9)–(1.11). Since the problem (1.9)–(1.11) converges to the problem (1.3)–(1.5) as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ (cf. [20]), the methods constructed in this subsection are indirect methods for approximating the problem (1.3)–(1.5).

Because for each fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ equation (1.9) is a semi-linear system of wave equations, a natural strategy is to adapt some of best known numerical schemes developed for the linear wave equation to the problem (1.9)–(1.11). Indeed, two families of such schemes will be considered in this subsection. The first family of schemes motivated by the work of Baker [3] are one-step implicit mixed methods in the sense of Remark 3.1 (a); the second family motivated by the work of Dupont [13] are two-step implicit methods.

Apart from the similarities of numerical methods to be given below and those developed in [3, 13], we emphasize that in addition to the extra difficulty caused by the nonlinearity in (1.9), we also have to cope with a new scale which is due to the introduction of the penalization parameter ε . In particular, we need to make sure our numerical solutions satisfy a discrete conservation law which mimics the differential conservation law (1.12), and they are robust with respect to ε .

First, adapting the schemes of [3], we introduce the following fully discrete implicit discretization of (1.9)–(1.11).

ALGORITHM 3.2.

- (i) Choose $(\mathbf{U}^0, \mathbf{V}^0) \in [\mathcal{V}_h]^2$ as a suitable approximation to $(\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{u}_1)$.
- (ii) For $j = 0 \rightarrow (J-1)$, given $(\mathbf{U}^j, \mathbf{V}^j) \in [\mathcal{V}_h]^2$, find $(\mathbf{U}^{j+1}, \mathbf{V}^{j+1}) \in [\mathcal{V}_h]^2$ such that for all $(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\chi}) \in [\mathcal{V}_h]^2$

$$\begin{aligned} (d_t \mathbf{V}^{j+1}, \mathbf{w})_h + (\nabla \mathbf{U}^{j+\frac{1}{2}}, \nabla \mathbf{w}) + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} ((|\mathbf{U}^{j+1}|^2 + |\mathbf{U}^j|^2 - 2) \mathbf{U}^{j+\frac{1}{2}}, \mathbf{w})_h &= 0, \\ (d_t \mathbf{U}^{j+1}, \boldsymbol{\chi})_h &= (\mathbf{V}^{j+\frac{1}{2}}, \boldsymbol{\chi})_h. \end{aligned}$$

Next, adapting the schemes of [13], we introduce our second family of fully discrete implicit methods for (1.9)–(1.11).

ALGORITHM 3.3.

- (i) Choose $\mathbf{U}^0, \mathbf{U}^1 \in \mathcal{V}_h$ as suitable approximations to \mathbf{u}_0 and $\mathbf{u}(t_1, \cdot)$.
- (ii) For $j = 1 \rightarrow (J-1)$, given $\{\mathbf{U}^i\}_{i=0}^j \subset \mathcal{V}_h$, find $\mathbf{U}^{j+1} \in \mathcal{V}_h$ such that for all $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{V}_h$

$$(d_t^2 \mathbf{U}^{j+1}, \mathbf{w})_h + (\nabla \mathbf{U}^{j+\frac{1}{4}}, \nabla \mathbf{w}) + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} ((|\mathbf{U}^{j+\frac{1}{2}}|^2 + |\mathbf{U}^{j-\frac{1}{2}}|^2 - 2) \mathbf{U}^{j+\frac{1}{4}}, \mathbf{w})_h = 0.$$

Convergence analysis of Algorithms 3.2 and 3.3 will be presented in Section 5. We note that in the above equation $\mathbf{U}^{j+\frac{1}{4}}$ could be replaced by $\mathbf{U}^{j,\theta}$ for any $\theta \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$. However, as pointed out in [13], although for $\theta \geq \frac{1}{4}$ the analogues of the above scheme all are absolutely stable, the time truncation error is minimized over this class at $\theta = \frac{1}{4}$, which is the main reason for the choice of $\theta = \frac{1}{4}$.

4. Convergence analysis for Algorithm 3.1. The main goal of this section is to prove that the solution sequence $\{\mathbf{U}^j\}$ of Algorithm 3.1 has a convergent subsequence whose limit is a weak solution of (1.3)–(1.5). To this end, we first need to establish some energy estimates for the solution sequence $\{\mathbf{U}^j\}$. Throughout this section we assume $\tau_1 = \tau$.

4.1. Stability. Recall that by definition every weak solution of (1.3)–(1.5) must satisfy the energy inequality (2.2). In the sequel, we show that the solution sequence $\{(\mathbf{U}^j, \mathbf{V}^j)\}$ generated by Algorithm 3.1 satisfies a discrete energy inequality, which mimics (2.2), provided that the temporal mesh size τ and the spatial mesh size h satisfy the relation $\tau = o(h^{\frac{m+4}{3}})$. Specifically, we have

LEMMA 4.1. *Let $m \geq 1$ and $(\mathbf{U}^0, \mathbf{V}^0) \in \mathcal{M}_h \times \mathcal{F}_h(\mathbf{U}^0)$. Then, under the mesh condition $\tau = o(h^{\frac{4+m}{3}})$, the solution sequence $\{(\mathbf{U}^j, \mathbf{V}^j)\}_{j=0}^J$ of Algorithm 3.1 satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} E_h(\mathbf{V}^{j+1}, \mathbf{U}^{j+1}) + \frac{\tau^2}{2} \sum_{\ell=0}^j [\|d_t \mathbf{V}^{\ell+1}\|_h^2 + \|\nabla d_t \mathbf{U}^{\ell+1}\|_{L^2}^2] \\ = c_0 E_h(\mathbf{V}^0, \mathbf{U}^0) \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

with a positive constant $c_0 = 1 + o(1)$ and where

$$E_h(\mathbf{V}^j, \mathbf{U}^j) := \frac{1}{2} [\|\mathbf{V}^j\|_h^2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{U}^j\|_{L^2}^2]. \quad (4.2)$$

Proof. Since the proof is long, we divide it into two steps.

Step 1: Auxiliary solution estimates. Setting $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{V}^{j+1}$ in Step (ii) of Algorithm 3.1 and using the inverse inequality $\|\nabla \mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^2} \leq Ch^{-1} \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^2}$ yields

$$\frac{1}{2} d_t \|\mathbf{V}^{j+1}\|_h^2 + \frac{\tau}{2} \|d_t \mathbf{V}^{j+1}\|_h^2 = -(\nabla \mathbf{U}^j, \nabla \mathbf{V}^{j+1}) \leq Ch^{-1} \|\nabla \mathbf{U}^j\|_{L^2} \|\mathbf{V}^{j+1}\|_{L^2}. \quad (4.3)$$

Next, we need to get an estimate for $d_t \|\nabla \mathbf{U}^{j+1}\|_{L^2}^2$, which in turn requires an estimate for $\|d_t \mathbf{U}^{j+1}\|_{L^2}^2$. We now derive these estimates by borrowing an argument from [2]. Let

$$\mathbf{R}^{j+1} := \mathbf{U}^{j+1} - \mathbf{U}^j - \tau \mathbf{V}^{j+1}.$$

Note that $\mathbf{R}^{j+1} \in \mathcal{V}_h$ and $\tau^{-1} \mathbf{R}^{j+1}$ measures the discrepancy between $d_t \mathbf{U}^{j+1}$ and \mathbf{V}^{j+1} . By the definition of \mathbf{U}^{j+1} in (ii) of Algorithm 3.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{R}^{j+1}(\mathbf{q}_i)| &= \left| \frac{\mathbf{U}^j(\mathbf{q}_i) + \tau \mathbf{V}^{j+1}(\mathbf{q}_i)}{|\mathbf{U}^j(\mathbf{q}_i) + \tau \mathbf{V}^{j+1}(\mathbf{q}_i)|} - \mathbf{U}^j(\mathbf{q}_i) - \tau \mathbf{V}^{j+1}(\mathbf{q}_i) \right| \\ &= \left| 1 - |\mathbf{U}^j(\mathbf{q}_i) + \tau \mathbf{V}^{j+1}(\mathbf{q}_i)| \right| \quad \forall \mathbf{q}_i \in \mathcal{N}_h. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|\mathbf{U}^j(\mathbf{q}_i) + \tau \mathbf{V}^{j+1}(\mathbf{q}_i)| = \sqrt{1 + \tau^2 |\mathbf{V}^{j+1}(\mathbf{q}_i)|^2} \geq 1$, we conclude that

$$|\mathbf{R}^{j+1}(\mathbf{q}_i)| \leq \frac{\tau^2}{2} |\mathbf{V}^{j+1}(\mathbf{q}_i)|^2. \quad (4.4)$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\mathbf{R}^{j+1}| \, dx &\leq \int_{\Omega} I_h[|\mathbf{R}^{j+1}|] \, dx \leq \frac{\tau^2}{2} \int_{\Omega} I_h[|\mathbf{V}^{j+1}|^2] \, dx \\ &\leq \frac{\tau^2(m+2)}{2} \int_{\Omega} |\mathbf{V}^{j+1}|^2 \, dx. \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

Similarly,

$$\|\mathbf{R}^{j+1}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|\mathbf{R}^{j+1}\|_h^2 \leq \frac{\tau^4}{4} \|\mathbf{V}^{j+1}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\mathbf{V}^{j+1}\|_h^2 \leq C\tau^4 h^{-m} \|\mathbf{V}^{j+1}\|_{L^2}^4,$$

thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|d_t \mathbf{U}^{j+1}\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq [\|\mathbf{V}^{j+1}\|_{L^2} + \tau^{-1} \|\mathbf{R}^{j+1}\|_{L^2}]^2 \\ &\leq [1 + C\tau h^{-\frac{m}{2}} \|\mathbf{V}^{j+1}\|_{L^2}]^2 \|\mathbf{V}^{j+1}\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

Now, setting $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{V}^{j+1} = d_t \mathbf{U}^{j+1} - \tau^{-1} \mathbf{R}^{j+1}$ in Step (ii) of Algorithm 3.1, we get

$$(\mathbf{d}_t \mathbf{V}^{j+1}, \mathbf{V}^{j+1})_h + (\nabla \mathbf{U}^{j+1}, \nabla d_t \mathbf{U}^{j+1}) = \tau^{-1} (\nabla \mathbf{U}^j, \nabla \mathbf{R}^{j+1}) + \tau \|\nabla d_t \mathbf{U}^{j+1}\|_{L^2}^2,$$

which and an application of the inverse inequality and (4.6) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} d_t \|\mathbf{V}^{j+1}\|_h^2 + \frac{1}{2} d_t \|\nabla \mathbf{U}^{j+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\tau}{2} \|d_t \mathbf{V}^{j+1}\|_h^2 + \frac{\tau}{2} \|\nabla d_t \mathbf{U}^{j+1}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ \leq C\tau^{-1} h^{-2} \|\mathbf{U}^j\|_{L^\infty} \|\mathbf{R}^{j+1}\|_{L^1} + C\tau h^{-2} \|d_t \mathbf{U}^{j+1}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ \leq C\tau^2 h^{-2} \|\mathbf{V}^{j+1}\|_h^2 + C\tau h^{-2} \|d_t \mathbf{U}^{j+1}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ \leq C\tau h^{-2} \|\mathbf{V}^{j+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + C\tau h^{-2} [1 + \tau h^{-\frac{m}{2}} \|\mathbf{V}^{j+1}\|_{L^2}]^2 \|\mathbf{V}^{j+1}\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

Step 2: Finishing up. We now conclude the proof by an induction argument. The assumptions on \mathbf{u}_0 and \mathbf{U}^0 imply that there exists a positive constant C_1 independent of τ and h such that $\|\nabla \mathbf{U}^0\|_{L^2} \leq C_1$. Assume that $\|\nabla \mathbf{U}^i\|_{L^2} \leq C_1$ for all $0 \leq i \leq j$, it follows from (4.3) and discrete version of Gronwall's lemma that

$$\|\mathbf{V}^{j+1}\|_{L^2} \leq \|\mathbf{V}^{j+1}\|_h \leq Ch^{-1}. \quad (4.8)$$

If we use this result in (4.7), together with the mesh condition, we have existence of another $C_2 = C_2(T) > 0$, such that $\tau h^{-2} \tau^2 h^{-m} \|\mathbf{V}^{j+1}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C_2$. Discrete version of Gronwall's lemma then yields to ($h \rightarrow 0$)

$$E_h(\mathbf{V}^{j+1}, \mathbf{U}^{j+1}) + \frac{\tau^2}{2} \sum_{\ell=0}^j [\|d_t \mathbf{V}^{\ell+1}\|_h^2 + \|\nabla d_t \mathbf{U}^{\ell+1}\|_{L^2}^2] \leq (1 + o(1)) E_h(\mathbf{V}^0, \mathbf{U}^0).$$

Hence, by induction (4.1) holds for all $j = 0, 1, \dots, J$. The proof is complete. \square

It follows immediately from Lemma 4.1 and (4.6) that

COROLLARY 4.2. *The solution sequence $\{\mathbf{U}^j\}$ of Algorithm 3.1 also satisfies*

$$\|d_t \mathbf{U}^{j+1}\|_{L^2} \leq C, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, J. \quad (4.9)$$

4.2. Convergence. To establish the convergence of Algorithm 3.1, we first need some preparations. Let $(\mathbf{U}_{\tau,h}^+, \mathbf{U}_{\tau,h}^-, \overline{\mathbf{U}}_{\tau,h}, \mathbf{U}_{\tau,h})$ and $(\mathbf{V}_{\tau,h}^+, \mathbf{V}_{\tau,h}^-, \overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\tau,h}, \mathbf{V}_{\tau,h})$ denote their respective constant and linear interpolations in time of the solution sequences $\{\mathbf{U}^j\}$ and $\{\mathbf{V}^j\}$ of Algorithm 3.1 as defined in Section 3.1. However, for notational brevity, most time we omit sub-indices τ, h in this subsection and use $(\mathbf{U}^+, \mathbf{U}^-, \overline{\mathbf{U}}, \mathbf{U})$ and $(\mathbf{V}^+, \mathbf{V}^-, \overline{\mathbf{V}}, \mathbf{V})$ to stand for $(\mathbf{U}_{\tau,h}^+, \mathbf{U}_{\tau,h}^-, \overline{\mathbf{U}}_{\tau,h}, \mathbf{U}_{\tau,h})$ and $(\mathbf{V}_{\tau,h}^+, \mathbf{V}_{\tau,h}^-, \overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\tau,h}, \mathbf{V}_{\tau,h})$, respectively.

We first derive the following reformulation of Algorithm 3.1.

LEMMA 4.3. *Suppose that the assumptions of Lemma 4.1 are valid. There holds for all $\mathbf{w} \in C_0^\infty([0, T]; \mathcal{F}_h(\mathbf{U}^-))$*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^T [-(\mathbf{U}_t, \mathbf{w}_t) + (\nabla \mathbf{U}, \nabla \mathbf{w})] dt + (\mathbf{V}^0, \mathbf{w}(0, \cdot)) \right| \\ & \leq (C\tau h^{-\frac{m}{2}} + h) \left[\int_0^T \|\mathbf{w}_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{w}_t\|_{L^2}^2 dt + \|\nabla \mathbf{w}(0, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \quad + \left| \int_0^T (\mathbf{V} - \mathbf{V}^+, \mathbf{w}_t) dt \right| + \left| \int_0^T (\nabla[\mathbf{U} - \mathbf{U}^-], \nabla \mathbf{w}) dt \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

Proof. Using the new notations we rewrite Step (ii) in Algorithm 3.1 as

$$\int_0^T [(\mathbf{V}_t, \mathbf{w})_h + (\nabla \mathbf{U}^-, \nabla \mathbf{w})] dt = 0.$$

Integrating by parts in t in the first term yields

$$\int_0^T [-(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{w}_t)_h + (\nabla \mathbf{U}^-, \nabla \mathbf{w})] dt + (\mathbf{V}^0, \mathbf{w}(0, \cdot))_h = 0$$

which and the relation $\mathbf{V}^+ = \mathbf{U}_t - \tau^{-1} \mathbf{R}^+$ imply that

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_0^T [-(\mathbf{U}_t, \mathbf{w}_t) + (\nabla \mathbf{U}, \nabla \mathbf{w})] dt - (\mathbf{V}^0, \mathbf{w}(0, \cdot)) \\ & = \int_0^T [(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{w}_t) - (\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{w}_t)_h] dt + (\mathbf{V}^0, \mathbf{w}(0, \cdot))_h - (\mathbf{V}^0, \mathbf{w}(0, \cdot)) \\ & \quad + \int_0^T [\tau^{-1}(\mathbf{R}^+, \mathbf{w}_t) + (\mathbf{V}^+ - \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{w}_t) + (\nabla[\mathbf{U}^- - \mathbf{U}], \nabla \mathbf{w})] dt. \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

By (4.1) and the inequality below (4.5) we have

$$\int_0^T \|\mathbf{R}^+\|_{L^2}^2 dt \leq C\tau^4 h^{-m}.$$

Finally, the assertion (4.10) follows from (4.11), (4.9) and (3.2). \square

We are ready to state and prove the first main convergence theorem of this paper.

THEOREM 4.4. *Let $T > 0$, and $(\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{u}_1) \in W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathbf{S}^{n-1}) \times L^2(\Omega, T\mathbf{S}^{n-1})$. Suppose that $(\mathbf{U}^0, \mathbf{V}^0) \in \mathcal{M}_h \times \mathcal{F}_h(\mathbf{U}^0)$ satisfies $\mathbf{U}^0 \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_0$ strongly in $W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)$, and $\mathbf{V}^0 \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_1$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)$ as $h \rightarrow 0$. Let $\tau = o(h^{\frac{4+m}{3}})$. Then there exist a map $\mathbf{u} \in L^\infty(0, T; W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)) \cap W^{1,\infty}(0, T; L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n))$ and a subsequence of solutions $\{\mathbf{U}_{\tau,h}\}$ (denoted by the same notation) of Algorithm 3.1 such that as $h \rightarrow 0$*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{U}_{\tau,h} & \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \mathbf{u} \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0, T; W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)), \\ (\mathbf{U}_{\tau,h})_t & \rightharpoonup \mathbf{u}_t \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega_T, \mathbf{R}^n). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, \mathbf{u} is a weak solution of (1.3)–(1.5).

Proof. It follows from Lemma 4.1 that under the above mesh relation, there exist a map $\mathbf{u} \in W^{1,\infty}(0, T; L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)) \cap L^\infty(0, T; W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n))$ and a subsequence of $\{\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{U}_{\tau, h}\}$ (denoted by the same notation) such that as $h \rightarrow 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{U}^-, \mathbf{U}^+ &\overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \mathbf{u} \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0, T; W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)), \\ &\rightarrow \mathbf{u} \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega_T, \mathbf{R}^n), \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

$$\mathbf{U}_t \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \mathbf{u}_t \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)). \quad (4.13)$$

Moreover, taking $h \rightarrow 0$ in (4.1) immediately shows that \mathbf{u} satisfies the energy inequality in item (5) of Definition 2.1. Furthermore, from the inequality

$$\| |\mathbf{U}^+(t, \cdot)|^2 - 1 \|_{L^2} \leq Ch \|\nabla \mathbf{U}^+\|_{L^2} \quad \forall t \in [0, T]$$

we conclude that $|\mathbf{u}| = 1$ a.e. in Ω_T .

Given $\phi \in C_0^\infty([0, T]; C^\infty(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n))$ let $\mathbf{w}_h = I_h(\mathbf{U} \wedge \phi)$. By the properties of the interpolation operator I_h we get (cf. [9, 12])

$$\begin{aligned} &\| (I_h(\mathbf{U} \wedge \phi) - \mathbf{U} \wedge \phi)_t \|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq Ch^4 \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left(\|\nabla^2(\mathbf{U}_t \wedge \phi)\|_{L^2(K)}^2 + \|\nabla^2(\mathbf{U} \wedge \phi_t)\|_{L^2(K)}^2 \right) \\ &\leq Ch^4 \left[\|\mathbf{U}_t\| \|\nabla^2 \phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{U}_t\| \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla^2 \phi_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{U}\| \|\nabla \phi_t\|_{L^2}^2 \right] \\ &\leq Ch^4 \left[\|\phi\|_{W^{2,\infty}}^2 + h^{-2} \|\mathbf{U}_t\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|\phi_t\|_{W^{2,\infty}}^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $(\mathbf{w}_h - \mathbf{U} \wedge \phi)_t \rightarrow 0$ in $L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n))$. Hence, as $h \rightarrow 0$, using $\mathbf{U}_t \cdot (\mathbf{U}_t \wedge \phi) = 0$ and (4.12) and (4.13),

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega_T} \langle \mathbf{U}_t, (\mathbf{w}_h)_t \rangle \, dxdt \\ &= \int_{\Omega_T} \langle \mathbf{U}_t, (I_h(\mathbf{U} \wedge \phi) - \mathbf{U} \wedge \phi)_t \rangle \, dxdt + \int_{\Omega_T} \langle \mathbf{U}_t, \mathbf{U} \wedge \phi_t \rangle \, dxdt \\ &\rightarrow \int_{\Omega_T} \langle \mathbf{u}_t, \mathbf{u} \wedge \phi_t \rangle \, dxdt. \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

Similarly, we can show

$$\|\nabla [I_h(\mathbf{U} \wedge \phi) - \mathbf{U} \wedge \phi]\|_{L^2}^2 \leq Ch^2 \left[\|\phi\|_{W^{2,2}}^2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{U}\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^\infty}^2 \right].$$

On noting the vector identity $\langle \nabla \mathbf{z}, \nabla \mathbf{z} \wedge \phi \rangle = \langle \nabla \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z} \wedge \nabla \phi \rangle$, from (4.12) and (4.13) we conclude that as $h \rightarrow 0$

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega_T} \langle \nabla \mathbf{U}, \nabla \mathbf{w}_h \rangle \, dxdt \\ &= \int_{\Omega_T} \langle \nabla \mathbf{U}, \nabla [I_h(\mathbf{U} \wedge \phi) - \mathbf{U} \wedge \phi] \rangle \, dxdt + \int_{\Omega_T} \langle \nabla \mathbf{U}, (\mathbf{U} \wedge \nabla \phi) \rangle \, dxdt \\ &\rightarrow \int_{\Omega_T} \langle \nabla \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} \wedge \nabla \phi \rangle \, dxdt. \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

Straightforward calculations show that

$$\left| \int_0^T \langle \mathbf{V} - \mathbf{V}^+, \mathbf{w}_t \rangle \, dt \right| \leq C\tau^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\tau \int_0^T \|\mathbf{V}_t\|_{L^2}^2 \, dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^T \|\mathbf{w}_t\|_{L^2}^2 \, dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Similarly, we can bound the last term in (4.10) and benefit from the estimates for $\tau \int_0^T \|\mathbf{V}_t\|_{L^2}^2 dt$ and $\tau \int_0^T \|\nabla \mathbf{U}_t\|_{L^2}^2 dt$ of Lemma 4.1. Letting $h \rightarrow 0$ in (4.10) and using (4.14) and (4.15) then gives (2.1).

In order to verify item (4) of Definition 2.1, we adopt an argument from [20, p. 92]. $\mathbf{u}_0 = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\tau, h \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{U}(t, \cdot)$ in $L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)$ follows immediately from (5.7). It remains to verify $\mathbf{U}_t(t, \cdot) \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_1$ in $L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)$ as $t \rightarrow 0$. To the end, multiply $\square \mathbf{u} \wedge \mathbf{u} = 0$ with $\mathbf{w} \in C_0^\infty([0, T]; C^\infty(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n))$, integrate by parts on Ω_T , and then subtract the resulting equation from (4.10); together with Lemma 4.3 and (5.7), (5.8), as well as assumptions on $(\mathbf{U}^0, \mathbf{V}^0)$, we find for the limit $\tau, h \rightarrow 0$,

$$((\mathbf{u}_t(0, \cdot) - \mathbf{u}_1) \wedge \mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{w}) = 0 \quad \forall \mathbf{w} \in C_0^\infty([0, T]; C^\infty(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)).$$

On noting $\langle \mathbf{u}_1(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{u}_0(\mathbf{x}) \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}_t(0, \mathbf{x}), \mathbf{u}_0(\mathbf{x}) \rangle = 0$ for almost every $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$, it follows from the vector identity $\mathbf{v} = \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u} \wedge (\mathbf{u} \wedge \mathbf{v})$ with $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{u}_t(0, \cdot) - \mathbf{u}_1$ that $\mathbf{u}_t(t, \cdot) \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_1$ in $L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)$ as $t \rightarrow 0$.

We also need to show $\mathbf{u}_t(t, \cdot) \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_1$ in $L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)$ as $t \rightarrow 0$. By weak lower semicontinuity of L^2 -norm and Fatou's lemma

$$\|D\mathbf{u}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} \leq \liminf_{\tau, h \rightarrow 0} \|D\mathbf{U}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} \quad t \geq 0.$$

Hence, for all $t \geq 0$, by (3.2), Lemma 4.1, and the assumptions on initial data,

$$\begin{aligned} E(\mathbf{u}_t(t, \cdot), \mathbf{u}(t, \cdot)) &\leq \liminf_{\tau, h \rightarrow 0} E(\mathbf{U}_t(t, \cdot), \mathbf{U}(t, \cdot)) \\ &= \liminf_{\tau, h \rightarrow 0} E_h(\mathbf{U}_t(t, \cdot), \mathbf{U}(t, \cdot)) \leq E(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_0). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} \|\mathbf{u}_t(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} \leq \|\mathbf{u}_1\|_{L^2}, \quad \limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_0\|_{L^2},$$

and the weak convergence $\mathbf{u}_t(t, \cdot) \rightharpoonup \mathbf{u}_1(\cdot)$ in $L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)$ and $\nabla \mathbf{u}(t, \cdot) \rightharpoonup \nabla \mathbf{u}_0(\cdot)$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ implies strong convergence $\mathbf{u}_t(t, \cdot) \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_1(\cdot)$ and $\nabla \mathbf{u}(t, \cdot) \rightarrow \nabla \mathbf{u}_0(\cdot)$ in $L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^{mn})$ as $t \rightarrow 0$. Consequently, $\mathbf{u} : \Omega_T \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ attains prescribed initial data continuously in $W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n) \times L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)$.

Since all requirements of Definition 2.1 are verified, hence, the map $\mathbf{u} : \Omega_T \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ is a weak solution to (1.3)–(1.5). The proof is complete. \square

As a by product, the above convergence result provides an alternative (to the one given in [20]) proof of existence of weak solutions to (1.3)–(1.5).

5. Convergence analysis for Algorithms 3.2 and 3.3. The goal of this section is to prove that the solution sequences $\{\mathbf{U}^j\}$ of Algorithms 3.2 and 3.3 converge uniformly in ε , and the limits of both sequences are weak solutions of (1.9)–(1.11).

5.1. Stability of Algorithms 3.2 and 3.3. Let $E_h(\cdot, \cdot)$ be same as in (4.2), and define

$$F_h(\mathbf{U}^j) = \frac{1}{4} \|\ |\mathbf{U}^j|^2 - 1 \|_h^2.$$

The following lemma establishes a discrete conservation law for Algorithm 3.2, which mimics the differential conservation law (1.12).

LEMMA 5.1. For $\varepsilon > 0$, let $\tau_1 = \tau$ and $(\mathbf{U}^0, \mathbf{V}^0) \in [\mathcal{V}_h]^2$. Then the solution sequence $\{(\mathbf{U}^j, \mathbf{V}^j)\}$ generated by Algorithm 3.2 satisfies for $j = 0 \rightarrow (J - 1)$

$$E_h(\mathbf{V}^{j+1}, \mathbf{U}^{j+1}) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} F_h(\mathbf{U}^{j+1}) = E_h(\mathbf{V}^0, \mathbf{U}^0) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} F_h(\mathbf{U}^0). \quad (5.1)$$

Moreover, if $\mathbf{U}^0 \in \mathcal{M}_h$ then $F_h(\mathbf{U}^0) = 0$, and

$$\|d_t \mathbf{U}^{j+1}\|_h^2 \leq 2E_h(\mathbf{V}^0, \mathbf{U}^0). \quad (5.2)$$

Proof. Taking test functions $(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\chi}) = (d_t \mathbf{U}^{j+1}, d_t \mathbf{V}^{j+1})$ in (ii) of Algorithm 3.2 and using binomial formulas we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (d_t \mathbf{V}^{j+1}, d_t \mathbf{U}^{j+1})_h + \frac{1}{2} d_t \|\nabla \mathbf{U}^{j+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} d_t F_h(\mathbf{U}^{j+1}) &= 0, \\ (d_t \mathbf{U}^{j+1}, d_t \mathbf{V}^{j+1})_h &= \frac{1}{2} d_t \|\mathbf{V}^{j+1}\|_h^2. \end{aligned}$$

Subtracting the second equation from the first one and summing up the resulting equation over the index from 1 to j gives (5.1).

Alternatively, taking $\boldsymbol{\chi} = d_t \mathbf{U}^{j+1}$ as a test function in the second equation of (ii) of Algorithm 3.2, it follows from (5.1) and the fact $F_h(\mathbf{U}^0) = 0$ if $\mathbf{U}^0 \in \mathcal{M}_h$ that

$$\|d_t \mathbf{U}^{j+1}\|_h^2 \leq \|\mathbf{V}^{j+\frac{1}{2}}\|_h^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{V}^{j+1}\|_h^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{V}^j\|_h^2 \leq 2E_h(\mathbf{V}^0, \mathbf{U}^0).$$

The proof is complete. \square

Likewise, we now prove that Algorithm 3.3 also satisfies a discrete conservation law which mimics the differential conservation law (1.12).

LEMMA 5.2. Let $\varepsilon > 0, m \geq 1$ and $(\mathbf{U}^0, \mathbf{U}^1) \in [\mathcal{V}_h]^2$. Then the solution sequence $\{\mathbf{U}^j\}$ generated by Algorithm 3.3 satisfies for $j = 1 \rightarrow (J - 1)$

$$E_h(d_t \mathbf{U}^{j+1}, \mathbf{U}^{j+\frac{1}{2}}) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} F_h(\mathbf{U}^{j+\frac{1}{2}}) = E_h(d_t \mathbf{U}^1, \mathbf{U}^{\frac{1}{2}}) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} F_h(\mathbf{U}^{\frac{1}{2}}). \quad (5.3)$$

Proof. Choose $\mathbf{w} = \delta_t \mathbf{U}^j$ in (ii) of Algorithm 3.3, and use the identities (cf. [14])

$$\delta_t \mathbf{U}^j = d_t \mathbf{U}^{j+\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{1}{2} (d_t \mathbf{U}^{j+1} + d_t \mathbf{U}^j), \quad \mathbf{U}^{j, \frac{1}{4}} = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{U}^{j+\frac{1}{2}} + \mathbf{U}^{j-\frac{1}{2}}).$$

and binomial formulas to simplify the resulting equation. Assertion (5.3) follows easily from summing up the equation over the index from 1 to j . \square

We remark that the existence of solutions to Algorithms 3.2 and 3.3 now follows from the discrete conservation laws (5.1) and (5.3), respectively, and an application of Brouwer fixed point theorem.

5.2. Convergence of Algorithm 3.2. The same notations as those in Section 4.2 will be used in this subsection. The following lemma prepares us to prove the convergence of Algorithm 3.2.

LEMMA 5.3. *In addition to the assumptions of Lemma 5.1, we assume $\mathbf{U}^0 \in \mathcal{M}_h$, then for all $\mathbf{w} \in C_0^\infty([0, T]; \mathcal{V}_h)$ there holds,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^T [-(\mathbf{U}_t, \mathbf{w}_t) + (\nabla \mathbf{U}, \nabla \mathbf{w}) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (|\mathbf{U}|^2 - 1) \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{w}] dt + (\mathbf{V}^0, \mathbf{w}(0, \cdot)) \right| \quad (5.4) \\ & \leq C \left[h + \frac{\tau + h}{\varepsilon} \right] \left\{ \int_0^T (\|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{w}_t\|_{L^2}^2) dt + \|\nabla \mathbf{w}(0, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \quad + \left| \int_0^T (\mathbf{V} - \bar{\mathbf{V}}, \mathbf{w}_t)_h dt \right| + \left| \int_0^T (\nabla[\mathbf{U} - \bar{\mathbf{U}}], \nabla \mathbf{w}) dt \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Using the new notations and integration by parts equations in (ii) of Algorithm 3.2 can be rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \left\{ -(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{w}_t)_h + (\nabla \bar{\mathbf{U}}, \nabla \mathbf{w}) + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} (|\mathbf{U}^-|^2 + |\mathbf{U}^+|^2 - 2) \bar{\mathbf{U}}, \mathbf{w} \right\}_h dt \quad (5.5) \\ = -(\mathbf{V}^0, \mathbf{w}(0, \cdot))_h, \end{aligned}$$

$$\int_0^T (\mathbf{U}_t - \bar{\mathbf{V}}, \mathbf{w})_h dt = 0. \quad (5.6)$$

Using the second equation we restate terms in the first equation as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T (\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{w}_t)_h dt &= \int_0^T (\mathbf{U}_t, \mathbf{w}_t) dt - \int_0^T [(\mathbf{U}_t, \mathbf{w}_t) - (\mathbf{U}_t, \mathbf{w}_t)_h] dt \\ & \quad + \int_0^T (\mathbf{V} - \bar{\mathbf{V}}, \mathbf{w}_t)_h dt, \\ \int_0^T (\nabla \bar{\mathbf{U}}, \nabla \mathbf{w}) dt &= \int_0^T (\nabla \mathbf{U}, \nabla \mathbf{w}) dt - \int_0^T (\nabla[\mathbf{U} - \bar{\mathbf{U}}], \nabla \mathbf{w}) dt, \\ \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \int_0^T (|\mathbf{U}^-|^2 + |\mathbf{U}^+|^2 - 2) \bar{\mathbf{U}}, \mathbf{w} \right\}_h dt &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^T (|\mathbf{U}|^2 - 1) \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{w} \right\}_h dt \\ &= -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^T \left\{ (|\mathbf{U}|^2 - 1) \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{w} \right\}_h dt \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \int_0^T (2|\mathbf{U}|^2 - |\mathbf{U}^-|^2 - |\mathbf{U}^+|^2) \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{w} \right\}_h dt \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \int_0^T (|\mathbf{U}^-|^2 + |\mathbf{U}^+|^2 - 2) (\mathbf{U} - \bar{\mathbf{U}}), \mathbf{w} \right\}_h dt. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (3.2), L^p -stability of I_h , and an inverse inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^T [(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{w}_t)_h - (\mathbf{U}_t, \mathbf{w}_t)] dt \right| \leq Ch \int_0^T \|\mathbf{U}_t\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}_t\|_{L^2} dt + \left| \int_0^T (\mathbf{V} - \bar{\mathbf{V}}, \mathbf{w}_t)_h \right|, \\ & \left| \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \int_0^T \left\{ (|\mathbf{U}^-|^2 + |\mathbf{U}^+|^2 - 2) \bar{\mathbf{U}}, \mathbf{w} \right\}_h - 2(|\mathbf{U}|^2 - 1) \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{w} \right\}_h dt \right| \\ & \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \int_0^T \left\{ h \|I_h(|\mathbf{U}|^2 - 1) \mathbf{U}\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{L^2} + h \|\nabla(|\mathbf{U}|^2 - 1) \mathbf{U}\|_{L^1} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{L^\infty} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \tau \|\mathbf{U}_t\|_{L^2} \|\mathbf{U}\|_{L^4}^2 \|\mathbf{w}\|_{L^\infty} + \frac{\tau}{2} \|\mathbf{U}_t\|_{L^2} \|I_h(|\mathbf{U}^-|^2 + |\mathbf{U}^+|^2 - 2)\|_{L^2} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{L^\infty} \right\} dt. \end{aligned}$$

The assertion of the lemma now follows from combining above estimates and appealing to Lemma 5.1. \square

We are ready to state and prove the second main convergence theorem of this paper.

THEOREM 5.4. *Let $\varepsilon > 0, m \geq 1, \tau_1 = \tau$, and $(\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{u}_1) \in W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathbf{S}^{n-1}) \times L^2(\Omega, T\mathbf{S}^{n-1})$. Suppose $(\mathbf{U}^0, \mathbf{V}^0) \in \mathcal{M}_h \times \mathcal{V}_h$ satisfies $\mathbf{U}^0 \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_0$ strongly in $W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)$ and $\mathbf{V}^0 \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_1$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)$ as $h \rightarrow 0$. Then there exist a map $\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon \in L^\infty(0, T; W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)) \cap W^{1,\infty}(0, T; L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n))$ and a subsequence of the solution sequence $\{\mathbf{U}_{\varepsilon, \tau, h}\}$ (denoted by the same notation) of Algorithm 3.2 such that as $\tau, h \rightarrow 0$*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{U}_{\varepsilon, \tau, h} &\overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0, T; W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)), \\ (\mathbf{U}_{\varepsilon, \tau, h})_t &\overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \mathbf{u}_t^\varepsilon \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)) \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in ε . Moreover, \mathbf{u}^ε is a weak solution of (1.9)–(1.11). Hence, $\mathbf{u} := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\tau, h \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{U}_{\varepsilon, \tau, h}$ exists and is a weak solution of (1.3)–(1.5), by [20].

Proof. It follows from Lemma 5.1 that there exist $\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon \in W^{1,\infty}(0, T; L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)) \cap L^\infty(0, T; W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n))$, and a subsequence of $\{\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{U}_{\varepsilon, \tau, h}\}$ (denoted by the same notation) such that as $\tau, h \rightarrow 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{U}^-, \mathbf{U}^+, \overline{\mathbf{U}} &\overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0, T; W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)), \\ &\rightarrow \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega_T, \mathbf{R}^n), \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

$$\mathbf{U}_t \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \mathbf{u}_t^\varepsilon \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)), \tag{5.8}$$

all uniformly in ε . For a.a. $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ and all $j = 0, 1, \dots, J-1$ there holds $\int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} (\mathbf{V} - \overline{\mathbf{V}})(\mathbf{x}, t) dt = 0$ hence we can subtract the temporal average

$$\overline{\mathbf{w}}_t(x) = (1/\tau) \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \mathbf{w}_t(\mathbf{x}, t) dt$$

of w . Then by a Poincaré estimate we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_0^T (\mathbf{V} - \overline{\mathbf{V}}, \mathbf{w}_t) dt \right| &= \left| \int_0^T (\mathbf{V} - \overline{\mathbf{V}}, \mathbf{w}_t - \overline{\mathbf{w}}_t) dt \right| \\ &\leq C\tau \left(\int_0^T \|\mathbf{V} - \overline{\mathbf{V}}\|_{L^2}^2 dt \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_0^T \|\mathbf{w}_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 dt \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

and this tends to zero for $h, \tau \rightarrow 0$. Similarly, we can bound the last term in (5.4). Therefore, for any $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega_T, \mathbf{R}^n)$, let $\mathbf{w} = I_h \phi$, using (5.1), (5.2), and the above inequality we can easily pass to the limit in (5.4) by setting $\tau, h \rightarrow 0$, and hence conclude that \mathbf{u}^ε satisfies (1.9)–(1.11) in distributional sense.

We now show that initial data are continuously taken for $t \rightarrow 0$ by the argumentation used at the end of the proof of Theorem 4.4. Since $\{DU\}_{k,h}$ is bounded in $L^2(\Omega_T, \mathbf{R}^n)$, we have $\mathbf{U} \rightarrow \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon$ in $C^0(0, T; L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n))$ as $\tau, h \rightarrow 0$, hence, $\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon : \Omega_T \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ assumes data $\mathbf{u}_0 : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ continuously in $L^2(\Omega; \mathbf{R}^n)$. Multiply (1.9) with $\mathbf{w} \in C_0^\infty([0, T]; C^\infty(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n))$, integrate by parts on Ω_T , and then subtract the resulting equation from (5.4); together with Lemma 5.3 and (5.7), (5.8), as well as the assumptions on the initial data $\mathbf{U}^0, \mathbf{V}^0$, we find that $\mathbf{u}_t^\varepsilon(t, \cdot) \rightharpoonup \mathbf{u}_1(\cdot)$ weakly in

$L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)$ as $t \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, by weak lower semicontinuity of L^2 -norm and Fatou's lemma we have

$$\|D\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} \leq \liminf_{\tau, h \rightarrow 0} \|D\mathbf{U}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}, \quad F(\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(t, \cdot)) \leq \liminf_{\tau, h \rightarrow 0} F(\mathbf{U}(t, \cdot)).$$

Hence, for all $t \geq 0$, by (3.1), Lemma 5.1, and the assumptions on initial data,

$$\begin{aligned} E(\mathbf{u}_t^\varepsilon(t, \cdot), \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(t, \cdot)) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} F(\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(t, \cdot)) &\leq \liminf_{\tau, h \rightarrow 0} \left[E(\mathbf{U}_t(t, \cdot), \mathbf{U}(t, \cdot)) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} F(\mathbf{U}(t, \cdot)) \right] \\ &\leq \liminf_{\tau, h \rightarrow 0} \left[E_h(\mathbf{U}_t(t, \cdot), \mathbf{U}(t, \cdot)) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} F_h(\mathbf{U}(t, \cdot)) \right] \\ &\leq E(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_0). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} \|\mathbf{u}_t^\varepsilon(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} \leq \|\mathbf{u}_1\|_{L^2}, \quad \limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_0\|_{L^2}.$$

and weak convergence $\mathbf{u}_t^\varepsilon(t, \cdot) \rightharpoonup \mathbf{u}_1(\cdot)$ in $L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)$ and $\nabla \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(t, \cdot) \rightharpoonup \nabla \mathbf{u}_0(\cdot)$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ implies strong convergence $\mathbf{u}_t^\varepsilon(t, \cdot) \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_1(\cdot)$ and $\nabla \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(t, \cdot) \rightarrow \nabla \mathbf{u}_0(\cdot)$ in $L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^{mn})$ as $t \rightarrow 0$. Hence, $\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ attains prescribed initial data continuously in $W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n) \times L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)$, and is a weak solution of (1.9)–(1.11) in the sense of [20, Definition 5.1]. \square

5.3. Convergence of Algorithm 3.3. Let $\{\mathbf{U}^j\}$ be the solution sequence generated by Algorithm 3.3, define for $j = 1 \rightarrow J$

$$\mathbf{V}^j := d_t \mathbf{U}^j = \frac{1}{\tau} (\mathbf{U}^j - \mathbf{U}^{j-1}), \quad \mathbf{Z}^j := \mathbf{U}^{j-\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{U}^{j-1} + \mathbf{U}^j).$$

We note that τ needs to be replaced by τ_1 in the definition of \mathbf{V}^j when $j = 1$. Let $\mathbf{U}^+, \mathbf{U}^-, \bar{\mathbf{U}}, \mathbf{U}$ (respectively, $\mathbf{V}^+, \mathbf{V}^-, \bar{\mathbf{V}}, \mathbf{V}$ and $\mathbf{Z}^+, \mathbf{Z}^-, \bar{\mathbf{Z}}, \mathbf{Z}$) be the constant and linear interpolations of $\{\mathbf{U}^j\}$ (respectively, $\{\mathbf{V}^j\}$ and $\{\mathbf{Z}^j\}$) in time as defined in Section 3.1.

Using the new notations the equation in (ii) of Algorithm 3.3 can be rewritten as for any $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{V}_h$

$$\begin{aligned} (d_t \mathbf{V}^{j+1}, \mathbf{w})_h + (\nabla \mathbf{Z}^{j+\frac{1}{2}}, \nabla \mathbf{w}) + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} (|\mathbf{Z}^j|^2 + |\mathbf{Z}^{j+1}|^2 - 2|\mathbf{Z}^{j+\frac{1}{2}}|^2, \mathbf{w})_h &= 0, \\ (d_t \mathbf{U}^{j+1} - \mathbf{V}^{j+1}, \mathbf{w})_h &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

or equivalently, for any $\mathbf{w} \in C_0^\infty([0, T]; \mathcal{V}_h)$

$$\int_0^T \left\{ -(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{w}_t)_h + (\nabla \bar{\mathbf{Z}}, \nabla \mathbf{w}) + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} (|\mathbf{Z}^+|^2 + |\mathbf{Z}^-|^2 - 2|\bar{\mathbf{Z}}|^2, \mathbf{w})_h \right\} dt \quad (5.9)$$

$$= (\mathbf{V}^0, \mathbf{w}((0, \cdot)))_h.$$

$$\int_0^T (\mathbf{U}_t - \mathbf{V}^+, \mathbf{w})_h dt = 0. \quad (5.10)$$

Comparing equations (5.9)–(5.10) with (5.5)–(5.6) we see that (5.9) can be obtained from (5.5) by replacing \mathbf{Z} by \mathbf{U} , and (5.10) from (5.6) by replacing \mathbf{V}^+ by $\bar{\mathbf{V}}$. Moreover, the discrete conservation law (5.3) provides the same energy estimates for

(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{V}) here as those enjoyed by (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) in Subsection 5.2 as a result of the discrete conservation law (5.1). Hence, on noting $\mathbf{U}^j = \mathbf{Z}^j - \tau \mathbf{V}^j$ for Algorithm 3.3 and the inequality (3.3), by repeating the proof of Lemma 5.3 we easily get

LEMMA 5.5. *Let $\{\mathbf{U}^j\}$ be the solution sequence of Algorithm 3.3 and $\mathbf{V}^+, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{Z}^+, \mathbf{Z}^-$ and $\bar{\mathbf{Z}}$ be defined as above. In addition to the assumptions of Lemma 5.2, we assume $(\mathbf{U}^0, \mathbf{U}^1) \in [\mathcal{M}_h]^2$ such that $E_h(d_t \mathbf{U}^1, \mathbf{U}^{\frac{1}{2}}) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} F_h(\mathbf{U}^{\frac{1}{2}}) \leq C$, then for all $\mathbf{w} \in C_0^\infty([0, T]; \mathcal{V}_h)$, there holds,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^T [-(\mathbf{U}_t, \mathbf{w}_t) + (\nabla \mathbf{Z}, \nabla \mathbf{w}) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (|\mathbf{Z}|^2 - 1) \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{w}] dt + (\mathbf{V}^0, \mathbf{w}(0, \cdot)) \right| \\ & \leq C \left[h + \frac{\tau + h}{\varepsilon} \right] \left\{ \int_0^T (\|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{w}_t\|_{L^2}^2) dt + \|\nabla \mathbf{w}(0, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \quad + \left| \int_0^T (\mathbf{V} - \mathbf{V}^+, \mathbf{w}_t)_h dt \right| + \left| \int_0^T (\nabla[\mathbf{Z} - \bar{\mathbf{Z}}], \nabla \mathbf{w}) dt \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

We now state and show the third main convergence theorem of this paper.

THEOREM 5.6. *Let $\varepsilon > 0, m \geq 1$, and $(\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{u}_1) \in W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathbf{S}^{n-1}) \times L^2(\Omega, T\mathbf{S}^{n-1})$. In addition to the assumptions of Lemma 5.5, suppose $(\mathbf{U}^0, \mathbf{U}^1) \in [\mathcal{M}_h]^2$ satisfies $\mathbf{U}^0 \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_0$ strongly in $W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)$ and $d_t \mathbf{U}^1 \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_1$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)$ as $\tau_1, h \rightarrow 0$. Then there exist a map $\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon \in L^\infty(0, T; W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)) \cap W^{1,\infty}(0, T; L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n))$ and a subsequence of the solution sequence $\{\mathbf{U}_{\varepsilon, \tau, h}\}$ (denoted by the same notation) of Algorithm 3.3 such that as $\tau, h \rightarrow 0$*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{U}_{\varepsilon, \tau, h} \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0, T; W^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)), \\ & (\mathbf{U}_{\varepsilon, \tau, h})_t \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \mathbf{u}_t^\varepsilon \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)) \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in ε . Moreover, \mathbf{u}^ε is a weak solution of (1.9)–(1.11). Hence, $\mathbf{u} := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\tau, h \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{U}_{\varepsilon, \tau, h}$ exists and is a weak solution of (1.3)–(1.5), by [20].

Proof. The proof is essentially same as that of Theorem 5.4. A slight complication is that after extracting convergent subsequences of $\{\mathbf{U}\}$, $\{\mathbf{Z}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{V}\}$ (which is possible thanks to the discrete energy law (5.3)) and passing to the limit in (5.11), we now need to relate the three limiting functions $\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon, \mathbf{z}^\varepsilon$ and \mathbf{v}^ε to each other.

To this end, first, on noting identity $\mathbf{U}^j = \mathbf{Z}^j - \tau \mathbf{V}^j$, (or equivalently, $\mathbf{U}^+ = \mathbf{Z}^+ - \tau \mathbf{V}^+$) and inequality (3.3) we conclude that $\mathbf{U}^+, \mathbf{Z}^+$ and \mathbf{Z} must converge to the same limit. Hence, $\mathbf{u}^\varepsilon = \mathbf{z}^\varepsilon$. Next, it follows from identity $\mathbf{V}^j = d_t \mathbf{U}^j$ (or equivalently, $\mathbf{V}^+ = \mathbf{U}_t$) and inequality (3.3) that $\mathbf{v}^\varepsilon = \mathbf{u}_t^\varepsilon$. The proof is complete. \square

REMARK 5.1. (a). *The use of Algorithm 3.3 requires choosing suitable starting values \mathbf{U}^0 and \mathbf{U}^1 . It is easy to see that \mathbf{U}^0 can be constructed straightforwardly as the interpolation or the L^2 -projection of \mathbf{u}_0 . On the other hand, the choice of \mathbf{U}^1 is less obvious since \mathbf{U}^1 must satisfy (i) $d_t \mathbf{U}^1 \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_1$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{R}^n)$ as $\tau_1, h \rightarrow 0$; (ii) $\frac{1}{\varepsilon} F_h(\mathbf{U}^{\frac{1}{2}}) \leq C$. To the end, let \mathbf{V}^0 be the interpolation or the L^2 -projection of \mathbf{u}_1 and define $\mathbf{U}^1 := \mathbf{U}^0 + \tau_1 \mathbf{V}^0$. Clearly, requirement (i) is fulfilled. Since $\mathbf{U}^{\frac{1}{2}} = \mathbf{U}^0 + \frac{\tau_1}{2} \mathbf{V}^0$, then $|\mathbf{U}^{\frac{1}{2}}| = 1 + O(\tau_1)$ and $\frac{1}{\varepsilon} F_h(\mathbf{U}^{\frac{1}{2}}) = O(\frac{\tau_1^2}{\varepsilon})$. Hence, requirement (ii) is fulfilled provided that $\tau_1 = O(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}})$. We also note that if $\mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \mathbf{u}_1 = 0$, \mathbf{V}^0 in above can be chosen such that $\mathbf{U}^0 \cdot \mathbf{V}^0 = 0$, in this case we have $\frac{1}{\varepsilon} F_h(\mathbf{U}^{\frac{1}{2}}) \leq C$ provided that $\tau_1 = O(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{4}})$.*

(b). *It is interesting to note that Algorithm 3.3 is stable (and converges) uniformly in ε provided that $\tau_1 = O(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}})$, which means that the first time step must be chosen*

very small. On the other hand, no restriction is imposed on h and the later time step τ for stability. Hence, as expected, the algorithm is absolutely stable.

6. Numerical experiments. Besides local existence results, the only global result is a unique smooth solution for all times, provided that the initial energy is sufficiently small [20]. In order to obtain global existence without the assumption of small energy it would be sufficient to show that the energy cannot concentrate at the hypothetical singularity. Similar to [8], our results for same initial data evidence a concentration effect in case of large initial data at a finite time $T > 0$.




FIG. 6.1. $W^{1,\infty}$ seminorm and discrete energy as functions of $t \in [0, 2]$ for approximations obtained with Algorithms 3.1 and 3.2 for various choices of ϵ .

6.1. Consistent discretization versus penalized approximation. In our first numerical experiment we report the performance of Algorithms 3.1 and 3.2 on an example that leads to large gradients. In particular, we follow [6] and employ, for $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbf{R}^2$, $r := |\mathbf{x}|$, and $a(r) := (1 - 2r)^4$, the pair of initial data

$$\mathbf{u}_0(\mathbf{x}) := \begin{cases} (0, 0, -1) & \text{for } r \geq 1/2, \\ (2x_1 a, 2x_2 a, a^2 - r^2)/(a^2 + r^2) & \text{for } r \leq 1/2, \end{cases} \quad \mathbf{u}_1(\mathbf{x}) := \mathbf{0}.$$

We use a uniform triangulation of $\Omega = (-1/2, 1/2)^2$ into 2048 triangles which are squares halved along the direction $(1, 1)$ and with maximal diameter $h = \sqrt{2}2^{-5}$. The time-step size that we use is $\tau = h^{2.1}$, where the additional power 0.1 is motivated by the condition $\tau = o(h^2)$. Figure 6.1 displays the $W^{1,\infty}$ seminorm

$$|\mathbf{U}(t)|_{1,\infty} = \|\nabla \mathbf{U}(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$$

as a function of $t \in [0, 2]$ and with \mathbf{U} obtained from Algorithm 3.1 (indicated as “consistent”) and Algorithm 3.2 for various choices of ϵ . In addition, we displayed the discrete energies

$$E_h(\mathbf{U}(t)) = E_h(\mathbf{V}^+(t), \mathbf{U}^+(t))$$

and

$$E_h^\varepsilon(\mathbf{U}(t)) = E_h(\mathbf{V}^+(t), \mathbf{U}^+(t)) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} F_h(\mathbf{U}^+(t)),$$

for the approximate solutions obtained with Algorithm 3.1 and Algorithm 3.2, respectively. We observe that the $W^{1,\infty}$ seminorm attains its maximum value

$$\max_{\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{V}_h; \forall \mathbf{q}_i \in \mathcal{N}_h, |\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{q}_i)|=1} \|\nabla \mathbf{W}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = 2\sqrt{2}2^{-5} \approx 90.5097$$

among functions $\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{V}_h$ that satisfy $|\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{q}_i)| = 1$ for all nodes $\mathbf{q}_i \in \mathcal{N}_h$ for the solution obtained with Algorithm 3.1 at $t \approx 0.25$. Its energy $E_h(\mathbf{U}(t))$ is almost a constant indicating robustness of our direct method. The numerical results differ significantly when the approximation is obtained with Algorithm 3.2 and when different values for ε are used. Nevertheless we see that the results approach those obtained with Algorithm 3.1 when ε becomes small. But even for the extremely small choice $\varepsilon = h^3$ the $W^{1,\infty}$ seminorm of the numerical approximation remains away from the maximum value. We note that such a choice of ε is critical since Lemma 5.3 suggests that convergence of the numerical approximations obtained by Algorithm 3.2 can only be expected if $\tau, h = o(\varepsilon)$.




FIG. 6.2. $W^{1,\infty}$ seminorm and discrete energy as functions of $t \in [0, 2]$ for approximations obtained with Algorithms 3.1 on refining triangulations.

6.2. Numerical evidence for finite-time blow-up and occurrence of singular solutions. Even though Algorithms 3.1 and 3.2 are mathematically equivalent in the sense that they both provide subsequences that converge weakly to a solution of the wave map equation we believe that Algorithm 3.1 is better suited to study the occurrence of singularities since the corresponding topological effects are not diffused as in the regularized (penalized) approximation scheme of Algorithm 3.2. Figure 6.2




FIG. 6.3. Scaled first two components of $\mathbf{U}(t, \cdot)$ for the solution provided by Algorithm 3.1 for $t = 0, 0.20025, 0.40051, 0.60076, 0.80102, 1.00130$.




FIG. 6.4. Scaled solution $\mathbf{U}(t, \cdot)$ obtained with Algorithm 3.1 in a neighborhood of the origin for $t = 0, 0.20025, 0.40051, 0.60076, 0.80102, 1.00130$ on a criss-cross triangulation.

displays the behavior of numerical solutions obtained with Algorithm 3.1 for decreasing mesh-sizes and with the initial data described above. As in the previous subsection we employed uniform triangulations of $\Omega = (-1/2, 1/2)^2$ into squares halved along the direction $(1, 1)$. The time-step size was defined through $\tau = h^{2.1}$ for $h = \sqrt{2}2^{-5}$, $\sqrt{2}2^{-6}$, $\sqrt{2}2^{-7}$ corresponding to a sequence of triangulations with 2048, 8192, and 32768 triangles, respectively. Figure 6.2 shows that for each triangulation the maximal $W^{1,\infty}$ seminorm is assumed. This indicates that an existing exact solution for the choice of our initial data has unbounded $W^{1,\infty}$ norm, i.e., is a singular solution. This so-called finite-time blow-up behavior occurs in our example when the solution at the origin points into another direction than all surrounding vectors. We illustrated this behavior in Figures 6.3 and 6.4, where the first two components of the vector field $\mathbf{U}(t, \mathbf{x})$, for the nodes $\mathbf{q}_i \in (-1/4, 1/4)^2 \cap \mathcal{N}_h$ and the vectors in a neighborhood of the origin are shown, respectively, for the solution obtained with the triangulation that consists of 2048 triangles. After a small period of large (maximal) gradients, the vector at the origin changes its direction. This change of direction may be unstable and mesh-dependent. It is not clear to the authors whether such an effect also occurs in the continuous situation. We note that in this experiment it was not possible to recover the initial data by reversing time. The results in the following subsection indicate that the quantitative behavior does not change significantly when other triangulations with more symmetry are used.

6.3. Effect of symmetric/asymmetric triangulations. In order to obtain a better understanding of the mechanism that forces the vector at the origin to change its direction after occurrence of a maximal $W^{1,\infty}$ norm we apply Algorithm 3.1 to the initial data given above for different spatial triangulations of comparable mesh-size. The four different triangulations we used (before two further uniform red refinements) are displayed in Figure 6.5. The first one (left upper plot) is obtained from four uniform refinements of a coarse triangulation \mathcal{T}_0 of $\Omega = (-1/2, 1/2)$ into two triangles. The next triangulation (right upper plot) resulted from four uniform refinements of that coarse triangulation of Ω that is obtained from dividing Ω into four similar triangles by dividing it along its diagonals. The third triangulation shown (left lower plot) is obtained from previous one by a random perturbation of those nodes that do not belong to the boundary $\partial\Omega$ by a value smaller than $h/10$ in each direction. Finally, we also employed an approximation of the disk $\Omega = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{R}^2 : |\mathbf{x}| \leq 1/2\}$, cf. the last triangulation in Figure 6.5 (right lower plot). Figure 6.6 displays the $W^{1,\infty}$ seminorms of the numerical approximations using the four different triangulations. We observe that quantitatively, the behavior does not change significantly when more symmetry is introduced in the grid or when symmetry is entirely destroyed by perturbing the positions of the vertices. We thus believe that our Algorithm 3.1 provides an accurate approximation of the exact solution and is capable of detecting singularities in a reliable way.

6.4. Equivariant initial data. In our last series of experiments we follow the work of [8] and employ equivariant initial data defined by

$$\mathbf{u}_0(r, \theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \sin \chi(r, \theta) \sin \theta \\ \sin \chi(r, \theta) \cos \theta \\ \cos \chi(r, \theta) \end{pmatrix} \quad \mathbf{u}_1(r, \theta) \equiv 0,$$

where (r, θ) denotes polar coordinates in \mathbf{R}^2 . We ran Algorithm 3.1 with these initial data on uniform triangulations of $\Omega = (-2, 2)^2$ with 2048, 8192, and 32768 triangles.



FIG. 6.5. *Triangulations with different symmetry properties.*FIG. 6.6. $W^{1,\infty}$ semi norm and discrete energy as functions of $t \in [0, 2]$ for approximations obtained with Algorithm 3.1 for (refinements of) the triangulations shown in Figure 6.5.

Figure 6.7 displays the $W^{1,\infty}$ seminorms and the energy as functions of $t \in [0, 3]$ obtained with the three different triangulations. As in [8] we observe finite-time blow-up. We remark that in [8] the results were obtained by reducing the problem to a one-dimensional model that guarantees that the solutions remains an equivariant map for all times. Here, this is not included as a constraint in the approximation scheme. Nevertheless, the sequence of snapshots of the numerical solution shown in Figure 6.8 for $t \approx 0, 2, 4, \dots, 10$ indicates that this is true for our numerical solution. In particular, the vector at the origin does not change its direction on triangulations that obey certain symmetry properties. In Figure 6.9 we displayed the third component of the solution at the origin as a function of $t \in [0, 10]$, i.e., the real number $\mathbf{U}^{(3)}(t, \mathbf{0})$, for the numerical solution obtained on the different triangulations described above (scaled by a factor 4 for this experiment) and indicated in Figure 6.9 (for simplicity, we did not perturb the vertex located at the origin). For the unperturbed triangulations the solution vector at the origin does not change for $t \in (0, 10)$ while for the perturbed triangulation the vector changes its direction for a small period of time when the blow up occurs. Finally, we remark that in this experiment (on the non-symmetric, unperturbed triangulation) it was possible to reverse time and to reproduce the initial data.




FIG. 6.7. $W^{1,\infty}$ seminorm and discrete energy as functions of $t \in [0, 3]$ for approximations obtained with Algorithms 3.1 for equivariant initial data on refining triangulations.

Acknowledgment: Part of the work was done when S.B. visited ‘Forschungsinstitut für Mathematik’ (ETH Zürich) in February 2006.

REFERENCES

- [1] I. J. R. Aitchison, *Gauge Theories in Particle Physics, Volume I: A Practical Introduction: From Relativistic Quantum Mechanics to QED*, Graduate Student Series in Physics, Taylor & Francis, 2002.




FIG. 6.8. Scaled first two components of $\mathbf{U}(t, \cdot)$ for the solution provided by Algorithm 3.1 for equivariant initial data for $t \approx 0, 2.0, 4.0, 6.0, 8.0, 10.0$.




FIG. 6.9. $W^{1,\infty}$ seminorm and third component of numerical solutions at origin of $t \in [0, 10]$ for approximations obtained with Algorithm 3.1 for (refinements of) the triangulations shown in Figure 6.5 and equivariant initial data.

- [2] F. Alouges, P. Jaisson, *Convergence of a finite elements discretization for the Landau Lifshitz equations*, downloadable at: mahery.math.u-psud.fr/alouges/ (2004).
- [3] G. A. Baker, *Error estimates for finite element methods for second-order hyperbolic equations*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., **13** (1976), pp. 564–598.
- [4] J. W. Barrett, S. Bartels, X. Feng, A. Prohl, *A convergent and constraint-preserving finite element method for the p-harmonic flow into spheres* (manuscript) (2005).
- [5] J. W. Barrett, X. Feng, A. Prohl, *p-harmonic map heat flows for $1 \leq p < \infty$ and their finite element approximations with applications to image processing*, downloadable at: www.fim.math.ethz.ch/preprints/2005 (2005).
- [6] S. Bartels, J. Ko, A. Prohl, *Numerical approximation of the Landau-Lifshitz-Gilbert equation and finite time blow-up of weak solutions* downloadable at: www.fim.math.ethz.ch/preprints/2005
- [7] B. K. Berger, P. T. Chrusciel and V. Moncrief, *On “asymptotically flat” space-times with G_2 -invariant Cauchy surfaces*, Ann. Physics, **237** (1995), pp. 322–354.
- [8] P. Bizon, T. Chmaj, Z. Tabor, *Formation of singularities for equivariant 2 + 1 dimensional wave maps into two-sphere*, Nonlinearity **14**, pp. 1041–1053 (2001).
- [9] S. C. Brenner and L. R. Scott, *The Mathematical Theory of Finite Element Methods*, Springer, 1994.
- [10] S. M. Carroll, *Spacetime and Geometry - An Introduction to General Relativity*, Addison Wesley (2003).
- [11] T.-P. Cheng and L.-F. Li, *Gauge Theory of Elementary Particle Physics*, Oxford University Press, 1983.
- [12] P. G. Ciarlet, *Basic error estimates for elliptic problems*, in Handbook of Numerical Analysis, I, North-Holland, Amsterdam, (1991), pp. 17–351.
- [13] T. Dupont, *L^2 -estimates for Galerkin methods for second-order hyperbolic equations*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., **10** (1973), pp. 880–889.
- [14] X. Feng, *Analysis of finite element methods and domain decomposition algorithms for a fluid-solid interaction problem*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., (38)2000, 1312–1336.
- [15] A. Freire, *Global weak solutions of the wave map system to compact homogeneous spaces*, Manuscripta Math., **91** (1996), pp. 525–533.
- [16] M. Giaquinta and S. Hildebrandt, *Calculus of Variations I*, Springer, New York, 1996.
- [17] J. Isenberg, S.L. Lieblich, *Singularity formation in 2 + 1 wave maps*, J. Math. Phys. **43**,

- pp. 678–683 (2002).
- [18] S. Müller, M. Struwe, *Spatially discrete wave maps on $(1 + 2)$ -dimensional space-time*, Topol. Meth. Nonlin. Anal. **11**, pp. 295–320 (1998).
 - [19] J. Shatah, *Weak solutions and development of singularities in the $SU(2)$ σ -model*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **41**, pp. 459–469 (1988).
 - [20] J. Shatah, M. Struwe, *Geometric wave equations*, New York University, Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York (1998).
 - [21] J. Shatah, M. Struwe, *The Cauchy problem for wave maps*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **11**, pp. 555–571 (2002).
 - [22] M. Struwe, *Geometric evolution problems*, IAS/Park City Math. Series, vol. **2**, pp. 259–339 (1996).
 - [23] M. Struwe, *Recent existence and regularity results for wave maps*, Journées “Équations aux Dérivées Partielles” (Saint-Jean-de-Monts, 1997), Exp. No. XVII, 7 pp., École Polytech., Palaiseau (1997).
 - [24] M. Struwe, *Equivariant wave maps in two space dimensions*.— Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **56**, pp. 815–823 (2003).
 - [25] D. Tataru, *The wave maps equation*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **41**, pp. 185–204 (2004).