## CHARACTERISTIC DIRECTION FOR EQUATIONS OF MOTION OF NON-NEWTONIAN FLUIDS

J. L. Ericksen

1. Introduction. According to the Reiner-Rivlin theory of nonNewtonian fluids, ${ }^{1}$ the stress tensor $t_{j}^{i}$ is given in terms of the rate of strain tensor $d_{j}^{i}$ by relations of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
t_{j}^{i}=-p \delta_{j}^{i}+\mathscr{F}_{1} d_{j}^{i}+\mathscr{F}_{2} d_{k}^{i} d_{j}^{k}, \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $p$ is an arbitrary hydrostatic pressure, the $\mathscr{F}$ 's are essentially arbitrary differentiable functions of

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{II}=-\frac{1}{2} d_{j}^{i} d_{i}^{j}, \quad \mathrm{III}=\operatorname{det} d_{j}^{i} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $d_{j}^{i}$ satisfies the incompressibility condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{i}^{i}=0 . \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The tensors $d_{j}^{i}$ and $t_{j}^{i}$ are both symmetric.
It is known [2] that the characteristic directions of the corresponding equations of motion are the unit vectors $\nu_{i}$ satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
F\left(\nu_{i}\right) \equiv 2 U^{2}+2 U U_{i}^{i}+\left(U_{i}^{i}\right)^{2}-U_{j}^{i} U_{i}^{j}=0, \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
U= & \mathscr{F}_{1}+\mathscr{F}_{2} \mu^{i} \nu_{i}, \\
U_{j}^{i}= & \mathscr{F}_{2}\left(d_{j}^{i}-\nu^{i} \mu_{j}\right)+2\left(\mu^{i}-\nu^{i} \mu_{k} \nu^{k}\right)\left(\mu^{m} d_{m j} \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{1}}{\text { IIII }}-\mu_{j} \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{1}}{\partial \mathrm{II}}\right) \\
& +2\left(d_{m}^{i} \mu^{m}-\nu^{i} \mu_{m} \mu^{m}\right)\left(\mu^{n} d_{n j} \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{2}}{\partial \mathrm{III}}-\mu_{j} \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{2}}{\partial \mathrm{II}}\right), \\
\mu_{i}= & d_{i j} \nu^{j} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $F\left(\nu_{i}\right)$ is a continuous function of $\nu_{i}$ on the compact set $\nu_{i} \nu^{i}=1$, a necessary and sufficient condition that no real characteristic directions exist is that $F\left(\nu_{i}\right)$ be of one sign for all unit vectors. Using this fact, we obtain simpler necessary conditions which are shown to be sufficient when $\mathscr{F}_{2} \equiv 0$.
2. Necessary conditions. Let $d_{1}, d_{2}$ and $d_{3}$ denote the eigenvalues of $d_{j}^{i}$. From (3),

[^0]$$
d_{1}+d_{2}+d_{3}=0 .
$$

We restrict our attention to unit vectors $\nu_{i}$ which are perpendicular to an eigenvector of $d_{j}^{i}$ and note that $F\left(\nu_{i}\right)$, being a continuous function of $\nu_{i}$, must be of one sign for all unit vectors in order that no real characteristic directions exist. Given any unit vector $\nu_{i}$ perpendicular to an eigenvector $e_{i}$ corresponding to $d_{3}$, we may introduce a rectangular Cartesian coordinate system such that, at a point, $\nu_{i}$ is parallel to the positive $x^{1}$-axis and $e_{i}$ is parallel to the $x^{3}$-axis. Then

$$
\begin{gathered}
\nu_{i}=\partial_{i 1}, d_{13}=d_{23}=d_{13} d_{3}^{i}=d_{22} d_{3}^{i}=0, \\
2 d_{12}=\left(d_{1}-d_{2}\right) \sin 2 \phi, d_{33}=d_{3},
\end{gathered}
$$

where $\phi$ is the angle between $\nu_{i}$ and an eigenvector corresponding to $d_{1}$. Making these substitutions in $F\left(\nu_{i}\right)$, given by (4), we obtain, by a routine calculation,

$$
\begin{align*}
F\left(\nu_{i}\right)=2\left[\mathscr{F}_{1}-\mathscr{F}_{2} d_{2}\right]\left\{\mathscr{F}_{1}\right. & -\mathscr{F}_{2} d_{3}-\frac{1}{2}\left(d_{1}-d_{2}\right)^{2} \sin ^{2} 2 \phi\left[\frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{1}}{\partial \mathrm{II}}\right.  \tag{6}\\
& \left.\left.-d_{3} \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{2}}{\partial \mathrm{II}}+d_{3} \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{1}}{\partial \mathrm{III}}-d_{3}^{2} \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{2}}{\partial \mathrm{III}}\right]\right\},
\end{align*}
$$

which must be of one sign for all real angles $\phi$. This is clearly true if and only if it is of the same sign for $\phi=0$ and $\phi=\pi / 4$. That is, either

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[\mathscr{F}_{1}-\mathscr{F}_{2} d_{2}\right]\left[\mathscr{F}_{1}-\mathscr{F}_{2} d_{3}\right]>0 \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
{\left[\mathscr{F}_{1}-\mathscr{F}_{2} d_{2}\right]\left\{\mathscr{F}_{1}\right.} & -\mathscr{F}_{2} d_{3}-\frac{1}{2}\left(d_{1}-d_{2}\right)^{2}\left[\frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{1}}{\partial \mathrm{II}}\right.  \tag{8}\\
& \left.\left.-d_{3} \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{2}}{\partial \mathrm{II}}+d_{3} \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{1}}{\partial \mathrm{II}}-d_{3}^{2} \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{2}}{\partial \mathrm{II}}\right]\right\}>0,
\end{align*}
$$

or (7) and (8) hold simultaneously with the inequalities reversed. By similarly analyzing the cases where $\nu_{i}$ is perpendicular to eigenvectors of $d_{j}^{i}$ corresponding to $d_{1}$ and $d_{2}$, we conclude that either

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[\mathscr{F}_{1}-\mathscr{F}_{2} d_{i}\right]\left[\mathscr{F}_{1}-\mathscr{F}_{2} d_{j}\right]>0 \quad(i \neq j), \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
{\left[\mathscr{F}_{1}-\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{F}} d_{j}\right]\left\{\mathscr{F}_{1}\right.} & -\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{F}} d_{k}-\frac{1}{2}\left(d_{i}-d_{j}\right)^{2}\left[\frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{1}}{\partial \mathrm{II}}\right.  \tag{10}\\
& \left.\left.-d_{k} \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{2}}{\partial \mathrm{II}}+d_{k} \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{1}}{\partial \mathrm{III}}-d_{k}^{2} \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{2}}{\partial \mathrm{III}}\right]\right\}>0 \quad(i, j, k \neq),
\end{align*}
$$

or

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[\mathscr{F}_{1}-\mathscr{F}_{2} d_{i}\right]\left[\mathscr{F}_{1}-\mathscr{F}_{2} d_{j}\right]<0 \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

and (10) holds with the inequality reversed. Now (11) cannot hold for all $i$ and $j$, so this possibility is ruled out. We thus have

Theorem 1. A necessary and sufficient condition that no real characteristic directions exist is that $F\left(\nu_{i}\right)>0$; in order that there exist no real characteristic directions perpendicular to an eigenvector of $d_{j}^{i}$, it is necessary and sufficient that the inequalities (9) and (10) hold.

For (9) and (10) to hold, it is necessary and sufficient that either

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{F}_{1}-\mathscr{F}_{2} d_{i}>0 \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathscr{F}_{1}-\mathscr{F}_{2} d_{k}-\frac{1}{2}\left(d_{i}-d_{j}\right)^{2}\left[\frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{1}}{\partial \mathrm{II}}-d_{k} \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{2}}{\partial \mathrm{II}}+d_{k} \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{1}}{\partial \mathrm{II}}-d_{k}^{2} \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{2}}{\partial \mathrm{III}}\right] & >0  \tag{13}\\
& (i, j, k \neq),
\end{align*}
$$

or

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{F}_{1}-\mathscr{F}_{2} d_{i}<0 \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathscr{F}_{1}-\mathscr{F}_{2} d_{k}-\frac{1}{2}\left(d_{i}-d_{j}\right)^{2}\left[\frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{1}}{\partial \mathrm{II}}-d_{k} \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{2}}{\partial \mathrm{II}}+d_{k} \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{1}}{\partial \mathrm{III}}-d_{k}^{2} \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{2}}{\partial \mathrm{III}}\right]<0  \tag{15}\\
(i, j, k \neq) .
\end{align*}
$$

3. Equivalent conditions. Let $t_{i}$ denote the eigenvalues of the stress tensor corresponding to the eigenvalue $d_{i}$ of $d_{m n}$ so that from (1),

$$
t_{i}=-p+\mathscr{F}_{1} d_{i}+\mathscr{F}_{2} d_{i}^{2} .
$$

Using (5),

$$
\begin{align*}
t_{i}-t_{j} & =\left[\mathscr{F}_{1}+\mathscr{F}_{2}\left(d_{i}+d_{j}\right)\right]\left(d_{i}-d_{j}\right)  \tag{16}\\
& =\left[\mathscr{F}_{1}-\mathscr{F}_{2} d_{k}\right]\left(d_{i}-d_{j}\right) \quad(i, j, k \neq) .
\end{align*}
$$

From (2) and (5),

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{II}=-\frac{1}{2}\left(d_{1}^{2}+d_{2}^{2}+d_{3}^{2}\right)=-\frac{1}{4}\left(d_{i}-d_{j}\right)^{2}-\frac{3}{4} d_{k}^{2}  \tag{17}\\
& \mathrm{III}=d_{1} d_{2} d_{3}=\frac{1}{4} d_{k}\left[d_{k}^{2}-\left(d_{i}-d_{j}\right)^{2}\right]
\end{align*}
$$

Using (16) and (17) to express $t_{i}-t_{j}$ as a function of $d_{i}-d_{j}$ and $d_{k}(i, j, k \neq)$, we calculate

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.\frac{\partial\left(t_{i}-t_{j}\right)}{\partial\left(d_{i}-d_{j}\right)}\right|_{d_{k}=\text { const. }}  \tag{18}\\
= & \mathscr{F}_{1}-\mathscr{F}_{2} d_{k}-\frac{1}{2}\left(d_{i}-d_{j}\right)^{2}\left[\frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{1}}{\partial \mathrm{II}}-d_{k} \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{2}}{\partial \mathrm{II}}+d_{k} \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{1}}{\partial \mathrm{III}}-d_{\kappa}^{2} \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{2}}{\partial \mathrm{III}}\right] .
\end{align*}
$$

From (12), (13), (14), (15), (16), (18) and Theorem 1, we have

Theorem 2. When the eigenvalues of $d_{j}^{i}$ are all unequal, a necessary and sufficient condition that there exist no real characteristic direction perpendicular to an eigenvector of $d_{j}^{i}$ is that either

$$
\left(t_{i}-t_{j}\right) /\left(d_{i}-d_{j}\right)>0 \quad \text { and } \quad \partial\left(t_{i}-t_{j}\right) /\left.\partial\left(d_{i}-d_{j}\right)\right|_{d_{k}=\text { const. }}>0,
$$

or

$$
\left(t_{i}-t_{j}\right) /\left(d_{i}-d_{j}\right)<0 \quad \text { and } \quad \partial\left(t_{i}-t_{j}\right) /\left.\partial\left(d_{i}-d_{j}\right)\right|_{d_{k}=\text { const. }}<0 \quad(i, j, k \neq)
$$

When (12) holds, the stress power $\Phi$, given by

$$
3 \Phi=3 t_{j}^{i} d_{j}^{i}=\left(t_{1}-t_{2}\right)\left(d_{1}-d_{2}\right)+\left(t_{2}-t_{3}\right)\left(d_{2}-d_{3}\right)+\left(t_{3}-t_{1}\right)\left(d_{3}-d_{1}\right)
$$

is negative, a possibility which many writers exclude on thermodynamic grounds.
4. The case $\mathscr{F}_{2} \equiv 0$. When $\mathscr{F}_{2} \equiv 0, \mathscr{F}_{1} \neq 0$, the characteristic equation (4) has been shown [2] to reduce to

$$
\begin{equation*}
G\left(\nu_{i}\right) \equiv \mathscr{F}_{1}+A^{i} B_{i}=0, \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A^{i}=2\left(\mu^{i}-\nu^{i} \mu_{k^{2}}{ }^{k}\right), \\
& B_{i}=\mu^{m} d_{m i} \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{1}}{\partial \mathrm{III}}-\mu_{i} \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{1}}{\partial \mathrm{II}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

In fact, $F\left(\nu_{i}\right)=\mathbf{2} \mathscr{F}_{1} G\left(\nu_{i}\right)$. When $\mathscr{F}_{2}=0, \mathscr{F}_{1}=0$, every direction is characteristic, a case which we exclude. Using the Hamilton-Cayley theorem,

$$
d_{j}^{i} d_{k}^{j} d_{m}^{k}=\mathrm{III} \delta_{m}^{i}-\mathrm{II} d_{m}^{i},
$$

we can reduce (19) to the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
G(\alpha, \beta) \equiv \mathscr{F}_{1}+2(\mathrm{III}-\mathrm{II} \alpha-\beta \alpha) \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{1}}{\partial \mathrm{III}}+2\left(\alpha^{2}-\beta\right) \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{1}}{\partial \mathrm{II}}=0, \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha=\mu_{i} \nu^{i}=d_{i j} \nu^{i} \nu^{j}, \quad \beta=\mu^{i} \mu_{i}=d_{k}^{i} d_{i m} \nu^{k^{k} \nu^{m}} . \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now (21) is a mapping of the unit sphere $\nu_{i} \nu^{i}=1$ onto a region $R$ in the $\alpha-\beta$ plane. The conditions

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\partial G}{\partial \alpha}=-2(\mathrm{II}+\beta) \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{1}}{\partial \mathrm{III}}+4 \alpha \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{1}}{\partial \mathrm{II}}=0 \\
& \frac{\partial G}{\partial \beta}=-2 \alpha \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{1}}{\partial \mathrm{III}}-2 \frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{1}}{\partial \mathrm{II}}=0 \\
& \pm d^{2} G= \pm 4\left[\frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{1}}{\partial \mathrm{II}} d \alpha^{2}-\frac{\partial \mathscr{F}_{1}}{\partial \mathrm{III}} d \alpha d \beta\right] \geqq 0 \text { for all } d \alpha, d \beta
\end{aligned}
$$

must be satisfied at any interior point of $R$ at which $G$ is a maximum or minimum. These conditions cannot be satisfied unless $\partial \mathscr{F}_{1} / \partial \mathrm{II}=$ $\partial \mathscr{F}_{1} / \partial \mathrm{III}=0$, in which case $G\left(\nu_{i}\right)$ is independent of $\nu_{i}$, and $\mathscr{F}_{1} \neq 0$ is then necessary and sufficient that there exist no real characteristics. From the implicit function theorem, values of $\nu_{i}$ corresponding to boundary points of $R$ are such that the equations

$$
d \alpha=2 d_{i j} \nu^{i} d \nu^{j}, \quad d \beta=2 d_{k}^{i} d_{i m} \nu^{k} d \nu^{m}, \quad 0=\nu_{i} d \nu^{i}
$$

do not admit a unique solution for $d_{\nu}{ }^{i}$ in terms of $d \alpha$ and $d \beta$. We thus have

Theorem 3. Maximum and minimum values of $G\left(\nu_{i}\right)$, hence of $F\left(\nu_{i}\right)$, hence of $F\left(\nu_{i}\right)$, occur only at values of $\nu_{i}$ such that the vectors $\nu_{i}, d_{i j} \nu^{j}$ and $d_{i}^{k} d_{k m} \nu^{m}$ are linearly dependent or, equivalently, at values such that the determinant $D$ of these three vectors vanishes.

Whatever be the unit vector $\nu_{i}$, we can always choose rectangular Cartesian coordinates such that, at a point, $\nu_{i}=\delta_{i 1}, d_{23}=0$. The condition $D=0$ then reduces to

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 & =\left|\begin{array}{ccc}
1 & 0 & 0 \\
d_{11} & d_{21} & d_{31} \\
d_{11}^{2}+d_{12}^{2}+d_{13}^{2} & d_{21}\left(d_{11}+d_{22}\right) & d_{31}\left(d_{11}+d_{33}\right)
\end{array}\right| \\
& =d_{21} d_{31}\left(d_{33}-d_{22}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

If $d_{21}=0\left(d_{31}=0\right), \delta_{i 2}\left(\delta_{i 3}\right)$ is an eigenvector of $d_{i j}$. If $d_{21} d_{31} \neq 0, d_{33}=d_{22}$, the vector with components $\left(0, d_{31},-d_{21}\right)$ is an eigenvector of $d_{i j}$, whence follows

Theorem 4. The vectors $\nu_{i}, d_{i j} \nu^{j}, d_{i}^{k} d_{k m} \nu^{m}$ can be linearly dependent only when $\nu_{i}$ is perpendicular to an eigenvector of $d_{j}^{i}$.

Theorems 3 and 4 imply that, when $\mathscr{F}_{2} \equiv 0$, we will have $F\left(\nu_{i}\right)>0$ for all unit vectors $\nu_{i}$ if and only if $F\left(\nu_{i}\right)>0$ for each unit vector $\nu_{i}$ which is perpendicular to an eigenvector of $d_{j}^{i}$. From Theorem 1, we then deduce

Theorem 5. When $\mathscr{F}_{2} \equiv 0$, a necessary and sufficient condition that there exist no real characteristic directions is that the inequalities (9) and (10) hold.
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    ${ }^{1}$ This theory was proposed independently by Reiner [4] for compressible fluids, by Rivlin [5] for incompressible materials. We treat the latter case.

