E lasticity of G aussian and nearly-G aussian phantom networks

O ded Farago and Yacov K antor

School of Physics and Astronom y, TelAviv University, TelAviv 69 978, Israel

W e study the elastic properties of phantom networks of G aussian and nearly-G aussian springs. W e show that the stress tensor of a G aussian network coincides with the conductivity tensor of an equivalent resistor network, while its elastic constants vanish. W e use a perturbation theory to analyze the elastic behavior of networks of slightly non-G aussian springs. W e show that the elastic constants of phantom percolation networks of nearly-G aussian springs have a power low dependence on the distance of the system from the percolation threshold, and derive bounds on the exponents.

62.20 D c, 61.43.-j, 64.60 Fr, 65.50.+m

I. IN TRODUCTION

Rubber and gels are large polymeric solid networks form ed when polymers or monomers in uid solutions are random ly cross-linked by perm anent bonds. This process is called vulcanization or gelation, when the latter term usually applies to cross-linking of m onom ers or very short polymers | gels; while the former term usually describes form ation of dense networks of long polymers | rubber. Rubber and gels are much more exible than ordinary crystalline solids and, m oreover, m ay rem ain in the linear elastic regim e even in response to deform ations increasing their dimensions far beyond their original, unstrained, size. Such a behavior is attributed to the network structure of these materials, and to the fact that the elastic restoring forces are of entropic, rather than energetic, origin. The sim plest theory of rubber elasticity which captures these essential physical features, is the \phantom network" (PN) model introduced by Jam es and Guth [1]. Thism odel assumes that the congurations of the dierent polym er chains are independent of each other, and neglects the excluded volume interactions between the m onom ers. W ith these simplifying assumptions one can treat each polymer chain in the network as an ideal one. By averaging over the positions of the monomers one nds that the probability density of nding chain ends separated by r, takes a Gaussian form exp $\frac{1}{2}Br^{2}$, where B usually depends on the tem perature T. The free energy of the chain is proportional to (m inus) the logarithm of this probability density and, therefore, proportional to r², as if it is a linear spring of vanishing equilibrium length, which will be called Gaussian spring. In the PN model, the therm all averages of som e quantities can be calculated analytically due to the Gaussian form of the statistical weights [2], and this makes it an excellent starting point form odels with excluded volum e interactions and entanglem ents [3].

The problem of gel elasticity introduces an additional com plication already at the level of the PN model. In gels the network strands are very short and do not necessarily resemble G aussian springs. Nevertheless, one may still construct a G aussian model of gel elasticity, sim ply by replacing each bond of the gel by a G aussian spring.

In the absence of excluded volum e interactions, the validity of this model is justied by the fact that even if the elementary pair potential between bonded atom s is very dierent from that of a Gaussian spring, the e ective interaction between som ew hat more distant atom s is, almost always, quadratic. This is a well known feature of long polymer chains [4], but it has also been dem onstrated for m ore com plicated networks [5]. D e G ennes used an analogy between elasticity of networks of G aussian springs and conductivity of random resistor networks [6], and argued that rigidity, just like conductivity, appears at the connectivity threshold, when a macroscopically large network spans the system . He further argued that at the phase transition the shear modulus and the conductivity should have the same dependence on the distance of the system from the connectivity threshold. Surprisingly, the details of the argum ent of de Gennes have never been worked out, i.e., there is no detailed calculation of the quantities characterizing the elastic response of Gaussian networks, namely the stress and elastic constants tensors. [There are several analytical studies of the statistical properties (including the elastic properties) of system s of G aussian springs [2,7], but none of them makes such an explicit calculation.] In section II of this paper we derive exact results for the stress and elastic constants of G aussian networks. W e prove that the stress tensor of a Gaussian elastic network is equal to the conductivity tensor of an equivalent resistor network. A detailed proof of this equality, which holds for a Gaussian network of arbitrary topology, is given in the appendix of the paper. We also show that the elastic constants of a system consisting of a single spanning cluster of Gaussian springs vanish. We discuss the elect of the nite clusters which model the small molecules form ed in the process of crosslinking and show that they play a crucial role in stabilizing the system .

In section III we investigate the elastic behavior of phantom networks of nearly-G aussian springs, whose energy dependence on their extension includes a sm all quartic term additional to the quadratic one. A perturbative analysis yields an expression for the elastic constants. In section IV we use this expression to evaluate the elastic constants of phantom percolation networks [8], close to the percolation threshold p_c . We conjecture a universal

scaling law for the elastic constants, C $(p \ p)^g$, and derive exact bounds for the scaling exponent g. Section V includes a short sum m ary and discussion of the m ain results.

II. E LA ST IC IT Y OF SY STEM S OF GAUSSIAN SPR INGS | EXACT RESULTS

A.De nitions in the theory of elasticity

The theory of elasticity describes deform ations of therm odynamic systems in response to external forces. At a nite temperature, it is convenient to consider hom ogeneous deform ations of the boundaries of the system, which can be described by a constant matrix, M_{ij} . When the system is strained, the separation between a pair of surface points, which prior to the deform ation was R, changes to

$$\mathbf{r}_{i} = \mathbf{M}_{ij} \mathbf{R}_{j}; \tag{1}$$

where the subscripts denote Cartesian coordinates, and sum mation over repeated indices is im plied. U sually the energy of the system depends on the relative distances between the atom s. The squared distance in the deform ed system is equal to

$$r^{2} = r_{k}r_{k} = M_{ki}R_{i}M_{kj}R_{j}$$

= M^tM_{ij}R_iR_j (_{ij} + 2_{ij})R_iR_j; (2)

where M $^{\rm t}$ is the transpose of M, and $_{\rm ij}$ is the strain tensor, while $_{\rm ij}$ is the K ronecker delta. The strain tensor vanishes at the undeform ed reference state. Expanding the m ean free energy density in the strain variables

$$f(f g) = f(f0g) + _{ij ij} + \frac{1}{2}C_{ijkl ij kl} + \dots; (3)$$

we identify the coe cients $_{\rm ij}$ as the com ponents of the stress tensor, while C $_{\rm ijkl}$ are the elastic constants (som etim es referred to as the elastic sti ness tensor).

The elastic constants of a therm odynam ic system are related to each other through certain equalities. The actual num ber of independent elastic constants depends on the sym metries of the system. Isotropic systems, for instance, have only three di erent non-vanishing elastic constants: $C_{xxxx} = C_{yyyy} = C_{zzzz}$ C_{11} ; $C_{xxyy} = C_{yyzz} = C_{zzxx} = ::: C_{12}$; and $C_{xyxy} = C_{yzyz} = C_{zxzx} = ::: C_{14}$. Moreover, these three elastic constants obey an additional relation [9]: C_{11} $C_{12} = 2C_{44}$, which reduces the num ber of independent elastic constants of isotropic systems to two. Frequently, one nds it more useful to describe the elastic behavior in such systems in terms of the shear modulus, , and the bulk modulus, , de ned by [10]

$$= C_{44} P;$$
 (4)

and

$$= \frac{\frac{1}{2} (C_{11} + C_{12});}{\frac{1}{3} (C_{11} + 2C_{12} + P); \text{ for } 3 \quad \text{dim ensional system s}}$$

(5)

where P = xx = yy = zz is the pressure. When and are positive, the system is mechanically stable [11].

B.Description of the system

We consider a d-dimensional system shown schematically in Fig. 1. The black circles in Fig. 1 represent atom s while the zigzag lines indicate the bonds, attractive pair-potentials, which connect them in a certain xed (quenched) topology. Atom s which are found inside the volume of the system s are called internal atom s. Surface atom s have xed coordinates on the boundaries of the system. The bonds connect atom s into clusters. Clusters containing only internal atom s are free to move in the entire volume. Cluster with both internal and surface atom s are non-free. Am ong them, one (and, in som e cases, several) may extend from one side of the system to the opposite side. This is the \spanning" cluster.



FIG.1. A schem atic picture of a network of springs. The system includes a spanning elastic network as well as some nite clusters. A tom s can be either internal, i.e., free to m ove inside the volume, or external, i.e., attached to a perm anent positions on the boundaries. Non-free clusters have at least one external atom.

The system which we study in this section consists of point-like atom s connected by G aussian springs. The energy of each G aussian spring is given by

$$R = \frac{1}{2}K = R = \frac{1}{2}K = R = \frac{1}{2}K = \frac{1}{2}K$$

where R and R denote the positions of atom s and , and R is the distance between these atom s. The spring constant K is assumed to have a xed, tem peratureindependent, value. The total elastic energy is given by the sum over the energies of all the springs

$$E = {X \\ h i } = {X \\ \frac{1}{2}} K R^{2}$$
:

C.Elasticity of the system

The components of the stress tensor of our system are related to the pair-potentials, (R), via relation

$$_{ij} = \frac{1}{V} \begin{array}{c} X \\ h & i \end{array} R \begin{array}{c} \frac{R_i R_j}{R} \end{array} \xrightarrow{R_i R_j} \begin{array}{c} N \ kT \ ij}{V}; \quad (7)$$

which has been derived thirty years ago by Squire, Holt and Hoover [12] as an extension of the Born and Huang theory of elasticity [13], to system s at nite-tem perature. In expression (7) summation over all distinct pairs of atom s, , is performed, where R_i and R_j are the ith and the jth Cartesian components of \mathcal{R} \mathcal{R} \mathcal{R} . The symbolh i indicates a therm alaverage, while N and V denote the number of internal atom s and the volume of the system, respectively. For potential (6) the expression (7) reduces to

$$_{ij} = \frac{1}{V} X K R_{i} R_{j} \frac{N kT}{V}_{ij}; \qquad (8)$$

where the sum is over the connected pairs.

The two terms in the expression (8) are called the congurational and kinetic terms, respectively. The con gurational term can be divided into terms, each one including the sum over the bonds of one distinct cluster. Since there are no excluded volume interactions, these terms are independent of each other (the clusters do not interact with each other), and the contributions of the di erent clusters to the stress are additive. We identify the stress applied by each cluster as

$$_{ij}^{cluster} = \frac{1}{V} \begin{pmatrix} x & & + \\ & X & \\ & & K & R_{i} & R_{j} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} N_{I}kT & \\ & V & ij; \end{pmatrix}$$
(9)

where N $_{\rm I}$ is the number of internal atom s of the cluster.

D . The contribution of the free clusters

The gas of free clusters is an ideal gas. Since the di erent clusters do not \feel" each other, it is intuitively clear that the contribution to the stress of each free cluster (fc) should be as of a point-like atom. To prove this result (which is general and does not depend on the particular form of the pair-potential), we use the fact that for a free cluster (fc), one can integrate out d degrees of freedom (of say, \mathbb{R}^1) in Eq.(9), and express the term s appearing in it in the relative coordinates $\mathbb{R}'_i = \mathbb{R}_i$ \mathbb{R}^1_i f = 2;:::;N_Ig. (This statement is correct only in the therm odynamic limit, when the linear size of the system becomes much larger than the radius of gyration of the free cluster.) One can easily verify that in the relative coordinates Eq.(9) may also be written in the follow ing way

$$_{ij} = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{i=2}^{*} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{i} \frac{\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{i}}{\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{j}} + \frac{N_{I}kT}{V}_{ij};$$

which from the equipartition theorem gives $_{\rm ij}$ = (kT=V) $_{\rm ij}$. The stress applied by all the free clusters is simply

$$_{ij}^{fc} = \frac{N_0 kT}{V} _{ij}; \qquad (10)$$

where N₀ is the total number of free clusters. Sim ilarly, the contribution of the free clusters to the elastic constants is also as of an ideal gas, given by the kinetic term [12]

$$C_{ijkl}^{fc} = \frac{2N_0kT}{V}_{il jk}: \qquad (11)$$

E.E lasticity of the spanning cluster

The stress and elastic constants of the spanning network of G aussian springs with temperature-independent force constants, are temperature-independent. The free energy F of the spanning network is a function of the temperature T and the positions of the surface atoms fR^sg . If the values of these variables change quasistatically, then

$$dF = S dT + f_{ext}^{s} Rd^{s}; \qquad (12)$$

where S is the entropy, f_{ext}^s is the external force which drags the surface atom s and sum mation is made over all the surface atom s. In a quasi-static process, the force f_{ext}^s is balanced by the force f^s applied by the network on atom s, namely

$$\mathbf{f}_{\text{ext}}^{\text{s}} = \mathbf{f}^{\text{s}} = \mathbf{K}^{\text{s}} \mathbf{R}^{\text{s}} \mathbf{R}^{\text{s}} \mathbf{R}^{\text{s}} ; \quad (13)$$

where sum m ation is over all atom s connected to atom s. The term sappearing in the therm alaverage in Eq.(13)

are linear in the coordinates R . Since the Boltzm ann weight is a Gaussian, i.e., an exponent of a quadratic form of the coordinates, these averages coincide with the most probable values, namely their values at the energetic ground state, and therefore do not depend on the tem perature. We thus conclude that $f^{\rm s}$ is a tem perature-independent quantity, and from Eqs.(12) and (13) we readily nd that

$$\frac{\mathrm{@}^{2}\mathrm{F}}{\mathrm{@T}\,\mathrm{@R}^{\,\mathrm{s}}} = \frac{\mathrm{@f}^{\,\mathrm{s}}}{\mathrm{@T}} = 0:$$

The last result implies that F can be decomposed into two parts

$$F(T; fR^{s}g) = F_{1}(T) + F_{2}(fR^{s}g):$$

If we consider hom ogeneous deform ations we may de ne a reference system and use the strain variables $f_{ij}g_{,in}$ stead of $f \tilde{R}^s g$

$$F = F_1(T) + F_2(f_{ij}g)$$
:

The stress and elastic constants are the coe cients in the f g-expansion of F_2 [see Eq.(3)]. Therefore, they do not depend on the tem perature.

The stress applied by the spanning network is equal to the conductivity of a resistor network with the same topology. The stress of the spanning cluster (spc) [eq.(9)]

$$\sum_{ij}^{spc} = \frac{1}{V} X K R_{i} R_{j} \frac{N_{I}kT}{V} ij;$$

can be rew ritten in the form

where the rst sum is over all the internal atom s, while the second sum is over all the bonds connecting internal and surface atom s. (The subscripts s and denote surface and internal atom s, respectively.) In the therm odynam ic lim it we deduce from the equipartition theorem that the rst and the third (kinetic) term s in Eq.(14) canceleach other. We are thus left only with the second term

$$\sum_{ij}^{spc} = \frac{1}{V} \frac{4}{V} \sum_{h \ si \ 2 \ spc}^{Spc} K^{s} R_{i}^{s} R_{j}^{s} 5 :$$
(15)

The therm alaverages in Eq.(15) are of quantities which are linear in the coordinates of the internal atom s and therefore may be replaced by the equilibrium values of these quantities (see earlier in this section). The equilibrium values of R minimize the energy of the spanning cluster

The dependence of E ^{spc} on the components R_j corresponding to one C artesian direction, j, is included in the term E_j^{spc} . The problem of nding the equilibrium values of R decouples into d scalar problem s of nding the equilibrium values of R_j . In order to calculate these values we need to solve d sets of linear equation (one set for each C artesian component):

X
K
$$R_{j}$$
 $R_{j} = 0;$ (17)

corresponding to the vanishing of the jth component of the force acting on each internal atom. (For each atom , sum m ation in the relevant equation is over all atom s connected to it.)

Let us de ne a resistor network with the same connectivity as the elastic network, in which each spring is replaced by a resistor with conductance K . . The values of the electric potential at the internal nodes, f' g, are obtained by minim ization of the heat power produced in the network, $P = \int_{h \in I} K (' ')^2 \cdot Except$ for a plays the role of R_{i} . If we replace R_{i} by ' in the force equations (17), we obtain the set of K ircho equations enforcing the vanishing of the sum of currents entering the internal nodes of the network. By replacing R_{i} by ', we de neam apping of the mechanical problem to an electrostatic one. In fact, we have d di erent electrostatic problem s corresponding to each Cartesian com ponent of the mechanical problem. They dier from each other in their boundary conditions, namely the values of the electric potential on the surface nodes, f' ^sg. In the jth electrostatic problem, we set 's equal to R^s_i, i.e., we assum e that the electric potential at each boundary point is equal to the jth Cartesian coordinate of the point.

The interesting question now is what is the analog of the stress tensor in the electrostatic problem. This appears to be the conductivity tensor, $_{ij}$ de ned by

$$hj_i i = ijhE_j i;$$

where his and he is are the volume averages of the current density and the electric eld, respectively. More precisely, if we follow the mapping de ned above we have the exact equality

$$_{ij} = _{ij}:$$
(18)

A detailed proof of this equality is given in the appendix to this paper. Here we just note that the proof consists of two steps: In the state we show that in the jth electrostatic problem, because of the choice of boundary conditions, he is a unity electric eld pointing in the (j)th direction. In the presence of such an electric eld hj_ii = ____ij. On the next step of the proof we show that

hji, and therefore $_{ij}$, are given by the electrostatic equivalent of Eq.(15)

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{spc} \\ \text{ij}}}^{\text{spc}} = \frac{1}{V} \frac{1}{V} \sum_{\substack{\text{h si 2 spc}}}^{X} K^{\text{s}} R_{i}^{\text{s}} (\prime^{\text{s}} \prime^{\text{s}})^{5}; \quad (19)$$

and therefore Eq.(18) is valid.

The elastic constants of the spanning network vanish. We have already shown that C_{ijk1}, the elastic constants of the spanning cluster of Gaussian springs with tem perature-independent force constants, are tem perature-independent. Therefore, we may calculate them at any tem perature, and in particular at T = 0. At zero tem perature the free energy coincides with the internal energy, given by Eq.(16), where fR g, the positions of the internal nodes, take their equilibrium values. Suppose now that the system is hom ogeneously strained. The positions of the surface nodes, fR^sg, change according to the linear transform ation (1), with a constant m atrix M ii. [Transform ation (1) was originally de ned for the separation between surface points. However, we can always set the origin of axes to be on the original (unstrained) surface, and in this case the transform ation applies to the positions of the surface points.] In order to nd the new equilibrium positions of the internal atom s, in the strained system, we need to solve the set of equation (17) with the new boundary conditions. Since both the equations and the transform ation of the boundary conditions are linear, the new solution is given by $r_i = M_{ij}R_j$. The elastic energy of the strained spanning cluster is given by [see Eqs.(2) and (16)]

$$E^{spc} = \frac{1}{2} X K (r)^{2}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} X K (r)^{2}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} X K (M^{t}M)_{ij}R_{i}R_{j}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} X K (2_{ij} + i_{j})R_{i}R_{j} :$$
h si 2 spc

This gives the dependence of E on the strain variables, which include only linear terms in $_{ij}$. Since the elastic constants are the coe cients of the quadratic terms in the f g-expansion of the free energy [Eq.(3)], we conclude that

$$C_{ijkl}^{spc}$$
 0: (20)

F.The stability of system s of G aussian springs

We have mentioned earlier in this section that stable solid therm odynam ic system s have positive bulk and shear moduli, and [Eqs.(4) and (5)]. In phantom system s, the contributions of the spanning cluster and the ensemble of free clusters to and are additive. Due to the vanishing of the elastic constants of the spanning cluster (20), we nd that its contribution to the elastic moduli is: spc = P spc > 0, and spc = 0 (twodimensions) or spc = P spc = 3 < 0 (three-dimensions) \mathbb{P}^{spc} is the negative (stretching) pressure applied by the spanning cluster]. The fact that is not positive means that the spanning cluster alone is not stable against homogeneous volume uctuations. The contribution of the free clusters to the elastic moduli is as of an ideal gas, given by: fc = 0, and $fc = N_0 kT = V$ [see Eqs.(4), (5), (10) and (11)]. The vanishing of the of the shear moduhus simply indicates that the collection of free clusters is a uid. The positive contribution of the free clusters to the bulk modulus is crucial for the stability of the system . Two-dimensionalGaussian networks are stabilized in the presence of free clusters since $= {}^{\text{spc}} + {}^{\text{fc}} = {}^{\text{fc}} > 0$. Three-dimensional systems are stabilized provided that the positive contribution of the free clusters to overcom es the negative contribution of the spanning cluster.

III. E LA ST IC IT Y OF SY ST EM S OF N E A R LY -G A U SSIAN SPR IN G S

The elastic response of polymers and polymeric networks is as of systems of Gaussian springs only in the rst approximation. It always includes a non-linear part, which becomes signicant when the network is su ciently stretched, much beyond its characteristic therm al lengths [1,14]. In order to study the nature of this correction, we consider networks of springs having the spring energies

$$R = \frac{1}{2}K \quad R \quad ^{2} + \frac{1}{4}a \quad R \quad ^{4}$$
: (21)

O ur choice for the spring energy is inspired by the free energy of a nite long polymer chain [1], where the leading correction to the linear relation between the force and the chain end-to-end vector $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{K} \ \mathbf{R}$, is a term proportional to $\mathbf{R}^2 \mathbf{R}$. The elastic energy of the system is given, again, as the sum of all springs energies

$$E = X = X = \frac{X}{h i} = \frac{1}{2}K = R + \frac{1}{4}a = R + \frac{1}{4}a = \frac{4}{4}$$

$$E_0 + E_1: \qquad (22)$$

W e assume that $E_1 = E_0$, and treat the quartic term perturbatively. In fact, we will make a more restrictive assumption that for each bond a R $\stackrel{4}{}$ K R $\stackrel{2}{}$. Since the quadratic term E_0 does not make any contribution to the elastic constants, we will mainly focus on the contribution of the perturbation term, E_1 , to them.

In the lowest order of a perturbation theory, the elastic constants of the network are tem perature independent. Substituting the pair potential (22) into expression (7) for the stress tensor, and expanding this expression to the rst order in a , yields

$${}^{ij} = {}^{0}_{ij} + \frac{1}{V} {}^{X}_{a} {}^{R}_{i} {}^{R}_{j}$$

$${}^{h}_{*}{}^{i}_{0} {}^{1}_{*} {}^{0}_{+}$$

$$\frac{1}{V kT} {}^{0}_{k} {}^{K}_{i} {}^{R}_{j} {}^{A}_{E_{1}} {}^{i}_{;} {}^{(23)}$$

where A A hA_0i denotes a thermal uctuation of the quantity A, and h i_0 denotes a thermal average with the (unperturbed) G aussian Boltzm ann weight exp($E_0=kT$). $^0_{ij}$ is the stress tensor of the corresponding G aussian network (where a 0), given by Eq.(8), which can be also expressed by its value at T = 0

$${}^{0}_{ij} = \frac{1}{V} {}^{X}_{h \ i} K R_{0} R_{0} ;$$
(24)

In the above expression R_0 is the ith Cartesian com – ponent of the bond vector \tilde{R}_0 , at the ground state of the unperturbed Gaussian network.

The next step is to substitute the pair potential (22) into the expression for the elastic constants [12] (see also Eq.(7) in Ref. [15]). By expanding this expression to the rst order in fa g, and using the fact that for the G aussian network C_{ijkl} 0 (20), we nd that

$$C_{ijkl} = \frac{2}{V} X_{h i} = R_{i} R_{j} R_{k} R_{l} + hX i_{0};$$

where X is combination of terms, each of which includes the thermal uctuations of some quantities. Since at T = 0 there are no thermal uctuations, that term vanishes and we readily not that

$$C_{ijkl}(T = 0) = \frac{2}{V} \bigvee_{h i}^{*} a R_{i} R_{j} R_{k} R_{l}$$

= $\frac{2}{V} \bigvee_{h i}^{X} a R_{0} R_{0} R_{0} R_{0} R_{0} R_{0}$; (25)

The second equality in the above equation is obtained by equating the expression inside $h i_0$ to its value at equilibrium (at zero tem perature the therm all average coincides with this value).

At a nite temperature we may write the elastic constants as the product of C_{ijkl} (T = 0), and a dimensionless function, which may depend only on terms of the form (kT a)=(K K). Expanding the function into power series in these variables yields

$$C_{ijkl}$$
 (T = 0) 1 + linear term s in $\frac{kTa}{KK}$ + ::: :

Since C_{ijkl} (T = 0) is a linear function in the quantities a , and since we are interested only in the rst order correction due to the perturbation (namely, in term s linear in a), we conclude that to the lowest order in a , C_{ijkl} are temperature independent, and therefore given by the above expression (25).

IV.ELASTICITY OF PHANTOM PERCOLATION NETW ORKS

A. The percolation m odel

One of the models which has been proposed to describe the process of gelation is percolation [8]. In the percolation model, the sites or the bonds of a lattice are random ly occupied by, respectively, atom s or bonds, with an occupation probability p. In the site percolation model, one links every two neighboring occupied sites, while in the bond percolation m odel one assum es that all the sites are occupied by atom s and each pair of neighbors is linked if the bond between the atom s exists. W ithin the percolation model, the gel point is identied with the percolation threshold, the critical site/bond concentration above which a spanning cluster is form ed. The percolation m odel predicts that close to the percolation threshold, p_c, quantities like the mean cluster mass, typical cluster linear size and gel fraction, have power-law dependence on (p p.). The relevant exponents are universal and depend only on the dimensionality of the system, but not on the atom ic-scale features of the system. The values of these exponents have been measured experim entally for various gel system s [16]. A fairly good agreem ent have been found between the measured exponents and their values as predicted by the percolation model, what proves the applicability of the percolation model to gelation.

The situation concerning the elastic behavior of gels is not that clear. The main question is whether the shear modulus also follows a scaling law $(p \ p)^f$ with a universal exponent f. Experimental values of this exponent measured for dierent polymeric systems are very scattered [17]. On the theoretical side, it has been demonstrated that at T = 0, the elastic behavior of percolation systems depends on the nature of the interactions in the system. For non-stressed central force networks the rigidity threshold occurs at a concentration of bonds much larger than p_c [18]. If bond bending forces are present, rigidity and percolation thresholds coincide; how ever the rigidity exponent f, is considerably larger than the conductivity exponent, t, suggesting that the two problem sbelong to di erent universality classes [19]. As the number of models of elasticity of random systems increased, it became clear that de Gennes' conjecture about the identity of the exponent f to the conductivity exponent t [6] can be justiled only within models which \reduce" the therm odynamic behavior of gels to so called \scalarelasticity" models [20]. Recently, the equality f = t was measured by P lischke et al. in a numerical study of phantom central force percolation networks at T \notin 0 [21]. The authors attributed this elastic behavior to the entropic part of the elastic free energy.

B.E lasticity of percolation networks

We would like to apply our results from sections II and III to phantom percolation networks of identical springs having the energy $E = \frac{1}{2}KR^2$ (Gaussian network) or $E = \frac{1}{2}KR^2 + \frac{1}{4}aR^4$ (nearly-Gaussian network). We discuss the critical elastic behavior of such networks, in the regime where the correlation length (p (G is much larger than the characteristic atom ic length scale b, but much smaller then the linear size of the system L. The correlation length is the length scale below which the spanning cluster has a fractal structure and above which the system is hom ogeneous. A quantity that fol-(Y =) when L lows a power law ^Y(g q) scales as to $L^{(Y=)}$ when L. (At p_c the latter power law is always relevant because is in nite.) Since b, we expect the structure of the spanning cluster to \forget" the details of the lattice, and have the elastic properties of an isotropic system. In the Gaussian case, the tensorial equality $_{ij} = _{ij}$ (18) becomes a scalar equality P = . A lso, because of the vanishing of the elastic constants of Gaussian networks (20), we have for the shear modulus of the spanning cluster that = C₄₄ P = P = (4). C lose to the percolation threshold, the conductivity scales as (p p_e)^t, and therefore we conclude that for G aussian networks

$$= P = (p p)^{t};$$
 (26)

in accordance with de G ennes' argument. This result is not changed if we also include the nite clusters, since the latterm ake no contribution to the shearm odulus (just as they do not contribute to the conductivity of the system). The equality of the shearm odulus and the stress, a signature of G aussian elasticity, was observed num erically in Ref. [21].

In the nearly-G aussian case, we have from Eq.(23) that the leading term in the expression for the stress is the G aussian term, and therefore we expect to have the sam e scaling behavior as in Eq.(26). W hat distinguishes non-G aussian networks from purely G aussian ones is the non-

vanishing elastic constants of the form er. For percolation networks it is reasonable to assume that the elastic constants also follow a power law C (p p)^g. The elastic constants of a nearly-Gaussian networks should be \almost" zero, namely much smaller than the network stress. Therefore, the perturbative analysis in section III would be self-consistent only if it yields that the exponent q > f. W e can use expression (25) for the elastic constants to derive exact bounds on the value of the exponent g. Consider a percolation network of linear size L in d dimensions at p_c. An upper bound on the exponent g is obtained by including only a partial set of the bonds of the spanning cluster in the sum in expression (25). We take the set of singly connected bonds (SCBs), which are such bonds that rem oval of each one of them disconnects the spanning cluster. Their num ber scales as $L^{1=}$ [22]. The force acting on a SCB is the total force applied on the surface of the system, which is proportional to PL^(d 1) $L^{(t=+d 1)}$. The length to which a SCB is stretched, $(R_{SCB})_0$, is proportional to the force, and therefore have the same scaling form

$$(R_{SCB})_0 L^{(t=+d\ 1)};$$
 (27)

and consequently from Eq.(25) we get

C L
$$g^{=}$$
 L $^{d}L^{1=}L^{4}(t^{=}+d^{-1});$

which yields the upper bound g (4t 1) (3d 4). A lower bound for g is obtained by noting that for any bond other than the SCBs, $(R_{bond})_0 < (R_{SCB})_0$. That is because the SCBs are the only bonds which experience the total force acting on the system. We use this fact in expression (25) and write that

C L^{g=}
$$[(R_{SCB})_0]^2 \frac{1}{V} \frac{X}{a[(R_{bond})_0]^2}$$
:

The term in braces in the above inequality is, however, proportional to the pressure [see Eq.(24)], which scales like L ^{t=}. This, together with result (27), bring us to the lower bound q 3t 2 (d 1). Using the known values of the exponents t and [23,8], we nd that in three-dimensions 2:48 g 2:6. In six-dimensions both bounds coincide to give g = 4. This last result re ects the fact that in six-dimensions essentially all the bonds of the network are SCBs. In two-dimensions we have the bounds 1:22 q 1:52. However, we must mention a special feature of the two-dim ensional case which questions the validity of the \nearly" Gaussian model. The m odel assum es that the contribution of the quartic term to the spring energy is sm all compared to the quadratic term [Eq.(21)]. This happens only if the bond length satis es

$$R_{bond}$$
 (K =a)¹⁼²: (28)

The longest bonds in the network are the bonds that inside a cell of size $^{\rm d}$ serve as SCBs. Close to $p_{\rm c}$, their length scales like

R_{bond} t= + (d 1)	(p	p) ^t	(d 1)	(p	р) ^у :
-----------------------	----	-----------------	-------	------------	-------------------

In two-dimensions the exponent y < 0, what implies that the length of the SCBs diverges, and certainly does not satisfy criterion (28). The problem is not limited to the SCBs only, but is relevant to a larger fraction of the bonds including the doubly-connected bonds, triply-connected bonds, and so on. It is di cult to predict, a priori, whether this observation should modify the results of the nearly-G aussian model from section III. Note that we do not encounter such a problem for dimensionality larger than two, where the exponent y is positive.

V.SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

We have studied the elastic properties of phantom G aussian and nearly-G aussian networks. For G aussian networks, the stress and elastic constants were calculated exactly. We found that a characteristic feature of G aussian networks is the vanishing of their elastic constants. This feature is both tem perature and network-topology independent. We also proved the equality between the stress tensor of a G aussian elastic network to the conductivity tensor of a resistor network, in which the conductance of each resistor is equal to the corresponding spring constant K . This result quanti es the som ewhat vague statem ent about an analogy between elasticity of G aussian networks to conductivity of resistors networks.

W e have investigated the non-linear correction to the elastic behavior, by studying the properties of networks of springs whose energies include sm all quartic terms, additional to the leading quadratic (Gaussian) terms. W hile the stress tensor is still dom inated by the contribution of the quadratic term, the elastic constants (which vanish in the Gaussian network) are solely due to the non-Gaussian correction. W e calculated the elastic constants to the rst order in perturbation theory.

Finally, we applied the results of both the Gaussian and the nearly-Gaussian models, to describe the elastic behavior of phantom percolation networks close to the percolation threshold. O bviously, the well known result that the shearm odulus follows the same scaling law,

 $(p \ p)^t$, like the conductivity, was recovered. We made a new prediction that the elastic constants also follow a scaling law C $(p \ p)^g$, with exponent g > t, and found bounds on the values of the exponent g.

This work was supported by the Israel Science Foundation through G rant No. 177/99.

APPENDIX A:THE CONDUCTIVITY TENSOR OF FINITE RESISTOR NETWORKS.

We consider a network whose bonds are resistors of conductance K , where the superscripts and label the nodes which the particular resistor connects. The

network is nite and has an arbitrary topology, i.e., we make no assumption on the symmetry. We denote by R the position of the node and by ' the electric potential at the node. The network is placed inside a rectangular box of volume $V = L_1 \quad L_2 \quad ::: \quad L_4$, where L_i is the length of the box along the ith Cartesian direction. (The derivation presented here can be easily generalized to system s of arbitrary shape.) The nodes of the network which are located on the surface of the system are called surface nodes, and we label them with the superscript s. The rest of the nodes are called the internal nodes, which we denote with the superscript . The superscripts and

will be used to denote nodes of both types.

The conductivity of an electrical system is a tensor, $_{\rm ij}$, de ned by

$$hj_i i = _{ij}hE_j i;$$
 (A1)

where the subscripts denote C artesian coordinates and sum m ation over repeated indices is in plied, while hji and hE i are the volum e averages of the current density and the electric eld, respectively. This de nition of $_{ij}$ applies to continuous electrical system s. It can be generalized to discrete networks, if we de ne the current density by a set of D irac -functions representing the currents in the bonds. Let us assume now that the electric potential, ', applied on the surface of the network is such that on each surface point it is equal to the jth C artesian coordinate of the point. Since $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{\tilde{f}}'$, we have

where the surface integration is over the boundaries $x_i = 0$ and $x_i = L_i$, norm alto the ith direction. However, with our choice for the electric potential on the boundaries, $' = x_j$, it is easy to see that hE_ii = ____ij, where ____ij is the K ronecker delta.

The mean current density hjii, is given by

$$hj_{i}i = \frac{1}{V} \frac{Z}{j_{i}}dV \qquad (A2)$$

As we have already noted, the above de nition (A 2) applies to continuous electrical systems. To make it applicable to resistor networks we need to write the current density as a sum of D irac -functions representing the currents in the \linear" resistors. W ith this form al representation, the contribution to hj_ii of each resistor is given by the line-integral

$$Z_{R}$$

$$I dx_{i} = K ' ' R_{i} R_{i} ;$$

$$R_{i} = K ' ' R_{i} R_{i} ;$$

where I = K ' is the current across the resistor between nodes and . Adding the contributions of all the resistors we nd that

$$hj_{i}i = \frac{1}{V} X K ' R_{i} R_{i} :$$

W e m ay write the last result is a slightly di erent way

$$hj_{i}i = \frac{1}{2V} \begin{pmatrix} & & \\ & X & X \\ & & & \\$$

where the variable takes the value 1 if the nodes and are connected by a resistor and if at least one of them is an internal node; and the value 0, otherw ise. The sum s in square brackets corresponding to internal nodes

= vanish due to the K ircho \junction nule" for the vanishing of the sum of currents entering an internal node: X

W e are left with the contribution of the surface nodes = s only, i.e.,

8						9	
$hj_i i = \frac{1}{V} \cdot \frac{X}{V}$	X Ri ^s	K	s	s	,	= 's ;	:

This last result can be also represented by summation over all the resistors h si, between surface and internal nodes

$$hj_{i}i = \frac{1}{V} \frac{4}{V} K^{s} R^{s}_{i} (\prime \prime^{s})^{5}:$$

Finally, since the electric eld is equal to $E_i i = i_j$, we have from Eq.(A1) that

$$_{ij} = h_{ji} = \frac{1}{V} \frac{4}{V} \frac{X}{h_{si}} K {}^{s} R_{i}^{s} (' {}^{s} ')^{5} :$$

W e have obtained expression (19), which we constructed by mapping expression (15) for $_{ij}$ into the electrostatic problem. This proves that indeed $_{ij} = _{ij}$. Note that

^{ij} does not depend on the positions of the internal nodes but only on the details of the conductivity. In large random networks the relation (A1) su ces to de ne ^{ij} without need of a detailed speci cation of boundary conditions. However, out exact result is valid also for sm all networks of arbitrary topology, provided that the electric eld E is generated using the very speci c boundary conditions speci ed in the Appendix.

- H.M. Jam es and E.G uth, J.Chem. Phys.11, 455 (1943).
 For a more recent extensive review on the classical theories of rubber elasticity see L.R.G. Treloar, Rep. Prog. Phys. 36, 755 (1973).
- [2] J.H.W einer, Statistical Theory of Elasticity (John W iley and Sons, New York, 1983), section 6.10.
- [3] R.T.Deam and S.F.Edwards, Phil.Trans.R.Soc.A 280,317 (1976). A short historical review as wellasm any references to di erent theories is found in R.Everears, Euro.Phys.J.B 4,341 (1998).
- [4] P.G. de Gennes, scaling Concepts in Polymer Physics, (Cornell Univ. Press, Itacha, N.Y. 1979).
- [5] e.g., Y. Kantor, M. Kardar and D. R. Nelson Phys. Rev. A 35, 3056 (1987).
- [6] P.G. de Gennes, J. Phys. (Paris) Lett. 37, L1 (1976).
- [7] Y.Kantor in \Statistical Mechanics of Membranes and Surfaces - Proceedings of the Fifth Jerusalem W inter School for Theoretical Physics", ed. by D.R.Nelson, T.Piran and S.W einberg pp.115-136 (World Scientic, Singapore, 1989), and references therein.
- [8] D. Stau er and A. A harony, Introduction to Percolation Theory (Taylor and Francis, London, 1992).
- [9] D.C.W allace, in Solid State Physics, eds.H.Ehrenreich, F.Seitz and D.Turnbull, (A cadem ic, New York, 1970), Vol. 25, p. 301.
- [10] In many textbooks the shear modulus is defined by $= C_{44}$. This inaccurate definition is relevant to regular solid for which, under standard temperature and pressure conditions, C_{44} P. We show in this section that for G aussian networks $C_{44} = 0$, and therefore they represent the extrem e opposite case.
- [11] Z. Zhou and B. Joos, Phys. Rev. B 54, 3841 (1996).
- [L2] D.R.Squire, A.C.Holt and W.G.Hoover, Physica 42, 388 (1969).
- [13] M. Bom and K. Huang, Dynam ical Theory of Crystal Lattices (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1954).p.129.
- [14] O. Farago and Y. K antor, cond-m at/0004276, accepted to Euro. Phys. J. E
- [15] O.Farago and Y.Kantor, Phys. Rev. E 61, 2478 (2000).
- [16] A review article containing m any relevant references: M. A dam and D.Lairez, in Physical Properties of Polymeric Gels, ed J.P.Cohen A ddad, (J.W iley and Sons, Chichester U.K., 1996), p. 87.
- [17] A partial list of experim entalworks from the last decade:
 F.Carciun, C.Galassy and E.Roncari, Europhys.Lett.
 41, 55 (1998); M.Adam, D.Lairez, K.Karpasas and M.Gottlieb, Macromol. 30, 5920 (1997); R.H.Colby, J. R.Gillmor and M.Rubinstein, Phys.Rev.E 48, 3712 (1993); F.Devreux, J.P.Boilot, F.Chaput, M.Mailier and M.A.V.Axelox, Phys.Rev.E 47, 2689 (1993); M. A.V.Axelox and M.Kolb, Phys.Rev.Lett 64, 1457 (1990). See also Ref. [16].

- [18] S.Feng and P.N.Sen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 52, 216 (1984);
 D.J.Bergm an and Y.Kantor, Phys. Rev. Lett. 53, 511 (1984);
 S.Feng, M.F.Thorpe and E.Garboczi, Phys. Rev. B 31, 276 (1985);
 S.Arbabiand M.Sahim i, Phys. Rev. B. 47, 695 (1993).
- [19] Y. Kantor and I. W ebm an, Phys. Rev. Lett. 52, 1891 (1984); S.Arbabiand M. Sahim i, Phys. Rev. B. 47, 703 (1993).
- [20] S.Alexander and R.Orbach, J. Phys. (Paris) Lett. 45,

L625 (1982); M.E.Cates, Phys.Rev.Lett. 53, 926 (1984); S.Alexander, Phys.Rep.296, 66 (1998).

- M. Plischke and B. Joos, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 4907 (1998); M. Plischke, D C. Vemon, B. Joos and Z. Zhou, Phys. Rev. E 60, 3129 (1999).
- [22] A.Coniglio, Phys. Rev. Lett. 46, 250 (1981).
- [23] H. J. Herrm ann, B. Derrida and J. Vannim enus, Phys. Rev. B 30, 4080 (1984); D. B. G ingold and C. J. Lobb, Phys. Rev. B 42, 8220 (1990).