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#### Abstract

W e study the response of a two-dim ensional hexagonal packing of rigid, frictionless spherical grains due to a vertically dow nw ard point force on a single grain at the top layer. W e use a statistical approach, where each con guration of the contact foroes is equally likely. W e show that this problem is equivalent to a correlated $q-m$ odel. $W e$ nd that the response displays two peaks which lie precisely on the dow nw ard lattice directions em anating from the point of application of the force. W ith increasing depth, the m agnitude of the peaks decreases, and a central peak develops. On the bottom of the pile, only the $m$ iddle peak persists. The response of di erent system sizes exhibits self-sim ilarity.


Force transm issions in (static) granular packings have attracted a lot of attention in recent years $[1][1]$. G ranular packings are assem blies ofm acroscopic particles that interact only via $m$ echanical repulsion e ected through physical contacts. Experim ental and num erical studies of these system s have identi ed two m ain characteristics. F irst, large uctuations are found to occur in the $m$ agnitudes of inter-grain forces, im plying that the probability distribution of the force $m$ agnitudes is rather broad [ [4] . Secondly, the average propagation of forces | studied via the response to a single extemal force | is strongly dependent on the underlying contact geom etry

The available theoretical models capture ether one or the other of these two aspects. T he scalar $q-m$ odel $\left[_{1}^{\prime}\right]$ reproduces reasonably well the observed force distribution, but yields di usive propagation of forces, in con ict $w$ th experim ents []$\left._{1}^{11} 1,12\right]$. $C$ ontinuum elastic and elasto-plastic theories [ $[\underline{6}]$ predict responses in qualitative agreem ent w ith experim ents [ but they provide a description only at the average macroscopic level. M ore ad-hoc \stressonly" m odels [1] $\overline{1}]$ include structural random ness, but its consequences on the distribution of foroes are unclear. In other words, an approach that produces both realistic uctuations and propagation of forces in granularm aterials from the sam e set of fundam ental principles is still called for.

A sim ple con jecture, which could provide such a fundam ental principle for allproblem s of granular statics, has been put forw ard by Edwards years ago ["4 all \jammed" con gurations equally probable. A priori, there is no justi cation for such an
ergodic hypothesis, but its application to m odels of jam m ing and com paction has been rather successful [1] ]. Its extension to the forces in granular packings is in principle straightforw ard: sets of forces belonging to allm echanically stable con gurations have equalprobability. H ow ever, in an ensem ble of stable granular packings, tw o levels of random ness are generally present $\overline{\mathbb{R}}] \cdot \mathrm{F}$ irst, the force geom etry clearly depends on the underly ing geom etrical contact netw ork, which is di erent in di erent packings. Secondly, random ness in the values of the forces is present even in a xed contact netw ork, since the forces are not necessarily uniquely determ ined from the contact netw ork. Instead of considering both levels of random ness sim ultaneously, a natural rst step is thus to obtain the averages for a xed contact geom etry, and then possibly to average over the contact geom etries.


(c) $F_{1}^{(N+1, j)} \underbrace{(N+1, j)}_{m} F_{2}^{(N+1, j)}$

Fig. 1 \{ (a) Them odel: $(\mathbb{N}+2)$ p array of hexagonally close-packed rigid friction less sphericalgrains in tw o-dim ensions (draw $n$ for odd $N$ ). At the top, there is only a single vertically dow nward point force applied on one particle. At the boundaries, little gray circles appear on interfaces where the contact forces are non-zero. (b-c) Schem atically shown forces on the jth grain in the ith layer: (b) i $N$, (c) $i=(\mathbb{N}+1)$, the bottom reaction $W_{N+1}$ is shifted upw ards for clarity; $F_{m}^{(i, j)} 08 \mathrm{~m}$.

W hile such a $m$ ethod has recently been show $n$ to produce single inter-grain force probability distributions in $x e d$ geom etry that com pare well with experim ents [1 $[1]$, in this Letter we dem onstrate that it also leads to an average response function qualitatively in agreem ent w ith experim ents. M ore precisely, we determ ine the behaviour of the response of a two-dim ensional hexagonalpacking of rigid, frictionless spherical grains placed betw een tw o verticalw alls (see $F$ ig ${ }_{(1-1}^{\prime} 1$ ), due to a vertically dow nw ard force $F$ applied on a single grain at the top layer. Experim entally $\left.[1], 1]_{1} 1\right]$ it w as found that a force $F$ applied to the top of a hexagonalpacking of photo-elastic particles propagaters $m$ ainly along the tw o dow nw ard lattice directions. $W$ e
 force transm itted by the ( $i ; j$ )th grain to the layer below it respectively w ith and w ithout the extemal force $F$, and the angular brackets denote averaging over all con gurations of $m$ echanically stable contact forces $w$ th equal probabillity.

To start $w$ th, we describe a $m$ ethod for assigning the uniform probability $m$ easure on the ensemble E of stable repulsive contact forces pertaining to a xed geom etrical con guration of $P$ rigid, frictionless two-dim ensional grains of anbitrary shapes and sizes (for a rigorous geom etrical description of a granular packing, see Ref. [1] [-1]). The directions of the foroes are xed at each of the $Q$ contact points, and one can represent any force con guration by a colum $n$ vector $F$ consisting of $Q$ non-negative scalars $f F_{k} g$ ( $w$ ith $k=1 ;:: ; Q$ ) as its individual elem ents. These elem ents satisfy 3P N ew ton's equations (3 equations per grain: tw o for balancing foroes in the x and y directions and one for balancing torque), which can be represented as $A \quad F=E_{x t}$. Here, $A$ is a $3 P \quad Q$ matrix, and $F_{\text {ext }}$ is a $3 P$-dim ensional colum $n$ vector representing the extemal forces. If $w e$ assum $e 3 P<Q$ [2d], then there is no
unique solution for $F$. Instead, there exists a whole set of solutions that can be constructed via the three follow ing steps: (1) one rst identi es an orthonorm albasis $f \mathrm{fl}^{(1)} \mathrm{g}\left(1=1 ;::: ; \mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{K}}=\right.$ Q 3P ) that spans the space of $K$ er (A); (2) one then determ ines a unique solution $F^{(0)}$ of A $F^{(0)}=F_{\text {ext }}$ by requiring $F^{(0)} F^{(1)}=0$ for $l=1 ;::: ; d_{K}$; and (3) one nally obtains all solutions of $A \quad F=E_{x t}$ as $F=F^{(0)}+{ }^{Q} P^{3 P} f_{l} F^{(1)}$, where $f_{l}$ are real num bers. This im plies that $E$ is param etrized by the $f_{1}$ 's belonging to a set $S$ obeying the non-negativity conditions for all forces. The uniform m easure on E , which is usually com pact [23], is thus equivalent to the uniform m easure $d=\mathrm{dF}_{\mathrm{k}} \quad\left(\mathrm{A} \quad \mathrm{F} \quad \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{x}}\right) \quad\left(\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{k}}\right)=\mathrm{dF}_{1}$ on S .

In ourm odel, the grains are spherical, so that the dim ension of $A$ reduces to $2 \mathrm{P} \quad \mathrm{Q} . \mathrm{We}$ consider the force $F$ and the weights of the individual grains as the non-zero elem ents of $F_{\text {ext }}$, while $F$ is com posed of all inter-particle and non-zero boundary forces. Sim ple counting then
 particle (see Fig. ${ }^{1} 11(b-c)$ ) [20

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.F_{5}^{(i ; j)}=F_{2}^{(i ; j)}+m g=\overline{3}+\mathbb{E}_{4}^{(i ; j)} \quad F_{3}^{(i ; j)}\right] \\
& \left.\mathrm{F}_{6}{ }^{(\mathrm{i} ; j)}=\mathrm{F}_{1_{1}}{ }^{(\mathrm{i} ; j)}+\mathrm{mg}={ }^{\mathrm{P}} \overline{3} \quad \mathrm{E}_{4}^{(\mathrm{i} ; j)} \mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{i}} \quad \mathrm{~F}_{3}{ }^{(\mathrm{i} ; j)}\right] \\
& W_{N+1 ; j}=\mathrm{P}_{3} \mathrm{~F}_{1}{ }^{(\mathbb{N}+1 ; j)}+\mathrm{F}_{2}^{(\mathbb{N}+1 ; j)^{i}}=2+\mathrm{mg} \\
& \mathrm{~F}_{4}^{(\mathbb{N}+1 ; j)} \quad \mathrm{F}_{3}^{(\mathbb{N}+1 ; j)}=\mathrm{F}_{1}^{(\mathbb{N}+1 ; j)} \mathrm{F}_{2}^{(\mathbb{N}+1 ; j)^{i}}=2 ; \tag{1}
\end{align*}
$$

i.e., $2(\mathbb{N}+2)$ p equations alltogether, im plying that $d_{K}=N+2+(N+1) p . W$ echoose $F_{3}^{(i ; 1)} r_{S}$ fori $\quad(\mathbb{N}+1)$ and $F_{4}{ }^{(i ; j)}$ 's fori $N ; 1 \quad j \quad N$ to param eterize $E$. O nce these forces are xed,
 It is easily seen that the num ber of these param eters is indeed $d_{K}$, as it should be. C learly,
 on $S$ for our m odel. Furtherm ore, $w$ th $G_{i ; j}=F_{4}^{(i ; j)} F_{3}{ }^{(i ; j)}$, i.e., w ith [24]

$$
\begin{equation*}
F_{4}^{(i ; j)}=F_{3}{ }^{(i ; 1)}+{ }_{j^{0}=1}^{P^{j}} G_{i ; j^{0}} ; \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

 $(i ; j)=(0 ; 1) \quad(i ; j)=(0 ; 1)$ the non-negativity conditions for $\mathrm{F}_{5}{ }^{(\mathrm{i} ; \mathrm{j})}$ 'S and $\mathrm{F}_{6}{ }^{(\mathrm{i} ; j)}$ 's, one m ust satisfy

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{F}_{2}^{(\mathrm{i} ; j)}+\mathrm{mg}=\mathrm{p}_{3}^{i} \quad G_{i ; j} \quad F_{1}^{(i ; j)}+\mathrm{mg}=\mathrm{p} \overline{3} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

im plying that the set $S^{0}$ of allowed values of $G_{i ; j}$ ' is com pact. H ow ever, since the nonnegativity conditions for $\mathrm{F}_{3}{ }^{(\mathrm{i} ; \mathrm{j})}$ and $\mathrm{F}_{4}{ }^{(\mathrm{i} ; j)}$ 's provide only lower bounds for $\mathrm{F}_{3}{ }^{(\mathrm{i} ; 1)}$ ' S , S in this m odel is actually unbounded.

The rem edy we use is to $x$ the $F_{3}^{(i ; 1)}$ values: indeed, as can be seen in Eq. ( $\left.\left.\overline{1}\right)^{\prime}\right)$, the values of the $W_{i ; j}$ depend only the $G_{i ; j}$ 's so that in this model the precise values of $F_{3}{ }^{(i ; 1)}$ have no physicalm eaning. $N$ evertheless, one has to be careful: notice that the $G_{i ; j}{ }^{\prime}$ s are di erences of the physical contact forces and thus they are allow ed to becom e negative in $m$ agnitude. In


F ig. 2 \{ C olour plots for $\mathrm{N}=35$ and $\mathrm{m}=0$ : (a) m ean response; (b) the standard deviation of the response.
 requirem ent of the $F_{4}{ }^{(i ; j)} \mathrm{m}$ ight further restrict the choice of $\mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{i} ; j}$ values $w$ ithin the bounds of inequality $\left(\bar{Z}_{1}^{\prime}\right)$. In this Letter, we $x$ the $m$ agnitudes $F_{3}^{(i ; 1)}=2 \mathbb{F}+\left(\begin{array}{ll}i & 1) \mathrm{mg}\end{array} \mathrm{F}^{\mathrm{P}} \overline{3} \quad \mathrm{~F}_{0}\right.$ so that all values of $\mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{i} ;}$ w ithin the bounds of inequality ( $\mathrm{B}_{\text {) }}$ ) are allowed (details of the cases
 to the uniform m easure on $S_{Z}^{0}$, which is a $(\mathbb{N}+1$ )p-dim ensionalpolyhedron.
 constant, we de ne

$$
\begin{equation*}
q_{i ; j}=h^{h_{p}} \overline{3}\left(G_{i ; j}+F_{2}{ }^{(i ; j)}\right)=2+m g=2^{i}=W_{i ; j} ; \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

$w$ here $q_{i ; j}$ is the fraction ofW $i_{i j}$ that the $(i ; j)$ th particle transm its to the layerbelow it tow ard the left, i.e., $F_{5}^{(i ; j)}=2 q_{i ; j} W{ }_{i ; j}=\overline{3}$ and $F_{6}^{(i ; j)}=2\left(1 \quad q_{i ; j}\right) W_{i ; j}=\overline{3}$. Equation $\left.\overline{(\overline{4}}\right)$ then reduces Eq. ( $\bar{l}_{1}$ ) to $0 q_{i ; j}$ 1. C learly, $W_{0 ; j}$ are the extemal forces applied on the top layer. For i> $0, W_{i ; j}$ is a function of $q_{k ; 1}$ for $k<i$, since

$$
W_{i ; j}=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
1 & q_{i} 1 ; j 1 \tag{5}
\end{array}\right) W_{i 1 ; j} 1+q_{i} 1 ; j W_{i 1 ; j}+m g:
$$



Fig. 3 \{ Behavior of $\mathrm{hW}(i ; j) i$ for $m=0$ in reduced co-ordinates $x$ and $z:(a)$ scaling of $h W$ ( $x ; z$ )i $w$ ith system size for $j x<z=2$ at two $z$ values (for clarity, $z=0: 8$ and $z=0: 6$ have been shifted upwards by one and two units respectively); (b) data collapse for $h \mathbb{N}$ ( $x ; z$ ) $i \dot{j}_{k}=z=2$ at three $N$ values. See text for further details.
 the $q-m$ odel $\left[\frac{15}{1}\right]$. There is how ever an im portant subtlety to take notice of. In the $q-m$ odel, the q's corresponding to di erent grains are usually uncorrelated, while in our case, the uniform $m$ easure on $S^{0}$ im plies, from Eq. ( $\underline{4}^{-1}$ ), that

$$
\begin{equation*}
{\underset{i ; j}{Q} d G_{i ; j}=2^{(\mathbb{N}+1) p}{ }_{i ; j}^{Q} d q_{i ; j} W_{i ; j}(q) 3^{(\mathbb{N}+1) p=2}: ~}_{\text {i }} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

D ue to the presence of the Jacobian on the right hand side of Eq. (i) , the uniform $m$ easure on $S^{0}$ translates to a non-uniform $m$ easure on the $(\mathbb{N}+1) p$-dim ensional unit cube form ed by the accessible values of the q's.
$N$ otioe an im portant artifact of this approach: the joint probability distribution ${ }^{2} W_{i ; j}$ (q) depends on the $q_{i ; j}$ values over the whole system, thereby $m$ aking $q_{i ; j}{ }^{j}$ scorrelated with each other. In fact, the induced probability $P\left(q_{i ; j}\right)$ for a single grain does not only depend on the num ber of layers present above the grain, but also on the num ber of layers below it. It is thus clear that the foroes in this $m$ odel do not propagate top dow $n$, as they do in hyperbolic \stress-only" m odels $\underline{k}_{1}^{-1}$.

Form assless grains $(m=0)$, it is clear that (i) for $F=0, W_{i j}^{(0)}=08$ (i; j) (ii) the $\mathrm{hW}{ }_{i ; j}{ }^{i}$ values scale linearly with $F$ (hence, we use $F=1$ ), and (iii) $\mathrm{hW} \mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{i} j} \mathrm{i}=0$ outside the triangle form ed by the two dow nw ard lattioe directions em anating from $(i ; j)=\left(0 ; j_{0}\right)$, the point of application of $F$. The $\mathrm{hW} \mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{i} j} \mathrm{i}^{\prime}$ 's, evaluated num erically via the M etropolis algorithm on these q's, appear in Fig. $\overline{3} 1$

O ur sim ulation results for $\mathrm{WW} \mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{i} j} \mathrm{i}$ and the standard deviation $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{i} ; j}=\underset{\mathrm{WW}}{\mathrm{i}_{i j} \mathrm{i}} \quad \mathrm{hW} \mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{i} ; \mathrm{j}} \mathrm{i}^{2}$ w ithin the triangle are plotted in Fig. 示, using the built-in cubic interpolation function of M athem atica. O utside the triangle, $\mathrm{hW} \mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{i} ;} \mathrm{i} \quad 0$ appears in deep indigo; the largest $\mathrm{h} \mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{i} ;} \mathrm{j}$ ivalue within the triangle appears in dark red; and any other non-zero $\mathrm{hW} \mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{i} j} \mathrm{i}$ value is represented by a linear wavelength scale in betw een [25-1]. We nd 8 N that (a) the $\mathrm{hW}_{\mathrm{i} ; j} \mathrm{i}^{1}$ values display tw o single-grain-diam eter-w ide sym $m$ etric peaks that lie precisely on the tw o dow nw ard lattioe directions em anating from $j_{0}$, (b) the magnitudes of these peaks decrease $w$ ith depth, and (c) only a centralm axim um for $\mathrm{hW}{ }_{i ; j} i$ is seen at the very bottom layer ( $i=N+1$ ). The standard deviation $W_{i j}$ has a sim ilar shape to $\mathrm{WW}_{i ; j} \mathrm{i}^{\prime}$, although the peaks are less pronounced.
$W$ e further de ne $x=(j \quad \dot{j})=(\mathbb{N}+1)$ and $\left(j \quad j_{0}+1=2\right)=(\mathbb{N}+1)$ respectively for even and odd $i$, and $z=i=(N+1)$ [see $F i g$. $\left.{ }_{1}^{\prime} \overline{1}\right]$ in order to put the vertioes of the triangle form ed by the locations of non-zero $\mathrm{hW}{ }_{i ; j}$ i values on $(0 ; 0) ;(1=2 ; 1)$ and $(1=2 ; 1) 8 \mathrm{~N}$. The
 w ith the inverse system size $\mathbb{E}$ ig. ${ }_{3} 1 \mathbf{1}(\mathrm{a})$; we how ever show only three z values], while the
 suggest that in the them odynam ic $\lim$ it $\mathrm{N}!1$, the response eld $\mathrm{hW}(x ; z)$ i scales $1=\mathrm{N}$ for $\mathfrak{j x j}<\mathrm{z=}=2$, but reaches a non-zero lim iting value on $\mathfrak{k j}=\mathrm{z} 8 \mathrm{z}<1$. We thus expect $\lim _{N} \lim _{1}(x ; z) i_{j \times j=z=2}>\mathrm{hW}(x ; z) i_{j \times j<z=2} 8 z<1$; or equivalently, a double-peaked response $N$ ! ${ }^{1}$ eld at all depths $z<1$ for large $N$.

W e have not found a sim ple explanation for such scaling behaviour oftw ( $x ; z$ )i. It how ever tums out that exact analytical expressions can be obtained for all $m$ om ents of $W_{i ; j} 8$ ( $i ; j$ ), for any $\mathrm{N} . \mathrm{T}$ he detailed calculations appear in Ref . [1] ] ].

In view of the self-sim ilarity oflW ( $x ; z$ )i that we observe for di erent system sizes in $F$ igs.位 $(b-c)$, it seem $s$ natural that we also study the sam e properties for $m \in 0$. In this case, $\mathrm{h} \mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{i} ; \mathrm{j}}{ }^{(0)} \mathrm{i} 0$ and $\mathrm{WW}{ }_{i ; j} \mathrm{i} \varnothing \mathrm{F}$. Tom in mize the e ect of the boundaries in the regions around $j=j_{0}$, we have used $p=2 N+5$. Form $m$, the relevant scale for the $m$ agnitude of $F$ is


Fig. 4 \{ Scaling properties of hw $(x ; z)$ i, analogous to $F$ igs. ${ }^{-131}(b-c)$, for $=100$ and three $N$ values (a.u. arbitrary units).
obviously $=F=m$ g. For 0 , just like in the case of $m=0$, we observe a double-peaked response, and the peaks are still single grain diam eter wide. Furthem ore, for a given value of $N$ and increasing , the $m$ agnitude of the response on $x=z=2$ decays $m$ ore slow ly, i.e. the peaks penetrate the packing to progressively higher values of $z$. In order to avoid repetition, we do not use colour gures like Fig data clearly indicates that for $x e d \mathrm{~N}$, one should recover the results corresponding to $\mathrm{m}=0$ in the lim it ! 1 .

It is clear from the qualitative behaviour described in the above paragraph that in order to obtain scaling with increasing $N$, one also needs to scale in som eway. To this end, we de ne $==(\mathbb{N}+1)$ and keep constant for increasing $N$. The corresponding graphs are shown in $F$ ig. $\overline{4}$ for $=100$. The fact that the self-sim ilarity in $F$ ig. $\overline{4}$ for di erent system sizes is not as striking as in Figs. $i_{13}^{1}(b-c)$ suggests that there is m ore to the story of scaling properties. It is likely that the full scaling properties can be unraveled only at much higher values of $N$, but unfortunately, sim ulations $w$ ith $N$ values signi cantly higher than 50 require im practically long tim es.

In sum $m$ ary, we nd that assigning equal probability to allm echanically stable force congurations for rigid, frictionless spherical grains (w ith or without mass) in a two-dim ensional hexagonally close-packed geom etry yields a double-peaked response. The peaks are single grain diam eter wide, they lie on the two dow nward lattioe directions em anating from the point of application of $F$. $W$ ith increasing depth, the $m$ agnitude of the peaks decreases, and a third peak starts to develop directly below the applied force. N ear (and on) the bottom layer only the $m$ iddle peak persists; i.e., the response becom es single-peaked. A s the num ber of layers is increased, the transition from double to single peak takes place deeper in the packing. M oreover, for grains each $w$ ith $m$ ass $m$, the peaks penetrate the packing deeper $w$ ith larger $F$. The standard deviation of the response is sim ilar in shape to the response, but the peaks are weaker.

W e em phasize that the results presented here are obtained for the boundary condition $\mathrm{F}_{3}{ }^{(\mathrm{i} ; 1)} \quad \mathrm{F}_{0}$. The case $\mathrm{F}_{3}{ }^{(\mathrm{i} ; 1)}<\mathrm{F}_{0}$ and other kinds ofboundary conditions have been analyzed elsew here $\left[10_{1}^{\prime}, 19_{1}^{1}\right]$. T hese results together indicate that the quantitative behaviour of the response depends crucially on the side forces (i.e. boundary conditions) | this feature is consistent w ith other theoretical approaches [ַַ']. In particular, we note that the transition to a single-peaked response does not take place for $\mathrm{F}_{3}^{(i ; 1)}$ su ciently sm all.

W e also note that the double-peaked structure of both the $m$ ean response and the standard deviation of the response is in qualitative agreem ent $w$ th experim ents $[1]\left[\begin{array}{ll}1 \\ {[1]}\end{array}\right]$, but the
uctuations observed in the $m$ odel are $m$ uch weaker than found in experim entsi[12]. A nother crucialdi erence betw een our and the experim ental results is that in this $m$ odel the peaks are single-diam eter wide, while in experim ents the peaks widen with depth [12]. This di erence probably stem $s$ from the fact that in experim ents the ect of inter-grain friction can never be neglected. P resence of friction would also certainly $m$ ake uctuations in the response $W_{i ; j}$ stronger. A study of the ects of friction on the response along the lines of [ $[2][2]$ is therefore an im portant direction for fiuture work.

It is a pleasure to thank J.P. B ouchaud, D. D har, J.M.J. van Leeuwen, B. N ienhuis, J. Snoeijer and D. W olf for useful discussions. F inancial support was provided by the D utch research organization FOM (Fundam enteel O nderzoek der M aterie).

## REFERENCES

[1] H.M. Jaeger et al, Rev. M od. Phys. 68, 1259 (1996); P. G. de G ennes, Rev.M od. Phys. 71, 374 (1999).
[2] J.P.B ouchaud, in Les H ouches, Session LXXV II, J L. B arrat et al. Eds., SpringerモD P Sciences (2003). See also references cited therein.
[3] L.Vanelet al, Phys. Rev.E 60,R 5040 (1999).
[4] D.M.M ueth et al, Phys. Rev.E 57, 3164 (1998); D.L. B lair et al, Phys. Rev.E 63, 041304 (2001); F. R adjaiet alP hys. Rev. Lett. 77, 274 (2001).
[5] S.N.C oppersm th et al, Phys. Rev.E 53, 4673 (1996).
[6] R.M.N edderm an, Statics and $K$ inem atics of $G$ ranular $M$ aterials, $C$ am bridge U niversity $P$ ress (1982).
[7] C. G oldenberg et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 084302 (2002); I. G oldhirsch et al, Eur. Phys. J.E 9,245 (2002).
[8] G. R eydellet and E. C lem ent, P hys. Rev. Lett. 86, 3308 (2001).
[9] D . Serero et al, Eur. Phys. J. E_6, 169 (2001).
[10] A.A tm an et al, cond-m at 0501118.
[11] J. Geng et al, P hys. R- $\overline{\mathrm{ev}} . \overline{\mathrm{L}} \overline{\mathrm{ett}} . \overline{8} \overline{7}, 035506$ (2001).
[12] J. Geng et al, P hysica D 182, 274 (2003).
[13] N.W .M ueggenburg et al, Phys. Rev.E 66, 031304 (2002).
[14] S.F.Edwards et al, P hysica A 157, 1080 (1989).
[15] S.F.Edwards et al, P hysica A 302, 162 (2001).
[16] H.A.M akse et al, N ature 415, 614 (2002).
[17] J. H. Snoeijer et al, P hys. R ev. Lett. 92, 054302 (2004).
[18] S. O sto j̈c and D. P an ja, J. Stat. M ech.(JSTAT) P 01011 (2005).
[19] S.O sto j̈c and D. P an ja, proceedings of P ow ders and G rains 2005, 'cond-m at/0503752.
[20] For frictionless rigid spherical grains, the num ber of forces is exactly equal to the num ber of equations [21]. Num erical studies [22] how ever nd that in the lim it of large but nite rigidity the num ber of equations is alw ays less then the num ber of contacts, and th is is what we assum e here.
[21] C.F.M oukarzel, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 1634 (1998); A. V.T kachenko et al, Phys. Rev.E 60, 687 (1999).
[22] L.E. Silbert et al, Phys. Rev.E 65, 031304 (2002).
[23] T. U nger et al, icond-m at/04030891.
[24] O ne uses the fact that $\mathrm{F}_{4}^{(i ; j)}=\mathrm{F}_{3}{ }^{(\mathrm{I} ; j+1)}$ for $1 \quad j<p$.
[25] The thin green regions that appear on the outer edge of the triangle are artifacts of the interpolation. It is also im portant to note that the horizontal $h F_{4}{ }^{(i ; j)}{ }_{i}$ forces are non-zero everyw here, but they are not show in Fig. .
[26] L. B reton et al, E urophys. Lett. 60, 813 (2002).

