



Provided by the author(s) and University of Galway in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite the published version when available.

Title	The explicit secular equation for surface acoustic waves in monoclinic elastic crystals
Author(s)	Destrade, Michel
Publication Date	2001-01-25
Publication Information	Destrade, M. (2001). The explicit secular equation for surface acoustic waves in monoclinic elastic crystals. <i>The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America</i> , 109(4), 1398-1402.
Publisher	Acoustical Society of America
Link to publisher's version	http://dx.doi.org/10.1121/1.1356703
Item record	http://hdl.handle.net/10379/4211
DOI	http://dx.doi.org/10.1121/1.1356703

Downloaded 2024-04-16T03:28:01Z

Some rights reserved. For more information, please see the item record link above.



The explicit secular equation for surface acoustic waves in monoclinic elastic crystals

Michel Destrade

2001

Abstract

The secular equation for surface acoustic waves propagating on a monoclinic elastic half-space is derived in a direct manner, using the method of first integrals. Although the motion is at first assumed to correspond to generalized plane strain, the analysis shows that only two components of the mechanical displacement and of the tractions on planes parallel to the free surface are nonzero. Using the Stroh formalism, a system of two second order differential equations is found for the remaining tractions. The secular equation is then obtained as a quartic for the squared wave speed. This explicit equation is consistent with that found in the orthorhombic case. The speed of subsonic surface waves is then computed for twelve specific monoclinic crystals.

I INTRODUCTION

The modern theory of surface acoustic waves in anisotropic media owes most of its results to the pioneering works of A. N. Stroh. Although his two seminal articles [1, 2] went largely unnoticed for a long time, their theoretical implications were far reaching, as many came to realize since their publication. Among others, Currie [3], Barnett and Lothe [4], Chadwick and Smith [5], were able to use his ‘sextic formalism’ to address many problems, such as the existence of a single real secular equation for the wave speed, the existence of a limiting velocity (the smallest velocity of body wave solutions) which defines ‘subsonic’ and ‘supersonic’ ranges for the speeds, or numerical schemes to compute the polarization vectors and the speed of the surface wave. A comprehensive review of these topics can be found in a textbook by Ting [6].

However precise numerical procedures might be, there is still progress to be made in the search for secular equations in analytic form. So far, explicit expressions have remained few. The secular equation for surface waves in orthorhombic crystals was established by Sveklo [7] as early as 1948 and later, Royer and Dieulesaint [8] proved that it could account for sixteen different crystal configurations, such as tetragonal, hexagonal, or cubic. For monoclinic media, Chadwick and Wilson [9] devised a procedure to derive the secular equation, which is given as ‘explicit, [...] *apart* from the solution of [a] bicubic equation.’ The object of this paper is to derive *one* expression for the secular equation which is *fully explicit*, when the surface wave propagates in monoclinic crystals.

A classical approach to the problem of surface waves in anisotropic crystals is to consider that a wave propagates with speed v in the direction x_1 of a material axis (on the free plane surface) of the material, and is attenuated along another material axis x_2 , orthogonal to the free surface, so that the mechanical displacement \mathbf{u} is written as $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}(x_1 + px_2 - vt)$, where p is unknown. Then, assuming a complex exponential form for the displacement, the equations of motion are written in the absence of body forces and solved for p . Finally, the boundary conditions yield the secular equation for v . The principal mathematical difficulty arising from this procedure is that the equations of motion yield a sextic (generalized plane strain) or a quartic (plane strain) for p which in general are impractical to solve analytically, or even, as a numerical scheme suggests in the sextic case, are actually insoluble analytically (in the sense of Galois) [10].

In 1994, Mozhaev [11] proposed ‘some new ideas in the theory of surface acoustic waves.’ He introduced a novel method based on first integrals [14] of the displacement components, which bypasses the sextic (or quartic) equa-

tion for p and yields directly the secular equation. He successfully applied this method to the case of orthorhombic materials. In the present paper, generalized plane strain surface waves in a monoclinic crystal with plane of symmetry at $x_3 = 0$ are examined. The method of first integrals is adapted in order to be applied to the tractions components on the planes $x_3 = \text{const.}$, rather than to the displacement components. This switch presents several advantages. First, the equations of motion, the boundary conditions, and eventually the secular equation itself, are expressed directly in terms of the usual elastic stiffnesses. Second, it makes it apparent that one of the traction components is zero and thus that, in this paper's context, generalized plane strain leads to plane stress. Third, the boundary conditions are written in a direct and natural manner, because they correspond to the vanishing of the tractions on the free surface and at infinite distance from this surface. Finally, this procedure can easily accommodate an internal constraint, such as incompressibility [12, 13] (the secular equation for surface waves in incompressible monoclinic linearly elastic materials is obtained elsewhere).

The plan of the paper is the following. After a brief review of the basic equations describing motion in linearly elastic monoclinic materials (Section II), the equations of motion are written down in Section III for a surface acoustic wave with three displacement components which depend on two coordinates, that in the direction of propagation and that in the direction normal to the free surface (generalized plane strain). Then in Section IV, it is seen that one of the traction components is identically zero (plane stress), and that consequently, so is one of the displacement components (plane strain). For the remaining two traction components, coupled equations of motion and the boundary conditions are derived in Section V. Finally in Section VI, the method of first integrals is applied and the secular equation for acoustic surface waves in monoclinic elastic materials is derived explicitly. As a check, the subcase of orthorhombic materials is treated, and numerical results obtained by Chadwick and Wilson [9] for some monoclinic materials are recovered.

II PRELIMINARIES

First, the governing equations for a monoclinic elastic material are recalled. The material axes of the media are denoted by x_1 , x_2 , and x_3 , and the plane $x_3 = 0$ is assumed to be a plane of material symmetry. For such a material, the relationship between the nominal stress $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ and the strain $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ is given by

[15]

$$\begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{11} \\ \sigma_{22} \\ \sigma_{33} \\ \sigma_{23} \\ \sigma_{31} \\ \sigma_{12} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} c_{11} & c_{12} & c_{13} & 0 & 0 & c_{16} \\ c_{12} & c_{22} & c_{23} & 0 & 0 & c_{26} \\ c_{13} & c_{23} & c_{33} & 0 & 0 & c_{36} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & c_{44} & c_{45} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & c_{45} & c_{55} & 0 \\ c_{16} & c_{26} & c_{36} & 0 & 0 & c_{66} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon_{11} \\ \epsilon_{22} \\ \epsilon_{33} \\ 2\epsilon_{23} \\ 2\epsilon_{31} \\ 2\epsilon_{12} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

where c 's denote the elastic stiffnesses, and the strain components ϵ 's are related to the displacement components u_1, u_2, u_3 through

$$2\epsilon_{ij} = (u_{i,j} + u_{j,i}) \quad (i, j = 1, 2, 3). \quad (2)$$

The equations of motion, written in the absence of body forces, are

$$\sigma_{ij,j} = \rho u_{i,tt} \quad (i = 1, 2, 3), \quad (3)$$

where ρ is the mass density of the material, and the comma denotes differentiation.

Finally, the 6×6 matrix \mathbf{c} given in Eq. (1) must be positive definite in order for the strain-energy function density to be positive.

III SURFACE WAVES

Now the propagation of a surface wave on a semi-infinite body of monoclinic media is modeled. In the same manner as Mozhaev [11], the amplitude of the associated displacement is assumed to be varying sinusoidally with time in the direction of propagation x_1 , whilst its variation in the direction x_2 , orthogonal to the free surface, is not stated explicitly. Thus, calling v the speed of the wave, and k the associated wave number, the displacement components are written in the form

$$u_j(x_1, x_2, x_3, t) = U_j(x_2)e^{ik(x_1 - vt)} \quad (j = 1, 2, 3), \quad (4)$$

where the U 's depend on x_2 only. For these waves, the planes of constant phase are orthogonal to the x_1 -axis, and the planes of constant amplitude are orthogonal to the x_2 -axis.

The stress-strain relations (1) reduce to

$$\begin{aligned} t_{11} &= ic_{11}U_1 + c_{12}U_2' + c_{16}(U_1' + iU_2), \\ t_{22} &= ic_{12}U_1 + c_{22}U_2' + c_{26}(U_1' + iU_2), \\ t_{33} &= ic_{13}U_1 + c_{23}U_2' + c_{36}(U_1' + iU_2), \\ t_{32} &= c_{44}U_3' + ic_{45}U_3, \\ t_{13} &= c_{45}U_3' + ic_{55}U_3, \\ t_{12} &= ic_{16}U_1 + c_{26}U_2' + c_{66}(U_1' + iU_2), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where the prime denotes differentiation with respect to kx_2 , and the t 's are defined by

$$\sigma_{ij}(x_1, x_2, x_3, t) = kt_{ij}(x_2)e^{ik(x_1-vt)} \quad (i, j = 1, 2, 3). \quad (6)$$

The boundary conditions of the problem (surface $x_2 = 0$ free of tractions, vanishing displacement as x_2 tends to infinity) are

$$t_{i2}(0) = 0, \quad U_i(\infty) = 0 \quad (i = 1, 2, 3). \quad (7)$$

Finally, the equations of motion (3) reduce to

$$it_{11} + t'_{12} = -\rho v^2 U_1, \quad it_{12} + t'_{22} = -\rho v^2 U_2, \quad it_{13} + t'_{32} = -\rho v^2 U_3. \quad (8)$$

At this point, a sextic formalism could be developed for the three displacement components U_1, U_2, U_3 , and the three traction components t_{12}, t_{22}, t_{32} . However, it turns out that one of these traction components is identically zero, as is now proved.

IV PLANE STRESS

It is known (see the Appendix of Stroh's 1962 paper [2], and also Ting's book [6], p.66) that for a two-dimensional deformation of a monoclinic crystal with axis of symmetry at $x_3 = 0$, the displacements u_1 and u_2 are decoupled from u_3 . Taking $u_3 = 0$ for surface waves, it follows from the stress-strain relationships (5) that $t_{13} = t_{32} = 0$. Here, an alternative proof of this result is presented.

Using Eqs. (5)₄, (8)₃, and (5)₅, two first order differential equations for t_{32} and U_3 are found as

$$t_{32} = ic_{45}U_3 + c_{44}U'_3, \quad t'_{32} = (c_{55} - \rho v^2)U_3 - ic_{45}U'_3. \quad (9)$$

These equations may be inverted to give U_3 and U'_3 as

$$\begin{aligned} (c_{44}c_{55} - c_{45}^2 - c_{44}\rho v^2)U_3 &= ic_{45}t_{32} + c_{44}t'_{32}, \\ (c_{44}c_{55} - c_{45}^2 - c_{44}\rho v^2)U'_3 &= (c_{55} - \rho v^2)t_{32} - ic_{45}t'_{32}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Differentiation of (10)₁ and comparison with (10)₂ yields the following second order differential equation for t_{32} ,

$$c_{44}t''_{32} + 2ic_{45}t'_{32} - (c_{55} - \rho v^2)t_{32} = 0. \quad (11)$$

The boundary conditions (7) and Eq. (5)₄ imply that the stress component t_{32} must satisfy $t_{32}(0) = t_{32}(\infty) = 0$. The only solution of this boundary value problem for the differential equation (11) is the trivial one. Consequently,

$$t_{32}(x_2) = 0 \quad \text{for all } x_2, \quad (12)$$

and so it is proved that, as far as the propagation of surface acoustic waves in monoclinic crystals with plane of symmetry at $x_3 = 0$ is concerned, generalized plane strain leads to plane stress.

It is also worth noting that by Eq. (10)₁, plane stress leads in turn to plane strain which, as an assumption, was not needed a priori. This result was obtained by Stroh [2] in a different manner: ‘[when] there is a reflection plane normal to the x_3 axis, [...] there is no coupling of the displacement u_3 with u_1 and u_2 ; any two dimensional problem reduces to one of plane strain ($u_3 = 0$) and one of anti-plane strain ($u_1 = u_2 = 0$).’

Now the equations of motion can be written for the remaining displacements and traction components.

V EQUATIONS OF MOTION

Here, the equations of motion are derived, first as a system of four first order differential equations for the nonzero components of mechanical displacement and tractions, and then as a system of two second order differential equations for the tractions.

The stress-strain relations (5) and the equations of motion (8) lead to a system of differential equations for the displacement components U_1, U_2 , and for the traction components t_1, t_2 , defined by

$$t_1 = t_{12}, \quad t_2 = t_{22}. \quad (13)$$

This system is as follows

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}' \\ \mathbf{t}' \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} i\mathbf{N}_1 & \mathbf{N}_2 \\ -(\mathbf{N}_3 + X\mathbf{1}) & i\mathbf{N}_1^T \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{t} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (14)$$

where $\mathbf{u} = [U_1, U_2]^T$, $\mathbf{t} = [t_1, t_2]^T$, $X = \rho v^2$, and the 2×2 matrices \mathbf{N}_1 , \mathbf{N}_2 , and \mathbf{N}_3 are submatrices of the fundamental elasticity matrix \mathbf{N} , introduced by Ingebrigsten and Tønning [16]. Explicitly, \mathbf{N}_1 , \mathbf{N}_2 , \mathbf{N}_3 are given by [6]

$$-\mathbf{N}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} r_6 & 1 \\ r_2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{N}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} s_{22} & -s_{26} \\ -s_{26} & s_{66} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{N}_2^T, \quad -\mathbf{N}_3 = \begin{bmatrix} \eta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = -\mathbf{N}_3^T, \quad (15)$$

where the quantities r_2 , r_6 , s_{22} , s_{26} , s_{66} , and η are given in terms of the elastic stiffnesses as

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta &= \begin{vmatrix} c_{22} & c_{26} \\ c_{26} & c_{66} \end{vmatrix} = c_{22}c_{66} - c_{26}^2, \\ r_6 &= \frac{1}{\Delta}(c_{22}c_{16} - c_{12}c_{26}) \\ r_2 &= \frac{1}{\Delta}(c_{12}c_{66} - c_{16}c_{26}), \\ s_{ij} &= \frac{1}{\Delta}c_{ij} \quad (i, j = 2, 6), \\ \eta &= \frac{1}{\Delta} \begin{vmatrix} c_{11} & c_{12} & c_{16} \\ c_{12} & c_{22} & c_{26} \\ c_{16} & c_{26} & c_{66} \end{vmatrix} = c_{11} - \frac{c_{66}c_{12}^2 + c_{22}c_{16}^2 - 2c_{12}c_{16}c_{26}}{c_{22}c_{66} - c_{26}^2}.\end{aligned}\tag{16}$$

Throughout the paper, it is assumed that the matrix $\mathbf{N}_3 + X\mathbf{1}$ is not singular, which means that the surface wave propagates at a speed distinct from that given by $\rho v^2 = \eta$. This assumption made, the second vector line of the system (14) yields

$$\mathbf{u} = i(\mathbf{N}_3 + X\mathbf{1})^{-1}\mathbf{N}_1^T \mathbf{t} - (\mathbf{N}_3 + X\mathbf{1})^{-1} \mathbf{t}'.\tag{17}$$

On the other hand, differentiation of the system (14) leads to

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}'' \\ \mathbf{t}'' \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -\mathbf{N}_1\mathbf{N}_1 - \mathbf{N}_2(\mathbf{N}_3 + X\mathbf{1}) & i(\mathbf{N}_1\mathbf{N}_2 + \mathbf{N}_2\mathbf{N}_1^T) \\ -i[(\mathbf{N}_3 + X\mathbf{1})\mathbf{N}_1 + \mathbf{N}_1^T(\mathbf{N}_3 + X\mathbf{1})] & -(\mathbf{N}_3 + X\mathbf{1})\mathbf{N}_2 - \mathbf{N}_1^T\mathbf{N}_1^T \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{t} \end{bmatrix},\tag{18}$$

Now the second vector line of this equation yields, using Eq. (17), a system of two second order differential equations for \mathbf{t} , written as

$$\hat{\alpha}_{ik}t_k'' - i\hat{\beta}_{ik}t_k' - \hat{\gamma}_{ik}t_k = 0,\tag{19}$$

where the symmetric 2×2 matrices $\hat{\alpha}$, $\hat{\beta}$, and $\hat{\gamma}$, are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\alpha} &= -(\mathbf{N}_3 + X\mathbf{1})^{-1}, \quad \hat{\beta} = -\mathbf{N}_1(\mathbf{N}_3 + X\mathbf{1})^{-1} - (\mathbf{N}_3 + X\mathbf{1})^{-1}\mathbf{N}_1^T \\ \hat{\gamma} &= \mathbf{N}_2 - \mathbf{N}_1(\mathbf{N}_3 + X\mathbf{1})^{-1}\mathbf{N}_1^T,\end{aligned}\tag{20}$$

or, explicitly, by their components,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\alpha}_{11} &= \frac{1}{\eta - X}, \quad \hat{\alpha}_{12} = 0, \quad \hat{\alpha}_{22} = -\frac{1}{X}, \\ \hat{\beta}_{11} &= -\frac{2r_6}{\eta - X}, \quad \hat{\beta}_{12} = \frac{1}{X} - \frac{r_2}{\eta - X}, \quad \hat{\beta}_{22} = 0, \\ \hat{\gamma}_{11} &= s_{22} + \frac{r_6^2}{\eta - X} - \frac{1}{X}, \quad \hat{\gamma}_{12} = \frac{r_2r_6}{\eta - X} - s_{26}, \quad \hat{\gamma}_{22} = \frac{r_2^2}{\eta - X} + s_{66}.\end{aligned}\tag{21}$$

The system (19) of second order differential equations for the traction components is more convenient to work with than the corresponding system for the displacement components, because the boundary conditions are simply written, using Eqs. (7), (5), and (13), as

$$t_i(0) = t_i(\infty) = 0 \quad (i = 1, 2). \quad (22)$$

This claim is further justified in the next section, where the secular equation is quickly derived.

VI SECULAR EQUATION

Now the method of first integrals is applied to the system (19). Mozhaev [11] defined the following inner product,

$$(f, \phi) = \int (f\bar{\phi} + \bar{f}\phi)dx_2, \quad (23)$$

and multiplying Eq. (19) by $i\bar{t}_j$ gives

$$\hat{\alpha}_{ik}D_{kj} + \hat{\beta}_{ik}E_{kj} + \hat{\gamma}_{ik}F_{kj} = 0, \quad (24)$$

where the 2×2 matrices \mathbf{D} , \mathbf{E} , \mathbf{F} , are defined by

$$D_{kj} = (it_k'', t_j), \quad E_{kj} = (t_k', t_j), \quad F_{kj} = (t_k, it_j). \quad (25)$$

By writing down $F_{kj} + F_{jk}$, it is easy to check that the matrix \mathbf{F} is antisymmetric. Integrating directly $E_{kj} + E_{jk}$, and integrating $D_{kj} + D_{jk}$ by parts, and using the boundary conditions (22), it is found that the matrices \mathbf{E} and \mathbf{D} are also antisymmetric. So \mathbf{D} , \mathbf{E} , and \mathbf{F} may be written in the form

$$\mathbf{D} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & D \\ -D & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{E} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & E \\ -E & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{F} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & F \\ -F & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (26)$$

and Eq. (24) yields the following system of three linearly independent equations for the three unknowns D , E , F ,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\alpha}_{11}D + \hat{\beta}_{11}E + \hat{\gamma}_{11}F &= 0, \\ \hat{\alpha}_{12}D + \hat{\beta}_{12}E + \hat{\gamma}_{12}F &= 0, \\ \hat{\alpha}_{22}D + \hat{\beta}_{22}E + \hat{\gamma}_{22}F &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

This homogeneous linear algebraic system yields nontrivial solutions for D , E , and F , only when its determinant is zero, which, accounting for the fact

that $\widehat{\alpha}_{12} = \widehat{\beta}_{22} = 0$, is equivalent to $\widehat{\beta}_{12}(\widehat{\alpha}_{11}\widehat{\gamma}_{22} - \widehat{\alpha}_{22}\widehat{\gamma}_{11}) = -\widehat{\alpha}_{22}\widehat{\beta}_{11}\widehat{\gamma}_{12}$, or equivalently, using the expressions (21) and multiplying by $X^3(\eta - X)^3$,

$$[\eta - (1 + r_2)X]\{(\eta - X)[(\eta - X)(s_{22}X - 1) + r_6^2X] + X^2[(\eta - X)s_{66} + r_2^2]\} \\ = 2r_6X^2(\eta - X)[(\eta - X)s_{26} - r_2r_6]. \quad (28)$$

Hence *the secular equation is obtained explicitly as the quartic* (28) *in* $X = \rho v^2$, with coefficients expressed in terms of the elastic stiffnesses through Eqs. (16).

For consistency, the orthorhombic case, where $c_{16} = c_{26} = c_{45} = 0$, is now considered. In this case, the coefficients (16) reduce to

$$r_6 = 0, \quad r_2 = \frac{c_{12}}{c_{22}}, \quad s_{22} = \frac{1}{c_{66}}, \quad s_{26} = 0, \quad s_{66} = \frac{1}{c_{22}}, \quad \eta = c_{11} - \frac{c_{12}^2}{c_{22}}, \quad (29)$$

and the right hand-side of Eq. (28) is zero, while the left hand-side yields the equation

$$[\eta - (1 + r_2)X]\{(\eta - X)^2(s_{22}X - 1) + X^2[(\eta - X)s_{66} + r_2^2]\} = 0. \quad (30)$$

The nullity of the first factor in this equation corresponds to $\widehat{\beta}_{12} = 0$. Because for the orthorhombic case, $\widehat{\alpha}_{12} = \widehat{\gamma}_{12} = \widehat{\beta}_{11} = \widehat{\beta}_{22} = 0$ also, the equations of motion (19) then decouple into

$$\widehat{\alpha}_{11}t_1'' + \widehat{\gamma}_{11}t_1 = 0, \quad \widehat{\alpha}_{22}t_2'' + \widehat{\gamma}_{22}t_2 = 0, \quad (31)$$

whose solutions satisfying the boundary conditions (22) are the trivial ones. The nullity of the second factor in Eq. (30) corresponds to the well-studied [7, 17, 6] secular equation for surface waves in orthorhombic crystals,

$$\frac{c_{22}}{c_{11}} \left(\frac{c_{11}c_{22} - c_{12}^2}{c_{22}c_{66}} - \frac{\rho v^2}{c_{66}} \right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{\rho v^2}{c_{66}} \right) - \left(\frac{\rho v^2}{c_{66}} \right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{\rho v^2}{c_{11}} \right) = 0. \quad (32)$$

Finally, concrete examples are given (see Table 1). In each considered case, the secular equation (28) has either 2 or 4 positive real roots, out of which only one corresponds to a subsonic wave. The elimination of the other roots is made by comparison with the speed of a homogeneous body wave propagating in the direction of the x_1 material axis. For this body wave, the functions $U_i(x_2)$, $t_i(x_2)$, ($i = 1, 2$), are constant, and the equations of motion imply that the determinant of the 4×4 matrix in Eq. (14) is zero, condition from which the body wave speed can be found. Also, it is checked a posteriori that the value $X = \eta$ corresponds to the supersonic range, and so that the matrix $N_3 + X\mathbf{1}$ is indeed invertible within the subsonic range.

For instance, for tin fluoride, η is of the order of 3×10^7 , the secular equation (28) has the roots 1339, 2350, 2513, and 3403, and the slowest body wave in the x_1 direction travels at 1504 m s^{-1} ; hence a subsonic surface wave travels in tin fluoride at 1339 m s^{-1} .

Table 1. *Values of the relevant elastic stiffnesses (GPa), density (kg m^{-3}), and surface wave speed (m s^{-1}) for 12 monoclinic crystals.*

material	c_{11}	c_{22}	c_{12}	c_{16}	c_{26}	c_{66}	ρ	v
aegirite-augite	216	156	66	19	25	46.5	3420	3382
augite	218	182	72	25	20	51.1	3320	3615
diallage	211	154	37	12	15	62.2	3300	4000
diopside	238	204	88	-34	-19	58.8	3310	3799
diphenyl	14.6	5.95	2.88	2.02	0.40	2.26	1114	1276
epidote	202	212	45	-14.3	0	43.2	3400	3409
gypsum	50.2	94.5	28.2	-7.5	-11.0	32.4	2310	3011
hornblende	192	116	61	10	4	31.8	3120	3049
microcline	122	66	26	-13	-3	23.8	2561	2816
oligoclase	124	81	54	-7	16	27.4	2638	2413
tartaric acid	46.5	93	36.7	-0.4	-12.0	8.20	1760	1756
tin fluoride	33.6	47.9	5.3	6.5	-5.1	12.9	4875	1339

Barnett, Chadwick, and Lothe [18], and Chadwick and Willson [9] considered surface waves propagating in monoclinic materials, and computed the surface wave speed v in two steps, first by solving numerically a bicubic, then by substituting the result into another equation of which v is the only zero. These authors studied surface wave propagation for every value of the angle α between the reference plane and the plane of material symmetry. Numerical values for v are only given in the cases of aegirite-augite, diallage, gypsum, and microcline, and at $\alpha = 0$, these results are in agreement with those presented in Table 1. Sources of experimental data and extensive discussions on limiting speeds, existence of secluded supersonic surface waves, rotation of the reference plane with respect to the plane of material symmetry, etc., can be found in these articles and in references therein.

VII CONCLUDING REMARKS

Surface wave motion in monoclinic crystals with plane of symmetry at $x_3 = 0$ turned out to correspond to plane strain and plane stress motion (Section IV). Thanks to this, the equations of motion yielded a system of only two differential equations for the tractions (Section V). Once the method of first integrals was applied, a homogeneous system of 3 linearly independent

equations for three unknowns was obtained (Section VI). Had the motion not corresponded to plane stress, then the same procedure would have given a system of 18 equations for 18 unknowns, when the equations of motion are written for the displacement components [11], or a system of 9 equations for 9 unknowns, when the equations of motion are written for the traction components as in the present paper. However these equations are not linearly independent, and the secular equation cannot be obtained in this manner. Hence, it ought to be stressed again that the method presented in the paper is not a general method for a surface wave traveling in arbitrary direction in an anisotropic crystal, but was limited to the study of a surface wave propagating in the x_1 -direction of a monoclinic crystal with plane of symmetry at $x_3 = 0$, with attenuation in the x_2 -direction.

Nevertheless, some plane strain problems remain open and it is hoped that the method exposed in this paper might help solve them analytically. Also, beyond mathematical satisfaction, the derivation of an explicit secular equation provides a basis for a possible nonlinear perturbative analysis.

References

- [1] A.N. Stroh, "Dislocations and cracks in anisotropic elasticity," *Phil. Mag.* **3**, 625–646 (1958).
- [2] A.N. Stroh, "Steady state problems in anisotropic elasticity," *J. Math. Phys.* **41**, 77–103 (1962).
- [3] P.K. Currie, "Rayleigh waves on elastic crystals," *Q. J. Mech. appl. Math.* **27**, 489–496 (1974).
- [4] D.M. Barnett and J. Lothe, "Consideration of the existence of surface wave (Rayleigh wave) solutions in anisotropic elastic crystals," *J. Phys. F: Metal Phys.* **4**, 671–686 (1974).
- [5] P. Chadwick and G.D. Smith, "Foundations of the theory of surface waves in anisotropic elastic solids," *Adv. Appl. Mech.* **17**, 303–376 (1977).
- [6] T.C.T. Ting, "Anisotropic elasticity: theory and applications," (Oxford University Press, New York, 1996).
- [7] V.A. Sveklo, "Plane waves and Rayleigh waves in anisotropic media," (in Russian) *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **59**, 871–874 (1948).

- [8] D. Royer and E. Dieulesaint, “Rayleigh wave velocity and displacement in orthorhombic, tetragonal, and cubic crystals,” *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* **76**, 1438–1444 (1984).
- [9] P. Chadwick and N.J. Wilson, “The behaviour of elastic surface waves polarized in a plane of material symmetry, II. Monoclinic media,” *Proc. R. Soc. London, Sect. A.* **438**, 207–223 (1992).
- [10] A.K. Head, “The Galois unsolvability of the sextic equation of anisotropic elasticity,” *J. Elasticity* **9**, 9–20 (1979).
- [11] V.G. Mozhaev, “Some new ideas in the theory of surface acoustic waves in anisotropic media,” *IUTAM Symposium on anisotropy, inhomogeneity and nonlinearity in solids* (D.F. Parker and A.H. England, eds.), 455–462 (Kluwer, Holland 1994).
- [12] S. Nair and D.A. Sotiropoulos, “Elastic waves in orthotropic incompressible materials and reflection from an interface,” *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* **102**, 102–109 (1997).
- [13] D.A. Sotiropoulos and S. Nair, “Elastic waves in monoclinic incompressible materials and reflection from an interface,” *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* **105**, 2981–2983 (1999).
- [14] M.Y. Yu, “Surface polaritons in nonlinear media,” *Phys. Rev. A* **28**, 1855–1856 (1987).
- [15] A. E. H. Love, “A treatise on the mathematical theory of elasticity,” (Cambridge University Press, England, 1927).
- [16] K.A. Ingebrigsten and A. Tonning, “Elastic surface waves in crystal,” *Phys. Rev.* **184**, 942–951 (1969).
- [17] R. Stoneley, “The propagation of surface waves in an elastic medium with orthorhombic symmetry,” *Geophys. J.* **8**, 176–186 (1963).
- [18] D.M. Barnett, P. Chadwick and J. Lothe, “The behaviour of elastic surface waves polarized in a plane of material symmetry. I. Appendix,” *Proc. R. Soc. London, Sect. A.* **433**, 699–710 (1991).