AD-A059 896 AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATES OF PRINCETON INC N J F/G 20/4
THEORY OF SOLITON WAVES.(U)
SEP 78 H SEGUR
UNCLASSIFIED ARAP-358 N00014-77-C-0610
NL

END
DATE FILMED
12-78
DDC


1.0
1.1
1.25
1.4
1.6
2.8
3.2
3.6
4.0
2.5
2.2
2.0
1.8
MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

AD A059896

DDC FILE COPY

LEVEL II

12

2

DDC
RECEIVED
OCT 11 1978
F

This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited.

A.R.A.P.

AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATES *of* PRINCETON, INC.

78 09 29 034

DDC FILE COPY AD A059896

A.R.A.P. REPORT NO. 358

THEORY OF SOLITON WAVES

Final Report

by

Harvey Segur

DDC RECEIVED OCT 11 1978 F

Aeronautical Research Associates of Princeton, Inc.
50 Washington Road, P.O. Box 2229
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

ACCESSION for
NTIS White Section
DDC Buff Section
UNANNOUNCED
JUSTIFICATION
BY
DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODES
Dist. SPECIAL
A

September 1978

Prepared for

Office of Naval Research
under
Contract No. N00014-77-C-0610

This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited.

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Date Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM

1. REPORT NUMBER

2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. (9) Final Rept. 1 Sep 77-31 Aug 78

3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER

4. TITLE (and Subtitle)

(6) Theory of Soliton Waves, Final Report

5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED

Final, 9/1/77-8/31/78

(14) ARAP-

6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER

A.R.A.P. Report No. 358

7. AUTHOR(s)

(10) Harvey H. Segur

8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)

(15) N00014-77-C-0610

9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS

Aeronautical Research Associates of Princeton, Inc.
50 Washington Road, P.O. Box 2229
Princeton, NJ 08540

10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS

(11) Sep 78

11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS

Office of Naval Research
Department of the Navy
800 N. Quincy Avenue
Arlington, VA 22217

REPORT DATE

9/78

13. NUMBER OF PAGES

85

14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)

Office of Naval Research
Department of the Navy
800 North Quincy Avenue
Arlington, VA 22217

(12) 87 p.

15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)

Unclassified

15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

The overall objective of the work done under this contract is to determine the feasibility of using solitons, rather than sinusoidal wavetrains, as the basic building blocks in a theory of water waves. The goal of devising such a revised description is to model phenomena that occur over longer time scales than can be adequately described in terms of sinusoidal wavetrains. This report summarizes the work done in this direction during the first year of this contract.

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Date Entered)

008 400

The work done under this contract resulted in two scientific papers, both of which were co-authored with Mark Ablowitz:

(i) "Long internal waves in fluids of great depth," submitted to The Physics of Fluids; and

(ii) "On the evolution of packets of water waves," submitted to the Journal of Fluid Mechanics.

These papers are include in this report an Appendices A and B..

The first paper discusses three-dimensional effects on the kind of internal waves first discovered by Benjamin (1967) and Davis and Acrivos (1967). In this paper, we derive the appropriate higher-dimensional generalization of Benjamin's equation describing the evolution of these waves, and show that the (plane-wave) solitons are not unstable to long transverse perturbations.

The second paper represents the major effort under this contract. In it, we discuss three-dimensional effects on packets of surface waves, including both long waves (governed by the Korteweg-deVries equation in two dimensions) and short waves (governed by the nonlinear Schrodinger equation in two dimensions). In each case, we derive the appropriate higher-dimensional equation, along with the appropriate boundary conditions. Then using these equations we

(i) analyze the stability of (plane-wave) solitons to long transverse perturbations;

(ii) show the-existence of "lumps," which are higher dimensional analogues of solitons;

(iii) derive conditions under which a packet of capillary-type waves must "focus" at a point in a finite time (a strong nonlinear instability);

(iv) investigate the suitability of Inverse Scattering Transforms for these higher dimensional equations; and

(v) discuss some special solutions that may have physical interest.

It is difficult to describe the outcome of these analyses simply, because different results are obtained in different ranges of the dimensionless fluid depth and dimensionless surface tension. Certainly the evolution of wave packets in three dimensions involves phenomena that cannot occur in two dimensions. More detail has been given in the previous quarterly progress reports, and of course in the paper itself (Appendix B).

The work in these two papers shows the direction of research that seemed most fruitful as it developed. The final result, however, is not obviously related to the set of problems outlined in the original proposal for this contract. Therefore, it may be worthwhile to comment here on the current status of the problems that were originally outlined almost two years ago.

1. It was proposed to analyze the resonant interaction of a long internal wave with a packet of short surface waves, originally discussed by Phillips (e.g., 1974). The proposed analysis would employ multiple time-scales, in order to see if the evolution could be described in terms of solitons. The answer is affirmative, but no work on that problem was done under this contract, primarily because the analysis had already been initiated by Larry Redekopp (private communication). His work should appear shortly as a TRW Report; related work was also done by Grimshaw (1977).

2. It was proposed to analyze the oblique interaction of envelope solitons, to see whether an interaction like Miles' (1977) three-wave resonance of KdV solitons could occur. The answer is affirmative, as shown by Newell and Redekopp (1977). However, the results of our stability analyses are relevant here. The fact that envelope solitons are unstable to long transverse perturbations, whereas KdV-type solitons ordinarily are not, suggests that the oblique interaction of envelope solitons has limited physical significance.

78 09 29 034

3. It was proposed to reinterpret field measurements of ocean wave spectra in terms of solitons. But these spectra are decidedly three-dimensional in character. The differences already discovered between wave evolution in two and three dimensions suggest that (two-dimensional) solitons alone will not explain these spectra, and points to the need for more work on the three-dimensional problem.

4. It was proposed to study the stability of envelope solitons to transverse perturbations. This analysis was completed under this contract. Experiments to test these results are now being set up by Joe Hammack.

5. It was proposed to study the viscous decay of envelope solitons. The experimental portion of this problem has been completed; development of an appropriate theory, and its comparison with the experimental data should occur within the next year.

In summary, the work completed this year on the evolution of packets of water waves in three dimensions indicates that even though the two-dimensional theory (involving solitons) may describe well the essentially two-dimensional laboratory experiments on water waves, neither is necessarily representative of what happens in the three-dimensional ocean. We have begun to understand some of the additional phenomena that occur in three dimensions, but much more work is required.

REFERENCES

T.B. Benjamin, J. Fluid Mech. 29, p. 559, 1967.

R.E. Davis and A. Acrivos, J. Fluid Mech. 29, p. 593, 1967.

R. Grimshaw, Stud. App. Math. 56, p. 241, 1977.

J.W. Miles, J. Fluid Mech. 79, p. 157, 1977.

A.C. Newell and L.G. Redekopp, Phys. Rev. Lett. 38, p. 377, 1977.

O.M. Phillips, Ann. Rev. Fluid Mech. 6, p. 93, 1974.

APPENDIX A

LONG INTERNAL WAVES IN FLUIDS OF GREAT DEPTH

by

M. J. Ablowitz*
Program in Applied Mathematics
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

and

H. Segur
Aeronautical Research Associates
of Princeton, Inc.
50 Washington Road
P.O. Box 2229
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

ABSTRACT

An equation is derived that governs the evolution in two spatial dimensions of long internal waves in fluids of great depth. The equation is a natural generalization of Benjamin's (1967) one-dimensional equation, and relates to it in the same way that the equation of Kadomtsev and Petviashvili relates to the Korteweg-deVries equation. The stability of one-dimensional solitons with respect to long transverse disturbances is studied in the context of this equation. Solitons are found to be unstable with respect to such perturbations in any system in which the phase speed is a minimum (rather than a maximum) for the longest waves. Internal waves do not have this property, and are not unstable with respect to such perturbations.

---

*Permanent Address: Department of Mathematics, Clarkson College, Potsdam, New York, 13676.

February 1978

I. INTRODUCTION

It is known that the evolution of long waves of moderate amplitude in a nonlinear system depends on the form of the linearized dispersion relation. If, in the long wave limit $(k \to 0)$, the linearized dispersion relation is

$$\omega^2 = c_o^2 k^2 - 2\beta c_o k^4 + 0(k^6) \quad , \tag{1.1}$$

the governing equation is typically the Korteweg-deVries (KdV) equation [1,2,3] (assuming quadratic nonlinearities),

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \alpha u \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + \beta \frac{\partial^3 u}{\partial x^3} = 0 \quad . \tag{1.2}$$

If the dispersion relation has the form

$$\omega^2 = c_o^2 k^2 - 2bc_o k^2 |k| + 0(k^4) \quad , \tag{1.3}$$

then (1.2) is replaced by the equation of Benjamin [4],

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + au \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + b \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} H(u) = 0 \quad , \tag{1.4}$$

where

$$H(f) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int \frac{1}{y-x} f(y)dy$$

is the Hilbert operator. [Note the sign convention.] Both equations are known to have soliton solutions [5], and these agree in many of their important features: for (1.2),

$$u = (12K^2\beta/\alpha)\operatorname{sech}^2\{K(x - 4K^2\beta t)\} \tag{1.5}$$

and for (1.4), with $cb > 0$,

$$u = \frac{4c}{a}\left\{\left(\frac{c}{b}\,(x - ct)\right)^2 + 1\right\}^{-1} . \qquad (1.6)$$

Whereas the KdV equation can be solved exactly as an initial value problem [6,7], a corresponding method of solution for (1.4) has not yet been discovered. Therefore, it is not presently known how different the general solutions of the two problems really are.

If the long waves in (1.2) are subjected to even longer transverse modulations, Kadomtsev and Petviashvili [8] reasoned that the KdV equation should be generalized to:

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \alpha u \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + \beta \frac{\partial^3 u}{\partial x^3} - \frac{c_o}{2}\int_x^{x_o} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial y^2}\, d\xi = 0 , \quad c_o > 0 \qquad (1.7)$$

Moreover, they showed that the soliton solution, (1.5), is either neutrally stable for a limited time or unstable, depending on whether β is positive or negative; i.e., if the linearized phase speed (ω/k) has a maximum at $k = 0$ $(\beta > 0)$, then the solitons are not unstable. For example, this is the situation for long water waves without surface tension.

[For $\beta > 0$ (the stable case), no information travels faster than the waves described by (1.7), and it is appropriate to take $x_o = +\infty$. Further, one may require that $u \to 0$ as $x \to +\infty$, but then one cannot require that

$u \to 0$ as $x = -\infty$ unless $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial y^2}\, dx = 0$. For $\beta < 0$, the situation is reversed and one should take $x_o = -\infty$. Moreover, it is worth noting that when the one-dimensional solitons are unstable ($\beta < 0$) , (1.7) admits "lump" solutions, which are localized in both x and y and do have $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial y^2}\, dx = 0$ [9]. Their interaction behavior suggests that lumps are two-dimensional analogues of solitons.]

The purpose of this note is to show that, with regard to very long transverse modulations, (1.2) and (1.4) behave similarly. Specifically, we will show that:
(i) the appropriate generalization of (1.4) for two-dimensional waves is ($c_o > 0$)

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + au\,\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + b\,\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}\,H(u) - \frac{c_o}{2}\int_{x}^{x_o} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial y^2}\, d\xi = 0 \quad , \tag{1.8}$$

subject to the constraint that $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial y^2}\, dx = 0$; and
(ii) the soliton solution, (1.6), is either neutrally stable for a limited time or unstable, depending on whether b is positive or negative. Again, if the linearized phase speed has a maximum at $k = 0$, then the solitons are not unstable. This is the situation for long internal waves, traveling along the thermocline in the deep ocean [4,10,11].

In Section III, we show how to derive (1.8) in the context of internal waves on an ocean thermocline. This derivation is based on the work of Ono [11], but we have found his analy-

sis to be incomplete. In particular, the matching section of his analysis applies only if the density gradient is continuous, although no such restriction is stated (or even suggested) in [11]. In order to complete this analysis, therefore, we show how to match correctly both where the density gradient is continuous, and where either the density or its gradient is discontinuous.

Finally, we note that if one is simply interested in the structure of the underlying equation, such a derivation is unnecessary, because one can see directly from the linear dispersion relation, (1.3), that (1.8) is the appropriate generalization of (1.4). In two dimensions, we must interpret

$$k^2 = k_x^2 + k_y^2$$

in (1.3). In order that the effects of y-variations enter at the same order as the linear dispersion, we require that

$$k_y^2 = 0(k_x^3) \quad , \quad |k_x| << 1 \ . \tag{1.9}$$

Then (1.3) becomes

$$\omega^2 \sim c_o^2 k_x^2 \left[1 + \left(\frac{k_y}{k_x} \right)^2 - 2 \frac{b}{c_o} |k_x| \right] \ ,$$

and for waves in one direction, we obtain

$$k_x \omega \sim c_o k_x^2 - b k_x^2 |k_x| + \frac{c_o}{2} k_y^2 \ . \tag{1.10}$$

This corresponds to a certain linear operator acting on $\exp \{i(k_x x + k_y y - \omega t)\}$. After the Galilean transforma-

tion $\xi = x - c_o t$, $\tau = t$, this operator becomes

$(k_x \to -i\partial x \ , \quad \omega \to i\partial t \ , \quad \mathrm{sgn}(k_x) \to -iH)$

$$Lv = \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi}\left(\frac{\partial v}{\partial \tau} + b\,\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \xi^2} H(v)\right) + \frac{c_o}{2}\,\frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y^2} = 0$$

Integrating once gives the linearized version of (1.8) and the analysis which yields (1.4) shows that the nonlinear term also enters at this order.

II. STABILITY OF THE SOLITON

In order to test the stability of (1.6) to weak transverse perturbations, it is convenient to rescale y so that (1.8) becomes

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + au\,\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + b\,\frac{\partial^2 H(u)}{\partial x^2} - \delta^2 \int_x^{x_o} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial y^2}\,dx' = 0 \quad , \qquad \delta << 1 \quad . \tag{2.1}$$

We define a slow time scale, and a spatial scale that travels with the wave:

$$\begin{aligned} T &= \delta t \\ z &= x - \int^t c\,dt' - \theta(T,y,\delta) \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

and we assume

$$u = u_o(z,T,y,\delta) + \delta u_1(z,T,y,\delta) \quad . \tag{2.3}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} &= -\bar{c}\,\frac{\partial u}{\partial z} + \delta\,\frac{\partial u}{\partial T} \quad , \quad \bar{c} = c(T) + \delta\,\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial T} \quad , \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} &= p\,\frac{\partial u}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} \quad , \quad p = -\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial y} \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

Substituting into (2.1) yields

$$\begin{aligned} &-\bar{c}\,\frac{\partial u_o}{\partial z} + au_o\,\frac{\partial u_o}{\partial z} + b\,\frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} H(u_o) \\ &+ \delta\left[\frac{\partial u_o}{\partial T} - \bar{c}\,\frac{\partial u_1}{\partial z} + a\,\frac{\partial}{\partial z}(u_o u_1) + b\,\frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} H(u_1)\right] \\ &+ \delta^2\left[\frac{\partial u_1}{\partial T} + au_1\,\frac{\partial u_1}{\partial z} + p^2\,\frac{\partial u_o}{\partial z} + 2p\,\frac{\partial u_o}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial p}{\partial y}\,u_o \right. \\ &\left. - \int_z^{z_o} \frac{\partial^2 u_o}{\partial y^2}\,dz'\right] = O(\delta^3) \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

To leading order, (2.5) is

$$-\bar{c}\,\frac{\partial u_o}{\partial z} + a u_o \frac{\partial u_o}{\partial z} + b\,\frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} H(u_o) = 0 \ , \qquad (2.6)$$

and the solution of interest is

$$u_o(z;\bar{c}) = \frac{\frac{4\bar{c}}{a}}{\left(\frac{\bar{c}z}{b}\right)^2 + 1} \ , \qquad \bar{c}b > 0 \qquad (2.7)$$

At higher order, the equations all take the form

$$Lf = F \ , \qquad (2.8)$$

where

$$Lf = -\bar{c}\,\frac{\partial f}{\partial z} + a\,\frac{\partial}{\partial z}\,(u_o f) + b\,\frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} H(f)$$

The usual secularity condition is found by multiplying (2.8) by $u_o(z)$, integrating on $(-\infty,\infty)$, and using (2.6):

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} u_o F dz = \left[\frac{a u_o^2}{2} f - b H(u_o)\,\frac{\partial f}{\partial z}\right]_{-\infty}^{\infty}$$

Inserting (2.7), this can be written as

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} u_o F dz = \left[\frac{4b^2}{az}\,\frac{d}{dz}\left(\frac{z^2 f}{z^2 + \left(\frac{b}{c}\right)^2}\right)\right]_{-\infty}^{\infty}$$

Thus, the solution of (2.8) and its derivative is bounded for all z only if

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} u_o F dz = 0 \ . \qquad (2.9)$$

This provides our basic secularity condition. We also note that (2.9) will not yield a uniformly valid solution on $|x| < \infty$, but does give the correct evolution following the soliton. This is also true for (1.7).

At $O(\delta)$, (2.5) yields

$$Lu_1 = - \frac{\partial u_o}{\partial \bar{T}} \tag{2.10}$$

Applying (2.9) requires that

$$\frac{\partial \bar{c}}{\partial \bar{T}} = O(\delta) \quad ; \quad \bar{c} = c + \delta \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \bar{T}} (T, y, \delta) \tag{2.11}$$

Hence, the first nontrivial result comes by taking $u_1 = \delta u_2$. The question of stability is determined at $O(\delta^2)$, where (2.5) becomes

$$Lu_2 = - \frac{1}{\delta} \frac{\partial u_o}{\partial \bar{T}} - p^2 \frac{\partial u_o}{\partial z} - 2p \frac{\partial u_o}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial p}{\partial y} u_o + \int_z^{z_o} \frac{\partial^2 u_o}{\partial y^2} \, dz \quad . \tag{2.12}$$

Applying (2.9) to (2.12), and using $\partial \bar{c}/\partial y = O(\delta)$, yields an expression which reduces to

$$- \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 \theta}{\partial \bar{T}^2} + \bar{c} \frac{\partial^2 \theta}{\partial y^2} \sim 0 \quad . \tag{2.13}$$

If $b < 0$, then $\bar{c} < 0$ (from (2.7)), and (2.13) shows that arbitrarily small y-variations in the phase of the soliton grow rapidly; i.e., the soliton is unstable with respect to such transverse perturbations. In fact, (2.13) is elliptic when $\bar{c} < 0$, and (2.13) with initial conditions actually is ill-posed. However, this is due to the fact that we are considering

long wave perturbations. A similar result occurs in Whitham's analysis of the Stokes wave problem [12]: he finds that the slow modulation equations are elliptic. In the one-dimensional problem this instability leads to solitons. Here we expect to find lump-type solutions.

Conversely, if $b > 0$, then $\bar{c} > 0$, and these perturbations merely propagate without change along the crest of the soliton. Thus, the stability of the soliton solution of (1.8) with respect to transverse perturbations is determined by exactly the same criterion that determines the (transverse) stability of the KdV soliton obeying (1.7); i.e., whether the linearized phase speed is a maximum or a minimum at $k = 0$.

III. DERIVATION OF THE TWO-DIMENSIONAL EQUATION

In this section, we derive (1.8) in the context of long internal waves. For the sake of definiteness, it is convenient (but not necessary) to think in terms of a background density distribution of the form

$$\rho_o(z) = \rho_\infty\{1 + \delta \exp(-z/h)\} \quad , \quad z > 0 \quad , \qquad (3.1)$$

For the problem of waves propagating along the oceanic thermocline, $z = 0$ denotes a plane of symmetry (where the vertical velocity vanishes for the modes of interest) at the center of thermocline, h is a measure of the thermocline thickness, the ocean surface is taken at $z = +\infty$, and typically $\delta \sim 10^{-2}$. "Long" disturbances have horizontal scales much larger than h , and (1.8) results if they are also much smaller than the distance to the surface. Later, we will indicate in context what modifications to this derivation are necessary for density distributions that differ significantly from that in (3.1).

The equations of motion of an incompressible, non-diffusive fluid are

$$\frac{D\rho}{Dt} = 0 \quad ,$$

$$\nabla\cdot\vec{u} = 0 \quad ,$$

$$\rho \frac{D\vec{u}}{Dt} = -\nabla p - \hat{g} \quad . \qquad (3.2)$$

where $\vec{u} = (u,v,w)$, $\hat{g} = g(0,0,1)$ and $D/Dt = \partial/\partial t + \vec{u}\cdot\nabla$. In this problem, we require

$$w = 0 \quad \text{at} \quad z = 0 \quad , \quad |\vec{u}| \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad z \to \infty \tag{3.3}$$

In the absence of any fluid motion,

$$\begin{aligned} &\vec{u} = 0 \quad , \\ &\rho = \rho_o(z) \quad , \quad \text{given} \ , \\ &p = p_o(z) = -g \int_z \rho_o d\zeta \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

The required strategy for this problem can be seen by looking for infinitesimal perturbations of the form

$$\phi(z) e^{ik(x-c(k)t)}$$

around this undisturbed state. The result is an equation for the vertical velocity of the form

$$\frac{d}{dz}\left(\rho_o(z)\ \frac{d\phi}{dz}\right) - \left\{\frac{g}{c^2}\ \frac{d\rho_o}{dz}\ (z) + k^2\rho_o(z)\right\}\phi = 0 \tag{3.5}$$

For realistic density profiles, a natural length scale is

$$h = \left[\frac{\rho_o(z) - \rho_\infty}{-\frac{d\rho_o}{dz}\ (z)}\right]_{\min} \tag{3.6}$$

Hence, the waves in (3.4) are long if

$$\varepsilon = |k|h << 1 \quad . \tag{3.7}$$

In what follows, we shall assume that $|\rho_o'(z)|$ is monotonically decreasing, and is finite as $z \to 0$. Assuming

$c^2(k)$ *remains* finite as $k \to 0$, it follows that there is an "inner region" where (z/h) is the appropriate variable and the last term in (3.5) can be neglected, to leading order. In this region, the solution can be expanded as

$$\phi \sim \phi_o(z) + |k|\phi_1(z) \quad ,$$
$$c^2 \sim c_o^2 + |k|c_1^2 \qquad (3.8)$$

On the other hand, for fixed, small k and sufficiently large z, there is an "outer region" where density variations can be neglected and (3.5) reduces to

$$\phi'' - k^2\phi \sim 0 \quad .$$

The appropriate variable in this region is $|k|z(=\varepsilon z/h)$, and the solution of interest is

$$\phi \sim Ae^{-|k|z} \quad . \qquad (3.9)$$

The region of overlap is found by solving for z from the relation:

$$-\frac{1}{\rho_o(z)}\frac{d\rho_o}{dz} \sim \frac{k^2c^2(k)}{g} \quad . \qquad (3.10)$$

For the density distribution given by (3.1), this occurs as $z/h \to \infty$ in the inner region, and as $|k|z \to 0$ in the outer region. For other types of smooth density distributions, the matching can occur in a neighborhood of a finite z/h, but always as $|k|z \to 0$. Provided $d\rho_o/dz$

is continuous, ϕ and its derivative must match in this region of overlap, and it follows from the structure of (3.8) and (3.9) that the required conditions are

$$\phi_o \to A \quad , \quad \frac{d\phi_o}{dz} \to 0 \quad , \quad \frac{d\phi_1}{dz} \to -A \quad . \tag{3.11}$$

These matching conditions provide the additional information required to specify the solutions ϕ_o, ϕ_1 completely.

If $d\rho_o/dz$ is discontinuous, there may be no region of overlap, and then the matching must be done along the isopycnic surface (surface of constant density) where the discontinuity occurs. The required matching conditions now are that the normal velocity and pressure are continuous across this surface. In the linearized problem, these reduce to matching ϕ and $d\phi/dz$, but not in the nonlinear problem. We will discuss this point in more detail after first deriving (1.8) for a density distribution like that in (3.1), where $d\rho_o/dz$ is continuous.

Returning now to (3.2) and (3.3), we apply these ideas to the nonlinear problem. Small amplitude waves which are long in the sense described above, traveling in the x-direction, are obtained by using the following scaling in the lower layer ($z/h = 0(1)$) :

$$
\left.
\begin{aligned}
\xi &= \varepsilon(x - c_o t)/h \quad , \\
\eta &= \varepsilon^{3/2}(y/h) \quad , \\
\zeta &= z/h \quad , \\
\tau &= \varepsilon^2 c_o t/h \quad , \\
u &\sim \varepsilon c_o u_1(\xi,\eta,\zeta,\tau) + \varepsilon^2 c_o u_2 \quad , \\
v &\sim \varepsilon^{3/2} c_o v_1(\xi,\eta,\zeta,\tau) \quad , \\
w &\sim \varepsilon^2 c_o w_1(\xi,\eta,\zeta,\tau) + \varepsilon^3 c_o w_2 \quad , \\
\rho &\sim \rho_o(\zeta) + \varepsilon\rho_\infty \rho_1(\xi,\eta,\zeta,\tau) \quad , \\
p &\sim p_o(\zeta) + (\varepsilon\rho_\infty c_o^2) p_1(\xi,\eta,\zeta,\tau) \quad .
\end{aligned}
\right\} \tag{3.12}
$$

These scales were used by Ono [11], except for y, which is based on (1.9), and v, which is required for momentum balance. To leading order, after using (3.4), (3.2) yields

$$
\left.
\begin{aligned}
-\rho_\infty \frac{\partial \rho_1}{\partial \xi} + w_1 \frac{d\rho_o}{d\zeta} &= 0 \quad , \\
\frac{\partial u_1}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial \zeta} &= 0 \quad , \\
(\rho_o(\zeta)/\rho_\infty) \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial \xi} &= 0 \quad , \\
\frac{\partial p_1}{\partial \zeta} + \frac{gh}{c_o^2} \rho_1 &= 0 \quad , \\
(\rho_o(\zeta)/\rho_\infty) \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial \eta} &= 0 \quad .
\end{aligned}
\right\} \tag{3.13}
$$

We define

$$
w_1 = -\frac{\partial f}{\partial \xi}(\xi,\eta,\tau)\phi(\zeta) \tag{3.14}
$$

and for future purposes, we require that $\partial f/\partial \xi \to 0$ as $|\xi| \to \infty$. Then (3.13) provides the equation that determines the vertical structure of the waves:

$$\frac{d}{d\zeta}\left\{\rho_o(\zeta)\ \frac{d\phi}{d\zeta}\right\} - \frac{gh}{c_o^2}\ \frac{d\rho_o}{d\zeta}\ (\zeta)\phi = 0 \quad . \qquad (3.15)$$

It also determines the other unknowns in terms of f and ϕ .

As $\zeta \to \infty$, $\rho_o \to \rho_\infty$ and ϕ approaches a linear function of ζ ; (i.e., $\phi'' \to 0$). The only bounded solution, therefore, satisfies the boundary conditions:

$$\phi(0) = 0 \ , \quad \frac{d\phi}{d\zeta} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \zeta \to \infty \qquad (3.16)$$

in accord with (3.11). Now (3.15) and (3.16) constitute an eigenvalue problem for $(1/c_o^2)$. There are infinitely many solutions to this problem, but the lowest eigenvalue, whose eigenfunction does not vanish in $(0,\infty)$, is ordinarily the solution of physical interest. We normalize this eigenfunction by choosing $\phi(\infty) = 1$.

The relevant equations at the next order are:

$$\left.\begin{aligned}
&-\rho_\infty \frac{\partial \rho_2}{\partial \xi} + w_2 \frac{d\rho_o}{d\zeta} = -\frac{\partial f}{\partial \tau}\ \phi\ \rho_o' + f\ \frac{\partial f}{\partial \xi}\ \{\phi'\phi\rho_o' - \phi(\rho_o'\phi)'\} \quad , \\
&\frac{\partial u_2}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial \eta} + \frac{\partial w_2}{\partial \zeta} = 0 \quad , \\
&-\rho_o(\zeta)\ \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial \xi} + \rho_\infty \frac{\partial p_2}{\partial \xi} = -\frac{\partial f}{\partial \tau}\ \rho_o\phi' \\
&\qquad + f\ \frac{\partial f}{\partial \xi}\ \{-\rho_o(\phi')^2 + \rho_o\phi\phi'' - \rho_o'\phi\phi'\} \quad , \\
&\frac{\partial p_2}{\partial \zeta} + (gh/c_o^2)\rho_2 = 0 \quad ,
\end{aligned}\right\} \qquad (3.16)$$

and $w_2 = 0$ at $\zeta = 0$.

These equations reduce to a single nonhomogenous equation for w_2 , the homogenous portion of which is

identical to that in (3.15). The equation has a solution only if the nonhomogenous terms satisfy an orthogonality condition:

$$\rho_o\{w_2\phi' - \phi w_2'\}\Big|_{\zeta\to\infty} = \int_0^\infty (\rho_o\phi')'\phi\, d\zeta \cdot \left(2\frac{\partial f}{\partial \tau} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \eta^2}\int^{\xi} f d\tilde{\xi}\right)$$
$$+ \int_0^\infty \{3(\rho_o\phi'^2)' - 2\rho_o\phi'\phi'' - 2(\rho_o\phi\phi'')'\}\phi\, d\zeta \cdot f\frac{\partial f}{\partial \xi} \tag{3.18}$$

Again we note that if (3.10) should hold at a finite ζ, say h_o, then "∞" in (3.18) should be replaced by h_o.

In the upper layer, the fluid is nearly homogenous and it is assumed that the only motion is that excited by waves in the lower layer. Therefore, the equations of motion must reduce to LaPlace's equation to leading order. Moreover, the horizontal scales should be chosen to be consistent with those in the lower layer, but the vertical scale changes. Hence, in this region, we define

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \varepsilon z/h = \varepsilon\zeta \quad , \\ w &= \varepsilon^2 c_o W(\xi,\eta,Z,\tau,\varepsilon) \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

and the scaling of the other independent variables is taken from (3.12). The equation for the vertical velocity ($Z > 0$) is

$$\frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial \xi^2} + \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial Z^2} = O(\varepsilon) \quad , \tag{3.20}$$

subject to the conditions that

$$\left.\begin{aligned} W &\to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad Z \to \infty \quad , \\ W &\to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad |\xi| \to \infty \quad , \\ W &= -\frac{\partial f}{\partial \xi}\,(\xi,\eta,\tau,\varepsilon) \quad \text{on} \quad Z = 0 \quad . \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{3.21}$$

This last condition is derived from the requirement that the two representations of the vertical velocity must match (as functions) in the region of overlap, which in this case is

$$\varepsilon^p\, z/h = 0(1) \quad , \quad 0 < p < 1 \quad . \tag{3.22}$$

The solution of this problem is

$$W(\xi,\eta,Z,\tau;\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{\pi}\int\left[-\frac{\partial f}{\partial \tilde{\xi}}\,(\tilde{\xi},\eta,\tau,\varepsilon)\right]\frac{Z}{(\tilde{\xi}-\xi)^2 + Z^2}\,d\tilde{\xi} \tag{3.23}$$

Ono [11] noted that

$$\begin{aligned} \left.\frac{\partial W}{\partial Z}\right|_{Z=0} &= -\frac{1}{\pi}\frac{\partial}{\partial \xi}\int\left[-\frac{\partial f}{\partial \tilde{\xi}}\,(\tilde{\xi},\eta,\tau,\varepsilon)\right]\frac{d\tilde{\xi}}{\tilde{\xi}-\xi} \\ &= -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \xi^2}\,H(f) \end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

By construction, the two representations of the vertical velocity match. Matching the vertical derivatives of these functions as well insures the unique analytic continuation of W, as required. From (3.16) and (3.24), this implies

$$\left.\frac{\partial w_2}{\partial \zeta}\right|_{\zeta \to \infty} = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \xi^2} H(f) \tag{3.25}$$

The last step is to substitute (3.25) into (3.18) and integrate by parts appropriately, using the fact that

$$\phi'' \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \zeta \to \infty \quad . \tag{3.26}$$

The result has the form of (1.8), where u is identified with f,

$$a = 3\int_0^\infty \rho_o \phi'^3 d\zeta \Big/ \left[2\int_0^\infty \rho_o \phi'^2 d\zeta\right] \quad ,$$

$$b = \rho_\infty \Big/ \left[2\int_0^\infty \rho_o \phi'^2 d\zeta\right] \quad . \tag{3.27}$$

and $c_o = 1$ because of our scaling in (3.12). In this application $b > 0$, and no disturbance can arrive at $\xi = +\infty$ before the solution of (1.8). Hence, it is appropriate to take $x_o = +\infty$ in (1.8), so that the integral term becomes $\int_\xi^\infty \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \eta^2}\, d\xi'$. It follows from (3.12), (3.13) and (3.14) that f, the solution of (1.8), represents both the horizontal fluid velocity and the vertical displacement of an isopycnic surface. Moreover the soliton, (1.6), is not unstable with respect to long transverse perturbations, as shown in Section II.

The integrals in (3.23) and (3.24) coverge only if $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \xi} \to 0$ as $|\xi| \to \infty$. With $x_o = +\infty$, there is no apparent

difficulty in requiring that the solution of (1.8) should vanish, along with its derivatives, as $\xi \to +\infty$. However, even if f (i.e., u) and all of its derivatives vanish initially as $\xi \to -\infty$, it is evident from (1.8) that f will not remain zero there unless

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \eta^2} \, d\xi = 0 \quad . \tag{3.28}$$

This additional constraint on the solution can be interpreted in terms of the vertical component of vorticity,

$$\omega = \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} \quad . \tag{3.29}$$

Using (3.12), (3.13) and (3.14), one can show that both terms in (3.29) are of the same order of magnitude (in ε) , and that both are proportional to $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \eta}$. Thus, (3.28) is satisfied if the total (i.e., integrated in ξ) ω-component of vorticity is constant in η .

We close this section by outlining the analysis required for discontinuous density profiles. The main point is that when either ρ_o or $\rho_o'(z)$ is discontinuous, there is no matching region, but rather a sharp interface. In these cases, we must match normal velocity and pressure along the interface which, in turn, has to be found. The essential steps are as follows. We define the interface $z = \zeta(x,y)$ by

$$\frac{Dz}{Dt} = \frac{\partial \hat{\zeta}}{\partial t} + \vec{u} \cdot \nabla \hat{\zeta} = W \quad . \tag{3.30}$$

If we call

$$F = z - \hat{\zeta} = z - 1 - \varepsilon\hat{\zeta}_1 - \varepsilon^2\hat{\zeta}_2 \cdots ,$$

then using the unit normal, $\hat{n} = \nabla F/|\nabla F|$, the problem becomes specified by the matching conditions

$$\vec{u}\cdot\hat{n}\Big|_{\text{lower}} = \vec{u}\cdot\hat{n}\Big|_{\text{upper}} , \tag{3.31}$$

$$\text{Pressure}\Big|_{\text{lower}} = \text{Pressure}\Big|_{\text{upper}} \tag{3.32}$$

We then successively (in powers of ε) satisfy in order: (3.31), (3.30), (3.32), from which we obtain unique functions for the velocity, interface, and pressure. In all cases, we find (1.8) with a,b given by (3.27) (and ∞ replaced by $h_o = 1$). In the case where we have two homogenous fluids of differing densities, $a = 3/2$, $b = \rho_\infty/2\rho_o$ where ρ_∞ , ρ_o are the respective densities of the upper and lower fluids.

When $\rho_o(z)$ is continuous, but $\rho_o'(z)$ is discontinuous, then the effect of the interface is weaker. To obtain (1.8), we need only use leading order results from (3.31); i.e., continuity of vertical velocity (to higher order, however, (3.31) itself must be employed). If $\rho_o'(z)$ is also continuous then a matching region exists, and the analysis presented at the beginning of this section applies.

Finally, it should be noted that the wave modes of interest here, which leave the center of the thermocline undisturbed, travel slower than either the surface wave or the fastest internal wave with the same horizontal wavenumber. The analysis presented here assumes that if there is any energy in these other wave modes, the relevant group velocities greatly exceed c_o, so that there is no coupling between the long internal waves considered here and packets of shorter waves in these other modes. If there is significant coupling, the equations are more complicated than (1.4) and (1.8).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the Office of Naval Research, and by the National Science Foundation. It was recently brought to our attention that some of these results have also been found by Case and Rosenbluth [13].

REFERENCES

1. D.J. Benney, J. Math. & Phys. 45, 52 (1966).
2. C.S. Gardner, and C.H. Su, J. Math. Phys. 10, 536 (1969).
3. T. Taniuti, and C.C. Wei, J. Math. Phys. 24, 941 (1968).
4. T.B. Benjamin, J. Fluid Mech. 29, 559 (1967).
5. R.I. Joseph, J. Math. Phys. 18, 2251 (1977).
6. C.S. Gardner, J.M. Greene, M.D. Kruskal, and R.M. Miura, Phys. Rev. Lett. 19, 1095 (1967).
7. _____, Comm. Pure & Appl. Math. 27 97 (1974).
8. B.B. Kadomtsev, and V.I. Petviashvili, Sov. Phys.-Dok 15, 539 (1970).
9. M.J. Ablowitz & J. Satsuma, preprint.
10. R.E. Davis, and A. Acrivos, J. Fluid Mech. 29, 593 (1967).

11. H. Ono, J. Phys. Soc. Japan 39, 1082 (1973).

12. G.B. Whitham, Linear and Nonlinear Waves, Wiley-Interscience, 562 (1974).

13. K.M. Case and M.N. Rosenbluth, JASON Report JSR-76-29, Stanford Research Institute, Menlo Park, CA, 1977.

APPENDIX B

ON THE EVOLUTION OF PACKETS OF WATER WAVES

Mark J. Ablowitz*

Applied Math. Program
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

and

Harvey Segur

Aeronautical Research Associates of Princeton, Inc.
50 Washington Road, P.O. Box 2229
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

May 1978

*Permanent address: Mathematics Department, Clarkson College, Potsdam, New York.

ABSTRACT

We consider the evolution of packets of water waves that travel predominantly in one direction, but in which the wave amplitudes are modulated slowly in both horizontal directions. Two separate models are discussed, depending on whether or not the waves are long in comparison with the fluid depth. These models are two-dimensional generalizations of the Korteweg-deVries equation (for long waves) and the cubic nonlinear Schrödinger equation (for short waves). In either case, we find that the two-dimensional evolution of the wave packets depends fundamentally on the dimensionless surface tension and fluid depth. In particular, for the long waves, one-dimensional (KdV) solitons become unstable with respect to even longer transverse perturbations when the surface tension parameter becomes large enough, i.e., in very thin sheets of water. Two-dimensional long waves ("lumps") that decay algebraically in all horizontal directions and interact like solitons exist only when the one-dimensional solitons are found to be unstable.

The most dramatic consequence of surface tension and depth, however, occurs for capillary-type waves in sufficiently deep water. Here a packet of waves that are everywhere small (but not infinitesimal) and modulated in both horizontal dimensions can "focus" in a finite time,

producing a region in which the wave amplitudes are finite. This nonlinear instability should be stronger and more apparent than the linear instabilities examined to date; it should be readily observable.

Another feature of the evolution of short wave packets in two-dimensions is that all one-dimensional solitons are unstable with respect to long transverse perturbations. Finally, we identify some exact similarity solutions to the evolution equations.

1. INTRODUCTION

Our understanding of the evolution of surface water waves of moderate amplitude has increased significantly within the last decade or so. The evolution in one spatial dimension of a packet of inviscid waves of sufficiently small amplitude is governed by linear equations on a short time scale, and by either the Korteweg-deVries (KdV) equation

$$u_t + uu_x + u_{xxx} = 0 \tag{1.1}$$

or the cubic nonlinear Schrödinger equation

$$iA_t + A_{xx} + \sigma|A|^2A = 0 \tag{1.2}$$

on longer time scales, depending on whether or not the typical wavelengths are large in comparison with the fluid depth. In (1.2) and throughout this paper, $\sigma = \pm 1$, and represents an irreducible choice of signs. Both of these equations can be solved exactly as initial value problems, using inverse scattering transforms (IST; an account of IST can be found in [1]). In situations in which viscous effects are felt on an even longer time scale, these theories (or viscously-corrected versions of them) predict with very reasonable accuracy the evolution of waves over quite long distances in wave tanks (Hammack and Segur, [2], [3]; Yuen and Lake, [4]).

Outside of specially designed tanks, surface waves ordinarily evolve in two spatial dimensions and here the theory is much less complete. A two-dimensional generalization of (1.1) for nearly one-dimensional long waves was given by Kadomtsev and Petviashvili [5] in the form:

$$u_t + uu_x + \sigma u_{xxx} - \int_x^\infty u_{yy}\, d\tilde{x} = 0 \quad , \tag{1.3}$$

Results by several authors indicate that (1.3) is of IST-type, but a complete method of inverse scattering, analogous to that in one spatial dimension, has not yet been developed.

Two-dimensional generalizations of (1.2) were derived by Zakharov [6], Benney and Roskes [7], Davey and Stewartson [8], and Djordjevic and Redekopp [9]. All of these analyses followed approximately the same lines. The problem was also studied by Hayes [10], using somewhat different methods. The most general analysis was by Djordjevic and Redekopp, who included the effects of gravity, surface tension and arbitrary depth to get a system that can be reduced to

$$\begin{aligned} iA_t + \sigma_1 A_{xx} + A_{yy} &= \sigma_2 |A|^2 A + \Phi_x A \quad , \\ a\Phi_{xx} + \Phi_{yy} &= -b(|A|^2)_x \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

where $(a, b, \sigma_1, \sigma_2)$ depend on the (dimensionless) fluid depth and surface tension. In the long wave limit, (1.4) reduces

to one of the problems that Ablowitz and Haberman [11] had shown were of IST-type. As with (1.3), beyond identifying the appropriate linear scattering problem and obtaining special solutions, no general inverse scattering theory has yet been developed.

In these two cases, (1.3) and the long wave limit of (1.4), one can reasonably anticipate that the necessary inverse scattering theory eventually will be developed, and that the general solutions of (1.3) and (1.4), as initial value problems, will become available. In these cases, the two-dimensional problem should eventually be solved to the extent that the one-dimensional problem is now. However, as discussed in §5, we conjecture that (1.4) cannot be solved by inverse scattering transforms over the entire range of parameters and that the general two-dimensional problem cannot be solved in a manner analogous to that in one dimension.

The purpose of this paper is to identify some important results regarding (1.3) and (1.4), and to suggest the role that they play in the solution of initial value problems. A major result of this study is the dramatic effect that surface tension can have upon the dynamics of the wave motion. A summary of these results, and an outline of the paper is as follows.

(§2) The derivations of (1.3) and (1.4) from the physical problem of water waves are discussed. These equations are well established in the literature, but the question of what boundary conditions and other constraints are required to make the problems well-posed is still open. We show that the original problem selects certain side conditions as "natural."
Which conditions are appropriate depends on the dimensionless

surface tension and depth. In this section we also consider the physical interpretation of an infinite set of conservation laws.

(§3) The role that one-dimensional soliton solutions can play in the two-dimensional problems is examined (i.e., stability of solitons). KdV solitons are unstable in (1.3) when $\sigma = -1$, which occurs in sufficiently thin sheets of water (i.e., large enough surface surface tension coefficient). For zero surface tension $\sigma = +1$, and the argument does not yield instability. When solitons are unstable, they cannot be viewed as the asymptotic ($t \to \infty$) states towards which the solution evolves, as they are in the one-dimensional problem. In this case, "lump" solutions exist and may play an asymptotic role analogous to that of one-dimensional solitons.

Zakharov and Rubenchik [12] showed that for the one-dimensional cubic nonlinear Schrödinger equation all one-dimensional solitons are unstable. These results apply to the deep water limit of (1.4). We extend their analysis to demonstrate the equivalent results in the case of finite depth.

(§4) The most dramatic effect of strong surface tension is <u>focusing</u>. A wave that is large enough (in a certain integral sense) focuses at a particular point in space after a finite time. Here there is no asymptotic ($t \to \infty$) state, because the solution of (1.4) develops a singularity in a finite time. Focusing provides a mechanism by which a field of relatively small amplitude waves produces a local

region in which the amplitudes are large. Focusing is a potentially important mechanism in the redistribution of energy within the spectrum; it should be readily measurable.

(§5) We consider the question of the complete integrability of (1.4). Moreover, we exhibit some special solutions that are not one-dimensional, and are candidates for asymptotic states in the two-dimensional problem.

2. RELEVANT EVOLUTION EQUATIONS

The classical problem of water waves is to find the the irrotational motion of an inviscid, incompressible, homogeneous fluid, subject to the forces of gravity and surface tension. The fluid rests on a horizontal and impermeable bed of infinite extent at $z = -h$ (h may be finite or infinite), and has a free surface at $z = \zeta(x,y,t)$.

The fluid has a velocity potential, ϕ , which satisfies

$$\nabla^2\phi = 0 \qquad -h < z < \zeta(x,y,t) \tag{2.1}$$

It is subject to boundary conditions on the bottom, $z = -h$:

$$\phi_z = 0 \quad ; \tag{2.2}$$

and along the free surface, $z = \zeta$:

$$\frac{D\zeta}{Dt} = \zeta_t + \phi_x\zeta_x + \phi_y\zeta_y = \phi_z \quad .$$

$$g\zeta + \phi_t + \frac{1}{2}|\nabla\phi|^2 = T\,\frac{\zeta_{xx}(1+\zeta_y^2) + \zeta_{yy}(1+\zeta_x^2) - 2\zeta_{xy}\zeta_x\zeta_y}{(1+\zeta_x^2+\zeta_y^2)^{3/2}} \tag{2.3}$$

Here g is the gravitational acceleration, and T is the ratio of surface tension coefficient to fluid density. We note that the linearized dispersion relation for this system is

$$\omega^2 = (g\kappa + \kappa^3 T)\tanh \kappa h \quad , \tag{2.4}$$

In two dimensions, one should interpret $\kappa = \sqrt{k^2 + \ell^2}$ in (2.4).

2.1 KdV Limit

The solution of (1.3) provides an approximate solution to these equations that is valid when the initial disturbnace consists primarily of nearly one-dimensional long waves of small amplitude. To be precise, let $\vec{\kappa} = (k,\ell)$ be the horizontal wavenumber characteristic of the disturbance. Orient the horizontal coordinate system such that the x-direction is the principal direction of wave propagation. Let a denote the characteristic amplitude of the disturbance. Then we need:

(i) small amplitudes,

$$\varepsilon \equiv a/h << 1 \quad ; \tag{2.5a}$$

(ii) long waves,

$$(\kappa h)^2 << 1 \quad ; \tag{2.5b}$$

(iii) nearly one-dimemensional waves,

$$(\ell/\kappa)^2 << 1 \quad . \tag{2.5c}$$

The KdV equation (1.1) results when the first two effects balance in truly one-dimensional problems, and (1.3) results when all three effects balance:

$$(\kappa h)^2 = O(\varepsilon) \quad , \tag{2.5d}$$

$$(\ell/\kappa)^2 = O(\varepsilon) \quad . \tag{2.5e}$$

Under the assumptions of (2.5) a first approximation of (2.1) - (2.3) reduces to

$$\frac{\partial^2 \zeta}{\partial t^2} - gh \frac{\partial^2 \zeta}{\partial x^2} = 0(\varepsilon) \tag{2.6}$$

Thus, to lowest order, the solution of (2.1) - (2.3) may be approximated by

$$\zeta \sim \varepsilon h[f_1(x - \sqrt{gh}t;y) + f_2(x + \sqrt{gh}t;y)] , \tag{2.7}$$

where f_1, f_2 are known in terms of the initial data. Throughout this paper, we are interested in problems where the initial disturbances are localized, and it is then convenient to assume a fortiori that the physical quantities have compact support initially. In this case, it is easy to show the f_1 and f_2 in (2.7) have compact support as well.

To go to higher order, we define scaled, dimensionless variables:

$$\left.\begin{aligned} r &= \sqrt{\varepsilon}(x-\sqrt{gh}t)/h \quad , \quad s = \sqrt{\varepsilon}(x+\sqrt{gh}t)/h \\ \eta &= \varepsilon y/h \quad , \quad \tau = \varepsilon\sqrt{gh}t/h \\ u &= f_1 \quad , \quad v = f_2 \\ \hat{T} &= T/gh^2 \quad . \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{2.8}$$

Now we look for solutions of the form $\zeta \sim \varepsilon h[u(r,\tau,\eta) + v(s,\tau,\eta)]$; i.e., we use the method of multiple scales. To eliminate secular terms at the next order, we find

$$\begin{aligned} &(2u_\tau + 3uu_r + (\tfrac{1}{3} - \hat{T})u_{rrr})_r + u_{\eta\eta} = 0 \quad , \\ &(2v_\tau - 3vv_s - (\tfrac{1}{3} - \hat{T})v_{sss})_s - v_{\eta\eta} = 0 \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

The equation given by Kadomtsev and Petviashvili [5] is in this form.

For most circumstances of interest in water waves,

$$\tfrac{1}{3} - \hat{T} > 0 \quad , \tag{2.10}$$

and it follows from (2.4) that the linearized phase speed is a (local) maximum at $\kappa = 0$. Thus, the waves governed by (2.9) travel faster than their neighbors (in κ-space) and there should be no disturbance as $r \to +\infty$, or $s \to -\infty$. Consequently, (2.9a) may be integrated to

$$2u_\tau + 3uu_r + (\tfrac{1}{3} - \hat{T})u_{rrr} - \int_r^\infty u_{\eta\eta}\,dz = 0 \quad , \tag{2.11}$$

with a similar equation for (2.9b). This is now in the form of an evolution equation for u, as is (1.3). For very thin sheets of water (i.e., $\hat{T}$ large enough) (2.10) is false, the long waves travel slower than their neighbors, and the integral in (2.11) should be over $(-\infty, r)$.

Given (2.10), there is no apparent difficulty in requiring that u should vanish, along with its derivatives, as $r \to +\infty$. However, even if u and all of its derivatives vanish initially as $r \to -\infty$, it is evident from (2.11) that u will not remain zero there unless

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} u_{\eta\eta} dr = 0 \qquad (2.12)$$

Since u is the derivative of a velocity potential, (2.12) is automatically satisfied at the initial instant. Indeed, for the linearized form of (2.11), (2.12) is a constant of the motion, and it is sufficient to require it initially.

The constraint in (2.12) has a simple physical interpretation. One can identify $\int u(r,\eta,\tau)dr$ as the total mass of the wave in a thin strip at η. Then (2.12) assures that the transverse derivative of mass is constant, and this prevents a net flow of mass to (or from) any particular strip.

There are several indications that (2.11), or (1.3), is of IST-type. Dryuma [13] has identified an appropriate linear scattering problem for (1.3); Zakharov and Shabat [14] have related special solutions to a linear integral equation; Chen [15] found a Bäcklund transformation; Satsuma [16] has obtained "N soliton," but nonlocalized, solutions by direct methods. In Section III we discuss localized lump solutions. However, as mentioned earlier, no complete IST method has been developed for (1.3) to date.

2.2 The Nonlinear Schrödinger Limit

Let us now consider the derivation of (1.4) from (2.1) - (2.3). Here we are following a packet of nearly one-dimensional waves, traveling in the x-direction, with an identifiable (mean) wavenumber, $\vec{\kappa} = (k,\ell)$. We denote the maximum variation in k within the packet by δk . To derive (1.4) we need:

(i) small amplitudes,

$$\varepsilon \equiv \kappa a << 1 \tag{2.15a}$$

(ii) slowly-varying modulations,

$$\delta k/\kappa << 1 \tag{2.15b}$$

(iii) nearly one-dimensional waves,

$$|\ell|/\kappa << 1 \tag{2.15c}$$

(iv) balance of all three effects,

$$\delta k/\kappa = O(\varepsilon) \tag{2.15d}$$

$$|\ell|/\kappa = O(\varepsilon) \tag{2.15e}$$

The dimensionless depth, kh , can be finite or infinite, but to avoid the shallow water limit (and KdV), we need

$$(kh)^2 >> \varepsilon \ . \tag{2.16}$$

In this limit, the solution of the lowest order (linear) problem is

$$\phi \sim \varepsilon\left(\frac{\cosh k(z+h)}{\cosh kh}\,[\tilde{A}\exp(i\theta) + (*)] + \text{const.}\right) \tag{2.17a}$$

where (*) denotes complex conjugate,

$$\theta = kx - \omega(k)t \quad , \tag{2.17b}$$

and $\omega(k)$ is given by (2.4). To go to higher order, we introduce slow (dimensional) variables (again, using the method of multiple scales),

$$x_1 = \varepsilon x \quad , \quad y_1 = \varepsilon y \quad , \quad t_1 = \varepsilon t \quad , \quad t_2 = \varepsilon^2 t \quad , \tag{2.18}$$

and expand ϕ and ζ :

$$\phi \sim \varepsilon\left\{\tilde{\Phi}(x_1,y_1,t_1,t_2) + \frac{\cosh k(z+h)}{\cosh kh}\,[\tilde{A}(x_1,y_1,t_1,t_2)\exp(i\theta) + (*)]\right\} + O(\varepsilon^2) \tag{2.19}$$

$$\zeta = \varepsilon\left\{\tilde{\zeta}_{11}\exp(i\theta)+(*)\right\} + O(\varepsilon^2) \quad , \quad \tilde{\zeta}_{11} = \frac{i\omega}{g+k^2T}\,\tilde{A}$$

In order to derive (1.4), these expansions must be carried out to $O(\varepsilon^3)$. The variations allowed in $\tilde{A}$ reflect the fact that this is a wave packet, rather than a uniform wavetrain, and $\tilde{\Phi}$ provides the mean drift current generated by the packet. In what follows we shall only discuss the secular effects that the higher order terms have on $\tilde{\Phi}$, and $\tilde{A}$; details can be found in [7]-[9].

At the next order of approximation, a secular condition requires that the wave packet travel with its linear group velocity,

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{A}}{\partial t_1} + C_g(k)\,\frac{\partial \tilde{A}}{\partial x_1} = 0 \qquad (2.20)$$

where $C_g = d\omega/dk$. On this same time scale, $\tilde{\Phi}$ satisfies a forced wave equation,

$$\frac{\partial^2 \tilde{\Phi}}{\partial t_1^2} - gh\left\{\frac{\partial^2 \tilde{\Phi}}{\partial x_1^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{\Phi}}{\partial y_1^2}\right\} = k\omega\beta_1\,\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}\,|\tilde{A}|^2 \quad , \qquad (2.21)$$

where

$$\beta_1 = \frac{kC_g}{\omega}\,\mathrm{sech}^2 kh + 2/(1+\tilde{T}) \quad ,$$

$$\tilde{T} = k^2 T/g = (kh)^2 \hat{T} \quad .$$

The solution of (2.21) changes dramatically, depending on whether or not

$$gh > C_g^2 \quad . \qquad (2.22)$$

If the ratio $C_g/\sqrt{gh}$ is interpreted as the "Mach number" of the wave packet, then (2.22) is the condition for "subsonic" flow. In this case, if $\tilde{A}$ has compact support, then $\tilde{\Phi}$ has a forced component that travels with speed C_g (i.e., it satisfies (2.20)), and a free component that radiates outward with speed $\sqrt{gh}$, and is $O(t_1^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ as $t_1 \to \infty$. Hence with (2.22), as $t_1 \to \infty$, we find that $\tilde{\Phi}$ satisfies both (2.20) and

$$\alpha\,\frac{\partial^2 \tilde{\Phi}}{\partial x_1^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{\Phi}}{\partial y_1^2} = -\,\frac{k\omega}{gh}\,\beta_1\,\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}\,|\tilde{A}|^2 \quad , \qquad (2.23)$$

where

$$\alpha = (gh - C_g^2)/gh \quad ,$$

along with the boundary condition that $\tilde{\Phi}$ vanishes as $(x_1^2 + y_1^2) \to \infty$. These are the boundary conditions prescribed by Davey and Stewartson [8], and they are correct without surface tension.

If the effects of surface tension are strong enough, (2.22) fails and the flow is "supersonic." Now even if $\tilde{A}$ has compact support, $\tilde{\Phi}$ and its derivatives are nonzero along "Mach lines" that emanate from the support of $\tilde{A}$. In the limit $t_1 \to \infty$, $\tilde{\Phi}$ satisfies both (2.20) and (2.23) as before. However, the appropriate boundary conditions for (2.23) now are that $\tilde{\Phi}$ and its derivatives vanish ahead of the support of $\tilde{A}$ (e.g., as $x_1 \to \infty$), and <u>no</u> conditions as $x_1 \to -\infty$. Hence, in general, we can not expect that global integrals involving $\tilde{\Phi}$ will converge.

The limit $t_1 \to \infty$ is of interest because (1.4) appears when one eliminates secular terms on the <u>next</u> time scale, $t = O(\varepsilon^{-2})$. Carrying this out, and putting the result in dimensionless form, we define

$$\left.\begin{aligned} \xi &= \varepsilon k(x - C_g t) \quad , \quad \eta = \varepsilon k y \quad . \\ \tau &= \varepsilon^2 (gk)^{\frac{1}{2}} t \quad , \\ A &= k^2 (gk)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{A} \quad , \quad \Phi = k^2 (gk)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\Phi} \end{aligned}\right\} \quad , \qquad (2.24)$$

and find that A and Φ satisfy

$$\left.\begin{aligned} iA_\tau + \lambda A_{\xi\xi} + \mu A_{\eta\eta} &= \chi|A|^2A + \chi_1 A\Phi_\xi \quad , \\ \alpha\Phi_{\xi\xi} + \Phi_{\eta\eta} &= -\beta(|A|^2)_\xi \quad , \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{2.25}$$

where

$$\left.\begin{aligned} &\sigma = \tanh kh \quad , \quad \tilde{T} = k^2T/g \quad , \quad \kappa = \sqrt{k^2+\ell^2} \quad , \\ &\omega^2 = gh\sigma(1+\tilde{T}) \geq 0 \quad , \\ &\omega_o^2 = g\kappa \quad , \\ &\lambda = \kappa^2\left(\frac{\partial^2\omega}{\partial\kappa^2}\right)/2\omega_o \quad , \\ &\mu = \kappa^2\left(\frac{\partial^2\omega}{\partial\ell^2}\right)/2\omega_o = \frac{\kappa C_g}{2\omega_o} \geq 0 \quad , \\ &\chi = \left(\frac{\omega_o}{4\omega}\right)\left\{\frac{(1-\sigma^2)(9-\sigma^2) + \tilde{T}(2-\sigma^2)(7-\sigma^2)}{\sigma^2 - \tilde{T}(3-\sigma^2)} + 8\sigma^2\right. \\ &\qquad\qquad \left. - 2(1-\sigma^2)^2(1+\tilde{T}) - \frac{3\sigma^2\tilde{T}}{1+\tilde{T}}\right\} \quad , \\ &\chi_1 = 1 + \frac{\kappa C_g}{2\omega}(1-\sigma^2)(1+\tilde{T}) \geq 0 \quad , \\ &\alpha = (gh - C_g^2)/gh \quad , \\ &\beta = \left(\frac{\omega}{\omega_o kh}\right)\left\{\frac{\kappa C_g}{\omega}(1-\sigma^2) + \frac{2}{1+\tilde{T}}\right\} \geq 0 \quad , \\ &\nu = \chi - \chi_1\beta/\alpha \quad . \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{2.26}$$

In the above formulae, all functions are evaluated at $\ell=0$, since we are considering our underlying wavetrain to be propagating purely in the x-direction. It should be noted that (2.25) can be easily scaled to (1.4) where $\sigma_1 = \text{sign } \lambda$, $\sigma_2 = \text{sign } \chi$, $a = \alpha\mu/\lambda^2$ and $b = \beta\mu\chi_1/\lambda^2|\chi|$ in (1.4).

(2.25) - (2.26) are equivalent to those of Djordjevic and Redekopp ([9], their equations (2.12) - (2.13)) except for the correction of a misprint. If the initial wave packet is local, it is appropriate to require that A vanishes as $\xi^2 + \eta^2 \to \infty$. As discussed above, the appropriate boundary conditions for Φ depend on the sign of α

In the deep water limit, (2.25) reduces to

$$iA_\tau + \lambda_\infty A_{\xi\xi} + \mu_\infty A_{\eta\eta} = \chi_\infty |A|^2 A \quad , \tag{2.27}$$

where

$$\lambda_\infty = -\frac{\omega_o}{8\omega}\left(\frac{1-6\tilde{T}-3\tilde{T}^2}{1+\tilde{T}}\right) \quad ,$$

$$\mu_\infty = \frac{\omega_o}{4\omega}\,(1+3\tilde{T}) \quad ,$$

$$\chi_\infty = \frac{\omega_o}{4\omega}\,\frac{8+\tilde{T}+2\tilde{T}^2}{(1-2\tilde{T})(1+\tilde{T})} \quad .$$

The appropriate boundary conditions for localized initial data are that A vanish as $\xi^2 + \eta^2 \to \infty$

The character of the solution of (2.25) depends fundamentally on the signs of the coefficients in the equations. Figure 1 is a map of parameter space, showing where these signs change. The figure is that of Djordjevic and Redekopp [9] , who used it to explain the various regions of stability/instability of the Stokes wave. Each boundary line corresponds to a simple zero of a coefficient, as shown, except for the two curves bounding region F . These two curves denote singularities of ν . In a neighborhood of each of these two curves, phenomena occur on a shorter time scale than the $O(\varepsilon^{-2})$ scale required elsewhere; cf. [9].

If we take the long wave limit, $kh \to 0$, of (2.25) but keeping $\varepsilon << (kh)^2$, we find equations which are of IST-type. We discuss this further in Section 5. Alternatively, the long wave limit in which $\varepsilon = 0((kh)^2)$, where (2.11) applies, corresponds to the lower left-hand corner of this figure ($kh \to 0$, $\tilde{T} \to 0$, $\hat{T}$ fixed). The only parameter that changes sign in this limit is $(1/3 - \hat{T})$, which is positive in Region A, and negative in Region B. The uniformity of the limits $kh \to 0$, $\varepsilon \to 0$ has been discussed in [17,18,19].

2.3 Conservation Laws

Our final objective in this section is to give a simple physical interpretation for an infinite set of conservation laws. It is well-known that the equations of water waves conserve mass, horizontal momentum and energy. If we interpret "mass" as the mass associated with the wave, etc., then these conserved quantities may be represented as integrals. In one dimension (which is sufficient for the purpose of this discussion) we have:

Mass

$$M = \rho \int \zeta dx \quad ; \tag{2.28}$$

Momentum

$$m_x = \rho \int \left[\int_{-h}^{\zeta} \phi_x dz \right] dx \tag{2.29}$$

Energy

$$\text{K.E.} = \frac{\rho}{2}\int \int_{-h}^{\zeta} |\nabla\phi|^2 dz\, dx$$

$$\text{P.E.} = \frac{\rho}{2} g \int \zeta^2 dx \tag{2.30}$$

$$E = \text{K.E.} + \text{P.E.}$$

On the other hand, problems that have been solved exactly by IST possess an infinite set of conservation laws. For example, the first few quantities conserved by (1.2) are

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \int |A|^2 dx \\ I_2 &= \int (A^* A_x - A_x^* A) dx \\ I_3 &= \int (|A_x|^2 - \frac{\sigma}{2} |A|^4) dx \end{aligned} \tag{2.31}$$

There has been some speculation about the proper physical interpretation of this infinite set of conserved quantities. We offer here a very simple explanation. We have seen that (1.1) - (1.4) all are obtained <u>via</u> expansions in wave amplitude, ε . From this viewpoint, one might also expand (for example) the expression for the mass of the wave in powers of ε , to obtain a series of the form

$$M = \rho \sum_{1}^{\infty} \varepsilon^n C_n \tag{2.32}$$

Because M is constant in time, it follows that each coefficient, C_n , is also constant.

Because one generates the complete series for ϕ , ζ through $O(\varepsilon^3)$ in deriving (1.4), it is then straightforward to compute the series in (2.32) to this order. In (2.19), any terms involving $\exp(i\theta)$ can be shown to contribute only at higher order, using integration by parts:

$$\int \zeta_{11}(x_1,t_1,t_2)e^{i\theta}dx = -\frac{1}{ik}\int \frac{\partial \zeta_{11}}{\partial x} e^{i\theta}dx$$

$$= -\frac{\varepsilon}{ik}\int \frac{\partial \zeta_{11}}{\partial x_1} e^{i\theta}dx$$

This process can be repeated as many times as ζ_{11} can be differentiated. The result of explicit computation is

$$\begin{aligned} M &= \varepsilon a_1 I_1 + \varepsilon^2 a_2 I_2 + O(\varepsilon^3) \quad ; \\ m_x &= \qquad \varepsilon^2 b_2 I_2 + O(\varepsilon^3) \quad ; \\ \text{K.E.} &= \varepsilon c_1 I_1 + \varepsilon^2 c_2 I_2 + O(\varepsilon^3) \quad ; \\ \text{P.E.} &= \varepsilon c_1 I_1 + \varepsilon^3 c_2 I_2 + O(\varepsilon^3) \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{2.33}$$

I_3 enters at $O(\varepsilon^3)$. The coefficients (a_i,b_i,c_i) are unimportant for our purpose. The momentum starts at higher order because it is referred to a coordinate system traveling with the group velocity of the wave. The identity of the last two series is a statement of the equipartition of the averaged energy, to this order. It is <u>not</u> true that I_1 , I_2 and I_3 represent respectively the mass, momentum and energy of the water waves. (Similarly, the first three conserved

quantities for KdV are not respectively the leading terms of the expansions of the mass, momentum and energy of the water waves.)

3. STABILITY OF SOLITONS

The primary purpose of this section is to discuss the stability of solitons with respect to transverse perturbations.

3.1 The KdV Limit

Let us first consider the long wave problem, and (2.11). The one-dimensional limit, $\partial/\partial\eta = 0$, yields KdV. Here initial data on compact support evolve into a finite number of solitons, ordered by amplitude, followed by decaying oscillations that can be described in terms of a modulated similarity solution. The decay rate of the oscillations is not uniform in space, but it is of algebraic order [20]. The solitons are (theoretical) waves of permanent form when separated spatially from other waves. They represent water waves that decay only due to viscous effects. A KdV soliton is shown in Figure 2a. Both the solitons and the decaying oscillations have been observed experimentally [2,3].

Kadomtsev and Petviashvili [5] analyzed the stability of a KdV soliton with respect to long transverse perturbations in (2.11). They found that the soliton is unstable with respect to such perturbations when (2.10) fails (i.e., in the lower left corner of Region B in Figure 1). The usual situation is Region A, where (2.10) applies. Here they did not find that the soliton is unstable.

In Region B, where the solitons are unstable, the KdV theory is of limited value. Here the solitons cannot represent asymptotic states, as they do in the one-dimensional problem. Thus, the question arises as to whether (2.11) has any other special solutions that might act as asymptotic states when the solitons are unstable. The answer is not known definitively at this time, but the work in [21,22] is suggestive. In Region B, but not in Region A, (2.11) possesses "lump" solutions. Lumps share many of the important properties of solitons:

(i) Each is a permanent wave whose speed, relative to the linearized speed, $\sqrt{gh}$, can be made proportional to its amplitude.

(ii) Solitons are localized waves, with exponential tails in one dimension; lumps are localized waves, with algebraic tails, in two dimensions.

(iii) Two solitons regain their original amplitudes and speeds after a collision; the final effect of the collision is a phase shift of each soliton. Two lumps regain their original amplitudes and speeds after a collision, and suffer no phase shift.

(iv) Explicit formulae are available for N solitons, and for N lumps. The formulae for the one soliton and one lump solutions of (1.3), with $\sigma = -1$, are:

Soliton

$$u = -12\frac{d^2}{dx^2}\,\ell n\,\{1 + \exp(-2\kappa x')\}\quad , \qquad x' = x + 4\kappa^2 t\quad ; \tag{3.1}$$

Lump

$$u = -12\frac{d^2}{dx^2}\,\ell n\,\{(x' + py')^2 + (qy')^2 + 3/q^2\}\ , \tag{3.2}$$

where

$$x' = x + (p^2 + q^2)t\quad , \qquad y' = y - 2pt$$

These two solutions are drawn in Figure 2 for a particular choice of the constants. (The soliton is a negative wave in Region B, as shown. In Region A, solitons are positive.)

These stability results suggest that whereas the one-dimensional KdV solution may play an important role in (1.3) with $\sigma = +1$ (Region A), no such situation is envisaged when $\sigma = -1$ (Region B).

3.2 The Nonlinear Schrödinger Limit

Next, we consider the nonlinear Schrödinger equation (2.25). Observe that (2.25) admits one-dimensional solitons traveling at almost any acute angle relative to the group velocity of the packet. The extreme cases are found by setting either $\partial/\partial\eta = 0$ or $\partial/\partial\xi = 0$. If $\partial/\partial\eta = 0$, the second equation in (2.25) can be integrated once, and the system reduces to

$$iA_\tau + \lambda A_{\xi\xi} = \nu|A|^2A\quad , \qquad \Phi_\xi = -\beta/\alpha|A|^2 \tag{3.3}$$

where $\nu = \chi - \chi_1 \beta/\alpha$, and the coefficients λ , α , β , χ , χ_1 are defined in (2.26). (Throughout this discussion, it should be borne in mind that the amplitude A represents the envelope of a train of plane waves.) Initial data can be created experimentally by modulating (in time) the stroke of an oscillating paddle at the end of a one-dimensional wave tank. If $\lambda\nu > 0$, as it is in Regions A, B and E, of Figure 1, there are no solitons. The initial data evolve into a field of decaying oscillations that we shall refer to as "radiation." This radiation can be described in terms of a modulated similarity solution, and it decays as $\tau^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ [23]. In Regions C, D and F, $\lambda\nu < 0$, and the same initial data now produce a finite set of envelope solitons in addition to the radiation. (For appropriate initial data, multi-soliton states are also possible [1]). The one-soliton solution of (3.3) is

$$A = a|2\lambda/\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathrm{sech}\{a(\xi-2b\tau)\}\exp\{ib\xi + i\lambda(a^2-b^2)\tau\} \quad . \qquad (3.4)$$

The constant b in (3.4) represents an $0(\varepsilon)$ correction to the basic wavenumber, k ; without loss of generality we take $b = 0$. It is evident from (3.4) that the amplitude of the envelope soliton is of permanent form, and represents a physical wave that decays only due to viscous effects. Figure 3 shows the experimental measurements of such a wave, and we have superposed on the measurements the soliton solution with the same peak amplitude. [This experiment was conducted by Professor J.L. Hammack while

at the University of Florida, and we are grateful to him for allowing us to use his unpublished data.] It is clear from this comparison that, at least in some aspects, the model represented by (3.3) is remarkably accurate. For more detailed comparisons, see [4] or [24].

At the other extreme, if $\partial/\partial\xi = 0$ in (2.25), the system reduces to

$$iA_\tau + \mu A_{\eta\eta} = \chi|A|^2A \quad , \tag{3.5}$$

which is mathematically equivalent to (3.3) but represents a much different situation physically. Here wave crests move in the x (or ξ) direction, but they are modulated in the η direction. These modulations can move only in the η direction. To our knowledge, this configuration has not been explored experimentally in water waves, although it is common in nonlinear optics, where $A_{\eta\eta}$ represents diffraction of the light. In optics, initial data is produced experimentally with a diffraction grating, and the solution of (3.5) provides a nonlinear description of Fraunhofer diffraction (cf., Manakov, [25]). Solitons exist where $\chi < 0$ (since $\mu \geq 0$) in Regions B, C and F. To distinguish them from the soliton solutions of (3.3), we will refer to the solitons in (3.3) as "envelope solitons," and the solitons in (3.5) as "waveguides."

Between these two extremes, $\partial/\partial\eta = 0$ and $\partial/\partial\xi = 0$, is a one-parameter family of other one-dimensional restrictions of (2.25), corresponding to one-dimensional waves (of the envelope) traveling at various angles relative to the group velocity of the carrier wave. Each of these one-dimensional problems is governed by an equation of the form (1.2), except at one angle

that corresponds to crossing from region B to F, and another that corresponds to crossing from F to D.

Again, the question arises of the physical relevance of the one-dimensional soliton in the two-dimensional problem. For the nonlinear Schrödinger equation, (2.25), the answer seems to be that except for specially contrived one-dimensional geometries (like laboratory wave tanks), they are unlikely to persist. We show next that every one-dimensional soliton solution of (2.25), envelope soliton or waveguide, is unstable with respect to a long-wave transverse perturbation. Apparently, this instability has not been observed in wave tanks only because the tanks are too narrow to admit the long-wave perturbations required. The instability was discovered first by Zakharov and Rubenchik [12] for (2.27). Our analysis is a generalization of theirs to the case of finite depth.

Consider first the envelope solitons, which are solutions of (3.3) and can exist in Regions C, D and F in Figure 1. As remarked above, it is sufficient to demonstrate the instability of the stationary soliton:

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \exp(i\lambda a^2 \tau)\psi(\xi) \quad , \\ \Phi_\xi &= -\beta/\alpha\psi^2(\xi) \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

where $\psi(\xi)$ is real and satisfies

$$-\lambda\psi_{\xi\xi} + \lambda a^2 + \nu\psi^3 = 0 \quad . \tag{3.7}$$

Perturbations about this soliton can be put in the form

$$\left.\begin{aligned} A &= \exp(i\lambda a^2\tau)[\psi + u + iv] \\ \Phi &= (\beta/\alpha)\int_{\xi}^{\infty}(\psi^2 + 2\psi u)dz + w \quad , \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{3.8}$$

where u , v , and w are real,

$$|u|,|v| << \psi \quad , \quad |w| << \Phi \quad ,$$

and

$$u,v,w \sim \exp(ip\eta \pm i\Omega\tau) \quad .$$

The question of stability now comes down to determining whether Ω^2 is positive. Substituting (3.8) into (2.25), linearizing and eliminating v yields

$$\left.\begin{aligned} \Omega^2 u &= (L_o + \mu p^2)(L_1 + \mu p^2)u + \chi_1(L_o + \mu p^2)\psi w_\xi \quad , \\ \alpha w_{\xi\xi} &= p^2\left[\frac{2\beta}{\alpha}\int_{\xi}^{\infty}(\psi u)dz + w\right] \quad , \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{3.9}$$

where L_o and L_1 are the self-adjoint operators defined by

$$L_o = -\lambda\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\xi^2} + \lambda a^2 + \nu\psi^2 \quad ,$$

$$L_1 = -\lambda\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\xi^2} + \lambda a^2 + 3\nu\psi^2 \quad .$$

In the short-wave limit $(p^2 \to \infty)$, (3.9) reduces to

$$\left.\begin{aligned} \Omega^2 u &= \mu^2 p^4 u + 0(p^2) \quad , \\ \frac{2\beta}{\alpha}\int_{\xi}^{\infty}(\psi u)dz + w &\sim 0 \quad . \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{3.10}$$

Clearly Ω^2 is positive in this limit, and short waves are not unstable. Indeed, if they were unstable, it would be difficult to observe envelope solitons even in narrow wave tanks.

In order to analyze the long wave limit ($p^2 \to 0$), we expand the unknowns in (3.9) as

$$\begin{aligned} u &\sim u_o + p^2 u_1 \quad , \\ w &\sim p^2 w_1 \quad , \\ \Omega^2 &\sim p^2 \Omega_1^2 \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Then to leading order, (3.9) becomes

$$L_o L_1 u_o = 0 \quad . \tag{3.12}$$

In order to solve (3.12), we define certain odd (-) and even (+) functions of ξ :

$$u_o^- = \psi_\xi \quad , \quad u_o^+ = -\frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial a^2} \quad , \quad v_o^- = -\xi\psi/2\lambda \quad , \quad v_o^+ = \psi \quad . \tag{3.13}$$

The following relations can be obtained from (3.7):

$$\begin{aligned} L_o v_o^+ &= 0 \quad , \\ L_o v_o^- &= u_o^- \quad , \\ L_1 u_o^- &= 0 \quad , \\ L_1 u_o^+ &= v_o^+ \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

It follows that u_o^- and u_o^+ both satisfy (3.12), and that v_o^- and v_o^+ satisfy the adjoint equation,

$$L_1 L_o v_o = 0 \tag{3.15}$$

In each case, there are two other solutions that do not vanish as $|\xi| \to \infty$. We will also need certain scalar products of these functions. Using the notation

$$(\phi_1, \phi_2) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi_1 \phi_2 d\xi \quad ,$$

one computes

$$\begin{aligned} (v_o^+, v_o^+) &= I \quad , \\ (v_o^-, u_o^-) &= I/4\lambda \quad , \\ (v_o^+, u_o^+) &= -\frac{1}{\lambda}\frac{dI}{da^2} \quad , \\ (v_o^+, u_o^-) &= (v_o^-, u_o^+) = 0 \quad . \\ (u_o^-, u_o^-) &= \int \psi_\xi{}^2 d\xi \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

where

$$I = \int |A|^2 d\xi = 4\left|\frac{\lambda a}{\nu}\right|$$

At $O(p^2)$, (3.9) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} L_o L_1 u_1 &= \Omega_1^2 u_o - \mu(L_o + L_1)u_o - \chi_1 L_o \psi(w_1)_\xi \quad , \\ \alpha(w_1)_{\xi\xi} &= \frac{2\beta}{\alpha}\int_{\xi}^{\infty} (\psi u_o) dz \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

For u_1 to decay as $|\xi| \to \infty$, it is necessary that the nonhomogeneous terms in (3.17) be orthogonal to the decaying solutions of the homogeneous adjoint equation (3.15). Because the equations are linear, it is sufficient to consider the odd and even modes separately. Thus, if u_o in (3.17) is u_o^+, we multiply (3.17a) by v_o^+, integrate over ξ, and use integration by parts to obtain

$$0 = (\Omega_1^2)^+(-\frac{1}{\lambda}\frac{dI}{da^2}) - \mu I \quad ,$$

or

$$(\Omega_1^2)^+ = -\frac{\lambda\mu I}{(\frac{dI}{da^2})} = -2\lambda\mu a^2 \quad . \tag{3.18}$$

For the odd mode, u_o^-, we multiply (3.17a) by v_o^- and use (3.17b). The result is

$$\begin{aligned}(\Omega_1^2)^- &= \frac{4\lambda}{I}\left[\mu\int\psi_\xi^2 d_\xi + \frac{\chi_1\beta}{2\alpha^2}\int\psi^4 d\xi\right] \\ &= \frac{4}{3}\lambda a^2\left[\mu + \frac{2\chi_1\beta}{\alpha^2}|\lambda/\nu|\right]\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

The question of stability of envelope solitons depends only on the sign of λ (the other factors in (3.18) and (3.19) are intrinsically positive). Using $\Omega^2 \sim p^2(\Omega_1^2)$, we summarize the result as follows:

(i) In Region D, where $\lambda < 0$, an envelope soliton with amplitude a is unstable with respect to long disturbances that are antisymmetric (-) in ξ. The growth rate $(i\Omega)$ of the disturbance with wavenumber p is found from

$$\Omega^2 = -\frac{4}{3}p^2a^2|\lambda|(\mu + \frac{2\chi_1\beta}{\alpha^2}|\lambda/\nu|) + O(p^4) \tag{3.20}$$

In the deep water limit, this simplifies to

$$\Omega^2 = -\frac{4}{3}p^2a^2\mu|\lambda| + O(p^4) \quad , \tag{3.21}$$

as found by Zakharov and Rubenchik [12]. Thus, for an inviscid fluid, the effect of finite depth is to enhance the growth rate of the instability. Zakharov and Rubenchik

found the $O(p^4)$ correction to (3.21), and argued qualitatively that the most unstable wave satisfies

$$\mu p^2 = O(|\lambda| a^2) \tag{3.22a}$$

and that the maximum growth rate is on the order of

$$|\Omega| = O(|\lambda| a^2) \quad . \tag{3.22b}$$

Moreover, they noted that the growth of a mode that is antisymmetric in ξ and sinusoidal in η tends to bend the wavecrest, producing a "snake" effect; i.e., the crest of the perturbed wave oscillates back and forth in the $(\xi-\eta)$ plane about its unperturbed position. Recent numerical computations in [26] have made (3.22) more precise.

(ii) In Regions C and F, where $\lambda > 0$, an envelope soliton with amplitude a is unstable with respect to long symmetric (+) disturbances. The growth rate of the disturbances with wavenumber p is found from

$$\Omega^2 = -2p^2 a^2 \lambda \mu + O(p^4) \quad , \tag{3.24}$$

and this result also holds in the deep water limit. Again, qualitative considerations yield (3.22b). Growth of a symmetric mode tends to modulate the wave amplitude periodically in η.

Analysis of the stability of waveguides (in Regions B, C and F) follows similar lines, and it is necessary only to indicate the main points of the analysis. A stationary waveguide has the form

$$A = \exp(i\mu a^2\tau)\psi(\eta) \qquad (3.25)$$
$$\Phi = 0 \quad ,$$

where ψ is real and

$$-\mu\psi_{\eta\eta} + \mu a^2\psi - \chi\psi^3 = 0 \quad .$$

Perturbations take the form

$$A = \exp(i\mu a^2\tau)[\psi + u + iv] \quad ,$$
$$\Phi = -\int_{\xi}^{\infty} w\,dz \quad . \qquad (3.26)$$

The linearized equations for u and w, derived from (2.25), are

$$\left.\begin{aligned} \Omega^2 u &= (L_o + \lambda p^2)(L_1 + \lambda p^2)u + \chi_1(L_o + \lambda p^2)\psi\, w \quad , \\ w_{\eta\eta} &= p^2[2\beta\psi u + \alpha w] \quad , \end{aligned}\right\} \qquad (3.27)$$

where

$$L_o = -\mu\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\eta^2} + \mu a^2 + \chi\psi^2 \quad ,$$
$$L_1 = -\mu\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\eta^2} + \mu a^2 + 3\chi\psi^2 \quad .$$

These equations are very similar to those in (3.9) and we simply state the final result. Throughout Regions B, C and F, (λ,μ) are positive. Anywhere in these regions, a stationary waveguide with amplitude a is unstable with respect to long symmetric (in η) disturbances. The growth rate $(i\Omega)$ of the disturbance with wavenumber p (in ξ) is found from

$$\Omega^2 = -2p^2a^2\lambda\mu + O(p^4) \quad , \tag{3.28}$$

and qualitative considerations given (3.23a,b) with λ, μ interchanged.

We conclude this section by summarizing our results for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation, (2.25). There are many one-dimensional limits, including (3.3) and (3.5). These two limits admit envelope solitons and waveguides, respectively, in various regions of Figure 1. However, all possible solitons are unstable with respect to some long-wave transverse perturbation. This instability does not appear in experiments in one-dimensional wave tanks, provided the tank width is small in comparison with the soliton length, because the unstable modes are excluded by the geometry. If this constraint is removed, however, the instability should occur, and neither kind of soliton is a stable asymptotic state that can be achieved from initial data in (2.25).

4. FOCUSING

In one-dimensional problems, like (1.2), the most dramatic nonlinear effect is that smooth initial data can "focus" into a localized soliton, or into a set of solitons, which then persist forever. In this section, we show that focusing is even more dramatic in two dimensions and that a solution of (2.25) that evolves from smooth initial data can become singular at a point in space after a finite time. This is known as the "self-focusing singularity," or simply as "focusing." In such a case the water wave equations must be re-examined in the neighborhood of the focus.

To our knowledge, the phenomenon of focusing has not yet been observed as such in water waves, although it has been known for some time in nonlinear optics (e.g., Vlasov, Petrishchev and Talonov [27]). Some of the analysis discussed here uses the ideas presented by Zakharov and Synakh [28] who studied what amounts to the two-dimensional version of (1.2) (i.e., 2.27) in the context of the optics problem.

4.1 Necessity of Focusing

Our first objective is to identify circumstances under which the solution of (2.25) must focus in a finite time.

Consider any point in Region F of Figure 1, where $(\lambda,\mu,(-\chi),\chi_1,\alpha,\beta)$ are all positive; i.e., consider capillary-type waves in sufficiently deep water. Consider initial data for (2.25) which are infinitely differentiable and which decay rapidly as $(\xi^2 + \eta^2) \to \infty$; e.g., $A(\xi,\eta,0)$ might have compact support. If a solution of (2.25) exists and vanishes rapidly enough as $(\xi^2 + \eta^2) \to \infty$, then the following integrals are constants of the motion:

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_1 &= \iint |A|^2 d\xi d\eta \\
I_2 &= \iint \left(A \frac{\partial A^*}{\partial \xi} - A^* \frac{\partial A}{\partial \xi}\right) d\xi d\eta \\
I_3 &= \iint \left(A \frac{\partial A^*}{\partial \eta} - A^* \frac{\partial A}{\partial \eta}\right) d\xi d\eta \\
I_4 &= \iint \left[\left\{\lambda\left|\frac{\partial A}{\partial \xi}\right|^2 + \mu\left|\frac{\partial A}{\partial \eta}\right|^2\right\} - \frac{1}{2}\left\{(-\chi)|A|^4 + \frac{\alpha\chi_1^3}{\beta}(\Phi_\xi)^2 \right.\right. \\
&\qquad \left.\left. + \frac{\chi_1^3}{\beta}(\Phi_\eta)^2\right\}\right] d\xi d\eta
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.1}
$$

Each bracket, $\{\}$, in I_4 is positive definite, and the second bracket vanishes in the linear limit of (2.25). Clearly $I_4 < 0$ is possible (e.g., if the initial data has sufficiently large amplitude).

It also follows from (2.25) that

$$
\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \tau^2} \iint \left\{\frac{\xi^2}{\lambda} + \frac{\eta^2}{\mu}\right\} |A|^2 d\xi d\eta = 8I_4 \tag{4.2}
$$

As noted in Section 2, one may interpret I_1 as the mass of the wave (to leading order in ε). Then the integral in (4.2) may be interpreted as the moment of inertia, and (4.2) is an example of the virial theorem (e.g., [29], p. 581). (4.2) is easily integrated, and we see that if $I_4 < 0$, then the moment of inertia vanishes at a finite time. Clearly, no global solution exists after this time, because the (positive definite) moment of inertia would become negative! Since the mass of the wave is conserved, (4.2) suggests that prior to this time the radius of gyration is vanishing as the mass accumulates at a single point. The rapid development of this singularity is what we mean by focusing.

Before examining the nature of the singularity that develops, let us consider the implications of this argument outside of Region F. In Regions B and C, where $\alpha < 0$, global integrals involving Φ are generally unbounded (cf., Section 2) and no global information about the solution is available by this approach. Whether focusing exists in these regions is open. In Region E there is no focusing in the deep water limit, since the parameters are such that $I_4 > 0$. In arbitrary depth the question of focusing is still open.

In Regions A and D, the integral in (4.2) is not of definite sign, and provides no contradiction. Both because of the breakdown of this argument and because the type of instability of solitons is different than in Region F,

we expect that if singularities develop in these regions, they will be qualitatively different than those of the self-focusing type.

4.2 Nature of the Singularity

Next, we examine the possible behavior of the singularity that develops at the focus. Zakharov and Synakh [28] studied the radially symmetric case of (2.27). They investigated this equation both by numerical compuations and an approximate analytic procedure. From these they concluded that as $\tau \to \tau_0$ (τ_0 being the time of focus) the wave amplitude grows as $(\tau_0-\tau)^{-p}$, $p = 2/3$. In this section we show that there are a number of quasi-self-similar solutions to the generalized nonlinear Schrodinger equation, (1.4), including one with $p = 2/3$, but we have found no convincing argument that this local behavior is necessarily of the $p = 2/3$ type.

For convenience, we consider the scaled form of (2.25), namely (1.4). In Region F of Figure 1, where focusing can occur, $\sigma_1 = +1$, $\sigma_2 = -1$.

Let $A = B \exp(i\Psi)$ in (1.4), with B, Ψ real and find:

$$(\tfrac{1}{2}B^2)_t + (\Psi_x B^2)_x + (\Psi_y B^2)_y = 0 \quad , \tag{4.3a}$$

$$-\Psi_t B + B_{xx} + B_{yy} - B(\Psi_x^2 + \Psi_y^2) = -B^3 + \Phi_x B \quad , \tag{4.3b}$$

$$a\Phi_{xx} + \Phi_{yy} = -b(B^2)_x \qquad (4.3c)$$

We seek quasi-self-similar solutions of (4.3) in the neighborhood of the point of focus in the form

$$B \sim \frac{1}{f} R(\bar{x},\bar{y}) + R_o(\bar{x},\bar{y},t) \quad , \qquad (4.4a)$$

$$\Phi \sim \frac{1}{f} Q(\bar{x},\bar{y}) + Q_o(\bar{x},\bar{y},t) \qquad (4.4b)$$

where $\bar{x} = x/f$, $\bar{y} = y/f$, $f(t) = (t_o - t)^p$, so that $f \to 0$ as $t \to t_o$. This expansion is asymptotic near the focus provided $R_o << R$, $Q_o << Q$ in this region. Zakharov and Synakh [28] also assumed

$$R_o = 0(fR) \quad , \qquad (4.5)$$

but this assumption seems to be unnecessary. In any case, the dominant terms in (4.3a) as $t \to t_o$ are

$$(\Psi_x R^2 - \frac{\bar{x}}{2} R^2 f')_x + (\Psi_y R^2 - \frac{\bar{y}}{2} R^2 f')_y = 0 \qquad (4.6)$$

A special solution of (4.5) is

$$\Psi_x = \frac{\bar{x}}{2} f' + \frac{G_1(\bar{y},t)}{R^2} \quad ,$$
$$\Psi_y = \frac{\bar{y}}{2} f' + \frac{G_2(\bar{x},t)}{R^2} \quad . \qquad (4.7)$$

Taking $G_1 = G_2 = 0$ (for which some motivation is provided below) yields

$$\Psi = \frac{ff'}{4} (\bar{x}^2 + \bar{y}^2) + g(t) \quad , \qquad (4.8)$$

and with this we have from (4.3) - (4.4), as $f \to 0$,

$$R_{\bar{x}\bar{x}} + R_{\bar{y}\bar{y}} + R^3 - RQ_{\bar{x}} - g'(t)f^2R - \frac{f^3f''}{4}(\bar{x}^2 + \bar{y}^2)R \sim 0 \quad (4.9a)$$

$$aQ_{\bar{x}\bar{x}} + Q_{\bar{y}\bar{y}} + b(R^2)_{\bar{x}} \sim 0 \quad (4.9b)$$

There are various possibilities; e.g.,

(a) $f''f^3 \ll 1$, $g' = \kappa/f^2$;

(b) $f''f^3 = 0(1)$, $g' = \kappa/f^2$;

others are obtained similarly. Case (a) implies that to leading order (4.9) reduces to

$$R_{\bar{x}\bar{x}} + R_{\bar{y}\bar{y}} + R^3 - RQ_{\bar{x}} - \kappa R = 0 \quad , \quad (4.10a)$$

$$aQ_{\bar{x}\bar{x}} + Q_{\bar{y}\bar{y}} = -b(R^2)_{\bar{x}} \quad . \quad (4.10b)$$

If one also assumes (4.5), then (a) becomes $f^3f'' = 0(f)$, from which it follows that $p = 2/3$. However, the spatial structure defined by (4.10) does not depend on (4.5), or on $p = 2/3$. In the deep water case with radial symmetry [28], $b = Q = 0$, $\bar{r}^2 = \bar{x}^2 + \bar{y}^2$, and (4.10a) reduces to

$$R_{\bar{r}\bar{r}} + \frac{1}{\bar{r}} R_{\bar{r}} + R^3 - \kappa R = 0 \quad . \quad (4.11)$$

Chiao, Garmire and Townes [30] first studied (4.11) as a model of cylindrical optical beams, and showed that its bounded solutions decay exponentially for large $\bar{r}$. The equation also arises as an exact reduction of (1.4) if we take

$$Q = b = 0 \quad ,$$

$$\bar{r} = \lambda\sqrt{x^2 + y^2} \quad , \tag{4.12}$$

$$A = \lambda R(\bar{r})\exp(i\kappa\lambda^2 t) \quad ,$$

The fact that (4.11) is exact has important consequences, which we discuss in Section 5.

In case (b), $p = 1/2$ and the solution is exactly self-similar. Here (4.8) - (4.9) yield

$$R_{\bar{x}\bar{x}} + R_{\bar{y}\bar{y}} + R^3 - RQ_{\bar{x}} - \kappa R + \frac{1}{16}(\bar{x}^2 + \bar{y}^2)R = 0 \tag{4.13a}$$

$$aQ_{\bar{x}\bar{x}} + Q_{\bar{y}\bar{y}} = -b(R^2)_{\bar{x}} \tag{4.13b}$$

$$\Psi = -\frac{1}{8}(\bar{x}^2 + \bar{y}^2) - \kappa \ell n\,(t_o - t) + \Psi_o \; . \tag{4.13c}$$

In the radially symmetric case, (4.13a) becomes

$$R_{\bar{r}\bar{r}} + \frac{1}{\bar{r}} R_{\bar{r}} + (\frac{\bar{r}^2}{16} - \kappa)R + R^3 = 0 \quad , \tag{4.14}$$

and for large $\bar{r}$ all bounded solutions decay as $(\bar{r})^{-1}$. We also note that a somewhat more general equation than (4.14), obtained by retaining G in (4.7), can be found in the symmetric case:

$$R_{\bar{r}\bar{r}} + \frac{1}{\bar{r}} R_{\bar{r}} + (\frac{\bar{r}^2}{16} - \kappa)R + R^3 - \frac{C^2}{\bar{r}^2 R^3} = 0 \tag{4.15a}$$

$$\Psi = -\frac{\bar{r}^2}{8} - \kappa \ell n(t_o - t) + C\int^{\bar{r}} \frac{d\rho}{\rho R^2(\rho)} + \Psi_o \tag{4.15b}$$

However, one can show from (4.15a) that R has a finite value at the origin only if $C = 0$. This result provides some justification for neglecting G in (4.7).

Using any of these similarity solutions, going back to the full water wave equations and rescaling, we find that the focusing instability produces a finite (i.e., $O(1)$) region of space in which the wave amplitudes are potentially large enough to break $(O(1))$.

Next, we present an argument which suggests that the self-focusing singularity cannot be of the $p = 1/2$ type, as we have described it here. For convenience, we consider the case of radial symmetry. The expansion in (4.4) is valid in a region near the focus where the first terms are dominant. If we assume that this "inner solution" matches to an outer solution that is $O(1)$, then the inner expansion breaks down where

$$\frac{1}{f} R(\bar{r}) = O(1) \tag{4.15}$$

But for large $\bar{r}$, R decays as $(\bar{r})^{-1}$, so that $\frac{1}{f} R$ decays as r^{-1} ; i.e., there is no time-dependence. It follows that (4.16) defines a boundary for the focal region, denoted by $r = O(L)$, where L is time-independent. The mass within this region is proportional to

$$M = \int_0^L r \, \frac{1}{f^2} R^2(\bar{r}) \, dr = \int_0^{L/f} \bar{r} R^2(\bar{r}) d\bar{r} \quad , \tag{4.17}$$

and (because $R \sim \bar{r}^{-1}$) this grows logarithmically as $t \to t_o$. But the total mass is finite, and this is a contradiction.

In case (a) $R(\bar{r})$ decays exponentially and no such contradiction appears. Moreover, if the nonlinearity in

(1.4) were slightly stronger, no contradiction appears in the purely self-similar case. To be precise, if the nonlinear term in (1.4) were replaced with $|A|^{2a}A$, $a > 1$, then the radially symmetric similarity solution becomes

$$A = (t_o - t)^{-\frac{1}{2a}} B(\bar{r}) \quad , \quad \bar{r} = r/(t_o - t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad . \tag{4.18}$$

In this case the radial decay is $B(\bar{r}) \sim (\bar{r})^{-1/a}$, and again L is finite. However, in this situation, when $a > 1$ the mass remains finite as $\tau \to \tau_o$, and the pure similarity solution is a likely candidate for describing the dynamics of the focus regime.

Finally, we remark that a natural generalization of (1.4) is:

$$iA_t + \sigma_1 A_{xx} + A_{yy} + \sigma_2 A_{zz} = \sigma_3 |A|^{2a} A + \Phi_x A \quad , \tag{4.19a}$$

$$a_1 \Phi_{xx} + \Phi_{yy} + a_2 \Phi_{zz} = -b(|A|^{2a})_x \quad , \tag{4.19b}$$

where the $\sigma_i = \pm 1$ $(i = 1,2,3)$ and a_1 , a_2 , b are constant. The spherically symmetric limit is obtained by taking $b = \Phi = 0$, $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = +1$. Since the spherically symmetric equation has wide applicability, and (1.4) is itself physically relevant, we expect that (4.23) will also arise in physical problems.

5. OTHER SOLUTIONS OF THE NONLINEAR SCHRÖDINGER EQUATION

The purpose of this section is to identify other features of the solution of (2.25) that may play a role in its asymptotic ($t \to \infty$) solution.

5.1 Complete Integrability

Perhaps the fundamental question to answer about (2.25) is whether it is completely integrable; i.e., whether it can be solved exactly by relating it to an appropriate linear scattering problem. The question is natural in light of the fact that the one-dimensional problem can be solved in this way.

Consider first the long-wave limit of (2.25), subject to the constraint in (2.16). Here, (2.25) becomes (after rescaling of variables)

$$\begin{aligned} iA_\tau - \sigma_1 A_{\xi\xi} + A_{\eta\eta} &= \sigma_1 |A|^2 A + A\Phi_\xi \\ \sigma_1 \Phi_{\xi\xi} + \Phi_{\eta\eta} &= -2(|A|^2)_\xi \quad , \quad \sigma_1 = \text{sign}(\tfrac{1}{3} - \hat{T}) \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

This system is of I.S.T. type [11]. Special N solitons solutions can be constructed either by a direct (Hirota type) method or via the Zakharov-Shabat approach [14,31].

The situation seems to be much different in the deep water limit. Here we have already seen that (4.11) is an exact reduction of (2.25) to an ordinary differential equation; i.e., every solution of (4.11) provides an exact solution of (2.25) in this limit. Let us consider those partial differential equations (PDE) which have been solved exactly by IST methods. We have found that every reduction of one of these PDE's to an ordinary differential equation (ODE) results (perhaps after a transformation of dependent variables) in an ODE without moveable critical points [32,33].

We expect that if (2.25) can be solved by some IST, then (4.11) should have no moveable critical points. But Ince [34], esp. p. 344) provides a complete list of all such second-order equations; (4.11) is not on this list and cannot be transformed to an equation on this list. Therefore, the solution of (4.11) has moveable critical points. Moreover, one can show that (4.11) has logarithmic singularities in addition to poles. On this basis, we conjecture that (2.25) cannot be solved exactly by IST in the deep-water limit.

Although (2.25) can be solved by IST in the shallow-water limit (i.e., lower-left corner of Figure 1), it apparently cannot be solved in this way in the deep-water limit. Wherever IST methods fail, one is forced to piece together special solutions of the problem to describe the general solution.

5.2 Decaying Oscillations

The special solutions discussed so far in this paper have been localized: either solitons (or soliton-like) or self-focusing singular solutions. However, in the one-dimensional limit of (2.25), solitons make up only part of the asymptotic solution of the initial value problem. That part of the solution associated with the continuous spectrum spreads over large regions of space, while it decays as $t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. In particular, an exact solution of (1.2) is

$$A = t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Lambda \exp\{i(\frac{x^2}{4t} + \sigma\Lambda^2 \ell n\, t + \phi)\} \quad , \qquad (5.2)$$

where Λ and ϕ are real constants; the solution of (1.2) associated with the continuous spectrum tends to a slowly-varying modulation of this, where Λ and ϕ depend on (x/t) [22,35].

In the two-dimensional problem, (1.4), there is an analogous exact solution:

$$A = t^{-1} \Lambda \exp\{i\,(\frac{\sigma_1 x^2 + y^2}{4t} + \sigma_2\Lambda^2/t + B(t) + \phi)\} \quad ,$$
$$\Phi = -B'(t)x + C(t)y + D(t) \quad . \qquad (5.3)$$

Similar solutions in the deep water limit of (2.25) were found by Talanov [36]. On the basis of the one-dimensional theory, we anticipate that the part of the solution of (1.4) that decays in time can be described in terms of a slowly-varying modulation of this exact solution.

Moreover, this behavior would be consistent with the results of Lin and Strauss [37] who studied the three-dimensional problem

$$iu_t - \Delta u + |u|^2 u = 0 \quad , \tag{5.4}$$

where Δ is the Laplacian in three dimensions. They found that the solution exists for all time and decays as $t^{-3/2}$. The appropriate similarity solution here is

$$u = t^{-3/2} A \exp\{i\,(-\frac{x^2+y^2+z^2}{4t}) + A^2/2t^2 + \phi)\} \quad . \tag{5.5}$$

Without solitons or focusing, the decay rate of the solution of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation seems to be

$$u = 0(t^{-n/2}) \tag{5.6}$$

where n is the number of spatial dimensions. This decay rate is the same as in the linearized problem.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We are grateful to L.G. Redekopp and to J.L. Hammack for lending us the material in Figures 1 and 3, respectively, and to Martin Kruskal for useful comments. This work was supported by the Office of Naval Research and by the National Science Foundation.

REFERENCES

1. Ablowitz, M.J., Kaup, D.J., Newell, A.C., and Segur, H., Stud. Appl. Math. 53, 249, 1973.

2. Hammack, J., and Segur, H., J. Fluid Mech. 65, 209, 1974.

3. Hammack, J., and Segur, H., J. Fluid Mech. 84, 337, 1978.

4. Yuen, H.C., and Lake, B.M., Phys. Fluids 18, 956, 1975.

5. Kadomtsev, B., and Petviashvili, V., Sov. Phys. Dokl. 15, 539, 1970.

6. Zakharov, V.E., Sov. Phys. J. Appl. Mech. Techn. Phys. 4, 86, 1968.

7. Benney, D.J., and Roskes, G.J., Stud. Appl. Math. 1, 377, 1969.

8. Davey, A., and Stewartson, K., Proc. Roy. Soc. 388, 191, 1974.

9. Djovdjevic, V.D., and Redekopp, L.G., J. Fluid Mech. 79, 703, 1977.

10. Hayes, W.D., Proc. Roy. Soc. A, 332, 199, 1973.

11. Ablowitz, M.J., and Haberman, R., Phys. Rev. Lett. 35, 1185, 1975.

12. Zakharov, V.E., and Rubenchik, A.M., Sov. Phys. JETP 38, 494, 1974.

13. Dryuma, V., Sov. Phys. JETP Lett. 19, 387, 1974.

14. Zakharov, V.E., and Shabat, A.B., Func. Anal. and Appl. 8, 226, 1974.

15. Chen, H., J. Math. Phys. 16, 2382, 1975.

16. Satsuma, J. J. Phys. Soc. Japan 40, 286, 1976.

17. Ursell, F., Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc., 49, 685, 1953.

18. Hasimoto, H. and Ono, H., J. Phys. Soc. Japan, 33, 805, 1972.

19. Freeman, N.C. and Davey, A., Proc. Roy. Soc. A, 344, 427, 1975.

20. Ablowitz, M.J., and Segur, H., Stud. Appl. Math. 57, 13, 1977.

21. Lecture by Novikov, S.P. for Zakharov, V.E. on work Bordag, L.A., Its, A.R., Manakov, S.V., Matreev, V.B., and Zakharov, V.E., Rome, Italy, June 1977.

22. Ablowitz, M.J., and Satsuma, J., J. Math. Phys., to be published.

23. Segur, H., and Ablowitz, M.J., J. Math. Phys. 17, 710, 1976.

24. Hammack, J., to appear.

25. Manakov, S.V., Sov. Phys. JETP 38, 693, 1974.

26. Saffman, P.G., and Yuen, H.C., Phys. Fluids 21, 1450, 1978.

27. Vlasov, V.N., Petrishchev, I.A., Talanov, V.I., Quantum Electronics, Radiophys. 14, 1062, 1974.

28. Zakharov, V.E., and Synakh, V.S., Sov. Phys. JETP 4, 465, 1976.

29. Chandrasekhar, S., Hydrodynamic and Hydromagnetic Stability, Oxford Press, London, 1961.

30. Chiao, R.Y., Garmire, E., and Townes, C.H., Phys. Rev. Lett. 13, 479, 1964.

31. Anker, D., and Freeman, N.E., J. Fluid Mech., to be published.

32. Ablowitz, M.J., and Segur, H., Phys. Rev. Lett. 38, 1103, 1977.

33. Ablowitz, M.J., Ramani, A., and Segur, H., preprint.

34. Ince, E.L., Ordinary Differential Equations, Dover, N.Y., 1944.

35. Segur, H., J. Math. Phys. 17, 714, 1976.

36. Talanov, V.I., Radiophysics 9, 260, 1967.

37. Lin, J.E., and Strauss, W.A., J. Funct. Anal., to appear.

LIST OF FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. Map of parameter space, showing where the coefficients in (2.25) change sign. The dynamics of wave evolution is different in each region.

Figure 2a. KdV soliton, as seen in two space dimensions at a fixed time; $\kappa^2 = 1/12$ in (3.1), with $\sigma = -1$.

Figure 2b. Lump solution of (3.2) as seen in two dimensions of a fixed time; $p = 0$, $q^2 = 1/3$, $\sigma = -1$.

Figure 3. Measured surface displacement, showing evolution of envelope soliton at two downstream locations;
$h = 1$ m , $kh = 4.0$, $\omega = 1$ cps ,
$\tilde{T} = 1.0 * 10^{-4}$;
—— , measured history of surface displacement;
--- , theoretical envelope shape

$$\kappa\zeta = \kappa a \operatorname{sech}(z)$$
$$z = \frac{ag}{\omega}(\nu/8\lambda)^{\frac{1}{2}}(C_g t - x)$$

(3a) 6 m downstream of wavemaker, $\kappa a = 0.132$.
(3b) 30 m downstream of wavemaker, $\kappa a = 0.116$.

Figure 4. Stationary waveguide, as seen in time at a fixed location. In (3.5), $\mu = 2$, $\chi = -4$ and $\mathrm{Re}(A) = 2 \operatorname{sech} 2\eta \cos 8\tau$ is plotted. The displacement of the free surface, $\kappa\zeta$, is similar.


4
3
2
1
0
κh
χ>0, ν>0
χ<0, ν<0
λ<0
λ>0
F
α>0, ν<0
α<0, ν>0
E
D
ν>0
ν<0
A
B
ν>0
ν<0
C
0
.25
.5
.75
1.0
1.25
1.5
T̃ = κ²T/g

Fig. 1.



Fig. 2a.



Fig. 2b.



Fig. 3a.



Fig. 3b.



Fig. 4.