

EXACT SHORT TIME DYNAMICS FOR STEEPLY REPULSIVE POTENTIALS

James W. Dufty

*Department of Physics, University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32611*

Matthieu H. Ernst

*Instituut voor Theoretische Fysica, Universiteit Utrecht
Postbus 80.195, 3580 TD Utrecht, The Netherlands*

(Dated: 1-25-04)

Abstract

The autocorrelation functions for the force on a particle, the velocity of a particle, and the transverse momentum flux are studied for the power law potential $v(r) = \epsilon(\sigma/r)^\nu$ (soft spheres). The latter two correlation functions characterize the Green-Kubo expressions for the self-diffusion coefficient and shear viscosity. The short time dynamics is calculated exactly as a function of ν . The dynamics is characterized by a universal scaling function $S(\tau)$, where $\tau = t/\tau_\nu$ and τ_ν is the mean time to traverse the core of the potential divided by ν . In the limit of asymptotically large ν this scaling function leads to delta function in time contributions in the correlation functions for the force and momentum flux. It is shown that this singular limit agrees with the special Green-Kubo representation for hard sphere transport coefficients. The domain of the scaling law is investigated by comparison with recent results from molecular dynamics simulation for this potential.

I. INTRODUCTION

The dynamics of fluctuations in simple classical fluids is a well-studied problem over a wide range of densities and temperatures. Important questions remain open at the quantitative level, but important qualitative features (e.g. behavior at high density, long times) have been largely resolved over the past few decades. In most cases the qualitative features do not depend sensitively on the form of the pair potential for interactions among the particles. An exception is the short time behavior of time correlation functions where the dynamics does depend sensitively on the form of the potential. This is due to the dominance of trajectories of pairs of particles as they traverse their common force field on this time scale. The most striking example of this is the difference between a continuous potential with a finite pair interaction time and hard spheres, for which this time is zero. The objective here is to explore this difference quantitatively for the case of time correlation functions characterizing the Green-Kubo transport coefficients.

This work is motivated by the recent series of molecular dynamics studies of the same problem by Powles and co-workers [1, 2, 3, 4]. They consider a steeply repulsive potential of the form $v(r) = \epsilon(\sigma/r)^\nu$ with exponent $12 \leq \nu \leq 1152$. In the following this will be referred to as the soft sphere potential. Clearly, for asymptotically large ν this approaches the hard sphere potential which is infinite for $r < \sigma$ and zero for $r > \sigma$ (see Figure 1).

It is straightforward to show that the thermodynamic and structural properties of the soft sphere fluid are continuously related to those of the hard sphere fluid, as expected. However, the corresponding relationship for dynamical properties is more complex. For example, the exact short time expansion of time correlation functions for the soft sphere fluid is a series with only even coefficients [5], while that for the hard sphere fluid has finite odd order contributions as well [6]. A second qualitative difference is the form of the Green-Kubo expressions for transport coefficients. For the soft sphere fluid these are time integrals of the flux autocorrelation function, with the flux being associated with some conserved density. For the hard sphere fluid it looks as if there is an additional term due to instantaneous momentum transport caused by configurations for pairs of particles initially at contact. Nevertheless, it is clear that the soft sphere and hard sphere fluids should be physically equivalent for large ν . So, such apparent differences must be understood in an appropriate context.

The context refers to the time scale on which the comparison is to be made. For the soft sphere potential there is a characteristic force range $r_\nu = \sigma/\nu$ around $r \simeq \sigma$, and an associated time $\tau_\nu = \sqrt{\beta m \sigma}/\nu$, which is essentially the time it takes a particle to traverse the steep part of the potential. For large ν and $t > \tau_\nu$ a pair of particles initially separated by $r \approx \sigma$ will have transferred an amount of momentum quantitatively approaching that for a pair of hard spheres. On this time scale all dynamical properties of the soft sphere and hard sphere fluid should be comparable. However, for $t < \tau_\nu$ the soft sphere and hard sphere fluid are always qualitatively different in their dynamics regardless of how large ν is taken. In effect the hard sphere fluid is always in the domain of times large compared to τ_ν , as the collisions are instantaneous. This explains, for example, the above difference in the two short time power series




FIG. 1: Soft sphere potential $v(r)$ as a function of r/σ for several values of ν .

expansions. One of the main results described here is an exact determination of the crossover behavior for the soft sphere fluid from $t < \tau_\nu$ to the hard sphere form for $t > \tau_\nu$ for large ν .

The detailed analysis given here is made possible by the simplifications that occur for repulsive power law potentials at large ν . This entails both a limitation to times $t \approx \tau_\nu$ and restricted spatial domains $\sigma - r_\nu < r < \sigma + r_\nu$. The relevant other time and space scales are the mean free time t_E and the mean free path l_E . Although both of these can be quite small at high densities (e.g., $l_E < \sigma$) they are insensitive to ν . This means that for sufficiently large ν there is a separation of both time and space scales, $\tau_\nu \ll t_E$ and $r_\nu \ll l_E$. As a consequence the dynamics to be studied reduces to pair dynamics since force ranges of different pairs will not overlap and times are much shorter than that for sequences of pair collisions. The problem of evaluating the pair dynamics on this time scale has been solved for the velocity autocorrelation function (VACF) for three-dimensional soft spheres by de Schepper [7]. His analysis can be extended to other time correlation functions and different dimensions as well. It is found that the time domain for $t \ll t_E$ and $\tau_\nu \ll t_E$ is described by a universal scaling function $\mathcal{S}(\tau)$ depending on time only through $\tau = t/\tau_\nu$ and otherwise independent of density, temperature, and potential parameters. As it turns out, the time dependence of all Green Kubo correlation functions are related to a single scaling functions $\mathcal{S}(\tau)$. The domain of validity for this scaling law is studied by comparison with the three-dimensional simulation results of Powles et al. at $\nu = 1152$ and at a packing fraction of $\xi = 0.3$. A more complete comparison at $\nu = 1152$, at higher densities, and for more general time correlation functions will be given elsewhere [8].

The initial values of correlation functions of fluxes involving the force are proportional to ν for large ν [9, 12]. The combination of $\nu S(t/\tau_\nu)$ becomes proportional to a Dirac delta function in t in the limit $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ at fixed t . This is the domain $t > \tau_\nu$ for which the hard sphere limit is expected. To explore the crossover to hard sphere behavior and the implications of this delta function a detailed description of the Green-Kubo relations and time correlation functions for the hard sphere fluid are included here as well. The dynamics for hard spheres is no longer described by forces. Instead there are straight line trajectories for all particles until a pair is in contact. Instantaneously, the pair exchanges momentum according to an elastic collision and proceeds along the new straight line trajectory. The generators for this dynamics (Liouville operators) involve binary collision operators rather than forces [13]. These differences from the dynamics for continuous potentials lead to the qualitative differences in the Green-Kubo relations and associated correlation functions mentioned above. Generically, the time correlation functions $C(t)$ approach in the limit as $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ to $\bar{C}(t) = \mathcal{L}_\infty \delta^+(t) + \delta C(t)$. The first term represents a singular part, which is delta-correlated in time, and a regular smooth function $\delta C(t)$. Here $\delta^+(t)$ is the delta function normalized to unity over the positive time axis. The coefficient, \mathcal{L}_∞ , vanishes for any continuous potential but is non-zero for hard spheres. Consequently, the Green-Kubo formulas for the transport coefficients, \mathcal{L} , in the hard sphere limit have the form, $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_\infty + \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{V \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t ds \delta C(s)$.

This limiting behavior is confirmed analytically below and shown to be consistent with the simulation data. Although the literature on hard sphere fluids is large, the detailed forms for hard sphere Green-Kubo relations and

discussion of these differences do not seem to have been given before. Instead, an equivalent form of Helfand relations has been used in the literature both for theoretical analysis [10, 11, 14], and for computer simulations [15], since this form does not involve the forces explicitly, and is valid for both the soft sphere and the hard sphere fluid. Here the Helfand relations are taken as the starting point for derivation of the hard sphere Green-Kubo relations.

A preliminary report on the issues considered here has been given by one of us [16], restricted to the case of the shear viscosity and without calculating the scaling function. There is a substantial literature on the dynamics for continuous potentials on time scales comparable to time τ_ν , typically associated with memory function models [17]. This domain is important for many conditions in neutron scattering, spectroscopy, and short-pulse laser experiments where high frequency domains can be accessed. The attention here is more focused on the limiting form of the dynamics for the soft sphere potential and the associated universal scaling properties. For a given potential, e.g. Lennard-Jones, the short time dependence will be potential specific and the results obtained here have little or no relationship to more general potential forms.

The analysis here is exact in the limits considered. The objective here is to clarify the differences mentioned above for soft sphere and hard sphere interactions regarding the dynamics of the associated correlation functions. To allow this broad scope of discussion, attention is limited to the auto correlation functions for the force, which exposes most directly the scaling function at short times, and those for the shear viscosity and self-diffusion coefficient. A similar analysis of the thermal conductivity and bulk viscosity has been carried out and will be present separately [8]. The plan of the paper is as follows. In the next section the Green-Kubo relations for the shear viscosity and self-diffusion coefficient are recalled for the case of smooth (differentiable) potentials. The fluxes defining the associated correlation functions are identified as the sum of kinetic part (k) and a collisional transfer or potential part (v), and the correlation functions are decomposed into the corresponding contributions from these components. Also in this section the equivalent Einstein-Helfand formulas are recalled. These formulas are applicable to both smooth interactions and hard spheres. The generators for hard sphere dynamics are given in Appendix A and applied in the Helfand formulas to derive the Green-Kubo formulas for hard spheres discussed in Section III. For later comparison with the limiting forms for the soft sphere fluid, the short time behavior of the hard sphere correlation functions is calculated in Section IV. The short time dynamics of the soft sphere fluid is addressed in Section V, where the scaling properties of the velocity autocorrelation function and force autocorrelation function are discussed. The dominant short time contribution to the autocorrelation function for the shear viscosity, which is the stress autocorrelation function, is given by the same scaling function. These results are then compared with the MD simulation results of Powles et. al. in Section VI and final comments are offered in the last section.

II. TIME CORRELATION FUNCTIONS FOR SMOOTH INTERACTIONS

Our goal is to study the short time behavior of time correlation functions $C(t) = (\beta/V)\langle J(0)J(t) \rangle_o$ of microscopic fluxes J that enter in the Green-Kubo formulas for the transport coefficients in classical fluids with smooth interactions. These fluxes contain in general a kinetic part, J^k , and a potential part, J^v , i.e. $J = J^k + J^v$. In this paper we only illustrate the general results by considering the most simple cases, being the velocity autocorrelation function (VACF), the force autocorrelation function (FACF), and the stress autocorrelation function (SACF). The time integrals over the VACF and the SACF determine the self-diffusion coefficient and shear viscosity, respectively.

For smooth interactions the time correlation functions are regular at the origin, i.e. they can be expanded in powers of t^2 . In the limit where the repulsive part of the potential becomes very steep, and approaches the hard sphere limit, singularities develop at $t = 0$. The type of singularities is quite different for the different ab -parts of the correlation functions, $C^{ab}(t) = (\beta/V)\langle J^a(0)J^b(t) \rangle_o$ with $ab = \{kk, kv, vk, vv\}$.

We start with the Green-Kubo formula for shear viscosity expressed in the grand canonical ensemble, characterized by a temperature $T = 1/k_B\beta$, a chemical potential, and a volume V . Here averages are denoted by $\langle \dots \rangle_o$. Then,

$$\eta = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{V \rightarrow \infty} \eta_V(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{V \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t ds C_\eta(s), \quad (\text{II.1})$$

where $\eta_V(t)$ is a time integral over the time correlation function,

$$C_\eta(t) = (\beta/V)\langle J(0)J(t) \rangle_o = C_\eta^{kk}(t) + 2C_\eta^{kv}(t) + C_\eta^{vv}(t). \quad (\text{II.2})$$

Here $C_\eta^{kv}(t) = C_\eta^{vk}(t)$ are equal, and the fluxes are given by

$$\begin{aligned} J &= \sum_i m v_{ix} v_{iy} + \sum_{i < j} r_{ij,x} F_{ij,y} \\ J^k &= \sum_i m v_{ix} v_{iy}; \quad J^v = \sum_{i < j} r_{ij,x} F_{ij,y}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{II.3})$$

Similarly, the Green-Kubo formula for the self diffusion coefficient D is given by

$$D = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{V \rightarrow \infty} D_V(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{V \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t ds C_D(s), \quad (\text{II.4})$$

where $C_D(t)$ is the autocorrelation function for the velocity of one of the particles,

$$C_D(t) = \langle v_{1x}(0)v_{1x}(t) \rangle_o. \quad (\text{II.5})$$

A self-correlation in the grand canonical ensemble has to be understood as $\langle a_1(0)a_1(t) \rangle_o = \langle \sum_i a_i(0)a_i(t) \rangle_o / \langle N \rangle_o$. Finally, we will also consider here the autocorrelation function for the total force acting on a single particle

$$C_F(t) = (\beta/m) \langle F_{1x}(0)F_{1x}(t) \rangle_o. \quad (\text{II.6})$$

where $F_{1x} = \sum_{i>1} F_{1i,x}$ is the force on particle 1. The FADF is simply related to the second derivative of the VACF. Its time integral does not give any transport coefficient, but vanishes in fact. However, it is included in this study since it has a time dependence closely related to that of the SACF. For simplicity it will be referred to as a "Green-Kubo correlation function" along with $C_D(t)$ and $C_\eta(t)$.

Next we consider the Einstein-Helfand Formulas. These formulas [14, 15] for the transport coefficients are the analogs of the Einstein formula for the self diffusion coefficient D in terms of the second moment of the displacements,

$$D_V(t) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \langle (x(t) - x(0))^2 \rangle_o = \int_0^t ds \langle v_{1x}(0)v_{1x}(s) \rangle_o. \quad (\text{II.7})$$

The first equality is the Einstein-Helfand form while the second equality is the Green-Kubo form. The latter follow directly from the identities $\dot{x} = v_x$ and $x(t) - x(0) = \int_0^t ds \dot{x}(s)$, and the stationarity of the VACF. The Helfand formula for the shear viscosity is given by an analogous moment formula,

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_V(t) &= \frac{\beta}{2V} \frac{d}{dt} \langle (M(t) - M(0))^2 \rangle_o \\ M &= \sum_i m v_{ix} r_{iy}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{II.8})$$

where M is a Helfand moment. The equivalence of (II.8) with the Green-Kubo formula can be established along the same lines as in (II.7) by observing that the flux is given by,

$$J = \dot{M} = \{M, H\} \equiv LM, \quad (\text{II.9})$$

where $H = K + V$ is the Hamiltonian, and $\{M, H\}$ is a Poisson bracket. The last equality defines the Liouville operator for smooth potentials. Expressions in terms of a Liouville operator are of interest as we want to consider also interactions between hard spheres. Such interactions can not be described by a Hamiltonian being a smooth function of the relative distances between the particles. However, there exist in the literature pseudo-Liouville operators, that generate the hard sphere dynamics inside statistical averages [13]. The Helfand formulas are given in terms of the moments M which do not involve the force that becomes singular for the hard sphere limit, in contrast to the fluxes in the Green-Kubo representation. As indicated in the next section, use of the hard sphere pseudo-Liouville operators in (II.9) provides the correct definition for the microscopic hard sphere fluxes and the corresponding hard sphere Green-Kubo representation using (II.9).

III. TIME CORRELATION FUNCTIONS FOR HARD SPHERES FLUIDS

A. Einstein-Helfand and Green-Kubo Formulas

The corresponding time correlation functions for hard sphere fluids, denoted by $\tilde{C}_\mu^{ab}(t)$, are singular at $t = 0$. They behave quite differently at short times from those for smooth interactions, which are regular at $t = 0$. For instance, the VACF for hard spheres decays exponentially on the time scale of the Enskog mean free time t_E , and it is *even* in t . So, it is singular at $t = 0$ with a jump in the first derivative, and a delta function in the second derivative.

In order to investigate what happens in the limit of very steep repulsion, we want to first calculate the corresponding hard sphere results, which have only been studied in the literature for the VACF and the incoherent scattering function [7, 18]. The problem is that the fluxes J in (II.3) contain the forces \mathbf{F}_{ij} , which are ill-defined for hard spheres, and

there is no obvious way to extend the usual Green-Kubo formulas to hard sphere fluids. However, as noted above, the equivalent Einstein-Helfand formula (II.8) involve only momenta and energies which remain well-defined in the hard sphere limit.

The proper way to formulate hard sphere dynamics for an equilibrium time correlation function $\langle A(0)B(t) \rangle_o$ is to introduce the forward (+) and backward (-) generators $e^{\pm tL_{\pm}}$ with $t > 0$. They generate the trajectories in Γ -space, $A(t) = e^{\pm tL_{\pm}}A(0)$, for an arbitrary phase function inside a statistical average. The generators involve the pseudo-Liouville operators L_{\pm} and the binary collision operators T_{\pm} defined in Appendix A (see Ref [13]), where we also explain how to express the Einstein-Helfand correlation function for η in terms of these hard sphere generators, and subsequently into a Green-Kubo formula. The result is,

$$\eta_V(t) = \int_0^t ds \bar{C}_{\eta}(s) = \eta_{\infty} + \int_0^t ds \delta C_{\eta}(s), \quad (\text{III.1})$$

where the limits in (II.1) still have to be taken. Here we have introduced,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{C}_{\eta}(t) &= \eta_{\infty} \delta^+(t) + \delta C_{\eta}(t); & \delta C_{\eta}(t) &= (\beta/V) \langle J_- e^{tL_+} J_+ \rangle_o \\ J_{\pm} &= J^k + J_{\pm}^v = L_{\pm} M; & J^k &= L_0 M = \sum_i m v_{ix} v_{iy} \\ J_{\pm}^v &= \pm \sum_{i < j} T_{\pm}(ij) M = \pm \sum_{i < j} T_{\pm}(ij) \frac{1}{2} m g_{ij,x} r_{ij,y} \\ \eta_{\infty} &= -(\beta/V) \langle M L_+ M \rangle_o. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{III.2})$$

The delta-function is normalized as $\int_0^{\infty} dt \delta^+(t) = 1$. The kinetic part of the flux in (III.2) is identical to that for smooth interactions (II.3). For the time being the collisional part, involving T -operators, will be kept in the schematic form above.

Next we consider the instantaneous viscosity η_{∞} , which is defined as an equilibrium average, and vanishes for smooth interactions (i.e., when L_+ is replaced by L). For the hard sphere fluid η_{∞} can be expressed in terms of the hard sphere pair distribution function by combining the expressions for η_{∞} and $L_+ M = J_+$ in (III.2), where we have changed to center of mass, $\{\mathbf{R}_{ij}, \mathbf{G}_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{v}_j)\}$, and relative phase variables, $\{\mathbf{r}_{ij}, \mathbf{g}_{ij} = \mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{v}_j\}$. The result is

$$\eta_{\infty} = -\frac{1}{8} \beta (mn)^2 \chi \int d\mathbf{r} \langle \langle g_x r_y T_+(12) g_x r_y \rangle \rangle, \quad (\text{III.3})$$

where $\langle \langle \dots \rangle \rangle$ denotes a Maxwellian velocity average over all particles involved. Moreover, the \mathbf{r} -integration can be carried out because the operator T_+ contains a factor $\delta^{(d)}(\mathbf{r} - \sigma \hat{\sigma})$. Consequently $\chi = g^{(2)}(\sigma_+)$ is the hard sphere pair correlation function at contact. The remaining integrals are d -dimensional generalizations of the collision integrals as appearing in the Enskog theory for hard sphere fluids (See Chapter 16.8 of Ref. [19]). Performing the $\hat{\sigma}$ - and velocity integrations yields finally,

$$\eta_{\infty} = \frac{mn\sigma^2}{d(d+2)t_E} \equiv \frac{d}{d+2} \varpi. \quad (\text{III.4})$$

The Doric pi ϖ , defined in (III.4), has been chosen such that it reduces for $d = 3$ to the same symbol as used in the classical Enskog theory, as presented in Chapters 16.51, 16.52 and 16.6. of Ref. [19]. In the above formula the Enskog mean free time t_E is given by,

$$t_E = \sqrt{\pi} t_{\sigma} / 2dbn\chi \equiv \sqrt{\pi} t_{\sigma} / 2d\Delta \quad (\text{III.5})$$

where $t_{\sigma} = \sqrt{\beta m} \sigma$ and b is the excluded volume, equal to half the volume of the d -dimensional interaction sphere of radius σ .

There are two conspicuous differences between the formulas for hard spheres and for smooth interactions. First, the pseudo-fluxes J_{\pm} in the time correlation functions are different depending on their position relative to the generator e^{tL_+} . We also note that $J_+ e^{-tL_-} J_-$ is an equivalent order. Second, there is the instantaneous contributions, η_{∞} , which is vanishing for *smooth* interactions.

Before closing this section we point out that the hard sphere time correlation formula $\bar{C}_{\eta}(t)$ in (III.2) can also be split into $\bar{C}_{\eta}^{ab}(t)$ with $(ab) = \{kk, kv, vv\}$ by splitting the flux as $J_{\pm} = J^k + J_{\pm}^v$ (see (III.2)). The form of the kinetic part J^k is identical to that for smooth interactions. The remaining collisional transfer part J_{\pm}^v is different.

B. The hard sphere FACF and VACF

In the same way as described above for $C_\eta(s)$, the Helfand representation for the force autocorrelation function can be used to obtain the equivalent hard sphere form

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{C}_F(t) &= \gamma_\infty \delta^+(t) + \delta C_F(t) \\ \delta C_F(t) &= \frac{\beta}{m} \langle F_{1x-} e^{tL_+} F_{1x+} \rangle_o \\ F_{1x,\pm} &= L_\pm m v_{1x} = \pm \sum_{j \neq 1} T_\pm(1j) m v_{1x}. \\ \gamma_\infty &= -\beta m \langle v_{1x} L_+ v_{1x} \rangle_o = 4\Delta / \sqrt{\pi} t_\sigma = 2/dt_E.\end{aligned}\tag{III.6}$$

One directly recognizes the expression for γ_∞ as the opposite of the initial slope of the hard sphere VACF, which has been calculated exactly along the same lines as (III.4) (see Ref.[18]). We also note that γ_∞ vanishes for smooth interactions.

Finally, the VACF for hard spheres is much simpler to obtain since there is no explicit dependence on the forces. Consequently, only the generator for the dynamics has to be changed, leading to

$$\bar{C}_D(t) = \langle v_{1x}(0) e^{tL_+} v_{1x} \rangle_o \tag{III.7}$$

This completes our identification of the hard sphere Green-Kubo time correlation functions $\bar{C}_\eta(t)$, $\bar{C}_F(t)$, and $\bar{C}_D(t)$.

C. A new relation for the hard sphere fluid

An interesting consequence for the hard sphere FACF follows by explicitly integrating (II.6) over t using Newton's law to find for, say, soft spheres,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t ds C_F(s) = \beta \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \langle F_x(0) (v_{1x}(t) - v_{1x}(0)) \rangle_o = 0, \tag{III.8}$$

because positions and velocities become uncorrelated in this limit. Taking the limit of the exponent of the power law interaction $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ suggests that this relation also holds in the case of the hard sphere correlation function $\bar{C}(t)$ in (III.6), i.e. $\int_0^\infty ds \bar{C}_\eta(s) = 0$. As a consequence we obtain the following relation,

$$\gamma_\infty = -\frac{\beta}{m} \int_0^\infty dt \langle F_{1x-} e^{tL_+} F_{1x+} \rangle_o. \tag{III.9}$$

The left side of the last equation has been calculated exactly above. The right side is a complex dynamical quantity involving the entire time evolution of the system. Thus we have obtained a rare "zero frequency" sum rule for the hard sphere fluid. It should be noted however that equating (III.8) with the corresponding integral over \bar{C} , implies an interchange of limits, i.e. $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty}$ and $\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty}$, which is presumably allowed. However, interchanging the limits, $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0}$ and $\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty}$, is not allowed, and the consequences of this non-uniformity is in fact the main subject of this paper. The full implications of the new relation (III.9) are not clear at this point.

IV. EVALUATION OF HARD SPHERE PROPERTIES

Having obtained Green-Kubo correlation functions $C_\mu^{ab}(t)$ for smooth interactions and $\bar{C}_\mu^{ab}(t)$ for hard sphere interactions, we now discuss the structure of the short time behavior of these functions. After a brief introduction we consider in this section the hard sphere case, and in Section V the case of smooth interactions, in particular soft spheres.

First, some perspective on the differences between these two cases is given by listing in Table I the qualitative structure of the short time behavior for smooth and hard sphere interactions. We first note that all Green-Kubo-type correlation functions are even functions of time. If they are regular at $t = 0$, as is the case for smooth interactions, then they can be expanded in powers of t^2 . For hard sphere systems the correlation functions are also even functions of t , but they are singular at the origin.

SHORT TIME BEHAVIOR OF TIME CORRELATION FUNCTIONS
FOR SMOOTH INTERACTIONS AND FOR HARD SPHERE INTERACTIONS.

$\mu \downarrow$	$C_\mu^{ab}(t)$ FOR SI			$\bar{C}_\mu^{ab}(t)$ FOR HARD SPHERE		
$ab \rightarrow$	kk	kv	vv	kk	kv	vv
D	$O(1) + O(t^2)$			$O(1) + \bar{O}(t)$		
F			$O(1)$			$\delta(t)$
η	$O(1) + O(t^2)$	$O(t^2)$	$O(1)$	$O(1) + \bar{O}(t)$	$\bar{O}(1)$	$\delta(t)$

Table I shows the schematic structure of the selected correlation functions for smooth interactions and hard sphere fluids, where the terms $O(t^n)$ and $\bar{O}(t^n)$ with $n = 0, 1, 2$ are non-vanishing terms of order t^n for small t . The results for smooth interactions are well-known in the literature. Regarding hard spheres we first note that at small t only the leading order terms (initial values) in $C_\mu^{kk}(t)$ and $\bar{C}_\mu^{kk}(t)$ are equal. The entries in the remaining columns for smooth interactions and hard spheres are all different. The hard sphere results are obtained from (III.2) for $\bar{C}_\eta(t)$, (III.6) for $\bar{C}_F(t)$, and (III.7) for $\bar{C}_D(t)$. All contributions involving a single T -operator are non-vanishing, as in the hard sphere entries on location (μ, kk) and (μ, kv) . The hard sphere entries on location (μ, vv) involve two T -operators, and are more complicated. They will be discussed later.

Inspection of Table I shows that the results for smooth interactions and hard spheres are indeed very different. The goal of this section and the next is to calculate the entries in the table, and study in a quantitative manner the crossover of the correlation functions to hard sphere interactions from smooth, but steeply repulsive power law interactions, $v(r) \sim 1/r^\nu$. This will be done for times t , short compared to the Enskog mean free time t_E .

In the remaining part of this section the short time behavior of the correlation functions for the hard sphere fluid in Table I will be calculated, i.e. the initial values and initial slopes. We start with the (kk) -correlations, and include the VACF $\bar{C}_D(t)$ as the most typical one. In the sequel we restrict ourselves exclusively to $t > 0$, to avoid possible confusion regarding the definitions of the T -operators.

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{C}_D(t) &= \langle v_{1x} \{1 + tL_+ \dots\} v_{1x} \rangle_o \equiv (1/\beta m) \{1 - \gamma_D t + \dots\} \\ \bar{C}_\eta^{kk}(t) &= \langle J^k \{1 + tL_+ \dots\} J^k \rangle_o \equiv (n/\beta) \{1 - \gamma_\eta t + \dots\}.\end{aligned}\tag{IV.1}$$

As explained in the previous subsection, we restrict ourselves in the small- t expansion to terms that are at most linear in the T -operator. Terms of $\mathcal{O}((tT)^2)$ have been neglected in (IV.1). Initial values and slopes can be evaluated, and yield

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_D &= \gamma_\infty = -\langle v_x L_+ v_x \rangle_o / \langle v_x^2 \rangle_o = 2/dt_E \\ \gamma_\eta &= -\langle J^k L_+ J^k \rangle_o / \langle (J^k)^2 \rangle_o = 4/(d+2)t_E\end{aligned}\tag{IV.2}$$

with J^k defined in (II.3).

Next we consider the (kv) -cross-correlations $\bar{C}_\eta^{kv}(t) = (\beta/V) \langle J^k \exp[tL_+] J_+^v \rangle_o$. As $J_+^v \equiv J_+ - J^k$ in (III.2) itself is already linear in T , we can only calculate its initial value exactly,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{C}_\eta^{kv}(t) &= (\beta/V) \langle J^k \{1 + \dots\} \sum_{i < j} T_+(ij) \frac{1}{2} m g_{ij,x} r_{ij,y} \rangle_o \\ &= \frac{1}{8} \beta (mn)^2 \chi \int d\mathbf{r} \langle g_x g_y T_+(12) g_x r_y \rangle = \left(\frac{n}{\beta}\right) \frac{2\Delta}{d+2}.\end{aligned}\tag{IV.3}$$

Finally we discuss the (vv) - or collisional transfer correlations for hard spheres in Table I. It is instructive to first compare $C_\eta^{vv}(t)$ for smooth power law interactions with $\bar{C}_\eta^{vv}(t)$ for hard spheres. The correlation function $C_\eta^{vv}(t)$ for smooth interactions develops in the hard sphere limit a strong delta function - type singularity, as represented by the first line in (III.2) – and similarly in (III.6) for $C_F(t)$. The remaining part, $\delta C_\eta^{vv}(t)$, containing the pseudo-fluxes J_\pm^v , represents in fact the regular part, that approaches a finite limit as $t \rightarrow 0$. Indeed, the short time behavior of $\delta C_F(t)$, or equivalently $\bar{C}_D(t)$, has already been analyzed in great detail in the literature (see Ref.[18]). There it has been shown that the hard sphere correlation functions related to $\delta \bar{C}_D(t)$ or $\delta C_F(t)$, and containing two T -operators, are smooth functions of time near $t = 0$, which indeed approach a finite non-vanishing value. The explicit evaluation of these contributions is much more complex than performing simple binary collision integrals, as we have been doing in the previous sections. The reason is that these contributions are coming from the overlapping part of uncorrelated binary collisions (12)(13), and from renormalized ring collisions of the form (12)(13)(23) [18], which involve in fact *three* instead of two hard spheres. However, for the purpose of this paper the fact that these values are finite, is sufficient.

V. SCALING FORMS IN SOFT SPHERE FLUIDS

A. Force autocorrelation function (FACF)

In the previous section we have calculated the leading short time hard sphere results. These are needed to compare and identify the limiting results for soft sphere correlation functions on time scales that describe the crossover to hard sphere behavior, i.e. the crossover from the *initial* time scale, where the detailed shape of the interparticle interaction matters, to the *kinetic* time scale t_E , where only asymptotic scattering properties matter.

This will be done for *soft spheres*, represented by the repulsive power law potential $v(r) = \epsilon(\sigma/r)^\nu$. In this case the FACF and SACF turn out to be proportional to a scaling function $\mathcal{S}(t/\tau_\nu)$, where $\tau_\nu = t_\sigma/\nu$ is the mean time that a particle needs to traverse the steep part of the potential, and $t_\sigma = \sqrt{\beta m \sigma}$ the mean time to traverse the total hard core diameter σ . These time scales are only well-defined and well-separated for large values of exponent ν . At high densities there is another relevant time scale, the mean free time between collisions, t_E , which can be estimated for sufficiently steep repulsion by the Enskog mean free time, t_E , which is proportional to $t_\sigma/bn\chi$. Given the large values of the two- and three-dimensional pair correlation function χ at contact, t_E and t_σ can be of the same magnitude (for example in two- and three-dimensional hard sphere systems at packing fractions around 30%), or t_E may even be an order of magnitude smaller than t_σ (for example in typical neutron scattering experiments on liquid Argon). Hence, to describe the crossover from the initial τ_ν -scale to the kinetic scale t_E , the initial scale must satisfy $\tau_\nu \ll \min\{t_E, t_\sigma\}$. These estimates suggest that the exponent ν should be rather large at high densities. The example of the next section with packing fraction 0.3 and $\nu = 1152$ satisfies these constraints, as will be illustrated in Section VII.

Our analysis begins with the FACF in a d -dimensional system, defined in (II.6). It is an even function of time t and regular at the origin for finite values of the exponent ν , i.e. it can be expanded in powers of t^2 . However for very large ν , the initial value $C_F(0) \rightarrow \infty$, implying that the function is singular at the origin. It is the goal of this subsection to analyze the dominant small- t singularity of $C_F(t)$ in the hard sphere limit and to describe the crossover of the FACF from soft to hard sphere behavior.

A study of this short time crossover problem can be carried out following the work of de Schepper [7] for the VACF. His analysis is based on a perturbation expansion of e^{tL} in powers of $(tL)^k$, where the Liouville operator contains the force \mathbf{F}_{ij} . He has shown that the most dominant contributions for large ν are obtained by keeping in each order in $(tL)^k$ only terms involving forces between a single pair (ij) , and finally resumming these contributions. Here we exploit this result and calculate directly the entire pair contribution. The basic physical idea is that the autocorrelation function $\langle \mathbf{F}_{12}(0)\mathbf{F}_{12}(t) \rangle_o$ of the pair force $\mathbf{F}_{12} = -\nabla v(r) \sim \mathcal{O}(\nu)$ controls the short time dynamics on the time scale τ_ν , and the time evolution is controlled by two-particle dynamics since $\tau_\nu \ll t_E$. More explicitly, the dominant short time contribution to $C_F(t)$ for $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ is,

$$\begin{aligned} C_F(t) &\simeq (\beta n/mV) \int d\mathbf{R} d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{g} d\mathbf{G} \phi(g)\phi(G)g^{(2)}(r)F_x(r)e^{tL_{12}}F_x(r) \\ &\equiv (\beta n\chi/m)\langle F_{12,x}e^{tL_r}F_{12,x} \rangle^{(2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{V.1})$$

The second line defines a two-particle average over positions and velocities, the latter one with Maxwellian weights. A change of variables from $\{\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{v}_2\}$ to relative and center of mass coordinates $\{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{G}\}$ has been made with the replacement $L_{12} = L_r + \mathbf{G} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{R}}$, and $n = \langle N \rangle_o/V$. For large ν the \mathbf{r} -integrand is sharply peaked around $r = \sigma$. Consequently the pair distribution function $g^{(2)}(r)$ can be replaced by its value at contact, $\chi \equiv g^{(2)}(\sigma+)$.

The analysis is now reduced to a one body problem in the soft sphere potential. The detailed calculations are still rather technical, and will be published elsewhere. The final result is

$$C_F(t) \simeq (\gamma_\infty/\tau_\nu)\mathcal{S}(t/\tau_\nu). \quad (\text{V.2})$$

where the crossover function $\mathcal{S}(\tau)$ is found as,

$$\mathcal{S}(\tau) \equiv \left(\frac{d}{d\tau}\right)^2 2\tau \int_0^\infty dy e^{-y^2} y^3 \coth \tau y. \quad (\text{V.3})$$

Interestingly, the crossover function is independent of the dimensionality d , and depends on the exponent ν only through the scaling variable $\tau = \nu t/t_\sigma$. All explicit ν -dependence in (V.2) is accounted for in the overall factor ν contained in $1/\tau_\nu$.

The crossover function $\mathcal{S}(\tau)$ can be expanded, both at short and at long times, in a convergent infinite series with




FIG. 2: Figure (a) shows the exact scaling function $\mathcal{S}(\tau)$ (solid line) together with the phenomenological one $1/\cosh(\tau\sqrt{2})$ (triangles), as discussed in the text. The insert shows the same on a logarithmic scale, in order to visualize the differences between the exact and phenomenological one at large τ . Figure (b) shows the scaling function $\mathcal{F}(\tau)$ for the VACF together with its large- τ asymptote (dashed line).

known coefficients, of which we quote the leading terms,

$$\mathcal{S}(\tau) \simeq \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\pi}(1-\tau^2) + \mathcal{O}(\tau^4) & (\tau < \pi) \\ \frac{\pi^4}{5}\tau^{-5} + \mathcal{O}(\tau^{-7}) & (\tau > \pi) \end{cases} \quad (\text{V.4})$$

A numerical evaluation is shown in Figure 2.

The scaling property was first noticed in the MD simulation results of Powles and collaborators [1, 2, 3, 4]. In that work a phenomenological crossover function $\propto 1/\cosh(\tau\sqrt{2})$ has been used, which decays exponentially. The insert in Figure 2 also shows that it is correct at short times, but decays too fast at longer times.

The short time behavior for the soft sphere fluid (fixed, but large ν) occurs for $\tau = t/\tau_\nu \ll \pi$ and therefore is obtained from the small- τ behavior in (V.4),

$$C_F(t) = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{dt_E} \left(\frac{1}{\tau_\nu} \right) [1 - (t/\tau_\nu)^2 + \mathcal{O}((t/\tau_\nu)^4)]. \quad (\text{V.5})$$

To describe the crossover to the hard sphere fluid we observe that

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\tau_\nu} \mathcal{S} \left(\frac{t}{\tau_\nu} \right) = \delta^+(t) \quad (\text{V.6})$$

can be considered as a delta function on the interval $(0, \infty)$, i.e.

$$\int_0^\infty dt \delta^+(t) = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^\infty d\tau \mathcal{S}(\tau) = 1. \quad (\text{V.7})$$

Its value at $t = 0$ is infinite, and vanishes at $t \neq 0$, because $\mathcal{S}(0) \neq 0$ and $\mathcal{S}(\infty) = 0$. The hard sphere behavior ($\nu \rightarrow \infty$) at *small, but fixed* t , is obtained from the large- τ behavior of $\mathcal{S}(\tau)$ in (V.4) and (V.6), and yields for $t/\tau_\nu > \pi$ or $\nu > \pi t_\sigma/t$,

$$C_F(t) = \frac{2}{dt_E} \left(\frac{1}{\tau_\nu} \right) \left(\delta^+ \left(\frac{t}{\tau_\nu} \right) + \frac{1}{5}\pi^4 (\tau_\nu/t)^5 + \mathcal{O}((t/\tau_\nu)^7) \right). \quad (\text{V.8})$$

The first term inside the curly brackets represents the dominant contribution to the hard sphere FACF in (III.6) at short times, and the second term represents the dominant correction to the limiting result. The identification of the

crossover function and demonstration that it generates a delta function singularity is one of the main results of this work. It provides the basis for understanding the connection between the soft sphere VACF and the singular form of the hard sphere VACF shown in (III.6). It is noted that the coefficient of the delta function arising from (V.2) is exactly the same as that of (III.6) coming from transformation of the Helfand formula.

B. Stress Autocorrelation Function (SACF)

Application of this analysis to the collisional transfer or vv-parts of the correlation functions for the shear viscosity, bulk viscosity, and thermal conductivity leads to exact results for the short time crossover function of the form (V.2) with a different pre-factor, but with the same scaling form $\mathcal{S}(\tau)$. In the hard sphere limit this scaling form approaches according to (V.6) again to a Dirac delta function. The kk- and kv-parts of the time correlation functions at short times are less singular than the vv-parts. So the dominant short time singularity of the full time correlation functions is contained in the collisional transfer (vv) terms. We only quote explicitly the result for the stress-stress correlation function,

$$C_\eta(t) \simeq C_\eta^{vv}(t) \simeq (\eta_\infty/\tau_\nu)\mathcal{S}(t/\tau_\nu). \quad (\text{V.9})$$

Again, the delta function singularity and its prefactor associated with this result agree exactly with the singular part of (III.2).

C. Velocity Autocorrelation Function (VACF)

Finally we consider the VACF $C_D(t)$ for the soft sphere fluid, as defined in (II.5). It is regular at $t = 0$ with $C_D(t) = (1/\beta m)\{1 + \mathcal{O}(t^2)\}$ according to Table I. On the other hand, for the hard sphere fluid $\tilde{C}_D(t) = (1/\beta m)\{1 - \gamma_\infty|t|/t_\sigma + \dots\}$ is linear in t at small positive t . Again, computing the dominant contribution of the pair force autocorrelation function with pair dynamics we recover the result of [7],

$$C_D(t) = \frac{1}{\beta m} \{1 + \gamma_\infty \tau_\nu \mathcal{F}(\tau)\} = C_D(0) \left\{1 + \frac{4\Delta}{\sqrt{\pi}} \mathcal{F}(\tau)\right\} \quad (\text{V.10})$$

with $\Delta = bn\chi$ and $\tau = t/\tau_\nu$, and the new crossover function is

$$\mathcal{F}(\tau) = 2 \int_0^\infty dy e^{-y^2} y^2 (1 - \tau y \coth \tau y). \quad (\text{V.11})$$

The function $\mathcal{F}(\tau)$ is simple related to $\mathcal{S}(\tau)$ by

$$(d^2/d\tau^2)\mathcal{F}(\tau) = -\mathcal{S}(\tau). \quad (\text{V.12})$$

This is consistent with the exact relationship of the VACF and the FACF, $C_F(t) = -\beta m \ddot{C}_D(t)$. The initial conditions on $\mathcal{F}(\tau)$ as $\tau \rightarrow 0$ can be read off from location (D, kk) in Table I to be $\mathcal{F}(0) = 0$ and $\mathcal{F}'(0) = 0$, which determines the two integration constants.

The small and large τ -expansions of $\mathcal{F}(\tau)$ are for positive τ ,

$$\mathcal{F}(\tau) \simeq \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\pi}\tau^2 + \mathcal{O}(\tau^4) & (\tau < \pi) \\ -\tau + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\pi} - \frac{\pi^4}{60}\tau^{-3} + \mathcal{O}(\tau^{-5}) & (\tau > \pi) \end{cases} \quad (\text{V.13})$$

The short time behavior in the soft sphere system at fixed, but large ν is now found to be,

$$C_D(t) \simeq \frac{1}{\beta m} \{1 - \Delta(t/\tau)^2 + \mathcal{O}((t/\tau_\nu)^4)\}. \quad (\text{V.14})$$

This is the explicit form of the short time behavior of $C_D(t)$, listed in schematic form in Table I on location (D, kk) for the smooth interactions case. Similarly we find for large t/τ_ν behavior (with t fixed, but small),

$$C_D(t) \simeq \frac{1}{\beta m} \{1 - (4\Delta/\sqrt{\pi})[t/\tau_\nu - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\pi}] + \mathcal{O}(\tau_\nu^3)\}, \quad (\text{V.15})$$

where the first two terms inside the curly brackets represent the behavior of the VACF for hard spheres at small t , as given schematically in Table I, and explicitly in (IV.1). Note that the dominant correction of $\mathcal{O}(\nu^{-1})$ to the hard sphere result is independent of t , and decreases very slowly with ν .




FIG. 3: Force autocorrelation function (FACF) as a function of $\tau = t/\tau_\nu$ (solid line) for packing fraction 0.3 and $\nu = 1152$, compared with MD simulations (circles). The insert shows the same except on a logarithmic scale, in order to make manifest that the asymptotic theory breaks down at large τ .

VI. COMPARISON WITH SIMULATIONS

During the past five years Powles and collaborators have carried out a systematic study of the short time dynamics for the soft sphere fluid by molecular dynamics simulation. They report results at two packing fractions 0.3 and 0.45, corresponding to a moderately dense fluid, for the range of exponents $\nu = 12, 24, 36, 72, 144, 526$, and 1152. This is done for the correlation functions occurring in the Green-Kubo expressions for shear and bulk viscosity, thermal conductivity, self-diffusion coefficient, and the force autocorrelation function. These results provide extensive data to test and interpret the theoretical predictions made here. As only partial results have been given here, for the FACF, SACF and VACF, the comparison will be limited to these cases. Furthermore, attention will be restricted to the packing fraction 0.3 and $\nu = 1152$. These are the best conditions for the separation of time scales $\tau_\nu \ll \min\{t_E, t_\sigma\}$.

We first observe that our theoretical results are *asymptotically exact*, i.e. ν has to be large enough such that on the one hand the gap between τ_ν and the minimum of $\{t_E, t_\sigma\}$ is sufficiently large to test the predictions for asymptotically large $\tau = t/\tau_\nu$, and on the other hand t has to be short enough, i.e. $t \ll t_E$, such that the dynamics of the isolated pairs describes the full time evolution of the N -particle system. An estimate at $\xi = 0.3$ and $\nu = 1152$ gives: $t_E \simeq 125\tau_\nu \simeq 0.099t_\sigma$, illustrating that the time scales are well separated.

It is useful to anticipate the results of the comparison between the short time scaling behavior determined here and that from the simulations. Since the results here are asymptotically exact, there must be agreement in all cases where $\tau_\nu \ll \{t_E, t_\sigma\}$ and $t \ll t_E$. There will then be the crossover domain where the short time form begins to fail. However, the long time form of the scaling functions represents the "short time" dynamics of a hard sphere fluid (fixed small t , large ν), as indicated in the previous section. This is the domain for which the VACF exhibits behavior, linear in t .

What happens for larger t , where the decay of the VACF becomes exponential, rather than linear (say for $t > 0.5t_E$), is strictly outside the predictions of the present theory, and no exact results are known for these larger time intervals. Of course the results may still be compared with the Enskog theory for hard sphere fluids, but we do not consider approximate results in the present article. Similarly, the singular part of the FACF and SACF will be very small on this kinetic time scale, and no predictions on the regular parts of these functions, $\delta C_F(\tau)$ and $\delta C_\eta(t)$, can be given in the context of the present theory. We note that these regular parts contain, among other, the full kk- and kv-parts of $C_\eta(t)$.

Consider first the FACF. Figure 3 shows that the agreement between the short time crossover function and MD simulation is excellent at very short times. The insert shows the same data on a logarithmic scale to discover that




FIG. 4: Stress autocorrelation function (SACF) as a function of $\tau = t/\tau_\nu$ (solid line) for packing fraction 0.3 and $\nu = 1152$, compared to MD simulations (solid circles). The insert is a logarithmic plot of the same data, to show that the asymptotic theory breaks down for large τ values. Note that the MD data (open circles) for the collisional (vv) part of the SACF agree with the theory over a larger time interval than the full SACF, as is to be expected.

deviations occur for $\tau \geq 3$. Figure 4 shows a similar representation for the SACF. Also shown in the insert for this figure is the potential part of the correlation function. It is seen that the agreement between the crossover function and the potential part is again excellent up to about $\tau = 4$.

The VACF shows a smoother crossover to the hard sphere behavior. Figure 5 shows the good agreement for $\tau \leq 4$, and also shows clearly the crossover to the hard sphere form, as follows from the long time expansion. The extrapolation of this hard sphere form to $t = 0$ gives a value different from 1, due to the crossover to soft sphere behavior near $t = 0$. As ν increases this short time domain goes to zero and the offset for the hard sphere form goes to zero, as shown by the lower dashed curve. The large- τ asymptote, $y = \tau - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\pi}$, shows a horizontal shift $\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\pi}$, as follows from the asymptotic expansion (V.15).

VII. CONCLUSIONS

The exact short time dynamics has been calculated for the force, stress, and velocity autocorrelation functions for the special case of a power law potential with large negative exponent. The analysis applies for times much shorter than the mean free time between pair collisions t_E , but includes times less than and greater than the time $\tau_\nu = t_\sigma/\nu$, which is the time a particle needs to traverse the steep part of the potential. This latter interval around τ_ν is referred to here as the crossover domain because the dynamics is characteristic of fluids with smooth interactions at the shorter times ($t < \tau_\nu$), but becomes more representative of a hard sphere fluid at longer times ($\tau_\nu \ll t \ll t_E$). The results can be all expressed in a single universal scaling functions, $\mathcal{S}(\nu t/t_\sigma)$, which is the autocorrelation function of the pair force, $\langle F_{12,x}(0)F_{12,x}(t) \rangle_o$ at times $t \ll t_E$. It is independent of the dimensionality of the system.

Thus, identification of the crossover dynamics allows several conceptual and quantitative questions to be addressed regarding the relationship of fluids with steeply repulsive interactions to those of the hard sphere fluid. To pose such questions it is important to have detailed results for the hard sphere fluid. There are complications due to the singular nature of the interactions. For example, the correlation functions associated with the Green-Kubo expressions for transport coefficients involve fluxes with forces that are ill-defined for hard spheres. Similarly, the usual Hamiltonian dynamics for these correlation functions is no longer applicable for hard spheres.

The first part of our analysis here was to show how these problems could be handled, with well defined expressions for the hard sphere fluid. First, the Helfand representation for transport coefficients was recalled as an equivalent alternative to the Green-Kubo forms. It was shown in Appendix A how this representation could be used, together




FIG. 5: Velocity autocorrelation function (VACF) as a function of $\tau = t/\tau_v$ for packing fraction 0.3 and $\nu = 1152$ (solid circles), compared to MD simulations (solid circles). Also shown is the same asymptote as in figure 2(b), parallel to the exact initial slope γ_D and shifted by the constant "offset" in Eq.(V.15).

with an appropriate pseudo-Liouville dynamics to arrive at the corresponding Green-Kubo expressions for the hard sphere fluid. Interestingly, these differ in form from those for smooth interactions by constant contributions due to instantaneous collisional transfer contributions from initial configurations of particles at contact. This implies that there appears in the hard sphere limit ($\nu \rightarrow \infty$) a delta function singularity in the correlation functions starting with smooth interactions. The exact short time behavior of the velocity autocorrelation function and kinetic-kinetic parts of the Green-Kubo time correlations functions, are described by the scaling function $\mathcal{F}(\nu t/t_\sigma)$, which satisfies $d^2\mathcal{F}(\tau)/d\tau^2 = -\mathcal{S}(\tau)$. In the hard sphere limit these functions have cusp singularities, with exact short time expansions, depending linearly on the magnitude of t , while the corresponding functions for the smooth interactions are analytic in time.

A primary result reported here is the identification of a single crossover function $\mathcal{S}(\tau)$ that describes the short time dynamics of all of these time correlation functions for smooth interactions. The above anomalous differences between smooth and hard interactions can be understood qualitatively and quantitatively from the properties of this function. For the stress autocorrelation function it yields a delta function singularity showing the consistency between the different Green-Kubo forms for smooth and hard interactions. It also shows the non-uniform nature of the short time limit with respect to the steepness of the potential, explaining the differences between the analytic and non-analytic forms of the short time expansions for smooth and hard interactions, respectively.

VIII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research of JWD was supported by Department of Energy grant DE-FG02-02ER54677.

Appendix A: Pseudo-Liouville and Binary Collision Operators

The time evolution of any phase function $A(t)$, evolving under hard sphere dynamics with diameter σ can be described for positive times ($t > 0$) by the forward generator $A(t) = e^{tL_+} A(0)$ with the pseudo-Liouville operator L_+ [13].

The equilibrium time correlation functions necessarily satisfies the relation $\langle A(0)B(t) \rangle_o = \langle B(0)A(-t) \rangle_o$ because of stationarity. This requires in the hard sphere case a *backward* generator e^{-tL_-} ($t > 0$), where

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\pm} &= L_0 \pm \sum_{i < j} T_{\pm}(ij) \\ L_0 &= \sum_i \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \nabla_i \\ T_{\pm}(ij) &= \sigma^{d-1} \int^{(\mp)} d\hat{\sigma} |\mathbf{g}_{ij} \cdot \hat{\sigma}| \delta(\mathbf{r}_{ij} - \sigma) (b_{\sigma} - 1) . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The superscript on the $\hat{\sigma}$ -integral denotes the constraints ($\mp \mathbf{g}_{ij} \cdot \hat{\sigma} > 0$). The b_{σ} -operator is a substitution operator, executing the collision laws, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} b_{\sigma} \mathbf{v}_i &= \mathbf{v}'_i = \mathbf{v}_i - (\mathbf{g}_{ij} \cdot \hat{\sigma}) \hat{\sigma} \\ b_{\sigma} \mathbf{v}_j &= \mathbf{v}'_j = \mathbf{v}_j + (\mathbf{g}_{ij} \cdot \hat{\sigma}) \hat{\sigma}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

The stationarity of the time correlation function under hard sphere dynamics for positive t is expressed as,

$$\langle B e^{tL_+} A \rangle_o \equiv \int d\Gamma \rho_o B e^{tL_+} A = \int d\Gamma \rho_o A e^{-tL_-} B \equiv \langle A e^{-tL_-} B \rangle_o, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where the operators L_{\pm} and $e^{\pm tL_{\pm}}$ inside the thermal averages $\langle \dots \rangle_o$ are always preceded by an N -particle equilibrium distribution function ρ_o . It includes the overlap function $W(N)$, which vanishes for overlapping configurations (with at least one pair distance $r_{ij} < \sigma$), and $W(N) = 1$ for non-overlapping configurations. For the derivation of these and other properties we refer to the original literature [13].

The only additional properties needed in this article are the conservation laws for the summational invariants $a_i = \{1, \mathbf{v}_i, v_i^2\}$, where

$$T_{\pm}(ij)(a_i + a_j) = 0. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

An important application of (A.3) in the present context is the interpretation of the Einstein-Helfand formulas (II.8) with the time correlation function $\langle (M(t) - M(0))^2 \rangle_o$ for hard sphere fluids. There is a caveat here. The phase function with $A(t)B(t)$ and $t > 0$ can only be expressed in hard sphere generators as $e^{tL_+} A(0)B(0)$. It is *not* equal to $(e^{tL_+} A(0))(e^{tL_+} B(0))$, because e^{tL_+} is not a substitution operator, like the streaming operator e^{tL} for smooth interactions. One shows stationarity of an equal-time average as $\langle A(t)B(t) \rangle_o = \langle e^{tL_+} AB \rangle_o = \langle AB \rangle_o$, where we have used (A.3) and the relation (A.3) in the form $e^{-tL_-} 1 = 1$.

With this in mind the Helfand formula (II.8), say for the shear viscosity, can be expressed in hard sphere generators as,

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_V(t) &= \frac{\beta}{V} \left(\frac{d}{dt} \right) \langle M^2(0) - M(0)M(t) \rangle_o \\ &= -\frac{\beta}{V} \left(\frac{d}{dt} \right) \langle M e^{tL_+} M \rangle_o = -\frac{\beta}{V} \langle M e^{tL_+} L_+ M \rangle_o. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Application of (A.3) and use of the identity,

$$e^{-tL_-} = 1 - \int_0^t ds e^{-sL_-} L_-, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

allows us to transform the Helfand formula for hard spheres into,

$$\eta_V(t) = -\frac{\beta}{V} \langle M L_+ M \rangle_o + \frac{\beta}{V} \int_0^t ds \langle (L_- M) e^{sL_+} L_+ M \rangle_o. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

This relation is used in (III.2) of the main text.

-
- [1] J.G. Powles, G. Rickkayzen and D. M. Heyes, Proc.R. Soc. Lond. A **455**, 3725-3742 (1999).
[2] J.G. Powles and D.M. Heyes, Molec. Phys. **98**, 917-927 (2000).
[3] D.M. Heyes and J.G. Powles, Molec. Phys. **99**, 1077-1089 (2001).

- [4] D.M. Heyes, J.G. Powles and G. Rickayzen, *Molec. Phys.* **100**, 595-610 (2002).
- [5] P. G. de Gennes, *Physica* **25**, 825 (1959); A. Rahman, K. S. Singwi, and A. Sjolander, *Phys. Rev.* **126**,986 (1962); B. Nijboer and A. Rahman, *Physica* bf 32, 415 (1966).
- [6] H. C. Longuet-Higgins and J. A. Pople, *J. Chem. Phys.* **25**, 884 (1956); J. Lebowitz, J. Percus, and J. Sykes, *Phys. Rev.* **188**, 487 (1969); V. Sears, *Phys. Rev. A* **5**, 452 (1972); J. Sykes, *J. Stat. Phys.* **8**, 279 (1973).
- [7] I. M. de Schepper, *Phys. Rev. A* **24**, 2789 (1981).
- [8] M. H. Ernst and J. W. Dufty (to be published).
- [9] R. W. Zwanzig and R. D. Mountain, *J. Chem. Phys.* **43**, 4464 (1965).
- [10] J.R. Dorfman, M.H. Ernst and E.G.D. Cohen, *Physica* 31 (1965) 493.
- [11] P. Gaspard and J.R. Dorfman, *Phys. Rev. E*, **52**, 3525 (1995).
- [12] D. Heyes, *J. Chem. Phys.* **107**, 1963 (1997); D. Heyes and J. Powles, *Molec. Phys.***95**, 259 (1998).
- [13] M. Ernst, J. Dorfman, W. Hoegy, and J. van Leeuwen, *Physica* **45**, 127 (1969); J. Sengers, M. Ernst, and D. Gillespie, *J. Chem. Phys.* 56, 5583 (1972).
- [14] E. Helfand, *Phys. Rev.* **119**, 1 (1960).
- [15] M. P. Allen and D. J. Tildesley, *Computer Simulation of Liquids*, (Larendron Press, Oxford, 1988).
- [16] J. W. Dufty, *Molec. Phys.* **100**, 2331 (2002).
- [17] J-P. Boon and S. Yip, *Molecular Hydrodynamics*, (McGraw-Hill, NY, 1980).
- [18] I.M. de Schepper, M.H. Ernst and E.G.D. Cohen, *J.S.Phys.*, **25**, 321 (1981).
- [19] S.Chapman and T.G. Cowling, *Th Mathematical Theory of Non-uniform Gases* (University Press, Cambridge, 1960).