

Mechanics - Lecture 9 - 3/29/2022

Reminder where we are: the two alternative perspectives on classical mechanics are

- (1) The Lagrangian perspective: trajectories solve the EL eqns of a var'l prob

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} L(q, \dot{q}) dt$$

where $L: \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex in the 2nd variable (with faster-than-linear growth as $|\dot{q}| \rightarrow \infty$). In other words, they solve

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial q_i}(q, \dot{q}) - \frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}_i}(q, \dot{q}) = 0$$

where each term is evaluated at $q(t), \dot{q}(t) = \frac{d}{dt} q(t)$.

- (2) The Hamiltonian perspective: trajectories solve an ODE system of form

$$\dot{q}_i = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i} \quad , \quad \dot{p}_i = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial q_i}$$

where $H: \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex in p (again, a growth cond is needed too as $|p| \rightarrow \infty$).

Equivalence of these viewpoints is far from obvious in general, but for interacting particles solving

$$m_i \ddot{x}_i = - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} U(x_1, \dots, x_N)$$

it is elementary:

$$H = \sum_i \frac{1}{2} m_i^{-1} |p_i|^2 + U(q_1, \dots, q_N)$$

$$p_i = m_i \dot{x}_i, \quad q_i = x_i$$

$$L = \sum_i \frac{1}{2} m_i |\dot{q}_i|^2 - U(q_1, \dots, q_N)$$

$$q_i = x_i, \quad \dot{q}_i = \dot{x}_i$$

We'll discuss the equivalence in greater generality pretty soon, but first let's explore the implications + uses of these viewpoints.

We started last wk with the Lagrangian approach. A key takeaway (implicit but not explicit in that discussion) is that when there are no forces on a particle except the constraint to stay on a hypersurface, the

(Lagrangian) trajectories are constant-speed geodesics. Another takeaway was how easy it is to change coordinates.

A different use of Lagrangian perspective is to see how invariances of the Lagrangian lead to conservation laws.

Before starting that, let's review the entirely elementary facts that

a) For any Hamiltonian system

$$\dot{q}_i = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i}, \quad \dot{p} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial q_i}, \quad \frac{d}{dt} H(q(t), p(t)) = 0$$

[the pt is just chain rule]

b) For masses interacting by a pair potential

$$m_i \ddot{x}_i = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \sum_{j \neq k} V(|x_j - x_k|)$$

linear momentum is conserved
(assuming $m_i = \text{const}$ in time):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \sum_i m_i \dot{x}_i &= \sum_i m_i \ddot{x}_i \\ &= - \sum_{i \neq k} V'(|x_i - x_k|) \frac{x_i - x_k}{|x_i - x_k|} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \neq j} V'(|x_j - x_i|) \frac{x_j - x_i}{|x_j - x_i|} \end{aligned}$$

$$= 0$$

Note: in this setting Newton's law says

$$m_i \ddot{x}_i = \sum_{j \neq i} F_{ij} \quad \text{where } F_{ij} \parallel x_i - x_j \quad \text{and } F_{ji} = -F_{ij}$$

and preceding argt amounted to $\sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} F_{ij} = 0$ (since $F_{ij} = -F_{ji}$).

c) In the setting of (b) restricted to masses moving in $\mathbb{R}^3$, angular momentum is also conserved.

[Why just $\mathbb{R}^3$? Well, angular momentum is $\sum_i x_i \wedge m_i \dot{x}_i$. We need the vector crossproduct to define it!]

$$\frac{d}{dt} \sum_i x_i \wedge m_i \dot{x}_i = \sum_i x_i \wedge m_i \ddot{x}_i$$

(since $\dot{x}_i \wedge \dot{x}_i = 0$)

$$= \sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} x_i \wedge F_{ij}$$

Now, if $i \neq j$, $F_{ij} = c_{ij}(x_j - x_i)$ with $c_{ij} = c_{ji}$,
so

$$x_i \wedge F_{ij} + x_j \wedge F_{ji} = c_{ij} [x_i \wedge (x_j - x_i) + x_j \wedge (x_i - x_j)]$$

$$= c_{ij} [x_i \wedge x_j - x_j \wedge x_i]$$

$$= 0$$

$$\text{so } \sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} x_i \wedge F_{ij} = 0.$$

Presented this way, these laws look like mere accidents. Emmy Noether was the first to understand that they are special cases of a much more general principle, by which any one-parameter family of invariances of the Lagrangian leads to a conservation law.

Peter Olver has a nice talk about this result on his website

[www-users.cse.umn.edu/olver/t_/](http://www-users.cse.umn.edu/olver/t_/noetherth.pdf)

noetherth.pdf

(a 2015 talk). Rather than present a full treatment, I'll try to give the flavor of this result through some examples.

Example 1: Reduction of a 2D particle in a central force field to an ODE for $r(t)$ only: suppose a Newtonian

particle in $\mathbb{R}^2$ experiences force assoc to a potential $U(r)$ with $r = |x|$.
Using polar coords, and remembering that

$$\dot{x} = \dot{r} e_r + \dot{\theta} r e_\theta$$

$$L = \frac{1}{2} m (\dot{r}^2 + r^2 \dot{\theta}^2) - U(r)$$

and EL eqn for $\int L(r, \theta, \dot{r}, \dot{\theta}) dt$ is

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial r} = \frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{r}} \quad , \quad \frac{\partial L}{\partial \theta} = \frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{\theta}}$$

$$\Rightarrow -U'(r) + mr\dot{\theta}^2 = \frac{d}{dt}(m\dot{r})$$

$$0 = \frac{d}{dt}(mr^2\dot{\theta})$$

Assuming $m = \text{const}$, this gives

$$mr^2\dot{\theta} = c_0 \Rightarrow \dot{\theta} = \frac{c_0}{mr^2}$$

$$\Rightarrow m\ddot{r} = -U'(r) + \frac{c_1}{r^3}$$

with $c = \frac{c_0^2}{m}$. In particular, c_1 is constant (determined by m and the initial values of $r + \dot{\theta}$).

Essential mechanism of this calculation: The independence of L wrt θ (that is, the invariance of L wrt rotation about o) led to the conservation law $r^2 \dot{\theta} = \text{const}$

Example 2: If $L(q, \dot{q})$ has no explicit dependence on time then trajectories "conserve energy" in the sense that

$$E = \left(\sum_i \dot{q}_i \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}_i} \right) - L$$

is constant in time. [Note: we'll see later that if $L = T - U$ with $T = \frac{1}{2} \langle a(q) \dot{q}, \dot{q} \rangle$ for some symmetric -

matrix-valued $a(q)$, then the assoc Hamiltonian system uses $p_i = \sum_j a_{ij} \dot{q}_j$ and $H = \frac{1}{2} \langle a^{-1} p, p \rangle + U = T + U$. In this setting $\langle \dot{q}, \nabla_{\dot{q}} L \rangle = 2T$ so $E = 2T - L = 2T - (T - U) = T + U$ is the Hamiltonian, and this law is the familiar fact that $H = \text{const}$ along trajectories].

Pf: EL eqn $\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}_i} \right) = \frac{\partial L}{\partial q_i}$ gives (since L has no explicit time dependence)

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt} L &= \sum_i' \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}_i} \dot{q}_i + \sum_i' \frac{\partial L}{\partial \ddot{q}_i} \ddot{q}_i \\
&= \sum_i' \frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}_i} \right) \dot{q}_i + \sum_i' \frac{\partial L}{\partial \ddot{q}_i} \ddot{q}_i \\
&= \frac{d}{dt} \left(\sum_i' \dot{q}_i \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}_i} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Example 3: Cons of linear momentum comes similarly from translation invariance, ie hypoth that for any $\vec{a} \in \mathbb{R}^3$,

$$\frac{d}{dt} L(q_1 + t\vec{a}, \dots, q_N + t\vec{a}; \dot{q}_1, \dots, \dot{q}_N) = 0.$$

In fact this gives

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}_i} = 0 \text{ as a vector in } \mathbb{R}^3$$

Combining this with the EL eqn $\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}_i} = \frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \ddot{q}_i} \right)$ gives

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \ddot{q}_i} \right) = 0$$

ie

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial L}{\partial \ddot{q}_i} \text{ is constant along trajectories.}$$

Example 4: Cons of angular momentum comes from rotational invariance of the Lagrangian, ie from

$$L(q_1, \dots, q_N; \dot{q}_1, \dots, \dot{q}_N) \\ = L(Rq_1, \dots, Rq_N; R\dot{q}_1, \dots, R\dot{q}_N)$$

where $q_i = \text{posn of } i^{\text{th}} \text{ particle in } \mathbb{R}^3$, and $R = \text{any rotn of } \mathbb{R}^3$. Arg't is not unlike that of Example 3; see eg 2.9 of Landau + Lifshitz for details. Here I'll present just a special case, whose proof captures the main idea:

(*) for particles in $\mathbb{R}^3$ moving by

$$m_i \ddot{x}_i = - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} U(x_1, \dots, x_N),$$

if U is invariant under rotn abt $\vec{E}$ axis then the $\vec{E}$ component of angular momentum is conserved.

Proof of (*): recall that $L = \sum_i \frac{1}{2} m_i |\dot{q}_i|^2 - U$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dt} \sum_i [\mathbf{x}_i \wedge (m_i \dot{\mathbf{x}}_i)] \cdot \vec{e} \\
&= \frac{d}{dt} \sum_i \left[\mathbf{q}_i \wedge \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{\mathbf{q}}_i} \right] \cdot \vec{e} \\
&= \sum_i \left[\underbrace{\dot{\mathbf{q}}_i \wedge \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{\mathbf{q}}_i}}_{\substack{0 \text{ since} \\ \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{\mathbf{q}}_i} = m_i \dot{\mathbf{q}}_i}} + \mathbf{q}_i \wedge \frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{\mathbf{q}}_i} \right) \right] \cdot \vec{e} \\
&= \sum_i \left[\mathbf{q}_i \wedge \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{\mathbf{q}}_i} \right] \cdot \vec{e} \quad \text{since} \quad \frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{\mathbf{q}}_i} = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{q}_i}
\end{aligned}$$

Now we use the fact that if $\varphi_{\pm}(x)$ = rotn of x by angle $\pm$ about $\vec{e}$ axis,
 $\frac{d}{dt} \varphi_{\pm}(x) = \vec{e} \wedge \vec{x}$. So our hypothesis

on L says $\sum_i \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{\mathbf{q}}_i} \cdot (\vec{e} \wedge \mathbf{q}_i) = 0$

Using the vector identity $a \cdot (b \wedge c) = -b \cdot (a \wedge c)$
 [they're both $\det(a, b, c)$] we get

$$\left(\sum_i \mathbf{q}_i \wedge \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{\mathbf{q}}_i} \right) \cdot \vec{e} = 0.$$

So $(\sum_i \mathbf{x}_i \wedge m_i \dot{\mathbf{x}}_i) \cdot \vec{e}$ constant along trajectories.

The Hamiltonian viewpoint also has important consequences (which are non-obvious even for the simplest examples, such as particles in $\mathbb{R}^3$ interacting by conservative forces).

One is Liouville's Thm: the flow

$$\dot{q}_i = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i} \rightarrow \dot{p}_i = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial q_i}$$

is volume-preserving in the sense that it conserves the measure $dq_1 \dots dq_N dp_1 \dots dp_N$.

Proof: For any flow in Eucl space (in this case $\mathbb{R}^{6N}$ if the particles are in $\mathbb{R}^3$, but to start we can consider any flow $x \rightarrow \Phi_\pm(x)$ defined for $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$) we can consider its "infinitesimal generator"

$$\Phi_\pm(\vec{x}) = \vec{x} + \pm \vec{F}(\vec{x}) + \mathcal{O}(\pm^2)$$

where $\vec{F}(\vec{x}) = \left. \frac{d}{d\pm} \Phi_\pm(\vec{x}) \right|_{\pm=0}$ is a vector field.

The flow is volume-preserving iff $\vec{F}$ is divergence-free, since for any set D

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} (\text{vol of image of } D) = \int_D \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \det(I + t \nabla \vec{f})$$

$$= \int_D \text{div } \vec{f}.$$

Applying this to the Hamiltonian flow using $\vec{x} = (\vec{q}, \vec{p})$ and $\vec{f} = (\frac{\partial H}{\partial \vec{p}}, -\frac{\partial H}{\partial \vec{q}})$, we get

$$\text{div } \vec{f} = \sum_i \frac{\partial}{\partial q_i} \left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i} \right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} \left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial q_i} \right) = 0.$$

Liouville's thm has some surprising consequences, eg

Poincaré's recurrence thm: if g is a vol preserving map (eg the time-one map of a Hamiltonian flow) and $g(D) = D$ for some set D of finite volume, then g is "recurrent" in the sense that

for any set B of pos measure (eg a tiny ball), $\exists x_0 \in B$ st $g^n(x_0)$ is again in B for some $n < \infty$.

[Instructive examples: rotn of S^1 by a rational or irrational angle].

Proof of recurrence: clearly $B, g(B), g^2(B),$ etc cannot all be disjoint (since they are subsets of D and D has finite volume). So $\exists x, \text{ st } x \in g^k(B) \cap g^l(B)$ for some $l < k$. Then $x_0 = g^{-k}(x)$ satisfies $x_0 \in B \cap g^{l-k}(B)$, ie

$$x_0 \in B \text{ and } g^{k-l}(x_0) \in B$$

as claimed.

Typical mechanical consequence: consider motion of a ball in an asymmetric bowl under gravity.



Region of phase space st kinetic + potential energy $\leq \text{const}$ is invariant & has finite volume in the assoc 4-dim'l phase space. Take $B = \{ \text{initial velocity near } 0, \text{ initial posn near } x_* \}$ for any x_* . Then there's an x_0 near x_* and an initial velocity near 0 and an $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ st ball starting this way returns to be nearly at rest & nearly at x_0 after n iterations.

One more consequence of Hamiltonian framework is a scheme for "dimensional reduction": if H is independent, say, of q_1 , then problem reduces to Hamilton's eqns in $(q_2, \dots, q_N, p_2, \dots, p_N)$. In fact,

$$\frac{dp_1}{dt} = \frac{-\partial H}{\partial q_1} = 0 \quad \text{by hypoth,}$$

so $p_1 = \text{const}$ along the trajectory. (The const would be determined by the initial data.) We can then solve

$$\dot{p}_j = \frac{-\partial H}{\partial q_j}, \quad \dot{q}_j = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_j} \quad (j \geq 2)$$

(substituting the constant value of p_1 to evaluate the RHS). Finally, $q_1(t)$ can be found by integrating

$$\frac{dq_1}{dt} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_1}$$

along the resulting path.

This argument can be repeated. So if H depends on just one "spatial" variable then the evolution can be reduced to phase plane analysis. (Our Lagrangian

Example 1 was of this form; indeed, this dimension reduction idea amounts to a Hamiltonian perspective on that type of example. We'll show later that

$$H(q, p) = \sup_{\dot{q}} \langle p, \dot{q} \rangle - L(q, \dot{q})$$

and

$$L(q, \dot{q}) = \sup_p \langle \dot{q}, p \rangle - H(q, p)$$

so H is indep of $q_i \iff L$ is indep of $\dot{q}_i$.)