

Lecture Notes in Mathematics

1844

Editors:

J.-M. Morel, Cachan

F. Takens, Groningen

B. Teissier, Paris

Springer

Berlin

Heidelberg

New York

Hong Kong

London

Milan

Paris

Tokyo

Karl Friedrich Siburg

The Principle of Least Action in Geometry and Dynamics



Springer

Author

Karl Friedrich Siburg

Fakultät für Mathematik
Ruhr-Universität Bochum
44780 Bochum, Germany

e-mail: siburg@math.ruhr-uni-bochum.de

Library of Congress Control Number: 2004104313

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000): 37J , 53D, 58E

ISSN 0075-8434

ISBN 3-540-21944-7 Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg New York

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilm or in any other way, and storage in data banks. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the German Copyright Law of September 9, 1965, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer-Verlag. Violations are liable for prosecution under the German Copyright Law.

Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg New York a member of BertelsmannSpringer
Science + Business Media GmbH

<http://www.springer.de>

© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2004
Printed in Germany

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

Typesetting: Camera-ready \TeX output by the author

SPIN: 11002192 41/3142/du-543210 - Printed on acid-free paper

Preface

The motion of classical mechanical systems is determined by Hamilton's differential equations:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = \partial_y H(x(t), y(t)) \\ \dot{y}(t) = -\partial_x H(x(t), y(t)) \end{cases}$$

For instance, if we consider the motion of n particles in a potential field, the Hamiltonian function

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n y_i^2 - V(x_1, \dots, x_n)$$

is the sum of kinetic and potential energy; this is just another formulation of Newton's Second Law.

A distinguished class of Hamiltonians on a cotangent bundle T^*X consists of those satisfying the Legendre condition. These Hamiltonians are obtained from Lagrangian systems on the configuration space X , with coordinates $(x, \dot{x}) = (\text{space}, \text{velocity})$, by introducing the new coordinates $(x, y) = (\text{space}, \text{momentum})$ on its phase space T^*X . Analytically, the Legendre condition corresponds to the convexity of H with respect to the fiber variable y . The Hamiltonian gives the energy value along a solution (which is preserved for time-independent systems) whereas the Lagrangian describes the action. Hamilton's equations are equivalent to the Euler-Lagrange equations for the Lagrangian:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \partial_{\dot{x}} L(x(t), \dot{x}(t)) = \partial_x L(x(t), \dot{x}(t)).$$

These equations express the variational character of solutions of the Lagrangian system. A curve $x : [t_0, t_1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a Euler-Lagrange trajectory if, and only if, the first variation of the action integral, with end points held fixed, vanishes:

$$\delta \int_{t_0}^{t_1} L(x(t), \dot{x}(t)) dt \Big|_{x(t_0)}^{x(t_1)} = 0.$$

In other words, solutions extremize the action with fixed end points on each finite time interval.

This is not quite what one usually remembers from school¹, namely that solutions should *minimize* the action. The crucial point here is that the minimizing property holds only for short times. For instance, when looking at geodesics on the round sphere, the movement along a great circle ceases to be the shortest connection as soon as one comes across the antipodal point.

However, under certain circumstances there may well be action minimizing trajectories. The investigation of these minimal objects is one of the central topics of the present work. In fact, they do not always exist as genuine solutions, but they do so as invariant measures. This is the outcome of a theory by Mather and Mañé which generalizes Aubry–Mather theory from one to more degrees of freedom. In particular, there exist action minimizing measures with any prescribed “asymptotic direction” (described by a homological rotation vector). Associating to each such rotation vector the action of a minimal measure, we obtain the *minimal action* functional

$$\alpha : H_1(X, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

By construction, the minimal action does not describe the full dynamics but concentrates on a very special part of it. The fundamental question is how much information about the original system is contained in the minimal action?

The first two chapters of this book provide the necessary background on Aubry–Mather and Mather–Mañé theories. In the following chapters, we investigate the minimal action in four different settings:

1. convex billiards
2. fixed points and invariant tori
3. Hofer’s geometry
4. symplectic geometry.

We will see that the minimal action plays an important role in all four situations, underlining the significance of that particular variational principle.

1. Convex billiards. Can one hear the shape of a drum? This was Kac’ pointed formulation of the inverse spectral problem: is a manifold uniquely determined by its Laplace spectrum? We do know now that this is not true in full generality; for the class of smooth convex domains in the plane, however, this problem is still open.

We ask a somewhat weaker question for the length spectrum (i.e., the set of lengths of closed geodesics) rather than the Laplace spectrum, which is closely related to the previous one: how much geometry of a convex domain is determined by its length spectrum? The crucial observation is that one can consider this geometric problem from a more dynamical viewpoint. Namely,

¹ depending on the school, of course. . .

following a geodesic inside a convex domain that gets reflected at the boundary, is equivalent to iterating the so-called billiard ball map. The latter is a monotone twist map for which the minimal action is defined.

The main results from Chapter 3 can be summarized as follows.

Theorem 1. *For planar convex domains, the minimal action is invariant under continuous deformations of the domain that preserve the length spectrum.*

In particular, every geometric quantity that can be written in terms of the minimal action is automatically a length spectrum invariant.

In fact, the minimal action is a complete invariant and puts all previously known ones (e.g., those constructed in [2, 19, 63, 87]) into a common framework.

2. Fixed points and invariant tori. We consider a symplectic diffeomorphism in a neighbourhood of an elliptic fixed point in \mathbb{R}^2 . If the fixed point is of “general” type, the symplectic character of the map makes it possible (under certain restrictions) to find new symplectic coordinates in which the map takes a particularly simple form, the so-called Birkhoff normal form. The coefficients of this normal form, called Birkhoff invariants, are symplectically invariant.

The Birkhoff normal form describes an asymptotic approximation, in the sense that it coincides with the original map only up to a term that vanishes asymptotically when one approaches the fixed point. In general, it does not give any information about the dynamics away from the fixed point.

The main result in this context introduces the minimal action as a symplectically invariant function that contains the Birkhoff normal form, but also reflects part of the dynamics near the fixed point.

Theorem 2. *Associated to an area-preserving map near a general elliptic fixed point there is the minimal action α , which is symplectically invariant.*

It is a local invariant, i.e., it contains information about the dynamics near the fixed point. Moreover, the Taylor coefficients of the convex conjugate α^ are the Birkhoff invariants.*

Area-preserving maps near a fixed point occur as Poincaré maps of closed characteristics of three-dimensional contact flows. A particular example is given by the geodesic flow on a two-dimensional Riemannian manifold. In this case, the minimal action is determined by the length spectrum of the surface, and we obtain the following result.

Theorem 3. *Associated to a general elliptic closed geodesic on a two-dimensional Riemannian manifold there is the germ of the minimal action, which is a length spectrum invariant under continuous deformations of the Riemannian metric.*

The minimal action carries information about the geodesic flow near the closed geodesic; in particular, it determines its C^0 -integrability.

In higher dimensions, we consider a symplectic diffeomorphism ϕ in a neighbourhood of an invariant torus Λ . If we assume that the dynamics on Λ satisfy a certain non-resonance condition, one can transform ϕ into Birkhoff normal form again. If this normal form is positive definite the map ϕ determines the germ of the minimal action α , and we will show again that the minimal action contains the Birkhoff invariants as Taylor coefficients of α^* .

3. *Hofer's geometry.* Whereas the first three settings had many features in common, the viewpoint here is quite different. Instead of looking at a single Hamiltonian system, we investigate all Hamiltonian systems on a symplectic manifold (M, ω) at once, collected in the Hamiltonian diffeomorphism group $\text{Ham}(M, \omega)$. It is one of the cornerstones of symplectic topology that this group carries a bi-invariant Finsler metric d , usually called Hofer metric, which is constructed as follows.

Think of $\text{Ham}(M, \omega)$ as infinite-dimensional Lie group whose Lie algebra consists of all smooth, compactly supported functions $H : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with mean value zero. Introduce any norm $\|\cdot\|$ on those functions that is invariant under the adjoint action $H \mapsto H \circ \psi^{-1}$. Then the Hofer distance of a diffeomorphism ϕ from the identity is defined as the infimum of the lengths of all paths in $\text{Ham}(M, \omega)$ that connect ϕ to the identity:

$$d(\text{id}, \phi) = \inf \left\{ \int_0^1 \|H_t\| dt \mid \varphi_H^1 = \phi \right\}.$$

The problem is to choose the norm $\|\cdot\|$. The Hamiltonian system is determined by the first derivatives of H , but $\|dH\|_{C^0}$, for instance, is not invariant under the adjoint action. It turns out that the oscillation norm

$$\|\cdot\| = \text{osc} := \max - \min$$

is the right choice although it seems to have nothing to do with the dynamics. Loosely speaking, the Hofer metric generates a C^{-1} -topology and measures how much energy is needed to generate a given map.

The resulting geometry is far from being understood completely. This is due to the fact that, despite its simple definition, the Hofer distance is very hard to compute. After all, one has to take *all* Hamiltonians into account that generate the same time-1-map. A fundamental question concerns the relation between the Hofer geometry and dynamical properties of a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism: does the dynamical behaviour influence the Hofer geometry and, vice versa, can one infer knowledge about the dynamics from Hofer's geometry? Only little is known in this direction.

In Chap. 5, we take up this question for Hamiltonians on the cotangent bundle $T^*\mathbb{T}^n$ satisfying a Legendre condition. This leads to convex Lagrangians on $T\mathbb{T}^n$ for which the minimal action α is defined. On the other hand, the Hamiltonians under consideration are unbounded and do not fit into the framework of Hofer's metric. Therefore, we have to restrict them to

a compact part of $T^*\mathbb{T}^n$, e.g., to the unit ball cotangent bundle $B^*\mathbb{T}^n$, but in such a way that we stay in the range of Mather's theory.

Let α denote the minimal action associated to a convex Hamiltonian diffeomorphism on $B^*\mathbb{T}^n$. Our main result in this context shows that the oscillation of α^* , which is nothing but $\alpha(0)$, is a lower bound for the Hofer distance. This establishes a link between Hofer's geometry of convex Hamiltonian mappings and their dynamical behaviour.

Theorem 4. *If $\phi \in \text{Ham}(B^*\mathbb{T}^n)$ is generated by a convex Hamiltonian then*

$$d(\text{id}, \phi) \geq \text{osc } \alpha^* = \alpha(0).$$

4. Symplectic geometry. Consider the cotangent bundle $T^*\mathbb{T}^n$ with its canonical symplectic form $\omega_0 = d\lambda$. Here, λ is the Liouville 1-form which is $y dx$ in local coordinates (x, y) . Suppose $H : T^*\mathbb{T}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a convex Hamiltonian. Because H is time-independent the energy is preserved under the corresponding flow, i.e., all trajectories lie on (fiberwise) convex $(2n - 1)$ -dimensional hypersurfaces $\Sigma = \{H = \text{const.}\}$. Of particular importance in classical mechanics are so-called KAM-tori, i.e., invariant tori carrying quasiperiodic motion. These are graphs over the base manifold \mathbb{T}^n , with the additional property that the symplectic form ω_0 vanishes on them; submanifolds with the latter property are called Lagrangian submanifolds.

We want to study symplectic properties of Lagrangian submanifolds on convex hypersurfaces. To do so, we observe that a Lagrangian submanifold possesses a Liouville class a_Λ , induced by the pull-back of the Liouville form λ to Λ . The Liouville class is invariant under Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms, i.e., it belongs to the realm of symplectic geometry. On the other hand, being a graph is certainly *not* a symplectic property. Our starting question in this context is as follows: is it possible to move a Lagrangian submanifold Λ on some convex hypersurface Σ by a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism inside the domain U_Σ bounded by Σ ?

In a first part, we will see that, under certain conditions on the dynamics on Λ , it is impossible to move Λ at all; we call this phenomenon *boundary rigidity*. In fact, the Liouville class a_Λ already determines Λ uniquely.

Theorem 5. *Let Λ be a Lagrangian submanifold with conservative dynamics that is contained in a convex hypersurface Σ , and let K be another Lagrangian submanifold inside U_Σ . Then*

$$a_\Lambda = a_K \iff \Lambda = K.$$

What can happen if boundary rigidity fails? Surprisingly, even if it is possible to push Λ partly inside the domain U_Σ , it cannot be done completely. Certain pieces of Λ have to stay put, and we call them *non-removable intersections*. In the case where Σ is some distinguished "critical" level set, these non-removable intersections always contain an invariant subset with specific

dynamical behaviour; this subset is the so-called Aubry set from Mather–Mañé theory. This result reveals a hidden link between aspects of symplectic geometry and Mather–Mañé theory in modern dynamical systems.

Finally, we come back to the somewhat annoying fact that the property of being a Lagrangian section is not preserved under Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms. For this, we consider

Theorem 6. *Let U be a (fiberwise) convex subset U of $T^*\mathbb{T}^n$. Then every cohomology class that can be represented as the Liouville class of some Lagrangian submanifold in U , can actually be represented by a Lagrangian section contained in U .*

So, from this rather vague point of view at least, Lagrangian sections actually do belong to symplectic geometry.

Furthermore, the above result allows *symplectic* descriptions of seemingly non-symplectic objects: the stable norm from geometric measure theory, and also our favourite, the minimal action.

Theorem 7. *The stable norm of a Riemannian metric g on \mathbb{T}^n , and the minimal action of a convex Lagrangian $L : T\mathbb{T}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, both admit a symplectically invariant description.*

This closes the circle for our investigation of the Principle of Least Action in geometry and dynamics.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: On behalf of the many people who supported and encouraged me, I cordially thank Leonid Polterovich from Tel Aviv University and Gerhard Knieper from the Ruhr–Universität Bochum.

This book was written while I was a Heisenberg Research Fellow. I am grateful to the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft for its generous support.

Contents

1	Aubry–Mather theory	1
1.1	Monotone twist mappings	1
1.2	Minimal orbits	6
1.3	The minimal action for monotone twist mappings	8
2	Mather–Mañé theory	15
2.1	Mather’s minimal action	15
2.1.1	The minimal action for convex Lagrangians	16
2.1.2	A bit of symplectic geometry	21
2.1.3	Invariant tori and the minimal action	23
2.2	Mañé’s critical value	26
2.2.1	The critical value for convex Lagrangians	26
2.2.2	Weak KAM solutions	29
2.2.3	The Aubry set	32
3	The minimal action and convex billiards	37
3.1	Convex billiards	38
3.2	Length spectrum invariants	45
3.2.1	Classical invariants	49
3.2.2	The Marvizi–Melrose invariants	52
3.2.3	The Gutkin–Katok width	55
3.3	Laplace spectrum invariants	56
4	The minimal action near fixed points and invariant tori	59
4.1	The minimal action near plane elliptic fixed points	60
4.2	Contact flows in three dimensions	68
4.2.1	Spectral invariants	71
4.2.2	Length spectrum invariants of surfaces	74
4.3	The minimal action near positive definite invariant tori	76

5	The minimal action and Hofer’s geometry	81
5.1	Hofer’s geometry of $\text{Ham}(M, \omega)$	82
5.2	Estimates via the minimal action	89
6	The minimal action and symplectic geometry	97
6.1	Boundary rigidity in convex hypersurfaces	98
6.1.1	Graph selectors for Lagrangian submanifolds	98
6.1.2	Boundary rigidity	102
6.2	Non-removable intersections	105
6.2.1	Mather–Mañé theory for minimizing hypersurfaces	105
6.2.2	The Aubry set and non-removable intersections	110
6.3	Symplectic shapes and the minimal action	114
6.3.1	Lagrangian sections in convex domains	115
6.3.2	Symplectic descriptions of the stable norm and the minimal action	117
	References	121
	Index	127