

# Notes on Kiefer 2012

Yi-Fan Wang

October 13, 2017

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Parametrised and relational systems</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Particle systems . . . . .	1
1.1.1	Parametrised non-relativistic particle . . . . .	1

## 1 Parametrised and relational systems

### 1.1 Particle systems

Gitman and Tyutin 1990; Prokhorov and Shabanov 2009; H. J. Rothe and K. D. Rothe 2010 can also be helpful.

#### 1.1.1 Parametrised non-relativistic particle

The advantage of the complication below is to clarify the steps at which the constraints are not to be imposed.

**Un-parametrised system** The action reads

$$S[q] := \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt L(q, q'), \quad (1.1)$$

where

$$q' := \frac{dq}{dt}. \quad (1.2)$$

It can be rephrased (see below) in the velocity formalism Gitman and Tyutin 1990, ch. 2

$$S[q, p, v] := \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \{p(q' - v) + L^v(q, v)\}, \quad (1.3)$$

in which

$$L^v(q, v) := L(q, q'). \quad (1.4)$$

Variation of eq. (1.3) with respect to  $(q, p, v)$  gives

$$\frac{\partial L^v}{\partial q}(q, v) = p', \quad \frac{\partial L^v}{\partial v}(q, v) = p, \quad q' = v, \quad (1.5)$$

respectively. Eliminating  $(p, v)$  in eq. (1.5) recovers the Euler–Lagrange equation.

To move to the Hamiltonian formalism, transforms the action in eq. (1.3)

$$\begin{aligned} S[q, p, v] &\equiv \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \{pq' - (pv - L^v(q, v))\} \\ &=: \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \{pq' - H^v(q, p, v)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

One may solve  $v$  by  $(q, p)$  from the second equation in eq. (1.5) by partially inverse the function  $\frac{\partial L^v}{\partial v}(q, v)$ , and denote the solution by

$$v = \bar{v}(q, p). \quad (1.7)$$

In the current case, all velocity can be solved, and one passes to the *canonical Hamiltonian* in one leap

$$H^c(q, p) := H^v(q, p, \bar{v}(q, p)) \equiv p\bar{v}(q, p) - L^v(q, \bar{v}(q, p)). \quad (1.8)$$

**Parametrised system** Parametrising  $t$  in eq. (1.1) gives

$$S[q, t] = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} d\tau \tilde{L}(q, t, \dot{q}, \dot{t}), \quad (1.9)$$

where

$$\tilde{L}(q, t, \dot{q}, \dot{t}) := tL\left(q, \frac{\dot{q}}{\dot{t}}\right), \quad \dot{f}(q, t) := \frac{df}{d\tau}(q, t). \quad (1.10)$$

The corresponding velocity formalism reads

$$\begin{aligned} S[q, t, p_q, p_t, u, N] &:= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} d\tau \{p_q(\dot{q} - u) + p_t(\dot{t} - N) + \tilde{L}^v(q, t, u, N)\} \\ &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} d\tau \left\{ p_q(\dot{q} - u) + p_t(\dot{t} - N) + NL^v\left(q, \frac{u}{N}\right) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.11)$$

Variation of eq. (1.11) with respect to  $u$  gives

$$p_q = \frac{\partial \tilde{L}^v}{\partial u} \equiv \frac{L^v}{v}\left(q, \frac{u}{N}\right), \quad (1.12)$$

whereas the variation with respect to  $N$  leads to

$$p_t = \frac{\partial \tilde{L}^v}{\partial N} \equiv L^v\left(q, \frac{u}{N}\right) - \frac{u}{N} \cdot \frac{\partial L^v}{\partial v}\left(q, \frac{u}{N}\right). \quad (1.13)$$

Can one in this case solve both  $(u, N)$  by  $(q, t, p_q, p_t)$  from eqs. (1.12) and (1.13)? The answer is negative. With the help of eq. (1.7), one finds

$$\frac{u}{N} = \bar{v}(q, p_q) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad u = \bar{u}(q, p_q, N) := N\bar{v}(q, p_q). \quad (1.14)$$

from eq. (1.12) (compare it with the second equation in eq. (1.5)!) . Inserting eqs. (1.7), (1.12) and (1.14) into eq. (1.13) yields

$$p_t = L^v(q, \bar{v}(q, p_q)) - \bar{v}(q, p_q) \cdot p_q \equiv H^c(q, p_q). \quad (1.15)$$

One sees that eq. (1.15) contains no more velocity, and  $N$  cannot be solved by the positions and momenta.

Inserting the partially solved set of velocities, the action eq. (1.11) reads

$$\begin{aligned}
S[q, t, p_q, p_t, N] &:= S[q, t, p_q, p_t, \bar{u}, N] \\
&= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \mathbb{d}\tau \left\{ p_q \dot{q} + p_t \dot{t} - [p_q \bar{u} + p_t N - \tilde{L}^v(q, t, \bar{u}, N)] \right\} \\
&=: \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \mathbb{d}\tau \left\{ p_q \dot{q} + p_t \dot{t} - \tilde{H}^p(q, t, p_q, p_t, N) \right\}, \tag{1.16}
\end{aligned}$$

in which

$$\tilde{H}^p = N \tilde{H}_\perp(q, p_q), \quad \tilde{H}_\perp := p_t + H^c(q, p_q) \tag{1.17}$$

are the *Hamiltonian with primary constraints* and *Hamiltonian constraint*, respectively. The canonical Hamiltonian in this case vanishes, since there are only constraints in  $H^p$  and nothing else left.

## References

- Gitman, Dmitriy M. and Igor V. Tyutin (1990). *Quantization of Fields with Constraints*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-83938-2. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-83938-2>.
- Kiefer, Claus (2012). *Quantum Gravity*. 3rd. Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199585205.001.0001. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199585205.001.0001>.
- Prokhorov, Lev V. and Sergei V. Shabanov (2009). *Hamiltonian Mechanics of Gauge Systems*. Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/cbo9780511976209. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511976209>.
- Rothe, Heinz J and Klaus D Rothe (2010). *Classical and Quantum Dynamics of Constrained Hamiltonian Systems*. WORLD SCIENTIFIC. DOI: 10.1142/7689. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1142/7689>.