# Integrability: Historic Overview

#### Alexander Veselov, Loughborough University

#### LMS-EPSRC Durham Symposium, July 25, 2016

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

Origins of Integrability - classical dynamics

◆□ ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 • 의 Q @</p>

- Origins of Integrability classical dynamics
- Integrability and XIX-century algebraic geometry

- Origins of Integrability classical dynamics
- Integrability and XIX-century algebraic geometry

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

Integrability in classical differential geometry

- Origins of Integrability classical dynamics
- Integrability and XIX-century algebraic geometry

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

- Integrability in classical differential geometry
- Integrability and quantum theory

Part I: Origins of Integrability - classical dynamics

<□ > < @ > < E > < E > E のQ @

# The magic of Johannes Kepler

On January 1, 1600 a teacher of mathematics and astronomy from Graz Johannes Kepler set off to Prague by invitation of Tycho Brahe, the imperial astronomer of the Holy Roman Emperor Rudolf II.



Figure: Kepler (1571-1630) and his "Mysterium Cosmographicum" (1596)

"Forerunner of the Cosmological Essays, Which Contains the Secret of the Universe; on the Marvelous Proportion of the Celestial Spheres, and on the True and Particular Causes of the Number, Magnitude, and Periodic Motions of the Heavens; Established by Means of the Five Regular Geometric Solids"

# Second attempt: conic sections



Figure: Apollonius's "Conics" (First Latin edition: Bononiae, 1566)

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

# Kepler's laws of planetary motion

First Kepler's Law (1605):

The orbits of the planets are ellipses with one of the foci at the Sun

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

# Kepler's laws of planetary motion

#### First Kepler's Law (1605):

The orbits of the planets are ellipses with one of the foci at the Sun

#### Second Kepler's Law (1602):

The sectorial velocity remains constant along the orbit



▲ロト ▲帰 ト ▲ ヨ ト ▲ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ・ の Q ()

# Kepler's laws of planetary motion

#### First Kepler's Law (1605):

The orbits of the planets are ellipses with one of the foci at the Sun

#### Second Kepler's Law (1602):

The sectorial velocity remains constant along the orbit



#### Third Kepler's Law (1619):

The square of the periods are proportional to the cube of the major semi-axes of the orbits

$$\frac{T_1^2}{T_2^2} = \frac{a_1^3}{a_2^3}.$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

# The breakthrough: Isaac Newton

Isaac Newton: Kepler's laws imply the Universal Gravity Law:



◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

# The breakthrough: Isaac Newton

Isaac Newton: Kepler's laws imply the Universal Gravity Law:







Figure: Isaac Newton (1642-1727) and his own copy of "Principia" (1687)

# The breakthrough: Isaac Newton

Isaac Newton: Kepler's laws imply the Universal Gravity Law:







Figure: Isaac Newton (1642-1727) and his own copy of "Principia" (1687)

The Mathematical Physics was born...

Very lucky...

◆□ ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 • 의 Q @</p>

Very lucky...

Consider the motion of particle under a **central force** with magnitude depending only on the distance r from the origin (centre):

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Very lucky...

Consider the motion of particle under a **central force** with magnitude depending only on the distance r from the origin (centre):



Bertrand (1873): If a central force system has all bounded orbits closed, then either

$$F(r) = \frac{\kappa}{r^2}$$
 (Newton's, or Coulomb's law),

or

$$F(r) = \kappa r$$
 (Hooke's law).

(日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

Very lucky ...

Consider the motion of particle under a **central force** with magnitude depending only on the distance r from the origin (centre):



Bertrand (1873): If a central force system has all bounded orbits closed, then either

$$F(r) = \frac{k}{r^2}$$
 (Newton's, or Coulomb's law),

or

$$F(r) = \kappa r$$
 (Hooke's law).

The same is true if we assume that all orbits are conic sections, although in that case we can allow the force to be repulsive (Bertrand, Darboux).

Very lucky ...

Consider the motion of particle under a **central force** with magnitude depending only on the distance r from the origin (centre):



Bertrand (1873): If a central force system has all bounded orbits closed, then either

$$F(r) = \frac{k}{r^2}$$
 (Newton's, or Coulomb's law),

or

$$F(r) = \kappa r$$
 (Hooke's law).

The same is true if we assume that all orbits are conic sections, although in that case we can allow the force to be repulsive (Bertrand, Darboux).

Albert Einstein: "God may be sophisticated, but not malicious."

#### Leonhard Euler (1760): Integrability of two-fixed centre problem



Figure: Orbits of two-fixed centre problem (produced by R. Sakamoto)

▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ★ 国▶ ★ 国▶ - 国 - のへで

# Hamiltonian formalism



Figure: Euler (1707-1787), Lagrange (1736-1813) and W.R. Hamilton (1805-1865)

William Rowan Hamilton (1837): Euler-Lagrange equations of mechanics can be re-written as **Hamiltonian systems** 

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

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

where i = 1, ..., n and H = H(p, q) is called **Hamiltonian** of the system.

# Hamiltonian formalism



Figure: Euler (1707-1787), Lagrange (1736-1813) and W.R. Hamilton (1805-1865)

William Rowan Hamilton (1837): Euler-Lagrange equations of mechanics can be re-written as Hamiltonian systems

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

where i = 1, ..., n and H = H(p, q) is called **Hamiltonian** of the system.

Define **Poisson bracket** of two functions F and G on the phase space  $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$  as

$$\{F,G\} := \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial p_{i}} \frac{\partial G}{\partial q_{i}} - \frac{\partial F}{\partial q_{i}} \frac{\partial G}{\partial p_{i}}\right).$$

The equations of motion can be re-written then in an elegant form

 $\dot{F} = \{H, F\}.$ 

$$\{F, G\} = -\{G, F\}$$

$$\{c_1F_1 + c_2F_2, G\} = c_1\{F_1, G\} + c_2\{F_2, G\}$$

$$\{FG, H\} = \{F, H\}G + F\{G, H\}$$

$$\{\{F, G\}, H\} + \{\{G, H\}, F\} + \{\{H, F\}, G\} = 0 \quad (Jacobi \ identity).$$

◆□ ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 • 의 Q @</p>

$$\{F, G\} = -\{G, F\}$$
  
$$\{c_1F_1 + c_2F_2, G\} = c_1\{F_1, G\} + c_2\{F_2, G\}$$
  
$$\{FG, H\} = \{F, H\}G + F\{G, H\}$$
  
$$\{\{F, G\}, H\} + \{\{G, H\}, F\} + \{\{H, F\}, G\} = 0 \quad (Jacobi \ identity).$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

In particular, the space of functions  $\mathcal{F}_{2n}$  on the phase space  $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$  forms an infinite-dimensional Lie algebra with respect to Poisson bracket.

$$\{F, G\} = -\{G, F\}$$
$$\{c_1F_1 + c_2F_2, G\} = c_1\{F_1, G\} + c_2\{F_2, G\}$$
$$\{FG, H\} = \{F, H\}G + F\{G, H\}$$
$$\{\{F, G\}, H\} + \{\{G, H\}, F\} + \{\{H, F\}, G\} = 0$$
 (Jacobi identity).

In particular, the space of functions  $\mathcal{F}_{2n}$  on the phase space  $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$  forms an infinite-dimensional Lie algebra with respect to Poisson bracket.

*F* is called an **integral** of the Hamiltonian system with Hamiltonian *H* if it is preserved by the flow:  $\dot{F} \equiv 0$ , or equivalently to

$$\{F, H\} \equiv 0.$$

$$\{F, G\} = -\{G, F\}$$
$$\{c_1F_1 + c_2F_2, G\} = c_1\{F_1, G\} + c_2\{F_2, G\}$$
$$\{FG, H\} = \{F, H\}G + F\{G, H\}$$
$$\{\{F, G\}, H\} + \{\{G, H\}, F\} + \{\{H, F\}, G\} = 0 \quad (Jacobi identity).$$

In particular, the space of functions  $\mathcal{F}_{2n}$  on the phase space  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$  forms an infinite-dimensional Lie algebra with respect to Poisson bracket.

*F* is called an **integral** of the Hamiltonian system with Hamiltonian *H* if it is preserved by the flow:  $\dot{F} \equiv 0$ , or equivalently to

$$\{F, H\} \equiv 0.$$

**Poisson's theorem.** Poisson bracket of two integrals is an integral of the same Hamiltonian system.

(日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

$$\{F, G\} = -\{G, F\}$$
$$\{c_1F_1 + c_2F_2, G\} = c_1\{F_1, G\} + c_2\{F_2, G\}$$
$$\{FG, H\} = \{F, H\}G + F\{G, H\}$$
$$\{\{F, G\}, H\} + \{\{G, H\}, F\} + \{\{H, F\}, G\} = 0 \quad (Jacobi identity).$$

In particular, the space of functions  $\mathcal{F}_{2n}$  on the phase space  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$  forms an infinite-dimensional Lie algebra with respect to Poisson bracket.

*F* is called an **integral** of the Hamiltonian system with Hamiltonian *H* if it is preserved by the flow:  $\dot{F} \equiv 0$ , or equivalently to

$$\{F, H\} \equiv 0.$$

**Poisson's theorem.** Poisson bracket of two integrals is an integral of the same Hamiltonian system.

**Corollary.** The integrals of a Hamiltonian system also form a Lie algebra with respect to the Poisson bracket.

# Integrals and symmetries: Noether's principle



Figure: Emmy Noether (1882-1935)

**Emmy Noether (1918)**: there is a correspondence between integrals and symmetries:

#### $INTEGRALS \leftrightarrow SYMMETRIES$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

# Integrals and symmetries: Noether's principle



Figure: Emmy Noether (1882-1935)

**Emmy Noether (1918)**: there is a correspondence between integrals and symmetries:

#### $INTEGRALS \leftrightarrow SYMMETRIES$

In particular, if F is an integral of the system  $\dot{\Phi} = \{H, \Phi\}$ , then  $\Phi' = \{F, \Phi\}$ is a (continuous) symmetry of this system.

## Integrals and symmetries: Noether's principle



Figure: Emmy Noether (1882-1935)

**Emmy Noether (1918)**: there is a correspondence between integrals and symmetries:

#### $INTEGRALS \leftrightarrow SYMMETRIES$

In particular, if F is an integral of the system  $\dot{\Phi} = \{H, \Phi\}$ , then  $\Phi' = \{F, \Phi\}$  is a (continuous) symmetry of this system.

**Example.** For a central force system in  $\mathbf{R}^3$  we have

Angular momentum  $M = p \times q \leftrightarrow Rotational$  symmetry.

Poisson algebra of components of M is nothing but the Lie algebra so(3):

$$\{M_1, M_2\} = M_3, \{M_2, M_3\} = M_1, \{M_3, M_1\} = M_2.$$

$$H=rac{1}{2}|oldsymbol{p}|^2+rac{1}{2}\omega^2|oldsymbol{q}|^2,\ oldsymbol{p},oldsymbol{q}\in\mathbb{R}^n$$

has the integrals  $M_{ij} = p_i q_j - p_j q_i$ , i < j, corresponding to rotational symmetry, and additional integrals

$$N_{ij} = p_i p_j + q_i q_j, \ i \leq j,$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

and the full symmetry algebra is the unitary Lie algebra u(n).

$$H=rac{1}{2}|oldsymbol{p}|^2+rac{1}{2}\omega^2|oldsymbol{q}|^2,\ oldsymbol{p},oldsymbol{q}\in\mathbb{R}^n$$

has the integrals  $M_{ij} = p_i q_j - p_j q_i$ , i < j, corresponding to rotational symmetry, and additional integrals

$$N_{ij} = p_i p_j + q_i q_j, \ i \leq j,$$

and the full symmetry algebra is the unitary Lie algebra u(n).

The orbits of isotropic harmonic oscillator are ellipses with centre at the origin.

$$H=rac{1}{2}|oldsymbol{p}|^2+rac{1}{2}\omega^2|oldsymbol{q}|^2,\ oldsymbol{p},oldsymbol{q}\in\mathbb{R}^n$$

has the integrals  $M_{ij} = p_i q_j - p_j q_i$ , i < j, corresponding to rotational symmetry, and additional integrals

$$N_{ij} = p_i p_j + q_i q_j, \ i \leq j,$$

and the full symmetry algebra is the unitary Lie algebra u(n).

The orbits of isotropic harmonic oscillator are ellipses with centre at the origin.

Indeed, assume for simplicity that  $\omega = 1$ , then the equations of motion are  $\dot{p} = -q$ ,  $\dot{q} = p$ , or for  $z = p + iq \in \mathbb{C}^n$ 

$$\dot{z} = iz$$
.

Its solutions are circles  $z = z_0 e^{it}$ . The orbits are their projections on *q*-space, which are ellipses.

(日) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

Kepler system has the Hamiltonian

$$H=rac{1}{2}|p|^2-rac{k}{|q|},\quad p,q\in \mathbf{R}^3.$$

(ロ)、(型)、(E)、(E)、 E) の(の)

It describes also the **Hydrogen atom**, which makes it probably the most important system in natural sciences.

Kepler system has the Hamiltonian

$$H=rac{1}{2}|p|^2-rac{k}{|q|}, \quad p,q\in \mathbf{R}^3.$$

It describes also the **Hydrogen atom**, which makes it probably the most important system in natural sciences.

Laplace (1799): a "hidden symmetry" of Kepler system: Laplace's vector, (also known as Runge-Lenz vector):

$$L = p \times M + \frac{kq}{|q|}.$$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

Kepler system has the Hamiltonian

$$H=rac{1}{2}|p|^2-rac{k}{|q|}, \quad p,q\in \mathbf{R}^3.$$

It describes also the **Hydrogen atom**, which makes it probably the most important system in natural sciences.

Laplace (1799): a "hidden symmetry" of Kepler system: Laplace's vector, (also known as Runge-Lenz vector):

$$L = p \times M + \frac{kq}{|q|}.$$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

Components of M and L form together a Lie algebra isomorphic to so(4), which is the full symmetry of Kepler system.
# Liouville integrability

We say that a Hamiltonian system in  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$  is **integrable in Liouville sense** (or, simply, **integrable**) if it has *n* independent integrals  $F_1, \ldots, F_n$  in involution:

 $\{F_i,F_j\}\equiv 0.$ 

## Liouville integrability

We say that a Hamiltonian system in  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$  is **integrable in Liouville sense** (or, simply, **integrable**) if it has *n* independent integrals  $F_1, \ldots, F_n$  in involution:

 $\{F_i, F_j\} \equiv 0.$ 

**Liouville-Arnold theorem.** Assume that a Hamiltonian system in  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$  has *n* independent integrals  $F_1 = H, F_2, \ldots, F_n$  in involution and consider a level set

 $M_c = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n} : F_j(x) = c_j, j = 1, \dots, n\}.$ 

We say that a Hamiltonian system in  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$  is **integrable in Liouville sense** (or, simply, **integrable**) if it has *n* independent integrals  $F_1, \ldots, F_n$  in involution:

$$\{F_i,F_j\}\equiv 0.$$

**Liouville-Arnold theorem.** Assume that a Hamiltonian system in  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$  has *n* independent integrals  $F_1 = H, F_2, \ldots, F_n$  in involution and consider a level set

$$M_c = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n} : F_j(x) = c_j, j = 1, \dots, n\}.$$

Assume that grad  $F_i$  are linearly independent on  $M_c$ . Then

1.  $M_c$  is a smooth manifold, invariant under the phase flows with Hamiltonians  $F_1, \ldots, F_n$ .

We say that a Hamiltonian system in  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$  is **integrable in Liouville sense** (or, simply, **integrable**) if it has *n* independent integrals  $F_1, \ldots, F_n$  in involution:

$$\{F_i,F_j\}\equiv 0.$$

**Liouville-Arnold theorem.** Assume that a Hamiltonian system in  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$  has *n* independent integrals  $F_1 = H, F_2, \ldots, F_n$  in involution and consider a level set

$$M_c = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n} : F_j(x) = c_j, j = 1, \dots, n\}.$$

Assume that grad  $F_j$  are linearly independent on  $M_c$ . Then

1.  $M_c$  is a smooth manifold, invariant under the phase flows with Hamiltonians  $F_1, \ldots, F_n$ .

2. If  $M_c$  is compact and connected, then it is diffeomorphic to a torus  $T^n = \{(\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n) \mod 2\pi\}.$ 

We say that a Hamiltonian system in  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$  is **integrable in Liouville sense** (or, simply, **integrable**) if it has *n* independent integrals  $F_1, \ldots, F_n$  in involution:

$$\{F_i,F_j\}\equiv 0.$$

**Liouville-Arnold theorem.** Assume that a Hamiltonian system in  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$  has *n* independent integrals  $F_1 = H, F_2, \ldots, F_n$  in involution and consider a level set

$$M_c = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n} : F_j(x) = c_j, j = 1, ..., n\}.$$

Assume that grad  $F_i$  are linearly independent on  $M_c$ . Then

1.  $M_c$  is a smooth manifold, invariant under the phase flows with Hamiltonians  $F_1, \ldots, F_n$ .

2. If  $M_c$  is compact and connected, then it is diffeomorphic to a torus  $T^n = \{(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n) \mod 2\pi\}.$ 

3. In a neighbourhood of such  $M_c$  there is a canonical change of variables  $(p, q) \rightarrow (I, \phi \mod 2\pi)$  (action-angle variables), such that in the new coordinates the Hamiltonian H = H(I). The flow is linear in angle variables:

$$\phi = \omega(I)t + \phi_0, \quad \omega_j(I) = rac{\partial H}{\partial I_i}(I),$$

so the orbits are winding lines on the corresponding torus. The second second



Figure: Joseph Liouville (1809-1882), Vladimir I. Arnold (1937-2010) and Liouville torus in a central force system

◆□▶ ◆圖▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ ─ 臣

# Examples of integrable systems

1. Any central force system in  ${\ensuremath{\mathsf{R}}}^3$  (in particular, Kepler system) is integrable with

$$F_1 = H, F_2 = M_1, F_3 = |M|^2$$

1. Any central force system in  ${\ensuremath{\mathsf{R}}}^3$  (in particular, Kepler system) is integrable with

$$F_1 = H, F_2 = M_1, F_3 = |M|^2$$

2 (Euler). Two-fixed centre problem on the plane with

$$H = \frac{1}{2}(p_1^2 + p_2^2) - \frac{m_1}{r_1} - \frac{m_2}{r_2},$$

where

$$r_1 = \sqrt{(q_1 + c)^2 + q_2^2}, r_2 = \sqrt{(q_1 - c)^2 + q_2^2}$$

are the distances from the centres, has an additional integral

$$F = \frac{1}{2}(p_1q_2 - p_2q_1)^2 + \frac{1}{2}c^2p_1^2 + cq_1\left(\frac{m_1}{r_1} - \frac{m_2}{r_2}\right)$$

1. Any central force system in  ${\ensuremath{\mathsf{R}}}^3$  (in particular, Kepler system) is integrable with

$$F_1 = H, F_2 = M_1, F_3 = |M|^2$$

2 (Euler). Two-fixed centre problem on the plane with

$$H = \frac{1}{2}(p_1^2 + p_2^2) - \frac{m_1}{r_1} - \frac{m_2}{r_2},$$

where

$$r_1 = \sqrt{(q_1 + c)^2 + q_2^2}, r_2 = \sqrt{(q_1 - c)^2 + q_2^2}$$

are the distances from the centres, has an additional integral

$$F = \frac{1}{2}(p_1q_2 - p_2q_1)^2 + \frac{1}{2}c^2p_1^2 + cq_1\left(\frac{m_1}{r_1} - \frac{m_2}{r_2}\right)$$

3. Harmonic oscillator with

$$H = \frac{1}{2}|p|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\omega_i^2 q_i^2$$

has *n* commuting independent integrals

$$F_i = \frac{1}{2}p_i^2 + \frac{1}{2}\omega_i^2q_i^2, \ i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Euler: motion of rigid body fixed at centre of mass

## Integrability in rigid body dynamics

Euler: motion of rigid body fixed at centre of mass

Lagrange: axisymmetric case with gravity (Lagrange top)

・ロト・日本・モート モー うへぐ

### Integrability in rigid body dynamics

Euler: motion of rigid body fixed at centre of mass

Lagrange: axisymmetric case with gravity (Lagrange top)

Alfred Clebsch (1871): special case of rigid body motion in infinite fluid

(ロ)、(型)、(E)、(E)、 E) のQの

## Integrability in rigid body dynamics

Euler: motion of rigid body fixed at centre of mass

Lagrange: axisymmetric case with gravity (Lagrange top)

Alfred Clebsch (1871): special case of rigid body motion in infinite fluid

Sofia Kowalevskaya (1888): a special asymmetric top, "Prix Bordin" (1888), arguably the most complicated integrable system of XIX century.





MADAME KOWALEVSKI, Professor of Mathematics at the University of Stockholm

Figure: Alfred Clebsch (1833-1872) and Sofia Kowalevskaya (1850-1891)

Poincare (1892-99): non-integrability and chaos in 3-body problem in celestial mechanics

### Paradise lost: Poincare and chaos

Poincare (1892-99): non-integrability and chaos in 3-body problem in celestial mechanics



Figure: Henri Poincaré (1854-1912) and homoclinic tangles

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Poincare (1892-99): non-integrability and chaos in 3-body problem in celestial mechanics



Figure: Henri Poincaré (1854-1912) and homoclinic tangles

Much of this came as a result of correcting the mistake in his early 1887 work...

▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ★ 国▶ ★ 国▶ - 国 - のへで

# A glimpse of hope: KAM-theory



・ロト ・聞ト ・ヨト ・ヨト

э

Figure: A.N. Kolmogorov (1903-1987), V.I. Arnold (1937-2010) and J. Moser (1928-1999)

# A glimpse of hope: KAM-theory



Figure: A.N. Kolmogorov (1903-1987), V.I. Arnold (1937-2010) and J. Moser (1928-1999)

**KAM-theorem (1954-63):** most of Liouville's tori survive under a small perturbation of integrable system

$$H = H(I) + \varepsilon H_1(I, \varphi).$$

# Renaissance of Integrability: soliton theory (1967-)



Figure: John Scott Russell (1808-82) and his soliton re-created in 1995

3

・ロト ・ 日 ト ・ モ ト ・ モ ト

## Renaissance of Integrability: soliton theory (1967-)



Figure: John Scott Russell (1808-82) and his soliton re-created in 1995

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

More in Mark Ablowitz's lecture

Part II: Integrability and XIX-century algebraic geometry

Carl Gustav Jacobi (1843): a famous lecture course on Dynamics in Königsberg, which were later edited by Clebsch and published in 1866.



Figure: Carl Gustav Jacob Jacobi (1804-51) and second edition of his "Lectures on Dynamics"

▲ロト ▲帰 ト ▲ ヨ ト ▲ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ・ の Q ()

To find the geodesics on an ellipsoid Jacobi introduced a "remarkable substitution" -*Elliptic Coordinates*.



Figure: Elliptic coordinates on an ellipsoid

▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ★ 国▶ ★ 国▶ - 国 - のへで

To find the geodesics on an ellipsoid Jacobi introduced a "remarkable substitution" -*Elliptic Coordinates*.



Figure: Elliptic coordinates on an ellipsoid

The elliptic coordinates  $u_1, \ldots, u_n$  are the roots of

$$\frac{x_1^2}{a_1+u} + \frac{x_2^2}{a_2+u} + \cdots + \frac{x_n^2}{a_n+u} = 1$$

and correspond to the confocal quadrics extensively studied in XIX-th century (e.g. in Salmon and Fiedler "Analytische Geometrie des Raumes" (1863-65)).

#### Abel map and Jacobi inversion problem

Jacobi showed that for n = 2 the elliptic coordinates  $u_1, u_2$  satisfy

$$\begin{split} \dot{\xi}_1 &= \frac{\dot{u}_1}{\sqrt{R(u_1)}} + \frac{\dot{u}_2}{\sqrt{R(u_2)}} = 1, \\ \dot{\xi}_2 &= \frac{u_1 \dot{u}_1}{\sqrt{R(u_1)}} + \frac{u_2 \dot{u}_2}{\sqrt{R(u_2)}} = 0, \end{split}$$

where R(z) is some polynomial of degree 5, and

$$\xi_1 = \int^{u_1} \frac{dz}{\sqrt{R(z)}} + \int^{u_2} \frac{dz}{\sqrt{R(z)}},$$
  
$$\xi_2 = \int^{u_1} \frac{zdz}{\sqrt{R(z)}} + \int^{u_2} \frac{zdz}{\sqrt{R(z)}}$$

is the Abel map of  $S^2\Gamma o J(\Gamma)$  for hyperelliptic curve  $\Gamma$  given by

$$y^2 = R(z).$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

#### Abel map and Jacobi inversion problem

Jacobi showed that for n = 2 the elliptic coordinates  $u_1, u_2$  satisfy

$$\begin{split} \dot{\xi}_1 &= \frac{\dot{u}_1}{\sqrt{R(u_1)}} + \frac{\dot{u}_2}{\sqrt{R(u_2)}} = 1, \\ \dot{\xi}_2 &= \frac{u_1 \dot{u}_1}{\sqrt{R(u_1)}} + \frac{u_2 \dot{u}_2}{\sqrt{R(u_2)}} = 0, \end{split}$$

where R(z) is some polynomial of degree 5, and

$$\xi_1 = \int^{u_1} \frac{dz}{\sqrt{R(z)}} + \int^{u_2} \frac{dz}{\sqrt{R(z)}},$$
  
$$\xi_2 = \int^{u_1} \frac{zdz}{\sqrt{R(z)}} + \int^{u_2} \frac{zdz}{\sqrt{R(z)}}$$

is the Abel map of  $S^2\Gamma o J(\Gamma)$  for hyperelliptic curve  $\Gamma$  given by

$$y^2 = R(z).$$

This was the origin of the classical Jacobi inversion problem, which is one of the most fundamental in classical algebraic geometry.

In December 28, 1838 Jacobi wrote to his colleague Friedrich Bessel:

The day before yesterday I reduced the geodesic line of an ellipsoid with three unequal axes to quadratures. The formulas are the simplest in the world, Abelian integrals, transforming into the known elliptical ones if two axes are made equal.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

In December 28, 1838 Jacobi wrote to his colleague Friedrich Bessel:

The day before yesterday I reduced the geodesic line of an ellipsoid with three unequal axes to quadratures. The formulas are the simplest in the world, Abelian integrals, transforming into the known elliptical ones if two axes are made equal.

However explicit formulas for the geodesics had to wait until 1861 when Weierstrass used the genus two generalisation of elliptic functions introduced by Göpel and Rosenhein.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

In December 28, 1838 Jacobi wrote to his colleague Friedrich Bessel:

The day before yesterday I reduced the geodesic line of an ellipsoid with three unequal axes to quadratures. The formulas are the simplest in the world, Abelian integrals, transforming into the known elliptical ones if two axes are made equal.

However explicit formulas for the geodesics had to wait until 1861 when Weierstrass used the genus two generalisation of elliptic functions introduced by Göpel and Rosenhein.

In full generality, the solution was found by Bernhard Riemann, who introduced the classical Riemann  $\theta$ -function

$$\theta(z,B) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^g} \exp 2\pi i (m^t z + m^t Bm),$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

where B is Riemann matrix of b-periods.



Figure: Karl Weierstrass (1815-97), Bernhard Riemann (1826-66) and Felix Klein (1849-1925)

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?



Figure: Karl Weierstrass (1815-97), Bernhard Riemann (1826-66) and Felix Klein (1849-1925)

In 1925 Felix Klein complained:

When I was a student, abelian functions were, as an effect of the Jacobian tradition, considered the uncontested summit of mathematics and each of us was ambitious to make progress in this field. And now? The younger generation hardly knows abelian functions.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

This led to remarkable results in algebraic geometry, including

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

This led to remarkable results in algebraic geometry, including

Proof of Novikov's conjecture on Schottky problem (Shiota, 1986)

This led to remarkable results in algebraic geometry, including

- Proof of Novikov's conjecture on Schottky problem (Shiota, 1986)
- Proof of Welter's trisecant conjecture (Arbarello and De Concini, 1984; Krichever, 2006)

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

This led to remarkable results in algebraic geometry, including

- Proof of Novikov's conjecture on Schottky problem (Shiota, 1986)
- Proof of Welter's trisecant conjecture (Arbarello and De Concini, 1984; Krichever, 2006)
- Geometric characterization of Prym varieties (Grushevsky, Krichever, 2010)

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <
The situation changed from 1974 when  $\theta$ -functions became common tool in the theory of integrable PDEs (S.P. Novikov, Dubrovin, Its, Matveev, Krichever).

This led to remarkable results in algebraic geometry, including

- Proof of Novikov's conjecture on Schottky problem (Shiota, 1986)
- Proof of Welter's trisecant conjecture (Arbarello and De Concini, 1984; Krichever, 2006)
- Geometric characterization of Prym varieties (Grushevsky, Krichever, 2010)

Another very important development was

ADHM construction of instantons (Atiyah, Drinfeld, Hitchin, Manin, 1976)

Part III: Integrability in classical differential geometry

**Line congruence** is a 2-parameter family of straight lines in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . For a general line congruence there are exactly 2 **focal surfaces**:



Figure: Focal curve (envelope) in the plane and 2 focal surfaces in space

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

**Line congruence** is a 2-parameter family of straight lines in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . For a general line congruence there are exactly 2 **focal surfaces**:



Figure: Focal curve (envelope) in the plane and 2 focal surfaces in space

Luigi Bianchi (1879): Suppose that the distance between corresponding points of focal surfaces is 1 and that the corresponding normals are orthogonal, then both surfaces have Gaussian curvature K = -1 (pseudospherical surfaces).

・ロト ・ 日 ・ ・ 日 ・ ・ 日 ・ ・ 日

**Line congruence** is a 2-parameter family of straight lines in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . For a general line congruence there are exactly 2 **focal surfaces**:



Figure: Focal curve (envelope) in the plane and 2 focal surfaces in space

Luigi Bianchi (1879): Suppose that the distance between corresponding points of focal surfaces is 1 and that the corresponding normals are orthogonal, then both surfaces have Gaussian curvature K = -1 (pseudospherical surfaces).

Lie (1879), Bäcklund (1883): converse to this statement and one-parameter generalization

## Bäcklund transform and sine-Gordon equation



Figure: Luigi Bianchi (1856-1928), Sophus Lie (1842-99) and Albert Victor Bäcklund (1845-1922)

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

## Bäcklund transform and sine-Gordon equation



Figure: Luigi Bianchi (1856-1928), Sophus Lie (1842-99) and Albert Victor Bäcklund (1845-1922)

The angle  $\phi$  between the asymptotic lines of pseudospherical surfaces satisfies sine-Gordon equation:

 $\phi_{xy} = \sin \phi.$ 

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

## Bäcklund transform and sine-Gordon equation



Figure: Luigi Bianchi (1856-1928), Sophus Lie (1842-99) and Albert Victor Bäcklund (1845-1922)

The angle  $\phi$  between the asymptotic lines of pseudospherical surfaces satisfies sine-Gordon equation:

$$\phi_{xy} = \sin \phi.$$

Lie-Bäcklund transform:

$$\psi_x = \phi_x + 2a\sin\left(\frac{\phi+\psi}{2}\right), \quad \psi_y = -\phi_y + \frac{2}{a}\sin\left(\frac{\psi-\phi}{2}\right).$$

### Bianchi: Lie-Bäcklund transforms commute:



#### Figure: Bianchi permutability diagram

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

### Bianchi: Lie-Bäcklund transforms commute:



Figure: Bianchi permutability diagram

Corresponding solutions of sine-Gordon equation satisfy the relation

$$\phi_{12} = \phi + 4 \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{a_2 - a_1}{a_2 + a_1} \tan \frac{\phi_2 - \phi_1}{4} \right),$$

・ロト ・ 理 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ

which is an example of integrable purely discrete 2D equation.

## Menelaus theorem and discrete SKP equation



Figure: Menelaus of Alexandria (70-140AD) and his theorem

**Menelaus theorem:**  $\phi_{13}, \phi_{23}, \phi_{12}$  lie on a straight line iff

$$\frac{(\phi_1-\phi_{12})}{(\phi_{12}-\phi_2)}\frac{(\phi_2-\phi_{23})}{(\phi_{23}-\phi_3)}\frac{(\phi_3-\phi_{13})}{(\phi_{13}-\phi_1)}=-1.$$

## Menelaus theorem and discrete SKP equation



Figure: Menelaus of Alexandria (70-140AD) and his theorem

**Menelaus theorem:**  $\phi_{13}, \phi_{23}, \phi_{12}$  lie on a straight line iff

$$\frac{(\phi_1-\phi_{12})}{(\phi_{12}-\phi_2)}\frac{(\phi_2-\phi_{23})}{(\phi_{23}-\phi_3)}\frac{(\phi_3-\phi_{13})}{(\phi_{13}-\phi_1)}=-1.$$

Konopelchenko, Schief (2001): this is nothing but Bianchi theorem for the Schwarzian KP equation!

## Menelaus theorem and discrete SKP equation



Figure: Menelaus of Alexandria (70-140AD) and his theorem

**Menelaus theorem:**  $\phi_{13}, \phi_{23}, \phi_{12}$  lie on a straight line iff

$$\frac{(\phi_1-\phi_{12})}{(\phi_{12}-\phi_2)}\frac{(\phi_2-\phi_{23})}{(\phi_{23}-\phi_3)}\frac{(\phi_3-\phi_{13})}{(\phi_{13}-\phi_1)}=-1.$$

Konopelchenko, Schief (2001): this is nothing but Bianchi theorem for the Schwarzian KP equation! Adler, Bobenko, Suris (2010): classification of integrable discrete equations of this (octahedral) type

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

Cantor's proof of uncountability of the real numbers

- Cantor's proof of uncountability of the real numbers
- Salmon and Cayley result about 27 lines on a generic cubic surface

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

# Hilbert on XIX-century mathematics

When David Hilbert was asked about the most important results of XIX-century mathematics, he allegedly mentioned

- Cantor's proof of uncountability of the real numbers
- Salmon and Cayley result about 27 lines on a generic cubic surface
- Staude's string construction of an ellipsoid.



Figure: David Hilbert (1862-1943) and Staude's construction from Hilbert-Cohn Vossen "Anschauliche Geometrie"

- Cantor's proof of uncountability of the real numbers
- Salmon and Cayley result about 27 lines on a generic cubic surface
- Staude's string construction of an ellipsoid.



Figure: David Hilbert (1862-1943) and Staude's construction from Hilbert-Cohn Vossen "Anschauliche Geometrie"

The last one is based on the integrability of Jacobi's geodesic problem.

Part VI: Integrability and quantum theory

W.R. Hamilton (1834) used deep analogy between mechanics and optics to introduce Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$\frac{\partial S}{\partial t} + H(\frac{\partial S}{\partial q}, q, t) = 0$$

where S = S(q, t) is the *action* of the corresponding Hamiltonian system.

W.R. Hamilton (1834) used deep analogy between mechanics and optics to introduce Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$\frac{\partial S}{\partial t} + H(\frac{\partial S}{\partial q}, q, t) = 0$$

where S = S(q, t) is the *action* of the corresponding Hamiltonian system.

An amazing discovery of Jacobi that this PDE is sometimes easier to solve than the original system of ODEs !

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

W.R. Hamilton (1834) used deep analogy between mechanics and optics to introduce Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$\frac{\partial S}{\partial t} + H(\frac{\partial S}{\partial q}, q, t) = 0$$

where S = S(q, t) is the *action* of the corresponding Hamiltonian system.

An amazing discovery of Jacobi that this PDE is sometimes easier to solve than the original system of ODEs !

Namely, the complete solution can be found as a sum (?!)

$$S = Et + W_1(Q_1, \alpha) + W_2(Q_2, \alpha) + \ldots + W(Q_n, \alpha),$$

where  $Q_1, Q_2, ..., Q_n$  are some new coordinates. This method is known as **separation of variables** in the Hamilton-Jacobi equation and still remains arguably the most effective method in the theory of integrable systems.

# "Older Quantum Theory"

Bohr, Sommerfeld (1913-15): quantisation conditions

$$\oint p_k dq_k = n_k \hbar,$$

where  $n_k$  are integers,  $\hbar$  is a Planck constant.

# "Older Quantum Theory"

Bohr, Sommerfeld (1913-15): quantisation conditions

$$\oint p_k dq_k = n_k \hbar,$$

where  $n_k$  are integers,  $\hbar$  is a Planck constant.

Schwarzschild, Epstein (1916), Einstein (1917): true only in separation coordinates of Hamilton-Jacobi equation...



Figure: Karl Schwarzschild (1873-1916) and Paul Epstein (1871-1939), who were first to emphasise the role of Jacobi's work in the "Older Quantum Theory."

## New Quantum Theory: Schrödinger equation

#### Schrödinger equation

 $i\hbar \frac{\partial \Psi(\vec{r},t)}{\partial t} = \left[-\frac{\hbar^2 \nabla^2}{2m} + V(\vec{r})\right] \Psi(\vec{r},t)$ 

Second Series

December, 1926 Vol. 28, No. 6

THE

#### PHYSICAL REVIEW

#### AN UNDULATORY THEORY OF THE MECHANICS OF ATOMS AND MOLECULES

BY E. SCHRÖDINGER

ABSTRACT

The paper gives an account of the author's work on a new form of quantum theory, §1. The Hamiltonian analogy between mechanics and optics, §2. The analogy is to be extended to include real "physical" or "undulatory" mechanics instead of mere geometrical mechanics. §3. The significance of wave-length;



#### The Nobel Prize in Physics 1933 Erwin Schrödinger, Paul A.M. Dirac

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

The Nobel Prize in Physics 1933 was awarded jointly to Erwir Schrödinger and Paul Adrien Maurice Dirac "for the discovery of new productive forms of atomic theory."



## New Quantum Theory: Schrödinger equation



**Quasi-classical limit**: setting  $\Psi = \exp iS/\hbar$  and neglecting  $\hbar^2$ -terms we come to

$$\left. \frac{\partial S}{\partial t} + \left| \frac{\partial S}{\partial x} \right|^2 + V(x) = 0,$$

which is exactly the Hamilton-Jacobi equation with  $H = |p|^2 + V(q)$ .

## New Quantum Theory: Schrödinger equation



**Quasi-classical limit**: setting  $\Psi = \exp iS/\hbar$  and neglecting  $\hbar^2$ -terms we come to

$$\frac{\partial S}{\partial t} + \left| \frac{\partial S}{\partial x} \right|^2 + V(x) = 0,$$

which is exactly the Hamilton-Jacobi equation with  $H = |p|^2 + V(q)$ .

The separation of variables in the quantum case looks quite natural:

$$\Psi=\Psi_1(X_1)\Psi_2(X_2)...\Psi_n(X_n).$$

So Jacobi's method is SEMI-QUANTUM !

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへ⊙

 Spectral theory: existence of commuting operators imply "finite-gap" properties (S.P. Novikov; Lax (1974))

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

- Spectral theory: existence of commuting operators imply "finite-gap" properties (S.P. Novikov; Lax (1974))
- Special functions: Jack polynomials as eigenfunctions of quantum Calogero-Moser problem (Jack (1970); Calogero, Sutherland (1971))

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

- Spectral theory: existence of commuting operators imply "finite-gap" properties (S.P. Novikov; Lax (1974))
- Special functions: Jack polynomials as eigenfunctions of quantum Calogero-Moser problem (Jack (1970); Calogero, Sutherland (1971))
- Algebra: QIST method and quantum groups (Drinfeld; Jimbo (1986)), Dunkl operators and Cherednik algebras (Cherednik (1993))

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

- Spectral theory: existence of commuting operators imply "finite-gap" properties (S.P. Novikov; Lax (1974))
- Special functions: Jack polynomials as eigenfunctions of quantum Calogero-Moser problem (Jack (1970); Calogero, Sutherland (1971))
- Algebra: QIST method and quantum groups (Drinfeld; Jimbo (1986)), Dunkl operators and Cherednik algebras (Cherednik (1993))
- ► Topology: Yang-Baxter equation and knot invariants (Turaev (1988)), Chern-Simons theory and Jones polynomial (Witten (1989))

- Spectral theory: existence of commuting operators imply "finite-gap" properties (S.P. Novikov; Lax (1974))
- Special functions: Jack polynomials as eigenfunctions of quantum Calogero-Moser problem (Jack (1970); Calogero, Sutherland (1971))
- Algebra: QIST method and quantum groups (Drinfeld; Jimbo (1986)), Dunkl operators and Cherednik algebras (Cherednik (1993))
- ► Topology: Yang-Baxter equation and knot invariants (Turaev (1988)), Chern-Simons theory and Jones polynomial (Witten (1989))
- Differential geometry: TQFT and Frobenius manifolds (Dubrovin (1993))