

Symplectic Reduction of Classical Mechanics on Shape Space

SAHAND TOKASI*

PETER PICKL†

University of Tübingen

March 15, 2022

Abstract

One of the foremost goals of research in physics is to find the most basic and universal theories that describe our universe. Many theories assume the presence of an absolute space and time in which the physical objects are located and physical processes take place. However, it is more fundamental to understand time as relative to the motion of another object, e.g. the number of swings of a pendulum, and the position of an object primarily as relative to other objects.

The goals of this paper is to explain, how using the principle of relationalism (to be introduced below), classical mechanics can be formulated on a most elementary space, which is freed from absolute entities: shape space. On shape space only the relative orientation and length of subsystems are taken into account. In order to find out how the shape of a classical system evolves in time, the method of "symplectic reduction of Hamiltonian systems" is extended to include scale transformations, and in this way the reduction of a classical system with respect to the full similarity group is achieved. A necessary requirement for the validity of the principle of relationalism is that changing the length scale of a system, all parameters of the theory that depend on the length, get changed accordingly. In particular, the principle of relationalism requires a proper transformation of the coupling constants of the interaction potentials in Classical Physics. This leads consequently to a transformation in Planck's measuring units, which enables us to derive a metric on shape space in a unique way. Later in this paper, we will explain the derivation of the reduced Hamiltonian and symplectic form on shape space.

We dedicate this paper to Prof. Dr. Detlef Dürr.

CONTENTS			
		iv.1	Scale invariant Classical Gravity 11
		iv.2	Constants of Nature . . . 12
I	Introduction	2	
II	Relationalism	3	
	i Shape Space as the Physical configuration space	3	
	ii Time as an emergent concept . . .	5	
	iii Emergence of time in Classical Mechanics	6	
	iv Principle of Relationalism	11	
			III Symplectic reduction of phase space with respect to a symmetry group 16
	i Definition of a Hamiltonian system in symplectic phase space . . .	16	
	ii Momentum mappings	17	
	iii Marsden-Weinstein method of Reduction of dynamical systems:	18	
			IV Example: Reduction with respect to the Euclidean group $E(3)$ 18

*sahand.tokasi@uni-tuebingen.de

†p.pickl@uni-tuebingen.de

i	Reduction with respect to the translation group $G = \mathbb{R}^3$	19
ii	Reduction with respect to the Rotation group $G = SO(3)$	20
V	Reduction with respect to the similarity group $Sim(3)$	24
i	Metrics on the internal and shape space	24
ii	Reduction of the theory	27
	ii.1 Symplectic reduction of phase space	28
VI	Conclusions	31
VII	Appendix	32
i	Geodesics as true evolution on shape space?	32
ii	Mass tensor	33
iii	Adjoint and Coadjoint action of a Lie-Group	34
iv	Isomorphism R	34
v	Symbols	35

I. INTRODUCTION

This paper can be divided to 3 parts.

In the *first part* (section II), we review the foundations of classical mechanics with an emphasis on the ideas of *Leibniz*, and compare the Leibnizian relational worldview with absolute worldview of Newton. One of the most basic building blocks of Newtonian mechanics is the idea of an absolute time and space, the existence of which were assumed by *Isaac Newton* when formulating the laws of motion. We will take the absoluteness of space and time into question and will review how Newton's absolute time can be deduced from the change in the positions of particles. By this approach, time loses its status as a primitive notion in physics, and takes an emergent status instead. Our dynamics will be defined on shape space S^1 , for which, in contrast to the configuration space used in Newtonian Mechanics, time and space are not absolute entities. The central new concept in the discussion is the *principle of relationalism*, which forces us to consider constants of nature as homogeneous functions of proper degrees on the universe's configuration space.

In the *second part* (sections III and IV) of this paper we give a review of the literature on symplectic reduction of classical systems with respect to the Euclidean group $E(3)$. Here we follow [1] and [2] to a big extend.

In the *third part* of this paper (section V), we explain how these methods can be expanded to include scale transformations, and consequently how the reduction of a classical system with respect to the full similarity group $sim(3)$, which we consider in

¹quotient of absolute configuration space $Q \cong \mathbb{R}^{3N}$ with respect to the similarity group $sim(3)$, which comprises all global spatial translations, rotations, and scalings.

this manuscript to be the symmetry group, is achieved. Here we explain among others, how the kinetic metric of configuration space leads in a unique way to a metric on shape space, using the principle of relationalism. Given the known procedures of deriving the reduced equations of motion with respect to the Euclidean group $E(3)$ in the Hamiltonian formalism using a symplectic structure on phase space, we derive the reduced symplectic form, and the Hamiltonian of a N particle system on its reduced phase space with respect to the similarity group. This suffices to determine the evolution of a classical system on shape space, given its initial shape and shape velocities, without any reference to the system's orientation, position, or scale in absolute space.

II. RELATIONALISM

i. Shape Space as the Physical configuration space

The goal of physics is to give a most accurate description, prediction and understanding of nature and its phenomena. Imagine an experimental physicist in a laboratory, watching a specific physical phenomenon unfolding itself in front of his eyes. Imagine now an identical universe, which however is translated by some amount, and rotated by some angle, and dilated by some scale factor with respect to this universe. Would anything different from the first universe be observed by the physicist in the lab watching the phenomenon he was interested in? In other words, can the experimenter tell in which of these two possible universes he finds himself/herself? In fact the physicist is fully blind to all of these global operations. By moving all the objects in the universe 1 meter to the left, the distances between the objects, would not change at all. That's why the physicist would never see (measure) any difference concerning his state or the state of his environment or even the universe, and intuitively one expects no difference in the way the phenomenon would unfold in front of him. From an internal point of view the universe seems exactly the same, whether it is located here or 1 meter to its left. It looks exactly the same after a total rotation of the universe by some degree, or scaling of the universe (hence all the inter particle distances) with some constant. One could object that by scaling the universe the distances between the objects would also get scaled and hence an internal observer would be able to observe this difference. But as length measurements require rulers, and the inter particle distances of the rulers are scaled up by the same factor as all other distances, one doesn't notice any difference. So: two configurations of the universe which can be transformed into each other by a member of the similarity group $sim(3)$ are kinematically indistinguishable from an internal point of

view. There might be a difference for an external observer, but any discussion on what an external observer of the full universe would see is purely academic, at best it has a philosophical meaning but for sure it is irrelevant for any physical descriptions.

To illustrate the core concepts of the subject matter, let us start with an example of a toy universe which consists of only three particles located in absolute space \mathbb{R}^3 . Each particle's position is given by 3 coordinates, hence 9 numbers are needed to specify the configuration of this system. But as we explained in the last paragraph, this is what an *external* observer watching these three particles in absolute space would say. From an *internal* point of view, for example from the point of view of one of the three particles, not more than 2 degrees of freedom can be observed: the two angles of the triangle formed by these three particles. As explained in the last paragraph, this is because the absolute position (of for instance center of mass), orientation, and scale of the system of 3 particles is unobservable from an internal point of view. One needs 3 numbers to specify the system's center of mass, and 3 numbers to specify the orientation of the system (i.e. Euler angles w.r.t. some frame of reference), and one number to specify the scale of the system. In other words, the similarity group $sim(3)$ is a 7 dimensional group, hence its action on the system's configuration space would lead to a 7 dimensional orbit. As the configuration space of a three particle system was $3 \times 3 = 9$ dimensional, 2 dimensions remain, which are called the shape degrees of freedom. In general observations are always internal, thus they always take place in shape space. Observations always give a quantity in terms of a pre-defined unit of that quantity. Hence the numbers we register as the result of measurements are always relative data and not absolute.

Since from an internal point of view just 2 angles are observable, one concludes that for our toy universe there exists just 2 physical

degrees of freedom. In other words, the physical configuration space is 2 dimensional in contrast to the absolute configuration space which is 9 dimensional.

This toy model can be indeed generalized to N -particles, where N may be as big as the number of elementary particles in the whole universe. The absolute configuration space Q is in that case a $3N$ dimensional, homogeneous space with $sim(3)$ as its structure group. The fibers F are the orbits (generically 7 dimensional) generated by the action of $sim(3)$ on absolute configuration space. The base space $S = \frac{Q}{sim(3)}$ is then isomorphic to the shape space of the universe. S can be understood as the *equivalence classes* of points on absolute configuration space where two points are being set equivalent if they can be transformed into each other by a similarity transformation, i.e. for x, y being two points in Q

$$x \sim y \text{ if } \exists g \in Sim(3) \mid x = gy$$

In the physics literature one frequently uses the terms "relational configuration space" or *shape space* instead of "physical configuration space". How the objects are located with respect to each other, or, equivalently, which shape they form is the only observable from an internal point of view. Thus formulating the dynamics in this base manifold S is more basic than any description in absolute space. A curve in S corresponds to a unique evolution of the physical degrees of freedom of the system under investigation. These so called physical degrees of freedom are the only quantities visible (or sensible) to internal observers. Adding the gauge degrees of freedom, any curve in S represents an infinite number of trajectories in absolute space², all of which describe the same phenomena (see discussion above).

Finally, we want to mention that by considering shape space of dimension $3N - 7$,

²Note, that a description on phase space, however, often simplifies the equations of motion

we tacitly have assumed the existence of a 3-dimensional absolute space. In a more general setting one should rather start with a m -dimensional shape space where m is not necessarily $3N - 7$, and argue how and under which circumstances an apparent 3 dimensional absolute space would emerge for subsystems. Given that the effective 3 dimensionality of absolute space (at least locally) is an empirical fact, we will consider the case $m = 3N - 7$ in the present manuscript, and postpone the more general setting to future works.

ii. Time as an emergent concept

According to the worldview of Newton, there exists an absolute 3 dimensional space³, in which physical objects e.g. particles move. The positions of the particles then change as time passes, and Newton's laws tell how the positions change. Time is an ever flowing external entity, which exists independently of matter and space. In that sense, time generates the dynamics. Without it there is no concept of motion.

Newton did, however, acknowledge that only *relative* positions are experimentally observable. In the scholium⁴ of his famous book *Principia* [3] he announces to explain how the existence of these absolute structures can be derived from the relative motions of the observable entities. He even claims that this was the central motivation for writing the book [4], however he does not come back to this later in his book.

Leibniz in contrary was unsatisfied with this way of describing nature. Accepting that the point like particles of Newtonian Mechanics are the fundamental constituents of the universe, one expects from a physical theory to explain a.o. the behavior (in this case the motions) of these particles. In order to do this Newton added two extra invisible entities to his description of nature: absolute

space and absolute time. Those are essential entities of Newton's laws of motion, specially in his law of inertia. Leibniz in contrast thought of them as extra structures that are unphysical and do not exist in on their own nature. In his own words [5]:

"As for my own opinion, I have said more than once, that I hold space to be something merely relative, as time is, that I hold it to be an order of coexistences, as time is an order of successions."

Downgrading space to the *order of coexistences*, seems to us a clear denial of Newton's notion of absolute space reviewed above. Also Ernst Mach expressed in the late 19'th century his critique of absolute time [6]:

"we must not forget that all things in the world are connected with one another and depend on one another, and that we ourselves and all our thoughts are also a part of nature. It is utterly beyond our power to measure the changes of things by time. Quite the contrary, time is an abstraction, at which we arrive by means of the change of things; made because we are not restricted to any one definite measure, all being interconnected. A motion is termed uniform in which equal increments of space described correspond to equal increments of space described by some motion with which we form a comparison, as the rotation of the earth. A motion may, with respect to another motion, be uniform. But the question whether a motion is in itself uniform, is senseless. With just as little justice, also, may we speak of an absolute time — of a time independent of change. This absolute time can be measured by comparison with no motion; it has therefore neither a practical nor a scientific value; and no one is justified in saying that he knows aught about it. It is an idle metaphysical conception."

In a relational theory time is an emergent concept, and it is most rational to define time in such a way that a change in time always relates to a change in the configuration of the system, for example the change in positions of the atoms forming a pendulum.

³whose existence is independent of matter.

⁴A scholium is a explanatory note in a book written by the author himself

Time is defined along the trajectories, it is not a concept based on the configurations alone. Any monotonically increasing function f can be used to define the increment of time via $\delta t = f(|\delta x_1|, \dots, |\delta x_N|)$ for infinitesimally small increments of the particle's positions $|\delta x_i|$. Given an arbitrary trajectory on configuration space, including (among others) the two configurations A and B, any monotonous function of the arc length of that trajectory going from configuration A to configuration B can serve, for instance, as a definition of the duration of time passed between A and B. As we will review below, duration can be indeed defined as a function of the changes in positions in a unique way such that the Newtonian equations of motion are valid. We are perfectly allowed to use any other suitable function as definition of time, but any different choice would make the form of the equations of motion different from the ones Newton wrote down, of course; among all possibilities, Newtonian time has the advantage of bringing the equations of motion in its simplest form.

iii. Emergence of time in Classical Mechanics

Originally the principle of least action was developed to justify the equations of motion in different theories. The idea behind the principle was expressed in many different ways by different brilliant thinkers. *Pierre Louis Maupertuis* (1698-1759) is usually credited as the first who gave a concrete formulation of the least action principle (although it is disputed that Leibniz was even earlier). Maupertuis' motivation was to rationalize the (by then known) laws of ray optics and mechanics with theological arguments based on design or purpose to explain natural phenomena. Here is a quote from Maupertuis which sheds some light on his views [7]:

"The laws of movement and of rest deduced from this principle being precisely the same as those observed in nature, we can admire the application

of it to all phenomena. The movement of animals, the vegetative growth of plants ... are only its consequences; and the spectacle of the universe becomes so much the grander, so much more beautiful, the worthier of its Author, when one knows that a small number of laws, most wisely established, suffice for all movements."

Given an initial point in the configuration space of the system under consideration q_A and a final point q_B , the path chosen by nature minimizes a functional depending on the trajectories connecting the two end points. This functional is usually called "action". In other words: the trajectory between q_A and q_B taken by the system minimizes the value of the action functional. To be more precise, the chosen trajectory is a stationary point of the action, but in most cases the only stationary point is a minimum.

Maupertuis proposed to define action as the integral of the so called *Vis viva* (Latin for 'living force'). The term *Vis viva* was introduced by Leibniz during the 1680's by his observation that the sum of the products of the constituting masses of a system (i.e. a multiparticle system) with the squares of their respective velocities is almost constant during (elastic) collisions, i.e. $\sum_{i=1}^N m_i v_i^2 = C$. This is, of course, what we now call principle of conservation of energy (in modern terms Leibniz's *Vis viva* becomes 2 times the kinetic energy). It seemed to oppose the theory of conservation of momentum advocated by the rival camp (Sir Isaac Newton and Rene Descartes).

Maupertuis' suggestion therefore comes down to the following action functional

$$W = \int_{t_A}^{t_B} 2K dt = \int_{q_A}^{q_B} p dq \quad (1)$$

which is the right formula for systems in which the kinetic energy is quadratic in the velocities. Here the letter t stands for the absolute time of Newton.

Maupertuis' principle states that for the true trajectories (the ones chosen by nature), Maupertuis' action W is stationary on all trial

trajectories with fixed initial and final positions q_A and q_B and fixed energy⁵ $E = K + V$.

$$(\delta W)_E = 0 \quad (2)$$

where in variational calculus the constraint of fixed end points is usually left implicit, and every other constraint on the trial trajectories (thus in this case fixed energy) is written down explicitly. Note that in (1) no constraint is imposed on the value of t_B , as for different paths a different amount of absolute time is needed to reach the endpoint q_B . In other words: t_b stands for the absolute time (moment) at which the configuration q_B is reached, and this obviously changes as the path taken between q_A and q_B changes.

However, in modern physics literature the most common action principle is the minimization of Hamilton's action denoted by S . It is defined as an integral along the *spacetime* trajectory $q(t)$ connecting two configurations $q_A = q(t_A)$ and $q_B = q(t_B)$

$$S = \int_{t_A}^{t_B} L(q, \dot{q}) dt \quad (3)$$

The statement of **Hamilton's principle** then becomes as following: among all possible trajectories $q(t)$ that can connect the two configurations q_A and q_B during the exact given time interval $t_B - t_A = T$, the chosen trajectories are those making S minimal (respectively stationary). Thus, Hamilton's principle can be written as

$$(\delta S)_T = 0 \quad (4)$$

where, as before, the extra constraint of constant travel time is assumed and denoted explicitly as subscript. Bear in mind that there may be more than one trajectory satisfying these constraints of fixed endpoints and travel time, see [8]. As mentioned, in contrary to Maupertuis' principle, the allowable trial

trajectories of Hamilton's principle do not need to satisfy the constant energy constraint *a priori*: the conservation of energy is here a consequence of Hamilton's principle for time invariant systems (i.e. the Lagrangian does not have an explicit time dependence). Thus, Hamilton's principle (4) is applicable to both conservative (time-invariant) and non-conservative systems (i.e. systems that have an explicitly time-dependent Lagrangian due to, for instance, time-dependent potentials $V(q, t)$), while Maupertuis' principle (2) is restricted to conservative systems. For conservative systems, one can show that Hamilton and Maupertuis principles are equivalent and related to each other by the famous Legendre transformations. The results one gets from the action principles are curves that stand for the trajectory of the system. It provides us a manifestly covariant way of describing its evolution. For non-holonomic systems, however, non of these action principles are applicable.

So far it seems that Hamilton's action principle is a more general and powerful principle than Maupertuis. *Carl Gustav Jacob Jacobi* (1804 - 1851) thought so, too. But he wanted to take it one step further by taking Newton's intuition of the existence of an absolute time more seriously by treating time as a variable in the variational calculations. In Newton's spirit, the value of time is as important as the value of the x -component of a particle's position for example, or any generalized coordinate. Both of them are absolute, and have physical reality. So, if one wants to apply Hamilton's principle properly, one should not use the absolute Newtonian time t as an independent variable, but in contrary all $n + 1$ variables q_1, \dots, q_n, t should be considered as functions of some arbitrary independent variable τ . This enables one to include the variation of t in the variational principle.

Thus we aim to write Hamilton's action principle for a system containing $n + 1$ degrees

⁵For the most general mechanical systems, energy is $E = \sum_i p_i \dot{q}_i - L$ which reduces to the well known expression $T + V$ in cases where the Lagrangian can be written as $L = T - V$ with T being a quadratic form in the velocities, and V being independent of the velocities.

of freedom (see[9]). For consistency from now on in this chapter we denote the derivative with respect to the Newtonian(absolute) time $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$ by dot, and with respect to the independent variable (used to parametrize the $n + 1$ physical degrees of freedom) $\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau}$ by prime. Starting with Hamilton's action functional (3) for the well known Lagrangian $L(q, \dot{q})$ of classical mechanics, which is the difference of kinetic and potential energy of the system, and rewriting it in terms of the independent variable τ we get

$$S = \int_{\tau_A}^{\tau_B} L(q, \frac{q'}{t'}) t' d\tau \quad (5)$$

from which the new Lagrangian (for this new system which has $n + 1$ degrees of freedom) can be read off, namely

$$L_{new} = Lt'.$$

Although we arrived at this by a simple mathematical step (change of integration variable in (3)), be aware of the huge physical difference between (3) and (5). In the latter we are varying the space-time curves connecting space-time events $A = (q_A, t_A)$ and $B = (q_B, t_B)$. Now as no t appears in L_{new} , t is then by definition a cyclic variable. Hence its conjugate momentum

$$\begin{aligned} p_t &= \frac{\partial L_{new}}{\partial t'} = \frac{\partial (Lt')}{\partial t'} = L + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}_i} \frac{\partial \dot{q}_i}{\partial t'} \right) t' \\ &= L - \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}_i} \frac{q'_i}{t'^2} \right) t' = L - \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \dot{q}_i \end{aligned}$$

is a constant of motion. In the third equation chain rule is used. In the fourth equation we used $\dot{q} = \frac{q'}{t'}$, hence $\frac{\partial \dot{q}_i}{\partial t'} = -\frac{q'_i}{t'^2}$. But the expression derived for p_t coincides (up to a minus sign) with the first integral of the Lagrangian equations of motion (for scleronomous systems where the equations of constraints do not have explicit time dependence, see [10]), which is defined in the literature as the total energy E of the system. So in short, if t is a cyclic variable, (which is the case when the corresponding Lagrangian

L of the system we started with is conservative i.e. L has no explicit time dependence) then

$$p_t = -E \quad (6)$$

is a constant of motion. This may as well be considered as an alternative derivation of the theorem of conservation of energy for conservative systems.

It is well known that n_c cyclic variables can be eliminated from the variational problem resulting in the reduction of the original variational problem by n_c degrees of freedom using the general reduction procedure (see e.g. [9]). For this reason cyclic variables are also called *ignorable variables* in Hamilton's formulation of mechanics. In the present case, the ignorable variable is t , and we are interested in reduction with respect to the variable t . The modified Lagrangian becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{L}_{new} &= L_{new} - p_t t' = Lt' - p_t t' = (L - p_t) t' \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \dot{q}_i t' \end{aligned}$$

hence the modified action functional becomes

$$\bar{S} = \int_{\tau_A}^{\tau_B} \bar{L}_{new} = \int_{\tau_A}^{\tau_B} \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \dot{q}_i t' d\tau = \int_{\tau_A}^{\tau_B} 2K t' d\tau \quad (7)$$

where expression (89) for the kinetic energy K is used.

Note here that because $t' d\tau = dt$, the modified action (7) can simply be rewritten as Maupertuis' action (1). But Jacobi's dissatisfaction with Maupertuis' principle was of the same fundamental kind as his dissatisfaction with Hamilton's principle – with which by the way he started his considerations in the first place. In Maupertuis' action the absolute time t is used as an independent variable for integration. However in the Newtonian worldview, t itself must be subject of the variational calculation, just like any of the q_i . It matters at which absolute time $t \in [t_A, t_B]$ a given configuration q_C (which locates on

the true trajectory somewhere between q_A and q_B) is reached; as much as it matters at which value of the generalized coordinate q_i a specific value of some q_j is reached ($i \neq j$). It is indeed only to this end that one uses the variational principle at all. So Jacobi's concerns are quite justified for a convinced follower of Newtonian philosophy.

It is worth to emphasize that Jacobi's point (of putting time variable and position variables of a mechanical system on equal footing), is a novel formal difference to the works of his predecessors, and truly finds its fundamental motivation in the Newtonian worldview. However his point does not make a practical difference to Maupertuis' principle, if the system subject of variational calculations is conservative, and the initial value of the absolute time is additionally provided ⁶. This is because for conservative systems the motion in time is constraint by (6). So the velocity by which the configuration point of the system moves on its trajectory can be calculated throughout the whole trajectory, and hence we can calculate exactly at which absolute time any intermediate configuration q_C has been reached, and in this way no need for variation of t is remained. A simple calculation can elaborate this point, and leads to a formula for the exact value of the absolute time at an intermediate configuration, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} t_C &= t_A + \int_{\tau_A}^{\tau_C} t' d\tau = t_A + \int_{q_A}^{q_C} \frac{dl}{\sqrt{2K}} \\ &= t_A + \int_{q_A}^{q_C} \frac{dl}{\sqrt{2(E-V)}} \\ &= t_A + \int_{\tau_A}^{\tau_C} \frac{\sqrt{\langle q' | q' \rangle}}{\sqrt{2(E-V)}} d\tau \end{aligned}$$

where $q(\tau)$ stands of course for the true trajectory of the conservative system in configuration space (in this case also a solution of Maupertuis' principle), $V = V(q(\tau))$, and

⁶which is indeed the case in Jacobi's principle, as you choose a spacetime point as your lower boundary of integration 7.

the norm $\langle . | . \rangle$ on configuration space is defined with respect to the mass tensor (see appendix ii). In the second equality the expression of the kinetic energy in Newtonian theory (i.e. (8)) is used to substitute the increment of absolute time dt with the line element of configuration space dl .

So the use of absolute time as an independent variable in Maupertuis' principle is *a posteriori* satisfied. From Jacobi's analysis it becomes clear that the circumstances under which Maupertuis' principle is applied (constancy of the total energy) leaves no room for a variation of absolute time (its value being fixed for any intermediate configuration as we have just calculated).

Now let's move on with the last step of the reduction of a cyclic variable, which is the elimination of its velocity using the equation of motion of its conjugate momentum, in this case eliminating t' using (6).

We equip configuration space with a Riemannian metric, and set this metric equal to the mass tensor \mathbf{M} . Then the kinetic energy can simply be expressed as,

$$K = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{dl}{dt} \right)^2 \quad (8)$$

in which dl denotes the line element (with respect to \mathbf{M} as metric)⁷ of configuration space. So, in Newtonian theory, the velocity with which the configuration point of a system moves in configuration space is $\sqrt{2K}$. Again, in the present case, since we use τ as our independent variable, (8) needs to be rewritten as

$$K = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{dl}{d\tau} \right)^2 / t'^2. \quad (9)$$

Now, using this and the momentum equation (which is equivalent to the energy theorem(6)), the cyclic variable (i.e. the remaining t' in the modified action (7)) can eventually be eliminated by inserting

$$t' = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2(E-V)}} \frac{dl}{d\tau} \quad (10)$$

⁷ $dl^2 = \mathbf{M}_{ij} dx^i dx^j$

into (7)

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{S} &= \int_{\tau_A}^{\tau_B} 2Kt' d\tau = \int_{\tau_A}^{\tau_B} 2K \frac{1}{\sqrt{2(E-V)}} \frac{dl}{d\tau} d\tau \\
&= \int_{\tau_A}^{\tau_B} 2(E-V) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2(E-V)}} \frac{dl}{d\tau} d\tau \\
&= \int_{\tau_A}^{\tau_B} \sqrt{2(E-V)} \frac{dl}{d\tau} d\tau \\
&= \int_A^B \sqrt{2(E-V)} dl
\end{aligned}$$

This finally leads to the reduced action functional

$$\bar{S} = \int_{\tau_A}^{\tau_B} \sqrt{2(E-V)} \frac{dl}{d\tau} d\tau = \int_A^B \sqrt{2(E-V)} dl \quad (11)$$

where the last equation shows invariance of this expression with respect to reparametrizations. As usual, the minimizing path's of the action satisfy

$$(\delta\bar{S}) = 0 \quad (12)$$

and we have arrived at what is called **Jacobi's principle**. Please note that constancy of the total energy E here is not a constraint imposed manually in the variational calculation (as in (2)), but a consequence of Hamilton's principle for time invariant systems; hence we didn't write a letter E explicitly in (12). As is evident from (11), absolute time t does not appear in its formulation. The solution of this principle is a path in configuration space, without any reference to the motion in absolute time. However, the motion in absolute time (which was of course the question of Jacobi in first place) can easily be recovered from (10), the integration of which gives us the physical time t as a function of the independent parameter τ (which now parametrizes all $n+1$ degrees of freedom as Jacobi wanted).

Much more recently [11], Julian Barbour preferred to rewrite Jacobi's action (11) as

$$\bar{S} = 2 \int_{\tau_A}^{\tau_B} \sqrt{E-V} \sqrt{\tilde{K}} d\tau \quad (13)$$

where $\tilde{K} := \frac{1}{2} \frac{dq}{d\tau} \cdot \frac{dq}{d\tau}$ with the inner product defined with respect to the mass tensor, again. It can easily be rewritten as $\tilde{K} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{d\mathbf{r}_i}{d\tau} \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{r}_i}{d\tau}$ where dot denotes the standard Euclidean metric on \mathbb{R}^3 , and the index i runs over the number of particles. Note that \tilde{K} has nothing to do with the kinetic energy which is a Newtonian term. When one uses the physical time to express the velocities, \tilde{K} becomes by definition the kinetic energy we are all familiar with. The Lagrangian L read off from (13) is used to define the canonical momenta

$$p_i := \frac{\partial L}{\partial \left(\frac{dq_i}{d\tau}\right)} = m_i \sqrt{\frac{E-V}{\tilde{K}}} \frac{dq_i}{d\tau} \quad (14)$$

and the corresponding Euler-Lagrange equation becomes

$$\frac{dp_i}{d\tau} = \frac{\partial L}{\partial q_i} = -\sqrt{\frac{\tilde{K}}{E-V}} \frac{\partial V}{\partial q_i}. \quad (15)$$

Remember that we had the full freedom to choose any independent variable τ since the action (13) is reparametrization invariant. One possibility is to choose a parametrization which is such that $\tilde{K} = E - V$. We already know that this specific option for τ mimics the absolute time of Newton for two reasons. First, inside Newtonian Mechanics for a conservative system, the kinetic energy is of course $E - V$, and as τ here has been chosen such that \tilde{K} becomes equal to $E - V$, we can conclude that this specific choice for τ marches in synchronous to absolute time. Another reason which is even more convincing, is that for this specific τ , equation (15) takes its familiar form, namely Newton's second law.

Now from $\tilde{K} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{d\mathbf{r}_i}{d\tau} \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{r}_i}{d\tau} = E - V$ one easily deduces

$$dt = \frac{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N m_i d\mathbf{r}_i \cdot d\mathbf{r}_i}}{\sqrt{2(E-V)}} = \frac{dl}{\sqrt{2(E-V)}}, \quad (16)$$

where ds is again the line element of the configuration space with respect to the mass tensor.

As Barbour said, from this one can see how *change creates time*. See also [12] for a beautiful

presentation of the notion of relational time, from physical and historical point of view. The sentence of Mach we quoted at the beginning of this chapter "*It is utterly beyond our power to measure the changes of things by time. Quite the contrary, time is an abstraction, at which we arrive by means of the change of things*", is fully reflected in (16).

(16) illustrates another fully holistic feature of Newtonian theory which was invisible to us in the way Newton was advocating it. A change in the position of the most far objects, causes the time we are experiencing to move forward! This idea is however not far from how in practice astronomers defined and used the so called *ephemeris time*. The motion of planet earth with respect to the farthest stars was used since thousands of years to keep track of the time passing, which is a similar concept. Time is a derived notion and not a primitive one as Leibniz was emphasizing all the time.

Using Jacobi's principle and finally arriving at (16) might have shaken Jacobi in his grave.

iv. Principle of Relationalism

In the first part of this section we have already mentioned the difference between the two alternative worldviews of Newtonian absolutism and Leibnizian relationalism. Given, that:

1. Most of our current physical theories (like Classical Mechanics, Quantum Mechanics , ...) are based on the Newtonian worldview;
2. Predictions of our current physical theories are compatible with the empirical data to an astonishingly high degree of accuracy, and give a quite clear explanation for the occurrence of numerous natural phenomena;
3. We think relational worldview should be adopted in physics,

it is at a first sight unclear whether a realistic relational theory can be formulated at all, because it is not clear whether statements

2 and 3 are compatible with each other. In the following we will explain how both statements 2 and 3 can be true. To this end we introduce the **Principle of Relationalism** as follows:

Two possible absolute configurations of the universe, differing from each other just by a global similarity transformation $sim(3)$, are observationally⁸ indistinguishable.

If a theory based on the Newtonian worldview, satisfies the Principle of Relationalism, it can be recasts into an empirically equivalent theory based on the Leibnizian worldview.

iv.1 Scale invariant Classical Gravity

A natural question to ask now is whether Classical Mechanics satisfies the Principle of Relationalism or not? As the interaction potential functions like Newton's gravitational potential $V = \frac{Gm_1m_2}{r_{12}}$, or Coulomb potential $V = \frac{1}{4\pi\epsilon_0} \frac{q_1q_2}{r_{12}}$ defined on the absolute space, though being manifestly rotational and translational invariant, are clearly not scale invariant, the answer of the above question seems to be *negative*, and with it the hope for a relational understanding of Classical Mechanics is vanished. But prior to the above question, we should have asked another more primitive question. *Do we already know everything about Newtonian theory of classical Mechanics?* The answer to this question may be "Yes", if we had a derivation of the value of for instance the gravitational coupling constant G from Newtonian theory. In other words, we have the opinion that in a complete physical theory based on the Newtonian worldview, there exists a theoretical derivation of the value of the gravitational constant G , which then must of course coincide with the value observed in our universe. So we agree with Einstein that, even if the Newtonian worldview is the correct view, Newtonian theory of gravitation contains a

⁸with observationally indistinguishable we mean kinematically and dynamically indistinguishable.

foundational incompleteness (or gap) in it. In the following we propose a way to partially fill this gap in a manner that is compatible with the Principle of Relationalism.

We can always render an arbitrary potential function defined on Q_{cm} or absolute space, scale-invariant, by postulating a special kind of scale-dependent transformation law for its coupling constant. This law should be exactly the inverse of the transformation law of the potential function without its coupling constant. In this way, scale invariance of the total potential function we started with on the absolute space is established.

So take any potential function

$$V(r_1, \dots, r_N) = Yf(r_1, \dots, r_N)$$

with Y being its coupling constant. Now apply a scale transformation

$$r_i \rightarrow cr_i$$

with $c \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Under this transformation the function f and its coupling constant Y will transform as the following

$$\begin{cases} f(r_1, \dots, r_N) \rightarrow f'(r_1, \dots, r_N) := f(cr_1, \dots, cr_N) \\ Y \rightarrow Y'. \end{cases}$$

Then clearly the potential V transforms as

$$V \rightarrow V' = Y'f'$$

Now by requiring V to be scale invariant i.e. $V' = V$, we can deduce the required transformation law of Y , namely

$$Y' = Y \frac{f}{f'}.$$

In other words, if f is a homogeneous function of degree k on absolute configuration space (as it is the case for gravitational potential), Y must also be a homogeneous function but of degree $-k$.

This way the potential $V(x)$ on absolute space uniquely projects down to a potential function $V_s(q)$ on the reduced configuration space $\frac{\mathbb{R}^{3N}}{\mathbb{R}} \cong \mathbb{R}^{3N-1}$ w.r.t. the scale transformations.

Denote this projection by $\pi : \mathbb{R}^{3N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3N-1}$. Then for each $q \in \frac{\mathbb{R}^{3N}}{\mathbb{R}} \cong \mathbb{R}^{3N-1}$ and $x \in \pi^{-1}(q)$ we have

$$V_s(q) = V(x) \quad (17)$$

This assignment is indeed independent of x (as long as it lies on that fiber above q), because $V(x)$ is a scale invariant function on absolute configuration space. In other words, to each equivalence class of configurations under scale transformations⁹, one unique value of the potential is given. Of course to find out the unique value for a given shape, one has to choose a representative of the equivalence class, and this representative may as well be our good old representation in which $G = 6.67408 \times 10^{-11} m^3 kg^{-1} s^{-2}$. In this way, we can make classical gravity scale invariant, and hence compatible with the Principle of Relationalism. Equivalently one can say in the gauge where the length of the international prototype meter bar is set to 1 meter, the measured value of G in our universe¹⁰ in its current state becomes the above value.

iv.2 Constants of Nature

In the last subsection we have introduced a transformation law for the value of the gravitational constant G . This is obviously in conflict with the general belief that G is a constant. Hence we found it necessary to clarify this point, and clear up possible confusions which may arise in this regard. To be more precise, we argue which constants of nature (numbers appearing in laws of nature of the respective theories) have to remain unchanged, given that the universe has to look and work the same way after a global scale transformation. We will see that G is not among those unchanging "constants of nature", neither is the Planck's constant \hbar , nor the vacuum permittivity ϵ_0 .

Observationally, we experience a huge number of regularities and fascinating patterns

⁹or obviously similarity transformation

¹⁰strictly speaking near Earth

in nature, and our quest to understand the reason of their occurrence, leads us to the discovery of the laws of Nature in which a collection of dimensionless numbers appear whose exact values are not derived in any way inside the theory, but rather determined experimentally. In words of *John D. Barrow* [13] these dimensionless numbers capture at the same time our greatest knowledge and our greatest ignorance about the universe. To make it clear to the reader which numbers we are referring to, the nice correspondence of Einstein with Ilse Rosenthal-Schneider [14] on this topic is very helpful. i.e.

"Now let there be a complete theory of physics in whose fundamental equations the "universal" constants c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n occur. The quantities may somehow be reduced g, cm, sec . The choice of these three units are obviously quite conventional. Each of these c_1, \dots, c_n has a dimension in these units. We now will choose conditions in such a way that c_1, c_2, c_3 have such dimensions that it is not possible to construct from them a dimensionless product $c_1^\alpha c_2^\beta c_3^\gamma$. Then one can multiply c_4, c_5 , etc., in such a way by factors built from powers of c_1, c_2, c_3 that these new symbols c_4^, c_5^*, c_6^* are pure numbers. These are the genuine universal constants of the theoretical system which have nothing to do with conventional units. My expectation now is that these constants c_4^* etc., must be basic numbers whose values are established through the logical foundation of the whole theory. Or could put it like this: In a reasonable theory there are no dimensionless numbers whose values are only empirically determinable. Dimensionless constants in the laws of nature, which from the purely logical point of view can just as well have different values, should not exist. To me, with my "trust in god" this appears to be evident, but there will be few who are of the same opinion."*

To Max Planck it seemed natural that the three dimensionful constants G, \hbar, c which appear in physical theories determine the three basic measuring units. The units derived from them retain their natural significance as long as the law of gravitation, and that of propaga-

tion of light in a vacuum remain valid. They therefore must be found always to be the same, when measured by the most widely differing intelligences according to the most widely differing methods. He defined the Plank mass and length and time units as

$$L_P = \sqrt{\frac{G\hbar}{c^3}} = 1.616 \times 10^{-35} m$$

$$M_P = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar c}{G}} = 2.177 \times 10^{-5} g$$

$$T_P = \sqrt{\frac{G\hbar}{c^5}} = 5.390 \times 10^{-44} s$$

These are Einstein's dimensionful constants c_1, c_2, c_3 .

So far we are aware of 4 distinct forces of nature, i.e. gravity, electromagnetism, weak and strong forces. The strength of these 3 forces (compared to the strong force) can be considered dimensionless (or Einstein's pure) numbers that define our world. The value of these dimensionless numbers are

$$\alpha_{EM} := \frac{e^2}{4\pi\epsilon_0\hbar c} \approx \frac{1}{137.036}$$

$$\alpha_G := \frac{Gm_p^2}{\hbar c} \approx 5 \times 10^{-39}$$

$$\alpha_W := \frac{G_F m_p^2 c}{\hbar^3} \sim 1.03 \times 10^{-5} \approx 10^{-15}$$

Universes for which the value of any of these three dimensionless numbers are different from the above values are observationally different (cause the balances of the forces differ).

Coming back to the proposed transformation law $G \rightarrow cG$ of the gravitational constant under scale transformations $r \rightarrow cr$, one can immediately see from α_G , that it changes the balance of Forces in Nature, and leads to observable differences, which clearly violates the Principle of Relationalism. However, if this transformation of G is accompanied by a transformation $\hbar \rightarrow c\hbar$ of the Planck's constant, the strength of gravity would remain unchanged. It is well known from Quantum

mechanics that even the smallest change of the value of \hbar would lead to a sudden release or absorption of an enormous amount of energy, due to the dependence of the atomic orbital energy levels to the value of \hbar , i.e. for the hydrogen atom $E_n = -\frac{me^4}{8h^2\epsilon_0^2} \frac{1}{n^2}$, and this again violates the Principle of Relationalism. However, if a transformation $\epsilon_0 \rightarrow \frac{\epsilon_0}{c}$ of the vacuum permittivity is also taking place along the mentioned transformations of G and \hbar , the value of energy levels remain unchanged so that the mentioned principle is respected.

To summarize, after performing a scale transformation by a factor $c \in \mathbb{R}^+$

$$r \rightarrow cr$$

on the whole universe, the Principle of Relationalism requires the following transformation of (Einstein's dimensionful) constants

$$G \rightarrow cG \quad (18)$$

$$\hbar \rightarrow c\hbar \quad (19)$$

$$\epsilon_0 \rightarrow \frac{\epsilon_0}{c} \quad (20)$$

To appreciate the consistency of these transformation laws more, notice that they automatically induce the expected transformation of the Bohr radius $a_0 = \frac{4\pi\epsilon_0\hbar^2}{me^2}$, classical electron's radius $r_e = \frac{1}{4\pi\epsilon_0} \frac{e^2}{m_e c^2}$, and the fine structure constant α_{EM} , namely $a_0 \rightarrow ca_0$, $r_e \rightarrow cr_e$ and $\alpha_{EM} \rightarrow \alpha_{EM}$. So all atoms in the universe get bigger by exactly the same scaling factor for the universe itself and the strength of the electromagnetic force remains unchanged. Moreover they also automatically result in a scale invariant electrical force (Coulomb's potential).

Imagine an experiment by which you want to figure out the velocity of an object. We argue that after performing of a global scale transformation, the velocity of the same object during the same experiment remains unchanged. One can see this in the following way: From the formulas of Planck's system of

units mentioned above, one can easily see that a scale transformation

$$r \rightarrow cr$$

reshuffles the values of these units expressed in SI¹¹ as

$$L_p \rightarrow cL_p$$

$$M_p \rightarrow M_p$$

$$T_p \rightarrow cT_p.$$

As expected the natural unit of length gets bigger by the same factor $c \in \mathbb{R}^+$. The time (measured in Planck's unit) gets also dilated and runs faster by the same factor.

Hence the measured speed v of an object transforms under a global scale transformation as follows

$$v = \frac{\Delta x}{\Delta t} \rightarrow v' = \frac{\Delta x'}{\Delta t'} = \frac{c\Delta x}{c\Delta t} = v$$

where Δx stands for instance for the distance between two other objects (which are needed to define the start and end point of any interval in space), and Δt for the time (measured in Plank unit) the object takes to travel between those two reference objects. The primed versions have the same quantities, however after scale transforming the universe and measuring everything in new Plank units. The same can be said about the velocity of light ¹² c , where one measures the time needed for light to path the distance between two objects. Note that in the relation $\Delta t' = c\Delta t$ the Principle of Relationalism is tacitly invoked in equating the number of ticks(or steps) of our new clock in the scaled universe for the duration

¹¹Here SI is being thought of as some measures of hypothetical absolute space and time, in the sense that they are exempted from the global transformation we perform on the universe. So we scale everything in the universe except the SI standard meter stick and the SI standard clock as resembling the absolute distance and absolute time duration, and a hypothetical mean to compare the new Plank's units after expansion to the old ones inside the absolute framework that classical theories and quantum mechanics are presented.

¹²To be more precise, the average two way light's velocity is meant here. There exist no experimental way to measure the direct one way velocity of light as a consequence of conventionality of simultaneity.

of a physical phenomenon (in this example the passage of light of an object between the two reference objects), and the number of ticks of the old clock in the old (smaller) universe while the same phenomenon is taking place. So the measured speed of any object in universes before and after global scale transformations comes out the same. The Principle of Relationalism, and the characteristics of Planck units together are responsible for this result. As a consequence of the constancy of the speed of light (measured in Planck units) $c = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon_0 \mu_0}}$ under scale transformations, one can deduce the corresponding transformation law of vacuum Permeability, namely

$$\mu_0 \rightarrow c\mu_0$$

The dilation of time under scale transformation in the presented way is also compatible with operational SI definition of time unit, i.e. the *second* is defined as the duration of 9192631770 cycles of radiation corresponding to the transition between two energy levels of the ground state of the cesium-133 atom at rest at a temperature of absolute zero. By performing a scale transformation $r \rightarrow cr$, the wave-length of the emitted photon transforms correspondingly ($\lambda_{photon} \rightarrow c\lambda_{photon}$), and hence the time required for one cycle, i.e. $T = \frac{\lambda_{photon}}{c}$, transforms as $T \rightarrow cT$. In this way the SI second will also get dilated by the same factor c . This shows the expected coherence between Planck and SI units of time under global scalings.

Remember that Jacobi's principle stated that the path taken by a classical system minimizes the Jacobi action $\bar{S} = \int_{x_1}^{x_2} \sqrt{E - V} ds$ with x_1 and x_2 standing for the initial and final configuration of the system. For the path $x(t)$ that minimizes this action one has the energy conservation equation i.e. $E = \frac{1}{2}M(\frac{dx}{dt}, \frac{dx}{dt}) + V$. Hence along this path (which is the only physical path in the sense that only this path is realized by nature) one has $K := \frac{1}{2}M(\frac{dx}{dt}, \frac{dx}{dt}) = E - V$. Now Jacobi action along this path can be rewritten as $\bar{S} = \int_{x_1}^{x_2} \sqrt{K} ds$. If one now performs a scale transformation $r \rightarrow cr$, with

$c \in \mathbb{R}^+$ the system naturally gets bigger but the velocity of the constituting particles of the system measured in the new Planck units of time and length remain unchanged. Moreover, the length of the path between cx_1 and cx_2 measured in the new Planck length remains also unchanged. So in this way one sees that the action of classical mechanics is invariant under scale transformations.

III. SYMPLECTIC REDUCTION OF PHASE SPACE WITH RESPECT TO A SYMMETRY GROUP

In this section we will review how the collective motion of a multi-particle system (in particular the rotations and translations of system) is gotten rid of in the Hamiltonian formalism using the reduction procedure of Marsden/Weinstein. We follow [1],[2] to a big extent. First we review the expression of the laws of classical mechanics using a symplectic structure on phase space. This level of abstraction for formulating Classical Mechanics seems at first sight to be an unnecessary complication, but its power lies in its generality, and is beneficial, compared to less abstract formulations, when dealing with curved spaces. This is the case in many mechanical systems with constraints, as well as on reduced spaces like internal configuration space $Q_{int} = \frac{Q}{E(3)} = \frac{\mathbb{R}^{3N}}{E(3)}$ or shape space $S = \frac{Q}{sim(3)}$ of a N -particle system.

i. Definition of a Hamiltonian system in symplectic phase space

Denote the configuration space of a N -particle system with $Q \cong \mathbb{R}^{3N}$. A symplectic form σ on Q is a closed non-degenerate differential two-form. Closed means that the exterior derivative of σ vanishes, i.e. $d\sigma = 0$, and non-degenerate means that if there exists some $u \in T_x(Q)$ such that $\sigma(u, v) = 0$ for all $v \in T_x(Q)$, then $u = 0$. The Hamiltonian H is a function on $T^*(Q)$ to which one can associate the respective Hamiltonian flow, which is a vector field X_H on Q defined by the equation $\sigma(X_H, Y) = dH$ for all $Y \in T(Q)$. Symplectic geometry is well suited for investigating mechanical systems. Starting with the configuration space Q of a system, its phase space $T^*(Q)$ is canonically symplectic. Denoting the configuration coordinates by q_i , and the remaining coordinates needed on $T^*(Q)$ by p_i , the canonical symplectic form becomes $\sigma = \sum_{i=1}^N dq_i \wedge dp_i$. The Hamiltonian

flow associated to a physical Hamiltonian $H = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{p_i^2}{2} + V$ leads to an evolution of the system's initial state $(q_i(0), p_i(0)) \in T^*(Q)$, which is compatible with Newton's laws of motion. In the following we explain this construction more precisely.

The cotangent space $T_x^*(Q)$ at $x \in Q$ is isomorphic to the tangent space $T_x(Q)$ by the induced isomorphism defined through the following equation

$$I_x : T_x(Q) \rightarrow T_x^*(Q) \quad (21)$$

$$I_x(v).u = K_x(u, v)$$

for $u, v \in T_x(Q)$. Here \cdot stands for the pairing of vectors $T(Q)$ and covectors $T^*(Q)$. Setting $p := I_x(v)$ and writing $p = (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_N)$ as a tuple, we get from the definition of K_x

$$p_k = m_k v_k \quad (22a)$$

$$p.u = \sum_{k=1}^N (p_k, u_k). \quad (22b)$$

Thus we have obtained the induced variables x and p , constituting a coordinate system of the cotangent space $T^*(Q) \cong Q \times \mathbb{R}^{3N}$. x and p are often called the coordinate and momentum variables.

Now we define the canonical one-form θ on the cotangent bundle $T^*(Q)$. For

$$(u, w) \in T(T^*(Q))$$

being a tangent vector at

$$(x, p) \in T^*(Q) \cong Q \times \mathbb{R}^{dN}$$

we define

$$\theta_{(x,p)}(u, w) := p.u. \quad (23)$$

If u is a vector field on Q , then $dx_k^i(u) = u_k^i$ in Cartesian coordinates, so that the canonical one-form θ can be expressed in the following form

$$\theta = p.dx = \sum (p_k, dx_k). \quad (24)$$

The exterior derivative of θ reads

$$d\theta = dp \wedge dx = \sum (dp_k \wedge dx_k).$$

A scalar product K_x^* on the cotangent space $T_x^*(Q)$ can be defined as

$$K_x^*(q, p) := K_x(I_x^{-1}(q), I_x^1(p)) = \sum \frac{(q_k | p_k)}{m_k} \quad (25)$$

for $q, p \in T_x^*(Q)$.

The Hamiltonian of a system is a function on $T^*(Q)$ of the following form

$$H = K^*(p, p) + U, \quad (26)$$

where U is a potential function invariant under translations (\mathbb{R}^n) and rotations ($SO(3)$).

The triple

$$(T^*(Q), d\theta, H)$$

constitutes a Hamiltonian system.

Hamilton's equations of motion are given by the Hamiltonian vector field \mathbf{X}_H , which is defined through

$$d\theta(\mathbf{X}_H, \mathbf{Y}) = dH(\mathbf{Y})$$

$\forall \mathbf{Y} \in T(Q)$.

Before moving to the next section, we shortly discuss how a symplectic form can be used to express electromagnetic laws of motion for a charged particle [15] for the purpose of illustration. Using the isomorphism (21), the magnetic vector potential \mathbf{A} can be considered as a 1-form. Then the magnetic field \mathbf{B} becomes a 2-form $d\mathbf{A}$ on configuration space Q . Gauss's law for magnetism $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0$ is in this formalism expressed as $d\mathbf{B} = 0$. Then one defines a new phase space $(T^*(Q), \sigma_{\mathbf{B}})$ which differs from the previous phase space $(T^*(Q), \sigma)$ in that the canonical symplectic form σ on $T^*(Q)$ is replaced with

$$\sigma_{\mathbf{B}} = \sigma + \pi^* \mathbf{B},$$

where $\pi : T^*(Q) \rightarrow Q$. Denoting the electric potential function by ϕ , and denoting the velocity or momentum of the charged particle (which are identified to each other by the metric) by \mathbf{v} , the Hamiltonian becomes $H = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 + \phi$.

The Hamiltonian vector field which defines the dynamics in the presence of Electromagnetic field, can then be derived from $\sigma_{\mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{X}_H, \mathbf{Y}) = dH(\mathbf{Y})$ for all $\mathbf{Y} \in T(Q)$.

ii. Momentum mappings

The symplectic structure on $T^*(Q)$, enables us to express Noether's theorem more naturally. The action of a Lie-group G on $T^*(Q)$ can be generated by a vector field \mathbf{a}_x on $T^*(Q)$, known as infinitesimal generator of the action. Integral curves of \mathbf{a}_x are the G -orbits on $T^*(Q)$. Noether's theorem then ensures the existence of a function μ on $T(Q)$, preserved by the action and conjugated to \mathbf{a}_x by the symplectic form, i.e. $\sigma(\mathbf{a}_x, Y) = d\mu(Y)$ for all vector fields Y . This function is called the momentum map, and it is preserved by the Hamiltonian flow. Here we review the important concept of momentum mapping which will be used frequently in the process of reduction. If a group G acts on the manifold Q and (\cdot, \cdot) is a G -invariant Riemannian metric, we define for

$$\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{G}$$

$$v_x \in T_x Q$$

the momentum map μ as follows

$$\mu : T(Q) \equiv T^*(Q) \rightarrow \mathbf{G}^* \quad (27a)$$

$$\mu(v_x) \cdot \mathbf{a} := (\mathbf{a}_x, v_x) \quad (27b)$$

$$\mathbf{a}_x = \left. \frac{d(e^{t\mathbf{a}}x)}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \in T_x^*(Q). \quad (27c)$$

$T(Q)$ and $T^*(Q)$ are identified with the metric.

There is an intrinsic formulation of the connection form in terms of the momentum map. Remember the definition of the inertia tensor (or operator) A . It was a linear operator in $\wedge^2(3)$, and there existed an isomorphism R between $\wedge^2(3)$ and $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ (see appendix iv), and since the tangent space and the cotangent space of Q are identified through the Riemannian metric on Q , we are able to redefine the inertia operator as follows

$$A : \mathbf{G} \rightarrow \mathbf{G}^* \quad (28a)$$

$$A_x(\mathbf{a}) \cdot \mathbf{b} = (\mathbf{a}_x, \mathbf{b}_x). \quad (28b)$$

The connection form is then

$$\omega(v_x) = A_x^{-1}(\mu(v_x)). \quad (29)$$

The horizontal distribution is the kernel of the momentum map μ .

Alternatively, one can also think of G as the group of symplectic transformations (preserving $d\theta$), and \mathbf{G} as the Lie-algebra of G (which is identified with the tangent space to G at the identity). For every $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{G}$ we get a one-parameter subgroup of G by $\exp(t\mathbf{a})$.

If for any $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{G}$ there exists a function $F_{\mathbf{a}}$ on $T^*(Q)$ satisfying $d\theta_{\mathbf{a}_x} = -dF_{\mathbf{a}}$, then the action of G is called strongly symplectic. The function $F_{\mathbf{a}}$ depending linearly on \mathbf{a} , can be expressed in the form $F_{\mathbf{a}}(x, p) = \mu(x, p) \cdot \mathbf{a}$ which is the defining property of the momentum map μ of $T^*(Q)$ to \mathbf{G}^* .

If the action of G is moreover exactly symplectic, G leaves θ invariant – then there is a simple equation which gives us the momentum map

$$\mu(x, p) \cdot \mathbf{a} = \theta(\mathbf{a}_x). \quad (30)$$

As we see below momentum mappings cover linear and angular momentum.

It is well-known and intuitively clear that the expression of the connection form (29) for the $SO(3)$ fiber bundle, in Jacobi coordinates \mathbf{r}_j becomes

$$\omega = R \left(A_x^{-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \mathbf{r}_j \times d\mathbf{r}_j \right) \right) \quad (31)$$

where $d\mathbf{r}_j$ is the 3 dimensional vector valued one form, which, if applied to a vector on configuration space Q , gives the velocity vector of just the j 's particle.

iii. Marsden-Weinstein method of Reduction of dynamical systems:

Consider a symplectic manifold $P = T^*(Q)$, the symplectic form σ on this manifold, and a σ -preserving symplectic group G acting on P . The adjoint Ad_g and coadjoint Ad_g^* representations of G on the Lie-algebra space \mathbf{G} and its

dual space \mathbf{G}^* respectively, are defined in appendix iii (see (90)).

Let μ be the Ad^* -equivariant momentum mapping associated with the action of G . That is

$$\mu : P \rightarrow \mathbf{G}^* \quad (32a)$$

$$\mu(gx) = Ad_{g^{-1}}^* \mu(x), \forall x \in P. \quad (32b)$$

For $r \in \mathbf{G}^*$, $\mu^{-1}(r)$ is a submanifold of P . The isotropy subgroup G_r of G at $r \in \mathbf{G}^*$ is defined as the following

$$G_r = \{\forall g \in G \mid Ad_{g^{-1}}^* r = r\}. \quad (33)$$

Define then the manifold

$$P_r := \frac{\mu^{-1}(r)}{G_r} \quad (34)$$

with its canonical projection

$$\pi_r : \mu^{-1}(r) \rightarrow P_r. \quad (35)$$

P_r is called the **reduced phase space**.

With the help of the inclusion map

$$i_r : \mu^{-1}(r) \rightarrow P$$

we can get a unique symplectic form σ_r on P_r

$$\pi_r^* \sigma_r = i_r^* \sigma. \quad (36)$$

And at last, if the Hamiltonian H on P is invariant under the action of G , the Hamiltonian vector field \mathbf{X}_H projects to a vector field \mathbf{X}_{H_r} on P_r , namely

$$\pi_r^* \mathbf{X}_H = \mathbf{X}_{H_r}. \quad (37)$$

With

$$\pi_r^* H_r = i_r^* H. \quad (38)$$

Hence one obtains the **reduced system**

$$(P_r, \sigma_r, H_r).$$

IV. EXAMPLE: REDUCTION WITH RESPECT TO THE EUCLIDEAN GROUP $E(3)$

As an illustration of the general symplectic reduction procedure discussed in the previous section, we review the reduction of phase space of a classical system with respect to the Euclidean group, following [1] to a big extend.

i. Reduction with respect to the translation group $G = \mathbb{R}^3$

The translation group \mathbb{R}^3 forms an exact symplectic group on $T^*(Q)$. Any member of this group $a \in \mathbb{R}^3$ acts on $T^*(Q)$ as following which obviously leaves the one-form θ invariant

$$\begin{aligned} &(x_1, \dots, x_N, p_1, \dots, p_N) \\ &\quad \downarrow \\ &(x_1 + a, \dots, x_N + a, p_1, \dots, p_N). \end{aligned}$$

For $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, where \mathbb{R}^3 now stands for the Lie algebra of the translation group, the infinitesimal generator of the subgroup $a(t) = \exp(\mathbf{a}t)$ has the form

$$\mathbf{a}_x(x, p) = (\mathbf{a}, \dots, \mathbf{a}, 0, \dots, 0) \in T_x^*(Q)$$

so that the momentum map $\mu_t : T^*(Q) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ is given by:

$$\mu_t(x, p) \cdot \mathbf{a} = \theta(\mathbf{a}_x) = \sum (p_k, \mathbf{a}) = (\sum p_k \mid \mathbf{a}) \Rightarrow$$

$$\mu_t(x, p) = \sum p_k. \quad (39)$$

This way we obtain the usual linear momentum.

Now in order to perform the reduction of the phase space $T^*(Q)$ with respect to the translation group \mathbb{R}^3 we apply the Marsden-Weinstein method. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $\mu_t^{-1}(\lambda)$ is a submanifold of $T^*(Q)$ determined by $\sum p_k = \lambda$. This submanifold is isomorphic with $Q \times \mathbb{R}^{(N-1) \cdot 3}$ for any λ . It is clear that the isotropy subgroup at λ , denoted by G_λ , is the whole group of translations \mathbb{R}^3 . So the reduced phase space

$$P_\lambda = \frac{\mu_t^{-1}(\lambda)}{\mathbb{R}^3}$$

can be identified with $\frac{Q}{\mathbb{R}^3} \times \mathbb{R}^{3(N-1)}$, and therefore with

$$P_\lambda \cong Q_{cm} \times \mathbb{R}^{3(N-1)}.$$

This reduced space can in turn be thought of as a submanifold of $T^*(Q)$ determined by the

following conditions

$$\sum m_k x_k = 0 \quad (40a)$$

$$\sum p_k = \lambda. \quad (40b)$$

What we are interested in is the case $\lambda = 0$. The submanifold $\frac{\mu_t^{-1}(0)}{\mathbb{R}^3}$ can then be identified with the cotangent bundle $T^*(Q_{cm})$

$$P_{\lambda=0} \cong T^*(Q_{cm}).$$

The reduced symplectic form on $T^*(Q_{cm})$ is then the restriction of $d\theta$ (which was the form on $T^*(Q)$) on $T^*(Q_{cm})$. For notational convenience both of them are denoted by the same letter. So one arrives at the reduced Hamiltonian system with respect to the group of 3 dimensional spatial translations i.e. $(T^*(Q_{cm}), d\theta, H)$.

Note that the identification between the reduced phase space with respect to the group of translations $P_\lambda = \frac{\mu_t^{-1}(\lambda)}{\mathbb{R}^3}$, and the cotangent bundle of the center of mass system $T^*(Q_{cm})$ holds only for $\lambda = 0$. In the remaining part of this subsection we explain one way to see this point more clearly.

Consider a generic point $y \in T^*(Q)$. This point can symbolically be denoted as $y =$

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} \vec{p}_1 \\ \dots \\ \vec{p}_N \end{array} \right) (x) \text{ where } \vec{p}_i \text{ stands for the mo-}$$

mentum of i 'th particle (here the isomorphism between 1-forms and vectors is invoked too), and $x \in Q \cong \mathbb{R}^{3N}$ stands for a point in the configuration space of the multiparticle system. One can view $T^*(Q)$ simply as a $2N \cdot 3$ dimensional space, which is coordinatized by $\vec{x}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_N, \vec{p}_1, \dots, \vec{p}_N$. As each of these vectors consists of 3 numbers, they are indeed a collection of $6N$ numbers. As explained in

the last paragraph, $\frac{\mu_t^{-1}(0)}{\mathbb{R}^3}$ can be considered as a $2(N-1) \cdot 3$ dimensional submanifold of $T^*(Q)$ given by the constraints (40). So far so good. One can alternatively view $T^*(Q)$ as follows: take the configuration space Q of the system, and attach to each point $x \in Q$ a $(3N)$ -dimensional vectorspace. This vector

space is thought to be the collection of all possible elements $\begin{pmatrix} \vec{p}_1 \\ \dots \\ \vec{p}_N \end{pmatrix}$ and denote this vector space by V_Q . Now comes the tricky point.

The condition (40.a) gives us a fixed $3(N-1)$ dimensional surface in the absolute configuration space Q . By definition this solid surface can be identified by Q_{cm} (one can even call this surface Q_{cm} no matter whether it is embedded into some bigger space or not). For the moment we denote this surface by Q_{cm}^p , where p reminds us that this surface is part of a bigger configuration space Q . Now condition (40.b) selects a subspace of the vectorspace which was attached to each point on Q , hence also to each point on the surface Q_{cm}^p . Clearly this subvectorspace consists of special

elements $\begin{pmatrix} \vec{p}_1 \\ \dots \\ \vec{p}_N \end{pmatrix}$; namely the ones with $\sum \vec{p}_k = \lambda$. We denote this subvectorspace by $V_\lambda \subset V_Q$. In this way $\frac{\mu_i^{-1}(\lambda)}{\mathbb{R}^3}$ (which again was a submanifold of $T^*(Q)$ realized by constraints (40)) can be viewed as $Q_{cm}^p \times V(\lambda)$.

On the other hand, the cotangent space over the centre of mass system i.e. $T^*(Q_{cm})$ is on its own an independently existing $2(N-1)d$ dimensional space, without any need of an ambient space. Similarly this space $T^*(Q_{cm})$ can be viewed as $Q_{cm} \times V_{cm}$, where V_{cm} is just the $3(N-1)$ dimensional vector space attached to each point of the center of mass configuration space Q_{cm} .

Now if one tries to embed $T^*(Q_{cm})$ into $T^*(Q)$ one can indeed perfectly fit Q_{cm} on Q_{cm}^p , but one can never fit V_{cm} on V_λ unless $\lambda = 0$. The reason is that $V_\lambda \cap V_{cm}^p = \emptyset$. Here V_{cm}^p denotes the embedding of V_{cm} in V_Q . Any element $v \in V_{cm}$ will assign a set of velocities to the particles. Pulled up to the absolute space in the center of mass system (so condition (40).a being valid), these velocities add up to zero (so they have to be elements of $V_{\lambda=0}$); otherwise we would immediately move out of the surface Q_{cm}^p and that results does not fit with $T^*(Q_{cm})$ on $Q_{cm}^p \times V_\lambda$ for $\lambda \neq 0$.

ii. Reduction with respect to the Rotation group $G = SO(3)$

We now proceed to the angular momentum defined on $T^*(Q)$. The rotation group $SO(3)$ plays here the role of an exact symplectic group (preserving $d\theta$) whose action on $T^*(Q)$ is defined for (x, p) and $g \in SO(3)$ by

$$(x, p) \rightarrow (gx, gp). \quad (41)$$

For the case of vanishing linear momentum, i.e. $\lambda = 0$, we note that $SO(3)$ acts actually on $T^*(Q_{cm})$ as the conditions (40) are invariant under $SO(3)$. If λ is non-vanishing, only a subgroup of $SO(3)$ acts on $\frac{\mu_i^{-1}(\lambda)}{\mathbb{R}^3}$.

Consider some $\mathbf{a} = R_\xi \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$, where $\xi \in \wedge^2(3)$ is the two-vector corresponding to the Lie-algebra element \mathbf{a} , and the correspondence is given by the isomorphism $R : \wedge^2(3) \rightarrow \mathfrak{so}(d)$ introduced in appendix iii, see (95). The infinitesimal generator of the subgroup $exp(t\mathbf{a})$, is given by

$$\mathbf{a}_x(x, p) = (R_\xi(x), R_\xi(p))$$

$$= (R_\xi(x_1), \dots, R_\xi(x_N), R_\xi(p_1), \dots, R_\xi(p_N))$$

where (97) is used. Therefor the momentum mapping

$$\mu_r : T^*(Q_{cm}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{so}^*(3)$$

can be calculated as follows:

$$\mu_r(x, p) \cdot \mathbf{a} = \theta_{(x,p)}(\mathbf{a}_x) = \sum_{k=1}^N (p_k \mid R_\xi(x_k))$$

$$= \left(\sum_{k=1}^N p_k \wedge x_k \mid \xi \right) = (R_{\sum_{k=1}^N p_k \wedge x_k} \mid R_\xi)$$

where (98).e has been used, and in the last equality the fact that the mapping R is isometric is being invoked. Hence one ends up with

$$\mu_r(x, p) = R_{-\sum_{k=1}^N x_k \wedge p_k}. \quad (42)$$

Here we have identified $\mathfrak{so}(d)$ and $\mathfrak{so}^*(d)$ through the scalar product on $\mathfrak{so}(d)$, namely $(\alpha, \beta) = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\alpha\beta^T)$.

One can prove that for an exact symplectic group (transformations which leave the 1-form θ invariant), the associated momentum mapping is Ad^* -equivariant.

Now we apply the reduction theorem to the rotation group $SO(3)$.

Let $\mathbf{a} \in \mathfrak{so}(3) \cong \mathfrak{so}^*(d)$. Then $\mu_r^{-1}(\mathbf{a})$ is a submanifold of $T^*(Q_{cm})$. Factoring out the orbits of the isotropy subgroup $G_{\mathbf{a}}$ of $SO(3)$ at \mathbf{a} , we obtain a reduced phase space $\frac{\mu_r^{-1}(\mathbf{a})}{G_{\mathbf{a}}}$. This process is merely an elimination of the angular momentum.

An important question now pops up: is the reduced phase space $\frac{\mu_r^{-1}(\mathbf{a})}{G_{\mathbf{a}}}$ diffeomorphic to the cotangent bundle $T^*(Q_{int})$ of the internal space $Q_{int} = \frac{Q}{\mathbb{R}^3 \circ SO(d)}$ as it was the case for the translations group?

The answer is NO, for $a \neq 0$.

For the N-body problem in \mathbb{R}^3 the dimension of the phase space reduces by 4 when eliminating the angular momentum. This is because the Lie-algebra $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ is 3 dimensional, and the isotropy subgroup $G_{\mathbf{a}}$ for $a \neq 0$ turns out to be $SO(2)$. So the condition $\mu_r = \mathbf{a}$ in phase space diminishes the dimension by 3, and factoring out the $SO(2)$ orbits does by 1. Intuitively, once a single member of the 3-dimensional space $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ has been chosen for the total angular momentum \mathbf{a} of the Hamiltonian system, we end up on a sub-manifold with 3 dimensions less. Now, in the original space start rotating the whole system about an axis which is parallel to the total angular momentum vector and passes through the center of mass of the system. This is indeed an $SO(2)$ rotation. It is clear that the value of the momentum map μ_r does not change at all by applying this $SO(2)$ rotation. So this constitutes the isotropy subgroup.

On the other hand $\dim(T^*(Q_{int}))$ is by 6 smaller than $\dim(T^*(Q_{cm}))$. Thus

$$\dim\left(\frac{\mu_r^{-1}(\mathbf{a})}{G_{\mathbf{a}}}\right) = \dim(T^*(Q_{int})) + 2. \quad (43)$$

So, in general the reduced phase space with

respect to rotations $SO(3)$ is diffeomorphic to the cotangent bundle of the internal space $T^*(Q_{int})$. From the discussion above, it is clear that the total group $SO(3)$ becomes an isotropy subgroup $G_{\mathbf{a}}$ if and only if $\mathbf{a} = 0$, and in this case one has

$$\frac{\mu_r^{-1}(0)}{SO(3)} \cong T^*(Q_{int}). \quad (44)$$

Generally speaking, the reduced phase space is diffeomorphic to the fiber product $T^*\left(\frac{Q}{G}\right) \times_f \left(\frac{Q}{G_{\mathbf{a}}}\right)$ over the quotient $\frac{Q}{G}$, keeping in mind that $\frac{Q}{G_{\mathbf{a}}}$ is naturally identified with the coadjoint orbit bundle $Q \times_G \left(\frac{G}{G_{\mathbf{a}}}\right)$ over $\frac{Q}{G}$ (see [16],[17])

Now we want to study the symplectic form $\sigma_{\mathbf{a}}$ on the reduced phase space $P_{\mathbf{a}} = \frac{\mu_r^{-1}(\mathbf{a})}{G_{\mathbf{a}}}$. Since $\sigma_{\mathbf{a}}$ is defined by

$$\pi_{\mu}^* \sigma_{\mu} = i_{\mu}^* \sigma$$

and $\sigma = d\theta$. we have furthermore $i_{\mu}^* d\theta = d(i_{\mu}^* \theta)$ in our case. Remember that the maps used are $\pi_r : \mu^{-1}(r) \rightarrow P_r$ and $i_r : \mu^{-1}(r) \rightarrow T^*(Q_{cm})$.

For notational convenience we work in the following on the tangent bundle over configuration space which is isomorphic to the cotangent bundle. Through this isomorphism the tangent bundle can be endowed with a canonical symplectic form, which we denote by the same letter we used for the cotangent bundle, i.e.

$$\theta_{(x,v)} = \sum m_k \langle v_k, dx_k \rangle = K(v, dx) \quad (45)$$

where each tangent space is equipped with a scalar product given by

$$K_x(u, v) = \sum m_k \langle u_k | v_k \rangle \quad (46)$$

for $u = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$ and $v = (v_1, \dots, v_N)$ of $T_x(Q)$.

Define

$$\omega_x^D : \mathfrak{so}(3) \rightarrow T_x(Q)$$

dual to $\omega_x : T_x \rightarrow \mathfrak{so}(3)$ where the following isomorphisms has been taken into account

$\mathfrak{so}(3) \cong \mathfrak{so}^*(3)$ and $T_x(Q) \cong T_x^*(Q)$. For $\mathbf{a} \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$ and $v \in T_x(Q)$, ω_x^D is defined by

$$(\omega_x(v) \mid \mathbf{a}) =: K_x(v, \omega_x^D(\mathbf{a})). \quad (47)$$

One can prove that for any $v \in T_x(Q)$ the vector $v - \omega_x^D \mu_r(x, p)$ with $I_x^{-1}(p) = v$ is vibrational (horizontal). To this end, it suffices to show that $v - \omega_x^D \mu_r(x, p)$ and $R_\xi(x)$ are orthogonal for any $\xi \in \wedge^2 \mathbb{R}^d$, in other words showing $K_x(R_\xi, v - \omega_x^D \mu_r(x, p)) = 0$, for $\forall \xi \in \wedge^2 \mathbb{R}^3$ (see [1]).

Taking

$$(x, v)$$

as a coordinate system on $T(Q)$, the submanifold $\mu_r^{-1}(\mathbf{a})$ is determined in $T(Q)$ by the condition $R_{-\sum m_k x_k \wedge v_k} = \mathbf{a}$. Let now

$$w = v - \omega_x^D \mu_r(x, p)$$

with $I_x^{-1}(p) = v$, then the pair

$$(x, w)$$

meets the condition $R_{-\sum m_k x_k \wedge w_k} = 0$, so that it serves as coordinate system in $\mu_r^{-1}(0)$ under that condition. A coordinate system on $\mu_r^{-1}(\mathbf{a})$ can then be given by the pair $(x, w + \omega_x^D \mathbf{a})$. With this in mind we rewrite the canonical one-form θ at point $(x, v) \in T(Q_{cm})$, which obviously has $T_{(x,v)}(T(Q_{cm}))$ as its domain

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{(x,v)} &= K(v, dx) \\ &= K_x(w, dx) + K_x(\omega_x^D \mu_r(x, p), dx) \\ &= K_x(w, dx) + (\mu_r(x, p) \mid \omega_x \circ dx), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we have used (47). Consequently on $\mu_r^{-1}(\mathbf{a})$ we have

$$i_{\mathbf{a}}^* \theta_{(x,v)} = K_x(w, dx) + (\mathbf{a} \mid \omega_x \circ dx) \quad (48)$$

where $v = w + \omega_x^D \mathbf{a}$. Thus the canonical two-form $d\theta$ restricts to $d(i_{\mathbf{a}}^* \theta)$ on $\mu_r^{-1}(\mathbf{a})$;

$$d(i_{\mathbf{a}}^* \theta) = d(K_x(w, dx)) + d(\mathbf{a} \mid \omega \circ dx). \quad (49)$$

In all these equations dx should be viewed as a vector $[dx_1, dx_2, \dots, dx_{N-1}]$. So you can formally act on it by the connection form ω and then take exterior derivative and so on.

Since w is horizontal i.e. $w \in T_{x,hor} \cong T_{\pi(x)}(Q_{int})$ the first term on the right hand side of (49) is invariant under the action of $SO(3)$, and hence in one-to-one correspondence with the canonical two-form on $T(Q_{int}) \cong T^*(Q_{int})$. In contrast, the second term of the same side, depending on x , cannot project to a two-form on Q_{int} . In fact $(\mathbf{a} \mid d\omega)$ is not horizontal (its value changes if we act with the group on it, or to be more precise acting by any member of G/G_a). We recall that the horizontal part of $d\omega$ is defined as the curvature form.

Last but not least, we discuss how an invariant metric¹³ on the total space of fiber bundles, induces metrics on horizontal and vertical subspaces. In the context of molecular physics this is known as *splitting of energy into vibrational and rotational parts* [1], as the total space $T(Q_{cm})$ is the tangent bundle over the center of mass configuration space of a molecule, and the group of 3-dimensional rotations being the structure group.

Recall the decomposition

$$T_x(Q_{cm}) = T_{x,rot} \oplus T_{x,hor}$$

and the orthogonal projections

$$P_x : T_x \rightarrow T_{x,rot}$$

and

$$H_x := (1_x - P_x) : T_x \rightarrow T_{x,hor}$$

where 1_x denotes the identity element in $T_x(Q_{cm})$. With the help of the connection form $\omega_x : T_x(Q_{cm}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{so}(d)$, one has the following orthogonal decomposition for any $v \in T_x(Q_{cm})$

$$\omega_x(v) = P_x(v) \Rightarrow v = P_x(v) + H_x(v)$$

Hence for any v and $u \in T_x(Q_{cm})$ one has

$$K_x(v, u) = K_x(P_x(v), P_x(u)) + K_x(H_x(v), H_x(u)). \quad (50)$$

Now if we set $v = u$, we obtain the kinetic energy expressed as the sum of rotational and

¹³Invariant under action of the structure group.

vibrational energies. However this does not mean that there is no coupling between the rotational and vibrational motions. The coupling rather manifests itself into the dynamics through the connection form ω .

We now focus on the second term on the r.h.s of (50). Let π be the natural projection of Q_{cm} onto Q_{int} . Differentiation of that map $\pi_* : T(Q_{cm}) \rightarrow T(Q_{int})$ restricted on $T_{x,hor}$ gives an isomorphism of $T_{x,hor}$ with $T_{\pi(x)}(Q_{int})$. Let $X, Y \in T_m(Q_{int})$ for some $m \in Q_{cm}$. Then, at every point x with $\pi(x) = m$, one has unique horizontal vectors v and u satisfying $\pi_*(v) = X$ and $\pi_*(u) = Y$. If the metric K_x is $SO(3)$ -invariant, i.e. $K_{gx}(gv, gu) = K_x(v, u)$ then the vibrational energy (second term of (50)) induces a Riemannian metric B on Q_{int} through

$$B_m(X, Y) := K_x(v, u) \quad (51)$$

One can easily verify that this definition is independent of the choice of x with $\pi(x) = m$.

We now look at the restriction of the vibrational energy to the submanifold μ_a^{-1} . Using the coordinate

$$w = v - \omega_x^D \mu_a(x, p)$$

(with $I_x^{-1}(p) = v$, paring the vectors and covectors (21)) the vibrational energy is written as $k_x(w, w)$ with $R_{-\sum m_k x_k \wedge w_k} = 0$, and is in one-to-one correspondence with the kinetic energy of the internal motion.

Now we turn to the first term on the r.h.s of (50), the rotational energy. Considering the definition of the inertia operator A_x of the configuration x , as a linear operator in $\wedge^2 \mathbb{R}^3$, one can calculate (see [1])

$$\begin{aligned} K_x(P_x(v), P_x(v)) &= K_x(\omega_x(v), \omega_x(v)) \\ &= (RA_x^{-1}R^{-1}\mu_r(x, p) \mid \mu_r(x, p)). \end{aligned}$$

If the system's Hamiltonian is rotation invariant the angular momentum is conserved i.e. $\mu = \mathbf{a}$, and the last expression becomes a function of just the space variables x , namely $(RA_x^{-1}R^{-1}\mu \mid \mu)$. This function is in fact invariant under G_a (easily verifiable by using

(98d), and thus projects down to a function on the reduced phase space, which can be seen as centrifugal potential.

Now all the necessary ingredients are available for the reduction of the Hamiltonian system with respect to $SO(3)$. Remembering the inclusion map and the projection map

$$i_a : \mu^{-1}(\mathbf{a}) \rightarrow P = T(Q_{cm}) \quad (52a)$$

$$\pi_a : \mu^{-1}(\mathbf{a}) \rightarrow P_a = \frac{\mu^{-1}(\mathbf{a})}{G_a}. \quad (52b)$$

The reduced phase space $\frac{\mu^{-1}(\mathbf{a})}{G_a}$ carries the symplectic form σ_a which, as discussed before, is related to the canonical form $d\theta$ through

$$i_a^* d\theta = \pi_a^* \sigma_a.$$

On $\frac{\mu^{-1}(\mathbf{a})}{G_a}$ the reduced Hamiltonian H_μ is defined by

$$H_a \circ \pi_a = H \circ i_a.$$

Note, that in the equations above defining the reduced symplectic form σ_a , and the reduced Hamiltonian H_a , the usage of π_a^{-1} is avoided, because the projection map π_a is obviously not invertible (it sends a whole fiber to a point on the reduced space). This form and the Hamiltonian are expressed in coordinates (x, v) on $\mu_r^{-1}(\mathbf{a})$ with $v = w + \omega_x^D \mathbf{a}$

$$\pi_a^* \sigma_a = i_a^* d\theta = d(K(w, dx)) + d(\mathbf{a} \mid \omega) \quad (53a)$$

$$H_a \circ \pi_a = H \circ i_a = \frac{1}{2}K(w, w) \quad (53b)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2}(RA_x^{-1}R^{-1}\mu_r(x, p) \mid \mu_r(x, p)) + U$$

where $R_{-\sum m_k x_k \wedge w_k} = 0$.

The r.h.s. of these equations are invariant under G_a , and hence can be thought of as quantities on the reduced phase space. The first expressions on the r.h.s. of (53a) and (53b) are in one-to-one correspondence with the "canonical two-form", and the "kinetic energy" on $T^*(Q_{int}) \cong T(Q_{int})$ respectively. The second expressions on the r.h.s. of (53a) and (53b) can be seen as the source of the "coriolis force" and the "centrifugal potential" of the system's projected motion on the internal space (so the internal motion) respectively.

Note, that if $a = 0$, the reduced phase space is diffeomorphic to the cotangent bundle $T^*(Q_{int})$ of the internal space Q_{int} , and the symplectic form $\sigma_{\mathbf{a}}$ becomes the canonical two form on $T^*(Q_{int})$. The reduced Hamiltonian H_a is then a sum of the kinetic energy of internal (horizontal) motions and the potential on Q_{int} (which is exactly the same potential as the one up on Q_{cm}). If the system's motion on absolute space is planar (so $Q \cong \mathbb{R}^{2N}$), and $\mathbf{a} \neq 0$ the reduced phase space is still diffeomorphic to $T^*(Q_{int})$, but the symplectic form $\sigma_{\mathbf{a}}$ is the canonical one plus a two-form which can be seen as a "magnetic field" on Q_{int} . The reduced Hamiltonian H_a also becomes the sum of kinetic and potential energies plus a centrifugal potential. In both these cases the system's motion is internal (horizontal). That means that it can be described on $T^*(Q_{int})$ or in terms of internal coordinates and their conjugate momenta.

V. REDUCTION WITH RESPECT TO THE SIMILARITY GROUP $Sim(3)$

i. Metrics on the internal and shape space

Following [18] we next review how the kinetic metric on absolute configuration space induces a metric on the internal configuration space $Q_{int} = \frac{Q_{cm}}{SO(3)}$. Thereafter, we explain a new way to derive a metric on shape space from the mass metric on absolute configuration space in a unique way.

Metric on the internal space:

Let us recall how the metric on the internal space $Q_{int} = \frac{Q_{cm}}{SO(3)}$ was derived from the $SO(3)$ -invariant mass metric (46) on the center of mass system

$$\mathbf{M}_x(u, v) = \sum m_k \langle u_k | v_k \rangle \quad (54a)$$

$$\mathbf{M}_x(u, v) = \mathbf{M}_{gx}(gu, gv) \quad (54b)$$

where $u = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$ and $v = (v_1, \dots, v_N) \in T_x(Q_{cm})$ being any two tangent vectors of Q_{cm} at the point $x \in Q_{cm}$.

Now given two internal vectors $v', u' \in T_q(Q_{int})$, there are unique vectors $u, v \in T_x(Q_{cm})$ ¹⁴ so that

$$\begin{cases} \pi(x) = q \\ \pi_*(u) = u' \\ \pi_*(v) = v'. \end{cases}$$

Now the metric B on Q_{int} can be defined in the following way

$$B_q(v', u') := \mathbf{M}_x(v, u). \quad (55)$$

Since the metric M is $SO(3)$ -invariant, it does not make any difference to which $x \in \pi^{-1}(q)$ the internal vectors v, u had been lifted for the value assigned by B_q . This is, in fact, crucial for the well-definedness of the reduced metric.

The kinetic energy of a N -particle system in the center of mass frame is $K = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N-1} |\dot{\mathbf{r}}_{\alpha}|^2$.

¹⁴namely their horizontal lifts (60).

Using $\dot{\mathbf{r}}_{b\alpha} = \boldsymbol{\omega} \times \mathbf{r}_{b\alpha} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}_{b\alpha}}{\partial q^\mu} \dot{q}^\mu$, and the expression

$$\mathbf{A}_\mu(q) = I^{-1} \mathbf{a}_\mu$$

for the gauge potentials, where

$$\mathbf{a}_\mu = \mathbf{a}_\mu(q) := \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N-1} \mathbf{r}_{b\alpha} \times \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}_{b\alpha}}{\partial q^\mu} \quad (56)$$

and A being the moment of inertia tensor with components

$$A_{ij} = A_{ij}(q) := \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N-1} (|\mathbf{r}_{b\alpha}|^2 \delta_{ij} - r_{b\alpha i} r_{b\alpha j})$$

one can write down the kinetic energy as

$$K = \frac{1}{2} \langle \boldsymbol{\omega} | A | \boldsymbol{\omega} \rangle + \langle \boldsymbol{\omega} | A | \mathbf{A}_\mu \rangle \dot{q}^\mu + \frac{1}{2} h_{\mu\nu} \dot{q}^\mu \dot{q}^\nu \quad (57)$$

with

$$h_{\mu\nu} = h_{\mu\nu}(q) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N-1} \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\rho}_\alpha}{\partial q^\mu} \cdot \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\rho}_\alpha}{\partial q^\nu}. \quad (58)$$

The velocity of a system's configuration in Jacobi coordinates is given by a vector

$$|v\rangle = [\dot{\mathbf{r}}_{s1}, \dots, \dot{\mathbf{r}}_{s,n-1}]$$

and in orientational and internal coordinates by the vector

$$|v\rangle = [\dot{\theta}^i, \dot{q}^\mu]$$

where θ^i are the Euler angles which turn the space frame to the body frame of a configuration. If one decides to use the components of the body angular velocity $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ instead of the time derivatives of the Euler angles for denoting vectors in $T(SO(3))$ the configuration's velocity can alternatively be expressed as

$$|v\rangle = [\boldsymbol{\omega}, \dot{q}^\mu]$$

in angular velocity and internal basis. This last combination forms an anholonomic frame or vielbein on $T(Q_{cm})$. Remember the relation

between the body components of angular velocity and derivatives of Euler angles

$$\begin{bmatrix} \omega_1 \\ \omega_2 \\ \omega_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -\sin\beta\cos\gamma & \sin\gamma & 0 \\ \sin\beta\sin\gamma & \cos\gamma & 0 \\ \cos\beta & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \dot{\alpha} \\ \dot{\beta} \\ \dot{\gamma} \end{bmatrix}.$$

So the (kinetic)metric tensor $m_{Q_{cm}}$ in angular and internal basis vectors $\{\omega^i, \dot{q}^\mu\}$, where $i = 1, 2, 3$, and $q = 1, \dots, 3N - 6$ becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v | v \rangle &= [\boldsymbol{\omega}^T \quad \dot{q}^\mu] \begin{bmatrix} A & \mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}_\nu \\ \mathbf{A}_\mu^T A & h_{\mu\nu} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\omega} \\ \dot{q}^\nu \end{bmatrix} \\ &= (m_{Q_{cm}})_{ab} v^a v^b. \end{aligned}$$

So, the metric on Q_{cm} in angular and internal basis vectors $[\boldsymbol{\omega}, \dot{q}^\mu]$ is given by

$$\mathbf{M}_{ab} = \begin{bmatrix} A & \mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}_\nu \\ \mathbf{A}_\mu^T A & h_{\mu\nu} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (59)$$

Decomposition of an arbitrary system's velocity in horizontal and vertical parts gives

$$|v\rangle = |v_v\rangle + |v_h\rangle$$

$$[\boldsymbol{\omega}, \dot{q}^\mu] = [\boldsymbol{\omega} + \mathbf{A}_v \dot{q}^\nu, 0] + [-\mathbf{A}_\mu \dot{q}^\nu, \dot{q}^\mu]$$

Correspondingly, the kinetic energy of the system can also be thought of as the addition of two separate vertical and horizontal kinetic energies, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} K &= K_v + K_h = \frac{1}{2} (\boldsymbol{\omega} + \mathbf{A}_\mu \dot{q}^\mu) A (\boldsymbol{\omega} + \mathbf{A}_\nu \dot{q}^\nu) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} B_{\mu\nu} \dot{q}^\mu \dot{q}^\nu \end{aligned}$$

where $B_{\mu\nu}$ is the metric on internal space

$$B_{\mu\nu} = h_{\mu\nu} - \mathbf{A}_\mu \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}_\nu.$$

So, in summary, to a vector

$$|v'\rangle = \dot{q}^\mu$$

on internal space Q_{int} we associate a vector $|v_h\rangle$ on Q_{cm} which is called its *horizontal lift*, connecting the two fibers. In the basis made of angular and shape velocities, the horizontal lift of v' takes the form

$$|v_h\rangle = [-\mathbf{A}_\mu \dot{q}^\mu, \dot{q}^\mu]. \quad (60)$$

Then, the metric $B_{\mu\nu}$ on the internal space can be found by the following defining equation

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v'_1 | v'_2 \rangle &= B_{\mu\nu} \dot{q}_1^\mu \dot{q}_2^\nu := \langle v_{1h} | v_{2h} \rangle \\ &= \mathbf{M}_{ab} v_{1h}^a v_{2h}^b \end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$B_{\mu\nu} = h_{\mu\nu} - \mathbf{A}_\mu \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}_\nu. \quad (61)$$

For more information about the derivation of the metric on internal space, we highly recommend [18].

Metrics on shape space:

Now we are ready to derive a metric N on shape space $S = \frac{Q}{sim(3)}$. Since the mass metric M is not scale invariant, it is generally believed that, in contrary to Q_{int} , it does not directly induce a metric on shape space S . Once one takes the change of the “flow of time” (measured in Planck units) under scale transformation into account, one can see that the original mass metric M_x directly induces a unique metric on Shape space. We first review how the metric on shape space is derived with introduction of a conformal factor, and then give our new derivation of the corresponding metric on shape space.

As is explained in [19] one can introduce a new $sim(3)$ -invariant metric on Q , which subsequently induces a metric on shape space in a natural way. As the mass metric \mathbf{M} is already rotation- and translation-invariant, the easiest way to arrive at a similarity-invariant metric is to multiply the mass metric by a function $f(x)$ (the so called conformal factor), so that the full expression

$$\mathbf{M}'_x := f(x) \mathbf{M}_x$$

becomes scale invariant, i.e.

$$\forall c \in \mathbb{R}^+, \forall u, v \in T_x(Q) :$$

$$f(cx) \mathbf{M}_{cx}(cu, cv) = f(x) \mathbf{M}_x(u, v).$$

Note that the function f must itself be translation- and rotation-invariant so that it

doesn't spoil the nice properties of the mass metric. As $M'_x = f(x)M_x$ is now a metric invariant under the full similarity group we are ready to write down the metric N on shape space:

$$N_s(v', u') := \mathbf{M}'_x(v, u) = f(x) \mathbf{M}_x(v, u), \quad (62)$$

where

$$\begin{cases} \pi(x) = s \\ \pi_*(u) = u' \\ \pi_*(v) = v' \end{cases}$$

with the projection map $\pi : Q_{cm} \rightarrow S = \frac{Q}{sim(3)}$. From the behavior of the mass metric \mathbf{M} under dilations i.e. $\mathbf{M}_{cx}(cu, cv) = c^2 \mathbf{M}_{cx}(v, u)$ one easily sees that any rotation- and translation-invariant homogeneous function¹⁵ of degree -2 perfectly meets all the requirements of a conformal factor. For instance

$$f(x) = \sum_{i < j} \| \mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j \|^2 \quad (63)$$

or

$$f(x) = I_{cm}^{-1} \quad (64)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_{cm}(x) &= \sum_j m_j \| \mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_{cm} \|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{\sum_i m_i} \sum_{i < j} m_i m_j \| \mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i \|^2 \end{aligned}$$

are two legitimate examples of conformal factors (as suggested in [19]). However, as the introduction of conformal factors leads to the appearance of unphysical forces (see appendix i for clarification), and as there exists some arbitrariness in the choice of this function, we prefer to avoid this method here. Below we propose another way to derive the corresponding metric on shape space which does not show the problems just mentioned.

Bearing in mind that measurements of the velocity are something experimental, the transformation law of the velocities under scale

¹⁵A function of r variables x_1, \dots, x_r is being called homogeneous of degree n if $f(cx_1, \dots, cx_r) = c^n f(x_1, \dots, x_r), \forall c$

transformations of the system (or any other transformation of the system) must also include experimental reasoning. Based on the principle of relationalism we showed that the behavior of rods and clocks under scale transformations of the system is such that the measured velocities of objects (or parts of the system) are invariant. This is a natural consequence of the simultaneous expansion of the measuring rod and a corresponding dilation of unit of time (See section II.iv for an explanation of this fact).

Hence a velocity vector

$$v_x = (v_1, \dots, v_N) \in T_x(Q_{cm})$$

of an N-particle system transforms under dilations of the system as

$$x \rightarrow cx$$

$$v_x = (v_1, \dots, v_N) \in T_x(Q_{cm})$$

$$\rightarrow v_{cx} = (v_1, \dots, v_N) \in T_{cx}(Q_{cm}).$$

Hence for this transformation of velocities under scale transformations of the system, the mass metric is indeed scale invariant in a trivial way, i.e.

$$\mathbf{M}_x(v_x, u_x) \rightarrow \mathbf{M}_{cx}(v_{cx}, u_{cx}) = \mathbf{M}_x(v_x, u_x).$$

In other words, the mass metric M expressed in special coordinates on Q_{cm} built from internal rods (for example Planck's unit of length), is scale invariant.

So the metric N of the shape space can be written as

$$N_s(v', u') := \mathbf{M}_x(v, u), \quad (65)$$

where

$$\begin{cases} \pi(x) = s \\ \pi_*(u) = u' \\ \pi_*(v) = v' \end{cases}$$

with the projection map $\pi : Q_{cm} \rightarrow S = \frac{Q}{sim(3)}$. The metric N is defined as before and it does not make any difference for the value assigned by N_s to which $x \in \pi^{-1}(q)$ the shape vectors v', u' are lifted, because the metric \mathbf{M} is $Sim(3)$ -invariant

ii. Reduction of the theory

For the purpose of reduction of classical mechanics w.r.t. scale transformations, we now use the methods explained in chapter III. One of the reasons that so far nobody has gone after extension of these formalisms to the similarity group is obviously that the potential function defined on absolute space, though being manifestly rotational and translational invariant, is clearly not scale invariant (take Newtonian gravity as an example). However as explained in chapter II, scale transformation becomes an additional symmetry of classical physics (see equation (17)) and this enables us to perform a symplectic reduction of the system's phase space with respect to the whole similarity group $G = sim(3)$.

Beside having a similarity invariant potential function on absolute configuration space (see equation (17)), in order to reduce the classical systems with respect to the similarity group (which was originally argued for and motivate in chapter II) with the help of symplectic reduction methods explained in chapter III, we have to change the connection form (31) to the following one

$$\begin{aligned} \omega &= \omega_r + \omega_s \\ &= R \left(A_x^{-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N-1} r_j \times dr_j \right) \right) + I_3 \mathbf{D}_x^{-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N-1} r_j \cdot dr_j \right) \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

in which I_3 is the 3×3 identity matrix, and we have defined the operator

$$\mathbf{D}_x : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

$$\dot{\lambda} \rightarrow D$$

expansion velocity \rightarrow *dilational momentum*

as

$$\mathbf{D}_x(\dot{\lambda}) := \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} r_j^2 \dot{\lambda} \quad (67)$$

and we call it the "*dilational tensor*". Here $\dot{\lambda}$ stands for the rate of change of scale of the

system (scale velocity so to speak)¹⁶

$$\dot{\lambda} := \frac{\dot{\lambda}}{\lambda} \quad (68)$$

with

$$\lambda := \max |\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j| \quad (69)$$

for $i, j = 1, \dots, N$ being the system's scale variable.

We constructed this operator in direct analogy to the inertia tensor A_x . The inertia tensor sends an angular velocity (which can be represented as a vector in \mathbb{R}^3) to another vector in \mathbb{R}^3 which represents the total angular momentum of the whole system (object). In the same way, the dilational tensor \mathbf{D}_x takes an expansion velocity, which can be represented by just a number in \mathbb{R} to a measure of total expansion of the system (dilational momentum D) which again can be represented by another number in \mathbb{R} . As the Lie algebra of the group $\frac{sim(3)}{trans(3)}$ can be considered to be the addition of 3×3 skew-symmetric matrices of $\mathfrak{so}(3)$, and real multiples of 3×3 identity matrix I_3 , one recognizes the correct structure in this connection form. If one takes a random vector of $T_x(M)$ and act on it by this connection form, the first term of (66) gives a member of $\mathfrak{so}(3)$, and the second term, a number multiplied by the identity matrix I_3 . So, it does what it is expected to do.

ii.1 Symplectic reduction of phase space

Now that the metric (65) on shape space, and the connection form (66) is given, the way to get the reduced Hamiltonian equations of motion with respect to the similarity group is paved.

The first step is to find the momentum mapping corresponding to the group

$$G = SO(3) \times \mathbb{R}^+.$$

¹⁶Here of course we assume that all measurements are conducted with the use of special Newtonian rods and clocks, which are isolated from the materialized universe and do not get affected by them in any way or by transformations we perform on the materialized universe. Practically of course such measuring instruments do not exist, but existence of absolute space and absolute time in Newtonian world view justifies their hypothetical existence.

To this end consider first the Lie algebra of G . It can be written as

$$\mathbf{G} = zI_3 + \mathfrak{so}(3)$$

where $z \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ are as usual the skew-symmetric 3×3 matrices standing for the lie algebra of the rotations group.

The action of G on $T^*(Q_{cm})$ is the following

$$(x_1, \dots, x_{N-1}; p_1, \dots, p_{N-1}) \quad (70)$$

↓

$$(cgx_1, \dots, cgx_{N-1}; gp_1, \dots, gp_{N-1}),$$

where, as before, $c \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $g \in SO(3)$ (and all the lengths and time intervals are measured by the absolute Newtonian rods and clocks.).

The momentum mapping corresponding to scale transformations is $\mu_{scale} = \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} r_j \cdot dr_j$. Hence the momentum mapping for the group ¹⁷ G becomes

$$\mu_{sim} = I_3 \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} r_j \cdot dr_j + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} R_{-r_j \wedge p_j}. \quad (71)$$

We call μ_{sim} the similarity momentum ¹⁸. Remember that mathematically the similarity momentum is the following mapping

$$\mu_{sim} : P = T^*(Q_{cm}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}I_3 + \mathfrak{so}(3) := \mathbf{G} \cong \mathbf{G}^*. \quad (72)$$

In fact \mathbf{G} is the summation of a skewsymmetric matrix with a real multiple of the identity matrix.

Let $a \in \mathbf{G} \cong \mathbf{G}^*$. It can be rewritten as $a = DI_3 + \mathbf{L}$ for some $D \in \mathbb{R}$ standing for dilational momentum (diagonal part of a), and some $\mathbf{L} \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$ standing for the angular momentum (the non-diagonal part of a). As before, $\mu_G^{-1}(a)$ is a submanifold of $P = T^*(Q_{cm})$. The reduced phase space $\frac{\mu_G^{-1}(a)}{G_a}$ is then achieved by quotienting $\mu_G^{-1}(a)$ with respect to the isotropy group G_a .

¹⁷of both rotations and scale transformations

¹⁸with slight abuse of notation, since starting with the center of mass system translations are not taken into account.

The isotropy group corresponding to rotations was already discussed in chapter 3. Now it's time to discuss the same question for the scale transformations. For simplicity consider a system which is purely expanding. The dilational momentum of this system is

$$D = \sum_{i=1} \mathbf{r}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i.$$

Now perform a scale transformation $\mathbf{r}_i \rightarrow c\mathbf{r}_i$. Having the corresponding transformation law of the velocities (70) in mind, the dilational momentum transforms as

$$D \rightarrow D' = \sum_i (c\mathbf{r}_i) \cdot \mathbf{v}_i = cD. \quad (73)$$

This should be compared to the system's angular momentum, which is also in general¹⁹ not invariant under rotations²⁰. From (73) it becomes clear that any scale transformation changes the value of the dilational momentum, except if $D = 0$. Hence the isotropy subgroup of the scale transformations is \emptyset when $D \neq 0$, and \mathbb{R}^+ when $D = 0$.

Now we are in a position to compare the reduced phase space $\frac{\mu_G^{-1}(a)}{G_a}$ with respect to $G = \mathbb{R}^+ \circ SO(3)$ with the cotangent bundle of shape space $T^*(S)$. Remember that $\dim(T^*(Q_{cm})) = 6N - 6$ and $\dim(T^*(S)) = 6N - 14$. Thus when going from the cotangent bundle of the center of mass system $T^*(Q_{cm})$ to the cotangent bundle of the shape space $T^*(S)$, 8 dimensions get eliminated.

Choosing a specific value $a \in \mathbf{G}$ for the similarity momentum of the system reduces the dimension of $T^*(Q_{cm})$ by 4. Consequently taking the quotient with respect to the corresponding isotropy group G_a , leads to an elimination of 1 extra dimension when $\mathbf{L} \neq 0$ and $D \neq 0$ (because in this case $G_a = SO(2)$) and 4 extra dimension when $\mathbf{L} = D = 0$. For this latter case 8 dimensions are eliminated in total and hence the reduced phase space becomes

¹⁹whenever the system's angular momentum is non-vanishing

²⁰Note however, using instead of absolute Newtonian rods and clocks internal rods and clocks, dilational momentum becomes invariant under scale transformations.

isomorphic to the cotangent bundle of shape space i.e.

$$\frac{\mu_G^{-1}(0)}{G_0} \cong T^*(S).$$

For the generic case of $\mathbf{L}, D \neq 0$ we have

$$\dim\left(\frac{\mu_G^{-1}(a)}{G_a}\right) = \dim(T^*(S)) + 3. \quad (74)$$

Now we wish to discuss the canonical form and its reduction with respect to $G = SO(3) \times \mathbb{R}^+$. In particular we seek the reduced symplectic form σ_a on the reduced phase space

$$P_a = \frac{\mu_r^{-1}(a)}{G_a}$$

starting as usual with the canonical one-form $\theta = \sum m_k \langle v_k, dx_k \rangle = K(v, dx)$ as we saw in (45). Remember that σ_a was defined by $\pi_\mu^* \sigma_\mu = i_\mu^* \sigma$ with $\sigma = d\theta$ and the inclusion map i_μ and the projection map π_a were defined as the following

$$i_a : \mu_{sim}^{-1}(a) \rightarrow P = T^*(Q_{cm}) \quad (75a)$$

$$\pi_a : \mu_{sim}^{-1}(a) \rightarrow P_a = \frac{\mu_{sim}^{-1}(a)}{G_a}. \quad (75b)$$

Define an operator dual to the connection form (66) as

$$\omega_x^D : \mathbf{G} = \mathbb{R}I_3 + \mathfrak{so}(3) \rightarrow T_x(Q_{cm}).$$

For $a \in \mathbf{G}$ and $v \in T_x(Q_{cm})$, ω_x^D was defined in (47). We mentioned in section IV.ii that for any $v \in T_x(Q)$ the vector $v - \omega_x^D \mu_{sim}(x, p)$ with $I_x^{-1}(p) = v$ is horizontal.

We choose (x, v) as coordinate system in $T(Q_{cm})$. The submanifold $\mu_{sim}^{-1}(a)$ is determined in $T(Q_{cm})$ by the condition

$$I_3 \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} x_j \cdot v_j + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} R_{-m_j x_j \wedge v_j} = a.$$

Now with the help of ω_x^D decompose a vector $v \in T(Q_{cm}) \cong T^*(Q_{cm})$ into horizontal and vertical part, i.e. $v = w + \omega_x^D \mu_{sim}(x, p)$ where again $I_x^{-1}(p) = v$. Rewrite the canonical one-form θ as the following

$$\theta_{(x,v)} = \mathbf{M}(v, dx) = \mathbf{M}(w + \omega_x^D \mu_{sim}(x, p), dx)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbf{M}(w, dx) + K(\omega_x^D \mu_{sim}(x, p), dx) \\
&= \mathbf{M}(w, dx) + (\mu_{sim}(x, p) \mid \omega_x \circ dx).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence on $\mu_{sim}^{-1}(a)$ we get the following one-form

$$i_a^* \theta_{(x,v)} = \mathbf{M}(w, dx) + (a \mid \omega_x \circ dx), \quad (76)$$

where we again used the horizontal-vertical decomposition of vectors $v = w + \omega_x^D a$. The canonical two-form on $\mu_{sim}^{-1}(a)$ then becomes

$$d(i_a^* \theta) = d(\mathbf{M}(w, dx)) + d(a \mid \omega \circ dx). \quad (77)$$

Since w is horizontal i.e. $w \in W_{x,hor} \cong T_{\pi(x)}(S)$ the first term in the right hand side of (77) is invariant under $G = \mathbb{R}^+ \times SO(3)$, and hence in one-to-one correspondence with the canonical two-form on $T(S) \cong T^*(S)$. Contrary to this the second term of the same side, depends on x , and hence does not project to any two-form on $T^*(S)$. As a matter of fact $(a \mid d\omega)$ is not horizontal (its value changes if we act with the group on it, or to be more precise acting by any member of G/G_a).

Having the following substitutions for the similarity momentum

$$a = DI_3 + \mathbf{L}$$

and for the connection form (66),

$$\omega = \omega_r + \omega_s$$

where as before

$$\omega_r : T(Q_{cm}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{so}(3)$$

and

$$\omega_s : T(Q_{cm}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}I_3$$

we rewrite the second term in (77) as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
d(a \mid \omega \circ dx) &= d(DI_3 + \mathbf{L} \mid (\omega_r + \omega_s) \circ dx) \\
&= d(\mathbf{L} \mid \omega_r \circ dx) + d(DI_3 \mid \omega_s \circ dx).
\end{aligned}$$

Here we also used the fact that a diagonal and a skew-symmetric matrix are perpendicular to each other w.r.t. the matrix inner product $(A \mid B) = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(AB^T)$. Hence, the two-form

on reduced phase space $\mu_{sim}^{-1}(a)$ can be rewritten:

$$\begin{aligned}
d(i_a^* \theta) &= d(\mathbf{M}(w, dx)) + d(\mathbf{L} \mid \omega_r \circ dx) \quad (78) \\
&\quad + d(DI_3 \mid \omega_s \circ dx).
\end{aligned}$$

As mentioned before in general ($\mathbf{L} \neq 0$ and $D \neq 0$) neither the second term nor the third term is in one-to-one correspondence with two-forms on $T^*(S)$ as a result of the non-trivial transformation laws of \mathbf{L} and D under the group $\frac{G}{G_a}$. However, as these terms are invariant under G_a , they can legitimately be considered as differential forms on reduced phase space P_a . The second term is the source of *Coriolis force* [1]. We call the last term *dilational force*. Note that even when the overall angular momentum of the system under consideration vanishes, i.e. $\mathbf{L} = 0$, its overall expansion (or contraction) causes extra complication for the reduced motion on S , so that it fails to be a describable in $T^*(S)$. So the dilational force, like the Coriolis force, is a non-Hamiltonian force (cannot be derived from a potential function on S).

A similar procedure as the one seen in the previous section leads to a splitting of the kinetic energy. Having the decomposition

$$T_x(Q_{cm}) = T_{x,sim} \oplus T_{x,hor}$$

and the orthogonal projections

$$P_x = T_x \rightarrow T_{x,sim}$$

and

$$H_x = 1_x - P_x$$

in mind, for any v and $u \in T_x(Q_{cm})$ one has

$$\mathbf{M}_x(v, u) =$$

$$\mathbf{M}_x(P_x(v), P_x(u)) + \mathbf{M}_x(H_x(v), H_x(u)).$$

Now if we set $v = u$, we obtain the kinetic energy expressed as the sum of similarity and shape energies. In particular the similarity energy can be written down as

$$\mathbf{M}_x(P_x(v), P_x(v)) = (RA_x^{-1}R^{-1}\mathbf{L} \mid \mathbf{L}) \quad (79)$$

$$+(I_3 \mathbf{D}^{-1} D | I_3 D),$$

where R and A_x were defined as

$$R : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathfrak{so}(3)$$

$$R(a) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -a^3 & a^2 \\ a^3 & 0 & -a^1 \\ -a^2 & a^1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

for $a \in \mathbb{R}^3$, as explained in more extend in appendix iv, and

$$A_x : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$$

$$A_x(\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \mathbf{r}_j \times (\mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{r}_j), \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^3, x \in Q_{cmns}.$$

The symplectic form σ_a on the reduced phase space $P_a = \frac{\mu_{sim}^{-1}(a)}{G_a}$ can as before be derived from the canonical 2-form $d\theta$ through

$$i_a^* d\theta = \pi_a^* \sigma_a$$

and the reduced Hamiltonian H_a on P_a is defined through $H_a \circ \pi_a = H \circ i_a$.²¹ Choosing the coordinate system (x, v) on $\mu_{sim}^{-1}(a)$, where $v = \omega^D(a)$, one gets the following expressions for the reduced two-form, and reduced Hamiltonian

$$\pi_a^* \sigma_a = i_a^* d\theta = d(\mathbf{M}(w, dx)) + d(\mathbf{L} | \omega_r) \quad (80)$$

$$+ d(DI_3 | \omega_s)$$

$$H_a \circ \pi_a = H \circ i_a = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{M}(w, w) + \frac{1}{2} (RA_x^{-1} R^{-1} \mathbf{L} | \mathbf{L}) \quad (81)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} (I_3 \mathbf{D}^{-1} D | I_3 D) + U.$$

The last term at the right hand side of (80) can be understood as a new kind of fictitious force, which we call *dilational force*. It has a similar nature as the Coriolis force. The third term on the right hand side of (81) can also be understood as a new kind of potential, which we call *scale potential*. The scale force, which is defined as the gradient of the scale potential, is in its nature similar to the centrifugal force.

²¹As before the inclusion map was defined as

$$i_a : \mu_{sim}^{-1}(a) \rightarrow P = T^*(Q_{cm})$$

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we reviewed the method of symplectic reduction of a dynamical system with respect to a symmetry group. To illustrate this method, we also reviewed its application in reducing classical mechanics with respect to the Euclidean group $E(3)$.

We introduced a new physical principle, i.e. the "*Principle of Relationalism*", as a guideline for the implementation of relational ideas in modern physics. This principle enabled us to make classical physics scale invariant, which in turn ensured the existence of laws of motion on shape space. So it enabled us to achieve a full relational reading of classical physics, which was hiding itself behind some foundational incompletenesses of the classical theories, i.e. lack of any derivation for the so called "constants of nature" from within the theories. We then performed the symplectic reduction of the new scale invariant theory on absolute configuration space, and derived the reduced equations of motion (for the system's shape degrees of freedom). The appearance of two new forces on the reduced phase space were noticeable.

VII. APPENDIX

i. Geodesics as true evolution on shape space?

One can assume²² that the true evolution on shape space is exactly along the geodesics corresponding to the metric (62) on shape space, as is the case in [11] and [19]. Of course, horizontal lifting of any geodesic from shape space S to absolute configuration space Q also results in a geodesic with respect to a conformal metric \mathbf{M}' there. Now consider the Jacobi action on Q

$$\bar{S} = \int_{\tau_A}^{\tau_B} \sqrt{(E - V)} \frac{dl}{d\tau} d\tau = \int_{\tau_A}^{\tau_B} \sqrt{(E - V)} dl \quad (82)$$

and take $E = 0$. To ensure that the corresponding action principle $\bar{S} = \int_{\tau_A}^{\tau_B} \sqrt{-V} dl$ ²³ always leads to a geodesic on absolute configuration space, V must indeed take the role of a conformal factor, i.e. $V = -f(x)$. Thus the expression $\sqrt{-V} dl$ becomes the line element with respect to the new metric \mathbf{M}' , as is elaborated in [19]. So, using (63) for the conformal factor (as one among many options) one gets $V = \sum_{i < j} \frac{1}{\|x_i - x_j\|^2}$, where the summation goes over all particles. The characteristic feature of this potential is its homogeneity of degree -2 , which is a necessary condition for a conformal factor. As the main classical interaction potentials between particles are known to be inversely proportional to their distance from each other, the previous result seems at first glance to be empirically inadequate. However it may be the case that under certain circumstances an effective potential function of degree -1 could emerge for certain subsystems of the universe whose shape is evolving along a geodesic on shape space. Julian Barbour probed this possibility (in [11]) by starting with the following homogeneous function

of degree -2

$$U = -\frac{W^2}{2}$$

as the potential on absolute space, where $W = \sum_{i < j} \frac{m_i m_j}{|x_i - x_j|}$. Then in an inertial frame of reference with the spacial Newtonian time parameter t (see (16)), the equations of motion are

$$\frac{dp^i}{dt} = -W \frac{\partial W}{\partial x^i} \quad (83)$$

which is the Newton's law if the W behind the differentiation is replaced with G . He then goes on and argues that if the system is virialized,²⁴ the value of W remains effectively constant, and hence the motions of Newtonian type (hence described by homogenous potentials of degree -1) emerge effectively. Note that the vanishing of the Dilational momentum as a consequence of best matching with respect to scale transformations, enforces the constancy of the moment of inertia I_{cm} . So one may think that the experimentally verified Hubble expansion is clearly in contradiction with constancy of I_{cm} . But as Julian Barbour argued, constancy of I_{cm} would not prevent the matter from clumping, which would increase $-W$ and hence the gravitational constant. Take for instance, a planet orbiting a sun in a universe that in general is becoming clumpier. According to Barbour's theory, the gravitational force should then become stronger, and hence distance between the planet and the sun should adiabatically decrease. However if one insists that the strength of gravity in the distinguished inertial frame is constant (as is the case in normal Newtonian theory)

²⁴virialized means a system of gravitationally interacting particles that is stable. The smaller structures can still interact with each other, but the clusters as a whole doesn't expand or collapse. When a cluster is virialized the merging process and the collapse of matter have finished and the formation process of the galaxy is done. A system is virialized when the potential energy is twice the negative kinetic energy. From this one can find the condition $R_{vir} \cong \frac{R_{max}}{2}$ where R_{vir} is the radius when the cluster is virialized, and R_{max} is the radius (of the moment) at which the cluster starts to collapse. So by looking at the radius and the density of a cluster one can deduce if a cluster is virialized or not.

²²Arguments for this assumption are usually based on simplicity and beauty which are being seen in reducing all of physics to geometry as strongly promoted by Descartes.

²³ $dl^2 = g_{ij} dx^i dx^j$

one is forced to have an adiabatic increase of all scales in this frame. This would then mimic a Hubble-type expansion in this frame. However, he does mention that he probably cannot go around the Hubble red shift in this way... .

Barbour then tried another option to achieve a scale invariant theory. This time by using the unique conserved quantity I_{cm} in his 2003 theory. Newtonian potentials can be converted into scale invariant potentials if multiplied by an appropriate power of $\mu = \sqrt{I_{cm}} = \sqrt{\sum_{i<j} m_i m_j r_{ij}^2}$.

Thus, starting with the general Newtonian potential

$$V = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} a_k V_k$$

with V_k 's being homogeneous functions of degree k , one goes over to the scale invariant potential

$$\tilde{V} = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} b_k V_k \mu^{-(2+k)}$$

and according to Newton's law of motion, one ends up with the following equations of motion

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dp^i}{dt} &= - \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} b_k \mu^{-(2+k)} \frac{\partial V_k}{\partial x^i} \\ &+ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} (2+k) b_k \mu^{-(2+k)} V_k \frac{1}{\mu} \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial x^i} \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

In order to make the connection with the observations (hence also to V), one has to set $b_k \mu^{-(2+k)} = a_k$. Then the equations of motion for the modified (scale-invariant) potential (84) turns into the following

$$\frac{dp^i}{dt} = - \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} a_k \frac{\partial V_k}{\partial x^i} + C(t) \sum_j m_i m_j \frac{\partial r_{ij}^2}{\partial x^i} \quad (85)$$

with $C(t) = \frac{\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} (2+k) a_k V_k}{2 \sum_{i<j} m_i m_j r_{ij}^2}$.

So the real force acting on the i 'th particle can be decomposed into the Newtonian-type forces and a residue which is a cosmological force. However in [20] it is claimed that also

this attempt turns out to be empirically inadequate, since it fails to show the formation of clusters for an expanding N-body solutions, and therefore fails to explain the emergence of stars and galaxies.

In a recent publication [19], these ideas of emergence of interacting theories on absolute space, from a free (non-interacting) theory on Shape space are being elaborated, and expanded to the quantum mechanics.

In this paper we did not insist on geodesicity of dynamics on shape space. We rather sought the projected dynamical law from the absolute configuration space down to the shape space. The principle of relationalism was used to make classical physics invariant under global scale transformations.

ii. Mass tensor

Originally the Kinetic energy K of a classical N -particle system is expressed (defined) in Cartesian coordinates as following

$$K = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \dot{\mathbf{r}}_i^2 = \frac{1}{2} [\dot{\mathbf{r}}_1, \dots, \dot{\mathbf{r}}_N] \mathbf{M} \begin{bmatrix} \dot{\mathbf{r}}_1 \\ \dots \\ \dot{\mathbf{r}}_N \end{bmatrix} \quad (86)$$

where $\dot{\mathbf{r}}_i := \frac{d\mathbf{r}_i}{dt}$ with $\mathbf{r}_i = \begin{bmatrix} x_{3i-2} \\ x_{3i-1} \\ x_{3i} \end{bmatrix}$ and \mathbf{M} is

the so called mass matrix which is in this case just a block diagonal $3N \times 3N$ matrix with

$$\begin{bmatrix} m_j & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m_j & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & m_j \end{bmatrix} \text{ as its } j\text{'s block.}$$

Here, as usual, configuration space is coordinatized by x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{3N} which are in turn the collection of Cartesian coordinates $x_{3i-2}, x_{3i-1}, x_{3i}$ used to denote the position (vector in \mathbb{R}^3) of the i 'th particle \mathbf{r}_i .

Now if the system suffers a number of holonomic constraints, generalized coordinates q_1, q_2, \dots, q_f (with $f < 3N$ standing for total number of remaining degrees of freedom), can be used for coordinatizing the new (generalized) configuration space.

Now if one rewrites the kinetic energy K in

terms of these new generalized coordinates q_j and their velocities \dot{q}_j one ends up usually with a much more complicated expression than (86) and, in fact, the metric loses independence of the configuration, and its simple diagonal quadratic form in the velocities. In generalized coordinates, it is quadratic but not necessarily homogeneous in the velocities \dot{q}_j , and has in general a non-trivial dependence on the coordinates q_j (through M).

If the coordinate transformation between the set of Cartesian coordinates x_1, \dots, x_{3N} and the generalized coordinates q_1, \dots, q_f is time-independent (see [18]), the kinetic energy can be written as

$$K = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,l} M_{kl} \dot{q}_k \dot{q}_l = \frac{1}{2} [\dot{q}_1, \dots, \dot{q}_f] \mathbf{M} \begin{bmatrix} \dot{q}_1 \\ \dots \\ \dot{q}_f \end{bmatrix}, \quad (87)$$

where

$$M_{kl} = \sum_{j=1}^N m_j \frac{d\mathbf{r}_j}{dq_k} \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{r}_j}{dq_l} \\ = \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i=0}^2 m_j \frac{dx_{3j-i}}{dq_k} \frac{dx_{3j-i}}{dq_l}$$

are elements of the $f \times f$ matrix \mathbf{M} .

The Lagrangian of classical mechanics is shown to be $L = K - V$, where the potential V is usually independent of the generalized velocities \dot{q}_i . The conjugate momentum to q_i is defined as

$$p_i = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}_i} = \frac{\partial K}{\partial \dot{q}_i} = \sum_{j=1}^f M_{ij} \dot{q}_j. \quad (88)$$

Thus the expression (87) for the kinetic energy which involved just the velocities can be rewritten as

$$K = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^f p_i \dot{q}_i \quad (89)$$

iii. Adjoint and Coadjoint action of a Lie-Group

Let G be a Lie group, and \mathbf{G} its Lie algebra, and \mathbf{G}^* be the dual vector space of \mathbf{G} . The adjoint representation of $g \in G$ on \mathbf{G} is defined

by

$$Ad_g(Y) = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} (g e^{tY} g^{-1}) \quad (90)$$

for $Y \in \mathbf{G}$.

The coadjoint action of $g \in G$ on \mathbf{G}^* is characterized by

$$\langle Ad_g^*(\xi), Y \rangle = \langle \xi, Ad_{g^{-1}}(Y) \rangle \quad (91)$$

for $\xi \in \mathbf{G}^*$

Here, $\langle, \rangle : \mathbf{g}^* \times \mathbf{g} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is the dual pairing.

In summary: $ad_g(x) = gxg^{-1}$, $Ad_g = (ad_g)^* : \mathbf{G} \rightarrow \mathbf{G}$ being called the adjoint action, $Ad_g^* : \mathbf{G}^* \rightarrow \mathbf{G}^*$ being called the coadjoint action.

iv. Isomorphism R

There exists an isomorphism R between the Lie-algebra $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ of the rotation group, and the linear space $\wedge^2 \mathbf{R}^3$ of all antisymmetric tensors of order 2, which we want to explain shortly.

Take $\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_3$ as an orthonormal basis of \mathbf{R}^3 . Then $\mathbf{e}_i \wedge \mathbf{e}_j$ with $i < j$ constitutes an orthonormal basis of $\wedge^2 \mathbf{R}^3$. The inner product in $\wedge^2 \mathbf{R}^2$ is defined as the following

$$(u \wedge v | x \wedge y) = \begin{vmatrix} (u | x) & (u | y) \\ (v | x) & (v | y) \end{vmatrix}. \quad (92)$$

One can easily check that for two two-vectors (or tensors of order 2) $\xi = \sum_{i < j} \xi_{ij} \mathbf{e}_i \wedge \mathbf{e}_j$ and $\zeta = \sum_{k < l} \zeta_{kl} \mathbf{e}_k \wedge \mathbf{e}_l$, definition (92) leads to the following

$$(\xi | \zeta) = \sum_{i < j} \xi_{ij} \zeta_{ij}. \quad (93)$$

Now we identify the Lie-algebra of the rotation group in 3 dimensions $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ with the space of two forms (anti-symmetric tensors) $\wedge^2 \mathbf{R}^3$ by the isomorphism R

$$R : \wedge^2 \mathbf{R}^3 \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{so}(3) \quad (94)$$

$$\xi \rightarrow R_\xi.$$

So for $u, v, x \in \mathbf{R}^3$ we define the following

$$R_{u \wedge v}(x) := (v | x)u - (u | x)v. \quad (95)$$

$R_{u \wedge v}$ is in fact a 3 dimensional square matrix and its multiplication by a 3 dimensional vector x is given by the last equation. For $\xi \in \wedge^2 \mathbb{R}^3$ and $x = \sum x_j \mathbf{e}_j \in \mathbb{R}^3$ one can also write the above formula as

$$R_{\xi}(x) = \sum_i \left(\sum_j \xi_{ij} x_j \right) \mathbf{e}_i. \quad (96)$$

That is, R_{ξ} is an antisymmetric matrix with entries ξ_{ij} .

Given the natural scalar product of the Lie algebra; $(\alpha | \beta) = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\alpha \beta^T)$ for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$ one can show that the identification R is even an isometry from $\wedge^2 \mathbb{R}^d$ to $\mathfrak{so}(d)$.

As explained in [1], the space $\wedge^2 \mathbb{R}^3$ can be identified with \mathbb{R}^3 by $\mathbf{e}_1 \wedge \mathbf{e}_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{e}_3$ and its cyclic permutations. Hence if one sets

$$\xi_{12} = \phi^3, \xi_{23} = \phi^1, \xi_{31} = \phi^2$$

the two vector

$$\xi = \sum_{i < j} \xi_{ij} \mathbf{e}_i \wedge \mathbf{e}_j$$

is identified with

$$\phi = \sum \phi^i \mathbf{e}_i.$$

So in this case R becomes a linear isomorphism from \mathbb{R}^3 to $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ i.e.

$$R : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathfrak{so}(3)$$

$$R_{\xi}(x) = R_{\phi}(x) = -\phi \times x \quad (97)$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$.

Alternatively, R_{e_1} is the matrix (ξ_{ij}) with the only nonzero elements $\xi_{23} = -\xi_{32} = 1$.

One can also show([1]) that R is Ad-equivariant i.e. $R_{g\phi} = Ad_g R(\phi) = gR(\phi)g^{-1}$.

The map R , and the inertial tensor A_x have the following properties:

$$R_a b = a \times b \quad (98a)$$

$$R_{g a} = g R_a g^{-1} \quad (98b)$$

$$R_a \cdot R_b = \langle a | b \rangle \quad (98c)$$

$$A_{g x}(a) = g A_x(g^{-1} a) := Ad_g A_x(a) \quad (98d)$$

$$(x | R_{\xi} y) = (x \wedge y | \xi) \quad (98e)$$

$$(R_{\xi} x | R_{\eta} y) = (R_{\xi} x \wedge y | \eta) \quad (98f)$$

where $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $g \in SO(3)$.

v. Symbols

x	A point on $Q_{cm} := \frac{Q}{\mathbb{R}^3}$
q	A point on $Q_{int} = \frac{Q_{cm}}{SO(3)}$
s	A point on shape space $S := \frac{Q}{\text{sim}(3)}$
dl	line element w.r.t. the mass metric
\mathbf{r}_i	i 's Jacobi vector of an N -particle system
λ	Scale variable of a system
$\dot{\lambda}$	Scale velocity of a system
$\hat{\lambda}$	Scale velocity of a system measured in internal units
α, β, γ	Euler angles connecting a body frame to the space frame
$\{\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \mathbf{e}_3\}$	Fixed laboratory frame, or space frame
$\{\mathbf{e}'_1, \mathbf{e}'_2, \mathbf{e}'_3\}$	Body frame
$\mathbf{J} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N m_{\alpha} x_{\alpha} \times \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{\alpha}}$	Total angular momentum
\mathbf{J}	$= \sum_{a=1}^3 \mathbf{e}_a J_a = \sum_{a=1}^3 \mathbf{e}'_a L_a$
J_a	$= (\mathbf{e}_a \mathbf{J})$
L_a	$= (\mathbf{e}'_a \mathbf{J})$
$J_a \mathbf{r}_i$	$= \mathbf{e}_a \times \mathbf{r}_i$
$L_a \mathbf{r}_i$	$= \mathbf{e}'_a \times \mathbf{r}_i = g(\mathbf{e}_a \times \sigma_i(q))$
$\omega^a(J_b)$	$= \delta_b^a$
$\omega'^a(L_b)$	$= \delta_b^a$
\mathbf{k}	Curvature tensor of shape space
c	Speed of light
c	letter used to characterize scale transformations by a factor $c \in \mathbb{R}^+$
\mathbf{D}	Dilational tensor
D	value of system's dilational momentum measured in internal units
\mathbf{M}	Mass metric on Q_{cm} or Q
K	kinetic metric on Q_{cm} or Q , i.e. $K = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{M}$
B	metric on Q_{int}
N	metric on shape space S
A	Moment of inertia tensor
I_x	The canonical isomorphism from tangent space to cotangent space of Q

Acknowledgement: We are greatly thankful to Prof. Dr. Detlef Dürr for his supervision, generous support, and numerous enlightening discussions during the supervision of one of the authors master thesis, and Ph.D thesis. We are also thankful to Dr. Paula Reichert, Prof. Julian Barbour, and Dr. Ward Struyven for numerous interesting discussions. We also want to thank Prof. Dr. Christian Maes, for his support for the conduction of one of the author's master thesis.

REFERENCES

- [1] Toshihiro Iwai. A geometric setting for classical molecular dynamics. *Annales de l'I.H.P. Physique thorique*, 47(2):199–219, 1987.
- [2] Marsden Jerrold and Weinstein Alan. Reduction of symplectic manifolds with symmetry. *Reports on Mathematical Physics*, (1):121130. ISSN 0034-4877.
- [3] Isaac Newton. The mathematical principles of natural philosophy, 1687.
- [4] Scholium to the definitions in philosophiae naturalis principia mathematica, bk. 1 (1689), trans. andrew motte (1729), rev. florian cajori, berkeley: University of california press, 1934. pp. 6-12, paragraph xiv.
- [5] ed. H. G. Alexander. The leibniz-clarke correspondence. *Manchester: Manchester University Press*.
- [6] Ernst Mach. The science of mechanics: A critical and historical account of its development, 1883.
- [7] Pierre L M Maupertuis. Les loix du mouvement et du repos déduites d'un principe metaphysique. *Histoire de l'Académie Royale des Sciences et des Belles Lettres*, 1746.
- [8] Chris G. Gray. Principle of least action. (2009), *Scholarpedia*, 4(12):8291, doi:10.4249/scholarpedia.8291.
- [9] Lanczos Cornelius. The variational principles of mechanics. *University of Totonto press*, 1952.
- [10] Herbert Goldstein. Classical mechanics (3rd ed.). *United States of America: Addison Wesley*, 1980.
- [11] Julian Barbour. Scale-Invariant Gravity Particle Dynamics. 2003.
- [12] Julian Barbour. He nature of time. *Submitted to the essay competition fqxi.org/essay on 2008*.
- [13] John D. Barrow. The constants of nature: from alpha to omega-the numbers that encode the deepest secrets of the universe. *Random House U.K., London*, 2002.
- [14] Ilse Rosenthal-Schneider. Conversations with einstein, von laue and planck. *Vieweg*, 1988.
- [15] Eva Miranda Galceran Baptiste Coquinot, Pau Mir Garcia. The b-geometry of magnetic fields, 2020.
- [16] A. Weinstein. A universal phase space for particles in yang-mills fields. *Lett. Math. Phys*, 1978.
- [17] V. Guillemin and S. Sternberg. Symplectic techniques in physics, 1984.
- [18] R. Littlejohn and M. Reinsch. Gauge fields in seperation of rotation and internal motion. *Review of Modern Physics*, 1997.
- [19] S. Goldstein D. Dürr, N. Zanghi. Quantum motion on shape space and the Gauge dependent Emergence of Dynamics and Probability in Absolute Space and Time. *J Stat Phys* 180, 2019.
- [20] Flavio Mercati Julian Barbour, Tim Koslowski. A gravitational origin of arrows of time, 2013.