

HAMILTONIAN FORMALISM FOR GENERAL VARIATIONAL PROBLEMS

G. QUIJÓN AND S. CAPRIOTTI[†]

ABSTRACT. The present article introduces a generalization of the Hamiltonian field theory for a Lagrangian density, allowing the formulation of this kind of field theories for variational problem of more general nature than those associated to a classical variational problem. It is achieved by realizing that the usual construction of the Hamiltonian equations can be performed without the use of the so called Hamiltonian section, whose existence is problematic when general variational problems are considered. The developed formalism is applied to obtain an unified problem and a Hamiltonian field theory for the vakonomic Herglotz variational problem.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. The unified formalism for higher order field theories	3
2.1. The classical Lepage equivalent problem for first order field theories	3
2.2. The unified formalism	4
2.3. Lagrangian formalism	5
2.4. Hamiltonian formalism	8
3. The Hamilton equations for general variational problems	12
3.1. Unified formalism for general variational problems	12
3.2. Hamilton equations for general variational problems	14
3.3. Constraint algorithm for singular Lagrangians	18
3.4. Examples	20
References	24

1. INTRODUCTION

The Hamiltonian version of a field theory is a important step in the quantization of the system it is describing. Nevertheless, the usual construction requires the choice of a foliation of the spacetime with spacelike 3-surfaces, and thus losing the explicit Lorenz symmetry of the theory. As a way to overcome this problem, efforts have been made to formulate Hamiltonian field theories from their Lagrangian counterpart preserving the basic symmetries of the theory [Sha82; H01; GF10; Kru02; EE+07; EELRR00]. On the other hand, it is often advantageous to work with variational problems in bundles not necessarily related to a jet bundle; this is a quite common need when symmetry reduction is considered [CGR07] or in alternate formulations for gravitation [Cap14; Cap+20]. These variational problems consist into finding extremals for the functional

$$A_\lambda(\sigma) := \int_M \sigma^* \lambda$$

where $\lambda \in \Omega^m(W)$ is a m -form on a general bundle $\tau : W \rightarrow M^m$, and $\sigma : M \rightarrow W$ is a section of this bundle annihilating a set of forms on W . When $W = J^{k+1}\pi$, $\lambda = \mathcal{L}$ and the set of forms is the contact structure on $J^{k+1}\pi$, this setting recovers the classical variational problem. It is reasonable to assume that not every variational problem should necessarily occur in a jet bundle and that, even when this is the case, the sections to be integrated into the action could not be holonomic.

In the present article, we propose a generalization of the construction of Hamiltonian field theories in the realm of general variational problems.

One of the problems one encounters when trying to perform this generalization, is that the usual formulation of Hamiltonian field theory out from its Lagrangian counterpart requires geometrical constructions that are intimately related to the jet bundle structures associated to the variational problem. In particular, the *Hamiltonian form*, from which the Hamilton equations are written, requires for its definition of the notion of a *Hamiltonian section*, which is a section of a bundle obtained through quotient from a multimomentum space that in turn is the space of affine maps on the jet bundle. It is quite evident that some of these structures are missing in general variational problems as those indicated above.

Nevertheless, it is possible to find geometrical structures that are common among variational problems in general. Between them, the more important for our purposes is the so called *unified* or *Lagrangian-Hamiltonian formalism* (also called *Skinner-Rusk formalism*, after the authors who first proposed it in [SR83]). In the case of classical field theories, these formulations has been studied in several places; for example, see [Cam+09; CV07; LMM03; Ech+04], and [Vit10] for a formulation using secondary calculus. Also, the reader can find a proposal for second order field theories avoiding the appearance of non symmetric momenta in [PMRR15]. It finds immediate application in the study of the Hamiltonian formulation for field theories with singular Lagrangians, where no method is available for such formulation. As we have been warned above, a crucial feature of the previously cited articles is that they work in the realm of the so called *classical variational problems*; namely, the kind of variational problems on a jet bundle $J^{k+1}\pi$ (where $\pi : P \rightarrow M$ is the bundle of fields) prescribed by a functional determined through a Lagrangian density using the formula

$$A_{\mathcal{L}}(s) := \int_M (j^{k+1}s)^* \mathcal{L}.$$

The crucial feature of the unified formalism is that it is possible to be generalized to variational problems more general than the classical variational problem. A first step in this direction was taken in the works [Cap17; Cap+20]; in these articles, and using a construction described in [Got91b], it was possible to find an unified formalism for first order and Lovelock gravity. Also, a variation of this formalism was successfully employed in the definition of Routh reduction of a first order field theory by a general Lie group [CGTA19]. In principle, the method used in these works can be interpreted as *ad hoc*, since the relationship between such method and the canonical construction of the unified problem is not evident at first sight. One of the purposes of the present article is to prove that the construction of Gotay also replicates the usual unified formalism when the variational problem is classical. Although the basic scheme for this version of the unified formalism was outlined in the works previously cited, it is our conviction that it deserves its own exposition in a separate article. Additionally, and as a way to stress its practical value, another

physical example (aside from the applications to gravity mentioned above) will be discussed, where the generalized construction of the unified formalism shows its adequacy in dealing with variational problems of general nature [UJ98].

Once we have established that the unified formalism can be extended to general variational problems, it remains to show how a Hamiltonian field theory can be extracted from it. The second aim of the present article is to describe a construction of the usual Hamiltonian form directly from the unified formalism, without recurring to a Hamiltonian section, and to generalize this procedure to general variational problems, in order to find a Hamiltonian version for them.

2. THE UNIFIED FORMALISM FOR HIGHER ORDER FIELD THEORIES

We will devote the next section to the discussion of an unified formalism for higher order field theories. Essentially, it is based in the notion of *classical Lepage equivalent problem* as it is discussed in [Got91b], see also [Kru86a; Kru86b]. The basic idea of this approach is to consider that, as in the Lagrangian formulation the sections of the jet bundle to be used in the functional should be holonomic, the contact structure of the jet bundle can be considered as a set of constraints, and so they can be put in the Lagrangian through Lagrange multipliers; from this viewpoint, the (multi)momenta are nothing but these multipliers. As there is a general way of performing this operation geometrically, these considerations free us from having to imagine how the space of multimomenta should be for each order.

2.1. The classical Lepage equivalent problem for first order field theories. Let us briefly describe in this section the formalism developed by Gotay in [Got91b; Got91a]. First, suppose that we have a bundle $\tau : Q \rightarrow M$, and consider the *contact subbundle* $I_{\text{con},2}^m = I_{\text{con}} \cap \Lambda_2^m J^1\tau$ spanned by m -forms which are 2-vertical and which, in view of the observations above, admits the following description:

$$(2.1) \quad I_{\text{con},2}^m|_{j_x^1s} = \mathcal{L} \left\{ \alpha \circ \theta \wedge \beta : \alpha \in T_{s(x)}^*Q, \beta \in (\Lambda_1^{m-1} J^1\tau)_{j_x^1s} \right\} \subset \wedge_2^m (J^1\tau),$$

where

$$\theta|_{j_x^1s} := T_{j_x^1s}\tau_{10} - T_x s \circ T_{j_x^1s}\tau_1$$

is the $V\tau$ -valued contact 1-form on $J^1\tau$. Also, the notation $\mathcal{L}\{\cdot\}$ denotes the linear span; in other words, an element ρ in the contact subbundle $I_{\text{con},2}^m$ is of the form

$$\rho = (\alpha_1 \circ \theta) \wedge \beta_1 + \cdots + (\alpha_k \circ \theta) \wedge \beta_k,$$

for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and with α_i, β_i . We will call an element of $I_{\text{con},2}^m$ with a single summand (i.e., $k = 1$) a *simple element*. Most of the proofs involving $I_{\text{con},2}^m$ will be done for simple elements, since the case of arbitrary elements is similar.

Next, given a Lagrangian density $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}$ considered as a τ_1 -horizontal m -form on $J^1\tau$, we construct the affine subbundle

$$W_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}} := \widehat{\mathcal{L}} + I_{\text{con},2}^m \subset \wedge_2^m (J^1\tau),$$

which becomes a bundle $\tau_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}} : W_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}} \rightarrow J^1\tau$ through the restriction of the natural map $\tau_2^m : \wedge_2^m (J^1\tau) \rightarrow J^1\tau$. Because $\wedge_2^m (J^1\tau)$ has a canonical m -form, we can pullback it along the inclusion $W_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}} \hookrightarrow \wedge_2^m (J^1\tau)$ in order to have a canonical m -form $\lambda_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}$ on $W_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}$. Then we have the following characterization for the extremals of

the Lagrangian field theory on the bundle $\tau : Q \rightarrow M$ associated to the Lagrangian density $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}$.

Proposition 1. *A section $s : U \subset M \rightarrow Q$ is critical for $(\tau : Q \rightarrow M, \widehat{\mathcal{L}})$ if and only if there exists a section $\Gamma : U \subset M \rightarrow W_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}$ such that*

- 1) Γ covers s , i.e. $\tau_{10} \circ \tau_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}} \circ \Gamma = s$, and
- 2) $\Gamma^* (X \lrcorner d\lambda_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}) = 0$, for all $X \in \mathfrak{X}^V(W_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}})$.

Here $\mathfrak{X}^V(W_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}})$ denotes the vector fields which are vertical w.r.t. the projection $W_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}} \rightarrow M$. Γ is called a *solution* of $(\tau : Q \rightarrow M, \widehat{\mathcal{L}})$ or of $(W_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}, \lambda_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}})$.

2.2. The unified formalism. We will adapt this description in order to find the equations of motion for a higher order field theory given by a $(k+1)$ -order Lagrangian density

$$\mathcal{L} : J^{k+1}\pi \rightarrow \wedge^m(T^*M).$$

Recall [Sau89] that for every $k \geq 1$ we have an immersion

$$\iota_{1,k} : J^{k+1}\pi \rightarrow J^1\pi_k.$$

Then, the representation for this structure that we will use in the present article comes from the following result.

Lemma 1. *The pullback form*

$$\theta_{k+1} := \iota_{1,k}^* \theta,$$

where $\theta \in \Omega^1(J^1\pi_k, V\pi_k)$ is the contact 1-form on $J^1\pi_k$, induces the contact structure on $J^{k+1}\pi$.

Let $\widehat{\mathcal{L}} : J^1\pi_k \rightarrow \wedge^m(T^*M)$ be a Lagrangian density on $J^1\pi_k$ such that

$$\iota_{1,k}^* \widehat{\mathcal{L}} = \mathcal{L};$$

then, using the construction described in Section 2.1 for $\tau = \pi_k : J^k\pi \rightarrow M$, define the affine subbundle $W_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}} \subset \wedge_2^m(J^1\pi_k)$. It induces an affine subbundle $\widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}} \subset \wedge_2^m(J^{k+1}\pi)$ through the formula

$$\widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}} \Big|_{J_x^{k+1} s} := \left\{ \alpha \circ T_{J_x^{k+1} s} \iota_{1,k} : \alpha \in W_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}} \right\}.$$

We are now ready for the introduction of the notion of *unified formalism for higher order field theories*.

Definition 1 (Unified formalism for $k+1$ -order field theories). The *unified formalism associated to the Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L} : J^{k+1}\pi \rightarrow \wedge^m(T^*M)$* is the pair $(\widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}}, \Theta_{\mathcal{L}})$, where $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the pullback of the canonical m -form on $\wedge_2^m(J^{k+1}\pi)$ to $\widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$. A section $\psi : U \subset M \rightarrow \widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$ for the bundle $\tau_{\mathcal{L}} : \widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}} \rightarrow M$ is a solution for the *Lagrangian-Hamiltonian problem posed by $(\widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}}, \Theta_{\mathcal{L}})$* is and only if

$$\psi^* (X \lrcorner d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}) = 0$$

for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}^{V\tau_{\mathcal{L}}}(\widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}})$.

Remark 1. It is customary in the literature to use the symbol $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}$ for the Cartan form associated to the Lagrangian density \mathcal{L} ; here we will deviate from this use, trusting that this choice of terminology will not cause any confusion, as the notion of a Cartan form will not be used in the present work. Therefore, the symbol $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}$ will indicate the m -form on $\widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$ defined above.

Remark 2. It should be stressed that there are two different ways to define the m -form on $\widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$: As described in Definition 1, or using the pullback of the m -form on $W_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}$ along the map $\iota_{1,k}$. It can be proved that both definitions give rise to the same form.

2.2.1. *Local expressions.* Let us take a look at these constructions in local terms. Using Equation (2.1) in the coordinates $(x^i, u^\alpha, u_I^\alpha)$, $|I| \leq k$ on $J^k\pi$, we have that $\rho \in W_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}$ can be locally written as

$$\rho = \widehat{L}\eta + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{0 \leq |I| \leq k} p_\alpha^{I,i} (du_I^\alpha - \bar{u}_{I,j} dx^j) \wedge \eta_i.$$

It means that an element $\tilde{\rho} \in \widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$ becomes

$$\tilde{\rho} = L\eta + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{0 \leq |I| \leq k} p_\alpha^{I,i} (du_I^\alpha - u_{I+1_j} dx^j) \wedge \eta_i,$$

where $\mathcal{L} = L\eta$. Then we have coordinates $(x^i, u^\alpha, u_I^\alpha; p_\alpha^{J,i})$, where $1 \leq |I| \leq k+1$ and $1 \leq |J| \leq k$ on $\widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$, and in these coordinates the m -form $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}$ becomes simply

$$(2.2) \quad \Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = L\eta + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{0 \leq |I| \leq k} p_\alpha^{I,i} (du_I^\alpha - u_{I+1_j}^\alpha dx^j) \wedge \eta_i.$$

Please note that in the coordinates just defined, the velocities u_I^α are symmetric in the multiindex I , but the multimomentum coordinates $p_\alpha^{J,i}$ has mixed symmetry in these indices.

2.3. **Lagrangian formalism.** We will need to relate the solutions for the Lagrangian-Hamiltonian problem with the solutions of the Euler-Lagrange equations for \mathcal{L} . It will be done using the notion of bivariant Lepage equivalent problem from [Got91b]. Namely, the Euler-Lagrange equations describe the extremals for the variational problem

$$A_{\mathcal{L}}(s) := \int_M (j^{k+1}s)^* \mathcal{L}, \quad s : U \subset M \rightarrow P$$

associated to the Lagrangian density \mathcal{L} ; on the other hand, the Lagrangian-Hamiltonian problem is the set of equations describing the extremals of the functional

$$A_{\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}}(\sigma) := \int_M \sigma^* \Theta_{\mathcal{L}}, \quad \sigma : U \subset M \rightarrow \widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}}.$$

In principle, no relationship should exist between these extremals; our first result shows that every extremal of $A_{\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}}$ projects along the map $\tau_{\mathcal{L}}$ onto an extremal for $A_{\mathcal{L}}$ (it is what is called *covariance* of the variational problem posed by $A_{\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}}$ in [Got91b]).

Lemma 2. *If $\sigma : M \rightarrow \widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is an extremal for $A_{\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}}$, then there exists an extremal $s : M \rightarrow P$ for $A_{\mathcal{L}}$ such that $\tau_{\mathcal{L}} \circ \sigma = j^{k+1}s$.*

Proof (Gotay [Got91b]). Let us define

$$\phi := \tau_{\mathcal{L}} \circ \sigma : M \rightarrow J^{k+1}\pi.$$

We will prove that $\phi^*\alpha = 0$ for every contact form α on $J^{k+1}\pi$, and that it is an extremal for the functional $A_{\mathcal{L}}$.

First, let β be a contact m -form on $J^{k+1}\pi$; then using the linear structure of $\wedge_2^m(J^{k+1}\pi)$ we can define the $\tau_{\mathcal{L}}$ -vertical vector field

$$(2.3) \quad X_{\beta}(\rho) := \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} (\rho + t\beta(\tau_{\mathcal{L}}(\rho))).$$

Because $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}$ comes from a canonical m -form, we have that

$$(2.4) \quad X_{\beta} \lrcorner d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = \tau_{\mathcal{L}}^*\beta,$$

and so

$$\phi^*\beta = \sigma^*\tau_{\mathcal{L}}^*\beta = \sigma^*(X_{\beta} \lrcorner d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}) = 0.$$

It means that ϕ annihilates on every contact m -form; it is clear that $\phi^*\beta = 0$ for contact p -forms with $p > k$. Now if β is a contact p -form with $p < m$, then $\beta \wedge \alpha$ with α an arbitrary $(m-p)$ -form is a contact m -form, and so $\phi^*\beta = 0$ again. Thus there exists a section $s : M \rightarrow P$ such that

$$\phi = j^{k+1}s.$$

Now let prove that s is an extremal for $A_{\mathcal{L}}$. Consider a section $w : J^{k+1}\pi \rightarrow \widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$ of $\tau_{\mathcal{L}}$ such that

$$w \circ j^{k+1}s = \sigma;$$

then

$$\sigma^*\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = (j^{k+1}s)^* w^*\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}.$$

But $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}$, being the pullback of the canonical m -form on $\wedge_2^m(J^1\pi_k)$ has the tautological property, namely

$$w^*\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = w;$$

furthermore, w has its image in $\widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$, and it means that

$$w \equiv \mathcal{L} \pmod{\text{contact forms}}.$$

Therefore

$$\sigma^*\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = (j^{k+1}s)^* w^*\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = (j^{k+1}s)^* w = (j^{k+1}s)^* \mathcal{L},$$

so

$$A_{\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}}(\sigma) = A_{\mathcal{L}}(s),$$

and s should be an extremal for $A_{\mathcal{L}}$, as required. \square

Obviously, the correspondence between extremals can be achieved if we can assure that every extremal for $A_{\mathcal{L}}$ can be lifted through $\tau_{\mathcal{L}}$ to an extremal for $A_{\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}}$; this property is described in [Got91b] as *contravariance*.

Lemma 3. *Every extremal for $A_{\mathcal{L}}$ can be lifted to an extremal for $A_{\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}}$.*

Proof. We will adapt the proof given in [Got91b] to our purposes. We need to construct a section $w : J^{k+1}\pi \rightarrow \widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$ for $\tau_{\mathcal{L}}$ such that

$$\sigma := w \circ j^{k+1}s$$

is extremal for $A_{\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}}$, for every $s : M \rightarrow P$ extremal of $A_{\mathcal{L}}$. Therefore, σ is a solution for the equations

$$(2.5) \quad \sigma^*(X \lrcorner d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}) = 0, \quad X \in \mathfrak{X}^{V(\pi_{k+1} \circ \tau_{\mathcal{L}})}(\widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}}).$$

Taking $X = X_{\beta}$ for β a contact m -form (see proof of Lemma 2), we obtain that

$$\sigma^*(X_{\beta} \lrcorner d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}) = (j^{k+1}s)^* w^* \tau_{\mathcal{L}}^* \beta = 0,$$

so these part of the equations are verified for any w . Now we have the decomposition

$$T\widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}} \Big|_{w(J^{k+1}\pi)} = Tw (TJ^{k+1}\pi) \oplus V\tau_{\mathcal{L}},$$

so that we can consider that X in Equation (2.5) have the form

$$H = Tw \circ V$$

for some $V \in \mathfrak{X}^{V\pi_{k+1}}(J^{k+1}\pi)$; so

$$0 = \sigma^*(X \lrcorner d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}) = (j^{k+1}s)^* w^*(Tw \circ V \lrcorner d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}) = (j^{k+1}s)^*(V \lrcorner dw)$$

where the tautological property for the canonical m -form on $\wedge_2^m(J^1\pi_k)$ was used. Therefore, it is the equation that section w should obey in order to lift the extremal s for $A_{\mathcal{L}}$ to an extremal of $A_{\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}}$.

Let us write the equation

$$(j^{k+1}s)^*(V \lrcorner dw) = 0, \quad V \in \mathfrak{X}^{V\pi_{k+1}}(J^{k+1}\pi)$$

in local terms. From discussion carried out in Subsection 2.2.1, we know that there will exist local functions $\lambda_{\alpha}^{I,i} \in C^{\infty}(J^{k+1}\pi)$ such that

$$w = L\eta + \lambda_{\alpha}^{I,i} (du_I^{\alpha} - u_{I+1,k} dx^k) \wedge \eta_i,$$

and then these functions should obey the following system of differential equations

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\alpha}^{(I,i)} &= \frac{\partial L}{\partial u_{I+1,i}^{\alpha}}, \quad |I| = k, \\ \left(\lambda_{\alpha}^{(J,i)} - \frac{\partial L}{\partial u_{J+1,i}^{\alpha}} \right) \eta &= d\lambda_{\alpha}^{I+1,i,k} \wedge \eta_k, \quad 0 \leq |J| < k, \end{aligned}$$

together with the equations of motion

$$d\lambda_{\alpha}^i \wedge \eta_i - \frac{\partial L}{\partial u^{\alpha}} \wedge \eta = 0,$$

which are identically satisfied on an extremal $s : M \rightarrow P$ for the functional $A_{\mathcal{L}}$. Therefore,

$$\lambda_{\alpha}^{I,i} = \begin{cases} \frac{\partial L}{\partial u_{I+1,i}^{\alpha}} + c_{\alpha}^{I,i}, & |I| = k, \\ \frac{\partial L}{\partial u_{I+1,i}^{\alpha}} + D_k \lambda_{\alpha}^{I+1,i,k} + c_{\alpha}^{I,i}, & 0 \leq |I| < k, \end{cases}$$

where the arbitrary functions $c_{\alpha}^{I,i}$ are only constrained by the requirement of having zero symmetric part, namely $c_{\alpha}^{(I,i)} = 0$, and D_k is the total derivative operator. Thus, using these definitions we can construct the section w that allows us to lift an extremal of $A_{\mathcal{L}}$ to an extremal for $A_{\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}}$. \square

Theorem 1. *The projection $\tau_{\mathcal{L}} : \widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}} \rightarrow J^{k+1}\pi$ establishes a one-to-one correspondence between solutions of the Euler-Lagrange equations for \mathcal{L} and the solutions of the Lagrangian-Hamiltonian problem of Definition 1.*

A key feature of Definition 1 for the unified formalism is that no symmetry properties for the multimomenta are prescribed in advance. Rather, they have an arbitrary non symmetric part that does not play any role in the equations of motion.

2.4. Hamiltonian formalism. In the present section we will discuss how to relate the solutions of the Lagrangian-Hamiltonian problem with the solutions of the so called *Hamilton equations of motion* (see Definition 2 below). Unlike what happened with Lagrangian mechanics, things are not very straightforward in the Hamiltonian side, because up to now we do not have a projection from $\widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$ onto a space of forms ($\widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a space of forms, but it contains too many velocities; we need a space of forms on $J^k\pi$ instead of on $J^{k+1}\pi$).

2.4.1. A space of multimomentum. In order to define the space of multimomentum, let us define the map

$$R : \widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}} \rightarrow J^{k+1}\pi \times_{J^k\pi} \wedge_2^m (J^k\pi)$$

by the condition

$$R(\rho) = (j_x^{k+1}s, \rho')$$

if and only if

$$\tau_{\mathcal{L}}(\rho) = j_x^{k+1}s \quad \text{and} \quad \rho' \circ T_{j_x^{k+1}s} \pi_{k+1,k} = \rho.$$

Locally, a m -form ρ' in $\wedge_2^m (J^k\pi)$ can be written as

$$\rho' = q\eta + q^{I,i} du_I^\alpha \wedge \eta_i, \quad |I| \leq k$$

and so for $j_x^{k+1}s \in J^{k+1}\pi$ it results that

$$\rho' \circ T_{j_x^{k+1}s} \pi_{k+1,k} = q\eta + q_\alpha^{I,i} du_I^\alpha \wedge \eta_i = \left(q + q_\alpha^{(I,i)} u_{I+1_i}^\alpha \right) \eta + p_\alpha^{I,i} \theta_I^\alpha \wedge \eta_i;$$

therefore the map R is locally given by

$$(2.6) \quad q = L - p_\alpha^{(I,i)} u_{I+1_i}^\alpha, \quad q_\alpha^{I,i} = p_\alpha^{I,i}.$$

Remark 3. The map R establishes an isomorphism of bundles on $J^k\pi$ between $\widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$ and the subbundle W_2 defined in [Cam+09].

Then we can construct projections $p_{\mathcal{L}} : \widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}} \rightarrow \wedge_2^m (J^k \pi)$ and $p_{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger} := \mu \circ p_{\mathcal{L}}$ making the following diagram commutative

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}} & \xrightarrow{R} & J^{k+1} \pi \times_{J^k \pi} \wedge_2^m (J^k \pi) \\ \downarrow \tau_{\mathcal{L}} & \searrow p_{\mathcal{L}} & \downarrow \text{pr}_2 \\ J^{k+1} \pi & & \wedge_2^m (J^k \pi) \\ \downarrow \pi_{k+1, k} & \searrow p_{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger} & \downarrow \mu \\ J^k \pi & \xleftarrow{\overline{\tau}_k^m} & J^{k+1} \pi^{\dagger} \end{array}$$

where $\mu : \wedge_2^m (J^k \pi) \rightarrow J^{k+1} \pi^{\dagger}$ is the quotient map onto

$$J^{k+1} \pi^{\dagger} := \wedge_2^m (J^k \pi) / \wedge_1^m (J^k \pi),$$

and we have introduced the handy notation

$$\overline{\tau}_k^m : J^{k+1} \pi^{\dagger} \rightarrow J^k \pi.$$

The map $p_{\mathcal{L}}$ has nice properties regarding the canonical form on these bundles.

Lemma 4. *Let $\Theta \in \Omega^m (\wedge_2^m (J^k \pi))$ be the canonical m -form on $\wedge_2^m (J^k \pi)$. Then*

$$p_{\mathcal{L}}^* \Theta = \Theta_{\mathcal{L}}.$$

Now, consider a section

$$h : \wedge_2^m (J^k \pi) / \wedge_1^m (J^k \pi) \rightarrow \wedge_2^m (J^k \pi)$$

for the quotient map $\mu : \wedge_2^m (J^k \pi) \rightarrow \wedge_2^m (J^k \pi) / \wedge_1^m (J^k \pi)$, that will be called *Hamiltonian section associated to \mathcal{L}* . Having a Hamiltonian section allows us to write down Hamilton equations of motion.

Definition 2 (Hamilton equations for higher order field theories). Let h be a Hamiltonian section for μ ; define

$$\Theta_h := h^* \Theta.$$

A section $\psi : U \subset M \rightarrow J^{k+1} \pi^{\dagger}$ is a *solution for the Hamilton equations posed by the Hamiltonian section h* if and only if

$$\psi^* (X \lrcorner d\Theta_h) = 0$$

for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}^{V(\overline{\tau}_k^m)} (J^{k+1} \pi^{\dagger})$.

2.4.2. The Hamiltonian form associated to a Lagrangian density. Given a Lagrangian density, the usual way to construct a Hamiltonian field theory is to construct a Hamiltonian section associated to this Lagrangian. The main drawback of this approach, when one have in mind the generalization of this procedure to general variational problems, is that no notion of extended multimomentum bundle can be found in the general setting. So it is necessary to find a way to avoid this difficulty; a close examination of the construction of Hamilton equations tells us that the only

role of the Hamiltonian section is to provide a manner to define the Hamiltonian section. In this vein, it could be advantageous to find a procedure allowing us to construct the Hamiltonian form directly from the Lagrangian-Hamiltonian formalism, without recurring to the Hamiltonian section.

Definition 3. The first constraint manifold $P_0 \subset \widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the set

$$P_0 := \left\{ \rho \in \widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}} : (\mathcal{L}_Z \Theta_{\mathcal{L}})(\rho) = 0 \text{ for all } Z \in \mathfrak{X}^{V p_{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger}}(\widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}}) \right\}.$$

Remark 4 (Local description for P_0). In every set of adapted coordinates $(x^i, u^{\alpha}, u_I^{\alpha}, p_{\alpha}^{J,i})$ on $\widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$, the equations

$$p_{\alpha}^{(I,i)} = \frac{\partial L}{\partial u_{I+1,i}^{\alpha}}, \quad |I| = k,$$

are a local description for P_0 .

Remark 5. From the local expression for $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}$

$$\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = \left(L - p_{\alpha}^{(I,i)} u_{I+1,i}^{\alpha} \right) \eta + p_{\alpha}^{I,i} du_I^{\alpha} \wedge \eta_i$$

it follows that on P_0 , the local functions

$$\widehat{H}(x^i, u_I^{\alpha}, p_{\beta}^{I,i}) = L(x^i, u_I^{\alpha}) - p_{\alpha}^{(I,i)} u_{I+1,i}^{\alpha}$$

are independent of the coordinates u_I^{α} , $|I| = k + 1$.

Let $i_0 : P_0 \hookrightarrow \widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$ be the canonical immersion, and define $p_0 := p_{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger} \circ i_0$; also, define the set

$$C_0 := p_0(P_0) \subset J^{k+1} \pi^{\dagger}.$$

We will assume that this set is a submanifold of $J^{k+1} \pi^{\dagger}$. From Remark 5 it results that this function induces a local function \widetilde{H} on C_0 . A crucial fact about the set P_0 is that it can be described as the maximal set in which the form $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}$ is horizontal respect to the projection $p_{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger}$; with this fact in mind, the following consequence of Lemma 4 can be derived.

Lemma 5. Let $\mathcal{L} : J^{k+1} \pi \rightarrow \wedge^m(T^*M)$ be a Lagrangian density. Then, there exists an m -form $\Theta' \in \Omega^m(C_0)$ such that

$$(2.8) \quad p_0^* \Theta' = i_0^* \Theta_{\mathcal{L}}.$$

We will see that this lemma characterizes uniquely the Hamiltonian form, without the use of a Hamiltonian section.

Proposition 2 (Hamiltonian form in classical variational problems). *The form Ω' is the Hamiltonian form associated to the Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L} : J^{k+1} \pi \rightarrow \wedge^m(T^*M)$.*

Proof. Let us see that this definition gives rise to the usual Hamiltonian form in the case of a classical variational problem; namely, we will show that Θ' from Lemma 5 becomes the usual Hamiltonian form

$$\Theta_h = -\widetilde{H} \eta + p_{\alpha}^{(I,i)} du_I^{\alpha} \wedge \eta_i$$

Now, from Remark 5 and the local characterization for P_0 given in Remark 4, we have

$$\Theta_0 = \widehat{H} \left(x^i, u_I^{\alpha}, p_{\alpha}^{J,i}, \frac{\partial L}{\partial u_{I+1,i}^{\alpha}} \right) \eta + p_{\alpha}^{J,i} du_J^{\alpha} \wedge \eta_i + \left(p_{\alpha}^{[I,i]} + \frac{\partial L}{\partial u_{I+1,i}^{\alpha}} \right) du_I^{\alpha} \wedge \eta_i,$$

where we have employed the convention $|J| < k$, $|I| = 1$ for the multiindices used in this expression. Because $p_{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger}$ is surjective and Θ_0 is 2-vertical with respect to the projection $\pi_{k+1} \circ \tau_{\mathcal{L}}$, the form Θ' should have the form

$$\Theta' = M\eta + N_{\alpha}^{I,i} du_{\tau}^{\alpha} \wedge \eta_i + S_{I,i}^{\alpha,j} dp_{\alpha}^{I,i} \wedge \eta_j,$$

and so it results

$$M = \tilde{H}, \quad N_{\alpha}^{I,i} = p_{\alpha}^{I,i}, \quad S_{I,i}^{\alpha,j} = 0,$$

giving rise to the Hamiltonian form Θ_h from Definition 2. \square

Therefore, Definition 10 provides us with a correct generalization for this form, without having to appeal to a Hamiltonian section, which is hard to define in the general case.

2.4.3. The projection of solutions of the Lagrangian-Hamiltonian problem. We are ready to prove the easier part of the relationship between the unified formalism and its Hamiltonian counterpart. It is analogous to the situation discussed in Section 2.3, where you first prove that solutions project adequately, and then attack the (in general harder) problem of lift them.

Proposition 3. *Let $\sigma : U \subset M \rightarrow P_0 \subset \widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$ be a solution for the Lagrangian-Hamiltonian problem posed by \mathcal{L} with associated Hamiltonian form Ω_h . Then the section*

$$\psi := p_0 \circ \sigma : U \rightarrow C_0 \subset J^{k+1}\pi^{\dagger}$$

is a solution for the Hamilton equations determined by the Hamiltonian form Ω_h .

Proof. We have to prove that

$$(2.9) \quad \psi^*(X \lrcorner d\Theta_h) = 0$$

for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}^{V(\pi_k \circ \overline{\tau_k^m})}(C_0)$, using the fact that σ is a solution for the Lagrangian-Hamiltonian problem associated to \mathcal{L} . Now, the map $p_0 : P_0 \rightarrow C_0$ is a surjective submersion, and so we can restrict the vector fields in (2.9) to be of the form

$$X := Tp_0 \circ Y$$

for $Y \in \mathfrak{X}^{V(\pi_{k+1} \circ \tau_0)}(P_0)$, with $\tau_0 : P_0 \rightarrow J^{k+1}\pi$ the restriction of $\tau_{\mathcal{L}}$ to $P_0 \subset \widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$. Therefore the Hamilton equations for ψ will read

$$\begin{aligned} \psi^*(X \lrcorner d\Theta_h) &= (p_0 \circ \sigma)^*((Tp_0 \circ Y) \lrcorner d\Theta_h) \\ &= \sigma^*(Y \lrcorner d(p_0)^* \Theta_h) \\ &= \sigma^*(Y \lrcorner d\Theta_0) \end{aligned}$$

where Lemma 5 was used. Then

$$\psi^*(X \lrcorner d\Theta_h) = \sigma^*(Y \lrcorner d\Theta_0) = 0,$$

and so ψ is a solution for the Hamilton equations, as required. \square

Remark 6 (On singular Lagrangians). This result should be compared with Proposition 1 from [PMRR15]. According to these authors, in the singular Lagrangian case, the construction of the solution of Hamilton equations require the projection onto the Lagrangian side and the translation along the Legendre transformation. The proof given here seems to work well without having regularity conditions imposed on the Lagrangian.

3. THE HAMILTON EQUATIONS FOR GENERAL VARIATIONAL PROBLEMS

We will devote this section to construct a set of Hamilton-like equations of motion for a general variational problem $(\pi : W \rightarrow M, \lambda, \mathcal{I})$. With the aim of carry out this task, we will use the general construction devised in [Got91b] in order to formulate a unified formalism for a general variational problem. As we showed in the previous section for the classical variational problem case, the Hamilton equations can be obtained directly from this formulation, without the need of defining a Hamiltonian section.

3.1. Unified formalism for general variational problems. Let us suppose that we have a general variational problem given by the triple

$$(3.1) \quad (\pi : W \rightarrow M, \lambda, \mathcal{I}),$$

where $\pi : W \rightarrow M$ is a bundle, $\lambda \in \Omega^m(W)$ is the so called *Lagrangian form* and \mathcal{I} is an ideal in $\Omega^\bullet(W)$ closed by exterior differentiation. The underlying variational problem is given by the action

$$S[\sigma] := \int_K \sigma^* \lambda, \quad K \subset M$$

restricted to sections $\sigma : M \rightarrow W$ such that $\sigma^* \mathcal{I} = 0$ (these kind of sections will be called *admissible sections*).

Example 1 (Classical variational problem). When $W = J^{k+1}\pi$, $\lambda = \mathcal{L}$ and \mathcal{I} is the differential ideal on $J^{k+1}\pi$ generated by the contact forms, this variational problem reduces to the classical variational problem considered in Section 2.

Example 2 (Vakonomic Herglotz variational problem). Let us consider the Herglotz variational problem for this viewpoint [Gas+22]. For $\pi : P \rightarrow M$ let us define the *Herglotz bundle*

$$H_\pi := J^1\pi \times_M \wedge^{m-1}(T^*M).$$

In terms of local coordinates, any element $z \in \wedge^{m-1}(T^*M)$ can be written as

$$z = z^i \eta_i.$$

Note that we have a canonical $(m-1)$ -form $\Theta_{m-1} \in \Omega^{m-1}(\wedge^{m-1}(T^*M))$ that can be pulled back to H_π ; we will indicate this pullback with the same symbol. Also, given a Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L} : J^1\pi \rightarrow \wedge^m(T^*M)$ considered as a horizontal m -form on $J^1\pi$, we can also pull it back to the Herglotz bundle. Therefore, we can define a m -form on H_π

$$\Phi := \mathcal{L} - d\Theta_{m-1}.$$

Definition 4 (Vakonomic Herglotz variational problem). The *Vakonomic Herglotz variational problem* is the triple

$$(H_\pi \rightarrow M, d\Theta_{m-1}, \mathcal{J}_H)$$

where \mathcal{J}_H is the exterior differential system on H_π generated by the (pullback of) contact forms on $J^1\pi$ and Φ .

In local coordinates, it means that $\lambda = dz^i \wedge \eta_i$ and every section $\sigma(x) = (x, f^\alpha(x), f_i^\alpha(x), \zeta^i(x))$ will be admissible if and only if

$$f_i^\alpha = \frac{\partial f^\alpha}{\partial x^i}, \quad \frac{\partial \zeta^i}{\partial x^i} = L.$$

The action on any section will read

$$S[\sigma] = \int_K \sigma^* d\Theta_{m-1} = \int_{\partial K} \sigma^* \Theta_{m-1}.$$

In order to apply the Gotay procedure [Got91b] for the construction of an unified formalism for a variational problem of this kind, a regularity condition for the ideal \mathcal{I} is needed.

Definition 5 (Regular variational problem). We will say that the variational problem (3.1) is *regular* if and only if the set of m -forms in \mathcal{I} that are k -vertical, namely

$$\mathcal{I}_k^m := \mathcal{I} \cap \Omega_k^m(W),$$

can be generated by the sections of a bundle of m -forms $I_K^m \subset \Omega^m(W)$.

Assuming that we are working with a regular variational problem, we can construct the affine subbundle

$$W_\lambda := \lambda + I_k^m \subset \wedge^m(T^*W).$$

Because it is a submanifold of a set of m -forms, it results that we can pull the canonical m -form on $\wedge^m(T^*W)$ back to W_λ ; we will indicate this pullback with the symbol Θ_λ .

Definition 6 (Unified formalism for regular variational problems). The *unified formalism for general variational problems of regular nature* is the variational problem posed by the following data

$$(W_\lambda \rightarrow M, \Theta_\lambda, 0).$$

Remark 7. It is an invariant procedure that allows us to incorporate the set of restrictions in \mathcal{I} as part of the Lagrangian through Lagrange multipliers. These multipliers play the role of (multi) momentum from this point of view. From this viewpoint, the *regularity order* k in the previous definition is a measure of the number of multimomentum necessary to allow the resulting unified formalism to be able to represent the Lagrangian equations of motion, and it is (more or less) described by the order of verticality of the forms generating \mathcal{I} .

Example 3 (Unified formalism for vakonomic Herglotz variational problem). Because we have found a formulation of the Herglotz variational problem as a general variational problem (see Example 2), Definition 6 will allow us to define a unified formalism for it. The set of restrictions \mathcal{J} are regular for $k = 2$, because the set of m -forms which are 2-vertical in this ideal is generated by sections of the subbundle

$$J_H^m := \{p_\alpha^i (du^\alpha - u_k^\alpha dx^k) + \mu (dz^i \wedge \eta_i - L\eta) : p_\alpha^i, \mu \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

Therefore, we can define the subbundle

$$W_H := d\Theta_{m-1} + J_H^m \subset \wedge^m(T^*H_\pi)$$

and pullback the canonical m -form on $\wedge^m(T^*H_\pi)$ to W_H , giving rise to the Lagrangian form Θ_H which in local coordinates reads

$$\Theta_H = dz^i \wedge \eta_i + p_\alpha^i (du^\alpha - u_k^\alpha dx^k) + \mu (dz^i \wedge \eta_i - L\eta).$$

Definition 7 (Unified formalism for Herglotz variational problem). The *unified formalism for the vakonomic Herglotz variational problem* is the variational problem posed by the data

$$V_H^l := (p_H : W_H \rightarrow M, \Theta_H, 0)$$

Please note that the form Θ_H found here coincides with the (multicontact) *La-grangian form* $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}$ constructed in [Le23]. The equations describing the extremals of this variational problem are

$$\sigma^*(Z \lrcorner d\Theta_H) = 0, \quad Z \in \mathfrak{X}^{Vp_H}(W_H);$$

Then we can establish the following result (see also [Gas+22]).

Theorem 2. *A section of $p_H : W_H \rightarrow M$ is an extremal for the variational problem V'_H if and only if the following equations hold*

$$\begin{aligned} d\mu \wedge \eta_i + \mu \frac{\partial L}{\partial z^i} \eta &= 0, & dz^i \wedge \eta_i - L\eta &= 0, & du^\alpha \wedge \eta_i - u_i^\alpha \eta &= 0, \\ dp_\alpha^i \wedge \eta_i - \mu \frac{\partial L}{\partial u^\alpha} \eta &= 0, & \left(p_\alpha^i - \mu \frac{\partial L}{\partial u_i^\alpha} \right) \eta &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

3.2. Hamilton equations for general variational problems. The first obstruction when dealing with general variational problems is the Hamiltonian section, as it plays a central role in the construction of the form Ω_h . It is evident that this problem is related with the fact that the set W_λ is akin to the first constraint submanifold W_0 of the usual approach to the unified formalism [PMRR15], and this submanifold projects onto the restricted multimomentum bundle $J^{k+1}\pi^\ddagger$; therefore, as we do not have a natural candidate in the generalized context for the extended multimomentum bundle, it becomes problematic to define a meaningful substitute for the Hamiltonian section. For this reason, we will suppose here that we have a map $p_\lambda : W_\lambda \rightarrow W^\ddagger$ analogous to the map $p_{\mathcal{L}}^\ddagger$, and we will try to formulate the Hamilton equations using only this structure.

3.2.1. Hamiltonian form from p_λ . The main property of the Hamiltonian form regarding the equations of motion is Corollary 5. In order to proceed, it is necessary to ensure that the equations defining P_0 exists. Thus, let us consider the following definition.

Definition 8 (Compatibility between a form and a projection). We will say that $p_\lambda : W \rightarrow W^\ddagger$ and Θ_λ are *compatible* if and only if

$$Y \lrcorner (\mathcal{L}_Z \Theta_\lambda) = 0, \quad Z \lrcorner \Theta_\lambda = 0,$$

for all $Y \in \mathfrak{X}^{V(\pi \circ \tau_\lambda)}(W_\lambda)$ and $Z \in \mathfrak{X}^{Vp_\lambda}(W_\lambda)$.

Remark 8 (The compatibility condition in local coordinates). Let us suppose that W^\ddagger is fibred on M , and (x^i, z^A, w^P) is a set of local coordinates adapted to the projections $p_\lambda : W \rightarrow W^\ddagger$ and $W^\ddagger \rightarrow M$, in such a way that

$$p_\lambda(x^i, z^A, w^P) = (x^i, w^P),$$

and so

$$Vp_\lambda = \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial z^A} \right\rangle, \quad V(\pi \circ \tau_\lambda) = \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial z^A}, \frac{\partial}{\partial w^P} \right\rangle.$$

Then we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_\lambda &= \sum_{p+r+s=m} F_{i_1, \dots, i_p, A_1, \dots, A_r, P_1, \dots, P_s} \\ &\quad \cdot dx^{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dx^{i_p} \wedge dz^{A_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dz^{A_r} \wedge dw^{P_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dw^{P_s}, \end{aligned}$$

and the conditions

$$Z \lrcorner \Theta_\lambda = 0$$

translate into

$$\Theta_\lambda = \sum_{p+r=m} F_{P_1, \dots, P_r}^{i_1, \dots, i_p} \eta_{i_1, \dots, i_p} \wedge dw^{P_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dw^{P_r}$$

and so

$$\mathcal{L}_{\partial/\partial z^B} \Theta_\lambda = \sum_{p+r=m} \frac{\partial F_{P_1, \dots, P_r}^{i_1, \dots, i_p}}{\partial z^B} \eta_{i_1, \dots, i_p} \wedge dw^{P_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dw^{P_r}$$

therefore, the conditions $Y \lrcorner (\mathcal{L}_Z \Theta_\lambda) = 0$ become

$$\frac{\partial F_{P_1, \dots, P_r}^{i_1, \dots, i_p}}{\partial z^B} = 0, \quad p < m, p + r = m.$$

For example, using the local expressions found in Section 2.2.1 for the unified formalism associated to the classical variational problem for a Lagrangian density \mathcal{L} , Eq. (2.2) can be written as

$$\Theta_\mathcal{L} = \left(L - p_\alpha^{I,i} u_{I+1,j}^\alpha \right) \eta + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{0 \leq |I| \leq k} p_\alpha^{I,i} du_I^\alpha \wedge \eta_i,$$

and these conditions are met, proving that $p_\mathcal{L}^\dagger : \widetilde{W}_\mathcal{L} \rightarrow J^{k+1} \pi^\dagger$ and the canonical form $\Theta_\mathcal{L}$ are in this case compatible.

Intuitively, it amounts for the form Θ_λ to be p_λ -semibasic, and the forms $\mathcal{L}_Z \Theta_\lambda$, $Z \in \mathfrak{X}^{V p_\lambda}(W_\lambda)$ to be horizontal forms with respect to the projection onto the base manifold M . Therefore, we can introduce the following definition, analogous to Definition 3.

Definition 9. Suppose that p_λ and Θ_λ are compatible. The *first constraint manifold* $P_0 \subset W_\lambda$ is the set

$$P_0 := \{ \rho \in W_\lambda : (\mathcal{L}_Z \Theta_\lambda)(\rho) = 0 \text{ and } (Z \lrcorner \Theta_\lambda)(\rho) = 0 \text{ for all } Z \in \mathfrak{X}^{V p_\lambda}(W_\lambda) \}.$$

Remark 9. Please note that this definition is indeed analogous to Definition (3). Also, it can be said that P_0 is the biggest set in W_λ where Θ_λ is p_λ -basic.

Let us indicate with $i_0 : P_0 \hookrightarrow W_\lambda$ the canonical immersion; define the m -form

$$\Theta_0 := i_0^* \Theta_\lambda \in \Omega^m(P_0).$$

Let us suppose further that the set $C_0 := p_\lambda(P_0) \subset W^\dagger$ is a submanifold; let us indicate with $p_0 : P_0 \rightarrow C_0$ the restriction of the map p_λ to P_0 . Then we have the following result.

Lemma 6. *There exists $\Theta_h \in \Omega^m(C_0)$ such that*

$$p_0^* \Theta_h = \Theta_0.$$

Proof. We need to prove that Θ_0 is a p_0 -basic form. According to Definition 9, we know already that

$$Z \lrcorner \Theta_0 = 0 \quad \text{for all } Z \in \mathfrak{X}^{V p_0}(P_0);$$

so we also have to prove that

$$\mathcal{L}_Z \Theta_0 = 0.$$

But for $Z \in \mathfrak{X}^{Vp_0}(P_0)$ we have that the image of

$$Z_0 := Ti_0 \circ Z$$

belongs to Vp_λ , because

$$Tp_\lambda \circ Z_0 = Tp_\lambda \circ Ti_0 \circ Z = Tp_0 \circ Z = 0.$$

Therefore, $\mathcal{L}_{Z_0} \Theta_\lambda = 0$ and so

$$0 = i_0^*(\mathcal{L}_{Z_0} \Theta_\lambda) = \mathcal{L}_Z \Theta_0$$

as required. \square

Definition 10 (Hamiltonian form). The form $\Theta_h \in \Omega^m(C_0)$ will be called *Hamiltonian form* associated to the variational problem $(\pi : W \rightarrow M, \lambda, \mathcal{I})$ and the projection p_λ .

Remark 10. In line with Remark 9, the Hamiltonian form is nothing but the form on C_0 whose pullback along p_0 gives rise to Θ_0 .

3.2.2. *Hamilton equations for general variational problems.* Using the notation of the previous section, Suppose that $q : W^\ddagger \rightarrow M$ gives W^\ddagger a fiber bundle structure on M such that the next diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W_\lambda & \xrightarrow{p_\lambda} & W^\ddagger \\ & \searrow \pi \circ \tau_\lambda & \downarrow q \\ & & M \end{array}$$

With the help of the Hamiltonian form $\Omega_h := d\Theta_h$ we can set the *Hamilton equations*¹.

Definition 11 (Hamilton equations for a general variational problem). Let $i : C \hookrightarrow W^\ddagger$ a subbundle. The *Hamilton equations on C for a (regular) general variational problem $(W \rightarrow M, \lambda, \mathcal{I})$* is the set of equations given by

$$(3.2) \quad \psi^*(X \lrcorner (i^* \Omega_h)) = 0 \quad \forall X \in \mathfrak{X}(C).$$

We will indicate with $H_C \subset \Gamma(q|_C)$ the set of (local) solutions for these equations. Accordingly, $C' \subset C$ will be the set on which the solutions of the Hamilton equations should live; we will call *solution set* to this set. We will say that C is *final* if for every $\rho \in C$ there exists an open set $U \subset M$ and a solution $\psi : U \rightarrow C$ for the Hamilton equations such that $\rho \in \text{Im } \psi$, namely, if $C = C'$.

¹The Hamilton-Cartan equations for classical variational problems have the additional requirement that its sections should be holonomic; this condition cannot be reproduced in the general case, because we do not have a double fibration structure such as $J^{k+1}\pi \rightarrow J^k\pi \rightarrow M$ in the latter.

3.2.3. *Hamiltonian field theory for (vakonomic) Herglotz variational problem.* Recall from Example 3 that the variational problem

$$V'_H := (W_H \rightarrow M, \Theta_H, 0)$$

provide us with a unified formalism for Herglotz variational problem. The construction just described will allow us to formulate a Hamiltonina field theory for this variational problem. So, let us define

$$W^\ddagger := \wedge_2^m (T^*P) \times_M \wedge^{m-1} (T^*M).$$

Then we have the following projection map

$$p_H^\ddagger : W_H \rightarrow W^\ddagger : \rho_{(j_x^1 s, \sigma)} \mapsto (\alpha, \beta, \nu)$$

if and only if $\beta = \sigma$ and

$$\rho = \alpha \circ T_{(\alpha, \beta, \nu)} (\text{pr}_1 \circ \pi_{10}) + (1 - \nu) d\Theta_{m-1}|_\beta \circ T_{(\alpha, \beta, \nu)} \text{pr}_2.$$

In coordinates, if $\alpha = q\eta + q_\alpha^i du^\alpha \wedge \eta_i$ and $\beta = w^i \eta_i$, this map is defined by the equations

$$q = \mu L - p_\alpha^i u_i^\alpha, \quad q_\alpha^i = p_\alpha^i, \quad \nu = \mu.$$

We have that

$$Vp_H^\ddagger = \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial u_i^\alpha} \right\rangle$$

and it can be seen that p_H^\ddagger and Θ_H are compatible in the sense of Definition 8, and so it is possible to construct a Hamiltonian field theory from this unified formulation.

So the first constraint submanifold in this case will become

$$P_0 = \left\{ (x^i, u^\alpha, u_i^\alpha, p_\alpha^i, z^i, \mu) \in W^\ddagger : p_\alpha^i = \mu \frac{\partial L}{\partial u_i^\alpha} \right\};$$

the phase space for the Hamiltonian field theory can be obtained from projection of this set along p_H^\ddagger , namely

$$\begin{aligned} C_0 &:= p_H^\ddagger (P_0) \\ &= \left\{ (x^i, u^\alpha, p_\alpha^i, z^i, \mu) \in W^\ddagger : p_\alpha^i = \mu \frac{\partial L}{\partial u_i^\alpha} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

In order to construct the Hamiltonian form, we must pull the m -form Θ_H back to P_0 ; it turns out that

$$i_0^* \Theta_H = -H_0 \eta + p_\alpha^i du^\alpha \wedge \eta_i + (1 - \mu) dz^i \wedge \eta_i,$$

where $H_0 = p_\alpha^i u_i^\alpha - \mu L$ is the energy function on P_0 . Therefore the Hamiltonian form will result

$$\Theta_h = -\tilde{H}_0 \eta + p_\alpha^i du^\alpha \wedge \eta_i + (1 - \mu) dz^i \wedge \eta_i$$

where \tilde{H}_0 is the function on C_0 induced by H_0 .

Theorem 3 (Hamiltonian field theory for Herglotz variational problem). *The Hamiltonian field theory for the Herglotz variational problem is the pair (C_0, Ω_h) . In this setting the Hamilton equations become*

$$\begin{aligned} dp_\alpha^i \wedge \eta_i + \frac{\partial \tilde{H}_1}{\partial u^\alpha} \eta &= 0, & du^\alpha \wedge \eta_i - \frac{\partial \tilde{H}_1}{\partial p_\alpha^i} \eta &= 0, \\ d\mu \wedge \eta_i - \frac{\partial \tilde{H}_1}{\partial z^i} \eta &= 0, & dz - Ldt &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

3.3. Constraint algorithm for singular Lagrangians. Let us see how to proceed when the Lagrangian of the theory is singular. We will formulate this procedure in the general case, with the original field theory given by a triple $(\pi : W \rightarrow M, \lambda, \mathcal{I})$; this generality has two reasons: On the one hand, it will allow us to apply the algorithm to some interesting examples, and on the other hand, as a way to show that some constructions that are central in the case of classical variational problems lose their special status when are considered from this generalized viewpoint.

Please note that, up to now, the subbundle C involved in Definition 11 is arbitrary, as long as we are only interested in the Hamilton equations; when we try to relate its solutions with the solutions of the underlying unified variational problem, some relationships arise between this submanifold and the set $P_0 \subset W_\lambda$. This section explores these relations.

3.3.1. Final constraint submanifold and Hamilton equations. Let us consider the basic setting of Section 3.2; therefore, we have a map $p_\lambda : W_\lambda \rightarrow W^\ddagger$, we will admit that this map is horizontal respect to the form Θ_λ , and we will single out a subbundle $P \subset P_0$ projecting via p_λ onto the submanifold $C \subset W^\ddagger$. Given a solution for Hamilton equations on C , it should be interesting to find conditions under which this solution can be lifted to a solution for the unified problem on W_λ posed by the form Θ_λ . With this objective in mind, let us consider the following property.

Definition 12. Given $\psi : U \subset M \rightarrow C$ solution for the Hamilton equations on C and $V \subset TPW_\lambda$ complementary to $TP + \ker Tp_\lambda$, a V -admissible lift for ψ is a section $\hat{\psi} : U \rightarrow P$ such that

- (1) $p_\lambda \circ \hat{\psi} = \psi$, and
- (2) $\hat{\psi}^*(Z \lrcorner d\Theta_\lambda) = 0$ for all $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(W_\lambda)$ such that

$$Z(\rho) \in V|_\rho + \ker T_\rho p_\lambda$$

for every $\rho \in P$.

Let us introduce the following definition.

Definition 13 (Final constraint submanifold). A subbundle $P_f \subset P_0$ projecting via p_λ onto a submanifold $C_f := p_\lambda(P_f) \subset W^\ddagger$ is a *final constraint submanifold* for p_λ if and only if C_f is final for Ω_h and such that every solution $\psi : U \subset M \rightarrow C_f$ of the Hamilton equations on C_f admits a V_ψ -admissible lift, for some complement V_ψ of $TP_f + \ker Tp_\lambda$ in TP_fW_λ .

The relevance of this definition relies in the following property regarding the lifting of solutions of the Hamilton equations to the unified problem.

Theorem 4. Let $p_f : P_f \rightarrow C_f$ be a final constraint submanifold; let $\psi : U \rightarrow C_f$ be a solution for the Hamilton equations on C_f . Then $\widehat{\psi} : U \rightarrow P_f$ is a solution for the unified variational problem on W_λ . Conversely, if $\widehat{\psi} : U \rightarrow P_f \subset W_\lambda$ is a solution of the unified variational problem on W_λ taking values in a final constraint submanifold, then $\psi := p \circ \widehat{\psi} : U \rightarrow C_f$ is a solution for the associated Hamilton equations on C_f .

Proof. Any p_λ -projectable vector field X on $P_f \subset W_\lambda$, when restricted to P_f , can be written as

$$X \circ i_f = T i_f \circ X_f + Z \circ i_f + W$$

where $X_f \in \mathfrak{X}(P_f)$ projects onto a vector field $\overline{X}_f \in \mathfrak{X}(C_f)$, $Z \in \mathfrak{X}^{V p_\lambda}(W_\lambda)$ and $W(\rho) \in V_\psi$ for every $\rho \in P_f$. Then, using Lemma 6

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\psi}^*(X \lrcorner d\Theta_\lambda) &= \widehat{\psi}^*((T i_f \circ X_f) \lrcorner d\Theta_\lambda) + \widehat{\psi}^*((Z + W) \lrcorner d\Theta_\lambda) \\ &= \widehat{\psi}^*(X_f \lrcorner (i_f^* \Omega_\lambda)) \\ &= \widehat{\psi}^*(X_f \lrcorner (p_\lambda^* \Omega_h)) \\ &= (p_\lambda \circ \widehat{\psi})^* [(T p_\lambda \circ X_f) \lrcorner \Omega_h] \\ &= \psi^*(\overline{X}_f \lrcorner \Omega_h) \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

as required. \square

Remark 11. There is a quite important case not covered by this theorem: Are there solutions of the unified variational problem not taking values in a final constraint submanifold?

Example 4 (The final constraint submanifold for the classical variational problem associated to a regular Lagrangian density). In this case we have that the projection map is $p_\lambda := p_{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger$. Then $P_f = P_0, C_f = J^{k+1}\pi^\dagger$, and the section γ_0 is implicitly defined by the equations

$$p_\alpha^{(I,i)} = \frac{\partial L}{\partial u_{I+1_i}}.$$

Namely, to give this section is to provide a set of functions $u_f^\alpha, |I| = k+1$, on $J^{k+1}\pi^\dagger$ with the additional requirement that $\text{Im } \gamma_0 \subset P_0$; because of the regularity of \mathcal{L} , we can use the equations defining P_0 to find these functions.

3.3.2. The constraint algorithm for general variational problems. We are now ready to formulate a version of the constraint algorithm working for general variational problems. Take P_0 as initial submanifold, $C_0 := p_\lambda(P_0)$ and define for every $l = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ the set $C_{l+1} \subset C_l$ subject to the following requirement: C_{l+1} is the maximal set in C_l^i (the solution set of C_l) such that there exists a complement V_l of $\ker T p_\lambda + T P_l$ in $T_{P_l} W_\lambda$ with the property that every $\psi \in H_{C_l}$ taking values in C_{l+1} has a V_l -admissible lift with image in P_l . Then define $P_{l+1} := p_\lambda^{-1}(C_{l+1})$.

Proposition 4. Let L be the minimum integer such that $C_L = C_{L+1}$. Then P_L is a final constraint submanifold for p_λ .

Proof. When $C_{L+1} = C_L$, then C_L is final for Θ_h and by Definition 13, P_L is a final constraint submanifold. \square

Remark 12. It could be possible for a map to have as final constraint submanifold the empty set.

3.4. Examples. Let us apply the previous scheme to some well-known systems, in order to show how it allows us to extract the constraints associated to a singular Lagrangian.

3.4.1. A pair of hanging springs. Let us consider an example from [Bro23]. It represents two springs (with spring constants k_1 and k_2) attached end-to-end and hanging from the roof; additionally, a mass m is located at the free end of the composed spring. If we indicate with x_1 and x_2 the length of each of the springs, the Lagrangian of the system becomes

$$L(x, \dot{x}) := \frac{m}{2} (\dot{x}^1 + \dot{x}^2)^2 + mg(x^1 + x^2) - \frac{k_1}{2} (x^1 - l_1)^2 - \frac{k_2}{2} (x^2 - l_2)^2,$$

where l_1 and l_2 are the equilibrium length for each of the springs. Thus we are dealing with a classical variational problem associated to the trivial bundle $\text{pr}_1 : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$; therefore we need to consider the Lagrangian L as defining a Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L} = Ldt$ on $J^1\text{pr}_1 = \mathbb{R} \times T\mathbb{R}^2$ with coordinates $(t, x^1, x^2, \dot{x}^1, \dot{x}^2)$. The space of forms W_L has global coordinates $(t, x^1, x^2, \dot{x}^1, \dot{x}^2, p_1, p_2)$ in such a way that $\rho \in W_L$ if and only if

$$\rho = L(x, \dot{x}) dt + p_i (dx^i - \dot{x}^i dt).$$

The projection defining the Hamiltonian theory is in this case

$$p_{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger : W_L \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 : (t, x^1, x^2, \dot{x}^1, \dot{x}^2, p_1, p_2) \mapsto (t, x^1, x^2, p_1, p_2).$$

Then

$$Vp_{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger = \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \dot{x}^1}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \dot{x}^2} \right\rangle$$

and because $\Theta_L = L(x, \dot{x}) dt + p_i (dx^i - \dot{x}^i dt)$, it follows that P_0 will be defined by the equations

$$[m(\dot{x}^1 + \dot{x}^2) - p_1] dt = 0 = [m(\dot{x}^1 + \dot{x}^2) - p_2] dt,$$

namely,

$$P_0 = \{(t, x^1, x^2, \dot{x}^1, \dot{x}^2, p_1, p_2) : p_1 = p_2 = m(\dot{x}^1 + \dot{x}^2)\}.$$

This submanifold can be parameterized through the coordinates $(t, x^1, x^2, \dot{x}^1, p)$ and we can embed it into W_L with the map

$$i_0(t, x^1, x^2, \dot{x}^1, p) = \left(t, x^1, x^2, \dot{x}^1, \frac{p}{m} - \dot{x}^1, p, p\right).$$

The Hamiltonian form Θ_0 should be retrieved from the pullback form

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_0 &= i_0^* \Theta_L \\ &= L(x, \dot{x}) dt + p(dx^1 - \dot{x}^1 dt + dx^2 - \dot{x}^2 dt) \\ &= [L(x, \dot{x}) - p(\dot{x}^1 + \dot{x}^2)] dt + p(dx^1 + dx^2); \end{aligned}$$

now, because

$$\begin{aligned} L(x, \dot{x}) - p(\dot{x}^1 + \dot{x}^2) &= \\ &= \frac{m}{2} \left(\frac{p}{m}\right)^2 + mg(x^1 + x^2) - \frac{k_1}{2} (x^1 - l_1)^2 - \frac{k_2}{2} (x^2 - l_2)^2 - \frac{p^2}{m} \\ &= mg(x^1 + x^2) - \frac{k_1}{2} (x^1 - l_1)^2 - \frac{k_2}{2} (x^2 - l_2)^2 - \frac{p^2}{2m} \\ (3.3) \quad &=: -H_0(t, x, p), \end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\Theta_0 = -H_0(t, x, p) dt + p(dx^1 + dx^2).$$

The Hamilton-Cartan equations on $C_0 = \{(t, x^1, x^2, p)\}$ become

$$\begin{aligned} dp - \frac{\partial H_0}{\partial x^1} dt &= 0 \\ dp - \frac{\partial H_0}{\partial x^2} dt &= 0 \\ (dx^1 + dx^2) - \frac{\partial H_0}{\partial p} dt &= 0; \end{aligned}$$

using Equation (3.3) it yields to

$$(3.4) \quad dp + [mg - k_1(x^1 - l_1)] dt = 0$$

$$(3.5) \quad dp + [mg - k_2(x^2 - l_2)] dt = 0$$

$$(3.6) \quad (dx^1 + dx^2) - \frac{p}{m} dt = 0.$$

Therefore, C_0 is not a final manifold for Θ_h , because any solution should live in the submanifold $C_1 \subset C_0$ given by the equation

$$k_1(x^1 - l_1) - k_2(x^2 - l_2) = 0$$

obtained from the subtraction of the second to the first equation. Given that

$$\dot{x}^2 = \frac{p}{m} - \dot{x}^1,$$

it results that $TP_0 = U_0^0$ and $\ker TP_L = W_0^0$, where

$$\begin{aligned} U_0 &= \left\langle d\dot{x}^2 - \frac{1}{m}dp + d\dot{x}^1, dp_1 - dp_2 \right\rangle \\ W_0 &= \langle dx^1, dx^2, dp_1, dp_2 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Then, because

$$U_0 + W_0 = \left\langle dx^1, dx^2, dp_1, dp_2, d\dot{x}^2 - \frac{1}{m}dp + d\dot{x}^1 \right\rangle,$$

we have that

$$TP_0 \cap \ker TP_L = (U_0 + W_0)^0 = \left\langle dx^1, dx^2, dp_1, dp_2, d\dot{x}^2 - \frac{1}{m}dp + d\dot{x}^1 \right\rangle^0,$$

and so the complement V_0 should have dimension 1. Using as complement the subbundle

$$V_0 := \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial p_1} \right\rangle,$$

we obtain that the lifting $\widehat{\psi}$ for any solution ψ of the Hamilton equations should annihilate the form

$$\alpha_0 := dx^1 - \dot{x}^1 dt.$$

It means that if $\psi(t) = (t, x^1(t), x^2(t), p(t))$ and $\widehat{\psi}(t) = (t, x^1(t), x^2(t), \dot{x}^1(t), p(t))$, then the function $\dot{x}^1 = \dot{x}^1(t)$ is determined by the formula

$$(3.7) \quad \dot{x}^1(t) = \frac{dx^1}{dt}(t).$$

Next, and according to the algorithm described in Section 3.3.2, we must define $P_1 := \left(p_L^\dagger\right)^{-1}(C_1)$, and consider the Hamilton equations on C_1 ; we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_1 &:= i_1^* \Theta_0 \\ &= -H_1(t, x_1, p) dt + \frac{(k_1 + k_2)p}{k_2} dx^1\end{aligned}$$

where

$$H_1(t, x_1, p) = -\frac{mg}{k_2} [(k_1 + k_2)x_1 + l_2 k_2 - k_1 l_1] + \frac{k_1(k_1 + k_2)}{2k_2} (x^1 - l_1)^2 + \frac{p^2}{2m}.$$

It is nothing but the Hamiltonian given by Equation (15) in [Bro23]. The Hamilton equations on C_1 become

$$-\left[\frac{mg(k_1 + k_2)}{k_2} - \frac{k_1(k_1 + k_2)}{2k_2} (x^1 - l_1)\right] dt + \frac{k_1 + k_2}{k_2} dp = 0$$

by contracting with $\partial/\partial x^1$, and

$$\frac{p}{m} dt - \frac{k_1 + k_2}{k_2} dx^1 = 0$$

when contracting with $\partial/\partial p$; because no restriction is necessary to find solutions to these equations, we can conclude that C_1 is a final submanifold for Ω_h .

Now, it is necessary to prove that for every solution $\psi(t) = (t, x^1(t), p(t))$ of the above equations we can construct a section $\widehat{\psi}(t) = (t, x^1(t), \dot{x}^1(t), p(t))$ of $P_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ covering ψ , and such that

$$\widehat{\psi}^*(Z \lrcorner d\Theta_L) = 0, \quad Z \in V_1$$

for V_1 a complement of $TP_1 + \ker Tp_L^\dagger \subset TP_1(W_L)$. Because $TP_1 = U_1^0$, where

$$U_1 = U_0 + \langle k_1 dx^1 - k_2 dx^2 \rangle,$$

it results that

$$U_1 + W_0 = U_0 + W_0,$$

and so $V_1 = V_0$, namely, $\widehat{\psi}$ can be constructed using Equation (3.7) as before. Then C_1 is final for Θ_h , and also $P_1 = P_f$, a final constraint submanifold.

3.4.2. Wave equation. Let us consider how can we get a non standard Hamiltonian theory for the wave equation. In order to proceed, consider the bundle

$$\text{pr}_{12} : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2 : (t, x, u) \mapsto (t, x);$$

then the wave equation can be represented by pulling back the contact structure on $J^2\text{pr}_{12}$ to the submanifold

$$R := \{(t, x, u, u_t, u_x, u_{tt}, u_{tx}, u_{xx}) \in J^2\text{pr}_{12} : u_{tt} = u_{xx}\} \subset J^2\text{pr}_{12}.$$

Define $\pi : R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ as the restriction of $(\text{pr}_{12})_{02}$ to R ; then a general variational problem representing this equation could be

$$(\pi : R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2, 0, \mathcal{I}_R)$$

where \mathcal{I}_R is the pullback of the contact structure on $J^2\text{pr}_{12}$ to R . Using Gotay construction, we define the bundle

$$W := I_R^m \subset \wedge_2^m (J^2\text{pr}_{12})$$

and an element $\rho \in W$ if and only if

$$\rho = p^1\theta \wedge dx - p^2\theta \wedge dt + p^{11}\theta_1 \wedge dx - p^{12}\theta_1 \wedge dt + p^{21}\theta_2 \wedge dx - p^{22}\theta_2 \wedge dt,$$

where

$$\theta = du - u_t dt - u_x dx, \quad \theta_1 = du_t - u_{tt} dt - u_{tx} dx, \quad \theta_2 = du_x - u_{tx} dt - u_{xx} dx$$

are the canonical generators for the contact structure on R (where $u_{tt} = u_{xx}$). The canonical form Θ on W is thus given by the formula

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta = & \\ = - & [p^1 u_t + p^2 u_x + (p^{11} + p^{22}) u_{tt} + (p^{12} + p^{21}) u_{tx}] dt \wedge dx + p^1 du \wedge dx - p^2 du \wedge dt + \\ & + p^{11} du_t \wedge dx - p^{12} du_t \wedge dt + p^{21} du_x \wedge dx - p^{22} du_x \wedge dt. \end{aligned}$$

We will use the following projection onto $W^\ddagger := \mathbb{R}^{10}$

$$p : W \rightarrow W^\ddagger : (t, x, u, u_t, u_x, u_{tt}, u_{tx}, p^I) \mapsto (t, x, u, u_t, u_x, p^I), \quad |I| \leq 2,$$

in order to construct the Hamilton equations. Then

$$Vp = \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial u_{tt}}, \frac{\partial}{\partial u_{tx}} \right\rangle,$$

and the first constraint manifold $P_0 \subset W$ becomes described by the equations

$$p^{11} + p^{22} = 0, \quad p^{12} + p^{21} = 0.$$

It means that

$$Vp = \langle dt, dx, du, du_t, du_x, dp^I \rangle^0, \quad TP_0 = \langle dp^{11} + dp^{22}, dp^{12} + dp^{21} \rangle^0,$$

and so $Vp \subset TP_0$; then for the complementary subbundle

$$(3.8) \quad V_0 = \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial p^{11}}, \frac{\partial}{\partial p^{12}} \right\rangle$$

we have that

$$T_{P_0}W = TP_0 \oplus V_0.$$

The Hamiltonian form on

$$C_0 := p(P_0) = \{(t, x, u, u_t, u_x, p^1, p^2, p^{11}, p^{12}, -p^{12}, -p^{11})\}$$

becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_h = - & (p^1 u_t + p^2 u_x) dt \wedge dx + p^1 du \wedge dx - p^2 du \wedge dt + \\ & + p^{11} (du_t \wedge dx + du_x \wedge dt) - p^{12} (du_t \wedge dt + du_x \wedge dx). \end{aligned}$$

The Hamilton equations on C_0 are

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial u}\right) : dp^1 \wedge dx - dp^2 \wedge dt &= 0, \\ \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial u_t}\right) : -p^1 dt \wedge dx - dp^{11} \wedge dx + dp^{12} \wedge dt &= 0, \\ \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial u_x}\right) : -p^2 dt \wedge dx - dp^{11} \wedge dt + dp^{12} \wedge dx &= 0, \\ \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial p^1}\right) : -u_t dt \wedge dx + du \wedge dx &= 0, \\ \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial p^2}\right) : -u_x dt \wedge dx - du \wedge dt &= 0, \\ \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial p^{11}}\right) : du_t \wedge dx + du_x \wedge dt &= 0, \\ \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial p^{12}}\right) : du_t \wedge dt + du_x \wedge dx &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

No further restrictions are necessary in order to ensure that this system has solutions; therefore, C_0 is final for Θ_h . Thus, the next step in the constraint algorithm is to construct a lift $\widehat{\psi} : U \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow P_0$ for every solution $\psi : U \rightarrow C_0$ of these equations, such that

$$\widehat{\psi}^* (Z \lrcorner d\Theta) = 0$$

for every $Z \in \mathfrak{X}^{V_0}(W)$; using Equation (3.8), it follows that

$$\widehat{\psi} = (t, x, u, u_t, u_x, u_{tt}, u_{tx}, p^1, p^2, p^{11}, p^{12}, -p^{12}, -p^{11})$$

must be integral for the ideal generated by the forms

$$-u_{tt} dt \wedge dx + du_t \wedge dx, \quad -u_{tx} dt \wedge dx + du_t \wedge dt.$$

It is straightforward to check that we can use the equations associated to these forms to choose the unknown functions u_{tt} , u_{tx} , and also the lift is guaranteed; so, P_0 is a final constraint submanifold.

REFERENCES

- [Bro23] J. D. Brown. “Singular Lagrangians and the Dirac–Bergmann algorithm in classical mechanics”. In: *American Journal of Physics* 91.3 (2023), pp. 214–224.
- [Cam+09] C. M. Campos, M. de León, D. Martín de Diego, and J. Vankerschaver. “Unambiguous formalism for higher order Lagrangian field theories”. In: *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* 42.47 (2009), p. 475207.
- [Cap14] S. Capriotti. “Differential geometry, Palatini gravity and reduction”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 55.1, 012902 (2014), p. 012902. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.4862855>.
- [Cap17] S. Capriotti. “Unified formalism for Palatini gravity”. In: *International Journal of Geometric Methods in Modern Physics* (2017), p. 1850044. DOI: [10.1142/S0219887818500445](https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219887818500445).

- [Cap+20] S. Capriotti, J. Gaset, N. Román-Roy, and L. Salomone. “Griffiths variational multisymplectic formulation for Lovelock gravity”. In: *General Relativity and Gravitation* 52.8 (Aug. 2020). DOI: [10.1007/s10714-020-02725-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10714-020-02725-8).
- [CGR07] M. Castrillón, P. L. García, and C. Rodrigo. “Euler–Poincaré reduction in principal fibre bundles and the problem of Lagrange”. en. In: *Differential Geometry and its Applications* 25.6 (Dec. 2007), pp. 585–593. ISSN: 09262245. DOI: [10.1016/j.difgeo.2007.06.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.difgeo.2007.06.007).
- [CGTA19] S. Capriotti and E. García-Toraño Andrés. “Routh reduction for first-order Lagrangian field theories”. In: *Letters in Mathematical Physics* 109.6 (2019), pp. 1343–1376. ISSN: 1573-0530. DOI: [10.1007/s11005-018-1140-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11005-018-1140-6).
- [CV07] F. Cantrijn and J. Vankerschaver. “The Skinner–Rusk approach for vakonomic and nonholonomic field theories”. In: *Differential Geometric Methods in Mechanics and Field Theory*. Academia Press, 2007, pp. 1–14. ISBN: 978-90-382-1128-2.
- [Ech+04] A. Echeverría-Enríquez, C. López, J. Marín-Solano, M. C. Muñoz-Lecanda, and N. Román-Roy. “Lagrangian-Hamiltonian unified formalism for field theory”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 45 (Jan. 2004), pp. 360–380. DOI: [10.1063/1.1628384](https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1628384).
- [EE+07] A. Echeverría-Enríquez, M. de León, M. C. Muñoz Lecanda, and N. Román-Roy. “Extended Hamiltonian systems in multisymplectic field theories”. In: *J.Math.Phys.* 48 (2007), p. 112901. DOI: [10.1063/1.2801875](https://doi.org/10.1063/1.2801875).
- [EELRR00] A. Echeverría-Enríquez, M. C. Muñoz Lecanda, and N. Román-Roy. “Geometry of multisymplectic Hamiltonian first-order field theories”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 41.11 (2000), pp. 7402–7444.
- [Gas+22] J. Gaset, M. Lainz, A. Mas, and X. Rivas. *The Herglotz variational principle for dissipative field theories*. 2022.
- [GF10] K. Grabowska and Faculty of Physics, University of Warsaw, Hoza 69, 00-681 Warszawa. “Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalism in Field Theory: A simple model”. en. In: *Journal of Geometric Mechanics* 2.4 (2010), pp. 375–395. ISSN: 1941-4897. DOI: [10.3934/jgm.2010.2.375](https://doi.org/10.3934/jgm.2010.2.375).
- [Got91a] M. Gotay. “A multisymplectic framework for classical field theory and the calculus of variations I: Covariant Hamiltonian formalism”. In: *Mechanics, Analysis and Geometry: 200 Years after Lagrange* (1991), pp. 203–235.
- [Got91b] M. Gotay. “An exterior differential system approach to the Cartan form”. In: *Symplectic geometry and mathematical physics. Actes du colloque de géométrie symplectique et physique mathématique en l’honneur de Jean-Marie Souriau, Aix-en-Provence, France, June 11-15, 1990*. Ed. by P. Donato, C. Duval, J. Elhadad, and G. Tuynman. Progress in Mathematics. 99. Boston, MA, Birkhäuser, 1991, pp. 160–188.
- [HÓ1] F. Hélein. “Hamiltonian formalisms for multidimensional calculus of variations and perturbation theory”. In: *Proceedings of the Congress in the Conference on noncompact variational problems and general relativity in honor of H. Brezis and F.E. Browder*. Ed. by A. Bahri, S. Klainerman, and M. Vogelius. Contemporary Mathematics 350. American Mathematical Society, 2001.
- [Kru02] O. Krupková. “Hamiltonian field theory”. In: *Journal of Geometry and Physics* 43.2 (2002), pp. 93–132. ISSN: 0393-0440. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0393-0440\(02\)00093-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0393-0440(02)00093-2).

- [Kru86a] D. Krupka. “Geometry of Lagrangean structures. I”. eng. In: *Archivum Mathematicum* 022.3 (1986), pp. 159–173.
- [Kru86b] D. Krupka. “Geometry of Lagrangean structures. II”. eng. In: *Archivum Mathematicum* 022.4 (1986), pp. 211–228.
- [Le23] M. de León, J. Gaset, M. C. Muñoz-Lecanda, X. Rivas, and N. Román-Roy. “Multicontact formulation for non-conservative field theories”. In: *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* 56.2 (2023), p. 025201. DOI: [10.1088/1751-8121/acb575](https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8121/acb575).
- [LMM03] M. de León, J. C. Marrero, and D. Martín de Diego. “A New geometric setting for classical field theories”. In: *Banach Center Publ.* 59 (2003), pp. 189–209.
- [PMRR15] P. D. Prieto-Martínez and N. Román-Roy. “A new multisymplectic unified formalism for second order classical field theories”. In: *Journal of Geometric Mechanics* 7.2 (2015), pp. 203–253. ISSN: 1941-4889. DOI: [10.3934/jgm.2015.7.203](https://doi.org/10.3934/jgm.2015.7.203).
- [Sau89] D. J. Saunders. *The Geometry of Jet Bundles*. Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- [Sha82] W. F. Shadwick. “The Hamiltonian formulation of regular r th-order Lagrangian field theories”. In: *Letters in Mathematical Physics* 6 (1982). DOI: [10.1007/bf00405859](https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00405859).
- [SR83] R. O. Skinner and R. Rusk. “Generalized Hamiltonian dynamics. I. Formulation on $T^*Q \oplus TQ$ ”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 24 (1983), pp. 2589–2594.
- [UJ98] F. J. de Urries and J. Julve. “Ostrogradski formalism for higher-derivative scalar field theories”. In: *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* 31.33 (1998), p. 6949. DOI: [10.1088/0305-4470/31/33/006](https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/31/33/006).
- [Vit10] L. Vitagliano. “The Lagrangian-Hamiltonian formalism for higher order field theories”. In: *Journal of Geometry and Physics* 60.6–8 (2010), pp. 857–873. ISSN: 0393-0440. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.geomphys.2010.02.003>.

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DEL SUR AND CONICET, 8000 BAHÍA BLANCA, ARGENTINA
 Email address: †santiago.capriotti@uns.edu.ar