

KOVALEVSKAYA EXPONENTS AND POISSON STRUCTURES

1

A. V. BORISOV, S. L. DUDOLADOV

Faculty of Mechanics and Mathematics,
Department of Theoretical Mechanics Moscow State University
Vorob'iev gory, 119899 Moscow, Russia
E-mail: borisov@uni.udm.ru, dsl@online.ru

Abstract

We consider generalizations of pairing relations for Kovalevskaya exponents in quasihomogeneous systems with quasihomogeneous tensor invariants. The case of presence of a Poisson structure in the system is investigated in more detail. We give some examples which illustrate general theorems.

1 Quasihomogeneous systems. Kovalevskaya exponents

A system of n differential equations

$$\dot{x}^i = v^i(x^1, \dots, x^n), \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (1)$$

is called *quasihomogeneous* with quasihomogeneity exponents g_1, \dots, g_n , if

$$v^i(\alpha^{g_i} x^1, \dots, \alpha^{g_n} x^n) = \alpha^{g_i+1} v^i(x^1, \dots, x^n) \quad (2)$$

for all values of \mathbf{x} and $\alpha > 0$. Thus, the equations (1) are invariant under substitution $x^i \mapsto \alpha^{g_i} x^i$, $t \mapsto \frac{t}{\alpha}$ [18].

Remark 1. *A more general definition of quasihomogeneity of degree m is the invariance of the system (1) under transformation $x^i \mapsto \alpha^{g_i} x^i$, $t \mapsto \frac{t}{\alpha^{m-1}}$ [14]. All further results hold for this case as well.*

An important example of the equations (1), (2) is a system with quasihomogeneous quadratic right-hand sides; in this case $g_1 = \dots = g_n = 1$. Motion equations of many important problems of dynamics (Euler-Poisson equations, Kirchhoff equations, Euler-Poincaré equations on Lie algebras, Toda lattices, etc.) are of the quasihomogeneous form.

¹REGULAR AND CHAOTIC DYNAMICS, V. 4, No. 3, 1999

Received September 30, 1999

AMS MSC 34G20, 34L40

Differentiating (2) with respect to α and setting $\alpha = 1$, we obtain the Euler formula for quasihomogeneous functions:

$$\sum_{k=1}^n g_k x^k \frac{\partial v^i}{\partial x^k} = (g_i + 1)v^i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (3)$$

The equations (1) possess partial solutions

$$x^i = C_i t^{-g_i}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (4)$$

where the complex constants C_1, \dots, C_n should satisfy the algebraic system of equations

$$v^i(C_1, \dots, C_n) = -g_i C_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (5)$$

Let us write variational equations for the partial solution (5) as

$$\dot{y}^i = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\partial v^i}{\partial x^k} (C_1 t^{-g_1}, \dots, C_n t^{-g_n}) y^k. \quad (6)$$

The linear system (6) possesses partial solutions of the form

$$y^1 = \varphi^1 t^{\rho - g_1}, \dots, y^n = \varphi^n t^{\rho - g_n},$$

where ρ is an eigenvalue and φ is an eigenvector of a matrix $\mathbf{K} = \|K_j^i\|$, $K_j^i = \left(\frac{\partial v^i}{\partial x^j}(\mathbf{C}) + g_i \delta_j^i \right)$, δ_j^i is the Kronecker symbol. The matrix \mathbf{K} is called *Kovalevskaya matrix*, its eigenvalues are called *Kovalevskaya exponents* (see [18]). One of the Kovalevskaya exponents always equals -1 [18].

If the general solution of the system (1) is expressed in terms of single-valued (meromorphic) functions of complex time, then Kovalevskaya exponents, except for -1 , are integer (nonnegative integer, respectively).

Relations between Kovalevskaya exponents are pointed out in [12]. They occur due to the presence of an invariant tensor field in the system (1).

Recall, that a tensor field \mathbf{T} of (p, q) type is called *quasihomogeneous* of degree m with quasihomogeneity exponents g_1, \dots, g_n , if

$$T_{j_1 \dots j_q}^{i_1 \dots i_p}(\alpha^{g_1} x^1, \dots, \alpha^{g_n} x^n) = \alpha^{m - g_{j_1} - \dots - g_{j_q} + g_{i_1} + \dots + g_{i_p}} T_{j_1 \dots j_q}^{i_1 \dots i_p}(x^1, \dots, x^n).$$

This tensor field is *invariant* for the system (1), if its Lie derivative along the vectorfield \mathbf{v} equals zero.

2 Hamilton equations

Let us consider quasihomogeneous equations of the form:

$$\dot{x}^i = \sum_k J^{ik} \frac{\partial H}{\partial x^k}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbf{J} = \|J^{ik}\|$ is a constant skew-symmetric tensor of type $(2, 0)$, H is a quasihomogeneous function of degree $m + 1$:

$$H(\alpha^{g_1} x^1, \dots, \alpha^{g_n} x^n) = \alpha^{m+1} H(x^1, \dots, x^n). \quad (8)$$

Checking the fulfillment of the condition (2) and using (8), we obtain

$$\sum_{k=1}^n J^{ik} \alpha^{m+1-g_k} \frac{\partial H(x)}{\partial x^k} = \alpha^{g_i+1} \sum_{k=1}^n J^{ik} \frac{\partial H(x)}{\partial x^k}.$$

Let $\mathbf{\Gamma} = \text{diag}(g_1, \dots, g_n)$. Differentiating the latter identity with respect to α and setting $\alpha = 1$, we obtain the following conditions in matrix form, to which the quasihomogeneity exponents should satisfy:

$$\mathbf{J}\mathbf{\Gamma} + \mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{J} = m\mathbf{J}. \quad (9)$$

Let us note, that the equations (7) are Hamilton equations with the Hamiltonian H in (possibly) noncanonical variables. If \mathbf{J} is a symplectic matrix, the conditions (9) have a simple form:

$$g_k + g_{k+\frac{n}{2}} = m.$$

It is shown in [16, 12], that in the case of diagonalizable Kovalevskaya matrix its exponents satisfy the analogous relations

$$\rho_k + \rho_{k+\frac{n}{2}} = m,$$

moreover, there are always -1 and $m + 1$ among them.

The following statement extends the corresponding results [16, 12] in general case of nondiagonalizable matrix \mathbf{K} . Let us note that one should not speak about single-valuedness and meromorphy of the general solution in the nondiagonalizable situation.

Theorem 1. *Let \mathbf{J} be a nondegenerate skew-symmetric matrix for the equations (7). Then the Kovalevskaya exponents decompose into pairs, which satisfy the relations*

$$\rho_k + \rho_{k+\frac{n}{2}} = m, \quad k = 1, \dots, \frac{n}{2},$$

and the structure of Jordan cells, associated with the exponents ρ_ and $(m - \rho_*)$, is the same.*

Proof.

Let us present the Kovalevskaya matrix in the form $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{J}\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{\Gamma}$, where

$$\mathbf{B} = \left\| \left\| \frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial x^i \partial x^k}(\mathbf{C}) \right\| \right\|$$

is a symmetric matrix. Therefore, all conclusions of Theorem 1 follow from the chain of equivalent statements:

$$\det\|\mathbf{K} - \rho\mathbf{E}\| = 0 \Leftrightarrow \det\|\mathbf{K} - \rho\mathbf{E}\|^T = 0 \Leftrightarrow \det\|(\mathbf{K} - \rho\mathbf{E})^T \mathbf{J}^{-1}\| = 0 \Leftrightarrow$$

$$\det\|(-\mathbf{B}\mathbf{J} + \mathbf{\Gamma} - \rho\mathbf{E})\mathbf{J}^{-1}\| = 0 \Leftrightarrow \det\|\mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mathbf{J}\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{\Gamma} + (h - 1 - \rho)\mathbf{E})\| = 0.$$

In the last link of the chain we used the fact, that it is possible to substitute \mathbf{J}^{-1} for \mathbf{J} in (9). ■

Let us generalize the above arguments on the case when the matrix J^{ik} is not certainly nondegenerate and constant. It corresponds to the considerations of quasi-homogeneous systems which admit the Poisson structure of a more general form (Lie-Poisson structures, quadratic structures, etc.) Let us preliminary prove the main theorem.

Theorem 2. *Let us assume that the equations (1) admit a quasihomogeneous tensor invariant \mathbf{T} of degree m and type $(2, 0)$. Then natural numbers from 1 to n can be grouped in a set (k_1, \dots, k_n) so that ρ_1, \dots, ρ_n satisfy at least $r = \text{rank } \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{C})$ relations:*

$$\rho_i + \rho_{k_i} = -m, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Proof

Using the expression of Lie derivative for an invariant tensor field, it is easy to show (see [12] for details) that the tensors \mathbf{T} and \mathbf{K} are connected by the following relations:

$$-mT^{ij} = K_s^i T^{sj} + T^{is} K_s^j,$$

which we shall write in matrix form

$$-m\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{K}\mathbf{T} + \mathbf{T}\mathbf{K}^T, \tag{10}$$

where $\mathbf{T} = \|T^{ij}\|$, $\mathbf{K} = \|K_{.j}^i\|$.

Let the matrix \mathbf{A} be formed of column-vectors e_1, \dots, e_n , which are Jordan vectors of \mathbf{K} :

$$\mathbf{K}\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{K}_*,$$

where \mathbf{K}_* for definiteness has the following form: there are the Kovalevskaya exponents (ρ_1, \dots, ρ_n) on the principal diagonal, and there can be units above the principal diagonal. The analogous relation holds for the transposed matrix \mathbf{K}^T :

$$\mathbf{K}^T(\mathbf{A}^{-1})^T = (\mathbf{A}^{-1})^T \mathbf{K}_*^T.$$

Let us denote column-vectors, which form the matrix $(\mathbf{A}^{-1})^T$, by f_1, \dots, f_n . On account of (10), we obtain

$$\mathbf{K}\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{A}^{-1})^T = -m\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{A}^{-1})^T - \mathbf{T}\mathbf{K}^T(\mathbf{A}^{-1})^T = \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{A}^{-1})^T(-m\mathbf{E} - (\mathbf{K}_*)^T).$$

The matrix $(-m\mathbf{E} - (\mathbf{K}_*)^T)$ is also of Jordan form, but now there can be -1 under the principal diagonal. Thus, under transformation $\mathbf{A} \mapsto \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{A}^{-1})^T$ to Jordan vectors (e_1, \dots, e_n) there correspond $r = \text{rank } \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{C})$ independent vectors $(\mathbf{T}f_1, \dots, \mathbf{T}f_n)$, which are also Jordan vectors of \mathbf{K} with the eigenvalues $(-m - \rho_1), \dots, (-m - \rho_n)$. ■

Remark 2. *It is possible that $i = k_i$ in general case. Then $\rho_i = -\frac{m}{2}$. The following Corollary specifies the theorem in the case of skew-symmetric tensor invariant.*

Corollary. *Let the tensor \mathbf{T} be skew-symmetric. Then among natural numbers from 1 to n one can extract two subsets with distinct numbers (i_1, \dots, i_l) and (k_1, \dots, k_l) , $l = \frac{1}{2}\text{rank } \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{C})$, such that Kovalevskaya exponents satisfy l relations*

$$\rho_{i_s} + \rho_{k_s} = -m, \quad s = 1, \dots, l.$$

Indeed, a nonzero vector $\mathbf{T}f_i$ can not be proportional to e_i in the case of skew-symmetric \mathbf{T} . It follows from the fact that $(e_i, f_j) = \delta_{ij}$, where (\cdot, \cdot) is the standard scalar product in \mathbb{R}^n ($\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^{-1} = \mathbf{E}$), and the skew-symmetric property of \mathbf{T} implies $(\mathbf{T}f_i, f_i) = 0$.

Since the skew-symmetric structural tensor J^{ij} is a tensor invariant of motion equations for general Hamiltonian systems (Section 2), then it follows from the corollary that the Kovalevskaya exponents are coupled, and the number of pairs equals $\frac{1}{2}\text{rank } \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{C})$.

3 Invariant measure

As a rule, quasihomogeneous equations of dynamics (the Euler-Poisson equations, the Kirchhoff equations, etc.) possess an invariant measure besides the degenerate Poisson structure (determined by algebra $e(3)$). The existence of invariant measure imposes an additional condition on Kovalevskaya exponents.

Indeed, let us assume that the system (1) admits a quasihomogeneous tensor invariant of type $(n, 0)$

$$\Omega = \Omega(\mathbf{x})dx^1 \wedge \dots \wedge dx^n, \quad \Omega(\mathbf{C}) \neq 0.$$

Then $\sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i = m$, where m is the quasihomogeneity degree of Ω . If Ω is the standard measure, then $\sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i = \sum_{i=1}^n g_i$; in particular, the sum of Kovalevskaya

exponents equals the system dimension n for systems with homogeneous quadratic right-hand sides. This result follows from the main theorem of [12].

As it was pointed out in [7], in the homogeneous case ($g_i = 1$) Kovalevskaya exponents are connected with multipliers of periodic solutions, and their pairing for Hamiltonian systems follows from the Poincaré-Lyapunov theorem on recurrence of roots of characteristic polynomial of variational equations.

4 Examples

a) Let us consider a variant of *the system of Lotka-Volterra type* [5, 17], which can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i &= x_i(\alpha_{i+1}x_{i+1} - \beta_{i-1}x_{i-1}), & i &= 1, \dots, n, \\ x_0 &= x_n, & x_{n+1} &= x_1, \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where α_i, β_i are constants. The equations (11) are generalizations of the integrable periodic Volterra system, for which $\alpha_i = \beta_i = \text{const}$ [2].

A straightforward calculation of Kovalevskaya exponents for the system (11) shows, that they satisfy the pairing conditions $\rho_i + \rho_j = 0$; it corresponds to occurrence of a quadratic tensor invariant T^{ij} (by definition of quasihomogeneity degree). However, the fulfillment of the theorem condition is not sufficient for the presence of the Poisson structure. If the relation $\prod_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = \prod_{i=1}^n \beta_i$ holds, the equations (11) possess an additional linear integral $F = (l, x)$, $l \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and under condition $\alpha_i = \beta_i$ the system (11) is indeed Hamiltonian with the quadratic Poisson bracket $J^{ij} = C^{ij}x_i x_j$ and linear Hamiltonian.

b) Let us consider *a generalized Suslov problem* as another example. It describes a rigid body motion around a fixed point with the nonholonomic constraint $\omega_3 = 0$. If the center of mass is on the principal axis, along which $\omega_3 = 0$, then motion equations of the system have the form:

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 \dot{\omega}_1 &= \varepsilon \gamma_2, & I_2 \dot{\omega}_2 &= -\varepsilon \gamma_1, \\ \dot{\gamma}_1 &= -\omega_2 \gamma_3, & \dot{\gamma}_2 &= \omega_1 \gamma_3, & \dot{\gamma}_3 &= \omega_2 \gamma_1 - \omega_1 \gamma_2, \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where I_1, I_2 are components of the inertia tensor, ε is the distance from the fixed point to the center of mass. Calculation of Kovalevskaya exponents gives the following values:

1. $\rho_1 = -1, \rho_2 = 2, \rho_3 = 4, \rho_{4,5} = \frac{1}{2} \left(3 \pm \sqrt{1 + 8 \frac{I_2}{I_1}} \right),$
2. $\rho_1 = -1, \rho_2 = 2, \rho_3 = 4, \rho_{4,5} = \frac{1}{2} \left(3 \pm \sqrt{1 + 8 \frac{I_1}{I_2}} \right).$

Similar in structure, but more complicated expressions for the Kovalevskaya exponents $\rho_{4,5}$ can be obtained in general case, when the position of the center of

mass and the nonintegrable constraint in the body are not related anyhow [15]. These Kovalevskaya exponents are coupled: $\rho_1 + \rho_3 = \rho_4 + \rho_5 = 3$. Therefore, it is natural to expect the presence of a tensor invariant in the system (12) and possibility of its representation in the Hamiltonian form (7) with some in general nonconstant structural tensor J^{ik} . It is valid indeed, if one chooses the geometrical integral $F = \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_1^2 + \gamma_2^2 + \gamma_3^2)$ as the Hamiltonian.

Let $x = (x^1, x^2, x^3, x^4, x^5) = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3)$ and rewrite (12) as

$$\dot{x}^i = J^{ij}(x) \frac{\partial F}{\partial x^j},$$

where

$$J = \|J^{ij}\| = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\varepsilon}{I_1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{\varepsilon}{I_2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\varepsilon}{I_2} & 0 & 0 & -\omega_2 \\ -\frac{\varepsilon}{I_1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_1 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega_2 & -\omega_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

For (12) \mathbf{J} is a tensor invariant of degree 3, which satisfies the Jacobi identity, what one verifies by straightforward calculations. The Casimir function of the Poisson structure J is the energy integral (of the Suslov problem)

$$\frac{1}{2}(I_1\omega_1^2 + I_2\omega_2^2) + \varepsilon\gamma_2 = h. \quad (13)$$

The reduction on a symplectic sheet can be carried out explicitly, if one notes, that the equations (12) can be rewritten as Lagrange equations [8] after excluding γ_3 from (13)

$$\frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{\omega}_i} = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \omega}, \quad L = T - V,$$

where

$$T = \frac{1}{2}(I_1^2\dot{\omega}_1^2 + I_2^2\dot{\omega}_2^2).$$

These equations are not integrable for $I_1 \neq I_2$. The Hamiltonian property for the Suslov problem is rather unexpected, since motion equations of nonholonomic dynamics do not preserve the invariant measure in general case [11].

c) Let us consider *a restricted problem in rigid body dynamics*.

$$\dot{\omega}_1 = \omega_2\omega_3 + z\gamma_2, \quad \dot{\omega}_2 = -\omega_1\omega_3 - z\gamma_1, \quad \dot{\omega}_3 = -\gamma_2, \quad \dot{\gamma} = \gamma \times \omega. \quad (14)$$

The equations (14) at $z = 0$ were studied in [13], where their nonintegrability was shown with the help of the separatrix splitting method; pictures of stochastic behavior are presented in [3].

In general case when $z \neq 0$, the system (14) is quasihomogeneous and possesses the following sets of partial solutions $\omega_i = \frac{\omega_i^0}{t}$, $\gamma_i = \frac{\gamma_i^0}{t^2}$, where

$$\omega_1^0 = 0, \quad \omega_2^0 = 0, \quad \omega_3^0 = 2i, \quad \gamma_1^0 = 2, \quad \gamma_2^0 = 2i, \quad \gamma_3^0 = 0;$$

and

$$\omega_1^0 = 0, \quad \omega_2^0 = 2i, \quad \omega_3^0 = 0, \quad \gamma_1^0 = \frac{2i}{z}, \quad \gamma_2^0 = 0, \quad \gamma_3^0 = \frac{2}{z}.$$

The Kovalevskaya exponents, corresponding to the chosen partial solutions, are of the form:

$$\rho = (-1, 0, 1, \rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3),$$

where (ρ_1, ρ_2, ρ_3) are roots of the cubic equation $\rho^3 - 9\rho^2 + 26\rho - (24 + 8z) = 0$, the solutions of which for any z have a complicated algebraic form. Apparently, it prevents from the existence of algebraic integrals of motion for the system (14). The occurrence of a Poisson structure for the equations (14) has not been also investigated.

d) Motion of a ferromagnet with the Barnett-London effect The essence of the quantum-mechanic effect of Barnett is that a neutral ferromagnet magnetizes along the axis of rotation. In this case the magnetic moment \mathbf{B} is connected with its angular velocity $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ by relation $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{\Lambda}_1 \boldsymbol{\omega}$, where $\mathbf{\Lambda}_1$ is a symmetric linear operator. The analogous moment occurs under rotation of a superconducting rigid body under the London effect. If a body rotates in homogeneous magnetic field with the intensity \mathbf{H} , then it is under magnetic forces with the moment $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{H}$. Let us denote $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = \mathbf{H}$, then equations of motion can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathbf{M}} &= \mathbf{M} \times \mathbf{A}\mathbf{M} + \mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{M} \times \boldsymbol{\gamma}, & \dot{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} &= \boldsymbol{\gamma} \times \mathbf{A}\mathbf{M}, \\ \mathbf{\Lambda} &= \mathbf{\Lambda}_1 \mathbf{A}, & \mathbf{A} &= \mathbf{I}^{-1} = \text{diag}(a_1, a_2, a_3). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

As it is shown in [9], the equations are Hamiltonian at $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \mathbf{A}$ (they are reduced to the Kirchhoff equations, i. e. to equations on the algebra $e(3)$), and also at $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$, $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{E}$. In the last case they are integrable and reduced to the Clebsh case on the algebra $e(3)$ by a linear coordinate transformation [4].

The equations (15) possess two integrals $F_1 = (\mathbf{M}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$, $F_2 = (\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$ and the standard invariant measure. There is the lack of two integrals for their integrability in general case.

These integrals are $F_3 = (\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{M})$, $F_4 = (\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{M})$ at $\mathbf{\Lambda} = 0$. At $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ using the method of separatrix splitting, one can show that for $a_1 \neq a_2 \neq a_3 \neq a_1$ the existence conditions for at least one of additional motion integrals, generated by F_3 or F_4 , have the form

$$\sum_{\hookrightarrow} \frac{\lambda_2 - \lambda_3}{a_1} = 0, \quad \sum_{\hookrightarrow} a_1^{-1} [a_2 \lambda_3 - a_3 \lambda_2 + \lambda_1 (a_2 - a_3)] = 0. \quad (16)$$

It is obvious from (16), that one more integral can actually exist at $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \mathbf{E}$. It is the integral of moment $F_3 = (\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{M})$. The system (15) is completely integrable at $a_1 = a_2 = a$, $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \mathbf{E}$, and its additional integral is

$$F_4 = aM_3 + \gamma_3.$$

The question concerning the Hamiltonian property of the equations (15) was arisen in [10], however it has not been solved yet. As it is noted in [1], the matrix $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ should be diagonal $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \text{diag}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \Lambda_3)$ for the Hamiltonian property in the case of $a_1 \neq a_2 \neq a_3 \neq a_1$.

Calculation of Kovalevskaya exponents at $a_2 = a_3 = B$, $a_1 = 1$ for the solution

$$(c_1, \dots, c_6) = \left(0, \frac{1}{B} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_3}{\lambda_2 - \lambda_3}}, \frac{1}{B} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_3 - \lambda_2}}, \frac{c_3}{\lambda_2 c_2}, -\frac{Bc_2}{\lambda_3}, -\frac{Bc_3}{\lambda_2} \right)$$

gives the set $(-1, 1, 2, 2, 1 + \sqrt{B^2 - 2B}, 1 - \sqrt{B^2 - 2B})$, and for the solution

$$(c_1, \dots, c_6) = \left(i, \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_1}{B(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)}}, \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_1}{B(\lambda_3 - \lambda_2)}}, 0, -\frac{Bc_2}{\lambda_1}, -\frac{Bc_3}{\lambda_1} \right)$$

the set $(-1, 2, 2, 2, B, 1 - B)$.

The pairing condition does not hold in this case, what is typical (in general situation of nondegeneracy of the structural tensor at the point (c_1, \dots, c_6)) for Hamiltonian systems. However, this observation can not be considered to be a strong evidence of the absence of the Hamiltonian property for the system (16).

References

- [1] *Yu. V. Barkin, A. V. Borisov.* Nonintegrability of the Kirchhoff equations and related problems of rigid body dynamics. No. 5037–89, M.: VINITI, 1989 (in Russian).
- [2] *O. I. Bogoyavlensky.* Reversing solitons. Nonlinear integrable equations. M.: Nauka, 1991. (in Russian).
- [3] *A. V. Borisov, K. V. Emelianov.* Nonintegrability and stochasticity in rigid body dynamics. Izhevsk, Izd. UdGU, 1995. (in Russian).
- [4] *it L. E. Veselova.* On two problems of rigid body dynamics. Vest. MGU, Ser. Mat. Mekh., 1986, No. 5, P. 90–91. (in Russian).
- [5] *V. Volterra.* Mathematical theory of the struggle for existence. M.: Nauka, 1976. Translation from French *V. Volterra.* Leçons sur la theorie mathematique de la lutte pour la vie, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 1931.

- [6] *S. L. Ziglin*. On the absence of an additional first integral in a problem of rigid body dynamics. DAN SSSR, V. 292, 1987, No. 4, P. 804–807. (in Russian).
- [7] *V. V. Kozlov*. Symmetries, topology and resonances in Hamiltonian dynamics. Izhevsk, Izd. UdGU, 1995. (in Russian).
- [8] *V. V. Kozlov*. To the theory of integrability of equations of nonholonomic dynamics. Uspekhi mekh., V. 8, 1985, No. 3, P. 85–101. (in Russian).
- [9] *V. V. Kozlov*. To the problem on rotation of a rigid body in magnetic field. Izv. AN SSSR, Ser. Mekh. Tv. T., 1985, No. 6, P. 28–33. (in Russian).
- [10] *V. V. Kozlov*. Some aspects of dynamical systems theory. eds. *V. V. Kozlov, A. T. Fomenko*. Geometry, differential equations and mechanics, M.: MGU, 1986, P. 4–18. (in Russian).
- [11] *V. V. Kozlov*. On existence of integral invariant of smooth dynamical systems. Prikl. Mat. Mekh., V. 51, 1987, No. 4, P. 538–545. (in Russian).
- [12] *V. V. Kozlov*. Tensor invariants of quasihomogeneous systems of differential equations and the asymptotic method of Kovalevskaya-Lyapunov. Mat. Zametki, V. 51, 1992, No. 2, P. 46–52. (in Russian).
- [13] *V. V. Kozlov, D. V. Treshchev*. Nonintegrability of the general problem on rotation of a dynamically symmetric heavy rigid body with a fixed point. II. Vestnik MGU, Ser. Mat. Mekh., 1986, No. 1, P. 39–44. (in Russian).
- [14] *V. V. Kozlov, S. D. Furta*. Asymptotics of solutions of strongly nonlinear systems of differential equations. M.: MGU, 1996. (in Russian).
- [15] *V. M. Nikiforov*. On single-valued solutions of the Suslov problem in homogeneous gravitational field. eds. *V. V. Kozlov, A. T. Fomenko*. Geometry, differential equations and mechanics, M.: MGU, 1986, P. 106–108. (in Russian).
- [16] *P. Lochak*. Pairing of the Kowalevski exponents in Hamiltonian systems. Phys. Lett., V. 108A, 1985, No. 4, P. 188–190.
- [17] *M. Plank*. Hamiltonian structures for the n-dimensional Lotka-Volterra equations. J. Math. Phys., V. 36(7), 1995, P. 3520–3534.
- [18] *H. Yoshida*. Necessary condition for the existence of algebraic first integrals, I–II. Cel. Mech., v. 31, 1983, No. 4, P. 363–399.