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§1. The Existing Formalism

It is clear that, for periodic mechanical systems of one degree of freedom, the quantization condition is

\[ \int p \, dq = \int p \, \frac{dq}{dt} \, dt = n \hbar \quad . \]  

(1)

The integration is performed over the entire period of the motion; \( q \) denotes the coordinate, \( p \) the conjugate momentum of the system. Further, the theoretical work of Sommerfeld demonstrates that for systems with \( \ell \) degrees of freedom, the single quantization condition must be replaced by \( \ell \) quantization conditions. According to Sommerfeld these \( \ell \) conditions are

\[ \int p_i \, dq_i = n_i \hbar \quad . \]  

(2)

This formulation is not independent of the choice of coordinates, so it can only be proven correct for certain choices of coordinates. It is only when such a choice has been made and the \( q_i \) are periodic functions of time that the conditions of Eq. (2) are applicable.

The more recent work of Epstein (and Schwarzschild) provides a fundamental improvement to this theory by providing criteria by which to choose the coordinates. Epstein bases his choice of coordinates on Jacobi's theorem.\(^2\)

Let \( H = H(q_i, p_i, t) \) be the Hamiltonian of the system, which appears in the canonical equations

\[ \dot{p}_i = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial q_i} \quad . \]  

(3)

\[ \dot{q}_i = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i} \quad . \]  

(4)

and which — provided it does not contain time explicitly — is identical with
If \( S(q_1, \ldots, q_L, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_L, t) \) is a total integral (Hamilton's principal function) of the Hamilton-Jacobi partial differential equation

\[
\frac{\partial S}{\partial t} + H(q_i, \frac{\partial S}{\partial q_i}) = 0
\]

then the solutions of the canonical equations are

\[
\frac{\partial S}{\partial q_i} = \beta_i
\]

\[
\frac{\partial S}{\partial q_i} = p_i
\]

If the Hamiltonian does not contain time explicitly, which is assumed in what follows, then Eq. (5) may be satisfied by use of the Ansatz

\[
S = W - Et
\]

where \( E \) is a constant and \( W \) (Hamilton's Characteristic Function) does not depend explicitly upon time. Equations (5), (6) and (7) are then replaced by

\[
\frac{\partial W}{\partial q_i} = \beta_i
\]

\[
\frac{\partial W}{\partial p_i} = t - t_0
\]

\[
\frac{\partial W}{\partial q_i} = p_i
\]

\*In this case one has

\[
\frac{\partial W}{\partial q_i} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial q_i} q_i + \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i} p_i
\]
The first equation in Eq. (6a) represents 2-1 equations, in the last equation \( \alpha_i \) is replaced by the constant \( E \), and \( \beta_n \) by the constant \( t_0 \).

Epstein showed that if the coordinates are chosen so that Hamilton's Characteristic Function has the form

\[
W = \int \Psi_i(q_i) \, ,
\]

where \( \Psi_i \) is a function of only \( q_i \) and not the other \( q_j \)'s, then Sommerfeld's quantization condition, Eq. (2), will be valid provided the coordinates are periodic functions.

In spite of the success of Sommerfeld's and Epstein's generalization of the quantum principle in treating systems of several degrees of freedom, it still remains unsatisfactory in that according to Eq. (8) it is dependent upon a separation of variables. Such a separation of variables is not related to the quantum problem. This paper proposes a small modification of the Sommerfeld-Epstein condition in order to avoid this drawback. I will briefly outline the basic thoughts in the next section, and then in the following carry them out more precisely.

§2. The Modified Formalism

For systems of one degree of freedom, \( pdq \) is an invariant, that is, independent of the choice of the coordinate. However, for systems of several degrees of freedom, the individual products \( p_i dq_i \) are not invariants; consequently the quantization conditions (2) do not lead to an invariant result. Only the sum \( \sum_i p_i dq_i \), which extends over all \( \ell \) degrees of freedom, is invariant. One can derive a set of invariant quantization conditions (from the single invariant sum) in the following manner: Let us consider the \( p_i \) as
functions of the $q_i$. Then one can consider the $p_i$ as a vector (covariant in character) on the $l$-dimensional space of the $q_i$. If one then draws an arbitrary closed curve, in coordinate space, which need not be a "trajectory" of the mechanical system, the line integral

$$\int \sum_i p_i dq_i,$$

performed over this curve, is an invariant. If the $p_i$ are any arbitrary functions of the $q_i$, then in general the integral (9) will have a different value for each closed curve. However, if

$$\frac{\partial p_i}{\partial q_k} - \frac{\partial p_k}{\partial q_i} = 0,$$  

(10)

which follows if the $p_i$ are derivable from a function $^5 W$, as

$$p_i = \frac{\partial W}{\partial q_i},$$  

(10a)

then the integral (9) has the same value for all closed curves which can be continuously deformed into each other. $^6$ Further, the integral (9) vanishes for all curves that can be contracted into a single point by a continuous change. Now if the coordinate space, with its associated momentum vector field is multiply connected, then there are closed paths that cannot be contracted to a point by means of a continuous change. $^7$ If this is the case, $W$ is not a single valued (but an infinitely multivalued) function of the $q_i$, and in general the integral (9) will be different from zero for such a curve. Moreover, there will exist a finite number of closed curves, $C_i$, in $q$-space, to which, by means of a continuous change, all closed curves are reducible. In this sense one can prescribe a finite number of quantization conditions.
\[ \int_{C_\ell} p_1 dq_1 = n_\ell h \]  \hspace{1cm} (11)

In my opinion these must replace the quantization conditions (2). We would expect that the number of equations (11), which cannot be reduced into one another, are equal to the number of degrees of freedom of the system. If it is smaller, then we have a case of "degeneracy."

The basic idea, which has been investigated above, will be explained in somewhat more detail in the following.

§3. A Descriptive Derivation from the Hamilton-Jacobi Differential Equation

If a point, P, in the coordinate space, with the coordinate \( q_1 \) and associated with the canonical momentum coordinate \( p_1 \), is given, then the motion is completely determined by the canonical equations (3) and (4). As a result, corresponding to every point on a trajectory \( L \), there is a definite velocity, that is, the \( p_1 \) are determined as functions of the \( q_1 \) on \( L \). If for each point \( P \) on a \((\ell-1)\) dimensional "surface" in coordinate space, the \( q_1 \) and \( p_1 \) are given, then associated with every point in coordinate space is such a trajectory \( L \). If the \( p_1 \) on the surface are continuous functions of the \( q_1 \), then these trajectories will continuously fill the coordinate space (or a part thereof). There will be a specific trajectory passing through every point \( (q_1) \) of the coordinate space; thus each of these points will also be associated with a specific momentum coordinate. From this it is clear that there is a vector field \( p_1 \) associated with coordinate space. We wish to formulate the law of this vector field.

*It is again assumed that \( H \) does not depend explicitly on time.*
If we consider the \( p_i \), in the canonical system of equations (3), as functions of the \( q_k \), we then must replace the left-hand sides by

\[
\frac{\partial p_i}{\partial q_k} \frac{\partial q_k}{\partial t} \quad ,
\]

which by (4) may in turn be replaced by

\[
\frac{\partial p_i}{\partial q_k} \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_k} \quad .
\]

Thus in place of (3) we obtain

\[
\frac{\partial H}{\partial q_i} + \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_k} \frac{\partial p_i}{\partial q_k} = 0 \quad .
\]

It is this system of \( \ell \) linear differential equations that defines the \( p_k \)'s as functions of \( q_k \)'s.

Now we ask whether there exists a function \( W \) from which one can derive the momentum vector field, and for which the conditions (10) and (10a) are fulfilled. If this is the case, Eq. (12) takes the form

\[
\frac{\partial H}{\partial q_i} + \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_k} \frac{\partial p_i}{\partial q_k} = 0 \quad .
\]

This equation shows that \( H \) is independent of the \( q_i \). Thus functions \( W \) of the desired kind exist, e.g., the \( W \)'s that satisfy the Hamilton-Jacobi equation (5a), or the \( S \) that satisfies equation (5).

It has been shown that equation (3) can be replaced by equation (7a) and (5a), or by (7) and (5). We shall now demonstrate that the system of equations (4) are fulfilled by (6a) or (6), even though this is of no importance for the subsequent discussion. After integration of (5a) one can express the \( p_i \) as functions of the \( q_i \) by virtue of (7a). The equations (4) form a system of
total differential equations which determines the \( q_i \)'s as functions of time.

According to the theory of differential equations of first order, this system of total differential equations is equivalent to the partial differential equation

\[
\sum_k \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_k} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial q_k} + \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} = 0
\]  

(13)

Equation (13) is satisfied by \( \phi = \partial S/\partial \alpha_i \), provided \( S \) is a complete integral of (5). This can be seen by placing this value of \( \phi \) in the left-hand side of (13), thus obtaining, using (7),

\[
\sum_k \frac{\partial H}{\partial (\partial J/\partial q_k)} \frac{\partial^2 S}{\partial q_k \partial \alpha_i} \frac{\partial S}{\partial \alpha_i}
\]

or

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_i} \left[ H(q_k, \frac{\partial S}{\partial q_k}) + \frac{\partial S}{\partial t} \right]
\]

which vanishes because of (5). From this it follows that equation (4) is integrable by means of (6) and (6a).

§4. The \( p_i \)-Field of a Unique Trajectory

Having shown, in §3, that there exist momentum fields \( p_i \) such that \( \int p_i dq_i \) is path independent, we now come to an essential point, which I have intentionally omitted in the previous sketch of basic thoughts in §2. In the arguments of §3, we have explored the \( p_i \)-field by the means of \( \xi - 1 \) infinites of trajectories, which fill the classically allowed region of coordinate space. We now follow the undisturbed motion of an isolated system through an infinitely long time and trace the trajectory in the \( q_i \)-space. Two cases may occur:

1) in the course of time, the trajectory comes arbitrarily close to every point in the classically allowed region of coordinate space, or

2) the trajectory is confined in a continuum of fewer than \( \xi \) dimensions.

(An example is the case of exactly closed orbits.)
Case 1 represents the general situation while Case 2 is a specialization. An example of 1, we imagine the motion of a point mass under the influence of a central force, described by two coordinates that determine the position of the point in the plane of motion. Case 2 occurs, for example, when the attractive force law is exactly proportional to $1/r^2$, and when the deviation from the Kepler motion arising from the relativistic theory is ignored; the orbit is then closed, and its points form a continuum of only one dimension. Considered in three-dimensional space, the central motion is always a motion of type 2, since the trajectory can be accommodated in a continuum of two dimensions. In working with three dimensions, one must consider the central motion as a special case of a more complicated (non-central) force law (for example that of Epstein's study of motion in the Stark effect).

The following argument is based on the general case 1. Consider an element $dt$ of $q_1$-space. A trajectory will pass through this element infinitely often. Corresponding to each such crossing is a momentum vector. A priori, two fundamentally different types of trajectories are possible. Type a): the $p_1$-vector repeats itself, so that only a finite number of $p_1$-vectors belong in $dt$. In this case the $p_1$ are single or multivalued functions of $q_1$. Type b): there appear infinitely many $p_1$-systems at the point considered. In this case the $p_1$ cannot be represented as a function of $q_1$.

One notices immediately that type b) excludes the quantization condition formulated in §2. Classical statistical mechanics on the other hand describe essentially only type b); only in this case is the microcanonical ensemble equivalent to the time averaged ensemble.*

---

*In the microcanonical ensemble there exist systems which for given $q_1$ arbitrary (with the proper energy) $p_1$ exist.
Summarizing, we note that application of the quantization condition (11) requires that (i) trajectories be of type a) and, ii) that the individual trajectories determine a function $W$ from which the momentum field can be derived. (However, see "Note added in proof," Ed.)

§5. The Rational Coordinate Space

It has already been mentioned that the $p_i$ are, in general, multivalued functions of the $q_i$. We consider, as a simple example, the circular motion of a point under the attractive force of a fixed center. The point moves in such a way that its distance from the attractive center oscillates periodically between a minimum value $r_1$ and a maximum value $r_2$. If one considers a point in the space of $q_i$, that is, a point on the coordinate space annulus whose limits are both of the circles with radii $r_1$ and $r_2$, then in the course of time the trajectory will come infinitely close to it, or -- less precisely -- pass through it. However, for the passage of a portion of the orbit with increasing $r$, or a portion of the orbit with decreasing $r$, the radial component of the velocity has different signs; the $p_\nu$ are double-valued functions of $q_\nu$.

The inconvenience for visualization caused by this fact is best removed by means of the well-known method introduced into function theory by Riemann. We imagine that we double the surface of a circular ring, so that two congruent, circular ring-shaped sheets lie on top of each other. On the upper annulus we imagine the orbit sections with positive $dr/dt$ together with the associated vector $p_\nu$, and on the lower annulus those sections with negative $dr/dt$ together with the associated vector $p_\nu$. At both circumferences we imagine the two sheets are connected, since the orbit must cross from one circular sheet to the other whenever the trajectory touches one of the boundary circumferences. It
is easily seen that along the circles the $p_y$ on both sheets are equal. Interpreted on this double surface, the $p_y$ are not only continuous but also single valued functions of the $q_y$.

On this double surface there are obviously two types of closed paths, which can neither be contracted to a point by a continuous change, nor be reduced to each other. Figure 1 shows an example of each of the two ($L_1$ and $L_2$) types; the parts of the path which lie on the lower sheet are drawn dotted. All other closed paths may, by a continuous change on the doubled surface, either be contracted into a point or deformed into one or more paths of types $L_1$ and $L_2$. The quantum condition (11) would here have to be applied to the two path types $L_1$ and $L_2$.

![Diagram](image)

Fig. 1

It is clear that this consideration generalizes for all motion that fulfills the condition of §4. One has to imagine the phase space is respectively divided into a number of "sheets" which are connected along $(l-1)$ dimensional "surfaces" in such a way that in order to interpret the resulting structure the $p_1$ are single valued and (with respect to crossing from one [sheet] to another) continuous functions. This auxiliary geometrical construction we will denote as the "rational phase space." The quantum principle (11) ought to be applicable to all contours, which are closed in rational coordinate space.
In order for the quantum principle in this formulation to have an exact meaning, the integral \( \int \mathbf{p}_1 \, dq_1 \), performed over all closed curves in rational \( q_1 \)-space that can be transformed continuously into one another, must have the same value. The proof is to be carried out according to the familiar scheme.

Let \( L_1 \) and \( L_2 \) be closed curves in rational \( q_1 \)-space (see Fig. 2), which, maintaining the direction of motion can be continuously transformed into one another. Then the line plotted in the figure is a closed curve which can be contracted continuously into a point. From this it follows, due to (10), that the integral, performed over the plotted line, vanishes. If one bears in mind that the integrals, performed over the infinitely adjacent joining lines \( \overline{A_1A_2} \) and \( \overline{B_1B_2} \), are equal to one another as a result of the single valuedness of the \( p_1 \) in the rational \( q_1 \)-space, it follows that the integrals performed over \( L_1 \) and \( L_2 \) are equal.

![Fig. 2](image)

Finally, we note that the function \( W \) is infinitely multivalued even in the rational \( q_1 \)-space. However, according to the quantum principle this multivaluedness is the simplest conceivable. That is, if \( W \) has the value \( W^* \) at a particular point in rational \( q_1 \)-space, then the remaining values of the function are \( W^* + nh \), where \( n \) is an integer.
Further reflection on condition (11) given at the end of §4 for the applicability of the quantization condition (11) reveals that it is always satisfied. That is, the following principle is true: If the motion determines a momentum field then there exists a function from which this field may be obtained by Eq. (10a).

According to Jacobi's principle, every motion of a system can be derived from a total integral $W$ of (5a). Thus there exists locally at least one function $W$ of the $q_1$, from which the $p_i$ of a system can be computed

\[ p_1 = \frac{\partial W}{\partial q_1}. \]

We must now remember that $W$ is obtained with the help of a partial differential equation. Thus if we want to know how $W$ changes for a system in the course of its motion, we must integrate the differential equation along the trajectory to obtain the continuation of $W$. Now if the orbit, after a certain (VERY long) time, closely approaches the vicinity of a point $P$, through which the orbit has previously passed, then $\partial W/\partial q_1$ produces that momentum for both times.

There are however two cases. Corresponding to motion of type "b" (see §4), on each return to $P$ one should not expect to return to the previous values of $\partial W/\partial q_1$. On the contrary, one should expect to encounter a new value of $p_i$ each time the orbit returns to $P$. Consequently it is not possible to find a global representation of the $p_i$ (or $W$) as a function of the $q_i$. Corresponding to motion of type "a," however, the $p_i$-vectors eventually reappear as the coordinate configuration repeats, then the $\partial W/\partial q_1$ can be represented globally as (multiple valued) functions of $q_i$. Thus if a $p_i$-field exists for the infinitely continued motion, then a function $W(q)$ exists.
We restate our conclusions as follows: If there exist \( l \) integrals of the equations of motion of the form

\[
R_k(q_i, p_i) = \text{const.},
\]

(14)

where the \( R_k \)'s are algebraic functions of the \( p_i \), then \( \int p_i dq_i \) is always a total differential. The quantization condition states that the integral \( \int p_i dq_i \), performed over an irreducible curve, should be a multiple of \( h \).

The quantization condition coincides with the Sommerfeld-Epstein condition if, specifically, every \( p_i \) depends only upon the associated \( q_i \). If there exist fewer than \( l \) integrals of type (14), as Poincare has proven for the three-body problem, then the \( p_i \) cannot be represented (globally) as functions of the \( q_i \), and even the modified form of the Sommerfeld-Epstein quantization condition [i.e., that of Eq. (11)] fails.
Subsequent work by Brillouin (1926), Keller (1958), and Maslov (1972) has shown
that even the one-dimensional quantization conditions must be modified to read
\[ \int p dq = (n + \alpha/4)\hbar, \]
where the value of the parameter \( \alpha \) is determined by counting the number of
causics (i.e., boundaries connecting the sheets or surfaces on which the \( p \)
are single valued in the \( q_i \)) which the integration path crosses. For further
discussion of this parameter the reader is referred to the work of Berry and
Mount (1972), Percival (1976), and Voros (1976).

See Goldstein (1950), Chapter 9, for a clear and informative discussion of
Hamilton-Jacobi theory. I have changed the notation in this paper to
correspond to Goldstein's notation.

Both \( S \) and \( W \) are generating functions, which are usually chosen to be of type
\( F_2(q,p) \), using the notation of Goldstein (1950). If we make this choice and
then choose the constants, \( q_i \)'s, to be the action variables, then the \( \beta_i \)'s
are the angle variables and develop linearly in time, i.e.,
\[ \beta_i = \omega_i t + \delta_i. \]

This is a Legendre transformation from the time-dependent representation of
classical mechanics to the time-independent formulation.

Einstein calls \( W \) a "potential," I have translated this as "function."

It should be noted that these results are analogous to Cauchy's theorem with
regard to integration in the complex plane.

By continuous change, Einstein means any deformation of the closed path on the
surface of the invariant torus which does not require the path to be broken.

A pedagogical discussion of the nature of these regular and irregular types
of classical motion is given by Berry (1978), and references therein.
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