




33
ИНСТИТУТ ЯДЕРНОЙ ФИЗИКИ СО АН СССР

B.V. CHIRIKOV and V.V. VECHESELOV

THE STRUCTURE OF A WEAKLY NONLINEAR
RESONANCE

PREPRINT 91-92



НОВОСИБИРСК

THE STRUCTURE OF A WEAKLY NONLINEAR RESONANCE

Dedicated to Professor Péter Szépfalussy.

B.V.CHIRIKOV and V.V.VECHESLAVOV

Institute of Nuclear Physics, 630090, Novosibirsk, USSR

ABSTRACT

An example of the weakly nonlinear resonance is considered. The unbounded resonance structure is described in detail, and is shown to be unstable against weak perturbations. Peculiarities of diffusive motion within the intricate chaotic component are discussed.

© Институт ядерной физики СО АН СССР

1. INTRODUCTION

A colorful world of nonlinear phenomena, one of whose architects and masters is Professor Péter Szépfalussy, continues to attract ever growing army of researchers from all the sciences and around. In this paper we hope to put a tiny new touch on this international painting by describing a peculiar phenomenon of the *weakly nonlinear resonance* (WNR). The most striking feature of nonlinear phenomena is complete rebuilding of the motion structure under a weak perturbation. An excellent example is the KAM theory (see, e.g., Ref. 1 and generalization in Ref. 2) with its subtle everywhere dense chaotic web.^{3,4}

Dynamical chaos — another fascinating discovery in nonlinear mechanics — is almost never just the plain dull disorder but has a highly organized and beautiful structure whose pictures have become common by now on the conference advertisements. A new example we are going to discuss below presents one more type of such a structure. This is intricate interplay of *nonlinear resonances* with control dynamics in Hamiltonian systems.

Let us start with the fundamental Poincaré problem defined by the Hamiltonian

$$H(I, \theta, t) = H_0(I) + \epsilon V(I, \theta, t) \quad (1)$$

where I, θ are N -dimensional action-angle variables, and $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ is perturbation parameter.

The unperturbed system H_0 is supposed to be 'trivial' that is completely integrable (for good texts in nonlinear dynamics see, e.g., Refs. 1, 5). If, moreover, it is nonlinear that is the determinant

$$|d^2 H/dI^2| \neq 0 \quad (2)$$

we call this *strong nonlinearity*. That nonlinearity does not depend on a weak perturbation and remains finite when the latter vanishes.

A single *strongly nonlinear resonance* (SNR) is then also completely integrable and, hence, trivial. Its phase-space picture is now also well known as a 'chain of islands' framed by the separatrix (Fig. 1a) which is the most unstable and chaotic place in the phase space, and which forms that Arnold web mentioned above. This picture is universal and structurally stable that is it remains topologically unchanged under sufficiently weak additional Hamiltonian (nondissipative) perturbation. Moreover, the effect of resonant perturbation vanishes with ϵ (e.g., the separatrix swing $\Delta I \sim \sqrt{\epsilon}$) even though it considerably exceeds that off the resonance ($\Delta I \sim \epsilon$). The *strong nonlinearity suppresses resonant perturbation* if the latter is sufficiently weak. This is one of the principal phenomena in nonlinear Hamiltonian dynamics underlying the celebrated KAM theory.




Fig. 1. Outline of the resonance phase-space structure for strong nonlinearity (a), and for weak nonlinearity (b); arrows show the direction of motion

Remember, that for the linear oscillator, that is when the whole Hamiltonian (1) is quadratic in Cartesian variables p, x any resonance, internal or driving, produces a big effect no matter how weak is the perturbation $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Also, the resonance conditions depend on oscillator's parameters only, and not on the initial conditions of motion like in nonlinear oscillator.

Now, an interesting question is what happens in between? We call this domain *weak nonlinearity*. In terms of Hamiltonian (1) it means that the

unperturbed Hamiltonian

$$H_0(I) = \omega_0 I \quad (3)$$

is linear in action variables or its frequencies $\omega_0 = \text{const}$, while perturbation $\epsilon V(I, \theta, t)$ remains arbitrary.

On the first glance, this problem may appear simpler, as compared to that for strong nonlinearity, due to another small parameter, nonlinearity $\nu \sim \epsilon$, to which only the perturbation term contributes now. Yet, that is not the case! A simple explanation is in that the weak nonlinearity may not suppress the resonance perturbation whose effect now depends on the ratio ϵ/ν of the two small parameters. Particularly, the extension of the KAM theory on weakly nonlinear systems is only possible under the additional requirement of the absence of unperturbed resonances.

Well, the physicists are always trying to go ahead of mathematicians. So, consider, on the contrary, the unperturbed resonance! This is certainly a more interesting case. But also a more difficult. Therefore, we choose the model as simple as possible. One of those is specified by the Hamiltonian:

$$H(p, x, t) = \frac{p^2 + \omega_0^2 x^2}{2} - \epsilon \cos(x - \Omega t) = \omega_0 I - \epsilon \cos(\rho \cos \theta - \Omega t) \quad (4)$$

where $\rho = (2I/\omega_0)^{1/2}$ is the amplitude of unperturbed oscillations.

This model has been extensively studied in plasma physics where it represents the motion of a charged particle in both the magnetic field (Larmor's frequency ω_0) and the plane wave electric field of strength ϵ (see, e.g., Ref. 5).

If we put $\omega_0 = 0$ the model describes a single SNR ($d^2H/dp^2 = 1$) which is completely integrable, as well as $H_0(p)$, with no trace of chaos. Moreover, the p variation is strictly bounded:

$$|\Delta p| \leq 4\sqrt{\epsilon} \quad (5)$$

Yet, for any $\omega_0 \neq 0$ nonlinearity becomes weak (as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$), and the motion drastically changes.

2. THE FIRST ORDER THEORY

The first approximation of the conventional resonant perturbation theory⁵ for model (4) and related models was thoroughly studied in a series of papers by Sagdeev, Zaslavsky and coworkers (see, e.g., Refs. 6, 7, and also Refs. 8-10).

To reveal the resonance structure we first get rid of unperturbed part $\omega_0 I$ of the Hamiltonian (4) by introducing new phase $\varphi = \theta - \omega_0 t$, and expand

the perturbation in Bessel functions:

$$\bar{H}(I, \theta, t) = -\epsilon \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} J_k(\rho) \cos \left[k\varphi - (\Omega - k\omega_0)t + \frac{\pi k}{2} \right] \quad (6)$$

All terms of this Hamiltonian satisfying $k \lesssim \rho$ are of the same order but differ in the frequency of time-dependence. This difference becomes crucial if we fix a resonance condition: $\Omega = n\omega_0$ with any integer $n \neq 0$ (in case $n = 0$ the system is completely integrable). Unlike the linear resonance with only one resonance condition ($\Omega = \omega_0$ for driving perturbation or $\Omega = 2\omega_0$ for parametric one) the WNR is much richer.




Fig. 2. An example of the phase-space structure of a single weakly nonlinear resonance in model (4): $\omega_0 = 1$; $\Omega = 2$; $\epsilon = 1$. Scattered points belong to a single chaotic trajectory bounded by a gap between third and fourth rows of resonant cells. Insert: an enlarged part of this gap near $\varphi = \pi/4$.

Now we can introduce the new unperturbed Hamiltonian

$$\bar{H}_0(I, \varphi) = -\epsilon J_n(\rho) \cos \left(n\varphi + \frac{\pi n}{2} \right) \quad (7)$$

the rest of the sum in Eq.(6) being a new perturbation. We emphasize again that the two parts of the new Hamiltonian differ in frequency only, and this difference increases as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. In other words, the perturbation is no longer small but is a *high-frequency* one (see Eq.(23) below). Hence, the unperturbed motion $\varphi(t)$ is *adiabatic* with respect to the perturbation. We call the whole situation *inverse adiabaticity*.⁴

The most interesting is the global structure of unperturbed motion (7) which is outlined in Fig. 1b in coordinates

$$\Phi = n\varphi + \pi n/2, \quad R = \rho - \pi n/2 - \pi/4,$$

the latter representing the asymptotics of Bessel function ($\rho \gg n$)

$$J_n(\rho) \approx \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi\rho}} \cos R \quad (8)$$

A real example of this resonance structure, which we are going to discuss in detail below, is presented in Fig. 2. Plane ρ, φ here is Poincaré's surface of section at $t = 0 \bmod 2\pi/\omega_0$ that is system's position plotted in each period T_0 of the unperturbed linear oscillation.

This resonance structure is characterized by an infinite(!) lattice of periodic trajectories (fixed points on plane R, Φ) both stable ($\sin \Phi \approx \sin R \approx 0$) and unstable ($\cos \Phi \approx \cos R \approx 0$), the latter being connected by separatrices. The striking difference from a strongly nonlinear resonance (cf. Fig. 1a)! Instead of a narrow restricted chain of islands we have now the unbounded lattice of resonance cells.

The discovery of this structure was very exciting. It took over 10 years to understand and evaluate the phenomenon. Moreover, in monograph⁵ (see also Refs. 8, 9) the resonance lattice is now(!) obvious in Fig. 2.11 (cf. Figs. 1b and 2 in this paper). Yet, it was missed in both the monograph and its translation into Russian by the present authors! One motivation of this paper is to show that this story is still not over (see Section 3).

Before to proceed let us see how the transition from SNR ($\omega_0 = 0$, Fig. 1a) to WNR (any $\omega_0 \neq 0$, Fig. 1b) is organized. As $\omega_0 \rightarrow 0$ being resonant the parameter $n = \Omega/\omega_0 \rightarrow \infty$ (Ω is fixed), and the first zero ρ_1 of $J_n(\rho)$ in Eq. (7) grows indefinitely:

$$\rho_k = \frac{\pi n}{2} + \pi k - \frac{\pi}{4} \quad (9)$$

where k is zero's number. Thus, the WNR lattice shifts up, the first row of resonance cells $(0, \rho_1)$ expanding indefinitely. For the initial condition inside SNR ($x \sim 1, \dot{x} \sim \Omega, \rho \sim \Omega/\omega_0 = n$) coordinate $x \sim \Omega t$ grows with time, as well as ρ , until ρ reaches ρ_1 . Around this time the SNR picture completely desintegrates, and only the WNR structure remains.

Already our first numerical experiments with model (4) revealed that WNR structure is not as simple as it is outlined in Fig. 1b. Besides distortion of separatrices (a routine perturbation effect) and their chaotic layers (a universal nonlinear phenomenon, see below, Section 4) we noticed an intricate structure at the intersections of separatrices (see insert in Fig. 2). Further studies showed that the resonance lattice is not a connected formation but cut through by many narrow gaps.

3. INSTABILITY OF THE RESONANCE LATTICE

Unlike the SNR chain the WNR lattice proved to be structurally unstable. We shall analyze this problem using the asymptotic representation (8) of unperturbed Hamiltonian (7):

$$\bar{H}_0(I, \varphi) = -\epsilon \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi\rho}} \cos R \cos \Phi + V(I, \varphi) \quad (10)$$

where we introduced additional time-independent perturbation V . Remember, that we are studying the stability of the unperturbed WNR structure. The impact of the high-frequency perturbation will be considered later (Section 4).

Introducing new time and dynamical variables

$$\begin{aligned} \tau &= t\epsilon \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi\rho}} & (\rho \approx \text{const}) \\ r &= R - R_k; & s = \Phi - \Phi_k \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

and keeping only linear terms of perturbation V in new variables we arrive at the new Hamiltonian:

$$\bar{H}_0(I, \varphi) = -\sin r \sin s + \alpha r + \beta s \quad (12)$$

Here R_k, Φ_k are the coordinates of a certain fixed point (see Fig. 1b), and canonical variables remain I, φ as before.

Consider first a simpler case $\beta = 0$ (for $\alpha, \beta \neq 0$ see Section 7). Then horizontal separatrices ($r = \text{const}$) all remain unchanged but vertical ones

($s = \text{const}$) are destroyed because of the difference in \bar{H}_0 between the two neighbouring fixed points ($\Delta \bar{H}_0 = \pi |\alpha|$). The new structure is outlined in Fig. 3. Remarkably, an arbitrarily small perturbation ($\alpha \rightarrow 0$) qualitatively changes the structure making all the rows of resonance cells disconnected by narrow horizontal gaps. For small $\alpha > 0$ the width of a gap at $s = \pi/2$ and $r = 0 \pmod{2\pi}$ is:

$$\Delta \rho \approx 2 \left| \frac{\Delta \bar{H}_0}{\partial \bar{H}_0 / \partial \rho} \right| \approx 2\pi |\alpha| \quad (13)$$

Actually, each of such gaps consists of two nearly equal parts at both sides of the horizontal separatrix. The position of a gap in s is determined by the condition:

$$\alpha \cos r \sin s < 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \alpha \dot{\varphi} > 0 \quad (14)$$

Particularly, for a given α the direction of motion is the same in all gaps.




Fig. 3. A scheme of WNR structure with perturbation (12) for $\beta = 0$ (cf. Fig. 1b); the separation of resonance cell rows by horizontal gaps is clearly seen.

The perturbation shifts the fixed points whose position is determined by the equations:

$$\cos r \sin s - \alpha = 0; \quad \sin r \cos s = 0 \quad (15)$$

with two solutions

$$\begin{aligned} \cos s_1 &= 0; & \cos r_1 &= \pm \alpha \\ \sin s_2 &= \pm \alpha; & \sin r_2 &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

for stable and unstable fixed points respectively. If

$$|\alpha| > 1 \quad (17)$$

the WNR structure is completely destroyed, and all the gaps unite.

Consider, as an example, the model with Hamiltonian^{11,7}

$$H(p, x, t) = \frac{p^2}{2} - \cos(\omega_0 x) - \epsilon \cos(x - \Omega t) \quad (18)$$

Globally, this model describes the interaction of the two SNRs which results in the formation of relatively narrow chaotic layers around resonance separatrices. But near the center of the stronger resonance ($x \approx 0$) the model (18) is close to our basic model (4) of WNR. If $\Omega \neq n\omega_0$ the resonance center is stable for $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. But for $\Omega = n\omega_0$ a WNR lattice is formed inside the SNR. However, the former is destroyed at sufficiently large x as the nonlinearity in Eq. (18) is strong. For $|\omega_0 x| \ll 1$ the nonlinearity is described by the term

$$\delta H = \frac{\omega_0^4}{24} \langle x^4 \rangle = \frac{\omega_0^4 \rho^4}{64} \quad (19)$$

Linearizing this nonlinear perturbation in ρ we arrive, for $\rho \gtrsim n$, at Hamiltonian (12) with $\beta = 0$ and

$$\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \frac{\omega_0^4 \rho^{7/2}}{16 \epsilon} = 1 \quad (20)$$

The latter equality determines the border between WNR structure (with gaps, $\alpha < 1$) and SNR behavior ($\alpha > 1$). Particularly, the size ρ_w of the former is given by the relation

$$\frac{\rho_w}{\rho_s} = 0.66 \left(\frac{\epsilon}{\omega_0^4} \right)^{2/7} \quad (21)$$

where $\rho_s = \pi/\omega_0$ is the SNR separatrix size in x . This estimate holds in the interval

$$n \lesssim \rho_w \lesssim 1/\omega_0 \quad (22)$$

provided (see Eqs. (6), (7))

$$\left| \frac{n\dot{\varphi}}{\omega_0} \right| \equiv \frac{1}{\lambda} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{\epsilon n}{\omega_0^2 \rho^{3/2}} \lesssim 1 \quad (23)$$

This adiabaticity parameter is going to play important role in what follows (see Section 4). At the border $\rho = \rho_w$ (see Eq. (21))

$$\lambda_w^{-1} \sim \Omega \epsilon^{4/7} \omega_0^{3/14} \rightarrow 0$$

as $\omega_0 \rightarrow 0$ with fixed Ω and ϵ . Inequalities (22) imply that $\Omega \lesssim 1$.

Comparison with numerical results in Refs. 11, 7 shows that the accuracy of Eq. (23) is about 10 per cent even for $\rho_w/n \approx 1.5$.

The unbounded WNR lattice is related to periodicity in ρ of unperturbed Hamiltonian (7) due to the special structure of perturbation in Eq. (4). Again, unlike the SNR behavior the WNR one is not universal. For example, if the additional nonlinear term (19) would be proportional to ϵ , hence would belong to the weak nonlinearity according to our definition above, parameter α were independent of ϵ , while the resonance structure would vary in a broad range, from WNR one ($\omega_0 \rightarrow 0$) to that of SNR ($\omega_0 \rightarrow \infty$).

Another simple example is a detuning $\delta\Omega = n\delta\omega_0$ from the resonance $\Omega = n\omega_0$. The additional term in Hamiltonian (4) is $\delta H = \omega_0 \delta\omega_0 \rho^2/2$, hence the perturbation parameter

$$\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \frac{\omega_0 \rho^{3/2}}{\epsilon} \delta\omega_0 = \lambda \frac{\delta\Omega}{\omega_0} \quad (24)$$

in agreement with the previous result in Ref. 8. Notice, that for a fixed $\delta\Omega \neq 0$ the WNR structure is always destroyed as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ ($\epsilon \rightarrow 0$). This is a simple explanation of the KAM integrability for weak nonlinearity.

Coming back to model (4) we wonder what would be the origin of gaps revealed in our numerical experiments? Apparently, it is the effect of higher-order perturbation, namely, the second-order correction to unperturbed Hamiltonian (7). It can be evaluated as follows.

First, we rewrite the original Hamiltonian (4) in the form ($\omega_0 = 1, \Omega = n$)

$$H(I, \theta, t) = I - \epsilon \cos(\rho \cos \theta) + \epsilon [\cos(\rho \cos \theta) - \cos(\rho \cos \theta - nt)] \quad (25)$$

Expanding it in Bessel functions we, then, change variables $I, \theta \rightarrow I_1, \theta_1$ in such a way to eliminate all first-order terms in brackets but the resonant one (7). Finally, we introduce a new phase $\varphi_1 = \theta_1 - t$. As is easily verified the time-independent part of the result is given up to terms $\sim \epsilon^2$ by the expression

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{H}_0(I, \varphi) = & -\epsilon J_n(\rho) \cos\left(n\varphi + \frac{\pi n}{2}\right) + \frac{\epsilon^2}{\rho} \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{d}{d\rho} J_{2m}^2(\rho) - \\ & - \frac{\epsilon^2}{\rho} \sum_{m \neq n} \frac{m}{m-n} \frac{d}{d\rho} J_m^2(\rho) \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where we dropped sub 1. Asymptotically, the second sum can be neglected as it decreases faster ($\sim \rho^{-1}$) than the first one

$$\sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{d}{d\rho} J^2_{2m}(\rho) = -\frac{1}{2} [J_1(2\rho) - 2J_1(\rho)J_0(\rho)] \rightarrow$$

$$\rightarrow -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi\rho}} \cos\left(2\rho - \frac{3\pi}{4}\right) \quad (27)$$

On all horizontal separatrices (Fig. 1b) $\cos(2\rho_k - 3\pi/4) \approx \cos(\pi n + \pi/4) = (-1)^{n+1}/\sqrt{2}$ is approximately the same, and we arrive at Hamiltonian (12) with

$$\alpha = -\frac{3}{8}(-1)^n \frac{\epsilon}{\rho_k^2} \quad (28)$$

From Eq. (13) the gap width is

$$\Delta\rho_k = \frac{3\pi}{4} \frac{\epsilon}{\rho_k^2} \quad (29)$$

4. CHAOTIC WEB

Without high-frequency perturbation (see Eq. (6)) all separatrices are lines on the surface of section ρ, φ and all rows of resonance cells are separated by the gaps. As is well known, the perturbation destroys separatrices and produces chaotic layers. If the width of a layer exceeds that of the adjacent gap the rows get connected and the global motion drastically changes.

The unperturbed motion on a separatrix can be found from the first-order Hamiltonian (7), and for a horizontal ($\rho \approx \text{const}$) separatrix is described by the equation

$$\dot{\Phi}_s = \frac{\omega_0}{\lambda} \cos \Phi_s \quad (30)$$

The solution

$$\frac{\omega_0 t}{\lambda} = \ln \tan\left(\frac{\Phi_s}{2} + \frac{\pi}{4}\right) \quad (31)$$

is the same as for the SNR separatrix. Hence, the well developed theory of the chaotic layer (see, e.g., Ref. 3) is applicable. Particularly, the amplitude of Hamiltonian (7) variation, or separatrix's splitting, is given by the relation

$$\Delta H_a = \epsilon J_k(\rho) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \cos(k\varphi(t) + \omega_0 t) \omega_0 dt =$$

$$= \epsilon J_k(\rho) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \cos(m\Phi + \omega_0 t) \omega_0 dt \approx 2\pi\epsilon J_k(\rho) \frac{(2\lambda)^m}{\Gamma(m)} \exp(-\pi\lambda/2) \quad (32)$$

where $\Gamma(m)$ is gamma-function and the latter expression holds for $\lambda \gg 1$. Notice, that the effect is exponentially small in λ which is characteristic for the adiabatic processes.

Of all perturbation terms in Hamiltonian (6) only two with the lower frequency are operative

$$k = n \pm 1; \quad m = \frac{n \pm 1}{n} \quad (33)$$

with corresponding values of parameter m . Of these two the main contribution comes from one for which $\dot{\varphi}(n-k) > 0$. Taking account of Eqs. (14) and (28) we have

$$m = \frac{n+1}{n}, \quad n \text{ even}; \quad m = \frac{n-1}{n}, \quad n \text{ odd.} \quad (34)$$

In the first case the chaotic layer is considerably wider than in the second (see Eq. (32)). We mention that our result is somewhat different from that in Refs. 6,7.

As $\lambda \sim \rho^{3/2}$ the nonadiabatic effect Eq. (32) exponentially decreases with growth of ρ by a factor of

$$g = \exp\left(-\frac{3\pi^2 \lambda}{4 \rho}\right) \ll 1 \quad (35)$$

for each period $\Delta\rho = \pi$ of the resonance lattice. Particularly, this implies that in evaluating ΔH_a the minimal ρ should be taken within a connected chaotic layer. For the upper half of a gap (see Fig. 3) it is gap's $\rho = \rho_g$ but for the lower part $\rho = \rho_g - \pi$. As a result the latter is closed at a smaller perturbation.

Another interesting implication is the competition of the two mechanisms of closing the upper half of the gap. One is related to the width of its chaotic layer

$$\Delta H_s = \lambda \Delta H_a \quad (36)$$

taken at $\rho = \rho_g$. The second one corresponds to a single change ΔH_a but taken at a smaller $\rho = \rho_g - \pi$. Their ratio

$$\frac{\Delta H_s(\rho_g)}{\Delta H_a(\rho_g - \pi)} \approx \lambda g \quad (37)$$

asymptotically drops with ρ . Thus, for sufficiently large ρ the second mechanism is decisive.

Using Eqs. (29), (32) and the relation $|\Delta H_a| = \Delta \rho_a \left| d\bar{H}_0/d\rho \right| \approx \Delta \rho_a \epsilon J_n(\rho)$ we obtain for the ratio ($\omega_0 = 1$)

$$\frac{\Delta \rho_a}{\Delta \rho_k} \approx \frac{4}{3\Gamma(m)} \left(\frac{4}{\pi}\right)^m n \sqrt{\rho_g} \Lambda^{m+1}(\rho_g) \exp[-\Lambda'(\rho_g)] \quad (38)$$

where new parameters are

$$\Lambda(\rho_g) = \frac{\pi}{2} \lambda(\rho_g) \approx \frac{2\rho_g^{3/2}}{\epsilon n}; \quad \Lambda'(\rho_g) = \Lambda(\rho_g - \pi) \quad (39)$$

The second one is the main (but not only) parameter of gap's closure which roughly corresponds to $\Delta \rho_a \approx \Delta \rho_k$.

5. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

The gaps discussed above are typically very narrow, and this was apparently the reason why they were missed in previous studies.^{6,7} Also, to compute the width of a gap and check relation (29) a high accuracy of computation is required. Instead of time-dependent Hamiltonian (4) we made use of the equivalent model

$$H(I, K, \theta, \psi) = I + nK - \epsilon \cos[x(\theta, I) - \psi] = \text{const} \quad (40)$$

where we put $\omega_0 = 1$; $\Omega = n$. This Hamiltonian is conserved which allows the efficient control of computation errors. The equations of motion were represented as the third-order implicit map which provided exact conservation of the phase-space volume.¹²

At first, the width of the gaps were measured for several values of ρ_k ($J_n(\rho_k) = 0$, $n = 2$, $\varphi = 0$, $8.5 \leq \rho_k \leq 49.5$) and sufficiently weak perturbation strength ϵ when the chaotic layers could be neglected. The top and bottom borders of the gap were located via the transition of the border trajectory from rotation to oscillation, or vice versa, during one period of slow motion. In all computations the time-step value provided the conservation of Hamiltonian (40) better than 10 per cent of its variation over the gap.

If the perturbation parameter ϵ increases, the chaotic layer occupies some part of the gap, and, finally, closes the gap completely. We studied this process by running 16 trajectories equidistributed across the gap for a hundred of slow motion periods. The number of trajectories which persisted in the gap

and did not deviate into the adjacent chaotic layers determined the remaining width of the gap $\Delta \rho_r$.




Fig. 4. The dependence of reduced gap width $\Delta \tilde{\rho}$, Eq. (41), on chaotic layer parameter Λ , Eq. (39): diamonds are numerical results, crosses are theoretical estimate (42). Logarithm is decimal.

Our main numerical results are represented in Fig. 4 by diamonds for 23 gaps with different ρ and ϵ ($8.5 \leq \rho \leq 49.5$; $0.5 \leq \epsilon \leq 7$). This figure shows the dependence $\Delta \tilde{\rho}(\Lambda)$ where

$$\Delta \tilde{\rho} = \frac{\Delta \rho_r}{\Delta \rho_k} = \frac{\Delta \rho_r \rho_k^2}{(3\pi/4)\epsilon} \quad (41)$$

is the ratio of actual gap's width $\Delta \rho_r$ to the asymptotic value (29) without chaotic layers which depend on parameter $\Lambda = \rho_k^{3/2}/\epsilon$ (see Eq. (38)). For large Λ values the chaotic layers can be neglected, and $\Delta \tilde{\rho} \rightarrow 1$ as expected. Higher values of $\Delta \tilde{\rho}$ for smaller Λ are apparently due to deviations from asymptotical dependence (29). The sharp cut-off in $\Delta \tilde{\rho}(\Lambda)$ at $\Lambda \approx 20$ is the effect of chaotic layers which close the gaps. This effect can be estimated

using Eq. (38) as

$$\Delta\bar{\rho} \approx 1 - \frac{\Delta\rho_a}{\Delta\rho_k} \approx 4.3\sqrt{\rho_k}\Lambda^{5/2}\exp(-\gamma\Lambda') \quad (42)$$

where we put the values $n = 2$; $m = 3/2$ used in numerical experiments. The theoretical values of $\Delta\bar{\rho}$ are also plotted in Fig. 4 by small crosses. Notice the scattering of the latter which is explained by the dependence of $\Delta\bar{\rho}$ on the two different variables, ρ_k and ϵ . To agree numerical and theoretical values of $\Delta\bar{\rho}$ we had to introduce fitting parameter $\gamma \approx 0.78$. This deviation from theoretical estimate (38) is apparently related to a poor approximation (30) where the unperturbed separatrix is used. With this correction the agreement seems to be satisfactory for such a delicate phenomenon as the separatrix chaotic layer.

6. DIFFUSION PECULIARITIES IN RESONANCE WEB

Now we are going to compare the motion within the WNR web and the Arnold diffusion (AD) in a strongly nonlinear system. One thing in common is the network of chaotic layers of a similar structure as we have seen in Section 4. An important difference is the minimal dimensionality to support diffusion: $N = 2$ freedoms for WNR web and $N = 3$ for AD (in conservative systems). Also, the former is not universal as AD is. First, the WNR structure itself is not universal as discussed above (see Section 3), and second, even such WNR web is structurally unstable (Section 3) so that the diffusion is restricted by the gaps.

Farther, within the allowed region the WNR diffusion is very peculiar. The local diffusion rate averaged over many resonance cells (not a good approximation because of a small factor $g \ll 1$, Eq. (35), see below) is according to Refs. 4, 13

$$D_\rho \equiv \frac{\langle (\Delta\rho)^2 \rangle}{t} \approx \frac{\omega_0}{\pi\lambda^3} \sim \frac{\epsilon^3 n^3}{\omega_0^5 \rho^{9/2}} \quad (43)$$

that is very fast compared to AD which is exponentially small in λ . This is because in the present case the diffusion proceeds in big jumps ($\Delta\rho = \pi$) instead of $\Delta\rho \sim \exp(-\pi\lambda/2)$ for AD. Yet, it does not mean that the global diffusion is always fast.^{6,7,9} The point is that the general Fokker — Planck — Kolmogorov diffusion equation has two terms⁵

$$\frac{\partial f(\rho, t)}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} D_\rho(\rho) \frac{\partial f}{\partial \rho} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} B_\rho(\rho) f \quad (44)$$

the second one describing the drift

$$V_\rho(\rho) \equiv \frac{\langle \dot{\rho} \rangle}{t} = B_\rho + \frac{dD_\rho}{d\rho} \quad (45)$$

Function $B_\rho(\rho)$ can be derived from Einstein's relation using the steady-state distribution, or invariant measure

$$f_s \sim \exp(-\pi\lambda/2) \quad (46)$$

which is roughly proportional to chaotic layer's width (36). From Eqs. (44), (45) we have

$$B_\rho = \frac{D_\rho}{2} \frac{d \ln f_s}{d\rho} \sim -\frac{\epsilon^2 n^2}{\omega_0^3 \rho^4}$$

$$V_\rho \sim -\frac{\epsilon^3 n^3}{\omega_0^5 \rho^{11/2}} - \frac{\epsilon^2 n^2}{\omega_0^3 \rho^4} \sim -\frac{\epsilon^2 n^2}{\omega_0^3 \rho^4} \quad (47)$$

Term B_ρ in Eq. (45) dominates as the ratio

$$\frac{dD_\rho/d\rho}{B_\rho} \sim \frac{1}{\lambda} \ll 1 \quad (48)$$

The drift acts as a damping even though the system is Hamiltonian. This is a peculiar effect of the specific structure of chaotic component. Notice, that if its measure $f_s(\rho)$ would grow with ρ the blow-up occurred ($V_\rho > 0$) instead of damping.

In any case, the diffusion is fast but in one direction only, downwards in our case. The average motion in this direction becomes dynamical (the 'secondary dynamics' we use to say) described by the equation

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} \approx V_\rho(\rho) \approx -C \frac{\epsilon^2 n^2}{\omega_0^3 \rho^4} \quad (49)$$

where $C \sim 1$ is a constant. Particularly, the 'fall' time is

$$t_f \approx \frac{\omega_0^3 \rho_0^5}{5C\epsilon^2 n^2} \quad (50)$$

where ρ_0 is the initial value.

A better approximation for t_f is simply to sum up the life times at each row (see Eq. (43))

$$t_f \approx \sum_{k=1}^{k_0} \frac{\pi^2}{D_\rho} \approx C_1 \int_0^{\rho_0} \frac{\omega_0^5}{\epsilon^3 n^3} \rho^{9/2} d\rho = \frac{2C_1}{11} \frac{\omega_0^5}{\epsilon^3 n^3} \rho_0^{11/2} \quad (51)$$

where $C_1 \sim 1$ is some constant and k_0 stands for the initial value.

The motion upwards, forbidden in dynamical approximation, is only possible due to statistical fluctuations of a chaotic trajectory. A crude estimate for the 'ascension' time t_a can be obtained from the statistical balance of transitions between the lower part of the steady state with measure $\mu_0 \approx 1$ and an upper part ($\rho > \rho_1$) of a small measure $\mu_1 = f_s \sim \exp(-\pi\lambda/2)$ (see Eq. (46))

$$\frac{\mu_0}{t_a} \sim \frac{\mu_1}{t_f}$$

whence

$$t_a \sim t_f \exp(\pi\lambda/2) \quad (52)$$

This mechanism of dynamical-statistical transport is also typical for AD in a SNR chaotic web (see, e.g., Refs. 3-5, 10). It increases numerical factor in the exponent for the mean diffusion rate.

7. LINEAR RESONANCE IN NONLINEAR WEB

Now we consider the effect of the second perturbation in Hamiltonian (12) that is the case $\beta \neq 0$. If $\alpha = 0$ the resonance structure simple turns by the angle $\pi/2$ due to the symmetry of Hamiltonian in this approximation. Particularly, the gaps become vertical that is along r rather than along s before. For the original system this would be a crucial change implying a fast energy growth for the initial conditions in gaps if $\beta < 0$ (cf. Eq. (14), the opposite sign is due to canonical conjugation in Hamiltonian systems). Since s is angle the perturbation is periodic in φ , and parameter β has both signs at different φ . The linear approximation (12) makes sense for $n \gg 1$ only.

A more interesting resonance structure arises when both α and β are nonzero. In this case all unperturbed separatrices are destroyed or, better to say, drastically transformed. If $|\alpha|, |\beta| \ll 1$ the fixed points are shifted only slightly but the shape of four separatrices (two ingoing and two outgoing) per unstable fixed point are now completely different. As outlined in Fig. 5 (cf. Figs. 1b and 3) two of them unite and frame a cell of closed trajectories around the stable fixed point while the two remaining (unclosed) determine the gaps. In the infinite lattice in both r and s the unclosed separatrices are also infinite for irrational α/β which is the typical case. For rational α/β the unclosed separatrix ends at some other fixed point.

At average (over many resonance cells) the unclosed separatrices follow the perturbation levels ($\alpha r + \beta s = \text{const}$ in linear approximation (12)). The global behavior of gaps is not universal and crucially depends on a particular

perturbation. To get an idea what it could be like, we consider the additional perturbation to Hamiltonian (4) in the form

$$\delta H(p, x, t) = \nu x \cos \Omega_1 t \quad (53)$$

which is the linear driving perturbation. It becomes resonant if we put $\Omega_1 = \omega_0$ which is the second resonance in addition to $\Omega = n\omega_0$. With linear perturbation (53) and second-order term (26) the Hamiltonian (7) becomes

$$\bar{H}_0(I, \varphi) = -\epsilon J_n(\rho) \cos\left(n\varphi + \frac{\pi n}{2}\right) + \frac{(-1)^n \epsilon^2}{2\sqrt{2\pi} \rho^{3/2}} + \frac{\nu \rho}{2} \cos \varphi \quad (54)$$

As is easily verified the high-frequency term in perturbation (53) results, to order of ν^2 , in a constant change of Hamiltonian which does not affect the motion. The gap trajectories $\rho(\varphi)$ approximately satisfy the conservation law

$$\frac{(-1)^n \epsilon^2}{2\sqrt{2\pi} \rho^{3/2}} + \frac{\nu \rho}{2} \cos \varphi \approx \text{const} \quad (55)$$

as was explained above.




Fig. 5. Outline of the WNR structure with perturbation (12) for $\alpha = 0.041$; $\beta = 0.1$. One of the unclosed separatrices is shown by the fat line.

Analysis of this equation shows that there exists a certain critical value of $\rho = \rho_c$ such that for $\rho > \rho_c$ the gap trajectories go to infinity ($\rho \rightarrow \infty$) while below ρ_c their oscillations are bounded. Approximation (55) holds for $\nu \ll \epsilon^2$ only when $\rho \gg 1$, and

$$\rho_c \approx \left(\frac{4\epsilon^2}{27\sqrt{2\pi}|\nu|}\right)^{2/9} \approx 0.53 \left(\frac{\epsilon^2}{|\nu|}\right)^{2/9} \quad (56)$$

In the opposite limiting case ($\nu \gg \epsilon^2$) all the gap trajectories are apparently unbounded but this case requires further analysis.

In conclusion we would like to emphasize again the richness of nonlinear dynamics even in fairly simple models discussed above.

8. REFERENCES

1. *V.I. Arnold and A. Avez*, Ergodic Problems of Classical Mechanics (Benjamin, 1968).
2. *N.N. Bogolyubov, Yu.A. Mitropolsky and A.M. Samoilenko*, Methods of Accelerated Convergence in Nonlinear Mechanics (Springer, 1976).
3. *B.V. Chirikov*, Phys.Reports, 52 (1979) 263.
4. *B.V. Chirikov and V.V. Vecheslavov*, KAM Integrability, in: Analysis etc, Eds. P. Rabinowitz and E. Zehnder (Academic Press, 1990) p.219.
5. *A. Lichtenberg and M. Lieberman*, Regular and Stochastic Motion (Springer, 1983).
6. *A.A. Chernikov, R.Z. Sagdeev and G.M. Zaslavsky*, Physica, D33 (1988) 65.
7. *G.M. Zaslavsky et al.*, Weak Chaos and Quasiregular Structures (Moskva, Nauka, 1991, in Russian).
8. *A.V. Timofeev*, Nucl. Fus. 14 (1974) 165.
9. *A. Fukuyama et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 38 (1977) 701.
10. *B.V. Chirikov and V.V. Vecheslavov*, How Fast is the Arnold Diffusion? (Preprint INP 89-72, Novosibirsk, 1989).
11. *A.A. Chernikov et al.*, Phys. Lett. A122 (1987) 39.
12. *V.V. Vecheslavov*, Canonical Integration in Any Order (Preprint INP 89-35, Novosibirsk, 1989, in Russian).
13. *A. Lichtenberg and B. Wood*, Diffusion Through a Stochastic Web (Berkeley, 1988, unpublished)

B.V. Chirikov and V.V. Vecheslavov

The Structure of a Weakly Nonlinear Resonance

B.B. Вечеславова, Б.В. Чуриков

Структура слабонелинейного резонанса

Ответственный за выпуск С.Г. Попов

Работа поступила 16 июля 1991 г.

Подписано в печать 23.09 1991 г.

Формат бумаги 60×90 1/16 Объем 1,3 печ.л., 1,0 уч.-изд.л.

Тираж 290 экз. Бесплатно. Заказ N 92

Ротапринт ИЯФ СО АН СССР,

Новосибирск, 630090, пр. академика Лаврентьева, 11.