SEMICLASSICAL CHAOLOGY

Michael Berry

H.H.Wills Physics Laboratory, Tyndall Avenue

Bristol BS8 1TL, U.K.

The connection between classical and quantum mechanics (i.e. the semiclassical limiting asymptotics as $\hbar \to 0$ (must be subtle and complicated, because classical mechanics itself (i.e. the classical limit $\hbar=0$) is subtle and complicated: the orbits of systems governed by Hamilton's equations of motion may be predictable (regular) or unpredictable (irregular) depending on subtle details of the form of the Hamiltonian $H(\{q_i\},\{p_i\})$[1-3]. A natural question is: how does the 'chaology' of classical orbits reflect itself in the correspnding quantum system? Sometimes this question is put in the form: what is quantum chaos?

There are many approaches to this question. One is to study the dynamics of quantum systems which are classically chaotic, that is, to study non-stationary states. There have been many studies of mathematical models of such quantum evolution[4-10], which have found important recent application in interpreting experiments on the microwave ionization of Hydrogen atoms[11-13]. Another approach is to look at stationary states and concentrate on the form of the wave functions: these are remarkably different for eigenstates corresponding to regular and chaotic systems[14-19].

Here however I will concentrate on the energies of stationary states, and ask how the distribution of eigenvalues $\{E_n\}=E_1,E_2\ldots$ of a quantum Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = H(\{\hat{q}_i\},\{\hat{p}_i\})$ reflects the chaology of the classical trajectories generated by the classical H, in which $\{q_i\}$ and $\{p_i\}$are variables rather than operators. Of course the energies $\{E_n\}$depend on $\hbar$. I will consider only the nontrivial case where the number of freedoms N exceeds unity, and confine myself to a brief review of current ideas.

Ideally one would like an explicit asymptotic formula giving $\{E_n(\hbar)\}$ with an error that decreases as $\hbar \to 0$ faster than the mean level spacing. Such a formula has been found only for classically integrable (i.e. nonchaotic) systems[20,21,22] and is a generalization of the familiar WKB theory for one dimension. For integrable systems with N freedoms, there are N constants of motion (including the energy) which confine motion to N-dimensional tori in the 2N-dimensional phase space[23]. In lowest order, quantization selects the energies E of those tori whose N actions are separated by multiples of $\hbar$, i.e.

$$E_{\{n_i\}} = H(\{I_i = (n_i + \tfrac{1}{4}\alpha_i)h\}) \tag{1}$$

where $\{n_i\} = n_1 \cdots n_N$ are the quantum numbers, $\{I_i\}$ are the actions

$$I_i \equiv \oint_{\gamma_i} p_j dq_j \tag{2}$$

round the irreducible cycles γ_i of the torus, and the α_i are constants (Maslov indices[20]). Obviously (1) works only when tori exist. In the chaotic extreme, motion is ergodic and there are no constants of motion apart from E; therefore there are no tori and the semiclassical rule (1) cannot be applied: so far nobody has found a semiclassical quantization rule for chaotic systems.

In these circumstances one must seek less precise information, in the form of <u>average</u> properties of the distribution of energies. These spectral averages can be defined semiclassically, because as $\hbar \to 0$ infinitely many levels crowd into any fixed energy interval however small. The simplest spectral average is the mean <u>spectral density</u> $\langle d(E) \rangle$. This is the average of

$$d(E) \equiv \Sigma\, \delta(E-E_n) = \mathrm{Tr}\, \delta(E-H), \tag{3}$$

and is given semiclassically by the 'Weyl rule'[21]

$$\langle d(E) \rangle = \frac{d\Omega(E)/dE}{h^N} \tag{4}$$

where Ω is the phase volume

$$\Omega(E) = \int_{(H<E)} d^N q \int d^N p, \text{ i.e. } d\Omega/dE = \int d^N q \int d^N p\, \delta(E-H(\{q_i\},\{p_i\})). \tag{5}$$

The Weyl rule formalises the old idea of 'one quantum state per volume h^N of phase space'. When applied to quantum billiards (vibrating drums[49]), the Weyl rule plus corrections[50] can be made the basis of a method[51] for accurately reconstructing aspects of billiard geometry (e.g. area and length) from sequences of eigenvalues.

The result (4) tells us nothing about quantum chaos, because the classical volume $\Omega(E)$ is insensitive to the regularity or chaos of the orbits. This is disappointing but nevertheless two useful pieces of information can be obtained. First, the mean level spacing $\langle d \rangle^{-1}$ is of order $\hbar^N$; thus for example in a classically small energy range of size $\hbar$ there are many levels (of order $\hbar^{-(N-1)}$); this will be important later. And second, a rough quantization rule can be found by realizing that the integral of d(E) is the <u>spectral staircase</u>

$$\mathcal{N}(E) \equiv \Sigma\Theta(E-E_n) = \int_{-\infty}^{E} dE' d(E') \tag{6}$$

where Θ is the unit step; the rule, expressing the idea that the smooth curve of the average staircase might intersect the steps halfway, on average, is then

$$(n+\tfrac{1}{2}) = \langle \mathcal{N}(E_n) \rangle = \Omega(E_n)/h^N. \tag{7}$$

The above rule is rough because it fails to describe the fine-scale <u>fluctuations</u> in the levels (in graphs of the E_n as a function of a parameter on which $\hat{H}$ depends, these fluctuations appear as avoided crossings[24-26]). To describe these fluctuations it is necessary to employ statistics which (unlike $\langle d \rangle$ and $\langle \mathcal{N} \rangle$) involve correlations between nearby levels, that

is on scales $\hbar^N$. Such fluctuation measures have been devised in random-matrix theory[27] and applied to sequences of excited resonance levels of atomic nuclei. The fluctuation statistics depend not on the raw spectrum levels $\{E_n\}$ but on the 'unfolded' spectrum of levels $\{x_n\}$ which have been scaled so as to have unit mean spacing. Thus

$$x_n + \frac{1}{2} \equiv \langle \mathcal{N}(E_n) \rangle . \tag{8}$$

(without the fluctuations, (7) shows that x_n would be simply n). Two particular useful statistics are the probability distribution P(S) of the level spacings $\{S_n \equiv x_{n+1} - x_n\}$, and the spectral rigidity[28-30]

$$\Delta(L) \equiv \min \frac{1}{L} \int_{x-L/2}^{x+L/2} d\zeta [\mathcal{N}(\zeta) - A - B\zeta]^2 \rangle \tag{9}$$

(This is the least squares deviation of the staircase from a straight line, over a range of L mean spacings, averaged over an interval of energies x that includes many levels). P(S) is useful in describing spectral correlations on the finest scales - i.e. between neighbouring levels - and $\Delta(L)$ is useful for describing how spectral correlations depend on range - i.e. large or small L.

When spectral statistics are computed for sequences of levels of Hamiltonian systems with classical limits, a remarkable 'experimental' fact emerges: the statistics display universality, and the spectral universality class depends on the chaology of the classical orbits. The universality classes are

(a) Classically integrable systems. Here the spectral statistics are those of a Poisson - i.e. uncorrelated random - distribution of levels[30,31]. At first sight it is surprising that the quantum conditions (1) can give rise to a random sequence, but the surprise dissipates with the realisation that neighbouring levels E_n, E_{n+1} can have very different sets of quantum numbers $\{n_i\}$. For Poisson statistics,

$$P(S) = \exp(-S), \text{ and } \Delta(L) = L/15 \tag{10}$$

(b) Classically chaotic spinless (or integral-spin) systems with time-reversal symmetry. Here the spectral statistics are those of the Gaussian orthogonal ensemble (GOE), which consists[27] of real symmetric matrices whose elements are Gauss-distributed so as to make the statistics of the ensemble invariant under orthogonal rotations. Only real symmetric matrices are involved because time-reversal symmetry implies that the wavefunctions are real. For the GOE, to a close approximation,

$$P(S) \approx \frac{\pi}{2} S \exp(-\pi S^2/4) \tag{11}$$

and

$$\Delta(L) \to L/15 \quad (L \ll 1)$$

$$\to \frac{\ln L}{\pi^2} - .000695 \quad (L \gg 1) \tag{12}$$

(c) Classically chaotic systems without time-reversal symmetry. This is in a sense the generic case which best justifies the label 'quantum chaos'. One way to break time-reversal symmetry (T) is with magnetic fields. These may be smoothly-varying[32] or may consist of a single (Aharonov-Bohm) flux line[33] (which has the advantage of breaking T without altering the classical chaology). (An even simpler way[52], not

involving magnetic fields, is through the massless Dirac equation with boundary conditions corresponding to a 4-scalar potential ('neutrino billiards').) Here the spectral statistics are those of the Gaussian unitary ensemble (GUE)[27], of complex Hermitian matrices whose elements are Gauss-distributed so as to make the statistics of the ensemble invariant under unitary transformations. For the GUE, to a close

$$P(S) \approx \frac{32S^2}{\pi^2} \exp(-4S^2/\pi) \tag{13}$$

and

$$\Delta(L) \to L/15 \quad (L \gg 1)$$

$$\to \frac{\ln L}{2\pi^2} + 0.05902 \quad (L \gg 1) \tag{14}$$

Before anticipating that a system without T will have GUE statistics, care must be taken to determine whether it has any geometric symmetries, because these can act so as to mimic T-symmetry and generate levels with GOE statistics; in the theory of this 'false time-reversal symmetry-breaking'[34] it is shown that for GUE the system must possess no antiunitary symmetry operator $\hat{A}$[27,35](commuting with $\hat{H}$) and satisfying $\hat{A}^2=1$ or $\hat{A}\hat{A}^* = 1$ (T is represented in position representation by the operator $\hat{A}$=complex conjugation). A set of numbers recently discovered to have GUE statistics is the imaginary parts of zeros of Riemann's zeta function[36]; this is surprising and suggestive[37]

(d) Classically chaotic systems with half-integer spin and with T (or more generally, chaotic systems with an antiunitary symmetry satisfying $\hat{A}^2=-1$). Here there are so far no numerical experiments (I am planning one now) but the spectral statistics are expected to be those of the Gaussian symplectic ensemble (GSE)[27], of quaternion real Hermitian matrices whose elements are Gauss-distributed so as to make the ensemble invariant under symplectic transformations. For the GSE, to a close approximation,

$$P(S) \approx \frac{2^{18}S^4}{3^6\pi^3} \exp(-64S^2/9\pi) \tag{15}$$

and

$$\Delta(L) \to L/15 \quad (L \ll 1)$$

$$\to \frac{\ln L}{4\pi^2} + .006076 \quad L \gg 1) \tag{16}$$

That completes the list of universality classes. But I now reveal that life is really not so simple, and describe two ways in which universality is compromised. First, most classical systems are neither purely regular nor purely chaotic[1], but exhibit mixed (or, in the jargon 'KAM') behaviour in which some orbits are regular and some predictable, depending on initial conditions. Such cases are important in quantum mechanics because they correspond to the anharmonically coupled oscillators describing vibrating molecules and to atoms in strong magnetic fields occurring astrophysically. It is natural to expect that in lowest approximation the spectral statistics will interpolate between those of the Poisson and the appropriate random-matrix universality classes, to a degree which depends on the relative phase-space volumes of regions of

regular and chaotic motion; a theory along these lines[38] is supported by numerical experiments[39]. Second, even for purely regular or purely chaotic systems the domain of universal behaviour is limited to energy ranges not exceeding a quantity of order $\hbar$; for the rigidity $\Delta(L)$, this means that universality holds when $L<L_{max} \sim \hbar^{-(N-1)}$, so that in the semiclassical limit the domain of universality shrinks to zero in energy but nevertheless extends over infinitely many levels. When $L>L_{max}$, numerical experiments[40] (so far restricted to integrable systems) show, and a theory[30] (for both integrable and chaotic systems) explains, that $\Delta(L)$ does not continue to increase as in (10), (12), (14) and (16), but saturates at nonuniversal values characteristic of the particular system.

In spite of these caveats, the universality of semiclassical spectra is a remarkable phenomenon that demands explanation. One class of theories[41,42] considers the energies to depend on a parameter t which is regarded as akin to a time variable, and the 'motion' of the eigenvalues $\{E_n(T)\}$ on the E axis is put into correspondence with the statistical mechanics of particles on a line. These theories can be made to generate random-matrix behaviour but the derivations rest on statistical assymptions about the matrix elements of the t derivatives of $\hat{H}$ between different eigenstates. It is desirable to understand spectral statistics directly, without introducing parameters or extra statistical assymptions. Some progress has been made as I now describe.

The behaviour of P(S) as $S \to 0$ can be related to the codimensiona K of degeneracies when the system is embedded in an ensemble of similar ones[43,21,24]. K is the number of parameters that must be varied to produce a degeneracy; for separable systems K=1, for real symmetric matrices K=2, for complex Hermitian matrices K=3 and for quaternion real matrices K=5. The result is

$$P(S) \sim S^{K-1} \text{ as } S \to 0 \qquad (17)$$

and this agrees with (10), (11), (13) and (15). But K is only roughly related to the classical symmetries (subtleties arise from barrier penetration[44]) and a semiclassical understanding of P(S) is still lacking.

The behaviour of $\Delta(L)$ on the other hand is rather well understood[30] in terms of a semiclassical theory. According to (9), $\Delta(L)$ is a quadratic functional of the spectral staircase (6). This can be expressed as its average $\langle \mathcal{N} \rangle$ (equation 7) plus a series of correction terms which are oscillatory functions of E. Each such correction comes from a <u>closed orbit</u> of the classical system[45,47], and gives an oscillation with energy period $\hbar/T$ where T is the time period of the orbit. So values of $L<<L_{max}$, corresponding to energy scales $<<\hbar$, correspond to <u>very long orbits</u>. In particular, any fixed L corresponds as $\hbar \to 0$ to periods of order $\hbar^{-(N-1)}$. But for these very long orbits there exist <u>universal sum rules</u>[48] which depend on the classical chaology, and it is these that enable the theory[30] to reproduce the random-matrix results (10), (12), (14) (but not-yet-(16)). When $L>>L_{max}$, the previously-mentioned breakdown of universality occurs and is explained by $\Delta(L)$ depending only on short closed orbits which of course differ from system to system.

Much work remains to be done in understanding semiclassical spectra. The most pressing and also fundamental problem is to discover whether the semiclassical sum over the closed orbits of a chaotic system can be extended (or interpreted, or analytically continued[37]) so as to describe the finest spectral scales such as those embodied in P(S) (or even - we can at least hope - a complete quantization formula). Then there are 'crossover' phenomena associated with the breakdown of universality when $L \sim L_{max}$. Finally, higher spectral statistics, depending more than

quadratically on $\mathcal{N}(E)$, should be studied semiclassically. It is likely that from the program outlined in the last two sentences there might emerge a statistic which for chaotic systems depends on the Kolmogorov-Sinai[1] entropy which is so important in classical chaology.

REFERENCES

1. A.J.Lichtenberg and M.A.Lieberman, "Regular and Stochastic Motion," Springer: New York (1983).
2. M.V.Berry, Regular and Irregular Motion in "Topics in Nonlinear Mechanics" S.Jorna, ed., Am.Inst.Phys.Conf.Proc. 46: 16-120 (1978).
3. H.G.Schuster, "Deterministic Chaos", Physik-Verlag GMBH: Mannheim (1984)
4. G.Casati, B.V.Chirikov, J.Ford and F.M.Izraelev in "Stochastic Behaviour in Classical and Quantum Hamiltonian Systems," G.Casati,J.Ford, ed., Springer Lecture Notes in Physics 93: 334-352 (1979).
5. M.V.Berry, N.L.Balazs, M.Tabor andA.Voros, Ann.Phys. (N.Y) 122:26-63 (1979).
6. H.J.Korsch and M.V.Berry, Physica 3D: 627-636 (1981).
7. M.V.Berry, Physica 10D: 369-378 (1984).
8. B.V.Chirikov, F.M.Izraelev and D.L.Shepelyansky, Sov.Sci.Revs. 2C: 209-267 (1981).
9. D.L.Shepelyansky, Physica 8D: 208-222 (1983).
10. Shmuel Fishman, D.R.Grempel and R.E.Prange, Phys.Rev.Lett. 49: 509-512 (1982).
11. R.V.Jensen, in "Chaotic Behavior in Quantum Systems", G.Casati,ed., Plenum, 171-186 (1985).
12. J.E.Bayfield, L.D.Gardner and P.M.Koch, Phys.Rev.Lett. 39: 76-79 (1977).
13. G.Casati, B.V.Chirikov and D.L.Shepelyansky, Phys.Rev.Lett. 53: 2525-2528 (1984).
14. M.V.Berry, Phil.Trans.Roy.Soc. A287: 237-271 (1977).
15. S.W.McDonald and A.N.Kaufman, Phys.Rev.Lett. 42: 1189-1191 (1979)
16. M.V.Berry, J.Phys.A 10: 2083-2091 (1977).
17. M.V.Berry, J.H.Hannay and A.M.Ozorio de Almeida, Physica 8D: 229-242 (1983).
18. E.J.Heller, Phys.Rev.Lett. 16: 1515-1518 (1984).
19. M.V.Berry and M.Robnik, J.Phys.A 1365-1372 (1986).
20. V.P. Maslov and M.V.Fedoriuk, "Semiclassical Approximation in Quantum Mechanics," D.Reidel: Dordrecht, (1981).
21. M.V.Berry Semiclassical Mechanics of Regular and Irregular Motion in "Chaotic Behavior of Deterministic Systems, " Les Houches Lectures XXXVI, G.Iooss, R.H.G.Helleman and R.Stora, eds., North-Holland, Amsterdam, pp 171-271 (1983).
22. I.C.Percival, Adv.Chem.Phys. 36: 1-61 (1977).
23. V.I.Arnold, "Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics," Springer, New York, (1978).
24. M.V.Berry, Ann.Phys. (N.Y.) 131: 163-216 (1981).
25. R.Ramaswamy and R.A.Marcus, J.Chem.Phys. 74: 1379-1384, 1385-1393 (1981).
26. M.V.Berry and M.Wilkinson, Proc.Roy.Soc.Lond. A392: 15-43 (1984).
27. C.E.Porter, "Statistical Theories of Spectra: Fluctuations," Academic Press, New York (1965).
28. F.J.Dyson and M.L.Mehta, J.Math.Phys. 4: 701-712 (1963).
29. O.Bohigas and M.J.Giannoni, Chaotic motion and random-matrix theories, in "Mathematical and Computational Methods in Nuclear Physics," J.S.Dehesa, J.M.G.Gomez and A.Polls,eds., Lecture Notes in Physics 209, Springer-Verlag, N.Y. pp 1-99 (1984).
30. M.V.Berry, Proc.Roy.Soc.Lond. A400: 229-251 (1985).
31. M.V.Berry and M.Tabor, Proc.Roy.Soc.Lond. A356: 375-394 (1977).
32. T.H.Seligman and J.J.M.Verbaarschot, Phys.Lett. 108A: 183-187 (1985).
33. M.V.Berry and M.Robnik, J.Phys.A 19: 649-668 (1986).
34. M.Robnik and M.V.Berry, J.Phys.A 19: 669-682 (1986).

35. J.J.Sakurai, "Modern Quantum Mechanics," Benjamin, USA (1985).
36. A.M.Odlyzko, On the distribution of spacings between zeros of the zeta function, Bell. Lab. Preprint (1986).
37. M.V.Berry, Riemann's zeta function - a model for quantum chaos? in "Proc. 2nd Int. Conf. Quantum Chaos," T.Seligman ed., Springer (1987).
38. M.V.Berry and M.Robnik J.Phys.A 17: 2413-2421 (1984).
39. H-D.Meyer, E.Haller, H.Köppel and L.S.Cederbaum, J.Phys.A 17: L831-836 (1984).
40. G.Casati, B.V.Chirikov and I.Guarneri, Phys.Rev.Lett. 54: 1350-1353 (1985).
41. P.Pechukas, Phys.Rev.Lett. 51: 943-946 (1983).
42. T.Yukawa, Phys.Rev.Lett. 54: 1883-1886 (1985).
43. M.V.Berry, Aspects of degeneracy in "Proc. Como Conference on Quantum Chaos," G.Casati, ed., Plenum, London 123-140 (1985).
44. M.Wilkinson, J.Phys.A. In press.
45. M.C.Gutzwiller, J.Math.Phys. 12: 343-358 (1971).
46. M.C.Gutzwiller, in "Path Integrals and Their Applications in Quantum, Statistical and Solid-State Physics," G.J.Papadopoulos and J.T. Devreese, eds., Plenum, N.Y. 163-200 (1978).
47. R.Balian and C.Bloch, Ann.Phys.(N.Y.) 69: 76-160 (1972).
48. J.H.Hannay and A.M.Ozorio de Almeida, J.Phys.A 17: 3429-3440 (1984).
49. M.Kac, Amer.Math.Monthly 73 no. 4: 1-23 (1966).
50. H.P.Battes and E.R.Hilf, "Spectra of Finite Systems," B.I.Wissenschaftsverlag: Mannheim (1976).
51. M.V.Berry, to be published 1987.
52. M.V.Berry, to be published 1987.