

## FUNDAMENTAL LEMMA OF THE CALCULUS OF VARIATIONS

The simplest problem in the calculus of variations is the optimization problem:

$$\min_{x \in X} J(x)$$

where

$$J(x) = \int_{t_0}^{t_f} \phi[x(t), \dot{x}(t), t] dt$$

$$X = \{x \in D[t_0, t_f] : x(t_0) = x_0, x(t_f) = x_f\}$$

Here,  $t_0, t_f, x_0, x_f$  are fixed constants,  $D[t_0, t_f]$  denotes the class of continuously differentiable functions on  $[t_0, t_f]$ , and  $\phi$  is a function that is continuously differentiable in  $x$  and  $\dot{x}$ , and continuous in  $t$ .

We will see in the lecture tomorrow that if  $x^o_{[t_0, t_f]}$  solves this *fixed end-point* calculus of variations problem, then there exists a constant  $C$ , such that the following integral equation is satisfied:

$$\phi_x(x^o(t), \dot{x}^o(t), t) = \int_{t_0}^t \phi_x(x^o(s), \dot{x}^o(s), s) ds + C$$

This integral equation is called the *Euler-Lagrange equation in integral form*. If  $\phi$  is twice continuously differentiable in  $x$  and  $\dot{x}$ , and continuously differentiable in  $t$ , then we have its differential equation version:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \phi_x(x^o(t), \dot{x}^o(t), t) = \phi_x(x^o(t), \dot{x}^o(t), t)$$

which has to be solved subject to the boundary conditions:  $x(t_0) = x_0, x(t_f) = x_f$ . This is the standard (familiar) Euler-Lagrange equation of the calculus of variations. It is also sometimes called the *Euler-Lagrange equation in differential form*, which I derived in the lecture yesterday.

In the derivation of the Euler-Lagrange equation in integral form, we will make use of a fundamental lemma, which is stated and proved below.

### Lemma 1

Let  $[t_0, t_f]$  be a given interval, and  $\mathbf{N}$  be the class of all piecewise continuously differentiable functions  $\eta$  on  $[t_0, t_f]$ , satisfying the end-point restrictions  $\eta(t_0) = \eta(t_f) = 0$ . Let  $M$  be a piecewise continuous function defined on the same interval. Then,

$$\int_{t_0}^{t_f} M(t) \dot{\eta}(t) dt = 0, \quad \text{for all } \eta \in \mathbf{N},$$

if, and only if,

$$M(t) = c \quad (\text{a constant}) \quad t \in [t_0, t_f],$$

except possibly at a finite number of points in  $[t_0, t_f]$ .

*Proof.* Choose

$$\eta(t) = \int_{t_0}^t [c - M(s)] ds$$

where

$$c := \frac{1}{t_f - t_0} \int_{t_0}^{t_f} M(s) ds$$

(this makes  $\eta \in \mathbf{N}$ ). Then,

$$\int_{t_0}^{t_f} M(t)\dot{\eta}(t) dt = \int_{t_0}^{t_f} M(t)[c - M(t)] dt.$$

Adding to this the identically zero quantity

$$-c \int_{t_0}^{t_f} [c - M(t)] dt ,$$

we obtain

$$- \int_{t_0}^{t_f} M(t)\dot{\eta}(t) dt = \int_{t_0}^{t_f} [c - M(t)]^2 dt = 0,$$

where the last equality (to zero) follows from the hypothesis of the Lemma. Hence,

$$M(t) = c \quad \text{a.e. } t \in [t_0, t_f]$$

which follows as a necessary condition (on  $M$ ) for the hypothesis of the Lemma to be valid. Sufficiency follows trivially, by direct substitution.  $\diamond$

This result is due to Dubois and Reymond, who also proved the weaker (but still useful) version given below.

## Lemma 2

Let  $[t_0, t_f]$  be a given interval, and  $\mathbf{N}$  be the class of all continuously differentiable functions  $\eta$  on  $[t_0, t_f]$ , satisfying the end-point restrictions  $\eta(t_0) = \eta(t_f) = 0$ . Let  $m$  be a piecewise continuous function defined on the same interval. Then,

$$\int_{t_0}^{t_f} m(t)\eta(t) dt = 0 , \quad \text{for all } \eta \in \mathbf{N},$$

if, and only if,

$$m(t) = 0 \quad t \in [t_0, t_f],$$

except possibly at a finite number of points in  $[t_0, t_f]$ .

*Proof.* Follows from Lemma 1, by “integration by parts”. It can also be proven directly (try it !).  $\diamond$

*Note.* One can use Lemma 2 directly, to arrive at the differential equation form of the Euler-Lagrange equation, which I did on Monday.

*Historical Note.* The differential equation version of the Euler-Lagrange equation is due to the Swiss mathematician Leonard Euler (1707-1783), who derived it in 1744 using polygonal approximation. The first derivation using variational calculus was given by the French mathematician Joseph Louis de Lagrange (1736-1813) who, however, did not prove Lemma 2; the proof was later furnished by Dubois and Reymond.

$\diamond \quad \diamond \quad \diamond$