

## 3D-Central Force Problems II

Last time:  $[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}] = i\hbar \rightarrow$  vector commutation rules: generalize from 1-D to 3-D  
conjugate position and momentum components in Cartesian  
coordinates

Correspondence Principle Recipe  
Cartesian and vector analysis  
Symmetrize (make it Hermitian)  
classical in  $\hbar \rightarrow 0$  limit

Derived key results:

$$[f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{p}_x] = i\hbar \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}$$

$$[f(\mathbf{r}), \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{p}] = i\hbar \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{r}} \cdot \mathbf{r} \quad \text{based on } \frac{d\mathbf{f}}{d\mathbf{r}} \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \quad \text{and } \mathbf{r} = [\mathbf{x}^2 + \mathbf{y}^2 + \mathbf{z}^2]^{1/2}$$

$$*\mathbf{p}_r = \mathbf{r}^{-1}(\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{p} - i\hbar) \leftarrow \boxed{\text{(came from symmetrization in Cartesian coordinates)}}$$

$$*\mathbf{p}^2 = \mathbf{p}_r^2 + \mathbf{r}^{-2} \mathbf{L}^2$$

operator algebra gave simple separation of variables

$$*\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{q} \times \mathbf{p}$$

not necessary (or possible) to symmetrize

$$*\mathbf{H} = \frac{\mathbf{p}_r^2}{2\mu} + \left[ \frac{\mathbf{L}^2}{2\mu r^2} + V(\mathbf{r}) \right]$$

$V_\ell(r)$  radial effective potential

We do not yet know anything about  $\mathbf{L}^2$  and  $\mathbf{L}_i$ .

TODAY [purpose is mostly to practice [,] and angular momentum algebra]

Obtain angular Momentum Commutation Rules  $\rightarrow$  Block diagonalize  $\mathbf{H}$

$\varepsilon_{ijk}$  Levi-Civita Antisymmetric Tensor

useful in derivations, vector commutators, and remembering stuff.

Next Lecture: Begin derivation of all angular momentum matrix elements  
starting from Commutation Rule definitions of angular momentum.

## 5.73 Lecture #22

22 - 2

### GOALS

1.  $[\mathbf{L}_i, f(\mathbf{r})] = 0$  any scalar function of scalar  $\mathbf{r}$ .
2.  $[\mathbf{L}_i, \mathbf{p}_r] = 0$  difficult - need  $\epsilon_{ijk}$
3.  $[\mathbf{L}_i, \mathbf{p}_r^2] = 0$
4.  $[\mathbf{L}_i, \mathbf{L}^2] = 0$  (but  $[\mathbf{L}_i, \mathbf{L}_j^2] \neq 0!$ )
5. C.S.C.O.  $\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{L}^2, \mathbf{L}_i \rightarrow$  block diagonalize  $\mathbf{H}$

These 1-4 are chosen to show that all terms in  $\mathbf{H}$  commute with  $\mathbf{L}^2$  and  $\mathbf{L}_i$

$$1. \quad [\mathbf{L}_z, f(\mathbf{r})] = [\mathbf{x}\mathbf{p}_y - \mathbf{y}\mathbf{p}_x, f(\mathbf{r})] = \mathbf{x}[\mathbf{p}_y, f] + [\mathbf{x}, f]\mathbf{p}_y - \mathbf{y}[\mathbf{p}_x, f] - [\mathbf{y}, f]\mathbf{p}_x$$

$$[\mathbf{x}, f] = 0, \quad [\mathbf{y}, f] = 0 \text{ because } [\vec{\mathbf{q}}, f(\mathbf{r})] = 0\hat{\mathbf{i}} + 0\hat{\mathbf{j}} + 0\hat{\mathbf{k}}$$

$$\text{recall } [f(\mathbf{r}), \mathbf{p}_x] = i\hbar \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{r}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} = i\hbar \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{r}} \frac{x}{r}$$

$$[\mathbf{L}_z, f(\mathbf{r})] = -i\hbar \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{r}} \left[ x \frac{y}{r} - y \frac{x}{r} \right] = 0$$

$$2. \quad [\mathbf{L}_z, \mathbf{p}_r] = [\mathbf{L}_z, \mathbf{r}^{-1}(\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{p} - i\hbar)] = [\mathbf{L}_z, \mathbf{r}^{-1} \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{p}]$$

$$= [\mathbf{L}_z, \mathbf{r}^{-1}] \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{p} + \mathbf{r}^{-1} [\mathbf{L}_z, \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{p}]$$

$$[\mathbf{L}_z, \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{p}] = \mathbf{q} \cdot [\mathbf{L}_z, \vec{\mathbf{p}}] + [\mathbf{L}_z, \vec{\mathbf{q}}] \cdot \mathbf{p} \quad \text{two vector commutators on RHS}$$

Note that  $\vec{\mathbf{q}}$  is not  $f(\mathbf{r})!$

need to define special notational trick to evaluate these DIFFICULT COMMUTATORS

Levi-Civita Symbol	$\epsilon_{ijk}$
cyclic order	$\epsilon_{xyz} = \epsilon_{yzx} = \epsilon_{zxy} = +1$
adjacent interchange	$\epsilon_{yxz} = \epsilon_{zyx} = \epsilon_{xzy} = -1$
2 repeated indices	$\epsilon_{xxy} = \text{etc.} = 0$

I claim  $[\mathbf{L}_i, \mathbf{p}_j] = i\hbar \sum_k \epsilon_{ijk} \mathbf{p}_k$ . This will become the *definition* of a “vector operator” with respect to  $\mathbf{L}$ .

---

Nonlecture: Verify claim for 1 of  $3 \times 3 = 9$  possible cases

let  $i = x, j = y$

$$\begin{aligned}
 [\mathbf{L}_x, \mathbf{p}_y] &= [\mathbf{y}\mathbf{p}_z - \mathbf{z}\mathbf{p}_y, \mathbf{p}_y] = [\mathbf{y}\mathbf{p}_z, \mathbf{p}_y] + 0 \\
 &= [\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{p}_y] \mathbf{p}_z + \mathbf{y} [\mathbf{p}_z, \mathbf{p}_y] \\
 &= i\hbar \mathbf{p}_z
 \end{aligned}$$

Now check this using  $\epsilon_{ijk}$

$$\begin{aligned}
 [\mathbf{L}_x, \mathbf{p}_y] &= i\hbar \sum_k \epsilon_{xyk} \mathbf{p}_k = i\hbar [\cancel{\epsilon_{yxx}} \mathbf{p}_x + \cancel{\epsilon_{xyy}} \mathbf{p}_y + \epsilon_{xyz} \mathbf{p}_z] \\
 &= i\hbar \mathbf{p}_z. \quad \text{OK}
 \end{aligned}$$

All other 8 cases go similarly

---

Other important Commutation Rules

$$\left. \begin{aligned}
 [\mathbf{L}_i, \mathbf{p}_j] &= i\hbar \sum_k \epsilon_{ijk} \mathbf{p}_k \\
 [\mathbf{L}_i, \mathbf{q}_j] &= i\hbar \sum_k \epsilon_{ijk} \mathbf{q}_k
 \end{aligned} \right\} \begin{array}{l} \text{general definition of} \\ \text{a “vector” operator} \end{array}$$

$$[\mathbf{L}_i, \mathbf{L}_j] = i\hbar \sum_k \epsilon_{ijk} \mathbf{L}_k \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{general definition of an} \\ \text{“angular momentum.” Works} \\ \text{even for spin where } \mathbf{q} \times \mathbf{p} \\ \text{definition is inapplicable} \end{array}$$

All angular momentum matrix elements will be derived from these commutation rules.

**FOR THE READER: VERIFY ONE COMPONENT OF EACH OF THE THREE ABOVE COMMUTATORS**

$[\mathbf{L}_i, \mathbf{L}_j] = i\hbar \sum_k \epsilon_{ijk} \mathbf{L}_k$  is identical to

$$\mathbf{L} \times \mathbf{L} = i\hbar \mathbf{L}$$

(expect 0! because vector cross product  $\vec{A} \times \vec{B} = |\mathbf{A}| |\mathbf{B}| \sin \theta \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{AB}$ )

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{L} \times \mathbf{L} &= \begin{pmatrix} \hat{i} & \hat{j} & \hat{k} \\ \mathbf{L}_x & \mathbf{L}_y & \mathbf{L}_z \\ \mathbf{L}_x & \mathbf{L}_y & \mathbf{L}_z \end{pmatrix} = \hat{i} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{L}_y \mathbf{L}_z - \mathbf{L}_z \mathbf{L}_y \end{pmatrix} + \hat{j} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{L}_z \mathbf{L}_x - \mathbf{L}_x \mathbf{L}_z \end{pmatrix} + \hat{k} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{L}_x \mathbf{L}_y - \mathbf{L}_y \mathbf{L}_x \end{pmatrix} \\ &= i\hbar [\hat{i} \mathbf{L}_x + \hat{j} \mathbf{L}_y + \hat{k} \mathbf{L}_z] = i\hbar \mathbf{L} \end{aligned}$$

This vector cross product definition of  $\mathbf{L}$  is more general than  $\mathbf{q} \times \mathbf{p}$  because there is no way to define spin in  $\mathbf{q} \times \mathbf{p}$  form but  $\mathbf{S} \times \mathbf{S} = i\hbar \mathbf{S}$  is quite meaningful.

Can one generalize that, if  $\mathbf{L} \times \mathbf{L} = i\hbar \mathbf{L}$  (instead of 0), and the  $[\mathbf{L}_i, \mathbf{L}_j]$  and  $[\mathbf{L}_i, \mathbf{p}_j]$  commutation rules have similar forms, that  $\mathbf{L} \times \mathbf{p} = i\hbar \mathbf{p}$ ? NO! Check for yourself!

2. Continued.

$$[\mathbf{L}_z, \mathbf{p}_r] = \mathbf{r}^{-1} \mathbf{q} \cdot [\mathbf{L}_z, \vec{\mathbf{p}}] + \mathbf{r}^{-1} [\mathbf{L}_z, \vec{\mathbf{q}}] \cdot \mathbf{p}$$

vector commutators

$$[\mathbf{L}_i, \vec{\mathbf{p}}] = i\hbar \sum_k (\hat{i} \epsilon_{ixk} + \hat{j} \epsilon_{iyk} + \hat{k} \epsilon_{izk}) \mathbf{p}_k$$

sum of 3 terms

$$\mathbf{q} \cdot [\mathbf{L}_i, \vec{\mathbf{p}}] = i\hbar \sum_k (\mathbf{x} \epsilon_{ixk} + \mathbf{y} \epsilon_{iyk} + \mathbf{z} \epsilon_{izk}) \mathbf{p}_k$$

only one of these terms is nonzero

$$= i\hbar \sum_{j,k} \epsilon_{ijk} \mathbf{q}_j \mathbf{p}_k \quad (1)$$

and the other term  $[\mathbf{L}_i, \vec{\mathbf{q}}] \cdot \vec{\mathbf{p}}$

$$\begin{aligned}
 [\mathbf{L}_i, \vec{\mathbf{q}}] &= i\hbar \sum_k \left[ \hat{i}\epsilon_{ixk} + \hat{j}\epsilon_{iyk} + \hat{k}\epsilon_{izk} \right] \mathbf{q}_k \\
 [\mathbf{L}_i, \vec{\mathbf{q}}] \cdot \mathbf{p} &= i\hbar \sum_k \left[ \epsilon_{ixk} \mathbf{q}_k p_x + \epsilon_{iyk} \mathbf{q}_k p_y + \epsilon_{izk} \mathbf{q}_k p_z \right] \\
 &= i\hbar \sum_{j,k} \epsilon_{ijk} \mathbf{q}_k p_j = i\hbar \sum_{k,j} \epsilon_{ikj} \mathbf{q}_j p_k \quad (\text{k} \leftrightarrow \text{j labels permuted}) \\
 &= -i\hbar \sum_{k,j} \epsilon_{ijk} \mathbf{q}_j p_k \quad (2)
 \end{aligned}$$

switch order of j and k

putting Eqs. (1) and (2) together

$$\mathbf{q} \cdot [\mathbf{L}_i, \mathbf{p}] + [\mathbf{L}_i, \mathbf{q}] \cdot \mathbf{p} = i\hbar \sum_{j,k} \left[ \epsilon_{ijk} \mathbf{q}_j p_k - \epsilon_{ijk} \mathbf{q}_j p_k \right] = 0!$$

Elegance and power of  $\epsilon_{ijk}$  notation!

We have shown that:

\*  $[\mathbf{L}_i, \mathbf{p}_r] = 0$  for all  $i$

\* easy now to show  $[\mathbf{L}_i, \mathbf{p}_r^2] = 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Finally } [\mathbf{L}_i, \mathbf{L}^2] &= \sum_j [\mathbf{L}_i, \mathbf{L}_j^2] = \sum_j \left( \mathbf{L}_j [\mathbf{L}_i, \mathbf{L}_j] + [\mathbf{L}_i, \mathbf{L}_j] \mathbf{L}_j \right) \\
 &= \sum_j \left[ \mathbf{L}_j \left( i\hbar \sum_k \epsilon_{ijk} \mathbf{L}_k \right) + \left( i\hbar \sum_k \epsilon_{ijk} \mathbf{L}_k \right) \mathbf{L}_j \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

same trick: permute  $j \leftrightarrow k$  indices in second term

$$\epsilon_{ijk} = -\epsilon_{ikj} \quad - \left( i\hbar \sum_k \epsilon_{ijk} \mathbf{L}_j \right) \mathbf{L}_k$$

$$= 0$$

But be careful:  $[\mathbf{L}_i, \mathbf{L}_j^2] = \mathbf{L}_j [\mathbf{L}_i, \mathbf{L}_j] + [\mathbf{L}_i, \mathbf{L}_j] \mathbf{L}_j = i\hbar \left( \mathbf{L}_j \sum_k \epsilon_{ijk} \mathbf{L}_k + \sum_k \epsilon_{ijk} \mathbf{L}_k \mathbf{L}_j \right)$

because this is a sum only over  $k$ , so can't combine and cancel terms.

for  $i = x, j = y$

$$[\mathbf{L}_x, \mathbf{L}_y^2] = i\hbar[\mathbf{L}_y\mathbf{L}_z + \mathbf{L}_z\mathbf{L}_y] \neq 0!$$

so we have shown

$$[\mathbf{L}^2, \mathbf{L}_i] = 0$$

$$[\mathbf{L}^2, f(\mathbf{r})] = 0$$

$$[\mathbf{L}_i, f(\mathbf{r})] = 0$$

$$[\mathbf{L}^2, \mathbf{p}_r] = 0$$

$$[\mathbf{L}_i, \mathbf{p}_r] = 0$$

$\therefore \mathbf{L}^2, \mathbf{L}_i, \mathbf{H}$  all commute — Complete Set of Mutually Commuting Operators

eigenfunction of  $\mathbf{L}^2$  with  
eigenvalue  $\hbar^2 L(L+1)$

So what does this tell us about  $\langle \mathbf{L} | \mathbf{H} | \mathbf{L}' \rangle = ?$

BLOCK DIAGONALIZATION OF  $\mathbf{H}$ !

Basis functions  $\psi = \underbrace{\chi(\mathbf{r})}_{\substack{\text{radial} \\ \text{special}}} \underbrace{|\mathbf{L}^2, \mathbf{L}_z\rangle}_{\substack{\text{angular} \\ \text{universal}}} = |nLM_L\rangle$

$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{eigenfunctions of } \mathbf{L}_z \\ \text{eigenfunctions of } \mathbf{L}^2 \\ \text{which radial eigenfunction?} \end{array} \right.$

Next time I will show, starting from

$$\boxed{[\mathbf{L}_i, \mathbf{L}_j] = i\hbar \sum_k \epsilon_{ijk} \mathbf{L}_k}, \text{ that}$$

- \*  $\mathbf{L}^2 |nLM_L\rangle = \hbar^2 L(L+1) |nLM_L\rangle \quad L = 0, 1, \dots$
- \*  $\mathbf{L}_z |nLM_L\rangle = \hbar M_L |nLM_L\rangle \quad M_L = -L, -L+1, \dots, +L$

also derive all  $\mathbf{L}_x$  and  $\mathbf{L}_y$  matrix elements in  $|nLM_L\rangle$  basis set.