

The Hidden Symmetry Unique to $n=2$ — Why Inverse-Square Orbits Close: The Laplace–Runge–Lenz Vector and the Dynamical Twin of Paper 01 — [Paper 79]

Yuuki YAMAGISHI (山岸 勇輝)
Yamagishi Complexity Torus Lab, Japan
August 2026

— *From thinking to syncing.* —

ABSTRACT

Paper 01 showed that the density exponent for which the spherical-shell mass is independent of radius in 3D space is uniquely $n = 2$ (inverse-square), establishing the **geometric uniqueness** of $n = 2$. This paper presents its **dynamical twin**: the same $1/r^2$ force possesses **an extra conserved quantity absent from other central forces** — the **Laplace–Runge–Lenz (LRL) vector $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{p} \times \mathbf{L} - m\mathbf{k}\hat{\mathbf{r}}$** — **which makes the orbit close** (a non-precessing ellipse). $\mathbf{A}$ is conserved pointing along the major axis, and this is the answer to "why do planetary orbits close?" This extra conservation generates, for bound states, a **hidden symmetry $SO(4)$** (Fock 1935) — one step larger than the ordinary rotational $SO(3)$. **The key is consistency with Bertrand's theorem, and the discipline**: the central forces whose orbits close for all conditions are exactly two — $1/r^2$ and the harmonic oscillator r^2 — yet their hidden symmetries **differ ($SO(4)$ for $1/r^2$, $SU(3)$ for the harmonic)**. Although "the orbit closes" is a shared value, the **origins are distinct and must not be merged** (distinct roots; Papers 58/48). That is, the specialness of $n = 2$ **propagates** from 3D geometry (Paper 01) into dynamics (a hidden symmetry) — but this does not make $n = 2$ the sole winner; it places $n = 2$ as "one of the two special exponents, the one bearing its own symmetry." **Scope**: the LRL vector, Fock's $SO(4)$, and Bertrand's theorem are all borrowed standard facts; this paper produces no new mathematics and no new predictions. It "solves" nothing. This is a **structural interpretation** that rereads Paper 01's geometric uniqueness from the aspect of a hidden symmetry of classical mechanics.

Positioning of this paper: This paper is a **structural interpretation** of established physical laws and theorems. It claims neither the discovery of new physical laws nor the resolution of open problems. The LRL vector, Fock's $SO(4)$, and Bertrand's theorem, as used here, are all standard, established results; this paper adds no new theorem to them. Words such as "Universe OS" are **interpretive lenses and metaphors**, not testable claims; we state this explicitly at the outset.

1. Introduction: From Geometric Uniqueness to Dynamical Uniqueness

Paper 01 showed that the spherical-shell mass growth rate $dm/dr = 4\pi r^{2-n}$ of $\rho(r) = r^{-n}$ is independent of radius only for $n = 2$. The inverse-square law is **geometrically** required by flux conservation in 3D space (the solid angle 4π) — the core reconfirmed across Papers 01, 02, and 13.

Does anything special, then, happen to the **motion** under that $1/r^2$ force? The answer is yes. This paper shows that the specialness of $n = 2$ extends beyond geometry (Paper 01) and appears also on the side of dynamics, as a proper mark — a hidden symmetry. It is the structure behind a fact everyone knows: that planetary orbits close (the ellipse does not precess).

2. Preliminaries: Conserved Quantities of Central Forces, and Bertrand's Theorem

For any central force $\mathbf{F} = f(r)\hat{\mathbf{r}}$, the energy E and the angular momentum $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{p}$ are conserved. Conservation of $\mathbf{L}$ means the motion is confined to a plane (Kepler's equal-area law). But E and $\mathbf{L}$ alone **do not guarantee a closed orbit** — in general the perihelion slowly rotates, giving a "rosette" orbit.

Standard Fact (Bertrand's Theorem, 1873)

The central-force potentials $V(r) \propto r^\beta$ whose orbits **close** for all bound initial conditions are exactly **two**:

- $\beta = -1$ (force $\propto 1/r^2$; Kepler / Coulomb)
- $\beta = +2$ (force $\propto r$; isotropic harmonic oscillator)

(Already cited in Paper 01.)

This theorem guarantees "the $1/r^2$ orbit closes," but does not say **why**. The reason is the following extra conserved quantity.

3. The Extra Conserved Quantity: The Laplace–Runge–Lenz Vector

Standard Fact (Conservation of the LRL Vector)

For the inverse-square force $\mathbf{F} = -\frac{k}{r^2} \hat{\mathbf{r}}$ ($V = -k/r$),

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{p} \times \mathbf{L} - mk\hat{\mathbf{r}}$$

is **conserved** ($d\mathbf{A}/dt = \mathbf{0}$). This conservation is **proper to the inverse-square force** and does not hold for general central forces. $\mathbf{A}$ lies in the orbital plane, with magnitude $|\mathbf{A}| = mke$ (e the eccentricity), pointing along the **major axis of the ellipse (toward perihelion)**.

The conservation of $\mathbf{A}$ is "extra." Any central force possesses $E, \mathbf{L}$ (four independent conserved quantities), but $1/r^2$ possesses $\mathbf{A}$ **in addition**. This surplus conservation constrains the orbit tightly.

4. Why the Orbit Closes

Observation 4.1 (The Direct Reason for a Closed Orbit)

$\mathbf{A}$ is held **constant in both magnitude and direction, along the major axis of the ellipse**. That the direction of the major axis does not change in time means the **perihelion does not precess** — the orbit overlaps itself exactly each period and **closes**. Were the force to deviate even slightly from $1/r^2$, $\mathbf{A}$ would not be conserved, the major axis would slowly rotate, and the orbit would become a rosette. **"The orbit closes" is another way of saying " $\mathbf{A}$ is conserved."**

Thus the content of the $1/r^2$ side of Bertrand's theorem is explained: the closed orbit is not a geometric accident but a **consequence of the extra conserved quantity $\mathbf{A}$ proper to the inverse square**. (Historically, the **residual** precession of Mercury's perihelion is a manifestation of the Sun's gravity deviating from an exact $1/r^2$ — general relativity — a real instance of the non-conservation of $\mathbf{A}$.)

5. The Hidden Symmetry: $SO(4)$ for Bound States

An extra conserved quantity is the shadow of a larger-than-usual symmetry (Noether, run in reverse). The angular momentum $\mathbf{L}$ corresponds to spatial rotations $SO(3)$. For $1/r^2$, $\mathbf{A}$ is added, and together they generate a **larger symmetry group**.

Standard Fact (Fock 1935 / Bargmann 1936)

The **bound states** of the inverse-square (Kepler) problem possess the hidden symmetry $SO(4)$ ($\mathbf{L}$ and a suitably normalized $\mathbf{A}$ form the generators of $SO(4)$). Fock showed, in momentum space, that the bound Kepler problem is equivalent to **free motion on the 3-sphere S^3** — the rotational symmetry $SO(4)$ of S^3 is the true identity of the hidden symmetry in real space.

(This S^3 is the same stage that recurs in this corpus as the Hopf fibration $S^3 \rightarrow S^2$, but **identifying the two is not a claim of this paper** — the appearance of two S^3 's in different contexts is left as a "rhyme" to be examined separately under the distinct-roots discipline. Papers 67, 68.)

6. The Distinct-Roots Discipline: Two Closed Orbits, Two Different Symmetries

Here the discipline of Papers 58 and 48 applies. Bertrand says "the closed orbits are $1/r^2$ and the harmonic oscillator." But their **hidden symmetries differ**.

Potential	Closed orbit	Extra conserved quantity	Hidden symmetry
$V = -k/r$ (inverse-square)	closes	LRL vector $\mathbf{A}$	$SO(4)$ (bound states; Fock)
$V = \frac{1}{2}m\omega^2r^2$ (harmonic)	closes	symmetric tensor (Fradkin)	$SU(3)$

Observation 6.1 ("Closes" Is a Shared Value; the Symmetries Are Distinct Roots)

$1/r^2$ and the harmonic oscillator share the **value** "the orbit closes," but the reason — the hidden symmetry — **differs: $SO(4)$ versus $SU(3)$** . This is an instance of the distinct-roots discipline of Papers 58/48: **the same result (a closed orbit) must not be taken to have the same origin merely because the values coincide. $n = 2$ is not the sole member of the "closed-orbit club," but one member, bearing its own symmetry $SO(4)$** .

7. Connection to the Corpus, and the OS Lens

Paper 01 established the **geometric** uniqueness of $n = 2$ (3D flux conservation = the solid angle 4π). This paper showed that the same $1/r^2$ bears, on the side of **dynamics**, a proper mark (the LRL vector and the hidden $SO(4)$). Thus the specialness of $n = 2$ **propagates** from geometry to dynamics — yet not as a "sole winner," but as **the side bearing its own symmetry**, distinct-rooted from Bertrand's other case (the harmonic, $SU(3)$).

Read through the system's lens (metaphor) — again, **a lens, not a testable claim** — a closed orbit is a **stable loop that the Universe OS can keep rendering without drift**, and the extra conserved quantity **A** is "the additional lock that fixes the major axis, so the same ellipse is redrawn each frame." This additional lock possessed by $1/r^2$ is the "bonus stability" of the force chosen by 3D geometry (Paper 01).

8. Scope (What Is Shown, and What Is Not)

What is shown (descriptive):

- $1/r^2$ possesses the extra conserved quantity, the LRL vector **A**, which makes the orbit close (non-precessing) (§§3–4).
- **A** and **L** generate, for bound states, the hidden symmetry **SO(4)** (Fock) (§5).
- Bertrand's two closed orbits ($1/r^2$ and the harmonic) carry **different hidden symmetries**, **SO(4)** and **SU(3)** = distinct roots (§6). The specialness of **n = 2** propagates from Paper 01's geometry into dynamics (§7).

What is not shown (restraint):

- **No new mathematics.** The LRL vector, Fock's **SO(4)**, and Bertrand's theorem are all standard. This paper adds no theorem.
- **n = 2 is not claimed to be "the sole closed orbit."** The closed orbits are two — $1/r^2$ and the harmonic (Bertrand). This paper only places **n = 2** as "the one bearing its own symmetry."
- **The two S^3 's are not identified.** The appearance of Fock's momentum-space **S³** and the corpus's Hopf **S³** (67/68) is a "rhyme" to be examined separately, not a fusion (distinct roots; 58/48).
- **No new prediction is made.** The framework yields the same observational results as standard classical mechanics. Hence this paper remains at Layer 2 (structural interpretation). "OS" and "lock" are lenses.

9. Conclusion

Paper 01 showed "**n = 2** is geometrically special." This paper showed its **dynamical twin**: the same inverse-square force possesses an extra conserved quantity found in no other — the Laplace–Runge–Lenz vector — which makes the orbit close without precession and generates, for bound states, the hidden symmetry **SO(4)**. **The answer to "why do planetary orbits close?" is this extra symmetry proper to $1/r^2$.**

Yet the discipline is not forgotten: the closed orbit is not the exclusive property of $1/r^2$ but a two-member club shared with the harmonic oscillator, whose symmetries (**SO(4)** and **SU(3)**) are distinct roots. The specialness of **n = 2** does indeed propagate from 3D geometry (Paper 01) into dynamics (a hidden symmetry), but this is not a claim of uniqueness — only a **structural observation that the force chosen by geometry also bears a proper mark on the side of dynamics**. Nothing new has been solved — we have merely turned one more page, to show why the inverse square is so "well made."

References

1. Bertrand, J. (1873). *Théorème relatif au mouvement d'un point attiré vers un centre fixe*. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris 77, 849–853.
 2. Laplace, P.-S. (1799). *Traité de mécanique céleste*, Tome I.
 3. Runge, C. (1919). *Vektoranalysis*. Hirzel, Leipzig.
 4. Lenz, W. (1924). *Über den Bewegungsverlauf und die Quantenzustände der gestörten Keplerbewegung*. Z. Phys. 24, 197–207.
 5. Fock, V. (1935). *Zur Theorie des Wasserstoffatoms*. Z. Phys. 98, 145–154.
 6. Bargmann, V. (1936). *Zur Theorie des Wasserstoffatoms*. Z. Phys. 99, 576–582.
 7. Goldstein, H. (1980). *Classical Mechanics* (2nd ed.). Addison-Wesley.
 8. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Uniqueness Theorem of $\mathfrak{n} = 2$ for Spherically Symmetric Density Distributions* [Paper 01]. Zenodo: 10.5281/zenodo.21403186.
 9. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Pfaffian's $2^{\mathfrak{n}}\mathfrak{n}!$ Is One Block* [Paper 48]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.21602525
-

— *From thinking to syncing.* —

Yuuki YAMAGISHI (山岸 勇輝)

© 2026 Yamagishi Complexity Torus Lab, Japan · Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)