

The Principle of Least Action — One Principle from Which Mechanics Grows: The Foundation Beneath the Phase-Space Trilogy (Euler), yet Not Teleology — [Paper 84]

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

— *From thinking to syncing.* —

ABSTRACT

The phase-space trilogy (Paper 76 = the hinge (T^*M, ω, H) ; 77 = Liouville; 78 = friction; and 80 = Noether) all stood upon the **Hamiltonian stage**. This paper treats the **single foundation lying still beneath that stage — the principle of least action**. Conceived by Maupertuis, forged into the calculus of variations by **Euler**, and completed by Lagrange and Hamilton, this principle states: the motion of a body follows the path that renders the action $S = \int L dt$ (L = the Lagrangian = kinetic minus potential energy) **stationary** ($\delta S = 0$). From it the Euler–Lagrange equation follows, and Lagrangian mechanics $\rightarrow$ (Legendre transform) $\rightarrow$ Hamiltonian mechanics $(T^*M, \text{Paper 76}) \rightarrow$ Liouville (77), Noether (80) all grow. Thus **84 is the root of the trilogy. The most important discipline (against misreading): least action is rigorously equivalent to $F = ma$, and is neither a "deeper cause" nor a "purpose."** The solution of $\delta S = 0$ is a **stationary path**, not necessarily a minimum (saddles occur). And the **teleology "nature knows its destination and picks the cheapest road" is false**: the Euler–Lagrange equation is a **local differential equation**, and the apparent teleology is **dissolved** by Feynman's path integral (all paths contribute; stationary phase). **Do not conflate "economy (least, elegance)" with "purpose (teleology)"** — this is the paper's distinct-roots discipline (Papers 58/48). **Scope**: the calculus of variations, Euler–Lagrange, and the path integral are all borrowed standard results; this paper produces no new mathematics and no new prediction. It does **not solve the ultimate "why does nature obey an action principle"** (the path integral answers with "interference," not "purpose"). "The Universe OS's cost function" is a Layer-3 non-science lens (quarantined). The contribution is only to **lay one foundation beneath the trilogy, with its correct label**.

Positioning of this paper (discipline): This paper is a **structural interpretation** of established physics (the principle of least action, the Euler–Lagrange equation, the Legendre transform, the Feynman path integral). It contains no new physical law and no new prediction. **Least action is equivalent to Newtonian mechanics and claims no "more fundamental cause" nor "purpose of nature."** "Universe OS" and "cost function" are Layer-3 metaphors carrying the "non-science" label (quarantined in a dashed box), not claims of physical mechanism.

1. Introduction: What Lies "Beneath" the Trilogy?

Papers 76–82 read the hinge, Liouville, friction, and conservation (Noether) upon the stage of phase space (T^*M, ω) . But where did that stage itself — the Hamiltonian H , the action, the Lagrangian — come from? The answer is a single foundation of classical mechanics, **the principle of least action**. Lagrangian mechanics, Hamiltonian mechanics, and Noether's theorem (80) all grow from this one slab. This paper lays that root, correctly, beneath the trilogy.

Yet this principle, being so beautiful, is often **misread**: "nature purposefully chooses the shortest, cheapest road." Half the work of this paper is to **firmly reject** this seductive misreading. It shows the power of the principle and its correct label (not teleology) at once.

2. The Principle of Least Action and the Euler–Lagrange Equation

Standard Fact (Least Action / Euler–Lagrange)

For a Lagrangian $L(q, \dot{q}, t) = T - V$ (kinetic minus potential energy), define the action

$$S[q] = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} L(q, \dot{q}, t) dt.$$

The actual motion is the path that, with endpoints fixed, renders the action **stationary** ($\delta S = 0$). This condition is equivalent to the **Euler–Lagrange equation**:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}} \right) - \frac{\partial L}{\partial q} = 0.$$

Maupertuis (1744) gave the primitive form, **Euler (1744)** forged it into the rigorous tool of the calculus of variations, Lagrange generalized it to arbitrary coordinates, and Hamilton brought it to modern form. Ever since, a vast range of physics — electromagnetism, relativity, field theory, quantum theory — is written in the **single form** " $\delta S = 0$ for an appropriate L ."

3. Equivalence with Newton: Not a Deeper Cause, but Another Language

Observation 3.1 (Least Action = $F=ma$)

Inserting $L = \frac{1}{2}m\dot{q}^2 - V(q)$ into the Euler–Lagrange equation gives

$$\frac{d}{dt}(m\dot{q}) = -\frac{\partial V}{\partial q}, \quad \text{i.e.} \quad m\ddot{q} = F.$$

The principle of least action is rigorously equivalent to Newton's equation of motion. If one is true, so is the other — merely two restatements of the same physics. Least action is therefore not a "deeper cause" than Newton. **It is an elegant reformulation that "says the same thing in fewer words,"** not a hidden will behind mechanics.

Making this equivalence explicit is crucial to the discipline. The "beauty" of least action is often mistaken for "mystery." But mathematically it is the same content as $F = ma$, expressed in the language of variation.

4. The Teleology Trap: Nature Does Not "Know Its Destination"

Least action sounds naively teleological: "the particle knows its endpoint in advance and, among all possible roads, chooses the one of least action." This is a **powerful misreading**. Three honest corrections.

- **Stationary, not necessarily minimum.** $\delta S = 0$ selects a **stationary point** of S (minimum or saddle). Often it is a minimum, but not always. "Least action" is a historical name; properly it is "**stationary action**."
- **It is local.** The Euler–Lagrange equation is a **differential equation** at each instant; it needs no global will to "compare all paths and then choose." The particle merely obeys the local law at each moment, and traces the stationary path as a result.
- **The apparent teleology dissolves into "interference."** In Feynman's path integral, quantum-mechanically **all paths contribute**, each carrying a phase $e^{iS/\hbar}$. Only the neighbourhood of the classical stationary path aligns in phase and **adds constructively**; the rest cancel randomly. The look of "choosing one cheapest road" is the **afterimage of this interference**, not a purpose.

Observation 4.1 (Distinct Roots: Economy $\neq$ Purpose)

"The action is stationary (economical, elegant)" and "nature purposefully optimizes (teleology)" are **distinct matters**. The former is a mathematical fact; the latter a metaphysical story. That the value (being stationary) is beautiful does not license reading a "will" — a distinct root — into it (the distinct-roots discipline of Papers 58/48, in this guise). This paper asserts only the former and firmly rejects the latter.

5. The Root of the Trilogy: Action $\rightarrow$ Lagrange $\rightarrow$ Hamilton (T^*M)

We show, by lineage, that least action is the "foundation beneath" the trilogy.

Standard Fact (From Action to Phase Space)

From the Euler–Lagrange equation (configuration space q), the **Legendre transform** $p = \partial L / \partial \dot{q}$, $H = p\dot{q} - L$ gives birth to the Hamiltonian $H(q, p)$ and the phase space T^*M (the stage of Paper 76). Hamilton's canonical equations $\dot{q} = \partial H / \partial p$, $\dot{p} = -\partial H / \partial q$ are the womb of Liouville's theorem (77) and Noether's symmetry–conservation law (80). Thus **the action S is the root of the entire phase-space trilogy**.

A single lineage runs through: **84 (the action = root)** $\rightarrow$ **76 (the hinge T^*M)** $\rightarrow$ **77 (Liouville)** $\rightarrow$ **78 (friction)** $\rightarrow$ **81 (recurrence)**, with **80 (Noether) a consequence of the action's symmetry**. The trilogy is a tree grown upon this one slab.

6. Connection to the Corpus: One Principle, Many Laws (Euler's Bloodline)

Least action also resonates with the corpus's aesthetic of unification. Paper 13 stated that "mechanics, electromagnetism, gravity, and relativity share one geometric quantity 4π (= the structure becomes visible)." Least action is the **mechanical version of that unification** — many laws of motion fit the single form " $\delta S = 0$ for an appropriate L ." But with the same discipline as Paper 13: this is the **visualization of a structure ("it can be written in one language")**, not a "grand unification deriving new predictions from a single principle." And **Euler** — the father of the calculus of variations, one of the geometric-physics lineage the corpus reveres — supplies the tool that supports the foundation.

The Author's Vision (Layer 3, non-science label / not a mechanism, not a prediction)

In the corpus's lens (metaphor), the action S is something like a **cost function** along which the Universe OS "renders" a path, and the OS may be pictured as choosing, each frame, the update at which the local cost is stationary. **But it carries the non-science label**: this is not teleology (§4). The OS does not "look ahead and pick the cheapest"; rather, obeying the local law (Euler–Lagrange) produces what merely "looks like" a stationary path — in path-integral terms, the image that survives interference. "Cost function" and "rendering" are lenses for intuition, not claims of physical mechanism nor testable propositions.

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

What is shown (descriptive):

- The principle of least action ($\delta S = 0$) and the Euler–Lagrange equation are the root of Lagrangian and Hamiltonian mechanics, and T^*M (76), Liouville (77), and Noether (80) grow from here (§§2, 5).
- Least action is equivalent to $F = ma$ = not a deeper cause (Observation 3.1).
- "Stationary (economy)" and "purpose (teleology)" are distinct roots, and the apparent teleology dissolves into the interference of Feynman's path integral (§4).

What is not shown (restraint):

- **No new mathematics.** The calculus of variations, Euler–Lagrange, the Legendre transform, and the path integral are all standard. This paper adds no theorem.
- **The ultimate "why does nature obey an action principle" is not solved.** The path integral answers with "quantum interference," not "purpose"; but why quantum mechanics is so is a deeper open edge (the same humility as Paper 71).
- **No teleology is asserted.** Least action is neither will nor design. Economy is not conflated with purpose (distinct roots).
- **OS and cost function are Layer-3 non-science lenses.** Mechanics needs none of it (§6 dashed box).
- **No new prediction is made.** It yields the same observational results as standard analytical mechanics. Hence it remains at Layer 2 (structural interpretation).

8. Conclusion

Beneath the stage on which the phase-space trilogy (76–82) stood, there was a single foundation — **the principle of least action**. From this principle, conceived by Maupertuis and forged by Euler, grow Lagrangian mechanics, Hamiltonian mechanics (T^*M), Liouville, and Noether. It is the backbone of mechanics, gathering a vast range of physics into the single form " $\delta S = 0$ for an appropriate L ."

Yet the discipline is strictly kept: least action is **equivalent** to $F = ma$, not a deeper cause. And most importantly — **this is not teleology**. $\delta S = 0$ is stationary (not necessarily minimum), Euler–Lagrange is local, and the story that "nature knows its destination and picks the cheapest road" is a mere appearance dissolved by Feynman's interference. Do not mistake economy for purpose (distinct roots). What this paper could offer is only to lay one foundation beneath the trilogy, with its power and its correct label. The beauty by which many laws grow from one principle is real, but that beauty is not "will" — it is "structure." That, joined to Euler's lineage, is what we record honestly.

References

1. Maupertuis, P. L. M. de (1744). *Accord de différentes lois de la nature qui avaient jusqu'ici paru incompatibles*. Mém. Acad. Sci. Paris.

2. Euler, L. (1744). *Methodus inveniendi lineas curvas maximi minimive proprietate gaudentes*.
3. Lagrange, J.-L. (1788). *Mécanique analytique*.
4. Hamilton, W. R. (1834). *On a General Method in Dynamics*. Phil. Trans. R. Soc.
5. Feynman, R. P. (1948). *Space-Time Approach to Non-Relativistic Quantum Mechanics*. Rev. Mod. Phys. 20, 367–387.
6. Arnold, V. I. (1989). *Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics* (2nd ed.). Springer.
7. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *A Covariant Symplectic Structure for Velocity-Space Curvature and the Spacetime Metric on Phase Space $\mathbf{T^*M}$* [Paper 76]. Zenodo: 10.5281/zenodo.21722145.
8. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *Conservation Laws Are the Shadow of Symmetry* [Paper 80]. Zenodo: 10.5281/zenodo.21732957.
9. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Pfaffian's $2^n n!$ 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)