

# The Fermi-Pasta-Ulam “numerical experiment”: history and pedagogical perspectives

Thierry Dauxois<sup>†§</sup>, Michel Peyrard<sup>†</sup> and Stefano Ruffo<sup>†‡</sup>

<sup>†</sup> Laboratoire de Physique, UMR-CNRS 5672, ENS Lyon, 46 Allée d’Italie, 69364 Lyon cédex 07, France

<sup>‡</sup> Dipartimento di Energetica, “S. Stecco” and CSDC, Università di Firenze, and INFN, via S. Marta, 3, 50139 Firenze, Italy

**Abstract.** The Fermi-Pasta-Ulam (FPU) pioneering numerical experiment played a major role in the history of computer simulation because it introduced this concept for the first time. Moreover, it raised a puzzling question which was answered more than 10 years later. After an introduction to this problem, we briefly review its history and then suggest some simple numerical experiments, with a provided Matlab<sup>©</sup> code, to study various aspects of the “FPU” problem.

## 1. The physical question

The “FPU problem”, as it is known presently, bears the name of the three scientists<sup>||</sup> who wanted to study the thermalization process of a solid [1]. As revealed by S. Ulam later [2], these authors were looking for a theoretical physics problem suitable for an investigation with one of the very first computers, the “Maniac”. Their work, published in 1955 in a classified Los Alamos National Laboratory report, had been completed shortly before the death of Enrico Fermi in 1954. Ulam said later that Fermi did not suspect the importance of this discovery and considered this work as “minor”. He nevertheless intended to talk about it at the conference of the American Mathematical Society, where he had been invited just before he became seriously ill.

Fermi, Pasta and Ulam decided to study how a crystal evolves towards thermal equilibrium by simulating a chain of particles of unitary mass, linked by a quadratic interaction potential, but also by a weak nonlinear interaction. One of the one-dimensional systems they considered is described by the Hamiltonian

$$H = \sum_{i=0}^N \frac{1}{2} p_i^2 + \sum_{i=0}^N \frac{1}{2} (u_{i+1} - u_i)^2 + \frac{\alpha}{3} \sum_{i=0}^N (u_{i+1} - u_i)^3 \quad , \quad (1)$$

where  $u_i$  is the displacement along the chain of atom  $i$  with respect to its equilibrium position, and  $p_i$  its momentum. The stiffness of the harmonic spring and the lattice spacing have been set to one, without losing generality. The coefficient  $\alpha \ll 1$  measures the strength of the nonlinear contribution to the interaction potential. The two ends of the chain were assumed to be fixed, i.e.  $u_0 = u_{N+1} = 0$ .


<sup>§</sup> To whom correspondence should be addressed (Thierry.Dauxois@ens-lyon.fr)

<sup>||</sup> Mary Tsingou, who took part in the numerical study is not an author of the report, but her contribution is however recognised by two lines of acknowledgments!

The common approach in physics is to think in terms of “normal modes”, related to the displacements through  $A_k = \sqrt{2/(N+1)} \sum_{i=1}^N u_i \sin(ik\pi/(N+1))$  with the frequencies  $\omega_k^2 = 4 \sin^2(k\pi/2(N+1))$ . They provide a basis to rewrite the Hamiltonian (1) as

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^N \left( \dot{A}_k^2 + \omega_k^2 A_k^2 \right) + \frac{\alpha}{3} \sum_{k,\ell,m=1}^N c_{k\ell m} A_k A_\ell A_m \omega_k \omega_\ell \omega_m \quad , \quad (2)$$

where the coefficients  $c_{k\ell m}$  are given for example in Ref. [3]. The last term, generated by the nonlinear contribution to the potential, leads to a coupling between the modes, and scales as  $N^{3/2}$ .



**Figure 1.** FPU recurrence: the plot shows the time evolution of the kinetic and potential energy  $E_k = \frac{1}{2} (\dot{A}_k^2 + \omega_k^2 A_k^2)$  of each of the four lowest modes. Initially, only mode 1 was excited (from reference [1]).

FPU thought that, due to this term, the energy introduced into a single mode, mode  $k = 1$  in their simulation, should slowly drift to the other modes, until the equipartition of energy predicted by statistical physics is reached. The beginning of the calculation indeed suggested that this would be the case. Modes 2, 3, ..., were successively excited. However, by accident [4], one day, they let the program run long after the steady state had been reached. When they realized their oversight and came back to the room, they noticed that the system, after remaining in a steady state for a while, had then departed from it. To their great surprise, after 157 periods of the mode  $k = 1$ , almost all the energy (all but 3%) was back to the lowest frequency mode, as shown in figure 1.

The initial state seems to be almost perfectly recovered after this recurrence period. Further calculations, performed later with faster computers, showed that the same phenomenon repeats many times, and that a “super-recurrence” period exists, after which the initial state is recovered with a much higher accuracy. Thus, contrary to the expectations of the authors, the drift of the energy of the initially excited mode 1 towards the modes with a higher wave number does not occur. This highly remarkable result, known as the FPU paradox, shows that nonlinearity is not enough to guarantee equipartition of energy.

## 2. Fermi, Pasta, Ulam: the characters.

Born in Rome, ENRICO FERMI (1901-1954) has been one of the brightest physicists of the twentieth century, who made major experimental and theoretical discoveries. His name is famous for his contributions to statistical physics, elementary particle physics, the control of nuclear energy. It is thanks to his trip to receive the Nobel prize in Sweden in 1938 that he left fascist Italy, and emigrated to the United States where he studied atomic fission and set up the first controlled chain reaction in Chicago in 1942. He was naturally called to be one of the leaders of the Manhattan project for the development of nuclear energy and the atomic bomb. We are less familiar with his work on various nonlinear problems at the end of his life, before his premature death from stomach cancer.

JOHN R. PASTA (1918-1981) did not have such a bright career. In spite of his interest in physics he had to leave the New York City College during the great depression. He was first a real estate agent and then a police officer in New York from 1941 to 1942. Then he has been recruited as radar and cryptography specialist by the American army during the second world war. His earnings as a GI allowed him to return to the University, where he got a PhD in theoretical physics in 1951. He immediately started to work in Los Alamos, on the MANIAC computer which was under construction and tests. His career went developed as a computer expert for the Atomic Energy Commission, where he extensively developed the Mathematics and Computer Division. Then John R. Pasta became a physics professor and, in 1964, dean of the computer science department of the university of Illinois, where he focused on the use of computers to solve applied problems in physics and mathematics.

Born in Poland, STANISLAW M. ULAM (1909-1984) quickly became interested in mathematics and obtained a PhD in 1933 under the supervision of Banach (1892-1945). Following a first invitation by Von Neumann to the prestigious Princeton Institute for Advanced Study in 1935, he visited the United States several times before leaving Poland definitely before the start of the second world war. He became an American citizen in 1943, and was invited by von Neumann himself to join the Los Alamos team to prepare the atomic bomb. Among other things he solved the problem of the initiation of fusion in the hydrogen bomb. In collaboration with N. C. Metropolis he invented the Monte-Carlo method to solve problems requiring a statistical sampling. He stayed in New Mexico until 1965 before his appointment as a mathematics professor at Colorado University.

The FPU numerical experiment has been performed on the MANIAC (Mathematical Analyser, Numerical Integrator And Computer) built in 1952 for the Manhattan project, which has been used in the development of Mike, the first hydrogen bomb. Richard Feynman (1918-1987) and Nicholas C. Metropolis (1915-1999), exasperated by the slow and noisy mechanical calculators which were nevertheless necessary to the design of the bombs, promoted its construction. The name of the computer, MANIAC, had been chosen by the project director, N. Metropolis, who hoped that it would stop the raising fashion of naming computers by acronyms. The effect has been exactly the opposite, although, according to Metropolis [4], George Gamow (1904-1968) was instrumental in rendering this and other computer names ridiculous when he dubbed the Maniac “Metropolis And von Neumann Install Awful Computer”. The Maniac was able to perform about  $10^4$  operations per second, which must be compared to the  $10^8$  operations per second of any personal computer today. It is Fermi who had the genius to propose that computers could be used to study a

problem or test a physical idea by simulation, instead of simply performing standard calculus. He proposed to check the prediction of statistical physics on this system now called FPU.

The discovery that resulted from this study has not only been at the origin of the soliton concept and of many features of chaotic phenomena, as discussed in the following section, but it also introduced the concept of *numerical experiment*. This had far reaching consequences, leading to a complete revolution in the investigation of physical phenomena. The computer is no more used only to perform a calculation that cannot be done by pencil-and-napkin, but to check a theoretical conjecture that cannot be proven analytically, or even to provide the theorist with “experimental” results that wait for a mathematical proof: a source of problems, like in a “true laboratory experiment”. Of course, the *numerical experiment* does not possess all the complexity of a true physical experiment, because the reality which is represented is highly virtual. However, today numerical simulations of condensed matter systems, one reaches such a level of confidence that sometimes it has happened that a laboratory experiment has been questioned because a numerical experiment had given contrary indications [5]. Today, *computational physics* is an established discipline and it is considered as sort of separated from both theoretical and experimental physics. Students are currently trained in computational physics as in other disciplines, and specialized journals publish the results of the research in this field. This big epistemological and sociological change began with the FPU experiment.

### 3. Epilogue: The solution of the FPU problem

Pursuing the solution of the FPU paradox, two main different lines of thought were followed. On one side, people like J. Ford [6] focused on the Fourier mode dynamics, looking for non-resonance conditions that could explain the inefficient energy transfer. No convincing explanation was found before the news spread of a theorem announced by Kolmogorov [7], and then proven by Moser [8] and Arnold [9] (KAM theorem), which states that most orbits of a slightly perturbed integrable Hamiltonian systems remain quasi-periodic. Although *qualitative* explanations of the FPU recurrence were obtained following this path no *quantitative* explanation has been obtained, to our knowledge. On the contrary, a remarkable result was obtained by Izrailev and Chirikov [10], following KAM theory. If the perturbation is strong enough that nonlinear resonances “superpose”, the FPU recurrence is destroyed and one obtains a fast convergence to thermal equilibrium. This prediction was tested numerically and is nowadays at the basis of the phenomenon called “strong stochasticity threshold” [11].

The other line of thought, which went towards the so-called *continuum limit*, led to the solution of the FPU paradox by Zabusky and Kruskal [12] in terms of the dynamics of *solitons* [13]. Starting from the FPU equations of motion, derived from Hamiltonian (1),

$$\ddot{u}_i = (u_{i+1} + u_{i-1} - 2u_i) + \alpha [(u_{i+1} - u_i)^2 - (u_i - u_{i-1})^2] \quad , \quad (3)$$

and restricting the investigation to long wavelength modes, they could derive the Korteweg-de Vries equation [14]

$$w_\tau + \frac{1}{24} w_{\xi\xi\xi} + \alpha w w_\xi = 0 \quad , \quad (4)$$

where the field  $w$  is a conveniently rescaled spatial derivative of the displacement field  $u_i$ ,  $\tau$  is a rescaled time and  $w_x = \partial w / \partial x$ .

The sinusoidal initial condition develops sharp fronts, and then breaks into a series of pulses, which are solitons. They preserve their shapes and velocities and, during their motion in the finite system with periodic boundary conditions¶, from time to time, they come back to the positions that they had initially, restoring the initial condition. This is why FPU recurrence is observed.

It is important to emphasize that the FPU paradox would probably not have been a mystery for more than 10 years, if, before Zabusky and Kruskal, somebody had the idea to look carefully at the dynamics of the nonlinear lattice as a function of the space coordinate (see the suggested numerical experiment in Sec. 5). But physicists were so used to analyse linearised problems, which naturally leads to a description in the Fourier space, and only add nonlinearity afterwards as a coupling between the modes, that the observation of the solitons emerging from the sinusoidal initial condition had not been done.

#### 4. The remake: FPU and the Japanese School

The history of the FPU problem is quite rich, as documented in the report by Ford [15] and in the recent book by Weissert [16]. We will not discuss it in this paper and we just recall that some of the contributions to the Chaos issue [17], printed this year to celebrate the anniversary of the FPU experiment, are devoted to a brief historical reconstruction.

Because of its relevance for the determination of a quantitative formula for the recurrence time, we would like to discuss briefly the contribution of the Japanese school, which has been very active in this field since the 60's.

The original FPU report [1], not published, was known by very few people, most of them within America. This is why, in Japan, Nobuhiko Saito (1919-) together with his PhD student Hajime Hirooka (1939-) were developing closely related research works in complete ignorance of what had been done in Los Alamos ten years earlier.

As explained by the title of Hirooka's PhD Thesis, "The approach to thermal equilibrium in a nonlinear lattice", the motivation was to explore the mechanism of ergodicity. As the mechanics of collisions in a gas was too complicated, they thought that an anharmonic lattice would be a more appropriate system; it appeared finally that its dynamics was difficult to solve. This is why, in 1964 they started to perform numerical simulations on a small computer provided by NEC: it took all the night to compute the evolution for only 5 lattice sites during several periods of the lowest mode! In 1965, they switched to the new Supercomputer provided by Hitachi Co. to Tokyo University, installed under a national plan for all Japanese universities and research institutes.

Saito and Hirooka considered a one-dimensional anharmonic lattice with quadratic and quartic potentials between neighboring particles, and with both ends fixed. The initial excitation was slightly different since all particles were at rest, whereas a constant force was applied to the first particle. They also prepared a similar system, with only harmonic potentials, and analytically calculated several quantities of interest, in particular the long-time averages of the squares of the velocities of the particles  $\langle \dot{u}_i^2 \rangle$  and the correlations  $\langle \dot{u}_i \dot{u}_{i+1} \rangle$  of the velocities of neighboring particles. The long-time averages of  $\langle \dot{u}_i^2 \rangle$  were the same for all particles, but the correlation

¶ The calculation performed by Zabusky and Kruskal used periodic boundary conditions, while the FPU calculation used fixed boundaries. This does not change the analysis because either the solitons pass through the boundaries and enter on the opposite side, or they are totally reflected

functions did not vanish in the long term, and the Maxwellian distribution of velocities was not observed, contrary to their expectations.

It is interesting to emphasize that they were hesitating to publish these results, because they were not familiar with the computer calculation and were afraid of having introduced some errors. However, they found numerical experiments similar to the FPU original one in several papers on nonlinear oscillation, in particular, those of Ford [6]. These papers also convinced Morikazu Toda to study solitons and to introduce the lattice with exponential interactions, nowadays called the Toda lattice [18].

Soon after, they also learned that the original FPU report [1] was reproduced in the Collected Papers of Fermi. Very excited, Saito and Toda read the paper at the library of Tokyo University of Education (now Tsukuba University). As they had found results similar to those of Fermi, Pasta and Ulam, they finally decided to publish their calculations [19]. Afterwards, they considered the simpler FPU initial condition and found the induction phenomenon and the occurrence of the random character of lattice vibrations.

Finally, they discovered the Zabusky-Kruskal seminal paper [12] soon after the publication of their papers in 1967. Norman Zabusky went to Kyoto in 1968 at the International conference of Statistical Mechanics, where he showed his movies and in particular the KdV cinema, which “has the power to communicate unbiased information in a credible manner, much beyond the power of words, graphs and equations”.

At that time, M. Toda gave the first analytical estimate of the recurrence time, based on the exact solutions of the exponential lattice, nowadays called the Toda lattice. Introducing the period  $T_1 = 2N$  of the first mode and the amplitude  $a$  of the initial sine wave, he got

$$T_R = \frac{3}{\pi^{3/2}\sqrt{2}} \frac{N^{3/2}}{\sqrt{a\alpha}} T_1 \simeq 0.76 \frac{N^{5/2}}{\sqrt{a\alpha}} \quad , \quad (5)$$

which compares well with the first empirical estimate due to Zabusky. Toda’s result was a little larger than Zabusky’s formula: the prefactor is 0.31 instead of 0.38 in equation (5). The discrepancy is due to the fact that, when solitons pass through each other, they accelerate because of the compression of the lattice. See Ref. [20] for a more complete discussion and Ref. [21] for a recent check of formula (5).

## 5. Pedagogical perspectives

It is quite easy, with contemporary computational tools, to reproduce the original FPU experiment. An example is the simple MATLAB<sup>©</sup> code reported in the Appendix, which solves the equations for the dynamics of the FPU model and computes the normal modes  $A_k$ . We suggest the student to use it to reproduce different aspects of the FPU problem

- Try to reproduce Fig. 1 using the original FPU initial condition given in the code. Be careful in the choice of the amplitude  $a$  because the cubic lattice is unstable at large energies.
- By careful inspection of the difference field  $(u_{i+1} - u_i)$ , it is possible to detect the presence of propagating structures, which are indeed the solitons of the Zabusky-Kruskal analysis.

- Between  $a = 1$  and  $a = 10$ , the FPU model with  $N = 32$  undergoes relaxation to equilibrium [10]. Check the absence of FPU recurrences and the establishment of energy equipartition among the normal modes.
- Since the initial sine wave form solitons [12], it is quite natural to begin with a lattice soliton initial condition. The exact kink-like soliton solution for the Toda lattice [20] is

$$u_i(t) = \pm \frac{1}{2\alpha} \log \frac{1 + \exp[2k(i-1-i_0) \pm t \sinh k]}{1 + \exp[2k(i-i_0) \pm t \sinh k]}, \quad (6)$$

where  $k$  is the inverse width. This solution is only approximate for the FPU lattice, and due to the fixed boundary conditions, one must put a kink (+) and an antikink (-) solutions, centered around 2 different sites of the lattice. Our advice is to first choose a large lattice (e.g.  $N = 128$ ). The time evolution of the derivative field  $u_{i+1} - u_i$  shows the propagation of coherent structures, their mutual interactions and reflection from the boundaries.

- Try to reproduce the relevant scalings of formula (5), for instance the  $N^{2.5}$  dependence on the number of oscillators.
- Finally, try the Zabusky-Deem [22] initial condition  $u_i = a \sin[i\pi N/(N+1)]$ , which corresponds to the highest frequency mode. Similar oscillations of mode energies as the one of long wavelengths are observed. Try to characterize these recurrences.

The scaling of formula (5) is quite different from the one of the Poincaré recurrence time [23], which can be shown to increase exponentially with  $N$  in the harmonic limit [24]. No striking change of this scaling should occur for a small nonlinearity, e.g. in the FPU recurrence region, although nothing is rigorously known for this case. The interested student can find the statement of Poincaré recurrence theorem in most books of statistical mechanics. However, in simple words, the theorem says that whenever a dynamical system preserves phase-space volume in its time evolution (and this is the case of Hamiltonian systems, including the FPU oscillator chain), “almost all” trajectories return arbitrarily close to their initial position, and they do this an infinite number of times. The exponential scaling with  $N$  of the Poincaré recurrence time with respect to the algebraic one of Toda’s formula proves that the FPU recurrence is not a manifestation of this phenomenon. It’s remarkable that, although certainly Fermi and Ulam did know Poincaré theorem, they did not quote it at all in their paper as a possible explanation of the observed recurrence<sup>+</sup>.

Another pedagogical aspect, which is worth discussing in connection with the FPU experiment, is the relation between *continuum* and *discrete*. Analytical “human” approaches to the problem consider continuous variables, while with the computers, it was natural and necessary to use discretized variables; the human and computer way of dealing with physical problems were therefore for the first time contrasted. The only discreteness appearing in the FPU model is the spatial one: the oscillators are put on a lattice. Time flows continuously and the displacement field variable  $u_i$  is also continuous. Models of space-time evolution have been considered where time is discrete, while the lattice variable is still continuous: so-called *coupled map lattices* [25]. Hamiltonian versions of this type of models exist, in the sense that phase-space volume is conserved by the dynamical evolution, although the total energy is not.

<sup>+</sup> This fallacious possibility has been considered by others (who perhaps did not know the theorem as well as Fermi and Ulam) when the news about the FPU experiment spread around.

The extreme case of discreteness is the one of *cellular automata* [26], for which also the lattice variable takes a discrete set of values. Depending on the physical system at hand, one model or the other has been considered as appropriate, and several examples exist where even the extreme discrete case of cellular automata provides a good representation of the physical process under analysis.

In this respect, quite advanced still open questions related to the FPU recurrence are: Is the recurrence observed also in “Hamiltonian” coupled map lattices and in cellular automata? Is it related to the propagation of coherent structures which have some resemblance to solitons? How does the recurrence time scale with system size? These are open research issues, on which perhaps a curious PhD student might want to challenge his own computational skill, taking the opportunity to make his own first “numerical experiment”, a privilege once reserved only to a few people isolated in a deserted region of New Mexico.

### Acknowledgments

We thank R. Botet and E. Trizac for the opportunity they gave us to contribute to this *Eur. J. Phys.* issue on “Teaching Physics with computers”. We also thank G. Battimelli, H. Hirooka, M. D. Kruskal, N. Saito and N. J. Zabusky for useful exchanges of information. We thank R. Khomeriki for help in coding with Matlab. S.R. thanks ENS Lyon for hospitality and CNRS for financial support. This work is part of the contract COFIN03 of the Italian MIUR *Order and chaos in nonlinear extended systems*.

### Appendix: MATLAB<sup>®</sup> Code

Codes are available at the website:

<http://perso.ens-lyon.fr/Thierry.Dauxois/fpu.html>

#### Main Program

```

N=32; % Number of particles must be a power of 2
alpha=0.25; % Nonlinear parameter
TMAX=10000; DT=20; % tmax and Delta t
tspan=[0:DT:TMAX];
options=odeset('Reltol',1e-4,'OutputFcn','odeplot','OutputSel',[1,2,N]);
% Test different tolerances, changing Reltol
for I=1:N,
a=1; b(I)=a*sin(pi*I/(N+1)); b(I+N)=0; % FPU initial condition
%a=1; b(I)=a*sin(pi*N*I/(N+1)); b(I+N)=0; % Zabusky-Deem init. cond.
%k=0.8; sk=(sinh(k))^2; ek=exp(-k); i1=I-N/4; i2=i1-N/2; %Solitons
%b(I)=-0.5/alpha*log((1+exp(2*k*(i1-1)))/(1+exp(2*k*i1)));
%b(I)=b(I)+0.5/alpha*log((1+exp(2*k*(i2-1)))/(1+exp(2*k*i2)));
%b(I+N)= sk*ek/alpha/cosh(k*i1)/(exp(-k*i1)+exp(k*i1)*exp(-2*k));
%b(I+N)=b(I+N)-sk*ek/alpha/cosh(k*i2)/(exp(-k*i2)+exp(k*i2)*exp(-2*k));
omegak2(I)=4*(sin(pi*I/2/N))^2; % Mode Frequencies
end
[T,Y]=ode45('fpu1',tspan,b',options,N); % Time integration
for IT=1:(TMAX/DT),

```

```

TIME(IT)=IT*DT*sqrt(omegak2(1))/2/pi;           % Time iteration loop
YX(IT,1:N+1)=[0 Y(IT,1:N)]; YV(IT,1:N+1)=[0 Y(IT,N+1:2*N)];
sXF(IT,:)=imag(fft([YX(IT,1:N+1) 0 -YX(IT,N+1:-1:2)]))/sqrt(2*(N+1));
sVF(IT,:)=imag(fft([YV(IT,1:N+1) 0 -YV(IT,N+1:-1:2)]))/sqrt(2*(N+1));
Energ(IT,1:N)=(omegak2(1:N).*(sXF(IT,2:N+1).^2)+sVF(IT,2:N+1).^2)/2;
for J=2:N-1,                                     % Space loop
DifY(IT,J)=Y(IT,J+1)-Y(IT,J);
end
end
plot(TIME,Energ(:,1),TIME,Energ(:,2),TIME,Energ(:,3),TIME,Energ(:,4));
surf(DifY);           % Space derivative field to show the soliton dynamics

```

*fpu1 function*

```

function dy=fpu1(t,y);
N=32;alpha=0.25;
D(N+1)=y(2) -2*y(1)+alpha*((y(2)-y(1))^2-y(1)^2);D(1)=y(N+1);
D(2*N)=y(N-1)-2*y(N)+alpha*(y(N)^2-(y(N)-y(N-1))^2);D(N)=y(2*N);
for I=2:N-1,
D(N+I)=y(I+1)+y(I-1)-2*y(I)+alpha*((y(I+1)-y(I))^2-(y(I)-y(I-1))^2);
D(I)=y(N+I);
end
dy=D';

```

- [1] FERMI E., PASTA J., ULAM S., *Los Alamos report LA-1940* (1955), published later in *Collected Papers of Enrico Fermi*, E. Segré (Ed.), University of Chicago Press (1965).
- [2] ULAM S. M., *Adventures of a Mathematician*, Charles Scribner's Son, New York, (1976).
- [3] D. S. Sholl, *Physics Letters A* **149**, 253 (1990).
- [4] METROPOLIS N., *Daedalus* **121**, 119-130 (1992).
- [5] JENSEN P., BLASE X., "La matière fantôme", *La Recherche* (avril 2002).
- [6] FORD J., *Jour. Math. Phys.* **2**, 387-393 (1961).
- [7] KOLMOGOROV A. N., *Akad. Nauk. S.S.S.R Doklady* **98**, 527 (1954).
- [8] MOSER J., *Nachr. Akad. Wiss. Göttingen Math. Phys. Kl.* **2**, 1 (1962).
- [9] ARNOLD V. I., *Russian Math. Surveys* **18**, 85 (1963).
- [10] IZRAILEV F. M., CHIRIKOV B. V., *Soviet Phys. Dokl.* **11**, 30 (1966).
- [11] LIVI R., PETTINI M., RUFFO S., SPARPAGLIONE M., VULPIANI A., *Phys. Rev. A* **28**, 3544 (1985).
- [12] ZABUSKY N. J., KRUSKAL M. D., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **15**, 240-243 (1965).
- [13] DAUXOIS T., PEYRARD M., *Physics of Solitons*, Cambridge University Press (2005).
- [14] KORTEWEG D. J., DE VRIES G., *Philosophical Magazine 5th Series*, **36**, 422-443 (1895).
- [15] FORD J, *Phys. Rep.* **213**, 271 (1992).
- [16] WEISSERT T. P., *The Genesis of Simulation in Dynamics: Pursuing the Fermi-Pasta-Ulam Problem*, Springer (1997).
- [17] *Chaos* (AIP Journal) Focus issue devoted to the FPU problem (2005).
- [18] TODA M., *Jour. Phys. Soc. Japan* **22**, 431-436 (1967).
- [19] SAITO N., HIROOKA H., *Jour. Phys. Soc. Japan* **23**, 157-166 (1967); *ibid.* **23**, 167-171 (1967).
- [20] TODA M., *Theory of Nonlinear Lattices*, Springer (1978).
- [21] LIN C. Y., CHO S. N., GOEDDE C. G., LICHTER S., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 259 (1999).
- [22] ZABUSKY N. J., DEEM G. S., *J. Comp. Phys.* **2**, 126 (1967).
- [23] POINCARÉ H., *Acta Math.* **13**, 1 (1890).
- [24] HEMMER P. C., MAXIMON L. C., WERGERLAND H., *Phys. Rev.* **111**, 689 (1958).
- [25] *Chaos* (AIP Journal) Focus issue devoted to Coupled Map Lattices, **2** (1992).
- [26] WOLFRAM S., *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **55**, 601 (1983).