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Abstract. We investigate the classical problem of motion of a mathematical pendulum with an oscillating pivot. This simple mechanical setting is frequently used as the prime example of a system that exhibits parametric resonance phenomenon wherein the modulation of system parameters can lead to surprising stabilisation/destabilisation effects. In order to draw the corresponding stability diagram in the parameter space in the classical case of the pivot oscillations given by a cosine wave, one needs to analyse the behaviour of solutions to Mathieu equation. This is not a straightforward procedure, and it does not lead to exact and simple analytical results expressed in terms of elementary functions, which can obscure the mathematical explanation of the parametric resonance phenomenon. We show that the analysis is much more easier if one considers the pivot motion that is given by a non-smooth function—a triangular or a nearly rectangular wave. The non-smooth pivot motion leads to the presence of singularities (Dirac distributions) in the corresponding Mathieu type equation, which is a minor technical difficulty easily to resolve on the intuitive basis as well as a rigorous basis. Once the mathematical setting for the non-smooth forcing is settled down, the corresponding stability diagram is straightforward to obtain, and it turns out that the stability boundaries are given in terms of simple analytical formulae involving only elementary functions.

1. Introduction

Parametric resonance is a well-known dynamical phenomenon that can take place in systems with periodically varying parameters. The modulation of system parameters—rather than direct external forcing as in the standard resonance phenomenon—can have striking stabilising/destabilising impact on the dynamical behaviour of the system. A simple manifestation of the parametric resonance is the classical problem of stabilisation of the inverted pendulum by the means of an oscillating pivot, first analysed by Stephenson (1908) and later independently by Kapitza (1951), see also Acheson (1993) for further historical remarks.

A surprising manifestation of the parametric resonance is the fact that the inverted pendulum can be stabilised—it can be made “hanging upwards”—by fast vertical pivot oscillations. Such a result is frequently discussed in introductory texts on classical mechanics and mechanical vibrations, see den Hartog (1956), Landau and Lifshitz [1976] or Nayfeh (1981, 2000) to name a few, and on theory of ordinary differential equations, see, for example, the classical textbook Jordan and Smith (2007). The explanation of the phenomenon is usually given in terms of analysis of Mathieu equation

$$\frac{d^2\theta^*}{dt^2} + (\alpha + \beta \cos t^*) \theta^* = 0,$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are some parameters, and $\theta^*$ describes the angular displacement of the pendulum, see below for details. The dependence of the stability of solutions to (1) on parameters $\alpha$ and $\beta$ typically relies on the standard Floquet theory followed by some perturbation technique either directly, see, for example, Nayfeh (1981, 2000), or indirectly in the manipulations with the so-called Hill determinant, see Hill (1886) and modern discussion for example in Morse and Feshbach (1953), Phelps and Hunter (1965) or Jordan and Smith (2007) to name a few. The other possibility is to employ a heuristics based on the slow/fast time scale separation, and the construction of an effective potential, which is the method originally applied by Kapitza (1951). For further references in this regard see, for example, Butikov (2001) or Artstein (2021) and references therein. These methods either give analytical results valid only in a small amplitude and/or high frequency approximation (small parameter $\beta$, small parameter $\alpha$), or require one to perform relatively elaborate manipulations with the Hill determinant, and in the evaluation of the determinant one has to anyway finally resort to yet another approximation procedure, see Jordan and Smith (2007).
Consequently, the analysis of the parametric resonance phenomenon for inverted pendulum remains either only on a heuristic level or is obscured by relatively involved calculations. In principle, this is not a problem since the heuristics suffice to give an insight into the phenomenon, and the rigorous analysis of Mathieu equation—as well as the more general Hill equation—is nowadays a well-developed field, see [McLachlan 1947] and [Magnus and Winkler 1979]. However, since the parametric resonance phenomenon is important in technical practice, see [Champneys 2011] and references therein, and a matter of everlasting curiosity, see, for example, [Keller 2010], there is a relentless effort to provide a simple and intuitive and simultaneously also rigorous enough explanation of this phenomenon without the need to resort to cumbersome technical manipulations.

Such attempts are, for example, based on a slight reformulation of the problem, see [den Hartog 1956] or [Levi and Weckesser 1995], or on various physical arguments see, for example, a more recent discussion in [Butikov 2001, 2011, 2018] and [Artstein 2021]. In what follows we provide yet another reformulation of the parametric resonance problem for the pendulum with an oscillating pivot, while the presented reformulation allows one to explicitly carry out all the necessary calculations in terms of simple expressions involving only elementary functions.

The key modification that leads to a very simple subsequent analysis based on Floquet theory is to choose the right modulation of the pivot motion. It turns out that the triangular wave instead of the classical cosine wave is a good choice. (Note that the original analysis by [Stephenson 1905] partially went in this direction as well.) The fact that we work with a non-smooth pivot motion leads to relatively minor technical difficulty.

The reason is that the acceleration of the pivot motion is given in terms of generalised functions, in particular the classical Mathieu equation (1) is replaced by

\[ \frac{d^2\theta^*}{dt^2} + \left( \alpha + \beta \left( \delta_{t^*-(2n+1)\pi} - \delta_{t^*-2n\pi} \right) \right) \theta^* = 0, \] (2)

where \( \delta_{t^*-a} \) denotes the Dirac distribution with respect to the variable \( t^* \) located at point \( a \). (See Section 2 for details and detailed discussion of the notation.) This means that we face the problem of multiplication of the solution \( \theta^* \) with the generalised function \( \delta_{t^*-a} \), which is an operation not defined in the classical theory of distributions, see [Schwartz 1954]. Once this minor complication is overcome, the remaining calculations are straightforward.

After the analysis of the resonance induced by the triangular wave we proceed with yet another non-smooth pivot motion, name with (nearly) rectangular wave. This is a very interesting case of non-smooth pivot motion, since it allows one to challenge the conventional wisdom namely the fact that “practicing engineers often think of this subharmonic instability close to \( \alpha = \frac{1}{4} \) […] as being the hallmark of parametric resonance”, see [Champneys 2011].

2. Governing equations

Using the standard techniques of analytical mechanics, see, for example, [Meirovitch 2001], the governing equations for pendulum of length \( l \) swinging in the homogeneous gravitational field with gravitational acceleration \( g \) and with pivot localised at vertical position \( \xi(t) \) are found to be

\[ ml^2 \frac{d^2 \theta}{dt^2} + ml \left( \frac{d^2 \xi}{dt^2} + g \right) \sin \theta = 0, \] (3)

where \( \theta \) denotes the angle between the vertical axis and the pendulum, see Figure 1. If we assume that the pivot is oscillating with a minimal period \( T \) and the corresponding angular frequency \( \Omega = \frac{2\pi}{T} \), and if we introduce the dimensionless time \( t^* \) as \( t^* = \frac{t}{T} \), then the governing equation (3) reduces to

\[ \frac{d^2 \theta^*}{dt^2} + \left( \frac{1}{T} \frac{d^2 \xi}{dt^2} + \frac{g}{\Omega^2} \right) \sin \theta^* = 0. \] (4)

Using the symbol \( \omega_0 = \frac{\sqrt{g}}{T} \) for the natural frequency of the pendulum, we can further rewrite (4) as

\[ \frac{d^2 \theta^*}{dt^2} + \left( \frac{1}{T} \frac{d^2 \xi}{dt^2} + \alpha \right) \sin \theta^* = 0, \] (5)

where \( \alpha = \frac{g^2}{\Omega^2} \). We consider the response of the system to two pivot motions. In the first case the pivot motion is given as a triangular wave, see Figure 2a, while in the second case we consider the pivot motion given by an approximation of a rectangular wave, see Figure 2b. Both responses are compared to the response in the classical setting, that is to the case when the pivot motion is given as a cosine wave.
The behaviour of solutions to (5) is typically investigated in the linearised setting, that is the term $\sin \theta^*$ is linearised as $\sin \theta^* \approx \theta^*$ (pendulum is swinging close to the pendent position) or as $\sin \theta^* \approx -\zeta^*$ (pendulum is swinging close to the upright position $\theta^* = \zeta^* + \pi$, $\zeta^* \approx 0$). In the ongoing analysis we stick to the linearised setting as well. (Regarding some preliminary analysis in the nonlinear cosine wave case see Kidachi and Onogi (1997).) In the standard setting, that is if one sets $\xi = A\cos(\Omega t)$, then upon linearisation one gets the standard Mathieu equation (1) for $\theta^*$ and $\zeta^*$ respectively. Note that the latter case (upright position) is formally identical to the former one (pendent position), the only difference is that in the latter case we work with negative values of parameters $\alpha$ and $\beta$.

In our generalised setting we consider pivot motion given by a triangular wave (13), Figure 2a, or by an (approximated) rectangular wave (26), Figure 2b, but we still work with a linear ordinary differential equation with time periodic coefficients. This means that we can still use the standard Floquet theory, see Floquet (1883) and modern discussion thereof in, for example, Jordan and Smith (2007). However, we need to make necessary amendments of Floquet theory to the setting of generalised functions. Indeed, since the pivot motion $\xi(t^*)$ is not smooth, the second derivative $\frac{d^2 \xi}{dt^2}$ in the governing equation (5) involves singular terms, namely the Dirac distributions centered at given points, see Figure 2 and Figure 3 respectively. This is however a minor technical difficulty, and we discuss it below.

In Floquet theory the stability analysis for our system of interest essentially boils down to the evaluation of the trace of the monodromy matrix $E$, which is the fundamental matrix $\Phi$ evaluated at (dimensionless) time $t^* = 2\pi$, see the classical detailed textbook discussion in Jordan and Smith (2007). Consequently, before we proceed with full analysis, it is worthwhile to study the response of the system to a single jump forcing and the response of the system in the free (unforced) regime. The monodromy matrix $E$ for the response of the system to the forcing by a triangular/rectangular wave is then simply assembled as a matrix product of fundamental matrices for single jump forcing and the free regime.
3. System response in simple cases

3.1. System response to a single jump. We first investigate what happens if the system governed by the equation

\[ \frac{d^2 \theta^*}{dt^*^2} + \left( \alpha + \Gamma \delta_{t^* - t_{\text{jump}}^*} \right) \theta^* = 0, \]

where \( \Gamma \in \mathbb{R} \) is a fixed number, crosses the singularity at \( t^* = t_{\text{jump}}^* \). It is straightforward to verify that traversing the singularity at \( t^* = t_{\text{jump}}^* \) induces a jump in the derivative of the function \( \theta^* \), while the function \( \theta^* \) itself remains continuous across the jump, that is

\[ \lim_{t^* \to t_{\text{jump}}^*} \theta^* = \lim_{t^* \to t_{\text{jump}}^*} \theta^* = \lim_{t^* \to t_{\text{jump}}^*} \theta^*, \quad \lim_{t^* \to t_{\text{jump}}^*} \frac{d\theta^*}{dt^*} = \lim_{t^* \to t_{\text{jump}}^*} \frac{d\theta^*}{dt^*} = \Gamma \theta^*|_{t^* = t_{\text{jump}}^*}. \]

If we rewrite conditions (7) in a matrix form we see that

\[ \begin{bmatrix} \theta^* \\ \frac{d\theta^*}{dt^*} \end{bmatrix}_{t^* = t_{\text{jump}}^*} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -\Gamma & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \theta^* \\ \frac{d\theta^*}{dt^*} \end{bmatrix}_{t^* = t_{\text{jump}}^*}. \]

Consequently the fundamental matrix \( \Phi_{t^* = t_{\text{jump}}^* - t_{\text{jump}}^*} \) that transfers the system across the singularity reads

\[ \Phi_{t^* = t_{\text{jump}}^* - t_{\text{jump}}^*} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -\Gamma & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \]

Note however that our argument is rather sloppy from the rigorous theoretical point of view. We are multiplying two generalised functions/distributions, namely the sought function \( \theta^* \) and the Dirac distribution \( \delta_{t^* - t_{\text{jump}}^*} \), which is not possible in the classical theory of distributions, see Schwartz (1954). (This theory of generalised functions allows one to multiply a distribution only by a smooth function. In other cases the multiplication operation is not defined.) Consequently, we need to employ another viewpoint regarding the generalised functions/distributions, namely we need a structure that allows us to transparently and simultaneously handle operations/distributions, namely we need a structure that allows us to transparently and simultaneously handle discontinuity, differentiation and nonlinearity. This can be done for example in the so-called Colombeau algebra, see especially Colombeau (1984, 1985, 1992), Biagioni (1990), Rosinger (1987) or Grosser et al. (2001); for applications of Colombeau algebra in physics see, for example, Colombeau and Le Roux (1988), Grosser et al. (2001), Steinbauer and Vickers (2006), Aragona et al. (2014), Todorcevic (2015), Rehors et al. (2016) and Průša and Rajagopal (2016); Průša et al. (2017) to name a few. We shall however not go into the technical details, we will be content with the claim that in the present case all manipulations work as expected, meaning that the product of a continuous function and the Dirac distribution yields the value of the function at the corresponding point, and that all the required manipulations can be—if necessary—formalised.

3.2. System response in the free regime. Next we investigate what happens if the system governed by the equation

\[ \frac{d^2 \theta^*}{dt^*^2} + \alpha \theta^* = 0, \]

where \( \alpha = 0 \). Consequently the fundamental matrix \( \Phi_{t^* = t_{\text{jump}}^* - t_{\text{jump}}^*} \) that transfers the system across the singularity reads

\[ \Phi_{t^* = t_{\text{jump}}^* - t_{\text{jump}}^*} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -\Gamma & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \]
evolves from time $t'_0$ to time $t'_0 + \tau^*$. Elementary calculation yields that

$$
\left[ \frac{\theta^*}{d\theta^*}{d\tau^*} \right]_{t'_0 + \tau^*} = \left[ \begin{array}{cc}
0 & 1 \\
\alpha & -\alpha
\end{array} \right]_{t'_0 - \tau^*} \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\theta^* \\
\frac{d\theta^*}{d\tau^*}
\end{array} \right]_{t'_0 - \tau^*} = \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\cos(\sqrt{\alpha}(t'_0 - \tau^*)) \\
\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \sin(\sqrt{\alpha}(t'_0 - \tau^*))
\end{array} \right] - \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\cos(\sqrt{\alpha}(t'_0)) \\
\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \sin(\sqrt{\alpha}(t'_0))
\end{array} \right].
$$

Consequently the fundamental matrix $\Phi_{t'_0 + \tau^*}^{t'_0}$ that transfers the system in the free regime from time $t'_0$ to time $t'_0 + \tau^*$ reads

$$
\Phi_{t'_0 + \tau^*}^{t'_0} = \left[ \begin{array}{cc}
\cos(\sqrt{\alpha}(t'_0 + \tau^*)) \\
\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \sin(\sqrt{\alpha}(t'_0 + \tau^*))
\end{array} \right] - \left[ \begin{array}{cc}
\cos(\sqrt{\alpha}(t'_0)) \\
\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \sin(\sqrt{\alpha}(t'_0))
\end{array} \right].
$$

4. Pivot motion given as a triangular wave

Having obtained the fundamental matrix for the free regime over the time interval of length $\tau$ and the fundamental matrix for the singularity crossing, we can proceed with the identification of the monodromy matrix for the pivot motion given as a triangular wave.

4.1. Triangular wave – governing equations. A triangular wave with amplitude $A$ and minimal period $2\pi$ in the dimensionless time, see Figure 2a, is given by the function $\xi$ specified by the formula

$$
\xi(t^*) = \begin{cases}
A - \frac{2A}{\pi} t^*, & t^* \in [0, \pi], \\
-3A + \frac{2A}{\pi} t^*, & t^* \in (\pi, 2\pi).
\end{cases}
$$

The first and second derivatives of $\xi$ are then—informally—given by the formulae

$$
\frac{d\xi}{dt^*} = \frac{2A}{\pi} (-\chi_{[0, \pi]} + \chi_{(\pi, 2\pi)}),
$$

$$
\frac{d^2\xi}{dt^{*2}} = \frac{4A}{\pi} (\delta_{t^*-(2n+1)\pi} - \delta_{t^*-2n\pi}),
$$

where $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, and where the symbol $\delta_{t^*}$ denotes the Dirac delta distribution centered at point $t^* = t'_0$, and $\chi_{[0, \pi]}$ denotes the characteristic function of the corresponding interval. Substituting (14b) into the governing equation (5) yields

$$
\frac{d^2\theta^*}{dt^{*2}} + \left( \alpha + \beta \left( \delta_{t^*-(2n+1)\pi} - \delta_{t^*-2n\pi} \right) \right) \sin \theta^* = 0.
$$

(The acceleration is schematically shown in Figure 3a and it consists of positive/negative pulses located at points 0 and $\pi$ with period $2\pi$.) The dimensionless parameter $\beta$ is given by the formula $\beta = \text{def} \frac{4A}{\pi t}$. The linearisation with respect to $\theta^*$ leads to

$$
\frac{d^2\theta^*}{dt^{*2}} + \left( \alpha + \beta \left( \delta_{t^*-(2n+1)\pi} - \delta_{t^*-2n\pi} \right) \right) \theta^* = 0,
$$

$$
\frac{d^2\theta^*}{dt^{*2}} - \left( \alpha + \beta \left( \delta_{t^*-(2n+1)\pi} - \delta_{t^*-2n\pi} \right) \right) \theta^* = 0,
$$

depending whether we linearise in the vicinity of the point 0 or $\pi$. In the former case, that is if the pendulum is hanging down, we get (16a), while in the latter case, that is if the pendulum is in the inverted position, we get (16b). This formally allows us to investigate the system both for the positive and negative values of parameters $\alpha$ and $\beta$. (Positive values correspond to the pendulum in the pendant position, while negative values correspond to the pendulum in the upright position.)
4.2. Monodromy matrix. If we want to find the monodromy matrix $E$ for the system governed by the equation (16a), we then first convert the equation to the form of system of first order differential equations,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ \alpha - \beta \left( \delta t_{-} - (2n+1)\pi - \delta t_{-} - 2n\pi \right) & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix},$$

(17)

where we denote $x = \text{def} \theta^*$, $y = \text{def} \frac{d\theta^*}{dt}$. The fundamental matrix evaluated over the period $\Phi_{0\to 2\pi} = \Phi_{\pi\to 2\pi} \Phi_{0\to \pi} \Phi_{0\to 0\to \pi}$ is given by the product of fundamental matrices for the free regime and matrices for the single jump of height $\pm \beta$ located at time instants zero and $\pi$, see (12) and (9). We get

$$E = \Phi_{0\to 2\pi} - \Phi_{\pi\to 2\pi} \Phi_{0\to \pi} \Phi_{0\to 0\to \pi} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\sqrt{\alpha}\pi) & \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \sin(\sqrt{\alpha}\pi) \\ -\sqrt{\alpha} \sin(\sqrt{\alpha}\pi) & \cos(\sqrt{\alpha}\pi) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -\beta & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\sqrt{\alpha}\pi) & \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \sin(\sqrt{\alpha}\pi) \\ -\sqrt{\alpha} \sin(\sqrt{\alpha}\pi) & \cos(\sqrt{\alpha}\pi) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \beta & 1 \end{bmatrix}. $$

(18)

We see that

$$\text{Tr} \Phi_{0\to 2\pi} = 2 \cos(2\pi\sqrt{\alpha}) - \frac{\beta^2}{\alpha} \sin^2(\pi\sqrt{\alpha}),$$

(19)

which upon application of trigonometric identities yields

$$\text{Tr} \Phi_{0\to 2\pi} = 2 \cos^2(\pi\sqrt{\alpha})\left( 2 + \frac{\beta^2}{\alpha} \right) \sin^2(\pi\sqrt{\alpha}).$$

(20)

If necessary (20) can also be rewritten as

$$\text{Tr} \Phi_{0\to 2\pi} = -\frac{\beta^2}{2\alpha} + \frac{4\alpha + \beta^2}{2\alpha} \cos(2\pi\sqrt{\alpha}),$$

(21)

but it seems that (20) is the most convenient for the ongoing manipulations. In the case for $\alpha < 0$ we can rewrite (20) in terms of hyperbolic functions. We interpret $\sqrt{\alpha}$ as $i\sqrt{|\alpha|}$, and we use identities $\cosh x = \cos(ix)$ and $i\sinh x = \sin(ix)$.

4.3. Search for periodic solutions. Following the standard analysis, see [Jordan and Smith (2007)], we know that the system (16) possesses a periodic solution provided that $\text{Tr} \Phi_{0\to 2\pi} = \pm 2$, and know that the curves $\text{Tr} \Phi_{0\to 2\pi} = \pm 2$ are known to be boundaries of stable/unstable regions in the parameter space $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

4.3.1. Solution of equation $\text{Tr} \Phi_{0\to 2\pi} = 2$. If we use expression (20) for the trace of the monodromy matrix, we see that for $\alpha > 0$ the equation $\text{Tr} \Phi_{0\to 2\pi} = 2$ reduces to

$$-\left( 4 + \frac{\beta^2}{\alpha} \right) \sin^2(\pi\sqrt{\alpha}) = 0,$$

(22)

while in the case of $\alpha < 0$ we get

$$\left( 4 - \frac{\beta^2}{|\alpha|} \right) \sinh^2(\pi\sqrt{|\alpha|}) = 0.$$  

(23)

4.3.2. Solution of equation for $\text{Tr} \Phi_{0\to 2\pi} = -2$. For $\alpha > 0$ the equation reduces to

$$|\beta| = 2\sqrt{\alpha} \left| \frac{\cos(\pi\sqrt{\alpha})}{\sin(\pi\sqrt{\alpha})} \right|,$$

(24)

while in the case of $\alpha < 0$ we get

$$|\beta| = 2\sqrt{|\alpha|} \left| \frac{\cosh(\pi\sqrt{|\alpha|})}{\sinh(\pi\sqrt{|\alpha|})} \right|.$$  

(25)

4.3.3. Ince–Strutt diagram. In all cases discussed above the equations lead to explicit formulae describing curves in the parameter space $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, and it is straightforward to plot these curves and the corresponding stable/unstable regions in $\mathbb{R}^2$, see Figure [4]. Some important quantitative aspects of the stability curves are easy to find from the obtained analytical expressions. For example, it is straightforward to verify that the curves emanating from the points $[\alpha \beta] = [0 \ 0]$ and $[\alpha \beta] = \left[ \frac{1}{2} \ 0 \right]$ get closer as $\alpha \to -\infty$, which means that the stability gap in the negative half-plane is getting narrower as $\alpha \to -\infty$. Similarly the intersection points with the vertical axis are easy to find as well.
5. Pivot motion given as an approximated rectangular wave

The stability analysis for the pivot motion given by an approximated rectangular wave goes along the same lines as for the triangular wave.

5.1. Rectangular wave – governing equations. The pivot motion is, in the dimensionless time, given by the $2\pi$-periodic function $\xi$ specified by the formula

$$\xi_n(t^*) = \begin{cases} 
 nAt^*, & t^* \in \left[-\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}\right], \\
 A, & t^* \in \left(\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{n}\right), \\
 -nA(t^* - \pi), & t^* \in \left[\pi - \frac{1}{n}, \pi + \frac{1}{n}\right], \\
 -A, & t^* \in \left(\pi + \frac{1}{n}, 2\pi - \frac{1}{n}\right),
\end{cases}$$

see Figure 2b. (This time we consider a sequence of possible pivot motions. The sequence labeled by $n \in \mathbb{N}$ approximates for $n \to +\infty$ the exact rectangular wave.) The first and second time derivatives are—informally—given by the formulae

$$\frac{d\xi_n}{dt^*} = \begin{cases} 
 nA, & t^* \in \left[-\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}\right], \\
 0, & t^* \in \left(\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{n}\right), \\
 -nA, & t^* \in \left[\pi - \frac{1}{n}, \pi + \frac{1}{n}\right], \\
 0, & t^* \in \left(\pi + \frac{1}{n}, 2\pi - \frac{1}{n}\right),
\end{cases}$$

and

$$\frac{d^2\xi_n}{dt^{*2}} = nA\delta(t^* - \frac{1}{n}) - nA\delta(t^* - \frac{1}{n}) - nA\delta(t^* - \frac{\pi}{n}) + nA\delta(t^* + \frac{\pi}{n}).$$

(This is periodically extended to $\mathbb{R}$. We again see that the acceleration is given as a sequence of pulses, schematic sketch of the acceleration is given in Figure 3b.) Substituting (28) into (5) and linearising with respect to $\theta^*$ yields

$$\frac{d^2\theta^*}{dt^{*2}} + \left(\alpha + n\beta\left(\delta(t^* - \frac{1}{n}) - \delta(t^* - \frac{\pi}{n}) + \delta(t^* - \frac{\pi}{n})\right)\right)\theta^* = 0,$$

where the dimensionless parameter $\beta$ is now given by the formula $\beta = \frac{A}{l}$. (Again negative parameter values correspond to the upright position, while positive parameter values correspond to the pendent position.)
5.2. Monodromy matrix. If we want to find the monodromy matrix \( \mathbb{L} \) for the system governed by the equation \((20)\), then we again first convert the equation to the form of system of first order differential equations,

\[
\frac{d}{dt^+} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -\alpha - n\beta \left( \delta_{t^+} \frac{1}{2} - \delta_{t^-} \frac{1}{2} - \delta_{t^+} (\pi - \frac{1}{2}) + \delta_{t^-} (\pi - \frac{1}{2}) \right) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix},
\]

where we denote \( x = \text{def } \theta^+ \), \( y = \text{def } \frac{d\theta^+}{dt^+} \). The fundamental matrix evaluated over the period \( \Phi_{\frac{\pi}{n} \rightarrow (2\pi - \frac{1}{n})} \), that is the monodromy matrix \( \mathbb{L} \) for the system of interest \((20)\), is given by the product of fundamental matrices for free propagation and matrices for single jumps, see \((9)\) and \((12)\). We get

\[
\mathbb{L} = \Phi_{\frac{\pi}{n} \rightarrow (2\pi - \frac{1}{n})} = \Phi_{(\pi + \frac{1}{n}) \rightarrow (2\pi - \frac{1}{n})} \Phi_{(\pi + \frac{1}{n}) \rightarrow (\pi + \frac{1}{n})} \Phi_{(\pi - \frac{1}{n}) \rightarrow (\pi + \frac{1}{n})} \Phi_{(\pi - \frac{1}{n}) \rightarrow (\pi - \frac{1}{n})} \Phi_{\frac{\pi}{n} \rightarrow \frac{\pi}{n}} \Phi_{\frac{\pi}{n} \rightarrow \frac{\pi}{n}} \Phi_{\frac{\pi}{n} \rightarrow \frac{\pi}{n}}
\]

which upon the application of trigonometric identities yields

\[
\Phi_{\frac{\pi}{n} \rightarrow (2\pi - \frac{1}{n})} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \left( \sqrt{n} \frac{\pi - \sqrt{n} \alpha}{2} \right) & \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sin \left( \sqrt{n} \frac{\pi - \sqrt{n} \alpha}{2} \right) \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sin \left( \sqrt{n} \frac{\pi + \sqrt{n} \alpha}{2} \right) & \cos \left( \sqrt{n} \frac{\pi + \sqrt{n} \alpha}{2} \right) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ n\beta & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \cos \left( \sqrt{n} \frac{\alpha}{2} \right) & \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sin \left( \sqrt{n} \frac{\alpha}{2} \right) \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sin \left( \sqrt{n} \frac{\alpha}{2} \right) & \cos \left( \sqrt{n} \frac{\alpha}{2} \right) \end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -n\beta & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \cos \left( \sqrt{n} \frac{\alpha}{2} \right) & \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sin \left( \sqrt{n} \frac{\alpha}{2} \right) \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sin \left( \sqrt{n} \frac{\alpha}{2} \right) & \cos \left( \sqrt{n} \frac{\alpha}{2} \right) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ n\beta & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},
\]

which upon the application of trigonometric identities yields

\[
\text{Tr} \Phi_{\frac{\pi}{n} \rightarrow (2\pi - \frac{1}{n})} = \frac{4\beta^2 n^2 (4\alpha + \beta^2 n^2) \sin^2 \left( \frac{\sqrt{n}(\pi - 2)}{n} \right) - 4\beta^2 n^2 (4\alpha + \beta^2 n^2) \cos \left( \frac{2\sqrt{n}(\pi - 4)}{n} \right) - 2\beta^2 n^2 (4\alpha + \beta^2 n^2) \cos \left( \frac{4\sqrt{n}}{n} \right) + \cos \left( \frac{2\pi \sqrt{n}}{4} \right) (4\alpha + \beta^2 n^2)^2}{8\alpha^2} = \frac{4\beta^2 n^2 (4\alpha + \beta^2 n^2) \sin^2 \left( \pi - \frac{2\sqrt{n}}{n} \right) + \beta^4 n^4 \cos \left( \frac{2\pi \sqrt{n}}{4} - \frac{8\sqrt{n}}{n} \right) - 2\beta^2 n^2 (4\alpha + \beta^2 n^2) \cos \left( \frac{4\sqrt{n}}{n} \right) + \cos \left( \frac{2\pi \sqrt{n}}{4} \right) (4\alpha + \beta^2 n^2)^2}{8\alpha^2} = \frac{n^2 \left( 4\beta^2 \sin^2 \left( \frac{\pi \sqrt{n}}{\alpha} \right) - 4\beta^2 \left( 1 + 2\beta^2 \right) \sin \left( 2\pi \sqrt{n} \right) + \beta^4 n^4 \cos \left( \frac{2\pi \sqrt{n}}{4} - \frac{8\sqrt{n}}{n} \right) - 2\beta^2 n^2 (4\alpha + \beta^2 n^2) \cos \left( \frac{4\sqrt{n}}{n} \right) + \cos \left( \frac{2\pi \sqrt{n}}{4} \right) (4\alpha + \beta^2 n^2)^2 \right)}{8\alpha^2} \cos \left( \frac{2\pi \sqrt{n}}{4} - \frac{8\sqrt{n}}{n} \right) - \frac{8\beta^2 n^2 (4\alpha + \beta^2 n^2)^2}{3} - \frac{8\beta^4}{3} \left( \beta^2 - 3 \right) \frac{1}{n^2} + O \left( \frac{1}{n^3} \right).
\]

Note that the limit \( n \to +\infty \) is not finite, hence we cannot directly analyse the exact rectangular wave, we must stay on the level of approximated rectangular wave.

5.3. Search for periodic solutions. Following again the standard analysis, see \cite{Jordan:2007}, we know that the system \((16)\) possesses a periodic solution provided that \( \text{Tr} \Phi_{\frac{\pi}{n} \rightarrow (2\pi - \frac{1}{n})} = \pm 2 \), and that the implicitly defined curves \( \text{Tr} \Phi_{\frac{\pi}{n} \rightarrow (2\pi - \frac{1}{n})} = \pm 2 \) separate the stable/unstable regions in the parameter space.

5.3.1. Solution of equation \( \text{Tr} \Phi_{\frac{\pi}{n} \rightarrow (2\pi - \frac{1}{n})} = 2 \). Solutions to this equation can be without any difficulties found numerically, see Figure \( \ref{fig:1} \). Some quantitative characteristics are however given by explicit formulae. For example the solution curves intersect the horizontal axis at points where

\[
2 \cos \left( 2\pi \sqrt{n} \right) = 2,
\]

which holds for

\[
\alpha = k^2,
\]

where \( k \in \mathbb{N} \). Nontrivial intersection with the vertical axis \( \alpha = 0 \) is also straightforward to find, \( \beta_{\text{int}} = \pm \sqrt{\frac{2}{n\pi - 2}} \), see Figure \( \ref{fig:1} \).
5.3.2. Solution of equation $\text{Tr} \Phi_\alpha^{(2\pi - \frac{1}{n})} = -2$. The equation has only trivial solutions for $\beta = 0$. (It has no solutions for $\beta \neq 0$.) If $\beta = 0$, then we use (33), and we see that $\text{Tr} \Phi_\alpha^{(2\pi - \frac{1}{n})} = -2$ reduces to

$$2 \cos (2\pi \sqrt{\alpha}) = -2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (36)

This equation has solutions

$$\alpha = \left( k + \frac{1}{2} \right)^2,$$ \hspace{1cm} (37)

where $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The fact that for sufficiently high $n$ there are no additional solutions in the neighbourhood of the point $[\alpha, \beta] = [\frac{1}{4}, 0]$ can be shown by the following argument which is easy to extend to other $\alpha$ parameters in the form (37). The equation $\text{Tr} \Phi_\alpha^{(2\pi - \frac{1}{n})} = -2$ reads

$$4\beta^2 n^2 (4\alpha + \beta^2 n^2) \sin^2 \left( \alpha \sqrt{\alpha} = \frac{2\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) + \beta^4 n^4 \cos \left( 2\pi \sqrt{\alpha} - \frac{8\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) - 2\beta^2 n^2 (4\alpha + \beta^2 n^2) \cos \left( \frac{4\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) + \cos \left( 2\pi \sqrt{\alpha} \right) \left( 4\alpha + \beta^2 n^2 \right)^2 \over 8\alpha^2 = -2,$$ \hspace{1cm} (38)

which can be rewritten as

$$\beta^4 n^4 \left[ 4 \sin^2 \left( \alpha \sqrt{\alpha} - \frac{2\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) + \cos \left( 2\pi \sqrt{\alpha} - \frac{8\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) - 2 \cos \left( \frac{4\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) + \cos \left( 2\pi \sqrt{\alpha} \right) \right]$$

$$+ 4\alpha \beta^2 n^2 \left[ 4 \sin^2 \left( \alpha \sqrt{\alpha} - \frac{2\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) - 2 \cos \left( \frac{4\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) + 2 \cos \left( 2\pi \sqrt{\alpha} \right) \right] = -16\alpha^2 \left[ 1 + \cos \left( 2\pi \sqrt{\alpha} \right) \right].$$ \hspace{1cm} (39)

Clearly, the pair $\alpha = \frac{1}{4}$ and $\beta = 0$ is a solution to (39) for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. On the other hand, if $\alpha = \frac{1}{4}$, meaning that if $\alpha$ is close to $\frac{1}{4}$ but not equal to $\frac{1}{4}$, then the right-hand side of (39) is negative, while the terms $A$ and $B$ are for sufficiently high $n$ nonnegative. Consequently, equation (38) has no solution in the neighbourhood of $\frac{1}{4}$ except of the trivial solution $\alpha = \frac{1}{4}$ and $\beta = 0$.

The nonnegativity of $A$ and $B$ follows from the manipulation

$$A = 4 \sin^2 \left( \alpha \sqrt{\alpha} - \frac{2\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) + \cos \left( 2\pi \sqrt{\alpha} - \frac{8\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) - 2 \cos \left( \frac{4\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) + \cos \left( 2\pi \sqrt{\alpha} \right)$$

$$= 2 - 2 \cos \left( \alpha \sqrt{\alpha} - \frac{4\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) + 2 \cos \left( 2\pi \sqrt{\alpha} - \frac{4\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) \cos \left( \frac{4\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) + 2 \cos \left( 2\pi \sqrt{\alpha} \right) \frac{4\sqrt{\alpha}}{n}$$

$$= 2 \left[ \cos \left( \frac{4\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) - 1 \right] \cos \left( 2\pi \sqrt{\alpha} - \frac{4\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) - 2 \left[ \cos \left( \frac{4\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) - 1 \right] \cos \left( \alpha \sqrt{\alpha} - \frac{4\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) - 1$$

$$= 2 \left[ 1 - \cos \left( \frac{4\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) \right] \left[ 1 - \cos \left( 2\pi \sqrt{\alpha} - \frac{4\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) \right] \geq 0.$$ \hspace{1cm} (40)

(The nonnegativity holds for arbitrary $n$ and arbitrary positive $\alpha$.) Regarding the term $B$, we see that it can be rewritten as

$$B = 4 \sin^2 \left( \pi \sqrt{\alpha} - \frac{2\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) - 2 \cos \left( \frac{4\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) + 2 \cos \left( 2\pi \sqrt{\alpha} \right)$$

$$= 4 \sin^2 \left( \pi \sqrt{\alpha} - \frac{2\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) - 4 \sin \left( \pi \sqrt{\alpha} + \frac{2\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) \sin \left( \pi \sqrt{\alpha} - \frac{2\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) - 2 \cos \left( \frac{4\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) + 2 \cos \left( 2\pi \sqrt{\alpha} \right)$$

$$= 4 \left[ \sin \left( \pi \sqrt{\alpha} - \frac{2\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) + \sin \left( \pi \sqrt{\alpha} + \frac{2\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) \right] \sin \left( \pi \sqrt{\alpha} - \frac{2\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) \sin \left( \pi \sqrt{\alpha} - \frac{2\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right)$$

$$= -8 \sin \left( \frac{4\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) \cos \left( 2\pi \sqrt{\alpha} \right) \sin \left( \pi \sqrt{\alpha} - \frac{2\sqrt{\alpha}}{n} \right) \geq 0,$$ \hspace{1cm} (41)
where we need to consider sufficiently high \( n \) and \( \alpha \) close to \( \frac{1}{4} \).

\[
\frac{d^2 \theta}{dt^2} + \left( \frac{g}{l} - \frac{A \Omega^2}{l} \cos(\Omega t) \right) \sin \theta = 0.
\]

For small oscillations \( \sin \theta \approx \theta \), the dimensionless counterpart of (42) is the Mathieu equation

\[
\frac{d^2 \theta^*}{dt^*2} + \left( \alpha + \beta \cos t^* \right) \theta^* = 0,
\]
where $\alpha = \frac{\omega_0^2}{T^2}$ and $\beta = \frac{A_l}{T}$. The corresponding Ince–Strutt stability diagram is shown in Figure 6. Note that the stability diagram is nowadays very easy to produce, since many software packages, for example Wolfram Mathematica, have built-in routines for special functions such as Mathieu functions. In particular, the diagram shown in Figure 6 has been produced in Wolfram Mathematica using the built-in routines MathieuCharacteristicA and MathieuCharacteristicB. However, the implementation of routines for special functions such as Mathieu functions is far from being trivial, see, for example, Alhargan (1996) for a related discussion, and it usually heavily relies on fine analytical results and approximations, see especially the pioneering work by Ince (1927) and numerous monographs on Mathieu functions such as McLachlan (1947) or Magnus and Winkler (1979).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure6}
\caption{Classical Ince–Strutt diagram. Stable and unstable regions in the $(\alpha, \beta)$ plane – motion of pendulum pivot given by a cosine wave. Stable regions are shown in white, while unstable regions are shown in grey.}
\end{figure}

\section{Discussion and conclusion}

The stability diagrams for the pendulum with moving pivot are indeed straightforward to obtain for the pivot motion described by a triangular wave and by the approximated rectangular wave. In particular, the
curves separating the stable and unstable regions in the stability diagram corresponding to the triangular wave are described by an explicit formula given in terms of elementary functions, see Section 4. This is in striking contrast with the classical analysis for the pivot motion described by a cosine wave that heavily relies on various approximations and properties of special functions.

Interestingly, in the case of the triangular wave the basic qualitative features of the stability diagrams are the same as for the classical case. Both stability diagrams have a stability region in the negative half-plane and close to the origin, compare Figure 1 and Figure 3, which means that both pivot motions can stabilise the pendulum in the upright position. Furthermore, the classical subharmonic resonance close to $\alpha = \frac{1}{4}$ is present both for the triangular and the cosine wave, compare again Figure 1 and Figure 3.

The fact that the qualitative behaviour of the two systems is in this regard the same makes the triangular wave an ideal candidate for the presentation of the parametric resonance phenomenon in the case of pendulum with a moving pivot. The rigorous analysis for the triangular wave is much simpler and complete than in the classical case of the cosine wave, hence the phenomenon is not obscured by the necessary mathematical manipulations as in the classical case.

The approximated rectangular wave also leads to a stability region in the negative half-plane and close to the origin, compare Figure 5 and Figure 6, which means that even this pivot motion can stabilise the pendulum in the upright position. However, the counterpart of the classical subharmonic resonance close to $\alpha = \frac{1}{4}$ is in this case not present, which challenges the classical “rule of thumb” regarding the destabilisation inducing frequencies via the parametric resonance mechanism.

Finally, let us remark that since we have analytical formulae for the monodromy matrices, in particular in the case of the triangular wave, the results can be generalised to the case of damped pendulum via the classical transformation, see, for example, [Jordan and Smith](2007).
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