

MIT OpenCourseWare  
<http://ocw.mit.edu>

6.002 Circuits and Electronics, Spring 2007

Please use the following citation format:

Anant Agarwal, *6.002 Circuits and Electronics, Spring 2007*  
(Massachusetts Institute of Technology: MIT  
OpenCourseWare). <http://ocw.mit.edu> (accessed MM DD,  
YYYY). License: Creative Commons Attribution-  
Noncommercial-Share Alike.

Note: Please use the actual date you accessed this material in your  
citation.

For more information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use,  
visit: <http://ocw.mit.edu/terms>

MIT OpenCourseWare  
<http://ocw.mit.edu>

6.002 Circuits and Electronics, Spring 2007  
Transcript – Lecture 20

All right. Good morning. Let's get going. In today's lecture we continue with the operational amplifier, "op amp" for short. And what we are going to do is just build up a bunch of fun building blocks using the op amp.

As a quick review -- To quickly review what we've seen about the op amp -- We represented the op amp as a device that looked like this where the amplifier had an incredibly high gain. So, if I had a small voltage difference here -- I call this  $v_+$  and this  $v_-$  with respect to ground.

And if I had a small voltage difference then this gain here would multiply the difference by a large number and thereby giving me an output that was on the order of a million times greater than this difference.

And because of that when I use the op amp in a mode like this without any negative feedback the output would usually crank up to the positive rail or the negative rail. We also saw that it had infinite input resistance so that the current flowing in here or here was zero and also had zero output resistance.

This is my ideal op amp where irrespective of what load I connect here the op amp would supply pretty much any current. Now, in practical op amps that's not the case. But suffice it to say that when used as an ideal op amp the output impedance, the output resistance is going to be zero.

The op amp is a huge workhorse of the analog industry. You will see based both on what you've done on Tuesday and Wednesday but also today that it's very, very simple to build circuits using the op amp.

When you use the amplifier, you don't have to worry about things like nonlinear analysis. You don't have to worry about am I really meeting the criteria for saturation limits and so on? To some extent you have to think about that with the op amp, too, because if the output hits the positive rail or negative rail it isn't going to behave like you expect it to.

But fundamentally with this primitive model, this idea model it becomes really simple to build circuits with the op amp. Therefore it has become a key building block for circuits. When circuit designers build analog circuits very often their primitive building blocks are really an amplifier of this sort, an op amp, resistors, capacitors and some of our other primitive building elements.

If you look at the course notes the readings are -- There are a bunch of examples solved in Chapter 16. And you will see that using the op amp it is indeed possible to build current sources that look like more or less ideal current sources.

It is also possible to build voltage sources and so on. It is an incredibly neat building block using which you can do all kinds of cool stuff. In this course you will see a whole bunch of example circuits using the op amp.

In today's lecture you will see things like a subtractor. You will also see integrators and a differentiator. And then in your lab, lab four, you will build a really fun mixed signal circuit involving both digital and analog components.

And you will build what is called a digital to an analog converter using the op amp. And of course I can build all our good-old amplifiers and circuits of that sort. In a later lecture you will also see how we can build filters using an op amp.

This is going to be using the knowledge you learn in terms of connecting resistors, capacitors and inductors together and doing a frequency domain analysis, well we can throw the op amp in there and build filters, too.

This is just to give you a preview of upcoming attractions. For today I am going to focus on these circuits. I won't be covering any new theory or any new set of foundations but pretty much take the simple properties that I have explained to you about the op amp.

And using those simple properties very quickly build up a bunch of circuits that you can use to analyze signals in a variety of ways. Let's start with the following circuit. With op amps I start with this little guy.

And what I am going to do is use two voltage sources,  $v_1$ , and this is a resistor, not an inductor. And value  $R_1$ , value  $R_2$ . So, I have a voltage connected by a divider, voltage divider to the plus input.

And I am going to provide some negative feedback in the following way. This is going to be  $R_2$ , the same as this one here, a resistor  $R_1$ . And then a voltage source  $v_2$  that I connect out here. So notice that—Oh, and I take the output  $v_{OUT}$  out here.

And that  $v_{OUT}$  of course is with respect to ground, and  $R_2$ ,  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  are also connected to ground. What I am going to do is analyze the circuit it two different ways, and as I analyze it describe some other interesting properties to you.

In the last lecture the technique I used to analyze op amps was one in which I replaced the op amp with its ideal model involving a dependent source and so on with a large gain  $A$  and showed that. I wrote the expression and then I let  $A$  increase to infinity to the limits and got an expression that was independent of  $A$ .

And then in recitation yesterday you would have covered another technique which makes it much simpler to analyze op amps. Let me very quickly review that method. We fondly call that technique, there is no formal name for it, but we fondly call that  $v$  plus more or less equal to  $v$  minus method.

This is also variously called the virtual ground method and so on, but we shall call it the  $v$  plus more or less equal to  $v$  minus method. The insight here is that whenever I use the op amp in a way in which I am giving it negative feedback, so I am feeding some portion of the output to its negative input.

I am giving it negative feedback. That's one property. Second property is that my inputs,  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ , and my resistance values are chosen such that the output is not in saturation. So, the op amp is not at the plus  $V_S$  rail or minus  $V_S$  rail.

Rather it's somewhere in the middle in its active region. When that happens we claim that the  $v$  minus and  $v$  plus for the op amp are more or less equal. And to give you some intuition as to why that is so, let's say the output is 6 volts and my supply is plus/minus 12.

This is 6 volts and the amplifier is a gain of a million, ten to the six. To sustain 6 volts at the output all I need is a difference of 6 microvolts

here. Six divided by ten to the six is the difference between  $v_{plus}$  and  $v_{minus}$ .

It's very, very, very small. It's so small as to make  $v_{plus}$  more or less equal to  $v_{minus}$ . All it takes is a very small differential voltage here to give you 6 volts at the output. The key thing to observe is under negative feedback, when the op amp is not in saturation the property that  $v_{plus}$  equals  $v_{minus}$  holds.

And the way it works is that it's not that it's a magical property. It is simply that when I apply negative feedback the negative feedback is such that it will force this  $v_{minus}$  node here to be at more or less the same voltage as  $v_{plus}$ .

Remember the when in doubt simply go back and think about the anti lock brakes example we did last time. For example if  $v_{plus}$  increases the output will increase and so will the voltage here and tend to make these two equal.

What we can do, being rather tricky here, what we'll do is say look, if we know for a fact that under negative feedback the op amp is going to engineer these two node voltages to be more or less equal then why don't I just use that fact to begin with and analyze my circuit assuming that it's true.

This is just a bit of inverted logic here that says look, the circuit is going to make that happen. If the circuit is going to make that happen to analyze the circuit in its steady state, why don't I just go ahead and assume that to begin with? This again goes back to us wanting to be engineers here and do whatever is simply and find the simplest possible way of getting some place.

I want to use that method, the  $v_{plus}$  equals  $v_{minus}$  method. Let me just first write down some values that I know about. I know that  $v_{plus}$  is simply a voltage divider relation here. That's  $v_1$  times  $R_2$  divided by  $R_1$  plus  $R_2$ .

And by the  $v_{plus}$  equals  $v_{minus}$  method I know that this is going to be equal to  $v_{minus}$ . And this is going to be true because I am giving you negative feedback here. And we are going to engineer the values of  $R_1$ ,  $R_2$ ,  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  such that the op amp is not in saturation.

So, we know that. The next thing that we know, let's say this is a current  $i$ . This current  $i$  flows here. Know that there is no current going

in here. Op amp has an infinite input resistance so there is nothing going in there.

There is no current going in there. If there is no current going in here, what must happen to  $i$ ? Remember, from the foundations of the universe Maxwell's equations and therefore KVL and KCL hold. KVL and KCL simply come straight from nature.

You and I cannot mess with that. Bad things happen to you if you do. So, nature, Maxwell's equations, KVL, KCL. It's simply nature. So, KCL applies here. Current comes in here. Nothing goes there.

Don't argue. The current has to go here, period. No if, ands or buts. There is  $i$  coming in here, nothing goes there, so that current must flow here. It has no choice. It's from basic nature. I can write down what my current  $i$  is going to look like.

What is  $i$  going to look like? Well, I know  $v_2$ , I know  $v$  minus.  $v$  minus is the same as  $v$  plus. And  $v$  plus is the  $i$  expression given here. So, I can write  $i$  as  $v_2$  minus  $v$  minus divided by  $R_1$ . Let me keep track of those two and then go ahead and compute  $v_{OUT}$ .

So, my goal in life is compute  $v_{OUT}$  as a function of the two input voltages  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ . And just for kicks I have gone ahead and computed some of the intermediate node voltages and currents. How do I write  $v_{OUT}$ ? What is  $v_{OUT}$ ?  $v_{OUT}$  is simply  $v$  minus from KVL.

$v_{OUT}$  is simply  $v$  minus minus the drop across this resistor. So, the drop across that resistor is simply  $iR_2$ . From good-old KVL from the first lecture, a voltage minus the drop across the resistor is equal to  $v_{OUT}$ .

Therefore it's simply  $v$  minus minus  $iR_2$ . One thing to be very cautious about, I will tell you right now, is that the output here relates to the inversion of the voltage across this resistor  $R_2$ . Be very, very careful in that if I have a voltage across this resistor here that impacts  $v_{OUT}$  with a minus sign attached to it.

Notice that  $iR_2$  is the voltage across  $R_2$  and  $v_{OUT}$  relates to the negative of that. Be very cautious. That's one of the commonest silly mistakes I have seen people make in solving problems like this.

Let's go ahead. I know  $v$  minus and I don't know  $i$ . Let me substitute for  $i$  for now, and that is  $v_2$  minus  $v$  minus divided by  $R_1$  times  $R_2$ . Let

me go ahead and collect all the  $v$  minuses.  $v$  minus, I get a one here, minus minus becomes a plus, and so I get  $R_2$  divided by  $R_1$  out there.

And then I minus  $v_2 R_2$  divided by  $R_1$ . That is  $v_{OUT}$ . Now let me go ahead and substitute for  $v$  minus. And that is simply  $v_1 R_2$  divided by  $R_1$  plus  $R_2$ . That is  $v$  minus. And this character here is simplified to be  $R_1$ ,  $R_1$  plus  $R_2$  minus  $v_2 R_2$  divided by  $R_1$ .

What do we get? I cancel these two suckers out and what I end up with is  $v_1 R_2$  divided by  $R_1$  minus  $v_2 R_2$  divided by  $R_1$ , which is simply  $R_2/R_1(v_1-v_2)$ . What is interesting here is that what I have ended up building is a very primitive subtractor.

So, my output relates to  $v_1$  minus  $v_2$  multiplied by the constant factor given by  $R_2$  divided by  $R_1$ . Again, as I pointed out to you at the beginning of this lecture, no new foundations today, no new theories, no new disciplines, no new laws.

We are just going to take what you have learned -- Three simple things, infinite gain, infinite input resistance, zero output resistance, plus this new thing  $v$  plus equals  $v$  minus. And just being armed with those four principles we are just going to charge ahead and analyze a bunch of circuits.

It is purely intellectual and pure applications today. This is one way of doing it. There is another way of solving it. We can solve the circuit. Remember, whenever you see a linear circuit and you see two sources or three sources, just think superposition, right? You see a linear circuit and two or three sources, think superposition.

We should be able to apply superposition to this. The op amp is simply another building block. It's a linear circuit. So, let's see if we get the same answer. Let's try to solve the circuit using superposition and see if we get the same answer.

To do superposition what I am going to do is build two subcircuits. One subcircuit in which  $v_1$  is zero, and that subcircuit looks like this. If I set  $v_1$  to be zero then I get  $R_1$  parallel  $R_2$  going to ground.

So, if  $v_1$  is set to zero then  $R_1$  goes to ground. And I get  $R_1$  parallel  $R_2$  here. And of course I have  $v_2$  as before. And this was  $R_1$ , this was  $R_2$ , and let me call that  $v_{OUT1}$ . Oh, I'm sorry. Let me call it  $v_{OUT2}$  corresponding to that component of the output that relates to  $v_2$  acting alone.

Remember superposition? Build two subcircuits, one that depends on  $v_2$  and another one that depends on  $v_1$ . Let's do the second one, too. Second one is  $v_2$  going to zero. Here is my little op amp. And what I will do is simply flip the op amp just to see if you can identify some interesting patterns.

Just flip the op amp around. And this is  $v_1$  as before. And recall that  $v_1$  was going to the plus node through a resistor  $R_1$ . And then I had a  $R_2$  to ground. And then let me short  $v_2$  to ground. And when I short  $v_2$  to ground what happens? When I short  $v_2$  to ground what happens is that the tail of  $R_1$  here goes to ground.

And so it is as if the output is connected to the node  $v$  minus through a resistor, so it as if the output  $v$   $R_2$  is connected to the minus input through a resistor. We will draw it like this. And the minus input goes through a resistor  $R_1$ , to ground.

If you thought that patterns were important in the earlier part of the course doing voltage divider patterns and current divider patterns and amplifier pattern, the source follower pattern, op amps is all about patterns.

You should remember two or three simple patterns and be able to write down the expression for those just by observation. So, this is one common pattern that you have seen before in the very first lecture.

And I just wrote it down in that manner. Let me go ahead and solve this circuit. It turns out that this is also a pattern. I will analyze it today but in the future  $v_2$  going to this node through  $R_1$  and then  $R_2$  to the output.

You have probably also seen this in your recitation. This one is called an inverting connection and this one here is called a non-inverting connection. Let's go ahead and do  $v_{OUT2}$ .  $v_{OUT2}$  is simply given by, notice that since this is ground, no current flowing here, this voltage is zero.

If this voltage is zero, this voltage is zero by the  $v$  plus equals  $v$  minus method. If this is zero, the current that goes through here is  $v_2$  divided by  $R_1$ . And that same current must flow through the resistance  $R_2$  as well.



If the current  $v_2$  divided by  $R_1$  flows through this resistor, the drop across this resistor is simply given by, let me hide this for a second, is simply given by  $v_2$ . So,  $v_2$  divided by  $R_1$  is the current here.

This is zero. So, the drop across this resistor is  $v_2 R_1$  multiplied by  $R_2$ . That's a drop across this resistor. This voltage is simply zero minus a drop across the resistor. So, it's zero minus the drop across the resistor and that gives me  $v_2$ .

Again, remember this minus sign comes in when I want to convert this to get the output voltage from that. This is a very common pattern. It's called an inverting connection where the output is some factor of the input voltage and the factor is given by  $R_2$  divided by  $R_1$ .

Let's go ahead and analyze this guy now. What is  $v_{OUT1}$  equal to? I should have called this  $v_{OUT1}$  because it relates to  $v_1$ .  $v_{OUT1}$ . There is a  $v$  plus here. From our first lecture I know that  $v_{OUT1}$  relates to  $v$  plus in the following way.

I know that it is  $v$  plus times the sum of the resistances divided by  $R_1$ . Based on the first lecture this is true.  $v_{OUT1}$  is simply an amplified version of  $v$  plus where the amplification factor is given by  $R_1$  plus  $R_2$  divided by  $R_1$ .

And I know  $v$  plus is simply a voltage divider action here. And I can take a simple voltage divider action here because the current going in is zero. Looking in here this is as if it's an infinite resistance, so it is as if the element simply does not exist.

The voltage here is simply  $v_1$  divided by  $R_1$  plus  $R_2$  multiplied by  $R_2$ , our voltage divider pattern. So, I get  $v_1$  times  $R_2$  divided by  $R_1$  plus  $R_2$  times  $R_1$  plus  $R_2$  divided by  $R_1$ . These two cancel out which gives me  $v_{OUT1}$  is simply  $v_1 R_2$  divided by  $R_1$ .

To get  $v_{OUT}$  I add up the two.  $v_{OUT}$  is  $v_{OUT1}$  plus  $v_{OUT2}$ , which is my goal. And that is simply  $v_1 R_2$  by  $R_1$  minus  $v_2 R_2$  by  $R_1$ .

Thankfully what we have here is the same as here. Again, there is really nothing new that I am going to cover today.

Simply apply, apply, apply, four simple principles. Here I have used superposition and I am showing you a circuit. So, it turns out with op amps you should really remember that pattern. You will see it again and again and again.

And each time you see it, it will save you six minutes of having to solve the circuit without knowing the pattern. So, remember this pattern. You can pick up another three or four minutes by remembering this pattern here.

This pattern is simply  $v_2 R_2$  divided by  $R_1$ . Imprint those two patterns into your brains. OK, so those are a couple of simple circuits using the op amp. We built a subtractor. The next step, let's go ahead and try to build an integrator.

Using this little building block we can go ahead and try to build a bunch of circuits. We can build filters, A to D converters and so on. Let's build an integrator. Abstractly I need to build this box.

Which when fed a  $v_I$ , I want that box to integrate and give me a  $v_O$  which is  $v_I$  integrated over time. That is what I want to build. How do I go about building it? What I would like to do next is give you some flavor for design.

How do you go about designing things with an op amp? Knowing that you do not know the pattern for this yet, how do you go about designing things? Well, let's start with the following intuition. The intuition that I begin with is that if I have a current  $i$ , and remember that capacitors and inductors related to, you saw differentiation and integration happening when we dealt with capacitors and inductors.

So, I think we have to invoke a capacitor here or an inductor. In this example I invoke a capacitor. Notice that if I stick a capacitor in here this current is  $i$ , capacitance  $C$ , then my voltage  $v_O$  is given by what? Voltage is simply the integral of the current flowing through it or vice versa  $i$  is  $C dv/dt$ .

If  $i$  is  $C dv/dt$  then  $v$  is simply one by  $C$  integral. If I can pass the current through a capacitor then the voltage across the capacitor must be a current. Notice then that  $v_O$  is related to  $i dt$ . I have some multiplying constants and so on, but fundamentally what I have found is if I can stick a current through a capacitor then the voltage across the capacitor relates to the integral of the current.

OK, that's interesting. So, I have an integral in there. But I have a current. Notice my goal was to integrate a voltage. What I figured out how to do was if I can turn that voltage into a current -- If I can turn that voltage into a proportional current and then pump that current through a capacitor I will get the integration that I want.

How do I convert my  $v_I$  to  $i$ ? How do I do that? Well, let's take a stab at it. Here is my  $v_I$ . Let's take the resistor  $R$ . And remember I need to stick the capacitor here. I have some current  $I$  here.

I don't know what the current is yet. And I stick a voltage here. And what I am trying to do is trying to see if I stick a voltage and a resistance in series then there is some relationship between the current and this voltage.

Recall that I am trying to make this current be directly proportional to the voltage  $v_I$ . But it turns out that  $i$  here is not equal to  $v_I$  divided by  $R$ . If  $i$  was  $v_I$  divided by  $R$  somehow, I am done. If  $i$  was  $v_I$  divided by  $R$ , by some magic, then I have converted my voltage to a current, I feed that current through my capacitor and  $v_O$  is my integral that I am looking for.

But unfortunately  $i$  is not equal to  $v_I$  divided by  $R$ . You know that.  $i$  relates to  $v_I$  minus the capacitor voltage divided by  $R$ . So,  $i$  is not simply  $v_I$  divided by  $R$  for all time but  $i$  is really  $v_I$  minus the capacitor voltage divided by  $R$ .

And, in fact, when we did RC circuits you wrote this equation to represent the dynamics of the circuit,  $RC \frac{dv_O}{dt} + v_O = v_I$ . We wrote down this circuit for a first order RC, wrote this equation for a first order RC circuit.

Now, it does turn out, to wrap up on this wild goose chase that we went on, it does turn out that if this term here is much bigger than that term. If this term is much bigger than that term then I can ignore that term and write down  $RC \frac{dv_O}{dt} \approx v_I$ .

If that were true, this would be true, and then  $v_O$  would be more or less equal to one by  $RC$  integral of  $v_I dt$ . Again, if this were true. If this were true for all time then  $v_O$  would be integral of  $v_I dt$ .

Again, remember this is all a wild goose chase. Just write down WGC there just so you don't get confused. I am on this wild goose hunt here trying to find a way to get a current from a voltage which I can then feed into a capacitor.

This was one thing I knew, but this was not what I want. But it does turn out to be what I want when  $v_O$  is very, very small. So, I see some glimmer of hope but not quite. It turns that in  $R$  and  $C$ , if I make  $R$

and  $C$  very, very big, if I have a huge time constant, with a huge time constant the voltage  $v_O$  looks like an integral of  $v_I$ , but only when I have a very huge time constant.

So, I give up on that track. Instead I try something else. Another try. I would like you to notice if you take your op amp, here is your op amp, if you take this op amp and you stick the positive terminal to ground, under reasonable feedback, under reasonable negative feedback what do you notice about the current? If I had a current  $i$  flowing here what did you notice? Look at this picture.

I had a current  $i$  flowing in here,  $v_2$  divided by  $R_1$ . And because this resistance was infinite all the current went through the upper terminal. So, this is zero volts. And by the  $v_+$  equals  $v_-$  method this is also more or less equal to zero.

And I have a current  $i$  flowing in here, nothing goes here, so then the  $i$  must flow up there. So, all I am doing here is causing a reflection of the current from this grounded node. My current is being reflected into, or deflected if you feel like it, the upper edge here after coming in through this edge.

That is interesting. We are just one step away from the key insight. I have an  $i$  coming in here, an  $i$  going out there. Notice that, as I said before, this is zero volts. How do I get my voltage  $v_I$  to look like a current, to become proportional to a current? It is simple now.

All I do is put a voltage  $v_I$  and put a resistor  $R$  out there. If I do that, and since this is zero, the current  $i$  is given by  $v_I$  divided by  $R$ . I have gotten to where I want to be. So, by using an op amp and using the fact that the minus node here,  $v_-$  is at the same potential as  $v_+$  when there is negative feedback then I can stick a resistor here.

And because this is zero the current here is simply  $v_I$  divided by  $R$ . I have gotten to the first place. Now all I need to do is simply pump this current through a capacitor and I get the integral of the, the voltage becomes an integral of the current.

That is easy. I stick my capacitor here and I get my answer out there as  $v_O$ . Notice that when I do this, let's say this is plus/minus  $VC$ . This is zero. So,  $v_O$  is minus  $VC$ . Again, I will keep emphasizing it maybe 17 times throughout this course that if this is zero then the output here is related to the negative of this voltage, common, common, common mistake.

I will be very upset after doing all this if I see this mistake happen in any of the future homeworks or finals or whatever. This should not happen. So,  $v_O$  is a minus sign here  $V_C$ . And I know that if I have a current  $i$  through a capacitor what is  $V_C$ ? If I have current  $i$  through a capacitor then this is simply  $\int i dt$ .

And  $i$  by design is -- So, I have my integrator. It is a two-step process. I stuck a resistor here, so the current became equal to  $v_I$  divided by  $R$ . Then I took that current and pumped it through a capacitor through this terminal here, and the voltage across the capacitor for a current  $i$  is given by this expression.

This is Capacitors 101. OK Capacitors 101 says that the voltage across the capacitor is simply  $\frac{1}{C} \int i dt$ . Another way of looking at it is the voltage across the capacitor is  $C$ , I'm sorry, the current through a capacitor is  $C dv/dt$ .

This is simply the integral form of that equation. And I am done with my integrator. So, this is another very common building block. Remember this. Most of the circuits we will be seeing with op amps simply involve something here and some there.

And the output in this inverting connection is the output times, if it is a resistance it is simply  $R_2$  divided by  $R_1$ , if it's a capacitor I get the integral form looking like this. Yes. Can someone tell me where the negative sign went? The blackboard ate it up.

Good catch. After all that lecture about watching the negative sign. After this little bit of faux pas here, now I will be doubly mad if you guys make that mistake. All right. Now that we have built the integrator, I could give this out as a homework problem.

And you should be able to design a differentiator based on what you've learned here. You now have the tools to go and do some design like this, but we don't have any more homeworks left so I guess I will go ahead and solve this for you right here and do the design for you.

The building block that we need looks like this,  $d/dt$  here. Let me take a  $v_I$  and stick a  $v_I$  in there. That's what I want to build. And what I built here is that differentiator box. And what I would like to do now is build a differentiator box.

How do I go about doing it? I will go really slow here so you will have some time to think about it for yourselves and see if you folks are crack op amp circuit designers already, if you have the right instincts here.

Again, when you see differentiation integration think capacitors or inductors, it doesn't matter. In fact, as a homework exercise, you may want to go back and see how you can get a similar effect using inductors.

Can you play with inductors and get a similar effect? So, inductors are devices that are a dual of the capacitor. Whatever we will do with capacitors, there must be a corresponding way with inductors.

You can try it out in your spare time. Let's go back to this one here. I will stick with the capacitor way of looking at things. I need a differentiation now. Remember this. If I have a  $v_I$  and I stick this across a capacitor, I have a current  $C$  and some voltage  $v_C$  across the capacitor, what does  $i$  relate to?  $i$  is simply  $C dv/dt$  and  $v_C$  in this case is simply  $C \int v_I/dt$ .

If I can stick a voltage across a capacitor, if my input voltage is stuck across a capacitor then the resulting current relates to  $dv_I/dt$ . Here we have the opposite problem. By doing this simple trick, I can obtain a current that has the right form.

Now what I need to do is somehow convert that current into a voltage because the abstraction that I need is a voltage to voltage. The next step, what I need to do is somehow convert a current to a voltage.

How do I go about doing that? Again, remember for the op amp, if I have a current  $i$  flowing here then by the reflection property  $i$  gets pushed up into this edge, provided that the whole circuit is working with descent negative feedback.

Given this trick what I can do is say look, suppose I did this. Remember, my goal here is how do I convert a current to a voltage? I have a current  $i$  coming in here, and I can turn that into a voltage because I know the current must come out here, I know this current must come out there.

All I have to do is stick a resistor in there. If I stick a resistor in there what is  $v_O$  equal to?  $v_O$  is simply  $iR$ , right? That's right.  $v_O$ , I get  $i$

here, so  $i$  pumps through here. Remember, what comes in here must get reflected up because the current going in here is zero.

All the  $i$  must come out here. So, that  $i$  must pump through this resistor. The drop across this resistor is  $iR$ . That's the voltage drop across that resistor. And since this at a virtual ground the output here is simply zero minus this drop which is minus  $iR$ .

So, I have gotten to where I want to be. I have my current  $i$  being converted to a voltage. I have taken my current, and I have been able to convert that into a voltage by sticking a resistor in here.

As a final step, I simply need to produce the current. And that is pretty easy to do. Abstractly what I need to do, again, this is design here so we will talk about abstract stuff. If I had a voltage  $v_I$ , I need to produce a current which relates to  $C dv_I/dt$ .

And I know I can do that by simply doing this. By doing this I know my  $i$  is  $C dv_I$ , correct? If I can get this effect, I put this in quotes because that's my pattern. I am looking for a pattern, where a voltage  $v_I$  is directly applied across a capacitor.

And when that happens the current relates to  $C dv/dt$ . Let's go back to our op amp pattern here, op amp circuit. So far I have achieved -- I just repeated this out there. And so somehow I need to take this pattern here and learn from that pattern and apply the pattern here.

So, what I can do is, this is a ground node, correct? Now, the poor little capacitor, what does it care, whether it's a ground node or a virtual ground node? As long as it's a zero volt node down here what does it care? What I am going to do is stick this point, not here but into a virtual ground node.

I am going to grab that point, take it here and stick it here. The poor little capacitor doesn't know the difference. I have really suckered the little beast. This is  $v_I$ . Remember this. My  $i$  through the capacitor is proportional to  $C dv/dt$ .

Instead what I have done is taken this guy and stuck it here to get something like this. Just remember these four or five little tricks. And you apply them in op amp circuits again and again and again and again.

So, this is  $v_I$ , this is my virtual ground. As far as this poor little capacitor is concerned, it is chugging along merrily thinking that it is connected to ground. Little does it know it is only a virtual ground, all right? But the current  $i$  here is simply  $C dv_I/dt$ .

And that current, the  $C dv_I/dt$ , that current flows through here and gives me  $v_O$  as  $iR$ . So,  $v_O$  is simply minus  $R$ . Let me substitute for  $i$  there,  $C dv_I/dt$ . OK, so notice then that my  $v_O$  is now proportional to  $dv_I/dt$ .

So,  $v_O$  is some  $RC$  time constant times  $dv_I/dt$ . Therefore, I have my differentiator circuit. Remember this as a closing thought. Remember this  $v$  plus more or less equal to  $v$  minus trick. And to the extent possible simply use that trick to analyze op amp circuits under feedback and not in saturation.

Just remember these two. Very quickly for the demo, I have a square wave input here to the op amp, that's my  $v_I$  to the integrator. And this is the output  $v_O$ . The integral of a square wave is a triangular wave, as you can see.

And we will do the same thing for a differentiator. And for the differentiator, I input the square wave to this differentiator circuit. And I get this, wherever there is a sharp rise, I get this huge negative spike and a positive spike because of the minus sign.

So, this is the differentiator circuit. Then I feed this into the op amp. OK. Thank you.