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Abstract
We prove the existence of partially hyperbolic geodesic rays in the Newtonian N–body problem.

1 Introduction
In the context of the Newtonian N–body problem, in [MS] Ch. Marchal and D. Saari proved that a motion defined for every instant in the future evolves in such a way that the maximum separation \( R(t) \) among the bodies is superlinear:

\[
\lim_{t \to +\infty} \frac{R(t)}{t} = +\infty
\]

or the bodies evolve in linearly expanding clusters where a pair of bodies in a cluster remain at bounded distance or expand as \( t^{2/3} \).

The first case is called superhyperbolic and necessarily in this case the minimum distance between the bodies asymptotically goes to zero. For the second case, if each cluster consists of one body only, then the motion is hyperbolic and necessarily the energy is greater than zero. If there is only one cluster consisting of all the bodies, then the motion is parabolic and necessarily the energy is zero. The remaining case is called partially hyperbolic and has energy greater than zero.

The existence of hyperbolic and parabolic motions is well known for a long time ago in the form of homographic type motions. However, the existence of superhyperbolic and partially hyperbolic motions is an open problem.

Recently in [MV], E. Maderna and A. Venturelli developed a new method for the Newtonian N–body problem and proved, given an arbitrary initial configuration, positive energy level and final configuration without collisions, the existence of hyperbolic geodesic rays with the prescribed data. In particular, they proved the existence of non homographic hyperbolic motions\(^1\).

In [MdL], E. Maderna and A. da Luz proved the existence of parabolic geodesic rays and the non existence of parabolic geodesic lines\(^2\). The existence

---

\(^1\)In the ninth page of the mentioned paper, in the paragraph right after Corollary 1.8, we read: “...We do not know if there are partially hyperbolic geodesic rays.”

\(^2\)See also [MV2], where it was proved the existence of globally minimizing parabolic motions with a prescribed final minimizing central configuration. The reader should not confuse the concept of globally minimizing motion, i.e. fixed time minimizer on every compact interval of time, with that of free time minimizer motion or equivalently, a Jacobi–Maupertuis geodesic ray.
of hyperbolic geodesic lines is an open problem.

In this paper, we prove for the first time the existence of partially hyperbolic motions in the form of geodesic rays:

**Theorem 1.1.** There are partially hyperbolic geodesic rays with respect to the Jacobi–Mapertuis metric.

For the proof we use weak KAM Theory techniques and the method developed in [MV].

## 2 Preliminaries

Although minimalist, this brief section is intended to make the paper self-contained and the proof readable especially for readers not familiarized with the formalism.

Along the text, the configuration space will be $E^N$ where $E$ is the $n$–dimensional euclidean space and $N$ is the number of bodies.

### 2.1 Final evolution of $N$–body systems

Given a motion $\gamma : [t_0, +\infty) \to E^N$, define the distance functions:

$$R(t) := \max_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} r_{ij}(t), \quad r(t) := \min_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} r_{ij}(t)$$

where $r_{ij}(t) := ||x_i(t) - x_j(t)||_E$ for any configuration $x \in E^n$. Denote by $\Omega$ the open set of noncollision configurations.

The following Theorem of Ch. Marchal and D. Saari ([MS], Theorem 1) describes the final evolution of motions defined for every instant in the future:

**Theorem 2.1.** Let $\gamma$ be a motion defined for all $t > t_0$. Then either $R(t)/t \to +\infty$ and $r(t) \to 0$, or there is a configuration $a \in E^n$ such that

$$\gamma(t) = at + O(t^{2/3}).$$

In particular, systems evolve in linearly expanding clusters and bodies in the same cluster expand as $O(t^{2/3})$. The configuration $a$ in the previous Theorem will be called the final configuration.

The previous Theorem motivates the following definition:

**Definition 2.1.** Consider a motion defined for all $t > t_0$. It is superhyperbolic if:

$$\lim_{t \to +\infty} \sup \frac{R(t)}{t} = +\infty$$

In particular, for superhyperbolic motions the quotient $R(t)/t$ diverges and $r(t) \to 0$.

**Definition 2.2.** Consider a non superhyperbolic motion defined for all $t > t_0$ with final configuration

$$a = (a_1, a_2, \ldots a_N)$$

with each $a_i$ in $E$. The motion is classified as follows:
1. **Hyperbolic** if \( a \) is in \( \Omega \).

2. **Partially hyperbolic** if \( a \neq 0 \) and \( a \) is in the complement of \( \Omega \).

3. **Parabolic** if \( a = 0 \).

In terms of the linearly expanding clusters mentioned before, a non super-hyperbolic motion is hyperbolic if each cluster has one body only, parabolic if there is only one cluster (necessarily of zero energy) and partially hyperbolic otherwise.

### 2.2 Minimizer motions

Given an absolute continuous curve \( \gamma : [0, \tau] \to E^N \), its Lagrangian action is:

\[
AL(\gamma) = \int_0^\tau ds \ L(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s))
\]

where \( L : E^N \times E^N \to \mathbb{R} \) is the Newtonian Lagrangian \( L(x, v) = T(v) + U(x) \) such that:

\[
T(v) = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i ||v_i||^2_E}{2}, \quad U(x) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} \frac{m_i m_j}{||x_i - x_j||_E}
\]

where \( T \) is the kinetic energy and \( U \) is the potential \(^3\). The Newtonian Lagrangian is a particular case of a Tonelli Lagrangian and by Tonelli’s Theorem on the lower semicontinuity of the action, there is a minimum among the space \( C(x, y, \tau) \) of absolute continuous curves joining the configurations \( x \) and \( y \) in time \( \tau \):

\[
\phi(x, y, \tau) = \min \{AL(\gamma) \mid \gamma \in C(x, y, \tau)\}
\]

\[
\phi(x, y) = \min \{AL(\gamma) \mid \gamma \in C(x, y, \tau), \tau > 0\}
\]

These functions are the **fixed action potential** and **free (or critical) action potential** respectively in Aubry–Mather Theory [Ma].

Every minimizer is a critical curve hence it is a solution of the Euler–Lagrange equations, Newton equations for the Newtonian Lagrangian, and it is a motion whenever the solution does not have collisions. However, as it was noticed by H. Poincaré [Po], there are finite action curves with isolated collisions hence a minimizer could a priori not be a true motion.

The following Theorem, whose main idea was given by Ch. Marchal [Mar] and complete proofs given by A. Chenciner [Ch] and by D. Ferrario and S. Terracini [FT], unlocks the use of variational methods in the Newtonian \( N \)-body problem.

**Theorem 2.2.** Suppose \( \dim E \geq 2 \). If \( \gamma : [a, b] \to E^N \) is such that \( AL(\gamma) = \phi(\gamma(a), \gamma(b), b-a) \), then \( \gamma(t) \in \Omega \) for all \( t \in (a, b) \).

For a Tonelli Lagrangian \( L \), the following is the **supercritical action potential** defined by R. Mañé in [Ma] :

\[
\phi_h(x, y) = \min \{AL(\gamma) + h\tau \mid \gamma \in C(x, y, \tau), \tau > 0\}
\]

In the case of the Newtonian Lagrangian, because the Mañé’s critical value of the Newtonian \( N \)-body Lagrangian is zero, the previous definition only makes sense for \( h \geq 0 \).

\(^3\)The potential \( U \) is opposite to the potential energy \( V \): \( U = -V \).
Definition 2.3. An absolute continuous curve $\gamma$ defined for all $t \geq 0$ is a $h \geq 0$ free time minimizer if

$$A_{L+h} (\gamma_{[t,t+\tau]}) = \phi_h (\gamma(t), \gamma(t+\tau))$$

for every $t, \tau \geq 0$.

Proposition 2.3. Every $h > 0$ free time minimizer is a non superhyperbolic motion with energy $h$.

Free time minimizers defined for every instant in the future are geodesic rays with respect to the Jacobi–Maupertuis metric. The following is Theorem 1.1 in [MV]:

Theorem 2.4. For any $h > 0$, any configuration $x$ and any configuration $a$ without collisions, there is a hyperbolic geodesic ray starting at $a$ with energy $h$ and final configuration $a$.

### 2.3 Weak KAM Theory

Consider the Hamiltonian $H : (T\Omega)^* \to \mathbb{R}$, the Legendre transformation of the Lagrangian $L$:

$$H(x, p) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{2m_i} |p_i|^2 - U(x)$$

where each $p_i$ is in the dual space $E^*$.

Definition 2.4. A continuous function $u : E^N \to \mathbb{R}$ is a viscosity solution of the Hamilton–Jacobi equation if it is a sub and supersolution where

1. it is a subsolution if $H(x_0, d_{x_0} \psi) \leq h$ for any $\psi \in C^1(\Omega)$ and any local maximum $x_0$ of $u - \psi$.
2. it is a supersolution if $H(x_0, d_{x_0} \psi) \geq h$ for any $\psi \in C^1(\Omega)$ and any local minimum $x_0$ of $u - \psi$.

Viscosity solutions of the Hamilton–Jacobi equation were defined by M. G. Crandall and P–L. Lions in [CL] and used in the context of Lagrangian dynamics and weak KAM Theory by A. Fathi [Fa]. The weak KAM Theory for $N$–body problems was established by E. Maderna in [Mad].

Definition 2.5. A continuous function $u : E^N \to \mathbb{R}$ is dominated by $L + h$ if

$$u(x) - u(y) \leq \phi_h(x, y)$$

for every $x$ and $y$ in $E^N$. We denote this property by $u \prec L + h$.

In the following Proposition, the direct is from general Theory and the converse is Proposition 2.8 in [MV].

Proposition 2.5. $u \prec L + h$ iff $u$ is a Hamilton–Jacobi viscosity subsolution.

By Rademacher’s Theorem, for almost every point $x$ in $\Omega$, a viscosity subsolution $u$ is differentiable at $x$ and $H(x, d_x u) \leq h$.

For $h > 0$, the supercritical action potential $\phi_h$ is a distance hence, by triangular inequality, $u_p$ defined by $u_p(x) = \phi_h(x, p)$ is a Hamilton–Jacobi viscosity subsolution for every configuration $p$.  

4
Definition 2.6. Consider a Hamilton–Jacobi viscosity subsolution $u : [a, b] \to \mathbb{E}^N$. The curve is

1. $h$–calibrating of $u$ if $u(\gamma(a)) - u(\gamma(b)) = A_{L+h}(\gamma)$.
2. $h$–minimizer of $L$ if $\phi_h(\gamma(a), \gamma(b)) = A_{L+h}(\gamma)$.

Remark 2.1. Every $h$–calibrating curve of $u \preceq L + h$ is an $h$–minimizer of $L$ for

$$u(\gamma(a)) - u(\gamma(b)) \leq \phi_h(\gamma(a), \gamma(b)) \leq A_{L+h}(\gamma).$$

However, in contrast with minimizers, calibrating curves can be concatenated. This a direct consequence of the definition.

Definition 2.7. A continuous function $u : \mathbb{E}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ is an $h$–horofunction if there is a sequence $(p_n)$ such that $||p_n|| \to +\infty$ and

$$u(x) = \lim_{n \to +\infty} (\phi_h(x, p_n) - \phi_h(0, p_n))$$

for every configuration $x$. If there is a configuration $a$ such that

$$p_n = a\lambda_n + o(\lambda_n), \quad \lambda_n \to +\infty$$

then the horofunction is directed by $a$.

Horofunctions are global Hamilton–Jacobi viscosity solutions (Theorem 3.1 in [MV]).

Remark 2.2. The set of Hamilton–Jacobi viscosity subsolutions vanishing at the origin is compact (Corollary 2.12 in [MV]) with respect to the compact–open topology hence $u$ is a Hamilton–Jacobi viscosity subsolution and for every sequence $(p_n)$ such that $||p_n|| \to +\infty$ there is a subsequence defining a horofunction as above.

The following is Theorem 3.2 in [MV].

Theorem 2.6. Consider an $h$–horofunction $u$. For every configuration $x$ there is a curve $\gamma_x : [0, +\infty) \to \mathbb{E}^N$ such that $\gamma_x|_{[0,t]}$ is $h$–calibrating of $u$ for every $t > 0$.

The following is a very weak form of Chazy’s Lemma continuité de l’instabilité enough for our purpose.

Lemma 2.7. Consider motions $\gamma_n, \gamma : [0, +\infty) \to \mathbb{E}^N$ with final configurations $a_n, \gamma$ respectively without collisions such that $\gamma_n \to \gamma$ and $\dot{\gamma}_n \to \dot{\gamma}$ uniformly over compact sets. Then, $a_n \to a$.

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Proof. Let $h > 0$ and consider a sequence $(a_n)$ of points in $\Omega$ such that

$$||a_n||^2/2 = h$$

for every $n$ and converging to some $b$ in $\mathbb{E}^N - \Omega$. Note that necessarily

$$||b||^2/2 = h > 0$$
and in particular $b$ is not zero.

Let $x \in \Omega$. By Maderna–Venturelli’s Theorem\ref{2.1} for every $n$ there is an $h$ free time minimizer hyperbolic motion $\gamma_n : [0, +\infty) \to \Omega$ such that

$$\gamma_n(t) = a_n t + o_n(t), \quad \gamma_n(0) = x.$$  

The initial velocities $v_n := \dot{\gamma}(0)$ lie in a sphere with and taking a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that there is $v$ in the sphere such that $v_n$ converges to it.

Let $\zeta : [0, \omega_+) \to \Omega$ be a solution with maximal $\omega_+$ such that $\zeta(0) = x$ and $\dot{\zeta}(0) = v$. It is clear that $\zeta$ has energy $h$ and $\omega_+ > 0$ for $x$ is in $\Omega$. We will prove that $\omega_+ = +\infty$ and $\zeta$ is a partially hyperbolic free time minimizer motion.

Consider a sequence $(\lambda_n)$ such that $a_n(\lambda_n) = o(\lambda_n)$ and define $p_n = \gamma_n(\lambda_n)$. Therefore, the sequence $(p_n)$ verifies the following asymptotics:

$$p_n = a_n \lambda_n + o_n(\lambda_n) = b \lambda_n + (a_n - b) \lambda_n + o_n(\lambda_n) = b \lambda_n + o(\lambda_n).$$

By remark\ref{2.2} taking a subsequence if necessary we may assume that the sequence $(p_n)$ defines a horofunction function $u$ directed by $b$:

$$u(x) = \lim_{n \to +\infty} (u_{p_n}(x) - u_{p_n}(0)) \quad (1)$$

where $u_p(x) = \phi_h(x, p)$ and the convergence is uniform over compact sets.

By the continuity respect to the parameters, $\gamma_n \to \zeta$ and $\dot{\gamma} \to \dot{\zeta}$ uniformly converge over compact sets. Then,

$$\lim_{n \to +\infty} A_{L+h}(\gamma_n|_{[0, \tau]}) = A_{L+h}(\zeta|_{[0, \tau]}) \quad (2)$$

for every $0 \leq \tau < \omega_+$. Because each $\gamma_n$ is an $h$ free time minimizer motion,

$$A_{L+h}(\gamma_n|_{[0, \tau]}) = u_{p_n}(x) - u_{p_n}(\gamma_n(\tau)) \quad (3)$$

for every $n$. Because the convergence is uniform over compact sets in $\Omega$, from equations\ref{2.1}, \ref{2.2} we have

$$u(x) - u(\zeta(\tau)) = A_{L+h}(\zeta|_{[0, \tau]})$$

for every $0 < \tau < \omega_+$ hence $\zeta$ is an $h$–calibrating curve of $u$.

Let $0 < t_+ < \omega_+$. By Theorem\ref{2.4} there is an $h$–calibrating curve $\gamma : [0, +\infty) \to E^N$ of $\alpha$ such that $\gamma(0) = \zeta(t_+)$. By remark\ref{2.1} the concatenation of $\zeta|_{[0, t_+]}$ with $\gamma$ is also an $h$–calibrating curve hence an $h$ free time minimizer curve. By Marchal–Chenciner’s Theorem\ref{2.2} this concatenation is a true motion hence $\dot{\gamma}(0) = \dot{\zeta}(t_+)$ so $\gamma$ is an extension of $\zeta$. Because $\omega_+$ was assumed maximal, we conclude that $\omega_+ = +\infty$.

Because $\zeta$ is an $h$–calibrating curve, by remark\ref{2.1} it is an $h$ free time minimizer and by Theorem\ref{2.3} it is not superhyperbolic. By Marchal–Saari’s Theorem\ref{2.4} there is $b' \in E^N$ such that

$$\zeta(t) = b't + o(t).$$

If $b'$ is in $\Omega$, then by Chazy’s Lemma\ref{2.4} $a_n \to b'$ hence $b = b'$ so $b$ is in $\Omega$ as well, a contradiction. Because $\zeta$ has energy $h > 0$, we conclude that $b'$ neither is zero nor it is in $\Omega$. We have proved that $\zeta$ is an $h$ free time minimizer partially hyperbolic motion. □
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