

Dynamics of spinning test bodies in the Schwarzschild space-time: reduction and circular orbits

Ivan Bizyaev

*Ural Mathematical Center, Udmurt State University, ul. Universitetskaya 1, 426034 Izhevsk, Russia**

This paper investigates the motion of a rotating test body in the Schwarzschild space-time. After reduction, this problem reduces to an analysis of a three-degree-of-freedom Hamiltonian system whose desired trajectories lie on the invariant manifold described by the Tulczyjew condition. An analysis is made of the fixed points of this system which describe the motion of the test body in a circle. New circular orbits are found for which the orbital angular momentum is not parallel to the angular momentum of the test body. Using a Poincaré map, bifurcations of periodic solutions are analyzed.

CONTENTS

I. Introduction	1	momentum $S^{\alpha\beta}$ of the body, but not the evolution of velocity u^α . In order to eliminate this ambiguity, we will use the Tulczyjew condition [3].
II. The Mathisson — Papapetrou equations	2	This paper examines in detail the Mathisson — Papapetrou equations and presents a brief derivation of these equations that is based on the approach suggested in Refs. [4, 5]. Also, a discussion is given of pole-dipole approximation in the Newtonian case in order to emphasize some analogy with the Mathisson — Papapetrou equations. This paper does not discuss the linearization of the Mathisson — Papapetrou equations (see, e.g., [6]) in the components of the angular momentum $S^{\alpha\beta}$.
A. Newtonian gravitation	2	
B. Relativistic theory	3	
C. The Tulczyjew condition	6	
D. Hamiltonian form	8	
III. The Schwarzschild space-time	9	
A. Additional integrals	10	
B. Reduction in the case $\vec{Q} \neq 0$	10	
C. Reduction in the case $\vec{Q} = 0$	12	
IV. Relative equilibria	13	
A. Symmetric circular orbits	13	
B. Asymmetric circular orbits	14	
C. Stability analysis	17	
V. Poincaré map	18	
VI. Conclusion	19	
Acknowledgments	21	
References	21	

I. INTRODUCTION

In general relativity theory, the angular momentum of a test body can have a considerable influence on its trajectory. The method of multipole expansion allows one to obtain a closed finite-dimensional system for the motion of this body. In the first order (pole) the trajectory of the body is a geodesic. In the next order (pole-dipole) the motion of the body is described by the Mathisson — Papapetrou equations [1, 2]. These equations govern the evolution of the linear momentum p^α and the angular

momentum $S^{\alpha\beta}$ of the body, but not the evolution of velocity u^α . In order to eliminate this ambiguity, we will use the Tulczyjew condition [3]. This paper examines in detail the Mathisson — Papapetrou equations and presents a brief derivation of these equations that is based on the approach suggested in Refs. [4, 5]. Also, a discussion is given of pole-dipole approximation in the Newtonian case in order to emphasize some analogy with the Mathisson — Papapetrou equations. This paper does not discuss the linearization of the Mathisson — Papapetrou equations (see, e.g., [6]) in the components of the angular momentum $S^{\alpha\beta}$. The Mathisson — Papapetrou equations reduce to investigating a Hamiltonian system with six degrees of freedom. For the Schwarzschild space-time this system admits an energy integral. In addition to it, the Mathisson — Papapetrou equations admit three additional integrals between which the Poisson bracket forms the algebra $so(3)$. On the zero level set of these integrals the Mathisson — Papapetrou equations admit a reduction by four degrees of freedom and are integrable by quadratures. To show this, one also needs to take into account the invariant manifold that follows from the Tulczyjew condition. Previously, this simple integrable case was apparently not found.

In the general case, reduction by three degrees of freedom is possible and the problem reduces to an analysis of a two-dimensional Poincaré map. Previously, this Poincaré map was investigated in Ref. [7, 8]. There it was shown that in the general case the Mathisson — Papapetrou equations are nonintegrable by quadratures since in the Poincaré map one can clearly see chaotic trajectories for which the leading Lyapunov exponent has positive values. In Ref. [9] it is shown that resonances and chaos can be found for astrophysical values of the angular momentum of the test body. This paper presents an explicit reduction after which the Mathisson — Papapetrou equations in the Schwarzschild space-time reduce to a system with three degrees of freedom. The required trajectories of this system lie on the invariant manifold given by the Tulczyjew condition. The fixed points of the reduced system describe the motion of the test body in a circle. Previously, circular orbits in which the orbital angular momentum

* bizyaevtheory@gmail.com

is parallel to the angular momentum of the body were analyzed in Refs. [10–12]. In this paper we also find other fixed points of the reduced system in which the orbital angular momentum is not parallel to the angular momentum of the body. For values of the total angular momentum of the test body that corresponds to neutron stars or black holes these circular orbits turn out to be unstable.

In addition, we numerically construct a Poincaré map. In the map, as the energy of the body increases, one can observe two pitchfork bifurcations that follow one after the other: supercritical and subcritical. This gives rise to five fixed points or five periodic solutions of the reduced system in the Poincaré map. In addition, we construct separatrices for the unstable fixed points of the Poincaré map which intersect each other transversely. To numerically construct the separatrices, we use the algorithm suggested in Ref. [13].

We also note that the Poisson bracket for the reduced system obtained is degenerate since it has two Casimir functions. To search for fixed points and numerically integrate this system, it is more convenient not to introduce canonical coordinates on a symplectic leaf since in these redundant coordinates the reduced equations of motion admit an algebraic form (i.e., they do not contain different trigonometric functions). Previously, the use of such redundant variables turned out to be useful in searching for various special cases of an additional integral or an invariant manifold in the equations of classical rigid body dynamics [14]. The search for such cases for the reduced system obtained in this paper remains an interesting topic.

In this paper we choose a geometric system of units in which the gravitational constant and the velocity of light are equal to unity and the following notation is used. The Latin indices of tensors range from 1 to 3, and the Greek indices of tensors range from 0 to 3. Summation over repeating indices is implied. The signature of the metric is $(-, +, +, +)$. We denote the antisymmetric Levi-Civita symbol by $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu}$ for which we set $\varepsilon_{0123} = 1$. The covariant derivative is denoted by ∇_α and the curvature tensor is defined by $[\nabla_\alpha, \nabla_\beta]A^\mu = R^\mu_{\nu\alpha\beta}A^\nu$.

II. THE MATHISSON — PAPAPETROU EQUATIONS

A. Newtonian gravitation

Suppose that a body moves in a gravitational field with a given potential $\varphi(x_1, x_2, x_3)$. Since the model of an absolutely rigid body encounters contradictions in relativity theory, the body will be assumed to be a continuous medium. We will neglect the influence of the body on the gravitational field, i.e., we will consider a test body.

Let $\rho(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ denote the density of the body, and $v_i(x_1, x_2, x_3)$, its velocity distribution relative to the fixed coordinate system $Ox_1x_2x_3$ (see Fig. 1). The linear mo-




FIG. 1. A test body.

mentum is defined by

$$p_i = \int \rho v_i d^3x.$$

Inside the test body we single out point P with coordinates y_i and translational velocity u_i . As a rule, point P is chosen as the center of mass of the body, but at the moment we will assume it to be arbitrary.

The angular momentum of the body relative to point P can be defined using a skew-symmetric matrix whose elements have the form

$$S_{ij} = \int \rho((x_i - y_i)v_j - (x_j - y_j)v_i) d^3x.$$

We represent the equations governing the evolution of the linear momentum and the angular momentum in the following form [15]:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dp_i}{dt} &= F_i, \quad \frac{dS_{ij}}{dt} = p_i u_j - p_j u_i + M_{ij}, \\ F_i &= - \int \rho \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} d^3x, \\ M_{ij} &= - \int \rho \left[(x_i - y_i) \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_j} - (x_j - y_j) \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} \right] d^3x. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

We assume that the body is in relative equilibrium [16, 17], i.e., the pressure on its boundary vanishes. Therefore, equations (1) contain no terms that are due to surface forces. Also, the mass of the body remains unchanged:

$$m = \int \rho d^3x = \text{const.} \quad (2)$$

The pole-dipole (pole-dipole) approximation will imply the following assumption.

Suppose that the potential $\varphi(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ in the region occupied by the body changes weakly so that we can restrict ourselves to the decomposition of force F_i and angular momentum M_i to order two in a neighborhood of point P .

This gives

$$\begin{aligned} F_i &= -m \left. \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} \right|_{x=y} - d_j \left. \frac{\partial^2 \varphi}{\partial x_j \partial x_i} \right|_{x=y}, \\ M_{ij} &= -d_i \left. \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_j} \right|_{x=y} + d_j \left. \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} \right|_{x=y}, \end{aligned}$$

where d_i is the dipole moment defined by

$$d_i = \int (x_i - y_i) \rho d^3x.$$

Differentiating this relation with respect to time and taking into account condition (2), we obtain the following equation:

$$\frac{d}{dt} d_i = p_i - m u_i.$$

This leads to an unclosed system of equations that governs the evolution of p_i , S_{ij} and d_i . This system remains unclosed until point P is chosen. If we choose it as the body's center of mass

$$y_i = \frac{1}{m} \int x_i \rho d^3x,$$

then $d_i = 0$ and $u_i = \frac{p_i}{m}$. As a result, $S_{ij} = \text{const}$, and the equations for the evolution of the linear momentum and the coordinates of point P take the form

$$\frac{dp_i}{dt} = -m \left. \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} \right|_{x=y}, \quad \frac{dy_i}{dt} = \frac{p_i}{m}. \quad (3)$$

Thus, in the Newtonian gravitation the problem reduces to an analysis of system (3), which does not explicitly depend on the dipole moment and the angular momentum. As a result, the pole-dipole approximation is equivalent to the polar approximation.

We point out two important properties of the pole-dipole approximation. First, the function of density $\rho(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ for which the mass and the dipole moment are nonzero and the moments of higher order vanish can be given using the Dirac delta-function

$$\rho(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \left(m - d_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \right) \delta^{(3)}(x_i - y_i), \quad (4)$$

$$\delta^{(3)}(x_i - y_i) = \delta(x_1 - y_1) \delta(x_2 - y_2) \delta(x_3 - y_3).$$

Second, the resulting equations (3) do not depend on details of the internal structure of the body. The two properties described above admit a generalization to relativistic theory.

B. Relativistic theory

In general relativity theory, space-time is considered as a four-dimensional manifold \mathcal{M}^4 . On this manifold, we denote the local coordinates as $(x^\alpha) = (x^0, \dots, x^3)$ and represent the interval as

$$ds^2 = g_{\alpha\beta} dx^\alpha dx^\beta,$$

where $\mathbf{g} = ||g_{\alpha\beta}||$ is a metric that satisfies the Einstein equations.

Consider a gravitational field with a given metric in which the test body moves. It is described by an energy-momentum tensor $T^{\alpha\beta}$ that satisfies the following conditions:

- (i) the symmetry $T^{\alpha\beta} = T^{\beta\alpha}$;
- (ii) the conservation law $\nabla_\beta T^{\alpha\beta} = 0$.

The trajectory of the test body (see Fig. 2) on the manifold \mathcal{M}^4 is a world tube $\mathcal{W} = \text{supp}(T^{\alpha\beta})$ all spatial sections of which are compact. Inside \mathcal{W} we choose a supporting time-like curve $\mathcal{C} = \{x^\alpha = y^\alpha(\tau)\}$, where τ is an arbitrary (nonnatural) parameter. The tangent vector to this curve $u^\alpha = \frac{dy^\alpha}{d\tau}$ satisfies the condition $u^\alpha u_\alpha < 0$.




FIG. 2. A schematic representation of the world tube.

Let $\mathcal{H}(\tau_*)$ be a space-like surface formed by combining all geodesics $z^\alpha(s)$, which, first, pass through the fixed point $O \in \mathcal{C}$ with the parameter value $\tau = \tau_*$ and, second, have a tangent line orthogonal to $u^\alpha(\tau_*)$. Next, moving along the supporting curve and varying the parameter τ , we obtain a family of surfaces $\mathcal{H}(\tau)$.

Assume that the spatial sections of the body are sufficiently small so that the following condition is satisfied:

- (iii) except at the points of the supporting curve \mathcal{C} , the geodesics $z^\alpha(s)$ constructed both for the fixed $\tau = \tau_*$ and for different values of τ do not intersect each other inside the tube \mathcal{W} .

For flat space, the linear momentum and the angular momentum or the spin tensor are known to be given by

$$p^\alpha(\tau) = \int_{\mathcal{H}(\tau)} T^{\alpha\beta} d\sigma_\beta, \quad (5)$$

$$S^{\alpha\beta}(\tau) = \int_{\mathcal{H}(\tau)} [(x^\alpha - y^\alpha) T^{\beta\gamma} - (x^\beta - y^\beta) T^{\alpha\gamma}] d\sigma_\gamma,$$

where $d\sigma_\alpha$ is the vector element of the volume of the surface $\mathcal{H}(\tau)$. These relations can be combined by defining the generalized linear momentum

$$\mathcal{P}_\xi(\tau) = \int_{\mathcal{H}(\tau)} T^{\alpha\beta} \xi_\beta d\sigma_\alpha, \quad (6)$$

where ξ_β is a given 1-form. The quantity \mathcal{P}_ξ has the physical meaning of the “total” 4-momentum which intersects the surface $\mathcal{H}(\tau)$ along ξ_β . Relations (5) follow from the definition (6) if one chooses as ξ_β the 1-forms defined by Killing vector fields, which for the linear momentum p^α correspond to four translations, and for the angular momentum $S^{\alpha\beta}$, to six rotations.

The integral curves of the Killing field define the isometry transformation and therefore they satisfy the equation

$$\mathcal{L}_\xi(g) = 0 \text{ or the equivalent equation } \nabla_\alpha \xi_\beta + \nabla_\beta \xi_\alpha = 0, \quad (7)$$

where \mathcal{L}_ξ denotes the Lie derivative along the vector field ξ^α .

In this approach, 10 solutions to (7) are required to define the linear and angular momenta. This number of solutions arises only in spaces of constant curvature (see, e.g., [18]). Therefore, to define the linear and angular momenta in an arbitrary space-time \mathcal{M}^4 , we use generalized Killing fields [19, 20]. Before passing to them, we recall that it follows from (7) that any Killing field satisfies Eq. [18]

$$\nabla_\gamma \nabla_\alpha \xi_\beta = R^\delta_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \xi_\delta. \quad (8)$$

However, the converse does not hold: not any solution of (8) satisfies Eq. (7). If the coordinates x^α in Eqs. (8) lie entirely on some geodesic, then this equation defines the Jacobi field along this geodesic.

Denote $A_\alpha = \xi_\alpha$ and $B_{\alpha\beta} = \nabla_\alpha \xi_\beta$ along the supporting curve \mathcal{C} . Then Eq. (8) is equivalent to the linear system of ordinary differential equations

$$\frac{D}{d\tau} A_\alpha = B_{\alpha\beta} u^\beta, \quad \frac{D}{d\tau} B_{\alpha\beta} = R_{\alpha\beta\mu}{}^\nu(y) u^\mu A_\nu, \quad (9)$$

where $\frac{D}{d\tau} = u^\alpha \nabla_\alpha$. Thus, for given initial values of A_α and $B_{\alpha\beta}$, integrating system (9), we can continue ξ_α along the curve \mathcal{C} . System (9) has the invariant manifold

$$B_{\alpha\beta} + B_{\beta\alpha} = 0. \quad (10)$$

Below, we will assume that the initial conditions satisfy (10) and, as a consequence, the following conditions [19] are satisfied for ξ^α :

$$\mathcal{L}_\xi(g)|_{\mathcal{C}} = 0, \quad (\nabla_\alpha \mathcal{L}_\xi(g))|_{\mathcal{C}} = 0. \quad (11)$$

For the geodesics $z^\alpha(s)$ defining the surface $\mathcal{H}(\tau_*)$, Eq. (8) can be represented as

$$\frac{D^2}{ds^2} \xi_\alpha - R_{\alpha\beta\gamma}{}^\delta(z) v^\beta v^\gamma \xi_\delta = 0, \quad v^\alpha = \frac{dz^\alpha}{ds}, \quad (12)$$

with initial conditions at point O :

$$\xi_\alpha = A_\alpha(\tau_*), \quad \frac{D\xi_\alpha}{ds} = B_{\alpha\beta}(\tau_*) v^\beta. \quad (13)$$

Thus, using the partial solution of system (9), from the solution of Eq. (12) with conditions (13) we can define the generalized Killing field. By condition (iii), it is uniquely defined in region \mathcal{W} . System (9) has only 10 linearly independent partial solutions satisfying (10). Hence, we can construct in the same way 10 linearly independent generalized Killing fields. Detailed information and other reasons for introduction of generalized Killing fields can be found in Ref. [19].

On the surface $\mathcal{H}(\tau_*)$, any 1-form of the generalized Killing field can be represented as [18]

$$\xi_\alpha = K_\alpha{}^\beta A_\beta + H_\alpha{}^{\beta\gamma} B_{\beta\gamma}, \quad (14)$$

where the functions $K_\alpha{}^\beta$ and $H_\alpha{}^{\beta\gamma}$ are the same for all partial solutions of (9). An expression (explicit for them) in terms of the Synge world function is presented in Ref. [5].

An important property of the definition (6) is that \mathcal{P}_ξ depends linearly on ξ_α . Therefore, substituting (14) into (6), we obtain

$$\mathcal{P}_\xi = p^\alpha(\tau) A_\alpha + \frac{1}{2} S^{\alpha\beta}(\tau) B_{\alpha\beta},$$

where the linear and angular momenta are defined:

$$p^\alpha(\tau) = \int_{\mathcal{H}(\tau)} T^{\mu\nu} K_\nu{}^\alpha d\sigma_\mu, \quad S^{\alpha\beta}(\tau) = \int_{\mathcal{H}(\tau)} T^{\mu\nu} H_\nu{}^{\alpha\beta} d\sigma_\mu. \quad (15)$$

Differentiating this relation along the curve \mathcal{C} and taking into account Eq. (8), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathcal{P}_\xi}{d\tau} &= A_\alpha \left[\frac{Dp^\alpha}{d\tau} + \frac{1}{2} R^\alpha{}_{\lambda\mu\nu} u^\lambda S^{\mu\nu} \right] + \\ &\quad \frac{1}{2} B_{\alpha\beta} \left[\frac{DS^{\alpha\beta}}{d\tau} - p^\alpha u^\beta + u^\alpha p^\beta \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

On the other hand, differentiating (6), we obtain (for details, see [21]):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathcal{P}_\xi}{d\tau} &= \int_{\mathcal{H}(\tau)} \nabla_\alpha (T^{\alpha\beta} \xi_\beta) w^\gamma d\sigma_\gamma = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{H}(\tau)} T^{\alpha\beta} Q_{\alpha\beta} w^\gamma d\sigma_\gamma, \\ Q_{\alpha\beta} &= (\mathcal{L}_\xi(g))_{\alpha\beta}, \end{aligned}$$

where w^γ is the vector field of the normal to the surface $\mathcal{H}(\tau)$. The last equation is a consequence of conditions (i) and (ii). Now, expanding the resulting relation as a series in a neighborhood of the curve \mathcal{C} , we find

$$\frac{d\mathcal{P}_\xi}{d\tau} = \frac{1}{2} [\mu^{\alpha\beta}(\tau) \cdot Q_{\alpha\beta}|_{\mathcal{C}} + \mu^{\gamma\alpha\beta}(\tau) \cdot (\nabla_\gamma Q_{\alpha\beta})|_{\mathcal{C}} + \dots], \quad (17)$$

where the multipole moments have been introduced:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^{\alpha\beta}(\tau) &= \int_{\mathcal{H}(\tau)} T^{\alpha\beta} w^\gamma d\sigma_\gamma, \\ \mu^{\gamma\alpha\beta}(\tau) &= \int_{\mathcal{H}(\tau)} (x^\gamma - y^\gamma) T^{\alpha\beta} w^\mu d\sigma_\mu, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

which, due to property (i), are symmetric in the last two indices.

The pole-dipole (pole-dipole) approximation will imply the following assumption.

In the expansion (17) we restrict ourselves to two multipole moments $\tau^{\alpha\beta}$ and $\tau^{\gamma\alpha\beta}$, and assume the other moments to be zero.

Thus, for the pole-dipole approximation from (11) we obtain $\frac{d\mathcal{P}_\xi}{d\tau} = 0$. According to (16), this leads to the following statement.

Proposition 1. *Let p^α be the linear momentum of the test body and let $S^{\alpha\beta}$ be its tensor of angular momentum, which are defined by relations (15). Their evolution in the pole-dipole approximation is governed by the following system of equations:*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{Dp^\alpha}{d\tau} &= -\frac{1}{2}R^\alpha_{\lambda\mu\nu}u^\lambda S^{\mu\nu}, \\ \frac{DS^{\alpha\beta}}{d\tau} &= p^\alpha u^\beta - u^\alpha p^\beta, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where $R^\alpha_{\mu\nu\lambda}$ is the curvature tensor and the following covariant derivative has been introduced:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{Dp^\alpha}{d\tau} &= \frac{dp^\alpha}{d\tau} + \Gamma^\alpha_{\mu\nu}p^\mu u^\nu, \\ \frac{DS^{\alpha\beta}}{d\tau} &= \frac{dS^{\alpha\beta}}{d\tau} + \Gamma^\alpha_{\mu\nu}S^{\mu\beta}u^\nu + \Gamma^\beta_{\mu\nu}S^{\alpha\mu}u^\nu, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma^\alpha_{\mu\nu}$ is the Christoffel symbol.

System (19) is usually referred to as the Mathisson—Papapetrou equations. But in fact, they obtained the equations in a somewhat different form. We consider their results in greater detail.

The problem of deriving the equations of motion for a rotating test body in general relativity theory was first addressed by Mathisson (1937) [1, 22]. In order to reproduce the reasoning of Mathisson, we let $\Phi_{\alpha\beta}$ denote the symmetric tensor field with a compact support. For this support we obtain

$$J = \int T^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_{\alpha\beta} \sqrt{-g} d^4x = \int_C d\tau \int_{\Sigma(\tau)} T^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_{\alpha\beta} w^\gamma d\Sigma_\gamma, \\ g = \det \mathbf{g}.$$

Let us expand $\Phi_{\alpha\beta}$ in a series in a neighborhood of the supporting curve and restrict ourselves, according to the pole-dipole approximation, to two nonzero multipole moments:

$$J = \int_C d\tau [\mu^{\alpha\beta} \cdot \Phi_{\alpha\beta}|_C + \mu^{\gamma\alpha\beta} \cdot (\nabla_\gamma \Phi_{\alpha\beta})|_C].$$

Conditions (i) and (ii) lead to the following relation:

$$J = 0, \quad \text{if} \quad \Phi_{\alpha\beta} = \nabla_\alpha V_\beta + \nabla_\beta V_\alpha.$$

Then, explicitly using the additional assumption

$$S^{\alpha\beta} u_\beta = 0, \quad (20)$$

Mathisson obtained equations of motion equivalent to (19), but taking condition (20) into account. The work of Mathisson and their further development are discussed in detail in Ref. [23]. Of interest are Refs. [24, 25], which present a Lagrangian function that models an elementary particle with rotation and leads to equations similar to those obtained by Mathisson. The Lagrangian of a point particle explicitly depending on acceleration is considered in Ref. [24]. Ref. [25] discusses a two-point model in which the distance between particles remains constant in some reference system.

REMARK 1. The multipole moments (18) have the form [5]:

$$\mu^{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2}(p^\alpha u^\beta + p^\beta u^\alpha), \quad \mu^{\gamma\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2}(S^{\gamma\alpha} u^\beta + S^{\gamma\beta} u^\alpha).$$

If the energy-momentum tensor $T^{\alpha\beta}$ is explicitly given, to calculate the multipole moments (18) it is convenient to use Fermi's coordinates. The metric in these coordinates in a neighborhood of the curve \mathcal{C} up to terms of order two is presented in Ref. [26].

The equations of motion for a rotating body that are equivalent to (19) were obtained by Papapetrou (1951)[2]. He used a noncovariant definition of multipole moments. Later, his approach was refined in Ref. [27]. It should be noted that, in contrast to Mathisson, Papapetrou imposed no additional condition, which allowed the search for such a condition to be viewed as a separate topic.

The approaches of Mathisson and Papapetrou were simplified by Tulczyjew [3](1959). He noted that the pole-dipole approximation reduces to an energy-momentum tensor in the form

$$T^{\alpha\beta} = \int_C d\tau \left[\mu^{\alpha\beta} \delta^{(4)}(x - y(\tau)) - \mu^{\gamma\alpha\beta} \nabla_\gamma \delta^{(4)}(x - y(\tau)) \right], \quad (21)$$

where $\delta^{(4)}(x - y(\tau))$ is the four-dimensional Dirac delta-function. Relations (21) can be regarded [28, 29] as a relativistic generalization of the density (4) in which the multipole moments $\mu^{\alpha\beta}$ and $\mu^{\gamma\alpha\beta}$ are concentrated along the curve \mathcal{C} .

Next, using some properties of integrals in the form (21), Tulczyjew showed that conditions (i) and (ii) lead to equations of motion that are equivalent to (19). The Tulczyjew method and the proof of the properties used by him are discussed in detail in Ref. [30]. Further development of the Tulczyjew method taking into account multipole moments of higher order is described in Ref. [31].

A generalization of these results for an extended body, i.e., for a body with an energy-momentum tensor that contains no Dirac delta-function, was made by Dixon

[21](1964). He obtained equations of motion in the form (19) and introduced a definition of linear momentum and angular momentum using relations (15). Later, Dixon obtained equations taking into account multipole moments of higher order (for details, see [23, 32]). An explicit introduction of generalized Killing fields and the generalized linear momentum (6) by Harte [19] (2008) simplified the derivation of the equations of motion (19). In addition, Harte derived equations of motion in the Newtonian gravitation using Killing fields in Ref. [4].

We note that under the pole-dipole approximation the equations do not explicitly depend on the velocity distribution in the test body. If one takes into account multipole moments of higher order, this holds no longer [33].

C. The Tulczyjew condition

By assumption, p^α is time-like and $S^{\alpha\beta}$ is space-like. Hence,

$$m^2 = -p_\alpha p^\alpha, \quad c^2 = \frac{S_{\alpha\beta} S^{\alpha\beta}}{2}. \quad (22)$$

Next, we let m denote the mass of the body, and c , its total angular momentum or spin length. Also, we denote

$$k = -p^\alpha u_\alpha.$$

We point out a few important properties of the Mathisson—Papapetrou equations (19).

- If $S^{\alpha\beta} = 0$, then this system reduces to an analysis of geodesics. For them the linear momentum and the velocity are parallel to each other:

$$p^\alpha = m u^\alpha \quad (23)$$

and $k = m$.

- If $S^{\alpha\beta} \neq 0$, then in the general case relation (23) is not satisfied and $m \neq k$. Therefore, the linear momentum is not parallel to velocity $p^\alpha \not\parallel u^\alpha$, moreover, for them it is possible that $k = 0$, i.e., they can be orthogonal to each other (see Remark 2). However, if condition (23) is fulfilled and $S^{\alpha\beta} \neq 0$, then it follows from the Mathisson—Papapetrou equations [34] that the angular momentum is transported in parallel along the trajectory. For example, this holds in de Sitter space [35], which has a constant curvature.

As in the Newtonian gravitation, system (19) turns out to be incomplete since velocity u^α is not given as a function of p^α and $S^{\alpha\beta}$. To determine velocity u^α , we define the vector

$$f^\alpha = S^{\alpha\beta} p_\beta.$$

As noted by Tulczyjew [3], the additional condition (20), which is used by Mathisson, does not define a unique

point even in flat space (for details, see [36]). He suggested another condition, which we will call the *Tulczyjew condition* in what follows:

$$f^\alpha = 0. \quad (24)$$

In Refs. [37, 38] it was proved that, if the linear and angular momenta are defined by relations (15), then condition (24) for an extended body is satisfied by a unique point on the surface $\mathcal{H}(\tau)$ under some additional, but completely natural, conditions imposed on the energy-momentum tensor.

Condition (24) defines only three independent relations as

$$f^\alpha p_\alpha = S^{\alpha\beta} p_\alpha p_\beta \equiv 0.$$

Note that Eqs. (24) have nontrivial solutions $p_\alpha \neq 0$ if

$$\det ||S^{\alpha\beta}|| = \left(\frac{1}{8} \sqrt{-g} \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} S^{\alpha\beta} S^{\mu\nu} \right)^2 = (S^{01} S^{23} - S^{02} S^{13} + S^{03} S^{12})^2 = 0, \quad (25)$$

whence it follows that $S^{\alpha\beta}$ satisfies the condition

$$S^{\alpha\beta} S^{\mu\nu} - S^{\mu\beta} S^{\alpha\nu} + S^{\mu\alpha} S^{\beta\nu} = 0. \quad (26)$$

Another consequence of relation (25) is that the skew-symmetric matrix $||S^{\alpha\beta}||$ has rank two. Accordingly, at the fixed point O one can choose a reference system in which the linear and angular momenta have the form [39]:

$$p^\alpha = (-m, 0, 0, 0), \quad S^{\alpha\beta} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & c \\ 0 & 0 & -c & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

and relations (24) are satisfied trivially. Therefore, the Tulczyjew condition implies that a reference system of the zero 3-momentum $p^i = 0$ has been chosen. As a rule, such a supporting curve \mathcal{C} is called the *line of the center of mass* [5].

Proposition 2. *If the Tulczyjew condition (24) is satisfied and $k \neq 0$, then system (19) admits the additional integral $m = \text{const}$.*

Proof. Using system (19) and the asymmetry of the curvature tensor in the first two indices, one can show that

$$\frac{dm}{d\tau} = -\frac{1}{2m} R_{\beta\alpha\mu\nu} p^\beta u^\alpha S^{\mu\nu} = \frac{p_\beta}{mk} \frac{DS^{\alpha\beta}}{d\tau} \frac{Dp_\alpha}{d\tau}.$$

Next, we differentiate the vector f^α by virtue of system (19) and set the resulting relation equal to zero

$$\frac{df^\alpha}{d\tau} = p_\beta \frac{DS^{\alpha\beta}}{d\tau} + S^{\alpha\beta} \frac{Dp_\beta}{d\tau} - \Gamma^\alpha_{\mu\nu} f^\mu u^\nu = 0, \quad (27)$$

where the last term is zero by virtue of (24), whence we find that

$$\frac{dm}{d\tau} = \frac{1}{mk} S^{\alpha\beta} \frac{Dp_\alpha}{d\tau} \frac{Dp_\beta}{d\tau} = 0.$$

□

Relation (27) is a linear system in the velocity components u^α , which, using (24), can be represented as

$$u^\alpha - \frac{1}{2m^2} \mathcal{D}^\alpha_\beta u^\beta = \frac{k}{m^2} p^\alpha, \quad \mathcal{D}^\alpha_\beta = S^{\alpha\gamma} R_{\gamma\beta\mu\nu} S^{\mu\nu}. \quad (28)$$

To solve this system, we use the following statement.

Proposition 3. *For the matrix $\mathbf{D} = \|\mathcal{D}^\alpha_\beta\|$, the following [40] holds true:*

$$\mathbf{D}^2 = d\mathbf{D}, \quad d = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\mathbf{D}) = -\frac{1}{2} R_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} S^{\alpha\beta} S^{\mu\nu}. \quad (29)$$

Proof. We rewrite the elements of the matrix \mathbf{D} as follows:

$$\mathcal{D}^\alpha_\beta = S^{\alpha\gamma} Q_{\gamma\beta}, \quad Q_{\gamma\beta} = R_{\gamma\beta\mu\nu} S^{\mu\nu}.$$

For the elements of the matrix \mathbf{D}^2 , using the property (26) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}^\alpha_\mu \mathcal{D}^\mu_\gamma &= S^{\alpha\beta} S^{\mu\nu} Q_{\beta\mu} Q_{\nu\gamma} = \\ (S^{\mu\beta} S^{\alpha\nu} - S^{\mu\alpha} S^{\beta\nu}) Q_{\beta\mu} Q_{\nu\gamma} &= \mathcal{D}^\mu_\mu \mathcal{D}^\alpha_\gamma - \mathcal{D}^\alpha_\beta \mathcal{D}^\beta_\gamma, \end{aligned}$$

where account is taken of the fact that $Q_{\beta\mu} = -Q_{\mu\beta}$. As we see, it follows from this relation that

$$\mathbf{D}^2 = \text{tr}(\mathbf{D})\mathbf{D} - \mathbf{D}^2,$$

which leads us to (29). \square

Using the Neumann series and the property (29), we obtain

$$\left(1 - \frac{\mathbf{D}}{2m^2}\right)^{-1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbf{D}^n}{(2m^2)^n} = 1 - \frac{\mathbf{D}}{d - 2m^2}.$$

Multiplying system (28) by this matrix, we find that for $d \neq 2m^2$ the velocity is given by

$$u^\alpha = \frac{k}{m^2} \left(p^\alpha + \frac{\mathcal{D}^\alpha_\beta p^\beta}{2m^2 - d} \right). \quad (30)$$

In order to completely define the velocity, we need to define the parameter τ . We will stick to the parametrization proposed in Ref. [41] (see also [42]), according to which this parameter is chosen in such a way that

$$\frac{k}{m} = 1. \quad (31)$$

Velocity u^α is a time-like vector. Hence, it follows from (30), (31) and (24) that

$$U = \frac{\mathcal{D}^\alpha_\beta \mathcal{D}_{\alpha\gamma} p^\beta p^\gamma}{(d - 2m^2)^2} - m^2 < 0. \quad (32)$$

As is well known, this condition can generally be violated (for examples, see [43, 44]). If this condition is

not satisfied, then the pole-dipole approximation is violated [45, 46] and one needs to consider multipole moments of higher order.

The Mathisson—Papapetrou equations (19) for velocity (30) and (31) reduce to the following system:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{D S^{\alpha\beta}}{d\tau} &= \frac{p^\alpha p^\beta - p^\beta p^\alpha}{m} + \frac{p^\alpha \mathcal{D}^\beta_\mu - p^\beta \mathcal{D}^\alpha_\mu}{m(d - 2m^2)} p^\mu, \\ \frac{D p_\alpha}{d\tau} &= -\frac{1}{2m} R_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} \left[p^\beta + \frac{\mathcal{D}^\beta_\lambda p^\lambda}{d - 2m^2} \right] S^{\mu\nu}, \\ \frac{d y^\alpha}{d\tau} &= \frac{p^\alpha}{m} + \frac{\mathcal{D}^\alpha_\beta p^\beta}{m(d - 2m^2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

If the metric $g_{\alpha\beta}$ has a Killing field ξ^α satisfying (7) then the equations of motion (33) have the additional integral [5]:

$$F = p_\alpha \xi^\alpha + \frac{1}{2} S^{\alpha\beta} \nabla_\alpha \xi_\beta. \quad (34)$$

Of special note is that the equations for velocity (28) explicitly take the Tulczyjew condition into account. If one finds velocity u^α from the solution to the initial equation (27), then the Mathisson—Papapetrou equations will have the additional integrals $f^\alpha = \text{const}$. This general solution is rather cumbersome, but for $f^\alpha = 0$ it reduces to the solution (30). Thus, the analysis of system (33) should be carried out exclusively on its invariant manifold given by (24). Specifically, the stability of the partial solutions should be investigated only with respect to perturbations lying on this manifold.

REMARK 2. System (33) contains a singularity if $d - 2m^2 = 0$. In this case, one should seek a different solution of system (28). For this solution, it may turn out that $k = 0$ and mass m will no longer remain unchanged. We give the following example.

Suppose that the initial conditions lie on the surface

$$N = p^\alpha p_\alpha - \frac{1}{4} R_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} S^{\alpha\beta} S^{\mu\nu} = 0. \quad (35)$$

Then, taking $k = 0$ into account, Eq. (28) has the form

$$\mathcal{A}^\alpha_\beta u^\beta = 0, \quad \mathcal{A}^\alpha_\beta = \delta^\alpha_\beta - \frac{\mathcal{D}^\alpha_\beta}{d}.$$

If one considers the Schwarzschild metric, then $\text{rank}[\mathcal{A}^\alpha_\beta] = 2$ and hence the general solution can be represented as

$$u^\alpha = j u^\alpha_o + l u^\alpha_*, \quad (36)$$

where u^α_o and u^α_* are two linearly independent partial solutions and $j, l = \text{const}$. To define one of these constants, we require that the Mathisson—Papapetrou equations (19) admit an additional integral K . To do so we differentiate it by virtue of this system and set it equal to zero

$$\frac{dN}{d\tau} = 2R_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} p^\alpha u^\beta S^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{4} S^{\alpha\beta} S^{\mu\nu} u^\lambda \nabla_\lambda R_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} = 0.$$

Substituting velocity (36) into this equation, we obtain a linear equation from which we express one of the constants. The other constant can be found from the normalization condition, for example, $u_\alpha u^\alpha = -1$. Then, substituting the velocity, we obtain Mathisson—Papapetrou equations that are different from (33). By direct calculations one can show that, in the case of a Schwarzschild metric, mass m does not remain unchanged for this system.

D. Hamiltonian form

The resulting system (33) governs the evolution of $S^{\alpha\beta}$, p_α and y^α . We define the Poisson brackets between these variables as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \{S^{\alpha\beta}, S^{\mu\nu}\} &= g^{\alpha\mu} S^{\beta\nu} - g^{\alpha\nu} S^{\beta\mu} + g^{\beta\nu} S^{\alpha\mu} - g^{\beta\mu} S^{\alpha\nu}, \\ \{S^{\alpha\beta}, p_\mu\} &= -\Gamma_{\lambda\mu}^\alpha S^{\lambda\beta} - \Gamma_{\lambda\mu}^\beta S^{\alpha\lambda}, \\ \{y^\alpha, p_\beta\} &= \delta_\beta^\alpha, \quad \{p_\alpha, p_\beta\} = -\frac{1}{2} R_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} S^{\mu\nu}, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where only nonzero Poisson brackets are presented. This Poisson bracket arose first in the work of Souriau [47] (1970) (for a detailed discussion of his work, see also [48]). Later, the bracket (37) was independently found in Refs. [49–52].

The equations of motion (33) on the invariant manifold (24) can be represented as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dS^{\alpha\beta}}{d\tau} &= \{S^{\alpha\beta}, S^{\mu\nu}\} \frac{\partial H}{\partial S^{\mu\nu}} + \{S^{\alpha\beta}, p_\mu\} \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_\mu}, \\ \frac{dp_\alpha}{d\tau} &= \{p_\alpha, S^{\mu\nu}\} \frac{\partial H}{\partial S^{\mu\nu}} + \{p_\alpha, p_\mu\} \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_\mu} - \frac{\partial H}{\partial y^\alpha}, \\ \frac{dy^\alpha}{d\tau} &= \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_\alpha}, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

where the Hamiltonian H is given by

$$H = \frac{p^\alpha p_\alpha}{2m} - \frac{\mathcal{D}^{\alpha\beta} p_\alpha p_\beta}{m(d + 2p_\alpha p^\alpha)}. \quad (39)$$

On the invariant relation (24) the Hamiltonian takes the fixed value $H = -\frac{m}{2}$.

An interesting interpretation of the Hamiltonian (39) was presented in Ref. [53]. Consider a Hamiltonian corresponding to the geodesics

$$H^* = \frac{p^\alpha p_\alpha}{2m},$$

but with the Poisson bracket (37). Consider the relations given by the Tulczyjew condition as Dirac constraints [54]. For these conditions to define an invariant manifold, we need to choose the Hamiltonian

$$H = H^* + \lambda_\alpha f^\alpha,$$

where λ_α are the undefined multipliers. They are defined from the system

$$\{H, f^\alpha\} = \{H^*, f^\alpha\} + \lambda_\beta \{f^\beta, f^\alpha\} = 0. \quad (40)$$

With the Tulczyjew condition in mind, one can write the Poisson brackets appearing in this relation as follows:

$$\{f^\beta, f^\alpha\} = N S^{\beta\alpha}, \quad \{H^*, f^\alpha\} = \frac{1}{2m} \mathcal{D}^\alpha_\beta p^\beta,$$

where N is defined by relation (35). Further, from (40) one can find λ_α , which lead to the Hamiltonian (39) (for details, see [53]).

REMARK 3. A passage from the Hamiltonian system (38), (39) with the Dirac constraints (24) to an equivalent (degenerate) Lagrangian system was examined in detail in Ref. [55]. The Lagrangian function found there contains a quadratic root from the expression that also contains a quadratic root. Previously, a similar Lagrangian function for a spherical top in flat Minkowski space was found in Ref. [56].

The Poisson tensor defined by the bracket (37) has rank 12, thus giving rise to two Casimir functions:

$$C_\star = \frac{1}{8} \sqrt{-g} \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} S^{\alpha\beta} S^{\mu\nu}, \quad C_o = \frac{1}{2} S^{\alpha\beta} S_{\alpha\beta}.$$

According to (25), one Casimir function has zero value, and the other takes, according to (22), positive values, so that the trajectories we are interested in lie on the family of symplectic leaves

$$\mathcal{M}_c^{12} = \{C_\star(S^{\alpha\beta}) = 0, C_o(S^{\alpha\beta}) = c^2 > 0\}.$$

The Poisson bracket (37) can be simplified if we transform from the coordinate basis in the tangent plane $T\mathcal{M}^4$ to the orthonormal basis composed of the tetrad $\{e_A^\alpha\}$, four vector fields satisfying the relations

$$g_{\alpha\beta} e_A^\alpha e_B^\beta = \eta_{AB},$$

where $\eta_{AB} = \text{diag}(-1, 1, 1, 1)$. Here and in the sequel the indices labeled by capital Latin letters will take values from 0 to 3 and denote the sequence number of the tetrad.

Let P_α denote the new linear momentum, which we define as follows: (for details, see [49, 57]):

$$p_\alpha = P_\alpha + \frac{1}{2} \omega_{\alpha AB} S^{AB}, \quad S^{\alpha\beta} = S^{AB} e_A^\alpha e_B^\beta,$$

where the Ricci coefficients of rotation have been introduced

$$\omega_{\alpha AB} = g_{\mu\nu} e_A^\mu \nabla_\alpha e_B^\nu. \quad (41)$$

Hence, the Poisson bracket between the new linear momenta will be equal to zero: $\{P_\alpha, P_\beta\} = 0$. We parametrize the components of the matrix S^{AB} in the

orthonormal basis by two three-dimensional vectors $\vec{L} = (L_1, L_2, L_3)$ and $\vec{M} = (M_1, M_2, M_3)$:

$$S^{AB} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \vec{M} \\ -\vec{M}^T & \hat{L} \end{pmatrix},$$

where the symbol \hat{L} stands for the following matrix constructed of the components of the vector \vec{L} :

$$\hat{L} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & L_3 & -L_2 \\ -L_3 & 0 & L_1 \\ L_2 & -L_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here and in what follows, we will denote the three-dimensional Euclidean vector \vec{L} , and the standard scalar and vector products by (\vec{L}, \vec{M}) and $\vec{L} \times \vec{M}$, respectively.

In the new variables the nonzero Poisson brackets (37) become

$$\begin{aligned} \{L_i, L_j\} &= \hat{L}_{ij}, & \{L_i, M_j\} &= \hat{M}_{ij}, & \{M_i, M_j\} &= -\hat{L}_{ij} \\ \{y^\alpha, P_\beta\} &= \delta^\alpha_\beta, \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

As we see, the commutation relations between \vec{L} and \vec{M} form the algebra $so(3, 1)$, for which the preceding Casimir functions take the form

$$C_\star = (\vec{L}, \vec{M}), \quad C_\circ = (\vec{L}, \vec{L}) - (\vec{M}, \vec{M}). \quad (43)$$

Finally, the equations of motion can be represented in the following vector form:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\vec{L}}{d\tau} &= \frac{\partial H}{\partial \vec{L}} \times \vec{L} + \frac{\partial H}{\partial \vec{M}} \times \vec{M}, \\ \frac{d\vec{M}}{d\tau} &= \vec{M} \times \frac{\partial H}{\partial \vec{L}} + \frac{\partial H}{\partial \vec{M}} \times \vec{L}, \\ \frac{dP_\alpha}{d\tau} &= -\frac{\partial H}{\partial y^\alpha}, \quad \frac{dy^\alpha}{d\tau} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial P_\alpha}, \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where $H = H(\vec{L}, \vec{M}, P_\alpha, y^\alpha)$ is the Hamiltonian in the new variables. Explicit relations for the Hamiltonian H and f^α in the new variables are rather cumbersome, and so they are not presented here.

Thus, in the general case system (44) is a Hamiltonian system with six degrees of freedom. The main advantage of the chosen variables is that the Poisson bracket in them is the simplest and the equations for \vec{M} and \vec{L} are similar to systems arising in rigid body dynamics [14, 58, 59]. All this allows one to apply efficient reduction methods to system (44) in the case of additional integrals of the form (34). Below this will be illustrated by a Schwarzschild metric. Previously, such reduction methods have proved to be efficient in the problem of two bodies in spaces of constant curvature [60, 61].

III. THE SCHWARZSCHILD SPACE-TIME

If we denote the coordinates by $(x^\alpha) = (t, r, \theta, \varphi)$, then the interval for a Schwarzschild metric can be represented

as

$$ds^2 = -a(r)dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{a(r)} + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\varphi^2), \quad a(r) = 1 - \frac{2\mu}{r}. \quad (45)$$

This interval describes a spherically symmetric black hole with the event horizon $\mathcal{S}_h = \{(x^\alpha) \mid r = 2\mu\}$, where the parameter μ has the physical meaning of the mass of a black hole. Below we will consider the motion of the test body only on the outside of the event horizon.

The nonzero components of the curvature tensor in the basis attached to the coordinates have the form

$$\begin{aligned} R_{trtr} &= -\frac{2\mu}{r^3}, & R_{t\theta t\theta} &= a(r)\frac{\mu}{r}, \\ R_{t\varphi t\varphi} &= a(r)\frac{\mu}{r} \sin^2 \theta, & R_{r\theta r\theta} &= -\frac{\mu}{ra(r)}, \\ R_{r\varphi r\varphi} &= -\frac{\mu}{ra(r)} \sin^2 \theta, & R_{\theta\varphi\theta\varphi} &= 2\mu r \sin^2 \theta, \end{aligned}$$

and the other nonzero components can be obtained from the antisymmetry properties $R_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} = -R_{\alpha\beta\nu\mu} = -R_{\beta\alpha\mu\nu} = R_{\beta\alpha\nu\mu}$.

Since the metric is diagonal, orthonormalized vectors can be obtained by normalizing the chosen basis

$$e_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{a(r)}} \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \quad e_1 = \sqrt{a(r)} \frac{\partial}{\partial r}, \quad e_2 = \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta}, \quad e_3 = \frac{1}{r \sin \theta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi}.$$

Next, we will need relations for the coefficients $\omega_{\alpha AB}$. Straightforward calculation from (41) shows that only eight coefficients do not vanish:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{t01} &= -\frac{\mu}{r^2}, & \omega_{\theta 12} &= -\sqrt{a(r)} \\ \omega_{\varphi 13} &= -\sqrt{a(r)} \sin \theta, & \omega_{\varphi 23} &= -\cos \theta, \end{aligned}$$

and four other coefficients can be obtained from the antisymmetry property $\omega_{\alpha AB} = -\omega_{\alpha BA}$.

In the case of a Schwarzschild metric, system (33) has the discrete symmetry:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}: \quad \theta &\rightarrow \pi - \theta, \quad p_\theta \rightarrow -p_\theta, \quad S^{r\theta} \rightarrow -S^{r\theta}, \\ S^{t\theta} &\rightarrow -S^{t\theta}, \quad S^{\theta\varphi} \rightarrow -S^{\theta\varphi}, \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

where the other variables remain unchanged. As is well known, the fixed symmetry points form an invariant submanifold which for \mathcal{I} consists of trajectories lying in the equatorial plane

$$\text{Fix } \mathcal{I}: \quad \theta = \frac{\pi}{2}, \quad p_\theta = 0, \quad S^{r\theta} = S^{t\theta} = S^{\theta\varphi} = 0. \quad (47)$$

Next, the explicit coordinates of the tensors in the coordinate basis will be denoted by t, r, θ, φ , and the components of the three-dimensional vectors \vec{L} and \vec{M} will be labeled by 1, 2, 3 to emphasize their difference.

A. Additional integrals

The metric (45) has four Killing fields:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}, -\sin \varphi \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} - \frac{\cos \varphi}{\tan \theta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi}, \cos \varphi \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} - \frac{\sin \varphi}{\tan \theta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi}.$$

As a result, system (44) admits four additional integrals, which, according to (34), can be represented as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E} &= -P_t, \quad \vec{Q} = (Q_1, Q_2, P_\varphi), \\ Q_1 &= \frac{\cos \varphi}{\sin \theta} (L_1 - P_\varphi \cos \theta) - P_\theta \sin \varphi, \\ Q_2 &= \frac{\sin \varphi}{\sin \theta} (L_1 - P_\varphi \cos \theta) + P_\theta \cos \varphi. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

where \mathcal{E} is the energy of the test body.

The Poisson bracket (42) of the integral \mathcal{E} with the components of the vector \vec{Q} is zero. Between the components of \vec{Q} this bracket has the form

$$\{Q_i, Q_j\} = \hat{Q}_{ij}.$$

As we see, if $\vec{Q} \neq 0$, then the set of integrals (48) is non-involutive and forms the algebra $so(3)$. From the components of \vec{Q} one can combine two involutive integrals P_φ and

$$\begin{aligned} F = (\vec{Q}, \vec{Q}) &= P_\theta^2 + P_\varphi^2 + \frac{(L_1 - P_\varphi \cos \theta)^2}{\sin^2 \theta} = \\ P_\theta^2 + L_1^2 + \frac{(L_1 \cos \theta - P_\varphi)^2}{\sin^2 \theta} &\geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

This leads us to the following result.

Proposition 1. *The Hamiltonian system (44) for a Schwarzschild metric admits the reduction*

- by three degrees of freedom if $\vec{Q} \neq 0$;
- by four degrees of freedom if $\vec{Q} = 0$.

Next, we consider the reduction in these two cases separately.

B. Reduction in the case $\vec{Q} \neq 0$

The metric (45) does not explicitly depend on φ and t . Therefore, reduction by two degrees of freedom has, in fact, been performed in system (44) as the system governing the evolution of \vec{L} , \vec{M} , P_r , r , P_θ , and θ decouples. To perform further reduction of the order of the system,

we write the symmetry field generated by the integral F :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{P_\varphi \cos \theta - L_1}{\sin^2 \theta} \left[L_3 \frac{\partial}{\partial L_2} - L_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial L_3} + M_3 \frac{\partial}{\partial M_2} - M_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial M_3} - \right. \\ \left. \frac{L_1 \cos \theta - P_\varphi}{\sin \theta} \frac{\partial}{\partial P_\theta} \right] + P_\theta \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta}. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

As is well known (for details see, e.g., [54]), to perform the reduction one needs to choose as new variables the integrals of this symmetry field, i.e., the variables in which the Poisson bracket (42) with integral F is equal to zero. However, arbitrariness in the choice of reduced variables arises since an arbitrary function of these integrals is also an integral.

In this case, the vector field (50) is fairly simple and it is easy to find its additional integrals:

$$\begin{aligned} L_1, \sqrt{L_2^2 + L_3^2}, M_1, (\vec{M}, \vec{L}), M_2 L_3 - M_3 L_2, \\ L_3 P_\theta - \frac{L_2}{\sin \theta} (L_1 \cos \theta - P_\varphi), L_2 P_\theta + \frac{L_3}{\sin \theta} (L_1 \cos \theta - P_\varphi). \end{aligned}$$

We make use of the arbitrariness described above to simplify the Poisson bracket for the value of the Casimir function, $C_\star = 0$. By straightforward calculations one can verify that it is convenient to choose P_r , r and

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{E} &= \left(L_1, \frac{L_3 P_\theta}{\sqrt{L_2^2 + L_3^2}} + L_2 \frac{L_1 \cos \theta - P_\varphi}{\sin \theta \sqrt{L_2^2 + L_3^2}}, \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{L_2 P_\theta}{\sqrt{L_2^2 + L_3^2}} + L_3 \frac{L_1 \cos \theta - P_\varphi}{\sin \theta \sqrt{L_2^2 + L_3^2}} \right), \\ \vec{Z} &= \left(-\frac{M_1 \sqrt{(\vec{L}, \vec{L})}}{\sqrt{L_2^2 + L_3^2}}, \sqrt{(\vec{L}, \vec{L})}, \frac{M_2 L_3 - M_3 L_2}{\sqrt{L_2^2 + L_3^2}} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

as new variables since in these variables the nonzero Poisson brackets on the level set of the integral $C_\star = 0$ have a fairly simple form:

$$\begin{aligned} \{E_1, E_2\} &= E_3, \quad \{E_1, E_3\} = -E_2, \quad \{E_2, E_3\} = E_1, \\ \{Z_1, Z_2\} &= Z_3, \quad \{Z_1, Z_3\} = Z_2, \quad \{Z_2, Z_3\} = Z_1, \end{aligned} \quad (52a)$$

$$\{r, P_r\} = 1. \quad (52b)$$

Note that the Poisson bracket (52a) corresponds to expansion in the direct sum $so(3) \otimes so(2, 1)$.

The rank of the matrix defined by the Poisson bracket (52) is six. Hence, it has two Casimir functions. One of them is C_\circ , which is defined by (43), and the other is the additional integral (49). In the coordinates (51) they have the form

$$C_\circ = -Z_1^2 + Z_2^2 - Z_3^2, \quad F = E_1^2 + E_2^2 + E_3^2. \quad (53)$$

In the new variables, the Hamiltonian (39) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
H = & \frac{a(r)}{m} \left[\frac{1}{2} + \frac{2\Theta^2 + Z_2^2 - E_1^2}{V} \right] P_r^2 + \frac{\Gamma + E_2}{mrV} \left[E_1 E_3 \left(\frac{Z_1^2}{Z_2^2} - 1 \right) - Z_3 E_2 \frac{Z_1}{Z_2} \right] P_r + \frac{Z_2^2 - E_1^2}{mr^3 V} [r\Gamma^2 + \mu Z_1^2] - \\
& \frac{(\mu\Theta - r^2\mathcal{E})^2}{mr^3(r-2\mu)} \left[\frac{1}{2} - \frac{Z_1^2 + Z_3^2 - 3\Theta^2}{V} \right] + \frac{\sqrt{Z_2^2 - E_1^2}}{mrV} [Z_3(\Theta - 2r\mathcal{E})P_r - Z_1 Z_2 \mathcal{E}] + \frac{E_3^2 + \Gamma^2}{mr^2} \left[\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2E_1^2}{V} \right] - \\
& \frac{\mu\Theta - r^2\mathcal{E}}{mr^2 V \sqrt{r(r-2\mu)}} [E_1 E_3 Z_3 + Z_1 Z_2 E_2] - \frac{1}{mr^2 V} \left[\frac{Z_1}{Z_2} E_1 E_3 + Z_3 \Gamma \right]^2,
\end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

where the following notation has been introduced:

$$\begin{aligned}
V &= \frac{m^2}{\mu} r^3 - 2Z_1^2 - Z_2^2 + Z_3^2 + 3E_1^2 \left(1 + \frac{Z_1^2}{Z_2^2} \right), \\
\Gamma &= \sqrt{a(r)(Z_2^2 - E_1^2)} - E_2, \quad \Theta = \frac{Z_1}{Z_2} \sqrt{Z_2^2 - E_1^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, system (44) reduces to an analysis of the following Hamiltonian system with three degrees of freedom:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\vec{E}}{d\tau} &= \vec{E} \times \frac{\partial H}{\partial \vec{E}}, \quad \frac{d\vec{Z}}{d\tau} = (\mathbf{J}\vec{Z}) \times \frac{\partial H}{\partial \vec{Z}}, \\
\frac{dP_r}{d\tau} &= -\frac{\partial H}{\partial r}, \quad \frac{dr}{d\tau} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial P_r},
\end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

where $\mathbf{J} = \text{diag}(1, -1, 1)$. Note that, in deriving the equations of motion (55) and in the other relations in this section in which the partial derivative of the Hamiltonian appears, we need to explicitly substitute the following equation into the function V :

$$m^2 = -a(r)P_r^2 + \frac{(\mu\Theta - \mathcal{E}r^2)^2}{r^3(r-2\mu)} - \frac{E_3^2 + \Gamma^2}{r^2}. \quad (56)$$

Since $C_o > 0$, the trajectories of system (55) lie on the family of symplectic leaves

$$\mathcal{S}_c^6 = \{(\vec{E}, \vec{Z}, r, P_r) \mid C_o(\vec{Z}) = c^2, F(\vec{E}) = \ell\}.$$

Note that the Hamiltonian (54) contains the term $\frac{Z_1}{Z_2}$. Therefore, it has a singularity if $Z_2 = 0$, while on the leaves \mathcal{S}_c^6 the coordinates of the vector \vec{Z} lie on a two-sheet hyperboloid whose cavities are separated by the plane $Z_2 = 0$, so that in this case for the trajectories we have $Z_2 \neq 0$. In addition, according to (51), if $\vec{L} \neq 0$ then $Z_2 > 0$.

We identify the singularities of Eqs. (55) which can be reached by the trajectories of this system. First, they include the event horizon \mathcal{S}_h , which corresponds to the value of the radial coordinate $r = 2\mu$. Second, they include the case $d = 2m^2$ pointed out in Sec. (II C), which for the reduced system is equivalent to $V = 0$. The above-mentioned two singularities were present in the initial system (44). In addition to them, the equations of motion have a singularity after reduction if $E_1 = \pm Z_2$, which in the initial system reduces to the case $L_2 = 0$, $L_3 = 0$. This singularity requires a separate analysis.

System (55) has an invariant manifold defined by two relations from the Tulczyjew condition:

$$\begin{aligned}
f^r &= -\Theta P_r - \sqrt{Z_2^2 - E_1^2} \frac{Z_3}{r} + \frac{E_2 Z_2 Z_3 - E_1 Z_1 E_3}{Z_2 \sqrt{r(r-2\mu)}} = 0, \\
f^\theta &= \mathcal{E}\Theta + \frac{\mu\Theta^2}{r^2} - (\Gamma + E_2) \frac{\Gamma}{r} = 0.
\end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

On this invariant manifold, system (55) describes a four-dimensional flow on which the desired trajectories lie. This flow is given by a Hamiltonian system with two degrees of freedom since one degree of freedom can be eliminated using Eqs. (57). Hence, for it to be integrable by quadratures, we need an additional integral. In the general case, this integral is absent [8] and the problem reduces to an analysis of a two-dimensional Poincaré map.

We now consider how one can retrieve the values of the coordinates θ , φ and t from the known solution of the reduced system (55). Since the Schwarzschild space-time is spherically symmetric, for each trajectory there exists a coordinate system [8] in which

$$Q_1 = 0, \quad Q_2 = 0. \quad (58)$$

This gives

$$P_\theta = 0, \quad \cos \theta = \frac{E_1}{P_\varphi}. \quad (59)$$

Since in this section we set $\vec{Q} \neq 0$, we obtain $P_\varphi \neq 0$ from (58). Taking (59) into account, the equations defining the angle φ can be represented as

$$\frac{d\varphi}{d\tau} = \frac{P_\varphi}{E_2^2 + E_3^2} \left(E_2 \frac{\partial H}{\partial E_2} + E_3 \frac{\partial H}{\partial E_3} \right). \quad (60)$$

The Poisson bracket of the coordinate t with all variables of the reduced system is equal to zero. Hence,

$$\frac{dt}{d\tau} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial \mathcal{E}}. \quad (61)$$

Thus, the problem reduces to an analysis of the reduced system (55), and the evolution of the remaining coordinates is governed by (59), (60) and (61).

In the variables of the reduced system, inequality (32)

can be represented as

$$U = \frac{1}{a(r)} \left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial P_r} \right)^2 + r^2 \left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial E_2} \right)^2 + r^2 \left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial E_3} \right)^2 - a(r) \left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial \mathcal{E}} \right)^2 < 0. \quad (62)$$

REMARK 4. If one does not assume that relations (58) are satisfied, then to define the remaining coordinates one needs to find a cyclic coordinate corresponding to the integral F . It satisfies the condition

$$\{\psi, F\} = \text{const}, \quad (63)$$

where the Poisson bracket is defined by (42). If $\ell > P_\varphi$ and $\ell > L_1$, one can define the angles

$$\cos \alpha = \frac{P_\varphi}{\ell}, \quad \cos \beta = \frac{L_1}{\ell},$$

where $\alpha, \beta \in (0, \pi)$. Then condition (63) is satisfied by ψ , which is defined by the equation

$$\cos \theta = \cos \alpha \cos \beta + \sin \alpha \sin \beta \cos \psi. \quad (64)$$

This equation has the following geometric interpretation. Define a spherical triangle with sides α, β, θ . Then re-

lation (64) is a theorem of cosines where ψ is the angle between sides α and β .

The cyclic variable ψ has the following nonzero Poisson brackets with reduced variables:

$$\{\psi, E_2\} = \frac{E_2}{\sqrt{\ell} \sin^2 \beta}, \quad \{\psi, E_3\} = \frac{E_3}{\sqrt{\ell} \sin^2 \beta}.$$

As a result, the cyclic coordinate satisfies the analogous equation (60). In this approach, the angle φ can be defined, for example, from the solution of the equation $Q_1 = \text{const}$. However, throughout the remainder of this paper we will assume for simplicity that relations (58) hold.

C. Reduction in the case $\vec{Q} = 0$

Consider separately the case $\vec{Q} = 0$. It follows from (48) that system (44) has the invariant manifold

$$P_\theta = 0, \quad L_1 = 0, \quad P_\varphi = 0. \quad (65)$$

In this case, according to (51), we have $\vec{E} = 0$, i.e., for the reduced system (55) these trajectories correspond to the zero value of the Casimir function $F(\vec{E}) = 0$.

Taking $Z_2 > 0$ into account, the Hamiltonian (55) simplifies to

$$H_0 = H|_{\vec{E}=0} = a(r) \left[\frac{1}{2} + \frac{2Z_1^2 + Z_2^2}{V_0} \right] P_r^2 + Z_2 Z_3 \frac{Z_1 + 2r\mathcal{E}}{rV_0} P_r + \frac{Z_2^2}{r^3 V_0} [ra(r)Z_2^2 + \mu Z_1^2] - \frac{(r\mathcal{E} + \mu Z_1)^2}{r^3(r - 2\mu)} \left[\frac{1}{2} + \frac{2Z_1^2 - Z_3^2}{V_0} \right] + \frac{Z_2^2}{r} \left[\mathcal{E} Z_1 + \frac{a(r)}{2r^2} - \frac{a(r)Z_3^2}{rV_0} \right], \quad V_0 = \frac{m^2}{\mu} r^3 - 2Z_1^2 - Z_2^2 + Z_3^2.$$

Thus, the problem reduces to an analysis of a Hamiltonian system with two degrees of freedom

$$\frac{d\vec{Z}}{d\tau} = (\mathbf{J}\vec{Z}) \times \frac{\partial H}{\partial \vec{Z}}, \quad \frac{dP_r}{d\tau} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial r}, \quad \frac{dr}{d\tau} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial P_r}. \quad (66)$$

The trajectories of this system lie on the symplectic leaf

$$\mathcal{S}_c^4 = \{(\vec{Z}, r, P_r) \mid C_0(\vec{Z}) = c^2\}.$$

The Tulczyjew condition defines the invariant manifold

$$Z_1 P_r + \frac{Z_2 Z_3}{r} = 0, \quad \mathcal{E} Z_1 + \frac{\mu Z_1^2}{r^2} - \frac{a(r)}{r} Z_2^2 = 0.$$

On this invariant manifold, system (66), with the Hamiltonian taken into account, describes a two-dimensional flow and is integrable by quadratures.

Now consider how one can retrieve the values of the coordinates θ, φ and t from the known solution of (66).

The nonzero Poisson brackets (42) of these coordinates with the variables of the reduced system have the form

$$\begin{aligned} \{\theta, E_2\} &= \frac{L_3}{\sqrt{L_2^2 + L_3^2}}, & \{\theta, E_3\} &= -\frac{L_2}{\sqrt{L_2^2 + L_3^2}}, \\ \{\varphi, E_2\} &= -\frac{L_2}{\sin \theta \sqrt{L_2^2 + L_3^2}}, & \{\varphi, E_3\} &= -\frac{L_3}{\sin \theta \sqrt{L_2^2 + L_3^2}}. \end{aligned}$$

It turns out that system (44) on the invariant manifold described by relations (65) and by the value of the Casimir function $C_\star = 0$ has the additional integral

$$K = \frac{L_2 \sin \theta}{\sqrt{L_2^2 + L_3^2}}.$$

Let us fix the value of this integral $K(\vec{L}, \theta) = \kappa < 1$ and express L_2 and L_3 in terms of κ and Z_2 as follows:

$$L_2 = \frac{\kappa Z_2}{\sin \theta}, \quad L_3 = \pm Z_2 \sqrt{1 - \frac{\kappa^2}{\sin^2 \theta}}. \quad (67)$$

With this in mind, the equations can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d\theta}{d\tau} &= \pm \sqrt{1 - \frac{\kappa^2}{\sin^2 \theta}} \left. \frac{\partial H}{\partial E_2} \right|_{\vec{E}=0} - \frac{\kappa}{\sin \theta} \left. \frac{\partial H}{\partial E_3} \right|_{\vec{E}=0}, \\ \frac{d\varphi}{d\tau} &= -\frac{\kappa}{\sin^2 \theta} \left. \frac{\partial H}{\partial E_2} \right|_{\vec{E}=0} \mp \frac{1}{\sin \theta} \sqrt{1 - \frac{\kappa^2}{\sin^2 \theta}} \left. \frac{\partial H}{\partial E_3} \right|_{\vec{E}=0}, \\ \frac{dt}{d\tau} &= -\frac{\partial H_0}{\partial \mathcal{E}},\end{aligned}$$

where the upper sign corresponds to the case $L_3 > 0$, and the lower sign, to the case $L_3 < 0$. Each time the radicand in (67) vanishes, the upper and lower signs in these equations must be interchanged.

A qualitative analysis of the trajectories of system (66) is a separate problem and is not considered in this paper. In what follows, we will consider only the case $\vec{Q} \neq 0$.

IV. RELATIVE EQUILIBRIA

We describe the fixed points of the reduced system (55) obtained above, which are relative equilibria. For them $r = \text{const}$ and $E_1 = \text{const}$. Then it follows from (59) that $\theta = \text{const}$. Therefore, for relative equilibria the test body moves generally in a circular orbit.

In the reduced system (55), one can assume without loss of generality that

$$m = 1, \quad \mu = 1. \quad (68)$$

Indeed, the mass of the test body and the black hole can be excluded from system (55) after transforming from the initial variables and energy to the dimensionless ones

$$P_r \rightarrow m\bar{P}_r, \quad r \rightarrow \mu\bar{r}, \quad E_i \rightarrow m\mu\bar{E}_i, \quad Z_i \rightarrow m\mu\bar{Z}_i, \quad \mathcal{E} \rightarrow m\bar{\mathcal{E}}.$$

After this change of variables, the dimensionless total angular momentum has the form

$$\bar{c} = \frac{c}{m\mu}.$$

The most realistic test body is one of the following compact objects [7]:

- a black hole that is described by a Kerr metric and has a total angular momentum that satisfies $c < m^2$;
- a neutron star for which, according to [62], various state equations predict $c \leq 0.6m^2$.

Taking into account the assumption about the smallness of the mass of the test body $m \ll \mu$, we obtain $\bar{c} \ll 1$. However, we will consider the case $\bar{c} \sim 1$ to completely analyze the dynamics of the Mathisson–Papapetrou equations and to supplement the results of [10, 12].

In addition, formally one can obtain $\bar{c} \sim 1$ for naked singularities, which arise for some solutions of the Einstein equations. Naked singularities have not been observed in nature, and their existence would violate the Cosmic Censorship Hypothesis, but they continue to be the subject of intense research (see, e.g., [63]).

Next, we will assume that conditions (68) are satisfied since this will allow us to simplify the explicit relations presented below.

A. Symmetric circular orbits

For the reduced system (55) the symmetry (46) is preserved and has the form

$$\mathcal{I}^{(r)} : E_1 \rightarrow -E_1, \quad E_3 \rightarrow -E_3,$$

where the other variables remain unchanged.

We fix the coordinates on the line of the fixed points of this symmetry

$$\text{Fix } \mathcal{I}^{(r)} : E_1 = 0, \quad E_3 = 0.$$

Then from the invariant submanifold (57), the symplectic leaf \mathcal{S}_c^6 and the integral (56) we obtain two solutions:

$$\mathcal{N}_0^\pm = \left\{ (\vec{E}, \vec{Z}, r, P_r) \mid \vec{E} = (0, \pm\sqrt{\ell}, 0), \quad \vec{Z} = \vec{Z}^\pm, \quad P_r = P_r^\pm \right\}.$$

Here and in what follows, the upper sign corresponds to \mathcal{N}_0^+ , and the lower sign, to \mathcal{N}_0^- . The vectors \vec{Z}^+ , \vec{Z}^- and the linear momentum P_r^\pm are given by the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned}Z_1^\pm &= -\frac{r^2 c (\mathcal{E} c \mp \sqrt{\ell})}{r^3 - c^2}, \quad Z_2^\pm = \frac{c \sqrt{b(r)} (r^3 \mathcal{E} \mp c \sqrt{\ell})}{r^3 - c^2}, \\ Z_3^\pm &= c \sqrt{b(r)} P_r^\pm, \\ \frac{(r^3 \mathcal{E} \mp c \sqrt{\ell})^2}{b(r) (r^3 - c^2)^2} - \frac{r^4 (\mathcal{E} c \mp \sqrt{\ell})^2}{(r^3 - c^2)^2} - b(r) (P_r^\pm)^2 &= 1,\end{aligned}$$

where the following notation has been introduced:

$$b(r) = 1 - \frac{2}{r}.$$

After substituting these values of the reduced variables into the equation for the radial coordinate, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\frac{dr}{d\tau} \right)^2 &= \frac{R_\pm(r)}{\chi_\pm^2(r)}, \\ R_\pm(r) &= (\mathcal{E} r^3 \mp c \sqrt{\ell})^2 - r^4 b(r) (\mathcal{E} c \mp \sqrt{\ell})^2 - b(r) (r^3 - c^2)^2, \\ \chi_\pm(r) &= r^3 - c^2 - 3 \left[\frac{r^2 c (\mathcal{E} c \mp \sqrt{\ell})}{r^3 - c^2} \right]^2.\end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

Previously, these relations were obtained, using different notation, independently in Refs. [43, 64]. Moreover,

these papers present derivations of equations on the invariant manifold (47) for a more general case of the Kerr metric.

We represent Eqs. (60) and (61) on \mathcal{N}_0^\pm as

$$\frac{d\varphi}{d\tau} = \frac{r(r^3 + 2c^2)(c\mathcal{E} \pm \sqrt{\ell})}{(r^3 - c^2)\chi_\pm(r)}, \quad \frac{dt}{d\tau} = \frac{r(r^3\mathcal{E} \mp c\sqrt{\ell})}{(r - 2)\chi_\pm(r)}.$$

Inequality (62) reduces to

$$U = \frac{(r^3 + 2c^2)(r^3 - c^2) - (2r^3 + c^2)\chi_\pm(r)}{\chi_\pm^2(r)} < 0. \quad (70)$$

The behavior of the radial coordinate in Eq. (69) is examined in detail in Ref. [12]. We consider only the case of circular orbits $r = \text{const}$, in which \mathcal{N}_0^\pm define the fixed points of the reduced system (55). In this case, $P_r = 0$ and r is the critical point of the function $R_\pm(r)$:

$$R_\pm(r) = 0, \quad \frac{dR_\pm(r)}{dr} = 0. \quad (71)$$

For such circular orbits the angular momentum of the body is parallel to the orbital angular momentum. Note that for \mathcal{N}_0^+ they are aligned, and for \mathcal{N}_0^- they have opposite directions.

The system of Eqs. (71) has a rather complex dependence on the radial coordinate r , whereas the terms \mathcal{E} and $\sqrt{\ell}$ appear in Eqs. (71) only in the first and the second degree. Solving this system for the above values of the first integrals, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_0^\pm &= \left\{ (\ell, c, \mathcal{E}) \mid \ell = \frac{2\eta^2}{r\Delta_\pm}, \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_\pm(r, c) \right\}, \\ \eta &= r^6 - 2c^4(r - 2)^2 - c^2r^4(r - 7) - 11c^2r^3 \\ \mathcal{E}_\pm &= \pm \frac{2((2r - 3)c^4 - 3c^2r^3 + r^6(r - 3))\sqrt{\frac{\eta^2}{\Delta_\pm}}}{r^4c\sqrt{2r}(2r^3 + c^2 - 9r^2)} \\ &\quad \mp \frac{(r^3 - c^2)\sqrt{\Delta_\pm}}{r^4c\sqrt{2r}(2r^3 + c^2 - 9r^2)}, \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

where Σ_0^+ corresponds to \mathcal{N}_0^+ , Σ_0^- corresponds to \mathcal{N}_0^- , and the following function has been introduced:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_\pm &= 2r^3(r - 3)(r^3 - c^2)^2 \mp \\ &\quad r^2c(r - 2)(2r^3 + c^2 - 9r^2)\sqrt{4r^7 + 13c^2r^4 - 8c^4r +} \\ &\quad c^2(r - 2)[(r - 2)c^2(4(2r - 3)c^2 + r^3(8r - 39)) + \\ &\quad 2r^7(r - 8) + 33r^6]. \end{aligned}$$

To describe the surfaces Σ_0^+ and Σ_0^- , it is convenient to consider the section formed by their intersection with the plane $c = \text{const}$ on which they define two curves.

If $c = 0$, then we obtain the case of geodesics in which relations (72) define one curve (see Fig. 3a) on which the radial coordinate changes in the interval $r \in (3, +\infty)$. The value $r = 6$ corresponds to a singular cusp point on

this curve (see, e.g., [65]), which separates stable circular orbits with $r \in (6, +\infty)$ from unstable orbits.

Further, as the total angular momentum c increases, the curves defined by (72) no longer coincide (see Fig. 3b), but the singular cusp point persists [11, 12]. Also, on each curve the domain of definition of the radial coordinate r is given by the condition $\Delta_\pm > 0$ for Σ_0^\pm , respectively. The value of the radial coordinate r defining the cusp satisfies the equation

$$\left. \frac{d^2R_\pm(r)}{dr^2} \right|_{\Sigma_0^\pm} = 0.$$

How the domain of definition of the radial coordinate and the position of the cusp change depending on c is illustrated in Fig. 4 separately for each of the curves, Σ_0^+ and Σ_0^- . The region in which inequality (70) is not satisfied is hatched. As we see, in this domain the functions $\chi_\pm(r) = 2r^{-3}(d + 2p_\alpha p^\alpha)|_{\Sigma_0^\pm}$ can vanish, but the pole-dipole approximation cannot be applied any longer, and so the corresponding trajectories should be analyzed by taking higher multipole moments into account.

It is also seen from Fig. 4 that, due to the spin-orbit interaction, for \mathcal{N}_0^+ the circular orbits can be nearer to the event horizon. Conversely, for \mathcal{N}_0^- they can be farther from the event horizon (for details, see [8, 11]). We note that such a spin-orbit interaction is, according to Sec. II A, a purely relativistic phenomenon.

In the general case, for rotating test bodies on the curve Σ_0^+ the singular cusp point separates trajectories that are stable and unstable only with respect to perturbations lying on the invariant manifold $\text{Fix } \mathcal{I}^{(r)}$. It was shown in Ref. [10] that the equilibrium points considered can lose stability with respect to perturbations that do not lie in $\text{Fix } \mathcal{I}^{(r)}$. It turns out that this is closely related to the birth of other asymmetric relative equilibria (i.e., those that do not lie in $\text{Fix } \mathcal{I}^{(r)}$). Previously, these equilibrium points were not found, and so we consider them separately.

B. Asymmetric circular orbits

On the invariant submanifold (57) and at a fixed value of the integral (56), the reduced system (55) possesses two one-parameter families of equilibrium points

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_1^\pm &= \left\{ (\vec{E}, \vec{Z}, r, P_r) \mid \vec{E} = (0, E_2^{(1)}, E_3^\pm), \right. \\ \vec{Z} &= (z, \sqrt{z^2 + 27(1 - z\mathcal{E})}, 0), \quad r = 3, \quad P_r = 0 \left. \right\}, \\ E_2^{(1)} &= \frac{12\sqrt{3}(3 - 2z\mathcal{E})}{\sqrt{z^2 + 27(1 - z\mathcal{E})}}, \\ E_3^\pm &= \pm 3\sqrt{\frac{(1 - z\mathcal{E})(z - 9\mathcal{E})^2}{z^2 + 27(1 - z\mathcal{E})}} - 1, \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

where z is a parameter. As we see, these equilibrium points are, according to (59), circular orbits lying in the




FIG. 3. Curves Σ_0^\pm on the plane (ℓ, \mathcal{E}) for different c .




FIG. 4. Domain of definition (gray) of the radial coordinate r depending on c for Σ_0^\pm .

equatorial plane $\theta = \frac{\pi}{2}$ for which

$$\frac{d\varphi}{d\tau} = \frac{P_\varphi}{9}, \quad \frac{dt}{d\tau} = 3\mathcal{E}.$$

To describe the domain of definition of the parameter z , we note that for \mathcal{N}_1^\pm inequality (62) is equivalent to

$$U = -z\mathcal{E} < 0.$$

The domain of definition of z is given by this inequality and by the condition for positivity of the expressions under the square root in \mathcal{N}_1^\pm . This region on the plane (z, \mathcal{E}) is shown in Fig. 5a.

We express z in terms of the value of the Casimir function $C_o(\vec{Z}) = c^2$:

$$z = \frac{27 - c^2}{27\mathcal{E}},$$

the corresponding region is shown in Fig. 5b. Then, taking this relation into account and substituting (73)

into $F(\vec{E}) = \ell$, we obtain

$$\Sigma_1 = \left\{ (\ell, c, \mathcal{E}) \mid \frac{c^2}{3} + 27\mathcal{E}^2 - \ell = 9 \right\},$$

where $\ell \in (\ell^*, +\infty)$ and

$$\ell^* = \frac{2}{9}c^2 - \frac{3}{2} + \frac{3}{c}\sqrt{27 + \frac{13}{4}c^2 - \frac{2}{27}c^4}.$$

The equilibrium points \mathcal{N}_1^\pm have $E_1 = 0$. Therefore, they lie, according to (59), in the equatorial plane $\theta = \frac{\pi}{2}$. In addition to them, the reduced system (55) also possesses equilibrium points that have $E_3 = 0$, but $E_1 \neq 0$. For them $\theta \neq \frac{\pi}{2}$ and they are not given by explicit relations, and so we represent them in the following implicit




FIG. 5. Region on the plane (z, \mathcal{E}) and (c, \mathcal{E}) for which there exist equilibrium points \mathcal{N}_1^\pm (gray). Black indicates the curve on which $E_3^\pm = 0$.

form:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_2^\pm &= \left\{ (\vec{E}, \vec{Z}, r, P_r) \mid \vec{E} = (\pm\sqrt{z^2 - W^2}, E_2^{(2)}, 0), \right. \\ &\quad \left. \vec{Z} = (\sqrt{z^2 - c^2}, z, 0), P_r = 0 \right\}, \\ E_2^{(2)} &= W \left(\sqrt{b(r)} - \frac{z^2 - c^2}{r z^2 \sqrt{b(r)}} \right) + \frac{r \mathcal{E} \sqrt{z^2 - c^2}}{z \sqrt{b(r)}}, \\ W &= \frac{r^2 z}{c \sqrt{z^2 - c^2}} (c \mathcal{E} - z \sqrt{b(r)}), \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

where the parameters r and z satisfy the following system:

$$\begin{aligned} &6r^{\frac{7}{2}} c^3 \mathcal{E} - \sqrt{3\zeta(z^2 - c^2)} + 3z\sqrt{r-2} \cdot \\ &(2c^2 r^3 - (2r^3 + c^2)(z^2 - c^2)) = 0, \\ &\frac{z\sqrt{3\zeta}}{2} [z^2(r-2)(c^4 - (2r^3 + c^2)z^2) + \\ &c^2 r^3 \left((r-3)z^2 + c^2 \left(r - \frac{5}{3} \right) \right)] + \\ &\sqrt{(r-2)(z^2 - c^2)} \left(\frac{z^2 \zeta}{2} + \frac{c^2 r^3 z^2}{2} (2r^3 + c^2) \cdot \right. \\ &\left. (3(z^2 - c^2)(r-1) - 2c^2) + c^4 r^6 (c^2 + 3z^2) \right) = 0, \\ &\zeta = 3z^2(r-2)(2r^3 + c^2)^2(z^2 - c^2) + 4c^4 r^3 (r^3 + 2c^2) > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

REMARK 5. To obtain relations (75), one needs to restrict system (55) to relations (74). This leaves us with the

following two equations:

$$\left(E_2 \frac{\partial H}{\partial E_1} - E_1 \frac{\partial H}{\partial E_2} \right) \Big|_{\mathcal{N}_2^\pm} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial H}{\partial r} \Big|_{\mathcal{N}_2^\pm} = 0. \quad (76)$$

Next, by choosing a linear combination of these equations one can obtain a quadratic equation in \mathcal{E} . Choosing the principal root of this equation, one obtains the first of relations (75). The other root must be excluded since inequality (62) is not satisfied for it. Next, substituting the resulting solution for \mathcal{E} into any of Eqs. (76), one can show that it reduces to the second of Eqs. (75). The computations themselves are rather cumbersome and so they are not presented here explicitly.

Figure 6 shows how the dependences $z(r)$ and $\mathcal{E}(r)$ change for the equilibrium points \mathcal{N}_2^\pm . In these figures, the curves have an origin in which $z = W$. This corresponds to $E_1 = 0$. Substituting these values of the coordinates for (74) into $F(\vec{E}) = \ell$ and taking (75) into account, we can write in implicit form

$$\Sigma_2 = \left\{ (\ell, c, \mathcal{E}) \mid \ell = \tilde{\ell}(c, \mathcal{E}) \right\}.$$

According to Figs. 5b and 6b, the circular orbits (73) and (74) have energy $\mathcal{E} > 1$ for small c . In the limit $c \rightarrow 0$ we have $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow +\infty$, i.e., the asymmetric circular orbits found above arise only when the angular momentum of the test body is nonzero. We analyze how the angular momentum is directed in this case using the Pauli-Lubanski vector:

$$S^\alpha = \frac{\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu}}{2m\sqrt{-g}} p_\beta S_{\mu\nu},$$

which satisfies the condition $p_\alpha S^\alpha = 0$. In the reduced variables the components of this vector can be represented as




FIG. 6. Dependence $z(r)$ and $\mathcal{E}(r)$ for the equilibrium points \mathcal{N}_2^\pm for different values of c .

$$\begin{aligned}
 S^t &= \frac{E_3 \sqrt{Z_2^2 - E_1^2}}{\sqrt{r(r-2)}}, \quad S^r = \frac{\sqrt{b(r)}}{r Z_2} (E_1 E_2 Z_1 + E_3 Z_2 Z_3) - \mathcal{E} E_1 - \frac{(r-3) Z_1 E_1}{r^2 Z_2} \sqrt{Z_2^2 - E_1^2}, \\
 S^\theta &= \frac{\sqrt{Z_2^2 - E_1^2}}{P_\varphi Z_2 r^{\frac{5}{2}} \sin \theta \sqrt{r-2}} (E_2 Z_1 (r-3) \sqrt{Z_2^2 - E_1^2} - Z_1 (E_2^2 + E_3^2) \sqrt{r(r-2)} + r^2 \mathcal{E} E_2 Z_2), \\
 S^\varphi &= \frac{E_3 P_\varphi \sqrt{Z_2^2 - E_1^2}}{r^{\frac{5}{2}} \sqrt{r-2} Z_2 (E_2^2 + E_3^2)} (\mathcal{E} r^2 Z_2 + Z_1 (r-3) \sqrt{Z_2^2 - E_1^2}),
 \end{aligned}$$

where in the last two components we have explicitly taken relations (59) into account. As noted above, for the symmetric circular orbits (72) we have $S^r = S^\varphi = 0$, whereas for the asymmetric circular orbits the angular momentum is not parallel to the orbital angular momentum:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{N}_1^\pm : S^r &= 0, \quad S^\theta \neq 0, \quad S^\varphi \neq 0, \\
 \mathcal{N}_2^\pm : S^r &\neq 0, \quad S^\theta = 0, \quad S^\varphi = 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

C. Stability analysis

Let us analyze the stability of the asymmetric relative equilibria together with Σ_0^+ . Note that the pairs of relative equilibria are related to each other by the symmetry transformation:

$$\mathcal{I}^{(r)}(\mathcal{N}_1^+) = \mathcal{N}_1^-, \quad \mathcal{I}^{(r)}(\mathcal{N}_2^+) = \mathcal{N}_2^-,$$

and hence the equilibrium points from each pair are of the same type.

The characteristic polynomial of linearization of the Hamiltonian system (55) in a neighborhood of the equilibrium points on the invariant manifold (57) has the form

$$p(\lambda) = \lambda^2(\lambda^4 + A\lambda^2 + B),$$

where two zero eigenvalues are related to the additional integrals (53). Depending on the character of the eigenvalues, four types of singular points are possible:

- center-center ($\lambda_{1,2} = \pm i\alpha$, $\lambda_{3,4} = \pm i\beta$);
- saddle-center ($\lambda_{1,2} = \pm i\alpha$, $\lambda_{3,4} = \pm \beta$);
- saddle-saddle ($\lambda_{1,2} = \pm \alpha$, $\lambda_{3,4} = \pm \beta$);
- focus-focus ($\lambda_{1,2,3,4} = \pm \alpha \pm i\beta$),

where α and β are real numbers. We note that it is only the singular point of center-center type that is Lyapunov stable.

To analyze the stability of the equilibrium points, we will construct for the fixed $c = \text{const}$ the curve Σ_0^+ together with Σ_1 and Σ_2 on the plane (ℓ, \mathcal{E}) . In addition, we will show the corresponding equilibrium points on the plane of the coefficients of the characteristic polynomial (A, B) as curves. This will allow us to define the type of equilibrium points (for details, see [66]) since regions with different types of singular points on the plane of the coefficients are separated by the parabola $A^2 - 4B = 0$ and the straight line $B = 0$ (see Figs. 7b and 8b). Both figures provide a clear description of the types of equilibrium points and their bifurcations.

We will distinguish three cases:




FIG. 7. Curves Σ_0^+ , Σ_1 and Σ_2 on the plane (ℓ, ε) and the corresponding equilibrium points on the plane of the coefficients of the characteristic polynomial for the fixed $c = 0.65$.




FIG. 8. Curves Σ_0^+ , Σ_1 and Σ_2 on the plane (ℓ, ε) and the corresponding equilibrium points on the plane of the coefficients of the characteristic polynomial for the fixed $c = 1.5$.

(i) $c \in (0, c_1^*)$, where $c_1^* \approx 0.98878$;

(ii) $c \in (c_1^*, c_2^*)$, where $c_2^* \approx 1.3234$;

(iii) $c > c_2^*$.

The typical form of the curves Σ_0^+ , Σ_1 and Σ_2 for case (i) is shown in Fig. 7a. As we see, asymmetric circular orbits arise from Σ_0^+ at points C_1 and C_2 . The types of singular points for this case are shown in Fig. 7b, in which the type of the singular point Σ_0^+ , except for the cusp, changes at points C_1 and C_2 .

The value $c = c_1^*$ corresponds to the case where point C_2 coincides with the cusp on the curve Σ_0^+ , and then, as c is increased, case (ii) arises, in which asymmetric circular orbits are also unstable. Then, for $c = c_2^*$ the other point C_1 coincides with the cusp on the curve Σ_0^+ . As c is increased further, we obtain case (iii). For this case, the typical form of the curves Σ_0^+ , Σ_1 and Σ_2 and the types of singular points are shown in Fig. 8. As we see, in this case circular orbits \mathcal{N}_1^\pm can be of center-center type and hence be stable.

REMARK 6. Throughout this section, for the above-mentioned curves we have assumed $c \leq 2$. If $c > 2$, then

the curves Σ_0^\pm , Σ_1 and Σ_2 can bifurcate or disappear. For example, the radicand in ℓ^* can become negative.

V. POINCARÉ MAP

Consider the trajectories of the reduced system (55) that are different from the equilibrium points found in Sec. IV. For this we make use of a Poincaré map. Below we describe the procedure for constructing it.

1. As the secant of the vector field of system (55) we choose a plane that is given by the condition $E_1 = 0$.
2. We will construct the Poincaré map in the variables (r, P_r) . As for the other five variables, we will define them from the conditions defining the invariant manifold (57), from the Casimir functions (53) and from the integral corresponding to the mass (56). The values on the plane (r, P_r) for which there are no real roots will be shown as gray points, which will be spaced equally apart.

3. For the initial conditions described above, we numerically integrate system (55). At the same time, using the Henon method [67], we will find intersections of the trajectories with the chosen section, on which the quantity $\frac{dE_1}{d\tau}$ has the same sign. Showing the values of the coordinates on the plane (r, P_r) , we obtain a two-dimensional Poincaré point map.




FIG. 9. A Poincaré map for the fixed $c = 1.4$, $\ell = 16$, $E = 0.92292941$, $m = 1$ and $\mu = 1$, which qualitatively reproduces the map from Ref. [8] (see Fig. 4f).

The procedure described above of constructing a Poincaré map differs from that used in Ref. [8]. The latter involves numerically solving part of the initial Mathisson—Papapetrou equations (19) in constructing a Poincaré map, whereas the former involves numerically solving the reduced system (55), which has two variables less. One variable has been eliminated using the Casimir function $C_\star = 0$, and the other, using the cyclic coordinate of the symmetry field (50).

Nonetheless, in this case the Poincaré map for the parameter values from Ref. [8] is qualitatively reproduced (see Fig. 9) with the difference that, in Ref. [8], the velocity component of the supporting curve u^r (and not P_r) and a different secant were chosen in the ordinate (vertical) axis.

We note that the trajectories corresponding to falling, $r \rightarrow 2\mu$, or those going to infinity, $r \rightarrow +\infty$, can cease to cross the chosen secant. Therefore, a Poincaré map can be used only in the case where the recurrence of the trajectories is observed. In Ref. [8], an analog of the effective potential has been constructed and analyzed to search for such trajectories.

In this case, we make use of the results of Sec. IV and choose values of the integrals c , ℓ and \mathcal{E} a little above the part of the curve Σ_0^+ in which the equilibrium point is of center-center type. A typical Poincaré map for small values of c is shown in Fig. 10a. As we see, in this case the map has a stable fixed point (shown in red), which is surrounded by invariant curves. Next, as we increase energy \mathcal{E} , we cross the part of the curve Σ_0^+ that contains equi-

librium points of saddle-center type. An unstable fixed point arises in the map above this curve. This point is shown in blue in Fig. 10b. In Fig. 10b, separatrices to this unstable fixed point are numerically constructed (they are shown in different colors). One pair of separatrices splits, and the other pair of separatrices tends to the event horizon in forward or backward time. Previously, such a situation arose for the geodesics of the Schwarzschild—Melvin metric [68]. As energy \mathcal{E} is increased further, the invariant curves in the map break down. After some value of energy is reached, the trajectories begin to fall onto the event horizon. We note that here and in what follows we assume $\mathcal{E} < 1$, for if this is not satisfied, trajectories going to infinity arise in the reduced system.

For large values of c , a different scenario may take place. At first, the fixed point in the map loses stability due to a supercritical pitchfork bifurcation (see Fig. 11b), and then regains stability after a subcritical pitchfork bifurcation (see Fig. 11c). Thus, five fixed points arise from one fixed point. The corresponding trajectories of the reduced system are shown in Fig. 13. Figure 12 shows a Poincaré map and separatrices constructed for different values of energy \mathcal{E} . As we see, separatrices from different fixed points in the map begin to intersect and heteroclinic trajectories arise. This confirms the assumption made in Ref. [8] that the observed chaos is due to a “heteroclinic tangle”. For these parameters, if we increase the energy further after intersection with the curve Σ_2 , the trajectories cease to cross the chosen secant and begin to approach the event horizon.

VI. CONCLUSION

This paper is concerned with the motion of a rotating test body in the Schwarzschild metric, which is described by the Mathisson—Papapetrou equations and the Tulczyjew condition. This system admits additional integrals, making it possible to decrease the number of equations in it, i.e., to perform a reduction. This paper presents an explicit reduction after which the Mathisson—Papapetrou equations reduce to a Hamiltonian system with three degrees of freedom. This system has an invariant manifold on which the required trajectories lie. On this manifold, the problem reduces to a Hamiltonian system with two degrees of freedom.

Among the fixed points of this system there are the well-known [8, 43] symmetric circular orbits. The orbital angular momentum of these trajectories is parallel to the angular momentum of the test body. It has turned out that the change of type of these fixed points leads to the emergence of asymmetric circular orbits. The angular momentum of these orbits is not parallel to the angular momentum of the body. If the test body is a black hole or a neutron star, these solutions turn out to be unstable. We note that asymmetric circular orbits have no analogs for geodesics since for them, as $c \rightarrow 0$, $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow +\infty$.




FIG. 10. A Poincaré map for the fixed $c = 0.65$, $\ell = 3.715$, $m = 1$, $\mu = 1$ and different values of energy \mathcal{E} .




FIG. 11. A Poincaré map for the fixed $c = 1.0$, $\ell = 3.807$, $m = 1$, $\mu = 1$ and different values of energy \mathcal{E} .




FIG. 12. A Poincaré map for the fixed $c = 1.0$, $\ell = 3.807$, $m = 1$, $\mu = 1$ and $\mathcal{E} = 0.9235$.

From the viewpoint of qualitative dynamical systems theory, there is nothing special in the emergence of such




FIG. 13. Projection of the trajectories of the reduced system onto the plane (P_r, E_1) and the space (r, P_r, E_1) for the parameters and the initial conditions in a neighborhood of fixed points in the Poincaré map in Fig.11c.

equilibrium points. Indeed, the fixed point of the reduced system is simultaneously a critical point of the Hamiltonian. As can be seen from Figs. 7b and 8b, the symmetric circular orbits change their type if the coefficient of the characteristic polynomial B changes its sign. This is accompanied by a change of the Morse index of the critical point. As a rule, such a change of the index is accompanied by the emergence of new equilibrium points and helps in finding them (for details, see, e.g., Ref. [66]). To all appearances, according to the results of Ref. [8], such a situation also arises for symmetric circular orbits in a Kerr metric. However, the analysis of the Kerr metric is made difficult by the fact that, for this metric, the additional Carter integral [69] is not generalized and the problem reduces to an analysis of a Hamiltonian system with three degrees of freedom. Therefore, the search for asymmetric circular orbits of a rotating test body for the Kerr metric is an interesting problem in its own right.

In addition, this paper presents a Poincaré map constructed by numerically solving the reduced system. In-

terestingly, this map exhibits two types of pitchfork bifurcations: supercritical and subcritical. As a result, five fixed points arise in the Poincaré map. Additionally, separatrices are constructed for unstable fixed points which intersect each other transversally. This confirms the assumption made in Ref. [8] that the observed chaos is due to a “heteroclinic tangle”.

We note that, according to Fig. 8b, a change of the type of singular point from center-center to focus-focus is observed for the equilibrium points \mathcal{N}_1^\pm . As a rule, such a bifurcation is called the *Hamiltonian Hopf bifurcation* [70], and this bifurcation may give rise to a periodic solution. It would be interesting to address this question for such a system, for example, using a Poincaré map.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author extends appreciation to I.S.Mamaev for discussing the topics covered in this paper. This work was carried out within the framework of the state assignment of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of Russia (FEWS-2024-0007).

-
- [1] M. Mathisson, Neue mechanik materieller systeme, Acta Physica Polonica **6**, 163–200 (1937).
 - [2] A. Papapetrou, Spinning test-particles in general relativity. i, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences **209**, 248–258 (1951).
 - [3] W. Tulczyjew, Motion of multipole particles in general relativity theory, Acta Phys. Pol **18**, 94 (1959).
 - [4] A. I. Harte, Mechanics of extended masses in general relativity, Classical and Quantum Gravity **29**, 055012 (2012).
 - [5] W. G. Dixon, Extended bodies in general relativity; their description and motion, Isolated Gravitating Systems in

- General Relativity, the International School of Physics Enrico Fermi, Course, Verenna, June 28-July 10, 1976 (1979).
- [6] P. Ramond and S. Isoyama, Symplectic mechanics of relativistic spinning compact bodies: Canonical formalism in the schwarzschild spacetime, Physical Review D **111**, 10.1103/physrevd.111.064027 (2025).
- [7] M. D. Hartl, Dynamics of spinning test particles in kerr spacetime, Physical Review D **67**, 10.1103/physrevd.67.024005 (2003).
- [8] S. Suzuki and K. Maeda, Chaos in schwarzschild spacetime: The motion of a spinning particle, Physical Review

- D **55**, 4848–4859 (1997).
- [9] O. Zelenka, G. Lukes-Gerakopoulos, V. Witzany, and O. Kopáček, Growth of resonances and chaos for a spinning test particle in the schwarzschild background, *Physical Review D* **101**, 10.1103/physrevd.101.024037 (2020).
 - [10] S. Suzuki and K. Maeda, Innermost stable circular orbit of a spinning particle in kerr spacetime, *Physical Review D* **58**, 10.1103/physrevd.58.023005 (1998).
 - [11] P. I. Jefremov, O. Y. Tsupko, and G. S. Bisnovaty-Kogan, Innermost stable circular orbits of spinning test particles in schwarzschild and kerr space-times, *Physical Review D* **91**, 10.1103/physrevd.91.124030 (2015).
 - [12] E. Hackmann, C. Lämmerzahl, Y. N. Obukhov, D. Puetzfeld, and I. Schaffer, Motion of spinning test bodies in kerr spacetime, *Physical Review D* **90**, 10.1103/physrevd.90.064035 (2014).
 - [13] H. Li, Y. Fan, and J. Zhang, A new algorithm for computing one-dimensional stable and unstable manifolds of maps, *International Journal of Bifurcation and Chaos* **22**, 1250018 (2012).
 - [14] A. Borisov and I. S. Mamaev, *Rigid body dynamics*, Vol. 52 (Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG, 2018).
 - [15] L. I. Sedov, *A Course in Continuum Mechanics: Elastic and plastic solids and the formation of cracks*, Vol. 4 (Wolters-Noordhoff, 1971).
 - [16] R. Lyttleton, *The stability of rotating liquid masses* (Cambridge University Press, 2013).
 - [17] S. Chandrasekhar, *Ellipsoidal figures of equilibrium*, New York: Dover (1987).
 - [18] S. Weinberg, *Gravitation and Cosmology: Principles and Applications of the General Theory of Relativity* (1972).
 - [19] A. I. Harte, Approximate spacetime symmetries and conservation laws, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **25**, 205008 (2008).
 - [20] S. E. Gralla, A. I. Harte, and R. M. Wald, Bobbing and kicks in electromagnetism and gravity, *Physical Review D* **81**, 10.1103/physrevd.81.104012 (2010).
 - [21] W. G. Dixon, A covariant multipole formalism for extended test bodies in general relativity, *Il Nuovo Cimento* **34**, 317–339 (1964).
 - [22] M. Mathisson, Republication of: New mechanics of material systems, *General Relativity and Gravitation* **42**, 1011–1048 (2010).
 - [23] W. G. Dixon, The new mechanics of myron mathisson and its subsequent development, in *Equations of Motion in Relativistic Gravity* (Springer International Publishing, 2015) p. 1–66.
 - [24] Z. Borelowski, Equations of motion for a one-point model of elementary particle in an external gravitational field, *Acta Physica Polonica* **28**, 349–360 (1965).
 - [25] Z. Borelowski, Equations of motion of a relativistic bi-point model of free elementary particle in an external gravitational field, *Acta Physica Polonica* **28**, 585–597 (1965).
 - [26] W.-T. Ni and M. Zimmermann, Inertial and gravitational effects in the proper reference frame of an accelerated, rotating observer, *Physical Review D* **17**, 1473–1476 (1978).
 - [27] B. Tulczyjew and W. Tulczyjew, On multipole formalism in general relativity, *Recent developments in general relativity*, 465 (1962).
 - [28] J. Steinhoff, Canonical formulation of spin in general relativity, *Annalen der Physik* **523**, 296–353 (2011).
 - [29] A. Trautman, Lectures on general relativity, *General Relativity and Gravitation* **34**, 721–762 (2002).
 - [30] A. Ohashi, Multipole particle in relativity, *Physical Review D* **68**, 10.1103/physrevd.68.044009 (2003).
 - [31] J. Steinhoff and D. Puetzfeld, Multipolar equations of motion for extended test bodies in general relativity, *Physical Review D* **81**, 10.1103/physrevd.81.044019 (2010).
 - [32] W. G. Dixon, Dynamics of extended bodies in general relativity. i. momentum and angular momentum, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences* **314**, 499–527 (1970).
 - [33] W. G. Dixon, Dynamics of extended bodies in general relativity iii. equations of motion, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences* **277**, 59–119 (1974).
 - [34] S. Kopeikin, M. Efroimsky, and G. Kaplan, *Relativistic Celestial Mechanics of the Solar System* (Wiley, 2011).
 - [35] Y. N. Obukhov and D. Puetzfeld, Dynamics of test bodies with spin in de sitter spacetime, *Physical Review D* **83**, 10.1103/physrevd.83.044024 (2011).
 - [36] L. F. Costa, C. Herdeiro, J. Natário, and M. Zilhão, Mathisson’s helical motions for a spinning particle: Are they unphysical?, *Physical Review D* **85**, 10.1103/physrevd.85.024001 (2012).
 - [37] R. Schattner, The center of mass in general relativity, *General Relativity and Gravitation* **10**, 377–393 (1979).
 - [38] R. Schattner, The uniqueness of the center of mass in general relativity, *General Relativity and Gravitation* **10**, 395–399 (1979).
 - [39] J.-M. Souriau, Modèle de particule à spin dans le champ électromagnétique et gravitationnel, *Annales de l’institut Henri Poincaré. Section A, Physique Théorique*, *Annales de l’institut Henri Poincaré. Section A, Physique Théorique* **20**, 315 (1974).
 - [40] E. Santos and C. Batista, Conserved quantities for the free motion of particles with spin, *Physical Review D* **101**, 10.1103/physrevd.101.104049 (2020).
 - [41] J. Ehlers and E. Rudolph, Dynamics of extended bodies in general relativity center-of-mass description and quasi-rigidity, *General Relativity and Gravitation* **8**, 197–217 (1977).
 - [42] G. Lukes-Gerakopoulos, Time parameterizations and spin supplementary conditions of the mathisson-papapetrou-dixon equations, *Physical Review D* **96**, 10.1103/physrevd.96.104023 (2017).
 - [43] K. P. Tod, F. de Felice, and M. Calvani, Spinning test particles in the field of a black hole, *Il Nuovo Cimento B Series 11* **34**, 365–379 (1976).
 - [44] S. Hojman and N. U. Princeton Univ., Electromagnetic and gravitational interactions of a relativistic spherical top (2024).
 - [45] O. Semerak, Spinning test particles in a kerr field – i, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **308**, 863–875 (1999).
 - [46] R. Hojman and S. Hojman, Spinning charged test particles in a kerr-newman background, *Physical Review D* **15**, 2724–2730 (1977).
 - [47] J.-M. Souriau, Sur le mouvement des particules à spin en relativité générale, *CR Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. AB* **271**, 751 (1970).
 - [48] T. Damour, Editorial note to jean-marie souriau’s” on the motion of spinning particles in general relativity”, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10013* (2024).
 - [49] Y. Feldman and G. E. Tauber, The internal state of a gas of particles with spin, *General Relativity and Gravitation*

- 12**, 837–856 (1980).
- [50] H. P. Künzle, Canonical dynamics of spinning particles in gravitational and electromagnetic fields, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **13**, 739–744 (1972).
 - [51] I. Khriplovich, *Spinning particle in a gravitational field*, Tech. Rep. (AN SSSR, Novosibirsk (USSR). Inst. Yadernoj Fiziki, 1988).
 - [52] G. d’Ambrosi, S. Satish Kumar, and J. van Holten, Covariant hamiltonian spin dynamics in curved space-time, *Physics Letters B* **743**, 478–483 (2015).
 - [53] V. Witzany, J. Steinhoff, and G. Lukes-Gerakopoulos, Hamiltonians and canonical coordinates for spinning particles in curved space-time, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **36**, 075003 (2019).
 - [54] V. I. Arnold, V. V. Kozlov, and A. I. Neishtadt, *Mathematical Aspects of Classical and Celestial Mechanics: Third Edition* (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2006).
 - [55] W. G. Ramírez and A. A. Deriglazov, Lagrangian formulation for mathisson-papapetrou-tulczyjew-dixon equations, *Physical Review D* **92**, 10.1103/physrevd.92.124017 (2015).
 - [56] A. Hanson and T. Regge, The relativistic spherical top, *Annals of Physics* **87**, 498–566 (1974).
 - [57] G. E. Tauber, Canonical formalism and equations of motion for a spinning particle in general relativity, *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **27**, 335–344 (1988).
 - [58] A. V. Borisov and I. S. Mamaev, Rigid body dynamics in non-euclidean spaces, *Russian Journal of Mathematical Physics* **23**, 431–454 (2016).
 - [59] A. V. Tsiganov, Rotations and integrability, *Regular and Chaotic Dynamics* **29**, 913–930 (2024).
 - [60] P. Arathoon, Unifying the hyperbolic and spherical 2-body problem with biquaternions, *Regular and Chaotic Dynamics* **28**, 822–834 (2023).
 - [61] A. V. Borisov, L. C. García-Naranjo, I. S. Mamaev, and J. Montaldi, Reduction and relative equilibria for the two-body problem on spaces of constant curvature, *Celestial Mechanics and Dynamical Astronomy* **130**, 10.1007/s10569-018-9835-7 (2018).
 - [62] G. B. Cook, S. L. Shapiro, and S. A. Teukolsky, Rapidly rotating neutron stars in general relativity: Realistic equations of state, *The Astrophysical Journal* **424**, 823 (1994).
 - [63] B. Nguyen, P. Christian, and C.-k. Chan, Shadow geometry of kerr naked singularities, *The Astrophysical Journal* **954**, 78 (2023).
 - [64] M. Saijo, K.-i. Maeda, M. Shibata, and Y. Mino, Gravitational waves from a spinning particle plunging into a kerr black hole, *Physical Review D* **58**, 10.1103/physrevd.58.064005 (1998).
 - [65] J. Stewart and M. Walker, Black holes: the outside story, in *Astrophysics* (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1973) p. 69–115.
 - [66] A. V. Bolsinov, A. V. Borisov, and I. S. Mamaev, Bifurcation analysis and the conley index in mechanics, *Regular and Chaotic Dynamics* **17**, 451–478 (2012).
 - [67] M. Henon, On the numerical computation of poincaré maps, *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* **5**, 412–414 (1982).
 - [68] I. Bizyaev, Classification of the trajectories of uncharged particles in the schwarzschild-melvin metric, *Physical Review D* **110**, 10.1103/physrevd.110.104031 (2024).
 - [69] G. Compère and A. Druart, Complete set of quasi-conserved quantities for spinning particles around kerr, *SciPost Physics* **12**, 10.21468/scipostphys.12.1.012 (2022).
 - [70] van der Meer Jan-Cees, *The Hamiltonian Hopf Bifurcation* (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1985).