# SAMPLE

## Chaos Theory

The Butterfly Effect and Deterministic Chaos

Aira Astralis

Free sample: Chapter 1

putrabooks.github.io

**Buy the full book:**

Gumroad

Payhip

# Contents

Chapter 1:  The Discovery of Chaos Theory

Chapter 2: Defining Chaos — Predictability Horizons and Formal Definitions

Chapter 3:  Understanding Chaos Theory

Chapter 4:  Key Characteristics of Chaos Theory

Chapter 5:  The Science Behind Chaos Theory

Chapter 6:  Observation and Measurement of Chaos Theory

Chapter 7:  Important Features of Chaos Theory

Chapter 8:  Chaos Theory in Context

Chapter 9:  Modern Understanding of Chaos Theory

Chapter 10:  Research and Exploration of Chaos Theory

Chapter 11:  Significant Discoveries About Chaos Theory

Chapter 12:  Challenges and Mysteries of Chaos Theory

Chapter 13:  Future Directions in Chaos Theory Research

Chapter 14:  Fun Facts and Trivia About Chaos Theory

# Chapter 1: The Discovery of Chaos Theory

Chaos theory concerns deterministic systems which are predictable for some amount of time and then appear to become random.

# Chapter 2: Defining Chaos — Predictability Horizons and Formal Definitions

The amount of time for which the behavior of a chaotic system can be effectively predicted depends on three things: How much uncertainty can be tolerated in the forecast, how accurately its current state can be measured, and a time scale depending on the dynamics of the system, called the Lyapunov time. Some examples of Lyapunov times are: Chaotic electrical circuits, about 1 millisecond; weather systems, a few days (but unproven); the inner solar system, 4 to 5 million years.

In chaotic systems, the uncertainty in a forecast increases exponentially with elapsed time. Hence, mathematically, doubling the forecast time more than squares the proportional uncertainty in the forecast. This means, in practice, a meaningful prediction cannot be made over an interval of more than two or three times the Lyapunov time. When meaningful predictions cannot be made, the system appears random. In common usage, "chaos" means "a state of disorder". However, in chaos theory, the term is defined more precisely.

Although no universally accepted mathematical definition of chaos exists, a commonly used definition, originally formulated by Robert L. Devaney, says that to classify a dynamical system as chaotic, it must have these properties: it must be sensitive to initial conditions, it must be topologically transitive, it must have dense periodic orbits. In some cases, the last two properties above have been shown to actually imply sensitivity to initial conditions. In the discrete-time case, this is true for all continuous maps on metric spaces.

In these cases, while it is often the most practically significant property, "sensitivity to initial conditions" need not be stated in the definition. If attention is restricted to intervals, the second property implies the other two. An alternative and a generally weaker definition of chaos uses only the first two properties in the above list. Sensitivity to initial conditions means that each point in a chaotic system is arbitrarily closely approximated by other points that have significantly different future paths or trajectories.

Thus, an arbitrarily small change or perturbation of the current trajectory may lead to significantly different future behavior. Sensitivity to initial conditions is popularly known as the "butterfly effect", so-called because of the title of a paper given by Edward Lorenz in 1972 to the American Association for the Advancement of Science in Washington, D.C., a talk whose famous title asked whether a butterfly's wingbeat in

Brazil could set off a tornado in Texas.

The flapping wing represents a small change in the initial condition of the system, which causes a chain of events that prevents the predictability of large-scale phenomena. Had the butterfly not flapped its wings, the trajectory of the overall system could have been vastly different. As suggested in Lorenz's book entitled The Essence of Chaos, published in 1993, "sensitive dependence can serve as an acceptable definition of chaos".

In the same book, Lorenz defined the butterfly effect as: "The phenomenon that a small alteration in the state of a dynamical system will cause subsequent states to differ greatly from the states that would have followed without the alteration." The above definition is consistent with the sensitive dependence of solutions on initial conditions (SDIC). An idealized skiing model was developed to illustrate the sensitivity of time-varying paths to initial positions.

A predictability horizon can be determined before the onset of SDIC (i.e., prior to significant separations of initial nearby trajectories). A consequence of sensitivity to initial conditions is that if we start with a limited amount of information about the system (as is usually the case in practice), then beyond a certain time, the system would no longer be predictable. This is most prevalent in the case of weather, which is generally predictable only about a week ahead.

This does not mean that one cannot assert anything about events far in the future - only that some restrictions on the system are present. For example, we know that the temperature of the surface of the earth will not naturally reach 100 °C (212 °F) or fall below −130 °C (−202 °F) on earth (during the current geologic era), but we cannot predict exactly which day will have the hottest temperature of the year.

In more mathematical terms, the Lyapunov exponent measures the sensitivity to initial conditions, in the form of rate of exponential divergence from the perturbed initial conditions. More specifically, given two starting trajectories in the phase space that are infinitesimally close, with initial separation δ Z, the two trajectories end up diverging at a rate given by t e where

This behavior can be studied through the analysis of a chaotic mathematical model or through analytical techniques such as recurrence plots and Poincaré maps. Chaos theory has applications in a variety of disciplines, including meteorology, anthropology, sociology, environmental science, computer science, engineering, economics, ecology, and pandemic crisis management. The theory formed the basis for such fields of study as complex dynamical systems, edge of chaos theory and self-assembly processes.

The rate of separation depends on the orientation of the initial separation vector, so a whole spectrum of Lyapunov exponents can exist. The number of Lyapunov exponents is equal to the number of dimensions of the phase space, though it is common to just refer to the largest one. For example, the maximal Lyapunov exponent (MLE) is most often used, because it determines the overall predictability of the system.

A positive MLE, coupled with the solution's boundedness, is usually taken as an indication that the system is chaotic. In addition to the above property, other properties related to sensitivity of initial conditions also exist. These include, for example, measure-theoretical mixing (as discussed in ergodic theory) and properties of a K-system. A chaotic system may have sequences of values for the evolving variable that exactly repeat themselves, giving periodic behavior starting from any point in that sequence.

However, such periodic sequences are repelling rather than attracting, meaning that if the evolving variable is outside the sequence, however close, it will not enter the sequence and in fact, will diverge from it. Thus for almost all initial conditions, the variable evolves chaotically with non-periodic behavior. Topological mixing (or the weaker condition of topological transitivity) means that the system evolves over time so that any given region or open set of its phase space eventually overlaps with any other given region.

This mathematical concept of "mixing" corresponds to the standard intuition, and the mixing of colored dyes or fluids is an example of a chaotic system. Topological mixing is often omitted from popular accounts of chaos, which equate chaos with only sensitivity to initial conditions. However, sensitive dependence on initial conditions alone does not give chaos. For example, consider the simple dynamical system produced by repeatedly doubling an initial value.

This system has sensitive dependence on initial conditions everywhere, since any pair of nearby points eventually becomes widely separated. However, this example has no topological mixing, and therefore has no chaos. Indeed, it has extremely simple behavior: all points except 0 tend to positive or negative infinity. A map f X

Topological transitivity is a weaker version of topological mixing. Intuitively, if a map is topologically transitive then given a point x and a region V, there exists a point y near x whose orbit passes through V. This implies that it is impossible to decompose the system into two open sets. An important related theorem is the Birkhoff Transitivity Theorem. It is easy to see that the existence of a dense orbit implies topological transitivity.

An easy way to visualize a chaotic attractor is to start with a point in the basin of attraction of the attractor, and then simply plot its subsequent orbit. Because of the topological transitivity condition, this is likely to produce a picture of the entire final attractor, and indeed both orbits shown in the figure on the right give a picture of the general shape of the Lorenz attractor.

Unlike fixed-point attractors and limit cycles, the attractors that arise from chaotic systems, known as strange attractors, have great detail and complexity. Strange attractors occur in both continuous dynamical systems (such as the Lorenz system) and in some discrete systems (such as the Hénon map).

The Lorenz attractor discussed below is generated by a system of three differential equations such as:

The Birkhoff Transitivity Theorem states that if X is a second countable, complete metric space, then topological transitivity implies the existence of a dense set of points in X that have dense orbits. For a chaotic system to have dense periodic orbits means that every point in the space is approached arbitrarily closely by periodic orbits. The one-dimensional logistic map defined by x → 4 x (1 – x) is one of the simplest systems with density of periodic orbits.

For example, (or approximately 0.3454915 → 0.9045085 → 0.3454915) is an (unstable) orbit of period 2, and similar orbits exist for periods 4, 8, 16, etc. Sharkovskii's theorem is the basis of the Li and Yorke (1975) proof that any continuous one-dimensional system that exhibits a regular cycle of period three will also display regular cycles of every other length, as well as completely chaotic orbits.

The cases of most interest arise when the chaotic behavior takes place on an attractor, since then a large set of initial conditions leads to orbits that converge to this chaotic region.

Chaos theory was not discovered in a single moment; it leaked into science over three centuries, resisted at every step, until a handful of twentieth-century discoveries forced everyone to admit what the mathematics had been saying all along: determinism and predictability are not the same thing.

The first leak appeared in the late nineteenth century, in the work of the French mathematician Henri Poincaré. Asked to settle the stability of the solar system for a prize competition, Poincaré found that even the simple three-body problem — Sun, planet, moon — could not be solved by the tidy formulas of Newtonian mechanics. His error-filled but revolutionary prize essay showed that in such systems, small differences in initial conditions can grow into enormous differences in outcomes, and that certain orbits wander forever without settling into any repeating pattern. Poincaré, in a famous passage, saw exactly what it meant: prediction may be impossible in practice even when the laws are perfectly known, because small causes can have large effects. It was chaos theory a century early — but the world was not ready to hear it.

For decades, Poincaré's insight remained a mathematical curiosity, a footnote in celestial mechanics. Physics was busy with relativity and quantum mechanics, and both fields had trained everyone to think of unpredictable systems as either random (governed by probability, like dice) or simply complicated (governed by too many variables, like weather). The idea that a simple, deterministic system with only three variables could be fundamentally unpredictable was almost insulting — and so, when it reappeared, it reappeared by accident.

The accident happened to Edward Lorenz. In 1961, at MIT, Lorenz was running a simplified weather model on a slow room-sized computer. Wanting to rerun a sequence, he re-entered its starting numbers from a printout, rounding 0.506127 to 0.506 — a difference of one part in a thousand. The new run should have duplicated the old. Instead it diverged wildly, ending in a completely different weather pattern. Lorenz, a careful meteorologist, checked for computer failure; there was none. The

explanation was staggering: in his twelve-equation model, the tiny rounding difference had grown exponentially. Perfectly deterministic equations, with almost identical inputs, produced utterly different futures. In 1963 he published his finding under the modest title "Deterministic Nonperiodic Flow" — the founding paper of chaos theory, largely ignored for a decade.

The 1970s brought the scattered pieces together. Mathematical biologists, including Robert May, showed that the simplest imaginable population model — one equation, one variable — could double its oscillations period by period into wild irregularity, a route to chaos called period-doubling that Mitchell Feigenbaum would soon show to be universal, obeying the same constants in every system. In 1975, Tien-Yien Li and James Yorke gave the phenomenon its name in a paper titled "Period Three Implies Chaos," proving that a simple rule following three cycles must also produce infinitely many unpredictable ones. That same decade, David Ruelle and Floris Takens proposed that turbulence — the oldest unsolved problem of fluid mechanics — was not a pile of endlessly stacked oscillations but a "strange attractor": a state of perpetual, structured unpredictability.

The discovery reached the public in 1987, when James Gleick's book Chaos: Making a New Science became a bestseller, introducing the world to the butterfly effect — Lorenz's own metaphor for sensitive dependence: a tiny wingbeat in Brazil growing, in principle, into a tornado in Texas. Gleick's account, and Thomas Kuhn's earlier idea of paradigm shifts that many researchers reached for to describe what was happening, framed chaos as more than a result: it was a new way of seeing, a scientific revolution in which the irregular — weather, turbulence, heart rhythms, animal populations — stopped being noise to be averaged away and became structure to be understood.

By the 1990s, chaos was a working science with journals, conferences, textbooks, and toolkits: the mathematics of nonlinear dynamics, applied from ecology to economics to cardiology. What had been discovered, in the end, was a buried assumption — that simple laws produce simple behavior — and its demolition. The rest of this book explains what replaced it.

The discovery also had a technology precondition worth naming, because chaos theory is a child of the computer age in a way that matters. Poincaré could see chaos in mathematics but never watch it; his three-body trajectories existed as existence proofs, not pictures. It took machines that could iterate simple rules millions of times — Lorenz's Royal McBee, the desktop calculators of the Feigenbaum era, the graphics terminals of the 1980s — to turn sensitive dependence from a theorem into an image. The famous pictures of the field (the butterfly attractor, the bifurcation tree of the logistic map) are not illustrations of the theory; they are the theory's experiments, run in silicon. Historians of science have noted that chaos theory arrived when it did not because nature changed but because a new instrument appeared — one that, unlike the telescope and microscope, extends not the senses but the patience of iteration.

The discovery story should end with its most human detail, the one that survived every retelling because it is true. Lorenz did not set out to discover a new science; he was testing a statistical idea about weather forecasting, and the model he built for

that test — twelve equations, a few variables — happened to sit in the small corner of parameter space where chaos lives. The accident required the right person as well as the right machine: another scientist might have cursed the divergence, blamed the computer, and rerun the simulation. Lorenz instead spent a year proving to himself that nothing was wrong, and then three more turning a debugging puzzle into "Deterministic Nonperiodic Flow." That is the last lesson of the discovery — the one that graduate students take from it — that the anomalies we curse are sometimes the discovery itself, wearing the disguise of a mistake. History does not say what the twelfth equation's exact contribution was; it says that curiosity outlasted convenience, and that the largest effects in the history of chaos theory were launched by the smallest of causes: 0.000127, and a man who refused to round it away.

## Chapter 3: Understanding Chaos Theory

Chaos theory is best understood not as a single theory but as a set of ideas that fit together — determinism, sensitivity, attractors, and nonlinearity. This chapter defines each piece in turn, then shows how they combine into the science of chaos.

Start with the kind of system chaos theory studies. A dynamical system is anything whose state changes over time according to fixed rules: a pendulum governed by Newton's laws, a population governed by a growth rule, a weather governed by the equations of fluid flow. The complete set of possible states of a system is called its phase space, and the system's history is a trajectory — a path traced through that space. Classical physics assumed that if you know the rules and the starting point, the whole future follows: this is determinism, and chaos does not violate it. A chaotic system is fully deterministic; run it twice from the same starting point and it does the same thing twice.

What chaos violates is predictability, through the property called sensitive dependence on initial conditions — the butterfly effect. In a chaotic system, any two nearby starting points, however close, drift apart from each other exponentially fast. Small errors in measurement — and every real measurement has errors — therefore explode into total uncertainty in finite time. The rate of that separation is measured by the Lyapunov exponent, the signature number of chaos: a positive Lyapunov exponent is the mathematical definition of sensitivity, and it means the system has a prediction horizon — a time beyond which forecasts are impossible in principle, not just in practice. Lorenz's weather model has one; real weather has one, of roughly two weeks.

The next piece is the attractor. Dissipative systems — anything with friction, from a damped pendulum to a weather system — lose energy, and their trajectories settle toward some restricted region of phase space called an attractor. Most attractors are tame: a fixed point (the pendulum hanging at rest), or a closed loop (the pendulum swinging forever). A chaotic system settles instead onto a strange attractor — a geometric object of infinite complexity on which the trajectory wanders forever, never repeating, never escaping, and never filling the same place twice. Strange attractors turned out to be fractals: objects with structure at every scale of magnification, whose

dimension is not a whole number but a fraction. Lorenz's attractor, the first discovered, has a shape like butterfly wings folded from two discs — the mathematical origin of the butterfly metaphor.

Nonlinearity is the enabling condition. Linear systems — those whose responses add proportionally — cannot be chaotic: double the input, and a linear system merely doubles the output, keeping errors small and futures tame. Chaos requires nonlinearity: feedback, thresholds, saturation — terms in the equations that multiply a state by itself, so that the system's response to its own history amplifies itself. The logistic map, the one-line population equation that May and Feigenbaum made famous, is nonlinear for exactly this reason, and its period-doubling cascade — steady, one-cycle, two-cycle, four-cycle, eight-cycle, chaos — is the cleanest known demonstration of how orderly systems fall into irregularity. Feigenbaum's constant, the rate at which the cascades converge, is the same for water faucets, insect populations, and electronic circuits: a genuinely universal number of nature, like pi.

With the pieces assembled, the definition follows: chaos is deterministic unpredictability — bounded, structured, non-repeating behavior generated by simple nonlinear rules, drawing trajectories to strange attractors, and amplified by sensitive dependence. Each clause matters. Bounded: a chaotic system stays within a finite region; it wanders, but within walls. Structured: a strange attractor is not noise; it has a fractal geometry you can measure, and statistics that are perfectly stable even though individual outcomes are not. Non-repeating: the trajectory never exactly revisits a state, which is why the system never settles into a cycle. Simple rules: chaos requires no complexity of description, only nonlinearity — three differential equations suffice, as Lorenz showed.

The last idea worth naming is the window of predictability that chaos leaves open. Because chaotic systems are deterministic and their attractors have stable statistics, short-term prediction is possible — better than a coin flip — while long-term prediction is impossible, and the crossover point is the horizon set by the Lyapunov exponent. Chaos theory's practical promise is therefore precise: it does not promise to see the future; it promises to say how far ahead the future can be seen, and to give the geometry and statistics of what happens beyond that horizon. Weather forecasting after Lorenz became exactly this — an honest science of horizons, with its ensemble forecasts and its error bars — and the remaining chapters show what that honesty bought the rest of science.

The discovery's sociology completes the story. Chaos theory was built by people who crossed borders: Lorenz was a meteorologist with an MIT mathematician's training; May a physicist turned biologist; Feigenbaum a particle theorist who wandered into a problem nobody owned; Mandelbrot an economist-for-hire at IBM who kept finding the same shapes in cotton prices, coastlines, and noise. The field's first institutions were as improvised as its founders' careers — summer schools, ad hoc conferences, journals borrowed from other disciplines — and its founding papers are scattered across meteorology, mathematics, ecology, and physics, which is why the history reads as convergence rather than invention: many discoverers, one idea, found at

last. The practical reading of that window is the difference between weather and climate, and it deserves its own closing example. A weather forecast is a prediction of a trajectory — and trajectories of chaotic systems diverge, so the forecast dies on schedule, Lorenz's own rule of thumb placing the atmosphere's limit near two weeks. A climate projection is a prediction of the attractor — the statistics of where the trajectories spend their time — and attractors are stable under small perturbations, which is why climate can be projected decades ahead by the very same physics that cannot say whether it will rain on the twenty-third. Chaos, understood properly, does not make the future unknowable; it sorts the future into the questions that expire and the questions that do not.

# Chapter 4: Key Characteristics of Chaos Theory

Other discrete dynamical systems have a repelling structure called a Julia set, which forms at the boundary between basins of attraction of fixed points. Julia sets can be thought of as strange repellers. Both strange attractors and Julia sets typically have a fractal structure, and the fractal dimension can be calculated for them. In contrast to single type chaotic solutions, studies using Lorenz models have emphasized the importance of considering various types of solutions.

For example, coexisting chaotic and non-chaotic may appear within the same model (e.g., the double pendulum system) using the same modeling configurations but different initial conditions. The findings of attractor coexistence, obtained from classical and generalized Lorenz models, suggested a revised view that "the entirety of weather possesses a dual nature of chaos and order with distinct predictability", in contrast to the conventional view of "weather is chaotic". Discrete chaotic systems, such as the logistic map, can exhibit strange attractors whatever their dimensionality.

In contrast, for continuous dynamical systems, the Poincaré–Bendixson theorem shows that a strange attractor can only arise in three or more dimensions. Finite-dimensional linear systems are never chaotic; for a dynamical system to display chaotic behavior, it must be either nonlinear or infinite-dimensional. The Poincaré–Bendixson theorem states that a two-dimensional differential equation has very regular behavior.

Five of the terms on the right hand side are linear, while two are quadratic; a total of seven terms. Another well-known chaotic attractor is generated by the Rössler equations, which have only one nonlinear term out of seven. Sprott found a three-dimensional system with just five terms, that had only one nonlinear term, which exhibits chaos for certain parameter values.

Zhang and Heidel showed that, at least for dissipative and conservative quadratic systems, three-dimensional quadratic systems with only three or four terms on the right-hand side cannot exhibit chaotic behavior. The reason is, simply put, that solutions to such systems are asymptotic to a two-dimensional surface and therefore solutions are well behaved. While the Poincaré–Bendixson theorem shows that a continuous dynamical system on the Euclidean plane cannot be chaotic,

two-dimensional continuous systems with non-Euclidean geometry can still exhibit some chaotic properties.

The above set of three ordinary differential equations has been referred to as the three-dimensional Lorenz model. Since 1963, higher-dimensional Lorenz models have been developed in numerous studies for examining the impact of an increased degree of nonlinearity, as well as its collective effect with heating and dissipations, on solution stability. Perhaps surprisingly, chaos may occur also in linear systems, provided they are infinite dimensional. A theory of linear chaos is being developed in functional analysis.

Quantum mechanics is also often considered as a prime example of linear non chaotic theory, that dampens out chaotic behaviour in the same manner that viscosity dampens out turbulence, this is actually not the case for quantum mechanical systems with infinite degrees of freedom, such as strongly correlated systems that do exhibit forms of nano scale turbulence. The straightforward generalization of coupled discrete maps is based upon convolution integral which mediates interaction between spatially distributed maps: n r

For instance, team building and group development is increasingly being researched as an inherently unpredictable system, as the uncertainty of different individuals meeting for the first time makes the trajectory of the team unknowable.

A note on the characteristic that most people find hardest to accept: chaos is not randomness. A random system — a coin flip, radioactive decay — has no memory and no rule connecting one outcome to the next; run it twice from identical conditions and you get different results. A chaotic system has a perfect rule and perfect memory; run it twice from exactly the same point and you get exactly the same future, every time. Its unpredictability is observational, not fundamental: it lives in our inability to specify the starting point exactly, not in the system's refusal to obey its equations. This is why chaotic systems can be simulated, studied, and statistically characterized, and why casinos cannot be beaten with chaos theory but weather models can be improved with it — a distinction that saves much confusion.

It is also worth recording what chaos theory's characteristics do not include. Chaotic systems do not violate any conservation law, require no quantum effects, and need no external randomness to produce their irregularity; and chaotic does not mean unstable in the catastrophic sense — a strange attractor is, in the technical sense, attracting: trajectories that start elsewhere flow into it and stay. The popular image of chaos as disorder is thus precisely inverted: a strange attractor is one of the most organized objects in mathematics, a fold of infinite detail whose every region the trajectory visits in a lawful order that merely never repeats. Chaos theory, properly read, is the study of a very specific and very disciplined kind of order. One more contrast makes the distinction concrete. Flip a coin a thousand times and record the string of heads and tails: unpredictable, because the outcome of each flip is not determined by the previous one. Watch a double pendulum swing a thousand times and record its turning points: equally unpredictable, yet every instant of its motion follows rigidly from the instant before, in full view of Newton's laws. The coin's record

has nothing to decode; the pendulum's record is a deterministic system observed too coarsely, and its structure — the attractor's shape — can be recovered from the record itself, a discovery of the 1980s that turned measured time series into pictures of dynamics. That recovery procedure, impossible for the coin, works for the pendulum, and its success is the operational proof that chaos and randomness are different things.

# Chapter 5: The Science Behind Chaos Theory

Under the right conditions, chaos spontaneously evolves into a lockstep pattern. In the Kuramoto model, four conditions suffice to produce synchronization in a chaotic system. Examples include the coupled oscillation of Christiaan Huygens' pendulums, fireflies, neurons, the London Millennium Bridge resonance, and large arrays of Josephson junctions. Moreover, from the theoretical physics standpoint, dynamical chaos itself, in its most general manifestation, is a spontaneous order.

The essence here is that most orders in nature arise from the spontaneous breakdown of various symmetries. This large family of phenomena includes elasticity, superconductivity, ferromagnetism, and many others. According to the supersymmetric theory of stochastic dynamics, chaos, or more precisely, its stochastic generalization, is also part of this family. The corresponding symmetry being broken is the topological supersymmetry which is hidden in all stochastic (partial) differential equations, and the corresponding order parameter is a field-theoretic embodiment of the butterfly effect.

There are also definitions of chaos that don't require the sensitivity on initial conditions property, such as combinatorial chaos (I.e. This is also comparable and similar to chaos generated by cellular automata.

This is important because, as this type of chaos can be equivalent to a turing machine, it is possible to execute computation with such dynamical systems, which is an intuitive way to see that the halting problem is not decidable, implying that some computational algorithms may never end. Unpredictability in this type of system is typically of a different nature than that of other types of chaos.

James Clerk Maxwell was the first scientist to emphasize the importance of initial conditions, and he is seen as being one of the earliest to discuss chaos theory, with work in the 1860s and 1870s. In the 1880s, while studying the three-body problem, Henri Poincaré found that there can be orbits that are nonperiodic, and yet not forever increasing nor approaching a fixed point.

In 1898, Jacques Hadamard published an influential study of the motion of a free particle gliding frictionlessly on a surface of constant negative curvature, called "Hadamard's billiards". Hadamard was able to show that all trajectories are unstable, in that all particle trajectories diverge exponentially from one another, with a positive Lyapunov exponent. Later studies, also on the topic of nonlinear differential equations, were carried out by George David Birkhoff, Andrey Nikolaevich Kolmogorov, Mary Lucy Cartwright and John Edensor Littlewood, and Stephen Smale.

# ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Aira Astralis is a science writer specializing in astronomy and space exploration. Her work spans the full breadth of humanity's relationship with the cosmos -- from the earliest naked-eye observations to the engineering marvels of modern space missions.

Her books are built on a foundation of primary sources: peer-reviewed research, mission archives, and direct engagement with the scientific community. She writes for readers who want to understand not just what we know about the universe, but how we came to know it.

She believes that the most important frontier is not out there but in the gap between what scientists discover and what the public understands. Her books exist to close that gap.