

Contents

Useful Numbers.....	xiii
Conventions & Miscellany	xv
Preface.....	xvii
1 Overview	1
1.1 The legacy of Maxwell	1
1.2 The legacy of Newton	2
1.3 The need for a geometric framework.....	3
2 Minkowski Spacetime.....	7
2.1 4-vectors	7
2.2 Transformation of gradients	11
2.3 Transformation matrix.....	13
2.4 Tensors.....	17
2.4.1 The energy-momentum stress tensor.....	17
2.5 Electrodynamics	19
2.5.1 4-currents and 4-potentials	19
2.5.2 Electromagnetic field tensor.....	21
2.6 Conservation of $T^{\alpha\beta}$	21
3 The Effects of Gravity	27
3.1 The principle of equivalence.....	27
3.2 The geodesic equation	30
3.3 The metric tensor	33
3.4 Variational calculation of the geodesic equation	36
3.5 The Newtonian limit	37

4	Tensor Analysis.....	43
4.1	Transformation laws	43
4.2	The covariant derivative	47
4.2.1	Contravariant vectors.....	47
4.2.2	Transformation of the affine connection.....	48
4.2.3	Covariant vectors.....	49
4.2.4	Tensors of arbitrary rank.....	50
4.2.5	Going from special to general relativity.....	51
4.2.6	The affine connection and basis vectors.....	52
4.3	Identities of tensor calculus	54
4.4	Hydrostatic equilibrium	59
4.5	Covariant differentiation and parallel transport.....	61
5	The Curvature Tensor	63
5.1	Commutation rule for covariant derivatives.....	63
5.2	The curvature tensor via basis vectors	65
5.3	Round trip by parallel transport.....	66
5.4	Geodesic deviation	69
5.5	Algebraic identities of $R^{\sigma}_{\nu\lambda\rho}$	70
5.5.1	Remembering the curvature tensor formula.....	70
5.5.2	$R_{\lambda\mu\nu\kappa}$: Fully covariant form.....	70
5.5.3	How many independent components does the curvature tensor have?.....	72
5.6	The Ricci tensor	73
5.7	Curvature and Newtonian gravity	75
5.8	The Bianchi identities.....	76
5.9	The Einstein field equations	78
5.10	A Lorentz-invariant gravitational pseudotensor.....	82
5.11	Field equations from local inertial coordinates	84
5.12	Variational derivation of the field equations*	85
5.12.1	Matter stress tensor from a variational principle.....	86
5.12.2	The gravitational action.....	87
5.12.3	Conservation of $T^{\mu\nu}$	89

6	Schwarzschild Black Holes	91
6.1	Schwarzschild metric	91
6.2	Schwarzschild metric in Cartesian coordinates	97
6.3	The Schwarzschild radius	98
6.4	Birkhoff's theorem	102
6.5	The metric determinant and mass	104
6.6	Schwarzschild spacetime	105
6.6.1	Radial photon geodesic.....	105
6.6.2	Orbital equations.....	107
6.7	The deflection of light by an intervening body.....	111
6.8	The perihelion advance of Mercury	115
6.8.1	Newtonian orbit limit.....	116
6.8.2	Relativistic corrections to the orbit of Mercury.....	118
6.9	General solution for Schwarzschild orbits*	122
6.9.1	Formulation.....	122
6.9.2	Solution.....	123
6.10	Gravitational collapse*	125
6.11	Shapiro delay: The fourth protocol	128
7	Kerr Black Holes.....	133
7.1	Vacuum rotating spacetime: Kerr metric.....	133
7.2	Boyer-Lindquist coordinates	136
7.3	Kerr geometry	138
7.3.1	Singularities.....	138
7.3.2	Stationary limit surface: $g_{00} = 0$	139
7.3.3	Event horizon: $g^{rr} = 0$	140
7.3.4	The angular velocity of the outer event horizon.....	142
7.4	The Penrose process.....	143
7.4.1	Energy and angular momentum transferral.....	143
7.4.2	Relation to the Hawking area theorem.....	145
7.5	Orbital equations	145
7.6	Stable circular and quasi-circular orbits*	147
7.6.1	Stable circular orbits.....	147

	7.6.2	Quasi-circular orbits.....	150
	7.6.3	From Schwarzschild to maximally spinning Kerr black hole.....	152
8		Self-Gravitating Hydrostatic Equilibrium	155
	8.1	Relativistic stellar structure	155
	8.2	Fundamentals	158
	8.3	Constant-density stars	161
	8.4	Tolman's method*	164
	8.5	White dwarfs.....	167
	8.6	Neutron stars.....	172
	8.7	The physics of neutron star matter: A descriptive overview	179
9		Gravitational Radiation	183
	9.1	Overview	184
	9.2	The linearized gravitational wave equation	185
	9.2.1	The harmonic gauge.....	185
	9.2.2	Review of the retarded wave solution.....	192
	9.3	Plane waves	194
	9.3.1	The transverse-traceless (TT) gauge.....	195
	9.4	The quadrupole formula	197
	9.5	Radiated energy	199
	9.5.1	Scalar theory.....	199
	9.5.2	Energy flux for linearized gravity.....	201
	9.6	Radiated quadrupole energy for gravitational waves.....	204
	9.7	Gravitational radiation from binary stars.....	208
	9.7.1	Orbital energy loss.....	208
	9.7.2	Angular momentum loss*.....	213
	9.8	Detection of gravitational radiation.....	218
	9.8.1	Preliminary comments.....	218
	9.8.2	Indirect methods: Orbital energy loss in binary pulsars.....	222

9.8.3	Direct methods: LIGO.....	225
9.8.4	Direct methods: Pulsar timing array.....	229
10	Cosmology.....	235
10.1	A dynamic Newtonian universe	235
10.1.1	Equation of motion.....	237
10.1.2	Cosmological redshift.....	238
10.2	Cosmology models for the impatient	239
10.2.1	The large-scale spacetime metric.....	239
10.2.2	The Einstein–de Sitter universe: A classic benchmark model....	241
10.2.3	The growth of density perturbations in an expanding universe.....	244
10.3	The Friedmann–Robertson–Walker metric.....	247
10.3.1	Maximally symmetric 2-spaces.....	247
10.3.2	Maximally symmetric 3-spaces.....	249
10.4	Large-scale dynamics.....	253
10.4.1	The effect of a cosmological constant.....	253
10.4.2	Formal analysis.....	254
10.4.3	The Ω_0 parameter.....	258
10.5	The classic, matter-dominated universes	260
10.6	Our Universe.....	263
10.6.1	A Universe of ordinary matter and vacuum energy.....	264
10.6.2	Radiation-dominated era.....	267
10.7	Observational foundations of cosmology	271
10.7.1	The discovery of cosmological redshifts.....	271
10.7.2	The cosmic distance ladder.....	272
10.7.3	The parameter q_0	273
10.7.4	The redshift–magnitude relation.....	275
10.8	The cosmic microwave background radiation (CMB)	279
10.8.1	Overview.....	279
10.8.2	An observable cosmic radiation background: The Gamow argument.....	283
10.8.3	The cosmic microwave background (CMB): Subsequent developments.....	286

10.9	Thermal history of the Universe	288
10.9.1	Preliminaries.....	288
10.9.2	Classical cosmology: Helium nucleosynthesis	290
10.9.3	Neutrino and photon temperatures.....	292
10.9.4	Ionization of hydrogen.....	294
11	Supplemental Topics*	297
11.1	The Oppenheimer-Snyder problem.....	297
11.2	The energy and angular momentum of black hole spacetimes	302
11.3	Particle production and event horizons	304
11.3.1	Minkowski and Rindler metrics.....	306
11.3.2	Scalar field equation.....	307
11.3.3	Review of quantum field theory.....	308
11.3.4	Bogoliubov formalism	310
11.3.5	Invariant inner product.....	311
11.3.6	Minkowski and Rindler vacuums	314
11.3.7	The Hawking effect.....	317
11.3.8	Hawking luminosity and Bekenstein-Hawking entropy.....	318
11.4	The Raychaudhuri equation	320
11.5	The focusing theorem	324
11.5.1	WKB solutions of the Maxwell equations.....	324
11.5.2	The governing equation.....	326
11.5.3	Proof of the theorem.....	329
11.6	Effects of electric charge.....	331
11.6.1	The Reissner-Nordström metric.....	331
11.6.2	Singular metric structure: Wormholes and white holes	333
11.6.3	Naked singularities.....	334
11.7	Derivation of the Hellings-Downs curve	334
11.8	An effective Newtonian potential for weak gravitational radiation	337

11.9	Inflationary models	340
11.9.1	“Clouds on the horizon”	340
11.9.2	The stress-energy tensor of a scalar field.....	341
11.9.3	Effective potentials in quantum field theory.....	345
11.9.4	The slow-roll inflationary scenario.....	347
11.9.5	Inflated expectations.....	351
	Bibliography	353
	Credits	354
	Index	355

CHAPTER 1

Overview

Most of the fundamental ideas of science are essentially simple, and may, as a rule, be expressed in a language comprehensible to everyone.

—ALBERT EINSTEIN

1.1 The legacy of Maxwell

Historians tell us that the most important victories of the greatest Roman generals were celebrated with a triumph. Adoring crowds would line the streets, cheering wildly in support of their hero as he passed by in a grand procession. But the Romans astutely realized the need for a counterpoise, so an enslaved person would ride with the general, whispering in his ear, “All glory is fleeting.”

All glory is fleeting—and never more so than in theoretical physics. No sooner is a triumph hailed but unforeseen puzzles emerge that could not possibly have been anticipated before the breakthrough. The mid-nineteenth-century reduction of all electromagnetic phenomena to four equations, the Maxwell equations, is very much a case in point.

The 1861 synthesis provided by Maxwell’s equations united electricity, magnetism, and optics, showing them to be different manifestations of the same field. The theory accounted for the existence of electromagnetic waves, explained how they propagated, and showed that the propagation velocity is $1/\sqrt{\epsilon_0\mu_0}$ (ϵ_0 is the permittivity, and μ_0 the permeability, of free space). This combination is precisely equal to the measured speed of light, even though the permittivity and permeability constants are determined, respectively, from electrostatic and magnetostatic measurements. Light is therefore a form of electromagnetic radiation! The existence of electromagnetic radiation was later verified by brilliant experiments carried out by Heinrich Hertz in 1887, in which the radiation was both generated and detected.

But when one probed, Maxwell’s theory, for all its success, had disquieting features. For one, there seemed to be no provision in the theory for allowing the velocity of light to change with the observer’s velocity. The speed of light was always $1/\sqrt{\epsilon_0\mu_0}$. A related point is that simple Galilean invariance was not obeyed; i.e., absolute velocities appeared to affect the physics, something that had not been seen before. Lorentz and Larmor in the late nineteenth century discovered that Maxwell’s equations, in fact, had a simple mathematical velocity transformation that did leave them invariant, but it was *not* Galilean, and most bizarrely, it involved changing the *time*. The non-Galilean character of the transformation equation

relative to the “aetherial medium” thought to host the waves was put down, a bit vaguely, to electromagnetic interactions between charged particles that truly changed the length of the object. In other words, the non-Galilean transformation was somehow electrodynamic in origin. As to the time change . . . well, one would just have to put up with it as an aetherial formality.

All was resolved in 1905 when Einstein showed how, by adopting as postulates (i) the speed of light is constant in all frames (as had already been indicated by a body of very compelling experiments, most notably the famous Michelson-Morley null result); and (ii) the truly essential Galilean notion that relative uniform velocity cannot be detected by any physical experiment, that the “Lorentz transformations” (as they had become known) must follow. In the process, electromagnetic radiation in vacuo took on a reality all its own: it no longer needed to be viewed as some sort of aetherial displacement. The increasingly problematic aether host medium could be abandoned: the waves were self-sustaining, “hosted” by the vacuum itself. Most stunningly, *all* equations of physics, not just electromagnetic phenomena, had to be invariant in form under the kinematic Lorentz transformations, even with the peculiar relative time variable. The transformations themselves really had nothing to do with Maxwellian electrodynamics; they were far more general. It just so happened that the Maxwell equations were the first such set discovered that adhered to the correct transformation laws of physics, because they pertained directly to light propagation. The other equations had to be fixed up!

These ideas, and the consequences that ensued collectively from them (e.g., the equivalence of energy and inertia) became known as *relativity theory*, in reference to the invariance of form with respect to relative velocities. (Einstein preferred the term “invariance theory,” though it never caught on.) The relativity theory that emerged from the excavation of the Lorentz transformations from within the Maxwellian formulation of electrodynamics is rightly regarded as one of the crown jewels of twentieth-century physics: in other words, a triumph.

1.2 The legacy of Newton

Another triumph, another problem. If indeed all of physics had to be compatible with relativity, what of Newtonian gravity? By the early twentieth century, it had been verified with great precision, even predicting the existence of a new distant planet (Neptune) in the solar system. But Newtonian gravity is manifestly *not* compatible with relativity, because the governing Poisson equation

$$\nabla^2\Phi = 4\pi G\rho \tag{1.1}$$

implies instantaneous transmission of changes in the Φ field from source to observer. (Here Φ is the Newtonian potential function, G the Newtonian gravitational constant, and ρ the mass density.) Wiggle the density locally, and throughout all space there must *instantaneously* be a wiggle in Φ , as given by equation (1.1). Gravity was an outlier from relativity theory, a loner status it retains today in its obstinate refusal to accommodate quantum field theory.

In Maxwell’s theory, the *electrostatic* potential also satisfies its own Poisson equation, but the appropriate time-dependent potential obeys a wave equation:¹

$$\nabla^2\Phi - \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2\Phi}{\partial t^2} = -\frac{\rho}{\epsilon_0}, \quad (1.2)$$

and solutions of this equation do not propagate instantaneously throughout all space. They propagate at the speed of light c . At least in retrospect, this is rather simple. Might it not be the same for gravity?

Alas, no. The problem is that the source of the signals for the electric potential field, i.e., the charge density, behaves differently from the source for the gravity potential field, i.e., the mass density. The electrical charge of an individual bit of matter does not change when the matter is in motion, but the gravitating “mass,” in the form of relativistic energy, does. This deceptively simple detail complicates everything. Relativistic energy, not just ordinary matter, must also be a source of a gravitational field, and this includes the distributed energy of the gravitational field itself. In other words, any relativistic theory of gravity would have to be nonlinear. In such a time-dependent theory of gravity, it is not even clear a priori what the appropriate mathematical objects should be on the right side or the left side of the wave equation. Come to think of it, should we be using a wave equation at all?

1.3 The need for a geometric framework

In 1908, the mathematician Hermann Minkowski presented a remarkable insight. He argued that one should not view the Lorentz transformations as a mere set of rules for how space and time coordinates change from one constant-velocity kinematic reference frame to another. Minkowski’s idea was that these coordinates should be regarded as living in their own sort of pseudo-Euclidean geometry—a *spacetime*, if you will: Minkowski spacetime. There was even a ready-made mathematical structure at hand to be used: hyperbolic geometry.

To understand the motivation for this, start simply. We know that in ordinary Euclidean space we are free to choose any set of Cartesian coordinates we like, and it can make no difference to the description of the space itself, e.g., in measuring how far apart objects are. If (x, y) is a set of Cartesian coordinates for the plane, and (x', y') another coordinate set related to the first by a rotation (including a possible shift or origin), then

$$dx^2 + dy^2 = dx'^2 + dy'^2; \quad (1.3)$$

i.e., the distance between two closely spaced points is the same number, regardless of the coordinates used. The quantity $dx^2 + dy^2$ is said to be an *invariant* under rotational transformations.

Now, an abstraction. From a mathematical viewpoint, there is nothing particularly special about the use of $dx^2 + dy^2$ as our metric for closely spaced points. Imagine a space in which the metric invariant was $dy^2 - dx^2$. We needn’t worry about the plus/minus sign;

¹The knowledgeable reader will recognize that this form relies on the choice of the Lorenz gauge, in which causality in the potential is most transparent.

mathematically speaking, an invariant is an invariant. Indeed, the hyperbolic geometry arising from this form of invariant had been studied by Bolyai and Lobachevsky (and was known to Gauss) long before. With $dy^2 - dx^2$ as our prescribed invariant, we are, in fact, describing a hyperbolic Minkowski space, with $dy = c dt$ and dx a space interval as before. Under the simplest form of the Lorentz transformations, $c^2 dt^2 - dx^2$ emerges as an invariable quantity, which is precisely what is needed to guarantee that the speed of light is always constant . . . an invariant, if you will. With this formulation, the interval $c^2 dt^2 - dx^2$ always vanishes for light propagation along the x direction, in any coordinates related by a Lorentz transformation, which we may think of as separate observers, if we so wish. The obvious metric generalization

$$c^2 dt^2 - dx^2 - dy^2 - dz^2 = 0 \quad (1.4)$$

will guarantee the same is true in any of the three spatial directions. A better way to express this is that our Universe is a structure of four dimensions, but its hyperbolic geometry picks out one of these dimensions to appear with a different sign in formulating the invariant metric interval. This component of dimensional separation, therefore, has a different character from the other three and is perceptively experienced in its own distinct way. We feel the need to separate this one particular form of dimensional separation from the others; we cannot “spatially” point to it. Instead, we give it its own name: time. And it is not just our subjective consciousness that treats this dimension separately. When we actually solve a partial differential equation (PDE) like the Laplace equation, with all coordinates on an equal Euclidean footing, we specify the value of the function to be solved for (or its gradient) on closed surfaces everywhere and allow the PDE to fill in the rest of the space. But when we solve a PDE with the structure of the wave equation, in a mathematically hyperbolic space, we fix the special timelike coordinate and specify the function (and its time derivative) on all the spatial (nontime) surfaces. Then, we solve an initial value problem going forward in the timelike direction. The Laplace equation is an example of what is known as an *elliptical PDE*; the wave equation, in contrast, is known as a *hyperbolic PDE*. Our conscious reality, flowing from one moment to the next in some external, fourth dimension of separation, “feels” like the solution to a hyperbolic PDE.

To summarize: Minkowski took what seemed to be a purely kinematic requirement—that the speed of light needs to be a universal constant—and gave it a geometric interpretation in terms of an invariant quantity in a hyperbolic Minkowski space—rather, to be more explicit, Minkowski *spacetime*.

Pause. And so what? Call it whatever you like. Who needs obfuscating mathematical pretense? Eschew obfuscation! One could argue that lots of things add together quadratically, and it is not particularly helpful to regard them as geometric objects. The Lorentz transform stands on its own, thank you very much. That was very much Einstein’s initial take on Minkowski’s pesky mathematical meddling with his theory.

However, as the reader has no doubt sensed, it is the geometric viewpoint that is truly deeper and much more fundamental, a perspective that time (our fourth dimension!) has vindicated. In Minkowski’s 1908 tour-de-force lecture, we find more than just a simple analogy or mathematical pretense.² We can understand *why* the kinematics is changing

²Minkowski, H. 1908, Space and Time. The 80th Assembly of German Natural Scientists and Physicians, Cologne, September 21, 1908, 133.

from Galilean-Newtonian: it stems from the core underlying geometry of the spacetime itself. In Minkowski's work, we find the first presentation of relativistic 4-vectors and tensors, of the Maxwell equations in manifestly covariant form, and the remarkable realization that the magnetic vector and electrostatic potentials combine seamlessly to form their own 4-vector. Gone are the comforting kinematic tools and pedagogical aids of Einstein's 1905 relativity paper, the clocks, the rods, the quaint Swiss trams. This is no mere "überflüssige Gelehrsamkeit" (superfluous erudition), Einstein's dismissive term for the whole business.

It took until 1912 for Einstein to finally change his viewpoint. Five years earlier, in 1907, he had had the seed of a very important idea but had been unable to build upon it. It was in 1912 that Einstein discovered what it was that he had discovered. His great revelation was that *the effect of the presence of matter (or its equivalent energy) throughout the Universe is to distort Minkowski's spacetime and that this embedded geometric distortion manifests itself as the gravitational field*. Minkowski spacetime is not some mere mathematical formalism; it is physical stuff, you can mess with it, and it takes real, tangible energy to do that. The spacetime distortions of which we speak must become, when sufficiently weak, familiar Newtonian gravitational theory. You thought gravity was a dynamic force? No. Gravity is a purely geometric phenomenon.

Now that is one big idea, one whose implications physicists are still trying to fully take in. How did Einstein make this leap? What was the path that led him to change his mind? Where did the notion of a gravity-geometry connection come from?

It came from that "important idea" he had in 1907, a year before Minkowski published his geometric interpretation of relativity. In a freely falling elevator, or more safely in an expertly piloted aircraft executing a ballistic parabolic arc, one feels weightless. That is, the effect of gravity can be made to disappear locally in the appropriate reference frame—more precisely, the right coordinates. Let that sit. The fundamental physics of gravity must be intimately associated with coordinate transformations! This is because gravity has exactly the same effect on all types of mass, regardless of its bulk or elemental composition. But how does one go from "intimately associated with coordinate transformations" to a rigorous theory? In 1912, Einstein, with the help of his mathematician friend and colleague Marcel Grossman, grasped that this is precisely what would naturally emerge from a theory in which test objects were responding to background geometric distortions instead of to an applied force. In a state of free fall, gravity is in effect absent, and we locally return to the environment of an undistorted ("flat," in mathematical parlance) Minkowski spacetime, much as a flat Euclidean tangent plane is an excellent local approximation to the surface of a curved sphere. That is why it is easy to be fooled into thinking that the Earth is flat, if your view is too local. "Tangent plane coordinates" on small-scale road maps locally eliminate spherical geometry complications, but if we are flying from London to Hong Kong, Earth's curvature is important. Einstein's notion that the effect of gravity is to cause a geometric distortion of an otherwise flat Minkowski spacetime, but that it is always possible to find coordinates in which local distortions may be eliminated *to leading local order*, is the foundational insight of general relativity. It is known as the *equivalence principle*. We will have more to say on this topic.

Spacetime. *Spacetime*. Once again, bringing in time, you see, is everything. Who would have thought of doing that in a geometric theory? The theory of non-Euclidean geometry, as developed by the great mathematician Bernhard Riemann, begins with just the notion we've been discussing, that any distorted space looks *locally* flat. Riemannian geometry is thus the natural mathematical language of gravitational theory, a point impressed upon Einstein by

Grossman. Indeed, half a century before Einstein, Riemann himself had the notion that gravity might arise from a non-Euclidean curvature in a space of three or more dimensions! He got nowhere, because time was not part of his geometry. Riemann was thinking only of space. It was the genius of Minkowski, who by showing how to incorporate time into a purely geometric theory, allowed Einstein to take the crucial next step, freeing himself to think of gravity in geometric terms, without having to agonize over whether it made any sense to have time as part of a geometric framework. In fact, the Newtonian limit is reached *not* from the leading-order curvature terms in the spatial part of the geometry, but from the leading-order “curvature” (if that is the word) of the dimension we associate with the most natural *time* coordinate. And that is why Riemann failed.

Indeed, as we have already noted, it is best to think of time not as something that has been *incorporated* into a four-dimensional geometry but as something that *emerges* formally from a natural four-dimensional hyperbolic space, which is our Universe in its pristine vacuum form, with metric $dw^2 - dx^2 - dy^2 - dz^2$. The dimension that comes in with the different sign, dw , is the separation we *experience* as time. We move through w much more rapidly than through x, y or z , which is why we think the “speed of light” is large and why w and x, y, z seem so decoupled from one another.³

In brief: Riemann created the mathematics of non-Euclidean geometry. Minkowski realized that the natural language of the Lorentz transformations was neither electrodynamic, nor even kinematic, it was ultimately geometric. But you need to identify time as a component of the geometric interpretation! Einstein took the great leap of realizing that the force we call gravity arises from the distortions of Minkowski’s flat spacetime which are created by the presence of mass/energy.

Well done. You now understand the conceptual framework of general relativity, and that is itself a giant leap. From here on, it is just a matter of the technical details. But then, you and I also know how to draw like Leonardo da Vinci.

It is just a matter of the technical details.

³In the time it takes us to walk a meter or two, we have moved through the time dimension the equivalent of the distance from Earth to the Moon.

Index

- Ω_0 parameter, 258–260
 q_0 parameter, 273
 4-vectors, 7–11; 4-current, 11, 20;
 4-momentum, 10; 4-velocity, 11
- A**
 Adams, W.S., 40, 220
 affine connection, 31–33, 48–49, 186; as
 basis vector derivative, 53; differential
 as a tensor, 49
 angular momentum pseudovector, 84
- B**
 Baade, W., 155
 Bardeen, J., 135, 154
 Barrish, B., 185
 baryon acoustic oscillations, 350
 basis vectors, 52–54, 65–66
 Bekenstein-Hawking entropy, 318–319;
 rotating black hole, 320
 beta decay, inverse, 180
 Bianchi identities, 76–78
 Bianchi, L., 77
 Birkhoff’s theorem, 102–104, 161, 241, 298
 black hole energy and angular
 momentum, *see* energy and angular
 momentum, black hole
 Bogoliubov formalism, 308, 310–314
 Bohr-Einstein thought experiment, 41
 Boltzmann, L., 319
 Boltzmann-Unruh temperature, 316, 317
 Bolyai, J., 4
 Boyer-Lindquist coordinates, 136–138
 Buchdahl’s theorem, 163, 167
 Burke, B., 286
- C**
 Carter, B., 135
 Cassini spacecraft, 130
 Cepheid variable stars, 271
 Chadwick, J., 155
 Chandrasekhar mass, 169, 172, 273
 characteristic paths, 300
 chirp mass, 228
 circular orbit; Kerr, 147–150;
 Schwarzschild, 109
 Clausius, R., 319
 conformal metric, 251
 contravariant vector, 44
 coordinate differential, 44; contravariant,
 13; covariant, 13
 correlation function, 233
 Cosmic Background Explorer (COBE),
 281–283
 cosmic background radiation, 267–271,
 279–288; departures from blackbody,
 282; Gamow argument, 283, 286
 cosmic censorship hypothesis, 106, 334
 cosmological constant, 81, 253–254, 288;
 as vacuum stress energy, 254
 cosmological equation of motion, 238
 cosmological expansion, discovery, 271
 cosmological metric; Euclidian, 239
 cosmological models; Newtonian, 235–238
 cosmological redshift, 238–239
 cosmological scale factor, 237; global
 approximation, 271; of our Universe,
 264–267
 covariant derivative, 47–51; of tensors, 51
 covariant differentials, nonexact, 46
 covariant divergence, 56
 covariant vector, 44
 creation and annihilation operators, 309,
 310
 critical energy density, 259
 curvature tensor, 63–73, 321; as a tidal
 force, 72; fully covariant form, 70–72;
 identities, 70; independent
 components, 72–73; symmetries, 72;
 via basis vectors, 65; via geodesic
 deviation, 69; via parallel transport,
 66–68
- D**
 d’Alembertian operator, 26, 58, 186
 da Vinci, Leonardo, 6
 Darwin problem, 25
 deflection of light, 30; by Sun, 1919,
 111–113; by VLBI, 113; local, 114
 Dicke radiometer, 286
 Dicke, R., 286
 Dirac, P., 309
 Doppler shift, 17, 110, 128, 211, 222, 223,
 238, 273
 Downs, R., 230
 Drever, R., 225
- E**
 Eötvös experiment, 28–29
 Eddington, A., 111, 156, 190, 254, 266
 Einstein field equations, derivation, 78–82,
 85; from local inertial coordinates,
 84–85
 Einstein summation, 13
 Einstein, A., 2–6, 10, 27, 30, 77, 80, 81, 91,
 96, 111, 115, 120, 128, 158, 190, 208, 218
 Einstein–de Sitter universe, 241–244;
 growth of density perturbations,
 244–247
 elliptical partial differential equation, 4
 energy and angular momentum, black
 hole, 302–304
 energy-momentum pseudovector, 84
 energy-momentum stress tensor, 17–19,
 22
 equation of motion, relativistic, 22
 equation of state; electrons, 170; neutrons
 (ideal), 173–176, 181
 equivalence principle, 5, 27–30

F

Faber-Jackson relation, 273
Fermi momentum, 156, 169–170
Feynman sticky bead argument, 220
Feynman, R., 220, 345
field tensor, electromagnetic, 21
first law of thermodynamics, relativistic, 257
Fisher, R., 273
flatness problem, 340
Fock space, 306, 309
focusing theorem, 324–330
Friedmann, A., 235
Friedmann–Robertson–Walker universe, 247–253; dynamic equation derivation, 254–258

G

Galileo, G., 28
Gamow, G., 283
gauge invariance; gravitational, 189; Maxwellian, 20; of geodesic equation, 191; relation to coordinate transformations, 189; relation to polarization components, 191
Gauss, C., 4, 76
geodesic deviation, 69–70
geodesic equation, 30, 118; covariant form, 61; Kerr geometry, 145–147; photon, 105, 112, 147; Schwarzschild geometry, 107–111, 122; variational method, 36
geometric optics, 48
gravitational action, 87–88
gravitational collapse, spherical, 125–128, 297–302, 324
gravitational pseudotensor, 82
gravitational radiation, 183–234; cross section, 221; effective Newtonian potential, 213, 337–340; elliptical orbital energy loss, 208–213; energy flux, 201–204; harmonic gauge, 185–192; orbital angular momentum loss, 214–216; parabolic orbit angular momentum loss, 216; parabolic orbit energy loss, 212; plane waves, 194–197; quadrupole formula, 197–199; angular momentum radiated, 213–218; energy radiated, 204–208; transverse-traceless (TT) gauge, 195–197
gravitational redshift, 29–30, 40, 126–128, 318

Gravity Probe B, 68

Green's function, 193

Grossman, M., 5

H

harmonic coordinates, 58; relation to harmonic gauge, 192
harmonic gauge, *see* gravitational radiation
Harrison, B., 179
Harvard University, 40
Harward, A., 77
Hawking; area theorem, 145, 229; effect, 317–318; temperature, 318
Hawking, S., 99, 304, 318
HE 1523-0901 (oldest known star), 263
Heisenberg, W., 309
helium nucleosynthesis, 290, 292
Hellings, R., 230
Hellings-Downs function, 230–234, 334–337
Hertz, H., 1, 185
Higgs boson, 346
Hilbert, D., 80, 85, 240
horizon problem, 340
Hubble constant, 241, 242, 259, 279, 287
Hubble, E., 271
Humason, M., 271
hydrogen ionization, 294–295
hydrostatic equilibrium, 59–61; neutron stars; constant density, 161–164; Oppenheimer–Volkoff, 176; Tolman's method, 164–167; white dwarf, 171
hyperbolic differential equation, 4

I

idempotent operator, 205
identities of tensor calculus, 54–59
inflationary cosmology, 289; slow roll model, 347–351
inflationary models of the early Universe, 340–351
Invariance theory, 2
invariant inner product, 311–314
Israel, W., 135

J

James Webb Space Telescope, 288
Julian century, 120

K

Kerr geometry; angular velocity of outer even horizon, 142; closed timelike curves, 142; event horizons, 138–143; maximally spinning, 152–154; stationary limit surface, 139–142
Kerr metric, 98, 133; Boyer–Lindquist coordinates, 136; Kerr–Schild coordinates, 134
Kerr, R., 133, 135
Kerr–Newman black hole, 133
Kerr–Schild coordinates, 133
Klein–Gordon equation, 307, 341
Kretschmann scalar, 90, 99
Kruskal, M., 100

L

Lambert W -function, 100
Landau, L., 156
Lane–Emden equation, 170, 172, 176
Larmor, J., 1
Laser Interferometer Gravitational-Wave Observatory (LIGO), 221, 225–227
Lass; coordinates, 307, 308; metric, 307; null coordinates, 307
Leibniz Rule for covariant derivative, 51
Levi-Civita symbol, 21, 55
Levi-Civita, T., 43
Liénard–Wiechert potential, 194
Lobachevsky, N., 4
local inertial coordinates, 30
logarithmic eternity, 266
Lord Rayleigh, *see* Strutt, John William, 3rd Baron Rayleigh
Lorentz scalar, 12
Lorentz transformation, 2, 8; matrix, 14, 15; of gradients, 11
Lorentz, H., 1
Lorenz gauge, 3, 20, 188, 191
Lowell, P., 271

M

M87, xvii, 69
Mössbauer spectroscopy, 40
magnitude, astronomical, 276
mass; neutron star; typical, 157; upper limit, 157; white dwarf; upper limit, 169
Mather, J., 282

- matter-dominated cosmologies, 260–263
maximally symmetric spaces, 247–253
Maxwell equations, 1, 19–21; general covariant form, 325
Maxwell, J., 1, 78
mean free path, 289
metric tensor, 33–36, 45; spatial part, 35
Michelson-Morley experiment, 2
Minkowski; spacetime, 3; in FRW metric, 258; vacuum, 310
Minkowski, H., 3
- N**
naked singularities, 334
Neptune, 2
neutrino temperature, 292–294
neutron drip, 180
neutron stars, 172–182; Harrison-Wheeler treatment, 179–182; stability, 176
Newtonian gravity, 2, 75–76
Newtonian orbit, 116–118
- O**
oblateness parameter, 133
Olber's paradox, 236
Oppenheimer, J. R., 125, 156–158, 176
Oppenheimer-Snyder problem, *see* gravitational collapse, spherical
orbital equations, *see* geodesic equation
our Universe, 263–267
- P**
Pais, A., 77, 115
Palatini identity, 75
parallax; spectroscopic, 272; trigonometric, 272
parallel transport, 61–62
particle horizon, 243; Einstein–de Sitter universe, 243–244
particle production at event horizons, 304–320
Peebles, P.J.E., 286
Penrose process, 143–145
Penrose, R., 106, 135, 157, 323, 330, 334
Penzias, A., 286
periastron advance; PSR 1913+16, 120, 223
perihelion advance; Mercury, 115, 118; Venus, Earth, Icarus, 121
Perlmutter, S., 243, 276
Planck length, 319
Planck luminosity, 229
Planck scale quantities, 289
Poisson equation, 2
Pound and Rebka experiment, 40
principle of equivalence, *see* equivalence principle
principle of general covariance, 43
pulsar; Crab Nebula, 157; PSR 1913+16, 184, 208; orbital evolution, 218, 222–224; PSR 1937+21, 229; PSR J0737–3039, 184; orbital evolution, 224–225
Pulsar Timing Array (PTA), 185, 229–231
- Q**
quadrupole formula, *see* gravitational radiation
quasi-circular orbits, 150–152
- R**
radiation, gravitational, *see* gravitational radiation
Raychaudhuri equation, 320–324
Raychaudhuri, A., 320
redshift-magnitude relation, 275–278; Einstein–de Sitter, 275
Reissner-Nordstrom metric, 331–334
retarded wave solution, 192–194; relation to Lorentz transformation, 194
Ricci; scalar, 74, 186; tensor, 73, 186
Ricci, G., 43, 77
Riemann curvature tensor, *see* curvature tensor
Riemann, B., 5, 7, 27, 43, 76
Riemannian manifold, 7
Riess, A., 243, 276
Rindler; coordinates, 307, 308; metric, 306–307; number operator, 311; vacuum, 306, 310, 311
Roll, P., 286
Rome, 1
- S**
Sackur-Tetrode entropy, Sun, 319
scalar dot product, generalization, 46
scale factor, *see* cosmological scale factor
Schmidt, B., 243, 276
Schwarzschild metric; Cartesian, 97; isotropic, 96; Kruskal, 101; standard, 96
Schwarzschild radius, 98
Schwarzschild, K., 91, 96, 135
Schwinger limit, 334
Schwinger, J., 334
semilatus rectum, 117, 209; Mercury, 118, 120
Shakespeare, W., 155
Shapiro delay, 128, 135
Shapiro, I., 128
Sirius B, 40
Slipher, M., 271
Smoot, G., 282
Snyder, H., 157
source function, 79
stress tensor; conservation, 21–22, 89; electromagnetic, 23; energy-momentum, 17–19; gravitational, 187; particle, 86; scalar field, 341
Strominger-Vafa entropy, 320
Strutt, John William, 3rd Baron Rayleigh, 148
Sumeria, 288
supernova, type Ia, 273
- T**
Tennyson; Alfred, Lord Tennyson, 221
tensor transformation laws, 17, 44
Thorne, K., 185
Tolman, R., 156
Tolman-Oppenheimer-Volkoff equation, 156–161; interpretation, 160
transverse-traceless gauge, *see* gravitational radiation
trapped surface, 324
Tully, R., 273
Tully-Fisher relation, 273
- U**
Unruh radiation, 305
Unruh temperature, *see* Boltzmann-Unruh temperature
Unruh, W., 305

V

vacuum energy density, 242
vector transformation laws, 44
Volkoff, G., 156
volume element, covariant, 54
Voss, A., 77

W

Weber bars, 220
Weber, J., 220, 221

Weiss, R., 185

Weyl tensor, 105

Weyl, H., 77, 190

Wheeler, J., 158, 179

white dwarf star, 167

white hole, 333

Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe
(WMAP), 287

Wilkinson, D., 286, 287

Wilson, R., 286

WKB method, 324

wormhole, 333

Y

Young-Laplace equation, 76

Z

Zwicky, F., 155