Seminar 5

General relativity

Will Barker¹²

¹Cavendish Laboratory University of Cambridge ²Kavli Institute for Cosmology University of Cambridge







What is general relativity?

• Which was invented first, special relativity or general relativity?





What is general relativity?

- Which was invented first, special relativity or general relativity?
- Special relativity tells us about the fundamental structure of spacetime (Minkowskian signature, four dimensions etc)





What is general relativity?

- Which was invented first, special relativity or general relativity?
- Special relativity tells us about the fundamental structure of spacetime (Minkowskian signature, four dimensions etc)
- General relativity tells us how the geometry of the spacetime is affected by matter





Yesterday you studied how spacetime is deformed depending on your velocity





- Yesterday you studied how spacetime is deformed depending on your velocity
- In fact, the principles you derived are about as hard as special relativity gets!





- Yesterday you studied how spacetime is deformed depending on your velocity
- In fact, the principles you derived are about as hard as special relativity gets!
- Unfortunately, general relativity is unbelievably more complicated...





- Yesterday you studied how spacetime is deformed depending on your velocity
- In fact, the principles you derived are about as hard as special relativity gets!
- Unfortunately, general relativity is unbelievably more complicated...
- In the second part of the seminar, you will derive some interesting properties of black holes and gravitational waves





- Yesterday you studied how spacetime is deformed depending on your velocity
- In fact, the principles you derived are about as hard as special relativity gets!
- Unfortunately, general relativity is unbelievably more complicated...
- In the second part of the seminar, you will derive some interesting properties of black holes and gravitational waves
- To start off, I'll try to give an overview of the physics





- Yesterday you studied how spacetime is deformed depending on your velocity
- In fact, the principles you derived are about as hard as special relativity gets!
- Unfortunately, general relativity is unbelievably more complicated...
- In the second part of the seminar, you will derive some interesting properties of black holes and gravitational waves
- To start off, I'll try to give an overview of the physics
- FEEL FREE TO HAVE A NAP IF YOU AREN'T INTERESTED: IT IS FRIDAY...





• The first thing is to understand what we mean by curved spacetime





- The first thing is to understand what we mean by curved spacetime
- Let's say a photon moves through Δt in time and Δx , Δy and Δz in space. . .





- The first thing is to understand what we mean by curved spacetime
- Let's say a photon moves through Δt in time and Δx , Δy and Δz in space. . .
- What was the formula with squares and a square-root that the photon obeyed in **special relativity**, which didn't change with v?





- The first thing is to understand what we mean by curved spacetime
- Let's say a photon moves through Δt in time and Δx , Δy and Δz in space. . .
- What was the formula with squares and a square-root that the photon obeyed in **special relativity**, which didn't change with v?
- We had:

$$\sqrt{c^2 \Delta t^2 - \Delta x^2 - \Delta y^2 - \Delta z^2} = 0$$





- The first thing is to understand what we mean by curved spacetime
- Let's say a photon moves through Δt in time and $\Delta x,\,\Delta y$ and Δz in space. . .
- What was the formula with squares and a square-root that the photon obeyed in **special relativity**, which didn't change with *v*?
- We had:

$$\sqrt{c^2 \Delta t^2 - \Delta x^2 - \Delta y^2 - \Delta z^2} = 0$$

Square it!





$$c^2 \Delta t^2 - \Delta x^2 - \Delta y^2 - \Delta z^2 = 0$$







• Ok, so a **photon** does this in **flat** spacetime:

$$c^2 \Delta t^2 - \Delta x^2 - \Delta y^2 - \Delta z^2 = 0$$

 We also learned that the LHS means distance in special relativity, right?







$$c^2 \Delta t^2 - \Delta x^2 - \Delta y^2 - \Delta z^2 = 0$$

- We also learned that the LHS means distance in special relativity, right?
- What do they tell you about how light travels in school?





$$c^2 \Delta t^2 - \Delta x^2 - \Delta y^2 - \Delta z^2 = 0$$

- We also learned that the LHS means distance in special relativity, right?
- What do they tell you about how light travels in school?
- And what is the **shortest distance** between two points in geometry?







$$c^2 \Delta t^2 - \Delta x^2 - \Delta y^2 - \Delta z^2 = 0$$

- We also learned that the LHS means distance in special relativity, right?
- What do they tell you about how light travels in school?
- And what is the **shortest distance** between two points in geometry?
- OK, so the equation we have is just a mathematical statement of the shortest distance!





• If spacetime is curved, the shortest distance isn't a straight line







- If spacetime is curved, the shortest distance isn't a straight line
- In this case, the nice simple formula gets very horrible:

$$c^{2}g_{tt}\Delta x^{2} + g_{xx}\Delta x^{2} + g_{yy}\Delta y^{2} + g_{zz}\Delta z^{2}$$
$$+2cg_{tx}\Delta t\Delta x + 2cg_{ty}\Delta t\Delta y + 2cg_{tz}\Delta t\Delta z$$
$$+2g_{xy}\Delta x\Delta y + 2g_{xz}\Delta x\Delta z + 2g_{zy}\Delta z\Delta y = 0$$





- If spacetime is curved, the shortest distance isn't a straight line
- In this case, the nice simple formula gets very horrible:

$$c^{2}g_{tt}\Delta x^{2} + g_{xx}\Delta x^{2} + g_{yy}\Delta y^{2} + g_{zz}\Delta z^{2}$$
$$+2cg_{tx}\Delta t\Delta x + 2cg_{ty}\Delta t\Delta y + 2cg_{tz}\Delta t\Delta z$$
$$+2g_{xy}\Delta x\Delta y + 2g_{xz}\Delta x\Delta z + 2g_{zy}\Delta z\Delta y = 0$$

• We have introduced a new object:

$$g_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu}(ct, x, y, z)$$





- If spacetime is curved, the shortest distance isn't a straight line
- In this case, the nice simple formula gets very horrible:

$$c^{2}g_{tt}\Delta x^{2} + g_{xx}\Delta x^{2} + g_{yy}\Delta y^{2} + g_{zz}\Delta z^{2}$$
$$+2cg_{tx}\Delta t\Delta x + 2cg_{ty}\Delta t\Delta y + 2cg_{tz}\Delta t\Delta z$$
$$+2g_{xy}\Delta x\Delta y + 2g_{xz}\Delta x\Delta z + 2g_{zy}\Delta z\Delta y = 0$$

• We have introduced a new object:

$$g_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu}(ct, x, y, z)$$

• The **labels** μ and ν could be t, x, y or z





• What kind of **mathematical object** do you think $g_{\mu\nu}$ is?







- What kind of **mathematical object** do you think $g_{\mu\nu}$ is?
- So $g_{\mu\nu}$ is very like a 4×4 matrix!





- What kind of **mathematical object** do you think $g_{\mu\nu}$ is?
- So $g_{\mu\nu}$ is very like a 4×4 matrix!
- Actually it is a tensor, don't worry about the difference!





- What kind of **mathematical object** do you think $g_{\mu\nu}$ is?
- So $g_{\mu\nu}$ is very like a 4×4 matrix!
- Actually it is a tensor, don't worry about the difference!
- We say $g_{\mu\nu}$ is the **metric tensor**, it varies with **space** and **time**, and encodes the fact that the **shortest distance** might not be the **straightest line**





- What kind of **mathematical object** do you think $g_{\mu\nu}$ is?
- So $g_{\mu\nu}$ is very like a 4×4 matrix!
- Actually it is a tensor, don't worry about the difference!
- We say $g_{\mu\nu}$ is the **metric tensor**, it varies with **space** and **time**, and encodes the fact that the **shortest distance** might not be the **straightest line**
- Therefore it contains all the information about the curvature, which is equal to the gravitational field





- What kind of **mathematical object** do you think $g_{\mu\nu}$ is?
- So $g_{\mu\nu}$ is very like a 4×4 matrix!
- Actually it is a tensor, don't worry about the difference!
- We say $g_{\mu\nu}$ is the **metric tensor**, it varies with **space** and **time**, and encodes the fact that the **shortest distance** might not be the **straightest line**
- Therefore it contains all the information about the curvature, which is equal to the gravitational field
- Mason/Emre or anyone else not napping: can you find $g_{\mu\nu}$ for the original **flat case** there should only be **four** $g_{\mu\nu}$ components which aren't zero. . .





• Now $g_{\mu\nu}$ might contain the information about gravity, but it isn't equal to the curvature immediately. . .





- Now $g_{\mu\nu}$ might contain the information about gravity, but it isn't equal to the curvature immediately. . .
- The curvature is given by the curvature tensor $R_{\mu\nu}$ which depends in a complicated way on $g_{\mu\nu}$...







$$\begin{split} R_{\mu\nu} &= \\ &\frac{1}{2} \, \partial_{\rho} g^{\rho\sigma} \, \partial_{\nu} g_{\mu\sigma} \, + \frac{1}{2} \, \partial_{\rho} g^{\rho\sigma} \, \partial_{\mu} g_{\nu\sigma} \, - \frac{1}{2} \, \partial_{\rho} g^{\rho\sigma} \, \partial_{\sigma} g_{\mu\nu} \, + \frac{1}{2} \, g^{\rho\sigma} \partial_{\nu\rho} g_{\mu\sigma} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \, g^{\rho\sigma} \partial_{\mu\rho} g_{\nu\sigma} \, - \frac{1}{2} \, g^{\rho\sigma} \partial_{\rho\sigma} g_{\mu\nu} \, - \frac{1}{2} \, \partial_{\nu} g^{\rho\sigma} \, \partial_{\mu} g_{\rho\sigma} \, - \frac{1}{2} \, g^{\rho\sigma} \partial_{\mu\nu} g_{\rho\sigma} \\ &+ \frac{1}{4} \, g^{\kappa\lambda} \partial_{\nu} g_{\mu\kappa} \, g^{\rho\sigma} \partial_{\lambda} g_{\rho\sigma} \, + \frac{1}{4} \, g^{\kappa\lambda} \partial_{\mu} g_{\nu\kappa} \, g^{\rho\sigma} \partial_{\lambda} g_{\rho\sigma} \, - \frac{1}{4} \, g^{\kappa\lambda} \partial_{\kappa} g_{\mu\nu} \, g^{\rho\sigma} \partial_{\lambda} g_{\rho\sigma} \\ &- \frac{1}{4} \, g^{\kappa\lambda} \partial_{\mu} g_{\kappa\rho} \, g^{\rho\sigma} \partial_{\nu} g_{\lambda\sigma} \, - \frac{1}{2} \, g^{\kappa\lambda} \partial_{\kappa} g_{\mu\rho} \, g^{\rho\sigma} \partial_{\sigma} g_{\nu\lambda} \, + \frac{1}{2} \, g^{\kappa\lambda} \partial_{\kappa} g_{\mu\rho} \, g^{\rho\sigma} \partial_{\lambda} g_{\nu\sigma} \end{split}$$





That formula should tell you something about how smart Einstein was...





- That formula should tell you something about how smart Einstein was...
- But where does the **curvature** come from?







- That formula should tell you something about how smart Einstein was...
- But where does the curvature come from?
- So somehow we need an equation to relate $R_{\mu\nu}$ to mass-energy, momentum and stress (or as Claudia said, pressure)...







- That formula should tell you something about how smart Einstein was...
- But where does the curvature come from?
- So somehow we need an **equation** to relate $R_{\mu\nu}$ to **mass-energy**, **momentum** and **stress** (or as Claudia said, **pressure**)...
- So we need one of these **tensor things** that encodes the **mass-energy**, **momentum** and **stress**...





• All these things which generate **gravity** are described by the stress-energy tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$





- All these things which generate **gravity** are described by the stress-energy tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$
- Let's write it in matrix form:

$$\mathbf{T} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{E} & p_x & p_y & p_z \\ p_x & s_{xx} & s_{xy} & s_{xz} \\ p_y & s_{yx} & s_{yy} & s_{yz} \\ p_z & s_{zx} & s_{zy} & s_{zz} \end{bmatrix}$$





- All these things which generate **gravity** are described by the stress-energy tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$
- Let's write it in matrix form:

$$\mathbf{T} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{E} & p_x & p_y & p_z \\ p_x & s_{xx} & s_{xy} & s_{xz} \\ p_y & s_{yx} & s_{yy} & s_{yz} \\ p_z & s_{zx} & s_{zy} & s_{zz} \end{bmatrix}$$

• Any idea what the components represent?





 We are now very close to the fundamental statement behind general relativity!





- We are now very close to the fundamental statement behind general relativity!
- We just need to define something that depends on the curvature tensor, called the Einstein tensor:

$$G_{\mu\nu} = R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}R$$





- We are now very close to the fundamental statement behind general relativity!
- We just need to define something that depends on the curvature tensor, called the Einstein tensor:

$$G_{\mu\nu} = R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}R$$

• And finally we get this:

$$G_{\mu\nu} = \frac{8\pi G}{c^4} T_{\mu\nu}$$





• These are the **Einstein field equations**:

$$G_{\mu\nu} = \frac{8\pi G}{c^4} T_{\mu\nu}$$





• These are the **Einstein field equations**:

$$G_{\mu\nu} = \frac{8\pi G}{c^4} T_{\mu\nu}$$

• First written down in 1915/1916







• These are the **Einstein field equations**:

$$G_{\mu\nu} = \frac{8\pi G}{c^4} T_{\mu\nu}$$

- First written down in 1915/1916
- You've seen how complicated they are when expressed with $g_{\mu\nu}$: it is incredably hard to find solutions to these equations







 We began by stating that curved spacetime can cause light to move in a non-straight line (in Seminar 1 and 2 we saw pictures of lensed light and black holes)





- We began by stating that curved spacetime can cause light to move in a non-straight line (in Seminar 1 and 2 we saw pictures of lensed light and black holes)
- The same is true for matter: what does Newton's 1st/2nd law say about matter moving through a vacuum?





- We began by stating that curved spacetime can cause light to move in a non-straight line (in Seminar 1 and 2 we saw pictures of lensed light and black holes)
- The same is true for matter: what does Newton's 1st/2nd law say about matter moving through a vacuum?
- So matter usually moves in straight lines like light, but if the spacetime is curved, it will move in a curved line, example anyone?





- We began by stating that curved spacetime can cause light to move in a non-straight line (in Seminar 1 and 2 we saw pictures of lensed light and black holes)
- The same is true for matter: what does Newton's 1st/2nd law say about matter moving through a vacuum?
- So matter usually moves in straight lines like light, but if the spacetime is curved, it will move in a curved line, example anyone?
- Something in orbit!





- We began by stating that curved spacetime can cause light to move in a non-straight line (in Seminar 1 and 2 we saw pictures of lensed light and black holes)
- The same is true for matter: what does Newton's 1st/2nd law say about matter moving through a vacuum?
- So matter usually moves in straight lines like light, but if the spacetime is curved, it will move in a curved line, example anyone?
- Something in orbit!
- The formula we began with is a statement of the **geodesic equation**, which encodes all these ideas about how things **move**





- So we're done! We have **two ideas** out of **general relativity**:
 - Geodesic equation: curved spacetime tells matter how to move
 - Einstein field equations: matter tells spacetime how to curve







- So we're done! We have **two ideas** out of **general relativity**:
 - Geodesic equation: curved spacetime tells matter how to move
 - Einstein field equations: matter tells spacetime how to curve
- If you take these ideas away today, Seminar 5 will have been a success
 :)





WAKE UP EVERYONE!







- WAKE UP EVERYONE!
- So I mentioned the Einstein field equations were very hard to solve, the first solution that was found (1916) is the Schwarzschild solution







- WAKE UP EVERYONE!
- So I mentioned the Einstein field equations were very hard to solve, the first solution that was found (1916) is the Schwarzschild solution
- I mentioned it before, anyone rememeber what it is?





- WAKE UP EVERYONE!
- So I mentioned the Einstein field equations were very hard to solve, the first solution that was found (1916) is the Schwarzschild solution
- I mentioned it before, anyone rememeber what it is?
- The curved spacetime in the vacuum around a spherically symmetric mass, ${\cal M}$





- WAKE UP EVERYONE!
- So I mentioned the Einstein field equations were very hard to solve, the first solution that was found (1916) is the Schwarzschild solution
- I mentioned it before, anyone rememeber what it is?
- The curved spacetime in the vacuum around a spherically symmetric mass, ${\cal M}$
- Y'all are living inside of the Schwarzschild solution!







"""schwarzschild".png





 Okay, but if we live in the Schwarzschild solution (e.g. the curved spacetime in the vacuum around the sun through which the Earth orbits) then why is this section titled Schwarzschild black hole?





- Okay, but if we live in the Schwarzschild solution (e.g. the curved spacetime in the vacuum around the sun through which the Earth orbits) then why is this section titled Schwarzschild black hole?
- The point is that the solution is only valid in the **vacuum** part, if the sun became **more dense** but kept **the same mass**, M, the solution would extend down to the **smaller surface radius**. r





- Okay, but if we live in the Schwarzschild solution (e.g. the curved spacetime in the vacuum around the sun through which the Earth orbits) then why is this section titled Schwarzschild black hole?
- The point is that the solution is only valid in the **vacuum** part, if the sun became **more dense** but kept **the same mass**, M, the solution would extend down to the **smaller surface radius**, r
- When r becomes a certain value, we are looking at a **black hole**!







- Okay, but if we live in the Schwarzschild solution (e.g. the curved spacetime in the vacuum around the sun through which the Earth orbits) then why is this section titled Schwarzschild black hole?
- The point is that the solution is only valid in the **vacuum** part, if the sun became **more dense** but kept **the same mass**, M, the solution would extend down to the **smaller surface radius**. r
- When r becomes a certain value, we are looking at a **black hole**!
- What did I say about a solar-mass black hole?





- Okay, but if we live in the Schwarzschild solution (e.g. the curved spacetime in the vacuum around the sun through which the Earth orbits) then why is this section titled Schwarzschild black hole?
- The point is that the solution is only valid in the **vacuum** part, if the sun became **more dense** but kept **the same mass**, M, the solution would extend down to the **smaller surface radius**, r
- When r becomes a certain value, we are looking at a **black hole**!
- What did I say about a solar-mass black hole?
- So it is the same gravity/curvature out here in the Earth's orbit!







 Note to self: go to whiteboard and talk about light-cones, future, past and causality...





 Right, so let's just consider a photon which moves directly toward or directly away from the black hole





- Right, so let's just consider a photon which moves directly toward or directly away from the black hole
- What two coordinates are we going to need?







- Right, so let's just consider a photon which moves directly toward or directly away from the black hole
- What two coordinates are we going to need?
- ullet Should be t (or ct if we're being careful!) and the **radial** coordinate, r





- Right, so let's just consider a photon which moves directly toward or directly away from the black hole
- What two coordinates are we going to need?
- ullet Should be t (or ct if we're being careful!) and the **radial** coordinate, r
- Switch off all the other coordinates, keep it simple!





 Just with those two coordinates we expect a complete mess for the shortest distance followed by a photon:

$$c^2 g_{tt} \Delta t^2 + g_{rr} \Delta r^2 + 2c g_{tr} \Delta t \Delta r = 0$$







 Just with those two coordinates we expect a complete mess for the shortest distance followed by a photon:

$$c^2 g_{tt} \Delta t^2 + g_{rr} \Delta r^2 + 2c g_{tr} \Delta t \Delta r = 0$$

Actually it isn't nearly so bad as we might expect:

$$\left(1 - \frac{r_s}{r}\right)c^2\Delta t^2 - \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{r_s}{r}\right)}\Delta r^2 = 0$$





 Just with those two coordinates we expect a complete mess for the shortest distance followed by a photon:

$$c^2 g_{tt} \Delta t^2 + g_{rr} \Delta r^2 + 2c g_{tr} \Delta t \Delta r = 0$$

Actually it isn't nearly so bad as we might expect:

$$\left(1 - \frac{r_s}{r}\right)c^2\Delta t^2 - \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{r_s}{r}\right)}\Delta r^2 = 0$$

• You have **probably heard** of the quantity r_s in science fiction, anyone know what it is?





• Photon's path towards/away from a black hole:

$$\left(1 - \frac{r_s}{r}\right)c^2\Delta t^2 - \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{r_s}{r}\right)}\Delta r^2 = 0$$





• Photon's path towards/away from a black hole:

$$\left(1 - \frac{r_s}{r}\right)c^2\Delta t^2 - \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{r_s}{r}\right)}\Delta r^2 = 0$$

• So r_s is the **Schwarzschild radius**:

$$r_s = \frac{2MG}{c^2}$$







• Photon's path towards/away from a black hole:

$$\left(1 - \frac{r_s}{r}\right)c^2\Delta t^2 - \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{r_s}{r}\right)}\Delta r^2 = 0$$

• So r_s is the **Schwarzschild radius**:

$$r_s = \frac{2MG}{c^2}$$

• What happens if $M \to 0$?







Photon's path towards/away from a black hole:

$$\left(1 - \frac{r_s}{r}\right)c^2\Delta t^2 - \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{r_s}{r}\right)}\Delta r^2 = 0$$

• So r_s is the **Schwarzschild radius**:

$$r_s = \frac{2MG}{c^2}$$

- What happens if $M \to 0$?
- We just have the photon motion of **flat space**, but written x = r:

$$c^2 \Delta t^2 - \Delta r^2 = 0$$







• Over to you now!







- Over to you now!
- Here is the photon's movement towards/away from a black hole:

$$\left(1 - \frac{r_s}{r}\right)c^2\Delta t^2 - \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{r_s}{r}\right)}\Delta r^2 = 0$$





- Over to you now!
- Here is the photon's movement towards/away from a black hole:

$$\left(1 - \frac{r_s}{r}\right)c^2\Delta t^2 - \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{r_s}{r}\right)}\Delta r^2 = 0$$

• Find this:

$$\frac{c\Delta t}{\Delta r}$$







- Over to you now!
- Here is the photon's movement towards/away from a black hole:

$$\left(1 - \frac{r_s}{r}\right)c^2\Delta t^2 - \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{r_s}{r}\right)}\Delta r^2 = 0$$

• Find this:

$$\frac{c\Delta t}{\Delta r}$$

• Emre: $r=0.9r_s$ and $r=r_s$, Mason: $r=0.1r_s$ and r=0, Ali Goktug: $r=100000r_s$, Claudia: $r=2r_s$, Federico: $r=3r_s$, Beltran: $r=4r_s$





So what did we find:







- So what did we find:
 - When $r \to \infty$ we get the **same** light-cone as with $M \to 0$, i.e. **flat** space, why?







- So what did we find:
 - When $r \to \infty$ we get the same light-cone as with $M \to 0$, i.e. flat space, why?
 - When $r \to r_s$ but $r > r_s$ the light-cone becomes **squashed**, we can think of this as the photon being **pulled** by the increasingly curved spacetime, but crucially, **the photon**, and any massive particle, can still move towards or away from the black hole





- So what did we find:
 - When $r \to \infty$ we get the same light-cone as with $M \to 0$, i.e. flat space, why?
 - When $r \to r_s$ but $r > r_s$ the light-cone becomes **squashed**, we can think of this as the photon being **pulled** by the increasingly curved spacetime, but crucially, **the photon**, and any massive particle, can still move towards or away from the black hole
 - When $r=r_s$ the light-cone vanishes, and takes with it the future and past





- So what did we find:
 - When $r \to \infty$ we get the **same** light-cone as with $M \to 0$, i.e. **flat** space, why?
 - When $r \to r_s$ but $r > r_s$ the light-cone becomes **squashed**, we can think of this as the photon being **pulled** by the increasingly curved spacetime, but crucially, **the photon**, and any massive particle, can still move towards or away from the black hole
 - When $r=r_s$ the light-cone vanishes, and takes with it the future and past
 - When $r < r_s$ we slip below the **event horizon**: the light-cone can be drawn again, but it points sideways! The rôle of t is taken by r, and **future of all particles/photons points towards the centre**. Particles may move **forwards** or **backwards** in time, but always towards r = 0!





- So what did we find:
 - When $r \to \infty$ we get the **same** light-cone as with $M \to 0$, i.e. **flat** space, why?
 - When $r \to r_s$ but $r > r_s$ the light-cone becomes **squashed**, we can think of this as the photon being **pulled** by the increasingly curved spacetime, but crucially, **the photon**, and any massive particle, can still move towards or away from the black hole
 - When $r=r_s$ the light-cone vanishes, and takes with it the future and past
 - When $r < r_s$ we slip below the **event horizon**: the light-cone can be drawn again, but it points sideways! The rôle of t is taken by r, and **future of all particles/photons points towards the centre**. Particles may move **forwards** or **backwards** in time, but always towards r = 0!
 - When r = 0 something **terrible** happens, **physics breaks**





Some points to note







- Some points to note
 - The point at the **centre** is called the **singularity**, the light-cones show that **everything goes there** once it **crosses the event horizon**, even the matter that formed the black hole in the first place!







- Some points to note
 - The point at the **centre** is called the **singularity**, the light-cones show that **everything goes there** once it **crosses the event horizon**, even the matter that formed the black hole in the first place!
 - Physicists hate the singularity, because their laws don't hold there –
 we probably need a quantum theory of gravity to make sense of it





- Some points to note
 - The point at the **centre** is called the **singularity**, the light-cones show that **everything goes there** once it **crosses the event horizon**, even the matter that formed the black hole in the first place!
 - Physicists hate the singularity, because their laws don't hold there –
 we probably need a quantum theory of gravity to make sense of it
 - (Ali Goktug asked about Hawking radiation rememeber to mention this)





Another note to self:







- Another note to self:
 - Find a clip from Interstellar or something?







More notes to self:





- More notes to self:
 - Find some black-hole collisions...







- More notes to self:
 - Find some black-hole collisions...
 - Talk about the wave equation...







• So now we have learned a bit about gravity waves





- So now we have learned a bit about gravity waves
- Earlier on I asked some of you to find the metric function for flat spacetime:

$$\mathbf{g} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$$







- So now we have learned a bit about gravity waves
- Earlier on I asked some of you to find the metric function for flat spacetime:

$$\mathbf{g} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$$

As you can see, it isn't a function, it is constant!





- So now we have learned a bit about gravity waves
- Earlier on I asked some of you to find the metric function for flat spacetime:

$$\mathbf{g} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$$

- As you can see, it isn't a function, it is **constant!**
- We write it as $g_{\mu\nu}=\eta_{\mu\nu}$





• So now we have learned a bit about gravity waves





- So now we have learned a bit about gravity waves
- Earlier on I asked some of you to find the metric function for flat spacetime:

$$\mathbf{g} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$$







- So now we have learned a bit about gravity waves
- Earlier on I asked some of you to find the metric function for flat spacetime:

$$\mathbf{g} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$$

• As you can see, it isn't a function, it is **constant!**





- So now we have learned a bit about gravity waves
- Earlier on I asked some of you to find the metric function for flat spacetime:

$$\mathbf{g} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$$

- As you can see, it isn't a function, it is **constant!**
- We write it as $g_{\mu\nu}=\eta_{\mu\nu}$





• When gravity is **weak**, we can say $g_{\mu\nu}=\eta_{\mu\nu}+h_{\mu\nu}$ and $h_{\mu\nu}$ is **small**





- When gravity is **weak**, we can say $g_{\mu\nu}=\eta_{\mu\nu}+h_{\mu\nu}$ and $h_{\mu\nu}$ is **small**
- The wave equation says f(x,t) is a wave moving at speed v along x:

$$\frac{1}{v^2} \frac{\partial^2 f(x,t)}{\partial t^2} - \frac{\partial^2 f(x,t)}{\partial x^2} = 0$$





- When gravity is **weak**, we can say $g_{\mu\nu}=\eta_{\mu\nu}+h_{\mu\nu}$ and $h_{\mu\nu}$ is **small**
- The wave equation says f(x,t) is a wave moving at speed v along x:

$$\frac{1}{v^2} \frac{\partial^2 f(x,t)}{\partial t^2} - \frac{\partial^2 f(x,t)}{\partial x^2} = 0$$

With weak gravity the Einstein field equations (with coordinates x and t only) become:

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \frac{8\pi G}{c^4} T_{\mu\nu} \to \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2 h_{\mu\nu}(x,t)}{\partial t^2} - \frac{\partial^2 h_{\mu\nu}(x,t)}{\partial x^2} = \frac{8\pi G}{c^4} T_{\mu\nu}$$





• So in a vacuum, the Einstein field equations predict that the shape of spacetime (i.e. shortest distance between points) moves along like a wave at speed \boldsymbol{c}





• You have learned some laws, e.g. **Newton's 1st and 2nd law**, and where they come from (energy conservation)





- You have learned some laws, e.g. Newton's 1st and 2nd law, and where they come from (energy conservation)
- You have also learned **Beltran's 1st law**: "This turned into maths really fast..."





- You have learned some laws, e.g. Newton's 1st and 2nd law, and where they come from (energy conservation)
- You have also learned Beltran's 1st law: "This turned into maths really fast..."
- Seriously, there is no such thing as physics without maths, and the more interesting the physics, the more intense the maths, so be prepared!





- You have learned some laws, e.g. Newton's 1st and 2nd law, and where they come from (energy conservation)
- You have also learned **Beltran's 1st law**: "This turned into maths really fast..."
- Seriously, there is no such thing as physics without maths, and the more interesting the physics, the more intense the maths, so be prepared!
- I'm sorry about the circuits, I hate them too...





- You have learned some laws, e.g. Newton's 1st and 2nd law, and where they come from (energy conservation)
- You have also learned **Beltran's 1st law**: "This turned into maths really fast..."
- Seriously, there is no such thing as physics without maths, and the more interesting the physics, the more intense the maths, so be prepared!
- I'm sorry about the circuits, I hate them too...
- Thanks for your time, enjoy week 2! :)





- You have learned some laws, e.g. Newton's 1st and 2nd law, and where they come from (energy conservation)
- You have also learned **Beltran's 1st law**: "This turned into maths really fast..."
- Seriously, there is no such thing as physics without maths, and the more interesting the physics, the more intense the maths, so be prepared!
- I'm sorry about the circuits, I hate them too...
- Thanks for your time, enjoy week 2! :)
- (for Uni application references etc, or questions, I'm at wb263@cam.ac.uk)



