

Supermassive Objects as Gamma-Ray Bursters

George M. Fuller and Xiangdong Shi

Department of Physics, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093

Received _____; accepted _____

arXiv:astro-ph/9711020v3 14 Mar 1998

ABSTRACT

We propose that the gravitational collapse of supermassive objects ($M \gtrsim 5 \times 10^4 M_\odot$), either as relativistic star clusters or as single supermassive stars (which may still result from stellar mergers in dense star clusters), could be a cosmological source of γ -ray bursts. Collapsing supermassive objects could release a fraction of their huge gravitational binding energy as thermal neutrino pairs. (These events could provide the seeds of the supermassive black holes observed at the center of many galaxies.) We show that the accompanying neutrino/antineutrino annihilation-induced heating could drive electron/positron “fireball” formation, relativistic expansion, and associated γ -ray emission. There are two major advantages of this model. (1) Supermassive object collapses are far more energetic than solar mass-scale catastrophic events such as neutron-star/neutron-star mergers; therefore, the conversion of gravitational energy to fireball kinetic energy in the supermassive object scenario need not be highly efficient, nor is it necessary to invoke directional beaming. (2) There is no need for actively star-forming galaxy hosts, since the formation/collapse of supermassive objects may not be tied to the formation of ordinary stars.

Subject headings: gamma rays: bursts - cosmology: observations and theory

1. Introduction

In this letter we propose that the collapse of supermassive objects and the associated neutrino/antineutrino annihilation could give rise to high redshift (cosmological) γ -ray bursts. This model can meet current observational constraints and could alleviate a number of vexing problems associated with the energetics and the lack of host-galaxy detections of conventional stellar remnant-based models. We define a supermassive object to be a star or star cluster that suffers the general relativistic Feynman-Chandrasekhar instability early in its evolution. This corresponds to objects with masses $M > 5 \times 10^4 M_\odot$.

Detections of the metal line absorption and OII emission features at a redshift $z = 0.835$ in the spectral observation of the afterglow of γ -ray burst GRB970508 (Metzger et al. 1997a,b) have established that at least some of the γ -ray burst sources lie at cosmological distances (redshift $z \gtrsim 1$). Observations show that the total energy in gamma rays associated with a γ -ray burst at cosmological distances is $10^{51} - 10^{52}$ erg when a 4π solid angle coverage is assumed (Fenimore et al. 1993; Wijers et al. 1997). Catastrophic collapse events, such as neutron-star/neutron-star mergers (Paczynski 1986; Goodman 1986; Eichler et al. 1989), neutron-star/black-hole mergers (Mochkovitch et al. 1993), failed supernovae (Woosley 1993), “hypernovae” (Paczynski 1997), collapse of Chandrasekhar-mass white dwarfs (Usov 1992), have been touted as natural candidates for cosmological γ -ray burst sources. Fireballs created in these collapse events could accelerate material to the ultra-relativistic regime, with Lorentz factors $\Gamma = E_e/m_e c^2 \gtrsim 10^2$ (Paczynski 1986, Goodman 1986, Rees & Mészáros 1992, Mészáros & Rees 1992, Piran 1996). The kinetic energy in these fireballs could then be converted to γ -rays possibly via the cyclotron radiation and/or the inverse Compton processes associated with ultrarelativistic electrons. In these models, the energy loss of the shock(s) propelled by the fireball would produce the afterglow associated with a γ -ray burst event (Waxman 1997).

There are, however, several potential problems for these stellar remnant-based models. One is an energetics problem. The total gravitational binding energy released when a $\sim 1 M_{\odot}$ configuration collapses to a black hole is $\sim 10^{54}$ erg. Calculations have shown that it is very difficult to power a γ -ray burst of energy $\sim 10^{52}$ erg (Wijers et al. 1997), or an afterglow with a similar energy (Waxman 1997; Dar 1997) with such a collapse scenario, unless the γ -ray emission and the blast wave causing the afterglow are highly collimated. A second problem is the lack of clear detections of galaxies that host these stellar remnants (Schaefer 1992; Fenimore et al. 1993; Vrba, Hartmann & Jennings 1995; Schaefer et al. 1997; Band & Hartmann 1998). So far there has been only one possible detection of a host galaxy, an extended source that overlaps with GRB970228. In this case the extended source is too faint to be a normal L_* galaxy. It is not impossible that the host galaxies are intrinsically too dim ($\lesssim 0.1L_*$) to detect, but if these stellar remnants trace the star formation rate to some degree (which they should), the host galaxies should tend to have active star formation and so be bright. A possible solution to the no-host problem is to assume that most of the stellar remnants such as the neutron-star/neutron-star binaries were kicked out of their host galaxies at high velocities (e.g., pulsars in our own galaxy have a mean birth velocity of 450 ± 90 km/sec; see Lyne & Lorimer 1994). However, in this case the lack of “interstellar medium” outside a galaxy may pose a problem for the deceleration of fireballs.

The supermassive object collapse model could alleviate both potential problems outlined above. There is no direct evidence for supermassive stars ever having been extant in the universe. However, it has been argued that their formation could be an inevitable result of the collapse of $\sim 10^5 M_{\odot}$ to $10^6 M_{\odot}$ primordial clouds (the baryon Jean’s mass at early epochs, see Peebles & Dicke 1968, and Tegmark et al. 1997) at high redshifts in which cooling was not as efficient as in clouds contaminated with metals, or more likely, as a result of stellar mergers associated with relativistic star cluster collapse (Hoyle & Fowler

1963; Begelman & Rees 1978; Bond, Arnett, & Carr 1984; Fuller, Woosley, & Weaver 1986, hereafter FWW; McLaughlin & Fuller 1996). The scenarios for supermassive black hole production outlined by Begelman & Rees (1978) include several pathways whereby supermassive stars are formed as an intermediate stage in the collapse/evolution of large and dense star clusters. Further, supermassive black holes apparently are ubiquitous in the universe. They are invoked as the central engines of Active Galactic Nuclei (AGNs) and quasars, and are inferred to be in the centers of nearby galaxies (van der Marel et al. 1997).

We note that Prilutski and Usov (1975) have previously tied γ -ray bursts to magneto-energy transfer during collapses of supermassive rotators ($\sim 10^6 M_\odot$) postulated to power AGNs and quasars (Prilutski & Usov 1975). Here we propose a different energy transfer mechanism (neutrinos) based on objects not necessarily tied to AGNs or quasars, but which could possibly be related to the birth of the supermassive black holes that power them.

The gravitational binding energy release of a supermassive object collapsing to a black hole end state is $10^{59} M_5^{\text{HC}} \text{ erg}$ (where M_5^{HC} is the homologous core mass of the star in units of $10^5 M_\odot$), much higher than that of a stellar mass scale object. Some of this gravitational energy is radiated as thermal neutrino/antineutrino pairs (FWW; Fuller & Shi 1998) whose annihilations into electron/positron pairs could create a fireball above the core that generates γ -rays.

The formation of supermassive stars might not be associated with on-going active formation of 1–100 M_\odot stars. Therefore there is potentially no need for actively star-forming “host galaxies” with this model.

2. Fireballs from Supermassive Object Collapse

General Relativistic instability in supermassive stars sets in at or before the onset of hydrogen burning (c.f., FWW). As such a star collapses, the entropy per baryon is slightly increased by nuclear burning, but then is reduced by neutrino pair emission. Though initially the whole star can collapse homologously, as the entropy is reduced only an inner “homologous core” can continue to collapse homologously. It is this homologous core that will plunge through an event horizon as a unit to make a black hole.

The collapse to a black hole of a supermassive star with a homologous core mass M^{HC} (crudely) will have a characteristic (prompt) Newtonian gravitational binding energy release of $\sim E_s \approx 10^{59} M_5^{\text{HC}} \text{ erg}$. Neutrino emission in supermassive stars will result from e^\pm -annihilation in the core, with an emissivity which scales as the core temperature to the *ninth* power (Dicus 1972). As a result, most of the gravitational binding energy removed by neutrinos will be emitted very near the point where the core becomes a black hole, and on a timescale characterized by the free fall time (or light crossing time) of the homologous core near the black hole formation point. We employ a characteristic free fall collapse time scale of $t_s \approx M_5^{\text{HC}} \text{ sec}$, and a characteristic radius (the Schwarzschild radius) of $r_s \approx 3 \times 10^{10} M_5^{\text{HC}} \text{ cm}$. For a core mass $\gtrsim 10^4 M_\odot$ the neutrinos will not be trapped in the core and will freely stream out.

The neutrino luminosity can be crudely estimated from the product of the neutrino energy emissivity near the black hole formation point and the volume inside the Schwarzschild radius, i.e., $4 \times 10^{15} (T_9^{\text{Schw}})^9 (4\pi r_s^3/3) \text{ erg/sec}$ (Schinder et al. 1987; Itoh et al. 1989). Here T_9^{Schw} is the characteristic *average* core temperature near the black hole formation point in units of 10^9 K . For a spherical non-rotating supermassive star we can show that

$$T_9^{\text{Schw}} \approx 12 \alpha_{\text{Schw}}^{1/3} \left(\frac{11/2}{g_s} \right)^{1/3} \left(\frac{M_5^{\text{init}}}{M_5^{\text{HC}}} \right)^{1/6} (M_5^{\text{HC}})^{-1/2}, \quad (1)$$

where α_{Schw} is the ratio of the final entropy per baryon to the value of this quantity in the initial pre-collapse hydrostatic configuration (whose mass we take to be M_5^{init} in units of $10^5 M_\odot$), and $g_s \approx g_b + 7/8 g_f \approx 11/2$ is the statistical weight of relativistic particles in the core. Since for spherical non-rotating supermassive stars $M_5^{\text{init}}/M_5^{\text{HC}} \approx \sqrt{5.5/2} \alpha_{\text{Schw}}^{-2}$ (FWW), we can conclude that $T_9^{\text{Schw}} \approx 13(M_5^{\text{HC}})^{-1/2}$. The characteristic neutrino luminosity is then

$$L_{\nu\bar{\nu}} \sim 4 \times 10^{15} (T_9^{\text{Schw}})^9 (4\pi r_s^3/3) \text{ erg/sec} \approx 5 \times 10^{57} (M_5^{\text{HC}})^{-3/2} \text{ erg/sec.} \quad (2)$$

Since 70% of the neutrino emission is in the $\nu_e \bar{\nu}_e$ channel, the characteristic luminosity of ν_e or $\bar{\nu}_e$ is $L_{\nu_e} = L_{\bar{\nu}_e} \approx 0.35 L_{\nu\bar{\nu}}$.

The copious $\nu\bar{\nu}$ emission during the collapse can create a fireball above the homologous core by $\nu\bar{\nu} \rightarrow e^+e^-$. Clearly, the neutrino luminosities will suffer gravitational redshift which will degrade the total energy deposition above the star, though this will be compensated by increased $\nu\bar{\nu}$ -annihilation from gravitational bending of null trajectories (Cardall & Fuller 1997). A detailed calculation of these two effects is beyond the scope of this letter. And we do not expect the combination of them to change our ensuing order-of-magnitude estimates significantly. The energy deposition rate per unit volume from the $\nu\bar{\nu}$ annihilation at a radius r above a spherical shell of thermal neutrino emission with a radius R_ν , is then (Goodman, Dar, & Nussinov 1987; Cooperstein, van den Horn, & Baron 1987)

$$\dot{Q}_{\nu\bar{\nu}}(r) = \frac{KG_F^2 \Phi(x) \hbar^2 c}{12\pi^2 R_\nu^4} L_\nu L_{\bar{\nu}} \left[\frac{\langle E_\nu^2 \rangle}{\langle E_\nu \rangle} + \frac{\langle E_{\bar{\nu}}^2 \rangle}{\langle E_{\bar{\nu}} \rangle} \right]. \quad (3)$$

Here G_F is the Fermi constant, L is the luminosity of the neutrinos/anti-neutrinos, and the brackets denote averages of neutrino energy or squared-energy over the appropriate neutrino or antineutrino energy spectra (see Shi & Fuller 1998). The phase space and spin factors are $K \approx 0.124$ (0.027) for $\nu = \nu_e (\nu_\mu, \nu_\tau)$, and the radial dependence of the energy deposition rate is $\Phi(x) = (1-x)^4 (x^2 + 4x + 5)$, with $x = [1 - (R_\nu/r)^2]^{1/2}$.

The characteristic neutrino luminosity $L_{\nu\bar{\nu}}$ in eq. (2) could be in fact an underestimate of the true neutrino luminosity. As the neutrino energy loss rate scales steeply as T_9^9 , and the temperature distribution in the homologously collapsing core (an index $n = 3$ polytrope) follows the Lane-Emden function and so peaks at the center, a detailed numerical calculation (without considering the uncertain gravitational redshift, however) shows that the true average neutrino luminosity can be much higher if there is rapid rotation and/or magnetic fields holding up the collapse (Shi & Fuller 1998). Most of the luminosity will come out from the central part of the core. Compensating this situation will be the R_ν^4 dependence of the above $\nu\bar{\nu}$ energy deposition rate $\dot{Q}_{\nu\bar{\nu}}$. Therefore, as a crude approximation we will approximate the entire neutrino emissivity of the core as arising from the edge of the core ($R_\nu \sim r_s$), and then take $L_{\nu\bar{\nu}}$ as the characteristic neutrino luminosity from eq. (2).

The spectrum of the neutrino emission yields $\langle E_\nu^2 \rangle / \langle E_\nu \rangle = \langle E_{\bar{\nu}}^2 \rangle / \langle E_{\bar{\nu}} \rangle \approx 6 (M_5^{\text{HC}})^{-1/2} \text{ MeV}$ (Shi & Fuller 1998). Therefore, the neutrino energy deposition rate per unit volume will be roughly

$$\dot{Q}_{\nu\bar{\nu}}(r) \sim 4 \times 10^{22} (M_5^{\text{HC}})^{-7.5} (r_s/r)^8 \text{ erg cm}^{-3} \text{ s}^{-1} \quad (4)$$

The total energy deposited into the fireball above a radius r is

$$E_{\text{f.b.}}(r) = t_s \int_r^\infty 4\pi r^2 \dot{Q}_{\nu\bar{\nu}}(r) dr \sim 2.5 \times 10^{54} (M_5^{\text{HC}})^{-3.5} (r_s/r)^5 \text{ erg}, \quad (5)$$

which is tremendous. The fireball will undoubtedly lose some of this energy to thermal neutrino emission. But, once the e^\pm pair density is high enough for this, neutrino/electron scattering should deposit even more energy. If $M_5^{\text{HC}} = 1$, the energy deposited in the fireball will be $\sim 10^{52}$ erg at a radius $r \sim 3r_s \approx 10^{11}$ cm. This is the total observed energy in a γ -ray burst assuming a 4π solid angle and a cosmological distance.

Once again we emphasize that eq. (2) through eq. (5) are naive calculations without considering two compensating effects: gravitational redshift, and trajectory bending. These estimates are also only valid for $M_5^{\text{HC}} \gtrsim 0.15$ where neutrinos freely escape from the core.

A successful model of a γ -ray burst must avoid excessive baryon loading so that a Lorentz factor of $\Gamma \gtrsim 10^2$ can be achieved for the baryons accelerated by the fireball. This suggests that the region at several Schwarzschild radii away from the supermassive star core should have extremely low baryon density. This may be satisfied if the *whole* star collapses homologously into a black hole, and/or substantial rotation causes the star to collapse in a flattened geometry with very little material in the polar directions (an extreme case of this geometry was discussed in Bardeen & Wagoner, 1969). The homologous collapse of the entire star could only be engineered if the star has substantial centrifugal support from rotation and/or if there is significant magnetic pressure (but not so much that an explosion results). Therefore, rotation could be a crucial factor in the picture.

Another route to avoid excessive baryon loading may be to consider the collapse of a dense star cluster - the likely route to supermassive star build-up, and the likely manner in which the “seeds” of supermassive black holes associated with AGNs and quasars are formed. Huge star cluster collapse and supermassive stars may well represent two extremes on a continuum of supermassive object collapse. Indeed, relativistic star clusters can collapse on the Feynman-Chandrasekhar instability (Shapiro & Teukolsky 1985) and build up a central supermassive star via collisions of $M_* \sim M_\odot$ stars. During the collapse these stars will have relativistic speeds and the typical entropy per baryon produced in collisions will be $S \sim 10^4 \Gamma^{1/2} (g_s/5.5)^{1/4} (M_\odot/M_*)^{1/4} (V_*/V_\odot)^{1/4}$ with $T_9 \sim 1$, conditions commensurate with those required for hydrostatic supermassive stars ($S \approx 10^4 (M/10^8 M_\odot)^{1/2}$). (Here $\Gamma > 1$ is an appropriate Lorentz factor, and V_*/V_\odot is the ratio of the stellar collision interaction volume to the solar volume.) In the collapse, space between moving stars may provide baryon-free “lanes”, and the stellar collisions themselves may cause the neutrino emission to be “spiky” (the overall emission profile, however, should nevertheless follow the free fall collapse profile indicated above for supermassive stars). Both processes are stochastic, possibly contributing to the “spiky” time structure of the γ -ray bursts.

3. Gamma-Ray Burst Event Rate, Peak Flux Distribution and Time Dilation

The rate of supermassive object collapses should be able to match the observed rate of γ -ray burst events (several per day) if a substantial fraction of the burst events are to come from this source. Assuming that supermassive objects all form and collapse at a redshift z , the rate of these collapses as observed at the present epoch is

$$4\pi r^2 a_z^3 \frac{dr}{dt_0} \frac{\rho_b F (1+z)^3}{M}, \quad (6)$$

where r is the Friedman-Robertson-Walker comoving coordinate distance of these supermassive objects (with earth at the origin), a_z is the scale factor of the universe at the epoch corresponding to a redshift z (with $a_0 = 1$), t_0 is the age of the universe, $\rho_b \approx 2 \times 10^{-29} \Omega_b h^2 \text{ g cm}^{-3} \approx 5 \times 10^{-31} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ (Tytler & Burles 1997) is the baryon density of the universe today, F is the fraction of baryons that were incorporated in supermassive objects and M is the mass of a typical supermassive object. Since $dr/dt_0 = c$, the speed of light, and r is of order $6000h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$ so long as $z \gtrsim 1$, this rate is

$$0.3FM_5^{-1} \text{ sec}^{-1} \sim 3 \times 10^4 FM_5^{-1} / \text{day}. \quad (7)$$

Therefore, with $F \sim 0.01\%$, i.e., with 0.01% of all baryons having been incorporated into supermassive objects, we should observe (assuming a 100% detection efficiency) several collapses per day if the γ -rays they emitted have a 4π solid angle, matching the observed rate of γ -ray burst events. This fraction translates into an expectation that about 0.01% of the baryons in our universe are in $\gtrsim 10^5 M_\odot$ black holes at the present epoch. In fact, almost all galaxies that have been examined appropriately seem to have supermassive black holes in their centers (van den Marel et al. 1997).

If all γ -ray bursts are from $z \gtrsim 1$ (as we would expect if they are from supermassive object collapses), then the γ -ray burst peak flux distribution ($\log N$ - $\log P$) will be very different from models with a homogeneously distributed population of γ -ray bursters. The

observed $\log N$ - $\log P$ distribution is a power law with index = -1.5 which has a break at the faint end (Fenimore et al. 1993). This would be consistent with homogeneously distributed cosmological sources with a cut-off at high redshifts, unless the peak flux of γ -ray bursts, P , cannot be regarded as a standard candle. But since the $\log N$ - $\log P$ distribution is a convolution of the peak flux and spatial distribution, there is no guarantee that the observed power law requires a homogeneous distribution of sources. For our model, in which supermassive object collapses most likely occur at cosmological distances with $z \gtrsim 1$, we can always invoke variances in the peak flux of γ -ray bursts, and/or an evolution of supermassive object co-moving number densities, or invoke another population of γ -ray bursters, to fit the observed γ -ray burst peak flux distribution. It is worth noting that even in existing stellar remnant-based models, the sources tend to be more abundant at $z \gtrsim 1$, because the star formation rate was higher then (Lilly et al. 1996; Madau et al. 1996; Totani 1997). Therefore, similar assumptions are likely needed to fit the same observations with the supermassive object model.

Another consequence of supermassive objects preferentially residing at higher redshifts is that their γ -ray bursts show a different time dilation factor than models in which sources are distributed uniformly between redshift zero and high redshifts. For example, if most supermassive objects formed and collapsed between the epochs corresponding to redshifts of from 1 to 3, the time dilation spread is a factor of 2. This is consistent with statistical tests that show a factor of 2 (Norris et al. 1995) or less (Mitrofanov, Litvak & Ushakov 1997) time dilation effect. Of course, the time dilation effect can be complicated by many other factors, not the least of which are the special relativistic effect of beamed γ -ray emission (Brainerd 1994), and correlation between the luminosity and duration of bursts (Band 1994).

4. Conclusion

The formation route of the seeds of the supermassive black holes inferred in AGNs, quasars and many galaxies may well involve an intermediate supermassive star phase. As Begelman and Rees (1978) have shown this could happen for huge clusters of stars. We point out here that collapses of these objects will be accompanied by prodigious thermal neutrino emission which could transport a fraction of the gravitational binding energy of these objects to a region(s) where the baryon loading is low. One of the advantages of this model is a potentially huge energy release. If (some) γ -ray bursts are at very high redshifts, energy considerations could favor supermassive object collapse as the origin of these events. We have shown that the collapse timescale and expected collapse event rates are consistent with γ -ray burst parameters. The principal weakness of our model is the baryon loading problem. We have outlined possible ways to circumvent this problem by appealing to high angular momentum and flattened collapses, and by appealing to the stochastic nature of stellar collision-induced supermassive star build-up in the collapse of huge relativistic star clusters.

We thank David Band and Edward Fenimore for valuable suggestions. This work is supported by NASA grant NAG5-3062 and NSF grant PHY95-03384 at UCSD.

REFERENCES

- Band, D. L. 1994, ApJ, 432, L23
- Band, D.L., & Hartmann, D.H. 1998, ApJ, in press
- Bardeen, J.M., & Wagoner, R.V. 1969, ApJ, 158, L65
- Begelman, M.C. & Rees, M.J. 1978, MNRAS, 185, 847
- Brainerd, J. J. 1994, ApJ, 428, L1
- Bond, J.R., Arnett, W.D., & Carr, B.J. 1984, ApJ, 280, 825
- Cardall, C.Y., & Fuller, G.M. 1997, ApJ, 486, L111
- Cooperstein, J., van den Horn, L.J., & Baron, E. 1987, ApJ, 321, L129
- Dar, A. 1997, unpublished
- Dicus, D.A. 1972, Phys. Rev. D, 6, 941 D.N. 1989, Nature, 340, 126
- Eichler, D., Livio, M., Piran, T., and Schramm, D.N. 1989, Nature, 340, 126
- Fenimore, E. E. et al. 1993, Nature, 366, 40
- Fuller, G.M., Woosley, S.E., & Weaver, T.A. 1986, ApJ, 307, 675 (FWW)
- Fuller, G.M. & Shi, X. 1997, ApJ, 487, L25
- Fuller, G.M. & Shi, X. 1998, in preparation
- Goodman, J. 1986, ApJ, 308, L47
- Goodman, J., Dar, A., & Nussinov, S. 1987, ApJ, 314, L7
- Hoyle, F. & Fowler, W.A. 1963, MNRAS, 125, 169

- Itoh, N., Adachi, T., Nakagawa, M., Kohyama, Y., & Munakawa, H. 1989, *ApJ*, 339, 354
- Lilly, S. J., Le Fèvre, O., Hammer, F., and Crampton, D. 1996, *ApJ*, 460, L1
- Lyne, A., and Lorimer, D. R. 1994, *Nature*, 369, 127
- Madau, P. et al. 1996, *MNRAS*, 283, 1388
- McLaughlin, G.C. & Fuller, G.M. 1996, *ApJ*, 456, 71
- Mészáros, P., & Rees, M.J. 1992, *MNRAS*, 257, 29p
- Metzger, R.M., et al. 1997a, *Nature*, 387, 879
- Metzger, R.M., Cohen, J.G., Chaffee, M.H., & Blandford, R.D. 1997b, IAU circular No. 6676
- Mitrofanov, I. G., Litvak, M. L., and Ushakov, D. A. 1997, *ApJ*, 490, 509
- Mochkovitch, R., Hernanz, M., Isern, J., and Martin, X. 1993, *Nature*, 361, 236
- Norris, J. P., et al. 1995, *ApJ*, 439, 542
- Paczyński, B. 1986, *ApJ*, 308, L43
- Paczyński, B. 1997, *ApJ*, submitted
- Peebles, P.J.E. & Dicke, R.H. 1968, *ApJ*, 154, 891
- Prilutski, O.F., & Usov, V.V. 1975, *Ap&SS*, 34, 395
- Rees, M.J., & Mészáros, P. 1992, *MNRAS*, 258, 41p
- Piran, T. 1996, in *Unsolved Problems in Astrophysics*, eds. J. N. Bahcall and J. P. Ostriker (Princeton: Prince University Press)

- Schaefer, B. E. 1992, in *Gamma-Ray Bursts: Observations, Analyses, and Theories*, eds. C. Ho, R. I. Epstein, & E. E. Fenimore, pp. 107 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Schaefer, B. E., Cline, T. L., Hurley, K. C. & Laros, J. C. 1997, *ApJ*, in press
- Schinder, P.J., et al. 1987, *ApJ*, 313, 531
- Shapiro, S. L. & Teukolsky, S. A. 1985, *ApJ*, 292, 41
- Shi, X. & Fuller, G.M. 1998, *ApJ*, in press
- Totani, T., 1997, *ApJ*, 486, L71
- Tytler, D., & Burles, S. 1997, in "Origin of Matter and Evolution of Galaxies", eds. T. Kajino, Y. Yoshii & S. Kubono (World Scientific Publ. Co.: Singapore), 37
- Usov, V. V. 1992, *Nature*, 357, 472
- van der Marel, R.P., de Zeeuw, P.T., Rix, H., & Quinlan, G.D. 1997, *Nature*, 385, 610
- Vrba, F. J., Hartmann, D. H., and Jennings, M.C. 1995, *ApJ*, 446, 115
- Wallace, R.K. & Woosley, S.E. 1981, *ApJS*, 45, 389
- Waxman, E. 1997, *ApJ*, 489, L33
- Wijers, R.A.M.J., Bloom, J.S., Bagla, J.S., & Natarajan, P. 1997, submitted to *MNRAS*
- Woosley, S. E. 1993, *ApJ*, 405, 273