

ON FRIEDMANN'S UNIVERSES

ANGELO LOINGER

ABSTRACT. There is a perfect concordance between Friedmann's cosmological models and the correspondent (purely gravitational interactions and negligible pressure) Newtonian models. This renders quite intuitive the fact that in general relativity no motion of bodies generates gravitational waves.

1. - As it is well known, Friedmann's cosmological models [1] can be characterized in the following way:

i) A spacetime interval ds given by Friedmann-Robertson-Walker metric (x^1, x^2, x^3, r are dimensionless coordinates):

$$(1) \quad ds^2 = (dx^0)^2 - A^2(r^2) F^2(x^0) \left[(dx^1)^2 + (dx^2)^2 + (dx^3)^2 \right] \quad ,$$

where

$$(1') \quad A(r^2) \equiv 1 + \zeta r^2/4,$$

and $\zeta = 0, \pm 1$, $r^2 = (x^1)^2 + (x^2)^2 + (x^3)^2$; $F(x^0)$ is a function of time to be determined by Einstein field equations. Eq.(1) yields the most general metric expression describing a *uniform* (i.e. homogeneous and isotropic) three-dimensional space. ($\zeta = 0$: Euclidean space; $\zeta = 1$: spherical – or elliptical – space; $\zeta = -1$: hyperbolic space).

ii) A mass tensor T^{jk} , ($j, k = 0, 1, 2, 3$), of the galaxy “dust”, given by

$$(2) \quad T^{jk} = \rho \frac{dx^j}{ds} \frac{dx^k}{ds}, \quad (c = 1),$$

where ρ is the invariant mass density. A “dust” particle represents a galaxy. The particles interact *only* gravitationally. Eq.(1) is written in a particular *Gaussian-normal* coordinate frame [2] – *synchronous* frame, according to the expressive terminology of Landau-Lifchitz [2]. For frames of this kind the time lines are geodesic lines. Remark that for *any* physical system of particles, the mass tensor of which is given by eq.(2), the *world* lines of the particles are *geodesic* lines, and therefore *no* gravitational wave

To be published on *Spacetime & Substance*.
 email: angelo.loinger@mi.infn.it
 Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Milano, Via Celoria, 16 - 20133 Milano (Italy).

can be emitted [3]. Thus, our coordinate frame is synchronous and comoving [4] – *and the galaxy trajectories are **geodesic** lines*. We have:

$$(3) \quad dx^\alpha/ds = 0, \quad (\alpha = 1, 2, 3); \quad dx^0/ds = 1; \quad T^{00} = T_{00} = \rho.$$

Substituting the preceding equations into Einstein field equations:

$$(4) \quad R_{jk} - \frac{1}{2}g_{jk}R = -\kappa T_{jk}; \quad \kappa \equiv 8\pi G,$$

where G is the gravitational constant, one obtains:

$$(5) \quad \frac{\zeta}{F} + \frac{\dot{F}^2}{F} + 2\ddot{F} = 0,$$

$$(6) \quad \frac{\zeta}{F^2} + \frac{\dot{F}^2}{F^2} - \frac{1}{3}\kappa\rho = 0.$$

Clearly, the distance between two galaxies is *proportional* to the function F of time. The solutions of eqs.(5), (6) are well known: for $\zeta = 1$, we have a cosmic periodic oscillation between $F = 0$ and $F = F_{max}$; for $\zeta = 0, -1$ we have a cosmic monotonic expansion. In all cases, $\zeta/F^2(x^0)$ is the curvature of the space section $x^0 = \text{constant}$. For $F = 0$ the density ρ is infinite and the gravitational field is singular.

2. - In the Thirties of the past century, a Newtonian cosmology was developed: an investigation of the kinds of flow in a galaxy “dust”, when homogeneity, isotropy, and irrotational flow are assumed [5]. A galaxy which is on the surface of an expanding sphere of radius $\mathfrak{R}(t)$ is attracted by the mass M within the sphere according to Newton’s law:

$$(7) \quad \ddot{\mathfrak{R}} = -\frac{\kappa M}{8\pi\mathfrak{R}^2}; \quad M = \frac{4}{3}\pi\mathfrak{R}^3(t)\rho(t) = \text{constant};$$

thus:

$$(7') \quad \ddot{\mathfrak{R}} + \frac{\kappa}{6}\mathfrak{R}\rho = 0,$$

from which:

$$(8) \quad \frac{\eta}{\mathfrak{R}^2} + \frac{\dot{\mathfrak{R}}^2}{\mathfrak{R}^2} - \frac{1}{3}\kappa\rho = 0,$$

where η is an integration constant, which characterizes the total energy, kinetic plus potential.

In conclusion, we can write the two following equations:

$$(7'') \quad \frac{\eta}{\mathfrak{R}} + \frac{\dot{\mathfrak{R}}^2}{\mathfrak{R}} + 2\ddot{\mathfrak{R}} = 0,$$

$$(8) \quad \frac{\eta}{\mathfrak{R}^2} + \frac{\dot{\mathfrak{R}}^2}{\mathfrak{R}^2} - \frac{1}{3}\kappa\rho = 0.$$

If we put $\eta = 0, \pm 1$, eqs. (7'') and (8) become identical to Friedmann's eqs. (5) and (6).

We have here three Newtonian models which, starting from a singular point of an infinite mass density, give either a monotonic expansion (for $\eta = 0, -1$) or a periodic oscillation (for $\eta = 1$) between $\mathfrak{R} = 0$ and $\mathfrak{R} = \mathfrak{R}_{max}$. *The concordance with Friedmann's results is complete.*

The Newtonian eqs. (7'') and (8) give in a three-dimensional Euclidean *Bildraum* three faithful representations of the Einsteinian eqs.(5) and (6). *Vice-versa*, the Einsteinian eqs. (5) and (6) give in three three-dimensional *Bildräume* (resp. Euclidean, spherical, hyperbolic) three faithful representations of the Newtonian eqs. (7'') and (8).

3. - The Newtonian images of the Einsteinian Friedmann's models render quite intuitive the physical fact that in general relativity *no* motion of bodies generates gravitational waves [6]. (Let us observe that Birkhoff's theorem [7] regards only the *outside* space of a spherically symmetric mass distribution).

Another remark. The Oppenheimer-Snyder treatment of the spherically symmetric collapse of a "dust" (with negligible pressure) – simplified image of a gravitationally collapsing star – utilizes Friedmann's formalism relative to the return motion in a periodic oscillation, from $F = F_{max}$ to $F = 0$ [8]. These authors describe the gravitational field in the outside space of the star with the standard Hilbert-Droste-Weyl form of solution of the Schwarzschild problem, improperly called "Schwarzschild solution". Now, this form is actually *not* suitable to the present problem, because it is mathematically and physically valid only for $r > 2GM/c^2$. Neglecting erroneously this *fact*, one obtains a black hole as a final product of the contraction. But if we employ the ORIGINAL form of solution given by Schwarzschild [9], which is regular for *all* values of the radial coordinate r different from zero (and is diffeomorphic to the exterior part, $r > 2GM/c^2$, of the standard HDW-form), we obtain simply a point mass, i.e. a quite usual object [10] in lieu of a fictive black hole.

This conclusion is corroborated by the following consideration. If we employ the Newtonian formalism (sect.2.) relative to the return motion in a periodic oscillation, the problem of the sphero-symmetric gravitational collapse of a star becomes quite simple – and the final result is quite standard: a Newtonian point mass. (Very keen papers on gravitational collapse – from both the standpoints, Einsteinian and Newtonian – have been published by Mc Vittie [11]).

The so-called *observed* black holes are only very large – or enormously large – masses concentrated in relatively small volumes. as it can be verified very easily with a careful reading of the concerned papers.

4. - The previous formalisms are well known in the pertinent literature, only the *perspective* according to which they are here considered is new. I

have emphasized the great significance of Friedmann's results in regard to the question of the gravitational waves.

There is a perfect parallelism between the time variation of the curvature $\zeta/F^2(t)$ of the spatial section $t = \text{const}$ and the time variation of its Newtonian analogue $\eta/\mathfrak{R}^2(t)$, which is proportional to Newton's force $\kappa M/[8\pi\mathfrak{R}^2(t)]$.

In general – and roughly speaking: a displacement of a given mass causes a corresponding displacement of its Newton's force and a corresponding displacement of the Einsteinian space curvature. *No gravitational wave is ever generated*, the analogy between Einstein field and Maxwell-Lorentz field is a misleading analogy.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Friedmann, *Z. Phys.*, **10** (1922) 377; A. Einstein, *The Meaning of Relativity*, (Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.) 1955, p.112 *sqq.*; V. Fock, *The Theory of Space, Time and Gravitation*, (Pergamon Press, Oxford, *etc.*) 1964, sect. **94**; L. Landau et E. Lifchitz, *Théorie du Champ*, (Édition Mir, Moscou) 1966., Ch. XII; C. Møller, *The Theory of Relativity* (Clarendon Press, Oxford) 1972, sects. **12.8**, **12.9**.
- [2] D. Hilbert, *Mathem. Annalen*, **92** (1924) 1; L. Landau et E. Lifchitz [1], sect. **99**; C. Møller [1], p.350.
- [3] A. Loinger, *Nuovo Cimento B*, **115** (2000) 679.
- [4] See e.g. L. Landau et E. Lifchitz [1], pp.368 and 421.
- [5] See e.g. A. Unsöld and B. Baschek, *The New Cosmos*, Fourth Edition (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, *etc.*) 1991, sects. **5.9.1** and **5.9.2**.
- [6] See A. Loinger, *arXiv:physics/0502089 v1* (February 16th, 2005); *Spacetime & Substance*, **6** (2005) 28 – and the literature quoted there *sub* [3], [6], [10], [11], [14].
- [7] G. Birkhoff, *Relativity and Modern Physics* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.) 1923, p.253; J. Eiesland, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **27** (1925) 213.
- [8] J.R.. Oppenheimer and H. Snyder, *Phys. Rev.*, **56** (1939) 455; S. Weinberg, *Gravitation and Cosmology etc.* (Wiley and Sons, New York, *etc.*) 1972, sect. **11.9**.
- [9] K. Schwarzschild, *Berl. Ber.*, (1916) 189; for an English version see *arXiv:physics/9905030* (May 12th, 1999).
- [10] See M. Brillouin, *Journ. Phys. Rad.*, **23** (1923) 43; for an English version see *arXiv:physics/0002009* (February 3rd, 2000). See also N. Rosen, *Nuovo Cimento B*, **72** (1982) 51.
- [11] G.C. Mc Vittie, *Astrophys. J.*, **140** (1964) 401; Idem, *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré*, VI (1967) 1.
