

Astro 404  
Lecture 25  
Oct. 25, 2019

Announcements:

- **Problem Set 7 due today 5pm**
- last minute instructor Office Hours after class
- **Problem Set 8 due Fri Nov 1**

Last time: **Congratulations!**

last piece of physics in place!

recall: stars interweave all four fundamental forces

and require understanding matter at high and low  $\rho, P, T$

and at scales from subatomic to astronomical

- ↳ and you now have the know-how! ...but based on HW questions,  
a few more words might help.

## What Makes a Particle Relativistic?

individually and in groups

particles behave differently if they are relativistic vs not but how do we know when these apply?

Newtonian physics: developed for slow particles:  $v \ll c$   
these are **non-relativistic**, and familiar

for particle of mass  $m$

- non-relativistic momentum  $p_{nr} = mv$
- non-relativistic kinetic energy  $E_{k,nr} = mv^2/2 = p^2/2m$

# Special Relativity

Einstein: Newtonian physics fails when speeds  $v \rightarrow c$   
need to rethink particle dynamics!

- **relativistic momentum**

$$p_{\text{rel}} = \frac{mv}{\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}}$$

- **relativistic total energy**

$$E_{\text{rel}} = \frac{mc^2}{\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}} = \sqrt{(cp_{\text{rel}})^2 + (mc^2)^2}$$

Q: Einstein results for  $v = 0$ ? for  $v \ll c$ ?

relativistic momentum  $p_{\text{rel}} = mv / \sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$

relativistic energy  $E_{\text{rel}} = mc^2 / \sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$

for  $v = 0$ :

$p_{\text{rel}} = 0$ : agrees with Newtonian result for  $v = 0$

$E_{\text{rel}} = mc^2$ : even with no motion, particle mass contains energy!

“rest mass energy” or “rest energy” is  $E_{\text{rest}} = mc^2$

for  $v \ll c$ :

$p_{\text{rel}} \rightarrow mv$  – recover Newtonian result!

use Maclaurin expansion  $(1 - v^2/c^2)^{-1/2} = 1 + 1/2 v^2/c^2 + \dots$

$$E_{\text{rel}} = mc^2 \left( 1 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{v^2}{c^2} \right) = mc^2 + \frac{1}{2} mv^2 + \dots = E_{\text{rest}} + E_{\text{k,nr}}$$

4

energy just due to motion is Newtonian kinetic energy!

## iClicker Poll: When are We Relativistic?

Which of these indicates a particle is relativistic?

that is, need to use special relativity momentum, energy?

**A**  $v \sim c$

**B**  $p \gtrsim mc$

**C**  $E_K \gtrsim mc^2$

**D** (a), (b), and (c) are all true if any are true

Newtonian limit good for  $v \ll c$   
will fail when  $v$  becomes close to  $c$

example: for what  $v$  is *relativistic momentum*  $p = mc$ ?

$$p_{\text{rel}} = \frac{mv}{\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}} = mc \quad (1)$$

when  $v = c/\sqrt{2} = 0.707c$ : 70.5% of lightspeed  
and  $E = \sqrt{2}mc^2$ , so that  $E_{\text{k,rel}} = 0.414 mc^2$

confirms: *relativistic effects large when*  $v \sim c$

and shows this is *equivalent to*:  $p_{\text{rel}} \gtrsim mc$ ,  $E_{\text{k,rel}} \gtrsim mc^2$

PS7: use  $p/mc$  as test of how relativistic

o Q: *what about ultra-relativistic limit*  $v \rightarrow c$ ?

Q: *what about massless particles?*

ultra-relativistic limit:  $v \rightarrow c$ :

- $p \rightarrow mc/\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2} = E/c$
- $E \gg mc^2$

for photons (massless particles):

use  $E = \sqrt{(cp)^2 + (mc^2)^2} = cp$

same as ultrarelativistic limit for massive particle!

*Q: whats the connection between non-relativistic vs relativistic and degenerate vs non-degenerate gasses?*

for gasses:

- non-relativistic:  $\langle v \rangle \ll c$
- relativistic:  $\langle v \rangle \sim c$  (or  $v = c$  if photons)

these conditions are *independent of*:

- **non-degenerate**: **particle spacing**  $\gg$  “**quantum particle reach**”  
that is:  $\ell \sim n^{-1/3} \gg \lambda_{\text{deB}} = h/p$  de Broglie wavelength  
that is:  $n < n_Q \sim (mkT/h^2)^{3/2}$  quantum concentration
- **degenerate**:  $n > n_Q$  “**maximal density**”

so: four possibilities

- non-relativistic and non-degenerate
- relativistic and non-degenerate
- non-relativistic and degenerate
- relativistic and degenerate

∞

stars sample all of these cases!



# Polytropes

We see that cold degenerate gas pressure

- that depends only on density
- and varies as a power law:  $P \propto \rho^\gamma$

generalize to *polytropic equation of state*

$$P = K \rho^\gamma = K \rho^{1+1/n} \quad (2)$$

- pressure depends only on density, with
- $K$  a constant
- $n = 1/(\gamma - 1)$  called the polytrope index

no temperature dependence: simplifies modeling

mechanical structure decoupled from thermal structure

# Hydrostatic Equilibrium of a Polytrope

use polytropic equation of state

$$P = P(\rho) = K \rho^\gamma = K \rho^{1+1/n} \quad (3)$$

hydrostatic equilibrium gives

$$\frac{dP}{dr} = -\frac{Gm(r) \rho(r)}{r^2} \quad (4)$$

isolate enclosed mass term

$$\frac{r^2 dP}{\rho dr} = -Gm(r) \quad (5)$$

now recall enclosed mass  $dm = 4\pi r^2 \rho dr$  so

$$\frac{d}{dr} \left( \frac{r^2 dP}{\rho dr} \right) = -4\pi G r^2 \rho \quad (6)$$

hydrostatic equilibrium, rewritten

$$\frac{d}{dr} \left( \frac{r^2}{\rho} \frac{dP}{dr} \right) = -4\pi G r^2 \rho \quad (7)$$

for polytrope  $P = K \rho^\gamma$ , can write this as

$$\frac{K}{4\pi G} \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{d}{dr} \left( \frac{r^2}{\rho} \frac{d\rho^\gamma}{dr} \right) = -\rho \quad (8)$$

a version of the **Lane-Emden equation**

a differential equation that only depends on  $\rho$

- so solution gives  $\rho(r)$
  - which also gives  $P(r) = K \rho(r)^\gamma$
- ⇒ determines structure of star!

11

PS8: solve Lane-Emden for a simple-ish case

## A Non-Relativistic Degenerate Star

consider a star of mass  $M$  and radius  $R$   
made of a non-relativistic degenerate gas  
so pressure is  $P = K_{\text{nr}} n_e^{5/3}$

equate this to the central pressure  $P_c \sim GM^2/R^4$ :

$$K_{\text{nr}} \left( \frac{M}{R^3} \right)^{5/3} \sim \frac{GM^2}{R^4} \quad (9)$$

$$K_{\text{nr}} \frac{M^{5/3}}{R^5} \sim \frac{GM^2}{R^4} \quad (10)$$

so the stellar radius:

$$R \sim \frac{K_{\text{nr}}}{G} M^{-1/3} \quad (11)$$

and for  $M = 1M_{\odot}$  with 2 nucleons per electron, estimate

$$R_{\text{degen}}(1M_{\odot}) \sim 10^4 \text{ km} \sim 2 R_{\text{Earth}} \quad (12)$$

Q: what does this imply? are there objects like this?

## White Dwarfs: Degenerate Stars

we see that a degenerate star is *incredibly compact!*

$$R_{\text{degen,nr}} \sim \frac{K_{\text{nr,degen}}}{G} \frac{1}{M^{1/3}} \quad (13)$$

$$R_{\text{degen,nr}}(1M_{\odot}) \sim 10^4 \text{ km} \sim 2R_{\text{Earth}} \quad (14)$$

mass of the Sun packed into Earth-sized volume  
as expected for a maximally dense object

compared to stars we know, radius is:

- *tiny* compared to the Sun, giants, and supergiants
- but is *exactly in line with white dwarfs*

### **white dwarfs are degenerate stars!**

- supported by degeneracy pressure
- somehow resulting from incredible compression which left high temperature (hence white)

## White Dwarfs Observed

nearest white dwarf is **Sirius B**: unseen by naked eye but companion of Sirius A, brightest star in sky

binary system, so mass known:  $M(\text{Sirius B}) = 1.02M_{\odot}$   
but radius about Earth-sized! (PS7)

www: Sirius B in optical

www: Sirius B in X-ray – outshines Sirius A!

Q: *what does this mean?*

mass-radius relation:

$$R_{\text{degen,nr}} \sim \frac{K_{\text{nr,degen}}}{G} \frac{1}{M^{1/3}} \quad (15)$$

Q: *radius if more massive? less? how to test?*

## White Dwarfs Radius and Mass

white dwarfs:  $R_{\text{nr,degen}} \sim M^{-1/3}$

so larger mass means smaller radius!

white dwarfs get more compact when adding mass!

to test: compare radii for white dwarfs with different masses

**40 Eridani B:** Trekkers—this is Vulcan's system, with a confirmed planet!

$$M(40 \text{ Eri B}) = 0.50M_{\odot} \approx M(\text{Sirius B})/2 \quad (16)$$

$$R(40 \text{ Eri B}) = 1.7R(\text{Sirius B}) \quad (17)$$

indeed smaller mass  $\rightarrow$  smaller radius

15 Q: how does average density depend on mass for a white dwarf?

Q: what if we keep adding mass to a white dwarf?

## White Dwarfs: Increasing Mass

white dwarfs:  $R_{\text{nr,degen}} \sim M^{-1/3}$   
 so average density grows with mass!

$$\rho_{\text{nr,degen}} \sim \frac{M}{R^3} \propto M^2 \quad (18)$$

adding mass  $\rightarrow$  smaller size, higher density  
 eventually density so high: Fermi level  $p_0 \sim n_e^{1/3} h \gg m_e c$   
*star becomes relativistic degenerate!*

for relativistic degenerate gas:  $P_{\text{rel,degen}} = K_{\text{rel,degen}} \rho^{4/3}$   
 and equating this to  $P_c \sim GM^2/R^4$  gives

$$K_{\text{rel,degen}} \left( \frac{M}{R^3} \right)^{4/3} \sim \frac{GM^2}{R^4} \quad (19)$$

$$K_{\text{rel,degen}} \frac{M^{4/3}}{R^4} \sim \frac{GM^2}{R^4} \quad (20)$$

$$M^{2/3} \sim \frac{G}{K_{\text{rel,degen}}} \quad (21)$$



hydrostatic equilibrium in degenerate relativistic star gives **mass**

$$M \sim \left( \frac{G}{K_{\text{rel,degen}}} \right)^{3/2} \quad (22)$$

- radius drops out!
- also independent of density
- **only a single, unique mass works!**

numerically:

$$M = M_{\text{Chandra}} = 1.4M_{\odot}$$

**Chandrasekhar limit!** S. Chandrasekhar 1931(!!)

*Q: what if white dwarf has  $M < M_{\text{Chandra}}$ ?*

*Q: what if white dwarf has  $M > M_{\text{Chandra}}$ ?*

*if high-density WD has  $M < M_{\text{Chandra}}$*

then pressure (more than) enough to balance gravity

→ *WD is stable against collapse*

but: *if high-density WD has  $M > M_{\text{Chandra}}$*

then pressure *not enough* to balance gravity

→ gravity force not balanced

→ *star unstable → collapses under its own weight!*

→ catastrophe!

conclusion: *Chandrasekhar mass is*

*maximum mass of white dwarfs!*

i.e., most massive possible “ordinary solid” = supported by  $e$  degeneracy

Confirmed! All observed white dwarfs have  $M < M_{\text{Chandra}}$

# White Dwarf Cooling

White dwarfs are hot—hence the name  
but supported by degeneracy pressure  
not by heating from nuclear reactions

no energy source → white dwarfs cool over time  
⇒ a white dwarf is like a cup of coffee!

luminosity gives energy loss:  $L = 4\pi R^2 \sigma T_{\text{eff}}^4$   
but for non-relativistic white dwarfs  $R \propto M^{-1/3}$ , so

$$L_{\text{wd}} \propto M^{-2/3} T_{\text{eff}}^4$$

- at fixed  $T_{\text{eff}}$  more massive → less luminous!
- degeneracy pressure nearly independent of temperature  
so cooling doesn't change  $R$ , only  $T_{\text{eff}}$   
Q: so for a fixed WD mass, how does  $L_{\text{wd}}$  change?

White dwarf luminosity:

$$L_{\text{wd}} \propto M^{-2/3} T_{\text{eff}}^4$$

for fixed mass cooling drops  $T_{\text{eff}}$

and thus drops  $L_{\text{wd}} \propto T_{\text{eff}}^4$

so on a plot of  $y = \log L$  vs  $x = \log T_{\text{eff}}$

we expect white dwarfs of a fixed mass to fall on line:

“white dwarf cooling sequence”

$$y = \log L = 4 \log T_{\text{eff}} - \frac{2}{3} \log M + \text{const} \quad (23)$$

$$= 4x - \frac{2}{3} \log M + \text{const} \quad (24)$$

so test by looking at HR diagram

20 Q: expectations if all WD have same mass? if a range of masses?

www: Gaia white dwarfs