

**GRAVITATIONAL COLLAPSE
WITH NON-VANISHING TANGENTIAL STRESSES II:
A LABORATORY FOR COSMIC CENSORSHIP EXPERIMENTS**

Giulio Magli

Dipartimento di Matematica del Politecnico di Milano
P.le Leonardo da Vinci 32, 20133 Milano, Italy
e-mail magli@mate.polimi.it

The general exact solution describing the dynamics of anisotropic elastic spheres supported only by tangential stresses is reduced to a quadrature using Ori's mass-area coordinates. This leads to the explicit construction of the root equation governing the nature of the central singularity. Using this equation, we formulate and motivate on physical grounds a conjecture on the nature of this singularity. The conjecture covers a large sector of the space of initial data; roughly speaking, it asserts that addition of a tangential stress cannot undress a covered dust singularity. The root equation also allows us to analyze the case of self-similar spacetimes and to get some insight on the role of stresses in deciding the nature of the singularities in this case.

I. Introduction.

The present status of research in black hole formation and cosmic censorship is quite intriguing. Indeed, both analytical results in dust collapse (see e.g. Jhingan & Joshi 1997 and references therein) and numerical results in scalar field collapse (see e.g. Gundlach 1997 and references therein) indicate the existence of a critical behaviour governing the formation of black holes or naked singularities. In principle, this behaviour should be the “remnant” of some hypothesis of a - still unknown - cosmic censorship theorem and, as such, should be related to the properties of the collapsing matter like fulfilment of energy conditions and local stability. If we want to understand the physics of such phenomena in the case of “ordinary” matter (i.e. not boson stars), we are enforced to approach analytically the gravitational collapse of non pressureless matter, since the dust equation of state is “trivial” from the viewpoint of matter properties: all energy conditions, causality conditions and stability conditions reduce to positivity of energy. However, this problem is extremely difficult if approached in full generality (see e.g. Joshi 1996 and references therein).

Recently (Magli 1997, to be referred towards as [I]), we discussed a class of solutions of the Einstein field equations describing spherically symmetric, non-static elastic spheres supported only by tangential stresses (elastic matter is of interest in strongly collapsed situations; for instance neutron stars typically have solid regions - see e.g. Haensel 1995). Previous investigations on systems having vanishing radial stresses trace back to Einstein (1939) and Florides (1974) in the static case, while non-static models have been considered by Datta (1970), Bondi (1971), and Herrera & Santos (1995) (for a general review on anisotropic systems in General Relativity see Herrera & Santos 1997).

From the viewpoint of cosmic censorship, understanding the nature of singularities for such solutions can be considered as a first step toward a full understanding of spherical gravitational collapse with general stresses. Indeed the investigation of some particular models carried out recently by Singh and Witten (1997) already shows behaviours which can be drastically different from the dust ones. The purpose of this paper is to contribute to a program which should hopefully lead to a full understanding of the final fate of gravitational collapse with tangential stresses.

The paper is organized as follows. The first problem we have to face with is the fact that, due to the presence of stresses, the comoving time differs from the proper time of the shells of particles. As a consequence, the first order “energy equation” which arises from mass conservation is coupled, for generic equations of state, to the equation giving the acceleration of the world lines of the particles. This coupling has the effect that the equation for null geodesics (whose behaviour near the central singularity governs the nature of the collapse) cannot be written in explicit form. Here, we overcome this difficulty (section II) using mass-area coordinates. These coordinates were originally introduced by Ori (1990) to obtain the general exact solution for charged dust. Here we obtain the general solution for gravitational collapse with non vanishing tangential stresses in a very simple form, in which only an integral remains to be performed.

Using the line element in the new coordinates, it is possible (section III) to write the “root equation”, namely the algebraic equation governing the nature of the central singularity, in explicit form. This equation depends only on the choice of the equation of

state and of the initial distributions of density and velocity.

It turns out to be a quite difficult task to study this equation in full generality; it is, however, worth mentioning that a full understanding of the nature of the singularities for *dust* spacetimes has been achieved only very recently (Singh & Joshi 1996). To get some insights into the physical contents of this equation, we carry out a detailed examination of small deviations from the dust equation of state. This leads us to formulate a conjecture on the final fate of the collapse and to give a plausibility argument supporting it (section IV). Finally, in section V, we analyze the case of self-similar spacetimes putting in evidence some qualitative effects of the tangential stress on the nature of the central singularity.

The paper ends with some concluding remarks in section VI.

II. Mass–Area coordinates and general solution

Recently (see [I]) we discussed a class of solutions of the Einstein field equations describing spherically symmetric, non-static elastic spheres supported only by tangential stresses. Using comoving coordinates, the line element reads

$$ds^2 = -e^{2\nu} dt^2 + \frac{(Y')^2 h^2}{1+f} dr^2 + Y^2 (d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2) , \quad (1)$$

where ν and Y are function of r and t satisfying

$$\nu' = -\frac{1}{h} \frac{\partial h}{\partial Y} Y' , \quad (2)$$

$$\dot{Y}^2 e^{-2\nu} = -1 + \frac{2F}{Y} + \frac{1+f}{h^2} . \quad (3)$$

In the above formulae, $F(r)$ and $f(r)$ are the “conserved mass” and the “binding function” familiar from the Tolman–Bondi solutions, while $h = h(r, Y)$ is the internal elastic energy per unit volume (it plays the role of equation of state of the material). For physical reasonability, F , $1+f$ and h must be chosen as positive functions (positivity of mass, of g_{rr} and of elastic energy, respectively). Moreover, the function h is severely constrained by the local stability of matter, which requires this function to have a minimum at $Y = r$ (see [I] for details). If h is equal to one (more precisely, is a constant which may be rescaled to unity) there is no dependence on the strain: the material is a dust cloud and the line element reduces to the Tolman–Bondi one. This fact will be very important in what follows; we shall call *dust limit* of any equation depending on the choice of h the same equation written with $h = 1$.

The energy-momentum tensor of the material is diagonal in the comoving frame and has only three non-vanishing components, namely the energy density $\epsilon = -T_0^0$ and the tangential stress $\Pi = T_\theta^\theta = T_\phi^\phi$. These quantities are given by

$$\epsilon = \frac{F'}{4\pi Y^2 Y'} , \quad (4)$$

$$\Pi = \mathcal{H}\epsilon , \quad (5)$$

where the “generalized adiabatic index” \mathcal{H} is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{H} := -\frac{Y}{2h} \frac{\partial h}{\partial Y} . \quad (6)$$

In [I] the physical properties of these solutions are thoroughly discussed. We recall here that the metric is well behaved at the centre if the equation of state satisfies the “minimal stability requirement” (h has a minimum at $Y = r$) and the conditions $Y(0, t) = 0$, $f(0) = h^2(0, 0) - 1$ hold. The behaviour of the energy density at $r = 0$ is the same as that familiar from the Tolman–Bondi models, namely ϵ is initially regular if $F(r)$ is of the form $r^3 \tilde{F}(r)$ with $\tilde{F}(0) < +\infty$. Matching our solutions with the Schwarzschild vacuum is possible on any chosen boundary surface $r = r_b$, provided that the value of F at r_b is identified with the Schwarzschild mass M . However, the transformation between comoving and Schwarzschild coordinates is highly non-trivial. The energy conditions lead to inequalities on the function \mathcal{H} , and therefore to differential inequalities on the state function h . In particular *wec* holds if $\mathcal{H} \geq -1$. Once this is satisfied, *dec* requires $\mathcal{H} \leq 1$, while *sec* is satisfied if $\mathcal{H} \geq -1/2$. Analyzing the behaviour of the function appearing at the right hand side of equation (3) for a fixed shell of particles ($r = \text{const.}$), one can give a qualitative analysis of the possible motions. In particular, it is shown in [I] that there exist physically valid models of oscillating elastic spheres as well as of finite-bouncing spheres.

The metrics (1) are not completely explicit due to the coupling between eqs. (2) and (3); physically, this is simply a reflection of the fact that the comoving time differs from the proper time since the particles are not in geodesic motion. The two equations decouple only if h depends uniquely on Y ($h = w(Y)$, say). In this case we have

$$e^{2\nu} = \frac{1}{w^2} ,$$

$$\dot{Y}^2 = \frac{1}{w^2} \left[\frac{1+f}{w^2} - \left(1 - \frac{2F}{Y} \right) \right] ,$$

and the function \mathcal{H} defined in (6) reads

$$\mathcal{H} = -\frac{Y}{2} \frac{d}{dY} \log w(Y) .$$

This particular class of solutions contains that discussed by Singh & Witten (1997), in which the tangential stress is proportional to the density. In this case the stress–strain relation has the “barotropic form” $\Pi = k\epsilon$ with constant “adiabatic index” $\mathcal{H} = k$, and the equation of state is $w(Y) = Y^{-2k}$.

A consequence of the above described coupling problem is that, in general, it is not possible to write explicitly the null geodesic equation in comoving coordinates. As will be recalled in the next section, this equation governs the nature (naked or black hole) of the central singularity, and it is therefore very difficult to investigate on censorship using the comoving frame.

A system which is mathematically very similar to ours is charged, spherically symmetric dust (Vickers 1973). Indeed for such a system the mass is conserved and it is possible to analyze the dynamics in comoving coordinates; however the coupling between “times” does not allow explicit integration. To get rid of this problem Ori (1990) introduced a system of coordinates which removes the coupling and obtained the general exact solution for charged dust. Ori’s system is obtained by replacing the comoving time t and the radial label r with the “area coordinate” $R = Y(r, t)$ and the “mass coordinate” $m = F(r)$; the mass coordinate, being conserved, is comoving (if u^μ denotes the velocity of matter, one has $u^\mu = u \delta_R^\mu$ where $u := u^R$). The line element in these coordinates has the form

$$ds^2 = -Adm^2 - 2BdRdm - CdR^2 + R^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\varphi^2) ,$$

where A , B and C are functions of m and R .

We are now going to show that Ori’s technique can be applied also in the case of solutions with vanishing radial stresses. This is essentially due to the fact that the mass is conserved also in this case, and therefore gives an unambiguous “comoving label” for the shell of particles (for simplicity, the general solution is presented here in the non-charged case; however our results can be easily extended to the case of charged materials, as briefly reported in appendix).

Since m is comoving, we have

$$C = \frac{1}{u^2} .$$

The energy density can now be written as

$$\epsilon = \frac{h}{4\pi u R^2 E \sqrt{H}} . \quad (7)$$

where h is to be considered as a function of m and R , the quantity H is defined by

$$H := B^2 - AC ,$$

and E is an arbitrary function of m corresponding to $\sqrt{1+f}$ (we have introduced this notation in order to facilitate the comparison with Ori’s 1990 paper).

There are four (compatible) Einstein equations for the three unknowns A, B, C . We start considering equations $G_m^m = 8\pi T_m^m$, $G_m^R = 8\pi T_m^R$ and $G_R^m = 8\pi T_R^m$:

$$\frac{1}{R^2} \left[1 - \frac{A}{H} - R \left(\frac{A}{H} \right)_{,R} \right] = 0 , \quad (8)$$

$$\frac{1}{R} \left(\frac{A}{H} \right)_{,m} = 8\pi B u^2 \epsilon , \quad (9)$$

$$B \frac{H_{,R}}{H} - C_{,m} = 0 . \quad (10)$$

Equation (8) can be integrated:

$$A = H \left(1 - \frac{2m}{R} \right) . \quad (11)$$

Using $B^2 = H + A/u^2$ and equation (7), from (9) we get

$$u = \pm \sqrt{-1 + \frac{2m}{R} + \frac{E^2}{h^2}} , \quad (12)$$

and the metric function B can be written as

$$B = -\frac{E\sqrt{H}}{hu} .$$

Therefore, we have solved for u (and thus for C) in terms of the arbitrary functions and expressed A and B in terms of a single unknown H . To complete the solution, we plug the above results in (10), obtaining

$$\left(\sqrt{H} \right)_{,R} = \frac{h}{E} \left(\frac{1}{u} \right)_{,m} .$$

We have, therefore, reduced the problem to the calculation of an indefinite integral:

$$\sqrt{H(m, R)} = g(m) \pm \int G(m, R) dR , \quad (13)$$

where the \pm sign is the same as that of u , $g(m)$ is an arbitrary function, and

$$G(m, R) := \frac{h}{RE} \left[1 + \frac{R}{2} \left(\frac{E^2}{h^2} \right)_{,m} \right] \left(-1 + \frac{2m}{R} + \frac{E^2}{h^2} \right)^{-\frac{3}{2}} . \quad (14)$$

If $h = 1$ the above formulae give the Tolman–Bondi line element in mass–area coordinates (Ori 1990).

It is easy to check that the remaining field equation $G_\theta^\theta = 8\pi T_\theta^\theta$ is identically satisfied once eqs. (8), (9) and (10) are.

III. A laboratory for Cosmic Censorship

In this section we use the general exact solution derived in the previous section to build up a “laboratory” for studying cosmic censorship. The key instrument which is needed in this laboratory is already known from the work by Dwivedi & Joshi (1994) and may be called “root equation”; as recalled below, it is an algebraic equation arising from the behaviour of outgoing null geodesics near the singularity. In the present section we

construct this equation explicitly for the case at hand. We shall also derive the conditions for shell-crossings singularities in terms of an integral equation.

3.1 Physical content of the arbitrary functions: initial data

In order to approach the problem of singularities, we first need to identify the physical content of the arbitrary functions, so that regular initial data can be chosen.

There are three arbitrary functions, namely the equation of state $h = h(m, R)$ and the functions $E(m), g(m)$. To understand the physical meaning of E and g observe that, physically, such functions must be related to the “initial distributions” of density and velocity (here quotation marks are due to the fact that we shall take care of the initial data always referring to the “original” - comoving - coordinates). Consider, therefore, regular initial data at some comoving time t ($t = 0$, say). We use the scaling freedom in the choice of the r coordinate to identify the lagrangian and the eulerian label initially, so that $Y(r, 0) = r$. In mass-area coordinates, to the equation $Y(r, 0) = r$ corresponds some curve $R = R^0(m)$, where $R^0 = F^{-1}$ and we are assuming the mass to be a monotonically increasing function. Introducing the initial distribution of velocity ($V(m)$, say) from (12) it follows

$$V^2(m) = \frac{E^2(m)}{h^2(m, R^0)} - 1 + \frac{2m}{R^0} .$$

The above formula gives the relationship between E and the initial velocity profile.

The relationship between g and the initial data is, in general, quite complicated. To obtain it, observe that the following formula may be easily proved:

$$\frac{\partial Y}{\partial m} = \frac{E}{h} u \sqrt{H} . \quad (15)$$

The above equation evaluated “at $t = 0$ ” yields

$$g(m) = \pm \left[\frac{R_{,m}^0(m) h(m, R^0)}{V(m) E(m)} - \int^{R^0(m)} G(m, R) dR \right] , \quad (16)$$

(the \pm sign is the same as that of u).

3.2 Shell-focussing singularities

The energy density (4) becomes singular whenever $Y(r, t)$ or $Y'(r, t)$ vanish during the dynamics. Physically, such singularities correspond to those occurring in dust models: $Y = 0$ corresponds to “crushing to zero size” (shell-focussing singularities) while $Y' = 0$ corresponds to the shell crossing phenomenon: the world lines of the (shells of) particles intersect each other and the “lagrangian labelling” description breaks down.

Contrary to what happens in the dust case, where shell-focussing collapse is unavoidable, within our solutions there exist globally regular models of oscillating or bouncing back materials. However, equation (3) can be used (see [I]) to show that for any physically valid choice of the equation of state it is possible to choose initial data leading to continued

gravitational collapse and therefore to shell-focussing singularities (it is worth mentioning that the remark made by Singh & Witten (1997) that regularity conditions “explicitly disallow the formation of a singularity at $r = 0$ ” is incorrect: these conditions imply only regularity on the initial data surface and non-preferredness of the centre).

To analyze the nature of shell-focussing singularities, we first observe that the relation $Y(r, t) = 0$ defines a “singularity curve” $t^s(r)$; in general, different shells become singular at different times, and it is customary to call central singularity that occurring at $r = 0$. This singularity plays a distinguished role because it is possible to show that non-central singularities are always covered. For, notice that the shell labelled r becomes trapped at a time $t^t(r)$ such that $Y(r, t^t) = 2F(r)$. For each fixed shell, consider the function $\bar{Y}(t) = Y(r, t)$. We have $\bar{Y}(t^t) = 2F(r) > \bar{Y}(t^s) = 0$, but $d\bar{Y}(t)/dt$ is negative in a collapsing situation, so that $\bar{Y}(t)$ is decreasing and it must be $t^s(r) > t^t(r)$. It follows that the shell becomes trapped before becoming singular, so that the singularity is covered (under certain conditions, it is possible to prove this result also in presence of non-vanishing radial stresses, see Cooperstock *et al* (1997) for details).

The above argument does not work for the central singularity, at which $Y(0, t^t) = 2F(0) = 0$. To study this singularity, we translate in the mass-area formalism and make use of the method developed by Dwivedi & Joshi (1994) and successfully applied to the dust case in a series of recent papers (see e.g. Singh & Joshi 1996, Jhingan *et al.* 1996).

Consider the equation for radial, outgoing null geodesics in mass-area coordinates:

$$\frac{dR}{dm} = -\frac{B + \sqrt{B^2 - AC}}{C} = -\sqrt{H}u \left(|u| - \frac{E}{h} \right). \quad (17)$$

This is an ordinary differential equation with a singular point at the central singularity $R = 0$, $m = 0$. This singularity is (at least locally) naked if there are geodesics starting at it with a definite value of the tangent. If no such geodesics exists, the singularity is not naked and (strong) cosmic censorship holds. To investigate the behaviour near the singular point, define

$$x := \frac{R}{2m^\alpha},$$

where $\alpha > 1/3$. If the singularity is naked, there exist some α such that at least one finite positive value x_0 exists which solves the algebraic equation

$$x_0 := \lim_{R, m \rightarrow 0} x = \lim_{R, m \rightarrow 0} \frac{R}{2m^\alpha}.$$

Applying L'Hospital rule we have

$$x_0 = \lim_{R, m \rightarrow 0} \frac{m^{1-\alpha}}{2\alpha} \frac{dR}{dm} = \lim_{R, m \rightarrow 0} -\frac{m^{1-\alpha}}{2\alpha} \sqrt{H}u \left(|u| - \frac{E}{h} \right).$$

Using eqs. (12) and (13), the above equation can be written in explicit form as

$$x_0 = \frac{1}{2\alpha} \lim_{R, m \rightarrow 0} m^{\frac{3}{2}(1-\alpha)} \left[g(m) - \int^{2m^\alpha x} G(m, R) dR \right] \left(\sqrt{\left(-1 + \frac{E^2}{h^2}\right) m^{\alpha-1} + \frac{1}{x}} \right) \times \\ \times \left(\sqrt{\frac{m^{1-\alpha}}{x} - 1 + \frac{E^2}{h^2}} - \frac{E}{h} \right). \quad (18)$$

This equation depends only on the initial data g and E , as in the dust case, and on the choice of the material we are dealing with, i.e. the equation of state h . This means that the dynamics has been completely “gauged away”; such a simplification cannot be achieved in comoving coordinates since in such coordinates the general exact solution is not available in explicit form. In the next two sections, we shall illustrate a simple way to extract physically interesting information from this equation without solving it explicitly.

3.3 Remarks on shell-crossing singularities

As recalled above, shell crossing singularities correspond to zeroes of Y' , so that in the mass–area description a shell crossing occurs when $Y_{,m}$ vanishes. Generally speaking, we do not expect a zero of $Y_{,m}$ to occur at a turning point ($u = 0$) so that equation (15) implies that shell crossing singularities correspond to zeroes of H . Let $R^{\text{sc}}(m)$ be the curve on which such singularities eventually occur. Using eqs. (13) and (16) we obtain that $R^{\text{sc}}(m)$ must satisfy to

$$\frac{R_{,m}^0(m)h(m, R^0)}{V(m)E(m)} = - \int_{R^0(m)}^{R^{\text{sc}}(m)} G(m, R) dR. \quad (19)$$

This equation *may* have physically meaningful solutions. For instance, consider the Tolman–Bondi case. The solutions of equation (19) are physically meaningful only if the vanishing of $Y_{,m}$ happens *before* (in comoving time terms) the singularity at $Y = 0$ is reached. It is possible to characterize fully in terms of differential inequalities the set of initial data such that no shell crossing occur in physically allowed “times” (Hellaby & Lake 1985, Newman 1986, Jhingan & Joshi 1998). On the contrary, Ori (1990) used the charged dust counterpart of this equation (see appendix) to show that the characteristic “bounce in a new universe” process (De La Cruz & Israel 1967) which is typical in such solutions always occur *after* a shell-crossing, thereby casting serious doubts on its physical realizability (see also Ori 1991).

In the general case of non-vanishing tangential stresses, the analysis is also possible in full generality and will be presented elsewhere.

IV. The nature of the central singularity: a conjecture

As we have seen, the nature of the central singularity depends on the existence of solutions of equation (18). A complete study of this equation requires a detailed investigation on the behaviour of the equation of state in the limit of approach to the singularity in

physically valid situations, and goes far beyond the scope of the present paper. However, some insights into this problem can be obtained by a careful analysis and comparison with the (already well known) results holding for dust. For our considerations it will be sufficient to consider the case of marginally bound collapse; we are, therefore, going to give a simple derivation in mass–area coordinates of the results on the nature of the central singularity in this case (we completely refer the reader to the original paper by Singh & Joshi (1996) for details).

The marginally bound dust case corresponds to $E = h = 1$. From formula (16) we get

$$g(m) = \pm \sqrt{\frac{R^0}{2m}} m^{\frac{1}{3}} \frac{d}{dm} (m^{-\frac{1}{3}} R^0). \quad (20)$$

The behaviour of this function as m tends to zero can be obtained as follows. Consider regular initial data in comoving coordinates. Then the function F will be of the form

$$F(r) = F_0 r^3 + F_q r^{q+3} + \dots$$

where q is the order of the first non vanishing derivative of the initial density profile at the centre, and dots stand for higher order terms. Therefore, we have

$$R^0(m) = F^{-1}(m) = \left(\frac{m}{F_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} - \frac{F_q}{3F_0} \left(\frac{m}{F_0}\right)^{\frac{1+q}{3}} + \dots$$

Considering now equation (20) and recalling that we are considering collapse (so that the negative sign must be chosen) we obtain

$$g \approx P_q m^{\frac{q}{3}-1},$$

where

$$P_q := \frac{qF_q}{9\sqrt{2}F_0^{\frac{q}{3}+\frac{3}{2}}}.$$

Thus g exhibits a “critical” behaviour: it diverges (respectively, goes to a finite non-zero limit, vanishes) if $q < 3$, $q = 3$, $q > 3$. Surprisingly enough, it is this behaviour that governs the nature of the singularity. In fact, equation (18) yields

$$x_0 = \frac{1}{2\alpha} \lim_{R, m \rightarrow 0} \left[P_q m^{\frac{q}{3}+\frac{1}{2}(1-3\alpha)} - \frac{2}{3} x^{\frac{3}{2}} \right] \frac{1}{\sqrt{x}} \left(\frac{m^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}}}{\sqrt{x}} - 1 \right).$$

The first term in square brackets goes to a finite, non zero limit iff

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{3} \left(1 + \frac{2q}{3} \right),$$

so we get

$$x_0 = \frac{1}{\frac{2}{3} \left(1 + \frac{2q}{3} \right)} \left(P_q - \frac{2}{3} x_0^{\frac{3}{2}} \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{x_0}} \lim_{R, m \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{m^{\frac{1}{3}(1-\frac{q}{3})}}{\sqrt{x}} - 1 \right). \quad (21)$$

If q is “super-critical” ($q > 3$) the limit diverges: there are no null geodesics escaping and therefore the singularity is not naked. If q is “sub-critical” ($q = 1, 2$) the limit goes to minus one and (21) gives a real positive solution for x_0 (provided that the initial density is decreasing outwards): the singularity is naked. At the critical value $q = 3$ (21) becomes a quartic equation. This equation has no real positive roots (and therefore the singularity is covered) if the quantity $\zeta = F_3/(2\sqrt{2}F_0^{5/2})$ is greater than a certain numerical value, otherwise the singularity is naked.

The qualitative features of the general (i.e. non-marginally bound) case are similar to those recalled above, namely nakedness depends on the “critical” behaviour of some parameter \tilde{q} (which reduces to the parameter q in the marginally bound case); if the singularity is censored the limit diverges for any \tilde{q} greater than the critical value (Singh & Joshi 1996).

Consider now a generic solution with tangential stresses. To identify it uniquely, we need to choose the equation of state and the initial distribution of density and velocity. This means that the space of the free functions can be visualized as follows: to any fixed choice of the initial data $g(m)$ and $E(m)$ corresponds a family of solutions \mathcal{S}_h . Each member of this family corresponds to a different material (a different choice of $h(m, R)$ within the physically allowed range) and each family contains one and only one Tolman–Bondi solution \mathcal{S}_1 (“dust limit”) corresponding to $h = 1$. Chosen a family \mathcal{S}_h , we can immediately infer from the Singh & Joshi work if the dust limit \mathcal{S}_1 corresponds to a naked singularity or to a blackhole.

We conjecture that, if the central singularity of \mathcal{S}_1 is not naked and it is not critical (i.e., the limit in (21) is divergent), the central singularity of \mathcal{S}_h is also not naked for any physically valid choice of h . Roughly speaking, this means that one cannot use a physically valid tangential stress to undress a covered dust singularity.

The above conjecture is based on arguments of physical plausibility as follows. Consider a small deviation from the dust equation of state. This can be represented as

$$h = 1 + \mu(R, m) , \quad (22)$$

where the function μ is positive and vanishes at $R = R^0(m)$ (a reasonable choice for μ could be the “quasi-hookean” equation of state $\mu = \mu_0(m)(R - R^0)^2$ with positive μ_0). Then each term in equation (18) can be expanded to first order in μ ; if this function is physically valid (i.e. is chosen as described above) every such terms will be quadratic in $R - R^0$. In particular, the last factor in round brackets will have this behaviour. Now, it is easy to check that quadratic terms in $R - R^0$ (or higher order terms) cannot regularize a diverging behaviour of the zero-order term in this factor. Since divergency occurs in the non critical covered case, the conjecture is proved at least for small deviations from the dust equation of state.

V. Self-similar spacetimes

The above described proposal on the nature of the central singularity, although covering a large sector of the space of initial data, leaves completely open the problem of

interpretation of critical behaviour. For instance: what happens to marginally bound solutions having a naked dust limit with $q = 3$? Do such solutions remain naked with the addition of *any* (physically valid) tangential stress? Do they become *always* covered? It seems likely that none of the above would hold, but rather that the threshold of black hole formation for fixed initial data should depend on the equation of state (i.e. on the choice of the function h), hopefully in a physically reasonable and understandable way. We don't have the answer to this question yet. However, we are going to present here some (again, qualitative) evidence that really a behaviour like this should occur.

Difficulties in studying critical cases arise because we must investigate finite values of the limit (18) and, therefore, existence of positive solutions of the root equation. To get some insight into this we consider, among the solutions presented above, a particularly simple case which, however, is not deserved of physics, namely the case of self-similar spacetimes (see e.g. Carr 1997).

In mass area coordinates we can use as self similar variable the quantity $x = R/2m$. It is easy to check that the spacetimes are self-similar if the following conditions hold (see Magli 1993 for a discussion of self-similarity in the case of anisotropic matter):

- 1) h is a function of x only
- 2) $g(m)$ and $E(m)$ are constant.

In what follows, it will again be sufficient to consider the marginally bound case $E = 1$. The above conditions imply that $R^0(m)$ is a linear function, and indeed it is well known that for self-similar spacetimes the mass function (the inverse of R^0) is linear. We therefore set $F(r) = \lambda r/2$ ($\lambda = \text{const.}$) so that

$$R^0(m) = \frac{2m}{\lambda} ,$$

this implies that the value \bar{x} of x at initial data is $1/\lambda$. Using equation (16) with $h(\bar{x}) = 1$, the root equation (18) can be written as

$$x = -\frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{6\gamma} + \int_{\bar{x}}^x \mathcal{G}(z) dz \right] \sqrt{-1 + \frac{1}{h^2} + \frac{1}{x}} \left(\sqrt{-1 + \frac{1}{h^2} + \frac{1}{x}} - \frac{1}{h} \right) , \quad (23)$$

where $\gamma := \lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}/12$ and

$$\mathcal{G}(x) := \frac{h}{x} \left(1 + 2 \frac{x^2}{h^3} \frac{dh}{dx} \right) \left(-1 + \frac{1}{h^2} + \frac{1}{x} \right)^{-\frac{3}{2}} . \quad (24)$$

To extract from equation (23) some qualitative information we again start from the dust limit. What happens in this limit is already well known (Joshi & Singh 1995), and we completely refer the reader to this paper for details.

Setting $h = 1$ equation (23) simplifies to

$$x = -\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{9\gamma} + \frac{2}{3} x^{3/2} \right) \sqrt{\frac{1}{x}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{x}} - 1 \right) . \quad (25)$$

To facilitate the comparison with the Joshi & Singh paper we change variable to

$$y := \frac{2}{3} \left(1 - 12\gamma x^{\frac{3}{2}} \right)$$

then (25) becomes a quartic equation in the variable y :

$$y^3 \left(\frac{2}{3} - y \right) = \gamma(2 - y)^3, \quad (26)$$

where $0 < y < 2/3$. Rewriting this equation in canonical form as $ay^4 + 4by^3 + 6cy^2 + 4dy + e = 0$, it can be shown that real, positive solutions exist only if the quantity

$$\Delta := (ae - 4bd + 3c^2)^3 - 27(ace + 2bcd - ad^2 - eb^2 - c^3)^2,$$

is negative (in this case there are two such solutions). This happens if $\gamma < \gamma_1 \simeq 6.41 \times 10^{-3}$ or $\gamma > \gamma_2 \simeq 17.32$. Thus the collapse leads to black hole formation if $\gamma_1 < \gamma < \gamma_2$, to naked singularities otherwise. The range $\gamma > \gamma_2$ is, however, unphysical since it would correspond to imaginary values of x . Therefore self-similar dust spacetimes exhibit a “phase transition” between naked singularities and black holes. The transition depends on the value of γ which is the remaining free parameter. This quantity is related to the central density of the material; using a fiducial model Joshi & Singh have shown that γ typically do belong to the range of black hole formation for densities near the nuclear one.

We now want to investigate, at least qualitatively, the changes introduced in the above picture by the presence of tangential stresses. For, consider once again a small deviation from the dust equation of state of the form (22) (obviously, for self-similar spacetimes μ has to be considered a function of x only). In what follows, we shall systematically discard terms of order higher than one in μ . Expanding the root equation (23) we obtain

$$y^3 \left(y - \frac{2}{3} \right) = \gamma(y - 2 + \tilde{K})^3. \quad (27)$$

In the above formula, \tilde{K} is the value at order one of the following function

$$K(y) := \frac{9}{2y} \left(\frac{2}{3} - y \right) \left[\frac{(2-y)(\frac{2}{3}-y)}{4y^2} \mu + \gamma \int_{\frac{1}{\lambda}(1-\frac{3}{2}y)}^{\frac{1}{\lambda}} \sqrt{z} \left((1+3z)\mu + 2z^2 \frac{d\mu}{dz} \right) dz \right]. \quad (28)$$

Notice that this function is strictly positive. Linearity in μ also implies $\tilde{K} = K(y_0)$ where y_0 is the solution of the dust quartic (26) in the neighbourhood of which we want to study the deviation from the dust case.

Expanding also equation (27) to first order, we finally obtain a quartic with “displaced” parameters a, b, c, d, e . A quite long, but straightforward, calculation gives that the range of black hole formation $\gamma_1 < \gamma (< \gamma_2)$ is altered by the perturbation as $\tilde{\gamma}_1 < \gamma (< \tilde{\gamma}_2)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\gamma}_1 &= \gamma_1 - \tilde{K} \delta_1, \\ \tilde{\gamma}_2 &= \gamma_2 + \tilde{K} \delta_2 \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

and $\delta_1 \simeq 17 \times 10^{-3}$, $\delta_2 \simeq 12.8$ (as usual in any perturbative approach, the above results also give the condition of applicability of the approximation: \tilde{K} must be not greater than about $1/3$).

Formulae (29) show, at least at a qualitative level, that black hole formation is facilitated by the presence of tangential stresses. Indeed, since \tilde{K} is positive, the upper bound γ_2 becomes higher and certainly remains unphysical, while the lower bound γ_1 tends to decrease. It might happen that the addition of tangential stress *dresses* the singularity, which would be equivalent to $\tilde{\gamma}_1 < 0$, but of course to draw a conclusion of this kind it will be necessary to investigate the root equation without approximations.

VI. Concluding remarks

The results of the present paper can be summarized as follows. First of all, we have shown that Ori's mass-area formalism can be used to bring the general spherically symmetric solution of the Einstein field equations with non-vanishing tangential stresses in a very explicit form, in which only the calculation of an integral remains to be performed (this can be done independently whether electromagnetic coupling is present or not; the generalization to charged materials is indeed straightforward and is briefly reported in the appendix).

The introduction of mass-area coordinates proves to be a very powerful tool as far as the analysis on existence and nature of singularities in such solutions is concerned. In fact it allows to obtain the root equation governing the nature of the central singularity in explicit form.

We presented first results coming from the investigation of the dust limit of this equation. Such results give some insight about what should be the nature of the final fate of collapse with tangential stresses. In particular, we proposed a conjecture which, roughly speaking, asserts that “tangential stress cannot undress covered dust”. In the last section, we discussed self-similar spacetimes and showed, at least qualitatively, that the effect of the stress can be an enlargement of the blackhole initial data space.

Both the above recalled results depend on the structure of the state equation, and therefore show once again and in a clear way that a connection should exist between a (still lacking) mathematically rigorous formulation of cosmic censorship and the conditions of physical acceptability of the equations of state. Such conditions obviously include the energy conditions but also the existence of an absolute minimum of the internal energy, which is intimately related to stability issues; a relevant improvement in our understanding of this topic could come from the knowledge of the explicit structure of the blackhole threshold in terms of the derivatives of the state equation evaluated near the singularity. Work in this direction is now in progress.

Acknowledgments

The final version of this paper benefited very much of many discussions had by the author during a visit at the Theoretical Astrophysics Group, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Bombay, India. The author expresses his thanks to all members of this group,

and in particular to S. Jhingan, P.S. Joshi and T.P. Singh. The author also acknowledges Elisa Brinis Udeschini and T. Harada for useful discussions.

References

- Bondi, H., (1971) “On Datta’s spherically symmetric systems in General Relativity.” *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **2**, p.321.
- Carr, B.J. (1997) “Spherically symmetric similarity solutions and their applications in Cosmology and Astrophysics.” To appear in “Proceedings of the 7th canadian conference on General Relativity and Relativistic Astrophysics”
- Cooperstock, F.J., Jhingan, S., Joshi, P.S., Singh, T.P., (1997) “Cosmic censorship and the role of pressure in gravitational collapse.” *Class. Quantum Gravity*, **14** 2195.
- Datta, B.K., (1970) “Non-static spherically symmetric clusters of particles in General Relativity:I.” *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **1**, p.19.
- De La Cruz, V., Israel, W., (1967) “Gravitational bounce.” *Nuovo Cimento* **51A**, p.744.
- Dwivedi, I.H., Joshi, P.S., (1994) “On the occurrence of naked singularities in spherically symmetric gravitational collapse.” *Comm. Math. Phys.* **166**, p.117.
- Einstein, A., (1939) “On a stationary system with spherical symmetry consisting of many gravitating masses.” *Ann. Math.* **40**, 4, p.922.
- Florides, P.S., (1974) “A new interior Schwarzschild solution.” *Proc. R. Soc. L.* **A 337**, p.529.
- Gundlach, C., (1997) “Critical phenomena in gravitational collapse.” gr-qc/9712084, To appear in *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.*
- Haensel, P., (1995) “Solid interiors of neutron stars and gravitational radiation.” In *Astrophysical sources of gravitational radiation*, J.A. Marck and J.P. Lasota ed. (Les Houches 1995).
- Hellaby, C., Lake, K., (1985) “Shell crossing and the Tolman model.” *Ap. J.* **290**, p.381.
- Herrera, L., Santos, N., (1997) “Energy content of a slowly collapsing gravitating sphere.” *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **27** p.1071.
- Herrera, L., Santos, N., (1997) “Local anisotropy in self-gravitating systems.” *Phys. Rep.* **286**, 2.
- Jhingan, S., Joshi, P.S. (1998) “The final state of collapse in Einstein theory of gravitation.” In “Proceedings of the Haifa workshop on the Internal Structure of Black Holes and Spacetime Singularities” Lior Burko and Amos Ori ed., *Annals of the Israel Physical Society* **13** (I.O.P., Bristol).
- Jhingan, S., Joshi, P.S., Singh, T.P. (1996) “The final fate of spherical inhomogeneous dust collapse II. Initial data and causal structure of the singularity.” *Class. Quantum Gravity* **13**, p.3057.
- Joshi, P.S. (1996) *Global aspects in gravitation and cosmology.* Oxford Science Publ. (Clarendon, Oxford).

- Joshi, P.S., Singh, T.P. (1995) "Role of initial data in the gravitational collapse of inhomogeneous dust." *Phys. Rev.* **D51**, p.6778.
- Magli, G., (1993) "The dynamical structure of the Einstein equations for a non rotating star." *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **25**, p. 441.
- Magli, G. (1997) "Gravitational collapse with non-vanishing tangential stresses: a generalization of the Tolman-Bondi model." *Class. Quantum Gravity* **14**, p. 1937 (Paper [I]).
- Newman, R.P.A.C., (1986) "Strengths of naked singularities in Tolman-Bondi spacetimes." *Class. Quantum Gravity* **3**, p.527
- Ori, A. (1990) "The general exact solution for spherical charged dust." *Class. Quantum Gravity* **7**, p.985.
- Ori, A. (1991) "Inevitability of shell crossing in the gravitational collapse of weakly charged dust spheres." *Phys. Rev.* **D44**, p.2278.
- Singh, T.P., Joshi, P.S., (1996) "The final fate of spherical inhomogeneous dust collapse." *Class. Quantum Gravity* **13**, p.559.
- Singh, T.P., Witten, L. (1997) "Spherical gravitational collapse with tangential pressure." *Class. Quantum Gravity* **14**, p.3489.
- Vickers, P.A. (1973) "Charged dust spheres in General Relativity." *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré* **18**, p. 137.

Appendix: the charged case

Consider a material carrying a non-vanishing charge density σ . We keep the description of the mechanical and gravitational degrees of freedom as in the body of the paper, and simply introduce the Maxwell tensor which, due to spherical symmetry, has only one independent component $F^{mR} := \mathcal{E}(m, R)$. Maxwell's equations yield

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E} &= \frac{Q}{R^2 \sqrt{H}} , \\ \sigma &= \frac{Q_{,m}}{4\pi R^2 \sqrt{H} u} .\end{aligned}$$

where $Q = Q(m)$ is arbitrary. The field equation (8) now has a source term and reads

$$\frac{1}{R^2} \left[1 - \frac{A}{H} - R \left(\frac{A}{H} \right)_{,R} \right] = \frac{Q^2}{R^4} ,$$

while (9) and (10) remain unchanged. Since $Q = Q(m)$, the equation above can be integrated at once and gives

$$A = H \left(1 - \frac{2m}{R} + \frac{Q^2}{R^2} \right) .$$

Using $B^2 = H + A/u^2$ and equation (7), from (9) we get

$$u = \pm \sqrt{-1 + \frac{2m}{R} - \frac{Q^2}{R^2} + \frac{1}{h^2} \left(E - \xi \frac{Q}{R} \right)^2} ,$$

where the “specific charge” $\xi := EQ_{,m}$. The metric function B can be written as

$$B = -\frac{1}{hu} \left(E - \xi \frac{Q}{R} \right) \sqrt{H} ,$$

so that (10) gives

$$\left(\sqrt{H} \right)_{,R} = \frac{h}{E - \xi \frac{Q}{R}} \left(\frac{1}{u} \right)_{,m} .$$

It follows

$$\sqrt{H(m, R)} = g(m) \pm \int \tilde{G}(m, R) dR ,$$

where $g(m)$ is arbitrary and

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{G} &:= \frac{h}{R \left(E - \xi \frac{Q}{R} \right)} \left\{ 1 - \frac{QQ_{,m}}{R} + \frac{R}{2} \left[\frac{1}{h^2} \left(E - \xi \frac{Q}{R} \right)^2 \right]_{,m} \right\} \times \\ &\times \left[-1 + \frac{2m}{R} - \frac{Q^2}{R^2} + \frac{1}{h^2} \left(E - \xi \frac{Q}{R} \right)^2 \right]^{-\frac{3}{2}} .\end{aligned}$$

For $h = 1$ (dust case) the function \tilde{G} is a rational fraction and its integral may be carried out explicitly (Ori 1990), while for $Q = 0$ (non-charged case) the above function coincides with that defined in (14).