SAMPLE

Spacetime

The Fabric of the Universe

Aira Astralis

Free sample: Chapter 1

putrabooks.github.io

Buy the full book:

Gumroad
Payhip

Contents

Chapter 1: Two Rooms and an Argument

Chapter 2: A Clerk, Two Postulates, and No Ether

Chapter 3: The Professor's Lecture

Chapter 4: The Interval: The Fabric's Yardstick

Chapter 5: Light Cones: The Shape of Influence

Chapter 6: Worldlines: Lives Drawn as Threads

Chapter 7: When the Fabric Bends

Chapter 8: The Verdicts of Experiment

Chapter 9: The Arrow of Time: Why the Fabric Remembers

Chapter 10: Ripples: The Fabric in Motion

Chapter 11: Holes in the Fabric

Chapter 12: The Speculative Wing: Shortcuts Through the Fabric

Chapter 13: The Whole Fabric: An Expanding Stage

Chapter 14: The Quantum Puzzle: Where the Fabric Refuses to Fit

Chapter 15: Conclusion: The Significance of the Fabric

Chapter 1: Two Rooms and an Argument

Imagine two rooms. In one, a tall, solitary figure insists that space and time are absolute: a container exists whether or not anything fills it, and duration flows whether or not anyone measures it. In the other room, a smaller man with a sharp wit replies that this is nonsense, that space is only the order of bodies and time only the order of events, and that talking about empty containers is talking about nothing at all. Isaac Newton and Gottfried Leibniz conducted their quarrel by letter, through intermediaries, in the 1710s, and every argument about the nature of space and time since has been a footnote to it.

Newton had practical reasons for his position. His mechanics worked by describing motion against a fixed background. Acceleration, he argued, has to be acceleration relative to something absolute, otherwise a spinning bucket of water has nothing to press its surface into a curve against. His famous bucket hung by a rope: twist the rope, let go, and the water climbs the walls. Relative to the bucket, the water is at rest at first, yet its surface curves. Something beyond the bucket, beyond the room, beyond every object in the universe, must supply the standard against which the water turns. Newton named it absolute space, and gave time the same dignity: true time, he wrote, flows equably without relation to anything external.

Leibniz replied with a razor that philosophers still wield. If space is a real container, then the universe could have been created a mile east of where it sits, or a day earlier, and these would be different universes. But what would make them different? Every object would bear the same relations to every other object. God, whom both men took seriously as an economist of reasons, would have no ground for choosing. Since a choice without a reason is beneath a rational creator, space and time cannot be containers; they must be systems of relations among the things that exist. Time is not a river; it is the order of happenings, as a genealogy is not a ladder in a library but the order of family members.

Newton won the physics of the next two centuries, partly because his mathematics ran and Leibniz's metaphysics merely stood. Engineers measured distances and durations and never once needed to ask whether the distance was "really" there when nobody looked. The bucket argument in particular haunted anyone who tried to dismiss absolute space entirely: acceleration, unlike constant velocity, produces felt effects, and the felt effects demand a background.

Yet the cracks accumulated. In the 1880s Ernst Mach, an Austrian physicist with a talent for unsettling everybody, published his criticisms. The water in Newton's bucket, he suggested, climbs the walls because it rotates relative to the distant masses of the universe, not relative to an invisible container. Remove everything but the bucket, and the notion of its spinning loses meaning. The background, if it exists, is the stars. A young reader in Bern would later call this book-reading episode a major jolt to his thinking, and the idea that local physics depends on the whole universe

would echo through general relativity, where the geometry of the stage is set by everything standing on it.

The second crack came from light. By the late 1800s, Maxwell's equations described light as a wave rippling through an all-pervading medium, the luminiferous ether, which would supply exactly the sort of absolute frame Newton wanted. If the earth plows through the ether on its orbit, light should race past us faster when we swim with the current than against it. Albert Michelson and Edward Morley built the most sensitive interferometer of their age to catch the difference. Their instrument could have detected a drift far smaller than the orbital motion predicted. It found nothing. The current did not exist. The stage, which the nineteenth century had finally furnished with a physical medium, turned out to be empty, and a stage that is nothing but emptiness is a stage that carries a question mark.

By 1900, then, the argument in the two rooms was unresolved but freshly armed. Newton's absolute background was needed by mechanics and disowned by experiment. Leibniz's relational view was philosophically elegant and physically vague. Nature, as it turned out, had a third answer prepared, one that neither disputant could have phrased: the background is real, but it is neither space alone nor time alone, and its geometry is not the one Euclid drew.

The ether deserves a fuller obituary than the textbook usually gives it, because the idea was not foolish. Light behaved, unmistakably, like a wave, and every wave anyone had ever met lived in some medium: sound in air, ripples in water, tremors in rock. To postulate a medium for light was to extend a perfectly successful pattern of reasoning, not to indulge a fantasy. The failure came only at the level of detail, and it came strangely: the medium had to be stiff enough to carry the fastest known signal and yet offer no resistance to the planets sweeping through it, rigid as steel and thin as nothing. It is worth honoring the ether as the best available idea of its time, if only because the lesson generalizes; the vacuum that replaced it, as the later chapters will show, turned out to be no simple emptiness either, and the fabric's final portrait may hold surprises as unmannerly as the ether's did.

Chapter 2: A Clerk, Two Postulates, and No Ether

Into this deadlock stepped a young man employed by the Swiss patent office in Bern, examining electromagnetic patents by day and rebuilding the foundations of physics in his spare evenings. Albert Einstein was twenty-six in 1905, his miracle year, when he published four papers that individually would have made a career. The one that concerns this book is titled, with deceptive modesty, "On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies," and it opens not with a grand claim about the universe but with a small, almost embarrassed confession: an asymmetry in the then-current treatment of magnets and wires had always seemed artificial.

The conventional story of the paper begins with two postulates, so let me give them plainly. First, the laws of physics take the same form for every observer moving at constant velocity; there is no experiment you can perform in a sealed, smoothly

gliding laboratory that reveals how fast you are going. Second, light travels at one fixed speed for every such observer, regardless of how the source moves or how the observer moves. Neither postulate sounds revolutionary. The first restates a principle going back to Galileo, who imagined experiments below decks on a sealed ship. The second was just what Maxwell's equations and the failed ether hunts seemed to say.

The revolution hid in the conjunction. Speeds, in everyone's experience, add. A ball thrown forward from a moving carriage arrives at the speed of the throw plus the speed of the carriage. If the speed of light refuses to add, then something upstream of speed itself has to yield, and Einstein, with a logician's patience, worked out what: the measurements of space and time made by different observers are not the same measurements. They cannot be. Two events that one observer calls simultaneous, another observer in relative motion calls staggered, and no experiment can decide which observer is right, because both are.

Einstein built the argument from mirrors and trains, and the train version is worth retelling. Lightning strikes the front and rear of a moving train, and an observer standing beside the track happens to be exactly halfway between the two scorch marks. Light from both strikes reaches her at the same instant; she concludes the strikes were simultaneous. But a passenger seated at the midpoint of the moving train was riding toward the light from the front strike and away from the light from the rear one. The light from the front reaches him first. Since he too is exactly halfway between the scorch marks in his own carriage, and since light for him travels at the same fixed speed in both directions, he must conclude the front strike happened first. Both measured honestly. Both reasoned correctly. Simultaneity, the absolute backdrop Newton called true time, is a property of an observer's viewpoint, not of the world.

From there the dominoes fell in a tidy line. If simultaneity is relative, then the length of a moving object, measured by simultaneous readings of its front and back, must differ from observer to observer. Moving rods contract along their direction of travel. Clocks tick at different rates for observers in relative motion: a clock you pass at speed runs slow by your reckoning, and its slowness is not a mechanical defect but a statement about the geometry you share. Duration itself, like simultaneity, carries an "according to whom" clause that no experiment can strip away.

Notice what Einstein did not do. He did not say time is an illusion, and he did not say everything is relative. He found exactly what is relative, and in doing so he protected what is absolute, though the absolute would only be named three years later. Every observer's clock is right about the events it records. The disagreements are not errors to be reconciled but structural facts about a world in which signals travel at a finite, universal speed.

The ether, meanwhile, was quietly fired. If the speed of light is the same for everyone, there is no current to detect and no medium needed. The luminiferous ether, which had survived a century of increasingly desperate engineering, was dismissed between the lines of a paper about magnets and kept out of physics without a funeral. What replaced it, at first, was not a new substance but a new austerity: a physics with no

background at all, only observers, laws, and light. The stage had dissolved entirely.

That austerity was accurate but unbearable, and within three years a mathematician would rebuild the stage from the wreckage, fusing the two dissolved notions into the single fabric this book describes. The patent clerk had pulled space and time apart; the professor would show that they had been one thing all along, wearing two costumes.

Chapter 3: The Professor's Lecture

Hermann Minkowski was the son of a Lithuanian Jewish family in East Prussia, a mathematician of high reputation, and, incidentally, one of Einstein's former professors at Zurich. He had reportedly found his student lazy, in the way of professors confronted with students who learn by refusing homework. It is one of the small ironies in the history of physics that the geometry Einstein's physics demanded was supplied by the teacher he had disappointed.

On September 21, 1908, at a congress in Cologne, Minkowski delivered a lecture titled "Space and Time." He began with a sentence that became the most quoted line in the subject: henceforth space by itself, and time by itself, are doomed to fade away into mere shadows, and only a kind of union of the two will preserve an independent reality. Reporters and physicists alike found the lecture baffling in person. Yet the idea inside it was simple enough to sketch on a napkin, and it changed physics from a study of things moving through the world into a study of a single geometric object.

The idea is this. Any event, such as a firecracker popping, is located by four numbers: where it happened, in three coordinates, and when, in one more. Collect all the events there have ever been or ever will be, and you have a four-dimensional collection. Mathematicians had contemplated such collections for decades without claiming the world was one. Minkowski's insight was that the physics of 1905 gives this collection a geometry, a way of measuring separation that all observers agree on, and that the agreed measure mixes space and time inseparably.

Take two events and ask how far apart they are. In space alone, you would reach for a ruler; in time alone, for a clock. A truck backfiring near your left ear and a firecracker popping near your right one happen at nearly the same time but far apart in space; two ticks of your wristwatch are close in time and hardly separated in space at all. Ordinary experience lets you sort every pair of events into "far in space," "far in time," or both. What Einstein's postulates imply, and Minkowski's algebra made explicit, is that you can combine the two separations into a single number, now called the interval, and that this combined number is the same for every observer, even though the observers disagree about the ruler part and the clock part separately.

The recipe for the interval has a twist that carries the whole personality of the fabric. Time's contribution enters with the opposite sign from space's contribution, so that the two partly cancel. For events close enough together that a signal slower than light could connect them, time dominates and the interval is a kind of squared duration; for events too widely separated for any light signal to cross, space dominates and the

interval behaves as a squared distance. The boundary between the two regimes is exactly the track of a light ray, and light rays, in this geometry, are the "zero-length" lines, the ones whose space and time contributions cancel perfectly.

The union deserves a slower look, because the word "geometry" is doing quiet work here. In the geometry of Euclid, the one taught in school for two thousand years, the distance between two points is a sum of squares, all plus signs. Minkowski's geometry keeps the machinery of Euclid but flips one sign, and the flip changes everything: straight lines become the longest available routes rather than the shortest, circles become hyperbolas, and rotation in the usual sense is replaced by a skewing transformation that leaves the interval untouched. It was exactly the transformation Hendrik Lorentz had written down for electron theory a year earlier, but in Minkowski's hands it stopped being an algebraic curiosity and became what he called a rotation in the union of space and time.

Why should anyone care that the stage has this particular geometry? Because it converts the strange findings of 1905 from paradoxes into ordinary facts. That a moving clock runs slow is, in Minkowski's picture, a statement that the clock's path through the four-dimensional arena is tilted relative to yours, and that its ticks measure a different slice of the arena than your ticks do. Nothing is being distorted; the clock is simply traveling through the same place by a different line, and duration, like mileage, depends on the route. Length contraction becomes the same fact read sideways: your simultaneous slice of a moving rod is a slanted cut through its four-dimensional extent, and slanted cuts through anything measure shorter than square ones.

Einstein's initial reaction was lukewarm; he grumbled that mathematicians had pounced on his work, and he said the formalism made relativity harder for physicists to learn. Within two years, while constructing his theory of gravity, he reversed himself completely. He found that the geometric machinery he needed could not be built out of space and time separately, because gravity is not a force acting in space and in time but a property of the arena itself. The professor's lecture, dismissed at first as embellishment, turned out to be the load-bearing structure of the whole building. Minkowski did not live to see it; he died in January 1909, of a ruptured appendix, at forty-four, having spent his last years founding the geometry that bears his name.

A word on the yardstick's discovery is worth inserting, because the quantity itself has a genealogy. The combination of space and time with opposite signs did not wait for the fused fabric to be understood; it appears, almost shyly, in the older physics of electromagnetic fields, where charges and currents already entered equations in mixed partnerships. Several mathematicians wrote down the combination before anyone dared say what it meant. The interval's career is a standing reminder that the fabric's deep structure tends to show up in the mathematics before anyone recognizes it as geography, and that recognizing a thing as physical rather than formal is among the rarest moves in science.

Chapter 4: The Interval: The Fabric's Yardstick

Every science needs something everyone can agree on. For surveyors it is the meter; for accountants, the currency. The physics of the fused fabric agrees on the interval, and it is worth meeting this quantity properly, in words rather than symbols, because every strange-sounding result in the rest of this book is secretly a statement about it.

Suppose a flashbulb fires at some place and moment, and a second flash fires at another. Four numbers separate the two flashes: three of space and one of time. Observers moving relative to each other will assign wildly different values to the three spatial numbers and to the single temporal one. A passenger on a fast train can honestly measure the two flashes as occurring in the same seat of her carriage, while a trackside observer measures them several carriages apart. What no observer, moving however fast, can alter is the combination: take the spatial separation, in any observer's numbers, and the temporal separation in the same observer's numbers, form the two squares with opposite signs, and the result is one number, identical for everyone. That number, or more precisely its square root where it exists, is the interval.

The interval comes in three personalities, and the personality is the physics. When the time part exceeds the space part, the pair of events can be connected by something slower than light, and the interval is timelike: it equals the reading a well-behaved clock would show if it were carried from one event to the other, gently, without violent acceleration. Timelike intervals are private property; there exists a frame in which the two events occur in the same place, and in that frame the interval is simply the duration between them. When the space part exceeds the time part, the interval is spacelike: no signal, no object, no influence can connect the events, and there exists a frame in which they occur at the same moment in different places. The two events cannot even agree on which came first; different observers, moving differently, will order them oppositely, and the disagreement does not matter, because nothing that happens at one can reach the other to make the order observable. When the two contributions cancel exactly, the interval is lightlike, or null: the events lie on the track of a single light ray, and only light itself can attend both.

This trichotomy is the fabric's constitution. Timelike separation means the events can be cause and effect; spacelike separation means they cannot, and any apparent correlation between them must be coincidence or the legacy of an earlier common cause; null separation means the events are linked by the fastest messenger there is. Notice what has happened to the speed of light in this telling. It stops being the speed of a particular object and becomes a structural constant, the slope separating the region "can influence" from the region "cannot influence," the same for every observer because the interval is the same for every observer. When physicists say nothing travels faster than light, the honest full sentence is: no event can influence another outside its causal reach, and light happens to mark the boundary exactly.

A small numerical example makes the mixing vivid. Let one event be the flash of a camera at your front door, and another the flash of a camera at your back door, and

suppose the two flashes are simultaneous in your frame, ten meters apart in space. For you the time gap is zero and the interval is fixed by the ten meters. A jogger passing your house will measure the two flashes separated in time as well as in space, front flash first or back flash first depending on her direction, and her spatial number will not be ten meters; yet her combination, with her numbers, comes out exactly equal to yours. The disagreement among observers is total at the level of rulers and clocks and zero at the level of the interval. This is what physicists mean when they say the fused fabric has an observer-independent geometry: the shadows differ, the object does not.

One more property deserves emphasis because the rest of the book leans on it. The interval between two events depends only on the two events, not on any path between them. It is a property of the arena's points, like the distance between two cities on a map, not of any road you might drive. Paths through the fabric have their own measure, called proper time or path length, which does depend on the route, and the difference between these two notions, interval as property and path length as route-dependent quantity, is exactly the difference that the next chapters exploit. Keep them distinct and the famous puzzles of relativity, the twin story chief among them, dissolve into bookkeeping.

The cone picture deserves a moment of credit for what it did to the subject's habits of thought, because before it, even excellent physicists reasoned about space and time as separable backgrounds on which events were pinned. The cones put the structure of influence itself on the map, in a form a draftsman could draw, and once drawn, the diagram did what good diagrams do: it turned arguments about abstractions into checks of pictures. Nearly every dispute the later chapters recount, from the ordering of distant events to the fate of a falling observer, resolves quickly once the parties agree to draw the same cones and look. It is worth remembering that one of the century's deepest revisions of nature rode into common understanding on a drawing that a patient student can make with a ruler and a will to be careful.

Chapter 5: Light Cones: The Shape of Influence

Draw a map of one event's reach. Put the event at the center, mark time upward, and ask a question with a ruler: given how much time has passed, how far could anything have traveled? A walker covers a few kilometers in an hour; a jet crosses a continent; a radio pulse, in that same hour, wraps the earth thousands of times over. But no matter how long you wait, the fastest anything moves is one light-second per second, one light-hour per hour, and one light-year per year. The reachable region grows, but it grows inside a strict boundary: a widening cone whose slope never changes, tipped upward from the event. This is the future light cone of the event, and its downward twin, gathering everything that could have reached it, is its past light cone. The pair of cones is the most important diagram in this book, so it is worth walking around slowly.

The inside of the upward cone is the event's genuine future: every place and moment that a signal, a stone, or a grandchild of the original event could affect. The inside of the downward cone is its genuine past: everything that could have sent it news,

momentum, or a cause. Outside both cones lies a wide, indifferent territory: events too distant in space and too close in time to have exchanged anything with the event at the center. Between an event and this territory there is no relation of before or after that all observers share, and none is needed, because influence never crosses the boundary in either direction.

The speed of light appears here in its true role, and it is not the speed of a thing but the slope of a law. Nothing that happens inside the future cone can be heard, seen, felt, or influenced from outside the same cone's boundary. The boundary itself is made of the tracks of light rays, which is why physicists draw cones rather than columns: the slope of the cone encodes the single number that every observer, however they move, agrees on. If you ride past the event at enormous speed, your ruler numbers for any pair of points tilt wildly, your clock numbers disagree with a colleague's, and yet the assignment of every event to inside, outside, or on the cone of the original does not move. The cones are the same cones for everyone. Causal structure, unlike duration and distance, is public property.

One consequence deserves a plain-language warning, because it disciplines everything else in physics: the cone never widens its slope for a faster traveler. Popular imagination puts rockets at ever greater speeds until they pierce the cone and outrun light, and the geometry simply forbids it, not as a traffic law with penalties but as a confusion of categories. To pass outside the cone, a journey would have to cover more light-distance than it spends light-time, and every physical process, every engine, every falling object, is itself a chain of events that unfolds within cones, slanted though they may be. The prohibition is less like a wall around the universe and more like the observation that you cannot walk north of the North Pole: the words stop meaning anything.

Look now at the whole family of cones. Every event has its pair; tile the four-dimensional arena with them, each cone nested among its neighbors, and you have the causal skeleton of the universe, the architecture within which every story told in this book takes place. Two events sit in each other's cones, or they do not, and that binary fact underlies every subtler one. An explosion in a distant galaxy happened, in our frame, millions of years before a detector on earth registered it; the two events sit on each other's light cone surface, linked by exactly the photons that made the detection possible. Meanwhile a supernova in one galaxy and a birthday party in another may be spacelike separated, and then no ordering of them is right, and no ordering is wrong, and the universe keeps no file on which came first.

The cones also quietly settle an old worry about free will and prediction. The future of an event is not a schedule but a range: everything inside the upward cone is reachable, nothing outside is, and which of the reachable futures actually occurs depends on what happens inside, which physics may or may not determine. The fabric does not pre-write the play; it fixes the theater's sightlines. Determinism is a question for the laws that run on the stage, not for the stage itself.

Finally, the cones give a precise meaning to a phrase that poets use loosely: the present is local. Your personal "now" at this moment is your body, this breath, this

reading; everything else you assign to now is a reconstruction from signals that arrived on your past cone. The sun you see is the sun of eight minutes ago; the farthest things you can see with your eyes on a dark night are seen across a delay of millennia. Every observer's moment is a tiny tip of a cone, and the collection of all such tips, no two of which can be compared without argument, is what the fused fabric offers in exchange for Newton's single, universal, vanished "now."

The thread picture earns one more application, because it dissolves a puzzle that troubles many readers on first meeting the theory: the feeling that relativity makes motion meaningless, since any observer may claim to be the one at rest. The threads settle the matter with an unexpected precision. Of all the worldlines threading through a pair of events, one stands out geometrically: the straight thread, the path of gentle motion, and it records between the two events a longer duration than any of its bent cousins. A traveler who accelerates always pays for the detour in accumulated time, and no accounting of anyone's perspective erases the difference, because the difference lives in the geometry of the whole thread, not in the perspective of any slice. Motion is not meaningless in the fused fabric; it is merely a property of curves rather than of points, a fact about the whole path that every observer, comparing notes honestly, must agree on.

Chapter 6: Worldlines: Lives Drawn as Threads

Take a photograph of a person and you see an object at one instant. Take, in imagination, a four-dimensional photograph of that person, and you see something stranger: a long, slender thread, beginning at a birth, ending at a death, woven through the fabric alongside billions of other threads, densely braided where lives shared rooms, running nearly parallel where families traveled together, crossing and parting where strangers met. Physicists call the thread a worldline, and the shift from objects to worldlines is the single most clarifying change of viewpoint the fused fabric offers. A particle is not a dot that moves; it is a thread that persists. Motion is not a property of the thing but an angle of the thread relative to yours.

The tilt of a thread has a strict meaning. A thread standing perfectly upright in the diagram, covering time but no space in some frame, is a body at rest for that frame; lean the thread, and the body is moving, and the steeper the lean, the faster the motion. Light rays themselves are drawn at the critical angle, riding the surface of the cones, and no material thread can lean that far: every clock-carrying, mass-bearing thread must stand closer to vertical than a ray of light in every observer's diagram. The prohibition of the last chapter becomes, in this picture, a rule about the permissible angles of threads, which is how geometers prefer to state laws.

Now the payoff for this change of vocabulary, and the reason the twin story deserves retelling as geometry. Two twins meet at an airport, embrace, and separate. One stays home; her thread runs straight up the fabric. The other flies out, turns around at a distant city, and returns; his thread bends out and back, a shallow V in the four-dimensional arena. At the reunion the travelers compare wristwatches, and the wristwatch that traveled along the bent path shows less elapsed time than the one

that stayed home. The worldlines between the same two reunion events are different routes through the fabric, and elapsed time is a property of the route, like mileage on a road trip. The straight route, remarkably, is the route of longest duration, not shortest, because of the sign flip built into the interval; the flying twin banked some of his time into distance and cannot get it back.

There is no paradox anywhere in this, and the word "paradox" survives only because the geometry is unfamiliar. Nothing turned around for the stay-at-home twin; something turned around for the traveler, and the turning, an acceleration, is written into the shape of his thread where it kinks. Acceleration, the very thing Newton's bucket used to prove an absolute background, appears here as curvature of a worldline, a visible feature drawn in the shared fabric, requiring no background beyond the fabric itself. The twins do not need to agree, at any point in their separation, about what the other's clock "really" reads now; each assigns the distant clock a reading based on a convention about simultaneity, the conventions disagree, and at the single event where they reunite, the disagreement ends, because the reunion is one event with one wristwatch comparison, and the two worldlines have delivered different totals.

Worldlines also give honest language for particles that do not last. A muon created in the upper atmosphere by cosmic rays has a thread only a few hundred meters long when drawn at the scale of its own internal clock, far too short to reach the ground; yet reach the ground it does, because its thread, drawn in the arena shared with the earth, is stretched by its speed, its few hundred meters of proper duration slanted across tens of kilometers of the ground's space. The muon does not live longer by its own account; it lives the same brief life along a longer, more slanted route. Detectors in mines and subway stations register the arrivals, a daily experimental confirmation that duration belongs to routes, not to the universe.

Where threads touch, events happen. Every collision, every emission, every absorption in physics is, in the arena, a junction where two or more worldlines meet and leave changed. The tracks in a particle detector, bubble chamber photographs, the streak of a comet and the arc of a thrown ball, are worldline fragments made visible; the detector is a four-dimensional camera with a wide shutter. Even light, which has no wristwatch and no rest frame, leaves its null track along the cone surfaces, stitching event to event at the one angle the fabric permits all observers to agree on.

And the viewpoint scales up without effort. A planet is a fat thread braided from the threads of everything it contains, winding around the thicker braid of its star; the history of a galaxy is a cable of worldlines; the whole observable universe is a tapestry in which every thread that ever carried a clock runs tip to tail from its beginning event to its end. When, in later chapters, the fabric itself bends and ripples, remember what it must mean: not that the objects moved strangely, but that the arena in which the threads are drawn acquired a shape, and the threads, doing only what threads do, following the straightest lines available, showed the shape to us.

The bending deserves one more worked picture before the formal treatment, because

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Aira Astralis is a science writer specializing in astronomy and space exploration. Her work spans the full breadth of humanity's relationship with the cosmos -- from the earliest naked-eye observations to the engineering marvels of modern space missions.

Her books are built on a foundation of primary sources: peer-reviewed research, mission archives, and direct engagement with the scientific community. She writes for readers who want to understand not just what we know about the universe, but how we came to know it.

She believes that the most important frontier is not out there but in the gap between what scientists discover and what the public understands. Her books exist to close that gap.