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ABSTRACT

We consider the post-Newtonian approximation for the Dedekind ellipsoids in the case of axisymmetry. The approach taken by Chandrasekhar & Elbert excludes the possibility of finding a uniformly rotating (deformed) spheroid in the axially symmetric limit, though the solution exists at the point of axisymmetry. We consider an extension to their work that permits the possibility of such a limit.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The Dedekind tri-axial ellipsoids are an example of non-axisymmetric, but stationary solutions within Newtonian gravity. Due to internal motions, they are, in fact, stationary in an inertial frame. When addressing the question of whether or not stationary, but non-axisymmetric solutions are possible within general relativity, this property makes the Dedekind ellipsoids a natural choice upon which to base one’s considerations. It was, in part, with this question in mind that Chandrasekhar & Elbert (1974, 1978) turned their attentions to the post-Newtonian (PN) approximation of the Dedekind ellipsoids. In a paper from the same series, Chandrasekhar (1967b) had already considered the axisymmetric limit of the PN Jacobi ellipsoids at length and was able to show that it coincides with a certain PN Maclaurin spheroid (just as their Newtonian counterparts coincide at the point of bifurcation). This is related to the fact that the PN figures were chosen to rotate uniformly. On the other hand, the PN velocity field chosen in Chandrasekhar & Elbert (1978) excludes the possibility of uniform rotation in the axisymmetric limit although it is possible in the axisymmetric case. This restriction seems neither natural nor advisable in the context of trying to settle the question as to the existence of relativistic, non-axisymmetric, stationary solutions. The naive expectation is that the axisymmetric PN Dedekind ellipsoids contain the PN Maclaurin spheroids in the axisymmetric limit (up to arbitrary order).

In this article, we begin in Section 2 by examining the axisymmetric case of a generalization to the solution presented in Chandrasekhar & Elbert (1978). We proceed in Section 3 to consider a (continuous) limit to axisymmetry. In Section 4, the connection to the PN Maclaurin spheroids is examined.

2. THE AXISYMMETRIC SOLUTION OF A GENERALIZATION TO CHANDRASEKHAR AND ELBERT’S PAPER

We consider a generalization of the PN Dedekind ellipsoids presented in Chandrasekhar & Elbert (1978) (referred to from here on in as CE78) in which we add PN terms to the velocity. We comply with the notation used in CE78 and refer the reader to the definitions there for the various quantities. The PN contributions to the velocity, which we introduce here are

\[
\begin{align*}
\delta v_1 &= a_1^2 w_1 x_2 + (q_1 + q) x_1^2 x_2 + r_1 x_1^2 + t_1 x_2 + t_2 x_3^2 \\
\delta v_2 &= a_2^2 w_2 x_1 + (q_2 - q) x_1 x_2^2 + r_2 x_1 + t_2 x_1 x_2 + t_2 x_3^2 \\
\delta v_3 &= q_3 x_1 x_2 x_3,
\end{align*}
\]

(1)

where the terms with \(w_1\) and \(w_2\) have been added for reasons that will be made clear when we discuss the solution. Note that we could eliminate one constant by introducing variables to denote \(q_1 + q\) and \(q_2 - q\), but choose instead to retain the notation in CE78.

The Newtonian ellipsoid is characterized by the semi-major axes \(a_1 \geq a_2 \geq a_3\). Let us assume for the moment that, as in the Newtonian setting, the axisymmetric case is obtained by considering \(a_2 = a_1\), an assumption that will be verified shortly. In this case, the index “2” in the index symbols \(A_{ijk}\) and \(B_{ijk}\) used in CE78 and discussed at length in Section 21 of Chandrasekhar (1987) can be replaced by “1” as is evident from the definitions. Using the relations given in that book, it is possible to reduce all the index symbols to \(1\) and \(2\), giving by Equation (36) in Section 17 of Chandrasekhar (1987). Furthermore, Equation (2) from Chandrasekhar & Elbert (1974) shows us that

\[
Q_2 \equiv -Q_1,
\]

(2)

where we define the symbol \(\equiv\) to mean that the expression is evaluated at the point \(a_2 = a_1\), i.e.,

\[
C|_{a_2=a_1} = D|_{a_2=a_1}
\]

(3)

is denoted by \(C \equiv D\).

The value for \(a_3\) can be found from the equation

\[
a_1^2 a_2^2 A_{12} = a_1^2 A_3,
\]

(4)

which holds for the Dedekind (and Jacobi) ellipsoids and gives the value

\[
\frac{a_3}{a_1} = 0.5827241661 \ldots
\]

(5)

Throughout this paper, \(a_3\) is to be understood as a function of \(a_1\) and \(a_2\), given by Equation (4).

We can now consider the integrability conditions for the pressure and the continuity equation. We again follow CE78 and shall refer to the equation numbers there by adding a prime. It turns out that Equation (38) (of CE78) remains unchanged despite the modification to the velocity, so that we find

\[
q_3 \equiv 0
\]

(6)

\(^{5}\) The three-velocity \(v^i\) in CE78 does not refer to the spatial components of the four-velocity \(u^a = dx^a/dt\), but is instead defined as \(v^i = dx^i/dt = u^i/u^0\).
and then from Equation (24') that
\[ q_2 = -q_1. \]  
(7)

Equation (28') is identically fulfilled for \( a_2 = a_1 \), meaning that \( q_1 \) is left undetermined, in contrast to the general case.

With the changes to the velocity, Equations (30') and (31') gain the additional terms \((a_1^2 Q_2w_1 + a_1^2 Q_1w_2)\) and \((a_1^2 Q_1w_1 + a_1^2 Q_2w_2)\), respectively. Equations (32')–(38') remain unchanged. Equation (32') yields
\[ r_2 = -r_1 \]  
(8)
and Equation (37') gives
\[ t_2 = t_1 \]  
(9)
(we shall see shortly that each \( t_i \) becomes zero). There are additional terms in Equation (39') corresponding to adding \(-\alpha a_1^2 Q_2w_1 + \alpha a_2^2 Q_1w_2)/2 = \alpha a_1^2 Q_1(w_1 - w_2)/2\) both to \( a_1^2 \) and \( a_2^2 \).

Requiring for the new velocity that its normal component vanishes on the surface leads to a change in Equation (50') and thus the resulting equations (52')–(56') by which the terms with \( S_1 - S_2 \) are modified. They now become
\[ S_1 - S_2 = \frac{w_1 + w_2}{Q_1}. \]  
(10)

Using Equations (2), (7), and (8), we can subtract Equation (54') from (55') in CE78 to arrive at
\[ q + q_1 - r_1 \equiv \frac{4}{3} Q_1(4S_3 + S_4). \]  
(11)

Next, we turn our attention to the system of Equations (58') from CE78.\(^5\) In the case being considered here, the first of these equations becomes
\[
0 = Q_{11}^{78} + \frac{a_1^2}{a_1^4} Q_{22}^{78} - \frac{a_1^2}{a_1^4} Q_{12}^{78} \\
= a_{11}^{78} + \frac{a_1^2}{a_1^4} A_3(4S_3 + S_4) \\
= \alpha a_{11}^{78} + \alpha a_{22}^{78} + \alpha Q_1(q - r_1) \\
- \frac{2a_1^2}{3a_1^4} A_3(4S_3 + S_4) + \sum_{i=3}^{5} S_i(u^{(i)}_{11} + u^{(i)}_{22} - u^{(i)}_{12}) \\
= \frac{2}{3} Q_1(4S_3 + S_4) - \frac{2a_2^2}{3a_1^4} A_3(4S_3 + S_4) + \frac{2}{3} a_1^6 A_{1111}(4S_3 + S_4),
\]  
(12)
where the values for the \( \alpha ' \)'s and their axisymmetric limits can be found in Appendix A, and the \( \alpha ' \)'s are given in Chandrasekhar (1967b) (hereafter C67b)\(^6\) equations (72) and (73) and where we made use of Equation (11) from the current paper. The unique solution to this equation is
\[ S_5 \equiv -\frac{17a_1^2}{3a_1^4} S_3. \]  
(13)
as it is for the analog equation (100) of C67b despite the fact that the term with \( q - r_1 \) is absent there. With the result Equation (13), Equation (11) becomes
\[ q + q_1 - r_1 \equiv 0 \]  
(14)
and for Equation (53') from CE78,\(^7\) or equivalently the sum of Equations (54') and (55'), we find
\[ S_1 - S_2 \equiv \frac{5}{3} S_3. \]  
(15)

The third minus the second of equations (58') is the analog of Equation (101) in CE78b and is in fact precisely the same equation despite the different definitions for \( P_{ij} \):
\[ 0 = Q_{11}^{78} - \frac{a_1^4}{a_1^7} Q_{22}^{78} - \frac{a_1^2}{a_1^4} Q_{11}^{78} - \frac{a_1^4}{a_1^7} Q_{33}^{78} + \frac{a_1^2}{a_1^4} Q_{23}^{78} \\
\equiv a_{11}^{78} - a_{22}^{78} + \frac{a_1^2}{a_1^4} (P_{31}^{78} - P_{23}^{78}) - \frac{2a_1^2}{a_1^4} A_1 \left( \frac{17}{3} a_1^2 S_3 + a_2^2 S_5 \right) \\
= a_1^{78} - a_{22}^{78} + \frac{a_1^2}{a_1^4} (a_{31}^{78} - a_{23}^{78}) - \frac{2a_1^2}{a_1^4} A_3 \left( \frac{17}{3} a_1^2 S_3 + a_2^2 S_5 \right) \\
+ \sum_{i=3}^{5} S_i \left( (u^{(i)}_{11} - u^{(i)}_{22}) - \frac{a_1^2}{a_1^4} (u^{(i)}_{31} - u^{(i)}_{23}) \right) \\
= -2\frac{a_1^2}{a_1^4} A_3 \left( \frac{17}{3} a_1^2 S_3 + a_2^2 S_5 \right) \\
+ (a_1^2 A_{111} + 6a_2^2 A_{113} - 7a_3^2 A_{1113}) \left( \frac{17}{3} a_1^2 S_3 + a_2^2 S_5 \right). \]  
(16)
The unique solution to this equation is
\[ S_5 \equiv -\frac{17a_1^2}{3a_1^4} S_3. \]  
(17)

We can use Equation (56') together with Equations (9), (13), (15), and (17) to conclude that
\[ t_1 \equiv t_2 \equiv 0. \]  
(18)

Equation (47') of CE78 tells us that the bounding surface is axisymmetric to the first PN order if and only if Equations (13), (15), and (17) hold. The PN velocity field of CE78 can then be seen to be axisymmetric in the limit we are discussing, when we additionally require
\[ w_2 \equiv -w_1. \]  
(19)

Using what has been shown above, the third equation of (58') in CE78 can be used to find the value of \( S_3 \) (where the

---

4 We use the superscripts “67” and “78” to distinguish the quantities defined in Chandrasekhar (1967b) from those in Chandrasekhar & Elbert (1978).

5 Please note that we have been unable to reproduce the values from Table 1’ in CE78 that result from solving Equation (58’). A detailed discussion can be found in Appendix A.

6 As mentioned in C67b, the \( \alpha ' \)'s belonging to the displacements \( \xi^{(4)} \) and \( \xi^{(5)} \) are generated by cyclically permuting the indices. The precise meaning is best understood via the example that \( u^{(4)}_{31} \) can be generated from \( u^{(3)}_{41} = -\frac{1}{4} a_1^2 (a_1^2 B_{123} - a_1^2 B_{113}) \) and becomes \( u^{(4)}_{31} = -\frac{1}{4} a_1^2 (a_1^2 B_{321} - a_1^2 B_{221}) \).

7 In Equation (53') of CE78, the factor \( Q_1 \) is missing from the term with \( (S_1 - S_2) \).
relationship between the $\alpha^{78}$'s and the $\alpha^{67}$'s can be found in Appendix A1)

$$0 = a_4^4 Q_{11} + a_3^2 Q_{33} - a_1^2 a_3^2 Q_{11}$$

$$a_4 = a_4 P_{11} + a_3^2 P_{33} - a_1^2 a_3^2 P_{11} + \frac{130}{9} a_1^2 a_3^2 A_3 S_3$$

$$= a_4^4 \alpha_{11} + a_3^2 \alpha_{33} - a_1^2 a_3^2 \alpha_{33} + \frac{a_1^2 Q_1}{4} (q + r_1) + \frac{130}{9} a_1^2 a_3^2 A_3 S_3$$

$$+ \sum_{i=3}^5 S_i (a_1^2 u_{1i} + a_3^2 u_{3i} + a_1^2 a_3^2 w_{1i})$$

and the solution is

$$S_1 \approx -0.01742648312 + 0.1061462885 r_1, \quad (21)$$

The analytic expression of which can be found in Appendix B).

We now turn to the fifth of the equations (58') to solve for $S_1$.

The equation is

$$0 = a_4^4 Q_{11} + a_3^2 Q_{33} - a_1^2 a_3^2 Q_{11}$$

$$a_4 = a_4 P_{11} + a_3^2 P_{33} - a_1^2 a_3^2 P_{11} + 2 a_1^2 a_3^2 \left(3 S_1 + \frac{35}{9} S_3 \right)$$

$$= a_4^4 \alpha_{11} + a_3^2 \alpha_{33} - a_1^2 \alpha_{33} - a_1^2 a_3^2 \alpha_{33} + \frac{a_1^2 Q_1}{2} (r_1 + r_1)$$

$$+ 2 a_1^2 \alpha_{33} \left(3 S_1 + \frac{35}{9} S_3 \right) - a_1^2 \alpha_{33} + a_1^2 a_3^2 (a_1^2 u_{1i} + a_3^2 u_{3i})$$

$$+ \sum_{i=3}^5 S_i (a_1^2 u_{1i} + a_3^2 u_{3i} + a_1^2 a_3^2 w_{1i}) \quad (22)$$

and the solution is

$$S_1 \approx -(0.2836731908 + 0.7419792757 r_1$$

$$+ 1.121542227 w_1), \quad (23)$$

cf. Appendix (B) for the analytic expression. The fourth equation is then identically fulfilled. We have obtained a solution to all the equations at the point $a_2 = a_1$ and have two remaining constants, $w_1$ and $r_1$ (although $q$ and $q_1$ are not determined, they always appear in the combination $q + q_1$, which is equal to $r_1$, cf. Equation (14)).

3. THE AXISYMMETRIC LIMIT OF A GENERALIZATION TO CHANDRASEKHAR AND ELBERT'S PAPER

Before discussing the solution obtained above, we consider the solution to the PN equations not at the point $a_2 = a_1$, but in the limit $a_2 \to a_1$. The equations listed above are also obtained as limiting relations. However, in the limit, we also obtain two new equations, one of which allows us to determine $\lim_{a_2 \to a_1} q_1$ and the other, say $\lim_{a_2 \to a_1} r_1$.

Equations (24'), (28'), and (38') of CE78 provide a system of three linear equations for the quantities $q_1$, $q_2$, and $q_3$. After solving this linear system, the limit $a_2 \to a_1$ can be taken to give

$$q_1 \to -6 \sqrt{2} B_{11} \left(4 a_1^2 B_{11} + \frac{a_4^4}{a_3^4} B_{113} \right)$$

$$= - \left(2 a_2 + 1 \right) Q_3^3$$

$$\approx 2.827158725,$$  \quad (24)

where we have defined the eccentricity

$$e := \sqrt{1 - a_2^2/a_1^2}$$  \quad (25)

and where the explicit expression for $Q_1$ is

$$\lim_{a_1 \to a_1} Q_1 = \lim_{a_1 \to a_1} - \frac{8 e^2 (1 - e^2)}{3 + 8 e^2 - 8 e^4} \quad (26)$$

We provide the analytic expression in Appendix B.

Strictly speaking, we have to show that the fourth of the equations (58') is fulfilled to all orders in $e$ to be certain that Equation (28) is continuously connected to the PN Dedekind solutions. We were able to solve the whole system of equations along the PN Dedekind sequence for arbitrary $w_1$ and $w_2$, meaning that the limit presented here can be taken on continuously.

4. DISCUSSION

The axially symmetric PN solutions we have generated depend on two parameters or one if we require that the solution be continuously connected to the PN Dedekind “ellipsoids” with the velocity field (1). The solutions are not uniformly rotating in general. If we add this constraint, then requiring that the four-velocity be shear free tells us that

$$r_1 \to 0 \quad \text{(shear free)} \quad (29)$$

must hold.

We now show that with this additional constraint, the solution is indeed the PN Maclaurin solution (thereby demonstrating that the shearfree condition is not only necessary, but also sufficient for uniform rotation in our case). Let us first note that upon taking into account the results above and in particular $Q_2 \to -Q_1$, the components of the velocity become

$$v_1 = \sqrt{\pi G \rho} \left(Q_1 + \frac{\pi G \rho}{c^2} a_1^2 w_1 \right) x_2$$

$$v_2 = -\sqrt{\pi G \rho} \left(Q_1 + \frac{\pi G \rho}{c^2} a_1^2 w_1 \right) x_1$$

$$v_3 = 0. \quad (30)$$
This is precisely the form of the velocity for the PN Maclaurin spheroids, as can be found in Chandrasekhar (1967a) (hereafter C67a) equation (3), where $\Omega$ is a constant containing a Newtonian and PN contribution, cf. (Equation (28)) of that paper.

Next we note that for a given equation of state, an axially symmetric, stationary, and uniformly rotating fluid is described by two parameters. For our purposes, we can take them to be $a_3/a_1$, which we prescribe using Equation (4), and the value for $a_1$, which we leave undetermined.

One has two additional degrees of freedom, which amount to the mapping between a Newtonian and PN solution and is a matter of convention (cf. Bardeen 1971). For example, one can write the coordinate volume of the star to be
\[
V = V_0 + V_1 \delta + \cdots ,
\]
where $\delta$ is some relativistic parameter, and then choose to have the PN contribution vanish, $V_1 = 0$. This is the choice that was made in CE78 and C67b and also in Chandrasekhar’s original paper on the PN Maclaurin spheroids, C67a. We have followed this convention in the current paper, making it easy to compare our results to those of C67a. The second degree of freedom one has was left unspecified in much of C67a, though Table 1 lists values with the choice $S_0 = S_3 = 0$.\footnote{Where necessary, we distinguish the constants of C67a from those used here by adding the superscript “M”.


| $a_3/a_1$ | $q_1$ | $q_2$ | $q_3$ | $S_1$ | $S_2$ | $S_3$ | $q$ | $r_1$ | $r_2$ | $r_3$ |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-------|-------|-------|
| 1.00     | 2.8272 | -2.8272 | 0.0000 | -0.3050 | -0.3290 | -0.0144 | 0.0574 | 0.2398 | -2.7984 | 0.0288 | -0.0288 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| 0.99     | 2.8173 | -2.8370 | 0.0211 | -0.2944 | -0.3323 | -0.0132 | 0.0542 | 0.2481 | -2.7984 | 0.0196 | -0.0378 | -0.0245 | 0.0445 |
| 0.98     | 2.8073 | -2.8470 | 0.0424 | -0.2838 | -0.3555 | -0.0120 | 0.0508 | 0.2565 | -2.7984 | 0.0105 | -0.0466 | -0.0092 | 0.0387 |
| 0.97     | 2.7972 | -2.8570 | 0.0639 | -0.2733 | -0.3387 | -0.0107 | 0.0474 | 0.2648 | -2.7984 | 0.0002 | -0.0553 | -0.1407 | 0.1324 |
| 0.96     | 2.7869 | -2.8671 | 0.0857 | -0.2628 | -0.3146 | -0.0093 | 0.0438 | 0.2732 | -2.7984 | -0.0010 | -0.0638 | -0.1906 | -0.1757 |
| 0.95     | 2.7766 | -2.8774 | 0.1077 | -0.2524 | -0.3045 | -0.0078 | 0.0401 | 0.2815 | -2.7985 | -0.0207 | -0.0722 | -0.2422 | -0.2186 |
| 0.94     | 2.7665 | -2.8879 | 0.1293 | -0.2413 | -0.2949 | -0.0060 | 0.0369 | 0.2899 | -2.7985 | -0.0207 | -0.0722 | -0.2422 | -0.2186 |
| 0.93     | 2.7564 | -2.8984 | 0.1510 | -0.2302 | -0.2853 | -0.0043 | 0.0339 | 0.2983 | -2.7985 | -0.0207 | -0.0722 | -0.2422 | -0.2186 |
| 0.92     | 2.7462 | -2.9091 | 0.1728 | -0.2191 | -0.2758 | -0.0026 | 0.0310 | 0.3068 | -2.7986 | -0.0207 | -0.0722 | -0.2422 | -0.2186 |
| 0.91     | 2.7360 | -2.9201 | 0.1947 | -0.2080 | -0.2664 | -0.0009 | 0.0282 | 0.3154 | -2.7987 | -0.0207 | -0.0722 | -0.2422 | -0.2186 |
| 0.90     | 2.7266 | -2.9312 | 0.2167 | -0.1969 | -0.2570 | 0.0002 | 0.0255 | 0.3240 | -2.7988 | -0.0207 | -0.0722 | -0.2422 | -0.2186 |
| 0.89     | 2.7171 | -2.9425 | 0.2387 | -0.1858 | -0.2476 | 0.0005 | 0.0229 | 0.3326 | -2.7989 | -0.0207 | -0.0722 | -0.2422 | -0.2186 |
| 0.88     | 2.7075 | -2.9539 | 0.2609 | -0.1748 | -0.2383 | 0.0008 | 0.0203 | 0.3412 | -2.7990 | -0.0207 | -0.0722 | -0.2422 | -0.2186 |
| 0.87     | 2.6980 | -2.9653 | 0.2832 | -0.1638 | -0.2291 | 0.0011 | 0.0178 | 0.3499 | -2.7991 | -0.0207 | -0.0722 | -0.2422 | -0.2186 |
| 0.86     | 2.6884 | -2.9768 | 0.3057 | -0.1528 | -0.2200 | 0.0014 | 0.0153 | 0.3586 | -2.7992 | -0.0207 | -0.0722 | -0.2422 | -0.2186 |

### Table 1
The Numerical Values We Find for the Quantities Listed in Table 1 of Chandrasekhar & Elbert (1978)

If we introduce the new coordinate
\[
\sigma^2 := x_1^2 + x_2^2 ,
\]
and make use of Equations (13), (15), and (17), then the bounding surface (cf. Equation (47) in CE78) is given by
\[
0 = \frac{\sigma^2}{a_1^2} + x_1^2 - 1 - 2 \frac{G \rho}{c^2} \left[ S_1 \left( \sigma^2 - 2 \frac{a_1 x_1^2}{a_3} \right) a_1^2 + S_2 \left( \frac{5}{3} \sigma^2 - \frac{4}{3} \frac{a_1 x_1^2}{a_3} \right) + 4 \sigma^2 \frac{x_1^2}{a_3} \right] - \frac{17}{9} \frac{a_1 x_1^2}{a_3} + \frac{5}{3} \frac{\sigma^2}{a_1^2} + \frac{x_1^2}{a_3} - 1 \right] .
\]

Using the equation for the surface $\sigma^2/a_3^2 = 1 - x_1^2/a_3^2$, which holds at the Newtonian level and can thus be inserted into the PN term above, one sees that the term with $x_1^2$ vanishes and one finds that the equation is identical to Equation (42) of C67a if
\[
S_3 = -\frac{9}{13} S_0^M + \frac{3}{13 a_1^2} S_0^M ,
\]
and
\[
S_1 = S_0^M + \frac{16}{13} S_2^M - \frac{a_1^2}{13 a_1^2} .
\]
hold. As mentioned in that paper, $S^M_3 = 0$ may be chosen without loss of generality\(^9\) which then leads to a unique relationship between $S_3$ and $S^M_2$, which is shown to be correct in Equation B.3. The constant $S^M_1$ can be chosen arbitrarily just as with $S_1$ (which depends on $w_1$).

If one considers the limit $a^2 \rightarrow a_1$ and simultaneously requires that the star rotates uniformly, then Equation (28) provides the unique value for $w_1$,

$$w_1 \approx 0.01646051799,$$  

(36)

which is equivalent to making a choice for $S^M_1$ different from the one made in C67a, but no more and no less physically meaningful.

The most significant result of the analysis of the axisymmetric limit is that Equation (28) shows us that the rigidly rotating limit ($r_1 = 0$) and the original choice of velocity field in CE78 ($w_1 = w_2 = 0$) are incompatible. While it is possible with that velocity field to find the PN Maclaurin solution at the bifurcation point, this solution is not continuously connected to any other solution. When considering the question of the existence or non-existence of non-axially symmetric but stationary solutions, it seems important to retain the possibility of studying a neighborhood of the axially symmetric and uniformly rotating limit, especially since such solutions are known to exist.\(^10\) This possibility was excluded by the approach taken in CE78.

In a follow-up paper, we intend to tackle the problem with a more general approach that lends itself better to proceeding to higher PN orders, is not as restrictive in the solutions it permits, and allows one to show that the singularity discussed in CE78 is an artifact of the specific method chosen and not an inherent property of the PN Dedekind solutions (cf. Gürlebeck & Petroff 2010).

We gratefully acknowledge helpful discussions with M. Ansorg, J. Bičák, J. Friedman, and R. Meinel. The first author was financially supported by the grants GAUK 116–10/258025 and GACR 205/09/H033 and the second by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft as part of the project “Gravitational Wave Astronomy” (SFB/TR7–B1).

APPENDIX A

A DETAILED DISCUSSION OF CHANDRASEKHAR AND ELBERT’S WORK

We mentioned in footnote 5 that we have been unable to reproduce the values from Table 1 of CE78 that result from solving (58') nor have we succeeded in finding the source of the discrepancy. It is important to rule out an error in our understanding of that paper or an error in our own solutions to the equations presented there, and we therefore provide a detailed discussion here (in this section we use the velocity field in that paper, i.e., $w_1 = w_2 = 0$).

The calculations we performed were done with the aid of computer algebra. As a test, we did all the calculations using both Maple and Mathematica. To be absolutely certain that we solved the equations correctly, we wrote down the line element and energy–momentum tensor as given in Chandrasekhar (1965), had Mathematica (TTC package) determine Einstein’s equations to first PN order, and then verified that they are indeed fulfilled. When the values from Table 1 of CE78 are inserted, one then finds that the condition that pressure vanishes on the surface is violated at a level 3 orders of magnitude higher than with the values from our Table 1. We also verified that the violation vanishes in our case as more significant figures are added.

The solutions we found for $q_1$, $q_2$, and $q_3$ agree with those given in Table 1 of CE78. This provides strong evidence suggesting that our numerical evaluation of $a_3/a_1$ for a given $a_2/a_1$ and of the index symbols is correct. Moreover, the dependence of $q$, $r_1$, $r_2$, $t_1$, and $t_2$ on $S_i$ as given in Equations (37') and (53')–(56') can be seen to hold both in Table 1 and Table 1. This indicates strongly that the typo in Equation (53') of CE78 mentioned in footnote 7 is truly only that and that the quantities in the integrability condition of Equation (11') are treated correctly in both papers, leaving only $\delta U$ and $\Phi$ to be verified.

The system of linear equations providing the values for $S_i$, i.e., Equation (58'), can of course be written as follows:

$$\begin{pmatrix} M_{11} & \cdots & M_{15} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ M_{51} & \cdots & M_{55} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} S_1 \\ \vdots \\ S_5 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} N_1 \\ \vdots \\ N_5 \end{pmatrix}.$$

(A1)

For a given value of $a_2/a_1$, the matrix $(M_{ij})$ depends on the $u$'s from C67b and via their $S_i$ dependence, indirectly on $q$, $r_1$, $r_2$, $t_1$, and $t_2$. The vector $(N_i)$ depends on the $a$'s and again on the (non-$S_i$ dependent part of) $q$, $r_1$, $r_2$, $t_1$, and $t_2$. We return to a discussion of this equation after mentioning a few incongruities in C78.

In Equation (44') a factor $1/(\pi G \rho)$ is missing in $\delta U$ because the equation is copied directly from Equation (74) of C67b, whereas the relationship between $p/\rho$ and $\delta U$ is not the same in Equation (39') of CE78 and Equation (75) of C67b. This mistake is corrected in Equations (45') and (46') however. In Equation (39') there is also a factor $1/(\pi G \rho)^2$ missing in the term $2\Phi + 2v^2 U + \frac{1}{2}(\frac{\delta}{\rho})^2$ as can be seen by checking dimensions\(^11\) and comparing to Equation (11) in Chandrasekhar & Elbert (1974). Finally, we note that Equation (A1) from above only ensures that the pressure is constant on the surface of the PN ellipsoid as discussed in C67b, cf. Equation (75) in loc. cit., but not that it vanishes. The constant that would have to be determined to ensure vanishing pressure was not

\(^9\) Note that Equations (34) and (35) together with Equation (15) are equivalent to the three equations (123) of C67b as can be seen either by taking $S^M_3 = 0$ or identifying $a$ of that equation with $S^M_3 + \frac{a^2}{S^M_2} S^M_2$ and $b$ with $S^M_2 - \frac{a^2}{S^M_2} S^M_2$.

\(^10\) As far as we know, there exists no formal proof demonstrating the existence of such solutions. Steps in that direction were taken by Heilig (1995) and the existence has been demonstrated by many groups that are able to solve Einstein’s equations numerically to extremely high accuracy (see, e.g., Ansorg et al. 2003).

\(^11\) We advise the reader that, as mentioned after Equation (14) in Chandrasekhar & Elbert (1974), the units in which $Q_1$ and $Q_2$ are measured change as of this point by a factor $\sqrt{\pi G \rho}$. 
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written in Equation (39') or (40)'\textsuperscript{12} and the constant that is a part of $\delta U$ in Equation (44') was dropped when proceeding to Equation (45'). Since the determination of this constant plays no role in the paper however, we need not discuss it further and have not done so in our own paper.

We find that the determinant of $(M_y)$ vanishes at $a_2/a_1 = 0.3370003168\ldots$ just as in CE78, where it is given to four significant figures. This provides evidence suggesting that the matrices agree (and thus the $\delta U$) and that the vectors ($N_y$) disagree. If we multiply $\delta U$ by a factor $\pi$, as suggested in the last paragraph, then the determinant becomes zero for $a_2/a_1 = 0.30874\ldots$. Nonetheless, we tested that neither an arbitrary factor in front of this term, nor one in front of the term $2\Phi + 2v^2U + \frac{1}{2}(\frac{\rho}{\rho})^2$ can explain the results in CE78.

A natural explanation for a disagreement between the vectors ($N_y$) in our case and in CE78 would be that one of the $\alpha$’s contains a mistake. We checked, however, to see that an arbitrary change in a single $\alpha$ cannot account for the differences in the results. Since an explicit expression for these $\alpha$’s is not provided in CE78, we cannot test directly to see whether or not each agrees. However, in the implicit expressions from (39’) and (40’), only the contributions from $2\Phi + 2v^2U + \frac{1}{2}(\frac{\rho}{\rho})^2$ are not written out. This can easily be compared to those written out explicitly for the $\alpha$’s of CE76b, where the appropriate modifications for the different Newtonian velocity have to be taken into account and show perfect agreement with our expressions. In particular, the relationship to the $\alpha$’s of CE76b for $a_2 = a_1$, which is discussed in Appendix A.1, provides additional evidence for the correctness of our expressions. We also generated the $\alpha$’s with computer algebra by typing out the expressions for (11’), solving the integrability condition and integrating it and showed that these agree with the expressions provided below:\textsuperscript{13}

$$a_{17}^{78} = -\frac{a_4^2}{a_1^2}A_3^2 - 4a_2^2B_{12}(A_1 + A_2) - 2I Q_1 Q_2 - (2I + 3a_2^2A_3)A_1 +$$
$$+ \left(\frac{a_4^2}{a_1^2}A_11 - \frac{1}{2}B_{11}\right) \left(2a_4^2Q_2^2 - 2a_1^2A_1 - 3a_2^2A_3\right) - \frac{1}{2}B_{12}(2a_4^2Q_2^2 - 2a_2^2A_2 - 3a_2^2A_3) + \frac{5}{2}a_2^2A_3B_{13}$$

(A2)

$$a_{27}^{78} = -\frac{a_4^2}{a_1^2}A_3^2 - 4a_1^2B_{12}(A_1 + A_2) - 2I Q_1 Q_2 - (2I + 3a_2^2A_3)A_2 +$$
$$+ \left(\frac{a_4^2}{a_1^2}A_22 - \frac{1}{2}B_{22}\right) \left(2a_4^2Q_2^2 - 2a_2^2A_2 - 3a_2^2A_3\right) - \frac{1}{2}B_{12}(2a_4^2Q_2^2 - 2a_1^2A_1 - 3a_2^2A_3) + \frac{5}{2}a_2^2A_3B_{23}$$

(A3)

$$a_{37}^{78} = -\frac{a_4^2}{a_1^2}A_3^2 - (2I + 3a_2^2A_3)A_3 - \frac{1}{2}B_{23}(2a_4^2Q_2^2 - 2a_2^2A_2 - 3a_2^2A_3)$$
$$- \frac{1}{2}B_{13}(2a_4^2Q_2^2 - 2a_1^2A_1 - 3a_2^2A_3) + \frac{5}{2}a_2^2A_3(B_{23} - 2a_2^2A_3)$$

(A4)

$$a_{12}^{78} = \frac{a_4^2}{a_1^2}A_2 - 2Q_2^2 \left(\frac{1}{2}A_1 + \frac{a_4^2}{a_1^2}A_2\right) + (2a_4^2Q_2^2 - 2a_1^2A_1 - 3a_2^2A_3) \left(-a_1^2A_{112} + \frac{1}{2}B_{11}\right)$$
$$+ \left(2a_2^2Q_2^2 - 2a_2^2A_2 - 3a_2^2A_3\right) \left(-a_2^2A_{122} + \frac{1}{2}B_{22}\right) - \frac{5}{2}a_2^2A_3B_{123} + 2Q_1Q_2 \left(1 - \frac{a_2^2}{a_1^2}\right)A_2$$
$$- \frac{1}{2}Q_1^2Q_2 - 2a_1^2Q_1Q_2(3A_{22} + A_{12}) + 4Q_1^2 \left(\frac{1}{2}A_1 - \frac{a_2^2}{a_3^2}A_2\right) - Q_1 \left(q_1 + \frac{1}{2}q_2\right)$$

(A5)

$$a_{32}^{78} = \frac{a_4^2}{a_1^2}A_3^2 - 2Q_2^2A_3 + 2Q_1^2 \left(1 - \frac{a_2^2}{a_1^2}\right)A_3 - 2a_1^2Q_1Q_2(A_{13} + A_{23}) + (2a_2^2Q_2^2 - 2a_1^2A_1 - 3a_2^2A_3) \left(\frac{1}{2}B_{23}\right)$$
$$+ \left(2a_2^2Q_2^2 - 2a_2^2A_2 - 3a_2^2A_3\right) \left(-a_2^2A_{222} + \frac{1}{2}B_{223}\right) - \frac{5}{2}a_2^2A_3(-2a_2^2A_{233} + B_{233})$$

(A6)

$$a_{33}^{78} = \frac{a_4^2}{a_1^2}A_3^2 - 2Q_2^2A_3 + 2Q_1Q_2 \left(1 - \frac{a_2^2}{a_1^2}\right)A_3 - 2a_1^2Q_1Q_2(A_{13} + A_{23}) - \frac{5}{2}a_2^2A_3(-2a_2^2A_{133} + B_{133})$$
$$+ \left(2a_2^2Q_2^2 - 2a_1^2A_1 - 3a_2^2A_3\right) \left(-a_1^2A_{113} + \frac{1}{2}B_{113}\right) + (2a_2^2Q_2^2 - 2a_2^2A_2 - 3a_2^2A_3) \left(\frac{1}{2}B_{123}\right)$$

(A7)

$$a_{17}^{78} = \frac{1}{2}a_4^2 A_3^2 - 2Q_2^2A_1 + (2a_4^2Q_2^2 - 2a_1^2A_1 - 3a_2^2A_3) \left(-a_1^2A_{111} + \frac{1}{4}B_{111}\right)$$
$$+ (2a_2^2Q_2^2 - 2a_2^2A_2 - 3a_2^2A_3) \left(\frac{1}{4}B_{112}\right) - \frac{5}{4}a_2^2A_3B_{113} + Q_1Q_2 \left(1 - \frac{a_2^2}{a_1^2}\right)A_1$$
$$- \frac{1}{4}Q_1Q_2 - a_2^2Q_1Q_3(3A_{11} + A_{12}) - \frac{1}{4}Q_2q_1$$

(A8)

\textsuperscript{12} The constant contained in $\delta U$ is completely determined by Equation (44’) and is thus not available as a variable to ensure that the pressure vanishes on the surface.

\textsuperscript{13} For the terms in Equation (11’), we checked our expressions by ensuring that $V^2U = -4\pi G\rho$, Equation (8’) and the Newtonian equations hold. Furthermore, we tested the $\alpha$’s by first ensuring that the moments $\mathcal{D}_i$, $\mathcal{D}_{ij,k}$ fulfill the appropriate Poisson equation and that the $\delta U^{(i)}$ of Equation (69) from CE76b agree with Equations (70) and (71) from the same paper.
\[
\alpha^3_{33} = \frac{1}{2} a^3_3 + \frac{1}{2} (2a^3_2 Q^2_2 - 2a^2_2 A_2 - 3a^2_2 A_3) B_{133} + \frac{1}{4} (2a^2_2 Q^2_1 - 2a^2_1 A_2 - 3a^2_1 A_3) B_{233} - \frac{5}{2} a^2_1 A_3 (2a^2_1 A_{33} + 1 B_{333}).
\]

Let us summarize the arguments from above. We have checked all the equations in Part I of CE78 and find the analytic expressions to be free of error, except for the few minor points mentioned above. We have good reason to believe that both correct.

**A.1. The Solution at the Bifurcation Point**

At the point \(a_2 = a_1\), i.e., at the bifurcation point along the Maclaurin sequence, the following relations can be used to simplify the expressions for the \(\alpha^i\)'s, where \(\Omega\) refers to the angular velocity of the uniformly rotating Newtonian solution and has the same meaning as in C67b:

\[
a^2_1 A_3 = a^3_1 A_{11} = a^2_1 (A_1 - B_{11}) = I - 2a^2_1 A_1 = a^2_1 \left( A_1 - \frac{1}{2} Q^2_1 \right), \quad \Omega^2 = 2B_{11} = Q^2_1.
\]

Note that at this point, the \(\alpha^i\)'s of C67b and C67a agree and we find

\[
\alpha^7_1 = -\frac{a^4_1}{a^2_1} A^2_3 - 8a^2_1 B_{11} A_1 + 21 Q^2_1 - (2I + 3a^2_2 A_3)A_1 + (a^2_1 A_{11} - B_{11}) (2a^2_1 Q^2_1 - 2a^2_1 A_1 - 3a^2_1 A_3) + \frac{5}{2} a^2_3 A_3 B_{13}
\]

\[
= -15a^2_1 A^2_3 - \frac{19}{4} a^2_1 Q^2_1 + 14a^2_1 A_1 Q^2_1 + \frac{5}{2} a^2_3 A_3 B_{13}
\]

\[
= \alpha^6_7 = \alpha^2_8 = \alpha^6_7
\]

\[
\alpha^8_3 = -a^2_2 A^2_3 - (2 + 3a^2_3 A_3) A_3 - B_{13} (2a^2_1 Q^2_1 - 2a^2_1 A_1 - 3a^2_1 A_3) + \frac{5}{2} a^2_3 A_3 (B_{33} - 2a^2_3 A_{33})
\]

\[
= a^2_1 (2Q^2_1 - 10A_1) A_3 + a^2_1 Q^2_1 A_{13}
\]

\[
= \alpha^6_7
\]

\[
\alpha^{12}_1 = \alpha^{12}_7 = \frac{a^4_1}{a^2_1} A^3_3 - 4Q^2_1 A_1 + a^2_1 \left( \frac{7}{2} Q^2_1 - 5A_1 \right) \left( -2a^2_1 A_{11} + B_{11} \right) - \frac{5}{2} a^2_3 A_3 B_{113} + \frac{1}{2} Q^1_1 + 8a^2_1 Q^2_1 A_{11} - \frac{1}{2} q_1 Q_1
\]

\[
= \alpha^{12}_7 - \frac{1}{2} q_1 Q_1
\]

\[
\alpha^{23}_1 = \alpha^{23}_7 = \frac{a^2_1}{a^2_1} A^2_3 - 2Q^2_1 A_3 + 4a^2_1 Q^2_1 A_{13} + a^2_1 \left( \frac{7}{2} Q^2_1 - 5A_1 \right) (B_{113} - a^2_7 A_{113}) - \frac{5}{2} a^2_3 A_3 (2a^2_3 A_{13} + B_{133})
\]

\[
= \alpha^{23}_7 = \alpha^{31}_7 = \alpha^{67}_7
\]

\[
\alpha^{71}_1 = \alpha^{71}_7 = \frac{1}{2} a^2_2 + \frac{1}{2} a^2_1 \left( \frac{7}{2} Q^2_1 - 5A_1 \right) B_{133} - \frac{5}{2} a^2_3 A_3 \left( -2a^2_3 A_{33} + \frac{1}{2} B_{333} \right)
\]

\[
= \alpha^{67}_7.
\]
APPENDIX B
EXPLICIT EXPRESSIONS FOR $S_1$, $S_3$, AND $R_1$

At the point $a_2 = a_1$, the $u$'s from C67b and C67a are related by

$$u^{(2)M}_{ij} = -\frac{9}{13} \left( a_{ij}^{(3)} - 4a_{ij}^{(4)} - \frac{17a_i^2 a_j^2}{3a_3^4} u_{ij}^{(5)} \right) \bigg|_{a_2 = a_1},$$

(B1)

which follows from Equation (119) of C67b.

Using these relations, those between the $\alpha$'s and Equations (11), (13), and (17), one finds that the third of the equations (58') of CE78 becomes

$$0 = a_1^4 Q_{11}^{78} - a_1^2 a_3^2 Q_{13}^{78} + a_3^4 Q_{33}^{78}$$

$$= a_1^4 a_{11}^{67} - a_1^2 a_3 a_{13}^{67} + a_3^4 a_{33}^{67} + \frac{a_1^4 Q_1}{2} r_1 + \frac{130}{9} a_1^2 a_3^2 A_1 S_3 - \frac{1}{9} \left( a_1^4 A_1^2 M - a_1^2 a_3^2 A_3^2 M + a_3^4 A_3^2 M \right),$$

(B2)

We thus have the solution

$$S_3 = \frac{9}{13} \frac{a_1^4 a_{11}^{67} - a_1^2 a_3 a_{13}^{67} + a_3^4 a_{33}^{67} + a_1^4 Q_1 r_1/2}{a_1^4 u_{11}^{(2)M} - a_1^2 a_3^2 u_{13}^{(2)M} + a_3^4 u_{33}^{(2)M} - 10a_1^2 a_3^2 A_3},$$

(B3)

which agrees with Equation (99) of C67a if we take Equation (34) of this paper into account. In order to provide concise explicit formulae, we again make use of the eccentricity

$$e = \sqrt{1 - a_2^2/a_1^2},$$

the quantity

$$C := 104e^6 - 444e^4 + 630e^2 - 245$$

(B4)

and recall that $Q_1$ is

$$Q_1 \equiv -\frac{8e^2(1 - e^2)}{3 + 8e^2 - 8e^4}.$$

We now provide explicit expressions for $S_1$, $S_3$, and $r_1$. Note that the expressions for $S_1$ and $S_3$ can be obtained either as limiting values or by placing oneself directly on the point $a_2 = a_1$. On the other hand, $r_1$ can only be obtained by a limiting process. The formulae read

$$S_1 \equiv \frac{e}{2e^2 - 1} \left[ -\frac{1}{26eC} (2864e^8 - 10128e^6 + 14712e^4 - 8120e^2 + 1365) Q_1^2 
+ \frac{e}{3Q_1} w_1 + \frac{4e}{39C Q_1} (224e^6 - 840e^4 + 1170e^2 - 455)r_1 \right],$$

(B5)

$$S_3 \equiv \frac{36e^4}{65C} \left[ \frac{(272e^4 - 244e^2 + 35) Q_1^2}{8e^2} - \frac{3e^2}{Q_1} r_1 \right],$$

(B6)

$$r_1 \to \frac{-Q_1}{8e^2(2e^2 + 1)} (24e^4 - 12e^2 - 1) - \frac{7}{4} w_1.$$

(B7)

In deriving these expressions, we have made use of the identities

$$a_1^2 \left( 4A_{11} - \frac{2}{a_1^2} \right) - 4a_1^2 A_{11} + 3A_1 \bigg|_{a_2 = a_1} = 0,$$

(B8)

$$3A_1^2 - 3A_1 - 4a_1^2 A_{11} + 5a_1^4 A_{11}^2 - 2a_1^4 A_{11}^2 \bigg|_{a_2 = a_1} = 0.$$

(B9)
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