going style means that you are soon reading about time steps and particle-mesh codes without realizing that it's become more technical. At the end, there is even room for a discussion of whether we live in a simulation. References to academic papers are provided for those wishing to dive in deeper, but this is essentially the nearest you can get to light reading on numerical cosmology. Highly recommended — especially given the remarkable price for a hardback these days. — STEVE PHILLIPPS.

**The End of Everything (Astrophysically Speaking)**, by Katie Mack (Penguin), 2021. Pp. 238, 19·5 × 13 cm. Price £9·99 (paperback; ISBN 978 0 141 98958 7).

Katie Mack has "[bounced] back and forth between physics and astronomy departments, studying black holes, galaxies, intergalactic gas, intricacies of the Big Bang, dark matter, and the possibility that the universe might suddenly blink out of existence" and "even dabbled in experimental particle physics for a while"; she now holds the Hawking Chair in Cosmology and Science Communication at the Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics in Canada and has written many popular-science pieces in various media, though this is her first book. There are many books, from popular-science books to technical monographs, about the origin of the Universe, but comparatively few about the possible ways it might end. After an introduction and summary of the history of the Universe from the Big Bang until now, she looks at five ways the Universe could end: Big Crunch, Heat Death, Big Rip, vacuum decay, and bounce.* The final chapter before the Epilogue starts with a discussion of a paper[7] in this *Magazine* by the later Astronomer Royal Martin Rees, 'The collapse of the Universe: an eschatological study'. (At that time, a Big Crunch seemed most likely — though Rees also touched on a 'conventional' Big Bounce — but today that seems to be the least likely possibility.) That is followed by a look at Dyson's view[8] assuming that the Universe will expand forever before current (and future) experiments and various ideas about where theory might be heading are discussed. The Epilogue features Rees again and other scientists talking about their personal feelings regarding the end of the Universe.

On the whole, the book does its job well, giving a popular-science-level introduction to some ways in which the Universe could end (as well as a summary of its history). Many readers might not have heard of the Big Rip or vacuum decay, and those are explained clearly and well. My main gripe is that it gets some things wrong regarding traditional observational cosmology. While it is not uncommon for confusion to arise from over-simplification, that shouldn't be a problem for a professional science communicator. The problem is not a new one: confusion related to 'the redshift–distance and velocity–distance laws'.† At the latest after the publications of Harrison's paper[9] with that title, no-one should still be confused, but many, even some professionals, are.[10] The Hubble–Lemaître law, that recession velocity is proportional to

*Tegmark [1,2] (the latter reviewed in these pages[3]) also discusses five ways in which the Universe might end: Big Chill (Heat Death), Big Crunch, Big Rip, Big Snap (can occur if the fabric of space is not infinitely stretchable), and Death Bubbles (vacuum decay; also known as the Big Slurp), but not a bouncing Universe. Of course, in some sense a bouncing Universe doesn't end, but the main reason for the difference is probably that the Big Snap has not been discussed as much as the other four, while the old idea of a bouncing or, in general, cyclic Universe (*e.g.*, ref. 4) has become more popular recently in the context of the ekpyrotic model[5] and Conformal Cyclic Cosmology[6].

†The second footnote on p. 58 provides almost a textbook example of the confusion Harrison[9] addresses.

proper distance*, is extremely simple: it is the only velocity–distance law for which a homogeneous and isotropic universe remains so. (Note that that is pure kinematics; no dynamics, much less physics, let alone General Relativity, is needed.) The dependence of (various sorts of) distance on redshift is in general complicated, and observational cosmology works by comparing an observed distance–redshift relation (the distance is hard to measure accurately; the redshift is easy) to those calculated for various combinations of the cosmological parameters. Velocities play no role. While it is true that knowing the expansion history of the Universe ($H(z)$, where $H$ is the Hubble constant and $z$ the redshift) allows one to determine the cosmological parameters $\Omega$ and $\lambda$ (the density parameter and normalized cosmological constant, respectively) and *vice versa*, one cannot actually measure the expansion velocity at high redshift. Thus, Mack's scheme (p. 59) of determining the expansion history by measuring $z$ and using the Hubble–Lemaître law to get the distance and then using that distance to determine the light-travel time and hence the time the light was emitted won't work: Measuring $z$ gives us the velocity only if we already know the cosmological parameters (by using them to calculate the distance and then, *via* the Hubble–Lemaître law, to *calculate* the velocity), and similarly the light-travel time can be calculated only if the cosmological parameters are known. (Of course, in general the light-travel-time distance is not the same as the luminosity distance or angular-size distance which are the distances most commonly used in observational cosmology, though knowing the cosmological parameters allows one to calculate them all.) On p. 62, she claims that if the Universe collapses, then the Hubble–Lemaître law is valid "right up until the expansion stops completely". No. The Hubble–Lemaître law is *always* valid (at least in a Friedmann model, which is the context here). "Right now, the more distant an object, the faster it recedes [true] and therefore, the higher the redshift [not in general] (the Hubble–Lemaître law.)" She claims that we would "*perceive* distant objects as still receding long after they start turning around" [her italics]. We cannot 'perceive' velocity. We can measure redshift, but cannot (except in the limit of small redshift) convert that to a velocity without additional knowledge or assumptions. The Hubble–Lemaître law still applies, but it connects velocity with distance, not with redshift. On p. 69, she notes, correctly, that to know whether the Universe will collapse (by knowing the cosmological parameters), we must know the expansion history. True. That involves measuring distance, which is difficult. True. But the claim that galaxy velocities "can be determined with redshift measurements" at large redshift is just plain wrong. As described above, we can calculate them if we know the distance as a function of redshift, but if we know that, we don't actually need the velocities. On pp. 72–73 she again implies that not only distance measurements but also velocity measurements are part of observational cosmology. The

*Hubble himself used low-redshift data (many from Slipher and uncredited). At low redshift, one can use apparent magnitude as a proxy for distance (luminosity distance, but in the limit of low redshift all distance measures are equivalent) and redshift as a proxy for velocity, thus Hubble[11] could correctly speak of the observations supporting 'A Relation between Distance and Radial Velocity among Extra-Galactic Nebulae', since he was working only at low redshift. What he actually observed is a correlation between apparent magnitude (for sources of presumably similar absolute magnitude) and redshift. Although there is some variation in how the terminology is (ab)used, the consensus is that the Hubble(–Lemaître) law refers to the correlation between distance and radial velocity, as in the title of Hubble's article (the velocity–distance law), although that is not what he observed. (The redshift–distance law — in general, a different law for different distances which also depends on the cosmological parameters — is neither a simple law nor named after anyone.)

latter are neither possible nor needed. Again on p. 74 (discussing supernova cosmology), she claims that one needs distance and velocity as a function of redshift; the former is sufficient. On p. 185 it is again repeated that *measurement* of the velocities of high-redshift supernovae are needed to derive the expansion history of the Universe; the reverse is true, and velocities are not needed as input into any other calculations. In any case, the redshift cannot indicate "how quickly cosmic expansion is happening at that point" without already knowing the cosmological parameters. Velocities, measured or calculated, are not used in observational cosmology at all. On p. 191, redshift drift (*e.g.*, ref. 12 and references therein) is mentioned, but confusingly cast in terms of "apparent velocity".

I have dwelt on that confusion because it demonstrates, yet again, that some who really should know better still get it wrong. Also, such popular-science books are read by many more people than those who read technical textbooks, the former sometimes providing an introduction to the latter. The reader then must understand the confusion, and the impression left is that of sloppiness. It's worth it to get it right, whatever the context. Other errors are minor: I don't think that Einstein "reluctantly" gave up the cosmological constant when he learned that the Universe is expanding; by all accounts he was more than happy to do so, whether or not he actually described it as his 'biggest blunder'[13]. The Hubble radius is sometimes confused with the event horizon (ref. 14 sets the record straight, although that should have been clear since Rindler's classic paper[15]). Entropy is not the only part of physics which cares about the arrow of time[16,17]. A universe with a (positive) cosmological constant can (but doesn't have to; it depends on the value) accelerate not only if its spatial geometry is flat, but also in the positively and negatively curved cases. A couple of things (the relationship between geometry and destiny and Hawking radiation) are presented more or less correctly, but only after repeating the common special-case version (for the former) or a completely wrong explanation (for the latter, though here the wrong version is presented explicitly to contrast it with the proper explanation).

The production is fine except for the black-and-white figures in which too-light shades of grey are very difficult to make out (perhaps black-and-white versions of colour figures?). Typos are few and annoying matters of style too many but nevertheless about average for most books I read. There are fortunately footnotes rather than end notes. There is no bibliography as such, though a few papers are mentioned by author and title in the main text. The book ends with three pages of acknowledgements and a ten-page small-print index.

Despite the goofs mentioned above (which some readers might recognize and forgive), I can nevertheless recommend the book, since otherwise it is well written and provides a popular-level introduction to a topic which is usually reserved for more technical literature (*e.g.*, refs. 1, 7, 18–20). — Phillip Helbig.

## *References*

(1) M. Tegmark, *Phys. Rev. D.*, **85**, 123517, 2012.
(2) M. Tegmark, *Our Mathematical Universe* (Allen Lane), 2014.
(3) P. Helbig, *The Observatory*, **134**, 150, 2014.
(4) S. J. Gould, *Time's Arrow, Time's Cycle: Myth and Metaphor in the Discovery of Geological Time* (Harvard University Press), 1987.

(5) J. Khoury *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D.*, **64**, 123522, 2001.
(6) R. Penrose, *Cycles of Time: An Extraordinary New View of the Universe* (Bodley Head), 2010.
(7) M. Rees, *The Observatory*, **89**, 972, 1969.
(8) F. J. Dyson, *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **51**, 447, 1979.
(9) E. R. Harrison, *ApJ*, **403**, 28, 1993.
(10) P. Helbig, *The Observatory*, **138**, 22, 2018.
(11) E. Hubble, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA*, **15**, 168, 1929.
(12) P. Helbig, *MNRAS*, **519**, 2769, 2023.
(13) C. O'Raifeartaigh & S. Mitton, *Physics in Perspective*, **20**, 318, 2018.
(14) P. van Orschot, J. Kwan & G. F. Lewis, *MNRAS*, **404**, 1633, 2010.
(15) W. Rindler, *MNRAS*, **116**, 6, 1956.
(16) B. W. Roberts, *Reversing the Arrow of Time* (Cambridge University Press), 2022.
(17) P. Helbig, *The Observatory*, **143**, 238, 2023.
(18) A. S. Eddington, *Nature*, **127**, 447, 1931.
(19) J. Barrow & F. Tipler, *The Anthropic Cosmological Principle* (Oxford University Press), 1988.
(20) F. C. Adams & G. Laughlin, *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **69**, 337, 1997.

**Solar Surveyors: Observing the Sun from Space**, by Peter Bond (Springer), 2022. Pp. 535, 24 × 16·5 cm. Price £29·99 (paperback; ISBN 978 3 030 98787 9).

*Solar Surveyors* is a very comprehensive overview of mostly space-based solar and interplanetary missions dating from the earliest rocket launches to study solar X-ray and ultraviolet emission in the years following World War II to the latest probes still operating. There is a long introductory passage giving the reader the fundamentals of solar physics, including solar radiation and the nuclear source of solar energy, as well as the history of the subject dating back to the time of Newton and Herschel. There is a well-illustrated section on ground-based observatories including the latest telescope in Hawaii with an outline of the helioseismology *GONG* network, followed by how the early rocket-borne instruments enabled solar astronomers to investigate the nature of the high-temperature solar corona and solar flares.

A discussion of interplanetary probes takes the reader on to the meat of the book, the space observatories looking at the Sun from low-Earth orbit to those viewing the Sun from interplanetary probes. Examples include the high-energy X-ray mission *RHESSI*, the two *STEREO* spacecraft and Japanese *Hinode* spacecraft, and *Solar Orbiter*, which is still about to obtain images of the polar regions of the solar corona as well as hard-X-ray images of flares.

Nearly all the references are to web sites rather than journal articles, which could be a little dangerous as web sites are liable to change with time. I did some spot checks and they seemed to be still valid. I am familiar with many of the missions listed and found at least one (to the *Coronas F* mission) where the wavelength ranges are wrong, apparently by a factor ten because of an erroneous Ångstrom-to-nanometre conversion.

Although the book is very well illustrated, some of the figures seem to have come from an imperfect reproduction of those in web sites.

The book would be very useful to those who are writing introductions to their PhD theses and perhaps the general reader who wishes to be familiar with the history of space solar physics, although the level of detail may be a little off-putting. — Ken Phillips.