



1  
00:00:00,634 --> 00:00:03,470  
For the first time ever,  
astronomers might have witnessed

2  
00:00:03,470 --> 00:00:07,908  
a star actually become a black  
hole right before our eyes... or

3  
00:00:07,908 --> 00:00:11,078  
telescopes. In this visible  
light image from the Hubble

4  
00:00:11,078 --> 00:00:14,882  
Space Telescope, we can see a  
large star about 25 times the

5  
00:00:14,882 --> 00:00:18,151  
mass of our Sun around 22  
million light years away in the

6  
00:00:18,151 --> 00:00:24,424  
galaxy NGC 6946. This was in  
2007. But in a Hubble image from

7  
00:00:24,424 --> 00:00:27,961  
2015, looking with the same  
filters at the same wavelengths,

8  
00:00:27,961 --> 00:00:33,233  
the star appears to be gone. One  
possible explanation - the star

9  
00:00:33,233 --> 00:00:38,071  
died and became a black hole.  
But it gets weirder. The most

10  
00:00:38,071 --> 00:00:40,540  
prevalent theory for how a black  
hole forms is through a

11  
00:00:40,540 --> 00:00:44,278  
supernova - if a star is big  
enough, at the end of its life

12  
00:00:44,278 --> 00:00:47,381  
it will eject its outer layers  
at high velocity in a massive

13  
00:00:47,381 --> 00:00:50,851  
explosion while the inner core  
collapses into a very tiny

14  
00:00:50,851 --> 00:00:54,454  
space, creating a gravity well  
so great that light can't

15  
00:00:54,454 --> 00:00:58,992  
escape. Literally, a black hole.  
So did we see this star go

16  
00:00:58,992 --> 00:01:02,996  
supernova? No, not really. A  
team of astronomers was

17  
00:01:02,996 --> 00:01:05,499  
monitoring this star with the  
Large Binocular Telescope in

18  
00:01:05,499 --> 00:01:10,037  
Arizona and saw the star get  
brighter in 2009, but not nearly

19  
00:01:10,037 --> 00:01:14,574  
as bright as a supernova. They  
call it a failed supernova. The

20  
00:01:14,574 --> 00:01:18,245  
star does expel its outer-most  
layer, but relatively gently and

21

00:01:18,245 --> 00:01:22,115

not in a big explosion. Ok, so  
this star got brighter in

22

00:01:22,115 --> 00:01:26,420

visible light in 2009, and then  
disappeared in visible light.

23

00:01:26,420 --> 00:01:29,022

How do we know it's not just  
hidden behind a cloud of dust or

24

00:01:29,022 --> 00:01:32,859

something? The team checked for  
that; they looked at infrared

25

00:01:32,859 --> 00:01:35,862

observations from the Spitzer  
Space Telescope, which would be

26

00:01:35,862 --> 00:01:39,733

able to see the heat of dust  
warmed by the star. What we see

27

00:01:39,733 --> 00:01:42,869

with Spitzer is there is some  
emission in the mid-infrared,

28

00:01:42,869 --> 00:01:46,540

but it's fading and fainter than  
what you'd expect to see with a

29

00:01:46,540 --> 00:01:49,476

hidden star. The team thinks  
instead that this infrared light

30

00:01:49,476 --> 00:01:52,813

is from the heat of gas falling  
back onto the newly formed black

31

00:01:52,813 --> 00:01:56,850

hole. To help confirm that this star is now a black hole, the

32

00:01:56,850 --> 00:01:59,519

team plans to analyze observations taken with the

33

00:01:59,519 --> 00:02:03,390

Chandra X-Ray Observatory, which would be able to reveal X-rays

34

00:02:03,390 --> 00:02:06,860

being emitted by the gas falling into the black hole. The team

35

00:02:06,860 --> 00:02:09,529

also wants to continue monitoring the star's location

36

00:02:09,529 --> 00:02:13,667

in visible light with Hubble, in case the star is still there and re-appears, and

37

00:02:13,667 --> 00:02:15,936

they'll want to look at the location with the upcoming James

38

00:02:15,936 --> 00:02:19,006

Webb Space Telescope to check if there's a surviving star hidden

39

00:02:19,006 --> 00:02:22,576

by cooler dust than can be observed with Spitzer. So if

40

00:02:22,576 --> 00:02:25,645

this really is a black hole birth, what does that mean for

41

00:02:25,645 --> 00:02:29,416  
astronomy? First of all, this  
would show that a star doesn't

42

00:02:29,416 --> 00:02:33,353  
need to go supernova to form a  
black hole. Astronomers actually

43

00:02:33,353 --> 00:02:36,390  
haven't seen as many supernovas  
occur with the largest stars as

44

00:02:36,390 --> 00:02:39,559  
they would expect to see, and  
they've been wondering why this

45

00:02:39,559 --> 00:02:44,264  
is. Perhaps 10 to 30 percent of  
massive stars don't go supernova

46

00:02:44,264 --> 00:02:47,801  
and are still able to simply  
form a black hole. If future

47

00:02:47,801 --> 00:02:50,937  
observations confirm this team's  
findings, this would be the

48

00:02:50,937 --> 00:02:54,441  
first birth of a black hole ever  
witnessed and the first failed

49

00:02:54,441 --> 00:02:57,344  
supernova ever discovered, both  
of which would usher in an

50

00:02:57,344 --> 00:03:00,814  
exciting era of astronomy  
research.

