Look Back Time, the Age of the Universe, and the Case for a Positive Cosmological Constant*

Kevin Krisciunas

Joint Astronomy Centre

660 N. A'ohoku Place

University Park

Hilo, Hawaii 96720 USA

Abstract

We present explicit expressions for the calculation of cosmological look back time, for zero cosmological constant and arbitrary density parameter Ω, which, in the limit as redshift becomes infinite, give the age of the universe. The case for non-zero cosmological constant is most easily solved via numerical integration. The most distant objects presently known (approaching redshift z = 5) have implied ages of $\approx$ 1-2 Gyr after the the Big Bang. The range of such age is narrow, in spite of a variety of cosmological models one might choose.

We give a graphical representation of a variety of cosmological models and show that a wide range of Hubble constants and values of the age and density of the universe compatible with modern studies are consistent with adoption of a positive cosmological constant.

Assuming the correctness of the standard Big Bang scenario (Peebles *et al.* 1991), the redshift (z) of a distant galaxy or quasar can be related (Longair 1984, Eq. 15.19) to the cosmic scale factor of the universe (R), as follows:

$$R = \frac{1}{1+z} \ .$$ (1)

R = 1 at the present epoch. An object at z = 1 emitted its light when the universe was half its present scale (R = 0.5). *How long ago* the light was emitted (the look back time τ) depends on the dynamics of the universe.

The look back time (following Longair 1984, Eq. 15.47), and assuming for now a zero cosmological constant, is:

$$\tau = \frac{1}{H_o} \int_0^z \frac{dz'}{(1+z')^2(\Omega z' + 1)^{1/2}} \ .$$ (2)

Here the density parameter $\Omega = \frac{\rho_o}{\rho_c}$ is the ratio of the density of the universe to the critical density

$$\rho_c = \frac{3H_o^2}{8\pi G} = 1.88 \times 10^{-29} \left[\frac{H_o}{100}\right]^2 \ g/cm^3 \ .$$ (3)

If the vacuum energy density of the universe is zero (i.e. if Einstein's cosmological constant $\Lambda = 0$), $\Omega < 1$ implies a universe with negative curvature which will expand forever; $\Omega > 1$ implies a universe with positive curvature which will eventually recollapse; and $\Omega = 1$ (the "Einstein-de Sitter universe") implies a universe with flat geometry which will expand forever, but which will eventually reach zero expansion rate.

In Equations 2 and 3 above H_o is the Hubble constant, measured in km/sec/Mpc. Note that it is measured in terms of distance per unit time per some other unit of distance, or $(\text{time})^{-1}$. If we denote $h = H_o$ / (100 km/sec/Mpc), then we speak of a "Hubble time" (in units of 100 km/sec/Mpc) as follows:

$$T_H = H_o^{-1} = 9.778 \, h^{-1} \, (Gyr) \,. \tag{4}$$

For $H_o = 50$ km/sec/Mpc, $h = 0.5$ and the Hubble time is 19.6 billion years. It is important to note that the age of the universe can be less than or greater than the Hubble time, depending on the value of Ω and whether or not Einstein's cosmological constant (Λ) is zero. But if $\Lambda = 0$, the age of the universe is necessarily less than the Hubble time, because of the gravitational "braking effect" of the matter in the universe. (In that case the present expansion rate of the universe is necessarily less than it was in the past.)

For an empty universe ($\Omega = 0$) Equation 2 has the simple solution:

$$\tau = T_H \left(\frac{z}{1+z} \right) \,. \tag{5}$$

3

For $\Omega = 1$, Equation 2 has another simple solution:

$$\tau = \frac{2}{3} T_H \left[1 - \frac{1}{(1+z)^{3/2}} \right] .$$

<div align="right">(6)</div>

For $\Omega > 1$, we can solve Equation 2 with the help of Gradshteyn and Ryzhik (1965):

$$\frac{\tau}{T_H} = \frac{(1+\Omega z)^{1/2}}{(\Omega - 1)(1+z)} + \frac{\Omega}{(\Omega - 1)^{3/2}} \tan^{-1} \left[\left(\frac{1+\Omega z}{\Omega - 1} \right)^{1/2} \right]$$

$$- \frac{1}{(\Omega - 1)} - \frac{\Omega}{(\Omega - 1)^{3/2}} \tan^{-1} \left[\left(\frac{1}{\Omega - 1} \right)^{1/2} \right] .$$

<div align="right">(7)</div>

And for $0 < \Omega < 1$, it can be shown (Gradshteyn and Ryzhik 1965) that the look back time is:

$$\frac{\tau}{T_H} = \frac{-(1+\Omega z)^{1/2}}{(1-\Omega)(1+z)} - \frac{\Omega}{2(1-\Omega)^{3/2}} \ln \left[\frac{(1+\Omega z)^{1/2} - (1-\Omega)^{1/2}}{(1+\Omega z)^{1/2} + (1-\Omega)^{1/2}} \right]$$

$$+ \frac{1}{(1-\Omega)} + \frac{\Omega}{2(1-\Omega)^{3/2}} \ln \left[\frac{1 - (1-\Omega)^{1/2}}{1 + (1-\Omega)^{1/2}} \right] .$$

<div align="right">(8)</div>

While Equations 5 and 6 are often used to describe look back time, Equation 8 is a much more realistic one to use, since many studies imply $\Omega \approx 0.1$ (e.g. Ford *et al.* 1981, Press and Davis 1982).

Other solutions mathematically equivalent to Equations 7 and 8 have appeared in the literature. For the $\Omega > 1$ case it is easy to show that Equation 23 of Sandage's (1961b) parametric method is equal to Equation 3.24 *minus* Equation 3.22 of Kolb and Turner (1990). For the $0 < \Omega < 1$

case it is not difficult to show that Sandage's Equation 24 equals Kolb and Turner's Equation 3.25 *minus* Equation 3.23, providing one uses the identity:

$$\cosh^{-1}\theta = \sinh^{-1}(\sqrt{\theta^2 - 1}) \ .$$

Then, using trigonometric identities for $\cos(x-y)$, $\cos(x/2)$ and $\sin(x/2)$ it is possible to show that Kolb and Turner's Equations 3.24 *minus* 3.22 equals our Equation 7 above. (Only the *sum* of the second and fourth terms of our Equation 7 equals the *sum* of two of the terms from Kolb and Turner.) For the $0 < \Omega < 1$ case it can be shown that our Equation 8 equals Kolb and Turner's Equation 3.25 *minus* Equation 3.23 providing we use the identity:

$$\cosh^{-1}\theta = \ln[\theta + (\theta^2 - 1)^{1/2}] \ .$$

Conveniently, our Equation 8 works out term by term with the solution of Kolb and Turner. Finally, we note that Schmidt and Green (1983) give an expression equivalent to our Equation 8 divided by Equation 15 (below).

For $\Lambda \neq 0$, following Caroll *et al.* (1992, Equation 16) or Krisciunas (1993, Equation 27), Equation 2 becomes

$$\frac{\tau}{T_H} = \int_0^z \frac{dz'}{(1 + z')^2 \left\{ \Omega z' + 1 - \lambda \left[\frac{2z' + (z')^2}{(1+z')^2} \right] \right\}^{1/2}} \ . \tag{9}$$

where

$$\lambda = \frac{\Lambda c^2}{3H_o^2} \tag{10}$$

5

is the "reduced" (dimensionless) cosmological constant. Defined this way $1/\sqrt{\Lambda}$ has units of length. This is the "length scale over which the gravitational effects of a nonzero vacuum energy density would have an obvious and highly visible effect on the geometry of space and time" (Abbott 1988). In general Equation 9 is most easily solved by means of numerical integration.

In Figure 1 we show the look back time *vs.* redshift for four scenarios: $H_o = 50$ and $\Omega = 0.0$, 0.3, and 1.0 (with $\lambda = 0$); and $H_o = 80$, $\Omega = 0.12$, $\lambda = 0.88$. The advantages of the last model will become clear shortly.

In Figure 2 we show the look back time, measured in terms of the age of the universe (using Equations 14, 15, and 17 below).

According to the inflationary scenario (Narlikar and Padmanabhan 1991), the universe should have flat geometry, a condition satisfied by:

$$\Omega + \lambda = 1 . \tag{11}$$

So either: 1) $\Omega = 1$ (and we cannot find the missing mass even from the dynamics of clusters of galaxies); 2) $\Omega < 1$ and $\lambda = 1 - \Omega$; or 3) the inflationary paradigm is incorrect.

In the limit as $z \to \infty$ for Equations 5 through 8, we obtain expressions for the age of the universe (T_o), assuming $\lambda = 0$:

$$T_o = T_H . \quad (\Omega = 0) \tag{12}$$

$$T_o = \frac{2}{3} T_H . \quad (\Omega = 1) \tag{13}$$

6

$$\frac{T_o}{T_H} = \frac{-1}{(\Omega - 1)} + \frac{\Omega}{(\Omega - 1)^{3/2}} \sin^{-1}\left[\left(\frac{\Omega - 1}{\Omega}\right)^{1/2}\right] . \qquad (\Omega > 1) \qquad (14)$$

$$\frac{T_o}{T_H} = \frac{1}{(1 - \Omega)} - \frac{\Omega}{2(1 - \Omega)^{3/2}} \ln\left[\frac{2 - \Omega}{\Omega} + \frac{2(1 - \Omega)^{1/2}}{\Omega}\right] . \qquad (0 < \Omega < 1) \qquad (15)$$

Our Equation 14 is mathematically equivalent to Equation 61 of Sandage (1961a), given $q_o = \Omega/2$ for $\lambda = 0$. Our Equation 15 is equal to Equation 65 of Sandage (1961a) given the same definition of q_o.

It should be noted that Equations 14 and 15 are more easily derived by integrating an expression for the Hubble constant divided by the rate of change of the cosmic scale factor over the age of the universe:

$$\frac{T_o}{T_H} = \int_0^{T_o} \frac{H_o}{(dR/dt)} = \int_0^1 \frac{dR}{\left[\frac{\Omega}{R} + 1 - \Omega + \lambda(R^2 - 1)\right]^{1/2}} , \qquad (16)$$

as is done in Krisciunas (1993, Appendix A).

For the special case of $0 < \Omega < 1$ and $\Omega + \lambda = 1$, Equation 16 can be solved by making the substitution:

$$R = \left(\frac{\Omega}{1 - \Omega}\right)^{1/3} \sinh^{2/3}\theta$$

and by using the identity

$$\sinh^{-1}\theta = \ln[\theta + (\theta^2 + 1)^{1/2}] .$$

The solution is:

$$\frac{T_o}{T_H} = \frac{2}{3} \frac{1}{(1-\Omega)^{1/2}} \ln\left[\frac{1+(1-\Omega)^{1/2}}{\Omega^{1/2}}\right] \ . \quad (0 < \Omega < 1; \ \Omega + \lambda = 1) \quad (17)$$

This is equivalent to Equation 3.32 of Kolb and Turner (1990).

Assuming values for Ω and λ allows us to calculate the age of the universe in Hubble times. Assuming H_o allows us to calculate the Hubble time in billions of years. In Figure 3, assuming $\lambda = 0$, we show various loci of points corresponding to a range of Hubble constants, values of the age of the universe, and density scale factors.

Now a common idea associated with the construction of the new 8-10 meter class telescopes is that they will "allow us to see 13 billion years into the past, about 1 to 2 billion years after the Big Bang." It turns out that only the second half of that statement is necessarily correct.

The largest observed quasar redshift is presently 4.897 (Schneider *et al.* 1991), and the largest observed galaxy redshift is 3.8 (Chambers *et al.* 1990). Let us consider the look back time of objects of redshift 5, regarded by many to be the beginning of the era of galaxy formation (Ellis 1987). Using Equations 6, 8, 13, 15 and 17, and numerical solutions to 9, we give a number of examples in Table 1. For all these cases the age of a $z = 5$ object, reckoned since the Big Bang, is about 1 to 2 billion years, even though the look back time (depending on the model) ranges from 9.68 to 15.49 Gyr. Because of uncertainties in choosing the right model, we do not really have an accurate handle on the *look back time* of a $z = 5$ object (because the range of derived

8

values of the *age* of the universe), but we can say with some certainty that that light originated 1 to 2 Gyr after the Big Bang.

Let us now consider the implications of the loci of points in Figure 3. Following Fowler (1987), we agree that our understanding of single star evolution is on a reasonably firm footing, though it should be pointed out that changes in the assumed abundances of certain elements (e.g. oxygen) have led to significant revisions in the ages of the oldest known stars in our galaxy. We could have extended the loci of points in Figure 3 further to the right – the universe could be older than 18 Gyr. That would further strengthen the idea that the Hubble constant must have a "small" value or that $\lambda > 0$ (see below).

One often estimates the age of the universe by deriving the age of the oldest stars in our galaxy and adding a "sensible" incubation time for our galaxy. Let us suppose for a moment that the age of the oldest stars in our galaxy is equal to that value derived in the careful study of the globular cluster 47 Tucanae by Hesser *et al.* (1987), who find an age of 13.5 ± 0.5 Gyr (internal error; ± 2.0 Gyr external error). The formal error bars should not be taken too seriously, but we can take a representative age-since-the-Big-Bang of 1.5 Gyr from Table 1, and add it to the age of 47 Tucanae, 13.5 Gyr, giving an age of the universe, T_o, of 15.0 Gyr.

What is the most valid value to adopt for the Hubble constant? This is a subject too complex to investigate in any detail here, but values of H_o based on the infrared Tully-Fisher relation cluster around 80 km/sec/Mpc. Okamura and Fukugita (1992) give a graphical summary. Two recent reviews (Jacoby *et al.* 1992; van den Bergh 1992) give $H_o = 80 \pm 11$ and $H_o = 76 \pm$

9, respectively. The Sandage-Tammann value of about 50 km/sec/Mpc also has its strong advocates (though they presently seem to be the minority).

If $T_o = 15.0$ Gyr and $H_o = 80$ km/sec/Mpc, an inspection of Figure 3 immediately indicates that the density of the universe must by less than zero! For a zero cosmological constant, if $T_o = 15.0$ Gyr, $H_o \leq 65$. If $H_o = 80$, then $T_o \leq 12.2$ Gyr. So either the "most sensible" value of the Hubble constant is wrong; *or* we need to revise the models from which we derive the ages of the oldest stars; *or* the cosmological constant might be non-zero. Now, this is not a new idea, but the simplicity of Figure 3 has the advantage that it can be easily understood by non-cosmologists. van den Bergh (1992) points out that studies of globular cluster ages give a range of 12 to 17 Gyr, so our adoption of 13.5 Gyr and a galaxy incubation time of 1.5 Gyr may not be intellectually honest. But as long as determinations of the Hubble constant give $H_o \approx 80$, we must take seriously the idea of $\lambda > 0$.

A positive cosmological constant is the same as attributing "repulsive" force to the vacuum. As the universe expands, this repulsive force becomes stronger and stronger, as there there is more space within which it works. To illustrate the extent of the effect, consider the basic idea of Equation 16:

$$\frac{(dR/dt)}{H_o} = \left[\frac{\Omega}{R} + 1 - \Omega + \lambda(R^2 - 1) \right]^{1/2} . \tag{18}$$

In Figure 4 we graph this function for $\Omega = 2.0$ and various small positive values of λ. One can see that λ only need be as large as $\approx +0.042$ for the rate of change of R to be positive always. In other words, the universe can expand forever, even in cases where $\Omega + \lambda$ is significantly greater than 1.

10

The effect of a positive cosmological constant is to take the loci of points in Figure 3 and pull them up in the diagram (see Figure 5). Scanning through the examples in Table 1, if $\Omega = 0.1186$, and $\lambda = 1 - \Omega$, then we find that $T_o = 15.0$ Gyr if $H_o = 80$ km/sec/Mpc. This satisfies the theoreticians who advocate the verisimilitude of the inflationary scenario, while also allowing our understanding of stellar evolution and the values of H_o based on the infrared Tully-Fisher relation to stand as valid. But perhaps this is only a modern example of the ancient Greek method of "saving the phenomenon".[1]

Allowing T_o to range from 14.5 to 15.5 Gyr, allowing H_o to range from 70 to 90 km/sec/Mpc, and assuming that $\Omega + \lambda = 1$, gives $0.06 < \Omega < 0.23$. Such a range of Ω is in accord with studies of large scale structures in the universe (e.g. Ford *et al.* 1981, Press and Davis 1982), as well as Big Bang

---

[1]For example,the ancient Greeks asserted that a planet's motion must be *uniform* and *circular*. The planet moves uniformly on its circular deferent around the Earth. But, because of the observed effect of retrograde motion, they "saved the phenomenon" of uniform, circular motion by inventing the idea of an epicycle, a smaller circle that turned at a faster rate than the deferent and whose center rode around on the deferent. Similarly, they invented *eccentric* deferents and *equants* to match the observed planetary positions better with the ephemerides. (See Krisciunas 1988.) As a modern example of "saving the phenomenon", to explain the advance of the perihelion of the orbit of Mercury and retain Newtonian gravity, astronomers postulated the existence of the planet Vulcan. This certainly worked for the anomalies of the motion of Uranus, which led to the discovery of Neptune. However, for Mercury's motion what was needed was a new theory of gravity, namely General Relativity. We use these two examples to point out that if *ad hoc* hypotheses such as the cosmological constant are "required", perhaps the solution resides in "proper" correction of some of the other data, or a significant revision of the theoretical underpinnings.

nucleosynthesis studies (Boesgaard and Steigman 1985). Also, $\lambda \approx$ 0.8-0.9 does not contradict a recent constraint on the cosmological constant derived from the study of gravitational lens galaxies (Kochanek 1992), that $\lambda < 0.9$.

In choosing a particular cosmological model one must pick *families* of parameters (T_o, H_o, Ω, λ) that satisfy particular mathematical relationships. Not all combinations are allowed. Sensible values of T_o and H_o point to a positive value for the cosmological constant. (See Tayler 1986 for a similar discussion.) However, various theoretical discussions (e.g. Weinberg 1989) stipulate that the cosmological constant should be identically zero.

References

Abbott, L., 1988, Sci. Amer., 258, No. 5 (May issue), 106

Boesgaard, A. M., and Steigman, G., 1985, Ann. Rev. A & A, 23, 319

Caroll, S. M., Press, W. H., and Turner, E. L., 1992, Ann. Rev. A & A, 30, 499

Chambers, K. C., Miley, G. K., and van Breugel, W. J. M., 1990, ApJ, 363, 21

Ellis, R., 1987, in *High Redshift and Primeval Galaxies*, ed. J. Bergeron *et al.*, (Gif Sur Yvette, France), p. 3

Ford, H. C., Harms, R. J., Ciardullo, R., and Bartko, F., 1981, ApJ, 245, L53

Fowler, W. A., 1987, QJRAS, 28, 87

Gradshteyn, I. S., and Ryzhik, I. M., 1965, *Table of Integrals, Series, and Products*, (Academic Press, New York), p. 78

Hesser, J. E., Harris, W. E., VandenBerg, D. A., Allwright, J. W. B., Shott P., and Stetson, P., 1987, PASP, 99, 739

Jacoby, G. H., Branch, D., Ciardullo, R., Davies, R. L., Harris, W. E., Pierce, M. J., Pritchet, C. J., Tonry, J. L., and Welch, D. L., 1992, PASP, 104, 599

Kochanek, C. S., 1992, ApJ, 384, 1

Kolb, E. W., and Turner, M. S., 1990, *The Early Universe*, (Addison-Wesley, Redwood City, California)

Krisciunas, K., 1988, *Astronomical Centers of the World*, (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge and New York), chapter 1

Krisciunas, K., 1993, "Fundamental cosmological parameters," in *Encyclopedia of Cosmology*, ed. N. S. Hetherington, (Garland, New York and London), p. 218

Longair, M. S., 1984, *Theoretical Concepts in Physics*, (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge and New York), chapter 15

Narlikar, J. V., and Padmanabhan, T., 1991, Ann. Rev. A & A, 29, 325

Okamura, S., and Fukugita, M. 199[2]. "istance to the Coma cluster and the value of H_o," in *Primordial Nucleosynthesis and Evolution of the Early Universe*, in press

Peebles, P. J. E., Schramm, D. N., Turner, E. L., and Kron, R. G., 1991, Nature, 352, 769

Press, W. H., and Davis, M., 1982, ApJ, 259, 449

Sandage, A., 1961a, ApJ, 133, 355

Sandage, A., 1961b, ApJ, 134, 916

Schmidt, M, and Green, R. F., 1983, ApJ, 269, 352

Schneider, D. P., Schmidt, M., and Gunn, J. E., 1991, AJ, 102, 837

van den Bergh, S., 1992, PASP, 104, 861

Weinberg, S., 1989, Rev. Mod. Phys., 61, 1

Figure Captions

Fig. 1 - Look back time *vs.* redshift for four cosmological models. A1, A2, and A3 have H_o = 50 km/sec/Mpc, $\lambda = 0$, and Ω = 0.0, 0.3, and 1.0, respectively. Model B1 has H_o = 80 km/sec/Mpc, $\lambda = 0.88$, $\Omega = 0.12$.

Fig. 2 - Look back time, measured in terms of the age of the universe, vs. redshift. A1, A2, and A3 have $\lambda = 0$, and Ω = 0.0, 0.3, and 1.0, respectively. Model B1 has $\lambda = 0.88$, $\Omega = 0.12$.

Fig. 3 - Loci of constant Ω for a range of Hubble constants and values of the age of the universe (T_o). These models assume a zero cosmological constant.

Fig. 4 - The rate of change of the cosmic scale factor (divided by the present value of the Hubble constant) *vs.* the cosmic scale factor for $\Omega = 2.0$ and various small positive values of the scaled cosmological constant. If the curve intersects the X-axis, the model indicates a universe that reaches a maximum scale, then recollapses. Otherwise, the model indicates a universe that expands forever.

Fig. 5 - Loci of constant Ω for a range of Hubble constants and values of the age of the universe (T_o), assuming the correctness of the condition stipulated by the inflationary scenario, $\Omega + \lambda = 1$.