

# Equilibrium boundary conditions, dynamic vacuum energy, and the Big Bang

F.R. Klinkhamer\*

*Institute for Theoretical Physics,  
University of Karlsruhe (TH),  
76128 Karlsruhe, Germany*

## Abstract

The near-zero value of the cosmological constant  $\Lambda$  in an equilibrium context may be due to the existence of a self-tuning relativistic vacuum variable  $q$ . Here, a nonequilibrium context is considered with a corresponding time-dependent cosmological parameter  $\Lambda(t)$  or vacuum energy density  $\rho_V(t)$ . A specific model of a closed Friedmann–Robertson–Walker universe is presented, which is determined by equilibrium boundary conditions at one instant of time ( $t = t_{\text{eq}}$ ) and a particular form of vacuum-energy dynamics ( $d\rho_V/dt \propto \rho_M$ ). This homogeneous and isotropic model has a standard Big Bang phase at early times ( $t \ll t_{\text{eq}}$ ) and reproduces the main characteristics of the present universe ( $t = t_0 < t_{\text{eq}}$ ).

PACS numbers: 11.30.Cp, 04.20.Cv, 95.36.+x, 98.80.Jk

Keywords: Lorentz invariance, general relativity, cosmology, dark energy

---

\*Electronic address: frans.klinkhamer@physik.uni-karlsruhe.de

## I. INTRODUCTION

It has been argued that the gravitating vacuum energy density  $\rho_V$  or cosmological constant  $\Lambda$  [1, 2, 3, 4, 5] vanishes in a perfect quantum vacuum, provided that this vacuum can be considered to be a self-sustained medium at zero external pressure and that there exists a new type of conserved charge density  $q$  which self-adjusts so as to give vanishing internal pressure [6]. As the perfect quantum vacuum is taken to be Lorentz invariant (see, e.g., Refs. [7, 8] for bounds on Lorentz violation in the photon sector), this vacuum variable  $q$  must be of an entirely new type, different from known conserved charges such as baryon minus lepton number,  $B - L$ . The detailed microscopic theory is, of course, unknown, but two examples of possible theories with such a vacuum variable  $q$  have been given in Ref. [6].

For the perfect Lorentz-invariant quantum vacuum, the vacuum variable  $q$  would be constant over the whole of spacetime. The previous discussion then applies to an equilibrium situation and describes what may be called the “statics of dark energy.” The outstanding questions are how the equilibrium argument relates to the observed *expanding* universe and which physical principle governs the “dynamics of dark energy.” Obviously, these are profound questions and the present article can only hope to provide a small step towards a possible solution. In fact, the first question is temporarily replaced by the following restricted question: *is it possible at all to relate equilibrium boundary conditions for  $\rho_V(0)$  to an expanding universe which matches the observations, even if we are absolutely free to choose the type of vacuum-energy dynamics,  $d\rho_V/dt \neq 0$ ?* In mathematical terms, we are after an “existence proof” for this type of universe, which has equilibrium boundary conditions setting the numerical value of the vacuum energy density  $\rho_V$  at one moment in time (here, coordinate time  $t = 0$ ).

It turns out to be rather difficult to construct such an “existence proof,” but, in the end, we have been able to find one class of suitable universes. The main lesson we will learn from this exercise is the necessity of some form of “instability” of the imperfect quantum vacuum (for the case considered, Lorentz invariance is perturbed by the presence of thermal matter and gravity) and we will get an idea of what type of instability would be required to reproduce our known universe [2, 3, 4, 5]. In a way, our goal is to find the “Kepler laws” of the accelerating universe, leaving the underlying physics to future generations.

## II. DYNAMIC VACUUM ENERGY DENSITY

### A. Gravitational action with four-form and scalar fields

The crucial issue is the exchange of energy between the deep vacuum (as described by the variable  $q$ , for example) and the low-energy degrees of freedom corresponding to the physics of the standard model and general relativity. The detailed microscopic theory is unknown, but we can try to seek guidance from the concrete four-form theory considered in Ref. [6].

This particular theory, coupled to low-energy matter, is given by the action [6, 9, 10]

$$S = \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left( \frac{R}{16\pi G_N} - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \phi \partial_\nu \phi g^{\mu\nu} - \epsilon(F) \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2} \phi^2/M^2 \right) \right), \quad (2.1a)$$

$$F^2 \equiv -\frac{1}{24} F_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} F_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} g^{\alpha\mu} g^{\beta\nu} g^{\gamma\rho} g^{\delta\sigma}, \quad (2.1b)$$

where  $R(x)$  is the Ricci curvature scalar from the metric  $g_{\mu\nu}(x)$ ,  $F_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}(x)$  the four-form field strength of a three-form gauge field  $A_{\nu\rho\sigma}(x)$ ,  $\epsilon(F)$  an arbitrary even function of  $F$ , and  $\phi(x)$  a real scalar field with coupling constant  $1/M^2$  to the microscopic energy density  $\epsilon(F)$ . One of the results of this article will be that a strong hierarchy of energy scales,  $M^4 \ll \epsilon(F)$ , appears to be required in order to match the present universe. Here, and in the rest of this section, we use natural units with  $\hbar = c = 1$ .

The variational principle applied to action (2.1a) results in three field equations, a generalized Maxwell equation for the  $F_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$  field, a generalized Klein–Gordon equation for the  $\phi$  field, and the standard Einstein equation for the  $g_{\mu\nu}$  field with an energy-momentum tensor  $T_{\mu\nu}$  from both  $F_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$  and  $\phi$  fields.

### B. Vacuum energy in a flat FRW universe

In order to solve the field equations from the model action (2.1), use the following *Ansatz*: a spatially-flat ( $k = 0$ ) Friedmann–Robertson–Walker (FRW) metric [2], a Levi–Civita-type four-form field [6, 9, 10], and a homogenous scalar field. Specifically, the *Ansatz* fields are given by

$$g_{\mu\nu}(x) = \text{diag}(+1, -a^2(t), -a^2(t), -a^2(t)), \quad (2.2a)$$

$$F_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}(x) = q(t) e_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}, \quad (2.2b)$$

$$\phi(x) = \phi(t), \quad (2.2c)$$

with scale factor  $a(t)$  and totally antisymmetric Levi–Civita symbol  $e_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ . In terms of the vacuum compressibility  $\chi_V \equiv 1/(q^2 d^2\epsilon/dq^2)$  introduced in Ref. [6], the generalized Maxwell

equation reduces to

$$\frac{\dot{q}}{q} = \chi_V q \epsilon' \frac{\phi \dot{\phi}}{M^2 - \frac{1}{2} \phi^2}, \quad (2.3)$$

where the overdot stands for differentiation with respect to the time coordinate  $t$  and the prime for differentiation with respect to the vacuum variable  $q$ . As a first approximation, consider the case of an *incompressible* fluid,  $\chi_V = 0$ , so that the vacuum variable does not change with time,

$$q = q_c = \text{const.} \quad (2.4)$$

For the *Ansatz* fields (2.2), the vacuum energy density in the Einstein field equation is given by

$$\rho_V = \left( \epsilon(q) - q \frac{d\epsilon}{dq} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2} \phi^2/M^2 \right) \equiv \tilde{\epsilon}(q) \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2} \phi^2/M^2 \right), \quad (2.5)$$

which equals the previous result  $\tilde{\epsilon}(q)$  from Ref. [6] multiplied by an overall factor containing  $\phi^2/M^2$ . The reason for obtaining this simple multiplicative result is that the metric does not enter the coupling of  $\phi^2$  and  $\epsilon(F)$  in (2.1a). In the following, it will be assumed that the equilibrium value  $q_c$  is such that  $\tilde{\epsilon}(q_c) \neq 0$ , where the value  $q_c$  (different from the value  $q_0$  for Minkowski spacetime) may result from some type of perturbation as discussed in Ref. [6].

### C. Energy exchange between vacuum and matter

The structure of the vacuum energy density from the simple model considered allows us to say something concrete about the energy exchange between vacuum and matter. Indeed, the time derivative of (2.5) is given by

$$\dot{\rho}_V = -\tilde{\epsilon} \phi \dot{\phi}/M^2, \quad (2.6)$$

for vanishing  $\dot{q}$  due to the assumed vacuum incompressibility,  $\chi_V = 0$ .

At this moment, it is useful to define

$$\tilde{\mu}_c^2 \equiv -\tilde{\epsilon}(q_c)/M^2, \quad \mu_c^2 \equiv \epsilon(q_c)/M^2, \quad (2.7)$$

for the constant equilibrium value  $q_c$ , and to assume  $\mu_c^2 \geq 0$ , so that the scalar is nontachyonic, and  $\tilde{\mu}_c^2 \neq 0$ , so that the vacuum dynamics (2.6) nontrivial [see also the remark at the end of the last subsection]. Furthermore, recall that the energy-momentum tensor  $T_{\mu\nu}$  of the perfect fluid corresponding to the homogeneous scalar field  $\phi(t)$  has the following energy density and pressure [3, 4, 5]:

$$\rho_M = \frac{1}{2} \dot{\phi}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \mu_c^2 \phi^2, \quad P_M = \frac{1}{2} \dot{\phi}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \mu_c^2 \phi^2, \quad (2.8)$$

and introduce the following equations of state for matter and vacuum:

$$P_M = w_M \rho_M, \quad P_V = w_V \rho_V = -\rho_V. \quad (2.9)$$

Relation (2.6) can then be written solely in terms of  $\tilde{\mu}_c$ ,  $\mu_c$ ,  $\rho_M(t)$ , and  $w_M(t)$ :

$$\dot{\rho}_V = \text{sgn}(\tilde{\mu}_c^2 \dot{\phi}) |\tilde{\mu}_c^2/\mu_c| \sqrt{1 - w_M^2(t)} \rho_M(t), \quad (2.10)$$

which allows us to study simple cosmological models.

Result (2.10) describes the change of vacuum energy density due to nontrivial matter dynamics ( $\dot{\phi} \neq 0$ ). However, (2.10) holds only for the case of constant vacuum variable  $q$  (having assumed  $\chi_V = 0$ ), for matter described by a single real scalar field  $\phi$ , and for the flat  $k = 0$  FRW universe. Therefore, we introduce, in the next section, an *Ansatz* for  $\dot{\rho}_V$  which is more general but still proportional to  $\rho_M$ .

### III. CLOSED FRW UNIVERSE

#### A. Equilibrium boundary conditions

The spatially flat ( $k = 0$ ) FRW universe does not have an obvious time for equilibrium boundary conditions, apart from the limiting case  $a(t) \rightarrow \infty$  for  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . But, for  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , the matter density can be expected to vanish,  $\rho_M(t) \rightarrow 0$ , which complicates the discussion. For this reason, we turn to the closed ( $k = 1$ ) FRW universe [2] with metric

$$g_{00}(x) = 1, \quad g_{m0}(x) = 0, \quad g_{mn}(x) = -a^2(t) \hat{g}_{mn}(x), \quad (3.1)$$

in terms of the standard metric  $\hat{g}_{mn}$  of a unit 3-sphere for spatial indices  $m, n = 1, 2, 3$ . The scale factor  $a(t)$  now corresponds to the radius of the universe. Henceforth, we discuss only the dynamics of classical relativity and use units with  $c = 8\pi G_N/3 = 1$ , unless stated otherwise. (Note that the boundary conditions to be discussed shortly rely, however, implicitly on quantum mechanics, as does the vacuum instability to be discussed in the next subsection.)

The closed ( $k = 1$ ) FRW universe has an equilibrium point  $t_{\text{eq}} \equiv 0$  where the expansion momentarily stops,  $\dot{a}/a = 0$ , provided the following condition holds:

$$(8\pi G_N/3) (\rho_V(t_{\text{eq}}) + \rho_M(t_{\text{eq}})) = k a(t_{\text{eq}})^{-2} \Big|_{k=1}, \quad (3.2)$$

with the gravitational coupling constant  $G_N$  and the dimensionless curvature parameter  $k$  shown temporarily. A thermodynamical argument [11] suggests a further Gibbs–Duhem-like condition at the equilibrium point:

$$\rho_V(t_{\text{eq}}) = w_M \rho_M(t_{\text{eq}}) + \frac{1}{2} (1 + w_M) \rho_M(t_{\text{eq}}), \quad (3.3)$$

where, strictly speaking,  $w_M$  stands for  $w_M(t_{\text{eq}})$ .

Let us briefly comment on the meaning of this last condition. The first term on the right-hand side of (3.3) corresponds to the flat-spacetime condition  $\rho_V = P_M = w_M \rho_M$  from pressure equilibrium  $P_V + P_M = P_{\text{ext}} = 0$  and the vacuum equation of state  $P_V = -\rho_V$ ; see Ref. [6] and references therein. The second term on the right-hand side of (3.3) describes the gravitational effects, even though Newton's gravitational constant  $G_N$  does not appear explicitly [ $G_N$  does enter condition (3.2) explicitly]. Specifically, the complete relation (3.3) follows from the two conditions  $P_V + P_M + P_{\text{grav}} = 0$  and  $\rho_V + \rho_M + \rho_{\text{grav}} = 0$  for an effective gravitational equation of state  $P_{\text{grav}} = -(1/3)\rho_{\text{grav}}$ ; see Sec. 7 of Ref. [11] for further discussion. For our purpose of trying to reproduce the present accelerating universe, (3.3) is attractive because it naturally has a nonzero vacuum energy density (provided the closed universe contains some matter), whereas the asymptotic equilibrium state of the flat FRW universe is Minkowski spacetime with vanishing vacuum energy density.

Conditions (3.2) and (3.3) will be seen to nullify the right-hand sides of differential equations (3.4) and (3.7) below. In other words, both conditions are consistent with Einstein's equations but the last one, that is, Eq. (3.3), can be derived from thermodynamic principles [11] and, for the quantum vacuum as discussed in Ref. [6] and Sec. II, would have a naturally small vacuum energy density by the self-adjustment of the vacuum variable  $q$  (or, more specifically, the  $q$  from the four-form field strength  $F$  in Sec. II). In this respect, the closed model universe presented here is in better shape than the model of a fundamental scalar field evolving towards an attractor solution (cf. Refs. [12, 13]), which does not solve the quantum-mechanical cosmological constant problem of why  $\rho_V$  vanishes in Minkowski spacetime without fine tuning. Still, the general analysis of an evolving scalar field (possibly related to the quantum-vacuum parameter  $q$ ) may turn out to be relevant for an accurate description of the present universe with  $\rho_V \sim \rho_M \ll E_{\text{Planck}}^4 \equiv (\hbar c^5/G_N)^2$ .

## B. Nonstatic universe from vacuum instability

Consider, then, the dynamics of this closed ( $k = 1$ ) FRW universe [2], which is governed by the 00-component of the Einstein equation,

$$\ddot{a}/a = -(4\pi G_N/3) (\rho_{\text{total}} + 3 P_{\text{total}}) = (8\pi G_N/3) \left( \rho_V - \frac{1}{2} (1 + 3 w_M) \rho_M \right), \quad (3.4)$$

the energy-conservation equation,

$$(\dot{\rho}_V + \dot{\rho}_M) = -3 (\dot{a}/a) (1 + w_M) \rho_M, \quad (3.5)$$

and a dynamical vacuum-energy equation which generalizes (2.10). Here, the equations of state (2.9) for matter and vacuum have already been used, assuming a time-independent value of the matter parameter  $w_M$  (this assumption can be relaxed later).

Given boundary conditions (3.2) and (3.3), the problem is to get away from the *static* Einstein universe [1] with  $a(t) = a(0)$ ,  $\rho_V(t) = \rho_V(0)$ , and  $\rho_M(t) = \rho_M(0)$ . It appears that the only way to achieve this is to consider either a modification of gravity (e.g., modified Einstein field equations as discussed in Ref. [14]) or a new type of instability of the perturbed quantum vacuum as will be discussed here. Specifically, we assume the time variation of the vacuum energy to be described by the following *Ansatz*:

$$\dot{\rho}_V = \gamma \Gamma_{\text{VM}} \rho_M, \quad (3.6)$$

with a dimensionless functional  $\gamma = \gamma[a(t)/a_{\text{eq}}]$ , normalized by  $\gamma[1] = 1$ , and a new fundamental decay constant  $\Gamma_{\text{VM}}$  [here, quantum mechanics may enter if, for example,  $\Gamma_{\text{VM}} \propto Mc^2/\hbar$  for a mass scale  $M$ , as in (2.10) from the toy model of Sec. II]. As mentioned before, the origin of (3.6) needs to be explained by the detailed microphysics, but, here, we take a purely phenomenological (“Keplerian”) approach and simply assume a particular form for  $\dot{\rho}_V$ . [The next subsection provides some background remarks which are, however, not essential for the rest of this article.]

Equations (3.4), (3.5), and (3.6) with boundary conditions (3.2) and (3.3) can now be solved numerically to give  $a(t)$ ,  $\rho_M(t)$ , and  $\rho_V(t)$ . As we intend to take equilibrium-point boundary conditions also for the standard case with  $\rho_V(t) = 0$  [details are given in the Appendix], we use the second-order Einstein equation (3.4) instead of the first-order Friedmann equation,

$$(\dot{a}/a)^2 = (8\pi G_N/3) (\rho_V + \rho_M) - k/a^2 \Big|_{k=1}. \quad (3.7)$$

It is well known [2] that, with appropriate boundary conditions, the differential equations (3.4) and (3.7) are equivalent when combined with the energy-conservation equation (3.5). Incidentally, the 11-component of the Einstein equation is also satisfied, as are the 22 and 33 components by isotropy.

### C. Type of vacuum instability considered

The following remarks on the vacuum-instability *Ansatz* (3.6) may be helpful:

1.  $\dot{\rho}_V$  vanishes if  $\rho_M = 0$ , so that the perfect Lorentz-invariant quantum vacuum without matter remains stable [this property has also been derived for the model of Sec. II as shown by result (2.10)];
2.  $\rho_M$  for  $w_M = 0$  can be interpreted as corresponding to the cold-dark-matter energy density from observational cosmology, with the baryonic contribution neglected;

3.  $\dot{\rho}_V$  does not necessarily vanish if  $\dot{a}/a = 0$  and, in particular,  $\dot{\rho}_V$  does not vanish at  $t = t_{\text{eq}}$ , so that the universe can get away from the static Einstein universe;
4. time-reversal invariance around  $t_{\text{eq}}$  is broken if  $\gamma(t)$  is continuous at  $t = t_{\text{eq}}$ .

Let us assume from now on that the dimensionful decay constant  $\Gamma_{\text{VM}}$  in (3.6) is nonzero and positive. Then our *Ansatz* (3.6) resembles Eq. (8) of Ref. [15] and Eq. (3) of Ref. [16], but differs by points 1 and 3, respectively. Observe that point 1 holds precisely for result (2.10) derived from the toy model of Sec. II.

From point 3 above and taking  $\gamma(t_{\text{eq}}) > 0$ , there is, in principle, the possibility of having a “Big Bang” with  $a(t_{\text{BB}}) = 0$  at  $t_{\text{BB}} < t_{\text{eq}}$ . Remark that the direction of the coordinate time  $t$  has no direct physical meaning for the homogenous models considered here, as the physical “arrow-of-time” appears to be related to the “growth” of inhomogeneities “originating” from a smooth Big Bang; cf. Refs. [17, 18].

From point 4, there is also the possibility that, even with a Big Bang at  $t_{\text{BB}} < t_{\text{eq}}$ , the universe does *not* return to vanishing 3-volume for  $t > t_{\text{eq}}$ . Two cases among others may be distinguished. The first case has nonnegative  $\gamma(t)$  for  $t \geq t_{\text{eq}}$ , so that the universe may approach a de-Sitter-like universe [2, 3, 4] with  $\rho_M \rightarrow 0$  and  $\rho_V \rightarrow \text{const}$  for  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

The second case has a discontinuous jump to  $\gamma(t) = 0$  for  $t > t_{\text{eq}}$  and the model universe would be static for  $t \in [t_{\text{eq}}, \infty)$ . There would then be an infinitely long equilibrium phase which makes the discussion of an self-adjusting vacuum variable  $q$  quite natural [6] (the vacuum variable  $q$  may also play a crucial role for the stability issue; see Sec. II C of Ref. [6]). Considering the coordinate time  $t$  to run in the negative direction, the nonstatic universe then takes off at  $t \equiv 0$  due to the sudden onset of instability, leading to a Big Bang for an appropriate behavior of  $\gamma(t)$  at  $t \leq 0$ , as will be discussed in the next section. This fluctuation scenario resembles, in a way, earlier discussions [19] on the tunneling origin of the nonstatic universe (around  $a \sim 0$ ), but our fluctuation “starts at the other end,” that is,  $a \sim a_{\text{eq}}$ .

## IV. MODEL UNIVERSE

### A. Specific $\gamma$ Ansatz

As explained in the Introduction, our goal is relatively modest: to find at least one functional  $\gamma[a(t)/a_{\text{eq}}]$  so that equations (3.4), (3.5) and (3.6), with boundary conditions (3.2) and (3.3) can produce a solution which more or less reproduces our known universe (see, e.g., Refs. [5, 20, 21, 22, 23] and references therein), which is spatially flat to a high degree



of precision and approximately consists of 75 % “dark energy” and 25 % matter (primarily nonbaryonic “cold dark matter”).

With three coupled nonlinear ordinary differential equations (ODEs), this modest goal is surprisingly difficult to reach. Still, we have been successful by first considering the *inverse* problem which consists of the following two steps: (i) to find, given a more or less reasonable  $a_{\text{designer}}(t)$ , which densities  $\rho_{\text{M}}(t)$  and  $\rho_{\text{V}}(t)$  are required; (ii) to determine, by differentiation of the  $\rho_{\text{V}}(t)$  from the first step, the required  $\gamma\Gamma_{\text{VM}}$  from (3.6).

Inspired by these “designer-universe” results, we make the following *Ansatz* for the (dimensionless) vacuum dynamics functional:

$$\gamma[\alpha(t)] = N \left( \frac{(1-\alpha)^6}{(c_1)^6 + (1-\alpha)^6} \alpha^2 \sin(c_2 \pi \alpha) + \frac{\alpha^7}{(c_1)^6 + \alpha^6} \left( \frac{(c_3)^{1/3}}{(c_3)^{1/3} + |1-\alpha|^{1/3}} \right)^4 \right), \quad (4.1)$$

with  $\alpha(t) \equiv a(t)/a_{\text{eq}}$  restricted to the range  $[0, 1]$ , numerical coefficients  $c_n$ , and normalization factor  $N \equiv 1 + (c_1)^6$ , so that  $\gamma[1] = 1$ . Roughly speaking, this *Ansatz* for  $\gamma(t)$  consists of a sharply-peaked positive term of the form  $(1-t)^{-4}$  modulated to be effective just below  $a = a_{\text{eq}}$  for  $t \leq 0$  and a term proportional to  $a^3$  modulated to be effective near  $a = 0$ . A nonzero value of  $\gamma(t_{\text{eq}})\Gamma_{\text{VM}}$  will be seen to be needed to get a nonstatic universe and the behavior  $\gamma \propto a^3$  near  $a = 0$  will be seen to allow for a finite limiting value of  $\rho_{\text{V}}(a)$  by compensating the divergent  $w_{\text{M}} = 0$  behavior  $\rho_{\text{M}} \propto 1/a^3$  on the right-hand side of (3.6).

## B. Numerical solution

Now take the following numerical values (in units with  $8\pi G_{\text{N}}/3 = c = 1$ ) for the boundary conditions at  $t = t_{\text{eq}} \equiv 0$  and the model parameters (specifically, the matter parameter  $w_{\text{M}}$ , the vacuum decay constant  $\Gamma_{\text{VM}}$ , and the *Ansatz* coefficients  $c_n$ ):

$$\begin{pmatrix} a(0) \\ \rho_{\text{M}}(0) \\ \rho_{\text{V}}(0) \\ w_{\text{M}} \\ \Gamma_{\text{VM}} \\ c_1 \\ c_2 \\ c_3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 10 \\ 2/300 \\ 1/300 \\ 0 \\ 50 \\ 1/5 \\ 9/4 \\ 1/15 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.2)$$

with the implicit equilibrium condition  $\dot{a}/a = 0$  at  $t = 0$  from the Friedmann equation (3.7). Remark that, if, for example, the value of the curvature radius  $a(0)$  is fixed, the values of the energy densities  $\rho_{\text{M}}(0)$  and  $\rho_{\text{V}}(0)$  are determined by the equilibrium conditions (3.2) and (3.3), for given  $w_{\text{M}}$ .




FIG. 1: Closed FRW universe with pressureless matter ( $w_M = 0$ ) and dynamic vacuum energy ( $w_V = -1$ ) for boundary conditions (4.2) in units with  $8\pi G_N/3 = c = 1$ . The assumed behavior of the vacuum-energy dynamics is given by (3.6) with the functional  $\gamma[a(t)/a_{\text{eq}}]$  from (4.1). The three nonzero equilibrium boundary conditions on  $a$ ,  $\rho_M$ , and  $\rho_V$  at  $t = t_{\text{eq}} \equiv 0$  are indicated by the heavy dots (only shown if clearly different from zero) and the hypothetical functional  $\gamma$  (with numerical coefficients  $c_1$ ,  $c_2$ , and  $c_3$ ) is indicated by the heavy curve in the left-most panel of the middle row. Moreover, the vacuum decay constant  $\Gamma_{VM}$  has been set to 50 and this relatively large value explains the rapid change of  $\rho_V/\rho_M$  near  $t = 0$ . The scale factor  $a$  vanishes at  $t = t_{\text{BB}} = -0.91636$  and the expansion of the universe is accelerated ( $\ddot{a}/a > 0$ ) if  $\rho_V/\rho_M > 1/2$ , as indicated by the dashed curve in the right-most panel of the second row from the top.

The numerical solution of the coupled ODEs (3.4), (3.5), and (3.6) with boundary conditions (4.2) is given in Fig. 1. Observe that  $\gamma \Gamma_{VM} = 0$  would give a static Einstein universe with  $a(t) = a(0)$ ,  $\rho_V(t) = \rho_V(0)$ , and  $\rho_M(t) = \rho_M(0)$  at the values indicated by the heavy dots in Fig. 1. As explained in the previous section, we have appealed to a new type of “instability” of the perturbed quantum vacuum with  $\gamma \Gamma_{VM} \neq 0$  in order to get away from this static universe (for time coordinate  $t$  starting at a value 0 and running in the negative direction, so that  $\rho_V$  decreases initially).

### C. Big Bang and present universe recovered

Turning to the detailed model results of Fig. 1, the “Big Bang” would occur at coordinate time  $t = t_{\text{BB}} = -0.91636$ , which differs by one order of magnitude from the result without vacuum energy in Fig. 2 of the Appendix. Still, approximately the same behavior for  $t \downarrow t_{\text{BB}}$  is observed in both figures, namely, a scale factor vanishing as  $a(t) \propto (t - t_{\text{BB}})^{2/3}$  and a matter energy density diverging as  $\rho_{\text{M}} \propto a^{-3}$ , with the vacuum energy density  $\rho_{\text{V}}(t)$  in Fig. 1 approaching a finite value at  $t = t_{\text{BB}}$ .

The “present universe” with density ratio  $\rho_{\text{V}}/\rho_{\text{M}} \approx 2.75$  (close to the WMAP–5yr mean value from Table 1 in Ref. [23] for  $h = 0.70$ ) would approximately correspond to the time  $t = t_0 = -0.584$  in Fig. 1 (choosing the latest time of two possible times, which both happen to be close to the maximum of  $\rho_{\text{V}}/\rho_{\text{M}}$ ). The model values of the “present universe” are then

$$\begin{pmatrix} t \\ t - t_{\text{BB}} \\ a \\ \dot{a}/a \\ \rho_{\text{M}} \\ \rho_{\text{V}} \\ \rho_{\text{V}}/\rho_{\text{M}} \\ \Omega_{\text{V}} + \Omega_{\text{M}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -0.584 \\ 0.332 \\ 5.582 \\ 2.985 \\ 2.384 \\ 6.557 \\ 2.750 \\ 1.004 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.3)$$

where  $\Omega_{\text{X}}$  is the energy density  $\rho_{\text{X}}$  relative to the critical density  $\rho_{\text{crit}} \equiv (\dot{a}/a)^2$  in units with  $8\pi G_{\text{N}}/3 = c = 1$

By identifying the calculated value  $\dot{a}/a = 2.985$  with the measured value [24] of the Hubble constant  $H_0 = h/(9.78 \cdot 10^9 \text{ yr}) \approx 0.70/(9.78 \text{ Gyr})$ , the present age of the model universe  $t_0 - t_{\text{BB}} \approx 0.332$  becomes

$$\tau_0 \approx 13.85 (0.70/h) \text{ Gyr}. \quad (4.4)$$

Similarly, the present radius of the model universe  $a_0 \approx 5.582$  becomes of the order of  $2 \times 10^{11} \text{ lyr}$ , significantly larger than the present particle horizon. It is far from trivial that more or less reasonable values for  $\rho_{\text{V}0}/\rho_{\text{M}0}$ ,  $\Omega_{\text{V}0} + \Omega_{\text{M}0}$ , and  $\tau_0$  can be produced at all in our approach.

The equilibrium time  $t_{\text{eq}} - t_{\text{BB}} \approx 0.91636$  of the model universe corresponds to  $\tau_{\text{eq}} \approx 38.22 \text{ Gyr}$ , but there need not be a Big Crunch at even later times because of the possible lack of time-reversal invariance, as discussed in the previous section. With the measured photon temperature  $T_{\gamma 0} \approx 3 \text{ K}$  and the model value  $a_0 \approx 6$ , the matter equation-of-state parameter  $w_{\text{M}}$  must change to a value  $1/3$  for  $0 \leq a \lesssim 6 \times 10^{-3}$  (relativistic matter being

dominant for  $T \gtrsim 3000$  K), in order to recover the standard nucleosynthesis of the very early universe [2, 4].

As to the phenomenology of  $\gamma[a(t)/a_{\text{eq}}]$ , we clearly recognize three phases in Fig. 1, where  $\gamma(t)$  is positive, negative, and again positive as the time coordinate  $t$  moves away from  $t_{\text{eq}} = 0$  in the negative direction. (Other structures of  $\gamma$  are not excluded *a priori*, but the one found suffices for the present discussion.) The resulting behavior of  $\rho_V(t)$  from (3.6) is shown in the figure panel next to the one of  $\gamma$ . The fact that there is energy exchange between vacuum and matter is exemplified by the nonconstant behavior of  $\rho_M a^3$  as shown by the middle panel of the bottom row of Fig. 1 (compare with the corresponding panel of Fig. 2 in the Appendix).

Note also that  $\rho_V(t_{\text{BB}})$  need not be negative, as different  $\Gamma_{\text{VM}}$  values and coefficients  $c_n$  in (4.1) can give positive  $\rho_V(t_{\text{BB}})$  values of order 1 or perhaps even  $\rho_V(t_{\text{BB}}) = 0$ . Different  $\Gamma_{\text{VM}}$  values and coefficients  $c_n$  can also give a  $\rho_V/\rho_M$  peak above 3, but it may be difficult to keep the “present age” of the universe at the value (4.4) and to prevent it from dropping to a significantly lower value.

From the approximate linearity of  $a(t)$  up to the “present value”  $t_0 \approx -0.584$  in Fig. 1, it is possible to relate the time coordinate  $t$  just below  $t_0$  to the redshift  $z$  used by observational cosmology through the approximate relation  $1 + z \approx (t_0 - t_{\text{BB}})/(t - t_{\text{BB}})$ . Then, a coordinate time  $t = -0.75$  would correspond to a redshift  $z \approx 1$  and the model vacuum energy density  $\rho_V(z)$  from Fig. 1 is seen to be more or less constant for redshifts  $z$  between 0 and 1. In fact, if future observations can measure  $\rho_V(z)$  and  $\rho_M(z)$  up to  $z \approx 10$  (see, e.g., Ref. [25] for theoretical considerations), this would indirectly constrain the behavior of  $\gamma(t)\Gamma_{\text{VM}}$  for  $t \in (t_{\text{BB}}, t_0]$ . These observations can perhaps also constrain  $\gamma(t)\Gamma_{\text{VM}}$  over the *whole* range  $[t_{\text{BB}}, t_{\text{eq}}]$  if there are effective two-boundary conditions such as  $\rho_V(t_{\text{BB}}) = 0$  and  $\rho_V(t_{\text{eq}}) \neq 0$  from the underlying physics (possibly with a new mechanism of T and CPT violation; cf. Refs. [17, 18]).

## V. DISCUSSION

By way of summary, we list the main features of the particular closed model universe from Sec. IV and Fig. 1:

1. a Gibbs–Duhem-like boundary condition (3.3) at  $t = t_{\text{eq}}$  with a finite vacuum energy density  $\rho_V(t_{\text{eq}}) = \frac{1}{2} \rho_M(t_{\text{eq}})$  for matter with equation-of-state parameter  $w_M = 0$ ;
2. finite  $|\rho_V(t)|$  within a factor of order  $10^3$  from the value set at  $t = t_{\text{eq}}$ , which may result from the self-tuning of the vacuum variable  $q$  to an equilibrium value  $q_c$  (see also point 1);

3. a standard Big Bang phase at  $t \sim t_{\text{BB}} < t_{\text{eq}}$  having  $a(t) \propto (t - t_{\text{BB}})^{2/3}$  for  $w_{\text{M}} = 0$ , matter energy density  $\rho_{\text{M}} \propto a^{-3}$ , and suppressed vacuum energy density with  $\rho_{\text{V}}/\rho_{\text{M}} \rightarrow 0$  for  $t \downarrow t_{\text{BB}}$ ;
4. an accelerating universe for “present times,” with  $\rho_{\text{V}}/\rho_{\text{M}}$  of order 1 and an approximately flat 3-geometry.

This model universe constitutes the “existence proof” mentioned in the Introduction. Points 1 and 2 suggest, moreover, that a nonvanishing vacuum energy density  $\rho_{\text{V}}(t)$  relevant to cosmology may not require fine-tuning by factors of order  $(E_{\text{Planck}}/10^{-3} \text{ eV})^4 \sim 10^{124}$  due to the self-adjustment [6] of the vacuum variable  $q$  in the equilibrium phase  $t \geq t_{\text{eq}}$ .

Still, it remains to be explained theoretically that the fundamental vacuum-dynamics constant  $c/\Gamma_{\text{VM}} \approx 1 \times 10^9 \text{ yr} \approx \hbar c/(2 \times 10^{-32} \text{ eV})$  is of the order of the length scale  $a(t_{\text{eq}}) \approx 4 \times 10^{11} \text{ yr}$  of the equilibrium model universe. [As mentioned before, the single quantity  $a(t_{\text{eq}})$  determines the two other quantities  $\rho_{\text{M}}(t_{\text{eq}})$  and  $\rho_{\text{V}}(t_{\text{eq}})$  from conditions (3.2)–(3.3) for a given value of  $w_{\text{M}}$ .] The theoretical explanation of this very small energy scale  $\hbar\Gamma_{\text{VM}} \approx 2 \times 10^{-32} \text{ eV}$  would, most likely, trace back to the detailed microphysics, perhaps along the lines of the toy model discussed in Sec. II with a hierarchy of energy scales  $M^4 \ll \tilde{\epsilon} \ll \epsilon$ . Inversely, there is the possibility that observational cosmology, by measuring the time dependence of the vacuum energy density, can provide information on the microscopic structure of the quantum vacuum.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is a pleasure to thank G.E. Volovik and J. Weller for valuable discussions.

## APPENDIX A: STANDARD CLOSED FRW UNIVERSE

In this appendix, a standard closed FRW universe [2] is reviewed which has the same extremal radius as the nonstandard universe discussed in Sec. IV. Specifically, the boundary conditions at  $t = t_{\text{max}} \equiv 0$  and parameter values are (in units with  $8\pi G_{\text{N}}/3 = c = 1$ ):

$$\begin{pmatrix} a(0) \\ \rho_{\text{M}}(0) \\ \rho_{\text{V}}(0) \\ w_{\text{M}} \\ \Gamma_{\text{VM}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 10 \\ 1/100 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A1})$$




FIG. 2: Closed FRW universe with pressureless matter ( $w_M = 0$ ) and boundary conditions (A1) in units with  $8\pi G_N/3 = c = 1$ . On the first row are shown the scale factor  $a(t)$  and various derivatives,  $\dot{a}/a$  and  $\ddot{a}/a$ . On the second row are shown  $a(t)$  scaled by a fractional power of the elapsed time since  $t_{\text{BB}} = -5\pi \approx -15.71$  where  $a(t)$  vanishes, the matter energy density  $\rho_M$  multiplied by  $a^3$ , and the matter-density parameter  $\Omega_M \equiv \rho_M/\rho_{\text{crit}}$  defined in terms of the critical density  $\rho_{\text{crit}} \equiv (\dot{a}/a)^2$ . The two boundary conditions on  $a$  and  $\rho_M$  at  $t = t_{\text{max}} \equiv 0$  are indicated by heavy dots.

so that the vacuum energy dynamics from (3.6) becomes trivial. Note that boundary conditions (A1) imply  $\dot{a}/a = 0$  at  $t = 0$  by the Friedmann equation (3.7).

The corresponding numerical solution of the differential equations (3.4) and (3.5) is displayed in Fig. 2. The analytic solution, in terms of an auxiliary angle  $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$ , is given by [2, 3]

$$a = a_{\text{max}} \sin^2(\theta/2), \quad (\text{A2a})$$

$$\rho_M(a) = a_{\text{max}}/a^3, \quad \rho_V(a) = 0, \quad (\text{A2b})$$

$$t = (\theta - \sin \theta - \pi) a_{\text{max}}/2, \quad (\text{A2c})$$

with boundary condition  $a_{\text{max}} = 10$  from (A1). The time-symmetric solution (A2a) has Big Bang coordinate time  $t_{\text{BB}} = -\pi a_{\text{max}}/2$  and Big Crunch coordinate time  $t_{\text{BC}} = +\pi a_{\text{max}}/2$ . For  $t \downarrow t_{\text{BB}}$ , the behavior of  $a(t)$  approaches that of the flat ( $k = 0$ ) FRW universe,  $a(t) \propto (t - t_{\text{BB}})^{2/3}$ .

The above results for a standard closed FRW universe serve as benchmark for those of the nonstandard universe discussed in Secs. III and IV. For example, the comparison of the top rows in Figs. 1 and 2 highlights the different behavior at  $t = 0$ .

- 
- [1] A. Einstein, “Kosmologische Betrachtungen zur allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie,” Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. Wiss. 1917, p. 142; translated as: “Cosmological considerations on the general theory of relativity,” in: *The Principle of Relativity*, edited by H.A. Lorentz *et al.* (Dover Publ., New York, 1952), Chap. 9.
- [2] S. Weinberg, *Gravitation and Cosmology* (Wiley, New York, 1972).
- [3] S.W. Hawking and G.F.R. Ellis, *The Large Scale Structure of Space-Time* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 1973).
- [4] V. Mukhanov, *Physical Foundations of Cosmology* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2005).
- [5] S. Weinberg, *Cosmology* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, England, 2008).
- [6] F.R. Klinkhamer and G.E. Volovik, “Self-tuning vacuum variable and cosmological constant,” Phys. Rev. D **77**, 085015 (2008), arXiv:0711.3170 [gr-qc].
- [7] A. Kostelecký and M. Mewes, “Signals for Lorentz violation in electrodynamics,” Phys. Rev. D **66**, 056005 (2002), arXiv:hep-ph/0205211.
- [8] (a) F.R. Klinkhamer and M. Risse, “Ultrahigh-energy cosmic-ray bounds on nonbirefringent modified-Maxwell theory,” Phys. Rev. D **77**, 016002 (2008), arXiv:0709.2502 [hep-ph]; (b) F.R. Klinkhamer and M. Risse, “Addendum: Ultrahigh-energy cosmic-ray bounds on nonbirefringent modified-Maxwell theory,” Phys. Rev. D **77**, 117901 (2008), arXiv:0709.2502 [hep-ph].
- [9] M.J. Duff and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, “Quantum inequivalence of different field representations,” Phys. Lett. B **94**, 179 (1980).
- [10] A. Aurilia, H. Nicolai, and P.K. Townsend, “Hidden constants: The theta parameter of QCD and the cosmological constant of N=8 supergravity,” Nucl. Phys. B **176**, 509 (1980).
- [11] G.E. Volovik, “Cosmological constant and vacuum energy,” Annalen Phys. (Leipzig) **14**, 165 (2005), arXiv:gr-qc/0405012.
- [12] C. Wetterich, “Cosmology and the fate of dilatation symmetry,” Nucl. Phys. B **302**, 668 (1988).
- [13] B. Ratra and P.J.E. Peebles, “Cosmological consequences of a rolling homogeneous scalar field,” Phys. Rev. D **37**, 3406 (1988).
- [14] G.E. Volovik, “Evolution of cosmological constant in effective gravity,” JETP Lett. **77**, 339 (2003), arXiv:gr-qc/0302069.
- [15] C. Barcelo, “Cosmology as a search for overall equilibrium,” JETP Lett. **84**, 635 (2007), arXiv:gr-qc/0611090.
- [16] L. Amendola, G. Camargo Campos, and R. Rosenfeld, “Consequences of dark matter–dark

- energy interaction on cosmological parameters derived from SNIa data,” *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 083506 (2007), arXiv:astro-ph/0610806.
- [17] R. Penrose, “Singularities and time-asymmetry,” in: *General Relativity: An Einstein Centenary Survey*, edited by S.W. Hawking and W. Israel (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1979), Chap. 12.
- [18] F.R. Klinkhamer, “Fundamental time asymmetry from nontrivial space topology,” *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 047701 (2002), arXiv:gr-qc/0111090.
- [19] A. Vilenkin, “Quantum creation of universes,” *Phys. Rev. D* **30**, 509 (1984); “Boundary conditions in quantum cosmology,” *Phys. Rev. D* **33**, 3560 (1986); “The quantum cosmology debate,” arXiv:gr-qc/9812027.
- [20] D.J. Eisenstein *et al.* [SDSS Collaboration], “Detection of the baryon acoustic peak in the large-scale correlation function of SDSS luminous red galaxies,” *Astrophys. J.* **633**, 560 (2005), arXiv:astro-ph/0501171.
- [21] P. Astier *et al.* [SNLS Collaboration], “The Supernova Legacy Survey: Measurement of  $\Omega_M$ ,  $\Omega_\Lambda$  and  $w$  from the first year data set,” *Astron. Astrophys.* **447**, 31 (2006), arXiv:astro-ph/0510447.
- [22] A.G. Riess *et al.*, “New Hubble Space Telescope discoveries of type Ia supernovae at  $z > 1$ : Narrowing constraints on the early behavior of dark energy,” *Astrophys. J.* **659**, 98 (2007), astro-ph/0611572.
- [23] E. Komatsu *et al.*, “Five-year Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) observations: Cosmological interpretation,” arXiv:0803.0547v1 [astro-ph].
- [24] W.L. Freedman *et al.* [Hubble Space Telescope Collaboration], “Final results from the Hubble Space Telescope Key Project to measure the Hubble constant,” *Astrophys. J.* **553**, 47 (2001), arXiv:astro-ph/0012376.
- [25] V. Sahni and A.A. Starobinsky, “Reconstructing dark energy,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **15**, 2105 (2006), arXiv:astro-ph/0610026.