

Arvind Borde

AST 10: Homework 10b

- I presented a table in class listing different values for the Hubble constant at present, H_0 , and the age of the Universe in billions of years. But, I engaged in a little standard astronomical hanky-panky with the units. In the numbers presented there, the age of the Universe, T , is not simply $1/H_0$. For example, the first line had Hubble's measured value $H_0 = 500$ corresponding to an age of $T = 2$ billion years. But $2 \neq 1/500$. You need to divide H_0 by something to get the units to match up so that $T = 1/H_0$. What division factor do you need?
- Using the "correct" (i.e., consistent) units, here's a table of recent measurements of H_0 . What are the biggest and smallest ages of the Universe that you get from these values?

 H_0 and T (billions of years)

Year	Mission/Instrument	H_0	$T = 1/H_0$
2013	ESA Planck satellite	0.0678	
2012	NASA Explorer 80	0.0693	
2008	Chandra	0.0776	
2005	Hubble	0.0720	

- One of the lines in the Hydrogen spectrum has a wavelength of 4.861×10^{-7} m. The line is observed in the spectrum of a distant galaxy at 4.923×10^{-7} m.
 - What is the change in wavelength, $\Delta\lambda$?
 - What is $\Delta\lambda/\lambda$?
 - Using $\Delta\lambda/\lambda = v/c$ (and the value $c = 3 \times 10^5$ km/sec) what is the velocity, v , of the galaxy?
 - Is the galaxy moving away from us or toward us?
- Let's use Hubble's Law, $V = H_0 R$, as a distance-measuring tool to estimate how far away the galaxy in the previous question is.
 - Using a value of $H = .075$ (in appropriate units – see below), and V from the answer to the previous question, what is R ?
 - The answer in (a) is in kpc (kilo parsecs), where the pc is a unit astronomers like to use. $1 \text{ pc} = 3.26 \text{ ly}$. Convert your answer to ly and express it in millions of light years.
- The left-hand side of the red-shift equation, $\Delta\lambda/\lambda = v/c$, is often denoted by astronomers by the letter z .
 - Objects with $z > 1$ are known. What does that say about the velocity of their recession?
 - It is a basic pillar of the theory of relativity that no physical object can travel faster than c , the speed of light. Is that consistent with part (a)? If not, how do you think this inconsistency might be resolved? (Hint: remember the picture with people riding motorcycles through space as opposed to merely sitting in chairs.)
- We've seen that if the "acceleration" of the scale factor, $a(t)$, is negative everywhere, then the graph of $a(t)$ must be concave down and, therefore, $a(t) = 0$ at some point in the past. If you don't require the acceleration to be negative, sketch a possible graph for $a(t)$ that does not have $a(t) = 0$ anywhere.