

Cosmological models from a dynamical systems perspective

J. Wainwright¹ and W.C. Lim^{1,2}

¹ Department of Applied Mathematics, University of Waterloo,
Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3G1

² Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Dalhousie University,
Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada B3H 3J5

Email: jwainwri@math.uwaterloo.ca, wclim@mathstat.dal.ca

Abstract

It is useful to study the space of all cosmological models from a dynamical systems perspective, that is, by formulating the Einstein field equations as a dynamical system using appropriately normalized variables. We will discuss various aspects of this work, the choices of normalization factor, multiple representations of models, the past attractor, nonlinear dynamics in close-to-Friedmann-Lemaître models, Weyl curvature dominance, and numerical simulations.

1 Introduction

The hot big-bang model of modern cosmology is based on the assumption that the large scale geometry and dynamics of the universe can be described by an exact FLRW model, with more detailed and smaller scale physical phenomena, such as density fluctuations or gravitational waves, being described by perturbed FL models, i.e. by solutions of the EFE linearized about an exact FL model.

We begin with the premise that it is important to study cosmological models more general than perturbed FL models. In particular one is interested in the set \mathcal{M}_{obs} , namely, the set of all universes that are compatible with current observations (Ellis 2004). A member of this set must have an epoch, possibly finite, during which the model is close to FL; at early or later times it may deviate significantly from FL.

More generally we are interested in the set \mathcal{M} of *all* cosmological models, and in the relationship between \mathcal{M} , \mathcal{M}_{obs} and \mathcal{M}_{FL} , the set of all FL models. For example, we want to study the relation between linearly perturbed FL models and models that are close to FL in some well-defined, gauge-invariant sense, and satisfy the exact EFE. Are nonlinear effects perhaps significant in close-to-FL models? Another question that takes one outside the realm of linearly perturbed FL models is the detailed nature of the generic cosmological singularity.

With the preceding discussion as motivation we consider the class \mathcal{M} of all cosmological models, whose state at time t can be represented by a vector \mathbf{X} in a state space \mathcal{S} . The evolution of a model universe is then described by a curve $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}(t)$ in \mathcal{S} , called an orbit, that will be a solution of a system of first order autonomous evolution equations and constraints

of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t \mathbf{X} &= \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{X}, \partial_i \mathbf{X}, \dots), \\ \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{X}, \partial_i \mathbf{X}, \dots) &= 0,\end{aligned}$$

where ∂_i denotes partial differentiation with respect to the spatial coordinates x^i , and \dots denotes possible higher order spatial derivatives. The goal is to choose state variables that remain bounded during the evolution of the model and a time variable t such that $t \rightarrow -\infty$ at the initial singularity and $t \rightarrow +\infty$ at late times.

Within this framework, classes of models with symmetries will be represented by invariant subsets of \mathcal{S} , the most important being the subset \mathcal{S}_{FL} that describes the FL cosmologies. One expects that the orbits of close-to-FL models will shadow orbits in \mathcal{S}_{FL} .

The appropriate mathematical vehicle for implementing the above program is the orthonormal frame formalism¹, since it expresses the EFE directly as first order (in time) autonomous evolution equations. It is also necessary to introduce a process of normalization in order to create bounded variables. A choice that has proven effective is the so-called *Hubble normalization*. This approach to the study of cosmological dynamics has been discussed in some detail in Wainwright & Ellis 1997², and more recently by Coley 2003, with emphasis on spatially homogeneous models. Since then the approach has been extended to models without symmetry by Uggla *et al.* 2003.

The plan of this paper is as follows. In Section 2 we describe the principal features of the Hubble-normalized state space, and in Section 3 we discuss close-to-FL models and the related notion of isotropization. In Section 4 we give an overview of the dynamics of a special class of models in the cosmological hierarchy, the nontilted spatially homogeneous cosmologies. In Section 5 we describe a candidate for the past attractor in the Hubble-normalized state space, and mention some recent numerical simulations which support this proposal. In Section 6 we briefly introduce a modification of Hubble normalization which provides a description of nontilted spatially homogeneous models that undergo recollapse. Section 7 contains our concluding remarks.

2 The Hubble-normalized state space

In this section we give the motivation for introducing Hubble-normalized variables, and describe the principal features of the resulting Hubble-normalized state space and evolution equations.

¹This formalism was introduced in relativistic cosmology by Ellis 1967, among others, and an extended version was given by van Elst & Uggla 1997.

²We shall abbreviate this reference to WE in this paper.

2.1 Hubble-normalized variables

One of the rationals for using dynamical systems methods in cosmology is the hope that one can describe the evolution of cosmological models near the initial singularity by means of a *past attractor* of a cosmological dynamical system, and the dynamics at late times in a particular epoch by means of a *future attractor*.

In order to formulate the Einstein field equations as a dynamical system it is clear that one has to normalize the variables, since near the initial singularity physical variables typically diverge and at late times typically tend to zero. Physical considerations suggest that in a cosmological setting, normalization with the Hubble scalar of the fundamental congruence is an appropriate choice. Firstly, consider the density parameter Ω_m , which plays a fundamental role in cosmology, in that it measures the influence of the matter on the dynamics. In geometrized units, it is defined to be the matter density ρ divided by $3H^2$, where H is the Hubble scalar. Secondly, the extent to which the overall expansion of the universe is close to isotropy is measured by the ratio of the shear (the trace-free part of the expansion tensor) to the Hubble scalar.

The importance of Hubble normalization appears to have first been mentioned in the literature by Kristian & Sachs 1966 (see page 398) in connection with their general analysis of the potential constraints that observations of distant galaxies can place on the geometry of spacetime. The role of Hubble-normalized variables emerges again when one analyzes the potential constraints that arise from observations of the CMB (Maartens *et al.* 1995, 1996). In both analyses one finds that bounds are placed on Hubble-normalized physical and geometrical quantities. Our principal interest, however, lies in using Hubble-normalized variables as dynamical variables, which dates back to Collins 1971, who gave a qualitative analysis of the dynamics of some special classes of cosmological models.

Working within the orthonormal frame formalism we introduce Hubble-normalized variables and write the EFE as first order evolution equations in the Hubble-normalized state space. For simple classes of ever-expanding models, for example open FL models, and spatially homogeneous models of Bianchi type I, the Hubble-normalized state space is bounded. Near the singularity physical variables such as the matter density diverge, but the Hubble scalar also diverges and at such a rate that the corresponding Hubble-normalized quantity, the density parameter $\Omega_m = \frac{\rho}{3H^2}$, remains bounded. In contrast, if H is close to zero, then the other physical variables are equally close to zero, so that the Hubble-normalized quantities are bounded.

For more general models, however, it turns out that this simple picture is not valid – *the Hubble-normalized state space is unbounded*. The primary reason is that the Hubble-normalized Weyl curvature tensor can assume arbitrarily large values. All available evidence, however, suggests that *the Hubble-normalized variables are bounded into the past*, i.e. on approach to the initial singularity. In addition, if there is a positive cosmological constant there is strong evidence that the Hubble-normalized variables are also bounded into the future. Thus, even though the Hubble-normalized state space is unbounded, one expects that the evolution equations will admit a past attractor and a future attractor.

2.2 Asymptotic regimes

When one formulates the EFE as a dynamical system, one uses a time variable t that potentially assumes all real values. The *asymptotic regimes* are then defined by the limits $t \rightarrow -\infty$ and $t \rightarrow +\infty$. Cosmologists model the physical universe as a sequence of epochs in time, an epoch being identified by which source term is dynamically dominant. A typical succession of epochs is

- i) inflationary, dominated by a scalar field φ ,
- ii) radiation-dominated, $p = \frac{1}{3}\rho$,
- iii) matter-dominated, $p = 0$,
- iv) accelerating, dominated by a cosmological constant $\Lambda > 0$.

With each source term is associated a Hubble-normalized energy density,

$$\Omega_\varphi, \Omega_r, \Omega_m, \Omega_\Lambda,$$

and a particular epoch is defined as the time interval during which a particular Ω is dominant.

In analytic work one typically assumes the presence of one or two source terms³ and one investigates the asymptotic regimes, which are described mathematically by the past attractor and future attractor of the dynamical system. Thus, for example, the past asymptotic regime of the radiation-dominated epoch would physically coincide with the end of the inflationary epoch and the future asymptotic regime would coincide with the beginning of the matter-dominated epoch.

2.3 The gravitational and matter variables

A cosmological model is a spacetime with a preferred timelike vector field \mathbf{u} whose metric is a solution of the EFE with appropriate matter/energy content. It is assumed that there is an epoch during which the model is expanding, i.e. the preferred vector field satisfies

$$H := \frac{1}{3}\nabla_a u^a > 0,$$

where H is referred to as the Hubble scalar. We assume furthermore that \mathbf{u} is the normal vector field to a family of spacelike hypersurfaces $t = \text{constant}$, thereby defining a time variable.

We introduce an orthonormal frame $\{\mathbf{e}_a\}$, with $\mathbf{e}_0 = \mathbf{u}$, and choose the spatial frame vectors \mathbf{e}_α to be Fermi-propagated. Within this framework, the gravitational field variables are the commutation functions γ^c_{ab} associated with the frame, defined by

$$[\mathbf{e}_a, \mathbf{e}_b] = \gamma^c_{ab} \mathbf{e}_c.$$

³A cosmological constant can be incorporated with little increase in complexity in the evolution equations.

They may conveniently be expressed in terms of geometric quantities

$$\{H, \sigma_{\alpha\beta}, \dot{u}_\alpha, a_\alpha, n_{\alpha\beta}\}, \quad (1)$$

according to

$$\gamma^\alpha{}_{0\beta} = -\sigma_\beta{}^\alpha - H\delta_\beta{}^\alpha, \quad \gamma^0{}_{0\alpha} = \dot{u}_\alpha, \quad \gamma^\mu{}_{\alpha\beta} = \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\nu} n^{\mu\nu} + a_\alpha \delta_\beta{}^\mu - a_\beta \delta_\alpha{}^\mu,$$

(see for example WE, page 32). Here \dot{u}_α is the acceleration and $\sigma_{\alpha\beta}$ is the shear of the congruence \mathbf{u} , while a_α and $n_{\alpha\beta}$ determine the curvature of the spacelike hypersurfaces (WE, pages 18, 19, 34).

As regards matter/energy content we consider a cosmological constant Λ and a perfect fluid with 4-velocity vector field $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ and linear barotropic equation of state $\tilde{p} = (\gamma - 1)\tilde{\rho}$, with $1 \leq \gamma \leq 2$. In the orthonormal frame formalism the perfect fluid is described by its energy density ρ relative to \mathbf{e}_0 and its velocity v^α relative to \mathbf{e}_0 , i.e. the projection of $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ orthogonal to \mathbf{e}_0 (see Uggla *et al.* 2003, equations (2.1)–(2.6) for details). So the gravitational variables (1) are augmented by the matter variables

$$\{\rho, v_\alpha, \Lambda\}. \quad (2)$$

The velocity v^α is dimensionless and satisfies

$$0 \leq v_\alpha v^\alpha < 1.$$

We now introduce Hubble-normalized variables⁴ and differential operators according to

$$\{\Sigma_{\alpha\beta}, \dot{U}_\alpha, A_\alpha, N_{\alpha\beta}\} := \{\sigma_{\alpha\beta}, \dot{u}_\alpha, a_\alpha, n_{\alpha\beta}\}/H, \quad \{\Omega_m, \Omega_\Lambda\} := \{\rho, \Lambda\}/(3H^2), \quad (3)$$

$$\partial_0 = \frac{1}{H}\mathbf{e}_0, \quad \partial_\alpha = \frac{1}{H}\mathbf{e}_\alpha.$$

It is also necessary to introduce the derivatives of the normalization factor, namely the *deceleration parameter* q and the *spatial Hubble gradient* r_α , defined by

$$q + 1 := -\frac{1}{H}\partial_0 H, \quad r_\alpha := -\frac{1}{H}\partial_\alpha H. \quad (4)$$

At this stage we introduce the separable volume gauge (Uggla *et al.* 2003), which is characterized by

$$\dot{U}_\alpha = r_\alpha$$

and the existence of local coordinates t, x^i such that

$$\partial_0 = \partial_t, \quad \partial_\alpha = E_\alpha{}^i \partial_i,$$

⁴Hubble-normalized variables have also been defined for cosmological models with source terms other than a perfect fluid with linear equation of state and a cosmological constant, e.g. magnetic fields (LeBlanc 1998), scalar fields (Coley & van den Hoogen 2000) and brane matter fields (Coley *et al.* 2004).

with the preferred hypersurfaces being given by $t = \text{constant}$. Here ∂_t and ∂_i denote partial differentiation with respect to t and x^i . The deceleration parameter q can then be expressed in terms of the variables in (3) and the differential operator $\boldsymbol{\partial}_\alpha$, using the Raychaudhuri equation.

With the above choices of gauge the Hubble-normalized state vector becomes

$$\mathbf{X} = (E_\alpha^i, r_\alpha, \Sigma_{\alpha\beta}, A_\alpha, N_{\alpha\beta}, \Omega_m, \Omega_\Lambda, v_\alpha)^T.$$

The EFE, the Jacobi identities and the commutators lead to a system of evolution equations and a system of constraints for the components of \mathbf{X} . In order to describe the structure of these equations, it is convenient to decompose the state vector \mathbf{X} as follows:

$$\mathbf{X} = (E_\alpha^i, r_\alpha)^T \oplus \mathbf{Y}, \quad (5)$$

where

$$\mathbf{Y} = (\Sigma_{\alpha\beta}, A_\alpha, N_{\alpha\beta}, \Omega_m, \Omega_\Lambda, v_\alpha)^T. \quad (6)$$

The evolution equations have the following form:

$$\partial_t E_\alpha^i = (q \delta_\alpha^\beta - \Sigma_\alpha^\beta) E_\beta^i \quad (7)$$

$$\partial_t r_\alpha = (q \delta_\alpha^\beta - \Sigma_\alpha^\beta) r_\beta + E_\alpha^i \partial_i q \quad (8)$$

$$\partial_t Y_A = F_A(\mathbf{Y}) + F_A^{B\alpha}(\mathbf{Y}) E_\alpha^i \partial_i Y_B + F_A^{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{Y}) E_\alpha^i \partial_i r_\beta + F_A^\alpha(\mathbf{Y}) r_\alpha, \quad (9)$$

where the deceleration parameter q is given by

$$q = 2\Sigma^2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{[(3\gamma - 2) + (2 - \gamma)v^2]}{1 + (\gamma - 1)v^2} \Omega_m - \Omega_\Lambda - \frac{1}{3} (E_\alpha^i \partial_i - 2A_\alpha) r^\alpha. \quad (10)$$

There is also a set of constraints that can be written symbolically as

$$0 = \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{X}, \partial_i \mathbf{X}). \quad (11)$$

One of the constraints, the so-called Gauss constraint, is of particular importance, and we thus give it specifically⁵:

$$\Omega_m + \Omega_\Lambda + \Omega_k + \Sigma^2 = 1, \quad (12)$$

where Σ^2 is the Hubble-normalized shear scalar given by

$$\Sigma^2 = \frac{1}{6} \Sigma_{\alpha\beta} \Sigma^{\alpha\beta}, \quad (13)$$

and Ω_k is the Hubble-normalized spatial curvature⁶ of the hypersurfaces $t = \text{constant}$, given

⁵Lim *et al.* 2004, equation (2.27).

⁶ Ω_k is defined by $\Omega_k = -\frac{{}^3R}{6H^2}$, where 3R is the curvature scalar of the metric induced on the hypersurfaces $t = \text{constant}$.

by

$$\Omega_k = -\frac{2}{3}(\boldsymbol{\partial}_\alpha - r_\alpha)A^\alpha + \frac{1}{6}N_{\alpha\beta}N^{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{12}(N_\alpha^\alpha)^2 + A_\alpha A^\alpha. \quad (14)$$

The detailed form of equations (7)–(11) is given in Lim *et al.* 2004 (equations (2.18)–(2.30) with $R^\alpha = 0$). What concerns us here is the overall structure of this system. We make a number of observations.

- i) The equations are first order evolution equations in time, but do contain second order spatial derivatives, namely the second derivatives of the spatial Hubble gradient $\partial_i\partial_j r_\alpha$. These derivatives appear in (8), on account of (10). In this respect, the equations are reminiscent of a system of quasi-linear diffusion equations. We shall discuss this matter further in Section 5.
- ii) The frame variables E_α^i enter into the remaining equations only through the spatial differential operator $\boldsymbol{\partial}_\alpha$. Recalling that r_α is the spatial Hubble gradient we thus regard the variables E_α^i and r_α as controlling the spatial inhomogeneity in the cosmological model, while the variables in \mathbf{Y} directly determine the spacetime geometry (i.e. the gravitational field) and the matter content.

2.4 The cosmological hierarchy

We consider three classes of ever-expanding cosmological models, namely, Friedmann-Lemaître (FL) models, spatially homogeneous (SH) models and general models, i.e. models without symmetry. The SH models admit a three-parameter local group G_3 of isometries acting on spacelike hypersurfaces, while in the FL models the isometry group is a G_6 . For brevity we shall refer to the models without symmetry as G_0 cosmologies. So we have the following cosmological hierarchy:

$$\text{FL} \subset \text{SH} \subset G_0.$$

We will use \mathcal{S} to denote the corresponding Hubble-normalized state spaces:

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{FL}} \subset \mathcal{S}_{\text{SH}} \subset \mathcal{S}_{G_0}.$$

One can construct a more detailed hierarchy by including models with two or one spacelike Killing vectors. Classes of models with two Killing vectors are variously referred to⁷ as Gowdy⁸, T_2 -symmetric or G_2 cosmologies. Models with one Killing vector are referred to as $U(1)$ -symmetric⁹ or G_1 cosmologies.

⁷See Ugglá *et al.* 2003, Table 3, for selected references.

⁸See Andersson *et al.* 2004 for a detailed analysis of Gowdy models using Hubble-normalized variables.

⁹See Berger 2004 for a discussion of Mixmaster dynamics in these models.

SH cosmologies

The SH cosmologies are obtained by requiring that the spatial frame derivatives of the gravitational field and matter variables \mathbf{Y} , and of the normalization factor H be zero, i.e.

$$\partial_\alpha \mathbf{Y} = 0, \quad r_\alpha = 0. \quad (15)$$

It then follows that all the dimensional commutation functions and matter variables are constant on the hypersurface $t = \text{constant}$, which are thus the orbits of a three-parameter group G_3 of isometries. The evolution equations (8) and (9) imply that the SH restrictions (15) define an invariant set of the full evolution equations, which we shall call the *SH invariant set*. Indeed, equation (8) is trivially satisfied, and equation (9) reduces to a system of ordinary differential equations, namely

$$\partial_t Y_A = F_A(\mathbf{Y}). \quad (16)$$

The nontrivial constraints become purely algebraic restrictions on \mathbf{Y} , which we write symbolically as

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{Y}) = 0. \quad (17)$$

An important consequence of this specialization is that the evolution equation (7) for E_α^i decouples from the evolution equation for \mathbf{Y} , which means that *the dynamics of SH cosmologies can be analyzed using only equations (16) and (17)*. In this context, one can think of the variable \mathbf{Y} in equation (6) as defining a *reduced Hubble-normalized state space*, of finite dimension, for the SH cosmologies. The Bianchi classification of the isometry group then leads to a hierarchy of invariant subsets.

In the SH context the restriction¹⁰ $v^\alpha = 0$ defines an invariant subset, giving the so-called *nontilted SH cosmologies*. This class of models have been analyzed in detail in the literature. We give an overview of the known results in Section 4. We note in passing that tilted SH cosmologies (i.e. $v^\alpha \neq 0$) were first studied by King & Ellis 1973. Considerable progress has been made recently, using Hubble-normalized variables (see Hewitt *et al.* 2001, Hervik 2004, Coley & Hervik 2004).

FL cosmologies

The FL cosmologies are obtained by imposing the restrictions

$$\Sigma_{\alpha\beta} = 0, \quad v_\alpha = 0, \quad r_\alpha = 0,$$

¹⁰This restriction means that the fluid 4-velocity is orthogonal to the orbits of the group of isometries (Ellis & MacCallum 1969).

which is equivalent to requiring that the fluid has zero shear, vorticity and acceleration¹¹. It follows that the density parameters are constant on the hypersurface $t = \text{constant}$ ¹²:

$$\partial_\alpha \Omega_m = 0, \quad \partial_\alpha \Omega_\Lambda = 0.$$

In addition¹³ the Weyl curvature is zero,

$$\mathcal{E}_{\alpha\beta} = 0 = \mathcal{H}_{\alpha\beta},$$

and the 3-Ricci curvature satisfies

$$\mathcal{S}_{\alpha\beta} = 0, \quad \partial_\alpha \Omega_k = 0. \quad (18)$$

The dynamics of the FL models is governed by the matter evolution equations which simplify to a system of two ODEs,

$$\partial_t \Omega_m = [2q - (3\gamma - 2)]\Omega_m \quad (19)$$

$$\partial_t \Omega_\Lambda = 2(q + 1)\Omega_\Lambda, \quad (20)$$

with

$$q = \frac{1}{2}(3\gamma - 2)\Omega_m - \Omega_\Lambda. \quad (21)$$

The Gauss constraint (12) simplifies to

$$\Omega_m + \Omega_k + \Omega_\Lambda = 1, \quad (22)$$

where all three quantities are functions of time only. For future reference we note that the curvature parameter Ω_k satisfies the evolution equation

$$\partial_t \Omega_k = 2q\Omega_k, \quad (23)$$

as follows from (19), (20) and (22).

The remaining evolution equations simplify to

$$\partial_t E_\alpha^i = qE_\alpha^i, \quad \partial_t A_\alpha = qA_\alpha, \quad \partial_t N_{\alpha\beta} = qN_{\alpha\beta},$$

and hence decouple from (19) and (20). These variables reflect the choice of spatial frame, and do not affect the essential dynamics. Since $q = q(t)$, these equations can be integrated to yield

$$E_\alpha^i = f(t)\hat{E}_\alpha^i, \quad A_\alpha = f(t)\hat{A}_\alpha, \quad N_{\alpha\beta} = f(t)\hat{N}_{\alpha\beta},$$

where hatted variables depend only on the spatial coordinates x^i , and $f'(t) = qf(t)$. These quantities are restricted by equation (18). Models with negative, zero and positive spatial

¹¹Refer to WE, Section 2.4 for the characterizations of FL.

¹²The first follows from the evolution equation for v_α and the second from the definition of Ω_Λ and r_α .

¹³See Ugla *et al.* 2003, equations (A10), (A11), (A14) and (A15).

curvature are characterized respectively by

$$\Omega_k > 0, \quad \Omega_k = 0, \quad \Omega_k < 0,$$

and in the corresponding canonical spatial frames we have

$$\begin{aligned} N_{\alpha\beta} &= 0, & A_\alpha &= (A, 0, 0), & \Omega_k &= A^2, \\ N_{\alpha\beta} &= 0, & A_\alpha &= 0, & \Omega_k &= 0, \\ N_{\alpha\beta} &= \text{diag}(N, N, N), & A_\alpha &= 0, & \Omega_k &= -\frac{1}{4}N^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the FL cosmologies with perfect fluid and cosmological constant are described by a reduced Hubble-normalized state space, namely the two-dimensional space with the state vector $(\Omega_m, \Omega_\Lambda)$, and evolution equations (19)–(21). It follows from (22) that for models with negative and zero spatial curvature ($\Omega_k \geq 0$), the state space is bounded. This state space is shown in Figure 1 in Section 3, using Ω_k and Ω_Λ as variables.

2.5 Cosmological equilibrium points

In the analysis of the dynamics of SH models using the reduced Hubble-normalized state space \mathcal{S}_{SH} , the equilibrium points (i.e. fixed points) of the dynamical system, defined by

$$\partial_t \mathbf{Y} = 0,$$

naturally play a significant role. At this stage the Kasner vacuum solutions come into play, given in Hubble-normalized variables by

$$N_{\alpha\beta} = 0, \quad A_\alpha = 0, \quad \Sigma^2 = 1, \quad \Omega_m = 0, \quad \Omega_\Lambda = 0, \quad q = 2, \quad (24)$$

with

$$\partial_t \Sigma_{\alpha\beta} = 0.$$

These equilibrium points¹⁴ form a 4-sphere (recall the definition (13), and that $\Sigma_{\alpha\beta}$ is trace-free), which we shall call the *Kasner sphere* \mathcal{K} . If $\Sigma_{\alpha\beta}$ is diagonal, then \mathcal{K} reduces to a circle.

Two other important equilibrium points lie in the FL invariant set and satisfy

$$N_{\alpha\beta} = 0, \quad A_\alpha = 0, \quad \Sigma_{\alpha\beta} = 0, \quad v_\alpha = 0,$$

¹⁴The fact that the Kasner invariant set, defined by (24), consists only of equilibrium points is a consequence of the fact that we are using a Fermi-propagated spatial frame. See Uggla *et al.* 2003, page 7, for a different spatial gauge choice, which leads to a circle of equilibrium points, and “frame transition orbits”.

and one of the following sets of conditions: ¹⁵

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{flat FL} & \Omega_m = 1, \quad \Omega_\Lambda = 0, \quad q = \frac{1}{2}(3\gamma - 2) \end{array} \quad (25)$$

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{de Sitter} & \Omega_m = 0, \quad \Omega_\Lambda = 1, \quad q = -1. \end{array} \quad (26)$$

The local stability of the flat FL and de Sitter equilibrium points is of importance in connection with the phenomenon of isotropization, as discussed in Section 3.2. In the following tables we give the dimensions of the stable and unstable manifolds of these equilibrium points, for both nontilted and tilted SH models.

Table 1: Stability of the flat FL and de Sitter equilibrium points in the state space for nontilted SH models (six dimensional)

Equilibrium point	dimension of the stable manifold	dimension of the unstable manifold
flat FL	2	4
de Sitter	6	0

Table 2: Stability of the flat FL and de Sitter equilibrium points in the state space for tilted SH models (nine dimensional)

Equilibrium point	dimension of the stable manifold	dimension of the unstable manifold
flat FL	5	4
de Sitter, $0 < \gamma < \frac{4}{3}$	9	0
de Sitter, $\frac{4}{3} < \gamma < 2$	6	3

The SH equilibrium points, with the exception of de Sitter, represent self-similar solutions of the EFE, admitting a four-parameter group H_4 of similarities. We refer to WE, Section 9.1, for a complete list of these self-similar solutions within the class of nontilted SH models.

2.6 The silent boundary

On account of (7) and (8), the conditions

$$E_\alpha^i = 0, \quad r_\alpha = 0 \quad (27)$$

¹⁵The de Sitter solution has other representations that involve the peculiar velocity v_α . See Table 3.

define an invariant set, the so-called *silent boundary*¹⁶, that forms part of the boundary of the Hubble-normalized state space. Solutions of the evolution equations in this invariant set do not correspond to solutions of the EFE, however, since the frame variables have to satisfy $\det(E_{\alpha}{}^i) \neq 0$. Nevertheless, it appears that this invariant set plays a fundamental role in describing the asymptotic behaviour of cosmological models. Indeed current investigations suggest that the past attractor and the future attractor for G_0 cosmologies are subsets of the above invariant set (subject to $\Lambda > 0$ in the case of the future attractor). We will discuss this matter further in Sections 3 and 5. The condition $E_{\alpha}{}^i = 0$ in the definition of the silent boundary implies that $\partial_{\alpha}\mathbf{Y} = 0$. It thus follows that the evolution equations and constraints, when specialized to the silent boundary, are precisely the SH evolution equations and constraints, as given by (16) and (17). In addition each self-similar H_4 solution determines an equilibrium point in the silent boundary.

3 Close-to-FL models and isotropization

3.1 Close-to-FL models

It is customary to regard a cosmological model as being “close to FL” if its metric is a linear perturbation of an FL metric (e.g. Bardeen 1980), i.e. the dynamics of such models are governed by the *linearized* EFE.¹⁷ An alternative approach is to regard a cosmological model as being “close to FL” if an appropriate set of Hubble-normalized anisotropy parameters are small.¹⁸ For simplicity we will restrict our attention to two parameters. Firstly we consider the shear parameter Σ , defined by (13), which describes the anisotropy in the rate of expansion of the fundamental congruence. Secondly we consider the Weyl parameter \mathcal{W} defined by

$$\mathcal{W}^2 = \frac{1}{6H^4}(E_{\alpha\beta}E^{\alpha\beta} + H_{\alpha\beta}H^{\alpha\beta}),$$

where $E_{\alpha\beta}$ and $H_{\alpha\beta}$ are the electric and magnetic parts of the Weyl curvature tensor relative to the fundamental congruence. The Weyl parameter can be thought of as quantifying the intrinsic anisotropy of the gravitational field.

As described in Section 2.4, the FL cosmologies with negative or zero spatial curvature and positive cosmological constant have a two-dimensional Hubble-normalized state space. Using Ω_k and Ω_{Λ} as independent variables, the state space is shown in Figure 1. The equilibrium points represent the flat FL model (F), de Sitter model (dS), and the Milne model (M). One sees that F is the past attractor and dS is the future attractor. The Milne

¹⁶This notion was first introduced in van Elst *et al.* 2002 and Ugla *et al.* 2003. See Andersson *et al.* 2004 for further discussion.

¹⁷For a fully covariant approach to scalar perturbation of FL, which physically describe density fluctuations, we refer to Ellis & Bruni 1989, and Ellis *et al.* 1989.

¹⁸See WE pages 63-4, for a tentative definition of “close-to-FL”. Kristian & Sachs 1966 give a list of parameters, called “adjustable parameters” in their Table 1 (page 393) and referred to as “anisotropy and inhomogeneity parameters” on page 398.

point M is a saddle, which means that a subset of open FL models with $\Lambda > 0$ will have a “close-to-Milne” epoch of finite duration.




Figure 1: The Hubble-normalized state space for flat and open FL cosmologies with $\Lambda > 0$ and equation of state $p = (\gamma - 1)\rho$, $\frac{2}{3} < \gamma < 2$.

When one regards the FL models as a subset of the SH models, a complication arises: a specific FL model is represented by infinitely many orbits in the reduced Hubble-normalized SH state space. This multiple representation occurs because a flat FL model admits a G_3 of Bianchi type I and one of Bianchi type VII₀, while an open FL model admits a G_3 of Bianchi type V and one of Bianchi type VII_h, for any $h > 0$ (see Ellis & MacCallum 1969). The state space can be described by the variables

$$(\Omega_\Lambda, \Omega_k, N),$$

where

$$\Omega_k = A^2 = hN^2.$$

Here h is the group parameter and A and N are spatial curvature variables defined by

$$N_{\alpha\beta} = \text{diag}(0, N, N), \quad A_\alpha = (A, 0, 0).$$

The state space, which we will denote by \mathcal{S}_{FL} , is shown in Figure 2.

We see that the state space is the union of a one-parameter family of “leaves”, and that the Milne model is represented by a line of equilibrium points M_h , one in each leaf. The family of orbits in one leaf with $h > 0$ are physically equivalent to those in another. The orbits in the leaf with $h = 0$, and hence $\Omega_k = 0$, are multiple representations of flat FL models with $\Omega_\Lambda = 0$ or $\Omega_\Lambda > 0$. In particular, the orbit with $\Omega_\Lambda = 0$, $\Omega_k = 0$ is an unbounded orbit that describes the flat FL model, and the orbit with $\Omega_k = 0$, $\Omega_m = 0$ is an unbounded orbit that describes the de Sitter model. The state space $\Omega_k = 0$ is shown in Figure 3.




Figure 2: The Hubble-normalized state space for flat and open FL cosmologies with $\Lambda > 0$ and equation of state $p = (\gamma - 1)\rho$, $\frac{2}{3} < \gamma < 2$, showing multiple representations.

The FL state space \mathcal{S}_{FL} is an invariant subset of the SH state space \mathcal{S}_{SH} , defined by the requirement that the shear of the congruence normal to the G_3 orbits is zero. It is natural to regard an SH model as being close to FL during some epoch if its orbit lies in a sufficiently small neighbourhood of the FL state space \mathcal{S}_{FL} . The Hubble-normalized Weyl tensor is unbounded in such a neighbourhood, however, with the result that close-to-FL models can have large Hubble-normalized Weyl curvature. In particular there are models with $\Omega_m \approx 1$, $\Sigma \approx 0$ and \mathcal{W} large (close to flat FL) and models with $\Omega_\Lambda \approx 1$, $\Sigma \approx 0$ and \mathcal{W} large (close to de Sitter), during some epoch.

It is also of interest to consider the connection with perturbed FL models. Are orbits in a neighbourhood of \mathcal{S}_{FL} described accurately by solutions of the linearized EFE, or do nonlinear effects come into play? Consideration of SH cosmologies of Bianchi type VII₀ shows that the latter occurs. Linearizing the Hubble-normalized evolution equations about the FL invariant set $\Omega_\Lambda = 0$ and $\Omega_k = 0$ gives

$$\mathcal{W} \approx C e^{3(\gamma-1)\tau}, \quad \text{for } \frac{2}{3} < \gamma < 2,$$

while an analysis of the exact equations for large τ gives

$$\mathcal{W} \approx \begin{cases} C e^{3(\gamma-1)\tau}, & \text{for } \frac{2}{3} < \gamma < \frac{4}{3} \\ C \tau^{-\frac{3}{2}} e^\tau, & \text{for } \gamma = \frac{4}{3} \\ C e^{\frac{3}{2}(2-\gamma)\tau}, & \text{for } \frac{4}{3} < \gamma < 2, \end{cases}$$




Figure 3: The state space $\Omega_k = 0$, showing multiple representations of the flat FL models.

(Wainwright *et al.* 1999). Thus for this class of models, linearization does not give the correct dynamics.

It would be of interest to extend this analysis to G_0 cosmologies, i.e. consider \mathcal{S}_{FL} as an invariant set of the state space of G_0 cosmologies and analyze the dynamics of close-to-FL cosmologies in this context. It would be necessary to determine all representations of the FL models within the G_0 state space, which would give an invariant set larger than \mathcal{S}_{FL} .

3.2 Isotropization

The term “isotropization” is used in three different contexts in cosmology:

- i) asymptotic isotropization into the future,
- ii) isotropic initial singularity,
- iii) intermediate isotropization.

We discuss these dynamic phenomena in turn.

Asymptotic isotropization into the future

A well known result of Wald 1983 states that any SH cosmology with zero or negative spatial curvature (i.e. $\Omega_k \geq 0$) approaches the de Sitter solution in the sense that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \Sigma = 0, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \Omega_\Lambda = 1.$$

Wald proved this result without making specific assumptions about the matter/energy distribution. More detailed analyses of SH cosmologies with a tilted perfect fluid (Goliath &

Ellis 1999) revealed that a bifurcation occurs at $\gamma = \frac{4}{3}$: if $\gamma \geq \frac{4}{3}$ the peculiar velocity v^α of the fluid does not tend to zero. Specifically, $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} v_\alpha = c_\alpha$, where $c_\alpha c^\alpha \leq 1$ if $\gamma = \frac{4}{3}$ and $c_\alpha c^\alpha = 1$ if $\frac{4}{3} < \gamma < 2$. This behaviour occurs for the following reason. For the de Sitter solution the reduced state vector \mathbf{Y} in (6) is given by

$$N_{\alpha\beta} = 0, \quad A_\alpha = 0, \quad \Sigma_{\alpha\beta} = 0, \quad \Omega_m = 0, \quad \Omega_\Lambda = 1, \quad (28)$$

with v_α subject to the evolution equation

$$\partial_t v_\alpha = \frac{(3\gamma - 4)(1 - v^2)}{1 + (\gamma - 1)v^2} v_\alpha.$$

In the reduced Hubble-normalized state space the de Sitter solution is thus represented by a set of equilibrium points, given by (28) and with v_α subject to $v_\alpha = 0$, or $v^2 = 1$ (a point and a sphere) if $\gamma \neq \frac{4}{3}$, and subject to $v^2 \leq 1$ (a solid sphere) if $\gamma = \frac{4}{3}$. The limiting behaviour of v^α determines the future attractor in the reduced Hubble-normalized state space, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3: The future attractor for SH cosmologies with $\Lambda > 0$ and equation of state $p = (\gamma - 1)\rho$.

Equation of state	Future attractor
$0 < \gamma < \frac{4}{3}$	de Sitter with zero tilt ($v_\alpha = 0$)
$\gamma = \frac{4}{3}$	de Sitter with intermediate tilt ($0 \leq v_\alpha v^\alpha \leq 1$)
$\frac{4}{3} < \gamma < 2$	de Sitter with extreme tilt ($v_\alpha v^\alpha = 1$)

The future attractor for SH cosmologies with $\Lambda > 0$ forms the basis for the description of G_0 cosmologies that are future asymptotic to the de Sitter solution, as we now explain. The frame variables E_α^i satisfy equation (7), which, when specialized to the de Sitter equilibrium solution (28) can be solved to give

$$E_\alpha^i = \hat{E}_\alpha^i e^{-t},$$

where the \hat{E}_α^i are constants. It follows that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} E_\alpha^i = 0. \quad (29)$$

In addition the constraints imply that the spatial Hubble gradient is zero ($r_\alpha = 0$). Thus in the Hubble-normalized G_0 state space, the de Sitter solution is described by orbits that are future asymptotic to a de Sitter equilibrium point on the silent boundary.

G_0 cosmologies that are future asymptotic to the de Sitter solution are described within the Hubble-normalized state space as follows. Along a fixed timeline, the evolution is described by an orbit that is future asymptotic to a de Sitter equilibrium point on the silent boundary. The specific equilibrium point will depend on the equation of state parameter γ according to Table 3. The idea is that the evolution is described by an orbit that is attracted to the silent boundary, i.e. (29) holds, and within the silent boundary, the evolution is governed by the SH evolution equations, as described in Section 2.6. The asymptotic dependence of the Hubble-normalized variables for this class of models has been determined by systematically integrating the evolution equations (Lim *et al.* 2004). The fact that the orbit is asymptotic to the silent boundary means that the spatial dependence is asymptotically unrestricted, which manifests itself in the appearance of an arbitrary 3-metric in the asymptotic expansion of the spacetime metric (Lim *et al.* 2004).

The issue of how large is the class of G_0 cosmologies that are future asymptotic to de Sitter has not been completely resolved. For recent progress we refer to Rendall 2003.

Isotropic singularities

The second type of asymptotic isotropization, namely isotropization at the initial singularity, arises in connection with the notion of *quiescent cosmology* (cf., e.g., Barrow 1978), which provides an alternative to cosmic inflation. The idea is that, due to entropy considerations on a cosmological scale, a suitable initial condition for the universe is that the Weyl curvature should be zero (or at least dynamically unimportant) at the initial singularity; this is the *Weyl curvature hypothesis*, proposed by Penrose 1979 (see page 630). This hypothesis leads to the notion of an *isotropic initial singularity*. Recently, Khalatnikov *et al.* 2003 (see page 3) have suggested that a solution with an isotropic singularity could represent an *intermediate* asymptotic regime during expansion of the universe after inflation. Cosmological initial singularities of this type first arose as a special case in the general analysis of initial singularities performed by Lifshitz & Khalatnikov 1963 (see page 203). This type of initial singularity was also encountered in the work of Eardley *et al.* 1972 (see page 101). Subsequently, Goode & Wainwright 1985 gave a formal definition of an isotropic initial singularity, using a conformally related metric, and derived various properties. Heuristically, the model approaches the flat FL model near the singularity:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \Sigma = 0, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \Omega_m = 1.$$

For SH models, the occurrence of an isotropic singularity is characterized by the orbit in the reduced Hubble-normalized state space being past asymptotic to the flat FL equilibrium point F. In other words, the orbit of a SH model with an isotropic singularity lies in the unstable manifold of the flat FL equilibrium point, which confirms that isotropic singularities occur only for a set of initial conditions of measure zero.

The above behaviour forms the basis for the description of G_0 cosmologies that admit an isotropic singularity, as we now explain. The frame variables E_α^i satisfy equation (7),

which, when specialized to the flat FL equilibrium point can be solved to give

$$E_\alpha^i = \hat{E}_\alpha^i e^{\frac{1}{2}(3\gamma-2)t},$$

where the \hat{E}_α^i are constants. It follows that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} E_\alpha^i = 0,$$

assuming $\frac{2}{3} < \gamma < 2$. In addition, the constraints imply that the spatial Hubble gradient is zero ($r_\alpha = 0$). Thus in the Hubble-normalized G_0 state space, the flat FL model is described by an orbit that is past asymptotic to an equilibrium point on the silent boundary.

G_0 cosmologies that have an isotropic singularity are described as follows. Along a fixed timeline, the evolution is described by an orbit that is past asymptotic to the flat FL equilibrium point on the silent boundary. The asymptotic time dependence for this class of models has been determined by systematically integrating the evolution equations (Lim *et al.* 2004). The fact that the orbit is past asymptotic to the silent boundary means that the spatial dependence is asymptotically unrestricted, which manifests itself in the appearance of an arbitrary 3-metric in the asymptotic expansion of the spacetime metric (see Lim *et al.* 2004).

Intermediate isotropization

The flat FL equilibrium point F, given by (25), is a saddle point in the reduced Hubble-normalized state space for SH cosmologies. Thus, for any $\epsilon > 0$ there is a family of orbits, corresponding to an open set of initial conditions, that pass through an ϵ -neighbourhood of F but are not asymptotic to F. For the corresponding cosmological models there will be a finite time interval during which the rate of expansion of the model is highly isotropic (i.e. $\Sigma \ll 1$) and hence compatible with observational constraints. This behaviour is called *intermediate isotropization*, and occurs in models of all Bianchi types except Bianchi type I, in which case F is a sink.¹⁹

At this stage, intermediate isotropization for G_0 cosmologies has yet to be investigated in detail.

4 The dynamics of nontilted SH cosmologies

The largest class of cosmologies for which there is a comprehensive and quite detailed knowledge of the dynamics, is the class of nontilted SH cosmologies with $\Lambda \geq 0$ and equation of state $p = (\gamma - 1)\rho$, with $\frac{2}{3} < \gamma < 2$. The reduced Hubble-normalized state space \mathcal{S}_{SH} is an unbounded subset of \mathbb{R}^6 . This class of cosmologies has two subsets referred to as class A and class B in the classification of Ellis & MacCallum 1969. We focus on the class A models, since they display a wider range of dynamical phenomena, while at the same time

¹⁹Bianchi type I cosmologies undergo asymptotic isotropization as $t \rightarrow +\infty$.

permitting a simpler choice of frame. In describing the dynamics of this class of cosmologies, it is helpful to make use of the hierarchy of invariant subsets of lower dimension that arise from specializing the matter/energy content and the Bianchi type²⁰. We list these invariant subsets in Table 4.

Table 4: Dimension of invariant subsets

Invariant subset	dimension
zero cosmological constant $\Omega_\Lambda = 0$	5
vacuum $\Omega_m = 0$	5
Bianchi VI ₀ and VII ₀	5
Bianchi II	4
Bianchi I	3

We will discuss various dynamical phenomena, indicating how likely it is that each will occur. We say that a dynamical behaviour is

- i) *generic*, if it occurs for all initial conditions except for a set of measure zero²¹,
- ii) *typical*, if it occurs for a set of initial conditions of positive measure, whose complement is also of positive measure.
- iii) *special*, if it occurs for a set of initial conditions of measure zero.

One can say that generic behaviour has probability one, typical behavior has probability between zero and one, and special behaviour has probability zero.

We now list the various dynamical phenomena in Table 5 and discuss each in turn.

Table 5: Dynamical phenomena in nontilted SH cosmologies with $\Lambda > 0$ and equation of state $p = (\gamma - 1)\rho$, $\frac{2}{3} < \gamma < 2$.

Dynamical behaviour	probability
oscillatory singularity/Mixmaster dynamics	generic
inflationary isotropization/future asymptotic to de Sitter	generic
Weyl curvature domination	typical
intermediate isotropization	typical
isotropic singularity	special

²⁰The Bianchi types that occur in class A are I, II, VI₀, VII₀, VIII and IX, with the last two being of maximum generality. We exclude Bianchi IX because models of this type can recollapse.

²¹One can equivalently say “for all orbits in the reduced Hubble-normalized state space except for a set of measure zero”.

4.1 Oscillatory singularity/Mixmaster dynamics

Within \mathcal{S}_{SH} , the Mixmaster dynamics is described by a past attractor, which is the union of the Kasner circle of equilibrium points and the vacuum Bianchi II orbits, first described by Ma & Wainwright 1992²². The attractor contains infinite heteroclinic sequences, i.e. infinite sequences of Kasner points joined by vacuum Bianchi II orbits. A generic orbit that is asymptotic to the attractor shadows one of these heteroclinic sequences. The evolution of the corresponding cosmological model towards the initial singularity is thus a non-terminating sequence of quasi-equilibrium Kasner states, punctuated by increasingly brief curvature transitions. The early work on the attractor was based solely on heuristic local stability arguments and numerical simulations. Recently, however, Ringström 2001 proved²³ the existence of the past attractor, using the Hubble-normalized evolution equations. This result may have wider significance in view of the conjectures about the local past attractor for G_0 cosmologies that have recently been made (Uggla *et al.* 2003 and Section 5).

As indicated in Table 5, Mixmaster dynamics are generic. Examples of special behaviour are provided by models which are past asymptotic to a specific Kasner solution and by models with an isotropic singularity.

4.2 Inflationary isotropization

Within \mathcal{S}_{SH} , inflationary isotropization is simply described by the fact that the de Sitter equilibrium point (26), which describes the de Sitter solution, is a global sink²⁴, and hence forms the future attractor in the state space. This behaviour is generic, and special behaviour is restricted to the invariant set $\Omega_\Lambda = 0$. The dimensionless scalars satisfy

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} (\Sigma, \mathcal{W}, \Omega_m) = 0, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \Omega_\Lambda = 1.$$

The asymptotic time dependence can be obtained from Lim *et al.* 2004 and Rendall 2003.

4.3 Weyl curvature domination

Generic orbits in the invariant subset $\Omega_\Lambda = 0$ escape to infinity, and satisfy

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{W} = \infty. \tag{30}$$

This result holds for Bianchi VIII orbits if the equation of state satisfies $1 \leq \gamma < 2$ (Horwood & Wainwright 2004) and for Bianchi VII₀ orbits of $1 < \gamma < 2$ (Wainwright *et al.* 1999). In other words the Weyl curvature is dynamically dominant at late times. From a mathematical perspective this result means that the invariant subset $\Omega_\Lambda = 0$ does not admit a future

²²This article is reprinted in Hobill *et al.* 1994. See also WE, Section 6.4.

²³Ringström's proof was given for the case of Bianchi IX cosmologies. A technical difficulty remains in extending the proof to Bianchi VIII cosmologies.

²⁴This statement is essentially equivalent to the theorem of Wald 1983, discussed in Section 3.2.

attractor. Despite this fact, one can still determine the asymptotic dependence of the state vector as $t \rightarrow +\infty$ (Horwood & Wainwright 2004).

The asymptotic behaviour in the invariant set $\Omega_\Lambda = 0$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$, as epitomized by (30), has a significant effect on the dynamics in the full state space $\Omega_\Lambda > 0$, in that *it approximates the intermediate dynamics* of a typical class of models with $\Omega_\Lambda > 0$. One can think of the asymptotic state of models with $\Omega_\Lambda = 0$ acting as a *generalized saddle* in the full state space, temporarily attracting orbits but eventually repelling them. In summary, for a typical class of models with $\Omega_\Lambda > 0$ there will be a finite epoch during which Weyl dominance occurs (i.e. $\mathcal{W} \gg 1$).

4.4 Intermediate isotropization with $\Omega_m \approx 1$

A cosmological model undergoes intermediate isotropization with $\Omega_m \approx 1$ if there is a finite epoch during which the model is close to the flat FL model. This behaviour is created by the local stability properties of the flat FL model. We have seen that the flat FL model has a multiple representation, as the flat FL equilibrium point F and as an unbounded orbit (see Section 3.1, in particular, Figure 3). Orbits that are future asymptotic to F (i.e. orbits that form the two dimensional stable manifold of F) satisfy

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \Omega_m = 1, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \Sigma = 0, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{W} = 0. \quad (31)$$

On the other hand orbits that are future asymptotic to the unbounded orbit satisfy²⁵

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \Omega_m = 1, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \Sigma = 0, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{W} = \begin{cases} L & \text{if } \gamma = 1 \\ +\infty & \text{if } 1 < \gamma \leq \frac{4}{3}. \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

We say that models that satisfy (31) are *asymptotic to flat FL in the strong sense*, while those satisfy (32) are *asymptotic to flat FL in the weak sense*. Both of these asymptotic states can act as (generalized) saddles in the full state space, leading to intermediate isotropization with $\Omega_m \approx 1$. Thus intermediate isotropization with $\Omega_m \approx 1$ in the full state space is a result of the occurrence of asymptotic isotropization with $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \Omega_m = 1$ in lower dimensional invariant sets.

Intermediate isotropization in the weak sense with $\Omega_m \approx 1$ is illustrated schematically in Figure 4. An orbit that is past asymptotic to a Kasner equilibrium point \mathcal{K} spirals around the flat FL orbit, creating an epoch of intermediate isotropization with $\Omega_m \approx 1$, before approaching the de Sitter equilibrium point.

4.5 Isotropic singularity

Within \mathcal{S}_{SH} , a cosmological model with an isotropic singularity is simply described by an orbit that is past asymptotic to the flat FL equilibrium point (25), i.e. an orbit that lies in

²⁵These orbits form the four dimensional Bianchi VII₀ invariant set with $\Omega_\Lambda = 0$.




Figure 4: Intermediate isotropization in the weak sense.

the unstable manifold of this equilibrium point. Recall that this manifold is of dimension 4 (see Table 1). It follows that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} (\Sigma, \mathcal{W}, \Omega_\Lambda) = \mathbf{0}, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \Omega_m = 1$$

for these models. The asymptotic time dependence can be obtained from Lim *et al.* 2004.

5 The vacuum past attractor and numerical simulations

5.1 The vacuum past attractor

We now describe the attractor in the Hubble-normalized G_0 state space, following the discussion in Uggla *et al.* 2003, but using a different choice of gauge. One of the goals of that paper was to give a precise statement of the so-called BKL conjecture, by describing the past attractor in the Hubble-normalized state space.

The BKL conjecture. For almost all cosmological solutions of Einstein’s field equations, a spacelike initial singularity is *vacuum-dominated, local and oscillatory*.

For cosmological models with a perfect fluid matter source, the phrase “vacuum-dominated,” or, equivalently, “matter is not dynamically significant,” is taken to mean that the Hubble-normalized matter density Ω_m tends to zero at the initial singularity. One might then expect

that the past attractor for cosmological models with a perfect fluid matter source would be the same as the past attractor for an idealized vacuum cosmological model. It turns out (Uggla *et al.* 2003) that this expectation is unwarranted – the peculiar velocity v_α plays a role in determining the past attractor. Nevertheless, partly in the interests of simplicity and also because the numerical simulations that have been recently performed (Garfinkle 2003) have been for vacuum models, we shall restrict our discussion here to the vacuum case.

In terms of Hubble-normalized variables and the separable volume gauge, the spacelike initial singularity in a G_0 cosmology is approached as $t \rightarrow -\infty$. We now define a *silent initial singularity* to be one which satisfies

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} E_\alpha^i = 0, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} r_\alpha = 0, \quad (33)$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \partial_\alpha \mathbf{Y} = 0. \quad (34)$$

More precisely, we require that (33) and (34) are satisfied along typical timelines of \mathbf{e}_0 . One might initially think that the condition (34) is a consequence of (33), since

$$\partial_\alpha \mathbf{Y} = E_\alpha^i \frac{\partial \mathbf{Y}}{\partial x^i}.$$

However the analysis of Gowdy solutions with so-called spikes²⁶ shows that the partial derivatives $\partial \mathbf{Y} / \partial x^i$ can diverge as $t \rightarrow -\infty$. Thus the requirement (34) demands that E_α^i tend to zero sufficiently fast. The asymptotic analysis of the Gowdy solutions shows that (34) is satisfied along typical timelines even when spikes occur (see Uggla *et al.* 2003, Section IV.A). In more general G_2 cosmologies, however, the validity of (34) is still open and further work is needed.

We now refer to Uggla *et al.* 2003, pages 9–10, for further evidence to justify making the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1: For almost all cosmological solutions of Einstein’s field equations, a spacelike initial singularity is silent.

Proving this conjecture entails establishing the limits (33)–(34).

We think of the evolution of the Hubble-normalized state vector $\mathbf{X}(t, x^i)$ for fixed x^i , as being described by an orbit in a finite-dimensional Hubble-normalized state space. As $t \rightarrow -\infty$, this orbit will be asymptotic to a local past attractor \mathcal{A}^- , which in accordance with the definition of silent initial singularity, will be contained in the silent boundary, defined by (27).

The past attractor is based on the Kasner solutions. We have seen that in the reduced Hubble-normalized state space for SH models, the Kasner solutions are represented by a sphere of equilibrium points. In the full G_0 state space, these solutions are represented by orbits that are past asymptotic to Kasner equilibrium points on the silent boundary. Thus

²⁶See Berger & Moncrief 1993, Garfinkle & Weaver 2003, Rendall & Weaver 2001.

we focus our attention on the *Kasner sphere* \mathcal{K} on the silent boundary, defined by

$$A_\alpha = 0, \quad N_{\alpha\beta} = 0, \quad \Sigma^2 = 1,$$

in addition to (27). Each non-exceptional²⁷ equilibrium point on the Kasner sphere has one negative eigenvalue and hence has a one-dimensional unstable manifold into the past, which represents a SH vacuum solution of Bianchi type II on the silent boundary. We refer to these orbits as *curvature transitions*, since on each such orbit one degree of freedom of the spatial curvature is activated.²⁸ These curvature transitions satisfy

$$\det(N_{\alpha\beta}) = 0, \quad \Delta_N := N_{\alpha\beta}N^{\alpha\beta} - (N_\alpha^\alpha)^2 = 0, \quad N_\alpha^\alpha \neq 0,$$

corresponding to the fact that two eigenvalues of $N_{\alpha\beta}$ are zero. In addition

$$A_\alpha = 0,$$

and the Gauss constraint simplifies to

$$\Sigma^2 + \frac{1}{12}(N_\alpha^\alpha)^2 = 1.$$

We now make our second conjecture, motivated by our knowledge of SH dynamics.

Conjecture 2: The local past attractor \mathcal{A}^- for vacuum G_0 cosmologies with a silent initial singularity is

$$\mathcal{A}^- = \mathcal{K} \cup \mathcal{T}_N,$$

where \mathcal{K} is the Kasner sphere and \mathcal{T}_N is the set of all curvature transitions in the silent boundary.

Establishing this conjecture entails proving the following limits:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} A_\alpha = 0, \tag{35}$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \det(N_{\alpha\beta}) = 0, \tag{36}$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} [N_{\alpha\beta}N^{\alpha\beta} - (N_\alpha^\alpha)^2] = 0. \tag{37}$$

The fact that the sequence of transitions is non-terminating implies that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \Sigma^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} N_\alpha^\alpha$$

²⁷The exceptional Kasner points describe the flat Kasner solution (the Taub form of Minkowski spacetime) and are characterized by the restriction $\Sigma_{\langle\alpha}{}^\gamma\Sigma_{\beta\rangle\gamma} - \Sigma_{\alpha\beta} = 0$, where $\langle \rangle$ denotes tracefree symmetrization.

²⁸If one performs a spatial rotation to a shear eigenframe, one sees immediately from the evolution equations for $N_{\alpha\beta}$ that one diagonal component of $N_{\alpha\beta}$ is unstable into the past.

do not exist. However it follows from the Gauss constraint (12) and equations (33), (34) and (37) that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} [\Sigma^2 + \frac{1}{12}(N_\alpha^\alpha)^2] = 1.$$

In addition it follows from one of the other constraints in (11), the Codacci constraint²⁹, and the limits (33), (34) and (37) that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma} N_{\beta\delta} \Sigma_\gamma^\delta = 0. \quad (38)$$

We thus expect that in a shear eigenframe, $N_{\alpha\beta}$ will be ‘‘asymptotically diagonal’’ as $t \rightarrow -\infty$.

The geometrical interpretation of the asymptotic evolution is as follows: the orbit describing the evolution of the state vector $\mathbf{X}(t, x^i)$ for fixed x^i approaches the Kasner sphere \mathcal{K} in the silent boundary and then shadows increasingly closely an infinite sequence of curvature transitions joining Kasner equilibrium points.

5.2 Numerical simulations

Some numerical simulations of the past asymptotic behaviour of vacuum G_0 cosmologies using the Hubble-normalized evolution equations (7)–(11) have been recently performed by Garfinkle 2003. He found it convenient to use the deceleration parameter as a dynamical variable, with the defining equation (10) forming an additional constraint. The evolution equation for q has the form of a quasilinear diffusion equation, and it is the only evolution equation to contain second order spatial derivatives.

The Hubble-normalized evolution equations were solved numerically on a 3-torus, i.e. with periodic boundary conditions, using a Crank-Nicholson scheme. The initial conditions were chosen to be of the form

$$E_\alpha^i = \psi^{-2} \delta_\alpha^i, \quad r_\alpha = 0, \quad N_{\alpha\beta} = 0, \quad A_\alpha = -2\psi^{-3} \delta_\alpha^i \partial_i \psi,$$

$$\Sigma_{\alpha\beta} = \psi^{-6} \text{diag}(\bar{\Sigma}_{11}, \bar{\Sigma}_{22}, \bar{\Sigma}_{33}) = \psi^{-6} \text{diag} \left(\begin{array}{c} a_2 \cos y + a_3 \cos z + b_2 + b_3 \\ a_1 \cos x - a_3 \cos z + b_1 - b_3 \\ -a_1 \cos x - a_2 \cos y - b_1 - b_2 \end{array} \right),$$

where a_α, b_α are arbitrary constants.

The Gauss constraint gives a nonlinear elliptic PDE for $\psi(x^i)$:

$$\nabla^2 \psi = \frac{3}{4} \psi^5 - \frac{1}{8} \psi^{-7} [\bar{\Sigma}_{11}^2 + \bar{\Sigma}_{22}^2 + \bar{\Sigma}_{33}^2],$$

where ∇^2 is the Euclidean Laplacian in x, y and z . This PDE has to be solved numerically on a 3-torus to obtain explicit initial conditions. The remaining constraints are satisfied identically. Note that the above choice of E_α^i corresponds to a conformally flat initial 3-metric.

²⁹See (2.28) in Lim *et al.* 2004.

The numerical simulations show a brief transient epoch after which a sequence of curvature transitions takes place, following the usual BKL transition law, which we now describe. The Kasner exponents p_α are related to the shear variables $\Sigma_{\alpha\beta}$ in a shear eigenframe as follows:

$$\Sigma_{\alpha\beta} = \text{diag}(3p_1 - 1, 3p_2 - 1, 3p_3 - 1).$$

The exponents satisfy

$$p_1 + p_2 + p_3 = 1, \quad p_1^2 + p_2^2 + p_3^2 = 1,$$

and thus can be expressed in terms of a single parameter u according to

$$p_1 = -\frac{u}{1 + u + u^2}, \quad p_2 = \frac{1 + u}{1 + u + u^2}, \quad p_3 = \frac{u(1 + u)}{1 + u + u^2}.$$

The transition law between Kasner states can then be written in the form³⁰

$$u \rightarrow \begin{cases} u - 1, & \text{if } u \geq 2 \\ \frac{1}{u - 1}, & \text{if } 1 < u < 2. \end{cases}$$

The numerical simulations also suggest that asymptotically $\Sigma_{\alpha\beta}$ and $N_{\alpha\beta}$ have a common eigenframe in accordance with (38).

The figures show the results of a numerical simulation with $t = 0$ initially, and then becoming negative, i.e. evolution towards the initial singularity ($t \rightarrow -\infty$). Figures 5a and 6a show the transitions of the Kasner parameter u along two different timelines and Figures 5b and 6b show the diagonal values of $N_{\alpha\beta}$ in the common asymptotic eigenframe, along the same timelines. Overall, the simulations provide support for the limits (33) and (34), and (35)–(38) along typical timelines.

The numerical simulation is incomplete in two ways. First, the duration of the Kasner epochs in the simulation is far too short, due to the fact that the decay of the eigenvalues of $N_{\alpha\beta}$ to increasingly small values, which determines when the curvature transitions occur, is not described sufficiently accurately. The reason for this difficulty is that an arbitrarily chosen Fermi-propagated frame is not asymptotic to the eigenframe of $N_{\alpha\beta}$ as $t \rightarrow -\infty$. Second, the simulation does not have high enough numerical resolution to correctly simulate spiky structures. These structures are known to develop in G_2 cosmologies, on approach to the singularity (Berger & Moncrief 1993), and we expect that similar structure will develop in G_0 cosmologies. From our experience with numerical simulations of G_2 cosmologies, these spiky structures occur within the particle horizon of timelines where one of the eigenvalues of $N_{\alpha\beta}$ crosses zero (Lim 2004). As the particle horizon shrinks into the past, increasingly high numerical resolution is needed to simulate the spiky structures. It may be prohibitively expensive to perform such simulations in G_0 cosmologies.

³⁰See, for example, WE page 236.




Figure 5: Transitions of the Kasner parameter u and the diagonal values of $N_{\alpha\beta}$ in the common asymptotic eigenframe, as $t \rightarrow -\infty$ along a fixed timeline, i.e. for fixed spatial coordinates x^i .




Figure 6: Transitions along a different fixed timeline.

6 A normalization for recollapsing models

The principal deficiency of Hubble-normalized variables is that they break down in an expanding cosmological model that reaches a maximum state of expansion ($H = 0$), as is possible in an FL model with positive spatial curvature. This difficulty can be addressed, at least for FL models and SH models of Bianchi type IX, by using a modified normalization factor first proposed by Uggla (WE Section 8.5.2).

In the interests of simplicity we introduce the modified normalization procedure for the class of FL models with positive spatial curvature. For these models the normalization factor is defined by

$$D = \sqrt{H^2 + \frac{1}{6} {}^3R},$$

where 3R is the curvature scalar of the metric induced on the hypersurfaces $t = \text{constant}$. Since ${}^3R > 0$, this factor is positive throughout the evolution, including at the time of maximum expansion $H = 0$. Dimensionless variables are defined in the usual way, using D instead of H :

$$\tilde{\Omega}_\Lambda = \frac{\Lambda}{3D^2}, \quad \tilde{\Omega}_m = \frac{\rho}{3D^2}, \quad \tilde{H} = \frac{H}{D}.$$

It follows that

$$\tilde{\Omega}_m + \tilde{\Omega}_\Lambda = 1.$$

Introducing a time variable $\tilde{\tau}$ according to

$$\frac{dt}{d\tilde{\tau}} = \frac{1}{D},$$

one obtains the following evolution equations for \tilde{H} and $\tilde{\Omega}_\Lambda$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\tilde{H}}{d\tilde{\tau}} &= -\tilde{q}(1 - \tilde{H}^2), \\ \frac{d\tilde{\Omega}_\Lambda}{d\tilde{\tau}} &= 2(1 + \tilde{q})\tilde{H}\tilde{\Omega}_\Lambda, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{q} = \frac{1}{2}(3\gamma - 2 - 3\gamma\tilde{\Omega}_\Lambda).$$

We note that \tilde{q} is related to the usual deceleration parameter q according to

$$\tilde{q} = \tilde{H}^2 q,$$

whenever $H \neq 0$. The state space is bounded, being defined by the inequalities

$$-1 \leq \tilde{H} \leq 1, \quad 0 \leq \tilde{\Omega}_\Lambda \leq 1,$$

and is shown in Figure 7. The sign of \tilde{H} determines whether the model is expanding ($\tilde{H} > 0$) or collapsing ($\tilde{H} < 0$). The sign of \tilde{q} determines whether the model is decelerating ($\tilde{q} > 0$)

or accelerating. The fixed points of the evolution equations are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Omega}_\Lambda = 0, \quad \tilde{H}^2 = 1, & \quad \text{the flat FL model } F_\pm, \\ \tilde{\Omega}_\Lambda = 1, \quad \tilde{H}^2 = 1, & \quad \text{the de Sitter model } dS_\pm, \\ \tilde{\Omega}_\Lambda = \frac{3\gamma - 2}{3\gamma}, \quad \tilde{H} = 0, & \quad \text{the Einstein static model E.} \end{aligned}$$

The points F_+ and dS_+ represent expanding models ($\tilde{H} = 1$) while F_- and dS_- represent the time reversed models ($\tilde{H} = -1$). The orbits $F_+ \rightarrow F_-$ represent models that expand from a big-bang singularity and then recollapse to a future singularity. The orbits $F_+ \rightarrow dS_+$ represent models that expand indefinitely from a big-bang singularity, enter an accelerating epoch, and approach de Sitter at late times.




Figure 7: State space for the FL cosmologies with positive and zero spatial curvature, $\Lambda \geq 0$ and equation of state $p = (\gamma - 1)\rho$, $\frac{2}{3} < \gamma < 2$.

Figure 7 illustrates the central role played by the Einstein static model within the class of FL cosmologies with positive and zero spatial curvature. The fixed point E is a saddle point whose stable and unstable manifolds are one-dimensional. The unstable manifold describes a one-parameter family of cosmologies that are past asymptotic to the Einstein static model, and hence do not have an initial singularity. These cosmological models have recently been proposed by Ellis & Maartens 2004 as a possible description of the early universe, a so-called emergent universe.

We note that this normalization procedure can be generalized to the class of nontilted SH cosmologies of Bianchi type IX. The normalization factor is (WE, equation (8.6))

$$D = \sqrt{H^2 + \frac{1}{4}(n_{11}n_{22}n_{33})^{\frac{2}{3}}},$$

where $n_{\alpha\beta} = \text{diag}(n_{11}, n_{22}, n_{33})$. The resulting state space, which gives a unified description of the dynamics of nontilted SH cosmologies of Bianchi type IX, VII₀, II and I, has not been explored in detail. In addition, a variation of this normalization has been given by Heinzle *et al.* 2004, and has been used to give a detailed analysis of the nontilted SH cosmologies of Bianchi type IX that are locally rotationally symmetric.

7 Conclusion

The dynamical systems approach has two key attributes. Firstly, it provides a geometric framework for analyzing the space of cosmological models. Secondly, it provides a system of first order evolution equations, whose specific form depends on the choice of gauge. This system of equations is potentially useful for giving a rigorous analysis of the asymptotic dynamics of cosmological models, and also for performing numerical simulations. The utility of this approach has been amply demonstrated as regards the SH cosmologies, and there are indications that it may be equally useful as regards the G_0 cosmologies.

Acknowledgements

This work has been influenced significantly by our collaboration with Claes Uggla and Henk van Elst. It is a pleasure to acknowledge the many discussions that we have had over the past few years. We also thank George Ellis for his continued interest and encouragement, and David Garfinkle for providing Figures 5 and 6, and for helpful discussions on the numerical simulations. J.W. expresses his appreciation to Lars Andersson and Gregory Galloway and the Department of Mathematics at the University of Miami for their hospitality during the Miami Waves Conference in January 2004. This work was partially supported by a grant to J.W. from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

References

- [1] L. Andersson, H. van Elst & C. Uggla 2004, Gowdy phenomenology in scale-invariant variables, *CQG* **21**, S29–S57
- [2] J.M. Bardeen 1980, Gauge invariant cosmological perturbations, *PRD* **22**, 1882–905
- [3] J.D. Barrow 1978, Quiescent cosmology, *Nature* **272**, 211

- [4] B.K. Berger 2004, Hunting local Mixmaster dynamics in spatially inhomogeneous cosmologies, *CQG* **21**, S81–S96
- [5] B.K. Berger and V. Moncrief 1993, Numerical Investigation of Cosmological Singularities, *PRD* **48**, 4676–87
- [6] A.A. Coley 2003, *Dynamical systems and cosmology*, Kluwer Academic Publishers
- [7] A.A. Coley, He & Lim 2004, Isotropic singularity in inhomogeneous brane cosmological models, *CQG* **21**, 1311–42
- [8] A.A. Coley & S. Hervik 2004, Bianchi cosmologies: a tale of two tilted fluids, *CQG* **21**, 4193–208
- [9] A.A. Coley & R.J. van den Hoogen 2000, The dynamics of multi-scalar field cosmological models and assisted inflation, *PRD* **62**, 023517
- [10] C.B. Collins 1971, More qualitative cosmology, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **23**, 137–56
- [11] D. Eardley, E.P. Liang & R.K. Sachs 1972, Velocity-dominated singularities in irrotational dust cosmologies, *J. Math. Phys.* **13**, 99–107
- [12] G.F.R. Ellis 1967, Dynamics of pressure-free matter in general relativity, *J. Math. Phys.* **8**, 1171–94
- [13] G.F.R. Ellis 2004, The space of cosmological space-times, *preprint*
- [14] G.F.R. Ellis & M. Bruni 1989, Covariant and gauge-invariant approach to cosmological density fluctuations, *PRD* **40**, 1804–18
- [15] G.F.R. Ellis, J. Hwang & M. Bruni 1989, Covariant and gauge-independent perfect-fluid Robertson-Walker perturbations, *PRD* **40**, 1819–26
- [16] G.F.R. Ellis & R. Maartens 2004, The Emergent Universe: inflationary cosmology with no singularity, *CQG* **21** 223–32
- [17] G.F.R. Ellis & M.A.H. MacCallum 1969, A class of homogeneous cosmological models, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **12**, 108–41
- [18] H. van Elst & C. Uggla 1997, General relativistic 1+3 orthonormal frame approach, *CQG* **14**, 2673–951
- [19] H. van Elst, C. Uggla & J. Wainwright 2002, Dynamical systems approach to G_2 cosmology, *CQG* **19**, 51–82
- [20] D. Garfinkle 2003, Numerical simulations of generic singularities, gr-qc/0312117
- [21] D. Garfinkle & M. Weaver 2003, High velocity spikes in Gowdy spacetimes, *PRD* **67** 124009

- [22] M. Goliath & G.F.R. Ellis 1999, Homogeneous cosmologies with a cosmological constant, *PRD* **60**, 023502
- [23] S.W. Goode & J. Wainwright 1985, Isotropic singularities in cosmological models, *CQG* **2**, 99–115
- [24] J.M. Heinzle, N. Rohr & C. Uggla 2004, Matter and dynamics in closed cosmologies, *gr-qc/0406072*
- [25] S. Hervik 2004, The asymptotic behaviour of tilted Bianchi type VI₀ universes, *CQG* **21**, 2301–17
- [26] C.G. Hewitt, R. Bridson & J. Wainwright 2001, The asymptotic regimes of tilted Bianchi II cosmologies, *GRG* **33**, 65–94
- [27] D. Hobill, A. Burd & A.A. Coley (ed) 1994, *Deterministic Chaos in General Relativity*, Plenum Press
- [28] J.T. Horwood & J. Wainwright 2004, Asymptotic regimes of magnetic Bianchi cosmologies, *GRG* **36**, 799–823
- [29] I.M. Khalatnikov, A.Yu. Kamenshchik, M. Martellini, A.A. Starobinsky 2003, Quasi-isotropic solution of the Einstein equations near a cosmological singularity for a two-fluid cosmological model, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **03**, 001
- [30] A.R. King & G.F.R. Ellis 1973, Tilted homogeneous cosmological models, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **31**, 209–42
- [31] J. Kristian & R.K. Sachs 1966, Observations in cosmology, *ApJ* **143**, 379–99
- [32] V.G. LeBlanc 1998, Bianchi II magnetic cosmologies, *CQG* **15**, 1607–26
- [33] E.M. Lifshitz & I.M. Khalatnikov 1963, Investigations in relativistic cosmology, *Adv. Phys.* **12**, 185–249
- [34] W.C. Lim 2004, *The dynamics of inhomogeneous cosmologies*, PhD thesis, University of Waterloo
- [35] W.C. Lim, H. van Elst, C. Uggla & J. Wainwright 2004, Asymptotic isotropization in inhomogeneous cosmology, *PRD* **69**, 103507
- [36] R. Maartens, G.F.R. Ellis & W.R. Stoeger 1995, Limits on anisotropy and inhomogeneity from the cosmic background radiation, *PRD* **51**, 1525–35
- [37] R. Maartens, G.F.R. Ellis & W.R. Stoeger 1996, Anisotropy and inhomogeneity of the universe from $\Delta T/T$, *Astron. Astrophys.* **309**, L7–L10

- [38] R. Penrose 1979, Singularities and time-asymmetry. In *General Relativity: An Einstein Centenary Survey*, eds S.W. Hawking & W. Israel. Cambridge University Press.
- [39] A.D. Rendall 2003, Asymptotics of solutions of the Einstein equations with positive cosmological constant, gr-qc/0312020
- [40] A.D. Rendall & M. Weaver 2001, Manufacture of Gowdy spacetimes with spikes, CQG **18**, 2959–76
- [41] H. Ringström 2001, The Bianchi IX attractor, *Annales Henri Poincaré* **2**, 405–500
- [42] C. Uggla, H. van Elst, J. Wainwright & G.F.R. Ellis 2003, Past attractor in inhomogeneous cosmology, PRD **68**, 103502
- [43] J. Wainwright, M.J. Hancock & C. Uggla 1999, Asymptotic self-similarity breaking at late times in cosmology, CQG **16**, 2577–98
- [44] J. Wainwright & G.F.R. Ellis (ed) 1997, *Dynamical Systems in Cosmology*, Cambridge University Press
- [45] R.M. Wald 1983, Asymptotic behaviour of homogeneous cosmological models in the presence of a positive cosmological constant, PRD **28**, 2118–20