# Relativistic gravitation theory for the MOND paradigm

Jacob D. Bekenstein

Racah Institute of Physics, Hebrew University of Jerusalem Givat Ram, Jerusalem 91904 ISRAEL (Dated: March 20, 2022)

The modi ed newtonian dynamics (MOND) paradigm of Milgrom can boast of a number of successful predictions regarding galactic dynamics; these are made without the assumption that dark matter plays a signi cant role. MOND requires gravitation to depart from Newtonian theory in the extragalactic regime where dynamical accelerations are small. So far relativistic gravitation theories proposed to underpin MOND have either clashed with the post-Newtonian tests of general relativity, or failed to provide signi cant gravitational lensing, or violated hallowed principles by exhibiting superlum inal scalar waves or an a priori vector eld. We develop a relativistic MOND inspired theory which resolves these problems. In it gravitation is mediated by metric, a scalar

eld and a 4-vector eld, all three dynam ical. For a simple choice of its free function, the theory has a Newtonian limit for nonrelativistic dynam ics with signi cant acceleration, but a MOND limit when accelerations are small. We calculate the and PPN coe cients showing them to agree with solar system measurements. The gravitational light de ection by nonrelativistic systems is governed by the same potential responsible for dynam ics of particles. To the extent that MOND successfully describes dynam ics of a system, the new theory's predictions for lensing by that system 's visible m atter will agree as well with observations as general relativity's predictions made with a dynam ically successful dark halo m odel. C osm ological m odels based on the theory are quite similar to those based on general relativity; they predict slow evolution of the scalar eld. For a range of initial conditions, this last result makes it easy to rule out superlum inal propagation of metric, scalar and vector waves.

PACS num bers: 95.35.+ d,95.30.Sf, 98.62.Sb, 04.80.Cc

### I. IN TRODUCTION

In the extragalactic regime, where Newtonian gravitational theory would have been expected to be an excellent description, accelerations of stars and gas, as estimated from D oppler velocities and geometric considerations, are as a rule much larger than those due to the Newtonian eld generated by the visible matter in the system [1, 2]. This is the \m issing mass" problem [3] or \acceleration discrepancy" [4]. It is fashionable to infer from it the existence of much dark matter in system sranging from dwarf spheroidal galaxies with masses  $10^6$ M to great clusters of galaxies in the  $10^{13}$ M regime [3, 5]. And again, galaxies and clusters of galaxies are found to gravitationally lense background sources. When interpreted within general relativity (G R), this lensing is anom alously large unless one assumes the presence of dark matter in quantities and with distribution sim ilar to those required to explain the accelerations of stars and gas. Thus extragalactic lensing has naturally been regarded as con ming the presence of the dark matter suggested by the dynamics.

But the putative dark matter has never been identied despite much experimental and observational e ort [6]. This raises the possibility that the acceleration discrepancy as well as the gravitational lensing anomaly may reject departures from New tonian gravity and GR on galactic and larger scales. Now alternatives to GR are traditionally required to possess a New tonian limit for small velocities and potentials; thus the acceleration discrepancy also raises the possibility that the correct relativistic gravitational theory may be of a kind not generally considered hitherto.

In the last two decades M ilgrom 'sm odi ed New tonian dynam ics (M O ND) paradigm [7, 8, 9] has gained recognition as a successful scheme for unifying much of extragalactic dynam ics phenom enology without invoking \dark matter". In contrast with earlier suggested modi cations of New ton's law of universal gravitation [10, 11, 12, 13], MOND is characterized by an acceleration scale  $a_0$ , not a distance scale, and its departure from New tonian predictions is acceleration dependent:

$$\sim (j_{a} j_{=} a_{0})_{a} = r_{N} : \qquad (1)$$

Here N is the usual Newtonian potential of the visible matter, while  $\sim$  (x) x for x 1 and  $\sim$  (x) ! 1 for x 1.

E lectronic address: bekenste@ vm shuji.ac.il; URL: http://www.phys.huji.ac.il/~bekenste/

M ilgrom estimated  $a_0 = 1 = 10^8$  cm s<sup>2</sup> from the empirical data. In the laboratory and the solar system where accelerations are strong compared to  $a_0$ , formula (1) goes over to the New tonian law  $a = r_N$ .

M ilgrom constructed form ula (1) to agree with the fact that rotation curves of disk galaxies become e at outside their central parts. That far out a galaxy of mass M exhibits an approximately spherical N ewtonian potential. The scales are such that  $\dot{r}_{N}$  j GM r<sup>2</sup>  $a_0$  in this region, and so Eq. (1) with  $\sim (x)$  x gives jaj (GM a)<sup>1=2</sup>r<sup>1</sup> which has the r dependence appropriate for the centripetal acceleration  $v_c^2$ =r of a radius independent rotational velocity  $v_c$  an asymptotically at rotation curve. In fact one obtains the relation M = (G  $a_0$ )  ${}^1v_c{}^4$  which leads to the prediction that for any class of galaxies with a constant mass to luminosity ratio in a specie of spectral band, the luminosity in that band should scale as  $v_c{}^4$ . And indeed, there exists an empirical law of just this form : the Tully {F isher law [14] (TFL) relating near infrared (H {band}) luminosity L<sub>H</sub> of a spiral disk galaxy to its rotation velocity, L<sub>H</sub> /  $v_c{}^4$ , with the proportionality factor being constant w ithin each galactic morphology class.

This version of the TFL was established only after MOND was enunciated [15]. It is in harmony with the MOND prediction in two ways. First, the infrared light of a galaxy comes mostly from cooldwarf stars which make up most of its mass (hence giving a tight correlation between M of the predicted relation and  $L_H$  of the empirical law). Second, the proportionality coe cient varies from class to class as would be expected from the observed correlation between of a galaxy and its momentum or a construction between the second stars would be expected from the observed correlation between of a galaxy and its momentum of the predicted relation and  $L_H$  of the empirical law).

of a galaxy and its m orphology.

In the alternative dark matter paradigm (which casts no doubt on standard gravity theory), at rotation curves are explained by assuming that every disk galaxy is nested inside a roundish spherical halo of dark matter [16] whose mass density drops approximately like  $r^2$ . The halo is supposed to dominate the gravitational eld in the outer parts of the galaxy. This makes the Newtonian potential approximately logarithm is with radius in those regions, thereby leading to an asymptotically at rotation curve. In practice the dark halo resolution works only after ne tuning. It is an observational fact that for bright spiral galaxies the rotation curve in the optically bright region is well explained in Newtonian gravity by the observed matter [17]. But, as mentioned, in the outer regions the visible matter's contribution must be dwarfed by the halo's. So ne tuning is needed between the dark halo parameters (velocity dispersion and core radius) and the visible disk ones [18, 19].

This ne tuning problem is exacerbated by the TFL  $L_H / v_c^4$ . Because the infrared lum inosity comes from the visible matter in the galaxy, but the rotation velocity is mostly set by the halo, the TFL also requires ne tuning between halo and disk parameters. The standard dark matter explanation of the r<sup>2</sup> pro le of an halo is that it arises naturally from prim ordial cosm obgical perturbations [20]. The visible galaxy is regarded as forming by dissipational collapse of gas into the potential well of the halo. The ne tuning mentioned is then viewed as resulting from the adjustment of the halo to the gravitation of the incipient disk [19, 21]. But the TFL is observationally a very sharp correlation; in fact, it is the basis for one of the most reliable methods for gauging distances to spiral galaxies. Such sharpness is hardly to be expected from statistical processes of the kind envisaged in galaxy formation, a point emphasized by Sanders [22]. So in the dark matter picture the TFL is something of a mystery.

There are other MOND successes. M ilgrom predicted early that in galaxies with surface mass density well below  $a_0G^{-1}$ , the acceleration discrepancy should be especially large [8]. In dwarf spirals this property was established em – pirically years later [23], and it is now known to be exhibited by a large number of low surface brightness galaxies [24]. A nother example: MOND successfully predicts the detailed shape of a rotation curve from the observed matter (stars and gas) distribution on the basis of a single free parameter, , down to correlating features in the velocity eld with those seen in the light distribution [25, 26, 27, 28]. This is especially true in the case of low surface mass density disk galaxies for which MOND's predictions are independent of the speci c choice of ~ (x) [29], and these MOND theoretical rotation curves t the observed curves of a number of low surface brightness dwarf galaxies [27, 30, 31] very well. By contrast, the dark halo paradigm requires one or two free parameters apart from to approximate the success of the MOND predictions [32]. In fact, even when the empirical data is analyzed within the dark halo paradigm, it displays the preferred acceleration scale  $a_0$  of MOND [33].

O ccasionally doubt has been cast on MOND's ability to describe clusters of galaxies properly [34]. Many of these exhibit accelerations not small on scale  $a_0$ , yet conventional analysis suggests they contain much dark matter in opposition to what MOND would suggest. Sanders has recently reanalyzed the problem [35] with the conclusion that these clusters may contain much as yet undiscovered baryonic matter in the core which should be classed as \visible" in connection with MOND. O ther MOND successes, outside the province of disk galaxies, have been reviewed elsewhere [22, 32, 36].

So the simple MOND formula (1) is very successful. But it is not a theory. Literally taken the MOND recipe for acceleration violates the conservation of momentum (and of energy and of angular momentum) [7]. And MOND entails a paradox: why does the center of mass of a star orbit in its galaxy with anomalously large acceleration given by Eq. (1) with ~ 1, while each parcel of gas composing it is subject to such high acceleration that is should, by the same formula, be accelerated Newtonially ? [7]. In short, the MOND formula is not a consistent theoretical scheme e. Neither is MOND, as initially stated, complete. For example, it does not specify how to calculate gravitational lensing by galaxies and clusters of galaxies. As is well known, in standard gravity theory light de ection

is well described only by relativistic theory (GR). And whereas New tonian cosm ological models work well for part of the cosm ological evolution, MOND cosm ologicalm odels built in analogy with their New tonian counterparts, though som etim es agreeing with phenom enology [34], can yield peculiar predictions [37] (but see Ref. 38). In short, a com plete, consistent theoretical underpinning of the MOND paradigm which accords with observed facts, and is also relativistic, has been lacking.

This lack is being resolved in measured steps. A rst step was the lagrangian reform ulation of MOND [39] called AQUAL (see Sec. IIA). AQUAL cures the nonconservation problem s and resolves the paradox of the galactic motion of an object whose parts accelerate strongly relative to one another; it does so in accordance with a conjecture of M ilgrom [7]. And for system s with high symmetry AQUAL reduces exactly to the MOND formula (1).

A relativistic generalization of AQUAL is easy to construct with help of a scalar eld which together with the metric describes gravity [39] (see Sec. IIC 1 below). It reduces to MOND approximately in the weak acceleration regime, to New tonian gravity for strong accelerations, and can be made consistent with the post-New tonian solar system tests for GR. But relativistic AQUAL is acausal: waves of the scalar eld can propagate superlum inally in the MOND regime (see the appendix of Ref. 39 or Appendix A here). The problem can be traced to the aquadratic kinetic part of the lagrangian of the theory which m in ics that in the original AQUAL. A theory involving a second scalar eld, PCG, was thus developed to bypass the problem [4, 40, 41] (see Sec. IIC 2 below). PCG may be better behaved causally than relativistic AQUAL [42], but it brings woes of its own. It is marginally in con ict with the observed perihelion precession of M ercury [4], and in common with relativistic AQUAL, PCG predicts extragalactic gravitational lensing which is too weak if there is indeed no dark matter. This last problem is traceable to a feature common to PCG and relativistic AQUAL: the physical metric is conform alto the metric appearing in the Einstein-H ilbert action [43].

One way to sidestep this problem without discarding the MOND features is to exploit the direction de ned by the gradient of the rst scalar eld to relate the physical metric to the E instein metric by a disform altransform ation (see Ref. [43] or Sec. IIC 3 below). But it turns out that with this relation the requirement of causal propagation acts to depress gravitational lensing [44], rather than enhancing it as is observationally required. The persistence of the lensing problem in modiled gravitational theories has engendered a folk theorem to the elect that it is in possible for a relativistic theory to simultaneously incorporate the MOND dynamics, observed gravitational lensing and correct post-New tonian behavior without calling on dark matter [45, 46, 47, 48].

N eedless to say, this theorem cannot be proved [49]. Indeed, by the sim ple device of relating the physical and E instein m etrics via a disform al transform ation based on a constant time directed 4-vector, Sanders [50] has constructed an AQUAL like \strati ed" relativistic theory which gives the correct lensing while ostensibly retaining the MOND phenom enology and consistency with the post-New tonian tests. A dm ittedly Sanders' strati ed theory is a preferred fram e theory, and as such outside the traditional fram ework for gravitational theories. But it does point out a trail to further progress.

The present paper introduces TeVeS, a new relativistic gravitational theory devoid of a priori elds, whose nonrelativistic weak acceleration limit accords with MOND while its nonrelativistic strong acceleration regime is New tonian. TeVeS is based on a metric, and dynamic scalar and 4-vector elds (one each); it naturally involves one free function, a length scale, and two positive dimensionless parameters, k and K. TeVeS passes the usual solar system tests of GR, predicts gravitational lensing in agreement with the observations (without requiring dark matter), does not exhibit superluminal propagation, and provides a specie formalism for constructing cosm ologicalm odels.

In Sec. II we sum marize the foundations on which a workable relativistic form ulation of MOND must stand. We follow this with a brief critical review of relativistic AQUAL, PCG and disform almetric theories, some of whose elements we borrow. Sec. IIIA builds the action for TeVeS while Sec. IIIB derives the equations for the metric, scalar and vector elds. In Sec. IIIC we demonstrate that TeVeS has a GR limit for a range of small k and K. This is shown explicitly for cosm ology (Sec. IIIC 1) and for quasistatic situations like galaxies (Sec. IIIC 2). All the above applies for any choice of the free function; in Sec. IIIE we make a simple choice for it which facilitates further elaboration. For spherically symmetric systems the nonrelativistic MOND limit is derived in Sec. IV B, while the N ew tonian limit is recovered for modestly small k in Sec. IV C. The above conclusions are extended to nonspherical systems in Sec. IV D. Sec. V shows that the theory passes the usual post-N ew tonian solar system tests. Sec. VI demonstrates that for given dynamics, TeVeS gives the same gravitational lensing as does a dynam ically successful dark halo model within GR. In Sec. VII we discuss TeVeS cosm ologicalm odels with at spaces showing that they are very similar to the corresponding GR m odels (apart from the question of cosm ologicaldark matter which is left open), and demonstrating that the scalar eld evolves little, and so can be taken to be small and positive. A s discussed next in Sec. VIII, this last conclusion serves to rule out superlum inal propagation in TeVeS.

# II. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS FOR THE MOND PARADIGM

#### A. AQUAL: nonrelativistic eld reform ulation of MOND

However successful empirically when describing motions of test particles e.g. stars in the collective eld of a galaxy, formula (1) is not fully correct. It is easily checked that a pair of particles accelerating one in the eld of the other according to (1) does not conserve momentum. Thus the MOND formula by itself is not a theory. It is, however, a simple matter to construct a fully satisfactory nonrelativistic theory for MOND ([39]). Suppose we retain the Galilean and rotational invariance of the Lagrangian density which gives Poisson's equation, but drop the requirement of linearity of the equation. Then we come up with

$$L = \frac{a_0^2}{8 G} f \frac{jr}{a_0^2} :$$
 (2)

Here is the mass density,  $a_0$  is a scale of acceleration introduced for dimensional consistency, and f is some function. New tonian theory (Poisson's equation) corresponds to the choice f(y) = y. From Eq. (2) follows the gravitational eld equation

$$[~(jr j=a)r] = 4 G ;$$
 (3)

where  $\sim (7y)$  df (y)=dy. Because of its AQUA dratic Lagrangian, the theory has been called AQUAL 4]. The form of f and the value of  $a_0$  m ust be supplied by phenom enology. We assume

r

$$f(y) ! \frac{y}{\frac{2}{3}y^{3=2}} y 1;$$
 (4)

For system s with spherical, cylindrical or planar geom etry, Eq. (3) can be integrated once im m ediately. With the usual prescription for the acceleration,

$$a = r ;$$
 (5)

the solution corresponds precisely to the MOND formula (1). This is no longer true for lower symmetry. However, numerical integration reveals that (1) is approximately true, in most cases to respectable accuracy [51].

The mentioned inexactness of Eq. (1) for systems such as a discrete collection of particles is at the root of the mentioned violation of the conservation laws. Because AQUAL starts from a Lagrangian, it respects all the usual conservation laws (energy, momentum and angular momentum), as can be checked directly [39]. This supplies the appropriate perspective for the mentioned failings of MOND. AQUAL also supplies the tools for showing that New - tonian behavior of the constituents of a large body, e.g. a star, is consistent with non-New tonian dynam ics of the latter's center of mass in the weak collective eld of a larger system, e.g. a galaxy.

To sum marize, whenever parts of a system devoid of high sym metry move with accelerations weak on scale  $a_0$ , the eld r which de nest heir accelerations is to be calculated by solving the AQUAL equation (3). AQUAL then become some sthe nonrelativistic eld theory on which to model the relativistic formulation of the MOND paradigm.

# B. Principles for relativistic M O N D

A relativistic M O N D theory seems essential if gravitational lensing by extragalactic systems and cosm ology are to be understood without reliance on dark matter. W hat principles should the relativistic embodiment of the M O N D paradigm adhere to ? The following list is culled from those suggested by Bekenstein [4, 43], Sanders [52] and R om atka [53].

# 1. Principles

Action principle The theory must be derivable from an action principle. This is the only way known to guarantee that the necessary conservation laws of energy, linear and angular momentum are incorporated automatically. It is simplest to take the action as an integral over a local lagrangian density. A nonlocal action has been tried [47], but the resulting theory fails on account of gravitational lensing.

Relativistic invariance Innum erable elementary particle experiments provide direct evidence for the universal validity of special relativity. The action should thus be a relativistic scalar so that all equations of the theory are relativistically invariant. Implied in this is the correspondence of the theory with special relativity when gravitation is negligible. This proviso rules out preferred frame theories.

Equivalence principle As demonstrated with great accuracy (1 part in  $1b^2$ ) by the Eotvos(Dicke experiments [54], free particles with negligible self(gravity fall in a gravitational eld along universal trajectories (weak equivalence principle). For slow motion (the case tested by the experiments), the equation a = r, which encapsulates the universality, is equivalent to the geodesic equation in a (curved) metric g with  $g_{tt}$  1 2. For light propagating in a static gravitational eld, such a metric would predict that all frequencies as measured with respect to (w.r.t.) observers at rest in the eld undergo a redshift measured by . This is experimentally veried [55] to 1 part in  $10^4$ . It thus appears that a curved metric g describes those properties of spacetime in the presence of gravitation that are sensed by material objects. A coording to Schi 's conjecture [54, 56], this im plies that the theory must be a metric theory, i.e., that in order to account sfor the eld expressed in their usual laboratory form s but with the metric g replacing the Lorentz metric. This is the E instein equivalence principle [54].

Causality So as not to violate causality and thereby compromise the logical consistency of the theory, the equations deriving from the action should not perm it superlum inal propagation of any measurable eld or of energy and linear and angular momenta. Superlum inal here means exceeding the speed which is invariant under the Lorentz transform ations. By Lorentz invariance of Maxwell's equations this is also the speed of light. In curved space, where curvature can cause waves to develop tails, the maxim alspeed is that of wavefronts, typically that of the high frequency components.

Positivity of energy Fields in the theory should never carry negative energy. From the quantum point of view this is a precaution against instability of the vacuum. This principle is usually taken to mean that the energy density of each eld should be nonnegative at each event (local positivity). The fact that the gravitational eld itself cannot be generically assigned an energy density shows that this popular conception is overly stringent. A more useful statem ent of positivity of energy is that any bounded system must have positive energy (global positivity instead of the stronger local positivity). For example, the gravitational eld can carry negative energy density locally (at least in the New tonian conception), yet for pure gravity and in some cases in the presence ofm atter, a com plete gravitating system is subject to the positive energy theorems [57]. A lso, there are exam ples of scalar elds whose local energy density is of inde nite sign, yet a com plete stationary system of such elds with sources has positive m ass [58]. O f course, local positivity in plies global positivity.

Departures from Newtonian gravity The theory should exhibit a preferred scale of acceleration below which departures from Newtonian gravity should set in, even at low velocities.

#### 2. Requirem ents

The relativistic embodim ent of MOND should predict a number of well established phenom ena. For example, we expect the following.

? Agreem ent with the extragalactic phenom enology: The nonrelativistic lim it of the theory should make predictions in agreem ent with those of the AQUAL equation, which is known to subsume much extragalactic phenom enology. This is checked for TeVeS in Sec. IV B.

? A green ent with phenom enology of gravitational lenses: The theory should predict correctly the lensing of electrom agnetic radiation by extragalactic structures which is responsible for gravitational lenses and arcs. In particular, it should give predictions similar to those of GR within the dark matter paradigm. This point is established for TeVeS in Sec.VI.

? Concordance with the solar system : The theory should make predictions in agreement with the various solar system tests of relativity [54]: de ection of light rays, time delay of radar signals, precessions of the perihelia of the inner planets, the absence of the Nordtvedt e ect in the lunar orbit, the nullness of aether drift, etc. TeVeS is confronted with the rst three tests in Sec.V.

? Concordance with binary pulsar tests : The theory should make predictions in harm ony with the observed pulse times of arrival from the various binary pulsars. These contain information about relativistic time delay, periastron precession and the orbit's decay due to gravitational radiation. They thus constitute a test of the strong potential limit of the theory.

? Harm ony with cosm obgical facts: The theory should give a picture of cosm obgy in harm ony with basic empirical facts such as the Hubble expansion, its tim escales for various eras, existence of the microwave background, light element abundances from primordial nucleosynthesis, etc. The similarity of cosm obgical evolution in GR and in

TeVeS is established in Sec.VII, though the problem of how to eliminate cosm ological dark matter with TeVeS is left open.

# C. Som e antecedent relativistic theories

It is now in order to brie y review some of the previous attempts to give a relativistic theory of M O N D. This will introduce the concepts to be borrowed by T eV eS, and help to establish the notation and conventions that we shall follow. A metric signature + 2, and units with c = 1 are used throughout this paper. G reek indeces run over four coordinates while Latin ones run over the spatial coordinates alone.

## 1. Relativistic AQUAL

It is wellknown that theories constructed, for example, by using a local function of the scalar curvature as Lagrangian density, have a purely New tonian limit for weak potentials. So if we steer away from nonlocal actions, then AQUAL behavior cannot arise from merely modifying the gravitational action. The theory one seeks has to involve degrees of freedom other than the metric.

In the rst relativistic theory with MOND aspirations, relativistic AQUAL [39], the physical metric g was taken as conform alto a primitive (Einstein) metric g , i.e.,  $g = e^2 g$  with a real scalar eld. In order not to break violently with GR, which is well tested in the solar system (and to some extent in cosm ology), the gravitational action was taken as the Einstein-Hilbert's one built out of g . The MOND phenom enology was in planted by taking for the Lagrangian density for

$$L = \frac{1}{8 G L^2} f L^2 g ; ; ;$$
 (6)

where f is some function (not known a priori), and L is a constant with dimensions of length introduced for dimensional consistency. Note that when f'(y) = y, L is just the lagrangian density for a linear scalar eld, but in general L is aquadratic.

To implement the universality of free fall, one must write all lagrangians of matter elds using a single metric, which is taken as g (not g which choice would make the theory GR). Thus for example, the action for a particle of mass m is taken as

$$S_{m} = m e (g dx dx)^{1=2}$$
: (7)

Hence test particle motion is nongeodesic w.r.t. g but, of course, geodesic w.r.t. g . Evidently this last is the metric measured by clocks and rods, hence the physical metric. Addition of a constant to merely multiplies all masses by a constant (irrelevant global rede nition of units), so that the theory is insensitive to the choice of zero of

For slow motion in a quasistatic situation with nearly at metric g , and in a weak eld , e ( g dx dx )<sup>1=2</sup>  $(1 + _{\rm N} + v^2 = 2)$ dt, were  $_{\rm N} = (g_{\rm t} + 1) = 2$  is the New tonian potential determined by the mass density through the linearized E instein equations for g , and v is the velocity de ned w r.t. the M inkowskim etric which is close to g . Thus the particle's lagrangian is m (v<sup>2</sup>=2  $_{\rm N}$  ); this leads to the equation of motion

a 
$$r(_{N} + )$$
: (8)

How is determined? For stationary weak elds the Lagrangian density for , including a point source of physical mass M at r = 0, is from the above discussion and Eqs. (6)-(7),

$$L = \frac{1}{8 G L^2} f L^2 (r)^2 \qquad M (r):$$
 (9)

C om paring Eqs. (9) and (2) we conclude that here corresponds to of mass M as computed from AQUAL'S Eq. (3), provided we take f = f and  $L = 1=a_0$ . W henever  $jr j jr_N j(N is the New tonian potential of the same m ass distribution), the equation of motion (8) reduces to (5), and we obtain MOND like dynam ics. For the choice of MOND function (4) the said strong inequality is automatic in the deep MOND regime, <math>jr j a_0$ , because  $\sim 1$  there.

In the regime jr j  $a_0$ , ~ 1 and f (y) y so that reduces to  $_N$ . It would seem from Eq. (8) that a particle's acceleration is then twice the correct New tonian value. However, this just means that the measurable New ton's constant  $G_N$  is twice the bare G appearing in L or in Einstein's equations. It is thus clear, regarding dynamics, that the relativistic AQUAL theory has the appropriate MOND and New tonian limits depending on the strength of r

But relativistic AQUAL has problem s. Early on [4, 39, 42] it was realized that waves can propagate faster than light. This acausal behavior can be traced to the aquadratic form of the lagrangian, as explained in Appendix A. A second problem [43, 53] issues from the conform al relation  $g = e^2 g$ . Light propagates on the null cones of the physical metric; by the conform al relation these coincide with the lightcones of the E instein metric. This last is calculated from E instein's equations with the visible matter and eld as sources. Thus so long as the eld contributes comparatively little to the energy momentum tensor, it cannot a ect light de ection, which will thus be that due to the visible matter alone. But in reality galaxies and clusters of galaxies are observed to de ect light stronger than the visible mass in them would suggest. Thus relativistic AQUAL fails to accurately describe light de ection in situations in which GR requires dark matter. It is thus empirically falsi ed.

Relativistic AQUAL bequeaths to TeVeS the use of a scalar eld to connect E instein and physical metrics, a eld which satis es an equation rem iniscent of the nonrelativistic AQUAL Eq. (3).

### 2. Phase coupling gravitation

The Phase Coupled Gravity (PCG) theory was proposed [4, 40, 42] in order to resolve relativistic AQUAL's acausality problem. It retains the two metrics related by  $g = e^2 g$ , but envisages as one of a pair of mutually coupled real scalar elds with the Lagrangian density (our de nitions here di er slightly from those in Ref. 4)

$$L_{A} = \frac{1}{2} g (A; A; + {}^{2}A^{2}; ;) + V (A^{2})$$
(10)

Here is a real parameter and V a real valued function. The coupling between A and is designed to bring about AQUAL-like features for small j j. The theory receives its name because matter is coupled to , which is proportional to the phase of the self-interacting complex eld =  $Ae^{\{= \}}$ .

Variation of L , A w rt. A leads to (all covariant derivatives and index raising w rt. g )

$$A'; \qquad {}^{2}A; \qquad A V^{0}(A^{2}) = 0$$
 (11)

In the variation w.r.t. we must include the Lagrangian density of a source, say a point mass M at rest at r = 0 [c.f. S<sub>m</sub> in Eq. (7)]:

$$A^2g$$
 ;  $=^2e M (r)$  (12)

The connection with AQUAL is now clear. For su ciently small j jthe A'; term in Eq. (11) becomes negligible, and the other two establish an algebraic relation between ; ' and A<sup>2</sup>. Substituting this in Eq. (12) gives the AQUAL type of equation for that would derive from L in Eq. (6).

The PCG Lagrangian's advantage over that of the relativistic AQUAL's is precisely in that it involves rst derivatives only in quadratic form. This would seem to rule out the superlum inality generating X dependent terms discussed in Appendix A. In practice things are more complicated. A detailed local analysis employing the eikonal approximation [42] shows that there are superlum inal perturbations, for example when  $V^{00} < 0$ . However, the same analysis shows that such superlum inality occurs only when the background solution is itself locally unstable. This makes the said causality violation moot.

One way to obtain MOND phenom enology from PCG is to choose  $V(A^2) = \frac{1}{3}$ " <sup>2</sup>A<sup>6</sup> with " a constant with dimension of energy. Although with this choice  $V^{00} < 0$  which makes for unstable backgrounds, we only need this form for small A; V can take di erent form for large argument. Then in a static situation with nearly at g and weak , Eqs. (11)-(12) reduce to

$$r^{2}A = {}^{2}A(r)^{2} + {}^{2}A^{5} = 0;$$
 (13)

 $r (Ar) = {}^{2}M (r)$ : (14)

The spherically symmetric solution of Eqs. (13)-(14) is

$$A = ("=r)^{1=2}; d = dr = (\$ = 4 r)$$
 (15)

\$ 
$$(M = ");$$
  $2^{3=2} 1 + p \frac{1}{1 + 4\$^2} = (16)$ 

One may evidently still use Eq. (8):

$$a_r = GM = r^2 (^2M = 4 "r)$$
 (17)

Thus a 1=r force competes with the Newtonian one. For small M it starts to dominate at a xed radius scale  $r_c$ , just as in Tohline's [59] and Kuhn-Kruglyak's [60] non-Newtonian gravity theories. Here  $r_c = 2$  G "= <sup>2</sup>. By contrast for M M<sub>c</sub>  $\frac{1}{2}$  "= ,  $\frac{1}{2}$ <sup>P</sup> \$ and the 1=r force scales as M<sup>1=2</sup> and begins to dominate when the Newtonian acceleration drops below the xed acceleration scale

$$a_0 = {}^3 = (4 \ G''):$$
 (18)

For  $a_r = a_0$  the circular velocity whose centripetal acceleration balances the 1=r force is  $v_c = (G a_0 M)^{1=4}$ , precisely as in MOND. Thus  $a_0$  here is to be identified with M ilgrom's constant  $a_0$ . We conclude that, with a suitable choice of parameters, PCG with a sextic potential recovers the main features of MOND: asymptotically at rotation curves and the TFL for disk galaxies. Specifically, the choice = 10<sup>-8</sup> and " = 10<sup>53</sup> erg gives  $a_0 = 8:7$  10<sup>9</sup> cm s<sup>-2</sup>,  $M_c = 8:7$  10<sup>6</sup> M and  $r_c = 5:2$  10<sup>9</sup> cm. Now since  $r_c$  is larger than the Hubble scale, the Tohline-Kuhn-Kunglyak 1=r force is comparatively unimportant. Hence for M 10<sup>7</sup> M we should have MOND, and for low masses alm ost Newtonian behavior. This is about right: globular star clusters at 10<sup>4</sup> 10<sup>6</sup> M show no m issing mass problem.

How ever, the above parameters are bad from the point of view of the solar system tests of gravity, as sum marized in Appendix B. But the gravest problem with PCG is that it, just as AQUAL, provides insu cient light de ection [43]. Here again, the conformal relation between Einstein and physical metric is to blame. TeVeS incorporates PCG's Lagrangian density (10) in the limit of small in which A becomes nondynamical.

## 3. Theories with disform ally related m etrics

The light de ection problem can be solved only by giving up the relation  $g = e^2 g$ . It was thus suggested [43] to replace this conform all relation by a disform all one, namely

$$g = e^{2} (Ag + BL^{2}; ;);$$
 (19)

with A and B functions of the invariant g ; ; and L a constant length unrelated, of course, to that in Eq. (6). This relation already allows to de ect light via the ; ; term in the physical metric. However, it was found [44] that if one insists on causal propagation of both light and gravitational waves w r.t. the light cones of the physical metric, then the sign required of B is opposite that required to enhance the light de ection com ing from the metric g alone. Thus the cited disform al relation between metrics, if respecting causality, will give weaker light de ection than would g were it the physical metric.

This last observation of Ref. 44 has given rise to a folk belief that relativistic gravity theories which attempt to supplant dark matter's dynamical elects necessarily reduce light delection rather than enhancing it [34, 46, 47, 48]. However, as remarked by Sanders, the mentioned problem disappears if the term ; ; is replaced by U U, where U is a constant 4-vector which, at least in the solar system and within galaxies, points in the time direction [50]. Speci cally Sanders takes  $g = e^2 g = 2UU \sinh(2)$ .

This \strati ed" gravitation theory is reported to do well in the confrontation with the solar system tests, and to possess the right properties to explain the coincidence between  $a_0$  of MOND and the Hubble scale [7]. But its vector U is an a priori nondynam ical element whose direction is selected in an unspecied way by the cosm ological background. This means the theory is a preferred frame theory (although it is reported to be protected on this account against falsi cation in the solar system and other strong acceleration system s by its AQUAL behavior [50]). This is obviously a conceptual shortcom ing which TeVeS removes, but the latter's debt to the strati ed theory should be underlined.

# III. FUNDAM ENTALS OF TeVeS

## A. Fields and actions

 $T \in V \in S$  is based on three dynam ical gravitational elds: an E instein metric g with a well de ned inverse g , a time like 4-vector eld U such that

$$g U U = 1;$$
 (20)

and a scalar eld ; there is also a nondynamical scalar eld (the acronym TeVeS recalls the theory's Tensor-Vector-Scalar content). The physical metric in TeVeS, just as in Sanders' strati ed theory, is obtained by stretching the E instein metric in the spacetime directions orthogonal to U g U by a factor  $e^2$ , while shrinking it by the same factor in the direction parallel to U :

$$g = e^{2}(g + UU) e^{2}UU$$
 (21)

 $= e^{2} g 2UU \sinh(2)$  (22)

It is easy to verify that the inverse physical metric is

$$g = e^2 g + 2U U \sinh(2)$$
 (23)

where U will always mean g U.

The geometric part of the action,  $S_g$ , is formed from the Ricci tensor R of g just as in GR:

$$S_g = (16 G)^{1} g R (g)^{1-2} d^4 x$$
: (24)

Here g m eans the determ inant of metric g . This choice is made in order to keep TeVeS close to GR in some sense to be claried below.

7

In term s of two constant positive parameters, k and `, the action for the pair of scalar elds is taken to be of roughly PCG form ,

$$S_{s} = \frac{1}{2} {}^{2}h ; ; + \frac{1}{2}G {}^{2}F (kG {}^{2}) (g)^{1=2}d^{4}x;$$
 (25)

where h g U U and F is a free dimensionless function (it is related to PCG's potential V). No overall coe cient is required for the kinetic term; were it included, it could be absorbed into a rede nition of and thereby in k and `. Because is obviously dimensionless, the dimensions of <sup>2</sup> are those of G<sup>1</sup>. Thus k is a dimensionless constant (it could be absorbed into the de nition of F, but we choose to exhibit it), while ` is a constant length.

Because no kinetic terms appear, the \equation of motion" of takes the form of an algebraic relation between it and the invariant h ; ; , and when this is substituted for in  $S_s$ , the phenom enologically successful AQUAL type action for appears. We could, of course, have written this last action directly. The present route is more suggestive of the possible origin of the action; for example,  $S_s$  resembles the action for a complex self-interacting scalar eld

 $\exp(\{=\})$  in the lim it of small . The term  $^{2}UU$ ; ; here included in the scalar's action is new; its role is to elim in the superlum in all propagation of the eld, a recalcitrant problem in AQUAL type theories.

The action of the vector U is taken to have the form

$$S_{v} = \frac{K}{32 \text{ G}} g g U_{[;]}U_{[;]} 2(=K)(g U U + 1) (g)^{1=2}d^{4}x;$$
(26)

where antisym m etrization in a pair of indeces is indicated by surrounding them by square brackets, e.g.  $A_{[}B_{]} = A B A B$ . In Eq. (26) is a spacetime dependent Lagrange multiplier enforcing the normalization Eq. (20) (we shall calculate later), while K is a dimensionless constant since U is dimensionless. Thus TeVeS has two dimensionless parameters, k and K, in addition to the dimensional constants G and `. The kinetic term s in Eq. (26) are chosen antisymmetric not because of any desire for gauge symmetry, which is broken by the form of the physicalmetric anyway, but because this choice precludes appearance of second derivatives of U in the energy (m omentum tensor of TeVeS (see next subsection). The action  $S_v$  is a special case of that in Jacobson and M attingly's generalization of GR with a preferred frame [61].

In accordance with the equivalence principle, the matter action in TeVeS is obtained by transcribing the at spacetime lagrangian L (; f; 0 f; ) for elds written schematically as

$$S_{m} = L (g; f; f_{j}; )^{1} (3g) (27)$$

where the covariant derivatives denoted by  $_j$  are taken w.r.t.g. This has the e ect that the spacetime delineated by matter dynamics has the metric g. The appearance of ( $g^{j=2}$  here requires us to specify its relation to ( $g^{j=2}$ . In Appendix C we show that

$$(g)^{1=2} = e^{2} (g)^{1=2}$$
 (28)

By coupling to matter only through g , the eld U is totally di erent from the Lee-Yang 4-vector eld with gravitation strength interaction [66], whose existence is ruled out by the equivalence principle tests as well as by cosm ological sym m etry arguments [66, 67].

# B. Basic equations

We shall obtain the basic equations by varying the total action  $S = S_g + S_s + S_v + S_m$  with respect to the basic elds g, and U. To this end we must be explicit about how g, which enters into  $S_m$ , varies with the basic elds. Taking increments of Eq. (23) we get

$$g = e^2 g + 2 \sinh(2) U g (U) + 2 e^2 g + 2U U \cosh(2) + 2 \sinh(2) U g) U$$
 (29)

where symmetrization in a pair of indeces is indicated by surrounding them by round brackets, e.g.  $A^{(B)} = A B + A B$ .

### 1. Equations for the metric

W hen varying S w.r.t. g we recall that  $S_g = (16 \text{ G})^{1}\text{G}$  (  $g)^{l=2}$  g (G denotes the E instein tensor of g ) while

$$S_{m} = \frac{1}{2}T$$
 (g)<sup>1=2</sup> g + ::: (30)

where the ellipsis denotes variations of the f elds, and T stands for the physical energy (m om entum tensor de ned with the metric g. We get

$$G = 8 G \tilde{T} + (1 e^{4}) U \tilde{T} (U) + +$$
(31)

where

$$\begin{array}{c} h \\ 2 \\ ; \\ ; \\ \frac{1}{2}g \\ \frac{1}{2}g$$

K g U<sub>[;]</sub>U<sub>[;]</sub> 
$$\frac{1}{4}$$
g g U<sub>[;]</sub>U<sub>[;]</sub>g U U (33)

W hen varying g in  $S_v$  we have used Eq. (20) to drop a term proportional to g .

# 2. Scalar equation

Variation of in  $S_s$  gives the relation between and ; (F<sup>0</sup> dF ()=d),

$$kG^{2}F_{1=2}(kG^{2})^{2}F^{0} = k^{2}h_{3};$$
 (34)

In carrying out the variation w r.t. it must be remem bered that this quantity enters in  $S_m$  exclusively through g, so that use must be made of Eqs. (29)-(30):

$$^{2}h$$
 ; ; = g + (1 + e<sup>4</sup>)U U T (35)

In view of Eq. (34) this is an equation for only, with T as source. Suppose we de ne a function (y) by

F () 
$$\frac{1}{2} F^{0}() = Y$$
: (36)

so that kG<sup>2</sup> =  $(k^{2}h_{i})$ ,  $(k^{2}h_{i})$ 

$$k^{2}h$$
 ; ; h ; = kG g + (1 + e<sup>4</sup>)U U T : (37)

This equation is reminiscent of the relativistic AQUAL scalar equation [see Appendix A, Eq. (A1)], albeit with the replacement g 7 h in the lh.s. In quasistatic situations we may replace h by g so that Eq. (37) has the same structure as the AQUAL equation.

### 3. Vector equation

Variation of S w.r.t. U and use of Eq. (29) gives the vector equation

$$KU^{[;]} + U + 8 G^{2}U ; g ; = 8 G(1 e^{4})g U T^{2}$$
 (38)

As mentioned, here is a Lagrange multiplier. It can be solved for by contracting the previous equation with U . Substituting it back gives

$$K U^{[;]} + U U U^{[;]} + 8 G^{2} U ; g ; + U (U ;)^{2}$$
  
= 8 G (1 e<sup>4</sup>) g U T + U U U T (39)

This equation has only three independent components since both sides of it are orthogonal to U. It thus determ ines three components of U with the fourth being determ ined by the norm alization (20). Like any other partial di erential equation, the vector equation does not by itself determ ine U uniquely.

# C. General relativity lim it

TeVeS has three parameters: k; `and K. Here we show rst that in several familiar contexts the limit k ! 0, `/ k  $^{3=2}$ , K / k of it corresponds to standard GR for any form of the function F. M any of the interm ediate results will be seful in Sec. V and V II. We then expand on a remark by M ilgrom that the GR limit actually follows under m ore general circum stances: K ! 0 and `! 1.

W henever a speci cm atter content is needed, we shall assume the matter to be an ideal uid. Its energy-momentum tensor has the familiar form

$$\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{a}\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{g} + \mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}); \tag{40}$$

where ~ is the proper energy density, p the pressure and u the 4-velocity, all three expressed in the physical metric. W e may protably simplify Eq. (37) in any case when for symmetry reasons u is collinear with U. In order that the velocity be normalized w.r.t. g, we must take in that case u = e U from which follows

$$g + \alpha \alpha = e^{2} (g + U U);$$
 (41)

Substituting this in T allow s us to rew rite Eq. (37) as

$$k^{2}h$$
 ; , h ;  $= kG(-+3p)e^{2}$  : (42)

This form is suitable for the analysis of cosm ology as well as static system s.

# 1. Cosm ology

N ot only in portant in itself, cosm ology is relevant for setting boundary conditions in the study of T eV e S in the solar system and other localized weak gravity situations. W e shall con ne our remarks to Friedmann-R obertson {W alker (FRW ) cosm ologies, for which the metric can be given the form

g dx dx = 
$$dt^2 + a(t)^2 [d^2 + f()^2 (d^2 + sin^2 d'^2)]$$
: (43)

Here f () sin ; ; sinh for closed, at and open spaces, respectively.

In applying Eq. (37) we shall assume that the elds , and U partake of the symmetries of the FRW spacetime. Thus we take these elds to depend solely on t. Also since there are no preferred spatial directions, U must point in the cosm ological time direction: U = t (that this is possible distinguishes U from the Lee-Yang eld which is ruled out in FRW cosm ology [67]). O by buously this is a case where w = e U; the scalar equation then takes the form

a 
$${}^{3}\theta_{t}[a^{3}(2k^{2}-b^{2})] = \frac{1}{2}kG(a^{2}+3p)e^{2};$$
 (44)

where an overdot signi es @=@t. The rst integral is

$$(2k^{2}-2) = \frac{k^{2}}{2a^{3}} \int_{0}^{t} G(x+3p)e^{2} a^{3}dt;$$
 (45)

As is custom any in scalar{tensor theories, we have dropped an additive integration constant; this has the e ect of am eliorating any divergence of -as a ! 0. In fact we can see that the rhs. of the equation behaves there as  $k(+3p)e^2 t$ . We observe that as  $k! 0 with '/k^{3=2}$ , -w ill behave as k with the argument of staying constant. Thus regardless of the form of , we have <math>-k. It is thus consistent to assume that itself is of 0 (k) throughout cosm ological history. This despite the possible divergence of -at the cosm ological singularity, since the rate of that divergence is also proportional to k, as we have just seen. Recalling that kG<sup>2</sup> = , we conclude that <sup>2</sup> is of 0 (k<sup>1</sup>) in the cosm ological solutions (otherwise would vary with k whereas its argument stayed constant).

Let us check whether our assumption that U = t is consistent with the vector equation (38). The choice U = t makes  $U^{[i]} = 0$ . For a comoving ideal uid  $U^{T} = e^2 - U$ . Thus the spatial components of the vector equation (38) vanish identically, while the tem poral one inform sus that

$$= 8 G^{2} - \frac{2}{2} 2 \sim \sinh(2):$$
 (46)

Our previous com m ents m ake it clear that is of O(k).

Turning to the gravitational equations (31)-(33) we rst note that in the limit fk ! 0,  $k^{3=2}$ , K / kg, and are both 0 (k). It follows that G = 8 GT + 0 (k). Since the difference between g and g is also of 0 (k), it is obvious that G = 8 GT + 0 (k) so that any cosm ological model based on TeVeS difference the corresponding one in GR only by term s of 0 (k). In FRW cosm ology TeVeS has GR as its limit when k ! 0 with  $k^{3=2}$  and K / k.

# 2. Quasistatic localized system

We now turn to system s such as the solar system, or a neutron star, which may be thought of as quasistatic situations in asymptotically at spacetime (at least up to sub{cosm ological distances). We shall idealize them as truly static system s with time independent metrics of the form

$$g dx dx = g_{tt}(x^{k}) dt^{2} + g_{ij}(x^{k}) dx^{i} dx^{j}$$
(47)

and no energy ow. The scalar and vector equations have a variety of joint solutions. We shall single out the physical one by requiring the boundary condition that ! const. at spatial in nity, the constant being just the value of from the cosm obgical model in which our localized system is embedded. Likewise, we shall require that U  $!_t$  so that the vector eld matches the cosm obgical eld at spatial in nity".

We rst show that U = N, with = t the Killing vector associated with the static character of the spacetime, is an acceptable solution (with N (g))<sup>1=2</sup>, U is properly normalized). Let us consider the expression g U T + U U U T appearing in the source of the vector equation (39) for this choice of U. Its = t component is N  $T^{t}_{t} + U_{t}U^{t}T^{t}_{t} = 0$ , while the  $= i \text{ com ponent is N} g^{ij}T_{jt} + U^{i}(U^{t})^{2}T_{tt}$  which also vanishes because  $T_{jt} = 0$  (no energy ow). Turn now to the lhs. of Eq. (39). Because U has only a (time(independent) tem poral component, U); = 0, and the only nonvanishing components of  $U^{[i]}$  are the jt ones, and they depend only on the  $x^{j}$ . Hence  $U^{[i; j]}$ ; = 0 so that the = i com ponents of the lhs. of the equation vanish. W hat is left of the  $= t \text{ com ponent is K} (U^{[t; j]}; + U^{t}U_{t}U^{[t; j]}; )$  which vanishes by the normalization of U. Hence U = N satis es the vector equation for any k and K. We have not succeeded in proving that this is the unique solution, but this seem s to be a reasonable supposition.

Now, as k ! 0, the scalar equation (37) reduces to (h;); = 0. Multiplying this by ( $g^{j=2}$ , discarding all time derivatives, and integrating over space gives, after an integration by parts and application of the boundary condition at in nity, that g; ( $g^{j=2}d^3x = 0$ . Because for any static metric,  $g^{ij}$  is positive de nite and, when de ned, > 0, this equation is satistic ed only by = const. throughout. But for k ! 0, the cosm ologicalm odel has ! 0. Hence as k ! 0, ! 0 in all the space.

Returning to the full scalar equation (37) and recalling that  $'/k^{3=2}$ , it is easy to see that for small but nite k the gradient of scales as k. From the last paragraph it then follows that = 0 (k). These last conclusions are actually independent of the form of because its argument goes to a nonzero constant in the lim it k ! 0. We recall [see Eq. (34)] that as k ! 0,  $^2/k^1$ . Thus the scalars' energy-momentum tensor is of 0 (k) (recall '/ k  $^{3=2}$ ). From the = t component of Eq. (38) we see that = 0 (k) + 0 (K). Hence = 0 (k) + 0 (K). In addition, the term in the gravitational equations (31) proportional to 1  $e^4$  is itself of 0 (k); hence we have G = 8 GT + 0 (k) + 0 (K). Since the di erence between g and g is of 0 (), namely 0 (k), it is obvious that G' = 8 GT + 0 (k) + 0 (K). Thus for quasistatic situations also, TeVeS has GR as its lim it when k ! 0 with '/ k  $^{3=2}$  and K / k.

## D. Generic general relativity lim it

M ilgrom (private communication) has remarked that GR actually follows from TeVeS in the more general limit K ! 0 and '! 1 with k arbitrary. This is easily seen after the change of variables 7 ', 7 k, whereby only g and S<sub>s</sub> are changed:

$$g = e^{2} i g_{Z}^{*} 2UU \sinh(2 = 1)$$
 (48)

$$S_s = \frac{1}{2k^2 x^2} k^2 h$$
;  $+ \frac{1}{2}G^4 F (G^2) (g)^{1-2}d^4 x$ ; (49)

Thus as `! 1 the scalar action disappears and decouples from the theory. In addition, with K ! 0, the vector's action  $S_v$  disappears apart from the term with . All this means that the rhs. of the Einstein equations (31) retains only the T and U U terms. But according to the vector equation (38), from which the terms with dimensional dimensional sector equation (38).

and U have dropped out, ! 0 because  $(1 e^{4})! 0$ . A coordingly, we get the usual E instein equations. Since g and g coincide as `! 1, we get exact GR.

In this paper we shall assume that k=1 and K=1 without restricting `. Empirical bounds on k and K are discussed in Secs. IV C and V .

#### E. The choice of F

Because we have no theory for the functions F() or y(), there is great freedom in choosing them . In this paper we shall adopt, as an example, the form

$$y = \frac{3}{4} \frac{2}{1} \frac{(2)^2}{1}$$
(50)

plotted in Fig.1. As y ranges from 0 to 1, (y) increases m onotonically from 0 to unity; for smally, (y)  $\frac{1}{y=3}$ . For negative y the function (y) is double-valued. As y decreases from 0, one branch decreases m onotonically from = 2 and diverges as y ! 1.

W e adopt the second (far right) branch as the physical one.

FIG.1: The function y( ) as relevant for quasistationary system s, 0 < ~< 1, and for cosm ology, 2 < ~< 1 .

W hat features of the above y() are essential for the following sections? The denominator in Eq. (50) is included so that shall asymptote to unity for y ! 1 (the Newtonian limit, c.f. Sec. IV C). The factor <sup>2</sup> ensures that the MOND limit is contained in the theory (see Sec. IV B), while the factor ( $2^{2}$  ensures there exists a monotonically decreasing branch of (y) which covers the whole of the range y 2 [0; 1) (relevant to cosm ology, c.f. Sec.VII) and only it.





FIG.2: The function F ( ) as relevant for quasistationary system s, 0 < < 1, and for cosm ology, 2 < < 1 .

Integrating Eq. (36) with y() we obtain (see Fig. 2)

$$F = \frac{3}{9} \frac{4+2}{2} \frac{4^2+3+2\ln[(1)^2]}{2};$$
(51)

where we ignore a possible integration constant (which will, how ever, be useful in Sec.V IIF below). Obviously F < 0 in the range 2 (0;1) (relevant for quasistationary systems) but F > 0 for > 2 (the cosm ological range). Where negative, F contributes negative energy density in the energy momentum tensor (32). Despite this there seems to be no collision with the requirement of positive overall energy density (see Secs.V and VIIA).

# IV. NONRELATIVISTIC LIM IT OF TeVeS

Sec. IIIC 2 shows that in quasistatic systems TeVeS approaches GR in the limit fk ! 0,  $k^{3=2}$ , K kg. But in what limit do we recover standard New tonian gravity ? And where is MOND, which is antagonistic to New tonian gravity, in all this ? This section shows that with our choice of F, both New tonian and MOND limits emerge from TeVeS for small gravitational potentials, but that MOND requires in addition small gravitational elds, just as expected from M ilgrom 's original scheme.

#### A. Quasistatic system s

We are here concerned with a quasistatic, weak potential and slow motion situation, such as a galaxy or the solar system . As in Sec. IIIC 2, quasistatic means we can neglect time derivatives in comparison with spatial ones. Let us assume that the metric g is nearly at and that j j 1. Then linearization of Eq. (31) in terms of the New tonian potential V generated by the energy content on its rh.s. gives  $g_{tt} = (1 + 2V) + O(V^2)$ . From the prescription given in Sec. IIIC 2, U =  $[1 + V + O(V^2)]_t$ . It follows from Eq. (22) that to O() and O(V),  $g_{tt} = (1 + 2V + 2)$ . Thus in TeVeS the total potential governing all nonrelativistic motion is = V + ... We should remark that if asymptotically ! = 60, the  $g_{tt}$  does not there correspond to a M inkow skim etric. This is remedied by rescaling the time (or spatial) coordinates by factors e  $\circ$  (or e  $\circ$ ). W ith respect to the new coordinates the metric is then asymptotically M inkow skian. In this paper we assume throughout that  $j_c j = 1$ ; Sec. V II shows this is consistent with cosm obgical evolution of .

How is related to  $_N$ , the Newtonian gravitational potential generated by the mass density ~ according to Poisson's equation with gravitational constant G? To relate to  $_N$  we rst set temporal derivatives in Eq. (42) to zero which means replacing h ; ! g ;:

$$k^{2}g$$
 ; ; g ; \_ = kG (~ + 3p) e<sup>2</sup> : (52)

This equation is still exact. Next we replace g ! as well as  $e^2$  ! 1. This is the nonrelativistic approximation. Further, to be consistent we must neglect p compared to  $\sim$ ; keeping the form er would be tantam ount to accepting that V is not small. Thus

This is just the AQUAL equation (3) with a suitable reinterpretation of the function . Now comparing Eq. (53) with Poisson's equation we see that

$$\mathbf{k}^{\perp} \dot{\mathbf{j}} \mathbf{r}^{\perp} \mathbf{j} = O(\dot{\mathbf{j}} \mathbf{r}_{N} \mathbf{j}) \tag{54}$$

This will be made more precise below in situations with symmetry.

We now show that it is consistent to take  $V = C_N$ , with C a constant close to unity (to be determined). The starting point are the modi ed Einstein equations (31). With F as in (51), F < 0 simultaneously with  $F^{0} < 0$  for 0 < 1; it follows from Eq. (36) that  $f'_{j} < y$ . Now the F term on the rh.s. of Eq. (31) is  $2 G^2 \cdot 2 F$  (kG  $^2$ )g =  $2 k^2 \cdot 2 F$  ()g . Similarly, since t = 0 here, the term s on the r.h.s. involving ; are of order 8 G  $^{2}h$  ; g = 8 k  $^{2}$   $^{2}y$  ()g . Thus by our earlier remark the derivative terms in dom inate the F term, and by Eq. (54) they are of order 8 k  $^{1}$  (r  $_{N}$ )<sup>2</sup>. But (r  $_{N}$ )<sup>2</sup> is precisely the type of source New tonian gravitational energy or stress density) needed to compute the rst nonlinear or 0 ( $_{\rm N}$ <sup>2</sup>) contributions to the metric. A swe shall see in Sec. VII, we need k 10<sup>2</sup>, so that if all we desire is to compute the metric to 0 ( $_{\rm N}$ ), and is not very small, then all of may be neglected.

Further, since  $U = [1 + V + O(V^2)]_t$ , the  $U_{[;]}^2$  term s in have the form (C r  $_{\rm N}$ )<sup>2</sup>; we drop them for the same reason that we dropped the O ( $_{\rm N}$ <sup>2</sup>) term in . It follows that in the weak potential approximation the spatio-tem poral and spatial-spatial com ponents of E instein's equations are exactly the same as in GR because the term proportional to 1 e<sup>4</sup> can be dropped by virtue of the slow motion condition which suppresses the spatiotem poral components of T . The tem poral-tem poral component of Einstein's equations depends on , and is thus another story. From Eqs. (38) and (40) and the observation that  $U_{i} = 0$ ,

$$= K U U^{[;]}$$
; 16 G ~ sinh (2): (55)

W ith our U the rst term is  $K U_t U^{[t; ]}$ ; =  $K C r^2 _N + K C^2 O (r _N^2)$ , where by Poisson's equation  $r^2 _N = 4 G \sim .$ Further, as we shall see in Sec.V, is always very close to its aforem entioned asymptotic value  $_{\rm c}$  (which is just 's very slow by varying cosm ological value). D ropping the C<sup>2</sup>O (r  $\sqrt{2}$ ) contribution for the same reason as above gives

Substituting this in Eq. (33) and combining the result with the (1  $e^4$  c) term in the G<sub>tt</sub> equation Eq. (31), we see that ( $e^{2} + KC = 2$ ) ~ replaces the source ~ appropriate in the weak potential approximation to GR.By linearizing the G<sub>tt</sub> equation as done in GR, we conclude that

$$V = (e^{-2} \circ + K C = 2)_{N}$$
(57)

which veries the claim that V is proportional to N. Indeed, since the proportionality constant here must be identical with C, we have C =  $(1 \text{ K} = 2)^{1} \text{ e}^{2} \text{ c}$ . Since we shall show in Sec. V II that it is consistent to assume j<sub>c</sub>j 1, and assum e that K 1, we shall replace C everywhere by  $1 + K = 2 2_{c}$ . In particular

$$=$$
 <sub>N</sub> + : (58)

In sum mary, Eq. (58), which is subject to corrections of 0 (  $_{\rm N}$  <sup>2</sup>), quantiles the dilerence at the nonrelativistic level between TeVeS and GR, a di erence which is in harm ony with our conclusion in Sec. IIIC 2. We shall use it until we turn to post-New tonian corrections. The condition \ is not very small" which we imposed above to be able to neglect the contribution to the gravitational equations is not restrictive. For the Newtonian limit we shall see that 1.And when 1 (extrem e M O N D lim it relevant for extragalactic phenom ena), the consequent connections of 0 (  $_{
m N}$   $^2$  ) (with large coe cient) to V are entirely ignorable because this potential is then dom inated by

in the expression for , c.f. Eq. (59).

## B. The MOND lim it: spherical sym metry

F irst for orientation we assume a spherically symmetric situation. Then from Eq. (53) together with G auss' theorem we infer that

$$r = (k=4) r_{N}$$
: (59)

In view of Eq. (58) we have

with

$$\sim$$
 (+ k=4 )<sup>1</sup>: (61)

Consider the case 1 for which  $k^{2}(jr)^{2}$  (k=3)<sup>1=2</sup> jr j (see Sec. IIIE). E liminating r <sub>N</sub> between Eqs. (59) and (60) and dening

$$a_0 = \frac{(3k)^{1-2}}{4}$$
 (62)

we obtain a quadratic equation for with positive root

$$= (k=8) \qquad 1 + \frac{p}{1+4j} = \frac{1}{j=a_0}$$
(63)

This is obviously valid only when  $jr j (4 = k)^2 a_0$  since otherwise is not sm all. From Eq. (61) we now deduce the MOND function

$$= \frac{1}{-1} \frac{1 + \frac{p}{1 + 4jc} \frac{j}{j = a_0}}{1 + \frac{p}{1 + 4jc} \frac{j}{j = a_0}}$$
(64)

For  $j_r = a_0$  (which is consistent with the above restriction since k = 1) this equation gives to low est order in K and  $c_c$ 

$$\sim j_{r} j_{=a_0}$$
: (65)

Thus if we identify our  $a_0$  with M ilgrom 's constant, Eq. (60) with this ~ coincides with the MOND form ula (1) in the extrem e low acceleration regime. Therefore, TeVeS recovers MOND's successes in regard to low surface brightness disk galaxies, dwarf spheroidal galaxies, and the outer regions of spiral galaxies. For all these the low acceleration limit of Eq. (1) is known to sum marize the phenom enology correctly.

Now suppose jr j varies from an order below  $a_0$  up to a couple of orders above it. This respects the condition jr j  $(4 = k)^2 a_0$ . Then Eq. (64) shows ~ to grow monotonically from about 0.1 to 0.9. Then Eq. (60) is essentially form ula (1) in the interm ediate MOND regime. This regime is relevant for the disks of massive spiral galaxies well outside the central bulges but not quite in their outer reaches. It is known that the precise form of ~ makes little di erence for the task of predicting detailed rotation curves from surface photom etry.

We see that TeVeS reproduces the MOND paradigm encapsulated in Eq. (1) for not too large values of  $j_{\pm a_0}$ . What happens for very large  $j_{\pm a_0}$ ?

#### C. The Newtonian lim it: spherical sym metry

A coording to our choice of y(), Eq. (50), the limit ! 1 corresponds to y ! 1, that is to say jr j! 1. By Eqs. (59) { (61) we simultaneously have jr j! 1 and  $\sim !$  ( + k=4 ) <sup>1</sup>. Defining the Newtonian gravitational constant by

$$G_N = (+k=4)G;$$
 (66)

we see from Eq. (60) that r is obtained from r  $_{\rm N}$  by just replacing G !  $G_{\rm N}$  in it. In other words, in the nonrelativistic and arbitrarily large jr jregime, TeVeS is equivalent to New tonian gravity, but with a \renorm alized" value of the gravitational constant. Now is really a surrogate of C = (1 K = 2)  $^{1}e^{-2}$ °; hence for K < 2,  $G_{\rm N}$  is positive. A smentioned, we here assume K 1.

But how close are dynamics to New tonian for large but nite  $jr = a_0$ ? Expanding the rh.s. of Eq. (50) in the neighborhood of = 1 gives

$$y = \frac{3=4}{1} + O(1)$$
 (67)

We also have by Eqs. (59) and (60) that y  $k^2 \dot{r} \dot{f} (k^{3-2}=16^{-2})\dot{r} \dot{f}^2$  where we have dropped corrections of higher order in (k=4). Dropping the O (1) term in y () and eliminating 'in favor of a (with = 1) we get

$$1 - \frac{b^4}{k^4} \frac{a_0^{-1}}{j^2}$$
(68)

Thus to trust the approximation 1 we must have  $jr = a_0 = 8^{-2}k^{-2}$ . Using Eqs. (68) and (61) we obtain, again after dropping higher order terms in k, that

$$\frac{G}{G_{\rm N}} = 1 - \frac{16^{-3}}{k^3} \frac{{a_0}^2}{jr \ j^2} \quad : \tag{69}$$

Here the factor ( $G = G_N$ ) just rejects the mentioned \renorm alization" of the gravitational constant; it is the next factor which interests us as a measure of departures from strict New tonian behavior. For example, if k = 0.03 there is a 5.3 10 <sup>9</sup> fractional enhancement of the sun's New tonian eld at Earth's orbit where jr j= 0.59 cm s<sup>2</sup>. This is probably unobservable today. At Satum's orbit where jr j= 0.0065 cm s<sup>2</sup> the fractional correction is 4.3 10<sup>5</sup>, corresponding to an excess acceleration 2.8 10<sup>7</sup> cm s<sup>2</sup> (at this point departs from unity by only 0.018 so that Eq. (68) is still reliable). A lthough this departure from New tonian predictions seem s serious, it should be remembered that navigational data from the Pioneer 10 and 11 spacecrafts seem to disclose a constant acceleration in excess of New tonian of about 8 10<sup>8</sup> cm s<sup>2</sup> between U ranus' orbit and the trans-P lutonian region [63]. It is, how ever, unclear whether the correction in Eq. (69), sensitive as it is to the choice of F, has anything to do with the \Pioneer anomaly".

#### D. Nonspherical system s

We now consider generically asymmetric systems. Since any system has a region where diers from unity and is variable, Eq. (59) is not the general solution of Eq. (53) and must be replaced by

$$r = (k=4)(r_{N} + r_{h});$$
 (70)

where h is some regular vector eld which is determined up to a gradient by the condition that the curl of the rhs. of Eq. (70) vanish.

The freedom inherent in h allows it to be m ade divergenceless. Then by G auss' theorem h m ust fallo faster than  $1=r^2$  and r h faster than  $1=r^3$  at large distances. On physical grounds jr h j is expected to be of the same order as jr N jwell inside the matter. But since the latter quantity falls o as  $1=r^2$  well outside the matter, the curl term in Eq. (70) m ust rapidly become negligible well outside the system. We thus expect the discussion in Sec. IV B to apply well outside any nonspherical galaxy just as it applies anywhere inside a spherical one. The interior and near exterior of such a galaxy, where r h is still important, m ust be treated by numerical methods which would be no di erent than those developed by M ilgrom within the old AQUAL theory [51].

N eedless to say, an asymmetric system so dense that the New tonian regime ( approximately constant) obtains in its interior, e.g. an oblate globular cluster like ! Centauri, can be described everywhere without an h. For in the interior h is not needed since even in its absence the curl of the r.h.s. of Eq. (70) vanishes (approximately). And

begins to di er substantially from unity only well outside the system where we know from our previous argument that any h is becoming negligible. Hence both Newtonian and MOND regimes of the system may be described as in Secs. IV B and IV C.

In sum m ary, we see that the extragalactic predictions of the MOND equation (1) are recovered from TeVeS; at the same time TeVeS hints at non-New tonian behavior in the reaches of the solar system, though the e ect is sensitive to the choice of F in the theory.

## V. THE POST-NEW TONIAN CORRECTIONS

The upshot of the discussion at the end of Sec. IIIC 2 is that in the solar system (regarded as a static system | with rotation neglected | embedded in a FRW cosm ological background), G = 8 GT + 0 (k) + 0 (K). Here we compute the consequent 0 (k) + 0 (K) corrections to the Schwarzschild metric

$$g dx dx = \frac{(1 Gm = 2\%)^2}{(1 + Gm = 2\%)^2} dt^2 + (1 + Gm = 2\%)^4 [d\%^2 + \%^2 (d^2 + \sin^2 d'^2)]$$
(71)

that describes the exterior of a spherically mass m , and determ ine the post-N ew tonian parameters of  $T \in V \in S$  which we compare with those of G R.

R ather than just extending the Newtonian limit calculation of Sec. IV C, we start from scratch. First we write the spherically symmetric and static metric of the sun (inside and outside it) as

$$g dx dx = e dt^{2} + e^{\xi} [d^{\xi^{2}} + \xi^{2} (d^{2} + \sin^{2} d'^{2})]$$
(72)

with = (%) and & = & (%). Just as for metric (1), outside the sun these functions should adm it the expansions ( $_i$  and  $_i$  are dimensionless constants)

$$e = 1 \quad r_g = \$ + _2 (r_g = \$)^2 +$$
(73)

$$e^{k} = 1 + {}_{1}r_{g} = + {}_{2}(r_{g} = + {}_{3})^{2} + ;$$
 (74)

where  $r_g$  is a lengthscale to be determined (see Appendix D). The magnitude of the coe cient of the  $r_g$ =% term in Eq. (73) has been absorbed into  $r_g$ ; its sign must be negative, as shown, because gravity is attractive. From the fact that TeVeS approaches GR for small k and K, we may infer that  $r_g$  is close to 2G times the system's Newtonian mass. This is made precise below.

Taking = (%) and T from Eq. (40), we may write the scalar equation (42) as

$$e^{2}e^{(+3i)=2}[e^{(+i)=2}e^{2} 0]^{0} = kGe^{2} (-+3p):$$
 (75)

Here  $^{0}$  stands for d=d%. The rst integral of Eq. (75) is

$${}^{0} = \frac{kGe}{\frac{\varphi^{2}}{\varphi^{2}}} \int_{0}^{Z} (+ 3p)e^{-2t^{2} + 3k^{2} - 2t^{2}} \sqrt[8]{2}d\vartheta; \qquad (76)$$

where the integration constant has been chosen so that is regular at % = 0.

Supposing the matter's boundary is at % = R, we denote the (positive) \scalar mass"

7

$$m_s = 4 \qquad (\sim + 3p)e^{-2 + 3k = 2 - 2} \ ^2d$$
; (77)

Because for a nonrelativistic uid  $p \sim m_s m$  ust be close to the New tonian m ass. In fact, as shown in Appendix D,  $m_s$  and an appropriately de ned gravitational mass  $m_g$  di er only by a fraction of O (G m  $_g$ =R) which am ounts to 10 <sup>5</sup> for the inner solar system. For > R we may expand <sup>0</sup> as

$${}^{0} = \frac{kGm_{s}h}{4}\frac{1}{2} + \frac{(1_{s})r_{g}}{2\$^{3}} + O(\$^{4})^{i}$$
(78)

It is obvious from this that decreases inward. Its asymptotic value, as will be explained in Sec.VII, is positive and of O (k). The decrement in down to \radius" is, according to Eq. (76), or its integral Eq. (92) below, of O (kGm s=4 %). In any weakly gravitating system, Gm s= 1 and for strongly gravitating systems like a neutron star, Gm s= is still well below unity (black holes require a special discussion which we defer to another occasion). Thus remains positive and small throughout space for all system s, and for the solar system in particular. This will have repercussions for the causality question exam ined in Sec.VIII.

Since we are not here interested in purely MOND corrections, we shall take = 1 in Eq. (78) as well as in the terms in , Eq. (32), which explicitly involve derivatives. The in the F term of is not so easily disposed of because with our choice of F, and indeed with any viable one, F must be singular at = 1. If neglecting the F term in 8 G can be justiled, then using Eq. (78) we may compute from Eq. (32) that for \$ > R

8 G <sub>tt</sub> = 8 G <sub>%%</sub> = 
$$\frac{kG^2m_s^2}{4 %^4} + 0 (\% ^5)$$
: (79)

Now by the approximation (68) the ratio of the F term in 8 G to these last terms is

$$\frac{8^{2} {}^{2} {}^{2} {}^{2} {}^{2} {}^{1} {}^{()} {}^{3} {}^{4} {}^{2} {}^{2} {}^{2} {}^{2} {}^{1} {}^{()} {}^{j} {}^{j} {}^{j} {}^{2} {}^{2} {}^{3} {}^{j} {}^{()} {}^{j} {}^{j} {}^{j} {}^{j} {}^{2} {}^{3} {}^{(1)} {}^{j} {}^{j} {}^{j} {}^{j} {}^{j} {}^{(1)} {}^{j} {}^{j} {}^{j} {}^{(1)} {}^{j} {}$$

which num erically does not exceed 0.04 for > 0.99. This justices Eq. (79) in any region where MOND elects are totally negligible. However, as pointed out in Sec. IV C, at Satum's orbit already departs from unity by two percent. In such cases the contribution of the F term to must be taken into account, and its post-Newtonian elects compared with the MOND departure from strict Newtonian behavior calculated in Sec. IV C. Here we shall only be concerned with inner solar system dynamics where is very close to unity. Because the is dominated by the derivative terms, the energy density contributed by the scalar elds is evidently positive.

C learly in our situation (see Sec. IIIC 2)

$$U = fe^{-2};0;0;0g:$$
 (81)

Using this in Eqs. (33) and (38) we nd for % > R that

$$= \frac{K(2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1) (2 + 1)$$

$$_{tt} = \frac{K (2_1 3 + 8_2)r_g^2}{8^{64}} + O (\%^5)$$
(83)

$$_{\$\$} = \frac{K r_g^2}{8\$^4} + 0 (\$^5)$$
 (84)

W ith this we now turn to Einstein's equations (31) for all%. By virtue of U 's form here, the tt and %% components simplify to

$$e^{\delta} \delta^{0} + \frac{1}{4} \delta^{0} + 2 \delta^{0} = 8 = 8 G (2e^{4} - 1)\Gamma_{tt} + tt + tt$$
(85)

$$\frac{1}{4}\xi_{\alpha}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{2}\xi_{\alpha}^{(0)} + (\xi_{\alpha}^{(0)} + 0) = = 8 \quad \text{G} \quad T_{\$\$} + \$_{\$} \quad (86)$$

First we solve these for  $\gg R$  where T = 0. From Eqs. (73) and (74) it follows that

$${}^{0} = r_{q} = {}^{9}{}^{2} + (1 \quad 2_{2})r_{q}^{2} = {}^{9}{}^{3} +$$
(87)

$$\delta^{0} = {}_{1}r_{g} = \delta^{2} + ({}_{1}{}^{2} - 2{}_{2})r_{g}{}^{2} = \delta^{3} +$$
(88)

Substituting these together with Eqs. (73), (74), (79) and (83) in Eqs. (85)–(86), m atching  $\infty e$  cients of like powers of 1=%, and solving the three resulting algebraic conditions gives to lowest order in k and K

$$_{1} = 1$$
 (89)

$$_{2} = \frac{1}{2}$$
 (90)

$$_{2} = \frac{3}{8} + \frac{1}{16} K = \frac{kG^{2}m_{s}^{2}}{8r_{g}^{2}}$$
 (91)

U sing these results we show in Appendix D that  $r_g = 2 \text{Gm}_g [1+0 (k\text{Gm}_g=R)+0 (K \text{Gm}_g=R)]$  with  $m_g$ , the gravitational mass, de ned by Eq. (D4). The relative correction here is 10<sup>5</sup> for the inner solar system. We also remark that with the values (89)-(91) the energy density contributed by tt is positive (see Eq. (83)).

For solar system tests of TeVeS we must know the physical metric g. According to Eqs. (22) and (81),  $g_{tt} = e^{2} + g_{tt} = g = g^{2} = g_{tt} = g^{2} + g^{2} = g^{2}$ 

$$(\%) = {}_{c} \frac{kGm_{s}}{4\%} + O(\%^{3}); \qquad (92)$$

whereupon

$$e^{2} = e^{2} \circ 1 \frac{kGm_{s}}{2 \%} + \frac{k^{2}G^{2}m_{s}^{2}}{8 ^{2}\%^{2}} + O(\%^{3}) :$$
 (93)

The integration constant  $_{\rm c}$  is evidently the cosm obgical value of  $\,$  at the epoch in question. This value changes slow ly over solar system timescales, so we can ignore its drift form ost purposes. Thus by taking the advantage of the isotropic form of the metric (72), and rescaling the t and % coordinates appropriately, we absorb the factors e<sup>2</sup>  $^{\circ}$  and e  $^{2}$   $^{\circ}$  that would otherwise appear in g so that it can asymptote to M inkow skian form as expected. W ith this precaution one can calculate as if  $_{\rm c}$  vanished. It must be stressed that this strategy works at a particular cosm ological era.

= 1

A coordingly

$$g_{tt} = 1 + 2G_N m \$^{-1} 2 G_N^{-2} m^{-2} \$^{-2} + O(\$^{-3})$$
(94)

$$g_{\$\$} = 1 + 2 G_{N} m \$^{-1} + O (\$^{-2})$$
(95)

$$G_{N} m r_{g}=2 + (kGm_{s}=4)$$
 (96)

As previously,  $G_N$  is defined by Eq. (66). Recalling the relations between  $r_g$ ,  $m_g$  and  $m_s$  (Appendix D), we not that  $m = m_g [1 + 0 (kGm_g = R)] + 0 (kGm_g = R)]$ , i.e., in the inner solar system m and  $m_g$  differ fractionally by 10<sup>5</sup>. Setting  $r_g = 2Gm_g = 2Gm$  gives the second form of . Our results for and are consistent with those obtained by E iling and Jacobson [62] for the relevant case of the Jacobson-M attingly theory.

The and are the standard post-New tonian coe cients measurable by the classical tests of gravity theory [54]. They are both unity in TeVeS, exactly as in GR (for this was rst noticed by G iannios). Consequently the classical tests (perihelion precession, light de ection and radar time delay) cannot distinguish between the two theories with present experimental precision.

The and are not the only PPN coe cients. Future work should look at those coe cients having to do with preferred frame e ects, as well as at the Nortvedt e ect, which should not be null in TeVeS.

# VI. GRAVITATIONAL LENSING IN TeVeS

In Sec.V we touched upon gravitational lensing in the New tonian regime. Here we show that in the low acceleration regime, TeVeS predicts gravitational lensing of the correct magnitude to explain the observations of intergalactic lensing without any dark matter. First by following the essentially exact method of Ref. 44, we show this for a spherically symmetric structure; in nature many elliptical galaxies and galaxy clusters are wellm odelled as spherically symmetric. We then use linearized theory to give a short proof of the same result for asymmetric systems. Our discussion refers to lensing of both rays that pass through the system and those that skirt it, and is thus a generalization of the implicit result about light de ection in Sec.V in more than one way.

# A. Spherically sym m etric system s

We adopt the E instein metric (72); the physical metric is obtained by replacing  $e ! e^{+2}$  and  $e^{k} ! e^{k^2}$  in it. Consider a light ray which propagates in the equatorial plane of the metric (which may, of course, be chosen to suit any light ray). The 4-velocity <u>x</u> of the ray (derivative taken with respect to some suitable parameter) must satisfy

$$e^{+2}t^{2} + e^{\delta}t^{2} (e^{2} + e^{2}t^{2}) = 0;$$
 (99)

From the metric's stationarity follows the conservation law  $e^{+2} t = E$  where E is a constant characteristic of the ray. From spherical symmetry it follows that  $e^{\delta} = 2 \frac{2}{2} - E$  where L is another constant property of the ray. Let us write  $\delta = (d^2 - d^2)$ . Now eliminating t and '\_ from Eq. (99) in favor of E and L, and dividing by  $E^2$  yields

$$e^{2} + (b = s)^{2} e^{s + 2} [s^{2} (ds = d')^{2} + 1] = 0;$$
(100)

where b = L = E. By going to in nity where the metric factors approach unity one sees that b is just the ray's impact parameter with respect to the matter distribution's center at % = 0. This last equation has the quadrature

e

$$' = \frac{2}{e^{\hat{k}}} \frac{4}{b} + \frac{2}{b} \frac{1}{b} \frac{1}{b}$$

Were the physical metric exactly at, this relation would describe a line with ' varying from 0 to as % decreased from in nity to its value  $\%_{turn}$  at the turning point, and then returned to in nity. Hence the de ection of the ray due to gravity is

$$' = 2 \frac{e^{\delta}}{b} \frac{4'}{b} \frac{8}{b} \frac{2}{b} \frac{1}{b} \frac{1=2}{8} \frac{d^8}{b} :$$
(102)

This last integral is dicult. So let us take advantage of the weakness of extragalactic elds which allow us to assume that , & and are all sm all compared to unity. Then the above result is closely approximated by

$$' = 4 \frac{\varrho}{\varrho} \frac{2}{\varepsilon_{turn}} \frac{1}{1 + \omega} \frac{h}{2} \frac{1}{b} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2}{2} \frac{d^2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2}{2} \frac{d^2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2}{2} \frac{d^2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2}{2} \frac{d^2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2}{2} \frac{d^2}{2} \frac{d^2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2}{2} \frac{d^2}{2}$$

The rew riting in terms of an derivative allows us to Taylor expand the radical in the small quantity & 4' without incurring a divergence of the integral at its lower limit. The zeroth order of the expansion yields a well known integral which cancels the . Thus, to rst order in small quantities

$$\prime = -\frac{2}{b}\frac{0}{b}\frac{1}{b}p^{p} - \frac{(\& 4) \& 4}{(\&^{2} - B)^{1-2}} = 1$$
(104)

At this point it pays to integrate by parts:

$$' = \frac{2}{b} \frac{0}{6} \lim_{\substack{\$! \ 1}} (\& 4) \frac{2}{5} \frac{2}{b} \Big)^{1=2} \int_{a}^{a} (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4) (\& 0 - 4)$$

Since , & and all decrease asymptotically as  $^{\circ}$ <sup>1</sup>, the integrated term, being independent, contributes nothing. Carrying out the derivative, and introducing the usual Cartesian x coordinate along the initial ray by x ( $^{\circ}_{\circ}$  b<sup>2</sup>)<sup>1=2</sup>, we have

$$Y = \frac{b^{2}}{2} \frac{1}{1} - \frac{b^{2}}{8} dx:$$
(106)

A factor 1=2 appears because we have included the integral in Eq. (105) twice, once with % decreasing to, and once with % increasing from b. The integral is now perform ed over an in nite straight line following the original ray.

The di erence between GR with dark matter and TeVeS in this respect is that with dark matter one would have = 0 and would compute and & from Einstein's equations including dark matter as source, whereas in TeVeS one has a nontrivial, and computes and & on the basis of the visible matter alone.

We may simplify the above result by means of Einstein's equation (86). We shall neglect the  $\delta^{0}$  and  $\delta^{0}$  terms because they are of second order, and thus smaller than  $^{0}=$ % by a factor G mass=% which amounts to<sup>2</sup>y, with v the typical orbital velocity in the system. U sing the residual terms we eliminate  $\delta^{0}$  from Eq. (106):

$$Y = b \int_{1}^{Z_{1}} \frac{0+2}{\$} dx \quad 4 \ G b \quad T_{\$\$} + {}_{\$\$} + {}_{\$\$} = 8 \ G \ dx:$$
(107)

Now by Sec. IV A, =  $2V + O(V^2)$  and = V + . Hence with fractional corrections of  $O(V^2)$ ,

$$Z_{1} = 2b - \frac{Z_{1}}{\frac{8}{3}} dx + 4 G b - T_{88} + R_{88} = 8 G dx;$$
(108)

The rst integral here depends exclusively on the potential which determ ines nonrelativistic motion. That is, the observed stellar or galactic dynamics will uniquely x this part of '. For this reason the rst term makes the same predictions for lensing by nonrelativistic systems in TeVeS as in GR (where = N, the last calculated assuming dark matter). We next show that for nonrelativistic systems the second integral is negligible.

In astrophysical matter the radial pressure  $T_{\$\$}$  is of order ~ times the local squared random velocity of the matter particles (stars, gas clouds, galaxies). Thus  $T_{\$\$} dx = hv^2 i \sim dx$  with  $hv^2 i$  a suitably averaged  $v^2$ . But by Poisson's equation 4 G ~ = r  $r_N = \int_{N}^{0} e^{-\vartheta} e^{-\vartheta} e^{-\vartheta} e^{-\vartheta}$  where we have also used Eq. (60). Thus the term with the integral over  $T_{\$\$}$  is smaller than the rst term in Eq. (108) by a factor of O (~hv<sup>2</sup>i). In GR (for which e ectively ~ = 1) this factor is no larger than 10<sup>-5</sup> for all extragalactic system s which have a missing mass problem; in TeV eS it is even smaller because typically ~ 1 for such system s.

Turning now to  $_{\$\$}$  we recall from Sec. IV A that in the quasistatic situation in question, the F part is dominated by the term quadratic in derivatives. Using Eqs. (59)-(60) we work out that 4 G  $_{\$\$}$  (k~=8)  $_{N}^{0}$ . Evidently  $_{0}^{0}$  =%, and since = 0 (v<sup>2</sup>) and (k~=8) <  $\frac{1}{2}$ , the contribution of  $_{\$\$}$  to the second term of Eq. (108) is no larger than that coming from T<sub>\*</sub>.

Finally we note that the term in  $\frac{1}{8}$  vanishes in a quasistatic situation because then U (1 + N) t. And from this last formula we estimate  $j_{\frac{1}{8}}j = \frac{1}{2}K (N^{0})^{2} K^{2}j = \frac{1}{2}K$ . Since  $\sim < 1$  and by Sec. V we must take  $K < 10^{-2}$ , it is clear that the contribution of  $\frac{1}{8}$  is much smaller than that coming from  $T_{\frac{1}{8}}$ . From all the above the light ray de ection in TeVeS is

$$Y = 2b \ 1 + 0 \ (\sim v^2) \ \frac{z_1}{1 \ \frac{9}{8}} dx:$$
(109)

In GR with dark matter the same form ula is valid with 0 ( $\sim v^2$ ) replaced by 0 ( $v^2$ ). Since these corrections are beyond foreseeable accuracy of extragalactic astronomy, it is clear that for given dynamics (given ), both theories predict identical lensing. We shall elaborate on this statement shortly.

### B. A sym m etric system s

We now turn to system s with no particular spatial sym metry. The weakness of the gravitational potentials typical of nonrelativistic system s entitles us to use linearized theory [64] in which the metric is viewed as a perturbed Lorentz

m etric:

$$g = + h \frac{1}{2} h$$
 (110)

with  $j_1$  is a sequence of the sequence of t

$$G = \frac{1}{2}$$
 @ @ h ; (111)

so that E instein's equations take the form of wave equations in at spacetime with the rh.s. of Eq. (31) as sources. O focurse there are motions and changes in galaxies and clusters of galaxies, but the associated changes in the metric are mostly very slow. Thus we can ne ourselves to quasistationary situations where we can drop time derivatives (but not yet the  $g_{ti}$  components since galaxies do rotate). This tells us that

$$G_{tt} = \frac{1}{2}r^{2}h_{tt} = 8 \ G \ T_{tt} + 2(1 \ e^{4})U \ T_{t}U_{t} + \frac{1}{tt} + \frac{1}{tt}:$$
(112)

The various parts of the source here were explored in Sec. IV A; from that discussion it follows that

$$h_{tt} = 4V = 4_{N}$$
: (113)

In regard to the spatio-tem poral source components of Eq. (31), we observe that the  $T_{it}$  is an O (v) below  $T_{tt}$  (m om entum density is velocity times mass density). Further, the dominant contributions to  $_{ti}$  are  $h_{ti}$  multiplied by  $^{2 \ jk}$   $_{;j}$   $_{;k}$  and by  $(G = ^{2})$   $^{4}F$ . Of these the rst dominates (see Sec. IV A), and it is small on the scale of ~ both because it is of second order (c.f. Sec. V), and because  $j_{tij}$  1. We can guess that  $U_i$  is at most of order  $h_{ti}$  (it would vanish in a truly static situation), and since by Eq. (56) is below 8 G ~ by factors of O (K) and O ( $_{c}$ ), we see that the  $U_tU_i$  term contribution to  $_{ti}$  is small compared to 8 G ~. Sim ilarly, the K g  $U_{[,ti]}U_{[,ii]}$  contribution to  $_{ti}$ , being of second order in  $V_{;i}$  and rst order in  $h_{ti}$ , or rst order in  $V_{;i}$  and rst order in  $h_{ti;j}$  (aside of carrying the small coe cient K), must be very small. We conclude that the source of the spatio-tem poral E instein equation can be neglected, so that to the accuracy of Eq. (113),  $h_{ti}$  0.

Things are similar for the spatial-spatial components. We have already remarked that  $T_{ij}$  is an O (v<sup>2</sup>) below  $T_{tt}$ . The  $_{ij}$  consists of a term quadratic in  $_{;i}$  and one with a F factor which has been argued to be smaller. Hence  $_{ij}$  is small. Again the K g  $U_{[;i]}U_{[;j]}$  contributions to  $_{ij}$  are quadratic in  $V_{;i}$  and suppressed by the K coe cient, so they are also small. And the , which we remarked above to be small, is multiplied by two factors  $h_{ti}$ , and so is also small. So by the same logic as above we neglect the sources of the spatial-spatial components  $h_{ij}$  and conclude that  $h_{ij} = 0$ .

Substituting all these results in Eq. (110) we obtain

$$g = (1 \ 2V) \ 4V \ t \ t$$
 (114)

The absence of  $g_{ti}$  in this approximation makes the situation truly static (rather than just stationary); hence U = t. Calculating the physical metric from Eq. (22) with  $e^2 = 1 + 2 = 1 + 2 = 1$ .

$$g = (1 \quad 2V \quad 2) \quad 4(V + )_{t t}$$
(115)

which is equivalent to

$$\mathbf{g} \, \mathrm{dx} \, \mathrm{dx} = (1+2) \mathrm{dt}^2 + (1-2)_{\mathrm{ij}} \mathrm{dx}^{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{dx}^{\mathrm{j}} \tag{116}$$

with = V + as in Sec. IV A.

M etric (116) has the same form as the GR m etric for weak gravity [64]. Thus in TeVeS just as in GR the same potential governs dynam ics and gravitational lensing. This accords with the conclusion of Sec. VIA for the spherically sym m etry case. W hat does this mean in practice? In GR 's role is played by the New tonian potential due to the visible matter together with the putative dark matter; in TeVeS is the sum of the scalar eld and the renorm alized New tonian potential generated by the visible matter alone. These two prescriptions for need not agree a priori, but as we argued in Sec. IV B, nonrelativistic dynam ics in TeVeS are approximately of MOND form, and MOND's predictions have been found to agree with much of galaxy dynam ics phenomenology. We thus expect TeVeS's predictions for gravitational lensing by galaxies and some clusters of galaxies to be as good as those of dark halo m odels within GR.But, of course, the early MOND form ula (1), and TeVeS with our choice (51) for F ( ) both claim that asymptotically the potential of an isolated galaxy grows logarithm ically with distance inde nitely. Dark halo m odels do not. So TeVeS for a speci c choice of F is in principle falsi able. Dark matter is less falsi able because of the essentially unlimited choice of halo m odels and choices of their free param eters. One should also remem ber that gravitational lensing a ords the opportunity to m ap the to greater distances than can dynam ics; for unlike the latter, lensing can be m easured outside the gas or galaxy distribution. U sing this both GR and TeVeS would predict the same edynam ics for stars or galaxies, while disagreeing on the implied distribution of m ass.

### VII. COSMOLOGICAL EVOLUTION OF

### A. Persistence of cosm ological expansion

This section (where we write rather than c) shows that for a range of initial conditions, FRW cosm ological models with at spaces in TeVeS expand forever, have 0 1 throughout, and their law of expansion is very similar to that in GR. The second point is crucial for our discussion of causality in Sec. V III.

First using Eq. (22) we transform metric (43) to the physical metric

$$g dx dx = d^{2} + a(t)^{2} d^{2} + f(t)^{2} (d^{2} + sin^{2} d'^{2}); \qquad (117)$$

$$dt = e dt; \quad a = e \quad a: \tag{118}$$

In what follows we take the initial moment, conventionally written as t = 0, at the end of the quantum era with a(0) a very small scale; furtherm one we take the zero of t to coincide with t = 0. For illustration we assume the initial conditions -(0) = 0 (an overdot always denotes e=et) and 0 < 0 (0) 1. Hence a also starts o from a very small scale,  $a_0$ , and can only increase initially.

We now show that the spatially at (f ()) FRW models in TeVeS persist and cannot recollapse, i.e. a has no nite maximum. As in Sec. IIIC 1 we have U = t which causes  $U^{[;]}$  to vanish. As a consequence  $t = t^{t-t}$  with given by Eq. (46). Since t = (t), Eq. (32) gives  $t = 2^{2} - 2 + G (4^{2})^{-1} + 4F ()$ . As mentioned in Sec. IIIC 1,  $U = -e^{2} U$ . Using g = 1 gives u = 1. Substituting all the above in the tt component of Eq. (31), we get the follow ing analog of Friedmann's equation:

$$\frac{a^{2}}{a^{2}} = \frac{8}{3} \frac{G}{3} \sim e^{2} + \frac{8}{3} \frac{G^{2}}{3} + \frac{2}{3k^{2}} \frac{2}{2} F()$$

$$= \frac{8}{3} \frac{G}{3} \sim e^{2} + \frac{4}{3k^{2}} \frac{1}{2} Y() + \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2} F()$$
(119)

W ith the choice (50) for y() we have > 0, y() < 0 and F > 0 in the cosm ological dom ain. Thus the scalar elds contribute positive energy density and the rhs. of Eq. (119) is positive densite (~< 0 is physically unacceptable). It follows that <u>a</u> cannot vanish for any t, so that by our earlier remark it must always be positive. Now the relations (118) in ply that

$$da = dt = e^{2} (\underline{a} = a_{-}):$$
 (120)

The fact that -is given by an integral over time [see Eq. (45)] means that in a cosm obgical phase transition, where  $\sim m$  ay change suddenly, - (and of course ) will nevertheless evolve continuously in time. It follows that F will also evolve continuously in time [see Eq. (36)]. A consequence of Eq. (119) is that any jump in  $\sim$  will be rejected in a similar jump in (a=a)<sup>2</sup> or in the square of the Hubble function H<sup>°</sup> a <sup>1</sup> da=dt.

# B. The proto-radiation era

C ontem porary cosm ology regards the in ationary era as preceded by a brief radiation dom inated era, the protoradiation era, in which the physical scale factor a expands by just a few orders following the quantum gravity regime. As in any radiation dom inated regime, here the equation of state is  $\sim = 3p$  with both p and  $\sim$  varying as a <sup>4</sup>. It follows from Eq. (45) that throughout the era

$$-= \frac{k}{a^{3}} \int_{0}^{Z_{t}} G \sim e^{2} a^{3} dt; \qquad (121)$$

Because in the cosm ological regim e > 2, we have -< 0 throughout this era. Thus as promised da=dt in Eq. (120) is positive. Using the constancy of  $(G \sim)^{1=2}a^2e^{-2}$  we can now write

$$-= \frac{k (G \sim)^{1=2} e^{-2}}{a} \int_{0}^{Z} (G \sim)^{1=2} a dt:$$
(122)

Tentatively assuming that j j 1 throughout the era we may, according to Eq. (119), bound both instances of  $(G \sim)^{1=2}$  from above by (3=8)<sup>1=2</sup> a=a. The consequent integral is then trivial, and since  $a_0$  is essentially zero we get

$$j_{-j} < (3k=8) (a=a):$$
 (123)

Thus j\_j< (3k=16) ( $\underline{a}=a$ ); since k 1, we have by Eq. (120) that  $d\underline{a}=d\underline{t}$   $\underline{a}$ .

We can now show that the cosm ological evolution during the proto-radiation era is very similar to that within GR. For the choice (51) both F and F<sup>0</sup> are positive in the cosm ological dom ain (see Fig. 2). It follows from Eq. (36) that  ${}^{2}F < y$  (recall that y < 0), so the last term on the rhs. of the Friedmann equation is less than half the second.

Next we use  $y = 2k^2 - 2k$  infer from Eq. (123) that

$$\frac{4}{3k^{2}v^{2}} \quad jyj < \frac{3k}{8} \quad \frac{a}{a}^{2} \tag{124}$$

But this means that the scalar eld contributions to the Friedmann equation are small compared to its lh s. Specically, to within a fractional correction of 0 (k=16) (actually smaller than this because will turn out to be large), the relation between H<sup>°</sup> and ~ is the same as in GR.

The fact that the scalar eld contributions to the Friedmann equation are small compared to its lhs. also means that inequality (123) is nearly saturated, as must be its kin (124). Then

<sup>2</sup> 
$$\dot{y}$$
 ()  $\dot{j} = \frac{1}{6} (3k=4)^4 (\underline{a}=a)^2 a_0^2$ : (125)

But  $a=\underline{a}$  is a very short scale (in standard cosm ological models H<sup>-1</sup> 10<sup>35</sup> s in the proto-radiation era) while  $a_0$ <sup>-1</sup> 3 10<sup>8</sup> s. Thus <sup>2</sup>y() 1. Since by Eq. (50) this is possible only for 1, we can sharpen our earlier conclusion from Eq. (123): j=j (3k=8)  $\underline{a}=a$ . Now it is even clearer that a and a (as well as t and t) are essentially equal, so that the expansion in this era proceeds just as in GR. Further, integrating this last inequality gives

$$j_{pr} _{0}j (3k=8) \ln (a_{pr}=a_{0});$$
 (126)

where the subscript \pr" stands for the end of the proto-radiation era. Since this era spans just a few e-foldings of the scale a, the logarithm here is of order unity. Hence is almost frozen at its initial value  $_0$ , provided this last is not extrem ely sm all. By choosing as initial condition  $0 < _0$  1, as we proposed, but avoiding extrem ely sm all  $_0$ , we get  $0 < _1$  throughout the proto-radiation era, as assumed earlier. Thus our assumption was consistent.

# C. The in ationary era

The equation of state during in ation is  $p = -\infty = -\infty$  and then (45) tells us that

$$-=\frac{k}{a^3}\int_{t_{\rm pr}}^{t_{\rm pr}} G \sim e^2 a^3 dt + \Pr - \Pr \frac{a_{\rm pr}}{a}^3 :$$
(127)

The integration constant prefacing the last term is xed by the condition that and —be continuous through the proto-radiation in ation divide. It is clear that after rapid expansion has suppressed the last (negative) term here, —becomes positive. Because ~ is constant, we may pull a factor ( $G \sim j^{=2}$  out of the integral. Then by Eq. (119) and assuming everywhere that e 1 (which we verify below), we have ( $G \sim j^{=2} e^{-2} < (3=8)^{1=2} a=a$  both in and outside the integral. Thus

$$- < \frac{3ka}{8a^4} a^2 a dt + pr pr \frac{a_{pr}}{a}^3$$
(128)

$$= \frac{ka}{8a} 1 \frac{a_{pr}^{3}}{a^{3}} \frac{3k}{8} \frac{a}{a} \frac{a_{pr}}{a^{3}}^{3}$$
(129)

where we have used Eq. (123) as an equality as the end of the proto-radiation era. Thus during in ation

$$(3k=8)(\underline{a}=a)_{pr} < -< (k=8)(\underline{a}=a):$$
 (130)

The lh.s. here comes from the last term in Eq. (127) in light of inequality (123). In the passage from the protoradiation era, which involves a phase transition,  $\sim$  can change by a factor of order unity, but then settles down to a constant. Thus by Eq. (119) <u>a</u>=a remains at least of the same order of magnitude as  $(\underline{a}=a)_{pr}$ . Hence inequality (130) translates into one of the same form as (123) but valid during in ation. As in Sec. VIIB, this tells us that  $d\underline{a}=d\underline{t}$  <u>a</u> also during in ation. And the argument following inequality (123) can now be repeated to show that the y and

 $^{2}$ F terms in Friedmann's equation amount to relative corrections of 0 (k=16) (actually smaller), so that in ation in TeVeS proceeds very much like in GR.

Repeating the argument leading to Eq. (129) in light of this last conclusion and the added realization that the a <sup>3</sup> terms disappear very rapidly, we conclude that during the -> 0 part of in ation, inequality (123) is very nearly saturated. One can then rederive Eq. (125) as in Sec. VIIB. Because the in ation timescale is again very short compared to  $a_0$  <sup>1</sup>, the argument yielding Eq. (126) can be repeated with slight modi cations to show that during in ation 1, and consequently

$$_{i}$$
 pr (3k=8) ln (a<sub>i</sub>=a<sub>pr</sub>); (131)

where a subscript i stands for the end of in ation. Thus, although in standard models in ation can span up to 70 e-foldings of a, the rhs. of this inequality is very small compared to unity. We conclude that in ation manages to raise above its value at the end of the proto-radiation era by a very small fraction of unity. This justiles our replacement of by unity in deriving Eq. (129).

In what follows we shall denote by  $H_{i}$ , i, i and -i the values of the Hubble parameter,  $(2k^2 - 2)$ , and -i respectively, at the end of in ation,  $t = t_i$ , where  $a = a_i$ .

#### D. The radiation era

In the ensuing radiation era the equation of state switches back to 3p = -w ith both p and -varying as a <sup>4</sup>. Thus the integral in Eq. (45) is

$$-= \frac{k^{2}}{a^{3}} \int_{t_{i}}^{t_{i}} G \sim e^{2} a^{3} dt + \int_{i-1}^{t_{i}} \frac{a_{i}}{a}^{3}; \qquad (132)$$

with the integration constant i - i set so - a the radiation's era outset equals that at in ation's end. A lthough initially -> 0, clearly the integral will eventually dom in the last term making - negative thereafter.

Now according to Eq. (129), i - i < (k=8)  $(\underline{a}=a)_i$ . Due to the approximate continuity of  $(\underline{a}=a)$  across the in ationradiation eras divide [which itself follows from the approximate continuity of ~ and Eq. (119)], and from the fact that  $(\underline{a}=a)$  falls o no faster than  $(a_i=a)^2$  in the radiation era, Eq. (132) gives

$$-< (k=8) (\underline{a}=a)_{i} (a_{i}=a)^{3} < (k=8) (\underline{a}=a):$$
(133)

On the other hand, from  $\sim a^4 = \text{const.}$  we can move a factor (G  $\sim )^{1=2}a^2e^2$  out of the integral in Eq. (132). Using again (G  $\sim )^{1=2} < (3=8)^{1=2}a=a$  from Eq. (119) (if we assume provisionally that e 1) both in and outside the integral, we have

$$-> \frac{3ka}{8a^2} \sum_{t_i}^{2} \frac{a_{a}}{a} adt + \frac{a_{i}}{a} a^3 :$$
 (134)

The integral is a (t) a. Hence

$$-> ( 3k=8 ) (1 a=a) (a=a) + (a=a)^{3} > (3k=8 ) (a=a) (135)$$

In view of Eqs. (133) and (135), inequality (123) is again valid here. Because > 2 we get again from Eq. (120) that da=da a=a. We may now reproduce inequality (124) and show as in Sec. V IIB that to within a fractional correction of 0 (k=16), the relation between H and ~ is the same as in GR.

Because of this last result, Eq. (133) and the rapid decay of  $a_i=a$  in Eq. (135), we may conclude that when -<0, inequality (123) is nearly saturated. We may then rederive Eq. (125) as before. Now in conventional cosm ology at redshift z during the radiation era H<sup>--</sup> 3  $10^{20} (1 + z)^2 s^{-1}$ , which by previous inference closely approximates  $a_i=a$  in ourm odel. We thus obtain  ${}^2$  jy() j 5  $10^{6}k^4 (1 + z)^4$ . Taking k 0.03 on the basis of Sec.IV C we see that at the end of the radiation era (z  $10^{4}$ ),  ${}^2$  jy() j 4  $1^{6}$  which corresponds to 10. For earlier times /  $(1 + z)^{4=5}$  so that it rises to  $10^{19}$  at the beginning of the era at z  $10^{67}$ . Going back to inequality (123) we see that in the last three e-foldings of the era (t) i > 8  $10^{4}$  with the previous 50 e-foldings contributing an even sm aller 1 was evidently justi ed if  $_0$  is taken sm all compared to unity, yet su ciently positive to keep (t) positive throughout the era.

We shall denote by r, r and -r the values of  $(2k^2 - 2)$ , and -r respectively, at the end of the radiation era,  $t = t_r$  where  $a = a_r$ .

### E. The matter era

In the matter era p = 0 and ~ varies as a <sup>3</sup>. Integrating Eq. (45) gives, c.f. Eq. (132)

$$-=\frac{k^{2}}{2a^{3}}\int_{t_{a}}^{t_{a}}G \sim e^{2}a^{3}dt + r_{a}\frac{a_{r}}{a}^{3}:$$
(136)

It is clear that - continues to be negative throughout the matter era. U sing  $\sim a^3 e^{-3} = \text{const.}$  and setting henceforth e = 1 (whose consistency will be checked below), we explicitly perform the integral in Eq. (136) from  $t_r$  to t:

$$-= \frac{1}{2} kG \sim (t \quad \underline{t}) + r_{r-r} (a_{r}=a)^{3}:$$
 (137)

Integrating the inequality  $(G \sim a^3)^{1=2} < (3=8)^{1=2}a^{1=2}a$  com ing from Eq. (119) we get  $(G \sim)^{1=2}$  (t  $\pm$ ) < (2=3) (3=8)^{1=2}. Both together give  $G \sim (t \pm) < (a=4 a)$ , which when substituted in Eq. (137) nally gives

$$->$$
 ( k=8 ) (a=a) + <sub>r</sub> -<sub>r</sub> (a<sub>r</sub>=a)<sup>3</sup>: (138)

Now according to Eq. (135)  $r_{r} > (3k=8)(\underline{a}=\underline{a})$ . Thus at the beginning of the matter era, where  $a = a_r$ , the lower bound on the second term on the rhs. of inequality (138) maybe as much as three times larger in magnitude than the rst term, yet it decays as a <sup>3</sup> while the rst term cannot do so faster than a <sup>3=2</sup> [see Friedmann's equation (119)]. Hence within about one e-folding of a, the rst term comes to dom in the rhs., and overmost of the matter era

$$j_{j-j} < (k=8) (a=a):$$
 (139)

From this follows a tighter version of bound (124) which again demonstrates that the scalar eld terms in E instein's equations are rather negligible. The fact that (139) may be exceeded by a factor of a few early in the matter era is no reason to exclude that epoch from the just mentioned conclusion: the rather large at the end of the radiation era (10) and a bit beyond acts to suppress that factor. Using by now well worm logic we conclude that in the matter era as well, the relation between H<sup>°</sup> and ~ is alm ost the same as in G R.

Integrating inequality (139) with the use of > 2 (the rst e-folding's relatively larger contribution is suppressed by the larger which holds sway then), we get

(t) 
$$_{\rm r}$$
 > (k=16) ln (a= $q_{\rm r}$ ): (140)

Because the matter era thus far has spanned nine e-foldings, has decreased by less than 0.0054 during this era.

Note that we have not addressed the cosm ological matter problem. In TeVeS the expansion is driven by just ~, the visible matter's density, whereas the observations require that the source of Friedmann's equation which falls o like a <sup>3</sup> should be larger by a factor of perhaps 6. There are at least two possible avenues for dealing with this embarrassment. First, we have stuck to a particular F (); possibly a more realistic F () would change late cosm ological evolution enough to resolve the problem. Second, we have insisted on being small. This is a consistent solution as we have shown, but it is perhaps not the unique solution. Plainly nonegligible values of can a ect the Friedmann equation signic cantly.

# F . The accelerating expansion

Lately data from distant supernovae indicate that in recent times (z < 0.5) the cosm ological expansion has began to accelerate, namely, that dH =dt> H<sup>2</sup>. The data are best interpreted in GR by accepting the existence a positive cosm ological constant 2H<sup>2</sup><sub>today</sub> [65]. One can incorporate such accelerating epoch in the TeVeSE instein equations (31) by adding to  ${}^{2}F()$  purely phenom enologically a constant (-independent) term of magnitude  $k^{2}{}^{2}=2$ . Such constant part, which corresponds to the integration constant involved in solving Eq. (36), leaves y() unchanged, m erely shifting the curve for F() in Fig. 2 up. Furtherm ore, according to Eq. (62) and the empirical connection  $a_{0} = H_{0}$  [7], the added constant is  $3k^{3}=16^{2}$ , that is very sm all. It cannot thus a ect the discussion in earlier sections, and in particular F continues to make a positive contribution to the energy both in static system s, and in cosm ology.

The appearance of the cosm ological constant in F has almost no e ect on the value of . To see why note that does not directly a ect the scalar equation (42), but only the Friedmann equation (119). Hence Eq. (137) is still valid. As the expansion accelerates, a begins to grow exponentially with t. Both terms on the rhs. of Eq. (137) thus fall o drastically, and becomes \stuck" at the value it had soon after the onset of acceleration. Consolidating the results of Secs. V IIB-V IIE with our conclusion we see that the range of initial conditions 0:007 < 0 1 insures that > 0 and e 1 throughout cosm ological evolution.

TeVeS's predecessors, AQUAL and PCG, permitted superlum inal propagation of scalar waves on a static background. In the case of PCG with a convex potential this occurs hand in hand with an instability of the background, so it is unclear if true causality violation occurs. How does TeVeS handle causality issues ?

The question is complicated here by of the existence of two metrics, g and g, whose null cones do not coincide (except where = 0). Which of the two cones is the relevant one for causal considerations? We shall take the view that since common rods and clocks are material systems with negligible self-gravity, the coordinates to which the Lorentz transform ations of special relativity refer are those of local orthonorm all frames of the physical metric g and not of g. It is by ascertaining that in no such physical Lorentz transform ations involve a parameter, the critical speed \c". We shall identify this with the speed of electrom agnetic disturbances so that, as custom ary, the speed of light is the same in all Lorentz frames. Since we have built special relativity into TeVeS by insisting that all nongravitational physics equations (including M axwell's equation) take their standard form when written with g, this procedure is consistent. In fact, all signals associated with particles of all sorts are sublum inal or travel at light's speed with respect to g.

There remains the question of whether gravitational perturbations (tensor, vector or scalar) can ever exit g 's null cone. The analysis given below is quite di erent for tensor and vector perturbations on the one hand, and scalar perturbations on the other. One point in common, how ever, is that causality is guaranteed only in spacetime regions for which > 0. As shown in Sec.V II, there is gam ut of reasonable cosm obgicalm odels for which is indeed positive throughout the expansion.

# A. Propagation of tensor and vector disturbances is causal

The characteristics of both E instein's equations (31) and the vector equation (38) lie on the null cone of g because all terms in them with two derivatives are the usual ones in E instein's and gauge eld's equations. A coordingly, we do not expect metric and vector perturbations to travel outside the null cone of the E instein metric g. How ever, the interesting question is rather what is the speed of a wave of this class in terms of the physical metric g?

In the eikonal approximation the wavevector of metric perturbations, that is the 4-gradient of the characteristic function, will satisfy g = 0. Hence Eq. (23) gives

g 
$$2(U)^2 \sinh(2) = 0$$
: (141)

We consider a generic situation where U may have both tem poral and spatial components. The norm alization (20) implies by Eq. (22) that g U U =  $\hat{e}$ . Thus in an appropriately oriented local Lorentz frame, L, of the metric g we may parametrize U by

$$U = e (1 V^2)^{1=2} f_1; V;0;0q$$
 (142)

with 1 < V < 1. This V is actually the ordinary velocity (measured by the physical metric) of L w.r.t. the privileged frame in which the matter is at rest (whether in cosm ology or in a local static con guration), namely that in which U = fe ;0;0;0g. This is evident by considering a Lorentz transform ation from the matter rest frame to the coordinates appropriate to frame L.

In view of the above, Eq. (141) reduces to

Α

D

$$0 = A!^{2} + 2B_{k}! + D_{k}^{2} (1 V^{2})_{?}^{2}$$
(143)

 $e^4 V^2$  (144)

$$1 + V^2 e^4$$
 (146)

with ! = t and k and r the spatial components of collinear and normal to  $U_i$  (the space part of U), respectively. For arbitrary V (143) is an anisotropic inhom ogeneous dispersion relation (! depends on position through as well as on direction of the wavevector). How ever, in the rest frame of the matter (V = 0), it is isotropic (though still position dependent through ) with group (or phase) speed equal to

$$v_0 = e^{-2}$$
: (147)

The condition for tensor and vector perturbations not to propagate superlum inally ( $v_0$  1 as judged in the physical metric) is thus that > 0, which as we saw, is satisfied in a wide range of cosm ological models (see Sec.VII) as well as quasistatic systems embedded in them (Sec.V). Normally this conclusion could be carried over to all Lorentz frames without further calculations. But because TeVeS admits a locally privileged frame, that in which U = e f1;0;0;0g, we investigate this conclusion in more detail for any V<sup>2</sup> < 1.

Solving Eq. (143) for ! gives

$$! = (B_{k} S)A^{1}; (148)$$

S 
$$(C_{k}^{2} + A(1 V^{2})_{2}^{2})^{1=2};$$
 (149)

C 
$$B^2 AD = (1 V^2)^2 e^4$$
: (150)

The condition > 0 makes A here strictly positive. It is possible for the above expression for ! to change sign, so for given we must agree to always choose the branch of the square root that makes ! positive (negative ! with opposite sign is the same mode, of course). In what follows we call the modes with upper (lower) signs of the square root + () modes. For the components of group velocity collinear and orthogonal to  $U_i$ , respectively, we derive

 $v_k = 0! = 0_k = (B C S^1_k) A^1;$  (151)

$$v_{2} = 0! = 0_{2} = (1 \quad V^{2}) S^{-1}_{2} :$$
 (152)

Since these expressions are hom ogeneous of degree zero in  $\alpha$ , there is no dispersion, but for V  $\epsilon$  0 the propagation is anisotropic. For small one has analytically

$$v = 1 \quad 2(1 \quad V \cos{\#}^{2}) (1 \quad V^{2})^{-1} + O(2^{2})$$
(153)

where  $v = (v_k^2 + j_2, j^2)^{1=2}$  and # is the angle between and  $U_i$ . Thus form oderate V the group speed v is sublum in al, but obviously form ula (153) becomes unreliable for V close to unity.

For arbitrary V it is protable, as remarked by M ilgrom, to write v in terms of !. In fact a straightforward calculation gives

1 
$$v^2 = S^{-2}C(\frac{2}{k} + \frac{2}{2} !^2);$$
 (154)

from which it is clear that v can become superlum inal only if the (isotropic) phase speed !  $({}^{2}_{k} + {}^{2}_{?})^{1=2}$  does the same simultaneously. Since the latter was found sublum inal at V = 0, we have only to ask if there is some V < 1 for which ! =  $({}^{2}_{k} + {}^{2}_{?})^{1=2}$ ; we might then suspect there is superlum inal propagation for larger V. Suppose we substitute this last value of ! in Eq. (143) together with those of A, B and D. Collecting terms one can put the condition for the transition to superlum inality in the form

(e<sup>4</sup> 1) V <sub>k</sub> + 
$$\frac{q}{k} + \frac{2}{2} + \frac{2}{2} = 0$$
: (155)

A swe saw in Sec.V II, for a broad class of cosm ological models > 0 throughout the expansion, and as Sec.V testi es, variation of in the vicinity of localized masses embedded in such a cosm ology is far short of what is required to turn the sign of . It is thus clear that even in the case  $_{\rm k}$  < 0, condition (155) cannot be satisfied for V < 1. Hence superlum inal propagation of vector and tensor perturbations is forbidden.

How does v vary with V ? When  $_{?} \notin 0$ , we nd numerically the following behavior. For the + mode with  $_{k} = 0$ ,  $v_{k} < 0$  for all V, and after experiencing a shallow maximum at modest V, v reaches a minimum at V very near unity, which is the deeper and farther from V = 1 the larger j  $_{?} = _{k}$  j. As V grows further, v rises and approaches unity for V ! 1. If  $_{k} > 0$ ,  $v_{k}$  starts positive for small V but eventually turns negative at a rather large V which grows with  $j_{?} = _{k}$  j. As V grows further, v reaches a minimum, which gets shallower with growing  $j_{?} = _{k}$  j and then begins to rise. At a critical V the positive  $_{k}$  + mode term inates. However, the mode with negative  $_{k}$  takes over onward from the critical V; it features  $v_{k} < 0$ , and for it v rises with V and approaches unity as V ! 1. The mode with  $_{k} > 0$  is always unphysical.

For  $_{2} = 0$  and  $_{k} < 0$  the + m ode has  $v_{k} < 0$  throughout, and v rises m onotonically with V approaching unity as V ! 1. For  $_{k} > 0$  that same m ode has  $v_{k} > 0$  and v decreasing with increasing V up to a V =  $V_{c}$  e<sup>2</sup> at which point both  $v_{k}$  and v vanish. The term inated sequence is continued by the mode with  $_{k} < 0$  for which  $v_{k} < 0$  and v rises m onotonically with V from zero at V =  $V_{c}$  and approaches unity as V ! 1.

## B. Propagation of scalar perturbations is also causal

The term s with second derivatives in the scalar equation (37) have a nonstandard form reminiscent of those in relativistic AQUAL (see Appendix A). Do scalar perturbations propagate across g 's null cone, that is do they travel faster than electrom agnetic waves? We now show that the answer is negative. In the scalar equation (37) in free space we break into background and perturbation  $= _{\rm B} +$ , but ignore perturbations of g and U. For convenience we shall call  $_{\rm B}$  simply . To rst order in we get [c.f. Eqs. A 2)-(A 4)]

$$0 = h + 2 H H$$
; + (156)

H (h ; ; )  $^{1=2}h$  ; (157)

$$d\ln (y) = d\ln y \tag{158}$$

where the ellipsis denotes term s with dimensional only once. We have term porarily assumed that H is spacelike. U sing Eq. (23) we reexpress (156) in terms of the physical metric:

$$\left[e^{2} g (2 e^{4})UU + 2HH\right]; + = 0$$
(159)

# 1. Quasistatic background

For a quasistatic background, e.g. a quiescent galaxy, H is indeed a purely space vector in coordinates that reject the time symmetry. By (157) H is normalized to unity wirt. metric g and to  $e^2$  wirt. g. In a local Lorentz fram e of g at rest wirt. to those coordinates and appropriately oriented, a generic H will have the form e f0;s;0;  $1 \pm s$  g, with s the cosine of the angle between H<sub>i</sub> and the positive x axis. Then in a Lorentz fram e moving wirt, the rst one at velocity V in the positive x direction

$$H = e (1 \quad V^2)^{1=2} f \quad V s; s; 0; \quad (1 \quad s^2) (1 \quad V^2) g$$
(160)

In this same frame U is given by Eq. (142).

In the eikonal approximation (c.f. Appendix A) one replaces in a Lorentz frame ; 7 and drops rst derivatives. Again interpreting t as ! this gives a generalization of (143), namely

$$0 = \hat{A!}^{2} + 2(B_{k} + B_{?})! + \hat{D_{k}}^{2} (1 - V^{2})(\frac{2}{b} + E_{?}^{2}) + 2B_{?}V^{1}_{k}$$
(161)

$$\hat{A}$$
  $2\hat{e}^4$   $(1+2\hat{s})V^2$  (162)

$$B_k = V (2e^4 - 1 - 2e^3)$$
 (163)

$$B_{?} = 2V s (1 s^{2}) (1 V^{2})$$
(164)

$$\hat{D}$$
  $2V^2e^4$   $(1+2\hat{s})$  (165)

$$E = 1 + 2 (1^{2});$$
 (166)

where  $_{k}$  is the component in the x direction,  $_{?}$  is that in a direction orthogonal to x in the plane spanning the x axis and H  $_{i}$ , and  $_{b}$  is the component orthogonal to that plane (we use vector symbols for components to keep with previous notation).

For V = 0 (rest fram e of matter) there is nothing to distinguish the x axis from H<sub>i</sub>'s direction, so without restricting generality we may set s = 1 and speak jointly of  $_{?}$  and  $_{b}$  as a vector  $_{?}$ . Then the group speed  $v = j_{0}! = 0$   $j_{1}^{j=2}$  turns out to be

$$v_{0} = \frac{e^{2}}{P_{2}} \frac{(1+2)^{2} + \frac{2}{k} + \frac{2}{2}}{(1+2)^{2} + \frac{2}{k} + \frac{2}{2}}$$
(167)

From Sec. IIIE we compute the logarithm ic slope

$$() = (1)(2) = (3^2 + 4)$$
 (168)

whose graph is shown in Fig.3. In particular,  $\frac{1}{2}$  in a quasistatic region. In the deep MOND regime (y)  $\overline{y=3}$  so  $\frac{1}{2}$ , while in the high acceleration limit (y) 1 so 0. Consequently, in the deep MOND regime,  $w = 2^{-1}$  with equality for y = 0. In the Newtonian regime  $v_0 = 2^{-1/2}e^{-2}$  for all . Finally, in the intermediate regime



FIG.3: The logarithm ic slope ( ) as relevant for quasistationary system s, 0 <  $\,$  < 1, and for cosm ology, 2<  $\,$  < 1 .

 $2^{1=2}e^2$  v<sub>0</sub>  $(1 + 2^{\frac{1}{2}})^{=2}2^{1=2}e^2$ , with lower and upper equality for  $_k = 0$  and  $_2 = 0$ , respectively. Sum m arizing, scalar waves propagate sublum inally in the frame in which the matter is at rest, provided, of course, > 0.

Since the vector U de ness a privileged Lorentz frame, the form of the wave equation (159) is different in different frames. Thus we must check explicitly that the sublum inal propagation of scalar waves remains valid in all Lorentz frames. Since the analytic expressions for general are cumbersome, we have done so numerically for small positive. For small V the group speed starts at the value (167). If  $_{\rm k} < 0$ , v for the + mode rises with increasing V approaching unity as V ! 1. By contrast, if  $_{\rm k} > 0$ , v at rst decreases with increasing V only to reach a minimum

which can be quite narrow and deep for  $_{k}$ =j jnear unity. Beyond the minimum is a critical V past which the + mode with positive  $_{k}$  is no longer possible. It is replaced by the mode with opposite sign of  $_{k}$ , whose v rises as V rises beyond the critical V, approaching unity for V ! 1.

In sum mary, provided > 0 as guaranteed (see Sec.V) for the vicinity of masses embedded in the cosm obgies studied in Sec.VII, no case of superlum inal propagation is observed for scalar perturbations on a quasistatic background.

#### 2. Cosm ological background

Consider now propagation of scalar perturbations in FRW cosm ology. Here U remains pointed in the time direction, and takes the form (142) in a local Lorentz frame of the physical metric which moves w.r.t. the matter at velocity V in the x direction. Since H is now timelike, one must change the sign of the argument of the square root in de nition (157). De nition (158) then requires a switch in sign of the term in Eq. (156). We may evidently write ; = U (with spacetime dependent). It follows from de nition (142) that  $H = {}^{P}$  2U independent of . Using all this in the modil ed wave equation (159), we obtain in the said Lorentz frame, after an eikonal approximation, a dispersion relation of the form (143) with the coe cients A, B and C modil ed according to the rule e  ${}^{4}$  ! (2+4) e  ${}^{4}$ . Thus in the frame L where the matter is at rest (V = 0) we now ind the isotropic group speed, c.f. Eq. (147),

$$v_0 = (2 + 4)^{1=2} e^{-2}$$
; (169)

so that according to Fig. 3, for > 0,  $v_0$  never exceeds  $1 = {}^{p} 2$ .

For V > 0 we use the analysis leading to Eqs. (154)–(155) with the substitution  $e^4 ! (2+4)e^4$  to conclude that the passage to superlum inality is forbidden. Numerical plots disclose a behavior of v(V) very similar to the one for tensor waves. For + type modes with  $_k < 0, v$  grows monotonically approaching unity for V ! 1. For  $_k > 0$  modes there is a minimum of v at some high V, the narrower and deeper the larger  $_k=j$  j. A mode of this type exists only up to a critical V beyond the minimum, and is thereafter taken over by the type mode whose  $_k$  is of opposite sign, and for which v approaches unity as V ! 1.

# C. Caveats

Sum m ing up, propagation of weak perturbations of the tensor, vector or scalar gravitational elds of TeVeS is always sublum inal with respect to the physical metric. We have checked this in detail only for waves propagating on pure cosm obgical backgrounds or on quasistatic backgrounds. Furtherm ore, the analysis boked at perturbations of one eld while keeping the others \frozen" at their background values. A more advanced analysis would have exam ined propagation of joint tensor-vector-scalar modes. This said, no mechanism is evident for the form ation of causal bops. This under the condition > 0 which, as we have seen, is widely obeyed in at-space cosm ological models and quasistatic system s em bedded therein.

## A cknow ledgm ents

I thank M ordehai M ilgrom, R obert Sanders, A rthur K osow sky for a num ber of critical com m ents and for pointing out algebraic errors as well as easier ways to do things. Som e results in Sec.V have been corrected for an error noticed by D im itrios G iannios.

# APPENDIX A: ACAUSALITY IN RELATIVISTIC AQUAL

This comes about because the wave equation for free propagation of deriving from the L in Eq. (6) (covariant derivatives are wirting ),

$$[f^{0}(L^{2}g ; ; )g ; ]; = 0;$$
(A1)

leads to the following linear equation for propagation of small perturbations  $\,$  on the background fg  $\,$ ;  $_{
m B}$  g:

$$0 = g + 2 X X , + (A2)$$

X 
$$(g_{B}; B;)^{1=2}g_{B};$$
 (A3)

$$d \ln^{2}(y) = d \ln y$$
 (A 4)

In Eq. (A 2) the ellipsis stands for term s where is di erentiated only once.

For a static background X is a unit purely space vector X. In an appropriately oriented Cartesian coordinate system in a local Lorentz frame, it will point in the x direction. In such frame Eq. (A 2) takes the form

$$0 = _{tt} + (1 + 2) _{ixx} + _{iyy} + _{izz} + (A 5)$$

In the eikonal approximation appropriate for short wavelengths, one sets  $= A e^{t'}$  and neglects term swith derivatives of A or of k t'; Then Eq. (A 5) gives

$$! = k_{\rm E} = [(1+2)k_{\rm X}^2 + k_{\rm y}^2 + k_{\rm z}^2]^{1=2}$$
(A6)

The group speed  $v_q = \frac{1}{2}! = 0k \frac{1}{2} + 2k \frac{1}{2}$  turns out to be

$$v_{g} = \frac{(1+2)^{2}k_{x}^{2} + k_{y}^{2} + k_{z}^{2}}{(1+2)k_{x}^{2} + k_{y}^{2} + k_{z}^{2}} \stackrel{1=2}{:}$$
(A7)

In the deep MOND regime [f(y) =  $\frac{2}{3}y^{3=2}$ ], 2 = 1 while in the high acceleration limit f(y) y], 0. Thus whatever the choice of f, 0 < < 1 over some range of y (acceleration). There  $v_{g} > 1$  if k is not exactly orthogonal to X (distances and times measured w.r.t. metric g). On the other hand, light waves travelon light cones of g while metric waves do so on null cones of g. The two metrics are conformally related so their null cones coincide: light and metric waves travel with unit speed. Thus most waves are superluminal, in violation of the causality principle [see Sec. IIB].

# APPENDIX B: PROBLEM S FOR PCG IN SOLAR SYSTEM

The perm issible ranges of and " are strongly constrained by the solar system. It can be shown [4] that the 1=r force in Eq. (17) causes the K epler \constant" of planetary orbits with periods P and sem in a jor axes a to vary slightly with a:

$$4^{2}a^{3}=P^{2}=GM$$
 (1 +  $a_{0}a=$  ): (B1)

A stronger constraint comes the perihelia precessions of the planets. The anomalous force in Eq. (17) generates an extra precession [4] which in M ercury's case (excentricity 0.206 and  $a = 6 10^{12} ext{ cm}$ ) amounts to 3  $10^{8} 1$  arcsec=century. W ith  $= 2 10^{7}$  this already amounts to 0.35% of the Einstein precession, which is measured to about that accuracy. Trying to assume M  $> M_{c}$  just aggravates the problem. And we are not at liberty to raise further because for xed  $a_{0}$ ,  $M_{c}$  scales as  $^{2}$ . Thus, for example, with  $= 3 10^{7}$ , the MOND limit of PCG would not apply to galaxies with M < 8 10<sup>9</sup>, a range including m any dwarf spirals with m issing m ass problems ! Hence the perihelion precession m arginally rules out PCG with a sextic potential.

## APPENDIX C:RELATION BETW EEN DETERM INANTS GAND g

From Eqs. (22-23) it follows that

$$g g = e^2 + (1 e^4)UU$$
 (C1)

Viewing this as multiplication of two matrices, we take the determinant:

$$g^{1}g = e^{8} \text{ DetK}(;U); \quad K(;U) \quad I + (1 \quad e^{4})U$$
 (C2)

where I is the unit matrix whose components are while U is a matrix with components U U . Now both g and g are scalar densities, so that their ratio must be a true scalar. Hence DetK (;U) is a scalar.

In a local Lorentz frame in which the unit timelike vector U has components f1;0;0;0g, U's only nonvanishing component is  $U_0^0 = 1$ . Therefore, DetK =  $[1 (1 e^4)] = 1 1 1 = e^4$ . Substituting this in Eq. (C2) we recover Eq. (28).

# APPENDIX D:RELATIONS BETW EEN m $_{\rm s},$ m $_{\rm g}$ AND $r_{\rm g}$

To determ ine  $r_g$  one must delve into the region % < R. Assuming that the ideal uid modeling the matter is at rest in the global coordinates, we may write its 4-velocity as  $r = e U = e^{+} e^{-2} t$  (see Sec.IIIC). Let us return to Eq. (85), substitute  $T_{tt}$  from Eq. (40) and reorganize the left hand side to obtain

$$e^{2}e^{5\epsilon^{2}4}(e^{2}\epsilon^{0}e^{\epsilon^{4}})^{0} = 8 GP$$
 (D1)

$$P \sim e(2e^{2} e^{2}) + tt + tt = 8 G$$
 (D2)

Integration gives for % > R

$$\&^{0}e^{\&=4} = \frac{2Gm_{g}}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(8 G_{tt} + t_{tt}\right)e^{5\&=4} \sqrt{2}d\%$$
(D 3)

$$m_g \qquad 4 \qquad P e^{5\xi = 4} \ \%^2 d\%;$$
 (D 4)

where the integral in Eq. (D 3) does not contain  $\sim$  since it extends only outside the uid.

How much does the \gravitationalmass"  $m_g$  di er from the scalarmass  $m_s$ ? For a star the volume integral of p is of order the random kinetic energy, which by the New tonian virial theorem is of order of the gravitational energy  $Gm_g=R$ . A coording to Eqs. (73), (74) and (92) this is also the order of the fractional correction to  $m_s$  or to  $m_g$  coming from the metric factors and e. We have not worked out  $_{tt}$  or  $_{tt}$  in the interior, but from Eqs (79) and (83) we may estimate that the  $_{tt}$  and  $_{tt}=8$  G terms contribute to  $m_g$  terms of O (kGm  $_s^2=R$ ) and O (K  $r_g^2=GR$ ), respectively. Because we assume small k and K, these last two terms are obviously subdom inant contributions. We may conclude that  $m_g$  and  $m_s$  di er by a fraction of order Gm  $_g=R$  which is 10  $^5$  for the solar system.

Let us now calculate  $\&^0 e^{\&=4}$  at & = R using Eq. (74), (89) and (91) and equate the result to 2G m<sub>g</sub>=R<sup>2</sup> as stipulated by Eq. (D 3):

$$r_{g} + \frac{K r_{g}^{2}}{8R} - \frac{kG^{2}m_{s}^{2}}{4 R} + O (r_{g}^{3} = R^{2}) = 2Gm_{g}$$
 (D 5)

For the sun  $r_{\alpha}=R$   $Gm_{s}=R$  10<sup>5</sup>; we see that  $r_{\alpha}$  2Gm<sub> $\alpha$ </sub> with fractional accuracy much better than 10<sup>5</sup>.

- [1] J.Oort, Bull. A stron. Soc. Neth. 6, 249 (1932); 15, 45 (1960).
- [2] F. Zwicky, Helv. Phys. Acta 6, 110 (1933); see also S. Sm ith, A strophys. Journ. 83, 23 (1936).
- [3] Dark Matter in the Universe, G.R.K napp and J.K orm endy, eds. (Reidel, Dordrecht 1987).
- [4] J.D. Bekenstein, in Second Canadian Conference on General Relativity and Relativistic A strophysics, A.Coley, C.Dyer and T.Tupper, eds. (World Scientic, Singapore 1988), p. 68.
- [5] The Birth and Early Evolution of our Universe: Proceedings of Nobel Symposium # 79, Grafavallen, Ostersund, Sweden, Physica Scripta T 36 (1991).
- [6] J.Ellis, Ref. 5; M. Turner, Ref. 5; C. Munoz, ArX iv hep-ph/0309346.
- [7] M.Milgrom, Astrophys. Journ. 270, 365 (1983).
- [8] M. Milgrom, Astrophys. Journ. 270, 371 (1983).
- [9] M.Milgrom, Astrophys. Journ. 270, 384 (1983).
- [10] R.Berendzen, R.Hart, and D.Seeley, M an Discovers the Galaxies (Columbia University Press, New York 1987).
- [11] J. Jeans, Month. Not. Roy. A stron. Soc. 84, 60 (1923).
- [12] F. Zwicky, Morphological Astronomy (Springer, Berlin 1957).
- [13] A.Finzi, Month.Not.Roy.Astron.Soc.127,21 (1963).
- [14] R.B.Tully and J.R.Fisher, Astron. Astrophys. 54, 661 (1977).
- [15] M. Aaronson and J. Mould, Astrophys. Joum. 265, 1 (1983); M. Aaronson, G. Bothun, J. Mould, J. Huchra, R. A. Schom m er and N. E. Cornell, Astrophys. Journ. 302, 536 (1986); W. L. Frædman, Astrophys. Journ. 355, L35 (1990), R. H. Sanders and M. A. W. Verheijen, Astrophys. Journ. 503, 97 (1998).
- [16] J.P.O striker, P.J.E. Peebles and A.Yahil, Astrophys. Journ. 193, L1 (1974).
- [17] A.Kalnajs in The InternalK inem atics and Dynam ics of Galaxies, E.Athanassoula, ed. (Reidel, Dordrecht 1983), p.87.
- [18] J.N.Bahcall and S.Cassertano, Astrophys. Journ. 293, L7 (1985)
- [19] T.S.van Albada and R.Sancisi, Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. London A 320, 447 (1986).
- [20] P. J. Quinn, J. K. Salmon and W. H. Zurek, Nature 322, 329 (1986); J. Silk in A Uni ed View of the Micro- and Macro-Cosmos, A. de Rujula, D. V. Nanopoulos and P.A. Shaver, eds. (World Scienti c, Singapore 1987).
- [21] G. Blum enthal, S. M. Faber, R. A. Flores, and J. R. Prim ack, A styrophys. Journ. 301, 27 (1986); J. Barnes, in Nearly Normal Galaxies, S. M. Faber, ed. (Springer, New York 1987), p. 154; B. S. Ryden and J. E. Gunn, A strophys. Journ. 318, 15 (1987).
- [22] R.H. Sanders, Astron. Astrophys. Rev. 2, 1 (1990).
- [23] M. Jobin and C. Carignan, A stron. Journ. 100, 648 (1990); C. Carignan, R. Sancisi and T. S. van Albada, A stron. Journ. 95, 37, (1988); C. Carignan and S. Beaulieu, A strophys. Journ. 347, 192, (1989).
- [24] S.S.M oG augh and W .J.G. de Blok, A strophys. Journ. 508, 132 (1998).
- [25] S.M. Kent, Astron. Journ. 93, 816 (1987).
- [26] M. Milgrom, Astrophys. Journ. 333, 689 (1988).
- [27] K.G.Begeman, A.H.Broeils and R.H.Sanders, Month.Not.Roy.Astron.Soc.249, 523 (1991).
- [28] G. Gentile, P. Salucci, U. Klein, D. Vergani and P. Kalberla, ArX iv astro-ph/0403154.
- [29] M.Milgrom and E.Braun, Astrophys. Journ. 334, 130 (1988).
- [30] S.S.M cG augh and E. de Blok, A strophys. Journ. 499, 66 (1998).
- [31] Begum, A., and Chengalur, J.N., A stron. and A strophys. 413, 525 (2004).
- [32] R.H. Sanders and S.S.M cG augh, Ann. Rev. A stron. A strophys. 40, 263 (2002).
- [33] S.S.M oG augh, A rX iv astro-ph/0403610.
- [34] A.Aguirre, Proceedings of the IAU Symposium 220 \Dark matter in galaxies", eds.S.Ryder, D.J.Pisano, M.W alker and K.Freeman (2003).
- [35] R.H. Sanders, Mon. Not. R. Ast. Soc. 342, 901 (2003).
- [36] M.Milgrom, 287, 571, 1984; R.H. Sanders, Astron. Astrophys. 284, (1994); M.Milgrom and R.H. Sanders, Astrophys. J. 599, L25 (2003); R. Scarpa, G.M arconi and R.G ilm ozzi, Astron. and Astrophys. 405, L15 (2003).
- [37] J.E.Felten, Astrophys. Journ. 286, 3 (1984).
- [38] R.H. Sanders, Mon. Not. Roy. A stron. Soc. 296, 1009 (1998).
- [39] J.D.Bekenstein and M.Milgrom, Astrophys. Journ. 286, 7 (1984).
- [40] J.D. Bekenstein, Physics Letters B202, 497 (1988).
- [41] R.H. Sanders, M onth.Not.Roy.Ast.Soc.235, 105 (1988).
- [42] J. D. Bekenstein in Developments in General Relativity, A strophysics and Quantum Theory, F. I. Cooperstock, L. P. Horwitz and J. Rosen, eds. (IO P Publishing, Bristol 1990), p. 156.
- [43] J.D. Bekenstein, in Proceedings of the Sixth M arcelG rossm an M eeting on General Relativity, H. Sato and T. Nakamura, eds. (W orld Scienti c, Singapore 1992), p. 905.
- [44] J.D. Bekenstein and R.H. Sanders, Astrophys. Journ. 429, 480 (1994).
- [45] V V. Zhytnikov and J.M. Nester, Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 2950 (1994).
- [46] A. Edery, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 3990- (1999) and rebuttal J. D. Bekenstein, M. Milgrom and R. H. Sanders, Phys. Rev.

Lett.85,1346 (2000).

- [47] M.E.Soussa and R.P.W oodard, Class.Quant.Grav.20, 2737 (2003).
- [48] M.E.Soussa and R.P.W oodard, Phys.Lett.B 578, 253 (2004).
- [49] M.E.Soussa, ArX iv astro-ph/0310531.
- [50] R.H. Sanders, A strophys. Journ. 480, 492 (1997).
- [51] M.Milgrom, Astrophys. Journ. 302, 617 (1986).
- [52] R.H.Sanders, Month.Not.Roy.Astron.Soc.223,559 (1986).
- [53] R.Romatka, Dissertation (University of Munich, 1992).
- [54] C.W ill, Theory and Experiment in Gravitational Physics (Cambridge University, Cambridge 1986).
- [55] R.F.C.Vessot and M.A.Levine, Phys. Rev. Letters 45, 2081 (1980).
- [56] L.Schi , Am.Journ. Phys. 28, 340 (1960).
- [57] E.W itten, Commun.Math.Phys.80, 381 (1981).
- [58] J.D. Bekenstein, Int. Journ. Theor. Phys. 13, 317 (1975).
- [59] J.E. Tohline, in Internal K inem atics and D ynam ics of G alaxies, A.A thanassoula, ed., (R eidel, D ordrecht 1982), p 205.
- [60] J.R.Kuhn and L.Kruglyak, Astrophys. Journ. 313, 1 (1987).
- [61] T.Jacobson and D.M attingly, Phys. Rev. D 64, 024028 (2001).
- [62] C.Eiling and T.Jacobson, Phys. Rev. D 69, 064005 (2004).
- [63] M.M.Nieto and S.G.Turyshev, ArXiv gr-qc/0308017.
- [64] C.M isner, K.S.Thome and J.A.W heeler, Gravitation (Freeman, San Francisco 1973).
- [65] A .G .R iess, L .G . Strolger et. al, A rX iv astro-ph/0402512.
- [66] T.D.Lee and C.N.Yang, Phys.Rev. 98, 1501 (1955).

[67] R.H.Dicke, The Theoretical Signi cance of Experim ental Relativity (Gordon and Breach, New York 1964).