

# The right-hand side of the Jacobi identity: to be naught or not to be?

**Arthemy V Kiselev**

Johann Bernoulli Institute for Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Groningen,  
P.O.Box 407, 9700 AK Groningen, The Netherlands

E-mail: A.V.Kiselev@rug.nl

**Abstract.** By studying one example of three variational multi-vectors in two very different ways, we inspect the mechanism(s) for validity of Jacobi’s identity for the variational Schouten bracket (e.g., in the geometry of Poisson bi-vectors or Batalin–Vilkovisky formalism). Namely, we illustrate and contrast the logics of “genuine” and “naïve” geometries of iterated variations which are contained in the well-known identities satisfied by the Schouten bracket and BV-Laplacian. Whereas the true picture keeps track of several copies of the integration manifold in both the functionals and pairs of variations’ parity-even and odd components, too early does the traditional approach merge the integration domains. Using an elementary counterexample, we point at an inconsistency in the traditional paradigm.

**Keywords:** Variational multi-vectors, Schouten bracket, Jacobi identity, Batalin–Vilkovisky Laplacian, symbolic computations.

## 1. Introduction

?: Do elephants have wings?

✓: Yes, they do; but the wings are equal to zero.

*Instrument of scientific discourse.*

The variational geometry of jet bundles  $J^\infty(\pi: E^{(m_0|m_1)+n} \xrightarrow{N^{(m_0|m_1)}} M^n)$  and the calculus of variational multi-vectors on jet spaces enlarge the symplectic geometry for usual (super) manifolds  $N^{(m_0|m_1)}$ ; one can integrate by parts in the new set-up. The classes of highest horizontal cohomology groups  $\bar{H}^n(\pi)$  are generated by the lift  $d_h$  of the de Rham differential on the base  $M^n$  to the total space  $J^\infty(\pi)$ . Each  $d_h$ -cohomology class carries a substantial freedom: a  $d_h$ -exact term added to a class representative in the input data, nothing changes in the output of a calculation — provided that a variational derivative acts on that input term *at once*.<sup>1</sup>

In these terms, the variational derivatives  $\delta/\delta\mathbf{q}$  and  $\delta/\delta\mathbf{q}^\dagger$  are viewed in the Lagrangian or Hamiltonian formalisms [1] as proper extensions of the partial derivatives  $\partial/\partial\mathbf{q}$  and  $\partial/\partial\mathbf{q}^\dagger$  along the fibre  $N^{(m_0|m_1)}$  in the (super-)bundle  $\pi$ . These extensions are immediate indeed, meaning that all the integrations by parts over  $M^n$  are indivisibly attached to the derivations along the fibre. The two analytic operations are not separated, even though the integrations could be postponed to a later moment. The resulting approach is adequate for the one-step derivation of Euler–Lagrange equations and for verification of the property for some systems

<sup>1</sup> Let us recall that the identity  $\delta/\delta\mathbf{q} \circ d/dx \equiv 0$  is the primary exercise in the entire theory of variations.

of PDEs to be manifestly Euler–Lagrange (by using the Helmholtz criterion, see [2]). The conventional formalism is sufficient also for the construction of variational Poisson brackets of integral functionals.<sup>2</sup>

Strictly speaking, it follows from nowhere why the integrations by parts over the base manifold  $M^n$  should be inseparable from the partial derivatives along the fibres in  $J^\infty(\pi)$ . It could well be that some other modus operandi is preferable as soon as the transition from the supermanifold  $N^{(m|m)}$  standing alone to the super-bundle  $\pi$  with the fibre  $N^{(m|m)}$  over each point  $\mathbf{x} \in M^n$  is accomplished.

There are at least two reasons to study possible alternatives. First, the calculus must fully grasp the true geometry of iterated variations. Second, the set-up of jet bundles carries a new system of values: in particular, it is desirable that the calculus on it were consistent and that it allowed for meaningful predictions in model applications of the theory, not leading to contradictions in formulae.

The Batalin–Vilkovisky technique for quantisation of gauge systems [3, 4] puts the mathematical methods of the calculus of variations to a hard test. The traditional approach [1] to variation of local functionals and construction of variational Poisson brackets is incapable of avoiding contradictions in the calculus (e.g., see a counterexample on p. 12 below). In consequence, the claims in [5, §1.3] about interrelation between the Batalin–Vilkovisky Laplacian  $\Delta$  and variational Schouten bracket  $\llbracket, \rrbracket$  are legitimate; they codify the picture that can be rigorously substantiated in the supergeometry of ordinary supermanifolds, but it is the jet-superbundle set-up in which there were neither proof nor examples (in fact, identity (12) on p. 11 below would have been the sumbling-stone).

The reason why such well-known difficulties occurred is elementary: the geometry of iterated variations must be analysed in depth before claims are made and calculations start. This troubleshooting has been done in [6, 7]. Now, the resolution of apparent difficulties can be phrased as follows: haste is forbidden. Every calculation is thus split in two steps. First, the ground line in (1) is stretched through the entire reasoning; then the test shifts are processed in the upper floor of that formula: Detached from the respective partial derivatives, all the integrations by parts are performed at the end of calculation, prior only to the reconfiguration of (co)vector couplings and their evaluation to  $\pm 1$  (see Eq. (2) on p. 4 below).

The global effect produced by the revision of action priorities is that the constructions of BV-formalism and the logic of its formulae resume working (in particular, justifying the claims made in [5]). Actually, the entire language of calculations is changed: each input object, such as an integral functional or a test shift along the fibre of  $\pi$ , brings its own copy of the base  $M^n$  into the emergent product of bundles. This means that the composite-structure objects in the output of a calculation retain a kind of memory about the way how they were produced. On the other hand, conversion of such objects to ordinary integral functionals entails a loss of information that could otherwise govern their behaviour in the future reasoning.<sup>3</sup>

The right-hand side of Jacobi’s identity for the variational Schouten bracket  $\llbracket, \rrbracket$  is a convenient indicator of the difference between the two approaches. By following the traditional scheme, one obtains some cohomologically trivial term in the right-hand side of the identity; that representative of the equivalence class of zero functional depends on a choice of representatives for the three inputs of the Jacobiator  $\text{Jac}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$  in the left-hand side. But within the geometric picture, the identity’s right-hand side is the integral functional the density of which vanishes by construction; it is the researcher who could then add to it at will any other trivial functional. The stronger claim which the true theory of iterated variations asserts is a key to resolution of

<sup>2</sup> The variational Schouten bracket  $\llbracket, \rrbracket$  itself is an example of variational Poisson bracket for the specific  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded set-up such that the fibres  $N^{(m|m)}$  are described by the parity-even coordinates  $\mathbf{q}$  and their canonical conjugates  $\mathbf{q}^\dagger$  of odd parity.

<sup>3</sup> This unexpected way of conduct is depicted in the present paper, c.f. conclusive Remark 1 on p. 13.

apparent inconsistency within the traditional paradigm.

The aim of this paper is to illustrate this distinction. We continue the line of reasoning from the papers [6] and [7], to which we refer for a detailed description of the geometry of iterated variations and proof of the main theorems, as well as for an overview of the history of the problem, outline of the theory's applications in the BV-quantisation technique, and further references. (The other application domains are the deformation quantisation of zero-curvature representations for integrable systems [8] – in the context of inverse scattering transform, – and the deformation quantisation of Poisson structures [9, 10].)

The three functionals  $F$ ,  $G$ , and  $H$  which we use in all the examples in this text are such that the calculation of  $\text{Jac}(F, G, H) = 0$  within the true theory of variations is done by hand in §2. The cohomology class estimate  $\text{Jac}(F(x), G(x), H(x)) \cong 0$  in the frames of traditional approach would be also manageable by hand but hard (see §3), whereas the inspection of validity mechanism for Jacobi's identity via the restriction  $\text{Jac}(F(x), G(y), H(z)) \Big|_{x=y=z} \cong 0$  is fairly impossible without using proper software for symbolic computations [11, 12]. Yet most of the processor's time is then consumed by a calculation that does not encode any mathematical object. — In the same geometry, that ephemeral fiction destroys all rigor in a class of elementary problems just next to the verification of Jacobi's identity; this is confirmed in §4 by using a counterexample. (The full matching of the same objects is demonstrated on pp. 34–36 in [6], where we eradicated the apparent inconsistency.)

The notation is standard and as simple as possible. The base manifold  $M^n \ni \mathbf{x}$  is one-dimensional and boundary terms are always discarded.<sup>4</sup> The two fibre coordinates in the vector superbundle  $\pi$  are the parity-even  $q$  and its canonical conjugate, parity-odd  $q^\dagger$ , c.f. Eq. (2) below. The volume form  $\text{dvol}(x)$  in the integral functionals is just  $dx$  in the weak-field approximation.

## 2. Geometric approach to the Jacobi identity

### 2.1. The variational Schouten bracket

The variational Schouten bracket  $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket$  extends the commutator  $[\cdot, \cdot]$  of (variational) one-vectors to the space of variational multivectors<sup>5</sup>; the true, operational definition of  $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket$  is the algorithm for detachment and reconfiguration of couplings between (co)vectors — with respect to which one expands the differentials of arguments' densities and the test shifts  $\delta \mathbf{q}$  and  $\delta \mathbf{q}^\dagger$ . The working formula for  $F = \int f(\mathbf{x}_1, [\mathbf{q}], [\mathbf{q}^\dagger]) \text{dvol}(\mathbf{x}_1)$  and  $G = \int g(\mathbf{x}_2, [\mathbf{q}], [\mathbf{q}^\dagger]) \text{dvol}(\mathbf{x}_2)$  is then

$$\llbracket F(\mathbf{x}_1), G(\mathbf{x}_2) \rrbracket^{\delta \mathbf{q}(\mathbf{y}_1), \delta \mathbf{q}^\dagger(\mathbf{y}_2)} = \iiint \text{d}\mathbf{y}_1 \text{d}\mathbf{y}_2 \text{d}\mathbf{x}_1 \text{dvol}(\mathbf{x}_2) \cdot$$

<sup>4</sup> Whenever the model geometry is taken from the closed string or brane theory, the source manifold  $M^n$  is closed so that there is no boundary to have any such terms at (c.f. [13]). In the frames of field theory one postulates the rapid decay of every section  $\mathbf{s} \in \Gamma(\pi)$  at the space-time infinity [2, 14], but it would take quite some effort to get there and bring back the minus sign from the integration by parts. However, the real theory of fields as excitations of the local degrees of freedom [3, 4] allows us to consider their test shifts  $\delta \mathbf{q}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{x}))$  with compact supports concentrated only around a point of  $M^n$ , whence improper integrals over the space-time make sense, reducing to proper integrals over such tiny neighbourhoods.

<sup>5</sup> The sequential order in which the densities of two arguments in  $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket$  are differentiated with respect to the parity-even jet coordinates  $q_\sigma^\dagger$  and parity-odd  $q_{j,\tau}^\dagger$ 's is often chosen in such a way that the shifted-graded skew-symmetric Schouten bracket of variational one-vectors  $F = \int X^i(\mathbf{x}, [\mathbf{q}]) q_i^\dagger \text{dvol}(\mathbf{x})$  and  $G = \int Y^j(\mathbf{y}, [\mathbf{q}]) q_j^\dagger \text{dvol}(\mathbf{y})$  is determined by *minus* the usual commutator of the respective evolutionary vector fields within the purely even geometry of  $\mathbf{q}$ 's: one has that  $\llbracket F, G \rrbracket = - \int [X, Y]^k(\mathbf{z}, [\mathbf{q}]) q_k^\dagger \text{dvol}(\mathbf{z})$ , where  $[X, Y]^k = +(X(Y^k) - Y(X^k))$  is the componentwise action; this convention is adopted in [6, 7]. The two conventions for  $[\cdot, \cdot]$  and  $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket$  coincide if one takes  $[X, Y]^k = -(X(Y^k) - Y(X^k))$  as in Lie theory.

$$\cdot \left\{ \underbrace{(f)}_{\mathbf{x}_1} \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial \mathbf{q}_{\sigma_1}} \overleftarrow{\left( \frac{d}{d\mathbf{y}_1} \right)^{\sigma_1}} \underbrace{\langle \delta \mathbf{q} | \delta \mathbf{q}^\dagger \rangle}_{\mathbf{y}_1 \mathbf{y}_2} \overrightarrow{\left( \frac{d}{d\mathbf{y}_2} \right)^{\sigma_2}} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}}{\partial \mathbf{q}_{\sigma_2}^\dagger} \underbrace{(g)}_{\mathbf{x}_2} + \text{v.v.} (\mathbf{q} \rightleftharpoons \mathbf{q}^\dagger) \right\}, \quad (1)$$

where the diagonal  $\mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{y}_1 = \mathbf{y}_2$  is wrought by the three singular linear integral operators (note that a restriction to the graph of a section  $\mathbf{s} \in \Gamma(\pi)$  is implicit throughout the text, see [6, §1 and §2.1]). The subscript arrows indicate the final directions along which the total derivatives will act. All the integrations by parts precede only the on-the-diagonal reconfiguration of couplings, whose final portrait is shown in the formula above and which are normalized by the values

$$\langle \delta \mathbf{q}(\mathbf{y}_1), \delta \mathbf{q}^\dagger(\mathbf{y}_2) \rangle \Big|_{\mathbf{y}_1 = \mathbf{y}_2} = +1, \quad \langle \delta \mathbf{q}^\dagger(\mathbf{y}_2), \delta \mathbf{q}(\mathbf{y}_1) \rangle \Big|_{\mathbf{y}_1 = \mathbf{y}_2} = -1. \quad (2)$$

The crucial point is that the delayed integration by parts guarantees that the iterated variations are graded-permutable, stemming from the terms like this:

$$\left( -\frac{\overleftarrow{d}}{d\mathbf{y}} \right)^{\sigma \cup \tau} \circ \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}^2}{\partial \mathbf{q}_\tau \partial \mathbf{q}_\sigma^\dagger}, \quad (3)$$

or similar — with any other combination of  $\mathbf{q}$ 's and/or  $\mathbf{q}^\dagger$ 's.

If a calculation that involves  $\llbracket F, G \rrbracket$  as sub-formula is continued, then we conveniently indicate the future action of total derivatives  $d/d\mathbf{y}_i$  on the densities  $f$  and  $g$  in the following way,

$$\llbracket F(\mathbf{x}_1), G(\mathbf{x}_2) \rrbracket^{\delta \mathbf{q}(\mathbf{y}_1), \delta \mathbf{q}^\dagger(\mathbf{y}_2)} = \iiint \int d\mathbf{y}_1 d\mathbf{y}_2 d\mathbf{x}_1 d\text{vol}(\mathbf{x}_2) \cdot \left\{ \underbrace{(f)}_{\mathbf{x}_1} \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial \mathbf{q}_{\sigma_1}} \overleftarrow{\left( \frac{d}{d\mathbf{y}_1} \right)^{\sigma_1}} \cdot \underbrace{\langle \delta \mathbf{q}(\mathbf{y}_1), \delta \mathbf{q}^\dagger(\mathbf{y}_2) \rangle}_{+1} \cdot \overrightarrow{\left( \frac{d}{d\mathbf{y}_2} \right)^{\sigma_2}} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}}{\partial \mathbf{q}_{\sigma_2}^\dagger} \underbrace{(g)}_{\mathbf{x}_2} + \underbrace{\text{v.v.} (\mathbf{q} \rightleftharpoons \mathbf{q}^\dagger)}_{\text{Eq. (2)}} \right\}, \quad (4)$$

still keeping in mind that actually, such total derivatives have not been reversed yet,  $\overrightarrow{d}/d\mathbf{y}_1 \mapsto -\overleftarrow{d}/d\mathbf{y}_1$  and  $\overleftarrow{d}/d\mathbf{y}_2 \mapsto -\overrightarrow{d}/d\mathbf{y}_2$ , so that in the meantime, other partial derivatives, e.g.,  $\partial/\partial \mathbf{q}_{\tau_1}$  or  $\partial/\partial \mathbf{q}_{\tau_2}^\dagger$ , can freely overtake them.<sup>6</sup>

However, suppose that the bracket of functionals  $F$  and  $G$  is the endpoint of a calculation (that is, the reasoning stops there and the object  $\llbracket F, G \rrbracket: \Gamma(\pi) \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$  is used only for its evaluation at sections but it is *not* contained in any larger formula such as the left-hand side of Jacobi's identity for  $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket$ ). Should this be known in advance, then one re-derives the familiar provisional formula (in fact, one of many – see [15]),

$$\llbracket F, G \rrbracket \text{ “=” } \int \left( (f) \frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta \mathbf{q}} \cdot \frac{\overrightarrow{\delta}}{\delta \mathbf{q}^\dagger} (g) - (f) \frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta \mathbf{q}^\dagger} \cdot \frac{\overrightarrow{\delta}}{\delta \mathbf{q}} (g) \right) d\mathbf{x}. \quad (5)$$

We recall that a step-by-step construction of objects which are then evaluated at sections is typical in the search for stationary points of action functionals in the Lagrangian formalism. This may not be the case in a larger framework.

<sup>6</sup> We refer to [6] for a thorough substantiation of this geometric concept and to [7] for a demonstration how these conventions work in the proof of Jacobi's identity for the variational Schouten bracket  $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket$ .

## 2.2. The Jacobi identity for $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket$

The Jacobi identity for the Schouten bracket  $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket$  can be understood as the graded Leibniz rule

$$\llbracket F, \llbracket G, H \rrbracket \rrbracket = \llbracket \llbracket F, G \rrbracket, H \rrbracket + (-)^{(|F|-1)(|G|-1)} \llbracket G, \llbracket F, H \rrbracket \rrbracket; \quad (6)$$

the bracket's own grading equals  $-1$ , which is responsible for the shifts of grading  $|\cdot|$  in the exponent. Equivalently, the Jacobi identity for  $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket$  is the (shifted-)graded commutator of operators  $\llbracket F, \cdot \rrbracket$  and  $\llbracket G, \cdot \rrbracket$  acting on a test functional  $H$ ,

$$\llbracket F, \llbracket G, \cdot \rrbracket \rrbracket(H) - (-)^{(|F|-1)(|G|-1)} \llbracket G, \llbracket F, \cdot \rrbracket \rrbracket(H) = \llbracket \llbracket F, G \rrbracket, \cdot \rrbracket(H);$$

we refer to [16, 17, 18] in this context.<sup>7</sup>

**Example 1.** Let us illustrate the validity mechanism for Jacobi's identity (6) by verifying it at three given functionals. For simplicity, let there be just one independent variable  $x$ , one parity-even coordinate  $q$  and its parity-odd canonical conjugate  $q^\dagger$ . Set

$$F = \int q^\dagger q q_{x_1 x_1} \, \text{dvol}(x_1), \quad G = \int q_{x_2}^\dagger \exp(q_{x_2}) \, \text{dvol}(x_2), \quad \text{and} \quad H = \int q_{x_3 x_3}^\dagger \cos q \, \text{dvol}(x_3);$$

we note that the functionals  $F$  and  $H$  re-appear in Counterexample 4 on p. 12 below and in the resolution to the paradox contained in it, see [6, pp. 34–36]. We have  $|F| = 1$  and  $|G| = 1$ , whence  $(-)^{(|F|-1)(|G|-1)} = +1$  in (6).

Let  $\delta \mathbf{s}_1 = (\delta s_1, \delta s_1^\dagger)$  and  $\delta \mathbf{s}_2 = (\delta s_2, \delta s_2^\dagger)$  be two normalized test shifts, i. e., suppose that  $\delta s_\alpha(y) \cdot \delta s_\alpha^\dagger(y) = 1$  at every  $y$  for  $\alpha = 1, 2$ . We recall from Lemma 1 in [6, p. 24] that the values of Schouten brackets in (6) are independent of a concrete choice of the normalized functional coefficients  $\delta s_\alpha$  and  $\delta s_\alpha^\dagger$ , which implies that the test shifts  $\delta \mathbf{s}_1$  and  $\delta \mathbf{s}_2$  in the inner and outer brackets can be swapped (this would amount to relabelling  $y \rightleftharpoons z$  of their arguments). We shall not write the basic (co)vectors  $\vec{e}(y)$  and  $\vec{e}^\dagger(y)$  in expansions of the test shifts and differentials of densities of the functionals (see [6, § 2.2–3] for detail); it is enough to know the couplings' values, which are  $\pm 1$  by Eq. (2).

We have that<sup>8</sup>  $\llbracket G, H \rrbracket =$

$$\begin{aligned} & \iiint \text{d}y_2 \, \text{d}y_3 \, \text{d}x_2 \, \text{dvol}(x_3) \cdot \left\{ \left\langle \left( -\frac{\text{d}}{\text{d}y_2} \right) \underbrace{\left( q_{x_2}^\dagger \exp(q_{x_2}) \right)}_{x_2} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{\text{d}^2}{\text{d}y_3^2} (\cos q)}_{x_3} \right\rangle \cdot \underbrace{\langle \delta s(y_2), \delta s^\dagger(y_3) \rangle}_{+1} + \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \left\langle \left( -\frac{\text{d}}{\text{d}y_2} \right) \underbrace{\left( \exp(q_{x_2}) \right)}_{x_2} \cdot \underbrace{q_{x_3 x_3}^\dagger \cdot (-\sin q)}_{x_3} \right\rangle \cdot \underbrace{\langle \delta s^\dagger(y_2), \delta s(y_3) \rangle}_{-1} \right\}; \end{aligned}$$

<sup>7</sup> The bi-linear, shifted-graded skew-symmetric structure  $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket$  extends via

$$\llbracket F, G \cdot H \rrbracket = \llbracket F, G \rrbracket \cdot H + (-)^{(|F|-1) \cdot |G|} G \cdot \llbracket F, H \rrbracket$$

to the vector space of formal products  $H_1 \cdot \dots \cdot H_\ell: \Gamma(\pi) \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$  of integral functionals.

<sup>8</sup> Let us repeat that integrations by parts, which cast the derivatives off the test shifts, are performed only when all the objects – such as the l.-h.s. or r.-h.s. of (6) – are fully composed, all partial derivatives of the functionals' densities are calculated, and reconfigurations of the couplings are ready to start. In practice, this means that partial derivatives like  $\vec{\partial}/\partial q_x$  or  $\vec{\partial}/\partial q_{xx}^\dagger$  dive under  $\vec{\text{d}}/\text{d}y$  or  $\vec{\text{d}}/\text{d}z$  because those total derivatives have not yet appeared at the places where we write them ahead of time.

as usual, we display the integration variables  $x_i$  under the remnants of respective densities. Next, we obtain that  $\llbracket F, \llbracket G, H \rrbracket \rrbracket =$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int dz_1 \int dz_{23} \int dy_2 \int dy_3 \int dx_1 \int dx_2 \int d\text{vol}(x_3) \cdot \underbrace{\langle \delta s(z_1), \delta s^\dagger(z_{23}) \rangle}_{+1} \cdot \\
& \left\{ \left\langle \underbrace{\left( \binom{1}{1} q^\dagger q_{x_1 x_1} + \binom{2}{2} \frac{d^2}{dz_1^2} (q^\dagger q) \right)}_{x_1} \cdot \left( -\frac{d}{dz_{23}} \right) \left( -\frac{d}{dy_2} \right) \underbrace{\left( \exp(q_{x_2}) \right)}_{x_2} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{d^2}{dy_3^2} (\cos q)}_{x_3} \right\rangle \cdot \underbrace{\langle \delta s(y_2), \delta s^\dagger(y_3) \rangle}_{+1} + \right. \\
& \left. + \left\langle \underbrace{\left( \binom{3}{3} q^\dagger q_{x_1 x_1} + \binom{4}{4} \frac{d^2}{dz_1^2} (q^\dagger q) \right)}_{x_1} \cdot \left( -\frac{d}{dy_2} \right) \underbrace{\left( \exp(q_{x_2}) \right)}_{x_2} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{d^2}{dz_{23}^2} (-\sin q)}_{x_3} \right\rangle \cdot \underbrace{\langle \delta s^\dagger(y_2), \delta s(y_3) \rangle}_{-1} \right\} + \\
& + \int dz_1 \int dz_{23} \int dy_2 \int dy_3 \int dx_1 \int dx_2 \int d\text{vol}(x_3) \cdot \underbrace{\langle \delta s^\dagger(z_1), \delta s(z_{23}) \rangle}_{-1} \cdot \\
& \left\{ \left\langle \underbrace{\left( \binom{5}{5} q q_{x_1 x_1} \right)}_{x_1} \cdot \left( -\frac{d}{dz_{23}} \right) \left( -\frac{d}{dy_2} \right) \underbrace{\left( q_{x_2}^\dagger \exp(q_{x_2}) \right)}_{x_2} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{d^2}{dy_3^2} (\cos q)}_{x_3} \right\rangle + \right. \\
& \quad + \left\langle \underbrace{\left( \binom{6}{6} q q_{x_1 x_1} \right)}_{x_1} \cdot \left( -\frac{d}{dy_2} \right) \underbrace{\left( q_{x_2}^\dagger \exp(q_{x_2}) \right)}_{x_2} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{d^2}{dy_3^2} (-\sin q)}_{x_3} \right\rangle \cdot \underbrace{\langle \delta s(y_2), \delta s^\dagger(y_3) \rangle}_{+1} + \\
& \quad + \left\langle \underbrace{\left( \binom{7}{7} q q_{x_1 x_1} \right)}_{x_1} \cdot \left( -\frac{d}{dz_{23}} \right) \left( -\frac{d}{dy_2} \right) \underbrace{\left( \exp(q_{x_2}) \right)}_{x_2} \cdot \underbrace{\left( q_{x_3 x_3}^\dagger \cdot (-\sin q) \right)}_{x_3} \right\rangle + \\
& \quad \left. + \left\langle \underbrace{\left( \binom{8}{8} q q_{x_1 x_1} \right)}_{x_1} \cdot \left( -\frac{d}{dy_2} \right) \underbrace{\left( \exp(q_{x_2}) \right)}_{x_2} \cdot \underbrace{\left( q_{x_3 x_3}^\dagger \cdot (-\cos q) \right)}_{x_3} \right\rangle \cdot \underbrace{\langle \delta s^\dagger(y_2), \delta s(y_3) \rangle}_{-1} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,  $\llbracket F, G \rrbracket =$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \iiint dy_1 dy_2 dx_1 d\text{vol}(x_2) \cdot \left\{ \left\langle \underbrace{\left( q^\dagger q_{x_1 x_1} + \frac{d^2}{dy_1^2} (q^\dagger q) \right)}_{x_1} \cdot \left( -\frac{d}{dy_2} \right) \underbrace{\left( \exp(q_{x_2}) \right)}_{x_2} \right\rangle \cdot \underbrace{\langle \delta s(y_1), \delta s^\dagger(y_2) \rangle}_{+1} + \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \left\langle \underbrace{\left( q q_{x_1 x_1} \right)}_{x_1} \cdot \left( -\frac{d}{dy_2} \right) \underbrace{\left( q_{x_2}^\dagger \exp(q_{x_2}) \right)}_{x_2} \right\rangle \cdot \underbrace{\langle \delta s^\dagger(y_1), \delta s(y_2) \rangle}_{-1} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We infer that  $\llbracket \llbracket F, G \rrbracket, H \rrbracket =$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int dz_{12} \int dz_3 \int dy_1 \int dy_2 \int dx_1 \int dx_2 \int d\text{vol}(x_3) \cdot \underbrace{\langle \delta s(z_{12}), \delta s^\dagger(z_3) \rangle}_{+1} \cdot \\
& \left\{ \left\langle \underbrace{\left( \binom{9}{9} \frac{d^2}{dz_{12}^2} (q^\dagger) + \binom{10}{10} \frac{d^2}{dy_1^2} (q^\dagger) \right)}_{x_1} \cdot \left( -\frac{d}{dy_2} \right) \underbrace{\left( \exp(q_{x_2}) \right)}_{x_2} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{d^2}{dz_3^2} (\cos q)}_{x_3} \right\rangle + \right. \\
& \quad + \left\langle \underbrace{\left( \binom{1}{1} q^\dagger q_{x_1 x_1} + \binom{2}{2} \frac{d^2}{dy_1^2} (q^\dagger q) \right)}_{x_1} \cdot \left( -\frac{d}{dz_{12}} \right) \left( -\frac{d}{dy_2} \right) \underbrace{\left( \exp(q_{x_2}) \right)}_{x_2} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{d^2}{dz_3^2} (\cos q)}_{x_3} \right\rangle \cdot \underbrace{\langle \delta s(y_1), \delta s^\dagger(y_2) \rangle}_{+1} + \\
& \quad + \left\langle \underbrace{\left( \binom{3}{3} q^\dagger q_{x_1 x_1} + \binom{4}{4} \frac{d^2}{dy_1^2} (q^\dagger q) \right)}_{x_1} \cdot \left( -\frac{d}{dz_{12}} \right) \left( -\frac{d}{dy_2} \right) \underbrace{\left( \exp(q_{x_2}) \right)}_{x_2} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{d^2}{dz_3^2} (-\sin q)}_{x_3} \right\rangle \cdot \underbrace{\langle \delta s^\dagger(y_1), \delta s(y_2) \rangle}_{-1} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \left\langle \underbrace{\langle^{(11)} q_{x_1 x_1} + \langle^{(12)} \frac{d^2}{dz_{12}^2}(q)\rangle}_{x_1} \cdot \underbrace{\left(-\frac{d}{dy_2}\right) \left(q_{x_2}^\dagger \exp(q_{x_2})\right)}_{x_2} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{d^2}{dz_3^2}(\cos q)}_{x_3} \right\rangle + \\
& \quad + \left\langle \underbrace{\langle^{(5)} qq_{x_1 x_1}\rangle}_{x_1} \cdot \underbrace{\left(-\frac{d}{dz_{12}}\right) \left(-\frac{d}{dy_2}\right) \left(q_{x_2}^\dagger \exp(q_{x_2})\right)}_{x_2} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{d^2}{dz_3^2}(\cos q)}_{x_3} \right\rangle \cdot \underbrace{\langle \delta s^\dagger(y_1), \delta s(y_2) \rangle}_{-1} \Big\} + \\
& + \int dz_{12} \int dz_3 \int dy_1 \int dy_2 \int dx_1 \int dx_2 \int d\text{vol}(x_3) \cdot \underbrace{\langle \delta s^\dagger(z_{12}), \delta s(z_3) \rangle}_{-1} \cdot \\
& \left\{ \left\langle \underbrace{\langle^{(13)} q_{x_1 x_1} + \langle^{(14)} \frac{d^2}{dy_1^2}(q)\rangle}_{x_1} \cdot \underbrace{\left(-\frac{d}{dy_2}\right) \left(\exp(q_{x_2})\right)}_{x_2} \cdot \underbrace{\left(q_{x_3 x_3}^\dagger \cdot (-\sin q)\right)}_{x_3} \right\rangle \cdot \underbrace{\langle \delta s(y_1), \delta s^\dagger(y_2) \rangle}_{+1} \right\rangle + \\
& \quad + \left\langle \underbrace{\langle^{(7)} qq_{x_1 x_1}\rangle}_{x_1} \cdot \underbrace{\left(-\frac{d}{dz_{12}}\right) \left(-\frac{d}{dy_2}\right) \left(\exp(q_{x_2})\right)}_{x_2} \cdot \underbrace{\left(q_{x_3 x_3}^\dagger \cdot (-\sin q)\right)}_{x_3} \right\rangle \cdot \underbrace{\langle \delta s^\dagger(y_1), \delta s(y_2) \rangle}_{-1} \Big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thirdly,  $\llbracket F, H \rrbracket =$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \iiint\!\!\!\int dy_1 dy_3 dx_1 d\text{vol}(x_3) \cdot \left\{ \left\langle \underbrace{\left(q_{x_1 x_1}^\dagger + \frac{d^2}{dy_1^2}(q^\dagger)\right)}_{x_1} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{d^2}{dy_3^2}(\cos q)}_{x_3} \right\rangle \cdot \underbrace{\langle \delta s(y_1), \delta s^\dagger(y_3) \rangle}_{+1} \right\rangle + \\
& \quad + \left\langle \underbrace{\langle qq_{x_1 x_1} \rangle}_{x_1} \cdot \underbrace{\left(q_{x_3 x_3}^\dagger \cdot (-\sin q)\right)}_{x_3} \right\rangle \cdot \underbrace{\langle \delta s^\dagger(y_1), \delta s(y_3) \rangle}_{-1} \Big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

In view of the functionals' gradings, we have  $+1 \cdot \llbracket G, \llbracket F, H \rrbracket \rrbracket =$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int dz_2 \int dz_{13} \int dy_1 \int dy_3 \int dx_1 \int dx_2 \int d\text{vol}(x_3) \cdot \underbrace{\langle \delta s(z_2), \delta s^\dagger(z_{13}) \rangle}_{+1} \cdot \\
& \left\{ \left\langle \underbrace{\left(-\frac{d}{dz_2}\right) \left(q_{x_2}^\dagger \exp(q_{x_2})\right)}_{x_2} \cdot \underbrace{\langle^{(11)} q_{x_1 x_1} + \langle^{(12)} \frac{d^2}{dy_1^2}(q)\rangle}_{x_1} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{d^2}{dy_3^2}(\cos q)}_{x_3} \right\rangle \cdot \underbrace{\langle \delta s(y_1), \delta s^\dagger(y_3) \rangle}_{+1} \right\rangle + \\
& \quad + \left\langle \underbrace{\left(-\frac{d}{dz_2}\right) \left(q_{x_2}^\dagger \exp(q_{x_2})\right)}_{x_2} \cdot \underbrace{\langle^{(6)} qq_{x_1 x_1}\rangle}_{x_1} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{d^2}{dz_{13}^2}(-\sin q)}_{x_3} \right\rangle \cdot \underbrace{\langle \delta s^\dagger(y_1), \delta s(y_3) \rangle}_{-1} \Big\} + \\
& + \int dz_2 \int dz_{13} \int dy_1 \int dy_3 \int dx_1 \int dx_2 \int d\text{vol}(x_3) \cdot \underbrace{\langle \delta s^\dagger(z_2), \delta s(z_{13}) \rangle}_{-1} \cdot \\
& \left\{ \left\langle \underbrace{\left(-\frac{d}{dz_2}\right) \left(\exp(q_{x_2})\right)}_{x_2} \cdot \underbrace{\langle^{(10)} \frac{d^2}{dz_{13}^2}(q^\dagger) + \langle^{(9)} \frac{d^2}{dy_1^2}(q^\dagger)\rangle}_{x_1} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{d^2}{dy_3^2}(\cos q)}_{x_3} \right\rangle + \right. \\
& \quad + \underbrace{\left(-\frac{d}{dz_2}\right) \left(\exp(q_{x_2})\right)}_{x_2} \cdot \underbrace{\langle^{(3)} q_{x_1 x_1}^\dagger + \langle^{(4)} \frac{d^2}{dy_1^2}(q^\dagger q)\rangle}_{x_1} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{d^2}{dy_3^2}(-\sin q)}_{x_3} \Big\rangle \cdot \underbrace{\langle \delta s(y_1), \delta s^\dagger(y_3) \rangle}_{+1} \\
& \quad + \left\langle \underbrace{\left(-\frac{d}{dz_2}\right) \left(\exp(q_{x_2})\right)}_{x_2} \cdot \underbrace{\langle^{(13)} q_{x_1 x_1} + \langle^{(14)} \frac{d^2}{dz_{13}^2}(q)\rangle}_{x_1} \cdot \underbrace{\left(q_{x_3 x_3}^\dagger \cdot (-\sin q)\right)}_{x_3} \right\rangle + \\
& \quad \left. + \underbrace{\left(-\frac{d}{dz_2}\right) \left(\exp(q_{x_2})\right)}_{x_2} \cdot \underbrace{\langle^{(8)} qq_{x_1 x_1}\rangle}_{x_1} \cdot \underbrace{\left(q_{x_3 x_3}^\dagger \cdot (-\cos q)\right)}_{x_3} \right\rangle \cdot \underbrace{\langle \delta s^\dagger(y_1), \delta s(y_3) \rangle}_{-1} \Big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Each term  $\langle 1 \rangle - \langle 8 \rangle$  meets its match from the other side of (6), whereas terms  $\langle 9 \rangle - \langle 14 \rangle$  occur in pairs of opposite signs; therefore, they all cancel out in the r.-h.s. of the Jacobi identity.

We conclude that within the true geometry of iterated variations, the Jacobi identity for  $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket$  is

$$\text{Jac}(F(x_1), G(x_2), H(x_3)) = 0. \quad (7)$$

By construction, its right-hand side is the functional whose density vanishes identically.

### 3. The traditional approach to Jacobi's identity

Let us “forget” the operational definition of variational Schouten bracket (that is, the way how the structure  $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket$  is determined by the Batalin–Vilkovisky Laplacian, see Eq. (14) below), now regarding the operation  $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket$  as if it were introduced by formula (5). The price that one pays is inconsistency of calculus — but let us postpone a counterexample till §4.

An illusory profit that one could think he gains from the loss of touch with geometry in favour of symbolic computations is simplicity: all the intermediate objects are realized in the same way, as integral functionals over the infinite jet superbundle.

**Example 2.** By taking the three functionals

$$F = \int q^\dagger q q_{xx} dx, \quad G = \int q_y^\dagger \exp(q_x) dx, \quad H = \int q_{xx}^\dagger \cos q dx,$$

and first, plugging any two of them into formula (5), one then inserts the output for an argument of the outer bracket in Jacobi's identity (6). In this way one calculates the integral functional<sup>9</sup>

$$\llbracket G, H \rrbracket \text{ “=” } \int \exp(q_x) \cdot \{q_x^\dagger q_x^2 q_{xx} \cos q + q_{xx}^\dagger q_x^2 \cos q + q_x^\dagger q_{xx}^2 \sin q\} dx,$$

then making a short break. Resuming the job, one deduces that

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket F, \llbracket G, H \rrbracket \rrbracket \text{ “=” } & - \int \exp(q_x) \cdot \left\{ q_x^\dagger q q_{xx}^4 \sin q + 2q_x^\dagger q_x^4 q_{xx} \sin q + 2q_x^\dagger q_x^3 q_{xx}^2 \sin q \right. \\ & + 4q_{xx}^\dagger q q_{xx}^3 \sin q + 3q_x^\dagger q q_{xx}^3 \cos q + 2q_x^\dagger q_x q_{xx}^3 \sin q - 2q_x^\dagger q_x^2 q_{xx}^2 \cos q \\ & - 2q_x^\dagger q_x q_{xx}^3 \cos q + 10q_x^\dagger q_x^2 q_{xx}^2 \sin q + 4q_x^\dagger q_{xx}^2 q_{xxx} \sin q + 2q_{xx}^\dagger q q_{xx}^2 \sin q \\ & - 4q_{xx}^\dagger q q_{xx}^2 \cos q + q_{xx}^\dagger q q_x^4 \cos q - q_x^\dagger q q_x^3 q_{xx}^2 \sin q - q_x^\dagger q q_x^4 q_{xx} \cos q \\ & + 3q_x^\dagger q q_x q_{xx}^3 \cos q - 6q_x^\dagger q q_x^2 q_{xx}^2 \sin q + 4q_x^\dagger q q_{xx}^2 q_{xxx} \sin q + q_{xx}^\dagger q q_x q_{xx}^2 \cos q \\ & + 6q_{xx}^\dagger q q_x^2 q_{xx} \sin q + 6q_{xx}^\dagger q q_{xx} q_{xxx} \sin q - 2q_{xx}^\dagger q q_x q_{xxx} \cos q + 4q_x^\dagger q_x q_{xx} q_{xxx} \sin q \\ & - 4q_x^\dagger q_x q_{xx} q_{xxx} \cos q - 2q_{xx}^\dagger q q_x q_{xx} \cos q + 2q_x^\dagger q q_{xx} q_{xx} \sin q + 2q_x^\dagger q_x^5 \cos q \\ & + 2q_x^\dagger q_{xx}^4 \sin q - 4q_x^\dagger q_{xx}^3 \cos q - 4q_x^\dagger q_x^2 q_{xxx} \cos q + 10q_x^\dagger q_x^3 q_{xx} \sin q \\ & \left. + 2q_x^\dagger q_x^4 q_{xx} \cos q - 4q_x^\dagger q_x q_{xx}^2 \cos q + 4q_x^\dagger q q_x q_{xx} q_{xxx} \cos q \right\} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Likewise,

$$\llbracket F, G \rrbracket \text{ “=” } \int q_{xx} \exp(q_x) \cdot \{q_x^\dagger q q_{xx} - 2q_x^\dagger q_x - 2q_x^\dagger q_{xx}\} dx;$$

<sup>9</sup> The reader is invited to ponder whether it would be *these* formulas that he or she is tempted to write.



here one stops for a while. The line of reasoning continues with

$$\begin{aligned}
[[[F, G], H]] \text{ “=”} &= \int \exp(q_x) \cdot \left\{ q_x^\dagger q q_x^2 q_{xxx}^3 \cos q + 3q_{xx}^\dagger q q_x^2 q_{xx}^2 \cos q + 4q_{xx}^\dagger q q_x^2 q_{xxx} \cos q \right. \\
&+ 2q_{xxx}^\dagger q q_x^2 q_{xx} \cos q + 2q_{xx}^\dagger q q_x^2 q_{4x} \cos q - 2q_{xxx}^\dagger q_x^3 \cos q - 3q_{xx}^\dagger q_x^3 \sin q \\
&- 2q_{xx}^\dagger q_x q_{xxx} \sin q - 2q_{xxx}^\dagger q_x q_{xx} \sin q - 4q_{xx}^\dagger q_{xx} q_{4x} \sin q + 3q_{xx}^\dagger q_x^3 q_{xx}^2 \cos q \\
&- 2q_{xx}^\dagger q_x^2 q_{xx}^3 \cos q + 4q_{xx}^\dagger q_x^3 q_{xxx} \cos q + 2q_{xx}^\dagger q_x^3 q_{xx} \cos q - 4q_{xx}^\dagger q_x^2 q_{4x} \cos q \\
&+ q_{xx}^\dagger q_x q_{xx}^2 \sin q + q_{xx}^\dagger q q_{xx}^4 \sin q + 4q_{xx}^\dagger q q_x^3 \sin q + 3q_{xx}^\dagger q_x q_{xx}^3 \sin q \\
&- 3q_{xx}^\dagger q_x^2 q_{xx}^2 \cos q - 8q_{xx}^\dagger q_{xx}^2 q_{xxx} \sin q + 2q_{xxx}^\dagger q q_{xx}^2 \sin q + 4q_{xx}^\dagger q q_{xx}^2 q_{xxx} \sin q \\
&+ 6q_{xx}^\dagger q q_{xx} q_{xxx} \sin q + 4q_{xx}^\dagger q_x q_{xx} q_{xxx} \sin q + 2q_{xx}^\dagger q q_{xx} q_{4x} \sin q - 2q_{xx}^\dagger q_x^4 \sin q \\
&- 6q_{xx}^\dagger q_x^2 \sin q - 6q_{xx}^\dagger q_x^2 q_{xx} \cos q - 8q_{xx}^\dagger q_x^2 q_{xxx} \cos q - 8q_{xx}^\dagger q_{xx} q_{xxx} \sin q \\
&\left. - 8q_{xx}^\dagger q_x^2 q_{xx} q_{xxx} \cos q + 4q_{xx}^\dagger q q_x^2 q_{xx} q_{xxx} \cos q \right\} dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Thirdly,

$$[[F, H]] \text{ “=”} = \int \left\{ q_{xx}^\dagger q q_x^2 \cos q + 2q_{xx}^\dagger q_x^3 \cos q + 2q_{xx}^\dagger q_x^2 q_{xx} \cos q + 2q_{xx}^\dagger q_x q_{xx} \sin q + 2q_{xx}^\dagger q_x^2 \sin q \right\} dx,$$

and now is the time for a pause. Finally, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
[[G, [[F, H]]] \text{ “=”} &= \int \exp(q_x) \cdot \left\{ -q_x^\dagger q q_x^4 q_{xx} \cos q - q_{xx}^\dagger q q_x^4 \cos q - 5q_{xx}^\dagger q q_x^2 q_{xx}^2 \sin q \right. \\
&+ 2q_{xx}^\dagger q q_x q_{xx} q_{xxx} \cos q - 6q_{xx}^\dagger q q_x^2 q_{xx} \sin q + 2q_{xx}^\dagger q q_x^3 \cos q - q_{xx}^\dagger q_x^2 q_{xx}^2 \cos q \\
&+ 2q_{xx}^\dagger q_x^3 q_{xx} \sin q + 12q_{xx}^\dagger q_x^2 q_{xx}^2 \sin q + 2q_{xx}^\dagger q q_x q_{xxx} \cos q - 2q_{xx}^\dagger q_x q_{xx} q_{xxx} \sin q \\
&- 8q_{xx}^\dagger q_x q_{xx} q_{xxx} \cos q + 2q_{xx}^\dagger q q_x q_{xx} \cos q + 4q_{xx}^\dagger q q_{xx}^2 \cos q - 6q_{xx}^\dagger q_x q_{xx}^2 \cos q \\
&- 6q_{xx}^\dagger q_x^3 \cos q - 2q_{xx}^\dagger q_x q_{xxx} \sin q - 8q_{xx}^\dagger q_{xx} q_{xxx} \sin q - 2q_{xx}^\dagger q_x q_{xx} \sin q \\
&\left. + 2q_{xx}^\dagger q_x^4 q_{xx} \cos q - 4q_{xx}^\dagger q_{xx} q_{4x} \sin q - 6q_{xx}^\dagger q_x^2 \sin q \right\} dx.
\end{aligned}$$

By using the software Jets [11] for symbolic calculations, one verifies that

$$[[F, [[G, H]]] - ([[F, G], H] + (-)^{(|F|-1)(|G|-1)} [[G, [[F, H]]] \cong 0. \quad (8)$$

It is easy to explore the structure of cohomologically trivial functional in the right-hand side of the equivalence

$$\text{Jac}(F(x), G(x), H(x)) \cong 0; \quad (9)$$

for  $F$ ,  $G$ , and  $H$  as above, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Jac}(F(x), G(x), H(x)) &= - \int dx \frac{d}{dx} \left( \exp(q_x) \cdot \left\{ 2q_{xx}^\dagger q_{xx}^2 q_x^2 \cos q - q_{xx}^\dagger q q_{xx}^2 q_x^2 \cos q - 2q_{xx}^\dagger q q_{xx} q_x^3 \sin q \right. \right. \\
&+ 5q_{xx}^\dagger q q_{xx}^2 q_x \cos q - 2q_{xx}^\dagger q_{xx} q_x q_x^3 \cos q + 4q_{xx}^\dagger q_{xx} q_x^3 \sin q - 2q_{xx}^\dagger q q_{xx} q_x^2 \cos q + 4q_{xx}^\dagger q_{xxx} q_x^2 \cos q \\
&\left. \left. + 2q_{xx}^\dagger q_x^4 \sin q - 2q_{xx}^\dagger q q_x^2 q_{xxx} \cos q + 4q_{xx}^\dagger q_x^3 \sin q - 10q_{xx}^\dagger q_{xx}^2 q_x \cos q - q_{xx}^\dagger q_{xx}^2 q_x \sin q + 2q_{xx}^\dagger q_x^3 \cos q \right\} \right). \quad (10)
\end{aligned}$$

To track where these extra terms in the right-hand side came from, let us notice the following. First, the integrations by parts were always attached to the respective vertical differentials.

Consequently, whenever two variations fell on (whatever remained of) one functional, they produced the terms with operators like

$$\left(-\frac{\vec{d}}{d\mathbf{x}}\right)^\tau \circ \frac{\vec{\partial}}{\partial \mathbf{q}_\tau} \circ \left(-\frac{\vec{d}}{d\mathbf{x}}\right)^\sigma \circ \frac{\vec{\partial}}{\partial \mathbf{q}_\sigma^\dagger}, \quad (11)$$

or similar — with any other combinations of  $\mathbf{q}$ 's and/or  $\mathbf{q}^\dagger$ 's.

Yet even worse, the construction of nested brackets in a term like  $\llbracket F, \llbracket G, H \rrbracket \rrbracket$  according to formula (5) prescribes that, in the course of integration by parts in the bracket of  $F$  and entire  $\llbracket G, H \rrbracket$ , whenever a partial derivative  $\partial/\partial \mathbf{q}_\tau$  or  $\partial/\partial \mathbf{q}_\tau^\dagger$  with  $|\tau| > 0$  falls on the density of  $H$ , the total derivative  $(-\vec{d}/d\mathbf{x})^\tau$  does act on  $G$ , spreading over  $G$  and  $H$  via Newton's binomial formula. Note the cancellation of terms in which the total derivative  $(-\vec{d}/d\mathbf{x})^\tau$  falls exclusively on the image of its "native" partial derivative  $\partial/\partial \mathbf{q}_\tau$  or  $\partial/\partial \mathbf{q}_\tau^\dagger$ ; this was proved in [7] and illustrated in §2 above.<sup>10</sup>

**Example 3.** Let us analyse how the remaining cross-terms emerge and contribute to the right-hand side of (9). To visualize their origin from one of the three functionals, we formally denote by  $x$ ,  $y$ , and  $z$  the respective base variables so that

$$F = \int q^\dagger q q_{xx} dx, \quad G = \int q_y^\dagger \exp(q_y) dy, \quad H = \int q_{zz}^\dagger \cos q dz;$$

the restriction  $\text{Jac}(F(x), G(y), H(z))|_{x=y=z}$  to the diagonal at the end of the day will yield (10) in the right-hand side of (9).

We emphasize that the genuine contribution to the right-hand side of (8) is identically zero; the rest is *naught* (i.e., not a mathematical description of any existing object) which equals

$$\begin{aligned} & \exp(q_y) \cdot \left\{ 2q^\dagger q_{xx} q_y q_{yy} q_{zz} \cos q - 8q^\dagger q_{xx} q_y q_z q_{yz} \sin q + q_{xx}^\dagger q q_y q_{yy} q_{zz} \cos q \right. \\ & - 4q_{xx}^\dagger q q_y q_z q_{yz} \sin q + 2q_{xx}^\dagger q_x q_y q_{yy} q_{zz} \cos q - 8q_{xx}^\dagger q_x q_y q_z q_{yz} \sin q + q_y^\dagger q q_{xx} q_y^2 q_z^2 \cos q \\ & + q_y^\dagger q q_{xx} q_{yy} q_z^2 \sin q - q_y^\dagger q q_{xx} q_{yy} q_z^2 \sin q + q_y^\dagger q q_{xx} q_y^2 q_{zz} \sin q + q_{yy}^\dagger q q_{xx} q_y q_z^2 \sin q \\ & - 2q_{yz}^\dagger q q_{xx} q_{yy} q_{yz} \sin q - 2q_{yz}^\dagger q q_{xx} q_{yy} q_{zz} \sin q + q_{zz}^\dagger q q_{xx} q_y q_{yy} \cos q - q_y^\dagger q q_{xx} q_{yy} q_{zz} \cos q \\ & - 2q_{yz}^\dagger q q_{xx} q_{yz} q_{yy} \sin q - q_{yy}^\dagger q q_{xx} q_y q_{zz} \cos q - 2q_{yz}^\dagger q q_{xx} q_y q_{yz} \cos q - 2q_{yy}^\dagger q q_{xx} q_y q_z \cos q \\ & - 2q_y^\dagger q q_{xx} q_{yy} q_z \cos q + q_y^\dagger q q_{xy} q_{yy} q_z^2 \cos q + q_y^\dagger q_{xx} q_y q_{yy} q_z^2 \cos q + 2q_y^\dagger q_x q_{xy} q_{yy} q_z^2 \cos q \\ & + q_y^\dagger q q_{xy} q_{yy} q_{zz} \sin q + 2q_y^\dagger q q_{xy} q_{yy} q_z^2 \cos q + 2q_{xy}^\dagger q q_{xy} q_{yy} q_z^2 \cos q + 2q_y^\dagger q q_{xy} q_{xy} q_z^2 \cos q \\ & + q_y^\dagger q_{xx} q_y q_{yy} q_{zz} \sin q + 2q_y^\dagger q_x q_{xy} q_{yy} q_{zz} \sin q + 2q_y^\dagger q q_{xxy} q_{yy} q_{zz} \sin q + 2q_{xy}^\dagger q q_{xy} q_{yy} q_{zz} \sin q \\ & + 2q_{yz}^\dagger q q_{xy} q_{xy} q_{zz} \sin q - 8q^\dagger q_x q_{yy} q_{xz} q_z \sin q + q_y^\dagger q q_x^2 q_{yy} q_z^2 \cos q + q_y^\dagger q q_x^2 q_{yy} q_{zz} \sin q \\ & - 2q_y^\dagger q q_x q_{yy} q_{xzz} \cos q + 4q_{yy}^\dagger q q_x q_{xz} q_z \sin q - 2q^\dagger q_{xx} q_y q_{yy} q_z^2 \sin q - q_{xx}^\dagger q q_y q_{yy} q_z^2 \sin q \\ & - 2q_{xx}^\dagger q_x q_y q_{yy} q_z^2 \sin q - 4q_{xy}^\dagger q_{xy} q_{zz} \sin q - 2q_{zz}^\dagger q_x^2 q_{yy} \cos q + 4q^\dagger q_{yy} q_{xz}^2 \cos q \\ & + 4q_{xx}^\dagger q_{yy} q_{xzz} \sin q + 2q_{xxz}^\dagger q_{yy} q_z \sin q + 4q_{xz}^\dagger q_{yy} q_{xz} \sin q + 4q_z^\dagger q_{yy} q_{xzz} \sin q \\ & + 4q^\dagger q_{yy} q_{xzz} \sin q - 2q_{zz}^\dagger q_{xxy} q_y \sin q + q_{yy}^\dagger q_{xx} q_z^2 \cos q - 2q_{yy}^\dagger q q_{xz}^2 \cos q \\ & + 2q_{yy}^\dagger q_{xzz} q_z \sin q + 4q^\dagger q_{xx} q_y^2 \cos q + 2q_{xx}^\dagger q q_{yz}^2 \cos q + 4q_x^\dagger q_x q_{yz}^2 \cos q \\ & - q_{xx}^\dagger q_{yy} q_z^2 \cos q - 4q_x^\dagger q_{xy} q_z^2 \cos q - 2q_{xxy}^\dagger q_y q_z^2 \cos q - 4q_y^\dagger q_{xxy} q_z^2 \cos q \end{aligned}$$

<sup>10</sup> An explanation why the mess of redundant cross-terms remains overall exact is an instructive exercise for the reader.

$$\begin{aligned}
& -4q^\dagger q_{xxyy}q_z^2 \cos q - 4q^\dagger q_{xy}q_{xy}q_z^2 \cos q - 4q^\dagger q_{xxyy}q_{zz} \sin q - 2q^\dagger q_{xxy}q_yq_{zz} \sin q \\
& -4q^\dagger q_{xxy}q_{zz} \sin q - 4q^\dagger q_{xxyy}q_{zz} \sin q + 4q^\dagger q_{xxz}q_{yy}q_z \cos q + q^\dagger_{zz}qq_{xy}^2q_{yy} \sin q \\
& -q^\dagger_{zz}q_{xx}q_yq_{yy} \sin q + 2q^\dagger_{zz}qq_{xy}q_{xyy} \sin q + q^\dagger_{yy}qq_{xz}^2q_z^2 \cos q + q^\dagger_{yy}qq_{xz}^2q_{zz} \sin q \\
& -2q^\dagger_{yy}qq_{yy}q_{xz}^2 \cos q - 2q^\dagger_{yy}qq_{xx}q_{xzz} \cos q + 2q^\dagger_{yy}q_{xxz}q_{yy}q_z \sin q - 4q^\dagger_{xx}q_xq_{yz}q_{yyz} \sin q \\
& + 4q^\dagger_{xx}q_xq_yq_{yzz} \cos q - q^\dagger_{zz}qq_{xx}q_y^2 \sin q - q^\dagger_{yy}qq_{xx}q_{yz}^2 \sin q - 2q^\dagger_{yy}qq_{xx}q_{yz}^2 \cos q \\
& -2q^\dagger_{yyz}qq_{xx}q_{yz} \sin q - 2q^\dagger_{yy}qq_{xx}q_{yzz} \sin q - 2q^\dagger_{yz}qq_{xx}q_{yyz} \sin q - 2q^\dagger_{yy}qq_{xx}q_{yzz} \sin q \\
& + 2q^\dagger_{yz}qq_{xx}q_y \cos q - 2q^\dagger_{yy}q_{xy}^2q_z^2 \cos q + q^\dagger_{yy}qq_{xy}^2q_z^2 \cos q + 2q^\dagger_{yy}q_{xx}q_{yy}q_z^2 \cos q \\
& + q^\dagger_{yy}q_{xx}q_yq_z^2 \cos q - q^\dagger_{xx}q_yq_{yy}q_z^2 \cos q - 4q^\dagger_{xx}q_{xy}q_{yy}q_z^2 \cos q + 2q^\dagger_{yy}q_{xy}q_xq_z^2 \cos q \\
& + 2q^\dagger_{yy}q_xq_{xy}q_z^2 \cos q - 2q^\dagger_{xy}q_{xy}q_{yz}^2 \sin q - 4q^\dagger_{xy}q_{xy}q_{yy}q_z^2 \cos q + q^\dagger_{yy}qq_{xy}^2q_{zz} \sin q \\
& + 2q^\dagger_{yy}q_{xxy}q_yq_z^2 \cos q + 2q^\dagger_{yy}q_xq_{xyy}q_{zz} \sin q - 4q^\dagger_{xy}q_{xxy}q_{yz}^2 \sin q + 2q^\dagger_{yy}q_{xxy}q_yq_{zz} \sin q \\
& + 2q^\dagger_{yy}qq_{xxy}q_{zz} \sin q + 2q^\dagger_{yy}qq_{xxyy}q_{zz} \sin q + 2q^\dagger_{xyy}qq_{xy}q_{zz} \sin q + 2q^\dagger_{xy}qq_{xyy}q_{zz} \sin q \\
& - 4q^\dagger_{xy}q_{xyy}q_{zz} \sin q - 2q^\dagger_{xy}q_x^2q_{yy}q_z^2 \cos q - 2q^\dagger_{xx}q_{xy}q_y^2 \sin q + 2q^\dagger_{yy}qq_{xxy}q_z^2 \cos q \\
& + 2q^\dagger_{yy}qq_{xxyy}q_z^2 \cos q + 2q^\dagger_{xyy}qq_{xy}q_z^2 \cos q + 2q^\dagger_{xy}qq_{xyy}q_z^2 \cos q - 4q^\dagger_{xy}q_{xyy}q_z^2 \cos q \\
& + q^\dagger_{yy}q_{xx}q_{yy}q_{zz} \sin q + q^\dagger_{yy}q_{xx}q_yq_{zz} \sin q - q^\dagger_{xx}q_{yy}q_yq_{zz} \sin q - 4q^\dagger_{xx}q_{xy}q_{yy}q_{zz} \sin q \\
& + 2q^\dagger_{yy}q_xq_{xy}q_{zz} \sin q - 2q^\dagger_{xx}q_xq_y^2q_z^2 \cos q - q^\dagger_{xx}qq_{xy}^2q_z^2 \cos q - 2q^\dagger_{xx}q_xq_y^2q_z^2 \cos q \\
& - 2q^\dagger_{xx}q_{xy}q_y^2 \sin q - 2q^\dagger_{xx}q_xq_y^2q_{zz} \sin q - q^\dagger_{xx}qq_{xy}q_y^2 \sin q - q^\dagger_{xx}qq_y^2q_{zz} \sin q \\
& - 2q^\dagger_{xx}q_xq_{yy}q_y^2 \sin q - 2q^\dagger_{xx}q_xq_y^2q_{zz} \sin q - 4q^\dagger_{xx}q_{xy}q_{yz}q_{yyz} \sin q + 4q^\dagger_{xx}q_{xy}q_{yz} \cos q \\
& - 2q^\dagger_{xx}qq_{yz}q_{yyz} \sin q + 2q^\dagger_{xx}qq_{xy}q_{yzz} \cos q - 2q^\dagger_{xx}q_xq_{yy}q_z^2 \sin q - 2q^\dagger_{xx}q_x^2q_{yy}q_{zz} \sin q \\
& + q^\dagger_{zz}qq_{xy}^2 \sin q + 2q^\dagger_{xx}q_{xy}q_{yz} \cos q + 2q^\dagger_{xx}q_xq_{yy}q_{yz} \cos q + 4q^\dagger_{xx}q_{xz}q_{yy}q_z \cos q \\
& + 4q^\dagger_{xx}q_xq_{yy}q_{xzz} \cos q - 2q^\dagger_{xzz}qq_{xx}q_{yy} \cos q + q^\dagger_{yy}qq_{xx}q_yq_{yy}q_z^2 \sin q - q^\dagger_{yy}qq_{xx}q_yq_{yy}q_{zz} \cos q \\
& - 2q^\dagger_{yy}qq_{xx}q_{yy}q_{yz}q_z \cos q + 4q^\dagger_{yy}qq_{xx}q_yq_{yz}q_z \sin q + 4q^\dagger_{yy}qq_{xx}q_{xz}q_{yy}q_z \sin q \Big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Clearly, it would have been fairly impossible to calculate this quantity without suitable software ([11, 12]). Yet it is this ephemeral fiction that consumed most of the processor time; the genuine right-hand side (which there is none) was calculated by hand, see Eq. (7) on p. 8.

#### 4. Contradiction

Owl told us that the Opposite of an Introduction, my dear Pooh, was a Contradiction.

*A. A. Milne*, “The House at Pooh Corner.”

We agree that the presence of exact terms in the right-hand side of (9) does not discredit any result known from the theories in which all objects are processed only by the Schouten bracket (possibly, in its transcript (5)). For instance, the claims remain true for variational Poisson bivectors, the Poisson cohomology groups they give rise to [19], or bi-Hamiltonian cohomology [13]. The contrast between (3) and (11) makes no harm in that narrow sub-class of problems which are posed in the frames of variational symplectic supergeometry of parity-even  $\mathbf{q}$ 's and their parity-odd canonical conjugates  $\mathbf{q}^\dagger$  over  $\mathbf{x} \in M^n$ .

Unfortunately, there is much amiss if the superbundle  $\pi$  stays the same but the class of problems to-consider is less narrow (e.g., see [3, 4] or [6] and references therein). Namely, the Batalin–Vilkovisky Laplacian  $\Delta$  stops being a graded derivation of the Schouten bracket,

$$\Delta(\llbracket F, G \rrbracket) = \llbracket \Delta F, G \rrbracket + (-)^{|F|-1} \llbracket F, \Delta G \rrbracket, \quad (12)$$

whence the parity-odd linear operator  $\Delta$  stops being a differential,<sup>11</sup> see (16). We substantiate this claim in what follows by using a counterexample.

It is often accepted that the Batalin–Vilkovisky Laplacian  $\Delta$  is no more than the parity-odd linear operator which acts on a given integral functional  $H = \int h(\mathbf{x}, [\mathbf{q}], [\mathbf{q}^\dagger]) \text{dvol}(\mathbf{x})$  by the formula

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(H) \text{ “=” } & \int \frac{\vec{\delta}}{\delta \mathbf{q}} \cdot \frac{\vec{\delta}}{\delta \mathbf{q}^\dagger} (h) (\mathbf{x}, [\mathbf{q}], [\mathbf{q}^\dagger]) \text{dvol}(\mathbf{x}) = \\ & = \int \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{\substack{|\sigma| \geq 0 \\ |\tau| \geq 0}} \left( \left( -\frac{\vec{d}}{d\mathbf{x}} \right)^\tau \circ \frac{\vec{\partial}}{\partial q_\tau^i} \circ \left( -\frac{\vec{d}}{d\mathbf{x}} \right)^\sigma \circ \frac{\vec{\partial}}{\partial q_{i,\sigma}^\dagger} \right) h(\mathbf{x}, [\mathbf{q}], [\mathbf{q}^\dagger]) \text{dvol}(\mathbf{x}). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

The linear operation  $\Delta$  is extended to the vector space of formal products of integral functionals by the Leibniz rule for  $\vec{\partial}/\partial \mathbf{q}_\tau$  and  $\vec{\partial}/\partial \mathbf{q}_\sigma^\dagger$ :

$$\Delta(F \cdot G) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Delta F \cdot G + (-)^{|F|} [F, G] + (-)^{|F|} F \cdot \Delta G, \quad (14)$$

In effect, the variational Schouten bracket  $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket$  defined through identity (14) measures the deviation of  $\Delta$  from being a derivation.

Let us demonstrate<sup>12</sup> that formula (13) is oversimplified to the extent that it is not able to let the Batalin–Vilkovisky Laplacian satisfy important identity (12).

**Counterexample 4.** Let us denote by  $f$  and  $h$  the respective integrands in  $F = \int q^\dagger q q_{xx} dx$  and  $H = \int q_{xx}^\dagger \cos q dx$ . One eagerly calculates<sup>13</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta f}{\delta q} &= q^\dagger q_{xx} + \frac{d^2}{dx^2} (q^\dagger q) = 2q^\dagger q_{xx} + 2q_x^\dagger q_x + q_{xx}^\dagger q, & \frac{\delta f}{\delta q^\dagger} &= q q_{xx}, \\ \frac{\delta h}{\delta q^\dagger} &= \frac{d^2}{dx^2} (\cos q) = -q_{xx} \sin q - q_x^2 \cos q, & \frac{\delta h}{\delta q} &= -q_{xx}^\dagger \sin q. \end{aligned}$$

Consider first  $\Delta(\llbracket F, H \rrbracket)$ . Our new working formula (13), combined with the primary exercise  $\delta/\delta q \circ d/dx = \delta/\delta q^\dagger \circ d/dx \equiv 0$ , suggests that one writes  $\Delta(G) \text{ “}\cong\text{” } \int (\partial/\partial q \circ \partial/\partial q^\dagger)(g) dx$  for any integral functional  $G = \int g dx$ . This implies that only those terms survive under  $\Delta$  in which the density of  $\llbracket F, H \rrbracket$  carries  $q^\dagger$  without derivatives with respect to  $x$ . So, one takes into account only

$$\llbracket F, H \rrbracket \text{ “=” } \int ((2q^\dagger q_{xx} + \dots) \cdot (-q_{xx} \sin q - q_x^2 \cos q) + \dots) dx,$$

where the dots indicate the irrelevant terms with  $q_x^\dagger$  or  $q_{xx}^\dagger$ . This produces the functional

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\llbracket F, H \rrbracket) \text{ “}\cong\text{” } & -2 \int \frac{\partial}{\partial q} \frac{\partial}{\partial q^\dagger} (q^\dagger q_{xx}^2 \sin q + q^\dagger q_x^2 q_{xx} \cos q) dx \\ & = -2 \int \frac{\partial}{\partial q} (q_{xx}^2 \sin q + q_x^2 q_{xx} \cos q) dx = -2 \int (q_{xx}^2 \cos q - q_x^2 q_{xx} \sin q) dx, \end{aligned}$$

<sup>11</sup> Equally bad an option would it be to postulate the validity of main relations between the Batalin–Vilkovisky Laplacian  $\Delta$  and variational Schouten bracket  $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket$ , so that neither their proof nor explicit examples are possible any longer.

<sup>12</sup> Let us warn the reader that all claims in Counterexample 4 about any equalities between functionals (specifically, for  $\Delta F$  and  $\Delta H$  or for  $\llbracket F, H \rrbracket$  and  $\Delta(\llbracket F, H \rrbracket)$ , etc.) should be viewed as the classical parable about a cage which contains an elephant but carries an inscription “BUFFALO” — one may not trust his own eyes. We refer to Remark 1 below and also to Example 2.4 in [6], in which we explicitly calculate the objects  $\Delta F$  and  $\Delta H$  or  $\Delta(\llbracket F, H \rrbracket)$ , confirming that equality (15) is valid.

<sup>13</sup> Note that since all the four variational derivatives contain at most one parity-odd  $q^\dagger$  or its derivatives, the directions of the arrows do not actually matter — i.e., reversing their direction would not result in minus signs.

the integrand of which is not cohomologically trivial (as could be readily seen by calculating its variational derivative, which gives nonzero).

On the other hand,  $\Delta F \cong \int q_{xx} dx \cong 0$ , whence  $\llbracket \Delta F, H \rrbracket = \llbracket 0, H \rrbracket = 0$ . At the same time, the density  $h$  contains no  $q^\dagger$  but only the second derivative  $q_{xx}^\dagger$ , which means now that  $\Delta H \cong 0$  as well, whence  $\llbracket F, \Delta H \rrbracket = \llbracket F, 0 \rrbracket = 0$ . In conclusion to this “counterexample,”

$$\Delta(\llbracket F, H \rrbracket) \neq \llbracket \Delta F, H \rrbracket + (-)^{|F|-1} \llbracket F, \Delta H \rrbracket = 0. \quad (15)$$

This “contradiction” marks the limits of jet-bundle approach [1] to the BV-geometry via Vinogradov’s  $\mathcal{C}$ -spectral sequence  $E_i^{p,q}$  (specifically, by using the upper line  $E_1^{n,q}$  of its first term such that  $E_1^{n,0} = \bar{H}^n(\pi) \ni F, G, H$ , cf. [14]). The resolution of apparent difficulties is achieved in [6, 7], where we rigorously prove the validity of identities (12), (14), and

$$\Delta^2 = 0. \quad (16)$$

In particular, identity (12) holds of course for the functionals  $F$  and  $H$  as above — this is confirmed in [6, pp. 34–36] by using a “counter-counterexample.”

*Remark 1.* A very interesting effect which the true theory of iterated variations now offers is the natural existence of synonyms for zero functional; that is, there are objects which would take every section  $s \in \Gamma(\pi)$  of the superbundle to  $0 \in \mathbb{k}$  but which, belonging in fact to spaces larger than that for the trivial cohomology class  $\int d_h \eta \in E_1^{n,0}$ , can contribute *nontrivially* to the output of a calculation. (To comprehend why this is possible, compare (3) with (11) and refer to [6, §1.4] for more explanation.) Such is the object  $\Delta H$  in (15) for the functional  $H = \int q_{xx}^\dagger \cos q dx$ , which we used in all the examples here.

This phenomenon manifests the first main slogan in the geometry of iterated variations: **no calculation can be interrupted at any intermediate step.**

*Remark 2.* The second guiding principle is that the integrations by parts always fall only on the functionals which they stem from but never hit the contributions from other functionals. Therefore, the variation of  $G$  or  $H$  within  $\llbracket G, H \rrbracket$  in a term like  $\llbracket F, \llbracket G, H \rrbracket \rrbracket$  is such that the specific choice of  $H$  (or, respectively,  $G$ ) does not matter; the structure  $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket$  is uniquely defined by (4) – or, equivalently, by (14) – for all pairs of functionals.

Conversely, formula (5) tells us that the bi-linear operation introduced by it makes the derivations which will fall on  $G$  or  $H$  within  $\llbracket G, H \rrbracket$  in the future calculation of  $\llbracket F, \llbracket G, H \rrbracket \rrbracket$  explicitly dependent on a choice of the other argument (i.e.,  $H$  or  $G$ , respectively). In other words, formula (5) encodes *infinitely many* structures (roughly speaking, its own structure for each pair of arguments). This is in contrast to the standard idea<sup>5</sup> on p. 3 that the variational Schouten bracket is a *unique* extension of the commutator  $[\cdot, \cdot]$  of evolutionary vector fields on  $J^\infty(\pi)$  to the space of variational multi-vectors on it.

## Acknowledgments

The author thanks the Organising committee of the 7th International workshop ‘Group Analysis of Differential Equations and Integrable Systems’ (15–19 June 2014, Larnaca, Cyprus) for a warm atmosphere during the meeting. This research was partially supported by JBI RUG project 103511 (Groningen). A part of this work was done while the author was visiting at the IHÉS (Bures-sur-Yvette, France); the hospitality and partial financial support of that institution are gratefully acknowledged.

[1] Kupershmidt B A 1980 Geometry of jet bundles and the structure of Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalisms *Geometric methods in mathematical physics (Proc. NSF-CBMS Conf., Univ. Lowell, Lowell, Mass., 1979) (Lecture Notes in Math. vol 775)* (Springer, Berlin) pp 162–218

- [2] Olver P J 1993 *Applications of Lie groups to differential equations* 2nd ed (*Graduate Texts in Mathematics* vol 107) (Springer-Verlag, New York)
- [3] Batalin I A and Vilkovisky G A 1981 Gauge algebra and quantization *Phys. Lett. B* **102** 27–31
- [4] Batalin I A and Vilkovisky G A 1983 Quantization of gauge theories with linearly dependent generators *Phys. Rev. D (3)* **28** 2567–82
- [5] Kosmann-Schwarzbach Y 2008 Poisson manifolds, Lie algebroids, modular classes: a survey *SIGMA Symmetry Integrability Geom. Methods Appl.* **4** Paper 005, 30 (*Preprint* 0710.3098[math.SG])
- [6] Kiselev A V 2013 The geometry of variations in Batalin–Vilkovisky formalism *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser.* **474** Paper 012024, 51 (*Preprint* 1312.1262[math-ph])
- [7] Kiselev A V 2014 The Jacobi identity for graded-commutative variational Schouten bracket revisited *PEPAN Letters* **11** 1–4 (*Preprint* 1312.4140[math-ph])
- [8] Kiselev A V and Krutov A O 2014 Non-Abelian Lie algebroids over jet spaces *J. Nonlin. Math. Phys.* **21** 188–213 (*Preprint* 1305.4598[math.DG])
- [9] Kontsevich M 2003 Deformation quantization of Poisson manifolds *Lett. Math. Phys.* **66** 157–216 (*Preprint* q-alg/9709040)
- [10] Cattaneo A S and Felder G 2000 A path integral approach to the Kontsevich quantization formula *Comm. Math. Phys.* **212** 591–611 (*Preprint* math.QA/9902090)
- [11] Marvan M 2009 Sufficient set of integrability conditions of an orthonomic system *Found. Comput. Math.* **9** 651–74 (*Preprint* 0605009[nlin.SI])
- [12] Kiselev A V and Wolf T 2007 Classification of integrable super-systems using the SsTools environment *Comput. Phys. Comm.* **177** 315–28 (*Preprint* 0609065[nlin.SI])
- [13] Dubrovin B and Zhang Y 2001 Normal forms of hierarchies of integrable PDEs, Frobenius manifolds and Gromov–Witten invariants (*Preprint* math.DG/0108160)
- [14] Vinogradov A M 1984 The  $C$ -spectral sequence, Lagrangian formalism, and conservation laws. I, II. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **100** 1–129
- [15] Kiselev A V and Ringers S 2013 A comparison of definitions for the Schouten bracket on jet spaces *Proc. 6th Int. workshop ‘Group analysis of differential equations and integrable systems’ (June 18–20, 2012; Protaras, Cyprus)* pp 127–41 (*Preprint* 1208.6196[math.DG])
- [16] Kiselev A V 2012 On the variational noncommutative Poisson geometry *PEPAN* **43** 663–5 (*Preprint* 1112.5784[math-ph])
- [17] Kiselev A V 2012 The calculus of multivectors on noncommutative jet spaces (*Preprint* 1210.0726[math.DG])
- [18] Olver P J and Sokolov V V 1998 Integrable evolution equations on associative algebras *Comm. Math. Phys.* **193** 245–68
- [19] De Sole A and Kac V G 2013 The variational Poisson cohomology *Jpn. J. Math.* **8** 1–145 (*Preprint* 1106.0082[math-ph])