

# Henneaux-Teitelboim Form of the Generalized Unimodular Gravity Action

Dmitry Nesterov\*

Theory Department, P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Leninsky Prospekt 53, Moscow, 119991, Russia

Ksenia Lyamkina

Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Institutskiy per. 9, Dolgoprudny, Moscow Region, 141700, Russia

We present an alternative formulation of generalized unimodular gravity (GUMG), extending the Henneaux-Teitelboim approach to unimodular gravity (UMG). The central feature of this formulation is the consistent incorporation of time reparameterization, which enhances the gauge structure and reveals a spatial nonlocality hidden in the dynamics of the original formulation. We examine the resulting dynamics, emphasizing the effects of spatial nonlocality, and outline the constraint structure. In particular, we show that the gauge symmetry in the gravitational sector is extended by a functionally incomplete symmetry, as occurs in the unimodular gravity. Furthermore, we identify a subset of GUMG models for which the alternative formulation preserves manifest locality.

## I. GENERALIZED UNIMODULAR AND UNIMODULAR GRAVITY THEORIES

Modifications of general relativity are an active area of research, driven by open problems in cosmology, quantum gravity, puzzles of dark energy and dark matter. Among these modifications, it is worth noting models that deform Einstein's general relativity (GR) by imposing additional restrictions on the configuration space. A prominent example of restricted gravity theories is unimodular gravity (UMG) with the local restriction  $\sqrt{|g|} = 1$  on the spacetime metric determinant [1–6]. Although UMG preserves the local physical dynamics of general relativity, it introduces subtle changes by constraining the spacetime volume and leaving the cosmological constant undetermined. A virtue of this theory is the alternative covariant formulation proposed by Henneaux and Teitelboim [7].

Generalized unimodular gravity (GUMG) models, introduced by Barvinsky and Kamenshchik [8],

$$S_{GUMG}[g, \lambda_{\perp}] = \int dt dx \left( \sqrt{|g|} {}^d R(g) - \lambda_{\perp} (N^{\perp} - F(\sqrt{\gamma})) \right), \quad (1)$$

are the simplest generalizations of unimodular gravity. In the action (1),  $g_{\mu\nu}$  is the unrestricted d-dimensional spacetime metric, decomposed into Arnowitt–Deser–Misner (ADM) components [9, 10] as  $g_{\mu\nu} dX^{\mu} dX^{\nu} = \gamma_{mn} (dx^m + N^m dt)(dx^n + N^n dt) - N^{\perp 2} dt dt$ , where  $N^{\perp}$  is the lapse function,  $N^m$  are shift functions, and  $\gamma_{mn}$  is the induced metric on  $t = \text{const}$  hypersurfaces. The first term in (1) is the GR Einstein-Hilbert action and the second term via the Lagrange multiplier mechanism enforces the GUMG restriction condition,

$$N^{\perp} = F(\sqrt{\gamma}), \quad (2)$$

which expresses the lapse function in terms of some positive monotonic function of the square root of the induced-metric determinant  $\sqrt{\gamma} = \sqrt{\det \gamma_{mn}}$ . The choice of  $F$  defines a specific model in the GUMG family.

The observation, which drew attention to GUMG, was that the restriction term in (1) generates an energy-momentum tensor of the cosmological perfect fluid,  $T^{\mu\nu} = \varrho u^{\mu} u^{\nu} + p (g^{\mu\nu} + u^{\mu} u^{\nu})$ , on the right side of the Einstein equations ( $u^{\mu}$  — timelike unit vector field, normal to  $t = \text{const}$  hypersurfaces). Expressions for energy density,  $\varrho = \frac{\lambda_{\perp}}{2\sqrt{\gamma}}$ , and pressure,  $p = \frac{\lambda_{\perp}}{2\sqrt{\gamma}} \frac{FW}{N^{\perp}}$ , on the restriction surface (2) imply the equation of state

$$p = W \varrho, \quad (3)$$

where barotropic equation-of-state parameter,

$$W(\sqrt{\gamma}) = \frac{d \ln F(\sqrt{\gamma})}{d \ln \sqrt{\gamma}}, \quad (4)$$

is the derived characteristic function which depends on the induced measure factor of spatial sections [11].

Besides initial motivation for a new dark energy mechanism, the dynamical and constraint analysis of GUMG [12, 13] reveals additional features, such as the possibility of inflationary scenario consistent with observations a certain subclass of  $F$ . The dynamical nature of  $W$  is also an attractive feature in cosmological phenomenology.

Unimodular gravity emerges as a special case of the GUMG family, defined by

$$F(\sqrt{\gamma}) = \sqrt{\gamma}^{-1}, \quad W(\sqrt{\gamma}) \equiv 1. \quad [\text{UMG}] \quad (5)$$

However, this is an exceptional case, whose dynamical content is almost general-relativistic, whereas GUMG describes gravitational dynamics in the presence of additional physical degree of freedom associated with the cosmological perfect fluid [8, 12]. Also, unlike unimodular case, GUMG models imply a preferred time direction, reflecting the space-time anisotropy of the perfect fluid.

\* nesterov@lpi.ru

## II. GUMG ANALOG OF THE HENNEAUX-TEITELBOIM ACTION FOR UMG

Henneaux and Teitelboim suggested an alternative formulation of unimodular gravity via the so-called covariant action [7], providing unrestricted diffeomorphism invariance while remaining physically equivalent to the standard UMG setup.

We claim that analog of the Henneaux-Teitelboim representation for GUMG theories is

$$S_{GUMG}^{alt}[g, \Lambda, \mathcal{V}] = \int dt dx \sqrt{|g|} ({}^d R(g) - \Lambda) + \int dt dx \partial_\mu \mathcal{V}^\mu \hat{E} F \sqrt{\gamma} \Lambda, \quad (6)$$

where  ${}^d R(g)$  — scalar curvature for unrestricted space-time metric  $g_{\mu\nu}$ ,  $\sqrt{\gamma}$  is the covariant induced measure on  $t = const$  hypersurfaces,  $\Lambda$  is the so-called cosmological-constant field,  $\mathcal{V}^\mu$  is the auxiliary Henneaux-Teitelboim field, and  $\hat{E}$  is the spatially nonlocal, nondegenerate operator defined by the kernel

$$E(t|x; x') = \delta(x; x') - \frac{W^{-1}(t, x) W(t, x')}{V} + \frac{1}{V}, \quad (7)$$

where  $W(t, x) = W(\sqrt{\gamma}(t, x))$  and  $V = \int 1$  is the background spatial volume. Integrals without explicit measure denote *spatial* integration

$$\int f(t) = \int_{t=const} dx f(t, x). \quad (8)$$

In the unimodular case (5) the factor  $\hat{E} F \sqrt{\gamma}$  tends to unity and the UMG covariant action [7] is restored.

Another convenient form of the action,

$$S_{GUMG}^{alto}[g, \Lambda_0, \mathcal{V}] = \int dt dx \sqrt{|g|} ({}^d R(g) - \sqrt{\gamma}^{-1} F^{-1} \hat{E}^{-1} \Lambda_0) + \int dt dx \partial_\mu \mathcal{V}^\mu \Lambda_0, \quad (9)$$

is obtained from (6) via nondegenerate redefinition  $\Lambda_0 = \hat{E} F \sqrt{\gamma} \Lambda$ . The inverse operator  $\hat{E}^{-1}$  has the kernel

$$E^{-1}(t|x; x') = \delta(x; x') - \frac{W^{-1}(t, x)}{\int W^{-1}(t)} - \frac{W(t, x')}{\int W(t)} + 2 \frac{W^{-1}(t, x) V W(t, x')}{\int W^{-1}(t) \int W(t)}. \quad (10)$$

The convenience follows from the gauge invariance of  $\Lambda_0$  field, which is a spacetime constant on shell.

The origin and consequences of the delocalization will be discussed later. Here we highlight a prominent GUMG subfamily, termed w-GUMG and defined by

$$F(\sqrt{\gamma}) = \sqrt{\gamma}^w, \quad W(\sqrt{\gamma}) \equiv w = const, \quad [w\text{-GUMG}] \quad (11)$$

for which spatial delocalization disappears because  $\hat{E}$  and  $\hat{E}^{-1}$  become identity operators with kernel  $\delta(x, x')$ . [14]

## III. TIME PARAMETERIZATION OF GUMG CANONICAL ACTION

In this section, we derive the alternative GUMG action, which simultaneously establishes the equivalence of the representations. The key step is the consistent time parameterization of the canonical extended action of the theory, which deserves special discussion.

We start with the extended canonical action, previously analyzed for general GUMG in [12] using the Dirac scheme. Here, we briefly revisit this through a concise Hamiltonization approach. First, we reduce (1) with respect to the  $\lambda_\perp$ ,  $N^\perp$ , then introduce conjugate momenta  $\pi^{mn}$  for the spatial metric  $\gamma_{mn}$  via a Legendre transform. This yields a canonical theory on the phase space  $(\gamma_{mn}, \pi^{mn})$  with a Hamiltonian density  $F(\sqrt{\gamma}) H_\perp(\gamma, \pi)$  and primary constraints  $H_n(\gamma, \pi) = 0$ , corresponding to spatial diffeomorphisms. The structures  $H_\perp$  and  $H_n$  are identical to the Hamiltonian and momentum constraints in canonical Einstein gravity [10],

$$H_\perp(\gamma, \pi) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}} \left( \pi^{mn} \pi_{mn} - \frac{1}{d-2} \pi^2 \right) - \sqrt{\gamma} R(\gamma), \quad (12)$$

$$H_n(\gamma, \pi) = -2\gamma_{nm} \pi^{mk};_k, \quad (13)$$

where  $\pi_{mn} = \gamma_{mk} \pi^{kl} \gamma_{ln}$ ,  $\pi = \gamma_{mn} \pi^{mn}$ ,  $R(\gamma)$  is the scalar curvature of  $t = const$  hypersurfaces, and semicolons denote spatial covariant derivatives. It is important to note that in GUMG  $H_\perp$  (12) is not a constraint, but a component of the nontrivial Hamiltonian density.

Dynamics do not preserve primary constraints  $H_n = 0$  (for  $W \neq 0$ , [15]) and the Dirac consistency procedure reveals the secondary constraints,

$$(W(\sqrt{\gamma}) F(\sqrt{\gamma}) H_\perp(\gamma, \pi))_{,m} = 0, \quad (14)$$

which have a form of spatial gradient ( $f_{,m} = \partial_m f$ ). Presuming spacetime is foliated into  $t = const$  hypersurfaces, this effectively constrains the inhomogeneous component  $\overline{WFH}_\perp \equiv WFH_\perp - \overline{WFH}_\perp = 0$ . We denote *average-free* and *spatially homogeneous* components of local functions with tildes and overlines respectively, [16]

$$\widetilde{f}(t, x) = f(t, x) - \overline{f}(t), \quad \overline{f}(t) = \int f(t, x) / \int 1. \quad (15)$$

The constraints  $H_n = 0$  and  $(WFH_\perp)_{,m} = 0$  form a complete set [17], so GUMG concise extended action reads

$$S_E[\gamma, \pi, N, \mu] = \int dt dx \left( \dot{\gamma}_{mn} \pi^{mn} - FH_\perp - N^n H_n - \mu^m (WFH_\perp)_{,m} \right). \quad (16)$$

Time parameterization of the field-theoretic canonical action in a mechanical-like form by means of the local fields, which was applied in [7] for UMG, remains valid for w-GUMG subfamily, characterized by constant  $W \equiv w = const$  and  $F \rightarrow F_w = \sqrt{\gamma}^w$ , for which the

parameterized action can be written as

$$S_w^{par}[\gamma, \pi, \tau^0, \pi_0, \lambda^0, N, \mu] = \int dt dx \left( \dot{\gamma}_{mn} \pi^{mn} + \dot{\tau}^0 \pi_0 - \lambda^0 (\pi_0 + F_w H_\perp) - N^n H_n - \mu^m (w F_w H_\perp)_m \right). \quad (17)$$

To ensure the equivalence of the original and parameterized representations of general field theory, two conditions must be satisfied. First, the new parameterized Hamiltonian constraint must introduce a new *first-class* constraint into the extended set. This new constraint is not necessarily the parameterized Hamiltonian itself, it may involve a linear combination with the original constraints. Second, there must exist an *accessible* gauge fixing (e.g.  $\tau^0 - t = 0$ ) for the new first-class constraint, which recovers the original action (16) upon reduction.

These requirements are satisfied in w-GUMG and UMG for the local parameterized action (17). Notably, in w-GUMG ( $w \neq -1$ ) the new first-class constraint introduced through parameterization is  $\int \varepsilon P_I = \int \varepsilon (\pi_0 + \overline{F_w H_\perp}) = \int (\varepsilon \pi_0 + \overline{\varepsilon} F_w H_\perp)$ , which involves only the spatially homogeneous component of the Hamiltonian density. (By  $\varepsilon, \zeta, \eta, \xi$ , etc. we denote local gauge parameters.) This means that the time reparameterization gauge symmetry introduced in (17) by local parameterization, in the sector of metric fields manifests as a functionally incomplete symmetry with a homogeneous parameter  $\overline{\varepsilon}(t)$ . Whereas in the sector of the auxiliary fields this symmetry remains local. The constraint  $\int \varepsilon P_I$  is a linear combination of the local parameterization constraint  $\int \varepsilon (\pi_0 + F_w H_\perp)$  and the secondary constraint  $\int (\partial_n \eta^n) (w F_w H_\perp)$  with  $(\partial_n \eta^n) = -\tilde{\varepsilon} w^{-1}$ . Both of which are second class. This suggests that the local parameterization (17) is valid because the average-free part of the Hamiltonian density was constrained (14) prior to parameterization [18].

In the general field theory, particularly for GUMG with nonconstant  $W(\sqrt{\gamma})$ , a mechanical-like parametrization similar to (17) *does not* yield an equivalent theory. The local constraint  $\pi_0 + F H_\perp$  fails to introduce a new first-class constraint. From the Poisson brackets

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ \int \xi^n H_n, \int \eta^m H_m \right\} &= \int (\xi^m \partial_m \eta^n - \eta^m \partial_m \xi^n) H_n, \\ \left\{ \int \xi^n H_n, \int \eta^m \mathcal{T}_m \right\} &= \int \xi^n (\partial_n \eta) \mathcal{T}_n + \int (\partial \xi) (\partial \eta) \Omega \mathcal{T}, \\ \left\{ \int \xi^n \mathcal{T}_n, \int \eta^m \mathcal{T}_m \right\} &= \int ((\partial \xi) \overleftrightarrow{\partial}_n (\partial \eta)) \gamma^{nm} F^2 W^2 H_m, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ \int \varepsilon (\pi_0 + F H_\perp), \int \varepsilon' (\pi_0 + F H_\perp) \right\} &= \int (\varepsilon \overleftrightarrow{\partial}_n \varepsilon') F^2 \gamma^{nk} H_k, \\ \left\{ \int \varepsilon (\pi_0 + F H_\perp), \int \eta^n H_n \right\} &= -\int \varepsilon_{,n} \eta^n \frac{1}{W} \mathcal{T} + \int \varepsilon (\partial \eta) \mathcal{T}, \\ \left\{ \int \varepsilon (\pi_0 + F H_\perp), \int \eta^n \mathcal{T}_n \right\} &= -\int (\varepsilon \overleftrightarrow{\partial}_n (\partial \eta) W) F^2 \gamma^{nk} H_k \\ &\quad - \int \varepsilon (\partial \eta) \Theta \pi \mathcal{T}, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where we use shorthand notations  $\mathcal{T} = W F H_\perp$ ,  $(\partial \xi) = \partial_n \xi^n$ ,  $(f \overleftrightarrow{\partial}_n g) = (f \partial_n g - g \partial_n f)$  and introduce  $\Omega(\sqrt{\gamma}) = \frac{d \ln W}{d \ln \sqrt{\gamma}} + W + 1$ ,  $\Theta(\sqrt{\gamma}) = \frac{1}{d-2} \frac{d \ln W}{d \ln \sqrt{\gamma}} \frac{F}{\sqrt{\gamma}}$ , it follows that the Poisson bracket matrix for the constraint

set  $(\pi_0 + F H_\perp, H_n, (W F H_\perp)_m)$  has a greater rank than for the initial set  $(H_n, (W F H_\perp)_m)$  [19]. To maintain the rank and satisfy the correspondence condition, one may extend all constraints with  $O(\tau^0_{,n})$  terms. This extension results in an infinite series in powers of  $\tau^0$  and its spatial derivatives. Furthermore, since the structure functions in (18),(19) are spatial differential operators, and some constraints are functionally incomplete, the result becomes uncontrollably nonlocal.

However, for field theories in which the *weighted* average-free part of the Hamiltonian density is constrained in the original theory, the equivalent parameterized action with local auxiliary fields can be constructed in a concise explicit form at the cost of simple spatial nonlocality. Conceptually, the desired representation of the theory is achieved in two steps, each of which clearly preserves the physical equivalence of the representations. First, a universally valid homogeneous time parameterization [20] is applied to (16) by introducing homogeneous fields  $\overline{\tau}^0(t), \overline{\pi}_0(t), \overline{\lambda}^0(t)$ . Then, the average-free parts of these fields are added via separate pure-gauge combination  $\tilde{\tau}^0 \overline{\pi}_0 - \tilde{\lambda}^0 \overline{\pi}_0$ . After this, it becomes possible to combine a functionally complete  $H_\perp$  term in a constraint, which is necessary to obtain the desired generalization of the Henneaux-Teitelboim representation.

For the general GUMG model, this parameterization yields the equivalent parameterized action in the form

$$S^{par}[\gamma, \pi, \tau^0, \pi_0, \lambda^0, N, \mu] = \int dt dx \left( \dot{\gamma}_{mn} \pi^{mn} + \dot{\tau}^0 \pi_0 - \lambda^0 (\pi_0 + \overline{F H_\perp}) - N^n H_n - \mu^m (W F H_\perp)_m \right), \quad (20)$$

where auxiliary fields are combined into local fields  $\tau^0(t, x), \pi_0(t, x), \lambda^0(t, x)$ . It can be verified that the rank of the matrix of Poisson brackets of constraints does not change, the gauge  $\tau^0 - t = 0$  is accessible, and the reduction with respect to  $(\pi_0 + \overline{F H_\perp}, \tau^0 - t)$  reproduce (16) [21]. The form of the new first-class constraint, introduced during such parameterization, can be guessed from general principles. This is  $P_I = \pi_0 + \overline{F H_\perp} + \overline{U_0^n H_n}$ , where  $U_0^n(\gamma, \pi)$  is an on-shell solution for the Lagrange multipliers  $N^n$ , which in w-GUMG can be chosen equal to zero, but is nontrivial in general GUMG [22]. The new first-class constraint  $\int \varepsilon P_I$  and the transverse diffeomorphisms  $\int \zeta_{(t)}^n H_n$ ,  $(\partial_k \zeta_{(t)}^k = 0)$ , generate the canonical gauge algebra of the model. The secondary constraint and longitudinal spatial diffeomorphisms are the second-class constraints.

For w-GUMG ( $w \neq 1$ ), this reproduces the constraint structure derived from the local action (17). The newly introduced parameterization symmetry acts homogeneously on the metric phase-space fields, with the reason for this being more transparent in this scheme. Only the homogeneous part of  $F H_\perp$  from  $P_I$  generate gauge transformations, while the inhomogeneous part of  $F H_\perp$ , constrained by  $(W F H_\perp)_{,n} = 0$ , remains second-class. For the UMG case  $W \equiv w = 1$ , parameterization (20) clarifies how the lacking homogeneous mode of  $\sqrt{\gamma}^{-1} H_\perp$  enter

the game, with the inhomogeneous part of the new symmetry acting entirely within the auxiliary sector. Unlike in GUMG, the inhomogeneous part of the Hamiltonian constraint and the longitudinal part of spatial diffeomorphisms are initially first-class, so the homogeneous mode just completes the original gauge symmetry to full diffeomorphism invariance in the metric sector.

This parameterization scheme also clarifies that only the homogeneous time-reparameterization transformations are shared by both the metric and the auxiliary fields, while the remaining symmetries act independently on these sectors.

To derive the generalized Henneaux-Teitelboim form of the action from (20), we rearrange its constraint basis. The constraint equations  $\pi_0 + \overline{FH}_\perp = 0$ ,  $(WFH_\perp)_{,m} = 0$  are equivalent to the set  $\pi_0 + \overline{FH}_\perp + W^{-1}(\widetilde{WFH}_\perp) = 0$ ,  $(WFH_\perp)_{,m} = 0$ . The first constraint in the latter set can be recast as  $\pi_0 + \hat{E}FH_\perp = 0$ , where the operator  $\hat{E}$ , with kernel (7), is nondegenerate and acts to the right on the Hamiltonian density  $FH_\perp$ . This is the origin of the spatial nonlocality in the parameterized GUMG: it is generally not possible to merge functionally incomplete constraints into functionally complete local combinations.

To assemble the dynamical metric dependence into a GR-like combination, the  $H_\perp$  must be consolidated into a single constraint. Substituting  $FH_\perp = -\hat{E}^{-1}\pi_0$ , where  $\hat{E}^{-1}$  is defined in (10), into the secondary constraint results in  $(W\hat{E}^{-1}\pi_0)_{,m} = 0$ . The latter looks awkward but simplifies to  $\pi_{0,m} = 0$ , [23]. In the new constraint basis the canonical action becomes

$$S^{par'}[\gamma, \pi, \tau^0, \pi_0, \lambda, N, \nu] = \int dt dx \left( \dot{\gamma}_{mn} \pi^{mn} + \dot{\tau}^0 \pi_0 - \lambda(\pi_0 + \hat{E}FH_\perp) - N^n H_n - \nu^m \pi_{0,m} \right) \quad (21)$$

The equivalence of (20) and (21) is straightforward, as they are related by a nondegenerate redefinition of the Lagrange multipliers,  $\lambda^0 = \lambda - \partial_k \nu^k$ ,  $\partial_k \mu^k = -\lambda \widetilde{W}^{-1}$ .

Finally, the effective lapse function  $N^\perp$  is recovered via the redefinition  $\lambda = N^\perp F^{-1} \hat{E}^{-1}$ , which completes the formation of the canonical expression for the Einstein-Hilbert Lagrangian. The Legendre reduction to Lagrangian action proceeds identically to GR, which leads to the action (9), where spacetime metric is  $g_{\mu\nu} dX^\mu dX^\nu = \gamma_{mn} (dx^m + N^m dt)(dx^n + N^n dt) - N^{\perp 2} dt dt$ , the cosmological-constant field  $A_0$  is just the renamed  $\pi_0$ , and the Henneaux-Teitelboim field is  $\mathcal{V}^\mu = (\tau^0, \nu^m)$ .

#### IV. DYNAMICAL PROPERTIES

The variational equations of motion for action  $S^{alt}[g, \Lambda, \mathcal{V}]$  (6) with respect to the auxiliary fields  $\mathcal{V}^\nu$ ,

$$\partial_\nu(\hat{E}F\sqrt{\gamma}\Lambda) = \partial_\nu A_0 = 0, \quad (22)$$

generalize the cosmological constant behavior, implying that  $A_0$  is an unfixed on-shell spacetime constant. Oper-

ator  $\hat{E}$  (7) introduces spatial nonlocality into the classical behavior of the cosmological-constant field  $\Lambda$ ,

$$\Lambda = \sqrt{\gamma}^{-1} F^{-1} \hat{E}^{-1} c_0 = \sqrt{\gamma}^{-1} F^{-1} \frac{W^{-1}}{\overline{W}^{-1}} c_0, \quad (23)$$

where  $c_0$  is an on-shell constant value of  $A_0$  and  $\overline{W}^{-1}(t)$  is the average of  $W^{-1}(\sqrt{\gamma}(t, x))$  over  $t = \text{const}$  hypersurface. For w-GUMG subfamily (11)  $W^{-1}/\overline{W}^{-1} = 1$  and the spatial nonlocality disappears. In the unimodular case (5),  $\Lambda$  coincides with  $A_0$  and on shell equals to  $c_0$ .

The variational equation with respect to  $\Lambda$  gives

$$\sqrt{|g|} = \partial_\mu \mathcal{V}^\mu \hat{E} F \sqrt{\gamma}, \quad (24)$$

with  $\hat{E}$  acting to the left.

For GUMG models, unlike the exceptional unimodular case (5), two average-free second-class constraints arise. Differential consequences of the equations of motion impose two constraints on metric components, which in canonical treatment are the Lagrange multipliers at these constraints. First, the lapse function  $N^\perp$  satisfies

$$\widetilde{N^\perp F^{-1}} = 0. \quad (25)$$

This and (24) imply  $\widetilde{\partial_\mu \mathcal{V}^\mu \hat{E}} \sim (\partial_\mu \widetilde{\mathcal{V}^\mu W^{-1}}) = 0$ , leading to

$$\partial_\mu \mathcal{V}^\mu \hat{E} = \overline{\partial_\mu \mathcal{V}^\mu} = \dot{\tau}^0, \quad (26)$$

and reinstating the GUMG restriction condition (2) as  $N^\perp = \dot{\tau}^0 F(\sqrt{\gamma})$ . Factor  $\dot{\tau}^0(t)$  reflects time reparameterization gauge ambiguity in parameterized GUMG, which acts on the gravitational variables homogeneously, and is equal to 1 in the correspondence gauge  $\tau^0 - t = 0$ . The second constraint concerns Lagrange multipliers for longitudinal spatial diffeomorphisms,

$$\partial_n N^n = \dot{\tau}^0 (\Omega^{-1} \Theta \pi - \Omega^{-1} \int \Omega^{-1} \Theta \pi / \int \Omega^{-1}), \quad (27)$$

where  $\Omega(\sqrt{\gamma}) = \frac{d \ln W}{d \ln \sqrt{\gamma}} + W + 1$ ,  $\Theta(\sqrt{\gamma}) = \frac{1}{d-2} \frac{d \ln W}{d \ln \sqrt{\gamma}} \frac{F}{\sqrt{\gamma}}$ .

Finally, the variational derivative of  $S^{alt}[g, \Lambda, \mathcal{V}]$  with respect to  $g_{\mu\nu}$  leads to the Einstein equations

$${}^d R^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} {}^d R g^{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} T^{\mu\nu}, \quad (28)$$

where the Einstein tensor for spacetime metric  $g_{\mu\nu}$  is on the left, and terms proportional to  $\Lambda$  are attributed to the matter sector, whose contribution is encoded on the right-hand side in the energy-momentum tensor  $T^{\mu\nu} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{|g|}} \frac{\delta S_{mat}}{\delta g_{\mu\nu}}$ . The latter can be cast on shell to

$$T^{\mu\nu} = \Lambda n^\mu n^\nu + W \Lambda (g^{\mu\nu} + n^\mu n^\nu), \quad (29)$$

where  $n^\mu$  is a unit vector field orthogonal to constant-time hypersurfaces. In (29)  $\varrho = \Lambda$  is the energy density and  $p = W \Lambda$  is the pressure, reproducing the perfect fluid equation of state (3),

$$p = W \varrho. \quad (30)$$

Note that for nonconstant  $W(\sqrt{\gamma})$  the on-shell behaviour of energy and pressure bears the imprint of the spatial nonlocality due to (23).

## V. CONCLUSIONS

In this letter, we introduced an alternative formulation of generalized unimodular gravity (GUMG), inspired by the Henneaux-Teitelboim action for unimodular gravity. We derived this formulation, addressing issues of consistent parameterization, and highlighted its key dynamical and gauge features, including the emergence of spatial nonlocality. A more detailed discussion, including a complete analysis of the gauge structure of the Lagrangian theory, a comprehensive specification of exceptional particular cases, some geometric and functional aspects of the formalism, and a note on the quantum implications of the nonlocality, will be presented elsewhere [23].

The parameterization approach and the alternative action in the generalized Henneaux-Teitelboim form, along with the underlying techniques for dealing with functionally incomplete quantities and constraints, can be extended to restricted gravity models with more general restriction conditions. These methods can also be applied to other field theories where the gradient of the weighted Hamiltonian density vanishes on the constraint surface. Such theories can be generated by restricting diffeomorphism-invariant gauge theories, where the restriction relates the field serving as the Lagrange multiplier in the Hamiltonian constraint (analogous to  $N^+$ ) to a rather arbitrary function of the Lagrangian dynamical fields (analogous to  $\gamma_{mn}$ ).

In conclusion, we remark on the nature of the emerged spatial nonlocality. While one might view the nonlocality encoded in  $\hat{E}$  as an artifact of the “unfortunate” parameterization by local auxiliary fields, we argue that this nonlocality is implicitly present in the physical sector of  $W \neq const$  GUMG models already in the original formu-

lation. In the canonical framework, the integrated Hamiltonian density  $F\hat{H}_\perp$  is a gauge-invariant constant of motion, with its on-shell values parameterized by a constant  $-c_0$ . The secondary constraint  $\widehat{WFH}_\perp$  is a gauge invariant that vanishes on shell. Thus,  $\hat{E}FH_\perp$  is functionally complete (but spatially nonlocal) gauge-invariant constant of motion — a property that the alternative parameterized representation makes explicit.

The significance of this observation is further supported by the perspective of the restricted-theory formalism [24, 25], which sheds light on the connection between the effective actions of the parental and restricted gauge theories. An important element is to understand and conveniently describe the change of physical space when passing from the parental to the restricted theory, when the restriction is not a pure gauge fixing [24]. In GUMG the deformation of the physical space is parameterized by a constant. While the physical trajectories of the parental theory (GR) are tied to the constraint surface  $H_\perp = 0$ ,  $H_n = 0$ , in the restricted theory (GUMG) the constraint surface expands [26] to  $H_\perp = -F^{-1}\hat{E}^{-1}c_0 = -F^{-1}\frac{W^{-1}}{W-1}c_0$ ,  $H_n = 0$ .

We anticipate that our results and the methods developed for generalized unimodular gravity will provide a useful basis for further exploration of such theories and their quantum properties.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We wish to thank Andrei Barvinsky for stimulating discussions. The research was supported by the Russian Science Foundation grant No 23-12-00051.

- 
- [1] A. Einstein, “Do gravitational fields play an essential part in the structure of the elementary particles of matter?,” *Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. Wiss. Berlin (Math. Phys.)*, vol. 1919, pp. 349–356, 1919. Translated and included in *The Principle of Relativity*, by H.A. Lorentz et al. (Dover Press, New York, 1923).
- [2] S. Weinberg, “The Cosmological Constant Problem,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, vol. 61, pp. 1–23, 1989.
- [3] W. G. Unruh, “A Unimodular Theory of Canonical Quantum Gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 40, p. 1048, 1989.
- [4] Y. J. Ng and H. van Dam, “Unimodular Theory of Gravity and the Cosmological Constant,” *J. Math. Phys.*, vol. 32, pp. 1337–1340, 1991.
- [5] R. Bousso, “TASI Lectures on the Cosmological Constant,” *Gen. Rel. Grav.*, vol. 40, pp. 607–637, 2008.
- [6] R. Bufalo, M. Oksanen, and A. Tureanu, “How unimodular gravity theories differ from general relativity at quantum level,” *Eur. Phys. J. C*, vol. 75, no. 10, p. 477, 2015.
- [7] M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim, “The Cosmological Constant and General Covariance,” *Phys. Lett. B*, vol. 222, pp. 195–199, 1989.
- [8] A. O. Barvinsky and A. Y. Kamenshchik, “Darkness without dark matter and energy – generalized unimodular gravity,” *Phys. Lett. B*, vol. 774, pp. 59–63, 2017.
- [9] R. L. Arnowitt, S. Deser, and C. W. Misner, “Dynamical Structure and Definition of Energy in General Relativity,” *Phys. Rev.*, vol. 116, pp. 1322–1330, 1959.
- [10] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne, and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1973.
- [11] To avoid additional complications of the canonical constraint structure we assume  $W(\sqrt{\gamma})$  to be sign-definite function. This causes monotonicity of  $F(\sqrt{\gamma})$ . However, this is not the strict limitation. For example, the cold dust case,  $W \equiv 0$ , also fits the formalism.
- [12] A. O. Barvinsky, N. Kolganov, A. Kurov, and D. Nesterov, “Dynamics of the generalized unimodular gravity theory,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 100, no. 2, p. 023542, 2019.
- [13] A. O. Barvinsky and N. Kolganov, “Inflation in generalized unimodular gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 100, no. 12, p. 123510, 2019.
- [14] The constructive derivation admits a certain ambiguity in the form of the delocalization operator. Operators  $E_a(t|x; x') = a^{-1}(t, x)\delta(x; x')W(t, x') - a^{-1}(t, x)\frac{1}{\mathcal{V}}W(t, x') + \frac{1}{\mathcal{V}}$  with arbitrary sign-definite func-

- tion  $a(\gamma_{mn})$  describes classically equivalent models. The choice (7) is preferable not only because of simplifications, but also in view of the identity limit for w-GUMG.
- [15] The cold dust case,  $W \equiv 0$  ( $F = \text{const}$ ), is the special GUMG case in which dynamics preserves all constraints  $H_n = 0$ , which thus are first-class. However, the constraint  $(b(\sqrt{\gamma})H_\perp)_{,n}$  can be added by hand as a partial gauge fixing. Thus, the following derivation and the final representation are also valid for  $W \equiv 0$  case upon substituting  $W(\sqrt{\gamma}) \rightarrow b(\sqrt{\gamma})$  with any  $|b(\sqrt{\gamma})| > 0$ .
- [16] Various arguments rely on decomposing quantities on average (homogeneous) and average-free parts via complementary projectors. Here we use the form valid for compact spaces. Analogous construction exists for spacetimes with noncompact spatial sections. In fact, only the existence of such decomposition and the equivalence of average-free quantities with spatial vector divergencies are essential [23].
- [17] We do not provide a separate discussion of the peculiarities associated with the so-called GR-branch of GUMG [12], which is a particular submanifold characterized by a rank discontinuity of the matrix of Poisson brackets of constraints. Minor changes affect the constraint classification: on the GR-branch all constraints become first-class. Consequently, there is no dynamical constraints on any of the Lagrange multipliers. Importantly, the GR-branch is preserved and correctly described by the alternative parameterized GUMG description.
- [18] The constraint set of the parameterized w-GUMG can be rearranged to disentangle first-class subspace spanned by  $P_I$  and the transverse part of  $H_n$ , which generate the canonical gauge algebra of the model. Meanwhile, the average-free part of  $F_w H_\perp$  (encoded in the secondary constraint) and the longitudinal part of  $H_n$  form a pair of second-class constraints. In the exceptional UMG case,  $w = -1$ , this pair becomes first-class, restoring full space-time diffeomorphism invariance in accordance with [7].
- [19] Note that in the right-hand side of (18) and (19),  $\mathcal{T} = WFH_\perp$  (or, more precisely, its homogeneous component) does not vanish on shell. The exceptional cases with  $\Omega \equiv 0$  correspond either to UMG,  $W \equiv w = -1$ , or to models with pathological constraint structures, and are thus excluded from regular GUMG [23].
- [20] Homogeneous time parameterization of a general gauge field theory is possible because the dynamical and constraint structures in the extended canonical theory (16) are harmonized by the Dirac consistency procedure: the spatially integrated Hamiltonian density, even when shifted by a commuting element, remains in involution with the complete set of the original constraints.
- [21] The rank property may be checked using (19), whose right-hand side vanishes on the constraint surface after substitution  $\varepsilon \rightarrow \bar{\varepsilon}$ ,  $\varepsilon' \rightarrow \bar{\varepsilon}'$ , caused by the change of the parameterized Hamiltonian constraint. The correspondence property is evident since the canonical action of  $\pi_0 + \overline{FH}_\perp$  is obviously transversal to  $\tau^0 - t$ .
- [22] The combination  $FH_\perp + U_0^n H_n$ , which appear in  $P_I$ , is the so-called first-class Hamiltonian density [27]. Also we recall that the discussed properties of the constraints are related to the physical space of the theory outside the GR-branch [13].
- [23] submitted for publication.
- [24] A. O. Barvinsky and D. V. Nesterov, "Restricted gauge theory formalism and unimodular gravity," *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 108, no. 6, p. 065004, 2023.
- [25] in preparation.
- [26] The corresponding contraction of the physical space [24] is not confined to the phase space, as it restricts a global mode of the quantity involving the Lagrange multiplier  $N^\perp$ . However, it can also be inferred from the actions of the alternative representation.
- [27] M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim, *Quantization of gauge systems*. 1992.