

On the essential constants in Riemannian geometries

G.O. Papadopoulos*

*National & Kapodistrian University of Athens, Physics Department
Nuclear & Particle Physics Section
Panepistimioupolis, Ilisia GR 157-71, Athens, Hellas*

Dedication The author dedicates this work to Elena and Katerina.

Abstract

In the present work the problem of distinguishing between essential and spurious (i.e., absorbable) constants contained in a metric tensor field in a Riemannian geometry is considered. The contribution of the study is the presentation of a sufficient and necessary criterion, in terms of a covariant statement, which enables one to determine whether a constant is essential or not. It turns out that the problem of characterization is reduced to that of solving a system of partial differential equations of the first order. In any case, the metric tensor field is assumed to be smooth with respect to the constant to be tested. It should be stressed that the entire analysis is purely of local character.

MSC-Class (2000): 83C05;83C15;83C20

Keywords: essential constants, local isometric embedding

1 Introduction

When dealing with Riemannian spaces, especially in a local description and in a coordinate approach, one frequently encounters the problem of attributing a character to a constant (or a parameter) which may appear in the metric tensor field. Generally, there are two possibilities: this constant is either essential (i.e., a true degree of freedom) or spurious (i.e., absorbable with the help of a change in the coordinates).

*E-Mail: gopapado@phys.uoa.gr

The issue is of great interest in the context of general relativity, where the metric tensor field is the solution to the Einstein equations, and the constants emerge from the integration procedure. But, this observation will not limit the spirit of the present work.

There is a variety of ways to attack the problem under discussion. In the relevant literature, one can find two main approaches:

- A_1 The first main approach consists simply in trying to find that particular change in the coordinates which can serve to eliminate the “suspect” constant. When this is possible, the constant is incorporated in the very definition of the new coordinate system, being thus absorbed. The difficulty here is that, in general, there is no systematic way to find the desired transformation. Obviously, failure to find such a transformation does not necessarily imply the essentiality of the constant.
- A_2 The second main approach, which is more elaborate and sophisticated, can be divided into two subcategories: one can either use the invariant classification methods for a single Riemannian space, or implement the methods of the *equivalence problem* (ref. [1]). The second way (which may be more laborious than the first) consists in the following steps: one considers twice the metric tensor field: once for a given value of the constant and once for another value of it. The final step is to compare these two metrics and to check whether they are equivalent or not. A positive answer dictates that the constant is spurious (and a negative, that it is essential) (see also ref. [2] for a connection between limits of space-time and the problem of essentiality).

The non-equivalence between two given Riemannian spaces can easily be checked using the notion of *curvature invariant relations*, functionally independent relations among scalars. These scalars are constructed either from the Riemann tensor and its covariant derivatives up to a given order by contracting all the indices, or as “ratios” between two tensors (obtained from the Riemann tensor) which differ only by a factor. The first case gives scalars entering *syzygies*, *polynomial invariants*, *mixed invariants*, and the *Cartan invariants* –see ref. [1] and the references therein for details. The second case is described in ref. [3] (especially the last two references therein). It is sufficient for the two given spaces to differ in only one such relation in order to be inequivalent.

Curvature-invariant relations have one very important property: they do not depend on points of the Riemannian space; thus, their functional forms are invariant statements (i.e., they retain the same functional form in all coordinate systems). Consequently, if these functional forms depend on some

constants, that means these constants, which clearly are some from those in the metric tensor field, are not affected by a change in the coordinates. If a constant of the metric tensor field could be eliminated by such a change, then the metric tensor field in the new coordinate system as well as all the curvature invariant relations based on it, would lack this particular constant, an invariant statement, since the curvature invariant relations are invariant in form. Therefore, only essential constants will appear in the curvature-invariant relations.

An example will elucidate the above arguments: consider the well-known Schwarzschild metric in the usual local coordinate system $\{t, r, \theta, \phi\}$ and e.g., the two curvature scalars:

$$S_1 \equiv R_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu}R^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} = 48M^2/r^6 \quad (1.1)$$

$$S_2 \equiv S_{1;\mu}{}^{\mu} = -3456M^3/r^9 + 1440M^2/r^8 \quad (1.2)$$

which are, of course, r -dependent. However, if r is eliminated between them, one arrives at the relation:

$$R(S_1, S_2, M) \equiv S_2 + 6\sqrt{3} S_1^{3/2} - 5M^{-2/3} \sqrt[3]{9/2} S_1^{4/3} = 0 \quad (1.3)$$

This relation is not only independent of the space-time points, i.e., it can be evaluated everywhere in the Schwarzschild space-time (except, of course, the true singularity at $r = 0$), but also invariant under any change in the local coordinate system; although the functional form (in terms of the coordinates) of the two curvature scalars S_1, S_2 will change, the relation $R(S_1, S_2, M)$ will retain its form (as a function of its arguments S_1, S_2 , and M) and thus constitutes a curvature invariant relation. Indeed, consider for example the change $r \rightarrow \tilde{r} : r = M^{1/3}\tilde{r}$ which eliminates the parameter M from S_1 and alters the form of S_2 , yet keeps the relation $R(S_1, S_2, M)$ unchanged.

To use the above considerations in order to deduce equivalence between two Riemannian spaces is problematic, since it would require the existence of a countable basis for an arbitrary functional space.

The following section presents a sufficient and necessary criterion, in a covariant language which offers one the ability to check whether a constant, appearing in a metric tensor field, is essential or not. In the second case, the criterion also provides a way to find the desired local finite transformation of the change in the coordinates.

2 The Criterion

Before presenting the criterion, a word must be said for the existence of yet another kind of constant, namely the global (or topological) constants:

indeed, there are cases where a constant can be removed from local coordinate patches but it does appear in the transforms between them (e.g., in the appropriate range of the coordinates).

From the previous section, it is clear that *essential* and *spurious* are mutually complementary notions. It will turn out more practical, though equivalent, to deal with spurious. Indeed, if the constant is spurious one can, in the coordinates in which the constant is removed, take a product metric tensor field on $\mathcal{S} \times I$ (where \mathcal{S} is the initial n -dimensional manifold and I the domain of definition of the spurious constant), and then deduce that the only non-zero components of curvature in $n + 1$ dimensions are those which correspond to the curvature tensor of the n -dimensional metric tensor field. In these coordinates the normals to \mathcal{S} form a symmetry. Alternatively, one can also consider the $(n + 1)$ -dimensional manifold using the original coordinates, with the spurious constant as the extra coordinate, and use the constant to label the n -dimensional slices.

The above arguments can be made more precise as follows:

Let \mathcal{S} be a Riemannian space which is described by the pair (\mathcal{M}, g) , where¹ \mathcal{M} is an n -dimensional, connected, Hausdorff and (C^∞) manifold and g is a $(C^r)^2$ metric tensor field on it; a non-degenerate, covariant tensor field of order 2, with the property that at each point of \mathcal{M} one can choose a frame of n vectors $\{z_0, \dots, z_{n-1}\}$, such that³: $g(z_\alpha, z_\beta) = \eta_{\alpha\beta}$, where η is a diagonal matrix with entries $\{\varepsilon_0, \dots, \varepsilon_{n-1}\}$, and: $\varepsilon_\alpha = \pm 1$.

Let also this metric tensor field depend on a constant λ ; so in a local coordinate system $\{x^\mu\}$, it is:

$$g_{\alpha\beta} = g_{\alpha\beta}(x^\gamma; \lambda) \tag{2.1}$$

It is also supposed that the metric tensor field g is a (C^∞) function (i.e., smooth) with respect to λ – a basic assumption which is also encountered in ref. [2], where limits of space-time are considered (which of course have to be defined in terms of essential constant(s)).

Let $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be the domain of definition (i.e., the range of possible values) of the constant λ . Another Riemannian space $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ can, naturally, emerge; the product: $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{S} \times I$. By this it is meant that the initial Riemannian space is nothing but the hypersurface $\lambda = \text{const.}$ in $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$; a local isometric embedding. If $p \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}$, then the tangent space $T_p\mathcal{S}$ of \mathcal{S} is a subspace of $T_p\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$. Since \mathcal{S} is a

¹This definition is influenced by the definition of space-time, but C^∞ –instead of simply C^r , connectedness as well as the Hausdorff condition seem to be minimal extensions.

²The value of r depends on the applications. In the context e.g., of general relativity, it is assumed that $r \geq 2$ –see ref. [4], pp. 55-59 for a relevant discussion.

³Small Greek indices take the values $\{0, \dots, n - 1\}$.

regular submanifold of $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$, there exists a basis⁴ $\{\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_\mu\} \equiv \mathbf{e}_N$ of $T_p\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ such that its ‘‘spatial’’ part $\{\mathbf{e}_\mu\}$ is the basis of $T_p\mathcal{S}$. Since the difference of dimensions is 1, the subspace has no torsion. Consequently there is only one normal to it, vector \mathbf{n} . Without loss of generality it is taken to be of unit length. Then, one assigns:

$$\mathbf{n} = n^A \mathbf{e}_A = \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{e}_0 - \frac{N^\alpha}{N} \mathbf{e}_\alpha \Rightarrow n^A = \frac{1}{N} \{1, -N^\alpha\} \quad (2.2)$$

with:

$$\tilde{g}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{n}) = \varepsilon = \pm 1 \quad (2.3)$$

(the sign is rather irrelevant), so:

$$\mathbf{e}_0 = N\mathbf{n} + N^\alpha \mathbf{e}_\alpha \quad (2.4)$$

The quantity N is the *lapse function* and the object N^α is the *shift vector*. By definition:

$$\tilde{g}_{00} = \tilde{g}(\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_0) = N^2 \tilde{g}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{n}) + N^\alpha N^\beta \tilde{g}(\mathbf{e}_\alpha, \mathbf{e}_\beta) \quad (2.5)$$

$$\tilde{g}_{0\alpha} = \tilde{g}(\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_\alpha) = N_\alpha \equiv N^\beta g_{\alpha\beta} \quad (2.6)$$

$$\tilde{g}_{\alpha\beta} = \tilde{g}(\mathbf{e}_\alpha, \mathbf{e}_\beta) = g_{\alpha\beta} \quad (2.7)$$

Thus, the Greek indices change position with the initial metric $g_{\alpha\beta}$, while the capital Latin indices change position with the new metric \tilde{g}_{AB} .

Finally:

$$\tilde{g}_{AB} = \begin{pmatrix} N_\rho N^\rho + \varepsilon N^2 & N_\beta \\ N_\alpha & g_{\alpha\beta} \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.8)$$

A straightforward calculation results in:

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{00}^0 = \frac{\dot{N}}{N} + \varepsilon \frac{N^\mu N^\nu}{N} K_{\mu\nu} + \frac{N^\mu}{N} N_{|\mu} \quad (2.9a)$$

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{0\nu}^0 = \varepsilon \frac{N^\mu}{N} K_{\mu\nu} + \frac{N_{|\nu}}{N} \quad (2.9b)$$

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^0 = \varepsilon \frac{K_{\mu\nu}}{N} \quad (2.9c)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Gamma}_{00}^\kappa &= -\frac{\dot{N}}{N} N^\kappa - \varepsilon \frac{N^\mu N^\nu N^\kappa}{N} K_{\mu\nu} - \frac{N^\mu N_{|\mu}}{N} N^\kappa + \dot{N}^\kappa \\ &\quad - \varepsilon N N^{|\kappa} + N_{|\nu}^\kappa N^\nu - 2N K_\nu^\kappa N^\nu \end{aligned} \quad (2.9d)$$

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{0\nu}^\kappa = -\frac{N^\kappa}{N} N_{|\nu} - \varepsilon \frac{N^\kappa N^\mu}{N} K_{\mu\nu} + N_{|\nu}^\kappa - N K_\nu^\kappa \quad (2.9e)$$

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\kappa = \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\kappa - \varepsilon \frac{N^\kappa}{N} K_{\mu\nu} \quad (2.9f)$$

⁴Capital Latin indices take the values $\{0, \dots, n\}$.

where:

$$K_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2N} (N_{\mu|\nu} + N_{\nu|\mu} - \dot{g}_{\mu\nu}) \quad (2.10)$$

is the *extrinsic curvature* (in the literature of the theory of surfaces, it is also known as *second fundamental form*, of *shape tensor*) and describes the embedding curvature.

The bar ($\bar{}$) denotes covariant derivative with respect to the initial metric g of the subspace, while the dot ($\dot{}$) denotes differentiation with respect to the extra coordinate, i.e., λ .

The general theory of embedding can be found in any book on differential geometry, e.g., [5] are some classical references. There, one can see that the present case, where the difference in the dimensions is 1 (resulting in zero torsion for the subspace) is very simple. In fact, the Mainardi-Codazzi conditions are identically satisfied, while the Weingarten-Gauss conditions assume the form:

$$\tilde{R}_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} = R_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} - \varepsilon(K_{\alpha\mu}K_{\beta\nu} - K_{\alpha\nu}K_{\beta\mu}) \quad (2.11a)$$

$$\tilde{R}_{\perp\beta\mu\nu} = K_{\beta\nu|\mu} - K_{\beta\mu|\nu} \quad (2.11b)$$

of course, after the use of the projections:

$$T_{B\dots}^{A\dots} n^B \equiv T_{\perp\dots}^{A\dots}, \quad T_{B\dots}^{A\dots} n_A \equiv T_{B\dots}^{\perp\dots}, \quad T_{B\dots}^{A\dots} y_{,\alpha}^B \equiv T_{\alpha\dots}^{A\dots} \quad (2.12)$$

$y_{,\alpha}^B$ being the Jacobian $\partial y^A / \partial x^\alpha$ between a set of local coordinates in $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$, say $\{y^A\}$, and the set of the corresponding local coordinates in \mathcal{S} , say $\{x^\alpha\}$.

For the chosen embedding it is: $\{y^A\} = \{\lambda, x^\alpha\}$

If one defines the tensor on $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$:

$$C_{AB} \doteq -\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{n}} \tilde{g}_{AB} \equiv -\frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{n}_{A;B} + \mathbf{n}_{B;A}) \quad (2.13)$$

where the semicolon ($;$) denotes covariant differentiation with respect to the new metric \tilde{g} , one will have:

$$C_{AB} = \begin{pmatrix} N^\mu N^\nu K_{\mu\nu} + \varepsilon N^\mu N_{|\mu} & \varepsilon \frac{1}{2} N_{|\beta} + K_{\beta\mu} N^\mu \\ \varepsilon \frac{1}{2} N_{|\alpha} + K_{\alpha\mu} N^\mu & K_{\alpha\beta} \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.14)$$

In order for the two spaces, i.e., the embedding and the embedded, to have exactly the same geometrical information (in other words, exactly the same curvature properties), something which happens when and only when the constant (i.e., the extra coordinate) λ is absorbable, the Weingarten-Gauss

conditions (2.11) suggest that the extrinsic curvature must vanish –for any embedding:

$$K_{\alpha\beta} = 0 \tag{2.15}$$

Condition (2.15) as well as the demand for its validity for any embedding, and thus for the particular embedding in a Gaussian system of coordinates: $N = 1$ or $N = N(\lambda)$ and $N^\alpha = 0$, result in the vanishing of the tensor C_{AB} ; an invariant statement. Hence, follows the:

Criterion. The constant λ contained in the metric tensor field g of the Riemannian space \mathcal{S} is spurious, if and only if the Lie derivative of the metric tensor field \tilde{g} of the embedding space $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ with respect to the normal (to the subspace) vector \mathbf{n} , $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{n}}\tilde{g}$, vanishes.

Proof. First, one observes that the vanishing of the tensor field C_{AB} results in the following set of partial differential equations (PDEs):

$$C_{00} = 0 \Rightarrow N^\mu N_{|\mu} = 0 \tag{2.16a}$$

$$C_{0\alpha} = 0 \Rightarrow N_{|\alpha} = 0 \tag{2.16b}$$

$$C_{\alpha\beta} = 0 \Rightarrow K_{\alpha\beta} = 0 \tag{2.16c}$$

or:

$$N = N(\lambda) \quad (\text{though an arbitrary function}) \tag{2.17a}$$

$$N_{\alpha|\beta} + N_{\beta|\alpha} = \dot{g}_{\alpha\beta} \tag{2.17b}$$

The lines preceding the criterion prove its necessity. In order to prove its sufficiency, let $n^A = \frac{1}{N(\lambda)}\{1, -N^\alpha(\lambda, x^\beta)\}$ a normal vector whose components satisfy (2.17b). The set of its integral curves, parametrized by a parameter s , has the form:

$$\frac{dy^A}{ds} = n^A(y^B(s)) \tag{2.18}$$

and, from the theory of ordinary differential equations, it is known that this problem is well posed and it always has a solution. Written out in detail:

$$\frac{dy^0}{ds} = \frac{1}{N(y^0)} \tag{2.19a}$$

$$\frac{dy^\alpha}{ds} = -\frac{N^\alpha(y^0, y^\beta)}{N(y^0)} \tag{2.19b}$$

As usual, this set defines a one-parametric (s being the parameter) family of transformations from the set $\{y^A\}$ to the set $\{\bar{y}^A\}$, the latter being the

constants of integration of the flow lines of the vector \mathbf{n} . It is very easy to see that the emerging transformation has the general functional form:

$$y^0 \rightarrow \bar{y}^0 : \bar{y}^0 = f(y^0) \quad (2.20a)$$

$$y^\alpha \rightarrow \bar{y}^\alpha : \bar{y}^\alpha = f^\alpha(y^0, y^\gamma) \quad (2.20b)$$

while the vector \mathbf{n} undergoes a change:

$$\mathbf{n} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{n}} : \bar{n}^A = \frac{\partial \bar{y}^A}{\partial y^B} n^B \quad (2.21)$$

with the help of the transformation (2.20):

$$\bar{n}^A = \frac{1}{N(y^0)} \left\{ \frac{\partial f(y^0)}{\partial y^0}, \frac{\partial f^\alpha(y^0, y^\gamma)}{\partial y^0} - \frac{\partial f^\alpha(y^0, y^\gamma)}{\partial y^\beta} N^\beta(y^E) \right\} \quad (2.22)$$

But:

$$\frac{d\bar{y}^\alpha}{ds} = 0 \Rightarrow \frac{\partial f^\alpha(y^0, y^\gamma)}{\partial y^0} - \frac{\partial f^\alpha(y^0, y^\gamma)}{\partial y^\beta} N^\beta(y^E) = 0 \quad (2.23)$$

by virtue of the flow lines equations (2.19). Thus:

$$\mathbf{n} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{n}} : \bar{n}^A = \frac{1}{N(y^0)} \left\{ \frac{\partial f(y^0)}{\partial y^0}, 0 \right\} \quad (2.24)$$

i.e., a Gaussian system of coordinates. Hence, in the new coordinate system, the vanishing of the tensor \bar{C}_{AB} , obviously, is tantamount to:

$$\frac{\partial \bar{g}_{\alpha\beta}}{\partial \bar{y}^0} = 0 \quad (2.25)$$

i.e., the transformed metric tensor field of the subspace does not contain the corresponding extra coordinate \bar{y}^0 , which is a function of the constant under discussion. q.e.d.

3 An application and a pedagogical example

One immediate and simple application of the criterion is achieved when the latter is applied to the case where the “suspect” constant is an overall factor; i.e., in a local system of coordinates $\{x^\mu\}$:

$$g_{\alpha\beta} = g_{\alpha\beta}(x^\gamma; \lambda) \equiv \lambda G_{\alpha\beta}(x^\gamma) \quad (3.1)$$

Then, the criterion, in its “solved form” (2.17b), results in:

$$N_{\alpha|\beta} + N_{\beta|\alpha} = \dot{g}_{\alpha\beta} = G_{\alpha\beta} \Rightarrow N_{\alpha|\beta} + N_{\beta|\alpha} = \frac{1}{\lambda} g_{\alpha\beta} \quad (3.2)$$

which is nothing but the homothety equations for the subspace –a well-known result.

For the sake of simplicity and brevity, the paper concludes with a pedagogical example.

Let a two-dimensional metric tensor field, which in a local coordinate system $\{x^\mu\} \equiv \{u, v\}$, has the form:

$$g_{\alpha\beta}(u, v; \lambda) = (1 + \lambda^2) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 + u^2 + (1 + \lambda^2)^2 v^2 \\ 1 + u^2 + (1 + \lambda^2)^2 v^2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.3)$$

Solution to:

$$N_{\alpha|\beta} + N_{\beta|\alpha} = \dot{g}_{\alpha\beta} \quad (3.4)$$

results in:

$$N^\alpha = \left\{ 0, \frac{2\lambda v}{1 + \lambda^2} \right\} \equiv \left\{ 0, \frac{2y^0 y^2}{1 + (y^0)^2} \right\} \quad (3.5)$$

and hence:

$$n^A = \frac{1}{N(y^0)} \left\{ 1, 0, -\frac{2y^0 y^2}{1 + (y^0)^2} \right\} \quad (3.6)$$

The corresponding flow lines are described by:

$$\frac{dy^0}{ds} = \frac{1}{N(y^0)} \quad (3.7a)$$

$$\frac{dy^1}{ds} = 0 \quad (3.7b)$$

$$\frac{dy^2}{ds} = -\frac{1}{N(y^0)} \frac{2y^0 y^2}{(1 + (y^0)^2)} \quad (3.7c)$$

and the integral curves:

$$\int N(y^0) dy^0 = s + \bar{y}^0 \quad (3.8a)$$

$$y^1 = \bar{y}^1 \quad (3.8b)$$

$$y^2 = \bar{y}^2 (1 + (y^0)^2)^{-1} \quad (3.8c)$$

Then, as expected, it is:

$$\bar{n}^A = \{1, 0, 0\} \quad (3.9)$$

leading to the transformed embedding metric:

$$\bar{g}_{AB} = \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{g}_{\alpha\beta} \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.10)$$

with:

$$\bar{g}_{\alpha\beta} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 + \bar{u}^2 + \bar{v}^2 \\ 1 + \bar{u}^2 + \bar{v}^2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.11)$$

Though the example may seem simple and trivial, its purpose is to exhibit not only the implementation of the criterion but also all the details connected to it.

Acknowledgements

The project is co-funded by the European Social Fund and National Resources —(EPEAEK II)— PYTHAGORAS II.

The author wishes to thank Associate Professor Dr. T. Chistodoulakis, Dr. S. Bonanos, and M.Sc. P. Terzis for stimulating discussions.

References

- [1] H. Stephani, D. Kramer, M. MacCallum, C. Hoenselaers and E. Hertl, *Exact Solutions of Einstein's Field Equations*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003)
- [2] R. Geroch, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **13** pp. 180–193 (1969);
or for a coordinate-free approach:
F.M. Paiva, M.J. Rebouças and M.A.H. MacCallum, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **10** pp. 1165–1178 (1993)
- [3] R. Geroch, *Ann. Phys.* **48** 526–540 (1968);
W. Kundt, in *Recent Developments in General Relativity*, (Pergamon Press, New York, 1962), p. 307;
W. Kundt, in *Les Theories Relativistes de la Gravitation*, (Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris, 1962), p. 155
- [4] S.W. Hawking and G.F.R. Ellis, *The large scale structure of space-time*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1973)
- [5] L.P. Eisenhart, *Riemannian Geometry*, (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1949);
B. O' Neill, *Semi-Riemannian Geometry*, (Academic Press, New York, 1983)