

Lagrangian symmetries of the ADM action. Do we need a solution to the “non-canonicity puzzle”?

N. Kiriushcheva,^{*} P. G. Komorowski,[†] and S. V. Kuzmin[‡]

*The Department of Applied Mathematics,
The University of Western Ontario,
London, Ontario, Canada, N6A 5B7*

(Dated: November 15, 2018; Received)

Abstract

We argue that there is nothing puzzling in the fact that the Hamiltonian formulation of a covariant theory, General Relativity, after a non-covariant change of field variables is not canonically related to the formulation based on the original variable, the metric tensor. Were such a puzzle to be “solved” it would lead to the conclusion that a covariant theory can be converted into a non-covariant one in many different ways and without consequence. The non-canonicity of transformations from covariant to non-covariant variables shows the need to work in the original variables so as to be able to restore the covariant gauge transformations in the Hamiltonian approach. Any modification of Dirac’s procedure for the constrained Hamiltonian with the aim to prove the legitimacy of non-covariant changes of field variables, or rejection of Dirac’s procedure as “not fundamental and undoubted” because it does not allow such changes (as recently suggested by Shestakova [*CGQ*, 28 (2011) 055009]), is equivalent to the rejection of the covariance of General Relativity, and to surrender to such temptation is truly puzzling.

^{*}Electronic address: nkiriush@uwo.ca

[†]Electronic address: pkomoro@uwo.ca

[‡]Electronic address: skuzmin@uwo.ca

“Numquam ponenda est pluralitas sine necessitate.”

William of Ockham (1285-1349)

Plurality must never be posited without necessity.

I. INTRODUCTION

The term “non-canonicity puzzle” was coined in [1] to describe the apparently contradictory results of applying the Dirac procedure to the Hamiltonian formulations of constrained systems [2], in particular, to the Einstein-Hilbert (EH) and to the Arnowitt-Deser-Misner (ADM) [3, 4] actions. The contradiction arises from the fact that the ADM action can be obtained from the EH action by an invertible change of variables, which is an admissible procedure at the Lagrangian level. Yet at the same time, the corresponding Hamiltonians are not related to each other by a canonical transformation [5]; therefore, they are not equivalent at the Hamiltonian level. We shall use Lagrangian methods to explore this apparent paradox.

In the case of the two older Hamiltonian formulations due to Pirani, Schild, and Skinner (PSS) [6] and due to Dirac [7], where the metric tensor is used as a field variable, the first-class constraints and their algebra of Poisson brackets (PBs) lead to diffeomorphism invariance¹ in both formulations, as demonstrated in [9] and [5]. The PSS and Dirac Lagrangians differ by a total derivative that Dirac added to simplify the primary constraints [7]; this difference does not affect the equations of motion, which in both cases are Einstein’s original equations, as the field variables in these two formulations are the same: the components of the metric tensor. When the same Dirac Hamiltonian method is applied to the ADM action, a different (though unique) symmetry follows, which is known by many names: “spatial diffeomorphism”, “special induced diffeomorphism”, “field-dependent diffeomorphism”, “foliation preserving diffeomorphism”, “one-to-one correspondence”, and “one-to-one mapping” (see [5] and references therein). Because the two symmetries, diffeomorphism and the symmetry that follows from the Hamiltonian analysis of the ADM action, are distinct, it is no surprise that the corresponding Hamiltonians are not equivalent and that the field variables

¹ We understand diffeomorphism invariance (*diff*) to mean “active” [8] (p. 62), when “coordinates play no role”, i.e. the transformations of fields are written in the same coordinate system.

are not related by a canonical transformation, as was explicitly demonstrated in [5]. Further, as it was conjectured in [10] for Hamiltonians with constraints, based on the comparison of the two equivalent Hamiltonians (leading to the same symmetry) of PSS [6, 9] and Dirac [5, 7], the ordinary canonicity condition [11] (PBs for two sets of phase-space variables) is only a necessary condition; the whole structure of PB algebra of first-class constraints must also be preserved.

There is nothing puzzling in the non-equivalence of two Hamiltonians with different symmetries. But the change of field variables performed by ADM is invertible, and such changes could keep two actions equivalent; yet, in the case of the EH action we are dealing with a singular (gauge invariant) and generally covariant theory, and in passing to the ADM action, a non-linear and non-covariant change of variables is performed. How does this change affect the results? The disappearance of diffeomorphism invariance in the Hamiltonian formulation of the ADM action was proclaimed long ago, e.g. in the statement of Isham and Kuchar [12]: “the full group of spacetime diffeomorphism has *somehow* got lost in making the transition from the Hilbert action to the Dirac-ADM action” (italic is ours)². If diffeomorphism is the gauge symmetry of the EH action and its Hamiltonian formulation, and it “got lost” in the ADM action, then the two actions cannot be equivalent; and the “*somehow*” only arises in making the transition – a non-covariant and non-linear change of field variables. To us, it appears that the conclusion in [12] was based on the results of Hamiltonian analysis, not on an analysis at the Lagrangian level, about which “the ADM action” statement is made.

In [13] we considered the symmetries of the EH action at the Lagrangian level. We compared the diffeomorphism transformation and the transformation that follows from the Hamiltonian analysis of the ADM action for the same field: the metric tensor (the ADM transformations are known, and the redefinition of their variables in terms of the metric can be used to calculate how the metric is transformed under this symmetry). The ADM transformations of the metric tensor can be formally presented as diffeomorphism invariance with field-dependent gauge parameters (this is the origin of some names for the ADM transformations, e.g. “field-dependent diffeomorphism”). At the Lagrangian level, by Noether’s second theorem [14, 15], gauge symmetries are related to differential identities (DIs) – combinations

² The name of Dirac is used incorrectly in this statement because the Dirac Hamiltonian is not canonically related to the ADM Hamiltonian [5]. In addition, Dirac’s modification of the EH action is performed in a way that preserves Einstein’s equations [7].

of Euler-Lagrange derivatives (ELDs) that are identically zero (off-shell). Even if some symmetry could be formally presented as another symmetry by a field-dependent redefinition of gauge parameters, these symmetries would be distinct since they correspond to different DIs (see [13]). A new DI, obtained in such a way, is an identity; thus, by the converse of Noether's second theorem, the ADM transformations of the metric tensor, which are described by such DIs, are also a symmetry of the EH action; and many other "field-dependent diffeomorphisms" can be constructed by using different redefinitions of the parameters. Is such a plurality of symmetries also a plurality of equally good outcomes? The study of the group properties of such transformations for the EH action [13] shows that only one (unique) symmetry has group properties: diffeomorphism; and the other symmetries, which are easily constructed by relating the gauge symmetries by using a field-dependent redefinition of the gauge parameters, including the ADM symmetry, do not have group properties. When the Dirac algorithm is applied to the EH action it leads exactly to this one (unique), or shall we say, canonical, gauge symmetry of the EH action (there is no puzzle), and the metric is a canonical variable of the canonical Hamiltonian formulation of General Relativity (PSS and Dirac). Note that the DI that describes the diffeomorphism of the metric tensor is a covariant derivative of a true tensor density; consequently, it is identically zero in all coordinate systems. But all DIs obtained by a non-covariant field-dependent redefinition of gauge parameters are not true tensors; therefore, the identities are not valid in all coordinate systems.

In this paper we continue the investigation we began in [13] by studying different symmetries and their group properties for the ADM action. In the next Section we briefly review the origin of the ADM Lagrangian and establish notation. In Section III we study the group properties of the symmetry, which follows from applying Dirac's Hamiltonian method to the ADM action. In Section IV we consider the invariance of the ADM action under diffeomorphism (written for the ADM variables) and its group property. In Discussion we analyze the results of the Lagrangian consideration for the EH and ADM actions, and discuss their relation to the Dirac Hamiltonian analysis of the same actions. We summarize this work in Conclusion.

II. PRELUDE. THE ADM LAGRANGIAN

A long chain of manipulations performed on the EH Lagrangian density gives rise to the ADM Lagrangian³,

$$L_{EH}(g_{\mu\nu}) \longrightarrow L_{\Gamma\Gamma}(g_{\mu\nu}) \longrightarrow L_{Dirac}(g_{\mu\nu}) \longrightarrow L_{ADM}(N, N^i, \gamma_{km}). \quad (1)$$

It is only for the ADM Lagrangian that the original field variable, the metric tensor, has been changed to new, non-covariant variables.

The EH action, written in manifestly covariant form, is [16, 17]

$$S_{EH}(g_{\mu\nu}) = \int L_{EH}(g_{\mu\nu}) d^4x = \int \sqrt{-g} R d^4x, \quad (2)$$

where the Ricci scalar, R , contains terms with second-order derivatives of the metric. The presence of second-order derivatives in time (“accelerations”) does not allow one to pass to the Hamiltonian formulation directly, since momenta have to be introduced by performing a variation of the Lagrangian with respect to the first-order derivatives in time of the metric (the “velocities”). Despite the belief that “accelerations” in the action forbid “any canonical treatment of the theory” [1], it is possible to work with the original action (where “accelerations” are present) by a generalization of the Ostrogradsky method [18, 19] (see also [20]) and to find Hamiltonians for Lagrangians with higher order derivatives, after a proper generalization of the Ostrogradsky method for constrained systems [21] (also see [22]). An attempt to work with (2) was made in [23], but to the best of our knowledge it was never completed, although in our opinion it should be possible. An example of how to perform the Hamiltonian analysis using the Ostrogradsky method was given in [24] for the two-dimensional metric and tetrad gravities.

In the first Hamiltonian formulation of the EH action [6] the need to work with the second-order derivatives in (2) was avoided by using the so-called gamma-gamma form (without second-order derivatives of the metric in the Lagrangian), which leads to the same equations of motion,

$$S_{\Gamma\Gamma}(g_{\mu\nu}) = \int L_{\Gamma\Gamma}(g_{\mu\nu}) d^4x = \int \sqrt{-g} g^{\mu\nu} (\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{\rho} \Gamma_{\rho\sigma}^{\sigma} - \Gamma_{\mu\rho}^{\sigma} \Gamma_{\nu\sigma}^{\rho}) d^4x. \quad (3)$$

³ We use Greek letters for space-time indices, $\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3$, and Latin letters for space indices, $i = 1, 2, 3$.

Action (3) is quadratic in the first-order derivatives of the metric, so it is at most quadratic in “velocities”; because of this, it is well suited for standard Hamiltonian formulations. The Hamiltonian formulation of the EH action in the gamma-gamma form, using the Dirac procedure, was outlined in [6] but not completed; at that time the technique to restore gauge invariance from the first-class constraints was not known, and even Dirac’s conjecture about the connection of the first-class constraints and gauge transformations appeared much later [2]. From the algebra of constraints of the PSS formulation [6], the restoration of gauge symmetries was performed in [9] by using the Castellani procedure [25]. The total Hamiltonian has the form [9]

$$H_T = \dot{g}_{0\mu}\phi^{0\mu} + g_{0\mu}\chi_{PSS}^{0\mu} , \quad (4)$$

and the entire set of first-class constraints ($\phi^{0\mu}$ – primary and $\chi^{0\mu}$ – secondary) leads to diffeomorphism invariance [9].

Without affecting the equations of motion or changing the original variables, the next modification was performed a few years later by Dirac [7] who added two total derivatives to the Lagrangian L_{Γ} :

$$\begin{aligned} S_{Dirac}(g_{\mu\nu}) &= \int L_{Dirac}(g_{\mu\nu}) d^4x \\ &= \int \left\{ L_{\Gamma}(g_{\mu\nu}) + \left[(\sqrt{-g}g^{00})_{,v} \frac{g^{v0}}{g^{00}} \right]_{,0} - \left[(\sqrt{-g}g^{00})_{,0} \frac{g^{v0}}{g^{00}} \right]_{,v} \right\} d^4x . \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The main goal of Dirac’s modification was to simplify the primary constraints of [6], which are not pure momenta for the S_{Γ} action. In addition, some rearrangements were made in the course of calculating the Hamiltonian [7]. (The detail analysis of Dirac’s paper can be found in [5].) The total Hamiltonian of Dirac is

$$H_T = \dot{g}_{0\mu}\pi^{0\mu} + g_{0\mu}\chi_{Dirac}^{0\mu} . \quad (6)$$

Note that the primary and secondary first-class constraints in (4) and (6) have a different form, but the algebra of PBs among the constraints is the same in both the Dirac and PSS formulations [10]. The gauge transformations that correspond to the Dirac constraints were calculated in [5], and as in the case of the PSS formulation, they also lead to diffeomorphism invariance. Comparison of the two Hamiltonians (4) and (6) revealed that their

phase-space variables are related by a canonical transformation [10] (not surprisingly, as they have the same symmetry), which in addition preserves the structure of the constraint algebra (although the constraints themselves are different). Both Lagrangians (2) and (3) are functionals of the metric tensor, and the phase-space variables in both Hamiltonians are the metric and corresponding momenta.

The ADM Lagrangian can be obtained by performing a change of field variables in the final form of the Dirac Lagrangian (which is based on the Hamiltonian analysis, see Section 4.5 of [5]):

$$N = (-g^{00})^{-1/2}, \quad N^i = -\frac{g^{0i}}{g^{00}}, \quad \gamma_{km} = g_{km}. \quad (7)$$

This change of field variables is non-linear, non-covariant, yet invertible. The names assigned to these variables, lapse N and shift N^i functions, reflect the non-covariant nature of this redefinition. In some works N_i is used instead of N^i as an independent variable, but of course this cannot affect the results. Our choice of N^i is dictated by a particular and common expression for the secondary first-class constraints of the ADM Hamiltonian $N^\mu \mathcal{H}_\mu$ (e.g. see [26])

$$H_T = \dot{N}^\mu p_\mu + N^\mu \mathcal{H}_\mu. \quad (8)$$

Note that this form is not covariant, as $N^\mu = (N, N^i)$ and $\mathcal{H}_\mu = (\mathcal{H}_\perp, \mathcal{H}_k)$ are quantities that are neither vectors nor components of some covariant quantities; unlike the Hamiltonian formulation of the EH action in the PSS or Dirac forms, where the secondary constraints $\chi^{0\mu}$ enter the total Hamiltonian as a combination $g_{0\mu} \chi^{0\mu}$, which is a contraction of $\chi^{0\mu}$ with the components of a true tensor (see (6) and (7)). The inverse transformations for the covariant and contravariant metric tensors are easy to find from (7) by using $g_{\mu\nu} g^{\nu\alpha} = \delta_\mu^\alpha$ (see also, e.g. [25]):

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_{ij} N^i N^j - N^2 & \gamma_{ij} N^j \\ \gamma_{ij} N^j & \gamma_{ij} \end{pmatrix}, \quad g^{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{N^2} & \frac{N^i}{N^2} \\ \frac{N^i}{N^2} & \gamma^{ij} - \frac{N^i N^j}{N^2} \end{pmatrix}; \quad (9)$$

where γ^{ik} is defined by $\gamma^{ik} \gamma_{km} = \delta_m^i$. We note that the independent field variables of the ADM Lagrangian are N, N^i , and g_{km} , so the combination $\gamma^{km} - \frac{N^k N^m}{N^2}$ is g^{km} , since $\gamma^{km} = e^{km} = g^{km} - \frac{g^{0k} g^{0m}}{g^{00}} = g^{km} + \frac{N^k N^m}{N^2}$. The combination e^{km} was introduced by Dirac [7]; and to avoid unnecessary complications with notation, we shall use g_{km} and Dirac's

short form e^{km} , which makes the comparison of transformations for the metric and the ADM variables more transparent. The ADM Lagrangian is reported in many places (e.g. [27, 28]), and it is usually written in the following form:

$$L_{ADM} = \sqrt{\det g_{km}} N (E^{rsab} K_{rs} K_{ab} + R_3), \quad (10)$$

where

$$E^{rsab} = e^{rs} e^{ab} - e^{rb} e^{as}, \quad (11)$$

$$K_{rs} = \frac{1}{2N} (g_{rp} N_{,s}^p + g_{sp} N_{,r}^p + N^p g_{rs,p} - g_{rs,0}), \quad (12)$$

$$R_3 = g_{mn,kt} E^{mnkt} + g_{mn,k} g_{pq,t} F^{mnkpqt} \quad (13)$$

with

$$F^{mnkpqt} = \frac{1}{4} (E^{mnpq} e^{kt} - 2E^{ktpn} e^{mq} - 4E^{pqnt} e^{mk}). \quad (14)$$

Note that the form of R_3 is the result of a calculation in the Dirac Hamiltonian formulation. And R_3 is also equivalent to a similar expression used by Dutt and Dresden [23]. The Dirac Lagrangian is not only a modification of L_{Γ} of the PSS Lagrangian, but because of further rearrangements it also contains expressions that include terms with second-order derivatives, as in (2) (for the details of how the ADM Lagrangian follows from the Dirac Hamiltonian analysis by the change of variables (7) see [5]). Equation (12) is written in a form where the basic variables N , N^i , and g_{km} are presented explicitly. The shorter, more frequently used form of (12) is less suitable for calculations; but nothing can be shorter than $\sqrt{-g}R$, and for a covariant theory the covariant form is always preferable.

The Dirac procedure applied to the ADM Lagrangian (10) leads to the total Hamiltonian in the form (8). The gauge transformations that follow are not diffeomorphism, and this formulation is not canonically related to Dirac's (this is not unexpected since they have different gauge transformations). This difference of transformations in the Hamiltonian approach leads to the conclusion (e.g. of Isham and Kuchar) that "diffeomorphism has

somehow got lost in making the transition” from the EH action to the ADM action⁴; and if a gauge symmetry “got lost”, then two actions cannot be equivalent. In paper [13] we considered the invariance of the EH action under two transformations (diffeomorphism and ADM) and demonstrated that both, and many others, are symmetries of the EH action; but the one that has a group property is diffeomorphism. In this paper we perform the same analysis for the ADM Lagrangian, and for the same two symmetries. We shall investigate whether diffeomorphism has really *been lost* or if it is a symmetry of the ADM action; and we shall investigate whether or not it is the only symmetry with a group property, as in the case of the EH action, or do the ADM transformations for the ADM action also have a group property?

III. GROUP PROPERTIES OF THE ADM TRANSFORMATIONS

Use of the standard Dirac procedure⁵ for the Hamiltonian formulation of the ADM Lagrangian (8) leads to the following gauge transformations (e.g. see appendix of [25] and Section 4.3 of [5]):

$$\delta_{ADM}N = \varepsilon_{,j}^{\perp}N^j - \varepsilon_{,0}^{\perp} - \varepsilon^i N_{,i} , \quad (15)$$

$$\delta_{ADM}N^k = -\varepsilon^{\perp}N_{,j}e^{jk} + \varepsilon_{,j}^{\perp}Ne^{kj} - \varepsilon^j N_{,j}^k + \varepsilon_{,j}^k N^j - \varepsilon_{,0}^k , \quad (16)$$

and

$$\delta_{ADM}g_{km} = \varepsilon^{\perp} \frac{1}{N} [g_{kn}N_{,m}^n + g_{mn}N_{,k}^n - g_{km,0} + N^n g_{km,n}] - \varepsilon_{,m}^i g_{ik} - \varepsilon_{,k}^i g_{im} - \varepsilon^i g_{km,i} , \quad (17)$$

⁴ In the literature, despite this loss of diffeomorphism, which is the gauge symmetry of the EH action and Hamiltonian formulations of the PSS and Dirac actions, the equivalence of EH and ADM actions is presumed, e.g. in the title of the original ADM paper [3]: “Dynamics of General Relativity”, or in [26]: “the canonical formalism [ADM] of GR”, or in [29]: “the ADM decomposition of the Einstein-Hilbert action”, or in [30]: “the true Hamiltonian dynamics of general relativity”.

⁵ Dirac’s procedure includes: introducing momenta to all fields; finding the primary constraints; considering their time development until the closure is reached; eliminating second-class constraints; constructing gauge generators using all first-class constraints; and finding the transformations of all phase-space variables, which after elimination of momenta give the gauge transformations in terms of the original variables that enter the Lagrangian. For the EH action in the gamma-gamma form (second order), there are no second-class constraints; but, e.g. for the affine-metric, first-order, formulation of GR [31–33], second-class constraints do appear [34–37].

where ε^\perp and ε^i are gauge (field-independent) parameters. It would be a heroic task to show directly the invariance of the ADM action (10) under transformations (15)-(17). Alternatively, we can use Noether's second theorem, which allows one to find a corresponding identity if a gauge transformation is known. It is a straightforward procedure to check whether or not an identity that has been found in this way is satisfied. We will also need the DIs that correspond to (15)-(17) in the next Section.

Using the prescription outlined in [38], we write

$$\delta S_{ADM} = \int [E\delta N + E_i\delta N^i + E_{ADM}^{km}\delta g_{km}] d^4x = \int [\varepsilon^\perp I_\perp^{ADM} + \varepsilon^k I_k^{ADM}] d^4x, \quad (18)$$

where E , E_i , and E_{ADM}^{km} are the Euler-Lagrange derivatives of the ADM action, i.e. $E = \frac{\delta L_{ADM}}{\delta N}$, *et cetera*. (We use the subscript 'ADM' in E_{ADM}^{km} to distinguish it from the $E^{km} = \frac{\delta L_{EH}}{\delta g_{km}}$ for the EH action.) The substitution of transformations (15)-(17) into (18) and a rearrangement of terms (including integration by parts) to single out the gauge parameters lead to the following DIs:

$$\begin{aligned} I_\perp^{ADM} &= - (N^j E)_{,j} + E_{,0} - N_{,j} e^{jk} E_k - (N e^{kj} E_k)_{,j} \\ &+ \frac{1}{N} (g_{kn} N_{,m}^n + g_{mn} N_{,k}^n - g_{km,0} + N^n g_{km,n}) E_{ADM}^{km} \equiv 0, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

$$I_k^{ADM} = -N_{,k} E - N_{,k}^m E_m - (N^m E_k)_{,m} + E_{k,0} + (g_{kn} E_{ADM}^{nm})_{,m} + (g_{km} E_{ADM}^{nm})_{,n} - g_{nm,k} E_{ADM}^{nm} \equiv 0. \quad (20)$$

We invite the reader to compare (19)-(20) with the covariant DI of the EH action:

$$I^\mu = \nabla_\nu E^{\mu\nu} \equiv 0 \quad (21)$$

(where ∇_ν is a covariant derivative)⁶. We see that the expressions for DIs (19)-(20) are much larger than (21), and the kind of "geometrical interpretation" of (19)-(20) that might compel someone to use these DIs and the ADM variables at the Lagrangian level, is inconceivable. If one were to consider the Lagrangian method as an algorithm (similar to the Hamiltonian

⁶ The first time this identity appeared along with the EH action was in Hilbert's work [39, 40].

analysis) to find *a priori* unknown symmetries, a prescription for the construction of a DI would need to be developed. For covariant theories, it is natural to expect covariant DIs to exist (e.g. see [41]), but it is not at all clear how to find DIs like (19)-(20). These DIs can only be explicitly checked by substitution of the ELDs of the ADM action into (19)-(20).

Let us, as in [13], find the group property of transformations (15)-(17); this entails a more complicated calculation compared with similar calculations for the EH action. The possibility to work with a quasi-covariant form leads to considerable simplification (see [13]). In this case, separate calculations for the transformations of different fields are needed. We start from the commutator of two transformations, and begin with the first field (lapse) – the one that has the simplest expression.

We try to present the commutator

$$[\delta_2, \delta_1] N = (\delta_2 \delta_1 - \delta_1 \delta_2) N = \delta_{[1,2]} N \quad (22)$$

in a form that preserves (15)

$$\delta_{[1,2]} N = \varepsilon_{[1,2],j}^\perp N^j - \varepsilon_{[1,2],0}^\perp - \varepsilon_{[1,2]}^i N_{,i} \quad (23)$$

for some expressions, $\varepsilon_{[1,2]}^\perp$ and $\varepsilon_{[1,2]}^i$ (to shorten notation, we eliminate the subscript ‘ADM’). Calculating (22)

$$\begin{aligned} [\delta_2, \delta_1] N &= \delta_2 [\varepsilon_{1,j}^\perp N^j - \varepsilon_{1,0}^\perp - \varepsilon_1^i N_{,i}] - \delta_1 [\varepsilon_{2,j}^\perp N^j - \varepsilon_{2,0}^\perp - \varepsilon_2^i N_{,i}] = \\ &\varepsilon_{1,j}^\perp \delta_2 N^j - \varepsilon_1^i (\delta_2 N)_{,i} - \varepsilon_{2,j}^\perp \delta_1 N^j + \varepsilon_2^i (\delta_1 N)_{,i} \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

and using the transformations of fields (15)-(16) and the field-independence of the parameters (not affected by transformations) gives

$$\begin{aligned} [\delta_2, \delta_1] N &= -\varepsilon_{1,k}^\perp \left[\varepsilon_2^\perp N_{,j} e^{jk} - \varepsilon_{2,j}^\perp N e^{kj} + \varepsilon_2^j N_{,j}^k - \varepsilon_{2,j}^k N^j + \varepsilon_{2,0}^k \right] - \varepsilon_1^i \left[\varepsilon_{2,k}^\perp N^k - \varepsilon_{2,0}^\perp - \varepsilon_2^k N_{,k} \right]_{,i} \\ &+ \varepsilon_{2,k}^\perp \left[\varepsilon_1^\perp N_{,j} e^{jk} - \varepsilon_{1,j}^\perp N e^{kj} + \varepsilon_1^j N_{,j}^k - \varepsilon_{1,j}^k N^j + \varepsilon_{1,0}^k \right] + \varepsilon_2^i \left[\varepsilon_{1,k}^\perp N^k - \varepsilon_{1,0}^\perp - \varepsilon_1^k N_{,k} \right]_{,i} . \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Collecting terms with parameters only

$$-\varepsilon_{1,k}^\perp \varepsilon_{2,0}^k + \varepsilon_1^k \varepsilon_{2,0k}^\perp + \varepsilon_{2,k}^\perp \varepsilon_{1,0}^k - \varepsilon_2^k \varepsilon_{1,0k}^\perp = -(-\varepsilon_1^k \varepsilon_{2,k}^\perp + \varepsilon_2^k \varepsilon_{1,k}^\perp),_0 \quad (26)$$

and comparing with (23) (the term without fields is $-\varepsilon_{[1,2],0}^\perp$), we uniquely obtain

$$\varepsilon_{[1,2]}^\perp = -\varepsilon_1^k \varepsilon_{2,k}^\perp + \varepsilon_2^k \varepsilon_{1,k}^\perp. \quad (27)$$

The remaining terms (see (25)) must be combined into $\varepsilon_{[1,2],j}^\perp N^j$ with the same $\varepsilon_{[1,2]}^\perp$; what is left has to contribute to the second parameter

$$\varepsilon_{[1,2]}^k = \varepsilon_{1,m}^\perp \varepsilon_2^\perp e^{mk} - \varepsilon_1^i \varepsilon_{2,i}^k - \varepsilon_{2,m}^\perp \varepsilon_1^\perp e^{mk} + \varepsilon_2^i \varepsilon_{1,i}^k. \quad (28)$$

Note that the same redefinition of parameters, as was made in the EH Lagrangian (Eq. (37) of [13]), is responsible for a breakdown of the group properties of the ADM transformations.

We must check the consistency of the structure of parameters (27)-(28), which are a kind of “structure functions”, for the rest of the fields. We know what kind of the parameter to expect, and this simplifies the calculations (gives some hint how to sort out terms). A straightforward calculation leads to the result that the same redefinition works for the shift and spatial components of the metric tensor, i.e. it is consistent for all fields:

$$[\delta_2, \delta_1] \begin{pmatrix} N \\ N^i \\ g_{km} \end{pmatrix} = \delta_{[1,2]} \begin{pmatrix} N \\ N^i \\ g_{km} \end{pmatrix} \quad (29)$$

with $\varepsilon_{[1,2]}^\perp$ and $\varepsilon_{[1,2]}^k$ given by (27)-(28). Note that the explicit form of the transformations is different for the fields in (29), but the composition of the parameters is the same.

To determine whether or not these transformations form a group, the double commutator is needed to check the Jacobi identity:

$$([\delta_1, \delta_2], \delta_3] + [[\delta_3, \delta_1], \delta_2] + [[\delta_2, \delta_3], \delta_1] \begin{pmatrix} N \\ N^i \\ g_{km} \end{pmatrix} \equiv 0. \quad (30)$$

In this case, if it is not zero for one field, then (30) is not an identity and the transformations do not form a group.

Let us consider the double commutator for the field with the simplest transformation

$$[[\delta_1, \delta_2], \delta_3] N = (\delta_{[1,2]}\delta_3 - \delta_3\delta_{[1,2]}) N ; \quad (31)$$

in a manner similar to (24), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta_{[1,2]} [\varepsilon_{3,j}^\perp N^j - \varepsilon_{3,0}^\perp - \varepsilon_3^i N_{,i}] - \delta_3 [\varepsilon_{[1,2],j}^\perp N^j - \varepsilon_{[1,2],0}^\perp - \varepsilon_{[1,2]}^i N_{,i}] \\ &= \varepsilon_{3,j}^\perp \delta_{[1,2]} N^j - \varepsilon_3^i (\delta_{[1,2]} N)_{,i} - \varepsilon_{[1,2],j}^\perp \delta_3 N^j + \varepsilon_{[1,2]}^i (\delta_3 N)_{,i} + N_{,i} \delta_3 \varepsilon_{[1,2]}^i . \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

The first four terms on the right hand side of (32) are the same as those in (24), and only the last one (the fifth term) creates the additional contribution. Consequently, by making a simple substitution of indices in (27)-(28): $1 \rightarrow [1, 2]$ and $2 \rightarrow 3$ (as was performed in [13]), the first four terms lead to the same results for the parameters. Due to the last contribution in (32), one extra term will appear, for the $\varepsilon_{[[1,2],3]}^k$ parameter,

$$\varepsilon_{[[1,2],3]}^\perp = -\varepsilon_{[1,2]}^k \varepsilon_{3,k}^\perp + \varepsilon_3^k \varepsilon_{[1,2],k}^\perp , \quad (33)$$

$$\varepsilon_{[[1,2],3]}^k = \varepsilon_{[1,2],m}^\perp \varepsilon_3^\perp e^{mk} - \varepsilon_{[1,2]}^i \varepsilon_{3,i}^k - \varepsilon_{3,m}^\perp \varepsilon_{[1,2]}^\perp e^{mk} + \varepsilon_3^i \varepsilon_{[1,2],i}^k + \delta_3 \varepsilon_{[1,2]}^k . \quad (34)$$

To obtain an explicit form, the expressions for $\varepsilon_{[1,2]}^\perp$ and $\varepsilon_{[1,2]}^k$, (27) and (28), must be substituted into (34); in the last term only the part of $\varepsilon_{[1,2]}^k$ that is proportional to fields is needed since only fields are affected by δ_3 . The final expression is

$$\delta_3 \varepsilon_{[1,2]}^k = [\varepsilon_{1,m}^\perp \varepsilon_2^\perp - \varepsilon_{2,m}^\perp \varepsilon_1^\perp] \delta_3 e^{mk} = - [\varepsilon_{1,m}^\perp \varepsilon_2^\perp - \varepsilon_{2,m}^\perp \varepsilon_1^\perp] e^{kp} e^{mn} \delta_3 g_{pn} \quad (35)$$

$$= (\varepsilon_{2,m}^\perp \varepsilon_1^\perp - \varepsilon_{1,m}^\perp \varepsilon_2^\perp) \left[\varepsilon_3^\perp \frac{1}{N} (e^{mn} N_{,n}^k + e^{kp} N_{,p}^m + e_{,0}^{mk} - e_{,i}^{km} N^i) - \varepsilon_{3,p}^m e^{kp} - \varepsilon_{3,n}^k e^{mn} + \varepsilon_3^i e_{,i}^{km} \right] ,$$

where $g_{km} e^{mn} = \delta_k^n$ was used to find $\delta_3 e^{mk}$ from (17).

Verifying the Jacobi identity (30) is equivalent to checking the corresponding identity for the parameters, which for ε^k is:

$$\varepsilon_{[[1,2],3]}^k + \varepsilon_{[[3,1],2]}^k + \varepsilon_{[[2,3],1]}^k \neq 0. \quad (36)$$

The transformations that follow from the Hamiltonian formulation of the ADM action do not form a group; this is exactly the same outcome as for the case of the EH action, where the ADM symmetry was one of many symmetries that can be found at the Lagrangian level by a non-covariant modification of the DI for the diffeomorphism transformation [13]. The only difference is that for the EH action, the Hamiltonian formulation leads to diffeomorphism invariance instead of the ADM transformations for the Hamiltonian formulation of the ADM action. This difference in symmetries produced by the Dirac procedure is naturally related to the non-canonicity of these variables between the two Hamiltonians [5]. To complete the comparison, we have to examine the properties of both symmetries, as we did for the EH action [13]. Let us find the diffeomorphism transformation for the ADM variables, and check whether or not it is also a symmetry of the ADM action. Note that we will consider the full diffeomorphism, not only its “spatial” part, the part that some consider to be a symmetry of the ADM formulation, and consequently a symmetry of GR (e.g., see [42]: “Unfortunately, the canonical treatment breaks the symmetry between space and time in general relativity and the resulting algebra of constraints is not the algebra of four diffeomorphisms”).

IV. IS DIFFEOMORPHISM A GAUGE SYMMETRY OF THE ADM ACTION?

Let us first determine how the ADM variables should transform under diffeomorphism. The known transformations of the contravariant metric,

$$\delta_{diff} g^{\mu\nu} = \xi^\nu_{,\alpha} g^{\mu\alpha} + \xi^\mu_{,\alpha} g^{\nu\alpha} - g^{\mu\nu} \xi^\alpha_{,\alpha}, \quad (37)$$

and the covariant metric with the same, contravariant gauge parameter ξ^α ,

$$\delta_{diff} g_{\gamma\sigma} = -g_{\sigma\nu} \xi^\nu_{,\gamma} - g_{\gamma\mu} \xi^\mu_{,\sigma} - g_{\gamma\sigma, \alpha} \xi^\alpha, \quad (38)$$

are needed because the ADM variables are a mixture of covariant and contravariant components of the metric tensor (7). (Equation (38) can be obtained from the condition $g_{\mu\nu} g^{\nu\alpha} = \delta_\mu^\alpha$.)

Using change of variables (7), one finds the diffeomorphism transformations of the ADM variables in terms of the metric by applying (37)

$$\delta_{diff} N = \delta_{diff} (-g^{00})^{-1/2} = -\frac{1}{2} (-g^{00})^{-3/2} (-\delta_{diff} g^{00}). \quad (39)$$

Substituting $\delta_{diff} g^{00}$ from (37) and expressing the metric components in (39) in terms of the ADM variables, one obtains for the lapse N :

$$\delta_{diff} N = - (N\xi^0)_{,0} + N\xi_{,k}^0 N^k - \xi^k N_{,k}. \quad (40)$$

Repeating the same calculations for the shift N^k and space-space components g_{km} yields:

$$\delta_{diff} N^k = +\xi_{,m}^0 N^2 e^{im} - \xi_{,0}^i + \xi_{,p}^i N^p - N_{,0}^i \xi^0 - N_{,k}^i \xi^k - N^i \xi_{,0}^0 + N^i \xi_{,k}^0 N^k, \quad (41)$$

$$\delta_{diff} g_{km} = -g_{kp} N^p \xi_{,m}^0 - g_{kp} \xi_{,m}^p - g_{mp} N^p \xi_{,k}^0 - g_{mp} \xi_{,k}^p - g_{km,0} \xi^0 - g_{km,p} \xi^p. \quad (42)$$

If these transformations are a gauge symmetry of the ADM action, then the corresponding Noether's DIs must exist and they can be easily restored, similarly to (18) of the previous Section,

$$\delta S_{ADM} = \int [E \delta_{diff} N + E_i \delta_{diff} N^i + E_{ADM}^{km} \delta_{diff} g_{km}] d^4 x = \int [\xi^0 I_0^{diff} + \xi^k I_k^{diff}] d^4 x. \quad (43)$$

Simple rearrangements then lead to:

$$\begin{aligned} I_0^{diff} &= +N E_{,0} - (N N^k E)_{,k} - (N^2 e^{im} E_i)_{,m} - N_{,0}^i E_i + (N^i E_i)_{,0} - (N^i N^k E_i)_{,k} \\ &+ (g_{kp} N^p E_{ADM}^{km})_{,m} + (g_{mp} N^p E_{ADM}^{km})_{,k} - g_{km,0} E_{ADM}^{km} \equiv 0, \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

$$I_k^{diff} = -N_{,k} E + E_{k,0} - (N^p E_k)_{,p} - N_{,k}^i E_i + (g_{nk} E_{ADM}^{nm})_{,m} + (g_{mk} E_{ADM}^{nm})_{,n} - g_{nm,k} E_{ADM}^{nm} \equiv 0. \quad (45)$$

The correctness of these DIs can be checked by direct substitution of the ELDs of the ADM action into (44)-(45). Because the DIs for ADM transformations are already known, (19)-(20), to prove that (44)-(45) are indeed DIs (and according to the converse of Noether's second theorem, the corresponding transformations are a gauge invariance of the ADM

action), it is enough to show that they are a linear combination of the known DIs. Let us seek such connections. Compare DI (20) for the ADM transformation and DI (45) for diffeomorphism; we find that they are identical,

$$I_k^{diff} = I_k^{ADM}. \quad (46)$$

DI (19) for the ADM transformations and DI (44) for diffeomorphism are not the same; but we observe that the terms with time derivatives of the ELDs for the lapse in (19) is $+E_{,0}$, and in (44) it is $+NE_{,0}$. This suggests the relation $I_0^{diff} = NI_{\perp}^{ADM} + \dots$. After collecting such terms, the analysis of the remainder leads to the extra contribution proportional to I_k^{ADM} ,

$$I_0^{diff} = NI_{\perp}^{ADM} + N^k I_k^{ADM}. \quad (47)$$

Because the DIs of diffeomorphism are linear combinations of DIs known for the ADM transformations, diffeomorphism is also a symmetry of the ADM action. Let us perform some simple rearrangements,

$$\begin{aligned} \xi^k I_k^{diff} + \xi^0 I_0^{diff} &= \xi^k I_k^{ADM} + \xi^0 (NI_{\perp}^{ADM} + N^k I_k^{ADM}) \\ &= \xi^0 NI_{\perp}^{ADM} + (\xi^k + \xi^0 N^k) I_k^{ADM} = \tilde{\varepsilon}^{\perp} I_{\perp}^{ADM} + \tilde{\varepsilon}^k I_k^{ADM}; \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

this allows us to present the diffeomorphism transformations of the ADM action in a particular form, in which the ADM transformations have field-dependent parameters:

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}^{\perp} = N\xi^0, \quad (49)$$

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}^k = \xi^0 N^k + \xi^k. \quad (50)$$

Note that all of the different symmetries, which can be constructed using linear combinations of DIs, can be presented in such a form where a field-dependent redefinition of parameters appears. This fact does not make these DIs equal because the gauge parameters must be independent of fields; consequently, such relations (such as (49) and (50)) can be used only as shorthand notation that might simplify some calculations. In the case of the

EH action, it was possible to use such a presentation to write different transformations in quasi-covariant form, and thus perform the calculations at once for all of the components of the metric tensor [13]. For the ADM formulation, this technique is not possible because of its non-covariant form; but relations (49)-(50) allow us to use the results of the previous Section to help in the calculation of the commutators of the two transformations for the ADM variables (we are interested in group properties of transformations (40)-(42)).

The transformations under diffeomorphism can be presented in the form of ADM transformations with field-dependent parameters (which are shorthand notations (49)-(50))

$$\delta_{diff} N = \tilde{\varepsilon}_{,k}^{\perp} N^k - \tilde{\varepsilon}_{,0}^{\perp} - \tilde{\varepsilon}^k N_{,k} ; \quad (51)$$

and we can find the commutator (to shorten notation, we use $\delta_{diff} \equiv \tilde{\delta}$)

$$\left(\tilde{\delta}_2 \tilde{\delta}_1 - \tilde{\delta}_1 \tilde{\delta}_2 \right) N = \tilde{\delta}_2 \left(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{1,k}^{\perp} N^k - \tilde{\varepsilon}_{1,0}^{\perp} - \tilde{\varepsilon}_1^k N_{,k} \right) - \tilde{\delta}_1 \left(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{2,k}^{\perp} N^k - \tilde{\varepsilon}_{2,0}^{\perp} - \tilde{\varepsilon}_2^k N_{,k} \right)$$

that, taking into account the field-dependent representation of parameters (49)-(50), can be written as

$$\left(\tilde{\delta}_2 \tilde{\delta}_1 - \tilde{\delta}_1 \tilde{\delta}_2 \right) N = \tilde{\varepsilon}_{1,k}^{\perp} \tilde{\delta}_2 N^k - \tilde{\varepsilon}_1^k \tilde{\delta}_2 N_{,k} - \tilde{\varepsilon}_{2,k}^{\perp} \tilde{\delta}_1 N^k + \tilde{\varepsilon}_2^k \tilde{\delta}_1 N_{,k} \quad (52)$$

$$+ N^k \tilde{\delta}_2 \tilde{\varepsilon}_{1,k}^{\perp} - \tilde{\delta}_2 \tilde{\varepsilon}_{1,0}^{\perp} - N_{,k} \tilde{\delta}_2 \tilde{\varepsilon}_1^k - N^k \tilde{\delta}_1 \tilde{\varepsilon}_{2,k}^{\perp} + \tilde{\delta}_1 \tilde{\varepsilon}_{2,0}^{\perp} + N_{,k} \tilde{\delta}_1 \tilde{\varepsilon}_2^k .$$

The first line corresponds exactly to the previous calculations (24) (of course, with a new field-dependent parameter), so we can use the previous result, and substitute parameters (49)-(50) into (52). The last line of (52) gives additional terms, which can be combined to obtain

$$N^k \left(\tilde{\delta}_2 \tilde{\varepsilon}_1^{\perp} - \tilde{\delta}_1 \tilde{\varepsilon}_2^{\perp} \right)_{,k} - \left(\tilde{\delta}_2 \tilde{\varepsilon}_1^{\perp} - \tilde{\delta}_1 \tilde{\varepsilon}_2^{\perp} \right)_{,0} - \left(\tilde{\delta}_2 \tilde{\varepsilon}_1^k - \tilde{\delta}_1 \tilde{\varepsilon}_2^k \right) N_{,k} .$$

The composition of the parameters is now given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\varepsilon}_{[1,2]}^{\perp} &= -\tilde{\varepsilon}_1^k \tilde{\varepsilon}_{2,k}^{\perp} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_2^k \tilde{\varepsilon}_{1,k}^{\perp} + \tilde{\delta}_2 \tilde{\varepsilon}_1^{\perp} - \tilde{\delta}_1 \tilde{\varepsilon}_2^{\perp} \\ &= -\tilde{\varepsilon}_1^k \tilde{\varepsilon}_{2,k}^{\perp} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_2^k \tilde{\varepsilon}_{1,k}^{\perp} + \xi_1^0 \tilde{\delta}_2 N - \xi_2^0 \tilde{\delta}_1 N . \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Performing further calculation gives

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}_{[1,2]}^\perp = N \left(-\xi_1^k \xi_{2,k}^0 + \xi_2^k \xi_{1,k}^0 - \xi_1^0 \xi_{2,0}^0 + \xi_2^0 \xi_{1,0}^0 \right) = N \xi_{[1,2]}^0 = N \left(-\xi_1^\alpha \xi_{2,\alpha}^0 + \xi_2^\alpha \xi_{1,\alpha}^0 \right),$$

with

$$\xi_{[1,2]}^0 = \xi_2^\alpha \xi_{1,\alpha}^0 - \xi_1^\alpha \xi_{2,\alpha}^0. \quad (54)$$

Note that a covariant form is partially restored. The same can be confirmed for the second parameter,

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}_{[1,2]}^k = \varepsilon_{,m}^{1\perp} \varepsilon^{2\perp} e^{mk} - \varepsilon^{1i} \varepsilon_{,i}^{2k} - \varepsilon_{,m}^{2\perp} \varepsilon^{1\perp} e^{mk} + \varepsilon^{2i} \varepsilon_{,i}^{1k} + \tilde{\delta}_2 \tilde{\varepsilon}_1^k - \tilde{\delta}_1 \tilde{\varepsilon}_2^k, \quad (55)$$

which can also be presented in semi-covariant form

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}_{[1,2]}^k = \xi_{[1,2]}^k = \xi_2^\alpha \xi_{1,\alpha}^k - \xi_1^\alpha \xi_{2,\alpha}^k. \quad (56)$$

In spite of using non-covariant ADM variables for the diffeomorphism transformations, which are not only complicated expressions, but different for each field (N, N^k, g_{km}) , the parameters are redefined in a covariant way. The combination of (54) and (56) obviously can be written in a covariant form

$$\xi_{[1,2]}^\mu = \xi_2^\alpha \xi_{1,\alpha}^\mu - \xi_1^\alpha \xi_{2,\alpha}^\mu. \quad (57)$$

Because the variables are not covariant, the complete proof is more complicated. To verify (57) for all fields similar calculations must be repeated for the remaining fields, and the consistency of the redefinition of parameters must be checked. Such calculations confirm that the above redefinition is preserved for all fields, i.e.

$$\left(\tilde{\delta}_2 \tilde{\delta}_1 - \tilde{\delta}_1 \tilde{\delta}_2 \right) \begin{pmatrix} N \\ N^i \\ g_{km} \end{pmatrix} = \tilde{\delta}_{[1,2]} \begin{pmatrix} N \\ N^i \\ g_{km} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (58)$$

Fields are absent in (54) and (56), that is why the correctness of the Jacobi identity for double commutators is evident, i.e. the group properties are preserved. So among the four cases (a) - (d), which are discussed in [13], the last one, (d), is realized – the EH and ADM

actions are invariant under diffeomorphism, the only symmetry with the group property. But this result raised many questions, some of which were briefly discussed in [13].

One question is: what is the origin of the statements, so often made in the literature, that the ADM action is invariant only under spatial diffeomorphism? As we have shown in the present paper, the ADM variables (all of them: N , N^i and g_{km}) are invariant under the diffeomorphism transformations (40)-(42) that correspond to the DIs (46)-(47). Although these DIs are non-covariant, they lead to the invariance of the ADM action under 4-diffeomorphism. Therefore the assertion of Kuchar and Isham [12] that “the full group of spacetime diffeomorphism has somehow got lost in making the transition from the Hilbert action to the Dirac-ADM action” is not correct. The statements about spatial diffeomorphism can even be found in earlier papers that describe the first attempts to perform the Hamiltonian analysis of GR. For example, in [43] it is written: “It is clear that $\mathcal{H}_u(x)$ [7] is just the set of infinitesimal generators of the group of general coordinate transformations on the potential g_{rs} ”⁸ (see also [45]) and continue to propagate to more recent papers, e.g. in [42]: “the diffeomorphism constraint can be shown to be associated with the invariance of general relativity under spatial diffeomorphism”, or in [46]: “the momentum constraints ... generate diffeomorphism of 3-metric g_{ab} ”.

As we have shown in [5], a spatial diffeomorphism alone cannot be obtained directly in the course of the Hamiltonian analysis of the ADM formulation without some unjustified manipulations, such as: disregarding primary first-class constraints⁹; promoting secondary constraints into primary; and leaving only one, “diffeomorphism”, constraint in the gauge generator, which would produce spatial diffeomorphism only for g_{km} . But such manipulations contradict any procedure for finding gauge transformations and cannot be seriously considered. The Dirac Hamiltonian procedure applied to the ADM action leads to different gauge transformations: (15)-(17). To derive the gauge transformations for the ADM or EH Hamiltonian formulations, all the first-class constraints, four primary and four secondary, are needed. Using only three constraints to produce a splinter of gauge transformations is

⁷ In “modern” language: “diffeomorphism”, or “momentum”, constraint.

⁸ In Erratum [44], Higgs commented that his “former statement is not quite correct” and “certain transversality conditions” must be satisfied.

⁹ To quote Dirac [2]: “If we are to have any motion at all with a zero Hamiltonian, we must have at least one primary constraint.”

not understandable, and a “geometrical interpretation” is no justification.

The same is valid at the Lagrangian level. According to Noether’s theorem, there are four independent DIs for the ADM or EH action, therefore, there are four independent parameters in the gauge transformations. Let us assume that someone wants to use only three DIs, for example $I_k \equiv 0$, and to set $\tilde{\varepsilon}^\perp = 0$, then the commutator of such transformations gives for both (15)-(17) and (40)-(42)

$$\left(\tilde{\delta}_{(k)2} \tilde{\delta}_{(k)1} - \tilde{\delta}_{(k)1} \tilde{\delta}_{(k)2} \right) \begin{pmatrix} N \\ N^i \\ g_{km} \end{pmatrix} = \tilde{\delta}_{(k)[1,2]} \begin{pmatrix} N \\ N^i \\ g_{km} \end{pmatrix} \quad (59)$$

with

$$\xi_{[1,2]}^k = \xi_2^m \xi_{1,m}^k - \xi_1^m \xi_{2,m}^k$$

(the subscript (k) in $\tilde{\delta}_{(k)i}$ indicates that these transformations correspond to a spatial DI $I_k \equiv 0$ only).

From (59) it looks as though spatial transformations can be considered separately from the translation in the time direction. The situation is even more confusing because of (46), which one might take as an indication of the presence of spatial diffeomorphism. Firstly, note that all fields are engaged in (59), not just the spatial components of the metric tensor. Secondly, the commutator of two transformations that involves only a “perpendicular” parameter $\tilde{\varepsilon}_i^\perp$ cannot be written in the form of “perpendicular” transformation with the new parameter $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{[1,2]}^\perp$, as was similarly done in (53) (note that $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{[1,2]}^\perp$ in (53) also depends on $\tilde{\varepsilon}_i^k$, so the “perpendicular” transformations do not form a group). And thirdly, DIs (44) and (45) are satisfied identically if *all* ELDs are present. For example, if one takes the last three terms in (44) or (45), which are the only terms responsible for the spatial diffeomorphism of g_{km} , then such identities would vanish only if $E = 0$ and $E_k = 0$; but this can only happen if the corresponding fields, N and N^i , are not present in the Lagrangian (or N and N^i are constants). In such a case, however, the remainder of the action will not represent a gauge theory at all because it will be quadratic in the first derivatives in time of g_{km} , which is an invertible expression.

In relation to the Hamiltonian formulation (puzzle), there are other questions to ask: why is it that when working with the original variable, the metric, the transformation

that follows from the constraint structure of the PSS and Dirac Hamiltonian formulations is diffeomorphism? This is the only symmetry with a group property, out of the many transformations that can be constructed using modifications of the DIs for the EH action [13]; yet when the same Dirac method is applied to the ADM action, a different symmetry follows, and because this symmetry is different, the two formulations are not canonically related. Is it “the contradiction that again witnesses about the incompleteness of theoretical foundation” [47]? Working with the original Einstein’s variables, the Hamiltonian procedure produces diffeomorphism transformations as in all field theories when the original, natural choice of variables is used; there is nothing puzzling in such a result. Is it puzzling that the Dirac procedure gives a different symmetry for the ADM action? “Would not it be better to restrict ourselves by transformations in phase space of original canonical variables in the sense of Dirac?” [47]; this solution has to be rejected according to [47] by the reasoning that the ADM parametrization “is preferable because of its geometrical interpretation”. But what about many other possible changes of field variables? Are they not also subject to this criterion? And why is it that their possible geometrical interpretation also not significant or preferable? Do we need this plurality¹⁰?

The Dirac method does not produce diffeomorphism transformations for the ADM variables (or for any other possible parametrization of fields, except the original variable – the metric); and because of this fact, it is claimed in [47] that the Dirac method is “not fundamental and undoubted”, which suggests that the puzzle is related to the Dirac method. These suppositions are rooted in the choice of preferable geometrical interpretation. If someone is satisfied with the geometrical meaning of the metric and with the original formulation of Einstein, then no puzzle exists, and the Dirac approach is fundamental; but if another, geometrical meaning (or interpretation) is preferred¹¹, which is considered more fundamental than the geometrical meaning of the metric, then the Dirac approach is judged not to

¹⁰ The explanation of why we have a plurality of parametrizations, but only one should be chosen, is similar to the reason why Einstein rejected extra dimensions [48]: “It is anomalous to replace the four-dimensional continuum by a five-dimensional one and then subsequently to tie up artificially one of these five dimensions in order to account for the fact that it does not manifest itself”.

¹¹ There are many possible reasons, e.g. “to recover the old comforts of a Hamiltonian-like scheme: a system of hypersurfaces stacked in a well-defined way in space-time, with the system of dynamical variables distributed over these hypersurfaces and developing uniquely from one hypersurface to another” [49], or in [50]: “Although ‘reasonable’ from the point of view of classical Laplacian determinism, the assumption of the existence of a global Cauchy hypersurface is hard to justify from the standpoint of general relativity.”

be fundamental and it must be modified or substituted with another method.

Would it not be better to argue that the ADM variables (and all other possible parametrizations, except the metric) are not fundamental and undoubted, instead of the Dirac method, and that the geometrical interpretation of the ADM variables is in contradiction with the geometrical meaning of Einstein’s theory? We provide such arguments in Discussion.

V. DISCUSSION

In our previous paper [13], we analyzed the group properties of different symmetries of the EH action. We found that among the plurality of gauge symmetries and gauge transformations, which can be built by modifying Noether’s DIs of the EH action, there is one symmetry, diffeomorphism, with a group property [13]. Other DIs can be obtained by writing different linear combinations of known DIs. These new DIs correspond to field-dependent redefinitions of gauge parameters in a formal way. Such a correspondence should not be taken as another representation of the same symmetry because these DIs describe different symmetries. This can be said about the ADM transformations: despite being called the “field-dependent diffeomorphism”, they differ from diffeomorphism and do not have group properties [13]. Further, such modifications as were made to obtain the ADM transformations destroy the covariant character of the basic Noether’s DI (21) of the EH action; and in addition to the disappearance of group properties, such DIs also effectively impose severe restrictions on possible coordinate transformations (in generally covariant theory!): “the most general set of coordinate transformations is reduced to arbitrary 3-dimensional transformations and time reparametrization” [1].

In the present paper we performed an analysis similar to that in [13] for the ADM action: studying group properties under the same transformations – diffeomorphism and the ADM symmetry. As in the case of the EH action, these two (and many more) symmetries leave the action invariant, but only diffeomorphism has a group property, despite diffeomorphism transformations for the ADM action having a very different form compared to those of the EH action. As we have mentioned before, this result contradicts the statement of Isham and Kuchar [12]: “the full group of spacetime diffeomorphisms has somehow got lost in making the transition from the Hilbert action to the Dirac-ADM action”. In general, any symmetry

of the EH action that one can construct by modification of basic DIs is also a symmetry of the ADM action, and *vice versa*. This can be demonstrated in general because any DI written for one field parametrization can be rewritten for another. Note that a plurality of symmetries in one parametrization can be eliminated if we restrict our choice to the symmetries that possess group properties; but for this one particular symmetry there is still a plurality of parametrization choices.

The modification of any DI under the change of field variables is a general procedure. According to Noether's theorem, if a transformation is known, then the corresponding DI can be easily found. If the variables are changed, then the same changes should appear in the corresponding DIs. We shall briefly describe this procedure using the ADM variables as an illustrative example, and one particular DI that is responsible for diffeomorphism.

Let us consider

$$L_{EH}(g_{\mu\nu}) \rightarrow L_{Dirac}(g_{\mu\nu}) \rightarrow L_{ADM}(g_{\mu\nu}(N, N^i, g_{km})). \quad (60)$$

If we know the DI for the original formulation (the EH action)

$$I_\alpha = -2(g^{\mu\nu}E_{\mu\alpha})_{,\nu} - g^{\mu\nu}E_{\mu\nu} \equiv 0, \quad (61)$$

then we can determine how this DI transforms under a change of variables. (We use the identity with a covariant index I_α , instead of I^α from (21), because of the specific form of the ADM change of field variables, see (7).)

We express (61) in terms of the new fields and ELDs that follow from the new Lagrangian. Variations and ELDs are simply connected (the chain rule). If we want the contravariant parameter ξ^μ , we must seek the relation of the new ELDs E, E_i , and E_{ADM}^{km} with $E_{\mu\nu}$ of the original action and corresponding DIs, i.e. perform a variation with respect to a contravariant metric,

$$E = \frac{\delta L}{\delta N} = \frac{\delta L}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}} \frac{\delta g^{\mu\nu}}{\delta N} = E_{\mu\nu} \frac{\delta g^{\mu\nu}}{\delta N} = 2E_{00} \frac{1}{N^3} - 4E_{0k} \frac{N^k}{N^3} + 2E_{pq} \frac{N^p N^q}{N^3}, \quad (62)$$

$$E_i = \frac{\delta L}{\delta N^i} = \frac{\delta L}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}} \frac{\delta g^{\mu\nu}}{\delta N^i} = E_{\mu\nu} \frac{\delta g^{\mu\nu}}{\delta N^i} = +2E_{0k} \frac{1}{N^2} - 2E_{kq} \frac{N^q}{N^2}, \quad (63)$$

$$E_{ADM}^{km} = \frac{\delta L}{\delta g_{km}} = \frac{\delta L}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}} \frac{\delta g^{\mu\nu}}{\delta g_{km}} = E_{\mu\nu} \frac{\delta g^{\mu\nu}}{\delta g_{km}} = -E_{pq} e^{pk} e^{qm}. \quad (64)$$

Solving these equations for the ELDs of the original formulation (ELDs of the EH action) gives

$$E_{pq} = -g_{pk}g_{qm}E_{ADM}^{km} , \quad (65)$$

$$E_{0k} = \frac{1}{2}N^2E_k - N^qg_{pk}g_{qm}E_{ADM}^{pm} , \quad (66)$$

and

$$E_{00} = \frac{1}{2}N^3E + N^2N^kE_k - N^qN^kg_{pk}g_{qm}E_{ADM}^{pm} . \quad (67)$$

Substituting equations (65)-(67) into (61), and also by expressing the contravariant metric in terms of the ADM variables using (7), the same DIs (44)-(45) follow. Therefore, if a DI is known we can easily find a new one based on a known change of variables; in particular, one may find the DI that describes the canonical (with group property) symmetry of the EH action: diffeomorphism.

Note that if the Lagrangian method is to be considered an algorithm¹² for finding an *a priori* unknown gauge invariance, then one has to develop some procedure to build DIs from a given set of ELDs. For covariant theories, where a covariant result should be expected for the DIs, there is not much flexibility in constructing the DIs; among the plurality of possible DIs, we should choose (almost uniquely) DIs such as (21) or (61) for the EH action. But it is not clear to us how to formulate an algorithm that, for example for the ADM Lagrangian, uniquely chooses DIs such as (44)-(45) instead of the DIs for the ADM transformations (19)-(20) which are simpler. What procedure and what criteria could one possibly use to select such DIs, among the plurality of DIs, without the structure and guidance from covariance?

Is it acceptable to have this plurality of parametrizations (ADM is only one of the many possible) and are they all equally good? Alternatively, as in the case of changing the DI in a particular parametrization, can some condition be found that allows us to choose a unique parametrization? In the original, natural parametrization of the EH action, which supports

¹² Exactly as Hamiltonian methods are often presented, e.g. [29]: “one of the advantages of the Hamiltonian formulation is that one does not have to specify the gauge symmetries a priori. Instead, the structure of the Hamiltonian constraints provides an essentially algorithmic way in which the correct gauge symmetry structure is determined automatically”.

manifest covariance, the DI that corresponds to diffeomorphism is a covariant expression; both DIs, (21) and (61), are true vectors, and if a true vector equals zero in one coordinate system then it is zero in all coordinate systems. All non-covariant parametrizations convert these DIs into non-covariant expressions, which are not true vectors or tensors, and cannot be zero in all coordinate systems. Only by imposing additional restrictions on possible coordinate transformations can these non-covariant DIs keep their form. This limitation explains the origin of yet another name for gauge invariance in the ADM formulation, “foliation preserving diffeomorphism”, which reflects the nature of these severe restrictions. Only changes of coordinates that preserve foliation are allowed: i.e. space-like surfaces go to space-like surfaces (see [34] and references therein). It should be possible to explicitly relate the form of DIs in different parametrizations to the restrictions on coordinate transformations that they impose. So, only one original parametrization leads to a gauge invariance that is independent of a change of coordinates. The preservation of covariance in covariant gauge theory must be adopted as one of the criteria for avoiding plurality.

Consider the Dirac Hamiltonian method; why does it pick only one symmetry in one parametrization, and a different symmetry in another? How does this method, not being covariant in nature (time is singled out), successfully select the unique symmetry and parametrization for a given action? Suppose we do not know *a priori* about the covariance/parametrization of an action or its gauge symmetries. When Dirac’s method is applied to the EH action in its original, metric form, despite that time plays a special role in Hamiltonian methods, covariance is not destroyed because at the end of the Dirac procedure the transformations of the Lagrangian can be restored; they are covariant and exactly the same as those known from the Lagrangian approach [5, 9]. Applying the same method (Dirac’s) to the ADM Lagrangian (another parametrization) also gives a symmetry – the ADM symmetry, which does not preserve the covariant form and does not have group properties. Dirac’s method can be used to select the parametrization (that can be called “canonical”) in which the Lagrangian is written in a natural form, and in which the “canonical” Hamiltonian leads to the symmetry with group properties. Therefore, the advantage of the Dirac method lies in its field-parametrization dependence, which compensates for the lack of manifest covariance; and it is only because of its parametrization dependence that it can be useful in finding canonical variables, canonical symmetry, *et cetera*.

Hamiltonian methods are very sensitive to the choice of parametrization in covariant theo-

ries; this is clear from the effect that a non-covariant parametrization has on DIs, which after non-covariant changes retain their form only under additional restrictions on the changes of coordinate system. That is why it is important to choose the right parametrization before the Hamiltonian method is applied. The answer to the question posed by Shestakova in [47]: “Would not it be better to restrict oneself by transformations in phase space of original canonical variables in the sense of Dirac?” is “yes”. Covariant theories (all fundamental physical interactions are described by such theories) are built on the fundamental physical principle – covariance; the gauge symmetries related to them are also expressed in covariant form, and of course the use of natural variables in which the covariance is manifest is preferable. But Shestakova made a different choice; she concluded that Dirac’s method is “not fundamental and undoubted” because it is parametrization-dependent, and it prevents one from obtaining diffeomorphism invariance for the ADM parametrization, which is considered important because of its “geometrical interpretation” [47]. But this interpretation is related to “foliation preserving diffeomorphism” and the restriction on coordinate transformations; this is exactly the interpretation that Hawking stated “to be contrary to the whole spirit of relativity” [51]. The true puzzle is why one would need to dismiss the Dirac method (and covariance of the EH action) as not fundamental, and to search for “a clear proof” that can “restore a legitimate status of the ADM parametrization” [47].

The parametrization dependence of Dirac’s method is not limited to compensating for the lack of manifest covariance in his approach. It equally well plays an important role in non-covariant models, where it also allows one to find the canonical or natural parametrization of the gauge-invariant Lagrangian; in these variables, the corresponding symmetry has the simplest commutator [52] (examples that explicitly illustrate this point and descriptions how to find such parametrizations will be reported elsewhere [53]).

One additional advantage of Dirac’s method can be illustrated by the example of the EH action, where even imposing a requirement to use covariant DIs at the Lagrangian level leaves some freedom. One can build some additional covariant DIs, which are obviously satisfied, for example (there are still only four independent DIs),

$$D_\nu D^\nu I^\mu \equiv 0 \quad \text{or} \quad D_\nu D^\mu I^\nu \equiv 0, \quad (68)$$

and their corresponding transformations can be found. In the Hamiltonian analysis, however, it is not possible to obtain such transformations since it always picks the simplest one

with the lowest possible order of derivatives of the ELDs in the DIs. The order of derivatives is related to the degrees of freedom (DOF) counting in the Hamiltonian formulation for constrained systems (e.g. see [54]), which is based on the constraint structure of the Hamiltonian formulations: the length of constraint chains is related to the order of derivatives of the gauge parameters presented in the gauge transformation and the number of primary first-class constraints equals the number of gauge parameters. For DIs such as (68), there should be constraints up to fourth-order, and four gauge parameters, i.e. minus 16 DOF for only ten components of metric; this is a negative number and, therefore, not a physical result.

VI. CONCLUSION

Our original intention for writing the present paper was to provide the solution to the “non-canonicity puzzle” described in [1]. Using the Lagrangian method, we have already shown in [13] that the EH action is invariant under both transformations – diffeomorphism and the one that follows from the Hamiltonian formulation of the ADM gravity. The same was also confirmed for the ADM action: it is invariant under both these transformations. Therefore diffeomorphism is not lost in the ADM action at the Lagrangian level; yet, this is not the solution to the “puzzle” because these two formulations (EH and ADM) are not equivalent at the Hamiltonian level, and the Dirac analysis leads to unique, though different gauge symmetries for these two formulations.

What is a possible solution to the “puzzle”? One solution would be to modify the Dirac procedure and force it to produce the “expected symmetry” for all conceivable parametrizations. Another solution would be to respect the plurality of gauge symmetries at the Lagrangian level, and to try to relate each symmetry at the Lagrangian level to a particular parametrization that leads uniquely to this symmetry at the Hamiltonian level (i.e. do not modify the Dirac procedure). Returning to the epigraph of our paper: “Plurality must never be posited without necessity”, we are faced with another question: are all possible parametrizations and DIs equally good? Among the plurality of parametrizations and gauge symmetries (linear combinations of DIs), there is one Lagrangian symmetry that possesses a group property – diffeomorphism; and it is exactly this symmetry that follows naturally from the original Einstein formulation of General Relativity.

If we start from the EH action

$$S_{EH} = \int \sqrt{-g} R d^4x , \quad (69)$$

for which the ELD is

$$E^{\alpha\beta} = \frac{\delta L_{EH}}{\delta g_{\alpha\beta}} = \sqrt{-g} \left(\frac{1}{2} g^{\alpha\beta} R - R^{\alpha\beta} \right) , \quad (70)$$

then it leads to the DI

$$I^\mu = \nabla_\nu E^{\mu\nu} \equiv 0 \quad (71)$$

and the corresponding gauge transformation:

$$\delta g_{\mu\nu} = -\nabla_\mu \xi_\nu - \nabla_\nu \xi_\mu . \quad (72)$$

Note, all these expressions are generally covariant. In natural parametrization, metric tensor, the Dirac procedure leads exactly to the same symmetry at the Hamiltonian level [5, 9]. All other field parametrizations (e.g. ADM) can be used to rewrite (70) - (72), but general covariance would be lost. In addition, the Dirac procedure would produce different symmetries for different field parametrizations.

When delivering the 1933 Herbert Spencer lecture, Einstein said: “It is the grand object of all theory to make these irreducible elements as simple and as few in number as possible, without having to renounce the adequate representation of any empirical content whatever”, and later: “Our experience hitherto justifies us in believing that nature is the realization of the simplest conceivable mathematical ideas” [55]. What could be simpler than equations (69)-(72)? Do we need another set of field variables that will complicate them and destroy covariance?

There is no “non-canonicity puzzle”, and there is no “contradiction that again witnesses about the incompleteness of the theoretical foundation” [47], unless one desperately wants to find “a clear proof” of the legitimacy of the non-covariant ADM variables because these variables are a “common currency” [30]. In our opinion, to support the legitimacy of the common currency and its derivatives may incur a high cost; indeed, one might barter away valuable physical assets.

VII. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We would like to thank A.M. Frolov, L.A. Komorowski, D.G.C. McKeon, and A.V. Zvelindovsky for discussions.

-
- [1] F. Cianfrani, M. Lulli, G. Montani, arXiv:1104.0140 [gr-qc]
 - [2] P.A.M. Dirac, *Lectures on Quantum Mechanics* (Belfer Graduate School of Sciences, Yeshiva University, New York, 1964)
 - [3] R. Arnowitt, S. Deser, C.W. Misner, in *Gravitation: An Introduction to Current Research*, ed. by L. Witten (Wiley, New York, 1962), p. 227; arXiv:gr-qc/0405109
 - [4] R. Arnowitt, S. Deser, C.W. Misner, *Gen. Relativ. Gravit.* **40**, 1997 (2008)
 - [5] N. Kiriushcheva, S.V. Kuzmin, *Central Eur. J. Phys.* **9**, 576 (2011)
 - [6] F.A.E. Pirani, A. Schild, R. Skinner, *Phys. Rev.* **87**, 452 (1952)
 - [7] P.A.M. Dirac, *Proc. Roy. Soc. A* **246**, 333 (1958)
 - [8] C. Rovelli, *Quantum Gravity* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004)
 - [9] N. Kiriushcheva, S.V. Kuzmin, C. Racknor, S.R. Valluri, *Phys. Lett. A* **372**, 5101 (2008)
 - [10] A.M. Frolov, N. Kiriushcheva, S.V. Kuzmin, S.V.: arXiv:0809.1198 [gr-qc] (to appear in *Grav. & Cosm.*, **17**, No 4, 2011)
 - [11] C. Lanczos, *The variational principles of mechanics*, fourth ed. (Dover Publications, New York, 1970)
 - [12] C.J. Isham, K.V. Kuchar, *Ann. Phys.* **164**, 316 (1985)
 - [13] N. Kiriushcheva, P.G. Komorowski, S.V. Kuzmin, arXiv:1107.2449 [gr-qc]
 - [14] E. Noether, *Nachr. d. König. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, Math.-phys. Klasse*, **2**, 235 (1918)
 - [15] E. Noether (M.A. Tavel's English translation), arXiv:physics/0503066
 - [16] L.D. Landau, E.M. Lifshitz, *The Classical Theory of Fields*, fourth ed. (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1975)
 - [17] M. Carmeli, *Classical Fields, General Relativity and Gauge Theory* (World Scientific, New Jersey, 2001)
 - [18] M. Ostrogradsky, *Memoires l'Acad. Imperiale Sci. St.-Petersbourg*, **IV**, 385 (1850)

- [19] M. Ostrogradsky, in: *Variatsionnye printsipy mekhaniki*, ed. by L.S. Polak (Fizmatgiz, 1959), p. 315
- [20] E.T. Whittaker, *A Treatise on the Analytical Dynamics of Particles and Rigid Bodies* (Dover Publications, 1944)
- [21] D. M. Gitman, S.L. Lyakhovich and I. V. Tyutin, *Izvestiya Vuz. Fiz.* **26**, 61 (1983); *Sov. Phys. J.* **26**, 730 (1984)
- [22] D. M. Gitman and I. V. Tyutin, *Quantization of Fields with Constraints* (Springer, Berlin, 1990)
- [23] S.K. Dutt and M. Dresden, *Pure gravity as a constrained second-order system*, Preprint ITP-SB-86-32 (1986)
- [24] R.N. Ghalati, N. Kiriushcheva and S.V. Kuzmin, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **22**, 17 (2007)
- [25] L. Castellani, *Ann. Phys.* **143**, 357 (1982)
- [26] J.M. Pons, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **20**, 3279 (2003)
- [27] C.W. Misner, K.S. Thorne, J.A. Wheeler, *Gravitation* (W.H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco, 1973)
- [28] R.M. Wald, *General Relativity* (The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1984)
- [29] P. Hořava and C.M. Melby-Thompson, *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 064027 (2010)
- [30] J. Pullin, *Golden Oldie Editorial*, *Gen. Relativ. Gravit.* **40**, 1989 (2008)
- [31] A. Einstein, *Sitzungsber. preuss. Akad. Wiss., Phys.-Math.* **1**, 414 (1925)
- [32] A. Einstein, *The Complete Collection of Scientific Papers*, vol. **2** (Nauka, Moscow, 1966), p. 171
- [33] English translation of some of Einstein's papers is available from: <http://www.lrz-muenchen.de/~aunzicker/ae1930.htm>, and A. Unzicker, T. Case, arXiv:physics/0503046
- [34] N. Kiriushcheva and S. V. Kuzmin, *Ann. Phys.* **321** (2006) 958
- [35] N. Kiriushcheva, S.V. Kuzmin, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **70**, 389 (2010)
- [36] R.N. Ghalati and D.G.C. McKeon, arXiv:0712.2861v3 [gr-qc]
- [37] D.G.C. McKeon, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **25**, 3453 (2010)
- [38] J. Schwinger, *Phys. Rev.* **130**, 1253 (1963)
- [39] D. Hilbert, *Nachr. d. König. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, Math.-phys. Klasse*, **8**, 395 (1916)
- [40] D. Hilbert, in *The Genesis of General Relativity*, ed. by J. Renn (Springer, 2007) vol. **4**, p.

- [41] N. Kiriushcheva, S.V. Kuzmin, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **42**, 2613 (2010)
- [42] J. Pullin, *AIP Conf. Proc.* **668**, 141 (2003), arXiv:gr-qc/0209008
- [43] P.W. Higgs, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **1**, 373 (1958)
- [44] P.W. Higgs, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **3**, 66 (1959)
- [45] B.S. DeWitt, *Phys. Rev.* **160**, 1113 (1967)
- [46] T.P. Shestakova and C. Simeone, *Grav. & Cosm.* **10**, 161 (2004)
- [47] T.P. Shestakova, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **28**, 055009 (2011)
- [48] A. Einstein, *Science*, **74**, 438 (1922)
- [49] K. Kuchař, in: *Relativity, Astrophysics and Cosmology*, ed. by W. Israel (D. Reidel Publ. Comp, Dordrecht, 1973), p. 237
- [50] S.W. Hawking, R. Penrose, *Proc. Roy. Soc. A* **314**, 529 (1970)
- [51] S.W. Hawking, in: *General Relativity. An Einstein Centenary Survey*, ed. by S.W. Hawking and W. Israel (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1979), p. 746
- [52] N. Kiriushcheva, P.G. Komorowski, S.V. Kuzmin, arXiv:1107.2981 [gr-qc]
- [53] N. Kiriushcheva, P.G. Komorowski, S.V. Kuzmin (in preparation)
- [54] M. Henneaux, C. Teitelboim and J. Zanelli, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 332**, 169 (1990)
- [55] A. Einstein, *Ideas and Opinions*, ed. by C. Weltbild, translated by S. Bargmann (Wings Books, New York, 1954)