

A Strange Detail Concerning the Variational Principle of General Relativity Theory

Peter Ostermann*

A mathematical mistake due to an unjustified assumption in the variational principle of general relativity theory, which obviously confused Einstein and Hilbert, is shown and cleared up here.

There is a strange mathematical detail hidden in the variational principle of general relativity theory (GRT) as used by Einstein [1], Pauli [2] to Landau-Lifshitz [3] e.g., who claim the tensor density

$$\mathbf{E}_{ik} \equiv \sqrt{g} E_{ik} \equiv \mathbf{R}_{ik} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{R} g_{ik} \quad (1)$$

with \mathbf{R}_{ik} Ricci's tensor density, \mathbf{R} its trace, to result from

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{G}}{\partial g^{ik}} - \partial_l \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{G}}{\partial g_l^{ik}} \right). \quad (2)$$

Here g^{ik} is the contravariant fundamental tensor ($i, k = 0 \dots 3$), $g \equiv -1/|g^{ik}|$ is a function of the g^{ik} only (therefore $\partial \sqrt{g} / \partial g^{ik} = -\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{g} g_{ik}$ is used in the following) and $\partial_l \equiv \partial / \partial x^l$ the partial derivation with respect to the coordinate x^l , $g_l^{ik} \equiv \partial_l g^{ik}$ as well as $g_{lik} \equiv \partial_l g_{ik}$ are mere abbreviations. – The Lagrangian \mathbf{G} of the gravitational field may be written in the form

$$\mathbf{G} \equiv \sqrt{g} g^{um} g^{sv} g^{rw} \{ \Gamma_{v,ur} \Gamma_{w,ms} - \Gamma_{v,um} \Gamma_{w,sr} \}, \quad (3)$$

as is well known, where Christoffel's symbols $\Gamma_{l,ik}$ are

$$\Gamma_{l,ik} \equiv \frac{1}{2} (g_{kli} + g_{ilk} - g_{lik}). \quad (4)$$

That something might be wrong with expression (2) above, is indicated by the peculiarity, that – as far as I know – there actually does not exist any straightforward calculation of Einstein's tensor density \mathbf{E}_{ik} from (2). I will show here that this expression at least suffers from a misleading notation.

The obstacle is avoided by other authors from Weyl [4] to Weinberg [5] e.g., who treat the variational principle alternatively, in that they calculate \mathbf{E}_{ik} without using any partial derivatives like $\partial / \partial g^{ik}$, $\partial / \partial g_l^{ik}$, thus properly converting:

$$\delta \int \mathbf{G} dx = \int \mathbf{E}_{ik} \delta g^{ik} dx. \quad (5)$$

The simple reason why (2) does not work, however, is that \mathbf{G} cannot be written as a function of \sqrt{g} , g^{ik} , g_l^{ik} (without g_{ik}) solely, as seemed necessary so far (though it is an unjustified requirement, that the Lagrangian should always be composed of quantities together with their *direct* partial derivatives only). In particular, from (3), (4) it is clearly seen that $\mathbf{G} \equiv \mathbf{G}(\sqrt{g}, g^{ik}, g_{lik})$, thus (5) is immediately leading to:

$$\mathbf{E}_{ik} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{G}}{\partial g^{ik}} + g_{ia} g_{kb} \partial_l \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{G}}{\partial g_{lab}} \right). \quad (6)$$

One may easily verify that contrary to (2) this relation really works, calculating Einstein's tensor from (6) straightforwardly. Since $\partial \mathbf{G}(g_w^{rs}, \dots) / \partial g_l^{ik} = -g_{ia} g_{kb} \partial \mathbf{G}(g_w^{rs}, \dots) / \partial g_{lab}$, \mathbf{E}_{ik} cannot result from (2) because of $\partial \mathbf{G} / \partial g_{lab} \times \partial_l (g_{ia} g_{kb}) \neq 0$.

Relation (6) is not the only valid representation according to (5), however. If one insisted on handling \mathbf{G} as a function $\mathbf{G}(\sqrt{g}, g^{ik}, g_{lik} := -g_{ia} g_{kb} g_l^{ab})$ instead, one may also find

$$\mathbf{E}_{ik} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{G}}{\partial g^{ik}} - \partial_l \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{G}}{\partial g_l^{ik}} \right) - g_{ia} g_{kb} \frac{\partial \mathbf{G}}{\partial g_{ab}} \quad (7)$$

e.g. (where $\delta g_{ab} = -g_{ia} g_{kb} \delta g^{ik}$ was used again). Since (7) is right – as I verified, too – expression (2) apparently must be different from \mathbf{E}_{ik} (given one is keeping in mind what partial derivatives like $\partial / \partial g_{ik}$, $\partial / \partial g_{lik}$, $\partial / \partial g_l^{ik}$, $\partial / \partial g_l^{ik}$ usually mean).

In 1915, discussing (2) and (5) – s. Doc.s 60,62,64,66,67, 69,71,74,75,77,78,80 of [6] v. 8 – Levi-Civita showed, though with an earlier \mathbf{G} , that (2) would not be a tensor density (Doc. 67). Einstein, however, erroneously insisted that the tensor character of (2) definitely arises from (5) [“I have not yet experienced such an interesting correspondence”, Doc. 69, translated by author]. This amicable controversy now dissolves by the result $\mathbf{E}_{ik} \neq (2)$.

The incomplete expression (2) does not affect the validity of Einstein's wonderful equations, of course. That it, however, seems to have confused Einstein even while writing his basic 1916 paper [7] on GRT, might be seen from a manuscript published posthumously (s. Doc. 31 of [6] v. 6), which “was originally intended as §14 of ... and later as an appendix to ...”, before it was left out in the end. In that manuscript he tried to handle the variational principle without the restriction $\sqrt{g} = 1$ (otherwise mostly used), but obviously was not satisfied (s. also Doc.s 183/84 of [6] v. 8).

It took about seven months, before Einstein came back with “Hamilton's Principle and the General Theory of Relativity” [1, in German], where he refers to the achievements of Hilbert [8] (and Lorentz) explicitly. Thus, he insists on (2), apparently without further trying to verify it by direct calculation. The ironic background, however, is that Hilbert – though using \mathbf{R} instead of \mathbf{G} – had claimed an expression analogous to (2), which unfortunately is misleading for \mathbf{E}_{ik} , too (at least by its notation), “... readily without calculation” [8, translated by author].

* Electronic address: <box@peter-ostermann.de>

- [1] Einstein A., Sitz.ber.Preuß.Akad.Wiss. (1916) 1111-1116 (reprint in Doc. 41 of [6] v. 6)
- [2] Pauli W.: *Theory of Relativity*, 1958 (1st Ed. in German 1921)
- [3] Landau L.D., Lifschitz E.M., *Lehrbuch d. theor. Physik*, Bd. II, *Klassische Feldtheorie*, 12. Aufl., 1992
- [4] Weyl H., *Raum - Zeit - Materie*, 1./3. Aufl., 1918/20
- [5] Weinberg S., *Gravitation and Cosmology*, 1972
- [6] *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, v. 6 ed. by Kox A.J., Klein M.J., Schulmann R., 1996; v. 8 ed. by Schulmann R., et al., 1998
- [7] Einstein A., Ann.d.Phys. **49** (1916), 769-822 (reprint in Doc. 30 of [6] v. 6)
- [8] Hilbert D., Nachr.Ges.Wiss.Gött. (1915) 395-407

Appendix

In a most instructive paper Corry, Renn, Stachel [A1] have already pointed to the delicate fact, too, that Hilbert [8] presented the tensor density (1A) \equiv (1) without calculation. They conclude from different well justified reasons that he did not anticipate Einstein's explicit form of the field equations, thereby rightly dismissing his false argument, that the tensor density (1) had been the only thinkable result because of its constituents. Hilbert might tacitly have used *Einstein's* final insight, that in addition the covariant derivative must vanish identically, which insight – in my view – is necessary to complete his argumentation, but is not mentioned there.

Now those authors' conclusion seems strongly supported by the fact that Hilbert would *not* have found the correct result calculating straightforwardly from his basic relations. The reason is the wrong presupposition that Riemann's curvature scalar could be handled as if algebraically composable of $g^{ik}, g_l^{ik}, g_{lm}^{ik}$ alone (without g_{ik}). Although this impossibility is clear from the version v1 of this note [an unnecessary aside in the line below (7) is corrected in v2], it will be shown in more detail because of the implications supporting Einstein's priority stated by the authors above.

As an extension of relation (2), Hilbert explicitly claimed Einstein's tensor density \mathbf{E}_{ik} to result from

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{R}}{\partial g^{ik}} - \partial_l \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{R}}{\partial g_l^{ik}} \right) + \partial_{lm} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{R}}{\partial g_{lm}^{ik}} \right), \quad (2A)$$

where he used the full Riemannian curvature scalar density

$$\mathbf{R} \equiv \sqrt{g} g^{um} \{ \partial_\nu \Gamma_{um}^\nu - \partial_m \Gamma_{uv}^\nu \} - \mathbf{G} \quad (3A)$$

in his variational principle instead of \mathbf{G} only (his $\mathbf{K} \equiv -\mathbf{R}$). To show that analogously to the argumentation above, \mathbf{R} can be understood to be a function of $\sqrt{g}, g^{ik}, g_{lik}, g_{mlk} \equiv \partial_m g_{lik}$ indeed, the term in curled brackets may be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \{ \partial_\nu \Gamma_{um}^\nu - \partial_m \Gamma_{uv}^\nu \} &= g^{sv} (X_{umsv} + Y_{umsv}), \\ \text{where:} \\ X_{umsv} &= (\partial_\nu \Gamma_{s,um} - \partial_m \Gamma_{s,uv}), \\ Y_{umsv} &= g^{rw} (g_{m\nu w} \Gamma_{s,ur} - g_{rvw} \Gamma_{s,um}). \end{aligned} \quad (4A)$$

It is commonly known, that $\delta \int \mathbf{R} dx$ can be reduced by partial integration to $\delta \int \mathbf{G} dx$, presupposing as usual that all variations vanish at the integration limits (see e.g. [3]). Nevertheless, taking Hilbert's full action integral without this reduction to (5) exactly as it is, then

$$\delta \int \mathbf{R} dx = \int \delta \mathbf{R} dx = \int \mathbf{E}_{ik} \delta g^{ik} dx \quad (5A)$$

results in the working relation

$$\mathbf{E}_{ik} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{R}}{\partial g^{ik}} + g_{ia} g_{kb} \partial_l \left[\frac{\partial \mathbf{R}}{\partial g_{lab}} - \partial_m \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{R}}{\partial g_{lmab}} \right) \right] \quad (6A)$$

analogously to relation (6) above (verified by direct calculation, too). And again, converting \mathbf{R} of (3A), (4A) into a function $\mathbf{R}(\sqrt{g}, g^{ik}, g_{lik} := -g_{ia} g_{kb} g_l^{ab}, \dots)$, one may also find

$$\mathbf{E}_{ik} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{R}}{\partial g^{ik}} - \partial_l \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{R}}{\partial g_l^{ik}} \right) + \partial_{lm} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{R}}{\partial g_{lm}^{ik}} \right) - g_{ia} g_{kb} \frac{\partial \mathbf{R}}{\partial g_{ab}}, \quad (7A)$$

thus necessarily completing Hilbert's (2A). In some detail, the derivation of (6A) is done as follows. At first

$$\delta \mathbf{R} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{R}}{\partial g^{ik}} \delta g^{ik} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{R}}{\partial g_{lab}} \delta g_{lab} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{R}}{\partial g_{lmab}} \delta g_{lmab} \quad (8A)$$

results from $\mathbf{R} \equiv \mathbf{R}(\sqrt{g}, g^{ik}, g_{lik}, g_{mlk})$ given by (3A), (4A). Then a repeated partial integration yields

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \int \mathbf{R} dx &= \int \{ \dots \} dx + \int \partial_l \mathbf{Q}^l dx \\ \text{where:} \\ \{ \dots \} &\equiv \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathbf{R}}{\partial g^{ik}} \delta g^{ik} - \partial_l \left[\frac{\partial \mathbf{R}}{\partial g_{lab}} - \partial_m \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{R}}{\partial g_{lmab}} \right) \right] \delta g_{ab} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (9A)$$

Evidently, substituting here $\delta g_{ab} = -g_{ia} g_{kb} \delta g^{ik}$ proves (6A), since according to the usual understanding the variation

$$\mathbf{Q}^l \equiv \left[\frac{\partial \mathbf{R}}{\partial g_{lab}} - \partial_m \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{R}}{\partial g_{lmab}} \right) \right] \delta g_{ab} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{R}}{\partial g_{lmab}} \delta g_{mab} \quad (10A)$$

vanishes at the boundary. It seems an interesting aspect, however, that using \mathbf{R} instead of \mathbf{G} is extending Einstein's original energy-momentum pseudo-tensor \mathbf{t}_i^k of the gravitational field by

$$\Delta \mathbf{t}_i^k \equiv \frac{1}{2} \{ (\mathbf{R} - \mathbf{G}) \delta_i^k + \partial_i [\sqrt{g} g_l^{kl} + 2 g^{kl} \partial_l \sqrt{g}] \}, \quad (11A)$$

yielding another form $\mathbf{t}_{i(R)}^k \equiv \mathbf{t}_i^k + \Delta \mathbf{t}_i^k$ according to (10A) immediately. Though, $\partial_k (\Delta \mathbf{t}_i^k) \equiv 0$ means that in fact there is *no* additional exchange of energy or momentum.

In this context, the same lack is obviously questioning any additional exchange of angular momentum in case of the well-known symmetric alternative pseudo-tensors [3], [5], too, thus reducing their attraction significantly.

Coming back to the question of priority last, it may be pointed to the simple fact, that there are two sides of Einstein's equations. As shown above, Hilbert would not have found the left hand side calculating from (2A) straightforwardly. For the right hand side, in addition, he offered some speculation insufficient to reach physical applicability. There, in contrast, Einstein had set the phenomenological energy-momentum tensor of matter and pressure already years ago, which including his 'geodesic' equations of motion has successfully proven applicable since that time in various situations, again and again. Therefore – in spite of some impressive mathematical achievements, in my view nobody can actually claim Hilbert to have derived Einstein's equations in his first note [8] or its draft *at all*.