

To Appear: *Class. Quantum Grav.*

Symmetric vacuum scalar–tensor cosmology

James E. Lidsey¹

*Astronomy Unit, School of Mathematical Sciences,
Queen Mary & Westfield, Mile End Road, LONDON, E1 4NS, U.K.*

Abstract

The existence of point symmetries in the cosmological field equations of generalized vacuum scalar–tensor theories is considered within the context of the spatially homogeneous cosmologies. It is found that such symmetries only occur in the Brans–Dicke theory when the dilaton field self–interacts. Moreover, the interaction potential of the dilaton must take the form of a cosmological constant. For the spatially flat, isotropic model, it is shown how this point symmetry may be employed to generate a discrete scale factor duality in the Brans–Dicke action.

PACS: 11.30.Ly, 98.80.Hw

¹Electronic address: jel@maths.qmw.ac.uk

In this paper we search for point symmetries in the cosmological field equations of generalized vacuum scalar–tensor theories of gravity. Interest in these theories has been widespread in recent years. They are defined by the action

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} e^{-\Phi} \left[R - \omega(\Phi) (\nabla\Phi)^2 - 2\Lambda(\Phi) \right], \quad (1)$$

where R is the Ricci curvature of the space–time and g is the determinant of the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ [1]. The dilaton field Φ plays the role of a time–varying gravitational constant and may self–interact through a potential $\Lambda(\Phi)$. The function $\omega(\Phi)$ is dimensionless and determines the precise form of the coupling between the dilaton and graviton. Each scalar–tensor theory is defined by the functional forms of $\omega(\Phi)$ and $\Lambda(\Phi)$. A cosmological constant in the gravitational sector of the theory corresponds to the special case where $\Lambda(\Phi)$ is a space–time constant.

Action (1) provides a natural background within which deviations from general relativity may be quantitatively studied. The simplest example is the Brans–Dicke theory, where $\omega(\Phi)$ is a space–time constant [2]. It is known that inflationary solutions exist in a wide class of scalar–tensor cosmologies and these theories are therefore relevant to the study of the very early Universe [3]. Indeed, higher–order [4] and higher–dimensional [5] theories of gravity may be expressed in a scalar–tensor form after suitable field redefinitions and the Brans–Dicke theory with $\omega = -1$ corresponds to a truncated version of the string effective action [6].

Point symmetries associated with action (1) have been discussed previously within the context of the spatially isotropic Friedmann Universes [7, 8]. It was found that $\omega(\Phi)$ and $\Lambda(\Phi)$ must be related in a certain way if the field equations are to be symmetric. In this paper we consider whether theory (1) admits point symmetries for the more general class of spatially homogeneous Bianchi Universes. We assume that $\Lambda(\Phi) \neq 0$ and that $\omega(\Phi) > -3/2$ for all physical values of Φ . We find that such symmetries only exist in these anisotropic cosmologies if strong restrictions are imposed on the form of Eq. (1). In particular, we show that for the Bianchi type I model, $\omega(\Phi)$ and $\Lambda(\Phi)$ must both be *constant*. We argue that this conclusion should apply for the other Bianchi types where a Lagrangian formulation of the field equations is possible.

The line element for the class of spatially homogeneous space-times is given by

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + h_{ab}\omega^a\omega^b, \quad a, b = 1, 2, 3, \quad (2)$$

where $h_{ab}(t)$ is a function of cosmic time t and represents the metric on the surfaces of homogeneity and ω^a are one–forms. These models have a topology $R \times G_3$, where G_3 represents a Lie group of isometries that acts transitively on the space–like three–dimensional orbits [9]. The Lie algebra of G_3 admits the structure constants $C^a_{bc} = m^{ad}\epsilon_{dbc} + \delta^a_{[b}a_{c]}$, where m^{ab} is a symmetric matrix, $a_c \equiv C^a_{ac}$ and $\epsilon_{abc} = \epsilon_{[abc]}$. The Jacobi identity $C^a_{b[c}C^b_{de]} = 0$ is only satisfied if $m^{ab}a_b = 0$, so m^{ab} must be transverse to a_b [10]. The model belongs to the Bianchi class A if $a_b = 0$ and to the class B if

$a_b \neq 0$. A basis may be found such that $a_b = (a, 0, 0)$ and $m^{ab} = \text{diag}[m_{11}, m_{22}, m_{33}]$, where m_{ii} take the values ± 1 or 0 . In the Bianchi class A, the Lie algebra is uniquely determined up to isomorphisms by the rank and signature of m^{ab} . The six possibilities are $(0, 0, 0)$, $(1, 0, 0)$, $(1, -1, 0)$, $(1, 1, 0)$, $(1, 1, -1)$ and $(1, 1, 1)$ and these correspond, respectively, to the Bianchi types I, II, VI₀, VII₀, VIII and IX. Finally, the three-metric may be parametrized by $h_{ab}(t) = e^{2\alpha(t)} (e^{2\beta(t)})_{ab}$, where $e^{3\alpha}$ represents the effective spatial volume of the Universe and

$$\beta_{ab} \equiv \text{diag} [\beta_+ + \sqrt{3}\beta_-, \beta_+ - \sqrt{3}\beta_-, -2\beta_+] \quad (3)$$

is a traceless matrix that determines the anisotropy in the models.

The configuration space Q for the Bianchi models derived from action (1) is therefore four-dimensional and is spanned by $\{q_n \equiv \alpha, \Phi, \beta_{\pm}\}$. The Lagrangian density $L(q_n, \dot{q}_n)$ is defined by $S = \int dt L(q_n, \dot{q}_n)$, where a dot denotes differentiation with respect to cosmic time. It may be derived by substituting the *ansatz* (2) into action (1) and integrating over the spatial variables. This procedure is unambiguous for the class A cosmologies and the action for these models simplifies to

$$S = \int dt e^{3\alpha - \Phi} \left[6\dot{\alpha}\dot{\Phi} - 6\dot{\alpha}^2 + 6\dot{\beta}_+^2 + 6\dot{\beta}_-^2 + \omega(\Phi)\dot{\Phi}^2 - 2\Lambda(\Phi) + e^{-2\alpha}U(\beta_{\pm}) \right], \quad (4)$$

where

$$U(\beta_{\pm}) = -e^{-4\alpha} \left(m_{ab}m^{ab} - \frac{1}{2}m^2 \right) \quad (5)$$

is the curvature potential, $m \equiv m^a_a$ and indices are raised and lowered with h^{ab} and h_{ab} , respectively [11]. In the case of the type B models, a divergence may arise because the three-curvature contains a term proportional to $a_b a^b$ [12]. In view of this, we do not consider these models further.

The field equations derived from action (4) take the familiar form

$$\frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}_n} = \frac{\partial L}{\partial q_n}. \quad (6)$$

Now, a point symmetry of a set of differential equations such as those given by Eq. (6) may be viewed as a one-parameter group of transformations acting in the space TQ that is tangent to Q and spanned by $\{q_n, \dot{q}_n\}$. One identifies such a symmetry by introducing a set of arbitrary, real, differentiable functions $\{X_n(q) = X_{\alpha}(q), X_{\Phi}(q), X_{\pm}(q)\}$ and contracting these with the field equations [13]. Thus,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(X_n \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}_n} \right) = \left(X_n \frac{\partial}{\partial q_n} + \frac{dX_n}{dt} \frac{\partial}{\partial \dot{q}_n} \right) L, \quad (7)$$

where summation over n is implied. The right hand side of this equation is the Lie derivative $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{X}}L$ of the Lagrangian density with respect to the vector field

$$\mathbf{X} \equiv X_n \frac{\partial}{\partial q_n} + \frac{dX_n}{dt} \frac{\partial}{\partial \dot{q}_n}. \quad (8)$$

This vector field belongs to the tangent space and is the infinitesimal generator of the point transformation. The Lie derivative (7) determines how the Lagrangian varies along the flow generated by \mathbf{X} in TQ . When this derivative vanishes, the Lagrangian density is *constant* along the integral curves of \mathbf{X} . It then follows immediately from Eq. (7) that the quantity $i_{\mathbf{X}}\theta_L \equiv X_n\partial L/\partial\dot{q}_n$ is conserved, where $i_{\mathbf{X}}$ denotes the contraction of the vector field \mathbf{X} with $\theta_L \equiv (\partial L/\partial\dot{q}_n)dq_n$.

Thus, one may uncover a Noether-type symmetry in the theory by determining the components $\{X_n(q)\}$ that satisfy $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{X}}L = 0$ [13]. In general, this equation reduces to an expression that is quadratic in \dot{q}_n for all values of n . However, the coefficients of these terms are determined by functions of q_n . Thus, each of the coefficients must vanish identically if the Lie derivative is to vanish. This leads to a number of separate constraints that take the form of first-order, partial differential equations in $\{X_n(q)\}$. A further constraint may arise from terms in the Lagrangian that are independent of \dot{q}_n . A Noether symmetry in the theory is then identified once a solution to these equations is found.

It can be shown after some algebra that the Lie derivative of the Lagrangian (4) with respect to \mathbf{X} vanishes if and only if $\{X_n(q)\}$ satisfy the set of partial differential equations:

$$6\Lambda X_\alpha - 2\Lambda X_\Phi + 2\Lambda' X_\Phi = e^{-2\alpha} \left[X_\alpha U - X_\Phi U + X_+ \frac{\partial U}{\partial \beta_+} + X_- \frac{\partial U}{\partial \beta_-} \right] \quad (9)$$

$$9X_\alpha - 3X_\Phi + 3\frac{\partial X_\alpha}{\partial \alpha} - 6\frac{\partial X_\alpha}{\partial \Phi} + 3\frac{\partial X_\Phi}{\partial \Phi} + \omega \frac{\partial X_\Phi}{\partial \alpha} = 0 \quad (10)$$

$$3\omega X_\alpha - \omega X_\Phi + \omega' X_\Phi + 6\frac{\partial X_\alpha}{\partial \Phi} + 2\omega \frac{\partial X_\Phi}{\partial \Phi} = 0 \quad (11)$$

$$3X_\alpha - X_\Phi + 2\frac{\partial X_\alpha}{\partial \alpha} - \frac{\partial X_\Phi}{\partial \alpha} = 0 \quad (12)$$

$$3X_\alpha - X_\Phi + 2\frac{\partial X_\pm}{\partial \beta_\pm} = 0 \quad (13)$$

$$\frac{\partial X_+}{\partial \beta_-} + \frac{\partial X_-}{\partial \beta_+} = 0 \quad (14)$$

$$3\frac{\partial X_\alpha}{\partial \beta_\pm} + \omega \frac{\partial X_\Phi}{\partial \beta_\pm} + 6\frac{\partial X_\pm}{\partial \Phi} = 0 \quad (15)$$

$$-2\frac{\partial X_\alpha}{\partial \beta_\pm} + \frac{\partial X_\Phi}{\partial \beta_\pm} + 2\frac{\partial X_\pm}{\partial \alpha} = 0, \quad (16)$$

where a prime denotes differentiation with respect to Φ .

We will search for non-trivial solutions to these equations where $\{X_\alpha, X_\Phi, \Lambda(\Phi) \neq 0\}$. Moreover, we shall consider the case where both sides of Eq. (9) are identically zero:

$$X_\alpha = \left(\frac{\Lambda - \Lambda'}{3\Lambda} \right) X_\Phi \quad (17)$$

$$X_\alpha U - X_\Phi U + X_+ \frac{\partial U}{\partial \beta_+} + X_- \frac{\partial U}{\partial \beta_-} = 0. \quad (18)$$

This separation is valid in general for the type I model, since the curvature potential $U(\beta_\pm)$ is identically zero in this case. However, it should also be consistent for the other Bianchi types. Eq. (13) implies that $\partial X_+/\partial \beta_+ = \partial X_-/\partial \beta_-$. If we differentiate this constraint with respect to β_\pm and compare it with the first derivative of Eq. (14), we find that X_\pm satisfy the one-dimensional Laplace equation:

$$\frac{\partial^2 X_\pm}{\partial \beta_\pm^2} + \frac{\partial^2 X_\pm}{\partial \beta_\mp^2} = 0. \quad (19)$$

Now, the components of \mathbf{X} must be real if they are to correspond to physical solutions. However, an exponential solution to Eq. (19) will have the generic form $X_j = \exp[ik\beta_\pm \pm k\beta_\mp]$, for some arbitrary, real constant k . This suggests that X_\pm can not contain real exponential terms in β_\pm . Furthermore, Eqs. (15) and (16) then imply that the same will be true for X_α and X_Φ . This is important because the curvature potential (5) consists entirely of exponential terms. We might expect, therefore, that the components of \mathbf{X} will be unable to cancel out these terms in the full expression given by Eq. (9). If so, Eq. (9) could only be satisfied if both sides were identically zero.

When Eq. (17) is valid, Eq. (12) simplifies to

$$\frac{\partial \ln X_\Phi}{\partial \alpha} = c(\Phi) = - \left(\frac{3\Lambda'}{\Lambda + 2\Lambda'} \right). \quad (20)$$

On the other hand, we may combine Eqs. (10) and (11) and eliminate the $\partial X_\alpha/\partial \Phi$ terms. Substituting Eq. (20) into the result then implies that

$$\frac{\partial \ln X_\Phi}{\partial \Phi} = f(\Phi) = \frac{1}{3 + 2\omega} \left[(3 + \omega) \frac{\Lambda'}{\Lambda} + \frac{3\Lambda'}{\Lambda + 2\Lambda'} \left(1 + \omega - \frac{\Lambda'}{\Lambda} \right) - \omega' \right]. \quad (21)$$

It follows from Eqs. (20) and (21) that X_Φ must be separable in α and Φ . Inserting a separable ansatz into Eq. (20) then implies that $c(\Phi) \equiv c$ must be *independent* of Φ .

We may also equate Eqs. (12) and (13) and differentiate with respect to α . The term containing second derivatives in X_\pm may then be eliminated by substituting the differential of Eq. (16) with respect to β_\pm . Moreover, substitution of Eq. (17) then removes any direct dependence on X_α . This procedure leads to the very useful constraints

$$\frac{\partial^2 X_\Phi}{\partial \alpha^2} = \frac{\partial^2 X_\Phi}{\partial \beta_+^2} = \frac{\partial^2 X_\Phi}{\partial \beta_-^2} = c^2 X_\Phi \quad (22)$$

on the second derivatives of X_Φ . These derivatives may be related to those of X_\pm by rewriting Eq. (13):

$$\frac{\partial X_\pm}{\partial \beta_\pm} = -\frac{c}{4c + 6} X_\Phi. \quad (23)$$

If we differentiate this equation twice with respect to β_{\pm} , we find that

$$\frac{\partial^3 X_{\pm}}{\partial \beta_{\pm}^3} = -\frac{c^3}{4c+6} X_{\Phi} \quad (24)$$

after substitution of Eq. (22). Differentiating Eq. (23) twice with respect to β_{\mp} then implies that

$$\frac{\partial^3 X_{\pm}}{\partial \beta_{\mp}^2 \partial \beta_{\pm}} = -\frac{c^3}{4c+6} X_{\Phi}. \quad (25)$$

However, differentiation of Eq. (19) with respect to β_{\pm} implies that

$$\frac{\partial^3 X_{\pm}}{\partial \beta_{\pm}^3} = -\frac{\partial^3 X_{\pm}}{\partial \beta_{\mp}^2 \partial \beta_{\pm}}, \quad (26)$$

so Eqs. (24), (25) and (26) are only consistent if $c = 0$. Thus, $\Lambda(\Phi)$ must be a space–time constant. Eq. (17) then implies that $3X_{\alpha} = X_{\Phi}$ if $\Lambda \neq 0$. When this condition is satisfied, Eq. (12) implies that X_{α} and X_{Φ} must be independent of α , as expected. It then follows from Eq. (10) that these functions must also be independent of Φ . Moreover, Eq. (11) can only be satisfied in this case if $\omega' = 0$. Thus, $\omega(\Phi)$ must also be a space–time constant and this corresponds to the Brans–Dicke theory.

The solution to Eqs. (13)–(16) for constant ω is found to be

$$\begin{aligned} X_{\Phi} &= h_0 + h_+ \beta_+ + h_- \beta_-, & X_{\Phi} &= 3X_{\alpha} \\ X_{\pm} &= x_{\pm} + b_{\pm} \beta_{\mp} - \frac{h_{\pm}}{6} (1 + \omega) \Phi - \frac{h_{\pm}}{6} \alpha, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where $\{h_0, b_+, h_{\pm}, x_{\pm}\}$ are arbitrary constants and $b_- = -b_+$. However, Eq. (18) must also be solved. This condition is trivial for the type I model, but it places further restrictions on the components of \mathbf{X} in the case of the other Bianchi types. Since there are no exponential terms in Eq. (27), Eq. (18) must reduce to six separate constraints:

$$\begin{aligned} m_{11}^2 [X_{\alpha} - 2X_+ - 2\sqrt{3}X_-] &= 0 \\ m_{22}^2 [X_{\alpha} - 2X_+ + 2\sqrt{3}X_-] &= 0 \\ m_{33}^2 [X_{\alpha} + 4X_+] &= 0 \\ m_{11}m_{22} [X_{\alpha} - 2X_+] &= 0 \\ m_{11}m_{33} [X_{\alpha} + X_+ - \sqrt{3}X_-] &= 0 \\ m_{22}m_{33} [X_{\alpha} + X_+ + \sqrt{3}X_-] &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

In the case of the type II model, these equations are satisfied when $h_0 = 6(x_+ + \sqrt{3}x_-)$ and $h_+ = -\sqrt{3}h_- = -6\sqrt{3}b_+$. For types VI₀ and VII₀, the stronger restrictions $X_- = 0$ and $X_{\alpha} = 2X_+ = \text{constant}$ must apply if a symmetry is to exist. However,

the only solution to Eq. (28) for types VIII and IX is $\{X_n\} = 0$, so the field equations for these two models do not admit non-trivial point symmetries.

Eq. (27) is the general solution to Eqs. (10)–(16) when $\Lambda(\Phi) \neq 0$ and Eqs. (17) and (18) are valid. When these conditions are satisfied, therefore, we may conclude that the only vacuum scalar–tensor gravity theory that contains a point symmetry in anisotropic cosmologies is the Brans–Dicke theory with a cosmological constant in the gravitational sector of the theory.

The Brans–Dicke theory also exhibits this symmetry when $\Lambda = 0$. This may be verified by substituting the ansatz $X_\Phi(\beta_\pm) = 3X_\alpha(\beta_\pm)$ into Eqs. (9)–(16). We should emphasize, however, that other theories may also be symmetric when Λ vanishes since the left hand side of Eq. (9) is trivial in this case. Consequently, Eq. (17) does not apply, so Eqs. (20) and (21) are not the unique solutions to Eqs. (10)–(12). This implies that X_Φ could take a more general form to that given in Eq. (27). It would be of interest to investigate whether other theories are indeed symmetric when the dilaton potential vanishes.

Recently, a further symmetry in the Brans–Dicke cosmology was identified within the context of the spatially flat, isotropic Friedmann Universe [14]. It can be shown by direct substitution that action (4) is invariant under a scale factor duality transformation

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha &= \frac{2+3\omega}{4+3\omega}z - \frac{2(1+\omega)}{4+3\omega}w \\ \Phi &= -\frac{6}{4+3\omega}z - \frac{2+3\omega}{4+3\omega}w\end{aligned}\tag{29}$$

when $\omega \neq -4/3$ and $U = \beta_\pm = \Lambda' = 0$. This symmetry is a generalization of the scale factor duality exhibited by the string effective action [15]. It is a discrete symmetry but it may be related to the continuous Noether symmetry discussed in this work.

In the isotropic case the configuration space is two-dimensional and the Lie derivative of the Lagrangian vanishes if $X_\Phi = 3X_\alpha = \text{constant}$ [8]. This Noether symmetry may be employed to generate a new set of variables $q_n = q_n(Q_k)$ ($n, k = 1, 2$). In this case the vector field (8) transforms to

$$\mathbf{X} = (i_{\mathbf{X}}dQ_k) \frac{\partial}{\partial Q_k} + \left[\frac{d}{dt} (i_{\mathbf{X}}dQ_k) \right] \frac{\partial}{\partial \dot{Q}_k},\tag{30}$$

where the contraction is over \mathbf{X} and $dQ_k = (\partial Q_k / \partial q_n) dq_n$ [16]. We may define $\{Q_k\}$ such that they satisfy the first-order partial differential equations

$$i_{\mathbf{X}}dw = \epsilon_1(w, z), \quad i_{\mathbf{X}}dz = \epsilon_2(w, z),\tag{31}$$

where $w \equiv Q_1$, $z \equiv Q_2$ and $\epsilon_i(w, z)$ are particular functions. If we specify these functions as $\epsilon_1 = -3X_\alpha$ and $\epsilon_2 = -X_\alpha$, respectively, the solution to Eq. (31) is given by Eq. (29). Thus, the scale factor duality of the Brans–Dicke theory may be generated by the point symmetry associated with the vector field \mathbf{X} .

We will conclude with some general remarks. The symmetry discussed in this work has a number of applications. Firstly, it leads to a conserved quantity of the form $i_{\mathbf{X}}\theta_L = X_n\partial L/\partial\dot{q}_n$. Since the Lagrangian density is quadratic in \dot{q}_n , the conservation of $i_{\mathbf{X}}\theta_L$ results in an equation that relates the first derivatives of the configuration space variables q_n . This represents a first integral of the field equations (6). In principle, it should be easier to solve this constraint, together with the Hamiltonian constraint, rather than the full system given by Eq. (6).

Thus, the existence of a conservation law implies that the field equations may be simplified considerably and this may lead to new solutions. In particular, it would be interesting to derive new inflationary solutions by this approach. The search for exact inflationary solutions in anisotropic cosmologies is well motivated. These solutions would provide insight into how the anisotropy is effectively washed away by the accelerated expansion, thereby leading to the highly isotropic Universe that is observed today. The question of how the anisotropy may influence the onset of inflation may also be addressed through exact solutions. Such solutions will exist since the symmetry is compatible with a cosmological constant in the gravitational sector of the theory. This term could also arise, for example, from the potential energy of a second scalar field that is coupled to the dilaton field in an appropriate fashion.

We have shown that a Noether symmetry arises in the Bianchi types I, II, VI₀ and VII₀ and have argued that it is unique to the Brans–Dicke theory in these cases. However, our conclusions also apply to other Bianchi models. Although a symmetry of the form discussed here does not exist for the Bianchi types VIII and IX, we may consider the high anisotropic limit of all Bianchi A models where $\beta_{\pm} \gg 1$. In this case, $h_{22}/h_{11} \ll 1$ and $h_{33}/h_{11} \ll 1$, so the dominate term in the curvature potential (5) is $m_{11}^2 h_{11}^2$. In effect, this is equivalent to specifying $m_{11} = 1$ and $m_{22} = m_{33} = 0$ in Eq. (5) and this corresponds to the type II model. Hence, the field equations of the Bianchi types VIII and IX will exhibit an approximate point symmetry if the anisotropy is sufficiently large. This is interesting because the initial state of the Universe may well have been very anisotropic due to quantum effects and the early Universe is precisely the regime where scalar–tensor gravity is thought to have been relevant.

We have not considered the Bianchi class B models directly in this work because the Lagrangian description of the field equations is not always consistent [12]. However, our conclusions will apply for those models in this class that can be expressed in a Lagrangian form, because the corresponding curvature potential will contain exponential terms in β_{\pm} [11]. Consequently, the separation of Eq. (9) into Eqs. (17) and (18) will apply in these cases also. Thus, the point symmetry associated with the Brans–Dicke theory arises in a number of different homogeneous cosmologies.

The question of which scalar-tensor theory may have applied in the early Universe is currently unresolved. There are two approaches that one might take in addressing this question. Firstly, one may identify the subset of theories that are attracted to the general relativistic limit at late times [17]. Alternatively, one may attempt to

uncover a deeper principle that strongly favours one particular theory. Symmetries often provide strong motivation for selecting a given theory from the space of possible theories. We have found that the requirement that a point symmetry exists in the homogeneous, cosmological field equations of generalized scalar–tensor gravity is surprisingly restrictive. Indeed, the Brans–Dicke theory is the only theory to exhibit such a symmetry when the dilaton field self–interacts. This may be significant because the Brans–Dicke theory is consistent with all cosmological observations if $\omega > 500$. If the point symmetry only arose in theories that could not reproduce Einstein gravity at the present epoch, it would be uninteresting. However, we have found that the symmetry is associated with a realistic theory of gravity.

Finally, we considered the Noether symmetry of the Brans–Dicke theory within the context of the spatially flat, isotropic Universe. We showed how it is directly related to a scale factor duality invariance of the theory. The Noether symmetry provides new insight into how the duality arises. It would be of interest to investigate whether the Noether symmetry associated with the anisotropic cosmologies may be employed in a similar fashion to uncover more general discrete symmetries in the Brans–Dicke theory. If such discrete symmetries exist, they could be employed to map a particular solution of the field equations onto a new, generally inequivalent, solution. In the isotropic model, solutions may be generated in this fashion with and without a cosmological term and, indeed, inflationary solutions may be found that are driven entirely by the kinetic energy of the dilaton field [18]. A similar approach could be followed in the anisotropic Universes.

To summarize, therefore, we have investigated the existence of point symmetries in the homogeneous, cosmological field equations of generalized vacuum scalar–tensor gravity under the assumption that the dilaton field self–interacts. In the case of the spatially flat, anisotropic cosmology, we found that the Brans–Dicke theory containing a cosmological constant is the only scalar–tensor theory whose field equations exhibit a point symmetry. We have argued that this result also applies for types II, VI₀ and VII₀. We may conclude, therefore, that the Brans–Dicke theory exhibits a higher level of symmetry than other scalar–tensor theories.

The author is supported by the Particle Physics and Astronomy Research Council (PPARC), UK.

References

1. Bergmann P G 1968 *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **1** 25
Wagoner R V 1970 *Phys. Rev. D* **1** 3209
Nordtvedt K 1970 *Astrophys. J.* **161** 1059
2. Brans C and Dicke R H 1961 *Phys. Rev.* **124** 925

3. Accetta F S, Zoller D J and Turner M S 1985 *Phys. Rev. D* **32** 3046
 Steinhardt P J and Accetta F S 1990 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64** 2470
 García-Bellido J and Quirós M 1990 *Phys. Lett.* **243B** 45
 Levin J J and Freese K 1993 *Phys. Rev. D* **47** 4282
 Levin J J and Freese K 1994 *Nucl. Phys.* **421B** 635
 Barrow J D and Mimoso J P 1994 *Phys. Rev. D* **50** 3746
4. Wands D 1994 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **11** 269
5. Holman R, Kolb E W, Vadas S and Wang Y 1991 *Phys. Rev. D* **43** 995
6. Fradkin E S and Tseytlin A A 1985 *Nucl. Phys.* **261B** 1
 Callan C G, Friedan D, Martinec E and Perry M J 1985 *Nucl. Phys.* **262B** 593
 Green M B, Schwarz J H and Witten E 1988 *Superstring Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
 Casas J A, García-Bellido J and Quirós M 1991 *Nucl. Phys.* **361B** 713
7. Demiański M, de Ritis R, Marmo G, Platania G, Rubano C, Scudellaro P and Stornaiolo C 1991 *Phys. Rev. D* **44** 3136
 Capozziello S and de Ritis R 1994 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **11** 107
 Capozziello S, Demiański M, de Ritis R and Rubano C 1995 *Phys. Rev. D* **52** 3288
8. Capozziello S and de Ritis R 1993 *Phys. Lett.* **177A** 1
9. Ryan M P and Shepley L C 1975 *Homogeneous Relativistic Cosmologies* (Princeton: Princeton University Press)
10. Ellis G F R and MacCallum M A H 1969 *Commun. Math. Phys.* **12** 108
11. Wald R M 1983 *Phys. Rev. D* **28** 2118
12. MacCallum M A H 1979 in *General Relativity; an Einstein Centenary Survey* ed. Hawking S W and Israel W (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
13. Marmo G, Saletan E J, Simoni A and Vitale B 1985 *Dynamical Systems* (New York: Wiley)
14. Lidsey J E 1995 *Phys. Rev. D* **52** R5407

- 15. Veneziano G 1991 *Phys. Lett.* **265B** 287
Gasperini M and Veneziano G 1992 *Phys. Lett.* **277B** 265
Tseytlin A A and Vafa C 1992 *Nucl. Phys.* **372B** 443
Giveon A, Porrati M and Rabinovici E 1994 *Phys. Rep.* **244** 177
- 16. Capozziello S, de Ritis R and Rubano C 1993 *Phys. Lett.* **177A** 8
- 17. Damour T and Nordtvedt K 1993 *Phys. Rev. D* **48** 3436
Damour T and Nordtvedt K 1993 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70** 2217
- 18. Levin J J 1995 *Phys. Rev. D* **51** 462
Gasperini M and Veneziano G 1993 *Astropart. Phys.* **1** 317