

LANL xxx E-print archive No. gr-qc/9805088

Normal frames and the validity of the equivalence principle

III. The case along smooth maps with separable points of self-intersection

Bozhidar Z. Iliev ^{*,†}

Short title: Normal frames and the equivalence principle: III

Classification numbers: 02.40.Hw, 02.40.Ky, 04.20.Cv, 04.50.+h

Ended: December 26, 1992

Revised: July 4, October 19, 1996

Produced: October 4, 2018

LANL xxx E-print archive No. gr-qc/9805088

Sent for submission to J. Phys. A : May 12, 1997

Sent for resubmission to J. Phys. A : November 12, 1997

Published in J. Phys. A: Math. & Gen. vol.31, No. 4, pp.1287–1296, 1998

BO HO

^{*}Department Mathematical Modeling, Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, blvd. Tzarigradsko Chaussée 72, 1784 Sofia, Bulgaria

[†]E-mail address: bozho@inrne.acad.bg

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Mathematical preliminaries	1
3	Derivations along every vector fields	3
4	Derivations along a fixed vector field	8
5	Linear connections	9
6	Conclusion. The equivalence principle	10

Abstract

The equivalence principle is treated on a mathematically rigorous base on sufficiently general subsets of a differentiable manifold. This is carried out using the basis of derivations of the tensor algebra over that manifold. Necessary and/or sufficient conditions of existence, uniqueness, and holonomicity of these bases in which the components of the derivations of the tensor algebra over it vanish on these subsets, are studied. The linear connections are considered in this context. It is shown that the equivalence principle is identically valid at any point, and along any path, in every gravitational theory based on linear connections. On higher dimensional submanifolds it may be valid only in certain exceptional cases.

1 Introduction

In connection with the equivalence principle [1, ch. 16], as well as from purely mathematical reasons [2, 3, 4, 5], an important problem is the existence of local (holonomic or anholonomic [2]) coordinates (bases) in which the components of a linear connection [3] vanish on some subset, usually a submanifold, of a differentiable manifold [3]. This problem has been solved for torsion free, i.e. symmetric, linear connections [3, 4] in the cases at a point [2, 3, 4, 5], along a smooth path without self-intersections [2, 5], and in a neighborhood [2, 5]. These results were generalized in our previous works [6, 7, 8, 9] for arbitrary, with or without torsion, derivations of the tensor algebra over a given differentiable manifold [3] and, in particular, for arbitrary linear connections. General results of this kind can be found in [10], where a criteria is presented for the existence of the above-mentioned special bases (coordinates) on submanifolds of a space with a symmetric affine connection.

The present work is a revised version of [11] and is a continuation of [7, 9]. It generalizes the results from [7, 9, 10] and deals with the problems of existence, uniqueness, and holonomicity of special bases (frames) in which the components of a derivation of the tensor algebra over a differentiable manifold vanish on some its subset of a sufficiently general type (Sect. 3 and Sect. 4). If such frames exist, they are called *normal*. In particular, the considered derivation may be a linear connection (Sect. 5). In this context we make conclusions concerning the general validity and the mathematical formulation of the equivalence principle in a class of gravitational theories (Sect. 6).

2 Mathematical preliminaries

Below we reproduce for further reference purposes, as well as for the exact statement of the above problems, a few simple facts about derivations of tensor algebras that can be found in [7, 9] or derived from the those in [3].

Let D be a derivation of the tensor algebra over a manifold M [12, 3]. By [3, proposition 3.3 of chapter I] there exist a unique vector field X and a unique tensor field S of type $(1,1)$ such that $D = L_X + S$. Here L_X is the Lie derivative along X [12, 3] and S is considered as a derivation of the tensor algebra over M [3].

If S maps from the set of C^1 vector fields into the tensor fields of type $(1,1)$ and $S : X \mapsto S_X$, then the equation $D_X^S = L_X + S_X$ defines a derivation of the tensor algebra over M for any C^1 vector field X [3]. Such a derivation will be called an S -derivation along X and denoted for brevity simply by D_X . An S -derivation is a map D such that $D : X \mapsto D_X$, where D_X is an S -derivation along X .

Let $\{E_i, i = 1, \dots, n := \dim(M)\}$ be a (coordinate or not [2, 4]) local basis (frame) of vector fields in the tangent bundle to M . It is holonomic (anholonomic) if the vectors E_1, \dots, E_n commute (do not commute) [2, 4]. Using the explicit action of L_X and S_X on tensor fields [3] one can easily deduce the explicit form of the local components of $D_X T$ for any C^1 tensor field T . In particular, the *components* $(W_X)_j^i$ of D_X are defined by

$$D_X(E_j) = (W_X)_j^i E_i. \quad (2.1)$$

Here and below all Latin indices, perhaps with some super- or subscripts, run from 1 to $n := \dim(M)$ and the usual summation rule on indices repeated on different levels is assumed. It is easily seen that $(W_X)_j^i := (S_X)_j^i - E_j(X^i) + C_{kj}^i X^k$ where $X(f)$ denotes the action of $X = X^k E_k$ on the C^1 scalar function f , as $X(f) := X^k E_k(f)$, and the C_{kj}^i define the commutators of the basic vector fields by $[E_j, E_k] = C_{jk}^i E_i$.

The change $\{E_i\} \mapsto \{E'_m := A_m^i E_i\}$, $A := [A_m^i]$ being a nondegenerate matrix function, implies the transformation of $(W_X)_j^i$ into (see (2.1)) $(W'_X)_l^m = (A^{-1})_i^m A_l^j (W_X)_j^i + (A^{-1})_i^m X(A_l^i)$. Introducing the matrices $W_X := [(W_X)_j^i]$ and $W'_X := [(W'_X)_l^m]$ and putting $X(A) := X^k E_k(A) = [X^k E_k(A_m^i)]$, we get

$$W'_X = A^{-1} \{W_X A + X(A)\}. \quad (2.2)$$

If ∇ is a linear connection with local components Γ_{jk}^i (see, e.g., [12, 3, 4]), then $\nabla_X(E_j) = (\Gamma_{jk}^i X^k) E_i$ [3]. Hence, we see from (2.1) that D_X is a covariant differentiation along X iff

$$(W_X)_j^i = \Gamma_{jk}^i X^k \quad (2.3)$$

for some functions Γ_{jk}^i .

Let D be an S-derivation and X and Y be vector fields. The *torsion operator* T^D of D is defined as

$$T^D(X, Y) := D_X Y - D_Y X - [X, Y]. \quad (2.4)$$

The S-derivation D is *torsion free* if $T^D = 0$ (cf. [3]).

For a linear connection ∇ , due to (2.3), we have $(T^\nabla(X, Y))^i = T_{kl}^i X^k Y^l$ where $T_{kl}^i := -(\Gamma_{kl}^i - \Gamma_{lk}^i) - C_{kl}^i$ are the components of the torsion tensor of ∇ [3].

Further we investigate the problem of existence of bases $\{E'_i\}$ in which $W'_X = 0$ for an S-derivation D along any or a fixed vector field X . These bases (frames), if any, are called *normal*. Hence, due to (2.2), we have to solve the equation $W_X(A) + X(A) = 0$ with respect to A under conditions that will be presented below.

3 Derivations along every vector fields

This section is devoted to the existence and some properties of special bases (frames) $\{E'_i\}$, defined in a neighborhood of a subset U of the manifold M , in which the components of an S -derivation D_X along an *every* vector field X vanish on U . These bases (frames), if any, are called *normal in U* .

The derivation D is called *linear on the set $U \subseteq M$* (cf. (2.3)) in some (and hence in any) basis $\{E_i\}$ is fulfilled

$$W_X(x) = \Gamma_k(x)X^k(x), \quad (3.1)$$

where $x \in U$, $X = X^k E_k$, and Γ_k are some matrix functions on U . Evidently, a linear connection on M is a linear on U for every U (see (2.3)).

Proposition 3.1 *If for some S -derivation D there exists a normal basis $\{E'_i\}$ in $U \subseteq M$, i.e. $W'_X|_U = 0$ for every vector field X , then D is linear on the set U .*

Proof. Let us fix a basis $\{E_i\}$ and put $E'_i = A_i^j E_j$. Then $W'_X|_U = 0$, i.e. $W'_X(x) = 0$ for $x \in U$, which, in conformity with (2.2), is equivalent to (3.1) with $\Gamma_k = -(E_k(A))A^{-1}$, $A = [A_j^i]$. ■

The opposite statement to proposition 3.1 is generally not true and for its appropriate formulation we need some preliminary results and explanations.

Let p be an integer, $p \geq 1$, and the Greek indices α and β run from 1 to p . Let J^p be a neighborhood in \mathbb{R}^p and $\{s^\alpha\} = \{s^1, \dots, s^p\}$ be (Cartesian) coordinates in \mathbb{R}^p .

Lemma 3.1 *Let $Z_\alpha : J^p \rightarrow \text{GL}(m, \mathbb{R})$, $\text{GL}(m, \mathbb{R})$ being the group of $m \times m$ matrices on \mathbb{R} , be C^1 matrix-valued functions on J^p . Then the initial-value problem*

$$\left. \frac{\partial Y}{\partial s^\alpha} \right|_s = Z_\alpha(s)Y, \quad Y|_{s=s_0} = \mathbb{1}, \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, p, \quad (3.2)$$

where $\mathbb{1} := [\delta_j^i]_{i,j=1}^m$ is the unit matrix of the corresponding size, $s \in J^p$, $s_0 \in J^p$ is fixed, and Y is $m \times m$ matrix function on J^p , has a solution, denoted by $Y = Y(s, s_0; Z_1, \dots, Z_p)$, which is unique and smoothly depends on all its arguments if and only if

$$R_{\alpha\beta}(Z_1, \dots, Z_p) := \frac{\partial Z_\alpha}{\partial s^\beta} - \frac{\partial Z_\beta}{\partial s^\alpha} + Z_\alpha Z_\beta - Z_\beta Z_\alpha = 0. \quad (3.3)$$

Proof. According to the results from [13, chapter VI], in which Z_1, \dots, Z_p are of class C^1 , the integrability conditions for (3.2) are (cf. [13, chapter VI, equation (1.4)])

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{\partial^2 Y}{\partial s^\alpha \partial s^\beta} - \frac{\partial^2 Y}{\partial s^\beta \partial s^\alpha} = \frac{\partial(Z_\beta Y)}{\partial s^\alpha} - \frac{\partial(Z_\alpha Y)}{\partial s^\beta} = \\ &= \frac{\partial Z_\beta}{\partial s^\alpha} Y - \frac{\partial Z_\alpha}{\partial s^\beta} Y + Z_\beta Z_\alpha Y - Z_\alpha Z_\beta Y = -R_{\alpha\beta}(Z_1, \dots, Z_p)Y. \end{aligned}$$

Hence (see, e.g. [13, chapter VI, theorem 6.1]) the initial-value problem (3.2) has a unique solution (of class C^2) iff (3.3) is satisfied. ■

Let $p \leq n := \dim(M)$, $\alpha, \beta = 1, \dots, p$ and $\mu, \nu = p+1, \dots, n$. Let $\gamma : J^p \rightarrow M$ be a C^1 map. We suppose that for any $s \in J^p$ there exists its (p -dimensional) neighborhood $J_s \subseteq J^p$ such that the restricted map $\gamma|_{J_s} : J_s \rightarrow M$ is without self-intersections, i.e. in J_s does not exist points s_1 and $s_2 \neq s_1$ with the property $\gamma(s_1) = \gamma(s_2)$. This assumption is equivalent to the one that the points of self-intersections of γ , if any, can be separated by neighborhoods. With J_s^p we denote the union of all the neighborhoods J_s with the above property; evidently, J_s^p is the maximal neighborhood of s in which γ is without self-intersections.

Let us suppose at first that $J_s^p = J^p$, i.e. that γ is without self-intersection, and that $\gamma(J^p)$ is contained in a single coordinate neighborhood V of M .

Let us fix some one-to-one C^1 map $\eta : J^p \times J^{n-p} \rightarrow M$ such that $\eta(\cdot, \mathbf{t}_0) = \gamma$ for a fixed $\mathbf{t}_0 \in J^{n-p}$, i.e. $\eta(s, \mathbf{t}_0) = \gamma(s)$, $s \in J^p$. In $V \cap \eta(J^p, J^{n-p})$ we define coordinates $\{x^i\}$ by putting $(x^1(\eta(s, \mathbf{t})), \dots, x^n(\eta(s, \mathbf{t}))) := (s, \mathbf{t}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $s \in J^p$, $\mathbf{t} \in J^{n-p}$.

Proposition 3.2 *Let $\gamma : J^p \rightarrow M$ be a C^1 map without self-intersections and such that $\gamma(J^p)$ lies only in one coordinate neighborhood. Let the derivation D be linear on $\gamma(J^p)$. Then a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a basis $\{E'_i\}$, defined in a neighborhood of $\gamma(J^p)$, in which the components of D along every vector field vanish on $\gamma(J^p)$ is the validity in the above-defined coordinates $\{x^i\}$ of the equalities*

$$[R_{\alpha\beta}(-\Gamma_1 \circ \gamma, \dots, -\Gamma_p \circ \gamma)]|_{J^p} = 0, \quad \alpha, \beta = 1, \dots, p, \quad (3.4)$$

where $R_{\alpha\beta}(\dots)$ are defined by (3.3) for $m = n$ and $(s^1, \dots, s^p) = s \in J^p$, i.e.

$$[R_{\alpha\beta}(-\Gamma_1 \circ \gamma, \dots, -\Gamma_p \circ \gamma)](s) = \frac{\partial \Gamma_\alpha(\gamma(s))}{\partial s^\beta} - \frac{\partial \Gamma_\beta(\gamma(s))}{\partial s^\alpha} + (\Gamma_\alpha \Gamma_\beta - \Gamma_\beta \Gamma_\alpha)|_{\gamma(s)}. \quad (3.5)$$

Remark. This result was obtained by means of another method in [10] for the special case when D is a symmetric affine connection and U is a submanifold of M .

Proof. The following considerations will be done in the above-defined neighborhood $V \cap \eta(J^p, J^{n-p})$ and coordinates $\{x^i\}$. Let $E_i = \partial/\partial x^i$.

NECESSITY. Let there exists a normal frame $\{E'_i = A_i^j E_j\}$ on $\gamma(J^p)$, i.e. $W_X^i(\gamma(s)) = 0$, $s \in J^p$. By (2.2) the existence of $\{E'_i\}$ is equivalent to that of $A = [A_i^j]$, transforming $\{E_i\}$ into $\{E'_i\}$, and such that $[A^{-1}(W_X A + X(A))]|_{\gamma(s)} = 0$ for every X . As D is linear on $\gamma(J^p)$ (cf.

proposition 3.1), the equation (3.1) is valid for $x \in \gamma(J^p)$ and some matrix-valued functions Γ_k . Consequently A must be a solution of $\Gamma'_k(x) = 0$, i.e. of

$$\Gamma_k(\gamma(s))A(\gamma(s)) + \frac{\partial A}{\partial x^k} \Big|_{\gamma(s)} = 0, \quad s \in J^p. \quad (3.6)$$

Now define nondegenerate matrix-valued functions B and B_i by

$$A(\gamma(s)) = B(s), \quad \frac{\partial A}{\partial x^\alpha} \Big|_{\gamma(s)} = \frac{\partial B(s)}{\partial s^\alpha}, \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, p,$$

$$\frac{\partial A}{\partial x^\nu} \Big|_{\gamma(s)} = B_\nu(s), \quad \nu = p+1, \dots, n.$$

Substituting these equalities into (3.6), we see that it splits to

$$\Gamma_\alpha(\gamma(s))B(s) + \frac{\partial B(s)}{\partial s^\alpha} = 0, \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, p, \quad (3.7)$$

$$\Gamma_\nu(\gamma(s))B(s) + B_\nu(s) = 0, \quad \nu = p+1, \dots, n. \quad (3.8)$$

As these equations do not involve B_α , the B_α 's are left arbitrary by (3.6), while the remaining B_i 's are expressed via $B(s)$ through (see (3.8))

$$B_\nu(s) = -\Gamma_\nu(\gamma(s))B(s), \quad \nu = p+1, \dots, n. \quad (3.9)$$

So, $B(s)$ is the only quantity for determination. It must satisfy (3.7). If we arbitrary fix the value $B(s_0) = B_0$ for a fixed $s_0 \in J^p$ and put $Y(s) = B(s)B_0^{-1}$ (B is a nondegenerate as A is such by definition), we see that Y is a solution of the initial-value problem

$$\frac{\partial Y}{\partial s^\alpha} \Big|_s = -\Gamma_\alpha(\gamma(s))Y(s), \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, p, \quad Y|_{s=s_0} = \mathbb{1}_p = [\delta_j^i]_{i,j=1}^p. \quad (3.10)$$

By lemma 3.1 this initial-value problem has a unique solution $Y = Y(s, s_0; -\Gamma_1 \circ \gamma, \dots, -\Gamma_p \circ \gamma)$ iff the integrability conditions (3.4) are valid.

Consequently the existence of $\{E'_i\}$ (or of A) leads to (3.4).

SUFFICIENCY. If (3.4) take place, the general solution of (3.7) is

$$B(s) = Y(s, s_0; -\Gamma_1 \circ \gamma, \dots, -\Gamma_p \circ \gamma)B_0, \quad (3.11)$$

in which $s_0 \in J^p$ and the nondegenerate matrix B_0 are fixed. Consequently, admitting A to be a C^1 matrix-valued function, we see that in $V \cap \eta(J^p, J^{n-p})$ we can expand $A(\eta(s, \mathbf{t}))$, $s \in J^p$, $\mathbf{t} \in J^{n-p}$ up to second order terms with respect to $(\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{t}_0)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} A(\eta(s, \mathbf{t})) &= B(s) + B_i(s)[x^i(\eta(s, \mathbf{t})) - x^i(\eta(s, \mathbf{t}_0))] + \\ &+ B_{ij}(s, \mathbf{t}; \eta)[x^i(\eta(s, \mathbf{t})) - x^i(\eta(s, \mathbf{t}_0))][x^j(\eta(s, \mathbf{t})) - x^j(\eta(s, \mathbf{t}_0))] \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

for the above-defined matrix-valued functions B , B_i , and some B_{ij} , which are such that $\det B(s) \neq 0, \infty$ and B_{ij} and their first derivatives are bounded when $\mathbf{t} \rightarrow \mathbf{t}_0$. (Note that in (3.12) the terms corresponding to $i, j = 1, \dots, p$ are equal to zero due to the definition of $\{x^i\}$.) In this case, due to (3.7)–(3.11), the general solution of (3.6) is

$$\begin{aligned} A(\eta(s, \mathbf{t})) &= \left\{ \mathbb{1} - \sum_{\lambda=p+1}^n \Gamma_\lambda(\gamma(s)) [x^\lambda(\eta(s, \mathbf{t})) - x^\lambda(\gamma(s))] \right\} \times \\ &\times Y(s, s_0; -\Gamma_1 \circ \gamma, \dots, -\Gamma_p \circ \gamma) B_0 + \sum_{\mu, \nu=p+1}^n \left\{ B_{\mu\nu}(s, \mathbf{t}; \eta) \times \right. \\ &\left. \times [x^\mu(\eta(s, \mathbf{t})) - x^\mu(\gamma(s))] [x^\nu(\eta(s, \mathbf{t})) - x^\nu(\gamma(s))] \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

where $s_0 \in J^p$ and the nondegenerate matrix B_0 are fixed and $B_{\mu\nu}$, $\mu, \nu = p+1, \dots, n$, together with their first derivatives are bounded when $\mathbf{t} \rightarrow \mathbf{t}_0$. (The fact that into (3.13) enter only sums from $p+1$ to n is a consequence from $x^\alpha(\eta(s, \mathbf{t})) = x^\alpha(\gamma(s)) = s^\alpha$, i.e. $x^\alpha(\eta(s, \mathbf{t})) - x^\alpha(\eta(s, \mathbf{t}_0)) = x^\alpha(\eta(s, \mathbf{t})) - x^\alpha(\gamma(s)) = s^\alpha - s^\alpha \equiv 0$, $\alpha = 1, \dots, p$.)

Hence, from (3.4) follows the existence of a class of matrices $A(x)$, $x \in V \cap \eta(J^p, J^{n-p})$ such that the frames $\{E'_i = A^j_i E_j\}$ are normal for D (which is supposed to be linear on $\gamma(J^p)$). ■

Thus bases $\{E'_i\}$ in which $W'_X = 0$ exist iff (3.4) is satisfied. If (3.4) is valid, then the normal bases $\{E'_i\}$ are obtained from $\{E_i = \partial/\partial x^i\}$ by means of linear transformations whose matrices must have the form (3.13).

Now we are ready to consider a general smooth (C^1) map $\gamma : J^p \rightarrow M$ whose points of self-intersection, if any, can be separated by neighborhoods. For any $r \in J^p$ chose a coordinate neighborhood $V_{\gamma(r)}$ of $\gamma(r)$ in M . Let there be given a fixed C^1 one-to-one map $\eta_r : J^p_r \times J^{n-p} \rightarrow M$ such that $\eta_r(\cdot, \mathbf{t}_0^r) = \gamma|_{J^p_r}$ for some $\mathbf{t}_0^r \in J^{n-p}$. In the neighborhood $V_{\gamma(r)} \cap \eta_r(J^p_r, J^{n-p})$ of $\gamma(J^p_r) \cap V_{\gamma(r)}$ we introduce local coordinates $\{x^i_r\}$ defined by

$$(x^1_r(\eta_r(s, \mathbf{t})), \dots, x^n_r(\eta_r(s, \mathbf{t}))) := (s, \mathbf{t}) \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where $s \in J^p_r$ and $\mathbf{t} \in J^{n-p}$ are such that $\eta_r(s, \mathbf{t}) \in V_{\gamma(r)}$.

Theorem 3.1 *Let the points of self-intersection of the C^1 map $\gamma : J^p \rightarrow M$, if any, be separable by neighborhoods. Let the S -derivation D be linear on $\gamma(J^p)$, i.e. (3.1) to be valid for $x \in \gamma(J^p)$. Then a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence in some neighborhood of $\gamma(J^p)$ of a basis $\{E'_i\}$ in which the components of D (along every vector field) vanish on $\gamma(J^p)$ is for every $r \in J$ in the above-defined local coordinates $\{x^i_r\}$ to be fulfilled*

$$[R_{\alpha\beta}(-\Gamma_1 \circ \gamma, \dots, -\Gamma_p \circ \gamma)](s) = 0, \quad \alpha, \beta = 1, \dots, p, \quad (3.14)$$

where Γ_α are calculated by means of (3.1) in $\{x^i_r\}$, $R_{\alpha\beta}$ are given by (3.5), and $s \in J^p_r$ is such that $\gamma(s) \in V_{\gamma(r)}$.

Proof. For any $r \in J^p$ the restricted map $\gamma|_{J_r^p} : J_r^p \rightarrow M$, where $J_r^p := \{s \in J_r^p, \gamma(s) \in V_{\gamma(s)}\}$, is without self-intersections (see the above definition of J_r^p) and $\gamma|_{J_r^p}(J_r^p) = \gamma(J_r^p)$ lies in the coordinate neighborhood $V_{\gamma(r)}$.

So, if exists a normal frame $\{E'_i\}$ for D , then, by proposition 3.2, the equations (3.14) are identically satisfied.

Conversely, if (3.14) are valid, then, again, by proposition 3.2 for every $r \in J^p$ in a certain neighborhood V_r of $\gamma(J_r^p)$ in $V_{\gamma(r)}$ exists a normal on $\gamma(J_r^p)$ basis $\{E'_i\}$ for D_X along every vector field X . From the neighborhoods V_r we can construct a neighborhood V of $\gamma(J^p)$, e.g., by putting $V = \bigcup_{r \in J^p} V_r$. Generally, V is sufficient to be taken as a union of V_r for some, but not all $r \in J^p$. On V we can obtain a normal basis $\{E'_i\}$ by putting $E'_i|_x = E_i^r|_x$ if x belongs to only one neighborhood V_r . If x belongs to more than one neighborhood V_r we can choose $\{E'_i|_x\}$ to be the basis $\{E_i^r|_x\}$ for some arbitrary fixed r . ■

Remark. Note that generally the basis obtained at the end of the proof of theorem 3.1 is not continuous in the regions containing intersections of several neighborhoods V_r . Hence it is, generally, no longer differentiable there. Therefore the adjective ‘normal’ is not very suitable in the mentioned regions. May be in such cases is better to be spoken about ‘special’ frames instead of ‘normal’ ones.

Proposition 3.3 *If on the set $U \subseteq M$ there exists normal frames on U for some S -derivation along every vector field, then all of them are connected by linear transformations whose coefficients are such that the action on them of the corresponding basic vectors vanishes on U .*

Proof. If $\{E_i\}$ and $\{E'_i = A_i^j E_j\}$ are normal on U bases, i.e. if $W_X(x) = W'_X(x) = 0$ for $x \in U$ and every vector field $X = X^i E_i$, then due to (2.2), we have $X(A)|_U = 0$, i.e. $E_i(A)|_U = 0$. Conversely, if $W_X|_U = 0$ in $\{E_i\}$ and $E'_i = A_i^j E_j$ with $E_i(A)|_U = 0$, then from (2.2) follows $W'_X(x)|_U = 0$, i.e. $\{E'_i\}$ is also a normal basis. ■

Proposition 3.4 *If for some S -derivation D there exists a local holonomic normal basis on the set $U \subseteq M$ for D along every vector field, then D is torsion free on U . On the other hand, if D is torsion free on U and there exist smooth (C^1) normal bases on U for D along every vector field, then all of them are holonomic on U , i.e. their basic vectors commute on U .*

Proof. If $\{E'_i\}$ is a normal basis on U , i.e. $W'_X(x) = 0$ for every X and $x \in U$, then using (2.1) and (2.4) (see also [6, eq. (15)]), we find $T^D(E'_i, E'_j)|_U = -[E'_i, E'_j]|_U$. Consequently $\{E'_i\}$ is holonomic on U , i.e. $[E'_i, E'_j]|_U = 0$, iff $0 = T^D(X, Y)|_U = \{X^i Y^j T^D(E'_i, E'_j)\}|_U$ for every vector fields X and Y , which is equivalent to $T^D|_U = 0$.

Conversely, let $T^D|_U = 0$. We want to prove that any basis $\{E'_i = A_i^j E_j\}$ in which $W'_X = 0$ is holonomic on U . The holonomicity on U means $0 = [E'_i, E'_j]|_U = \{-(A^{-1})^l_k [E'_j(A_i^k) - E'_i(A_j^k)] E'_l\}|_U$. However (see proposition 3.1 and (3.1)) the existence of $\{E'_i\}$ is equivalent to $W_X|_U = (\Gamma_k X^k)|_U$ for some functions Γ_k and every X . These two facts, combined with (2.1) and (2.4), lead to $(\Gamma_k)_j^i = (\Gamma_j)_k^i$. Using this and $\{\Gamma_k A + \partial A / \partial x^k\}|_U = 0$ (see the proof of proposition 3.1), we find $E'_j(A_i^k)|_U = -\left\{A_j^l A_i^m (\Gamma_l)_m^k\right\}|_U = \left(E'_i(A_j^k)\right)|_U$. Therefore $[E'_i, E'_j]|_U = 0$ (see above), i.e. $\{E'_i\}$ is holonomic on U . ■

4 Derivations along a fixed vector field

In this section we briefly outline some results concerning normal frames for (S-)derivations along a *fixed vector field*.

A derivation D_X is linear on $U \subseteq M$ along a *fixed* vector field X if (3.1) holds for $x \in U$ and the given X . In this sense, evidently, *any derivation along a fixed vector field is linear on every set* and, consequently, on the whole manifold M . Namely this is the cause due to which the analogue of proposition 3.1 for such derivations, which is evidently true, is absolutely trivial and does even need not to be formulated.

The existence of normal frames in which the components of D_X , with a *fixed* X , vanish on some set $U \subseteq M$ significantly differs from the same problem for D_X with an *every* X (see Sect. 3). In fact, if $\{E'_i = A_i^j E_j\}$, $\{E_i\}$ being a fixed basis on U , is a normal frame on U , i.e. $W'_X|_U = 0$, then, due to (2.2), its existence is equivalent to the one of $A := [A_i^j]$ for which $(W_X A + X(A))|_U = 0$ for the *given* X . As X is *fixed*, the values of A at two different points, say $x, y \in U$, are connected through the last equation if and only if x and y lie on one and the same integral curve of X , the part of which between x and y belongs entirely to U . Hence, if $\gamma : J \rightarrow M$, J being an \mathbb{R} -interval, is (a part of) an integral curve of X , i.e. at $\gamma(s)$, $s \in J$ the tangent to γ vector field $\dot{\gamma}$ is $\dot{\gamma}(s) := X|_{\gamma(s)}$, then along γ the equation $(W_X A + X(A))|_U = 0$ reduces to $dA/ds|_{\gamma(s)} = \dot{\gamma}(A)|_s = (X(A))|_{\gamma(s)} = -W_X(\gamma(s))A(\gamma(s))$. Using lemma 3.1 for $p = 1$, we see that the general solution of this equation is

$$A(s; \gamma) = Y(s, s_0; -W_X \circ \gamma) B(\gamma), \quad (4.1)$$

where $s_0 \in J$ is fixed, $Y = Y(s, s_0; Z)$, Z being a C^1 matrix function of s , is the unique solution of the initial-value problem (see [13, ch. IV, §1])

$$\frac{dY}{ds} = ZY, \quad Y|_{s=s_0} = \mathbb{1}, \quad (4.2)$$

and the nondegenerate matrix $B(\gamma)$ may depend only on γ , but not on s . (Note that (4.2) is a special case of (3.2) for $p = 1$ and by lemma 3.1 it has always a unique solution because $R_{11}(Z_1) \equiv 0$ due to (3.3) for $p = 1$.)

From the above considerations, the next propositions follow.

Proposition 4.1 *There exist normal bases for any S -derivation along a fixed vector field on every set $U \subseteq M$.*

Proposition 4.2 *The normal on the set $U \subseteq M$ bases for some S -derivation along a fixed vector field X are connected by linear transformations whose matrices are such that the action of X on them vanishes on U .*

Proof. If $\{E_i\}$ and $\{E'_i = A_i^j E_j\}$ are such that $W'_X|_U = W_X|_U = 0$, then, due to (2.2), we have $X(A)|_U = 0$. On the other hand, if $W_X|_U = 0$ and $X(A)|_U = 0$, then, by (2.2), is fulfilled $W'_X|_U = 0$, i.e. $\{E'_i\}$ is normal. ■

5 Linear connections

The results of Sect. 3 can directly be applied to the case of linear connections. As this is more or less trivial, we present below only three such consequences.

Corollary 5.1 *Let the points of self-intersection of the C^1 map $\gamma : J^p \rightarrow M$, if any, be separable by neighborhoods, ∇ be a linear connection on M with local components Γ_{jk}^i (in a basis $\{E_i\}$) and $\Gamma_k := [\Gamma_{jk}^i]_{i,j=1}^n$. Then in a neighborhood of $\gamma(J^p)$ there exists a normal frame $\{E'_i\}$ on $\gamma(J^p)$ for ∇ , i.e. $\Gamma'_k|_{\gamma(J^p)} = 0$, iff for every $r \in J^p$ in the coordinates $\{x_r^i\}$ (defined before theorem 3.1) is satisfied (3.14) in which Γ_α , $\alpha = 1, \dots, p$ are part of the components of ∇ in $\{x_r^i\}$ and $s \in J^p$ is such that $\gamma(s) \in V_{\gamma(r)}$.*

Proof. For linear connections (3.1) is valid for every X in any basis. So, if in a basis $\{E'_i\}$ is fulfilled $W'_X|_U = 0$ for $U \subseteq M$, we have in it $\Gamma'_k|_U = 0$ (see (2.2)) and vice versa, if in a basis $\{E'_i\}$ is valid $\Gamma'_k|_U = 0$, then $W_X|_U = 0$ for every X . Combining this fact with theorem 3.1, we get the required result. ■

Corollary 5.2 *If on the set $U \subseteq M$ there exist normal frames for some linear connection on U , then these frames are connected by linear transformations whose matrices are such that the action of the corresponding basic vectors on them vanishes on U .*

Proof. The result follows from proposition 3.3 and the proof of corollary 5.1. ■

Corollary 5.3 *Let, for some linear connection on a neighborhood of some set $U \subseteq M$, there exist locally smooth normal bases on U . Then one (and hence any) such basis is holonomic on U iff the connection is torsion free on U .*

Proof. The statement follows from (3.1) (or (2.3)) and proposition 3.4. ■

6 Conclusion. The equivalence principle

Mathematically theorem 3.1 is the main result of this work. From the view point of its physical application, it expresses a sufficiently general necessary and sufficient condition for existence of the considered here normal frames for tensor derivations, that, in particular, can be linear connections. For instance, it covers that problem on arbitrary submanifolds. In this sense, its special cases are the results from [10] and from our previous papers [7, 9].

Let $\gamma: J^p \rightarrow M$, with J^p being a neighborhood in \mathbb{R}^p for some integer $p \leq \dim M$, be a C^1 map. If $p = 0$ or $p = 1$, then the conditions (3.14) are identically satisfied, i.e. $R_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ (see (3.5)). Hence in these two cases normal bases along γ always exist (respectively at a point or along a path), which was already established in [7, 6] (and independently in [14]) and in [9] respectively.

In the other limiting case, $p = n := \dim(M)$, it is easily seen that the quantities (3.5) are simply the matrices formed from the components of the corresponding curvature tensor [7, 3, 4] and that the set $\gamma(J^p)$ consists of one or more neighborhoods in M . Consequently, now theorem 3.1 states that the normal frames investigated here exist iff the corresponding derivation is flat, i.e. if its curvature tensor is zero, a result already found in [7].

In the general case, when $2 \leq p < n$ (for $n \geq 3$), normal bases, even anholonomic, do not exist if (and only if) the conditions (3.14) are not satisfied. Besides, in this case the quantities (3.5) cannot be considered as a ‘curvature’ of $\gamma(J^p)$. They are something like ‘commutators’ of covariant derivatives of a type ∇_F , where F is a tangent to $\gamma(J^p)$ vector field (i.e. $F|_x \in T|_x(\gamma(J^p))$ if $\gamma(J^p)$ is a submanifold of M), and which act on tangent to M vector fields.

Let us also note that the normal frames on a set U are generally anholonomic. They may be holonomic only in the torsion free case when the derivation’s torsion vanishes on U .

The results of this work, as well as the ones of [7, 9], are important in connection with the use of normal frames in gravitational theories [1, 15]. In particular now we know that there exist normal frames (at a point or along paths) in Riemann-Cartan spacetimes, a problem that was open until recently [15].

The above results outline the general bounds of validity and express the exact mathematical form of the equivalence principle. This principle

requires [1] that the gravitational field strength, theoretically identified with the components of a linear connection, can locally be transformed to zero by a suitable choice of the local reference frame (basis), i.e. by it there have to exist local bases in which the corresponding connection's components vanish.

The above discussion, as well as the results from [7, 9], show the identical validity of the equivalence principle in zero and one dimensional cases, i.e. for $p = 0$ and $p = 1$. Besides, these are the *only cases* when it is fulfilled for *arbitrary* gravitational fields. In fact, for $p \geq 2$ (in the case $n \geq 2$), as we saw in Sect. 5, normal bases do not exist unless the conditions (3.14) are satisfied. In particular, for $p = n \geq 2$ it is valid only for flat linear connections (cf. [7]).

Mathematically the equivalence principle is expressed through corollary 5.1 or, in some more general situations, through theorem 3.1. Thus we see that in gravitational theories based on linear connections this principle is identically satisfied at any fixed point or along any fixed path, but on submanifolds of dimension greater or equal two it is generally not valid. Therefore in this class of gravitational theories the equivalence principle is a theorem derived from their mathematical background. It may play a role as a principle if one tries to construct a gravitational theory based on more general derivations, but then, generally, it will reduce such a theory to one based on linear connections.

A comprehensive analysis of the equivalence principle on the base of the present work and [7, 9] can be found in [16].

References

- [1] Misner C. W., Thorne K. S., and Wheeler J. A. *Gravitation*. W. H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco, 1973.
- [2] Schouten J. A. *Ricci-Calculus: An Introduction to Tensor Analysis and its Geometrical Applications*. Springer Verlag, Berlin-Göttingen-Heidelberg, second edition, 1954.
- [3] Kobayashi S. and Nomizu K. *Foundations of Differential Geometry*, volume I. Interscience Publishers, New York-London, 1963.
- [4] Lovelock D. and H. Rund. *Tensors, Differential Forms, and Variational Principles*. Wiley-Interscience Publication, John Wiley & Sons, New York-London-Sydney-Toronto, 1975.
- [5] Rashevskii P. K. *Riemannian Geometry and Tensor Analysis*. Nauka, Moscow, 1967. (In Russian).

- [6] Iliev B. Z. Special bases for derivations of tensor algebras. I. Cases in a neighborhood and at a point. JINR Communication E5-92-507, Dubna, 1992.
- [7] Iliev B. Z. Normal frames and the validity of the equivalence principle: I. Cases in a neighborhood and at a point. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 29(21):6895–6901, 1996. (LANL xxx archive server, E-print No. gr-qc/9608019).
- [8] Iliev B. Z. Special bases for derivations of tensor algebras. II. Case along paths. JINR Communication E5-92-508, Dubna, 1992.
- [9] Iliev B. Z. Normal frames and the validity of the equivalence principle: II. The case along paths. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 30(12):4327–4336, 1997. (LANL xxx archive server, E-print No. gr-qc/9709053).
- [10] O’ Raifeartaigh L. Fermi coordinates. *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, 59 Sec.A(2):15–24, 1958.
- [11] Iliev B. Z. Special bases for derivations of tensor algebras. III. Case along smooth maps with separable points of selfintersection. JINR Communication E5-92-543, Dubna, 1992.
- [12] Dubrovin B. A., Fomenko A. T., and Novikov S. P. *Modern geometry: methods and applications, pt. 2*, volume 104 of *Graduate text in Mathematics: The geometry and topology of manifolds*. Springer, New York, 1985. (Transl. from the original Russian ed., Moscow, Nauka, 1979).
- [13] Hartman Ph. *Ordinary Differential Equations*. John Wiley & Sons, New York-London-Sydney, 1964.
- [14] Hartley D. Normal frames for non-Riemannian connections. *Class. Quantum Grav.*, 12(11):L103–L105, nov 1995. (LANL xxx archive server, E-print No. gr-qc/9510013).
- [15] Gronwald F. and Hehl F. W. On gauge aspects of gravity. In Bergmann P. G., de Sabbata V., and Treder H.-J., editors, *Quantum Cosmology*, Proc. of the 14-th Course of the School of Cosmology and Gravitation, pages 148–198, Erice, Italy, May 1995, 1996. World Scientific, Singapore. (LANL xxx archive server, E-print No. gr-qc/9602013).
- [16] Iliev B. Z. Is the principle of equivalence a principle? *Journal of Geometry and Physics*, 24(3):209–222, 1997.