

ANNALES DE L'I. H. P., SECTION A

S. C. CHANG

ALLEN I. JANIS

A note on Perng's unified field theory

Annales de l'I. H. P., section A, tome 17, n° 3 (1972), p. 291-293

http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AIHPA_1972__17_3_291_0

© Gauthier-Villars, 1972, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Annales de l'I. H. P., section A » implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (<http://www.numdam.org/conditions>). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques

<http://www.numdam.org/>

A note on Perng's unified field theory*

by

S. C. CHANG and ALLEN I. JANIS

University of Pittsburgh,
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, U. S. A.

ABSTRACT. — Based on Perng's assumptions and a fundamental property of a symmetric affine connection, a simple argument shows the inconsistency of Perng's theory.

Mr. Jeng J. Perng recently published a paper with the title *A generalization of metric tensor and its application* in this periodical [1]. Some of the basic assumptions of this paper have been found to be inconsistent, or even worse, lead to the fantastic conclusion that there is no electromagnetic field. The details will be shown below.

One of Perng's assumptions is that the tensor A_{ik} satisfies the equation

$$(1) \quad A_{ik,m} - \Gamma_{im}^h A_{hk} - \Gamma_{km}^h A_{ih} = 0.$$

By interchanging indices, we have

$$(2) \quad A_{im,k} - \Gamma_{ik}^h A_{hm} - \Gamma_{mk}^h A_{ih} = 0.$$

and

$$(3) \quad A_{mk,i} - \Gamma_{mi}^h A_{hk} - \Gamma_{ki}^h A_{mh} = 0.$$

If we subtract (1) from the sum of (2) and (3), and use Perng's assumption that the affine connection Γ_{im}^h is symmetric, we immediately get

$$(4) \quad (A_{mh} + A_{hm}) \Gamma_{ik}^h = A_{mk,i} + A_{im,k} - A_{ik,m},$$

* Supported in part by a grant from the National Science Foundation.

and then, by interchanging indices,

$$(5) \quad (A_{mh} + A_{hm}) \Gamma_{ki}^h = A_{mi,k} + A_{km,i} - A_{ki,m}.$$

From (4) and (5), it is easy to see that

$$(6) \quad \varepsilon_{mh} \Gamma_{ik}^h = \frac{1}{2} (\varepsilon_{mk,i} + \varepsilon_{mi,k} - \varepsilon_{ik,m}), \quad \text{with} \quad \varepsilon_{mh} \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \frac{1}{2} (A_{mh} + A_{hm}).$$

If the tensor ε^{km} in Peng's paper is defined by [later we will show, based on Peng's assumption, that this must be this case !] :

$$(7) \quad \varepsilon^{km} \varepsilon_{mh} = \delta_h^k,$$

then from (6) and (7) we conclude that [remember ε^{jk} must be symmetric according to (7)] :

$$(8) \quad \Gamma_{ik}^j = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{jm} (\varepsilon_{mk,i} + \varepsilon_{mi,k} - \varepsilon_{ik,m}) = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{mj} (\varepsilon_{mk,i} + \varepsilon_{mi,k} - \varepsilon_{ik,m}).$$

Peng specifies $\left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} \sigma \\ \mu\nu \end{smallmatrix} \right\}$ as the Christoffel symbol constructed by $\varepsilon_{\mu\nu}$.

Therefore it is safe to conclude that

$$(9) \quad \Gamma_{ik}^j = \left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} j \\ ik \end{smallmatrix} \right\}.$$

Now according to assumption (i) of Peng's paper, the symmetric affine connection Γ_{ik}^j is defined as

$$(10) \quad \Gamma_{ik}^j = \left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} j \\ ik \end{smallmatrix} \right\} + 2 \varkappa \varepsilon_{ik} \varepsilon^{js} \varphi_s.$$

From (9) and (10) we conclude that

$$(11) \quad 2 \varkappa \varepsilon_{ik} \varepsilon^{js} \varphi_s = 0.$$

If $\varkappa = 0$, then Peng's whole theory is empty. If $\varkappa \neq 0$, then $\varepsilon_{ik} \varepsilon^{js} \varphi_s = 0$, and because $\det(\varepsilon^{js}) \neq 0$ [$\varepsilon^{\sigma\rho} \varepsilon_{\rho\mu} = \delta_{\mu}^{\sigma}$!] we must conclude $\varphi_s = 0$, i. e. there is no electromagnetic field !

Next we want to prove that if the Christoffel symbol $\left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} \sigma \\ \mu\nu \end{smallmatrix} \right\}$ is defined as

$$(12) \quad \left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} \sigma \\ \mu\nu \end{smallmatrix} \right\} = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{\sigma\rho} [\varepsilon_{\rho\mu,\nu} + \varepsilon_{\rho\nu,\mu} - \varepsilon_{\nu\mu,\rho}],$$

with $\varepsilon^{\sigma\rho}$ any second rank contravariant tensor, and if $\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{\sigma}$ is defined as in Equation (10), then $\varepsilon^{\sigma\rho} \varepsilon_{\rho\mu} = \delta_{\mu}^{\sigma}$.

Proof. — Under an arbitrary coordinate transformation, $\left\{ \begin{matrix} \sigma \\ \mu\nu \end{matrix} \right\}$ as defined in (12) will transform as

$$\left\{ \begin{matrix} \sigma \\ \mu\nu \end{matrix} \right\}' = \frac{\partial x'^{\sigma}}{\partial x^m} \left[\frac{\partial x^t}{\partial x'^{\mu}} \frac{\partial x^h}{\partial x'^{\nu}} \left\{ \begin{matrix} m \\ th \end{matrix} \right\} + \varepsilon^{ms} \varepsilon_{st} \frac{\partial^2 x^t}{\partial x'^{\mu} \partial x'^{\nu}} \right].$$

Since $2 \times \varepsilon_{\mu\nu} \varepsilon^{\sigma s} \varphi_s$ is a third rank mixed tensor, $\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{\sigma}$ as defined in (10) will transform as

$$(13) \quad \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{\sigma'} = \frac{\partial x'^{\sigma}}{\partial x^m} \left[\frac{\partial x^t}{\partial x'^{\mu}} \frac{\partial x^h}{\partial x'^{\nu}} \Gamma_{th}^m + \varepsilon^{ms} \varepsilon_{st} \frac{\partial^2 x^t}{\partial x'^{\mu} \partial x'^{\nu}} \right].$$

Because $\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{\sigma}$ is a symmetric affine connection, it should transform as

$$(14) \quad \Gamma_{\nu\mu}^{\sigma'} = \frac{\partial x'^{\sigma}}{\partial x^m} \left[\frac{\partial x^t}{\partial x'^{\nu}} \frac{\partial x^h}{\partial x'^{\mu}} \Gamma_{th}^m + \frac{\partial^2 x^m}{\partial x'^{\mu} \partial x'^{\nu}} \right].$$

Subtracting (14) from (13) we have

$$\frac{\partial x'^{\sigma}}{\partial x^m} [\varepsilon^{ms} \varepsilon_{st} - \delta_t^m] \frac{\partial^2 x^t}{\partial x'^{\mu} \partial x'^{\nu}} = 0, \quad \text{and thus} \quad \varepsilon^{ms} \varepsilon_{st} - \delta_t^m = 0,$$

or

$$\varepsilon^{ms} \varepsilon_{st} = \delta_t^m.$$

Q. E. D.

If we define $\left\{ \begin{matrix} \sigma \\ \mu\nu \end{matrix} \right\} \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{\rho\sigma} [\varepsilon_{\rho\mu, \nu} + \varepsilon_{\rho\nu, \mu} - \varepsilon_{\nu\mu, \rho}]$ then we will conclude $\varepsilon^{sm} \varepsilon_{st} = \delta_t^m$ and because ε_{st} is symmetric, then ε^{sm} must be symmetric and thus we also get $\varepsilon^{ms} \varepsilon_{st} = \delta_t^m$.

We thus see that the symmetric affine connection $\Gamma_{j,k}^i$ is totally determined by the tensor ε_{ik} if ε_{ik} is nonsingular and if we postulate $A_{ik;j} = 0$. Also, as we have shown, an attempt to modify the definition of the tensor ε^{ik} but keep the form of the symmetric affine connection proposed by Perng is doomed to be a failure.

REFERENCE

[1] JENG J. PERNG, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré*, t. XIII, n° 4, 1970, p. 287.

(Manuscrit reçu le 1^{er} mars 1971.)