

Hamiltonian gravity with fermions

Erick I. Duque*

*Institute for Gravitation and the Cosmos, The Pennsylvania State University,
104 Davey Lab, University Park, PA 16802, USA*

Fermions are coupled to the Einstein–Cartan system in the canonical formulation, including the cosmological, the Barbero–Immirzi, and the non-minimal coupling constants. The resulting ten first-class constraints generate gauge transformations that are on-shell equivalent to spacetime diffeomorphisms and $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ transformations. The gravitational second-class constraints receive fermionic contributions, which can be implemented by use of Dirac brackets or by solving them directly. Furthermore, we identify new fermionic (second-class) constraints that are necessary to recover the Dirac-fermion theory by relating the momenta to the configuration variables on dynamical solutions; this fermionic phase-space reduction is accomplished by use of corresponding Dirac brackets. The theory remains well-defined off the second-class constraint surfaces with ten additional degrees of freedom—six of which are gravitational and the remaining four are fermionic. Discrete (CPT) symmetries as well as implications for canonical quantization and modified theories of gravity with fermions are discussed.

I. INTRODUCTION

Fermions are notoriously complicated to manipulate algebraically. This is the main reason why most studies of quantum field theory focus on scalar fields instead and why the Hamiltonian formulation of fermions coupled to gravity, even in the classical context, remains largely unexplored.

In Lagrangian formulations, it is relatively straightforward to couple fermions to gravity in the Einstein–Cartan theory, which uses tetrads and connection variables, implying a larger gravitational field content compared to Einstein’s metric system. Canonical treatments of the Einstein–Cartan theory in vacuum, based on the Holst action (given by the Hilbert–Palatini action with a nontrivial Barbero–Immirzi constant), usually work in Ashtekar–Barbero variables [1–4], which, however, fix a particular gauge from the start and hence break the underlying Lorentz invariance of the action. Therefore, any canonical quantum gravity theory based on such a system is not guaranteed to be Lorentz covariant. This problem was resolved in [5] by performing the canonical decomposition of the Holst action without gauge fixing. This procedure results in a larger phase space compared to Ashtekar–Barbero variables and the resulting constraints generate gauge transformations that are on-shell equivalent to spacetime diffeomorphisms and $SO(1,3)$ transformations, contrary to the Ashtekar–Barbero system which cannot generate boosts. The main purpose of this paper is to couple fermions in this new formulation to preserve the full $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ transformations of the Einstein–Cartan theory; this is a necessary step preceding canonical approaches to diffeomorphism and Lorentz-covariant theories of quantum or modified gravity with fermionic matter.

This work is organized as follows. We start with a brief

review of the Lagrangian formulation of the Einstein–Cartan system coupled to a massless Dirac fermion, including the cosmological, Barbero–Immirzi, and non-minimal coupling constants in Section II. In Section III, the canonical analysis of this system is performed, identifying the symplectic structure, the non-dynamical variables, and the decomposition of useful spacetime quantities in terms of the variables of the extended phase space; we also identify hitherto neglected fermionic constraints that are necessary to relate the extended phase space to that of the Dirac fermions via a phase-space reduction. In Section IV, we compute the first-class constraints and their algebra under Poisson brackets of the extended phase space, study the gauge transformations of the system and their relation to spacetime diffeomorphisms and $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ transformations, and identify a set of (nonlocal) Dirac observables that imply conserved spin and electric currents. In Section V, we obtain the second-class constraints of the theory necessary to reduce the extended phase space to that implied by the action and derive the corresponding Dirac brackets. We incorporate the mass term in Section VI. In Section VII, we address some misconceptions about the canonical quantization of fermionic variables that led to some commutation inconsistencies [6, 7], which are resolved by a proper understanding of the phase-space reduction that is necessary to describe Dirac fermions in canonical formulations. In Section VIII, we study the system’s behavior under charge conjugation (C), parity (P), and time-reversal (T) transformations. In Section IX, we outline future applications to (emergent) modified gravity theories. The conclusions are presented in Section X.

We work exclusively in four dimensions with Lorentzian signature and set $c = 1$. Greek letters are used for spacetime indices and capital Latin letters $I, J, K, \dots \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ for internal Lorentz indices. We use the Latin letters a, b, c, \dots, h for spatial indices, and $i, j, k, \dots \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ will be reserved for internal Euclidean indices. We use dotted capital Latin letters \dot{A}, \dot{B}, \dots for the Dirac spinor index, which will usually

* eqd5272@psu.edu

be suppressed but its use facilitates the handling of Poisson brackets later; similarly, the dotted Latin letters $\dot{a}, \dot{b}, \dots \in \{1, 2\}$ are used for left-handed spinor indices, and double-dotted Latin letters $\ddot{a}, \ddot{b}, \dots \in \{1, 2\}$ are used for right-handed spinor indices.

II. LAGRANGIAN FORMULATION

A. Kinematics

Spacetime geometry can be described by a tetrad e_I^μ such that the metric is given by the inverse of

$$g^{\mu\nu} = \eta^{IJ} e_I^\mu e_J^\nu, \quad (1)$$

where η_{IJ} is the Minkowski metric. Spacetime indices are raised and lowered with $g_{\mu\nu}$ and internal Lorentz indices with η_{IJ} . Relation (1) implies

$$g_{\mu\nu} e_I^\mu e_J^\nu = \eta_{IJ}. \quad (2)$$

This spacetime metric defines the derivative operator ∇_μ compatible with it,

$$\nabla_\alpha g_{\mu\nu} = 0, \quad (3)$$

which is used to parallel transport spacetime tensors.

On the other hand, a connection 1-form ω_μ^{IJ} is necessary to parallel transport $\text{SO}(1,3)$ -valued tensor fields f^{I_1, I_2, \dots, I_n} with the covariant derivative

$$D_\mu f^{I_1, \dots, I_n} = \nabla_\mu f^{I_1, \dots, I_n} + \sum_{k=1}^n \omega_\mu^{I_k} f^{I_1, \dots, I_{k-1}, I_{k+1}, \dots, I_n}, \quad (4)$$

The antisymmetry of the connection implies that the internal Minkowski metric remains invariant under parallel transport,

$$D_\mu \eta_{IJ} = 0. \quad (5)$$

A general spacetime geometry has torsion, defined as

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\mu\nu}^I &\equiv D_{[\mu} e_{\nu]}^I \\ &= \partial_{[\mu} e_{\nu]}^I + \omega_{[\mu}^I{}_{|K|} e_{\nu]}^K. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Consider a Dirac spinor

$$\Psi^{\dot{A}} = \begin{pmatrix} \psi_{\dot{a}} \\ \chi^{\dot{a}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

where ψ is a left-handed Weyl field and χ is right-handed. The complex-conjugate of the Dirac spinor is given by $\bar{\Psi} = \Psi^\dagger \beta$. (Complex conjugation changes left to right-handed indices and viceversa: $(\psi_{\dot{a}})^* = \psi_{\dot{a}}^*$, $(\chi^{\dot{a}})^* = \chi^{\dot{a}*}$.) Here,

$$\beta = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \delta_{\dot{a}\dot{b}} \\ \delta_{\dot{a}b} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

We introduce the invariant symbols $\varepsilon_{\dot{a}\dot{b}}$, $\varepsilon^{\dot{a}\dot{b}}$, $\varepsilon_{\dot{a}\dot{b}}$, and $\varepsilon^{\dot{a}\dot{b}}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^{\dot{1}\dot{2}} &= \varepsilon^{\dot{2}\dot{1}} = \varepsilon_{\dot{2}\dot{1}} = \varepsilon_{\dot{1}\dot{2}} = +1, \\ \varepsilon^{\dot{2}\dot{1}} &= \varepsilon^{\dot{1}\dot{2}} = \varepsilon_{\dot{1}\dot{2}} = \varepsilon_{\dot{2}\dot{1}} = -1; \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

it follows that $\varepsilon_{\dot{a}\dot{b}} \varepsilon^{\dot{b}\dot{c}} = \delta_{\dot{a}}^{\dot{c}}$ and $\varepsilon^{\dot{a}\dot{b}} \varepsilon_{\dot{b}\dot{c}} = \delta^{\dot{a}}_{\dot{c}}$. We use (9) to raise and lower spinorial indices: $\psi^{\dot{a}} = \varepsilon^{\dot{a}\dot{b}} \psi_{\dot{b}}$, $\chi_{\dot{a}} = \varepsilon_{\dot{a}\dot{b}} \chi^{\dot{b}}$. In the following, spinorial indices will be suppressed when no confusion arises and assume that whenever two spinorial tensors appear together, their proximal indices are contracted according to the following convention: The contraction between two left-handed spinors is given by $\psi\xi = \psi^{\dot{a}} \xi_{\dot{a}}$, between two right-handed spinors by $\xi^\dagger \chi^\dagger = \xi_{\dot{a}}^\dagger \chi^{\dot{a}\dagger}$, between left and right-handed spinors by $\psi^\dagger \psi = \psi^{\dot{a}\dagger} \delta_{\dot{a}}^{\dot{a}} \psi_{\dot{a}}$, and similarly for other spinorial tensors.

The action of the covariant derivative on a Dirac spinor is given by

$$D_\mu \Psi = \partial_\mu \Psi + \frac{i}{2} \omega_\mu^{IJ} S_{IJ} \Psi, \quad (10)$$

where

$$S^{IJ} = \frac{i}{4} [\gamma^I, \gamma^J], \quad (11)$$

and

$$\gamma^I = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sigma^I \\ \bar{\sigma}^I & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (12)$$

are the Dirac matrices—not to be confused with the boosting function $\gamma = 1/\sqrt{1-v^2}$, which has no indices, or γ^2 , which will always refer to the squared boosting function here—with

$$\sigma_{\dot{a}\dot{a}}^I = (\delta_{\dot{a}\dot{a}}, \sigma_{\dot{a}\dot{a}}^i), \quad \bar{\sigma}^{I\dot{a}\dot{a}} = (\delta^{\dot{a}\dot{a}}, -\sigma^{i\dot{a}\dot{a}}), \quad (13)$$

where σ^i are the Pauli matrices. The covariant derivative of the Dirac co-spinor is given by

$$D_\mu \bar{\Psi} = \partial_\mu \bar{\Psi} - \frac{i}{2} \omega_\mu^{IJ} \bar{\Psi} S_{IJ}, \quad (14)$$

such that $D_\mu \bar{\Psi} = \overline{D_\mu \Psi}$ holds.

B. Dynamics

The vacuum dynamics are generated by the action [4]

$$S_G[e, \omega] = \int d^4x \frac{|e|}{16\pi G} [e_I^\mu e_J^\nu P_{KL}^{IJ} F_{\mu\nu}^{KL} - 2\Lambda],$$

where Λ is the cosmological constant, $|e|$ is the absolute value of the determinant of the co-tetrad e_μ^I , ϵ_{IJKL} is a totally antisymmetric internal tensor with $\epsilon_{0123} = -1$,

$$F_{\mu\nu}^{IJ} = 2\partial_{[\mu} \omega_{\nu]}^{IJ} + 2\omega_{[\mu}^{IK} \omega_{\nu]}^{LJ} \eta_{KL} \quad (15)$$

is the strength tensor field of the connection, and

$$P^{IJ}{}_{KL} = \delta_K^{[I} \delta_L^{J]} - \frac{\zeta}{2} \epsilon^{IJ}{}_{KL}, \quad (16)$$

where $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$ is the inverse of the Barbero–Immirzi parameter. The last expression has the inverse

$$(P^{-1})^{KL}{}_{IJ} = \frac{1}{1 + \zeta^2} \left(\delta_I^{[K} \delta_J^{L]} + \frac{\zeta}{2} \epsilon^{KL}{}_{IJ} \right), \quad (17)$$

such that $P^{IJ}{}_{MN} (P^{-1})^{MN}{}_{KL} = \delta_K^{[I} \delta_L^{J]}$.

In the presence of a massless Dirac fermion, the full action $S = S_G + S_F$ receives a fermionic contribution given by [8–11]

$$\begin{aligned} S_F &= \int d^4x |e| \frac{i}{2} e_I^\mu (\bar{\Psi} \gamma^I (1 - i\alpha\gamma^5) D_\mu \Psi - D_\mu \bar{\Psi} (1 - i\alpha\gamma^5) \gamma^I \Psi) \\ &= \int d^4x |e| \left[\frac{i}{2} e_I^\mu (\bar{\Psi} \gamma^I (1 - i\alpha\gamma^5) \partial_\mu \Psi - \partial_\mu \bar{\Psi} (1 - i\alpha\gamma^5) \gamma^I \Psi) - \frac{1}{4} e_K^\mu \omega_\mu^{IJ} \bar{\Psi} ([\gamma^K, S_{IJ}]_+ + i\alpha\gamma^5 [\gamma^K, S_{IJ}]) \Psi \right] \\ &= \int d^4x |e| \left[\frac{i}{2} e_I^\mu (\bar{\Psi} \gamma^I (1 - i\alpha\gamma^5) \partial_\mu \Psi - \partial_\mu \bar{\Psi} (1 - i\alpha\gamma^5) \gamma^I \Psi) + \frac{1}{4} e_K^\mu \omega_\mu^{IJ} \bar{\Psi} (\epsilon^{KL}{}_{IJ} + 2\alpha\delta_I^K \delta_J^L) \gamma_L \gamma^5 \Psi \right], \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ is the non-minimal coupling parameter, $\gamma^5 = -\frac{i}{4!} \epsilon_{IJKL} \gamma^I \gamma^J \gamma^K \gamma^L$, and we used

$$[\gamma^I, S^{JK}]_+ = -\epsilon^{IJK}{}_L \gamma^L \gamma^5, \quad (19)$$

$$[\gamma^I, S^{JK}] = -2i\eta^{I[J} \gamma^{K]} \quad (20)$$

to get the last line.

Using $\delta F_{\mu\nu}^{IJ} = 2D_{[\mu} \delta \omega_{\nu]}^{KL}$, the variation of the action with respect to the connection 1-form, upon some sim-

plification and neglecting boundary terms, is given by

$$\begin{aligned} e_\mu^P \frac{\delta S_G}{\delta \omega_\mu^{IJ}} &= e_\mu^P \frac{\epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}}{32\pi G} P_{IJ}{}^{KL} \epsilon_{KLMN} D_\nu (e_\alpha^M e_\beta^N) \\ &= -3! \frac{|e|}{16\pi G} P_{IJ}{}^{KL} \delta_{[K}^P T_{LN]}^N, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where $T_{JK}^I = e_J^\mu e_K^\nu T_{\mu\nu}^I$, from the gravitational contribution, and

$$e_\mu^P \frac{\delta S_F}{\delta \omega_\mu^{IJ}} = -\frac{|e|}{4} \bar{\Psi} ([\gamma^P, S_{IJ}]_+ + i\alpha\gamma^5 [\gamma^P, S_{IJ}]) \Psi \quad (22)$$

from the fermionic contribution. Therefore, the equation of motion $\delta S / \delta \omega_\mu^{IJ} = 0$ can be written as the vanishing of

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{\mu\nu}^P &\equiv -\frac{8\pi G}{|e|} e_\alpha^P e_\mu^I e_\nu^J (P^{-1})_{IJ}{}^{KL} \frac{\delta S}{\delta \omega_\alpha^{KL}} \\ &= e_\mu^I e_\nu^J \left[3\delta_{[I}^P T_{JN]}^N + \frac{8\pi G}{4} (P^{-1})_{IJ}{}^{RS} \bar{\Psi} ([\gamma^P, S_{RS}]_+ + i\alpha\gamma^5 [\gamma^P, S_{RS}]) \Psi \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

In particular, notice that this equation of motion implies

$$\begin{aligned} T_{IN}^N &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{8\pi G}{4} (P^{-1})_{IN}{}^{RS} \bar{\Psi} ([\gamma^N, S_{RS}]_+ + i\alpha\gamma^5 [\gamma^N, S_{RS}]) \Psi \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{8\pi G}{4} \frac{1}{1 + \zeta^2} \bar{\Psi} \left(\frac{\zeta}{2} \epsilon_{IN}{}^{RS} [\gamma^N, S_{RS}]_+ + i\alpha\gamma^5 [\gamma^N, S_{IN}] \right) \Psi. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Using

$$|e| e_I^\nu e_J^\mu T_{\mu\nu}^I = \frac{|e|}{2} D_\nu e_J^\nu, \quad (25)$$

we conclude that, in the presence of fermionic matter and nontrivial Barbero–Immirzi or non-minimal coupling parameters, the covariant divergence of the tetrad is non-

vanishing:

$$\begin{aligned} D_\mu (|e|e_I^\mu) &= \frac{8\pi G}{4} \frac{|e|}{1+\zeta^2} \bar{\Psi} \left(\frac{\zeta}{2} \epsilon_{IN}^{RS} [\gamma^N, S_{RS}]_+ \right. \\ &\quad \left. + i\alpha\gamma^5 [\gamma^N, S_{IN}] \right) \Psi \\ &= -\frac{3}{4} \frac{8\pi G|e|}{1+\zeta^2} \bar{\Psi} (\zeta - \alpha) \gamma_I \gamma^5 \Psi. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

On the other hand, the fermionic equation of motion $\delta S/\delta \bar{\Psi} = 0$ is given by

$$i|e|e_I^\mu \gamma^I D_\mu \Psi + \frac{i}{2} D_\mu (|e|e_I^\mu) (1 - i\alpha\gamma^5) \gamma^I \Psi = 0. \quad (27)$$

The second term in this equation is generally non-trivial according to (26). While Ψ and $\bar{\Psi}$ are kinematically (off shell) independent in the action (18), the equation of motion $\delta S/\delta \Psi = 0$ yielding the complex-conjugated version of (27) guarantees that, on dynamical solutions (on shell), the reality condition $\bar{\Psi} = \Psi^\dagger \beta$, such that $\bar{\Psi}$ is indeed related to Ψ by complex conjugation, can be consistently imposed.

C. Degrees of freedom

The 24 equations of motion derived from $\delta S/\omega_\mu^{IJ} = 0$ can be seen as equations for the torsion $T_{\mu\nu}^I$ with a source and hence correspond to only 12 independent equations with a first-order time derivative of e_I^μ , while the remaining 12 equations contain only spatial derivatives. Therefore, the latter are not evolution equations but constraints, implying that the connection has only 12 dynamical components. Similarly, from the 16 equations of motion derived from $\delta S/\delta e_I^\mu = 0$, only 12 contain first-order time derivatives of the connection, while the other 4 components contain only spatial derivatives. Therefore, the latter are constraints too and the tetrad has only 12 dynamical components. From the total of 16 constraints, 6 are second class and other 10 are first class [5]. This counting of constraints implies that the 12 pairs of dynamical gravitational field components reduce to expected 2 degrees of freedom on dynamical solutions—each first-class constraint determines a pair of dynamical field components.

On the other hand, the total of 16 components of the kinematically independent fermion fields Ψ and $\bar{\Psi}$ reduce to only 8 upon imposing the reality conditions $\bar{\Psi} = \Psi^\dagger \beta$. Furthermore, because the resulting Dirac equation (27) is a first-order differential equation, the 8 components of Ψ reduce to only 4 degrees of freedom on dynamical solutions.

III. CANONICAL FORMULATION

A. Foliation

Given a hyperbolic spacetime region, $M = \Sigma \times \mathbb{R}$, the line element in ADM form is given by [12, 13]

$$ds^2 = -N^2 dt^2 + q_{ab}(dx^a + N^a dt)(dx^b + N^b dt), \quad (28)$$

where N is the lapse, N^a the shift, and q_{ab} is the spatial metric induced on a three-dimensional hypersurface Σ .

The time-evolution vector field associated to this particular foliation is given by

$$t^\mu = Nn^\mu + N^a s_a^\mu, \quad (29)$$

where n^μ is a unit vector normal to Σ , and s_a^μ are three basis vectors tangential to Σ . The normal component of the time-evolution vector field is then given by the lapse, and its tangential components by the shift. The index $\bar{0}$ will be used as the normal component of spacetime indices, and t will be used for the time component.

We also define an internal normal vector \hat{n}^I and internal spatial basis vectors \hat{s}_i^I , such that $\eta_{IJ}\hat{n}^I\hat{n}^J = -1$, $\eta_{IJ}\hat{s}_i^I\hat{s}_j^J = \delta_{ij}$, and $\eta_{IJ}\hat{n}^I\hat{s}_j^J = 0$. The Minkowski metric can be written in terms of these basis vectors as

$$\eta_{IJ} = -\hat{n}_I\hat{n}_J + \delta_{ij}\hat{s}_I^i\hat{s}_J^j, \quad (30)$$

and the tetrad as [5]

$$\begin{aligned} e_I^\mu &= -\gamma N^{-1} (\hat{n}_I + v_i \hat{s}_I^i) t^\mu + (\gamma N^{-1} N^a + \varepsilon_k^a v^k) \hat{n}_I s_a^\mu \\ &\quad + (\gamma N^{-1} N^a v_i + \varepsilon_i^a) \hat{s}_I^i s_a^\mu \\ &=: -n_I n^\mu + \varepsilon_i^a \hat{s}_I^i s_a^\mu, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where $\gamma = 1/\sqrt{1-v^2}$ and $v^2 = v_i v^i$. Notice that $e_0^t = \hat{n}^I e_I^t = \gamma N^{-1}$ and $e_0^a = \hat{n}^I e_I^a = -(\gamma N^{-1} N^a + \varepsilon_k^a v^k)$. (We follow the index convention $T_0^I = \hat{n}^J T_J^I$ and $T_J^0 = -\hat{n}_I T_J^I$.) Inspection of the tetrad frame basis, defined by

$$n_I = e_I^\mu n_\mu = \gamma \hat{n}_I + \gamma v_i \hat{s}_I^i, \quad s_I^i = v^i \hat{n}_I + \hat{s}_I^i, \quad (32)$$

reveals that it is boosted with respect to the internal one, defined by (\hat{n}_I, \hat{s}_I^i) , by the relative velocity v^i .

B. Symplectic structure

Using $F_{ta}^{KL} \supset \dot{\omega}_a^{KL}$, the gravitational symplectic contribution to the action is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \int d^4x \left[\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_i^a \dot{K}_a^i + \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_i^a \dot{\Gamma}_a^i \right] \\ = \int d^4x \left[\mathcal{P}_i^a \dot{A}_a^i + \mathcal{K}_i^a \dot{B}_a^i \right] \\ = \int d^4x \left[\mathcal{P}_i^a \dot{\mathcal{D}}_a^i + v_i \dot{\mathcal{E}}^i + \mathfrak{K}_{ij} \dot{\mathcal{B}}^{ij} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where the configuration variables are the connection components

$$K_a^i = \omega_a^{0i} \quad , \quad \Gamma_a^i = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^i_{kl} \omega_a^{kl} \quad , \quad (34)$$

and their respective conjugate momenta are given by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_i^a = \mathcal{P}_i^a + \zeta \mathcal{K}_i^a \quad , \quad (35)$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_i^a = \mathcal{K}_i^a - \zeta \mathcal{P}_i^a \quad , \quad (36)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_i^a &= \frac{|\det e|}{8\pi G} (e_0^t e_i^a - e_i^t e_0^a) = \frac{|\det e|}{8\pi G} 2e_0^{[t} e_i^{a]} \\ &= \text{sgn}(N) \frac{\gamma^2/(8\pi G)}{\det \varepsilon} \varepsilon_j^a \left(\delta_i^j - v^j v_i \right) \quad , \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_i^a &= \frac{|\det e|}{8\pi G} e_k^t e_l^a \epsilon^{kl}_i \\ &= \text{sgn}(N) \frac{\gamma^2/(8\pi G)}{\det \varepsilon} \varepsilon_j^a \epsilon_i^{jk} v_k \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

The second and third lines of (33) imply that there exist the following two canonical transformations, which turn out to be important in our canonical analysis. The first one leads to the new configuration variables

$$A_a^i = K_a^i - \zeta \Gamma_a^i \quad , \quad (39)$$

$$B_a^i = \Gamma_a^i + \zeta K_a^i \quad , \quad (40)$$

whose respective conjugate momenta are given by (37) and (38). The second one leads to the new configuration variables

$$\mathcal{D}_a^i = A_a^i + \epsilon_j^{ik} v_k B_a^j + \mathfrak{K}_j^i B_a^j \quad , \quad (41)$$

$$\mathcal{E}^i = \epsilon_j^{ki} B_a^j \mathcal{P}_k^a \quad , \quad (42)$$

$$\mathcal{B}_{ik} = B_b^j \delta_{j(i} \mathcal{P}_{k)}^b \quad , \quad (43)$$

and the new momenta

$$v_i = -\frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{im}^n (\mathcal{P}^{-1})_b^m \mathcal{K}_n^b \quad , \quad (44)$$

$$\mathfrak{K}_{ij} = (\mathcal{P}^{-1})_b^m \delta_{m(i} \mathcal{K}_{j)}^b \quad , \quad (45)$$

where $(\mathcal{P}^{-1})_a^i$ is the inverse of \mathcal{P}_i^a .

The fermionic contribution to the symplectic term is given by

$$\int d^4x \left[P_{\Psi A} \dot{\Psi}^A + \dot{\bar{\Psi}}_A \overline{P_{\Psi}^A} \right] \quad , \quad (46)$$

with momenta

$$P_{\Psi} = -\Xi \bar{\Psi} \quad , \quad \overline{P_{\Psi}} = -\Xi \Psi \quad , \quad (47)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi &= \frac{i}{2} |e| e_I^t (1 - i\alpha \gamma^5) \gamma^I \\ &= \frac{i}{2} \gamma \sqrt{\det q} (1 - i\alpha \gamma^5) (\gamma^0 - v_i \gamma^i) \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Being Grassmanian-valued, the fermionic variables obey the basic (anti-)Poisson brackets

$$\{\Psi^A(x), P_{\Psi B}(y)\} = \{P_{\Psi B}(x), \Psi^A(y)\} = \delta_B^A \delta^3(x-y) \quad (49)$$

$$\{\bar{\Psi}_A(x), \overline{P_{\Psi}^B}(y)\} = \{\overline{P_{\Psi}^B}(x), \bar{\Psi}_A(y)\} = -\delta_A^B \delta^3(x-y) \quad ,$$

with all other combinations vanishing.

The full Poisson bracket between any two phase-space functionals \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{U} is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{U}\} &= \int d^3z \left[\frac{\delta \mathcal{O}}{\delta A_c^k(z)} \frac{\delta \mathcal{U}}{\delta \mathcal{P}_k^c(z)} - \frac{\delta \mathcal{O}}{\delta \mathcal{P}_k^c(z)} \frac{\delta \mathcal{U}}{\delta A_c^k(z)} + \frac{\delta \mathcal{O}}{\delta B_c^k(z)} \frac{\delta \mathcal{U}}{\delta \mathcal{K}_k^c(z)} - \frac{\delta \mathcal{O}}{\delta \mathcal{K}_k^c(z)} \frac{\delta \mathcal{U}}{\delta B_c^k(z)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\delta^R \mathcal{O}}{\delta \Psi^A(z)} \frac{\delta \mathcal{U}}{\delta P_{\Psi A}(z)} + \frac{\delta^R \mathcal{O}}{\delta P_{\Psi A}(z)} \frac{\delta \mathcal{U}}{\delta \Psi^A(z)} - \frac{\delta^R \mathcal{O}}{\delta \bar{\Psi}_A(z)} \frac{\delta \mathcal{U}}{\delta \overline{P_{\Psi}^A}(z)} - \frac{\delta^R \mathcal{O}}{\delta \overline{P_{\Psi}^A}(z)} \frac{\delta \mathcal{U}}{\delta \bar{\Psi}_A(z)} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

—where the superscript R denotes a right derivative and left derivatives are always used otherwise—or a variation using other canonical phase-space coordinates.

The symplectic structure defined by the Poisson bracket (50) corresponds to an extended phase space whose number of canonical pairs exceeds that of the dynamical fields implied by the action. Therefore, in order to describe the same theory of the Lagrangian formulation, a phase-space reduction must take place by imposing a specific set of constraints that we identify in the

next subsection.

C. Non-dynamical variables and phase-space reduction

The 6 components ω_t^{IJ} are non-dynamical because their time derivatives do not appear in the action and imply 6 first-class constraints. In the following, we will

denote these components by

$$K_t^i = \omega_t^{0i} \quad , \quad \Gamma_t^i = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^i_{kl} \omega_t^{kl} . \quad (51)$$

Similarly, no time derivatives of the lapse and the shift appear in the action, leading to 4 additional first-class constraints. The first-class status of these constraints is shown in the next section.

Furthermore, the relation

$$\mathcal{K}_i^a = \epsilon_i^{jk} \mathcal{P}_j^a v_k , \quad (52)$$

derived from comparing (37) and (38), implies that the momentum components \mathfrak{K}_{ij} vanish on physical solutions,

$$\mathfrak{K}_{ij} = 0 , \quad (53)$$

constituting 6 second-class constraints on the phase space. This implies that the time derivatives of the components \mathcal{B}_{ij} drop out from the symplectic term (33), and hence constitute 6 additional non-dynamical components of the connection, which lead to another 6 second-class constraints

$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{H}}{\delta \mathcal{B}^{ij}} = 0 , \quad (54)$$

where \mathcal{H} is the Hamiltonian. This constitutes a secondary second-class constraint enforcing the preservation of (53) under time evolution: $\delta \mathcal{H} / \delta \mathcal{B}^{ij} = -\{\mathfrak{K}_{ij}, \mathcal{H}\} = 0$. The second-class status of these constraints and the fact that no tertiary constraints are necessary to enforce the preservation of (54) under time evolution are shown in Section V.

The resulting 10 first-class constraints, together with the total of 12 second-class constraints, reduce the 18 gravitational canonical pairs to only 2 degrees of freedom on physical solutions, in agreement with our counting in the Lagrangian formulation.

On the other hand, the symplectic term (46) implies that the configuration variables Ψ and $\bar{\Psi}$ are kinematically independent fields, which in turn imply 16 canonical pairs of the fermion field. However, imposing the reality conditions

$$\bar{\Psi} = \Psi^\dagger \beta \quad , \quad \overline{P_\Psi} = \beta P_\Psi^\dagger , \quad (55)$$

lowers the total fermionic degrees of freedom from 16 to only 8 on dynamical solutions—the reality conditions can be consistently imposed if all the constraints are Hermitian, a property that will be applied in the forthcoming canonical decomposition and hence will always be assumed to hold. If the Hamiltonian is a fermion bilinear with up to first-order derivatives of the fermionic variables—which is the case in our system as shown in the next section—then Hamilton's equations of motion

for Ψ and P_Ψ result in first-order differential equations of Ψ and P_Ψ ,

$$O\Psi = 0 \quad (56)$$

and

$$P_\Psi U = 0 , \quad (57)$$

with some linear operators O and U , respectively. This implies that the 8 components of Ψ reduce to 4 degrees of freedom but so will the components of P_Ψ , totaling 8 fermionic degrees of freedom, rather than the 4 implied by the action. The reason for the doubling of the fermionic degrees of freedom can be identified as the fact that the momentum P_Ψ is not related to $\bar{\Psi}$ by the relation (47)—and their conjugate versions—at the kinematical level. These relations can hold on dynamical solutions, but only as a special case where they are restricted to satisfy the relation (47) and its conjugated version because they do not arise from the solution to the linear equations of motion alone: This requires the imposition of 8 additional constraints, given by

$$C_{\bar{\Psi}} = P_\Psi + \bar{\Psi} \Xi \quad (58)$$

and

$$C_\Psi = \overline{P_\Psi} + \Xi \Psi , \quad (59)$$

which, depending on the details of the first-class constraints, may be second class. We reiterate that the imposition of these constraints is different from that of the reality conditions (55) and must be implemented in addition to the latter to describe Dirac fermions.

If the constraints (58) and (59) are not imposed, then the canonical system implies a more general theory with 4 additional fermionic degrees of freedom compared to the Dirac theory that still satisfies the reality conditions. Such a theory is instead based on a different action contribution, given by

$$S_F = \int d^4x |e| \frac{i}{2} e_I^\mu \left[\bar{\Phi} \gamma^I (1 - i\alpha \gamma^5) D_\mu \Psi - D_\mu \bar{\Psi} (1 - i\alpha \gamma^5) \gamma^I \Phi \right] , \quad (60)$$

where Φ is an independent fermion field. The fermionic equations of motion of this action, $\delta S_F / \delta \bar{\Phi} = 0$ and $\delta S_F / \delta \bar{\Psi} = 0$, are respectively given by

$$|e| \frac{i}{2} e_I^\mu \gamma^I (1 - i\alpha \gamma^5) D_\mu \Psi = 0 \quad (61)$$

and

$$|e| \frac{i}{2} e_I^\mu (1 - i\alpha \gamma^5) \gamma^I D_\mu \Phi + \frac{i}{2} D_\mu (|e| e_I^\mu) (1 - i\alpha \gamma^5) \gamma^I \Phi = 0 , \quad (62)$$

which differ from (27) and the solutions are independent of α , up to its possible appearance in $D_\mu (|e| e_I^\mu)$. The covariant divergence of the tetrad based on this extended action is richer than that of the Dirac action:

$$\begin{aligned}
D_\mu(|e|e_I^\mu) &= \frac{8\pi G}{4} \frac{|e|}{1+\zeta^2} \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\zeta}{2} \epsilon_{IN}^{RS} \bar{\Phi} (1+i\alpha\gamma^5) [\gamma^N, S_{RS}]_+ \Psi + \bar{\Phi} (1+i\alpha\gamma^5) [\gamma^N, S_{IN}] \Psi + c.c. \right) \\
&= -\frac{3}{8} 8\pi G \frac{|e|}{1+\zeta^2} (\bar{\Phi} \gamma_I [(\zeta-\alpha)\gamma^5 - i(1+\alpha\zeta)] \Psi + c.c.) .
\end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

The symplectic term of the action contribution (60) is given by (46) too, but with the momentum

$$P_\Psi = -\bar{\Xi} \bar{\Phi} . \tag{64}$$

Notice, however, that, imposing $\Phi = \Psi$ a posteriori, equations (61) and (62) would imply that $D_\mu(|e|e_I^\mu)$ vanishes; however, according to (63), $D_\mu(|e|e_I^\mu)$ is generally non-vanishing with the exceptions lying on a specific small set of configurations of the fermionic fields. Solutions admitting $\Phi = \Psi$ are therefore extremely limited. Hence, the implementation of the Dirac-fermion constraints (58) and (59) must be performed a priori as a phase-space reduction rather than as a restriction to the solutions to the equations of motion of the extended phase space to recover a Dirac-fermion system—this is analogous to a free two-dimensional single-particle system with its motion confined to a ring: Circular motion cannot be recovered by restricting the solutions (linear motion) of the free single-particle system; the phase-space reduction must be performed prior to deriving the equations of motion from the Lagrangian or, alternatively, by using Lagrange multipliers to constrain the motion. This can be achieved in the canonical formulation by use of Dirac brackets, following the treatment of second-class constraints.

We conclude that the 34 canonical pairs of the extended phase space described by (50) reduce to only 6 degrees of freedom (2 of which are gravitational and 4 are fermionic) upon the imposition of the reality conditions (55), the Dirac-fermion constraints (58) and (59), and the gravitational second-class constraints (53) and (54), as well as the first-class constraints (and use of the equations of motion they generate) discussed in the next section. The implementation of the second-class constraints via Dirac brackets is discussed in Section V.

D. Canonical decomposition of geometric quantities

Having identified the canonical phase-space variables in terms of the Lagrangian fields, it is useful to invert these relations for a systematic canonical decomposition of the action. We gather several of these relations in this subsection.

The inverse spatial metric is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
q^{ab} &= \frac{|\det \mathcal{P}|^{-1}}{8\pi G} (\delta^{ij} + \gamma^2 v^i v^j) \mathcal{P}_i^a \mathcal{P}_j^b \\
&= \frac{\gamma^2 |\det \mathcal{P}|^{-1}}{8\pi G} \delta^{ij} (\mathcal{P}_i^a \mathcal{P}_j^b - \mathcal{K}_i^a \mathcal{K}_j^b) \Big|_{\bar{\kappa}=0} .
\end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

The determinant of q_{ab} is then given by

$$\det q = (8\pi G)^3 \frac{|\det \mathcal{P}|}{\gamma^2} . \tag{66}$$

In terms of the new canonical variables, the covariant derivative of the fermion field is given by

$$D_t \Psi = \dot{\Psi} - iK_t^i S_{0i} \Psi - i\Gamma_t^i S_i \Psi , \tag{67}$$

$$D_a \Psi = \partial_a \Psi - iK_a^i S_{0i} \Psi - i\Gamma_a^i S_i \Psi , \tag{68}$$

where we defined

$$S^i = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^i_{jk} S^{jk} . \tag{69}$$

The identity

$$(\gamma^0 - v_i \gamma^i) (\gamma^0 - v_j \gamma^j) = \frac{1}{\gamma^2} \tag{70}$$

is useful to invert (47) into

$$\bar{\Psi} = -P_\Psi \bar{\Xi}^{-1} , \tag{71}$$

$$\Psi = -\Xi^{-1} \bar{P}_\Psi , \tag{72}$$

where

$$\Xi^{-1} = -\frac{2i}{1+\alpha^2} \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{\det q}} (\gamma^0 - v_i \gamma^i) (1+i\alpha\gamma^5) \tag{73}$$

is the inverse of Ξ .

It is useful to write the Dirac equation (27) in terms of the canonical variables because it serves as a guide to construct the Hamiltonian that can generate it:

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\Psi} &= \Theta^a \partial_a \Psi + i\Omega \Psi \\
&\quad - \frac{\gamma^2 (\gamma^0 - v_i \gamma^i) (1-i\alpha\gamma^5) D_\mu(|e|e_I^\mu \gamma^I) \Psi}{2(8\pi G)^{3/2} \sqrt{|\det \mathcal{P}|}} ,
\end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

where

$$\Theta^a = N^a + \frac{8\pi G N}{\sqrt{\det q}} \mathcal{P}_q^a [v^q - (\gamma^0 - v_k \gamma^k) \gamma^q] , \tag{75}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega &= - \left[K_t^i - \left(N^a + N \frac{8\pi G}{\sqrt{\det q}} v^q \mathcal{P}_q^a \right) K_a^i \right] S_{0i} \\
&\quad - \left[\Gamma_t^i - \left(N^a + N \frac{8\pi G}{\sqrt{\det q}} v^q \mathcal{P}_q^a \right) \Gamma_a^i \right] S_i \\
&\quad - N \frac{8\pi G}{\sqrt{\det q}} (\gamma^0 - v_m \gamma^m) \mathcal{P}_j^a \gamma^j (K_a^i S_{0i} + \Gamma_a^i S_i) ,
\end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
D_\mu(|e|e_I^\mu \gamma^I) &= \frac{2}{i} \frac{1+i\alpha\gamma^5}{1+\alpha^2} \left[\{\Xi, \mathcal{H}\} - \partial_a (\bar{\Theta}^a \Xi) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - i(\bar{\Omega} \Xi - \Xi \Omega) \right] ,
\end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Omega}\Xi - \Xi\Omega = \frac{i}{2}\gamma\sqrt{\det q}(1+i\alpha\gamma^5) & \left[-i \left[K_t^i - \left(N^a + N \frac{8\pi G}{\sqrt{\det q}} v^q \mathcal{P}_q^a \right) K_a^i \right] (\gamma_i - v_i \gamma^0) \right. \\ & \left. + i \left[\Gamma_t^i - \left(N^a + N \frac{8\pi G}{\sqrt{\det q}} v^q \mathcal{P}_q^a \right) \Gamma_a^i \right] v_m \epsilon_i^m \gamma^l - i \frac{8\pi G N}{\gamma^2 \sqrt{\det q}} \mathcal{P}_j^a \left(K_a^j \gamma^0 + \Gamma_a^i \epsilon_i^j \gamma^l \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

The bracket $\{\Xi, \mathcal{H}\}$ cannot be written definitively in terms of the phase-space variables at this stage because it requires knowledge of the Hamiltonian, yet to be computed. However, on shell, it must be such that Eq. (77) coincides with (26) if the Dirac-fermion constraints are imposed.

Using the above results, the equation of motion for the fermionic momentum is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{P}_\Psi = \partial_a (P_\Psi \Theta^a) - i P_\Psi \Omega \\ + \frac{\gamma P_\Psi (1 - i\alpha\gamma^5) (\gamma^0 - v_n \gamma^n) D_\mu (|e| e_I^\mu \gamma^I)}{\sqrt{\det q}}. \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

Finally, relevant components of the torsion equation (23) for the forthcoming canonical analysis can be expressed by the symmetric internal tensor

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}^{ij} & \equiv - \frac{\delta_k^{(i} \epsilon^{j)pq} \mathcal{P}_p^a \mathcal{P}_q^b}{\sqrt{8\pi G |\det \bar{\mathcal{P}}|}} \mathcal{T}_{ab}^k \\ & = \left(\delta^{ij} \delta_q^p - \delta^{p(i} \delta^{j)} \right) \mathcal{P}_p^d \Gamma_d^q - \delta_q^{(i} \delta^{j)p} \mathcal{K}_p^d K_d^q \\ & \quad + \delta_k^{(i} \epsilon^{j)pq} \mathcal{P}_p^c \mathcal{P}_q^d \partial_d (\mathcal{P}^{-1})^k_c \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{1 + \zeta^2} [P_\Psi (\zeta - i\gamma^5) v^{ij} \Psi + c.c.], \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

where

$$v^{ij} = \delta^{ij} + \gamma^2 (\gamma^0 - v_u \gamma^u) v^{(i} \gamma^{j)}. \quad (81)$$

IV. FIRST-CLASS CONSTRAINTS

A. Constraints

The action $S = S_G + S_F$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} S = \int d^4x & \left[\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_i^a F_{ta}^{0i} + \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_i^a \mathcal{F}_{ta}^i + P_\Psi D_t \Psi + D_t \bar{\Psi} \overline{P}_\Psi \right. \\ & \quad + \frac{|e|}{16\pi G} e_I^a e_J^b P^{IJ}{}_{KL} F_{ab}^{KL} \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{i}{2} |e| e_I^a (\bar{\Psi} \gamma^I D_a \Psi - D_a \bar{\Psi} \gamma^I \Psi) \right] \\ & = \int d^4x \left[\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_i^a \dot{K}_a^i + \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_i^a \dot{\Gamma}_a^i + P_\Psi \dot{\Psi} + \bar{\Psi} \dot{\overline{P}}_\Psi \right] \\ & \quad - H[N] - H_a[N^a] - L_i[K_t^i] - G_i[\Gamma_t^i], \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

which is linear in all Lagrange multipliers and, therefore, all the local expressions of H , H_a , L_i , and G_i are constraints. Only the first line contributes to the symplectic

term and to L_i and G_i , while only the second and third lines contribute to H and H_a . Notice that the absolute value of the lapse $|N|$ smears the Hamiltonian constraint; this is because the action depends on the absolute value of the co-tetrad's determinant $|e|$. In the following, however, we will often write $H[N]$, but it is understood that we use only its magnitude. This detail is not relevant in most applications because the gauge choices of the lapse that change sign would require that it vanishes in some region of the spacetime, which would amount to a limitation of the coordinate chart related to that specific gauge choice and hence another well-defined gauge, with locally non-vanishing lapse, is required to describe that region of the spacetime; however, it will be important for the discussion on discrete symmetries presented in Section VIII.

We first focus on the Lorentz-Gauss constraints, given by $L_i = L_i^{(G)} + L_i^{(F)}$ and $G_i = G_i^{(G)} + G_i^{(F)}$, respectively, where

$$L_i^{(G)} = -\partial_a \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_i^a - \left(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_k^a \Gamma_a^l - \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_k^a K_a^l \right) \epsilon^k{}_{li} \quad (83)$$

$$= -\partial_a \mathcal{P}_i^a - \zeta \partial_a \mathcal{K}_i^a - \left(\mathcal{P}_k^a B_a^l - \mathcal{K}_k^a A_a^l \right) \epsilon^k{}_{li},$$

$$L_i^{(F)} = -i [P_\Psi S_{0i} \Psi - \bar{\Psi} S_{0i} \overline{P}_\Psi], \quad (84)$$

$$G_i^{(G)} = -\partial_a \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_i^a - \left(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_k^a K_a^l + \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_k^a \Gamma_a^l \right) \epsilon^k{}_{li} \quad (85)$$

$$= -\partial_a \mathcal{K}_i^a + \zeta \partial_a \mathcal{P}_i^a - \left(\mathcal{P}_k^a A_a^l + \mathcal{K}_k^a B_a^l \right) \epsilon^k{}_{li},$$

and

$$G_i^{(F)} = -i [P_\Psi S_i \Psi - \bar{\Psi} S_i \overline{P}_\Psi]. \quad (86)$$

The gravitational contributions to these constraints generate proper Lorentz transformations of the triad e_I^a and the spatial strength tensor F_{ab}^{IJ} even off shell [5]. The fermionic contributions preserve the generation of Lorentz transformations of the gravitational variables and also generate those of the fermionic variables:

$$\{\Psi, L_i[\beta^i]\} = -i\beta^i S_{0i} \Psi, \quad \{\Psi, G_i[\theta^i]\} = -i\theta^i S_i \Psi, \quad (87)$$

$$\{P_\Psi, L_i[\beta^i]\} = i\beta^i P_\Psi S_{0i}, \quad \{P_\Psi, G_i[\theta^i]\} = i\theta^i P_\Psi S_i. \quad (88)$$

The vector constraint is given by $H_a = H_a^{(G)} + H_a^{(F)}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} H_a^{(G)} & = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_i^b F_{ab}^{0i} + \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_i^b \mathcal{F}_{ab}^i \\ & = \mathcal{P}_i^b (F_{ab}^{0i} - \zeta \mathcal{F}_{ab}^i) + \mathcal{K}_i^b (\mathcal{F}_{ab}^i + \zeta F_{ab}^{0i}), \end{aligned} \quad (89)$$

is the gravitational contribution and

$$\begin{aligned} H_a^{(F)} &= P_\Psi D_a \Psi + \overline{D_a \Psi} \overline{P_\Psi} \\ &= P_\Psi \partial_a \Psi + \partial_a \overline{\Psi} \overline{P_\Psi} - K_a^i L_i^{(F)} - \Gamma_a^i G_i^{(F)}, \end{aligned} \quad (90)$$

is the fermionic contribution.

Above, we used the expressions

$$F_{ab}^{0i} = 2\partial_{[a} K_{b]}^i - 2\epsilon^i{}_{jk} K_{[a}^j \Gamma_{b]}^k \quad (91)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{ab}^i &= \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^i{}_{kl} F_{ab}^{kl} \\ &= 2\partial_{[a} \Gamma_{b]}^i + \epsilon^i{}_{jk} K_a^j K_b^k - \epsilon^i{}_{jk} \Gamma_a^j \Gamma_b^k. \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

The linear combinations with the Barbero–Immirzi parameter can be written more compactly in the A, B variables,

$$\begin{aligned} F_{ab}^{0i} - \zeta \mathcal{F}_{ab}^i &= 2\partial_{[a} A_{b]}^i \\ &+ 2\epsilon^i{}_{kl} \frac{1}{1+\zeta^2} \left(\frac{\zeta}{2} (A_{[a}^k A_{b]}^l - B_{[a}^k B_{b]}^l) - A_{[a}^k B_{b]}^l \right), \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{ab}^i + \zeta F_{ab}^{0i} &= 2\partial_{[a} B_{b]}^i \\ &+ 2\epsilon^i{}_{kl} \frac{1}{1+\zeta^2} \left(\frac{1}{2} (A_{[a}^k A_{b]}^l - B_{[a}^k B_{b]}^l) + \zeta A_{[a}^k B_{b]}^l \right). \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

The Hamiltonian constraint is given by

$$H = H^{(1)} + H^{(2)}, \quad (95)$$

where

$$H^{(1)} = H_a \frac{\gamma \sqrt{(\det \mathcal{P})^{-1}}}{\sqrt{8\pi G}} v^q \mathcal{P}_q^a.$$

and $H^{(2)} = H_{(G)}^{(2)} + H_{(F)}^{(2)}$ with the gravitational contribution

$$\begin{aligned} H_{(G)}^{(2)} &= -\frac{\sqrt{|(\det \mathcal{P})^{-1}|}}{2\gamma \sqrt{8\pi G}} \mathcal{P}_p^a \mathcal{P}_q^b \epsilon^{pq}{}_i (\mathcal{F}_{ab}^i + \zeta F_{ab}^{0i}) \\ &+ \frac{\sqrt{|\det \mathcal{P}|}}{\gamma} \sqrt{8\pi G} \Lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

and the fermionic contribution

$$\begin{aligned} H_{(F)}^{(2)} &= -\frac{\gamma \sqrt{(\det \mathcal{P})^{-1}}}{\sqrt{8\pi G}} \mathcal{P}_j^a \left[P_\Psi (\gamma^0 - v_m \gamma^m) \gamma^j (\partial_a \Psi + i (K_a^i S_{0i} + \Gamma_a^i S_i) \Psi) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (\partial_a \overline{\Psi} - i \overline{\Psi} (K_a^i S_{0i} + \Gamma_a^i S_i)) \gamma^j (\gamma^0 - v_m \gamma^m) \overline{P_\Psi} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

(The various replacements of $\overline{\Psi}$ for P_Ψ , and their respective conjugates, are necessary to recover the correct equations of motion and to respect the discrete symmetries of the theory as will be clear in Section VIII.)

Because all of the first-class constraints are independent of α , we find that the theory is kinematically independent of the non-minimal coupling parameter.

B. Constraint algebra

A straightforward computation shows that L_i and G_i satisfy the Lorentz algebra,

$$\{L_i[K_t^i], L_j[\beta^j]\} = -G_k[\epsilon^k{}_{ij} K_t^i \beta^j], \quad (98)$$

$$\{G_i[\Gamma_t^i], L_j[\beta^j]\} = L_k[\epsilon^k{}_{ij} \Gamma_t^i \beta^j], \quad (99)$$

$$\{G_i[\Gamma_t^i], G_j[\theta^j]\} = G_k[\epsilon^k{}_{ij} \Gamma_t^i \theta^j]. \quad (100)$$

Now consider the linear combination $\mathfrak{D}_b[N^b] = H_a[N^b] + G_i[\Gamma_b^i N^b] + L_i[K_b^i N^b]$; in its local form, it is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{D}_a &= \mathcal{P}_i^b \partial_a A_b^i + \mathcal{K}_i^b \partial_a B_b^i - \partial_b (\mathcal{P}_i^b A_a^i + \mathcal{K}_i^b B_a^i) \\ &+ P_\Psi \partial_a \Psi + \partial_a \overline{\Psi} \overline{P_\Psi}. \end{aligned} \quad (101)$$

It is then clear that the functional $\mathfrak{D}_a[N^a]$ generates spatial diffeomorphisms of all phase-space variables. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathcal{O}, H_b[N^b]\} &= \mathcal{L}_{\vec{N}} \mathcal{O} + \{G_i[\Gamma_b^i N^b], \mathcal{O}\} \\ &+ \{L_i[K_b^i N^b], \mathcal{O}\}, \end{aligned} \quad (102)$$

for any phase-space function \mathcal{O} .

Using the above, we obtain that the vector constraint commutes with the Lorentz–Gauss constraints,

$$\{H_a[N^a], G_k[\theta^k]\} = 0, \quad (103)$$

$$\{H_a[N^a], L_k[\beta^k]\} = 0. \quad (104)$$

Similarly, using (102), together with (103) and (104), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \{H_a[N^a], H_c[\epsilon^c]\} &= -H_a[\mathcal{L}_{\vec{\epsilon}} N^a] - G_i[\epsilon^a N^b \mathcal{F}_{ab}^i] \\ &- L_i[\epsilon^a N^b F_{ab}^{0i}]. \end{aligned} \quad (105)$$

The second and third lines of the action (82) are Lorentz invariant and they equal $-H[N] - H_a[N^a]$. Using (103) and (104), as well as the fact that the Lorentz–Gauss constraints generate proper Lorentz transformations on and off shell, it follows that the Lorentz–Gauss constraints commute with the Hamiltonian constraint

too:

$$\{H[N], G_k[\theta^k]\} = 0, \quad (106)$$

$$\{H[N], L_k[\beta^k]\} = 0. \quad (107)$$

Using (102), we obtain the bracket

$$\begin{aligned} \{H[N], H_c[\epsilon^c]\} &= -H[\mathcal{L}_\epsilon N] + G_i [N\epsilon^a \mathcal{F}_{0a}^i] \\ &\quad + L_i [N\epsilon^a F_{0a}^{0i}], \end{aligned} \quad (108)$$

where we defined the expressions

$$\begin{aligned} F_{0a}^{0i} &= \frac{1}{N} \{K_a^i, H[N]\}, \\ \mathcal{F}_{0a}^i &= \frac{1}{N} \{\Gamma_a^i, H[N]\}, \end{aligned} \quad (109)$$

which are compatible with the identification of the normal components of the strength tensor,

$$\begin{aligned} n^\mu F_{\mu a}^{0i} &= \frac{1}{N} F_{ta}^{0i} - \frac{N^b}{N} F_{ba}^{0i} = \frac{1}{N} \{K_a^i, H[N]\}, \\ n^\mu \mathcal{F}_{\mu a}^i &= \frac{1}{N} \mathcal{F}_{ta}^i - \frac{N^b}{N} \mathcal{F}_{ba}^i = \frac{1}{N} \{\Gamma_a^i, H[N]\}. \end{aligned} \quad (110)$$

Using all the above, we compute the bracket of the Hamiltonian constraint with itself in steps. First, using (105) and (102), we obtain

$$\{H^{(1)}[N], H^{(1)}[\epsilon^{\bar{0}}]\} = 0, \quad (111)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \{H^{(2)}[N], H^{(1)}[\epsilon^{\bar{0}}]\} &+ \{H^{(1)}[N], H^{(2)}[\epsilon^{\bar{0}}]\} \\ &= -H^{(2)} \left[\frac{\sqrt{(\det \mathcal{P})^{-1}}}{\sqrt{8\pi G}} \gamma v^q \mathcal{P}_q^a (\epsilon^{\bar{0}} \partial_a N - N \partial_a \epsilon^{\bar{0}}) \right] \\ &\quad - H_a \left[q^{ab} (\epsilon^{\bar{0}} \partial_b N - N \partial_b \epsilon^{\bar{0}}) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (112)$$

where q^{ab} is the inverse spatial metric (65). Using the antisymmetry of the Poisson brackets—with proper care of the sign changes from commuting the fermionic variables—it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \{H_{(G)}^{(2)}[N], H_{(G)}^{(2)}[\epsilon^{\bar{0}}]\} \\ = H_{(G)}^{(2)} \left[\frac{\sqrt{(\det \mathcal{P})^{-1}}}{\sqrt{8\pi G}} \gamma v^q \mathcal{P}_q^b (\epsilon^{\bar{0}} \partial_b N - N \partial_b \epsilon^{\bar{0}}) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (113)$$

$$\{H_{(F)}^{(2)}[N], H_{(F)}^{(2)}[\epsilon^{\bar{0}}]\} = 0, \quad (114)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \{H_{(G)}^{(2)}[N], H_{(F)}^{(2)}[\epsilon^{\bar{0}}]\} &+ \{H_{(F)}^{(2)}[N], H_{(G)}^{(2)}[\epsilon^{\bar{0}}]\} \\ &= H_{(F)}^{(2)} \left[\frac{\sqrt{(\det \mathcal{P})^{-1}}}{\sqrt{8\pi G}} \gamma v^q \mathcal{P}_q^b (\epsilon^{\bar{0}} \partial_b N - N \partial_b \epsilon^{\bar{0}}) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (115)$$

Therefore, the full bracket of the Hamiltonian constraint with itself is given by

$$\{H[N], H[\epsilon^{\bar{0}}]\} = -H_a \left[q^{ab} (\epsilon^{\bar{0}} \partial_b N - N \partial_b \epsilon^{\bar{0}}) \right]. \quad (116)$$

In summary, the constraint algebra in the extended phase space is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \{H_a[N^a], H_c[\epsilon^c]\} &= -H_a [\mathcal{L}_\epsilon N^a] - G_i [\epsilon^a N^b \mathcal{F}_{ab}^i] \\ &\quad - L_i [\epsilon^a N^b F_{ab}^{0i}], \end{aligned} \quad (117)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \{H[N], H_c[\epsilon^c]\} &= -H[\mathcal{L}_\epsilon N] + G_i [N\epsilon^a \mathcal{F}_{0a}^i] \\ &\quad + L_i [N\epsilon^a F_{0a}^{0i}], \end{aligned} \quad (118)$$

$$\{H[N], H[\epsilon^{\bar{0}}]\} = -H_a \left[q^{ab} (\epsilon^{\bar{0}} \partial_b N - N \partial_b \epsilon^{\bar{0}}) \right], \quad (119)$$

$$\{H_c[N^c], G_k[\theta^k]\} = 0, \quad (120)$$

$$\{H_c[N^c], L_k[\beta^k]\} = 0, \quad (121)$$

$$\{H[N], G_k[\theta^k]\} = 0, \quad (122)$$

$$\{H[N], L_k[\beta^k]\} = 0, \quad (123)$$

$$\{G_i[\Gamma_t^i], G_j[\theta^j]\} = G_k [\epsilon^k_{ij} \Gamma_t^i \theta^j], \quad (124)$$

$$\{G_i[\Gamma_t^i], L_j[\beta^j]\} = L_k [\epsilon^k_{ij} \Gamma_t^i \beta^j], \quad (125)$$

$$\{L_i[K_t^i], L_j[\beta^j]\} = -G_k [\epsilon^k_{ij} K_t^i \beta^j], \quad (126)$$

which is identical to that of the vacuum system [5].

C. Gauge transformations and covariance

While the transformation of phase-space functions under the flow of the first-class constraints is directly provided by the action of Poisson brackets, this is not the case for the non-dynamical fields N , N^a , K_t^i , and Γ_t^i . Instead, their transformations are defined by the preservation of the form of Hamilton's equations of motion along this flow—this is the definition of a gauge transformation—and hence are determined by the constraint algebra (117)-(126) [5, 14, 15]:

$$\delta_{\epsilon, \theta, \beta} N = \dot{\epsilon}^0 + \epsilon^b \partial_b N - N^b \partial_b \epsilon^{\bar{0}}, \quad (127)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\epsilon, \theta, \beta} N^a &= \dot{\epsilon}^a + \epsilon^b \partial_b N^a - N^b \partial_b \epsilon^a \\ &\quad + q^{ab} (\epsilon^{\bar{0}} \partial_b N - N \partial_b \epsilon^{\bar{0}}), \end{aligned} \quad (128)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\epsilon, \theta, \beta} K_t^i &= \dot{\beta}^i + \epsilon^j_{jk} (\beta^j \Gamma_t^k + \theta^j K_t^k) + \epsilon^a N^b F_{ab}^{0i} \\ &\quad + (\epsilon^{\bar{0}} N^a - N \epsilon^a) F_{0a}^{0i}, \end{aligned} \quad (129)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\epsilon, \theta, \beta} \Gamma_t^i &= \dot{\theta}^i + \epsilon^j_{jk} (\theta^j \Gamma_t^k - \beta^j K_t^k) + \epsilon^a N^b \mathcal{F}_{ab}^i \\ &\quad + (\epsilon^{\bar{0}} N^a - N \epsilon^a) \mathcal{F}_{0a}^i. \end{aligned} \quad (130)$$

That is, the canonical gauge transformations are given by the combined operation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O} &\rightarrow \mathcal{O} + \{\mathcal{O}, H[\epsilon^0] + H_a[\epsilon^a] + G_i[\theta^i] + L_i[\beta^i]\}, \\ N &\rightarrow N + \delta_{\epsilon, \theta, \beta} N, \quad N^a \rightarrow N^a + \delta_{\epsilon, \theta, \beta} N^a, \\ K_t^i &\rightarrow K_t^i + \delta_{\epsilon, \theta, \beta} K_t^i, \quad \Gamma_t^i \rightarrow \Gamma_t^i + \delta_{\epsilon, \theta, \beta} \Gamma_t^i, \end{aligned} \quad (131)$$

for all phase-space functions \mathcal{O} .

The transformations of the non-dynamical fields are essential to understand the transformations of the physical fields which generally depend on them—for instance, the components of the spacetime metric (28) depend on N and N^a , while the connection, and hence also the strength and torsion tensor fields, depend on K_t^i and Γ_t^i .

The canonical system is covariant only if the canonical gauge transformations of the physical fields correspond to spacetime diffeomorphisms and infinitesimal $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ transformations on shell. For instance, the canonical gauge transformation of the spacetime metric must satisfy the covariance condition

$$\delta_{\epsilon, \theta, \beta} g_{\mu\nu} \big|_{\text{OS}} = \mathcal{L}_\xi g_{\mu\nu} \big|_{\text{OS}}, \quad (132)$$

where "OS" denotes an evaluation on shell, involving the vanishing of the constraints and use of Hamilton's equations of motion in the right-hand side for the time-derivatives, $\dot{q}_{ab} = \{q_{ab}, \mathcal{H}\}$. The gauge parameters $(\epsilon^{\bar{0}}, \epsilon^a)$ in (132) are related to the diffeomorphism-generator vector field ξ^μ by the following change of basis,

$$\begin{aligned} \xi^\mu &= \epsilon^{\bar{0}} n^\mu + \epsilon^a s_a^\mu = \xi^t t^\mu + \xi^a s_a^\mu, \\ \xi^t &= \frac{\epsilon^{\bar{0}}}{N}, \quad \xi^a = \epsilon^a - \frac{\epsilon^{\bar{0}}}{N} N^a. \end{aligned} \quad (133)$$

On the other hand, the canonical decomposition of spacetime diffeomorphisms and proper Lorentz transformations—the latter denoted by $\delta^{\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})}$ in what follows—of the non-dynamical components of the connection are respectively given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\xi K_t^i &= \delta_{\xi^\mu \Gamma_\mu, \xi^\mu K_\mu}^{\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})} K_t^i + \epsilon^a N^b F_{ab}^{0i} \\ &\quad + \left(\epsilon^{\bar{0}} N^a - N \epsilon^a \right) F_{0a}^{0i}, \end{aligned} \quad (134)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\xi \Gamma_t^i &= \delta_{\xi^\mu \Gamma_\mu, \xi^\mu K_\mu}^{\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})} \Gamma_t^i + \epsilon^a N^b \mathcal{F}_{ab}^i \\ &\quad + \left(\epsilon^{\bar{0}} N^a - N \epsilon^a \right) \mathcal{F}_{0a}^i, \end{aligned} \quad (135)$$

and

$$\delta_{\theta, \beta}^{\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})} K_t^i = \dot{\beta}^i + \epsilon^i_{jk} (\beta^j \Gamma_t^k + \theta^j K_t^k), \quad (136)$$

$$\delta_{\theta, \beta}^{\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})} \Gamma_t^i = \dot{\theta}^i + \epsilon^i_{jk} (\theta^j \Gamma_t^k - \beta^j K_t^k). \quad (137)$$

Using this, the canonical gauge transformations (127)-(130) can be written as linear combinations of diffeomorphisms and Lorentz transformations:

$$\delta_{\epsilon, \theta, \beta} \cdot \big|_{\text{OS}} = \mathcal{L}_\xi \cdot + \delta_{\theta - \xi^\mu \Gamma_\mu, \beta - \xi^\mu K_\mu}^{\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})} \cdot \big|_{\text{OS}}. \quad (138)$$

All physical fields are therefore expected to follow this transformation under the gauge flow.

In particular, the covariance condition of the spacetime metric (132) agrees with the transformation (138) if the metric is Lorentz-invariant under the gauge flow. This is indeed the case because the lapse and shift do not suffer transformations under the flow of the Lorentz-Gauss

constraints, as implied by (127) and (128), and neither does the spatial metric,

$$\{q^{ab}, G_i[\theta^i]\} = 0, \quad (139)$$

$$\{q^{ab}, L_i[\beta^i]\} = 0. \quad (140)$$

This, in turn, implies that the vector constraint generates spatial diffeomorphisms of the spatial metric on shell:

$$\begin{aligned} \{q^{ab}(x), H_c[\epsilon^c]\} &= \mathcal{L}_{\bar{\epsilon}} q^{ab} - L_i [\{q^{ab}(x), K_b^i N^b\}] \\ &\quad - G_i [\{q^{ab}(x), \Gamma_b^i N^b\}]. \end{aligned} \quad (141)$$

Finally, the canonical gauge transformation of the spatial metric does not contain derivatives of the normal gauge function,

$$\frac{\partial \{q^{ab}, H[\epsilon^{\bar{0}}]\}}{\partial(\partial_{c_1} \epsilon^{\bar{0}})} \bigg|_{\text{OS}} = \frac{\partial \{q^{ab}, H[\epsilon^{\bar{0}}]\}}{\partial(\partial_{c_1} \partial_{c_2} \epsilon^{\bar{0}})} \bigg|_{\text{OS}} = \dots = 0. \quad (142)$$

This is a necessary condition—not implied by the constraint algebra—for (132) to hold [16]. Using equations (127), (128), and (139)-(142), we confirm that the covariance condition (132) is indeed satisfied.

Using (127), (128), and the fact that the Lorentz, Gauss, and vector constraints generate a linear combination of Lorentz transformations and spatial diffeomorphisms, the covariance condition of the tetrad

$$\delta_{\epsilon, \theta, \beta} e_\mu^I \big|_{\text{OS}} = \mathcal{L}_\xi e_\mu^I + \delta_{\theta - \xi^\mu \Gamma_\mu, \beta - \xi^\mu K_\mu}^{\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})} e_\mu^I \big|_{\text{OS}}, \quad (143)$$

can be reduced to a set of conditions for the Hamiltonian constraint, given by

$$\frac{\partial \{v_i, H[\epsilon^{\bar{0}}]\}}{\partial(\partial_c \epsilon^{\bar{0}})} \bigg|_{\text{O.S.}} = \frac{\sqrt{(\det \mathcal{P})^{-1}}}{\gamma \sqrt{8\pi G}} \mathcal{P}_i^c \bigg|_{\text{OS}}, \quad (144)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 \{v_i, H[\epsilon^{\bar{0}}]\}}{\partial(\partial_{c_1} \partial_{c_2} \epsilon^{\bar{0}})} \bigg|_{\text{OS}} = 0, \quad (145)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\delta_c^a \delta_i^k - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{P}_i^a (\mathcal{P}^{-1})_c^k \right) \frac{\partial \{\mathcal{P}_k^c, H[\epsilon^{\bar{0}}]\}}{\partial(\partial_d \epsilon^{\bar{0}})} \bigg|_{\text{OS}} \\ &= - \frac{\gamma \sqrt{(\det \mathcal{P})^{-1}}}{\sqrt{8\pi G}} v^j \mathcal{P}_j^a \mathcal{P}_i^d \bigg|_{\text{OS}}, \end{aligned} \quad (146)$$

$$\left(\delta_c^a \delta_i^k - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{P}_i^a (\mathcal{P}^{-1})_c^k \right) \frac{\partial^2 \{\mathcal{P}_k^c, H[\epsilon^{\bar{0}}]\}}{\partial(\partial_{d_1} \partial_{d_2} \epsilon^{\bar{0}})} \bigg|_{\text{OS}} = 0. \quad (147)$$

Similarly, the covariance condition of the connection,

$$\delta_{\epsilon, \theta, \beta} \omega_\mu^{IJ} \big|_{\text{OS}} = \mathcal{L}_\xi \omega_\mu^{IJ} + \delta_{\theta - \xi^\mu \Gamma_\mu, \beta - \xi^\mu K_\mu}^{\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})} \omega_\mu^{IJ} \big|_{\text{OS}}, \quad (148)$$

reduces to

$$\frac{\partial \{\omega_a^{IJ}, H[\epsilon^{\bar{0}}]\}}{\partial(\partial_{c_1} \epsilon^{\bar{0}})} \bigg|_{\text{OS}} = \frac{\partial \{\omega_a^{IJ}, H[\epsilon^{\bar{0}}]\}}{\partial(\partial_{c_1} \partial_{c_2} \epsilon^{\bar{0}})} \bigg|_{\text{OS}} = \dots = 0, \quad (149)$$

that of the fermion field,

$$\delta_{\epsilon, \theta, \beta} \Psi|_{\text{OS}} = \mathcal{L}_\xi \Psi + \delta_{\theta - \xi^\mu \Gamma_\mu, \beta - \xi^\mu K_\mu}^{\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})} \Psi|_{\text{OS}}, \quad (150)$$

to

$$\frac{\partial \{\Psi, H[\epsilon^{\bar{0}}]\}}{\partial (\partial_{c_1} \epsilon^{\bar{0}})} \Big|_{\text{OS}} = \frac{\partial \{\Psi, H[\epsilon^{\bar{0}}]\}}{\partial (\partial_{c_1} \partial_{c_2} \epsilon^{\bar{0}})} \Big|_{\text{OS}} = \dots = 0, \quad (151)$$

and that of the fermion momentum,

$$\delta_{\epsilon, \theta, \beta} P_\Psi|_{\text{OS}} = \mathcal{L}_\xi P_\Psi + \delta_{\theta - \xi^\mu \Gamma_\mu, \beta - \xi^\mu K_\mu}^{\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})} P_\Psi|_{\text{OS}}, \quad (152)$$

to

$$\frac{\partial \{P_\Psi \Xi^{-1}, H[\epsilon^{\bar{0}}]\}}{\partial (\partial_{c_1} \epsilon^{\bar{0}})} \Big|_{\text{OS}} = \frac{\partial \{P_\Psi \Xi^{-1}, H[\epsilon^{\bar{0}}]\}}{\partial (\partial_{c_1} \partial_{c_2} \epsilon^{\bar{0}})} \Big|_{\text{OS}} = \dots = 0, \quad (153)$$

or, using (142) and (144), to

$$\frac{\partial \{P_\Psi, H[\epsilon^{\bar{0}}]\}}{\partial (\partial_c \epsilon^{\bar{0}})} \Big|_{\text{OS}} = \frac{8\pi G}{\sqrt{\det q}} \mathcal{P}_j^c P_\Psi [v^j - (\gamma^0 - v_i \gamma^i) \gamma^j] \quad (154)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \{P_\Psi, H[\epsilon^{\bar{0}}]\}}{\partial (\partial_{c_1} \partial_{c_2} \epsilon^{\bar{0}})} \Big|_{\text{OS}} = 0, \quad (155)$$

where we used the fact that $P_\Psi \Xi^{-1}$ constitutes a cospinor field to arrive at (153). The covariance conditions of $\bar{\Psi}$ and $\overline{P_\Psi}$ are given by the complex conjugate of those of Ψ and P_Ψ because all the constraints are Hermitian upon use of the reality conditions and hence do not constitute independent covariance conditions.

The connection and fermion covariance conditions (149) and (151) can be readily verified to hold because the Hamiltonian constraint has no derivatives of their momenta; similarly, the covariance conditions for the fermion momentum (154) and (155) can be easily shown to hold from the simple dependence of the H on derivatives of Ψ . On the other hand, proving that the covariance conditions of the tetrad (144)-(147) hold requires several detailed computations, but they indeed hold in the vacuum [5] and the presence of fermions does not imply contributions to these equations because the respective contributions to the constraints do not contain derivatives of the configuration variables conjugate to v_i or \mathcal{P}_i^a .

All physical fields correspond to geometric objects, matter currents, or stress-energy tensor fields that are constructed with the tetrad, the connection, and Ψ ; therefore, the canonical gauge transformations of all physical fields correspond to linear combinations of

spacetime diffeomorphisms and $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ transformations. We conclude that our canonical system is indeed covariant in the extended phase space. This property holds on the second-class constraint surface, which we show in the next section by use of the corresponding Dirac brackets.

D. Dirac observables

The functionals

$$\mathfrak{L}_i[\alpha^i] = \int d^3x \alpha^i \left[- \left(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_k^a \Gamma_a^l - \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_k^a K_a^l \right) \epsilon_{ik}^l - i \left(P_\Psi S_{0i} \Psi - \bar{\Psi} S_{0i} \overline{P_\Psi} \right) \right], \quad (156)$$

and

$$\mathfrak{G}_i[\sigma^i] = \int d^3x \sigma^i \left[- \left(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_k^a K_a^l + \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_k^a \Gamma_a^l \right) \epsilon_{ik}^l - i \left[P_\Psi S_i \Psi - \bar{\Psi} S_i \overline{P_\Psi} \right] \right], \quad (157)$$

with constants α^i and σ^i , are (nonlocal) Dirac observables because they are identical to the Lorentz–Gauss constraints up to boundary terms when smeared by constants: Using $\{\mathfrak{L}_i, \mathcal{H}\} = \{L_i + \partial_a \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_i^a, \mathcal{H}\}$, and $\{\mathfrak{G}_i, \mathcal{H}\} = \{G_i + \partial_a \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_i^a, \mathcal{H}\}$, the brackets of the local versions of the observables with the constraints result in

$$\{\mathfrak{L}_i, L_j[K_t^j]\}|_{\text{OS}} = \partial_a \left(\epsilon_{ik}^l K_t^k \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_l^a \right), \quad (158)$$

$$\{\mathfrak{L}_i, G_j[\Gamma_t^j]\}|_{\text{OS}} = -\partial_a \left(\epsilon_{ik}^l \Gamma_t^k \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_l^a \right), \quad (159)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathfrak{L}_i, H_a[N^a]\}|_{\text{OS}} &= \partial_a (\mathfrak{L}_i N^a) \\ &+ \partial_a \left(\epsilon_{ij}^k \left(\Gamma_b^j \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_k^a - K_b^j \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_k^a \right) N^b \right), \end{aligned} \quad (160)$$

and

$$\{\mathfrak{G}_i, L_j[K_t^j]\}|_{\text{OS}} = -\partial_a \left(\epsilon_{ik}^l K_t^k \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_l^a \right), \quad (161)$$

$$\{\mathfrak{G}_i, G_j[\Gamma_t^j]\}|_{\text{OS}} = -\partial_a \left(\epsilon_{ik}^l \Gamma_t^k \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_l^a \right). \quad (162)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathfrak{G}_i, H_a[N^a]\}|_{\text{OS}} &= \partial_a (\mathfrak{G}_i N^a) \\ &+ \partial_a \left(\epsilon_{ik}^l \left(K_b^k \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_l^a + \Gamma_b^k \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_l^a \right) N^b \right), \end{aligned} \quad (163)$$

as well as

$$\{\mathfrak{L}_i, H[N]\}_{\text{OS}} = \partial_a \left[N \frac{\gamma \sqrt{(\det \mathcal{P})^{-1}}}{\sqrt{8\pi G}} \left(\mathfrak{L}_i v^q \mathcal{P}_q^a + \epsilon_{ij}{}^k \left(K_b^j \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_k^a - \Gamma_b^j \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_k^a \right) v^q \mathcal{P}_q^b + \frac{2}{\gamma^2} \mathcal{P}_i^{[a} \mathcal{P}_q^{b]} (K_b^q - \zeta \Gamma_b^q) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + (\mathcal{P}_j^a i P_\Psi (\gamma^0 - v_m \gamma^m) \gamma^j S_{0i} \Psi + c.c.) \right) \right], \quad (164)$$

$$\{\mathfrak{G}_i, H[N]\}_{\text{OS}} = \partial_a \left[N \frac{\gamma \sqrt{(\det \mathcal{P})^{-1}}}{\sqrt{8\pi G}} \left(\mathfrak{G}_i v^q \mathcal{P}_q^a + \epsilon_{ik}{}^l \left(K_b^k \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_l^a + \Gamma_b^k \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_l^a \right) v^q \mathcal{P}_q^b - \frac{\mathcal{P}_i^{[a} \mathcal{P}_q^{b]}}{\gamma^2} (\Gamma_b^q + \zeta K_b^q) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + (\mathcal{P}_j^a P_\Psi (\gamma^0 - v_m \gamma^m) \gamma^j i S_i \Psi + c.c.) \right) \right]. \quad (165)$$

The boundary terms imply conserved densitized currents: Defining

$$\mathcal{L}_i^t \equiv \mathfrak{L}_i \quad , \quad \{\mathfrak{L}_i, \mathcal{H}\}_{\text{OS}} =: -\partial_a \mathfrak{L}_i^a, \quad (166)$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}_i^t \equiv \mathfrak{G}_i \quad , \quad \{\mathfrak{G}_i, \mathcal{H}\}_{\text{OS}} =: -\partial_a \mathfrak{G}_i^a, \quad (167)$$

the densitized four-currents $\mathcal{L}_i^\mu = (\mathcal{L}_i^t, \mathcal{L}_i^a)$ and $\mathcal{G}_i^\mu = (\mathcal{G}_i^t, \mathcal{G}_i^a)$ are conserved on shell by definition: $\dot{\mathcal{L}}_i^t = \{\mathcal{L}_i, \mathcal{H}\}_{\text{OS}} = -\partial_a \mathcal{L}_i^a$ and $\dot{\mathcal{G}}_i^t = \{\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{H}\}_{\text{OS}} = -\partial_a \mathcal{G}_i^a$, and hence $\partial_\mu \mathcal{L}_i^\mu = 0$ and $\partial_\mu \mathcal{G}_i^\mu = 0$.

Moreover, these observables form a local Lorentz algebra,

$$\{\mathfrak{G}_i(x), \mathfrak{G}_j(y)\} = \epsilon_{ij}{}^k \mathfrak{G}_k \delta^3(x-y), \quad (168)$$

$$\{\mathfrak{G}_i(x), \mathfrak{L}_j(y)\} = \epsilon_{ij}{}^k \mathfrak{L}_k \delta^3(x-y), \quad (169)$$

$$\{\mathfrak{L}_i(x), \mathfrak{L}_j(y)\} = -\epsilon_{ij}{}^k \mathfrak{G}_k \delta^3(x-y). \quad (170)$$

The appearance of the fermionic variables in the observables (156) and (157) clarifies their physical meaning:

They are spin charges associated to the conserved spin currents \mathcal{L}_i^μ and \mathcal{G}_i^μ .

Similarly, we expect that the densitized electric current $J^\mu = |e| e_I^\mu \bar{\Psi} \gamma^I \Psi$ be conserved too. Indeed, the phase-space functional

$$\mathcal{Q}[\alpha] = -i \int d^3x \alpha (P_\Psi \Psi - \bar{\Psi} \overline{P_\Psi}), \quad (171)$$

whose local version is equivalent to J^t if the relation (47) is used, commutes with the first-class constraints up to boundary terms:

$$\{\mathcal{Q}, L_j[K_t^j]\} = 0, \quad (172)$$

$$\{\mathcal{Q}, G_j[\Gamma_t^j]\} = 0, \quad (173)$$

$$\{\mathcal{Q}, H_a[N^a]\} = \partial_a (\mathcal{Q} N^a), \quad (174)$$

and

$$\{\mathcal{Q}, H[N]\} = \partial_a \left[N \frac{\gamma \sqrt{(\det \mathcal{P})^{-1}}}{\sqrt{8\pi G}} \mathcal{P}_j^a (\mathcal{Q} v^j + i P_\Psi (\gamma^0 - v_m \gamma^m) \gamma^j \Psi - i \bar{\Psi} \gamma^j (\gamma^0 - v_m \gamma^m) \overline{P_\Psi}) \right]. \quad (175)$$

The boundary terms can be identified with the spatial components of the electric current J^a such that

$$\dot{\mathcal{Q}} = -\partial_a J^a \quad (176)$$

or $\partial_\mu J^\mu = 0$ on shell.

The bracket of this observable with itself forms a local Abelian algebra,

$$\{\mathcal{Q}(x), \mathcal{Q}(y)\} = 0. \quad (177)$$

E. Fermion dynamics in the extended phase space

Hamilton's equations of motion for the fermionic variables result in

$$\dot{\Psi} = \{\Psi, \mathcal{H}\} = \Theta^a \partial_a \Psi + i \Omega \Psi, \quad (178)$$

and

$$\dot{P_\Psi} = \{P_\Psi, \mathcal{H}\} = \partial_a (P_\Psi \Theta^a) - i P_\Psi \Omega. \quad (179)$$

A direct inspection shows that (178) is equivalent to (61).

Furthermore, using (64), the equation of motion of the momentum (179) can be written as

$$\dot{\Phi} = \Theta^a \partial_a \Phi + i \Omega \Phi - \Xi^{-1} [\{\Xi, \mathcal{H}\} - \partial_a (\bar{\Theta}^a \Xi) - i (\bar{\Omega} \Xi - \Xi \Omega)] \Phi, \quad (180)$$

upon complex conjugation, where the last line is propor-

tional to the covariant divergence of the tetrad (77) and hence (180) is identical to the equation of motion (62). This confirms that the canonical system, off the Dirac-fermion constraint surface, indeed describes the dynamics of the extended fermion action (60).

For completeness, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} & \{\Xi, \mathcal{H}\} - \partial_a (\bar{\Theta}^a \Xi) - i (\bar{\Omega} \Xi - \Xi \Omega) |_{\text{OS}} \\ &= \frac{3i}{8} \frac{8\pi G \gamma N}{1 + \zeta^2} (1 - i\alpha\gamma^5) \left[P_\Psi (\gamma^0 - v_m \gamma^m) \gamma^0 (1 + \zeta i\gamma^5) \Psi \gamma^0 - P_\Psi (\gamma^0 - v_s \gamma^s) \gamma_i (1 + \zeta i\gamma^5) \Psi \gamma^i \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{2}{3} \delta_{i[p} \mathfrak{R}_{l]}^p P_\Psi (\gamma^0 - v_s \gamma^s) \gamma^l (i\gamma^5 - \zeta) \Psi \gamma^i + c.c. \right] \\ &= \frac{3i}{16} \frac{\sqrt{\det q}}{\gamma} \frac{8\pi G N}{1 + \zeta^2} (1 - i\alpha\gamma^5) \left[-\bar{\Phi} \gamma^0 [(\zeta - \alpha) \gamma^5 - i(1 + \alpha\zeta)] \Psi \gamma^0 + \bar{\Phi} \gamma_i [(\zeta - \alpha) \gamma^5 - i(1 + \alpha\zeta)] \Psi \gamma^i \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{2}{3} \delta_{i[p} \mathfrak{R}_{l]}^p \bar{\Phi} \gamma^l ((1 + \zeta\alpha) \gamma^5 - i(\alpha - \zeta)) \Psi \gamma^i + c.c. \right], \end{aligned} \quad (181)$$

where OS here refers to an evaluation on the first-class constraint surface and we used (64) to get the second equality—see App. A 1 for intermediate steps of this calculation.

It follows that the Dirac-fermion constraint (59)—and hence also (58)—is second-class for non-trivial ζ , α , or \mathfrak{R}_{ij} :

$$\begin{aligned} \{C_\Psi, \mathcal{H}\} |_{\text{OS}} &= [\{\Xi, \mathcal{H}\} - \partial_a (\bar{\Theta}^a \Xi) - i (\bar{\Omega} \Xi - \Xi \Omega)] \Psi \\ &= \frac{3i}{8} \frac{\sqrt{\det q}}{\gamma} \frac{8\pi G N}{1 + \zeta^2} (1 - i\alpha\gamma^5) \left[-\bar{\Psi} \gamma^0 (\zeta - \alpha) \gamma^5 \Psi \gamma^0 + \bar{\Psi} \gamma^l \left(\delta_{li} (\zeta - \alpha) + \frac{2}{3} \delta_{i[p} \mathfrak{R}_{l]}^p (1 + \zeta\alpha) \right) \gamma^5 \Psi \gamma^i \right] \Psi, \end{aligned} \quad (182)$$

where we set $C_\Psi = 0 = C_{\bar{\Psi}}$ after the evaluation of the brackets.

V. SECOND-CLASS CONSTRAINTS

A. Gravitational second-class constraints

The fermionic contributions to the Lorentz, Gauss, and vector constraints do not involve the components of the connection in a way that they can contribute to the gravitational secondary second-class constraint (54) on shell, while their gravitational contributions similarly vanish on shell upon evaluation of the primary second-class constraint (53) [5]. Therefore, the only nontrivial contribution comes from the second term of the Hamiltonian constraint,

$$\frac{\delta H^{(2)}[N]}{\delta \mathcal{B}^{ij}} = N \frac{\sqrt{(\det \mathcal{P})^{-1}}}{\gamma \sqrt{8\pi G}} \mathcal{T}_{ij},$$

where \mathcal{T}_{ij} is given by the torsion term (80). This expression can be written as

$$\mathcal{T}_{ij} = \frac{1}{1 + \zeta^2} V_{ij}{}^{kl} (\mathcal{B}_{kl} - \bar{\mathcal{B}}_{kl}), \quad (183)$$

such that $\mathcal{B}^{kl} = \bar{\mathcal{B}}^{kl}$ solves the second-class constraint $\mathcal{C}_{ij} = 0$ —implying that no tertiary second-class constraints arise—and where

$$V_{ij}^{kl} = (\delta_{pq} - v_p v_q) \epsilon^{kp}{}_{(i} \epsilon^{lq}{}_{j)} =: V_{pq} \epsilon^{kp}{}_{(i} \epsilon^{lq}{}_{j)}, \quad (184)$$

using $V_{mn} = \delta_{mn} - v_n v_m$, and

$$\bar{\mathcal{B}}_{ij} = (V^{-1})_{ij}{}^{kl} \mathfrak{b}_{kl}, \quad (185)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{b}_{kl} &= \left(\delta_{p(k} \mathcal{K}_{l)}^d + \zeta \left(\delta_p^q \delta_{kl} - \delta_{p(k} \delta_{l)}^q \right) \mathcal{P}_q^d \right) \mathcal{D}_d^p \\ &\quad - \zeta v_{(k} \mathcal{E}_{l)} - (1 + \zeta^2) \delta_{m(k} \epsilon_{l)}^{pq} (\mathcal{P}^{-1})_c^m \mathcal{P}_p^d \partial_d \mathcal{P}_q^c \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} [P_\Psi (\zeta - i\gamma^5) v_{kl} \Psi + \bar{\Psi} v_{kl} (\zeta - i\gamma^5) \bar{P}_\Psi], \end{aligned} \quad (186)$$

and

$$(V^{-1})^{rs}_{kl} = \frac{1}{2\gamma^2} \left(V^{rs} V_{kl} - 2V_{(k}^r V_{l)}^s \right) \quad (187)$$

is the inverse of V_{ij}^{kl} :

$$(V^{-1})^{rs}_{kl} V_{ij}^{kl} = \delta_k^{(r} \delta_l^{s)}. \quad (188)$$

We can substitute the solution to the second-class constraints, $\mathcal{B}_{ij} = \bar{\mathcal{B}}_{ij}$ and $\mathfrak{K}_{ij} = 0$, in the first-class constraints and the symplectic structure, thereby reducing the phase space, now spanned by the canonical pairs $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{D})$, (v, \mathcal{E}) , (Ψ, P_Ψ) , and $(\bar{\Psi}, \bar{P}_\Psi)$. However, the constraints turn out to have a complicated dependence on the reduced phase space, which complicates explicit computations of their brackets. This complication is bypassed by preserving the extended phase space and use the corresponding Dirac brackets.

B. Dirac brackets

The Poisson brackets between the second-class constraints in the extended phase space are given by

$$\{\mathfrak{K}_{ij}(x), \mathfrak{K}^{kl}(y)\} = 0, \quad (189)$$

$$\{\mathfrak{K}_{ij}(x), \mathcal{T}^{kl}(y)\} = -\frac{1}{1+\zeta^2} V_{ij}^{kl} \delta^3(x-y), \quad (190)$$

$$\{\mathfrak{K}_{ij}(x), C_{\bar{\Psi}}(y)\} = 0 \quad , \quad \{\mathfrak{K}_{ij}(x), C_\Psi(y)\} = 0, \quad (191)$$

$$\{C_{\bar{\Psi}}(x), C_{\bar{\Psi}}(y)\} = 0 \quad , \quad \{C_\Psi(x), C_\Psi(y)\} = 0, \quad (192)$$

and

$$\{C_{\bar{\Psi}}(x), C_\Psi(y)\} = \Upsilon \delta^3(x-y), \quad (193)$$

where

$$\Upsilon = i(8\pi G)^{3/2} \sqrt{|\det \mathcal{P}|} (\gamma^0 - v_m \gamma^m), \quad (194)$$

with inverse

$$\Upsilon^{-1} = \frac{-i\gamma^2}{(8\pi G)^{3/2} \sqrt{|\det \mathcal{P}|}} (\gamma^0 - v_m \gamma^m), \quad (195)$$

$$\{\mathcal{T}_{ij}(x), C_{\bar{\Psi}}(y)\}|_{\text{SCS}} = \frac{4\zeta}{1+\zeta^2} \bar{\Psi} (1 + i\alpha\gamma^5) \bar{v}^{ij} \Upsilon \delta^3(x-y) \quad (196)$$

as well as

$$\{\mathcal{T}_{ij}(x), C_\Psi(y)\}|_{\text{SCS}} = \frac{-4\zeta}{1+\zeta^2} \Upsilon v^{ij} (1 + i\alpha\gamma^5) \Psi \delta^3(x-y) \quad (197)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathcal{T}_{ij}(x), \mathcal{T}^{kl}(y)\}|_{\text{SCS}} &= X_{ij}^{kl} \delta^3(x-y) \\ &\quad + Y_{ij}^{d\ kl} \frac{\partial \delta^3(x-y)}{\partial x^d}, \end{aligned} \quad (198)$$

where the subscript "SCS" denotes an evaluation on the second-class constraint surface,

$$Y_{ij}^{d\ kl} = 2 \frac{1}{1+\zeta^2} v^s \epsilon_{s(i}^{(k} \epsilon_{j)}^{l)} \mathcal{P}_p^d \mathcal{P}_p^c, \quad (199)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} X_{ij}^{kl} = & -\frac{1}{1+\zeta^2} \left[\left(\delta_{ij} \delta^{p(k} \delta_q^{l)} - \delta^{kl} \delta_{(i}^p \delta_{j)}^q \right) \left(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_p^a K_a^q - \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_p^a \Gamma_a^q \right) + \delta_{(i}^{(k} \epsilon_{j)}^{l)r} \left(G_r^{(G)} + \partial_a \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^a \right) \right. \\ & + \left(v^s \epsilon_{s(i}^{(k} - \zeta \delta_{(i}^{(k} \delta_{j)}^{l)} \delta_{j)r} \epsilon^{l)pq} (\mathcal{P}^{-1})_c^r \mathcal{P}_p^d \partial_d \mathcal{P}_q^c + \left(v^s \epsilon_{s(i}^{(k} + \zeta \delta_{(i}^{(k} \delta_{j)}^{l)} \delta_{|r|}^{l)} \epsilon_{j)}^{pq} (\mathcal{P}^{-1})_c^r \mathcal{P}_p^d \partial_d \mathcal{P}_q^c \right. \right. \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\zeta}{1+\zeta^2} \left(P_\Psi (\zeta - i\gamma^5) \left[\gamma^2 (\gamma^0 - v_u \gamma^u) \left[v_{(i} \delta_{j)}^{(k} \gamma^{l)} - v^{(k} \delta_{(i}^{l)} \gamma_{j)} \right] + [v_{ij}, v^{kl}] \right] \Psi + c.c. \right) \\ & \left. \left. - \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{1+\zeta^2} \left(P_\Psi [v_{ij}, v^{kl}] (\zeta - i\gamma^5)^2 \Psi + c.c. \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (200)$$

with

$$[v_{ij}, v^{kl}] = 4i\gamma^2 v_{(i} v^{(k} S_{j)}^{l)} + 2\gamma^4 (\gamma^0 - v_u \gamma^u) \left[v^{(k} \gamma^{l)} v_i v_j - v_{(i} \gamma_{j)} v^k v^l \right]. \quad (201)$$

The second-class constraint matrix is given by

$$C(x, y) = \left(\begin{array}{cccc} \{\mathfrak{K}_{ij}(x), \mathfrak{K}^{kl}(y)\} & \{\mathfrak{K}_{ij}(x), \mathcal{T}^{kl}(y)\} & \{\mathfrak{K}_{ij}(x), C_{\bar{\Psi}}(y)\} & \{\mathfrak{K}_{ij}(x), C_{\Psi}(y)\} \\ \{\mathcal{T}_{ij}(x), \mathfrak{K}^{kl}(y)\} & \{\mathcal{T}_{ij}(x), \mathcal{T}^{kl}(y)\} & \{\mathcal{T}_{ij}(x), C_{\bar{\Psi}}(y)\} & \{\mathcal{T}_{ij}(x), C_{\Psi}(y)\} \\ \{C_{\bar{\Psi}}(x), \mathfrak{K}^{kl}(y)\} & \{C_{\bar{\Psi}}(x), \mathcal{T}^{kl}(y)\} & \{C_{\bar{\Psi}}(x), C_{\bar{\Psi}}(y)\} & \{C_{\bar{\Psi}}(x), C_{\Psi}(y)\} \\ \{C_{\Psi}(x), \mathfrak{K}^{kl}(y)\} & \{C_{\Psi}(x), \mathcal{T}^{kl}(y)\} & \{C_{\Psi}(x), C_{\bar{\Psi}}(y)\} & \{C_{\Psi}(x), C_{\Psi}(y)\} \end{array} \right) \Big|_{\text{SCS}} \quad (202)$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\frac{V}{1+\zeta^2} & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{V}{1+\zeta^2} & X + Y^d \frac{\partial}{\partial x^d} & \frac{4\zeta}{1+\zeta^2} \bar{\Psi} (1 + i\alpha\gamma^5) \bar{v} \Upsilon & -\frac{4\zeta}{1+\zeta^2} \Upsilon v (1 + i\alpha\gamma^5) \Psi \\ 0 & \frac{-4\zeta}{1+\zeta^2} \bar{\Psi} (1 + i\alpha\gamma^5) \bar{v} \Upsilon & 0 & \Upsilon \\ 0 & \frac{4\zeta}{1+\zeta^2} \Upsilon v (1 + i\alpha\gamma^5) \Psi & \Upsilon & 0 \end{pmatrix} \delta^3(x - y),$$

and its inverse by

$$C^{-1}(x, y) = \begin{pmatrix} H(x, y) & (1 + \zeta^2)(V^{-1})\delta^3(x - y) & D_{\Psi}\delta^3(x - y) & D_{\bar{\Psi}}\delta^3(x - y) \\ -(1 + \zeta^2)(V^{-1})\delta^3(x - y) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ D_{\Psi}\delta^3(x - y) & 0 & 0 & \Upsilon^{-1}\delta^3(x - y) \\ D_{\bar{\Psi}}\delta^3(x - y) & 0 & \Upsilon^{-1}\delta^3(x - y) & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (203)$$

with

$$D_{\Psi} = 4\zeta(V^{-1})v(1 + i\alpha\gamma^5)\Psi, \quad D_{\bar{\Psi}} = -4\zeta\bar{\Psi}(1 + i\alpha\gamma^5)\bar{v}(V^{-1}), \quad (204)$$

$$H(x, y) = (1 + \zeta^2)^2 \left[(V^{-1})X(V^{-1}) - (V^{-1})\frac{\partial Y^d}{\partial x^d}(V^{-1}) \right] \delta^3(x - y) + (1 + \zeta^2)^2 (V^{-1})Y^d(V^{-1})\frac{\partial \delta^3(x - y)}{\partial x^d}, \quad (205)$$

where the expressions are ordered according to the contraction of the corresponding internal indices, which have been suppressed for brevity, such that

$$\int d^3z C^{-1}(x, z)C(z, y) = \int d^3z C(x, z)C^{-1}(z, y) = \begin{pmatrix} \delta_i^{(k)}\delta_j^{(l)} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \delta_i^{(k)}\delta_j^{(l)} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \delta_B^A & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \delta_B^A \end{pmatrix} \delta^3(x - y). \quad (206)$$

The Dirac bracket, for any phase-space functions \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{U} , is then given by

$$\{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{U}\}_{\text{D}} = \{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{U}\} - \{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{U}\}_{\text{C}}|_{\text{SCS}}, \quad (207)$$

with correction bracket

$$\{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{U}\}_{\text{C}} = \int d^3z_1 d^3z_2 \begin{pmatrix} \{\mathcal{O}, \mathfrak{K}(z_1)\} \\ \{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{T}(z_1)\} \\ \{\mathcal{O}, C_{\bar{\Psi}}(z_1)\} \\ \{\mathcal{O}, C_{\Psi}(z_1)\} \end{pmatrix}^{\text{T}} (C^{-1})(z_1, z_2) \begin{pmatrix} \{\mathfrak{K}(z_2), \mathcal{U}\} \\ \{\mathcal{T}(z_2), \mathcal{U}\} \\ \{C_{\bar{\Psi}}(z_2), \mathcal{U}\} \\ \{C_{\Psi}(z_2), \mathcal{U}\} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (208)$$

C. Dynamics and covariance on the second-class constraint surface

If \mathcal{U} is a first-class constraint, then the correction bracket $\{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{U}\}_{\text{C}}$ is non-trivial on the first-class and second-class constraint surfaces only if \mathcal{O} depends on \mathcal{B}_{ij} or the fermionic variables.

If both \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{U} are first-class constraints, then the correction bracket is proportional to first-class or second-class constraints; therefore, G_i , L_i , H_a , and H remain

first-class on the second-class constraint surface when using Dirac brackets.

Using the above, the correction brackets do not contribute to the covariance conditions of the metric (142), the tetrad (144)-(147, and the fermionic variables (151), (154), and (155). They contribute to the covariance condition of the connection (149) because it depends on \mathcal{B}_{ij} . However, this contribution is proportional to

$$\frac{\partial\{\mathcal{T}^{ij}, H[\epsilon^0]\}}{\partial(\partial_c \epsilon^0)} \Big|_{\text{OS}} = 0, \quad (209)$$

which vanishes on shell for the following reason. The tensor $\mathcal{T}_{\mu\nu}^I$, given by (23), is generally non-vanishing and, as a function of the tetrad, the connection, and the fermionic variables, it satisfies the covariance identity

$$\delta_{\epsilon,\theta,\beta}\mathcal{T}_{\mu\nu}^I|_{\text{OS}} = \mathcal{L}_\xi\mathcal{T}_{\mu\nu}^I + \delta^{\text{SL}(2,\mathbb{C})}\mathcal{T}_{\mu\nu}^I|_{\text{OS}} \quad (210)$$

in the extended phase space (off the second-class constraint surface). The relevant spatial components then satisfy

$$\left.\frac{\partial\{\mathcal{T}_{ab}^k, H[\epsilon^0]\}}{\partial(\partial_a\epsilon^0)}\right|_{\text{OS}} = -2\mathcal{T}_{0[a}^k\delta_{b]}^d\Big|_{\text{OS}}, \quad (211)$$

and the right-hand side vanishes on the second-class constraint surface where $\mathcal{T}_{\mu\nu}^I = 0$; therefore, (209) holds too.

Finally, imposing the Dirac-fermion constraint—which can also be done without imposing the gravitational second-class constraints—the correction bracket yields

$$\begin{aligned} \{\Psi, \mathcal{H}\}_{\text{C}}|_{\text{OS}} &= \Upsilon^{-1}\{C_\Psi, \mathcal{H}\}|_{\text{OS}} \\ &= \frac{i}{2}\Upsilon^{-1}(1 - i\alpha\gamma^5) D_\mu (|e|e_I^\mu\gamma^I), \end{aligned} \quad (212)$$

and hence the equation of motion becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\Psi} &= \{\Psi, \mathcal{H}\}_{\text{D}} \\ &= \Theta^a\partial_a\Psi + i\Omega\Psi - \frac{i}{2}\Upsilon^{-1}(1 - i\alpha\gamma^5) D_\mu (|e|e_I^\mu\gamma^I), \end{aligned} \quad (213)$$

which indeed matches the Dirac equation (74).

Finally, use of the Dirac brackets preserves the Dirac observables (156), (157), and (171) because they are independent of \mathcal{B}_{ij} on the second-class constraint surface.

VI. MASS TERM

Including the mass term of the action

$$S_m = - \int d^4x |e| m \bar{\Psi} \Psi \quad (214)$$

to the extended phase-space system is not trivial. The candidate terms

$$\bar{\Psi}\Psi, \quad P_\Psi \bar{\Xi}^{-1} \Xi^{-1} \bar{P}_\Psi, \quad -\frac{1}{2} \left(P_\Psi \bar{\Xi}^{-1} \Psi + \bar{\Psi} \Xi^{-1} \bar{P}_\Psi \right), \quad (215)$$

are all equivalent upon use of the Dirac-fermion constraints (58) and (59), but they are not otherwise: They correspond to the following contributions to the extended fermion action,

$$\begin{aligned} S_m^{\text{ext}} &= - \int d^4x |e| \left[m_\Phi \bar{\Phi} \Phi + m_\Psi \bar{\Psi} \Psi \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{m_{\Phi\Psi}}{2} (\bar{\Phi} \Psi + \bar{\Psi} \Phi) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (216)$$

Their contributions to the equations of motion mix Φ and Ψ , such that it is not entirely clear whether they should be considered interactions terms instead.

However, this ambiguity does not appear in the reduced phase-space system, where one can simply include the following mass contribution to the Hamiltonian constraint

$$H_{(m)} = \sqrt{\det q} m \bar{\Psi} \Psi, \quad (217)$$

and use Dirac brackets for the equations of motion: Computing

$$\{\Psi, H_{(m)}[N]\} = 0 \quad (218)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \{\Psi, H_{(m)}[N]\}_{\text{C}} &= -\Upsilon^{-1}\Psi \\ &= im\gamma(\gamma^0 - v_m\gamma^m) \end{aligned} \quad (219)$$

we conclude that the Dirac equation indeed acquires the correct mass term when using Dirac brackets.

VII. CANONICAL QUANTIZATION AND DENSITIZED SPINORS

A. Resolution to the inconsistency of the reality conditions

A critique about the canonical quantization of fermions coupled to gravity, raised in [6]—and followed up in [7] and several other studies—argues that the reality condition of the gravitational variables imposed on the spinor momenta implies an inconsistency upon quantization as follows. Adapted to the variables of our system, one first promotes the classical relation (47) to the operator relation

$$\hat{P}_\Psi = -\hat{\bar{\Psi}}\hat{\Xi}, \quad (220)$$

where $\hat{\Xi}$ is the operator version of (48). The quantum reality condition of the momentum (55) then implies

$$\hat{\bar{P}}_\Psi = -\hat{\Xi}\hat{\Psi}. \quad (221)$$

If f is a real-valued function of the connection components K_a^i or Γ_a^i , and \hat{f} its operator version, then the following inconsistent relation ensues:

$$0 = \overline{[\hat{P}_\Psi, \hat{f}]} = -\frac{i}{2} [\widehat{|e|e_I^t}, \hat{f}] (1 - i\alpha\gamma^5) \gamma^I \hat{\Psi} \neq 0. \quad (222)$$

The first fallacy of this argument lies in the fact that the quantization procedure plays no role in the alleged inconsistency: In the classical context, the same calculation applies,

$$0 = \overline{\{P_\Psi, f\}} = -\frac{i}{2} \{|e|e_I^t, f\} (1 - i\alpha\gamma^5) \gamma^I \Psi \neq 0. \quad (223)$$

Therefore, this argument is ill-posed as a critique for the quantum theory and its resolution should lie already at the classical level.

The second fallacy of this argument lies in the fact that the reality condition plays no role in the alleged inconsistency either: The inconsistency appears without use of the complex conjugation,

$$0 = \{P_\Psi, f\} = \frac{i}{2} \{ |e| e_I^t, f \} \bar{\Psi} \gamma^I (1 - i\alpha \gamma^5) \neq 0. \quad (224)$$

The third fallacy of the argument lies in the implicit assumption that the bracket used in the left-hand side, $\{P_\Psi, f\}$, shares the same symplectic structure as the bracket in the right-hand side, $\{|e| e_I^t, f\}$: The relation (220), or its classical version (47), constitutes a constraint on the phase space—given by (58) and (59)—whose imposition requires the use of the Dirac brackets computed in Subsection VB. Indeed, the Dirac bracket that correspondingly constrains the phase space automatically satisfies

$$\{C_{\bar{\Psi}}, f\}_D = 0, \quad (225)$$

and hence

$$\{P_\Psi, \mathcal{O}\}_D = \left\{ \frac{i}{2} |e| e_I^t \bar{\Psi} \gamma^I (1 - i\alpha \gamma^5), \mathcal{O} \right\}_D \quad (226)$$

for any phase-space function \mathcal{O} , which should hold in the quantum theory by use of corresponding Dirac commutators. Notice that $\{P_\Psi, f(A, B)\}_D \neq 0$ in the reduced phase space, while $\{P_\Psi, f(A, B)\} = 0$ in the extended phase space; the failure to distinguish this difference is the central mistake in (224).

B. Half-densitized fermions

We now address the alleged resolution to the inconsistency above put forward in [7], based on the introduction of a half-densitized fermionic configuration variable

$$\tilde{\Psi} = \sqrt[4]{\det q} \Psi, \quad (227)$$

with half-densitized momentum

$$\tilde{P}_\Psi = \frac{P_\Psi}{\sqrt[4]{\det q}}, \quad (228)$$

and a redefinition of the gravitational configuration variables,

$$\tilde{A}_a^i = A_a^i + \frac{1}{4} \left(\tilde{P}_\Psi \tilde{\Psi} + \bar{\tilde{\Psi}} \bar{\tilde{P}}_\Psi \right) \frac{\partial \ln \det q}{\partial \mathcal{P}_i^a}, \quad (229)$$

$$\tilde{B}_a^i = B_a^i + \frac{1}{4} \left(\tilde{P}_\Psi \tilde{\Psi} + \bar{\tilde{\Psi}} \bar{\tilde{P}}_\Psi \right) \frac{\partial \ln \det q}{\partial \mathcal{K}_i^a}, \quad (230)$$

such that the symplectic structure becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \int d^4x \left[\mathcal{P}_i^a \dot{A}_a^i + \mathcal{K}_i^a \dot{B}_a^i + P_{\Psi \tilde{A}} \dot{\tilde{\Psi}}^{\tilde{A}} + \bar{\tilde{\Psi}}^{\tilde{A}} \bar{P}_{\tilde{\Psi}}^{\tilde{A}} \right] \quad (231) \\ = \int d^4x \left[\mathcal{P}_i^a \dot{A}_a^i + \mathcal{K}_i^a \dot{B}_a^i + \tilde{P}_\Psi \dot{\tilde{\Psi}} + \bar{\tilde{\Psi}} \bar{\tilde{P}}_\Psi \right. \\ \left. - \frac{1}{4} \left(\tilde{P}_\Psi \tilde{\Psi} + \bar{\tilde{\Psi}} \bar{\tilde{P}}_\Psi \right) (\ln \det q)^\bullet \right] \\ = \int d^4x \left[\mathcal{P}_i^a \dot{A}_a^i + \mathcal{K}_i^a \dot{B}_a^i + \tilde{P}_\Psi \dot{\tilde{\Psi}} + \bar{\tilde{\Psi}} \bar{\tilde{P}}_\Psi \right], \end{aligned}$$

where an integration by parts in the time coordinate is performed, and boundary terms are neglected, to obtain the last line.

The previous argument is then repeated with the new variables, such that Eq. (224) is replaced for

$$0 = \{\tilde{P}_\Psi, f(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B})\} = 0, \quad (232)$$

hence resolving the inconsistency according to [7]. However, there is no actual resolution presented by this procedure at all: The phase-space variable \tilde{P}_Ψ Poisson commutes with \tilde{A}_a^i and \tilde{B}_a^i , but the Dirac-fermion conditions were not used in (232) as they were used to arrive at (224). Indeed, following the logic that led to (224), the replacement of the relation (228) into (232) and use of the Dirac-fermion conditions yields an inconsistency once again,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \{\tilde{P}_\Psi, f(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B})\} &= \{P_\Psi / \sqrt[4]{\det q}, f(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B})\} \quad (233) \\ &= \frac{i}{2} \bar{\tilde{\Psi}} \{ \gamma^4 \sqrt[4]{\det q} (\gamma^0 - v_i \gamma^i), f(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}) \} (1 - i\alpha \gamma^5) \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

A basic lesson of Hamiltonian formulations instructs us that the system remains unchanged under this redefinition of variables because it is equivalent to a canonical transformation—implied by the preservation of the symplectic structure (231). In particular, the results of Poisson brackets are invariant under canonical transformations. Were (224) a true inconsistency, it should remain an inconsistency under any canonical transformation, including the use of half-densitized fermionic variables. Therefore, the original inconsistency (222) cannot be due to the use of specific canonical variables as argued in [7]; it is due to a negligent treatment of the phase-space reduction implied by the relation (220).

VIII. DISCRETE SYMMETRIES

In this section, we seek to provide a complete analysis of the discrete symmetries of our system in the spirit of previous studies based on traditional Ashtekar–Barbero variables [17, 18].

In the Einstein–Cartan theory, the $SO(1,3)$ internal symmetry is associated to an internal frame basis rather than a coordinate one. Therefore, extending this group

to $O(1,3)$ requires an analysis of the discrete inversion of the internal basis that is not related to an actual inversion of the time or space coordinates—the latter may be associated instead to a discrete extension of the space-time diffeomorphism group. The decomposition of the internal space (30) induces a natural notion for internal parity and time reversal, defined by the discrete transformation of reversing the internal directions of the frame. In the following, the transformations P and T refer to parity and time-reversal transformations of the internal basis, respectively. This is the appropriate treatment if P and T are to be applied to the fermionic variables (and to associate them to the charge conjugation transformation C), which involve actions on the spinorial internal indices of the larger $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ group.

A. Geometric and Lagrangian formulations

1. Internal parity

The tetrads e_I^μ constitute four orthonormal vectors representing a dynamical frame, which we use to define parity and time-reversal transformations from a geometric perspective in the following.

We define the parity transformation as the change in sign of the Euclidean components of the tetrad:

$$P^{-1}e_0^\mu P = e_0^\mu \quad , \quad P^{-1}e_i^\mu P = -e_i^\mu . \quad (234)$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned} P^{-1}NP &= N \quad , \quad P^{-1}v_i P = -v_i , \\ P^{-1}N^a P &= N^a \quad , \quad P^{-1}\varepsilon_i^a P = -\varepsilon_i^a . \end{aligned} \quad (235)$$

Moreover, the parity transformation of spinors can be inherited from our understanding of flat spacetime,

$$P^{-1}\Psi P = i\beta\Psi , \quad (236)$$

or

$$\psi_{\dot{a}} \rightarrow i\chi^{\dot{a}} \quad , \quad \chi^{\dot{a}} \rightarrow i\psi_{\dot{a}} . \quad (237)$$

Notice that the parity transformations (234) and (236) do not imply the transformation of the connection.

An inspection of the action shows that it is invariant to the parity transformation if it is supplemented with the transformation of the connection

$$P^{-1}\omega_\mu^{0i} P = -\omega_\mu^{0i} \quad , \quad P^{-1}\omega_\mu^{ij} P = \omega_\mu^{ij} , \quad (238)$$

and the parameter sign changes

$$\zeta \rightarrow -\zeta \quad , \quad \alpha \rightarrow -\alpha . \quad (239)$$

However, ζ and α are constants rather than field variables; therefore, (239) cannot be part of a P transformation and hence they correspond to a parity-violating terms.

2. Internal time reversal

We define the time-reversal transformation as the change in sign of the normal internal components of the tetrad:

$$T^{-1}e_0^\mu T = -e_0^\mu \quad , \quad T^{-1}e_i^\mu T = e_i^\mu . \quad (240)$$

This implies

$$T^{-1}NT = -N \quad , \quad T^{-1}v_i T = -v_i , \quad (241)$$

$$T^{-1}N^a T = N^a \quad , \quad T^{-1}\varepsilon_i^a T = \varepsilon_i^a . \quad (242)$$

Similarly, the transformation of the fermionic field is given by

$$T^{-1}\Psi T = \mathcal{T}\gamma^5\Psi , \quad (243)$$

where

$$\mathcal{T} = \begin{pmatrix} -\varepsilon^{\dot{a}\dot{b}} & 0 \\ 0 & -\varepsilon_{\dot{a}\dot{b}} \end{pmatrix} . \quad (244)$$

or

$$\psi_{\dot{a}} \rightarrow \psi^{\dot{a}} \quad , \quad \chi^{\dot{a}} \rightarrow -\chi_{\dot{a}} . \quad (245)$$

The T transformation is anti-Hermitian: $T^{-1}FT = F^*$ for any complex number F .

An inspection of the action shows that it is invariant to the time-reversal transformation if it is supplemented with the transformation of the connection

$$T^{-1}\omega_\mu^{0i} T = -\omega_\mu^{0i} \quad , \quad T^{-1}\omega_\mu^{ij} T = \omega_\mu^{ij} , \quad (246)$$

and the parameter sign changes (239). Therefore, ζ and α are also time-reversal symmetry breaking terms.

The action is PT invariant without relying on the supplemental transformation of the parameters (239).

3. Charge conjugation

The charge conjugation transformation is given by

$$C^{-1}\Psi C = \mathcal{C}\bar{\Psi}^T = \mathcal{C}\beta^T\Psi^* , \quad (247)$$

where

$$\mathcal{C} = \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon^{\dot{a}\dot{b}} & 0 \\ 0 & \varepsilon_{\dot{a}\dot{b}} \end{pmatrix} , \quad (248)$$

or

$$C^{-1}\psi_{\dot{a}} C = \chi_{\dot{a}}^\dagger \quad , \quad C^{-1}\chi^{\dot{a}} C = \psi^{\dagger\dot{a}} . \quad (249)$$

And the gravitational variables remain invariant under charge conjugation.

The action (18) is C invariant and hence CPT invariant.

B. Hamiltonian formulation

The geometric formulation provides a guide for the discrete transformations of the tetrad and the spinor field. However, it does not automatically prescribe the transformations of all phase-space variables of the canonical system. Here, we propose a simple and unambiguous method to define the latter: We perform the known discrete transformations of e_I^μ and Ψ , which are more directly connected to the reversal of the internal frame, then perform the canonical decomposition of the transformed action; the decomposition of the transformed theory then defines the transformation of their canonical conjugates (the connection and fermion momenta) via the preservation of the symplectic structure.

The relation between the phase space and geometry holds only on-shell, but it is a universal relation that does not depend on the details of the dynamics [16]. Therefore, the geometric parity transformation of the tetrad components (235) induces a direct transformation of the following phase-space variables,

$$\begin{aligned} P^{-1}\mathcal{P}_i^a P &= -\mathcal{P}_i^a, & P^{-1}\mathcal{K}_i^a P &= \mathcal{K}_i^a, \\ P^{-1}\Psi P &= i\beta\Psi, & P^{-1}\bar{\Psi}P &= -i\bar{\Psi}\beta, \end{aligned} \quad (250)$$

where we also included the fermion transformation (236).

The preservation of the symplectic term,

$$\begin{aligned} P^{-1} \int d^4x [\mathcal{P}_i^a A_i^a + \mathcal{K}_i^a B_i^a + P_\Psi \Psi + \bar{\Psi} P_\Psi] P & \quad (251) \\ &= \int d^4x [-\mathcal{P}_i^a P^{-1} A_i^a P + \mathcal{K}_i^a P^{-1} B_i^a P \\ &\quad + i P^{-1} P_\Psi P \beta \Psi - i \bar{\Psi} \beta P^{-1} \bar{P}_\Psi P], \end{aligned}$$

determines

$$\begin{aligned} P^{-1} A_i^a P &= -A_i^a, & P^{-1} B_i^a P &= B_i^a, \\ P^{-1} P_\Psi P &= -i P_\Psi \beta, & P^{-1} \bar{P}_\Psi P &= i \beta \bar{P}_\Psi. \end{aligned} \quad (252)$$

Similarly, we obtain the internal-time-reversal transformations

$$\begin{aligned} T^{-1} \mathcal{P}_i^a T &= -\mathcal{P}_i^a, & T^{-1} \mathcal{K}_i^a T &= \mathcal{K}_i^a, \\ T^{-1} \Psi T &= \mathcal{T} \gamma^5 \Psi, & T^{-1} \bar{\Psi} T &= \bar{\Psi} \gamma^5 \mathcal{T}^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (253)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} T^{-1} A_i^a T &= -A_i^a, & T^{-1} B_i^a T &= B_i^a, \\ T^{-1} P_\Psi T &= P_\Psi \gamma^5 \mathcal{T}^{-1}, & T^{-1} \bar{P}_\Psi T &= \mathcal{T} \gamma^5 \bar{P}_\Psi. \end{aligned} \quad (254)$$

The charge-conjugation transformations are given by

$$C^{-1} \Psi C = \mathcal{C} \bar{\Psi}^T, \quad C^{-1} \bar{\Psi} C = \Psi^T \mathcal{C}, \quad (255)$$

$$C^{-1} P_\Psi C = \bar{P}_\Psi^T \mathcal{C}, \quad C^{-1} \bar{P}_\Psi C = \mathcal{C} P_\Psi^T. \quad (256)$$

Notice that the parity and time-reversal transformations (252) and (254) of the gravitational configuration variables do not match the connection transformations

(238) and (246). The reason is that they are simply not equivalent transformations: Given the transformations of the tetrad (234) and (240), equations (252) and (254) determine what the configuration variables associated to the new momenta are, irrespective of the values of ζ and α ; on the other hand, equations (238) and (246) are defined as the necessary transformations of the connection components for the action to remain invariant in the absence of ζ and α .

Using the transformations that we have derived, we find that the first-class constraints are C and PT invariant for arbitrary values of ζ , while they are P and T invariant only if $\zeta = 0$. (Recall that the Hamiltonian constraint is smeared by $|N|$ rather than N as explained after Eq. (82). Therefore, H does not receive an overall negative sign under an internal time reversal transformation despite the lapse transformation $T^{-1}NT = -N$ implied by (235).)

Similarly, the gravitational second-class constraints (53) and (80) are PT invariant for arbitrary values ζ . If $\zeta = 0$, they are P and T invariant up to an overall sign; however, the result of the Dirac brackets remains unchanged under this overall sign change and hence their dynamical implications are indeed invariant under P and T transformations.

The non-minimal coupling α appears only in the Dirac-fermion constraints (58) and (59). The discrete transformations of these constraints are given by

$$P^{-1} C_{\bar{\Psi}} P = -i \left[P_\Psi - \frac{i}{2} |e| e_I^t \bar{\Psi} \gamma^I (1 + i\alpha\gamma^5) \right] \beta, \quad (257)$$

$$T^{-1} C_{\bar{\Psi}} T = \left[P_\Psi + \frac{i}{2} |e| e_I^t \bar{\Psi} \gamma^I (1 + i\alpha\gamma^5) \right] \gamma^5 \mathcal{T}^{-1}, \quad (258)$$

and

$$C^{-1} C_{\bar{\Psi}} C = C_{\bar{\Psi}}^T \mathcal{C}, \quad (259)$$

and their respective complex conjugates. Notice that

$$T^{-1} P^{-1} C_{\bar{\Psi}} P T = i C_{\bar{\Psi}} \gamma^5 \mathcal{T}^{-1} \beta. \quad (260)$$

We conclude that the Dirac-fermions constraints are similarly PT and C invariant up to overall spinorial matrices that do not change the dynamics. If $\alpha = 0$, the Dirac-fermion constraints are P and T invariant in the same sense.

Therefore, the PT and C transformations remain discrete symmetries of the system even for non-zero ζ and α .

IX. EMERGENT FORMULATION

Recent developments have made it possible to circumvent the uniqueness theorems of general relativity

[19, 20] and formulate modified gravity (in metric variables) and Yang–Mills theories without additional degrees of freedom by introducing the concept of emergent fields [16, 21], which crucially depends on features of the canonical formulation. Explicit expressions of the modified constraints and emergent fields in this context have been obtained in several symmetry-reduced systems, including spherical and Gowdy symmetric systems, as well as cosmological ones, which all generate nonsingular dynamical solutions [16, 22, 23]. Furthermore, the coupling of different forms of matter in the emergent formulation has been successfully realized, including scalar matter and perfect fluids [24, 25], with fermions being the only type of matter of the standard model yet to be coupled. Because an Einstein–Yang–Mills $SO(1,3)$ system has the same constraint algebra of the system studied here in the extended phase space, we can import all the conceptual machinery of the emergent formulation of [21] to outline how the coupling of fermions would take place.

The generic meaning of a modified theory is to have modified dynamics. Since the dynamics is governed by the Hamiltonian constraint, this implies that we must consider a modified \tilde{H} that is different from the classical Hamiltonian constraint H , which can generally be recovered as a limit of the modification parameters introduced in \tilde{H} . However, because the Hamiltonian constraint generates not only dynamics but also gauge transformations, the allowed modifications must be restricted by the requirement that the modified system remains covariant. This is achieved by implementing the following four-step procedure.

First, we require that \tilde{H} , together with the vector and Lorentz–Gauss constraints, preserves an anomaly-free algebra of the form (117)–(126) in the extended phase space with H replaced by \tilde{H} and possibly modified structure functions \tilde{q}^{ab} , \tilde{F}_{0a}^{0i} , and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{0a}^i$ —such that the dependence of these structure functions on the phase-space may differ from the classical expressions, i.e., the relation (65) might suffer modifications, while (109) is replaced by $\tilde{F}_{0a}^{0i} = \frac{1}{N} \{K_a^i, \tilde{H}[N]\}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{0a}^i = \frac{1}{N} \{\Gamma_a^i, \tilde{H}[N]\}$.

Second, these modified structure functions are used to define an (emergent) spacetime metric $\tilde{g}_{\mu\nu}$ of the form (28) with q_{ab} replaced by the emergent spatial metric \tilde{q}_{ab} , which is given by the inverse of \tilde{q}^{ab} . Similarly, the emergent force field $\tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}^{IJ}$ is identical to the classical $F_{\mu\nu}^{IJ}$ up to the \tilde{F}_{0a}^{0i} and \tilde{F}_{0a}^{ij} components, which take the values of the corresponding structure functions. The emergent spacetime metric defines emergent tetrads \tilde{e}_I^μ up to Lorentz transformations, which, in turn, can be used to define the emergent torsion $\tilde{T}_{\mu\nu}^I = D_{[\mu} \tilde{e}_{\nu]}^I$ and all other geometric objects.

Third, the covariance conditions must be imposed on the physical fields using the modified constraint \tilde{H} instead of the classical H ; in this case, these are given by (148) for the connection and (143), with e_μ^I replaced by \tilde{e}_I^μ , for the emergent tetrad, as well as (150) and (152) for Ψ and P_Ψ if fermionic matter is present. The rest

of the geometric quantities are constructed from these fields and are therefore covariant if the aforementioned conditions are successfully realized.

(An additional $U(n)$ Gauss constraint must be introduced in the constraint algebra in the presence of each new Yang–Mills field when applying the first step and a corresponding modified strength tensor field would be derived in the second step. The third step would then have to include the evaluation of a new covariance condition for each of these force fields as well as for each new scalar or perfect fluid matter field.)

Fourth, the theory must allow the implementation of the second-class constraints with possible modifications restricted by—or that may be necessary for—the preservation of covariance in the reduced phase space via Dirac brackets. This is a highly nontrivial new step compared to previous examples of emergent modifications, which were based on a system with metric variables and without fermions and hence required no inclusion of second-class constraints.

A successful realization of this method will complete the emergent field theory of gravity with all known forms of matter and force fields.

X. CONCLUSIONS

We have generalized the results of the canonical analysis in [5] by coupling fermions to gravity based on the Hilbert–Palatini action with the Barbero–Immirzi, cosmological, and non-minimal fermion coupling constants. Unlike the Ashtekar–Barbero procedure, our analysis does not rely on any gauge fixing and hence it retains the full gauge content of the Einstein–Cartan theory, given by its underlying diffeomorphism and $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ covariance.

Moreover, we have identified a set of hitherto overlooked (second-class) constraints that are necessary to describe a theory of Dirac fermions. A proper treatment of the phase-space reduction implied by these Dirac-fermion constraints has clarified erroneous beliefs about an inherent inconsistency of the reality conditions in the quantum theory of fermions coupled to gravity that was put forward in [6, 7]; such an inconsistency disappears when the phase-space reduction is properly taken into account. We have also provided a detailed analysis of the discrete symmetries of the system and have found that the theory remains C and PT invariant even in the presence of the Barbero–Immirzi and non-minimal coupling constants, generalizing previous results based on Ashtekar–Barbero variables [17, 18].

We expect that our systematic study will serve as a firm basis for canonical approaches to modified and quantum theories of gravity with fermionic matter preserving diffeomorphism and Lorentz covariance. We have presented one example of such an application in the context of the emergent formulation [16, 21].

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author thanks Martin Bojowald, Idrus Husin Belfaqih, and Manuel Díaz for useful discussions and going through a draft version of this paper. This work was supported in part by NSF grant PHY-2206591.

Appendix A: Brackets

1. Hamiltonian constraint

Here, we gather relevant transformation generated by $H^{(2)}$. Using

$$\{\mathcal{P}_i^a, H^{(2)}[N]\} = 2 \frac{8\pi GN}{\sqrt{\det q}} \frac{\mathcal{P}_{[i}^a \mathcal{P}_{q]}^d}{\gamma^2} K_d^q + \frac{N}{1+\zeta^2} \frac{\gamma \sqrt{(\det \mathcal{P})^{-1}}}{\sqrt{8\pi G}} \mathcal{P}_j^a \left[iP_\Psi (\gamma^0 - v_m \gamma^m) (\gamma^j S_{0i} - \zeta \gamma^j S_i) \Psi + c.c \right], \quad (\text{A1})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathcal{K}_i^a, H^{(2)}[N]\} &= -\partial_c \left[\frac{8\pi GN}{\sqrt{\det q}} \frac{\mathcal{P}_p^c \mathcal{P}_q^a}{\gamma^2} \epsilon^{pq}_i \right] - 2 \frac{8\pi GN}{\sqrt{\det q}} \frac{\mathcal{P}_{[i}^a \mathcal{P}_{q]}^d}{\gamma^2} \Gamma_d^q \\ &\quad + \frac{N}{1+\zeta^2} \frac{\gamma \sqrt{(\det \mathcal{P})^{-1}}}{\sqrt{8\pi G}} \mathcal{P}_j^a \left[iP_\Psi (\gamma^0 - v_m \gamma^m) (\zeta \gamma^j S_{0i} + \gamma^j S_i) \Psi + c.c \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2})$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \{v_i, H^{(2)}[N]\} &= -\frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{im}^n \{(\mathcal{P}^{-1})_a^m \mathcal{K}_n^a, H^{(2)}[N]\} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{im}^n \left[(\mathcal{P}^{-1})_a^m \{\mathcal{K}_n^a, H^{(2)}[N]\} - (\mathcal{P}^{-1})_a^p (\mathcal{P}^{-1})_b^m \{\mathcal{P}_p^b, H^{(2)}[N]\} \mathcal{K}_n^a \right] \\ &= \frac{8\pi G}{\gamma \sqrt{\det q}} \partial_c \left[\frac{N}{\gamma} \mathcal{P}_i^c \right] - \frac{8\pi GN}{\gamma^2 \sqrt{\det q}} \mathcal{P}_q^d K_d^q v_i + \frac{8\pi GN}{\gamma^2 \sqrt{\det q}} \mathcal{P}_m^d \Gamma_d^m \epsilon^{m}_{ni} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \frac{8\pi GN}{\gamma^2 \sqrt{\det q}} \frac{L_i - \zeta G_i}{1+\zeta^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{3}{4} \frac{8\pi GN}{\sqrt{\det q}} \frac{1}{1+\zeta^2} \left[P_\Psi (\gamma^0 - v_s \gamma^s) (\gamma_i - v_i \gamma^0) (1 + \zeta i \gamma^5) \Psi + c.c \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \frac{8\pi GN}{\sqrt{\det q}} \frac{1}{1+\zeta^2} \delta_{i[p} \mathfrak{K}_{l]}^p \left[P_\Psi (\gamma^0 - v_s \gamma^s) \gamma^l (i \gamma^5 - \zeta) \Psi + c.c \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \{\sqrt{|\det \mathcal{P}|}, H^{(2)}[N]\}_{\text{os}} &= \frac{\sqrt{|\det \mathcal{P}|}}{2} (\mathcal{P}^{-1})_a^i \{\mathcal{P}_i^a, H^{(2)}[N]\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{8\pi G}} \frac{N}{\gamma} \mathcal{P}_n^d K_d^n + \frac{N}{1+\zeta^2} \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{8\pi G}} \frac{1}{4} \left[iP_\Psi (\gamma^0 - v_m \gamma^m) ([\gamma^i, S_{0i}] - \zeta [\gamma^i, S_i]_+) \Psi + c.c \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{8\pi G}} \frac{N}{\gamma} \mathcal{P}_n^d K_d^n + \frac{3}{4} \frac{\gamma N}{\sqrt{8\pi G}} \frac{1}{1+\zeta^2} \left[P_\Psi (\gamma^0 - v_m \gamma^m) \gamma^0 (1 + \zeta i \gamma^5) \Psi + c.c \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{i} \{\Xi, H^{(2)}[N]\}_{\text{os}} &= (1 - i\alpha \gamma^5) \left[(8\pi G)^{3/2} \{\sqrt{|\det \mathcal{P}|}, H^{(2)}[N]\} (\gamma^0 - v_i \gamma^i) - \gamma \sqrt{\det q} \{v_i, H^{(2)}[N]\} \gamma^i \right] \\ &= \frac{8\pi GN}{\gamma} \mathcal{P}_n^d K_d^n (1 - i\alpha \gamma^5) \gamma^0 - \left[8\pi G \partial_c \left(\frac{N}{\gamma} \mathcal{P}_i^c \right) + \frac{8\pi GN}{\gamma} \mathcal{P}_m^d \Gamma_d^m \epsilon^{m}_{ni} \right] (1 - i\alpha \gamma^5) \gamma^i \\ &\quad + (8\pi G)^{3/2} \frac{3}{4} \frac{\gamma N}{\sqrt{8\pi G}} \frac{1}{1+\zeta^2} \left[P_\Psi (\gamma^0 - v_m \gamma^m) \gamma^0 (1 + \zeta i \gamma^5) \Psi + c.c \right] (1 - i\alpha \gamma^5) (\gamma^0 - v_i \gamma^i) \\ &\quad - \gamma \sqrt{\det q} \left[\frac{3}{4} \frac{8\pi GN}{\sqrt{\det q}} \frac{1}{1+\zeta^2} \left[P_\Psi (\gamma^0 - v_s \gamma^s) (\gamma_i - v_i \gamma^0) (1 + \zeta i \gamma^5) \Psi + c.c \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \frac{8\pi GN}{\sqrt{\det q}} \frac{1}{1+\zeta^2} \delta_{i[p} \mathfrak{K}_{l]}^p \left[P_\Psi (\gamma^0 - v_s \gamma^s) \gamma^l (i \gamma^5 - \zeta) \Psi + c.c \right] \right] (1 - i\alpha \gamma^5) \gamma^i. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

Using the above, Eq. (182) follows.

2. Second-class constraints

Using

$$\frac{\partial v^{ij}}{\partial v^k} = \gamma^2 (\gamma^0 - v_u \gamma^u) \left[2\gamma^2 v_k v^{(i} + \delta_k^{(i} - \gamma^2 (\gamma^0 - v_n \gamma^n) \gamma_k v^{j)} \right] \gamma^{j)},$$

we obtain

$$\frac{\partial v^{ij}}{\partial \mathcal{P}_r^a} = \frac{\partial v^m}{\partial \mathcal{P}_r^a} \frac{\partial v^{ij}}{\partial v^m} = \gamma^2 (\gamma^0 - v_u \gamma^u) v_s (\mathcal{P}^{-1})_a^{[s} \delta^{r]m} \left[2\gamma^2 v_m v^{(i} + \delta_m^{(i} - \gamma^2 (\gamma^0 - v_n \gamma^n) \gamma_m v^{j)} \right] \gamma^{j)}, \quad (\text{A6})$$

$$\frac{\partial v^{ij}}{\partial \mathcal{K}_r^a} = \frac{\partial v^m}{\partial \mathcal{K}_r^a} \frac{\partial v^{ij}}{\partial v^m} = -\gamma^2 (\gamma^0 - v_u \gamma^u) \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{rm}{}_s (\mathcal{P}^{-1})_a^s \left[2\gamma^2 v_m v^{(i} + \delta_m^{(i} - \gamma^2 (\gamma^0 - v_n \gamma^n) \gamma_m v^{j)} \right] \gamma^{j)}, \quad (\text{A7})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left[-\delta_{r(i} \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{j)}^a - \zeta \delta_{ij} \mathcal{P}_r^a \right] \frac{\partial v^{kl}}{\partial \mathcal{P}_r^a} &= \frac{\zeta}{2} \gamma^2 (\gamma^0 - v_u \gamma^u) v_s \left[\delta_{(i}^m \delta_{j)}^s + \delta_{ij} \delta^{sm} \right] \left[2\gamma^2 v_m v^{(k} + \delta_m^{(k} - \gamma^2 (\gamma^0 - v_n \gamma^n) \gamma_m v^{l)} \right] \gamma^{l)} \\ \left[\delta_{ij} \mathcal{P}_r^a - \delta_{r(i} \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{j)}^a \right] \frac{\partial v^{kl}}{\partial \mathcal{K}_r^a} &= \frac{\zeta}{2} \gamma^2 (\gamma^0 - v_u \gamma^u) v_s \left[\delta_{(i}^s \delta_{j)}^m - \delta_{ij} \delta^{sm} \right] \left[2\gamma^2 v_m v^{(k} + \delta_m^{(k} - \gamma^2 (\gamma^0 - v_n \gamma^n) \gamma_m v^{l)} \right] \gamma^{l)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A8})$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta \mathcal{T}^{ij}(x)}{\delta \mathcal{P}_r^a(z)} &= \left[\left(\delta^{ij} \delta_q^r - \delta^{r(i} \delta_q^{j)} \right) \Gamma_a^q + \delta_m^{(i} \epsilon^{j)rq} (\mathcal{P}^{-1})_c^m \partial_a \mathcal{P}_q^c - (\mathcal{P}^{-1})_a^m (\mathcal{P}^{-1})_c^r \delta_m^{(i} \epsilon^{j)pq} \mathcal{P}_p^d \partial_d \mathcal{P}_q^c \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{1 + \zeta^2} \left(P_\Psi \frac{\partial v^{ij}}{\partial \mathcal{P}_r^a} \Psi + c.c. \right) \right] \delta^3(x - z) + (\mathcal{P}^{-1})_a^{(i} \epsilon^{j)pr} \mathcal{P}_p^d \frac{\partial \delta^3(x - z)}{\partial x^d}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A9})$$

$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{T}^{ij}(x)}{\delta \mathcal{K}_r^a(z)} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{1 + \zeta^2} \left(P_\Psi \frac{\partial v^{ij}}{\partial \mathcal{K}_r^a} \Psi + c.c. \right) - \delta^{r(i} \delta_q^{j)} K_a^q, \quad \frac{\delta \mathcal{T}_{ij}(x)}{\delta A_a^r(z)} = \frac{1}{1 + \zeta^2} \left[-\delta_{r(i} \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{j)}^a - \zeta \delta_{ij} \mathcal{P}_r^a \right], \quad (\text{A10}) \quad (\text{A14})$$

$$\frac{\partial v_q}{\partial \mathcal{P}_r^a} = \delta_q^{[r} (\mathcal{P}^{-1})_a^{u]} v_u, \quad \frac{\partial \mathcal{T}_{ij}(x)}{\partial K_a^r(z)} = \frac{1}{1 + \zeta^2} \left[-\delta_{r(i} \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{j)}^a - \zeta \delta_{r(i} \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{j)}^a \right], \quad (\text{A11}) \quad (\text{A15})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial v_q}{\partial \mathcal{K}_r^a} &= -\frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{qu}{}^r (\mathcal{P}^{-1})_a^u, \quad \text{and} \\ \frac{\partial \mathcal{T}_{ij}(x)}{\partial \mathcal{B}_{kl}} &= \frac{1}{1 + \zeta^2} \left[\delta_{ij} \delta^{kl} - \delta_{(i}^k \delta_{j)}^l + \epsilon_{(i}{}^p \epsilon^{l)q}{}_{j)} v_p v_q \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A12}) \quad (\text{A16})$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{T}_{ij}(x)}{\partial B_a^r(z)} = \frac{1}{1 + \zeta^2} \left[\delta_{ij} \mathcal{P}_r^a - \delta_{r(i} \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{j)}^a \right], \quad \text{Using the above, we obtain} \quad (\text{A13})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\int d^3z \left[\frac{\delta \mathcal{T}_{ij}(x)}{\delta A_a^r(z)} \frac{\delta \mathcal{T}^{kl}(y)}{\delta \mathcal{P}_r^a(z)} + \frac{\delta \mathcal{T}_{ij}(x)}{\delta B_a^r(z)} \frac{\delta \mathcal{T}^{kl}(y)}{\delta \mathcal{K}_r^a(z)} \right] \Big|_{\text{SCS}} \\ &= -\frac{1}{1 + \zeta^2} \left[\delta_{r(i} \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{j)}^a \left(\delta^{kl} \delta_p^r - \delta_p^{(k} \delta^{l)r} \right) \Gamma_a^p + \zeta \delta_{ij} \delta_p^{(k} \delta^{l)r} \mathcal{K}_r^a \mathcal{K}_a^p + \left(\delta_{ij} \mathcal{P}_r^a - \delta_{r(i} \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{j)}^a \right) \delta^{r(k} \delta_q^{l)} K_a^q \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(v^s \epsilon_{s(i}{}^{(k} - \zeta \delta_{(i}^{(k} \delta_{j)r} \epsilon^{l)pq} (\mathcal{P}^{-1})_c^r \mathcal{P}_p^d \partial_d \mathcal{P}_q^c \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \frac{\zeta}{1 + \zeta^2} \frac{\gamma^2}{2} \left(P_\Psi (\zeta - i\gamma^5) (\gamma^0 - v_u \gamma^u) \left[2\gamma^2 v_{(i} v^{(k} + \delta_{(i}^{(k} - \gamma^2 (\gamma^0 - v_n \gamma^n) \gamma_{(i} v^{l)} \right] v_{j)} \gamma^{l)} \Psi + c.c. \right) \right] \delta^3(x - y) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \frac{1}{1 + \zeta^2} \left[v^s \epsilon_{s(i}{}^{(k} - \zeta \delta_{(i}^{(k} \epsilon_{j)}^{l)} \epsilon^{l)p} \mathcal{P}_p^d \frac{\partial \delta^3(x - y)}{\partial x^d} \right] \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A17})$$

With this, the bracket (198) follows.

Appendix B: Discrete symmetries

In this appendix, we gather several useful discrete transformations of fermion bilinears, which can be used

to confirm the symmetries discussed in Sec. (VIII).

1. Parity

$$P^{-1}P_\Psi\Psi P = P_\Psi\Psi, \quad (\text{B1})$$

$$P^{-1}P_\Psi\overline{P_\Psi}P = P_\Psi\overline{P_\Psi}, \quad (\text{B2})$$

$$P^{-1}\overline{\Psi}\Psi P = \overline{\Psi}\Psi, \quad (\text{B3})$$

$$P^{-1}P_\Psi\gamma^0\Psi P = P_\Psi\gamma^0\Psi, \quad (\text{B4})$$

$$P^{-1}P_\Psi\gamma^i\Psi P = -P_\Psi\gamma^i\Psi, \quad (\text{B5})$$

$$P^{-1}P_\Psi\gamma^0\gamma^i\Psi P = -P_\Psi\gamma^0\gamma^i\Psi, \quad (\text{B6})$$

$$P^{-1}P_\Psi\gamma^i\gamma^j\Psi P = P_\Psi\gamma^i\gamma^j\Psi, \quad (\text{B7})$$

$$P^{-1}P_\Psi iS_{0i}\Psi P = -P_\Psi iS_{0i}\Psi, \quad (\text{B8})$$

$$P^{-1}P_\Psi iS_i\Psi P = P_\Psi iS_i\Psi, \quad (\text{B9})$$

$$P^{-1}P_\Psi\gamma^0\gamma^j iS_{0i}\Psi P = P_\Psi\gamma^0\gamma^j iS_{0i}\Psi, \quad (\text{B10})$$

$$P^{-1}P_\Psi\gamma^m\gamma^j iS_{0i}\Psi P = -P_\Psi\gamma^m\gamma^j iS_{0i}\Psi, \quad (\text{B11})$$

$$P^{-1}P_\Psi\gamma^0\gamma^j iS_i\Psi P = -P_\Psi\gamma^0\gamma^j iS_i\Psi, \quad (\text{B12})$$

$$P^{-1}P_\Psi\gamma^m\gamma^j iS_i\Psi P = P_\Psi\gamma^m\gamma^j iS_i\Psi, \quad (\text{B13})$$

$$P^{-1}P_\Psi i\gamma^5\Psi P = -P_\Psi i\gamma^5\Psi, \quad (\text{B14})$$

$$P^{-1}P_\Psi\gamma^i\gamma^0 i\gamma^5\Psi P = P_\Psi\gamma^i\gamma^0 i\gamma^5\Psi, \quad (\text{B15})$$

$$P^{-1}P_\Psi i\gamma^5\gamma^0\Psi P = -P_\Psi i\gamma^5\gamma^0\Psi, \quad (\text{B16})$$

$$P^{-1}P_\Psi i\gamma^5\gamma^i\Psi P = P_\Psi i\gamma^5\gamma^i\Psi. \quad (\text{B17})$$

2. Time reversal

$$T^{-1}P_\Psi\Psi T = P_\Psi\Psi, \quad (\text{B18})$$

$$T^{-1}P_\Psi\overline{P_\Psi}T = P_\Psi\overline{P_\Psi}, \quad (\text{B19})$$

$$T^{-1}\overline{\Psi}\Psi T = \overline{\Psi}\Psi, \quad (\text{B20})$$

$$T^{-1}P_\Psi\gamma^0\Psi T = P_\Psi\gamma^0\Psi, \quad (\text{B21})$$

$$T^{-1}P_\Psi\gamma^i\Psi T = -P_\Psi\gamma^i\Psi, \quad (\text{B22})$$

$$T^{-1}P_\Psi\gamma^0\gamma^i\Psi T = -P_\Psi\gamma^0\gamma^i\Psi, \quad (\text{B23})$$

$$T^{-1}P_\Psi\gamma^i\gamma^j\Psi T = P_\Psi\gamma^i\gamma^j\Psi, \quad (\text{B24})$$

$$T^{-1}P_\Psi iS_{0i}\Psi T = -P_\Psi iS_{0i}\Psi, \quad (\text{B25})$$

$$T^{-1}P_\Psi iS_i\Psi T = P_\Psi iS_i\Psi, \quad (\text{B26})$$

$$T^{-1}P_\Psi\gamma^0\gamma^j iS_{0i}\Psi T = P_\Psi\gamma^0\gamma^j iS_{0i}\Psi, \quad (\text{B27})$$

$$T^{-1}P_\Psi\gamma^m\gamma^j iS_{0i}\Psi T = -P_\Psi\gamma^m\gamma^j iS_{0i}\Psi, \quad (\text{B28})$$

$$T^{-1}P_\Psi\gamma^0\gamma^j iS_i\Psi T = -P_\Psi\gamma^0\gamma^j iS_i\Psi, \quad (\text{B29})$$

$$T^{-1}P_\Psi\gamma^m\gamma^j iS_i\Psi T = P_\Psi\gamma^m\gamma^j iS_i\Psi, \quad (\text{B30})$$

$$T^{-1}P_\Psi i\gamma^5\Psi T = -P_\Psi i\gamma^5\Psi, \quad (\text{B31})$$

$$T^{-1}P_\Psi\gamma^i\gamma^0 i\gamma^5\Psi T = P_\Psi\gamma^i\gamma^0 i\gamma^5\Psi, \quad (\text{B32})$$

$$T^{-1}P_\Psi i\gamma^5\gamma^0\Psi T = -P_\Psi i\gamma^5\gamma^0\Psi, \quad (\text{B33})$$

$$T^{-1}P_\Psi i\gamma^5\gamma^i\Psi T = P_\Psi i\gamma^5\gamma^i\Psi. \quad (\text{B34})$$

3. Charge conjugation

$$C^{-1}P_\Psi\partial_a\Psi C = \partial_a\overline{\Psi}\overline{P_\Psi}, \quad (\text{B35})$$

$$C^{-1}P_\Psi\overline{P_\Psi}C = P_\Psi\overline{P_\Psi}, \quad (\text{B36})$$

$$C^{-1}\overline{\Psi}\Psi C = \overline{\Psi}\Psi, \quad (\text{B37})$$

$$C^{-1}P_\Psi\gamma^0\gamma^i\partial_a\Psi C = \partial_a\overline{\Psi}\gamma^i\gamma^0\overline{P_\Psi}, \quad (\text{B38})$$

$$C^{-1}P_\Psi\gamma^i\gamma^j\partial_a\Psi C = \partial_a\overline{\Psi}\gamma^j\gamma^i\overline{P_\Psi}, \quad (\text{B39})$$

$$C^{-1}P_\Psi iS_{0i}\Psi C = -\overline{\Psi}iS_{0i}\overline{P_\Psi}, \quad (\text{B40})$$

$$C^{-1}P_\Psi iS_i\Psi C = -\overline{\Psi}iS_i\overline{P_\Psi}, \quad (\text{B41})$$

$$C^{-1}P_\Psi\gamma^0\gamma^j iS_{0i}\Psi C = -\overline{\Psi}iS_{0i}\gamma^j\gamma^0\overline{P_\Psi}, \quad (\text{B42})$$

$$C^{-1}P_\Psi\gamma^m\gamma^j iS_{0i}\Psi C = -\overline{\Psi}iS_{0i}\gamma^j\gamma^m\overline{P_\Psi}, \quad (\text{B43})$$

$$C^{-1}P_\Psi\gamma^0\gamma^j iS_i\Psi C = -\overline{\Psi}iS_i\gamma^j\gamma^0\overline{P_\Psi}, \quad (\text{B44})$$

$$C^{-1}P_\Psi\gamma^m\gamma^j iS_i\Psi C = -\overline{\Psi}iS_i\gamma^j\gamma^m\overline{P_\Psi}, \quad (\text{B45})$$

$$C^{-1}P_\Psi i\gamma^5\Psi C = \overline{\Psi}i\gamma^5\overline{P_\Psi}, \quad (\text{B46})$$

$$C^{-1}P_\Psi\gamma^i\gamma^0 i\gamma^5\Psi C = \overline{\Psi}i\gamma^5\gamma^0\overline{P_\Psi}, \quad (\text{B47})$$

$$C^{-1}P_\Psi i\gamma^5\gamma^I\Psi C = -\overline{\Psi}\gamma^I i\gamma^5\overline{P_\Psi}, \quad (\text{B48})$$

$$C^{-1}P_\Psi\gamma^I\Psi C = -\overline{\Psi}\gamma^I\overline{P_\Psi}. \quad (\text{B49})$$

-
- [1] A. Ashtekar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 2244 (1986).
 - [2] A. Ashtekar, Phys. Rev. D **36**, 1587 (1987).
 - [3] J. F. Barbero, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 5507 (1995), arXiv:gr-qc/9410014.
 - [4] S. Holst, Phys. Rev. D **53**, 5966 (1996), arXiv:gr-qc/9511026.
 - [5] E. I. Duque, *Hamiltonian gravity in tetrad-connection variables*, Phys. Rev. D **(To appear)**, arXiv:2509.06153.
 - [6] J. C. Baez and K. V. Krasnov, J. Math. Phys. **39**, 1251-1271 (1998), arXiv:9703112.
 - [7] T. Thiemann, Class. Quantum Grav. **15**, 1487 (1998), arXiv:9705021.
 - [8] S. Mercuri, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 084016 (2006).
 - [9] A. Perez and C. Rovelli, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 044013 (2006).
 - [10] L. Freidel, D. Minic, and T. Takeuchi, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 104002 (2005).
 - [11] S. Alexandrov, Class. Quantum Grav. **25**, 145012 (2008), arXiv:0802.1221.
 - [12] R. Arnowitt, S. Deser, and C. W. Misner, in *Gravitation: An Introduction to Current Research*, edited by L. Witten (Wiley, New York, 1962), reprinted in [13].
 - [13] R. Arnowitt, S. Deser, and C. W. Misner, Gen. Rel. Grav. **40**, 1997 (2008).
 - [14] J. M. Pons, D. C. Salisbury, and L. C. Shepley, Phys. Rev. D **658** (1997), arXiv:gr-qc/9612037.
 - [15] D. C. Salisbury, and K. Sundermeyer, Phys. Rev. D **27**, 740 (1983).
 - [16] M. Bojowald, and E. I. Duque, Phys. Rev. D **108**, 084066 (2023), arXiv:2310.06798.
 - [17] M. Bojowald and R. Das, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 064009 (2008), arXiv:0710.5722.
 - [18] F. Fragomeno and S. Rastgoo, *Canonical Electrodynamics in Ashtekar-Barbero variables*, arXiv:2507.06276.
 - [19] S. A. Hojman, K. Kuchař, and C. Teitelboim, Ann. Phys. (New York) **96**, 88 (1976).
 - [20] K. V. Kuchař, J. Math. Phys. **15**, 708 (1974).
 - [21] E. I. Duque, *Emergent field theory*, arXiv:2507.16163.
 - [22] M. Bojowald and E. I. Duque, Phys. Rev. D, **110**, 124001, (2024), arXiv:2407.13583.
 - [23] M. Bojowald, M. Díaz, E. I. Duque, *Perturbative emergent modified gravity on cosmological backgrounds: Kinematics*, arXiv:2507.14358.
 - [24] M. Bojowald and E. I. Duque, Phys. Rev. D **109**, 084006, (2024) arxiv:2311.10693.
 - [25] E. I. Duque, Phys. Rev. D **109**, 044014 (2024), arXiv:2311.08616.