

# A BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO DIRAC MANIFOLDS

HENRIQUE BURSZTYN

ABSTRACT. These notes are based on a series of lectures given at the school on *Geometric and Topological Methods for Quantum Field Theory*, in Villa de Leyva, Colombia. We present a basic introduction to Dirac manifolds, recalling the original context in which they were defined, their main features, and briefly mentioning more recent developments.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Notation, conventions, terminology	3
2. Presymplectic and Poisson structures	3
2.1. Two viewpoints to symplectic geometry	3
2.2. Going degenerate	5
3. Dirac structures	7
4. Properties of Dirac structures	9
4.1. Lie algebroid	9
4.2. Presymplectic leaves and null distribution	10
4.3. Hamiltonian vector fields and Poisson algebra	11
5. Morphisms of Dirac manifolds	11
5.1. Pulling back and pushing forward	12
5.2. Clean intersection and smoothness issues	15
6. Submanifolds of Poisson manifolds and constraints	19
7. Brief remarks on further developments	24
References	26

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Phase spaces of classical mechanical systems are commonly modeled by symplectic manifolds. It often happens that the dynamics governing the system's evolution is constrained to particular submanifolds of the phase space, e.g. level sets of conserved quantities (typically associated with symmetries of the system, such as momentum maps), or submanifolds resulting from constraints in the possible configurations of the system, etc. Any submanifold  $C$  of a symplectic manifold  $M$  inherits a *presymplectic* form (i.e., a closed 2-form, possibly degenerate), given by the pullback of the ambient symplectic form to  $C$ . It may be desirable to treat  $C$  in its own right, which makes presymplectic geometry the natural arena for the study of constrained systems, see e.g. [23, 25].

In many situations, however, phase spaces are modeled by more general objects: Poisson manifolds (see e.g. [35]). A Poisson structure on a manifold  $M$  is a bivector field  $\pi \in \Gamma(\wedge^2 TM)$  such that the skew-symmetric bracket  $\{f, g\} := \pi(df, dg)$  on  $C^\infty(M)$  satisfies the Jacobi identity. Just as for symplectic phase spaces, there are natural examples of systems on Poisson phase spaces which are constrained to submanifolds. The present notes address the following motivating questions: what kind of geometric structure is inherited by a submanifold  $C$  of a Poisson manifold  $M$ ? Can one “pullback” the ambient Poisson structure on  $M$  to  $C$ , similarly to what one does when  $M$  is symplectic? From another viewpoint, recall that  $M$  carries a (possibly singular) symplectic foliation, which completely characterizes its Poisson structure. Let us assume, for simplicity, that the intersection of  $C$  with each leaf  $\mathcal{O}$  of  $M$  is a submanifold of  $C$ . Then  $\mathcal{O} \cap C$  carries a presymplectic form, given by the pullback of the symplectic form on  $\mathcal{O}$ . So the Poisson structure on  $M$  induces a decomposition of  $C$  into presymplectic leaves. Just as Poisson structures define symplectic foliations, we can ask whether there is a more general geometric object underlying foliations with presymplectic leaves.

The questions posed in the previous paragraph naturally lead to *Dirac structures* [16, 17], a notion that encompasses presymplectic and Poisson structures. A key ingredient in the definition of a Dirac structure on a manifold  $M$  is the so-called *Courant bracket* [16] (see also [21]), a bilinear operation on the space of sections of  $TM \oplus T^*M$  used to formulate a general integrability condition unifying the requirements that a 2-form is closed and that a bivector field is Poisson. These notes present the basics of Dirac structures, including their main geometric features and key examples. Most of the material presented here goes back to Courant’s original paper [16], perhaps the only exception being the discussion about morphisms in the category of Dirac manifolds in Sec. 5.

Despite its original motivation in constrained mechanics<sup>1</sup>, recent developments in the theory of Dirac structures are related to a broad range of topics in mathematics and mathematical physics. Due to space and time limitations, this paper is *not* intended as a comprehensive survey of this fast growing subject (which justifies the omission of many worthy contributions from the bibliography). A (biased) selection of recent aspects of Dirac structures is briefly sketched at the end of the paper.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we recall the main geometric properties of presymplectic and Poisson manifolds. Section 3 presents the definition of Dirac structures and their first examples. The main properties of Dirac structures are presented in Section 4. Section 5 discusses morphisms between Dirac manifolds. Section 6 explains how Dirac structures are inherited by submanifolds of Poisson manifolds. Section 7 briefly mentions some more recent developments and applications of Dirac structures.

**Acknowledgments:** I would like to thank the organizers and participants of the school in Villa de Leyva, particularly Alexander Cardona for his invitation and encouragement to have these lecture notes written up. Versions of these lectures were delivered at Porto (*Oporto Meeting on Geometry, Topology and Physics, 2009*) and Canary Islands (*Young Researchers Workshop on Geometry, Mechanics and Control,*

---

<sup>1</sup>Dirac structures are named after Dirac’s work on the theory of constraints in classical mechanics (see e.g. [20, 41]), which included a classification of constraint surfaces (first class, second class...), the celebrated Dirac bracket formula, as well as applications to quantization and field theory.

2010) and helped me to shape up the notes (which I hope to expand in the future); I thank the organizers of these meetings as well. I am also indebted to P. Balseiro, A. Cardona, L. Garcia-Naranjo, M. Jotz, C. Ortiz and M. Zambon for their comments on this manuscript.

**1.1. Notation, conventions, terminology.** All manifolds, maps, vector bundles, etc. are smooth, i.e., in the  $C^\infty$  category. Given a smooth map  $\varphi : M \rightarrow N$  and a vector bundle  $A \rightarrow N$ , we denote the pullback of  $A$  to  $M$  by  $\varphi^*A \rightarrow M$ .

For a vector bundle  $E \rightarrow M$ , a *distribution*  $D$  in  $E$  assigns to each  $x \in M$  a vector subspace  $D_x \subseteq E_x$ . If the dimension of  $D_x$ , called the *rank* of  $D$  at  $x$ , is independent of  $x$ , we call the distribution *regular*. A distribution  $D$  in  $E$  is *smooth* if for any  $x \in M$  and  $v_0 \in D_x$ , there is a smooth local section  $v$  of  $E$  (defined on a neighborhood of  $x$ ) such that  $v(y) \in D_y$  and  $v(x) = v_0$ . A distribution that is smooth and regular is a subbundle. The rank of a smooth distribution is a lower semi-continuous function on  $M$ . For a vector bundle map  $\Phi : E \rightarrow A$  covering the identity, the image  $\Phi(E)$  is a smooth distribution of  $A$ ; the kernel  $\ker(\Phi)$  is a distribution of  $E$  whose rank is an upper semi-continuous function, so it is smooth if and only if it has locally constant rank. A smooth distribution  $D$  in  $TM$  is *integrable* if any  $x \in M$  is contained in an *integral submanifold*, i.e., a connected immersed submanifold  $\mathcal{O}$  so that  $D|_{\mathcal{O}} = T\mathcal{O}$ . An integrable distribution defines a decomposition of  $M$  into *leaves* (which are the maximal integral submanifolds); we generally refer to this decomposition of  $M$  as a *singular foliation*, or simply a *foliation*; see e.g. [22, Sec. 1.5] for details. When  $D$  is smooth and has constant rank, the classical Frobenius theorem asserts that  $D$  is integrable if and only if it is involutive. We refer to the resulting foliation in this case as *regular*.

Throughout the paper, the Einstein summation convention is consistently used.

## 2. PRESYMPLECTIC AND POISSON STRUCTURES

A symplectic structure on a manifold can be defined in two equivalent ways: either by a nondegenerate closed 2-form or by a nondegenerate Poisson bivector field. If one drops the nondegeneracy assumption, the first viewpoint leads to the notion of a *presymplectic* structure, while the second leads to *Poisson* structures. These two types of “degenerate” symplectic structures have distinct features that will be recalled in this section.

**2.1. Two viewpoints to symplectic geometry.** Let  $M$  be a smooth manifold. A 2-form  $\omega \in \Omega^2(M)$  is called *symplectic* if it is nondegenerate and  $d\omega = 0$ . The nondegeneracy assumption means that the bundle map

$$(2.1) \quad \omega^\sharp : TM \rightarrow T^*M, \quad X \mapsto i_X\omega,$$

is an isomorphism; in local coordinates, writing  $\omega = \frac{1}{2}\omega_{ij}dx^i \wedge dx^j$ , this amounts to the pointwise invertibility of the matrix  $(\omega_{ij})$ . The pair  $(M, \omega)$ , where  $\omega$  is a symplectic 2-form, is called a *symplectic manifold*.

The basic ingredients of the hamiltonian formalism on a symplectic manifold  $(M, \omega)$  are as follows. For any function  $f \in C^\infty(M)$ , there is an associated *hamiltonian vector field*  $X_f \in \mathcal{X}(M)$ , uniquely defined by the condition

$$(2.2) \quad i_{X_f}\omega = df.$$

In other words,  $X_f = (\omega^\sharp)^{-1}(df)$ . There is an induced bilinear operation

$$\{\cdot, \cdot\} : C^\infty(M) \times C^\infty(M) \rightarrow C^\infty(M),$$

known as the *Poisson bracket*, that measures the rate of change of a function  $g$  along the hamiltonian flow of a function  $f$ ,

$$(2.3) \quad \{f, g\} := \omega(X_g, X_f) = \mathcal{L}_{X_f}g.$$

The Poisson bracket is skew-symmetric, and one verifies from its definition that

$$(2.4) \quad d\omega(X_f, X_g, X_h) = \{f, \{g, h\}\} + \{h, \{f, g\}\} + \{g, \{h, f\}\};$$

it follows that the Poisson bracket satisfies the Jacobi identity, since  $\omega$  is closed. The pair  $(C^\infty(M), \{\cdot, \cdot\})$  is a *Poisson algebra*, i.e.,  $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$  is a Lie bracket on  $C^\infty(M)$  that is compatible with the associative commutative product on  $C^\infty(M)$  via the Leibniz rule:

$$\{f, gh\} = \{f, g\}h + \{f, h\}g.$$

It results from the Leibniz rule that the Poisson bracket is defined by a bivector field  $\pi \in \Gamma(\wedge^2 TM)$ , uniquely determined by

$$(2.5) \quad \pi(df, dg) = \{f, g\} = \omega(X_g, X_f);$$

we write it locally as

$$(2.6) \quad \pi = \frac{1}{2} \pi^{ij} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}.$$

The bivector field  $\pi$  defines a bundle map

$$(2.7) \quad \pi^\sharp : T^*M \rightarrow TM, \quad \alpha \mapsto i_\alpha \pi,$$

in such a way that  $X_f = \pi^\sharp(df)$ . Since  $df = \omega^\sharp(X_f) = \omega^\sharp(\pi^\sharp(df))$ , we see that  $\omega$  and  $\pi$  are related by

$$(2.8) \quad \omega^\sharp = (\pi^\sharp)^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad (\omega_{ij}) = (\pi^{ij})^{-1}.$$

The whole discussion so far can be turned around, in that one can take the bivector field  $\pi \in \Gamma(\wedge^2 TM)$ , rather than the 2-form  $\omega$ , as the starting point to define a symplectic structure. Given a bivector field  $\pi \in \Gamma(\wedge^2 TM)$ , we call it *nondegenerate* if the bundle map (2.7) is an isomorphism or, equivalently, if the local matrices  $(\pi^{ij})$  in (2.6) are invertible at each point. We say that  $\pi$  is *Poisson* if the skew-symmetric bilinear bracket  $\{f, g\} = \pi(df, dg)$ ,  $f, g \in C^\infty(M)$ , satisfies the Jacobi identity:

$$(2.9) \quad \text{Jac}_\pi(f, g, h) := \{f, \{g, h\}\} + \{h, \{f, g\}\} + \{g, \{h, f\}\} = 0,$$

for all  $f, g, h \in C^\infty(M)$ .

The relation

$$\pi(df, dg) = \omega(X_g, X_f)$$

establishes a 1-1 correspondence between nondegenerate bivector fields and nondegenerate 2-forms on  $M$ , in such a way that the bivector field is Poisson if and only if the corresponding 2-form is closed (see (2.4)). So a symplectic manifold can be equivalently defined as a manifold  $M$  equipped with a nondegenerate bivector field  $\pi$  that is Poisson.

The two alternative viewpoints to symplectic structures are summarized in the following table:

nondegenerate $\pi \in \Gamma(\wedge^2 TM)$ $\text{Jac}_\pi = 0$ $X_f = \pi^\sharp(df)$ $\{f, g\} = \pi(df, dg)$	nondegenerate $\omega \in \Omega^2(M)$ $d\omega = 0$ $i_{X_f}\omega = df$ $\{f, g\} = \omega(X_g, X_f)$
---	--

Although the viewpoints are interchangeable, one may turn out to be more convenient than the other in specific situations, as illustrated next.

**2.2. Going degenerate.** There are natural geometrical constructions in symplectic geometry that may spoil the nondegeneracy condition of the symplectic structure, and hence take us out of the symplectic world. We mention two examples.

Consider the problem of passing from a symplectic manifold  $M$  to a submanifold  $\iota : C \hookrightarrow M$ . To describe the geometry that  $C$  inherits from  $M$ , it is more natural to represent the symplectic structure on  $M$  by a 2-form  $\omega$ , which can then be pulled back to  $C$ . The resulting 2-form  $\iota^*\omega$  on  $C$  is always closed, but generally fails to be nondegenerate.

As a second example, suppose that a Lie group  $G$  acts on a symplectic manifold  $M$  by symmetries, i.e., preserving the symplectic structure, and consider the geometry inherited by the quotient  $M/G$  (we assume, for simplicity, that the action is free and proper, so the orbit space  $M/G$  is a smooth manifold). In this case, it is more convenient to think of the symplectic structure on  $M$  as a Poisson bivector field  $\pi$ , which can then be projected, or pushed forward, to  $M/G$  since  $\pi$  is assumed to be  $G$ -invariant. The resulting bivector field on  $M/G$  always satisfies (2.9), but generally fails to be nondegenerate.

These two situations illustrate why one may be led to generalize the notion of a symplectic structure by dropping the nondegeneracy condition, and how there are two natural ways to do it. Each way leads to a different kind of geometry: A manifold equipped with a closed 2-form, possibly degenerate, is referred to as *presymplectic*, while a *Poisson manifold* is a manifold equipped with a Poisson bivector field, not necessarily nondegenerate. The main features of presymplectic and Poisson manifolds are summarized below.

### 2.2.1. Presymplectic manifolds.

On a presymplectic manifold  $(M, \omega)$ , there is a natural *null distribution*  $K \subseteq TM$ , defined at each point  $x \in M$  by the kernel of  $\omega$ :

$$K_x := \ker(\omega)_x = \{X \in T_x M \mid \omega(X, Y) = 0 \forall Y \in T_x M\}.$$

This distribution is not necessarily regular or smooth. In fact,  $K$  is a smooth distribution if and only if it has locally constant rank (see Section 1.1). For  $X, Y \in \Gamma(K)$ , note that

$$i_{[X, Y]}\omega = \mathcal{L}_X i_Y \omega - i_Y \mathcal{L}_X \omega = \mathcal{L}_X i_Y \omega - i_Y (i_X d + di_X)\omega = 0;$$

it follows that, when  $K$  is regular, it is integrable by Frobenius' theorem. We refer to the resulting regular foliation tangent to  $K$  as the *null foliation* of  $M$ .

One may still define hamiltonian vector fields on  $(M, \omega)$  via (2.2), but, without the nondegeneracy assumption on  $\omega$ , there might be functions admitting no hamiltonian vector fields (e.g. if  $df$  lies outside the image of (2.1) at some point). We say that a function  $f \in C^\infty(M)$  is *admissible* if there exists a vector field  $X_f$  such that (2.2)

holds. In this case,  $X_f$  is generally not uniquely defined, as we may change it by the addition of any vector field tangent to  $K$ . Still, the Poisson bracket formula

$$(2.10) \quad \{f, g\} = \mathcal{L}_{X_f} g$$

is well defined (i.e., independent of the choice of  $X_f$ ) when  $f$  and  $g$  are admissible. Hence the space of admissible functions, denoted by

$$C_{adm}^\infty(M) \subseteq C^\infty(M),$$

is a Poisson algebra.

When  $K$  is regular, a function is admissible if and only if  $df(K) = 0$ , i.e.,  $f$  is constant along the leaves of the null foliation; in particular, depending on how complicated this foliation is, there may be very few admissible functions (e.g., if there is a dense leaf, only the constant functions are admissible). When  $K$  is regular and the associated null foliation is simple, i.e., the leaf space  $M/K$  is smooth and the quotient map  $q : M \rightarrow M/K$  is a submersion, then  $M/K$  inherits a symplectic form  $\omega_{red}$ , uniquely characterized by the property that  $q^*\omega_{red} = \omega$ ; in this case, the Poisson algebra of admissible functions on  $M$  is naturally identified with the Poisson algebra of the symplectic manifold  $(M/K, \omega_{red})$  via

$$q^* : C^\infty(M/K) \xrightarrow{\sim} C_{adm}^\infty(M)$$

(see e.g. [37, Sec. 6.1] and references therein).

### 2.2.2. Poisson manifolds.

If  $(M, \pi)$  is a Poisson manifold, then any function  $f \in C^\infty(M)$  defines a (unique) hamiltonian vector field  $X_f = \pi^\sharp(df)$ , and the whole algebra of smooth functions  $C^\infty(M)$  is a Poisson algebra with bracket  $\{f, g\} = \pi(df, dg)$ .

The image of the bundle map  $\pi^\sharp$  in (2.7) defines a distribution on  $M$ ,

$$(2.11) \quad R := \pi^\sharp(T^*M) \subseteq TM,$$

not necessarily regular, but always smooth and integrable. (The integrability of the distribution  $R$  may be seen as a consequence of Weinstein's splitting theorem [43].) So it determines a singular foliation of  $M$ , in such a way that two points in  $M$  lie in the same leaf if and only if one is accessible from the other through a composition of local hamiltonian flows. One may verify that the bivector field  $\pi$  is "tangent to the leaves", in the sense that, if  $f \in C^\infty(M)$  satisfies  $\iota^* f \equiv 0$  for a leaf  $\iota : \mathcal{O} \hookrightarrow M$ , then  $X_f \circ \iota \equiv 0$ . So there is an induced Poisson bracket  $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_\mathcal{O}$  on  $\mathcal{O}$  determined by

$$\{f \circ \iota, g \circ \iota\}_\mathcal{O} := \{f, g\} \circ \iota, \quad f, g \in C^\infty(M),$$

which is nondegenerate; in particular, each leaf carries a symplectic form, and one refers to this foliation as the *symplectic foliation* of  $\pi$ . The symplectic foliation of a Poisson manifold uniquely characterizes the Poisson structure. For more details and examples, see e.g. [11, 22, 35].

**Remark 2.1.** The integrability of the distribution (2.11) may be also seen as resulting from the existence of a Lie algebroid structure on  $T^*M$ , with anchor  $\pi^\sharp : T^*M \rightarrow TM$  and Lie bracket on  $\Gamma(T^*M) = \Omega^1(M)$  uniquely characterized by

$$[df, dg] = d\{f, g\},$$

see e.g. [11, 15]; we will return to Lie algebroids in Section 4.

### 3. DIRAC STRUCTURES

Dirac structures were introduced in [16, 17] as a way to treat both types of “degenerate” symplectic structures, namely presymplectic and Poisson, in a unified manner. This common framework relies on viewing presymplectic and Poisson structures as subbundles of

$$\mathbb{T}M := TM \oplus T^*M,$$

defined by the graphs of the bundle maps (2.1) and (2.7). The precise definition of a Dirac structure resorts to additional geometrical structures canonically present on  $\mathbb{T}M$ , as we now recall.

Let us consider  $\mathbb{T}M$  equipped with the natural projections

$$\text{pr}_T : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow TM, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{pr}_{T^*} : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow T^*M,$$

as well as two extra structures: the nondegenerate, symmetric fibrewise bilinear form  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  on  $\mathbb{T}M$ , given at each  $x \in M$  by

$$(3.1) \quad \langle (X, \alpha), (Y, \beta) \rangle = \beta(X) + \alpha(Y), \quad X, Y \in T_x M, \quad \alpha, \beta \in T_x^* M,$$

and the *Courant bracket*  $[[\cdot, \cdot]] : \Gamma(\mathbb{T}M) \times \Gamma(\mathbb{T}M) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathbb{T}M)$ ,

$$(3.2) \quad [[(X, \alpha), (Y, \beta)]] = ([X, Y], \mathcal{L}_X \beta - \mathcal{L}_Y \alpha + \frac{1}{2}d(\alpha(Y) - \beta(X))).$$

A *Dirac structure* on  $M$  is a vector subbundle  $L \subset \mathbb{T}M$  satisfying:

- (i)  $L = L^\perp$ , where the orthogonal is with respect to  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ ,
- (ii)  $[[\Gamma(L), \Gamma(L)]] \subseteq \Gamma(L)$ , i.e.,  $L$  is involutive with respect to  $[[\cdot, \cdot]]$ .

#### Remarks:

- Since the pairing  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  has split signature, condition (i) is equivalent to  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle|_L = 0$  and  $\text{rank}(L) = \dim(M)$ .
- The Courant bracket satisfies

$$(3.3) \quad [[a_1, a_2], a_3] + c.p. = \frac{1}{3}d(\langle [a_1, a_2], a_3 \rangle + c.p.),$$

for  $a_1, a_2, a_3 \in \Gamma(\mathbb{T}M)$ , where *c.p.* stands for “cyclic permutations”. So it fails to satisfy the Jacobi identity, and it is not a Lie bracket<sup>2</sup>.

- One may alternatively use, instead of (3.2), the non-skew-symmetric bracket

$$((X, \alpha), (Y, \beta)) \mapsto ([X, Y], \mathcal{L}_X \beta - i_Y d\alpha)$$

for condition (ii); (3.2) is the skew-symmetrization of this bracket, and a simple computation shows that both brackets agree on sections of subbundles satisfying (i).

A subbundle  $L \subset \mathbb{T}M$  satisfying (i) is sometimes referred to as a *lagrangian subbundle* of  $\mathbb{T}M$  (in analogy with the terminology in symplectic geometry), or as an *almost Dirac structure* on  $M$ . Condition (ii) is referred to as the *integrability condition*; by (i), condition (ii) can be equivalently written as

$$(3.4) \quad \langle [a_1, a_2], a_3 \rangle \equiv 0, \quad \forall a_1, a_2, a_3 \in \Gamma(L).$$

---

<sup>2</sup>The properties of the Courant bracket are axiomatized in the notion of a *Courant algebroid* [33], see Section 7.

For any lagrangian subbundle  $L \subset \mathbb{T}M$ , the expression

$$(3.5) \quad \Upsilon_L(a_1, a_2, a_3) := \langle \llbracket a_1, a_2 \rrbracket, a_3 \rangle,$$

for  $a_1, a_2, a_3 \in \Gamma(L)$ , defines an element  $\Upsilon_L \in \Gamma(\wedge^3 L^*)$  that we call the *Courant tensor* of  $L$ . Hence, for a lagrangian subbundle  $L$ , the integrability condition (ii) is equivalent to the vanishing condition  $\Upsilon_L \equiv 0$ .

**Example 3.1.** Any bivector field  $\pi \in \Gamma(\wedge^2 TM)$  defines a lagrangian subbundle of  $\mathbb{T}M$  given by the graph of (2.7),

$$(3.6) \quad L_\pi = \{(\pi^\sharp(\alpha), \alpha) \mid \alpha \in T^*M\}.$$

One may verify that, for  $a_i = (\pi^\sharp(df_i), df_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ ,

$$\Upsilon_{L_\pi}(a_1, a_2, a_3) = \langle \llbracket a_1, a_2 \rrbracket, a_3 \rangle = \{f_1, \{f_2, f_3\}\} + c.p.$$

So (3.4) holds, i.e., (3.6) is a Dirac structure, if and only if  $\pi$  is a Poisson bivector field. In fact, Poisson structures can be identified with Dirac structures  $L \subset \mathbb{T}M$  with the additional property that

$$(3.7) \quad L \cap TM = \{0\}.$$

Similarly, any 2-form  $\omega \in \Omega^2(M)$  defines the lagrangian subbundle

$$(3.8) \quad L_\omega = \text{graph}(\omega^\sharp) = \{(X, \omega^\sharp(X)) \mid X \in TM\} \subset \mathbb{T}M.$$

In this case, for  $a_i = (X_i, \omega^\sharp(X_i))$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ ,

$$\Upsilon_{L_\omega}(a_1, a_2, a_3) = \langle \llbracket a_1, a_2 \rrbracket, a_3 \rangle = d\omega(X_1, X_2, X_3).$$

So (3.8) is a Dirac structure if and only if  $\omega$  is presymplectic, and presymplectic structures are identified with Dirac structures  $L$  satisfying

$$(3.9) \quad L \cap T^*M = \{0\}.$$

**Example 3.2.** Let  $F \subseteq TM$  be a regular distribution, i.e., a vector subbundle, and let  $L = F \oplus F^\circ$ , where  $F^\circ \subseteq T^*M$  is the annihilator of  $F$ . Clearly  $L = L^\perp$ , and one may check that  $L$  satisfies the integrability condition (ii) if and only if  $F$  is involutive, i.e., it is tangent to the leaves of a regular foliation (by Frobenius' theorem). So one may view regular foliations as particular cases of Dirac structures.

**Remark 3.3.** The notion of Dirac structure may be naturally extended to the complexification  $\mathbb{T}M \otimes \mathbb{C}$ . A natural example arises as follows: consider an almost complex structure  $J$  on  $M$ , i.e., an endomorphism  $J : TM \rightarrow TM$  satisfying  $J^2 = -1$ , and let  $T_{1,0} \subset TM \otimes \mathbb{C}$  be its  $+i$ -eigenbundle. Following the previous example,  $L = T_{1,0} \oplus (T_{1,0})^\circ = T_{1,0} \oplus T^{0,1}$  is a (complex) Dirac structure provided  $T_{1,0}$  is involutive, i.e.,  $J$  is integrable as a complex structure. An interesting class of complex Dirac structures that includes this example is studied in [26] (see Section 7).

**Example 3.4.** Let  $P$  be a manifold, and let  $\omega_t$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , be a smooth family of closed 2-forms on  $P$ . This family determines a Dirac structure  $L$  on  $M = P \times \mathbb{R}$  by

$$L_{(x,t)} = \{((X, 0), (i_X \omega_t, \gamma)) \mid X \in T_x P, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}\} \subset (T_x P \times \mathbb{R}) \oplus (T_x^* P \times \mathbb{R}),$$

where  $(x, t) \in P \times \mathbb{R}$ .



**Example 3.5.** Consider  $M = \mathbb{R}^3$ , with coordinates  $(x, y, z)$ , and let

$$L = \text{span} \left\langle \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial y}, z dx \right), \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x}, -z dy \right), (0, dz) \right\rangle.$$

For  $z \neq 0$ , condition (3.7) is satisfied, and we see that we can write  $L$  as the graph of the Poisson structure  $\pi = \frac{1}{z} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial y}$ , with brackets

$$\{x, y\} = \frac{1}{z}, \quad \{x, z\} = 0, \quad \{y, z\} = 0.$$

Note that  $L$  is a *smooth Dirac structure*, despite the fact that this Poisson structure is singular at  $z = 0$ ; the singularity just reflects the fact that  $L$  ceases to be the graph of a bivector field (i.e., to satisfy (3.7)) when  $z = 0$ .

**Example 3.6.** Other examples of Dirac structure arise from the observation [40] that the abelian group of closed 2-forms  $\Omega_{cl}^2(M)$  acts on  $\mathbb{T}M$  preserving both  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  and  $[\cdot, \cdot]$  (more generally, the group of vector-bundle automorphisms of  $\mathbb{T}M$  preserving  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  and  $[\cdot, \cdot]$  is  $\text{Diff}(M) \times \Omega_{cl}^2(M)$ , see e.g. [26, Sec. 3]); the action is given by

$$(X, \alpha) \xrightarrow{\tau_B} (X, \alpha + i_X B), \quad \text{for } B \in \Omega_{cl}^2(M).$$

As a result, this operation, called *gauge transformation* in [40], sends Dirac structures to Dirac structures. So one may construct new Dirac structures from old with the aid of closed 2-forms. For example, given an involutive distribution  $F \subseteq TM$ , then the associated Dirac structure of Example 3.2 may be modified by  $B \in \Omega_{cl}^2(M)$  to yield a new Dirac structure

$$\{(X, \alpha) \mid X \in F, (\alpha - i_X B)|_F = 0\}.$$

More examples of Dirac structures coming from “constraints” in Poisson manifolds will be discussed in Section 6.

#### 4. PROPERTIES OF DIRAC STRUCTURES

We now describe the main geometric features of Dirac structures, generalizing those of presymplectic and Poisson manifolds recalled in Section 2. Specifically, we will see how the null distribution and the Poisson algebra of admissible functions of presymplectic manifolds, and the symplectic foliation of Poisson manifolds, generalize to Dirac manifolds.

**4.1. Lie algebroid.** A *Lie algebroid* is a vector bundle  $A \rightarrow M$  equipped with a Lie bracket  $[\cdot, \cdot]$  on  $\Gamma(A)$  and a bundle map (called the *anchor*)  $\rho : A \rightarrow TM$  so that

$$[u, f v] = (\mathcal{L}_{\rho(u)} f) v + f [u, v],$$

for  $u, v \in \Gamma(A)$  and  $f \in C^\infty(M)$ . A key property of a Lie algebroid  $A$  is that  $\rho(A) \subseteq TM$  is an integrable smooth distribution (possibly of non-constant rank); one refers to the leaves of the associated foliation as *leaves* or *orbits* of the Lie algebroid. More details on Lie algebroids can be found e.g. in [11, 22].

For a Dirac structure  $L$  on  $M$ , the vector bundle  $L \rightarrow M$  inherits a Lie algebroid structure, with bracket on  $\Gamma(L)$  given by the restriction of  $[\cdot, \cdot]$  and anchor given by restriction of  $\text{pr}_T$  to  $L$ :

$$(4.1) \quad [\cdot, \cdot]_L := [\cdot, \cdot]|_{\Gamma(L)}, \quad \rho_L := \text{pr}_T|_L : L \rightarrow TM.$$

Note that the Jacobi identity of  $[\cdot, \cdot]_L$  follows from (3.3) and (3.4).

On a Poisson manifold  $(M, \pi)$ , viewed as a Dirac structure with  $L$  given by (3.6), we have a vector-bundle isomorphism  $\text{pr}_{T^*}|_L : L \rightarrow T^*M$ . The Lie algebroid structure on  $L$  can be carried over to  $T^*M$ , and it coincides with the one mentioned in Remark 2.1.

For a presymplectic manifold  $(M, \omega)$ , the anchor  $\rho_L : L \rightarrow TM$  is an isomorphism between the Lie algebroid structure of  $L$  and the canonical one on  $TM$  (defined by the usual Lie bracket of vector fields and anchor given by the identity).

**4.2. Presymplectic leaves and null distribution.** Since (4.1) endows any Dirac structure  $L$  on  $M$  with a Lie algebroid structure, the distribution

$$(4.2) \quad R = \text{pr}_T(L) \subseteq TM$$

is integrable and defines a (singular) foliation on  $M$ . Each leaf  $\mathcal{O}$  of this foliation naturally inherits a closed 2-form  $\Omega_L \in \Omega^2(\mathcal{O})$ , defined at each  $x \in \mathcal{O}$  by

$$\Omega_L(X, Y) = \alpha(Y), \quad \text{where } X, Y \in T_x\mathcal{O} = R|_x \text{ and } (X, \alpha) \in L|_x.$$

The fact that the formula for  $\Omega_L$  does not depend on the choice of  $\alpha$  results from the observation that

$$R^\circ = L \cap T^*M,$$

while the smoothness of  $\Omega_L$  follows from the existence of smooth splittings for the surjective bundle map  $\text{pr}_T|_L : L|_{\mathcal{O}} \rightarrow T\mathcal{O}$ ; the condition  $d\Omega_L = 0$  follows from the integrability condition of  $L$ . One refers to the foliation defined by (4.2) as the *presymplectic foliation* of  $L$ . In the case of a Poisson manifold, this is just its symplectic foliation, while for a presymplectic manifold the leaves are its connected components.

The distribution

$$(4.3) \quad K := L \cap TM \subseteq TM$$

agrees, at each point, with the kernel of the leafwise 2-form  $\Omega_L$ , so we refer to it as the *null distribution* (or *kernel*) of the Dirac structure; as we saw for presymplectic manifolds, this distribution is not smooth unless it is regular, in which case it is automatically integrable, giving rise to a regular foliation - the *null foliation*. Note that the null distribution is zero at all points if and only if  $L$  is defined by a Poisson structure (c.f. (3.7)).

In analogy to what happens for Poisson manifolds, a Dirac structure  $L$  is completely determined by its presymplectic foliation; indeed, at each point,

$$L = \{(X, \alpha) \mid X \in \text{pr}_T(L), \alpha|_{\text{pr}_T(L)} = i_X\Omega_L\}.$$

The reader should have no problem to identify the distributions  $K$ ,  $R$ , and the presymplectic foliation in each example of Section 3.

In the spirit of Section 2 we have, schematically, the following equivalences:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Nondegenerate Poisson structure} &\iff \text{Symplectic structure} \\ \text{Poisson structure} &\iff \text{Symplectic foliation} \\ \text{Dirac structure} &\iff \text{Presymplectic foliation} \end{aligned}$$

**4.3. Hamiltonian vector fields and Poisson algebra.** The notion of hamiltonian vector field also extends to Dirac structures. Let  $L$  be a Dirac structure on  $M$ . Following the discussion for presymplectic manifolds in Section 2.2.1, a function  $f \in C^\infty(M)$  is called *admissible* if there is a vector field  $X$  such that

$$(X, df) \in L,$$

in which case  $X$  is called *hamiltonian* relative to  $f$ . Just as for presymplectic manifolds,  $X$  is not uniquely determined, as it may be modified by the addition of any vector field tangent to the null distribution  $K = L \cap TM$ . The space of admissible functions, denoted by  $C_{adm}^\infty(M)$ , is always a Poisson algebra, with Poisson bracket defined as in (2.10).

When  $K$  is regular, a function  $f$  is admissible if and only if its differential annihilates  $K$ , i.e., if  $f$  is constant along the leaves of the null foliation. In particular, if the null foliation is simple, its leaf space acquires a Poisson structure (generalizing the symplectic structure  $\omega_{red}$  of Section 2.2.1) through the identification of its functions with admissible functions on  $M$ .

In conclusion, Dirac structures naturally mix presymplectic and Poisson features (controlled by the distributions  $R$  and  $K$ ): presymplectic structures arise on their leaves, while Poisson structures arise on their algebras of admissible functions.

## 5. MORPHISMS OF DIRAC MANIFOLDS

As we saw in Section 2, symplectic structures are equivalently described in terms of (nondegenerate) 2-forms or bivector fields. As much as the two approaches are equivalent, they naturally lead to different notions of morphism, reflecting the fact that covariant and contravariant tensors have different functorial properties with respect to maps.

Let  $M_i$  be equipped with a symplectic form  $\omega_i$ , and corresponding Poisson bivector field  $\pi_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . There are two natural ways in which a map  $\varphi : M_1 \rightarrow M_2$  can preserve symplectic structures: either by preserving symplectic 2-forms,

$$(5.1) \quad \varphi^* \omega_2 = \omega_1$$

or by preserving Poisson bivector fields,

$$(5.2) \quad \varphi_* \pi_1 = \pi_2;$$

by (5.2) we mean that  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$  are  $\varphi$ -related: for all  $x \in M_1$ ,

$$(\pi_2)_{\varphi(x)}(\alpha, \beta) = (\pi_1)_x(\varphi^* \alpha, \varphi^* \beta), \quad \forall \alpha, \beta \in T_x^* M_2.$$

Conditions (5.1) and (5.2) are not equivalent. Consider  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with coordinates  $(q^1, p_1)$  and symplectic structure (written both as a 2-form and as a bivector field)

$$\omega_{\mathbb{R}^2} = dq^1 \wedge dp_1, \quad \pi_{\mathbb{R}^2} = \frac{\partial}{\partial p_1} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial q^1},$$

and  $\mathbb{R}^4$  with coordinates  $(q^1, p_1, q^2, p_2)$  and symplectic structure

$$\omega_{\mathbb{R}^4} = dq^1 \wedge dp_1 + dq^2 \wedge dp_2, \quad \pi_{\mathbb{R}^4} = \frac{\partial}{\partial p_1} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial q^1} + \frac{\partial}{\partial p_2} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial q^2}.$$

One readily verifies that the projection  $\mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $(q^1, p_1, q^2, p_2) \mapsto (q^1, p_1)$  satisfies (5.2), but not (5.1), while the inclusion  $\mathbb{R}^2 \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$ ,  $(q^1, p_1) \mapsto (q^1, p_1, 0, 0)$ , satisfies (5.1) but not (5.2). More generally, note that the nondegeneracy of  $\omega_1$  in (5.1)

forces  $\varphi$  to be an immersion, while the nondegeneracy of  $\pi_2$  in (5.2) forces  $\varphi$  to be a submersion. The two conditions (5.1) and (5.2) become equivalent when  $\varphi$  is a local diffeomorphism. It is also clear that (5.1) naturally extends to a notion of morphism between presymplectic manifolds, whereas (5.2) leads to the usual notion of *Poisson map* between Poisson manifolds.

As first noticed by A. Weinstein, the pull-back and push-forward relations carry over to Dirac structures, leading to two distinct notions of morphism for Dirac manifolds, generalizing (5.1) and (5.2).

**5.1. Pulling back and pushing forward.** In order to extend the notions of pull-back and pushforward to the realm of Dirac structures, it is convenient to start at the level of linear algebra.

*5.1.1. Lagrangian relations.* In the linear-algebra context, by a *Dirac structure on a vector space*  $V$  we will simply mean a subspace  $L \subset V \oplus V^*$  that is lagrangian, i.e., such that  $L = L^\perp$  with respect to the natural symmetric pairing

$$\langle (v_1, \alpha_1), (v_2, \alpha_2) \rangle = \alpha_2(v_1) + \alpha_1(v_2).$$

We also simplify the notation by writing  $\mathbb{V} = V \oplus V^*$ ; we denote by  $\text{pr}_V : \mathbb{V} \rightarrow V$  and  $\text{pr}_{V^*} : \mathbb{V} \rightarrow V^*$  the natural projections.

Let  $\varphi : V \rightarrow W$  be a linear map. We know that 2-forms  $\omega \in \wedge^2 W^*$  can be pulled back to  $V$ , while bivectors  $\pi \in \wedge^2 V$  can be pushed forward to  $W$ :

$$\varphi^* \omega(v_1, v_2) = \omega(\varphi(v_1), \varphi(v_2)), \quad \varphi_* \pi(\beta_1, \beta_2) = \pi(\varphi^* \beta_1, \varphi^* \beta_2),$$

for  $v_1, v_2 \in V$ ,  $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in W^*$ . These notions are generalized to Dirac structures as follows. The *backward image* of a Dirac structure  $L_W \subset \mathbb{W}$  under  $\varphi$  is defined by

$$(5.3) \quad \mathfrak{B}_\varphi(L_W) = \{(v, \varphi^* \beta) \mid (\varphi(v), \beta) \in L_W\} \subset V \oplus V^*,$$

while the *forward image* of  $L_V \in V \oplus V^*$  is

$$(5.4) \quad \mathfrak{F}_\varphi(L_V) = \{(\varphi(v), \beta) \mid (v, \varphi^* \beta) \in L_V\} \subset W \oplus W^*.$$

**Proposition 5.1.** *Both  $\mathfrak{B}_\varphi(L_W)$  and  $\mathfrak{F}_\varphi(L_V)$  are Dirac structures.*

The proof will follow from Lemma 5.2 below. Note that when  $L_W$  is defined by  $\omega \in \wedge^2 W^*$ , then  $\mathfrak{B}_\varphi(L_W)$  is the Dirac structure associated with  $\varphi^* \omega$  and, similarly, if  $L_V$  is defined by  $\pi \in \wedge^2 V$ , then  $\mathfrak{F}_\varphi(L_V)$  is the Dirac structure corresponding to  $\varphi_* \pi$ . So we also refer to the Dirac structures (5.3) and (5.4) as the *pullback* of  $L_W$  and the *pushforward* of  $L_V$ , respectively.

The pullback and pushforward operations (5.3) and (5.4) are not inverses of one another; one may verify that

$$(5.5) \quad \mathfrak{F}_\varphi(\mathfrak{B}_\varphi(L_W)) = L_W \text{ if and only if } \text{pr}_W(L_W) \subseteq \varphi(V), \text{ and}$$

$$(5.6) \quad \mathfrak{B}_\varphi(\mathfrak{F}_\varphi(L_V)) = L_V \text{ if and only if } \ker(\varphi) \subseteq L_V \cap V.$$

As a result,  $\mathfrak{F}_\varphi \circ \mathfrak{B}_\varphi = \text{Id}$  if and only if  $\varphi$  is surjective, while  $\mathfrak{B}_\varphi \circ \mathfrak{F}_\varphi = \text{Id}$  if and only if  $\varphi$  is injective.

Pullback and pushforward of Dirac structures can be understood in the broader context of composition of lagrangian relations (which is totally analogous to the calculus of canonical relations in the linear symplectic category, see [27], [5, Sec. 5]; see also [45] and references therein), that we now recall. Let us denote by  $\overline{\mathbb{V}}$  the vector space  $\mathbb{V} = V \oplus V^*$  equipped with the pairing  $-\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ . The product  $\mathbb{V} \times \mathbb{W}$

inherits a natural pairing from  $\mathbb{V}$  and  $\mathbb{W}$ . We call a lagrangian subspace  $L \subset \mathbb{V} \times \overline{\mathbb{W}}$  a *lagrangian relation* (from  $W$  to  $V$ ). Note that any Dirac structure  $L \subset \mathbb{V}$  may be seen as a lagrangian relation (either from  $V$  to the trivial vector space  $\{0\}$ , or the other way around), and any linear map  $\varphi : V \rightarrow W$  defines a lagrangian relation

$$(5.7) \quad \Gamma_\varphi = \{((w, \beta), (v, \alpha)) \mid w = \varphi(v), \alpha = \varphi^*(\beta)\} \subset \mathbb{W} \times \overline{\mathbb{V}}.$$

Lagrangian relations can be composed much in the same way as maps. Consider vector spaces  $U, V, W$  and lagrangian relations  $L_1 \subseteq \mathbb{U} \times \overline{\mathbb{V}}$  and  $L_2 \subset \mathbb{V} \times \overline{\mathbb{W}}$ . The *composition* of  $L_1$  and  $L_2$ , denoted by  $L_1 \circ L_2 \subset \mathbb{U} \times \overline{\mathbb{W}}$ , is defined by

$$L_1 \circ L_2 := \{((u, \alpha), (w, \gamma)) \mid \exists (v, \beta) \in \mathbb{V} \text{ s.t. } (u, \alpha, v, \beta) \in L_1, (v, \beta, w, \gamma) \in L_2\}.$$

**Lemma 5.2.** *The composition  $L_1 \circ L_2$  is a lagrangian relation.*

*Proof.* To verify that  $(L_1 \circ L_2)^\perp = L_1 \circ L_2$ , consider the subspace

$$(5.8) \quad \mathcal{C} := \mathbb{U} \times \Delta \times \overline{\mathbb{W}} \subset \mathbb{U} \times \overline{\mathbb{V}} \times \mathbb{V} \times \overline{\mathbb{W}},$$

where  $\Delta$  is the diagonal in  $\overline{\mathbb{V}} \times \mathbb{V}$ . Then

$$\mathcal{C}^\perp = \{0\} \times \Delta \times \{0\} \subseteq \mathcal{C},$$

and  $L_1 \circ L_2$  is the image of  $L_1 \times L_2 \subset \mathbb{U} \times \overline{\mathbb{V}} \times \mathbb{V} \times \overline{\mathbb{W}}$  in the quotient  $\mathcal{C}/\mathcal{C}^\perp = \mathbb{U} \times \overline{\mathbb{W}}$ :

$$(5.9) \quad L_1 \circ L_2 = \frac{(L_1 \times L_2) \cap \mathcal{C} + \mathcal{C}^\perp}{\mathcal{C}^\perp}$$

The projection  $p : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{C}^\perp$  satisfies  $\langle p(c_1), p(c_2) \rangle = \langle c_1, c_2 \rangle$  for all  $c_1, c_2 \in \mathcal{C}$ . So  $p(c_1) \in (L_1 \circ L_2)^\perp$ , i.e.,  $\langle p(c_1), p(c_2) \rangle = 0$  for all  $p(c_2) \in L_1 \circ L_2$ , if and only if  $\langle c_1, c_2 \rangle = 0$  for all  $c_2 \in (L_1 \times L_2) \cap \mathcal{C} + \mathcal{C}^\perp$ , i.e.,

$$c_1 \in ((L_1 \times L_2) \cap \mathcal{C} + \mathcal{C}^\perp)^\perp.$$

Now note that<sup>3</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} ((L_1 \times L_2) \cap \mathcal{C} + \mathcal{C}^\perp)^\perp &= (L_1 \times L_2 + \mathcal{C}^\perp) \cap \mathcal{C} \\ &= (L_1 \times L_2) \cap \mathcal{C} + \mathcal{C}^\perp, \end{aligned}$$

from where we conclude that  $(L_1 \circ L_2)^\perp = L_1 \circ L_2$ .  $\square$

We can now conclude the proof of Prop. 5.1.

*Proof.* (of Prop. 5.1) Let us view a Dirac structure  $L_V$  on  $V$  as a lagrangian relation  $L_V \subset \mathbb{V} \times \{0\}$ ; similarly, we regard a Dirac structure  $L_W$  on  $W$  as a lagrangian relation  $L_W \subset \{0\} \times \overline{\mathbb{W}}$ . Then one immediately verifies that the pushforward and pullback with respect to a linear map  $\varphi : V \rightarrow W$  are given by compositions of relations with respect to the lagrangian relation  $\Gamma_\varphi$  in (5.7):

$$(5.10) \quad \mathfrak{B}_\varphi(L_W) = L_W \circ \Gamma_\varphi, \quad \mathfrak{F}_\varphi(L_V) = \Gamma_\varphi \circ L_V.$$

It follows from Lemma 5.2 that (5.3) and (5.4) are Dirac structures.  $\square$

---

<sup>3</sup>Here we use that, for subspaces  $A, B$  of any vector space equipped with a symmetric pairing with split signature, we have  $(A + B)^\perp = A^\perp \cap B^\perp$  and  $(A \cap B)^\perp = A^\perp + B^\perp$ .

Before moving on to Dirac structures on manifolds, we discuss for later use how the composition expression in (5.9) may be simplified for the particular cases in (5.10). For the composition  $\mathfrak{B}_\varphi(L_W) = L_W \circ \Gamma_\varphi$ , we have (c.f. (5.8))

$$\mathcal{C} = \Delta_{\mathbb{W}} \times \overline{\mathbb{V}} \subset \overline{\mathbb{W}} \times \mathbb{W} \times \overline{\mathbb{V}},$$

where  $\Delta_{\mathbb{W}}$  is the diagonal subspace in  $\overline{\mathbb{W}} \times \mathbb{W}$ , so that  $\mathcal{C}^\perp = \Delta_{\mathbb{W}} \times \{0\}$ ; then, by (5.9),  $\mathfrak{B}_\varphi(L_W)$  is the image of  $(L_W \times \Gamma_\varphi) \cap \mathcal{C}$  under the projection  $p : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{C}^\perp = \overline{\mathbb{V}}$ . We may write  $p$  as a composition of two maps: the isomorphism  $p_1 : \mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{W} \times \mathbb{V}$ ,  $(w, w, v) \mapsto (w, v)$ , followed by the projection  $p_2 : \mathbb{W} \times \mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{V}$ . Noticing that  $p_1((L_W \times \Gamma_\varphi) \cap \mathcal{C}) = (L_W \times \mathbb{V}) \cap \Gamma_\varphi$ , we can write  $\mathfrak{B}_\varphi(L_W) = p_2((L_W \times \mathbb{V}) \cap \Gamma_\varphi)$ . One also checks that

$$\ker(p_2|_{(L_W \times \mathbb{V}) \cap \Gamma_\varphi}) = \{((0, \beta), (0, 0)) \mid (0, \beta) \in L_W, \varphi^* \beta = 0\} = (\ker(\varphi^*) \cap L_W) \times \{0\}.$$

As a result, we obtain

**Proposition 5.3.** *The following is a short exact sequence:*

$$(5.11) \quad (\ker(\varphi^*) \cap L_W) \times \{0\} \hookrightarrow (L_W \times \mathbb{V}) \cap \Gamma_\varphi \twoheadrightarrow \mathfrak{B}_\varphi(L_W),$$

where the second map is the projection  $\mathbb{W} \times \mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{V}$ . Similarly, we have the short exact sequence

$$(5.12) \quad \{0\} \times (\ker(\varphi) \cap L_V) \hookrightarrow \Gamma_\varphi \cap (\mathbb{W} \times L_V) \twoheadrightarrow \mathfrak{F}_\varphi(L_V),$$

where the second map is the projection  $\mathbb{W} \times \mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{W}$ .

**5.1.2. Morphisms on Dirac manifolds.** We now transfer the notions of pullback and pushforward of Dirac structures to the manifold setting, i.e., the role of  $\mathbb{V}$  will be played by  $\mathbb{T}M$ .

Let  $L_M \subset \mathbb{T}M$  and  $L_N \subset \mathbb{T}N$  be almost Dirac structures, and  $\varphi : M \rightarrow N$  a smooth map. Analogously to (5.7), we consider the lagrangian relation

$$\Gamma_\varphi = \{(Y, \beta), (X, \alpha) \mid Y = d\varphi(X), \alpha = \varphi^* \beta\} \subset \varphi^* \mathbb{T}N \oplus \overline{\mathbb{T}M}$$

where  $\varphi^* \mathbb{T}N \rightarrow M$  is the pull-back bundle of  $\mathbb{T}N$  by  $\varphi$ , and we define, as in (5.10), the *backward image* of  $L_N$  by

$$(5.13) \quad \mathfrak{B}_\varphi(L_N) = (\varphi^* L_N) \circ \Gamma_\varphi \subset \mathbb{T}M,$$

and the *forward image* of  $L_M$  by

$$(5.14) \quad \mathfrak{F}_\varphi(L_M) = \Gamma_\varphi \circ L_M \subset \varphi^* \mathbb{T}N.$$

By what we saw in Section 5.1.1,  $\mathfrak{B}_\varphi(L_N)$  and  $\mathfrak{F}_\varphi(L_M)$  define lagrangian distributions in  $\mathbb{T}M$  and  $\varphi^* \mathbb{T}N$ , respectively; the issue of whether they are smooth will be addressed in the next section.

We call  $\varphi : M \rightarrow N$  a *backward Dirac map* (or simply *b-Dirac*) when  $L_M$  coincides with  $\mathfrak{B}_\varphi(L_N)$ ,

$$(5.15) \quad (L_M)_x = \mathfrak{B}_\varphi(L_N)_x = \{(X, d\varphi^*(\beta)) \mid (d\varphi(X), \beta) \in (L_N)_{\varphi(x)}\}, \quad \forall x \in M,$$

and we call it a *forward Dirac map* (or simply *f-Dirac*) when  $\varphi^* L_N$  (the pullback of  $L_N$  to  $M$  as a vector bundle) coincides with  $\mathfrak{F}_\varphi(L_M)$ , i.e.,  $\forall x \in M$ ,

$$(5.16) \quad (L_N)_{\varphi(x)} = \mathfrak{F}_\varphi(L_M)_x = \{(d\varphi(X), \beta) \mid (X, d\varphi^*(\beta)) \in (L_M)_x\}.$$

As already observed, (5.15) generalizes the pullback of 2-forms, while (5.16) extends the notion of two bivector fields being  $\varphi$ -related.

If  $\varphi : M \rightarrow M$  is a diffeomorphism, then it is f-Dirac if and only if it is b-Dirac, and these are both equivalent to the condition that the canonical lift of  $\varphi$  to  $\mathbb{T}M$  preserves the subbundle  $L_M \subset \mathbb{T}M$ :

$$(5.17) \quad \Phi := (d\varphi, (d\varphi^{-1})^*) : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow \mathbb{T}M, \quad \Phi(L_M) = L_M.$$

We refer to  $\varphi$  as a *Dirac diffeomorphism*.

**Remark 5.4.** Forward Dirac maps  $\varphi : M \rightarrow N$  satisfying the additional transversality condition  $\ker(d\varphi) \cap L_M = \{0\}$  are studied in [1, 8, 7] in the context of actions and momentum maps.

**5.2. Clean intersection and smoothness issues.** In the previous subsection, we used pullback and pushforward to obtain two ways to relate Dirac structures on  $M$  and  $N$  by a map  $\varphi : M \rightarrow N$ : via (5.15) and (5.16). We now discuss the possibility of using pullback and pushforward to *transport* Dirac structures from one manifold to the other. In other words, we know that the backward (resp. forward) image of a Dirac structure (5.13) (resp. (5.14)) gives rise to a lagrangian distribution in  $\mathbb{T}M$  (resp.  $\varphi^*\mathbb{T}N$ ), and the issue is whether this distribution fits into a smooth bundle defining a Dirac structure. Note that while the lagrangian distribution generated by the backward image (5.13) is defined over all of  $M$ , the forward image (5.14) only defines the distribution over points in the image of  $\varphi$ . (This reflects the well-known fact that, while any map  $\varphi : M \rightarrow N$  induces a map  $\Omega^\bullet(N) \rightarrow \Omega^\bullet(M)$  by pullback, there is in general no induced map from  $\mathcal{X}^\bullet(M)$  to  $\mathcal{X}^\bullet(N)$ .) This makes the discussion for backward images a bit simpler, so we treat them first.

### 5.2.1. Backward images.

Let  $L_N$  be an almost Dirac structure on  $N$ , and consider a map  $\varphi : M \rightarrow N$ . As we already remarked, (5.15) defines, at each point  $x \in M$ , a lagrangian subspace of  $T_xM \oplus T_x^*M$ . This lagrangian distribution does *not* necessarily fit into a smooth subbundle of  $\mathbb{T}M$ , as illustrated by the following example.

**Example 5.5.** Let  $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  be the inclusion  $x \mapsto (x, 0)$ , and consider the Dirac structure on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  defined by the bivector field

$$\pi = x \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial y}.$$

We consider its backward image to the  $x$ -axis via  $\varphi$ . Whenever  $x \neq 0$ ,  $\pi$  is nondegenerate, and hence corresponds to a 2-form; its pullback is then a 2-form on  $\mathbb{R} - \{0\}$ , which must therefore vanish identically (by dimension reasons). So the backward image of  $\pi$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  is  $T_x\mathbb{R} \subset T_x\mathbb{R} \oplus T_x^*\mathbb{R}$  for  $x \neq 0$ . For  $x = 0$ , one can readily compute the backward image to be  $T_x^*\mathbb{R} \subset T_x\mathbb{R} \oplus T_x^*\mathbb{R}$ , so the resulting family of lagrangian subspaces is not a smooth vector bundle over  $\mathbb{R}$ .

As we now see, a suitable clean-intersection assumption guarantees the smoothness of backward images. For a smooth map  $\varphi : M \rightarrow N$ , let  $(d\varphi)^* : \varphi^*T^*N \rightarrow T^*M$  be the dual of the tangent map  $d\varphi : TM \rightarrow \varphi^*TN$ . For an almost Dirac structure  $L_N$  on  $N$ , we denote by  $\varphi^*L_N$  the vector bundle over  $M$  obtained by the pull-back of  $L_N$  as a vector bundle.

**Proposition 5.6.** *Let  $\varphi : M \rightarrow N$  be a smooth map, and let  $L_N$  be an almost Dirac structure on  $N$ . If  $\ker((d\varphi)^*) \cap \varphi^*L_N$  has constant rank, then the backward image*

$\mathfrak{B}_\varphi(L_N) \subset \mathbb{T}M$  defines a smooth lagrangian subbundle, i.e., it is an almost Dirac structure on  $M$ . If  $\mathfrak{B}_\varphi(L_N)$  is a smooth bundle and  $L_N$  is integrable, then  $\mathfrak{B}_\varphi(L_N)$  is integrable, i.e., it is a Dirac structure.

*Proof.* The backward image of  $L_N$  fits into a short exact sequence that is a pointwise version of (5.11):

$$(5.18) \quad \ker((d\varphi)^*) \cap \varphi^*L_N \rightarrow (\varphi^*L_N \oplus \mathbb{T}M) \cap \Gamma_\varphi \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}_\varphi(L_N),$$

where the first map is the inclusion  $\varphi^*\mathbb{T}N \rightarrow \varphi^*\mathbb{T}N \oplus \mathbb{T}M$ , and the second is the projection of  $\varphi^*\mathbb{T}N \oplus \mathbb{T}M$  onto  $\mathbb{T}M$ . Since  $\mathfrak{B}_\varphi(L_N)$  has constant rank, it is clear that  $(\varphi^*\mathbb{T}N \oplus \mathbb{T}M) \cap \Gamma_\varphi$  has constant rank if and only if so does  $\ker((d\varphi)^*) \cap \varphi^*L_N$ ; in this case both are smooth vector bundles, and hence so is  $\mathfrak{B}_\varphi(L_N)$ .

For the assertion about integrability, we compare the tensors  $\Upsilon_M$  and  $\Upsilon_N$  associated with the almost Dirac structures  $\mathfrak{B}_\varphi(L_N)$  and  $L_N$ , respectively (see (3.5)). Let us call (local) sections  $a = (X, \alpha)$  of  $\mathbb{T}M$  and  $b = (Y, \beta)$  of  $\mathbb{T}N$   $\varphi$ -related if the vector fields  $X$  and  $Y$  are  $\varphi$ -related and  $\alpha = \varphi^*\beta$ . If now  $a_i = (X_i, \alpha_i)$ ,  $b_i = (Y_i, \beta_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , are sections of  $\mathbb{T}M$  and  $\mathbb{T}N$ , respectively, such that  $a_i$  and  $b_i$  are  $\varphi$ -related, then a direct computation shows that

$$(5.19) \quad \langle a_1, \llbracket a_2, a_3 \rrbracket \rangle = \varphi^* \langle b_1, \llbracket b_2, b_3 \rrbracket \rangle.$$

Suppose that  $x_0 \in M$  is such that

- (i)  $d\varphi$  has constant rank around  $x_0$ , and
- (ii)  $\ker((d\varphi)^*) \cap \varphi^*L_N$  has constant rank around  $x_0$ .

By (i), we know that locally, around  $x_0$  and  $\varphi(x_0)$ , the map  $\varphi$  looks like

$$(5.20) \quad (x^1, \dots, x^m) \xrightarrow{\varphi} (x^1, \dots, x^k, 0, \dots, 0),$$

where  $k$  is the rank of  $d\varphi$  around  $x$ . In this local model,  $M = \{(x^1, \dots, x^m)\}$ ,  $N = \{(x^1, \dots, x^k)\}$ , and we identify the submanifolds of  $M$  and  $N$  defined by  $x^i = 0$  for  $i > k$  with  $S = \{(x^1, \dots, x^k)\}$ .

**Claim:** For any  $a_{x_0} \in \mathfrak{B}_\varphi(L_N)|_{x_0}$ , one can find local sections  $a$  of  $\mathfrak{B}_\varphi(L_N)$  and  $b$  of  $L_N$  so that  $a|_{x_0} = a_{x_0}$ , and  $a$  and  $b$  are  $\varphi$ -related.

To verify the claim, first extend  $a_{x_0}$  to a local section  $a_S = (X_S, \alpha_S)$  of  $\mathfrak{B}_\varphi(L_N)|_S$ ; using (ii) and (5.18), one can then find a local section  $b_S = (Y_S, \beta_S)$  of  $L_N|_S$  so that  $(b_S, a_S)$  is a section of  $\Gamma_\varphi|_S$ , i.e.,  $d\varphi(X_S) = Y_S$  and  $\alpha_S = \varphi^*\beta_S$ . Using the local form (5.20), one may naturally extend  $X_S$  to a vector field  $X$  on  $M$  satisfying  $d\varphi(X) = Y_S$ . It follows that  $a = (X, \varphi^*\beta_S)$  is a local section of  $\mathfrak{B}_\varphi(L_N)$  and, if  $b$  is any local section of  $L_N$  extending  $b_S$ ,  $a$  and  $b$  are  $\varphi$ -related. This proves the claim.

Given arbitrary  $(a_i)_{x_0} \in \mathfrak{B}_\varphi(L_N)|_{x_0}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , by the previous claim we can extend them to local sections  $a_i$  of  $\mathfrak{B}_\varphi(L_N)$  and find local sections  $b_i$  of  $L_N$ , so that  $a_i$  and  $b_i$  are  $\varphi$ -related. From (5.19), we have

$$\Upsilon_M((a_1)_{x_0}, (a_2)_{x_0}, (a_3)_{x_0}) = \Upsilon_M(a_1, a_2, a_3)(x_0) = \Upsilon_N(b_1, b_2, b_3)(\varphi(x_0)) = 0,$$

since  $L_N$  is integrable. It directly follows that  $\Upsilon_M$  vanishes at all points  $x \in M$  satisfying (i) and (ii). Since these points form an open dense subset in  $M$ , we conclude that  $\Upsilon_M \equiv 0$ , as desired. □



We refer to the condition that  $\ker((d\varphi)^*) \cap \varphi^*L_N$  has constant rank as the *clean-intersection condition* (c.f. [5, Sec. 5]). By (3.9), it always holds when  $L_N$  is defined by a 2-form on  $N$ .

**Example 5.7.** Let  $L$  be a Dirac structure on  $M$ , and let  $\varphi : C \hookrightarrow M$  be the inclusion of a submanifold. In this case,  $\ker(d\varphi)^* = TC^\circ$ , so the clean-intersection condition is that  $L \cap TC^\circ$  has constant rank. This guarantees that  $C$  inherits a Dirac structure by pullback, explicitly given (noticing that  $(L|_C \oplus TC) \cap \Gamma_\varphi$  projects isomorphically onto  $L \cap (TC \oplus T^*M|_C)$  in (5.18)) by

$$\mathfrak{B}_\varphi(L) = \{(X, \varphi^*\beta) \mid (X, \beta) \in L\} \cong \frac{L \cap (TC \oplus T^*M|_C)}{L \cap TC^\circ} \subset TC \oplus T^*C,$$

as originally noticed in [16].

### 5.2.2. Forward images.

Let  $L_M$  be an almost Dirac structure on  $M$  and  $\varphi : M \rightarrow N$  be a smooth map. The forward image (5.14) of  $L_M$  by  $\varphi$  defines a lagrangian distribution in  $\varphi^*\mathbb{T}N$ . The question of whether it is a Dirac structure on  $N$  involves two issues: first, as in the discussion of backward images, whether this distribution fits into a smooth subbundle of  $\varphi^*\mathbb{T}N$ ; second, if this subbundle determines a subbundle of  $\mathbb{T}N$ . The first issue leads to a clean-intersection condition, analogous to the one for backward images, while the second issue involves an additional invariance condition with respect to the map  $\varphi$ . This invariance condition is of course already necessary when one considers the pushforward of bivector fields: if  $\varphi : M \rightarrow N$  is a surjective submersion, for the pushforward of a bivector field  $\pi \in \Gamma(\wedge^2 TM)$  to be well defined, one needs that  $\pi$  satisfies, for all  $\alpha, \beta \in T_y^*N$ ,

$$\pi_x(\varphi^*\alpha, \varphi^*\beta) = \pi_{x'}(\varphi^*\alpha, \varphi^*\beta)$$

whenever  $\varphi(x) = \varphi(x') = y$ . We extend this invariance to the context of Dirac structures as follows: we say that  $L_M$  is  *$\varphi$ -invariant* if the right-hand side of (5.16) is invariant for all  $x$  on the same  $\varphi$ -fibre.

The next example illustrates a situation where a Dirac structure satisfies the invariance condition, but its forward image is not a smooth bundle.

**Example 5.8.** Consider the 2-form

$$\omega = x dx \wedge dy$$

on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , independent of  $y$ , and let  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the projection  $(x, y) \mapsto x$ . For  $x \neq 0$ , its forward image is  $T_x^*\mathbb{R} \subset T_x\mathbb{R} \oplus T_x^*\mathbb{R}$  (since the 2-form is nondegenerate at these points, so we may consider the pushforward of the corresponding bivector field), while for  $x = 0$  it is  $T_x\mathbb{R} \subset T_x\mathbb{R} \oplus T_x^*\mathbb{R}$ .

The following result is parallel to Prop. 5.6:

**Proposition 5.9.** *Let  $\varphi : M \rightarrow N$  be a surjective submersion and  $L_M$  be an almost Dirac structure on  $M$ . If  $\ker(d\varphi) \cap L_M$  has constant rank, then the forward image of  $L_M$  by  $\varphi$  is a smooth lagrangian subbundle of  $\varphi^*\mathbb{T}N$ . If the forward image of  $L_M$  is a smooth bundle in  $\varphi^*\mathbb{T}N$  and  $L_M$  is  $\varphi$ -invariant, then it defines an almost Dirac structure on  $M$ , which is integrable provided  $L_M$  is.*

*Proof.* Similarly to the proof of Prop. 5.6, one has the short exact sequence (c.f. (5.12))

$$(5.21) \quad \ker(d\varphi) \cap L_M \rightarrow \Gamma_\varphi \cap (\varphi^*\mathbb{T}N \oplus L_M) \rightarrow \mathfrak{F}_\varphi(L_M),$$

where the first map is the inclusion  $\mathbb{T}M \rightarrow \varphi^*\mathbb{T}N \oplus \mathbb{T}M$  and the second is the projection  $\varphi^*\mathbb{T}N \oplus \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow \varphi^*\mathbb{T}N$ . Since the rank of  $\mathfrak{F}_\varphi(L_M)$  is constant, one argues as in the proof of Prop. 5.6: the constant-rank condition for  $\ker(d\varphi) \cap L_M$  guarantees that  $\Gamma_\varphi \cap (\varphi^*\mathbb{T}N \oplus L_M)$  has constant rank, hence  $\mathfrak{F}_\varphi(L_M) \subset \varphi^*\mathbb{T}N$  is a (lagrangian) vector subbundle.

The  $\varphi$ -invariance of  $L_M$  guarantees that  $\mathfrak{F}_\varphi(L_M)$  determines a lagrangian subbundle of  $\mathbb{T}N$ , that we denote by  $L_N$ , given by the image of  $\mathfrak{F}_\varphi(L_M)$  under the natural projection  $\varphi^*\mathbb{T}N \rightarrow \mathbb{T}N$ ; one may also verify that  $\mathfrak{F}_\varphi(L_M) = \varphi^*L_N$  (the pullback of  $L_N$  as a vector bundle).

The assertion about integrability is verified as in Prop. 5.6. If  $x \in M$  is such that  $\ker(d\varphi) \cap L_M$  has constant rank around it, for any local section  $b$  of  $L_N$  around  $\varphi(x)$  one can choose a local section  $a$  of  $L_M$  around  $x$  (by splitting (5.21)) which is  $\varphi$ -related to  $b$ . Given arbitrary  $(b_y)_i \in L_N|_y$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , where  $y = \varphi(x)$ , we extend them to local sections  $b_i$  of  $L_N$ , and take local sections  $a_i$  of  $L_M$  so that  $a_i$  and  $b_i$  are  $\varphi$ -related. Denoting by  $\Upsilon_N$  and  $\Upsilon_M$  the Courant tensors of  $L_N$  and  $L_M$ , respectively, we have

$$\Upsilon_N((b_y)_1, (b_y)_2, (b_y)_3) = \Upsilon_N(b_1, b_2, b_3)(y) = \Upsilon_M(a_1, a_2, a_3)(x) = 0,$$

assuming that  $L_N$  is integrable. Using the fact that points  $x \in M$  around which  $\ker(d\varphi) \cap L_M$  has constant rank form an open dense subset of  $M$ , we conclude that  $\Upsilon_N \equiv 0$ .  $\square$

**Example 5.10.** Let  $M$  be equipped with a Dirac structure  $L$ , and suppose that  $\varphi : M \rightarrow N$  is a surjective submersion whose fibres are connected and such that

$$\ker(d\varphi) \subseteq L \cap TM = K.$$

Then  $\ker(d\varphi) \cap L = \ker(d\varphi)$  has constant rank. We claim that  $L$  is automatically  $\varphi$ -invariant. To verify this fact, the following is the key observation: given a vector field  $Z$  (assume it to be complete, for simplicity), its flow  $\psi_Z^t$  preserves  $L$  (i.e., it is a family of Dirac diffeomorphisms, see (5.17)), if and only if

$$(5.22) \quad \mathcal{L}_Z(X, \alpha) = ([Z, X], \mathcal{L}_Z\alpha) \in \Gamma(L), \quad \text{for all } (X, \alpha) \in \Gamma(L).$$

Since  $\varphi$  is a surjective submersion, it is locally a projection, so any  $x \in M$  admits a neighborhood in which, for any other  $x'$  on the same  $\varphi$ -fibre, one can find a (compactly supported) vector field  $Z$ , tangent to  $\ker(d\varphi)$ , whose flow (for some time  $t$ ) takes  $x$  to  $x'$ . Note that (5.22) holds, as the right-hand side of this equation is  $\llbracket (Z, 0), (X, \alpha) \rrbracket$ , which must lie in  $\Gamma(L)$  as a result of the integrability of  $L$  (since  $Z$  is a section of  $\ker(d\varphi) \subseteq L \cap TM$ ). So the (time- $t$ ) flow of  $Z$  defines a Dirac diffeomorphism taking  $x$  to  $x'$ . Since  $\varphi$  has connected fibres, it follows that one can find a Dirac diffeomorphism (by composing finitely many flows)  $\psi$  taking  $x$  to any  $x'$  on the same  $\varphi$ -fibre. Using  $\psi$ , we see that

$$\mathfrak{F}_\varphi(L|_{x'}) = \mathfrak{F}_\varphi(\mathfrak{F}_\psi(L|_x)) = \mathfrak{F}_{\varphi \circ \psi}(L|_{x'}) = \mathfrak{F}_\varphi(L|_x),$$

so  $L$  is  $\varphi$ -invariant.

It follows that the forward image of  $L$ , denoted by  $L_N$ , defines a Dirac structure on  $N$ . Moreover,  $L_N \cap TN = d\varphi(K)$ . A particular case of this situation is when the null foliation of  $L$  is simple,  $N$  is the leaf space,  $\varphi : M \rightarrow N$  is the natural projection, and  $K = \ker(d\varphi)$ . In this case,  $L_N \cap TN = \{0\}$ , so  $L_N$  is given by a bivector field  $\pi_N$ , determined by

$$\{f, g\}_N(\varphi(x)) = dg(\pi_N^\sharp(df))(\varphi(x)) = dg(d\varphi(X_{\varphi^*f}))(\varphi(x)) = \{\varphi^*f, \varphi^*g\}(x).$$

So  $\pi_N$  is the Poisson structure on  $N$  arising from the Poisson bracket on admissible functions (in this case, these agree with the basic functions relative to the null foliation) on  $M$  via the identification

$$\varphi^* : C^\infty(N) \rightarrow C^\infty(M)_{adm}.$$

Note that  $\varphi$  is f-Dirac by construction, but it is also b-Dirac by (5.6).

**Remark 5.11.** Consider a Lie group  $G$  acting on  $M$  preserving the Dirac structure  $L$ , i.e., an action by Dirac diffeomorphisms. If the action is free and proper, the quotient map  $\varphi : M \rightarrow N = M/G$  is a surjective submersion and  $L$  is  $\varphi$ -invariant. In this case the clean-intersection assumption, guaranteeing that the forward image of  $L$  on  $N$  is a Dirac structure, is that the distribution  $L \cap D$  has constant rank, where  $D$  is the distribution tangent to the  $G$ -orbits. Extensions of this discussion to non-free actions have been considered e.g. in [29].

## 6. SUBMANIFOLDS OF POISSON MANIFOLDS AND CONSTRAINTS

We now discuss Dirac manifolds arising as submanifolds of Poisson manifolds, analogous to the presymplectic structures inherited by submanifolds of symplectic manifolds. The discussion illustrates how Dirac structures provide a convenient setting for the description of the intrinsic geometry of constraints in Poisson phase spaces.

As pointed out in Example 5.7, submanifolds of Dirac manifolds inherit Dirac structures (modulo a cleanness issue) via pullback. We will focus on the Dirac structures inherited by submanifolds  $\iota : C \hookrightarrow M$  of a given *Poisson manifold*  $(M, \pi)$ . We denote by  $L$  the Dirac structure on  $M$  defined by  $\pi$ . Then

$$(6.1) \quad \mathfrak{B}_\iota(L) = \{(X, \iota^*\beta) \in \mathbb{T}C \mid X = \pi^\sharp(\beta) \in TC, \beta \in T^*M\}.$$

We will focus on the case where this is a smooth bundle, hence a Dirac structure on  $C$ . Note that the clean-intersection condition for this pullback is that  $\ker(\pi^\sharp) \cap TC^\circ$  has constant rank, which is equivalent to  $\pi^\sharp(TC^\circ) \subset TM|_C$  having constant rank, as a result of the short exact sequence  $\ker(\pi^\sharp) \cap TC^\circ \rightarrow TC^\circ \rightarrow \pi^\sharp(TC^\circ)$ .

The null distribution of  $\mathfrak{B}_\iota(L)$  is

$$(6.2) \quad TC \cap \mathfrak{B}_\iota(L) = TC \cap \pi^\sharp(TC^\circ).$$

We present a description of the Poisson bracket on admissible functions on  $C$  in terms of the Poisson structure on  $M$ .

**The induced Poisson bracket on admissible functions.** Assume that a function  $f$  on  $C$  admits a local extension  $\hat{f}$  to  $M$  so that

$$(6.3) \quad d\hat{f}(\pi^\sharp(TC^\circ)) = 0.$$

Then  $X_{\hat{f}} = \pi^\sharp(d\hat{f})$  satisfies  $\beta(X_{\hat{f}}) = 0$  for all  $\beta \in TC^\circ$ ; i.e.,  $X_{\hat{f}}|_C \in TC$ . It is then clear from (6.1) that

$$(X_{\hat{f}}|_C, df) \in \mathfrak{B}_\iota(L),$$

i.e.,  $X_{\hat{f}}|_C$  is a hamiltonian vector field for  $f$ .

Recall that, if the null distribution (6.2) has constant rank, then a function  $f$  on  $C$  is admissible for  $\mathfrak{B}_\iota(L)$  if and only if  $df$  vanishes on  $TC \cap \pi^\sharp(TC^\circ)$ . If we assume additionally that  $\pi^\sharp(TC^\circ)$  has constant rank, then any admissible function  $f$  on  $C$  can be extended to a function  $\hat{f}$  on  $M$  satisfying (6.3). Denoting by  $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_C$  the Poisson bracket on admissible functions, we have

$$(6.4) \quad \{f, g\}_C = X_f g = X_{\hat{f}}|_C g = X_{\hat{f}} \hat{g}|_C,$$

i.e., the Poisson brackets on  $C$  and  $M$  are related by

$$(6.5) \quad \{f, g\}_C = \{\hat{f}, \hat{g}\}|_C,$$

where the extension  $\hat{f}$  (resp.  $\hat{g}$ ) satisfies (6.3).

**A word on coisotropic submanifolds (or first-class constraints).** A submanifold  $C$  of  $M$  is called *coisotropic* if

$$(6.6) \quad \pi^\sharp(TC^\circ) \subseteq TC.$$

These submanifolds play a key role in Poisson geometry (see e.g. [11]) and generalize the notion of first-class constraints in physics [20, 23]: when  $C$  is defined as the zero set of  $k$  independent functions  $\psi^i$ , condition (6.6) amounts to  $\{\psi^i, \psi^j\}|_C = 0$ .

Note that (6.6) does not guarantee that the pullback image of  $\pi$  to  $C$  is smooth; indeed, Example 5.5 illustrates a pullback image to a coisotropic submanifold that is not smooth. Despite this fact, Dirac structures play an important role in the study of coisotropic submanifolds: they provide a way to extend the formulation of coisotropic embedding problems in symplectic geometry (treated in [24, 34]) to the realm of Poisson manifolds.

More specifically, assume that the pullback image of  $L$  to  $C$  is smooth, so that it defines a Dirac structure  $\mathfrak{B}_\iota(L)$ . Condition (6.6) implies that this Dirac structure has null distribution (c.f. (6.2))

$$(6.7) \quad TC \cap \mathfrak{B}_\iota(L) = \pi^\sharp(TC^\circ),$$

which necessarily has (locally) constant rank (since the rank of the left-hand side of (6.7) is an upper semi-continuous function on  $C$ , while the rank of the right-hand side is lower semi-continuous, c.f. Section 1.1).

Using Dirac structures, one can then pose the converse question: can any Dirac manifold with constant-rank null distribution be coisotropically embedded into a Poisson manifold? It is proven in [13] that this is always possible, extending a result of Gotay [24] concerning coisotropic embeddings of constant-rank presymplectic manifolds into symplectic manifolds. The reader can find much more on coisotropic embeddings into Poisson manifolds in [13].

**Poisson-Dirac submanifolds and the Dirac bracket.** Let us assume that the pullback image (6.1) is a smooth bundle, hence defining a Dirac structure  $\mathfrak{B}_\iota(L)$  on  $C$ . As we have seen, this is guaranteed by the condition that  $\ker(\pi^\sharp) \cap TC^\circ$ , or  $\pi^\sharp(TC^\circ)$ , has constant rank. The Dirac structure  $\mathfrak{B}_\iota(L)$  on  $C$  is defined by a *Poisson* structure if and only if its null distribution is zero; i.e., by (6.2), if and only if

$$(6.8) \quad TC \cap \pi^\sharp(TC^\circ) = 0.$$

In this case  $C$  is called a *Poisson-Dirac submanifold* [18] (c.f. [43, Prop. 1.4]). When  $M$  is symplectic, a Poisson-Dirac submanifold amounts to a symplectic submanifold (i.e., a submanifold whose natural presymplectic structure is nondegenerate). In general, Poisson-Dirac submanifolds are “leafwise symplectic submanifolds”, thus generalizing symplectic submanifolds to the Poisson world.

On Poisson-Dirac submanifolds, all smooth functions are admissible. Supposing that  $\pi^\sharp(TC^\circ)$  has constant rank, the Poisson bracket  $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_C$  on  $C$  may be computed as in (6.5):

$$(6.9) \quad \{f, g\}_C = \{\hat{f}, \hat{g}\}_C,$$

where  $\hat{f}, \hat{g}$  are local extensions of  $f, g$  to  $M$ , satisfying (6.3).

Amongst Poisson-Dirac submanifolds, there are two special cases of interest. The first one is when

$$\pi^\sharp(TC^\circ) = 0,$$

which is equivalent to  $TC^\circ \subseteq \ker(\pi^\sharp)$ , or  $\text{im}(\pi^\sharp) \subseteq TC$ ; this is precisely the condition (5.5) for  $\mathfrak{F}_\iota(\mathfrak{B}_\iota(L)) = L$ , i.e., for the inclusion  $\iota : C \hookrightarrow M$  to be a Poisson map, and hence for  $C$  to be a Poisson submanifold of  $M$ .

The second special case is when

$$TM|_C = TC \oplus \pi^\sharp(TC^\circ),$$

and  $C$  is called a *cosymplectic* submanifold. Such submanifolds extend the notion of *second-class constraints* to the realm of Poisson manifolds; this is the context in which the Dirac-bracket formula for the pullback Poisson structure  $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_C$  on  $C$  can be derived, see e.g. [37, Chp. 10], providing an alternative expression to (6.9) (see (6.11) below).

When  $C$  is a cosymplectic submanifold, one has natural projections

$$\text{pr}_{TC} : TM|_C \rightarrow TC, \quad \text{pr}_{\pi^\sharp(TC^\circ)} = \text{Id} - \text{pr}_{TC} : TM|_C \rightarrow \pi^\sharp(TC^\circ),$$

and it is clear from (6.9) that the Poisson structure on  $C$  is given by the bivector field  $\pi_C = (\text{pr}_{TC})_* \pi|_C$ . Note also that, for  $f, g$  smooth functions on  $C$  and  $F$  arbitrary local extensions of  $f$  to  $M$ , we have (see (6.4), recalling the extensions  $\hat{f}, \hat{g}$  in (6.3))

$$dg(X_f) = \{f, g\}_C = -df(X_{\hat{g}}|_C) = -dF(X_{\hat{g}})|_C = d\hat{g}(X_F)|_C = dg(\text{pr}_{TC}(X_F|_C));$$

we conclude that the hamiltonian vector fields  $X_f$  and  $X_F$  (with respect to  $\pi_C$  and  $\pi$ , respectively) are related by

$$(6.10) \quad X_f = \text{pr}_{TC}(X_F|_C).$$

Let us suppose that the “constraint” submanifold  $C$  is defined by  $k$  independent functions  $\psi^i$ , i.e.,  $C = \Psi^{-1}(0)$  for a submersion  $\Psi = (\psi^1, \dots, \psi^k) : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ . Then

$d\psi^i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , form a basis for  $TC^\circ$ , and  $TC = \ker(d\Psi)$  along  $C$ . Consider the matrix  $(c^{ij})$ , where

$$c^{ij} = \{\psi^i, \psi^j\};$$

the fact that  $C$  is cosymplectic means that  $\pi^\sharp(TC^\circ)$  has rank  $k$  (since  $TC$  has rank  $\dim(M) - k$ ), so  $\pi^\sharp|_{TC^\circ} : TC^\circ \rightarrow \pi^\sharp(TC^\circ)$  is an isomorphism, and  $X_{\psi^i} = \pi^\sharp(d\psi^i)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , form a basis of  $\pi^\sharp(TC^\circ)$ . Hence, for  $a_j \in \mathbb{R}$ , the condition  $c^{ij}(x)a_j = 0$  for all  $i$  means that  $-d\psi^i(a_j X_{\psi^j}) = 0$  for all  $i$ , that is,  $a_j X_{\psi^j} \in TC \cap \pi^\sharp(TC^\circ) = \{0\}$ , which implies that  $a_j = 0$ . So  $C$  being cosymplectic means that the matrix  $(c^{ij})$  is invertible (in this case, one may also check that  $k$  is necessarily even, so  $C$  has even codimension). Let us denote by  $(c_{ij})$  its inverse. We have the following explicit expression for the projection  $\text{pr}_{\pi^\sharp(TC^\circ)}$ : for  $Y \in TM|_C$ ,

$$\text{pr}_{\pi^\sharp(TC^\circ)}(Y) = d\psi^i(Y)c_{ij}X_{\psi^j}.$$

To verify this formula, note that if  $Y \in TC$ , then the right-hand side above vanishes. On the other hand, for each  $X_{\psi^i}$  in  $\pi^\sharp(TC^\circ)$ ,

$$\text{pr}_{\pi^\sharp(TC^\circ)}(X_{\psi^l}) = d\psi^i(X_{\psi^l})c_{ij}X_{\psi^j} = c^{li}c_{ij}X_{\psi^j} = \delta_j^l X_{\psi^j} = X_{\psi^l},$$

so  $\text{pr}_{\pi^\sharp(TC^\circ)}$  is the identity on  $\pi^\sharp(TC^\circ)$ . By (6.10), we see that

$$\{f, g\}_C = (\text{pr}_{TC}(X_F|_C))g = (\text{pr}_{TC}(X_F|_C))G = ((\text{Id} - \text{pr}_{\pi^\sharp(TC^\circ)})X_F|_C)G,$$

where  $F, G$  are arbitrary local extensions of  $f, g$ . So

$$(6.11) \quad \{f, g\}_C = (\{F, G\} - \{F, \psi^i\}c_{ij}\{\psi^j, G\})|_C,$$

which is Dirac's bracket formula for cosymplectic manifolds.

**Momentum level sets.** Another important class of submanifolds of Poisson manifolds is given by level sets of conserved quantities associated with symmetries, such as momentum maps.

Suppose that a Lie group  $G$  acts on a Poisson manifold  $M$  in a hamiltonian fashion, with equivariant momentum map  $J : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$ . This means that

$$(6.12) \quad u_M = X_{\langle J, u \rangle},$$

where  $u_M$  is the infinitesimal generator of the action associated with  $u \in \mathfrak{g}$ , and the equivariance of  $J$  is with respect to the coadjoint  $G$ -action on  $\mathfrak{g}^*$ ; infinitesimally, the equivariance condition implies that  $J$  is a Poisson map with respect to the Lie-Poisson structure on  $\mathfrak{g}^*$  (see e.g. [37, Sec. 10] for details). We denote by  $D \subseteq TM$  the distribution on  $M$  tangent to the  $G$ -orbits.

If  $\mu \in \mathfrak{g}^*$  is a regular value for  $J$ , one considers the submanifold  $C = J^{-1}(\mu)$ , which naturally carries an action of  $G_\mu$ , the isotropy group of the coadjoint action at  $\mu$ . Let us suppose that this  $G_\mu$ -action on  $J^{-1}(\mu)$  is free and proper, so that its orbit space is a smooth manifold, and we can consider the following diagram

$$(6.13) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} J^{-1}(\mu) & \xrightarrow{\iota} & M \\ p \downarrow & & \\ J^{-1}(\mu)/G_\mu & & \end{array}$$

where  $\iota$  is the inclusion and  $p$  is the quotient map, which is a surjective submersion. The reduction theorem in this context (see e.g. [37, Sec. 10.4.15]) says

that  $J^{-1}(\mu)/G_\mu$  inherits a natural Poisson structure  $\pi_\mu$ , with corresponding bracket  $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_\mu$ , characterized by the following condition:

$$(6.14) \quad \{f, g\}_\mu \circ p = \{\bar{f}, \bar{g}\} \circ \iota,$$

where  $\bar{f}, \bar{g}$  are local extensions of  $p^*f, p^*g \in C^\infty(J^{-1}(\mu))$  to  $M$  satisfying  $d\bar{f}|_D = 0, d\bar{g}|_D = 0$ . In this picture, both  $M$  and  $J^{-1}(\mu)/G_\mu$  are Poisson manifolds, but there is no geometric interpretation of the ‘‘intermediate’’ manifold  $C = J^{-1}(\mu)$ .

When the Poisson structure on  $M$  is nondegenerate, i.e., defined by a symplectic form  $\omega$ , we are in the classical setting of Marsden-Weinstein reduction. In this case  $J^{-1}(\mu)$  is naturally a presymplectic manifold, with 2-form  $\iota^*\omega$ , and the Poisson structure  $\pi_\mu$  on  $J^{-1}(\mu)/G_\mu$  is defined by a symplectic form  $\omega_\mu$ ; the condition relating  $\pi$  and  $\pi_\mu$  is easily expressed in term of the corresponding symplectic forms as

$$(6.15) \quad p^*\omega_\mu = \iota^*\omega,$$

which determines  $\omega_\mu$  uniquely. As we now see, Dirac structures allow us to identify the geometric nature of  $J^{-1}(\mu)$  in general and interpret (6.14) as a direct generalization of (6.15).

We start by considering the backward image of  $\pi$  with respect to  $\iota$ . The clean-intersection condition guaranteeing the smoothness of  $\mathfrak{B}_\iota(L_\pi)$  is that the distribution

$$\ker(dJ)^\circ \cap L_\pi = \text{im}((dJ)^*) \cap L_\pi = \text{im}((dJ)^*) \cap \ker(\pi^\sharp)$$

has constant rank over  $J^{-1}(\mu)$ . Since  $\mu$  is a regular value of  $J$  and, for  $x \in J^{-1}(\mu)$ ,  $\text{im}((dJ)^*) \cap \ker(\pi^\sharp)|_x = \{\alpha \in T_x^*M \mid \alpha = (dJ)^*(u), \pi^\sharp(\alpha) = u_M(x) = 0\} = (dJ)^*(\mathfrak{g}_x)$ , where  $\mathfrak{g}_x$  is the isotropy Lie algebra of the  $G$ -action at  $x$ , we see that the clean-intersection condition amounts to checking that  $\dim(\mathfrak{g}_x)$  is constant for  $x \in J^{-1}(\mu)$ . Since  $J$  is equivariant,  $G_x \subseteq G_\mu$ , and  $G_x$  agrees with the isotropy group of  $G_\mu$  at  $x$ , which is trivial since  $G_\mu$  acts on  $J^{-1}(\mu)$  freely. Hence  $\dim(\mathfrak{g}_x) = 0$  for  $x \in J^{-1}(\mu)$ . It follows that  $\mathfrak{B}_\iota(L_\pi)$  makes the momentum level set  $J^{-1}(\mu)$  into a Dirac manifold in such a way that  $\iota$  is a b-Dirac map.

Since  $\pi^\sharp(\ker(dJ)^\circ) = D$  (by (6.12)), the null distribution of  $\mathfrak{B}_\iota(L_\pi)$  is (c.f. (6.2))

$$T(J^{-1}(\mu)) \cap D = \ker(p),$$

where the equality follows from the equivariance of  $J$  and the fact that  $\ker(p)$  agrees with the distribution tangent to the  $G_\mu$ -orbits on  $J^{-1}(\mu)$ . By Example 5.10 and Remark 5.11, the forward image of  $\mathfrak{B}_\iota(L_\pi)$  under  $p$  defines a Poisson structure on  $J^{-1}(\mu)/G_\mu$ , with bracket given by

$$(6.16) \quad \{f, g\}_\mu \circ p = \{p^*f, \widehat{p^*g}\}_C,$$

where  $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_C$  is the Poisson bracket on admissible functions on  $J^{-1}(\mu)$ . By (6.5),

$$\{p^*f, \widehat{p^*g}\}_C = \{\widehat{p^*f}, \widehat{p^*g}\}_C,$$

where  $\widehat{p^*f}$  denotes a local extension of  $p^*f$  to  $M$  with differential vanishing on  $\pi^\sharp(TC^\circ) = \pi^\sharp(\text{im}(dJ^*)) = D$ . So the bracket  $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_\mu$  in (6.16) is the same as the bracket defined in (6.14).

In conclusion, Dirac geometry completes the reduction diagram (6.13) in the following way: the level set  $J^{-1}(\mu)$  inherits a Dirac structure  $\mathfrak{B}_\iota(L_\pi)$  for which  $\iota$  is a b-Dirac map, while the Poisson structure  $\pi_\mu$  on the quotient  $J^{-1}(\mu)/G_\mu$  is its forward image, so  $p$  is an f-Dirac map. As mentioned in Example 5.10,  $p$  is also

a b-Dirac map, and this condition uniquely determines  $\pi_\mu$ . We can then write the relationship between  $\pi$  and  $\pi_\mu$  (c.f. (6.14)) exactly like we do for symplectic forms:

$$\mathfrak{B}_\iota(L_\pi) = \mathfrak{B}_p(L_{\pi_\mu}),$$

noticing that, in the symplectic setting,  $\mathfrak{B}_\iota(L_\omega) = \mathfrak{B}_p(L_{\omega_\mu})$  is nothing but (6.15).

## 7. BRIEF REMARKS ON FURTHER DEVELOPMENTS

In this last section, we merely indicate some directions of more recent developments and applications of Dirac structures. Although these lectures have mostly focused on how Dirac structures arise in the study of constraints of classical systems on Poisson manifolds, subsequent work to Courant's paper [16] revealed connections between Dirac structures and many other subjects in mathematics and mathematical physics. Even in mechanics, (almost) Dirac structures have found applications beyond their original motivation, such as the study of implicit hamiltonian systems (including nonholonomic systems, see [42] for a survey and original references) as well as implicit lagrangian systems and variational principles, see e.g. [47].

Understanding the properties of the Courant bracket (3.2), used to formulate the integrability condition for Dirac structures, has led to the notion of *Courant algebroid* [33], which consists of a vector bundle  $E \rightarrow M$ , a symmetric nondegenerate fibrewise pairing on  $E$ , a bracket on the space  $\Gamma(E)$ , and a bundle map  $E \rightarrow TM$  satisfying axioms that emulate those of  $TM \rightarrow M$  equipped with  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ ,  $[[\cdot, \cdot]]$  and  $\text{pr}_T : TM \rightarrow TM$ , see Section 3 (a detailed discussion can be found in [32]). Dirac structures on general Courant algebroids are used in [33] to extend the theory of Lie bialgebras, Manin triples and Poisson-Lie groups to the realm of Lie algebroids and groupoids. From another perspective, Courant algebroids admit a natural super-geometric description in terms of certain types of differential graded symplectic manifolds [38, 39]; in this context, Dirac structures may be appropriately viewed as analogs of lagrangian submanifolds. Courant algebroids have also been studied in connection with field theories and vertex algebras (see e.g. [3, 6] and references therein).

A distinguished class of Courant algebroids, introduced by Severa (see e.g. [40]), is defined through a modification of the Courant bracket (3.2) on  $TM$  by a closed 3-form  $H \in \Omega^3(M)$ :

$$(7.1) \quad [[(X, \alpha), (Y, \beta)]]_H = [[(X, \alpha), (Y, \beta)]] + i_Y i_X H.$$

Such Courant algebroids are known as *exact*, and Dirac structures relative to  $[[\cdot, \cdot]]_H$  are often referred to as *H-twisted*. For example, the integrability condition for a bivector field  $\pi$  with respect to (7.1) becomes

$$\text{Jac}_\pi(f, g, h) = H(X_f, X_g, X_h),$$

see [31]. A key example of an *H-twisted* Dirac structure is the so-called *Cartan-Dirac* structure (see e.g. [1, 8]), defined on any Lie group  $G$  whose Lie algebra is equipped with a non-degenerate Ad-invariant quadratic form; in this case,  $H \in \Omega^3(G)$  is the associated Cartan 3-form.

As mentioned in Section 4, any Dirac structure  $L \subset TM$  carries a Lie algebroid structure. From a Lie-theoretic standpoint, it is natural to search for the class of Lie groupoids “integrating” Dirac structures. For Poisson structures, the corresponding global objects are the so-called *symplectic groupoids* [15] (see also [12], [19]), originally introduced as part of a quantization scheme for Poisson manifolds (see e.g.



[5]). More generally, the global counterparts of Dirac structures were identified in [8], and called *presymplectic groupoids*. Passing from Dirac structures to presymplectic groupoids is key to uncover links between Dirac structures, momentum maps and equivariant cohomology, see e.g. [8, 46].

The connection between Dirac structures and the theory of momentum maps is far-reaching. As recalled in Section 6, classical momentum maps in Poisson geometry are defined by Poisson maps

$$J : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$$

from a Poisson manifold into the dual of a Lie algebra. In the last 25 years, generalized notions of momentum maps have sprung up in symplectic geometry, mostly motivated by the role of symplectic structures in different areas of mathematics and mathematical physics; see [44] for a general discussion and original references. Prominent examples include the theory of hamiltonian actions of symplectic groupoids [36], in which arbitrary Poisson maps may be viewed as momentum maps, and the theory of  $G$ -valued moment maps, which arises in the study of moduli spaces in gauge theory [2]. These seemingly unrelated new notions of momentum map turn out to fit into a common geometric framework provided by Dirac structures and Courant algebroids. Much of the usual hamiltonian theory in Poisson geometry carries over to the realm of Dirac structures, and the key observation is that, just as classical momentum maps are Poisson maps, many generalized momentum maps are morphisms between Dirac manifolds (in an appropriate sense, see Remark 5.4); see e.g. [1, 7, 8, 9].

Another viewpoint to Dirac structures that has proven fruitful is based on their description via *pure spinors* [4, 28] (see also [1]). The bundle  $\mathbb{T}M$ , equipped with the symmetric pairing (3.1), gives rise to a bundle  $\text{Cl}(\mathbb{T}M)$  of Clifford algebras, and the exterior algebra  $\wedge^\bullet T^*M$  carries a natural representation of  $\text{Cl}(\mathbb{T}M)$ , defined by the action

$$(X, \alpha) \cdot \phi = i_X \phi + \alpha \wedge \phi,$$

for  $(X, \alpha) \in \mathbb{T}M$  and  $\phi \in \wedge^\bullet T^*M$ . In this way,  $\wedge^\bullet T^*M$  is viewed as a spinor module over  $\text{Cl}(\mathbb{T}M)$ . The subspace  $L \subset \mathbb{T}M$  that annihilates a given (nonzero)  $\phi$  is always isotropic, and  $\phi$  is called a *pure spinor* when  $L$  is lagrangian:  $L = L^\perp$ . Pure spinors corresponding to the same annihilator  $L$  must agree up to rescaling; as a result, almost Dirac structures on  $M$  are uniquely characterized by a (generally nontrivial) smooth line bundle

$$(7.2) \quad l \subset \wedge^\bullet T^*M,$$

generated by pure spinors at all points. The integrability of  $L$  relative to the ( $H$ -twisted) Courant bracket can be naturally expressed in terms of  $l$  as well, see e.g [4, 26]. In this way, Dirac structures are represented by specific line bundles (7.2) and, by taking (local) sections, one obtains concrete descriptions of Dirac structures through differential forms. For example, the Dirac structure  $L_\omega$  (3.8) is the annihilator of the differential form  $e^{-\omega} \in \Omega^\bullet(M)$ . This approach to Dirac structures leads to natural constructions of invariant volume forms associated with  $G$ -valued moment maps [1] and has been an essential ingredient in the study of generalized complex structures [28, 26], that we briefly recall next.

*Generalized complex structures* [26, 28] are particular types of complex Dirac structures  $L \subset \mathbb{T}M \otimes \mathbb{C}$ , with the extra property that  $L \cap \overline{L} = \{0\}$ ; they correspond to

$+i$ -eigenbundles of endomorphisms  $\mathcal{J} : TM \rightarrow TM$  satisfying  $\mathcal{J}^2 = -1$  and preserving the pairing (3.1). These geometrical structures unify symplectic and complex geometries, though the most interesting examples fall in between these extreme cases (see e.g. [14]). Given a complex structure  $J : TM \rightarrow TM$  and a symplectic structure  $\omega \in \Omega^2(M)$ , viewed as a bundle map  $TM \rightarrow T^*M$ , the associated generalized complex structures  $TM \rightarrow TM$  are

$$\begin{pmatrix} J & 0 \\ 0 & -J^* \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\omega^{-1} \\ \omega & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Besides their mathematical interest, generalized complex structures have drawn much attention due to their strong ties with theoretical physics, including e.g. topological strings and super symmetric sigma models, see e.g. [30, 48] and references therein.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Alekseev, A., Bursztyn, H., Meinrenken, E., Pure spinors on Lie groups. *Asterisque*. No. **327**, p. 129–197, 2010.
- [2] Alekseev, A., Malkin, A., Meinrenken, E., Lie group valued moment maps. *J. Differential Geom.* **48** (1998), 445–495.
- [3] Alekseev, A., Strobl, T., Current algebras and differential geometry. *JHEP*, 0503 (2005), 035.
- [4] Alekseev, A., Xu, P., Derived brackets and Courant algebroids, unpublished manuscript.
- [5] Bates, S., Weinstein, A., *Lectures on the geometry of quantization*, Berkeley Mathematics Lecture Notes, 8. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI; Berkeley Center for Pure and Applied Mathematics, Berkeley, CA, 1997.
- [6] Bressler, P., The first Pontryagin class. *Compositio Math.* **143** (2007), 1127–1163.
- [7] Bursztyn, H., Crainic, M., Dirac geometry, quasi-Poisson actions and D/G-valued moment maps. *J. Differential Geom.* **82** (2009), 501–566.
- [8] Bursztyn, H., Crainic, M., Weinstein, A., Zhu, C., Integration of twisted Dirac brackets. *Duke Math. J.* **123** (2004), 549–607.
- [9] Bursztyn, H., Iglesias-Ponte, D., Severa, P.: Courant morphisms and moment maps. *Math. Res. Lett.* **16**(2009), 215–232.
- [10] Bursztyn, H., Radko, O., Gauge equivalence of Dirac structures and symplectic groupoids. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, **53** (2003), 309–337
- [11] Cannas da Silva, A., Weinstein, A., *Geometric models for noncommutative algebras*. Berkeley Mathematics Lecture Notes, 10. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI; Berkeley Center for Pure and Applied Mathematics, Berkeley, CA, 1999.
- [12] Cattaneo, A., Felder, G., *Poisson sigma models and symplectic groupoids*. Quantization of singular symplectic quotients, 61–93, Progr. Math., **198**, Birkhauser, Basel, 2001.
- [13] Cattaneo, A., Zambon, M., Coisotropic embeddings in Poisson manifolds. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **361** (2009), 3721–3746.
- [14] Cavalcanti, G., Gualtieri, M, A surgery for generalized complex structures on 4-manifolds. *J. Differential Geom.*, **76** (2007) 35–43.
- [15] Coste, A., Dazord, P., Weinstein, A., *Groupoïdes symplectiques*. Publications du Département de Mathématiques. Nouvelle Série. A, Vol. 2, i–ii, 1–62, Publ. Dép. Math. Nouvelle Sér. A, 87-2, Univ. Claude-Bernard, Lyon, 1987.
- [16] Courant, T., Dirac manifolds, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **319** (1990), 631–661.
- [17] Courant, T., Weinstein, A., *Beyond Poisson structures*. Séminaire sudrhodanien de géométrie VIII. Travaux en Cours **27**, Hermann, Paris (1988), 39–49.
- [18] Crainic, M., Fernandes, R., Integrability of Lie brackets. *Ann. of Math.* **157** (2003), 575–620.
- [19] Crainic, M., Fernandes, R., Integrability of Poisson brackets. *J. Differential Geom.* **66** (2004), 71–137.
- [20] Dirac, P., *Lectures on quantum mechanics*, Belfer Graduate School of Science, Yeshiva University, New York, 1964.

- [21] Dorfman, I., *Dirac structures and integrability of evolution equations*. John Wiley & Son Ltd, 1993.
- [22] Dufour, J.-P., Zung, N.-T., *Poisson structures and their normal forms*, Progress in. Mathematics, 242, Birkhauser Boston, 2005.
- [23] Gotay, M., Coisotropic Imbeddings, Dirac Brackets and Quantization. In: *Geometric quantization* (M. Gotay, ed.), University of Calgary, 1981.
- [24] Gotay, M., On coisotropic imbeddings of presymplectic manifolds. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **84** (1982), 111–114.
- [25] Gotay, M., Constraints, reduction and quantization. *J. Math. Phys.* **27** (1986), 2051–2066.
- [26] Gualtieri, M., *Generalized Complex Geometry*. D.Phil. thesis, Oxford University, 2003. Arxiv: math.DG/0401221.
- [27] Guillemin, V., Sternberg, S., Some problems in integral geometry and some related problems in microlocal analysis. *Amer. Jour. Math.* **101** (1979), 915–955.
- [28] Hitchin, N., Generalized Calabi-Yau manifolds. *Q. J. Math.* **54** (2003), 281–308.
- [29] Jotz, M., Ratiu, T., Induced Dirac structures on isotropy type manifolds. *Transform. Groups* **16** (2011), 175 – 191.
- [30] Kapustin, A., Li, Y.: Topological sigma-models with H-flux and twisted generalized complex manifolds. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **11** (2007), 269–290.
- [31] Klimcik, C., Strobl, T.: WZW-Poisson manifolds. *J. Geom. and Phys.* **43** (2002), 341–344.
- [32] Kosmann-Schwarzbach, Y., Derived brackets, *Lett. Math. Phys.*, **69** (2004), 61–87.
- [33] Liu, Z.-J., Weinstein, A., Xu, P., Manin triples for Lie bialgebroids. *J. Differential Geom.* **45** (1997), 547–574.
- [34] Marle, C.-M., Sous-variété de rang constant d’une variété symplectique. *Asterisque*. No. **107**, pp. 69–86, 1983.
- [35] Marsden, J., Ratiu, T.: *Introduction to Mechanics and Symmetry*, Text in Applied Mathematics, Vol. 17, Springer-Verlag, 1994.
- [36] Mikami, K., Weinstein, A., Moments and reduction for symplectic groupoid actions. *Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ.* **24** (1988), 121–140.
- [37] Ortega, J.-P., Ratiu, T., *Momentum maps and Hamiltonian Reduction*, Progress in. Mathematics, 222, Birkhauser Boston, 2004.
- [38] Roytenberg, D.: On the structure of graded symplectic supermanifolds and Courant algebroids, In: *Quantization, Poisson Brackets and Beyond*, T. Voronov (ed.), Contemp. Math., Vol. 315, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2002.
- [39] Ševera, P., Some title containing the words “homotopy” and “symplectic”, e.g. this one. *Travaux mathématiques*. Fasc. XVI (2005), 121–137.
- [40] Ševera, P., Weinstein, A., Poisson geometry with a 3-form background. *Prog. Theo. Phys. Suppl.* **144** (2001), 145–154.
- [41] Sniatycki, J., Dirac brackets in geometric dynamics. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré*, Sec. A **20** (1974), 365–372.
- [42] van der Schaft, A.J., Port-Hamiltonian systems: an introductory survey. *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians*, Volume III, Madrid, Spain, pp. 1339–1365, 2006.
- [43] Weinstein, A., The local structure of Poisson manifolds. *J. Differential Geom.* **18** (1983), 523–557.
- [44] Weinstein, A.: The geometry of momentum, *Géométrie au XXème Siècle, Histoire et Horizons*, Hermann, Paris, 2005. Arxiv: math.SG/0208108.
- [45] Weinstein, A., Symplectic categories. *Port. Math.* **67** (2010), 261–278.
- [46] Xu, P., Momentum maps and Morita equivalence. *J. Differential Geom.* **67** (2004), 289–333.
- [47] Yoshimura, H., Marsden, J., Dirac structures in Lagrangian mechanics. I. Implicit Lagrangian systems. *J. Geom. Phys.* **57** (2006), 133–156.
- [48] Zabzine, M. Lectures on Generalized Complex Geometry and Supersymmetry. *Archivum Mathematicum*, vol. 42 (2006), issue 5, pp. 119–146.

INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA PURA E APLICADA, ESTRADA DONA CASTORINA 110, RIO DE JANEIRO, 22460-320, BRASIL

E-mail address: henrique@impa.br