

KUCP-0048
October 1992

Quantum Gravity by the Complex Canonical Formulation

Hideo Kodama

*Department of Fundamental Sciences, FIHS
Kyoto University, Yoshida, Kyoto 606, Japan*

The basic features of the complex canonical formulation of general relativity and the recent developments in the quantum gravity program based on it are reviewed. The exposition is intended to be complementary to the review articles available already and some original arguments are included. In particular the conventional treatment of the Hamiltonian constraint and quantum states in the canonical approach to quantum gravity is criticized and a new formulation is proposed.

To appear in Int. J. Theor. Phys. D.

arXiv:gr-qc/9211022v1 18 Nov 1992

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Canonical Formulation of General Relativity	7
2.1	Metric Approach	7
2.2	Real Triad Approach	13
2.2.1	$SO_+(3, 1)$ connection	15
2.2.2	1st-order Palatini action	18
2.2.3	$(3 + 1)$ -decomposition	21
2.3	Chiral 1st-Order Formalism	26
2.3.1	Chiral representation of the proper Lorentz group	26
2.3.2	Chiral action	28
2.3.3	$(3 + 1)$ -decomposition	30
2.3.4	Gauge invariance	34
2.3.5	Reality condition	35
3	Quantum Theory of Totally Constrained Systems	39
3.1	Gauge-invariant Quantities and Dynamics	41
3.1.1	Gauge-fixing method vs. gauge invariant formalism	42
3.1.2	Physical meaning of the general covariance	43
3.1.3	Dynamics in the invariant formalism	45
3.2	Quantization	47
3.2.1	Program	47
3.2.2	Hamiltonian constraint and dynamics	51
3.3	Examples	59
3.3.1	Quantum mechanics	59
3.3.2	Relativistic free particle	61
3.3.3	Minisuperspace model	63
4	Quantization of the Complex Canonical Theory	66
4.1	Operator Algebra	67
4.1.1	Constraint operators	67
4.1.2	Reality condition	69
4.2	Connection Representation	71
4.2.1	Bargmann representation	71
4.2.2	Holomorphic connection representation	73

4.2.3	Invariant states	75
4.2.4	Invariant operators	80
4.3	Loop Space Representation	83
4.3.1	Algebra of loop variables	84
4.3.2	Representation on the multi-loop space	85
4.4	Solutions to the Hamiltonian Constraint	88
4.4.1	Loop integral solutions	88
4.4.2	Non-degenerate solution in the connection representation	91
5	Summary and Discussion	98

1 Introduction

The most important concepts introduced in fundamental physics in this half century are renormalizability and gauge principle. Various experimental verifications of the standard model of elementary particles have marked their success. However, there remains one important field which is not encompassed by these ideas: the gravitational interaction.

Of course general relativity, the most successful classical theory of gravity, is a gauge field theory in the sense that gravity is described by a $SO(3, 1)$ connection. However, the requirement of the general covariance has made it quite different from ordinary gauge theories: the local gauge symmetry is intimately connected with space-time diffeomorphisms. Actually it is this feature that makes general relativity work as a theory of gravity.

This difference gives rise to the serious problem of unrenormalizable divergences when one tries to construct a quantum theory of general relativity. It implies that the dynamics becomes more and more intricate as one goes to smaller scales. In the classical theory this does not cause any trouble because one can suppress local excitations. In contrast such a suppression is not possible in the quantum regime due to the existence of uncontrollable quantum fluctuations.

Though various approaches have been tried to attack this problem historically, they are now converging to three main streams. The first is to construct a new theory of gravity which does not suffer from the above difficulty. The most successful approach along these lines is the superstring theory. Second is the canonical approach in which one tries to find a new framework to handle the nonperturbative nature of quantum gravity by starting from the conventional canonical quantization of general relativity. The third is the path-integral approach which differs from the second in that it formulates the theory in terms of sums over histories.

Superstring theory appears to be quite elegant in its formulation and fascinating in that it gives a unified treatment of all the interactions. In spite of these nice features it is yet at a premature stage as a theory of quantum gravity since it can treat gravity only perturbatively^[1]. The spacetime structure is built into the theory just as a classical object and its quantum dynamics cannot be studied. Two entities of completely different nature coexist. Further, since no satisfactory mechanism of dimensional reduction is found yet, there remains a significant ambiguity in its prediction for low energy physics.

In contrast, the canonical approach is far from being elegant and cannot restrict the structure of interactions other than gravity. Further there exists no justification for assuming that gravity is described by general relativity on small scales. The path-integral approach shares these features except that it utilizes the path-integral which is conceptually powerful but technically ill-defined. The main reason why people follow these approaches in spite of these limitations is in that they are currently the only approaches in which one can address the problem of the quantum dynamics of four-dimensional spacetimes directly without introducing extra ambiguities. This point is reflected in the historical development that the canonical approach was awakened from its long sleep relatively recently by the interesting work of Hawking and others^[2, 3, 4, 5, 6] on quantum cosmology.

It is quite interesting that these approaches are now coming closer and closer in spite of the differences in their starting points and features. It is the introduction of new canonical variables by Ashtekar^[7, 8] that has played a very important role in this development.

Ashtekar's theory was proposed as a rewriting of the traditional canonical theory of general relativity in terms of new variables and has two fascinating but one embarrassing feature: all the fundamental equations in the canonical theory are polynomial and the takes a form of a $SO(3, \mathbf{C})$ gauge theory, but the new variables are complex.

Soon after its proposal Samuel^[9] and Jacobson and Smolin^[10, 11] showed that Ashtekar's complex canonical theory can be derived from the first-order Palatini action by its (anti-)self-dual decomposition. They also clarified that the above three features are intimately related. Further with the help of this elegant reformulation gravity systems coupled with matter were rewritten in the same form by several authors^[12, 13, 14].

Almost at the same time Jacobson and Smolin^[15] revealed that Ashtekar's complex canonical theory when the above three features are fully utilized may provide a new breakthrough for the study of canonical quantum gravity. They found an infinite family of solutions to the quantum Hamiltonian constraint equation which is the central equation in the canonical gravity. This was astonishing because no exact solution had been found in the conventional ADM-WD formulation since its first detailed study by DeWitt^[16]. The essential ingredients were the introduction of a holomorphic connection representation^[17, 7] and loop integral variables. The former was a natural

consequence of adopting the complex connection as the fundamental variable and the latter of the gauge theoretical structure of the formulation.

There were, however, a few unpleasant aspects in these solutions. First they appeared to be unphysical since they represent spacetimes with spatial metrics everywhere degenerate^[18, 19]. Second they do not satisfy the diffeomorphism constraint. Since the diffeomorphism invariance is the most important feature of general relativity, the latter was regarded as a crucial defect.

Resolution was brought about by the introduction of the loop space representation by Rovelli and Smolin^[20, 21], which is in a sense a natural development provoked by the introduction of loop variables but is quite foreign to the conventional framework of canonical quantum gravity. There all the operators and the fundamental equations are transferred into the space of loops in a three-dimensional base manifold, and the problem of diffeomorphism invariance is reduced to the task of finding the knot or link invariants. Actually a solution to all the constraint equations which is nondegenerate at a point is found^[22] and is extended to a series of solutions^[23, 24] with the help of an exact solution of non-loop-integral type in the connection representation^[25] and the link between the Jones Polynomial and the Chern-Simons topological field theory found by Witten^[26]. Stimulated by these successes, a program has started to reformulate the other conventional gauge theories in terms of the loop space language in order to transfer all the physics onto the loop space and find physical interpretations of the loop space objects^[27, 28, 29, 28].

In spite of these exciting developments there remain lots of important problems yet to be solved in this approach to quantum gravity based on the complex canonical theory. Some of them are common to the traditional ADM-WD approach, such as the extraction of dynamics, the construction of diffeomorphism invariant operators and the interpretation. Though some investigations have been made on these problems by specializing the formalism to the Bianchi minisuperspace models^[30, 25, 31, 32] or the space-times with one or two Killing vectors^[33, 34], all of them are of a preliminary nature except for the recent construction of some finite geometrical operators on the loop space^[28]. The other problems are specific to the complex canonical theory. In particular the treatment of the reality condition, which is closely connected with the definition of the inner product of quantum states, is left as a quite difficult problem.

In the present paper I review the basic formulation of this complex canonical theory and the achievements and the problems in its application to quantum gravity. Since several good reviews^[35, 36, 37, 29] including the excellent book by Ashtekar himself^[38] already exist, I have tried to make this paper complementary to them keeping the exposition self-contained. In particular I have inserted a long section explaining the general structure of the canonical quantization program and its difficulties in order to help the readers to look at the present status of the theory objectively. A large fraction of the discussion in this section is original and in particular includes an important criticism on the conventional treatment of the quantum Hamiltonian constraint and its interpretation. Further as a technical point I avoid the use of the spinorial notation and describe the theory in the vector language as far as possible because the spinorial notation seems to be cumbersome for non-specialists. Since the main interest is in quantum gravity, I will not touch on some of the topics which are not directly relevant to it.

The main body of the paper consists of three sections. We begin in the next section by examining the basic structures and the characteristic features of the three main formulations of the classical canonical gravity, the metric approach, the real triad approach and the chiral approach (the complex canonical formulation), in order to see the similarities and the differences of them. In particular I explain in some detail how the latter two formulations are derived from the covariant actions to make clear the origin of the new features of the complex canonical theory and examine the correspondence among the three formulations.

In §3 I outline the generic structure of the canonical quantization program of gravity, and discuss its difficulty associated with the specification of dynamics and its origin, as a preliminary to the next section. In particular, by analyzing the physical meanings and roles of the three invariances in general relativity, the ordinary gauge invariance, the spatial diffeomorphism invariance and the time coordinate transformation invariance, I criticize the conventional treatment of the Hamiltonian constraint and quantum states, and propose a new treatment which I call the probability amplitude functional formalism. Some simple examples are given to illustrate how this formalism works.

In the light of the general framework given in §3, I describe in §4 what has been achieved and what to be done yet in the quantum gravity program

based on the complex canonical formulation. The exposition is limited to the basic aspects and technical details are often omitted since they are described in the reviews cited above. Section 5 is devoted to summary and discussion.

Finally I comment on the notation used in this paper. I adopt the natural units $c = \hbar = 1$ and use $\kappa^2 = 8\pi G$ in stead of G . The signature of the spacetime metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ is $[-, +, +, +]$, and the completely antisymmetric symbols always denote tensor densities normalized by $\epsilon_{0123} = 1$, $\epsilon^{0123} = -1$ and $\epsilon_{123} = \epsilon^{123} = 1$. The spacetime coordinate and spatial coordinate indices are denoted by the greek letters and the Latin letters starting from j , respectively, and the four- and three- dimensional internal indices by the Latin letters between a and h , and the capital letters starting from I , respectively. The zeroth component of the spacetime coordinate indices is denoted by t instead of 0 where it is necessary to distinguish it from that of the internal indices. Of course these letters are sometimes used in other senses due to the limited amount of symbols.

2 Canonical Formulation of General Relativity

In this first part of the paper we first summarize the basic structures and the characteristic features of two conventional real canonical formulations of the classical theory of general relativity, the metric approach and the real triad approach. Then we derive the complex canonical formulation and look at its structures and relation to the conventional ones.

2.1 Metric Approach

In the metric approach one starts from the action which is expressed in terms of the space-time metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ and the material field variables as

$$S = S_G + S_M, \quad (2.1.1)$$

where S_G is the Einstein-Hilbert action

$$S_G = \int_M d^4x \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} \sqrt{-g} R + \int_{\partial M} d\Sigma_\mu \frac{1}{\kappa^2} k^\mu, \quad (2.1.2)$$

and S_M is the action for matter. The second term in the right-hand side of Eq.(2.1.2) is the surface term to cancel the second derivative terms in the first term, where k^μ is the vector density defined in terms of an appropriate tetrad e_a^μ as

$$k^\mu := -\sqrt{-g}\eta^{ab}(\nabla_{e_a} e_b)^\mu, \quad (2.1.3)$$

and $d\Sigma_\mu$ is the three-dimensional volume element

$$d\Sigma_\mu = \frac{1}{3!}\epsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda\sigma}dx^\nu \wedge dx^\lambda \wedge dx^\sigma. \quad (2.1.4)$$

In the present subsection we only consider a three-component real scalar field Φ coupled with a $SO(3)$ gauge field \mathbf{A}_μ for simplicity. For this system S_M is given by

$$S_M = \int_M d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[-\frac{1}{4} \mathbf{F}_{\mu\nu} \cdot \mathbf{F}^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{D}_\mu \Phi \cdot \mathbf{D}^\mu \Phi - V(\Phi) \right], \quad (2.1.5)$$

where

$$\mathbf{F}_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu \mathbf{A}_\nu - \partial_\nu \mathbf{A}_\mu - e \mathbf{A}_\mu \times \mathbf{A}_\nu, \quad (2.1.6)$$

$$\mathbf{D}_\mu \Phi = (\partial_\mu - e \mathbf{A}_\mu \times) \Phi. \quad (2.1.7)$$

In order to construct a canonical theory of this system, we must foliate the spacetime into a family of space-like slices with constant time t , and decompose the fundamental variables to three dimensional tensors on each slice. In the present paper we assume that the spacetime manifold M has the structure $\mathbf{R} \times \Sigma$ after this time slicing where \mathbf{R} and Σ correspond to the curves with constant spatial coordinates and the time slices, respectively.

First, by expressing the future-directed unit normal vector n to each slice in terms of the lapse function N and the shift vector N^j as

$$n = N^{-1}(\partial_t - N^j \partial_j) \quad (2.1.8)$$

the space-time metric is written in terms of N , N^j and the intrinsic metric q_{jk} of each slice as

$$ds^2 = -N^2 dt^2 + q_{jk}(dx^j + N^j dt)(dx^k + N^k dt). \quad (2.1.9)$$

This (3+1)-decomposition leads to the following expression for the gravitational Lagrangian density:

$$\sqrt{-g}R = N\sqrt{q}({}^3R + K_{jk}K^{jk} - K^2) - \partial_0(2\sqrt{q}K) + \partial_j[2\sqrt{q}(N^jK - {}^3\nabla^jN)], \quad (2.1.10)$$

where ${}^3\nabla_j$ is the three-dimensional Riemannian covariant derivative with respect to q_{jk} , all the spatial-coordinate indices are raised and lowered by q_{jk} , and K_{jk} is the extrinsic curvature of each slice defined by

$$K_{jk} := -\nabla_j n_k = \frac{1}{2N}(-\dot{q}_{jk} + {}^3\nabla_j N_k + {}^3\nabla_k N_j), \quad (2.1.11)$$

$$K := K_j^j = q^{jk}K_{jk}. \quad (2.1.12)$$

In order to decompose the boundary term, we choose the tetrad such that $e_0 = n$. Then, since $k^0 = \sqrt{q}K$ on each time slice and $k^j = -\sqrt{q}[KN^j - {}^3\nabla^jN + N({}^3\nabla_{e_l}e_l)^j]$ on $\mathbf{R} \times \partial\Sigma$, the total derivative terms in (2.1.10) are canceled out by the boundary term.

Under the (3+1)-decomposition the action is written in terms of q_{jk} , N , N^j , \mathbf{A}_μ , and Φ . However, since no time derivatives of N^μ ($N^t := N$) and \mathbf{A}_0 are contained in the action as is seen from the expressions for $\sqrt{-g}R$ and $\mathbf{F}_{\mu\nu}$, we can introduce the canonical momentums only for q_{jk} , \mathbf{A}_j and Φ :

$$p^{jk} := \frac{\delta L}{\delta \dot{q}_{jk}} = -\frac{\sqrt{q}}{2\kappa^2}(K^{jk} - q^{jk}K), \quad (2.1.13)$$

$$\mathbf{E}^j := \frac{\delta L}{\delta \dot{\mathbf{A}}_j} = \frac{\sqrt{q}}{N}q^{jk}(\mathbf{F}_{0k} - N^l \mathbf{F}_{lk}), \quad (2.1.14)$$

$$\Pi := \frac{\delta L}{\delta \dot{\Phi}} = \frac{\sqrt{q}}{N}(\mathbf{D}_0\Phi - N^j \mathbf{D}_j\Phi). \quad (2.1.15)$$

In terms of these variables the Lagrangian is written in the canonical form as

$$L = \int_\Sigma d^3x (\dot{q}_{jk}p^{jk} + \mathbf{E}^j \cdot \dot{\mathbf{A}}_j + \Pi \cdot \dot{\Phi}) - H, \quad (2.1.16)$$

$$H = \int_\Sigma d^3x (N^\mu \mathcal{H}_\mu + \mathbf{A}_0 \cdot \mathbf{C}_\mathbf{A}) + H_\infty, \quad (2.1.17)$$

where

$$\mathbf{C}_\mathbf{A} = -\mathbf{D}_j \mathbf{E}^j + e\Phi \times \Pi, \quad (2.1.18)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_0 = \frac{2\kappa^2}{\sqrt{q}}(p^{jk}p_{jk} - \frac{1}{2}p^2) - \frac{\sqrt{q}}{2\kappa^2}{}^3R + \sqrt{q}T_{\mu\nu}n^\mu n^\nu, \quad (2.1.19)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_j = -2{}^3\nabla_k p_j^k + \sqrt{q}T_{j\mu}n^\mu, \quad (2.1.20)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{q}T_{\mu\nu}n^\mu n^\nu &= \frac{\Pi^2}{2\sqrt{q}} + \sqrt{q}\left(\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_j\Phi \cdot \mathbf{D}^j\Phi + V\right) + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{q}}\mathbf{E}_j \cdot \mathbf{E}^j \\ &\quad + \frac{\sqrt{q}}{2}q^{jk}q^{lm}\mathbf{F}_{jl}\mathbf{F}_{lm}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.1.21)$$

$$\sqrt{q}T_{j\mu}n^\mu = \Pi \cdot \mathbf{D}_j\Phi + \mathbf{E}^k \cdot \mathbf{F}_{jk}, \quad (2.1.22)$$

$$H_\infty = \int_{\partial\Sigma} dS_j \left[\frac{1}{\kappa^2} \sqrt{q} N (\mathbf{\nabla}_{e_I} e_I)^j + \mathbf{A}_0 \cdot \mathbf{E}^j \right]. \quad (2.1.23)$$

In the last expression $dS_j = (1/2)\epsilon_{jkl}dx^k \wedge dx^l$. For asymptotically flat spacetimes e_I should be taken so that it approaches some fixed Descartian frame at infinity in order for H_∞ to be finite. Of course H_∞ vanishes for the spatially compact case.

Thus by setting the Poisson brackets among the fundamental canonical variables as

$$\{q_{jk}(\mathbf{x}), p^{lm}(\mathbf{y})\} = \delta_{(j}^l \delta_{k)}^m \delta^3(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}), \quad (2.1.24)$$

$$\{\mathbf{A}_j^I(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{E}_J^k(\mathbf{y})\} = \delta_J^I \delta_j^k \delta^3(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}), \quad (2.1.25)$$

$$\{\Phi^I(\mathbf{x}), \Pi_J(\mathbf{y})\} = \delta_J^I \delta^3(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}), \quad (2.1.26)$$

$$\text{others are zero,} \quad (2.1.27)$$

the variation of the action with respect to these variables yields the canonical equation of motion for the canonical quantity $f(q, p, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{E}, \Phi, \Pi)$

$$\dot{f} = \{f, H\}. \quad (2.1.28)$$

On the other hand the variation with respect to the non-canonical variables N^μ and \mathbf{A}_0 yields the constraint equations

$$\mathcal{H}_\mu = 0, \quad (2.1.29)$$

$$C_{\mathbf{A}} = 0. \quad (2.1.30)$$

These constraints are shown to be of the first-class, that is, weakly closed under the Poisson bracket. Actually the classical commutation relations

among them are given by

$$\{C_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_1), C_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_2)\} = eC_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_1 \times \mathbf{\Lambda}_2), \quad (2.1.31)$$

$$\{C_{\mathbf{M}}(L_1), C_{\mathbf{M}}(L_2)\} = C_{\mathbf{M}}([L_1, L_2]) + C_{\mathbf{A}}(L_1^j L_2^k \mathbf{F}_{jk}), \quad (2.1.32)$$

$$\{C_{\mathbf{M}}(L), C_{\mathbf{H}}(T)\} = C_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathcal{L}_L T) - C_{\mathbf{A}}(q^{-1/2} T L^j \mathbf{E}_j), \quad (2.1.33)$$

$$\{C_{\mathbf{H}}(T_1), C_{\mathbf{H}}(T_2)\} = C_{\mathbf{M}}(T_1 \mathring{\nabla} T_2 - T_2 \mathring{\nabla} T_1), \quad (2.1.34)$$

$$\text{others} = 0, \quad (2.1.35)$$

where $C_{\mathbf{H}}(T)$, $C_{\mathbf{M}}(L)$ and $C_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{\Lambda})$ are defined in terms of smooth functions or vectors T , L^j and $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ with compact supports as

$$C_{\mathbf{H}}(T) := \int_{\Sigma} d^3x T \mathcal{H}_0, \quad (2.1.36)$$

$$C_{\mathbf{M}}(L) := \int_{\Sigma} d^3x L^j \mathcal{H}_j, \quad (2.1.37)$$

$$C_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{\Lambda}) := \int_{\Sigma} d^3x \mathbf{\Lambda} \cdot \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{A}}. \quad (2.1.38)$$

Since the Hamiltonian is written as a linear combination of these constraint functions apart from the term H_{∞} which does not affect the local dynamics, this first-class nature guarantees the consistency of the constraints with the canonical evolution equation.

Thus the general relativity theory can be consistently put in the canonical form. In the classical region this canonical formalism works well. Actually it is utilized successfully in practical problems such as numerically solving the Einstein equations. However, when regarded as the starting point of the quantum gravity program, it has some difficulties.

First, though the momentum constraint functional $C_{\mathbf{M}}$ has a rather simple structure (linear both in q_{jk} and p^{jk}), the Hamiltonian constraint functional $C_{\mathbf{H}}$ is non-polynomial in q_{jk} and includes \sqrt{q} . Of course, if one redefines N to $\bar{N} = N/(\sqrt{q}q^2)$, the new Hamiltonian constraint functional becomes a polynomial in q_{jk} . However, the resultant polynomial is at least of 8th degree (of 9th degree if the scalar field has a non-vanishing potential), and its structure is quite complicated. This complicated structure makes it difficult to find appropriate operator orderings and regularization of operator products in constructing the operator corresponding to the Hamiltonian constraint functional as well as to solve the constraint equation.

The second difficulty is associated with the constraint algebra. In general the appearance of first-class constraints is closely connected with the gauge

invariance of the original Lagrangian^[39]. In the present case the constraint $\mathcal{H}_\mu = 0$ is related with the general covariance and the constraint $\mathbf{C}_\mathbf{A} = 0$ with the $SO(3)$ gauge invariance. In fact the variation of the canonical variables under the infinitesimal coordinate transformation

$$\delta t = T, \quad \delta x^j = L^j, \quad (2.1.39)$$

and the infinitesimal gauge transformation

$$\delta \Phi = -e\mathbf{\Lambda} \times \Phi, \quad \delta \Pi = -e\mathbf{\Lambda} \times \Pi, \quad (2.1.40)$$

$$\delta \mathbf{A}_\mu = -\mathbf{D}_\mu \mathbf{\Lambda}, \quad \delta \mathbf{E} = -e\mathbf{\Lambda} \times \mathbf{E}, \quad (2.1.41)$$

$$(2.1.42)$$

is expressed as the canonical transformation

$$\delta f = \{G, \delta f\}; \quad f = f(q, p, \Phi, \Pi, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{E}), \quad (2.1.43)$$

with the generator

$$G = \int_\Sigma d^3x [T(N^\mu \mathcal{H}_\mu + \mathbf{A}_0 \cdot \mathbf{C}_\mathbf{A}) + L^j (\mathcal{H}_j + \mathbf{A}_j \cdot \mathbf{C}_\mathbf{A}) + \mathbf{\Lambda} \cdot \mathbf{C}_\mathbf{A}]. \quad (2.1.44)$$

Here Eq.(2.1.43) is valid for $T \neq 0$ only when the canonical variables satisfy the equation of motion.

Thus the constraint function $C_\mathbf{A}$ is the generator of the gauge transformation and the canonical quantity $C_\mathbf{D}$ defined by a linear combination of the constraint functions as

$$C_\mathbf{D}(L) := C_\mathbf{M}(L) + C_\mathbf{A}(L^j \mathbf{A}_j), \quad (2.1.45)$$

is the generator of the spatial coordinate transformation(or the spatial diffeomorphism). Further, the Poisson bracket algebra generated by these constraint functions,

$$\{C_\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_1), C_\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_2)\} = eC_\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_1 \times \mathbf{\Lambda}_2), \quad (2.1.46)$$

$$\{C_\mathbf{D}(L), C_\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{\Lambda})\} = C_\mathbf{A}(\mathcal{L}_L \mathbf{\Lambda}), \quad (2.1.47)$$

$$\{C_\mathbf{D}(L_1), C_\mathbf{D}(L_2)\} = C_\mathbf{D}([L_1, L_2]), \quad (2.1.48)$$

is completely isomorphic to the Lie algebra of the spatial coordinate transformation group and the $SO(3)$ gauge transformation group

$$[L(\xi_1), L(\xi_2)] = L([\xi_1, \xi_2]), \quad (2.1.49)$$

$$[L(\xi), L(\mathbf{\Lambda})] = L(\mathcal{L}_\xi \mathbf{\Lambda}), \quad (2.1.50)$$

$$[L(\mathbf{\Lambda}_1), L(\mathbf{\Lambda}_2)] = \epsilon L(\mathbf{\Lambda}_1 \times \mathbf{\Lambda}_2), \quad (2.1.51)$$

Hence the constraints $C_{\mathbf{A}} = 0$ and $C_{\mathbf{D}} = 0$ are purely kinematical ones. This point is also confirmed from the structure of their Poisson brackets with $C_{\mathbf{H}}$ given by

$$\{C_{\mathbf{A}}, C_{\mathbf{H}}(T)\} = 0, \quad (2.1.52)$$

$$\{C_{\mathbf{D}}(L), C_{\mathbf{H}}(T)\} = C_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathcal{L}_L T). \quad (2.1.53)$$

In contrast, though the generator of the time-coordinate transformation is written as a linear combination of the constraint functions, it is not a canonical quantity since it contains the noncanonical variables N^μ and \mathbf{A}_0 . This implies that the group of canonical transformations generated by all the constraint functions is not isomorphic to the group of the four-dimensional diffeomorphisms and the gauge transformations. This point is reflected in the fact that the structure coefficients in Eq.(2.1.34) depend on the canonical variables. This peculiarity occurs because in contrast to the other transformations the time-coordinate transformations can be represented on the phase space only by eliminating the time derivatives appearing in the transformation formula with the aid of the evolution equation. This implies that the Hamiltonian constraint is of a dynamical nature unlike the other constraints(cf. [40]).

Classically this Poisson bracket structure of the constraint functions causes no problem. However, if one tries to quantize the theory, it introduces a non-trivial ambiguity in the operator ordering for the constraint operators. This ambiguity is common to all the canonical approaches. This problem will be discussed in more detail in §4.

2.2 Real Triad Approach

If one would like to describe the interactions of spinor fields with the gravitational field, one must introduce the local pseud-orthonormal frame, the

so-called tetrad. The Einstein-Hilbert action can be easily rewritten in terms of the tetrad.

Let $e_a = e_a^\mu \partial_\mu$ be a tetrad field and $\theta^a = \theta_\mu^a dx^\mu$ be its dual 1-form basis:

$$\theta^a(e_b) = \theta_\mu^a e_b^\mu = \delta_b^a. \quad (2.2.1)$$

The metric tensor g is written in terms of θ^a as

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{ab} \theta_\mu^a \theta_\nu^b, \quad (2.2.2)$$

where η_{ab} is the flat metric. Though the gravitational action for the tetrad is obtained simply by substituting this expression into Eq.(2.1.2), it is better to introduce the connection form to make clear the structure of the action.

In general the connection form for the covariant derivative ∇ with respect to a given vector frame e_a and its dual 1-form basis θ^a is a set of 1-form ω^a_b defined by^[41]

$$\nabla_X e_a = e_b \omega^b_a(X), \quad \nabla_X \theta^a = -\omega^a_b(X) \theta^b. \quad (2.2.3)$$

The curvature tensor $R^\lambda_{\sigma\mu\nu}$ of this covariant derivative is related to the curvature 2-form defined by

$$\mathcal{R}^a_b = d\omega^a_b + \omega^a_c \wedge \omega^c_b \quad (2.2.4)$$

as

$$\mathcal{R}^a_{b\mu\nu} = \theta_\lambda^a e_b^\sigma R^\lambda_{\sigma\mu\nu}. \quad (2.2.5)$$

Hence the Lagrangian density of the Einstein-Hilbert action is written in terms of the tetrad and the connection form as

$$\sqrt{-g}R = |\theta| e^{a\mu} e^{b\nu} \mathcal{R}_{ab\mu\nu}, \quad (2.2.6)$$

where $|\theta| = \det(\theta_\mu^a) = \sqrt{-g}$ and the tetrad indices a, b, \dots are lowered and raised by η_{ab} .

Thus in terms of the tetrad and the connection form the Einstein theory can be put in a form similar to the gauge field theory. Actually the action obtained from the Lagrangian density (2.2.6) is invariant under the local Lorentz transformations as well as the general coordinate transformations. The theory in the present form, however, cannot be regarded as a genuine gauge theory since the connection form is not an independent field but is

assumed to be expressed in terms of the tetrad through the condition that it corresponds to the Riemannian connection. This condition is expressed by the following two equations:

$$\Theta^a := d\theta^a + \omega^a_b \wedge \theta^b = 0 \quad (\text{Torsion free}), \quad (2.2.7)$$

$$(\nabla g)_{ab} = \omega_{ab} + \omega_{ba} = 0 \quad (\text{Metricity}). \quad (2.2.8)$$

Apparently, if one would like to treat the connection form as an independent field, one should impose these equations as the extra constraints. Interestingly, however, it is not the case: if we only require the metricity condition, the torsion free condition is obtained from the action. Thus the Einstein theory can be formulated as a gauge theory for the proper Lorentz group $SO_+(3,1)$. This point will play an important role in putting the theory into the complex canonical form.

Before proving the above statement and its generalization to the case in which the interactions with matter fields are included, we must make some comments on the $SO_+(3,1)$ connection.

2.2.1 $SO_+(3,1)$ connection

From now on we denote the connection form by $A^a_b = A^a_{b\mu} dx^\mu$ and reserve the symbol ω^a_b to denote the Riemannian connection form expressed in terms of the tetrad. Further the latin indices a, b, \dots are always raised or lowered by η_{ab} and A^a_b is assumed to satisfy

$$A_{ab} = -A_{ba}, \quad (2.2.9)$$

which corresponds to the metricity condition.

In the above argument the connection form is regarded as defining an linear connection in the tangent bundle $T(M)$. From this standpoint, for example, the covariant derivative of a vector field $V = V^a e_a$ is expressed in terms of the connection form A^a_b as

$$\nabla_X V = e_a(dV^a(X) + A^a_b(X)V^b). \quad (2.2.10)$$

This expression consists of two parts: the part defining a derivative of the component fields V^a and the tetrad which maps the component fields to a

vector field. Since $\nabla_X V$ is invariant under the local Lorentz transformation $\Lambda \in SO_+(3, 1)$ of the tetrad

$$e_a \rightarrow e'_a = e_b (\Lambda^{-1})^b{}_a = \Lambda_a{}^b e_b, \quad (2.2.11)$$

$$\theta^a \rightarrow \theta'^a = \Lambda^a{}_b \theta^b \quad (2.2.12)$$

the connection form transforms under this transformation as

$$A \rightarrow A' = \Lambda A \Lambda^{-1} - d\Lambda \Lambda^{-1}. \quad (2.2.13)$$

Thus the connection form can be regarded as a $SO_+(3, 1)$ gauge field. Mathematically speaking this implies that the connection form $A^a{}_b$ defines a connection in a principal fiber bundle $P(M, SO_+(3, 1))$ or vector bundles associated with it^[42].

Conversely, if a connection A in the principal fiber bundle $P(M, SO_+(3, 1))$ is given, we can define an linear connection ∇ in the tangent bundle $T(M)$ with the aid of a quantity e_a^μ which transforms as a covector under the local $SO_+(3, 1)$ transformations and a contravariant vector under the general coordinate transformation simultaneously. If we define a metric by Eq.(2.2.2), the linear connection satisfies the metricity condition and $e_a = e_a^\mu \partial_\mu$ becomes a pseud-orthonormal tetrad with respect to this metric.

Thus $A^a{}_b$ can be regarded either as the connection form defining an linear connection in the tangent bundle $T(M)$ or as the $SO_+(3, 1)$ gauge field. Though both the view points are mathematically equivalent, the second view point turns out to be more natural and convenient if one would like to treat the connection form as an independent gauge field. Hence we adopt the second view point and regard the connection form as defining a connection in a principal fiber bundle $P(M, SO_+(3, 1))$ throughout this paper.

Let the covariant derivative in this sense be denoted by D . Then in general the covariant derivative of a quantity ϕ which transforms under the local $SO_+(3, 1)$ transformation $\Lambda(x)$ as

$$\phi \rightarrow \rho(\Lambda)\phi \quad (2.2.14)$$

with some representation $\rho : SO_+(3, 1) \rightarrow GL(\mathbf{R}^m)$ is given by

$$D_X \phi = d\phi(X) + d\rho(A(x))\phi. \quad (2.2.15)$$

For example, the covariant derivative of a vector field V^a as a section of $SO_+(3,1)$ vector bundle is given by

$$D_\mu V^a = \partial_\mu V^a + A^a_{b\mu} V^b. \quad (2.2.16)$$

Similarly the covariant derivative of a 2-component spinor field ξ as a section of a spinor bundle is given by

$$D_\mu \xi = \partial_\mu \xi + {}^\pm \mathcal{A}_{0I\mu} \sigma_I \xi, \quad (2.2.17)$$

where σ_I is the Pauli matrix and ${}^\pm \mathcal{A}$ is defined by

$${}^\pm \mathcal{A}_{0I} := \frac{1}{2} \left(A_{0I} \pm \frac{i}{2} \epsilon_{IJK} A_{JK} \right). \quad (2.2.18)$$

Here $+$ sign and $-$ sign corresponds to the left chiral and the right chiral field spinors, respectively. For a Dirac spinor field ψ these formulas are put together in the form

$$D_\mu \psi = \partial_\mu \psi - \frac{1}{8} A_{ab\mu} [\gamma^a, \gamma^b] \psi. \quad (2.2.19)$$

η_{ab} can be regarded as a natural metric of each fiber of the vector bundle, and the metricity condition Eq.(2.2.9) is expressed as

$$D\eta_{ab} = 0. \quad (2.2.20)$$

From this condition it follows that the covariant derivative of ϵ_{abcd} also vanishes:

$$D\epsilon_{abcd} = 0 \quad (2.2.21)$$

One important point to be noted here is that tensor fields expressed in the coordinate basis are regarded as scalar with respect to the derivative D . For example

$$D_\mu V^\nu = \partial_\mu V^\nu. \quad (2.2.22)$$

Thus DT does not behave as a tensor under the coordinate transformations even if T is a tensor in general. However, restricted to the tensorial forms, that is, differential forms whose values transform under the local $SO_+(3,1)$ transformation Λ as in Eq.(2.2.14), we can define a covariant derivative from D , so called the covariant exterior derivative, by

$$D\chi := d\chi + d\rho(A) \wedge \chi. \quad (2.2.23)$$

Like the ordinary exterior derivative the equation

$$D(\chi \wedge \phi) = D\chi \wedge \phi + (-1)^p \chi \wedge D\phi \quad (\chi : p\text{-form}) \quad (2.2.24)$$

holds, but D^2 does not vanish in general.

For example, the exterior covariant derivative of an ordinary 1-form, $D_\mu V_\nu - D_\nu V_\mu$, behaves as a 2nd-rank covariant tensor under the coordinate transformations. In particular the dual tetrad basis θ^a is a tensorial 1-form, and its covariant exterior derivative coincides with the torsion form of the corresponding linear connection:

$$\Theta^a := D\theta^a = d\theta^a + A^a_b \wedge \theta^b. \quad (2.2.25)$$

Taking the covariant exterior derivative of the torsion form, we get the first Bianchi identity

$$D\Theta^a = F^a_b \wedge \theta^b, \quad (2.2.26)$$

where F^a_b is the curvature form defined by

$$F^a_b := dA^a_b + A^a_c \wedge A^c_b. \quad (2.2.27)$$

Further the covariant exterior derivative of the curvature form yields the second Bianchi identity:

$$DF^a_b = 0. \quad (2.2.28)$$

Finally since the identity

$$|\theta| e_a^\mu = \frac{1}{4!} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda\sigma} \epsilon_{abcd} \theta_\nu^c \theta_\lambda^d \theta_\sigma^e \quad (2.2.29)$$

yields the equation

$$D(\epsilon_{abcd} \theta^c \wedge \theta^d \wedge \theta^e) = 4! D_\mu (|\theta| e_a^\mu) d^4 x, \quad (2.2.30)$$

$D_\mu (|\theta| e_a^\mu)$ behaves as a scalar density under the coordinate transformation.

2.2.2 1st-order Palatini action

Now we prove that the second-order action given by Eq.(2.2.6) is equivalent to the first-order Palatini action obtained from it by treating the connection

form as the independent variable:

$$\begin{aligned} S_G(e, A) &:= \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} \int_M d^4x |\theta| e^{a\mu} e^{b\nu} F_{ab\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{\kappa^2} \int_{\partial M} d\Sigma_\mu |\theta| e^{a\mu} e^{b\nu} A_{ab\nu} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} \int_M [\Sigma^{ab} \wedge *F_{ab} - d(\Sigma^{ab} \wedge *A_{ab})], \end{aligned} \quad (2.2.31)$$

where

$$\Sigma^{ab} := \theta^a \wedge \theta^b, \quad (2.2.32)$$

$$*F_{ab} := \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{abcd} F^{cd}. \quad (2.2.33)$$

First varying A in $S_G(e, A)$ we obtain

$$2\kappa^2 \delta_A S_G(e, A) = -2 \int_M \Theta^a \wedge \theta^b \wedge * \delta A_{ab}. \quad (2.2.34)$$

Hence $\delta_A S_G(e, A) = 0$ yields

$$\Theta^{[a} \wedge \theta^{b]} = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \Theta^a = 0. \quad (2.2.35)$$

Since the Riemannian connection is specified by the metricity and the torsion free conditions, this equation determines A^a_b to be $A^a_b = \omega^a_b(e)$. Therefore the total variational equation $\delta S_G(e, A) = 0$ is equivalent to the variational equation for the 2nd-order action $\delta S_G(e) = 0$.

This equivalence is easily extended to the case in which matter fields are included. For simplicity we consider as matter fields a Yang-Mills field $\mathbf{A} = (\mathbf{A}^P)$, a real scalar field multiplet Φ and a left-chiral spinor field multiplet ξ coupled with the gravitational field minimally. We do not lose any generality by restricting to left chiral spinors since right chiral spinors can be converted to left chiral spinors by the charge conjugation

$$\xi \rightarrow \xi_c = \pm i \sigma_2 \xi^*. \quad (2.2.36)$$

The action for the Yang-Mills field is given by

$$S_{\text{YM}} = -\frac{1}{4} \int_M \Omega_4 g^{\mu\nu} g^{\lambda\sigma} \mathbf{F}_{\mu\lambda} \cdot \mathbf{F}_{\nu\sigma}, \quad (2.2.37)$$

where the field strength $\mathbf{F} = (\mathbf{F}^P) = (\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{F}^P_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu)$ is expressed in terms of the gauge field \mathbf{A} and the structure constant f_{QR}^P as

$$\mathbf{F}^P = d\mathbf{A}^P + f_{QR}^P \mathbf{A}^Q \wedge \mathbf{A}^R, \quad (2.2.38)$$

and

$$\Omega_4 = \sqrt{-g}d^4x = \theta^0 \wedge \theta^1 \wedge \theta^2 \wedge \theta^3, \quad (2.2.39)$$

The action for the scalar field is given by

$$S_S = - \int_M \Omega_4 \left[\frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\nu} \mathbf{D}_\mu \Phi \cdot \mathbf{D}_\nu \Phi + V(\Phi) \right], \quad (2.2.40)$$

where \mathbf{D}_μ is the covariant derivative with respect to the gauge field \mathbf{A} and expressed in terms of the representation matrix $\mathbf{T} = (T_P)$ satisfying

$$[T_P, T_Q] = f_{PQ}^R T_R, \quad (2.2.41)$$

as

$$\mathbf{D}_\mu \Phi = \partial_\mu \Phi + e \mathbf{A}_\mu \cdot \mathbf{T} \Phi. \quad (2.2.42)$$

Finally the action for the left-chiral spinor field is given by

$$S_F = \int_M \Omega_4 \left[-\frac{i}{2} \xi^\dagger \sigma^a \mathbf{D}_a \xi + \frac{i}{2} (\mathbf{D}_a \xi)^\dagger \sigma^a \xi - \xi_c^\dagger M(\Phi) \xi \right], \quad (2.2.43)$$

where $\sigma_0 = 1$ and \mathbf{D}_a is expressed as

$$\mathbf{D}_a \xi = e_a^\mu (\partial_\mu + {}^+ \mathcal{A}_{0I\mu} \sigma_I + e \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{T}) \xi. \quad (2.2.44)$$

The total 1st-order action S_1 is given by the sum of these actions and $S_G(e, A)$:

$$S_1 = S_G(e, A) + S_{\text{YM}}(\mathbf{A}, e) + S_S(\Phi, \mathbf{A}, e) + S_F(\xi, \mathbf{A}, e, A). \quad (2.2.45)$$

Since the connection form appears in S_F as well as in S_G , the variational equation $\delta_A S_1 = 0$ is modified from Eq.(2.2.35) to

$$\Theta^{[a} \wedge \theta^{b]} = -\frac{\kappa^2}{12} \epsilon^{[a}{}_{cde} S^{b]} \theta^c \wedge \theta^d \wedge \theta^e, \quad (2.2.46)$$

where

$$S^a := \xi^\dagger \sigma^a \xi. \quad (2.2.47)$$

This equation can be solved with respect to Θ^a to yield

$$\Theta^a = -\frac{\kappa^2}{4} \epsilon^a{}_{bcd} S^b \theta^c \wedge \theta^d. \quad (2.2.48)$$

Thus the torsion does not vanish and the connection form A is not Riemannian when the gravitational field is coupled with spinor fields. In spite of this we can prove that the first-order action S_1 is equivalent to the second-order action obtained from S_1 by replacing A with the Riemannian connection form ω . First from the definition of the torsion form (2.2.25) and Eq.(2.2.48) the connection form is expressed in terms of the Riemannian connection form and the spinor current S^a as

$$A^a{}_b = \omega^a{}_b - \frac{\kappa^2}{4} \epsilon^a{}_{bcd} S^c \theta^d. \quad (2.2.49)$$

Putting this expression into S_G and S_F , we get

$$S_G(e, A) = S_G(e, \omega) + \frac{3\kappa^2}{16} \int_M \Omega_4 S_a S^a, \quad (2.2.50)$$

$$S_F(\xi, \mathbf{A}, e, A) = S_F(\xi, \mathbf{A}, e, \omega) - \frac{3\kappa^2}{16} \int_M \Omega_4 S_a S^a. \quad (2.2.51)$$

Thus the contributions of the spinor current to S_G and S_F cancels:

$$S_1(e, A, \mathbf{A}, \Phi, \xi) = S_1(e, \omega, \mathbf{A}, \Phi, \xi) = S_2(e, \mathbf{A}, \Phi, \xi). \quad (2.2.52)$$

This proves the equivalence of the first-order Palatini action and the minimally coupled second-order action.

2.2.3 (3 + 1)-decomposition

Now we put the action into the canonical form. It is a rather easy job if we start from the first-order action. For simplicity we neglect the material fields here. Further we restrict the freedom of the local Lorentz transformation of the tetrad so that e_0 is orthogonal to the $t=\text{const}$ hypersurfaces. We call this gauge *the spatial gauge*. This partial gauge fixing does not affect the physical content of the theory.

Under the spatial gauge e_0 is expressed in terms of the lapse function N and the shift vector N^j as

$$e_0 = N^{-1}(\partial_t - N^j \partial_j), \quad (2.2.53)$$

and e_I is tangential to the $t=\text{const}$ hypersurfaces:

$$e_I = e_I^j \partial_j. \quad (2.2.54)$$

Accordingly the dual basis is written as

$$\theta^0 = Ndt, \quad \theta^I = \theta_j^I(dx^j + N^j dt), \quad (2.2.55)$$

and the intrinsic three dimensional metric q_{jk} of the constant-time hypersurfaces is expressed in terms of θ_j^I as

$$q_{jk} = \theta_j^I \theta_k^I. \quad (2.2.56)$$

Since Σ^{ab} is expressed as

$$\Sigma^{0I} = N\theta_j^I dt \wedge dx^j, \quad (2.2.57)$$

$$\Sigma^{IJ} = \theta_j^I \theta_k^J \left[dx^j \wedge dx^k + dt \wedge (N^j dx^k - N^k dx^j) \right], \quad (2.2.58)$$

the first-order Lagrangian density is written as

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma^{ab} \wedge *F_{ab} &= \epsilon_{IJK} \left(\frac{1}{2} N \theta_j^I F_{JKkl} + \theta_j^I \theta_m^J N^m F_{0Kkl} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \theta_k^I \theta_l^J F_{0Klj} \right) dt \wedge dx^j \wedge dx^k \wedge dx^l. \end{aligned} \quad (2.2.59)$$

In order to make this expression simpler, let us introduce the following three dimensional vectors whose components are labeled by the internal index I, J, \dots :

$$\tilde{e}^j := (\tilde{e}^{jI}) := (\sqrt{q} e^{Ij}), \quad (2.2.60)$$

$$P_\mu := (P_{I\mu}) := \left(\frac{1}{2\kappa^2} A_{0I\mu} \right), \quad (2.2.61)$$

$$Q_\mu := (Q_{I\mu}) := \left(\frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{IJK} A_{JK\mu} \right). \quad (2.2.62)$$

The components of $F_{ab\mu\nu}$ appearing in the above equation are expressed in terms of P_μ and Q_μ as

$$\frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{IJK} F_{JKjk} = (F_{jk} + 4\kappa^4 P_j \times P_k)_I, \quad (2.2.63)$$

$$F_{0Ijk} = 2\kappa^2 (D_j P_k - D_k P_j)_I, \quad (2.2.64)$$

$$F_{0Itj} = 2\kappa^2 (\partial_t P_j - D_j P_t - Q_t \times P_j)_I, \quad (2.2.65)$$

where

$$F_{jk} := \partial_j Q_k - \partial_k Q_j - Q_j \times Q_k, \quad (2.2.66)$$

$$D_j P_k := \partial_j P_k - Q_j \times P_k. \quad (2.2.67)$$

Further from the identity

$$\epsilon^{jkl}\theta_j^I\theta_k^J\theta_l^K = \epsilon^{IJK}\sqrt{q}, \quad (2.2.68)$$

$$\epsilon_{IJK}\theta_j^I\theta_l^J\theta_l^K = \epsilon_{jkl}\sqrt{q} \quad (2.2.69)$$

we get

$$\epsilon_{IJK}\theta_j^J\theta_k^K = \epsilon_{jkl}\tilde{e}^{Il}, \quad (2.2.70)$$

$$\epsilon^{jkl}\theta_j^I = \frac{1}{\sqrt{q}}\epsilon^{IJK}\tilde{e}_J^j\tilde{e}_K^k. \quad (2.2.71)$$

Putting these expressions into the above Lagrangian density, we finally obtain the following gravitational Lagrangian in the canonical form:

$$\begin{aligned} L_G &= \int_{\Sigma} d^3x [2\tilde{e}^j \cdot P_j - (P_t \cdot C_B + Q_t \cdot C_R + N^j C_{Mj} + \mathcal{N} C_H)] \\ &\quad + \int_{\partial\Sigma} dS_j \left[\frac{1}{\kappa^2} \mathcal{N} (\tilde{e}^k \times \tilde{e}^j) \cdot Q_k + 2(\tilde{e}^j N^k - \tilde{e}^k N^j) \cdot P_k \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2.2.72)$$

where $\mathcal{N} = N/\sqrt{q}$ and

$$C_B := 2D_j\tilde{e}^j, \quad (2.2.73)$$

$$C_R := 2\tilde{e}^j \times P_j, \quad (2.2.74)$$

$$C_{Mj} := -2\tilde{e}^k \cdot (D_j P_k - D_k P_j), \quad (2.2.75)$$

$$C_H := -(\tilde{e}^j \times \tilde{e}^k) \cdot \left[\frac{1}{2\kappa^2} F_{jk} + 2\kappa^2 P_j \times P_k \right]. \quad (2.2.76)$$

From this expression we see that only the quantities (\tilde{e}^j, P_j) are dynamical canonical variables, and the others are non-dynamical. Among these non-dynamical variables, P_t , Q_t , N^j and \mathcal{N} play the role of Lagrange multipliers and the variation of the action with respect to them yield the four sets of constraints on the canonical variables,

$$C_B = 0, \quad (2.2.77)$$

$$C_R = 0, \quad (2.2.78)$$

$$C_{Mj} = 0, \quad (2.2.79)$$

$$C_H = 0. \quad (2.2.80)$$

The third and the fourth of these correspond to the momentum and the Hamiltonian constraints in the metric approach, respectively. On the other hand the first and the second ones are new constraints arising from the local Lorentz invariance of the theory, and represent the generators of the Lorentz boost and the spatial rotation of the tetrad, respectively.

In contrast to these variables, the variation of the action with respect to Q_j does not lead to a constraint but yields equations determining Q_j itself and P_t . In fact the variation with respect to Q_j yields

$$0 = \frac{\delta L_G}{\delta Q_j} = 2\tilde{e}^j \times (P_t - N^k P_k + \frac{N}{4\kappa^2} C_B + \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} \partial_k N \tilde{e}^k) + N^j C_R + \frac{N}{\kappa^2} D_k e^j \times \tilde{e}^k, \quad (2.2.81)$$

which is equivalent under the constraints $C_B = C_R = 0$ to the two equations

$$\phi^{jk} := (e^j \times D_l e^k) \cdot e^l = 0, \quad (2.2.82)$$

$$P_t = N^k P_k - \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} \partial_k N \tilde{e}^k - \frac{1}{4\kappa^2} N e^m \epsilon_{mjk} (e^j \times D_l e^k) \cdot \tilde{e}^l. \quad (2.2.83)$$

Since Q_j is non-dynamical, we must eliminate them to obtain a consistent canonical formalism. This is achieved with the help of the constraint $C_B = 0$ and the equation $\phi^{jk} = 0$. To show this, let us calculate the torsion form of the three-dimensional $SO(3)$ connection

$$D_j V_I = \partial_j V_I - \epsilon_{IJK} Q_{Jj} \times V_K. \quad (2.2.84)$$

Since the torsion form is given by the covariant exterior derivative of the three dimensional dual basis θ_j^I as ${}^3\Theta_{jk}^I = 2D_{[j}\theta_{k]}^I$, we obtain the following relation with the help of the identity equation (2.2.68):

$$\begin{aligned} {}^3\Theta^{pq} &:= \frac{1}{2} e^p_I \epsilon^{qjk} {}^3\Theta_{jk}^I \\ &= \frac{1}{4} (e^p \times e^q) \cdot C_B + \phi^{pq}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.2.85)$$

Thus the equations $C_B = \phi^{jk} = 0$ are equivalent to the torsion free condition on the metric connection D_j , which implies that the connection is the Riemannian connection with respect to the triad e_j^I :

$$Q_{jI} = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{IJK} \omega_{JKj}(e). \quad (2.2.86)$$

Thus, although the canonical Lagrangian (2.2.72) appears to be a simple polynomial, it is really a complicated rational function after the elimination of Q_j . In fact the momentum and the Hamiltonian constraint functions coincide with those in the metric approach modulo the constraint C_R . To see this, let us examine the relation between P_{Ij} and the momentum variable p^{jk} in the metric approach. First note that for the three-dimensional Riemannian connection $D_j e_I^k$ is related to the Christoffel symbol Γ_{kl}^j by

$$D_j e_I^k = \partial_j e_I^k + \omega^I{}_{Jj} e_J^k = \partial_j e_I^k - ({}^3\nabla_j e_I)^k = -\Gamma_{jl}^k e_I^l. \quad (2.2.87)$$

From this it follows that

$$(D_j P_k)_I = ({}^3\nabla_j P_{kl} + \Gamma_{jk}^m P_{ml}) e_I^l, \quad (2.2.88)$$

where

$$P_{jk} = P_{Ij} \theta_k^I. \quad (2.2.89)$$

Hence the momentum constraint function is expressed as

$$C_{Mj} = -2\sqrt{q} q^{kl} ({}^3\nabla_j P_{kl} - {}^3\nabla_k P_{jl}). \quad (2.2.90)$$

Now let us define p_{jk} by

$$p_{jk} := -\sqrt{q} (P_{(jk)} - q_{jk} P_{lm} q^{lm}). \quad (2.2.91)$$

Then from the relation

$$P_{[jkl]} = \frac{1}{4} \epsilon_{jkl} (C_R \cdot e^l), \quad (2.2.92)$$

we get

$$C_{Mj} = \mathcal{H}_j + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{q} \epsilon_{jkl} {}^3\nabla^k (C_R \cdot e^l). \quad (2.2.93)$$

Similarly the Hamiltonian constraint function is written as

$$C_H = \sqrt{q} \mathcal{H}_0 - \frac{\kappa^2}{4} C_R \cdot C_R. \quad (2.2.94)$$

Since the Poisson brackets of $q^{jk} = e^j \cdot e^k$ and p_{jk} with C_R vanishes, it follows from these equations that q^{jk} and p_{jk} defined above satisfy the same evolution equations as in the metric approach. This implies that p_{jk} here coincides with the momentum variable defined in the metric approach. In particular from Eq.(2.1.13) $P_{(jk)}$ is expressed in terms of the extrinsic curvature K_{jk} as

$$P_{(jk)} = \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} K_{jk}, \quad P_j \cdot \tilde{e}^j = \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} \sqrt{q} K. \quad (2.2.95)$$

2.3 Chiral 1st-Order Formalism

As we have seen in the previous section, the Hamiltonian becomes a complicated rational functions of the canonical variables in the canonical theory obtained from the 1st-order Palatini action in spite of its apparent simple structure at the start. The origin of this complexity was that the spatial part A_{IJ} of the connection form is not dynamical and should be eliminated. The main point of the complex canonical theory is that this elimination procedure can be avoided if the momentum variable is modified to a complex quantity to include A_{IJ} as its imaginary part.

2.3.1 Chiral representation of the proper Lorentz group

Let X_{ab} be a quantity antisymmetric with respect to the indices, $X_{ba} = -X_{ab}$, and $*X_{ab}$ be its dual defined by

$$*X_{ab} := \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ab}{}^{cd}X_{cd}. \quad (2.3.1)$$

This dual operation satisfies the identity equations

$$**X_{ab} = -X_{ab}, \quad (2.3.2)$$

$$*X_a{}^c \circ *Y_{cb} = \frac{1}{2}\eta_{ab}X_{cd} \circ Y^{cd} + X_{bc} \circ Y^c{}_a, \quad (2.3.3)$$

where \circ is any binary bilinear operation such as the exterior product of differential forms. From this it follows that

$$*X_{ab} \circ Y^{ab} = X_{ab} \circ *Y^{ab}. \quad (2.3.4)$$

With the help of this operation let us define the pair of complex chiral combinations of X_{ab} by

$${}^\pm X_{ab} := \frac{1}{2}(X_{ab} \pm i * X_{ab}). \quad (2.3.5)$$

These quantities are eigen quantities of the dual operation:

$$*{}^\pm X_{ab} = \mp i {}^\pm X_{ab}. \quad (2.3.6)$$

As we saw in §2.2, the connection form A_{ab} is coupled with the left(right) chiral spinor in the chiral combination ${}^+\mathcal{A}_{ab}({}^-\mathcal{A}_{ab})$. This is the reason why

we call ${}^\pm X$ the chiral combination. Accordingly we call ${}^+X_{ab}$ and ${}^-X_{ab}$ the left chiral and the right chiral combination, respectively. In the literature these quantities are often called the anti-dual and the dual variables as well, respectively.

Owing to the self-duality of the chiral combination, only the half of the components of ${}^\pm X_{ab}$ are independent:

$${}^\pm X_{0I} = \pm \frac{i}{2} \epsilon_{IJK} {}^\pm X_{JK}. \quad (2.3.7)$$

This implies that the Lorentz group can be linearly represented on the three-dimensional complex space \mathbf{C}^3 . In fact the chiral combinations yield natural isomorphisms between the proper Lorentz group $SO_+(3, 1)$ and the complex orthogonal group $SO(3, \mathbf{C})$. To be explicit, for $\Lambda \in SO_+(3, 1)$ under which X^{ab} transforms

$$X^{ab} \rightarrow \Lambda^a_c \Lambda^b_d X^{cd}, \quad (2.3.8)$$

${}^\pm X_{0I}$ transforms as

$${}^\pm X_{0I} \rightarrow {}^\pm X_{0J} {}^\pm O_{JI} \quad (2.3.9)$$

where ${}^\pm O_{IJ}$ is matrix defined by

$${}^\pm O_{IJ} = 2\Lambda^0_{[0} \Lambda^J_{I]} \mp i \epsilon_{JKLM} \Lambda^K_{[0} \Lambda^L_{I]}. \quad (2.3.10)$$

Since ${}^\pm O_{IJ}$ is shown to belong to $SO(3, \mathbf{C})$ and the correspondence is one-to-one, it gives the isomorphism.

Another way to look at this isomorphism is to utilize the spinor representation of $SO_+(3, 1)$ to $SL(2, \mathbf{C})$. For example the right chiral representation is the double-valued correspondence $\Lambda \in SO_+(3, 1) \rightarrow V \in SL(2, \mathbf{C})$ determined by

$$V \sigma_a V^\dagger = \sigma_b \Lambda^b_a. \quad (2.3.11)$$

If we parametrize V as $V = z^a \sigma_a$ by a four-dimensional complex time-like vector z^a satisfying $\eta_{ab} z^a z^b = -1$, Λ is expressed as

$$\Lambda^a_b = \eta^{ab} (|z^0|^2 - z^I \bar{z}^I) + 2z^{(a} \bar{z}^{b)} + i \epsilon^{abcd} z^c \bar{z}^d. \quad (2.3.12)$$

On the other hand the matrix O defined by

$$V \sigma_I V^{-1} = O_{IJ} \sigma_J \quad (2.3.13)$$

belongs to $SO(3, \mathbf{C})$ and gives a two-to-one representation of $SL(2, \mathbf{C})$ to $SO(3, \mathbf{C})$ as is seen from its expression in terms of z^a :

$$O_{IJ} = (1 + 2z^I z^J) \delta_{IJ} - 2z^I z^J + 2i \epsilon_{IJK} z^0 z^K. \quad (2.3.14)$$

Combination of these representations yields the above isomorphism based on the right chiral combination. Similarly using the left chiral representation which is obtained by assigning $(V^\dagger)^{-1}$ to Λ with V defined by Eq.(2.3.11) we obtain the isomorphism based on the left chiral combination.

As we will see soon, the fact that the chiral combination makes it possible to represent the Lorentz group on the three dimensional complex space plays an important role in the complex canonical theory.

2.3.2 Chiral action

As shown by Jacobson^[10, 11], the most elegant way to arrive at the complex canonical theory is to use the chiral decomposition of the first-order Palatini action written in terms of the tetrad and the connection form.

Let us define the chiral connection by

$$\pm \mathcal{A}_{ab} := \frac{1}{2}(A_{ab} \pm i * A_{ab}), \quad (2.3.15)$$

and the chiral gravitational action $\pm S_G$ in terms of the first-order Palatini action by

$$\pm S_G = S_G(e, \pm \mathcal{A}). \quad (2.3.16)$$

Then since the curvature form $F_{ab}[\pm \mathcal{A}]$ constructed from $\pm \mathcal{A}_{ab}$ coincides with the chiral combination of the curvature form $F_{ab}[A]$,

$$\pm \mathcal{F}_{ab} := \frac{1}{2}(F_{ab} \pm i * F_{ab}) = F_{ab}[\pm \mathcal{A}], \quad (2.3.17)$$

the chiral Lagrangian density $\pm \mathcal{L}_G$ corresponding to $\pm S_G$ is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \pm \mathcal{L}_G &= \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} [\Sigma^{ab} \wedge * \pm \mathcal{F}_{ab} - d(\Sigma^{ab} \wedge * \pm \mathcal{A}_{ab})] \\ &= \mp \frac{i}{2\kappa^2} [\Sigma^{ab} \wedge \pm \mathcal{F}_{ab} - d(\Sigma^{ab} \wedge \pm \mathcal{A}_{ab})] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_G \mp \frac{i}{4\kappa^2} [\Sigma^{ab} \wedge F_{ab} - d(\Sigma^{ab} \wedge A_{ab})]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3.18)$$

From the definition of the torsion form the second term in the second line of this equation is rewritten as

$$\Sigma^{ab} \wedge F_{ab} - d(\Sigma^{ab} \wedge A_{ab}) = -d(\theta^a \wedge d\theta_a) + \Theta_a \wedge \Theta^a. \quad (2.3.19)$$

Next we define the left-chiral action ${}^+S_F$ for the left chiral spinor multiplet by

$${}^+S_F := - \int_M \Omega_4 [i\xi^\dagger \sigma^a \mathbf{D}_a \xi + \xi_c^\dagger M(\Phi) \xi], \quad (2.3.20)$$

and the right-chiral action ${}^-S_F$ by its complex conjugate. Then the corresponding chiral Lagrangian density is written as

$${}^\pm \mathcal{L}_F = \mathcal{L}_F \pm \frac{i}{2} [-d(\frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{abcd} S^a \theta^b \wedge \theta^c \wedge \theta^d) + S^a * \Sigma_{ab} \wedge \Theta^b]. \quad (2.3.21)$$

From these equations, if we define the total chiral action ${}^\pm S$ by

$${}^\pm S := 2{}^\pm S_G + S_{YM} + S_S + {}^\pm S_F, \quad (2.3.22)$$

the real part of the total chiral Lagrangian density ${}^\pm \mathcal{L}$ coincides with the first-order Lagrangian density \mathcal{L} written in terms of the tetrad, the real connection form and the matter fields:

$$\begin{aligned} {}^\pm \mathcal{L} &= \mathcal{L} \pm \frac{i}{2} d(\frac{1}{\kappa^2} \theta^a \wedge d\theta_a - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{abcd} S^a \theta^b \wedge \theta^c \wedge \theta^d) \\ &\mp \frac{i}{2\kappa^2} (\Theta_a + \frac{\kappa^2}{2} * \Sigma_{ab} S^b) \wedge (\Theta^a + \frac{\kappa^2}{2} * \Sigma^a{}_c S^c), \end{aligned} \quad (2.3.23)$$

where we have used the identity $\Sigma_{ac} \wedge \Sigma^c{}_b = 0$.

The variational equations obtained from the chiral action splits into two sets of equations corresponding to the real and the imaginary part of the action. Hence the chiral action appears to only admit a more restricted class of solutions than the real first-order action. However, it is not the case. In fact, as was shown in §2.2, the variation of the real action with respect to the connection form yields Eq.(2.2.48), but the variation of the imaginary part of the action vanishes under this equation. Therefore the chiral action is equivalent to the original real first-order action.

2.3.3 (3 + 1)-decomposition

Now let us rewrite the complex chiral action in the canonical form. First note that the chiral gravitational Lagrangian density (2.3.18) is written from Eq.(2.3.4) and the self-duality of the chiral combinations as

$$\pm\mathcal{L}_G = \pm\frac{2i}{\kappa^2}[\pm\Sigma_{0I} \wedge \pm\mathcal{F}_{0I} - d(\pm\Sigma_{0I} \wedge \pm\mathcal{A}_{0I})]. \quad (2.3.24)$$

This equation shows that we only have to calculate the (0I) components.

In order to decompose the curvature form, let us introduce the vector-type notation as in §2.2:

$$\pm\mathcal{A}_\mu := (\pm\mathcal{A}_{I\mu}) := \left(\frac{1}{\kappa^2}\pm\mathcal{A}_{0I\mu}\right), \quad (2.3.25)$$

$$\pm\mathcal{B}_\mu := (\pm\mathcal{B}_{I\mu}) := (\epsilon_{IJK}\pm\mathcal{A}_{JK\mu}). \quad (2.3.26)$$

In contrast to the real connection, $\pm\mathcal{A}_\mu$ and $\pm\mathcal{B}_\mu$ are not independent but are related owing to the self-duality as

$$\pm\mathcal{B}_\mu = \mp 2i\kappa^2\pm\mathcal{A}_\mu, \quad (2.3.27)$$

which will play a crucial role later. In terms of these quantities the relevant curvature form is expressed as

$$\pm\mathcal{F}_{0I} = \kappa^2[\partial_t\pm\mathcal{A}_j - \mathcal{D}_j\pm\mathcal{A}_t]_I dt \wedge dx^j \pm \frac{i}{4}\pm\mathcal{F}_{Ijk}dx^j \wedge dx^k, \quad (2.3.28)$$

where

$$\mathcal{D}_j\pm\mathcal{A}_t := \partial_j\pm\mathcal{A}_t - \pm\mathcal{B}_j \times \pm\mathcal{A}_t, \quad (2.3.29)$$

$$\pm\mathcal{F}_{jk} := \partial_j\pm\mathcal{B}_k - \partial_k\pm\mathcal{B}_j - \pm\mathcal{B}_j \times \pm\mathcal{B}_k. \quad (2.3.30)$$

Next to rewrite $\pm\Sigma_{0I}$ let us rotate the tetrad e_a by some appropriate proper Lorentz transformation so that e_0 is orthogonal to the constant-time hypersurfaces. We denote this new tetrad by \hat{e}_a and define \tilde{e}^j , q^{jk} , N^j and \mathcal{N} from this tetrad as in §2.2. There we had to restrict the tetrad variable to this special one in order to arrive at the canonical formalism. In the present case we do not have to do such a gauge fixing. This is because $\pm\Sigma_{0I}$ for the general tetrad is related to $\pm\hat{\Sigma}_{0I}$ for the special tetrad by $\pm\Sigma_{0I} = \pm\hat{\Sigma}_{0J}\pm O_{JI}$

with some matrix $O \in SO(3, \mathbf{C})$ as was shown in §2.3.1. With the help of this relation, if we use the chirally rotated quantity \mathcal{E}^j defined by

$$\pm\mathcal{E}^j := (\pm\mathcal{E}^{Ij}) := (\tilde{e}^{Jj}\pm O_{JI}) \quad (2.3.31)$$

in stead of \tilde{e}^j , $\pm\Sigma_{0I}$ is simply written from Eqs.(2.2.57) and (2.2.58) as

$$\pm\Sigma_{0I} = \pm\frac{i}{4}\epsilon_{jkl}\pm\mathcal{E}^{Il}dx^j \wedge dx^k \mp \frac{i}{2}\epsilon_{jkl}[N^k\pm\mathcal{E}^l \mp \frac{i}{2}N\pm\mathcal{E}^k \times \pm\mathcal{E}^l]^I dt \wedge dx^j. \quad (2.3.32)$$

From these equations $\pm\mathcal{L}_G$ is put into the following canonical form:

$$\begin{aligned} 2\pm\mathcal{L}_G &= 2\pm\mathcal{E}^j \cdot \pm\mathcal{A}_j - 2\pm\mathcal{A}_t \cdot \mathcal{D}_j\pm\mathcal{E}^j \\ &\pm\frac{i}{\kappa^2}N^j\pm\mathcal{E}^k \cdot \pm\mathcal{F}_{jk} + \frac{1}{2\kappa^2}N(\pm\mathcal{E}^j \times \pm\mathcal{E}^k) \cdot \pm\mathcal{F}_{jk} \\ &+ \partial_j[(N^k\pm\mathcal{E}^j - N^j\pm\mathcal{E}^k \mp iN\pm\mathcal{E}^k \times \pm\mathcal{E}^j) \cdot \pm A_k]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3.33)$$

Next we rewrite the Lagrangian densities of the matter fields. First for the scalar field, introducing the momentum Π conjugate to Φ by Eq.(2.1.15), \mathcal{L}_S is written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_S &= \Pi \cdot \dot{\Phi} + e\Pi \cdot \mathbf{A}_t^P \mathbf{T}_P \Phi - N^j \Pi \cdot \mathbf{D}_j \Phi \\ &- N \left[\frac{1}{2}\Pi^2 + \frac{1}{2}qq^{jk}(\mathbf{D}_j \Phi) \cdot (\mathbf{D}_k \Phi) + qV(\Phi) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3.34)$$

Here, since $\pm O \in SO(3, \mathbf{C})$, q^{jk} and q are expressed in terms of $\pm\mathcal{E}^j$ as

$$qq^{jk} = \tilde{e}^j \cdot \tilde{e}^k = \pm\mathcal{E}^j \cdot \pm\mathcal{E}^k, \quad (2.3.35)$$

$$q = \frac{1}{3!}\epsilon_{jkl}(\tilde{e}^j \times \tilde{e}^k) \cdot \tilde{e}^l = \frac{1}{3!}\epsilon_{jkl}(\pm\mathcal{E}^j \times \pm\mathcal{E}^k) \cdot \pm\mathcal{E}^l. \quad (2.3.36)$$

Next for the gauge field only \mathbf{A}_j has the conjugate momentum \mathbf{E}^j defined by Eq.(2.1.14) and the Lagrangian density is written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{YM}} &= \mathbf{E}^j \cdot \dot{\mathbf{A}}_j - \partial_j(\mathbf{A}_t \cdot \mathbf{E}^j) + \mathbf{A}_t \cdot \mathbf{D}_j \mathbf{E}^j + N^j \mathbf{F}_{jk} \cdot \mathbf{E}^k \\ &- N \left(\frac{1}{2}q_{jk} \mathbf{E}^j \cdot \mathbf{E}^k + \frac{1}{4}qq^{jk}q^{lm} \mathbf{F}_{jl} \cdot \mathbf{F}_{km} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (2.3.37)$$

where

$$\mathbf{D}_j \mathbf{E}^{Pj} = \partial \mathbf{E}^{Pj} + e f^P_{QR} \mathbf{A}_j^Q \mathbf{E}^{Rj}. \quad (2.3.38)$$

Finally in order to rewrite the Lagrangian density for the spinor field, we recall the argument on the relation of the chiral representation of $SO_+(3, 1)$ to $SL(2, \mathbf{C})$ and to $SO(3, \mathbf{C})$ in §2.3.1. From the equations there $V \in SL(2, \mathbf{C})$ and ${}^+O_{IJ}$ are related for the left-chiral representation by

$$(V^\dagger)^{-1}\sigma_I V^\dagger = {}^+O_{IJ}\sigma_J. \quad (2.3.39)$$

With the aid of this relation and Eq.(2.3.11) we can express $\sigma^a e_a$ in Eq.(2.3.20) in terms of N , N^j , $\pm\mathcal{E}^j$ and V . Putting this expression into the chiral Lagrangian density for the spinor field yields

$$\begin{aligned} {}^+\mathcal{L}_F &= \eta(\partial_t + \kappa^2 {}^+\mathcal{A}_{It}\sigma_I + e\mathbf{A}_t \cdot \mathbf{T})\xi - N^j\eta(\partial_j + \kappa^2 {}^+\mathcal{A}_{Ij}\sigma_I + e\mathbf{A}_j \cdot \mathbf{T})\xi \\ &\quad - \underline{N} [{}^\pm\mathcal{E}^{jI}\eta\sigma_I(\partial_j + \kappa^2 {}^+\mathcal{A}_{Ij}\sigma_I + \mathbf{A}_j)\xi + q\xi_c^\dagger M\xi], \end{aligned} \quad (2.3.40)$$

where

$$\eta := i\sqrt{q}\xi^\dagger V V^\dagger. \quad (2.3.41)$$

With these equations altogether, we finally obtain the following canonical Lagrangian for the total system:

$$\begin{aligned} \pm L &= \int_\Sigma d^3x [2\dot{\mathcal{E}}^j \cdot \mathcal{A}_j + \Pi \cdot \dot{\Phi} + \mathbf{E}^j \cdot \dot{\mathbf{A}}_j + \eta\dot{\xi} \\ &\quad - (\mathbf{A}_t \cdot \mathbf{C}_A + \mathcal{A}_t \cdot \mathcal{C}_A + N^j \mathcal{C}_{Mj} + \underline{N} \mathcal{C}_H)] \\ &\quad + \int_{\partial\Sigma} dS_j (N^k \mathcal{E}^j - N^j \mathcal{E}^k \mp i \underline{N} \mathcal{E}^k \times \mathcal{E}^j) \cdot \mathcal{A}_k, \end{aligned} \quad (2.3.42)$$

where

$$\mathbf{C}_A := -e\Pi \cdot \mathbf{T}\Phi - \mathbf{D}_j \mathbf{E}^j + e\eta \mathbf{T}\xi, \quad (2.3.43)$$

$$\mathcal{C}_A := 2\mathcal{D}_j \mathcal{E}^j \mp \kappa^2 \eta \sigma \xi, \quad (2.3.44)$$

$$\mathcal{C}_{Mj} := \mp \frac{i}{\kappa^2} \mathcal{E}^k \cdot \mathcal{F}_{jk} + \Pi \cdot \mathbf{D}_j \Phi - \mathbf{F}_{jk} \cdot \mathbf{E}^k + \eta \mathbf{D}_j \xi, \quad (2.3.45)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_H &:= -\frac{1}{2\kappa^2} (\mathcal{E}^j \times \mathcal{E}^k) \cdot \mathcal{F}_{jk} + \frac{1}{2} (\Pi^2 + \mathcal{E}^j \cdot \mathcal{E}^k \mathbf{D}_j \Phi \cdot \mathbf{D}_k \Phi) + qV(\Phi) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4q} (\mathcal{E}^j \cdot \mathcal{E}^k) (\mathcal{E}^l \cdot \mathcal{E}^m) [\epsilon_{pjl} \epsilon_{pkm} \mathbf{E}^p \cdot \mathbf{E}^q + \mathbf{F}_{jk} \cdot \mathbf{F}_{lm}] \\ &\quad \pm \mathcal{E}^j \cdot (\eta \sigma \mathbf{D}_j \xi) + q {}^t \xi M(\Phi) \xi. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3.46)$$

Here in the expression for ${}^{-}L$, ξ should be replaced by the right chiral field ξ_c , η by $\eta_c := -i\sqrt{q}\xi_c^\dagger(VV^\dagger)^{-1}$, and the covariant derivative $\mathbf{D}_j\xi$ by

$$\mathbf{D}_j\xi_c = (\partial_j - \kappa^2 {}^{-}\mathbf{A}_j \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} + e\mathbf{A}_j \cdot \mathbf{T})\xi_c. \quad (2.3.47)$$

In these equations we have omitted the suffix \pm to distinguish the left and the right chiral variables. We will adopt this simplification throughout the paper from now on unless it is necessary to distinguish the left and the right chiral variables. The \pm or \mp signs in the equations are always to be understood that the upper sign corresponds to the left chiral variables and the lower sign to the right chiral ones.

In contrast to the real tetrad approach, \mathcal{B}_j which corresponds to Q_j is not independent from \mathcal{A}_j , and its elimination does not lead to any new constraint. Hence by treating the complex variables \mathcal{E}^j and \mathcal{A}_j as the fundamental canonical variables for the gravitational field and setting the Poisson brackets among them as

$$\{\mathcal{E}^{Ij}(x), \mathcal{A}_{Jk}(y)\} = \frac{1}{2}\delta_J^I\delta_k^j\delta^3(x-y), \quad (2.3.48)$$

$$\{\mathcal{E}^{Ij}(x), \mathcal{E}^{Jk}(y)\} = 0, \quad \{\mathcal{A}_{Ij}(x), \mathcal{A}_{Jk}(y)\} = 0, \quad (2.3.49)$$

the time evolution of a functional of the canonical variables is given by the canonical equation of motion

$$\dot{F} = \{F, H\}; \quad F = F(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{A}, \Phi, \Pi, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{E}, \xi, \eta) \quad (2.3.50)$$

with the complex Hamiltonian

$$H := C_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{A}_t) + C_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A}_t) + C_{\mathbf{M}}(\mathbf{N}) + C_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{N}). \quad (2.3.51)$$

This Hamiltonian is a differential polynomial of \mathcal{E}^j and \mathcal{A}_j which is of degree three in \mathcal{E}^j and two in \mathcal{A}_j if the material gauge fields do not exist. Including the material gauge fields breaks this polynomiality. If one makes it polynomial by rescaling \mathbf{N} to include $1/q$, the degree of the Hamiltonian in \mathcal{E}^j increases by three. Hence as far as the degree of the polynomialized Hamiltonian is concerned, the gain of introducing the complex chiral variable is small: it decreases the degree only by three compared to the metric approach. However, if we inspect the expression in detail, we find that its structure is much simplified: qq^{jk} which is a complicated combination of q_{jk} in the metric approach is replaced by a simple expression $\mathcal{E}^j \cdot \mathcal{E}^k$, and the cumbersome term ω_{Jj}^I in the real triad approach does not appear.

2.3.4 Gauge invariance

In the real triad approach we had to fix the local $SO_+(3, 1)$ gauge freedom of the tetrad partially in order to put the theory in the canonical form. As a result the gauge symmetry of the theory was reduced from $SO_+(3, 1)$ to $SO(3)$. In the chiral canonical theory this reduction of symmetry does not occur because the original local $SO_+(3, 1)$ transformation is faithfully represented as the local $SO(3, \mathbf{C})$ transformation on the canonical variables. In fact it is easily checked that the chiral canonical Lagrangian (2.3.42) is invariant under the local $SO(3, \mathbf{C})$ transformation by noting that \mathcal{D}_j is the connection with respect to this gauge symmetry and \mathcal{F}_{jk} is its curvature form.

As in the metric approach and the real triad approach, the constraint functionals $C_{\mathbf{A}}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda})$, $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{A}}(\lambda)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{D}}(L)$ defined by

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{D}}(L) := \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{M}}(L) + C_{\mathbf{A}}(L^j \mathbf{A}_j) + \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{A}}(L^j \mathcal{A}_j), \quad (2.3.52)$$

are the generators of the infinitesimal canonical transformations corresponding to the material gauge, the local $SO(3, \mathbf{C})$ and the spatial coordinate transformations, respectively. In particular the local $SO(3, \mathbf{C})$ and the spatial coordinate transformations of the complex canonical variables \mathcal{E}^j and \mathcal{A}_j are given by

$$\delta_\lambda \mathcal{E}(\phi) = \{\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{A}}(\lambda), \mathcal{E}(\phi)\} = \mp 2i\kappa^2 \mathcal{E}(\lambda \times \phi), \quad (2.3.53)$$

$$\delta_\lambda \mathcal{A}(\alpha) = \{\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{A}}(\lambda), \mathcal{A}(\alpha)\} = -\mathcal{D}\lambda(\alpha), \quad (2.3.54)$$

$$\delta_L \mathcal{E}(\phi) = \{\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{D}}(L), \mathcal{E}(\phi)\} = \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_L \phi), \quad (2.3.55)$$

$$\delta_L \mathcal{A}(\alpha) = \{\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{D}}(L), \mathcal{A}(\alpha)\} = \mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_L \alpha), \quad (2.3.56)$$

where

$$\mathcal{E}(\phi) := \int_{\Sigma} d^3x \mathcal{E}^j \cdot \phi_j, \quad \mathcal{A}(\alpha) := \int_{\Sigma} d^3x \mathcal{A}_j \cdot \alpha^j. \quad (2.3.57)$$

Due to this group theoretical property these constraint functionals form an algebra isomorphic to the Lie algebra of the corresponding groups with respect to the Poisson brackets as in the real canonical theories:

$$\{C_{\mathbf{A}}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_1), C_{\mathbf{A}}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_2)\} = eC_{\mathbf{A}}([\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_1, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_2]); \quad [\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_1, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_2]^\alpha = f^\alpha_{\beta\gamma} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_1^\beta \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_2^\gamma \quad (2.3.58)$$

$$\{\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{A}}(\lambda_1), \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{A}}(\lambda_2)\} = \mp 2\kappa^2 i \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{A}}(\lambda_1 \times \lambda_2), \quad (2.3.59)$$

$$\{\mathcal{C}_A(\lambda), C_A(\Lambda)\} = 0, \quad (2.3.60)$$

$$\{\mathcal{C}_D(L), C_A(\Lambda)\} = C_A(\mathcal{L}_L \Lambda), \quad (2.3.61)$$

$$\{\mathcal{C}_D(L), \mathcal{C}_A(\lambda)\} = \mathcal{C}_A(\mathcal{L}_L \lambda), \quad (2.3.62)$$

$$\{\mathcal{C}_D(L_1), \mathcal{C}_D(L_2)\} = \mathcal{C}_D([L_1, L_2]). \quad (2.3.63)$$

For the same reason the Poisson brackets of these constraints with the Hamiltonian constraint are given by

$$\{C_A(\Lambda), \mathcal{C}_H(\underline{T})\} = \{C_A(\lambda), \mathcal{C}_H(\underline{T})\} = 0, \quad (2.3.64)$$

$$\{\mathcal{C}_D(L), \mathcal{C}_H(\underline{T})\} = \mathcal{C}_H(\mathcal{L}_L \underline{T}), \quad (2.3.65)$$

where \underline{T} implies that it behaves as a scalar density of weight -1 . Finally the Poisson bracket of \mathcal{C}_H is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathcal{C}_H(\underline{T}_1), \mathcal{C}_H(\underline{T}_2)\} &= \mathcal{C}_M(\mathcal{E} \cdot \mathcal{E}(\underline{T}_1 \partial \underline{T}_2 - \underline{T}_2 \partial \underline{T}_1)) \\ &= \int_{\Sigma} d^3x \mathcal{E}^j \cdot \mathcal{E}^k (T_1 \partial_j T_2 - T_2 \partial_j T_1) \mathcal{C}_{Mj} \end{aligned} \quad (2.3.66)$$

2.3.5 Reality condition

In the complex canonical theory the dynamical degrees of freedom for the gravitational fields are doubled compared with the real triad formalism. Hence in order for the theory to be equivalent to the original Einstein theory, some additional constraints should be imposed. These constraints are obtained from the requirement that the spatial metric calculated from \mathcal{E}^j is real and its consistency with the time evolution equations.

First from the relation $qq^{jk} = \mathcal{E}^j \cdot \mathcal{E}^k$ the reality condition for the spatial metric is written as

$$\overline{(\mathcal{E}^j \cdot \mathcal{E}^k)} = (\mathcal{E}^j \cdot \mathcal{E}^k). \quad (2.3.67)$$

Since the time evolution of $\mathcal{E}^j \cdot \mathcal{E}^k$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{E}^j \cdot \mathcal{E}^k) \cdot &= -2\partial_l N^{(j} (\mathcal{E}^{k)} \cdot \mathcal{E}^l) + 2\partial_l N^l (\mathcal{E}^j \cdot \mathcal{E}^k) + N^l \partial_l (\mathcal{E}^j \cdot \mathcal{E}^k) \\ &\quad - \kappa^2 (N^j \mathcal{E}^k + N^k \mathcal{E}^j) \cdot \mathcal{C}_A + 2iN \psi^{jk}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.3.68)$$

where

$$\psi^{jk} := (\mathcal{E}^{(j} \times \mathcal{D}_l \mathcal{E}^{k)}) \cdot \mathcal{E}^l \mp \frac{i}{2} \kappa^2 (\mathcal{E}^j \cdot \mathcal{E}^k) \eta \xi, \quad (2.3.69)$$

the consistency of the condition (2.3.67) with the time evolution equations yields a further constraint

$$\overline{\psi^{jk}} = -\psi^{jk}. \quad (2.3.70)$$

It can be shown that the time derivative of this constraint yields no new constraint.

Though the second condition contains the spinor fields, their contribution is trivial. In order to see this, recall the relation (2.2.49). This relation implies that the connection form consists of a geometrical part and a spinor current part. As was shown in §2.2, the terms arising from the latter spinor part cancels in the total action. Thus it is expected that if we decompose the connection form as

$$A_{ab} = A'_{ab} \mp \frac{\kappa^2}{4} \epsilon_{abcd} S^c \theta^d, \quad (2.3.71)$$

the spinor contribution in Eq.(2.3.69) will be separated. This expectation is true. Actually by noting that this decomposition is written in terms of the chiral connection as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_j &= \mathcal{B}'_j \pm \frac{\kappa^2}{4} O^{-1} (\hat{S}_0 \hat{\theta}_j \pm i \hat{\mathbf{S}} \times \hat{\theta}_j) \\ &= \mathcal{B}'_j \mp i \frac{\kappa^2}{4q} \epsilon_{jkl} [(\eta \xi) \mathcal{E}^k \times \mathcal{E}^l \pm i(\eta \sigma \xi) \times (\mathcal{E}^k \times \mathcal{E}^l)], \end{aligned} \quad (2.3.72)$$

we can show that ψ^{jk} is written as

$$\psi^{jk} = (\mathcal{E}^{(j} \times \mathcal{D}'_l \mathcal{E}^{k)}) \cdot \mathcal{E}^l, \quad (2.3.73)$$

where \mathcal{D}'_j is the chiral covariant derivative with \mathcal{B}_j replaced by \mathcal{B}'_j . Further in the same way we can show that the constraint function \mathcal{C}_A is written as

$$\mathcal{D}'_j \mathcal{E}^j = 0. \quad (2.3.74)$$

With this separation of the spinorial contribution we can find the geometrical meaning of the reality condition. First note that the condition (2.3.67) implies that with some appropriate $SO(3, \mathbf{C})$ rotation \mathcal{E}^j can be made real, which is equivalent to take the spatial gauge for the tetrad $\mathcal{E}^j = \tilde{e}^j$. In this gauge if we decompose \mathcal{A}'_μ and \mathcal{B}'_μ as

$$\mathcal{A}'_\mu = P_\mu \pm \frac{i}{2\kappa^2} Q_\mu, \quad \mathcal{B}'_\mu = Q_\mu \mp 2\kappa^2 i P_\mu, \quad (2.3.75)$$

the real part of ψ^{jk} is proportional to ϕ^{jk} defined in Eq.(2.2.82):

$$\text{Re}\psi^{jk} = q^{3/2}\phi^{jk}. \quad (2.3.76)$$

Further from Eq.(2.3.74) the constraint function $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is decomposed as

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{A}} = C_{\text{B}} \mp 2\kappa^2 i C_{\text{R}}. \quad (2.3.77)$$

Hence from the argument in §2.2 it follows that the constraint (2.3.70) supplemented with the constraint $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{A}} = 0$ is equivalent in the spatial gauge to the condition that Q_j is given by the Riemannian three-dimensional connection determined from e^j .

Thus the reality condition reduces the dynamical degree of freedom of the gravitational fields to the correct one at the level of the equation of motion. However, if one tries to impose the reality condition within the framework of the canonical theory, one meets a difficulty. To see this, neglecting the spinor contribution for the moment for simplicity, let us decompose the chiral variables into their real parts and the imaginary parts as

$$\mathcal{E}^j = \mathcal{E}_1^j \mp i\mathcal{E}_2^j, \quad \mathcal{A}_j = P_j \pm \frac{i}{2\kappa^2} Q_j. \quad (2.3.78)$$

Putting this decomposition into the canonical Lagrangian, its kinetic part for the gravitational field is written as

$$-2\mathcal{E}^j \cdot \dot{\mathcal{A}}_j = -2(\mathcal{E}_1^j \cdot \dot{P}^j + \frac{1}{2\kappa^2}\mathcal{E}_2^j \cdot \dot{Q}_j) \pm 2i(\mathcal{E}_2^j \cdot \dot{P}_j - \frac{1}{2\kappa^2}\mathcal{E}_1^j \cdot \dot{Q}_j). \quad (2.3.79)$$

Hence if the real and the imaginary parts of the variables were regarded as independent dynamical freedoms, one would get two sets of canonical systems with different canonical structures after decomposing the Lagrangian into its real part and imaginary part. This implies that one cannot treat the real and imaginary parts of the complex variables as independent canonical degrees of freedom in the complex canonical theory, and that the reality condition is not a constraint in the dynamical complex phase space but exact relations among the complex variables to be satisfied on the image of embedding of a dynamical real phase space into the formal complex phase space.

For example, in the spatial gauge $\mathcal{E}^j = \tilde{e}^j$, from the argument above, the expression

$$\mathcal{A}_j = P_j \pm \frac{i}{2\kappa^2} Q_j(e) \quad (2.3.80)$$

with $Q_j(e)$ given by Eq.(2.2.86) and the real P_j yields a natural embedding, consistent with the reality condition, of the canonical variables in the real triad approach into the complex phase space. The real canonical theory induced by this embedding from the complex canonical theory is equivalent to the one given in §2.2. Actually Ashtekar constructed the complex canonical theory by this embedding when he first proposed the theory^[7, 8]. Here we give a rough sketch of the proof for the pure gravity case since some equations appearing in the course of the proof will be utilized later.

First note that from the relation

$$\mathcal{F}_{jk}^I = F_{jk}^I + 4\kappa^4(P_j \times P_k)^I \mp 2\kappa^2 i(D_j P_k - D_k P_j)^I, \quad (2.3.81)$$

the constraint functions \mathcal{C}_M and \mathcal{C}_H are decomposed into real parts and imaginary parts as

$$\mathcal{C}_{Mj} = C_{Mj} \pm 2\kappa^2 i P_j \cdot C_R \mp \frac{i}{\kappa^2} \tilde{e}^k \cdot F_{jk}, \quad (2.3.82)$$

$$\mathcal{C}_H = C_H \pm i \partial_j (\tilde{e}^j \cdot C_R) \mp 2i D_j (\tilde{e}^j \times \tilde{e}^k) \cdot P_k. \quad (2.3.83)$$

For Q_j given by Eq.(2.2.86), the last term on the right-hand side of the first equation $\tilde{e}^j \cdot F_{jk}$ vanishes due to the first Bianchi identity and the last term on the right-hand side of the second equation is written from Eq.(2.2.87) as

$$D_j (\tilde{e}^j \times \tilde{e}^k) \cdot P_k = \frac{1}{2} (\partial_j \sqrt{q}) e^j \cdot C_R. \quad (2.3.84)$$

Hence together with Eq.(2.3.77) the constraint functions are written as linear combinations of those in the real tetrad approach:

$$\mathcal{C}_A = \mp 2\kappa^2 i C_R, \quad (2.3.85)$$

$$\mathcal{C}_{Mj} = C_{Mj} \pm 2\kappa^2 i P_j \cdot C_R, \quad (2.3.86)$$

$$\mathcal{C}_H = C_H \pm i \partial_j (\tilde{e}^j \cdot C_R) \mp i (\partial_j \sqrt{q}) e^j \cdot C_R. \quad (2.3.87)$$

Putting these expressions into the chiral canonical Lagrangian (2.3.42), and setting the value of the arbitrary function P_t (the real part of \mathcal{A}_t) to be the one given in Eq.(2.2.83), the chiral canonical Lagrangian reduces to

$$\pm L = L \pm \int d^3 x \frac{i}{\kappa^2} \tilde{e}^j \cdot Q_j. \quad (2.3.88)$$

Due to the identity equation

$$2\dot{\tilde{e}}^j \cdot Q_j(e) = (\sqrt{q}\epsilon_{IJK}\theta_{Ij}\partial_k e^{Jj} e^{Kk})\dot{\ } + \partial_k(\sqrt{q}\epsilon_{IJK}\dot{\theta}_{Ij}e^{Jj}e^{Kk}), \quad (2.3.89)$$

the imaginary part of the chiral Lagrangian reduces to a total time derivative. This proves the equivalence.

Finally note that there exist an infinite number of embeddings consistent with the reality condition. They are all obtained from the above embedding by some appropriate local $SO(3, \mathcal{C})$ gauge transformations and are mutually equivalent. What is important here is that the dynamics is always described by the same complex theory irrespective of the embedding. Actually the detail of the embedding becomes relevant only when the correspondence between the theory and observations is concerned. In particular, when we are concerned only with the quantities invariant under the local $SO(3, \mathcal{C})$ gauge transformations, we do not even have to fix the embedding. This point becomes important in quantizing the theory.

3 Quantum Theory of Totally Constrained Systems

As we have seen in the previous section, the Hamiltonian in the canonical theory of general relativity is written as a linear combination of the first-class constraint functions, irrespective of the approaches to construct the canonical theory. We call such a canonical system *a totally constrained system*. Classically this special structure of the theory does not give rise to any serious problem, and can be treated like ordinary canonical systems with constraints. In contrast, however, when one tries to quantize such a system, some serious problems arise.

The first problem is the formulation of dynamics, i.e., the time evolution in the quantum theory. For example, let us consider a totally constrained system with a Hamiltonian

$$H = \sum_{\alpha} \lambda^{\alpha} C_{\alpha}, \quad (3.0.1)$$

where C_{α} are constraint functions and λ^{α} are arbitrary function of time. If one quantizes this system by the Dirac method, classical constraints $C_{\alpha} = 0$

are translated to a set of constraints on physical states:

$$\hat{C}_\alpha|\Psi\rangle = 0, \tag{3.0.2}$$

where \hat{C}_α are the operators corresponding to C_α . However, since the Hamiltonian operator \hat{H} is written as a linear combination of \hat{C}_α , these quantum constraints yield

$$\hat{H}|\Psi\rangle = 0, \tag{3.0.3}$$

which implies that the Schrödinger equation becomes trivial for the physical states. Hence one loses dynamics in this formal quantization method. This difficulty arises due to the time-reparametrization invariance of the theory which implies that the formal time variable of the system has no observational meaning^[43]. Therefore it is closely connected with the following set of problems: Is it possible to find natural time variables expressed in terms of the canonical variables? Are the time variables to be included among observables? Are the time variables represented as operators? and so on. These problems constitute the issue of time in quantum gravity.

The second problem is concerned with observables. In ordinary gauge field theories observables are restricted to the gauge-invariant quantities. The same restriction formally applies to totally constrained systems since it can be generally shown that each of the first-class constraints corresponds to a generator of some generalized gauge transformation^[39]. However, in totally constrained systems, some subtle problems arise.

First, as was stated above, totally constrained systems have the time-reparametrization invariance, which is a generalized gauge invariance generated by the constraint function C^t whose Poisson bracket with the time variable t does not vanish. Since time-reparametrization invariant quantities are essentially constant of motion as we will see later, one would lose the chance to extract dynamics in the Dirac quantization method if one restricts observables to those invariant under the time-reparametrization.

Second as we have seen in §2, a part of the constraint functions are the generators of the spatial coordinate transformation or the spatial diffeomorphism. Though this is a kind of gauge transformation in a generalized sense, invariance under this transformation has a meaning which is quite different from the usual gauge invariance. In particular the observational meaning of quantities invariant under the spatial coordinate transformation is not a

priori clear since all the observational information of physical quantities are expressed in a coordinate dependent fashion.

These problems have a long history and a lot of work has been done on them (see [43] on the early history and the difficulty in finding the internal time variables, and [44] on the recent arguments). Nevertheless, no resolution which satisfies most of people has not been found yet. If technical difficulties are neglected, the main controversial point is whether operators should be assigned to the time variables or not. The formulation of canonical quantum gravity, in particular the treatment of observables and states, changes significantly depending on which standpoint is taken.

Though this is a review article, we adopt the standpoint that the time variables should be included into the observables represented by operators since the other standpoint seems to be unsatisfactory to the author. In the subsequent part of this section we explain the reason for that by analyzing the above problems in detail both from the classical and the quantum points of view. Then from this standpoint we summarize the formal structure of the canonical quantization program of gravity. Further, after critical comments on the approaches proposed so far we propose one possible new approach on the treatment of the quantum hamiltonian constraint.

Finally we should remark the reader that, although there exist some researchers who take standpoints similar to ours(for example, see Kuchař's comment in the discussion part of Rovelli's article in [44]), our argument may not be convincing enough for people taking different standpoints(including C. Rovelli).

3.1 Gauge-invariant Quantities and Dynamics

Since most of the difficulties associated with quantization of a totally constrained system are caused by the gauge invariance of the system, we expect that a part of them are eliminated if we can separate the gauge invariant freedoms and extract the true physical freedoms at the classical level. However, in general, this separation procedure provokes various problems which do not arise in the ordinary gauge field theories. In this subsection we look at these problems and discuss how they should be handled in the classical framework.

3.1.1 Gauge-fixing method vs. gauge invariant formalism

There are in general two approaches to eliminate the gauge freedom. The first is the gauge-fixing method. In this method one imposes a set of additional constraints, the gauge fixing condition, by fixing the values of some canonical quantities as $\psi^\alpha = f^\alpha(t)$. If ψ^α is selected so that $\{C_\alpha, \psi^\beta\}$ is a regular matrix, the consistency of the gauge condition with the canonical time evolution equation,

$$\dot{f}^\alpha = \lambda^\beta \{C_\alpha, \psi^\beta\}, \quad (3.1.1)$$

completely determines the arbitrary functions λ^α . The only feature specific to the totally constrained system is that f^α should be explicitly time-dependent since all the λ^α should not vanish simultaneously.

The gauge fixing constraints with the original constraints are of the second class. Thus in general they should be solved explicitly before quantization. In realistic theories such as general relativity this is practically impossible. Of course if one modifies the canonical structure by the Dirac method or reformulates the theory by introducing ghost fields so that it is BRS-invariant, one does not need to solve the constraints. However, even in these methods, one needs the inverse of the matrix $\{C_\alpha, \psi^\beta\}$. Since this inversion is to solve non-linear partial differential equations, it is also practically quite difficult.

Besides this technical difficulty there exists a more fundamental problem specific to general relativity. In general relativity practical coordinate-fixing conditions are always local and can not be applied to the whole spacetime. Furthermore whether a given coordinate condition is appropriate or not depends on a solution of the Einstein equation. This feature makes it difficult to formulate the quantum theory.

The second approach is to find all the gauge-invariant quantities in the classical canonical theory and construct quantum theory based only on them. Since the constraint functions are the generators of the gauge transformations, the condition for a function F on the canonical phase space Γ to be gauge invariant is expressed as

$$\{C_\alpha, F\} = 0 \quad \forall \alpha. \quad (3.1.2)$$

Here for the generators which exactly form a Lie algebra the equations should hold strongly, but those for the others such as the Hamiltonian constraint are required to hold only modulo the constraints. Since the Hamiltonian is written as a linear combination of the constraint functions, this condition implies

that F is a constant of motion. Conversely any canonical quantity which is conserved for any choice of the arbitrary functions λ^α is gauge invariant.

In general finding all the constants of motion is equivalent to solving the canonical equation of motion. This also holds for the present case. To see this, let Γ_* be the subspace of the original phase space Γ determined by the constraints, \mathcal{O} be the set of all the function on Γ , $\mathcal{O}_{\text{cons}}$ be its subset consisting of the constants of motion, and X_j be a maximal subset of functions in $\mathcal{O}_{\text{cons}}$ which are independent on Γ_* . Since Γ_* is invariant under the canonical transformations generated by the constraint functions, Γ_* is decomposed to a set of orbits each of which has the same dimension as the number of independent constraint functions, and one orbit is picked up if the values of all X_j are specified. Hence, if we select a set of functions ψ^α in \mathcal{O} such that $\Delta_\beta^\alpha := \{\psi^\alpha, C_\beta\}$ is a regular matrix, X_j and ψ^α defines a local coordinate system of Γ_* . Now let S be a gauge orbit in Γ_* and γ be an arbitrary curve parametrized by t in S . Then, since X_j is constant along γ , we can find functions $g^\alpha(\psi)$ such that along γ ψ satisfies the differential equation

$$\frac{d\psi^\alpha}{dt} = g^\alpha(\psi). \quad (3.1.3)$$

Hence, if λ^α is a function on Γ determined by

$$g^\alpha(\psi) = \Delta_\beta^\alpha(\psi, X)\lambda^\beta(\psi, X), \quad (3.1.4)$$

any function F in \mathcal{O} satisfies the equation

$$\frac{dF}{dt} = \frac{\partial F}{\partial \psi^\alpha} g^\alpha(\psi) = \{F, \lambda^\alpha C_\alpha\} \quad (3.1.5)$$

along γ . This implies that the curve γ is a solution of the canonical equations of motion.

3.1.2 Physical meaning of the general covariance

The argument above shows that the gauge-invariant quantities carries all the dynamical information in the classical totally constrained systems. In particular the dynamics is determined only by the canonical structure and the constraint functions. If we assign operators only to the gauge-invariant quantities in quantization, however, we meet a difficulty of losing dynamics as stated at the beginning of this section. In order to find out what is

wrong with this approach, let us analyze the meaning of the three types of gauge invariances which appear in general relativity: the usual internal gauge invariance associated with the gauge fields and the tetrad field, the spatial coordinate transformation invariance, and the time coordinate transformation invariance.

In the usual gauge field theories gauge-dependent quantities are introduced to express the relations among directly measurable quantities in terms of equations local in the space-time coordinates. Thus they are genuinely theoretical entities and the restriction of observables to gauge-invariant quantities or relations is the fundamental postulate of the formulation. The spontaneous symmetry breaking does not change the situation: it is essentially breaking of a global symmetry at the phenomenological level and can be described only in terms of the gauge-invariant quantities. The freedom of the tetrad rotation in general relativity is of the same nature as the internal gauge transformation.

In contrast to the gauge field theories some of the quantities represented by space-time-coordinate dependent fields are measurable in general relativity. For example, let us consider the phase ϕ of electromagnetic fields which is a scalar quantity in general relativity, and an apparatus which measures the value of ϕ at the space-time location of the apparatus. Clearly the apparatus yields a definite value of ϕ by measurement. Of course the collection of the measurements at various spacetime points is just a set of real or complex numbers and is not described by a field.

However, if one performs similar measurements of other independent scalar quantities $\phi^1, \dots, \phi^n (n \geq 4)$, each measurement yields a definite set of values $(\phi, \phi^1, \dots, \phi^n)$, and the collection of the results at various space-time points will form a definite four-dimensional submanifold of the $(n + 1)$ -dimensional linear space. Let us select four quantities x^0, \dots, x^3 from ϕ^1, \dots, ϕ^n . If the projection of an open subset of this submanifold to a four-dimensional space (x^0, \dots, x^3) is one-to-one, then the observational data corresponding to this subset is represented by a function $\phi(x^0, \dots, x^3)$. If another choice of four scalar fields y^0, \dots, y^3 has the same property, one will obtain another expression for the data, $\phi(y^0, \dots, y^3)$. Clearly these functions behave as a scalar field if x^0, \dots, x^3 and y^0, \dots, y^3 are regarded as local coordinate systems of space-time.

This observation shows that a scalar field $\phi(x^0, \dots, x^3)$ in general relativity is a symbol to represent the set of relations of a measurable quantity ϕ to

four other independent scalar quantities describing the whole observational data of a spacetime phenomenon, and that the space-time coordinate transformations are just the change of the choice of scalar quantities to which ϕ is related. Thus if one denotes the set of all possible configurations of the scalar field by U , the coordinate transformations induce transformations of U and to each orbit of the transformation group corresponds one space-time phenomenon as a whole. Since the gauge-invariant functions on U take constant values on each orbit, they yield a set of label to classify the orbits or the space-time phenomena.

There appear of course much more complicated quantities such as tensors or tensor densities in general relativity. However, since they all are concepts theoretically derived from scalar fields or introduced to describe the structure of the manifold formed by the set of values of scalar quantities, the above argument can be essentially extended to the whole theory. Thus as in the gauge field theories it is true that only the values of the gauge-invariant quantities or functionals are determined by observations, but their meaning is different: the gauge-invariant quantities are not directly measurable ones in general but are abstract objects to describe the relations of the measurable quantities in each space-time phenomenon.

3.1.3 Dynamics in the invariant formalism

With the arguments so far in mind, let us analyze the problem of time evolution. This problem is intimately connected with the fundamental nature of the canonical approach as a framework to describe the physical law. In the canonical theories one decomposes the set of measured relations among physical quantities describing each spacetime phenomenon as a whole to a one-dimensional sequence of subsets, and formulate the physical law as the relations among the subsets independent of the phenomena. Usually this decomposition is done in terms of a special measurable quantity t called the time variable, and by slicing the four-dimensional data set to subsets on each of which the value of t is constant. Hence the quantities which are invariant under the space-time coordinate transformations and describe a space-time phenomenon as a whole are not sufficient to describe the law. One needs quantities to describe the relations in each data set with constant time.

Taking account of the arguments above on what are determined by observations, the most natural quantities to describe the information at each time

slice are the functions on the phase space Γ which are invariant under the internal gauge transformations and the spatial coordinate transformations. In fact we can write the canonical gravity theory only in terms of such invariant functions. Let \mathcal{O}_{inv} be the set of all such functions on Γ . $F \in \mathcal{O}_{\text{inv}}$ is characterized by the conditions

$$\{C_G(\Lambda), F\} = 0 \quad \forall \Lambda, \quad (3.1.6)$$

$$\{C_D(L), F\} = 0 \quad \forall L^j, \quad (3.1.7)$$

where C_G represents the constraint functions corresponding to the material gauge transformations and the tetrad rotations. \mathcal{O}_{inv} can be regarded as functions on the orbit space Γ_{inv} of the gauge transformation group acting on Γ . Each point of Γ_{inv} represent a state of the system on a time slice. Due to the first-class nature of C_G and C_D , $\{F_1, F_2\}$ is again invariant if $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{O}_{\text{inv}}$. Hence the Poisson brackets in \mathcal{O}_{inv} is naturally determined from that in \mathcal{O} .

The constraint functions $C_G(\Lambda)$ and $C_D(L)$ do not belong to \mathcal{O}_{inv} . However, if we replace the smoothing functions Λ and L by functionals $\hat{\Lambda}$ and \hat{L} which are expressed only in terms of the canonical quantities and have the same transformation behavior as Λ and L respectively, they can be made invariant:

$$\{C_G(\Lambda'), C_G(\hat{\Lambda})\} = \{C_D(L'), C_G(\hat{\Lambda})\} = 0, \quad (3.1.8)$$

$$\{C_G(\Lambda'), C_D(\hat{L})\} = \{C_D(L'), C_D(\hat{L})\} = 0. \quad (3.1.9)$$

Hence the gauge and diffeomorphism constraints are translated to the constraints in Γ_{inv} , which determines a subspace Γ_{inv}^* . Each point of Γ_{inv}^* determines a physical state(for the parametrization of Γ_{inv}^* see [45]). Points in Γ_{inv}^* are distinguished by the functions in \mathcal{O}_{inv} that does not vanish identically on Γ_{inv}^* ,

$$\mathcal{O}_{\text{inv}}^* := \mathcal{O}_{\text{inv}} / \mathcal{O}_{\text{inv}}[C_G, C_D]. \quad (3.1.10)$$

Like C_G and C_D the Hamiltonian constraint function $C_H(T)$ can be made invariant by replacing the smoothing function T by an invariant functional \hat{T} :

$$\{C_G(\Lambda), C_H(\hat{T})\} = \{C_D(L), C_H(\hat{T})\} = 0. \quad (3.1.11)$$

Hence the canonical equation of motion in Γ can be rewritten as the canonical equation for F in $\mathcal{O}_{\text{inv}} = \mathcal{O}(\Gamma_{\text{inv}})$,

$$\frac{dF}{dt} = \{F, C_{\text{H}}(\hat{N})\}, \quad (3.1.12)$$

with the constraints

$$C_{\text{G}}(\hat{\Lambda}) = 0, \quad C_{\text{D}}(\hat{L}) = 0, \quad C_{\text{H}}(\hat{T}) = 0. \quad (3.1.13)$$

If the states are restricted to Γ_{inv}^* , the first two of these constraints become redundant.

So far we have implicitly assumed that some time-slicing is given, but we did not have to specify the slicing. As a result of this, Γ_{inv} contains all the states obtained by all possible time slicings of the whole space-time phenomena. Actually, since the condition to specify a time slice, $t = \text{const}$, is by itself a gauge and spatial diffeomorphism invariant relation of the measured quantities, the time-slicing condition can be expressed in terms of functions in \mathcal{O}_{inv} . To be precise, corresponding to the freedom of the lapse function, we need formally ∞^3 numbers of the invariant functions to completely specify a time slicing within the framework of the canonical gravity. This point is reflected in Eq.(3.1.12) as the freedom of the invariant canonical function \hat{N} . Solutions to this equation obtained by changing the choice of \hat{N} with a fixed initial condition correspond to different time slicing of a single space-time solution.

Of course $\mathcal{O}_{\text{cons}}$ is a subset of \mathcal{O}_{inv} and the space-time solutions are completely classified by the functions in $\mathcal{O}_{\text{cons}}$. But as we have stated, we cannot restrict the variables to $\mathcal{O}_{\text{cons}}$ to treat dynamics in the canonical approach.

3.2 Quantization

On the basis of the analysis on classical totally constrained systems in the previous subsection, we describe the framework of the quantum gravity program and discuss the difficulties associated with it.

3.2.1 Program

As explained in the previous subsection, a state on each time slice is specified by the values of the gauge and the spatial-diffeomorphism invariant functionals \mathcal{O}_{inv} which is closed with respect to the Poisson brackets in the phase

space Γ , and the constraints are represented by a special set of functionals in \mathcal{O}_{inv} , $C_G(\hat{\Lambda})$, $C_D(\hat{L})$, and $C_H(\hat{T})$. Thus ideally the process to construct the canonical quantum gravity theory is summarized as follows:

- 1) Find all the invariant functionals \mathcal{O}_{inv} among the gauge-dependent functionals on the phase space Γ consisting of the triad fields and their conjugate momentums, or its chiral version Γ_C .
- 2) Select a set of fundamental invariant variables from which \mathcal{O}_{inv} is generated.
- 3) Construct an operator algebra $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\text{inv}}$ by defining the commutation relations among the operators corresponding to the classical fundamental variables based on their Poisson bracket structure.
- 4) Assign a set of operators \hat{C}_G^α , \hat{C}_D^β and \hat{C}_H^γ in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\text{inv}}$ to the classical constraint functionals $C_G(\hat{\Lambda})$, $C_D(\hat{L})$ and $C_H(\hat{T})$.
- 5) Construct a representation of $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\text{inv}}$ on a linear space \mathcal{V}_{inv} .
- 6) Define the involutive anti-linear operation $\hat{F} \rightarrow \hat{F}^*$ in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\text{inv}}$ which corresponds to the complex conjugation in \mathcal{O}_{inv} .
- 7) Construct a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} from a subset of \mathcal{V}_{inv} by defining an inner product such that \hat{F}^* becomes the hermitian conjugation of \hat{F} .
- 8) Define the dynamics by the constraint operators and find the interpretation.

There are however lots of problems in this simple-minded program. First no one has succeeded even in clearing the step 1) so far. Thus one would not be able to discuss any aspect of quantum gravity for a rather long while in the future if one exactly follows this program. Fortunately, however, there are several ways to study some partial aspects of the quantum gravity theory in advance of its full construction.

One is to start from a subset of functions in \mathcal{O} which are invariant under a subgroup of the full gauge and diffeomorphism group. Since the steps 2) to 5) are easily passed if the step 1) are cleared, one can construct a formal quantum theory by replacing \mathcal{O}_{inv} by the subset. Then it becomes possible to seek for the path to reach the final goal staying within the quantum

framework, or to investigate a part of the problems which can be discussed without the full knowledge of the final theory.

Thus various approaches are possible depending on at which stage of the classical theory one proceeds to the quantum framework, as is shown in Table 1. There \mathcal{O}_G in the classical framework denotes the set of functionals which are gauge invariant, and $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_G$ in the quantum framework denotes the subalgebra of $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ formed by the operators which commute with \hat{C}_G :

$$\hat{\mathcal{O}}_G := \{\hat{F} \in \hat{\mathcal{O}} \mid [\hat{C}_G(\Lambda), \hat{F}] = 0 \quad \forall \Lambda\}. \quad (3.2.1)$$

Similarly $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\text{inv}}$ is defined as

$$\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\text{inv}} := \{\hat{F} \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_G \mid [\hat{C}_D(L), \hat{F}] = 0 \quad \forall L\}. \quad (3.2.2)$$

* on the functional algebra means that it is restricted to the subspace of Γ determined by the constraints relevant at each stage. This restriction corresponds in the quantum framework to restricting the state vectors to the subspaces of \mathcal{V} , \mathcal{V}_G or \mathcal{V}_{inv} defined by

$$\mathcal{V}_G := \{|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{V} \mid \hat{C}_G(\hat{\Lambda})|\Phi\rangle = 0 \quad \forall \hat{\Lambda}\}, \quad (3.2.3)$$

$$\mathcal{V}_{\text{inv}} := \{|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{V}_G \mid \hat{C}_D(\hat{L})|\Phi\rangle = 0 \quad \forall \hat{L}\}. \quad (3.2.4)$$

For example, in the classical canonical theory obtained in the metric approach in §2.1, the fundamental variables q_{jk} and p^{jk} for the pure gravity case do not depend on the tetrad, hence are already gauge-invariant. Therefore one can move to the quantum framework at the stage II_C to get the Wheeler-DeWitt theory^[16]. Actually a large fraction of the work done on the canonical quantum gravity so far has followed this approach. At present, however, there exists no practical method to proceed to the next stage III_Q in this approach.

Another example is the loop space quantization of the chiral canonical theory, which starts from the stage I_C , proceeds to the stage II_C^* by constructing the gauge-invariant functionals in terms of the Wilson loop integrals, and then moves to II_Q^* . The future prospect of this approach is brighter than the Wheeler-DeWitt approach as we will see in detail in §4.

The second way to bypass the step 1) is to restrict the considerations to minisuperspace models. Since they are finite-dimensional, it is easy to go to the stage III_Q and to study how to get to the final step corresponding to 8) in

Classical Stages			Quantum Stages			
(I _C)	$\mathcal{O}, \Gamma;$	C_G, C_D, C_H	\implies	(I _Q)	$\hat{\mathcal{O}}, \mathcal{V};$	$\hat{C}_G, \hat{C}_D, \hat{C}_H$
	\downarrow				\downarrow	
(II _C)	$\mathcal{O}_G, \Gamma_G;$	$C_G(\hat{\Lambda}), C_D, C_H$	\implies	(II _Q)	$\hat{\mathcal{O}}_G, \mathcal{V};$	$\hat{C}_G(\hat{\Lambda}), \hat{C}_D, \hat{C}_H$
	\downarrow				\downarrow	
(II _C [*])	$\mathcal{O}_G^*, \Gamma_G^*;$	C_D, C_H	\implies	(II _Q [*])	$\hat{\mathcal{O}}_G, \mathcal{V}_G;$	\hat{C}_D, \hat{C}_H
	\downarrow				\downarrow	
(III _C)	$\mathcal{O}_{\text{inv}}, \Gamma_{\text{inv}};$	$C_D(\hat{L}), C_H(\hat{T})$	\implies	(III _Q)	$\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\text{inv}}, \mathcal{V}_G;$	$\hat{C}_D(\hat{L}), \hat{C}_H(\hat{T})$
	\downarrow				\downarrow	
(III _C [*])	$\mathcal{O}_{\text{inv}}^*, \Gamma_{\text{inv}}^*;$	$C_H(\hat{T})$	\implies	(III _Q [*])	$\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\text{inv}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{inv}};$	$\hat{C}_H(\hat{T})$
	\downarrow				\downarrow	
(IV _C [*])	$\mathcal{O}_{\text{cons}}^*, \Gamma_{\text{inv}}^*$			(IV _Q [*])	$\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\text{inv}}, (\mathcal{H}^*, \mathcal{H});$	$\hat{C}_H(\hat{T})$

Table 1: Flow of Quantization Program

the above program. Lots of interesting results are obtained in this approach centered around the work by Hawking, Hartle, and Vilenkin^[3, 4, 46, 5, 6]. Unfortunately, however, study in this approach is largely hampered at present because it cannot discuss any realistic problem for its oversimplicity.

The third way is to jump from the stage I_C to the final goal corresponding to the step 8) by constructing the quantum theory in terms of the path integral^[47, 39]. A lot of work in this approach has been done stimulated by the no-boundary proposal for the wavefunction of the Universe based on the Euclidean path-integral by Hartle and Hawking^[3]. The present status of this approach is not good either. The most serious obstacle is the bad behavior of the Euclidean path integral specific to the general relativity theory. Detailed investigations of its behavior for mini-superspace models^[48, 49, 50, 51] have revealed that the integration should be done along complex paths which are along the Lorentzian path to make the path integral well-defined. Further it is also shown that there remain large ambiguities in the choice of the integration contour even if one requires that the path integral converges. Thus it is difficult to give a sound basis to the Hartle-Hawking proposal.

The fourth way is to study the quantization of the lower dimensional versions of the general relativity as a preliminary step. For example, in the (2 + 1)-dimensional space-times, the pure gravity has only a finite degrees

of freedom which are all topological because the space-time solutions are all isometric to Minkowski space-time locally. Hence the exact quantum theory can be formulated if one can find an appropriate parametrization of the topological freedom^[52]. Some interesting work has been done on the possibility of quantum topology changes following this approach^[53, 54, 55]. However, for the cases in which the spatial slices are compact surfaces with genus higher than 2, the good parametrization of the freedom, which corresponds to constructing Γ_{inv} , is not found. Hence the relation of the low-dimensional theories to the four-dimensional quantum gravity is not clear at present.

3.2.2 Hamiltonian constraint and dynamics

In the previous subsection we have not touched upon the treatment of the hamiltonian constraint in the quantum theory. Since all the dynamical information is contained in the constraint functions and the constraints other than the hamiltonian constraint are purely group-theoretical, this problem constitutes the central part of constructing the physical quantum gravity theory.

Usually the hamiltonian constraint is treated like the other constraints, and in the quantum framework it is assumed to be represented as the quantum constraint on the physical state vectors,

$$\hat{C}_H|\Psi\rangle = 0. \quad (3.2.5)$$

However, this treatment leads to a theory with no dynamics as stated at the beginning of this section.

Various approaches have been proposed to resolve this difficulty so far. First is the WKB approach proposed in the context of quantum cosmology^[56, 57]. In this approach one first classifies the canonical variables into two classes, macroscopic variables (Q_A, P^A) and quantum variables (q_I, p^I) , and assumes that C_H has the structure

$$C_H = C_H^1(Q, P) + C_H^2(q, p, Q) \quad (3.2.6)$$

with

$$C_H^1(Q, P) = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G}_{AB}(Q)P^AP^B + \mathcal{V}_A(Q)P^A + \mathcal{U}(Q). \quad (3.2.7)$$

According to this classification one decomposes the state space as $\mathcal{V}_{\text{inv}} = \mathcal{V}_1 \otimes \mathcal{V}_2$, and expands the state vector $|\Psi\rangle$ in terms of the eigenstates of \hat{Q} in \mathcal{V}_1 as

$$|\Psi\rangle = \int dQ |Q\rangle \otimes |\Phi(Q)\rangle. \quad (3.2.8)$$

Here the criterion for (Q, P) to be regarded as macroscopic is that $|\Phi(Q)\rangle \in \mathcal{V}_2$ can be decomposed into a rapidly changing phase $e^{iS(Q)}$ expressed in terms of a solution $S(Q)$ to the Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$C_H^1(Q, \partial_Q S) = 0, \quad (3.2.9)$$

and a vector $|\Phi'(Q)\rangle$ changing slowly with Q , as

$$|\Phi(Q)\rangle = e^{iS(Q)} |\Phi'(Q)\rangle. \quad (3.2.10)$$

The solution to the Hamilton-Jacobi equation yields an ensemble of solutions to the classical equation of motion determined by C_H^1 , which foliate the Q -configuration space into a family of trajectories. Along each trajectory one can introduce a time variable by

$$\dot{Q} = \{Q, C_H^1(\hat{N})\}. \quad (3.2.11)$$

Then, owing to the Hamilton-Jacobi equation and the assumption on $|\Phi'(Q)\rangle$, one can show that $|\Phi'(Q)\rangle$ approximately satisfies the Schrödinger equation along each trajectory:

$$i\partial_t |\Phi'(Q)\rangle \simeq \hat{C}_H^2(\hat{N}) |\Phi'(Q)\rangle. \quad (3.2.12)$$

Apart from the problem of the unitarity, this approach has some intrinsic ambiguities. First it is not clear how to separate the macroscopic variables in the realistic situations in which the vector $|\Psi\rangle$ or the wavefunction has a quite complicated structure. Second it does not give the information which trajectory should be taken. These two ambiguities are intimately connected because there exists no variable which behaves always classically. Though a couple of proposals based on the idea of decoherence of history have been proposed so far to resolve these ambiguities^[58], they are far from satisfactory.

The second approach to extract dynamics from Eq.(3.2.5) is based on the deparametrization of the theory^[43]. In this approach one tries to find a

canonical transformation of the original variables Q_A and P^A to t_μ , π^μ , q_I and p^I , where t_μ 's are the time variables which specify a time slicing and π^μ 's are their conjugates (the index μ includes the freedom of the spatial coordinates). The requirement on the canonical transformation is that C_H can be written as

$$C_H(N) = N_\mu [\pi^\mu + h^\mu(q, p, t)]. \quad (3.2.13)$$

If this requirement is satisfied, the vector $|\Phi(t)\rangle$ obtained by the decomposition of $|\Psi\rangle$ as in Eq.(3.2.8) with Q replaced by t^μ exactly satisfies the functional Schrödinger equation

$$i \frac{\delta}{\delta t_\mu} |\Phi(t)\rangle = \hat{h}^\mu(t) |\Phi(t)\rangle. \quad (3.2.14)$$

Since the time variables are introduced in the classical level, this approach is essentially of the gauge-fixing type. Hence it is expected to share the same difficulties with the gauge-fixing method. In fact it is shown^[43] that, though one can find good time variables in the class of variables whose conjugates are written as linear combinations of P^A if C_H has the same structure as C_H^1 in the WKB approach and there exists a conformal Killing vector to the super metric \mathcal{G}_{AB} which keeps \mathcal{V}_A and \mathcal{U} invariant, it cannot be extended to the generic case. Of course this does not exclude the possibility of good time variables existing in the generic case. For example, it is shown by Ashtekar^[44] within the framework of the complex canonical theory that in the weak field approximation the variables conjugate to the term corresponding to the superpotential \mathcal{U} can be taken as good time variables in the above sense. However, it is not clear whether the same method applies to the generic case.

In these two approaches the vector $|\Phi'(Q)\rangle$ or $|\Phi(t)\rangle$ obtained by the decomposition of $|\Psi\rangle$ is to be regarded as the quantum state vector. Hence the hamiltonian constraint is not imposed on the state vectors in the genuine sense. In contrast to these, in the third approach called the frozen approach, the hamiltonian constraint is imposed strictly on state vectors. Since the operators consistent with this quantum constraint in general commute with \hat{C}_H weakly, i.e., satisfy the condition

$$[\hat{C}_H(\hat{T}), \hat{F}] = \hat{C}_H(\hat{T}'), \quad (3.2.15)$$

they correspond to the constants of motion $\mathcal{O}_{\text{cons}}$ in the classical theory. Hence in this approach the observables are limited to the constants of motion $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\text{cons}}$. In particular the time variables cannot be included in the observables because the classical time variables t_μ must satisfy the condition

$$\delta_T t_\mu = \{C_{\text{H}}(\hat{T}), t_\mu\} \neq 0 \quad \exists \mu \quad \forall \hat{T}, \quad (3.2.16)$$

which implies that the corresponding operators \hat{t}^μ does not commute with $\hat{C}_{\text{H}}(\hat{T})$.

Thus the only way to introduce the time evolution concept into the theory in this approach is to regard the time as the parameter of a special unitary transformation $U(t)$ in the space of the solutions to Eq.(3.2.5), $\mathcal{V}_{\text{cons}}$. Of course there exists no principle to select $U(t)$ within the frozen formalism. However, if one can find good time variables in the deparametrization approach explained above, it is possible to construct a natural one-parameter family of unitary transformations, $U(t)$.

To see this, first note that the set of functions on the classical phase space (q_I, p^I) in the deparametrization approach is isomorphic $\mathcal{O}_{\text{cons}}$. This isomorphism induces a one-to-one correspondence between $|\Psi\rangle \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{cons}}$ and the initial state $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{V}_1$ of $|\Phi(t)\rangle$. Hence through this correspondence the time evolution operator $U(t)$ in \mathcal{V}_1 , which is formally expressed as

$$U(t) = T \exp[-i \int dt_\mu \hat{h}^\mu(t)], \quad (3.2.17)$$

is transferred to the operator on $\mathcal{V}_{\text{cons}}$. For example for the minisuperspace models of class A Bianchi type I, II, VI₀ and VII₀, Ashtekar and others^[32] have succeeded in defining an inner product in $\mathcal{V}_{\text{cons}}$ and constructing a natural unitary operator $U(t)$.

In canonical quantum gravity theory we cannot assume in general that there is something like spacetime. Nevertheless, it is natural assume that there exist a set of observable quantities which can be regarded as time variables in a given set of phenomena, since otherwise we lose the possibility of discussing dynamics. Under this assumption the whole observational data of phenomena are divided into subsets for each of which an appropriate set of time variables take specific values, and the relations among each subset is represented by a quantum state. We call this decomposition into subsets a time slicing in analogy with the classical theory.

Thus we must give a special role to the time variables in the canonical quantum gravity. However, this does not mean that quantities chosen as the time variables in a given situation have any special intrinsic nature compared with the other quantities. In fact almost any local quantity can be used as a time variable in a certain situation. This consideration suggests that all the observational quantities should be treated at equal footing in the formulation and that which quantities should be regarded as the time variables is determined by the observational data.

In the above three approaches on the treatment of the time variables this point is not realized. The time variables are treated differently from the other variables at the basic level of formulation. In particular they are regarded as classical variables. This feature seems to be quite unsatisfactory to the author. For example the above approaches cannot deal with the situations in which different sets of time variables are measured at the state setting and at its observation. Further, if there does not exist a universal set of good time variables, which seems to be the case in the generic situation, the formalism itself breaks down.

If we include the time variables into observables represented by operators, we cannot impose the hamiltonian constraint on the state vectors since the operators corresponding to the time variables do not commute with \hat{C}_H . Then how should we implement the hamiltonian constraint into the quantum theory? Here we give one possible formulation which is not mathematically well-defined yet but formally answers to this question.

First note that in the quantum framework the dynamics is eventually represented by the probability for each possible result of measurements. In the conventional quantum mechanics this probability is expressed in terms of some time-dependent state vector $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ as

$$\Pr(\hat{A}_\alpha \rightarrow a_\alpha) = |\langle \Psi(t) | a_\alpha \rangle|^2. \quad (3.2.18)$$

In this equation, though $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ and $|a_\alpha\rangle$ both belong to the state space \mathcal{H} , they can be regarded as playing different roles: $|a_\alpha\rangle$ is an object to represent the observational data, while $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ is an object to assign the probability amplitude to each possible observational data represented by $|a_\alpha\rangle$. If we look at this equation in this fashion, the most natural way to assign the probability to the state vectors which carry information on the time t is to replace the bra $\langle \Psi(t) |$ by a linear functional $\Psi[\Phi]$ on the state space \mathcal{H} and

express the probability as

$$\Pr(\hat{A}_\alpha \rightarrow a_\alpha) = |\Psi[|a_\alpha \rangle]|^2. \quad (3.2.19)$$

Since this expression yields the probabilistic prediction on the results of measurements on arbitrary time slice and since Ψ does not carry an information on the time slicing any longer, Ψ represents the quantum counterpart of the complete data on a space-time phenomenon as a whole in the classical theory. Hence it cannot be a state vector unlike in the quantum mechanics. In particular it cannot be a continuous functional on \mathcal{H} since from Riesz's theorem each continuous linear functional on the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is in one-to-one correspondence to a vector in \mathcal{H} . We do not even require it to be defined on the whole \mathcal{H} . As a result, Ψ is not normalizable in general, and \Pr in the above expression should be understood to represent only the relative probability.

In spite of these properties we formally write the functional $\Psi[\Phi]$ from now on as

$$\Psi[\Phi] = \langle \Psi | \Phi \rangle, \quad (3.2.20)$$

for the notational simplicity, and call $\langle \Psi |$ the *probability amplitude functional*.

Since the dynamical information is carried by $\langle \Psi |$ in this formulation, it is the most natural to translate the classical hamiltonian constraint to the constraint on $\langle \Psi |$ as

$$\langle \Psi | \hat{C}_H(\hat{T}) = 0 \quad \forall \hat{T} \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}. \quad (3.2.21)$$

The exact meaning of this formal expression is

$$\langle \Psi | \hat{C}_H(\hat{T}) | \Phi \rangle = 0 \quad \forall | \Phi \rangle \in \mathcal{H}, \forall \hat{T} \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}. \quad (3.2.22)$$

We call this condition *the weak quantum hamiltonian constraint*.

In the limit the Planck constant \hbar vanishes the weak quantum hamiltonian constraint reduces to the classical one. To see this, let us represent the constraint in terms of the coherent representation. Let $|Q, P \rangle$ be the basis of the coherent representation of \mathcal{H} , and assume that the generalized version of the completeness condition on $|Q, P \rangle$,

$$\langle \Psi | \Phi \rangle = \int DQDP \langle \Psi | Q, P \rangle \langle Q, P | \Phi \rangle, \quad (3.2.23)$$

holds. Further let \hat{C}_H^μ be the generating operators for $\hat{C}_H(\hat{T})$ such that

$$\hat{C}_H(\hat{T}) = \hat{C}_H^\mu \hat{T}_\mu \quad \exists \hat{T}_\mu \in \mathcal{O}_{\text{inv}}. \quad (3.2.24)$$

Then the weak quantum hamiltonian constraint is represented as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Psi | \hat{C}_H^\mu | Q, P \rangle &= \int DQ' DP' \langle \Psi | Q' P' \rangle \langle Q' P' | \hat{C}_H^\mu | Q, P \rangle \\ &\simeq \langle \Psi | Q, P \rangle C_H^\mu(Q, P), \end{aligned} \quad (3.2.25)$$

where \simeq means that it becomes the exact equality in the limit $\hbar \rightarrow 0$. From this equation it follows that for $\langle \Psi | QP \rangle \neq 0$, $C_H^\mu(Q, P) \simeq 0$, which implies that the hamiltonian constraint holds in the classical limit. The origin of this result is the fact that the weak hamiltonian constraint in the configuration-space representation $\Psi(Q) = \langle \Psi | Q \rangle$ is nothing but the generalized Wheeler-DeWitt equation

$$\bar{C}_H^\mu(Q, -i \frac{\partial}{\partial Q}) \Psi(Q) = 0. \quad (3.2.26)$$

Further, since the hermitian operators in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\text{cons}}$ commute weakly with \hat{C}_H^μ , there exist a class of probability amplitude functionals each of which satisfies the equation

$$\langle \Psi | \hat{F} | \Phi \rangle \simeq f \langle \Psi | \Phi \rangle \quad \forall | \Phi \rangle \in \mathcal{H}, \quad (3.2.27)$$

for any hermitian operator \hat{F} in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\text{cons}}$ where f is a real number depend on the operator \hat{F} . In the coherent representation this equation is written as

$$\langle \Psi | QP \rangle (F(Q, P) - f) \simeq 0. \quad (3.2.28)$$

This implies that $\langle \Psi | QP \rangle$ does not vanish only around a subspace of Γ corresponding to the classical solution specified by the conditions on the constants of motion, $F(Q, P) = f$, provided the condition (3.2.27) is satisfied.

Thus at least in the sense of the word used in the quantum mechanics the above formulation reduces to the classical general relativity theory in the limit $\hbar \rightarrow 0$. Further, though its appearance is largely different from the conventional quantum mechanics, it can be shown that the above formalism is an extension of the latter in the sense that the quantum mechanics can be rewritten in the same form, as will be illustrated in the next subsection.

In order to complete the above formalism, we must give the procedure to determine $\langle \Psi |$ from the observational data. This problem is intimately connected with the choice of the time operators \hat{t}_μ . To see this, let us assume that the observational data determine the eigenvalues of a maximal commuting set \hat{q}_I and \hat{t}_μ of $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\text{inv}}$. Then if one can find a decomposition $\hat{C}_H^\mu = \hat{h}^\mu + \hat{\pi}^\mu$ and a set of operators \hat{n}_μ such that $\hat{\pi} := \hat{\pi}^\mu \hat{n}_\mu$ and $\hat{h} := \hat{h}^\mu \hat{n}_\mu$ are represented as

$$\langle \Psi | \hat{h} | q, t(\tau) \rangle = h(q, i \frac{\partial}{\partial q}, t) \overline{\Psi(q, t(\tau))}, \quad (3.2.29)$$

$$\langle \Psi | \hat{\pi} | q, t(\tau) \rangle = i \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \overline{\Psi(q, t(\tau))} \quad (3.2.30)$$

for some one-parameter family $t_\mu(\tau)$ where

$$\Psi(q, t) := \overline{\langle \Psi | q, t \rangle}, \quad (3.2.31)$$

then the weak hamiltonian constraint is expressed as

$$i \partial_\tau \Psi(q, t(\tau)) = h(q, -i \frac{\partial}{\partial q}, t) \Psi(q, t(\tau)). \quad (3.2.32)$$

Thus $\Psi(q, t(\tau))$ satisfies the Schrödinger equation with the time variable τ and is determined if the value at $\tau = 0$ is given. In particular if the measurements give data $(q_I^0, t_\mu(0))$, the weak hamiltonian constraint determines $\langle \Psi |$ at least on the subset $|q, t(\tau) \rangle$.

Here the reader will notice that this argument to derive the Schrödinger equation is quite similar to that in the deparametrization approach. Actually the above condition on the structure of \hat{C}_H is the quantum analogue of the condition for the good time variables to exist in the deparametrization approach. Further, if we expand $\langle \Psi |$ formally as

$$\langle \Psi | = \int dt \langle t | \otimes \langle \Phi(t) |, \quad (3.2.33)$$

the ket $|\Phi(t) \rangle$ dual to the bra $\langle \Phi(t) |$ given by

$$|\Phi(t) \rangle = \int dq \Psi(q, t) |q \rangle \quad (3.2.34)$$

satisfies the same functional Schrödinger equation as in the deparametrization approach.

Our formalism, however, is not completely equivalent to the deparametrization approach. It is because it does not depend on a special choice of the time variables and hence is more flexible. In particular it is potentially applicable to cases in which no universal set of good time variables exists. Of course in such cases a large ambiguity comes into the formulation in determining $\langle \Psi |$ by measurements. To cope with such a situation, we must impose some additional constraints on $\langle \Psi |$ to remove the ambiguity in $\langle \Psi |$ which remains even if the initial data are given, or limit the predictions to those insensitive to it. At present it is not clear which prescription is better. More detailed studies of variety of examples should be done to make complete the formulation.

3.3 Examples

In the previous subsection we proposed a new implementation of the hamiltonian constraint into the quantum framework and discussed its potential problems associated with the time variable and dynamics. In this subsection we will see how the formalism work in some simple examples and analyze the problems in more detail.

3.3.1 Quantum mechanics

As is well-known, the equation of motion of non-relativistic particles can be always written in a time-reparametrization invariant form^[43]. For example, the variational equation for a non-relativistic particle

$$\delta S = \delta \int dt \left(\frac{1}{2} m \left(\frac{dx}{dt} \right)^2 - V(x) \right) = 0 \quad (3.3.1)$$

is equivalent to

$$\delta S' = \delta \int d\tau (p\dot{x} + \pi\dot{t} - NC_H), \quad (3.3.2)$$

where the dot denotes the derivative with respect to the parameter time τ and

$$C_H = \pi + h(x, p); \quad h = \frac{p^2}{2m} + V(x). \quad (3.3.3)$$

The system described by the action S' is a totally constrained system with a single constraint function C_H .

Since there exists no symmetry corresponding to the gauge or the spatial diffeomorphism, Γ_{inv} and \mathcal{O}_{inv} are given by $\Gamma = \{(x, p, t, \pi)\}$ and $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}(\Gamma)$ in the present case. Hence $\hat{\mathcal{O}} = \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\text{inv}}$ is constructed from the fundamental operators \hat{x} , \hat{p} , \hat{t} and $\hat{\pi}$ satisfying the commutation relations

$$[\hat{x}, \hat{p}] = i, \quad [\hat{t}, \hat{\pi}] = i, \quad \text{others} = 0. \quad (3.3.4)$$

From the structure of C_{H} , in the standard coordinate representation for which \hat{x} and \hat{t} are diagonal, the weak quantum hamiltonian constraint is written as

$$\overline{\langle \Psi | \hat{C}_{\text{H}} | x, t \rangle} = -i\partial_t \Psi(x, t) + \hat{h}\Psi(x, t) = 0, \quad (3.3.5)$$

where

$$\Psi(x, t) = \overline{\langle \Psi | x, t \rangle}. \quad (3.3.6)$$

Hence in the present case the weak hamiltonian constraint is exactly identical to the Schrödinger equation if $\Psi(x, t)$ is interpreted as the wavefunction. This interpretation is consistent with the role of $\langle \Psi |$ as the probability amplitude functional in our formalism. From the Schrödinger equation, the norm of $\Psi(x, t)$ calculated by formally regarding it as the state vector is divergent:

$$\langle \Psi | \Psi \rangle := \int dx dt |\Psi(x, t)|^2 = \int dt |\Psi(x, 0)|^2 = +\infty. \quad (3.3.7)$$

Thus $\langle \Psi |$ is not continuous functional on the state space \mathcal{H} as discussed in the previous subsection in a general setting.

In the present case the dynamics is treated as follows. First let us assume that the measurements of two commuting observables $\hat{A}(x, p)$ and \hat{t} gave the results a_0 and t_0 . This result of measurements is represented by the eigen state vector $|a_0, t_0 \rangle \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\hat{A}|a_0, t_0 \rangle = a_0|a_0, t_0 \rangle, \quad \hat{t}|a_0, t_0 \rangle = t_0|a_0, t_0 \rangle. \quad (3.3.8)$$

Then the probability amplitude functional $\langle \Psi |$ is determined as a solution to the weak hamiltonian constraint satisfying the condition

$$\langle \Psi | a, t_0 \rangle = 0 \quad \forall a \neq a_0. \quad (3.3.9)$$

Since this condition is equivalent to fixing $\Psi(x, t_0)$ as $\Psi(x, t_0) = \Phi_{a_0}(x)$ with the eigenfunction $\Phi_{a_0}(x)$ of the operator \hat{A} , the equivalence of the weak

hamiltonian constraint with the Schrödinger equation guarantees that $\langle \Psi |$ is uniquely determined by this condition apart from the total normalization. This unique probability vector yields the probabilistic prediction on the results of measurements on other commuting operators including the time variable.

Thus the conventional quantum mechanics can be rewritten with our formalism. Of course the conventional one will be more convenient to solve practical standard problems. However, our formalism is much more flexible in treating dynamics than the conventional one as noted in the previous subsection. For example, the time variable used in prediction can be different from the one used to fix the probability amplitude functional. This feature seems to become important in quantum gravity since there exists in general no global time variable in general relativity.

3.3.2 Relativistic free particle

The classical action of a relativistic free particle

$$S = -m \int ds = -m \int d\tau [-\eta_{\mu\nu} \dot{x}^\mu \dot{x}^\nu]^{1/2} \quad (3.3.10)$$

is invariant under the reparametrization of τ , and is equivalent to the action with a structure similar to the previous example:

$$S = \int d\tau \left(\frac{1}{2N} \dot{x}^\mu \dot{x}^\nu - \frac{N}{2} m^2 \right). \quad (3.3.11)$$

Hence in the canonical form it becomes a totally constrained system:

$$L = \dot{x}^\mu p_\mu - NC_H, \quad (3.3.12)$$

$$C_H = \frac{1}{2}(p^\mu p_\mu + m^2). \quad (3.3.13)$$

This classical system can be easily quantized like the previous example. The operator algebra is generated from the fundamental operators \hat{x}^μ and \hat{p}_μ with the commutation relations

$$[\hat{x}^\mu, \hat{p}_\nu] = i\delta_\nu^\mu, \quad [\hat{x}^\mu, \hat{x}^\nu] = [\hat{p}_\mu, \hat{p}_\nu] = 0, \quad (3.3.14)$$

and the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} as its irreducible representation space is uniquely determined modulo the unitary equivalence.

In contrast to the example of non-relativistic particles, the constraint function of this system is quadratic in all of the momentum variables. Hence the difficulty associated with the time variable and dynamics discussed in §3.2 is expected to occur. Actually, since in the coordinate representation the weak quantum hamiltonian constraint becomes the Klein-Gordon equation for the wavefunction $\Psi(x)$:

$$(\partial^2 - m^2)\Psi(x) = 0, \quad (3.3.15)$$

the probability amplitude functional $\langle \Psi |$ is not uniquely determined by its value on a spacelike time slice.

In the present case, however, this difficulty is easily eliminated by imposing a natural additional constraint on the probability amplitude functionals. To see this, first note that the solutions of the hamiltonian constraint in the classical theory consist of two disconnected submanifolds $p^0 = \pm\omega(\mathbf{p})$ ($\omega(\mathbf{p}) = (\mathbf{p}^2 + m^2)^{1/2}$). Since the two solutions passing through $(x^\mu, \omega(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p})$ and $(x^\mu, -\omega(\mathbf{p}), -\mathbf{p})$ in these submanifolds correspond to the same trajectory in x -space, two points connected by the transformation $p^\mu \rightarrow -p^\mu$ represent the same classical state.

This degeneracy of the classical phase space should be taken into account in quantum theory. Since it is not consistent with the commutation relation to require the observables to be invariant under the transformation, the only possible way is to impose the constraint $p^0 > 0$ (or $p^0 < 0$). In the probability vector formalism this constraint is expressed as

$$\langle \Psi | \mathcal{P}_+ = \langle \Psi |, \quad (3.3.16)$$

where \mathcal{P}_+ is the projection operator defined by

$$\mathcal{P}_+ := \int d\mathbf{p} \int_0^\infty dp^0 |p \rangle \langle p|. \quad (3.3.17)$$

Under this constraint the general solution to Eq.(3.3.15) is written as

$$\Psi(x) = \int d\mathbf{p} \Psi_+(\mathbf{p}) e^{-i\omega t + i\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{x}}, \quad (3.3.18)$$

where $t = x^0$. Since this solution obeys the Schrödinger equation

$$i\partial_t \Psi(x) = \omega(\hat{\mathbf{p}}) \Psi(x), \quad (3.3.19)$$

the probability vector is uniquely fixed by its value on the states with a fixed value of t . Thus $t = x^0$ becomes a good time variable under the constraint (3.3.16).

As explained in §3.2 the treatment in this and the previous example is essentially equivalent to the deparametrization approach. Hence the same treatment is possible for the cases in which the latter approach works. For such examples see [43] and [32].

3.3.3 Minisuperspace model

As the final example, we consider the system of a spatially homogeneous real scalar field ϕ coupled to a closed Robertson-Walker geometry. We parametrize the Robertson-Walker metric as

$$ds^2 = \frac{2\kappa^2}{\Omega}[-N^2 dt^2 + \sigma \chi^I \chi^I], \quad (3.3.20)$$

where χ^I is the basis of the invariant forms on the Euclidean sphere normalized as

$$d\chi^I = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{IJK} \chi^J \wedge \chi^K, \quad (3.3.21)$$

and Ω is the coordinate volume defined by

$$\Omega = \int |\chi| d^3x = 16\pi^2. \quad (3.3.22)$$

Then the Lagrangian of the system is written as

$$L = p\dot{\sigma} + \pi\dot{\phi} - NC_H, \quad (3.3.23)$$

$$C_H = \sqrt{\sigma} \left[-\frac{1}{6} p^2 - \frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \pi^2 + \sigma V(\phi) \right]. \quad (3.3.24)$$

In contrast to the previous examples quantization of this system is not so straightforward. First it is not obvious which quantities should be taken as the fundamental variables: we can use, for example, $a = \sqrt{\sigma}$ and $2ap$, or $\alpha = \frac{1}{2} \ln \sigma$ and $2p\sigma$ in place of σ and p . Classically they are all equivalent, but after quantization they may lead to different theories. For example, since a should be positive, its conjugate momentum cannot be hermitian, while the momentum conjugate to α can be represented as a hermitian operator. A

similar problem occurs for the choice σ and p depending on whether we restrict the range of σ to $\sigma > 0$ or not.

Second we can always multiply C_H by any non-degenerate quantity by rescaling N . For example, in the chiral canonical theory, N is rescaled to $N = N/\sigma^{3/2}$, hence the expression with $\sqrt{\sigma}$ replaced by σ^2 in Eq.(3.3.24) should be used as C_H .

Third there is a large ambiguity in the operator ordering for \hat{C}_H . In quantum mechanics the ambiguity in operator ordering is often reduced by the requirement of hermiticity. However, this does not apply to the present case since \hat{C}_H need not be observable.

These ambiguities may be partly eliminated from some consistency conditions in the general quantum gravity theory, as we will see in §4. However, in the present case, they remain as the freedom in quantization. In the rest of this subsection we adopt σ and p as the fundamental variables and rescale N so that $\sqrt{\sigma}$ in Eq.(3.3.24) is eliminated for simplicity.

Let us first consider the case in which the scalar field contribution is neglected except for its constant potential energy acting as the cosmological constant. In this case the weak quantum hamiltonian constraint in the σ representation, $\Psi(\sigma) = \langle \Psi | \hat{C}_H | \sigma \rangle$, is written under the natural ordering as

$$\left(\frac{d^2}{d\sigma^2} - 9 + \lambda\sigma \right) \Psi(\sigma) = 0. \quad (3.3.25)$$

Since this equation is of second-order, the same problem as in the relativistic free particle system occurs if σ is taken as the time variable. In contrast to that case, however, there exists no natural constraint on $\Psi(\sigma)$ to eliminate this problem in the present case since there exists no degeneracy in the phase space. This does not imply no good time variable exists in this system. In fact since the hamiltonian constraint is written in the p -representation as

$$i \frac{d}{dp} \Psi(p) = -\frac{1}{\lambda} \left(p^2 + \frac{3}{2}\lambda \right) \Psi(p), \quad (3.3.26)$$

$-p$ can be taken as a good time variable. Classically this corresponds to taking the expansion rate of the universe as time. Obviously the quantum theory becomes trivial for this choice.

Unfortunately this success is specific to this simple case. The situation changes significantly if we take account of the scalar field dynamics. For

example let us consider the operator ordering of \hat{C}_H given by

$$\hat{C}_H = -\frac{1}{6}\hat{\sigma}^{-1/2}\hat{p}\hat{\sigma}\hat{p}\hat{\sigma}^{-1/2} - \frac{3}{2} + \frac{\hat{\pi}^2}{2\hat{\sigma}^2} + \hat{\sigma}V(\hat{\phi}). \quad (3.3.27)$$

Then for the potential of the form

$$V(\phi) = \sqrt{3} \left(a \cosh(\phi/\sqrt{3}) + b \sinh(\phi/\sqrt{3}) \right) \quad (3.3.28)$$

the hamiltonian constraint is exactly soluble^[51]. In fact in terms of the operators

$$\hat{x} = \sqrt{3}\hat{\sigma} \cosh(\hat{\phi}/\sqrt{3}), \quad (3.3.29)$$

$$\hat{y} = \sqrt{3}\hat{\sigma} \sinh(\hat{\phi}/\sqrt{3}), \quad (3.3.30)$$

$$\hat{p}_x = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \left(\hat{p} - \frac{i}{2\hat{\sigma}} \right) \cosh \frac{\hat{\phi}}{\sqrt{3}} - \frac{\hat{\pi}}{\hat{\sigma}} \sinh \frac{\hat{\phi}}{\sqrt{3}}, \quad (3.3.31)$$

$$\hat{p}_y = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \left(\hat{p} - \frac{i}{2\hat{\sigma}} \right) \sinh \frac{\hat{\phi}}{\sqrt{3}} + \frac{\hat{\pi}}{\hat{\sigma}} \cosh \frac{\hat{\phi}}{\sqrt{3}}, \quad (3.3.32)$$

which satisfy the standard commutation relations

$$[\hat{x}, \hat{p}_x] = i, \quad [\hat{y}, \hat{p}_y] = i, \quad \text{others} = 0, \quad (3.3.33)$$

\hat{C}_H is written as

$$\hat{C}_H = \frac{1}{2}(-\hat{p}_x^2 + \hat{p}_y^2) - \frac{3}{2} + a\hat{x} + b\hat{y}, \quad (3.3.34)$$

which is a sum of two simple decoupled systems.

The last equation suggests that, if $a \neq 0$, \hat{p}_x can be a good time variable as in the pure gravity case above. However, it is not the case. The trouble is caused by the fact that \hat{p}_x is symmetric but not hermitian. Due to this property the (p_x, y) -representation and (σ, p) -representation are not unitary equivalent.

This analysis of the simple example suggests that there exists no quantity which can be used as a good time variable universally. One should probably impose some constraint on the wavefunctions as a fundamental postulate such as the Hartle-Hawking ansatz, or restrict the observables. In the former case the choice of good time variables depends on the constraint, while in the latter case what can be predicted depends on the time variable chosen. At present we can say nothing about which approach is better.

4 Quantization of the Complex Canonical Theory

As noted in §3.2.1, in the ADM-WD theory based on the canonical theory in the metric approach, there is no gauge symmetry associated with the tetrad rotation in the phase space $\Gamma_{\text{ADM}} = \{(q_{jk}, p^{jk}, \dots)\}$. Hence as far as the gravitational fields are concerned one can start from the stage II_C^* in Table 1, and easily proceeds to the stage II_Q^* in the quantum framework at least formally. However, it is quite difficult to go to the next stage either in the classical framework or in the quantum framework.

Mathematically one can define an abstract space, called a *superspace*, as the set of diffeomorphism equivalent classes of metrics and fields on some three-dimensional manifold. If the superspace is constructed explicitly, then the cotangent bundle of the superspace will play the role of Γ_{inv} in the classical framework. This has been widely accepted as the ideal program to build the canonical quantum gravity since its proposal by Wheeler. However, little progress has so far been made on the quantum aspect of this program.

In the quantum framework the construction of the superspace is replaced by solving the spatial diffeomorphism constraint

$$\hat{C}_D(L)|\Phi\rangle = 0, \quad (4.0.1)$$

and the construction of its cotangent bundle by finding the diffeomorphism invariant operators $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\text{inv}} \subset \hat{\mathcal{O}}$. For the pure gravity case, in the representation in which \hat{q}_{jk} is diagonal, Eq.(4.0.1) is written as

$$i\delta_L\Phi[q] = -i \int d^3x \mathcal{L}_L q_{jk}(x) \frac{\delta}{\delta q_{jk}(x)} \Phi[q] = 0. \quad (4.0.2)$$

Thus the former problem is to find all the functionals on the space of metrics which are invariant under the spatial diffeomorphism transformations. Since this is almost equivalent to constructing the superspace and find a projection to it from the space of metrics, it is intractable like the corresponding classical problem. Thus, a generic class of solutions to Eq.(4.0.1) has not been constructed explicitly so far.

On the other hand the latter problem appears to be easily solved once the former problem is solved since $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\text{inv}}$ modulo the operators which vanish on \mathcal{V}_{inv} is in one-to-one correspondence with the operators in the subspace \mathcal{V}_{inv} .

However, this is not sufficient since one needs to know this correspondence explicitly to find the physical interpretation of the invariant operators.

In contrast to the ADM-WD theory the chiral canonical theory is formulated on the complex phase space $\Gamma_{\mathbf{C}} = \{(\mathcal{E}^j, \mathcal{A}_j, \dots)\}$ which is not gauge invariant. Hence one may suspect that it would be much more difficult to construct the quantum gravity theory starting from it than the ADM theory. However, it is not the case. One reason is that quite different constructions of the gauge-invariant quantities become possible in the chiral canonical theory. Another reason is the much simpler structure of equations. Owing to these features one can go at least to the same stage as in the ADM-WD approach and sometimes can go further.

In this section we will see these points in greater detail by constructing the quantum theory of the chiral canonical theory following the scheme presented in the previous section. We limit the consideration to the case of pure gravity with the cosmological constant since the cases in which material fields are coupled have not been studied well yet. Further we should remind the reader that most considerations in this section are formal and much is still to be done to make them mathematically well-defined.

4.1 Operator Algebra

First we follow the path which goes to the quantum framework at the stage I in Table 1. In this path we take \mathcal{E}^j and \mathcal{A}_j as the fundamental variables and assign to them the operators $\hat{\mathcal{E}}^j$ and $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_j$ with the commutation relations

$$\begin{aligned} [\hat{\mathcal{E}}^{Ij}(x), \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{Jk}(y)] &= \frac{i}{2} \delta_J^I \delta_k^j \delta^3(x-y), \\ [\hat{\mathcal{E}}^{Ij}(x), \hat{\mathcal{E}}^{Jk}(y)] &= [\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{Ij}(x), \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{Jk}(y)] = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.1.1)$$

The full operator algebra $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ is easily constructed from them. Thus apart from the regularization problem the remaining algebraic problem is to embed the constraint functions into this operator algebra by fixing the operator ordering.

4.1.1 Constraint operators

First there is no ordering ambiguity in the gauge constraint operator $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathbf{G}} := \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathcal{A}}$ since

$$[\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{[j|}(x), \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{K]}^j(y)] = 0. \quad (4.1.2)$$

Further it is easily checked that $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_G$ yields the generator of the $SO(3, \mathbf{C})$ gauge transformation in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$:

$$-i[\hat{\mathcal{C}}_G(\lambda), \hat{\mathcal{E}}(\phi)] = \mp 2i\kappa^2 \hat{\mathcal{E}}(\lambda \times \phi) = \delta_\lambda \hat{\mathcal{E}}(\phi), \quad (4.1.3)$$

$$-i[\hat{\mathcal{C}}_G(\lambda), \hat{\mathcal{A}}(\alpha)] = -\hat{\mathcal{D}}\lambda(\alpha) = \delta_\lambda \hat{\mathcal{A}}(\alpha). \quad (4.1.4)$$

In contrast there are some ordering ambiguities in $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_D$ due to the commutation relations

$$[\hat{\mathcal{E}}^{kI}(x), \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{Ijk}(y)] = \mp 3\kappa^2 \partial_j \delta^3(x-y), \quad (4.1.5)$$

$$[\hat{\mathcal{C}}_G^I(x), \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{Ij}(y)] = -3\kappa^2 \partial_j \delta^3(x-y). \quad (4.1.6)$$

However, this type of ambiguities can be easily eliminated by defining the products of operators at the same spatial point by

$$\hat{X}(x)\hat{Y}(x) := \lim \frac{1}{2} \left(\hat{X}(\alpha)\hat{Y}(\beta) + \hat{X}(\beta)\hat{Y}(\alpha) \right), \quad (4.1.7)$$

where $\hat{X}(\alpha)$ denotes $\int d^3x \alpha(x)\hat{X}(x)$, and \lim implies the limit $\alpha(y) \rightarrow \delta^3(y-x)$ and $\beta(y) \rightarrow \delta^3(y-x)$. Since this definition is quite natural, we adopt it throughout this paper and call it *the symmetric regularization*. Under the symmetric regularization there remains no ordering ambiguity in $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_D$ as far as one does not decompose the combinations $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{jk}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_G$, and it generates the infinitesimal coordinate transformation in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$:

$$-i[\hat{\mathcal{C}}_D(L), \hat{\mathcal{E}}(\phi)] = \hat{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{L}_L \phi) = \delta_L \hat{\mathcal{E}}(\phi), \quad (4.1.8)$$

$$-i[\hat{\mathcal{C}}_D(L), \hat{\mathcal{A}}(\alpha)] = \hat{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{L}_L \alpha) = \delta_L \hat{\mathcal{A}}(\alpha). \quad (4.1.9)$$

Since $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_G$ and $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_D$ are the generators of the transformations in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$, their commutation relations are isomorphic to the corresponding Lie algebra as in the classical theory and given by

$$[\hat{\mathcal{C}}_G(\lambda_1), \hat{\mathcal{C}}_G(\lambda_2)] = \pm 2\kappa^2 \hat{\mathcal{C}}_G(\lambda_1 \times \lambda_2), \quad (4.1.10)$$

$$[\hat{\mathcal{C}}_D(L), \hat{\mathcal{C}}_G(\lambda)] = i\hat{\mathcal{C}}_G(\mathcal{L}_L \lambda), \quad (4.1.11)$$

$$[\hat{\mathcal{C}}_D(L_1), \hat{\mathcal{C}}_D(L_2)] = i\hat{\mathcal{C}}_D([L_1, L_2]). \quad (4.1.12)$$

For the same reason the commutation relations of them with the Hamiltonian constraint operator $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_H$ have the same structure as in the classical theory

regardless of the ordering in $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{H}}$:

$$[\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{G}}(\lambda), \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{H}}(\underline{T})] = 0, \quad (4.1.13)$$

$$[\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{D}}(L), \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{H}}(\underline{T})] = i\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{H}}(\underline{\mathcal{L}}_L \underline{T}). \quad (4.1.14)$$

Unlike $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{D}}$ the ordering ambiguities in $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{H}}$ cannot be removed by the symmetric regularization since

$$[(\hat{\mathcal{E}}^j \times \hat{\mathcal{E}}^k)^I(x), \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{Ijk}(y)] = 8i\kappa^4(\hat{\mathcal{E}}^j(x) \cdot \hat{\mathcal{A}}_j(y) + \hat{\mathcal{A}}_j(y) \cdot \hat{\mathcal{E}}^j(x))\delta^3(x-y). \quad (4.1.15)$$

In this paper we only consider two orderings: the one in which all the $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$'s are located at the left to $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ and the reversed one $\hat{\mathcal{E}} \cdots \hat{\mathcal{A}} \cdots$. For these orderings the commutation relations among $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{H}}$ are given by

$$[\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{H}}(\underline{T}_1), \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{H}}(\underline{T}_2)] = i\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{M}}(\hat{L}) = i(\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{D}}(\hat{L}) - \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{G}}(\hat{L} \cdot \hat{A})), \quad (4.1.16)$$

where \hat{L} is given by

$$\hat{L}^j = (\hat{\mathcal{E}}^j \cdot \hat{\mathcal{E}}^k)(\underline{T}_2 \partial_k \underline{T}_1 - \underline{T}_1 \partial_k \underline{T}_2), \quad (4.1.17)$$

and the same ordering as in $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{H}}$ is supposed to be taken in $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{M}}(\hat{L})$.

4.1.2 Reality condition

As explained in §2.3.5, in order for the complex canonical theory to be equivalent to the general relativity theory, the reality condition must be satisfied. In the classical theory this condition had to be imposed not as a constraint on states but as a condition to reduce the freedom to the physical one and cut out a physical phase space from the formal complex phase space. Accordingly in the quantum theory it must be implemented as operator equations. Since the complex conjugation is replaced by the star operation in the quantum theory, from Eqs.(2.3.67) and (2.3.70), they are expressed at the formal algebraic level as the polynomial relations

$$(\hat{\mathcal{E}}^j \cdot \hat{\mathcal{E}}^k)^* = \hat{\mathcal{E}}^j \cdot \hat{\mathcal{E}}^k, \quad (4.1.18)$$

$$(\hat{\psi}^{jk})^* = -\hat{\psi}^{jk}. \quad (4.1.19)$$

Though these conditions are not expressed in terms of the invariant operators, the conditions themselves are invariant under the gauge and the spatial diffeomorphism transformations. Hence they are expected to be consistently translated to conditions on the star operation on the invariant operators. Then by requiring the star operation to be realized as the hermitian conjugation, they yield the conditions on the inner product to be constructed in \mathcal{V}_{inv} .

Thus the reality condition can be consistently built into the operator formalism formally. However, it is expected to be highly non-trivial task to construct the inner product consistent with it. To see this, let us consider the case in which the spatial gauge is imposed before quantization. In this gauge $\mathcal{E}^j = \tilde{e}^j$ is restricted to be real, and the second reality condition is explicitly solved to be expressed by Eq.(2.3.80) with the real quantity P_j in the classical theory. Hence after quantization the reality conditions are expressed as

$$(\hat{\mathcal{E}}^j)^* = \hat{\mathcal{E}}^j, \quad (4.1.20)$$

$$(\hat{\mathcal{A}}_j)^* = \hat{\mathcal{A}}_j \mp \frac{i}{\kappa^2} Q_j(\hat{\mathcal{E}}). \quad (4.1.21)$$

Since the gauge freedom of the tetrad is restricted to the local $SO(3)$ rotation in this gauge, these conditions are gauge and spatial diffeomorphism invariant again.

Here note that from the identity equation (2.3.89) $Q_j(e)$ is expressed as

$$Q_j(e) = \kappa^2 \frac{\delta W(\tilde{e})}{\delta \tilde{e}^j}, \quad (4.1.22)$$

where W is the functional

$$W(\mathcal{E}) := \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} \int d^3x (\mathcal{E}^j \times \mathcal{E}_k) \cdot \partial_j \mathcal{E}^k. \quad (4.1.23)$$

Here $\mathcal{E}_j = (\mathcal{E}_{Ij})$ is the inverse of $\mathcal{E}^j = (\mathcal{E}^{Ij})$. W is a homogeneous functional of degree one, spatial diffeomorphism invariant, and transforms under the infinitesimal triad rotation

$$\delta \tilde{e}^j = 2\kappa^2 \lambda \times \tilde{e}^j \quad (\lambda : \text{real}), \quad (4.1.24)$$

as

$$\delta W(\tilde{e}) = 2 \int d^3x \tilde{e}^j \cdot \partial_j \lambda. \quad (4.1.25)$$

From these properties it follows that the quantity Z defined by

$$Z(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}) := 2 \int d^3x \mathcal{E}^j \cdot \mathcal{A}_j \mp iW(\mathcal{E}) \quad (4.1.26)$$

is a functional invariant under the gauge and spatial diffeomorphism transformations as well as the star operation. This quantity will be used in the formal construction of the inner product in the next section.

4.2 Connection Representation

In order to construct a definite quantum theory, we must construct a representation of the operator algebra on a linear vector space where some inner product is eventually introduced. In contrast to the quantum mechanics of systems with finite degrees of freedom the explicit construction of representation is quite important in systems with infinite degrees of freedom since different representations in general lead to different quantum theories.

In the ADM or the real canonical theories the most natural representation at the stage I_Q is the one in which the operator corresponding to the metric or the triad is diagonal. In contrast in the complex canonical theory another representation in which the connection operator is diagonal is possible and may be much better than the triad representation at least as far as we start from the stage I_Q . Since this representation corresponds to a kind of the Bargmann representation or the coherent state representation of the real canonical theory, we first recapitulate some basic facts of the Bargmann representation in a somewhat generalized form.

4.2.1 Bargmann representation

For a quantum mechanical system with the fundamental canonical variables \hat{q} and \hat{p} let us consider the operator $\hat{\alpha}$ defined by

$$\hat{\alpha} := \hat{p} + i\partial_q w(\hat{q}) = e^{w(\hat{q})} \hat{p} e^{-w(\hat{q})}. \quad (4.2.1)$$

Though in the standard Bargmann theory $w(q)$ is given by a positive definite quadratic functions, we do not impose such restriction here with the application to the gravity theory in mind.

Since $\hat{\alpha}$ is not hermitian, the eigenvalues of its hermitian conjugate $\hat{\alpha}^\dagger$ are complex. Let us label the corresponding eigenvectors as

$$\hat{\alpha}^\dagger|\alpha\rangle = \bar{\alpha}|\alpha\rangle. \quad (4.2.2)$$

We normalize them in terms of their q representation as

$$\langle q|\alpha\rangle = e^{i\bar{\alpha}q-w(q)}. \quad (4.2.3)$$

These eigenvectors are not mutually orthogonal:

$$\langle \alpha'|\alpha\rangle = \int dq e^{i(\bar{\alpha}-\bar{\alpha}')q-2w(q)}. \quad (4.2.4)$$

However, they are overcomplete and satisfy the simple completeness relation

$$\mathbf{1} = \int \frac{d\alpha d\bar{\alpha}}{4\pi^2} \mu(2\text{Im}\alpha) |\alpha\rangle \langle \alpha|, \quad (4.2.5)$$

where $d\alpha d\bar{\alpha} = 2d\alpha_1 d\alpha_2$ for $\alpha = \alpha_1 + i\alpha_2$ and μ is given by

$$\mu(x) := \int dq e^{-ixq+2w(iq)}. \quad (4.2.6)$$

In terms of these eigenvectors let us assign a function $\Phi(\alpha)$ on the complex space to each state vector $|\Phi\rangle$ by

$$\Phi(\alpha) := \langle \alpha|\Phi\rangle = \int dq e^{-i\alpha q-w(q)} \tilde{\Phi}(q), \quad (4.2.7)$$

where $\tilde{\Phi}(q)$ is a wavefunction in the q -representation. Then in the representation defined by this assignment the operators are represented as

$$\hat{\alpha}|\Phi\rangle \rightarrow \alpha\Phi(\alpha), \quad (4.2.8)$$

$$\hat{q}|\Phi\rangle \rightarrow i\frac{\partial}{\partial\alpha}\Phi(\alpha). \quad (4.2.9)$$

If $w(q)$ is chosen so that the integrand in Eq.(4.2.7) is square integrable for any value of α and any square integrable function $\tilde{\Phi}(q)$, $\Phi(\alpha)$ yields a representation of the state vector by a holomorphic function. This is the most important features of the Bargmann representation.

From the completeness relation (4.2.5) the inner product is expressed as

$$\langle \Phi_1 | \Phi_2 \rangle = \int \frac{d\alpha d\bar{\alpha}}{4\pi^2} \mu(2\text{Im}\alpha) \overline{\Phi_1(\alpha)} \Phi_2(\alpha). \quad (4.2.10)$$

The completeness relation also yields the inversion formula of Eq.(4.2.7):

$$\tilde{\Phi}(q) = e^{-w(q)} \int \frac{d\alpha d\bar{\alpha}}{4\pi^2} \mu(2\text{Im}\alpha) e^{i\bar{\alpha}q} \Phi(\alpha). \quad (4.2.11)$$

In the case $\Phi(\alpha)$ is holomorphic, it is completely determined from its values on the real axis. As a result the inversion formula can be also expressed in terms of a contour integral

$$\tilde{\Phi}(q) = e^{w(q)} \int_C d\alpha e^{i\alpha q} \Phi(\alpha), \quad (4.2.12)$$

where the integration contour C is the real axis.

Some comments are in order here. First, though we have considered a one-dimensional system so far, this restriction is not essential and the extension of the formulation to multi-dimensional cases are straightforward. Second the transformation (4.2.7) in general yields holomorphic functions for a wider class of functional space V than $L_2(\mathbf{R}^n)$. In this extension the holomorphic functions corresponding to the normalizable states are characterized by the condition that the inner product Eq.(4.2.10) is finite. Third we can regard Eqs.(4.2.8) and (4.2.9) as defining a representation of the operator algebra on the space of holomorphic functions. In this case, we can show that if we require that the hermitian conjugate operator to $\hat{\alpha}$ is given by $\hat{\alpha}^\dagger = \hat{\alpha} - 2iw(\hat{q})$ and the inner product is expressed in the form (4.2.10), μ is uniquely determined to be given by Eq.(4.2.6). We call this representation *the holomorphic representation*.

4.2.2 Holomorphic connection representation

The chiral connection \mathcal{A}_j is a complex quantity, and has an expression similar to the variable α in Eq(4.2.1) in the spatial gauge as explained in §4.1.2. This suggests that it is natural to consider the holomorphic representation of the chiral canonical theory^[15].

Let us define a holomorphic functional $\Phi[\mathcal{A}]$ as a functional on the space \mathcal{C} of chiral connection \mathcal{A}_j such that $\Phi[\mathcal{A} + \sum_{a=1}^A z_a \phi^a]$ is a holomorphic function

of $(z_a) \in \mathbf{C}^A$ for any set of smooth field $\phi_{I_j}^a(x)$ and any number A . Then the holomorphic representation of the chiral operators $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_j$ and $\hat{\mathcal{E}}^j$ on the space \mathcal{C}^ω of holomorphic functional $\Phi[\mathcal{A}]$ is defined by

$$\hat{\mathcal{A}}(\alpha)|\Phi\rangle \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(\alpha)\Phi[\mathcal{A}], \quad (4.2.13)$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}(\phi)|\Phi\rangle \rightarrow \frac{i}{2} \int d^3x \phi_{I_j}(x) \frac{\delta}{\delta \mathcal{A}_{I_j}(x)} \Phi[\mathcal{A}] := \left. \frac{d}{dz} \Phi[\mathcal{A} + z\phi] \right|_{z=0} \quad (4.2.14)$$

It is easily checked that the commutation relations (4.1.1) are corrected represented. We call this *the holomorphic connection representation*.

By extending the correspondence between $\Phi(\alpha)$ and $\tilde{\Phi}(q)$ in the Bargmann representation, we can formally construct a transformation between the holomorphic functional $\Phi[\mathcal{A}]$ and the wavefunctional $\tilde{\Phi}[\tilde{e}]$ in the triad representation of the real canonical formalism defined by

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}(\phi)|\Phi\rangle \rightarrow \tilde{e}(\phi)\tilde{\Phi}[\tilde{e}], \quad (4.2.15)$$

$$\hat{P}(\chi)|\Phi\rangle \rightarrow \frac{1}{2i} \int d^3x \chi^{I_j}(x) \frac{\delta}{\delta \tilde{e}^{I_j}(x)} \tilde{\Phi}[\tilde{e}], \quad (4.2.16)$$

as

$$\Phi[\mathcal{A}] = \int [D\tilde{e}] e^{-2i\mathcal{A}(\tilde{e}) \mp W(\tilde{e})} \tilde{\Phi}[\tilde{e}] = \int [D\tilde{e}] e^{-iZ(\mathcal{A}, \tilde{e})} \tilde{\Phi}[\tilde{e}]. \quad (4.2.17)$$

Further we can define the formal inner product in \mathcal{C}^ω by

$$\langle \Phi_1 | \Phi_2 \rangle := \int [D\mathcal{A} D\bar{\mathcal{A}}] \Delta[\mathcal{A}] \mu[4\text{Im}\mathcal{A}] \overline{\Phi_1[\mathcal{A}]} \Phi_2[\mathcal{A}], \quad (4.2.18)$$

where, by noting that $W[\tilde{e}]$ is a homogeneous functional of \tilde{e}^j of degree one, $\mu[\mathcal{A}]$ is expressed as

$$\mu[X] := \int [D\tilde{e}] e^{-i\tilde{e}(X) \pm 2iW(\tilde{e})}. \quad (4.2.19)$$

This inner product respects the reality condition formally at least if $\Delta[\mathcal{A}]$ is taken to be unity.

As we will see soon, $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{inv}}$ is represented by a gauge and spatial diffeomorphism invariant functional. If the measure $[D\tilde{e}]$ is invariant under the gauge and the spatial-diffeomorphism, this invariance of the wavefunction is respected by the transform (4.2.17) since $Z(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ is an invariant functional

as shown in §4.1.2. For the same reason $\mu[4\text{Im}\mathcal{A}]$ is also an invariant functional. This invariance, however, makes the definition of the inner product ill-defined since the functional integration along the noncompact gauge-orbits will diverge if the measure $[D\mathcal{A}D\bar{\mathcal{A}}]\Delta[\mathcal{A}]$ is invariant. Thus in order to make the inner product (4.2.18) well-defined for the invariant states, we must take a gauge-variant functional or distribution as $\Delta[\mathcal{A}]$.

For real $SO(3)$ gauge fields it is shown by Ashtekar and Isham^[59] using the Gel'fand spectral theory that there exists a natural measure which leads to a well-defined inner product for the gauge-invariant wavefunctions. However, nothing definite is known in the cases in which the symmetry is extended to the gauge theories with non-compact groups or to the spatial diffeomorphism. Thus at present we can say nothing about whether we can find an appropriate measure $\Delta[\mathcal{A}]$.

4.2.3 Invariant states

In the holomorphic connection representation the action of the gauge constraint operator is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathcal{C}}_G(\lambda)\Phi[\mathcal{A}] &= -i \int d^3x \mathcal{D}_j \lambda \cdot \frac{\delta}{\delta \mathcal{A}_j} \Phi[\mathcal{A}] \\ &= i \left. \frac{d}{dz} \Phi[\mathcal{A} - z \mathcal{D}_j \lambda] \right|_{z=0} \\ &= i \delta_\lambda \Phi[\mathcal{A}].\end{aligned}\tag{4.2.20}$$

Hence the gauge constraint is equivalent to the condition that $\Phi[\mathcal{A}]$ is gauge invariant. Similarly, since the action of the diffeomorphism constraint operator is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathcal{C}}_D(L)\Phi[\mathcal{A}] &= -i \int d^3x \mathcal{L}_L \mathcal{A}_j \cdot \frac{\delta}{\delta \mathcal{A}_j} \Phi[\mathcal{A}] \\ &= i \left. \frac{d}{dz} \Phi[\mathcal{A} - z \mathcal{L}_L \mathcal{A}] \right|_{z=0} \\ &= i \delta_L \Phi[\mathcal{A}],\end{aligned}\tag{4.2.21}$$

the diffeomorphism constraint implies that $\Phi[\mathcal{A}]$ is spatial-diffeomorphism invariant.

Thus \mathcal{V}_{inv} is characterized as the linear space of gauge and spatial-diffeomorphism invariant holomorphic functionals in the holomorphic connection representation. Though this characterization is mathematically clear enough, it is too implicit to get a clear image of the structure of the state space and find the physical interpretation of states, like the superspace construction of \mathcal{V}_{inv} in the ADM-WD approach. We need a more explicit parametrization of the states. One of the most important features of the complex canonical theory is that we can construct such a parametrization with the help of the Wilson-loop type integral^[15].

Let γ be a closed curve $\gamma(s) = (x^j(s))$ ($\gamma(0) = \gamma(1)$) and define the matrix representing the parallel transport with respect to the $SL(2, \mathbf{C})$ connection \mathcal{A}_j along γ from $\gamma(s_0)$ to $\gamma(s)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} U_\gamma(s_0, s) &:= P_\gamma \exp \left[-\kappa^2 \int_{\gamma(s_0)}^{\gamma(s)} dx^j \mathcal{A}_j \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} \right] \\ &= P_\gamma \exp \left[\mp \frac{i}{2} \int_{\gamma(s_0)}^{\gamma(s)} dx^j \mathcal{B}_j \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (4.2.22)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (\sigma_I)$ is the Pauli matrix and P_γ is the path-ordered product whose precise definition is given by the differential equation for $U_\gamma(s_0, s)$,

$$\frac{d}{ds} U_\gamma(s_0, s) = -\kappa^2 U_\gamma(s_0, s) \dot{x}^j \mathcal{A}_j \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \quad (4.2.23)$$

$$U_\gamma(s_0, s_0) = 1. \quad (4.2.24)$$

Since $\mathcal{A}_j \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ transforms by the gauge transformation $V(x) \in SL(2, \mathbf{C})$ as

$$\mathcal{A}_j \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} \rightarrow V \mathcal{A}_j \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} V^{-1} - \kappa^{-2} \partial_j V V^{-1}, \quad (4.2.25)$$

it is shown from the above differential equation that $U_\gamma(s_0, s)$ transforms as

$$U_\gamma(s_0, s) \rightarrow V(\gamma(s_0)) U_\gamma(s_0, s) V(\gamma(s))^{-1}. \quad (4.2.26)$$

Hence the quantity defined by

$$T_\gamma[\mathcal{A}] := \text{Tr} U_\gamma(0, 1) \quad (4.2.27)$$

is gauge invariant.

An important property of these gauge invariant functionals is that if the values of $T_\gamma[(i/2\kappa^2)Q]$ for all the closed loops are given, the $SO(3)$ gauge-equivalent class of the real connection Q is uniquely specified. An elegant proof is given by Ashtekar and Isham^[59] using a general theory of embedding the holonomy group into a compact group. Here we give a more direct proof.

Let $\Omega(x_0)$ be the space of loops which pass through x_0 , and U_γ be the $SU(2)$ matrix obtained from $U_\gamma(0, 1)$ with \mathcal{A}_j replaced by $(i/2\kappa^2)Q_j$. Then U_γ and its trace T_γ are expressed in terms of some vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\gamma = (\theta_\gamma^I)$ as

$$U_\gamma = e^{i\frac{\boldsymbol{\theta}_\gamma \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}}{2}} = \cos \frac{\theta_\gamma}{2} + i\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\gamma \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} \sin \frac{\theta_\gamma}{2}, \quad (4.2.28)$$

$$T_\gamma = 2 \cos \frac{\theta_\gamma}{2}, \quad (4.2.29)$$

where $\theta_\gamma = |\boldsymbol{\theta}_\gamma|$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\gamma = \boldsymbol{\theta}_\gamma/\theta_\gamma$. Since two connections are equivalent if U_γ coincides for all closed loops in $\Omega(x_0)$ apart from the inner automorphism by a constant $SU(2)$ matrix, the statement is proved if we can show that $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\gamma$ is completely determined by the values of T_γ apart from its rotational freedom independent of γ .

First for the case $T_\gamma = \pm 2$ for any loop γ , U_γ is determined to be $U_\gamma = T_\gamma/2$, which implies the connection is trivial apart from the possible \mathbf{Z}_2 representations of the fundamental group π_1 of the space. Next for the case T_γ takes values different from ± 2 for some loops, let us take one such loop α and fix it. By an appropriate $SU(2)$ transformation we can put $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\alpha$ to $(0, 0, 1)$. Then since $T_{\gamma\alpha}$ is expressed as

$$T_{\gamma\alpha} = \text{Tr}U_\gamma U_\alpha = 2 \cos \frac{\theta_\gamma}{2} \cos \frac{\theta_\alpha}{2} - 2\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\gamma \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\alpha \sin \frac{\theta_\gamma}{2} \sin \frac{\theta_\alpha}{2}, \quad (4.2.30)$$

we can determine θ_γ^3 by the values of T_γ , T_α and $T_{\gamma\alpha}$. If $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\gamma^3 = \pm 1$ for any loop γ , the connection is reducible to $U(1)$ -connection and U_γ is completely determined from T_γ . On the other hand if there exists a loop β for which $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\beta^3 \neq \pm 1$, by an appropriate $SU(2)$ rotation which leaves $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\alpha$ invariant, we can put $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\beta$ to be $(0, \hat{\theta}_\beta^2, \hat{\theta}_\beta^3)$. Since $\hat{\theta}_\beta^3$ is known, the value of $\hat{\theta}_\beta^2 (\neq 0)$ is also fixed. Hence by the same argument as on $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\alpha$, we can determine θ_γ^2 by the values of T_γ , T_β and $T_{\gamma\beta}$. Since the angle θ_γ is determined only by T_γ , this completes the proof.

This property of the gauge-invariant functionals $T_\gamma[\mathcal{A}]$ implies that any holomorphic gauge-invariant functional $\Phi[\mathcal{A}]$ can be expressed as some functional on the set of $T_\gamma[\mathcal{A}]$, since $\Phi[\mathcal{A}]$ is determined by $\Phi[i\text{Im}\mathcal{A}]$. This in turn implies that a holomorphic functional $\Phi[\mathcal{A}]$ which is invariant under the $SO(3)$ gauge transformations is automatically $SO(3, \mathbf{C})$ gauge invariant.

Another important property of T_γ is that they are not independent. First from its definition the relation

$$T_{\gamma\alpha\alpha^{-1}} = T_\gamma \quad (4.2.31)$$

holds for any loops γ and α . Second from the relation for $U \in SL(2, \mathbf{C})$,

$$\sigma_2 U \sigma_2 = \mathcal{U}^{-1}, \quad (4.2.32)$$

it follows that

$$\sigma_2 U_\gamma(0, 1) \sigma_2 = \mathcal{U}_{\gamma^{-1}}(0, 1). \quad (4.2.33)$$

Hence T_γ is independent of the orientation of the loop:

$$T_\gamma = T_{\gamma^{-1}}. \quad (4.2.34)$$

Third from the equation

$$T_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2} T_\alpha T_\beta - 2\hat{\theta}_\alpha \cdot \hat{\theta}_\beta \sin \frac{\theta_\alpha}{2} \sin \frac{\theta_\beta}{2}, \quad (4.2.35)$$

noting that $\hat{\theta}_{\beta^{-1}} = -\hat{\theta}_\beta$, we obtain the relations

$$T_{\alpha\beta} = T_{\beta\alpha}, \quad (4.2.36)$$

$$T_{\alpha\beta} + T_{\alpha\beta^{-1}} = T_\alpha T_\beta. \quad (4.2.37)$$

The final relation shows that any product of a finite number of T_γ 's is expressed as a linear combination of T_γ 's. Thus together with the gauge-orbit separating property of T_γ proved above, it is expected that a wide class of holomorphic gauge-invariant functionals $\Phi[\mathcal{A}]$ are expressed formally as

$$\Phi[\mathcal{A}] = \int_{\gamma \in \Omega} \mu(\gamma) \Phi[\gamma] T_\gamma[\mathcal{A}], \quad (4.2.38)$$

where $\mu(\gamma)$ is some fixed measure in the loop space Ω of loops with no fixed point and $\Phi[\gamma]$ is a functional on Ω .

For the class of functionals of this form, the requirement of diffeomorphism invariance is translated to a condition on the measure $\mu(\gamma)\Phi[\gamma]$. To see this, first note that from the differential equation (4.2.23) the change of $U_\gamma(s_0, s)$ by an infinitesimal coordinate transformation $x^j \rightarrow x^j + L^j$ is represented as

$$U_\gamma(s_0, s; \mathcal{A} - \mathcal{L}_L \mathcal{A}) = U_{\gamma-L}(s_0, s; \mathcal{A}). \quad (4.2.39)$$

From this equation it follows that the action of a spatial diffeomorphism g on T_γ is expressed as

$$gT_\gamma[\mathcal{A}] := T_\gamma[g^{-1}\mathcal{A}] = T_{g\gamma}[\mathcal{A}]. \quad (4.2.40)$$

Hence $\Phi[\mathcal{A}]$ is diffeomorphism invariant if the measure $\mu(\gamma)\Phi[\gamma]$ is diffeomorphism invariant:

$$\mu(g\gamma)\Phi[g\gamma] = \mu(\gamma)\Phi[\gamma]. \quad (4.2.41)$$

Since any diffeomorphism invariant functional on the loop space depends on loops only through the knot invariants of them, this implies that each diffeomorphism functional in the class represented by Eq.(4.2.38) is expressed formally in terms of a functional $\Phi[L] = \Phi(L_1, L_2, \dots)$ on the knot invariants and a fixed measure $\mu(L)$ of the space of knot invariants as

$$\Phi[\mathcal{A}] = \int_{\Omega} \mu(L(\gamma))\Phi[L(\gamma)]T_\gamma[\mathcal{A}]. \quad (4.2.42)$$

Thus if we restrict the states to those expressed as in Eq.(4.2.38), the construction of the explicit parametrization of the invariant states is reduced to the following two problems:

- i) Determination of all the knot invariants,
- ii) Construction of the measure $\mu[L]$ on the space of knot invariants.

However, there exist some hidden difficulties in this parametrization. First it is not clear whether the states of the form (4.2.38) are dense in the physical state space \mathcal{H} . Second, as $T_\gamma[\mathcal{A}]$'s are not independent, $\Phi[\mathcal{A}]$ is not in one-to-one correspondence with $\Phi[\gamma]$, but is parametrized by some equivalent class of loop space functionals. We cannot determine this equivalent class explicitly at present since we do not know the full linear relations among T_γ 's.

4.2.4 Invariant operators

In order to give the correspondence between the theory and observations, one must construct the invariant operators $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\text{inv}}$ from the gauge-variant quantities and determine their operation on the invariant state space \mathcal{V}_{inv} .

As for the gauge-invariant operators one possible generating set can be constructed with the help of the Wilson-loop type integrals. To see this, we first show that the set of gauge-invariant functionals on the complex phase space, $T_\gamma[\mathcal{A}]$ defined by Eq.(4.2.27) and $T_\gamma^{(n)}[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}] = T_\gamma^{j_1, \dots, j_n}(s_1, \dots, s_n)[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}]$ defined by

$$T_\gamma^{j_1, \dots, j_n}(s_1, \dots, s_n)[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}] := \text{Tr} \left[U_\gamma(0, s_1) \mathcal{E}^{j_1}(\gamma(s_1)) \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} U_\gamma(s_1, s_2) \cdots \right. \\ \left. \cdots \mathcal{E}^{j_n}(\gamma(s_n)) \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} U_\gamma(s_n, 1) \right] \quad (4.2.43)$$

generate the holomorphic subset of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{G}}(\Gamma_{\mathbf{C}})$. Due to the holomorphic requirement we can restrict the consideration to the subspace of $\Gamma_{\mathbf{C}} = \{(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{A})\}$ such that \mathcal{A} is a pure imaginary $SO(3)$ connection, and the gauge group to $SO(3)$. Under this restriction $T_\gamma[\mathcal{A}]$ separates the gauge equivalent class of \mathcal{A} . Hence what we have to prove is that we can determine \mathcal{E} from the values of $T_\gamma^{(1)}, T_\gamma^{(2)}, \dots$, for a fixed \mathcal{A} modulo the $SO(3)$ gauge transformations which leave \mathcal{A} invariant.

We only need to consider the case in which the base manifold M is connected. Let us fix a point $x_0 \in M$ and assign to each point $x \in M$ a path γ_x connecting x_0 and x . Then $\mathcal{E}^j(x)$ is completely determined by the values of $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^j(x)$ defined by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^j(x) \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} := U_{\gamma_x^{-1}} \mathcal{E}^j(x) \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} U_{\gamma_x}, \quad (4.2.44)$$

which transforms under the gauge transformation $V(x) \in SU(2)$ as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^j(x) \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} \rightarrow V(x_0) \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^j(x) \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} V(x_0)^{-1}. \quad (4.2.45)$$

In terms of U_α used in the previous subsection $T_{\gamma_x \alpha \gamma_x}^{(1)}$ with \mathcal{E} inserted at x is expressed as

$$\text{Tr} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^j(x) \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} U_\alpha = \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^j \cdot \hat{\theta}_\alpha \sin \frac{\theta_\alpha}{2}. \quad (4.2.46)$$

Hence if the vector space spanned by $\{\hat{\theta}_\alpha | \alpha \in \Omega_{x_0}\}$ is three-dimensional, $T_{\gamma_x \alpha \gamma_x}^{(1)}$ determines \mathcal{E}^j completely.

On the other hand if the dimension of the vector space is smaller than 3, the connection \mathcal{A} is reducible to a $U(1)$ or trivial one. First for the case $U(1)$ reductive, U_α can be put in a form $U_\alpha = \cos \frac{\theta_\alpha}{2} + i\sigma_3 \sin \frac{\theta_\alpha}{2}$. Hence $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{3j}$ is determined by $T_{\gamma_x \alpha \gamma_x^{-1}}^{(1)}$. Further in this gauge the residual gauge transformation V is written as $V = \cos \frac{\theta}{2} + i\sigma_3 \sin \frac{\theta}{2}$ with a constant θ . The independent combinations of $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^j(x)$ invariant under this constant rotation are given by $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{3j}$ and $\sum_{I=1,2} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{Ij}(x) \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{Ik}(x')$. The latter can be replaced by $\text{Tr}[\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^j(x) \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^k(x') \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}]$ which is of the type $T_\gamma^{(2)}$. Hence the gauge equivalent class of \mathcal{E}^j is completely determined by $T_\gamma^{(1)}$ and $T_\gamma^{(2)}$ in this case. Finally for the case the connection is trivial, the residual gauge freedom is represented by an arbitrary constant matrix of $SU(2)$ under the gauge $\mathcal{A} = 0$. The independent combinations of $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^j$ invariant under this residual gauge freedom is given by $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^j \cdot \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^k$. Hence the gauge equivalent class is determined by $T_\gamma^{(2)}$. $T_\gamma^{(1)}$ vanishes in this case. This completes the proof of the statement.

Thus we can take $T_\gamma[\mathcal{A}]$ and $T_\gamma^{(1)}[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}]$ as fundamental gauge-invariant variables in the classical theory since the reductive connections form a subset of measure zero (for a more detailed treatment on the completeness of the loop variables, see [60]). This suggests that $T_\gamma[\hat{\mathcal{A}}]$ and $T_\gamma^{(1)}[\hat{\mathcal{A}}, \hat{\mathcal{E}}]$ can be taken as the fundamental operators in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_G$.

In contrast to the construction of the invariant state, there is a serious problem in constructing a generating set of diffeomorphism invariant operators from these loop-integral-type operators. Of course as for the operators depending only on $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$, a formal construction is possible with the help of the loop space integration introduced in the previous subsection as

$$\hat{T}_\Phi = \int_\Omega \mu(L(\gamma)) \Phi[L(\gamma)] T_\gamma[\hat{\mathcal{A}}]. \quad (4.2.47)$$

However, this formal prescription does not work in constructing invariant operators depending on $\hat{\mathcal{E}}^j$ from $T_\gamma^{(n)}[\hat{\mathcal{A}}, \hat{\mathcal{E}}]$ since we need covariant tensor densities to make them scalar. The only covariant tensor density which does not include the inverse of $\hat{\mathcal{E}}^j$ is ϵ_{jkl} . However, this is not sufficient to produce all the invariant operators (cf. [29]).

For example let us consider the gauge and diffeomorphism invariant quantity Z introduced in §4.1.2. This quantity has a clear physical meaning. In fact from Eq.(2.2.95) Z is expressed in terms of the ADM variables as

$$Z(\mathcal{A}, \tilde{e}) = 2 \int d^3x \tilde{e}^j \cdot P_j = \frac{1}{\kappa^2} \int d^3x \sqrt{q} K. \quad (4.2.48)$$

Hence noting that $\sqrt{q}K$ is written from Eq.(2.1.11) as

$$\sqrt{q}K = \frac{1}{N} \left(-\dot{\sqrt{q}} + \partial_j(\sqrt{q}N^j) \right), \quad (4.2.49)$$

we see that Z represents the expansion rate of the total spatial volume in the spatially compact cases.

Since the definition of Z can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \pm \frac{i}{2\kappa^2} \int d^3x q^{-1} q_{jk} (\mathcal{E}^j \times \mathcal{D}_l \mathcal{E}^k) \cdot \mathcal{E}^l \\ &= \pm \frac{i}{2\kappa^2} \int d^3x (\mathcal{E} \cdot \mathcal{E})_{jk}^{-1} \psi^{jk}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.2.50)$$

where $(\mathcal{E} \cdot \mathcal{E})_{jk}^{-1}$ is the inverse matrix of $\mathcal{E}^j \cdot \mathcal{E}^k$, Z is guaranteed to be real by the generic reality conditions in the classical framework. This expression, however, causes a problem in the quantum framework since it contains the inverse of \mathcal{E}^j . In particular it seems to be quite hard to give Z a regular expression in terms of the loop variables. Nevertheless, as it is a natural physical quantity, it should not be excluded from \mathcal{O}_{inv} . This simple example suggests that we should allow quantities with some singularities to be included in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\text{inv}}$, though all the expressions are simple polynomials at the stage where the spatial diffeomorphism invariance is not respected.

Beside this there occurs another subtle problem if we take the loop variables as the fundamental operators. To see this, let us consider the problem to express in terms of the loop variables the local gauge-invariant quantities written in terms of \mathcal{E}^j and \mathcal{A}_j . Due to the local nature of the gauge transformation, most of them are written as products of fields at the same spatial point. This implies that the local gauge-invariant quantities can be constructed only as a limit. For example qq^{jk} is expressed as

$$q(x)q^{jk}(x) = \mathcal{E}^j(x) \cdot \mathcal{E}^k(x) = \frac{1}{2} \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow x} T_\gamma^{jk}, \quad (4.2.51)$$

where $\gamma \rightarrow x$ implies to shrink the loop to a point x .

The expressions for the constraint functions become much more intricate because they contain the curvature tensor. To derive them, consider a one-parameter-family of loops $\gamma_\tau(s) = (x^j(s, \tau))$ with a common base point $\gamma_\tau(0)$. Then by differentiating Eq.(4.2.23) by τ , we obtain the following differential

equation for $U = U_{\gamma_\tau}(s_0, s)$:

$$\partial_s \left[(\partial_\tau U + \kappa^2 U \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathcal{A}_j \partial_\tau x^j) U^{-1} \right] = \frac{i}{2} U \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathcal{F}_{jk} U^{-1} \partial_s x^j \partial_\tau x^k. \quad (4.2.52)$$

If the curves γ_τ differ only within an interval $s_0 < s < s_1$, integration of this equation yields

$$\partial_\tau U(s_0, s_1) = \frac{i}{2} \int_{s_0}^{s_1} ds U(s_0, s) \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathcal{F}_{jk} U(s, s_1) \partial_s x^j \partial_\tau x^k. \quad (4.2.53)$$

From this equation we find that the variation of $T_\gamma^{(n)}$ by an infinitesimal deformation to the k -coordinate direction of the curve γ at a point $\gamma(s)$, when divided by the area swept by the deformation, yields $T_\gamma^{(n+1)}$ obtained by inserting $\pm(i/2)\dot{\gamma}^j \mathcal{F}_{jk} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ to $T_\gamma^{(n)}$ at $\gamma(s)$. Let us denote this area derivative by $\dot{\gamma}^j(s) \Delta_{jk}(s) T_\gamma^{(n)}$. Then the momentum and the hamiltonian constraint functions are expressed in terms of the loop variables as

$$\mathcal{C}_{Mj}(x) = -\frac{1}{\kappa^2} \lim_{\gamma_j \rightarrow x} \Delta_{jk}(s) T_\gamma^k(s), \quad (4.2.54)$$

$$\mathcal{C}_H(x) = \pm \frac{1}{\kappa^2} \sum_j \lim_{\gamma_j \rightarrow x} \Delta_{jk}(s) T_\gamma^{jk}(s, s), \quad (4.2.55)$$

where the loop γ_j is chosen so that $\dot{\gamma}_j^k(s) = \delta_j^k$.

4.3 Loop Space Representation

In the previous subsection we have seen that the classical loop variables $T_\gamma[\mathcal{A}]$ and $T_\gamma^{(1)}[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}]$ are complete at least in the space of the holomorphic functionals on the complex phase space and that a family of gauge-invariant operators can be constructed from them. We have also seen that a wide class of gauge-invariant states are represented by functionals on loop space at least formally. These results strongly suggest that one may construct a quantum theory at the stage Π_Q by directly quantizing the loop variables and representing them on the space of functionals on the loop space without referring to the connection or the tetrad. Actually Rovelli and Smolin showed that this observation is correct and proposed a new quantization program of the chiral canonical theory called *the loop space representation*^[20]. Since lots of excellent reviews have been published on this approach^[36, 37, 38, 29], we present here only its basic features and potential problems.

4.3.1 Algebra of loop variables

In order to construct a quantum theory based only on the loop variables, we must first show that they form a closed algebra under the Poisson bracket in the classical framework. It is easy to see that this requirement is satisfied at least formally. In fact the Poisson brackets among $T_\gamma[\mathcal{A}]$ and $T_\gamma^j[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}]$ can be calculated from Eqs.(2.3.48) and (2.3.49) as

$$\{T_\alpha, T_\beta\} = 0, \quad (4.3.1)$$

$$\{T_\alpha, T_\beta^j(s)\} = \kappa^2 \Delta^j[\beta, \alpha](s)(T_{\alpha\beta} - T_{\alpha\beta^{-1}}), \quad (4.3.2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \{T_\alpha^j(s), T_\beta^k(t)\} &= \kappa^2 \Delta^k[\beta, \alpha](t)(T_{\alpha\#_t\beta}^j - T_{\alpha\#_t\beta^{-1}}^j)(u(s)) \\ &\quad - \kappa^2 \Delta^j[\alpha, \beta](s)(T_{\beta\#_s\alpha}^k - T_{\beta\#_s\alpha^{-1}}^k)(u(t)), \end{aligned} \quad (4.3.3)$$

where $\alpha\#_t\beta$ denotes a loop formed from α and β by cutting both and reconnecting at $\beta(t)$ respecting the orientations, $u(s)$ is the value of the parameter u at the point $\alpha(s)$ of the curve $\alpha\#_t\beta$ normalized to the range $0 \leq u \leq 1$, and Δ^j is defined by

$$\Delta^j[\beta, \alpha](s) := \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 dt \dot{\alpha}^j \delta^3(\beta(s) - \alpha(t)). \quad (4.3.4)$$

Since these equations do not contain \mathcal{A}_j or \mathcal{E}^j explicitly, they guarantee that T_γ and $T_\gamma^{(1)}$ form a closed algebra with respect to the Poisson bracket. However, they have one uncomfortable feature: they are not mathematically well-defined since the coefficient Δ^j is singular. This implies that we must introduce some regularization in order to make them well-defined. A similar situation occurs in the field theories when local fields are taken as the fundamental variables as in the connection representation. There the expressions can be made well-defined by smoothing the local variables by smooth test functions. In the present case this method cannot be applied because the loop variables has no explicit dependence on the spatial coordinate.

One solution to this difficulty is to replace the loop variable $T_\gamma^{(1)}$ by the strip variable which depends only on a one-parameter family of loops $\Sigma = \{\gamma_\tau(s) = (x^j(s, \tau)) | 0 \leq s, \tau \leq 1\}$ and defined by

$$T_\Sigma^{(1)} := \int_0^1 ds \int_0^1 d\tau \partial_s x^j \partial_\tau x^k \epsilon_{jkl} T_{\gamma_\tau}^l(s). \quad (4.3.5)$$

Since the two-dimensional smoothing completely eliminates the δ -function singularity, the Poisson brackets of the strip variables are given by regular expressions:

$$\{T_\alpha, T_\Sigma^{(1)}\} = \frac{1}{2} \kappa^2 \sum_{\Sigma \cap \alpha} \text{sign}(\alpha : \Sigma) (T_{\Sigma \# \alpha} - T_{\Sigma \# \alpha^{-1}}), \quad (4.3.6)$$

$$\{T_{\Sigma_1}^{(1)}, T_{\Sigma_2}^{(1)}\} = \kappa^2 \sum_{\Sigma_1 \cap \Sigma_2} \text{sign}(\Sigma_1 : \Sigma_2 : \Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2) \left(T_{\Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2}^{(1)} - T_{\Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2^{-1}}^{(1)} \right). \quad (4.3.7)$$

In the first equation $\text{sign}(\alpha : \Sigma)$ denotes the orientation of the three vectors $\{\partial_s \alpha, \partial_t \gamma, \partial_\tau \gamma\}$ at each intersection point of α and $\Sigma = \{\gamma_\tau(t)\}$, $\Sigma \# \alpha$ represents a curve $\gamma \# \alpha$ formed from $\gamma \in \Sigma$ passing through the intersection point, and the summation is taken over all the intersection points. In the second equation $\Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2$ represents a strip formed from one-parameter family of the pairs of curves crossing at each connected segment in $\Sigma_1 \cap \Sigma_2$, and $\text{sign}(\Sigma_1 : \Sigma_2 : \Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2)$ is a sign determined as follows: first fix the τ -direction of the intersection segment to form $\Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2$; then the relative direction of this and the corresponding original τ -directions of Σ_1 and Σ_2 at the segment determines signs, $\text{sign}(\Sigma_1 : \Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2)$ and $\text{sign}(\Sigma_2 : \Sigma_1 \# \Sigma_2)$; finally multiply these two signs and the sign corresponding to the orientation of the triplet of the segment vector and the tangent vectors to curves in Σ_1 and Σ_2 .

We can construct smoothened strip variables from the higher-order variables $T^{(n)}$ in a similar way. In particular the momentum and the hamiltonian constraint functions can be expressed as some limits of these quantities starting from Eqs.(4.2.54) and (4.2.55). However, we do not give their explicit expressions here because they are complicated and we do not need them later.

4.3.2 Representation on the multi-loop space

Since the Poisson brackets among T_γ and $T_\gamma^j(s)$ (or $T_\Sigma^{(1)}$) are written by their linear combination, we can determine the commutation relations among the operators $\hat{T}[\gamma]$ and $\hat{T}^j[\gamma](s)(\hat{T}^{(1)}[\Sigma])$ corresponding them without ambiguity and construct the operator algebra $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_G$. Thus the remaining task in constructing the quantum theory at the stage Π_Q is to find an appropriate representation of them on the loop space functionals.

For that purpose let us recall Eq.(4.2.38) which connects the holomorphic functionals to loop space functionals. Of course this expression cannot be used to find the required representation since it does not fix $\Phi[\gamma]$ due to over-completeness of $T_\gamma[\mathcal{A}]$'s. However, this situation reminds us of the relation of the wavefunctions in the q -representation, $\tilde{\Phi}(q)$, and in the Bargmann representation, $\Phi(\alpha)$. If we compare the equations in §4.2.1 with the equations in the present case, we find that $\tilde{\Phi}(q)$, $\Phi(\alpha)$ and $\langle q|\alpha \rangle$ correspond to $\Phi[\mathcal{A}]$, $\Phi[\gamma]$ and $T_\gamma[\mathcal{A}]$, respectively. These correspondences and Eq.(4.2.7) suggests the transform

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi[\gamma] &= \int [D\mathcal{A}D\bar{\mathcal{A}}]\Delta[\mathcal{A}]\mu[4\text{Im}\mathcal{A}]\overline{T_\gamma[\mathcal{A}]} \Phi[\mathcal{A}] \\ &= \langle 0|\hat{T}[\gamma]^\dagger|\Phi \rangle .\end{aligned}\tag{4.3.8}$$

This formal expression is called *the Rovelli-Smolin Transform*(cf. [59]).

As shown in §4.2.3, the products of $\overline{T_\gamma}$'s are expressed as a linear combination of them. Since the proof given there can be applied even if $\mathcal{E}^j \cdot \sigma$ is inserted into the loop integral, this property holds also for $\overline{T_\gamma^{(n)}}$. Hence this transform can be used to find a representation of the loop variables on the functional space on Ω . There exists, however, one subtle problem in this method: an arbitrary functional $\Phi[\gamma]$ cannot be taken as representing a state since T_γ 's are not linearly independent. This situation is similar to the Bargmann representation: there the wavefunctions were required to be holomorphic. In the present case, however, the constraints to be satisfied by the functionals are not fully known since the relations among T_γ 's are not fully determined yet.

The method adopted by Rovelli and Smolin to deal with this problem was to utilize a functional Φ on the multi-loop space defined as a set of functionals

$$\Phi = \{\Phi_0, \Phi_1[\alpha], \Phi_2[\beta_1, \beta_2], \dots\},\tag{4.3.9}$$

where $\Phi_n[\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n]$ is a functional on Ω^n invariant under the permutations of $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n$. Let \mathcal{V}_{ML} be a linear space consisting of functionals of this type. Then by assigning to $\Phi_n[\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n]$ the expression obtained from Eq.(4.3.8) by replacing $\hat{T}[\gamma]$ by $\hat{T}[\gamma_1] \dots \hat{T}[\gamma_n]$ we find that $\hat{T}[\alpha]$ and $\hat{T}^{(1)}[\Sigma]$ are naturally represented on \mathcal{V}_{ML} as

$$\hat{T}[\alpha]\Phi[\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n] := \Phi[\alpha, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n],\tag{4.3.10}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{T}^{(1)}[\Sigma]\Phi[\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n] &:= -i\frac{\kappa^2}{2} \sum_{a=1}^n \sum_{\Sigma \cap \gamma_a} \text{sign}(\gamma_a : \Sigma) \\ &\times (\Phi[\gamma_1, \dots, \Sigma \# \gamma_a, \dots] - \Phi[\gamma_1, \dots, \Sigma \# \gamma_a^{-1}, \dots]). \end{aligned} \quad (4.3.11)$$

It is easily checked that the commutation relations corresponding to Eqs.(4.3.1)-(4.3.3) are satisfied.

As stated above, the loop variables are not independent but related at least by Eqs.(4.2.31), (4.2.34), (4.2.36) and (4.2.37). The operation defined above are consistent with them only if the functional Φ satisfies the following equations:

$$\Phi[\gamma, \dots] = \Phi[\gamma^{-1}, \dots], \quad (4.3.12)$$

$$\Phi[\alpha\beta, \dots] = \Phi[\beta\alpha, \dots], \quad (4.3.13)$$

$$\Phi[\alpha, \beta, \dots] = \Phi[\alpha\beta, \dots] + \Phi[\alpha\beta^{-1}, \dots], \quad (4.3.14)$$

$$\Phi[\alpha\gamma\gamma^{-1}, \dots] = \Phi[\alpha, \dots]. \quad (4.3.15)$$

Of course these do not exhaust all the relations. Further relations are obtained from the consistency of the operations of \hat{T} and $\hat{T}^{(1)}$ on these relations. Besides there may exist others derived from relations among the loop variables presently unknown. The true representation space \mathcal{V}_G is given by the quotient space of \mathcal{V}_{ML} by the linear subspace \mathcal{R}_{ML} spanned by these full relations.

From the relation (4.3.14) it follows that each multi-loop functional Φ is completely determined by its single-loop component (and null-loop component) as noted above. However, the full reduction to it is not possible until the complete knowledge on \mathcal{R}_{ML} are obtained. Thus in the multi-loops space approach the construction of a representation is divided to two steps: the construction of the formal representation of the operators and the determination of \mathcal{R}_{ML} . In this approach problems independent of the structure of \mathcal{R}_{ML} can be studied before the complete construction. This is the advantage of the multi-loop approach over the single-loop approach.

In order to complete the quantization program, one must construct invariant operators $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{inv}$ and an invariant state space $\mathcal{V}_{inv} \subset \mathcal{V}_G$, and introduce an inner product into the latter. As is expected from the argument in §4.2.4, the diffeomorphism invariant states are represented by the loop-space functionals which depend only on the link invariants. Hence the second problem

is reduced to finding all the link invariants $L = (L_1, L_2, \dots)$ and one invariant measure $\mu(\gamma)$ on the loop space. On the other hand the full construction of the diffeomorphism invariant operators cannot be reduced to such a well-defined problem. Of course, as for the operators corresponding to the variables expressed only in terms of \mathcal{A}_j 's, the invariant operators are constructed by taking the average of products of loop variables $\hat{T}[\gamma]$ with diffeomorphism invariant measures on the loop space. However, as for those containing \mathcal{E}^j 's, we need additional covariant tensors to make scalar quantities. The only such tensor we have at hand is ϵ_{jkl} . Though a few interesting geometrical invariants have been constructed with the help of ϵ_{jkl} ^[29], it is obvious that such quantities do not exhaust the full set of invariant operators as was discussed in §4.1.2. Finally the construction of the inner product is extremely difficult in this approach, since we do not know how to express the reality condition in terms of the loop variables. On this point the approach based on the connection representation appears to be more hopeful since the formal expression satisfying the reality condition can be given at least as explained in §4.2.

4.4 Solutions to the Hamiltonian Constraint

As explained in §3, all the dynamical information of the theory is contained in the quantum Hamiltonian constraint in the canonical quantum gravity. In the ADM-WD approach or the real tetrad approach no exact solutions to it has been so far obtained except for the minisuperspace models. In contrast an infinite number of exact solutions have been found in the chiral canonical approach. This point is one of the most fascinating features of the quantization program based on the chiral canonical theory. In this subsection we briefly summarize the present status of the problem in this approach.

4.4.1 Loop integral solutions

As discussed in §3.2, the Hamiltonian constraint cannot be applied to the quantum states. In order to resolve this difficulty, we proposed there the probability amplitude functional formalism in which the constraint is imposed on the probability functionals on the state space. Though this formalism is apparently different from the conventional one, there exists no difference between them at least as far as the problem of solving the constraint is

concerned, as noticed in §3.2.2.

In order to apply this formalism to the quantum theory in the holomorphic connection representation, however, we must eliminate some ambiguities concerned with the explicit expression of the constraint. To see this, let us assume that the probability amplitude $\langle \Psi | \Phi \rangle$ is expressed in terms of a holomorphic functional $\Psi[\mathcal{A}]$ as

$$\langle \Psi | \Phi \rangle = \int_{\mathcal{C}} [\mathcal{D}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{D}\bar{\mathcal{A}}] \mu[4\text{Im}\mathcal{A}] \Delta[\mathcal{A}] \overline{\Psi[\mathcal{A}]} \Phi[\mathcal{A}]. \quad (4.4.1)$$

Since the functional $\Delta[\mathcal{A}]$ should have a gauge-fixing nature, it is expected that the right-hand-side of this equation depends not on the values of $\Psi[\mathcal{A}]$ on the whole connection space \mathcal{C} but in the neighborhood of a subspace \mathcal{C}_0 transversal to all the gauge and diffeomorphism orbits. Hence holomorphic functionals which coincide with each other around \mathcal{C}_0 will give the same probability amplitude functional. This ambiguity is removed if we require that $\Psi[\mathcal{A}]$ is gauge and diffeomorphism invariant like $\Phi[\mathcal{A}]$.

Another ambiguity arises from the non-hermitian nature of the Hamiltonian constraint operator: we can formulate the constraint either as $\langle \Psi | \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{H}} = 0$ or as $\langle \Psi | \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{H}}^{\dagger} = 0$. For the second choice, from the above integral expression, the weak quantum Hamiltonian constraint is written as

$$\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{H}} \Psi[\mathcal{A}] = 0, \quad (4.4.2)$$

while for the first choice we get an expression with $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{H}}$ replaced by $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{H}}^{\dagger}$. Clearly the former equation, which is the one commonly used, is much more tractable than the latter choice in the connection representation.

Finally there is an ambiguity associated with the operator ordering. As shown in §4.1, $[\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{H}}, \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{H}}]$ is written in the form $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{D}k} \hat{\mathcal{E}}^j \cdot \hat{\mathcal{E}}^k$ for the ordering $\hat{\mathcal{A}} \cdots \hat{\mathcal{E}} \cdots$. Thus for this ordering the consistency of the Hamiltonian constraint yields a new constraint. This problem does not occur for the reversed ordering.

In most of the work on the Hamiltonian constraint the ordering $\hat{\mathcal{A}} \cdots \hat{\mathcal{E}} \cdots$ is adopted. In this ordering it is quite easy to find an infinite family of solutions by taking linear combinations of the functionals

$$\Psi[\mathcal{A}; \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n] = T_{\gamma_1}[\mathcal{A}] \cdots T_{\gamma_n}[\mathcal{A}]. \quad (4.4.3)$$

It is because this functional itself is a solution provided that the loops $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n$ are smooth and do not intersect with each other. In fact, since this

functional has a form $\Psi[\mathcal{A}] = f[X_a^I]$ ($X_a^I(x) = \mathcal{A}_j^I(x)V_a^j(x)$) where V_a^j is a tangent vector to the loop passing through x , the operation of $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_H$ on it is written as

$$8\kappa^2\hat{\mathcal{C}}_H(x)\Psi[\mathcal{A}] = \sum_{a,b} V_a^j(x)V_b^k(x)\epsilon^{IJK}\mathcal{F}_{jk}^I(x)\frac{\delta^2 f}{\delta X_J^a(x)\delta X_K^b(x)}, \quad (4.4.4)$$

where the summation is taken over all the tangent vectors to curves passing through x . The right-hand side of this equation vanishes for the non-intersecting case for which $a = b$. To be precise, this proof is too rough in that the functional derivatives of the loop variables produce distributional singular terms. For the exact proof taking account of the regularization see [15].

In the cases the loops have intersections one must take linear combinations of $\Phi[\mathcal{A}; \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n]$ because the right-hand side of the above equation does not vanish any longer. Fortunately the condition for its cancellation can be shown to be expressed by algebraic relations among the coefficients. So far solutions containing up to 5 intersecting loops have been explicitly constructed and a general algorithm to find a general n -loop solutions is found^[18, 19].

Though this family of solutions appear to be quite generic, they have a few unpleasant features. First they are obviously not diffeomorphism invariant. It is often stated that this is a difficulty of them. In our formalism, however, this is not a difficulty because $\Psi[\mathcal{A}]$ as a holomorphic representation of the probability amplitude functional need not be diffeomorphism invariant. Second it is shown that $\langle \Psi|\hat{q}(x)$ vanishes for all the known solutions in this family^[19]. This is not an obvious result since $\hat{q}(x)\Psi[\mathcal{A}]$ which is expressed in the relevant cases as

$$\hat{q}(x)\Psi[\mathcal{A}] = -\frac{i}{48}\epsilon_{jkl}\sum_{a,b,c} V_a^j(x)V_b^k(x)V_c^l(x)\epsilon_{IJK}\frac{\delta^3 f}{\delta X_a^I(x)\delta X_b^J(x)\delta X_c^K(x)} \quad (4.4.5)$$

is not expected to vanish for the cases where more than two loops intersect at a points. One possible reason of this unexpected result is the existence of an additional constraint for the ordering $\hat{\mathcal{A}} \cdots \hat{\mathcal{E}} \cdots$ noticed above.

Though the latter feature apparently suggests that the solutions represent spacetimes with degenerate spatial metrics, it is not really clear whether it implies that the solutions are unphysical, since $\hat{q}(x)$ is not a diffeomorphism-invariant operator. Some authors argue that the local operators such as $\hat{q}(x)$

are not good operators because, when one tries to construct finite operators corresponding to them from the loop variables by the point-splitting regularization, the results depend on the background metric used in the regularization^[29]. They instead propose some finite geometrical operators which can be utilized to extract information on spacetime structures for the above solutions under the assumption that the classical spacetimes are defined only on scales which contain lots of loops.

Finally we comment on the exact solutions in the loop space representation found by Brüggmann, Gambini and Pullin^[22, 23, 24]. They first constructed an exact solution to all the quantum constraints in terms of two knot invariants, for which $(\det q)^{1/2}(x)\Psi[\gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3]$ does not vanish at a point x where the three loops intersect non-degenerately. Later, by taking the Rovelli-Smolin transform of the non-degenerate solution for the pure gravity with non-vanishing cosmological constant Λ given in the next subsection and by expanding it in terms of Λ , they found that their first solution is a member of an infinite series of exact solutions to the constraints with $\Lambda = 0$, all of which are intimately connected with the Jones polynomial. Though their results are quite interesting, it is not clear at present whether they are genuine solutions because they are expressed by the single-loop functional on which the constraints are not fully known at present as stated in §4.3.

4.4.2 Non-degenerate solution in the connection representation

In the holomorphic connection representation only one exact non-degenerate solution to the quantum Hamiltonian constraint has been found so far^[25]. It is a solution in the case of the pure gravity with non-vanishing cosmological constant Λ and given by

$$\Psi_\Lambda[\mathcal{A}] = e^{-iS_\Lambda}; \quad (4.4.6)$$

$$S_\Lambda = \frac{2\kappa^2}{\Lambda} \int d^3x \epsilon^{jkl} \left[\mp 3i\mathcal{A}_j \cdot \partial_k \mathcal{A}_l + 2\kappa^2 \mathcal{A}_j \cdot (\mathcal{A}_k \times \mathcal{A}_l) \right]. \quad (4.4.7)$$

Since S_Λ is the Chern-Simons functional, its functional derivative with respect to \mathcal{A}_j is proportional to the curvature:

$$\frac{\delta S_\Lambda}{\delta \mathcal{A}} = \frac{3}{\Lambda} \epsilon^{jkl} \mathcal{F}_{kl}. \quad (4.4.8)$$

Hence from the Bianchi identity $\epsilon^{jkl}\mathcal{D}_j\mathcal{F}_{kl} \equiv 0$, it satisfies the gauge constraint. Further it is obviously diffeomorphism invariant. Finally since Eq.(4.4.8) is written as

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}^j\Psi_\Lambda[\mathcal{A}] = \frac{3}{2\Lambda}\epsilon^{jkl}\mathcal{F}_{jk}\Psi_\Lambda[\mathcal{A}], \quad (4.4.9)$$

the Hamiltonian constraint which is expressed in the present case as

$$\hat{\mathcal{C}}_H\Psi = -\frac{1}{2\kappa^2}(\hat{\mathcal{E}}^j \times \hat{\mathcal{E}}^k) \cdot \left(\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{jk} - \frac{\Lambda}{3}\epsilon_{jkl}\hat{\mathcal{E}}^l \right) \Psi, \quad (4.4.10)$$

is trivially satisfied for the ordering $\hat{\mathcal{E}} \dots \hat{\mathcal{A}} \dots$.

Since we do not have the full knowledge on the structure of the state space and the invariant operators, we cannot explore the physical interpretation of this solution exactly. However, we can get some insights by studying the behavior WKB orbits corresponding to the wavefunction since the WKB structure is a gauge and spatial diffeomorphism invariant property of the wavefunction.

As is seen from the above proof, $S_\Lambda[\mathcal{A}]$ is an exact solution to the classical Hamilton-Jacobi equation. Hence the WKB orbits corresponding to $\Psi_\Lambda[\mathcal{A}]$ are given by the solutions to the equations

$$\mathcal{F}_{jk} = \frac{\Lambda}{3}\epsilon_{jkl}\mathcal{E}^l, \quad (4.4.11)$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{A}}_j = \{\mathcal{A}_j, H\}. \quad (4.4.12)$$

From Eq.(2.3.42) the latter equation is written as

$$\mathcal{F}_{tj} = N^k\mathcal{F}_{kj} \pm iN\mathcal{E}^k \times \mathcal{F}_{jk}. \quad (4.4.13)$$

Comparing the expression for ${}^\pm\mathcal{F}_{0I}$ calculated from these equations taking account of Eq.(4.4.11) with Eq.(2.3.32), we find that the WKB equations are equivalent to the equation

$${}^\pm\mathcal{F}_{0I} = \frac{\Lambda}{6}{}^\pm\Sigma_{0I}. \quad (4.4.14)$$

If we require that θ^a is real and ${}^\pm\mathcal{F}_{0I}$ is the chiral combination obtained from the real curvature form F_{ab} , this equation is further rewritten as

$$F_{ab} = \frac{\Lambda}{6}\Sigma_{ab}. \quad (4.4.15)$$

By applying the second Bianchi identity (2.2.28) to this equation we obtain $\Theta^{[a} \wedge \theta^{b]} = 0$ which is equivalent to $\Theta^a = 0$. Hence this equation guarantees that the four-dimensional connection is Riemannian. On the other hand for the Riemannian connection the curvature form \mathcal{R}_{ab} for the constant curvature spacetime with sectional curvature K is expressed as

$$\mathcal{R}_{ab} = K\theta_a \wedge \theta_b = K\Sigma_{ab}. \quad (4.4.16)$$

Hence the solution to Eq.(4.4.15) represents the constant curvature spacetime with the sectional curvature $\frac{\Lambda}{6}$. Since all the constant curvature spacetimes with the same sectional curvature are locally isometric, this implies that there exists only one Lorentzian WKB orbit for the wavefunction $\Psi_\Lambda[\mathcal{A}]$. It is the de Sitter spacetime for $\Lambda > 0$, and the anti-de Sitter spacetime for $\Lambda < 0$. Thus the solution is a quantum counter part of the classical (anti-)de Sitter spacetime, and may be regarded as representing the ground state for the quantum vacuum spacetime with non-vanishing cosmological constant.

We have so far assumed that θ^a is real. However, this assumption is too restrictive in the complex canonical theory. In fact if we only require the reality condition on $\mathcal{E}^j \cdot \mathcal{E}^k$, a wider possibility is allowed. For example for the case \mathcal{E}^j , N^j and N are real but $q = \det(\mathcal{E}^{Ij})$ is negative, θ^a becomes pure imaginary since N is pure imaginary. The spacetime metric signature for this case is totally reversed and given by $[+, -, -, -]$. Though this case is usually excluded, there exists no a priori reason to regard it as unphysical because the causal structure is normal. Further this case occurs as a special sector of the single wavefunction in the complex canonical theory. Of course this does not mean that the two sectors with the different signatures are equivalent.

The reality condition also allows Euclidean WKB orbits. Such orbits correspond to the case $q < 0$ and N^j and N are real or the case $q > 0$ and N^j are real but N is pure imaginary. For these cases, since ${}^\pm\mathcal{F}_{0I}$ and ${}^\pm\Sigma_{0I}$ are pure imaginary and the left and the right chiral variables become independent, Eq.(4.4.14) does not lead to Eq.(4.4.15). Hence there exist an infinite number of WKB solutions^[25, 61, 62, 63].

In order to see these points explicitly, let us examine the behavior of the solution in the spatially homogeneous and isotropic sector. In this sector the chiral variables are expressed as

$$\mathcal{E}^{Ij} = \frac{\kappa^2}{\Omega} \sigma |\chi| X_I^j, \quad (4.4.17)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{Ij} = \frac{1}{6\kappa^2} A \chi_j^I, \quad (4.4.18)$$

where X_I^j is the basis of the invariant vectors dual to χ_j^I introduced in §3.3.3, and σ and A are variables independent of the space coordinates. The Poisson bracket between σ and A is given by

$$\{\sigma, A\} = 1, \quad (4.4.19)$$

and the spacetime metric is expressed in terms of σ and N as

$$ds^2 = [-N^2 dt^2 + \frac{\kappa^2}{\Omega} \sigma \chi^I \chi^I]. \quad (4.4.20)$$

Since S_Λ in this sector is simply given by

$$S_\Lambda = \frac{\Omega}{18\kappa^2\Lambda} (2A^3 \mp 9iA^2), \quad (4.4.21)$$

the WKB equations are reduced to

$$\sigma = \frac{\Omega}{3\kappa^2\Lambda} (A^2 \mp 3iA), \quad (4.4.22)$$

$$\dot{A} = -(N\sigma^{-3/2}) \frac{\kappa}{\Omega^{1/2}} \Lambda \sigma^2. \quad (4.4.23)$$

In the present case q is expressed as $q = (\kappa^2/\Omega)^3 \sigma^3 |\chi|^2$. Hence $q > 0$ corresponds to $\sigma > 0$. In the gauge $N = 1$ the solution to these equations for $\sigma > 0$ and $\Lambda > 0$ is given by the de Sitter solution dS^4 as is expected:

$$A = -\frac{3}{2} \sinh \xi, \quad (4.4.24)$$

$$\sigma = \frac{3\Omega}{4\kappa^2\Lambda} \cosh^2 \xi, \quad (4.4.25)$$

$$\xi = \left(\frac{\Lambda}{3}\right)^{1/2} t. \quad (4.4.26)$$

The Euclidean solutions are obtained from this solution by the analytic continuation of the time t or ξ to the imaginary region. For example, by replacing ξ by $i\xi$, we obtain the four dimensional Euclidean sphere S^4 for which $\sigma > 0$ and N is pure imaginary. On the other hand by the replacement $\xi \rightarrow \xi + i\pi/2$

we get the four-dimensional hyperbolic spacetime H^4 for which $\sigma < 0$. In the present case these exhaust the Euclidean WKB orbits for the wavefunction Ψ_Λ with $\Lambda > 0$. Thus in the WKB picture the wavefunction represents a sequence of two Euclidean spacetimes H^4 and S^4 , and one Lorentzian spacetime dS^4 .

This WKB picture for the wavefunction is slightly different from the one proposed by Hawking, Vilenkin and others. This difference comes from the difference in the range of the variable σ . To see this, let us apply the general formula (4.2.17) to the present case to find the corresponding wavefunction $\tilde{\Psi}(\sigma)$ in the ADM-type representation:

$$\Psi(A) = C \int d\sigma e^{-iA\sigma \mp 3\sigma/2} \tilde{\Psi}(\sigma). \quad (4.4.27)$$

For the solution $\Psi_\Lambda(A)$ the inversion of this transform yields

$$\tilde{\Psi}(\sigma) = C' \int_\gamma dz \exp \left[i \left(\frac{z^3}{3} + xz \right) \right], \quad (4.4.28)$$

where

$$x = \left(\frac{9\Omega}{8\kappa^2\Lambda} \right)^{2/3} \left(1 - \frac{4\kappa^2\Lambda}{3\Omega} \sigma \right). \quad (4.4.29)$$

This is the integral expression for the Airy function as is expected. The important point here is that Eq.(4.4.27) yields the original solution Ψ_Λ only when $Ai(x)$ is taken as $\tilde{\Psi}(\sigma)$ and the integration range in Eq.(4.4.27) is taken to be $-\infty < \sigma < \infty$ ^[25], while in the ADM theory σ is limited to the range $\sigma > 0$. Thus in the ADM-type representation the present solution corresponds to the Hartle-Hawking wavefunction extended to the classically forbidden region $q < 0$. Though this is just an analytic continuation in the spatially homogeneous and isotropic case, the wavefunction itself is not such a simple mathematical extension of any wavefunction in the ADM theory for the generic spacetime. Actually for such generic case in the ADM theory no exact solution is found and the Hartle-Hawking proposal has no well-defined formulation. Thus the quantum gravity theory based on the complex canonical theory yields a picture on the quantum behavior of the universe different from that based on the ADM theory if the universe can be described by a single wavefunction.

Figure 1: ADM-wavefunction $\tilde{\Psi}(E)$ in the Bianchi IX sector
The behavior of $\tilde{\Psi}(E)$ on the $E_1 = E_2$ section is shown. The high peak at $E_1 = E_2 = E_3 = 0$ is truncated.

The above WKB analysis of the wavefunction can be easily extended to the generic Bianchi sector, and the characteristic behavior of the solution and the structure of the WKB orbits are similar to the one in the isotropic case except that much more abundant Euclidean spacetimes appear. For example, in the Bianchi IX sector, if we parametrize the chiral variables as

$$\mathcal{E}^{Ij} = \frac{\kappa^2}{\Omega} E_I |\chi| X_I^j, \quad (4.4.30)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{Ij} = A_I \chi_j^I, \quad (4.4.31)$$

the wavefunction $\tilde{\Psi}(E)$ in the ADM-type representation corresponding to $\Psi_\Lambda[\mathcal{A}]$ with $\Lambda > 0$ is given by

$$e^{-W} \tilde{\Psi}(E) = C \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{\sqrt{1+z^2}} \exp \left[\frac{\lambda - (E_1^2 + E_2^2) + 2iE_1E_2z}{2(1+z^2)} + iE_3z - \frac{z^2}{2\lambda} \right], \quad (4.4.32)$$

where

$$W = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{E_2E_3}{E_1} + \frac{E_3E_1}{E_2} + \frac{E_1E_2}{E_3} \right), \quad (4.4.33)$$

$$\lambda = \frac{\kappa^2 \Omega}{3\Lambda}. \quad (4.4.34)$$

Though $\tilde{\Psi}(E)$ is singular at the surfaces $E_1 = 0$ or $E_2 = 0$ or $E_3 = 0$ from the structure of W , the spatial metric q_{IJ} does not become degenerate on these surfaces because $q_{IJ} = q_I \delta_{IJ}$ is expressed as $q_I = E_J E_K / E_I$ ($I \neq J \neq K$). Thus the relation between the regions $q > 0$ and $q < 0$ is not simple and the wavefunctions in these two regions are not connected by a simple analytic continuation. Outside these singular surfaces the behavior of the wavefunction is simple. It rapidly oscillates in the region $q > 0$ as q increases and falls off exponentially in the classically forbidden region $q < 0$ as in the isotropic case, as shown in Fig.1.

Finally, in connection with the extension of the solution to region $q < 0$, we comment on the difference of the right and the left chiral theories. By inspecting the structure of the chiral Lagrangian (2.3.42), we find that under the transformation $\mathcal{E}^j \rightarrow -\mathcal{E}^j$ and $\mathcal{A}_j \rightarrow -\mathcal{A}_j$ only the terms such as $V(\Phi)$ which explicitly contain q change sign if we simultaneously reverse the signs depending on the chirality. In particular for the present case the

region $q > 0$ for the right chiral theory with $\Lambda > 0$ is mapped by this transformation to the region $q < 0$ for the left one with $\Lambda < 0$. Since there exists no symmetry between the two regions $q\Lambda > 0$ and $q\Lambda < 0$ for a fixed chirality except for the spatially homogeneous and isotropic sector, this implies that the physical contents of the left and the right chiral theories are different in the quantum framework unlike in the classical framework. For example it is shown that in the spatially anisotropic cases there exists no ADM wavefunction corresponding to the solution $\Psi_\Lambda[\mathcal{A}]$ for the right chiral theory with $\Lambda > 0$ though one can find one for the left chiral theory with $\Lambda > 0$ ^[25].

5 Summary and Discussion

To construct a quantum gravity theory one must find a way to reconcile the general covariance of the classical gravity theory with the quantum framework. As explained in §3, the canonical approach which respects the structure of the conventional classical theories divides this task to the two problems: the construction of spatial-diffeomorphism invariant states and observables, and the formulation of dynamics in terms of them.

In the conventional approach based on the ADM formulation most of the work done so far is limited to the study of the minisuperspace models and is concerned mainly with the latter problem. Since the essential features of the general covariance appears only in systems with infinite degrees of freedom, this limitation is severe. Some aspects such as the hyperbolicity of the Hamiltonian constraint have been studied using superspace. However, the treatment is too formal to be useful in the explicit construction of the invariant states and observables.

In contrast, in the approach based on the complex canonical formulation, we could go beyond the minisuperspace models and directly attack the generic situations. The essential points were the introduction of the additional gauge freedom corresponding to the tetrad rotation and the chiral decomposition. They enabled us to express the fundamental equations by simple differential polynomials and gave a gauge field theoretical structure to the theory. In particular the introduction of loop integral variables based on the latter feature has reduced the problem of constructing the invariant states to finding and classifying the knot or the link invariant of three

manifolds. Further we could find an infinite number of exact solutions to the quantum Hamiltonian constraint owing to the simple structure of the equations.

In order to complete the quantization program in this approach, however, we must solve the following three problems at least.

First of all, though significant progress has been made in the construction and the parametrization of the invariant states, our knowledge about the structure of the invariant operators is still quite poor. Since the physical interpretation of the states is found only with the aid of the operators whose relation to the classical geometrical variables is known, this situation is quite unsatisfactory.

In connection with this problem we comment on the recent work by the Syracuse group^[29]. They succeeded in constructing finite operators which represent the spatial area of minimal surfaces and the total volume of the space in the loop space representation, and found that their eigenvalues are discrete and integer multiples of constants of order unity in the Planck units when acted on the so-called weave states which forms a sparse subset of the whole loop-functional space. Though these results are quite fascinating, the type of the operators constructed so far is too restrictive to be used as the basis of generic arguments. The origin of this limitation exists in the fact that we have no regular covariant tensor densities other than ϵ_{jkl} as noted in §4.2.4. The technique developed by the Syracuse group cannot be applied, for example, to the quantity Z representing the expansion rate of the space introduced in §4.1.2.

Second is the problem of the reality condition. Since the complex canonical theory is equivalent to the Einstein theory only under this condition, one may be studying a theory quite different from the Einstein theory if one neglects the condition. In the holomorphic connection representation this condition can be translated to the problem of finding a measure which makes the formal expression for the inner product well-defined. However, at the present stage, no such translation is possible in the loop space representation since we do not yet know how to express the reality condition only in terms of the loop language. The study of the relation between the left and the right chiral variables may shed light on this problem.

Finally we are far from being able to discuss dynamical problems in realistic situations. This is partly because of our poor knowledge on the invariant

operators touched upon above. However, it is not the whole reason. The main obstacle lies in the fact that there exists no consensus on the treatment of the time variables in the quantum framework. In order to settle this issue of time, detailed studies of realistic systems beyond the minisuperspace models are needed.

Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank Prof. Abhay Ashtekar for his valuable comments on the manuscript. This work is supported by the Grand-in-Aid for Scientific Research of the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture of Japan (No.02640228). The numerical computation and its graphic display in this work is supported by the Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics.

References

- [1] Green, M. B., Schwarz, J. H., and Witten, E., *Superstring Theory* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1987).
- [2] Hawking, S.W. in H. A. Brük and G. V. Coyne, editors, *Astrophysical Cosmology*, Pontifica Academia Scientarium, Vatican City, 1982.
- [3] Hartle, J. B. and Hawking, S. W., Phys. Rev. **D28**, 2960 (1983).
- [4] Hawking, S. W., Nucl. Phys. **B239**, 257 (1984).
- [5] Vilenkin, A., Phys. Rev. **D27**, 2848 (1983).
- [6] Vilenkin, A., Phys. Rev. **D30**, 509 (1984).
- [7] Ashtekar A., Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 2244 (1986).
- [8] Ashtekar, A., Phys. Rev. **D36**, 1587 (1987).
- [9] Samuel, J., Pramana J. Phys. **28**, L429–L432 (1987).
- [10] Jacobson, T. and Smolin, L., Phys. Lett. **B196**, 39–42 (1987).
- [11] Jacobson, T. and Smolin, L., Class. Quantum. Grav. **5**, 583–594 (1988).

- [12] Ashtekar, A., Romano, J. D., and Tate, R. S., Phys. Rev. **D40**, 2572 (1989).
- [13] Jacobson, T., Class. Quantum. Grav. **5**, 923–935 (1988).
- [14] Gorobey, N.N. and Lukyanenko, A.S., Class. Quantum. Grav. **7**, 67 (1990).
- [15] Jacobson, T. and Smolin, L., Nucl. Phys. **B299**, 295 (1988).
- [16] DeWitt, B. S., Phys. Rev. **160**, 1113 (1967).
- [17] Ashtekar, A., Self-duality and spinorial techniques in the canonical approach to quantum gravity, in *Quantum Concepts in Space and Time*, Penrose, R. and Isham, C.J., eds., p.302 (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1986).
- [18] Husain, V., Nucl. Phys. **B313**, 711 (1989).
- [19] Brüggmann, B. and Pullin, J., Nucl. Phys. **B363**, 221 (1991).
- [20] Rovelli, C. and Smolin, L., Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 1155 (1988).
- [21] Rovelli, C. and Smolin, L., Nucl. Phys. **B331**, 80 (1990).
- [22] Brüggmann, B., Gambini, R., and Pullin, J., Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 431 (1992).
- [23] Brüggmann, B., Gambini, R., and Pullin, J., Syracuse Univ. Preprint, SU-GP-92/1-1 (1992).
- [24] Brüggmann, B., Gambini, R., and Pullin, J., Syracuse Univ. Preprint, SU-GP-92-3/1 (1992).
- [25] Kodama, H., Phys. Rev. **D42**, 2548–2565 (1990).
- [26] Witten, E., Comm. Math. Phys. **121**, 351–399 (1989).
- [27] Ashtekar, A., Rovelli, C., and Smolin, L., Phys. Rev. **D44**, 1740 (1991).
- [28] Ashtekar, A., Rovelli, C., and Smolin, L., Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 237 (1992).

- [29] Smolin, L., Syracuse Univ. preprint , 1 (1992).
- [30] Kodama, H., Prog. Theor. Phys. **80**, 1024 (1988).
- [31] Ashtekar, A. and Pullin, J., Syracuse Univ. Preprint (1990).
- [32] Ashtekar, A., Tate, R., and Uggla, C., Syracuse Univ. Preprint (1992).
- [33] Husain, V. and Smolin, L., Nucl. Phys. **B327**, 205 (1989).
- [34] Husain, V. and Pullin, J., Modern Phys. Lett. **A5**, 733–741 (1990).
- [35] Ashtekar, A., *New Perspectives on Canonical Gravity* (Bibliopolous, Naples, 1988).
- [36] Smolin, L., in A. Ashtekar and J. Stackel, editors, Proceedings of the Osgood Hill Conference on *Conceptual Problems of Quantum Gravity* (Birkhauser, 1989).
- [37] Rovelli, C., Class. Quantum. Grav. **8**, 1613 (1991).
- [38] Ashtekar, A., *Lectures on Non-Perturbative Canonical Gravity* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1991).
- [39] Halliwell, J. J. and Hartle, J. B., Phys. Rev. **D43**, 1170 (1991).
- [40] Stone, C.L. and Kuchař, K.V., Class. Quantum. Grav. **9**, 757–776 (1992).
- [41] Misner, C.W., Thorne, K.S., and Wheeler, J.A., *Gravitation* (Freeman, San Francisco, 1973).
- [42] Kobayashi, S. and Nomizu, K., *Foundation of Differential Geometry I & II* (Interscience Pub., 1963).
- [43] Kuchař, K., Canonical methods of quantization, in *Quantum Gravity 2: A Second Oxford Symposium*, Isham, C.J., Penrose, R., and Sciama, D.W., eds., p.329 (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1981).
- [44] Ashtekar, A. and Stachel, J., editors, *Conceptual Problems of Quantum Gravity* (Birkhäuser, Boston, 1991).

- [45] Newman, E.T. and Rovelli, C., Univ. Pittsburgh preprint (1992).
- [46] Vilenkin, A., Phys. Lett. **B117**, 25 (1982).
- [47] Hawking, S.W., The path-integral approach to quantum gravity, in *General Relativity: an Einstein Centenary Survey*, Hawking, S.W. and Israel, W., eds., p.746 (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1979).
- [48] Halliwell, J. J. and Louko, J., Phys. Rev. **D39**, 2206 (1989).
- [49] Halliwell, J. J. and Louko, J., Phys. Rev. **D40**, 1868 (1989).
- [50] Halliwell, J. J. and Hartle, J. B., Phys. Rev. **D41**, 1815 (1990).
- [51] Garay, L.J., Halliwell, J.J., and Marugan, G.A.M., Phys. Rev. **D43**, 2572 (1991).
- [52] Witten, E., Nucl. Phys. **B311**, 46–78 (1988).
- [53] Fujiwara, Y., Higuchi, S., Hosoya, A., Mishima, T., and Siino, M., PR **D44**, 1756 (1991).
- [54] Fujiwara, Y., Higuchi, S., Hosoya, A., Mishima, T., and Siino, M., PR **D44**, 1763 (1991).
- [55] Fujiwara, Y., Higuchi, S., Hosoya, A., Mishima, T., and Siino, M., Tokyo Inst. Tech. preprint, TIT/HEP-184/COSMO-13 (1992).
- [56] Banks, T., Nucl. Phys. **B249**, 332 (1985).
- [57] Halliwell, J. J. and Hawking, S. W., Phys. Rev. **D31**, 1777 (1985).
- [58] Hartle, J.B., The quantum mechanics of cosmology, in *Quantum Cosmology and Baby Universe*, Jerusalem Winter School, C.Coleman et al, eds. (1991).
- [59] Ashtekar, A. and Isham, C.J., Syracuse Univ. Preprint, SU-GP-91-12-2 (1992).
- [60] Goldberg, J.N., Lewandowski, L., and Stornaiolo, C., Syracuse Univ. (1992).

- [61] Samuel, J., *Class. Quantum. Grav.* **5**, L123–L125 (1988).
- [62] Capovilla, R., Jacobson, T., and Dell, J., *Class. Quantum. Grav.* **7**, L1–L3 (1990).
- [63] Uehara, S., *Class. Quantum. Grav.* **8**, L229–L234 (1991).