

Abelianization of Constraints in SU(N) Yang-Mills Theory

F. Loran*

*Department of Physics, Isfahan University of Technology (IUT)
Isfahan, Iran*

Abstract

The abelian form of the first class constraints of SU(N) Yang-Mills theory in $D = 3 + 1$ is obtained explicitly. Considering the abelian constraints, it is shown that Coulomb gauge does not lead to Gribov copies. We also show that in the strong coupling limit, the gauge symmetry of the theory is similar to that of QED.

It is well known that SU(N) Yang-Mills theory is a constraint system [1] possessing non-abelian first class constraints ϕ_a^0 ,

$$\phi_a^0 = \nabla \cdot \vec{\Pi}_a - gf_{abc} \vec{A}_b \cdot \vec{\Pi}_c \approx 0, \quad a = 1, \dots, N^2 - 1, \quad (1)$$

in which, f_{abc} are the structure coefficients of SU(N) algebra, $\vec{\Pi}_a$'s are momenta conjugate to gauge fields \vec{A}_a 's,

$$\{A_a^i(x), \Pi_b^j(y)\} = \delta_{ab} \delta^{ij} \delta(x - y), \quad i, j = 1, 2, 3, \quad (2)$$

and g is the coupling constant of the gauge field self interaction [2, 3]. The constraints ϕ_a^0 's (1) form a representation of SU(N) algebra, i.e.

$$\{\phi_a^{0g_1}, \phi_b^{0g_2}\} = gf_{abc} \phi_c^{0g_1 g_2}, \quad (3)$$

where g_1 and g_2 are smooth real functions and $\phi_a^{0g} = \int_x g(x) \phi_a^0(x)$. In 1978, Gribov showed that Coulomb gauge $\nabla \cdot \vec{A}_a = 0$ is insufficient to fix the gauge freedom of the action generated by non-abelian constraints ϕ_a^0 's (1). He observed that for SU(2) Yang-Mills theory there exist at least two points on the gauge orbit that satisfy Coulomb gauge [4, 5]. This effect is in general called Gribov ambiguity and became a serious drawback for the quantization of Yang-Mills theory. There have been many attempts to remedy the Gribov ambiguities for example by

1. considering proper gauge fixing condition like the axial gauge $A_a^3 = 0$ [6, 7],
2. applying quantization approaches in which there is no need to do gauge fixing [8],
3. using the celebrated BRST-BFV approach [9, 10] where one considers BRS transformation instead of gauge transformation [11],

*e-mail: loran@cc.iut.ac.ir

4. and/or applying stochastic quantization method, see for example reference [12].

It is well known that Gribov ambiguities can be resolved by perturbation. In what follows, we introduce an approach to remedy these ambiguities in SU(N) Yang-Mills theory which is valid in the strong coupling limit.

It is proved that non-abelian constraints become abelian if one maps each constraint to the surface of the other ones [13]. To be explicit, consider two independent constraints ϕ and ψ which satisfy the following algebra:

$$\{\phi, \psi\} = C\phi + D\psi, \quad (4)$$

where C and D are some functions of phase space coordinates. One can show that the constraints $\phi' = \phi|_{(\psi=0)}$ and $\psi' = \psi|_{(\phi=0)}$ are equivalent to ϕ and ψ and commute with each other, i.e.

$$\{\phi', \psi'\} = 0. \quad (5)$$

The non-abelian constraints ϕ_a^0 's (1) can be made abelian in a similar way. Using the Helmholtz theorem in vector analysis [14], one can write the vector $\vec{\Pi}_a$ as,

$$\vec{\Pi}_a(x) = -\nabla \int_y \frac{\nabla \cdot \vec{\Pi}_a(y)}{4\pi |\vec{x} - \vec{y}|} + \nabla \times \int_y \frac{\nabla \times \vec{\Pi}_a(y)}{4\pi |\vec{x} - \vec{y}|}, \quad (6)$$

up to some surface terms. Inserting $\vec{\Pi}_a$ from Eq.(6) into Eq.(1), one can obtain a set of new constraints, say ϕ_a^1 's, equivalent to ϕ_a^0 's (1), defined as follows,

$$\phi_a^1(x) = \nabla \cdot \vec{\Pi}_a - gf_{abc} \vec{A}_b \cdot \nabla \times \int_y \frac{\nabla \times \vec{\Pi}_c(y)}{4\pi |\vec{x} - \vec{y}|} + g^2 R_a^{(2)}(x), \quad (7)$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} R_a^{(2)}(x) &= \frac{1}{g^2} \left(gf_{abc} \vec{A}_b \cdot \nabla \int_y \frac{\nabla \cdot \vec{\Pi}_c(y)}{4\pi |\vec{x} - \vec{y}|} \right) \\ &= f_{abc} f_{cde} \vec{A}_b \cdot \nabla \int_y \frac{\vec{A}_d \cdot \vec{\Pi}_e}{4\pi |\vec{x} - \vec{y}|}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

To obtain the second equality, we have considered $\phi_a^0 = 0$ (1). It is important to note that the constraints ϕ_a^1 's are equivalent to ϕ_a^0 's since,

$$\phi_a^1 = \phi_a^0 + gf_{abc} \vec{A}_b \cdot \nabla \int_y \frac{\phi_c(y)}{4\pi |\vec{x} - \vec{y}|}. \quad (9)$$

As can be easily verified by direct calculation, one finds $\{\phi_a^1, \phi_b^1\} = \mathcal{O}(g^2)$, as a result of the above mentioned theorem (see Eqs.(4,5)). Inserting $\vec{\Pi}_a$ from Eq.(6) into Eq.(7) and using Eq.(1) again, one obtains ϕ_a^2 's, a new set of constraints equivalent to ϕ_a^0 's, which satisfy the following algebra,

$$\{\phi_a^2, \phi_b^2\} = \mathcal{O}(g^3). \quad (10)$$

At N th step, one finds ϕ_a^N 's,

$$\phi_a^N(x) = \nabla \cdot \vec{\Pi}_a(x) - gf_{abc} \vec{A}_b \cdot \left[\left(\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} (-g)^n \mathcal{O}^{(n)} \right) \Pi^t \right]_a(x) - gf_{abc} \vec{A}_b \cdot \left((-g)^N \mathcal{O}^N \Pi \right)_c(x), \quad (11)$$

where,

$$\vec{\Pi}^t(x) = \nabla_x \times \int_y \frac{\nabla_y \times \vec{\Pi}_a(y)}{4\pi |\vec{x} - \vec{y}|}. \quad (12)$$

The operator \mathcal{O} is defined by the relation,

$$(\mathcal{O}_{ab}(x, y))_{ij} = f_{acb} \left(\nabla_x \frac{1}{4\pi |\vec{x} - \vec{y}|} \right)_i (\vec{A}_c(y))_j, \quad i, j = 1, 2, 3. \quad (13)$$

It is obvious that,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_{ab}^2(x, y) &= \int_z \mathcal{O}_{aa_1}(x, z) \cdot \mathcal{O}_{a_1b}(z, y) \\ &= f_{ac_1a_1} f_{a_1c_2b} \int_z \nabla_x \frac{1}{4\pi |\vec{x} - \vec{z}|} \vec{A}_{c_1}(z) \cdot \nabla_z \frac{1}{4\pi |\vec{z} - \vec{y}|} \vec{A}_{c_2}(y), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

and

$$(\mathcal{O}\vec{V})_a(x) = \int_y \mathcal{O}_{ab}(x, y) \cdot \vec{V}_b(y), \quad (15)$$

in which $\vec{V}(x)$ is some vector field. The constraints ϕ_a^N 's are equivalent to ϕ_a^0 's because,

$$\phi_a^N = \phi_a^0 + g f_{abc} \vec{A}_b \cdot \left(\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} (-g)^n \mathcal{O}^n \vec{\Phi} \right)_c, \quad (16)$$

where,

$$\vec{\Phi}_a(x) = \nabla \int_y \frac{\phi_a(y)}{4\pi |\vec{x} - \vec{y}|}. \quad (17)$$

Since,

$$\phi_a^N = \phi_a^N|_{(\phi_b^N=0)} + \mathcal{O}(g^{N+1}), \quad b \neq a, \quad (18)$$

one verifies that $\{\phi_a^N, \phi_b^N\} = \mathcal{O}(g^{N+1})$, (see Eqs.(4,5)). To obtain the abelian constraints one should obtain ϕ_a^∞ 's. Using Eq.(11) one verifies that,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_a^\infty(x) &= \nabla \cdot \vec{\Pi}_a(x) - g f_{abc} \vec{A}_b(x) \cdot \left[\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-g)^n \mathcal{O}^n \right) \vec{\Pi}^t \right]_c(x) \\ &= \nabla \cdot \vec{\Pi}_a(x) - g f_{abc} \vec{A}_b(x) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{1 - g\mathcal{O}} \vec{\Pi}^t \right)_c(x), \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

By construction, the constraints ϕ_a^∞ 's are *equivalent* to ϕ_a^0 's (see Eq.(16)) and, as can be verified by direct calculation, satisfy the algebra,

$$\{\phi_a^\infty, \phi_b^\infty\} = 0. \quad (20)$$

Consequently, the generator of gauge transformation is

$$G_\epsilon = \int_x \epsilon_a(x) \phi_a^\infty(x), \quad (21)$$

where $\epsilon_a(x)$ is some infinitesimal real smooth function. Since $\{\nabla \cdot \vec{A}_a(x), \vec{\Pi}^t(y)\} = 0$, one verifies that,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\epsilon (\nabla \cdot \vec{A}_a(x)) &= \left\{ \nabla \cdot \vec{A}_a(x), G_\epsilon \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \nabla \cdot \vec{A}_a(x), \int_y \epsilon_a(y) \nabla \cdot \vec{\Pi}_a(y) \right\} \\ &= -\nabla^2 \epsilon_a(x). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

We conclude that Coulomb gauge intersects the gauge orbit only once as is the case in QED. Therefore, Coulomb gauge does not lead to Gribov copies.

In the strong coupling limit, $g \rightarrow \infty$, the abelian constraints $\phi_a^\infty \approx 0$ become simply $\nabla \cdot \vec{\Pi}_a \approx 0$, similar to QED. This result can be verified noting that from Eq.(19) we have,

$$\lim_{g \rightarrow \infty} \phi_a^\infty(x) = \nabla \cdot \vec{\Pi}_a(x) + f_{abc} \vec{A}_b(x) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{O}} \vec{\Pi}^t \right)_c(x), \quad (23)$$

Defining $\vec{V} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{O}} \vec{\Pi}^t$, one can write $\vec{\Pi}^t = \mathcal{O} \vec{V}$. Using the identity $\nabla \cdot \vec{\Pi}^t = 0$ (see Eq.(12)) one obtains,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \cdot (\mathcal{O} \vec{V})_a &= \nabla_x \cdot \int_y f_{acb} \left(\nabla_x \frac{1}{4\pi |\vec{x} - \vec{y}|} \right) \vec{A}_c(y) \cdot \vec{V}_b(y) \\ &= -f_{acb} \vec{A}_c(x) \cdot \vec{V}_b(x) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Therefore the second term in Eq.(23) is vanishing and we have,

$$\lim_{g \rightarrow \infty} \phi_a^\infty(x) = \nabla \cdot \vec{\Pi}_a(x). \quad (25)$$

Consequently,

$$\lim_{g \rightarrow \infty} \delta_\epsilon \vec{A} = \nabla \epsilon, \quad (26)$$

which is similar to the gauge symmetry of QED.

It is interesting to obtain Ward identities corresponding to the gauge transformation generated by G_ϵ (21). To this aim, one should first add a proper combination of ϕ_a 's to the Hamiltonian H_{YM} to make the Poisson bracket of H_{YM} with ϕ_a^∞ 's vanishing. Since $\{H_{YM}, \phi_a^0\} \sim \phi_a^0$, this can be achieved by mapping H_{YM} to the surface of constraints ϕ_a^0 's [13]. This may provide a useful method to study the strong coupling limit of the theory.

Acknowledgement

The author would like to express his thanks to E. Biglar and M. Haghghat for useful discussions and J. Govaerts for his comment on Gribov ambiguities in BRST method.

References

- [1] P. A. M. Dirac, Can. J. Math. **2**, (1950) 129;
Proc. R. Soc. London Ser. A **246**, (1958) 326;
"Lectures on Quantum Mechanics", Yeshiva University Press, New York, 1964.
- [2] K. Sundermeyer, "Constrained Dynamics, Lecture Notes in Physics" Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg, 1982;
M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim "Quantization of Gauge System" Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1992.

- [3] M. Henneaux, Phys. Rep. **126**, (1985) 1.
- [4] V. N. Gribov, Nucl. Phys. **B139**, (1978) 1;
I. M. Singer, Comm. Math. Phys. **60**, (1978) 7.
- [5] J. Govaerts, " *Hamiltonian Quantisation and Constrained Dynamics*, Leuven Notes in Theoretical and Mathematical Physics, Leuven University Press, 1991.
- [6] R. Arnowitt and S. I. Fickler, Phys. Rev. **127**, (1962) 1821;
R. N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. **D4**, (1971) 2215;
I. Bars and F. Green, Nucl. Phys. **B142**, (1978) 157.
- [7] F. Lenz, H.W.L. Nausa and M. Thies, Annals Phys. **233**, (1994) 317-373.
- [8] J. R. Klauder, Lect. Notes Phys. **572**, (2001) 143, hep-th/0003297;
J. R. Klauder and S. V. Shabanov, Phys. Lett. **B398**, (1997) 116, hep-th/9608027;
J. Govaerts and J. R. Klauder, Annals Phys. **274**, (1999) 251, hep-th/9809119;
V. M. Villanueva, J. Govaerts, J-L. Lucio-Martinez, J.Phys. **A33**, (2000) 4183, hep-th/9909033.
- [9] C. Becchi, A. Rouet and R. Stora, Comm. Math. Phys. **42**, (1975) 127.
- [10] E. S. Fradkin and G. A. Vilkovisky, Phys. Lett. **B55**, (1975) 224;
I. A. Batalin and G. A. Vilkovisky, Phys. Lett. **B69**, (1977) 309;
E. S. Fradkin and E. S. Fradkina, Phys. Lett. **B72**, (1978) 343;
I. A. Batalin and E. S. Fradkin, Phys. Lett. **B122**, (1983) 157.
- [11] H. Neuberger, Phys. Lett. **B183**, (1987) 337.
- [12] D. Zwanzinger, "Non-perturbative Faddeev-Popov formula and infrared limit of QCD", hep-ph/0303028.
- [13] F. Loran, Phys. Lett. **B547**, (2002) 63, hep-th/0209180;
F. Loran, Phys. Lett. **B554**, (2003) 207, hep-th/0212341.
- [14] G. Arfken, *Mathematical Methods for Physicists*, second edition, Academic Press, Inc., New York, 1970.