

Re-dressing Emperor: Four Dimensional Yang-Mills Theory, Gauge Invariant Mass And Fluctuating Three Branes

Antti J. Niemi^{1,2,*} and Sergey Slizovskiy^{1,†}

¹*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Uppsala University, P.O. Box 803, S-75108, Uppsala, Sweden*

²*Laboratoire de Mathématiques et Physique Théorique CNRS UMR 6083,
Fédération Denis Poisson, Université de Tours, Parc de Grandmont, F37200, Tours, France*

We are interested in a gauge invariant coupling between four dimensional Yang-Mills field and a three brane that can fluctuate into higher dimensions. For this we interpret the Yang-Mills theory as a higher dimensional bulk gravity theory with dynamics that is governed by the Einstein action, and with a metric tensor constructed from the gauge field in a manner that displays the original gauge symmetry as an isometry. The brane moves in this higher dimensional space-time under the influence of its bulk gravity, with dynamics determined by the Nambu action. This introduces the desired interaction between the brane and the gauge field in a way that preserves the original gauge invariance as an isometry of the induced metric. After a prudent change of variables the result can be interpreted as a gauge invariant and massive vector field that propagates in the original space-time \mathbb{R}^4 : The presence of the brane becomes entirely invisible, except for the mass.

I: Introduction:

The existence of a mass gap in four dimensional Yang-Mills theory remains unresolved [1]. Here we propose a gauge invariant mass term that has its origin in higher dimensions. For this we reformulate the Yang-Mills theory as a gravity theory with Einstein action in a higher dimensional space-time. This space-time emerges when we replace the matrix valued Lie algebra generators by Killing vector fields that act on an internal Riemannian manifold with an isometry group that coincides with the original gauge group. The standard $D = 4$ flat space-time Yang-Mills action is obtained from the higher dimensional gravity action when we average over the internal manifold. This computation of the averages over the internal manifold replaces the evaluation of the matrix traces over the Lie algebra generators in the conventional formulation. We then proceed to introduce a three brane in this higher dimensional space-time. Asymptotically the brane stretches into \mathbb{R}^4 but it can locally fluctuate into the internal manifold where it moves under the influence of the bulk gravity and with dynamics determined by the Nambu action. The gravitational interaction of the brane leads to an effective interaction between the original Yang-Mills gauge field and the brane fluctuations. When viewed from the point of view of the original flat four dimensional space-time, this can be interpreted in terms of a massive vector field that resides in \mathbb{R}^4 : Much like in the conventional Higgs effect where a gauge field combines with a Higgs boson, the gauge field now *entirely* eats up the higher dimensional brane fluctuations and becomes massive so that at the end, there is nothing else left in the theory that reveals the presence of a brane except the mass. The internal Riemannian manifold can be chosen to be any manifold with an isometry group that coincides with the original gauge group, and different choices give rise to different kind of mass terms. Examples include the group manifold itself and its co-adjoint orbits.

II: Gauge Group as a Manifold:

The $SU(N)$ Yang-Mills action in \mathbb{R}^4 is

$$S_{YM} = -\frac{1}{2e^2} \int d^4x \text{Tr}\{F_{\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu}\} = \frac{1}{4e^2} \int d^4x F_{\mu\nu}^a F_{\mu\nu}^a \quad (1)$$

with

$$F_{\mu\nu}^a(A) = \partial_\mu A_\nu^a - \partial_\nu A_\mu^a + f^{abc} A_\mu^b A_\nu^c \quad (2)$$

*Electronic address: Antti.Niemi@physics.uu.se

†Electronic address: Sergey.Slizovskiy@physics.uu.se

The trace is over antihermitean matrices T^a that represent the Lie algebra of the gauge group $SU(N)$, normalized so that

$$Tr\{T^a T^b\} = -\frac{1}{2}\delta^{ab}$$

Here we are interested in the interaction between the Yang-Mills field and a three brane. Such an interaction can be either difficult to introduce or then it lacks a proper interpretation in the strictly four dimensional realm of (1). For this we replace the matrices T^a by Killing vector fields K^a that act on an internal Einstein manifold with isometry group $SU(N)$. This procedure is quite common in the context of Kaluza-Klein theories [2] and nonlinear σ -models [3], but is rarely used in the conventional Yang-Mills theory. Instead of the matrix trace we now have an integral over the internal manifold, and we shall assume that this integral generically gives us

$$Tr\{T^a T^b\} \rightarrow \mu^{\dim[V_{int}]} \int \sqrt{g} d\vartheta g_{mn}(\vartheta) K^{am}(\vartheta) K^{bn}(\vartheta) = \mu^{\dim[V_{int}]} \cdot \frac{\dim[V_{int}]}{\dim[SU(N)]} \cdot V_{int} \delta^{ab} \quad (3)$$

Here ϑ^m are the local coordinates and V_{int} is the volume of the internal manifold, and μ is a mass scale. The $K^{am}(\vartheta)$ are the components of Killing vectors

$$K^a(\vartheta) = K^{am} \frac{\partial}{\partial \vartheta^m}$$

that satisfy the Lie algebra of the gauge group,

$$[K^a, K^b] = f^{abc} K^c \quad (4)$$

The metric is invariant,

$$\mathcal{L}^a g_{mn} = g_{mk} \partial_n K^{ak} + g_{kn} \partial_m K^{ak} + K^{ak} \partial_k g_{mn} = 0 \quad (5)$$

Furthermore, when

$$g_{mn} = K_m^a K_n^b \delta_{ab} \quad (6)$$

we get from (4) the Maurer-Cartan equation

$$\partial_m K_n^a - \partial_n K_m^a = f^{abc} K_m^b K_n^c$$

In order to describe the interaction between the gauge field and the brane, instead of the Yang-Mills action (1) it is more convenient to take as the starting point the metric tensor

$$ds^2 = g_{\alpha\beta} dy^\alpha dy^\beta = (dx^\mu)^2 + g_{mn}(\vartheta) \{d\vartheta^m + K^{am}(\vartheta) A_\mu^a(x) dx^\mu\} \{d\vartheta^n + K^{bn}(\vartheta) A_\nu^b(x) dx^\nu\} \quad (7)$$

This metric tensor is akin the one that is widely employed in Kaluza-Klein theories [2]. But here our goal is very different. We wish to interpret all of our results solely from the perspective of ordinary \mathbb{R}^4 Yang-Mills theory; Note that we have selected g_{mn} and K^{am} to depend only on the internal coordinates ϑ^m , and the gauge field A_μ^a depends only on the coordinates x^μ of \mathbb{R}^4 .

The relation (5) implies that the metric (7) remains intact under the following diffeomorphism

$$\vartheta^m \rightarrow \vartheta^m - K^{am}(\vartheta) \varepsilon^a(x) \quad (8)$$

provided

$$A_\mu^a(x) \rightarrow A_\mu^a(x) + \partial_\mu \varepsilon^a(x) + f^{abc} A_\mu^b(x) \varepsilon^c(x) \quad (9)$$

This coincides with the familiar transformation law of a gauge field under infinitesimal gauge transformations. To ensure that this diffeomorphism is an invariance in our reformulated Yang-Mills theory, we choose the Einstein action in the higher dimensional space-time with a cosmological constant, and we evaluate it on the metric (7). This yields

$$S_E = \frac{1}{\kappa} \int \sqrt{g} d^4 x d\vartheta \{R - 2\Lambda\} = \frac{1}{\kappa} \int \sqrt{g} d^4 x d\vartheta \left\{ -\frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu}^a F_{\mu\nu}^b K^{am} K_m^b + R_{int} - 2\Lambda \right\} \quad (10)$$

Here R_{int} is the scalar curvature of the internal manifold. For an Einstein manifold R_{int} is a constant, and we select the cosmological constant to cancel it.

Notice that even though the rank of the metric (6) may be smaller than the dimension of the gauge group, when we average over the internal manifold we may still obtain the result (3). In the following we shall tacitly assume this to be the case, and if we use the relation (3) we are left with

$$S_E = \mu^{\dim[V_{int}]} \cdot \frac{\dim[V_{int}]}{\dim[SU(N)]} \frac{V_{int}}{4\kappa} \int d^4x F_{\mu\nu}^a F_{\mu\nu}^a \quad (11)$$

This coincides with the original Yang-Mills action (1) with

$$e^2 = \frac{\kappa}{V_{int}} \mu^{-\dim[V_{int}]} \cdot \frac{\dim[SU(N)]}{\dim[V_{int}]}$$

III: Mass from Three-Brane:

We introduce a three brane \mathcal{B} that is asymptotically stretched into the space-time \mathbb{R}^4 , but is allowed to locally fluctuate into the internal manifold [4], [5]. This brane is described by

$$\vartheta^m = X^m(x) \quad (12)$$

and we couple the brane to the Yang-Mills field by defining the brane dynamics to be determined by the Nambu action

$$S_{Nambu} = T \int d^4x \sqrt{G^{ind}} \quad (13)$$

Here G^{ind} is the determinant of the induced metric on the brane and T is the brane tension. We ensure that (13) is finite by assuming that the brane fluctuations are contractible and have a compact support so that at large enough distances the world-sheet of the brane coincides with our space-time \mathbb{R}^4 ,

$$X^m(x) = 0 \quad \text{as } |x| > R \quad (14)$$

Here R is some (finite) distance scale. This condition states that for distances that are larger than R the brane world-sheet merges with the original space-time \mathbb{R}^4 , which is chosen so that it coincides with $\vartheta^m = 0$ in the ambient space.

The induced brane metric is the pull-back of the bulk metric (7) to the world-sheet surface (12), obtained by using the vielbein components

$$E_\mu^\alpha = \delta_\mu^\alpha + \partial_\mu X^m \delta_m^\alpha$$

Explicitly the result is

$$G_{\mu\nu}^{ind} = E_\mu^\alpha g_{\alpha\beta} E_\nu^\beta = \delta_{\mu\nu} + (\partial_\mu X^m + K^{am} A_\mu^a) g_{mn} (\partial_\nu X^n + K^{bn} A_\nu^b)$$

The determinant can be evaluated using Sylvester's theorem,

$$G^{ind} = 1 + \delta^{\mu\nu} (\partial_\mu X^m + K^{am} A_\mu^a) g_{mn} (\partial_\nu X^n + K^{bn} A_\nu^b)$$

and to the leading order in the brane fluctuation the Nambu action is

$$S_{Nambu} = T \int d^4x + \frac{T}{2} \int d^4x \delta^{\mu\nu} J_\mu^m g_{mn}(X) J_\nu^n + \dots \quad (15)$$

where we have defined

$$J_\mu^m(X) = \partial_\mu X^m + K^{am} A_\mu^a \quad (16)$$

We remove the first term in (15) by re-adjusting the cosmological constant in (10). The second term is a mass term:

$$S_{mass} = \frac{T}{2} \int d^4x g_{mn}(X) J_\mu^m J_\mu^n \quad (17)$$

Due to the presence of the metric $g_{mn}(X)$ the mass apparently depends on the brane position but we shall soon find out that this is not the case, at least when the metric tensor admits the vielbein decomposition (6). But if the rank of the metric tensor is smaller than the dimension of the gauge group the number of massive components J_μ^m is smaller than the number of gauge fields, and in that case the massive combinations in general may depend on the brane position.

We first verify that the Nambu action with our induced metric preserves the $SU(N)$ isometry (8), (9) of the metric tensor (7), corresponding to the original gauge symmetry. For this we establish the gauge invariance of the current J_μ^m : We consider a diffeomorphism (8) of the internal manifold, generated by the Killing vector K^a . We get

$$\delta_\varepsilon(\partial_\mu X^m) = -K^{am}(X)\partial_\mu \varepsilon^a(x) \quad (18)$$

while

$$\delta_\varepsilon(K^{am}A_\mu^a) = \delta_\varepsilon(K^{am})\cdot A_\mu^a + K^{am}\cdot\delta_\varepsilon(A_\mu^a) = (\varepsilon^b \mathcal{L}^b K^{am})A_\mu^a + K^{am}(\partial_\mu \varepsilon^a + f^{abc}A_\mu^b \varepsilon^c) = K^{am}\partial_\mu \varepsilon^a$$

Consequently (16) and in particular the Nambu action is gauge invariant *i.e.* we conclude that the $SU(N)$ isometry of (7) is preserved by the coupling between the gauge field and the brane.

Consider next the quantity

$$B_\mu^a = K_m^a \partial_\mu X^m \quad (19)$$

We compute

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\mu B_\nu^a - \partial_\nu B_\mu^a &= \partial_\mu(\partial_\nu X^m K_m^a) - \partial_\nu(\partial_\mu X^m K_m^a) = (\partial_n K_m^a - \partial_m K_n^a)\partial_\nu X^m \partial_\mu X^n \\ &= -f^{abc} K_n^b K_m^c \partial_\nu X^m \partial_\mu X^n = -f^{abc} B_\mu^b B_\nu^c \end{aligned}$$

Consequently (19) obeys the Maurer-Cartan equation *i.e.* it is a pure gauge. In particular we can write

$$B_\mu \equiv B_\mu^a T^a = \partial_\mu \mathcal{U}^{-1} \cdot \mathcal{U} \quad (20)$$

where T^a are matrices in a defining representation of the gauge group $SU(N)$ and \mathcal{U} is an element of the gauge group. We introduce the vielbein basis

$$\hat{e}^a \equiv e_i^a T^i = \mathcal{U} T^a \mathcal{U}^{-1} \quad (21)$$

Next we introduce the composite vector field

$$\mathcal{J}_\mu^i T^i = (A_\mu^a + B_\mu^a) e_i^a T^i = \mathcal{U}(\partial_\mu + A_\mu)\mathcal{U}^{-1} \quad (22)$$

This vector is diffeomorphism *a.k.a.* gauge invariant under (8), (9). When we resolve (22) for A_μ^a and substitute the result in (2) we get

$$F_{\mu\nu}^a(A) = (\partial_\mu \mathcal{J}_\nu^i - \partial_\nu \mathcal{J}_\mu^i + f_{ijk} \mathcal{J}_\mu^j \mathcal{J}_\nu^k) e_i^a \equiv F_{\mu\nu}^i(\mathcal{J}) e_i^a$$

Furthermore, when we *assume* that the metric tensor has the vielbein decomposition (6) we can also write the Nambu (mass) term entirely in terms of (22). Combining the Nambu action with the Yang-Mills action we then get the following manifestly diffeomorphism *a.k.a.* gauge invariant action

$$\begin{aligned} S_{YM} + S_{Nambu} &= \int d^4x \left\{ \frac{1}{4e^2} F_{\mu\nu}^i(\mathcal{J}) F_{\mu\nu}^i(\mathcal{J}) + T \sqrt{1 + \mathcal{J}_\mu^i \mathcal{J}_\mu^i} \right\} \\ &= \int d^4x \left\{ \frac{1}{4e^2} F_{\mu\nu}^i(\mathcal{J}) F_{\mu\nu}^i(\mathcal{J}) + \frac{T}{2} \mathcal{J}_\mu^i \mathcal{J}_\mu^i + \dots \right\} \quad (23) \end{aligned}$$

Intrinsically this action describes the interaction between the Yang-Mills field A_μ^a with the three brane that fluctuates into the internal manifold. But remarkably, when we write it in terms of the variable \mathcal{J}_μ^i , it depends *only* on this variable and *all* reference to higher dimensions and in particular to the fluctuating brane has disappeared: The action (23) has a *direct* interpretation in terms of a massive vector field with $SU(N)$ invariant dynamics that takes place in the *original* space-time \mathbb{R}^4 . We can also interpret this so that the gauge field has "eaten up" the brane fluctuations

and the result is the massive vector field \mathcal{J}_μ^i , furthermore with translationally invariant dynamics in the original flat space-time \mathbb{R}^4 since all dependence on the brane position has also disappeared: The *only* thing that reveals the presence of the brane in our final theory is the presence of the mass term in \mathbb{R}^4 .

More generally, we can show that the Nambu action is both $SU(N)$ isometric and independent of the brane position whenever the Killing vectors act transitively on the internal manifold, and the dimension of the internal manifold does not exceed the number of the Killing vectors. This follows directly from the previous construction: We have verified that the vector field (16) is gauge invariant *i.e.* its Lie derivative along the flow (8), (9) vanishes. Consequently we can locally introduce a diffeomorphism generated by the Killing vectors that brings the brane coordinates to a constant value, for example

$$X^m(x) = 0$$

Consequently we can write the mass term patch-wise as

$$S_{mass} = \frac{T}{2} \int d^4x g_{mn}(0) J_\mu^m J_\nu^n$$

which establishes the independence on the brane position.

IV: Anomalies and Monopoles:

Since the variable \mathcal{J}_μ^i in (22) is gauge invariant, *any* Lorentz invariant action constructed from it is also gauge invariant. But in order to motivate the introduction of natural candidates we re-introduce the brane variable and re-write the mass contribution to the Nambu action in the following standard (Skyrme) form of a gauged non-linear σ -model,

$$S_{mass} = -\frac{T}{4} \int d^4x Tr\{\mathcal{U}(\partial_\mu + A_\mu)\mathcal{U}^{-1} \cdot \mathcal{U}(\partial_\mu + A_\mu)\mathcal{U}^{-1}\} = \frac{T}{2} \int d^4x g_{mn}(X) \nabla_\mu X^m \nabla_\nu X^n$$

This allows us to better relate our construction to known results [3], [6], [7]. The covariant derivative is defined by

$$\nabla_\mu X^m = \partial_\mu X^m + K^{am} A_\mu^a \quad (24)$$

This σ -model version proposes us to consider additional terms that have a natural σ -model interpretation. A general class of such terms is obtained by starting from the four-form [3]

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}} K_{mnpq}(\vartheta) d\vartheta^m d\vartheta^n d\vartheta^p d\vartheta^q \quad (25)$$

Here the integral extends over the entire four dimensional world-sheet of the fluctuating three brane. When we pull-back (25) into \mathbb{R}^4 and replace derivatives with covariant derivatives we obtain a diffeomorphism invariant *a.k.a.* gauge invariant action in \mathbb{R}^4 under (8), (9)

$$S_K = \frac{1}{4!} \int d^4x \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} K_{mnpq}(X) \nabla_\mu X^m \nabla_\nu X^n \nabla_\rho X^p \nabla_\sigma X^q \quad (26)$$

provided

$$\mathcal{L}^a K = 0$$

Furthermore, since the brane fluctuation has a compact support we can interpret its world-sheet to be the boundary of a contractible five dimensional disk \mathcal{D}_5 in the internal manifold. Due to the boundary condition that at large distances the brane coincides with \mathbb{R}^4 the disk also includes the point $\vartheta^m = 0$, which corresponds to the brane position of the original space-time \mathbb{R}^4 . We then use Stokes theorem to convert the integral (25) into an integral over the entire disk \mathcal{D}_5 . The result is an integral of the form

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}_5} H_{mnpqr}(\vartheta) d\vartheta^m d\vartheta^n d\vartheta^p d\vartheta^q d\vartheta^r \quad (27)$$

where $H_{mnpqr}(\vartheta)$ are the components of the closed five-form,

$$H_{mnpqr}(\vartheta) d\vartheta^m d\vartheta^n d\vartheta^p d\vartheta^q d\vartheta^r = d\{K_{mnpq}(\vartheta) d\vartheta^m d\vartheta^n d\vartheta^p d\vartheta^q\}$$

However, if we allow the five-form H in (27) to be closed but not exact the ensuing four-form K can only be introduced locally. In that case the extension of (27) into a diffeomorphism invariant quantity can not be constructed simply by minimal substitution. An example is the following Wess-Zumino functional [6], [7], [3],

$$S_{WZ} = -\frac{i}{2\pi^2 \cdot 5!} \int_{\mathcal{D}_5} d^5x \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\eta} \text{Tr}(B_\alpha B_\beta B_\gamma B_\delta B_\eta)$$

This corresponds to the closed five-form

$$H_{mnpqr}(\vartheta) = K_m^a K_n^b K_p^c K_q^d K_r^e \cdot \text{Tr}[T^a T^b T^c T^d T^e]$$

Its diffeomorphism invariant extension is

$$S_{WZ} = -\frac{i}{4! \cdot 2\pi^2} \int d^4x \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} [d_{abc} A_\mu^a \partial_\nu A_\rho^b B_\sigma^c + C_{abcd} \left(A_\mu^a A_\nu^b A_\rho^c B_\sigma^d - \frac{1}{2} A_\mu^a B_\nu^b A_\rho^c B_\sigma^d - A_\mu^a B_\nu^b B_\rho^c B_\sigma^d \right) + K_{mnpq} \partial_\mu X^m \partial_\nu X^n \partial_\rho X^p \partial_\sigma X^q]$$

where

$$\frac{1}{2} d_{abc} = \text{Tr}[T^a \{T^b, T^c\}] \quad \& \quad C_{abcd} = \text{Tr}[T^a T^b T^c T^d]$$

This is invariant under (18) only if [7]

$$\frac{\delta S_{WZ}}{\delta \epsilon^\alpha(x)} = \frac{i}{24\pi^2} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \partial_\mu (d_{abc} A_\nu^b \partial_\rho A_\sigma^c + C_{abcd} A_\nu^b A_\rho^c A_\sigma^d) = 0 \quad (28)$$

When (28) is non-vanishing we have the familiar non-Abelian anomaly equation [7], due to a single Weyl fermion in interaction with the gauge field. We can interpret this in alternative ways: The presence of a gauge anomaly in a Yang-Mills theory with Weyl fermions leads to a breaking of diffeomorphism invariance in space-time fluctuations away from \mathbb{R}^4 . Alternatively, a non-Abelian gauge anomaly that arises from Weyl fermions can be removed by allowing for appropriate three brane fluctuations that cancel those that emerge from the Weyl fermions. In this manner our approach provides a very natural interpretation and setting for the consistent quantization of anomalous gauge theories [7].

We also note that in the present approach we entirely avoid the conventional introduction of an *ad hoc* five-dimensional disk [3], [6], [7]. This disk has now a natural geometric interpretation in the context of our higher dimensional ambient space, and its boundary is the fluctuating three brane.

We return to (21). We choose H^α to be the Cartan subset of the $SU(N)$ generators T^a and we introduce the ensuing subset m_i^α of the vielbeins e_i^a in (21) [8],

$$\hat{m}^\alpha = m_i^\alpha T^i = \mathcal{U} H^\alpha \mathcal{U}^{-1} \quad (29)$$

It is straightforward to verify that

$$\begin{aligned} [\hat{m}^\alpha, \hat{m}^\beta] &= 0 \\ \{\hat{m}^\alpha, \hat{m}^\beta\} &= d^{\alpha\beta\gamma} \hat{m}^\gamma \\ \text{Tr}(\hat{m}^\alpha \partial_\mu \hat{m}^\beta) &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Using (20) we can also show that

$$d\hat{m}^\alpha = [\hat{m}^\alpha, B]$$

We introduce the following closed two-forms,

$$\Omega_H^\alpha = \text{Tr}(H^\alpha [\mathcal{U}^{-1} d\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{U}^{-1} d\mathcal{U}]) = f_{ijk} m_i^\alpha \partial_\mu m_j^\beta \partial_\nu m_k^\beta dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu \quad (30)$$

These are the symplectic two-forms on the orbit $SU(N)/U(1)^{N-1}$. Recall that according to the Borel-Weil theorem each of the linear combinations

$$\sum_\alpha n_\alpha \Omega_H^\alpha$$

where $n_\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}$ corresponds to an irreducible representation of $SU(N)$. We can show that

$$B_\mu dx^\mu = \mathcal{U} \partial_\mu \mathcal{U}^{-1} dx^\mu = C_H \cdot \hat{m} + [d\hat{m}, \hat{m}] \quad (31)$$

where

$$\partial_\mu C_H^\alpha{}_\nu - \partial_\nu C_H^\alpha{}_\mu = \Omega_H^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu} \quad (32)$$

This reveals a relation between the $SU(N)$ magnetic monopoles in the original space-time \mathbb{R}^4 , representations of $SU(N)$, and the non-triviality of the topological structure of the three brane \mathcal{B} .

V: $SU(2)$ as an Example:

As an explicit example we consider the case of $SU(2)$. For the internal manifold we first take $SU(2) \sim \mathbb{S}^3$. We use the following explicit Euler angle parametrization

$$\mathcal{U} = -i \begin{pmatrix} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} e^{\frac{i}{2}\phi_+} & -\cos \frac{\theta}{2} e^{\frac{i}{2}\phi_-} \\ -\cos \frac{\theta}{2} e^{-\frac{i}{2}\phi_-} & -\sin \frac{\theta}{2} e^{-\frac{i}{2}\phi_+} \end{pmatrix} \quad (33)$$

where $0 \leq \theta \leq \pi$ and $0 \leq \phi_\pm \leq 2\pi$ are local coordinates on \mathbb{S}^3 . The natural metric g_{mn} ($m, n = 1, 2, 3$) on \mathbb{S}^3 is the bi-invariant Killing two-form,

$$ds^2 = 2 \text{Tr}(d\mathcal{U}d\mathcal{U}^{-1}) = g_{mn} d\vartheta^m d\vartheta^n = (d\theta)^2 + \sin^2 \frac{\theta}{2} (d\phi_+)^2 + \cos^2 \frac{\theta}{2} (d\phi_-)^2 \quad (34)$$

We write the Maurer-Cartan one-form as follows,

$$B_\mu = \mathcal{U} d\mathcal{U}^{-1} = B_m^a d\vartheta^m \frac{1}{2i} \tau^a \quad (35)$$

where τ^a are the Pauli matrices. We relate the components B_m^a to the dreibeins for the metric (34),

$$g_{mn} = \delta_{ab} B_m^a B_n^b \quad (36)$$

The one-forms $K^a = B_m^a d\vartheta^m$ are subject to the $SU(2)$ Maurer-Cartan equation

$$dB^a = -\frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{abc} B^b \wedge B^c \quad (37)$$

Explicitly, we write

$$B^1 = n^1 d\psi_+ - e_2^1 d\theta \quad (38)$$

$$B^2 = n^2 d\psi_+ - e_2^2 d\theta \quad (39)$$

$$B^3 = n^3 d\psi_+ - d\psi_- \quad (40)$$

where we have defined

$$\psi_\pm = \frac{1}{2}(\phi_+ \pm \phi_-)$$

and we have introduced the right handed unit triplet

$$\vec{e}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \psi_- \cos \theta \\ \sin \psi_- \cos \theta \\ -\sin \theta \end{pmatrix} \quad \& \quad \vec{e}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} -\sin \psi_- \\ \cos \psi_- \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \& \quad \vec{n} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \psi_- \sin \theta \\ \sin \psi_- \sin \theta \\ \cos \theta \end{pmatrix} \quad (41)$$

There are the three invariant Killing vector fields

$$K^a = (K^a)^m \frac{\partial}{\partial \vartheta^m} \quad (m = 1, 2, 3)$$

that can be identified as the canonical duals of the one-forms B^a . With (38)-(40) this gives us the explicit realization

$$K^1 = \{ \sin \psi_- \partial_\theta + \cos \psi_- \cot \theta \partial_{\psi_-} \} + \frac{\cos \psi_-}{\sin \theta} \partial_{\psi_+} \quad (42)$$

$$K^2 = \{ -\cos \psi_- \partial_\theta + \sin \psi_- \cot \theta \partial_{\psi_-} \} + \frac{\sin \psi_-}{\sin \theta} \partial_{\psi_+} \quad (43)$$

$$K^3 = -\partial_{\psi_-} \quad (44)$$

and the commutators of the Killing vectors determine a representation of the $SU(2)$ Lie algebra,

$$[K^a, K^b] = -\epsilon^{abc} K^c \quad (45)$$

Using (31), (41) we write

$$B_\mu = \mathfrak{C}_\mu \hat{n} + [\hat{n}, \partial_\mu \hat{n}] \quad (46)$$

where

$$\mathfrak{C}_\mu = \vec{e}^+ \cdot \partial_\mu \vec{e}^-$$

with

$$e^\pm = \frac{1}{2} e^{-\psi_+} (\vec{e}_1 \pm i \vec{e}_2)$$

Explicitly, in terms of the angular variables in (41)

$$\mathfrak{C}_\mu = -\frac{1}{2} (\cos \theta \partial_\mu \psi_- + \partial_\mu \psi_+) \quad (47)$$

and for (32) we get

$$\partial_\mu \mathfrak{C}_\nu - \partial_\nu \mathfrak{C}_\mu = \vec{n} \cdot \partial_\mu \vec{n} \times \partial_\nu \vec{n} + \Sigma_{\mu\nu}$$

where

$$\Sigma_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{1}{2} [\partial_\mu, \partial_\nu] \psi_+$$

is the familiar Dirac string tensor. Indeed, in (47) we identify the familiar structure of pointlike Dirac monopoles. We note that this structure is also intimately related to the presence of knot-like configurations in the space \mathbb{R}^3 [9], and these knots are the natural candidates for describing the (glueball) spectrum of the Yang-Mills theory.

Instead of \mathbb{S}^3 , we can also take the internal manifold to be the co-adjoint orbit $SU(2)/U(1) \sim \mathbb{S}^2$. The Killing vectors are now

$$K^1 = -\sin \phi \partial_\theta - \cot \theta \sin \phi \partial_\phi \quad (48)$$

$$K^2 = \cos \phi \partial_\theta - \cot \theta \sin \phi \partial_\phi \quad (49)$$

$$K^3 = \partial_\phi \quad (50)$$

The rank of the metric tensor on \mathbb{S}^2 is two, but for the integral (3) we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \sin \theta d\theta d\phi g_{mn} K^{am} K^{bn} = 4\pi \cdot \frac{2}{3} \delta^{ab} \quad (51)$$

and consequently we obtain the Yang-Mills action from (10), (11). But (17) now gives a non-vanishing mass to only two of the vector fields J_μ^m , and the massless combination is

$$J_\mu = \sin \phi(x) \sin \theta(x) A_\mu^1 + \cos \phi(x) \sin \theta(x) A_\mu^2 + \cos \theta(x) A_\mu^3$$

where $\phi(x)$ and $\theta(x)$ are the spherical coordinates of the brane position; We note that by properly implementing the diffeomorphisms (8), (9) we can locally transport the brane position *e.g.* to the north-pole $\theta = 0$ so that the massless mode becomes A_μ^3 . This corresponds to selecting a unitary gauge in the original Yang-Mills theory.

VI: Conclusions:

In conclusion, we have considered a gauge invariant coupling between a four dimensional $SU(N)$ gauge field and a three brane. For this we have reformulated the four dimensional Yang-Mills theory as a gravity theory in a higher dimensional space-time, by replacing the Lie algebra generators with Killing vector fields. This enables us to employ the Nambu action to introduce an interaction between the Yang-Mills field and the three brane that fluctuates in the ensuing higher dimensional space-time. We have shown that the Nambu action for the brane leads to a vector field mass. The final theory describes the interactive dynamics of massive and massless vector fields in the original flat Euclidean four-space, with the mass constituent depending on the choice of the internal manifold. In particular, all other reference to the three brane besides the presence of a mass term in \mathbb{R}^4 becomes entirely removed. We have also investigated topologically nontrivial brane structures, and established their connection to magnetic monopoles in \mathbb{R}^4 . Our results suggest that the mass gap in Yang-Mills theory could well have its origin in higher dimensions. Or, at least our construction appears to give a novel and good motivation for introducing certain familiar Skyrme-like effective fields to describe both the mass gap and the gauge anomaly in a continuum Yang-Mills theory. From the four dimensional point of view these theories are non-renormalizable. However, with the present higher dimensional gravity/membrane formulation, maybe there is a completion into a consistent theory.

We thank M. Chernodub for discussions. This work has been partially supported by a grant from Vetenskapsrådet.

-
- [1] J. Carlson, A. Jaffe and A. Wiles, eds. *The Millennium Prize Problems* (Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society, 2006)
 - [2] M. Duff, B.E.W. Nilsson and C.N. Pope, Phys. Reports **130**, 1 (1986)
 - [3] C.M. Hull and B. Spence, Nucl. Phys. **B353**, 379 (1991)
 - [4] A.J. Niemi and S. Slizovskiy, e-print [arXiv:1004.0212](https://arxiv.org/abs/1004.0212)
 - [5] S. Slizovskiy, e-print [arXiv:1004.0216](https://arxiv.org/abs/1004.0216)
 - [6] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B223**, 422 (1983)
 - [7] L.D. Faddeev and S. Shatashvili, Theor. Math. Phys. **60**, 206 (1984)
 - [8] L.D. Faddeev and A.J. Niemi, Phys. Lett. **B449**, 214 (1999)
 - [9] L.D. Faddeev and A.J. Niemi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 1624 (1999)