

August 13, 2018

USITP 98-05

FROM TOPOLOGICAL TO PARAMETRIZED FIELD THEORY

Nuno Barros e Sá¹

Ingemar Bengtsson²

^{1,2}*Fysikum, Stockholms Universitet, Box 6730,
113 85 Stockholm, Sverige*

¹*DCTD, Universidade dos Açores, R. Mãe de Deus,
9500 Ponta Delgada, Açores, Portugal*

Abstract

It has been proposed to study the theory resulting from setting the gravitational constant to zero in the first order formalism for general relativity. In this letter we investigate this theory in the presence of matter fields, establish its equivalence with parametrized field theory on a flat background, and relate it to previous results in topological field theory (BF theory).

¹Email address: nunosa@vanosf.physto.se. Supported by grant PRODEP-Ação 5.2.

²Email address: ingemar@vana.physto.se. Supported by NFR-project 07923.

Over the past ten years a bewildering array of diffeomorphism invariant field theories has been studied. In many cases they contain a finite number of degrees of freedom only, and they carry topological information about the manifold on which they are defined. By contrast, the most interesting theory of this kind remains that of Einstein, in which the metric occurs as a dynamical variable carrying two degrees of freedom per spatial point. Einstein's theory in 2+1 dimensions occupies the middle ground. It can be formulated like the 3+1 dimensional theory, but it can also be formulated as a topological gauge theory in which the metric—or more precisely the metrical triad—occurs as a gauge field [1]. When matter couplings are included the first formulation turns out to be superior [2]. One is left wondering about the conditions under which a set of variables in a diffeomorphism invariant theory can be meaningfully identified as a spacetime metric.

We will not try to answer the general question in this letter. Instead, we will point out that there is a set of ideas that can be used to provide a 3+1 dimensional illustration of the issues involved. First we will show that the Einstein-Hilbert action can be "short circuited" in a certain way so that the metric carries no degrees of freedom (as first observed by Smolin [3]). In effect we obtain a diffeomorphism invariant theory where the only solution is Minkowski space—also when matter fields are included. We then show that this model is closely related to the BF topological field theory defined by Horowitz [4]. As in 2+1 gravity it is possible to reorganize the constraints of the model so that we obtain the constraint algebra familiar from general relativity. Our fourth and final point is that we can solve some of the constraints of our theory by means of a canonical transformation to gauge invariant variables. When this is done we recover precisely the parametrized field theories studied by Dirac and Kuchař [5].

We will assume that the metric that we define is non-degenerate. While rather foreign to topological field theory this assumption is natural in metrical theories. The same assumption has to be made in 2+1 gravity in order to show that the two formulations referred to above are indeed equivalent. In this as well as in our case there is a subtlety involved, and we will comment on this at the appropriate point.

Our starting point is the first order action for gravity built from tetrads e_I and connections ω_{IJ} ,

$$S_E = \frac{1}{8} \int \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \epsilon^{IJKL} e_{\alpha I} e_{\beta J} R_{\gamma\delta KL} + S_m . \quad (1)$$

Here I, J, \dots are internal indices that can be raised and lowered with a

Minkowski metric η_{IJ} , the curvature tensor is

$$R_{\alpha\beta IJ} = \partial_\alpha \omega_{\beta IJ} - \partial_\beta \omega_{\alpha IJ} + G \omega_{\alpha I}{}^K \omega_{\beta KJ} , \quad (2)$$

G is the gravitational coupling constant, and this form of the first order action may differ from that of other references by a redefinition $\omega_{IJ} \rightarrow G\omega_{IJ}$. S_m is an action for matter fields that is independent of the connection and depends on the tetrad only through the metric tensor

$$g_{\alpha\beta} = e_{\alpha I} e_{\beta J} \eta^{IJ} . \quad (3)$$

For definiteness we may choose an action for a scalar field,

$$S_m = -\frac{1}{2} \int \sqrt{-g} (g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\alpha \varphi \partial_\beta \varphi + m^2 \varphi^2) . \quad (4)$$

Our results will however be general and will not depend on this particular choice of the matter action.

The model that we will consider is obtained by setting $G = 0$ in the above action;

$$S = \frac{1}{4} \int \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \epsilon^{IJKL} e_{\alpha I} e_{\beta J} \partial_\gamma \omega_{\delta KL} + S_m . \quad (5)$$

This is a drastic operation. Instead of an $SO(3, 1)$ connection we now have a collection of six $U(1)$ connections, and the tetrad is a collection of four gauge invariant vector fields. Moreover we will see that this theory does not have any local degrees of freedom (in the absence of matter fields). The use of the matrix η_{IJ} to build a spacetime metric may therefore seem completely ad hoc. However, we will see that—at least when matter fields are included—it is actually quite well motivated. We do need η_{IJ} to build the matter action S_m .

The $G = 0$ "limit" was first studied by Smolin [3] in the context of Ashtekar's variables. Then the starting point is the self-dual form of the action, and the detailed results are quite different from ours since the equivalence between the two forms of the action breaks down when $G = 0$. In particular the model studied by Smolin has the same number of degrees of freedom as Einstein's theory (either Euclidean or complex Lorentzian).

Varying our action with respect to the connection yields an equation for the tetrad:

$$\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \epsilon^{IJKL} e_{\gamma K} e_{\delta L} = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \partial_\alpha e_{\beta I} - \partial_\beta e_{\alpha I} = 0 . \quad (6)$$

(Varying Einstein's action would yield an equation for the connection at this point—our action is indeed "short circuited".) This means that the tetrads are closed forms and that the only solution is (locally) Minkowski spacetime:

$$e_{\alpha I} = \partial_{\alpha} f_I \quad \Rightarrow \quad g_{\alpha\beta} = \partial_{\alpha} f^I \eta_{IJ} \partial_{\beta} f^J . \quad (7)$$

Varying the tetrads one obtains a set of equations relating the connections to the tetrads and to the matter fields. These may be solved for the connection—they do not constrain either the tetrads or the matter fields. Finally, varying the matter fields leads to the usual field equations for matter propagating in a flat background. Hence we have a diffeomorphism invariant theory in which matter does not curve geometry.

One may wonder whether there is anything special about flat space here? From the present point of view there is; although one may linearize the first order action around any connection $\omega_{IJ}^{(0)}$ that solves Einstein's equations and then proceed as above diffeomorphism invariance would be lost in the process. Unless $\omega_{IJ}^{(0)} = 0$ one ends up with an action that contains fixed functions of the coordinates.

We will now analyze our model in more detail using the Hamiltonian formalism. Until further notice we set $S_m = 0$, that is to say that we do not include the matter degrees of freedom. We start by defining a new set of variables

$$B_{\alpha\beta}^I = -\frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{IJKL} e_{[\alpha J} \omega_{\beta]KL} . \quad (8)$$

Provided that the tetrad is indeed non-degenerate this is a one-to-one transformation from the connections to the two forms B^I , having the inverse

$$\omega_{\alpha IJ} = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{IJKL} e^{\beta K} \left(B_{\alpha\beta}{}^L - \frac{1}{2} e^{\gamma L} e_{\alpha M} B_{\beta\gamma}{}^M \right) . \quad (9)$$

Hence we can perform this change of variables in the action. After a partial integration it becomes

$$S = \int \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} B_{\alpha\beta}^I \partial_{\gamma} e_{\delta I} . \quad (10)$$

In this form the action is just four copies of the BF topological field theory studied by Horowitz [4]. Hence we have shown that the $G = 0$ version of the Einstein action is equivalent to that sector of the abelian BF theory in which the tetrad is invertible.

The action has a large gauge invariance (larger than that of the Einstein action), namely

$$e_{\alpha I} \rightarrow e_{\alpha I} - \partial_{\alpha} \Lambda_I \quad (11)$$

$$B_{\alpha\beta}^I \rightarrow B_{\alpha\beta}^I - \partial_{[\alpha} \Lambda_{\beta]}^I . \quad (12)$$

It follows that a non-degenerate tetrad can always be transformed so that it vanishes at any chosen point. The same difficulty occurs when one attempts to show the equivalence between the two possible formulations of 2+1 gravity referred to above. It is a moderately embarrassing difficulty; a possible attitude to take in both cases is that the true starting point is a suitable form of the phase space action, in which this problem does not appear. Therefore we proceed with the calculation.

It is straightforward to perform a 3+1 decomposition of the action in the form that we arrived at. We get

$$S = \int \dot{e}_{\alpha I} \pi^{aI} + e_{tI} \partial_a \pi^{aI} - \lambda_a^I \epsilon^{abc} \partial_b e_{cI} , \quad (13)$$

where we renamed the components of the two form according to

$$\pi^{aI} = \epsilon^{abc} B_{bc}^I \quad \lambda_a^I = -2B_{ta}^I . \quad (14)$$

Excluding the matter action there are 16 first class constraints of which 12 are independent, and there are 12 canonical variables per spatial point. Hence the model is devoid of dynamical degrees of freedom. The constraint algebra is abelian, which means that diffeomorphism invariance—which should be realized as a gauge freedom—is not manifest. This form of the phase space action is analogous to Witten’s form of the phase space action for 2+1 gravity [1]. Non-degeneracy of the tetrad is not a gauge invariant property in this formulation, and inclusion of the matter fields in the constraints is problematic.

These problems can be avoided by a redefinition of the Lagrange multipliers. We wish to interpret the tetrad as giving rise to a metric, and we would therefore like to introduce the lapse function N and the shift vector N^a as multipliers. Any spacetime metric can be split into the spatial metric

$$q_{ab} = e_{aI} e_{bJ} \eta^{IJ} \quad (15)$$

induced on a spatial hypersurface at constant t , together with the lapse and shifts

$$N = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-qg^{tt}}} \quad N^a = -\frac{g^{ta}}{g^{tt}} . \quad (16)$$

(Here q is the determinant of the spatial metric, and we use a lapse function that is a tensor density of weight minus one.) These equations can be inverted so that the time component of the tetrad becomes

$$e_{tI} = \frac{N}{6} \epsilon_I^{JKL} \epsilon^{abc} e_{aJ} e_{bK} e_{cL} + N^a e_{aI} . \quad (17)$$

Our action does not single out a preferred metric, but if we trade the Lagrange multiplier e_{tI} for the lapse and shifts it will acquire one, having a signature determined by the signature of the matrix η_{IJ} .

When we use this result in the phase space action we obtain

$$S = \int \dot{e}_{aI} \pi^{aI} - N \mathcal{H} - N^a \mathcal{H}_a - \lambda^I \epsilon^{abc} \partial_b e_{cI} . \quad (18)$$

The constraints are the Hamiltonian and vector constraints, together with the constraints $\phi_I^a = 0$ already encountered:

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{1}{3!} \epsilon^{IJK} \epsilon^{abc} e_{aI} e_{bJ} e_{cK} \partial_d \pi^{dL} \quad (19)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_a = -e_{aI} \partial_b \pi^{bI} \quad (20)$$

$$\phi_I^a = \epsilon^{abc} \partial_b e_{cI} . \quad (21)$$

In this formulation the spatial diffeomorphisms are manifest, or almost so. In fact there is a simple combination of the constraints that generates spatial diffeomorphisms;

$$\mathcal{D}_a = \mathcal{H}_a + \epsilon_{abc} \pi^{bI} \phi_I^c . \quad (22)$$

The constraint algebra has the following non-zero brackets:

$$\{\mathcal{H}[N], \mathcal{H}[M]\} = \mathcal{H}_a [(N \partial_a M - M \partial_a N) q q^{ab}] \quad (23)$$

$$\{\mathcal{H}_a[N^a], \mathcal{H}[M]\} = \mathcal{H}[\mathcal{L}_{\vec{N}} M] - \phi_I^a [\epsilon^{IJK} e_{bJ} e_{cK} \partial_c \pi^{cL}] , \quad (24)$$

$$\{\mathcal{H}_a[N^a], \mathcal{H}_b[M^b]\} = \mathcal{H}_a[\mathcal{L}_{\bar{N}}M^a] - \phi_I^a[\epsilon_{abc}N^bM^c\partial_d\pi^{dI}], \quad (25)$$

where \mathcal{L} denotes the Lie derivative and the square bracket denote smearing with test functions. On the constraint surface $\phi_I^a = 0$ this is the usual constraint algebra of general relativity. It is the fingerprint of diffeomorphism invariance in a metric space in the Hamiltonian formulation, having the geometrical interpretation [6] as the algebra of deformations of spatial hypersurfaces in a Lorentzian spacetime. From this point of view the matrix η_{IJ} is an object that is inserted in the phase space action precisely in order to make a geometrical interpretation of the solutions possible.

We may now adopt this first order action as a precise definition of our model. This is analogous to the ADM formulation of 2+1 gravity, and it has the double advantages that non-degeneracy of the metric can be consistently imposed, and that inclusion of matter degrees of freedom is straightforward. The latter will affect the form of the Hamiltonian and vector constraints, but they will not affect the constraint algebra. This follows from the assumption that only metrical couplings of the matter fields will be considered (that is the case for bosonic fields and also for the standard coupling of fermionic fields when setting $G = 0$), together with the crucial bracket

$$\{q_{ab}, \mathcal{H}[N]\} = N\frac{1}{2}e_{aI}\epsilon^{IJKL}\epsilon^{cde}\partial_b(e_cJ e_{dK}e_{eL}) + (a \leftrightarrow b). \quad (26)$$

The point here is the absence of any derivatives acting on the lapse function. (For a full explanation of this point as well as of all other properties of our constraint algebra, see Hojman et al. [6].)

We now have a diffeomorphism invariant theory that describes matter propagating on a flat background. There are no local degrees of freedom attached to the geometry. One might expect that there should be a relation to parametrized field theory [5], which achieves the same goal at the expense of introducing special "embedding variables" into the action. This is in fact the case. To see this we observe that, restricting ourselves to simply connected space, we can solve some of our constraints explicitly:

$$\phi_I^a = \epsilon^{abc}\partial_b e_{cI} = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad e_{aI} = \partial_a X_I. \quad (27)$$

We can now use Hamilton-Jacobi theory to effect a (singular) canonical transformation from the tetrad and its momentum to a new set of canonical pairs (X_I, P^J) that coordinatize the constraint surface $\phi_I^a = 0$ modulo the gauge transformations generated by this constraint [7]. To this end we

choose a generating functional that depends on the "old" momenta and the "new" coordinates,

$$S_{pQ} = - \int \partial_a X_I \pi^{aI} . \quad (28)$$

Then the canonical transformation is given by

$$e_{aI} = - \frac{\delta S_{pQ}}{\delta \pi_I^a} = \partial_a X_I \quad (29)$$

$$P^I = - \frac{\delta S_{pQ}}{\delta X_I} = - \partial_a \pi^{aI} . \quad (30)$$

Making use of this in the phase space action (in the first of the two forms given above) we obtain

$$S = \int \dot{X}_I P^I - e_{tI} P^I . \quad (31)$$

This is the action describing the kinematics of the vector e_I that describes the deformations of spatial hypersurfaces in spacetime [5].

We can now trade the four vector e_I for the lapse and shifts, just as we did above. This means that we write

$$e_{tI} = N n_I + N^a \partial_a X_I , \quad (32)$$

where the vector n_I , as defined in eq. (17), obeys

$$n^I N^a \partial_a X_I = 0 . \quad (33)$$

We can also add any matter action (with metrical couplings) to the phase space action. In this way we arrive at

$$S = \int \dot{X}_I P^I + N \frac{1}{3!} \epsilon^{IJK} \epsilon^{abc} \partial_a X_I \partial_b X_J \partial_c X_K P^L - N^a \partial_a X_I P^I + S_m . \quad (34)$$

This is the action of a parametrized field theory on a flat background [5]; the constraint algebra is the same as that of general relativity.

In conclusion, we have realised the equivalence between a sector of a BF theory and Smolin's $G = 0$ limit of Einstein's gravity, successfully introduced matter terms in these models, and shown that they are equivalent to parametrized field theory on a flat background provided that spacetime is simply connected.

References

- [1] A. Achúcarro and P.K. Townsend, Phys. Lett. B180 (1986) 89.
E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B311 (1988) 46.
- [2] M.P. Blencowe, Nucl. Phys. B341 (1990) 213.
- [3] L. Smolin, Class. Quant. Grav. 9 (1992) 883.
- [4] G.T. Horowitz, Comm. Math. Phys. 125 (1989) 417.
- [5] P.A.M. Dirac: Lectures on Quantum Mechanics, Belfer Graduate School of Science, New York 1964.
K. Kuchař, in C.J. Isham, R. Penrose and D.W. Sciama (eds.): Quantum Gravity 2—A Second Oxford Symposium, Oxford 1981.
- [6] S.A. Hojman, K. Kuchař and C. Teitelboim, Ann. Phys. 96 (1976) 88.
- [7] E.T. Newman and C. Rovelli, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69 (1992) 1300.
E.T. Newman and C. Rovelli, in: F. Colomo, L. Lusanna and G. Marmo: Constraint Theory and Quantization Methods, Singapore 1994