

Gauge invariant discretization of Poincare quantum gravity

M.A. Zubkov^a

^a *ITEP, B.Chermushkinskaya 25, Moscow, 117259, Russia*

Abstract

In this paper we suggest gauge invariant discretization of Poincare quantum gravity. We generalize Regge calculus to the case of Riemann-Cartan space. The basic element of the constructed discretization is piecewise linear Riemann-Cartan space with flat pieces of hypercubic form. We consider the model with squared curvature action and calculate the correspondent lattice action. We construct local measure over the dynamical variables of the lattice model.

November 10, 2018

1 Introduction

In order to put quantum gravity theory on the lattice one should construct such discretization of the continuum model, which preserves as much symmetry of the original continuum model as possible. That's why Regge quantum gravity is considered to be one of the most natural lattice realizations of quantum gravity. The main success of Regge calculus is that it is manifestly gauge invariant, i.e. it preserves the whole symmetry of the original model. This is due to the fact, that in this lattice theory piecewise - linear Riemannian manifold plays the role of the dynamical variable. (In the original continuum theory Riemannian manifold of any possible form plays the role of the dynamical variable.) In other words, we approximate any given Riemannian manifold by piecewise - linear Riemannian manifolds. This discretization is gauge invariant by the construction.

In order to define measure over link lengths in Regge quantum gravity one may start from the invariant metric on the space of continuum Riemannian geometries [1, 2, 3]:

$$\|\delta g\|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \int d^D x \sqrt{|g|} (g^{\mu\nu} g^{\rho\eta} + g^{\rho\nu} g^{\mu\eta} + C g^{\mu\rho} g^{\nu\eta}) \delta g_{\mu\rho} \delta g_{\nu\eta} \quad (1)$$

where C is the arbitrary constant such that $C \neq -2/D$. Then we may postulate that the correct measure on the space of Riemannian geometries corresponds to this metric in the same sense as the measure dx on R^1 corresponds to the metric $\|\delta x\|^2 = (\delta x)^2$. Unfortunately, the shift from finite dimensional case to infinite dimensional case is not clear. Namely, we may generalize the finite dimensional formula for the measure correspondent to the given metric. Thus we obtain the continuum measure correspondent to the metric (1) (for more details see, for example, [5] and references therein):

$$Dg = \Pi_x (\sqrt{|g(x)|})^\sigma \Pi_{\mu \geq \nu} dg_{\mu\nu}(x) \quad (2)$$

Here the choice $\sigma = (D-4)(D+1)/4$ corresponds to the super-metric tensor in its form chosen in [1, 4] while the choice $\sigma = -(D+1)$ was considered in [2]. Obviously this ambiguity is related to the fact, that the product over points Π_x is not well defined if x belongs to R^D . Actually, the precise meaning could be given to (2) only when the discretization of Riemannian space is chosen.

In some of the papers devoted to Regge quantum gravity, the following measure over link lengths was considered (see, for example, [5]):

$$Dl = [\Pi_x V_x^\sigma] [\Pi_{ij} dl_{ij}^2] \Theta(l_{ij}), \quad (3)$$

where the product Π_x is over the simplices while the product Π_{ij} is over the vertices of the simplicial manifold. $\Theta(l_{ij})$ is the step function, which provides the triangle inequalities at each simplex. V_x is the volume of the simplex x , and l_{ij} is the length of the link that connects vertices i and j .

According to [5] the derivation of the measure (3) is as follows. At each simplex $V_x^\sigma \Pi_{ij} dl_{ij}^2(x)$ is the direct discretization of the expression

$(\sqrt{|g(x)|})^\sigma \Pi_{\mu \geq \nu} dg_{\mu\nu}(x)$ (where i and j are the vertices of the given simplex, and the constant factor is omitted). In the system of simplices glued together the link lengths are not independent. Therefore, the correspondent constraint should be imposed. In [5] this constraint was chosen in the form: $\Pi_{xy} \Pi_{ij} \delta(l_{ij}^2(x) - l_{ij}^2(y))$, where the product Π_{xy} is over the pairs of neighboring simplices while the product Π_{ij} is over the pairs of vertices of the side, which is common for x and y . Thus we obtain the lattice measure in the form (3).

We mention here again, that the derivation of the continuum formula (2) and even its own form cannot be considered as completely mathematically rigorous. There is also an ambiguity in the choice of the constraint, which is imposed on the link lengths in the system of simplices glued together. Namely, such a constraint may be chosen in the form $\Omega[l_{ij}] \Pi_{xy} \Pi_{ij} \delta(l_{ij}^2(x) - l_{ij}^2(y))$, where $\Omega[l_{ij}]$ depends upon link lengths. A priori the particular form of such functional is not known. Therefore, although the choice (3) seems to be quite natural, it is not derived rigorously from the expression (1) for the metric on space of continuum Riemannian geometries. This results, in particular, in the ambiguity in the choice of σ .

A possible solution for this problem would appear if there exists a symmetry in the continuum theory, which (after transferring to discretized model) fixes the form of lattice measure. Unfortunately, the existence of such a symmetry within Regge quantum gravity is not clear. Therefore, in the present paper we suggest to consider its generalization based on the so-called Poincare quantum gravity. We hope that the mentioned problem can be solved within this generalized model. This is the theory, in which the dynamical variable is the Riemann - Cartan manifold. (Riemannian manifold is the limiting case of Riemann - Cartan manifold with vanishing torsion.)

It is worth mentioning, that the topics related to the discretization of Poincare gravity were already considered. Say, in [9, 7] the independent $SO(4)$ connection was introduced into the Regge calculus. The connection is singular and lives on the sides of the simplices. In principle this con-

struction resembles the one suggested in the present paper. However, here we use hypercubic lattice, which is much more useful, than the simplicial one. Moreover, in the present paper we construct simple natural Poincare invariant measure over the dynamical variables, which was not done in [9, 7]. We also mention, that in [9, 7] there was no consideration of the squared curvature terms in the action.

Poincare gravity on the hypercubic lattice was considered, say, in [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13]. In these papers lattice discretization was constructed in the conventional way via direct discretization of the theory. Therefore, the correspondent constructions were not gauge invariant (in the gravity models the gauge group is the group of general coordinate transformations)¹. In the mentioned papers some of the considered lattice theories were invariant under lattice gauge transformations, which belong to the Poincare group. However, the existence of this invariance does not mean that the constructed discretizations are invariant under general coordinate transformations. For a brief comparison of our approach with the approaches of [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13] see section 3 of the present paper.

In the present paper we generalize Regge construction to Riemann-Cartan spaces. In our approach we approximate any given manifold by a piecewise-linear Riemann-Cartan manifold (with hypercubic elements). The crucial difference between our approach and the approaches of [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13] is that we use geometrical construction. I.e. we discretize the original manifold by the invariant objects (with respect to the group of general coordinate transformations). As a result our lattice model is gauge invariant by construction.

2 The discretization of Riemann-Cartan space

Thus, we consider Riemann-Cartan space, in which both $SO(4)$ connection² and the inverse vierbein are the dynamical variables. We do not require vanishing of torsion (which would lead to appearance of Riemannian manifold) or vanishing of curvature (which would lead to appearance of Weitzenbock

¹It was shown, for example, that in ordinary gauge theories the discretization, which is not gauge invariant, is not appropriate (say, in the correspondent lattice nonabelian gauge models there is no confinement of fundamental charges [14]).

²Further we imply, that Wick rotation to Euclidean signature is performed. So, we deal with Euclidean path integral formalism.

space). The discretized space is in itself a Riemann-Cartan space. It is composed of flat pieces connected together. We consider the case, when each such piece has the hypercubic form. Further we refer to hypercubes as to elements of the lattice. Form of the lattice elements is fixed by the set of vectors \mathbf{e}_μ that connect the center of the element with its vertices. The expression of \mathbf{e}_μ through elements of the orthonormal frame \mathbf{f}_A ($A = 1, 2, 3, 4$) (common for all lattice elements) is one of the basic variables of the construction. So we have

$$\mathbf{e}_\mu = \sum_A E_\mu^A \mathbf{f}_A \quad (4)$$

(Everywhere space - time indices are denoted by Greek letters contrary to the tetrad ones.) We imply here that vectors \mathbf{e}_μ ($\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$) are independent. The other vectors \mathbf{e}_μ ($\mu = 5, \dots, 15$) are defined in such a way, that opposite sides of the lattice element are parallel to each other. The hypercubic lattice is periodic and the position of the starting point of each lattice element is always denoted by \mathbf{e}_0 . Vectors \mathbf{e}_μ ($\mu = 1, 2, 3, 4$) point to its neighbors.

Variables E_μ^A represent translations from the center of the lattice element to its vertices. Metric (or vierbein) is implied to be constant inside each lattice element. Here shift of the center of lattice element by a vector v^A causes transformation of basic variables: $E_\mu^A \rightarrow E_\mu^A + v^A$, which could be treated as gauge transformation with respect to the translational gauge group. It represents the translation of the given lattice element within the correspondent local map.

In addition to the translational connection, which is defined by the set of variables E_μ^A , each shift from one lattice element to another is accompanied by the rotation in the four - dimensional tangent space. In other words, there is the $SO(4)$ connection, which is singular and is concentrated on the sides of lattice elements³. We denote by U_{IJ} the $SO(4)$ matrix, which is attached to the side that is common for the lattice elements I and J .

The constructed Riemann - Cartan space has singular connection. In this case definitions of curvature and torsion become ambiguous. Therefore we must fix one of the definitions. For the details we refer to the Appendix, where one of the definitions is used in order to calculate torsion and curvature

³In this paper we do not consider parity transformations, correspondent to the matrices $\text{diag}\{\pm 1, \pm 1, \pm 1, \pm 1\}$ with negative determinant since these transformations do not appear in the infinitesimal form of Poincare transformation. However, the considered model could be easily generalized in order to include parity transformations if we use $O(4)$ matrices instead of $SO(4)$ ones.

on the piecewise-linear manifold.

The gauge transformations with respect to the whole Poincare group are represented by translations and $SO(4)$ rotations of the lattice elements, that result in the following change of basic variables:

$$E_\mu^A \rightarrow \Theta_B^A E_\mu^B + v^A, \quad (5)$$

where Θ is the rotation matrix and v is the vector that represents translation.

3 The action

In this paper we consider the following action:

$$S = \int \left\{ \alpha (R_{AB} R_{AB} - \frac{1}{3} R^2) + \beta R^2 - \gamma m_p^2 R + \lambda m_p^4 \right\} |\mathcal{E}| d^4 x \\ + \delta m_p^2 \int T_{BC}^A T_{BC}^A |\mathcal{E}| d^4 x, \quad (6)$$

where $|\mathcal{E}| = \det \mathcal{E}_\mu^A$, \mathcal{E}_μ^A is the inverse vierbein, the tetrad components of Ricci tensor are denoted by R_{AB} , and R is the scalar curvature. Coupling constants α, β, γ and λ are dimensionless while m_p is a dimensional parameter. The second term is added in order to suppress torsion at $\delta \rightarrow \infty$. So, at $\delta \rightarrow \infty$ we arrive at the model considered in [15]. This model is renormalizable and asymptotic free at certain values of the coupling constants. Thus the model with the action (6) is worth considering. More arguments in favor of this point of view could be found in [16].

The action (6) can be calculated on the piecewise - linear Riemann-Cartan manifold composed of flat hypercubic cells. Below we represent the resulting expression. For the details of the definition and calculation of singular curvature and torsion on this manifold see Appendix.

In order to rewrite in a useful form the expressions (14) and (15) for lattice curvature and torsion we drop to the dual lattice. Then our rotation matrices are attached to links while the inverse vierbein is attached to sites. Let us denote by $U_\mu(x)$ the matrix correspondent to the link, which begins at the site x and points to the direction μ ($\mu = \pm 4, \pm 3, \pm 2, \pm 1$). We denote by $\Omega_{\mu\nu}(x) = U_\mu(x) \dots$ the product of link matrices along the boundary of the plaquette, which is placed in the $(\mu\nu)$ plane. The inverse vierbein, which is attached to the site x , is $\mathcal{E}_\mu^A = E_\mu^A - E_0^A$, $\mu = 1, 2, 3, 4$. For negative values of

μ we define $\mathcal{E}_{-\mu}^A = -\mathcal{E}_\mu^A$. The inverse matrix for positive values of indices is denoted by $\mathcal{E}_A^\mu(x) = \{\mathcal{E}(x)^{-1}\}_A^\mu$. We also expand this definition to negative values of indices: $\mathcal{E}_A^\mu(x) = \text{sign}(\mu)\{[\mathcal{E}(x)]^{-1}\}_A^{|\mu|}$. We shall denote by Δx_μ the shift on the lattice by one step in the μ -th direction ($\Delta x_{-\mu} = -\Delta x_\mu$). So, $x + \Delta x_\mu$ is the site which is obtained via the shift from the site x by one lattice spacing in the direction μ while $x - \Delta x_\mu$ is obtained by the shift in the opposite direction. Thus, $U_{-\mu}(x) = U_\mu^{-1}(x - \Delta x_\mu)$. Next, we define $\Delta_\mu \mathcal{E}_\nu(x) = U_\mu(x)\mathcal{E}_\nu(x + \Delta x_\mu) - \mathcal{E}_\nu(x)$. Everywhere we imply summation over the repeated indices. The summation over space - time indices μ, ν, \dots is implied over $\pm 4, \pm 3, \pm 2, \pm 1$.

We introduce lattice tetrad components of torsion and curvature attached to the sites of the lattice and to positive or negative directions (in this paragraph and in the next paragraph the summation over Greek indices is not implied):

$$\begin{aligned}
[\mathbf{R}^{\mu\nu}]_{CFB}^A(x) &= \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{E}_C^\mu\mathcal{E}_F^\nu[\Omega_{\mu\nu} - \Omega_{\nu\mu}]_B^A \\
[\mathbf{R}^{\mu\nu}]_{FB}(x) &= [\mathbf{R}^{\mu\nu}]_{AFB}^A(x) \\
[\mathbf{R}^{\mu\nu}](x) &= [\mathbf{R}^{\mu\nu}]_{AA}(x) \\
\mathbf{R}(x) &= \sum_{\mu,\nu} [\mathbf{R}^{\mu\nu}](x) \\
[\mathbf{T}^\mu]_{CF}^A(x) &= \sum_\nu \Delta_\mu \mathcal{E}_\nu^A [\mathcal{E}_C^\mu \mathcal{E}_F^\nu - \mathcal{E}_C^\nu \mathcal{E}_F^\mu]
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Now we are ready to express the action (6) on the piecewise-linear many-fold through its parameters $E_\mu^A(x)$ and $U_\mu(x)$. In order to do this we use the expressions for torsion and curvature (14) and (15). We omit the intermediate steps and represent the final result using the notations for lattice torsion and curvature introduced above.

$$\begin{aligned}
S &= \sum_{x \in \text{sites}} |\mathcal{E}(x)| \left(\sum_{\mu,\nu} \{ \bar{\alpha} [\mathbf{R}^{\mu\nu}]_{FB}(x) [\mathbf{R}^{\mu\nu}]_{FB}(x) + (\bar{\beta} - \frac{1}{3}\bar{\alpha}) [\mathbf{R}^{\mu\nu}]^2(x) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \bar{\gamma} m_p^2 [\mathbf{R}^{\mu\nu}](x) \right) + \bar{\delta} m_p^2 \sum_\mu [\mathbf{T}^\mu]_{BC}^A(x) [\mathbf{T}^\mu]_{BC}^A(x) + \bar{\lambda} m_p^4,
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where $|\mathcal{E}(x)| = |\det \mathcal{E}(x)|$ is the volume of the lattice element correspondent to the site x .

Here we introduce lattice couplings $\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}, \bar{\delta}, \bar{\lambda}, \bar{\gamma}$ that differ from the original ones by the factors, which are formally infinite and come from delta -

functions in expressions (14) and (15) for torsion and curvature. We assume here, that a certain regularization is made, which makes these factors finite. Our supposition is that after the renormalization each physical quantity may be expressed through physical couplings, which differ from the bare ones (both lattice and continuum), and the infinity encountered here is absorbed into the renormalization factors.

In our lattice model the translational connection $E_\mu^A(x)$ attached to sites and the $SO(4)$ connection $U_\mu(x)$ attached to links are the dynamical variables. The action of the model is expressed in a compact way through these variables. It is easy to understand, that (5) is the symmetry of the action. So, we have lattice model with the direct manifestation of Poincare gauge invariance.

As we have already noticed in the introduction, lattice realization of Poincare quantum gravity has already been considered in several papers (see, for example, [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13] and references therein). Now we are ready to compare our approach with the approaches of the mentioned papers. First, in all of them the continuum models were transferred to lattice via application of naive discretization procedure. This means, that certain variables attached to the sites and/or links of the hypercubic lattice were considered, and it was set up the correspondence between them and the Poincare group connection of the continuum theory. In [9, 12, 13] both vierbein and $SO(4)$ connection on the lattice were attached to links. In [10] Poincare group was considered as a limiting case of de Sitter group, and link variable belongs to $SO(5)$. In [8, 11] the $SO(4)$ connection was attached to links while the vierbein was attached to sites of the lattice. The definition of the lattice model in [11] is in principle close to the resulting definition of our model on the dual lattice. However, the resulting models are not identical. First of all, in [11] the action was of the Einstein - Hilbert form in Palatini formulation, i.e. it contains only the first power in lattice curvature. The term $-\bar{\gamma}m_p^2 \sum_{x \in sites} \mathbf{R}(x)|\mathcal{E}(x)|$ of (8) would coincide with the action of [11] if in the latter the symmetrization over different directions at each site is performed. In [8] the squared curvature action of general type was considered. Both the link $O(4)$ connection and the site inverse vierbein were considered in 4×4 spinor representation. The final expression for the lattice action is rather complicated and does not coincide with (8).

The crucial difference between the mentioned approaches and the approach of the present paper is that we use the regular procedure and approximate Riemann-Cartan manifold via piecewise - linear Riemann-Cartan

manifolds. This procedure gives us the discretization of the original continuum model, which is manifestly invariant under general coordinate transformations. Contrary to this, the constructions considered in [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13] violate general coordinate invariance and do not give gauge invariant discretization of Poincare gravity.

4 Measure over discretized geometries

In order to define measure over dynamical variables in our lattice model we use an analogy with QCD, the lattice version of which is considered to work perfectly. In QCD there are two kinds of fields:

1. Quarks and leptons. (The correspondent measure over Grassmann variables is well defined and unique.)
2. The gauge field. The correspondent measure on the lattice is unique as it is completely defined via symmetry properties: that is the local measure invariant under gauge transformations.

In our case there are two fields: $SO(4)$ connection and the translational connection. So, it is natural to use measures, which are invariant under lattice realization of the gauge transformation. Our choice of measure is the measure, which is simultaneously invariant under lattice gauge transformations and is local.

Each piecewise linear manifold described above is itself a Riemann - Cartan space. Let the given discretization (with varying E and U) be denoted as \mathcal{M} . Then, we consider the set of correspondent independent variables $\{E_\mu^A(\mathbf{I}); U_{\mathbf{I}\mathbf{J}}\}$. Gauge transformation corresponds to the shift of each lattice element by the vector $v^A(\mathbf{I})$ and its rotation $\Theta_{\mathbf{I}} \in SO(4)$. This transformation acts as $\{E_\mu^A(\mathbf{I}); U_{\mathbf{I}\mathbf{J}}\} \rightarrow \{\Theta_{\mathbf{I}} E_\mu(\mathbf{I}) + v(\mathbf{I}); \Theta_{\mathbf{I}} U_{\mathbf{I}\mathbf{J}} \Theta_{\mathbf{J}}^T\}$.

The locality of lattice measure means the following. The whole measure should be represented as

$$D_{\mathcal{M}}(E; U) = \prod_{\mathbf{I}} \prod_{\mu} DE_{\mu}^A(\mathbf{I}) \prod_{\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{J}} DU_{\mathbf{I}\mathbf{J}}, \quad (9)$$

Here the product is over the sides of lattice elements and over the links that connect centers of lattice elements with their vertices. The measure over link matrices $U_{\mathbf{I}\mathbf{J}}$ is denoted by $DU_{\mathbf{I}\mathbf{J}}$. The measure over vectors $E_{\mu}^A(\mathbf{I})$ is denoted by $DE_{\mu}^A(\mathbf{I})$. We call the lattice measure local if inside each lattice element DE_{μ}^A for the given μ depends upon E_{μ}^A only, and $DU_{\mathbf{I}\mathbf{J}}$ for the given \mathbf{I}, \mathbf{J} depends upon $U_{\mathbf{I}\mathbf{J}}$ only. It is obvious that this requirement together with

gauge invariance fixes the only choice of DE_μ^A and DU_ν : $DE_\mu^A = \Pi_{A,\mu} dE_\mu^A$, while DU is the invariant measure on $SO(4)$.

We must mention, that another locality principle can be formulated. Say, we may thought that the measure is local if DE_μ^A may depend upon E_ν^A with $\nu \neq \mu$ but it may not depend upon E_μ^A from another lattice element. Then gauge invariance does not fix measure precisely. However, we choose the more strong requirement that was described above since it gives us an opportunity to fix the only local gauge invariant measure.

5 Metropolis algorithm.

It is worth mentioning, that in real numerical calculations it would be useful to express each $SO(4)$ link matrix (on the dual lattice) as the function of the $SL(2, C)$ matrix. The correspondence is given by the conventional spinor representation of $SO(4)$ rotations. Then the invariant measure on $SL(2, C)$ generates the invariant measure on $SO(4)$. It is much more easy to simulate the $SL(2, C)$ field than the $SO(4)$ field itself.

Metropolis algorithm for the simulation of our model can be described as follows. At each step of the algorithm the given particular link and one of its ends are considered. It is formed the proposition of the link $SL(2, C)$ matrix and the 4×4 matrix attached to the given endpoint of the link⁴. Then the terms of the action (8), which contain torsion and correspond to the neighbors of the given point are calculated. Next, we calculate the terms of the action, which contain curvature and correspond to the points of the "butterfly" correspondent to the given link. The "butterfly" is the figure that consists of all plaquettes with the given link as one of their sides. Let the sum of these terms be denoted as S^{new} . Then let the same sum that was calculated using the old values of the proposed variables, be denoted as S^{old} . The proposition is accepted if $S^{\text{new}} < S^{\text{old}}$. Otherwise it is accepted with the probability $\exp(S^{\text{old}} - S^{\text{new}})$. Thereafter we choose another link and one of its ends, and the procedure is repeated.

In order to accelerate the numerical simulation one can save in the computer memory the values of all plaquette variables $\Omega_{\mu\nu}$, the values of all lattice derivatives $\Delta_\mu \mathcal{E}_\nu$, and the values of the inverse matrices $\{\mathcal{E}_\mu^A\}^{-1}$. This

⁴We may fix the gauge and choose $E_0^A = 0$. The correspondent Faddeev-Popov determinant is constant.

would lead to an essential economy of CPU time but requires an additional memory size.

6 Conclusions

In this paper we construct the hypercubic discretization of Poincare quantum gravity. The main achievement of our construction, which differs it from the other discretizations of Poincare gravity, is that this construction is manifestly gauge invariant (with respect to the group of general coordinate transformations). Namely, we approximate continuum Riemann-Cartan manifold by piecewise-linear Riemann-Cartan manifolds. The resulting lattice model deals with the invariant geometrical properties of these piecewise-linear manifolds. This construction is analogous to Regge discretization of Riemannian manifolds and is its direct generalization.

We consider piecewise - linear manifolds composed of flat pieces of hypercubic form. So, the geometry is defined by the forms and sizes of these flat pieces together with the $SO(4)$ rotation matrices attached to their sides. Actually these variables are expressed through the translational connection (which is constant inside each flat piece) and the $SO(4)$ connection (which is singular and is attached to the sides of the hypercubes). Therefore, these translational and rotational connections are the dynamical variables of the discretized model.

The piecewise-linear manifold has singular torsion and curvature, which are calculated directly and expressed through the sizes of the lattice elements and the rotation matrices.

In addition, we calculated the squared curvature action of rather general form on the piecewise-linear manifold. It is also expressed through the dynamical variables of the discretization.

Next, we point out that the lattice model may be considered as a lattice Poincare gauge theory. Namely, shift and rotation of each piece of the given piecewise-linear manifold with respect to the local map cause the transformation of the chosen dynamical variables. The lattice action is invariant under this transformation.

We construct local measure over lattice dynamical variables that is invariant under the lattice Poincare transformations.

Finally, we obtain gauge invariant lattice realization of Poincare quantum gravity, in which the translational connection (4×4 matrix) attached to the

sites of the dual lattice and the $SO(4)$ matrix (or, equivalently, $SL(2, C)$ matrix) attached to links of the dual lattice play the role of the dynamical variables. The action of the lattice model contains only the first lattice derivatives of the dynamical variables and has a compact and rather simple form. Thus the constructed lattice model is expected to be useful for the numerical simulations. The correspondent Metropolis algorithm is briefly described.

This work was partly supported by RFBR grants 06-02-16309, 05-02-16306, and 04-02-16079, by Federal Program of the Russian Ministry of Industry, Science and Technology No 40.052.1.1.1112.

7 Appendix

Here we represent the expressions for curvature and torsion on the piecewise-linear manifold.

Connection is singular on the sides of lattice elements. $SO(4)$ curvature is concentrated on the bones⁵. We choose the following integral equation as a definition of $SO(4)$ curvature.

$$2 \int_{y \in \Sigma} \Omega(z, y) R_{\mu\nu}(y) \Omega^+(z, y) dy^\mu \wedge dy^\nu = P \exp\left(\int_{z \in \partial \Sigma}^z \omega_\mu dx^\mu\right) - [P \exp\left(\int_{z \in \partial \Sigma}^z \omega_\mu dx^\mu\right)]^+ \text{ at } |\Sigma| \rightarrow 0 \quad (10)$$

Here ω_μ is $SO(4)$ connection⁶. Σ is a small surface, that crosses the given bone, and $|\Sigma|$ is its area. $\partial \Sigma$ is the boundary of Σ . Its orientation corresponds to orientation of Σ . $\Omega(z, y) = P \exp(\int_z^y \omega_\mu dx^\mu)$ is the parallel transporter along the path that connects a fixed point on $\partial \Sigma$ with the point y . We choose this path in such a way, that it is winding around the given bone in the same direction as $\partial \Sigma$ and has minimal length. The integral in the right hand side is over the path $\partial \Sigma$, which begins and ends at the point z .

It is worth mentioning, that the given definition does not contradict with the conventional one in case of smooth connection. And it gives us the possi-

⁵On the hypercubic lattice we refer to the plaquettes as to the bones in order to make an analogy with the simplicial Regge calculus.

⁶ $U_{IJ} = P \exp(\int \omega_\mu dx^\mu)$, where integral is over the path of minimal length, which connects centers of lattice elements I and J .

bility to calculate curvature in the case of the constructed singular piecewise - linear manifold.

Let us fix the given lattice element. Inside it lattice curvature is equal to

$$R_{\mu\nu B}^A(y) = \sum_{b \in \text{bones}} \int_{x \in b} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} dx^\rho \wedge dx^\sigma \delta^{(4)}(y-x) \frac{[\Pi_i U_{I_i I_{i+1}}^b - (\Pi_i U_{I_i I_{i+1}}^b)^+]_B^A}{2D!}, \quad (11)$$

Here the sum is over the bones that belong to the given lattice element. The integral is over the surface of the bone. The product $\Pi_i U_{I_i I_{i+1}}^b$ of the rotation matrices is along the closed path around the given bone b , which consists of links that connect centers of the lattice elements. Here we imply, that this closed path begins within the given lattice element and has the minimal lattice length.

Now let us calculate torsion, which is concentrated on the sides of lattice elements. The torsion field $T_{\mu\nu}^A$ is defined by the integral equation

$$\int_{y \in \Sigma} \Omega_B^A(z, y) T_{\mu\nu}^B(y) dy^\mu \wedge dy^\nu = \int_{\partial \Sigma} \Omega_B^A(z, y) b_\mu^B(y) dy^\mu \quad (12)$$

Here $b_\mu^A(x)$ is the field of inverse vierbein, which is expressed through our variables E_μ^A inside each lattice element if the given parametrization of the lattice element is chosen.

This equation is satisfied with the following expression (which is valid within the lattice element \mathbf{I}):

$$T_{\mu\nu}^A(y) = \sum_{s \in \text{sides}} \left[\int_{x \in s}^{\mathbf{J}^s} \frac{[U_{\mathbf{I}\mathbf{J}^s}]_B^A b_{[\mu}^B(x) \epsilon_{\nu]\tau\rho\sigma}}{D!} dx^\tau \wedge dx^\rho \wedge dx^\sigma \delta^{(4)}(y-x) - \int_{x \in s}^{\mathbf{I}} \frac{b_{[\mu}^A(x) \epsilon_{\nu]\tau\rho\sigma}}{D!} dx^\tau \wedge dx^\rho \wedge dx^\sigma \delta^{(4)}(y-x) \right] \quad (13)$$

Here the first integral in the sum is over the given side s seing from the neighbor lattice element \mathbf{J}^s (the side s is common for \mathbf{I} and \mathbf{J}^s). (We imply that in (13) the given lattice element and all its neighbors have the common parametrization.)

Let us define inside each lattice element the following variables: $\mathcal{E}_\mu^A = E_\mu^A - E_0^A$, $\mu = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Also we denote by \mathcal{E}_A^μ elements of the inverse matrix \mathcal{E}^{-1} . In tetrad components we have:

$$R_{CFB}^A(y) = \mathcal{E}_C^\mu \mathcal{E}_F^\nu \sum_{b \in \text{bones}} \int_{x \in b} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} dx^\rho \wedge dx^\sigma \delta^{(4)}(y-x) \frac{[\Pi_i U_{I_i I_{i+1}}^b - (\Pi_i U_{I_i I_{i+1}}^b)^+]_B^A}{2D!}, \quad (14)$$

Torsion is expressed as

$$T_{CF}^A(y) = \frac{\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{I}C}^\mu \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{I}F}^\nu}{D!} \sum_{s \in \text{sides}} \int_{x \in s} dx^\tau \wedge dx^\rho \wedge dx^\sigma \delta^{(4)}(y-x) \\ ([U_{\mathbf{I}\mathbf{J}^s}]_B^A \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{J}^s}^B \epsilon_{[\mu} \epsilon_{\nu] \tau \rho \sigma} - \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{I}[\mu}^A \epsilon_{\nu] \tau \rho \sigma}) \quad (15)$$

Here $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{I}\mu}^B$ is calculated inside the given lattice element \mathbf{I} while $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{J}^s\mu}^B$ is calculated within its neighbor \mathbf{J}^s .

References

- [1] Bryce S. DeWitt, Phys.Rev.160:1113-1148,1967, Phys.Rev.162:1239-1256,1967, Phys.Rev.162:1195-1239,1967
- [2] C.W.Misner, Rev.Mod.Phys. 29 (1957), 497
- [3] L.Fadeev,V.Popov, Sov.Phys.Usp. 16 (1974) 777
- [4] Kazuo Fujikawa, INS-461, Nucl.Phys.B226:437,1983
- [5] H. W. Hamber, R. M. Williams, Phys.Rev. D59 (1999) 064014, Nucl.Phys. B487 (1997) 345
- [6] M. Caselle, A. D'Adda , Lorenzo Magnea . DFTT-18/89, ITP-SB-89-68, Phys.Lett.B232:457,1989
- [7] I.T. Drummond DAMTP-85/28, Nucl.Phys.B273:125,1986
- [8] E.T.Tomboulis, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 1173 (1984)
- [9] M. Caselle, A. D'Adda, Lorenzo Magnea DFTT-3/87, ITP-SB-87-26, Phys.Lett.B192:406,1987
- [10] Lee Smolin, HUTP-78/A035, Nucl.Phys.B148:333,1979
- [11] C.L.T. Mannion, J.G. Taylor Phys.Lett.B100:261,1981
- [12] A. Das, M. Kaku, P.K. Townsend Phys.Lett.B81:11,1979
- [13] P.Menotti, A.Pelissetto Ann. Phys. 170 (1986) 287

- [14] A. Patrascioiu, E. Seiler, and I.O. Stamatescu, Phys. Lett. B **107**, 364 (1981);
E. Seiler, I.O. Stamatescu, and D. Zwanziger, Nucl. Phys. B **239**, 177 (1984);
Y. Yotsuyanagi, Phys. Lett. B **135**, 141 (1984);
K. Cahill, S. Prasad, R. Reeder, and B. Richter, Phys. Lett. B **181**, 333 (1986);
K. Cahill, Phys. Lett. B **231**, 294 (1989)
- [15] K.S.Stelle, Phys. Rev. **D 16** , 953 (1977)
- [16] M.A. Zubkov, Phys. Lett. B **582**, 243 (2004);