

Hidden Symmetry Unmasked: Matrix Theory and $E_{11}=E_8^{(3)}$

Shyamoli Chaudhuri ¹

214 North Allegheny Street
Bellefonte, PA 16823, USA

Abstract

In analogy with the planar reductions of large N rigid supersymmetric Yang-Mills theories, it is of fundamental interest to study the reduction of a locally supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory as a nonperturbative framework for String/M Theory, as was first emphasized by Nicolai. Planar reduction of the bosonic sector of the supergravity-Yang-Mills theory in ten dimensions with sixteen supercharges to a single spacetime point, inclusive of the full spectrum of Dpbrane p-form gauge potentials, gives a Bosonic Matrix Theory. A supersymmetric extension of this matrix model has been proposed by us as a new conjecture for M Theory. The relevant $U(N)$ matrix models are described in hep-th/0210134. They lie in a new class beyond the realm of supermatrix models and are characterized by extended symmetry algebras similar to the Cremmer-Julia hidden symmetries of dimensionally-reduced classical supergravities. We conjecture further in this paper that our proposal provides a concrete representation of the very-extension of a finite-dimensional Lie algebra on the field of $U(N)$ matrices. West has provided strong evidence that the algebra of interest is $E_{11}=E_8^{(3)}$, the rank eleven very-extension of E_8 , correctly incorporating Roman's IIA cosmological constant which does not have any straightforward origin thru direct dimensional reduction. In particular, both the electric nineform gauge potential, and its magnetic dual, a putative (-1)form gauge potential, are elegantly accounted for in this framework. We explain its consequences for Matrix Theory. We also address briefly some the significant conceptual issues raised by the 1995 discovery by Chaudhuri, Hockney, and Lykken (CHL) of the isolated island multi-universe landscape of String/M theory, describing how they might find resolution in our proposal for Matrix Theory. Necessary mathematical details are reviewed in the self-contained appendices to the paper.

¹E-mail: shyamoli@thphysed.org

1 Introduction

In earlier works [1, 2, 3], we presented a new proposal for a matrix theory based on a realization of local supersymmetry on $U(N)$ matrix variables that differed significantly from the c. 1996 attempts based on the planar reductions of rigid supersymmetric Yang-Mills theories [6, 7]. In this paper, we explain our conjectured framework for nonperturbative string/M theory from the perspective of the hidden symmetries of dimensionally-reduced locally supersymmetric field theories. In particular, we will succeed in making contact with the very interesting algebraic framework for M theory recently proposed by Peter West [23, 22, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 33] on three aspects:

- the identification of the global hidden symmetry algebra of a given supergravity theory with the extended symmetry algebra of a corresponding unitary matrix model, upon planar reduction of the former.
- the incorporation of both an electric nine-form potential and its magnetic dual, a putative (-1)-form potential [56], in the hidden symmetry algebra of the massive IIA supergravity and, consequently, in the corresponding matrix model.²
- the emergence of spacetime from both the algebraic and matrix model viewpoints.

We will conclude that these analyses lend strong credence to the bold conjecture that M theory can be formulated as the very-extended Lie algebra $E_{11} = E_8^{(3)}$, realized on the field of $U(N)$ matrices.³

It is well-known that the toroidally-compactified eleven-dimensional supergravity, as well as the ten-dimensional type I, type II, and heterotic, string supergravities, exhibit extended global symmetries as a consequence of the presence of massless scalar fields in the dimensionally-reduced supergravity action.⁴ Cremmer and Julia in 1978 were the first to notice that the dimensional reduction of a $(D+n)$ -dimensional theory containing gravity to D dimensions necessarily results in the appearance of an $SL(n, \mathbf{R})$ global symmetry, as viewed from the perspective of the D -dimensional spacetime [14]. This symmetry is already manifest in the form of the dimensionally-reduced Lagrangian. Including an overall scaling of the volume of the compactification manifold, the global symmetry group of the Lagrangian takes the precise form $GL(n, \mathbf{R}) \sim SL(n, \mathbf{R}) \times \mathbf{R}$.

When the $(D+n)$ -dimensional gravity theory also contains antisymmetric tensor field strengths, dimensional reduction will give rise to axionic scalar fields in D dimensions. A global \mathbf{R} symmetry in a toroidally-compactified supergravity corresponds to a shift symmetry of an axion [14, 15]. As an example, consider the case of eleven-dimensional supergravity with 32 supercharges. Upon dimensional reduction, the metric contributes $(11 - n)$ dilatonic scalars arising from its diagonal component, and $\frac{1}{2}(11 - n)(10 - n)$ axionic scalars, $\mathcal{A}_{[0]j}^i$. The three-form gauge potential contributes gauge potentials, $(\mathcal{A}_{[3]}, \mathcal{A}_{[2]i}, \mathcal{A}_{[1]ij})$, in D dimensions, in addition to $q = \frac{1}{6}(11 - n)(10 - n)(9 - n)$ axionic

²The appearance of both an electric D8brane and its magnetic dual, a putative D(-2)brane, has been independently demonstrated by us in the worldsheet formulation of the type I' string theory [57, 59].

³Appendix A contains a pedagogical introduction to the infinite-dimensional affine-, over-, and very-extensions of a finite-dimensional Lie algebra. The over and very extensions have a Cartan matrix with Lorentzian signature.

⁴Dimensional reduction is sometimes distinguished from toroidal compactification by the neglect of the Kaluza-Klein modes. As is conventional in the string literature, we will include all of the massless scalars when identifying the relevant global symmetry group of the theory, irrespective of their origin.

scalars, $\mathcal{A}_{[0]ijk}$. Associated with these axions are q shift symmetries, enhancing the global symmetry group to $GL(n, \mathbf{R}) \times \mathbf{R}^q$, where $q = \{0, 0, 0, 1, 4, 10, 20, 35, 56\}$ in $D = \{11, 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3\}$. The maximal \mathbf{R} symmetry is realized by all of the new axions in D dimensions that did not exist in $D+1$ dimensions [16]. We emphasize that this conclusion holds *prior* to performing any dualizations: if we were to dualize all axions to antisymmetric tensor gauge potentials, the Lagrangian would only exhibit a $GL(n, \mathbf{R})$ symmetry. In general, there is considerable freedom to alter the precise enlargement of the global symmetry group by invoking appropriate field-dualizations [15]. But we can safely conclude that the volume-preserving factor, $SL(n, \mathbf{R})$, will always be a subgroup of the global symmetry group of the dimensionally-reduced gravity theory, even in the extreme case of reduction to a single spacetime point. This extreme case of the dimensional reduction of a locally symmetric theory to *zero* spacetime dimensions results in a new class of matrix models, first explored by us in [1, 2]. Unlike the case of rigid Yang-Mills theories, however, the straightforward dimensional reduction of a locally symmetric theory to $D \leq 2$ dimensions is fraught with ambiguity in distinguishing scalars and gauge potentials. Thus, a more algebraic perspective on the process of spacetime reduction seems called for [48, 49, 47, 50, 1, 23, 34].⁵

The planar reduction procedure was first applied to the bosonic rigid Yang-Mills theory by Eguchi and Kawai in 1980 [4]. Dimensional reduction of a rigid $SU(N)$ Yang-Mills gauge theory to zero dimensions gives what is known as a reduced unitary matrix model: naively, we set to zero all spacetime derivatives in the Yang-Mills action, retaining the square of the commutator of one-forms. The result is a zero-dimensional unitary matrix model with quartic interactions. Reduced matrix models are the result of the dramatic thinning of the infinite number of degrees of freedom of a quantum field theory upon dimensionally reducing all spacetime fields to a single spacetime point. The analysis of the Eguchi-Kawai reduced model proceeded by examining the remnant global symmetries in the large N limit. Remarkably, it was found to share many features of exactly solvable unitary matrix models. It should be emphasized that many of the notions familiar from continuum quantum field theory, such as renormalization, universality classes, vacuum structure, and spontaneous symmetry breaking, are inherited by such dimensionally-reduced matrix models. Likewise, *supermatrix* models are obtained when one dimensionally reduces a rigid supersymmetric large N Yang-Mills theory to a spacetime point. Such supermatrix models have been the basis of some recent conjectures for nonperturbative string theories [6, 7, 8, 9].

With the discovery of Dbranes by Dai, Leigh and Polchinski [10, 11], the dimensional reduction of rigid Yang-Mills theories finds a satisfying new interpretation. Recall that the $(p+1)$ coordinates parallel to the worldvolume of the Dpbrane are Neumann while the $(9-p)$ directions orthogonal to the Dpbrane are Dirichlet. Thus, successive T-dualities on the worldvolume of N coincident D9branes in the type IB string theory carrying nonabelian Yang-Mills gauge fields convert all ten components of the worldvolume gauge bosons to bulk scalars [10]. The scalars are interpreted as the coordinate locations of the Dbrane soliton in the bulk spacetime. In the extreme case of D0branes, all nine spatial directions orthogonal to the worldvolume are Dirichlet. As first noticed by Witten [12], this implies the tantalizing fact that the coordinates of space orthogonal to the D0branes are

⁵I should perhaps remind the reader at the outset that the n -dimensional Lorentz algebra is contained within $GL(n, \mathbf{R})$, but not within its $SL(n, \mathbf{R})$ subalgebra. However, it is the volume preserving $SL(n, \mathbf{R})$ that is relevant to the spacetime reduction of a field theory to a single point. This is the reason we focused on this symmetry in [1, 2, 3]. It is only in the large N limit, that both spacetime, and the full Lorentz algebra, are expected to become manifest in the matrix model. I thank Andrei Mikhailov for requesting this clarification.

noncommuting, $N \times N$, unitary matrices: $A_\mu^A \tau_A \leftrightarrow X_\mu^A$. A is the Chan-Paton index, and the gauge group realized on N D0branes is $U(N)$ of rank N . The location of the A th D0brane is the A th eigenvalue of the $U(N)$ matrix X_μ^A , $A=1, \dots, N$. The dimensional reduction of the worldvolume nonabelian Yang-Mills action is the familiar quartic potential [10, 12], and we have a Hamiltonian quantum mechanics of unitary matrices. The reduced matrix models take this logic one step further: they follow as a result of T-dualizing all ten directions of spacetime. The coordinates X_μ^A , $A=1, \dots, N$, can now be interpreted as the locations of N Dinstantons in the bulk ten-dimensional spacetime.

Banks, Fischler, Shenker, and Susskind's [6] conjecture for M(atr)ix theory was based on the above-mentioned dimensional reduction to one dimension, namely, time, of a rigid super-Yang-Mills theory with sixteen supercharges. This gives a Hamiltonian quantum mechanics of unitary matrices. Ishibashi, Kawai, Kitazawa, and Tsuchiya's [7] IIB matrix model was based on an analogous dimensional reduction to zero dimensions. Roughly speaking, the discretum of N D0branes through their interactions are expected to generate a continuum spacetime theory in the large N limit. This suggestive idea originates in the $c = 1$ matrix model [5]: recall that the double-scaled large N limits of the one-dimensional matrix models were matched to string theories in 1+1 dimensions, the extra coordinate arising from the large N limit, identified with the Liouville field. Note that both M(atr)ix Theory [6], and the IIB matrix model [7], are conjectured theories of *induced* gravity: the gravitational force is expected to arise as an effective long-distance interaction of the more fundamental matrix degrees of freedom in the reduced large N Yang-Mills theory. Since D0branes do, of course, interact gravitationally at long distances, this expectation is well-founded. However, the complete worldvolume action of D0branes is expected to be much more complicated than its zero coupling limit. Not surprisingly, reconstructing the full nonlinear Einstein gravity from this starting point has proven to be prohibitively difficult [13]. As was emphasized by Nicolai [17], there is no evidence in either matrix model conjecture of the well-established global symmetries of the nonlinear Einstein supergravity theories. This is a serious puzzle. Furthermore, it is natural to suspect that the dimensional reductions of locally supersymmetric Yang Mills theories would be a more relevant direction to explore in the context of a conjecture for M theory. Although a concrete suggestion to this effect was made by Nicolai in 1997-98 [17], it appears not to have attracted much attention in the subsequent research literature.

In our new framework for a Matrix Theory incorporating local symmetries, we retain Witten's basic observation that the spacetime coordinates, X^μ , associated to the locations of N Dinstantons be identified with zero-dimensional, noncommuting, $N \times N$, unitary matrix variables. But the matrix variable of interest is now a *vielbein*, $E_a^\mu(X; \xi) d\xi^a$, transforming in the adjoint of $U(N)$, but as a scalar under the finite-dimensional Yang-Mills gauge group. Notice that it is also a field with respect to the local tangent space, parametrized by ξ^a , at the particular coordinate location, X , belonging to the spacetime discretum. It will not be easy to infer the correct matrix Hamiltonian (or Lagrangian) for the vielbein because of the ambiguities in straightforward dimensional reduction of locally supersymmetric theories below three dimensions. Nevertheless, although our 2001-02 proposal for Matrix Theory in [1, 3] was not prompted by Nicolai's suggestion and does not, in fact, correspond straightforwardly to the dimensional reduction of a locally supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory, it is helpful to understand our conjecture for Matrix theory from his well-motivated starting point. Clearly, the reduction of a large N Yang-Mills theory coupled to gravity to a single spacetime point should give rise to a reduced unitary matrix model. An important difference is that such a matrix model will have a nontrivial global symmetry group, \mathcal{G}_s , distinct from the large N symmetries,

that is inherited from the global symmetry group of the higher-dimensional gravity theory. The existence of an *extended* symmetry algebra in the matrix model, beyond the expected unitary large N algebra, was one of the main new observations made by us in [1, 2, 3]. Consider the bosonic sector of the ten-dimensional type I supergravity theory with sixteen supercharges coupled to $U(N) \times G$ Yang-Mills fields [18, 20, 19]. Reduction of this theory to a spacetime point gives a bosonic unitary matrix model with an $SL(10, \mathbf{R})$ subgroup in the global symmetry group. $G=SO(32)$ is the anomaly-free Yang-Mills group of the ten-dimensional type I string theory. The global remnant of the finite-dimensional nonabelian group will survive unscathed in the reduced unitary matrix model [1, 2], which has an extended symmetry algebra that includes $SL(10, \mathbf{R}) \times G \times U(N)$ [1, 2, 3]. A similar suggestion on incorporating finite rank gauge symmetry in a matrix model was first made by Iso and Kawai in [21]. However, taking into account the full spectrum of supergravity p -form tensor field strengths, we might expect additional axions from dualization, and a consequent enlargement of the global symmetry algebra of the reduced matrix model. Let us christen the Lagrangian of this new matrix model *Bosonic Matrix Theory*.⁶ As in previous studies of the hidden symmetry group of the bosonic sector of a supergravity theory [14], we will find that an understanding of the bosonic reduced matrix model will be helpful prior to taking on the technical complexities of its supersymmetric analog [1, 3].

Guided by the observation that there is considerable freedom to alter the hidden symmetry group of a supergravity theory by appropriate field-dualizations [15], it is of interest to ask what precise enhancement of $SL(10, \mathbf{R})$ determines the global symmetry group of Matrix Theory? In this paper, we investigate this issue by consolidating insights from the recent works of many authors on the subject of the hidden symmetries of M theory, and of other supergravity theories [15, 24, 17, 22, 29, 32, 33, 34]. It should be noted that there is a corresponding ambiguity in identifying a given matrix model Lagrangian⁷ as the spacetime reduction of a specific higher-dimensional string supergravity. As was emphasized in [1, 3], there exists a nine-dimensional Lagrangian formulation of the massive type IIA-IIB string theories due to Bergshoeff, de Roo, Green, Papadopoulos, and Townsend [35] which incorporates the full spectrum of Dbrane p -form potentials [11], including Roman's IIA cosmological constant [36]. By combining field-dualizations, as well as S and T -duality transformations on the couplings, this Lagrangian can be mapped to *any* of six supergravity theories: the circle-compactified type I, type IIA, or heterotic string supergravities, the Scherck-Schwarz reduction of the type IIB string supergravity, or the $S^1 \times S^1 / \mathbb{Z}_2$ compactification of eleven-dimensional supergravity. This covers all six vertices of a modified star diagram linking theories with sixteen supercharges [46, 37, 3]. The same property holds for the reduced matrix model: the matrix

⁶The analysis in [2] was presented in full generality; it is easily adapted to the spacetime reduction of the zero slope limit of either a bosonic string theory, or the bosonic sector of a supersymmetric string theory. Or, to the bosonic sector of any given supergravity field theory.

⁷We use the term *Lagrangian* for a reduced matrix model as follows: the Feynman path integral describing the quantum mechanics of the matrix model is a sum over matrix configurations, weighted by an exponentiated matrix-valued function. In analogy with field theory, we will refer to the exponentiated function defined on the field of unitary matrices, as the matrix *Lagrangian*. By contrast, in the case of the famous $c=1$ matrix model, the matrix variables were taken to be functions of an auxiliary parameter later identified with target-space time [5]. Thus, the exponentiated function weighting the Feynman path integral in the case of the $c=1$ matrix model is the *action*, expressed as a one-dimensional integral over time. In [3], and in section 3 of this paper, we define a proper time gauge for the reduced unitary matrix model allowing us to identify a corresponding action for bosonic matrix theory. Finally, in section 4, we give a more algebraic, and consequently abstract, presentation of our conjecture for Matrix Theory that makes no reference whatsoever to the Lagrangian framework.

Lagrangian is only unique upto appropriate dualizations defined on the matrix variables [1, 3]. On the one hand, this is a beautiful illustration of the unity of the different string theories with eleven-dimensional supergravity. But it points to the importance of understanding the global symmetry algebra: the identification of a specific, hidden symmetry algebra is what gives precise meaning to one, or other, class of supergravity/M theory toroidal compactifications. This observation has been reiterated recently by West [22, 26, 29, 30]. But it is not new to string theory, nor to supergravity: target-space duality groups, and their conjectured extension to U-dualities [45, 46], have been the bulwark of our understanding of string and M theory compactifications. In section 4 of this paper, we will argue that the notion of the global symmetry algebra also provides a precise generalization incorporating *all* of the ground states of M theory, beyond toroidal compactifications. Remarkably, this will include the isolated island universes discovered in string theory by Chaudhuri, Hockney, and Lykken [40].

Let us summarize some of the key insights gained in recent studies of hidden symmetry groups in supergravity. In the original work [14], Cremmer and Julia pointed out that, upon a Weyl rescaling to the Einstein frame metric, the \mathbf{R} subgroup of $GL(n, \mathbf{R})$ becomes a *hidden symmetry*: it is no longer manifest in the Einstein frame Lagrangian. Based on the counting of massless scalar fields in succeeding dimensions, it was conjectured that the hidden symmetry group of the reduced supergravity in $11 - n$ dimensions would take the general form E_{11-n} . The details were worked out for the dimensional reduction to four dimensions, establishing the appearance of the left coset scalar manifold $E_7/SU(8)$. $SU(8)$ is the maximal compact subgroup of E_7 of identical rank. Cremmer and Julia pointed out that the appearance of a coset structure G/H , where G is a noncompact internal symmetry group and H is the compact local invariance group, was a generic consequence of dimensional reduction, implying that the Lagrangian for supergravity scalars always takes the form of a nonlinear realization of a finite semi-simple Lie algebra G [38]. The compact local invariance group H is invariant under the Cartan involution. This expectation has been borne out in subsequent analyses. However, the precise coset form of the hidden symmetry group depends upon performing appropriate dualizations of the fields in the Lagrangian [24]. In dimensions nine and above, there is no enhancement of the $GL(n, \mathbf{R})$ symmetry. In eight dimensions, the \mathbf{R}_s hidden symmetry can be enhanced to an $SL(2, R)$, and the full global symmetry group takes the form $SL(3, \mathbf{R}) \times SL(2, \mathbf{R})$. Likewise, in seven dimensions, \mathbf{G}_s takes the form $SL(5, \mathbf{R})$. Note that, in both cases, the four-form field strength has been dualized. In six dimensions and below, there is a potential clash with the target space duality symmetries of the perturbative string theories [24], so let us turn to that subject.

How does the analysis above relate to the appearance of global symmetry groups in toroidal compactifications of the supersymmetric string theories? The Ramond-Ramond sector's antisymmetric p -form field strengths must now be distinguished from the Neveu-Schwarz sector's symmetric and antisymmetric two-form potentials, g^{ij} and b^{ij} , since the latter can couple directly to the string world-sheet. Thus, if we restrict ourselves to massless scalars arising as perturbative string winding or momentum modes, toroidal compactification of either type II string theory gives the scalar manifold $O(n, n)/[O(n) \times O(n)]$. Likewise, toroidal compactifications of the heterotic string give rise to the scalar manifold $O(n+16, n)/[O(16+n) \times O(n)]$. We must also mod out by the T-duality group, respectively, $O(n, n; \mathbf{Z})$, and $O(n+16, n; \mathbf{Z})$, which corrects for the over-counting of equivalent perturbative string compactifications [37]: there is a stringy $R \rightarrow \alpha'/R$ symmetry under the exchange of closed string momentum and winding modes. Finally, recall that the open and closed type I string

theory is not T-dual, since open strings can't wind. Thus, in this case, the scalar manifold coincides with what one infers from dimensional reduction. Notice, as has been emphasized by Lu and Pope [24], that no dualizations of NS-NS sector fields are necessary in order to make the full T-duality symmetry manifest in the Lagrangian.⁸

The zero slope limit of the massless IIA string is the same thing as eleven dimensional supergravity compactified on a circle [42, 45, 46]— this is in fact the route by which the IIA Lagrangian was first constructed [43], and so we expect a correspondence in the global symmetry groups in dimensions nine and below. Including the p additional axions obtained by dualizing all Ramond-Ramond sector field strengths, where $p=(0, 0, 0, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64)$ in $D=(11, 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3)$ dimensions, the G/H coset takes the form $\mathbf{R}^p \times \{O(n, n; \mathbf{Z}) \setminus [O(n, n)/(O(n) \times O(n))]\}$. For $D \geq 7$, the global symmetry group inferred from perturbative type IIA string theory, $\mathbf{R}^p \times O(n, n)$, is a subgroup of the Cremmer-Julia group and there is no clash with T-duality [24]. But it should be noted that the dualization of the R-R four-form field strength was essential in order for this to hold: the T-duality group is not a proper subgroup of the global symmetry group of the fully-undualized dimensionally-reduced Lagrangian in $D \leq 8$ [24]. Moreover, in six dimensions and below, it becomes necessary to also dualize the NS-NS fields in order to enlarge the manifest global symmetries of the Lagrangian beyond the perturbative T-duality symmetry group. $GL(11-n, \mathbf{R})$ and $O(10-n, 10-n)$ are both subgroups of E_{11-n} , and their closure indeed generates E_{11-n} . But neither the full \mathbf{R}^q of the fully-undualized global symmetry group, nor the full \mathbf{R}^p following from full R-R dualization, are contained within E_{11-n} ! To settle this ambiguity, it is incumbent upon us to understand the significance of alternative dualizations from a more physical standpoint. The results in lower dimensions with the various possible dualizations are summarized in the table below which we reproduce from the paper of Lu and Pope [24]. We will also note their observation that the global symmetry group of the eleven-dimensional supermembrane, $GL(11, \mathbf{R}) \times R^p$, contains the perturbative T-duality group of the massless IIA string, $O(10-n, 10-n)$, as a proper subgroup, while $GL(10, \mathbf{R})$ does not.

	Global Symmetry Groups			T-duality
D	No dualisation	R-R dualisation	Full dualisation	
9	$GL(2, R)$	$GL(2, R)$	$GL(2, R)$	—
8	$R * GL(3, R)$	$SL(3, R) \times SL(2, R)$	$SL(3, R) \times SL(2, R)$	$O(2, 2)$
7	$R^4 * GL(4, R)$	$SL(5, R)$	$SL(5, R)$	$O(3, 3)$
6	$R^{10} * GL(5, R)$	$R^8 * O(4, 4)$	$SO(5, 5)$	$O(4, 4)$
5	$R^{20} * GL(6, R)$	$R^{16} * O(5, 5)$	$E_{6(6)}$	$O(5, 5)$
4	$R^{35} * GL(7, R)$	$R^{32} * O(6, 6)$	$E_{7(7)}$	$O(6, 6)$
3	$R^{56} * GL(8, R)$	$R^{64} * O(7, 7)$	$E_{8(8)}$	$O(7, 7)$

Table 1: Global Symmetry Groups for Supergravities with 32 Supercharges

Finally, in two dimensions and below, the situation gets even murkier. It is tempting to continue the Cremmer-Julia conjecture, arguing for the appearance of the affine extension of the finite-

⁸It should be noted that the coset structure of the vacuum manifold can equivalently be inferred from the perspective of the current algebra on the string world-sheet. Toroidal compactifications are isomorphic to (Lorentzian) even self-dual lattices [39, 37]. The CHL moduli spaces are supersymmetry-preserving orbifolds of these [41].

dimensional Lie algebra E_8 , namely, E_9 , in $D = 2$, the first of the hyperbolic Kac-Moody algebras, E_{10} , in $D = 1$, and the non-hyperbolic, Lorentzian Kac-Moody algebra, E_{11} , in $D = 0$ [22]. Julia had already conjectured the appearance of E_9 and E_{10} back in 1981 [48]. But the entire framework of dimensional reduction and of duality transformations breaks down in this regime, essentially because a scalar field can no longer be sensibly distinguished from a gauge potential in two dimensions. We should point out that there is no difficulty in correctly identifying the perturbative T-duality group of compactified string theories in lower dimensions. The reason is that the world-sheet current algebra and the equivalent characterization by Lorentzian self-dual lattices, or orbifolds thereof, continue to be perfectly good tools for identifying the global symmetry group even when $D \leq 2$. In fact, both toroidal, and supersymmetry-preserving orbifold, compactifications of the heterotic and type II string theories to two dimensions were widely explored by Chaudhuri and Lowe in [47]. The basic message is that it is helpful to shift focus to purely algebraic techniques in lower dimensions. Indeed, the recent elucidation of an E_9 affine Lie algebra in two dimensions in [49, 50] was based on Nicolai's 1987 reformulation of eleven-dimensional supergravity, replacing the Lorentz $SO(1, 10)$ group with $SO(1, 2) \times SO(16)$ [49]. Note that only an $SO(1, 2) \times SO(8)$ subgroup of the eleven-dimensional Lorentz group was preserved in this reformulation: the Cremmer-Julia symmetry group does *not* follow from straightforward dimensional reduction in dimensions $D \leq 2$.

Let us now return to the ambiguity in the hidden symmetry group as a consequence of alternative dualizations in $D \leq 6$. A hint in the right direction is provided by Roman's ten-dimensional type IIA cosmological constant [36], later identified by Polchinski as the D8brane charge of the type IIA string theory [11]. We will find that the vexing problem of accommodating a generator corresponding to a nine-form gauge potential in the hidden symmetry algebra of M theory leads to the remarkable conclusion that the Cremmer-Julia E_{11-n} symmetries are not simply one of many options. Rather, they are *required* by the necessity of incorporating both the D8brane and its magnetic dual. The evidence pointing to this conclusion comes largely from the interesting recent works of Peter West [23, 22, 26, 27, 29].

We begin with a brief review of work on the M theory origin of the D8brane, which has been a long-standing puzzle. Roman's original construction introduced the mass parameter as a deformation of the field equations of the ten-dimensional IIA supergravity. Subsequently, Bergshoeff, Green, Hull, Papadopoulos, and Townsend [35] showed that, with suitable field redefinitions, there exists a form of the covariant Lagrangian with the mass parameter, M , appearing explicitly as an auxiliary field. Taking the limit $M \rightarrow 0$ smoothly recovers the massless IIA supergravity Lagrangian. The field equation for the auxiliary M simply sets the ten-form field strength equal to a constant \times the epsilon symbol. The explicit appearance of a nine-form gauge potential in the Lagrangian clarifies how it couples to an D8brane, but raises the question of its magnetic dual. Formally, this is a (-1) -form gauge potential with scalar field strength which should couple to a purported D(-2)brane. It follows that the D8brane is potentially a problem for any formalism based on the notion of self-duality that makes explicit use of gauge potentials [53, 54, 56].

For example, a new formalism for supergravity which extends the coset space description of the scalars to the p -form gauge fields was proposed in [54] based on doubled fields. This has the suggestive consequence that the equations of motion are elegantly formulated as a self-duality condition on the total field strength, which is a Lie superalgebra-valued object [48, 54]. However, the nine-form potential has been left out of this discussion. When suitably incorporated, as was shown

by [56], self-duality forces one to include consideration of a (-1) -form gauge potential. The tension of the associated D (-2) brane fits neatly into the tower of *jade relations* derived in [56]: equalities relating the tensions of the various branes in the duality spectrum. It is natural to ask how one might sensibly accommodate the notion of a (-1) -form potential and its associated D (-2) brane.

A partial answer to this question is provided by the worldsheet formalism of type I' string theory. Using the covariant string theory path integral [57, 59], we have shown that the tension of the magnetic dual of the D8brane can be calculated from first principles. Recall that Polchinski's Dpbrane tension calculation covered the range $-1 \leq p \leq 9$ [11]. The brane-tension was extracted from the factorization limit of the one-loop open string amplitude with boundaries on parallel and static Dpbranes: the end points of the open string lie in a $(p+1)$ -dimensional worldvolume. It turns out that the one-loop amplitude calculated in [11] permits precisely one possible generalization from the perspective of two-dimensional Riemannian geometry. This is the one-loop amplitude with *fixed* boundaries, the formalism for which was developed in the earlier works [60, 61]. The factorization limit of the amplitude with fixed boundaries yields the tension of an additional Dbrane. Remarkably, the result obtained for the tension matches perfectly with Polchinski's generic result if we set $p = -2$. The world-sheet formalism of string theory has no difficulty accommodating *both* a D8brane *and* its magnetic dual, the so-called D (-2) brane, in the duality spectrum.

An elegant and simple explanation of the so-called (-1) -form potential that lends credence to our result appears in a work by Schnakenburg and West [26]. The formalism of doubled fields [54] did not clarify how the coset unification of scalars and gauge fields might be extended to also incorporate the metric and fermionic fields of supergravity theories. An alternative approach was subsequently proposed by West [23], in which the entire bosonic sector of both eleven-dimensional supergravity, and of the massless type IIA and type IIB supergravities [25], were formulated as coset non-linear realizations of an appropriate Kac-Moody superalgebra. A key observation made by Cremmer, Julia, Lu, and Pope [15] highlighted in [23, 22], was to note the one-to-one correspondence between the massless fields of the bosonic sector of a supergravity theory, and the nodes in the Dynkin diagram of an E_{11-n} algebra. This leads irrefutably to the conclusion that the dimensional reduction of eleven-dimensional supergravity to zero dimensions in the zero volume limit *must* result in a rank 11 Kac-Moody algebra. The question that remains is which specific algebra.

A hint pointing towards E_{11} is the successful identification of generators corresponding to the nine-form gauge potential, *and even its magnetic dual*[26]. The key observation is that the momentum generator, P_a , already plays the role of the generator corresponding to a putative " (-1) -form" gauge potential in the hidden symmetry algebra of the massive type II supergravity: there is no need to invoke an additional spacetime field representing the " (-1) -form" generator in the non-linear realization. Thus, the complete bosonic field content of the massive IIA theory is simply:

$$h_a^b, A, A_c, A_{c_1 c_2}, A_{c_1 c_2 c_3}, A_{c_1 \dots c_5}, A_{c_1 \dots c_6}, A_{c_1 \dots c_7}, A_{c_1 \dots c_8}, A_{c_1 \dots c_9} \quad . \quad (1)$$

A is the dilaton, and $A_{c_1 c_2}$ is the Neveu-Schwarz twoform potential, coupling to perturbative type IIA closed strings. Their Hodge duals are the eight-form, and six-form, gauge potentials, respectively. The 1-form and 3-form gauge potentials, and their Hodge dual 5-form and 7-form potentials, are from the Ramond-Ramond sector. No dual fields have been introduced for the nine-form potential, nor for the metric. We now introduce generators, $R^{c_1 \dots c_p}$, corresponding to each p -form gauge field listed in Eq. (1). Let us denote the generators of $GL(10, \mathbf{R})$ as K_a^b , then $GL(10, \mathbf{R})$ invariance

manifests itself in the commutation relations:

$$[K_b^a, K_d^c] = \delta_b^c K_d^a - \delta_d^a K_b^c, \quad [K_b^a, P_c] = \delta_c^a P_b, \quad [K_b^a, R^{c_1 \cdots c_p}] = \delta_b^{c_1} R^{ac_2 \cdots c_p} + \cdots \quad (2)$$

The difference of the K_b^a are the generators, J_b^a , of $SO(9, 1)$ Lorentz transformations. Including the generators of translations, P_a , we have the additional commutation relations:

$$[R, P_a] = mb_0 P_a, \quad [P_a, R^{c_1 \cdots c_q}] = -mb_q (\delta_a^{c_1} R^{c_2 \cdots c_q} + \cdots) \quad (3)$$

If we now check the commutation relations among the $R^{c_1 \cdots c_p}$ by themselves, we find that Eq. (3) is simply a special case of this algebra with P_a playing the role of a putative (-1)-form potential [26]:

$$[R, R^{c_1 \cdots c_p}] = c_p R^{c_1 \cdots c_p}, \quad [R^{c_1 \cdots c_p}, R^{c_1 \cdots c_q}] = c_{p,q} R^{c_1 \cdots c_{p+q}} \quad (4)$$

We can set $c_{-1} = mb_0$. As pointed out in [26], the limit $m \rightarrow 0$ smoothly recovers the hidden symmetry algebra of the massless type IIA supergravity, denoted by \mathcal{G}_{IIA} in [25]. Notice the satisfying agreement with the physical interpretation of the (-1)-form potential in the corresponding worldsheet amplitude with fixed boundaries [57, 61]: the momentum generator acts as a derivative operator, *removing* a worldvolume of codimension one.

The structure constants in Eq. (4) can be determined by verifying consistency with the Jacobi identities [26]:

$$\begin{aligned} c_2 = -c_6 = \frac{1}{2}, \quad c_3 = c_5 = -\frac{1}{4}, \quad c_1 = -c_{-7} = -\frac{3}{4}, \quad c_{-1} = -c_9 = -\frac{5}{4} \\ c_{1,2} = -c_{2,3} = -c_{3,3} = c_{1,5} = c_{2,5} = 2, \quad c_{3,5} = 1, \quad c_{2,6} = 2, \quad c_{1,7} = 3 \\ c_{2,7} = -4, \quad b_2 = -\frac{1}{2}, \quad b_7 = -\frac{1}{2}, \quad b_0 = \frac{5}{8} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Consistency with the equations of motion of massive type IIA supergravity, and validity of the proposed non-linear realization of the hidden symmetry algebra, have been assumed in deriving Eq. (5).⁹ As was shown by Schnakenburg and West, the analysis above can be adapted to the type IIB theory [25], with algebra denoted as \mathcal{G}_{IIB} . The IIB theory has doublets of zero-form and two form fields, namely, the dilaton and axion, and the NS and RR sector two-form potentials with, respectively, eight-form, and six-form, Hodge dual doublets. No Hodge dual is introduced for the four-form RR potential, as in [54, 23], since its field strength satisfies a self-duality condition: the introduction of a “double” for a self-dual field would simply create a mismatch in the number of physical degrees of freedom. This mismatch is reflected in the well-known impossibility of writing down a covariant Lagrangian for the IIB supergravity theory [62].¹⁰ The generators of the hidden symmetry algebra are [25]:

$$K_b^a, P^a, R_s, R_s^{c_1 c_2}, R^{c_1 c_2 c_3 c_4}, R_s^{c_1 \cdots c_6}, R_s^{c_1 \cdots c_8}, \quad s = 1, 2 \quad (6)$$

where $s=1, 2$ distinguish potentials in the NS-NS, R-R, sectors, respectively. The generators satisfy the commutation relations given in Eq. (2), as well as the new relations:

$$[R_1, R_s^{c_1 \cdots c_p}] = d_p^s R_s^{c_1 \cdots c_p}, \quad [R_2, R_{s_1}^{c_1 \cdots c_p}] = \tilde{d}_p^{s_2} R_{\epsilon_{s_1 s_2} s_2}^{c_1 \cdots c_p}, \quad [R_{s_1}^{c_1 \cdots c_p}, R_{s_2}^{c_1 \cdots c_q}] = c_{p,q}^{s_1, s_2} R_{\epsilon_{s_1 s_2} s_2}^{c_1 \cdots c_{p+q}} \quad (7)$$

⁹I thank P. West for email clarification of this point.

¹⁰A clear explanation of some subtleties in quantizing a self-dual field strength appears in [53].

Notice that the dilaton and axion differ in their action on the remaining p -forms, respectively, acting so as to preserve, or switch, the generators within a doublet. Recall that, unlike the IIA algebra, the spinors of the IIB supergravity have identical chirality, precluding the possibility of a mass parameter in the supersymmetry algebra [36]. Thus, unlike the previous case, there is no non-trivial extension of the global algebra of p -form generators by the momentum generator [25]. The structure constants of this algebra are determined by requiring consistency with the Jacobi identities [25]:

$$\begin{aligned} d_{p+1}^1 &= -\frac{1}{4}(p-3), & d_{p+1}^2 &= \frac{1}{4}(p-3), & \tilde{d}_2^1 &= -\tilde{d}_6^2 = -\tilde{d}_8^2 = 1, & \tilde{d}_2^2 &= \tilde{d}_6^1 = \tilde{d}_8^1 = 0 \\ c_{2,2}^{1,2} &= -c_{2,2}^{2,1} = -1, & c_{2,4}^{2,2} &= -c_{2,4}^{2,1} = 4, & c_{2,6}^{1,2} &= 1, & c_{2,6}^{1,1} &= -c_{2,6}^{2,2} = \frac{1}{2} \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

How are the global symmetry algebras of the type II supergravities related to $E_{11} = E_8^{(3)}$? This question has been addressed in detail in the very recent paper by West [29], clarifying the precise relationship of \mathcal{G}_{IIA} , $\mathcal{G}_{\text{mIIA}}$, and \mathcal{G}_{IIB} , to $E_8^{(3)}$. It is remarkable that the global symmetries of each of the IIA, IIB, and massive IIA supergravities, as well as those of a broad spectrum of well-known solutions of the classical supergravities inclusive of the full spectrum of Dbranes and Mbranes can be elegantly unified within $E_8^{(3)}$ [29]. In Appendix B, we review West's arguments in more detail, invoking the framework of nonlinear realizations [14, 15, 22, 29].

2 Planar Reductions of Locally Symmetric Theories

The starting point of the conjecture for M theory made by us in [1, 3] was to consider the reduction to a single spacetime point of an n -dimensional Yang-Mills theory based on a finite-dimensional non-abelian group, G , coupled to Einstein gravity. Such a theory has both a vector potential, $A_\mu^A(x)\tau_A$, where the τ_A are generators of G , and a vielbein, $E_\mu^a(x)$, as fundamental degrees of freedom. As is customary in planar reductions of rigid Yang-Mills theories, we assume that both fields, in addition, transform in the adjoint representation of a large N Yang-Mills group. Spacetime reduction will give rise to a unitary large N matrix model with two distinct species of matrix variable: $A_\mu^A\tau_A$, and E_μ^a .¹¹ More precisely, we wish to preserve the global volume-preserving $SL(n, \mathbf{R})$ symmetry of the original n -dimensional gravity theory in the matrix Lagrangian. Thus, we distinguish n species of a matrix variable, $A_\mu^A\tau_A$, and n^2 species of a different matrix variable, E_μ^a . The index a parameterizes the flat n -dimensional tangent space at each point of an, in general, n -dimensional curved spacetime geometry, parameterized by index μ . Each matrix variable lives in an N^2 -dimensional representation of $U(N)$, while the index A parameterizes the adjoint representation of the finite-dimensional Yang-Mills group, G . What is the form of matrix Lagrangian that would make the $SL(n, \mathbf{R}) \times G$ global symmetry manifest? It is clear that the answer will bear close resemblance to the familiar Einstein and Yang-Mills Lagrangians.

In a nutshell, this was the basic idea pursued by us in [1, 2, 3]. We adapted the familiar Noether procedure for constructing covariant field theory Lagrangians to the construction of unitary matrix Lagrangians that manifest certain global symmetries. Extending this notion with supersymmetry, accounting for the reduction of both the supergravity gauge potentials and scalars, merely enlarges

¹¹We denote the spacetime field, $f(x)$, and its dimensionally-reduced $U(N)$ representative, f , by the same symbol.

the global symmetry algebra. In the context of M theory, or its low energy limit: eleven-dimensional supergravity without any finite-dimensional Yang-Mills gauge fields, it would seem to imply the existence of a unitary matrix Lagrangian that makes manifest the full Cremmer-Julia hidden symmetry algebra $E_{11} = E_8^{(3)}$ [22, 29]. We emphasize, as was already noted in the introduction, and as reiterated in the context of M theory in appendix B, that the Cremmer-Julia groups do not include the full $GL(n, \mathbf{R}) \sim SL(n, \mathbf{R}) \times \mathbf{R}_s$ symmetry of gravity: the \mathbf{R}_s symmetry which corresponds to an overall scaling of the compactification manifold is always a *hidden* symmetry. In addition, notice that the spacetime translation generators of the supergravity theory are always absent from the Cremmer-Julia algebra [22, 29]. These are the two key observations hinting at the identification of the extended symmetry algebras of the reduced matrix Lagrangians of n -dimensional locally supersymmetric theories with the Cremmer-Julia E_n sequence.

As is well known, the quantum consistency of a Yang-Mills field theory coupled to gravity requires that we also incorporate supersymmetry [18, 19, 63].¹² So we begin with, instead, the planar reduction of the bosonic sector of a locally supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory. As an aside to newcomers to this field, starting with the analysis of the bosonic sector of a supersymmetric theory is a time-honored practice in both supergravity and string theory research. For example, the bosonic string theory by itself has many sicknesses, but all of the techniques developed for full-fledged superstring calculations were honed by first working on the bosonic sector of the theory [63, 37]. The same has, of course, also been true of supergravity research [14, 29].

In [2], we considered the reduction to a spacetime point of the spacetime degrees of freedom in the zero slope limit of the unoriented bosonic open and closed string theory [37]. The zero slope limit yields a dilatonic gravity coupled to Yang-Mills gauge fields in 26 target spacetime dimensions, with $SO(2^{13})$ gauge group. This theory has a full spectrum of Dpbranes, with p running from -1 to 25 , coupling to $(p+1)$ -form potentials, C_{p+1} . It is clear that the dimensional reduction of the field theory with $SO(2^{13}) \times U(N)$ gauge fields gives a unitary matrix model. Notice that the simple form of the matrix Lagrangian written down in [2] manifests the $SL(26, \mathbf{R}) \times SO(2^{13})$ expected from dimensional reduction, but neglects the possibility of a further enlargement of the hidden symmetry algebra as a consequence of possible dualizations.

A precise identification of the hidden symmetry algebras underlying the non-maximal ten dimensional supergravities, namely, the heterotic and type I theories, with their rank 32 Yang-Mills gauge fields, and the relationship of these global symmetry algebras to $E_8^{(3)}$, has not as yet been addressed in the literature.¹³ Therefore, in what follows, we consider instead the spacetime reduction of the bosonic sector of the eleven-dimensional supergravity Lagrangian [15, 22, 26, 29]. We emphasize that this toy model is being introduced strictly for the purposes of illustrating the relationship of

¹²This basic point is clouded over in formalisms such as Ashtekar, Rovelli, and Smolin's loop quantum gravity [65]: the background independence, and the nonperturbative nature, of their proposed quantization of Einstein's four-dimensional general relativity is ensured by construction. But the issue of how to consistently derive background spacetime geometries with propagating gravitons is not even addressed. Requiring perturbative renormalizability of a relativistic quantum field theory of gravitons in four dimensions leads inexorably to the string supergravity actions, which necessarily contain Kalb-Ramond terms [63, 37] indicating the higher-dimensional string theory origin of such renormalizable effective field theories [63].

¹³A nonmaximal ten-dimensional heterotic-type supergravity coupled to abelian gauge fields has been discussed in the very recent paper [30].

our reduced matrix model methodology [1, 2, 3] to the works [15, 22, 29]. We have:

$$\mathcal{L}_{11} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\kappa^2} \left[\mathcal{R} + 4F_{[4]}^2 \right] \quad . \quad (9)$$

Unlike the framework for M theory described in Appendix B, we have retained only the three-form potential of eleven-dimensional supergravity. Comparing with [1, 3, 2], we see that the key difference in this toy model is the absence of finite dimensional Yang-Mills gauge fields, and of scalars. Neither have we invoked the framework of non-linear realizations. This is in keeping with the general philosophy of West's proposal [22, 27, 29]: namely, that the nonlinear field-theoretic realization of $E_8^{(3)}$ should be interpreted as a low energy approximation to a different, linear realization of the same symmetry algebra. This is motivated by the classic understanding of nonlinear realizations in particle physics models [38]: the scalars in the nonlinear realization are the Goldstone modes resulting from the spontaneous symmetry breaking of linearly realized symmetries at some higher energy scale. Our conjecture that $E_8^{(3)}$ can be realized on the field of $U(N)$ matrices should be understood within this perspective.

The presence of what looks, formally, like spacetime derivatives in a reduced matrix Lagrangian will startle the reader accustomed to the reduced matrix models of rigid Yang-Mills theories. In our earlier works [1, 2, 3], we have developed a non-trivial realization of the hidden symmetries of a gravity theory on the field of $U(N)$ matrices. We have shown that it is possible to consistently define $U(N)$ matrix-valued operations isomorphic to all of the operations familiar from Riemannian differential geometry: the infinitesimal volume element in p dimensional space, the line-element of a generic curved spacetime metric, the mathematical operation of partial differentiation, the notion of the gauge-covariant derivative, and of curvature, parallel transport, and geodesics [3]. The individual terms in the matrix Lagrangian are composites of unitary matrices, and each composite by itself transforms as a $U(N)$ scalar. Notice that although the individual components of a unitary matrix take value in the field of ordinary real (complex) numbers, the matrix itself is a noncommuting object obeying the rules of $U(N)$ matrix multiplication. Thus, unlike the case of c-number valued fields in a field theory, the *ordering* of matrices within a composite product of $U(N)$ matrices is of crucial importance. Verification of the closure of the extended symmetry algebra from first principles is therefore a nontrivial task [1, 3].

In the next section, we review this framework for the emergence of differential geometry, and of a spacetime continuum, in pedagogical detail. We end this section by mentioning other attempts to introduce local symmetry and the notion of general covariance into reduced matrix models. Motivated by the leading $O(\alpha')$ worldvolume action for N D0branes [12], it was assumed in [6][7] that the $U(N)$ matrix A_μ be identified with position X_μ , associating N^2 degrees of freedom with each of the coordinates of a noncommutative spacetime. The conjugate momentum space picture suggests, instead, that A_μ in the reduced matrix model be identified as the covariant derivative in spacetime, namely, D_μ . This suggestion is motivated from an older work by Gonzalez-Arroyo and Okawa [66], and has been explored in a series of papers by Azuma and Kawai [9]. Although an appealing idea, by itself it does not go very far towards realizing local Lorentz invariance. This class of reduced supermatrix models winds up in the category of attempts to find models for induced gravity, suffering from the same shortcomings pointed out in [17, 3].

3 Emergence of a Continuum Spacetime

The basic idea in [1, 2, 3] is to develop an isomorphism between the standard mathematical operations that underly Riemannian differential geometry and corresponding operations defined on the field of unitary matrices, consistent with the well-known rules of $U(N)$ matrix multiplication. Our guiding principle will be as follows: upon taking the large N limit, the $U(N)$ matrix-valued operations are required to map smoothly to the standard mathematical operations underlying Riemannian differential geometry.

The reader can pick their favorite undergraduate exposition of differential geometry, we will work in reference to the classic textbook by Schutz [67]. Let us associate a continuum flat tangent space parameterized by variables ξ^a , $a=0, \dots, 10$, to every point in spacetime. Spacetime itself is discrete, and it will be assumed that there are N^2 degrees of freedom associated with every point in spacetime, rather than the expected N . This familiar assumption is motivated by the well-known fact that the location of a D0brane, a quantum point particle in nonperturbative string theory, is specified by an $N \times N$ matrix, where N is the number of D0branes [37]. However, unlike [6, 7, 9], points in spacetime are mapped isomorphically to $U(N)$ matrices $E_{\mu a}(X; \xi)$ as follows:

$$X_\mu \equiv E_{\mu a}(X; \xi) d\xi^a, \quad \mu = 0, \dots, 10 \quad . \quad (10)$$

The introduction of the vielbein as a distinct unitary matrix variable is the crucial point of departure in our work [1, 2, 3] from other attempts to realize spacetime, and even local symmetry, in a matrix model framework [6, 7, 8, 9]. We emphasize that X_μ is *derived* from E_μ^a : it is the vielbein which is the fundamental matrix variable entering the matrix Lagrangian, the matrix equations of motion, and the extended symmetry algebra of the reduced matrix model. Notice that $E_\mu^a(X; \xi)$ is a continuum field with respect to the local tangent space, but we have a whole N^2 of such fields living at every point of the noncommutative discrete spacetime. A continuum curved spacetime manifold is said to be covered by patches, each a locally flat tangent space, sewn together by use of an affine connection. The same notion applies here, except that the sewing operation will now correspond to a $U(N)$ matrix-valued operation that tells us how to parallel transport the $U(N)$ matrix variable at the point X , namely, $E_\mu^a(X; \xi)$, specified with respect to the local tangent space parameterized ξ^a , to the $U(N)$ matrix variable at the neighboring point X' with corresponding $E_\mu^a(X'; \xi')$, specified with respect to a different local tangent space parameterized by ξ'^a . The goal is to find a definition for parallel transport that is both consistent with the rules of unitary matrix multiplication, the extended symmetries of the reduced matrix model, and with the correct correspondence in the large N limit to the standard definitions of Riemannian differential geometry.

The location of the spacetime point X with respect to an arbitrarily chosen origin is given by the natural choice of $U(N)$ invariant norm:

$$|X|^2 = \text{Tr} E_a^\mu(X; \xi) E_{\mu b}(X; \xi) d\xi^a d\xi^b \quad , \quad (11)$$

where the trace is over $U(N)$ indices. Translation of the origin corresponds, of course, to a $U(N)$ transformation on the vielbein. Notice that the $N \times N$ matrices, E_μ^a , are not all independent. They are required to satisfy the constraints:

$$E^{\mu a}(\xi) E_\mu^b(\xi) = \eta^{ab}, \quad a, b = 0, \dots, 10 \quad . \quad (12)$$

Finally, it will often be helpful to consider the equivalent physics in a Hamiltonian framework. To enable such discussion, we introduce what we will call the proper time gauge: X^0 is restricted to take diagonal form, such that the elements along the diagonal increase smoothly, and monotonically, denoting continuum time. Thus, in this gauge, we identify $X^0 = Cd\xi^0$, where C is a real constant:

$$(E_0^0)_{mn} = C\delta_{mn}, \quad (E_0^i)_{mn} = 0 \quad \forall m, n = 1, \dots, N, \quad i = 1, \dots, 10 \quad . \quad (13)$$

Since C takes the same value globally, a constant at all points in space, we have identified the global time coordinate with tangent space time upto an overall scaling. In the large N limit, all of the vielbein take diagonal form, and the elements along the diagonal of each X will increase smoothly and monotonically denoting the coordinates of space.

$$(X_i)_{mn} = (E_{ia})_{mn}d\xi^a = C_{ia}(X)d\xi^a \delta_{mn}, \quad \forall m, n = 1, \dots, N, \quad i = 1, \dots, 10 \quad . \quad (14)$$

Clearly, the choice $C_{ii}=C$, $C_{ia} = 0$, $\forall a \neq i$, recovers 11-dimensional Minkowskian spacetime. The constant C determines the box-regularized volume of spacetime. The coordinates of the spacetime have been identified globally with those of the tangent space up to an overall scaling of the compactification volume.

Next we introduce the notion of a differential volume element in spacetime. The interval between two neighbouring events in spacetime, ds^2 , where X^μ , $X'^\mu = X^\mu + (\Delta X)^\mu$, denote events separated by the increment $(\Delta X)^\mu$, is given by:

$$ds^2 = \text{Tr}_{U(N)} (\Delta E)_\mu^a (\Delta E)_a^\mu = \text{Tr}_{U(N)} G_{\mu\nu}(X; \xi) \eta^{ab} \partial_c E_a^\mu(X; \xi) \partial_d E_b^\nu(X; \xi) d\xi^c d\xi^d \quad , \quad (15)$$

an invariant norm for a given class of inertial observers. G is the metric tensor associated to the spacetime point, X , and is also $U(N)$ matrix-valued. Its determinant is defined as follows:

$$G_{\mu\nu}(X; \xi) = E_\mu^a(X; \xi) E_{\nu a}(X; \xi), \quad [\det(-G)]^{1/2} = \left[\det_{U(N)} \left(-\det(E_{\mu a}(X; \xi) E_{\nu b}(X; \xi) \eta^{ab}) \right) \right]^{1/2} . \quad (16)$$

The volume forms, dV_{p+1} , with $p=0, \dots, 10$, can be defined accordingly:

$$dV_{p+1} = \text{Tr}_{U(N)} [\det(-G)]^{1/2} (\Delta E)_{a_0}^0 \dots (\Delta E)_{a_p}^p d\xi^{a_0} \dots d\xi^{a_p} \quad . \quad (17)$$

Next, we move on to the notion of the covariant derivative. This requires that we define a $U(N)$ analog to partial differentiation in spacetime. This is achieved by making reference to the partial derivatives in the local tangent space:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial X^\mu} \equiv \left[\frac{\partial X^\mu}{\partial \xi^c} \right]^{-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi^c} = \left[\frac{(E_a^\mu(X; \xi) d\xi^a)}{\partial \xi^c} \right]^{-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi^c} = [\partial_c (E_a^\mu(X; \xi) d\xi^a)]^{-1} \partial_c \quad . \quad (18)$$

The inverse on the R.H.S. of the equation, $[\dots]^{-1}$, denotes taking the $U(N)$ inverse of the partial derivative, $\partial_c X$.¹⁴ The definition of the Christoffel connection consequently takes the form:

$$\Gamma_{\nu\lambda}^\mu(X; \xi) \equiv \frac{1}{2} G^{\mu\delta} \left([\partial_c (E_a^\lambda d\xi^a)]^{-1} G_{\delta\nu,c} + [\partial_c (E_a^\nu d\xi^a)]^{-1} G_{\delta\lambda,c} - [\partial_c (E_a^\delta d\xi^a)]^{-1} G_{\lambda\nu,c} \right) \quad . \quad (19)$$

¹⁴It is perhaps worth pointing out that, although a unitary matrix equals its inverse by construction, the partial derivative of a unitary matrix is not necessarily unitary: let $U = e^{iH(\xi)}$, then $\partial_a U = i\partial_a H(\xi) \cdot e^{iH(\xi)}$.

The expressions for covariant differentiation follow. Given the rank n unitary matrix-valued Lorentz tensors $A^\mu(X; \xi)$, $T^{\mu\nu}(X; \xi)$, \dots , we can define:

$$\begin{aligned} D_\lambda A^\mu &= [\partial_c(E_a^\lambda d\xi^a)]^{-1} \partial_c A^\mu + \Gamma_{\nu\lambda}^\mu A^\nu \\ D_\lambda T^{\mu\nu} &= [\partial_c(E_a^\lambda d\xi^a)]^{-1} \partial_c T^{\mu\nu} + \Gamma_{\delta\lambda}^\mu T^{\delta\nu} + \Gamma_{\delta\lambda}^\nu T^{\mu\delta} \\ \dots &= \dots \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where, as an example, $T^{\mu\nu}$ was taken to be the symmetric rank two energy-momentum tensor.

We now introduce the notion of parallel transport, providing a suitable characterization of spacetime geodesics. Since spacetime is discrete, and points in spacetime are isomorphic to $U(N)$ matrices $X^\mu = E_a^\mu d\xi^a$, referred to their local tangent space, it is natural to describe a curve in spacetime, \mathcal{C} , as a path-ordered progression of $U(N)$ matrices, in one-to-one correspondence with points, X^μ , along the curve. Let us denote an element of this progression by $V^\mu(X)$. The tangent to the curve is likewise given by a progression of tangent matrices, denoted $U^\mu(X)$. For a curve in a continuum space time this is parameterized by what is known as the proper time, or affine parameter, λ , and we can define: $\mathbf{U} = d\mathbf{V}/d\lambda$. As explained earlier, it is possible to make a gauge choice such that proper time is identified with the local tangent-space time at every point along the progression. Let us choose a point \mathcal{P} , with associated local tangent space, such that all components of the Christoffel connection vanish at that point. Then it follows that $U^\nu(D_\nu V^\mu)|_{\mathcal{P}} = 0$. This condition defines frame invariant parallel transport along the curve \mathcal{C} :

$$U^\mu D_\mu V^\nu = U^\mu [\partial_c(E_a^\mu d\xi^a)]^{-1} \partial_c U_\nu + U^\mu \Gamma_{\mu\lambda}^\nu U^\lambda = 0 \quad . \quad (21)$$

Parallel transport of the tangent vector itself determines the geodesics of the spacetime which are curves which satisfy the condition:

$$U^\mu D_\mu U^\nu = U^\mu [\partial_c(E_a^\mu d\xi^a)]^{-1} \partial_c U_\nu + U^\mu \Gamma_{\mu\lambda}^\nu U^\lambda = 0 \quad . \quad (22)$$

Parallel transport of a vector about an infinitesimal closed loop in spacetime at a given point \mathcal{P} defines the Riemann curvature tensor, taking the familiar form of a commutator of covariant derivatives:

$$R_{\nu\delta}^\mu = \Gamma_{\nu\delta,\lambda}^\mu - \Gamma_{\nu\lambda,\delta}^\mu + \Gamma_{\sigma\lambda}^\mu \Gamma_{\nu\delta}^\sigma + \Gamma_{\sigma\delta}^\mu \Gamma_{\nu\lambda}^\sigma, \quad [\nabla_\mu, \nabla_\nu] V^\lambda = R_{\delta\mu\nu}^\lambda V^\delta \quad . \quad (23)$$

Similarly, the Bianchi identities take their familiar form, except that partial and covariant derivatives are unitary matrix-valued operations defined as given above. Finally, consider the Yang-Mills field strength. We introduce the $U(N)$ matrix variable, $A_\mu^A \tau^A$, where A labels the adjoint representation of a finite-dimensional Yang-Mills group. In flat Minkowskian spacetime, the gauge covariant derivative takes the simple form:

$$\mathcal{D}_\lambda A_\mu = [\partial_c(E_a^\lambda d\xi^a)]^{-1} \partial_c A_\mu + g[A_\lambda, A_\mu] \quad . \quad (24)$$

In a generic curved spacetime background, we must also covariantize with respect to the Christoffel connection defined earlier, giving the vector potential or field strength as seen by a non-inertial observer. Thus, we have given concrete meaning to all of the elementary objects entering unitary matrix Lagrangians, such as Eq. (9), that correspond to spacetime reductions of locally symmetric field theories. In [1, 3], this kind of analysis was extended to the much more complicated case of supersymmetric matrix Lagrangians.

4 $E_8^{(3)}$ on the field of large N Unitary Matrices

This section assumes familiarity with the recent works of Peter West [22, 29], at least to the extent reviewed in the introduction and in Appendices A, B. As mentioned earlier, increasingly convincing evidence has been given that the rank eleven Lorentzian very-extension of the E_8 algebra, denoted $E_8^{(3)}$, is the symmetry algebra of nonperturbative string/M theory. The fundamental variables of this theory are unknown [46]; what is well-established is the duality symmetries linking the zero slope limits of five different string theories with the low-energy approximation to M theory, namely, the eleven-dimensional supergravity theory [45, 46, 37]. In Appendix B, we have reviewed West's demonstration of an $E_8^{(3)}$ algebra underlying the type IIA, mIIA, and IIB, string supergravities, as well as the eleven-dimensional supergravity field theory. Let us now consider the supergravity theories with sixteen supercharges, all of which couple to finite-dimensional Yang-Mills gauge fields, and which have played a central role in our earlier works including the conjecture for Matrix Theory [40, 41, 47, 57, 1, 3]. Although a more detailed investigation remains to be completed, we will provide some preliminary arguments suggesting that the nonmaximal supergravities are also characterized by an underlying $E_8^{(3)}$ hidden symmetry algebra.

We remind the reader that the type IB supergravity is obtained as an orientation projection of the IIB supergravity: the orientation projection, Ω , identifies the two same-chirality spinors of the IIB theory. The result is a theory with sixteen supercharges. The doublet structure of the zero and two-form potentials, and of their Hodge duals, is gone: the type IB supergravity retains a single dilaton and R-R two-form potential, plus their six-form and eight-form Hodge duals [37]. In the notation of Appendix B, we can introduce corresponding generators:

$$K_b^a, R, R^{c_1 c_2}, R^{c_1 \cdots c_6}, R^{c_1 \cdots c_8} \quad , \quad (25)$$

which is the same generator content as the heterotic supergravity theory, with its dilaton and NS-NS two-form potential, plus their Hodge duals. Both theories are coupled to nonabelian Yang-Mills gauge fields, with appropriate anomaly-free choice of gauge group [63, 37]. The global symmetry algebra of the type I supergravity can be identified by taking an appropriate projection of the global symmetry algebra, \mathcal{G}_{IIB} , of the type IIB supergravity [25, 29]. Setting the extra forms to zero in Eqs. (2), (7), and (8), we find the usual $GL(10, \mathbf{R})$ algebra, extended by translations:

$$[K_b^a, K_d^c] = \delta_b^c K_d^a - \delta_d^a K_b^c, \quad [K_b^a, P_c] = \delta_c^a P_b, \quad [K_b^a, R^{c_1 \cdots c_p}] = \delta_b^{c_1} R^{a c_2 \cdots c_p} + \cdots \quad , \quad (26)$$

plus the simplified algebra of 0, 2, 6, and 8-form generators:

$$[R, R^{c_1 \cdots c_p}] = d_p R^{c_1 \cdots c_p}, \quad [R^{c_1 \cdots c_p}, R^{c_1 \cdots c_q}] = c_{p,q} R^{c_1 \cdots c_{p+q}} \quad . \quad (27)$$

Comparing with the IIB results [25, 29] displayed in Eq. (8), the remnant non-vanishing structure constants take the simple form:

$$d_{q+1} = -\frac{1}{4}(q-3), \quad q = 1, 5, \quad c_{2,6} = \frac{1}{2} \quad , \quad (28)$$

in agreement with Eq. (1.4) of [30]. This algebra will be denoted \mathcal{G}_{IB} . So far we have not invoked the Yang-Mills gauge fields, and thus it is clear that \mathcal{G}_{IB} is also the global symmetry algebra of the supergravity sector of the zero slope limit of either heterotic string theory in ten dimensions.

If we now compare with the Chevalley basis for the algebra $E_8^{(3)}$, written in either its IIA or IIB guise as shown in Appendix B, we find that we are missing some of the positive root generators in either formulation. We have all of the generators, $E_a = K_{a+1}^a$, $a=1, \dots, 9$, of $SL(10, \mathbf{R})$. In the IIA formulation, given by Eq. (72), we are missing the roots corresponding to the R-R one-form, and NS-NS twoform, namely, $E_{10} = R^{10}$, and $E_{11} = R^{910}$. In the IIB formulation, we are missing the roots labelled $E_9 = R_1^{910}$, and $E_{10} = R_2$, arising, respectively, from the NS-NS two-form potential, and R-R scalar. It is clear we cannot build a full $E_8^{(3)}$ algebra from the restricted set of generators in \mathcal{G}_{IB} .

In [30], it was pointed out that a different rank eleven very-extended algebra, namely, the very-extension of the D_8 subalgebra of E_8 , can be spanned by the generators of \mathcal{G}_{IB} . But we should note that such a construction is somewhat unmotivated from the viewpoint of any relationship to the type II theories, to eleven-dimensional supergravity, or to M theory: the authors of [30] make the choice $E_a = K_{a+1}^a$, $a=1, \dots, 9$, $E_{10} = R^{910}$, and $E_{11} = R^{5678910}$. This choice of simple roots is shown to generate the very-extended algebra $D_8^{(3)}$. Appending a one-form generator to this set converts the $D_8^{(3)}$ algebra to $B_8^{(3)}$ [30]. However, it should be noted that, since the two-form and six-form potentials are Hodge dual to each other in ten dimensions, a construction which includes both in the simple root basis is quite different in spirit from that of the $E_8^{(3)}$ algebras underlying the IIA and IIB theories [22, 25, 26, 29].

We will suggest a different direction towards uncovering an $E_8^{(3)}$ algebraic structure in supergravity theories with sixteen supercharges. Since we already have the requisite two-form potential, respectively, the R-R, or NS-NS, two-form of the type IB, or heterotic, supergravities, our goal will be to identify a one-form potential that can play the role of the positive root generator labelled E_{10} in the IIA formulation of the $E_8^{(3)}$ algebra. A hint is provided by our understanding of the duality web linking the zero slope limits of the circle compactifications of the type I, type IIA, IIB, and heterotic string theories, along with M theory compactified on $S^1 \times S^1 / \mathbb{Z}_2$. Upon compactification on a circle, the heterotic string theories acquire an abelian one-form potential, namely, a Kaluza-Klein gauge boson. This perturbative gauge field is known to play a crucial role in six-dimensional weak-strong IIA-heterotic string-string duality: it maps under a weak-strong coupling duality to the R-R one-form potential of the IIA string theory compactified on K3.¹⁵ As the simple root generator labelled E_{11} in the IIA formulation of $E_8^{(3)}$, we choose, respectively, the NS-NS two-form potential of the IIA string or the two-form potential of the heterotic string. Note that these are mapped to each other under string-string duality. As an aside, the reader may wonder why we had to compactify all the way to six dimensions to see these equivalences, but this methodology is in keeping with how the Cremmer-Julia hidden symmetries of the type II theories were discovered. The full global symmetries only become manifest in the dimensionally-reduced supergravity theories, but this can be taken as a hint towards discovering a higher-dimensional correspondence. In summary, identifying the Kaluza-Klein one-form, and the two-form potential, as the two missing positive root generators in the Chevalley basis should plausibly allow one to demonstrate an $E_8^{(3)}$ global symmetry algebra

¹⁵To be more precise, compactifications of the IIA theory on K3 are described by a $(19, 3)$ cohomology lattice characterizing classical K3 surfaces. It is the quantum extension to a $(20, 4)$ quantum cohomology lattice, as a consequence of introducing a flux for the R-R one-form potential, that completes the isomorphism of the IIA theory compactified on K3 to the heterotic string compactified on T^4 . The quantum cohomology lattice is identified with the $(20, 4)$ Lorentzian momentum lattice of the heterotic string [68, 69, 47]. The heterotic theory has 20 abelian one-forms. One of these is distinguished as the partner of the R-R one-form of the IIA theory, and this is the Kaluza-Klein gauge field we have in mind.

in the circle compactifications of the heterotic supergravities.

The evidence for an $E_8^{(3)}$ global symmetry algebra is even clearer in the case of the circle-compactified type IB supergravity. Upon compactification to nine dimensions, the type I theory can acquire nonabelian gauge symmetries of nonperturbative origin. A T_9 -duality transformation to the equivalent type I' theory makes this clearer: the space-filling D9branes are mapped to D8branes. The type I' theory has the same p -form gauge potentials as the massive IIA theory, and so the correspondence to the $E_8^{(3)}$ hidden symmetry algebra is particularly transparent. Most importantly, we have the possibility of extra gauge bosons arising from the zero length limit of D0-D8brane strings. Such D0-D8brane backgrounds preserve all sixteen supersymmetries. The extension to D0-D8backgrounds, in addition to those with only 32 D8branes, permits identification of type I-I' strong-weak coupling duals for *all* of the nine-dimensional ground states of the heterotic string theories. In particular, this includes compactifications on a circle of both the $Spin(32)/Z_2$ and the $E_8 \times E_8$ heterotic string theories [70, 57]. Extra gauge bosons in the spinor representation of $SO(16)$ which were necessary in order to obtain E_8 gauge symmetry in the type I' string arise from the zero length limit of nonperturbative D0-D8 strings [72, 57]. Incidentally, since the type I' theory compactified on S^1 is the same thing as M theory compactified on $S^1 \times S^1/Z_2$, this is consistent with the identification of M theory on S^1/Z_2 as the strong coupling limit of the $E_8 \times E_8$ heterotic string theory [71].

In an earlier work [57], we showed that the inclusion of the D0-D8brane backgrounds also enables the identification of the type I-I' strong coupling duals for all of the heterotic CHL moduli spaces with sixteen supersymmetries [40, 41, 47]. The CHL models are supersymmetry preserving orbifolds of the standard toroidal compactifications of the heterotic string [41]. Thus, in nine spacetime dimensions, the vacuum structure of the theory with sixteen supercharges is multiply connected: in addition to the connected vacuum landscape with 17 abelian one-forms at generic points in the moduli space, we have a isolated island universe with $17-8=9$ abelian one-forms at generic points.¹⁶ This theory was first identified as an asymmetric orbifold of the circle compactification of the $E_8 \times E_8$ heterotic string theory by Chaudhuri and Polchinski [41]: the Z_2 orbifold action is a supersymmetry-preserving shift in the one-dimensional momentum lattice, accompanied by the outer automorphism exchanging the two E_8 lattices. The gauge symmetry at generic points in the moduli space is rank 9. For the purposes of the discussion here, it is important to notice that the supergravity structure of the CHL orbifold is identical with that of the circle compactification. Indeed, if we are correct in our expectation that the circle-compactified theory has an underlying $E_8^{(3)}$ global symmetry algebra, then this will also be true of the CHL orbifold. The distinction between the two theories lies in the Yang-Mills sector: they differ in the rank of the gauge group at generic points in the moduli space, respectively, 17, and 9. Are the precise nonabelian enhanced gauge symmetry groups relevant to this discussion? It has become customary to think not, since it is well-known that the precise nonabelian enhancement varies from point to point in the moduli space. Conventionally, this multiplicity of enhanced symmetry points is expressed in terms of the

¹⁶Since the orbifold twist becomes trivial in the noncompact decompactification limit where the requisite massless gauge bosons are simultaneously recovered, the CHL moduli space is not, strictly speaking, a disconnected component of the moduli space of 16 supercharges [41]. But we should emphasize that, at weak coupling, and from the perspective of low energy physics, the fields in this theory know nothing about the existence of other moduli spaces: this is an island universe. It should be noted that in similar examples, but with fewer supersymmetries, nonperturbative dynamics can sometimes be invoked to infer the possibility of tunneling to a different moduli space [73].

perturbative T-duality groups of the moduli spaces.

However, if the Kaluza-Klein one-form is absorbed in the nonlinear realization of $E_8^{(3)}$, an especially simple result follows: we find three distinct theories in nine spacetime dimensions with sixteen supercharges. They are characterized by three distinct global symmetry groups: $E_8^{(3)} \times (\text{Spin}(32)/\mathbb{Z}_2)$, $E_8^{(3)} \times (E_8 \times E_8)$, and $E_8^{(3)} \times (E_8)$.¹⁷ The factor in brackets arises from the Yang-Mills sector, the former from the supergravity sector. The strong coupling duals of these heterotic theories are, respectively, the circle compactified type IB, type I', and type I', theories in nine spacetime dimensions with corresponding global symmetry groups. Strictly speaking, since we are describing a self-dual theory whose strong-coupling limit is identified with its weak-coupling limit, the labels type I-I', or heterotic, are not very meaningful. Neither is the designation of weak, or strong, within such a pair of dual theories.

We emphasize that there is no known spacetime dynamics, field-theoretic or string-theoretic, that can repair the disconnectedness of the moduli space with sixteen supercharges: the isolated components represent isolated universes. All are characterized by similar basic ingredients, gravity and Yang-Mills gauge fields, but they differ in the specifics. Recall that there is no Higgs mechanism in theories with sixteen supercharges. Thus, while the precise enhanced gauge symmetry can vary from point to point, the rank of the abelian subalgebra is *fixed* for all points in a connected component of the moduli space [40]. More precisely, as is clarified by the orbifold construction [40, 41, 47], each isolated component of the moduli space is characterized by a distinct target-space duality group entering into specification of the global symmetry algebra of that island universe. An alternative viewpoint is to realize that each island universe is an example of a flux compactification [55]: one, or more, of the supergravity pform fluxes is nontrivial, an invariant on a connected component of the moduli space. The type IIA duals of the heterotic CHL models with nontrivial Ramond-Ramond one-form flux constructed by Chaudhuri and Lowe [47] are the earliest known examples of flux compactifications of the type II string theory. While the notion of isolated universes can be disconcerting, raising the spectre of the anthropic principle, and banishing hopes of a unique vacuum state for String/M theory picked by dynamics alone, we have argued elsewhere that the problem is one of misinterpretation [59]. In fact, generic considerations from quantum cosmology should have led us to expect such an outcome from a fundamental theory of the Universe.

From the perspective of the hidden symmetry algebra, on the other hand, there is hope of finding a tantalizing relationship between supergravity theories having 16 or 32 supercharges: M theory would have a superalgebra given by the fermionic extension of $E_8^{(3)}$ by 32 supersymmetry generators. An alternative extension of the bosonic algebra $E_8^{(3)}$ to a superalgebra with only sixteen supersymmetry generators would simultaneously permit the incorporation of up to 32 Yang-Mills gauge fields. More precisely, we would find that the possible extensions of the global symmetry group are isomorphic to the isolated components of the moduli spaces with sixteen supercharges. In nine dimensions, the only solutions are the rank 16 and rank 8 groups described above. But for moduli spaces in lower dimensions, there is a huge proliferation of isolated components to the moduli space, with the enhanced gauge symmetry varying from point to point, but with identical abelian

¹⁷We are using the same notation for the Yang-Mills gauge group and its global remnant. The E_8 in the case of the CHL orbifold is realized at level two of the worldsheet affine Lie algebra. From the perspective of spacetime, the \mathbb{Z}_2 orbifold structure indicates the necessity for care in determining the precise global remnant of the E_8 gauge symmetry.

subgroup at all points in the moduli space. Thus, a precise specification of the global remnant of this abelian subgroup is an accurate characterization of the CHL orbifold. Notice that the nontrivial global remnant of the abelian gauge symmetry simply reflects the action of the orbifold group on the toroidal spacetime. This is a slightly more physical explanation of how physics differs in the CHL moduli spaces.

Notice that from the perspective of the hidden symmetry algebra, there is nothing to distinguish M theory from the ten-dimensional IIA and IIB theories: all three share the same rank eleven global symmetry algebra. To see that the latter are ten-dimensional field theories requires that we introduce the notion of *spacetime*: in the purely algebraic formulation of $E_8^{(3)}$ proposed by West [22, 29], there are no spacetime translation generators, \mathcal{P}_a , to begin with. There are three opposing suggestions for how to introduce spacetime into the formalism of nonlinear realizations, reviewed in section 4 of [33]. In the context of $E_8^{(2)}$, also a competing proposal for the symmetry algebra of M theory [34], Damour, Henneaux, and Nicolai [31] proposed that the fields in the nonlinear realization should be taken as functions of time alone. Spatial dependence would arise thru the action of certain higher level generators of the $E_8^{(2)}$ algebra, which had the correct commutation relations to be identified as spatial derivatives. Thus, [31] showed that the 3-form, 6-form, and dual graviton representations appearing at level 1, 2, and 3, of $E_8^{(2)}$ contain tensors with the index structure of a k th spatial derivative at levels $1 + 3k$, $2 + 3k$, and $3 + 3k$. It is expected that similar identifications can be made for $E_8^{(3)}$ [33]. An alternative viewpoint has been put forward by West [23], namely, that spacetime can be incorporated by constructing the nonlinear realization of the semi-direct product of $E_8^{(3)}$ with a particular lowest weight representation denoted \bar{l}_1 : the \bar{l}_1 representation would contain the coordinates of spacetime, but it should be noted that it also contains coordinates corresponding to the central charges of the supergravity theory. Details can be found in [33]. A third suggestion comes from Englert and Houart [32], who propose that the fields in the nonlinear realization depend upon an auxiliary parameter, which is extended to a full spacetime by the identification of generators corresponding to spatial derivative operators in the very-extended algebra, analogous to the proposal of [31]. Since all of these proposals are at a preliminary stage of investigation, it behooves us to keep an open mind. On the other hand, it should be noted that our conjecture for Matrix Theory dovetails neatly with the algebraic formalism of hidden symmetries: identify the hidden symmetry algebra with the extended symmetry algebra of a reduced unitary matrix model that implements local invariances, as described in section 3. The large N limit of such a unitary matrix model naturally provides for the coordinates of a spacetime continuum.

In summary, let us reformulate our conjecture for Matrix Theory succinctly [1, 2, 3] in light of what we have learned from this survey of the hidden symmetry algebras of supergravity theories, including that of M theory. Given the striking evidence that the rank eleven very-extension of the Lie algebra E_8 incorporates the full spectrum of NS-NS and R-R charges, including the crucial D8brane charge, we will conjecture that the hidden symmetry algebra of supergravity theories with sixteen supercharges takes the form $E_8^{(3)} \times G$, where G is the global remnant of an appropriate finite-dimensional Yang-Mills gauge group. We conjecture further that nonperturbative String/M theory is the locally supersymmetric extension of the algebra $E_8^{(3)} \times G$ with sixteen supercharges realized on the field of unitary $N \times N$ matrices. A particular limit of this superalgebra will recover a full 32 supercharges at the cost of making G trivial.

5 Open Questions

A proposal as radical as that described in this paper [1, 2, 3], or in West's beautiful recent work [22, 29], has few concrete conclusions in comparison with the Pandora's box of fascinating questions it opens up for future investigation. We list the most significant, and accessible, of these questions below:

- The elucidation of an $E_8^{(3)}$ algebra with Chevalley basis chosen from among the generators of the global symmetry algebra of the circle-compactified type IB and heterotic string theories as proposed in the previous section needs to be checked. In particular, West has made the interesting observation that the IIA-IIB T-duality transformation simply reflects the bifurcation symmetry of the $E_8^{(3)}$ Dynkin diagram at its central node, interchanging the Dynkin diagrams of its two inequivalent A_{10} subalgebras [29]. This argument can clearly be adapted to the T-duality symmetry relating the type IB and type I' string theories. Or, to that relating the two circle-compactified heterotic string theories. The details need to be worked out.
- The conjectured global symmetry algebra of the Z_2 orbifold-compactified E_8 moduli space [41] needs to be verified. If the previous item bears out, there will be no difficulty in verifying the appearance of an $E_8^{(3)}$ hidden symmetry algebra in this case. Nor, for the hidden symmetry algebras of any of the vast proliferation of isolated theories with sixteen supercharges [73]. It should be noted that our new perspective on the hidden symmetry algebra takes seriously the strong-weak dualities linking the heterotic, type IB, and type IIA, string theories: a theory of sixteen supercharges is self-dual, and it would be meaningless to have different hidden symmetry algebras pertaining to the different string theories. Thus, while the perturbative T-duality group of the type II theory is, in fact, incorporated in E_{11} , the Lorentzian $O(16+d, d)$, $d < 10$, extension familiar from the toroidally-compactified heterotic string is *not* contained within E_{11} . We emphasize that E_{11} is the hidden symmetry algebra of a type I/heterotic supergravity with sixteen supercharges: it is unchanged for any of the CHL theories. Of course, the abelian subgroup of the nonabelian gauge symmetry characterizing generic points in a given moduli space, and hence G , will be different for each of the latter CHL theories. It just so happens that in nine dimensions there are no Wilson lines that permit either a breaking, or enhancement, of the E_8 Yang-Mills gauge symmetry ¹⁸
- As explained in Appendix B, it is a remarkable fact that there exists a *unique* assignment of phases in the bosonic $E_8^{(3)}$ algebra corresponding to an eleven-dimensional theory with, respectively, Minkowskian (1,10), or Euclidean (0,11) signature [87]. As has been shown by Keurentjes [87], every other self-consistent choice of phases for E_{11} results in a spacetime with two, or more, timelike directions. Furthermore, the Euclidean case also corresponds to a bosonic E_{11} algebra without supersymmetric extension [87], precisely as one would expect given its natural physical interpretation as the symmetry algebra of M theory at finite temperature. This Euclidean symmetry algebra is of great interest in the context of cosmology.

Let us mention here a suggestive interpretation for the principle subalgebra of the Euclidean signature bosonic E_{11} algebra. As expected from generic considerations [27, 28], every

¹⁸I thank Arjan Keurentjes for requesting this clarification.

Lorentzian Kac-Moody algebra has a principal $SO(1, 2)$ subalgebra, and it is natural to seek its physical interpretation. Based on our understanding of the String/M duality web in 11, 10, and 9, spacetime dimensions, and given the central role played by the nineform potential in West’s nonlinear realization of E_{11} , it is natural to identify the parameters of the $SO(1, 2)$ subalgebra, roughly, as follows.¹⁹ Labelling them as R_0 , R_{10} , and R_9 , respectively, suggests a natural identification with inverse temperature, β , string coupling, g , and cosmological constant M . The latter is Roman’s mass parameter, later interpreted by Polchinski as D8brane charge [36, 11]. Notice that the two-parameter subspace (β, g) , whose rough correspondence with the radius of coordinates (X^0, X^{10}) is well-known, is also the classic phase space parameterization relevant for the study of the dynamics of a finite temperature gauge theory [58]. Supplementing this with the cosmological constant gives a natural three-parameter phase space relevant for discussions of cosmology: the thermal dynamics of the Universe, inclusive of gravity [58, 59]. It should be emphasized that the principal $SO(1, 2)$ algebra should *not* be confused with the corresponding subalgebra of the spacetime Lorentz algebra.

It is worth pointing out that most reliable calculations in string thermodynamics to date have been relegated to the canonical ensemble simply because perturbative string theory is inherently background dependent: the “heat bath” representing the spacetime metric, and background fields, cannot be dispensed with [58]. Matrix Theory can overcome this obstacle, and formulation of the microcanonical ensemble of matrix degrees of freedom is therefore an important goal for future work. Finally, there has been an interesting stream of ongoing work on chaotic billiard ball cosmologies in the Einstein dilaton-graviton-pform system, in the vicinity of a spacelike singularity. Cosmological evolution is re-interpreted in terms of trajectories in the Weyl chamber of the Lorentzian Kac-Moody algebra E_{10} [52, 31, 34]. It would be nice to explore the relationship to E_{11} , and to the matrix theory framework for M theory.

- The details of the supersymmetric extension of the $E_8^{(3)} \times G$ hidden symmetry algebra is of profound importance. A preliminary investigation of some related issues has just appeared in a recent paper [74]. The possibility of consistently extending the bosonic algebra with sixteen supercharges, and the appearance of a full 32 supercharges, and trivial G , as a particular limiting case of the superalgebra, needs to be checked.
- Assuming the previous item works out, it remains to implement the $E_8^{(3)} \times G$ superalgebra as an extended locally supersymmetric algebra in the unitary matrix model framework proposed by us in [1, 2, 3]. In these works, the manifest extended symmetry algebra was simply $SL(10, \mathbf{R}) \times G$, the expected symmetry of the fully- undualized, dimensionally-reduced supergravity Lagrangian. We should emphasize that whether one implements this proposal in a Lagrangian or Hamiltonian framework is a matter of taste. Each perspective has distinct advantages.
- An important issue raised both by our focus on the principal three-parameter subalgebra of $E_8^{(3)}$, and by its realization in a locally supersymmetric unitary matrix model, is the possibility

¹⁹We should emphasize that this is very rough intuition. Thus, we are not making any clear statement on the precise topology of the group, discrete identifications might be necessitated.

of an undiscovered relation to the famous *supermembrane theory*, a conjectured theory of fundamental supermembranes [75, 76]. Does the locally supersymmetric matrix model represent a regularization of the three parameter manifold of the principal subgroup, analogous to the regularization of the worldvolume of the supermembrane provided by the rigid unitary matrix model [76]? These are open questions that should shed light on the large N continuum limit of Matrix Theory.

- Next, we must ask about theories with fewer supercharges: note that the field theory with eight supercharges includes in its moduli space both subspaces, or isolated points, with 4, or 0, supersymmetries, at finite distances in the moduli space. The appearance of matter fields is an added wrinkle. Can the framework of nonlinear realizations be adapted to supergravity theories coupled to chiral matter? This is a beautiful open question that first needs to be addressed purely in a field theoretic setting. Our conjecture is that the theory with eight, or fewer, supercharges has a hidden symmetry algebra that is *smaller* than $E_8^{(3)}$, possibly a subalgebra. The N=3 theories with 12 supercharges, recently revived by Frey and Polchinski [77], offer an interesting half-way point between the 16, 32 supercharge theories and theories with 8 or fewer supercharges.²⁰ They have well-defined moduli spaces with flat potential, while including examples of three-form flux compactifications that share many features of semi-realistic, N=1 flux compactifications with avenues for moduli stabilization. If a suitable generalization of the framework of nonlinear realizations and hidden symmetries can indeed be found for such semi-realistic supergravity theories, it should be straightforward to implement within the context of matrix theory.
- A related subject concerns the intriguing connections discovered between matrix models, N=2 super Yang Mills theories, the Seiberg-Witten curve, and integrable systems [80]. It is an important open problem to understand their correspondence in a locally supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory. Likewise, one can ask whether our Matrix Theory framework bears any relationship to the Dijkgraaf-Vafa correspondence [81].²¹
- What is the physical significance of the higher level roots of the Lorentzian very-extended Lie algebra? There is considerable ongoing investigation of this issue both in the context of the over-extended algebra $E_{10}=E_8^{(3)}$ [34, 31], and in the case of $E_{11}=E_8^{(3)}$ [89, 33, 32, 29]. The general feature common to all of these analyses is to attempt an isomorphism between all of the known classical supergravity solutions, including composite branes and bound states, to the root system of the Lie algebra. It is of course likely that there will be new solutions which do not have a supergravity correspondence; examples in the case of eleven-dimensional supergravity have been given by West in [29]. An interesting point raised by West [29] that deserves further investigation is the possibility of an isomorphism between the process of group multiplication between group elements corresponding to two elementary branes, and the formation of a composite brane or bound state. How should one interpret such states, and what is their correspondence in the matrix theory framework?

²⁰I thank Andrew Frey for stimulating my interest in this subject.

²¹Marco Matone has informed me of an interesting correspondence that relates the prepotential of the N=2 theory, inclusive of gravitational corrections, to the free energy of an appropriate matrix model [82].

- The absence of a clear picture for the origin of spacetime in proposals for nonlinear realizations of the hidden symmetry algebra [34, 31, 32, 22, 29] has made it difficult thus far to explore their relationship to alternative organizing principles for the Dbrane spectrum of type II string/M theory, such as the remarkably successful K-theory [78, 79].²² My expectation is that the matrix model framework and its large N continuum limit will eventually play an important role here. Preliminary steps would be to understand the relationship of K theory to the doubled field formalism of dimensionally-reduced supergravities [54], a precursor to West's nonlinear realization [22, 29], also based on the notion of self-duality [53]. Given the recent detailed understanding provided by West in [29] of the full pbrane spectrum of the type II string theory, M theory, and of eleven-dimensional supergravity, it must surely be possible to make contact with at least some of the results in [79]. Recent work in this direction has exploited the worldsheet correspondence, invoking the framework of RG flows in the larger space of generic two-dimensional field theories, thus incorporating unstable Dbranes. Do unstable branes find a natural setting within the framework of nonlinear realizations?
- Finally, there is the issue of what comes beyond leading order in large N in the matrix model: what is the significance of the off-diagonal elements of the variables in the unitary matrix model? Notice that there is an obvious extension to the notion of the double-scaling limit familiar from the $c = 1$ matrix model: namely, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty, g \rightarrow 0}$, with $g^\alpha N^\beta$ held fixed. The parameters (α, β) take an appropriate range of values for members in the discrete series of the gravitationally-dressed unitary conformal field theories with central charge $c \leq 1$ [5]. The generalization to large N limits with multiple-scaling was pointed out in our earlier works [1, 3]. Since we have a full range of background fields, $(g = e^\phi, \bar{A}_{c_1}, \bar{C}_{c_1}, \bar{C}_{c_1 c_2}, \dots, \bar{C}_{c_1 \dots c_9})$, where $g = (M_{11} R_{10})^{3/2}$, and the single mass scale, M_{11} , there are many possible inequivalent, multiple-scaling limits: a suitable combination of powers of N , M_{11} , and the background fields, can be held fixed, in the limit that we take $N \rightarrow \infty$. Here, M_{11} has been taken to be the eleven-dimensional Planck mass. The precise powers of M_{11} that enter into taking the large N limit can vary, depending on whether we wish to match to an eleven, or ten-dimensional, continuum field theory. For example, the ten-dimensional string mass scale is related as follows: $m_s = \alpha'^{-1/2} = M_{11}^{3/2} R_{10}^{1/2}$. We should emphasize the fact that it was essential that the matrix theory framework allow for a wide range of inequivalent large N limits, since it would not otherwise be possible to explain the multitude of known effective dualities relating M theory ground states.
- An important open question is the comparison of corrections to the large N limit of the matrix model obtained in a choice of scaling appropriate for matching to a string supergravity, with the known higher order in α' corrections to the spacetime effective Lagrangian.²³ We should remind the reader that these corrections have not been systematically calculated in most cases, although the general methodology has been known for many years [63, 37, 64], and certain subsets of such terms are explicitly known. It would seem that there is strong motivation for a renewed effort in this direction, given that it is only at higher orders in α' that we can make the nontrivial comparisons between the large N limit of Matrix Theory and string theory that go beyond testing supergravity symmetries.

²²I thank Clifford Johnson for raising this question.

²³I would like to thank Sanefumi Moriyama for asking this question.

In summary, we believe this could be the beginning of an exciting period in the search for a more fundamental description of String/M theory that transcends its weakly-coupled perturbative limits.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Bernard de Wit, Andrew Frey, Ori Ganor, Jaume Gomis, Clifford Johnson, Arjan Keurentjes, Marco Matone, Andrei Mikhailov, Sanefumi Moriyama, Hermann Nicolai, Igor Schnakenburg, and Peter West for helpful comments and stimulus. I thank Andrew Frey for the opportunity to present this material to a Caltech seminar audience. The paper was written in part at the Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of California at Santa Barbara. I am grateful to the staff for providing a supportive and stimulating environment for research on an informal visit.

Appendix A: The Very-Extension of a Lie Algebra

The introductory material in this appendix can be found in the classic texts [83, 84], as well as the well-known review article [85]. The notion of a very-extended algebra first appears in Gaberdiel, Olive, and West [27]. Our discussion of the very-extension of E_8 is based on section 5 and the appendices of this reference. We urge the reader to consult the original [27] for a far more complete treatment. A readable introduction to some novelties in the representation theory of very-extended algebras, the subject of current research, can be found in section 2 of [33].

As is well-known, Cartan's classification of the classical Lie algebras, the A_n , B_n , C_n , and D_n series, extends to three exceptional cases, namely, E_n , with $n=6, 7$, and 8 [86]. Every such finite-dimensional semi-simple Lie algebra has an infinite-dimensional affine extension, better known in the physics literature as a current algebra [38], or as an affine Lie algebra. The two-dimensional field theoretic realizations of affine Lie algebras have been the basis of considerable work in rational conformal field theory and string theory [85]. While affine Lie algebras are the best-studied examples of the Kac-Moody algebras, more generally, they are characterized as follows [83, 84]. We can write the generators of any Kac-Moody algebra, \mathcal{G} , in what is known as the Chevalley basis: the positive and negative simple root generators, E_a^\pm , are the generalization of the raising and lowering operators, J_\pm , of the angular momentum group $SU(2)$, familiar to every quantum physicist. Likewise, the role of the single eigenoperator of $SU(2)$, usually denoted J_3 , is more generally played by the Cartan subalgebra of \mathcal{G} . This is the maximal subset of mutually-commuting generators, denoted by H_a . The number of generators in the Cartan subalgebra gives the rank, r , of the algebra. We have the familiar commutation relations:

$$[H_a, E_b^\pm] = \pm A_{ab} E_b^\pm, \quad [E_a^+, E_b^-] = \delta_{ab} H_a \quad . \quad (29)$$

The matrix A_{ab} is known as the Cartan matrix. For the simple Lie algebras in Cartan's classification, its determinant is positive-definite: $\det(A) > 0$. It is important to note that the Cartan matrix uniquely defines a corresponding Kac-Moody algebra: given the entries of A_{ab} , we can use the commutation relations in Eq. (29) and what are known as Serre relations:

$$[E_a^+, \dots [E_a^+, E_b^+] \dots] = 0, \quad [E_a^-, \dots [E_a^-, E_b^-] \dots] = 0 \quad , \quad (30)$$

to reconstruct the generators and roots of the Kac-Moody algebra. Labelling the simple roots α_a , $a=1, \dots, r$, where r is the rank of \mathcal{G} , the Cartan matrix can be parametrized as follows:

$$A_{ab} = 2 \frac{(\alpha_a, \alpha_b)}{(\alpha_a, \alpha_a)} \quad , \quad (31)$$

from which it follows that $A_{aa}=2$. The generators can be normalized such that all off-diagonal entries of the Cartan matrix are negative integers, or zero. The entries of the Cartan matrix can be conveniently encoded by an unoriented graph with r nodes and adjacency matrix $2\delta_{ab} - A_{ab}$, known as the Dynkin diagram. It specifies the Cartan matrix uniquely upto a re-labelling of rows and columns. Thus, the simply-laced Dynkin diagrams contain only single links between nodes, since all off-diagonal entries of A_{ab} are either -1 , or 0 . Non-simply-laced Dynkin diagrams can include multiple links, corresponding to the appearance of other negative integers. A disconnected Dynkin diagram implies that the Cartan matrix takes block-diagonal form, and that the algebra decomposes into simple commuting factors. Notice that the Kac-Moody algebra is invariant under the set of involutions defined by:

$$E_a^+ \rightarrow \eta_a E_a^-, \quad E_a^- \rightarrow \eta_a E_a^+, \quad H_a \rightarrow -H_a \quad , \quad (32)$$

where the $\eta_a = \pm 1$ for every a . We emphasize that each self-consistent choice of phases, η_a , corresponds to a distinct Kac-Moody algebra. This freedom in the choice of phases becomes especially significant when attributing a spacetime interpretation to the related global symmetry algebra [22, 87], as discussed in Appendix B for E_{11} .

Every simple root generator is isomorphic to a vector α_a^i , such that $H_a = 2 \frac{\alpha_a^i H_i}{(\alpha_a, \alpha_a)}$, where the H_i define an alternative basis for the Cartan subalgebra known as the Cartan-Weyl basis. Thus, to any root, α , we can associate generators, E_α^\pm , such that $[H_i, E_\alpha^\pm] = \pm \alpha^i E_\alpha^\pm$. Notice that each set of three generators, $\{E_\alpha^+, \alpha^i H_i, E_\alpha^-\}$, defines a distinct A_1 subalgebra of \mathcal{G} . The r simple root vectors, α_a^i , span an r -dimensional vector space known as the root-lattice of \mathcal{G} , denoted $\Lambda_{\mathcal{G}}$. It is convenient to single out the so-called highest root vector in this lattice, usually denoted θ , normalized as $\theta^2=2$, and parameterized as follows: $\theta = \sum_{i=1}^r n_i \alpha_i$, where the $n_i = 2 \frac{(\theta, \lambda_i)}{(\alpha_i, \alpha_i)}$ are known as the Kac labels. The λ_i are the r distinct fundamental weight representations of the rank r simple Lie algebra, defined by the relations $2 \frac{(\lambda_j, \alpha_i)}{(\alpha_i, \alpha_i)} = \delta_{ij}$ [86, 83, 84].

Given any finite dimensional semi-simple Lie algebra \mathcal{G} , we can construct its affine extension, $\mathcal{G}^{(1)}$, by the addition of a node to its Dynkin diagram. This construction is reviewed in the classic paper of Goddard and Olive [85].²⁴ We begin with the unique Lorentzian even self-dual lattice of dimension two, $\Pi^{(1,1)}$, with norm $x \cdot y = x_1 y_1 - x_{-1} y_{-1}$. $\Pi^{(1,1)}$ is conveniently expressed in terms of a light-cone basis, mapping lattice vectors $x, y \rightarrow z, w$, where [85, 27]:

$$z = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(x_1 + x_{-1}), \quad \bar{z} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(x_1 - x_{-1}), \quad \text{and } z, \bar{z}, w, \bar{w} \in (m, n), \quad \forall m, n \in \mathbb{Z} \quad . \quad (33)$$

The primitive null vectors of $\Pi^{(1,1)}$ are $k=(1,0)$ and $\bar{k}=(0,1)$. Let us append $\Pi^{(1,1)}$ to the root lattice of \mathcal{G} , and consider the subspace of vectors in $\Lambda_{\mathcal{G}} \oplus \Pi^{(1,1)}$ that are orthogonal to the primitive

²⁴We have simplified the notation in [85] [27] as follows: $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ with $n=1, 2$, and 3 , will denote, respectively, the extension, over-extension, and very-extension, of the Lie algebra \mathcal{G} . This corresponds to successive extensions of the rank r simple root basis $\{\alpha_i, i=1, \dots, r\}$, by the addition of simple roots denoted α_{-n} , where $n=1, 2$, and 3 .

null vector k . It is clear that this subspace includes all of the root vectors of \mathcal{G} , spanned by the original set of simple roots $\{\alpha_i\}$. The enlarged span of the affine extended algebra is defined by appending an additional simple root, α_{-1} , also referred to as the extended, or affine, root. Thus, the affine extension of \mathcal{G} has rank $r + 1$. The extended root takes the form:

$$\alpha_{-1} = k - \theta, \quad k \cdot k = 0, \quad (\alpha_{-1}, \alpha_{-1}) = 2 \quad . \quad (34)$$

Notice that α_{-1} has been written as an $(r + 2)$ -dimensional vector, reflecting the fact that the root-lattice of $\mathcal{G}^{(1)}$ is an $(r + 1)$ -dimensional projection from the $(r + 2)$ -dimensional lattice, $\Lambda_{\mathcal{G}} \oplus \Pi^{(1,1)}$. Clearly, the Cartan matrix of the affine extension of \mathcal{G} will have one additional row, and one additional column, with entries given by the scalar products of α_{-1} with the simple roots of \mathcal{G} :

$$A_{i,r+1} = 2 \frac{(\alpha_{-1}, \alpha_i)}{(\alpha_i, \alpha_i)}, \quad A_{r+1,i} = (\alpha_{-1}, \alpha_i) \quad . \quad (35)$$

It is clear that the determinant of the extended Cartan matrix vanishes: $\det A_{ab}(\mathcal{G}^{(1)}) = 0$. As an aside, we comment that $\mathcal{G}^{(1)}$ has been denoted interchangeably by \mathcal{G}^+ in the recent literature [85, 27, 29, 30].

This naturally suggests that we ask what rank $(r + 2)$ algebra might correspond to the full extension of the root-lattice, $\Lambda_{\mathcal{G}} \oplus \Pi^{(1,1)}$? The mathematically well-defined way to address this question is to first return to the Dynkin diagram of $\mathcal{G}^{(1)}$, adding a single link to the affine node [85]. This defines what is known as the over-extension of \mathcal{G} : $\mathcal{G}^{(2)} = \mathcal{G}^{++}$ [85, 27]. The over-extended root takes the form:

$$\alpha_{-2} = -(k + \bar{k}), \quad k \cdot k = \bar{k} \cdot \bar{k} = 0, \quad (\alpha_{-2}, \alpha_{-2}) = 2 \quad . \quad (36)$$

The Cartan matrix of $\mathcal{G}^{(2)}$ is extended by the new entries:

$$A_{i,r+2} = 0, A_{r+2,i} = 0, A_{r+1,r+2} = A_{r+2,r+1} = -1. \quad (37)$$

Notice that the determinant of the Cartan matrix is non-singular and negative-definite, since \mathcal{G} was assumed to be a finite dimensional semi-simple Lie algebra:

$$\det A_{\mathcal{G}^{(2)}} = 2 \det A_{\mathcal{G}^{(1)}} - \det A_{\mathcal{G}} = -\det A_{\mathcal{G}} \quad . \quad (38)$$

Such a Kac-Moody algebra is said to be *Lorentzian*. The over-extension of a finite dimensional semi-simple Lie algebra is an especially simple example of a Lorentzian Kac-Moody algebra. We reiterate that, by construction, the root lattice of $\mathcal{G}^{(2)}$ has Lorentzian signature: $\Lambda_{\mathcal{G}^{(2)}} = \Lambda_{\mathcal{G}} \oplus \Pi^{(1,1)}$. The seemingly innocuous extension to a root-lattice with indefinite norm has profound consequences. Notice that the root system of a Lorentzian Kac-Moody algebra includes both real and *imaginary* roots, namely, those with $\beta^2 < 0$ [83, 51, 89, 34]. The representation theory of Lorentzian algebras turns out to be full of surprises: unlike what happens in a finite-dimensional Lie algebras, the adjoint representation is no longer a highest weight representation, nor can it be constructed as the tensor product of fundamentals. In fact, the adjoint representation can contain within it some of the fundamental representations of the algebra! We caution the reader that while the representation theory of the finite-dimensional and affine Lie algebras is known in explicit detail, only partial

results are available in the Lorentzian cases. But it is encouraging that the standard tools of Kac-Moody algebras: namely, the characterization of the root system with respect to the Weyl group of reflections, the use of the Weyl-Kac character formula for the computation of root multiplicities, and the well-known Peterson and Freudenthal identities, hold just as well for the Lorentzian cases [83, 84]. The explicit details of the representation theory of the over and very extended algebras are currently under investigation by a number of groups [51, 27, 89, 34].

A further extension of the algebra is enabled by the addition of a link to the over-extended node. This defines what is known as the very-extension of \mathcal{G} : $\mathcal{G}^{(3)} = \mathcal{G}^{+++}$, introduced in the work of Olive, Gaberdiel, and West [27]. The root-system of the very-extension is given by the projected subspace of vectors x that are orthogonal to the primitive timelike vector belonging to an additional $\Pi^{(1,1)}$ factor:

$$x \in \Lambda_{\mathcal{G}} \oplus \Pi^{(1,1)} \oplus \Pi'^{(1,1)}, \quad x \cdot (l - \bar{l}) = 0, \quad l, \bar{l} \in \Pi'^{(1,1)} \quad , \quad (39)$$

where l, \bar{l} are the primitive null vectors of $\Pi^{(1,1)}$. This root-system is defined by the addition of the so-called very-extended simple root:

$$\alpha_{-3} = k - (l + \bar{l}), \quad (\alpha_{-3}, \alpha_{-3}) = 2, \quad (\alpha_{-3}, \alpha_{-2}) = -1, \quad (\alpha_{-3}, \alpha_{-1}) = (\alpha_{-3}, \alpha_i) = 0 \quad . \quad (40)$$

Recall that k is a primitive null vector of $\Pi^{(1,1)}$. It is easy to see that the Cartan matrix of the very extension simply corresponds to the addition of a row, and column, with mostly zeroes, plus the single nonvanishing off-diagonal entries, $A_{r+2, r+3} = A_{r+3, r+2} = -1$. The determinant of the Cartan matrix is, once again, negative-definite: $\det A_{\mathcal{G}^{(3)}} = -2 \det A_{\mathcal{G}}$.

The weight system of the very-extended algebra can be inferred by tracing its progression thru the iterative construction described above [27]. The result is easy to motivate. In terms of the fundamental weights of the finite dimensional Lie algebra, λ_i , $i=1, \dots, r$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_i &= \lambda_i - (\lambda_i, \theta) [k - \bar{k} - \frac{1}{2}(l + \bar{l})] \\ \lambda_{-1} &= -[k - \bar{k} - \frac{1}{2}(l + \bar{l})], \quad \lambda_{-2} = -k, \quad \lambda_{-3} = -\frac{1}{2}(l + \bar{l}) \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

The weights of the over-extended algebra can be recovered from these expressions by simply setting $l = \bar{l} = 0$. For a simply-laced finite-dimensional Lie algebra with simply-laced root-lattice, and dual weight-lattice [86], it is easy to write down the weight-lattice of the over- and very- extensions [27]. The weight-lattice of the over-extension $\mathcal{G}^{(2)}$ is given by:

$$[\Lambda_{\mathcal{G}^{(2)}}]^* = \Lambda_{\mathcal{G}}^* \oplus \Pi^{(1,1)}, \quad \rightarrow \quad \frac{[\Lambda_{\mathcal{G}^{(2)}}]^*}{\Lambda_{\mathcal{G}^{(2)}}} = Z_{\mathcal{G}} \quad . \quad (42)$$

Likewise, for the very-extended algebra, $\mathcal{G}^{(3)}$, the root-lattice and weight-lattice, respectively, take the form:

$$\Lambda_{\mathcal{G}^{(3)}} = \Lambda_{\mathcal{G}} \oplus \Pi^{(1,1)} \oplus \{(m, -m) : m \in \mathbb{Z}\}, \quad [\Lambda_{\mathcal{G}^{(3)}}]^* = \Lambda_{\mathcal{G}}^* \oplus \Pi^{(1,1)} \oplus \{(n, -n) : 2n \in \mathbb{Z}\} \quad . \quad (43)$$

Notice that the roots and weights of the rank $(r+3)$ algebra are expressed here as vectors in an $(r+4)$ -dimensional vector space. We can infer that their coset takes the form:

$$\frac{[\Lambda_{\mathcal{G}^{(3)}}]^*}{\Lambda_{\mathcal{G}^{(3)}}} = Z_{\mathcal{G}} \times Z_2 \quad . \quad (44)$$

A more pedestrian approach to the representation theory of very extended algebras that eschews the traditional, and more abstract, methodology of the Weyl-Kac character formula and Freudenthal identity, can be found in [27, 89, 33, 90]. It has become conventional to label the Dynkin diagram of the very extended algebra as follows: the very, over, and affine, nodes are labelled 1, 2, and 3, starting from left to right along the horizontal, and then continuing from right to left with any nodes above the horizontal. Notice that deletion of a single node of the Dynkin diagram of the very extended algebra, also called the central node, always gives the Dynkin diagram of a finite-dimensional Lie algebra. In the case of $E_8^{(3)}$, the central node is labelled 11, and its deletion gives the Dynkin diagram of its A_{10} gravity subalgebra. Thus, any generic root, β , has a simple root decomposition that takes the form:

$$\beta = n_c \alpha_c + \sum_i n_i \alpha_i \quad , \quad (45)$$

where the α_i are the simple roots of the finite-dimensional algebra following deletion of the central node. The integer n_c is defined as the *level* of the Lorentzian Kac-Moody algebra [27, 51, 89, 33, 90]. Roots at level zero are simply those of the corresponding finite-dimensional Lie subalgebra. It should be noted that the commutators of the algebra preserve the level.

Very-Extension of E_8 : The cases of interest in this paper are the affine-, over-, and very- extensions of the simply-laced Lie algebra E_8 , with its famous rank eight Euclidean even self-dual root-lattice [86, 37]. In arriving at the Dynkin diagram of $E_{11} = E_8^{(3)}$, we first construct the affine extension of E_8 , which is known as E_9 , followed by its over-extension, E_{10} , of rank ten. This is the highest rank example of the hyperbolic Kac-Moody algebras. They have been exhaustively classified in the mathematics literature [48, 34]. Λ_{E_8} is spanned by the following eight simple root vectors [86]:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 &= (1, +1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0) & \alpha_2 &= (1, -1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0) \\ \alpha_3 &= (0, 1, -1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0) & \alpha_4 &= (0, 0, 1, -1, 0, 0, 0, 0) \\ \alpha_5 &= (0, 0, 0, 1, -1, 0, 0, 0) & \alpha_6 &= (0, 0, 0, 0, 1, -1, 0, 0) \\ \alpha_7 &= (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, -1, 0) & \alpha_8 &= (\tfrac{1}{2}, \tfrac{1}{2}, \tfrac{1}{2}, \tfrac{1}{2}, \tfrac{1}{2}, \tfrac{1}{2}, \tfrac{1}{2}, \tfrac{1}{2}) \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Appending the extended root α_{-1} determines the affine extension, E_9 , where we substitute for the highest root, θ , with the result:

$$\alpha_{-1} = k - \theta = ((0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, -1, 1), (1, 0)) \quad . \quad (47)$$

The over-extension, E_{10} , is specified by including the additional simple root:

$$\alpha_{-2} = -(k + \bar{k}) = ((0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0), (-1, 1)) \quad . \quad (48)$$

The rank-ten root-lattice of E_{10} , namely, $\Lambda_{E_8} \oplus \Pi^{(1,1)}$, is even, and self-dual, by construction. It coincides with the unique even Lorentzian self-dual lattice of dimension ten, usually denoted $\Pi^{(9,1)}$. Finally, for the very-extension, $E_{11} = E_8^{(3)}$, we include the additional simple root:

$$\alpha_{-3} = k - (l + \bar{l}) = ((0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0), (1, 0), (-1, 1)) \quad . \quad (49)$$

The root system of E_{11} is the projected subspace orthogonal to the primitive timelike vector, $l + \bar{l}$, in the unique even Lorentzian self-dual lattice in dimensions (10, 2):

$$x \in \Pi^{(10,2)} = \Lambda_{E_8} \oplus \Pi^{(1,1)} \oplus \Pi^{(1,1)}, \quad x \cdot (l - \bar{l}) = 0 \quad . \quad (50)$$

As a consequence of the self-duality property of the E_8 lattice, we now have the elegant result:

$$\frac{[\Lambda_{E_{11}}]^*}{\Lambda_{E_{11}}} = Z_2 \quad . \quad (51)$$

In summary, notice that, by construction, the rank-eleven algebra E_{11} contains the full Cremmer-Julia E_{11-n} , $n = 0, \dots, 11$, sequence of hidden symmetry algebras as proper subalgebras. This was, in fact, the original motivation for West's construction [22]. But it is a beautiful consequence that $E_8^{(3)}$ also incorporates the crucial nine-form potential: the generator associated with the very-extended node of its Dynkin diagram, thus unifying Roman's massive type IIA supergravity with both M theory, as well as the massless IIA and IIB supergravities and their toroidal compactifications to lower spacetime dimensions. This is precisely as was required by our conventional understanding of string/M dualities [44, 45, 46, 11, 37].

Appendix B: The Nonlinear Realization of the $E_{11} = E_8^{(3)}$ Algebra

The review paper by Cremmer, Julia, Lu, and Pope [15] contains a detailed explanation of the method of nonlinear realizations from first principles in section 4, and we urge the non-specialist to consult this reference prior to reading the recent work on very-extensions [23, 22, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 33]. For completeness, we begin with a brief overview of the straightforward nonlinear realization of the scalar Lagrangian in dimensions $D \geq 6$ in this appendix. The more complicated analysis for the cases $3 \leq D \leq 5$ can be found in the references [14, 15, 24].

We begin with the Lagrangian of the fully-undualized toroidally-compactified eleven-dimensional supergravity in D dimensions, using the notation in [15]. Let us denote the set of dilaton vectors as $\mathcal{A}_{[0]j}^i = b_{ij}$, and the axions collectively as $\mathcal{A}_{[0]ijk} = a_{ijk}$. The i, j, k are internal indices taking values from $1, \dots, 11-D$; at this stage, one need not distinguish them from tangent space indices. The key observation, dating back to [14], is that in each case the scalars are in one-to-one correspondence with the positive root vectors of the E_{11-n} algebra:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & \quad eR - \frac{1}{2}e(\partial\phi)^2 - \frac{1}{48}ee^{\mathbf{a}\cdot\phi}F_{[4]}^2 - \frac{1}{12}e\sum_i e^{\mathbf{a}_i\cdot\phi}(F_{[3]i})^2 - \frac{1}{4}e\sum_{i<j} e^{\mathbf{a}_{ij}\cdot\phi}(F_{[2]ij})^2 \\ & - \frac{1}{4}e\sum_i e^{\mathbf{b}_i\cdot\phi}(F_{[2]}^i)^2 - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i<j<k} e^{\mathbf{a}_{ijk}\cdot\phi}(F_{[1]ijk})^2 - \frac{1}{2}e\sum_{i<j} e^{\mathbf{b}_{ij}\cdot\phi}(\mathcal{F}_{[1]j}^i)^2 + \mathcal{L}_{\text{CS}} \quad , \quad (52) \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{L}_{CS} is the dimensional reduction of the $F_{[4]}\wedge F_{[4]}\wedge A_{[3]}$ in eleven dimensions. The notation distinguishes the 1-form field strengths by their origin in the metric, $\mathcal{F}_{[1]j}^i$, or in the three-form potential, $F_{[1]ijk}$, of eleven-dimensional supergravity:

$$F_{[1]ijk} = dA_{[0]ijk} - \mathcal{A} \wedge d\mathcal{A} \text{ terms}, \quad \mathcal{F}_{[1]j}^i = d\mathcal{A}_{[0]j}^i - \mathcal{A} \wedge d\mathcal{A} \text{ terms} \quad . \quad (53)$$

We choose $b_{i,i+1}$ and a_{123} as simple roots; removing a_{123} gives the simple roots of $SL(11-D, \mathbf{R})$. As is usual, the root-lattice is generated by linear combinations of the simple roots with positive-definite integer coefficients. The Dynkin diagram is as shown in Figure 1. Note that inclusion of the axions from dualized field-strengths in $3 \leq D \leq 5$, namely, $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{a}_{ij})$, fill out the root-lattices of E_6 , E_7 , and E_8 . It is helpful to introduce the following parameterization of roots [24, 15]:

$$\mathbf{a} = -\mathbf{g}, \quad \mathbf{b}_i = -\mathbf{f}_i, \quad \mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{f}_i - \mathbf{g}, \quad \mathbf{b}_{ij} = \mathbf{f}_j - \mathbf{f}_i, \quad \mathbf{a}_{ij} = \mathbf{f}_i + \mathbf{f}_j - \mathbf{g}, \quad \mathbf{a}_{ijk} = \mathbf{f}_i + \mathbf{f}_j + \mathbf{f}_k - \mathbf{g} \quad , \quad (54)$$

where \mathbf{f}_i and \mathbf{g} are $(11-D)$ -dimensional vectors satisfying the relations: $\mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{g} = 2\frac{11-D}{D-2}$, $\mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{f}_i = \frac{6}{D-2}$, and $\mathbf{f}_i \cdot \mathbf{f}_j = 2\delta_{ij} + \frac{2}{D-2}$. Also, $\sum \mathbf{f}_i = 3\mathbf{g}$. It follows that $\mathbf{b}_{ik} = \mathbf{b}_{ij} + \mathbf{b}_{jk}$, and $\mathbf{a}_{ijk} + \mathbf{b}_{il} = \mathbf{a}_{ljk}$. Identifying the positive roots \mathbf{b}_{ij} and \mathbf{a}_{ijk} with generators E_j^i and E^{ijk} , respectively, we see that they satisfy the commutation relations:

$$[E_i^j, E_k^l] = \delta_k^j E_i^l - \delta_i^l E_k^j, \quad [E_l^m, E^{ijk}] = -3\delta_l^{[i} E^{m]jk}, \quad [E^{ijk}, E^{lmn}] = 0 \quad . \quad (55)$$

The first two relations are an expression of $SL(11-D, \mathbf{R})$ covariance. In dimensions $D \geq 6$, the generators E^{ijk} commute. For $D \leq 5$, whether or not they commute depends upon dualizations. Finally, if we include the hidden subgroup \mathbf{R}_s , writing the Cartan generators as a vector \mathbf{H} , we have:

$$[\mathbf{H}, E_i^j] = \mathbf{b}_{ij} E_i^j, \quad [\mathbf{H}, E^{ijk}] = \mathbf{a}_{ijk} E^{ijk} \quad \text{no sum} \quad . \quad (56)$$

Introducing the non-linear realization [14, 15]:

$$\mathcal{V} = e^{\frac{1}{2}\phi \cdot \mathbf{H}} e^{\mathbf{b}_{ij} E_i^j} e^{\sum_{i < j < k} \mathbf{a}_{ijk} E^{ijk}} \quad , \quad (57)$$

it can be verified that:

$$d\mathcal{V}\mathcal{V}^{-1} = \frac{1}{2}d\phi \cdot \mathbf{H} + \sum_{i < j} e^{\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{b}_{ij} \cdot \phi} \mathcal{F}_{[1]j}^i E_i^j + \sum_{i < j < k} e^{\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{a}_{ijk} \cdot \phi} F_{[1]ijk} E^{ijk} \quad , \quad (58)$$

and the entire scalar Lagrangian is expressible in the form:

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{4} \text{tr} \left(\partial \mathcal{M}^{-1} \partial \mathcal{M} \right) \quad , \quad (59)$$

where we define $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{V}^T \mathcal{V}$, and where the superscript denotes the transpose. Having written the scalar Lagrangian in Meurer-Cartan form, it is helpful to identify the remnant local gauge symmetry. The transformation:

$$\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}' = U^T \mathcal{M} U \quad , \quad (60)$$

where U is a constant element in the global symmetry group, is found to leave the Lagrangian invariant. Thus, the Lagrangian is made out of $K(E_{11-D})$ invariants, where $K(G)$ is the maximal compact subgroup of G , and we have the coset structure $G/K(G)$ for $D \geq 6$.

West's nonlinear realizations of the hidden symmetry algebras underlying the different supergravity theories and M theory is similar in spirit, but brings in many new features [23, 22, 29]. Earlier in the text, a Hodge dual was introduced for each p -form gauge potential, other than the self-dual potentials, in addition to the generators of $GL(n, \mathbf{R})$, the translations, P^a , and scalars, R_s , if present in the supergravity theory. In the case of M theory, with its eleven-dimensional supergravity field theoretic limit, West proposes the following realization of an $E_{11} = E_8^{(3)}$ algebra:

$$[K_b^a, K_d^c] = \delta_b^c K_d^a - \delta_d^a K_b^c, \quad [K_b^a, R^{c_1 \dots c_p}] = \delta_b^{c_1} R^{ac_2 \dots c_p} + \dots, \quad p = 3, 6 \quad , \quad (61)$$

along with the additional commutator:

$$[K_b^a, R^{c_1 \dots c_8, d}] = \left(\delta_b^{c_1} R^{ac_2 \dots c_8, d} + \dots \right) + \delta_b^d R^{c_1 \dots c_8, b} \quad , \quad (62)$$

The K_b^a are the generators of the A_{10} subalgebra of $E_8^{(3)}$. Notice that this only represents the volume-preserving subgroup, $SL(11, \mathbf{R})$, of the expected $GL(11, \mathbf{R})$, and, in addition, that the momentum generators of eleven-dimensional supergravity are not part of the $E_8^{(3)}$. Thus, from this algebraic perspective, if E_{11} is indeed the symmetry algebra of M theory, it does not appear to be an inherently eleven-dimensional theory.²⁵

The $+\dots$ in the commutation relations denotes the antisymmetrization of all indices. Notice that the nine-index generator is antisymmetrized in only the first 8 indices. There is, of course, no nine-form potential in eleven-dimensional supergravity. The inclusion of a nine-index generator in the purported symmetry algebra is, therefore, a definitive statement that M theory is more than its low-energy limit. A more physical motivation is Roman's IIA mass parameter: inclusion of the nine-index generator in the symmetry algebra of M theory enables a simple relationship with the hidden symmetry algebra of the massive type IIA supergravity described in the introduction. In addition, note that E_{11} contains as proper subalgebras the entire Cremmer-Julia E_{11-n} sequence. As an aside, the subalgebra generated by $R^{c_1 c_2 c_3}$ and $R^{c_1 \dots c_6}$ alone was previously identified as the global symmetry algebra of the M5brane in [92], an early motivation for this algebraic approach to M theory. Thus, we have:

$$[R^{c_1 \dots c_3}, R^{c_4 \dots c_6}] = 2R^{c_1 \dots c_6}, \quad [R^{c_1 \dots c_6}, R^{b_1 \dots b_3}] = 3R^{c_1 \dots c_6 [b_1 b_2, b_3]}, \quad [R^{c_1 \dots c_6}, R^{b_1 \dots b_6}] = 0 \quad . \quad (63)$$

The Chevalley generators corresponding to positive simple roots of $E_8^{(3)}$ can be identified as follows [29]:

$$E_a = K_{a+1}^a, \quad a = 1, \dots, 10, \quad E_{11} = R^{91011} \quad , \quad (64)$$

and the rank eleven Cartan subalgebra is generated by:

$$H_a = K_a^a - K_{a+1}^{a+1}, \quad a = 1, \dots, 10, \quad H_{11} = -\frac{1}{3}(K_1^1 + \dots + K_8^8) + \frac{2}{3}(K_9^9 + K_{10}^{10} + K_{11}^{11}) \quad . \quad (65)$$

Notice that the six-form and nine-index generator do not enter at this level (zero) of the Kac-Moody algebra. However, since the commutator of R^{91011} with generic K_b^a generates all of the remaining components of the three-form potential, the commutator of the three-form with itself generates all components of the six-form and, finally, the commutators of the six-form and three-form yield the components of the nine-index generator, we can span the root-system of $E_8^{(3)}$ with this simple choice of basis. Thus, any generic root in the root-system will be isomorphic to a string of commutators of Chevalley generators, mapping to a unique group element via the nonlinear realization to which we now turn. The non-linear realization of $E_8^{(3)}$ is built up from group elements that take the form:

$$g = \exp \left[\sum_{a \leq b} h_b^a K_a^b \right] \exp \left[\frac{1}{3!} A_{c_1 c_2 c_3} R^{c_1 c_2 c_3} \right] \exp \left[\frac{1}{6!} A_{c_1 \dots c_6} R^{c_1 \dots c_6} \right] \exp \left[\frac{1}{8!} h_{c_1 \dots c_8, d} R^{c_1 \dots c_8, d} \right] \quad , \quad (66)$$

$A_{[3]}$, and $A_{[6]}$, are to be identified, respectively, with the three-form potential of supergravity, and its Hodge dual. h_b^a is related to the vielbein as shown below, and $h_{c_1 \dots c_8, d}$ plays the role of a dual field

²⁵We are describing the most recent formulation given in [29]. We should warn the reader that there has been a significant shift in perspective from West's earliest proposal regarding E_{11} , namely, in [23], to the more recent ideas summarized in [27, 29]. West remarks in [29] that a better name for this conjectured high-energy completion of eleven-dimensional supergravity might be *E-theory*.

of gravity. Thus, unlike previous proposals such as the doubled-field formalism [15], the notion of duality, and the framework of non-linear realizations, has been extended to the *full* bosonic sector, inclusive of the graviton! West’s motivation for a dual-field formalism for gravity comes from an older work by Borisov and Ogievetsky [91], and is described in [23, 22]. Notice that, since the generators of spacetime translations were absent from the $E_8^{(3)}$ algebra, they also do not appear in the group element. This is unlike the proposed nonlinear realizations of the ten-dimensional type II supergravities written down in [23, 25, 26], which are based on the \mathcal{G}_{II} algebras described in the introduction, and which explicitly include translations. Although it is possible to invoke the nonlinear realization of $E_8^{(3)}$ to develop an isomorphism of group elements to specific eleven-dimensional line elements because of the appearance of the vielbein, as will be illustrated below, the emergence of the translation generators from this algebraic framework remains an interesting puzzle [29, 33]. It is discussed further in section 4.

Let us now discuss the significance of the choice of phases $\eta_a = \pm 1$ in Eq. (32), without which the bosonic $E_8^{(3)}$ algebra has not been unambiguously specified. As shown by West, taking $\eta_1 = +1$, and all remaining η_a negative [22], leads to a hidden symmetry algebra with both an appropriate supersymmetric extension and a spacetime with Minkowskian signature and a single time direction, $(-, +, \dots, +)$. Taking all of the η_a negative gives, instead, a spacetime of Euclidean signature, defining what is known as the Cartan involution-invariant subalgebra [22]. This is also a physically well-motivated choice, of obvious relevance to future discussions of string/M theory at finite temperature [59]. Note that West interchangeably invokes either choice of phase in later work [29], since it is clear that the two alternatives simply correspond to a Wick rotation in spacetime.

The fact that every other choice of phases in the bosonic E_{11} algebra leads to an indefinite spacetime metric with two, or more, timelike directions, some of which do not even admit supersymmetric extension, was clarified in a recent paper by Keurentjes [87]. Restricting to E_{11} algebras that also admit a supersymmetric extension, one finds new self-consistent choices of phase correspond to indefinite spacetimes of signature (2,9), (5,6), (6,5), or (9,2) [87]. In other words, the relationship between the supersymmetric extension of an E_{11} algebra and M theory is unique upto freedom in the signature of spacetime. Interestingly, these signatures can be identified with the conjectured M^* and M' eleven-dimensional theories of Hull [88], whose existence was inferred by the application of timelike dualities on the standard (1,10) signature spacetime metric for eleven-dimensional supergravity. This clarifies the important fact that Hull’s new solutions [88] do not correspond to distinct eleven-dimensional theories: they belong in a theory with identical hidden symmetries, apart from the different spacetime signature.²⁶ It is a most satisfying result following from Keurentjes’ analysis that invoking either Euclidean (0,11) or Minkowskian (1,10) spacetime signature—each of which has a clear-cut physical interpretation, *uniquely* determines a bosonic E_{11} algebra with unambiguous phase choice. Note also that while the Minkowskian case permits supersymmetric extension, the Euclidean algebra does not, precisely as required by its physical interpretation as the symmetry algebra of finite temperature M theory.

We will conclude this appendix by illustrating: (i) the isomorphism between a specific group element, g , and the line-element of a well-known classical background of supergravity. (ii) the origin of the D8brane of the massive IIA supergravity, and the space-filling D9brane of the IIB

²⁶Of course, it is not clear at the present time that any physical significance should be attributed to these alternative solutions, in which case the corresponding E_{11} algebras can eventually be discarded.

supergravity, in specific group elements of $E_8^{(3)}$. We urge the reader to consult [29] for many more examples of such isomorphisms. The field h_b^a is related to the vielbein as follows:

$$e_a^\mu = e^{h_b^a} (e^{\bar{h}})_\mu^a, \quad \text{where } \bar{h}_b^a = h_b^a - \delta_b^a h_c^c, \quad (67)$$

We start with our favourite line element, for example, the M2brane metric discovered by Duff and Stelle [93]:

$$ds^2 = N_2^{-2/3} (-(dx_1)^2 + (dx_2)^2 + (dx_3)^2) + N_2^{1/3} ((dx_4)^2 + \cdots (dx_{11})^2), \quad (68)$$

with four-form field strength, $F_{1234} = \partial_m N_2^{-1}$, where m labels directions 4, \cdots , 11, orthogonal to the worldvolume of the M2brane, and the harmonic function $N_2 = 1 + k/r^2$, and $r^2 = \sum_{m=4}^{11} (x_m)^2$. Thus, we can identify:

$$(e^h)_1^1 = (e^h)_2^2 = (e^h)_3^3 = N_2^{-1/3}, \quad (e^h)_4^4 = \cdots = (e^h)_{11}^{11} = N_2^{-1/6}, \quad A_{123} = N_2^{-1} - 1, \quad (69)$$

where it should be noted that the gauge field is specified with respect to tangent space. Substituting into Eq. (70), we construct the corresponding group element:

$$g_{M2} = \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \ln N_2 \left(\frac{2}{3} (K_1^1 + K_2^2 + K_3^3) - \frac{1}{3} (K_4^4 + \cdots K_{11}^{11}) \right) \right] \exp \left[(1 - N_2) R^{123} \right], \quad (70)$$

As explained in [29], such isomorphisms extend to a vast spectrum of classical supergravity backgrounds, including bound states of multiple branes. Based on a large number of examples [29], West argues that the group element corresponding to a specific half-BPS solution of supergravity parameterized by a harmonic function N can always be written in the form:

$$g = \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \ln N \beta \cdot H \right] \exp \left[(1 - N) E_\beta \right], \quad (71)$$

where β is the corresponding root, and E_β the corresponding generator in $E_8^{(3)}$. This is a most remarkable identification.

Perhaps even more striking from our perspective is the detailed correspondence developed in [29] between the generators of $E_8^{(3)}$, and those of the global symmetry algebras of the maximal ten-dimensional supergravities, namely, $\mathcal{G}_{\text{mIIA}}$ and \mathcal{G}_{IIB} . West begins by observing that the Dynkin diagram of $E_8^{(3)}$ has precisely two inequivalent A_9 subalgebras. These are distinguished with respect to the bifurcation at the very-extended node, which can be labelled 8 on the Dynkin diagram of either A_9 . Decomposing $E_8^{(3)}$ with respect to the A_9 subalgebra corresponding to the IIA theory, we identify the following Chevalley basis:

$$E_a = K_{a+1}^a, \quad a = 1, \cdots, 9, \quad E_{10} = R^{10}, \quad E_{11} = R^{910}, \quad (72)$$

and corresponding Cartan subalgebra:

$$\begin{aligned} H_a &= K_a^a - K_{a+1}^{a+1}, & a &= 1, \cdots, 9 \\ H_{10} &= -\frac{1}{8} (K_1^1 + \cdots + K_9^9) + \frac{1}{8} K_{10}^{10} - \frac{3}{2} R \\ H_{11} &= -\frac{1}{4} (K_1^1 + \cdots + K_8^8) + \frac{3}{4} (K_9^9 + K_{10}^{10}) + R \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

Notice that this only preserves an $SL(10, \mathbf{R})$ subgroup as appropriate for a ten-dimensional theory. R is the IIA dilaton, and R^{10} and R^{910} are, respectively, components of the IIA R-R one-form

and NS-NS two-form generators. By inspection of the commutation relations among the K_b^a and p -form generators given in Eq. (2), and Eq. (4), it is easy to see that this choice of basis suffices to generate the full set of p -form generators entering the mIIA global symmetry algebra. Thus, if we exclude spacetime translations, preserving only the $SL(10, \mathbf{R})$ subalgebra of $GL(10, \mathbf{R})$, we find a clear-cut isomorphism between the generators of $E_8^{(3)}$, and a restricted subset of the generators of $\mathcal{G}_{\text{mIIA}}$: $\{(K_b^a, a, b = 1, \dots, 10), R, (R^{c_1 \dots c_q}, q = 1, \dots, 9)\}$. As argued by us in the main text, the symmetry algebra of significance to Matrix Theory is precisely this restriction of $\mathcal{G}_{\text{mIIA}}$.

Clearly, it is therefore possible to identify a specific $E_8^{(3)}$ group element corresponding to each member in the spectrum of $(p+1)$ -form generators in $\mathcal{G}_{\text{mIIA}}$. But, most remarkably, upon substitution in Eq. (71), West succeeds in deducing the line element for the corresponding p -brane in full agreement with previous results [29]. We begin by noting that the p -brane must couple to a $(p+1)$ -form potential with corresponding generator in the $E_8^{(3)}$ algebra. We begin with the non-linear realization [29]:

$$g_{\text{mIIA}} = \exp \left[\sum_a h_a^a K_a^a \right] \exp \left[\sum_{a < b} h_b^a K_b^a \right] \prod_{q=9}^5 \exp \left[\frac{1}{q!} A_{c_1 \dots c_q} R^{c_1 \dots c_q} \right] \prod_{q=3}^1 \exp \left[\frac{1}{q!} A_{c_1 \dots c_q} R^{c_1 \dots c_q} \right] \exp [AR] \quad , \quad (74)$$

where special attention must be paid to the reverse ordering in the products, with the zero-form acting first and the nine-form acting last. Suppose we wish to deduce the line-element of the supergravity p -brane coupling to the $(p+1)$ -form field with corresponding root, β_{p+1} , and corresponding lowest weight generator: $E_{\beta_{p+1}} = R^{1 \dots p+1}$. By inspection of the commutation relations, we can identify this generator as a string of commutators starting with the positive and negative simple roots in the Chevalley basis. This identifies the corresponding $E_8^{(3)}$ root [29]:

$$\beta_{p+1} \cdot H = \left\{ \frac{1}{8}(7-p) \left(K_1^1 + \dots + K_{p+1}^{p+1} \right) - \frac{1}{8}(p+1) \left(K_{p+2}^{p+2} + \dots + K_{10}^{10} \right) \right\} + b_p R \quad , \quad (75)$$

where $b_7 = 0$, and $b_p = \frac{1}{2}\eta(p-3)$, for $p \leq 6$, and with $\eta = \pm 1$ for NS-NS, R-R, respectively. Substituting in Eq. (71), we have the result:

$$g_p = \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \ln N \{ \dots \} - \frac{1}{2} b_p \ln N_p R \right] \exp \left[(1 - N_p) E_{\beta_{p+1}} \right] \quad , \quad (76)$$

where $\{ \dots \}$ represents the linear combination of generators appearing within curly brackets on the R.H.S. of Eq. (75). Using the identity:

$$\exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} b_p \ln N_p \right] \exp \left[(1 - N_p) E_{\beta_{p+1}} \right] = \exp \left[N_p^{-\frac{1}{2} b_p c_{p+1}} (1 - N_p) E_{\beta_{p+1}} \right] \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} b_p \ln N_p R \right] \quad , \quad (77)$$

where the $c_{p+1} = \frac{1}{4}\eta(p-3)$ dependence arises from the $[R, R^{p+1}]$ commutator. We can read off the solution for the dilaton and $(p+1)$ -form potential in terms of the harmonic function N_p :

$$e^A = (N_p)^{-\frac{1}{2} b_p}, \quad A_{1 \dots p+1} = N_p^{-1} - 1 \quad . \quad (78)$$

The corresponding line elements take the form:

$$ds^2 = N_p^{-\frac{1}{8}(7-p)} \left(-(dx_1)^2 + (dx_2)^2 + \dots + (dx_{p+1})^2 \right) + N_p^{\frac{1}{8}(p+1)} \left((dx_{p+2})^2 + \dots + (dx_{10})^2 \right) \quad . \quad (79)$$

Thus, we recover the well-known results for the line elements of the half BPS pbranes of type IIA supergravity [97, 96]: here, $p=1, 5$ parameterize the fundamental string and NS5brane, while $p=0,2,4,6$ parameterize Dpbranes in the R-R sector. The solution with $p=7$ is ordinary Minkowskian spacetime.

Moving on to the IIB theory with global symmetry algebra \mathcal{G}_{IIB} described in Eqs. (6), (7), and (8), we make a corresponding identification of Chevalley generators with inequivalent choice of the A_9 subalgebra:

$$E_a = K_{a+1}^a, \quad a = 1, \dots, 8, \quad E_{11} = K_{10}^9, \quad E_9 = R_1^{910}, \quad E_{10} = R_2, \quad (80)$$

and corresponding Cartan subalgebra:

$$\begin{aligned} H_a &= K_a^a - K_{a+1}^{a+1}, \quad a = 1, \dots, 8, \quad H_{11} = K_9^9 - K_{10}^{10} \\ H_9 &= K_9^9 + K_{10}^{10} + R_1 - \frac{1}{4} \sum_{a=1}^{10} K_a^a, \quad H_{10} = -2R_1. \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

As in the case of the mIIA theory, excluding the \mathbf{R}_s generator of $GL(10, \mathbf{R})$ and the translations, it can be verified by inspection of the commutator algebra given in Eqs. (7) and (8), that this choice of Chevalley basis suffices to generate the remaining p -form generators of \mathcal{G}_{IIB} algebra. We can define the nonlinear realization as before, identifying a corresponding group element for each of the $(p+1)$ -form generators in the IIB theory, coupling to supergravity pbranes. As shown by West [29], the analysis permits a successful deduction of the line elements of the full spectrum of type II branes: the $p=1, 5$ branes of the NS-NS sector and $p=-1,1,3,5,7$ Dbranes of the R-R sector. The NS-NS $p=7$ solution simply recovers Minkowskian spacetime.

References

- [1] S. Chaudhuri, *Nonperturbative Type I-I' String Theory*, hep-th/0201129; *Spontaneous Breaking of Diffeomorphism Invariance in Matrix Theory*, hep-th/0202138.
- [2] S. Chaudhuri, *Bosonic Matrix Theory and Matrix Dbranes*, hep-th/0205306.
- [3] S. Chaudhuri, *A New Proposal for Matrix Theory*, hep-th/0210134.
- [4] T. Eguchi and H. Kawai, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48** (1982) 1063. G. Parisi, Phys. Lett. **B112** (1982) 463. D. Gross and Y. Kitazawa, Nucl. Phys. **B206** (1982) 440. G. Bhanot, U. Heller, and H. Neuberger, Phys. Lett. **B113** (1982) 47.
- [5] E. Brezin and V.A. Kazakov, *Exactly Solvable Field Theories of Closed Strings*, Phys. Lett. **B236** (1990) 144. M.R. Douglas and S.H. Shenker, *Strings in less than one dimension*, Nucl. Phys. **B335** (1990) 144. D.J. Gross and A.A. Migdal, *Nonperturbative two-dimensional quantum gravity*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64** (1990) 127.
- [6] T. Banks, W. Fischler, S. Shenker, and L. Susskind, *M(atrix) Theory*, Phys. Rev. **D55** (1997) 5112.

- [7] N. Ishibashi, H. Kawai, Y. Kitazawa, and A. Tsuchiya, *A Large N Reduced Model as Superstring*, Nucl. Phys. **B510** (1998) 158.
- [8] L. Smolin, *M theory as a matrix extension of Chern-Simons theory*, Nucl. Phys. **B591** (2000) 227.
- [9] T. Azuma and H. Kawai, *Matrix model with manifest general coordinate invariance*, hep-th/0204078.
- [10] J. Dai, R. Leigh, and J. Polchinski, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A4** (1989) 2073; R. Leigh, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A4** (1989) 2767.
- [11] J. Polchinski, *Dirichlet-branes and Ramond-Ramond Charge*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75** (1995) 4724.
- [12] E. Witten, *Bound States of Strings and pbranes*, Nucl. Phys. **B460** (1996) 335, hep-th/9510135.
- [13] For a status report, and original references, see the review by W. Taylor, *M(atrix) Theory: Matrix Quantum Mechanics as a Fundamental Theory*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **73** (2001) 419.
- [14] E. Cremmer and B. Julia, *The $SO(8)$ Supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B156** (1979) 141. Phys. Lett. **B80** (1978) 48.
- [15] E. Cremmer, B. Julia, H. Lu, and C. Pope, *Dualization of Dualities I*, Nucl. Phys. **B523** (1998) 73, hep-th/9710119.
- [16] L. Andrianopoli, R. D'Auria, S. Ferrara, P. Fre, R. Minasian, and M. Trigiante, *Solvable Lie Algebras in Type IIA, Type IIB, and M Theories*, Nucl. Phys. **B493** (1997) 249.
- [17] H. Nicolai, *On Hidden Symmetries in $d=11$ Supergravity and Beyond*, hep-th/9906106.
- [18] D. Z. Freedman and J. A. Schwarz, *Unification of Supergravity and Yang-Mills Theory*, Phys. Rev. **D15** (1977) 1007. E. Bergshoeff, M. de Roo, B. de Wit, and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, *Ten-dimensional Maxwell-Einstein Supergravity, its Currents, and the issue of its auxiliary fields*, Nucl. Phys. **B195** (1982) 97.
- [19] A. H. Chamseddine, Phys. Rev. **D24** (1981) 3065. G. F. Chapline and N. S. Manton, Phys. Lett. **B120** (1983) 105.
- [20] E. Bergshoeff and M. de Roo, *Duality Transformations of String Effective Actions*, Phys. Lett. **B249** (1990) 27.
- [21] S. Iso and H. Kawai, *Spacetime and Matter in IIB Matrix Model: Gauge Symmetry and Diffeomorphisms*, Intl. Jour. Mod. Phys. **A15** (2000) 651. hep-th/9903217.
- [22] P. West, *E_{11} and M Theory*, Class. and Quantum Gravity **18** (2001) 4443, hep-th/0104081.
- [23] P. West, *Hidden Superconformal Symmetry in M Theory*, JHEP **08** (2000) 007, hep-th/0005270.
- [24] H. Lu and C. Pope, *T-Duality and U-Duality in Toroidally Compactified Strings*, Nucl. Phys. **B510** (1998) 139, hep-th/9701177.

- [25] I. Schnakenburg and P. West, *Kac-Moody Symmetries of IIB Supergravity*, Phys. Lett. **B517** (2001) 421, hep-th/0107181.
- [26] I. Schnakenburg and P. West, *Massive IIA Supergravity as a Nonlinear Realization*, hep-th/0204207.
- [27] D. Olive, M. Gaberdiel, and P. West, *A Class of Lorentzian Kac-Moody Algebras*, Nucl. Phys. **B645** (2002) 403, hep-th/0205068.
- [28] H. Nicolai, D. Olive, *The Principal $SO(2,1)$ Subalgebra of a Lorentzian Kac-Moody Algebra*, Lett. Math. Phys. 58 (2001) 141.
- [29] P. West, *The IIA, IIB, and eleven dimensional theories and their common E_{11} origin*, hep-th/0402140.
- [30] I. Schnakenburg and P. West, *Kac-Moody Symmetries of Ten-dimensional Nonmaximal Supergravity Theories*, hep-th/0401.
- [31] T. Damour, M. Henneaux, and H. Nicolai, *E_{10} and a small tension expansion of M theory*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89** (2002) 221601, hep-th/0207267.
- [32] F. Englert and L. Houart, *G^{+++} invariant formulation of Gravity and M theories: exact BPS solutions*, JHEP 04(2004) 002. hep-th/0311255.
- [33] A. Kleinschmidt and P. West, *Representations of \mathcal{G}^{+++} and the Role of Spacetime*, hep-th/0312247.
- [34] J. Brown, O. Ganor, and C. Helfgott, *M theory and E_{10} : Billiards, Branes, and Imaginary Roots*, hep-th/0401053.
- [35] E. Bergshoeff, M. de Roo, M. Green, G. Papadopoulos, and P. Townsend, *Duality of type II 7branes and 8branes*, Nucl. Phys. **B470** (1996) 113. C. Hull, *Massive String Theories from M-theory and F-theory*, JHEP 9811 (1998) 027.
- [36] L. Romans, *Massive $N=2A$ Supergravity in Ten Dimensions*, Phys. Lett. **B169** (1986) 374.
- [37] J. Polchinski, *String Theory*, Cambridge.
- [38] S. Coleman, J. Wess, and B. Zumino, Phys. Rev. **177** (1969) 2239. C. Callan, S. Coleman, J. Wess, and B. Zumino, Phys. Rev. **177** (1969) 2247. D.V. Volkov, Sov. J. Part. Nucl. 4 (1973) 3; D. V. Volkov and V.P. Akulov, JETP Lett. **16** (1972) 438; Phys. Lett. **B46** (1973) 109.
- [39] K. S. Narain, Phys. Lett. **B169** (1985) 41. K. S. Narain, M. Sarmadi, and E. Witten, *A Note on Toroidal Compactifications of the Heterotic String*, Nucl. Phys. **B279** (1987) 369.
- [40] S. Chaudhuri, G. Hockney, and J. Lykken, *Maximally Supersymmetric String Theories in $D < 10$* , Phys. Rev. Lett. **75** (1995) 2264.
- [41] S. Chaudhuri and J. Polchinski, *Moduli Space of CHL Strings*, Phys. Rev. **D52** (1995) 7168.

- [42] E. Cremmer, B. Julia, and J. Scherk, *Supergravity Theory in Eleven Dimensions*, Phys. Lett. **B76** (1978) 409.
- [43] C. Campbell and P. West, *$N=2$ $D=10$ nonchiral supergravity and its spontaneous compactification*, Nucl. Phys. **B243** (1984) 112.
- [44] A. Sen, *Strong-weak Coupling Duality in Four Dimensional String Theory*, Intl. Jour. Mod. Phys. **A9** (1994) 3707.
- [45] C. Hull and P. Townsend, *Unity of Superstring Dualities*, Nucl. Phys. **B438** (1995) 109.
- [46] E. Witten, *String Theory Dynamics in Various Dimensions*, Nucl. Phys. **B443** (1995) 84, hep-th/9505054.
- [47] S. Chaudhuri and D. Lowe, *Type IIA-Heterotic Duals with Maximal Supersymmetry*, Nucl. Phys. **B459** (1996) 113. *Monstrous String-String Duality*, Nucl. Phys. **B469** (1996) 21.
- [48] B. Julia, *Group Disintegrations*, in *Superspace and Supergravity*, Eds. S.W. Hawking and M. Rocek (Cambridge).
- [49] H. Nicolai, Phys. Lett. **B187** (1987) 316. H. Nicolai and N. Warner, *The Structure of $N=16$ supergravity in two dimensions*, Comm. Math. Phys. **125** (1989) 369.
- [50] H. Nicolai and H. Samtleben, *Integrability and Canonical Structure of $d=2$, $N=16$ Supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B533** (1998) 210.
- [51] H. Nicolai and T. Fischbacher, *Low Level Representations of E_{10} and E_{11}* , hep-th/0301017.
- [52] T. Damour, M. Henneaux, and H. Nicolai, *Cosmological Billiards*, Class. Quant. Gravity 20 (2003) R145-R200. T. Damour and M. Henneaux, *E_{10} , BE_{10} and Arithmetical Chaos in String Cosmology*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86 (2001) 4749.
- [53] G. Moore and E. Witten, *Self-duality, Ramond-Ramond Fields, and K-Theory*, JHEP 0005 (2000) 032, hep-th/9912279.
- [54] E. Cremmer, B. Julia, H. Lu, and C. Pope, *Dualization of Dualities II: Twisted self-duality of doubled fields and superdualities*, hep-th/9806106.
- [55] J. Polchinski and A. Strominger, *New Vacua for Type II String Theory*, Phys. Lett. **B388** (1996) 736.
- [56] I.V. Lavrinenko, H. Lu, C. Pope, K. Stelle, *Superdualities, Brane-Tensions, and Massive IIA/IIB Duality*, Nucl. Phys. **B555** (1999) 201.
- [57] S. Chaudhuri, *Confinement and the Short Type I' Flux Tube*, Nucl. Phys. **B591** (2000) 243.
- [58] S. Chaudhuri, *Deconfinement and the Hagedorn Transition in String Theory*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86** (2001) 1943. *Finite Temperature Bosonic String Theory: Thermal Duality and the Kosterlitz-Thouless Transition*, Phys. Rev. **D65** (2002) 066008. *Finite Temperature Gases of Fermionic Strings*, hep-th/0208112.

- [59] S. Chaudhuri, *Quantized D(-2)brane Charge and the Cosmological Constant*, hep-th/0312079.
- [60] A. Cohen, G. Moore, P. Nelson, and J. Polchinski, Nucl. Phys. **B267** (1986) 143.
- [61] S. Chaudhuri, Y. Chen, and E. Novak, Phys. Rev. **D62** (2000) 026004. S. Chaudhuri and E. Novak, Phys. Rev. **D62** (2000).
- [62] J. Schwarz, *Covariant Field Equations of Chiral N=2 D=10 Supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B226** (1983) 269. J. Schwarz and P. West, *Symmetries and Transformations of Chiral N=2 D=10 Supergravity*, Phys. Lett. **B126** (1983) 301.
- [63] M. Green, J.A. Schwarz, and E. Witten, *Superstring Theory*, Cambridge.
- [64] D. Gross and J. Sloan, *The Quartic Effective Action for the Heterotic String*, Nucl. Phys. **B291** (1987) 41.
- [65] For a recent account, and guide to the original literature, see A. Ashtekar and J. Landowski, *Background Independent Quantum Gravity: A Status Report*, gr-qc/0404018.
- [66] A. Gonzalez-Arroyo and M. Ogawa, Phys. Rev. **D27** (1983) 2397.
- [67] B. Schutz, *Geometric Methods in Mathematical Physics*, Cambridge.
- [68] A. Sen, *String-String Duality Conjecture in Six Dimensions and Charged Solitonic Strings*, Nucl. Phys. **B450** (1995) 103, hep-th/9504027.
- [69] J. Harvey and A. Strominger, *The Heterotic String is a Soliton*, Nucl. Phys. **B449** (1995) 535, hep-th/9504047.
- [70] J. Polchinski and E. Witten, *Evidence for Heterotic-Type I String Duality*, Nucl. Phys. **B460** (1996) 525.
- [71] P. Horava and E. Witten, *Heterotic and Type I String Dynamics from Eleven Dimensions*, Nucl. Phys. **B460** (1996) 506.
- [72] C. Bachas, M. Douglas, and M. Green, *Anomalous Creation of Branes*, JHEP 9707 (1997) 002. U.H. Danielsson, G. Ferretti, and I. Klebanov, *Creation of Fundamental Strings by Crossing Dbranes*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79** (1997) 1984. O. Bergman, M. Gaberdiel, and G. Lifschytz, *String Creation and Heterotic-Type I' Duality*, Nucl. Phys. **B524** (1998) 524. The distinction between string creation in brane-antibrane and brane-brane crossings is discussed in T. Kitao, N. Ohta, and J.-G. Zhao, Phys. Lett. **B428** (1998) 68.
- [73] E. Witten, *Toroidal Compactification without Vector Structure*, JHEP 9802:006 (1998). A summary status report, along with original references, appears in J. de Boer, R. Dijkgraaf, K. Hori, A. Keurentjes, J. Morgan, D. Morrison, and S. Sethi, *Triples, Fluxes, and Strings*, Adv. Theor. Mth. Physics **4** (2002) 995.
- [74] A. Miemiec and I. Schnakenburg, *Killing Spinors from Nonlinear Realizations*, hep-th/0404191.

- [75] J. Hughes, J. Liu, and J. Polchinski, *Supermembranes*, Phys. Lett. **180B** (1986) 370. E. Bergshoeff, E. Sezgin, and P. Townsend, *Supermembranes and Eleven-dimensional Supergravity*, Phys. Lett. **B189** (1987) 75. For a review, see M. Duff, *Supermembranes*, hep-th/9611203.
- [76] B. de Wit, J. Hoppe, and H. Nicolai, Nucl. Phys. **B305** [FS23] (1988) 545. B. de Wit, M. Luscher, and H. Nicolai, Nucl. Phys. **B320** (1989) 135. B. de Wit, *Supermembranes and Supermatrix Models*, hep-th/9902051.
- [77] L. Castellani, A. Ceresole, S. Ferrara, R. D'Auria, P. Fre, and E. Miana, *The Complete $N=3$ Matter Coupled Supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B268** (1986) 317. C. Kounnas and A. Kumar, *BPS States in $N=3$ Strings*, Nucl. Phys. **B511** (1998) 216. A. Frey and J. Polchinski, *$N=3$ Warped Compactifications*, Phys. Rev. **D65** (2002) 126009.
- [78] R. Minasian and G. Moore, *K Theory and Ramond-Ramond Charge*, JHEP **9711** 002 (1997). E. Witten, *Dbranes and K-Theory*, JHEP 9812 (1998) 019. See the recent status summary in G. Moore, *K Theory from a Physical Perspective*, hep-th/0304018.
- [79] D. Diaconescu, G. Moore, and E. Witten, *$E8$ Gauge Theory and a Derivation of K Theory from M theory*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **6** (2003) 1031.
- [80] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, *Electric-magnetic duality, monopole condensation, and confinement in $N=2$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory*, Nucl. Phys. **B426** (1994) 19. A. Gorskii, I. Krichever, A. Marshakov, and A. Morozov, *Integrability and Seiberg-Witten Exact Solution*, Phys. Lett. **B355** (1995) 466. E. Martinec and N. Warner, *Integrable Systems and Supersymmetric Gauge Theory*, Nucl. Phys. **B459** (1996) 97, hep-th/9509161. E. D'Hoker and D. H. Phong, *Lectures on Supersymmetric Yang Mills Theory and Integrable Systems*, hep-th/9912271.
- [81] R. Dijkgraaf and C. Vafa, *Matrix Models, topological strings, and supersymmetric gauge theories*, Nucl. Phys. **B644** (2002) 3, hep-th/0206255. T. Hollowood, A. Iqbal, and C. Vafa, *Matrix Models, Geometric Engineering, and Elliptic Genera*, hep-th/0310272.
- [82] M. Matone and L. Mazzucato, *Branched Matrix Models and the Scales of Supersymmetric Gauge Theories*, JHEP 0307 (2003) 015.
- [83] V. Kac, *Infinite dimensional Algebras*, 3rd edition, Cambridge.
- [84] M. Wakimoto, *Lectures on infinite-dimensional Lie Algebras*, World Scientific.
- [85] P. Goddard and D. Olive, *Algebras, Lattices, and Strings*, in *Vertex Operators in Mathematics and Physics*, MSRI Pub. 3 (Springer).
- [86] R. Gilmore, *Lie Groups, Lie Algebras, and Some of their Applications*, Wiley.
- [87] A. Keurentjes, *E_{11} a sign of the times*, hep-th/0402090.
- [88] C. Hull, *Duality and the Nature of Spacetime*, JHEP 9811 (1998) 017.
- [89] A. Kleinschmidt, I. Schnakenburg, and P. West, *Very-extended Kac Moody Algebras and their interpretation at low levels*, hep-th/0309198.

- [90] P. West, *Very Extended E_8 and A_8 at Low Levels*, Class. Quantum Gravity **20** (2003) 2393, hep-th/0307024.
- [91] V. Ogievetsky, Nuovo Cim. 8 (1973) 988. A. Borisov and V. Ogievetsky, Teor. Mat. Fiz. 21 (1974) 329.
- [92] O. Baerwald and P. West, *Brane-rotating Symmetries and the Fivebrane Equations of Motion*, Phys. Lett. **B476** (2000) 157.
- [93] M. Duff and K. Stelle, *Multimembrane Solutions of $d=11$ supergravity*, Phys. Lett. **B253** (1991) 113.
- [94] G. Gibbons and K. Maeda, *Black Holes and Membranes in Higher Dimensional Theories with Dilaton Fields*, Nucl. Phys. **B298** (1988) 741.
- [95] A. Dabholkar, G. Gibbons, J. Harvey, and F. Ruiz-Ruiz, *Superstrings and Solitons*, Nucl. Phys. **B340** (1990) 33.
- [96] G. Horowitz and A. Strominger, *Black Strings and Branes*, Nucl. Phys. **B360** (1991) 197.
- [97] M. Duff and H. Lu, *The self-dual type IIB superthreebrane*, Phys. Lett. **B273** (1991) 409; *Elementary Fivebrane Solutions of $D=10$ Supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B354** (1991) 141; *Black and Super pbranes in Diverse Dimensions*, Nucl. Phys. **B416** (1994) 301.