## A Geometric Representation for the Proca Model

Jaime Camacaro, Rolando Gaitán and Lorenzo Leal \*

Departamento de Física, Facultad de Ciencias

Universidad Central de Venezuela, Caracas, Venezuela.

## Abstract

The Proca model is quantized in an open-path dependent representation that generalizes the Loop Representation of gauge theories. The starting point is a gauge invariant Lagrangian that reduces to the Proca Lagrangian when certain gauge is selected.

<sup>\*</sup>e-mail: lleal@dino.conicit.ve Postal address: A.P. 47399, Caracas 1041-A, Venezuela

The quantization of systems with Second-Class Constraints (S.C.C.) has received considerable attention in recent times [1-6], mainly due to the appearance of this kind of restrictions in superstrings theories [4]. From the point of view of the modern path integral approach, S.C.C. turn the quantization procedure into a rather cumbersomed task, which has given rise to several interesting developments to handle this situation [7,8].

On the other hand, within the Loop Representation (LR) approach [9-12], which is the framework we shall adopt in this letter, things are not much better. The L.R. was built to quantize gauge-invariant theories, which are synonymous of first-class constrained ones. However, one feels that there is an underlying geometric content in certain second-class constrained theories, that might be accommodated in an adequate L.R. formulation.

In this paper we investigate the quantization of the massive Maxwell theory (Proca theory) in a geometric representation that generalizes the L.R.. The strategy we follow consists on converting the usual Proca theory (which posses S.C.C.) into an equivalent gauge-invariant theory that reduces to the former when certain gauge is chosen.

This idea is not new. In references [4,5], the S.C.C. of certain theories are taken as gauge-fixing conditions of a gauge-invariant theory, whose lagrangian is then constructed. Within the same spirit, in references [1-3,6] the phase space is enlarged by including aditional variables that turn the theory gauge-invariant. Applications of these procedures to concrete models are found in references [4,13-18].

In the present case, the model is so simple that there is no need to employ any of these methods although the underlying idea we use is the same. We start from the usual Proca lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2}M^2A_{\mu}A^{\mu} \tag{1}$$

where  $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_{\mu}A_{\nu} - \partial_{\nu}A_{\mu}$ . The mass term spoils the gauge invariance of the first one. To recover this symmetry, we add a dinamical auxiliary field  $\omega$  and consider, instead of (1), the lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L}' = -\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2}M^2(A_\mu + \partial_\mu\omega)(A^\mu + \partial^\mu\omega)$$
 (2)

which is invariant under:

$$A'_{\mu} = A_{\mu} + \wedge_{,\mu} \tag{3}$$

$$\omega' = \omega - \Lambda \tag{4}$$

Obviously, there is a gauge choice that gives back (1):  $\omega$  may be eliminated by taking  $\wedge = \omega$ . It is worth mentioning that  $\mathcal{L}'$ , sometimes called the Stückelberg lagrangian, has also been obtained from (1) through the Batalin, Fradkin and Tyutin method [1,2,18].  $\mathcal{L}'$  can also be obtained from the Abelian Maxwell-Higgs model, by "freezing" the radial mode  $|\phi|$  of the Higgs field  $\phi = |\phi|e^{i\omega}$  and keeping only the Goldstone mode  $\omega$ .

The "pure gauge" nature of  $\omega$  is of course also manifested in the equations of motion. These are:

$$M^{2}(\omega^{,\mu} + A^{\mu}) - F^{\mu\nu}_{,\nu} = 0 \tag{5}$$

$$\partial_{\mu}(\omega^{,\mu} + A^{\mu}) = 0 \tag{6}$$

Equation (6) is then a consistence condition onto equation (5). In the unitary gauge ( $\omega = 0$ ) the usual equations of the Proca model are recovered.

Canonical quatization of  $\mathcal{L}'$  may be resumed as follows. There is a primary constraint

$$\pi_A^0 \approx 0 \tag{7}$$

whose consistency produces the secondary one:

$$\partial_i \pi_A^i + \pi_\omega \approx 0 \tag{8}$$

Here,  $\pi_A^{\mu}$  and  $\pi_{\omega}$  are the canonical conjugates to  $A^{\mu}$  and  $\omega$  respectively. The Hamiltonian results to be:

$$H = \int d^3x \left\{ \frac{1}{2} (\pi_A^i)^2 + \frac{1}{2M^2} \pi_\omega^2 + \frac{1}{4} (F_{ij})^2 + \frac{M^2}{2} (\omega_{,i} + A_i)^2 + A_0 (\pi_\omega + \pi_{A,i}^i) \right\}$$
(9)

and the non vanishing canonical commutators are given by:

$$[A_{\mu}(y), \pi_{A}^{\nu}(x)] = i\delta_{\mu}^{\nu}\delta^{3}(x - y)$$
(10.a)

$$[\omega(x), \pi_{\omega}(y)] = i\delta^3(x - y) \tag{10.b}$$

It is easily verified that do not appear further constraints, and that (7) and (8) are first class ones, as corresponds to a gauge-invariant theory. To recover the usual canonical formulation of the Proca model, one should fix the gauge by adding the conditions:

$$\omega \approx 0 \tag{11.a}$$

$$\pi_{\omega} + M^2 A_0 \approx 0 \tag{11.b}$$

which, together with (7), (8) would complete a system of S.C.C.. Then, a straightforward calculation, which includes the obtention of the appropriate Dirac brackets yields the standard result.

Returning to the gauge invariant formulation, we see that the primary constraint (7) states that on the physical subspace, the wave functional  $\Psi(\omega, A_{\mu})$  do not dependent on  $A_0$  (we have momentarily chosen the Schrödinger polarization). Thus, operators  $A_0$  and  $\pi_0$  may be ignored. Alternatively, one may choose the temporal gauge  $A_0 \approx 0$ , which together with eq. (7) leads to the Dirac commutator  $[A_0, \pi_0] = 0$ . Then, both  $A_0$  and  $\pi_0$  may be taken as strongly vanishing operators. Regarding the "Gauss constraint" (8), it generates the time-independent gauge transformations of the theory. It is immediate to see that both  $\omega$  and  $A_i$  are the gauge-dependent operators, unlike their canonical conjugates  $\pi_{\omega}$  and  $\pi^i$ .

Within the spirit of the L.R. formulation, we introduce a gauge-invariant non local operator that encodes the physical information associated to  $\omega$  and  $A_i$ . A natural candidate is:

$$f(P_x^y) = exp(-i\omega(x))W(P_x^y)exp(i\omega(y))$$
(12)

where

$$W(P_x^y) = \exp(i \int_{P_x^y} dz^k A_k(z)) \tag{13}$$

is the Wilson-path operator associated to the spatial path  $P_x^y$  starting at x and ending at y. More generally, define a "generalized path"  $\mathcal{P}$  as an unordered collection of open  $(P_x^y)$  and closed  $(P_x^x)$  paths

$$\mathcal{P} \equiv \left\{ P_{x_1}^{(1)y_1}, \cdots, P_{x_N}^{(N)y_N} \right\} \tag{14}$$

From equation (12), we define:

$$f(\mathcal{P}) \equiv \prod_{\alpha=1}^{N} f(P^{(\alpha)}) \tag{15}$$

It is easy to see that

$$f(\overline{\mathcal{P}})f(\mathcal{P}) = \mathbf{1} \tag{16}$$

where  $\overline{\mathcal{P}} = \left\{\overline{P}^{(1)}, \dots, \overline{P}^{(N)}\right\}$  is the set of paths opposite to  $\overline{P}^{(1)}, \dots, \overline{P}^{(N)}$ . Equation (16) allows to build a group of generalized paths (GGP) that mimics the Abelian Group of Loops of Gambini-Trías [9]. We define the elements of the GGP by grouping the generalized paths  $\mathcal{P}$  into equivalence classes given by:

$$\mathcal{P} \sim \mathcal{Q} \quad iff \quad f(\overline{\mathcal{P}})f(\mathcal{Q}) = 1$$
 (17)

Then, it can be seen that the operation:

$$\mathcal{P} \cdot \mathcal{Q} \equiv \left\{ P^{(1)}, \dots, P^{(N)}, Q^{(1)}, \dots, Q^{(M)} \right\}$$
 (18)

defines a group product among the equivalence classes. It is worth mentioning that this group structure is absent in Scalar Electrodynamics, although even in this case the analogous to  $f(P_x^y)$  (eq. (11)) is a gauge-independent operator.

The algebra obeyed by  $\pi_{\omega}$ ,  $\pi_A^i$  and  $f(\mathcal{P})$  is given by:

$$[\pi_{\omega}(z), f(\mathcal{P})] = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N} \rho(z, P_{x_{\alpha}}^{y_{\alpha}}) f(\mathcal{P})$$
(19.a)

$$\left[\pi_A^i(z), f(\mathcal{P})\right] = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N T^i(z, P_{x_\alpha}^{y_\alpha}) f(\mathcal{P})$$
(19.B)

where

$$\rho(z, \mathcal{P}_{x_{\alpha}}^{y_{\alpha}}) = \delta^{3}(z - y_{\alpha}) - \delta^{3}(z - x_{\alpha})$$
(20)

and  $T^{i}(z, P)$  is the distributional field of tangent vectors associated to the path P:

$$T^{i}(z, P_{x}^{y}) = \int_{P_{x}^{y}} dx'^{i} \delta^{3}(x' - z)$$
(21)

This algebra may be realized onto path-dependent wave functionals  $\Psi(\mathcal{P})$  by prescribing:

$$\pi_{\omega}(z)\Psi(\mathcal{P}) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N} \rho(z, P_{x_{\alpha}}^{y_{\alpha}})\Psi(\mathcal{P})$$
(22)

$$\pi_A^i(z)\Psi(\mathcal{P}) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N T^i(z, P_{x_\alpha}^{y_\alpha})\Psi(\mathcal{P})$$
(23)

$$f(\mathcal{Q})\Psi(\mathcal{Q}) = \Psi(\mathcal{Q} \cdot \mathcal{P}) \tag{24}$$

Since

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial z^i} T^i(z, P_{x\alpha}^{y_\alpha}) + \rho(z, P_{x\alpha}^{y_\alpha}) = 0 \tag{25}$$

the Gauss constraint (eq. (8)) is automatically verified.

Equations (22)-(24) admit an easy geometrical interpretation. The operator  $f(\mathcal{P})$  performs "translations" on the generalized path space, while  $\pi_{\omega}$  and  $\pi_A^i$  measure the density of pairs of

points and the "shape" of the lines, respectively, associated to the paths. From a physical point of view, it can be said that in the  $\mathcal{P}$ -representation,  $f(\mathcal{P})$  creates lines of electric field with Goldstone bosons of opposite signs attached at its end points,  $\pi_{\omega}$  measures the density of such bosons and  $\pi_A^i$  measures the density of electrical flux.

Next we show how to write the Hamiltonian H in the  $\mathcal{P}$ -representation. To this end, we introduce a slightly modified Mandelstam derivative [19]  $\Delta_k(z)$ , defined as follows. Given a functional  $G(\mathcal{P})$  depending on generalized paths  $\mathcal{P}$ ,  $\Delta_k(z)G(\mathcal{P})$  computes the change of G when an infinitesimal open path  $\delta P_z^{z+h}(h\to 0)$  starting at z and ending at z+h is appended to the list of paths  $P^{(\alpha)}$  comprised in  $\mathcal{P}$ :

$$\Delta_i G(\mathcal{P}) = \lim_{h^i \to 0} \frac{G(\delta P, P^{(1)}, \dots, P^{(N)}) - G(P^{(1)}, \dots, P^{(n)})}{h^i}$$
 (26)

The  $\Delta_k(z)$  derivative is related with the "area" or "loop" derivative  $\Delta_{ij}(z)$  of Gambini-Trías [9] through the expresion:

$$\Delta_{ij}(z) = \frac{\partial}{\partial z^i} \Delta_j(z) - \frac{\partial}{\partial z^j} \Delta_i(z)$$
 (27)

The area derivative measures how a path-dependent functional changes when a small "plaquette" is attached at the point z.

In terms of these geometric derivatives, the stationary Schrödinger equation in the  $\mathcal{P}$ -representation looks as:

$$\int d^3z \left\{ -\Delta_{ij}(z)\Delta_{ij}(z) - \frac{M^2}{2}\Delta_k(z)\Delta_k(z) + \frac{1}{2}T^i(z,\mathcal{P})T^i(z,\mathcal{P}) + \frac{M^2}{2}\rho^2(z,\mathcal{P}) \right\} \Psi(\mathcal{P}) = E\Psi(\mathcal{P})$$
(28)

where we have set:

$$T^{i}(z,\mathcal{P}) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N} T^{i}(z, P_{x_{\alpha}}^{y_{\alpha}})$$
(29.a)

$$\rho(z, \mathcal{P}) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N} \rho(z, P_{x_{\alpha}}^{y_{\alpha}})$$
(29.b)

The left hand side of equation (28) has the following structure. It comprises a "kinetic energy" term, constructed from generalized laplacians  $(\Delta_{ij})^2$  and  $(\Delta_i)^2$  acting on path-space. The remaining terms may be viewed as "potential energy" contributions, that are quadratic in the "position variables"  $T^i(z, \mathcal{P})$ ,  $\rho(z, \mathcal{P})$ , associated to the generalized path  $\mathcal{P}$ . This structure generalizes that of the Maxwell case in the LR [10], with which our formulation should be compared.

As in the massless case [10], the Schrödinger equation (28) only holds at formal level, in the sense that involves ill defined products of distributions that should be appropriately regularized. Nevertheless, even at a formal level, it is possible to solve the functional eigenvalue problem (26) to obtain the  $\mathcal{P}$ -dependent eigenfunctions and their corresponding energies, starting from a formal vacuum functional of the type  $\Psi_0(\mathcal{P}) = exp(-\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathcal{P}}dx^i\int_{\mathcal{P}}dy^iD_{ij}(x-y))$  and using standard Fourier methods.

It seems possible to extend the above formulation to treat the more interesting non Abelian massive case. The so called 2 + 1 "self-dual" theory [20], which consists of a Chern-Simons term plus a mass term, could also be formulated in an appropriate path representation, following the present scheme of quantization.

## References

- [1] I.A. Batalin and E.S. Fradkin, Nucl. Phys. **B279** (1987) 514; Phys. Lett. **B180** (1986) 157.
- [2] I.A. Batalin and J.V. Tyutin, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A6 (1991) 3255.
- [3] A. Restuccia and J. Stephany, Phys. Lett **B305** (1993) 348.
- [4] R. Gianvittorio, A. Restuccia and J. Stephany, Mod. Phys. Lett. A6 (1991) 2121.
- [5] K. Harodo and H. Mukaida, Z. Phys. C48 (1990) 151.
- [6] I.A. Batalin, E.S. Fradkin and T.E. Fradkina, Nucl. Phys. **314** (1989) 158.
- [7] M.B. Green and J. Schwarz, Phys. Lett. **B109** (1983) 399.
- [8] L. Brink and J. Schwarz, Phys. Lett. **B100** (1981) 287.
- [9] R. Gambini and A. Trías, Phys. Rev. **D22** (1980) 1380; ibid **D23** (1981) 553; ibid **D27** (1983)
   2935; ibid **D31** (1985) 3144; Nucl. Phys. **B278** (1986) 436.
- [10] C. Di Bartolo, F. Nori, R. Gambini and A. Trías, Lett. Nuovo Cim. 38 (1983) 497.
- [11] R. Gambini. L. Leal and A. Trías, Phys. Rev. **D39** (1989) 3127.
- [12] C. Rovelli and L. Smolin, nucl. Phys. **331** (1990) 80.
- [13] M. Moshe and Y. Oz, Phys. Lett. **B224** (1989) 145.
- [14] T. Fujiwara, Y. Igarashi and J. Kubo, Nucl. Phys. **B341** (1990) 695.
- [15] J. Kowalski-Glikman, Phys. Lett. **B245** (1990) 79.

- [16] I.A. Batalin and I.V. Tyutin, Mod. Phys. Lett. A7 (1992) 1931.
- [17] N. Banerjee, Subir Ghosh and R. Banerjee, Phys. Rev. **D49** (1996) 49.
- [18] N. Banerjee and R. Banerjee, Generalized Hamiltonian embedding of the Proca model, S.N. Bose National Centre for Basic Sciencies-preprint (1996).
- [19] S. Mandelstam, Ann. Phys. **19** (1962) 1.
- [20] P.K. Townsend, K. Pilch and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Lett. 136 (1984) 38.