

SH-LIE ALGEBRAS INDUCED BY GAUGE TRANSFORMATIONS

RON FULP, TOM LADA, AND JIM STASHEFF

ABSTRACT. The physics of “particles of spin ≤ 2 ” leads to representations of a Lie algebra Ξ of gauge parameters on a vector space Φ of fields. Attempts to develop an analogous theory for spin > 2 have failed; in fact, there are claims that such a theory is impossible (though we have been unable to determine the hypotheses for such a ‘no-go’ theorem). This led Berends, Burgers and van Dam [Bur85, BBvD84, BBvD85] to generalize to ‘field dependent parameters’ in a setting where some analysis in terms of smooth functions is possible. Having recognized the resulting structure as that of an sh-lie algebra (L_∞ -algebra), we have now reproduced their structure entirely algebraically, hopefully shedding some light on what is going on.

1. INTRODUCTION

Ever since the discovery of Yang-Mills theory, physicists have been intrigued by the different manifestations of symmetries in field theories. Symmetries in gravitational theories are induced by spacetime transformations which preserve the spacetime structure whereas Yang-Mills symmetries are defined via transformations of some internal vector space. Many authors have attempted to reformulate gravitational symmetries in a manner which is compatible with the Yang-Mills approach as quantization of Yang-Mills theories is better understood than most attempts to quantize gravity.

The present paper has as its purpose to show that gauge symmetries of certain field theories have an unexpectedly rich algebraic structure. Traditional theories lead one to expect that the symmetries of field theories are encoded via Lie group actions, or more generally, as Lie algebra actions. We find that the gauge symmetries of many field theories in fact do not arise from a Lie algebra action, but rather from an sh-Lie (or L_∞) algebra action.

The physics of “particles of spin ≤ 2 ” leads to representations of a Lie algebra Ξ of gauge parameters on a vector space Φ of fields. A

Research supported in part by the NSF throughout most of my career, currently under grant DMS-9803435.

significant generalization occurs when the gauge parameters act in a *field dependent* way. By a field dependent action of Ξ on Φ , Berends, Burgers and van Dam [Bur85, BBvD86, BBvD85] mean a polynomial (or power series) map $\delta(\xi)(\phi) = \sum_{i=0} T_i(\xi, \phi)$ where T_i is linear in ξ and polynomial of homogeneous degree i in ϕ .

Field dependent gauge symmetries appear in several field theories, most notably in a class due to Ikeda [Ike94] and Schaller and Strobl [SS94], and employed by Cattaneo and Felder [CF99] to implement Kontsevich's deformation quantization [Kon97]. Ikeda [Ike94] considers two-dimensional theories with a generalized Yang-Mills field which has values in a so-called nonlinear Lie algebra. He finds that if the nonlinear Lie structure is chosen appropriately and if he allows the Yang-Mills field to interact with certain scalar fields, then he can recapture gravitational theories in two dimensions. In this way, two-dimensional gravity is formulated as a Yang-Mills theory and its symmetries arise in the same way as traditional Yang-Mills symmetries.

Although expressed rather differently, the Berends, Burgers and van Dam approach provides further insight into the algebraic structure of the gauge symmetries of the above class of field theories. In fact their context is more general than that of Ikeda and that of Cattaneo and Felder, since Berends, Burgers and van Dam consider arbitrary field theories, subject only to the requirement that the commutator of two gauge symmetries be another gauge symmetry whose gauge parameter is possibly field dependent. Thus Berends, Burgers and van Dam do not require an a priori given Lie structure to induce the algebraic structure of the gauge symmetry "algebra". On the other hand, Ikeda requires a structure called a nonlinear Lie algebra which he uses to obtain symmetries which in turn are used to find a Lagrangian for which the symmetries are gauge symmetries. In this sense, his nonlinear Lie structure drives the entire theory. Similarly, Cattaneo and Felder have a Poisson structure which explicitly appears in both the action of their theory and in their gauge symmetries.

The present work has as its goal to clarify the algebraic structure of the more general gauge "algebra" outlined in Berends, Burgers and van Dam. In fact we show that the gauge symmetry algebra of a large class of field theories is an sh-Lie algebra. Of course, as we show, this sh-Lie structure, in special cases, will reduce to the more familiar Lie structures one encounters in various field theories.

Although Berends, Burgers and van Dam formulate their ideas in terms of formal power series in the fields and the parameters of the theory, the algebraic structure of their theory is clarified if one uses the adjoint form of their polarization. In this form the relevant structures

are spaces of linear maps from a certain coalgebra $C = \Lambda^*\Phi$ into the respective vector spaces Φ of fields and Ξ of gauge parameters. The coalgebra and Lie-algebra structures of C are described in Section 2. It turns out that the space Ξ of gauge parameters has no natural Lie structure, but the space of linear maps from C into Ξ is a Lie algebra under certain mild assumptions along with a hypothesis which we refer to as the BBvD hypothesis. This is proved in Section 3. Section 4 provides the reader with a short description of two equivalent methods for defining sh-Lie algebras. Our main result is found in Section 5 where we show that under the same assumptions required in Section 3, the gauge algebra is an sh-Lie algebra. In Section 6 we show how our results relate to the classical situation in which the space Ξ of gauge parameters is a Lie algebra which acts on the space Φ of fields. Finally, Section 7 provides a link to the physics literature where certain sigma-models are shown to satisfy the BBvD hypothesis. These examples do not satisfy the classical conditions of Section 6 and so provide examples whose gauge algebras are sh-Lie algebras which are not Lie algebras.

We are grateful to Berends, Burgers and van Dam for the inspiration of Burgers' dissertation and especially to van Dam for several discussions as our research developed.

2. OUR FRAMEWORK

Let Φ be a vector space over a field k of characteristic 0 and let $\Lambda^*\Phi$ denote the free cocommutative coalgebra cogenerated by Φ with comultiplication denoted Δ . The vector space $\text{Coder}(\Lambda^*\Phi)$ of *coderivations* on $\Lambda^*\Phi$ is a Lie algebra with bracket given by the commutator with respect to composition. Recall that a coderivation is a linear map $\Theta : \Lambda^*\Phi \rightarrow \Lambda^*\Phi$ that satisfies the equation

$$\Delta \circ \Theta = (\Theta \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes \Theta) \circ \Delta.$$

(In the graded situation, the usual Koszul sign conventions are in effect.)

The vector space $\text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Phi)$ is isomorphic to $\text{Coder}(\Lambda^*\Phi)$ and hence inherits a Lie algebra structure; the bracket on $\text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Phi)$ is known as the Gerstenhaber bracket [Ger62, Sta93]. The isomorphism

$$\text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Phi) \ni h \rightleftharpoons \bar{h} \in \text{Coder}(\Lambda^*\Phi)$$

is given by the correspondence

$$\bar{h}(\phi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_n) = \sum_{\{unshuff\}} h(\phi_{\sigma(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\sigma(p)}) \wedge \phi_{\sigma(p+1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\sigma(n)}$$

for $h \in \text{Hom}(\Lambda^p(\Phi), \Phi)$. We may write \bar{h} as the composition $\bar{h} = m \circ (h \otimes 1) \circ \Delta$ where m is the usual wedge product in Λ^*V regarded as an algebra (no compatability with the coproduct is assumed nor needed).

The Gerstenhaber bracket on $\text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Phi)$ may be described as $[f, g] = f \circ \bar{g} - g \circ \bar{f}$ where \bar{f} and \bar{g} are the coderivations corresponding to f and g . In this notation the ‘‘Gerstenhaber comp’’ operation may be defined by $f \odot g = f \circ \bar{g}$, for $f, g \in \text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Phi)$. Thus an alternative notation for the Lie bracket on $\text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Phi)$ is $[f, g] = f \odot g - g \odot f$.

3. A PRELIMINARY RESULT

Now let Ξ and Φ be arbitrary vector spaces. Suppose that we are given a linear map $\delta : \Xi \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Phi)$. We can write $\delta(\xi) = \sum_{i=0} T_i(\xi)$ where T_i is 0 except on $\Lambda^i\Phi$. (This T_i is adjoint to the polarization of the Berends, Burgers and van Dam T_i .) We extend δ to a map

$$\hat{\delta} : \text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Phi)$$

by

$$\hat{\delta}(\pi) = ev \circ (\delta \circ \pi \otimes 1) \circ \Delta$$

where ev is the evaluation map. That is,

$$\hat{\delta}(\pi)(\phi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_n) = \sum_{\{unshuff\}} \delta(\pi(\phi_{\sigma(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\sigma(p)}))(\phi_{\sigma(p+1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\sigma(n)})$$

We may think of the space Ξ as being contained in the space $\text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi)$ by identifying $\xi \in \Xi$ with the map, also denoted ξ , in $\text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi)$ which is 0 except on the scalars where $\xi(1) = \xi$. It is easy to see that $\hat{\delta}(\xi) = \delta(\xi)$.

Our problem concerns the algebraic structure on Ξ ; consequently we consider the possibility of inducing a Lie-type bracket on $\text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi)$ via the mapping $\hat{\delta}$. Under certain conditions such a bracket may then be used to obtain a bracket on the parameter space defined by restricting the induced bracket on $\text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi)$ to the parameter space Ξ . With this in mind, define

$$[\pi_1, \pi_2] := \pi_1 \circ \overline{\hat{\delta}(\pi_2)} - \pi_2 \circ \overline{\hat{\delta}(\pi_1)},$$

for $\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi)$. It turns out that this bracket does not generally satisfy the Jacobi identity. Moreover if we choose $\pi_1 = \xi, \pi_2 = \eta \in \Xi$, then

$$[\xi, \eta] = \xi \odot \hat{\delta}(\eta) - \eta \odot \hat{\delta}(\xi) = 0,$$

and as a result, the restriction of the induced bracket to Ξ yields an abelian Lie-algebra structure. In many cases of interest, the parameter

space has an a priori nonabelian Lie-algebra structure on it and we would certainly want the Lie structure on $\text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi)$ to reproduce this structure when restricted to the parameter space Ξ . In order to assure the Jacobi property of bracket on $\text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi)$, we introduce a *correction term*. We accomplish this, following Berends, Burgers and van Dam, by assuming that there is a map

$$C : \Xi \otimes \Xi \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi)$$

such that

$$[\delta(\xi), \delta(\eta)] = \hat{\delta}C(\xi, \eta) \in \text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Phi)$$

for all $\xi, \eta \in \Xi$. We will refer to this as the *BBvD hypothesis*.

Extend C to a mapping

$$\hat{C} : \text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi) \otimes \text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi)$$

by

$$\hat{C}(\pi_1, \pi_2) = C \circ ((\pi_1 \otimes \pi_2) \otimes 1) \circ (\Delta \otimes 1) \circ \Delta,$$

where we have identified C with its adjoint mapping, which is the mapping \wr from $\Xi \otimes \Xi \otimes \Lambda^*\Phi$ into Ξ defined by

$$(\xi, \eta, \phi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_n) \longrightarrow C(\xi, \eta)(\phi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_n).$$

Next, we redefine the bracket on $\text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi)$ given above by including the correction term C :

$$[\pi_1, \pi_2] := \pi_1 \odot \hat{\delta}(\pi_2) - \pi_2 \odot \hat{\delta}(\pi_1) + \hat{C}(\pi_1, \pi_2).$$

Theorem 1. *The mapping $\hat{\delta}$ preserves brackets; that is, $\hat{\delta}[\pi_1, \pi_2] = [\hat{\delta}(\pi_1), \hat{\delta}(\pi_2)]$. Moreover, if $\hat{\delta} : \text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Phi)$ is injective, then $[\pi_1, \pi_2]$ satisfies the Jacobi identity.*

Proof. Observe that if $\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\delta}(\pi_1) \odot \hat{\delta}(\pi_2) &= \hat{\delta}(\pi_1) \odot \overline{\hat{\delta}(\pi_2)} \\ &= ev \circ [(\delta \circ \pi_1) \otimes 1] \circ \Delta \circ \overline{\hat{\delta}(\pi_2)} \\ &= ev \circ [(\delta \circ \pi_1) \otimes 1] \circ \overline{\{(\hat{\delta}(\pi_2) \otimes 1) + (1 \otimes \hat{\delta}(\pi_2))\}} \circ \Delta \\ &= ev \circ [((\delta \circ \pi_1) \circ \overline{\hat{\delta}(\pi_2)}) \otimes 1] \circ \Delta + ev \circ [((\delta \circ \pi_1) \otimes \overline{\hat{\delta}(\pi_2)})] \circ \Delta \\ &= \hat{\delta}(\pi_1 \circ \overline{\hat{\delta}(\pi_2)}) + ev \circ [((\delta \circ \pi_1) \otimes \overline{\hat{\delta}(\pi_2)})] \circ \Delta \\ &= \hat{\delta}(\pi_1 \odot \hat{\delta}(\pi_2)) + ev \circ [(\delta \circ \pi_1) \otimes \overline{\hat{\delta}(\pi_2)}] \circ \Delta. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$[\hat{\delta}(\pi_1), \hat{\delta}(\pi_2)] = \hat{\delta}(\pi_1 \odot \hat{\delta}(\pi_2)) - \hat{\delta}(\pi_2 \odot \hat{\delta}(\pi_1)) + E$$

where

$$E = ev \circ [(\delta \circ \pi_1) \otimes \overline{\hat{\delta}(\pi_2)}] \circ \Delta - ev \circ [(\delta \circ \pi_2) \otimes \overline{\hat{\delta}(\pi_1)}] \circ \Delta.$$

We must show that E is in the image of $\hat{\delta}$. Recall that for $f \in \text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Phi)$, we have $\overline{f} = m \circ (f \otimes 1) \circ \Delta$, where m denotes the algebra (wedge) product on $\Lambda^*\Phi$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} (\delta \circ \pi_1) \otimes \overline{\hat{\delta}(\pi_2)} &= (\delta \circ \pi_1) \otimes \{m \circ (\hat{\delta}(\pi_2) \otimes 1) \circ \Delta\} \\ &= (\delta \circ \pi_1) \otimes \{m \circ ([ev \circ ((\delta \circ \pi_2) \otimes 1)] \otimes 1) \circ (\Delta \otimes 1) \circ \Delta\}. \\ &= (\delta \circ \pi_1) \otimes \{m \circ ([ev \circ ((\delta \circ \pi_2) \otimes 1)] \otimes 1) \circ (1 \otimes \Delta) \circ \Delta\}. \end{aligned}$$

For $F \in \text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Phi)$, write $\Delta(F) = \sum(F_1 \otimes F_2)$, $\Delta(F_2) = \sum(F_{21} \otimes F_{22})$ and $\Delta(F_{22}) = \sum(F_{221} \otimes F_{222})$. In order to simplify notation, we drop the summation symbol wherever the latter coproducts appear below. From our last calculation we have

$$(ev \circ [(\delta \circ \pi_1) \otimes \overline{\hat{\delta}(\pi_2)}] \circ \Delta)(F) = [\delta(\pi_1(F_1)) \odot \delta(\pi_2(F_{21}))](F_{22}),$$

and

$$(ev \circ [(\delta \circ \pi_2) \otimes \overline{\hat{\delta}(\pi_1)}] \circ \Delta)(F) = [\delta(\pi_2(F_1)) \odot \delta(\pi_1(F_{21}))](F_{22}).$$

Because Δ is cocommutative, the full summations are equal:

$$\Sigma F_1 \otimes F_{21} \otimes F_{22} = \Sigma F_{21} \otimes F_1 \otimes F_{22}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} E(F) &= [\delta(\pi_1(F_1)), \delta(\pi_2(F_{21}))](F_{22}) = \delta(C(\pi_1(F_1), \pi_2(F_{21}), F_{221}))(F_{222}) \\ &= ev \circ (\{\delta \circ C \circ [(\pi_1 \otimes \pi_2) \otimes 1]\} \otimes 1)(F_1 \otimes F_{21} \otimes F_{221} \otimes F_{222}) \\ &= ev \circ (\{\delta \circ C \circ [(\pi_1 \otimes \pi_2) \otimes 1]\} \otimes 1)(F_1 \otimes F_{21} \otimes (\Delta F_{22})) \\ &= ev \circ (\{\delta \circ C \circ [(\pi_1 \otimes \pi_2) \otimes 1]\} \otimes 1)(([1 \otimes ((1 \otimes \Delta) \circ \Delta)] \circ \Delta)(F)) \\ &= ev \circ (\{\delta \circ C \circ [(\pi_1 \otimes \pi_2) \otimes 1]\} \otimes 1)((1 \otimes 1 \otimes \Delta) \circ (1 \otimes \Delta) \circ \Delta)(F). \end{aligned}$$

It follows from coassociativity that

$$\begin{aligned} E &= ev \circ (\{\delta \circ C \circ [(\pi_1 \otimes \pi_2) \otimes 1]\} \otimes 1) \circ ((\Delta \otimes 1 \otimes 1) \circ (\Delta \otimes 1) \circ \Delta) \\ &= ev \circ (\{\delta \circ C \circ [(\pi_1 \otimes \pi_2) \otimes 1]\} \otimes 1) \circ ([(\Delta \otimes 1) \circ \Delta] \otimes 1) \circ \Delta \\ &= ev \circ (\{\delta \circ C \circ [(\pi_1 \otimes \pi_2) \otimes 1]\} \otimes 1) \circ (\Delta \otimes 1) \circ \Delta \\ &= ev \circ (\{\delta \circ \hat{C}(\pi_1, \pi_2)\} \otimes 1) \circ \Delta = \hat{\delta}(\hat{C}(\pi_1, \pi_2)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus E is in the image of $\hat{\delta}$ and in fact

$$[\hat{\delta}(\pi_1), \hat{\delta}(\pi_2)] = \hat{\delta}(\pi_1 \odot \hat{\delta}(\pi_2) - \pi_2 \odot \hat{\delta}(\pi_1)) + \hat{\delta}(\hat{C}(\pi_1, \pi_2)) = \hat{\delta}([\pi_1, \pi_2]).$$

To verify the Jacobi identity, apply $\hat{\delta}$ to the hoped for Jacobi identity in $\text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi)$. By the morphism condition just established, the

result is the Jacobi identity valid in $\text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Phi)$. Assuming that $\hat{\delta}$ is injective, the Jacobi identity in $\text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi)$ follows. \square

We find it remarkable that the assumption on $C(\xi, \eta)$ has as consequence this behavior of $C(\pi_1, \pi_2)$. This result suggests that the parameter space should be enlarged to include all of $\text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi)$ but this is unacceptable to physicists since the number of independent parameters is linked to the number of independent Noether identities. It turns out the the polynomial equations of physical relevance define an sh-Lie structure on an appropriate graded vector space. We consider the sh-Lie formalism briefly in the next section.

4. SH-LIE ALGEBRAS

We now review the relationship between sh-Lie algebras (L_∞ -algebras) and cocommutative coalgebras [LS93, LM95]. Let (V, d) be a differential graded vector space. If (V, d) is a chain complex (degree $d = -1$), then an sh Lie structure on V is a collection of skew symmetric linear maps $l_n : V^{\otimes n} \longrightarrow V$ of degree $n - 2$ that satisfy the relations

$$\sum_{i+j=n+1} \sum_{\sigma} e(\sigma)(-1)^\sigma (-1)^{i(j-1)} l_j(l_i(x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(i)}), \dots, x_{\sigma(n)}) = 0$$

where $(-1)^\sigma$ is the sign of the permutation σ , $e(\sigma)$ is the sign that arises from the degrees of the permuted elements and σ is taken over all $(i, n - i)$ unshuffles.

If (V, d) is a cochain complex (degree $d = +1$), then the sh-Lie structure on V is given by skew symmetric linear maps $l_n : V^{\otimes n} \longrightarrow V$ of degree $2 - n$ that satisfy the same relations.

Let $\uparrow V$ denote the suspension of the graded vector space V ; i.e. $\uparrow V$ is the graded vector space with $(\uparrow V)_n = V_{n-1}$; similarly, let $\downarrow V$ denote the desuspension of V ; i.e. $(\downarrow V)_n = V_{n+1}$.

One may then describe an sh-Lie structure on the chain complex (V, d) by a coderivation \overline{D} of degree -1 on the coalgebra $\Lambda^*(\uparrow V)$ such that $\overline{D}^2 = 0$; similarly, an sh-Lie structure on the cochain complex (V, d) is a coderivation \overline{D} of degree $+1$ on the coalgebra $\Lambda^*(\downarrow V)$ such that $\overline{D}^2 = 0$. Equivalently, the sh-Lie structure may be described by a linear mapping $D : \Lambda^*(\downarrow V) \longrightarrow (\downarrow V)$ such that $D \circ \overline{D} = 0$. The proof of the assertion for chain complexes may be found in [LS93] and [Sta93]; a proof for cochain complexes can be formulated by a straightforward modification of the proof for chain complexes.

5. THE GAUGE ALGEBRA IS AN SH-LIE ALGEBRA

We now restrict our attention to the constant maps in $\text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi)$ and show that the algebraic structure of $\text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi)$ induces an sh-Lie structure on $\Xi \oplus \Phi$. Throughout this section we assume that Theorem 1 holds and consequently the bracket on $\text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi)$ defined by

$$[\pi_1, \pi_2] := \pi_1 \odot \hat{\delta}(\pi_2) - \pi_2 \odot \hat{\delta}(\pi_1) + \hat{C}(\pi_1, \pi_2)$$

satisfies the Jacobi identity. By definition,

$$[\delta(\xi), \delta(\eta)] = \delta(\xi) \odot \delta(\eta) - \delta(\eta) \odot \delta(\xi)$$

while the definition of C gives

$$[\delta(\xi), \delta(\eta)] = \delta C(\xi, \eta) \in \text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Phi),$$

so our *commutator relation* is

$$\delta(\xi) \odot \delta(\eta) - \delta(\eta) \odot \delta(\xi) = \delta(C(\xi, \eta)).$$

The definition of the bracket in $\text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi)$ restricted to constant maps takes on the form $[\xi_1, \xi_2] = C(\xi_1, \xi_2)$. Consequently, the Jacobi identity takes on the form

$$[C(\xi_1, \xi_2), \xi_3] - [C(\xi_1, \xi_3), \xi_2] + [C(\xi_2, \xi_3), \xi_1] = 0.$$

Let us examine the first term:

$$\begin{aligned} [C(\xi_1, \xi_2), \xi_3] &= \\ C(\xi_1, \xi_2) \odot \delta(\xi_3) - \xi_3 \odot \hat{\delta}C(\xi_1, \xi_2) + \hat{C}(C(\xi_1, \xi_2), \xi_3) &= \\ C(\xi_1, \xi_2) \odot \delta(\xi_3) + \hat{C}(C(\xi_1, \xi_2), \xi_3) & \end{aligned}$$

because $\xi_3 \odot \hat{\delta}C(\xi_1, \xi_2) = 0$ as ξ is a constant map (non-zero only on scalars). We now add together the results from the remaining two terms and write the *Jacobi relation* as

$$\begin{aligned} &C(\xi_1, \xi_2) \odot \delta(\xi_3) - C(\xi_1, \xi_3) \odot \delta(\xi_2) + C(\xi_2, \xi_3) \odot \delta(\xi_1) \\ &+ \hat{C}(C(\xi_1, \xi_2), \xi_3) - \hat{C}(C(\xi_1, \xi_3), \xi_2) + \hat{C}(C(\xi_2, \xi_3), \xi_1) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Define a differential graded vector space V with Ξ in degree 0, Φ in degree 1 and 0 in all other degrees. Take $\partial : \Xi \rightarrow \Phi$, given by $\partial(\xi) = \delta(\xi)(1) \in \Phi$, as the only non-trivial differential. Define

$$D : \Lambda^*(\downarrow V) \rightarrow \downarrow V$$

by

$$\begin{aligned} D(\xi) &= \partial(\xi) \\ D(\xi \wedge \phi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_n) &= \delta(\xi)(\phi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_n) \text{ for } n \geq 1 \\ D(\xi_1 \wedge \xi_2 \wedge \phi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_n) &= C(\xi_1, \xi_2)(\phi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_n) \end{aligned}$$

and $D = 0$ on elements of $\Lambda^*(\downarrow V)$ with more than two entries from Ξ or with no entry from Ξ .

Theorem 2. $D : \Lambda^*(\downarrow V) \rightarrow \downarrow V$ as defined above gives V the structure of an sh-Lie algebra.

Remark: We have tacitly assumed as hypothesis for this theorem that the bracket on $\text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi)$ satisfies the Jacobi identity. According to Theorem 1 this is true if $\hat{\delta}$ is injective. It is not difficult to prove that $\hat{\delta}$ is injective whenever δ is injective. The crucial property required by the space of gauge parameters is that the space of gauge symmetry mappings defined on Ξ should be in bijective correspondence with the Noether identities (called source constraints by Berends, Burgers and van Dam). In Berends, Burgers and van Dam , these gauge symmetry mappings are obtained from the components of δ . If we replace δ with the induced mapping from $\Xi/\ker(\delta)$ into $\text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Phi)$, one still has a bijection between the source constraints and the components of this new δ . Thus it is reasonable to replace Ξ by $\Xi/\ker(\delta)$ and consequently to assume that δ is injective. If we replace the original parameter space with the new parameter space $\Xi/\ker(\delta)$, one has the sh-Lie structure obtained in the proof below.

Proof. We need only evaluate $D \circ \bar{D}$ on elements of the form $(\xi_1 \wedge \xi_2 \wedge \phi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_n)$ and $(\xi_1 \wedge \xi_2 \wedge \xi_3 \wedge \phi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_n)$.

We begin with

$$\begin{aligned} D \circ \bar{D}(\xi_1 \wedge \xi_2 \wedge \phi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_n) &= \\ D\{ &\sum_{\sigma} \delta(\xi_1)(\phi_{\sigma(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\sigma(i)}) \wedge \xi_2 \wedge \phi_{\sigma(i+1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\sigma(n)} \\ &- \sum_{\tau} \delta(\xi_2)(\phi_{\tau(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\tau(j)}) \wedge \xi_1 \wedge \phi_{\tau(j+1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\tau(n)} \\ &+ \sum_{\rho} C(\xi_1, \xi_2)(\phi_{\rho(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\rho(k)}) \wedge \phi_{\rho(k+1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\rho(n)} \} \end{aligned}$$

where σ , τ and ρ are the evident unshuffles.

This composition is equal to

$$D\{ \sum_{\sigma} \xi_2 \wedge \delta(\xi_1)(\phi_{\sigma(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\sigma(i)}) \wedge \phi_{\sigma(i+1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\sigma(n)} \}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \sum_{\tau} \xi_1 \wedge \delta(\xi_2)(\phi_{\tau(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\tau(j)}) \wedge \phi_{\tau(j+1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\tau(n)} \\
& + \sum_{\rho} C(\xi_1, \xi_2)(\phi_{\rho(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\rho(k)}) \wedge \phi_{\rho(k+1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\rho(n)} \} \\
& = \sum_{\sigma} \delta(\xi_2)(\delta(\xi_1)(\phi_{\sigma(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\sigma(i)}) \wedge \phi_{\sigma(i+1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\sigma(n)}) \\
& - \sum_{\tau} \delta(\xi_1)(\delta(\xi_2)(\phi_{\tau(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\tau(j)}) \wedge \phi_{\tau(j+1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\tau(n)}) \\
& + \sum_{\rho} \hat{\delta}(C(\xi_1, \xi_2))(\phi_{\rho(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\rho(k)})(\phi_{\rho(k+1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\rho(n)})
\end{aligned}$$

which is equal to 0 by the commutator relation.

For the terms of the form $(\xi_1 \wedge \xi_2 \wedge \xi_3 \wedge \phi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_n)$, the only unshuffles that we need to consider are those that result in terms of the form

$$(\xi_i \wedge \phi_{\sigma(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\sigma(p)} \wedge \xi_j \wedge \xi_k \wedge \phi_{\sigma(p+1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\sigma(n)}) \text{ with } j < k$$

and

$$(\xi_i \wedge \xi_j \wedge \phi_{\tau(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\tau(q)} \wedge \xi_k \wedge \phi_{\tau(q+1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\tau(n)}) \text{ with } i < j.$$

Recall that when $i = 2$ in the first term and when $j = 3, k = 2$ in the second term, a coefficient of -1 must be introduced.

So we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& D \circ \bar{D}(\xi_1 \wedge \xi_2 \wedge \xi_3 \wedge \phi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_n) = \\
& D \{ \sum_{\sigma} \delta(\xi_i)(\phi_{\sigma(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\sigma(p)} \wedge \xi_j \wedge \xi_k \wedge \phi_{\sigma(p+1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\sigma(n)}) \\
& + \sum_{\tau} C(\xi_i, \xi_j)(\phi_{\tau(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\tau(q)}) \wedge \xi_k \wedge \phi_{\tau(q+1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\tau(n)} \} \\
& = D \{ \sum_{\sigma} \xi_j \wedge \xi_k \wedge \delta(\xi_i)(\phi_{\sigma(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\sigma(p)}) \wedge \phi_{\sigma(p+1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\sigma(n)} \\
& + \sum_{\tau} C(\xi_i, \xi_j)(\phi_{\tau(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\tau(q)}) \wedge \xi_k \wedge \phi_{\tau(q+1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\tau(n)} \} \\
& = \sum_{\sigma} C(\xi_i, \xi_j)(\delta(\xi_i)(\phi_{\sigma(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\sigma(p)}) \wedge \phi_{\sigma(p+1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\sigma(n)}) \\
& + \sum_{\tau} C(C(\xi_i, \xi_j)(\phi_{\tau(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\tau(q)}), \xi_k)(\phi_{\tau(q+1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{\tau(n)})
\end{aligned}$$

which, after expanding the i, j, k terms of the unshuffles along with the signs mentioned above, is seen to equal the Jacobi relation, and hence is equal to 0. \square

6. THE CLASSICAL STRICT LIE CASE

We examine the classical case in which Ξ is a Lie algebra and Φ is a Lie module over Ξ . Let us denote the action of Ξ on Φ by $\xi \cdot \phi$. We assume that we have a linear map $\partial : \Xi \rightarrow \Phi$ that interacts with the Lie module structure as follows:

$$\partial[\xi, \eta]_{\Xi} = \xi \cdot (\partial\eta) + \eta \cdot (\partial\xi)$$

where we have denoted the Lie bracket on Ξ by $[\cdot, \cdot]_{\Xi}$. As usual the Lie bracket on $V = \Xi \oplus \Phi$ is given by

$$(1) \quad [x, y]_V = \begin{cases} [x, y]_{\Xi} & \text{for } x, y \in \Xi \\ x \cdot y & \text{for } x \in \Xi, y \in \Phi \\ 0 & \text{for } x, y \in \Phi. \end{cases}$$

Similarly denote the Lie bracket on $Hom(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Phi)$ by $[\cdot, \cdot]_{Hom(\Phi)}$, and on $Hom(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi)$ by $[\cdot, \cdot]_{Hom(\Xi)}$.

Notice that this case is typical of the gauge structure which arises in fundamental physical theories such as Yang-Mills theory and basic gravitational theories. For the Yang-Mills case, the parameter space Ξ is the set of all smooth functions from the space-time M into the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} of the structure group G of the theory (for convenience we assume that the principal bundle of the theory is trivial). The Lie bracket on the parameter space is the point-wise bracket of two such parameters. The fields of Yang-Mills theory are \mathfrak{g} -valued one-forms on M . Note that Berends, Burgers and van Dam denote the action of Ξ on Φ by $\{A, \Lambda\}$ (for $A \in \Phi, \Lambda \in \Xi$) rather than the notation $\Lambda \cdot A$ used above. In this case $\delta(\Lambda)(A)$ is simply the covariant derivative of A relative to the connection A .

Similarly, when the Einstein-Hilbert action is utilized, the parameter space is the Lie-algebra of all vector fields ξ on the space-time manifold M . Again, in Berends, Burgers and van Dam, the background metric η (Minkowski) is presumed and general metrics are written in the form $\eta + h$ for an appropriate symmetric tensor h . Thus the fields of the theory are symmetric tensors h . The action of a parameter ξ on a field h is the Lie derivative of h relative to the vector field ξ . The function δ is given by

$$(\delta h)_{\mu\nu} = \partial_{\mu}\xi_{\nu} + \partial_{\nu}\xi_{\mu} + [(\partial_{\rho}h_{\mu\nu})\xi^{\rho} - h_{\rho\mu}(\partial^{\rho}\xi_{\nu}) - h_{\rho\nu}(\partial^{\rho}\xi_{\mu})].$$

Details of these two standard examples may be found in Burgers' dissertation [Bur85].

Notice that using a bracket notation for the action similar to that in Berends, Burgers and van Dam, $\xi \cdot \phi = [\xi, \phi]_V$; the requirement

that the bracket be a chain map with respect to ∂ is simply $\partial[\xi, \eta]_V = [\xi, \partial\eta]_V + [\eta, \partial\xi]_V$. (We already require that $[\cdot, \cdot]_V$ restrict to $[\cdot, \cdot]_\Xi$.)

Let us define the "gauge transformation" $\delta : \Xi \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Phi)$ by

$$(2) \quad \delta(\xi)(\phi) = \begin{cases} \partial\xi & \text{for } \phi = 1 \\ \xi \cdot \phi & \text{for } \phi \in \Lambda^1\Phi = \Phi \\ 0 & \text{for } \phi = \phi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_n \in \Lambda^n\Phi, n > 1. \end{cases}$$

Extend δ to $\hat{\delta} : \text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Phi)$ by $\hat{\delta}(\pi)(\phi) = \delta(\pi(\phi_1))(\phi_2) = \partial\pi(\phi)$ if $\phi_2 = 1$, $\pi(\phi_1) \cdot \phi_2$ if $\phi_2 \in \Lambda^1\Phi$, and 0 otherwise. Here, ϕ denotes an arbitrary element of $\Lambda^*\Phi$ and $\Delta(\phi) = \sum \phi_1 \otimes \phi_2$.

The canonical bracket on $\text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi)$ that is induced by $\hat{\delta}$ and defined below will not satisfy the Jacobi identity in general. This bracket is given by

$$[\pi_1, \pi_2]_{\text{Hom}(\Xi)}(\phi) = \pi_1 \circ \overline{\hat{\delta}(\pi_2)}(\phi) - \pi_2 \circ \overline{\hat{\delta}(\pi_1)}(\phi).$$

Here, $\overline{\hat{\delta}(\pi)}(\phi) = \hat{\delta}(\pi)(\phi_1) \wedge \phi_2 = \delta(\pi(\phi_{11}))(\phi_{12}) \wedge \phi_2$, and

$$(3) \quad \delta(\pi(\phi_{11}))(\phi_{12}) \wedge \phi_2 = \begin{cases} \partial(\pi(\phi_1) \wedge \phi_2) & \text{if } \phi_{12} = 1 \\ \pi(\phi_{11}) \cdot \phi_{12} \wedge \phi_2 & \text{if } \phi_{12} \in \Lambda^1\Phi \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In particular, if $\pi(\phi) = \xi(\phi)$ is defined to be the map with value ξ when $\phi = 1 \in k$ and 0 otherwise, then for $\phi = \sum(\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2)$,

$$(4) \quad \overline{\hat{\delta}(\xi)}(\phi) = \begin{cases} \partial\xi \wedge \phi_2 = \partial\xi \wedge \phi & \text{if } \phi_1 = 1 \\ (\xi \cdot \phi_1) \wedge \phi_2 & \text{if } \phi_1 \in \Lambda^1\Phi \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and so in $\text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi)$, the bracket

$$[\xi, \eta]_{\text{Hom}(\Phi)}(\phi) = (\xi \circ \overline{\hat{\delta}(\eta)})(\phi) - (\eta \circ \overline{\hat{\delta}(\xi)})(\phi) = 0$$

because the coderivations in the definition of the bracket have image in $\Lambda^n\Phi$ with $n > 0$.

It is important to note that the bracket on $\text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi)$ does not restrict to the original bracket on Ξ except in the abelian case; we must introduce the "correction" term C .

We continue with our construction and introduce the map

$$C : \Xi \otimes \Xi \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Xi)$$

by defining $C(\xi, \eta)(\phi) = [\xi, \eta]_\Xi$ if $\phi = 1$ and 0 otherwise. Here, $[\cdot, \cdot]_\Xi$ is the original Lie bracket on Ξ . Next, we must check that $\hat{\delta}C(\xi, \eta) = [\hat{\delta}(\xi), \hat{\delta}(\eta)]_{\text{Hom}(\Phi)}$.

So for $\phi \in \Lambda^*\Phi$, we have

$$(5) \quad \hat{\delta}C(\xi, \eta)(\phi) = \begin{cases} \partial[\xi, \eta]_{\Xi} & \text{if } \phi = 1 \\ [\xi, \eta]_{\Xi} \cdot \phi & \text{if } \phi \in \Lambda^1\Phi \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} & [\hat{\delta}(\xi), \hat{\delta}(\eta)]_{Hom(\Phi)}(\phi) = (\hat{\delta}(\xi) \circ \overline{\hat{\delta}(\eta)} - \hat{\delta}(\eta) \circ \overline{\hat{\delta}(\xi)})(\phi) \\ & = \begin{cases} \hat{\delta}(\xi)(\partial\eta \wedge \phi_2) - \hat{\delta}(\eta)(\partial\xi \wedge \phi_2) & \text{if } \phi_1 = 1 \\ \hat{\delta}(\xi)((\eta \cdot \phi_1) \wedge \phi_2) - \hat{\delta}(\eta)((\xi \cdot \phi_1) \wedge \phi_2) & \text{if } \phi_1 \in \Lambda^1\Phi \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

The first term is non-zero only if $\phi_2 = 1$ in which case $\phi = 1$ and we have $\xi \cdot (\partial\eta) - \eta \cdot (\partial\xi)$ which is equal to $\partial[\xi, \eta]_{\Xi}$ by our original assumption on ∂ . The second term is non-zero only for $\phi_2 = 1$ and $\phi_1 \in \Lambda^1\Phi$ and is then equal to $\xi \cdot (\eta \cdot \phi) - \eta \cdot (\xi \cdot \phi)$ which in turn is equal to $[\xi, \eta] \cdot \phi$ by the Lie module action of Ξ on Φ . Thus the BBvD hypothesis is satisfied.

Now we apply our Theorem 2 above to impose an sh Lie structure on the graded vector space $V = \Xi, \Phi$. It is easy to see that our construction gives back the usual Lie algebra structure on the graded vector space V .

7. A Σ -MODEL EXAMPLE

Field dependent gauge symmetries appear in several field theories including the class due to Ikeda [Ike94] and Schaller and Strobl [SS94] and employed by Cattaneo and Felder [CF99] to implement Kontsevich's deformation quantization [Kon97] referred to above. As throughout our paper, we denote the space of fields of a given physical theory by Φ and the space of gauge parameters by Ξ .

In Ikeda's paper [Ike94], there is a finite dimensional vector space M with basis $\{T_A\}$. In our analysis of Ikeda's example, the space Φ consists of all ordered pairs (ϕ, h) where:

- (1) ϕ is a mapping from a two-dimensional manifold Σ into the dual M^* of the vector space M , and
- (2) h is a mapping from the same manifold Σ to $T^*\Sigma \otimes M$, which in fact is required to be a section of the vector bundle $T^*\Sigma \otimes M \longrightarrow \Sigma$. These mappings are denoted locally by $\phi(x) = \phi_A(x)T^A$ and $h(x) = h_\mu^A(dx^\mu \otimes T_A)$, where $\{T_A\}$ is a basis of M and $\{T^A\}$ the basis of M^* dual to $\{T_A\}$.

For the most part, our exposition follows that of Ikeda, even to the point of using a similar notation (ϕ, h) for the fields of the theory. On the other hand, there is a parallel development in Cattaneo and Felder [CF99] in which Σ is a 2-dimensional disc and M is an arbitrary Poisson manifold. It is not hard to see that the ordered pairs (ϕ, h) of Ikeda may in fact be interpreted in a manner similar to that in the exposition of Cattaneo and Felder where $\phi : \Sigma \rightarrow M$ is an arbitrary smooth mapping (denoted by X in Cattaneo and Felder) and h is a section (denoted by η in Cattaneo and Felder) of the bundle $\phi^*(T^*M) \otimes T^*\Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ (notice that the factors in their tensor product are reversed from the conventions used in our description of Ikeda's results). In their exposition the section h may be written as $h(x) = h_{i,\mu}(x)(dx^i \otimes du^\mu)$ where $\{dx^i\}$ is a basis of $T_{\phi(x)}^*M$; which in the case M is a vector space may be identified with a fixed basis $\{T_A\}$ of $T_0^*M = M^*$.

When one compares these two approaches, one sees that for Ikeda M is a vector space while Σ is an arbitrary 2-dimensional manifold, whereas for Cattaneo and Felder Σ is a disc and M is a general Poisson manifold. The parallel between the two is closer than one might initially expect since Ikeda uses the vector space M to generate a Poisson-type structure on a space of polynomials in the variables $\{T_A\}$.

Let \mathcal{P} denote the commutative polynomial algebra generated by the basis $\{T_A\}$. The space of gauge parameters of Ikeda's theory is the linear space Ξ of all maps c from the manifold Σ into the vector space $M \subset \mathcal{P}$. The gauge symmetry mapping δ is defined locally, in this theory, as follows. Let π_A, π_μ^A denote the projections defined by $\pi_A(\phi, h) = \pi_A(\phi) = \phi_A$ and $\pi_\mu^A(\phi, h) = \pi_\mu^A(h) = h_\mu^A$, respectively. Choose polynomials $\{W_{AB}\}$ in \mathcal{P} and define the components of $\delta(c)(\phi, h)$ by

$$\pi_\mu^A(\delta(c)(\phi, h)) = \partial_\mu c^A + \frac{\partial W_{BD}(\phi)}{\partial T_A} h_\mu^B c^D$$

and

$$\pi_A(\delta(c)(\phi, h)) = W_{BA}(\phi) c^B.$$

Notice that, in case $W_{AB}(T) = f_{AB}^C T_C$, the polynomials W_{AB} define an ordinary Lie algebra structure on the vector space M with structure constants $\{f_{AB}^C\}$. This then induces a Lie algebra structure on the parameter space of all mappings c from Σ into M , as one expects in traditional Yang-Mills theory. In this case, the ϕ -component of $\delta(c)$ is the coadjoint action of the parameter space on the space of maps from Σ into M^* , while the h -component is simply the covariant derivative of c relative to the connection defined by the gauge field h . Thus, by introducing more general polynomials W_{AB} , Ikeda is introducing a

generalization of ordinary gauge theory by requiring that the gauge symmetries be defined via the polynomials W_{AB} . Further structure on these polynomials is required for this generalization to work; this will be discussed below.

In the physical theories we are discussing, our space $Hom(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Phi)$ should be identified with the space of all polynomials in the fields. Thus elements f of $Hom(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Phi)$ are identified with functions of the form: $\psi \longrightarrow f(\psi, \psi, \dots, \psi)$, where ψ is an element of the space of fields Φ . Consequently, in our application we restrict our attention to a subspace in which the ϕ -dependence is restricted to the space of all polynomials in the components of ϕ . For each $c \in \Xi$, $\delta(c)$ is a polynomial in the fields ϕ and thus is in the space $Hom(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Phi)$. Now Φ is an infinite dimensional vector space and with any reasonable topology one can identify the tangent space of Φ at a point $\psi \in \Phi$ with Φ itself. Thus maps from Φ into Φ may be regarded as vector fields on Φ . In particular, since $\delta(c)(\psi)$ is a polynomial in ψ , we can identify it with a vector field. The usual Lie bracket of the vector fields $\delta(c_1), \delta(c_2)$ turns out to be the negative of the bracket defined by Ikeda. On the other hand, our Lie structure on the space $Hom(\Lambda^*\Phi, \Phi)$ can be identified with the usual Lie bracket of vector fields. Thus our Lie structure is the negative of Ikeda's.

Using his brackets, Ikeda finds that the ϕ component of $[\delta(c_1), \delta(c_2)](\phi, h)$ is given by

$$[\delta(c_1), \delta(c_2)](\phi) = \delta(c_3(\phi))(\phi)$$

where

$$\pi_A(c_3(\phi)) = \frac{\partial W_{BD}}{\partial T_A}(\phi) c_1^B c_2^D.$$

To express the the h -component of $[\delta(c_1), \delta(c_2)](\phi, h)$, Ikeda makes the definition

$$D_\mu \phi_A = \partial_\mu \phi_A + W_{AB}(\phi) h_\mu^B.$$

(The resemblance to a covariant derivative is formal; it does not arise in an obvious manner from a “representation” of the nonlinear Lie algebra defined by Ikeda.) He then calculates

$$(7) \quad [\delta(c_1), \delta(c_2)](h) = \delta(c_3(\phi))(h) - \frac{\partial^2 W_{CD}}{\partial \phi_A \partial \phi_B} (D_\mu \phi_B) c_1^C c_2^D T_A.$$

We see that the Lie bracket of $[\delta(c_1), \delta(c_2)]$ is not of the form $\delta(c)$ where c is a gauge parameter independent of the fields (ϕ, h) but rather the gauge parameter c depends on c_1, c_2 and on the field ϕ . Thus one does not have closure on the original space of gauge parameters. We are forced to either enlarge the space of gauge parameters to include

mappings from Φ into M or to extend the gauge algebra to an sh-Lie algebra on a graded structure with Ξ in degree zero as we do below. When closure on the original space of M -valued gauge parameters is lost, physicists speak of an ‘open algebra’.

In order to obtain an algebraic structure on \mathcal{P} analogous to the usual Lie structure required in gauge theory, Ikeda defines a bracket on \mathcal{P} by

$$[T_A, T_B] = W_{AB} \in \mathcal{P}$$

and requires that these polynomials satisfy conditions which generalize the usual properties of a Lie algebra. Thus the polynomials $\{W_{AB}\}$ in \mathcal{P} are subject to skew-symmetry: $W_{AB} = -W_{BA}$ and an appropriate generalization of the Jacobi condition:

$$W_{AB} \frac{\partial W_{CD}}{\partial T_D} + W_{BC} \frac{\partial W_{AD}}{\partial T_D} + W_{CA} \frac{\partial W_{BD}}{\partial T_D} = 0.$$

The Lie product is then extended to all of \mathcal{P} by requiring that $[T_A, \cdot]$ and $[\cdot, T_A]$ act as derivations of the polynomial product. Consequently, the commutative algebra \mathcal{P} acquires a Lie-like structure which is in some sense more general than the usual notion of a Poisson algebra; the structure reduces to a Poisson algebra in the special case when $W_{AB} = f_{AB}^C T_C$ where $\{f_{AB}^C\}$ are the structure constants of a Lie algebra.

The Lagrangian of Ikeda’s theory is

$$\mathcal{L} = \epsilon^{\mu\nu} \{ h_\mu^A D_\nu \phi_A - \frac{1}{2} W_{AB}(\phi) h_\mu^A h_\nu^B \}.$$

This includes self-interacting terms for the generalized gauge fields h along with a minimal coupling of the scalar field ϕ through the generalized covariant derivative defined by

$$D_\mu \phi_A = \partial_\mu \phi_A + W_{AB}(\phi) h_\mu^B.$$

The tensor $\epsilon^{\mu\nu}$ is the area element which is assumed to be present on M and $W_{AB}(\phi)$ is a concise notation for the polynomial W_{AB} evaluated by replacing the generators $\{T_A\}$ by the corresponding components $\{\phi_A\}$ of ϕ . Ikeda really works with an equivalent Lagrangian which differs from the one given above by a divergence, although the physical content of the Lagrangian defined above is clearer.

Ikeda shows that for his equivalent Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(\phi, h, \partial\phi, \partial h)$, the function $\delta(c)(\mathcal{L})$ is a divergence for all parameters c . This is precisely the property physicists require in order to call δ a gauge symmetry.

The field equations of the Lagrangian are

$$D_\mu \phi_A = 0 \quad R_{\mu\nu}^A = 0$$

where $R_{\mu\nu}^A$ is the “generalized” curvature

$$R_{\mu\nu}^A = \partial_\mu h_\nu^A - \partial_\nu h_\mu^A + \frac{\partial W_{BC}}{\partial T_A}(\phi) h_\mu^B h_\nu^C$$

of the “generalized gauge field” $h = h_\mu^A(dx^\mu \otimes T_A)$.

It follows from equation 7 that

$$[\delta(c_1), \delta(c_2)]((\phi, h)) = \delta(c_3(\phi))(\phi, h)$$

for all (ϕ, h) satisfying the field equations $D_\mu \phi = 0$. Thus there exists a mapping $c_3 : \Phi \longrightarrow M$ such that the gauge symmetry mapping δ has the property that for fields $\psi \in \Phi$

$$[\delta(c_1), \delta(c_2)](\psi) = \delta(c_3(\psi))(\psi)$$

on shell.

This latter property is the one we have referred to above as the BBvD hypothesis.

A similar analysis applies to the Lagrangian of Cataneo and Felder. Thus Ikeda and Cataneo and Felder provide examples of field theories which satisfy the BBvD hypothesis “on shell.” It is this condition which we have assumed in our work above and which allows one to obtain an sh-Lie structure from the gauge structures of field theories of this kind.

REFERENCES

- [BBvD84] F.A. Berends, G.J.H. Burgers, and H. van Dam, *On spin three selfinteractions*, Z. Phys. C **24** (1984), 247–254.
- [BBvD85] F.A. Berends, G.J.H. Burgers, and H. van Dam, *On the theoretical problems in constructing interactions involving higher spin massless particles*, Nucl.Phys.B **260** (1985), 295–322.
- [BBvD86] F.A. Berends, G.J.H. Burgers, and H. van Dam, *Explicit construction of conserved currents for massless fields of arbitrary spin*, Nucl.Phys.B **271** (1986), 429–441.
- [Bur85] G.J.H. Burgers, *On the construction of field theories for higher spin massless particles*, Ph.D. thesis, Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden, 1985.
- [CF99] A. Cattaneo and G. Felder, *A path integral approach to the Kontsevich quantization formula*, [math.QA/9902090](#), 1999.
- [Ger62] M. Gerstenhaber, *The cohomology structure of an associative ring*, Ann. Math. **78** (1962), 267–288.
- [Ike94] N. Ikeda, *Two-dimensional gravity and nonlinear gauge theory*, Ann. Phys. **235** (1994), 435–464.
- [Kon97] M. Kontsevich, *Deformation quantization of Poisson manifolds, I*, preprint, IHES, 1997, [hep-th/9709040](#).
- [LM95] T. Lada and M. Markl, *Strongly homotopy Lie algebras*, Comm. in Algebra (1995), 2147–2161.
- [LS93] T. Lada and J.D. Stasheff, *Introduction to sh Lie algebras for physicists*, Intern’l J. Theor. Phys. **32** (1993), 1087–1103.

- [SS94] P. Schaller and T. Strobl, *Poisson structure induced (topological) field theories*, Modern Phys. Lett. A **9** (1994), 3129–3136.
- [Sta93] J. D. Stasheff, *The intrinsic bracket on the deformation complex of an associative algebra*, JPAA **89** (1993), 231–235, Festschrift in Honor of Alex Heller.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY, RALEIGH
NC 27695

E-mail address: fulp@eos.ncsu.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY, RALEIGH
NC 27695

E-mail address: lada@math.ncsu.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAPEL
HILL, NC 27599-3250, USA

E-mail address: jds@math.unc.edu