Local, global, divergent – which gauge symmetries are redundant?

T. A. Larsson
Vanadisvägen 29, S-113 23 Stockholm, Sweden
email: thomas.larsson@hdd.se

December 16, 2017

Abstract

A local gauge symmetry can not possibly be a mere redundancy of the description, provided that

1. charge is nonzero.
2. we also consider divergent gauge transformations, whose brackets with local transformations contain global charge operators.

If these conditions hold, unitarity requires the existence of gauge anomalies. We describe the relevant multi-dimensional generalization of affine Kac-Moody algebras, explain why it only arises if the observer's trajectory is explicitly introduced, and contrast it to the Mickelsson-Faddeev algebra which pertains to chiral-fermion type anomalies.

Gauge symmetries are widely considered as mere redundancies of the description rather than as genuine physical symmetries, and hence all physical states must be gauge invariant. However, this statement needs qualification. Clearly it can only apply to local gauge symmetries; global gauge generators include the charge operators, which act nontrivially on charged states. Thus the claim is that local gauge symmetries act trivially whereas global ones do not, at least in the presence of charge.

However, there is a well-known counterexample. The free classical string has a conformal gauge symmetry, but after quantization it is transformed into a conventional, non-gauge symmetry, which acts nontrivially on the physical Hilbert space, except if $D = 26$, due to conformal anomalies. It is not always appreciated that also the subcritical ($D < 26$) free string is a consistent theory; according to the no-ghost theorem, the inner product is positive definite and the action of the Virasoro algebra is unitary [1], despite the nonzero central charge $c = D$. We are thus led to ask why the gauge symmetries in string theory are different from those in other gauge theories.

An infinitesimal gauge transformation (of Yang-Mills type, say) is a function valued in a finite-dimensional Lie algebra. The crucial question is: which class of functions? In particular, we need to know the behavior when the distance from the origin $r \to \infty$. Assume that a function behaves like r^n. We can then distinguish between three classes of gauge transformations:

- Local, $n < 0$.
- Global, $n = 0$.
- Divergent, $n > 0$.

If we only consider local and global transformations, then the local transformations generate an ideal and the situation is what we expect: local transformations act trivially, global do not. However, if we also consider divergent transformations, the local transformations no longer generate an ideal and it is not possible to represent them trivially. This is because

$$[Local, Divergent] = Global + more,$$

and the RHS is necessarily nonzero for nonzero charge. The best we can do is to introduce some ground states which are annihilated by the local subalgebra, and let the divergent generators be creation operators.

We can also consider gauge transformations with compact support, i.e. there is some $R < \infty$ such that the functions vanish identically whenever $r > R$. Informally, we may think that such gauge transformations behave like $r^{-\infty}$. Hence they annihilate every state built from finitely many creation operators, so gauge transformations with compact support do indeed act trivially, even when divergent gauge transformations are taken into account. In contrast, those which vanish at infinity, without being identically zero for all $r > R$, can not act trivially in the presence of charge.

Let us rephrase this argument in more formal terms. Consider for definiteness Yang-Mills theory in flat space, whose gauge symmetries generate the algebra $\mathcal{G} = \mathfrak{map}(\mathbb{R}^3, \dot{\mathfrak{g}})$ of maps from 3-dimensional flat space $\mathbb{R}^3$ to some finite-dimensional Lie algebra $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}$. $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}$ is defined by generators J^a and brackets $[J^a, J^b] = i f^{ab}{}_c J^c$. The brackets in $\mathcal{G}$ read

$$[\mathcal{J}^a(\mathbf{x}), \mathcal{J}^b(\mathbf{y})] = i f^{ab}{}_c \mathcal{J}^c(\mathbf{x}) \delta^3(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}), \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Alternatively, we can consider the smeared generators $\mathcal{J}_X = \int d^3x X_a(\mathbf{x}) \mathcal{J}^a(\mathbf{x})$, where $X_a(\mathbf{x})$ are smooth functions on $\mathbb{R}^3$. $\mathcal{G}$ then takes the form $[\mathcal{J}_X, \mathcal{J}_Y] = \mathcal{J}_{[X,Y]}$, where $[X, Y] = i f^{ab}{}_c X_a Y_b J^c$.

$\mathcal{G}$ acts on fields over $\mathbb{R}^3$ valued in some $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}$ representation R:

$$[\mathcal{J}_X, \psi(\mathbf{x})] = X_a(\mathbf{x}) R(J^a) \psi(\mathbf{x}). \tag{2}$$

$\dot{\mathfrak{g}}$ can be identified with the $\mathbf{x}$-independent subalgebra of $\mathcal{G}$. In particular, the generators H^i of the Cartan subalgebra (CSA) constitute a complete set of commuting charges Q^i: $[H^i, \psi(\mathbf{x})] = Q^i \psi(\mathbf{x})$. If $\psi(\mathbf{x})$ is a charged field, the CSA, and thus $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}$ itself, clearly acts nontrivially on the Hilbert space. Let $\mathcal{G}_n = \{\mathcal{J}_X \in \mathcal{G} : \exists c < \infty, \text{ such that } |X_a(\mathbf{x})| < c|\mathbf{x}|^n, \ \forall a \text{ and } \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3\}$. In other words, $\mathcal{G}_n$ consists of gauge transformations which do not grow faster than $|\mathbf{x}|^n$ when $\mathbf{x} \to \infty$. There is a filtration

$$\mathcal{G}_{-\infty} \subset \ldots \subset \mathcal{G}_{-1} \subset \mathcal{G}_0 \subset \mathcal{G}_1 \subset \ldots \subset \mathcal{G}_\infty = \mathcal{G}, \tag{3}$$

where $[\mathcal{G}_m, \mathcal{G}_n] \subset \mathcal{G}_{m+n}$. Hence $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$ is the subalgebra of local gauge transformations and $\mathcal{G}_0$ the subalgebra of local+global transformations. We also consider the associated grading with $\mathfrak{g}_n = \mathcal{G}_n / \mathcal{G}_{n-1}$:

$$\mathcal{G} = \ldots + \mathfrak{g}_{-2} + \mathfrak{g}_{-1} + \mathfrak{g}_0 + \mathfrak{g}_1 + \mathfrak{g}_2 + \ldots, \tag{4}$$

where $[\mathfrak{g}_m, \mathfrak{g}_n] = \mathfrak{g}_{m+n}$. $\mathfrak{g}_0$ can clearly be identified with $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}$.

The CSA belongs to $\mathfrak{g}_0$, and hence $\mathfrak{g}_0$ can not act trivially on the Hilbert space. Since $[\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{g}_{-n}] = \mathfrak{g}_0$, the physical Hilbert space necessarily carries a nontrivial representation of the algebra of local gauge transformations in $\mathcal{G}_{-n}$. In contrast, if we restrict attention to the local+global algebra $\mathcal{G}_0$, nothing prevents the local subalgebra $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$ from acting trivially.

We can rephrase our argument using the language of induced representations. Given a $\mathfrak{g}_0$ representation R, we first extend it to a representation of the open algebra $\mathcal{G}_0$, also denoted by R, by setting the restriction of R to $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$ to zero. We then consider the induced $\mathcal{G}$ representation $Ind^{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{G}_0}(R)$. The restriction of $Ind^{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{G}_0}(R)$ to $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$ is nontrivial even though the restriction of R is trivial. It is important to note that $\mathcal{G}$ will in general contain an extension for unitarity.

More explicitly, assume that we can expand all relevant functions in a suitable basis, say powers of r times spherical harmonics:

$$J^a_{n,\ell,m} = r^n Y_{\ell,m}(\theta,\varphi) J^a. \tag{5}$$

The important issue is the behavior when $r \to \infty$. $J^a_{-n,\ell,m}$ are regular when $r \to \infty$, but have a pole at $r = 0$. This pole is irrelevant for the discussion here. It is straightforward to construct everywhere smooth functions with any prescribed behavior at infinity, but when we expand functions in the basis above, we make the additional assumption that the functions are not just smooth but real-analytic. A real-analytic function with a zero at infinity necessarily has poles somewhere else; hence the spurious poles at the origin.

Since the spherical harmonics form a basis for functions of θ and φ, there are coefficients $C^{\ell''}_{\ell,\ell'}$ such that

$$Y_{\ell,m}(\theta,\varphi) Y_{\ell',m'}(\theta,\varphi) = \sum_{\ell''=|\ell-\ell'|}^{\ell+\ell'} C^{\ell''}_{\ell,\ell'} Y_{\ell'',m+m'}(\theta,\varphi). \tag{6}$$

The $J^a_{n,\ell,m}$ satisfy the algebra

$$[J^a_{n,\ell,m}, J^b_{n',\ell',m'}] = i f^{ab}{}_c \sum_{\ell''=|\ell-\ell'|}^{\ell+\ell'} C^{\ell''}_{\ell,\ell'} J^c_{n+n',\ell'',m+m'}. \tag{7}$$

In particular

$$[J^a_{n,0,0}, J^b_{-n,0,0}] = i f^{ab}{}_c J^c_{0,0,0}. \tag{8}$$

Since $J^a_{0,0,0} = J^a$ can be identified with the generators of the finite-dimensional algebra $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}$, it acts nontrivially on the charged Hilbert space. We conclude that both $J^a_{n,0,0}$ and $J^b_{-n,0,0}$ also act nontrivially, despite the fact that the latter is a local gauge transformation which vanishes at infinity.

To avoid the spurious pole at $r = 0$, we must employ functions that are everywhere smooth and invertible, and still decay when $r \to \infty$. As an example, consider

$$f(r) = \begin{cases} 1 & r \leqslant 1 \\ 1 - \exp(-1/(r-1)) & r > 1 \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

This function is infinitely differentiable at $r = 1$, since $\exp(-1/(r-1))$ vanishes faster than any polynomial in $1/(r-1)$ when $r \to 1$. Moreover, $f(r) \approx 1/r$ goes to zero when $r \to \infty$, so $J^a_f = f(r)J^a$ generates a local gauge transformation. However, because of the non-analyticity at $r = 1$, we cannot expand J^a_f in the basis (5). The function $f(r)$ has the inverse

$$g(r) = \begin{cases} 1 & r \leqslant 1 \\ \Big[1 - \exp(-1/(r-1))\Big]^{-1} & r > 1 \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

The corresponding operator $J^a_g = g(r)J^a$ is everywhere smooth and well-defined, although it diverges linearly when $r \to \infty$; it is thus a divergent gauge transformation. Clearly,

$$[J^a_f, J^b_g] = if^{ab}{}_c J^c, \tag{11}$$

where J^c is the every constant generator of global charge. Hence J^a_f, which generates a local, everywhere smooth gauge transformation can not be represented trivially if the charge operator J^c is nonzero.

We note that (7) has the subalgebra

$$[J^a_{n,0,0}, J^b_{n',0,0}] = if^{ab}{}_c J^c_{n+n',0,0}, \tag{12}$$

isomorphic to a centerless affine algebra. It is well known that the only proper unitary lowest-weight representation of this algebra is the trivial one, for which the charge operator $J^a_{0,0,0} = 0$. In any unitary representation with nonzero charge, (12) acquires a central extension, and hence the full algebra (7) is also anomalous[1]. *Unitarity and nonzero charge imply anomalies.*

Note the complete analogy with string theory. A basis for a current algebra on the world sheet is given by $J^a_n = z^n J^a$, $-\infty < n < \infty$, which classically satisfies the algebra

$$[J^a_m, J^b_n] = if^{ab}{}_c J^c_{m+n}. \tag{13}$$

---

[1] This argument is not watertight. If we relax the condition that the restriction should be of lowest-weight type, there are unitary representations with zero central charge, e.g. the direct sum of a highest- and a lowest-energy representation.

This algebra is isomorphic to (12). In particular, (13) is a classical gauge symmetry, because a nilpotent BRST operator can always be constructed classically; anomalies only arise after quantization. If we additionally require unitarity, it is well known that the charge generators J^a_0 can not be nonzero on the quantum level, unless the algebra acquires an anomaly, turning it into an affine Kac-Moody algebra:

$$[J^a_m, J^b_n] = if^{ab}{}_c J^c_{m+n} + km\delta^{ab}\delta_{m+n}, \tag{14}$$

where δ^{ab} is the Killing metric. By the same token, unitarity and nonzero charge also lead to the Kac-Moody-like extension of the higher-dimensional current algebra, also known as a toroidal algebra [8, 2]:

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{J}_X, \mathcal{J}_Y] &= \mathcal{J}_{[X,Y]} + \frac{k}{2\pi i}\delta^{ab} \int dt\ \dot{q}^k(t)\partial_k X_a(\mathbf{q}(t))Y_b(\mathbf{q}(t)), \\ [\mathcal{J}_X, q^i(t)] &= [q^i(t), q^j(t)] = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

One might argue that transformations with nontrivial behavior at infinity take us to another superselection sector, which quantum mechanically is disconnected from the original theory. Since different superselection sectors are completely disconnected, we might as well restrict to a single sector and forget about all the others. However, this argument begs the question: why is string theory different? It is undeniable that in string theory, we consider gauge generators which diverge at $z = \infty$, both in the Kac-Moody case (13) and in the Virasoro case.

A more fruitful viewpoint is that the different superselection sectors are twisted versions of the original gauge theory. The untwisted theory is invariant under local gauge transformations, whereas a divergent transformation takes us to a twisted theory which is not gauge invariant; instead, there is a local gauge transformation which takes us back to the untwisted theory. Demanding that not just the untwisted theory, but the whole tower of twisted theories over it, behaves consistently under arbitrary local+global+divergent gauge transformations is a highly nontrivial constraint, which can potentially be used for theory selection.

We can map the situation to a lowest-weight module as follows:

untwisted theory ⇔ ground state
twisted theory ⇔ excited state
local gauge transformation ⇔ lowering operator
global gauge transformation ⇔ Cartan subalgebra
divergent gauge transformation ⇔ raising operator

That a gauge symmetry is a redundancy now becomes the statement that a lowering operator annihilates the ground state. While true, this is quite uninteresting, because it ignores all raising operators and excited states.

An important clarification is necessary. The algebra (15) defines a gauge anomaly in the sense that it is a cohomologically nontrivial extension of the algebra of gauge transformations. However, this extension is unrelated to conventional gauge anomalies which may arise when chiral fermions are coupled to gauge fields. The latter type of anomaly is described by a Mickelsson-Faddeev algebra [7]:

$$\begin{aligned}
[\mathcal{J}_X, \mathcal{J}_Y] &= \mathcal{J}_{[X,Y]} + \epsilon^{ijk} d^{abc} \int d^3x\ \partial_i X_a(\mathbf{x}) \partial_j Y_b(\mathbf{x}) A_{ck}(\mathbf{x}), \\
[\mathcal{J}_X, A_{ai}(\mathbf{x})] &= i f^{bc}{}_a X_b(\mathbf{x}) A_{ci}(\mathbf{x}) + \partial_i X_a(\mathbf{x}), \qquad (16) \\
[A_{ai}(\mathbf{x}), A_{bj}(\mathbf{y})] &= 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where d^{abc} are the totally symmetric structure constants associated with the third Casimir operator. In contrast, the Kac-Moody-like extension (15) is proportional to the *second* Casimir δ^{ab}. There is little doubt that conventional, chiral-fermion gauge anomalies lead to lack of unitarity, i.e. an inconsistency; a simple argument why the Mickelsson-Faddeev lacks unitary representations can be found in [4]. This argument does not apply to the Kac-Moody-like extension (15).

The reason why the Kac-Moody-like anomaly (15) does not arise in conventional quantization is that the extension is a functional of a privileged curve $\mathbf{q}(t) = (q^i(t))$, which can be interpreted as the trajectory of the observer. Unless such a curve has been explicitly introduced, it is impossible to formulate the relevant anomalies, and it becomes impossible to combine unitarity with nonzero charge within the context of the full algebra of local+global+divergent gauge transformations.

Let us explain the origin of observer-dependent anomalies, following [5, 6]. The basic idea is to first expand all fields in a Taylor series around the observer's trajectory, *viz.*

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}, t) = \sum_{\mathbf{m}} \frac{1}{\mathbf{m}!} \phi_{,\mathbf{m}}(t)(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{q}(t))^{\mathbf{m}}, \qquad (17)$$

where $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, m_2, m_3)$ is a multi-index of length $|\mathbf{m}| = \sum_{j=1}^3 m_j$, $\mathbf{m}! = m_1!m_2!m_3!$, and $(x - q(t))^{\mathbf{m}} = (x^1 - q^1(t))^{m_1}(x^2 - q^2(t))^{m_2}(x^3 - q^3(t))^{m_3}$. Up to issues of convergence, it is straightforward to formulate at least classical physics in terms of Taylor data $\{q^i(t), \phi_{,\mathbf{m}}(t)\}$ rather than field data $\phi(\mathbf{x}, t)$.

E.g., the Klein-Gordon equation

$$\frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial t^2} - \nabla^2 \phi + \omega^2 \phi = 0 \tag{18}$$

translates into the hierarchy (assuming that $\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{q}$ is time independent)

$$\ddot{\phi}_{,\mathbf{m}}(t) - \sum_{j=1}^{3} \phi_{,\mathbf{m}+2\hat{\jmath}}(t) + \omega^2 \phi_{,\mathbf{m}}(t) = 0, \tag{19}$$

where $\hat{\jmath}$ is a unit vector in the j:th direction. The solution to this hierarchy,

$$\phi_{,\mathbf{m}}(t;\mathbf{k}) = (-i)^{|\mathbf{m}|} \mathbf{k}^{\mathbf{m}} \exp(i\sqrt{\omega^2 + \mathbf{k}^2}t - i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{q}(t)), \tag{20}$$

where $\mathbf{k}^{\mathbf{m}} = k_1^{m_1} k_2^{m_2} k_3^{m_3}$, corresponds via (17) to the field

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}, t; \mathbf{k}) = \exp(i\sqrt{\omega^2 + \mathbf{k}^2}t - i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}), \tag{21}$$

which of course is a plane-wave solution of (18). However, the hierarchy (19) naturally singles out another class of solutions, of the form $\phi(\mathbf{x}, t) = P(\mathbf{x}, t) \exp(i\omega t)$, $P(\mathbf{x}, t)$ polynomial, which are obtained from (21) in the limit $\mathbf{k} \to 0$. There are only finitely many such solutions at any given degree.

In order to quantize a field theory, we must first regularize it. The natural regularization in a Taylor formulation is to truncate the Taylor series (17) after some finite order p, i.e. we pass to the space of p-jets. However, this comes with a price: the KG hierarchy (19) is undefined for $|\mathbf{m}| = p-1, p$, since it depends on the higher-order terms $\phi_{,\mathbf{m}+2\hat{\jmath}}(t)$. Therefore, there are two classes of solutions to the truncated hierarchy:

- Finitely many solutions $\phi(\mathbf{x}, t) = P(\mathbf{x}, t) \exp(i\omega t)$, associated with $\mathbf{m}$ such that $|\mathbf{m}| \leqslant p-2$. They exhaust the plane-waves (21) in the limit $p \to \infty$.
- Infinitely many solutions depending on an arbitary choice of functions $\phi_{,\mathbf{m}}(t)$, for $|\mathbf{m}| = p-1, p$.

It is the second class of solutions which is responsible for the observer-dependent gauge anomalies (15) in the context of gauge theories. This can be regarded as a regularization artefact, which remains also when the regularization is removed, i.e. in the limit $p \to \infty$.

The Klein-Gordon equation does of course not possess any gauge symmetry, but the passage to Taylor data works for gauge theories as well.

Moreover, the truncation to p-jets preserves manifest gauge and diffeomorphism symmetry classically, since the transformation law for a p-jet does not involve higher order jets. In fact, it has been know for a long time that in order to obtain a well-defined lowest-energy representation of the diffeomorphism algebra, one must first pass to the space of trajectories in jet space [3].

There is a simple physical argument why conventional, observer-dependent quantization runs into trouble when applied to gravity, in agreement with the known situation. Namely, in conventional quantum theory there is an implicit assumption of a classical, macroscopic observer, which is manifest in the Copenhagen interpretation of quantum mechanics. While such an assumption is an excellent approximation in most experiments, it leads to trouble when gravity is taken into account. Namely, a macroscopic observer is infinitely massive, since she (or at least her clock, which operationally defines time) does not recoil as an effect of making an observation. But an infinitely massive observer will immediately interact with gravity and collapse into a black hole. To avoid this problem we need an explicitly observer-dependent formulation of QFT, along the lines sketched above, in order to quantize gravity.

To conclude, we have observed that a local gauge symmetry can not possibly be a mere redundancy of the description, provided that

1. charge is nonzero.
2. we also consider divergent gauge transformations, whose brackets with local transformations contain global charge operators.

If these conditions hold, unitarity requires the existence of gauge anomalies, which in turn requires that the observer's trajectory be explicitly introduced; this amounts to a modification of QFT. This seems to be a prerequisite for a meaningful quantum theory of gravity.

References

[1] M.B. Green, J.H. Schwarz and E. Witten, *Superstring theory, volume I: Introduction*, Cambridge Univ. Press (1987).

[2] S. Eswara Rao, *On Representations of Toroidal Lie Algebras*, `math.RT/0503629` (2005)

[3] T.A. Larsson, *Extended diffeomorphism algebras and trajectories in jet space*. Comm. Math. Phys. **214** (2000) 469–491. `math-ph/9810003`

[4] T.A. Larsson, *Why the Mickelsson-Faddeev algebra lacks unitary representations*, `hep-th/0501023` (2005)

[5] T.A. Larsson, *Manifestly covariant canonical quantization I: the free scalar field*, `hep-th/0411028` (2004)

–, *Manifestly covariant canonical quantization II: Gauge theory and anomalies*, `hep-th/0501043` (2005)

–, *Manifestly covariant canonical quantization III: Gravity, locality, and diffeomorphism anomalies in four dimensions*, `hep-th/0504020` (2006)

–, in preparation.

[6] T.A. Larsson, *Manifestly covariant canonical quantization of gravity and diffeomorphism anomalies in four dimensions*, in *Focus on Quantum Gravity Research*, ed David C. Moore, Nova Science Publishers (2006).

[7] J. Mickelsson, *Current algebras and groups*, Plenum Monographs in Nonlinear Physics, London: Plenum Press, 1989.

[8] R.V. Moody, S.E. Rao, and T. Yokonoma, *Toroidal Lie algebras and vertex representations*, Geom. Ded. **35** (1990) 283–307.