Compact and noncompact gauge theories on a lattice

C. M. Becchi

Dipartimento di Fisica, Universita di Genova, Sezione Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare di Genova,
Via Dodecaneso, 33 I-16146 Genova, Italy

F. Palumbo

Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, P. O. Box 13, I-00044 Frascati, Italy
(Received 11 April 1991)

A noncompact formulation of gauge theories on the lattice recently proposed makes use of auxiliary fields. We show that in such a formulation the representation of the gauge group in the case of SU(2) is completely reducible, one of the irreducible multiplets containing the Yang-Mills fields plus one auxiliary field. Elimination of this field by a gauge-invariant constraint leads to Wilson's formulation.

The only consistent regularization of gauge theories outside the perturbative domain is their definition on the lattice. In Wilson's formulation [1], however, gauge fields have to be identified with coordinates on a compact group manifold. This gives rise to a number of problems if one wants to go beyond the numerical calculation on a lattice in order to understand the scaling behavior of the theory at short distance. From the point of view of Wilson regularization a decompactification transition is expected which should induce a regime of locally small field fluctuations consistent with asymptotic freedom. What remains, however, to be understood is the connection between decompactification and settlement of asymptotic freedom.

A related important issue concerns confinement. In the Wilson model its mechanism is quite simple at strong coupling where it is strictly connected with the compact nature of the gauge variables, while after decompactification it has not yet been understood.

A good starting point to try to answer these questions would be to use a regularization of gauge theories which would preserve the advantages of lattice regularization involving, however, noncompact fields, thus putting decompactification out of the game.

A different class of problems with the Wilson model comes from the fact that the action of a gauge transformation is highly nonlinear even in a neighborhood of the identity, resulting in a very complicated structure of the Faddeev-Popov terms which have to be introduced together with a gauge fixing to define a calculation procedure suitable for a perturbative treatment [2].

These difficulties could be avoided with an alternative regularization in which the action of gauge transformations is linear, which again requires noncompact gauge fields.

A noncompact formulation of gauge theories on a lattice has been proposed where exact gauge invariance is obtained by introducing auxiliary fields [3]. The whole set of gauge plus auxiliary fields lives in the algebra of GL(M,c), where M is the dimension of the (matrix) representation. Suitable gauge-invariant terms can be added to the action in order to ensure that in the formal continu-

um limit the auxiliary fields vanish, with the exception of an Abelian real field.

No attention was paid, formulating the new regularization, to the reducibility of the representation of the gauge group. In this note we show that for the gauge group SU(2) the representation breaks into two irreducible representations, one of which contains all the Yang-Mills fields plus one auxiliary field which can be made to vanish in the continuum limit. In this way the realization of the gauge group is linear at finite lattice spacing. But the auxiliary field can also be eliminated by a gauge-invariant constraint. Then the realization of the gauge group becomes nonlinear and one obtains Wilson's formulation.

To fix the notation and for the convenience of the reader let us sketch briefly the new lattice regularization. It is based on a discretized form of the continuum gauge transformations:

$$A'_\mu(x) = \frac{1}{i} g(x) \Delta_\mu g^\dagger(x) + g(x) A_\mu(x) g^\dagger(x+\mu) . \tag{1}$$

In the above equation a is the lattice spacing, x a vector with integral components, μ a vector with components $\mu_\nu = \delta_{\mu\nu}$, $g(x)$ an element of the group U(N), and Δ_μ the discrete derivative

$$\Delta_\mu f = \frac{1}{a} [f(x+\mu) - f(x)] . \tag{2}$$

The coupling constant has been set equal to unity.

In order that (1) transform into other objects of the same type, A_μ must be of the form

$$A_\mu = (\mathcal{A}_{\mu a} + iB_{\mu a}) T_a + \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} (V_\mu + iW_\mu) I , \tag{3}$$

where the factor $1/\sqrt{M}$ has been introduced for convenience, T_a are the generators of the gauge group, and I is the identity matrix. We use the normalization

$$[T_a, T_b] = if_{abc} T_c , \tag{4}$$

$$\{T_a, T_b\} = (2/M)\delta_{ab} + d_{abc} T_c .$$

From the transformation of the components

$$\mathcal{A}'_{\mu a} = \mathcal{A}_{\mu a} + \Delta_\mu \vartheta_a - f_{abc}\mathcal{A}_{\mu b}\vartheta_c - (a/\sqrt{M})W_\mu \Delta_\mu \vartheta_a - (a/2)d_{abc}B_{\mu b}\Delta_\mu \vartheta_c - (a/2)f_{abc}\mathcal{A}_{\mu b}\Delta_\mu \vartheta_c - aB_{\mu a}\Delta_\mu \vartheta_0 ,$$

$$W'_\mu = W_\mu + (a/\sqrt{M})\mathcal{A}_{\mu a}\Delta_\mu \vartheta_a + aV_\mu \Delta_\mu \vartheta_0 ,$$

$$B'_{\mu a} = B_{\mu a} - f_{abc}B_{\mu b}\vartheta_c + (a/\sqrt{M})V_\mu \Delta_\mu \vartheta_a + (a/2)d_{abc}\mathcal{A}_{\mu b}\Delta_\mu \vartheta_c - (a/2)f_{abc}B_{\mu b}\Delta_\mu \vartheta_c + a\mathcal{A}_{\mu a}\Delta_\mu \vartheta_0 ,$$

$$V'_\mu = V_\mu - (a/\sqrt{M})B_{\mu a}\Delta_\mu \vartheta_a + \sqrt{M}\,\Delta_\mu \vartheta_0 - aW_\mu \Delta_\mu \vartheta_0 ,$$

$$(5)$$

we see that for $a \to 0$ the $\mathcal{A}_{\mu a}$ transform like Yang-Mills fields so that the $B_{\mu a}$, V_μ, and W_μ are auxiliary fields.

The basic ingredient to construct the Lagrangian is the covariant derivative

$$D_\mu = (1/a)I + iA_\mu , \tag{6}$$

which under (1) transforms according to

$$D_\mu(x) = g(x)D_\mu(x)g^\dagger(x+\mu) . \tag{7}$$

The strength can be defined in analogy with the continuum

$$F_{\mu\nu}(x) = \frac{1}{i}[D_\mu(x)D_\nu(x+\mu) - D_\nu(x)D_\mu(x+\nu)] . \tag{8}$$

It is antisymmetric and transforms according to

$$F_{\mu\nu}(x) \to g(x)F_{\mu\nu}(x)g^\dagger(x+\mu+\nu) . \tag{9}$$

The pure Yang-Mills Lagrangian density can therefore be written

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{YM}} = \tfrac{1}{4}\beta \operatorname{Tr} F_{\mu\nu}^\dagger F_{\mu\nu} . \tag{10}$$

It is easy to check that $\mathcal{L}_{\text{YM}}$ becomes the Yang-Mills Lagrangian density in the continuum limit, so that in this limit it is also parity invariant. However, at finite lattice spacing it is not. Denoting by I_μ the operator which performs the inversion with respect to the μ axis $(x \to i_\mu x)$, we have

$$I_\mu^{-1}D_\mu(x)I_\mu = D_\mu^\dagger(i_\mu x - \mu) ,$$

$$I_\mu^{-1}D_\nu(x)I_\mu = D_\nu(i_\mu x) \quad \text{for } \mu \neq \nu . \tag{11}$$

$\mathcal{L}_{\text{YM}}$ is not invariant under the above transformations, but it can be made invariant by the addition of suitable terms that will be discussed later.

The gauge-invariant term which makes all the auxiliary fields but V_μ vanish is

$$\mathcal{L}_C = \frac{a}{2\lambda}\operatorname{Tr}\sum_\mu \left[D_\mu^\dagger(x)D_\mu(x) - \frac{1}{a^2}\right]^2 , \tag{12}$$

where λ is a parameter with the dimension of a length. In the formal limit $a \to 0$ it provides a term

$$\prod_{x,\mu}\delta[W_\mu(x)]\prod_a \delta[B_{\mu a}(x)] \tag{13}$$

in the measure of the partition function. Notice that the surviving field V_μ cannot be required to be zero by gauge fixing because the corresponding Faddeev-Popov determinant would vanish for $B_{\mu a} = 0$.

Finally, among other terms there is

$$\mathcal{L}_m = \frac{1}{2}m^2\sum_\mu \operatorname{Tr}\left[D_\mu^\dagger(x)D_\mu(x) = \frac{1}{a^2}\right] , \tag{14}$$

which has the form of a mass term, and has, in fact, led to the speculation [3] that the present regularization might provide a way to smuggle a mass for the vector bosons without making recourse to the Higgs mechanism. At the end of the paper we will show that actually this is not possible.

The gauge transformations within each multiplet are essentially homogeneous. They become exactly homogeneous introducing the field

$$C_\mu = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{a} - W_\mu . \tag{15}$$

We must emphasize, however, that the homogeneity of the transformations must be spontaneously broken according to the above equation, in order that the covariant derivative contain an ordinary derivative and hence the theory be a gauge theory. Such a breaking does occur in the presence of $\mathcal{L}_C$.

The case of U(2) is different from the others because of the reality of the SU(2) spinor representation which makes the symmetric constants d_{abc} vanish. If we restrict ourselves to SU(2), by setting $\vartheta_0 = 0$ in Eqs. (5), we see that the multiplets $(\mathcal{A}_{\mu a}, W_\mu)$ and $(B_{\mu a}, V_\mu)$ do not mix with each other and are irreducible representations:

$$\mathcal{A}'_{\mu a} = \mathcal{A}_{\mu a} + \left[1 - \frac{a}{\sqrt{2}}W_\mu\right]\Delta_\mu \theta_a - f_{abc}\mathcal{A}_{\mu b}\left[1 + \frac{a}{2}\Delta_\mu\right]\theta_c ,$$

$$W'_\mu = W_\mu + \frac{a}{\sqrt{2}}\mathcal{A}_{\mu a}\Delta_\mu \theta_a ,$$

$$B'_{\mu a} = B_{\mu a} + \frac{a}{\sqrt{2}}V_\mu \Delta_\mu \theta_a - f_{abc}B_{\mu b}\left[1 + \frac{a}{2}\Delta_\mu\right]\theta_c ,$$

$$V'_\mu = V_\mu - \frac{a}{\sqrt{2}}B_{\mu a}\Delta_\mu \theta_a . \tag{16}$$

The explicit expression of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{YM}}$ for the multiplet $(\mathcal{A}_{\mu a}, W_\mu)$ is

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{YM}} = \frac{1}{4}\beta\left[\left[\Delta_\mu W_\nu(x) - \Delta_\nu W_\mu(x) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[\mathcal{A}_{\mu b}(x)\mathcal{A}_{\nu b}(x+\mu) - W_\mu(x)W_\nu(x+\mu) - (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu)]\right]^2\right.$$

$$+ \left[\Delta_\mu \mathcal{A}_{\nu a}(x) - \Delta_\nu \mathcal{A}_{\mu a}(x) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[\epsilon_{abc}\mathcal{A}_{\mu b}(x)\mathcal{A}_{\nu c}(x+\mu) + W_\mu(x)\mathcal{A}_{\nu a}(x+\mu)\right.$$

$$\left.\left. + W_\nu(x+\mu)\mathcal{A}_{\mu a}(x) - (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu)]\right]^2\right] . \tag{17}$$

To have a renormalizable Lagrangian we must add all the other gauge-invariant terms of dimension not greater than 4. These terms are polynomials in the composite gauge-invariant field t_μ:

$$t_\mu(x)I = D_\mu^\dagger(x)D_\mu(x) - \frac{1}{a^2} = D_\mu(x)D_\mu^\dagger(x) - \frac{1}{a^2}$$

$$= \left[\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{A}_\mu^2 + \frac{1}{2}W_\mu^2 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{a}W_\mu \right]I \tag{18}$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}_\mu^2 = \sum_a \mathcal{A}_{\mu a}^2 . \tag{19}$$

Here we denote all these polynomials by $\mathcal{P}$ of which we only use the normalization

$$\mathcal{P} = 0 \quad \text{for } t_\mu = 0 . \tag{20}$$

The expression of $\mathcal{P}$ will be given in a separate paper where the perturbative features of the present regularization are analyzed. $\mathcal{P}$ also contains the terms necessary to make $\mathcal{L}_{YM}$ parity invariant.

Finally, the gauge-field Lagrangian density is

$$\mathcal{L}_G = \mathcal{L}_{YM} + \mathcal{L}_C + \mathcal{P} + \mathcal{L}_m \tag{21}$$

and the partition function can be written

$$Z = \int \prod_{x,\mu} dW_\mu(x) \prod_a d\mathcal{A}_{\mu a}(x) \exp\left[-\sum_y \mathcal{L}_G(\mathcal{A}_\mu, W_\mu) \right] . \tag{22}$$

This concludes the discussion of the irreducible representation when the auxiliary field W_μ is retained.

One can obtain Wilson's formation as a special case if W_μ is eliminated altogether by imposing the constraint

$$t_\mu = 0 , \tag{23}$$

whose solutions are

$$W_\mu^{\sigma_\mu} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{a} - \sigma_\mu \frac{\sqrt{2}}{a}[1 - \tfrac{1}{2}a^2\mathcal{A}_\mu^2(x)]^{1/2},$$

$$\sigma_\mu = \pm 1 , \tag{24}$$

with

$$\mathcal{A}_\mu^2 \le 2/a^2 . \tag{25}$$

The constraint (23) has the effect of compactifying the gauge field. As usual after elimination of auxiliary fields the representation becomes nonlinear:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mu a}' = \mathcal{A}_{\mu a} + \sigma_\mu(1 - \tfrac{1}{2}a^2\mathcal{A}_\mu^2)^{1/2}\Delta_\mu\vartheta_a$$

$$- f_{abc}\mathcal{A}_{\mu b}\vartheta_c - (a/2)f_{abc}\mathcal{A}_{\mu b}\Delta_\mu\vartheta_c . \tag{26}$$

The covariant derivative becomes

$$D_\mu = \frac{1}{a}U_\mu , \tag{27}$$

where

$$U_\mu = \sigma_\mu(1 - \tfrac{1}{2}a^2\mathcal{A}_\mu^2)^{1/2}I + ia\mathcal{A}_\mu \tag{28}$$

is a unitary matrix which can be identified with Wilson's link variable. All the terms in the action now vanish with the exception of $\mathcal{L}_{YM}$, which becomes Wilson's Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_{YM} = \mathcal{L}_w \quad \text{for } t_\mu = 0 . \tag{29}$$

The partition function can be written

$$Z_W = \int \prod_{x,\mu} dW_\mu(x) \prod_a d\mathcal{A}_{\mu a}(x)\delta[t_\mu(x)]$$

$$\times \exp\left(-\sum_y \mathcal{L}_{YM}(\mathcal{A}_\mu, W_\mu) \right) . \tag{30}$$

Integrating over W_μ, we get

$$Z_W \propto \int \prod_{x,m,a} d\mathcal{A}_{\mu a}(x)[1 - \tfrac{1}{2}a^2\mathcal{A}_\mu^2(x)]^{-1/2}$$

$$\times \sum_{\sigma_\mu} \exp\left(-\sum_y \mathcal{L}_{YM}(\mathcal{A}_\mu, W_\mu^{(\sigma_\mu)}) \right) . \tag{31}$$

In the Jacobian arising from the integration we recognize the invariant measure on SU(2), so we can rewrite Z_W in the standard form

$$Z_W \propto \int \prod_{x,\mu} dU_\mu(x) \exp\left(-\sum_y \mathcal{L}_w \right) . \tag{32}$$

We conclude the paper by showing that even with the present regularization pure gauge theories are incompatible with massive vector bosons. To this end we derive the Ward identities for the effective action Γ, under the hypothesis that it is stationary for $\mathcal{A}_{\mu a} = 0$, and $W_\mu = \overline{W}$:

$$\frac{\partial\Gamma}{\partial\mathcal{A}_{\mu a}(x)} = \frac{\partial\Gamma}{\partial W_\mu(x)} = 0 \quad \text{for } \mathcal{A}_{\mu a}(x) = 0, \ W_\mu(x) = \overline{W}_\mu . \tag{33}$$

Because of gauge invariance,

$$\delta\Gamma = \sum_{\mu,x} \delta C_\mu'(x)\frac{\partial\Gamma}{\partial C_\mu(x)} + \sum_a \delta\mathcal{A}_{\mu a}(x)\frac{\partial\Gamma}{\partial\mathcal{A}_{\mu a}(x)}$$

$$= 0 , \tag{34}$$

where

$$C_\mu' = \sqrt{2}/a - (W_\mu - \overline{W}) . \tag{35}$$

By the definition

$$\frac{\partial\Gamma}{\partial\mathcal{A}_\mu(x)} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sum_a T_a \frac{\partial\Gamma}{\partial\mathcal{A}_{\mu a}(x)} , \tag{36}$$

the above equation can be rewritten

$$\delta\Gamma = \text{Tr}\sum_{\mu,x} \left[-\sqrt{2}a\mathcal{A}_\mu(x)\Delta_\mu\theta(x)\frac{\partial\Gamma}{\partial C_\mu(x)} \right.$$

$$\left. + 2\delta\mathcal{A}_\mu(x)\frac{\partial\Gamma}{\partial\mathcal{A}_\mu(x)} \right] . \tag{37}$$

Integrating by parts, we get

$$\delta\Gamma = \sum_{\mu,x} \text{Tr}\,\theta(x)\left\{ \sqrt{2}a\Delta_\mu^{(-)}\left[\mathcal{A}_\mu(x)\frac{\partial\Gamma}{\partial C_\mu(x)} + [\overline{W} - C_\mu'(x)]\frac{\partial\Gamma}{\partial\mathcal{A}_\mu(x)} \right] \right.$$

$$\left. -i\left[\mathcal{A}_\mu(x-\mu), \frac{\partial\Gamma}{\partial\mathcal{A}_\mu(x-\mu)} \right] -i\left[\mathcal{A}_\mu(x), \frac{\partial\Gamma}{\partial\mathcal{A}_\mu(x)} \right] \right\} = 0 , \tag{38}$$

$\Delta_\mu^{(-)}$ being the left derivative

$$\Delta_\mu^{(-)}f(x) = \frac{1}{a}[f(x) - f(x-\mu)] .$$

(39)

Because of the arbitrariness of $\theta(x)$ the above equation implies the vanishing of the quantity in curly brackets at each point x. Evaluating the derivative with respect to $\mathcal{A}_\nu(y)$ of such a quantity at $\mathcal{A}_\mu = 0$, $W_\mu = \overline{W}$, we get

$$\sum_\mu [\overline{W} - C_\mu'(x)] \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{A}_\nu(y)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{A}_\mu(x)} \Gamma = 0 \quad \text{for } \mathcal{A}_\mu = 0, \quad C_\mu' = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{a} .$$

(40)

As already noticed we must exclude the possibility $\overline{W} = \sqrt{2}/a$, for which the covariant derivative would no longer contain an ordinary derivative. It then follows that there can be no effective-mass term in the effective action.

---

[1] K. G. Wilson, Phys. Rev. D **10**, 2455 (1974).
[2] For a review see, e.g., M. Lüscher, in *Fields, Strings and Critical Phenomena*, Proceedings of the Les Houches Summer School, Les Houches, France, 1988, edited by E.

Brezin and J. Zinn-Justin, Les Houches Summer School Proceedings, Vol. 49 (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1990).
[3] F. Palumbo, Phys. Lett. B **244**, 55 (1990); **250**, 212(E) (1990).