

quently, the relation (5.15) holds true for free fields with any spin, i.e.,

$$i[\phi^{(\kappa)}(x), \hat{D}] = -\left(x_\mu \partial_\mu + l^{(\kappa)} - m \frac{\partial}{\partial m}\right) \phi^{(\kappa)}(x). \quad (5.19)$$

It should also be pointed out that the relation (5.19) is true even for any  $c$ -number function of  $x_\mu$  and  $m$  (in this case, both sides of the equation are identically zero). Hence, for any functional  $F(x_\mu, m, \phi^{(\kappa)}(x))$ ,

$$i[F(x_\mu, m, \phi^{(\kappa)}(x)), \hat{D}] = -\left(x_\mu \partial_\mu + l - m \frac{\partial}{\partial m}\right) F(x_\mu, m, \phi^{(\kappa)}(x)), \quad (5.20)$$

where

$$[F] = L^{-1}.$$

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

One of us (H. U.) would like to thank the Theoretical Physics Institute, University of Alberta, for their kind hospitality extended to him during his visit to the Institute.

\*Work supported in part by the National Research Council of Canada.

<sup>1</sup>There are innumerable papers on the dilatation transformation. We only quote J. M. Jauch, in Proceedings of the Theoretical Physics Seminar, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, 1956 (unpublished); G. Mack, Nucl. Phys. **B5**, 499 (1968); P. Carruthers, Phys. Reports **1C**, 1 (1971). Other reference can be traced from here.

<sup>2</sup>Y. Takahashi, Proc. Roy. Irish Acad. **71A**, 1 (1971).

<sup>3</sup>Y. Takahashi, Phys. Rev. D **3**, 622 (1971).

<sup>4</sup>J. Strathdee and Y. Takahashi, Nucl. Phys. **8**, 113 (1958).

<sup>5</sup>This agrees with the generator proposed by Callan, Coleman, and Jackiw (Ref. 6). The construction of  $D(\sigma)$  from the  $T'_{\mu\nu}$  is in practice much simpler since the tedious symmetrization procedure can be omitted.

<sup>6</sup>C. G. Callan, S. Coleman, and R. Jackiw, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **59**, 42 (1970).

<sup>7</sup>J. Katz, Nuovo Cimento **3A**, 263 (1971).

PHYSICAL REVIEW D

VOLUME 5, NUMBER 4

15 FEBRUARY 1972

## Zero-Mass Divergences in Expansions about Chiral and Scale Symmetry

Douglas W. McKay

*University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66044*

and

William F. Palmer\*

*The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210*

(Received 27 September 1971)

Singularities of expansions in the symmetry-breaking parameters of chiral- and scale-asymmetric theories are studied, in the tree approximation, in polynomial Lagrangian models. The singularities are related to the appearance of zero-mass scalar fields, not necessarily Goldstone particles, at the radius of convergence of the expansion. Methods of avoiding these singularities are presented.

### I. INTRODUCTION

Analyticity of Nambu-Goldstone symmetry realizations<sup>1</sup> and the possibility of expansions<sup>2</sup> in symmetry-breaking parameters have recently been studied in the context of pion loop diagrams<sup>3</sup> and the solution, in the tree approximation, of specific

polynomial Lagrangian models<sup>4-7</sup> built on  $(3, 3^*) \oplus (3^*, 3)$  fields.<sup>8</sup> In the latter approach, with which we are concerned here, linear but spontaneously broken realizations of chiral and scale symmetry result in partial-conservation conditions with pseudoscalar masses determined quite simply by the symmetry nature of the ground state and the form

of the symmetry-breaking part of the Lagrangian,<sup>9-11</sup> whereas the scalar masses, as well as details of the spontaneously broken solution, are highly model-dependent. Such models have a wide variety of solutions but are limited by such general considerations as those of Okubo and Mathur,<sup>12</sup> or, apparently equivalently in the tree approximation, by positivity requirements<sup>5,11</sup> on the square of the masses. An actual fit to all meson masses<sup>4-7,11,13</sup> further limits the Lagrangian and its spontaneously broken solutions by constraining the coefficients of the various symmetric and symmetry-breaking terms. Thus if one arranges the number of such terms to be small enough, all coefficients may be determined, resulting in a complete theory whose analytic properties may be studied in various limits. It has been suggested that the properties found may be more general than the specific models from which they come. Here we wish to point out some general notions regarding analyticity in the symmetry-breaking parameter of the one-point function (and hence, usually, of the  $n$ -point functions) which guide one in constructing Lagrangians and imposing analytic structure, and apply these notions to current models of chiral- and scale-symmetry breaking. In general, we find that a singularity appears when a scalar mass vanishes, associated perhaps with an infrared divergence. (Consequently, the Nambu-Goldstone mechanism as applied to scale symmetry usually fails to have a power-series expansion in the scale-breaking parameter.) Exceptional cases exist, however, which allow a smooth limit when, by careful planning, the singularity is canceled by a zero. In particular, we wish to discuss analytic properties of the case in which  $\langle 0|u_8|0\rangle \equiv 0$  where bilinear (nonpole) terms are required<sup>9,11</sup> in the symmetry-breaking part of the Lagrangian, allowing (1, 8)  $\oplus$  (8, 1) contributions,<sup>9,14</sup> and nonunique  $c$  parameters.

The variety of symmetry-breaking structure and analytic behaviors possible in these models suggests that while it may be very difficult to abstract from them, *a priori*, detailed predictions on the possibility of expansions in the symmetry-breaking parameters or even predictions of the symmetry-breaking form of the non-pole terms, they will remain useful probes of chiral breakdown provided external input beyond scalar masses and PCAC (partial conservation of axial-vector current) conditions are imposed.

## II. CONNECTION BETWEEN SINGULARITIES AND ZEROS OF THE MASS MATRIX

Let us consider a Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}(\{\varphi\}, \delta)$  which is a polynomial in a set of scalar and pseudoscalar

fields  $\varphi_i$ ,  $i=1, 2, \dots$  and linear in a symmetry-breaking parameter  $\delta$ . Then

$$\frac{d}{d\delta} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \varphi_i} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi_j} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \varphi_i} \frac{d\varphi_j}{d\delta} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \varphi_i}. \quad (1)$$

For fields  $\tilde{\varphi}_i(\delta)$  which are solutions of the extremum equations<sup>15</sup>

$$\tilde{\varphi}_i(\delta): \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \varphi_i}(\{\varphi\}, \delta) = 0 \quad (2)$$

we have

$$\frac{d}{d\delta} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \varphi_i} = 0$$

and thus

$$\left( \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial \varphi_j \partial \varphi_i} \right)_{\tilde{\varphi}} \frac{d\tilde{\varphi}_j}{d\delta} + \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \varphi_i} \right)_{\tilde{\varphi}} = 0 \quad (3)$$

or

$$\frac{d\tilde{\varphi}_i}{d\delta} = [M^2]^{-1}_{ij} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \varphi_j} \right)_{\tilde{\varphi}} = M^{-2}_{ii} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \varphi_i} \right)_{\tilde{\varphi}}, \quad (4)$$

where  $M^2_{ij}$  is the (mass)<sup>2</sup> matrix, assumed here to have been transformed to the diagonal representation. For normal fields,  $\tilde{\varphi}_i \equiv 0$ , Eq. (4) requires

$$\left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \varphi_i} \right)_{\tilde{\varphi}} = 0.$$

For the fields we are interested in,  $\tilde{\varphi}_i(\delta) \neq 0$ ,  $M^2_{ii} = 0 \Leftrightarrow$  a singularity in  $d\tilde{\varphi}_i(\delta)/d\delta$ , unless the singularity of  $M^{-2}_{ii}$  is canceled by a zero of  $[(\partial/\partial \delta)(\partial \mathcal{L}/\partial \varphi_i)]_{\tilde{\varphi}}$  or, conversely, the singularity in  $d\tilde{\varphi}_i(\delta)/d\delta$  is carried by  $[(\partial/\partial \delta)(\partial \mathcal{L}/\partial \varphi_i)]_{\tilde{\varphi}}$ . Intuitively, the singularity in  $d\tilde{\varphi}_i/d\delta$  associated with a zero of  $M^2_{ii}$  occurs when the theory is about to become unstable as a (mass)<sup>2</sup> passes from a positive to a negative value.

More specifically, suppose we characterize the leading behavior of a vacuum solution<sup>16</sup>  $\tilde{\varphi}_0(\delta)$  near a possible singular point  $\bar{\delta}$  by the power law

$$(i) \quad \tilde{\varphi}_0(\delta) = \alpha + \beta(\delta - \bar{\delta})^\eta, \quad \eta > 0$$

or

$$(ii) \quad \tilde{\varphi}_0(\delta) = \beta(\delta - \bar{\delta})^\eta, \quad \eta \neq 0,$$

which includes the root, pole, or regular behavior possible in polynomial Lagrangians. For case (i)  $\alpha \neq 0$ ,  $\eta > 0$ , we have  $\varphi_0'(\delta) = O((\delta - \bar{\delta})^{\eta-1})$ . With  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{sym}} + \delta \mathcal{L}_B$ ,

$$\left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \varphi_0} \right)_{\tilde{\varphi}_0} = \left( \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_B}{\partial \varphi_0} \right)_{\tilde{\varphi}_0} \approx \sum_{p=0}^{N-1} C_p (\delta - \bar{\delta})^{\eta p},$$

where  $N$  is the highest power of  $\varphi_0$  in  $\mathcal{L}_B$ , where  $\mathcal{L}_B$  is the symmetry-breaking part of  $\mathcal{L}$ . If  $C_0 \neq 0$ , and this is always the case if only linear breaking

is allowed so that operator PCAC conditions are exactly implemented, then a zero of  $M^2_{00}$  requires a singular  $\bar{\varphi}_0'$  and conversely. Otherwise  $M^2_{00} = O((\delta - \bar{\delta})^{(\bar{p}-1)\eta+1})$ , where  $\bar{p}$  is the lowest  $p$  for which  $C_p \neq 0$ , and  $M^2_{00}$  vanishes ( $\eta > 0$ ) irrespective of  $\eta$  but a singularity of  $\varphi_0'$  is not implied. For case (ii), Eq. (4) requires  $M^2_{00} = O((\delta - \bar{\delta})^{\eta(\alpha-2)+1})$ , where  $q$  is the lowest (highest) power of  $\varphi_0$  in the expansion of  $\mathcal{L}_B(\bar{\varphi})$  when  $\eta > 0$  ( $\eta < 0$ ). For the interesting cases  $q=1, 2, 3, 4$  the requirement  $M^2_{00} \rightarrow 0$  is equivalent to  $\eta < 1$ ,  $\eta$  unrestricted,  $\eta > -1$ ,  $\eta > -\frac{1}{2}$ , respectively. Thus with only linear breaking,  $\eta < 1$  and  $\varphi_0'$  is necessarily singular at  $M^2_{00}=0$ , and conversely.  $M^2_{00} \rightarrow \text{const}$  requires  $\eta=1$ ,  $\eta=\infty$ ,  $\eta=-1$ ,  $\eta=-\frac{1}{2}$  for  $q=1, 2, 3, 4$ , respectively. For  $q=1$ ,  $M^2_{00} \rightarrow O((\delta - \bar{\delta})^{1-\eta})$  and poles of  $\bar{\varphi}_0$  are associated with zeros of  $M^2_{00}$ , a regular  $\bar{\varphi}_0$  with a non-zero mass, and root-type behavior of  $\bar{\varphi}_0$  with root-type vanishing of  $M^2_{00}$  for  $\eta < 1$ . For  $q=2$ ,  $M^2_{00} \rightarrow O(\delta - \bar{\delta})$  independent of  $\eta$  and there is no necessary connection. For  $q=3$  and  $4$ , the analysis proceeds in a similar manner.

To summarize, when the Lagrangian symmetry breaking is linear in fields, a vanishing mass of one of these fields implies a singularity in its vacuum expectation value and conversely. When higher powers of the fields are contained in the symmetry-breaking part of the Lagrangian, it may be possible to avoid the connection between singularities and mass zeros.

In the following section, we study a number of simple models. The emphasis is placed on models which have symmetry breakers with two or more powers of the basic fields because this type of breaking has received comparatively little attention in the literature and because cases in which zero mass  $\leftrightarrow$  singularity can be studied in detail. The SU(2) models are, of course, for illustration only, and no physical applications are implied.

### III. SINGULARITIES IN SU(2)-, CHIRAL SU(3)-, AND SCALE-BREAKING MODELS

The following examples illustrate the phenomenon discussed in Sec. II. Let  $\varphi_{1,2,3}$  be scalar fields with  $\sum_i \varphi_i \varphi_i = \varphi^2$ . Then with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &= \frac{1}{2} \partial^\mu \varphi_i \partial_\mu \varphi_i - \beta(\varphi^2 - a^2)^2 + \delta(\varphi_3^2 + \rho \varphi^2 \varphi_3) \\ &= \mathcal{L}_S + \delta \mathcal{L}_B, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

$\mathcal{L}_S$  has SU(2) symmetry and  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_B$  have  $I_3$  symmetry. The extremum condition has the Goldstone solution

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\varphi}_1 &\equiv 0, \quad \bar{\varphi}_2 \equiv 0, \\ \bar{\varphi}_3 &= \frac{3\rho}{8\beta} \delta + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \left( \frac{3\rho\delta}{4\beta} \right)^2 + 4 \left( \frac{\delta}{2\beta} + a^2 \right) \right]^{1/2}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

which is singular at  $\bar{\delta}$ , where

$$\bar{\delta}: \left( \frac{3\rho}{4\beta} \delta \right)^2 + 4 \left( \frac{\delta}{2\beta} + a^2 \right) = 0, \quad (7)$$

$$\bar{\varphi}_3(\bar{\delta}) = \frac{3\rho}{8\beta} \bar{\delta}. \quad (8)$$

The mass-squared matrix is diagonal with

$$\begin{aligned} M^2_{11} &= M^2_{22} = \delta(\rho \bar{\varphi}_3 + \frac{1}{2}), \\ M^2_{33} &= 3\rho \delta \bar{\varphi}_3 + 4\delta + 8\beta a^2. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

$M^2_{11} = M^2_{22} \rightarrow 0$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$  as required by the Goldstone theorem and  $M^2_{33}(\bar{\delta}) = 0$  as required by (4) because

$$\left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \varphi_3} \right)_{\bar{\varphi}_3} = 2\varphi_3 + 3\rho \varphi_3^2$$

does not in general vanish at the singular point. The special case  $\rho=0$ ,  $\bar{\delta} = -2\beta a^2$ ,  $\bar{\varphi}_3(\bar{\delta}) = 0$  behaves like

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\varphi}_3' &= O((\delta - \bar{\delta})^{-1/2}), \\ M^2_{33} &= O(\delta - \bar{\delta}), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

$$\left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \varphi_3} \right)_{\bar{\varphi}} = O((\delta - \bar{\delta})^{1/2}),$$

so that near  $\bar{\delta}$ , Eq. (4) requires again a zero mass because  $[(\partial/\partial \delta)(\partial \mathcal{L}/\partial \varphi_3)]_{\bar{\varphi}}$  does not diverge or, conversely, (4) requires a singularity in  $\varphi_3(\delta)$  because  $[(\partial/\partial \delta)(\partial \mathcal{L}/\partial \varphi_3)]_{\bar{\varphi}}$  does not cancel the zero of  $M^2_{33}$ . The interesting special case  $\bar{\delta}=0$ ,  $a^2=0$  with  $\bar{\varphi}_3(\bar{\delta})=0$  satisfies (4) in exactly the same way (see below). That exceptional cases exist in which a singularity of  $\bar{\varphi}(\delta)$  does not imply a vanishing scalar mass is illustrated by the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} \partial^\mu \varphi_i \partial_\mu \varphi_i - \beta(\varphi^2 - a^2)^2 + \delta \varphi_3^4, \quad (11)$$

which has a Goldstone solution

$$\bar{\varphi}_1 \equiv 0, \quad \bar{\varphi}_2 \equiv 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\varphi}_3(\delta) = \left( \frac{\beta a}{\beta - \delta} \right)^{1/2}$$

with both  $d\varphi_3(\delta)/d\delta$  and  $[(\partial/\partial \delta)(\partial \mathcal{L}/\partial \varphi_3)]_{\bar{\varphi}}$  of  $O((\delta - \bar{\delta})^{-3/2})$  near  $\bar{\delta} = \beta$  but with  $M^2_{33} = 4\beta a^2$ , independent of  $\delta$ .

Let us now consider the implications of (4) for  $\varphi_i(\delta) \neq 0$  realizations of scale symmetry. In this case,  $|M^2| \rightarrow 0$ , whether the scale symmetry is realized conventionally or in the Goldstone manner, when the scale breaking (proportional to  $\delta$ ) is shut off. Thus  $|M^2|$  is necessarily zero at  $\delta=0$ , requiring  $\bar{\varphi}_i$  to be singular at the symmetry point unless  $[(\partial/\partial \delta)(\partial \mathcal{L}/\partial \varphi_i)]_{\bar{\varphi}_i}$  carries the singularity. Consider for example the Lagrangian (5) with  $a^2=0$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}$  is scale-invariant when  $\delta=0$ . A spontaneously broken solution is

$$\bar{\varphi}_1 \equiv 0, \quad \bar{\varphi}_2 \equiv 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\varphi}_3 = \frac{3\rho\delta}{8\beta} \pm \frac{1}{2} \left[ \left( \frac{3\rho\delta}{4\beta} \right)^2 + \frac{4\delta}{2\beta} \right]^{1/2},$$

which has a branch point at  $\delta = \bar{\delta} = 0$ , where  $\bar{\varphi}_3(\bar{\delta}) = 0$ . Here

$$\begin{aligned} M_{33}^2 &= O(\delta), \\ \frac{d\bar{\varphi}_3}{d\delta} &= O(\delta^{-1/2}), \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \varphi_3} &= O(\delta^{1/2}), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

so that the zero of  $M_{33}^{-2}$  (where  $\varphi_3$  is coupled linearly to  $\theta^\mu$ , the energy-momentum stress tensor) requires a singular  $\varphi_3(\delta)$  and conversely.

That the necessary singularity in  $M_{33}^{-2}$  can be canceled, by careful planning, is illustrated by the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} \partial^\mu \varphi_i \partial_\mu \varphi_i - \beta \varphi^4 + \delta \varphi_3^3, \quad (13)$$

which has an asymmetric vacuum

$$\bar{\varphi}_1 = 0, \quad \bar{\varphi}_2 = 0, \quad \bar{\varphi}_3 = 3\delta/4\beta,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} M_{33}^2 &= O(\delta^2), \\ \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \varphi_3} \right)_{\bar{\varphi}} &= O(\delta^2). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

In this case, both scale-symmetry and SU(2)-symmetry breakdown are realized smoothly in the symmetry-breaking parameters.

We now discuss the SU(3)  $\sigma$  models in the light of this analysis. The basis fields are the 18 scalars and pseudoscalars ( $u_i, v_i$ ),  $i=0, \dots, 8$ , which span a  $(3, 3^*) \oplus (3^*, 3)$  representation of SU(3)  $\times$  SU(3). With  $I_2$ ,  $I_3^+$ , and  $I_4$  the usual<sup>17</sup> bilinear, trilinear (positive parity), and quartic scalar SU(3)  $\times$  SU(3) invariants, the original model of Lévy<sup>8</sup> restricted to SU(3)  $\times$  SU(3) [but not SU(2)] linear breaking is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &= \frac{1}{2} \partial^\mu u_i \partial_\mu u_i + \frac{1}{2} \partial^\mu v_i \partial_\mu v_i - \alpha_1 I_2 - \alpha_2 I_2^2 \\ &\quad - \beta I_3^+ - \gamma I_4 + \delta u_0. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

The extremum conditions have a solution  $\bar{u}_i(\delta) = \bar{u}_0(\delta) \delta_{i0}$ ,  $\bar{v}_i = 0$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}_0: 0 &= \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial u_0} \\ &= -u_0^3 (4\alpha_2 + \frac{16}{3} \gamma) - u_0^2 4\sqrt{6}\beta - u_0(2\alpha_1) + \delta. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

With  $\alpha_1 = 4\beta^2/(\alpha_2 + 4/3\gamma)$ ,  $\bar{u}_0(\delta)$  has a branch point at

$$\bar{\delta} = -1/27 [\sqrt{6}\beta/(\alpha_2 + 4/3\gamma)]^3,$$

where

$$\bar{u}_0(\bar{\delta}) = -\sqrt{6}\beta/3(\alpha_2 + 4/3\gamma) + (\bar{\delta})^{1/3}.$$

At this branch point

$$\left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial u_0} \right)_{\bar{u}_0} = 1$$

so that (4) requires a singularity of  $M_{00}^{-2}$ , which is indeed the case, as a simple calculation will verify.

Suppose we now drop the  $\beta I_3^+$  and  $\delta u_0$  terms in (16) and consider the approach to the scale limit  $\alpha_1 = 0$ . Then we have a solution

$$\bar{u}_0(\alpha_1) = \pm \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{-2\alpha_1}{\alpha_2 + 4/3\gamma} \right)^{1/2}$$

with a  $\sqrt{\alpha_1}$  branch point. Here

$$\left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_1} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial u_0} \right)_{\bar{u}_0} = O(\sqrt{\alpha_1}),$$

so that (4) requires  $M_{00}^2$  to vanish like  $O(\alpha_1)$ . In this case, the scale limit is accompanied by a singularity of the theory.

Again, special cases exist in which the zero of  $M_{00}^2$  does not require a singularity of  $\bar{u}_0$ . Consider for example the case  $\alpha_1 = 0$  in (15), discussed extensively by Carruthers<sup>18</sup> and by Carruthers and Haymaker.<sup>4-6</sup> With no chiral SU(3)  $\times$  SU(3) breaking ( $\delta = 0$ ), we have a solution  $\bar{u}_i(\beta) = \delta_{i0} \bar{u}_0(\beta)$ ,  $\bar{v}_i(\beta) = 0$ , with  $\bar{u}_0(\beta)$  a solution of

$$u_0^2 (2\sqrt{6}\beta + (\alpha_2 + 4/3\gamma)u_0) = 0. \quad (17)$$

As pointed out by Carruthers and Haymaker,<sup>6</sup> the  $\bar{u}_0 = 0$  solutions are unstable against chiral perturbations.<sup>19</sup> For  $\bar{u}_0(\beta) = -2\sqrt{6}\beta/(\alpha_2 + 4/3\gamma) = O(\beta)$ , we have a nonsingular theory because  $M_{00}^2 = O(\beta^2)$  [which never develops a negative (mass)<sup>2</sup>] and

$$\left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial u_0} \right)_{\bar{u}_0} = O(\beta^2)$$

so that the necessary zero of  $M_{00}^2$  in the scale limit is canceled by  $[(\partial/\partial \beta)(\partial \mathcal{L}/\partial u_0)]_{\bar{u}_0}$ .

We stress that the scale limit, because of (4), is a delicate one which, barring cancellations, is singular in the scale-breaking parameter.

This analysis of the relation between singularities and mass zeros was motivated by and has been a useful guide in a numerical study, in the tree approximation, of spontaneously broken solutions of the Lagrangian (15) and its generalizations. In the simplest cases

$$\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial \varphi_0^2} \Big|_{\bar{\varphi}_0} = 0$$

is equivalent to the statement that  $\bar{\varphi}_0$  is a multiple root of the extremum condition if  $\mathcal{L}$  is a polynomial. The analysis is not, however, restricted to polynomial Lagrangians, but is equally applicable to systems like

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} \partial^\mu \varphi_i \partial_\mu \varphi_i - e \varphi^2 + \alpha \varphi^2 + \delta \varphi_3^2 \quad (18)$$

with a ground-state solution  $\bar{\varphi}_3 = [\ln(\alpha + \delta)]^{1/2}$  and  $M_{11}^2 = M_{22}^2 = 2\delta$ ,  $M_{33}^2 = 4(\alpha + \delta) \ln(\alpha + \delta)$ . It is unclear whether such branch points are related to those of Li and Pagels.<sup>3</sup> We are currently studying this question in the chiral SU(3) context.

We close by discussing several cases in which the expression (4) itself fails because of an implicit dependence of  $\mathcal{L}$  on  $\delta$ , not only through the fields  $\varphi_i$ , but also through the coefficients of the various terms in  $\mathcal{L}$ . For example, with

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{kin}} - \alpha I_2 - \beta I_3^+ - \gamma I_4 + \delta[a(u_0 + cu_8) + d(U_0 + CU_8)], \quad (19)$$

where  $U_0$  and  $U_8$  are the  $(3, 3^*) \oplus (3^*, 3)$  decomposition of the tensor product of the basic multiplet with itself,<sup>20</sup> we have a solution  $\bar{u}_i(\delta) = \bar{u}_0(\delta)\delta_{i0}$ ,  $\bar{v}_i = 0$ , provided the constraint

$$\delta(ca - 4(\frac{2}{3})^{1/2}dC\bar{u}_0) = 0 \quad (20)$$

is maintained, with  $\bar{u}(\delta)$  a solution of

$$0 = 2\alpha u_0 + 4\sqrt{6}\beta u_0^2 + \frac{16}{3}\gamma u_0^3 - \delta a - 8\delta d(\frac{2}{3})^{1/2}u_0. \quad (21)$$

These two equations can be regarded as determining  $\bar{u}_0(\delta)$  and  $a(\delta)$ . Thus<sup>21</sup> the form (4) is modified to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\delta} \left( \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial u_0} \right) &= 0 \\ &= \left( \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial u_0^2} \right)_a \frac{d\bar{u}_0}{d\delta} + \left( \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial a} \frac{da}{d\delta} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial u_0} \right)_{\bar{u}_0} \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

or

$$\frac{d\bar{u}_0}{d\delta} = \left( \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial a} \frac{da}{d\delta} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial u_0} \right)_{\bar{u}_0} (M_{00}^2)^{-1}. \quad (23)$$

The singularity analysis then proceeds as above, but from (23) rather than (4). (In this Lagrangian, for example, there is a spontaneously broken solution in which  $M_{00}^2 \neq 0$  at the branch point of  $\bar{u}_0$ , and  $\bar{u}_0$  does not have a singularity at  $M_{00}^2 = 0$ .) Consider now the situation in which scale symmetry and chiral symmetry are realized simultaneously; that is,

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{kin}} - \alpha_2 I_2^2 - \gamma I_4 + \delta[a(u_0 + cu_8) + d(U_0 + CU_8) + eG_8], \quad (24)$$

where for generality we have included a  $(1, 8) \oplus (8, 1)$  nonpole term  $G_8 = d_{8ij}(u_i u_j + v_i v_j)$ . The extremum equation is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial u_0} &= 0 \\ &= -u_0^3(4\alpha_2 + \frac{16}{3}\gamma) + \delta a + 8(\frac{2}{3})^{1/2}\delta d u_0, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

subject to the constraint

$$\delta(ca - 4(\frac{2}{3})^{1/2}C d u_0 + 2e(\frac{2}{3})^{1/2}u_0) = 0, \quad (26)$$

which is necessary to maintain

$$\left. \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial u_8} \right|_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}} = 0.$$

Thus,

$$a = u_0 c^{-1} [4(\frac{2}{3})^{1/2} C d - 2(\frac{2}{3})^{1/2} e],$$

and we have the solutions

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(i)} \quad 4\alpha_2 + \frac{16}{3}\gamma &= 0, \quad \bar{u}_0 = a/8(\frac{2}{3})^{1/2}d \\ &= ca/2(\frac{2}{3})^{1/2}(2dc - e), \\ \text{(ii)} \quad 4\alpha_2 + \frac{16}{3}\gamma &\neq 0, \quad \bar{u}_0 = 0, \quad a = 0, \\ \text{(iii)} \quad 4\alpha_2 + \frac{16}{3}\gamma &\neq 0, \quad \bar{u}_0 \neq 0, \\ &\bar{u}_0 = [2\delta(\frac{2}{3})^{1/2}[d(2C/c + 4) - e/c]]^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

In special case (i), there is no unique  $C$  parameter,  $\bar{u}_0$  is a nonzero constant, and (23) is satisfied by

$$M_{00}^2 = O(\delta)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial a} \frac{da}{d\delta} + \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial u_0} \right)_{\bar{u}_0} = 0, \quad \frac{d\bar{u}_0}{d\delta} = 0.$$

Special case (ii) goes through similarly. The more interesting case (iii) satisfies (23) in the form

$$M_{00}^2 = O(\delta),$$

$$\frac{d\bar{u}_0}{d\delta} = O(\delta^{-1/2}), \quad \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial a} \frac{da}{d\delta} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial u_0} = O(\sqrt{\delta});$$

that is, the mass zero induces again a singularity of the theory. Note that solution (iii) is singular at  $c = 0$ ,  $C \neq 0$ . The following expressions isolate the effects of the bilinear breaking terms on the pseudoscalar octet (ps) masses. With  $c = C$ ,  $e \neq 0$ ,

$$(M_{ij}^2)_{\text{ps}} = \delta [2(4dc - e)/c] [(\frac{2}{3})^{1/2} \delta_{ij} + c d_{8ij}], \quad (28)$$

and with  $c \neq C$ ,  $e = 0$ ,

$$(M_{ij}^2)_{\text{ps}} = 8\delta d \{ (\frac{2}{3})^{1/2} [\frac{1}{2}(C/c + 2) - \frac{1}{2}] \delta_{ij} + C d_{8ij} \}. \quad (29)$$

It is clear that, so far as the pseudoscalar masses are concerned, the effects of bilinear  $(1, 8) \oplus (8, 1)$  breaking terms (nonpole) are largely invisible. This cannot be said for the bilinear  $(3, 3^*) \oplus (3^*, 3)$  breaking term, which is not surprising because the bilinear  $U_i, V_i$  have terms linear in the fields  $u_i, v_i$  when expanded about the ground-state solution.<sup>9</sup>

Finally, we wish to mention a variation of the Lagrangian of Eq. (24) which can be used to illustrate the scheme recently proposed by Mathur.<sup>22</sup> We write

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{kin}} - \alpha_2 I_2^2 - \gamma I_4 + \delta[a(u_0 + cu_8) + d(U_0 + cU_8) + I_2], \quad (30)$$

which can be written in the form proposed by Mathur,<sup>22</sup> where  $\delta I_2$  breaks scale invariance but

not chiral invariance and  $\delta \rightarrow 0$  produces the combined scale- and chiral-invariant limit. (Note that the  $\eta' - \pi$  degeneracy,<sup>23</sup> which afflicts the linear breaking model if  $I_3^+$  is absent, is lifted here by the bilinear breaking terms.) Requiring  $\tilde{u}_6 = \langle u_6 \rangle = 0$ , we have a solution  $\tilde{u}_i(\delta) = \tilde{u}_0(\delta)\delta_{i0}$ ,  $\tilde{v}_i = 0$ , with a constraint

$$\delta c [a - 4(\frac{2}{3})^{1/2} d \tilde{u}_0] = 0, \quad (31)$$

where  $\tilde{u}_0(\delta)$  is a solution of

$$0 = (4\alpha_2 + \frac{16}{3}\gamma)\tilde{u}_0^3 - 2\delta\tilde{u}_0 - \delta a - 8\delta d(\frac{2}{3})^{1/2}\tilde{u}_0. \quad (32)$$

When  $4\alpha_2 + \frac{16}{3}\gamma = 0$ , a possible solution to Eqs. (31) and (32) is the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}_0 &= -\frac{3}{2}a, \quad \text{independent of } \delta \\ d &= -\frac{1}{6}(\frac{3}{2})^{1/2}, \\ c &\neq 0, \\ (M^2_{00})_{\text{scalar}} &\sim O(\delta), \quad (M^2_{ii})_{\text{ps}} \sim O(\delta), \quad i=1, \dots, 8 \\ (M^2_{00})_{\text{ps}} &\sim O(\delta), \quad (M^2_{ii})_{\text{scalar}} \sim O(1), \quad i=1, \dots, 8. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Now since

$$\begin{aligned} (M^2_{ii})_{\text{ps}} &= 8\delta d[(\frac{2}{3})^{1/2} + cd_{8ii}], \quad i=1, \dots, 8 \\ &= -2(\frac{2}{3})^{1/2}\delta[(\frac{2}{3})^{1/2} + cd_{8ii}], \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

the usual value for the  $c$  parameter,<sup>24</sup>

$$c = \sqrt{2} \frac{M_\pi^2 - M_K^2}{M_\pi^2 + M_K^2} \approx -1.25, \quad (35)$$

is found. This model contains the basic features of the Mathur scheme and, as a result of the form of the constraint equation, has a vacuum solution with trivial dependence on  $\delta$ , ensuring a smooth scale limit which avoids the singularities which usually accompany the necessary zero mass in the scale limit.

Investigation of extended models of this kind, especially with regard to expansions in symmetry-breaking parameters and smoothness of matrix elements of symmetry-breaking parts of  $\mathcal{L}$  in pseudoscalar states is in progress. For a discussion of how low-mass scalar poles necessarily interfere with such smoothness in a current-algebra approach with pole saturation, and a motivation for considering such models, see Ref. 25.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

D.W.M. wishes to acknowledge the hospitality of Dr. C. Critchfield and the T-9 Group at the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory. W.F.P. wishes to acknowledge the hospitality of Professor G. Kramer and the International Summer Institute in Theoretical Physics, Hamburg, DESY.

\*Work supported in part by the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

<sup>1</sup>Y. Nambu and G. Jona-Lasinio, Phys. Rev. **122**, 345 (1961); J. Goldstone, Nuovo Cimento **19**, 154 (1961); J. Goldstone, A. Salam, and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **127**, 965 (1962). For early references on the semiclassical approach to spontaneous breakdown, see R. Brout, Nuovo Cimento **47A**, 932 (1967); P. de Mottion and E. Fabri, *ibid.* **54A**, 42 (1968). For a discussion of the extremal procedure from a group-theoretic point of view more general than that of Lagrangian theories, see L. Michel and L. A. Radicati, in *Proceedings of the Fifth Coral Gables Conference on Symmetry Principles at High Energies, University of Miami, 1968*, edited by A. Perlmutter, C. Hurst, and B. Kurşunoğlu (Benjamin, New York, 1968).

<sup>2</sup>R. Dashen, Phys. Rev. **183**, 1245 (1969); R. Dashen and M. Weinstein, *ibid.* **183**, 1261 (1969); **188**, 2330 (1969); Phys. Rev. Letters **22**, 1337 (1969); R. Dashen, Phys. Rev. **D 3**, 1879 (1971); T. P. Cheng and R. Dashen, Phys. Rev. Letters **26**, 594 (1971).

<sup>3</sup>L.-F. Li and H. Pagels, Phys. Rev. Letters **26**, 1204 (1971); **27**, 1089 (1971).

<sup>4</sup>P. Carruthers and R. W. Haymaker, Phys. Rev. Letters **27**, 455 (1971).

<sup>5</sup>P. Carruthers and R. W. Haymaker, Phys. Rev. **D 4**, 1815 (1971).

<sup>6</sup>P. Carruthers and R. W. Haymaker, Phys. Rev. **D 4**, 1808 (1971).

<sup>7</sup>R. Olshansky, Phys. Rev. **D 4**, 2440 (1971).

<sup>8</sup>M. Lévy, Nuovo Cimento **52A**, 23 (1967); W. A. Bardeen and B. W. Lee, Phys. Rev. **177**, 2389 (1969); S. Gasiorowicz and D. Geffen, Rev. Mod. Phys. **41**, 531 (1969); G. Cicogna, F. Strocchi, and R. Vergara Caffarelli, Phys. Rev. Letters **22**, 497 (1969); Phys. Rev. **D 1**, 1197 (1970); J. C. Bane and K. T. Mahanthappa, Phys. Rev. Letters **25**, 779 (1970); **25**, 1396(E) (1970); and Phys. Rev. **D 3**, 1446 (1971).

<sup>9</sup>William F. Palmer, Ohio State University Report No. C00-1545-82, 1970 (unpublished).

<sup>10</sup>J. Schechter and Y. Ueda, Phys. Rev. **D 3**, 168 (1971).

<sup>11</sup>J. Schechter and Y. Ueda, Phys. Rev. **D 3**, 2874 (1971).

<sup>12</sup>S. Okubo and V. Mathur, Phys. Rev. **D 1**, 2046 (1970); **1**, 3468 (1970).

<sup>13</sup>G. Cicogna, Phys. Rev. **D 1**, 1786 (1970).

<sup>14</sup>R. Arnowitt, M. H. Friedman, P. Nath, and R. Sutor, Phys. Rev. Letters **26**, 104 (1971); K. Schilcher, Phys. Rev. **D 4**, 237 (1971).

<sup>15</sup>For general background on this semiclassical approach, in which  $\phi_i$  is identified with the quantum-field-theoretic vacuum expectation value  $\langle 0|\phi_i|0\rangle$ , see P. de Mottion and E. Fabri, Ref. 1, and P. Carruthers and R. W. Haymaker, Refs. 4 and 5.

<sup>16</sup>We now consider the case in which only one of the fields,  $\phi_0$ , has a nonvanishing vacuum expectation value.

<sup>17</sup>See Ref. 8, especially G. Cicogna *et al.*, and Refs. 9 and 23 for our normalizations.

<sup>18</sup>P. Carruthers, Phys. Rev. **D 2**, 2265 (1970).

<sup>19</sup>Because  $M_{00}^2 = 0 \Leftrightarrow$  singularity in  $\tilde{u}_0(\delta)$  for linear breaking models, as established in Sec. II, we know immediately that this model will be singular when  $\tilde{y}_0 = 0$ , since all masses become zero. The feature that some masses must become negative when  $\delta \neq 0$  is a result of the particular form of  $I_3^+$ , as discussed in Ref. 6.

<sup>20</sup>The reduction in terms of the  $u_i, v_i$  basis is given in Refs. 9 and 23.

<sup>21</sup>The subsidiary constraint of Eq. (20), necessary for a solution with  $\tilde{u}_\delta = 0$ , imposes a relation among the parameters  $(e, a, d, C)$  and  $\tilde{u}_0(\delta)$ . When the solution  $\tilde{u}_0(\delta)$

of (21) is then inserted in (20) this implies a relation among the Lagrangian parameters and  $\delta$  which may be solved for any one [say  $a(\delta)$ ] regarding the others as fixed. But then  $\mathcal{L}$  depends on  $\delta$  not only via the fields but also via  $a(\delta)$ . Equation (22) then follows, analogous to (4).

<sup>22</sup>V. Mathur, Phys. Rev. Letters **27**, 452 (1971).

<sup>23</sup>S. Gasiorowicz and D. Geffen, Ref. 8.

<sup>24</sup>M. Gell-Mann, R. Oakes, and B. Renner, Phys. Rev. **175**, 2195 (1968).

<sup>25</sup>D. McKay and W. Palmer, Phys. Rev. D **4**, 1018 (1971).

PHYSICAL REVIEW D

VOLUME 5, NUMBER 4

15 FEBRUARY 1972

## Relativistic Particles in External Fields\*

H. Ekstein

*Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois 60439*

(Received 1 April 1971)

Axiomatic field theories suffer from a lack of nontrivial examples and especially of realistic ones. This paper explores an enlarged system of basic assumptions that encompasses the case of external fields. Then the Dirac theory of the hydrogen atom, for example, becomes both an example and a clue for further postulates. For nonrelativistic (Galilean) physics, a set of assumptions called presymmetry was found to account for the general features of empirically verified theories. In this paper those assumptions of presymmetry that seem reasonably extendable to the case of a Poincaré-covariant algebra of observation procedures are found to agree with properties of the theory of an electron-positron field in an external electromagnetic field. The full structure of the algebra  $\mathcal{O}$  of observation procedures remains to be explored, with the hope of finding additional structure in theories of interacting fields. Another motivation of more immediate interest is the desire for a general set of constraints in describing systems, typified by the hydrogen atom, in which one part of the system is sufficiently heavy to be idealized as a source of an external field, while the other has relativistic velocities.

### I. INTRODUCTION

The Dirac theory of the hydrogen atom is a great improvement on the Schrödinger theory. This success has stimulated work on relativistic wave equations with external fields and on their quantization. None of these theories for spins other than  $\frac{1}{2}$  has had an empirical success similar to that of the Dirac theory, and recent research shows that they have disturbing internal inconsistencies or, at least, "undesirable features."

The success of Dirac's hydrogen theory is ascribed to its relativistic nature. Yet, is it really relativistic? Surely not in the most obvious sense of the word, because the fixed nucleus privileges one frame. It then becomes important to understand in what sense it can be termed relativistic, because theories of that kind may in general be expected to be in better agreement with experiment. Hoping that a precise set of principles will aid us in constructing theories, we ask the question: What constraints does relativity impose on

a system in an external field?

Instead of proceeding in this systematic manner, one can try to make the source of the external field—in this case the proton—a part of a larger system that is relativistically invariant in the usual sense, and go to the limit  $v/c \rightarrow 0$  for the heavy particle. But the example of a meson interacting with a static nucleus shows that such a limiting procedure is ambiguous: One has to introduce a cutoff to make the theory meaningful. Is the resulting theory relativistic in the same sense as the Dirac hydrogen theory? There seems to be no way to avoid the question: What does the theory of relativity require in the presence of external fields? It will be seen that apparently obvious and simple answers raise new puzzling questions.

For a heuristic discussion, the classical case is enlightening. Relativistic invariance of a classical theory means, in the simplest sense,<sup>1</sup> that the set of world lines predicted by the theory is stable with respect to transformations induced by