

# Remark on equivalence of topological and quantum 2D gravity

A. Marshakov and A. Mironov

*Department of Theoretical Physics, P. N. Lebedev Physical Institute, 117924, Moscow*

A. Morozov

*Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Physics, 117259, Moscow*

(Submitted 4 October 1991)

*Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **54**, No. 8, 425–428 (25 October 1991)

We demonstrate the equivalence of Virasoro constraints imposed on the continuum limit of the partition function of the Hermitian 1-matrix model and the Ward identities of Kontsevich's model.

1. Since the early days of matrix models there has been the belief that partition functions of two *a priori* different models of 2D gravity should coincide. The first partition function is the (square root) of the partition function  $\sqrt{\mathcal{Z}_{qg}\{T_n\}}$  of ordinary Polyakov's quantum 2D gravity, which is described by the continuum limit of Hermitian 1-matrix model<sup>1</sup> (and is known to be a  $\tau$  function of KdV hierarchy<sup>2</sup>). The second partition function  $\mathcal{Z}_{tg}$  of Witten's topological gravity<sup>3</sup> is *a priori* defined as a generating functional of intersection indices of divisors on module spaces of Riemann surfaces with punctures.

Later, it was found<sup>4,5</sup> that  $\sqrt{\mathcal{Z}_{qg}\{T_n\}}$  satisfies a set of Virasoro constraints:

$$\mathcal{L}_n \sqrt{\mathcal{Z}_{qg}\{T\}} = 0, \quad n \geq -1 \quad (1)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_n = \sum_{k \geq \delta_{n+1,0}} T_k \frac{\partial}{\partial T_{k+n}} + \sum_{\substack{a+b=n \\ a,b \geq 0}} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial T_a \partial T_b} + \delta_{n+1,0} \cdot \frac{T_0^2}{16} + \delta_{n,0} \cdot \frac{1}{16}.$$

Equation (1) can be deduced<sup>6</sup> as a continuum limit of Ward identities in a discrete matrix model, which is associated with the shift of the integration variables<sup>7</sup>

$$X \rightarrow X + \epsilon X^{p+1} \quad (2)$$

in the integral

$$\mathcal{Z}_N^{(d)}\{t\} = \int DX \exp -trV\{X\} \quad (3)$$

$$V\{X\} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} t_k X^k.$$

However, it may be more reasonable to assume these Virasoro constraints to be a straightforward definition of  $\mathcal{Z}_{qg}\{T\}$ , which does not refer to a sophisticated change of variables  $\{t\} \rightarrow \{T\}$ <sup>6</sup> and to a discrete model (3).

As for  $Z_{ig}$ , it was recently represented by Kontsevich<sup>8</sup> in terms of another matrix model:

$$Z_{ig} = \lim_{\text{size } X \rightarrow \infty} Z_{ig}^{(d)}, \quad (4)$$

where

$$Z_{ig}^{(d)} = \frac{1}{C[M]} \int DX \exp -tr\{MX^2 + X^3\}, \quad (5)$$

with

$$C[M] = \int DX \exp -tr\{MX^2\} = \det(M \otimes I + I \otimes M)^{-1/2}, \quad (6)$$

where  $X$  and  $M$  are (anti-)Hermitian matrices.

It is a simple combinatorial result that as soon as  $X$  goes to infinity,  $Z_{ig}^{(d)}$  becomes dependent only on the variables

$$T_m = \frac{3^{2m+1}}{m + \frac{1}{2}} tr M^{-2m-1} + \frac{4}{3\sqrt{3}} \delta_{m,1}. \quad (7)$$

The explicit formulation of the original suggestion in these terms is

$$Z_{ig}\{T_m\} = \sqrt{Z_{gg}\{T_n\}}, \quad (8)$$

which, in particular, implies what is known as Witten's suggestion, i.e., that  $Z_{ig}\{T\}$  is, like  $\sqrt{Z_{gg}\{T\}}$ , a  $\tau$  function of KdV hierarchy. A necessary condition for (8) is that  $Z_{ig}\{T\}$ , which is defined by (4-6), satisfies the same Virasoro constraints (1).

This is the statement we prove in this letter. In addition, we shall prove a relation involving  $Z_{ig}^{(d)}$  [see Eq. (16) below], i.e., valid for *finite* dimensional matrices  $X$ , which implies the entire set of Virasoro constraints only as the size of the matrix goes to infinity.

This statement is equivalent to (8) modulo:

- (i) the assertions which have been made by Kontsevich in the derivation of (4)-(6) from Penner's formalism of fat graphs, and
- (ii) the so-far subtle problem of the uniqueness of solutions of the Virasoro constraints (1).

2. Since the Ward identities are somewhat obscure in Kontsevich's presentation, (4)-(6), we begin with a slight reformulation of his model.

After a shift of the integration variable  $X \rightarrow X - \frac{M}{3}$  and the redefinition  $M = 3\Lambda^2$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}\{\Lambda\} &\equiv \int DX \exp(-tr X^3 + tr \Lambda X) \\ &= C[\sqrt{\Lambda}] \exp\left(-\frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}} tr \Lambda^{3/2}\right) Z_{ig}^{(d)} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

with

$$C[\sqrt{\Lambda}] = \det(\sqrt{\Lambda} \otimes I + I \otimes \sqrt{\Lambda})^{-1/2}. \quad (10)$$

The functional  $\mathcal{F}\{\Lambda\}$  can be considered as a kind of matrix-Fourier transform of the exponential cubic potential  $\text{tr } X^3$ . It satisfies obvious Ward identities which are associated with a shift of the integration variables:

$$X \rightarrow X + \epsilon_p. \quad (11)$$

Specifically,

$$\text{tr} \left( \epsilon_p \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \Lambda_{ir}^2} - \frac{1}{3} \epsilon_p \Lambda \right) \mathcal{F}\{\Lambda\} = 0. \quad (12)$$

Here  $\epsilon_p$  represents any  $X$ -independent matrix, which may be diagonal simultaneously with  $\Lambda$ , e.g.,  $\epsilon_p = \Lambda^p$ .

Let us substitute in (12) the functional  $\mathcal{F}$  in the form prescribed by (9)

$$\mathcal{F}\{\Lambda\} = C[\sqrt{\Lambda}] \exp\left(-\frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}} \text{tr } \Lambda^{3/2}\right) \mathcal{Z}\{T_m\}, \quad (13)$$

with

$$T_m = \frac{1}{m + \frac{1}{2}} \text{tr } \Lambda^{-m-1/2} + \frac{4}{3\sqrt{3}} \delta_{m,1}. \quad (14)$$

We assert that after the substitution of (13) into (12) it becomes

$$\sum_{n \geq -1} \text{tr}(\epsilon_p \Lambda^{-n-2}) \mathcal{L}_n \mathcal{Z} = 0. \quad (15)$$

The identity

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{F}} \text{tr} \left( \epsilon_p \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \Lambda_{ir}^2} - \frac{1}{3} \epsilon_p \Lambda \right) \mathcal{F} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}} \sum_{n \geq -1} \text{tr}(\epsilon_p \Lambda^{-n-2}) \mathcal{L}_n \mathcal{Z} \quad (16)$$

is valid for any size of the matrix  $\Lambda$ , but only in the limit of infinitely large  $\Lambda$ :

(i) it is reasonable to substitute  $Z_{ig}^{(d)}$  in (9) by  $Z_{ig}$ , which depends only on  $\text{tr } \Lambda^{-q}$  with half-integer  $q$ 's;

(ii) the  $T_m$ 's in (14) are actually independent variables;

(iii) all the quantities

$$\text{tr}(\epsilon_p \Lambda^{-n-2}) \quad (17)$$

(e.g.,  $\text{tr } \Lambda^p \Lambda^{-n-2}$ ) become algebraically independent, so that Eq. (15) implies that

$$\mathcal{L}_n \mathcal{Z}_{ig}\{T\} = 0, \quad n \geq -1. \quad (18)$$

This concludes the derivation of the Virasoro constraints for  $Z_{ig}\{T\}$  defined as the continuum limit of Kontsevich's partition function.

The fact that the operators  $\mathcal{L}_n$  in (15) contain only the second  $T$  derivatives is a direct result of the fact that only double  $\Lambda$  derivatives arise in the *l.h.s.* and thus the

fact that the potential  $\text{tr} X^3$  in Kontsevich's model has a cubic nature. It is very interesting (in particular, from the point of view of multimatrix and Potts models) to study the matrix-Fourier transform of the potentials like  $\text{tr} X^{K+1}$  for any degree  $K + 1$ . Interestingly, the corresponding Ward identities, which are transformed to the form (15), contain operators similar to the higher-spin operators of the  $W_K$ -algebra, instead of the Virasoro generators  $\mathcal{L}_n$ .

We are deeply indebted to Prof. I. Singer, who informed us about his talk<sup>9</sup> and encouraged us to complete our study of the Ward identities in the Kontsevich model. We benefited considerably from the illuminating discussions on this subject with E. Corrigan, A. Gerasimov, M. Kontsevich, Yu. Makeenko, A. Niemi, and I. Zakharevich.

<sup>1</sup>V. Kazakov, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A4**, 2125 (1989); E. Brezin and V. Kazakov, *Phys. Lett.* **B236**, 144 (1990); M. Douglas and S. Shenker, *Nucl. Phys.* **B335**, 635 (1990); D. Gross and A. Migdal, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64**, 127 (1990).

<sup>2</sup>M. Douglas, *Phys. Lett.* **B238**, 176 (1990).

<sup>3</sup>E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B340**, 281 (1990); R. Dijkgraaf and E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B342**, 486(1990).

<sup>4</sup>M. Fukuma, H. Kawai, and R. Nakayama, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A6**, 1385 (1991).

<sup>5</sup>R. Dijkgraaf, E. Verlinde, and H. Verlinde, *Nucl. Phys.* **B356**, 574 (1991).

<sup>6</sup>Yu. Makeenko *et al.*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B356**, 574 (1991).

<sup>7</sup>J. Ambjorn, J. Jurkiewicz, and Yu. Makeenko, *Phys. Lett.* **B** (1990); A. Gerasimov *et al.*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B357**, 565 (1991); A. Mironov and A. Morozov, *Phys. Lett.* **B252**, 47 (1990).

<sup>8</sup>M. Kontsevich, *Func. Anal. and Appl.* (1990).

<sup>9</sup>E. Witten, in: a talk at NYC Conference, June 1991.

Submitted in English by Authors