

Gauge theories as spontaneous breaking theories

E. A. Ivanov and V. I. Ogievetskiĭ

Joint Institute for Nuclear Physics

(Submitted April 27, 1976)

Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **23**, No. 11, 661-664 (5 June 1976)

It is shown that any gauge theory is a spontaneous symmetry breaking theory with respect to a definite infinite-parametric group, and that the corresponding gauge field is the goldstonion that accompanies this spontaneous breaking.

PACS numbers: 11.30.Qc, 12.20.Hx

1. It is well known that there is a close analogy between gauge and Goldstone fields. This analogy is manifest, in particular, in the inhomogeneity of their group transformations.^[1] We demonstrate in this article that this analogy is not accidental, and is due to the fact that any gauge theory can be regarded as a theory of spontaneous breaking of a definite symmetry, and the corresponding gauge field can be regarded as the goldstonion accompanying this spontaneous breaking.

We develop and generalize in this paper the results of an article^[2] in which it is shown that gravitation theory is a theory of spontaneously broken affine and conformal symmetries, and the gauge field $h_{\mu\nu}$ (graviton) is a goldstonion. Similar in their conception are also the articles^[3,4] in which the photon is interpreted as a Goldstone field. We note that another approach to this problem, based on introduction of additional dimensions of space, was proposed in a recent paper.^[5]

2. We shall show first that the gauge transformation can be regarded as a transformation from a certain group K with constant parameters and an infinite number of generators. The commutation relations between these generators are uniquely determined by the algebra of the initial finite-parameter group G^0 .

Confining ourselves to gauge functions that can be expanded in a Taylor series in the vicinity of $x_\mu = 0$, we represent the element of a certain local-symmetry group $G^{I(x)}$ in the form

$$\exp\{i a^\alpha(x) Q^\alpha\} \equiv \exp\{i a^\alpha(0) Q^\alpha + \sum_{n \geq 1} a^\alpha_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n} Q^\alpha_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n}\}, \quad (1)$$

here Q^α are the generators of a finite-parameter subgroup G^0 and

$$a^\alpha_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n} \equiv \frac{1}{n!} \partial_{\mu_1}^x \dots \partial_{\mu_n}^x a^\alpha(x) \Big|_{x_\mu = 0}, \quad (2)$$

$$Q^\alpha_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n} \equiv x_{\mu_1} \dots x_{\mu_n} Q^\alpha.$$

The generators $Q^\alpha_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n}, \dots, Q^\alpha_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n}, \dots$ together with Q^α generate an infinite-parameter group K . The commutation relations of these generators with one another and with the generator of the 4-translations $P_\mu = -i\partial_\mu^x$ can be obtained by using the presentation (2):

$$[Q^\alpha_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_k}, Q^\beta_{\mu_{k+1} \dots \mu_n}] = i C_{\alpha\beta}^\gamma Q^\gamma_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n}, \quad (3)$$

$$[P_\rho, Q_\mu^\alpha] = -i \delta_{\rho\mu} Q^\alpha, \quad (4)$$

$$[P_\rho, Q_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n}^\alpha] = -i \left(\delta_{\rho\mu_1} Q_{\mu_2 \dots \mu_n}^\alpha + \dots + \delta_{\rho\mu_n} Q_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_{n-1}}^\alpha \right). \quad (5)$$

($n \geq 2$)

Here $C_{\alpha\beta}^\gamma$ are the structure constants of the subgroup G^0 . The transformation properties of $Q_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n}^\alpha$ relative to G^0 in the homogeneous Lorentz group L in the representation (2) are obvious. The group K together with the Poincare group \mathcal{P} form the semi-direct product $\mathcal{K} = K \otimes \mathcal{P}$.

3. Our main result is that the gauge theory connected with the local group $G^l(x)$ can be obtained as a result of a Nambu-Goldstone realization^{6,71} of the symmetry with respect to the group \mathcal{K} , with the subgroup $G^0 \otimes \mathcal{P}$ as the subgroup of the vacuum stability. The gauge field then turns out to be a goldstonion corresponding to the generator Q_μ^α .

The most direct and natural method of the Nambu-Goldstone realization of the symmetry is the method of nonlinear reactions, which has been developed in detail in^{18,91}. According to^{18,91}, we should parametrize the factor-space $\mathcal{K}/G^0 \otimes L$ by the fields $b_\mu^\alpha(x), \dots, b_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n}^\alpha(x), \dots$ with the quantum numbers of the generators $Q_\mu^\alpha, \dots, Q_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n}^\alpha, \dots$ and regard the action of the group \mathcal{K} in factor space as that of a group of left-hand shifts.

The Poincare group acts on the fields and on x_μ in standard manner, so that we are interested only in the action of the group K . The fields $b_\mu^\alpha(x), \dots, b_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n}^\alpha(x), \dots$ transform inhomogeneously:

$$Q_\mu^\alpha: \quad \delta b_\mu^\alpha(x) = a_\mu^\alpha + O_1(b, x) (= a_\mu^\alpha - C_{\beta\gamma}^\alpha b_\mu^\beta(x) x_\rho^\gamma),$$

$$Q_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n}^\alpha: \quad \delta b_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n}^\alpha(x) = a_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n}^\alpha + O_n(b, x).$$

These fields are therefore goldstonions. The other fields $\Psi(x)$ transform in accordance with the representations of the algebraic subgroup G^0 but with the function parameters $U^\alpha(x, k)$ (k is an element of the group K). If we confine ourselves to the algebraic subgroup of the field $\Psi(x)$, then $b_\mu^\alpha(x), \dots, b_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n}^\alpha(x)$ transforms in accordance with the corresponding representations of this subgroup with constant parameters.

The invariant Lagrangians are constructed in standard fashions from the fields and their covariant derivatives.^{18,91} Owing to the specific structure of the group \mathcal{K} , the covariant derivatives turn out to be polynomials in the goldstonions and can be easily obtained in explicit form. Using the general prescriptions,^{18,91} we obtain

$$\nabla_\rho b_\mu^\alpha(x) = \partial_\rho b_\mu^\alpha(x) + b_{\rho\mu}^\alpha(x) - \frac{1}{2} C_{\beta\gamma}^\alpha b_\rho^\beta(x) b_\mu^\gamma(x), \quad (6)$$

$$D_\rho \Psi(x) = (\partial_\rho + ib_\rho^{\alpha(\dots)} Q^\alpha) \Psi(x). \quad (7)$$

It is easy to duplicate also the remaining covariant derivatives.

It is important that the symmetrical and antisymmetrical parts of $\nabla_\rho b_\mu^\alpha$, viz.,

$$\nabla_{\{\rho} b_{\mu\}}^\alpha = \partial_\rho b_\mu^\alpha(x) + \partial_\mu b_\rho^\alpha(x) + 2 b_{\rho\mu}^\alpha(x), \quad (8)$$

$$\nabla_{[\rho} b_{\mu]}^\alpha = \partial_\rho b_\mu^\alpha(x) - \partial_\mu b_\rho^\alpha(x) - C_{\beta\gamma}^\alpha b_\rho^\beta(x) b_\mu^\gamma(x) \quad (9)$$

transform independently of each other. In this case $\nabla_{[\rho} b_{\mu]}$, just as $D_\rho \Psi$, does not contain goldstonions with ≥ 2 tensor indices. $\nabla_{[\rho} b_{\mu]}$ coincides in structure with the covariant Yang-Mills rotor. Thus, to construct the invariant Lagrangians it suffices to have at our disposal $\nabla_{[\rho} b_{\mu]}$, $D_\rho \Psi$ and Ψ

$$\mathcal{L}^{inv}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{L}^{inv}(G \otimes L)(D_\rho \Psi, \Psi, \nabla_{[\rho} b_{\mu]}^\alpha).$$

The connections of the goldstonion $b_\mu^\alpha(x)$ with itself and with the field $\Psi(x)$ are identical with the connections of the Yang-Mills gauge field, and it is this which allows us to identify $b_\mu^\alpha(x)$ with this gauge field.

The goldstonions $b_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n}^\alpha$ ($n \geq 2$) turn out in final analysis to be inessential. They can be eliminated by expressing in terms of the vector goldstonion and its derivatives with the aid of the inverse Higgs effect^[10] (by equating to zero the symmetrical parts of the covariant derivatives of the goldstonions).

We have considered above only the case of internal symmetries. The entire analysis, however, can be easily transferred also to the case when the initial group G^0 determines the space-time symmetry.

4. Thus, any gauge theory is a spontaneous symmetry-breaking theory.¹⁾ Consequently, spontaneously broken symmetries constitute a more profound and more general concept than gauge theories. A discussion of the ensuing consequences will be presented in a detailed article.

¹⁾The statement^[11] that there exist no goldstonions with spins $> 1/2$ is not applicable to gauge fields, since it makes essential use of the definiteness of the metric of the space of state and the explicit relativistic invariance—assumptions that cannot be satisfied simultaneously in any gauge theory.

¹⁾S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **177**, 2604 (1969).

²⁾A. B. Borisov and V. I. Ogievetskiĭ, Teor. Mat. Fiz. **21**, 329 (1974).

³⁾R. Ferrari and L. E. Picasso, Nucl. Phys. **B31**, 316 (1971).

⁴⁾R. A. Brandt and Ng Wing-Chin, Phys. Rev. **D10**, 4198 (1974).

⁵⁾Y. M. Cho and P. G. O. Freund, Phys. Rev. **D12**, 1711 (1975).

⁶⁾J. Goldstone, Nuovo Cimento **19**, 155 (1961).

⁷⁾Y. Nambu and G. Jona-Lasinio, Phys. Rev. **122**, 345 (1961); **124**, 246 (1961).

⁸⁾S. Coleman, J. Wess, and B. Zumino, Phys. Rev. **177**, 2239 (1969); C. L.

Callan, Jr., S. Coleman, J. Wess, and B. Zumino, *ibid.*, 2247; D. V. Volkov,

Preprint ITF 69-75, Kiev, 1969; V. I. Ogievetsky, Proc. Tenth Winter School of Theoretical Physics in Karpacz 1, 117, Wroclaw, PNR, 1974.

⁹D. V. Volkov, Fiz. Elem. Chastits At. Yadra 4, 3 (1973) [Sov. J. Part. Nucl. 4, 1 (1973)].

¹⁰A. A. Ivanov and V. I. Ogievetskiĭ, Teor. Mat. Fiz. 25, 164 (1975).

¹¹D. Maison and H. Reeh, Commun. Math. Phys. 24, 67 (1971).