Submitted to Physical Review

UC-32 & UC-34d

LBL-6711
Preprint c.1

RECEIVED
LAWRENCE
BERKELEY LABORATORY

AUG 3 1977

LIBRARY AND
DOCUMENTS SECTION

GAUGE-INVARIANT FORMULATION OF THE SELF-DUAL SECTOR

M. B. Halpern

July 12, 1977

For Reference

Not to be taken from this room

LAWRENCE BERKELEY LABORATORY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY

Prepared for the U. S. Energy Research and
Development Administration under Contract W-7405-ENG-48

DISCLAIMER

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. While this document is believed to contain correct information, neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor the Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or the Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof or the Regents of the University of California.

GAUGE-INVARIANT FORMULATION OF THE SELF-DUAL SECTOR*

M. B. Halpern

Department of Physics and Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory
University of California, Berkeley, California 94720

July 12, 1977

ABSTRACT

The field-strength formulation of non-Abelian gauge theories opens the gate to a description in terms of local gauge-invariant variables. As a first step in this direction, I work out a gauge-invariant formulation of the self-dual sector. A simple extension, using the ideas of Corrigan, Fairlie and Yates, provides a gauge-invariant characterization of broader regions within the saddle point.

0 0 0 4 8 0 0 9 5 7

I. Introduction

In a previous paper[1], I proposed a local formulation of non-Abelian gauge theories in terms of field-strengths $G^a_{\mu\nu}$. The formulation focuses attention on the inverse field-strength $(\mathcal{G}^{-1})^{ab}_{\mu\nu}$, $\mathcal{G}^{ab}_{\mu\nu} \equiv f^{abc}G^c_{\mu\nu}$, and configurations with $\det\mathcal{G} = 0$ (all x_μ) are singular [2]. To go beyond semi-classical expansions about non-singular configurations, one must prescribe G-contours (or regulators) near the singular configurations--such that the G-functional integral equals the original integral over potentials. I will discuss this question elsewhere. The present work is addressed to another aspect of the field-strength formulation, and I will limit myself here to non-singular configurations.

Having a formulation in terms of variables which "rotate" only (under gauge transformation) --instead of rotating and translating, as do the potentials--points the way to a local gauge-invariant description. In this paper I am going to treat only the very simple case of a self-(or anti-) dual sector--plus a simple extension, using the ideas of Corrigan, Fairlie and Yates[3], to broader regions of the saddle point. Hopefully some of the strategy I employ in the self-dual sector will be of aid in the more general case.

II. Choice of Variables and Strategy

In this paper, I treat only the gauge group O(3) in four space-time dimensions [4]. The field strength $G^a_{\mu\nu}$ has $6 \times 3 = 18$ components. Three of these can be removed by gauge transformation, and so one might expect to specify the gauge-invariant content of the theory in terms of $18 - 3 = 15$ gauge-invariants.

I will not pursue the full problem here, but rather go to the self-dual sector

$$G = \tilde{G},\ \tilde{G}^a_{\mu\nu} = \tfrac{1}{2}\,\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}G^a_{\rho\sigma},\ \epsilon_{0123} = +1. \tag{2.1}$$

Here we expect $9 - 3 = 6$ independent gauge-invariant variables. I express self-duality by writing

$$G^a_{\mu\nu} = E^a_i\,\eta'_{i\mu\nu},\ E^a_i = \tfrac{1}{4}\,\eta'_{i\mu\nu}G^a_{\mu\nu} \tag{2.2}$$

$$\eta'_{i\mu\nu} = \epsilon_{0i\mu\nu} - \delta_{\mu i}\delta_{\nu 0} + \delta_{\nu i}\delta_{\mu 0}$$

η' is the self-dual `t Hooft tensor [5]. Of the nine components of the electric field E^a_i (the upper index is color; the lower is spin), three can be removed by gauge transformation (and two signs fixed).

Consider the six gauge-invariant quantities

$$E^a_i E^a_j \equiv g_{ij} \tag{2.3}$$

In matrix notation $E^a_i \equiv (E)_{ai}$,

$$E^T E = g \tag{2.4}$$

and $E \to OE$, O orthogonal, is the gauge transformation. For reasons of provocation, I will refer to the symmetric 3×3 gauge-invariant matrix g as the "metric-tensor." From this point of view, the electric field is the "drei-bein" for the metric.

The metric tensor is adequate to describe those regions of the self-dual sector in which (det is determinant)

$$\xi \equiv 2 \det E \tag{2.5}$$

has fixed sign, for then $\xi = 2\,(\det g)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ up to that fixed sign. For the general case of a boundary (sign change of ξ), I will include ξ itself as a variable to measure the remaining sign. I found it convenient to use this overcomplete set $\{g, \xi\}$ in the algebraic details of the reformulation. It is a conceptual advantage however to note that a complete set of (just) six gauge-invariant variables is easily found. Such a set is

$$\{\xi, \bar{g} \equiv (\det g)^{-1/3} g = \left(\frac{|\xi|}{2}\right)^{-2/3} g\} \tag{2.6}$$

that is, a unimodular metric $\bar{g}$ and ξ.

The reader may find it instructive to work out the previous paragraph in a particular gauge. A convenient choice is: E (the matrix) upper-triangular, and $E_{11} \geq 0$, $E_{22} \geq 0$. It is not hard to solve Eq. (2.4) explicitly for $E(\bar{g}, \xi)$,

$$E_{11} = (g_{11})^{-\frac{1}{2}} g_{11}, \quad E_{22} = (g_{11})^{-\frac{1}{2}} (g_{11}g_{22} - g_{12}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{2.7}$$

$$E_{23} = (g_{11})^{-\frac{1}{2}} (g_{11}g_{12} - g_{12}^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (g_{23}g_{11} - g_{12}g_{23})$$

$$E_{33} = \tfrac{1}{2}\, \xi\, (g_{11}g_{22} - g_{12}^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$$

I should say before proceeding that my choice of variables was just to get off the ground in the first place; many other hopefully superior, more elegant choices can be made. My variables are not even covariant, so I can expect no more from the reformulation. It may be helpful, e.g., to work in terms of the redundant but covariant variables $I_{\mu\nu;\rho\sigma}$ and $K_{\mu\nu}$,

$$I_{\mu\nu;\rho\sigma} \equiv G^a_{\mu\nu} G^a_{\rho\sigma} = g_{ij}\, \eta'_{i\mu\nu}\, \eta'_{j\rho\sigma} \tag{2.8}$$

$$g_{ij} = \frac{1}{16}\, \eta'_{i\mu\nu}\, \eta'_{j\rho\sigma}\, I_{\mu\nu;\rho\sigma}$$

$$K_{\mu\nu} \equiv \frac{1}{3}\, \varepsilon^{ijk} (G^i G^j G^k)_{\mu\nu} = \xi\, \delta_{\mu\nu}$$

My first attempt to solve the problem was along the following lines: I know the field-strength saddle-point equations[1] (e is the gauge-coupling),

$$F^a_{\mu\nu}(J\,[G]) + e\, G^a_{\mu\nu} = 0 \tag{2.9a}$$

$$F^a_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu J^a_\nu - \partial_\nu J^a_\mu + \varepsilon^{abc} J^b_\mu J^c_\nu \tag{2.9b}$$

$$J^a_\mu\,[G] = (\mathcal{M}^{-1})^{ab}_{\mu\nu}\, \partial_\lambda G^b_{\lambda\nu} \tag{2.9c}$$

In the self-dual sector, these are equations for the electric field. If I go to a particular gauge, say the upper triangular gauge, I have the form $E = E(\bar{g}, \xi)$ explicitly Eq. (2.7). This form is of course gauge-dependent, but if I substitute into Eq. (2.9), I obtain equations for $\bar{g}$, ξ which must

be independent of gauge choice. Unfortunately this gauge is not rotationally invariant, and so the resulting equations for $\bar{g}$, ξ are in a terrible scramble. Other gauges (that I studied) suffer from compensating drawbacks. I report this "brute-force" approach for two reasons. First, anyone who tries it will believe it can be done in principle (and hence for full Yang-Mills?). Second, it provides a grim background against which to appreciate the relatively simple results I will present below.

The basic stragegy of the next section is as follows. By using Eq's. (2.2) and (2.9b,c), we can construct $F^a_{\mu\nu}(E)$ (F as a function of E and its derivatives). At first sight, this is a horrible expression; with a moment's thought however, F must be a function of E such that it rotates like E under gauge transformation. It is therefore reasonable to hope [6] that it can be put in the form

$$F^a_{\mu\nu} = \Theta_{\mu\nu;m}(\bar{g}, \xi)E^a_m \tag{2.10}$$

where Θ is a function only of the gauge-invariants. I shall show that this is precisely what happens. The gauge-invariant description follows immediately. Away from the singular configurations, E has an inverse. The field equations

$$(\Theta_{\mu\nu;m} + e\,\eta'_{m\mu\nu})E^i_m = 0 \tag{2.11}$$

are then equivalent to the gauge-invariant description

$$\Theta_{\mu\nu;m} + e\,\eta'_{m\mu\nu} = 0 \tag{2.12}$$

III. Field-Strength Structure and Gauge-Invariant Formulation

As described in Ref.(1), we have for O(3) in four dimensions

$$(\mathcal{G}^{-1})^{ij} = \tilde{G}^j G^i K^{-1} \tag{3.1}$$

$$K = \frac{1}{3}\,\varepsilon^{ijk} G^i \tilde{G}^j G^k$$

In the self-dual sector K is proportional to the unit matrix, and we have the "gluon" J,

$$J^i_\mu = \xi^{-1}(G^j G^i)_{\mu\nu}\,\partial_\lambda G^i_{\lambda\nu} \tag{3.2}$$

$$K = \xi = 2\det E$$

Note that $\det \mathcal{G}$ not identically zero for all x_μ implies the same for ξ and $\det g$.

Our first real task in this paper is then to sort out the numerator of the gluon J^i_μ. I would like to do the sorting in such a manner (consistent with our stragegy) as to show the gauge-transformation properties of the gluon. Each term in the gluon numerator is cubic in E, with two color indices contracted. When this pair is separated by a derivative, I separate out the gauge-invariant part with the identity

$$E^i_\ell \partial_\mu E^i_m = \tfrac{1}{2}\,(\partial_\mu g_{\ell m} + \varepsilon_{\ell mp} A^\mu_p) \tag{3.3}$$

$$A^\mu_p \equiv \varepsilon_{prs} E^a_r \partial_\mu E^a_s$$

A^μ_p is a (global) color singlet "spin-density." In this way, after some algebra, I can express the gluon as[7]

$$J^a_\mu = \xi^{-1}\ \{A^\mu_m + \eta'_{j\mu\nu}\partial_\nu \tilde{g}_{jm}\}E^a_m \tag{3.4}$$

$$\tilde{g}_{jm} \equiv g_{jm} - \tfrac{1}{2}\,\delta_{jm}\mathrm{Tr}(g)$$

where Tr means trace.

This form shows the gluon gauge-transformation property nicely. Under the infinitesimal rotation

$$\delta E^a_i = \epsilon^{abc}\chi^b E^c_i \tag{3.5}$$

χ^b arbitrary, the spin-density changes by

$$\delta A^\mu_p = -\xi\,\partial_\mu \chi^b \bar{E}^b_p \tag{3.6}$$

$$\bar{E}^b_p \equiv \xi^{-1}\epsilon^{abc}\epsilon_{ijk}E^b_j E^c_k$$

$$\bar{E}^b_p E^b_q = \delta_{pq},\ \bar{E}^b_p E^a_p = \delta^{ab}$$

Thus, I verify the gluon gauge transformation,

$$\delta J^a_\mu = -\partial_\mu \chi^a + \epsilon^{abc}\chi^b J^c_\mu \tag{3.7}$$

with the spin-density providing the translation term. In fact, the first term in J,

$$\tilde{J}^a_\mu \equiv \xi^{-1}A^\mu_m E^a_m = -\tfrac{1}{2}\epsilon^{abc}\bar{E}^b_\ell \partial_\mu E^c_\ell \tag{3.8}$$

has, by <u>itself</u>, the correct transformation property [Eq. (3.7)]. This gives us a simple laboratory to test our strategy.

I have computed the simpler object $F^a_{\mu\nu}(\tilde{J})$. Helpful identities are

$$\epsilon^{ijk}\,\epsilon^{j\ell m}\,\epsilon^{kpq} = -(\delta_{jp}\delta_{\ell q} - \delta_{jq}\delta_{\ell p})\epsilon^{jim} \tag{3.9}$$

$$+ (\delta_{jp}\delta_{mq} - \delta_{mp}\delta_{jq})\epsilon^{ji\ell}$$

$$\bar{E}^a_i\partial_\mu E^b_i = -E^b_i\partial_\mu \bar{E}^a_i,\ \bar{E}^a_i\partial_\mu E^a_j = -E^a_j\partial_\mu \bar{E}^a_i$$

$$\bar{E}^a_i\bar{E}^a_j = (g^{-1})_{ij},\ \bar{E}^k_a = E^k_b\,(g^{-1})_{ba}$$

With the help of the first four identities and Eqs. (2.3), (3.6), I can manage a contraction to 1, g or g^{-1} in each of the terms in $\epsilon^{abc}\tilde{J}^b_\mu\tilde{J}^c_\nu$. Then, I eliminate all $\bar{E}$'s in favor of E via the last identity. After some algebra I find that all terms with derivatives on E cancel, leaving the simple resul

$$F^i_{\mu\nu}(\tilde{J}) = \tfrac{1}{4}\,\partial_\mu(g^{-1})_{ca}g_{ab}\partial_\nu(g^{-1})_{bd}\epsilon^{ijk}E^j_c E^k_d \tag{3.10}$$

This certainly shows the correct gauge-transformation property. I can also put it in the desired (linear-in-E) form by the identity,

$$\epsilon^{ijk}E^j_c E^k_d = \tfrac{1}{4}\,\xi\,E^i_a(g^{-1})_{ab}\epsilon_{bcd} \tag{3.11}$$

Buoyed in spirit, I have computed the remaining terms in $F^a_{\mu\nu}(J)$. After some similar algebra, I obtain the desired result,

$$F^i_{\mu\nu} = \Theta_{\mu\nu;m}E^i_m \tag{3.12a}$$

$$\Theta_{\mu\nu;m} = \tfrac{1}{2}\xi\{\tfrac{1}{2}\partial_\mu(g^{-1})_{ca}g_{ab}\partial_\nu(g^{-1})_{bd} + Z_{\mu c}Z_{\nu d}\}\,(g^{-1})_{mr}\epsilon_{rcd}$$

$$+ \partial_\mu Z_{\nu m} - \partial_\nu Z_{\mu m} \tag{3.12b}$$

$$+ \tfrac{1}{2}(g^{-1})_{m\ell}\{\partial_\mu g_{\ell n}Z_{\nu n} - \partial_\nu g_{\ell n}Z_{\mu n}\}$$

$$Z_{\mu i} \equiv \xi^{-1}\eta'_{a\mu\sigma}\partial_\sigma\tilde{g}_{ai} \tag{3.12c}$$

The first term in Θ corresponds to Eq. (3.10). A nice check on the form of Θ is to remember that $F_{\mu\nu}$ is scale-invariant under $G \to \kappa^{\frac{1}{2}}G$. Now, under $g \to \kappa g$, $\xi \to \kappa^{3/2}\xi$, Θ is homogeneous of degree $\kappa^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. The form Eq. (3.12) for $F^i_{\mu\nu}$ is much simplified over previous work, and will be an aid in the field-strength formulation itself.

The field-strength equations of motion Eq. (2.9) are then

$$(\Theta_{\mu\nu;m} + e\eta'_{m\mu\nu})E^i_m = 0 \tag{3.13}$$

And, as discussed in Section II, the gauge-invariant formulation is simply

$$\Theta_{\mu\nu;m} + e\eta'_{m\mu\nu} = 0 \tag{3.14}$$

Multiplying our result by g_{mk} puts the equations in a form resembling general

relativity (say in the gauge with $g_{00} = 1$, $g_{0i} = 0$) with a cosmological constant.

Other interesting quantities are easily evaluated in terms of our variables. E.g., ignoring the "Faddeev-Popov" terms[1], I find for the field-strength action, using Eq. (3.12a)

$$S = \int d^4x\{-\frac{1}{2e}G^a_{\mu\nu}F^a_{\mu\nu} - \tfrac{1}{4}G^a_{\mu\nu}G^a_{\mu\nu}\}$$

$$= \int d^4x\{-\frac{1}{e}(\Theta_{0i;m} + \tilde{\Theta}_{0i;m})g_{mi} - \mathrm{Tr}(g)\}$$

where $\tilde{\Theta}$ is the usual dual of Θ.

IV. Simplest Ansatz

The gauge-invariant equations of motion, Eq. (3.14), are conveniently grouped, following Ref. (1), as self-dual and anti-self-dual parts,

$$\Theta^{+}_{\mu\nu;m} + e\eta'_{m\mu\nu} = 0, \quad \Theta^{-}_{\mu\nu;m} = 0 \tag{4.1a}$$

$$\Theta = \Theta^{+} + \Theta^{-}, \quad \Theta^{\pm} = \tfrac{1}{2}(\Theta \pm \tilde{\Theta}) \tag{4.1b}$$

I will seek a solution to these in the form of the <u>simplest</u> <u>conceivable</u> ansatz

$$\bar{g} = 1 \tag{4.2}$$

$$\xi = 2\lambda^3$$

From Eq. (2.6), this is equivalent to $g = \lambda^2$, $\xi = 2\lambda^3$. I have used λ instead of just ξ itself only to make contact with Reference (1). The equations of motion (4.1a, b) become respectively

$$-\frac{\partial_\mu\lambda\partial_\mu\lambda}{4\lambda^3} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\Box^2\lambda}{\lambda^2} + 2e = 0 \tag{4.3a}$$

and

$$\delta_{mi}\left[\frac{3}{4}\left(\frac{\partial_j\lambda\partial_j\lambda}{\lambda^3} - \frac{\partial_0\lambda\partial_0\lambda}{\lambda^3}\right) + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\partial_0^2\lambda}{\lambda^2} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial_j\partial_j\lambda}{\lambda^2}\right)\right] \tag{4.3b}$$
$$-\frac{3}{2}\frac{\partial_i\lambda\partial_m\lambda}{\lambda^3} + \frac{\partial_m\partial_i\lambda}{\lambda^2} + \epsilon_{mij}\left(\frac{3}{2}\frac{\partial_j\lambda\partial_0\lambda}{\lambda^3} - \frac{\partial_0\partial_j\lambda}{\lambda^2}\right) = 0$$

These equations are precisely those implied (before the $\lambda[R]$) assumption) in Ref. (1), now divided by λ. (The ansatz there was equivalent, $E^a_i = \delta^a_i\lambda$, $J^i_\mu = -\eta'_{i\mu\nu}\,\tfrac{1}{2}\partial_\nu \ln\lambda$.) Note that the simple variable change $\lambda = \phi^2$ ($\xi = 2\phi^6$) brings the self-dual part of the equations of motion (Eq. [4.3a]) to the form[8]

$$\frac{\Box^2\phi}{\phi^3} + 2e = 0 \tag{4.4}$$

Nevertheless, as stated in Ref. (1), when taken together Eq.'s (4.3a, b,) have as their only common solution, the translated pseudo-particle [9]

$$\lambda = \frac{4b}{e}\,\frac{1}{[(x-x_0)^2+b]^2} \tag{4.5}$$

b, $x_{0\mu}$ arbitrary. In the next section, I will discuss the circumstance under which Eq. (4.4) survives without interference from the anti-self-dual Eq. (4.3b).

There are also known[5] self-dual solutions of the form $V^a_\mu = -\frac{1}{g}J^a_\mu = \frac{1}{g}\eta_{a\mu\nu}\partial_\nu \ln\phi$, $\Box^2\phi = 0$ (η is the <u>anti</u>-self dual tensor in our notation). Except for the pseudo-particle itself however, these are not included in our simplest ansatz Eq. (4.2). (See however Section V.)

V. Corrigan-Fairlie-Yates and a Broader Gauge-Invariant Characterization

Corrigan, Fairlie and Yates (CFY)[3] have recently distributed a very interesting paper that independently observes the simplification of $\mathcal{J}^{-1}$ in the self-dual sector[1]. They also observed that the same simplification describes broader regions of the saddle point: one need not set the anti-self-dual part to zero.

They begin with the saddle point equations (2.9) in the form

$$F^a_{\pm\mu\nu}(J) + e\, G^a_{\pm\mu\nu} = 0 \tag{5.1a}$$

$$\partial_\mu G^a_{\mu\nu} + \varepsilon^{abc} J^b_\mu G^c_{\mu\nu} = 0 \tag{5.1b}$$

$$G = G_+ + G_-,\ G^a_{+\mu\nu} = S^a_{+i}\, \eta'_{i\mu\nu},\ G^a_{-\mu\nu} = S^a_{-i}\, \eta_{i\mu\nu}. \tag{5.1c}$$

Instead of setting $S_- = 0$ (as I did) they separate out $S_\pm$:

$$\partial_\mu G^a_{\pm\mu\nu} + \varepsilon^{abc} J^b_\mu\, G^c_{\pm\mu\nu} = 0 \tag{5.2}$$

If (say) G_+ has an inverse, $\mathcal{J}^{-1}_+$, then

$$J^a_\mu = (\mathcal{J}^{-1}_+)^{ab}_{\mu\nu}\, \partial_\lambda G^b_{+\lambda\nu} \tag{5.3}$$

On inspection of Eq's. (2.2) and (5.1c), it is evident then that $\mathcal{J}^{-1}_+$ and $J^a_\mu(S_+)$ are precisely our forms in the self-dual sector with the identification

$$E^a_i \leftrightarrow S^a_{+i}. \tag{5.4}$$

Equations for $S_\pm$

$$F^a_{+\mu\nu}(J[S_+]) + e\, S^a_{+i}\eta'_{i\mu\nu} = 0 \tag{5.5a}$$

$$F^a_{-\mu\nu}(J[S_+]) + e\, S^a_{-i}\eta_{i\mu\nu} = 0 \tag{5.5b}$$

reduce to ours if $S^a_{-i} = 0$. In general, CFY point out that, given S_+, S_- may be computed from (5.5b).

It is easy then to link up the advances of the present paper with the observation of CFY: all results of this paper for E should be read in terms of the map Eq. (5.4), and the anti-self dual parts of the equations should be used to compute S_-. One is then reading, e.g.

$$g_{ij} \equiv S^a_{+i} S^a_{+j},\ \xi \equiv 2\, \det S_+ \tag{5.6}$$

etc., in (say) Eq's. (3.4) and (3.12). The field-strength equations read

$$(\Theta^+_{\mu\nu;m} + e\, \eta'_{m\mu\nu}) S^i_m = 0 \tag{5.7a}$$

$$\Theta^-_{\mu\nu;m}\, S^a_{+m} + S^a_{-m}\eta_{m\mu\nu} = 0 \tag{5.7b}$$

(and [5.7b] determines S_-.) Finally, the gauge-invariant equations for $\bar{g}$, ξ are (just the self-dual part of our previous equations)

$$\Theta^+_{\mu\nu;m} + e\, \eta'_{m\mu\nu} = 0 \tag{5.8}$$

Thus, under the "simplest" ansatz (4.2), the result (4.4) stands potent.

It deserves emphasis then that the Wilczek-Corrigan-Fairlie ansatz is, within the gauge-invariant formulation, the simplest conceivable ansatz.

Note that <u>all gauge-invariants can be constructed from $\bar{g}$, ξ</u> using, say,

$$G^a_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{1}{e}\ \Theta_{\mu\nu;i}S^a_{+i} \tag{5.9}$$

$$\tilde{G}^a_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{1}{e}\ \tilde{\Theta}_{\mu\nu;i}S^a_{+i}$$

E.g., one easily computes

$$K_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{3}\,\epsilon^{abc}(G\tilde{G}G)_{\mu\nu} \tag{5.10}$$

$$= -\frac{\xi}{6e^3}\ \epsilon_{ijk}\Theta_{\mu\rho;i}\tilde{\Theta}_{\rho\sigma;j}\Theta_{\sigma\nu;k}$$

The CFY observation works as long as not both $\det S_\pm = 0$. This is not as broad as the "full" saddle point ($\det\mathcal{S} \neq 0$)-which presumably needs 15 gauge-invariant variables.

Following CFY, I can also find the $\Box^2\phi=0$ solutions[5] as a limit. As mentioned in Section III, under $S_+ \to \kappa^{1/2}S_+$, we have $\bar{g} \to \bar{g}$, $\xi \to \kappa^{3/2}\xi$, $\Theta \to \kappa^{-1/2}\Theta$. Thus with $S_+ = \kappa^{1/2}S'_+$, $\xi = \kappa^{3/2}\xi'$ we have in the limit $\kappa \to 0$,

$$\Theta^+_{\mu\nu;m}(\bar{g},\ \xi') = 0 \tag{5.11a}$$

$$\Theta^-_{\mu\nu;m}(\bar{g},\ \xi')S^{a\prime}_{+m} + S^a_{-m}\eta_{m\mu\nu} = 0 \tag{5.11b}$$

The ansatz (4.2) for ξ' then comes to $\phi^{-3}\Box^2\phi=0$ and (5.11b). Thus (still) $J^i_\mu = -\eta'_{i\mu\nu}\partial_\nu \ln\phi$ but the solutions are <u>anti</u>-self-dual.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank K. Bardakci, T. Clark, A. Hanson, P. Senjanovic, W. Siegel, C. Schwartz, and E. Wichmann for helpful discussions.

References and Footnotes

* Supported in part under the auspices of the Division of Physical Research of the Energy Research and Development Administration and in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant number PHY 74-08175-A03.

1. M. B. Halpern, "Field-Strength Formulation of Quantum Chromodynamics," Berkeley preprint (1977), to be published in Phys. Rev. D.

2. Previous work on the singular configurations, and the non-uniqueness problem include,
T. T. Wu and C. N. Yang, Phys. Rev. D12, 3843, (1975). R. Roskies, Phys Rev. D15, 1722, 1731, (1977). M. Calvo, Phys. Rev. D15, 1733, (1977). S. Deser and F. Wilzcek, Princeton preprint (1976).

3. E. Corrigan, D. B. Fairlie and R. G. Yates, "SU(2) Gauge Potentials and Field-Strengths" Durham preprint (1977).

4. A simpler case would be O(3) and three space-time dimensions. The full structure in that case should resemble the self-dual sector here.

5. G. `t Hooft, Phys. Rev. Letters 37, 8, (1976). Phys. Rev. D14, 3432, (1976).

6. I believe a proof can be found along the lines of the construction of Section III. Such an understanding, useless in the light of Section III might be crucial for the more general problem.

7. This simplification was independently reported in Ref. (3).

8. F. Wilzcek, Princeton preprint (1976).
E. Corrigan and D. B. Fairlie, Durham preprint (1976).

9. A. A. Belavin, A. M. Polyakov, A. S. Schwartz and Yu. S. Tyupkin, Physics Letters 59B, 85, (1975).

0 0 0 0 4 8 0 0 9 6 2

LEGAL NOTICE

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the United States Energy Research and Development Administration, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.

This report was done with support from the United States Energy Research and Development Administration. Any conclusions or opinions expressed in this report represent solely those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of The Regents of the University of California, the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory or the United States Energy Research and Development Administration.

TECHNICAL INFORMATION DIVISION
LAWRENCE BERKELEY LABORATORY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720