Completing Continuum Coulomb Gauge in the Functional Formalism

P. Watson and H. Reinhardt
Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Tübingen,
Auf der Morgenstelle 14, D-72076 Tübingen, Deutschland

It is argued that within the continuum functional formalism, there is no need to supply a further (spatially independent) gauge constraint to complete the Coulomb gauge of Yang-Mills theory. It is shown explicitly that a natural completion of the gauge-fixing leads to a contradiction with the perturbative renormalizability of the theory.

PACS numbers: 11.15.-q,12.38.-t

arXiv:0711.2997v1 [hep-th] 19 Nov 2007

Consider Yang-Mills theory, invariant under the following (local) gauge transform characterized by the infinitesimal parameter θ^a_x ($\sigma = A^0$):

$$\vec{A}^a_x \;\rightarrow\; \vec{A}^{\theta a}_x = \vec{A}^a_x + \frac{1}{g}\vec{\nabla}_x\theta^a_x - f^{acb}\vec{A}^c_x\theta^b_x, \tag{1}$$

$$\sigma^a_x \;\rightarrow\; \sigma^{\theta a}_x = \sigma^a_x - \frac{1}{g}\partial^0_x\theta^a_x - f^{acb}\sigma^c_x\theta^b_x. \tag{2}$$

We are interested in Coulomb gauge, defined as the condition $\vec{\nabla}_x\cdot\vec{A}^a_x = 0$. At the classical level it is clear that this condition restricts θ^a_x to be independent of spatial argument $\vec{x}$ but which can be time-dependent or global. Leaving aside the issue of global gauge fixing, the question addressed here is whether or not it is necessary to completely fix the local gauge; i.e., must we specify a time-dependent gauge condition in addition to the Coulomb gauge condition? It is shown that trying to complete the gauge-fixing leads to a contradiction and therefore that the system has in a sense 'chosen' its own nontrivial completion of the gauge.

In the quantum, functional formulation of the theory, the central object of interest is the functional integral

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}\Phi \exp\{\imath\mathcal{S}\} \tag{3}$$

(Φ denotes the collection of fields). Because the action, $\mathcal{S}$, (see [1] for our notation and conventions) is invariant under gauge transforms, we have to isolate the zero mode of the integral (generated by integration over the gauge group) and if we fix to Coulomb gauge using the Faddeev-Popov technique, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int \mathcal{D}\Phi \exp\{\imath\mathcal{S} + \imath\mathcal{S}_{fp}\}, \\ \mathcal{S}_{fp} &= \int d^4x \left[-\lambda^a\vec{\nabla}\cdot\vec{A}^a - \overline{c}^a\vec{\nabla}\cdot\left(\delta^{ab}\vec{\nabla} - gf^{acb}\vec{A}^c\right)c^b\right], \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where λ^a is a Lagrange-multiplier field introduced to enforce the gauge condition, $\overline{c}^a$ and c^b are Grassmann-valued ghost fields. The functional integral above still contains zero modes corresponding to time-dependent gauge transforms (we do not consider the Gribov copies here). If a further gauge-fixing condition is required to eliminate these zero modes, it must be spatially independent (so as not to interfere with Coulomb gauge itself) and we desire that it is local in the fields, such that functional techniques can be applied. An obvious choice is

$$F[\sigma] = \int d\vec{x}\sigma^a(x_0,\vec{x}) = 0. \tag{5}$$

The same condition exists when one considers the Coulomb gauge limit of interpolating (Landau-Coulomb) gauges in a finite volume and with periodic boundary conditions [2]. Note that if we consider the (weaker) constraint

$$\partial^0_x \int d\vec{x}\sigma^a(x_0,\vec{x}) = 0, \tag{6}$$

then since we have a single temporal dimension, this implies that

$$\int d\vec{x}\sigma^a(x_0,\vec{x}) = C \tag{7}$$

where C is a constant. However, under time-reversal, $\sigma^a(-x_0,\vec{x}) = -\sigma^a(x_0,\vec{x})$, which forces $C = 0$ and the condition, Eq. (5), above. The form of the gauge-fixing condition, Eq. (5), has an immediate consequence in the functional formalism – the Faddeev-Popov determinant generated is independent of the fields on the gauge-fixed hypersurface and is thus trivial. To be specific, using the Faddeev-Popov technique we isolate the integration over the time-dependent gauge group by inserting the following identity into the functional integral:

$$\mathbb{1} = \int \mathcal{D}\theta\delta(F[\sigma])\det\left[M^{ba}(y_0,x_0)\right], \tag{8}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} M^{ba}(y_0,x_0) &= \left.\frac{\delta F[\sigma^{a\theta}(x_0,\vec{x})]}{\delta\theta^b(y_0)}\right|_{F=0} \\ &= \left[-\frac{1}{g}\delta^{ba}\partial^0_x\delta(y_0-x_0)\int d\vec{x}\right. \\ &\quad \left. -f^{acb}\delta(y_0-x_0)\int d\vec{x}\sigma^c(x_0,\vec{x})\right]_{F=0} \\ &= -\frac{1}{g}\delta^{ba}\partial^0_x\delta(y_0-x_0)\int d\vec{x}. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

In the above, the spatial integral of σ is a number and vanishes due to the gauge condition $F = 0$. The remaining part of $\det(M)$ is thus a pure number, independent of the fields and which can be incorporated into the normalization of the functional integral. Clearly there will be no additional temporal Gribov ambiguity. Our completely gauge-fixed functional integral now reads:

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}\Phi\delta\left(\int d\vec{x}\sigma^a_x\right)\exp\{\imath\mathcal{S} + \imath\mathcal{S}_{fp}\}. \qquad (10)$$

It is to be emphasized that the interaction content of the theory has not been modified by the extra gauge-fixing. This means that the Dyson–Schwinger equations will not change their form; what will change are the propagators and the effects will be seen at tree-level. Thus, we may discard the interaction content of the theory from the discussion, save for one-loop integrals which will be considered later.

Let us then consider the generating functional of the theory by including source terms and restricting to at most quadratic terms in the action. For definiteness, we express the δ-functional constraint as an integral over a new time-dependent Lagrange multiplier field, $\chi^a(x_0)$[7]. We have

$$\begin{aligned} Z[J] &= \int \mathcal{D}\Phi\exp\{\imath\mathcal{S} + \imath\mathcal{S}_s\}, \\ \mathcal{S} &= \int d^4x\left\{-\frac{1}{2}A^a_i\left[\delta_{ij}\partial_0^2 - \delta_{ij}\nabla^2 + \nabla_i\nabla_j\right]A^a_j\right. \\ &\quad -\lambda^a\nabla_iA^a_i - \overline{c}^a\nabla^2c^a - \chi^a(x_0)\sigma^a \\ &\quad \left.-A^a_i\partial_0\nabla_i\sigma^a - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^a\nabla^2\sigma^a\right\}, \\ \mathcal{S}_s &= \int d^4x\ \{\rho^a\sigma^a + J^a_iA^a_i + \overline{c}^a\eta^a + \overline{\eta}^ac^a + \xi^a\lambda^a \\ &\quad +\kappa^a_x\chi^a(x_0)\}. \end{aligned} \qquad (11)$$

The generating functional of connected Green's functions is $W[J]$, where $Z = e^W$ (in the context here, J denotes a generic source). Also defining the classical fields $\Phi_\alpha = \delta W[J]/\delta\imath J_\alpha$ we can construct the effective action, Γ, as the Legendre transform of W:

$$\Gamma[\Phi] = W[J] - \imath J_\alpha\Phi_\alpha \qquad (12)$$

(condensed index notation implies summation over all discrete indices and integration over all continuous arguments). For notational convenience, we introduce a bracket notation to denote the functional derivatives of both W and Γ:

$$<\imath J_\alpha> = \frac{\delta W}{\delta\imath J_\alpha}, \quad <\imath\Phi_\alpha> = \frac{\delta\Gamma}{\delta\imath\Phi_\alpha}. \qquad (13)$$

We can now write down our tree-level equations for both proper and connected two-point functions using the techniques of [1, 3]. In the case of the proper functions, this is more or less trivial – for example, the Lagrange multiplier field λ gives rise to the equation

$$<\imath\lambda^a_x> = -\nabla_{ix}A^a_{ix} \qquad (14)$$

and all the further functional derivatives can be written down without ambiguity in either configuration or momentum space. The case for the connected (propagator) two-point functions is far less clear. The full set of equations reads:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^a_x &= \partial^0_x\nabla_{ix} <\imath J^a_{ix}> + \nabla^2_x <\imath\rho^a_x> + <\imath\kappa^a_x>, & (15)\\ J^a_{ix} &= \left[\delta_{ij}\partial^2_{0x} - \delta_{ij}\nabla^2_x + \nabla_{ix}\nabla_{jx}\right] <\imath J^a_{jx}> \\ &\quad +\partial^0_x\nabla_{ix} <\imath\rho^a_x> -\nabla_{ix} <\imath\xi^a_x>, & (16)\\ \xi^a_x &= \nabla_{ix} <\imath J^a_{ix}>, & (17)\\ \int d\vec{x}\kappa^a_x &= \int d\vec{x} <\imath\rho^a_x>, & (18)\\ \eta^a_x &= \nabla^2_x <\imath\overline{\eta}^a_x>\ . & (19) \end{aligned}$$

Let us begin with Eq. (17). The only non-zero functional derivative of the left-hand side is that with respect to $\imath\xi^b_y$, leading to

$$-\imath\delta^{ba}\delta(y-x) = \nabla_{ix} <\imath\xi^b_y\imath J^a_{ix}>\ . \qquad (20)$$

The solution to this is written as

$$<\imath\xi^b_y\imath J^a_{ix}> = \delta^{ba}\int \mathrm{d}\!\!^{-}k\, e^{-\imath k\cdot(y-x)}\frac{k_i}{\vec{k}^2} \qquad (21)$$

where we recognize that when sources are set to zero, the function must be translationally invariant and be odd under the parity transform (it is a spatial vector). This latter constraint necessarily precludes the possibility that there may be other (spatially independent) solutions to the homogeneous equation. Indeed, the functional derivative of Eq. (17) with respect to $\imath\rho^b_y$ is just such a homogeneous equation:

$$0 = \nabla_{ix} <\imath\rho^b_y\imath J^a_{ix}>\ . \qquad (22)$$

Since $<\imath\rho^b_y\imath J^a_{ix}>$ is a spatial vector, the function vanishes (as is clear if we Fourier transform into momentum space). The same holds for $<\imath\kappa^b_y\imath J^a_{ix}>$: i.e.,

$$<\imath\rho^b_y\imath J^a_{ix}> = <\imath\kappa^b_y\imath J^a_{ix}> = 0. \qquad (23)$$

The spatial gluon propagator,

$$<\imath J^b_{jy}\imath J^a_{ix}> = \int \mathrm{d}\!\!^{-}k\, e^{-\imath k\cdot(y-x)}D^{ba}_{AAji}(k_0,\vec{k}), \qquad (24)$$

is derived from the corresponding functional derivatives of equations (16) and (17):

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int \mathrm{d}\!\!^{-}k\, e^{-\imath k\cdot(y-x)}k_iD^{ba}_{AAji}(k_0,\vec{k}), \\ 0 &= \int \mathrm{d}\!\!^{-}k\, e^{-\imath k\cdot(y-x)}\times \\ &\quad \left[(k_0^2 - \vec{k}^2)D^{ba}_{AAji}(k_0,\vec{k}) - \imath\delta^{ba}t_{ji}(\vec{k})\right] \end{aligned} \qquad (25)$$

($t_{ji}(\vec{k}) = \delta_{ji} - k_jk_i/\vec{k}^2$ is the transverse projector). The solution to this is

$$D^{ba}_{AAji}(k_0,\vec{k}) = \delta^{ba}t_{ji}(\vec{k})\frac{\imath}{(k_0^2 - \vec{k}^2)}. \qquad (26)$$

Now let us examine the ghost propagator stemming from Eq. (19). Since the ghost field is Grassmann-valued whereas the propagators must be scalar, the ghost fields/sources must come in pairs. Because the ghost fields anticommute, in the absence of sources the quantity $<\imath\eta^b_y \imath\eta^a_x>$ must vanish – we cannot construct any antisymmetric, color diagonal, scalar, translationally invariant function of invariants $(x_0 - y_0)^2$ and $(\vec{x} - \vec{y})^2$. Thus, the only functional derivative of Eq. (19) that is of interest is

$$\nabla^2_x <\imath\overline{\eta}^a_x \imath\eta^b_y>= \imath\delta^{ab}\delta(x-y) \tag{27}$$

and the solution is

$$D^{ab}_c(x_0 - y_0, \vec{x} - \vec{y}) = -\delta^{ab} \int \mathrm{d}\, k\, e^{-\imath k\cdot(x-y)} \frac{\imath}{\vec{k}^2}. \tag{28}$$

In principle, we could add a homogeneous term $\sim \delta(\vec{k})D(k_0^2)$ to the integrand above. However, because the ghost propagator is connected to a ghost-gluon vertex with the factor k_i in any loop integral [1], the δ-function guarantees the situation whereby this term never appears in a calculation and we can disregard it.

Let us now turn to the remaining scalar propagators. Since the λ and χ fields are Lagrange-multiplier fields, propagators involving them will not contribute to any loop integral (they have no interaction term) and only the temporal gluon propagator, $<\imath\rho^b_y \imath\rho^a_x>$, is of consequence. We notice that Eq. (18) is integrated over $\vec{x}$ (a direct consequence of the fact that we must have a spatially independent second gauge condition) and will only determine the functions in momentum space at $\vec{k} = 0$. Indeed, we have that

$$D_{\sigma\sigma}(k_0, \vec{k} = 0) = 0. \tag{29}$$

This applies for all values of k_0, including the limit $k_0 \to \infty$. We are now led to a contradiction. Since $D_{\sigma\sigma}$ is the only propagator that can cancel the well-known energy divergence of the ghost loop (see [1] for an explicit realization of this cancellation), it must have a finite part as $k_0 \to \infty$, just as the ghost propagator, in order to effect the cancellation (we have explicitly shown that the mixed propagator, $D_{A\sigma}$, is zero and the spatial gluon propagator, D_{AA}, vanishes in this limit). However, on dimensional grounds the above constraint, Eq. (29), tells us that $D_{\sigma\sigma}$ must vanish – in the absence of any external scale it can only behave as $k_0^{-2}(\vec{k}^2/k_0^2)^\mu$ for some positive power μ in this limit. Moreover, if we try to determine $D_{\sigma\sigma}$ by solving the simultaneous set of equations generated from Eqs. (15) and (16) then we are led to the following (with the common color factors omitted):

$$\begin{bmatrix} k_0 & -\imath & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & k_0 & \imath \\ \vec{k}^2 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & \vec{k}^2 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} D_{\sigma\sigma}(k_0^2, \vec{k}^2) \\ k_0 D_{\lambda\sigma}(k_0^2, \vec{k}^2) \\ D_{\chi\sigma}(k_0^2, \vec{k}^2) \\ k_0 D_{\chi\lambda}(k_0^2, \vec{k}^2) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \imath \\ k_0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{30}$$

The matrix in the above has a zero determinant (for all momenta) and the solution is determined only up to an unknown scalar function. This function is only constrained by the requirement that it vanishes as $\vec{k}^2 = 0$ so as to agree with Eq. (29). The (physically meaningful) temporal gluon propagator is not determined, even at tree-level! Thus, we have a situation whereby completely fixing the gauge has resulted in the energy divergences of the ghost loops not being canceled and the propagator content of the theory being ill-defined.

In summary, we have attempted to completely fix the Coulomb gauge by adding a further spatially independent gauge condition. Whilst this extra condition seems justified (and even necessary) to deal with the zero modes in the functional formalism, its implementation has led to an explicit contradiction in defining the tree-level propagators of the theory. There could be one of two reasons for this. Since one is not familiar with such spatially independent constraints, the implementation here may be deficient in some way, although it is not clear how – the condition Eq. (29) certainly appears a robust consequence of the gauge-fixing and the requirement of canceling the energy divergence of the ghost-loop is not ambiguous. The more likely explanation is that the gauge-fixing condition contradicts the dynamics of the renormalizable quantum theory and in particular, Gauß' law. In the functional approach, Gauß' law appears as the dynamical equation of motion for the σ-field and it is primarily this equation that leads to definition of the temporal gluon propagator, $D_{\sigma\sigma}$. We are thus led to the conclusion that the construction of the functional formalism in Coulomb gauge implicitly 'chooses' the remaining temporal gauge condition with the requirement of perturbative renormalizability so that a further constraint such as Eq. (5) is not necessary. Because in principle we should be able to choose any (reasonable) gauge-fixing condition, we can further say that if the condition given by Eq. (5) is not allowed, then neither is any other condition, except that implicit condition 'chosen' by the system itself.

Whilst we have used the second order formalism here, the same arguments will apply to Coulomb gauge in the first order formalism. Formally, within the first order formalism, the system can be reduced to physical (spatially transverse gluon) degrees of freedom [3, 4] and, on reflection, this would indeed seem to imply that there is no need for a further, spatially independent gauge constraint and in agreement with the conclusions here. Further, the Gribov-Zwanziger confinement scenario [4, 5] in Coulomb gauge alludes to an infrared divergent temporal gluon propagator (from which a confining potential can be constructed) in contradistinction to condition Eq. (29).

Given that the temporal gauge condition, Eq. (5), occurs in the interpolating gauge [2], one might be tempted to infer from the results here that the Coulomb gauge end-point of interpolating gauge does not exist, or leads to different physical mechanisms when compared to Coulomb gauge. This is not necessarily true and not

our conclusion. It is seen in the interpolating gauge lattice calculations of Ref. [6] that as one approaches the Coulomb gauge limit, an increasingly infrared (but still finite $|\vec{k}|$) enhanced, yet $\vec{k} = 0$ vanishing temporal propagator emerges whilst the Coulomb gauge temporal propagator itself is infrared divergent. Thus, it should be kept in mind that in discussing the perturbative propagators here, what matters physically are the integrals and combinations of the tree-level factors that form, for example, the nonperturbative propagators. That the tree-level propagators, canceled energy divergences etc., have a different form in Coulomb gauge in distinction to interpolating gauges is not in itself either a drawback or a surprise – quite tautologically, many different integrals have the same value. Indeed, one may regard the differences between the internal constructions of Coulomb gauge and the interpolating gauge and how they still should result in the same observable physics as another fascinating piece of the puzzle to study.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank R. Alkofer for a critical reading of the manuscript. They would also like to thank M. Quandt and G. Burgio for useful discussions. This work has been supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) under contracts no. DFG-Re856/6-1 and DFG-Re856/6-2.

[1] P. Watson and H. Reinhardt, arXiv:0709.3963 [hep-th].
[2] L. Baulieu and D. Zwanziger, Nucl. Phys. B **548**, 527 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9807024].
[3] P. Watson and H. Reinhardt, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 045021 (2007) [arXiv:hep-th/0612114].
[4] D. Zwanziger, Nucl. Phys. B **518** (1998) 237.
[5] V. N. Gribov, Nucl. Phys. B **139** (1978) 1.
[6] A. Cucchieri, A. Maas and T. Mendes, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **22**, 2429 (2007) [arXiv:hep-lat/0701011].
[7] In principle this is not the only method, but we do not expect the results of the study to be altered by using different technical constructs.