

Spontaneously Generated Tensor Field Gravity

J.L. Chkareuli^{1,2}, C.D. Froggatt³, H.B. Nielsen⁴

¹*Center for Elementary Particle Physics, ITP, Ilia State University, 0162 Tbilisi, Georgia*

²*Particle Physics Department, Andronikashvili Institute of Physics, 0177 Tbilisi, Georgia*

³*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Glasgow University, Glasgow G12 8QQ, Scotland*

⁴*Niels Bohr Institute, Blegdamsvej 17-21, DK 2100 Copenhagen, Denmark*

Abstract

An arbitrary local theory of a symmetric two-tensor field $H_{\mu\nu}$ in Minkowski spacetime is considered, in which the equations of motion are required to be compatible with a nonlinear length-fixing constraint $H_{\mu\nu}^2 = \pm M^2$ leading to spontaneous Lorentz invariance violation, SLIV (M is the proposed scale for SLIV). Allowing the parameters in the Lagrangian to be adjusted so as to be consistent with this constraint, the theory turns out to correspond to linearized general relativity in the weak field approximation, while some of the massless tensor Goldstone modes appearing through SLIV are naturally collected in the physical graviton. In essence the underlying diffeomorphism invariance emerges as a necessary condition for the tensor field $H_{\mu\nu}$ not to be superfluously restricted in degrees of freedom, apart from the constraint due to which the true vacuum in the theory is chosen by SLIV. The emergent theory appears essentially nonlinear, when expressed in terms of the pure Goldstone tensor modes and contains a plethora of new Lorentz and CPT violating couplings. However, these couplings do not lead to physical Lorentz violation once this tensor field gravity is properly extended to conventional general relativity.

Keywords: Spontaneous Lorentz violation; Goldstone bosons; Emergent Gravity

1 Introduction

It is conceivable that spontaneous Lorentz invariance violation (SLIV) could provide a dynamical approach to quantum electrodynamics, gravity and Yang-Mills theories with the photon, graviton and gluons appearing as massless Nambu-Goldstone bosons [1, 2, 3, 4] (for some later developments see [5, 6, 7, 8, 9])¹. However, in contrast to the spontaneous violation of internal symmetries, SLIV seems not to necessarily imply a physical breakdown of Lorentz invariance. Rather, when appearing in a gauge theory framework, this may eventually result in a noncovariant gauge choice in an otherwise gauge invariant and Lorentz invariant theory. In substance the SLIV ansatz, due to which the vector field develops a vacuum expectation value (vev) $\langle A_\mu(x) \rangle = n_\mu M$ (where n_μ is a properly oriented unit Lorentz vector, while M is the proposed SLIV scale), may itself be treated as a pure gauge transformation with a gauge function linear in coordinates, $\omega(x) = n_\mu x^\mu M$. In this sense, gauge invariance in QED leads to the conversion of SLIV into gauge degrees of freedom of the massless Goldstonic photon, unless it is disturbed by some extra (potential-like) terms. This is what one could refer to as the generic non-observability of SLIV in QED. Moreover, as was shown some time ago [5], gauge theories, both Abelian and non-Abelian, can be obtained by themselves from the requirement of the physical non-observability of SLIV induced by vector fields rather than from the standard gauge principle.

A possible source for such a kind of unobserved SLIV is “nonlinearly realized” Lorentz symmetry imposed just by postulate on an underlying vector field A_μ through the length-fixing constraint

$$A_\mu A^\mu = n^2 M^2, \quad n^2 \equiv n_\nu n^\nu = \pm 1, \quad (1)$$

rather than due to some vector field potential. This constraint was first studied in the gauge invariant QED framework by Nambu [15] quite a long time ago², and then in more detail later [18, 19, 20, 21]. The constraint (1) is in fact very similar to the constraint appearing in the nonlinear σ -model for pions [22]. It means, in essence, that the vector field A_μ develops some constant background value and the Lorentz symmetry $SO(1, 3)$ formally breaks down to $SO(3)$ or $SO(1, 2)$, depending on the time-like ($n^2 > 0$) or space-like ($n^2 < 0$) nature of SLIV. The point is, however, that, in sharp contrast to the nonlinear σ model for pions, the nonlinear QED theory ensures that all the physical Lorentz violating effects strictly cancel out among themselves, due to the starting gauge invariance involved³.

¹Independently of the problem of the origin of local symmetries, Lorentz violation in itself has attracted considerable attention as an interesting phenomenological possibility which may be probed in direct Lorentz non-invariant extensions of quantum electrodynamics (QED) and the Standard Model [10, 11, 12, 13, 14].

²This constraint in the classical electrodynamics framework was originally suggested by Dirac [16] (see also [17] for further developments).

³Let us note, to make things clearer, that the length-fixing vector field constraint (1) is definitely Lorentz invariant by itself. Nonetheless, as is usual for the nonlinear sigma type models, this constraint means at the same time the spontaneous Lorentz violation. The point is, however, that in gauge invariant theories this violation becomes artificial being converted into gauge degrees of freedom rather than physical ones. In consequence, ordinary photons and other gauge fields (see below) appear in essence as the Goldstonic fields that could only be seen when taking the above nonlinear constraint (nonlinear gauge condition). In this connection, any other gauge, e.g. Coulomb gauge, is not in line with Goldstonic picture, since it breaks Lorentz invariance in an explicit rather than spontaneous way.

Furthermore, the most important property of the nonlinear vector field constraint (1) was shown [21] to be that one does not need to specially postulate the starting gauge invariance. This was done in the framework of an arbitrary relativistically invariant Lagrangian containing adjustable parameters, which is proposed only to possess some global internal symmetry. Indeed, the SLIV constraint (1) causing the condensation of a generic vector field or vector field multiplet, due to which the true vacuum in a theory is chosen, happens by itself to be powerful enough to require adjustment of the parameters to give gauge invariance. Namely, the existence of the constraint (1) is taken to be upheld by adjusting the parameters of the Lagrangian, in a way that leads to gauging of the starting global symmetry of the interacting vector and matter fields involved. In essence, the gauge invariance appears as a necessary condition for these vector fields not to be superfluously restricted in degrees of freedom as soon as the SLIV constraint holds. Indeed, a further reduction in the number of independent A_μ components would make it impossible to set the required initial conditions in the appropriate Cauchy problem and, in quantum theory, to choose self-consistent equal-time commutation relations [23].

Extending the above argumentation, we consider here spontaneous Lorentz violation realized through a nonlinear length-fixing tensor field constraint of the type

$$H_{\mu\nu}H^{\mu\nu} = \mathbf{n}^2 M^2, \quad \mathbf{n}^2 \equiv \mathbf{n}_{\mu\nu}\mathbf{n}^{\mu\nu} = \pm 1. \quad (2)$$

Here $\mathbf{n}_{\mu\nu}$ is a properly oriented ‘unit’ Lorentz tensor, while M is the proposed scale for Lorentz violation. We show that such a type of SLIV induces massless tensor Goldstone modes some of which can naturally be collected in the physical graviton. The underlying diffeomorphism (diff) invariance appears as a necessary condition for a symmetric two-tensor field $H_{\mu\nu}$ in Minkowski spacetime not to be superfluously restricted in degrees of freedom, apart from the constraint due to which the true vacuum in a theory is chosen by the Lorentz violation.

1.1 Outline of the paper

The paper is organized in the following way. Further in this section we discuss the main features of SLIV regarding both input and emergent gauge invariance. The focus of this paper will be on emergent gauge invariance. In section 2 we review the emergent QED and Yang-Mills theories [21], which appear due to a SLIV constraint being put on a vector field or a vector field multiplet, respectively. In section 3 we generalize this approach to the tensor field case and find the emergent gravity theory whose vacuum is also determined by spontaneous Lorentz violation. Finally, in section 4, we present a résumé and conclude.

1.2 SLIV: an intact physical Lorentz invariance

The original models realizing the SLIV conjecture were based on a four fermion (current-current) interaction, where the massless vector NG modes appear as fermion-antifermion pair composite states [1]. This is in complete analogy with the massless composite scalar modes in the original Nambu-Jona-Lasinio model [24]. Unfortunately, owing to the lack of a starting gauge invariance in such models and the composite nature of the NG modes which appear, it is hard to explicitly demonstrate that these modes together really form a massless vector boson

as a gauge field candidate universally interacting with all kinds of matter. Rather, there are in general three separate massless NG modes, two of which may mimic the transverse photon polarizations, while the third one must be appropriately suppressed.

In this connection, the more instructive laboratory for SLIV consideration proves to be a simple class of QED type models [15] having from the outset a gauge invariant form, in which the spontaneous Lorentz violation is realized through the nonlinear constraint (1). Remarkably, this type of model makes the vector Goldstone boson a true gauge boson (photon), whereas the physical Lorentz invariance is left intact. Indeed, despite an evident similarity with the nonlinear σ -model for pions, the nonlinear QED theory ensures that all the physical Lorentz violating effects prove to be non-observable, due to the starting gauge invariance involved. It was shown [15], while only in the tree approximation and for time-like SLIV ($n^2 > 0$), that the non-linear constraint (1) implemented as a supplementary condition into the standard QED Lagrangian containing the charged fermion field $\psi(x)$

$$L_{QED} = -\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} + \bar{\psi}(i\gamma\partial + m)\psi - eA_\mu\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu\psi, \quad A_\mu A^\mu = n^2 M^2 \quad (3)$$

appears in fact as a possible gauge choice for the vector field A_μ . At the same time the S -matrix remains unaltered under such a gauge convention. Really, this nonlinear QED contains a plethora of Lorentz and CPT violating couplings when it is expressed in terms of the pure Goldstonic photon modes (a_μ) according to the constraint condition (1)

$$A_\mu = a_\mu + \frac{n_\mu}{n^2}(M^2 - n^2 a^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad n_\mu a_\mu = 0 \quad (a^2 \equiv a_\mu a^\mu). \quad (4)$$

In addition there is an effective ‘‘Higgs’’ mode $(n_\mu/n^2)(M^2 - n^2 a^2)^{1/2}$ given by the constraint (for definiteness, one takes the positive sign for the square root when expanding it in powers of a^2/M^2). However, the contributions of these Lorentz violating couplings to physical processes completely cancel out among themselves. So, SLIV was shown to be superficial as it affects only the gauge of the vector potential A_μ , at least in the tree approximation [15].

Some time ago, this result was extended to the one-loop approximation and for both time-like ($n^2 > 0$) and space-like ($n^2 < 0$) Lorentz violation [18]. All the contributions to the photon-photon, photon-fermion and fermion-fermion interactions violating physical Lorentz invariance were shown to exactly cancel among themselves, in the manner observed by Nambu long ago for the simplest tree-order diagrams. This means that the constraint (1), having been treated as a nonlinear gauge choice at the tree (classical) level, remains as a gauge condition when quantum effects are taken into account as well. So, in accordance with Nambu’s original conjecture, one can conclude that physical Lorentz invariance is left intact at least in the one-loop approximation, provided that we consider the standard gauge invariant QED Lagrangian (3) taken in flat Minkowski spacetime. Later this result was also confirmed for spontaneously broken massive QED [19], non-Abelian theories [20] and tensor field gravity [9]. Some interesting aspects of SLIV in nonlinear QED were considered in [25].

1.3 SLIV: emergent gauge symmetries

In the above-discussed models, due to the assumed gauge symmetry, physical Lorentz invariance always appears intact, in the sense that all Lorentz non-invariant effects caused by the

vector field vacuum expectation values (vevs) are physically unobservable. However the most important property of the nonlinear vector field SLIV constraint (1), was shown [21] to be that one does not have to impose gauge symmetry directly. Indeed we showed that gauge invariance was unavoidable, if the equations of motion should have enough freedom to allow a constraint like (1) to be fulfilled. This need for gauge symmetry was deduced in a model with the nonlinear σ -model type spontaneous Lorentz violation, in the framework of an arbitrary relativistically invariant Lagrangian for elementary vector and matter fields, which are proposed only to possess some global internal symmetry. One simply assumes that the existence of the constraint (1) is to be upheld by adjusting the parameters of the Lagrangian. The SLIV conjecture happens to be powerful enough by itself to require gauge invariance, provided that we allow the parameters in the corresponding Lagrangian density to be adjusted so as to ensure self-consistency without losing too many degrees of freedom. Namely, due to the spontaneous Lorentz violation determined by the constraint (1), the true vacuum in such a theory is chosen so that this theory acquires on its own a gauge-type invariance, which gauges the starting global symmetry of the interacting vector and matter fields involved. In essence, the gauge invariance (with a proper gauge-fixing term) appears as a necessary condition for these vector fields not to be superfluously restricted in degrees of freedom.

Let us dwell upon this point in more detail. Generally, while a conventional variation principle requires the equations of motion to be satisfied, it is possible to eliminate one component of a general 4-vector field A_μ , in order to describe a pure spin-1 particle by imposing a supplementary condition. In the massive vector field case there are three physical spin-1 states to be described by the A_μ field. Similarly in the massless vector field case, although there are only two physical (transverse) photon spin states, one cannot construct a massless 4-vector field A_μ as a linear combination of creation and annihilation operators for helicity ± 1 states in a relativistically covariant way, unless one fictitious state is added [26]. So, in both the massive and massless vector field cases, only one component of the A_μ field may be eliminated and still preserve Lorentz invariance. Once the SLIV constraint (1) is imposed, it is therefore not possible to satisfy another supplementary condition, since this would superfluously restrict the number of degrees of freedom for the vector field. In fact a further reduction in the number of independent A_μ components would make it impossible to set the required initial conditions in the appropriate Cauchy problem and, in quantum theory, to choose self-consistent equal-time commutation relations [23].

We now turn to the question of the consistency of a constraint with the equations of motion for a general 4-vector field A_μ . Actually, there are only two possible covariant constraints for such a vector field in a relativistically invariant theory - the holonomic SLIV constraint, $C(A) = A_\mu A^\mu - n^2 M^2 = 0$ (1), and the non-holonomic one, known as the Lorentz condition, $C(A) = \partial_\mu A^\mu = 0$. In the presence of the SLIV constraint $C(A) = A^\mu A_\mu - n^2 M^2 = 0$, it follows that the equations of motion can no longer be independent. The important point is that, in general, the time development would not preserve the constraint. So the parameters in the Lagrangian have to be chosen in such a way that effectively we have one less equation of motion for the vector field. This means that there should be some relationship between all the (vector and matter) field Eulerians (E_A , E_ψ , ...) involved⁴. Such a relationship can quite

⁴ E_A stands for the vector-field Eulerian $(E_A)^\mu \equiv \partial L / \partial A_\mu - \partial_\nu [\partial L / \partial (\partial_\nu A_\mu)]$. We use similar notations for

generally be formulated as a functional - but by locality just a function - of the Eulerians, $F(E_A, E_\psi, \dots)$, being put equal to zero at each spacetime point with the configuration space restricted by the constraint $C(A) = 0$:

$$F(C = 0; E_A, E_\psi, \dots) = 0. \quad (5)$$

This relationship must satisfy the same symmetry requirements of Lorentz and translational invariance, as well as all the global internal symmetry requirements, as the general starting Lagrangian $L(A, \psi, \dots)$ does. We shall use this relationship in subsequent sections as the basis for gauge symmetry generation in the SLIV constrained vector and tensor field theories.

Let us now consider a “Taylor expansion” of the function F expressed as a linear combination of terms involving various field combinations multiplying or derivatives acting on the Eulerians⁵. The constant term in this expansion is of course zero since the relation (5) must be trivially satisfied when all the Eulerians vanish, i.e. when the equations of motion are satisfied. We now consider just the terms containing field combinations (and derivatives) with mass dimension 4, corresponding to the Lorentz invariant expressions

$$\partial_\mu(E_A)^\mu, A_\mu(E_A)^\mu, E_\psi\psi, \bar{\psi}E_{\bar{\psi}}. \quad (6)$$

All the other terms in the expansion contain field combinations and derivatives with higher mass dimension and must therefore have coefficients with an inverse mass dimension. We expect the mass scale associated with these coefficients should correspond to a large fundamental mass (e.g. the Planck mass M_P). Hence we conclude that such higher dimensional terms must be highly suppressed and can be neglected. A priori these neglected terms could lead to the breaking of the spontaneously generated gauge symmetry at high energy. However it could well be that a more detailed analysis would reveal that the imposed SLIV constraint requires an exact gauge symmetry. Indeed, if one uses classical equations of motion, a gauge breaking term will typically predict the development of the “gauge” in a way that is inconsistent with our gauge fixing constraint $C(A) = 0$. Thus the theory will generically only be consistent if it has exact gauge symmetry.

In the above discussion we have simply considered a single vector field. However in sections 2 and 3 we shall also consider a non-Abelian vector field A_μ^a and a tensor field $H_{\mu\nu}$ respectively. In these cases the lowest mass dimension terms analogous to the expressions (6) have symmetry indices. The function analogous to F in equation (5), which is a linear combination of these terms, must respect the assumed global non-Abelian symmetry and Lorentz symmetry. So all the terms must transform in the same way and carry the same symmetry index, a or ν respectively, which is then inherited by the function analogous to F . Since gravitational interactions vanish in the low energy limit, we have to include dimension 5 terms in our function \mathcal{F}^μ for the gravity case.

The other possible Lorentz covariant constraint $\partial_\mu A^\mu = 0$, while also being sensitive to the form of the constraint-compatible Lagrangian, leads to massive QED and massive Yang-Mills theories [23].

other field Eulerians as well.

⁵The Eulerians are of course just particular field combinations themselves and so this “expansion” at first includes higher powers and higher derivatives of the Eulerians.

In the case of a symmetric two-tensor field $H_{\mu\nu}$, we consider spontaneous Lorentz violation realized through a nonlinear tensor field constraint of the type (2). This constraint fixes the length of the tensor field in an analogous way to that of the vector field above by the constraint (1). For consistency between this constraint (2) and the equations of motion, we require the parameters of the theory to be chosen in such a way that the above-mentioned relationship $\mathcal{F}^\mu = 0$ be satisfied. As a result, the theory turns out to correspond to linearized general relativity in the weak field approximation, while some of the massless tensor Goldstone modes appearing through SLIV are naturally collected in the physical graviton. The accompanying diffeomorphism invariance appears as a necessary condition for the symmetric two-tensor field $H_{\mu\nu}$ in Minkowski spacetime not to be superfluously restricted in degrees of freedom, apart from the constraint due to which the true vacuum in the theory is chosen by the Lorentz violation. The emergent theory looks essentially nonlinear when expressed in terms of the pure Goldstone tensor modes and contains, besides general relativity (GR) in the weak-field limit approximation, a variety of new Lorentz and *CPT* violating couplings. However, they do not lead to physical Lorentz violation, due to the simultaneously generated diffeomorphism invariance, once the tensor field gravity theory (being considered as the weak-field limit of general relativity) is properly extended to GR⁶. So, this formulation of SLIV seems to amount to the fixing of a gauge for the tensor field in a special manner, making the Lorentz violation only superficial just as in the nonlinear QED framework [15]. From this viewpoint, both conventional QED and GR theories appear to be Goldstonic theories, in which some of the gauge degrees of freedom of these fields are condensed and eventually emerge as a noncovariant gauge choice. The associated massless NG modes are collected in photons and gravitons, in such a way that physical Lorentz invariance is ultimately preserved.

2 The Vector Goldstone Boson Primer

2.1 Emergent QED

Let us consider an arbitrary relativistically invariant Lagrangian $L(A, \psi)$ of one vector field A_μ and one complex matter field ψ , taken to be a charged fermion for definiteness, in an Abelian model with the corresponding global $U(1)$ charge symmetry imposed. For convenience and the apparent simplicity of the method, we choose to impose the SLIV constraint (1) using a well-known classical procedure for holonomic constraints (see, for example, [28]), involving a Lagrange multiplier term in an appropriately extended Lagrangian $L'(A, \psi, \lambda)$. Since the main point of the present article is to consider theories that become inconsistent unless they have special relations between the parameters of the theory – making them into gauge theories – we want to impose the SLIV constraint in a way that leads generically to such an inconsistency. The trick we use to achieve this is to arrange for the Lagrange multiplier field $\lambda(x)$ to disappear from the equations of motion (Eulerians) for the other fields. In order that the auxiliary field $\lambda(x)$, which acts as the Lagrange multiplier, should not appear in the equations of motion,

⁶Remarkably, the diff invariance appears so powerful that not only spontaneous but even explicit Lorentz violation may sometimes be converted into gauge degrees of freedom. One interesting example [27] is related to Chern-Simons modified gravity where the apparent Lorentz symmetry breaking may in fact be just a choice of gauge.

we take a quadratic form for the Lagrange multiplier term as follows

$$L'(A, \psi, \lambda) = L(A, \psi) - \frac{1}{4} \lambda (A_\nu A^\nu - n^2 M^2)^2. \quad (7)$$

Varying $L'(A, \psi, \lambda)$ with respect to the auxiliary field $\lambda(x)$ gives the equation of motion

$$E'_\lambda = \partial L' / \partial \lambda = \frac{1}{4} (A_\nu A^\nu - n^2 M^2)^2 = 0, \quad (8)$$

leading to just the SLIV condition (1). The equations of motion for A_μ in this case are independent of the $\lambda(x)$, which completely decouples from them rather than acting as some extra source of charge density, as it would in the case of a linear Lagrange multiplier term⁷.

Now, under the assumption that the SLIV constraint is preserved under the time development given by the equations of motion, we show how gauge invariance of the starting Lagrangian $L(A, \psi)$ is established. A conventional variation principle applied to the total Lagrangian $L'(A, \psi, \lambda)$ requires the following equations of motion for the vector field A_μ and the auxiliary field λ to be satisfied

$$(E'_A)^\mu = (E_A)^\mu = 0, \quad C(A) = A_\nu A^\nu - n^2 M^2 = 0, \quad (9)$$

where the Eulerian $(E_A)^\mu$ is given by the starting Lagrangian $L(A, \psi)$. However, in accordance with the general argumentation given in the Introduction, the existence of five equations for the 4-component vector field A^μ (one of which is the constraint) means that not all of the vector field Eulerian components can be independent. Therefore, there must be a relationship of the form $F(C = 0; E_A, E_\psi, \dots) = 0$ given in equation (5), expressed as a linear combination of the dimension 4 Lorentz invariant expressions given in equation (6). It follows that the parameters in the Lagrangian $L(A, \psi)$ must be chosen so as to satisfy an identity between the vector and matter field Eulerians of the following type

$$\partial_\mu (E_A)^\mu = c A_\mu (E_A)^\mu + i t E_\psi \psi - i t \bar{\psi} E_{\bar{\psi}}. \quad (10)$$

This identity immediately signals the invariance of the basic Lagrangian $L(A, \psi)$ under vector and fermion field local transformations whose infinitesimal form is given by⁸

$$\delta A_\mu = \partial_\mu \omega + c \omega A_\mu, \quad \delta \psi = i t \omega \psi. \quad (11)$$

Here $\omega(x)$ is an arbitrary function, only being restricted by the requirement to conform with the nonlinear constraint (1)

$$(A_\mu + \partial_\mu \omega + c \omega A_\mu)(A^\mu + \partial^\mu \omega + c \omega A_\mu) = n^2 M^2. \quad (12)$$

⁷Indeed, in this case one could propose that the auxiliary field $\lambda(x)$ is chosen in such a way that this extra source current is conserved $\partial_\mu (\lambda A^\mu) = 0$, according to which if the auxiliary field $\lambda(x)$ is fixed at one instant of time its value at other times can be then determined by this conservation law. Otherwise, with an arbitrary $\lambda(x)$, this field could have an uncontrollable influence on the vector field dynamics. However, this conservation law would in fact constitute an additional condition on the theory since, in contrast to a conventional Noether fermion current in the starting $U(1)$ globally invariant Lagrangian $L(A, \psi)$, this current $j^\mu = \lambda A^\mu$ is not automatically conserved.

⁸Since the Eulerians are functional derivatives of the action, e.g. $(E_A)^\mu = \frac{\delta S}{\delta A_\mu}$, a relation such as (10) between them implies that a certain combined variation of the various fields with the variations $\delta A_\mu, \delta \psi, \dots$ being proportional to the corresponding coefficients $c A_\mu, i t \psi, \dots$ of the Eulerians in (10) does not change S .

Conversely, the identity (10) follows from the invariance of the Lagrangian $L(A_\mu, \psi)$ under the transformations (11). Indeed, both direct and converse assertions are particular cases⁹ of Noether's second theorem [29]. The point is, however, that these transformations cannot in general form a group unless the constant c vanishes. In fact, by constructing the corresponding Lie bracket operation $(\delta_1\delta_2 - \delta_2\delta_1)$ for two successive vector field variations we find that, while the fermion transformation in (11) is an ordinary Abelian local one with zero Lie bracket, for the vector field transformations there appears a non-zero result

$$(\delta_1\delta_2 - \delta_2\delta_1)A_\mu = c(\omega_1\partial_\mu\omega_2 - \omega_2\partial_\mu\omega_1), \quad (13)$$

which is proportional to the constant c . Thus we necessarily require $c = 0$ for the bracket operation to be closed. Note also that for non-zero c the variation of A_μ given by (13) is an essentially arbitrary vector function. Such a freely varying A_μ is only consistent with a trivial Lagrangian (i.e. $L = \text{const}$). Thus, in order to have a non-trivial Lagrangian, it is necessary to have $c = 0$ and the theory given by the basic Lagrangian $L(A_\mu, \psi)$ then possesses an Abelian local symmetry¹⁰.

We have now shown how the choice of a vacuum conditioned by the SLIV constraint (1) enforces the choice of the parameters in the starting Lagrangian $L(A_\mu, \psi)$, so as to convert the starting global $U(1)$ charge symmetry into a local one. This SLIV induced local Abelian symmetry (11) allows the total Lagrangian L' to be determined in full. For a theory with renormalizable coupling constants, it is in fact the conventional QED Lagrangian (3) extended by the Lagrange multiplier term, which provides the SLIV constraint (1) imposed on the vector field A_μ . Thus, we eventually come to the total Lagrangian

$$L'(A, \psi, \lambda) = L_{QED} - \frac{1}{4}\lambda(A_\mu A^\mu - n^2 M^2)^2 \quad (14)$$

in the most direct way. This type of Abelian vector field theory with a quadratic Lagrange multiplier term was recently considered in [30]. The equations of motion generated by this theory are the equations in the absence of the constraint (1) plus the constraint itself. Thus the introduction of the quadratic Lagrange-multiplier type of term is in fact equivalent at the classical level to imposing the constraint on the equations of motion by hand¹¹. This theory is closely related to the Nambu QED model (3), in which the SLIV constraint is proposed to be substituted into the Lagrangian before varying the action, although the correspondence is not exact. The Nambu model yields a total of four equations for the fields: the constraint by itself and three equations of motion from the variation. Meanwhile, the model (14) yields five equations of motion instead, one of which is the constraint. The extra equation corresponds

⁹In general Noether's theorem applies to the invariance of an action rather than the invariance of a Lagrangian. However these are both completely equivalent, unless one considers spacetime symmetries with a local variation of coordinates as well (see section 3).

¹⁰We shall see below that non-zero c -type coefficients appear in the non-Abelian internal symmetry case, resulting eventually in a Yang-Mills gauge invariant theory.

¹¹Just the latter approach was used in our previous analysis [21] of gauge symmetry generation in SLIV constrained vector field theories. Here we follow the variational treatment of this constraint, although the only distinction between the two approaches is the presence of a decoupled Lagrange-multiplier field $\lambda(x)$ which is actually left undetermined in the theory.

to the Gauss law, which in the Nambu approach is imposed as a separate initial condition that subsequently holds at all times, by virtue of the three equations of motion and the constraint [30]. They both lead to SLIV, which generates massless Goldstone modes associated with photons and forces the massive mode to vanish. This pattern of SLIV emerges as a noncovariant gauge choice in an otherwise gauge invariant and Lorentz invariant theory, as was already discussed in the Introduction.

2.2 Emergent Yang-Mills theories

We shall here discuss the non-Abelian internal symmetry case and show that the Yang-Mills gauge fields also appear as possible vector Goldstone modes, when the true vacuum in the theory is chosen by the non-Abelian SLIV constraint

$$Tr(\mathbf{A}_\mu \mathbf{A}^\mu) = \mathbf{n}^2 M^2, \quad \mathbf{n}^2 \equiv \mathbf{n}_\mu^a \mathbf{n}^{\mu,a} = \pm 1, \quad (15)$$

where \mathbf{n}_μ^a is now some ‘unit’ rectangular matrix. We consider a general Lorentz invariant Lagrangian $L(\mathbf{A}_\mu, \psi)$ for the vector and matter fields involved possessing some global internal symmetry given by a group G with D generators t^a

$$[t_a, t_b] = i c_{abc} t_c, \quad Tr(t_a t_b) = \delta_{ab} \quad (a, b, c = 0, 1, \dots, D-1), \quad (16)$$

where c_{abc} are the structure constants of G . The corresponding vector fields, which transform according to the adjoint representation of G , are given in the matrix form $\mathbf{A}_\mu = \mathbf{A}_\mu^a t_a$. The matter fields (fermion fields for definiteness) are taken in the fundamental representation column ψ^σ ($\sigma = 0, 1, \dots, d-1$) of G .

We impose the SLIV constraint (15), as in the above Abelian case, by introducing an extended Lagrangian L' containing a quadratic Lagrange multiplier term

$$L'(\mathbf{A}_\mu, \psi, \lambda) = L(\mathbf{A}_\mu, \psi) - \lambda/4 [Tr(\mathbf{A}_\mu \mathbf{A}^\mu) - \mathbf{n}^2 M^2]^2. \quad (17)$$

The variation of $L'(\mathbf{A}_\mu, \psi, \lambda)$ with respect to \mathbf{A}_μ gives the vector field equation of motion

$$(E_{\mathbf{A}})_a^\mu - \lambda \mathbf{A}_a^\mu [Tr(\mathbf{A}_\mu \mathbf{A}^\mu) - \mathbf{n}^2 M^2] = 0 \quad (a = 0, 1, \dots, D-1). \quad (18)$$

Here the vector field Eulerian $E_{\mathbf{A}}$ is determined by the starting Lagrangian $L(\mathbf{A}_\mu, \psi)$, while the Eulerian of the auxiliary field $\lambda(x)$ taken on-shell

$$E'_\lambda = \partial L' / \partial \lambda = \frac{1}{4} [Tr(\mathbf{A}_\mu \mathbf{A}^\mu) - \mathbf{n}^2 M^2]^2 = 0 \quad (19)$$

gives the constraint (15). So, once the constraint holds, one has the following simplified equations for the vector fields

$$(E_{\mathbf{A}})_a^\mu = 0, \quad C(\mathbf{A}_\mu) = Tr(\mathbf{A}_\mu \mathbf{A}^\mu) - \mathbf{n}^2 M^2 = 0, \quad (20)$$

whereas the auxiliary field $\lambda(x)$, as in the Abelian case, entirely decouples from the vector field dynamics.

The need to preserve the constraint $C(\mathbf{A}_\mu) = 0$ with time implies that the equations of motion for the vector fields \mathbf{A}_μ^a cannot be all independent. Consequently the parameters in the Lagrangian $L(\mathbf{A}_\mu, \psi)$ must be chosen so as to give a relationship between the Eulerians for the vector and matter fields analogous to equation (5). We include just the lowest dimensional Lorentz invariant expressions constructed from the Eulerians in this relationship, on the grounds that other terms will be suppressed by a large mass parameter like M_P . These lowest dimension terms include $\partial_\mu(E_{\mathbf{A}})_a^\mu$ and all the terms in the relationship must transform in the same way under the global symmetry group G . Hence the relationship must transform as the adjoint representation of G and carry the symmetry index a

$$\mathbf{F}_a(C = 0; E_{\mathbf{A}}, E_\psi, \dots) = 0 \quad (a = 0, 1, \dots, D-1). \quad (21)$$

It therefore takes the following form

$$\partial_\mu(E_{\mathbf{A}})_a^\mu = d_{\mathbf{A}} c_{abc} \mathbf{A}_\mu^b (E_{\mathbf{A}})^{\mu,c} + d_\psi E_\psi (it_a) \psi + d_{\bar{\psi}} \bar{\psi} (-it_a) E_{\bar{\psi}}, \quad (22)$$

where $d_{\mathbf{A}}$, d_ψ and $d_{\bar{\psi}}$ are as yet undetermined constants. Noether's second theorem [29] can be applied directly to this identity (22), in order to derive the invariance of $L(\mathbf{A}_\mu, \psi)$ under vector and fermion field local transformations having the infinitesimal form

$$\delta \mathbf{A}_\mu^a = \partial_\mu \omega^a + d_{\mathbf{A}} c_{abc} \mathbf{A}_\mu^b \omega^c, \quad \delta \psi = d_\psi (it_a) \omega^a \psi, \quad \delta \bar{\psi} = d_{\bar{\psi}} \bar{\psi} (-it_a) \omega^a. \quad (23)$$

Of course from the symmetry transformations (23) one can generate the commutators $(\delta_1 \delta_2 - \delta_2 \delta_1) \mathbf{A}_\mu^a$, $(\delta_1 \delta_2 - \delta_2 \delta_1) \psi$ and $(\delta_1 \delta_2 - \delta_2 \delta_1) \bar{\psi}$ as new symmetry transformations. However, in order to avoid generating too many symmetry transformations which would essentially only be consistent with the Lagrangian density being a constant, we need that the Lie algebra of the transformations should close. That is to say we need relations between the above Lie brackets of the form

$$(\delta_1 \delta_2 - \delta_2 \delta_1) = \delta_{br}, \quad (24)$$

where the functions $\omega_{br}^a(x)$ associated with the transformation δ_{br} are expressed in terms of the functions $\omega_1^a(x)$ and $\omega_2^a(x)$ for the transformations δ_1 and δ_2 . For example

$$(\delta_1 \delta_2 - \delta_2 \delta_1) \psi = d_\psi^2 [it_a, it_b] \omega_1^a \omega_2^b \psi \quad (25)$$

can be interpreted as

$$\delta_{br} \psi = d_\psi it_c \omega_{br}^c \psi \quad (26)$$

provided that

$$\omega_{br}^c = -d_\psi c_{abc} \omega_1^a \omega_2^b. \quad (27)$$

Corresponding formulas apply for the Lie bracket of two symmetry transformations acting on $\bar{\psi}$ with

$$\omega_{br}^c = -d_{\bar{\psi}} c_{abc} \omega_1^a \omega_2^b. \quad (28)$$

Similarly the Lie bracket for the \mathbf{A}_μ^a field is given by

$$(\delta_1 \delta_2 - \delta_2 \delta_1) \mathbf{A}_\mu^a = -d_{\mathbf{A}} c_{abc} \partial_\mu (\omega_1^b \omega_2^c) + d_{\mathbf{A}}^2 c_{abc} c_{bde} (\omega_1^c \omega_2^e - \omega_2^c \omega_1^e) \mathbf{A}_\mu^d. \quad (29)$$

Using the Jacobi identity, we then obtain the closure of the Lie algebra on the \mathbf{A}_μ^a field with

$$\omega_{br}^c = -d_{\mathbf{A}} c_{abc} \omega_1^a \omega_2^b. \quad (30)$$

In order to obtain full closure of the Lie algebra for all the fields, we require that the three expressions (27), (28) and (30) for ω_{br}^c should be identical. Thus we obtain

$$d_{\mathbf{A}} = d_\psi = d_{\overline{\psi}}. \quad (31)$$

Here the $\omega^a(x)$ are arbitrary functions only being restricted, again as in the above Abelian case, by the requirement to conform with the corresponding nonlinear constraint (15).

So, by choosing the parameters in the Lagrangian to be consistent with the constraint (15), we have obtained a non-Abelian gauge symmetry under the transformations (23) with the coefficients satisfying (31). In order to construct a non-Abelian field tensor $\mathbf{F}_{\mu\nu}^a$ having the usual relationship

$$\mathbf{F}_{\mu\nu}^a = \partial_\mu \mathbf{A}_\nu^a - \partial_\nu \mathbf{A}_\mu^a + c_{abc} \mathbf{A}_\mu^b \mathbf{A}_\nu^c \quad (32)$$

with the gauge fields, we have to rescale \mathbf{A}_μ^a and ω^a by a factor of $d_{\mathbf{A}}^{-1}$

$$\mathbf{A}_\mu^a \rightarrow \frac{\mathbf{A}_\mu^a}{d_{\mathbf{A}}}, \quad \omega^a \rightarrow \frac{\omega^a}{d_{\mathbf{A}}}. \quad (33)$$

Then the transformations (23) expressed in terms of the rescaled field (33) become the standard non-Abelian gauge transformations. For a theory with renormalizable coupling constants, this derived gauge symmetry leads to the conventional Yang-Mills type Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{A}_\mu, \psi) = -\frac{1}{4g^2} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{F}_{\mu\nu} \mathbf{F}^{\mu\nu}) + \overline{\psi}(i\gamma\partial - m)\psi + \overline{\psi} \mathbf{A}_\mu \gamma^\mu \psi \quad (34)$$

with an arbitrary gauge coupling constant g .

Let us turn now to the spontaneous Lorentz violation which is caused by the nonlinear vector field constraint (15). Although the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{A}_\mu, \psi)$ only has an $SO(1,3) \times G$ invariance, the chosen SLIV constraint (15) possesses a much higher accidental symmetry $SO(D, 3D)$ determined by the dimensionality D of the adjoint representation of G to which the vector fields \mathbf{A}_μ^a belong. This symmetry is spontaneously broken at a scale M , together with the actual $SO(1,3) \otimes G$ symmetry, by the vev

$$\langle \mathbf{A}_\mu^a(x) \rangle = \mathbf{n}_\mu^a M. \quad (35)$$

Here the vacuum direction is now given by the matrix \mathbf{n}_μ^a describing simultaneously both of the generalized SLIV cases, time-like ($SO(D, 3D) \rightarrow SO(D-1, 3D)$) or space-like ($SO(D, 3D) \rightarrow SO(D, 3D-1)$) respectively, depending on the sign of $\mathbf{n}^2 \equiv \mathbf{n}_\mu^a \mathbf{n}^{\mu,a} = \pm 1$. In both cases this matrix has only one non-zero element, subject to the appropriate $SO(1,3)$ and (independently) G rotations. They are, specifically, \mathbf{n}_0^0 or \mathbf{n}_3^0 provided that the vacuum expectation value (35) is developed along the $a = 0$ direction in the internal space and along the $\mu = 0$ or $\mu = 3$ direction respectively in the ordinary four-dimensional spacetime. Side by side with one true vector Goldstone boson, corresponding to the spontaneous violation

of the actual $SO(1,3) \otimes G$ symmetry of the Lagrangian L , $D - 1$ vector pseudo-Goldstone bosons (PGB) are also produced¹² due to the breaking of the accidental $SO(D, 3D)$ symmetry of the constraint (15). In contrast to the familiar scalar PGB case [22], the vector PGBs remain strictly massless being protected by the simultaneously generated non-Abelian gauge invariance (34). Together with the above true vector Goldstone boson, they complete the whole gauge field multiplet of the internal symmetry group G .

After the explicit use of this constraint (15), which constitutes one supplementary condition on the vector field multiplet \mathbf{A}_μ^a , one can identify the pure Goldstone field modes \mathbf{a}_μ^a as follows

$$\mathbf{A}_\mu^a = \mathbf{a}_\mu^a + \frac{\mathbf{n}_\mu^a}{\mathbf{n}^2}(M^2 - \mathbf{n}^2 \mathbf{a}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \mathbf{n}_\mu^a \mathbf{a}^{\mu,a} = 0 \quad (\mathbf{a}^2 \equiv \mathbf{a}_\mu^a \mathbf{a}^{\mu,a}). \quad (36)$$

There is also an effective ‘‘Higgs’’ mode $(\mathbf{n}_\mu^a/\mathbf{n}^2)(M^2 - \mathbf{n}^2 \mathbf{a}^2)^{1/2}$ given by the SLIV constraint (one takes again the positive sign for the square root when expanding it in powers of \mathbf{a}^2/M^2). Note that, apart from the pure vector fields, the general Goldstonic modes \mathbf{a}_μ^a contain $D - 1$ scalar modes, $\mathbf{a}_0^{a'}$ or $\mathbf{a}_3^{a'}$ ($a' = 1 \dots D - 1$), for the time-like ($\mathbf{n}_\mu^a = n_0^a g_{\mu 0} \delta^{a0}$) or space-like ($\mathbf{n}_\mu^a = n_3^a g_{\mu 3} \delta^{a0}$) SLIV respectively. They can be eliminated from the theory if one imposes appropriate supplementary conditions on the $D - 1$ \mathbf{a}_μ^a fields which are still free of constraints. Using their overall orthogonality (36) to the physical vacuum direction \mathbf{n}_μ^a , one can formulate these supplementary conditions in terms of a general axial gauge for the entire \mathbf{a}_μ^a multiplet

$$\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{a} \equiv \mathbf{n}_\mu \mathbf{a}^{\mu,a} = 0, \quad a = 0, 1, \dots, D - 1. \quad (37)$$

Here \mathbf{n}_μ is the unit Lorentz vector, analogous to that introduced in the Abelian case, which is now oriented in Minkowskian space-time so as to be parallel to the vacuum matrix¹³ \mathbf{n}_μ^a . As a result, in addition to the ‘‘Higgs’’ mode excluded earlier by the above orthogonality condition (36), all the other scalar fields are eliminated. Consequently only the pure vector fields, \mathbf{a}_i^a ($i = 1, 2, 3$) or $\mathbf{a}_{\mu'}^a$ ($\mu' = 0, 1, 2$), for time-like or space-like SLIV respectively, are left in the theory. Clearly, the components $\mathbf{a}_i^{a=0}$ and $\mathbf{a}_{\mu'}^{a=0}$ correspond to the true Goldstone boson, for each type of SLIV respectively, while all the others (for $a = 1 \dots D - 1$) are vector PGBs. Substituting the parameterization (36) with the SLIV constraint (15) into the Lagrangian (34) and expanding the square root in powers of \mathbf{a}^2/M^2 , one is led to a highly nonlinear theory in terms of the pure Goldstonic modes \mathbf{a}_μ^a . The first and higher order terms in $1/M$ in this expansion of $L(\mathbf{a}_\mu^a, \psi)$ are Lorentz and CPT violating. Remarkably, however, this theory turns out to be physically equivalent to a conventional Yang-Mills theory. As was recently shown [20], the Lorentz and CPT violating contributions to physical processes actually completely cancel out among themselves. Therefore, the SLIV constraint (15) manifests itself as a noncovariant gauge condition which does not break physical Lorentz invariance in the theory.

All the above allows one to conclude that the Yang-Mills theories can naturally be interpreted as emergent theories caused by SLIV, although physical Lorentz invariance still remains

¹²Note that in total there appear $4D - 1$ pseudo-Goldstone modes, complying with the number of broken generators of $SO(D, 3D)$, both for time-like and space-like SLIV. From these $4D - 1$ pseudo-Goldstone modes, $3D$ modes correspond to the D three-component vector states as will be shown below, while the remaining $D - 1$ modes are scalar states which will be excluded from the theory.

¹³For such a choice the simple identity $\mathbf{n}_\mu^\alpha \equiv \frac{\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{n}_\mu^\alpha}{\mathbf{n}^2} \mathbf{n}_\mu$ holds, showing that the rectangular vacuum matrix \mathbf{n}_μ^α has the factorized ‘‘two-vector’’ form.

intact due to the simultaneously generated gauge invariance. These emergent theories are in fact theories which provide the building blocks for the Standard Model and beyond, whether they be exact as in quantum chromodynamics or spontaneously broken as in grand unified theories and non-Abelian family symmetry models [31, 32].

3 Emergent Tensor Field Gravity

3.1 Deriving diffeomorphism invariance

Let us consider an arbitrary relativistically invariant Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(H_{\mu\nu}, \phi)$ for one symmetric two-tensor field $H_{\mu\nu}$ and one real scalar field ϕ (chosen as the simplest possible matter) in the theory taken in Minkowski spacetime. As in vector theories we restrict ourselves to the minimal dimension interactions. In contrast to vector fields, whose basic interactions contain dimensionless coupling constants, interactions with coupling constants of inverse mass dimensionality (and some of higher powers) are essential for symmetric tensor fields. Otherwise, one has only a free theory for the spin two components of the tensor field in the presence of matter fields.

We first turn to the imposition of the SLIV constraint

$$H_{\mu\nu}H^{\mu\nu} = \mathfrak{n}^2 M^2, \quad \mathfrak{n}^2 \equiv \mathfrak{n}_{\mu\nu}\mathfrak{n}^{\mu\nu} = \pm 1 \quad (38)$$

on the tensor fields $H_{\mu\nu}$ in the Lagrangian \mathcal{L} , which only possesses global Lorentz (and translational) invariance. Following the procedure used above for the vector field case, we introduce an extended Lagrangian \mathcal{L}' containing a quadratic Lagrange multiplier term

$$\mathcal{L}'(H_{\mu\nu}, \phi, \lambda) = \mathcal{L}(H_{\mu\nu}, \phi) - \frac{1}{4}\lambda (H_{\mu\nu}H^{\mu\nu} - \mathfrak{n}^2 M^2)^2. \quad (39)$$

The variation of $\mathcal{L}'(H_{\mu\nu}, \phi, \lambda)$ with respect to $H_{\mu\nu}$ gives¹⁴ the tensor field equation of motion

$$(\mathcal{E}_H)^{\mu\nu} - \lambda H^{\mu\nu} (H_{\rho\sigma}H^{\rho\sigma} - \mathfrak{n}^2 M^2) = 0. \quad (40)$$

Here the tensor field Eulerian $(\mathcal{E}_H)^{\mu\nu}$ is determined by the starting Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(H_{\mu\nu}, \phi)$, while the Eulerian of the auxiliary field $\lambda(x)$ taken on-shell

$$\mathcal{E}'_\lambda = \partial\mathcal{L}'/\partial\lambda = \frac{1}{4} (H_{\mu\nu}H^{\mu\nu} - \mathfrak{n}^2 M^2)^2 = 0 \quad (41)$$

gives the constraint (38). So, as soon as this constraint holds, one has the simplified equations of motion

$$(\mathcal{E}_H)^{\mu\nu} = 0, \quad \mathcal{C}(H_{\mu\nu}) = H_{\mu\nu}H^{\mu\nu} - \mathfrak{n}^2 M^2 = 0. \quad (42)$$

However, due to the quadratic form of the Lagrange multiplier term, the auxiliary field $\lambda(x)$ entirely decouples from the tensor field dynamics rather than acting as a source of energy-momentum density, as would be the case if we considered instead a linear Lagrange multiplier term.

¹⁴Keeping in mind an application to gravity, we could also admit second order derivatives of the tensor field $H_{\mu\nu}$ in the Lagrangian \mathcal{L} so that the Eulerian $(\mathcal{E}_H)^{\mu\nu}$ would have the form $(\mathcal{E}_H)^{\mu\nu} = \partial\mathcal{L}/\partial H_{\mu\nu} - \partial_\rho[\partial\mathcal{L}/\partial(\partial_\rho H_{\mu\nu})] + \partial_\rho\partial_\sigma[\partial\mathcal{L}/\partial(\partial_\rho\partial_\sigma H_{\mu\nu})]$.

The tensor field $H_{\mu\nu}$, both massive and massless, contains many components which are usually eliminated by imposing some supplementary conditions¹⁵. In the massive tensor field case there are five physical spin-2 states to be described by $H_{\mu\nu}$. Similarly, in the massless tensor field case, although there are only two physical (transverse) spin states associated with the graviton, one cannot construct a symmetric two-tensor field $H_{\mu\nu}$ as a linear combination of creation and annihilation operators for helicity ± 2 states. It is necessary to add three (and $2j - 1$, in general, for a spin j massless field) fictitious states with other helicities [26]. So, in both the massive and massless tensor field cases, at most five components in the 10-component tensor field $H_{\mu\nu}$ may be eliminated and still preserve Lorentz invariance. Once the SLIV constraint (38) is imposed, it follows that only four further supplementary conditions are possible. In section 3.2 we shall actually only impose three further supplementary conditions, reducing the number of independent components of $H_{\mu\nu}$ to 6 as is done in the Hilbert-Lorentz gauge of general relativity.

We now turn to the question of the consistency of the SLIV constraint with the equations of motion for a general symmetric tensor field $H_{\mu\nu}$. For an arbitrary Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(H_{\mu\nu}, \phi)$, the time development of the fields would not preserve the constraint. So the parameters in the Lagrangian must be chosen so as to give a relationship between the Eulerians for the tensor and matter fields. In addition to the lowest dimensional Lorentz covariant expressions constructed from the Eulerians, we also include the next to lowest dimensional Lorentz covariant expressions in this relationship. This is necessary in order to allow for gravitational interactions which vanish in the low energy limit. The lowest dimensional terms include $\partial_\mu(\mathcal{E}_H)^{\mu\nu}$. Hence the relationship must transform as a Lorentz vector and carry the Lorentz index μ

$$\mathcal{F}^\mu(\mathcal{C} = 0; \mathcal{E}_H, \mathcal{E}_\phi, \dots) = 0 \quad (\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3). \quad (43)$$

It therefore takes the following form

$$\partial_\mu(\mathcal{E}_H)^{\mu\nu} = P_{\alpha\beta}^\nu(\mathcal{E}_H)^{\alpha\beta} + Q^\nu \mathcal{E}_\phi. \quad (44)$$

Here $P_{\alpha\beta}^\nu$ and Q^ν are operators which take the following general form

$$P_{\alpha\beta}^\nu = p_0 \eta_{\alpha\beta} \partial^\nu + p_1 \eta^{\nu\rho} [H_{\alpha\rho} \partial_\beta + H_{\rho\beta} \partial_\alpha + a(\partial_\beta H_{\alpha\rho} + \partial_\alpha H_{\rho\beta}) + b \partial_\rho H_{\alpha\beta} + c H_{\alpha\beta} \partial_\rho], \quad (45)$$

$$Q^\nu = q_0 \partial^\nu + q_1 \eta^{\nu\rho} (\partial_\rho \phi + d \phi \partial_\rho). \quad (46)$$

The constants p_0 and q_0 are dimensionless and associated with dimension 4 terms in the relationship, while p_1 and q_1 have an inverse mass dimension and are associated with dimension 5 terms in the relationship¹⁶. In addition a , b , c and d are as yet undetermined dimensionless

¹⁵Generally speaking, a symmetric two-tensor field $H_{\mu\nu}$ describes the states with spin 2 (five components), spin 1 (three components) and two spin 0 states (each is described by one of its components). Among them spin 1 must be necessarily excluded as the sign of the energy for spin 1 is always opposite to that for spin 2 and 0.

¹⁶We note that the double divergence $\partial_\mu \partial_\nu (\mathcal{E}_H)^{\mu\nu}$ does not appear in (43, 44), since it would require a term of dimension 6 or higher in order to transform as a vector.

constants. According to Noether's second theorem [29], the identity (44) implies the invariance of the corresponding action

$$I = \int \mathcal{L}(H_{\mu\nu}, \phi) d^4x \quad (47)$$

under local transformations of the tensor and scalar fields having the infinitesimal form

$$\begin{aligned} \delta H_{\mu\nu} = & \partial_\mu \xi_\nu + \partial_\nu \xi_\mu + p_0 \eta_{\mu\nu} \partial_\rho \xi^\rho + p_1 [\partial_\mu \xi^\rho H_{\rho\nu} + \partial_\nu \xi^\rho H_{\mu\rho} + \\ & + a(\xi^\rho \partial_\mu H_{\rho\nu} + \xi^\rho \partial_\nu H_{\mu\rho}) + b \xi^\rho \partial_\rho H_{\mu\nu} + c \partial_\rho \xi^\rho H_{\mu\nu}], \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

$$\delta \phi = q_0 \partial_\rho \xi^\rho + q_1 (\xi^\rho \partial_\rho \phi + d \partial_\rho \xi^\rho \phi). \quad (49)$$

Here $\xi^\mu(x)$ is an arbitrary 4-vector parameter function, only being required to conform with the nonlinear constraint (2). These field transformations are treated by themselves as fixed coordinate system transformations¹⁷, changing only the functional forms of the fields. One should remember that we started from a fundamentally flat Minkowski spacetime with only one set of coordinates (modulo global Lorentz transformations). However it actually turns out that these field transformations correspond in the end to reparameterization transformations. Thus it becomes natural to think of using a modified set of coordinates, deviating from the original fundamental coordinate system x^μ by $\delta x^\mu = x'^\mu - x^\mu \propto \xi^\mu$. In going from the x^μ to the x'^μ coordinate system, there are supposed to be infinitesimal coordinate variations δx^μ under which the action I is also left invariant. The form of these variations will be established later.

In order to avoid generating too many symmetry transformations, which would only be consistent with a trivial Lagrangian (i.e. $\mathcal{L} = \text{const}$), we further require that the general transformations (48, 49) constitute a group. This means that they have to satisfy the Lie bracket operations

$$\begin{aligned} (\delta_1 \delta_2 - \delta_2 \delta_1) H_{\mu\nu} &= \delta_{br} H_{\mu\nu}, \\ (\delta_1 \delta_2 - \delta_2 \delta_1) \phi &= \delta_{br} \phi. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Here the 4-vector parameter function ξ_{br}^μ related to the Lie bracket transformation δ_{br} is supposed to be constructed from the parameter functions ξ_1^μ and ξ_2^μ , which determine the single transformations δ_1 and δ_2 in (48) and (49). As in the vector field case, this requirement that the Lie algebra of transformations should close puts strong restrictions on the values of the constants appearing in (48) and (49). Actually, after a straightforward calculation similar to that given for the non-Abelian symmetry case in section 2.2, one finds that the Lie bracket relations (50) are only satisfied for the following values of the constants in the field variations $\delta H_{\mu\nu}$ and $\delta \phi$:

$$a = 0, \quad b = 1, \quad c = p_0; \quad q_0 = 0, \quad q_1 = p_1. \quad (51)$$

The parameter function ξ_{br}^μ associated with the transformation δ_{br} is given by the expression

$$\xi_{br}^\mu = p_1 (\xi_1^\rho \partial_\rho \xi_2^\mu - \xi_2^\rho \partial_\rho \xi_1^\mu). \quad (52)$$

¹⁷We shall refer to such transformations as fixed point transformations.

Remarkably, although the general transformations (48, 49) were only restricted to form a group, the emergent theory turns out to possess a diffeomorphism invariance provided that the field transformations (48, 49) are accompanied by an infinitesimal coordinate variation (see below).

Actually, for the quantity $g_{\mu\nu}$ defined by the equation

$$g^{p_0/2} g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + p_1 H_{\mu\nu} , \quad g \equiv \det(g_{\mu\nu}), \quad (53)$$

the transformation (48) may be written in the form¹⁸

$$\begin{aligned} \delta g_{\mu\nu} = & p_1 (\partial_\mu \xi^\rho g_{\rho\nu} + \partial_\nu \xi^\rho g_{\mu\rho} + \xi^\rho \partial_\rho g_{\mu\nu}) + \\ & + p_0 \left(p_1 \partial_\rho \xi^\rho + \frac{1}{2} p_1 \xi^\rho g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\rho g_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{2} g^{\alpha\beta} \delta g_{\alpha\beta} \right) g_{\mu\nu} , \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

after the above-determined values (51) of the constants are substituted in (48). Even in the general case with a non-vanishing value of the constant p_0 , the explicit solution to this equation for $\delta g_{\mu\nu}$ is still given just by the terms independent of p_0 in (55)

$$\delta g_{\mu\nu} = p_1 (\partial_\mu \xi^\rho g_{\rho\nu} + \partial_\nu \xi^\rho g_{\mu\rho} + \xi^\rho \partial_\rho g_{\mu\nu}), \quad (55)$$

provided that the contravariant tensor $g^{\mu\nu}$ is properly defined, that is $g_{\alpha\beta} g^{\beta\gamma} = \delta_\alpha^\gamma$. In fact one can readily verify that

$$p_1 \partial_\rho \xi^\rho + \frac{1}{2} p_1 \xi^\rho g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\rho g_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{2} g^{\alpha\beta} \delta g_{\alpha\beta} = 0 , \quad (56)$$

when the expression (55) is substituted for $\delta g_{\alpha\beta}$ in (56). So, one can see that $g_{\mu\nu}$ transforms as the metric tensor in Riemannian geometry with general coordinate transformations taken in the form

$$\delta x^\mu = -p_1 \xi^\mu(x) . \quad (57)$$

The constant p_1 may then be absorbed into the transformation 4-vector parameter function ξ^μ . Indeed, for this form of the coordinate variation, the metric changes to

$$g'^{\mu\nu} = \frac{\partial x'^\mu}{\partial x^\rho} \frac{\partial x'^\nu}{\partial x^\sigma} g^{\rho\sigma} \quad (58)$$

Plugging in $g^{\mu\nu} = \eta^{\mu\nu} - p_1 H^{\mu\nu} + \dots$ and using $(\partial x'^\mu / \partial x^\rho) = \delta_\rho^\mu - p_1 \partial_\rho \xi^\mu$, one finds in the weak field limit (neglecting the terms containing $p_1 H^{\mu\nu}$ and ξ^μ altogether and properly lowering the indices with $\eta_{\mu\nu}$ to this order) the reduced transformation law for the tensor field $H_{\mu\nu}$

$$\delta H_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu \xi_\nu + \partial_\nu \xi_\mu . \quad (59)$$

This result conforms with the general equation (55) taken in the same limit.

¹⁸In order to obtain this result, one has first to use the conventional formulas $\delta g^{p_0/2} = (p_0/2) g^{p_0/2} g^{\alpha\beta} \delta g_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\partial_\rho g^{p_0/2} = (p_0/2) g^{p_0/2} g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\rho g_{\alpha\beta}$ for the variation of the determinant g and its derivative respectively, and then to divide both of sides of the equation by $g^{p_0/2}$.

As to the scalar field $\phi(x)$, we can also simplify its transformation law (49, 51) if we replace it by $\phi' = g^{-d/2}\phi$

$$\delta\phi' = -d/2g^{-d/2}(g^{\alpha\beta}\delta g_{\alpha\beta})\phi + g^{-d/2}p_1(\xi^\rho\partial_\rho\phi + d\partial_\rho\xi^\rho\phi) = p_1\xi^\rho\partial_\rho\phi', \quad (60)$$

where we have again used equation (56). Therefore, the transformations for the redefined field ϕ' (the prime will be omitted henceforth) amount to pure local translations.

So we have shown that, in the tensor field case, the imposition of the SLIV constraint (2) promotes the starting global Poincare symmetry to the local diff invariance. This SLIV induced gauge symmetry now completely determines the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(H_{\mu\nu}, \phi)$ appearing in the invariant action I (47). Actually, as is well-known [33], if one requires the action integral defined over any arbitrary region to be invariant (that is, $\delta I = 0$) under a total variation, including the variations of the fields (59, 60) and of the coordinates (57), one must have

$$\delta\mathcal{L} + \partial_\mu(\delta x^\mu\mathcal{L}) = 0. \quad (61)$$

This implies that the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(H_{\mu\nu}, \phi)$ should transform like a scalar density rather than being invariant as it usually is in the internal symmetry case considered in section 2. Now the explicit form of the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(H_{\mu\nu}, \phi)$ satisfying the condition (61), which could be referred to as the action-invariant Lagrangian, is readily deduced. Indeed, in the weak field approximation, this is the well-known linearized gravity Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}(H_{\mu\nu}, \phi) = \mathcal{L}(H) + \mathcal{L}(\phi) + \mathcal{L}_{int}. \quad (62)$$

It consists of the H field kinetic term of the form

$$\mathcal{L}(H) = \frac{1}{2}\partial_\lambda H^{\mu\nu}\partial^\lambda H_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}\partial_\lambda H_{tr}\partial^\lambda H_{tr} - \partial_\lambda H^{\lambda\nu}\partial^\mu H_{\mu\nu} + \partial^\nu H_{tr}\partial^\mu H_{\mu\nu}, \quad (63)$$

(H_{tr} stands for the trace of $H_{\mu\nu}$, $H_{tr} = \eta^{\mu\nu}H_{\mu\nu}$) together with the scalar field free Lagrangian part and its interaction term

$$\mathcal{L}(\phi) = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\rho\phi\partial^\rho\phi - m^2\phi^2), \quad \mathcal{L}_{int} = -\frac{1}{2M_P}H_{\mu\nu}T^{\mu\nu}(\phi). \quad (64)$$

Here $T^{\mu\nu}(\phi)$ is the conventional energy-momentum tensor for a scalar field

$$T^{\mu\nu}(\phi) = \partial^\mu\phi\partial^\nu\phi - \eta^{\mu\nu}\mathcal{L}(\phi) \quad (65)$$

and the proportionality coefficient p_1 in the metric (53) is chosen to be just the inverse Planck mass, $p_1 = 1/M_P$. It is clear that, in contrast to the tensor free field terms given above by $\mathcal{L}(H)$, the scalar free field part $\mathcal{L}(\phi)$ and its interaction term \mathcal{L}_{int} (64) are only approximately action-invariant under the diff transformations (59, 60). This only works in the weak field limit, treating $\partial_\mu\xi_\nu$ as of the same order as $H_{\mu\nu}$.

We expect that the reparameterization symmetry will come out to all orders in $1/M_P$, because the full reparameterization symmetry is needed to ensure that the equations of motion are free to match with the constraint at all times. In order to determine the complete theory,

one should consider the full variation of the Lagrangian \mathcal{L} as a function of the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ and its derivatives (including the second order ones) and solve a general identity of the type

$$\delta\mathcal{L}(g_{\mu\nu}, g_{\mu\nu,\lambda}, g_{\mu\nu,\lambda\rho}; \phi, \phi_{,\lambda}) = \partial_\mu X^\mu. \quad (66)$$

Here subscripts after commas denote derivatives and X^μ is an unknown vector function. The latter must be constructed from the fields and local transformation parameters $\xi^\mu(x)$, taking into account the requirement of compatibility with the invariance of \mathcal{L} under Lorentz transformations and translations. Following this procedure [33, 34] for the field variations (55, 60) conditioned by the SLIV constraint (2), one can eventually find the total Lagrangian \mathcal{L} . The latter turns out to be properly expressed in terms of quantities similar to the basic ones in Riemannian geometry (like the metric, connection, curvature etc.). Actually, this theory successfully mimics general relativity, which allows us to conclude that the Einstein equations can really be derived in flat Minkowski spacetime provided that the Lorentz symmetry is spontaneously broken.

While we will mainly be focused, in what follows, on the linearized gravity theory case, our discussion can be extended to general relativity as well.

3.2 Graviton as a tensor Goldstone boson

Let us turn now to the spontaneous Lorentz violation which is caused by the nonlinear tensor field constraint (2). This constraint can be written in the more explicit form

$$H_{\mu\nu}^2 = H_{00}^2 + H_{i=j}^2 + (\sqrt{2}H_{i\neq j})^2 - (\sqrt{2}H_{0i})^2 = \mathfrak{n}^2 M^2 = \pm M^2 \quad (67)$$

(where the summing on indices $(i, j = 1, 2, 3)$ is imposed) and means in essence that the tensor field $H_{\mu\nu}$ develops the vev configuration

$$\langle H_{\mu\nu}(x) \rangle = \mathfrak{n}_{\mu\nu} M \quad (68)$$

determined by the matrix $\mathfrak{n}_{\mu\nu}$. The initial Lorentz symmetry $SO(1, 3)$ of the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(H_{\mu\nu}, \phi)$ given in (62) then formally breaks down at a scale M to one of its subgroups. We assume for simplicity a “minimal” vacuum configuration in the $SO(1, 3)$ space with the vevs (68) developed on only one of the $H_{\mu\nu}$ components. If so, there are in fact the following three possibilities

$$\begin{aligned} (a) \quad & \mathfrak{n}_{00} \neq 0, \quad SO(1, 3) \rightarrow SO(3) \\ (b) \quad & \mathfrak{n}_{i=j} \neq 0, \quad SO(1, 3) \rightarrow SO(1, 2) \\ (c) \quad & \mathfrak{n}_{i\neq j} \neq 0, \quad SO(1, 3) \rightarrow SO(1, 1) \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

for the positive sign in (67), and

$$(d) \quad \mathfrak{n}_{0i} \neq 0, \quad SO(1, 3) \rightarrow SO(2) \quad (70)$$

for the negative sign. These breaking channels can be readily derived, by counting how many different eigenvalues the matrix $\mathfrak{n}_{\mu\nu}$ has for each particular case (a-d). Accordingly, there are

only three Goldstone modes in the cases (a, b) and five modes in the cases $(c-d)$. In order to associate at least one of the two transverse polarization states of the physical graviton with these modes, one could have any of the above-mentioned SLIV channels except for the case (a) . Indeed, it is impossible for the graviton to have all vanishing spatial components, as happens for the Goldstone modes in the case (a) . Therefore, no linear combination of the three Goldstone modes in case (a) could behave like the physical graviton (see [8] for a more detailed consideration). In addition to the minimal vev configuration, there are many other possibilities. A particular case of interest is that of the traceless vev tensor $\mathbf{n}_{\mu\nu}$

$$\mathbf{n}_{\mu\nu}\eta^{\mu\nu} = 0, \quad (71)$$

in terms of which the Goldstonic gravity Lagrangian acquires an especially simple form (see below). It is clear that the vev in this case can be developed on several $H_{\mu\nu}$ components simultaneously, which in general may lead to total Lorentz violation with all six Goldstone modes generated. For simplicity we will use this form of vacuum configuration in what follows, while our arguments can be applied to any type of vev tensor $\mathbf{n}_{\mu\nu}$.

In this connection the question naturally arises of the other components of the symmetric two-index tensor $H_{\mu\nu}$, in addition to the pure Goldstone modes. They turn out to be pseudo-Goldstone modes (PGMs) in the theory. Indeed, although we only propose Lorentz invariance of the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(H_{\mu\nu}, \phi)$, the SLIV constraint (2) formally possesses the much higher accidental symmetry $SO(7, 3)$ of the constrained bilinear form (67), when the $H_{\mu\nu}$ components are considered as the “vector” components under $SO(7, 3)$. This symmetry is in fact spontaneously broken side by side with Lorentz symmetry at the scale M . Assuming again a minimal vacuum configuration in the $SO(7, 3)$ space with the vev (68) developed on only one of the $H_{\mu\nu}$ components, we have either time-like ($SO(7, 3) \rightarrow SO(6, 3)$) or space-like ($SO(7, 3) \rightarrow SO(7, 2)$) violations of the accidental symmetry depending on the sign of $\mathbf{n}^2 = \pm 1$ in (67). According to the number of broken $SO(7, 3)$ generators, just nine massless NG modes appear in both cases. Together with an effective Higgs component, on which the vev is developed, they complete the whole ten-component symmetric tensor field $H_{\mu\nu}$ of our Lorentz group. Some of them are true Goldstone modes of the spontaneous Lorentz violation. The others are PGMs since the accidental $SO(7, 3)$ is not shared by the whole Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(H_{\mu\nu}, \phi)$ given in (62). Notably, in contrast to the scalar PGM case [22] and similarly to the vector PGMs, they remain strictly massless being protected by the simultaneously generated diff invariance¹⁹. Owing to the latter invariance, some of the PGMs and Goldstone modes can be gauged away from the theory, as usual.

Now, one can rewrite the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(H_{\mu\nu}, \phi)$ in terms of the Goldstone modes explicitly using the SLIV constraint (2). For this purpose let us take the following handy parameterization for the tensor field $H_{\mu\nu}$ in the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(H_{\mu\nu}, \phi)$:

$$H_{\mu\nu} = h_{\mu\nu} + \frac{\mathbf{n}_{\mu\nu}}{\mathbf{n}^2}(\mathbf{n} \cdot H) \quad (\mathbf{n} \cdot H \equiv \mathbf{n}_{\mu\nu}H^{\mu\nu}), \quad (72)$$

¹⁹For a non-minimal vacuum configuration when vevs are developed on several $H_{\mu\nu}$ components, thus leading to a more substantial breaking of the accidental $SO(7, 3)$ symmetry, some extra PGMs are generated. However, they are not protected by diffeomorphism invariance and acquire masses of the order of the breaking scale (M).

where $h_{\mu\nu}$ corresponds to the pure Goldstonic modes²⁰ satisfying

$$\mathbf{n} \cdot h = 0 \quad (\mathbf{n} \cdot h \equiv \mathbf{n}_{\mu\nu} h^{\mu\nu}). \quad (73)$$

There is also an effective ‘‘Higgs’’ mode (or the $H_{\mu\nu}$ component in the vacuum direction) is given by the scalar product $\mathbf{n} \cdot H$. Substituting this parameterization (72) into the tensor field constraint (2), one obtains the following equation for $\mathbf{n} \cdot H$:

$$\mathbf{n} \cdot H = (M^2 - \mathbf{n}^2 h^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} = M - \frac{\mathbf{n}^2 h^2}{2M} + O(1/M^2) \quad (74)$$

taking, for definiteness, the positive sign for the square root and expanding it in powers of h^2/M^2 , $h^2 \equiv h_{\mu\nu} h^{\mu\nu}$. Putting then the parameterization (72) with the SLIV constraint (74) into the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(H_{\mu\nu}, \phi)$ given in (63, 64), one obtains the Goldstonic tensor field gravity Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(h_{\mu\nu}, \phi)$ containing an infinite series in powers of the $h_{\mu\nu}$ modes. For the traceless vev tensor $\mathbf{n}_{\mu\nu}$ (71) it takes, without loss of generality, the especially simple form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(h_{\mu\nu}, \phi) = & \frac{1}{2} \partial_\lambda h^{\mu\nu} \partial^\lambda h_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\lambda h_{tr} \partial^\lambda h_{tr} - \partial_\lambda h^{\lambda\nu} \partial^\mu h_{\mu\nu} + \partial^\nu h_{tr} \partial^\mu h_{\mu\nu} + \\ & + \frac{1}{2M} h^2 \left[-2\mathbf{n}^{\mu\lambda} \partial_\lambda \partial^\nu h_{\mu\nu} + \mathbf{n}^2 (\mathbf{n} \partial \partial) h_{tr} \right] + \frac{1}{8M^2} h^2 \left[-\mathbf{n}^2 \partial^2 + 2(\partial \mathbf{n} \mathbf{n} \partial) \right] h^2 \\ & + \mathcal{L}(\phi) - \frac{M}{2M_P} \mathbf{n}^2 [\mathbf{n}_{\mu\nu} \partial^\mu \phi \partial^\nu \phi] - \frac{1}{2M_P} h_{\mu\nu} T^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{4MM_P} h^2 [-\mathbf{n}_{\mu\nu} \partial^\mu \phi \partial^\nu \phi] \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

written in the $O(h^2/M^2)$ approximation. In addition to the conventional graviton bilinear kinetic terms, the Lagrangian contains three- and four-linear interaction terms in powers of $h_{\mu\nu}$. Some of the notations used are collected below:

$$\begin{aligned} h^2 & \equiv h_{\mu\nu} h^{\mu\nu}, \quad h_{tr} \equiv \eta^{\mu\nu} h_{\mu\nu}, \\ \mathbf{n} \partial \partial & \equiv \mathbf{n}_{\mu\nu} \partial^\mu \partial^\nu, \quad \partial \mathbf{n} \mathbf{n} \partial \equiv \partial^\mu \mathbf{n}_{\mu\nu} \mathbf{n}^{\nu\lambda} \partial_\lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

The bilinear scalar field term

$$- \frac{M}{2M_P} \mathbf{n}^2 [\mathbf{n}_{\mu\nu} \partial^\mu \phi \partial^\nu \phi] \quad (77)$$

in the third line in the Lagrangian (75) merits special notice. This term arises from the interaction Lagrangian \mathcal{L}_{int} (64) after application of the tracelessness condition (71) for the vev tensor $\mathbf{n}_{\mu\nu}$. It could significantly affect the dispersion relation for the scalar field ϕ (and any other sort of matter as well), thus leading to an unacceptably large Lorentz violation if the SLIV scale M were comparable with the Planck mass M_P . However, this term can be gauged away by an appropriate choice of the gauge parameter function $\xi^\mu(x)$ in the transformations (59, 60) of the tensor and scalar fields²¹. Technically, one simply transforms the scalar field

²⁰It should be particularly emphasized that the modes collected in $h_{\mu\nu}$ are in fact the Goldstone modes of the broken accidental $SO(7, 3)$ symmetry of the constraint (2) thus containing the Lorentz Goldstone modes and PGMs altogether.

²¹Actually, in the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(H_{\mu\nu}, \phi)$ satisfying the action invariance condition (61), the vacuum shift of the tensor field $H_{\mu\nu} = h_{\mu\nu} + \frac{\mathbf{n}_{\mu\nu}}{\mathbf{n}^2} M$ is in fact a gauge transformation which, for the appropriately chosen transformation of the scalar field $\phi(x)$, leaves the action I (47) invariant.

and its derivative to a new coordinate system $x^\mu \rightarrow x^\mu - \xi^\mu$ in the Goldstonic Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(h_{\mu\nu}, \phi)$. Actually, using the fixed-point variation of $\phi(x)$ given above in (60), with the coefficient p_1 absorbed into the parameter function $\xi^\mu(x)$, and differentiating both sides with respect to x^μ one obtains

$$\delta(\partial_\mu \phi) = \partial_\mu (\xi^\nu \partial_\nu \phi). \quad (78)$$

This gives in turn

$$\delta_{tot}(\partial_\mu \phi) = \delta(\partial_\mu \phi) + \delta x^\nu \partial_\nu (\partial_\mu \phi) = \partial_\mu \xi^\nu \partial_\nu \phi \quad (79)$$

for the total variation of the scalar field derivative. The corresponding total variation of the Goldstonic tensor $h_{\mu\nu}$, caused by the same transformation to the coordinate system $x^\mu - \xi^\mu$, is given in turn by equations (59) and (72) to be

$$\delta_{tot} h_{\mu\nu} = (\partial^\rho \xi^\sigma + \partial^\sigma \xi^\rho) \left(\eta_{\rho\mu} \eta_{\sigma\nu} - \frac{\mathbf{n}_{\mu\nu}}{\mathbf{n}^2} \mathbf{n}_{\rho\sigma} \right) - \xi^\rho \partial_\rho h_{\mu\nu}. \quad (80)$$

One can now readily see that, with the parameter function $\xi^\mu(x)$ chosen as

$$\xi^\mu(x) = \frac{M}{2M_P} \mathbf{n}^2 \mathbf{n}^{\mu\nu} x_\nu, \quad (81)$$

the dangerous term (77) is precisely cancelled²² by an analogous term stemming from the scalar field kinetic term in the $\mathfrak{L}(\phi)$ given in (64), while the total variation of the tensor $h_{\mu\nu}$ reduces to just the second term in (80). This term is of the natural order $O(\xi h)$, which can be neglected in the weak field approximation, so that to the present accuracy the tensor field variation $\delta_{tot} h_{\mu\nu} = 0$. Indeed, since the diff invariance is an approximate symmetry of the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(h_{\mu\nu}, \phi)$, the above cancellation will only be accurate up to the order corresponding to the linearized Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(H_{\mu\nu}, \phi)$ we started with in (62). Actually, a proper extension of the tensor field theory to GR with its exact diff invariance will ultimately restore the usual form of the dispersion relation for the scalar (and other matter) fields. Taking this into account, we will henceforth omit the term (77) in $\mathcal{L}(h_{\mu\nu}, \phi)$, thus keeping the “normal” dispersion relation for the scalar field in what follows.

Together with the Lagrangian one must also specify the other gauge fixing in addition to the general Goldstonic “gauge” $\mathbf{n}_{\mu\nu} \cdot h^{\mu\nu} = 0$ choice given above (73). The point is that the spin 1 states are still left in the theory²³ and are described by some of the components of the new tensor $h_{\mu\nu}$. Usually, they (and one of the spin 0 states) are excluded by the conventional Hilbert-Lorentz condition

$$\partial^\mu h_{\mu\nu} + q \partial^\nu h_{tr} = 0 \quad (82)$$

(q is an arbitrary constant giving the standard harmonic gauge condition for $q = -1/2$). On the other hand, as we have already imposed the constraint (73), we cannot use the full Hilbert-Lorentz condition (82), eliminating four more degrees of freedom in $h_{\mu\nu}$. Otherwise,

²²In the general case, with the vev tensor $\mathbf{n}_{\mu\nu}$ having a non-zero trace, this cancellation would also require the redefinition of the scalar field itself as $\phi \rightarrow \phi(1 - \mathbf{n}_{\mu\nu} \eta^{\mu\nu} \frac{M}{M_P})^{-1/2}$.

²³These spin 1 states must necessarily be excluded as the sign of the energy for spin 1 is always opposite to that for spin 2 and 0

one would have an “overgauged” theory with a non-propagating graviton. In fact the simplest set of conditions which conforms with the Goldstonic condition (73) turns out to be [9]

$$\partial^\rho(\partial_\mu h_{\nu\rho} - \partial_\nu h_{\mu\rho}) = 0 \quad (83)$$

This set excludes only three degrees of freedom²⁴ in $h_{\mu\nu}$ and it automatically satisfies the Hilbert-Lorentz spin condition as well. So, with the Lagrangian (75) and the supplementary conditions (73) and (83) lumped together, one eventually comes to a working model for the Goldstonic tensor field gravity. Generally, from ten components in the symmetric-two $h_{\mu\nu}$ tensor, four components are excluded by the supplementary conditions (73) and (83). For a plane gravitational wave propagating, say, in the z direction another four components can also be eliminated. This is due to the fact that the above supplementary conditions still leave freedom in the choice of a coordinate system, $x^\mu \rightarrow x^\mu - \xi^\mu(t - z/c)$, much as takes place in standard GR. Depending on the form of the vev tensor $\mathbf{n}_{\mu\nu}$, the two remaining transverse modes of the physical graviton may consist solely of Lorentz Goldstone modes or of Pseudo Goldstone modes or include both of them.

The theory derived looks essentially nonlinear and contains a variety of Lorentz (and *CPT*) violating couplings, when expressed in terms of the pure tensor Goldstone modes. Nonetheless, as was shown in recent calculations [9], all the SLIV effects turn out to be strictly cancelled in the lowest order graviton-graviton scattering processes, due to the exact diffeomorphism invariance of the pure gravity part in the basic Lagrangian \mathcal{L} (75). At the same time, an actual Lorentz violation may appear in the matter field interaction sector, which only possesses an approximate diff invariance, through deformed dispersion relations of the matter fields involved. However, a proper extension of the tensor field theory to GR with its exact diffeomorphism invariance ultimately restores the dispersion relations for matter fields and, therefore, the SLIV effects vanish. So, one could generally argue, the measurable effects of SLIV, induced by elementary vector or tensor fields, can be related to the accompanying gauge symmetry rather than to spontaneous Lorentz violation. The latter appears by itself to be physically unobservable and only results in a noncovariant gauge choice in an otherwise gauge invariant and Lorentz invariant theory.

From this standpoint, the only way for physical Lorentz violation to appear would be if the above local invariance is slightly broken at very small distances in an explicit, rather than spontaneous, way. This is in fact a place where the emergent vector and tensor field theories may differ from conventional QED, Yang-Mills and GR theories. Actually, such a local symmetry breaking could lead in the former case to deformed dispersion relations for all the matter fields involved. This effect typically appears proportional to some power of the ratio $\frac{M}{M_P}$ (just as we have seen above for the scalar field in our model, see (77)), though being properly suppressed due to the tiny gauge noninvariance. The higher the SLIV scale M becomes the larger becomes the actual Lorentz violation which, for some value of the scale M , may become physically observable even at low energies. Another basic difference between Goldstonic theories with non-exact gauge invariance and conventional theories is the

²⁴The solution for the gauge function $\xi_\mu(x)$ satisfying the condition (83) can generally be chosen to be $\xi_\mu = \square^{-1}(\partial^\rho h_{\mu\rho}) + \partial_\mu \theta$ where $\theta(x)$ is an arbitrary scalar function, so that only three degrees of freedom in $h_{\mu\nu}$ are actually eliminated.

emergence of a mass for the graviton and other gauge fields (namely, for the non-Abelian ones), if they are composed from Pseudo Goldstone modes rather than from pure Goldstone ones. Indeed, these PGMs are no longer protected by gauge invariance and may acquire tiny masses. This may lead to a massive gravity theory, where the graviton mass emerges dynamically, thus avoiding the notorious discontinuity problem [35]. So, while Goldstonic theories with exact local invariance are physically indistinguishable from conventional gauge theories, there are some principal differences when this local symmetry is slightly broken which could eventually allow us to differentiate between them in an observational way.

One could imagine how such a breaking might occur. As we have learned, only locally invariant theories provide the needed number of degrees of freedom for the interacting vector fields once SLIV occurs. Note that a superfluous restriction on a vector (or any other) field would make it impossible to set the required initial conditions in the appropriate Cauchy problem and, in quantum theory, to choose self-consistent equal-time commutation relations [23]. One could expect, however, that quantum gravity could in general hinder the setting of the required initial conditions at extra-small distances. Eventually this would manifest itself in an explicit violation of the above local invariance in a theory through some high-order operators stemming from the quantum gravity energy scale, which could lead to physical Lorentz violation. If so, one could have some observational evidence in favor of the emergent theories, just as was claimed at the very beginning when the SLIV idea was put forward [1]. However, is there really any strong theoretical reason left for the Lorentz invariance to be physically broken, if the Goldstonic gauge fields are anyway generated through the “safe” nonlinear sigma type SLIV models which recover conventional Lorentz invariance? We may return to this question elsewhere.

4 Conclusion

An arbitrary local theory of a symmetric two-tensor field $H_{\mu\nu}$ in Minkowski spacetime was considered, in which the equations of motion are required to be compatible with a nonlinear length-fixing constraint $H_{\mu\nu}^2 = \pm M^2$ leading to spontaneous Lorentz invariance violation (M is the proposed scale for SLIV). Allowing the parameters in the Lagrangian to be adjusted so as to be compatible with this constraint, the theory turns out to correspond to general relativity (in the weak field approximation). Also some of the massless tensor Goldstone modes appearing through SLIV are naturally collected in the physical graviton. The underlying diffeomorphism invariance directly follows from an application, of Noether’s second theorem [29]. In fact we argued for a relation between the Eulerians (equation of motion expressions), which then by Noether’s second theorem implies the reparameterization symmetry of the Lagrangian. Such a relation (43, 44) is needed for consistency, when the constraint $H_{\mu\nu}^2 = \pm M^2$ is to be upheld at all times. Otherwise the degrees of freedom of the symmetric two-tensor $H_{\mu\nu}$ would be superfluously restricted. Actually, this derivation of diffeomorphism symmetry excludes “wrong” couplings in the tensor field Lagrangian, which would otherwise distort the final Lorentz symmetry broken phase with unphysical extra states including ghost-like ones. Note that this procedure might, in some sense, be inspired by string theory where the coupling constants are just vacuum expectation values of the dilaton and moduli fields

[36]. So, the adjustment of coupling constants in the Lagrangian would mean, in essence, a certain choice for the vacuum configurations of these fields, which are thus correlated with SLIV.

The crucial point in our method of deriving gauge invariance seems to be that one degree of freedom for the vector or tensor field considered is not determined from the time development of their own equations of motion but solely by the relevant constraint (1, 2, 15). So, in order to avoid a possible inconsistency with an accordingly diminished number of independent degrees of freedom for the fields involved, their equations of motion must be generically prearranged to have less predictive power. Such a reduced predictive power is precisely what is achieved in gauge theories, where one cannot predict the evolution of gauge-fixing terms as time develops. The equations of motion in gauge theories are therefore less predictive by just the number of degrees of freedom corresponding to the number of gauge parameters, which are actually functions of spacetime. In order to allow for consistency with constraints like (1, 2, 15), one at first seems to need that the number of gauge degrees of freedom should be equal to the number of such constraints. But, as we have seen, even one constraint introduced as a length-fixing condition (1, 2, 15) may be enough for several gauge symmetry generators to emerge. Such a length-fixing constraint (1) applied to the one-vector field case (Section 2.1) leads to QED with only one gauge degree of freedom given by a gauge function $\omega(x)$. However, the analogous constraint (15) in the non-Abelian case, with the starting global G symmetry (Section 2.2), requires that D conditions $\mathbf{F}_a(C = 0; \mathbf{E}_A, \mathbf{E}_\psi, \dots) = 0$ have to be simultaneously fulfilled. This eventually leads to a gauge invariant Yang-Mills theory with D gauge degrees of freedom given by the set of parameter functions $\omega^a(x)$. Similarly in the tensor field case (Section 3.1), the length-fixing constraint (15) requires that just four equations $\mathcal{F}^\mu(C = 0; \mathcal{E}_H, \mathcal{E}_\phi, \dots) = 0$ should be arranged to be automatically satisfied. This leads to the diffeomorphism invariance (48) with the transformation 4-vector parameter function $\xi^\mu(x)$.

The appearance of gauge symmetries in our approach hinges strongly upon the imposition of a constraint. This can be done in either of the two following ways: (1) the constraint is imposed by hand prior to varying of the action or (2) the constraint is imposed by introducing a special quadratic Lagrange multiplier term, for which the Lagrange multiplier field is decoupled from the equations of motion and is thereby unable to ensure their consistency with the constraint. In both cases it is not possible to have consistency between the equations of motion and the constraint, unless the parameters in the Lagrangian are adjusted to allow for more freedom in the time development. This typically means that the Lagrangian should possess a generic, SLIV enforced, gauge invariance. As a result, all these vector and tensor field theories do not lead to any physical Lorentz violation and are in fact indistinguishable from conventional QED, Yang-Mills theories and general relativity²⁵. However, there might

²⁵Nonetheless, imposing nonlinear constraints in the emergent theories raises the question of unitarity and stability in them. Indeed, while the gauge invariant form for the vector (tensor) field kinetic terms in them prevents propagation of their longitudinal modes as the ghost modes, these nonlinear gauge conditions could cause them unless the phase space in these theories are properly restricted so as to have ghost-free models with positive Hamiltonians. Particularly, it was shown [30] that by restricting the phase space to the vector field solutions with initial values obeying Gauss's law, the equivalence of Nambu's nonlinear QED model with an ordinary ghost-free QED is restored. At the same time, if these constraints are introduced, as in our case, through the quadratic Lagrange multiplier potentials (7, 17, 39) then a Hamiltonian appears positive over the full phase space [30]. Though these results have been still established for Abelian case only, one could expect

appear some principal distinctions if these emergent local symmetries were slightly broken at very small distances controlled by quantum gravity in an explicit, rather than spontaneous, way that could eventually allow one to differentiate between emergent and conventional gauge theories observationally.

Acknowledgments

One of us (J.L.C.) appreciates the warm hospitality shown to him during his visit to the Division of Elementary Particle Physics, Department of Physics, University of Helsinki where part of this work was carried out. We would like to thank Masud Chaichian, Oleg Kancheli, Archil Kobakhidze, Rabi Mohapatra and Giovanni Venturi for useful discussions and comments. Financial support from Georgian National Science Foundation (grant N 07_462_4-270) is gratefully acknowledged by J.L.C. Also C.D.F. would like to acknowledge support from STFC in UK.

References

- [1] J.D. Bjorken, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **24** (1963) 174;
- [2] P.R. Phillips, Phys. Rev. **146**, 966 (1966).
- [3] T. Eguchi, Phys.Rev. D **14** (1976) 2755.
- [4] M. Suzuki, Phys. Rev. D **37** (1988) 210.
- [5] J.L. Chkareuli, C.D. Froggatt and H.B. Nielsen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87** (2001) 091601;
J.L. Chkareuli, C.D. Froggatt and H.B. Nielsen, Nucl. Phys. B **609** (2001) 46.
- [6] Per Kraus and E.T. Tomboulis, Phys. Rev. D **66** (2002) 045015.
- [7] V.A. Kostelecky, R. Potting, Phys.Rev.D **79** (2009) 065018.
- [8] S.M. Carroll, H.Tam, I.K. Wehus, Phys.Rev. D **80** (2009) 025020.
- [9] J.L. Chkareuli, J.G. Jejelava and G. Tatishvili, Phys. Lett. B **696** (2011) 126.
- [10] H.B. Nielsen and I. Picek, Phys. Lett. B **114** (1982) 141, Nucl. Phys. B **211** (1983) 269;
S. Chadha and H.B. Nielsen, Nucl. Phys. B **217** (1983) 125.
- [11] S.M. Carroll, G.B. Field and R. Jackiw, Phys. Rev. D **41** (1990) 1231.
- [12] V.A. Kostelecky and R. Potting, Nucl. Phys. B **359** (1991) 545;
D. Colladay and V.A. Kostelecky, Phys. Rev. D **58** (1998) 116002 ;
- [13] S. Coleman and S.L. Glashow, Phys. Rev. D **59** (1999) 116008.

that similar arguments are applicable to all gauge theories considered.

- [14] T. Jacobson, S. Liberati and D. Mattingly, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **321** (2006) 150.
- [15] Y. Nambu, *Progr. Theor. Phys. Suppl. Extra* 190 (1968).
- [16] P.A.M. Dirac, *Proc. Roy. Soc.* **209A** (1951) 292;
P.A.M. Dirac, *Proc. Roy. Soc.* **212A** (1952) 330.
- [17] R. Righi and G. Venturi, *Lett. Nuovo Cim.* **19** (1977) 633;
R. Righi, G. Venturi and V. Zamiralov, *Nuovo Cim.* **A47** (1978) 518.
- [18] A.T. Azatov and J.L. Chkareuli, *Phys. Rev. D* **73**, 065026 (2006).
- [19] J.L. Chkareuli and Z.R. Kepuladze, *Phys. Lett. B* **644**, 212 (2007).
- [20] J.L. Chkareuli and J.G. Jejelava, *Phys. Lett. B* **659** (2008) 754.
- [21] J.L. Chkareuli, C.D. Froggatt, J.G. Jejelava and H.B. Nielsen, *Nucl. Phys. B* **796** (2008) 211.
- [22] S. Weinberg, *The Quantum Theory of Fields*, v.2, Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [23] V.I. Ogievetsky and I.V. Polubarinov, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **25** (1963) 358.
- [24] Y. Nambu and G. Jona-Lasinio, *Phys. Rev.* **122** (1961) 345.
- [25] J. Alfaro and L.F. Urrutia, *Phys. Rev. D* **81** (2010) 025007.
- [26] S. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev. B* **138** (1965) 988.
- [27] R. Jackiv, *Lorentz Violation in a Diffeomorphism-Invariant Theory*, arXiv: 0709.2348 [hep-th].
- [28] C. Lanczos, *The variational Principles of Mechanics*, Dover publications, 1986.
- [29] E. Noether, *Nachrichten von der Kön. Ges. Wissenschaften zu Gettingen, Math.-Phys. Kl.*, **2**, 235 (1918);
J.G. Fletcher, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **32** (1960) 45;
D. Bak et al, *Phys. Rev. D* **49** (1994) 5173.
- [30] R. Bluhm, Shu-Hong Fung and V. A. Kostelecky, *Phys. Rev. D* **77** (2008) 065020;
R. Bluhm, N.L. Cage, R. Potting and A. Vrublevskis, *Phys. Rev. D* **77** (2008) 125007.
- [31] P. Ramond, *The Family Group in Grand Unified Theories*, hep-ph/9809459.
- [32] J.L. Chkareuli, *JETP Lett.* **32** (1980) 671, *Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **32** (1980) 684;
J.L. Chkareuli, C.D. Froggatt and H.B. Nielsen, *Nucl. Phys. B* **626** (2002) 307.
- [33] T.W. Kibble, *J. Math. Phys.* **2** (1960) 212.

- [34] V.I. Ogievetsky and I.V. Polubarinov, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **35** (1965) 167.
- [35] H. van Dam and M. J. G. Veltman, Nucl. Phys. B **22**, 397 (1970);
V. I. Zakharov, JETP Lett. **12** (1970) 312.
- [36] M.B. Green, J.H. Schwartz and E. Witten, *Superstring Theory*, Cambridge University Press, 1988.