

DUAL VARIABLES FOR M-BRANES

JENS HOPPE

ABSTRACT. Motivated in parts by [1], relativistic extended objects will be described by an (over-complete) set of generalized coordinates and momenta that in some sense are ‘dual’ to each other.

M -dimensional extended objects in D -dimensional Minkowski-space (see e.g. [2] for a review) are describable by a Hamiltonian whose potential is a homogenous polynomial of degree $2M$ in the derivative of the coordinate fields. As always with nonlinear theories, understanding their classical dynamics and possible quantization rests on finding suitable variables. Hence, partly motivated by [1], let us consider

$$\begin{aligned}
 (1) \quad L_\beta &= \int (p_{i/\rho} \gamma_{\beta\alpha}^i + \frac{1}{M!} \{x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_M}\} \gamma_{\beta\alpha}^{i_1 \dots i_M}) \theta_\alpha \rho d^M \varphi \\
 &=: \int (P_\alpha^\beta + Q_\alpha^\beta) \theta_\alpha \\
 A &= -\frac{1}{(M-1)!} \frac{1}{2} \int \gamma_{\alpha\varepsilon}^{i_2 \dots i_M} \theta_\alpha \{\theta_\varepsilon, x_{i_2} \dots x_{i_M}\} \rho d^M \varphi
 \end{aligned}$$

where the (canonically conjugate, classical) variables/fields, $x_{i=1\dots d}$ and $p_{j/\rho}$, are functions on a compact M -dimensional manifold $\mathbb{M}$, the $\theta_\alpha(\varphi)$ non-dynamical ‘book-keeping’ fermionic variables, satisfying

$$(2) \quad \theta_\alpha(\varphi) \theta_\varepsilon(\varphi') + \theta_\varepsilon(\varphi') \theta_\alpha(\varphi) = \delta_{\alpha\varepsilon} \frac{\delta(\varphi, \varphi')}{\rho},$$

$$(3) \quad \{f_1 \dots f_M\} := \frac{1}{\rho} \varepsilon^{r_1 \dots r_M} \partial_{r_1} f_1 \dots \partial_{r_M} f_M$$

(for any functions f_r on $\mathbb{M}$; the density ρ , which according to [6] can effectively be thought of as a constant, will for notational convenience be put $= 1$), and the γ^i ,

$$(4) \quad \gamma^i \gamma^j + \gamma^j \gamma^i = 2\delta^{ij} \mathbf{1}_{s \times s}$$

assumed to be (constant) real symmetric $s \times s$ matrices, with $\gamma^{i_1 \dots i_M}$ their standard fully antisymmetrized products ($= \gamma^{i_1} \dots \gamma^{i_M}$, if all i_r different).

Using (2) one has

$$\begin{aligned}
(5) \quad & L_\beta L_{\beta'} + L_{\beta'} L_\beta \\
&= \int (p_i \gamma_{\beta\alpha}^i + \frac{1}{M!} \{x_{i_1} \dots x_{i_M}\} \gamma_{\beta\alpha}^{i_1 \dots i_M}) (p_k \gamma_{\beta'\alpha}^k + \frac{1}{M!} \{x_{k_1} \dots x_{k_M}\} \gamma_{\beta'\alpha}^{k_1 \dots k_M}) \\
&= \delta_{\beta\beta'} \int \vec{p}^2 + \int \frac{1}{M!} \{x_{i_1} \dots x_{i_M}\} \{x_{k_1} \dots x_{k_M}\} (\frac{1}{M!} \gamma_{\beta\alpha}^{i_1 \dots i_M} \gamma_{\beta'\alpha}^{k_1 \dots k_M} + \beta \leftrightarrow \beta') \\
&\quad + \int p_k \{x_{i_1} \dots x_{i_M}\} \frac{1}{M!} (\gamma^{i_1 \dots i_M} \gamma^k)_{\beta\beta' + \beta'\beta} \\
&\cong \delta_{\beta\beta'} 2(H = T + V)
\end{aligned}$$

Due to the antisymmetrization $\{x_{i_1} \dots x_{i_M}\} \{x_{k_1} \dots x_{k_M}\}$ giving zero [3, 4] the second term on the rhs of (5) gives $\delta_{\beta\beta'} \frac{1}{M!} \int \sum_{i_1 \dots i_M} \{x_{i_1} \dots x_{i_M}\}^2$, as $\frac{1}{M!} (\gamma^{i_1} \dots \gamma^{i_M} \gamma^{i_M} \dots \gamma^{i_1}) = \mathbf{1}$, and the last term being zero on the reduced phase space of volume preserving (cp. [3]) functionals of x and p if $\gamma^{i_1 \dots i_M k}$ is antisymmetric, i.e. if $\frac{M(M+1)}{2}$ is odd resp. $M = 1, 2 \pmod{4}$.

On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned}
(6) \quad & L_\beta A - A L_\beta \\
&= - \int (p_i \gamma_{\beta\alpha}^i + \frac{1}{M!} \{x_{i_1} \dots x_{i_M}\} \gamma_{\beta\alpha}^{i_1 \dots i_M}) \gamma_{\alpha\varepsilon}^{k_2 \dots k_M} \frac{1}{(M-1)!} \{\theta_\varepsilon, x_{k_2} \dots x_{k_M}\} \\
&= + \frac{1}{(M-1)!} \int \theta_\varepsilon \{p_i, x_{k_2} \dots x_{k_M}\} (\gamma^i \gamma^{k_2 \dots k_M})_{\beta\varepsilon} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{(M-1)!} \{\{x_{i_1} \dots x_{i_M}\}, x_{k_1} \dots x_{k_M}\} \frac{1}{M!} (\gamma^{i_1 \dots i_M} \gamma^{k_2 \dots k_M})_{\beta\varepsilon} \\
&\cong \int (\dot{Q}_{\beta\alpha} + \dot{P}_{\beta\alpha}) \theta_\alpha \\
&= \dot{L}_\beta,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first term in the middle of (6) is zero on the reduced (volume-preserving) phase space whenever $i = k_r$ for some r (in the first term) and in the second term due to the $\{\}$ -identities ([3, 4]) unless $\{k_2 \dots k_M\} \subset \{i_1 \dots i_M\}$, (for which there are $M(M-1) \dots 2 = M!$ possibilities).

Note that the equations of motion can be put into the form $\dot{Q} = \Omega P$,

$$\dot{P} = \Omega Q,$$

$$(7) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{Q}_\alpha^\beta &= \pm \Omega_{\alpha\alpha'}^r \partial_r P_{\alpha'}^\beta, \\ \dot{P}_\alpha^\beta &= \Omega_{\alpha\alpha'}^r \partial_r Q_{\alpha'}^\beta, \\ \Omega_{\alpha\alpha'}^r &:= \frac{1}{(M-1)!} \varepsilon^{rr_2 \dots r_M} \partial_{r_2} x_{i_2} \dots \partial_{r_M} x_{i_M} \gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}^{i_2 \dots i_M}, \end{aligned}$$

with the ‘matrix-vectorfield’ $\Omega = (\Omega^r \partial_r) = (\Omega_{\alpha\alpha'})$ being divergence-free, and independent of β , and the + sign applying to $M = (1)2, 5(\bmod 4)$, the – sign to $M = 3, 4(\bmod 4)$:

$$(8) \quad \begin{aligned} \Omega_{\alpha\alpha'}^r \partial_r Q_{\alpha'}^\beta &= \frac{1}{(M-1)!} \varepsilon^{rr_2 \dots r_M} \partial_{r_2} x_{i_2} \dots \partial_{r_M} x_{i_M} \gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}^{i_2 \dots i_M} \frac{1}{M!} \partial_r \{x_{k_1} \dots x_{k_M}\} \gamma_{\beta\alpha'}^{k_1 \dots k_M} \\ &= \frac{1}{(M-1)!} \{ \{x_{k_1} \dots x_{k_M}\}, x_{i_2} \dots x_{i_M} \} \left(\frac{1}{M!} \gamma^{i_1 \dots i_M} \gamma^{k_M \dots k_1} \right)_{\alpha\beta} \\ &= \frac{1}{(M-1)!} \{ \{x_{k_1} \dots x_{k_M}\}, x_{k_2} \dots x_{k_M} \} \gamma_{\alpha\beta}^{k_1} \\ &= \dot{p}_k \gamma_{\beta\alpha}^k \\ &= \dot{P}_\alpha^\beta, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(9) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{Q}_\alpha^\beta &= \frac{1}{(M-1)!} \{p_i, x_{i_2} \dots x_{i_M}\} \gamma_{\beta\alpha}^{i_2 \dots i_M} \\ \Omega_{\alpha\alpha'}^r \partial_r P_{\alpha'}^\beta &= \partial_r p_i \gamma_{\beta\alpha'}^i \frac{1}{(M-1)!} \varepsilon^{rr_2 \dots r_M} \partial_{r_2} x_{i_2} \dots \partial_{r_M} x_{i_M} \gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}^{i_2 \dots i_M} \\ &= (-)^{\frac{(M-1)(M-2)}{2}} \{p_i, x_{i_2} \dots x_{i_M}\} (\gamma^{i_2 \dots i_M})_{\beta\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

It is then natural to look for ‘self-dual’ solutions of the form

$$(10) \quad P_\alpha^\beta = A_{\alpha\alpha'} Q_{\alpha'}^\beta$$

with (if A is constant)

$$(11) \quad A \gamma^{i_2 \dots i_M} A = (-)^{\frac{(M-1)(M-2)}{2}} \gamma^{i_2 \dots i_M},$$

choosing $A = \gamma := \gamma^1 \gamma^2 \dots \gamma^d$, $\gamma^2 = (-)^{d \frac{(d-1)}{2}}$, $\gamma^T = (-)^{d \frac{(d-1)}{2}} \gamma$, $\gamma \gamma^i = (-)^{(d-1)} \gamma^i \gamma$ (hence $\gamma \gamma^{i_2 \dots i_M} \gamma = (-)^{(M-1)(d-1) + d \frac{(d-1)}{2}} \gamma^{i_2 \dots i_M}$) one gets a condition on pairs (M, d) which for $M = 2$ is satisfied by $d = 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, \dots$ while for $d = 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, \dots$ if $M = 3$. There is however no guarantee that (10) is consistent for these allowed pairs (M, d) ; e.g., for $d = 2$, $M = 2$, $\gamma^1 = \sigma_3$, $\gamma^2 = \sigma_1$, $(P_\alpha^\beta) = (p_i \gamma_{\beta\alpha}^i) =$

$\begin{pmatrix} p_1 & p_2 \\ p_2 & -p_1 \end{pmatrix}$, $(Q_\alpha^\beta) = (\{x_1, x_2\}\gamma_{\beta\alpha}^{12}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_{12} \\ -x_{12} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $P_\alpha^1 = \varepsilon_{\alpha'\alpha} Q_{\alpha'}^1$ gives $p_1 = x_{12}$, $p_2 = -Q_1^1 = 0$, while $P_\alpha^2 = \varepsilon_{\alpha\alpha'} Q_{\alpha'}^2$ implies $p_2 = Q_2^2 = 0$, $-p_1 = -Q_1^2 = x_{12}$. While, related to quaternions and octonions, several special time-dependent solutions (see e.g. [5] and references therein) are known for the opposite (Euclidean) sign, which allows $d = 3, 4, 7, 8, \dots$ for $M = 2$ and $d = 4, 5, 8, 9$ for $M = 3$ it is important to notice the *generally* significant structure of the equations of motion (7), when written in the over-complete set of variables Q and P (with respect to which the Hamiltonian is quadratic, i.e. -was it not for the nontrivial symplectic form reflected by Ω - a set of harmonic oscillators).

Finally, let me note that (11), and the few lines following it, has to hold only modulo terms that vanish when inserted in the context of (7); even in the case of the few already known self-dual solutions (with the ‘wrong/euclidean’ sign), which are not necessarily of the form (10), as generally mixing the β -indices, $P_\alpha^\beta = M_{\beta\alpha, \beta'\alpha'} Q_{\alpha'}^{\beta'}$ the corresponding consistency equation $M\Omega^r M = \pm\Omega^r$ has to (and will) hold only up to terms vanishing when acting on $\partial_r Q$. That the over-complete variables Q and P have relevant orthogonal subspaces plays a role already for finite degrees of freedom; comparing the time-evolution of $V_{\alpha\alpha}^\beta = P_{\alpha\alpha}^\beta + Q_{\alpha\alpha}^\beta$ (see eq. (2), (6) of [1]) with calculating the classical dynamical Poisson-brackets,

$$(12) \quad \begin{aligned} \{V_{\alpha\alpha}^\beta, V_{\alpha'\alpha'}^{\beta'}\} &= f_{aba'} x_{sb} (\gamma_{\beta\alpha}^{st} \gamma_{\beta'\alpha'}^t + \gamma_{\beta'\alpha'}^{st} \gamma_{\beta\alpha}^t) \\ &=: z_{\alpha\alpha, \alpha'\alpha'}^{\beta\beta'}, \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_{\alpha\alpha}^\beta &= \{V_{\alpha\alpha}^\beta, H = \frac{1}{2} V_{\alpha'a'}^\beta V_{\alpha'a'}^\beta - \gamma_{\beta\beta}^t x_{te} J_e\} \\ &= z_{\alpha\alpha, \alpha'\alpha'}^{\beta\beta} V_{\alpha'a'}^\beta - \gamma_{\beta\beta}^t x_{te} f_{aeb} V_{\alpha b}^\beta \end{aligned}$$

implies e.g. that (for the fuzzy membrane in $d + 2$ space-time dimensions [7], resp. $d + 1$ Yang-Mills systems, e.g. [8] for $d = 3$, $N = 2$)

$$f_{aba'} x_{sb} (\gamma_{\beta\alpha}^{st} \gamma_{\beta'\alpha'}^t + \gamma_{\beta'\alpha'}^{st} \gamma_{\beta\alpha}^t + \gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}^s - \gamma_{\beta\beta}^s \delta_{\alpha'\alpha}) V_{\alpha'a'}^\beta = 0.$$

Acknowledgement. I would like to thank L.Mason for a conversation on twistors and self-duality, M.Kontsevich for having pointed out calibrated geometry, and S.Theisen for a discussion related to checking the linear relation between P and Q in an octonionic example.

REFERENCES

- [1] J.Hoppe, *Square-roots and Lax-pairs for supersymmetrizable systems*, arXiv:2101.01803
- [2] J.Hoppe, *Relativistic Membranes*, J.Phys.A 46, 2013
- [3] J.Hoppe, *On M-algebras, the quantization of Nambu brackets, and volume-preserving diffeomorphisms*, arXiv:hep-th/9602020
- [4] H. Awata, M. Li, D. Minic, T. Yoneya, *On the Quantization of Nambu brackets*, arXiv:hep-th/9906248
- [5] E.Floratos, G.K. Leontaris, *On the Octonionic Self-Duality equations of 3-brane Instantons*, arXiv:1702.08063
- [6] J.Moser, *On the volume element of a manifold*, Trans.Am.Math.Soc. 120 (1965)
- [7] J.Hoppe, *Quantum theory of a massless relativistic surface...*, Ph.D. thesis, MIT 1982 <http://dspace.mit.edu/handle/1721.1/15717>
- [8] S.G.Matinyan, G.K.Savvidy, N.G.Ter-Arutyunyan-Savvidi, *Classical Yang Mills mechanics ...*, Sov.Phys.JETP 80 (1981)

BRAUNSCHWEIG UNIVERSITY, GERMANY

Email address: jens.r.hoppe@gmail.com