

Spherically Symmetric Scalar Field Collapse: An Example of the Spacetime Problem of Time

by
Joseph D. Romano
Department of Physics
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

Abstract

A canonical formalism for spherical symmetry, originally developed by Kuchar to describe vacuum Schwarzschild black holes, is extended to include a spherically symmetric, massless, scalar field source. By introducing the ADM mass as a canonical coordinate on phase space, one finds that the super-Hamiltonian and supermomentum constraints for the coupled system simplify considerably. Yet, despite this simplification, it is difficult to find a functional time formalism for the theory. First, the configuration variable that played the role of time for the vacuum theory is no longer a spacetime scalar once spherically symmetric matter is coupled to gravity. Second, although it is possible to perform a canonical transformation to a new set of variables in terms of which the super-Hamiltonian and supermomentum constraints can be solved, the new time variable also fails to be a spacetime scalar. As such, our solutions suffer from the so-called spacetime problem of time. A candidate for a time variable that is a spacetime scalar is presented. Problems with turning this variable into a canonical coordinate on phase space are discussed.

PACS number(s): 0420, 0460, 9760L

1. Introduction

Canonical quantization is well-suited for the study of collapsing matter systems. First, by quantizing both geometry and matter, canonical quantization

goes beyond the semi-classical approximation used, for example, in the standard treatment of Hawking radiation [1]. Second, by working on arbitrary Cauchy hypersurfaces, one can study what happens to the canonical data inside a black hole as one approaches the curvature singularity. Third, by performing a midisuperspace reduction to spherically symmetric spacetimes, one obtains simpler models that, hopefully, one can then solve. Canonical quantization is thus a promising method for investigating the formation and evaporation of black holes, and for studying the nature of horizons and singularities in quantum theory.

As a first step toward obtaining a better understanding of spherically symmetric gravitational collapse, Kuchar[2] has given a detailed and elegant analysis of the canonical quantization of vacuum Schwarzschild black holes. He was able to cast the classical and quantum dynamics of primordial black holes into a simple and geometrically transparent form by turning the curvature radius R and Killing time T of the Schwarzschild solution into canonical coordinates on the geometrodynamical phase space:

$$m; p; T(r); P_T(r); R(r); P_R(r) : \quad (1)$$

T and R thus become embedding variables $T(r)$ and $R(r)$ that specify how the Cauchy hypersurfaces are drawn in the spacetime. The canonical variables m and p also have a simple physical meaning: m is the Schwarzschild mass of the spacetime, and p is the difference between proper times at the right and left infinities.

In terms of these canonical variables, the super-Hamiltonian and super-momentum constraints are equivalent to

$$P_T(r) = 0; \quad P_R(r) = 0 : \quad (2)$$

The Hamiltonian, which is a linear combination of these constraints, weakly vanishes, implying that the canonical variables m and p are constants of motion. The Dirac quantization of this theory is also particularly simple. Wave functions $\Psi = \Psi(m; t; T; R)$ satisfying the quantum version of the constraints (2) are independent of $T(r)$ and $R(r)$. Since the Hamiltonian of the theory vanishes, wave functions are also independent of the label time t . The final result: $\Psi = \Psi(m)$.

The next step is to extend the above analysis to include a spherically symmetric, massless, scalar field source.

To some extent, the geometrodynamics of a spherically symmetric, massless, scalar field coupled to gravity has already been worked out. Berger, Chitre, Moncrief, and Nutku (BCMN) [3] addressed this problem in the early 1970's. Subsequently, Unruh [4] and Hawking [5] carefully analyzed the BCMN model, especially in regard to black hole evaporation and the properties of apparent horizons in the canonical formalism.

But in all of these treatments, the action for the coupled system is reduced to a privileged foliation specified by the vanishing of the "radial" momentum. The Cauchy hypersurfaces are no longer arbitrary; they are selected by the above slicing condition. For the vacuum theory, this slicing condition amounts to working on the surfaces of constant Killing time T . These hypersurfaces thus cover only the static regions of the Kruskal diagram and fail to penetrate the horizon. Hawking [5] also chooses to foliate spherically symmetric spacetimes in such a way that the region interior to an apparent horizon is removed.

This is not what we want to do.

Rather, we want to be able to choose Cauchy hypersurfaces so that we can study what happens to the canonical data inside a black hole as we approach the curvature singularity. As such, we need our foliation to cover the whole spacetime; the hypersurfaces must be able to penetrate an apparent horizon. In addition, we want to know how the hypersurfaces are located in the spacetime. This means that we need to have embedding variables as canonical coordinates on phase space. Given that the super-Hamiltonian and supermomentum constraints can then be solved for the momenta canonically conjugate to these variables, the Dirac quantization of the theory would be described by wave functions satisfying first-order functional Schrödinger equations. In this way, we would avoid the difficulties associated with solving the second-order Wheeler-DeWitt equation.

In other words, we desire a functional time formalism for our collapsing matter system.

As mentioned earlier, Kuchar [2] succeeded to find a functional time formalism for vacuum spherically symmetric spacetimes. The purpose of this paper is to present two attempts to find a functional time formalism for the coupled system, and to show how these attempts fail. Basically, the solutions suffer from the so-called spacetime problem of time [6]. That is, the time variables that we introduce as canonical coordinates on phase space are not spacetime scalars, and hence fail to qualify as true embedding variables.

The plan of the rest of the paper is as follows: In section 2, we briefly describe the canonical formalism for a spherically symmetric, massless, scalar field coupled to gravity. In section 3, we introduce the ADM mass as a canonical coordinate on phase space, thereby simplifying the constraints just as Kuchar did for the vacuum theory. In section 4, we define what we mean by the spacetime problem of time and show that the time variable $T(r)$, originally introduced for the vacuum theory, is not a spacetime scalar once spherically symmetric matter is coupled to gravity. We also point out that, although one can introduce a new time variable $T(r)$ in terms of which we can solve the super-Hamiltonian and supermomentum constraints, $T(r)$ also fails to be a spacetime scalar. Finally, in section 5, we conclude by presenting a natural candidate for a time variable that is a spacetime scalar — the curvature time T of the general, spherically symmetric, spacetime line element — and discuss the problems of turning this privileged spacetime coordinate into a canonical coordinate on phase space.

2. Canonical formalism

Let $(\gamma; g)$ be a 3-dimensional, spherically symmetric, Riemannian space with coordinates $x^a = (r; \theta; \phi)$ adapted to the symmetry. The line element $d\sigma$ can be written as

$$d\sigma^2 = \gamma^2(r) dr^2 + R^2(r) d\Omega^2 \quad (3)$$

where $d\Omega^2 := d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2$ is the line element on the unit 2-sphere. Note that $d\sigma$ is completely characterized by two functions $\gamma(r)$ and $R(r)$ of the radial label $r \in [0; 1)$. The point $r = 0$ is the center of spherical symmetry.

Modulo boundary terms, the vacuum dynamics of the gravitational field follows from the ADM action

$$S^G := \int_0^Z dt \int_{\Sigma_1} dr \left[P^0 \dot{R} - N H^G - N^r H_r^G \right] \quad (4)$$

where

$$H^G := \frac{1}{2} R^{-1} P_R P + \frac{1}{2} R^{-2} P^2 + \frac{1}{2} R R^{00} - \frac{1}{2} R R^{00} + \frac{1}{2} R^{02} - \frac{1}{2} R^{02} \quad (5)$$

$$H_r^G := P_R R^0 - P^0 \quad (6)$$

are the gravitational super-Hamiltonian and supermomentum. The dynamics of a spherically symmetric, massless, scalar field propagating on this spacetime follows from the action

$$S := \int_0^Z dt \int_0^1 dr \left[-N H - N^r H_r \right] \quad (7)$$

where

$$H := \frac{1}{2} \left(R'^2 + R^2 \omega^2 \right) \quad (8)$$

$$H_r := \omega' \quad (9)$$

are the energy density and momentum density of the scalar field. The scalar field is coupled to gravity by adding the two actions: $S^G + S$. The total super-Hamiltonian and supermomentum are then

$$H := H^G + H; \quad H_r := H_r^G + H_r; \quad (10)$$

The details leading to all of the above results can be found in [2].

Boundary terms and fall-off conditions play an important role for vacuum primordial black holes. They play an equally important role for gravity coupled to a spherically symmetric matter source. But rather than write down the fall-off conditions in all their detail, let us just state them in results. Namely, it is possible to choose fall-off conditions on the canonical variables $(\phi; \pi; P; R; P_R)$ and on the lapse and shift $(N; N^r)$ at $r = 0$ and $r = 1$ such that: (i) the total action $S^G + S$ is well-defined; (ii) the $t = \text{const}$ surfaces are free of conical singularities at $r = 0$; (iii) no boundary terms are needed to compensate the variation of the scalar field variables at $r = 0$ and $r = 1$; and (iv) no boundary terms other than

$$\int_0^Z dt N_1(t) M_1(t) \quad (11)$$

are needed to compensate the variation of the gravitational variables at $r = 0$ and $r = 1$. (Expression (11) is equal to the boundary term at the right in nity for the vacuum theory. See [2] for details.)

For the boundary term (11) written as above, the lapse function cannot be freely varied at $r = 1$. If it were, we would find $M_1(t) = 0$, implying that spacetime is flat. We can remove this restriction on the variation of

the lapse by introducing the proper time e_{-1} at $r = 1$ as an additional dynamical variable. Since $N_1 = -1$, we can rewrite the boundary term as

$$S_{\partial} = - \int dt \int_{\partial} M_{-1} : \quad (12)$$

The total action is then given by

$$S = S^G + S + S_{\partial} : \quad (13)$$

It is to be thought of as a functional of $(\gamma; \gamma; \dot{\gamma}; P; R; P_R; N; N^r; \gamma_{-1})$.

3. ADM mass as a canonical coordinate

The total super-Hamiltonian and supermomentum

$$\begin{aligned} H &= -R^{-1} P_R P + \frac{1}{2} R^{-2} P^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} R R^{\theta\theta} - \frac{1}{2} R R^{00} + \frac{1}{2} R^{\theta\theta} - \frac{1}{2} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} R^{-1} R^{-2} P^2 + R^2 P^2 \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

$$H_r = -P_R R^0 - P^0 + \dots \quad (15)$$

are complicated expressions of the gravitational variables $(\gamma; P; R; P_R)$. We desire a canonical transformation to a new set of variables, in terms of which the constraints $H = 0 = H_r$ simplify.¹

For vacuum spherically symmetric spacetimes, Kuchar[2] found such a canonical transformation. He showed that the mapping $(\gamma; P; R; P_R) \mapsto (M; P_M; R; P_R)$ given by

$$M = -\frac{1}{2} R^{-1} P^2 - \frac{1}{2} R^2 R^{\theta\theta} + \frac{1}{2} R \quad (16)$$

$$P_M = R^{-1} F^{-1} P \quad (17)$$

$$R = R \quad (18)$$

$$\begin{aligned} P_R &= P_R - \frac{1}{2} R^{-1} P - \frac{1}{2} R^{-1} F^{-1} P \\ &\quad - R^{-1} R^2 F^{-1} ((P^0)^0 (R R^0) - (P^0) (R R^0)^0) \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

¹Alternatively, one may choose to solve the constraints $H = 0 = H_r$ by imposing the coordinate and slicing conditions $r = R; P = 0$. This is the approach followed by BCMN [3], Unruh [4], and Hajček [5] in their papers. We will not follow their approach here, since we do not want to restrict ourselves to a privileged foliation.

where

$$F := \frac{R^{0!2}}{R} - \frac{P^2}{R} \quad (20)$$

is a canonical transformation on the gravitational phase space irrespective of constraints or dynamics. As such, it remains a canonical transformation on the extended phase space that includes the scalar field variables $(\phi; \pi_\phi)$.

In terms of the new canonical variables, the expressions for the super-Hamiltonian and supermomentum simplify considerably:

$$H = F^{-1} M^0 R^0 - F P_M P_R + \frac{1}{2} R^2 \omega^2 + R^2 \omega \quad (21)$$

$$H_r = P_R R^0 + P_M M^0 + \omega \quad (22)$$

where

$$F = 1 - 2M/R : \quad (23)$$

Notice that the left hand side of (21) is the product of $\neq 0$ and H . We are allowed to perform such a scaling without changing the constraint $H = 0$.

For vacuum spherically symmetric spacetimes, the canonical coordinate $M(r)$ is the Schwarzschild mass of the spacetime. In fact, Kuchar[2] obtained expression (16) for $M(r)$ by equating the ADM form of the spacetime line element (constructed from N , N^r , and d) with the Schwarzschild line element

$$ds^2 = -1 - \frac{2M}{R} dT^2 + \left(1 - \frac{2M}{R}\right)^{-1} dR^2 + R^2 d\Omega^2 \quad (24)$$

for an arbitrary parametrization: $T = T(t; r)$; $R = R(t; r)$. It turns out that this reconstruction program for the mass also works for gravity coupled to an arbitrary, spherically symmetric, matter source. Instead of (24), we have

$$ds^2 = -G(T; R) dT^2 + \left(1 - \frac{2M(T; R)}{R}\right)^{-1} dR^2 + R^2 d\Omega^2 \quad (25)$$

where $G(T; R)$ is in general different from

$$F(T; R) := 1 - 2M(T; R)/R : \quad (26)$$

As shown, for example, by Synge[7] and Thorne[8], $M(T; R)$ equals the total ADM mass of the spacetime contained within the sphere of curvature radius R at the time T . Thus, the canonical coordinate $M(r)$ has a good physical meaning for any spherically symmetric matter source coupled to gravity. (See also the papers by Guven and O'Murchadha[9].)

4. Spacetime problem of time

For vacuum spherically symmetric spacetimes, the introduction of the Schwarzschild mass as a canonical variable served only as an intermediate step. After carefully taking into account the boundary terms at the left and right infinities, Kuchar[2] subsequently performed a transformation that turned the Killing time T of the Schwarzschild solution into a canonical coordinate $T(r)$ on the geometrodynamical phase space, and then solved the constraints. As mentioned in Sec. 1, the final result is extremely simple:

$$P_T(r) = 0; \quad P_R(r) = 0: \quad (27)$$

For gravity coupled to a spherically symmetric matter source, the same transformation (modified slightly to account for the different topology of Σ) can be performed. Unfortunately, the final result for this case is not nearly as nice. First, the constraints $H = 0 = H_r$ do not lend themselves to any obvious solution. Second, even if we could solve the constraints for the momenta canonically conjugate to $T(r)$ and $R(r)$, $T(r)$ is no longer a spacetime scalar once spherically symmetric matter is coupled to gravity. Thus, this solution of the super-Hamiltonian and supermomentum constraints| even if it exists| suffers from the so-called spacetime problem of time[6].

Let us be more specific. Consider the transformation $(\Sigma; M; P_M) \rightarrow (T; P_T)$ given by

$$T(r) := \int_1^Z dr P_M(r); \quad (28)$$

$$P_T(r) := M^0(r): \quad (29)$$

This is Kuchar's canonical transformation adapted to the topology $\Sigma = \mathbb{R}^3$. The mapping (28){(29) is invertible:

$$M(r) = \int_0^Z dr P_T(r); \quad (30)$$

$$P_M(r) = T^0(r); \quad (31)$$

$$\Sigma_1 = T(\Sigma): \quad (32)$$

It also sends

$$\int_0^{\Sigma_1} dr P_M(r) M(r) = M_1 \quad \rightarrow \quad \int_0^{\Sigma_1} dr P_T(r) T(r) \quad (33)$$

modulo an exact differential. Thus, $(r; R; P_R; T; P_T)$ is a canonical chart on the extended phase space.

In terms of these new variables, the super-Hamiltonian and super-momentum are given by

$$H = F^{-1} P_T R^0 + F P_R T^0 + \frac{1}{2} R^2 \omega^2 + R^2 \omega^2 \quad (34)$$

$$H_r = P_R R^0 + P_T T^0 + \omega^2 \quad (35)$$

where

$$F(r) = 1 + \frac{2}{R(r)} \int_0^r dr P_T(r) : \quad (36)$$

Although these expressions for H and H_r are much simpler than they were originally (see Eqs. (14) and (15)), it is still not obvious how to solve the constraints $H = 0 = H_r$. The culprits are the F^{-1} and F factors multiplying the first two terms of the scaled super-Hamiltonian (34). These factors are responsible for the nonlinear dependence of H on P_T . We did not succeed to solve these equations for P_T and P_R on a general hypersurface.²

²If we choose to impose the coordinate and slicing conditions $r = R; T^0 = 0$ (which are equivalent to the BCMN gauge conditions $r = R; P_r = 0$ | see footnote 1), we can solve the constraints for the momenta P_T and P_R , and recover the BCMN-Unruh reduced Hamiltonian. The solution is

$$P_T(R) = \frac{d}{dR} \left(\frac{R}{2} (1 - \mathcal{F}) \right) ; \quad P_R(R) = \omega^2(R) \quad (37)$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}(R) = R^{-1} \exp \left(\int_1^R \frac{Z_R}{S} dR \right) \exp \left(\int_0^R \frac{Z_R}{S} dR \right) \exp \left(\int_1^R \frac{Z_R}{S} dR \right) \quad (38)$$

and

$$S(R) = R^{-1} R^2 \omega^2 + R^2 \omega^2 : \quad (39)$$

The Hamiltonian for the reduced theory is simply

$$H_{\text{red}}[r;] = \int_0^1 dR P_T(R) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 dR \exp \left(\int_1^R \frac{Z_R}{S} dR \right) \exp \left(\int_0^R \frac{Z_R}{S} dR \right) \exp \left(\int_1^R \frac{Z_R}{S} dR \right) \quad (40)$$

which agrees (up to a factor of $\frac{1}{4}$) with the BCMN-Unruh reduced Hamiltonian. This calculation just serves as a check on our results. As mentioned in Sec. 1, we prefer not to work on a privileged foliation.

But let us suppose, for the sake of argument, that we were able somehow to solve the constraints for P_T and P_R . Could we then claim that we found a satisfactory functional time formalism for a spherically symmetric, massless, scalar field coupled to gravity? The answer is "no." The reason is the following: A true embedding variable must be a spacetime scalar; it should not depend on the hypersurface from which it was constructed. If two hypersurfaces Σ_0 and Σ_1 intersect at the same event E in spacetime, and if the canonical data on each of these hypersurfaces are related by the Einstein equations, then the values of the embedding variable at E (obtained from the two sets of canonical data) must be equal. Otherwise, the embedding variable would assign different values to the same spacetime point. Since, as we shall show below, $T(r)$ is not a spacetime scalar, it is not a true embedding variable. We do not have a functional time formalism for our theory, and this solution suffers from the spacetime problem of time[6].

The requirement that a dynamical variable be a spacetime scalar can be expressed in purely canonical language[6]. Namely, a dynamical variable $s(x)$ is a spacetime scalar if and only if: (i) the function $s(x)$ is a spatial scalar; and (ii) the value $s(x)$ is unchanged, modulo the constraints, if we evolve the canonical data with a smeared super-Hamiltonian whose smearing function vanishes at x . Condition (ii) is equivalent to

$$f s(x); H(y)g \propto (x;y) \quad (41)$$

where $\propto (x;y)$ is shorthand notation for terms proportional to $(x;y)$. Thus, the Poisson bracket of a spacetime scalar with the super-Hamiltonian is weakly proportional to a δ -function.

A fairly simple calculation shows that condition (41) is not satisfied for $T(r)$. Explicitly,

$$f T(r); (r)H(r)g = F^{-1}(r)R^0(r)(r;r) + \dots \propto (r-r) \quad (42)$$

where the coefficients of the terms multiplying the step function $(r-r)$ are not weakly equal to zero unless the scalar field vanishes. Thus, $T(r)$ is not a spacetime scalar, and this solution of the constraints| even if it exists| suffers from the spacetime problem of time.

To conclude this section, we point out that, modulo certain technical difficulties³, we can perform a transformation to a new time variable $T(r)$ in

³These amount to the non-invertibility of the transformation (43)-(46). We can only

terms of which we can explicitly solve the constraints. The transformation $(t; M; P_M; R; P_R) \rightarrow (T; P_T; R; P_R)$ is

$$T(r) = t + \int_1^r \frac{dr}{F(r)} P_M(r) \quad (43)$$

$$P_T = \frac{d}{dr} \left(\frac{R}{2} \ln |F| \right) \quad (44)$$

$$R = R \quad (45)$$

$$P_R = P_R + \frac{1}{2} F P_M - F^{-1} (1 + \ln |F|) \quad (46)$$

where

$$F = 1 - 2M/R : \quad (47)$$

The transformed constraints are

$$H = P_T R^0 + P_R T^0 + \frac{1}{2} R^2 \omega^2 + R^2 \omega \quad (48)$$

$$\frac{1}{2} R \omega^2 - T \omega - F^{-1} (1 + \ln |F|) \quad (49)$$

$$H_r = P_R R^0 + P_T T^0 + \quad (49)$$

where

$$|F(r)| = \exp \left(\frac{2}{R(r)} \int_0^r dr P_T(r) \right) : \quad (50)$$

The solution of the constraints is

$$P_T(r) = \frac{d}{dr} \left(\frac{R(r)}{2} \ln |F(r)| \right) \quad (51)$$

$$P_R(r) = \frac{1}{R^0(r)} P_T(r) T^0(r) + (r)^0(r) \quad (52)$$

where

$$|F(r)| = R^{-1}(r) \exp \left(\int_1^r S \right) \exp \left(\int_0^r dr R^0(r) \exp \left(\int_1^r S \right) \right) \quad (53)$$

recover the absolute value of F if we try to invert the transformation. (See Eq. (50).) If we try to avoid this problem by restricting ourselves to one sign of F , say $F(r) > 0$, then we lose the hypersurfaces which penetrate an apparent horizon $F(r) = 0$.

and

$$S(r) := 2R^{-1}(R^{\varpi} - T^{\varpi})^{-1} T^0 = 0 - \frac{1}{2}R^0 R^{-2} + R^2 \varpi : \quad (54)$$

If we impose the coordinate and slicing conditions $r = R$; $T^0 = 0$, our solution again reproduces the BCMN-Uruh reduced Hamiltonian. (See footnote 2.)

Unfortunately, just like $T(r)$, $T(r)$ is not a spacetime scalar:

$$fT(r);(r)H(r)g = R^0(r) \cdot (r;r) + \dots / (r-r) \quad (55)$$

where again the coefficients of the terms multiplying the step function are not weakly equal to zero. Thus, this explicit solution of the constraints also suffers from the spacetime problem of time.

5. Discussion

The time variables $T(r)$ and $T(r)$ that we introduced as canonical coordinates on phase space both failed to be spacetime scalars. As such, they did not qualify as true embedding variables. It is important to stress, however, that the two attempts presented in this paper do not constitute a proof that a functional time formalism for spherically symmetric matter systems coupled to gravity does not exist. In fact, as we shall argue below, our current belief is that a functional time formalism for these systems does exist. We need only be more clever in our choice of time variable.⁴

Indeed, a natural candidate for a time variable that is a spacetime scalar is the curvature time of the general, spherically symmetric, spacetime line element

$$ds^2 = -G(T;R) dT^2 + F(T;R)^{-1} dR^2 + R^2 d\varpi^2 \quad (56)$$

where

$$F(T;R) := 1 - 2M(T;R)/R : \quad (57)$$

(See also the discussion at the end of Sec. 3.) By its definition, the curvature time T is a spacetime scalar, and like the curvature radius R , T has an

⁴A functional time formalism for spherically symmetric spacetimes has also been discussed by Braham [10]. It appears that his solution of the constraints also suffers from the spacetime problem of time. The "embedding" variables given in [10] are not spacetime scalars.

invariant geometrical meaning: (i) the surfaces of constant T are orthogonal to the lines of constant R , θ , and ϕ ; and (ii) the labeling of the $T = \text{const}$ surfaces is specified (up to the choice of time origin) by requiring that T measure proper time at $R = 0$. Requirement (ii) imposes the boundary condition $G(T; R = 0) = 1$ on G .

The problem is how to turn this privileged spacetime coordinate into a canonical coordinate on our phase space.

For vacuum spherically symmetric spacetimes, there is no problem. Following the reconstruction program for the mass described in Sec. 3, one finds

$$T^0 = F^{-1} R^{-1} P \quad (58)$$

where

$$F = \frac{R_0'^2}{R} - \frac{P^2}{R} : \quad (59)$$

As shown in [2], $T^0(r)$ is the momentum canonically conjugate to the Schwarzschild mass $M(r)$. Then, by carefully taking into account the boundary terms at the left and right infinities, one can perform another transformation that turns T itself into a canonical coordinate on phase space. (See [2] for more details.)

For gravity coupled to a spherically symmetric matter source, things are not so simple. Equation (58) is replaced by

$$G^{\frac{1}{2}} T^0 = F^{-\frac{1}{2}} R^{-1} P \quad (60)$$

where F is given by our old expression (59). Thus, we have only been able to reconstruct the product $G^{\frac{1}{2}} T^0$ in terms of the original gravitational variables. To obtain an expression for G or T^0 separately, we must somehow involve the matter variables.

An idea that immediately suggests itself is to use one of the Einstein equations[7]:

$$G(T; R) = F(T; R) \exp \left[-8 \int_0^R dR' R' F^{-1}(T; R') (T; R') + p(T; R) \right] \quad (61)$$

where

$$\equiv T_T^T; \quad p \equiv T_R^R \quad (62)$$

are two components of the energy-momentum tensor T for the spherically symmetric matter source. The problem with this approach is that the integral

in (61) is over a $T = \text{const}$ surface. Even though it is possible to express the integrand of (61) in terms of the original canonical variables, we still have to evolve the canonical data from Σ to the $T = \text{const}$ surface before we can do the integration. Since Σ is an arbitrary spherically symmetric hypersurface, Σ need not agree with the $T = \text{const}$ surface anywhere. The resulting expression for G , and hence for T , would be non-local in time as well as in space.

Another approach, which appears to be more promising, has a somewhat different starting point. The idea is to first reduce the Einstein-Hilbert action to spherically symmetric spacetime metrics of the form (56) and (57), and then parametrize the resulting action to introduce the curvature time T and its conjugate momentum as canonical data on arbitrary, spherically symmetric, hypersurfaces. In this manner, we would succeed in promoting both the curvature radius R and curvature time T to canonical coordinates $R(r)$ and $T(r)$ on phase space. The spacetime problem of time would thereby be avoided. But a possible problem with this approach is the existence of second class constraints. In the process of eliminating the second class constraints prior to quantization, we may lose $T(r)$ as one of our canonical variables. We are currently investigating these issues.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Karel Kuchar for suggesting this problem, and for his many insightful comments and questions. I would also like to thank Carsten Gundlach and Don Marolf for discussions during the initial stages of this work. This research was supported in part by the NSF grants PHY 89-04035 and PHY-9207225, and by the U.S.-Czech Science and Technology Grant No 92067.

References

- [1] S.W. Hawking, "Particle Creation by Black Holes," *Commun. Math. Phys.* 43, 199 (1975).
- [2] K.V. Kuchar, "Geometrodynamics of Schwarzschild black holes," *Phys. Rev. D* 50, 3961 (1994).
- [3] B.K. Berger, D.M. Chitre, V.E. Moncrief, and Y. Nutku, "Hamiltonian formulation of spherically symmetric gravitational fields," *Phys. Rev. D* 5, 2467 (1972).
- [4] "Notes on black-hole evaporation," W.G. Unruh, *Phys. Rev. D* 14, 870 (1976).
- [5] P. Thomas, B. Isaac, and P. Hajček, "Spherically symmetric systems of fields and black holes. I. Definition and properties of apparent horizon," *Phys. Rev. D* 30, 1168 (1984); P. Hajček, "II. Apparent horizon in canonical formalism," *Phys. Rev. D* 30, 1178 (1984); "III. Positivity of energy and of a new type Euclidean action," *Phys. Rev. D* 30, 1185 (1984); P. Hajček, "IV. No room for black-hole evaporation in the reduced configuration space?" *Phys. Rev. D* 31, 785 (1985).
- [6] K.V. Kuchar, "Time and interpretations of quantum gravity," in *Proceedings of the 4th Canadian Conference on General Relativity and Relativistic Astrophysics*, eds. G. Kunstatter, D. Vincent, and J. Williams (World Scientific, Singapore, 1992).
- [7] J.L. Synge, *Relativity: The General Theory* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1971), Chap. VII.
- [8] K.S. Thorne, "Geometrodynamics of cylindrical systems," *Princeton University Ph.D. Thesis*, (1965), Chap. 6.
- [9] J. Guven and N.O. Murchadha, "The constraints in spherically symmetric classical general relativity. I. Optical scalars, foliations, bounds on the configuration space variables and the positivity of the quasi-local mass," *LANL e-print archive gr-qc/9411009* (1994); "IIa. Identifying the configuration space: A moment of time symmetry," *LANL e-print archive gr-qc/9411010* (1994).

- [10] S.P. Brahm, "Hypertime formalism for spherically symmetric black holes and worm holes," LANL e-print archive gr-qc/9406045, to appear in Phys. Rev. D (1994).