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#### Abstract

H artle's generalized quantum $m$ echanics in the sum -over-h istories form alism is used to describe a nonabelian gauge theory. P redictions arem ade for certain altematives, w ith particular attention given to coarse grainings involving the constraint. In this way, the theory is com pared to other quantum $m$ echanical descriptions of gauge theories in which the constraints are im posed by hand. $T$ he vanishing of them om entum space constraint is seen to hold, both through a sim ple form alargum ent and via a $m$ ore carefuldescription of the Lorentzian path integral as de ned on a spacetim e lattice. The con guration space realization of the constraint is show $n$ to behave in a $m$ ore com plicated fashion. For som e coarse grainings, we recover the know n result from an abelian theory, that coarse grainings by values of the constraint either predict its vanishing or fail to decohere. H ow ever, sets of altematives de ned in term s of a m ore com plicated quantity in the abelian case are exhibited where de nite predictions can be m ade which disagree w ith the assum ption that the constraints vanish. F inally, the con guration space sum -over-histories theory is exh ibited in a $m$ anifestly Lorentz-invariant form ulation.
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G eneral relativity ( $G R$ ) possesses a sym $m$ etry, nam ely di eom onphism invariance. In the $3+1$ form ulation, this divides into tim e reparam etrization invariance and the nonabelian gauge group of spatial di eom onphism $\left.s \underline{11}_{1 / 1}\right]$. A technique for form ulating quantum gravity, such as a generalized quantum $m$ echanics de ned by a sum over histories, $w$ ill have to address the issues raised by these invariances, such as how (or whether) to enforce the constraints which the invariances imply. It is thus useful to exam ine proposed quantum form ulations of R by considering sim pler theories exhibiting a subset of these invariances or sim ilar ones. P revious work has applied the generalized quantum $m$ echanics program to
 theory [2].]. In this paper, we form ulate a generalized quantum $m$ echanics of a nonabelian gauge theory, and exam ine the predictions for som e altematives.

The role of this work w th regard to the vast body of know ledge on Yang -M ills or nonabelian gauge theories (see [ī] for a review) is twofold: First, this is the rst application of a \decoherence functional" or \consistent histories" m ethod to their quantization ?' A s such, the focus is not prim arily upon using such a theory for the practical consideration of the strong or weak interaction, but as a toy $m$ odel which exhibits som e features of $G$ R . H ow ever, even as a quantization of a nonabelian gauge theory itself, both the generalized quantum $m$ echanics form alism and this im plem entation thereof deal $w$ ith di erent aspects of the theory than are usually considered. The altematives for which generalized quantum $m$ echanics predicts probabilities are not lim ited to pro jections onto eigenstates of operators at a single $m$ om ent oftim e, but include altematives de ned by eld averages over spacetim e regions, which are inacoessible in a theory based on states and wave function reduction. This broader class of altematives is especially of interest in connection with GR, where it is undesirable to single out a particular tim e variable for a conventional quantization. In addition, the considerations herein are predom inantly nonperturbative, as contrasted w ith the usual perturbative scattering problem s addressed in $m$ ost practical treatm ents of $Y$ angM ills theory. On the other hand, the rich sub ject of topological aspects of nonabelian gauge theories is not considered, and any potential global properties are in fact ignored by our assum ptions about the behavior of elds at spatial in nity.

A second accom plishm ent of this paper is that technical aspects of the path integrals involved in quantizing a nonabelian gauge theory are m ore carefully considered than in the standard literature. D elicate issues involved in the tim e slicing of an explicit (\skele-
 which are described only form ally or im plicitly in standard treatm ents such as tī̀

[^0]section ${ }^{\text {N }}$ 京 exhibits a form al description of this quantization schem $e$ which is $m$ anifestly Lorentz invariant.

The plan of this paper is as follow s: The review of nonabelian gauge theory in Section ' establishes the perspective and notational conventions for the rest of the paper. W e also provide therein a brief description of the generalized quantum $m$ echanics form alism and a heuristic recipe for applying it to the theory of interest.

Section path integral and in a spacetim e lattice approxim ation $\eta_{2}^{21}$ to the path integral. Technology is developed therein for handling the lattioe expressions (in particular the tim e slicing) explicitly, which should be of use in other treatm ents of path integrals as well. In the latter half of the section, we verify explicitly that the im plem entation is gauge invariant. W e also show there that our sum-over-histories expression agrees, in its description of the propagator, w ith the results of a reduced phase space canonical operator theory in which the constraints (G auss's law ) are enforoed before quantization. In our generalized quantum $m$ echanics form ulation, the constraints are not enforoed identically \{ as they are in a reduced phase space im plem entation \{but are quantities whose valuesm ust be predicted by the theory. Thus the prediction of probabilities for the values of the constraints occupies m ost of our attention in the rem ainder of the paper.

Section "İVi: considers one subset of all possible altematives which de nes a \phase space" realization (as de ned in section 'īָ̄ Ā'.') of the physical gauge elds. The predictions of such a theory are found to be consistent w ith the vanishing of the constraints for nearly all such sets of altematives, and thus to agree with those of a reduced phase space canonical theory. In section ${ }^{\text {VNI. }}$ ' we consider another subset of the allow ed altematives in which the gauge electric eld is realized in term $s$ of the potentials rather than their conjugate $m$ om enta. Since the m om enta are then not restricted by the altematives, we perform the integrals over them and reduce our theory to a lcon guration space" one. Now, de ning the constraints by their con guration space realizations, we nd the two most signi cant results of the paper. In section $\bar{i} \bar{T} \overline{\mathrm{C}}{ }^{\prime}$; we see that for som e quantities which vanish when the constraints are satis ed we recover the result of thi] for electrom agnetism, nam ely, either the quantities vanish w ith probability one or quantum $m$ echanical interference prevents us from assigning probabilities to possible outcom es. W e also verify that there are coarse grainings which fall into the rst category. H ow ever, the result does not necessarily hold for all quantities which vanish in the presence of the constraints, and in section ivili we exhibit such a quantity in the abelian theory of electrom agnetism for which we predict a nonzero probability of an altemative inconsistent w ith the constraints. Since this set of altematives involves averages of elds over tim e, it is not acoessible in less generalquantum Yang $M$ ills theories. From a spacetim e point of view, it is sensible that the constraints do not have a special status in this theory, being just one com ponent of the equations ofm otion.

Finally, section $\overline{\bar{V}} \bar{i}$ i veri es that the con guration space theory is Lorentz-invariant by casting the form al path integral in a form where that invariance is $m$ anifest, even in the

[^1]attachm ent of the initial and nal states.

## II. FORMULATION

A. N onabelian gauge theories

## 1. F ields

In this section we set out the conventions used herein to describe a nonabelian gauge theory $(\mathbb{N} A G T)$ in at spactim $e$ w the the etric diag $(1 ; 1 ; 1 ; 1)$.

The gauge group is described by $H$ em itian generators $\mathrm{fT}_{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{g}$ w ith real, totally antisym $m$ etric structure constants $\mathrm{ff}_{\mathrm{ab}}^{\mathrm{c}} \mathrm{g}$ : $\left[\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{a}} ; \mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{b}}\right]=\operatorname{if}_{\mathrm{ab}}^{\mathrm{C}} \mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{c}}{ }_{1}^{3_{1}, 1}$

A gauge transform ation is described by a matrix $U=e^{i g} a(x) T_{a}$. The connection is a four-vector $A^{a}(x)$ w ith com ponents $f A^{a}(x) g$, which transform $s$ under in nitesim al gauge transform ations according to

$$
\begin{equation*}
A^{a}=r \quad a \quad g f_{a b}^{c} A^{c} \quad{ }^{b}: \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

If we de ne a covariant derivative

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{D}=r+i g A^{a} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{a}} ; \tag{2,2}
\end{equation*}
$$

it transform s according to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{D} \quad!\mathrm{UD} \mathrm{U}^{1}: \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

This $m$ eans that if is an isovector, i.e., a vector in the sam e space as the $m$ atrioes $\mathrm{fT}_{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{g}$ whidh transform s under gauge transform ations according to ! U , the covariant gradient of will transform the sam e way:

$$
\begin{equation*}
D \quad(\mathrm{x})!\mathrm{UD} \quad(\mathrm{x}): \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

The eld strength tensor is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{a}}=\frac{\mathbb{D} ; \mathrm{D}]}{i g}: \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

In a particular L orentz fram e, we divide the connection $A^{a}$ into scalar and vector potentials ${ }^{\prime}{ }^{\text {a }}$ and $A^{a}$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
\prime & =A_{a}^{0}  \tag{2.6a}\\
A_{a} & =A_{a}^{i} e_{i} \tag{2.6b}
\end{align*}
$$

and the eld strength tensor into gauge electric and $m$ agnetic elds E and B :

[^2]\[

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{a}}^{\mathrm{i}}=\mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{a}}^{0 \mathrm{i}}  \tag{2.7a}\\
& \mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{a}}^{\mathrm{i}}=\frac{1}{2}^{\mathrm{ijk}} \mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{a}}^{\mathrm{jk}} \tag{2.7b}
\end{align*}
$$
\]

where ${ }^{i j k}$ is the Levi-C ivita symbol. The gauge electric and magnetic elds can then be expressed in term s of the scalar and vector potentials as

$$
\begin{align*}
& E_{a}=A_{a} \quad r^{\prime}{ }_{a} \quad g f_{a b}^{f} A_{c}^{\prime} b_{b}  \tag{2.8a}\\
& B_{a}=r \quad A_{a}+\frac{1}{2} g f_{a b}^{c} A_{c} \quad A_{b}: \tag{2.8b}
\end{align*}
$$

The gauge electric and $m$ agnetic elds can be show $n$ to transform under gauge transform ations as follow s :

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{Ea}_{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{a}}!\mathrm{UE}_{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{U}^{1}  \tag{2.9a}\\
& \mathrm{Ba}_{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{a}}!\mathrm{UB}_{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{U}^{1} \tag{2.9b}
\end{align*}
$$

which becom es, for an in nitesim al transform ation,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{a}}=\mathrm{g} \mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{a}}^{\mathrm{c}}{ }_{\mathrm{b}} \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{c}}  \tag{2.10a}\\
& B_{a}=g f_{a b}^{f}{ }_{b} B_{c} \text { : } \tag{2.10b}
\end{align*}
$$

$T$ his is the transform ation property of an isovector in the adjoint representation, in which the generators are represented by $\left(T^{c}\right)_{a b}=$ iff ; so we will often drop the index from $E$ or $B$ and consider it to be an isovector in the adjoint representation. The connection $A^{a}$ has an inhom ogeneous piece in its transform ation law (2. $\overline{1}$ ), so it is not a true isovector, but we w ill represent it as one notationally. Thus the gauge electric eld can be written as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{E}=\mathrm{A} \quad \mathrm{D}^{\prime} ; \tag{2.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we have realized $D$ in the adjoint representation as

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{a b}={ }_{a b} r+g f_{a b}^{c} A_{c}: \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

## 2. C lassical equations of motion

The action for a NAGT in the absence ofm atter is

$$
\begin{equation*}
S=d^{Z} x L=d^{4} \times \frac{1}{4} G_{a} G^{a}=d^{4} \times \frac{1}{2}\left(E^{2} \quad B^{2}\right): \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

The conjugate $m$ om enta in a particular reference fram e are found by di erentiating the Lagrangian density $L$ w ith respect to $A=\varrho_{t} A$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
0 & =\frac{D L}{D^{\prime}-}=0  \tag{2.14a}\\
& =\frac{D L}{D A}=A+D^{\prime}=E: \tag{2.14b}
\end{align*}
$$

The H am ittonian density is given by

$$
\begin{array}{rlrl}
H \mathbb{A} ;] & =A & L \stackrel{1}{{ }_{2}^{2}}{ }^{2}+\frac{1}{2} B^{2} & D^{\prime} \\
& =H \mathbb{A} ;] & D^{\prime} \tag{2.15}
\end{array}
$$

and H am ilton's equations ofm otion are

$$
\begin{align*}
A & =\quad D^{\prime}  \tag{2.16a}\\
D_{t} & =D \quad B^{\prime}  \tag{2.16.b}\\
D \quad & =0: \tag{2.16c}
\end{align*}
$$

Equation $(\underline{2}-1 \overline{1} \overline{6}()$ involves no tim e derivatives, so it is the constraint of this NAGT, which we call $\mathrm{K}=\mathrm{D}$.

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { B. G eneralized quantum } m \text { echan ics } \\
\text { 1. Form alism and de nitions }
\end{gathered}
$$

W e w illuse $H$ artle's generalized quantum mechanics form alism [ieil. The three fundam entalelem ents of this theory are the possible histories of the system ( $\backslash$ ne-grained histories"), allow able partitions of the histories into classes fc $g$ so that each history is contained in exactly one class ( $\backslash$ coarse grainings"), and a com plex matrix D ( ; ${ }^{0}$ ) corresponding to each coarse graining (\decoherence functional"). The decoherence functionalmust satisfy the follow ing properties.

Herm ticicity:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{D}\left({ }^{0} ;\right)=\mathrm{D}\left(;{ }^{0}\right): \tag{2.17a}
\end{equation*}
$$

Positivity of diagonalelem ents:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{D}(;) \quad 0: \tag{2.17b}
\end{equation*}
$$

N orm alization:

$$
x \quad \mathrm{x}\left(; \quad{ }^{0}\right)=1:
$$

Supenposition: If fc $g$ is a coarse graining constructed by combining classes in fc $g$ to form larger classes (\a coarser graining"), ie., $c=\int_{2}^{S} c$, the decoherence functional for fc $g$ can be constructed from the one for fc $g$ by

$$
\left.D(; \quad,)=\begin{array}{lll}
x & x & D(;)  \tag{2.17d}\\
2 & 0_{2} & 0
\end{array}\right):
$$

W hen the decoherence functional is diagonal, or nearly so:

$$
\begin{equation*}
D\left(;{ }^{0}\right) \quad \text { op; } \tag{2.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

we say the altematives exhibit $m$ edium decoherence, and identify the diagonalelem ents $f p \mathrm{~g}$ as probabilities of the altematives fc $g$. In fact, all that is necessary for the $f p g$ to obey the probability sum rules is a less restrictive condition known as weak decoherence:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{ReD}\left(;{ }^{0}\right) \quad \text { op : } \tag{2.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

W hen we refer to \decoherence" with no modi er, we will im plicitly mean medium decoherence. W hen the altematives do not decohere at least weakly, quantum mechanical interference prevents the theory from assigning probabilities to them.

As an exam ple of how a decoherenœ functional is constructed, consider nonrelativistic operator quantum mechanics. The decoherence functional is a generalization of the usual form ula for the probability that a measurem ent at a time $t$ of a quantity modeled by an operator $d$ w ill yield a result in a range, if the system is described by a density $m$ atrix at timet:

A possible outcom e of them easurem ent (an altemative) is described by a pro jection operator

$$
P=Q_{Q^{2}}^{Z} \text { dQ DQ inQ } j
$$

and the com plete set of altematives obeys

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{X} \\
& \mathrm{P}=\mathbb{1}  \tag{222a}\\
& \mathrm{P} \mathrm{P}=\mathrm{P}: \tag{2.22b}
\end{align*}
$$

If we generalize to the case of an initial state ${ }^{0}$ and a nal state ${ }^{\infty}$ (the case of $\backslash$ no nal condition" is described by $\left.{ }^{\infty}=\mathbb{1}\right)$, as well as a series of $n$ sets of altematives at tim es $f t_{i} g$, each of which is described by a set of projection operators $\mathrm{fP}{ }_{i}{ }_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{g}$, where

$$
\begin{align*}
& X_{i} P_{i}=\mathbb{1} \\
& P_{i}^{i} P_{i}={ }_{i=} P_{i} ; \tag{223a}
\end{align*}
$$

the description in term s of probabilities $m$ ust be replaced by a decoherence functional description:
where $C$ is the chain of pro jections corresponding to a particular series of altematives out of the series of sets:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.::: P_{2}^{2} e^{i\left(t_{2}\right.} t_{1}\right){ }^{W D} P_{1}^{1} e^{i\left(t_{1} \quad t^{0}\right) W D}:
\end{align*}
$$

It is straightforw ard to show that when the class operator consists of a single projection ( $\left.C=e^{i\left(t^{\infty}\right.} t^{t} H^{p} P e^{i\left(t t^{0}\right){ }^{p}}\right)$ and there is no nal condition $\left({ }^{\infty}=\mathbb{I}\right)$, the decoherence functional reduces exactly to the diagonal form in (2.1) w ith the probabilities given by the fom iliar form (2̄2̄Ø).

A s a consequence of $\left.\overline{2}-2 \mathbf{D}^{-} \mathbf{a}^{2}\right)$ the class operator obeys

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\mathrm{X} \quad C=e^{i\left(t^{\infty}\right.} \mathrm{t}^{0}\right) \mathrm{FD}: \tag{2,26}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the sum -over-histories form ulation (w hich exists for the preceding nonrelativistic quantum m echanics exam ple as well as for the NAGT which is the focus of this paper), the chain of projections $C$ is replaced by a class operator whose $m$ atrix elem ents are de ned via a path integral, as described below.

## 2. A pplication to a NAGT

To form ulate a NAGT in generalized quantum mechanics, we follow a procedure sim ilar to the one described in $\underset{\underline{Z}}{\mathbf{Z}}]$ for electrom agnetism ( $\mathrm{E} \& \mathrm{M}$ ).

Since we want to express the theory in term s of a sum over histories w ithout reference to a H iblbert space, we replace the initial density matrix ${ }^{0} \mathrm{w}$ ith a set of wave functional\$ ${ }^{4,11}$ $f \quad j\left[A^{0}\right] g$ w th corresponding non-negative weights (or \probabilities") fp ${ }_{j}^{0} g$. (In a H ibert space theory this would m ean de ning ${ }^{0}={ }^{P}{ }_{j} j_{j}{ }_{j} p_{j}^{0} h \quad j$ j.) Sim ilarly, the nal state is now de ned by a set of wave functionals $f{ }_{i}\left[A^{\infty}\right] g$ and weights $f p_{i}^{\infty} g$, which replace the density $m$ atrix ${ }^{\infty}$.

The wave functionals are taken to be functionals of scalar and vector potential oon gurations on an initial or nalsurface of constant tim e, as appropriate ${ }_{2}^{151} 1 \mathrm{~T}$ hey are assum ed to obey the operator form of the constraints $0=0$ and $D=0$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{D}{D^{\prime} 0} & \left.A^{0} ; t^{0}\right) \tag{227a}
\end{align*}=00
$$

[^3]and likew ise for $\mathbb{A}^{\infty} ; t^{\infty}$ ). (Since the $w$ ave functionals are independent of the scalar potential ', we w ill henceforth write the rst argum ent as the three-vector $A^{\circ}$ rather than the four-
 corresponds to the lack of dependence of the wave fiunctional for quantum GR on the shift vector $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{i}}$.

W ith these conventions, we replace the de nition (2-2 ${ }^{2}$ ) for the decoherence functional w ith

Here the quantity $h i f d j{ }_{j}{ }^{i}$ is analogous to a $m$ atrix elem ent of the class operator for the class c, but it is constructed by a sum over the histories in the class c, weighted by the initial and nalwave functionals $j$ and $i$ evaluated at the endpoints $A^{0}$ and $A{ }^{\infty}$ of the history. Schem atically:

It is convenient to refer to a \class operator C " even in the sum-over-histories theory, and when we do, we $m$ ean the ob ject de ned by (2-2 $\overline{2}_{1}^{\prime}$ ) $\cdot C_{u}$ is the class operator corresponding to the class $G_{u}$ of allpaths, which is just the propagator.
$H$ aving described schem atically the construction of the decoherence functional, we now specify the other two elem ents which describe the generalized quantum mechanics. The ne grained histories sum $m$ ed over are com plete eld con gurations A (x) [and also (x) if we are considering a phase space form ulation] in the region between the intial and nal time slices. The allow able coarse grainings are lim ited to gauge invariant partitions of the elds.
III. CLASS OPERATORS IN THEPATH INTEGRALFORMULATION
A. O verview

This section describes in detail how to im plem ent the sum over histories heuristically described in ( $\overline{2} \overline{2} \overline{2} \overline{-1})$. In section ' contains an explicit realization of this integral on a discrete spacetim e lattice, where the lattioe spacing is to be taken to be in nitesim ally sm all $1_{1}^{6_{1}}$ T he follow ing tw o sections dem onstrate that the particular details chosen in section '齊", were suitable by show ing that the path integral has desired properties. In section 'ITITD, the sum -over-histories expression for

[^4]the class operator $C_{u}$ corresponding to the class $C_{u}$ of all paths is show $n$ to equal, up to a constant multiplicative factor, the propagator $\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{il} \phi_{r e d} \mathrm{~T}}$ in a reduced phase space canonical theory. In section '䧶E, the path integral is show $n$ to be unchanged under the discrete equivalent of a gauge transform ation, in the lim it that the lattioe spacing goes to zero.
B. Form al expression

W e express the sum over histories ( 2

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{Z}}^{\mathrm{C}} \mathrm{ji=}  \tag{3.1}\\
& \left.\left.\mathrm{D}^{4} A^{3} \quad \mathbb{A}^{\infty} ; \mathrm{t}^{\infty}\right) \quad[G] \in \mathbb{A} ; \quad \mathrm{e}^{i S \operatorname{can} \mathbb{A} ;]} \mathbb{A}^{0} ; \mathrm{t}^{0}\right) ;
\end{align*}
$$

where the gauge condition is $G=0$ and ${ }_{G}$ is the corresponding Fadeev $P$ opov gauge- xing determ inant. It was originally de ned in $\left[\frac{6}{6}\right]$ in term $s$ of the P oisson bracket:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { G }=j \operatorname{detfG} ; K \text { gj: } \tag{32a}
\end{equation*}
$$

O ther usefiul (and equivalent) de nitions are (see e.g., [ī 1 ]

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }_{\mathrm{G}}=\operatorname{det} \frac{\mathrm{DG}}{\mathrm{D}} \tag{3.2b}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{G}={ }^{Z} \quad D \quad[G \quad G] ; \tag{32c}
\end{equation*}
$$

where is the param eter de ning a gauge transform ation which takes $G$ into $G$.
Finally, the canonical action is

$$
\begin{array}{rlrl}
S_{\text {can }} & = & z d^{4} x A- & \\
& z[A ; \quad] \\
& =d^{4} x A- & \frac{1}{2}^{2} \quad \frac{1}{2} B^{2}+\quad D^{\prime}: \tag{3.3}
\end{array}
$$

If we assum ell that' vanishes at spatial in nity, we can integrate by partss ${ }^{81}$, to obtain

[^5]\[

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{\text {can }}={ }^{Z} d^{4} x \quad A \quad \frac{1}{2}{ }^{2} \quad \frac{1}{2} B^{2} \quad \text { D } \quad: \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

\]

 as the starting point for the con guration space form ulation. If our coarse graining $m$ akes no reference to the conjugate $m$ om entum , we can work in a gauge which does not restrict
and integrate it out to obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\left.\left.\left.h j c i=D^{4} A \quad \mathbb{A}^{\infty} ; t^{\infty}\right)[G] \in \mathbb{A}\right] e^{i S} \mathbb{A}\right] \quad \mathbb{A}^{0} ; t^{0}\right) ; \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $S$ is the (con guration space) action (2.13) and for the purposes of this form al expression, a constant factor has been absorbed into $D{ }^{4} A$.

## C. Lattice realization

To give a concretem eaning to the form alpath integral in ( $\overline{3}$. 1.1 ), we im agine it to be de ned on an arbitrarily sm all lattige; the spatial volum e is divided into lattice elem ents of volum e ${ }^{3} x$ and the tim e interval from $t^{0}$ to $t^{\infty}$ is divided into sliges of separation $t=\frac{t^{\infty}}{J+1} \quad \frac{T}{J+1}$. $T$ he lattioe expression for the class operator is then
h j ji=

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{D}^{4} \mathrm{~A}^{\mathrm{J}+1} \stackrel{h}{A^{J+1}} ; \mathrm{t}^{\infty}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{M}=\mathrm{J} \\
& \mathrm{~F}^{+2} \mathrm{~h}_{\mathrm{G}^{M}}{ }^{i} \quad{ }_{G^{M}} \quad \mathrm{~h} \mathrm{~A}^{0} ; \mathrm{t}^{0} \text { e } \mathbb{A} \text {; ]; } \\
& \mathrm{M}=0
\end{aligned}
$$

where the \barred" quantities indicate tem poral averages:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \bar{A}^{M}=\frac{A^{M+1}+A^{M}}{2} ; 0 \quad M \quad J  \tag{3.6a}\\
& \bar{D}_{a b}^{M}=a b r+g f_{a b}^{c} \bar{A}_{c}^{M} \tag{3.6b}
\end{align*}
$$

and the lattice expression for the \velocity" is

$$
\begin{equation*}
A^{M}=\frac{A^{M+1} A^{M}}{t} ; 0 \quad M \quad J: \tag{3.6c}
\end{equation*}
$$

The expression ( $\overline{3} . \bar{G}$ ) re ects the fact that since the \velocity" $A^{M}$ is naturally associated w ith a point halfw ay betw een the coordinate lattice slices labeled $M$ and $M+1$ by ( $\overline{3}-6 \bar{d}$ ) , it is sensible to associate the conjugate $m$ om enta ${ }^{M}$ w ith those points as well, in light of the term $A^{M} \quad{ }^{M}$. This m eans that to $m$ aintain $m$ anifest tim e reversal sym $m$ etry we should not associate ${ }^{M}$ with $A^{M}$ or $A^{M+1}$, but instead with $\bar{A}^{M}$. The gauge- xing expressions $G^{M}$
and $G^{M}$ are also assum ed to be expressed in term $s$ of the averaged ${ }_{n}$ elds $_{0}^{n} \bar{A}^{M}$. whenever their com plexity prevents an unambiguous de nition in term sof the $A^{M}$ alone?

The factor ofe is a functional of the paths which is unity for any path in the class $c$ and vanishes for any path not in c . n o n o

The rem aining functionalintegrals $D{ }^{4} A^{M}$ and $D^{3} M$ are over functions of the spatial coordinate $x$. $W$ e leave consideration of the spatialdependence som ew hat form al, because all of the com plications involved in describing the gradients on the lattioe basically appear, and $m$ ore seriously, in the tem poraldirection. W e w ill thus be speaking as though the spacetim e function $A(x)$ is broken up into a series of functions of a continuous spatial variable $x$ :
$A^{M}(x)$. H ow ever, we can ultim ately consider the follow ing lattioe resolutions for the functional integrals and delta functions:

$$
\begin{align*}
& D A^{M}={ }^{Y} N_{A} d A_{a}^{M}(x)  \tag{3.7a}\\
& D^{M i}={ }_{Y}^{a ; x} N d_{a}^{M i}(x)  \tag{3.7b}\\
& \begin{array}{l}
h_{A^{M}}^{i}={ }_{Y}^{a_{i}} \quad\left(A_{a}^{M}(x)\right)=N_{A} \\
h_{M i^{i}}^{i}={ }_{Y}^{a ; x} \quad\left({ }_{a}^{M i}(x)\right)=N ;
\end{array} \tag{3.7c}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{A}}$ and N are arbitrary nom alization constants which obey

$$
\begin{equation*}
N_{A} N=\frac{{ }^{3} x}{2}: \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

fT his de nition is chosen to give the desirable properties ( $\left.\overline{1} 2 \overline{2} \overline{2}_{1}\right)$ for potentialand $m$ om entum eigenstates in the corresponding operator theory. See also equation (6228) of $\left.{ }^{1} \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1} 0\right] . \mathrm{g}$

Since ( $\overline{3},-\bar{d})$ ) only de nes a relation betw een $N_{A}$ and $N$, there is still an arbitrary factor in the de nitions of the $m$ easures (3.7). It is reassuring to verify that the class operator
 for instance ifwe double $N_{A}$ (and thus halve $N$ ), they are unchanged. To do this correctly, we must also keep in $m$ ind that the wave functionals $A^{\circ}$ ] and $A^{\infty}$ ] also depend on the value of $N_{A}$ as follow $s$. Let the wave functionals be norm alized according to

$$
\left.\left.{ }^{\mathrm{Z}} \mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{~A}^{0}\left[G\left[\mathbb{A}^{0}\right]\right]{ }_{G} \mathbb{A}^{0}\right] j \mathbb{A}^{0}\right]^{2}=1:
$$

[^6]Since there is a factor of $N_{A}{ }^{3}$ (where $N_{A}={ }^{Q}{ }_{a ; x} N_{A}$ and $N={ }^{Q}{ }_{a ; x} N$ ) associated with the $m$ easure $D^{3} A^{0}$ and a factor of $N_{A}{ }^{1}$ associated $w$ th the gauge xing delta function $\left[G^{0}\right]$, there $m$ ust be a factor of $N_{A}{ }^{2}$ associated w th the square of the $w$ ave functional so that the factors all cancel out. That is, if we double $N_{A}$, we must halve $A^{\circ}$ ] to m aintain the norm alization ( $\overline{3}-\bar{G})$. C onsidering the expression ( $\overline{3}$. $\bar{\alpha}$ ), if we multiply together all the norm alization factors ${ }^{-}\left(\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{A}}\right.$ for each $\mathrm{DA}^{\mathrm{M}}, \mathrm{N}$ foreach $\mathrm{D}^{-\mathrm{Mi}^{i}}, \mathrm{~N}_{\mathrm{A}}{ }^{1}$ foreach $\left[\mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{M}}\right]$, and $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{A}}{ }^{1}$ for each wave functional) we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& N_{A}^{4} N_{A}{ }^{1}\left(\mathbb{N}_{A}{ }^{4} N^{3}\right)^{J+1}\left(\mathbb{N}_{A}{ }^{1}\right)^{J+3} N_{A}{ }^{1} \\
& =N_{A}^{3 J+3} N^{3 J+3}=Y_{a ; X} \frac{}{3} X^{3 J+3} \tag{3.10}
\end{align*}
$$

and the arbitrariness of the nom alization $N_{A}$ does indeed cancel out of ( $\overline{3} \mathbf{A}$ (G) .

## D. Relation to reduced phase space theory

To illustrate why the details of ( $\overline{3} \mathbf{-}, \bar{d})$ ) were chosen, we show in this section that it gives the sam e expression, up to a norm alization constant, for the propagator $C_{u}$ as w ould be obtained from a canonical theory w orking w th only the \physical degrees of freedom ". [C om parisons of ( $\overline{3} . \overline{-}$ ) $)$ to the reduced phase space results for particular coarse grainings w ill be considered in later sections.] This derivation is essentially the one given in [ī], taken in reverse order and $w$ ith $m$ ore attention paid to the details of the lattioe.
$F$ irst, we observe that there are $J+2$ coordinate variables $A^{M}(x)$ but only $J+1$
 independent of the $J+1$ other $\bar{A}^{M}{ }^{\circ}$, norm alized so that the change of variables from ${ }^{n} A^{M}$ to ${ }^{n} \bar{A}^{M}$ has unit determ inant and
fo ne such choige is $\left.\overline{\mathrm{A}}^{J+1}=2^{J} \mathbb{A}^{J+1}+(1)^{J+1} A^{0}\right]$.g Since neither the velocity term $A$ nor the initial and nalwave fiunctionals depends on the scalar potential', it only enters
 independent of $\boldsymbol{T}^{\mathrm{J}+1}$. It is then natural to choose $\boldsymbol{T}^{\mathrm{J}+1}(\mathrm{x})=0$ as one of our $\mathrm{J}+3$ tim e sliges w orth of gauge conditions. The corresponding Fadeev $P$ opov determ inant is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.,-J+1=\operatorname{det} \mathbb{D}_{\mathrm{t}}\right] j=0=\operatorname{det}\left[\mathbb{C}_{\mathrm{t}}\right] ; \tag{3.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is a constant. O verall constant (i.e., the sam e for all ) factors in the class operator h $\overline{J C}$ jiwill cancelout in the expression ( e ect the physics.

For this dem onstration, it is sim plest to choose as the bulk of the gauge conditions the axial gauge, in which the com ponent of A along some xed unit vector $e_{n}$ vanishes:

$$
\begin{equation*}
e_{n} \quad A(x) \quad r^{A}(x)=0: \tag{3.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

The FadeevP opov determ inant of this gauge condition is

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{\mathrm{n}}=\operatorname{det}\left[\quad D_{\mathrm{n}}\right] \dot{\mathrm{A}}_{\mathrm{n}}=0=\operatorname{det}[\quad \text { Q }] ; \tag{3.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

another constant. The rem aining com ponents of the vector potential are

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{?}=A \quad A_{n} e_{n}: \tag{3.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus the class operator becom es
$h j C j i={ }^{Z}{ }^{2} A_{?}^{J+1} \stackrel{h}{A}{ }_{?}^{J+1} ; t^{\infty} \operatorname{det}\left[@_{t}\right] \operatorname{det}\left[Q_{1}\right]$

$$
\begin{align*}
& y^{0} D^{2} A_{?}^{M} D^{-M} D^{3}{ }^{M} \exp \text { it } d^{3} x A_{?}^{M} \text { ? } \\
& \left.A_{?}^{0} ; t^{0} \text { e } A ;\right] \text { : }  \tag{3.16}\\
& \mathrm{M}=\mathrm{J}
\end{align*}
$$

To specialize to the propagator $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{u}}$, which is de ned by a sum over all paths, we set $e=1 . W$ e can perform each of the ${ }^{\boldsymbol{r}}$ integrals to obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
& =\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{a} ; \mathrm{X}} \frac{2}{3_{X} \mathrm{t}} \quad \bar{D}^{M} \quad \mathrm{M} \quad(\mathrm{x})=\overline{\mathrm{D}}^{M} \quad \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{~T}^{1} \text {; } \tag{3.17}
\end{align*}
$$

where we have de ned the in nite constant

$$
\begin{equation*}
T=\underbrace{Y}_{a ; x} \quad t: \tag{3.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

In a reduced phase space theory, the gauge com ponent (here $\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{n}}$ ) of the coordinate is taken to vanish, and the corresponding com ponent of the conjugate $m$ om entum is restricted to the value which causes the constraint to be satis ed. [Since the Lagrange multipliers (here the scalar potential' ) multiply identically enforced constraints, they do not appear in the Lagrangian.] In the axial gauge, this $m$ eans that $n$ has the value which ensures $K=D \quad=0$, or

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{n}=@_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{n}=\mathrm{D}_{?} \quad ?: \tag{3.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e de ne a functionalwhich accom plishes that:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.n A_{?}^{0} ;{ }_{?}^{0} ; x\right)={ }^{Z} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{dx} \mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{n}}^{0}\left(\mathrm{D}_{?}^{0} \quad{ }_{?}^{0}\right)\left(\mathrm{x}_{?}+\mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{n}}^{0}\right) \\
& =\quad @_{n}^{1} D_{?}^{0} \quad{ }_{?}^{0}(x): \tag{3.20}
\end{align*}
$$

Retuming to the sum-over-histories expression, we observe that the delta function from (3]-1) enforcing the constraint can be rew ritten

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{D}^{M} \quad M^{i}=h_{n}^{M} \quad n_{n}^{h} \bar{A}_{?}^{M} ;{ }_{?}^{M i} \quad \operatorname{det} \frac{D_{n}^{M}}{D_{K}^{M}} \text { : } \tag{321}
\end{equation*}
$$

Recalling ( 3 (3-2a') we identify the determ inant in the expression above as the reciprocal of the Fadeev $P$ opov determ inant, since

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.A_{n}=j \operatorname{det}\left[£ A_{n} ; K g\right] j=\operatorname{det} \frac{D K}{D_{n}}=\operatorname{det} \mathbb{D}_{n}\right]: \tag{322}
\end{equation*}
$$

T hus we can com bine the Fadeev $P$ opov determ inant w ith the' integralproducing the delta function ( $\overline{3}-2 \overline{2} 2 \overline{1})$ ) to obtain
which $m$ eans we can rew rite the propagator as

$$
\begin{aligned}
& h \mathbb{C}_{u} j i={ }^{Z} D^{2} A_{?}^{J+1} \stackrel{h}{A+1} ; t^{\infty} \operatorname{det}\left[\mathbb{C}_{t}\right] \operatorname{det}[\quad \text { Q }] \\
& T^{1} \quad Y^{0} \quad Z \quad D^{2} A_{?}^{M} D^{2} \xrightarrow[?]{M}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { h } \\
& \text { A? ; } t^{0} \text {; } \tag{324}
\end{align*}
$$

where $H_{\text {red }}$ is the reduced H am iltonian density

To convert ( $\left.\overline{3}-\overline{2} \overline{2}^{-1}\right)$ into a canonical operator form of the propagator, we consider eigenstates of the \physical" cooordinate and $m$ om entum operators:

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{?}, A_{?}^{0} i=A_{?}^{0} A_{?}^{0} i \quad b ? j{ }_{?}^{0} i=e_{?}^{0} j{ }_{?}^{0} i ; \tag{3.26}
\end{equation*}
$$

norm alized so that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.\mathrm{hA} ?_{?}^{\infty} \mathrm{A}_{?}^{0} i=\mathbb{A}_{?}^{\infty} \mathrm{Z}_{?}^{0}\right]  \tag{327a}\\
& \mathrm{hA}{ }_{?}^{0} \mathrm{j}_{?}^{0} i=\exp i d^{3} x A_{?}^{0} \quad ? \quad \tag{327b}
\end{align*}
$$

which im plies, via ( $3.71+\frac{1}{2}$ ) , that

$$
\mathrm{h}{ }_{?}^{\infty} \mathrm{j} \underset{?}{0} \mathrm{i}=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
\infty & 0  \tag{3.27c}\\
? & \\
?
\end{array}\right]:
$$

A state vector corresponding to each wave functional is then de ned by

$$
\begin{equation*}
j i=\quad D^{2} A_{?}^{0} A_{?}^{0} i\left[A_{?}^{0}\right]: \tag{328}
\end{equation*}
$$

The operator form of the reduced H am iltonian density has an am biguity because of the
 which has the property that

Thus, de ning $\mathbb{H}_{\text {red }}=W\left(H_{\text {red }}\right)$, we can rew rite

$$
\begin{align*}
& =\quad D^{2} \underset{?}{M} \quad 1 \quad \text { i } t d^{3} x H \text { red } \frac{A_{?}^{M}+A_{?}^{M+1}}{2} ; \quad{ }_{?}^{M}+O\left((t)^{2}\right) \quad \exp \quad i \quad d^{3} x \quad A_{?}^{M+1} \quad A_{?}^{M} \\
& =A_{?}^{M+1} 1 \quad \text { i } t d^{3} x H_{\text {red }}^{M}+O\left((t)^{2}\right) \quad A_{?}^{M} \text {; } \tag{3.30}
\end{align*}
$$

so that, dropping term s of order $(t)^{2}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& h \mathbb{C}_{u j} i=D^{2} A_{?}^{J+1} \quad\left(t^{D}\right) A_{?}^{J+1}{ }^{E} \operatorname{det}\left[\mathbb{C}_{t}\right] \operatorname{det}\left[Q_{1}\right] T^{1}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& M=J \tag{3.31}
\end{align*}
$$

U sing the fact that

$$
D^{2} A_{?}^{M} \lambda_{?}^{M} \text { ihA }_{?}^{M} j=1 \text {; }
$$

we see that this di ers from the operator expression

$$
\begin{equation*}
h j^{i^{i p_{r e d} T}} j i \tag{3.33}
\end{equation*}
$$

only by the factor of $\operatorname{det}\left[\mathbb{C}_{t}\right] \operatorname{det}\left[@_{1}\right] T^{1}$, which is a constant. From $(\overline{2} \overline{2} \bar{d})$, we see that multiplying the class operator by a constant factor has no e ect on the decoherence functional.

[^7]We will now show that the theory described by ( $\overline{3}-\bar{a})$ is gauge invariant. W e do this explicitly and in detail because the standard dem onstration [G] m akes use of a canonical transform ation, which should be ill-de ned at the endpoints of the integration due to the fact that the path integral ( $\overline{3} . \overline{\mathrm{O}})$ ) has one $m$ ore con guration space integration than phase space integration. Put otherw ise, if $\overline{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{M}}$ and ${ }^{M}$ are linked by a canonical transform ation, there is no ${ }^{\mathrm{J}+1}$ to which the extra degree of freedom $\overline{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{J}+1}$ corresponds.
$F$ irst, we m ust describe how to im plem ent an in nitesim al gauge transform ation

$$
\begin{align*}
A^{a} & =r \quad a \quad g f_{a b}^{f} A^{c} \quad b  \tag{3.34a}\\
a & =g f_{a b}^{f} \tag{3.34b}
\end{align*}
$$

on a lattice. W e replace the continuous function $(x)$ w th functions ${ }^{n}{ }^{M}(x)$ de ned on lattioe slices 0 through $J+1$. The transform ation for the vector potential can then be taken as

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{a}^{M}=r{\underset{a}{M} \quad g f_{a b}^{f} A_{c}^{M} \quad \underset{b}{M} ; ~}_{n}^{M} \tag{3.35}
\end{equation*}
$$

but there is no sim ple translation of the scalar potential transform ation law because of the tim e derivative. M ore practical than the transform ation of $\mathrm{A}^{\mathrm{M}}$ given in ( $\left.{ }^{-}-\overline{3} \overline{5}\right)$ w ill be its im plications for transform ations of the tim e derivative $\mathbb{A}^{M}$ and $m$ idpoint average $\bar{A}^{M}$. U sing the fact that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{A^{M+1} B^{M+1} A^{M} B^{M}}{t} \\
& =\frac{A^{M+1} A^{M}}{t} \frac{B^{M+1}+B^{M}}{2} \\
& \quad+\frac{A^{M+1}+A^{M}}{2} \frac{B^{M+1} B^{M}}{t} \\
& =A^{M} \bar{B}^{M}+\bar{A}^{M} B^{M} ; \tag{3.36}
\end{align*}
$$

we see that $(\overline{3} \mathbf{3}, \underline{-} \overline{-1})$ im plies
which is exactly what one $m$ ight write dow from the corresponding continuum expression

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{a}=r \rightarrow_{a} g f_{a b}^{f} A_{c} b+A_{c} \rightarrow b: \tag{3.38}
\end{equation*}
$$

The case is not quite so sim ple w ith the averages. Since

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{1}{2} & A^{M+1} B^{M+1}+A^{M} B^{M} \\
= & \frac{1}{4} A^{M+1}+A^{M} \quad B^{M+1}+B^{M} \\
& +\frac{1}{4} A^{M+1} \quad A^{M} \quad B^{M+1} \quad B^{M} \\
= & \bar{A}^{M} \bar{B}^{M}+\frac{(t)^{2}}{4} A^{M} B^{M} ; \tag{3.39}
\end{align*}
$$

we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{A}_{a}^{M}=r —_{a}^{M} \quad g f_{a b}^{f} \bar{A}_{c}^{M}-_{b}^{M}+\frac{(t)^{2}}{4} A_{c}^{M} \quad{ }_{b}^{M} ; \tag{3.40}
\end{equation*}
$$

which di ers from the na ve analog of $1(\overline{3}-\overline{3} \underline{w})$ by a term proportional to ( $t$ ). However, we can neglect this term by the follow ing fam iliar argum ent [i]ind: as the lattice spacing $t$ goes to zero, the factor of $\exp \left[\right.$ i $t d^{3} x\left({ }^{2}=2\right.$ A ) ] will oscillate rapidly and suppress the path integral if $A$ is $m$ ore singular than ( $t)^{1=2}$. Likew ise, ifwe concem ourselves only w ith gauge transform ations which take histories which are su ciently nonsingular to contribute to the path integral into other such histories, $\left(\overline{3}-\overline{3}^{-} \overline{1}\right)$ tells us that the -should also blow up no faster than $(t)^{1=2}$ as $t!\quad 0$. Counting the factors of $t$ in the upper bounds, we see that the extra term in ( $\overline{3} .4 \overline{4}$ ) should be at worst proportional to $t$ and thus be negligible for su ciently sm all lattioe spacing. Thus we can use the sim pler form ula

$$
\begin{equation*}
\overline{\mathrm{A}}_{a}^{M}=r-{ }_{a}^{M} \quad g f_{a b}^{f} \bar{A}_{c}^{M}-\frac{M}{b}: \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The transform ation law sfor the con jugatem om entum and scalar potentialcan be de ned
 operator via its averaged values (assum ing that $\boldsymbol{T}^{\top+1}=0$ is alw ays taken as a gauge choioe), and so we only need to know how to transform ${ }^{T}$ and not'. Since ${ }^{T}$ and are de ned $m$ idw ay between lattice points, we prescribe transform ation laws which are the obvious lattioe realizations of (3,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \rightarrow{ }_{a}^{M}=\underset{a}{M} \quad g f_{a b}{ }^{+M}{ }_{c}^{M}{ }_{b}^{M}  \tag{3.41a}\\
& { }_{a}^{M}=\operatorname{gfab}_{f}^{f}{ }_{c}^{M}-{ }_{b}^{M} \text { : } \tag{3.41b}
\end{align*}
$$

N ow we show that under such a gauge transform ation, the expression $(\overline{3} . \overline{\mathrm{B}})$ for the class operator is unchanged. First, we exam ine the $m$ easure for the path integral. The dem onstrations for $D^{3} A^{M}, D^{-M}$ and $D^{3 M}$ are all essentially the sam $e$, so we show it explicitly only for $D^{3} A^{M}$. U nder the gauge transform ation $A^{M}$ ! $A^{M}=A^{M}+A^{M}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }_{a}^{Y} d \mathbb{A}_{a}^{M i}(x)=\sum_{a}^{Y} d A_{a}^{M i}(x) \quad \operatorname{det} \frac{\left(@ \mathbb{A}_{b}^{M i}(x)^{\prime}\right)}{@ A_{c}^{M i}(x)}: \tag{3.42}
\end{equation*}
$$

The Jacobian $m$ atrix is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{@ A_{b}^{M i}(x)}{@ A_{c}^{M}(x)}=b c^{M^{i}}+\frac{@ A_{b}^{M i}(x)}{@ A_{c}^{M}(x)}=\text { bc } \quad g_{f d}^{f} \quad{ }_{d}^{M}(x): \tag{3.43}
\end{equation*}
$$

$U$ sing the standard $m$ atrix result that to lowest order in $a$, $\operatorname{det}(1+a)=1+\operatorname{Tr} a$, we see that the Jacobian for the transform ation is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{det} \frac{\left(\varrho_{A_{b}^{M}}^{\mathrm{i}}(x)^{\prime}\right.}{@ A_{C}^{M}{ }^{i}(x)}=1 \quad f_{d}^{\infty} \quad{ }_{d}^{M}(x)=1 \tag{3.44}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we have used the fact that the structure constants are totally antisym $m$ etric. This tells us that

$$
\begin{equation*}
D^{3} \mathbb{A}^{M}=D^{3} A^{M} ; \tag{3.45a}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the dem onstrations that

$$
\begin{equation*}
D^{\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{M}}}=\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathrm{M} \tag{3.45b}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
D^{3} e^{M}=D^{3} M \tag{3.45c}
\end{equation*}
$$

proceed sim ilarly.
$N$ ext we consider the canonical action density [i.e., A- $m$ inus the $H$ am iltonian density; cf. ( $\left.\left.\overline{3}={ }^{3}\right)\right]$. The dem onstration is sim plest if we undo the integration by parts to write it in the form

$$
\begin{gather*}
A^{M}{ }^{M}+M-D^{M}-M \quad \frac{1}{2} M^{2} \frac{1}{2} B^{M}{ }^{2} \\
=E^{M} \quad \frac{M}{2} \quad M^{2} \quad \frac{1}{2} B^{M} ; \tag{3.46}
\end{gather*}
$$

where we have de ned the lattice realizations of the electric and $m$ agnetic elds by analogy


$$
\begin{equation*}
E^{M}=A^{M} \quad \bar{D}^{M} \rightarrow M \tag{3.47a}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
B_{a}^{M}=r \quad \bar{A}_{a}^{M}+\frac{1}{2} g f_{a b}^{c} \bar{A}_{c}^{M} \quad \bar{A}_{b}^{M}: \tag{3.47b}
\end{equation*}
$$

The conjugate $m$ om entum is de ned by (3. $\left.\bar{A} \overline{1} \overline{1} \bar{W}^{\prime}\right)$ to transform as an isovector. The transform ations of $E$ and $B$ are

$$
\begin{align*}
& E_{a}^{M}=A_{a}^{M} \quad D \quad \sim_{a}^{M} \quad g f_{a b}^{f} \bar{A}_{c}^{M} \tau_{b}^{M}  \tag{3.48a}\\
& B_{a}^{M}=r \quad \bar{A}_{a}^{M}+g f_{a b}^{c} \bar{A}_{c}^{M} \bar{A}_{b}^{M} ; \tag{3.48b}
\end{align*}
$$

which can be shown, w ith a little algebra, to give the expected isovector transform ations:

$$
\begin{align*}
& E_{a}^{M}=g f_{a b}^{f} E_{c}^{M}-\frac{b}{M}  \tag{3.49a}\\
& B_{a}^{M}=g f_{a b}^{f} B_{c}^{M}-\frac{M}{M}: \tag{3.49bb}
\end{align*}
$$

So, since ${ }^{M}, E^{M}$ and $B^{M}$ all transform as isovectors, $M^{2}$, $B^{M}{ }^{2}$ and $E^{M} \quad M$ are gauge invariant quantities, and

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { 舟 }{ }^{M} \quad e^{M}+e^{M} \overline{\bar{E}^{M}} \bar{e}^{M} \quad \frac{1}{2} e^{M} \quad \frac{1}{2} B^{M}{ }^{2} \\
& =A^{M} \quad M+M^{M}-M^{M} \quad \frac{1}{2} \quad M^{2} \quad \frac{1}{2} B^{M} \quad \text { : } \tag{3.50}
\end{align*}
$$

 determ inant as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{G}={ }^{Z} D^{0}\left[G^{0} G\right] ; \tag{3.51}
\end{equation*}
$$

$w$ here $G{ }^{\circ}$ indicates the result of a gauge transform ation on $G$ by the dum $m y$ variable ${ }^{0}(x)$, we see that the e ect of a gauge transform ation by $(x)$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{e_{G}}=\frac{1}{G}={ }^{Z} D^{0}\left[G^{0} G\right]: \tag{3.52}
\end{equation*}
$$

C hanging the variable of integration to ${ }^{\infty}=0$ (the gauge transform ation accom plished by successive application of ${ }^{0}$ and ), we have (using form alinvariance of the group $m$ easure; see section 7.5 of

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\frac{1}{e_{G}}={ }^{z} \quad \infty \quad G^{\infty} \quad \Theta\right]=\frac{1}{e}: \tag{3.53}
\end{equation*}
$$

C oarse graining only by gauge-invariant altematives $m$ eans that a path $f \mathscr{A}$; eg is in the class c if and only if the corresponding path $f A$; $g$ is, so

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{e}[\mathbb{A} ; \mathrm{e}]=\mathrm{e} \mathbb{A} ;]: \tag{3.54}
\end{equation*}
$$

Finally, we consider the behavior of the wave functionals and.

$$
\begin{align*}
{\left[A^{0}\right] } & \left.=A^{0}+A^{0}\right]=\left[A^{0}\right]+d^{Z} x A^{0}(x) \frac{D}{D A^{0}(x)} \\
& \left.=A^{0}\right] \quad d^{3} x\left(D^{0}{ }^{0}\right)(x) \frac{D}{D^{0}(x)}: \tag{3.55}
\end{align*}
$$

U pon integrating by parts, this becom es

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\left.\left[\text { A }^{0}\right]=A^{0}\right]+{ }^{Z} d^{3} x{ }^{0} D^{0} \frac{D}{D A^{0}}=A^{0}\right] ; \tag{3.56}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we have used (2 $\left.2 \overline{2} \overline{2} \overline{7} \overline{\mathrm{D}} \mathrm{D}^{\prime}\right)$ in the last step.
 $(\overline{3}-54)$ and $(\overline{3}-5 \overline{2})$ to convert the expression to
$h \mathrm{C} \quad j i=D^{3} \mathrm{R}^{J+1}$ 有 $^{J+1} ; t^{\infty}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{M}=\mathrm{J}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =D^{\mathrm{Z}=0} \mathrm{~A}^{\mathrm{J+1}} \quad \text { A }^{J+1} ; t^{\infty} \\
& y^{0} \quad D^{3} A^{M} D^{-M} D^{3} M \exp \text { it } d^{3} x A^{M} \quad M \quad H^{h} \bar{A}^{M} ; M^{i} \quad \rightarrow^{M} \bar{D}^{M} \quad M \\
& \mathrm{M}=\mathrm{J}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& M=0
\end{aligned}
$$

which show s that the expressions for the class operators are the sam e whether the gauge is $\mathrm{G}=0$ or $\mathbb{G}=0$.

```
IV.PHASE SPACE RESULTS
```


## A. A llow ed alternatives

In the previous section, we described a sum -over-histories construction of the class operators (and hence the decoherence functional) for a NAGT. For the class operators to have the desirable properties detailed therein, the altematives considered need only be gaugeinvariant coarse grainings of the connection $A$ and the conjugate $m$ om entum . H ow ever, in practioe we w ill not be interested in arbitrary gauge-invariant quantities, but only the physical quantities of the theory, nam ely the gauge electric and magnetic elds and the covariant derivative. In a phase space form ulation, those are identi ed w ith the isovectors $B$ and $D$, respectively. Thus we de ne physical phase space coarse grainings to be those in which the gauge electric eld is identi ed w ith and the gauge magnetic eld w ith B . ( $T$ he physical phase space theory is then a subset of the phase space theory described in section "III.)

W e can partition the histories by the values of anbitrary isoscalars (gauge invariant quantities) constructed from the physically allow ed isovectors. Since the length of an isovector is an isoscalar, coarse graining by the length of isovectors is allowed. It is $m$ ore convenient to think of this sort of coarse graining as specifying in which of a set of regions in isospace an isovector lies, where all the regions are rotationally invariant. From now on, when we talk about coarse graining by isovectors, this is what we m ean.

## B. C onstraints

So a general \physical" coarse graining can involve functionals of $, B, D$, and $D_{t}$. If we consider the subset of coarse grainings which involves the rst three but not the covariant tim e derivative $D_{t}$, we see that it involves only the vector potential A and the conjugate $m$ om entum , and not the scalar potential'. If we work in a gauge which also leaves ' unrestricted, we can perform the path integral over' to obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.{ }^{Z} D^{\prime} \exp i^{Z} d^{4} x^{\prime} D \quad=\mathbb{D} \quad=2 \quad\right] ; \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$



$$
\begin{align*}
& h \mathbb{C} j i=\left.D^{3} A D^{3} \quad A^{\infty} ; t^{\infty}\right) \operatorname{det}[2]  \tag{42}\\
&\mathbb{K}][G]_{G}[A ;] e^{i S_{\operatorname{can}}[A ;]}\left[A^{0} ; t^{0}\right):
\end{align*}
$$

In particular, ifwe coarse grain by values of the constraint $K=D$, the delta function $w$ ill cause the class operator to vanish for any class which does not include D $=0$, ie., the constraint satis ed. If exactly one class includes that condition, then, it w ill have the
only non-vanishing class operator, and the only non-vanishing elem ent of the decoherence functional will be the diagonal elem ent corresponding to that altemative. This will then allow the assignm ent of probabilities, nam ely, a probability of 1 for the altemative in which the constraint is satis ed and 0 for all others.

N ow we m ake this form al dem onstration m ore precise. G iven our choige of lattiae expressions, it should be clear that the relevant quantities are the follow ing functions de ned on each slige:

$$
\begin{equation*}
K^{M}(x)=\bar{D}^{M} \quad{ }^{M} \quad(x)^{\circ}: \tag{43}
\end{equation*}
$$

If we work in a gauge which sets $\boldsymbol{T}^{\mathrm{J}+1}$ to zero and does not otherw ise restrict ${ }^{\prime}$, we can

$h j \subset i=D^{3} A^{J+1} \quad A^{J+1} ; t^{\infty} \operatorname{det}\left[a_{t}\right]$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{M}=0
\end{aligned}
$$

The ${\underset{n}{k}}_{K^{M}}$ causes the class operator to vanish for any coarse graining not consistent w ith all the $K^{M}$ vanishing everyw here. Thus if we coarse grain by an average of the constraint over som e spacetim e region, which will correspond to som e average over the ${ }^{n} K^{M}{ }^{\circ}$, the only non-zero elem ent of the decoherence functional will be the diagonal one corresponding to that average vanishing.

## C. C om parison to reduced phase space theory

In a reduced phase space canonical theory, as described in section 'IIITD-1, the altematives are de ned by pro jections onto eigenstates of physicaloperators. W orking in the axialgauge, the operator corresponding to the gauge electric eld is [cf. ( $\left.\overline{\mathrm{B}} \overline{\mathrm{Z}} \overline{\mathrm{O}}_{1}\right)$ ]

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{b}_{?} \quad \mathrm{e}_{1} \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}}^{1}{ }^{1} \mathrm{D} \text { ? } \mathrm{b}_{?} \tag{4.5a}
\end{equation*}
$$

and that corresponding to the gauge $m$ agnetic eld is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{B}^{\mathrm{a}}=\mathrm{r} \quad \mathrm{~A}_{?}^{\mathrm{a}}+\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{gf}_{a b}^{c} A_{?}^{c} \quad \mathrm{~A}_{?}^{\mathrm{b}}: \tag{4.5b}
\end{equation*}
$$

The operator for the covariant gradient is $\bar{B}=a^{a b} r+g f_{a b}^{c} A{ }_{?}^{c}$, but it is less clear how
 need to consider the tim e derivatives of $\mathcal{A}$ ? and b ? . In an operator theory, one identi es the tim e derivatives at one $m$ om ent of tim e via the $H$ eisenberg equations ofm otion :

$$
\begin{align*}
& Q_{t} A_{?}=i^{h} A_{\text {red }} ; A_{?}^{i} \tag{4.6a}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{~b}_{?}^{a}=\mathrm{i} \mathrm{H}_{\text {red }} ; \mathrm{b}_{\text {? }}^{a} \\
& =\mathbb{I}_{3} \quad B_{?} \quad B^{a} \tag{4.6b}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{1}_{?}=\mathbb{1} \quad e_{1} \quad e_{r} \tag{4.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

is the tensor which pro jects onto the \penpendicular" directions. If we identify

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{b}=\mathrm{G}^{2} \mathrm{~B}_{?} \quad \mathrm{~b}_{?} ; \tag{4.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

and rem em ber that the naloperator expressions should alw ays be $W$ eyl-ordered, equations ( $\overline{4} . \overline{\mathrm{G}})$ ) give the operator versions of $\mathrm{E}_{\text {? }}=$ ? two of the com ponents of $\left.\left.\overline{2} \overline{1} \overline{\mathrm{G}} \mathrm{a}\right)\right]$ and the
 We also have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{n}}=\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{~b} ; \tag{4.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is the third com ponent of (

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{a b} a_{t}+g f_{a b}^{c} a_{n}{ }^{2} \Phi_{?} b_{?}{ }_{c} ; \tag{4.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the e ects of $@_{t}$ on other operators are given by ( $\left.\overline{4} . \overline{\mathrm{C}}\right)$. O f course, in a sum -overhistories form ulation, attem pts to describe instantaneous values of tim e derivatives do not yield sensible results due to the non-di erentiability of the paths. Instead, we coarse grain by tim e derivatives averaged over tim $e$, which correspond to coarse grainings by the di erence betw een values of a quantity at two nitely separated instants of time.

A s described in section 'İİB' 1 are described by expectation values of pro jection operators, while in an operator generalized quantum $m$ echanics $\left[\begin{array}{l}-1 / 1\end{array}\right]$, an altemative c corresponds to a class operator $C$ which is de ned as in $\left(\underline{2}-\overline{2}^{-} \overline{5}^{\prime}\right)$ by a chain of such projections:

Ifwe generalize further, and allow a class operator to be not just a single chain ofpro jections, but a sum ofsuch chains, we can describe m ore generalaltematives, such as coarse grainings by tim e averages. The operator expression corresponding to a coarse-grained class operator would be de ned by assigning to each class c a sum of chains of pro jections:

This will be equivalent to the corresponding sum-over-histories expression if we can replace the pro jections w ith restricted integrations on lattice sliges. First, consider a pro jection onto a range of the coordinate $A$ ? :

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{i}^{i}=D^{Z} A_{?} \not \mathrm{~A}_{?} \text { ie }{ }_{i}\left[A_{?}\right] h A_{?} j ; \tag{4.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{i}}\left[\mathbb{A}_{?}\right]=\begin{array}{lll}
0 ; & A_{?} Z & \mathrm{i}  \tag{4.13}\\
1 ; & A_{?} & 2
\end{array}
$$

is the indicator function for the region $i$ in the space of eld con gurations fA? (x)g. To exam ine the e ect that this pro jection has on the class operator, assum e that we have taken our lattioe spacing sm all enough that $t<t_{+1} \quad \hbar_{i} t_{i} \quad t_{1}$ so that if $t_{I}$ is the latest time slice before $t_{i}$ ( $i . e ., t_{I+1} \quad t \quad \frac{t}{4}$ ), no other pro jections lie in the interval ( $t_{I} ; t_{I+1}$ ). Then the e ect of the projection is to m odify the right-hand side of ( $(\underline{3}=\overline{3} \overline{0})$ to be, to rst order in
$t$,

In the sum -over-histories form ulation, we would choose an $A$ ? m ost closely corresponding to $A$ ? $\left(t_{i}\right)$ and one factor in the indicator function $e$ would be $e_{i}\left[A_{?}\right]$. $G$ iven the spirit of our lattioe resolution, that is clearly $\overline{\mathrm{A}}_{\text {? }}^{\mathrm{I}}$. There is a discrepancy betw een the expressions

$$
\begin{equation*}
e_{i} \overline{\mathrm{~A}}_{?}^{\mathrm{I}} \tag{4.15a}
\end{equation*}
$$

and
even when $t_{i}=t_{I}+\frac{t}{2}$. H ow ever, it can be seen as an artifact of the lattioe; we argued in
 so we expect both expressions to give the sam e results in that lim it. fIt is interesting to
 Feynm an's original paper on path integrals [1]inj].g

H ere we should consider a mom ent just what \pro jections onto ranges of $A$ ? " m eans, physically. A fter all, A is a gauge-dependent quantity, so it cannot be the expression which determ ines the coarse graining in ( $\overline{3}-\mathbf{A})$ independent of the gauge choige $G$. T he two quantities of interest constructed from A are D and B. Since B, as de ned by ( (2.BED'), depends only on the vector potentialA at a single tim e, a eld con guration $B(x)$ can be determ ined from a eld con guration A ( $x$ ) alone. In fact, the gauge freedom $m$ eans there are $m$ any con gurations ofA which lead to the sam eB con guration, so there is a one-to-one correspondence between eld con gurations B ( x ) and gauge- xed eld con gurations A ? $(\mathrm{x})$.

If we pro ject by values of ,

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{i}^{i}=D^{2}{ }_{?} j_{?} \text { ie }_{i}[?] h ? j i \tag{4.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

we nd that to rst order in $t$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { D }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& +\frac{\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{i}} \text { 在 }}{\mathrm{t}} 1 \quad \text { i } \mathrm{H}_{\text {red }} \frac{\mathrm{A}_{\text {? }}+\mathrm{A}_{\text {? }}^{\mathrm{I}}}{2} ; \text { ? } \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{i}}[\text { ? }] \text { : } \tag{4.17}
\end{align*}
$$

If we argue that in the lim it $t$ ! 0 we can replace $A$ ? with $A$ ? in the rst term and $A$ ? ${ }_{\text {? }}^{I}$ in the second term, we recover the sum -over-histories expression

N ow we consider physically what a projection onto values of ? m eans. The conjugate m om entum is gauge-covariant, and in the physical phase space theory directly accessible, so as long as the regions $f i g$ are rotationally invariant in isospace, these are allowed sets of altematives. H ow ever, dependence of the reduced H am iltonian ( $\overline{3} \overline{2} \overline{2}$ ) ) on ? not just directly but through the xed form of $n$ means that we are actually restricting not ? independently, but ? sub ject to the constraint $D=0$. This is no cause for alarm, though, since as long as the coarse graining $m$ akes no reference to $'\left(t_{i}\right)$, the result ( $\overline{4}-\bar{Z}$ ) [or (4̄. $\mathbf{I}_{1}$ ') ] ensures that this is also the case in the sum -over-histories form ulation.

It seem $s$ reasonable to assum $e$ that, $m$ odulo operator ordering delicacies, a sim ilar correspondence will hold for any com bination of D, B and , and the the sum-over-histories form ulation gives the sam e results as the corresponding reduced phase space canonical theory freferred to in $[\underline{\bar{Z}}]$ ] and elsew here as $\backslash A$ mow itt-D eser -M isner (ADM) quantization" $g$ for physical phase space coarse grainings not involving $D_{t}$.

## A. A llow ed alternatives; overview

In the sum -over-histories form ulation, it is possible to consider a set of physical altematives in which the conjugate m om enta are not speci ed. The gauge electric eld, which was previously described by , is now described solely in term s of the potentials as $\mathrm{E}=\mathrm{A} \mathrm{D}^{\prime} . \mathrm{W}$ hile these two de nitions of the gauge electric eld are classically equivalent, quantum mechanical descriptions based on them $w$ ill in generalbe inequivalent. The physical con guration space theory is that in which the gauge electric eld is represented by E and the gauge m agnetic eld by B . It has the advantage over the physical phase space realization that, as described in section Vill it is form ally manifestly Lorentz-invariant. H ow ever, for that very reason, it $w$ ill tum out to be not completely consistent $w$ ith the enforcem ent of the $G$ auss's law constraint.

In the subset of gauge-invariant altematives which do not restrict the m om enta (of which the physical con guration space altematives are in tum a subset), the integrals over the $m$ om enta in the path integral (3. $\overline{3} \mathbf{- 1})$ for the class operator can be explicitly perform ed. W e do this in section $\bar{V} \bar{B} \bar{B}$, which gives us a constructive de nition of the con guration space path integral ( $\overline{3}-\bar{J})$. For the punposes of the physical con guration space realization of the
 phase space route has enabled us to calculate naturally the $m$ easure for the con guration space path integral.

A fter constructing the con guration space path integral, we spend the next tw o subsec-
 we construct a class of quantities which have the sam e properties as those found for the constraints of $E \& M$ in $[\underline{\underline{2}} 1]$ : the only decohering coarse grainings are those which predict that the constraint is satis ed w ith 100\% probability. In section $\bar{N} \bar{N}^{-1}$, how ever, we exhibit a quantity in the abelian theory of E \& M which vanishes in the presence of the G auss's law constraint, yet violates this property; there are decohering coarse grainings which predict nonvanishing values of the quantity w ith nonzero probability.

## B. R educing the phase space form ulation to the con guration space form ulation

Since the coarse grainings $m$ ake no reference to the canonicalm om enta, we can work in a gauge where is unrestricted and perform the G aussian integrals over the $m$ om enta in (3.-1) using the form of the canonical action density in (3.46)]:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Z } \\
& D^{3} m \exp \quad i t d^{3} x \frac{1}{2} \quad m^{2} \quad m \quad A^{M}+\bar{D}^{M} \rightarrow M
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
=\exp \text { it } \mathrm{d}^{3} x \frac{1}{2} E^{M}{ }^{2} \mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{a} ; \mathrm{x}}^{2{\mathrm{i} \mathrm{~N}_{\mathrm{A}}^{2}}_{{ }^{3} \mathrm{X}}^{3=2}} \tag{5.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and rew rite the class operator as

$$
\begin{aligned}
& h X i=N \quad D^{4} A^{J+1} \quad \stackrel{h}{A} A^{J+1} ; t^{\infty} \\
& Y_{M=J}^{Z} D^{4} A^{M} \exp \text { it } \mathrm{d}^{3} x \frac{1}{2} \quad E^{M}{ }^{2} \quad B^{M} \quad{ }^{2} \text { ! }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { M }=0 \tag{52}
\end{align*}
$$

where $E^{M}$ and $B^{M}$ are as given in $(3)$ and we have de ned the norm alization constant

$$
\begin{equation*}
N=4_{a ; x}^{2} \frac{{ }^{3} \mathrm{X}}{2{\text { i } \mathbb{N}_{\mathrm{A}}^{2}}_{!}^{{ }_{3=2}^{3}}{ }_{5}^{3_{J+1}}:} \tag{52a}
\end{equation*}
$$

 the $m$ easure for the con guration space path integral explicitly calculated.

> C. C oarse grain ing by values of the constraints

## 1. Factoring the class operators

In con guration space, the constraint becom es

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q=D \quad E=D A+D^{2 \prime}=0 \tag{5.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the electric eld part of the Lagrangian is

$$
\begin{equation*}
d^{3} x \frac{1}{2} E^{2}={ }^{Z} d^{3} x \frac{1}{2}^{h} A^{2}+2 A \quad D^{\prime}+\left(D^{\prime 2}\right)^{i}: \tag{5.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

This is m ost fruitfully sim pli ed by a new gauge, which we dub the \dotted C oulom b gauge" (DCG) $)_{-1}^{111}$ in which

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { D } A=0: \tag{5.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

This di ers from the C oulom $b$ gauge in which $D \quad A=0$ because the tim e derivative does not com $m$ ute w th the covariant gradient $D$. In this gauge, the constraint becom es $Q=D^{2 r}=0$ and, after integrating by parts, the electric eld part of the Lagrangian becom es

[^8]\[

$$
\begin{equation*}
d^{z} \times \frac{1}{2} A^{2}+\left(D^{\prime}\right)^{2^{i}}: \tag{5.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

\]

T he lattice realization of the gauge condition is

$$
\begin{equation*}
G^{M}=\bar{D}^{M} \quad A^{M}=0 \tag{5.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $M=0$ to $J$, which, taken along $w i t h ~ G ~(t 2 ~=~+J+1=0$, leaves one hypersurface $w$ orth of gauge conditions $\mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{J}+1}$ to be speci ed. $W$ e assum $e$ that this is de ned on som e hypersurface aw ay from the region exam ined by our coarse graining, and ignore it. (It is conventional to assum e that it has been used to ensure that the scalar potential vanishes at spatial in nity.) The Fadeev-P opov determ inant for the D CG can be calculated from (3̄2̄") to give

$$
G=\operatorname{det}\left[\quad D^{2} @_{t}\right]=\operatorname{det}\left[\begin{array}{ll} 
& D^{2} \tag{5.8}
\end{array}\right] \operatorname{det}\left[@_{t}\right]
$$

and the class operator is now
h $\mathrm{J} \quad \mathrm{j} i=\mathrm{N}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& D^{3} A^{J+1} \operatorname{det}\left[a_{t}\right] \quad A^{J+1} ; t^{\infty} \quad \stackrel{h}{A}{ }^{0} ; t^{0} \\
& Y^{0} \quad Z \quad D^{3} A^{M} \exp \text { it } d^{3} x \frac{1}{2} \quad A^{M}{ }^{2} \quad B^{M} \quad{ }^{2} \quad \bar{D}^{M} \quad A^{M}{ }^{i} \operatorname{det} \quad \bar{D}^{M} \quad{ }^{2} @_{t} \text { ! }
\end{aligned}
$$

The expression (5. 5 . ) isbeginning to factor into tw o pieces: a piece depending on the in itial and nalwave fiunctionals which involves only the vector potential, and a piece describing the coarse graining which involves only the scalar potential. The two factors whidh still involve both potentials are the $\left(D^{\prime}\right)^{2}$ term in the exponential and the indicator functional e $\left.A ;^{\prime}\right]$. W e would like to solve the rst problem by changing variables from ' to $D$ ' in the path integral, but the latter is a vector while the form er is only a scalar. To construct a scalar corresponding to $D$ ', we need to develop som e notation.
$F$ irst, for the rem ainder of th is section, it w illbe usefulto consider all unadomed variables to be scalars rather than four-vectors. For exam ple, $k=k j=\bar{k} k$. Now, we de ne a nonlocal scalar operator $r=\left(r^{2}\right)^{1=2}$ via a Fourier transform :

$$
\begin{equation*}
r f(x)=\frac{z}{d^{3} x^{0} d^{3} k}(2)^{3} e^{i k} \quad\left(x^{k}\right) \operatorname{ikf}\left(x^{0}\right) \tag{5.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

so that $r^{2}=r^{2}$ is the Laplacian. (W e could have de ned the square root to have the opposite sign, but it w ould not substantially change what follow s.) Building on the properties of this operator, we de ne an analogous square root for the covariant Laplacian

$$
\begin{equation*}
D^{2}=r^{2}+i g\left(A^{a} \quad r+r \quad{ }^{a}\right) \mathbb{P}_{a} \quad g^{2}\left(A^{a} \quad A\right) T_{a} T_{b} \tag{5.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

via an expansion (the convergence of which we do not address) as follow s:

$$
\begin{align*}
D & =\left(D^{2}\right)^{1=2}=r^{2}+\left(D^{2} r^{2}\right)^{i_{1=2}} \\
& =\left(r^{2}\right)^{1=2} 1+r^{2}\left(D^{2} r^{2}\right)^{i_{1=2}} \\
& =r_{n=0}^{x^{1}} b_{n} r^{2}\left(D^{2}\left(r^{2}\right)^{i_{n}} ;\right. \tag{5.12}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\mathrm{fl}_{n} g$ are the Taylor expansion coe cients of $(1+x)^{1=2}$ and $r^{2}$ is another non-local operator

$$
\begin{equation*}
r^{2} f(x)=\frac{z}{(2)^{3} x^{0} d^{3} k} e^{i k} \quad(x \quad k) \quad \frac{1}{k^{2}} f\left(x^{0}\right) \tag{5.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

de ned so that $r^{2} r{ }^{2}=r{ }^{2} r^{2}=1$.
$N$ ow we want to $m$ assage the scalar potential part of the action so that it involves $D^{\prime}$ rather than $D^{\prime}$. Integrating by parts, we see that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{2}^{z} d^{3} x\left(D^{\prime}\right)^{2}=\frac{1}{2}^{z} d^{3} x^{\prime} D \quad D^{\prime}=\frac{1}{2}^{z} d^{3} x^{\prime} D^{2 \prime} \tag{5.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

and now we need to $m$ ove one of the $D$ operators back to the left. It is straightforw ard to show (by expanding and in Fourier transform s) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.{ }^{z} d^{3} x \quad(x) r \quad(x)\right)^{z} d^{3} x(r \quad)(x) \quad(x) \tag{5.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

(which is the opposite sign from the integration by parts involving $r$ ) and

$$
\begin{equation*}
d^{z} x(x) r^{2}(x)=^{z} d^{3} x\left(r^{2}\right)(x)(x): \tag{5.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

U sing those tw o results, along with
Z

$$
\begin{align*}
d^{3} x \quad(x) & \left(\mathbb{D}^{2} \quad r^{2}\right)(x) \\
& z d^{3} x^{2}\left(D^{2} r^{2}\right)(x)^{i} \quad(x) \tag{5.17}
\end{align*}
$$

(w hich follow s from the integration by parts procedures for $r$ and $D$ ) one can show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{2}^{z} d^{3} x^{\prime} D^{2 \prime}=\frac{1}{2}^{z} d^{3} x\left(D^{\prime}\right)^{2}: \tag{5.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

If we de ne ${ }_{-1}^{12!}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{M}}=\overline{\mathrm{D}}^{\mathrm{M}} \rightarrow \mathrm{M} \tag{5.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^9]the class operator becom es
\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Z } \\
& \text { h } \mathcal{J} \quad j i=N
\end{aligned}
$$
\]

$$
\begin{aligned}
& y^{0} Z D^{3} A^{M} \exp \text { it } d^{3} x \frac{1}{2} \quad A^{M}{ }^{2} \quad B^{M}{ }^{2} \quad \bar{D}^{M} \quad A^{M}{ }^{i} \operatorname{det}^{h} \overline{D D}^{M} C_{t}{ }^{\text {! }}
\end{aligned}
$$

N ow the only obstacle to factorization of the class operator is the indicator fiunctional e. If we coarse grain by som e tem poral and spatial average of the constraint

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q=D^{2 \prime}=i D E ; \tag{521}
\end{equation*}
$$

the indicator functional for a class in which this average lies in the range (which, since Q is an isovector, is a region in isospace which is $m$ apped onto itself by gauge transform ations) is (letting $n={ }_{\mathrm{a}} 1$ be the dim ension of the adjoint representation of the gauge group, and keeping in $m$ ind that $f$ is a com plex isovector quantity)

$$
\begin{equation*}
e=d^{z} d^{2 n} f \quad(f \quad h \quad i D E i) ; \tag{522}
\end{equation*}
$$

which depends on A via the operator $D$. If, however, we coarse grain by values of iD ${ }^{1} Q$, which classically should vanish whenever $Q$ does, we are coarse graining by $E, e$ is independent of $A$, and we can perform the follow ing $m$ anipulation:


$$
\begin{align*}
& y^{0} Z D^{3} A^{M} \exp i t d^{3} x \frac{1}{2} \quad A^{M}{ }^{2} \quad B^{M}{ }^{2} \quad \bar{D}^{M} \quad A^{M}{ }^{i} \operatorname{det}^{h} \overline{D D}^{M} C_{t}{ }^{\text {! }} \\
& h^{M}=J i \\
& G^{J+1} G^{\text {I }+1} \text {; } \tag{523}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.C=y_{M=J}^{\left(y^{0} Z\right.} D E^{M} \exp \text { it } d^{3} x \frac{1}{2} E^{M} 2^{\prime} \text { e } \mathbb{E}\right]: \tag{524}
\end{equation*}
$$

This $m$ eans that

$$
\begin{equation*}
D(; \quad 0)=\frac{C C}{\left.J_{u}\right\}^{2}} \tag{525}
\end{equation*}
$$

and we can apply an argum ent from section VI. 4 of factors in this way, the only way the o -diagonal elem ents can vanish is if only one of the $\mathrm{fC} g$ is non-zero. In that case, one diagonal elem ent of the decoherence functional is unity and allthe others vanish, which corresponds to a de nite prediction of that altemative ( $100 \%$ probability). Thus we have the result: coarse grainings of iD ${ }^{1}$ ( $D \quad E$ ) in con guration
space fall into two categories：either they yield a de nite prediction of a single altemative， or they fail to decohere．In the form er case，we expect that the predicted altemative w ill be the one consistent w ith constraint $Q=0$ ，but this argum ent itself does not settle the issue． H ow ever，the con jecture seem s very likely given that the integrand in the expression（524） for $C$ is stationary about $E=0$ ，which would seem to $m$ ake the altemative including $E=0$ the one $m$ ost likely to have a non－vanishing $C$ ．

## 2．A decohering exam ple

W e now present explicit calculation of $C$ for one choige of the average $h E i$ which veri es both that coarse grainings of the rst class exist and that the altemative predicted is（in this case）indeed the one consistent w ith the constraint．T he dem onstration is analogous to that used in section V I． 4 of $\left[\frac{\overline{2}}{-1}\right]$ for $E M$ ，and the specialization of the present result（ $\left.\bar{A}-\overline{1} \overline{1}^{-} \overline{6}\right)$ to the abelian case is in fact a m ore accurate version of equation（V I．4．12）therein．
$W$ e coarse grain by an average hEi over modes so that the indicator functional is

$$
\begin{equation*}
e \mathbb{E}]={ }^{Z} d^{2 n} f \quad(f \quad h E i): \tag{5,26}
\end{equation*}
$$

The average hEi is de ned to be over a tim e interval $t$ and a group of $m$ odes in spatial frequency space $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{k}}$ ．W e refer to this group ofm odes as，which we also use for the mode volume（ $=t \quad{ }^{3} k$ ），so that the average is

$$
\begin{equation*}
h E i=\frac{1}{2}^{Z} d t d^{3} k E_{k}(t)=\frac{1}{M 2}_{x}^{t^{Z}} d^{3} k E_{k}^{M} ; \tag{527}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $E_{k}$ is the Fourier transform

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{k}^{M}=\frac{Z}{(2)^{3=2}} e^{i k} \text { E. }^{M}(x): \tag{528}
\end{equation*}
$$

For this coarse graining，the calculation in appendix＇Ā－＇gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
C=K^{0} \quad d^{2 n} f e^{i \text { 过子 }} ; \tag{A}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $K^{0}$ is a constant．The integrand is an $\backslash$ im aginary $G$ aussian＂of $w$ idth $1=\frac{\mathrm{P}}{2}$ ；For近 $\jmath>1=2$ ，the integrand $w i l l$ oscillate rapidly and the contributions to the integral $w i l l$ cancel out．This means that if we average over a large enough group of m odes that the region

$$
\begin{equation*}
\underline{1}^{Z} d t d^{3} k E_{k}(t)^{2}<\frac{1}{2} \tag{529}
\end{equation*}
$$

is contained in a single bin ，that will correspond to the only non－negligible $C$ ，and we w ill have a de nite prediction that the con guration space constraint is satis ed to that accuracy．

This result is less com forting than the abelian one, since our altematives were de ned not by the usualcon guration space constraint $Q=D \quad E$ but a nonlocal fiunction of it. In $\mathrm{E} \& \mathrm{M}$, no one would ob ject to analogously coarse graining by the longitudinal com ponent of the electric eld rather than its divergence, but in that case the relationship between them does not involve the other com ponents of A so a sim ilar factorization can be perform ed on
$r \quad E$ as on $E$. How ever, in aNAGT, coarse graining by $Q=\quad i D E$ tangles up $E$ and $A$. Even in $E \& M$, we run into this problem if we coarse grain by quantities which involve both $E_{L}$ and $A_{T} \cdot W$ e exam ine one such coarse graining in the next section.

## D. C oarse graining E\&M by quantities proportional to the constraint

We showed in the previous section that coarse grainings by values of E in a NAGT (or $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{L}}$ in $\mathrm{E} \& \mathrm{M}$ ) could only decohere in cases where they led to a de nite prediction. The dem onstration does not work for coarse grainings by iD $E$ (or $\left.f \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{L}} ; \mathrm{B}\right]$ in $\mathrm{E} \& \mathrm{M}$ ). We will now exhibit such a coarse graining in $E \& M$ which decoheres, but predicts non-zero probabilities form ore than one altemative, thus verifying that the property described in the previous section does not alw ays hold.

The physical process believed to be responsible for decoherence in m ost practical situations of everyday life results when (see lī్1] for details and a bibliography of prior work) the \system " of interest is coupled to an \environm ent". The \environm ent" is not measured, but carries aw ay phase inform ation which causes sets of altematives describing the \system " to decohere. The present situation here is sim ilar, but w ith the follow ing di erences. The \system " variables A are coupled to the \environm ent" variables E not by the action, but by the coarse graining itself, and here it is the initial state rather than the coarse graining which is independent of the \environm ent" E. But as we shall see, this is still a m echanism which can produce decoherence of a sort di erent than that seen in the previous section, and lead to m ore than one altemative having non-zero probability. For our purposes, it will be $m$ ost useful to consider coarse grainings by functionals of $E_{L}$ and $B$ in the abelian gauge theory of electrom agnetism. (A lthough we will brie y m ention, at the end of the section, a sim ilar result in another theory to ilhustrate the generality of the $m$ echanism described here.)

In the abelian theory, the dotted Coulomb gauge ( 5 . gauge $A_{L}=0$ and ( 5.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Z h h } \\
& h j \quad j i=N \quad D{ }^{2} A_{T}^{J+1} \operatorname{det}\left[@_{t}\right] \quad A_{T}^{J+1} ; t^{\infty} \quad \stackrel{h}{A}{ }_{T}^{0} ; t^{0}
\end{aligned}
$$

For the purposes of $\mathrm{E} \& \mathrm{M}$, we need not concem ourselves with the details of the lattice approxim ation, because the reduced $H$ am iltonian is free from the operator ordering am bigu-
ties discussed in section 'AIMD gives the sam e reduced $\overline{\mathrm{H}}$ am iltonian, and in light of the discussion in footnote ilo page this $m$ eans that di erent lattige realizations of the path integralw ill be equivalent. W e are thus justi ed in working w ith the form al equivalent of ( 5
$\left.h j C i=G^{Z} D^{2} A_{T} D^{\prime} \quad A_{T}^{J+1} ; t^{\infty} \exp i d^{4} x \frac{1}{2} \quad A_{T} \quad{ }^{2} \quad r \quad A_{T}{ }^{2}+(r)^{\prime}\right)^{2} \quad h A_{T}^{0} ; t^{0}:$

Since we can observe that the \physical degrees of freedom " upon which the w ave functionals depend are just the transverse com ponents of $A$, it is useful to factor out the wave functionals and w rite

$$
\begin{align*}
h \not \subset \quad j i= & D^{2} A_{T}^{\infty} D^{2} A_{T}^{0} \quad\left[A_{T}^{\infty} ; t^{\infty}\right) \\
& C\left[A_{T}^{\infty} t^{\infty} A_{T}^{0} t^{0}\right) \quad\left[A_{T}^{0} ; t^{0}\right) ;
\end{align*}
$$

where ${ }^{1124}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
C\left[A_{T}^{\infty} t^{\infty} A_{A}^{0} t^{0}\right)=G_{A_{T}^{0} A_{T}^{\infty}}^{Z} D^{2} A_{T} D^{\prime} e^{R_{t^{0}} d t L}: \tag{5.33}
\end{equation*}
$$

If we w rite the initial and nal conditions as

$$
\begin{align*}
& { }_{t^{\infty}}^{\infty}\left[\mathbb{A}_{T 2}^{\infty} ; A_{T 1}^{\infty}\right]={ }_{i}^{X}\left[\mathbb{A}_{T 2}^{\infty} ; t^{\infty}\right) p_{i}^{\infty} \quad \text { i }\left[\mathbb{A}_{T 1}^{\infty} ; t^{\infty}\right)  \tag{5.34a}\\
& { }_{t^{0}}^{0}\left[\mathbb{A}_{T 2}^{0} ; A_{T 1}^{0}\right]=X_{j}^{X^{i}} \quad\left[A_{T 2}^{0} ; t^{0}\right) p_{j}^{0} \quad j\left[A_{T 1}^{0} ; t^{0}\right) ; \tag{5.34b}
\end{align*}
$$

we have, from ( 5

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{D}\left(;^{0}\right) / \quad \mathrm{D}^{2} \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{T} 2}^{\infty} \mathrm{D}^{2} \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{T} 1}^{\infty} \mathrm{D}^{2} \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{T} 2}^{0} \mathrm{D}^{2} \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{T} 1}^{0}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.\left.{ }_{t}^{0} \mathbb{A}_{\mathrm{T} 1}^{0} ; \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{T} 2}^{0}\right] \mathrm{C} \text { 。 } \mathbb{A}_{\mathrm{T} 2}^{\infty} \mathrm{t}^{\infty} \mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{T} 2}^{0} \mathrm{t}^{0}\right) \text {; } \tag{5.35}
\end{align*}
$$

where we have established the useful convention that / indicates a proportionality constant which is the same for all classes and thus can be absorbed into the norm alization. The quantity we choose to de ne our altematives is

[^10]\[

$$
\begin{equation*}
g \mathbb{B}] \eta E_{L} i \jmath^{2} ; \tag{5.36}
\end{equation*}
$$

\]

$w$ here $g \mathbb{B}]$ is a functional (which we take to be positive sem ide nite for reasons to becom e clear later) of the $m$ agnetic eld con guration $B$ on sometime slice $t_{i}$, and $h$ indicates an average over som e m ode volum e (i.e., an average over wavenum ber and tim ent int . The indicator function for this quantity to lie in som e interval is

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { Z } \\
& e=d f \quad f \quad g B] j E_{L} i \jmath^{2} \\
& \text { Z Z } \\
& =\quad \mathrm{df} \quad \mathrm{db} d \mathrm{da}(\mathrm{f} \quad \mathrm{ba}) \quad(\mathrm{b} \quad \mathrm{~g} B]) \\
& \text { a } \dagger \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{i}{ }^{2} \text {; } \tag{5.37}
\end{align*}
$$

which allow s us to w rite

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { C } \left.A_{T}^{\infty} t^{\infty}{ }_{-A} A_{T}^{0} t^{0}\right){ }_{z} \\
& \left.=d f \quad d b d a \quad(f \quad b a) A(a) B A_{T}^{\infty} ; A_{T}^{0} ; b\right) \\
& \left.={ }^{Z} \mathrm{df}^{\mathrm{Z}} \frac{\mathrm{db}}{\mathrm{bj}} \mathrm{~A} \frac{\mathrm{f}^{!}}{\mathrm{b}} \mathrm{~B} \mathbb{A}_{\mathrm{T}}^{\infty} ; \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{T}}^{0} ; \mathrm{b}\right) \text {; } \tag{5.38}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{array}{r}
A(a)=D^{z} D^{\prime} \exp i_{t^{0}}^{Z^{\infty}} d t d^{z} x \frac{1}{2}\left(r^{\prime}\right)^{2} \\
a \text { hr }^{\prime} i \xi \operatorname{det}[r] \tag{5.38a}
\end{array}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { B } \left.\mathbb{A}_{\mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{Z}}}^{\infty} ; \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{T}}^{0} ; \mathrm{b}\right) \\
& =\quad D^{2} \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{T}} \\
& A_{T}^{0} A_{T}^{\infty}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { (b } \mathrm{g}\left[\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{r} & \text { A }
\end{array}\right] \text { ): } \tag{5.38b}
\end{align*}
$$

W riting the average over a group ofm odes as

$$
\begin{equation*}
h r^{\prime} i=\frac{1}{2}^{\mathrm{Z}} \mathrm{dtd}^{3} \mathrm{k}\left[\mathrm{ik}_{\mathrm{k}}^{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(\mathrm{t})\right] ; \tag{5.39}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^11]a calculation analogous to the one in appendix 'A-'.' tells us that
\[

$$
\begin{align*}
& A(a) /{ }^{Z} D \exp i^{x} \text { j }{ }^{\text {J }} \text { a } \quad \text { jof } \\
& \text { Z } \\
& \text { / d }{ }_{0}^{R} d{ }_{0}^{I} \exp i j o j \quad a \quad j o j \\
& / e^{i}{ }^{a}(a) ; \tag{5.40}
\end{align*}
$$
\]

where (a) is the $H$ eaviside step function. M eanw hile, we can write $B$ as $\frac{n-1}{1 r \mid}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
B\left(A_{T}^{\infty} ; A_{T}^{0} ; b\right)={ }^{Z} D^{2} A_{T} G\left[A_{T}^{\infty} t^{\infty}{ }_{z} A_{T} t_{i}\right) \quad\left(b \quad g\left[x \quad A_{i}\right]\right) G\left[A_{T} t_{i} \exists_{T}^{0} t^{0}\right) ; \tag{5.41}
\end{equation*}
$$

where
is the propagator for the $A_{T}$ sector of the theory. By Fourier transform ing the spatial dependenœ of $A_{T}, G$ can be seen to be the propagator for a ham onic oscillator whose natural frequency depends on the wave num ber $k$ of the $m$ ode. Equation ( $5.4 \overline{1} 1$ ') allow $s$ us to write the dependence im plied by ( 5 conditions as

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Z }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { Z } \tag{5.43}
\end{align*}
$$

 is one of future indi erence:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.{ }^{\infty}\left[\mathbb{A}_{\mathrm{T} 2}^{\infty} ; \mathbb{A}_{\mathrm{T} 1}^{\infty}\right] / \quad \mathbb{A}_{\mathrm{T} 2}^{\infty} \quad \mathbb{A}_{\mathrm{T} 1}^{\infty}\right] \tag{5.44}
\end{equation*}
$$

(which is preserved by the propagator), $(\overline{5} .4 \overline{4})$ becom es proportional to

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { Z } \\
& D^{2} \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{T}} \quad\left(\mathrm{q} \quad \mathrm{~g}\left[\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{r} & \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{I}}
\end{array}\right]\right) \\
& \left.\left.\left.{ }_{t_{i}}^{0} A_{T} ; A_{T}\right] \text { ( } \mathrm{lr} \quad \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{I}}\right]\right) \\
& =\left(\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{b} & \mathrm{Q}
\end{array}\right) \mathrm{p}\left(\mathrm{~b}_{1}\right) \text {; } \tag{5.45}
\end{align*}
$$

[^12]where
\[

p(b)={ }^{Z} D^{2} A_{T} \quad (b \quad g\left[$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\left.\left[\begin{array}{l}
\text { A }
\end{array}\right]\right) \\
t_{i} \tag{5.46}
\end{array}
$$ \mathbb{A}_{T} ; A_{T}\right]:
\]

C om bining ( $\overline{5}-\overline{3} 5)$ and ( 5 $B$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { D ( ; }{ }^{0} \text { ) }  \tag{5.47}\\
& \text {, }{ }^{\mathrm{Z}} \mathrm{df}^{\mathrm{Z}} \mathrm{df}^{\mathrm{Z}} \frac{\mathrm{db}}{\mathrm{~b}^{2}} \mathrm{p}(\mathrm{~b}) \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}}\left(\mathrm{f}^{\left.\mathrm{f}^{0}\right)=\mathrm{b}} \quad \frac{\mathrm{f}^{!}}{\mathrm{b}} \quad \frac{\mathrm{f}^{0}}{\mathrm{~b}}:\right.
\end{align*}
$$

 vanishes for negative $b$ and the step functions above become (f) (f ${ }^{9}$ ). If we de ne the regions $f \mathrm{~g}$ to cover the positive real axis, we can drop the step functions to give

$$
\begin{equation*}
D(; \quad 0) /{ }^{Z} \mathrm{df}^{\mathrm{Z}} \mathrm{df}^{0} G\left(f \quad \mathrm{f}^{0}\right) \text {; } \tag{5.48}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
G(y)=\sum_{0}^{z_{1}} \frac{d b}{b^{2}} p(b) e^{i} y=b: \tag{5.48a}
\end{equation*}
$$

$N$ ote that since $G\left(f \quad f^{f}\right)$ depends only on the di erence betw een $f$ and $f^{0}$, no value of $f$ is preferred over any other. In particular, if the bins $f \mathrm{~g}$ are all the sam e size, $\mathrm{D}\left({ }^{\circ}{ }^{0}\right)$ depends only on the relative separation of and ${ }^{0}$, not their absolute location. Thism eans that if there is decoherence, (5.4) predicts that the m easured quantity is equally likely to have any value.

It is possible to choose the p (b) (w hich is determ ined by the initialconditions) to produce at least weak decoherence. For exam ple, let p (b) be a G aussian in $1=\mathrm{b}$ :

$$
\mathrm{p}(\mathrm{~b})=\mathrm{A} \quad \text { (b) }\left(\begin{array}{lll}
1 & \text { b) } e^{1=2^{2} b^{2}} \tag{5.49}
\end{array}\right.
$$

where A is a cuto -dependent nom alization given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
A^{1}={ }_{0}^{\mathrm{Z}} \mathrm{D}^{1} \mathrm{dbe}{ }^{1=2^{2} b^{2}}<\frac{\mathrm{P}}{2} \frac{2}{2} \tag{5.49a}
\end{equation*}
$$

to ensure ${ }_{0}^{R_{1}} \mathrm{p}(\mathrm{b})=1$.
If is sm allenough, the leading term $s$ in the decoherence functionalw ill not depend on it. If the real parts of the o -diagonalelem ents of the decoherence functionalare much less than the diagonal elem ents, the coarse graining w ill exhibit approxim ate weak decoherence
 in $e^{-(-)^{2}=2 \text {, }}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\operatorname{ReD}(J+J ; J)}{D(J ; J)}<\frac{\exp \left[\quad(\quad)^{2}(j J j \quad 1)^{2}=2\right]}{\overline{2}}: \tag{5.50}
\end{equation*}
$$

So D ( $J ; J \quad 1$ ) is suppressed by a factor of ( ) ${ }^{1}$ relative to D ( $J ; J$ ), while all the other elem ents of the decoherence fiunctional are exponentially suppressed. In general, we expect this sort of result if ReG (y) falls o on a scale which is sm all com pared to which should in general be determ inable from a steepest descents evaluation of ( 5 ". 4 -iad ) .] Schem atically

$J$ ) for $j J j 2 w i l l$ include none of the region for which $G(y)$ is signi cant. The area of the region in the integral for $\operatorname{ReD}(J ; J \quad 1)$ forwhich $G(y)$ is signi cant is ${ }^{2}=2$, while that for $D(J ; J)$ is $2 \quad 2$, so $\operatorname{ReD}(J ; J \quad 1)$ is suppressed by a factor of $=$.

This $m$ eans that if $\quad 1$, this coarse graining by $g \mathbb{B} \quad \dagger \dagger \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{L}}$ ij decoheres weakly for the initial condition ( $5.4 . \overline{9})$ and the nal condition of future indi erence, and there is an equal probability for the value to fall into any of the evenly spaced bins. A curious corollary is that if we coarse grain by combining bins 0 through $J_{0} 1$ into one altemative E , corresponding to $g \mathbb{B}] \mathfrak{j} \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{i} \xlongequal{?}<\mathrm{J}_{0}$, and allthebins $J_{0}$ and up into another, corresponding to $g \mathbb{B}] \mathfrak{j} \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{L}} i{ }^{2}>J_{0}$, we nd that since $p$ < is a sum of $J_{0}$ equalterm $s$ and $p$ is an in nite sum of the same term $s, p_{<}=0$ and $p_{>}=1$ for any nite $J_{0}$, a de nite prediction that $g \mathbb{B}] \mathfrak{j} \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{i} \jmath>J_{0}$. This sort of phenom enon is com $m$ on in the use of path integralm ethods (for another exam ple, see
$F$ inally, let us com $m$ ent on the signi cance of this result. If we coarse grained by values
 de nite prediction that it vanished. Thus the phase space and con guration space theories m ake di erent predictions. There are well-docum ented exam ples in generalized quantum $m$ echanics where analogous phase space and con guration space coarse grainings lead to di erent decoherence functionals (for exam ple, in SectionsV . 42 and V I. 4 of $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}]$ ), but in those cases, there was a coarse graining by $m$ om entum which decohered while coarse graining by the equivalent quantity in term $s$ of velocity did not. W hen the coarse graining by velocity decohered, it agreed w ith the coarse graining by m om entum. The present result is the rst case know $n$ to the author of corresponding phase space and con guration space coarse grainings, both of which decohere, but which give con icting probabilities.

This result is not lim ited to constrained theories. A nother system in which sim ilar phenom ena can occur is the non-relativistic quantum $m$ echanics of a free particle $w$ ith two degrees of freedom and an independent harm onic oscillator. In that case, one coarse grains by the product of some function of the position of the harm onic oscillator at one instant of time $w$ ith the square of a tim e average of the velocity of the free particle. If the in itial state is a zerom om entum eigenstate of the free particle tensored w ith a suitable state of the harm onic oscillator, one nds equal probability of any altemative, even though the corresponding phase space coarse graining yields a de nite prediction that the quantity vanishes.

## VI.A FEW W ORDSABOUT LORENTZ INVARIANCE

Since our im plem entation of the sum overhistories for the generalized quantum m echanics of a NAGT has relied rather heavily on a division into tim eand space, it is worth mentioning how little the form al theory really does to single out a preferred Lorentz fram e. The phase space theory is of course not Lorentz-invariant, as the conjugate $m$ om enta are de ned $w$ ith
respect to a particular tim e. Since and B are treated di erently, it is not possible to com bine them into a eld strength tensor which Lorentz transform s appropriately. This is the source of the apparent asym $m$ etry betw een di erent com ponents of the equations of m otion

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { D G }=0 \text {; } \tag{6.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

the constraints hold identically, while the others do not.
H ow ever, the form alcon guration space theory (and not just the \physical" con guration
 Lorentz-invariant. In the form alcon guration space expression

$$
\begin{align*}
h \mathbb{C} \quad j i= & \left.D^{4} A \quad A^{\infty} ; t^{\infty}\right)[G] G[A] \\
& \left.\exp \quad i_{t^{0}}^{z} d t \quad t^{\infty} x \frac{z}{4} G^{a} G_{a} \quad A^{0} ; t^{0}\right) ; \tag{62}
\end{align*}
$$

$E$ and $B$ are treated on equal footing from a spactim e point of view as part of the tensor G . Lorentz invariance is broken in two ways, both conceming the initial and nal wave functionals and. First, they are attached on surfaces of constant coordinate tim e rather than arbitrary spacelike surfaces; second, the operator constraints ( $2 \overline{2}-1)$ on and treat $'=A^{0}$ and $A=A^{i} e_{i}$ unequally. In this section, we dem onstrate that these two problem s are related to one another, and show how the conditions satis ed by the wave functionals can be related to the surfaces on which they are evaluated.

W e can generalize ( $\overline{6} \bar{Z}_{2}^{\prime}$ ) to arbitrary (spacelike) in itial and nal surfaces in the straightforw ard $m$ anner:

$$
\begin{align*}
& h \mathcal{C} j i={ }^{Z} D^{4} A \quad \stackrel{h}{A}{ }^{(\infty)} ; \infty \quad[G] G[A] \\
& \left.e^{i}{ }^{R} 0^{\infty} d^{4} x L(x) \quad A\left({ }^{0}\right) ;{ }^{0}\right) \text {; } \tag{6.3}
\end{align*}
$$

where A ' ) is the restriction of the function A (x) (here the four-vector potential, but the de nition will apply to any function de ned over spacetim e) onto the three-surface, and the integral for the action is over the region bounded by ${ }^{0}$ and ${ }^{\infty}$. U sing the sum over all histories to de ne a propagator

$$
\begin{align*}
& G \stackrel{h}{G}\left({ }^{\infty}\right) \infty A^{(0)} 0 \\
& =\quad Z \quad D{ }^{4} A \quad[G] G[A] e^{R}{ }_{0}^{\infty}{ }_{0}^{\infty} d^{4} x L(x) \tag{6.4}
\end{align*}
$$

we can go from a wave functional de ned on one spacelike surface to one de ned on another:

[^13]\[

$$
\begin{align*}
& h \\
A^{(\infty)} ; & \infty  \tag{6.5}\\
& Z^{(0)} \\
= & D^{4} A{ }^{(0)} G A\left(^{(\infty)} \infty A^{(0)} 0 \quad A^{(0)} ; 0\right. \text { : }
\end{align*}
$$
\]

The class operators de ned from ( $\overline{6}$ ( $\mathbf{N}_{3}$ ) for di erent choices of intial and nal surfaces are the sam e so long as all the spaœtim e points fxg at which the coarse grainings restrict the elds A ( x ) still lie in between the initial and nal surfaces.

The conditions satis ed by the wave functionalare a consequence of the gauge invariance of the path integral for the propagator, as discussed in [1] the 3-surface and specifying its embedding in the at M inkow skispace as fx $f{ }^{i} g g$, the $m$ etric on the surface $w i l l$ be

$$
\begin{align*}
& d s^{2}=\frac{@ x}{@{ }^{i}} d^{i} \frac{@ x}{@ j^{j}} d^{j}=h_{i j} d^{i} d^{j} ;  \tag{6.6}\\
& h_{i j}=\frac{@ x}{@^{i}} \frac{@ x}{@^{j}}: \tag{6}
\end{align*}
$$

The condition that be spacelike $m$ eans that the three $m$ etric $f_{i j} g$ is positive de nite, so that the volum e elem ent on is

$$
\begin{equation*}
d^{3}=d^{3} \bar{h} ; \tag{6.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $h=\operatorname{detfh}_{i j} g$. N ow the restriction of $A(x)$ onto is de ned by $A^{(1)}()=A(x())$, and is a function of the three coordinates $f{ }^{i} g$ alone. This is the rst argum ent of the wave functional $\mathbb{A}() ;$ ). Equation ( $\overline{6} \cdot \overline{-2})$ shows that the dependence of on its rst argum ent is the sam e as the dependence of the propagator $G$ on its rst argum ent. Since the path integral in ( $\overline{6} . \overline{4})$ is invariant under gauge transform ations on $A$, the propagator $m$ ust be invariant under the e ects of those gauge transform ations on $A\left({ }^{( }\right)$and $A\left({ }^{(0)}\right.$. Since the gauge transform ation

$$
\begin{equation*}
A^{a}=r \quad a \quad f_{a b}^{f} A^{c} \quad b \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

is nonlocal, the change in A ') cannot be described by using only the restriction () ( ) =
( $x()$ ) of the gauge transform ation param eter onto the surface. To identify the troublesom e com ponent of the gradient which introduces values of 0 of, it is usefiul to de ne a projection tensor

$$
\begin{equation*}
=\frac{@^{i}}{@ x} \frac{@ x}{@^{i}} ; \tag{6.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where @ ${ }^{i}=@ x$ is the gradient of with respect to $x$ lying in so that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{@^{i}}{@ x} \frac{@^{@}}{@^{j}}={ }_{j}^{i}: \tag{6.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

This also follows from the chain rule

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{@}{@^{i}}=\frac{@ x}{@^{i}} \frac{@}{@ x}: \tag{6.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

De ning a complem entary projection tensor =, we wish to project out the com ponents offA $g w$ ith and. Since $\operatorname{Tr}=3$ and $\operatorname{Tr}=1$, it is convenient to de ne projected objects w th the num ber of com ponents equal to the rank of the corresponding projection. Thus, projections along are m ore concisely de ned by sim ply projecting $w$ ith $@ x=@{ }^{i}$. De ning ${ }^{\text {ni8! }}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
@_{i}()=\frac{@ x}{@ \mathrm{i}^{\mathrm{i}}} \mathrm{~A}^{()}() \tag{6.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

and using ( $\left(\overline{6}=1 \overline{1}^{-1}\right)$, the com ponent of $(\overline{2} \bar{\prime} \bar{\prime})$ lying in is

$$
\begin{equation*}
@_{i}^{a}=\frac{@{ }_{a}^{(1)}}{@{ }^{i}} \operatorname{gf}_{a b}^{f} @_{i}^{c}{ }_{b}^{(1)} ; \tag{6.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is expressed entirely in term sof functions of .
To look at the projection of a four-vector by the rank-one, it is convenient to convert it into a scalar by dotting it into som e arbitrary tim elike vector $v$. $H$ ence the com ponent of A out of the surface is

$$
\begin{equation*}
()=v() A(x())=u() A(x()): \tag{6.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since has rank one, all possible vectors $u=v$ determ ined from di erent v's will be parallel to one another. Since

$$
\begin{equation*}
u \frac{d^{i}}{d x}=0 ; \tag{6.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

u m ust be parallel to the norm al to the surface . ( W e could choose it to be the norm al itself, but the norm alization factor w ill tum out to be irrelevant in what follow s.) Taking the dot product of $(\overline{2}, \bar{\prime})$ '1 $)$ w th $u$, and de ning

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\varrho}{@ u}=u \frac{@}{@ x} ; \tag{6.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
a=\frac{@}{a}^{!u} g_{a b}^{f^{e}}{ }_{b}^{(1)} \text {; } \tag{6.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

which cannot be determ ined from and (') alone.
$N$ ow, since the variation ofG $A() \quad A^{(0)} 0$ under a gauge transform ation $m$ ust vanish, this $m$ ust also be true for . That variation is given in term $s$ of the functional derivatives by

[^14]\[

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathbb{A}^{()}={ }^{z} d^{3} \frac{p}{h} \frac{D}{D A} A  \tag{6.17}\\
& \\
& =d^{z} d^{3} \bar{h} \frac{D}{D A^{()}} A^{()}+\frac{D}{D A^{()}} \quad A^{()}:
\end{align*}
$$
\]

In general, and willdepend on coordinate , but they will still com m ute with the gauge transform ation and the functional di erentiation D. Put otherw ise, the sam e am ount of inform ation is included in ( $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{g} ;$; ) as in $\mathrm{A}^{()} \mathrm{A}^{()} \boldsymbol{\prime}^{\prime}{ }^{()}$, so that $m$ ay be viewed as a functional of@ and, in which case ( 6.1

$$
\begin{align*}
& {[巴 ;]=d^{z}{ }^{p} \bar{h} \frac{D}{D @_{i}} \varrho_{i}+\frac{D}{D}} \tag{6.18}
\end{align*}
$$

Integrating the second term by parts and discarding the term at spatial in nity gives

For this to vanish for arbitrary ( x ), the coe cients of () () and ( $\left.\mathbb{Q}_{1}\right)^{()}$() must vanish separately. This leads to the generalization of (2 $\left.2 \overline{2} \overline{2}_{1}\right)$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.\frac{D}{D^{a}} \llbracket ; ;\right)=0  \tag{620a}\\
& \left.{ }_{a b} P^{1} \bar{h} \frac{@}{@}^{\mathrm{P}} \overline{\mathrm{~h}}+\mathrm{gf}_{a b}^{c} \complement_{i}^{c} \frac{\mathrm{D}}{\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{i}}^{\mathrm{b}}} \llbracket ; \text {; }\right)=0 \text { : } \tag{620~b}
\end{align*}
$$

Recognizing the form of the geom etric \oovariant divergence" on a curved $m$ anifold, we see that the general conditions are

$$
\begin{gather*}
\left.\frac{D}{D} \llbracket ; ;\right)=0  \tag{621a}\\
\left.D_{i} \frac{D}{D \varrho_{i}} \llbracket ; ;\right)=0 ; \tag{621b}
\end{gather*}
$$

where $D_{i}$ is the \covariant" gradient in both the gauge and geom etric senses of the w ord:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left(D_{i}{ }^{j}\right)_{a}=\frac{@_{a}^{j}}{@{ }^{i}}+{ }_{j k}^{j}{ }_{a}^{k}+g f_{a b}^{c} @_{i}^{c}{ }_{b}^{j} ;  \tag{622}\\
& \underset{j k}{j}=\frac{h^{j}}{2} \frac{@ h_{i}}{@^{k}}+\frac{@ h_{k},}{@ i} \frac{@ h_{i k}}{@} \text { ! }: \tag{6}
\end{align*}
$$

For the case of a surface of constant tim e, ( $\overline{6} \overline{2} \overline{2} \overline{1} \overline{1})$ reduces to $(\overline{2} \overline{2} \overline{2}-\overline{1})$.

So, if the initial and nal \tim es" are generalized to arbitrary spacelike surfaces, the conditions ( 6 ( $\overline{-} 2 \overline{1} \overline{1})$ ) obeyed by the initial and nalwave functionals do not truly break Lorentz invariance, since they depend only on the surfaces on which the states are attached, and not on any absolute time direction. Thus the entire theory can be form ulated in a manifestly Lorentz invariant way, at least form ally. W ith arbitrary initialand nalsurfaces, any lattice
 are doubtless di culties in de ning such integrals, but they are beyond the soope of the present work.

## V II. C O N C LU SIO N S

In this work, we have developed and exam ined the sum-over-histories form ulation of generalized quantum $m$ echanics for a nonabelian gauge theory in the absence of $m$ atter, which in addition to its inherent interest can be view ed as a toy $m$ odel for $E$ instein's general relativity. The path integrals have been explicitly de ned via an in nitesim al lattice, and shown to be gauge invariant.

The m ost general form of the theory allow s any set of gauge invariant phase space altematives to be assigned a decoherence functional. R estricting the altematives to the phase space im plem entations of the gauge electric and $m$ agnetic elds and the covariant derivative gives the \physical phase space form ulation". If instead only gauge invariant con guration space altematives are considered, we obtain a di erent subset of possible coarse grainings. $T$ his theory is form ally Lorentz-invariant as well. A further restriction to coarse grainings involving the con guration space im plem entations of gauge electric and $m$ agnetic elds and covariant derivative gives the \physical con guration space form ulation".

W e have show $n$ that the physical phase space form ulation agrees $w$ ith a reduced phase space canonical operator (or, as it is known in other works including lation, so long as the coarse grainings did not involve tim e derivatives. In particular, the nonabelian G auss's law constraint $D \quad=0$ is alw ays satis ed.

The physical con guration space form ulation behaves slightly di erently. O ne form ally de ned quantity which roughly corresponds to the longitudinalelectric eld $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{L}}$ from E \& M was shown to behave in the sam eway as $E_{L}$ did in the abelian theory. I.e., coarse grainings by this quantily which decohere predict that it vanishes. H ow ever, if one coarse grains by $m$ ore com plicated quantities related to the con guration space constraint $D \quad E$, that $m$ ay not be so. In E\&M, we have explicitly shown that for suitable in itial conditions, coarse grainings by one such quantity $\left.f g \mathbb{B}\left(\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)\right] \mathrm{HE}_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{i}^{2} g$ decohere and predict non-zero probabilities for the quantily not to vanish.

D espite the disagreem ent between the physical con guration space im plem entation and reduced phase space operator quantization, the sum -over-histories form ulation is still attractive, since it can be expressed in a manifestly Lorentz-invariant form. On the other hand, the operator theory gives special consideration to the tim e direction by singling out the constraint, which is just the tim elike com ponent of the equations ofm otion $D G=0$, to be identically satis ed.

Since the disagreem ent betw een the sum -over-histories theory and a natural extension of the operator theory com es about when the coarse graining involves quantities averaged
over a spactim e region, as opposed to the usual quantum m echanical expressions involving altematives de ned at a single $m$ om ent of tim e, perhaps the sum -over-histories and reduced phase space $m$ ethods should be seen as di erent generalizations of the previously tested formulations (in which the quantity considered here is not accessible). The Lorentz invariance of the sum -over-histories $m$ ethod then $m$ akes it the preferred generalization in light of the potential application to quantum gravity, as it takes one $m$ ore step tow ards elim inating the special role of tim e in the theory.

There is also som e question as to whether one could construct a physical apparatus to $m$ easure the involved quantity by which we coarse grained in section iN $\overline{\mathrm{D}} \mathrm{D}^{-}$; on a practical level, the elds are not directly m easurable, but only accessible through their interactions w ith charged particles. It is conceivable that the di erences betw een the sum-over-histories and operator form alism s are undetectable in their application to QED and QCD. H ow ever, it is reasonable to expect that the issues raised by the discrepancy between them will be relevant to a quantization of $G$. Is enforcem ent of the constraints $m$ ore fundam ental than $m$ anifest di eom orphism (here Lorentz) invariance, or should we only expect the constraints to be satis ed when the class of altematives considered singles out the corresponding tim e direction in its choige of surfaces?
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APPENDIX A: CALCULATION OF CLASS OPERATOR FOR SECTION
In this appendix we calculate

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.C=Y_{M=J}^{\left(y^{0} \quad Z\right.} D E^{M} \exp i t^{Z} d^{3} x \frac{1}{2} E^{M} 2^{\prime} \text { e } \mathbb{E}\right] ; \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
e \mathbb{E}]=^{z} d^{2 n} f \quad(f \quad h E i)
$$

describes the coarse graining by values of the $m$ ode average

$$
\begin{equation*}
h E i=\frac{1}{2}^{Z} d^{3} k E_{k}(t)=\underline{1}^{x} t^{z} d^{3} k E_{k}^{M}: \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

M 2
While $\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{x}$ ) is a real quantity, the Fourier transform

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{k}^{M}=\frac{Z}{(2)^{3=2}} e^{i k} \mathrm{E}^{M}(x) \tag{528}
\end{equation*}
$$

is com plex but constrained to obey $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{k}}=\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{k}}$. Integrating over the independent degrees of freedom in Fourier space necessitates the developm ent of $m$ ore notation. Letting a superscript of $R$ or I indicate the real or im aginary part, respectively, of a com plex num ber, and using the Jacobian determ inant calculated in appendix 'B' for the discrete Fourier transform, the path integralm easure is (using the in nite num erical constant de ned in appendix

$$
\begin{align*}
& D E^{M}={ }^{Y} N_{A} d E_{a}^{M}(X) \\
& \left.={\underset{a}{i} ; x}_{Y_{i} ;} N_{A} d E_{a}^{M R}(x) d E_{a}^{M I}(x) \mathbb{E}_{a}^{M I}(x)\right) \\
& =\begin{array}{ll}
Y & Y \\
a & N_{A} \frac{3_{k}}{3_{X}} d E_{a ; k}^{M R} d E_{a ; k}^{M}{ }^{I}
\end{array} \tag{A1}
\end{align*}
$$

where the ${ }^{Q}{ }_{1=2} \mathrm{~m}$ eans we are only taking the product over half the m odes (leaving out the redundant ones, whose spatial frequency is $m$ inus the spatial frequency of a $m$ ode already counted), so that ${ }_{x} f^{R}(x)$ and ${ }_{k}{ }_{k}=2 f_{k}^{R} f_{k}^{I}$ each have the sam e num ber of factors. $T$ he factor in ${ }^{Q}{ }_{1=2}$ for the zero $m$ ode ${ }^{n-1}$ is understood to be

$$
\begin{equation*}
{\frac{3_{x}}{3_{k}}}^{!=2}\left(\mathbb{E}_{a ; 0}^{M}\right): \tag{A1a}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e can use the delta fiunctions to perform the integrals over half of the Fourier com ponents so that

$$
\begin{align*}
D E^{M} & =Y \quad Y \quad{ }^{1=2} N_{A}^{2} \frac{{ }_{k}^{k}}{3_{X}} d E_{a ; k}^{M R} d E_{a ; k}^{M I} \\
& =n^{Y}{ }^{1=2} N_{A}^{2} \frac{3_{k}}{3_{X}}{ }^{n} d^{n} E_{k}^{M R} d^{n} E_{k}^{M I} \tag{A2}
\end{align*}
$$

[^15]w th the factor for the zero m ode understood to be
\[

$$
\begin{equation*}
N_{A}^{2}{\frac{Z_{k}}{3_{X}}}^{!{ }_{n=2}} d^{n} E_{0}^{M R}: \tag{A2a}
\end{equation*}
$$

\]

The relevant part of the Lagrangian is

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{1}{2}^{Z} d^{3} x E^{h}(x)^{i_{2}}=\frac{1}{2}^{Z} d^{3} x \quad E^{M}(x)^{2}=\frac{1}{2}^{Z} d^{3} k H_{K^{M}}{ }^{2} \tag{A3}
\end{align*}
$$

de ning ! $=t^{3} k$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
C= & Y^{0}{ }_{n}^{M=J}{ }^{Y}{ }^{M}=2 N_{A}^{2}{\frac{J_{k}}{Z_{X}}}^{l_{n}} \\
& d^{n} E_{k}^{M R} d^{n} E_{k}^{M I} \exp i!E_{k}^{M R}{ }^{2}+E_{k}^{M I^{2}} \\
& e \mathbb{E}]: \tag{A4}
\end{align*}
$$

If we use as a mode label, combining $M$ and $k$,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{e} \underset{\mathbb{Z}}{\mathbb{E}]} \\
& =d^{Z} f^{R} d^{n} f^{I n} f^{R} \quad!_{2}^{X} E^{R} \quad{ }^{n} f^{I} \quad!_{2}^{X} E^{I} \\
& ={ }^{Z} d^{2 n} f{ }^{2 n} f!_{2}^{X} E \tag{A5}
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& C=N_{(J+1)^{Y}} \quad N_{A}^{2} \frac{X^{3}}{3_{k}} n^{n} \\
& \left.{ }^{Z} d^{n} E^{R} d^{n} E^{I} \exp \text { i! } E^{R}{ }^{2}+E^{I^{2}} \quad \text { ! } \mathbb{E}\right]:
\end{aligned}
$$

W e can factor the product in $(\bar{A} \overline{\mathrm{~A}})$ into a product over m odes in and one over m odes not in . The latter is a constant which is the sam e for all altematives fc $g$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
& K=N_{Z(J+1)}^{Y} N_{A}^{2} \frac{{ }^{3} X}{3_{k}}{ }^{!} \\
& { }^{Z} d^{n^{R} E^{R}} d^{n} E^{I} \exp \text { i! } E^{R^{2}}+E^{I^{2}} \text { ! ; } \tag{A7}
\end{align*}
$$

which leaves

$$
\begin{align*}
& C=K \quad N_{A}^{2}{\frac{{ }_{X}}{X_{k}}}_{{ }^{!}{ }_{n}} \\
& { }^{2} \mathrm{Z} \\
& d^{n} E^{R} d^{n} E^{I} \exp i!\quad E^{R}{ }^{2}+E^{I^{2}} \\
& \text { Z } \\
& d^{2 n} f{ }^{2 n} \underbrace{}_{2} E \quad: \tag{A8}
\end{align*}
$$

If we de ne $N={ }^{P} \quad 1$ to be the num ber of $m$ odes in , and write all the $m$ odes of $E$ in as a 2 N -com ponent colum n vector:

$$
\begin{equation*}
E=E^{R} \tag{A9}
\end{equation*}
$$

we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& d^{2 n} f{ }^{2 n} \quad \underbrace{X} \quad E \quad: \tag{A10}
\end{align*}
$$

$W$ e de ne a colum $n$ vector to be the discrete Fourier transform of $E$ :
[T his is a rigorous version of the traditional treatm ent of the com plex and as independent variables; the $m$ iddle $m$ atrix of the product of three is the one which would be used to convert the colum $n$ vector $\underset{E_{\text {tk }}}{E_{\text {tk }}}$ to ${ }_{w y}{ }_{w y}$.] The zero components of are

$$
\begin{equation*}
00=\underline{!}_{2}^{\mathrm{X}} \mathrm{E}=\mathrm{hEi}: \tag{A12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $M$ is a realm atrix which is the product of three $m$ atrioes, each of which is proportional to a unitary $m$ atrix, it $m$ ust be proportional to an orthogonal (ie., real and unitary) m atrix M. The calculation in appendix ' ${ }^{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{M}$. yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{det} M=N^{N}=(\operatorname{det} M)\left(\mathbb{N}^{1=2}\right)^{2 N} ; \tag{A13}
\end{equation*}
$$

so we have $M=M \stackrel{P}{=} \bar{N}$. Thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }^{2}=E^{T R} M^{T R} M E=\frac{E^{T R} M{ }^{T R} M E}{N}=\frac{E^{2}}{N} ; \tag{A14}
\end{equation*}
$$

so ! $\mathrm{E}^{2}=\mathrm{N}!{ }^{2}=\quad{ }^{2}$ and


Factoring all the $f$ wy except the zero mode into the constant, and using the delta function to do the 00 integrals, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
C=K^{0} \quad d^{2 n} f e^{i \operatorname{jf} \text { 予 }}: \tag{A16}
\end{equation*}
$$

APPENDIX B: CALCULATION OF JACOBIAN DETERM INANTSFOR D ISCRETEFOURIERTRANSFORMS
$G$ İven a complex function $f(x)$ of a $D$ dim ensional variable $x=f x j=1 ; 2 ;:: D g$, if we de ne $f$ only on a spatial lattioe $w$ ith $N$ lattioe points in the direction (and thus $Q_{=1} N \quad N$ total lattioe points), we have a vector

$$
f=\begin{align*}
& f_{x}^{R}  \tag{B1}\\
& f_{x}^{I}
\end{align*}
$$

w ith 2 N real com ponents. Ifwe take the Fourier transform (see [ī్] ] for a general treatm ent of the discrete F ourier transform )

$$
\begin{equation*}
F_{k}={ }_{x}^{X} e^{i k} \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{x}} ; \tag{B2}
\end{equation*}
$$

there is a corresponding $m$ atrix transform ation ${ }_{-}^{1201}$ on $R^{2 N}$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
& \begin{array}{ccc} 
& i^{\prime} & f_{x}^{R} \\
1 & \text { i } & f_{x}^{I} \\
& & f_{x}^{I}
\end{array} \tag{B3}
\end{align*}
$$

or

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{F}=\mathrm{Mf} \mathrm{f}: \tag{B}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^16]The Jacobian of this transform ation is given by detM. Since the rst and third of the three $m$ atrioes ofw hich $M$ is a product are inverses ofeach other and the second is block diagonal, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& =\operatorname{det}_{N} \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{k}} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{ix}} \mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{ik} \mathrm{y}^{2}} \\
& =\operatorname{det}_{N}\left(\mathbb{N} x_{Y}\right)=N^{N} \text { : } \tag{B4}
\end{align*}
$$

To apply this to the transform ations in section $\overline{\bar{V}} \bar{C}$, we need to take into account the nom alization constants. In the discrete case, (528) becom es

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{a ; k}^{M}=x_{x}^{x} \frac{x^{x}}{(2)^{3=2}} e^{i k} \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{a}}^{M}(x) \tag{B5}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the Jacobian is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{N}^{\mathrm{N}}{\frac{{ }^{3} \mathrm{X}}{(2)^{3=2}}}^{{ }_{2 N}} \tag{B6}
\end{equation*}
$$

N ow, the relationship between ${ }^{3} x$, the number of spatial lattice sites $N$, and the lattice spacing ${ }^{3} \mathrm{k}$ in spatial frequency can be deduced by geom etric argum ents, but the sim plest $m$ ethod is to note that

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{a}^{M}(x)={ }_{k}^{x} \frac{3_{k}}{(2)^{3=2}} e^{i x} E_{a ; k}^{M} \tag{B7}
\end{equation*}
$$

and hence

$$
\begin{align*}
& \begin{array}{l}
\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{a}}^{\mathrm{R}}(\mathrm{x}) \\
\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{a}}^{\mathrm{MI}}(\mathrm{x})
\end{array}=\begin{array}{ll}
\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \\
\frac{1}{2 i} & \frac{1}{2 i}
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{ccc}
\frac{3_{k}}{(2)^{3=2}} e^{\text {ix } k} & 0 & 1 \\
0 & \frac{3_{k}}{(2)^{3=2}} e^{\text {ix }} \mathrm{k}^{\text {A }}
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{cc}
0 & \frac{3_{X}}{(2)^{3=2}} e^{i k} y \\
0 & d \frac{3_{X}}{(2)^{3=2}}! \\
& 0
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{lcl}
1 & i & E_{a}^{M R}(y)! \\
1 & i & E_{a}^{M I}(y)
\end{array} \text { : } \tag{B8}
\end{align*}
$$

Taking the determ inant, we nd
or

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{N}=\frac{(2)^{3}}{3_{k}^{3} \mathrm{x}} \tag{B10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Substituting into $(\bar{B} \overline{-} \overline{\mathrm{G}})$, we see that the Jacobian is
so that

$$
\begin{align*}
& ={ }_{k}^{Y} \frac{3_{k}}{3_{X}} d^{k} E_{a ; k}^{M R} d E_{a ; k}^{M} ; \tag{B12}
\end{align*}
$$

which is the correct factor for $(\underline{A}-\overline{1} \overline{1})$ ).
Equation ( $\bar{A}{ }^{-1} 1$ I' $)$ also involves the Jacobian for the transform ation of the delta functions

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{Y} \quad\left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{a}}^{\mathrm{M}}(\mathrm{X})\right) .  \tag{B13}\\
& \mathrm{x}
\end{align*}
$$

into

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
Y  \tag{B14}\\
1=2 & E_{a ; k}^{M R} \quad E_{d ; k}^{R} \quad E_{a ; k}^{M I}+E_{a ; k}^{M I}: \\
\text { : }
\end{array}
$$

To determ ine that, de ne $F_{k}=F_{k} \quad F_{k}$ and observe that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{Y} d f_{\mathrm{X}}^{\mathrm{R}} d f_{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{I}}=N^{N}{ }^{Y} d F_{k}^{R} d F_{k}^{I} \\
& \text { x } \\
& =N^{N}{ }^{Y^{k}} \quad 1=2 d F_{k}^{R} d F_{k}^{R} d F_{k}^{I} d F^{I}{ }_{k} \\
& =N^{N}{ }_{k}^{Y}{ }_{1=2} \frac{d F_{k}^{R+} d F_{k}^{R}}{2} \frac{d F_{k}^{I+} d F_{k}^{I}}{2} \text {; } \tag{B15}
\end{align*}
$$

so

$$
\begin{array}{lclllll}
Y & \left(f_{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{R}}\right) & \left(f_{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{I}}\right) \\
\mathrm{x} & \mathrm{~N}^{\mathrm{Y}}  \tag{B16}\\
=\mathrm{N}^{\mathrm{Y}} & { }^{1=2} 2 & \left(F_{k}^{R+}\right) & \left(\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{k}}^{\mathrm{R}}\right) 2 & \left(F_{k}^{\mathrm{I}+}\right) & \left(\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{k}}^{\mathrm{I}}\right):
\end{array}
$$

W e assum e by sym $m$ etry that $w$ hen we factor the Jacobian splits evenly:

$$
\begin{array}{lllll}
Y & \left(f_{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{R}}\right)=\mathrm{N}^{\mathrm{N}=2^{Y}}{ }^{1=2} 2 & \left(\mathrm{~F}_{\mathrm{k}}^{\mathrm{R}+}\right) & \left(\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{k}}^{\mathrm{I}}\right) \\
\mathrm{Y} & & \left(\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{I}}\right)=\mathrm{N}^{\mathrm{N}=2^{\mathrm{Y}}}{ }^{1=2} 2 & \left(\mathrm{~F}_{\mathrm{k}}^{\mathrm{R}}\right) & \left(\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{k}}^{\mathrm{I}+}\right) ;
\end{array}
$$

this m eans that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.\mathrm{Y} \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{a}}^{\mathrm{M}}(\mathrm{x})\right) \tag{B18}
\end{align*}
$$

is not quite equal to $2^{\mathrm{N}=2}$ because the analysis above does not go through for the zero m ode and som em odes on the boundary (see footnote', $1 \overline{1} 9,1$, page ' $14 \overline{4} \overline{4}$ ') which are identi ed w ith their im ages. In those cases, the analysis produces the sam e Jacobian, only w thout the factor of 2. At any rate, is a constant, and its precise value is unim portant.

The determ inant of the transform ation ( (AA $\overline{-} \overline{1} \overline{1})$ ) is even $m$ ore straightforw ard. There the num ber ofm odes is just $N=\rceil$, and the determ inant is thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
\underline{!}^{2 N} N^{N}=N^{N}: \tag{B19}
\end{equation*}
$$

APPENDIX C:CALCULATION OF THEDECOHERENCEFUNCTIONALFOR SECTION NIN THE PRESENCEOFA GAUSSIAN IN ITIALSTATE

H ere we calculate the decoherence functional ( $\overline{5} .4 \bar{d}$ ) for an in itial state where p (b) [cf. $(5-\overline{4}-\mathrm{G})]$ is a $G$ aussian in $B=\frac{1}{b}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
p\left(B^{1}\right)=A \quad(B \quad) e^{B^{2}=2^{2}}: \tag{C1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then (5. $5.4 \overline{-a}$ a') becom es

$$
\begin{align*}
G(y) /{ }^{Z_{1}} d B e^{i} y B & e^{B^{2}=2^{2}}  \tag{C2}\\
& =1(y)+e^{(y)^{2}=2^{Z_{1}}} d B e^{\left(B i^{2} y\right)^{2}=2^{2}} ;
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
1(y)=\int_{0}^{Z} d B e^{B^{2}=2^{2}} e^{i y B} \tag{C3}
\end{equation*}
$$

satis es

$$
\begin{equation*}
j_{1}(y) j<\quad: \tag{C4}
\end{equation*}
$$

The second term in $(\bar{C}-\overline{3})$ can be m assaged by deform ation of contour to give

$$
\begin{equation*}
G(y) / \quad \underline{s} \underline{I}(y)+G_{R}(y)+i G_{I}(y) ; \tag{C5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
G_{R}(y)=e^{(y)^{2}=2} \tag{C5a}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
G_{I}(y)={ }^{\frac{s}{2}} \sum_{0}^{z} d z e^{()^{2}\left(z^{2} \quad y^{2}\right)=2}: \tag{C5b}
\end{equation*}
$$

If we choose the bins to be of a uniform size :

$$
\text { J } \quad[J ;(J+1)) ; \quad 0 \quad J 2 \text { Z ; }
$$

we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \operatorname{ReD}\left(J ; J^{0}\right) /{ }_{J_{S}}^{Z} d f{ }_{J^{0}}^{Z\left(J^{0}+1\right)} d f^{0} e^{()^{2}\left(f f^{0}\right)^{2}=2} \\
& +\quad{ }^{J_{S}} \overline{2}{ }_{2}\left(\mathrm{~J}^{\mathrm{J}^{0}} \mathrm{~J}^{0} \boldsymbol{;}\right) \quad{ }^{2} \text {; } \tag{C7}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\left.=2^{2(\mathrm{~J}} \mathrm{J}_{\mathrm{Z}}^{\mathrm{J} \boldsymbol{i})} \mathrm{J}+1\right) \quad \mathrm{df}{ }_{\mathrm{J}^{0}}^{\mathrm{Z}} \mathrm{~J}^{0}+1\right) \quad \mathrm{df}^{0} \operatorname{Re}{ }_{1}\left(\mathrm{f} \quad \mathrm{f}^{0}\right) \tag{C8}
\end{equation*}
$$

again satis es

$$
\begin{equation*}
j_{2}(J \quad \text { Jo; }) j<\quad: \tag{C9}
\end{equation*}
$$

$M$ aking a suitable change of variables and factoring out ${ }^{2}$, we obtain
where $D$ is the contribution to the double integral from $\quad\left[\begin{array}{llll}f & f & (J \quad G)\end{array}\right]\left(J \quad J^{0}\right)>0$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
D \quad(J)=\int_{0}^{Z_{1}} \mathrm{~d}(1 \quad) \exp \left[\quad()^{2}(J \quad)^{2}=2\right] \tag{C10a}
\end{equation*}
$$



$$
\begin{align*}
D_{+}(J) & e^{(\quad)^{2}(J)^{2}=2^{Z} 1} d \quad\left(1 \quad e^{(\quad)^{2}=2}\right. \\
= & e^{(\quad)^{2}(J)^{2}=2} D_{+}(0): \tag{C11}
\end{align*}
$$

From the de nition $(\overline{\mathrm{C}} \overline{1} \overline{0} \mathbf{a})$ it is evident that $\mathrm{D} \quad(0)=\mathrm{D}_{+}(0)$. For J 1 ,

$$
\begin{align*}
D \quad(J)= & Z_{1}^{Z_{1}} d \operatorname{expf}(\quad)^{2}\left[\left(\begin{array}{ll}
J & 1)+]^{2}=2 g \\
& e^{(\quad)^{2}(J \quad 1)^{2}=2} D \quad(1):
\end{array}\right.\right.
\end{align*}
$$

C om bining these results, we sed

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\operatorname{ReD}(J+J ; J)}{D(J ; J)} \frac{e^{(\quad)^{2} j J j^{2}=2} D+(0)+e^{(\quad)^{2}(j J j 1)^{2}=2 D \quad(1)+{ }^{q} \overline{2=} 2(J ;)=}}{2 D+(0)+{ }^{q} \overline{2=} 2(J ;)=}: \tag{C13}
\end{equation*}
$$

So we have reduced the question of whether we have weak decoherence [jReD (J + J) j $D(J ; J)$ for $J \in 0]$ to a calculation of $D+(0)$ and $D(1)$. It is straightforw ard to show

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { D } \quad(1)=\frac{1 e^{(\quad)^{2}=2}}{()^{2}} \tag{C14}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{+}(0)=\frac{q \overline{=2}}{} \text { erf } p_{\overline{2}} \quad D(1) ; \tag{C15}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\operatorname{erf}(z)$ is the error fiunction $\operatorname{erf}(z)=p^{2}=R_{0} e^{t^{2}} d t$, which satis es erf $(1)=1$ and erfz $1 \quad e^{z^{2}}$. Thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
D+(0) & \frac{r}{2} \frac{1}{\left.e^{( }\right)^{2}=2} \frac{\left.1 e^{( }\right)^{2}=2}{()^{2}} \\
= & 1 e^{(\quad)^{2}=2} \frac{e^{2} 1^{1}}{()^{2}}:
\end{aligned}
$$

Thism eans that if the cuto $<e^{()^{2}=2,(13)}$ ( becom es, to low est order in e ()$^{2}=2$,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{\operatorname{ReD}(J+J ; J)}{D(J ; J)} \\
< & \frac{\exp \left[(\quad)^{2}(j J j \quad 1)^{2}=2 \mathbb{D} \quad(1)\right.}{2 D+(0)}+0 \quad- \\
< & \frac{\exp \left[(\quad)^{2}(j J j \quad 1)^{2}=2\right]}{P}+0- \tag{C17}
\end{align*}
$$

For large, the -dependent term will not be relevent to the issue of decoherence.

[^17]
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## FIGURES

FIG.1. The regions of integration of generalG ( $f \quad f^{9}$ ) to produce the decoherence functional $D\left(J ; J^{0}\right)$ via $\left[\begin{array}{c}{[5]} \\ 5\end{array}\right)$. If $(y)$ is negligible for $\dot{y} j^{>}$, integrals of $(y)$ over regions tw o orm ore spots ○ the diagonal ( $\bar{j} \quad J^{0} j \quad 2$ ) willbe negligible. Squares on the diagonal ( $J=J^{0}$ ) have a region of area $2{ }^{2}$ over which $G(y)$ is appreciable. Squares one spoto the diagonal ( $j J \quad J^{0} j=1$ ) include som e non-negligible values of $G(y)$, but only in a triangular region of area ${ }^{2}=2$. Thus $D(J ; J \quad 1)$ should be suppressed by a factor of $=$ relative to $D(J ; J) . C$ om pare $F i g .1$ of

FIG. 2. The regions of integration for $D(j J j)$. Because of the exponential dropo in ReG ( $f \quad f^{0}$ ) as one $m$ oves tow ards larger if $f^{0} j D+(j J j$ is reduced from $D+(0)$ by a factor ofe ()$^{2}(J)^{2}=2$, and $D \quad(j J \mathcal{J})$ is reduced from $D \quad(1)$ by a factor ofe ()$^{2}(J \quad 1)^{2}=2$.


Figure 1, Whelan


Figure 2, Whelan


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ R ecent w ork [6ָㅜㅜ] considers decoherence e ects in the quantum cosm ology ofm assive gauge elds, H ow ever, that work di ens from the present enterprise in that the gauge elds are there seen as a m odel of $m$ atter coupled to gravity, while we consider m assless gauge elds as a toy model for vacuum gravity itself. Even m ore signi cant is that while they study decoherence e ects, it is in the context of a W K B quantization schem e, rather than a generalized quantum mechanics or consistent histories approach.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ This is not in the sense of lattice gauge theory with its Euclidean lattice, W ilson loops, etc., but
    

[^2]:    ${ }^{3} R$ epeated indiges are sum $m$ ed over.

[^3]:    ${ }^{4} \mathrm{~W}$ e establish the convention here that the argum ents of functionals are enclosed in square brackets, and that a eld w ith a prim e or index such as $A^{\infty}$ or $A^{M}$ indicates a eld con guration as a function of spatial position $x$ only, while an unadomed eld such as A refers to a function de ned for all spactim e points $x$.

    5 [A ${ }^{0} ; t^{0}$ ) is a functional of eld con gurations $f A^{0}(x) g$ and a function of tim $e t^{0}$, whence the hybrid parentheses.

[^4]:    ${ }^{6}$ It should be stated once again that we are not doing Lattice $G$ auge $T$ heory in anything like the usual sense. The action is expressed directly in term s of elds de ned at each lattice point and not in term s of the \links" de ning a \plaquette". In addition, our spacetim e lattice is Lorentzian rather than Euclidean.

[^5]:    ${ }^{7}$ Throughout this paper we w ill neglect any global issues such as the G ribov am biguity [9] and assum e that elds can be taken to vanish at spatial in nity.
    ${ }^{8}$ It is worth pointing out once explicitly that the covariant gradient D behaves like the ordinary gradient under integration by parts. Exam ining $D={ }_{a} r a_{a}+f_{a b}^{c} a b{ }^{A}{ }_{c}$, we see that the rst term integrates by parts as usual, and the second term also picks up a m inus sign under the interchange of and due to the antisym $m$ etry of $f_{a b}^{c}$. Thus $D=r() \quad D$.

[^6]:    ${ }^{9}$ The reason why there are $J+3$ gauge conditions ${ }^{n} G^{M}$ is $m$ ost easily seen in the tem poral gauge' 0 . On a lattioe this corresponds to the $J+2$ conditions $\prime^{M}=0 ; 0 \quad M \quad J+1$. H ow ever, there is residual gauge freedom in the tem poral gauge, since a gauge transform ation by a param eter $(x)[5 e(\underline{2}, \overline{1}]$ which is independent of the tim t w ill preserve the tem poral gauge condition' 0 . To com pletely $x$ the gauge, then, we would need to specify one other quantity over all space at a particular time. This is the last of the $J+3$ gauge conditions.

[^7]:    ${ }^{10}$ D i erent choiges of operator ordering will typically lead to di erent lattice realizations than the one in (3. ${ }^{-1}$ ), although no system atic description of the correspondence is known to the author. $T$ wo sim ple exam ples of altemate operator ordering are one in which all the $\mathbb{R}$ 's are placed to the right of all the $b$ 's and one in which the $b$ 's are to the right of the fl 's. The form er will lead to a lattice expression in which ${ }^{M}$ and $A^{M}$ are associated $w$ ith $A^{M}$, while the latter will associate
    ${ }^{M}$ and $A^{M}$ w th $A^{M+1}$. W eyl ordering is preferable to either of these two because the m idpoint rule to which it leads does not pick out the future or the past as a preferred direction in tim e. Them idpoint rule was also originally advocated by Feynm an fequation (20) in [1] $\overline{1} 1]$ g as the natural skeletonization of a path.

[^8]:    ${ }^{11}$ It is possible to show that we can alw ays reach this gauge, via an argum ent analogous to that used in [1] [4] to show that one can alw ays reach the C oulom b gauge in a NAGT.

[^9]:    ${ }^{12} \mathrm{~T}$ he factor of i is necessary to m ake $\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{x})$ a real quantity. In $\mathrm{E} \& \mathrm{M}$, this change of variables is just changing to $\mathrm{E}=\quad \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{L}}$ where $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{L}}$ is the (scalar) longitudinal part of the electric eld.

[^10]:     $@_{n}{ }^{1} r$ ? $\quad$, which is independent ofA? so that $\frac{1}{2}\left({ }_{n} \mathbb{A} \text { ? ; ? }\right)^{2}$ can be unam biguously converted into an operator expression.
    ${ }^{14} \mathrm{H}$ ere we abuse the m ism atched-parentheses notation slightly. $\mathrm{C} \quad\left[\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{T}} \mathrm{D}^{\infty} \mathrm{m}_{-\mathrm{A}}{ }_{T}^{0} t^{0}\right.$ ) is a functional of $A^{\infty}$ and $A^{0}$ and a function of $t^{\infty}$ and $t^{0}$.

[^11]:    ${ }^{15}$ Since it involves a tim e average, this sort of altemative is not accessible in a standard operator-and-state form ulation of quantum $m$ echanics.

[^12]:    ${ }^{16} \mathrm{~T}$ he attentive reader m ay notice that we are im plicitly expressing our coarse graining in term s of A as though it corresponded to $A$ on a single lattice slice $A{ }^{I}$ rather than an average $\bar{A}^{I}$, as we were instructed to do in section ininici.'. This is not a problem, because, as discussed earlier, the $^{\text {In }}$ operator ordering am biguities that led us to $m$ ake the distinction betw een the two are not present in $E \& M$.

[^13]:    ${ }^{17}$ A gain, the $m$ ixed-parentheses notation is stretched som ew hat here; $G A{ }^{(0)} \omega^{\infty} A\left({ }^{0}\right)$ is a functional of the potentials $A\left({ }^{0}\right)$ and $A\left({ }^{(0)}\right.$ and a \function" of the spacelike surfaces ${ }^{0}$ and ${ }^{\infty}$.

[^14]:    ${ }^{18} \mathrm{~W}$ e call this $@_{i}$ rather than $A_{i}^{()}$to em phasize that the com ponents $@_{1} ; @_{2} ; @_{3}$ are de ned w ith respect to the coordinates ${ }^{1} ;{ }^{2} ;{ }^{3}$ lying in the surface and are not in general the spatial com ponents $\mathrm{A}_{1}^{(1)} ; \mathrm{A}_{2}^{(1)} ; \mathrm{A}_{3}^{()}$de ned w ith respect to the cartesian spatial coordinates $\mathrm{x}^{1} ; \mathrm{x}^{2} ; \mathrm{x}^{3}$.

[^15]:    ${ }^{19}$ T here w illtypically also bem odes on the boundary of spatial frequency space which are identi ed w ith the corresponding $m$ odes on the opposite boundary, and so that for these $k$ 's $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{k}}=\mathrm{E} \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{k}}$ asw ith the zero m ode $\mathrm{k}=0$. For exam ple, in the discrete Fourier transform on a one-dim ensional lattice [1] 1 ] w ith an even number N of points, the m odes of frequency $1=2 \mathrm{~N}$ and $1=2 \mathrm{~N}$ (the Nyquist critical frequency and its in age) are identi ed, so the situation is analogous to that of the zero $m$ ode. The identi cation, when com bined w ith the condition $E_{k}=E_{k}$, requires that the Fourier com ponents on the boundary be real. The boundary is not a region of interest to us in spatial frequency space, and we assum e that the prescription for those factors is sim ilar to the one for the zero m ode.

[^16]:    ${ }^{20}$ A s w th $\left(\bar{A} 1 \overline{1} \frac{1}{1}\right)$, this treatm ent is the $m$ ore careful analog of treating $f_{x}$ and $f_{x}$ as independent variables.

[^17]:    

