

# Three Dimensional Canonical Quantum Gravity

Hans-Jürgen Matschull

Department of Mathematics, King's College London,  
Strand, London WC2R 2LS, England

June 28, 1995

## Abstract

General aspects of vielbein representation, ADM formulation and canonical quantization of gravity are reviewed using pure gravity in three dimensions as a toy model. The classical part focusses on the role of observers in general relativity, which will later be identified with quantum observers. A precise definition of gauge symmetries and a classification of inequivalent solutions of Einstein's equations in dreibein formalism is given as well. In the quantum part the construction of the physical Hilbert space is carried out explicitly for a torus and cylinder type space manifold, which has not been done so far. Some conceptual problems of quantum gravity are discussed from the point of view of an observer sitting inside the universe.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Mathematics</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1	Covering manifold and loop group . . . . .	4
1.2	Symmetry algebras and groups . . . . .	8
<b>2</b>	<b>Kinematics</b>	<b>12</b>
2.1	Dreibein gravity as a theory of local observers . . . . .	13
2.2	Transport operators and geodesics . . . . .	16
2.3	Spinors, test particles, and measurements . . . . .	19
2.4	Singular metrics and conical singularities . . . . .	22
<b>3</b>	<b>Classical Dynamics</b>	<b>24</b>
3.1	Lagrangian and boundary conditions . . . . .	26
3.2	Poisson brackets, gauge symmetries and constraint algebra . . . . .	32
3.3	Solving the constraints . . . . .	35
3.4	Cylinder spacetimes . . . . .	40
<b>4</b>	<b>Canonical Quantization</b>	<b>45</b>
4.1	Quantum operators and constraints . . . . .	46
4.2	Physical states . . . . .	48
4.3	Observables . . . . .	50
<b>5</b>	<b>Quantum Physics</b>	<b>58</b>
5.1	Astronomy, clocks, and time evolution . . . . .	58
5.2	Hermitian operators and the Hilbert space . . . . .	63
5.3	Torus quantization . . . . .	66

## Why three dimensional canonical gravity?

When you started to learn quantum mechanics as a student, you have certainly studied some of the “toy models” appearing in every introductory lecture and every book on quantum physics. These standard examples not only provide very useful models to explain the “canonical construction” for the quantum state space of a system which is classically defined by an action principle. They also played an important role in the development of quantum mechanics itself. Nowadays we are looking for a quantum theory of gravity, and maybe we can learn something from quantum mechanics. What makes the development of quantum gravity a bit different, is that up to now, and possibly also in the near future, there are no “key observations” waiting to be explained. Instead, it is merely the lack of a mathematically consistent theory of physics at the Planck scale that forces us to look for a quantum theory of gravity. It is Einstein’s classical theory that is in contradiction with quantum physics at small length or high energy scales. Nevertheless there are a few standard toy models which are not so different from those considered in quantum mechanics, and studying these can help us to get some ideas of how quantum gravity might work and what its main principles are.

The hydrogen atom of quantum gravity is certainly the radiating black hole. Explaining the Hawking radiation, which might in some sense be considered as a key *observation*, within the framework of a mathematically consistent model would probably be one of the main steps towards a quantum theory of gravity, just like the explanation of the stability and discrete energy states of the hydrogen atom was a milestone for quantum mechanics. What we have so far are various semi-classical or perturbative models describing Hawking radiation as quantum effects occurring at horizons in classical spacetimes, or lower dimensional toy models with very special matter fields that allow a consistent quantization and behave similar to black holes in four dimensions. Coming back to quantum mechanics, these models should be compared with the Bohr model of the hydrogen atom. It already gave an intuitive understanding of some properties of atoms, but it was not based on a fully consistent theory. However, this article is not about the hydrogen atom. It is about the harmonic oscillator.

Like the harmonic oscillator in quantum mechanics, three dimensional pure gravity is a very nice model to study some of the main features of quantum gravity. It has all the typical features of gravity which are not present in other field theories like, e.g., quantum electrodynamics. On the other hand, all the technical difficulties normally appearing in quantum field theories are absent. For example, we do not need to renormalize the fields, all relevant operators will be well defined without regularization. In addition, complete solutions at both the classical and the quantum level can be given explicitly, so we can study the principal questions having explicit classical solutions and a well defined Hilbert space of quantum states (for a review on principal problems of quantum gravity see, e.g., [1, 2, 3]). In fact, some of these conceptual problems of quantum gravity can be solved for this toy model, and one can expect that similar solutions also exist in the four dimensional theory.

Gravity is different from other field theories mainly because of its background structure. Typical field theories, including the standard model, are based on a flat Minkowski space, and the resulting global Poincaré symmetry also plays a crucial role in any explicit calculation in these theories. It is especially the existence of particles and the perturbative approach based thereon that made the standard model so successful. There are several reasons why many attempts to quantize gravity in a similar way failed. First of all, there is no such background structure like Minkowski space in general relativity. There are no particles and no special field configuration which could serve as a starting point for perturbation theory. Moreover, even if one artificially introduces a background and describes gravity as a perturbation around a fixed metric, the resulting quantum theory turns out not to be renormalizable. Whereas this could be merely a technical difficulty, there is another and maybe deeper reason for the failure of these “covariant” quantization methods. When applied to a gauge theory, most of them require some kind of gauge fixing, but one always tries to keep the manifest Poincaré symmetry. It has even become a criterion for a good quantum field theory to be

manifestly Poincaré covariant. It is a priori not clear how this could work in general relativity, where the Poincaré group *is* the gauge group and a global Poincaré symmetry does not exist in general.

So we should either look for something completely new, like string theory, or, and this is what we are going to do here, go back to the early days of quantum physics, forgetting everything we know about quantum field theory in Minkowski space, and try to construct a quantum theory of Einstein gravity. Thereby we will use the main ideas of quantum physics but not the sophisticated methods of modern quantum field theory. Our “old fashioned” way of doing quantum physics is known from non-relativistic quantum mechanics. Starting from a classical action principle, one derives the Hamilton Jacobi formulation, translates phase space coordinates into quantum operators, defines quantum states as wave functions on which these operators act, and finally physics is described in terms of expectation values of observables, defined with respect to a scalar product on the state space. This procedure is known as the “Dirac programme” [4] or “canonical quantization.” There have been some early attempts to use this method to quantize gravity, based on the Hamilton Jacobi or “ADM” formalism derived by Arnowitt, Deser and Misner [5, 6]. The main result was the famous “Wheeler DeWitt equation” [7, 8, 9, 10], but for a long time these approaches had no success either, and they seemed to be technically even more difficult than the perturbative methods.

With two important discoveries the situation changed drastically and the “canonical quantization” of gravity became a promising field of research again. First it was shown by Ashtekar [11, 12] that there is a new set of variables for Einstein gravity which simplifies the canonical treatment and hence the Dirac programme considerably. Closely related to this Witten [13] showed that using the dreibein and spin connection instead of the metric as the basic fields variables, three dimensional gravity can be quantized by straightforward application of Dirac’s method. After that, other methods were shown to produce similar results [14, 15].

The aim of this article is to provide a self-contained presentation of the Dirac programme applied to three dimensional gravity, emphasizing mostly physical aspects which are interesting for quantum gravity in general. All you have to know to read this article is how to quantize systems with gauge degrees of freedom in Dirac’s formalism [4, 16], and some basic knowledge about general relativity, vielbein formalism, and the ADM formulations of Einstein gravity will be useful, too [6]. The new results presented here are mainly based on earlier work [17, 18], and also related to similar approaches in four dimensions [19]. It turns out that the combination of dreibein gravity, ADM formalism, and Dirac quantization is an ideal tool helping us to understand the physics of quantum gravity. Our approach will be a little bit unconventional, which hopefully makes this article interesting for both beginners looking for an introductory review and for experts, who might get some new insight into old questions considered from a different point of view. Our point of view will be that of an *observer* sitting inside the universe rather than looking at it from the outside, which is not restricted to three dimensions. One of the central questions will be whether we can make this observer a relativistic and a quantum observer at the same time.

Moreover, instead of the “standard” example of a torus or higher genus manifold, we will consider non-compact space manifolds. This makes the mathematical treatment more complicated at first sight, because we have to introduce boundary conditions, but on the other hand it will be much easier to give a complete classification of solutions and, which is even more important, to extract the physical properties of these solutions. This is because the “boundaries” of spacetime will behave like “asymptotically flat ends,” and associated with them there will be something like a “fixed stars background,” which can be used to synchronize clocks, measure velocities using a generalized “redshift” and for many other “astronomical” measurements. So we really want to do physics in our three dimensional universe, and notions like “observer” and “measurement” already appearing on the classical level will help us to get some insight into the quantum theory.

Nevertheless we will also focus on some mathematical subtleties, which so far have not been considered in detail. They turn out to be important when dealing with non-compact manifolds. The

first section will entirely be reserved to some helpful mathematical tools. Having exact mathematical definitions of, e.g., a covering manifold and the loop group, will enable us to give more precise theorems to classify solutions of the equations of motions and to construct the physical quantum state space. Sometimes it is also overlooked that the simply connected group associated with the Lorentz algebra in three dimensions is neither  $SO(1,2)$  nor  $SL(2)$ , so we will also discuss this point in more detail before going over to physics.

In section 2 we will present our “unconventional” approach to general relativity, which makes use of both the ADM formulation and the dreibein and connection field as the basic variables. The central object in this approach is the “local observer” sitting inside the universe and making experiments in his “local laboratory.” Gravity will be considered as the theory that describes how these observers communicate with each other. As an additional feature of this interpretation of gravity, it will not break down if we allow exactly those kinds of singular metrics which are needed to quantize the theory based on Witten’s idea. An explicit example will be given to show what happens at spacetime singularities.

We will also introduce some non-local objects like parallel transport operators and geodesic distances, which are closely related to the astronomical measurements mentioned above. These non-local objects are needed because three dimensional gravity is not really a field theory. Einstein’s equations in three dimensions imply that spacetime is locally flat (see, e.g., [20] for an introduction to lower dimensional gravity and many references). Hence, there are no gravitational waves or forces. Spacetime locally looks like Minkowski space (unless we are in the neighbourhood of a singularity), and no local observables like curvature exist. Non-trivial solutions to the field equations only occur if the spacetime manifold is not simply connected. Then, e.g., transporting a vector once around a non-contractible loop will in general result in a rotated vector, and the “angle” of this rotation is one of the finitely many degrees of freedom of gravity in three dimensions.

To identify all such parameters classifying a solution of Einstein’s equations modulo gauge transformations will be the aim of section 3. Here we will need all the mathematical structures introduced in section 1. We will find that this classification is much simpler for space manifolds with “asymptotic ends” than for those without like the torus. As an example, we will choose an infinitely long cylinder as space and construct some “funny spacetimes,” showing that there is a rich set of inequivalent solutions even for the simplest non-trivial manifold. This will also give us some understanding of the physical content of the gauge invariant parameters found to classify the solutions.

In section 4 we are going to quantize the model using Dirac’s method. As at the classical level, the reduction from a field theory to a state space with finitely many degrees of freedom will come out automatically. It will be even simpler to identify the quantum state space than to find the classical solutions. The result will be a physical state space consisting of “wave functions” depending on finitely many variables like in ordinary quantum mechanics, and a set of “observables” acting thereon as linear operators. We will also discuss some problems arising with products of non-commuting operators. As a consequence, for some of the observables the quantum operator will be defined up to ordering ambiguities only, or equivalently up to corrections of the order  $\hbar$ . However, we will find that the ordering is unique if we want the observables to become hermitian.

In the last section we will briefly discuss some conceptual problems of quantum gravity, and show how to solve them for our toy model. For example, we will describe what the physical content of the observables is, and how the “problem of time” can be solved by using special phase space functions that behave like clocks. For a cylinder manifold we will find a unique Hilbert space such that all observables become hermitian operators, and we will also see that there is a unique physical Hilbert space for the torus as well. Though the torus has always been the standard example, an explicit construction of the scalar product on the physical state space has not been carried out so far. We will find that up to rescaling there is only one reasonable product such that all standard observables become hermitian.

As we want to be mathematically as precise as possible, you will find some typically mathematical structures in this article. The main objects are introduced in “definitions,” and a few important results are summarized in “theorems.” This makes it somehow easier to refer to them later on, and it also helps to organize the article. In addition, there are lots of “exercises.” They mainly split into two categories. The first type just summarizes some simple properties of new symbols or notions, which are either easy to prove or interesting but actually not required for our special purpose. Another kind of exercise typically consists of a “physical” question. Here it is sometimes better to ask a precise question than to describe things lengthly. Some exercises also suggest generalizations or extensions, which are mostly straightforward but beyond the scope of this article.

# 1 Mathematics

In the main part of this article we want to focus on the physical aspects of three dimensional gravity, so maybe it’s best to introduce all the mathematical notions necessary for this purpose in a separate section. We then have all the structures at hand when we need them. There are mainly two mathematical objects playing a crucial role: the loop group (or first fundamental group) of some manifold and the three dimensional Poincaré group, which is the simply connected Lie group associated with the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{iso}(1,2)$ . Introducing these two objects will give us all the relevant mathematical structure.

In principle we should also introduce a number of fibre bundles to allow exact differential geometrical definitions for the various “fields”. However, we will restrict our considerations to models based on manifolds with trivial tangent bundles. This class of models is already interesting enough for our purpose. All the bundles will then become trivial and sections therein may be treated as fields, coordinates are always global etc. The notation (and also the mathematical language) simplifies considerably. All the constructions made below can nevertheless be extended to “higher genus” manifolds with non-trivial tangent bundles, and for those familiar with fibre bundles, sections and connections on them, here is a good exercise:

*Exercise 1.1 (Extension to general manifolds).* For all the “fields” introduced in this article, give the correct definition in differential geometrical terms (some of them are section, others are connections or maps from one fibre into another), and show that the general results are correct for manifolds with non-trivial tangent bundles as well. Sometimes one has to make other restrictions, e.g. the manifold has to be connected, orientable, etc.

## 1.1 Covering manifold and loop group

Given a manifold  $\mathcal{N}$ , we introduce its covering manifold  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$ . Physicists often define it by somehow “unwrapping”  $\mathcal{N}$ , so that the result is a simply connected manifold which is locally isomorphic to  $\mathcal{N}$ . This is rather illustrative, but there is a better “mathematical” definition, which turns out to be exactly the right thing for us here and, in addition, which will give us a second structure, the loop group, for free.

*Definition 1.1 (Covering Manifold).* Let  $\mathcal{N}$  be a connected manifold (in all our applications two dimensional, orientable). A path in  $\mathcal{N}$  is a (smooth) map  $\alpha : [0,1] \mapsto \mathcal{N}$ . Two paths are equivalent (or homotopic) if they can be (smoothly) deformed into each other without varying the end points, i.e.

$$\alpha \sim \beta \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \exists f : [0,1]^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{N}, \quad \begin{aligned} f(0,s) &= \alpha(s), & f(t,0) &= \alpha(0) = \beta(0), \\ f(1,s) &= \beta(s), & f(t,1) &= \alpha(1) = \beta(1). \end{aligned} \quad (1.1)$$

If two paths with the same end points are always homotopic, the manifold is called simply connected. Now fix a point  $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{N}$ , then the covering manifold is the set of all homotopy classes of paths beginning at  $\bar{x}$ :

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{N}} = \{\alpha \mid \alpha(0) = \bar{x}\} / \sim. \quad (1.2)$$

By “smooth” we always mean sufficiently often differentiable. The covering manifold is in fact a (discrete) bundle over  $\mathcal{N}$  and thus you can think of  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$  as somehow wrapped around  $\mathcal{N}$  such that when you go once around a non-contractible loop you are on a different sheet of  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$ . But the definition as homotopy classes of paths is more suitable as paths will naturally appear whenever we deal with  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$ . There are some natural maps on  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$ , the first is the projection back onto  $\mathcal{N}$ :

*Definition 1.2 (Projection).*

$$\pi : \widetilde{\mathcal{N}} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}, \quad \pi(\alpha) = \alpha(1). \quad (1.3)$$

We use the same symbols  $\alpha, \beta, \dots$  for paths and for their homotopy classes, i.e. points in  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$ ; this should not cause trouble. We only have to check that expressions are invariant under deformations whenever  $\alpha$  denotes a special path. In (1.3)  $\alpha$  denotes a homotopy class (an element of  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$ ) on the left hand side, but a special path on the right hand side. However,  $\alpha(1)$  is the same for all path belonging to a given homotopy class.

An important feature of paths is that they may be linked together, simply by going along one first and then along the other:

*Definition 1.3 (Link).* For two paths  $\alpha : s \mapsto \alpha(s)$  and  $\beta : s \mapsto \beta(s)$  such that  $\alpha(1) = \beta(0)$ , the link  $\alpha \bullet \beta$  is given by

$$\alpha \bullet \beta : s \mapsto \begin{cases} \alpha(2s) & \text{for } s \leq \frac{1}{2}, \\ \beta(2s - 1) & \text{for } s \geq \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases} \quad (1.4)$$

With the help of this operation one can show that the structure of the covering manifold does not depend on the choice of the arbitrary point  $\bar{x}$ , if  $\mathcal{N}$  itself is connected, i.e. for any two points there must be a path connecting them.

*Exercise 1.2.* The projection  $\pi$  is locally one-to-one, and by using the same coordinates  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$  becomes a differentiable manifold. If another origin  $\bar{x}'$  defines another covering manifold  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}'$ , then there is a one-to-one diffeomorphism  $f : \widetilde{\mathcal{N}} \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}'$  such that  $\pi' \circ f = \pi$ .

The link is also well defined for homotopy classes of paths, and thus it also acts on  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$ . However, elements of  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$  can only be linked if the first element is a loop, i.e. a path beginning and ending at  $\bar{x}$ . This subset of  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$  already provides the loop group of  $\mathcal{N}$ :

*Definition 1.4 (Loop Group).* The set of loops  $\Upsilon \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$  consists of all (homotopy classes of) paths  $\lambda$  ending at  $\bar{x}$ , and the group multiplication is  $\bullet$ . The unity  $\eta$  and the inverse  $\lambda^{-1}$  are given by (the homotopy classes of) the constant loop and the reversed loop, respectively,

$$\eta(s) = \bar{x}, \quad \lambda^{-1}(s) = \lambda(1 - s). \quad (1.5)$$

The last equation can also be used to define an inverse of any path  $\alpha$ , or of any homotopy class of paths, but for  $\alpha \in \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$  the inverse  $\alpha^{-1}$  is in general no longer an element of  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$ . As a set we have  $\Upsilon = \pi^{-1}(\bar{x})$ , i.e.  $\Upsilon$  consists of all points of  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$  lying “over  $\bar{x}$ ”. Our definition of the loop group does not require any additional structure: it is just a subset of  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$  and the multiplication is (1.4).

We can not only link a loop with another loop but also with another path starting at  $\bar{x}$ . This gives a second natural map on  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$ :

*Definition 1.5 (Shift).* For every loop  $\lambda \in \Upsilon$  there is a diffeomorphism

$$b_\lambda : \widetilde{\mathcal{N}} \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}, \quad \alpha \mapsto \lambda \bullet \alpha. \quad (1.6)$$

If the manifold  $\mathcal{N}$  is not too complicated, i.e. it does not have infinitely many “holes” or something like that, than the loop group has a simple structure. In all our examples it will be a discrete group generated by a finite number of elements.

*Definition 1.6 (Primitive Loops).* A finite set  $\Upsilon_0 \subset \Upsilon$  is called a set of primitive loops, if every  $\lambda \in \Upsilon$  can be written as a finite product of elements of  $\Upsilon_0$  and their inverses. The loop group itself is then given by the free group generated by  $\Upsilon_0$ , i.e. the set of all possible products of elements, modulo some relations, i.e. there may be products of primitive loops which are contractible.

A well know example is the torus, where we have two primitive loops  $\Upsilon_0 = \{\lambda, \kappa\}$ , and one relation  $\lambda \bullet \kappa \bullet \lambda^{-1} \bullet \kappa^{-1} = \eta$ . An example for a manifold with boundaries will be given below.

There are some other useful notions we introduce here without motivation. They will become important later on, but here is a better place to give their definitions. The first is rather simple.

*Definition 1.7 (Periodic Function).* A function  $f$  on  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$  is called periodic if  $f \circ b_\lambda = f$  for all  $\lambda \in \Upsilon$ .

Obviously, the projection  $\pi$  is periodic, and every periodic function can be written as  $f \circ \pi$  with some function  $f$  on  $\mathcal{N}$ . To simplify the notation, we always use the same symbol for a periodic function on  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$  and the corresponding function on  $\mathcal{N}$ . More interesting than periodic functions are quasiperiodic functions.

*Definition 1.8 (Quasiperiodic Function).* Let  $G$  be a group. A map  $\mathbf{g} : \widetilde{\mathcal{N}} \rightarrow G$  is called quasiperiodic if there are elements  $\mathbf{g}_\lambda \in G$  such that  $\mathbf{g} \circ b_\lambda = \mathbf{g}_\lambda \mathbf{g}$  for all  $\lambda \in \Upsilon$ .

Hence, the shifted function  $\mathbf{g} \circ b_\lambda$  differs from  $\mathbf{g}$  itself by multiplication with a constant from the left only. It follows immediately that  $\lambda \mapsto \mathbf{g}_\lambda$  is a group homomorphism  $\Upsilon \rightarrow G$ .


*Definition 1.9 (Normalized Quasiperiodic Function).* A quasiperiodic function is called normalized if  $\mathbf{g}_\lambda = \mathbf{g}(\lambda)$ , or equivalently if  $\mathbf{g}(\eta) = \mathbf{1}$ , the unity element of  $G$ .

Such functions will appear naturally as parameters for the solutions of the equations of motion, and we will also need them as auxiliary fields necessary to deal with boundaries.

The last construction in this section also has to do with boundaries. Assume that  $\mathcal{N}$  is a compact 2-manifold with some boundaries. Each boundary labeled by an index  $\ell$  is a circle (it is a 1-manifold, but it cannot be a real line because  $\mathcal{N}$  is compact). How does the boundary of  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$  look like? To see this, we introduce a periodic coordinate  $\phi$  on the boundary of  $\mathcal{N}$  (with period  $2\pi$ ). Then we can construct a family of paths  $\alpha_{\ell, \phi} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$ , all starting at  $\bar{x}$  and ending at the boundary point with coordinate  $\phi$ . Once we fixed the path  $\alpha_\ell = \alpha_{\ell, 0}$ , all other paths are unique up to smooth deformations. Figure 1 shows how the family looks like. Starting from  $\alpha_\ell$  the paths  $\alpha_{\ell, \phi}$  are obtained by moving the end point along the boundary. All these paths represent points on the boundary of  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$ . The family of paths is not unique: there are in general several boundaries of  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$  projected onto the same boundary of  $\mathcal{N}$ , as choosing another  $\alpha_\ell$ , say  $\lambda \bullet \alpha_\ell$  for some  $\lambda \in \Upsilon$ , we end up with a different family of paths in figure 1, corresponding to a different boundary of  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$ . However, there is a special element of the loop group for which we do not get a different family but only a reparameterization of the same family. Calling this  $\lambda_\ell$ , we have  $\lambda_\ell \bullet \alpha_{\ell, \phi} = \alpha_{\ell, \phi + 2\pi}$ .

If we now assume that this  $\lambda_\ell$  is not contractible, and that this is also true for any power of it, i.e.  $(\lambda_\ell)^z \neq \eta$  for  $z \neq 0$ , then two paths from the same family are never homotopic. Hence, the boundary of  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$  is a real line parameterized by  $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$ . For each  $\lambda \in \Upsilon$ , which is not a power of  $\lambda_\ell$ , we get a different line represented by  $\lambda \bullet \alpha_{\ell, \phi}$ ,  $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$ . In general there are infinitely many such lines, so the

Figure 1: The family of paths  $\alpha_{\ell,\phi}$  associated with a boundary of  $\mathcal{N}$  (the bold circle). The family is fixed by choosing the homotopy class of  $\alpha_\ell$ . There is also a loop  $\lambda_\ell \in \Upsilon$  associated with the boundary, which is given by  $\lambda_\ell = \alpha_{\ell,\phi+2\pi} \bullet \alpha_{\ell,\phi}^{-1}$  for any  $\phi$ .



boundary of  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$  is rather complicated. However, for our purposes it is sufficient to know that for each boundary of  $\mathcal{N}$  we can construct a *special* family of paths  $\alpha_{\ell,\phi}$ , which is not unique, but once fixed there is a unique loop  $\lambda_\ell$  that goes exactly once around that boundary.

As an example, consider a sphere with  $N \geq 2$  holes cut out, so that we have  $N$  boundaries like in figure 1. We can arrange the paths  $\alpha_\ell$  such that for  $\ell = 1, \dots, N$  they leave  $\bar{x}$  “clockwise” and do not intersect. Then we can take the  $\lambda_\ell$  to be the primitive loops and the loop group of  $\mathcal{N}$  is given as described in definition 1.6 with the relation  $\lambda_1 \bullet \dots \bullet \lambda_N = \eta$ , as linking all the loops together we get a single loop going once around all the holes, which can be contracted. For  $N = 2$  the two families form the complete boundary of  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$  ( $\mathcal{N}$  is a cylinder and  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$  is an infinitely long strip). But  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$  has infinitely many boundaries for  $N \geq 3$ .

*Exercise 1.3.* Of course, we can drop the loop  $\lambda_N$  from  $\Upsilon_0$ . Then the loop group becomes the free group generated by  $\Upsilon_0 = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{N-1}\}$ . More general: show that the loop group of a manifold consisting of a genus  $g$  surface, with  $N$  holes like in figure 1 cut out, is a free group generated by  $2g + N - 1$  primitive loops.

Finally, here are some useful features of paths and loops, some of which have already been used:

*Exercise 1.4.* Show that

1.  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$  is simply connected, or equivalently  $\widetilde{\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}} = \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$ ;
2. definition 1.3 can be changed such that  $\alpha \bullet \beta$  is smooth at  $s = 1/2$ ;
3. the link is well defined on homotopy classes of paths;
4.  $\Upsilon$  is a group;
5. the shift maps provide a representation of  $\Upsilon$ :  $b_\eta = \mathbf{id}$ ,  $b_\lambda \circ b_\kappa = b_{\lambda \bullet \kappa}$ .



## 1.2 Symmetry algebras and groups

Three dimensional gravity can be formulated as a gauge theory, the gauge group being the Poincaré group. The basic fields can be combined into a single connection and the equations of motion then require the field strength of this connection to vanish. Thus, to understand three dimensional gravity it is essential to know how the Poincaré algebra and especially the corresponding group looks like. The basic observables, i.e. the gauge invariant parameters of the solutions of the equations of motion, will turn out to be elements of this group.

*Definition 1.10 (Poincaré Algebra).* The Poincare algebra in three dimensions is six dimensional, and a suitable basis is given by the three Lorentz rotations  $\mathbf{L}^a$  together with three translations  $\mathbf{H}^a$ ,  $a = 0, 1, 2$  labeling the coordinates of three dimensional Minkowski space  $\mathbb{M}^3$ . Their commutation relations read

$$[\mathbf{L}^a, \mathbf{L}^b] = -\varepsilon^{ab}{}_c \mathbf{L}^c, \quad [\mathbf{L}^a, \mathbf{H}^b] = -\varepsilon^{ab}{}_c \mathbf{H}^c, \quad [\mathbf{H}^a, \mathbf{H}^b] = 0, \quad (1.7)$$

where the structure constants are given by the Levi Civita symbol obeying  $\varepsilon^{012} = -\varepsilon_{012} = +1$ , and indices are raised and lowered using the Minkowski metric  $\eta_{ab} = \text{diag}(-1, 1, 1)$ . Small Latin indices  $a, b, c, \dots$  are also called flat indices, referring to the flat metric  $\eta_{ab}$ .

Let us first have a look at the Lorentz subalgebra spanned by  $\mathbf{L}^a$ . The identity  $2\eta^{ab} = \varepsilon^{ac}{}_d \varepsilon^{bd}{}_c$  tells us that  $\eta_{ab}$  can be chosen to be the metric on the Lorentz algebra, so we can identify it with three dimensional Minkowski space  $\mathbb{M}^3$  (as a vector space). We need two matrix representations of this algebra:

*Definition 1.11 (Representations of the Lorentz Algebra).* The vector (or spin 1) representation of the Lorentz algebra is  $\mathfrak{so}(1, 2)$  and given by

$$\mathbf{L}^a \mapsto \varepsilon^a{}_{\cdot\cdot}, \quad [\varepsilon^a{}_{\cdot\cdot}, \varepsilon^b{}_{\cdot\cdot}] = -\varepsilon^{ab}{}_c \varepsilon^c{}_{\cdot\cdot}, \quad (1.8)$$

where the dots denote flat indices to be treated as matrix indices. The spinor (or spin 1/2) representation is  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$  and the basis is given by

$$\mathbf{L}^a \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\gamma^a, \quad [\frac{1}{2}\gamma^a, \frac{1}{2}\gamma^b] = -\varepsilon^{ab}{}_c \frac{1}{2}\gamma^c, \quad (1.9)$$

where the gamma matrices form a Clifford algebra

$$\gamma_a \gamma_b = \eta_{ab} \mathbf{1} - \varepsilon_{abc} \gamma^c, \quad (1.10)$$

and they are explicitly given by


$$\gamma_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \gamma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \gamma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1.11)$$

The representations act on vectors  $v^a \in \mathbb{M}^3$  and (Majorana) spinors  $\chi \in \mathbb{S}^2$ , where  $\mathbb{S}^2$  is some real two dimensional vector space. We will avoid products of spinors so it does not matter whether spinors are commuting or anticommuting, and no additional structure is needed on  $\mathbb{S}^2$ . To keep the notation consistent, we don't write out spinor indices explicitly. Vector indices are sometimes "abbreviated" by a dot to indicate that they are used like matrix indices. We also use the gamma matrices to map  $\mathbb{M}^3$  onto  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$  and vice versa:

$$\mathbf{v} = v^a \gamma_a, \quad v^a = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{v} \gamma^a), \quad v^a w_a = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{v} \mathbf{w}), \quad (1.12)$$

showing explicitly that  $\mathbb{M}^3 \simeq \mathfrak{sl}(2)$ . We use this isomorphism frequently and also speak of a "vector"  $\mathbf{v}$  which is actually a matrix. We call it spacelike, timelike or lightlike, or orthogonal to some other matrix, depending on the corresponding property of  $v^a$ .

Figure 2: The group  $\text{SL}(2)$  consists of two copies of the part of  $\mathbb{M}^3$  between the hyperboloids of proper length squared  $-1$ . The upper hyperboloid of the right part is glued to the lower one on the left and vice versa. The three dimensional manifold is obtained by rotating the picture around the vertical axis. The covering group  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$  consists of a series of such parts, each one's upper boundary glued to the next's lower boundary.



Now it is in principle straightforward to define the Lorentz group as the unique simply connected Lie group associated with the Lorentz algebra. Unfortunately this is neither  $\text{SO}(1,2)$  nor  $\text{SL}(2)$ , which would be similar to  $\text{SU}(2)$  as the simply connected Lie group associated with  $\mathfrak{so}(3) \simeq \mathfrak{su}(2)$ . In fact,  $\text{SL}(2)$  is a two-fold covering of  $\text{SO}(1,2)$ , but it is not yet simply connected. To see this, let's have a closer look at  $\text{SL}(2)$ .

It consists of all  $2 \times 2$  matrices with determinant one. The gamma matrices together with the unity matrix  $\mathbf{1}$  provide a basis of all  $2 \times 2$  matrices, so we can write an element of  $\text{SL}(2)$  as

$$\mathbf{g} = \hat{v} \mathbf{1} + v^a \gamma_a, \quad \hat{v} \in \mathbb{R}, \quad v^a \in \mathbb{M}^3. \quad (1.13)$$

Calculating the determinant yields the restriction

$$\hat{v}^2 - v^a v_a = 1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \hat{v} = \pm \sqrt{v^2 + 1}, \quad (1.14)$$

where  $v^2 = v^a v_a$ . Hence, we must have  $v^2 \geq -1$ : the vector  $v^a \in \mathbb{M}^3$  must lie in the region between the two timelike hyperboloids of length squared  $-1$ . For each vector there are two elements of  $\text{SL}(2)$ , corresponding to the sign in (1.14), except for  $v^2 = -1$ , where the two signs actually yield the same group element. Changing (1.13) slightly we introduce a useful set of coordinates on the group:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{g}(v^a, \pm) &= \pm(\hat{v} \mathbf{1} + v^a \gamma_a), \quad v^2 \geq -1, \quad \hat{v} = +\sqrt{v^2 + 1}, \\ &\Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{g}(v^a, +) = \mathbf{g}(-v^a, -) \quad \text{for} \quad v^2 = -1. \end{aligned} \quad (1.15)$$

A picture of this coordinate system is drawn in figure 2. We call the matrices  $\mathbf{g}(v^a, \pm)$  spacelike, lightlike, timelike, or null depending on the length squared of the vector  $v^a$ . The null matrices are obviously  $\mathbf{1}$  and  $-\mathbf{1}$ , and for all others we have  $|\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{g})|$  greater, equal, or less than 1 for spacelike, lightlike, or timelike matrices, respectively.

To show that  $\text{SL}(2)$  is a two-fold covering of  $\text{SO}(1,2)$ , we have to look for a group homomorphism that maps  $\mathbf{g}$  onto a matrix  $g^a_b$  satisfying  $g^a_b g^c_d \eta_{ac} = \eta_{bd}$ . The solution is given here:

*Exercise 1.5.*

$$\mathrm{SL}(2) \rightarrow \mathrm{SO}(1,2)_+ : \quad \mathbf{g} \mapsto g^a_b = \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{g}^{-1} \gamma^a \mathbf{g} \gamma_b) \quad (1.16)$$

is a two-to-one group homomorphism mapping  $\mathbf{g}$  and  $-\mathbf{g}$  onto the same  $g^a_b$ .

If an  $\mathrm{SL}(2)$  matrix is denoted by a bold letter, we denote the projected  $\mathrm{SO}(1,2)$  matrix by adding indices to the “un-bolded” symbol. We also drop the  $+$  index from  $\mathrm{SO}(1,2)$ , which always means the set of proper Lorentz transformations with  $g^0_0 > 0$ . The elements  $\mathbf{g}$  and  $-\mathbf{g}$  are located at the same point in figure 2 but in different parts, so  $\mathrm{SO}(1,2)$  just consists of one such part only, the upper and lower hyperboloid identified.

In figure 2 we see that  $\mathrm{SL}(2)$  is not simply connected, i.e. it is not the unique simply connected Lie group associated with  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \simeq \mathfrak{so}(1,2)$ . There is a non-contractible loop going along the central axis from  $-\gamma_0$  to  $\gamma_0$  in one part of the picture and then back on the other side. This is the  $\mathrm{SO}(2)$  subgroup of  $\mathrm{SL}(2)$ . With the tools introduced in the previous section, we know how to obtain the simply connected group we are looking for. It is the covering manifold of  $\mathrm{SL}(2)$ . It is obvious how this looks like if we draw a picture like figure 2. We get a whole series of parts instead of just two and they are glued together to a chain where each upper hyperboloid is glued to the lower boundary of the next part.

*Definition 1.12 (Lorentz Group).* The Lorentz group  $\widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}(2)$  is the covering manifold of  $\mathrm{SL}(2)$  (or  $\mathrm{SO}(1,2)$ ) with basepoint  $\bar{x} = \mathbf{1}$ , i.e. its elements are homotopy classes of paths in  $\mathrm{SL}(2)$ , denoted by  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}} : s \mapsto \mathbf{g}(s)$ , with  $\mathbf{g}(0) = \mathbf{1}$ . The product of two paths is defined “pointwise”:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{g}} : s \mapsto \mathbf{g}(s), \quad \tilde{\mathbf{h}} : s \mapsto \mathbf{h}(s) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \tilde{\mathbf{g}}\tilde{\mathbf{h}} : s \mapsto \mathbf{g}(s)\mathbf{h}(s). \quad (1.17)$$

The natural projection  $\widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}(2) \rightarrow \mathrm{SL}(2)$  is denoted by dropping the tilde from the symbol. Note that in addition to the group multiplication there is also the link defined on  $\widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}(2)$ , and there is in fact a simply relation between them.

*Exercise 1.6.* Show that the group multiplication coincides with the link  $\bullet$ , i.e.  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}\tilde{\mathbf{h}} = \tilde{\mathbf{g}} \bullet \tilde{\mathbf{h}}$ , if  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$  is a loop. The loop group of  $\mathrm{SL}(2)$  is a discrete subgroup of  $\widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}(2)$ .

Unfortunately there is no faithful matrix representation for the covering group, so the definition as homotopy classes of paths in  $\mathrm{SL}(2)$  is all we have. However, we can find some useful coordinates on the covering group. We can extend (1.15) using an integer instead of a sign, leading to the coordinates

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{g}}(v^a, z), \quad v^2 \geq -1, \quad z \in \mathbb{Z}, \\ \tilde{\mathbf{g}}(v^a, z) = \tilde{\mathbf{g}}(-v^a, z+1) \quad \text{for} \quad v^2 = -1, \quad v^0 > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (1.18)$$

The projection onto  $\mathrm{SL}(2)$  reads  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}(v^a, z) \mapsto \mathbf{g}(v^a, (-)^z)$ . Another set of coordinates is provided by exponentiating the algebra.

*Exercise 1.7.* Show that every element of  $\mathrm{SL}(2)$  can be written in the form

$$\mathbf{g} = \pm \exp(n^a \gamma_a), \quad (1.19)$$

but the spacelike sector of the right part in figure 2 cannot be “reached” if the sign is positive, i.e. there are group elements which are not exponentials of elements of the algebra.

For the covering group we define

$$\exp(n^a \tilde{\gamma}_a) : s \mapsto \exp(s n^a \gamma_a), \quad (1.20)$$

which provides the natural exponential map from the algebra into  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$ . Of course, the notation is only formal, as there are no matrices  $\tilde{\gamma}_a$  such that this map is given by exponentiating them. We can only define it as a homotopy class of paths in  $\text{SL}(2)$ . Observe that  $\exp(2\pi\gamma_0)$  is the unity matrix but  $\exp(2\pi\tilde{\gamma}_0)$  is not the unity of  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$ . Similar to (1.19) every element of  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$  can be written as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{g}} = \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_z \exp(n^a \tilde{\gamma}_a), \quad \text{where} \quad \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_z = \exp(z\pi\tilde{\gamma}_0) = \tilde{\mathbf{g}}(0, z). \quad (1.21)$$

The group element  $\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_z$  is the origin of part no.  $z$  in figure 2. It is a central element of  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$ , i.e. it commutes with all other group elements, and  $\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_0 = \mathbf{1}$  is the unity. The  $\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_z$  form the loop group of  $\text{SO}(1, 2)$ , and the even elements  $\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{2z}$  build up the loop group of  $\text{SL}(2)$ .

*Exercise 1.8.* There is also a *global* coordinate system on  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$ , which can be chosen to be

$$\tilde{\mathbf{g}}(w, x, y) = \exp(x\tilde{\gamma}_1 + y\tilde{\gamma}_2) \exp(w\tilde{\gamma}_0), \quad w, x, y \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (1.22)$$

As a consequence, show that for any smooth field  $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$  on some manifold, and its projection  $\mathbf{h} : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \text{SL}(2)$ , there exists a smooth deformation  $\mathbf{h}_s : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \text{SL}(2)$  such that  $\mathbf{h}_1 = \mathbf{h}$  and  $\mathbf{h}_0 = \mathbf{1}$ .

This property of  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$  valued fields will be important when defining gauge transformations: it will tell us whether two fields configurations are gauge-equivalent or not.

Our coordinates can also be used to read off whether two group elements commute or not. Using (1.15) and the Clifford algebra of the gamma matrices, we find that  $\mathbf{g}(v^a, \pm)$  and  $\mathbf{g}(w^a, \pm)$  commute if and only if the two vectors  $v^a$  and  $w^a$  are proportional to each other, and the same holds for  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$ :

*Exercise 1.9.* Two elements  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}(v^a, z), \tilde{\mathbf{g}}(w^a, z') \in \widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$  commute if and only if

$$\varepsilon_{abc} v^a w^b = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \exists r, s \in \mathbb{R} : rv^a = sw^b. \quad (1.23)$$

Given an element  $\mathbf{v} = v^a \gamma_a \in \mathfrak{sl}(2)$ , then there is the adjoint action of the group element  $\mathbf{u} \in \text{SL}(2)$  on  $\mathbf{v}$ :

$$\mathbf{v} = v^a \gamma_a \mapsto \mathbf{u}^{-1} \mathbf{v} \mathbf{u} = v^a u_a^b \gamma_b, \quad (1.24)$$

which is an  $\text{SO}(1, 2)$  Lorentz rotation  $u_a^b$  acting on the vector  $v^a \in \mathbb{M}^3$ . Similarly, an inner automorphism of the group  $\text{SL}(2)$  acts as a Lorentz rotation on the vector  $v^a$  in figure 2:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}^{-1} \mathbf{g}(v^a, \pm) \mathbf{u} &= \pm \mathbf{u}^{-1} (v^a \gamma_a + \hat{v} \mathbf{1}) \mathbf{u} \\ &= \pm (v^b u_b^a \gamma_a + \hat{v} \mathbf{1}) = \mathbf{g}(v^b u_b^a, \pm). \end{aligned} \quad (1.25)$$

This transformation is obviously well defined for the covering group  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$ , too, as the length of  $v^a$  is unaffected and we always stay in the same part of figure 2. Hence, there is a well defined map

$$\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2) \rightarrow \widetilde{\text{SL}}(2) : \tilde{\mathbf{g}} \mapsto \mathbf{u}^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{g}} \mathbf{u}, \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbf{u} \in \text{SL}(2). \quad (1.26)$$

Note that you cannot use group multiplication to define this map, because you cannot multiply elements of  $\text{SL}(2)$  and  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$  with each other. There are three alternative ways to define this map properly.

*Definition 1.13 (Automorphisms of  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$ ).* For each  $\mathbf{u} \in \text{SL}(2)$  there is an inner automorphism of  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$ , which is either defined by

$$\mathbf{u}^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{g}} \mathbf{u} = \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{g}} \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \quad (1.27)$$

for some  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in \widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$  whose projection is  $\mathbf{u}$ , or by

$$\mathbf{u}^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{g}} \mathbf{u} : s \mapsto \mathbf{u}^{-1} \mathbf{g}(s) \mathbf{u}, \quad (1.28)$$

where  $s \mapsto \mathbf{g}(s)$  is a path representing  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$ , or using the coordinates from above we can write

$$\mathbf{u}^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{g}}(v^a, z) \mathbf{u} = \tilde{\mathbf{g}}(v^b u_b^a, z) \quad (1.29)$$

*Exercise 1.10.* Show that the right hand sides of the first two definitions are independent of the special  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ , and of the special path  $\mathbf{g}(s)$ , respectively, that all three definitions are equivalent, and that these are *all* inner automorphisms of  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$ .

Now that we have the Lorentz group it is not difficult to get the Poincaré group, which is obtained by attaching the algebra to the group and define an appropriate multiplication.

*Definition 1.14 (Poincaré Group).* The Poincaré group is given by  $\widetilde{\text{ISO}}(1, 2) = \widetilde{\text{SO}}(1, 2) \times \mathfrak{so}(1, 2) \simeq \widetilde{\text{SL}}(2) \times \mathfrak{sl}(2)$ , i.e. its elements are pairs  $(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{f})$ , and the multiplication reads

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{f}) (\tilde{\mathbf{g}}', \mathbf{f}') &= (\tilde{\mathbf{g}}\tilde{\mathbf{g}}', \mathbf{f} + \mathbf{g}\mathbf{f}'\mathbf{g}^{-1}), \\ (\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{f})^{-1} &= (\tilde{\mathbf{g}}^{-1}, -\mathbf{g}^{-1}\mathbf{f}\mathbf{g}). \end{aligned} \quad (1.30)$$

*Exercise 1.11.* Show that this is in fact the group  $\widetilde{\text{ISO}}(1, 2)$ , i.e. the covering group of  $\text{ISO}(1, 2)$  consisting of Lorentz rotations and translations of three vectors, and whose elements are  $4 \times 4$  matrices

$$\begin{pmatrix} g^a_b & f^a \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1.31)$$

which is the projection of  $(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{f}) \in \widetilde{\text{ISO}}(1, 2)$  onto  $\text{ISO}(1, 2)$  (remember that  $g^a_b \in \text{SO}(1, 2)$  is obtained from  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$  by first projecting onto  $\mathbf{g} \in \text{SL}(2)$  and then using (1.16);  $f^a$  is obtained by expanding  $\mathbf{f} = f^a \gamma_a$ ).

This group is the full gauge group of dreibein gravity. However, we will not make much use of the fact that we can write it as a single group or single algebra. This is quite useful when considering only classical solutions of Einstein gravity in three dimensions. But when going over to Hamilton Jacobi formalism and then to quantum theory, we have to split the group into its components consisting of rotations and translations anyway. That's because the gauge fields corresponding to the different parts will become canonically conjugate quantities and non-commuting operators, respectively, so that it is not easy to keep the “one group” notation. In addition, the physical interpretation of the two sets of gauge fields is quite different, so to extract the physical content of various quantities becomes easier if we keep the “component notation”  $(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{f})$  for  $\widetilde{\text{ISO}}(1, 2)$ .

## 2 Kinematics

The aim of this section is to present an unusual approach to general relativity. It will turn out to have two very different advantages. The first is rather technical: it will be possible to extend spacetime beyond the conical singularities arising in three dimensional gravity. As a consequence, the solutions are always globally defined and we do not have to exclude points from the spacetime manifold. Nevertheless spacetime will look as if it had singularity. All this will become possible after allowing certain kinds of singular metrics.

Another feature of this approach is that in some sense we describe physics “from inside”, i.e. from the point of view of an observer sitting somewhere on the manifold. Associated with a local observer there will be a local three dimensional Minkowski space, which may be considered as his “laboratory”, where he can make experiments with test particles. All measurements, i.e. all physical entities, will be expressed as objects in this “local Lorentz frame”. With such an observer at each point in space, gravity (or geometry) becomes the theory of their interaction or rather their communication. We will even go further and forget that the points on the “spacetime manifold” are events. Each point just labels an observer at a specific time. This may sound a little bit strange but we will see that

this interpretation is able to deal with exactly those singular metrics mentioned above, and “physics” does not change at the singularities.

This approach to gravity is not restricted to three dimensions, except that only there it is possible to eliminate *all* singularities. Technically, what one has to do is to replace the metric by a vielbein and the spin connection as basic gravitational fields, then the Einstein Hilbert action is polynomial in both and well defined for singular vielbeins. Below we will do this for  $d = 3$  and we will find a rather simple interpretation for the singular metrics: if there is a line of “length” zero (not to be confused with a lightlike line), or an area or volume of vanishing measure, this just means that all the observers associated with this line are actually at the same “physical event”. The underlying manifold is no longer identical to the physical spacetime. Instead, spacetime is given by identifying those points of the manifold which have vanishing distance.

## 2.1 Dreibein gravity as a theory of local observers

One usually derives the dreibein formalism of gravity from the metric formalism by writing the metric as a function of the dreibein, introducing a spin connection via the dreibein postulate etc. That’s not the way we will follow here. Our starting point is the “set of local observers”, which is a 2-manifold  $\mathcal{N}$ . As already mentioned, the framework presented here is rather general, but we restrict  $\mathcal{N}$  to have a trivial tangent bundle. Typical examples for such manifolds are two-spheres or tori with arbitrarily many holes (but at least one for a sphere) cut out.

Now each point  $x \in \mathcal{N}$  shall corresponds to, or rather *is*, an individual local observer, who has a “laboratory” represented by a three dimensional Minkowski space  $\mathbb{M}^3$ . It is called the “local Lorentz frame” of  $x$ . Vectors in  $\mathbb{M}^3$  are denoted by  $v^a$ ,  $a = 0, 1, 2$ , and the Lorentz metric  $\eta_{ab}$  is used to raise and lower indices, which has been used already in section 1.2. Every measurement an observer makes has to be related to a quantity in his local frame. In general, all these local observers together form an  $\mathbb{M}^3$  bundle over  $\mathcal{N}$ , but with our restriction above it is reasonable to assume that this is trivial too, so that the “flat” indices  $a, b, \dots$  are also global. As part of exercise 1.1 the reader may think about the strange geometry arising if this bundle is not trivial (or not isomorphic to the tangent bundle of spacetime, see below).

So far we considered a two dimensional manifold which has something to do with “space”. Spacetime is now obtained by introducing a “time evolution” of space. Hence, our interpretation of gravity as theory of local observers is in principle the same as the Hamiltonian or Arnowitt Deser Misner (ADM) formalism of gravity [5, 6], except that not spacetime but the “space”  $\mathcal{N}$  is our basic background structure with its interpretation as a set of observers.

Using the language from above, what we do is the following. For each observer, we introduce a variable  $t$  called “time”, but which does not have to do anything with the physical time. You can think of it as some “bad” clock. i.e. it shows an increasing real number  $t$  which can be used to label events happening in the laboratory of the observer, but it is not suitable to measure the physical time. “Increasing” of course means that there is a relation to the physical time  $\tau$ , namely that  $\tau$  is a monotonic function of  $t$ . As we will see later on, this can always be established by “gauge fixing”. An event is now fixed by specifying where it happens, i.e. at which observer  $x \in \mathcal{N}$ , and at which time  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . Hence, we define spacetime to be  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{N} \times \mathbb{R}$ . Our interpretation of space as a given set of observers requires the same restriction on spacetime as the ADM formulation: spacetime must be globally hyperbolic, in order to get a well defined initial value problem. In the spacetime picture, the individual observer  $x \in \mathcal{N}$  becomes a worldline  $\mathbf{x}(t) = (x, t) \in \mathcal{M}$ . By a gauge choice we will be able to make this a timelike path, so that the interpretation as real physical observers is always possible.

The parameter time  $t$  can also be considered as a *global* time coordinate: we can look at the universe from the outside and what we see is a space  $\mathcal{N}$ , which is given by the set of all observers at a specific time  $t$ , and this space, i.e. the fields defined on  $\mathcal{N}$ , becomes time-dependent. The global

coordinate  $t$  will enter into the Hamilton Jacobi formalism as time variable: the action will become a “time” integral of some Lagrangian, which is a functional of the fields and their “velocities”. The Hamiltonian and Poisson brackets are defined such that they describe the evolution of the universe with respect to this parameter time. For the moment, however, we are only considering the kinematics of gravity, so yet we don’t have actions, Hamiltonians and things like that. All we have so far is a topological structure, i.e. we know which observers are in a neighbourhood of a special observer. We have to introduce some fields to describe the “interaction” of these observers. In particular, an observer has to know how far away another observer is and how other local Lorentz frames are related to his own. It is exactly this what is described by the dreibein and the spin connection.

In the following, we will sometimes switch between the “canonical” or ADM formalism, where the universe is described by fields on a space  $\mathcal{N}$  evolving in time, and the “spacetime” point of view, where it is just given by the same fields on a manifold  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{N} \times \mathbb{R}$ . Tangent indices on  $\mathcal{N}$  are denoted by  $i, j, k, \dots$ , and they can be considered as global indices, as we are assuming that  $\mathcal{N}$  has a trivial tangent bundle. For tangent indices on  $\mathcal{M}$  we use small Greek letters  $\mu, \nu, \rho, \dots$ , and they “take the values”  $t$  and  $i, j, k, \dots$ . A covector or one-form  $v_\mu$  on  $\mathcal{M}$  splits into a scalar  $v_t$  and another one-form  $v_i$  on  $\mathcal{N}$ , and similar relations hold for arbitrary tensors. As the first gravitational field the dreibein is now introduced as a field in  $\mathcal{M}$ :

*Definition 2.1 (Dreibein).* The dreibein is a linear map from the tangent bundle of  $\mathcal{M}$  into the observer bundle, or simply a matrix that maps a tangent vector  $v^\mu(\mathbf{x})$  of  $\mathcal{M}$  onto a vector  $v^a(\mathbf{x}) = v^\mu(\mathbf{x})e_\mu^a(\mathbf{x})$  in the local Lorentz frame of the observer at  $\mathbf{x}$ . The map is represented by a field  $e_\mu^a(\mathbf{x})$  which we only require to be a smooth function of  $\mathbf{x}$ .

No other restrictions are made, in particular, the matrix need not be invertible. In case of a more general manifold,  $e_\mu^a$  exists locally only and it is possible to define an invertible dreibein only if the observer bundle and the tangent bundle are isomorphic, simply because then the dreibein itself is an isomorphism. Thus assuming the observer bundle to be trivial is natural if the tangent bundle is trivial, otherwise the geometry would become rather strange (see above).

From the canonical point of view, the dreibein splits into a set of one-forms  $e_i^a(x, t)$  on  $\mathcal{N}$ , a  $2 \times 3$  matrix called the “spatial dreibein”, and a 3-vector  $e_t^a(x, t)$ . The physical interpretation of the dreibein is as follows. Given an observer at a specific time  $\mathbf{x}$  with local coordinates  $\mathbf{x}^\mu = (x^i, t)$  and another one with coordinates  $\mathbf{x}^\mu + d\mathbf{x}^\mu$ . Then  $d\mathbf{x}^a = e_\mu^a d\mathbf{x}^\mu$  is a vector in the local frame of  $x$  that tells him in which direction and distance  $\mathbf{x} + d\mathbf{x}$  is. We call this vector the “distance” from  $\mathbf{x}$  to  $\mathbf{x} + d\mathbf{x}$ . In particular, the length of the path from  $\mathbf{x}$  to  $\mathbf{x} + d\mathbf{x}$  is given by the length of this vector:

$$ds^2 = d\mathbf{x}^a d\mathbf{x}_a = g_{\mu\nu} d\mathbf{x}^\mu d\mathbf{x}^\nu, \quad \text{where} \quad g_{\mu\nu} = e_\mu^a e_\nu^b \eta_{ab}. \quad (2.1)$$

Restricting this consideration to a specific moment  $t = t_0$ , we also get a metric on  $\mathcal{N}$ . The distance of the two observers at the same time is given by the spatial dreibein and reads

$$ds^2 = dx^i dx^j g_{ij}, \quad \text{where} \quad g_{ij} = e_i^a e_j^b \eta_{ab} \quad (2.2)$$

is the induced metric on  $\mathcal{N}$  as a submanifold of  $\mathcal{M}$  defined by  $t = t_0$ . Note that this is not necessarily positive definite, and  $g_{\mu\nu}$  is in general not invertible, as there is no such restriction on the dreibein. The time component  $e_t^a(x, t)$  describes the relation between the parameter time  $t$  used by  $x$  and his physical time  $\tau$ . The proper time elapsing when  $t$  increases by  $dt$  is

$$d\tau^2 = -dt^2 e_t^a e_t^b \eta_{ab} = -dt^2 g_{tt}. \quad (2.3)$$

For  $\tau$  to be well defined,  $e_t^a$  must be a timelike vector, which is equivalent to requiring that the worldline on the observer is timelike. As  $e_t^a$  will turn out to be a pure gauge degree of freedom, we could restrict its values to any *open* subset of  $\mathbb{M}^3$  (otherwise we might loose equations of motion).

However, we can equally well keep it arbitrary, and whenever we have a special configuration we can find a gauge transformation such that  $e_t^a$  becomes timelike and we can read off the physical properties of that configuration, which are by definition invariant under gauge transformation.

It is now straightforward to interpret singular dreibein fields. If  $e_\mu^a$  has a zero eigenvalue one can find  $d\mathbf{x}^\mu = (dt, dx^i)$  such that  $d\mathbf{x}^a = 0$ . Using our interpretation from above this means that the distance between the two observers (possibly at different parameter time, if  $dt \neq 0$ ) is zero, they actually sit at the same spacetime event. The point  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}$  labels an observer at a given moment, not a point in spacetime. More precise, if  $d\mathbf{x}^a = 0$ , then the same physical event is seen by observer  $x$  at time  $t$  and observer  $x + d\mathbf{x}$  at *his* time parameter  $t + dt$ : the two (or more) observers meet each other at this event. Physical spacetime is defined as the set of equivalence classes of points in  $\mathcal{M}$ , where two points are equivalent (i.e. two observers see the same event), if there exists a path connecting them such that  $d\mathbf{x}^a = 0$  everywhere on the path. The resulting spacetime metric is non-singular in the sense that two different events always have finite distance. Note that  $d\mathbf{x}^a = 0$  is different from  $ds^2 = 0$ , which states that a path is lightlike. Observe also, that now the topology of spacetime is no longer fixed: different dreibein fields and thus different equivalence classes may lead to different topologies. An illustrating example will be given below.

*Definition 2.2 (Spin Connection).* As a second gravitational field we introduce the spin connection by defining a covariant derivative of vectors in the local Lorentz frames. It is represented by an  $\mathfrak{so}(1,2)$  gauge field  $\omega_{\mu ab} = -\omega_{\mu ba}$ . Given a vector field  $v^a$ , then the covariant derivative reads

$$D_\mu v^a = \partial_\mu v^a + \omega_\mu^a{}_b v^b. \quad (2.4)$$

We can expand  $\omega_{\mu ab}$  in terms of the generators of the vector representation of the Lorentz algebra (see definition 1.11) to get

$$\omega_{\mu ab} = \omega_{\mu c} \varepsilon^c{}_{ab} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \omega_{\mu c} = -\frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_c{}^{ab} \omega_{\mu ab}. \quad (2.5)$$

The covariant derivative then becomes

$$D_\mu v^a = \partial_\mu v^a + \omega_{\mu c} \varepsilon^{ca}{}_b v^b. \quad (2.6)$$

Thus  $\omega_{\mu a}$  is the abstract Lie algebra notation for the spin connection ( $a = 0, 1, 2$  labeling the generators), whereas  $\omega_{\mu ab}$  is its vector representation. The field strength or curvature of the spin connection is defined as the commutator of two covariant derivatives:

$$D_{[\mu} D_{\nu]} v^a = \frac{1}{2} F_{\mu\nu}^a{}_b v^b. \quad (2.7)$$

It reads explicitly

$$F_{\mu\nu ab} = \partial_\mu \omega_{\nu ab} - \partial_\nu \omega_{\mu ab} + \omega_{\mu a}^c \omega_{\nu cb} - \omega_{\nu a}^c \omega_{\mu cb}, \quad (2.8)$$

in the vector representation, and the abstract algebra representation is

$$F_{\mu\nu a} = \partial_\mu \omega_{\nu a} - \partial_\nu \omega_{\mu a} - \varepsilon_{abc} \omega_\mu^b \omega_\nu^c, \quad (2.9)$$

where the structure constants  $-\varepsilon_{abc}$  appear. A similar relation as for the spin connection itself holds:

$$F_{\mu\nu ab} = \varepsilon_{ab}^c F_{\mu\nu c} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad F_{\mu\nu a} = -\frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_a{}^{bc} F_{\mu\nu bc}. \quad (2.10)$$

Like the dreibein, the spin connection and its field strength split naturally into its space and time components, simply by inserting  $i, j$  or  $t$  for the indices  $\mu, \nu$ . The spatial component describes how vectors in the local Lorentz frames of two observers can be compared. Consider vectors  $v^a(x)$  and  $v^a(x + d\mathbf{x})$  measured by different observers (at the same time  $t$ ). The difference of these vectors,



measured in the local frame of  $x$  is given by  $dx^i D_i v^a$ . Similarly, the difference of two vectors measured by the same observer  $x$  at different times,  $v^a(t)$  and  $v^a(t+dt)$  reads  $dt D_t v^a$ . We will give more precise definitions for how to compare measurements made by different observers or at different times below by introducing transport operators. However, as we already introduced all the fields, we can see what dreibein gravity is: the theory that describes how measurements made by different observers can be compared and what the physical distance between them is.

## 2.2 Transport operators and geodesics

In this section we will construct non-local objects as functions of the fields  $e_\mu^a$  and  $\omega_{\mu ab}$ , describing concrete finite “measurements” made by our observers. In metric general relativity one defines a parallel transport operator as follows. Given a path  $\alpha : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ . The transport operator maps a tangent vector  $v^\mu(\alpha(a))$  at the beginning of the path onto another tangent vector at the end:

$$v^\mu(\alpha(b)) = v^\nu(\alpha(a)) U_\alpha(a, b)_\nu{}^\mu. \quad (2.11)$$

The matrix  $U_\alpha(a, b)_\nu{}^\mu \in \mathbf{GL}(3)$  is defined such that the vector is covariantly constant along the path, i.e. its covariant derivative with respect to  $b$  vanishes. The full definition is

$$\begin{aligned} U_\alpha(a, a)_\nu{}^\mu &= \delta_\nu{}^\mu, \\ \nabla_s U_\alpha(a, s)_\nu{}^\mu &= \frac{\partial}{\partial s} U_\alpha(a, s)_\nu{}^\mu + U_\alpha(a, s)_\nu{}^\rho \Gamma^\mu_{\sigma\rho} \alpha'^\sigma = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

Note that the two indices of  $U$  are tangent indices sitting at different points and transform differently under coordinate transformations, so that the covariant derivative acts on the index located at  $\alpha(s)$  only. The notations here is as follows: if the path’s tangent vector  $\alpha'^\mu$  or a field appears in a product with such a transport operator, the ordering of the product indicates where the fields are to be taken; i.e. in (2.12) the tangent vector has to be taken at  $s$  and the Christoffel connection at  $\alpha(s)$ .

A geodesic can now be defined as a path whose tangent vector is covariantly constant. We can write this as a local differential equation or as a non-local equation using the transport operator

$$\nabla_s \alpha'^\mu(s) = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \alpha'^\mu(b) = \alpha'^\nu(a) U_\alpha(a, b)_\nu{}^\mu. \quad (2.13)$$

More precise, it is sufficient that there is a reparameterization of the path such that this equation holds. This definition is equivalent to the “minimum length” or “maximum proper time” requirement (if no torsion is present), but it is more general as it applies to lightlike paths as well. Unfortunately, it is not suitable for our formalism, because we are dealing with local Lorentz vectors rather than tangent vectors of the manifold and also because the definition does not work for non-invertible metrics. However, as we introduced a connection as a basic field, we can define a transport operator with respect to this connection:

*Definition 2.3 (Transport operator).* Given a path  $\alpha : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  (always assumed to be smooth) we define a matrix  $U_\alpha(a, b)_a{}^b$  mapping a local Lorentz vector at  $\alpha(a)$  onto one at  $\alpha(b)$ . It is uniquely given by

$$\begin{aligned} U_\alpha(a, a)_a{}^b &= \delta_a{}^b, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial s} U_\alpha(a, s)_a{}^b &= U_\alpha(a, s)_a{}^c \omega_{\mu c}{}^b \alpha'^\mu. \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

As  $\omega_{\mu a}{}^b$  is an  $\mathfrak{so}(1, 2)$  connection, this gives an  $\mathbf{SO}(1, 2)$  matrix, i.e. a proper Lorentz rotation. One can also write  $U$  as a path ordered integral

$$U_\alpha(a, b)_\cdot{}^\cdot = \mathcal{P} \exp \left( \int_a^b ds \alpha'^\mu \omega_\mu \cdot{}^\cdot \right), \quad (2.15)$$

where path ordering is defined such that factors nearer to the lower boundary of the integral appear to the left. We do not require any ordering like  $a < b$  for the parameters. Transport operators may be linked together and they are “symmetric”:

$$U_\alpha(a, b)_a^b U_\alpha(b, c)_b^c = U_\alpha(a, c)_a^c, \quad U_\alpha(a, b)_{ab} = U_\alpha(b, a)_{ba}. \quad (2.16)$$

The second equation follows from the first if we set  $a = c$  and use the fact that the inverse of an  $\text{SO}(1, 2)$  matrix is given by its transpose, multiplied by the flat metric from both sides. In section 1.1 we always used the interval  $[0, 1]$  as the range for  $s$ , so we introduce  $U_{\alpha, a}^b$  as an abbreviation for  $U_\alpha(0, 1)_a^b$ , and instead of (2.16) we can write

$$U_{\alpha, a}^b U_{\beta, b}^c = U_{\alpha \bullet \beta, a}^c, \quad U_{\alpha, ab} = U_{\alpha^{-1}, ba}. \quad (2.17)$$

How is this transport operator related to the metric operator  $U_\alpha(a, b)_\mu^\nu$  defined above? A priori there is no relation, because it depends on the spin connection only whereas the metric depends on the dreibein. The relation we want to establish is that, given a vector at the beginning of some path, parallel transport with respect to the metric and then mapping it onto a local Lorentz vector by the dreibein should give the same result as first mapping it onto a local Lorentz vector and then transporting with respect to the spin connection. This is the “dreibein postulate”, which can also be formulated locally and is then called “torsion equation”:

*Exercise 2.1.* Show that, if the dreibein is invertible, the non-local dreibein postulate is equivalent to the torsion equation:

$$U_\alpha(a, b)_\mu^\nu e_\nu^b = e_\mu^a U_\alpha(a, b)_a^b, \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad D_{[\mu} e_{\nu]}^a = 0. \quad (2.18)$$

Here one has to use that the torsion equation actually states that the total covariant derivative of the dreibein vanishes (i.e. including the torsion-free Christoffel connection, but without antisymmetrization). As the torsion equation is an equation of motion, i.e. it is part of the “dynamics” of dreibein gravity, it is ensured that our transport operators and geodesics coincide with those derived from the metric in regions where it is invertible.

There are two important formulas describing how the transport operator changes under variation of the path or the spin connection, respectively.

*Exercise 2.2.* The functional differential of the transport operator (2.15) with respect to the connection reads

$$\delta U_\alpha(a, b) \cdot = \int_a^b ds U_\alpha(a, s) \cdot \alpha'^\mu \delta \omega_\mu \cdot U_\alpha(s, b) \cdot. \quad (2.19)$$

*Exercise 2.3.* Under a smooth deformation  $\alpha \mapsto \alpha + \delta\alpha$  of the path the variation of the transport operator is

$$\begin{aligned} \delta U_\alpha(a, b) \cdot &= U_\alpha(a, b) \cdot \delta \alpha^\mu \omega_\mu \cdot - \delta \alpha^\mu \omega_\mu \cdot U_\alpha(a, b) \cdot \\ &+ \int_a^b ds U_\alpha(a, s) \cdot \delta \alpha^\mu \alpha'^\nu F_{\mu\nu} \cdot U_\alpha(s, b) \cdot. \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

Here we replaced the flat indices of the transport operator again by the dots introduced in (1.8) to show that these are general formulas that hold for every representation of the transport operator, we only have to replace the field strength and connection by the appropriate terms. The indices are arranged such that they multiply the  $\mathfrak{so}(1, 2)$  and  $\text{SO}(1, 2)$  valued fields as matrices. Remember also the convention that the points where the fields are to be taken are indicated by the factor ordering,

i.e. in the first term in (2.20) we have to take them at  $\alpha(b)$ , at  $\alpha(a)$  in the second and at  $\alpha(s)$  inside the integral. We see that, if we fix the end points of the path, the variation is proportional to the field strength.

We can now extend the definition of a geodesic to singular metrics. However, it is no longer possible to parameterize the path using its own “proper time” or “proper length”.

*Definition 2.4 (Geodesic).* A path  $\alpha$  is called a geodesic if there exists a vector  $c^a$  at a (fixed) point  $\alpha(a)$  and a function  $\tau(s)$  such that

$$U_\alpha(a, s)^a{}_b e_\mu{}^b \alpha'^\mu = \tau'(s) c^a. \quad (2.21)$$

Hence, the tangent vector of a geodesic, projected into the local Lorentz frames, is covariantly constant up to rescaling. If the geodesic passes through a region where the dreibein is singular,  $\tau'$  might vanish, showing that the “proper length” does not increase: the path remains at the same spacetime event though it passes from one observer to another. In these regions with singular dreibeins the new geodesics behave quite strange but as we will see in the example below the definition still makes sense. If the dreibein is invertible, we obviously have  $\tau' \neq 0$  whenever  $\alpha'^\mu \neq 0$ , and we can reparameterize such that  $\tau(s) = s$ . With (2.18) we infer that our definition is then equivalent to the metric definition of a geodesic given above.

The vector  $c^a$  appearing in (2.21) is something like the finite version of  $d\mathbf{x}^a$  introduced above to measure the “distance” of two observers in spacetime. To see what  $c^a$  is, assume that  $\alpha$  is a geodesic from  $\alpha(0) = \mathbf{x}$  to  $\alpha(1) = \mathbf{y}$ . We can parameterize it such that  $\tau(0) = 0$  and  $\tau(1) = 1$ . Then it is obvious that  $c^a$  tells us how to get from  $\mathbf{x}$  to  $\mathbf{y}$ , namely by going in the direction indicated by  $c^a$  (it is the tangent vector to the geodesic at  $\mathbf{x}$ ), and the distance is given by the length of  $c^a$ , just as for the infinitesimal quantity  $d\mathbf{x}^a$  above. Hence, we may call  $c^a$  the “distance” from  $\mathbf{x}$  to  $\mathbf{y}$ , measured in the local Lorentz frame at  $\mathbf{x}$ .

Given the geodesic, we can calculate  $c^a$  by integrating (2.21)

$$c^a = \int_0^1 ds U_\alpha(0, s)^a{}_b e_\mu{}^b \alpha'^\mu. \quad (2.22)$$

This expression is invariant under reparameterization of  $s$ , we just have to know the geodesic itself to compute the distance  $c^a$ . In addition, the value of this integral also exists if  $\alpha$  is not a geodesic. It defines another quantity associated with a path. Let us call it the “distance of the path  $\alpha$ ”

$$V_\alpha(a, b)^a = \int_a^b ds U_\alpha(a, s)^a{}_b e_\mu{}^b \alpha'^\mu, \quad (2.23)$$

which is a vector in the local Lorentz frame at the beginning of the path. An alternative definition is, similar to (2.14), the differential equation with initial condition

$$V_\alpha(a, a)^a = 0, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial s} V_\alpha(a, s)^a = U_\alpha(a, s)^a{}_b e_\mu{}^b \alpha'^\mu. \quad (2.24)$$

As for  $U$  we use the abbreviation  $V_\alpha^a = V_\alpha(0, 1)^a$ . We have the following relations for the link or inverse of paths:

$$V_{\alpha \bullet \beta}^a = V_\alpha^a + U_\alpha^a{}_b V_\beta^b, \quad V_{\alpha^{-1}}^a = -V_\alpha^b U_{\alpha, b}^a. \quad (2.25)$$

Note that in the first equation  $V_\beta^b$  is a vector at  $\beta(0) = \alpha(1)$ , and  $U_\alpha^a{}_b$  maps this vector onto a vector at  $\alpha(0)$ , which can be added to  $V_\alpha^a$ . Together with (2.17) this is exactly the group multiplication on  $\text{ISO}(1, 2)$  as introduced in definition 1.14. If we arrange  $U$  and  $V$  such that they build a  $4 \times 4$  matrix, we can summarize their definitions as

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial s} \begin{pmatrix} U_\alpha^a{}_c & V_\alpha^a \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} U_\alpha^a{}_b & V_\alpha^a \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \omega_\mu^b{}_c & e_\mu^b \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \alpha'^\mu \quad (2.26)$$

The last matrix is the combined **iso**(1,2) connection. However, as already mentioned, we will not use it very much, as the physical interpretation of the two connection fields are quite different and the components are canonically conjugate phase space coordinates and non-commuting quantum operators. Finally, we also have to know how  $V$  transforms under deformations of the path. The formula is similar to that given for  $U$ . It will be sufficient to know how the transformation looks like if the field equations of gravity are satisfied.

*Exercise 2.4.* Assume that the torsion equation holds and the spin connection is flat. Then under a smooth variation of the path  $\delta\alpha$  the transport operator and the distance change by

$$\begin{aligned}\delta U_\alpha(a, b)_a^b &= U_\alpha(a, b)_a^c \delta\alpha^\mu \omega_{\mu c}^b - \delta\alpha^\mu \omega_{\mu a}^b U_\alpha(a, b)_c^b, \\ \delta V_\alpha(a, b)^a &= U_\alpha(a, b)^a_b \delta\alpha^\mu e_\mu^b - \delta\alpha^\mu (\omega_\mu^a_b V_\alpha(a, b)^b + e_\mu^a).\end{aligned}\tag{2.27}$$

As indicated by the factor ordering the fields and  $\delta\alpha^\mu$  are to be taken at  $\alpha(b)$  in the first term and  $\alpha(a)$  in the second term in both equations.

### 2.3 Spinors, test particles, and measurements

So far we considered paths and geodesics in spacetime. For a given path we defined a transport operator and a “distance” vector. We now want to discuss the physical meaning of these objects and how they can be measured. To make such measurements, our observers can use test particles. These test particles shall have the following properties. They may be scalar, spinor, or vector like particles, i.e. in a local Lorentz frame they are represented by a scalar (this is just a point particle with not extra structure), a spinor  $\chi$  as introduced in definition 1.11, or a vector  $v^a$ .

Any observer  $x$  can “emit” such a particle at a time  $t$ , it will then move along a geodesic to another observer  $y$ , where it arrives at time  $t'$ . The “state” of the particle, i.e. the vector  $v^a$  or the spinor  $\chi$ , shall stay covariantly constant while the particle is moving. In addition, the observers can measure geodesic distances, the result of such a measurement being the vector  $c^a$  appearing in (2.22). For physical reasons we should restrict the paths of test particles to be timelike or lightlike, but to simplify the treatment of measurements, let us also allow tachyons as test particles:

*Exercise 2.5.* In principle, for all following the experiments there is a possible physical realization of another experiment without tachyons, giving the same result if the equations of motion are satisfied (i.e. the dreibein postulate must hold and the connection must be flat). The only reason for such an experiment to fail is that horizons might be present, so that, e.g., a real particle can never pass along a certain loop in space. Find out which of the spacetimes constructed in section 3.4 have horizons and how this affects the measurements described here.

Consider a vector particle emitted in a state  $v^a(a)$  at  $\alpha(a)$ . The observer at  $\alpha(b)$  will see it in a state

$$v^b(b) = U_\alpha(b, a)_a^b v^a(a).\tag{2.28}$$

Locally this can be written as

$$D_s v^a = \partial_s v^a + \alpha'^\mu \omega_\mu^a_b v^b = 0.\tag{2.29}$$

For a spinor particle we get exactly the same, we only have to replace the vector representation of the Lorentz algebra by the spinor representation. We denote the spinor representation of the connection and the covariant derivative of a spinor by

$$\omega_\mu = \frac{1}{2} \omega_{\mu a} \gamma^a, \quad D_\mu \chi = \partial_\mu \chi + \omega_\mu \chi.\tag{2.30}$$

The corresponding representation of the field strength is given by the commutator of two covariant derivatives

$$D_{[\mu}D_{\nu]}\chi = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{F}_{\mu\nu}\chi \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{F}_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu\omega_\nu - \partial_\nu\omega_\mu + [\omega_\mu, \omega_\nu]. \quad (2.31)$$

We define the spinor transport operator similar to (2.14), with  $\omega_\mu \cdot$  replaced by  $\omega_\mu$ :

$$U_\alpha(a, a) = \mathbf{1}, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial s} U_\alpha(a, s) = U_\alpha(a, s) \omega_\mu \alpha'^\mu. \quad (2.32)$$

Hence, for a spinor particle moving along a path  $\alpha$  we have

$$D_s\chi = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \chi(b) = U_\alpha(b, a) \chi(a). \quad (2.33)$$

*Exercise 2.6.* Show that the spinor transport matrix obeys

$$U_\alpha U_\beta = U_{\alpha\bullet\beta}, \quad U_\alpha^{-1} = U_{\alpha^{-1}}, \quad (2.34)$$

where again  $U_\alpha$  is an abbreviation for  $U_\alpha(0, 1)$ , and that it is related to the vector transport operator by

$$U_\alpha(a, b)_{ab} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(U_\alpha(b, a) \gamma_a U_\alpha(a, b) \gamma_b), \quad (2.35)$$

which is the projection  $\text{SL}(2) \rightarrow \text{SO}(1, 2)$ . From this relation we can infer that we only need spinors as test particles to extract all information about the transport operators.

We can convert all our notation into the spinor representation by using the fact the three dimensional Minkowski space  $\mathbb{M}^3$  is isomorphic to the Lorentz algebra  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ . Hence, every 3-vector can be converted into an  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$  matrix by expanding it in terms of the gamma matrices. Doing this with the dreibein, we get the “curved” gamma matrices

$$\gamma_\mu = e_\mu^a \gamma_a, \quad e_\mu^a = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\gamma_\mu \gamma^a), \quad g_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu), \quad (2.36)$$

and the covariant derivative of an  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$  valued fields is

$$\mathbf{v} = v^a \gamma_a, \quad D_\mu \mathbf{v} = D_\mu v^a \gamma_a \quad \Rightarrow \quad D_\mu \mathbf{v} = \partial_\mu \mathbf{v} + [\omega_\mu, \mathbf{v}]. \quad (2.37)$$

Now the gravitational fields  $\gamma_\mu$  and  $\omega_\mu$  both take values in  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ . We can also define a matrix valued distance  $\mathbf{V}_\alpha = V_\alpha^a \gamma_a$ , so that the two basic non-local objects are

$$\begin{aligned} U_\alpha &= \mathcal{P} \exp \int_0^1 ds \alpha'^\mu \omega_\mu, \\ \mathbf{V}_\alpha &= \int_0^1 ds U_\alpha(0, s) \gamma_\mu \alpha'^\mu U_\alpha(s, 0). \end{aligned} \quad (2.38)$$

We can even go further and introduce an  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$  transport operator. However, this is not a matrix and does not correspond to any physical measurement with test particles. It is quite simple to define it as an equivalence class of paths in  $\text{SL}(2)$ :

$$\widetilde{U}_\alpha(a, b) : s \mapsto U_\alpha(a, a + s(b - a)). \quad (2.39)$$

*Exercise 2.7.* Show that the identities (2.34) hold for  $\widetilde{U}$  as well. This is not as trivial as it seems to be: for the inverse you have to show that

$$\widetilde{U}_\alpha^{-1} : s \mapsto U(s, 0) \quad \sim \quad \widetilde{U}_{\alpha^{-1}} : s \mapsto U(1, 1 - s), \quad (2.40)$$

and for the link the following paths in  $\mathrm{SL}(2)$  have to be homotopic:

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{U}_{\alpha \bullet \beta} : s \mapsto & \begin{cases} U_\alpha(0, 2s) & \text{for } s \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ U_\alpha U_\beta(0, 2s - 1) & \text{for } s \geq \frac{1}{2} \end{cases} \\ & \downarrow \\ \widetilde{U}_\alpha \widetilde{U}_\beta : s \mapsto & U_\alpha(0, s) U_\beta(0, s). \end{aligned} \quad (2.41)$$

The pair  $(\widetilde{U}_\alpha, \mathbf{V}_\alpha)$  is an element of  $\widetilde{\mathrm{ISO}}(1, 2)$ , and the relations (2.34) and (2.25) can be combined into

$$\begin{aligned} (\widetilde{U}_{\alpha \bullet \beta}, \mathbf{V}_{\alpha \bullet \beta}) &= (\widetilde{U}_\alpha, \mathbf{V}_\alpha) (\widetilde{U}_\beta, \mathbf{V}_\beta), \\ (\widetilde{U}_{\alpha^{-1}}, \mathbf{V}_{\alpha^{-1}}) &= (\widetilde{U}_\alpha, \mathbf{V}_\alpha)^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.42)$$

with the multiplication introduced in (1.30). The  $\mathbf{V}$  component of this relation reads explicitly

$$\mathbf{V}_{\alpha \bullet \beta} = \mathbf{V}_\alpha + U_\alpha \mathbf{V}_\beta U_\alpha^{-1}, \quad \mathbf{V}_{\alpha^{-1}} = -U_\alpha^{-1} \mathbf{V}_\alpha U_\alpha. \quad (2.43)$$

Let us now briefly describe how the values of these objects can be obtained by concrete measurements. Anticipating the results from section 3 let us assume that the fields are solutions of the equations of motion, which means that the torsion equation holds and that the field strength of the spin connection vanishes. From (2.27) we infer that the value of the transport operator or the distance then depends on the homotopy class of the path only.

It is quite easy to measure  $U_\alpha$  and  $\mathbf{V}_\alpha$  if there is a geodesic homotopic to  $\alpha$ . In this case one can simply send a spinor (or rather two independent spinors) along that geodesic to measure the transport operator  $U_\alpha$ , and  $\mathbf{V}_\alpha$  is the geodesic distance as defined in (2.22), converted into an  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$  matrix. This also means that if there is more than one geodesic within the same homotopy class, then they have the same distance vector  $c^a$  and, provided that the metric is invertible, they are in fact identical up to reparameterization. This is nothing but the trivial fact that in flat space there is only one geodesic connecting two points. However, there might be different geodesics in different homotopy classes, if spacetime is not globally Minkowskian. On the other hand, not every homotopy class contains a geodesic.

*Exercise 2.8.* To measure  $U_\alpha$  or  $\mathbf{V}_\alpha$  for a path such that there is no geodesic homotopic to  $\alpha$ , one can use a piecewise geodesic path homotopic to  $\alpha$  and compute the final result by (2.42). How can such a measurement be realized?

Hence, we are now able to measure the transport operator and the distance for all (homotopy classes of) paths. Returning to the ADM picture, we can distinguish between paths that lie entirely in  $\mathcal{N}$  and those in time direction. For the former, the transport operator depends on the spatial components  $\omega_i$  only, and we can say that a measurement (passing a test particle from  $x$  to  $y$ ) takes place *at the time  $t$*  (this needs a tachyon, but see exercise 2.5). This is what we need for quantum physics: measurements that are carried out at a fixed time. So let us stick to paths in  $\mathcal{N}$  in the following. For path in  $\mathcal{N}$  all the formulas above remain unchanged except that we have to replace the index  $\mu$  by  $i$ , i.e the tangent vector of the path becomes  $\alpha^i$  etc., and all objects become time dependent. By these measurements we cannot get information about the time components  $\gamma_t$  and  $\omega_t$ . So let us assume

that an observer  $x \in \mathcal{N}$  is also able to measure the quantities  $\omega_t(x, t)$  and  $\gamma_t(x, t)$  at any time  $t$ , and we can define a transport operator and distance in time direction

$$\begin{aligned} U_x(t_1, t_2) &= \mathcal{P} \exp \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \omega_t(x, t), \\ V_x(t_1, t_2) &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt U_x(t_1, t) \gamma_t(x, t) U_x(t, t_1). \end{aligned} \quad (2.44)$$

Obviously,  $U_x$  tells  $x$  how to compare measurements made at different times, as it transports a spinor along the worldline of  $x$ . As already mentioned, the time components  $\omega_t$  and  $\gamma_t$  will turn out to be pure gauge degrees of freedom, so actually  $x$  can not only *measure* them, he can *adjust* them as he likes.

*Exercise 2.9.* Show that with  $\omega_t = 0$  and  $\gamma_t = \gamma_0$  the observer becomes free falling, his local Lorentz frame is co-moving (i.e. it is his local restframe and does not rotate), and the time coordinate  $t$  represents his proper physical time. It is  $U_x(t_1, t_2) = \mathbf{1}$ , and  $V_x(t_1, t_2) = (t_2 - t_1)\gamma_0$  behaves like a clock.

## 2.4 Singular metrics and conical singularities

In this section we consider a simple example to show how the typical singularities of three dimensional gravity are described in dreibein formalism. We start with a flat Minkowski spacetime with polar coordinates  $t, r, \phi$ . Outside the origin the dreibein and spin connection satisfying the torsion equations are given by

$$e_t^0 = 1, \quad e_r^1 = 1, \quad e_\phi^2 = r, \quad \omega_\phi^0 = 1, \quad (2.45)$$

all other components vanishing. Alternatively, we can write it in spinor notation as

$$\gamma_t = \gamma_0, \quad \gamma_r = \gamma_1, \quad \gamma_\phi = r\gamma_2, \quad \omega_\phi = \frac{1}{2}\gamma_0. \quad (2.46)$$

In the sense of definition 2.1 this is not really a dreibein, as it is not defined for  $r = 0$  as a map from the tangent space of the manifold into  $\mathbb{M}^3$ . But we can change the topology of our space to make it well defined. Instead of having a Minkowski space with polar coordinates, we choose the space manifold to be a cylinder  $\mathcal{N} = \mathbb{R} \times S^1$ , i.e. we let  $r$  take any real value and do *not* identify points with different angles  $\phi$  at  $r = 0$ . The only identification is  $\phi \equiv \phi + 2\pi$ . Thus the “origin” of space becomes a circle and space extends “behind” this origin. One can check that (2.45) is a well defined dreibein and spin connection on this manifold and that the torsion equation is satisfied everywhere. The dreibein is singular at  $r = 0$  and with our interpretation from above this means that all observers with  $r = 0$  but  $\phi$  arbitrary sit at the same physical point. The topology of space (and spacetime) is *not*  $\mathcal{N} \times \mathbb{R}$  but space consists of two “cones” (with vanishing deficit angle) glued together at the top.

We also immediately see that the curvature or field strength vanishes everywhere and thus the transport operator along a loop depends on its homotopy class (which measures how often the path is wrapped around the  $S^1$ ) only. Given a path  $\alpha(s) = (t(s), r(s), \phi(s))$ , solving the differential equation (2.14) yields

$$U_\alpha(a, b) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos \Delta\phi & -\sin \Delta\phi \\ 0 & \sin \Delta\phi & \cos \Delta\phi \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Delta\phi = \phi(b) - \phi(a). \quad (2.47)$$

In fact, here it actually does not depend on the homotopy of the path, as adding  $2\pi$  to the angle does not change  $U$ . However, transporting a spinor once around the circle changes its sign, as the spinor transport operator is

$$U_\alpha(a, b) = \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\Delta\phi \gamma_0\right) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\Delta\phi/2) & \sin(\Delta\phi/2) \\ -\sin(\Delta\phi/2) & \cos(\Delta\phi/2) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.48)$$

How does a geodesic on this manifold look like? Of course, in the two regions  $r < 0$  and  $r > 0$  spacetime is just ordinary Minkowski space and geodesics which entirely lie in these regions are simply “straight lines”. A possible parameterization is

$$t(s) = t_0 + \bar{t}s, \quad r(s) = \pm \sqrt{r_0^2 + \bar{r}^2 s^2}, \quad \phi(s) = \phi_0 + \arctan \frac{\bar{r}s}{r_0}, \quad (2.49)$$

where  $(t_0, r_0, \phi_0)$  is the nearest point to the origin and the ratio  $\bar{r} : \bar{t}$  gives the “velocity”. Next consider a path that lies entirely inside  $r = 0$ :

*Exercise 2.10.* Show that for a path  $\alpha(s) = (t(s), 0, \phi(s))$  we have

$$U_\alpha(a, s)^a e_\mu^b \alpha'^\mu = t'(s) c^a, \quad \text{where } c^a = (1, 0, 0), \quad (2.50)$$

i.e. it is a timelike geodesic with  $\tau(s) = t(s)$  as “proper time”.

We see that a geodesic is no longer determined by giving a start point and a tangent vector. However, the definition still makes sense, because all these paths on the manifold  $\mathcal{N} \times \mathbb{R}$  represent the same path in physical spacetime. This was defined as the equivalence classes of points in  $\mathcal{M}$  having vanishing distance, and we saw that  $(t, 0, \phi)$  and  $(t, 0, \phi')$  have vanishing distance and thus all the paths above represent the “physical” geodesic  $t = t(s), r = 0$ .

Finally we have to consider geodesics that pass through  $r = 0$ . For such a path we must have  $\phi' = 0$  whenever  $r \neq 0$  (otherwise it would be of the type (2.49)). It therefore consists of three parts, the first and third being radial lines

$$\begin{aligned} t &= t_- + (s - s_-)\bar{t}_-, & r &= (s - s_-)\bar{r}_-, & \phi &= \phi_- & \text{for } s \leq s_-, \\ t &= t_+ + (s - s_+)\bar{t}_+, & r &= (s - s_+)\bar{r}_+, & \phi &= \phi_+ & \text{for } s \geq s_+, \end{aligned} \quad (2.51)$$

and in between we take an arbitrary path inside the  $r = 0$  circle as an ansatz:

$$t = t(s), \quad r = 0, \quad \phi = \phi(s) \quad \text{for } s_- \leq s \leq s_+. \quad (2.52)$$

Mapping the tangent vector of this path into the local Lorentz frames gives

$$e_\mu^a \alpha'^\mu = \begin{cases} (\bar{t}_-, \bar{r}_-, 0) & \text{for } s \leq s_-, \\ (t'(s), 0, 0) & \text{for } s_- \leq s \leq s_+, \\ (\bar{t}_+, \bar{r}_+, 0) & \text{for } s \geq s_+. \end{cases} \quad (2.53)$$

*Exercise 2.11.* Now you can show that the following conditions must hold for these three parts to fit together and to build a single geodesic:

1.  $t'(s) = 0$  in the middle part and thus  $t_+ = t_-$ ;
2. the path can be reparameterized such that  $\bar{t}_+ = \bar{t}_-$ ;
3. either  $\phi_+ - \phi_- = 0 \pmod{2\pi}$  and  $\bar{r}_+ = \bar{r}_-$ ,  
or  $\phi_+ - \phi_- = \pi \pmod{2\pi}$  and  $\bar{r}_+ = -\bar{r}_-$ .

The first statement says that the path, as seen from outside, “does not spend time” at  $r = 0$  even though the parameter might increase from  $s_-$  to  $s_+$ . From the second we can infer that  $\tau = s - s_-$ ,  $\tau = 0$ ,  $\tau = s - s_+$ , respectively for the three parts, is a possible proper length parameter for the path. Finally the third statements tells us how the two “outside parts” fit together: the first alternative gives a line that disappears from one region being continued in the other region where  $r$  has opposite



sign. The second one is a path that entirely lies within, e.g.,  $r \geq 0$  and is just a usual straight line through the origin, where the angular coordinate changes by  $\pi$ .

It is quite surprising that this comes out here, as our manifold is not Minkowski space but a “cylinder” with a singular metric. On  $\mathcal{M}$  the geodesic through  $r = 0$  looks rather strange: It enters  $r = 0$  at some angle  $\phi$ , then winding around the  $S^1$  some integer or half integer times, and then it leaves  $r = 0$  either into the region it came from (for “half integer”) or into the other asymptotic region (for “integer”). So this example shows that our definition of a geodesic is a reasonable extension to singular metrics.

Now all this might be amazing but, beside a strange extension of Minkowski space beyond  $r = 0$ , what is it good for? The answer is that with the same trick we can extend spacetime beyond a conical singularity. All we have to do is to change the values of the fields slightly. Instead of (2.46) we choose

$$\gamma_t = \gamma_0, \quad \gamma_r = \gamma_1, \quad \gamma_\phi = \zeta r \gamma_2, \quad \omega_\phi = \frac{1}{2}\zeta \gamma_0, \quad (2.54)$$

with a real constant  $\zeta > 0$ . The torsion equation is still satisfied and the curvature vanishes, but the transport operator

$$U_\alpha(a, b) \cdot = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos(\zeta \Delta\phi) & -\sin(\zeta \Delta\phi) \\ 0 & \sin(\zeta \Delta\phi) & \cos(\zeta \Delta\phi) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.55)$$

is no longer independent of the homotopy class of the path. Changing  $\Delta\phi$  by  $2\pi$  gives a different value for  $U_\alpha$ . The formula (2.49) for a geodesic outside the singularity does not change very much. One just has to replace the arctan by  $1/\zeta \arctan$ . This leads, e.g., to the fact that for  $\zeta < 1/2$  the geodesic can intersect itself.

Also exercise 2.11 still holds, except that “mod  $2\pi$ ” has to be replaced by “mod  $2\pi/\zeta$ ”. This changes the behaviour of the geodesic at  $r = 0$  drastically. It says that the path enters  $r = 0$  somewhere, goes around by an integer or half integer multiple of  $2\pi/\zeta$  then going back or into the opposite region. However, going  $2\pi/\zeta$  further before leaving  $r = 0$  will result in a different direction of the radial line: the geodesic is “scattered” at  $r = 0$  in any direction  $\Delta\phi = 2\pi z/\zeta \pmod{2\pi}$ ,  $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ . There are only finitely many such directions if  $\zeta$  is a rational, otherwise there is a dense set of possible directions. Here our geodesics are very different from those defined by (2.13) or by the extremal length condition. The first type is not well defined at  $r = 0$ . Paths with extremal proper length are also scattered at  $r = 0$ , but they exist for  $\zeta > 1$  only (otherwise it is always “shorter” to avoid the singularity), and instead of a discrete set of possible directions there is a continuous range around  $\Delta\phi = \pi$ .

So after all we have learned that it is possible to introduce singular metrics into three dimensional gravity such that at a conical singularity physics does not change in the sense that we do not have to give up the interpretation of the dreibein and connection field. Our example showed the simplest kind of such a singularity, in the next section we will find other singularities with more interesting structure.

### 3 Classical Dynamics

The dynamics of gravity is of course determined by the Einstein Hilbert action. In dreibein formalism it can be most easily expressed in terms of the field strength of the spin connection introduced in (2.9). It reads

$$I = \frac{1}{2} \int d^3x \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} e_\mu^a F_{\nu\rho a}. \quad (3.1)$$

Alternatively, we can express it in terms of the spinor representation and the curved gamma matrices  $\gamma_\mu = e_\mu^a \gamma_a$ . Remember that for the spin connection there is an extra factor of one half in the corresponding relation  $\omega_\mu = \frac{1}{2} \omega_{\mu a} \gamma^a$ , so that

$$I = \frac{1}{2} \int d^3 \mathbf{x} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} \text{Tr}(\gamma_\mu \mathbf{F}_{\nu\rho}). \quad (3.2)$$

The Levi Civita tensor density  $\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho}$  is defined such that the dreibein determinant  $e = \det(e_\mu^a)$  obeys the following relations:

$$e \varepsilon^{abc} = \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} e_\mu^a e_\nu^b e_\rho^c, \quad e \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho} = \varepsilon_{abc} e_\mu^a e_\nu^b e_\rho^c. \quad (3.3)$$

The components obey  $\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} = -\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho}$  (i.e.  $\mathcal{M}$  has negative signature). For the coordinates of our cylinder manifold we have  $\varepsilon^{tr\phi} = +1$ . We will almost immediately go over to the ADM formulation, where we have a Lagrangian on  $\mathcal{N}$  instead of the action on  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{N} \times \mathbb{R}$ . All we want to do in this  $\mathcal{M}$ -framework is to derive the equations of motion and have a brief look at the gauge symmetries of the action. Thereby we will ignore all the problems that might arise from ill-defined integrals or boundary terms produced by partial integration. We will deal with these problems in detail below. If we just vary the action with respect to the fields we get the equations

$$\begin{aligned} D_{[\mu} e_{\nu]}^a &= \partial_{[\mu} e_{\nu]}^a - \varepsilon^{ab} \omega_{[\mu b} e_{\nu]}^c = 0, \\ \frac{1}{2} F_{\mu\nu a} &= \partial_{[\mu} \omega_{\nu] a} - \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_a^{bc} \omega_{\mu b} \omega_{\nu c} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

or in the spinor representation

$$\begin{aligned} D_{[\mu} \gamma_{\nu]} &= \partial_{[\mu} \gamma_{\nu]} + [\omega_{[\mu}, \gamma_{\nu]}] = 0, \\ \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{F}_{\mu\nu} &= \partial_{[\mu} \omega_{\nu]} + \omega_{[\mu} \omega_{\nu]} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

The first is obviously the torsion equation. We already saw that its consequence is that our definitions of geodesics and transport operators coincide with those in the metric formulation. The second equation then states that spacetime is flat. So we do not get any local degrees of freedom like gravitational waves. All the physical properties of solutions to these equations have a “global” character, they are encoded in non-local quantities like those constructed in the previous section. The aim of this section is to identify these quantities and to give a classification of the set of physically inequivalent solutions. If you are not familiar with dreibein formalism, you should check that the model here is in fact equivalent to the metric description of three dimensional gravity [20, 21, 22, 23]:

*Exercise 3.1.* Show that, if the dreibein is invertible, the torsion equation can be solved for the spin connection uniquely. Inserting this solution into the field strength yields the Riemann tensor  $R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} = F_{\mu\nu ab} e_\rho^a e_\sigma^b$ , and the action becomes the Einstein Hilbert action  $\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{-g} R[g]$ .

The action also has gauge degrees of freedom, and in dreibein gravity these are the local Lorentz rotations and diffeomorphisms. In our language introduced in section 2, they directly correspond to Einstein’s relativity principles: For every observer the special relativity principle holds, i.e. physics looks the same in any local frame, as long as they are related by a Lorentz rotation, and general relativity means that physics looks the same for all observers and therefore interchanging observers (that’s what diffeomorphisms do) does not change physics.

The local Lorentz symmetry is realized by transforming the fields as

$$\delta \omega_\mu = \mathbf{L}[\boldsymbol{\lambda}] \omega_\mu = D_\mu \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \quad \delta \gamma_\mu = \mathbf{L}[\boldsymbol{\lambda}] \gamma_\mu = [\gamma_\mu, \boldsymbol{\lambda}], \quad (3.6)$$

where  $\lambda$  is an  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$  valued field on  $\mathcal{M}$ . To be more precise, at this point we only found a symmetry. Let us postpone the exact definition of what is a gauge symmetry. It will become clear in the Hamilton Jacobi formalism below.

Here  $L$  is introduced as a linear operator acting on fields. Diffeomorphisms are as usual generated by the Lie derivative of the fields. However, there is another symmetry of the action which is more basic than the diffeomorphisms and is also more suitable for our purpose: it treats  $\gamma_\mu$  as a gauge field just as  $\omega_\mu$  is treated as a gauge field of the Lorentz symmetry. We call the symmetry transformation a translation. It also has an  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$  field  $n$  as parameter:

$$\delta\omega_\mu = H[n]\omega_\mu = 0, \quad \delta\gamma_\mu = H[n]\gamma_\mu = D_\mu n. \quad (3.7)$$

To show that this is a symmetry of the action, one has to use the Bianchi identity  $D_{[\mu}F_{\nu\rho]} = 0$  after a partial integration. The diffeomorphisms generated by the Lie derivative with respect to some vector field can now be obtained by combining these two symmetries:

*Exercise 3.2.* Show that, given any vector field on  $\mathcal{M}$ , one can choose (field dependent) parameters  $n$  and  $\lambda$  such that  $L[\lambda] + H[n]$  acts as the Lie derivative with respect to this vector field.

If there are no more gauge symmetries, then they should form a closed Lie algebra:

*Exercise 3.3.* The operators  $L[\lambda]$  and  $H[n]$  provide a representation of the local Poincaré algebra  $\mathfrak{iso}(1,2)^\mathcal{M}$ , i.e. their commutators read

$$\begin{aligned} [L[\lambda_1], L[\lambda_2]] &= L[[\lambda_1, \lambda_2]], \\ [L[\lambda], H[n]] &= H[[\lambda, n]], \quad [H[n_1], H[n_2]] = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

### 3.1 Lagrangian and boundary conditions

So far we considered the classical equations of motion. To go over to quantum theory we want to reformulate the theory in Hamilton Jacobi formalism and then apply the Dirac canonical quantization method. All the necessary structure for this purpose has already been introduced. Spacetime is given by  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{N} \times \mathbb{R}$ , hence we have a global time coordinate which can be used as the canonical time. We just have to split off the integration over the real number  $t$  from the action integral (3.2) to get the Lagrangian.

This should yield the same equations of motion, but now some of them become time evolution equations for the fields, others do not contain time derivatives. These are “constraints”, i.e. they restrict the initial conditions we may choose for the remaining evolution equations. What we want to do in the following is to provide a well defined Lagrangian, compute momenta and Poisson brackets in the usual way and end up with a set of constraints and a Hamiltonian, which generates the correct time evolution by taking Poisson brackets. Even the first step will turn out not to be easy, because we want to allow our set of observers  $\mathcal{N}$  to be non-compact like the cylinder in the last section. After some redefinitions of fields we will be able to compactify  $\mathcal{N}$ , but this manifold will have boundaries. We have to introduce boundary conditions on the fields to get a finite Lagrangian and we will see that it is also necessary to introduce some extra degrees of freedom to get the correct equations of motion on these boundaries, which correspond to “spatial infinity”.

Let us first try to get the Lagrangian directly from the action by writing it as a time integral of some functional  $L$ . As this becomes an integral over the set of observers  $\mathcal{N}$ , we should also split the one-forms  $\omega_\mu, \gamma_\mu$  on  $\mathcal{M}$  into the one-forms  $\omega_i, \gamma_i$  and scalars  $\omega_t, \gamma_t$  on  $\mathcal{N}$ , as already described in section 2. The derivatives with respect to the coordinate  $t$  become “velocities”, denoted by a dot. We also need the Levi Civita tensor on  $\mathcal{N}$ , which is given by  $\varepsilon^{ij} = \varepsilon^{tij}$ , or  $\varepsilon_{ij} = -\varepsilon_{tij}$  (giving  $\mathcal{N}$  a

positive signature in contrast to the negative signature of  $\mathcal{M}$ ). Using all this we end up with the following Lagrangian:

$$L = \int d^2x \varepsilon^{ij} \text{Tr}(\dot{\omega}_i \gamma_j + \omega_t D_i \gamma_j + \tfrac{1}{2} \gamma_t \mathbf{F}_{ij}), \quad I = \int dt L \quad (3.9)$$

To obtain this  $L$  we performed a partial integration. This leads us to a problem which has been ignored up to now, namely that of the boundary conditions for the fields. It does, of course, not occur if space is compact without boundary, and that's the reason why most investigations on canonical gravity in three dimensions focussed on the torus, as this is the simplest non-trivial example for such a space.

We divide the boundary problem into two sub-problems. The first is to get a finite Lagrangian, the second will be to get the correct equations of motion by adding boundary terms. To get a finite action, we somehow have to restrict the asymptotic behaviour of the fields. Let us assume that the manifold  $\mathcal{N}$  has a finite number of non-compact “ends”, which asymptotically look like cylinders (or rather cones, but at the topological level this is the same as a cylinders), i.e.  $\mathcal{N}$  consists of some compact manifold, from which a number of “tubes” extend to infinity. The simplest example for such a manifold is the cylinder introduced in section 2.4 with two ends, but you can easily imagine a more complicated manifold consisting of a sphere with  $N > 2$  tubes going off, or even a torus with some of these tubes. Note that all these manifolds have trivial tangent bundles, as long as the genus of the “compact part” of  $\mathcal{N}$  is not greater than one.

Typical boundary conditions in field theory are given as fall-off conditions, i.e. the fields have to vanish suitably fast at infinity. In gravity such a condition does not work appropriately, because vanishing of the fields means that the metric becomes singular. That's not what we want. We want spacetime to be Minkowskian at infinity. So we have to look for different conditions. A first guess is to require that the difference of the fields to some set of background fields must vanish suitably fast. However, looking at the example considered in section 2.4, we immediately see that even this is not possible. The fields, especially  $\gamma_\phi$  at  $r \rightarrow \infty$ , differ by an infinite amount for different values of the parameter  $\zeta$ . So if we want to have all these solutions included, we cannot restrict the asymptotic behaviour in this way.

On the other hand, in contrast to other field theories, there is an advantage of gravity here: The coordinate system is arbitrary. This means that, given such an asymptotic end, instead of choosing “local” coordinates  $r, \phi$  with  $\phi \equiv \phi + 2\pi$  and  $r \in [r_0, \infty)$ , we may as well take another radial coordinate  $\rho$ , which is bounded,  $\rho \in [\rho_0, \rho_\infty)$ , and which is related to  $r$  by  $r = r(\rho)$  or  $\rho = \rho(r)$ . A typical choice could be  $\rho(r) = \arctan r$ . Using the  $\rho, \phi$  coordinate system, the integral in (3.9) runs over a finite range only, making the boundary somehow simpler. We can even compactify the manifold by taking  $\rho \in [\rho_0, \rho_\infty]$ . The “ends” of  $\mathcal{N}$  then look like the boundary considered in figure 1. From the physical point of view, what we did is to add some “observers at infinity” to  $\mathcal{N}$ . They will play a special role below: there will be extra fields defined for those observers only, and they will somehow “glue” a fixed background Lorentz frame to the boundary of  $\mathcal{N}$ . You can think of this as some kind of “fixed stars background”, and the extra degrees of freedom to be introduced are the relative positions and orientations of the observers with respect to this background. It will be necessary to introduce this extra structure to get the correct equations of motion from the Lagrangian.

However, let us return to the problem of making the Lagrangian finite. The fields may still diverge at  $\rho \rightarrow \rho_\infty$ , so we have to impose boundary conditions on them. Let us try the simplest possible condition: we require that all the fields can be smoothly extended to the compactified manifold, i.e. to  $\rho = \rho_\infty$ . Then the Lagrangian is certainly finite, as it is an integral over smooth functions on a compact manifold, which from now on will be called  $\mathcal{N}$ . Let's see whether these are reasonable physical boundary conditions. Transferring the spin connection from the  $\rho$ -system to the  $r$ -system we get the following limits for  $r \rightarrow \infty$  (note the extra factor  $\partial\rho/\partial r$  appearing when transforming the

cotangent index  $\rho$  into  $r$ ):

$$\omega_t(r) \rightarrow \bar{\omega}_t, \quad \omega_\phi(r) \rightarrow \bar{\omega}_\phi, \quad \omega_r(r) = \rho'(r)\omega_\rho(\rho(r)) \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.10)$$

The “bared” quantities are those at  $\rho = \rho_\infty$ , which may depend on  $\phi$  (and  $t$ , of course), and “ $\rightarrow$ ” denotes convergence at  $r \rightarrow \infty$  at least as fast as  $\rho'(r)$  converges to 0:

$$f(r) \rightarrow f_\infty \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} (f(r) - f_\infty)/\rho'(r) \text{ exists.} \quad (3.11)$$

These conditions are in fact reasonable, as they just require a gauge choice:

*Exercise 3.4.* You can always perform a Lorentz gauge transformation generated by (3.6) such that in the  $r$ -system we have  $\omega_r \rightarrow 0$ . The remaining conditions, stating that the limits for  $\omega_\phi$  and  $\omega_t$  exist, then follow by requiring  $\mathbf{F}_{rt} \rightarrow 0$  and  $\mathbf{F}_{r\phi} \rightarrow 0$ , which does not impose any further restrictions on the *solutions* of the equations of motion.

What about the dreibein field  $\gamma_\mu$ ? The boundary conditions for them look exactly like those in (3.10), but this is certainly not what we want:  $\gamma_r \rightarrow 0$  would mean that the radial lines become lines of proper length zero, and  $\gamma_\phi \rightarrow \bar{\gamma}_\phi$  is obviously not satisfied by the example in section 2.4. What seems to be missing is a “power of  $r$ ”, i.e. we want  $\gamma_r$  to approach a constant and  $\gamma_\phi$  to grow linearly with  $r$ , so that the end looks like a cone. The trick to achieve this works as follows. The physical dreibein field is not  $\gamma_\mu$  but given by

$$\hat{\gamma}_\mu = \gamma_\mu + D_\mu \gamma_\infty, \quad (3.12)$$

where  $\gamma_\infty$  is some  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$  valued field, which we have to adjust such that we get the correct boundary conditions. Note that this is just a transformation of the form (3.7), so  $\hat{\gamma}_\mu$  and  $\gamma_\mu$  obey the same equations of motion and (3.2) is still the correct action, though  $\gamma_\mu$  appearing therein is not the *physical* dreibein field. We choose  $\gamma_\infty$  such that it diverges at the boundary and thus  $\hat{\gamma}_\mu$  does not obey the same boundary conditions as  $\gamma_\mu$ . What we want is that the radial lines become spacelike geodesics with  $r$  the proper length of the line, which means  $g_{rr} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\hat{\gamma}_r \hat{\gamma}_r) \rightarrow 1$  and  $D_r \hat{\gamma}_r \rightarrow 0$ . Using the boundary conditions on  $\omega_\mu$ , this leads to the requirement  $\hat{\gamma}_r \rightarrow \bar{\gamma}$ , where  $\bar{\gamma}$  is some (possibly  $\phi$ -dependent) matrix such that  $\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\bar{\gamma} \bar{\gamma}) = 1$ .

To achieve this, we just have to set  $\gamma_\infty(r, \phi) = r \bar{\gamma}(\phi)$  for large  $r$  and smoothly falling off to 0 when going towards the interior of  $\mathcal{N}$ . The boundary conditions on the physical dreibein are obtained by replacing  $\omega_\mu$  with  $\gamma_\mu$  in (3.10) and then inserting (3.12):

$$\hat{\gamma}_r \rightarrow \bar{\gamma}, \quad \hat{\gamma}_t - r[\bar{\omega}_t, \bar{\gamma}] \rightarrow \bar{\gamma}_t, \quad \hat{\gamma}_\phi - r \partial_\phi \bar{\gamma} - r[\bar{\omega}_\phi, \bar{\gamma}] \rightarrow \bar{\gamma}_\phi. \quad (3.13)$$

They look rather awkward but you can see that now  $\hat{\gamma}_r$  becomes a constant and  $\hat{\gamma}_\phi$  becomes linear in  $r$ . If expressed in terms of the fields  $\gamma_\mu$  instead of  $\hat{\gamma}_\mu$ , however, they are as simple as (3.10) and they are even simpler in the  $\rho$  system, where all the fields just have to be smooth at the boundary of  $\mathcal{N}$ . We always assume that the fixed field  $\gamma_\infty$ , which provides the relation (3.12), does not depend on  $t$ . This is in principle possible but could cause some trouble with an explicitly time-dependent Hamiltonian.

*Exercise 3.5.* Show that under the conditions (3.13) the radial lines asymptotically become geodesics, and that the last two conditions follow from the first one by requiring the components  $D_{[r} \hat{\gamma}_{t]}$  and  $D_{[r} \hat{\gamma}_{\phi]}$  of the torsion to vanish for  $r \rightarrow \infty$ , so that they do not impose additional conditions on the solutions.

So after all we got a finite action in terms of the fields  $\omega_\mu, \gamma_\mu$  on a compactified manifold  $\mathcal{N}$ , which are related to the physical fields existing on the non-compact interior of  $\mathcal{N}$  only by (3.12). We can now

forget how this relation was constructed using local coordinates. The relation between the “physical” fields  $\hat{\gamma}_\mu$  and the “finite” fields (which appear in the Lagrangian and obey the boundary condition “well defined on the compactified  $\mathcal{N}$ ”) is entirely described by the  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$  valued field  $\gamma_\infty$ , which must diverge to spatial infinity, i.e.  $\text{Tr}(\gamma_\infty \gamma_\infty) \rightarrow +\infty$ , at the boundaries of  $\mathcal{N}$ . Our background structure is a compact manifold  $\mathcal{N}$  with some boundaries looking like figure 1, and a fixed field  $\gamma_\infty$  describing how the fields on  $\mathcal{N}$  are related to the physical fields on the non-compact interior of  $\mathcal{N}$ .

*Exercise 3.6.* Given a path  $\alpha$  in  $\mathcal{N}$ , then the “physical” distance  $\widehat{V}_\alpha$  is related to the “finite” distance  $V_\alpha$  by

$$\widehat{V}_\alpha = V_\alpha + U_\alpha \gamma_\infty(\alpha(1)) U_\alpha^{-1} - \gamma_\infty(\alpha(0)), \quad (3.14)$$

where the finite and physical distance is obtained by (2.38) with  $\gamma_\mu$  and  $\hat{\gamma}_\mu$  inserted, respectively. Hence, the finite distance of a path can be obtained by measuring the physical distance and “subtracting” the  $\gamma_\infty$  field (which has a fixed value for every observer). As  $V_\alpha$  has a finite limit if the path approaches the boundary, you can also measure the “distance” of the observers at infinity.

Let us now investigate the dynamics induced by the finite Lagrangian  $L$ . What we want is, of course, to get the equations of motion (3.5) back. It is easy to read off the canonical variables and Lagrange multipliers, because the Lagrangian is given in the first order standard form  $L = \dot{q}p - H$ , where  $q$  are the configuration variables  $\omega_i$ ,  $p$  the conjugate momenta  $\varepsilon^{ij}\gamma_j$ , and  $H$  is the Hamiltonian, depending on the phase space variables and the multipliers  $\omega_t$ ,  $\gamma_t$ , whose velocities do not enter the Lagrangian. We could introduce Poisson brackets right here, but we postpone it until we have our final Lagrangian. Let us first check whether  $L$  really provides the correct equations of motion. Variation of the Lagrangian with respect to the multipliers yields the constraint equations

$$\varepsilon^{ij} D_i \gamma_j \approx 0, \quad \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{ij} \mathbf{F}_{ij} \approx 0, \quad (3.15)$$

corresponding to the spatial components of the equations of motion (3.5). They define a subset of the phase space, which is called “physical phase space” or “constraint surface”. We introduce the usual notation “ $\approx$ ” for a “weak” equality, i.e. a relation between phase space functions which becomes an equality on the physical phase space. Hence, (3.15) is just a definition of the symbol  $\approx$ .

To simplify the notation, we derive the remaining Euler Lagrange equations as follows: if we vary a field whose time derivative enters the Lagrangian, we write

$$\delta L[\phi, \dot{\phi}] = \frac{\delta L}{\delta \phi} \delta \phi + \frac{\delta L}{\delta \dot{\phi}} \delta \dot{\phi} = \left( \frac{\delta L}{\delta \phi} - \frac{d}{dt} \frac{\delta L}{\delta \dot{\phi}} \right) \delta \phi, \quad (3.16)$$

which means that in all these variations we integrate the time derivative by parts if it acts on the variation of the field, so that we can directly read off the Euler Lagrange equation. With spatial derivatives and partial integrations, however, we have to be more careful, because the space  $\mathcal{N}$  has boundaries, and the boundary conditions do not require the fields to be fixed there.

If we now vary  $\gamma_i$ , we find

$$\begin{aligned} \delta L &= \int d^2x \varepsilon^{ij} \text{Tr}(\dot{\omega}_i \delta \gamma_j + \omega_t D_i \delta \gamma_j) \\ &= \int d^2x \varepsilon^{ij} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{F}_{ti} \delta \gamma_j) + \sum_\ell \oint d\phi \text{Tr}(\omega_t \delta \gamma_\phi). \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

Here we picked up a boundary term after a partial integration, using Stokes’ theorem

$$\int d^2x \varepsilon^{ij} \partial_i X_j = \sum_\ell \oint d\phi X_\phi, \quad (3.18)$$

where  $\phi$  is the periodic coordinate on the boundary. The sum runs over all boundaries of  $\mathcal{N}$ . They all have to be parameterized in the same direction, and the Levi Civita tensor has to be normalized such that  $\varepsilon^{\rho\phi} = +1$ , where  $\rho$  is the local coordinate pointing towards the boundary. Note that the compactification of  $\mathcal{N}$  now makes it very simple to deal with such integrals, as all the fields are well defined on the boundary, where the right hand side of (3.18) is evaluated. The symbol  $\oint$  denotes integration over any range  $\phi_0$  to  $\phi_0 + 2\pi$ . The fields  $\omega_t$ ,  $\gamma_\phi$ , etc., are considered as periodic functions of  $\phi$ .

Unfortunately, we do not get the correct equations of motion. Requiring (3.17) to vanish for all  $\delta\gamma_j$  gives the correct equation  $\mathbf{F}_{ti} = 0$ , but in addition we get  $\omega_t = 0$  on the boundary. A similar problem arises for the variation of the spin connection, where we have

$$\begin{aligned}\delta L &= \int d^2x \varepsilon^{ij} \text{Tr}(-\delta\omega_i \dot{\gamma}_j + \omega_t[\delta\omega_i, \gamma_j] + \gamma_t D_i \delta\omega_j) \\ &= \int d^2x \varepsilon^{ij} \text{Tr}((D_t \gamma_i - D_i \gamma_t) \delta\omega_j) + \sum_\ell \oint d\phi \text{Tr}(\gamma_t \delta\omega_\phi).\end{aligned}\tag{3.19}$$

Here we integrated the time derivative by parts as described in (3.16). Again, we get the correct time components of the torsion equation  $D_{[t}\gamma_{i]} = 0$ , but we also get  $\gamma_t = 0$  on the boundary. What would it mean if the values of the multipliers are fixed at the boundary? The freedom to choose the values of the multipliers corresponds to gauge symmetries. A consequence would be that we loose some gauge degrees of freedom. This would not be too bad, but to maintain the correct number of physically equivalent states, we had to “fix the gauge” somehow on the boundary.

*Exercise 3.7.* An alternative way to deal with boundary conditions is the following: find a suitable gauge fixing for the fields  $\gamma_\phi$  and  $\omega_\phi$  on the boundaries such that together with  $\omega_t = 0$  and  $\gamma_t = 0$  you get the same final result for the reduced phase space. You have to make the  $\gamma_\infty$  field time dependent to get a non-singular metric at infinity. However, this is rather cumbersome and at least as complicated as introducing the auxiliary fields below.

We can try to avoid these problems by adding the extra term

$$L' = - \sum_\ell \oint d\phi \text{Tr}(\gamma_t \omega_\phi + \omega_t \gamma_\phi)\tag{3.20}$$

to the Lagrangian. But then the equations of motion for the multipliers  $\omega_t$  and  $\gamma_t$  are no longer given by (3.15); we get extra constraints  $\omega_\phi = 0$  and  $\gamma_\phi = 0$  at the boundary. This is just the kind of boundary condition we rejected above, because the simple example from section 2.4 did not satisfy them. The only way out of this dilemma is to introduce extra auxiliary fields on the boundary. They look rather unmotivated first, but as already mentioned we will find a nice physical interpretation for them in the end.

For each boundary of  $\mathcal{N}$  we introduce a pair of fields  $\mathbf{u}(\phi) \in \text{SL}(2)$  and  $\mathbf{v}(\phi) \in \mathfrak{sl}(2)$ . They are not periodic in  $\phi$ , so consider them as fields on a real line instead of a circle, or as fields on the boundary of  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$  as defined by the family of paths in figure 1, instead of fields on the boundary of  $\mathcal{N}$ . However, they are not completely arbitrary. We require them to be quasiperiodic (see definition 1.8), i.e the pair  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ , considered as an  $\text{ISO}(1, 2)$  valued field, obeys the relation

$$(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})(\phi + 2\pi) = (\mathbf{u}_\ell, \mathbf{v}_\ell)(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})(\phi),\tag{3.21}$$

with the multiplication as given by (1.30). Written out in components, the relation becomes

$$\mathbf{u}(\phi + 2\pi) = \mathbf{u}_\ell \mathbf{u}(\phi), \quad \mathbf{v}(\phi + 2\pi) = \mathbf{v}_\ell + \mathbf{u}_\ell \mathbf{v}(\phi) \mathbf{u}_\ell^{-1}.\tag{3.22}$$

Quasiperiodic fields of this type will play a very important role below. They are used to classify the complete solution of the constraint equations. By taking derivatives, there is an alternative definition for quasiperiodic fields:

*Exercise 3.8.* Show that (3.22) is equivalent to the requirement that the following  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$  valued derivatives of  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$  are periodic:

$$\bar{\omega}_\phi = \mathbf{u}^{-1} \partial_\phi \mathbf{u}, \quad \bar{\gamma}_\phi = \mathbf{u}^{-1} \partial_\phi \mathbf{v} \mathbf{u}. \quad (3.23)$$

From these relations we infer that  $\mathbf{u}$  (as well as  $\mathbf{v}$ ) has one degree of freedom more than a periodic field, which is somehow encoded in the integration constant for the differential equation  $\mathbf{u}^{-1} \partial_\phi \mathbf{u} = \bar{\omega}_\phi$  (or the corresponding relation for  $\mathbf{v}$ ). You can also consider the constant  $\mathbf{u}_\ell$  (or  $\mathbf{v}_\ell$ ) as this extra degree of freedom.

To get the correct equations of motion for the dreibein and the spin connection, we now add a term to  $L$  which looks very much like (3.20):

$$L' = \sum_\ell \oint d\phi \operatorname{Tr}(\gamma_t(\bar{\omega}_\phi - \omega_\phi) + \omega_t(\bar{\gamma}_\phi - \gamma_\phi)) \quad (3.24)$$

If we now vary  $\omega_i$  or  $\gamma_i$ , the boundary terms in (3.17) and (3.19) cancel against the variation of  $L'$ . What we get is the correct time evolution for the dreibein and the spin connection

$$\dot{\omega}_i = D_i \omega_t, \quad \dot{\gamma}_i = D_i \gamma_t - [\omega_t, \gamma_i]. \quad (3.25)$$

Variation of the multipliers no longer yields  $\omega_\phi = \gamma_\phi = 0$  on the boundary, as we found for (3.20). Instead, we get new constraint equations relating the boundary fields  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}$  to the connection and dreibein field tangent to the boundary:

$$\mathbf{u}^{-1} \partial_\phi \mathbf{u} = \bar{\omega}_\phi \approx \omega_\phi, \quad \mathbf{u}^{-1} \partial_\phi \mathbf{v} \mathbf{u} = \bar{\gamma}_\phi \approx \gamma_\phi. \quad (3.26)$$

This does not impose any new constraints on  $\omega_i$  or  $\gamma_i$ , because the differential equations are globally integrable for any arbitrary pair of periodic fields  $\bar{\omega}_\phi$  and  $\bar{\gamma}_\phi$ . However, it seems that we only shifted the original problem somewhere else. As we have introduced new fields, we also get additional equations of motion for these fields. A variation of  $\mathbf{v}$ , e.g., would immediately give  $\omega_t = 0$ , which is exactly what we had before. But we may still add terms depending on the new fields only.

What we need is a kinetic term for the new fields, which makes the field  $\mathbf{u}$  a configuration variable and  $\mathbf{v}$  the conjugate momentum. It is

$$L_{\text{kin}} = \sum_\ell \left( \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{u}_\ell^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{u}}_\ell \mathbf{v}(\phi_0)) - \oint_{\phi_0} d\phi \operatorname{Tr}(\dot{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{u}^{-1} \partial_\phi \mathbf{v}) \right). \quad (3.27)$$

The notation  $\oint_{\phi_0}$  indicates that the range of the integral is  $\phi_0$  to  $\phi_0 + 2\pi$ .

*Exercise 3.9.* Show that the value of  $L_{\text{kin}}$  does not depend on  $\phi_0$ . The integrand itself is not periodic, but the first term compensates this non-periodicity.

At the moment there is absolutely no motivation for this awkward looking boundary term. The only reason to choose this  $L_{\text{kin}}$  is that now we get the correct equations of motion. It is straightforward but rather complicated to compute these equations, as we are dealing with group valued quasiperiodic fields. Only those variation are allowed which preserve (3.22). The actual derivation of the equations is given in the appendix. Requiring the action to be stationary implies

$$\dot{\mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{u} \omega_t, \quad \dot{\mathbf{v}} = \mathbf{u} \gamma_t \mathbf{u}^{-1}, \quad \dot{\mathbf{u}}_\ell = \dot{\mathbf{v}}_\ell = 0. \quad (3.28)$$

Hence, (3.25) and (3.28) provide the full set of evolution equations for the fields. Finally, we can check that these are consistent with the constraints in the following sense: given any solution to the constraints as initial condition for the time evolution equations, then the constraints are automatically satisfied at any later time. In Dirac's formalism such constraints are called first class, and we will see below that this is equivalent to the fact that the Poisson algebra of the constraints is closed.



*Exercise 3.10.* Show that under the time evolution the relations (3.22) and all the constraint equations (3.15) and (3.26) are conserved for arbitrary values of the multipliers  $\omega_t, \gamma_t$ . As a consequence, those cannot carry any physical information, as their time dependence is completely undetermined. All physical information is contained in the phase space variables  $\{\omega_i, \gamma_i, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}\}$ .

### 3.2 Poisson brackets, gauge symmetries and constraint algebra

We now have a well defined Lagrangian depending on the multipliers  $\omega_t, \gamma_t$ , the configurations variables  $\omega_i, \mathbf{u}$ , and their conjugate momentum variables  $\gamma_i$  and  $\mathbf{v}$ . The Lagrangian is first order in time derivatives, so it should be straightforward to read off the Poisson brackets. For the interior of  $\mathcal{N}$  it is in fact easy, as the canonically conjugate momentum of  $\omega_i$  is  $\varepsilon^{ij} \gamma_j$ . To avoid confusion with the matrix indices, we will not use brackets where both entries are matrices. Instead, we use “dummy”  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$  matrices and take traces to write down the brackets. The basic bracket between the spin connection and the dreibein reads

$$\{\text{Tr}(\mathbf{a}\gamma_i(y)), \omega_j(x)\} = \varepsilon_{ij} \mathbf{a} \delta(x, y), \quad (3.29)$$

or vice versa

$$\{\text{Tr}(\mathbf{a}\omega_i(y)), \gamma_j(x)\} = \varepsilon_{ij} \mathbf{a} \delta(x, y), \quad (3.30)$$

and brackets between components of the connection or the dreibein alone always vanish. Instead of tracing the momenta, we can also switch back to the vector representation for  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$  matrices (by taking  $\mathbf{a} = \frac{1}{2}\gamma^a$ ), where the same relation reads

$$\{e_i^a(y), \omega_j(x)\} = \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{ij} \gamma^a \delta(x, y), \quad (3.31)$$

So far this was not too sophisticated. However, if we now consider the boundary term, things get more involved. Not only that the fields are group valued, the quasiperiodicity makes it hard to find the brackets. It is not easy to derive the brackets of  $\mathbf{u}$  with  $\mathbf{v}$  in the usual way, and those of  $\mathbf{v}$  with itself are even worse. It turns out that there is only a subset of brackets that is actually needed, namely those where at least one entry is one of the periodic fields  $\bar{\omega}_\phi$  and  $\bar{\gamma}_\phi$  introduced in (3.23). The rather technical derivation of the complete brackets is given in the appendix. All  $\mathbf{u}$ 's commute, and thus also the bracket of  $\mathbf{u}$  with  $\bar{\omega}_\phi$  vanishes. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathbf{u}(\phi), \text{Tr}(\mathbf{a}\bar{\omega}_\phi(\phi'))\} &= 0, \\ \{\mathbf{v}(\phi), \text{Tr}(\mathbf{a}\bar{\omega}_\phi(\phi'))\} &= -\mathbf{u}(\phi) \mathbf{a} \mathbf{u}^{-1}(\phi) \hat{\delta}(\phi - \phi'), \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

where  $\hat{\delta}(\phi)$  is the periodic delta function on the circle, i.e. it has a peak whenever  $\phi = 2\pi z$ ,  $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ . The brackets with  $\bar{\gamma}_\phi$  are

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathbf{v}(\phi), \text{Tr}(\mathbf{a}\bar{\gamma}_\phi(\phi'))\} &= 0, \\ \{\mathbf{u}(\phi), \text{Tr}(\mathbf{a}\bar{\gamma}_\phi(\phi'))\} &= -\mathbf{u}(\phi) \mathbf{a} \hat{\delta}(\phi - \phi'). \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

Note that they are periodic in  $\phi'$  but quasiperiodic in  $\phi$ . In particular, the quasiperiodicity parameters  $\mathbf{u}_\ell$  and  $\mathbf{v}_\ell$  commute with both  $\bar{\omega}_\phi$  and  $\bar{\gamma}_\phi$ . Differentiating them with respect to  $\phi$  and using the definition (3.23) we obtain the following brackets between  $\bar{\omega}_\phi$  and  $\bar{\gamma}_\phi$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \{\text{Tr}(\mathbf{a}\bar{\omega}_\phi(\phi)), \text{Tr}(\mathbf{b}\bar{\gamma}_\phi(\phi'))\} &= \text{Tr}([\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}]\bar{\omega}_\phi) \hat{\delta}(\phi - \phi') - \text{Tr}(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{b}) \hat{\delta}'(\phi - \phi'), \\ \{\text{Tr}(\mathbf{a}\bar{\gamma}_\phi(\phi)), \text{Tr}(\mathbf{b}\bar{\gamma}_\phi(\phi'))\} &= \text{Tr}([\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}]\bar{\gamma}_\phi) \hat{\delta}(\phi - \phi'). \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

We can now use these brackets to reproduce the equations of motion. We first define the “smeared” constraints. Given any two  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$  valued fields  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$  and  $\boldsymbol{n}$  on  $\mathcal{N}$ , they are

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{L}[\boldsymbol{\lambda}] &= \int d^2x \varepsilon^{ij} \text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\lambda} D_i \boldsymbol{\gamma}_j) + \sum_{\ell} \oint d\phi \text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{\phi} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\phi})) \approx 0, \\ \boldsymbol{H}[\boldsymbol{n}] &= \int d^2x \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{ij} \text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{n} \boldsymbol{F}_{ij}) + \sum_{\ell} \oint d\phi \text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{n}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\omega}}_{\phi} - \boldsymbol{\omega}_{\phi})) \approx 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.35)$$

The constraint equations tell us that these quantities have to vanish for any pair of fields  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ ,  $\boldsymbol{n}$ . Remember that the integration runs over the compactified manifold  $\mathcal{N}$ , thus  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$  and  $\boldsymbol{n}$  have to be smooth at the boundary and the integrals are always well defined. Using this notation, we can write down the Hamiltonian as

$$H = -\boldsymbol{L}[\boldsymbol{\omega}_t] - \boldsymbol{H}[\boldsymbol{\gamma}_t] \approx 0. \quad (3.36)$$

Thus  $H$  is a linear combination of constraints, the coefficients given by the Lagrange multipliers. It vanishes for any solution of the constraints, i.e. on the whole physical phase space. This reflects the fact that our “time”  $t$  is unphysical. As a consequence, there is no “energy” of a physical state which is usually represented by the Hamiltonian defined with respect to the physical time. However, the Hamiltonian still generates the time evolution, but with respect to the parameter time  $t$ , by taking Poisson brackets. To compute these brackets, it is more suitable to perform a partial integration in (3.35), such that there are no more derivatives acting on  $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i$  or  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i$ . Using Stokes’ theorem we find

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{L}[\boldsymbol{\lambda}] &= - \int d^2x \varepsilon^{ij} \text{Tr}(D_i \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\gamma}_j) + \sum_{\ell} \oint d\phi \text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\lambda} \bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{\phi}), \\ \boldsymbol{H}[\boldsymbol{n}] &= - \int d^2x \varepsilon^{ij} \text{Tr}(\partial_i \boldsymbol{n} \boldsymbol{\omega}_j - \boldsymbol{n} \boldsymbol{\omega}_i \boldsymbol{\omega}_j) + \sum_{\ell} \oint d\phi \text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{n} \bar{\boldsymbol{\omega}}_{\phi}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.37)$$

With the brackets above we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \{\boldsymbol{L}[\boldsymbol{\lambda}], \boldsymbol{\omega}_i\} &= D_i \boldsymbol{\lambda}, & \{\boldsymbol{L}[\boldsymbol{\lambda}], \boldsymbol{u}\} &= \boldsymbol{u} \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \\ \{\boldsymbol{L}[\boldsymbol{\lambda}], \boldsymbol{\gamma}_i\} &= [\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i, \boldsymbol{\lambda}], & \{\boldsymbol{L}[\boldsymbol{\lambda}], \boldsymbol{v}\} &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.38)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \{\boldsymbol{H}[\boldsymbol{n}], \boldsymbol{\omega}_i\} &= 0, & \{\boldsymbol{H}[\boldsymbol{n}], \boldsymbol{u}\} &= 0, \\ \{\boldsymbol{H}[\boldsymbol{n}], \boldsymbol{\gamma}_i\} &= D_i \boldsymbol{n}, & \{\boldsymbol{H}[\boldsymbol{n}], \boldsymbol{v}\} &= \boldsymbol{u} \boldsymbol{n} \boldsymbol{u}^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.39)$$

There are two important facts summarized in these equations. First, observe that the right hand sides are exactly the Lorentz transformations (3.6) and translations (3.7), but now they act only on the canonical fields on  $\mathcal{N}$  instead of the fields on the spacetime manifold  $\mathcal{M}$ . In addition, we get some new transformations of the extra boundary fields, and one can check that these are indeed necessary for the complete action including the boundary terms to be invariant under gauge transformations. Hence, we found an explicit representation of the operators introduced in (3.6) and (3.7) as Poisson brackets with the constraints. We therefore call  $\boldsymbol{L}$  the Lorentz constraint, and  $\boldsymbol{H}$  is called Hamilton constraint: in ADM gravity using the metric as field variable, it splits into the generator of space and time diffeomorphism, and the name Hamilton constraint was introduced because it somehow replaces the Hamiltonian as the generator of time evolution.

Secondly, we see that the equations of motions are reproduced by the Poisson brackets as the Hamiltonian is a linear combination of  $\boldsymbol{L}$  and  $\boldsymbol{H}$ , and we only have to replace  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$  and  $\boldsymbol{n}$  with  $\boldsymbol{\omega}_t$  and  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_t$  to get (3.25) and (3.28) back. For any phase space function we have

$$\dot{F} = \{F, H\} = \{\boldsymbol{L}[\boldsymbol{\omega}_t], F\} + \{\boldsymbol{H}[\boldsymbol{\gamma}_t], F\}. \quad (3.40)$$

The arbitrariness of the multipliers reflects the fact that time evolution is unique only up to gauge transformations. In addition, as our “time”  $t$  itself is completely arbitrary, time evolution is in fact nothing but a gauge transformation. The action is invariant under any reparameterization of time, which is part of the gauge symmetry, so time evolution is formally equivalent to a gauge transformation.

We can now also check that the constraints are first class in the sense of Dirac, i.e. that the Poisson algebra of  $\mathbf{L}$  and  $\mathbf{H}$  closes. We already did two similar calculations: we have seen that the “linear operators”  $\mathbf{H}$  and  $\mathbf{L}$  defined in (3.6) and (3.7) do form a closes algebra, and we saw that the constraints are preserved by the time evolution.

*Exercise 3.11.* Compute the Poisson algebra of the constraints and show that

$$\begin{aligned}\{\mathbf{L}[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1], \mathbf{L}[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_2]\} &= \mathbf{L}[[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_2]], \\ \{\mathbf{L}[\boldsymbol{\lambda}], \mathbf{H}[\mathbf{n}]\} &= \mathbf{H}[[\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{n}]], \quad \{\mathbf{H}[\mathbf{n}_1], \mathbf{H}[\mathbf{n}_2]\} = 0.\end{aligned}\tag{3.41}$$

You have to be careful with partial integrations and boundary terms to get the correct results. As a consequence, given any two (smooth) phase space functions vanishing on the physical phase space,  $F \approx 0$ ,  $G \approx 0$ , then we also have  $\{F, G\} \approx 0$ .

We can now give an exact definition of what we mean by a gauge transformation, which in Dirac’s [4] canonical framework is a transformation generated by taking Poisson brackets with first class constraints.

*Definition 3.1 (Gauge Transformation).* Two physical field configurations  $\phi_0$  and  $\phi_1$  (denoting the set  $\{\boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_i, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}\}$ ) are called “gauge equivalent” or “related by a gauge transformations” if there is a smooth deformation  $\phi_s$ ,  $s \in [0, 1]$ , such that

$$\frac{d}{ds} \phi_s \approx \{\mathbf{L}[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_s] + \mathbf{H}[\mathbf{n}_s], \phi_s\},\tag{3.42}$$

with some parameter fields  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_s, \mathbf{n}_s$ , which may of course vary with  $s$ .

Field configurations related by a gauge transformation are assumed to represent the same physical state. All other symmetries of the action are called global symmetries and they map different physical states onto each other. We will see this quite explicitly for an example below, so it is really important to distinguish between these symmetries. In context of gravity those global symmetries are sometimes called “large diffeomorphisms” or “large Lorentz rotations”, because they cannot be cut into (infinitesimally) small pieces.

To identify the gauge invariant objects we will need later on, we have to know how the finite gauge transformations described in definition 3.1 look like, i.e. we have to go over from the gauge algebra to the gauge group. We formally get it by exponentiating the “infinitesimal generators”  $\mathbf{L}$  and  $\mathbf{H}$ . This is quiet easy for the translations as the exponential series is of first order only. A finite translation is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\omega}_i &\mapsto \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, & \mathbf{u} &\mapsto \mathbf{u}, \\ \boldsymbol{\gamma}_i &\mapsto \boldsymbol{\gamma}_i + D_i \mathbf{n}, & \mathbf{v} &\mapsto \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u} \mathbf{n} \mathbf{u}^{-1}.\end{aligned}\tag{3.43}$$

For the Lorentz symmetry exponentiation is not as simple, but of course we know how to do it. Instead of an  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$  valued field  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$  the parameter becomes a group valued  $\text{SL}(2)$  field  $\mathbf{h}$  and the Lorentz rotation reads

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\omega}_\mu &\mapsto \mathbf{h}^{-1}(\partial_\mu + \boldsymbol{\omega}_\mu)\mathbf{h}, & \mathbf{u} &\mapsto \mathbf{u}\mathbf{h}, \\ \boldsymbol{\gamma}_\mu &\mapsto \mathbf{h}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\gamma}_\mu\mathbf{h}, & \mathbf{v} &\mapsto \mathbf{v}.\end{aligned}\tag{3.44}$$

However, here we have to be a little bit more careful again. In section 1.2 we saw that the “Lorentz group” is actually  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$  and not  $\text{SL}(2)$ . So shouldn't the parameter of the Lorentz rotation better be an  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$  field  $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}$ ? Or, the other way around, couldn't we take an  $\text{SO}(1,2)$  field  $h^a_b$  as parameter, and what's the difference? We can rewrite (3.44) in the vector representation and get

$$\omega_{\mu ab} \mapsto h^c_a (\eta_{cd} \partial_\mu + \omega_{\mu cd}) h^d_b, \quad e_\mu^a \mapsto h_b^a e_\mu^b. \quad (3.45)$$

However, here we already get into trouble with the transformation of  $\mathbf{u}$ . Ignoring this problem for a moment, we could equally well replace the boundary field  $\mathbf{u} \in \text{SL}(2)$  with  $u_a^b \in \text{SO}(1,2)$ , so that we don't have to assume that  $h^a_b$  is the projection (1.16) of some field  $\mathbf{h}$  onto  $\text{SO}(1,2)$ . The symmetry transformation, at least for the gauge fields  $\omega_i$  and  $\gamma_i$ , is well defined for any  $\text{SO}(1,2)$  field  $h^a_b$ . The difference between (3.45) and (3.44) is that there are  $\text{SO}(1,2)$  valued fields which are not projections of  $\text{SL}(2)$  valued fields.

*Exercise 3.12.* Show that there are such fields on a manifold  $\mathcal{N}$  if and only if the loop group of  $\mathcal{N}$  is non-trivial, i.e.  $\Upsilon \neq \{\eta\}$ .

The question is: shall we consider those as gauge transformations or not? They are certainly symmetries of the action. However, the definition above tells us that they are not gauge symmetries in the sense of Dirac.

*Exercise 3.13.* Show that (3.43) and (3.44) are gauge transformations if and only if  $\mathbf{h}$  is a projection of some  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$  valued field  $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}$  on  $\mathcal{N}$  (see exercise 1.8). As an example, take the cylinder manifold with the fields given by (2.54). With our boundary conditions, these are in fact the  $\hat{\gamma}_\mu$  fields. Choose  $\gamma_\infty = r\gamma_1$  to transform to the finite fields. Then perform a Lorentz transformation with parameter  $\mathbf{h}(r, \phi) = \exp(\phi\gamma_0)$  (which is quite simple). Transform back to the physical fields  $\hat{\gamma}_\mu$ . You will end up with a different value of  $\zeta$ , showing that physics has changed by choosing a field  $\mathbf{h}$  as parameter for the Lorentz transformation which is not a projection of any  $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}$ .

*Exercise 3.14.* Under the finite gauge transformations, the transport operator and the distance of a path changes by

$$\widetilde{U}_\alpha \mapsto \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^{-1}(\alpha(0)) \widetilde{U}_\alpha \tilde{\mathbf{h}}(\alpha(1)), \quad \mathbf{V}_\alpha \mapsto \mathbf{h}^{-1}(\alpha(0)) \mathbf{V}_\alpha \mathbf{h}(\alpha(0)) \quad (3.46)$$

for a Lorentz rotation with parameter  $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$ , and

$$\widetilde{U}_\alpha \mapsto \widetilde{U}_\alpha, \quad \mathbf{V}_\alpha \mapsto \mathbf{V}_\alpha + \mathbf{U}_\alpha \mathbf{n}(\alpha(1)) \mathbf{U}_\alpha^{-1} - \mathbf{n}(\alpha(0)), \quad (3.47)$$

for a translation with parameter  $\mathbf{n} : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathfrak{sl}(2)$ , respectively.

### 3.3 Solving the constraints

To find classical solutions of the equations of motion, all we have to do is to solve the constraints. Time evolution of the so found states is then given by choosing suitable values for the multipliers and computing the brackets with the Hamiltonian. A “suitable” choice would be  $\omega_t = 0$  and  $\gamma_t = \gamma_0$ , corresponding to free falling local observers (see exercise 2.9). A second step will then be to classify the equivalence classes of the solutions modulo gauge transformations, which gives an overview over all physically inequivalent classical states.

Let us first consider the interior equations (3.15). The Hamilton constraint depends on  $\omega_i$  only and states that its field strength vanishes. The solution for such an equation is well known. It can be locally parameterized by an  $\text{SL}(2)$  valued field  $\mathbf{g}$  and reads

$$\omega_i = \mathbf{g}^{-1} \partial_i \mathbf{g}. \quad (3.48)$$

However, such a parameterization exists locally only and getting a parameterization for the global solution is not trivial. Before showing how to solve this problem, let us solve the Lorentz constraint locally, too. Inserting (3.48) we can rewrite it as

$$\varepsilon^{ij} g^{-1} \partial_i (g \gamma_j g^{-1}) g = 0. \quad (3.49)$$

It now states that the curl of the covector inside the parenthesis vanishes and therefore there is (locally) a “potential”  $\mathbf{f} \in \mathfrak{sl}(2)$  such that

$$g \gamma_i g^{-1} = \partial_i \mathbf{f} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \gamma_i = g^{-1} \partial_i \mathbf{f} g. \quad (3.50)$$

How can we find the global solution? The answer is that we cannot define the “potentials”  $\mathbf{g}$  and  $\mathbf{f}$  globally on  $\mathcal{N}$ , but we can do it on the covering manifold  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$ . In addition, we already learned that it might be better to take an  $\widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}(2)$  field  $\widetilde{\mathbf{g}}$  instead of  $\mathbf{g} \in \mathrm{SL}(2)$  right from the beginning. This will avoid confusion later on, as the gauge invariants are in fact  $\widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}(2)$  valued.

Remember that the elements of  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$  are homotopy classes of paths in  $\mathcal{N}$  starting at a special point  $\bar{x}$ . Hence, let us consider this point as a special observer and what follows will describe the universe as seen by this observer. Given a solution to the constraint equations (3.15), we will use the non-local objects from section 2.3 to define the following fields on  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$ :

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{g}}(\alpha) = \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_\alpha, \quad \mathbf{g}(\alpha) = \mathbf{U}_\alpha, \quad \mathbf{f}(\alpha) = \mathbf{V}_\alpha. \quad (3.51)$$

Of course,  $\mathbf{g}$  is just the projection of  $\widetilde{\mathbf{g}}$  onto  $\mathrm{SL}(2)$ , so it is not really an independent field, we just need it to derive some explicit formula. Remember that the transport operator and the distance of a path are invariant under smooth deformations of the path, provided that the dreibein postulate holds and the curvature of the spin connection vanishes. Hence, these fields are well defined on  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$  if the constraints are satisfied. If we now vary  $\alpha \in \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$  without keeping  $\alpha(1)$  fixed, we can use the spinor representation of (2.27) to get

$$\delta \mathbf{U}_\alpha = \mathbf{U}_\alpha \boldsymbol{\omega}_i \delta \alpha^i \quad \delta \mathbf{V}_\alpha = \mathbf{U}_\alpha \boldsymbol{\gamma}_i \delta \alpha^i \mathbf{U}_\alpha^{-1}, \quad (3.52)$$

where  $\delta \alpha^i$  is the variation of the end point of  $\alpha$ . Using the same coordinates on  $\mathcal{N}$  and  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$ ,  $\delta \alpha^i$  is also the variation of the point  $\alpha \in \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$ , so these two equations tell us how the derivatives of  $\mathbf{g}$  and  $\mathbf{f}$  look like. Explicitly, we get

$$g^{-1} \partial_i g = \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \quad g^{-1} \partial_i \mathbf{f} g = \boldsymbol{\gamma}_i. \quad (3.53)$$

Note, however, that these equations “live” on  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i$  and  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i$  are the pullbacks of the gauge fields onto  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$ . As  $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i$  and  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i$  are periodic, we are using the same symbol for a field on  $\mathcal{N}$  and the corresponding periodic field on  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$ .

Obviously, we can recover  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i$  and  $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i$  from  $\widetilde{\mathbf{g}}$  and  $\mathbf{f}$ , and we get exactly (3.48) and (3.50). Thus the potentials  $\widetilde{\mathbf{g}}$  and  $\mathbf{f}$  parameterize the solutions (3.15) completely. But not every arbitrary set of potentials on  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$  corresponds to such a solution on  $\mathcal{N}$ : the left hand sides of (3.53) have to be periodic on  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$ . We already dealt with these kinds of conditions for the  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$  fields above, so we expect the potentials to be quasiperiodic. Indeed, this time the condition is even stronger:

*Exercise 3.15.* Show that the field  $(\widetilde{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{f}) : \widetilde{\mathcal{N}} \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathrm{ISO}}(1, 2)$  defined by (3.51) is *normalized quasiperiodic*, i.e. we have

$$(\widetilde{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{f}) \circ b_\lambda = (\widetilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda, \mathbf{f}_\lambda) (\widetilde{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{f}) \quad (3.54)$$

for all  $\lambda \in \Upsilon$ , with  $\widetilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda = \widetilde{\mathbf{g}}(\lambda)$  and  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda = \mathbf{f}(\lambda)$ . In components:

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{g}}(\lambda \bullet \alpha) = \widetilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda \widetilde{\mathbf{g}}(\alpha), \quad \mathbf{f}(\lambda \bullet \alpha) = \mathbf{f}_\lambda + \mathbf{g}_\lambda \mathbf{f}(\alpha) \mathbf{g}_\lambda^{-1}. \quad (3.55)$$

Every solution to the constraints is mapped onto a pair of normalized quasiperiodic potentials. We already saw that this map is injective, as we were able to recover the fields from the potentials. On the other hand, if  $(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{f})$  is a set of normalized quasiperiodic potentials, we find that the gauge fields derived via (3.53) are periodic on  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$ , and of course they solve the constraints. Hence, there is an inverse map from the set of normalized quasiperiodic potentials to the solutions of the constraints. This inverse map is injective, too: if there are two potentials yielding the same gauge fields via (3.53), then they can differ by a constant only:  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}' = \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_0 \tilde{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{f}' = \mathbf{f}_0 + \mathbf{g}_0 \mathbf{f} \mathbf{g}_0^{-1}$ , or  $(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}', \mathbf{f}') = (\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_0, \mathbf{f}_0)(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{f})$ . But normalized quasiperiodic fields always obey  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}(\eta) = \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{f}(\eta) = 0$ . This gives  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_0 = \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{f}_0 = 0$ . So the map is in fact one-to-one.

Now what about the boundary fields  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$ ? We have to solve the boundary constraints (3.26), which relates the gauge fields on the boundary to the quasiperiodic fields  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$ . To insert the parameterization of the gauge fields in terms of the potentials on  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$ , we use the boundary paths introduced in figure 1. We get the gauge fields  $\omega_\phi$  and  $\gamma_\phi$  tangent to the boundary by fixing any family of paths  $\alpha_{\ell, \phi}$  and using the formulas (3.48) and (3.50). Hence, the boundary constraints are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{g}^{-1} \partial_\phi \mathbf{g}(\alpha_{\ell, \phi}) &= \mathbf{u}^{-1} \partial_\phi \mathbf{u}(\phi), \\ \mathbf{g}^{-1} \partial_\phi \mathbf{f} \mathbf{g}(\alpha_{\ell, \phi}) &= \mathbf{u}^{-1} \partial_\phi \mathbf{v} \mathbf{u}(\phi). \end{aligned} \quad (3.56)$$

The solution to these equations is that  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$  differs from  $(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{f})$  only by multiplication with a constant  $(\mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{c}_\ell)^{-1}$  from the left, or explicitly

$$\mathbf{u}(\phi) = \mathbf{b}_\ell^{-1} \mathbf{g}(\alpha_{\ell, \phi}), \quad \mathbf{v}(\phi) = \mathbf{b}_\ell^{-1} (\mathbf{f}(\alpha_{\ell, \phi}) - \mathbf{c}_\ell) \mathbf{b}_\ell, \quad (3.57)$$

where  $\mathbf{b}_\ell \in \text{SL}(2)$  and  $\mathbf{c}_\ell \in \mathfrak{sl}(2)$ . These two variables (for each end of  $\mathcal{N}$ ) represent the additional physical degrees of freedom introduced with the boundary fields  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$ . They depend on the special family of paths chosen in (3.57), so we always have to fix this family before introducing  $\mathbf{b}_\ell$  and  $\mathbf{c}_\ell$ . Nevertheless we now have a complete parametrization of the solutions to the constraint equations, and we can summarize the result as follows.

*Theorem 3.1.* There is a one-to-one map from the set of physical field configurations on  $\mathcal{N}$  onto the set of normalized quasiperiodic functions  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}} \rightarrow \text{ISO}(1, 2)$ :

$$\{\omega_i(x), \gamma_i(x), \mathbf{u}(\phi), \mathbf{v}(\phi)\} \longleftrightarrow \{\tilde{\mathbf{g}}(\alpha), \mathbf{f}(\alpha), \mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{c}_\ell\}. \quad (3.58)$$

It is explicitly given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{g}}(\alpha) &= \tilde{\mathbf{U}}_\alpha, & \mathbf{b}_\ell &= \mathbf{U}_{\alpha_{\ell, \phi}} \mathbf{u}^{-1}(\phi), \\ \mathbf{f}(\alpha) &= \mathbf{V}_\alpha, & \mathbf{c}_\ell &= \mathbf{V}_{\alpha_{\ell, \phi}} - \mathbf{U}_{\alpha_{\ell, \phi}} \mathbf{u}^{-1}(\phi) \mathbf{v}(\phi) \mathbf{u}(\phi) \mathbf{U}_{\alpha_{\ell, \phi}}^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.59)$$

where  $\alpha_{\ell, \phi}$  is a fixed family of boundary paths as defined in figure 1. The right hand sides are independent of  $\phi$ . The inverse map reads

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_i(x) &= \mathbf{g}^{-1} \partial_i \mathbf{g}(\alpha_x), & \mathbf{u}(\phi) &= \mathbf{b}_\ell^{-1} \mathbf{g}(\alpha_{\ell, \phi}), \\ \gamma_i(x) &= \mathbf{g}^{-1} \partial_i \mathbf{f} \mathbf{g}(\alpha_x), & \mathbf{v}(\phi) &= \mathbf{b}_\ell^{-1} (\mathbf{f}(\alpha_{\ell, \phi}) - \mathbf{c}_\ell) \mathbf{b}_\ell, \end{aligned} \quad (3.60)$$

where  $\alpha_x \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}$  is any path with  $\pi(\alpha_x) = x \in \mathcal{N}$ .

This theorem tells us what the solutions to the constraints are, or how the physical phase space looks like. It does not tell us whether two solutions are related by a gauge transformation and represent the same physical state. What we are looking for is the so called reduced phase space.

*Definition 3.2 (Reduced Phase Space).* The set of physically inequivalent states, i.e. the set of equivalence classes of solutions of the constraint equations modulo gauge transformations, is called the reduced phase space. A physical state is uniquely given as a point in the this space.

Hence, the reduced phase space gives a complete classification of the possible physical states of a system, and what we have to do is to find the equivalence classes of the sets  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{c}_\ell\}$  under Lorentz rotations und translations, which were given in (3.43) and (3.44). Remember that though  $\mathbf{h}$  appears in the finite Lorentz rotation, the parameter is actually an  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$  field  $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}$  on  $\mathcal{N}$ . We can use (3.47) and what we get is

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathbf{g}} &\mapsto \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_0^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{g}} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}, & \mathbf{b}_\ell &\mapsto \mathbf{h}_0^{-1} \mathbf{b}_\ell, \\ \mathbf{f} &\mapsto \mathbf{h}_0^{-1} \mathbf{f} \mathbf{h}_0, & \mathbf{c}_\ell &\mapsto \mathbf{h}_0^{-1} \mathbf{c}_\ell \mathbf{h}_0,\end{aligned}\tag{3.61}$$

for the Lorentz rotation and

$$\mathbf{f} \mapsto \mathbf{f} - \mathbf{n}_0 + \mathbf{g} \mathbf{n} \mathbf{g}^{-1}, \quad \mathbf{c}_\ell \mapsto \mathbf{c}_\ell - \mathbf{n}_0,\tag{3.62}$$

for the translation, where  $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_0 = \tilde{\mathbf{h}}(\bar{x})$  and  $\mathbf{n}_0 = \mathbf{n}(\bar{x})$ . To simplify the notation, we can combine both gauge transformations into a single  $\text{ISO}(1, 2)$  transformation

$$\begin{aligned}(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{f}) &\mapsto (\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_0, \mathbf{n}_0)^{-1} (\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{f}) (\tilde{\mathbf{h}}, \mathbf{n}), \\ (\mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{c}_\ell) &\mapsto (\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_0, \mathbf{n}_0)^{-1} (\mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{c}_\ell).\end{aligned}\tag{3.63}$$

Again, we are using the convention that the same symbol denotes a field on  $\mathcal{N}$  and the corresponding periodic field on  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$ . Hence, instead of using fields on  $\mathcal{N}$  we can use *periodic* fields  $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}$  and  $\mathbf{n}$  on  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$  as parameters of finite gauge transformations. We can now proof a second theorem which gives us part of the classification of gauge invariant parameters of solutions:

*Theorem 3.2.* Two configurations  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{c}_\ell\}$  and  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{g}}', \mathbf{f}', \mathbf{b}'_\ell, \mathbf{c}'_\ell\}$  are related by a gauge transformation if

$$\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda = \tilde{\mathbf{g}}'_\lambda, \quad \mathbf{f}_\lambda = \mathbf{f}'_\lambda, \quad \mathbf{b}_\ell = \mathbf{b}'_\ell, \quad \mathbf{c}_\ell = \mathbf{c}'_\ell,\tag{3.64}$$

for all  $\lambda \in \Upsilon$  and all ends  $\ell$ , i.e. if the potentials coincide on the loop group and the boundary parameters are equal.

The proof is quite simple. Define  $(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}, \mathbf{n}) = (\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{f})^{-1} (\tilde{\mathbf{g}}', \mathbf{f}')$ . This is periodic, because

$$(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}, \mathbf{n}) \circ b_\lambda = (\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{f})^{-1} (\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda, \mathbf{f}_\lambda)^{-1} (\tilde{\mathbf{g}}'_\lambda, \mathbf{f}'_\lambda) (\tilde{\mathbf{g}}' \mathbf{f}') = (\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{f})^{-1} (\tilde{\mathbf{g}}' \mathbf{f}') = (\tilde{\mathbf{h}}, \mathbf{n}),\tag{3.65}$$

and we also have  $(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_0, \mathbf{n}_0) = (\tilde{\mathbf{1}}, 0)$ . Thus  $(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}, \mathbf{n})$  can be used as a parameter for a gauge transformation (3.63), which transforms  $(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{f})$  into  $(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}', \mathbf{f}')$ .

As a result, we find that an equivalence class of solutions is entirely determined by the discrete set of variables  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda, \mathbf{f}_\lambda, \mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{c}_\ell\}$ . We call them the “holonomies”. They are still infinitely many, but they are not independent. From the quasiperiodicity conditions (3.54) we infer that they have to provide a representation of the loop group:

$$(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{\lambda \bullet \kappa}, \mathbf{f}_{\lambda \bullet \kappa}) = (\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda, \mathbf{f}_\lambda) (\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\kappa, \mathbf{f}_\kappa).\tag{3.66}$$

It is obviously sufficient to specify the values of  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda$  and  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda$  for the *primitive* loops introduced in definition 1.6, all others are then given by linking them and using (3.66). So there are only finitely many parameters left to classify the physical states, showing that the reduced phase space of three dimensional gravity on a reasonably well-behaving manifold is finite dimensional. But we still don’t have a full classification of physical states. First of all, even the finite set of “primitive holonomies” might not be independent, as there may be relations between the primitive loops which have to be respected by the holonomies. A standard example is the torus, where the relation  $\lambda \bullet \kappa \bullet \lambda^{-1} \bullet \kappa^{-1} = \eta$  leads to the restriction

$$(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda, \mathbf{f}_\lambda) (\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\kappa, \mathbf{f}_\kappa) (\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda, \mathbf{f}_\lambda)^{-1} (\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\kappa, \mathbf{f}_\kappa)^{-1} = (\tilde{\mathbf{1}}, 0)\tag{3.67}$$

for the primitive holonomies, which becomes rather complicated when written out in components. More complicated relations hold for higher genus manifolds, and it is getting even difficult to find the range of the primitive holonomies.

In addition, different holonomies not necessarily correspond to different physical states, as there are still gauge transformation acting on them. They are those gauge transformation which did not occur in the proof of theorem 3.2, i.e. for which the parameters  $\mathbf{h}_0$  and  $\mathbf{n}_0$  at  $\bar{x}$  do not vanish. Evaluating (3.63) for the holonomies gives

$$\begin{aligned}(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda, \mathbf{f}_\lambda) &\mapsto (\mathbf{h}_0, \mathbf{n}_0)^{-1}(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda, \mathbf{f}_\lambda)(\mathbf{h}_0, \mathbf{n}_0), \\(\mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{c}_\ell) &\mapsto (\mathbf{h}_0, \mathbf{n}_0)^{-1}(\mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{c}_\ell).\end{aligned}\tag{3.68}$$

Hence, for the holonomies corresponding to the loops the gauge transformations are inner automorphisms of  $\text{ISO}(1, 2)$ . From definition 1.13 we know that we can use an  $\text{ISO}(1, 2)$  parameter  $(\mathbf{h}_0, \mathbf{n}_0)$  instead of the  $\widetilde{\text{ISO}}(1, 2)$  parameter  $(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_0, \mathbf{n}_0)$  appearing in (3.63), as inner automorphisms of the covering group are completely parameterized by elements of  $\text{ISO}(1, 2)$ .

The boundary holonomies transform by multiplication from the left only, and therefore it is quite easy to find the equivalence classes under gauge transformations, provided that we have at least one end. Calling it  $\ell = o$ , then the quantities

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathbf{b}_{o,\ell}, \mathbf{c}_{o,\ell}) &= (\mathbf{b}_o, \mathbf{c}_o)^{-1}(\mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{c}_\ell) \quad \text{for } \ell \neq o, \\(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{o,\ell}, \mathbf{f}_{o,\ell}) &= (\mathbf{b}_o, \mathbf{c}_o)^{-1}(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda, \mathbf{f}_\lambda)(\mathbf{b}_o, \mathbf{c}_o) \quad \text{for } \lambda \in \Upsilon_0,\end{aligned}\tag{3.69}$$

are gauge invariant. Note that again we are multiplying  $\text{SL}(2)$  elements with  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$  elements in the second line, but  $\mathbf{b}_o$  acts as an inner automorphism so that the operation is well defined. These variables provide a full classification of the classical solution: by exercise 1.3 we know that the loop group of a manifold with boundary is free, so the reduced phase space is just a direct sum of “number of primitive loops” times  $\widetilde{\text{ISO}}(1, 2)$  plus “number of ends minus one” times  $\text{ISO}(1, 2)$ . If there are no “ends” of the space manifold  $\mathcal{N}$ , we cannot use the boundary holonomies to obtain gauge invariant quantities. In this case, one really has to find the equivalence classes of sets of  $\text{ISO}(2)$  elements (obeying extra relations) modulo inner automorphism.

Finally, let us consider the time evolution of the holonomies. As we know how they transform under gauge symmetries, we only have to replace the parameters by the time components of the gauge fields  $\omega_t$  and  $\gamma_t$  to get the time evolution. We find

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda &= [\mathbf{g}_\lambda, \omega_t(\bar{x})], & \dot{\mathbf{b}}_\ell &= -\omega_t(\bar{x}) \mathbf{b}_\ell, \\ \dot{\mathbf{f}}_\lambda &= [\mathbf{f}_\lambda, \omega_t(\bar{x})] - \gamma_t(\bar{x}) + \mathbf{g}_\lambda \gamma_t(\bar{x}) \mathbf{g}_\lambda^{-1}, & \dot{\mathbf{c}}_\ell &= [\mathbf{c}_\ell, \omega_t(\bar{x})] - \gamma_t(\bar{x}).\end{aligned}\tag{3.70}$$

We see that they only depend on the value of the multipliers at  $\bar{x}$ , because we eliminated all gauge degrees of freedom except those at this special point. In the first equation we gave the time evolution for  $\mathbf{g}_\lambda$  instead of  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda$ , which cannot be written as a simple commutator, as it is not a matrix. However, the time evolution acts as a Lorentz rotation only, so it is obvious how the time derivative of  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda$  looks like. We can also integrate the time evolution by using the “evolution operators” (2.44). We then get formally the same as (3.68) for the gauge transformations, and here we can insert  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda$  again:

$$\begin{aligned}(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda, \mathbf{f}_\lambda)(t_2) &= (\mathbf{U}_{\bar{x}}, \mathbf{V}_{\bar{x}})(t_2, t_1) (\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda, \mathbf{f}_\lambda)(t_1) (\mathbf{U}_{\bar{x}}, \mathbf{V}_{\bar{x}})(t_1, t_2), \\(\mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{c}_\ell)(t_2) &= (\mathbf{U}_{\bar{x}}, \mathbf{V}_{\bar{x}})(t_2, t_1) (\mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{c}_\ell)(t_1).\end{aligned}\tag{3.71}$$

For free falling observers the time derivatives become very simple, as  $\omega_t = 0$  and  $\gamma_t = \gamma_0$ :

$$\dot{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda = \dot{\mathbf{b}}_\ell = 0, \quad \dot{\mathbf{f}}_\lambda = \mathbf{g}_\lambda \gamma_0 \mathbf{g}_\lambda^{-1} - \gamma_0, \quad \dot{\mathbf{c}}_\ell = -\gamma_0.\tag{3.72}$$



### 3.4 Cylinder spacetimes

Before going over to quantum physics, in this last “classical” section we will use the formalism derived above to classify the solutions of Einstein’s equations on a given manifold. We will not need the results of this section later on. All we want to do here is to construct some interesting spacetimes, showing that there is a huge variety of inequivalent solutions to Einstein’s equations even on the simplest possible manifold. Explicit solutions to Einstein’s equations in three dimensions were classified in [24], and of course the solutions presented here are closely related those given there. For a similar approach using dreibein formalism see also [25, 26] for torus and higher genus manifolds, and recently the Klein bottle has been studied [27], too. Our picture of spacetime as a set of observers evolving in time is a very useful tool to visualize its structure and the various singularities. We take the set of local observers to be the cylinder  $\mathcal{N} = \mathbb{R} \times S^1$ . For simplicity, we drop all the boundary terms here. The boundary terms were constructed such that their existence does not affect on the gauge fields  $\omega_i$  and  $\gamma_i$ . They are easily restored by choosing arbitrary values for  $c_\ell$  and  $b_\ell$  and using (3.60). We will discuss their physical interpretation in detail in the quantum section.

The coordinates on  $\mathcal{N}$  are  $r, \phi$  with  $\phi \equiv \phi + 2\pi$ , and we have the same coordinates without periodicity relation on  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}} \simeq \mathbb{R}^2$ . For simplicity, we choose  $\bar{x} = (0, 0)$ , so that  $(r, \phi) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$  is represented by the path  $s \mapsto (sr, s\phi) \in \mathcal{N}$ . All the fields have trivial limits for  $r \rightarrow \pm\infty$ , so there is no need to introduce the  $\rho$  coordinate from section 3.1. Nevertheless we need the  $\gamma_\infty$  field which relates the finite fields  $\gamma_\mu$  to the physical fields  $\hat{\gamma}_\mu$  (see (3.12)), in order to get the correct behaviour of the physical fields at infinity. We simply choose  $\gamma_\infty = r\gamma_1$ , which obviously diverges to spacelike infinity  $\text{Tr}(\gamma_\infty\gamma_\infty) \rightarrow +\infty$  for  $r \rightarrow \pm\infty$ . In addition, we “gauge fix” all our observers to be free falling, i.e. we always have  $\omega_t = 0$  and  $\hat{\gamma}_t = \gamma_t = \gamma_0$ .

With the results of the previous section, we know that the solutions are parameterized by a single pair  $(\tilde{g}_\lambda, \mathbf{f}_\lambda)$ , where  $\lambda = (0, 2\pi) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$  is the primitive loop of the cylinder. Two such pairs represent the same physical state, if they are related by an inner automorphism, which explicitly reads

$$\tilde{g}_\lambda \mapsto h_0^{-1} \tilde{g}_\lambda h_0, \quad \mathbf{f}_\lambda \mapsto h_0^{-1} (\mathbf{f}_\lambda + g_\lambda \mathbf{n}_0 g_\lambda^{-1} - \mathbf{n}_0) h_0. \quad (3.73)$$

Using the classification of  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$  and  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$  elements, we can split the states into three classes, depending on the value of the parameters: if  $\tilde{g}_\lambda$  is non-null, then the state is called timelike, lightlike or spacelike depending on the value of  $\tilde{g}_\lambda$ , otherwise depending on the value of  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda$ . Note that if  $\tilde{g}_\lambda$  is null, then  $g_\lambda = \pm \mathbf{1}$ , and  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda$  does not transform under translations, so that the squared length of  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda$  is gauge invariant. The special cases  $\tilde{g}_\lambda = \pm \mathbf{1}_z, \mathbf{f}_\lambda = 0$  are included in the timelike states. An important property of translations can be used to simplify the complete classification of inequivalent states:

*Exercise 3.16.* Assume that  $\tilde{g}_\lambda$  is non-null, i.e.  $g_\lambda = g(v^a, \pm)$  for some vector  $v^a \neq 0$  in figure 2. Then for any vector (or matrix)  $w^a \gamma_a = \mathbf{w}$  orthogonal to  $v^a$  ( $v^a w_a = 0$  or  $\text{Tr}(g_\lambda \mathbf{w}) = 0$ ), and only for those, we can find a translation that adds  $\mathbf{w}$  to  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda$ .

Note that the vector added to  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda$  by a translation is the difference between  $\mathbf{n}_0$  and the Lorentz transformed “vector”  $g_\lambda \mathbf{n}_0 g_\lambda^{-1}$ . What the exercise says is that every vector that is orthogonal to the “axis” of this Lorentz rotation can be written as such a difference. This is quite obvious in Euclidean three dimensional space, but holds in Minkowski space as well.

Let us start with the timelike states: then either  $\tilde{g}_\lambda$  is non-null and lies in the timelike regions of figure 2, or  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda$  is timelike. It is obvious, that there is always a Lorentz rotation that maps a timelike vector onto the vertical axis, so in the first case we can assume that  $\tilde{g}_\lambda \in \widetilde{\text{SO}}(2)$  (which is the vertical axis in figure 2), in the second case we can assume that  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda$  lies on the  $\gamma_0$  axis. If  $\tilde{g}_\lambda$  is non-null, then we still have the freedom of making a translation acting on  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda$ . From exercise 3.16 we know that we can add any matrix lying in the  $\gamma_{1,2}$  plane to  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda$ , so that finally both parameters lie on the  $\gamma_0$  axis:

$$\tilde{g}_\lambda = \exp(\zeta \pi \tilde{\gamma}_0), \quad \mathbf{f}_\lambda = 2\pi l \gamma_0. \quad (3.74)$$

Remember that the exponential of the  $\tilde{\gamma}$  “matrices” was introduced as a formal notation for the exponential map  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \rightarrow \widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$  in section 1.2. The timelike states are therefore completely parameterized by two real numbers  $\zeta, l$ . There is no time evolution of the holonomies, because the right hand sides of (3.72) vanish. Hence, timelike states are static. To find a field configuration  $\omega_i, \gamma_i$  leading to these holonomies, we first have to find a pair of quasiperiodic fields  $(\tilde{g}, \tilde{f})$  on  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$ . This is not difficult, we take

$$\tilde{g}(r, \phi) = \exp(\tfrac{1}{2}\zeta\phi\tilde{\gamma}_0), \quad \tilde{f}(r, \phi) = l\phi\gamma_0 \quad (3.75)$$

Using (3.60) we compute the gauge fields

$$\omega_\phi = \tfrac{1}{2}\zeta\gamma_0, \quad \omega_r = 0, \quad \gamma_\phi = l\gamma_0, \quad \gamma_r = 0. \quad (3.76)$$

Transforming to the physical dreibein field by (3.12) gives

$$\hat{\gamma}_t = \gamma_0, \quad \hat{\gamma}_r = \gamma_1, \quad \hat{\gamma}_\phi = \zeta r\gamma_2 + l\gamma_0 \quad (3.77)$$

Obviously, for  $l = 0$  we get the “cones” considered in section 2.4. There we found that the “central cylinder”  $(t, r = 0, \phi)$  actually represents a *line* in spacetime only (the worldline of the peak of the two cones glued together at  $r = 0$ ), as points with different  $\phi$  but the same  $t$  can be connected by a path of zero distance  $d\mathbf{x}^a = 0$  everywhere. For  $l \neq 0$  this singularity is different. Writing the distance as an  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$  matrix we get

$$d\mathbf{x}^a\gamma_a = (dt + l d\phi)\gamma_0 + dr\gamma_1 + \zeta r d\phi\gamma_2. \quad (3.78)$$

This vanishes if  $r = 0$ ,  $dr = 0$  and  $dt = -ld\phi$ . Hence, there is still a singularity at  $r = 0$ , but this time the events to be identified lie on a helix winding around the central cylinder, rather than being the circles with constant  $t$ . The path specified by  $t + l\phi = t_0, r = 0$  represent one spacetime event only. But  $t_0$  and  $t_0 + 2\pi/l$  yield the same path, so the set of these lines, the “singularity”, forms a circle. However, it is still timelike, and we can measure its geodesic distance, which is  $2\pi l\gamma_0$ . Hence, the singularity is a timelike circle of “radius”  $|l|$ , and the sign of  $l$  tells us in which direction time runs around the circle.

As the singularity is a timelike closed path, one can expect that there are such paths outside the singularity as well. In fact, the circles at constant  $r$  and  $t$  become timelike for  $r < l/\zeta$ . For large  $r$ , the  $\zeta r$  term in  $d\mathbf{x}^a$  dominates the  $d\phi$  part, so far away from the singularity the universe looks like a cone. The metric itself is obtained by taking the square of the “distance” above:

$$ds^2 = -(dt + l d\phi)^2 + dr^2 + (\zeta r)^2 d\phi^2. \quad (3.79)$$

Outside  $r = 0$ , this describes the gravitational field of a spinning particle at the origin. Approaching the particle, the lightcones become more and more tilted into the angular direction in which the particles rotates. There is also a corresponding four dimensional spacetime (and this also holds for all the examples below), which can be obtained by adding  $dz^2$  to the metric, where  $z$  is an additional global coordinate. The timelike states then represent spinning cosmic strings.

The spacelike case is somehow dual to the timelike, and can be obtained by exchanging the  $r$  and  $t$  direction, and  $\gamma_1$  with  $\gamma_0$ . However, there are additional spacelike states leading to very peculiar spacetimes, which have no timelike counterpart. This is due to the fact that timelike elements of  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$  can always be written as exponentials whereas spacelike cannot. However, by the same arguments as above we can always perform a gauge transformation such that  $\tilde{g}_\lambda$  and  $\tilde{f}_\lambda$  lie on the  $\gamma_1$  axis. Use the coordinates (1.21), the parameters become two real numbers and an additional integer  $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ :

$$\tilde{g}_\lambda = \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_z \exp(\zeta\pi\tilde{\gamma}_1), \quad \tilde{f}_\lambda = 2\pi l\gamma_1. \quad (3.80)$$

These holonomies are not time-independent:  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda$  is still constant by (3.72), but  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda$  has a constant velocity, so that

$$\mathbf{f}_\lambda(t) = 2\pi l \gamma_1 + t(\mathbf{g}_\lambda \gamma_0 \mathbf{g}_\lambda^{-1} - \gamma_0). \quad (3.81)$$

We see that the state is no longer static, as it was in the timelike case. We can calculate the time dependence of  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda$  explicitly using the formula

$$\exp(-\frac{1}{2}a \gamma_1) \gamma_0 \exp(\frac{1}{2}a \gamma_1) = \cosh a \gamma_0 + \sinh a \gamma_2. \quad (3.82)$$

This gives

$$\mathbf{f}_\lambda(t) = 2\pi l \gamma_1 + t(\cosh(2\pi\zeta) - 1) \gamma_0 + t \sinh(2\pi\zeta) \gamma_2. \quad (3.83)$$

Remember that  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda$  measures the geodesic distance of the circumference of the cylinder at the base point  $\bar{x}$ . We can see that for  $\zeta \neq 0$  it grows linearly with  $t$  and calculating its length squared, i.e.  $\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{f}_\lambda \mathbf{f}_\lambda)$ , shows that it is always spacelike (except for  $\zeta = l = 0$ ). So this time we expect to get a non-static solution consisting of a growing spacelike cylinder. To find quasiperiodic potentials with the given holonomies is not so easy: for  $z \neq 0$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda$  is not an exponential of any element of the algebra, so there is no analogy of (3.75). Let us consider the case  $z = 0$  separately first. Then we can define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{g}}(r, \phi) &= \exp(\pi\zeta \tilde{\gamma}_1), \\ \mathbf{f}(r, \phi) &= l\phi \gamma_1 + t(\mathbf{g}(r, \phi) \gamma_0 \mathbf{g}^{-1}(r, \phi) - \gamma_0). \end{aligned} \quad (3.84)$$

The field  $\mathbf{f}(\phi, r)$  has become time-dependent as well. The computation is now straightforward and similar to the timelike case above. The result is that the physical fields are

$$\omega_\phi = \frac{1}{2}\zeta \gamma_1, \quad \hat{\gamma}_t = \gamma_0, \quad \hat{\gamma}_r = \gamma_1, \quad \hat{\gamma}_\phi = l \gamma_1 + \zeta t \gamma_2. \quad (3.85)$$

Here, the singularity is obviously at  $t = 0$ , so we have some kind of big bang universe. After that, there is an expanding cylinder with growing radius  $\zeta t$  and “offset”  $2\pi l$ , i.e. if you go once around the cylinder orthogonal to the  $r$ -direction, you end up  $2\pi l$  away from where you started. If  $l = 0$ , the cylinder degenerates to a line at the big bang, otherwise we find that the singularity is a spacelike circle of radius  $|l|$  similar to that for the timelike case above. For  $l \neq 0$  it is actually the length of the cylinder that shrinks to zero at  $t = 0$  and not the radius, so the singularity is in fact the circumference.

*Exercise 3.17.* Verify this by finding a coordinate transformation such that the new  $r$  and  $\phi$  directions become orthogonal. Then you have  $\gamma_r \rightarrow 0$  for  $l \neq 0$ , but  $\gamma_\phi \rightarrow 0$  for  $l = 0$  at the big bang.

As there is no mixing of space and time, i.e. the space  $\mathcal{N}$  is always orthogonal to the time direction  $t$ , it is quite easy to “see” how the spacelike states look like, using the ADM picture of a space evolving in time. This also works for  $z \neq 0$ . The simplest and most illustrative way to construct these spacetimes is to cut the cylinder into two strips at  $\phi = 0$  and  $\phi = \pi$ . As a consequence, the two parts behave quite differently, and spacetime is no longer symmetric under rotation of the  $\phi$  coordinate. But anyway we should not expect that spacetime has such a symmetry in general. As  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda$  is not an exponential for  $z \neq 0$ , the idea is to write it as a product of two exponential  $\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_z = \exp(\pi z \tilde{\gamma}_0)$  and  $\exp(\pi\zeta \tilde{\gamma}_1)$ , such that the quasiperiodic field  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$  increases from  $\tilde{\mathbf{1}}$  to  $\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_z$  on the first strip and to  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda$  on the second. The resulting field looks a bit complicated, as we have to define it on each strip of  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$  (labeled by an integer  $n$ ) separately:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{g}}(r, \phi) = \begin{cases} \exp(n\pi\zeta \tilde{\gamma}_1) \exp((\phi - n\pi)z \tilde{\gamma}_0) & \text{for } 2\pi n \leq \phi \leq 2\pi n + \pi, \\ \exp((\phi - n\pi)\zeta \tilde{\gamma}_1) \exp(n\pi z \tilde{\gamma}_0) & \text{for } 2\pi n - \pi \leq \phi \leq 2\pi n. \end{cases} \quad (3.86)$$

For  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda$  we could in principle insert the same expression as in (3.84), but the metric becomes simpler if we take  $\mathbf{f}$  to be constant on the first strip and increasing only on the second one, but of course twice as fast:

$$\mathbf{f}(r, \phi) = t(\mathbf{g}\gamma_0\mathbf{g}^{-1} - \gamma_0) + \begin{cases} 2n\pi l \gamma_1 & \text{for } 2\pi n \leq \phi \leq 2\pi n + \pi, \\ 2(\phi - n\pi)l \gamma_1 & \text{for } 2\pi n - \pi \leq \phi \leq 2\pi n. \end{cases} \quad (3.87)$$

*Exercise 3.18.* Show that  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$  and  $\mathbf{f}$  are continuous, and that they are normalized quasiperiodic with parameters  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda$  and  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda$  given by (3.80) and (3.81).

The  $\phi$  components of the gauge fields become

$$\omega_\phi = \begin{cases} z\gamma_0, \\ \zeta\gamma_1, \end{cases} \quad \gamma_\phi = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } 0 < \phi < \pi, \\ 2l\gamma_1 - 2\zeta t\gamma_2 & \text{for } \pi < \phi < 2\pi. \end{cases} \quad (3.88)$$

They are of course periodic, but not continuous because the potentials are not differentiable at  $\phi = n\pi$ . However, in principle  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$  and  $\mathbf{f}$  can be deformed slightly in the neighbourhood without destroying the quasiperiodicity, so that the gauge fields become continuous. The components of the fields tangent to the “border”  $\phi = n\pi$ , i.e. the  $r$  components, are continuous, so all the non-local objects like transport operators and lengths of path are well defined anyway. The physical fields are

$$\hat{\gamma}_t = \gamma_0, \quad \hat{\gamma}_r = \gamma_1, \quad \hat{\gamma}_\phi = \begin{cases} 2zr\gamma_2 & \text{for } 0 < \phi < \pi, \\ 2l\gamma_1 - 2\zeta t\gamma_2 & \text{for } \pi < \phi < 2\pi. \end{cases} \quad (3.89)$$

To read off the geometry, it is again more convenient to write down the infinitesimal distance. This contains the same information as the metric, which is just the sum of the squares of the factors in from of the gamma matrices (with a minus sign for  $\gamma_0$ ).

$$d\mathbf{x}^a \gamma_a = \begin{cases} dt\gamma_0 + dr\gamma_1 + 2zr d\phi\gamma_2 & \text{for } 0 < \phi < \pi, \\ dt\gamma_0 + (dr + 2l d\phi)\gamma_1 - 2\zeta t d\phi\gamma_2 & \text{for } \pi < \phi < 2\pi. \end{cases} \quad (3.90)$$

Now it is not very difficult to see how this space looks like. For  $z = \pm 1$ , the first part consists of two copies of flat Minkowski space in polar coordinates glued together in the origin as described in section 2.4, but there is a cut along a radial line, and  $\phi$  runs from 0 to  $\pi$  only (therefore the factor 2 in  $\gamma_\phi$ ). For larger  $z$ , instead of a simple Minkowski space, we get a screw-shaped space winding around the origin  $z$  times when  $\phi$  increases from 0 to  $\pi$ . The second part consists of a parallelogram shaped strip of width  $2\pi\zeta t$  and “offset”  $2\pi l$ , which is glued to the first part along the cuts. The width of the strip grows linearly with  $t$  and vanishes for  $t = 0$ .

*Exercise 3.19.* Find the equivalence classes of observers connected by paths with vanishing distance, which by definition represent a single physical point in space only. Show that for  $l \neq 0$  there is no essential singularity, i.e. all nontrivial such equivalence classes of points in  $\mathcal{N}$  are contractible objects. This was not so for the spacetimes considered before, where the paths with vanishing distance were circles or extended to infinity. Here you can also pass from one “end” to the other without going through the singularity, by passing over the strip at  $r < \pi l$ . So actually we have a wormhole spacetime rather than a conical singularity. If  $l = 0$ , but  $\zeta \neq 0$ , then there is only one essential singular event at  $t = 0, r = 0, \phi$  arbitrary, which forms a circle of observers and cannot be contracted.

So the spacelike states are already rather strange. You can try to find other coordinates that make them “smoother”, avoiding the rather artificial piecewise construction. Another possibility for the quasiperiodic field  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$  is to use the global coordinates  $(w, x, y)$  on  $\tilde{\mathbf{SL}}(2)$  introduced in exercise 1.8. This leads to a smooth but very awkward looking metric including many trigonometric and hyperbolic functions, and it is not easy to visualize the resulting spacetime.

What remains are the lightlike states. They are again completely different. As in the spacelike case there is an additional integer  $z$  labeling the part of  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$  in which the holonomy  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda$  lies. We only consider the case  $z = 0$  here. For non-vanishing  $z$  you can again cut the cylinder into pieces exactly as we did in the spacelike case, with an even more peculiar result. Let us also assume that  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda$  lies on the upper lightcone, otherwise we get the same type of solutions with  $\phi \mapsto -\phi$ . By a suitable Lorentz rotation, we can map any point on the lightcone onto any other, so we may take

$$\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda = \exp(\pi(\tilde{\gamma}_0 + \tilde{\gamma}_1)). \quad (3.91)$$

The corresponding quasiperiodic field is

$$\tilde{\mathbf{g}}(r, \phi) = \exp(\tfrac{1}{2}\phi(\tilde{\gamma}_0 + \tilde{\gamma}_1)) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{g}(r, \phi) = \mathbf{1} + \tfrac{1}{2}\phi(\gamma_0 + \gamma_1), \quad (3.92)$$

where the last equation follows because the matrix  $\gamma_0 + \gamma_1$  is nilpotent. For  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda$  we make the general ansatz

$$\mathbf{f}_\lambda = 2\pi l(\gamma_0 - \gamma_1) + 2\pi a(\gamma_0 + \gamma_1) + 2\pi b\gamma_2, \quad (3.93)$$

with real numbers  $l, a, b$ . By exercise 3.16 we know that we can add any matrix to  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda$  which is orthogonal to  $\gamma_0 + \gamma_1$ . This time, however, we can not arrange  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda$  to be proportional to this matrix, because it is orthogonal to itself. Instead, we can add anything to  $a$  and  $b$ , which also become time dependent, but we cannot change  $l$ , which is the only gauge invariant parameter for the lightlike states. The time evolution for  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda$  is

$$\dot{\mathbf{f}}_\lambda = \mathbf{g}_\lambda \gamma_0 \mathbf{g}_\lambda^{-1} - \gamma_0 = 2\pi^2(\gamma_0 + \gamma_1) - 2\pi\gamma_2. \quad (3.94)$$

Hence, we have  $\dot{a} = \pi$  and  $\dot{b} = -1$ . We will adjust  $a$  and  $b$  such that the resulting metric becomes as simple as possible. Next, we have to find a normalized quasiperiodic field  $\mathbf{f}$ , and we make an ansatz similar to  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda$ :

$$\mathbf{f}(r, \phi) = u(\phi)(\gamma_0 + \gamma_1) + v(\phi)(\gamma_0 - \gamma_1) + w(\phi)\gamma_2. \quad (3.95)$$

The equation  $\mathbf{f}(r, \phi + 2\pi) = \mathbf{g}_\lambda \mathbf{f}(r, \phi) \mathbf{g}_\lambda^{-1} + \mathbf{f}_\lambda$  now becomes a functional equation for  $u, v$  and  $w$ , depending on  $a$  and  $b$ , and the best thing one can do is to play around with these parameters until you get a simple final result (which is rather cumbersome, unless you use an algebraic computer program). It turns out that a good choice is

$$a = (\tfrac{4}{3}\pi^2 - 1)l + \pi t, \quad b = -2\pi l - t. \quad (3.96)$$

Solving the functional equations leads to

$$u(\phi) = \tfrac{1}{3}l\phi^3 + \tfrac{1}{2}t\phi^2 - l\phi, \quad v(\phi) = l\phi, \quad w(\phi) = -l\phi^2 - t\phi. \quad (3.97)$$

and a straightforward calculation yields the following gauge fields:

$$\omega_\phi = \tfrac{1}{2}(\gamma_0 + \gamma_1), \quad \gamma_\phi = -2l\gamma_1 - t\gamma_2, \quad (3.98)$$

Finally, the physical fields are

$$\hat{\gamma}_t = \gamma_0, \quad \hat{\gamma}_r = \gamma_1, \quad \hat{\gamma}_\phi = -2l\gamma_1 + (r - t)\gamma_2. \quad (3.99)$$

Again, the time direction is orthogonal to the space  $\mathcal{N}$ , and the infinitesimal distance is

$$d\mathbf{x}^a \gamma_a = dt\gamma_0 + (dr - 2ld\phi)\gamma_1 + (r - t)d\phi\gamma_2. \quad (3.100)$$

The best way to describe this spacetime is to call it a cosmic Hoover. For  $l = 0$  and fixed  $t$  we simply have the two copies of flat space known from section 2.4, with a singular point at the origin, which is now at  $r = t$ . At this point the two copies are glued together, i.e. the circle  $r = t$ ,  $\phi$  arbitrary, represents one spacetime event only. But now this structure is not static, as the singularity moves with the velocity of light in the direction of  $r$ . It is not simply a singularity moving around somewhere in the space  $\mathcal{N}$ . The situation is much worse: the positive  $r$  part is totally absorbed into the singularity with the velocity of light, and the observers disappearing into the singularity (where they meet all the observers with the same  $r$  coordinate) reappear on the other side.

For  $l \neq 0$  there is no essential singularity any more. Spacetime becomes totally regular as in the spacelike case, and observers never meet at a single event. This can be seen as follows. If there is any path connecting different observers with vanishing distance, we must have  $dt = 0$ ,  $dr = 2ld\phi$ , and  $(r - t)d\phi = 0$  everywhere of this path, which is impossible. Hence, we are only using bad coordinates at  $r = t$ . Instead of the singularity we get a wormhole connecting the two regions for positive and negative  $r$ , but still the vacuum cleaner is active, as the wormhole absorbs everything with the velocity of light.

## 4 Canonical Quantization

The aim of this section is to carry out Dirac's canonical quantization method [4] as proposed by Witten [13], starting from the classical phase space spanned by the spatial components of the spin connection and the dreibein, as well as the boundary fields. A quantum state is given by a "wave functional", which depends on one half of the phase space coordinates, spanning the "configuration space". These configuration variables are represented by multiplication operators, i.e. we have to choose them such that they commute, and the conjugate momentum operators become functional derivative operators.

The physical state space is then defined to be the kernel of the constraint operators: acting with the constraints on physical states gives zero. For this step it is essential that the commutator algebra of the quantized constraints closes, i.e. the quantum constraints have to be first class. This does not necessarily follow from the fact that the Poisson brackets of the classical constraints are proportional to the constraints again. There are mainly two problems arising with Dirac quantization at this point. The first is that straightforward translation of the constraints may lead to ill-defined operator products: there might appear functional differential operators acting at the same space point. This would require a regularization of the quantum operators. However, the great success of dreibein formulation of three dimensional gravity is mainly based on the fact that this doesn't happen, i.e. the constraints will become perfectly well defined operators without any regularization. From a physical point of view, the reason therefor is that the theory is not really a field theory with local degrees of freedom, whose quantization normally requires a regularization. In principle, we are dealing with "quantum mechanics", our system has finitely many degrees of freedom and we could equally well use our classical results and quantize the finite set of holonomies. This is the so called reduced phase space method [15]. However, constructing the physical phase space with Dirac's method will turn out to be even simpler than classifying the classical degrees of freedom explicitly.

After the constraints have been translated into their quantized versions, a second problem may arise, namely the operator ordering. The classical constraint algebra tells us that the commutator of the constraints is proportional to themselves again, but it does not tell us whether the operators in the commutator are in the same order as before. In general, there may be different choices for the operator ordering leading to different representations for the constraints. There is no reason why one of these orderings should lead to an algebra such that taking commutators will preserve this ordering. In addition, the structure constants appearing in the constraint algebra may itself be phase space functions. Then the quantum algebra must be such that these "structure functions" appear to

the left of the constraints. Otherwise the definition of the physical states would not be consistent, as acting with a commutator of constraints on a physical state gives zero. But the constraints are the *only* operators that by definition annihilate physical states. If it is not possible to arrange the operator ordering in this way, Dirac's method does not work and one has to choose other quantization schemes. Again, three dimensional gravity in dreibein formulation does not cause any problems here. We already saw that the structure constants of the classical algebra of the constraints (3.41) are not field-dependent. We will also find that there is no operator ordering ambiguity, as all products of phase space variables appearing in the constraints are such that the factors commute.

Hence, all the typical problems occurring in field theory are absent, though we are still dealing with an infinite dimensional phase space at the beginning. The reduction to finitely many degrees of freedom will automatically come out when we solve the constraint equations. Thereby, we will obtain the physical states as wave *functions* depending on a finite set of variables like the wave functions on ordinary quantum mechanics. The final step to get the Hilbert space is then the construction of the scalar product. It will be determined by requiring the operators corresponding to real classical quantities to become hermitian.

#### 4.1 Quantum operators and constraints

The first step in Dirac's programme is to define an operator representation for the phase space variables, i.e. the spatial components of the gauge fields  $\omega_i, \gamma_i$  and the boundary fields  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}$ . The most reasonable choice is the "connection representation", where the wave functional depends on  $\omega_i$  and  $\mathbf{u}$ . This is because we cannot choose  $\mathbf{v}$  to be a multiplication operator, as its components do not commute, and with  $\omega_i$  as a differential operator the Hamilton constraint would not be well defined, as it contains a quadratic term in  $\omega_i$ . Hence, the wave functional is given by  $\Psi[\omega_i, \mathbf{u}]$ .

As the functional depends on Lie group and algebra valued variables, we introduce some notation to deal with derivatives with respect to such variables. Consider a function depending on an algebra valued variable  $\mathbf{v} = v^a \gamma_a$ . We can then define the derivative of this function in the direction of  $\gamma^a$ , which is simply given by

$$\text{Tr}\left(\gamma^a \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}}\right) = \frac{\partial}{\partial v^a}. \quad (4.1)$$

Of course, we can insert any other matrix  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathfrak{sl}(2)$  instead of the gamma matrices. If the function is given as a power series in  $\mathbf{v}$ , then we can calculate the derivative most easily using

$$\text{Tr}\left(\mathbf{a} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}}\right) \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{a}. \quad (4.2)$$

This is of course quite simple because the algebra is a vector space and we can take derivatives with respect to the coordinates. We get the same result if we define a matrix valued derivative operator

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}}\right)_{pq} = \frac{\partial}{\partial v_{qp}}, \quad (4.3)$$

which is a derivative with respect to the matrix components. Taking the trace of this operator with some algebra element  $\mathbf{a}$  reproduces (4.2). However, the derivative with respect to matrix components is only defined if the support of the function it acts on is (an open subset of)  $\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ . If we only use expressions like (4.2), where  $\mathbf{a}$  is a matrix which is "tangent" to the algebra (as a subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ ), then we can extend the function to be differentiated arbitrarily to  $\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$  before using the derivative (4.3). The result will be independent of this extension, as we only take the components tangent to  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \subset \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ .

Now consider a function depending on  $\mathbf{u} \in \text{SL}(2)$ . We can extend it to some open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$  containing  $\text{SL}(2)$  and apply the matrix valued differential operator (4.3), with  $\mathbf{v}$  replaced by  $\mathbf{u}$ . We

are then only allowed to take those components of the derivative which are tangent to the group, i.e. we have to “trace” the result with  $\mathbf{u}\mathbf{a}$  or  $\mathbf{a}\mathbf{u}$  for some  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathfrak{sl}(2)$ . These are the matrices tangent to  $\mathrm{SL}(2)$  at  $\mathbf{u}$ . Hence, there are two complimentary sets of derivative operators

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathbf{u}\mathbf{a}\frac{\partial}{\partial\mathbf{u}}\right), \quad \mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{u}\frac{\partial}{\partial\mathbf{u}}\right), \quad \mathbf{a} \in \mathfrak{sl}(2). \quad (4.4)$$

*Exercise 4.1.* Show that (4.4) are the left and right invariant vector fields on the Lie group, respectively, and that they can be defined on  $\widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}(2)$  as well, obeying

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}\mathbf{a}\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde{\mathbf{g}}}\right)\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{g}\mathbf{a}, \quad \mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathbf{a}\tilde{\mathbf{g}}\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde{\mathbf{g}}}\right)\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{a}\mathbf{g}, \quad \mathbf{a} \in \mathfrak{sl}(2). \quad (4.5)$$

Note that here  $\mathbf{g}$  is treated as a matrix valued function of  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$ , and the trace is a formal notation only. Moreover, the total differential of a function  $F(\tilde{\mathbf{g}})$  on  $\widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}(2)$  is given by

$$dF = \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{g}^{-1}d\mathbf{g}\gamma_a) \mathrm{Tr}\left(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}\gamma^a\frac{\partial F}{\partial\tilde{\mathbf{g}}}\right) = \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{Tr}(d\mathbf{g}\mathbf{g}^{-1}\gamma_a) \mathrm{Tr}\left(\gamma^a\tilde{\mathbf{g}}\frac{\partial F}{\partial\tilde{\mathbf{g}}}\right). \quad (4.6)$$

Here the first traces are “real” traces of matrices, with  $d\mathbf{g}$  the differential of the special function  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}} \mapsto \mathbf{g}$ , whereas the right hand factors are the formal expressions (4.5).

The derivative operators on the group do not commute, but they provide two representation of the Lie algebra, commuting with each other:

$$\begin{aligned} \left[ \mathrm{Tr}\left(\gamma^a\tilde{\mathbf{g}}\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde{\mathbf{g}}}\right), \mathrm{Tr}\left(\gamma^b\tilde{\mathbf{g}}\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde{\mathbf{g}}}\right) \right] &= 2\varepsilon^{ab}{}_c \mathrm{Tr}\left(\gamma^c\tilde{\mathbf{g}}\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde{\mathbf{g}}}\right) \\ \left[ \mathrm{Tr}\left(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}\gamma^a\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde{\mathbf{g}}}\right), \mathrm{Tr}\left(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}\gamma^b\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde{\mathbf{g}}}\right) \right] &= -2\varepsilon^{ab}{}_c \mathrm{Tr}\left(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}\gamma^c\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde{\mathbf{g}}}\right) \\ \left[ \mathrm{Tr}\left(\gamma^a\tilde{\mathbf{g}}\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde{\mathbf{g}}}\right), \mathrm{Tr}\left(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}\gamma^b\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde{\mathbf{g}}}\right) \right] &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

The translation from classical Poisson brackets to operators is defined such that the latter is  $-i\hbar$  times the classical bracket. From (3.29) we get the operator representation for the dreibein

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{a}\gamma_i(x)) = -i\hbar\varepsilon_{ij} \mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathbf{a}\frac{\delta}{\delta\omega_j(x)}\right) \quad (4.8)$$

which gives the commutator

$$[\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{a}\gamma_i(x)), \omega_j(y)] = -i\hbar\varepsilon_{ij} \mathbf{a} \delta(x, y). \quad (4.9)$$

The operator representation for  $\mathbf{v}$  is more complicated, but from the bracket (A.20) we can read off that a suitable representation is

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{v}(\phi_0)) = i\hbar \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\phi \mathrm{Tr}\left(\Delta(\mathbf{a}, \phi - \phi_0) \mathbf{u}(\phi) \frac{\delta}{\delta\mathbf{u}(\phi)}\right), \quad (4.10)$$

where  $\Delta(\mathbf{a}, \phi)$  is the  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$  valued step function introduced in the appendix. We actually only need the following property of this operator:

$$[\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{v}(\phi_0)), \mathbf{u}(\phi)] = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad 0 < \phi - \phi_0 < 2\pi, \quad (4.11)$$



which follows from (A.24), and we need the operator representation for  $\bar{\gamma}_\phi$ , which is by (3.33):

$$\text{Tr}(\mathbf{a}\bar{\gamma}_\phi(\phi)) = -i\hbar \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{u}(\phi - 2\pi z) \mathbf{a} \frac{\delta}{\delta \mathbf{u}(\phi - 2\pi z)}). \quad (4.12)$$

We can now write down the quantized constraints. We define them as  $i\hbar^{-1}$  times the classical quantities. As a consequence, no extra factors of  $\hbar$  appear in their algebra and they generate exactly the same transformations on the wave functionals as the classical constraints generated on phase space functions. The Hamilton constraint is a pure multiplication operator and looks like (3.35):

$$\mathbf{H}[\mathbf{n}] = i\hbar^{-1} \int d^2x \varepsilon^{ij} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{n} \mathbf{F}_{ij}) + i\hbar^{-1} \sum_\ell \oint d\phi \text{Tr}(\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{u}^{-1} \partial_\phi \mathbf{u} - \boldsymbol{\omega}_\phi)). \quad (4.13)$$

The Lorentz constraint becomes a first order homogeneous differential operator. Here it is more suitable to use the form (3.37), to avoid spatial derivatives acting on functional derivatives:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{L}[\boldsymbol{\lambda}] &= -i\hbar^{-1} \int d^2x \varepsilon^{ij} \text{Tr}(D_i \boldsymbol{\lambda} \gamma_j) + i\hbar^{-1} \sum_\ell \oint d\phi \text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\lambda} \bar{\gamma}_\phi) \\ &= \int d^2x \text{Tr}(D_i \boldsymbol{\lambda} \frac{\delta}{\delta \boldsymbol{\omega}_i}) + \sum_\ell \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\phi \text{Tr}(\mathbf{u} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \frac{\delta}{\delta \mathbf{u}}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

Note that the sum in (4.12) has been used to change the range of the boundary integral, which runs over  $\mathbb{R}$  instead of once around the circle only.

*Exercise 4.2.* It is now easy to see that all the classical properties of the constraints are preserved:

1. there is no ordering ambiguity, i.e. the constraints do not contain products of non-commuting operators.
2. the commutators of the constraints with any field operator exactly coincides with the classical brackets (3.38) and (3.39).
3. the algebra of the constraint operators is closed and given by (3.41).

## 4.2 Physical states

After defining the operators for the phase space coordinates, we now have to construct the physical state space, which corresponds to the classical reduced phase space. It is the set of all possible gauge-inequivalent states of our “universe”.

*Definition 4.1 (Physical State Space).* The physical state space is the kernel of the constraint operators. A physical state is represented by a wave function satisfying

$$\mathbf{H}[\mathbf{n}] \Psi[\boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{u}] = 0, \quad \mathbf{L}[\boldsymbol{\lambda}] \Psi[\boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{u}] = 0. \quad (4.15)$$

Solving these equations is even simpler than finding the general solutions of their classical versions, as only half of the fields are involved. The first equation states that  $\Psi$  is non-zero only for those configurations  $\boldsymbol{\omega}, \mathbf{u}$  with  $\mathbf{F}_{ij} = 0$  and  $\mathbf{u}^{-1} \partial_\phi \mathbf{u} = \boldsymbol{\omega}_\phi$  on the boundaries. The solution is some kind of “functional delta function”, which, however, makes the treatment of the second equation a bit complicated. Hence, let us first eliminate all functional derivatives. We can do this by writing the Lorentz constraint equation as a functional equation instead of a functional differential equation.

From (4.14) we infer that  $\mathbf{L}[\boldsymbol{\lambda}]$  acts on the fields as

$$\mathbf{L}[\boldsymbol{\lambda}] \boldsymbol{\omega}_i = D_i \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \quad \mathbf{L}[\boldsymbol{\lambda}] \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u} \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \quad (4.16)$$

and since it is a first order homogeneous differential operator we have the Leibnitz rule

$$L[\boldsymbol{\lambda}](FG) = (L[\boldsymbol{\lambda}]F)G + F(L[\boldsymbol{\lambda}]G), \quad (4.17)$$

where  $F$  and  $G$  are functions of  $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i$  and  $\mathbf{u}$ . Thus,  $L[\boldsymbol{\lambda}]$  generates Lorentz transformations on the wave functional, and the constraint equation tells us that  $\Psi$  has to be invariant under local Lorentz rotations. As we know how *finite* Lorentz rotations act on the fields, we can rewrite the condition as

$$\Psi[\boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{u}] = \Psi[\mathbf{h}^{-1}(\partial_i + \boldsymbol{\omega}_i) \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{u} \mathbf{h}] \quad (4.18)$$

for any field  $\mathbf{h} \in \text{SL}(2)$  which is the projection of some  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$  valued field  $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}$  on  $\mathcal{N}$ . Together with the Hamilton constraint

$$\Psi[\boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{u}] = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad \mathbf{F}_{ij} \neq 0 \text{ or } \boldsymbol{\omega}_\phi \neq \mathbf{u}^{-1} \partial_\phi \mathbf{u}, \quad (4.19)$$

we get a set of constraints without functional derivatives, so we do not have to bother about differentiability of  $\Psi$  any more. The two conditions are consistent in the sense that the inequalities in the second condition are preserved under Lorentz transformations, because the constraints are first class and form a closed algebra.

To solve the Hamilton condition, remember that we know the complete solution for the equations  $\mathbf{F}_{ij} = 0$  and  $\boldsymbol{\omega}_\phi = \mathbf{u}^{-1} \partial_\phi \mathbf{u}$ . They are uniquely parameterized by a normalized quasiperiodic field  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}} : \widetilde{\mathcal{N}} \rightarrow \widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$  and an extra variable  $\mathbf{b}_\ell \in \text{SL}(2)$  for each boundary of  $\mathcal{N}$ :

$$\boldsymbol{\omega}_i(x) = \mathbf{g}^{-1} \partial_i \mathbf{g}(\alpha_x), \quad \mathbf{u}(\phi) = \mathbf{b}_\ell^{-1} \mathbf{g}(\alpha_{\ell, \phi}). \quad (4.20)$$

Due to the quasiperiodicity of  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$  we can insert any  $\alpha_x \in \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$  with  $\pi(\alpha_x) = x$  into the first equation. To get the second equations we needed the family of boundary paths  $\alpha_{\ell, \phi}$  from figure 1. Therefore, the complete solution to the Hamilton condition can be written as

$$\Psi[\boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{u}] = \begin{cases} \hat{\mathcal{F}}[\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, \{\mathbf{b}_\ell\}] & \text{if (4.20) holds,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4.21)$$

From (3.61) we know how Lorentz rotations act on the potential  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$  and the boundary variables  $\mathbf{b}_\ell$ , so we can rewrite the Lorentz condition (4.18) as

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}}[\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, \{\mathbf{b}_\ell\}] = \hat{\mathcal{F}}[\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_0^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{g}} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}, \{\mathbf{h}_0^{-1} \mathbf{b}_\ell\}], \quad (4.22)$$

which must hold for any *periodic* field  $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} : \widetilde{\mathcal{N}} \rightarrow \widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$ , where  $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_0 = \tilde{\mathbf{h}}(\bar{x})$  is its value at the base point of  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$ . Remember that this extra contribution to the finite Lorentz transformation of the potential  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$  was necessary because  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$  is *normalized* quasiperiodic.

We found that two potentials  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}'$  are always related by a Lorentz rotation if their values coincide on the loop group  $\Upsilon \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$ . Therefore,  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$  is in fact a function of the values  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda$ ,  $\lambda \in \Upsilon$  only. In addition, we know that the values  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda$  are not all independent, as they have to provide a representation of the loop group

$$\mathbf{g}_\lambda \mathbf{g}_\kappa = \mathbf{g}_{\lambda \bullet \kappa}. \quad (4.23)$$

So we conclude that  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$  can be written as a function of  $\mathbf{g}_\lambda$ ,  $\lambda \in \Upsilon_0$ , which is the set of primitive loops introduced in definition 1.6:

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}}[\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, \{\mathbf{b}_\ell\}] = \mathcal{F}(\{\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda | \lambda \in \Upsilon_0\}, \{\mathbf{b}_\ell\}). \quad (4.24)$$

Here we have to be careful if the primitive loops are subject to relations as described in definition 1.6. In this case, the support of  $\mathcal{F}$  is given by those sets of elements  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda\}$  which fulfill the corresponding

relation in  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$ . In case of  $\mathcal{N}$  being a torus, this would mean that the support of  $\mathcal{F}$  is given by the set of all pairs of commuting  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$  matrices, as from the relation  $\lambda \bullet \kappa = \kappa \bullet \lambda$  for the two primitive loops of a torus we get  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\kappa = \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\kappa \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda$ .

Yet we have not solved the Lorentz condition completely, because the variables still transform under Lorentz rotations at the base point  $\bar{x}$ , and  $\mathcal{F}$  has to fulfill the relation

$$\mathcal{F}(\{\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda\}, \{\mathbf{b}_\ell\}) = \mathcal{F}(\{\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_0^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_0\}, \{\mathbf{h}_0^{-1} \mathbf{b}_\ell\}) \quad (4.25)$$

for any  $\mathbf{h}_0 \in \widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$ . With definition 1.13 for inner automorphisms of  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$ , we can drop the tilde from  $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_0$  here, as the transformation  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}} \mapsto \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_0^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{g}} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_0$  can equally well be written as  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}} \mapsto \mathbf{h}_0^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{g}} \mathbf{h}_0$ , where  $\mathbf{h}_0$  is the projection of  $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_0$  onto  $\text{SL}(2)$ . Similar to (3.69) for the classical holonomies, it is not difficult to do the last step and get a full classification of all solution to the constraint equations, provided that  $\mathcal{N}$  has at least one boundary. Giving this boundary the special index  $\ell = 0$ , we found that  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{0,\lambda} = \mathbf{b}_0^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda \mathbf{b}_0$  and  $\mathbf{b}_{0,\ell} = \mathbf{b}_0^{-1} \mathbf{b}_\ell$  form a complete set of independent gauge invariant quantities. So the wave function depends on these variables only. The final result can be summarized as follows:

*Theorem 4.1.* If the space manifold  $\mathcal{N}$  has at least one boundary  $\ell = 0$ , the physical state space is given by the set of wave functions

$$\Psi[\omega_i, \mathbf{u}] = \begin{cases} \mathcal{F}(\{\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{0,\lambda} | \lambda \in \Upsilon_0\}, \{\mathbf{b}_{0,\ell} | \ell \neq 0\}) & \text{if (4.20) holds,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4.26)$$

If  $\mathcal{N}$  has no boundary, the general solutions to the constraint equations is

$$\Psi[\omega_i] = \begin{cases} \mathcal{F}(\{\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda | \lambda \in \Upsilon_0\}) & \text{if (4.20) holds,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (4.27)$$

where  $\mathcal{F}$  is subject to the relation

$$\mathcal{F}(\{\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda\}) = \mathcal{F}(\{\mathbf{h}_0^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda \mathbf{h}_0\}) \quad \text{for any } \mathbf{h}_0 \in \text{SL}(2), \quad (4.28)$$

and the support of  $\mathcal{F}$  is restricted by relations present between the primitive loops.

For physical states we will use Dirac's bra-ket notation, the states given above are denoted by  $|\mathcal{F}\rangle$ . If there is no boundary, it is more difficult to find the complete physical state space explicitly, especially because of the relations between the primitive loops, and identifying equivalence classes of special sets of  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$  elements can be rather awkward. Formally, a basis of the physical state space can be given in terms of the so called moduli space, which is defined as follows:

*Definition 4.2 (Moduli Space).* The set of equivalence classes of group homomorphisms  $\Upsilon \rightarrow \widetilde{\text{SL}}(2) : \lambda \mapsto \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda$  modulo inner automorphisms  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda \mapsto \mathbf{h}_0^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda \mathbf{h}_0$  is called the moduli space of a manifold  $\mathcal{N}$ , of which  $\Upsilon$  is the loop group.

If  $\mathcal{N}$  has no boundary, every point in the moduli space exactly corresponds to a basis vector of the physical state space, represented by a wave function  $\mathcal{F}$  that has support on this equivalence class only. Hence, physical wave function can be written as a function on the moduli space. Alternatively, the moduli space can also be defined to be the set of equivalence classes of maps  $\Upsilon_0 \rightarrow \widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$ , obeying the relations present between the primitive loops. In this case it is obvious that the moduli space is finite dimensional.

### 4.3 Observables

Compared to ordinary quantum mechanics of point particles, we are now at the very beginning, where the state space is introduced as the set of wave functions  $\Psi[\{x_i\}]$ . We now have to define operators acting on this physical state space, which have to be related to physical measurement. If an operator acts on the physical states space, it must map solutions of the constraint equations onto solutions again. It is exactly this what defines an observable:

*Definition 4.3 (Observables).* A phase space function or the corresponding quantum operator  $\mathcal{O}$  is called an observables, if it commutes weakly with the constraints

$$[L[\lambda], \mathcal{O}] \approx 0, \quad [H[n], \mathcal{O}] \approx 0. \quad (4.29)$$

Two such operators are considered as the same observable, if they are weakly equal.

*Exercise 4.3.* The Poisson bracket or commutator of two observables, or any function of observables, is again an observable.

At the classical level, (weak) vanishing of the Poisson brackets with the constraints means that  $\mathcal{O}$  is (at least on the physical phase space) gauge invariant. At the quantum level, an operator vanishes weakly if it maps all physical states to zero, and observables are exactly those operators that map physical states onto physical states. It is reasonable to consider weakly equal operators as the same observable, because they take the same values on the physical phase space, or their action on physical states are identical, respectively, so they correspond to the same physical quantity.

In section 3.3 we already looked for the classical gauge invariant phase space functions. As a result we found theorem 3.2, which tells us that all observables can be written as functions of the holonomies  $\tilde{g}_\lambda$  and  $\tilde{f}_\lambda$  for the loops and  $\tilde{b}_\ell$ ,  $\tilde{c}_\ell$  for the boundary paths. As we want the observables to be (real) numerical quantities, let us for a moment ignore that  $\tilde{g}_\lambda$  is an element of  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$  and take  $\mathbf{g}_\lambda \in \text{SL}(2)$  instead as the basic quantity. Using (3.59), we can express the holonomies directly as phase space functions:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{g}_\lambda &= U_\lambda, & \mathbf{b}_\ell &= U_{\alpha_{\ell,\phi}} \mathbf{u}^{-1}, \\ \mathbf{f}_\lambda &= V_\lambda, & \mathbf{c}_\ell &= V_{\alpha_{\ell,\phi}} - U_{\alpha_{\ell,\phi}} \mathbf{u}^{-1} \mathbf{v} \mathbf{u} U_{\alpha_{\ell,\phi}}^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.30)$$

Remember that  $\alpha_{\ell,\phi}$  denotes the family of boundary paths from figure 1, and, as indicated by the ordering, that the fields  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$  are to be taken at the endpoint of the curve  $\alpha_{\ell,\phi}$ , i.e. at the angular coordinate  $\phi$  on the boundary. The values of  $\mathbf{b}_\ell$  and  $\mathbf{c}_\ell$  as defined in (3.59) were (weakly) independent of the special value chosen for  $\phi$ , so for later convenience we keep it arbitrary here. Similarly, the holonomies also depend on the special path representing the homotopy class. However, they always lead to the same observables in the sense of definition 4.3, because under smooth deformation the variations of  $\mathbf{U}$  and  $\mathbf{V}$  are proportional to the constraints.

The holonomies themselves are not yet the observables, as they still transform under gauge transformations acting at  $\bar{x}$ , which were given in (3.68). To obtain observables, we have to find quantities which are invariant under these transformations. In case of a manifold without boundary, we only have the loop holonomies  $\mathbf{g}_\lambda$  and  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda$ . To get an observable, we can take the trace of  $\mathbf{g}_\lambda$ , which is of course invariant under inner automorphisms. Another gauge invariant quantity is the trace of  $\mathbf{g}_\lambda \mathbf{f}_\lambda$ , which is a matrix tangent to  $\mathbf{g}_\lambda$ . We denote these observables by

$$\mathcal{U}_\lambda = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{g}_\lambda), \quad \mathcal{V}_\lambda = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{g}_\lambda \mathbf{f}_\lambda). \quad (4.31)$$

They provide gauge invariant information contained in the holonomies  $\mathbf{g}_\lambda$  and  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda$ , telling us whether  $\mathbf{g}_\lambda$  is timelike or spacelike etc., so essentially they measures the type of the “singularity” associated with the loop  $\lambda$ . However, there are still some “exceptional” gauge invariant properties of  $\mathbf{g}_\lambda$  which are not encoded in the trace. If, e.g.,  $\mathbf{g}_\lambda$  is timelike or lightlike, then the sign of  $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{g}_\lambda \gamma_0)$  is invariant. We will need those observables explicitly to construct the state space of the torus.

*Exercise 4.4.* Of course, the trace observables exist for manifolds with boundaries, too. Find out how  $\mathcal{U}_\lambda$  and  $\mathcal{V}_\lambda$  are related to the parameters  $\zeta, l, z$  used in section 3.4 to classify the solutions of the constraints on the cylinder manifold, and which additional observables are needed to determine  $\zeta, l$  and  $z$  completely.

For the rest of this section we will consider a manifold with at least one boundary. With the results of section 3.3, it is not difficult to find out how observables in general look like. We have to take some loop  $\lambda$  (including the trivial loop  $\lambda = \eta$ ), and multiply the pair  $(\mathbf{g}_\lambda, \mathbf{f}_\lambda)$  with some boundary holonomies (but not necessary the same) from both sides to make it invariant under inner automorphisms. Hence, a pair of observables is given by

$$(\mathbf{b}_\ell, \mathbf{c}_\ell)^{-1}(\mathbf{g}_\lambda, \mathbf{f}_\lambda)(\mathbf{b}_{\ell'}, \mathbf{c}_{\ell'}). \quad (4.32)$$

Obviously, we can label such an observable by a path  $\beta = \alpha_\ell^{-1} \bullet \lambda \bullet \alpha_{\ell'}$ , whose end points both lie on a boundary of  $\mathcal{N}$  (possibly the same). The special observables (3.69), which form a complete set of independent observables, are included in (4.32) as those for paths starting at the special end  $\ell = o$  and going directly to another end, or around some primitive loop and back to the boundary  $o$ . We can express the observables directly in terms of the phase space variables using the transport operator and distance of the path  $\beta$ :

$$(\mathcal{U}_\beta, \mathcal{V}_\beta) = (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})(U_\beta, V_\beta)(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})^{-1}. \quad (4.33)$$

Again, our convention applies and that the boundary fields  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$  are to be taken at the beginning or end of  $\beta$ , respectively. In components, the observables read

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_\beta &= \mathbf{u} U_\beta \mathbf{u}^{-1}, \\ \mathcal{V}_\beta &= \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u} V_\beta \mathbf{u}^{-1} - \mathbf{u} U_\beta \mathbf{u}^{-1} \mathbf{v} \mathbf{u} U_{\beta^{-1}} \mathbf{u}^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.34)$$

The ordering indicates where the fields are to be taken:  $\mathcal{V}_\beta$  has to be an  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$  matrix at the beginning of  $\beta$ , so the first  $\mathbf{v}$  and the “outer”  $\mathbf{u}$ ’s are sitting there, whereas the “inner” boundary fields are sitting at the end of  $\beta$ . An important feature of all these observables is that they do not refer to the special point  $\bar{x}$  any more. They are either the trace of a holonomy along a loop, which can be deformed arbitrarily such that it no longer passes through  $\bar{x}$ , and the same holds for a path  $\beta$  connecting two boundaries. In addition, their end points can be shifted along the boundary, as the definition of the boundary holonomies in (3.59) is independent of  $\phi$ . In principle we could require the paths  $\beta$  labelling the observables to start and end at  $\phi = 0$ , but let us allow to shift the end points to small positive or negative angles. We will not shift them more than once around the boundary, as this might cause some trouble with the non-periodicity of the  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$  fields. Some of these paths are shown for the cylinder manifold in figure 4.

The  $\mathcal{U}_\beta$  and  $\mathcal{V}_\beta$  are in some sense the smallest possible complete and “symmetric” set of observables. More precise, they form the smallest set of observables such that every observable is a function thereof, but without marking any special set of “primitive loops” or choosing a special boundary like  $\ell = o$ . As we already introduced these special objects to define the physical state space, we should better not use them again here, which might break the symmetries of our universe. For example, we will require all basic observables to become hermitian, not only the already complete set (3.69). Otherwise it could happen that only for special observables, which a priori cannot be distinguished from others, there are well defined eigenstates with real eigenvalues etc., whereas for others are not because they are not hermitian.

The relations present between the basic observables are the same as those for transport operators and distances of arbitrary paths:

$$(\mathcal{U}_\alpha, \mathcal{V}_\alpha)(\mathcal{U}_\beta, \mathcal{V}_\beta) = (\mathcal{U}_{\alpha \bullet \beta}, \mathcal{V}_{\alpha \bullet \beta}), \quad (4.35)$$

which, of course, only holds if  $\beta$  starts at the boundary where  $\alpha$  ends (but the linked path can be deformed away from this boundary). To discuss the problems arising from quantization of these

observables, it is more convenient not to use the  $\text{ISO}(1,2)$  notation and switch back to the vector representation of the  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$  valued variables. Hence, the observables are

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{U}_\beta &= \mathbf{u} \mathbf{U}_\beta \mathbf{u}^{-1} \in \text{SL}(2), \\ \mathcal{V}_\beta^a &= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\gamma^a \mathcal{V}_\beta) = v^a + u^a_b V_\beta^b - u^a_b U_\beta^b{}_c u_d^c v^d \in \mathbb{M}^3,\end{aligned}\tag{4.36}$$

where  $u^a_b = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{u}^{-1} \gamma^a \mathbf{u} \gamma_b)$  and  $v^a = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{v} \gamma^a)$  are the vector representations of the boundary fields, obeying  $(u^{-1})^c_d = u_d^c$ . They directly correspond to basic physical quantities, which will be discussed in more detail in the next section:  $\mathcal{U}_\beta$  describes the transport of a spinor from one background frame into another (or back into the same along a non-trivial loop), and  $\mathcal{V}_\beta^a$  measures the relative position of two background frames. In components, the relation (4.35) becomes

$$\mathcal{U}_{\alpha\bullet\beta} = \mathcal{U}_\alpha \mathcal{U}_\beta, \quad \mathcal{V}_{\alpha\bullet\beta}^a = \mathcal{V}_\alpha^a + \mathcal{U}_\alpha^a{}_b \mathcal{V}_\beta^b.\tag{4.37}$$

The task is now to find the quantum representation of these observables such that (if possible) these relations as well as their classical Poisson brackets are preserved, and such that we can define a scalar product on the physical state space which makes them all hermitian. Let us start with the  $\mathcal{U}$  observables, as this is quite simple.

Of course, they all commute, because they depend on  $\omega_i$  and  $\mathbf{u}$  only, and they are represented by multiplication operators acting on the wave function  $\mathcal{F}(\{\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{o,\lambda}\}, \{\mathbf{b}_{o,\ell}\})$ . In particular, the observables associated with the variables on which the wave function depends act as

$$\mathcal{U}_{\alpha_o^{-1}\bullet\lambda\bullet\alpha_o} |\mathcal{F}\rangle = |\mathbf{g}_{o,\lambda} \mathcal{F}\rangle, \quad \mathcal{U}_{\alpha_o^{-1}\bullet\alpha_\ell} |\mathcal{F}\rangle = |\mathbf{b}_{o,\ell} \mathcal{F}\rangle.\tag{4.38}$$

All other  $\mathcal{U}$  observables can be obtained as functions thereof, and because they all commute it will be sufficient to render the observables (4.38) hermitian, then a real function thereof becomes hermitian as well.

As a consequence, the eigenspaces of these operators with different eigenvalues have to be orthogonal. However, these eigenspaces are still degenerate, as the  $\mathcal{U}$  observables fix the values of  $\mathbf{g}_{o,\lambda}$  but not that of  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{o,\lambda}$ . There should be an observable associated with the winding number of  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda$ . Introducing such additional observables, the eigenspaces would become non-degenerate, provided that we want to make them hermitian operators and their eigenstates normalizable. However, this is reasonable only if they really corresponds to physical measurements, i.e. if an observer inside the universe can measure them. We will see that this is not necessarily so, and, e.g. for the torus, the winding numbers do not correspond to any physical measurement. This will also have some effects on the scalar product, whose definition becomes rather a physical than a mathematical problem. So let us define the scalar product in the next section, after clarifying the role of the winding number as a physical observable.


To find the action of the  $\mathcal{V}$  observables on the physical states, we will exploit their commutation relations. To get the commutator of some  $\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a$  with  $\mathcal{U}_\beta$ , we proceed as follows. The non-commuting fields are the dreibein  $\gamma_i$  appearing in  $\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a$  through  $V_\alpha^b$ , which is conjugate to the spin connection  $\omega_i$  in  $\mathcal{U}_\beta$ , and the  $v^a$  and  $v^d$  boundary fields in  $\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a$ , which do not commute with the  $\mathbf{u}$ 's in  $\mathcal{U}_\beta$ . However, we can deform the paths such that all boundary fields commute. What we have to do is to shift the endpoints of  $\beta$  to a small positive angle  $\phi = \epsilon$ , thereby keeping the endpoints of  $\alpha$  at  $\phi = 0$  (if the two paths do not meet at a boundary, this procedure is not necessary). As  $\mathbf{v}(0)$  commutes with  $\mathbf{u}(\epsilon)$  for  $0 < \epsilon < 2\pi$ , the only remaining commutator to be computed is

$$[\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a, \mathcal{U}_\beta] = [u^a_b V_\alpha^b, \mathbf{u} \mathbf{U}_\beta \mathbf{u}^{-1}].\tag{4.39}$$

Hence, what we actually have to compute is a commutator of a distance of one path with the transport operator along another path. The distance is explicitly

$$V_\alpha^b = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 ds \alpha^i(s) \text{Tr}(\gamma^b \mathbf{U}_\alpha(0, s) \gamma_i \mathbf{U}_\alpha(s, 0)).\tag{4.40}$$

Figure 3: The solid line corresponds to a distance operator with an index  $b$  sitting at its start point, the dashed line to a transport operator. For each intersection there is a contribution to the commutator, consisting of a transport operator that “picks up” the gamma matrix. The “sign” is  $\frac{1}{2}i\hbar$  if you have to turn right at the intersection, and  $-\frac{1}{2}i\hbar$  if you turn left.



Obviously, there might be ordering ambiguities, because we can place the dreibein equally well to the left or right, but this does not affect the commutator to be computed here. A useful general formula is

$$[e_i^a(x), U_\alpha(a, b)] = -\frac{1}{2}i\hbar \int_a^b dt \epsilon_{ij} \alpha'^j(t) \delta(x, \alpha(t)) U_\alpha(a, t) \gamma^a U_\alpha(t, b), \quad (4.41)$$

which follows from the basic commutator relation (3.31) and the functional derivative of the transport operator with respect to the spin connection, which has been given in (2.19). Inserting this, we find

$$[V_\alpha^b, U_\beta] = -\frac{1}{2}i\hbar \int_0^1 ds \int_0^1 dt \epsilon_{ij} \alpha'^i(s) \beta'^j(t) \delta(\alpha(s), \beta(t)) \times U_\beta(0, t) U_\alpha(s, 0) \gamma^b U_\alpha(0, s) U_\beta(t, 1). \quad (4.42)$$

Here we get a contribution to the commutator whenever the two paths intersect. The term produced at each intersection consists of the transport operator along  $\beta$  to the intersection point, then along  $\alpha^{-1}$  to the beginning of  $\alpha$ , where it “picks up” the matrix  $\gamma^b$ , then back to the intersection and further along  $\beta$ . Figure 3 shows a picture of this operation. The sign of each contribution depends on the direction in which the paths intersect. The picture also shows the normalization of the  $\epsilon$  tensor: we defined  $\epsilon_{\rho\phi} = +1$ , where  $\rho$  is the coordinate pointing towards a boundary and  $\phi$  runs clockwise on the boundary. For the curves  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  in the picture we then have  $\epsilon_{ij} \alpha'^i \beta'^j < 0$  at the intersection, so that the factor in front becomes  $+\frac{1}{2}i\hbar$ . What remains to be shown is that the delta function contributes a factor  $\pm 1$  at each intersection, the sign depending on the direction in which the paths meet. More general:

*Exercise 4.5.*

$$\int_0^1 ds \int_0^1 dt \epsilon_{ij} \alpha'^i(s) \beta'^j(t) \delta(\alpha(s), \beta(t)) \quad (4.43)$$

gives an integer that counts the number of directed intersections of the paths, where an intersection is positive if  $\alpha$  “comes from the left”.

An illustrating example for this graphical method to compute commutators will be given in the next section for the cylinder manifold. What can be shown quite general is that the  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  observables for the same path do not commute:

*Exercise 4.6.* Using figure 3, compute the commutator of  $\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a$  and  $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$  (with the same path). Remember that you have to shift the ends of the  $\mathcal{U}$  path clockwise by a small positive angle at the boundaries, which produces one intersection between this and the  $\mathcal{V}$  path if  $\alpha$  connects two different boundaries, but two intersection points if  $\alpha$  starts and ends at the same boundary. The result should be

$$[\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a, \mathcal{U}_\alpha] = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{2}i\hbar(\gamma^a \mathcal{U}_\alpha - \mathcal{U}_\alpha \gamma^a) & \text{for loops } \alpha, \\ -\frac{1}{2}i\hbar \gamma^a \mathcal{U}_\alpha & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4.44)$$

As a consequence, show that

$$[\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a, \mathcal{U}_{\alpha,a}^b] = \begin{cases} i\hbar \varepsilon^{bcd} \mathcal{U}_{\alpha,cd} & \text{for loops } \alpha, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4.45)$$

We will not derive the commutator algebra of the  $\mathcal{V}$  observables explicitly, but we can see how they look like in general:

*Exercise 4.7.* Show that the set of all observables  $\mathcal{O}^{(1)}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  which are linear in  $\mathcal{V}$  form a closed algebra under the Poisson bracket and a graded algebra together with the observables  $\mathcal{O}^{(0)}(\mathcal{U})$  depending on  $\mathcal{U}$  only, i.e.

$$\{\mathcal{O}^{(1)}, \mathcal{O}^{(1)}\} = \mathcal{O}^{(1)}, \quad \{\mathcal{O}^{(1)}, \mathcal{O}^{(0)}\} = \mathcal{O}^{(0)}, \quad \{\mathcal{O}^{(0)}, \mathcal{O}^{(0)}\} = 0. \quad (4.46)$$

Including higher order homogeneous polynomials of degree  $n$  in  $\mathcal{V}$  the observable algebra becomes

$$\{\mathcal{O}^{(m)}, \mathcal{O}^{(n)}\} = \mathcal{O}^{(m+n-1)}. \quad (4.47)$$

To find the action of the  $\mathcal{V}$  observables on physical states, we first have to fix the operator ordering somehow. The simplest possible choice would be to place the differential operators to the right. This would define a unique quantum operator for every  $\mathcal{O}^{(1)}$  observable and the algebra (4.46) would be preserved. In addition, the relations (4.37) would hold, too. However, the last two factors  $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^a b$  and  $\mathcal{V}_\beta^b$  in this relation will in general not commute, so it cannot be a relation between hermitian operators. Hence, with this simple ordering prescription we cannot have all  $\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a$  operators hermitian, whatever the scalar product is. Instead, we should have

$$\mathcal{V}_{\alpha \bullet \beta}^a = \mathcal{V}_\alpha^a + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{U}_\alpha^a b \mathcal{V}_\beta^b + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{V}_\beta^b \mathcal{U}_\alpha^a b. \quad (4.48)$$

*Exercise 4.8.* Show that this relation is still associative, i.e.  $\mathcal{V}_{\alpha \bullet (\beta \bullet \gamma)}^a = \mathcal{V}_{(\alpha \bullet \beta) \bullet \gamma}^a$ .

This suggests another prescription. Suppose that  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are two paths such that there is no ordering ambiguity in  $\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a$  and  $\mathcal{V}_\beta^b$  (assuming that such paths exist, see below), but there is one for  $\alpha \bullet \beta$ . Then (4.48) already fixes the ordering for  $\mathcal{V}_{\alpha \bullet \beta}^a$ , which is given by the “symmetrized” operator, i.e.

$$\frac{1}{2}(\text{differentials right}) + \frac{1}{2}(\text{differentials left}). \quad (4.49)$$

With this prescription, we get a unique quantum operator for any  $\mathcal{O}^{(1)}$  (and of course also for any  $\mathcal{O}^{(0)}$ ). To check whether this is a suitable ordering, let us introduce the notation  ${}_R\mathcal{O}$  and  ${}_L\mathcal{O}$  for the quantum operators corresponding to a classical observable, with the differentials ordered to the right or left, respectively, including a factor  $\frac{1}{2}$  to simplify the notation. The quantum operators are then defined by  $\mathcal{O} \mapsto {}_R\mathcal{O} + {}_L\mathcal{O}$ . What we have to check is that the relation (4.48) holds for these operators. The left hand side becomes

$$\begin{aligned} {}_R\mathcal{V}_{\alpha \bullet \beta}^a + {}_L\mathcal{V}_{\alpha \bullet \beta}^a &= {}_R\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a + \mathcal{U}_\alpha^a b \mathcal{V}_\beta^b + {}_L\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a + \mathcal{U}_\alpha^a b \mathcal{V}_\beta^b \\ &= {}_R\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a + {}_L\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a + \mathcal{U}_\alpha^a b {}_R\mathcal{V}_\beta^b + {}_L\mathcal{V}_\beta^b \mathcal{U}_\alpha^a b. \end{aligned} \quad (4.50)$$



This must be equal to the right hand side

$${}_R\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a + {}_L\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{U}_\alpha^a{}_b({}_R\mathcal{V}_\beta^b + {}_L\mathcal{V}_\beta^b) + \frac{1}{2}({}_R\mathcal{V}_\beta^b + {}_L\mathcal{V}_\beta^b)\mathcal{U}_\alpha^a{}_b. \quad (4.51)$$

The difference between the two expressions is obviously one half of

$$[\mathcal{U}_\alpha^a{}_b, {}_R\mathcal{V}_\beta^b] + [{}_L\mathcal{V}_\beta^b, \mathcal{U}_\alpha^a{}_b], \quad (4.52)$$

which vanishes because the commutator is independent of the ordering chosen for  $\mathcal{V}_\beta^b$ .

*Exercise 4.9.* Show that with the prescription (4.49) the classical Poisson bracket of the observables (4.46) is preserved, i.e.

$$[{}_R\mathcal{O} + {}_L\mathcal{O}, {}_R\mathcal{O}' + {}_L\mathcal{O}'] = -i\hbar({}_R\{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}'\} + {}_L\{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}'\}), \quad (4.53)$$

for observables  $\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{O}^{(0)}, \mathcal{O}^{(1)}$  linear in or independent of  $\mathbf{V}$ .

This is the best we can get: a unique quantum operator for each classical observable that is linear in the momenta, and their classical Poisson algebra coincides with the commutator relations. In addition, the relations between the  $\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a$  do not prevent them from being hermitian. For higher order observables in  $\mathbf{V}$  there are no unique quantum operators. This is well known from quantum mechanics, where unique hermitian operators for higher order polynomials in  $p$  and  $x$  do not exist.

Finally, we have to find out how the  $\mathbf{V}$  operators act on a physical state. Before doing this, let us check whether there are ordering ambiguities at all (otherwise we could forget everything we just did). Fix some path  $\alpha$  connecting two ends or starting and ending at the same end. We use the same trick as above to simplify the computation. We want to avoid products of non-commuting boundary fields which are somewhat awkward because of the stepfunction appearing in their commutator. This time we have to shift the *beginning* of  $\alpha$  to a small positive angle  $\phi = +\epsilon$ , whereas the *end* of  $\alpha$  remains at  $\phi = 0$ . We then have

$$\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a = v^a(\epsilon) + u^a{}_b(\epsilon) V_\alpha^b - u^a{}_b(\epsilon) U_\alpha^b{}_c u_d^c(0) v^d(0). \quad (4.54)$$

The only product of non-commuting boundary fields in this expression is  $u_d^c(0)v^d(0)$ : the commutator of  $v^a(0)$  with  $u^a{}_b(\epsilon)$  either vanishes because the fields are sitting at different boundaries, or because for  $0 < \epsilon < 2\pi$  their commutator is zero by (4.11). Interchanging  $u_d^c(0)$  with  $v^d(0)$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} [u_d^c, v^d] &= \frac{1}{4}[\text{Tr}(\mathbf{u}^{-1}\gamma_d\mathbf{u}\gamma^c), \text{Tr}(\gamma^d\mathbf{v})] \\ &= -\frac{1}{4}i\hbar \text{Tr}(\mathbf{u}^{-1}[\gamma_d, \Delta(\gamma^d, 0)]\mathbf{u}\gamma^c), \end{aligned} \quad (4.55)$$

where the operator representation (4.10) has been inserted. Unfortunately, the value of the stepfunction is ill-defined (but not infinite) at  $\phi = 0$ . Nevertheless, if we regularize it in either direction, we get zero for the commutator in both cases, as  $\Delta(\gamma^d, +\epsilon) = 0$  and  $\Delta(\gamma^d, -\epsilon) = -\gamma^d$  (see (A.22) and (A.24)). Hence, the only possible ordering ambiguity occurs inside  $V_\beta^b$ , which depends on the dreibein and the spin connection only. If we change the ordering in (4.40), we always produce extra terms of the form

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 ds \alpha'^i(s) \text{Tr}(\gamma^b U_\alpha(0, s) \gamma_c [e_i^c(\alpha(s)), U_\alpha(s, 0)]). \quad (4.56)$$

*Exercise 4.10.* There is no ordering ambiguity in  $\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a$ , i.e.  ${}_R\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a = {}_L\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a$ , if all self-intersections of  $\alpha$  can be removed by smooth deformations, after shifting  $\alpha$  such that it starts at a boundary point with  $\phi = \epsilon$  and ends at  $\phi = 0$ .

This leads to a rather peculiar result if  $\alpha$  is a loop, i.e. it returns to the same boundary where it started: because we have to shift the *beginning* to a small angle  $\epsilon$  before looking for self-intersections,  $\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a$  and  $\mathcal{V}_{\alpha^{-1}}^a$  cannot be both free of ordering ambiguities, as one of them will have a self-intersection right at the beginning (where it meets its own end). This also follows from exercise 4.6, as by (4.48) we have

$$\mathcal{V}_{\alpha^{-1}}^a = -\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{U}_{\alpha,b}^a \mathcal{V}_\alpha^b - \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{V}_\alpha^b \mathcal{U}_{\alpha,b}^a, \quad (4.57)$$

but the two factors on the right do not commute if  $\alpha$  is a loop. To obtain the action of  $\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a = {}_R\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a + {}_L\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a$  onto physical states, we introduce a special state  $|1\rangle$  given by  $\mathcal{F} = 1$ . Obviously, we can then write every state as

$$|\mathcal{F}\rangle = \mathcal{F}|1\rangle, \quad (4.58)$$

where  $\mathcal{F}$  is a function of the observables (4.38), but possibly also of  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{o,\lambda}$  (see below). In addition, we have  ${}_R\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a|1\rangle = 0$ . To see this, take the complete wave functional (4.26), which can be considered as a phase space function. When the differential operators are ordered to the right, the action on  $\Psi$  is given by the Poisson bracket

$${}_R\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a \Psi[\boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{u}] = -i\hbar \{\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a, \Psi[\boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{u}]\}. \quad (4.59)$$

For the special state  $|1\rangle$ ,  $\Psi$  is a functional depending on the Hamiltonian constraint  $\mathbf{H}$  only: it is simply 1 if  $\mathbf{H} = 0$  everywhere and 0 otherwise. Now the bracket of  $\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a$  with  $\mathbf{H}$  vanishes exactly (not only weakly), and therefore the bracket of  $\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a$  with any function of  $\mathbf{H}$  vanishes, too. In addition, we can write

$$\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a = 2{}_R\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a + ({}_L\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a - {}_R\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a). \quad (4.60)$$

The term in the parenthesis is in fact an observable depending on  $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i$  and  $\mathbf{u}$  only: it is the commutator of the differential operators appearing in  $\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a$  with the multiplication operators therein. It also commutes with the constraints, so it must be an observable depending on  $\mathbf{U}$  only. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_\alpha^a |\mathcal{F}\rangle &= 2{}_R\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a |\mathcal{F}\rangle + ({}_L\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a - {}_R\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a) |\mathcal{F}\rangle \\ &= [2{}_R\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a, \mathcal{F}] |1\rangle + ({}_L\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a - {}_R\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a) |\mathcal{F}\rangle \\ &= [{}_L\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a, \mathcal{F}] + ({}_L\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a - {}_R\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a) \mathcal{F}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.61)$$

because the commutator of  $\mathcal{V}_\alpha$  with  $\mathcal{F}$  as well as the difference in the parenthesis is a multiplication operator.

*Exercise 4.11.* Here we actually need the commutator of an  $\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a$  with a function of  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{o,\lambda}$ , but so far we only have the commutator with the matrix  $\mathbf{g}_{o,\lambda} = \mathcal{U}_{\alpha_o^{-1} \bullet \lambda \bullet \alpha_o}$  and functions thereof. Using exercise 4.1, show that the commutator with a function  $F(\tilde{\mathbf{g}})$ , where  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$  is some  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$  valued function of  $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i$  and  $\mathbf{u}$  (like, e.g.  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{o,\lambda}$ ), is given by

$$[\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a, F(\tilde{\mathbf{g}})] = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{g}^{-1} [\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a, \mathbf{g}] \gamma_a) \text{Tr}\left(\tilde{\mathbf{g}} \gamma^a \frac{\partial F}{\partial \tilde{\mathbf{g}}}\right). \quad (4.62)$$

We can interpret the last term appearing in (4.61) as some kind of “quantum correction”, which is a multiplication operator of order  $\hbar$  acting on the wave function. It vanishes for paths without self-intersection and has to be introduced for those with, because otherwise the relation (4.48) would not be satisfied. We do not have to compute this correction term explicitly if we want to get the action of  $\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a$  for a path with self-intersections. It is always possible to find a set of “primitive” paths (not necessarily identical with those used in (4.38)), which are free of self-intersections and such that every path connecting boundaries can be obtained by linking them. Then we can derive all  $\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a$  operators using (4.48). Moreover, we can use this relation to proof any kind of property of the  $\mathcal{V}_\alpha^a$  operators by induction. For example, it is sufficient to render the observables for the primitive paths hermitian, for the rest it then follows automatically.

## 5 Quantum Physics

So far we have a physical state space and know how the observables act on the states. This alone, however, does not tell us very much about physics, as long as we cannot compute expectation values and things like this. A physical question which does not make use of the scalar product is: how does the universe in some state  $|\mathcal{F}\rangle$  evolve in time? Unfortunately it doesn't evolve at all, because the Hamiltonian is a linear combination of constraints, and by definition it annihilates every physical state. This is obvious also because the wave function depends on gauge invariant objects and therefore constants of motion only. In some sense we are dealing with a Heisenberg picture, but the observables acting on the physical states are time-independent as well. This is the famous “problem of time” in quantum gravity [2, 3, 28]: the state as well as the operators are time-independent, but nevertheless they represent a non-static universe in general. The question is how to reconstruct the time evolution. To investigate this in more detail, and to clarify the role of our observer in quantum physics is the aim of this section.

In principle, the problem of time is also present in classical canonical gravity, where the state of the universe is given as a point in the reduced phase space (see definition 3.2). Strictly speaking, a classical state is a point in this space, which is a gauge invariant object just like the quantum state, and it does not evolve in time. In the classical theory it was quite easy to recover all the physical structures including time evolution. The reduced phase space was defined to be a set of equivalence classes of dreibein and connection fields. Hence, we could simply choose *a particular* representative for each class to see how the corresponding state looks like. That's exactly what we did in section 3.4. For the quantum wave function this is not possible: it is just a function on the configuration space, sometimes called the “wave function of the universe”. The only way to recover things like “time” and to make physical statements is to formulate everything in terms of gauge invariant “observables”. This is a well known feature of theories with an unphysical time parameter (see, e.g., [18, 29] for a general discussion). What we need to get a time evolution is a special phase space variable that behaves like a clock. The time shown on this clock is a dynamical variable rather than an background parameter, because the physical time *is* a dynamical quantity in general relativity. A time evolution can then be recovered by reading off the clock whenever a measurement is made. In fact, we already have such a clock, and using this will “solve” the problem of time in our toy model.

### 5.1 Astronomy, clocks, and time evolution

The main idea to solve the problem of time is to consider time as something that exists for an observer inside the universe as a dynamical quantity, but which has no meaning to somebody looking at the universe from outside, who only “sees” the quantum state, or the point in the reduced phase space. So let us return to our observer  $\bar{x}$  sitting inside the manifold and making astronomical observations. A nice feature of this point of view is that it is possible to consider the same observer both as the *relativistic* observer (making experiments with test particles, clocks etc.) and as the *quantum* observer (interpreting the wave function as probability amplitude). We will also see that Dirac's formalism is a very convenient way to describe this situation. It will easily keep apart and show the relations between the objects related to “the universe”, which is, e.g., the quantum state and the observables derived in the last section, and quantities which are related to a single observer. These “local” quantities are the holonomies (4.30). They are associated with paths starting at the special point  $\bar{x}$  and, from the physical point of view, they correspond to astronomical measurements. To see that some of them may be used as clocks, we have to find out their physical meaning.

As seen from the observer  $\bar{x}$ ,  $g_\lambda$  is the transport operator along  $\lambda$  back to himself, and  $f_\lambda$  is the distance of this loop, which both can be measured as described in section 2.3. However,  $g_\lambda$  was actually a projection of an  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$  valued holonomy  $\tilde{g}_\lambda$ , which cannot be measured by passing spinors along loops. To distinguish between different values of  $\tilde{g}_\lambda$  corresponding to the same  $g_\lambda$ , the observer

has to use another method. From section 2.4 we know that different values of  $\tilde{g}_\lambda$  really correspond to different physics, in that case to different deficit angles of the conical singularity. So it should be possible to measure this from inside the universe. In fact, we need the  $\gamma_\infty$  field from (3.12), or, equivalently, we have to know how the physical dreibein behaves at infinity. Without going into details, here is the trick how to measure  $\tilde{g}_\lambda$ :

*Exercise 5.1.* Assume that  $\lambda = \lambda_\ell$  is the loop going once around an end as shown in figure 1. The observer  $\bar{x}$  now asks all the observers on the paths  $\alpha_{\ell,\phi}$  to send him the value of  $\gamma_\infty$  along these paths. As a result, he can define

$$\bar{\gamma}_\infty(\phi, s) = U_{\alpha_{\ell,\phi}}(0, s) \gamma_\infty(\alpha_{\ell,\phi}(s)) U_{\alpha_{\ell,\phi}}(s, 0), \quad (5.1)$$

which certainly depends on the special paths and even their parametrization, but which always diverges to spacelike infinity for  $s \rightarrow 1$ . Choosing  $s$  large enough such that  $\bar{\gamma}_\infty(\phi, s)$  is everywhere spacelike, he can count how often it winds around the  $\gamma_0$  axis when  $\phi$  increases by  $2\pi$  (which is not necessarily an integer). This is independent of the parametrization of the paths and also invariant under finite redefinitions of the  $\gamma_\infty$  field. Show that this winding number is twice the winding number of  $\tilde{g}_\lambda$ , interpreted as a path in  $\text{SL}(2)$ , around the non-contractible loop  $\text{SO}(2) \subset \text{SL}(2)$ . On the other hand, if  $\lambda$  is not a loop winding around a boundary, and especially if there is no boundary at all, then there is no way to measure  $\tilde{g}_\lambda$ , which uses only the background structure given and is in agreement with general relativity.

Hence, though from the mathematical point of view the winding numbers are observables, we will not consider them as physical observables in the sense that they can be measured by an observer inside a universe without asymptotic ends. This will have some important consequences for the scalar product and the state space of the torus. However, for manifolds consisting of a sphere with some holes, including the cylinder as our standard example, it is in fact possible to measure the winding numbers of the holonomies.

What is the physical meaning of the boundary holonomies  $\mathbf{b}_\ell$  and  $\mathbf{c}_\ell$ ? In (4.30), the  $\text{SL}(2)$  valued matrix  $\mathbf{b}_\ell$  is obtained by “pulling” the field  $\mathbf{u}$  from the boundary along the path  $\alpha_\ell$  to  $\bar{x}$ . Assume there is somebody sitting in the background emitting spinors  $\chi$  “at infinity” such that they appear in a state  $\mathbf{u}^{-1}(\phi)\chi$  at the boundary of  $\mathcal{N}$ , and move along the path  $\alpha_{\ell,\phi}^{-1}$ . Then  $\bar{x}$  will find them in the state  $\mathbf{b}_\ell\chi$ . Let us call this “somebody” a fixed stars background, or you can also think of a microwave background, with “microwaves” consisting of spinors. Then it is the relative orientation of the local frame of  $\bar{x}$  with respect to this background that is encoded in  $\mathbf{b}_\ell$ . The vector representation  $b_{\ell,a}{}^b$ , which gives a proper Lorentz rotation, actually tells us how the local frame of  $\bar{x}$  is rotated and boosted against the background. This can be measured via some kind of “generalized redshift” of particles in the microwave radiation, provided one knows in which state they are emitted (the redshift is nothing but the Lorentz-transformed wave vector of the photon, and if the microwaves consist of spinors of known polarization, then measuring the “redshift” is exactly what has been described).

There is also an interpretation for  $\mathbf{c}_\ell \in \mathfrak{sl}(2)$  or the corresponding vector  $c_\ell^a \gamma_a = \mathbf{c}_\ell$ . The expression for  $\mathbf{c}_\ell$  above looks very much like the “addition rule” (2.43) for distances. It is the geodesic distance to the boundary, minus a vector that is obtained by pulling  $\mathbf{u}^{-1}\mathbf{v}\mathbf{u}$  from the boundary to  $\bar{x}$ . Hence, if  $\mathbf{v}$  is interpreted as the relative position of the fixed stars background with respect to the boundary, then  $\mathbf{c}_\ell$  measures the relative position of  $\bar{x}$  with respect to the background, or simply the geodesic distance to some special event in the background, a supernova, say. Remember that  $\mathbf{V}_\alpha$  is not really the physical distance but  $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_\alpha$  given by (3.14), which of course diverges at the boundary, whose physical distance is infinite. Nevertheless  $\mathbf{c}_\ell$  can be interpreted as the physical distance to some special event. For simplicity, we can assume that  $\gamma_\infty(\bar{x}) = 0$ . Then you can think of  $\mathbf{v}$  as some renormalized “bare” field  $\widehat{\mathbf{v}}$  such that the last equation in (4.30) is a regularized version of the same expression with  $\mathbf{V}$  replaced by  $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$  replaced by  $\widehat{\mathbf{v}}$ , which both correspond to real physical but

infinite quantities: both the supernova and  $\bar{x}$  are infinitely far away from the boundary but their relative position is finite.

As this “relative position” of  $\bar{x}$  with respect to the background represents a position in both space and time, the variables  $\mathbf{c}_\ell$  essentially become clocks, measuring the time elapsed since the supernova. We can infer this already from the time evolution equations (3.72) for free falling observers. In this case the spacelike part of  $\mathbf{c}_\ell$  is constant (the place where the supernova took place) and the time component increases linearly in  $t$ . It is not unusual that in a way like this time reappears automatically. It is a general feature of canonical gravity on spaces that are either non-compact or have boundaries, that additional physical degrees of freedom appear, which are normally not necessary to introduce if one is just dealing with Einstein’s field equations. Sometimes they arise from extra boundary fields being introduced to obtain a well defined Lagrangian, like in our case. In other examples, like, e.g., the quantization of spherically symmetric gravity in four dimensions [30, 31], they can also arise from boundary conditions to be imposed on the multipliers and therefore on the parameters of gauge transformations. Then some of the symmetries normally considered as gauge symmetries no longer fit into the precise definition 3.1. As a result, there are more gauge invariants than expected. In the case mentioned one finds that in addition to the Schwarzschild mass, the only “classical parameter” of spherical symmetric vacuum Einstein gravity, there is a canonically conjugate variable representing the “time at infinity”. It is a “conserved current” corresponding to time rescaling symmetry at infinity, which in classical gravity is considered as a gauge transformation, but which cannot be generated by taking Poisson brackets with constraints.

How can one use the clocks to recover a time evolution? Without going into detail, let us sketch the main idea, using point particle quantum mechanics as a simple example once again. For a free particle we can introduce the first order action with parameter time  $L = \dot{x}p + \dot{T}E - H$ , where the Hamiltonian  $H = q\mathbf{C} = q(p^2/2m - E)$  with Lagrange multiplier  $q$  is, like in gravity, given by a “linear combination” of (only one) constraint  $\mathbf{C}$ . All the variables depend on  $t$ , and the equations of motion

$$\dot{x} = \frac{qp}{m}, \quad \dot{p} = 0, \quad \dot{T} = q, \quad \dot{E} = 0, \quad \mathbf{C} = \frac{p^2}{2m} - E \approx 0 \quad (5.2)$$

obviously describe a particle in one dimension and a clock  $T$ , where the free parameter  $q$  indicates how fast the physical time runs with respect to  $t$ , and the conjugate variable to  $T$  is the energy  $E$ . The constraint  $\mathbf{C}$  generates a gauge transformation in the sense of definition 3.1, whose finite version has a real parameter  $\xi$  and reads

$$x \mapsto x^{(\xi)} = x + \frac{\xi p}{m}, \quad T \mapsto T^{(\xi)} = T + \xi, \quad (5.3)$$

where the superscript  $(\xi)$  denotes the phase space function obtained by a finite gauge transformation with parameter  $\xi$ . The reduced phase space consists of equivalence classes of quadrupels  $\{x, p, T, E\}$  modulo this transformation. Canonical quantization is straightforward, we have a wave function  $\Psi[x, T]$  and

$$p = i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \quad E = i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial T}. \quad (5.4)$$

A physical state has to satisfy

$$\mathbf{C}\Psi = \left(\frac{p^2}{2m} - E\right)\Psi = \left(-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} - i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial T}\right)\Psi[x, T] = 0, \quad (5.5)$$

which formally looks like the Schrödinger equation, but  $T$  is not the canonical time coordinate  $t$ . There is no time evolution with respect to this coordinate: the state is a fixed function of the configuration variables  $x$  and  $T$ . To recover time evolution, one has to ask questions like: what is

the value of  $x$  “when”  $T$  takes the value  $T_0$ . At the classical level, the answer can be given as follows. The state is an equivalence class as described above, so choose a particular representative with the property  $T = T_0$ , then the value of  $x$  for this representative is what you want to know. We can define a corresponding phase space function

$$\begin{aligned} x|_{T=T_0} &= \int d\xi \frac{\partial T^{(\xi)}}{\partial \xi} \delta(T^{(\xi)} - T_0) x^{(\xi)} \\ &= \int d\xi \delta(T + \xi - T_0) \left( x + \frac{\xi p}{m} \right) = x + (T_0 - T) \frac{p}{m}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

Note that (for a fixed value of  $T_0$ ) this gives a phase space function which is in fact an observable: its bracket with the constraint  $\mathbf{C}$  vanishes. We obtained this quantity by intergrating over the gauge group  $(\mathbb{R}, +)$ , picking up only those configurations with  $T = T_0$ . The extra term  $\partial T^{(\xi)}/\partial \xi$  has been introduced to get the correct factor, because the intergral runs over the gauge parameter  $\xi$ , whereas the argument of the delta function is a special phase space function, the “clock”  $T$ . It is the *interpretation* of  $T$  as a clock that makes the last expression look like a time evolution of  $x$ . In quantum physics we can now ask for the expectation value of  $x$  “at the time”  $T = T_0$ , and we just have to insert the corresponding operator

$$\langle \Psi | (x|_{T=T_0}) | \Psi \rangle = \langle \Psi | \left( x + (T_0 - T) \frac{p}{m} \right) | \Psi \rangle. \quad (5.7)$$

But what is the scalar product? It has to be such that all real observables become hermitian, and up to rescaling there is only one such product:

$$\langle \Phi | \Psi \rangle = \int dx \Phi^*[x, T] \Psi[x, T]. \quad (5.8)$$

There is no integration over  $T$ , as otherwise physical states would not be normalizable. The value of the product is independent of the special  $T$  inserted, which follows from the “Schrödinger equation”  $\mathbf{C}\Phi = \mathbf{C}\Psi = 0$ .

*Exercise 5.2.* The scalar product is defined on the *physical* state space only. Show that it is not possible to define a product on the whole state space such that the operators  $x, p, T, E$  are hermitian and restricting it to the physical state space gives (5.8).

Now we can compute the expectation value

$$\langle \Psi | (x|_{T=T_0}) | \Psi \rangle = \int dx \left( x \Psi^* \Psi + \frac{i\hbar}{m} (T_0 - T) \Psi^* \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial x} \right). \quad (5.9)$$

Knowing that this is independent of  $T$ , we choose  $T = T_0$  and what we get is the usual expression for the expectation value of  $x$  at a time  $T_0$ . Hence, formally the wave function  $\Psi[x, T]$  behaves exactly like a solution of the time-dependent Schrödinger equation, but  $T$  is not the canonical time. Neither the state nor the observables depend on the parameter time  $t$ , which totally disappears from the canonical framework. Nevertheless there is a time evolution, which is encoded in  $\Psi[x, T]$  as a *correlation* between  $T$  and  $x$ . The state does not make any predictions about a measurement of, say,  $T$  alone, the result is just random. If you read off a clock for the first time in your life there is no “expectation value” for the result. The same holds for  $x$ , which might be considered as the position of the sun in the sky, which is completely random if you see it for the first time, too. However, there is a correlation between the two measurements, and it makes sense to ask for the position of the sun seen by somebody who just read off a specific time  $T_0$  from a clock. It is exactly this what the *observable* (5.9) represents.

What does this mean for our gravity model? Here we have some more gauge degrees of freedom than just the time rescaling above. It is not enough to ask for the value of, e.g., a holonomy  $f_\lambda$  at

a specific time, we also have to specify where the observer is when he makes this measurement. It turns out that the following is a reasonable question: what is the value of some function  $X$  of the holonomies (4.30) for an observer being in a relative position  $\mathbf{c}_o = \mathbf{c}$  and orientation  $\mathbf{b}_o = \mathbf{b}$  with respect to the supernova in the background  $\ell = o$ . Similar to (5.6) we can define a corresponding observable

$$X|_{\substack{\mathbf{b}_o=\mathbf{b} \\ \mathbf{c}_o=\mathbf{c}}} = \int d\mathbf{h} d\mathbf{n} \left| \frac{\partial(\mathbf{c}_o^{(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{n})}, \mathbf{b}_o^{(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{n})})}{\partial(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{n})} \right| \delta(\mathbf{c}_o^{(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{n})} - \mathbf{c}) \delta(\mathbf{b}_o^{(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{n})} \mathbf{b}^{-1}) X^{(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{n})}. \quad (5.10)$$

We are integrating over the gauge group  $(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{n}) \in \text{ISO}(1, 2)$  acting on the holonomies. According to (3.68) the transformed holonomies are

$$\mathbf{b}_o^{(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{n})} = \mathbf{h}^{-1} \mathbf{b}_o, \quad \mathbf{c}_o^{(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{n})} = \mathbf{h}^{-1} (\mathbf{c}_o - \mathbf{n}) \mathbf{h}. \quad (5.11)$$

The first term in the integral is the Jacobian of this transformation, which becomes one if we choose the measure to be a Haar measure on  $\text{ISO}(1, 2)$ , and define the delta functions with respect to this measure. Independent thereof we can solve the integral, as the delta functions pick up exactly one term, namely that for

$$\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{b}_o \mathbf{b}^{-1}, \quad \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{c}_o - \mathbf{b}_o \mathbf{b}^{-1} \mathbf{c} \mathbf{b} \mathbf{b}_o^{-1}. \quad (5.12)$$

As a special example choose  $X = \mathbf{f}_\lambda$ , so that by (3.68) we have

$$\mathbf{f}_\lambda^{(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{n})} = \mathbf{h}^{-1} (\mathbf{f}_\lambda + \mathbf{g}_\lambda \mathbf{n} \mathbf{g}_\lambda^{-1} - \mathbf{n}) \mathbf{h}. \quad (5.13)$$

Inserting all this, we end up with a slightly complicated expression

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{f}_\lambda|_{\substack{\mathbf{b}_o=\mathbf{b} \\ \mathbf{c}_o=\mathbf{c}}} &= \mathbf{b} \mathbf{b}_o^{-1} (\mathbf{f}_\lambda + \mathbf{g}_\lambda (\mathbf{c}_o - \mathbf{b}_o \mathbf{b}^{-1} \mathbf{c} \mathbf{b} \mathbf{b}_o^{-1}) \mathbf{g}_\lambda^{-1} - \mathbf{c}_o + \mathbf{b}_o \mathbf{b}^{-1} \mathbf{c} \mathbf{b} \mathbf{b}_o^{-1}) \mathbf{b}_o \mathbf{b}^{-1} \\ &= \mathbf{b} \mathbf{f}_{o,\lambda} \mathbf{b}^{-1} - \mathbf{b} \mathbf{g}_{o,\lambda} \mathbf{b}^{-1} \mathbf{c} \mathbf{b} \mathbf{g}_{o,\lambda}^{-1} \mathbf{b}^{-1} + \mathbf{c}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

where  $\mathbf{g}_{o,\lambda}$  and  $\mathbf{f}_{o,\lambda}$  are the gauge invariant quantities introduced in (3.69). Hence, the result is indeed an observable, as  $\mathbf{b}$  and  $\mathbf{c}$  are just numerical parameters. But where is the time evolution? It is not so obvious as in our point particle example, but we have to remember that an observer is actually represented by a worldline, so its relative position with respect to the supernova, i.e. the  $\mathbf{c}$  parameter above, will change. Assume that the observer is free falling, then by (3.72) his position and orientation with respect to the background is given by


$$\mathbf{b}(\tau) = \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \quad \mathbf{c}(\tau) = \bar{\mathbf{c}} - \tau \gamma_0, \quad (5.15)$$

where  $\tau$  is his own proper time. Once he found out which values of  $\bar{\mathbf{b}}$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{c}}$  apply to him, there is an observable  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda^{(\tau)}$  obtained by inserting (5.15) into (5.14), which is parameterized by  $\bar{x}$ 's local time and obeys

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} \mathbf{f}_\lambda^{(\tau)} = \bar{\mathbf{b}} \mathbf{g}_{o,\lambda} \bar{\mathbf{b}}^{-1} \gamma_0 \bar{\mathbf{b}} \mathbf{g}_{o,\lambda}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{b}}^{-1} - \gamma_0. \quad (5.16)$$

This is the time evolution of the holonomy  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda$  as seen by  $\bar{x}$ . It becomes a well defined gauge invariant phase space function or quantum observable after specifying the values for  $\bar{\mathbf{b}}$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{c}}$ , which can be obtained by measuring the geodesic distance and the “redshift” of the supernova in the background once at  $\tau = 0$ . Hence, for every *special* observer we can define observables describing the time evolution of the universe as seen by this observer, but there is nothing like the time evolution of the universe as a whole, expressed in terms of gauge invariant quantities.

Figure 4: The basic observables of the cylinder manifold. The wave functional depends on the two transport operators  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$  and  $\mathbf{b}$  corresponding to the paths  $\varrho$  and  $\beta$  in the picture. The observables are constructed from the holonomies corresponding to the paths  $\alpha_o$ ,  $\alpha_i$  and  $\lambda$ , all starting at the special observer  $\bar{x}$ .



Now this consideration was rather classical, but it should be clear how to transform it to quantum physics. As there is no prediction about the values of  $\bar{\mathbf{b}}$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{c}}$  to be measured first, there is also nothing like an uncertainty relations or something like this between them, though the holonomies  $\mathbf{b}_o$  and  $\mathbf{c}_o$  do not commute. The result of these measurements are random anyway, so  $\bar{x}$  can measure them and he will get some values. Then  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda^{(\tau)}$  becomes a well defined operator on the physical state space and one can compute an expectation value of this observable, or that of an projection operator onto some eigenspace of  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda^{(\tau)}$  (provided one has the scalar product, which will be derived in the next section). The interpretation of this expectation value is the probability for the observer on the worldline given by (5.15) to measure a specific value of  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda$  at a time  $\tau$ . This probability will in general depend on  $\tau$ , so the special observer  $\bar{x}$  sees a non-static universe.

## 5.2 Hermitian operators and the Hilbert space

After clarifying the physical meaning of the holonomies and observables, let us come back to the state space and the last problem to be solved, namely the construction of the scalar product. We already mentioned it in section 4.3, but we saw that it depends on which *mathematical* observables we want to become *physical* observables represented by hermitian operators having normalizable eigenstates. In particular the possibility to measure the winding number of  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda$  will play a crucial role. By exercise 5.1 we now know that it depends on the existence of a boundary of the space  $\mathcal{N}$  whether  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$  can be measured or not. We will give examples for both cases, the cylinder as a manifold with boundaries and the torus as the simplest without boundary in the next section.

Figure 4 shows a picture of the compactified cylinder manifold. Instead of drawing a cylinder, it is more convenient to consider it as a sphere with two holes, and the picture shows part of the sphere. On the two boundaries “o” and “i” we have the angular coordinate  $\phi$  running clockwise (note that on the “negative  $r$ ” end this is not the  $\phi$  coordinate used in sections 2.4 and 3.4: here we need both coordinates running clockwise, as otherwise the formulas for the brackets of the boundary fields  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$  would not be correct). We then choose a point  $\bar{x}$  inside  $\mathcal{N}$  as our observer, and select two paths  $\alpha_o$  and  $\alpha_i$  from  $\bar{x}$  to the boundaries at  $\phi = 0$ . They provide the family of boundary paths as introduced in figure 1, but we will actually only need these two. In addition, there is the primitive loop  $\lambda$ .



The wave functional of a physical state of the cylinder, as shown in theorem 4.1, is an arbitrary function of the two quantities  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}} = \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{o,\lambda}$  and  $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}_{o,i}$ , corresponding to the paths  $\varrho$  and  $\beta$  in the picture, which are already shifted to a small positive angle  $\epsilon$  to compute the commutators below. To obtain the action of some observable  $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$  on a state  $|\mathcal{F}(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{b})\rangle$ , we only have to deform the path such that it becomes a combination of  $\varrho$  and  $\beta$ , then the wave function is multiplied by the corresponding combination of  $\mathbf{g}$  and  $\mathbf{b}$ . For example, we have  $\alpha_i^{-1} \bullet \lambda^z \bullet \alpha_i \sim \beta^{-1} \bullet \varrho^z \bullet \beta$  and therefore

$$\mathcal{U}_{\alpha_i^{-1} \bullet \lambda^z \bullet \alpha_i} |\mathcal{F}\rangle = \mathcal{U}_{\beta^{-1} \bullet \varrho^z \bullet \beta} |\mathcal{F}\rangle = |\mathbf{b}^{-1} \mathbf{g}^z \mathbf{b} \mathcal{F}\rangle. \quad (5.17)$$

As we want all these observables to be hermitian, the scalar product has to obey

$$\langle \mathcal{F}_1 | \mathbf{g} \mathcal{F}_2 \rangle = \langle \mathbf{g} \mathcal{F}_1 | \mathcal{F}_2 \rangle, \quad \langle \mathcal{F}_1 | \mathbf{b} \mathcal{F}_2 \rangle = \langle \mathbf{b} \mathcal{F}_1 | \mathcal{F}_2 \rangle. \quad (5.18)$$

Or, equivalently, the eigenstates for different values of  $\mathbf{g}$  or  $\mathbf{b}$  (represented by delta functions in  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$  and  $\mathbf{b}$ ) have to be orthogonal. So far we saw this already for a general manifold, but now we can apply exercise 5.1, i.e. we know that there is another observable that measures the winding number of  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda$  and hence distinguishes between the different  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$  corresponding to the same value of  $\mathbf{g}$ . Of course, we want this observable to be hermitian, too. As a result, all the eigenspaces become one dimensional, and to make them orthogonal the scalar product must be

$$\langle \mathcal{F}_1 | \mathcal{F}_2 \rangle = \int d\tilde{\mathbf{g}} d\mathbf{b} \mathcal{G}(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{b}) \mathcal{F}_1^*(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{b}) \mathcal{F}_2(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{b}), \quad (5.19)$$

where  $\mathcal{G}$  is a function to be adjusted such that the conjugate observables become hermitian as well. The measure chosen for this integral is in principle arbitrary, as any redefinition can be absorbed into the function  $\mathcal{G}$ , but the most natural choice is to take a Haar measure on  $\mathrm{SL}(2)$  and  $\bar{\mathrm{SL}}(2)$ , respectively.

To fix the function  $\mathcal{G}$ , we have to compute the action of the  $\mathcal{V}$  observables. As we know from section 4.3, we only need to compute the action of two special  $\mathcal{V}$  observables corresponding to two independent self-intersection free paths, and make them hermitian. Their action on physical states is obtained by (4.61), where the “quantum correction” term vanishes. So what we need are two paths such that they have no self-intersections and, if possible, simply commutators with  $\mathbf{g}$  and  $\mathbf{b}$ , so that the commutator with  $\mathcal{F}(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{b})$  becomes simple, too. A good choice is

$$\gamma = \alpha_o^{-1} \bullet \lambda^{-1} \bullet \alpha_i, \quad \varsigma = \alpha_i^{-1} \bullet \lambda^{-1} \bullet \alpha_i. \quad (5.20)$$

The first is obviously self-intersection free, as it passes from one boundary to the other. The second is a loop, but if we shift its beginning, as required in exercise 4.10, to  $\phi = \epsilon$  (see figure 4), all intersections can be removed. Here it is essential that  $\lambda^{-1}$  appears and not  $\lambda$ , which would lead to a self-intersection. The reason for choosing these two paths is that each intersects with one of the paths  $\beta$  and  $\varrho$  once only, so we get simple commutators. With the graphical rules from figure 3 we have

$$[\mathcal{V}_\varsigma^a, \mathcal{U}_\beta] = \frac{1}{2} i \hbar \mathcal{U}_\beta \gamma^a, \quad [\mathcal{V}_\gamma^a, \mathcal{U}_\varrho] = \frac{1}{2} i \hbar \mathcal{U}_\varrho \gamma^a. \quad (5.21)$$

This immediately leads to the representation (using (4.62))

$$\mathcal{V}_\varsigma^a |\mathcal{F}\rangle = \left| \frac{1}{2} i \hbar \mathrm{Tr} \left( \mathbf{b} \gamma^a \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \mathbf{b}} \right) \right\rangle, \quad \mathcal{V}_\gamma^a |\mathcal{F}\rangle = \left| \frac{1}{2} i \hbar \mathrm{Tr} \left( \tilde{\mathbf{g}} \gamma^a \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \tilde{\mathbf{g}}} \right) \right\rangle. \quad (5.22)$$

Hence, the observables act by generating multiplication of  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$  or  $\mathbf{b}$ , respectively, from the right. This is exactly the transformation under which the Haar measure in (5.19) is invariant. To render these

operators hermitian, we have to choose  $\mathcal{G} = 1$  (or any other constant). Hence, the scalar product takes the simplest possible form

$$\langle \mathcal{F}_1 | \mathcal{F}_2 \rangle = \int d\tilde{\mathbf{g}} d\mathbf{b} \mathcal{F}_1^*(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{b}) \mathcal{F}_2(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{b}). \quad (5.23)$$

To illustrate some of the results of section 4.3, let us see how other observables act and which kind of ordering ambiguities appear. Consider the path  $\beta$  in figure 4. It is obviously free of self-intersections, so we expect  $\mathcal{V}_\beta^a$  to be free of ordering ambiguities. There are two ways to derive the quantum operator.

*Exercise 5.3.* Using the graphical rules from figure 3, show that

$$[\mathcal{V}_\beta^a, \mathcal{U}_\beta] = -\frac{1}{2}i\hbar \gamma^a \mathcal{U}_\beta, \quad [\mathcal{V}_\beta^a, \mathcal{U}_\varrho] = \frac{1}{2}i\hbar \mathcal{U}_\varrho \gamma^a. \quad (5.24)$$

Hence, assuming that there are no “quantum corrections” in (4.61) for this operator, we have

$$\mathcal{V}_\beta^a | \mathcal{F} \rangle = \left| \frac{1}{2}i\hbar \text{Tr} \left( \tilde{\mathbf{g}} \gamma^a \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \tilde{\mathbf{g}}} \right) - \frac{1}{2}i\hbar \text{Tr} \left( \gamma^a \mathbf{b} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \mathbf{b}} \right) \right\rangle. \quad (5.25)$$

This is obviously hermitian, too, because the Haar measure is invariant under multiplication from the left as well. Another way to obtain the same operator is to use that  $\beta \bullet \varsigma = \gamma$ , so the relation (4.48) gives

$$\mathcal{V}_\beta^a + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{U}_{\beta^a b} \mathcal{V}_\varsigma^b + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{V}_\varsigma^b \mathcal{U}_{\beta^a b} = \mathcal{V}_\gamma^a. \quad (5.26)$$

From (5.21) it is easy to infer that

$$[\mathcal{V}_\varsigma^b, \mathcal{U}_{\beta^a b}] = \frac{1}{2}[\mathcal{V}_\varsigma^b, \text{Tr}(\mathcal{U}_\beta^{-1} \gamma^a \mathcal{U}_\beta \gamma_b)] = 0, \quad (5.27)$$

so we can reorder the factors as we like and get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_\beta^a | \mathcal{F} \rangle &= \mathcal{V}_\gamma^a | \mathcal{F} \rangle - \mathcal{U}_{\beta^a b} \mathcal{V}_\varsigma^b | \mathcal{F} \rangle \\ &= \left| \frac{1}{2}i\hbar \text{Tr} \left( \tilde{\mathbf{g}} \gamma^a \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \tilde{\mathbf{g}}} \right) \right\rangle - \left| \frac{1}{2}i\hbar b^a_b \text{Tr} \left( \mathbf{b} \gamma^b \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \mathbf{b}} \right) \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (5.28)$$

With  $b^a_b \mathbf{b} \gamma^b = \gamma^a \mathbf{b}$  this becomes exactly the same as the operator given above. As another example, we can compute the observable  $\mathcal{V}_{\varsigma^{-1}}^a$  using (4.57):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_{\varsigma^{-1}}^a &= -\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{U}_{\varsigma, b}^a \mathcal{V}_\varsigma^b - \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{V}_\varsigma^b \mathcal{U}_{\varsigma, b}^a \\ &= -\mathcal{U}_{\varsigma, b}^a \mathcal{V}_\varsigma^b - \frac{1}{2}[\mathcal{V}_\varsigma^b, \mathcal{U}_{\varsigma, b}^a]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.29)$$

*Exercise 5.4.* Evaluate the commutator, using  $\varsigma = \beta^{-1} \bullet \varrho^{-1} \bullet \beta$  and the identity  $\gamma^a \mathbf{g} \gamma_a = -\mathbf{g} + 2 \text{Tr}(\mathbf{g}) \mathbf{1}$  for  $\text{SL}(2)$  matrices. The result is

$$\frac{1}{2}[\mathcal{V}_\varsigma^b, \mathcal{U}_{\varsigma, b}^a] = \frac{1}{2}i\hbar \text{Tr}(\mathcal{U}_\varrho) \text{Tr}(\mathcal{U}_\beta^{-1} \mathcal{U}_\varrho \mathcal{U}_\beta \gamma^a), \quad (5.30)$$

and the resulting quantum operator becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_{\varsigma^{-1}}^a | \mathcal{F} \rangle &= \left| \frac{1}{4}i\hbar \text{Tr}(\mathbf{b}^{-1} \mathbf{g}^{-1} \gamma^a \mathbf{g} \mathbf{b} \gamma_b) \text{Tr} \left( \gamma^a \mathbf{b} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \mathbf{b}} \right) \right\rangle \\ &\quad + \left| \frac{1}{2}i\hbar \text{Tr}(\mathbf{g}) \text{Tr}(\mathbf{b}^{-1} \mathbf{g} \mathbf{b} \gamma^a) \mathcal{F} \right\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (5.31)$$

Here we get a quantum correction in form of an extra imaginary multiplication term of order  $\hbar$ , and it is also obvious that there is an ordering ambiguity in the first part of this expression. If we bring the differential operator to the left, then it also acts on the prefactor, which depends on  $\mathbf{b}$ . But the extra term is exactly what is needed to make the operator hermitian under the scalar product (5.23), which can be checked by partial integration. Hence, we see that the “quantum corrections” appearing in (4.61) are really necessary to obtain a full set of hermitian  $\mathcal{V}$  operators.

There are many other interesting questions about the physics described by this state space, and most of them are still to be explored. For example, one can now ask for the eigenstates of the  $\mathcal{V}$  operators and their spectrum, look for complete sets of commuting observables other than the  $\mathcal{U}$ ’s to provide another basis for the state space, or find the uncertainty relations for the observables and construct semi-classical universes with minimum uncertainty. All typical questions arising in quantum mechanics can be translated to similar questions for our toy model of quantum gravity, and they will certainly also be interesting for quantum gravity in general. We will not go into more details here, as all this is far beyond the scope of this article. However, an article about three dimensional canonical gravity would not be complete without discussing *the* standard example, so the last section will be a rather mathematical derivation of the physical Hilbert space for the torus.

### 5.3 Torus quantization

Quantization of three dimensional canonical gravity has mostly focussed on the torus, because, from a mathematical point of view, this is the simplest non-trivial manifold (for a really huge collection of references see [32]). In contrast to the cylinder manifold, there are no boundary conditions for the fields and we don’t have to introduce the extra fields  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$ , which makes the canonical formalism easier. On the other hand, it is the lack of the background structures associated with the boundary fields that makes it more difficult to extract physical information. We considered this in detail for the cylinder manifold above, so let us focus on a mathematically rigorous construction of the Hilbert space in this section.

On the torus we have two primitive loops  $\lambda$  and  $\kappa$ , and they obey the relation  $\lambda \bullet \kappa = \kappa \bullet \lambda$ . Hence, the loop group is Abelian and the wave function is  $\mathcal{F}(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda, \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\kappa)$ , which has support on pairs of commuting  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$  elements, and must be invariant under inner automorphisms (4.28). Before constructing the state space explicitly, let us remember what we know about observables measuring the “winding number” of the holonomies  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\kappa$ . As the torus has no boundary, exercise 5.1 tells us that there is no way for an observer sitting on the torus to distinguish between the holonomies  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{2z}\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda$ , which are projected onto the same matrix  $\mathbf{g}_\lambda \in \text{SL}(2)$  (see (1.21), where the elements  $\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{2z} \in \widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$  have been introduced as the “loops” of  $\text{SL}(2)$ ; the maps  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}} \mapsto \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{2z}\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$  are the “shift” maps on  $\text{SL}(2)$  as introduced in section 1.1). Only the matrices  $\mathbf{g}_\lambda$  and  $\mathbf{g}_\kappa$  can be measured by passing a spinor once around the primitive loops. As a consequence, there are operators

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_\lambda |\mathcal{F}(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda, \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\kappa)\rangle &= |\mathcal{F}(\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{2z}\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda, \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\kappa)\rangle, \\ \mathcal{P}_\kappa |\mathcal{F}(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda, \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\kappa)\rangle &= |\mathcal{F}(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda, \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{2z}\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\kappa)\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (5.32)$$

commuting with all physical observables: if there was any observable which did not commute with  $\mathcal{P}_\lambda$ , then it would be possible to measure the winding number of  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda$ . The operators  $\mathcal{P}$  are very much like the permutation operators for identical particles in quantum mechanics. They also commute with all observables, as it is exactly this what “identical particle” means. In both cases the state space splits into “superselection sectors”. They are the eigenspaces of the  $\mathcal{P}$  operators, which can always be diagonalized simultaneously with any other set of commuting observables.

In multi-particle quantum mechanics, the square of any primitive permutation operator is the identity, which restricts its eigenvalues to be  $\pm 1$ , leading to bosonic and fermionic states. In our case the algebra of the  $\mathcal{P}$  operators is free. Thus any eigenvalue is allowed except zero, because the  $\mathcal{P}$ ’s are

invertible, and for any pair of non-vanishing complex numbers  $q_\lambda, q_\kappa$  we get a superselection sector. Note that we do not even have a restriction for the eigenvalues to be imaginary or real, because a priori there is no reason for the  $\mathcal{P}$  to be (anti)hermitian.

*Exercise 5.5.* Show that all sectors are isomorphic: for any pair  $q_\lambda, q_\kappa \in \mathbb{C} - \{0\}$ , one can define (quasiperiodic!) functions  $C_\lambda, C_\kappa : \widetilde{\text{SL}}(2) \rightarrow \mathbb{C} - \{0\}$  such that  $C_\lambda(\mathbf{1}_2 \tilde{\mathbf{g}}) = q_\lambda C_\lambda(\tilde{\mathbf{g}})$  and similar for  $\kappa$ . Then

$$|\mathcal{F}(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda, \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\kappa)\rangle \mapsto |C_\lambda(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda)C_\kappa(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\kappa)\mathcal{F}(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\lambda, \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\kappa)\rangle \quad (5.33)$$

is a one-to-one map from the sector with eigenvalues  $(1, 1)$  onto the sector  $(q_\lambda, q_\kappa)$ .

Hence, we only need to consider one special superselection sector, knowing that all others are isomorphic (in contrast to quantum mechanics, where the bosonic and fermionic sectors are not isomorphic). The simplest choice is of course the sector with eigenvalues 1 for both  $\mathcal{P}$  operators. In this sector the wave function  $\mathcal{F}$  depends on the  $\text{SL}(2)$  matrices  $\mathbf{g}_\lambda$  and  $\mathbf{g}_\kappa$  only.

To get a basis for the state space, we have to find the moduli space of the torus, but with respect to  $\text{SL}(2)$  instead of  $\widetilde{\text{SL}}(2)$ . This is not very difficult, the relevant properties of  $\text{SL}(2)$  have been studied already in section 1.2. We found (exercise 1.9) that two matrices commute if and only if they lie on the same line through the origin in figure 2, but they are allowed to lie in different parts. This line is unique if not both matrices are “null” elements of  $\text{SL}(2)$ , i.e. either  $\mathbf{1}$  or  $-\mathbf{1}$ . In this case they do not transform under inner automorphisms, and we get four special equivalence classes of pairs of commuting matrices called

$$\mathcal{C}_{z_\lambda, z_\kappa}(\mathbf{1}) = \{(z_\lambda \mathbf{1}, z_\kappa \mathbf{1})\}, \quad (5.34)$$

each consisting of a single pair only. In all other cases we can find a non-vanishing vector  $v^a$ , an angle  $\theta$  and two signs  $z_\lambda, z_\kappa = \pm$  such that the matrices are

$$\mathbf{g}_\lambda = \mathbf{g}(v^a \cos \theta, z_\lambda), \quad \mathbf{g}_\kappa = \mathbf{g}(v^a \sin \theta, z_\kappa). \quad (5.35)$$

Here we used the special coordinates  $\mathbf{g}(v^a, \pm)$  on  $\text{SL}(2)$  introduced in (1.15). The vector has to be of length squared greater or equal to  $-1$ , so the range for  $v^a$  and the angle  $\theta$  is restricted by

$$v^2 \geq -1/\cos^2 \theta, \quad v^2 \geq -1/\sin^2 \theta, \quad v^a \neq 0, \quad (5.36)$$

where  $v^2 = v^a v_a$ . There is still a sign ambiguity in this parameterization as  $v^a \mapsto -v^a, \theta \mapsto \theta + \pi$  does not change the holonomies. We can fix this partly by requiring that  $v^a$  lies inside or on the *upper* lightcone if it is timelike or lightlike, then the only remaining ambiguity occurs if it is spacelike or lies on the boundary, where one of the signs is arbitrary.


How do the equivalence classes look like? In section 1.2 we found that an inner automorphism acts on the vector  $v^a$  like a proper Lorentz rotation, and this is of course still true with extra factors of  $\cos \theta$  or  $\sin \theta$  here. Given two vectors  $v^a$  with the same length squared  $v^2$ , then we can always find a proper Lorentz rotation mapping them onto each other. This is obviously true for spacelike vectors as the hyperboloids with  $v^2 > 0$  are connected. For timelike (or lightlike) vectors  $v^a$  this follows because then by definition the vector always lies on the *upper* hyperboloid (or lightcone). Hence, an equivalence class of pairs of commuting non-null holonomies is determined by the length  $v^2$ , the angle  $\theta$ , and the two signs  $z_\lambda, z_\kappa$ . We denote it by

$$\mathcal{C}_{z_\lambda, z_\kappa}(v^2, \theta) = \{(\mathbf{g}(v^a \cos \theta, z_\lambda), \mathbf{g}(v^a \sin \theta, z_\kappa))\}. \quad (5.37)$$

Here  $v^a$  runs over all non-vanishing vectors with the given length squared  $v^2$ , lying inside or on the upper lightcone if  $v^2 \leq 0$ . Fixing the two signs  $z_\lambda, z_\kappa$ , we can draw a picture of the corresponding



Figure 6: The moduli space of the torus, consisting of the equivalence classes of commuting  $SL(2)$  matrices modulo inner automorphisms. It consists of four spacelike sectors in form of cylinders extending to infinity, where opposite points are identified, glue to a timelike sector, which is a torus with four holes. In between there are four lightlike circles and null points. Every point in this picture (except for the identifications in the spacelike sectors) corresponds to exactly one basis element of the physical state space.



the considered equivalence class and zero elsewhere. The basis elements of the state space are

$$|\mathbf{1}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa\rangle, \quad |z_\lambda, z_\kappa, v^2, \theta\rangle, \quad (5.38)$$

where the range of the parameters and the identifications are of course the same as for the equivalence classes. Let us introduce another set of coordinates on the moduli space, which will be more convenient later on. The states  $|\mathbf{1}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa\rangle$  will be called null states, and the remaining will be divided into timelike, lightlike, and spacelike states, depending on  $v^2$ . Of course, this means that the holonomies are timelike, lightlike or spacelike in the sense introduced in section 1.2. On each of these sectors we will introduce separate coordinates and “standard representatives” for the matrices.

Let us start with the timelike states. By a proper Lorentz rotation, we can always achieve that the vector  $v^a$  is vertical in figure 2, i.e. it lies on the  $\gamma_0$  axis and the holonomies are elements of the  $SO(2)$  subgroup. Then we can find two real numbers  $a, b$  such that

$$\mathbf{g}_\lambda = \begin{pmatrix} \cos a & \sin a \\ -\sin a & \cos a \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{g}_\kappa = \begin{pmatrix} \cos b & \sin b \\ -\sin b & \cos b \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.39)$$

The parameters  $a, b$  are obviously periodic with period  $2\pi$ , but apart from this they are unique, because every timelike hyperboloid intersects the  $SO(2)$  subgroup exactly once. However,  $a$  and  $b$  cannot be both multiples of  $\pi$ , as then we are back in the null sector. The states will be denoted by

$$|\mathcal{T}, a, b\rangle, \quad (a, b) \neq (m\pi, n\pi), \quad m, n \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (5.40)$$

The new parameters  $a, b$  are very different from the old  $v^2, \theta$  coordinates, as we now have one set of coordinates for the whole timelike sector, which was glued together in a complicated way before. Now we can easily see that it is a torus with four holes, but the boundaries are shrunk to points.

For the spacelike classes the result is similar. We can always rotate a spacelike vector such that it lies on the horizontal axis in figure 2, i.e. the  $\gamma_1$ -axis. In contrast to the timelike sector, the spacelike

sectors as shown in figure 6 are not connected, so we have to keep the two signs as parameters. The commuting matrices representing a spacelike class are

$$\mathbf{g}_\lambda = z_\lambda \begin{pmatrix} \cosh a & \sinh a \\ \sinh a & \cosh a \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{g}_\kappa = z_\kappa \begin{pmatrix} \cosh b & \sinh b \\ \sinh b & \cosh b \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.41)$$

and the corresponding states are called

$$|\mathcal{S}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa, a, b\rangle, \quad (a, b) \neq (0, 0) \quad (5.42)$$

Here we have to exclude  $a = b = 0$ , which yields a null class. Of course, this corresponds to the boundary of the spacelike region, which is also shrunk to a point. In addition, this time the parameters are not unique, as a given spacelike hyperboloid intersects the  $\gamma_1$  axis always twice and we can rotate a spacelike vector into its negative by a continuous transformation. This leads to the identification

$$|\mathcal{S}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa, a, b\rangle = |\mathcal{S}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa, -a, -b\rangle. \quad (5.43)$$

Finally, every lightlike vector can be rotated into the special vector  $v^a = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 0)$ , because every vector on the upper lightcone (by definition  $v^a$  lies always there) can be transformed into every other. We then keep the old coordinate  $\theta$  and get the representatives

$$\mathbf{g}_\lambda = z_\lambda \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \cos \theta \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{g}_\kappa = z_\kappa \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \sin \theta \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.44)$$

and the state functionals are denoted by

$$|\mathcal{L}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa, \theta\rangle. \quad (5.45)$$

To summarize, we now have a complete basis of the state space of the torus, and a general element of this state space can be expanded as

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{F}\rangle = & \sum_{z_\lambda, z_\kappa} \mathcal{F}_1(z_\lambda, z_\kappa) |\mathbf{1}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa\rangle + \oint da db \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{T}(a, b) |\mathcal{T}, a, b\rangle \\ & + \sum_{z_\lambda, z_\kappa} \int da db \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{S}(z_\lambda, z_\kappa, a, b) |\mathcal{S}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa, a, b\rangle \\ & + \sum_{z_\lambda, z_\kappa} \oint d\theta \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{L}(z_\lambda, z_\kappa, \theta) |\mathcal{L}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa, \theta\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (5.46)$$

where the wave function  $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{S}$  is assumed to be symmetric  $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{S}(z_\lambda, z_\kappa, a, b) = \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{S}(z_\lambda, z_\kappa, -a, -b)$ , and  $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{L}$  are periodic in  $a, b$  and  $\theta$ , respectively.

*Exercise 5.8.* The  $v^2, \theta$  coordinates above together with the  $a, b$  coordinates on the timelike and spacelike sectors provide a full atlas of the moduli space in figure 6 (ignoring the singular points and the identifications in the spacelike sector to make it a proper manifold). Find the transition functions.

Now we have to find out how the observables act on the basis of the physical state space. As there is no boundary, we only have the trace observables and some exceptional operators representing gauge independent properties of the holonomies which are not contained in the trace. Because the loop group of the torus is Abelian, every loop can be written as  $\varrho = \lambda^m \bullet \kappa^n$  for some  $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . The corresponding trace observables are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}(m, n) &= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{g}_\varrho) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{U}_\varrho(0, 1)), \\ \mathcal{V}(m, n) &= \text{Tr}(\mathbf{g}_\varrho \mathbf{f}_\varrho) = \int_0^1 ds \text{Tr}(\mathbf{U}_\varrho(0, s) \varrho^i \gamma_i \mathbf{U}_\varrho(s, 1)). \end{aligned} \quad (5.47)$$

The  $\mathcal{U}$  operators are obviously pure multiplication operators and they commute with each other. In fact, they form an algebra, as every product of them is again a linear combination. Explicitly, we have

$$2\mathcal{U}(m, n)\mathcal{U}(p, q) = \mathcal{U}(n + p, m + q) + \mathcal{U}(n - p, m - q), \quad (5.48)$$

and, as well as the  $\mathcal{V}$ 's, they are not independent. The most important relations are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}(m, n) &= \mathcal{U}(-m, -n), & \mathcal{U}(0, 0) &= 1, \\ \mathcal{V}(m, n) &= \mathcal{V}(-m, -n), & \mathcal{V}(0, 0) &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.49)$$

All these relations are derived from the following useful identities for  $\text{SL}(2)$  matrices:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{g}^{-1} &= \text{Tr}(\mathbf{g}) \mathbf{1}, & \mathbf{g} - \mathbf{g}^{-1} &= \text{Tr}(\mathbf{g}\gamma_a) \gamma_a, \\ \text{Tr}(\mathbf{g}) \text{Tr}(\mathbf{g}') &= \text{Tr}(\mathbf{g}\mathbf{g}') + \text{Tr}(\mathbf{g}^{-1}\mathbf{g}'). \end{aligned} \quad (5.50)$$

It is now straightforward to find out how the  $\mathcal{U}$  operators act on the physical states. They multiply them by the trace of the corresponding matrix  $\mathbf{g}_\lambda^m \mathbf{g}_\kappa^n$ , and since the trace is gauge-invariant, we may insert the “standard representatives” given above for the holonomies, i.e (5.39) for the timelike states etc. The result is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}(m, n) | \mathbf{1}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa \rangle &= z_\lambda^m z_\kappa^n | \mathbf{1}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa \rangle, \\ \mathcal{U}(m, n) | \mathcal{L}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa, \theta \rangle &= z_\lambda^m z_\kappa^n | \mathcal{L}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa, \theta \rangle, \\ \mathcal{U}(m, n) | \mathcal{S}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa, a, b \rangle &= z_\lambda^m z_\kappa^n \cosh(ma + nb) | \mathcal{S}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa, a, b \rangle, \\ \mathcal{U}(m, n) | \mathcal{T}, a, b \rangle &= \cos(ma + nb) | \mathcal{T}, a, b \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (5.51)$$

The basis states are obviously eigenstates of the  $\mathcal{U}$  operators, but some eigenspaces are still degenerate. Only the spacelike eigenspaces are one dimensional, because by (5.43)  $a, b$  and  $-a, -b$  represent the same state. In the timelike sector, the eigenspaces are two dimensional consisting of the states  $|\mathcal{T}, a, b\rangle$  and  $|\mathcal{T}, -a, -b\rangle$ , and the null and lightlike sectors are completely degenerate.

*Exercise 5.9.* Show that the following observables together with the  $\mathcal{U}$  operators form a complete set of commuting operators such that all eigenspaces are non-degenerate:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E} &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } \mathbf{g}_\lambda, \mathbf{g}_\kappa = \pm \mathbf{1}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ \mathcal{Z}_\lambda &= \begin{cases} \text{sign Tr}(\mathbf{g}_\lambda \gamma_0) & \text{if } \mathbf{g}_\lambda \text{ is lightlike or timelike} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ \sin \Theta \text{Tr}(\mathbf{g}_\lambda \gamma_a) &= \cos \Theta \text{Tr}(\mathbf{g}_\kappa \gamma_a). \end{aligned} \quad (5.52)$$

The first checks whether the state is a null state, the second, together with a similar observable for  $\kappa$ , tells us whether the matrices lie in the upper or lower lightcone if they are timelike or lightlike. In the third equation the angle  $\Theta$  is defined modulo  $\pi$  only, but together with the  $\mathcal{Z}$  observables we can fix its value on the lightlike states by requiring

$$\Theta | \mathcal{L}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa, \theta \rangle = \theta | \mathcal{L}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa, \theta \rangle. \quad (5.53)$$

As we want all these observables to be hermitian, the scalar product on the physical state space has to be such that the basis states are orthogonal. Of course, we can then normalize the basis to be orthonormal and the scalar product reads

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{1}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa | \mathbf{1}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa \rangle &= 1, \\ \langle \mathcal{L}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa, \theta | \mathcal{L}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa, \theta' \rangle &= \delta(\theta - \theta'), \\ \langle \mathcal{S}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa, a, b | \mathcal{S}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa, c, d \rangle &= \delta(a - c) \delta(b - d) + \delta(a + c) \delta(b + d), \\ \langle \mathcal{T}, a, b | \mathcal{T}, c, d \rangle &= \delta(a - c) \delta(b - d), \end{aligned} \quad (5.54)$$



and vanishes if the signs  $z_\lambda, z_\kappa$  do not coincide. Note that this is actually not the final definition of the scalar product, it just defines the product as a function of the basis elements. As the basis was only required to consist of eigenstates of the  $\mathcal{U}$  operators, we can still multiply all basis elements by arbitrary complex factors. If we want the  $\mathcal{V}$  observables to be hermitian as well, we now have to choose the basis states themselves appropriate.

The procedure to derive the product is slightly different from that used for the cylinder. What we are going to do can be explained most easily using our standard example again. Assume we have a particle in one dimension and let  $\mathcal{U}$  be the position operator. Then what we defined up to now is a basis consisting of eigenvectors  $\mathcal{U}|x\rangle = x|x\rangle$ , but we actually did not fixed the normalization of the basis vectors  $|x\rangle$ . Nevertheless we can *define* a scalar product depending on the basis by  $\langle x|y\rangle = \delta(x, y)$ : for each choice of basis states we get a different scalar product. Now there is another operator  $\mathcal{V}$  with  $[\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{U}] = i\hbar$ . The task is to fix the *basis*  $|x\rangle$  such that  $\mathcal{V}$  becomes hermitian. From the commutator we learn that

$$[\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{U}]|x\rangle = i\hbar|x\rangle \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathcal{V}|x\rangle = i\hbar \frac{d}{dx}|x\rangle - \hbar g'(x)|x\rangle, \quad (5.55)$$

where  $g$  is an unknown complex function. We can change the basis  $|x\rangle \mapsto \exp(ig(x))|x\rangle$ , and in the new basis  $\mathcal{V}$  simply acts as an differential operator, and it also becomes hermitian with respect to the scalar product derived from the new basis. In principle, it would be sufficient to render  $g$  real, but then we can still multiply the basis states by a phase factor, which does not change the scalar product any more, but simplifies the action of  $\mathcal{V}$  on the basis. As a result, we get a basis and a scalar product for the state space, without having to know their explicit representations in terms of wave functions.

Hence, all we have to do is to compute the commutator algebra of the  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  observables, then we know their action on the basis states up to some function like  $g$ . Provided that it is possible to make all  $\mathcal{V}$  observables hermitian, there must be a choice for the  $g$  function such that (5.54) is the correct product. Computing the commutator of  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  is straightforward. We rewrite the  $\mathcal{V}$  operators as

$$\mathcal{V}(m, n) = \int_0^1 ds \operatorname{Tr}(U_\varrho(0, s) \gamma_a U_\varrho(s, 1)) \varrho^i(s) e_i^a(\varrho(s)), \quad (5.56)$$

where  $\varrho$  is any loop homotopic to  $\lambda^m \bullet \kappa^n$ . Choosing another loop  $\varsigma \sim \lambda^p \bullet \kappa^q$  such that it intersects  $\varrho$  at finitely many points only, we can use the commutator (4.41) to get

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{V}(m, n), \mathcal{U}(p, q)] &= \int_0^1 ds \operatorname{Tr}(U_\varrho(0, s) \gamma_a U_\varrho(s, 1)) \varrho^i(s) [e_i^a(\varrho(s)), \operatorname{Tr}(U_\varsigma(0, 1))] \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}i\hbar \int_0^1 ds dt \varepsilon_{ij} \varrho^i(s) \varsigma'^j(t) \delta(\varrho(s), \varsigma(t)) \times \\ &\quad \operatorname{Tr}(U_\varrho(0, s) \gamma_a U_\varrho(s, 1)) \operatorname{Tr}(U_\varsigma(0, t) \gamma^a U_\varsigma(t, 1)). \end{aligned} \quad (5.57)$$

Using the second formula in (5.50) the product of the two traces becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &\operatorname{Tr}(U_\varrho(0, s) U_\varsigma(t, 1) U_\varsigma(0, t) U_\varrho(s, 1)) \\ &\quad - \operatorname{Tr}(U_\varrho(0, s) U_\varsigma(t, 0) U_\varsigma(1, t) U_\varrho(s, 1)). \end{aligned} \quad (5.58)$$

The delta function picks up a term only at intersection points of the two curves. Hence, the first of the two traces is the trace of a transport operator going along  $\varrho$  to an intersection point, then around  $\varsigma$  to the same point again, and finally further along  $\varrho$ , the second term is the same but the direction of  $\varsigma$  is reversed. The values of these transport operators are in fact independent of the special intersection point, as on the torus they depend on the two winding numbers of the loop only.

In particular, they take the same values for every intersection point. The integral then simply counts the intersections of the two loops, as already seen in exercise 4.5. Choosing the orientations of the loops such that the intersection number of  $\lambda$  with  $\kappa$  is  $+1$ , the intersection number of  $\lambda^m \bullet \kappa^n$  with  $\lambda^p \bullet \kappa^q$  is  $mq - np$ . We finally end up with the commutator

$$[\mathcal{V}(m, n), \mathcal{U}(p, q)] = \frac{1}{2}i\hbar(np - mq)(\mathcal{U}(m + p, n + q) - \mathcal{U}(m - p, n - q)). \quad (5.59)$$

*Exercise 5.10.* Show that a similar relation holds for the commutator of two  $\mathcal{V}$  operators:

$$[\mathcal{V}(m, n), \mathcal{V}(p, q)] = \frac{1}{2}i\hbar(np - mq)(\mathcal{V}(m + p, n + q) - \mathcal{V}(m - p, n - q)), \quad (5.60)$$

either by computing it straightforward using (4.41), or by showing that it is linear in  $\mathcal{V}$  again and using the Jacobi identities.

We can now compute the action of the  $\mathcal{V}$  operators on the basis states. For the timelike states, we have

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{V}(m, n), \mathcal{U}(p, q)]|\mathcal{T}, a, b\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}i\hbar(np - mq)(\mathcal{U}(m + p, n + q) - \mathcal{U}(m - p, n - q))|\mathcal{T}, a, b\rangle \\ &= -i\hbar(np - mq)\sin(ma + nb)\sin(pa + qb)|\mathcal{T}, a, b\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (5.61)$$

where we used the formula  $\cos(x + y) - \cos(x - y) = -2\sin x \sin y$ . We can rewrite the eigenvalue appearing in the last expression as

$$i\hbar\sin(ma + nb)\left(n\frac{\partial}{\partial a} - m\frac{\partial}{\partial b}\right)\cos(pa + qb), \quad (5.62)$$

so that the action of the  $\mathcal{V}$  operator is fixed to be

$$\mathcal{V}(m, n)|\mathcal{T}, a, b\rangle = -i\hbar\sin(ma + nb)\left(n\frac{\partial}{\partial a} - m\frac{\partial}{\partial b}\right)|\mathcal{T}, a, b\rangle, \quad (5.63)$$

up to an additional multiplicative term. However, one can easily check that the commutator relations between the  $\mathcal{V}$  operators are satisfied without “quantum corrections”, and in this form they are also hermitian with respect to the scalar product (5.54). Using our argument from above, any possible multiplicative term can now be absorbed into a redefinition of the basis, so that the last equation gives the correct action of the  $\mathcal{V}$  operators on timelike states. The computation for the spacelike sector is similar and gives

$$\mathcal{V}(m, n)|\mathcal{S}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa, a, b\rangle = -i\hbar z_\lambda^m z_\kappa^n \sinh(ma + nb)\left(n\frac{\partial}{\partial a} - m\frac{\partial}{\partial b}\right)|\mathcal{S}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa, a, b\rangle. \quad (5.64)$$

Another important fact to note here is that the vector fields represented by the  $\mathcal{V}$  operators on the timelike and spacelike sectors of the moduli space all vanish at the excluded points  $(0, 0)$  for the spacelike sector and  $(m\pi, n\pi)$  for the timelike sector. Hence, acting with any observable on spacelike and timelike states will never produce a state outside these sectors. We get another split into superselection sectors. The lightlike sectors should then of course also be mapped onto themselves by the  $\mathcal{V}$  observables. To see how they act there, we have to use some formulas:

*Exercise 5.11.* Compute the commutator of the  $\mathcal{V}$  observables with the matrices  $\mathbf{g}_\lambda$  and  $\mathbf{g}_\kappa$ . It is essential that they commute (as matrices), otherwise the result would depend on the special loop chosen in (5.56):

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{V}(m, n), \mathbf{g}_\lambda] &= \frac{1}{2}i\hbar n(\mathbf{g}_\lambda^{1+m} \mathbf{g}_\kappa^n - \mathbf{g}_\lambda^{1-m} \mathbf{g}_\kappa^{-n}) \\ [\mathcal{V}(m, n), \mathbf{g}_\kappa] &= -\frac{1}{2}i\hbar m(\mathbf{g}_\lambda^m \mathbf{g}_\kappa^{1+n} - \mathbf{g}_\lambda^{-m} \mathbf{g}_\kappa^{1-n}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.65)$$

Show also that for lightlike matrices we have

$$\text{Tr}(\mathbf{g}_\lambda^m \mathbf{g}_\kappa^n \gamma_a) = m \text{Tr}(\mathbf{g}_\lambda \gamma_a) + n \text{Tr}(\mathbf{g}_\kappa \gamma_a). \quad (5.66)$$

We can now derive the commutator of  $\mathcal{V}(m, n)$  with the angular variable  $\Theta$  introduced implicitly by (5.52). We just compute the commutator with the whole equation, which of course has to vanish. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} & -[\mathcal{V}(m, n), \Theta](\cos \Theta \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{g}_\lambda \gamma_a) + \sin \Theta \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{g}_\kappa \gamma_a)) \\ & = \sin \Theta [\mathcal{V}(m, n), \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{g}_\lambda \gamma_a)] - \cos \Theta [\mathcal{V}(m, n), \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{g}_\kappa \gamma_a)] \\ & = i\hbar (n \sin \Theta + m \cos \Theta) (m \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{g}_\lambda \gamma_a) + n \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{g}_\kappa \gamma_b)), \end{aligned} \quad (5.67)$$

where we used the formulas given in the exercise and the fact the the matrices are lightlike. Now (5.52) implies that there is a vector  $v_a$  such that  $\operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{g}_\lambda \gamma_a) = 2v_a \cos \Theta$  and  $\operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{g}_\kappa \gamma_a) = 2v_a \sin \Theta$  (which of course is the vector introduced in (5.35)). Inserting this into the last equation gives

$$[\mathcal{V}(m, n), \Theta] = i\hbar (n \sin \Theta + m \cos \Theta)^2 \quad (5.68)$$

From this we could infer that  $\mathcal{V}(m, n)$  has to acts on lightlike states as

$$\mathcal{V}(m, n) | \mathcal{L}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa, \theta \rangle = -i\hbar (n \sin \theta + m \cos \theta)^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} | \mathcal{L}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa, \theta \rangle, \quad (5.69)$$

but this not hermitian. Here we have to add an imaginary multiplicative term, or even simpler we have to “symmetrize” the operator:

$$\mathcal{V}(m, n) | \mathcal{L}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa, \theta \rangle = -i\hbar (n \sin \theta + m \cos \theta) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} (n \sin \theta + m \cos \theta) | \mathcal{L}, z_\lambda, z_\kappa, \theta \rangle, \quad (5.70)$$

which is obviously hermitian with respect to the product (5.54). This completes the construction of the physical Hilbert space for the torus. All observables now have well defined action on the basis states and we saw that it is possible to render all these operators hermitian with respect to a unique scalar product. The state space splits into 13 superselection sectors, the four spacelike, lightlike and null sectors and the single timelike sector (in addition to the split into superselection sectors with respect to the  $\mathcal{P}$  operators above, leading to sectors which cannot be distinguished by an observer sitting on the torus). A general state functional is given by expanding it as shown in (5.46), and restricting the wave functions of the non-compact spacelike sectors to be square integrable, i.e.

$$\int da db \mathcal{F}_S^* \mathcal{F}_S < \infty, \quad (5.71)$$

we finally get a well defined Hilbert space. Using that the scalar product is unique up to rescaling, we can answer some questions arising in a naive description of the state space of the torus, where one assumes that the wave function can be written as function of the traces of holonomies. First of all, we immediately see that in this way we cannot cover the whole state space, because the traces alone cannot distinguish between lightlike and null states. So already then we loose some states. Some approaches go even further trying to construct a Fock-like space based on the  $\mathcal{U}$  operators as creation operators. This leads to the so called loop states or loop representation, providing a discrete basis for the state space. There have been some discussions about the existence of such a basis [33, 34, 35, 36], so let us close this section with a brief look at these states.

We first have to find a suitable definition for loop states in our notation. Usually they are defined as wave functions  $\mathcal{F} = \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{g}_\varrho)$ , but as we do not know how our basis above looks like when expressed in terms of wave functions, we have to construct them using some basic properties. In fact, the loop states can be generated as follows. There is a “vacuum”  $|0, 0\rangle$ , represented by a constant wave function. In our formalism, this means that acting on it with the differential operators  $\mathcal{V}(m, n)$  gives zero. Then the loop states are

$$|m, n\rangle = \mathcal{U}(m, n) |0, 0\rangle. \quad (5.72)$$

They obviously have a nice generalization to higher genus manifolds, because we get a state for each homotopy class of loops on  $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$ . By using commutation relations, one can derive the action of the  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  operators on these states, and they are quite simple. However, in general the loop states are not normalizable, and they actually provide a very inconvenient basis of a subset of the state space. If  $\mathcal{V}(m, n)|0, 0\rangle = 0$  for all  $m, n$ , then all the functions  $\mathcal{F}$  in the expansion (5.46) must be constants, but not necessarily equal. If we want the vacuum to be normalizable, the spacelike parts must vanish, because otherwise we would get an infinite contribution to the norm of the state. So loop states can only be timelike, spacelike, or null, if we want them to be normalizable. On the other hand, in the null and lightlike sectors we cannot build up a Fock structure, because acting with the  $\mathcal{U}$  operators on the vacuum just reproduces it. Hence, the only useful loop states are timelike. We can compute them explicitly and get

$$|m, n\rangle = \oint da db \cos(ma + nb) |\mathcal{T}, a, b\rangle. \quad (5.73)$$

Note that in a similar construction for the spacelike sector a cosh would appear, so that the norms would be even more divergent than the norm of the vacuum. For the timelike states, however, the norm is finite, and they are in fact orthonormal:

$$\langle m, n | p, q \rangle = 2\pi^2 (\delta_{m,p} \delta_{n,q} + \delta_{m,-p} \delta_{n,-q}), \quad (5.74)$$

the symmetrization appearing here because the  $\mathcal{U}$  operators have the symmetries (5.49). But still they cover only half of the timelike sector, the remaining states with cos replaced by sin cannot be written as loop states. Hence, we have to conclude that loop states do not provide a suitable basis for the physical state space. They only exist when restricted to the timelike sector, but this means that they are not represented by wave functions of the form  $\mathcal{F} = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{g}_\lambda^n \mathbf{g}_\kappa^m)$ , which doesn't vanish on the spacelike sector. Even the existence of the timelike loop states is rather accidental and a special feature of the torus. It is essential that there is a superselection sector of the state space corresponding to a finite region of the moduli space. For the cylinder there are no such sectors and the wave functions  $\mathcal{F}(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{b}) = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{g}^n)$  are obviously not normalizable.

Coming back once again to simple point particle quantum mechanics, it is quite obvious to see what goes wrong. If you want to find a Fock-like basis for the state space for a particle in one dimension, you can, e.g., take the harmonic oscillator eigenfunctions to be your basis states, and this of course works perfectly, because you have the “correct” relations between the creation and annihilation operators, which are the hermitian conjugate of each other. For the loop states this is totally different, as the creation operators themselves are hermitian. The quantum mechanical analogy would be to define the “vacuum” by  $p|0\rangle = 0$  and to create the basis states by  $x|n\rangle = |n+1\rangle$ . This obviously leads to the wave functions  $\Psi_n(x) = x^n$ , which are not normalizable and do not provide any reasonable basis of the state space. The only exception occurs if the range of  $x$  is finite, and this corresponds to our timelike loop states.

## Appendix

In section 3 we did not give the details of how to compute the equations of motion and the Poisson brackets for the boundary fields  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$ . The technical details of these computations are rather cumbersome, though the results can be summarized in the simple equations (3.28) and the brackets (3.32–3.34). In principle only one of the two calculations is necessary, as once we have the Poisson brackets we could obtain the equations of motions by computing the brackets with the Hamiltonian. However, let us nevertheless do both independently and check whether the results are correct.

To compute the equations of motion for  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$ , we split the Lagrangian into an interior and a boundary term. We take the interior term to be everything which does not depend on  $\mathbf{u}$  or  $\mathbf{v}$ ,

i.e. (3.9), plus the  $\omega_\phi$  and  $\gamma_\phi$  part of (3.24). With Stokes' theorem we can write this as a single integral over the interior of  $\mathcal{N}$ :

$$L_{\text{int}} = \int d^2x \varepsilon^{ij} \text{Tr}(\dot{\omega}_i \gamma_j - D_i \omega_t \gamma_j - \partial_i \gamma_t \omega_j + \gamma_t \omega_i \omega_j). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The boundary term is the rest of (3.24) plus the kinetic term (3.27). By using (3.23) we can rewrite it as

$$L_{\text{bnd}} = \sum_{\ell} \left( \text{Tr}(\mathbf{u}_{\ell}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{u}}_{\ell} \mathbf{v}(\phi_0)) - \oint_{\phi_0} d\phi \text{Tr}(\mathbf{u}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{u}} \bar{\gamma}_{\phi} - \omega_t \bar{\gamma}_{\phi} - \gamma_t \bar{\omega}_{\phi}) \right), \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where  $\bar{\gamma}_{\phi}$  and  $\bar{\omega}_{\phi}$  are periodic functions of  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$ :

$$\bar{\omega}_{\phi} = \mathbf{u}^{-1} \partial_{\phi} \mathbf{u}, \quad \bar{\gamma}_{\phi} = \mathbf{u}^{-1} \partial_{\phi} \mathbf{v} \mathbf{u}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Only the multiplier fields appear in both parts and we can derive the equations of motion for the remaining fields independently. Varying  $\omega_i$  and  $\gamma_i$  in  $L_{\text{int}}$  immediately gives (3.25). Now consider a variation of  $\mathbf{v}$  in  $L_{\text{bnd}}$ . As  $\mathbf{v}$  is completely (and uniquely) determined by  $\mathbf{v}(\phi_0)$  and  $\bar{\gamma}_{\phi}$  via the differential equation (A.3), we can equally well vary  $\bar{\gamma}_{\phi}$  and  $\mathbf{v}(\phi_0)$  independently, which gives us the equations of motion

$$\mathbf{u}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{u}} = \omega_t, \quad \mathbf{u}_{\ell}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{u}}_{\ell} = 0. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

So we already found the first part of (3.28). The variation of  $\mathbf{u}$  is slightly more complicated, because we cannot vary  $\mathbf{u}$  without varying  $\mathbf{v}$ : the relation (3.22) has to remain invariant. However, as before we can vary  $\bar{\omega}_{\phi}$  and  $\mathbf{u}$  at some special point independently, keeping  $\bar{\gamma}_{\phi}$  and  $\mathbf{v}(\phi_0)$  fixed. To find the variation of  $L_{\text{bnd}}$ , we can use

$$\delta(\mathbf{u}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{u}}) = \mathbf{u}^{-1} \partial_t (\delta \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^{-1}) \mathbf{u}, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

and a similar formula for  $\mathbf{u}_{\ell}$ , which follows from the identity  $\partial \mathbf{u}^{-1} = -\mathbf{u}^{-1} \partial \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^{-1}$  for any matrix  $\mathbf{u}$  and any differential operator  $\partial$ . Inserting this and integrating time derivatives by parts if they act on variations, we find

$$\delta L_{\text{bnd}} = \sum_{\ell} \left( -\text{Tr}(\mathbf{u}_{\ell}^{-1} \delta \mathbf{u}_{\ell} \dot{\mathbf{v}}(\phi_0)) + \oint_{\phi_0} d\phi \text{Tr}(\delta \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^{-1} \partial_{\phi} \dot{\mathbf{v}} + \gamma_t \delta \bar{\omega}_{\phi}) \right), \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where we also dropped terms with  $\dot{\mathbf{u}}_{\ell}$  vanishing by (A.4). Integrating the  $\partial_{\phi}$  derivative by parts, we can use

$$\partial_{\phi} (\delta \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^{-1}) = \mathbf{u} \delta(\mathbf{u}^{-1} \partial_{\phi} \mathbf{u}) \mathbf{u}^{-1} = \mathbf{u}^{-1} \delta \bar{\omega}_{\phi} \mathbf{u}, \quad (\text{A.7})$$

and we have to take a boundary term into account:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta L_{\text{bnd}} = \sum_{\ell} \left( \text{Tr}(\delta \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{v}}|_{\phi_0}^{\phi_0+2\pi} - \mathbf{u}_{\ell}^{-1} \delta \mathbf{u}_{\ell} \dot{\mathbf{v}}(\phi_0)) \right. \\ \left. + \oint_{\phi_0} d\phi \text{Tr}(\delta \bar{\omega}_{\phi} (\gamma_t - \mathbf{u}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{v}} \mathbf{u})) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Making use of (3.22) again, we find that the first term can be converted into

$$\delta L_{\text{bnd}} = \sum_{\ell} \left( \text{Tr}(\delta \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^{-1} (\phi_0 + 2\pi) \dot{\mathbf{v}}_{\ell}) - \oint_{\phi_0} d\phi \text{Tr}(\delta \bar{\omega}_{\phi} (\mathbf{u}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{v}} \mathbf{u} - \gamma_t)) \right). \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Thus we may consider  $\delta\bar{\omega}_\phi$  and  $\delta\mathbf{u}(\phi_0 + 2\pi)$  as independent and get the equations

$$\mathbf{u}^{-1}\dot{\mathbf{v}}\mathbf{u} = \gamma_t, \quad \dot{\mathbf{v}}_\ell = 0, \quad (\text{A.10})$$

which is the second part of (3.28).

The Poisson brackets of the boundary fields are also slightly complicated to obtain, mainly because they are group and algebra valued and quasiperiodic. There are various methods to derive the brackets. For example, one could treat the conditions (3.22), defining  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$  to be quasiperiodic, as second class constraints, as well as the requirement that  $\mathbf{u} \in \text{SL}(2)$  and  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathfrak{sl}(2)$ . Then  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$  would become matrix fields on a real axis and one could derive the Dirac brackets in the usual way [4]. For group valued fields, there are methods to avoid this detour via Dirac brackets [37], but still we have to deal with the quasiperiodic character of the fields. However, after all the only requirement to be imposed in the brackets is that they reproduce the correct equation of motion, which have to coincide with the Euler Lagrange equations just derived. This leads to a nice trick to check whether some “suggested” brackets are correct, and we will use this trick to show that the brackets for the boundary fields given below are the right ones. This is much easier than calculating them by extracting the canonically conjugate momentum of  $\mathbf{u}(\phi)$  and solving second class constraints.

To use this trick, we define a very special bracket, namely that of a phase space function  $F$  with the kinetic part of the Lagrangian, which is always assumed to be of first order, so that the kinetic part simply consists of the terms containing a time derivative. The Lagrangian then splits into  $L = L_{\text{kin}} - H$ , where  $H$  is the Hamiltonian. In general, the Poisson bracket can be written as

$$\{F, G\} = \sum_{r,s} \frac{\partial F}{\partial q_r} \{q_r, q_s\} \frac{\partial G}{\partial q_s}, \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where  $q_r$  is any set of coordinates on the phase space. The bracket with  $L_{\text{kin}}$  is defined by replacing

$$\frac{\partial L_{\text{kin}}}{\partial q_r} \rightarrow \frac{\partial L_{\text{kin}}}{\partial q_r} - \frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial L_{\text{kin}}}{\partial \dot{q}_r}. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

It just means that whenever we compute a Poisson bracket with a velocity, we first integrate the kinetic Lagrangian by parts. This is reasonable because  $L_{\text{kin}}$  is anyway defined up to a total time derivative only. The result of such a bracket is again an expression which is of first order in time derivatives.

How does this help us to find brackets? Suppose we have a suggestion for the Poisson brackets, then it is quite obvious that

$$\{F, L_{\text{kin}}\} - \{F, H\} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

is proportional to the equations of motion. Hence, if for every phase space function  $F$  we have

$$\{F, L_{\text{kin}}\} = \dot{F}, \quad (\text{A.14})$$

then the brackets *do* provide the correct equations of motion. In our case, the Lagrangian has a rather simple structure, and we can even prove that under the condition (A.14) the brackets coincide exactly with the correct Poisson brackets. If we summarize the degrees of freedom of  $\mathbf{u}$  by a set of coordinates  $q_\alpha$  and those of  $\mathbf{v}$  by  $p_a$ , then the kinetic Lagrangian has the form  $L_{\text{kin}} = p_\alpha M_{\alpha a} \dot{q}_a$ , i.e. it is linear in both  $\dot{q}_a$  and  $p_\alpha$ , and the matrix  $M_{\alpha a}$  depends on the  $q$ 's only. We do not assume that  $M_{\alpha a}$  is quadratic or even invertible.

Now suppose we have the Poisson brackets such that the  $q_a$  commute and (A.14) holds. Take  $F = q_b$ :

$$\dot{q}_b = \{q_b, p_\alpha M_{\alpha a} \dot{q}_a\} = \{q_b, p_\alpha\} M_{\alpha a} \dot{q}_a. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Thus  $M_{\alpha a}$  is left invertible and  $\{q_b, p_\alpha\}M_{\alpha a} = \delta_{ab}$ . Then choose  $F = p_\beta$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{p}_\beta &= \{p_\beta, p_\alpha M_{\alpha a} \dot{q}_a\} \\ &= \{p_\beta, p_\alpha\} M_{\alpha a} \dot{q}_a + p_\alpha \{p_\beta, q_b\} \partial_b M_{\alpha a} \dot{q}^a \\ &\quad - p_\alpha \partial_b M_{\alpha a} \dot{q}_b \{p_\beta, q_a\} - \dot{p}_\alpha M_{\alpha a} \{p_\beta, q_a\}\end{aligned}\tag{A.16}$$

where  $\partial_b$  denotes the derivative with respect to the variable  $q_b$ . The first three terms must cancel and from the last term we infer that  $M_{\alpha a}$  is also right invertible, the bracket  $\{q_a, p_\alpha\}$  being the inverse. Some more algebra then shows that cancelation of the first three terms implies

$$\{p_\alpha, p_\beta\} M_{\alpha a} M_{\beta b} = p_\beta \partial_a M_{\beta b} - p_\alpha \partial_b M_{\alpha a}.\tag{A.17}$$

Using this and the previous results we find

$$\{p_\alpha M_{\alpha a}, p_\beta M_{\beta b}\} = 0, \quad \{p_\alpha M_{\alpha a}, q_b\} = \delta_{ab}.\tag{A.18}$$

Now  $p_\alpha M_{\alpha a}$  is exactly the ‘‘canonically conjugate’’ momentum of  $q_a$ , so the brackets are indeed the correct ones, which one can equivalently obtain directly from  $L_{\text{kin}}$ .

Obviously, deriving the brackets from  $L_{\text{kin}}$  in the usual way seems to be much simpler. However, observe that (A.14) does not require a suitable basis of the phase space, like  $q_a, p_\alpha$  above, to check whether the brackets are correct or not. In fact, it is not easy to find a simple basis for quasiperiodic fields. However, there is a simple (over-complete) set of phase space functions to test (A.14), namely the values  $\mathbf{u}(\phi), \mathbf{v}(\phi)$ ,  $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$ . A disadvantage of this method is that it does not help us to derive the brackets. The ansatz is, however, motivated by using the general methods for group valued canonical fields [37].

Because of the derivative acting on  $\mathbf{v}$  in the Lagrangian, we expect the brackets to be non-local, and in fact the full brackets of  $\mathbf{u}$  with  $\mathbf{v}$  and of  $\mathbf{v}$  with itself are rather awkward. They simplify considerably (but are still not as simple as those for  $\omega_i$  and  $\gamma_i$ ) if we fix  $\phi_0$  appearing in (3.27), and consider  $\mathbf{v}(\phi_0)$  and  $\bar{\gamma}_\phi(\phi)$  as independent variables instead of  $\mathbf{v}(\phi)$ , as we already did above. The kinetic Lagrangian expressed in terms of these variables is

$$L_{\text{kin}} = \sum_\ell \left( \text{Tr}(\mathbf{u}_\ell^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{u}}_\ell \mathbf{v}(\phi_0)) - \oint_{\phi_0} d\phi \text{Tr}(\mathbf{u}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{u}} \bar{\gamma}_\phi) \right).\tag{A.19}$$

Let us start with the bracket of  $\mathbf{u}(\phi)$  with  $\mathbf{v}(\phi_0)$ . We make the ansatz

$$\{\mathbf{u}(\phi), \text{Tr}(\mathbf{a} \mathbf{v}(\phi_0))\} = \Delta(\mathbf{a}, \phi - \phi_0) \mathbf{u}(\phi),\tag{A.20}$$

where  $\Delta(\mathbf{a}, \phi)$  is an  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$  valued function depending linearly on  $\mathbf{a}$ , and possibly also on  $\mathbf{u}$ . Note that  $\phi_0$  was arbitrary in (A.19), so this is the complete bracket of  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$ . We can now compute the bracket of  $\mathbf{v}(\phi_0)$  with the periodicity parameter  $\mathbf{u}_\ell$  and get

$$\begin{aligned}\{\mathbf{u}_\ell, \text{Tr}(\mathbf{a} \mathbf{v}(\phi_0))\} &= \{\mathbf{u}(\phi + 2\pi) \mathbf{u}^{-1}(\phi), \text{Tr}(\mathbf{a} \mathbf{v}(\phi_0))\} \\ &= \Delta(\mathbf{a}, \phi - \phi_0 + 2\pi) \mathbf{u}_\ell - \mathbf{u}_\ell \Delta(\mathbf{a}, \phi - \phi_0).\end{aligned}\tag{A.21}$$

Now the right hand side must be independent of  $\phi$ . Hence, there must be a matrix  $\Delta_0(\mathbf{a}) \in \mathfrak{sl}(2)$  such that

$$\Delta(\mathbf{a}, \phi + 2\pi) \mathbf{u}_\ell = \mathbf{u}_\ell \Delta(\mathbf{a}, \phi) + \mathbf{u}_\ell \Delta_0(\mathbf{a}).\tag{A.22}$$

As the last bracket is then also independent of  $\phi_0$ , we infer that the bracket of  $\mathbf{u}_\ell$  with  $\bar{\gamma}_\phi = \mathbf{u}^{-1} \partial_\phi \mathbf{v} \mathbf{u}$  vanishes. This leads to the following bracket of  $\mathbf{u}_\ell$  with  $L_{\text{kin}}$ , which has to reproduce the velocity of  $\mathbf{u}_\ell$ :

$$\{\mathbf{u}_\ell, L_{\text{kin}}\} = \{\mathbf{u}_\ell, \text{Tr}(\mathbf{u}_\ell^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{u}}_\ell \mathbf{v}(\phi_0))\} = \mathbf{u}_\ell \Delta_0(\mathbf{u}_\ell \dot{\mathbf{u}}_\ell) = \dot{\mathbf{u}}_\ell.\tag{A.23}$$

Thus we must have  $\Delta_0(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{a}$ . To get the correct bracket of  $\mathbf{u}$  with the kinetic Lagrangian, it turns out that the only additional requirement is

$$\Delta(\mathbf{a}, \phi) = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad 0 < \phi < 2\pi. \quad (\text{A.24})$$

Together with the quasiperiodicity (A.22) this defines  $\Delta$  uniquely as a stepfunction in  $\phi$ , up to the indeterminate values at the points  $\phi = 2\pi z$ . One can easily check (by calculating the heights of the steps recursively) that the derivative of the stepfunction is

$$\partial_\phi \Delta(\mathbf{a}, \phi) = \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}} (\mathbf{u}_\ell)^z \mathbf{a} (\mathbf{u}_\ell)^{-z} \delta(\phi - 2\pi z). \quad (\text{A.25})$$

Differentiating (A.20) with respect to  $\phi$  or  $\phi_0$  and using the quasiperiodicity relation for  $\mathbf{u}$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathbf{u}(\phi), \text{Tr}(\mathbf{a} \mathbf{u}^{-1} \partial_\phi \mathbf{v} \mathbf{u}(\phi_0))\} &= -\mathbf{u}(\phi) \mathbf{a} \hat{\delta}(\phi - \phi_0), \\ \{\mathbf{u}^{-1} \partial_\phi \mathbf{u}(\phi), \text{Tr}(\mathbf{a} \mathbf{v}(\phi_0))\} &= \mathbf{u}^{-1}(\phi_0) \mathbf{a} \mathbf{u}(\phi_0) \hat{\delta}(\phi - \phi_0), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.26})$$

where  $\hat{\delta}(\phi) = \sum \delta(\phi - 2\pi z)$  is the periodic delta function on the circle. This is already the bracket given in (3.33), as  $\mathbf{u}^{-1} \partial_\phi \mathbf{v} \mathbf{u} = \bar{\gamma}_\phi$  and  $\mathbf{u}^{-1} \partial_\phi \mathbf{u} = \bar{\omega}_\phi$ . Using these formulas we can compute the bracket of  $\mathbf{u}(\phi)$  with  $L_{\text{kin}}$ . As we can choose  $\phi_0$  in (A.19) arbitrarily, we take  $\phi_0 < \phi < \phi_0 + 2\pi$ , i.e.  $\phi$  lies inside the range of the integral and the bracket of  $\mathbf{u}(\phi)$  with  $\mathbf{v}(\phi_0)$  vanishes by (A.24):

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathbf{u}(\phi), L_{\text{kin}}\} &= \{\mathbf{u}(\phi), -\oint_{\phi_0} d\phi' \text{Tr}(\mathbf{u}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{u}} \bar{\gamma}_\phi)\} \\ &= \oint_{\phi_0} d\phi' \mathbf{u}(\phi) \mathbf{u}^{-1}(\phi') \dot{\mathbf{u}}(\phi') \delta(\phi - \phi') = \dot{\mathbf{u}}(\phi). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.27})$$

Finally, we have to define the brackets of  $\mathbf{v}$  with itself. They are fixed by requiring that any bracket of  $\mathbf{v}$  with itself is again linear in  $\mathbf{v}$ , and of course the Jacobi identities must hold. Taking the bracket of (A.20) with  $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{b} \mathbf{v}(\phi_0))$  (with the same angular coordinate again), and antisymmetrizing in  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}$ , leads to the bracket

$$\{\text{Tr}(\mathbf{a} \mathbf{v}(\phi_0)), \text{Tr}(\mathbf{b} \mathbf{v}(\phi_0))\} = -\text{Tr}([\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}] \mathbf{v}(\phi_0)). \quad (\text{A.28})$$

Note that this is valid only if the two  $\mathbf{v}$ 's are taken at the same point. From the first line in (A.26) we infer that  $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{a} \bar{\gamma}_\phi)$  acts on  $\mathbf{u}$  by multiplying it from the right with  $\mathbf{a}$ , whereas  $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{a} \mathbf{v})$  in (A.20) acts by multiplication from the left with some other matrix. Hence, these two actions commute and using the Jacobi identities gives

$$\{\text{Tr}(\mathbf{a} \mathbf{u}^{-1} \partial_\phi \mathbf{v} \mathbf{u}(\phi)), \text{Tr}(\mathbf{b} \mathbf{v}(\phi_0))\} = 0. \quad (\text{A.29})$$

This is the first line of (3.33) and can be transformed into a differential equation for the commutator of  $\mathbf{v}(\phi)$  with  $\mathbf{v}(\phi_0)$ , which is obviously linear in  $\mathbf{v}$  again, because we have the initial condition (A.28). Note that, in contrast to the bracket (A.20), that between the  $\mathbf{v}$ 's is an *integrated* stepfunction, and hence it is continuous in the angular coordinate, so that its value at the special point (A.28) is well defined. We do not need the full bracket explicitly to check whether they are correct. If we want to compute the bracket of  $\mathbf{v}(\phi)$  with the kinetic Lagrangian, we can take  $\phi = \phi_0$ , because  $\phi_0$  is arbitrary in (A.19). Then  $\mathbf{v}(\phi_0)$  commutes with the integral, as it commutes with  $\bar{\gamma}_\phi$  and by (A.20) it also commutes with  $\mathbf{u}(\phi)$  within the range of the integral  $\phi_0 < \phi < \phi_0 + 2\pi$  (there is no *distributional* contribution at the boundary, just a finite one which does not enter into the value of the integral). So we only have to consider the bracket with the first term. A formula similar to (A.5) can be used to simplify the calculation:

$$\{X, \mathbf{u}_\ell^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{u}}_\ell\} = \mathbf{u}_\ell^{-1} \partial_t (\{X, \mathbf{u}_\ell\} \mathbf{u}_\ell^{-1}) \mathbf{u}_\ell, \quad (\text{A.30})$$



where  $\partial_t$  acts on  $\mathbf{u}_\ell$  only. Using this we find with a partial integration of the  $\partial_t$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \{ \text{Tr}(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{v}(\phi_0)), \text{Tr}(\mathbf{u}_\ell^{-1}\dot{\mathbf{u}}_\ell\mathbf{v}(\phi_0)) \} \\ &= \text{Tr}(\mathbf{u}_\ell\mathbf{a}\mathbf{u}_\ell^{-1}\partial_t(\mathbf{u}_\ell\mathbf{v}(\phi_0)\mathbf{u}_\ell^{-1}) - [\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{u}_\ell^{-1}\dot{\mathbf{u}}_\ell]\mathbf{v}(\phi_0)) = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{a}\dot{\mathbf{v}}(\phi_0)). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.31})$$

Hence, with the brackets introduced, (A.14) holds and they are the correct Poisson brackets.

## References

- [1] C.J. Isham. Conceptual and geometrical problems in quantum gravity. In H. Mitter and H. Gaussterer, editors, *Recent Aspects of Quantum Fields*. Schladming Proceedings, Springer Verlag, 1991.
- [2] K. Kuchar. Time and interpretations of quantum gravity. In G. Kustatter, D.E. Vincent, and J.G. Williams, editors, *General Relativity and Relativistic Astrophysics*, Singapore, 1992. Winnipeg Proceedings, World Scientific.
- [3] C.J. Isham. Canonical quantum gravity and the question of time. Preprint ICTP-93-94-1, gr-qc/9310031, Imperial College, London, 1993.
- [4] P.A.M. Dirac. *Lectures on Quantum Mechanics*. Academic Press, New York, 1965.
- [5] R. Arnowitt, S. Deser, and C.W. Misner. The dynamics of general relativity. In L. Witten, editor, *Gravitation: An Introduction to Current Research*, New York, 1962. Wiley.
- [6] C.W. Misner, K.S. Thorne, and J.A. Wheeler. *Gravitation*. Freeman, New York, 1973.
- [7] J.A. Wheeler. Geometrodynamics and the issue of the final state. In C. DeWitt and B. DeWitt, editors, *Relativity, Groups and Topology*, New York, 1964. Gordon and Breach.
- [8] B. DeWitt. Quantum theory of gravity I. *Phys. Rev.*, 160:1113, 1967.
- [9] B. DeWitt. Quantum theory of gravity II. *Phys. Rev.*, 162:1195, 1967.
- [10] S.M. Christensen. *Quantum Theory of Gravity*. Adam Hilger, 1984.
- [11] A. Ashtekar. New variables for classical and quantum gravity. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 57:2244, 1986.
- [12] A. Ashtekar. New Hamiltonian formulation of general relativity. *Phys. Rev.*, D36:1587, 1987.
- [13] E. Witten. (2+1)-dimensional gravity as an exactly soluble system. *Nucl. Phys.*, B311:46, 1988.
- [14] S. Carlip and J.E. Nelson. Equivalent quantizations of (2+1)-dimensional gravity. *Phys. Lett.*, B324:299, 1994.
- [15] S. Carlip and J.E. Nelson. Comparative quantizations of (2+1) gravity. Preprint UCD-94-37, gr-qc/9411031, Univ. California, Davis, 1994.
- [16] A.J. Hanson, T. Regge, and C. Teitelboim. *Constrained Hamiltonian Systems*. Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Roma, 1976.
- [17] B. de Wit, H.-J. Matschull, and H. Nicolai. Physical states in d=3, N=2 supergravity. *Phys. Lett.*, B318:115, 1993.
- [18] H.-J. Matschull. Kanonische Formulierung von Gravitations- und Supergravitations-Theorien. Dissertation DESY 94-118, Universität Hamburg, 1994.

- [19] H.-J. Matschull. New representation and a vacuum state for canonical quantum gravity. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 12:651, 1995.
- [20] J.D. Brown. *Lower Dimensional Gravity*. World Scientific, 1988.
- [21] J. Abbott, S. Giddings, and K. Kuchar. Einstein's theory in a three-dimensional space time. *Gen. Rel. Grav.*, 16:751, 1984.
- [22] M. Alpert and J.R. Gott. General-relativity in a (2+1)-dimensional space-time. *Gen. Rel. Grav.*, 16:243, 1984.
- [23] J.D. Barrow, A.B. Burd, and D. Lancaster. 3-dimensional classical spacetimes. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 3:551, 1986.
- [24] S. Deser, R. Jackiw, and G. t'Hooft. Three dimensional Einstein gravity: Dynamics of flat space. *Ann. Phys.*, 152:220, 1984.
- [25] P. Newbury and W.G. Unruh. Solutions to 2+1 gravity in dreibein formalism. *Phys. Rev.*, D48:2686, 1993.
- [26] W.G. Unruh. Solution to 2+1 gravity in dreibein formalism. *Int. Jour. Mod. Phys.*, D3:131, 1994.
- [27] J. Louko. Wittens 2+1 gravity on  $R \times (\text{Klein bottle})$ . Preprint WISC-MILW-95-TH-15, gr-qc/9505026, Univ. Wisconsin, Milwaukee, 1995.
- [28] W.G. Unruh and R.M. Wald. Time and the interpretation of canonical quantum gravity. *J. Math. Phys.*, 12:918, 1971.
- [29] R.M. Wald. Proposal for solving the problem of time in canonical quantum gravity. *Phys. Rev.*, 48:R2377, 1993.
- [30] H.A. Kastrup and T. Thiemann. Canonical quantization of spherical symmetric gravity in Ashtekar's selfdual representation. *Nucl. Phys.*, B399:211, 1993.
- [31] H.A. Kastrup and T. Thiemann. Spherical symmetric gravity as a completely integrable system. *Nucl. Phys.*, B425:665, 1994.
- [32] S. Carlip. Lectures on (2+1)-dimensional gravity. Preprint UCD-95-6, gr-qc/9503024, Univ. California, Davis, 1995.
- [33] L. Smolin. Loop representation for quantum gravity in 2+1 dimensions. In *Topology and Quantum Field Theory*. Proceedings, John Hopkins Workshop, Firenze, 1990.
- [34] D.M. Marolf. Loop representations for 2+1 gravity on a torus. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 10:2625, 1993.
- [35] A. Ashtekar and R. Loll. New loop representation for 2+1 gravity. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 11:2417, 1995.
- [36] H.-J. Matschull. On loop states in quantum gravity and supergravity. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 11:2395, 1994.
- [37] H. Nicolai and H.-J. Matschull. Canonical treatment of coset space sigma-models. In *Journées Relativistes*, Bruxelles, 1993. Proceedings.