

# REMARK ON EQUIVALENCE OF TOPOLOGICAL AND QUANTUM 2D GRAVITY

*A.Marshakov, A.Mironov, A.Morozov<sup>1)</sup>*

Department of Theoretical Physics, P.N.Lebedev Physical Institute  
117924, Moscow

<sup>1)</sup>Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Physics  
117259, Moscow

Submitted 4 October 1991

We demonstrate the equivalence of Virasoro constraints imposed on continuum limit of partition function of Hermitean 1-matrix mod<sup>-1</sup> and the Ward identities of Kontsevich's model.

1. From the early days of matrix models there is a belief that partition functions of two *a priori* different models of 2d gravity should coincide. The first is the (square root of) partition function  $\sqrt{Z_{gg}\{T_n\}}$  of ordinary Polyakov's quantum 2d gravity, described by the continuum limit of Hermitean 1-matrix model <sup>1</sup> (and is known to be a  $\tau$ -function of KdV hierarchy <sup>2</sup>). The second partition function  $Z_{tg}$  of Witten's topological gravity <sup>3</sup> is *a priori* defined as a generating functional of intersection indices of divisors on module spaces of Riemann surfaces with punctures.

Later it was discovered <sup>4,5</sup> that  $\sqrt{Z_{gg}\{T_n\}}$  satisfies a set of Virasoro constraints:

$$\mathcal{L}_n \sqrt{Z_{gg}\{T\}} = 0, n \geq -1 \tag{1}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_n = \sum_{k \geq \delta_{n+1,0}} T_k \frac{\partial}{\partial T_{k+n}} + \sum_{\substack{a+b=n+1 \\ a,b \geq 0}} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial T_a \partial T_b} + \delta_{n+1,0} \cdot \frac{T_0^2}{16} + \delta_{n,0} \cdot \frac{1}{16}$$

Eq. (1) can be deduced <sup>6</sup> as a continuum limit of Ward identities in discrete matrix model, associated with the shift of integration variables <sup>7</sup>

$$X \rightarrow X + \epsilon X^{p+1} \tag{2}$$

in the integral

$$Z_N^{(d)}\{t\} = \int DX \exp -trV\{X\} \tag{3}$$

$$V\{X\} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} t_k X^k$$

However, it may be more reasonable to take these Virasoro constraints for a straightforward definition of  $Z_{gg}\{T\}$ , which does not refer to a sophisticated change of variables  $\{t\} \rightarrow \{T\}$  <sup>6</sup> and to discrete model (3) at all.

As for  $Z_{tg}$  it was recently represented by M.Kontsevich <sup>8</sup> in terms of another matrix model

$$Z_{tg} = \lim_{size X \rightarrow \infty} Z_{tg}^{(d)} \quad (4)$$

where

$$Z_{tg}^{(d)} = \frac{1}{C[M]} \int DX \exp -tr\{MX^2 + X^3\} \quad (5)$$

with

$$C[M] = \int DX \exp -tr\{MX^2\} = \det(M \otimes I + I \otimes M)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad (6)$$

and  $X, M$  being (anti)Hermitean matrices.

It is a simple combinatorial result, that as soon as the size of  $X$  goes to infinity  $Z_{tg}^{(d)}$  becomes dependent only on the variables

$$T_m = \frac{3^{2m+1}}{m + \frac{1}{2}} tr M^{-2m-1} + \frac{4}{3\sqrt{3}} \delta_{m,1} \quad (7)$$

The explicit formulation of the original suggestion in these terms would be

$$Z_{tg}\{T_m\} = \sqrt{Z_{gg}\{T_n\}} \quad (8)$$

which in particular implies what is known as Witten's suggestion, *i.e.* that  $Z_{tg}\{T\}$  is like  $\sqrt{Z_{gg}\{T\}}$  a  $\tau$ -function of KdV-hierarchy. A necessary condition for (8) to hold is that  $Z_{tg}\{T\}$  defined by (4-6) satisfies the same Virasoro constraints (1).

This is the statement which we prove in the letter. Moreover we shall prove a relation involving  $Z_{tg}^{(d)}$  (see eq.(16) below), *i.e.* valid for *finite* dimensional matrices  $X$ , which implies the entire set of Virasoro constraints only as the size of matrix goes to infinity.

This statement is equivalent to (8) modulo:

- (i) the assertions which have been made by Kontsevich in the derivation of (4-6) from Penner's formalism of fat graphs, and
- (ii) the so far subtle problem of uniqueness of solutions to Virasoro constraints (1).

2. Since the Ward identities are a little obscure in Kontsevich's presentation (4-6), we begin with a slight reformulation of his model.

After a shift of integration variable  $X \rightarrow X - \frac{M}{3}$  and the redefinition  $M = 3\Lambda^2$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}\{\Lambda\} &\equiv \int DX \exp(-trX^3 + tr\Lambda X) \\ &= C[\sqrt{\Lambda}] \exp\left(-\frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}} tr\Lambda^{3/2}\right) Z_{tg}^{(d)} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

with

$$C[\sqrt{\Lambda}] = \det(\sqrt{\Lambda} \otimes I + I \otimes \sqrt{\Lambda})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad (10)$$

The functional  $\mathcal{F}\{\Lambda\}$  can be considered as a kind of matrix-Fourier transform of exponential cubic potential  $\text{tr}X^3$ . It satisfies obvious Ward identities, associated with a shifts of integration variables

$$X \rightarrow X + \epsilon_p \quad (11)$$

namely

$$\text{tr}(\epsilon_p \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \Lambda_{tr}^2} - \frac{1}{3} \epsilon_p \Lambda) \mathcal{F}\{\Lambda\} = 0 \quad (12)$$

Here  $\epsilon_p$  stands for any  $X$ -independent *matrix*, which may be diagonal simultaneously with  $\Lambda$ , e.g.  $\epsilon_p = \Lambda^p$ .

Let us substitute in (12) the functional  $\mathcal{F}$  in the form, inspired by (9)

$$\mathcal{F}\{\Lambda\} = C[\sqrt{\Lambda}] \exp(-\frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}} \text{tr} \Lambda^{3/2}) Z\{T_m\} \quad (13)$$

with

$$T_m = \frac{1}{m + \frac{1}{2}} \text{tr} \Lambda^{-m - \frac{1}{2}} + \frac{4}{3\sqrt{3}} \delta_{m,1} \quad (14)$$

Our statement is that after the substitution of (13) into (12) it turns into

$$\sum_{n \geq -1} \text{tr}(\epsilon_p \Lambda^{-n-2}) \mathcal{L}_n Z = 0 \quad (15)$$

The identity

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{F}} \text{tr}(\epsilon_p \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \Lambda_{tr}^2} - \frac{1}{3} \epsilon_p \Lambda) \mathcal{F} = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{n \geq -1} \text{tr}(\epsilon_p \Lambda^{-n-2}) \mathcal{L}_n Z \quad (16)$$

is valid for *any size of the matrix*  $\Lambda$ , but only in the limit of infinitely large  $\Lambda$ :

(i) it is reasonable to substitute  $Z_{tg}^{(d)}$  in (9) by  $Z_{tg}$ , which depends only on  $\text{tr} \Lambda^{-q}$  with half-integer  $q$ 's;

(ii) the  $T_m$ 's in (14) are really independent variables;

(iii) all the quantities

$$\text{tr}(\epsilon_p \Lambda^{-n-2}) \quad (17)$$

(e.g.  $\text{tr} \Lambda^{p-n-2}$ ) become algebraically independent, so that eq. (15) implies that

$$\mathcal{L}_n Z_{tg}\{T\} = 0, n \geq -1 \quad (18)$$

This concludes the derivation of Virasoro constraints for  $Z_{tg}\{T\}$  defined as continuum limit of Kontsevich's partition function.

Note that the fact that operators  $\mathcal{L}_n$  in (15) contain only second  $T$ -derivatives, is a direct consequence of that only double  $\Lambda$ -derivatives arise in the *l.h.s.* and thus of the cubic nature of potential  $\text{tr}X^3$  in Kontsevich's model. It is very interesting (in particular, from the point of view of multimatrix and Potts models) to study the matrix-Fourier transform of potentials like  $\text{tr}X^{K+1}$  for any degree  $K + 1$ . Amusingly enough, the corresponding Ward identities being transformed to the form of (15) contain operators similar to the higher-spin operators of the  $W_K$ -algebra instead of the Virasoro generators  $\mathcal{L}_n$ .

We are deeply indebted to prof.I.Singer who informed us about the talk <sup>9</sup> and encouraged us to complete our study of the Ward identities in the Kontsevich model. We benefited a lot from illuminating discussions on the subject with E.Corrigan, A.Gerasimov, M.Kontsevich, Yu.Makeenko, A.Niemi and I.Zakharevich.

- 
1. Kazakov V. Mod.Phys.Lett., 1989, **A4**, 2125; Brezin E., Kazakov V. Phys.Lett., 1990, **B238**,144; Douglas M., Shenker S. Nucl.Phys., 1990, **B335**, 635; Gross D., Migdal A. Phys.Rev.Lett., 1990, **64**, 127.
  2. Douglas M. Phys.Lett., 1990, **B238**,176.
  3. Witten E. Nucl.Phys., 1990, **B340**, 281; Dijkgraaf R., Witten E. Nucl.Phys., 1990, **B342**, 486.
  4. Fukuma M., Kawai H., Nakayama R. Int.J.Mod.Phys., 1991, **A6**, 1385.
  5. Dijkgraaf R., Verlinde E., Verlinde H. Nucl.Phys., 1991, **B356**, 574.
  6. Makeenko Yu. et.al. Nucl.Phys., 1991, **B356**, 574.
  7. Ambjorn J., Jurkiewicz J., Makeenko Yu. Phys.Lett., 1990, **B**; Gerasimov A. et.al. Nucl.Phys., 1991, **B357**, 565; Mironov A., Morozov A. Phys.Lett., 1990, **B252**, 47.
  8. Kontsevich M. Func.Anal. and Appl. 1990.
  9. Witten E. in talk at NYC conference, June 1991.