

## $E_{10}$ and a Small Tension Expansion of M Theory

T. Damour

*Institut des Hautes Etudes Scientifiques, 35 route de Chartres, F-91440 Bures-sur-Yvette, France*

M. Henneaux

*Physique Théorique et Mathématique, Université Libre de Bruxelles, C.P. 231, B-1050 Bruxelles, Belgium*

H. Nicolai

*Max-Planck-Institut für Gravitationsphysik, Mühlenberg 1, D-14476 Golm, Germany*

(Received 31 July 2002; published 11 November 2002)

A formal “small tension” expansion of  $D = 11$  supergravity near a spacelike singularity is shown to be equivalent, at least up to 30th order in height, to a null geodesic motion in the infinite-dimensional coset space  $E_{10}/K(E_{10})$ , where  $K(E_{10})$  is the maximal compact subgroup of the hyperbolic Kac-Moody group  $E_{10}(\mathbb{R})$ . For the proof we make use of a novel decomposition of  $E_{10}$  into irreducible representations of its  $SL(10, \mathbb{R})$  subgroup. We explicitly show how to identify the first four rungs of the  $E_{10}$  coset fields with the values of geometric quantities constructed from  $D = 11$  supergravity fields and their spatial gradients taken at some comoving spatial point.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.89.221601

PACS numbers: 11.25.Hf, 04.65.+e, 11.10.Kk

The consideration of limits where some (possibly dimensionful) parameter is taken to be small is often a way of revealing the hidden symmetry structure of physical theories. A very prominent example is the high-energy limit of spontaneously broken gauge theories. Similarly, in [1], it was argued that the small tension limit  $T_s \rightarrow 0$  of string theory gives rise to an infinite number of relations between string scattering amplitudes, indicating the presence of an enormous symmetry. In this Letter, we shall consider the bosonic sector of M theory, and more specifically its low energy limit,  $D = 11$  supergravity [2], in a limit which can likewise be (intuitively) thought of as a small tension limit  $T_b \rightarrow 0$ , where  $T_b := c^4(32\pi G_N)^{-1}$  is the bulk tension governing the propagation of small excitations (e.g., gravitational waves) in the ten-dimensional spatial geometry. Indeed, taking  $T_b \rightarrow 0$  in the linearized Einstein-Hilbert action  $S = \frac{1}{2} \int dT d^{10}x [\rho_b (\partial_T h_{ij})^2 - T_b (\partial_x h_{ij})^2]$  is equivalent to taking the limit of vanishing velocity of propagation  $c = \sqrt{T_b/\rho_b}$ ; alternatively, it may be viewed as a strong coupling limit ( $G_N \rightarrow \infty$ ) [3]. Physically, this limit can be realized near a spacelike singularity, where the different spatial points become causally disconnected as the horizon scale  $\ell_H \sim cT$  becomes smaller than their spacelike separation ( $T$  being the proper time). Near such a singularity one therefore expects the time derivatives of the fields to dominate their spatial gradients, thereby realizing an effective “(1 + 0)-dimensional reduction” of the theory. As shown recently [4,5], this is indeed the case for the massless bosonic sector of  $D = 11$  supergravity. Furthermore, as  $T \rightarrow 0$ , the metric exhibits the chaotic oscillations originally discovered by Belinskii, Khalatnikov, and Lifshitz (BKL) for the generic cosmological solution to Einstein’s equations in four dimensions [6]. The oscillatory evolution of the metric at each spatial

point can be asymptotically described as a relativistic billiard taking place in the fundamental Weyl chamber of some indefinite Kac-Moody (KM) algebra [4,5]. Chaos occurs when this KM algebra is hyperbolic, in particular, for  $E_{10}$  [7].

In this Letter we extend these tantalizing results much beyond the leading order by relating a BKL-type expansion to an algebraic expansion in the height of the positive roots of the Lie algebra of  $E_{10}$ . We show how to map, up to height 30, geometrical objects of M theory onto coordinates in the infinite-dimensional coset space  $E_{10}/K(E_{10})$ , where  $K(E_{10})$  is the maximal compact subgroup of the canonical real form of  $E_{10}$ . Under this correspondence, the time evolution of the geometric M theory data at each spatial point is mapped, up to height 30, onto some (constrained) null geodesic motion of  $E_{10}/K(E_{10})$ . Our results underline the potential importance of  $E_{10}$ , whose appearance in the reduction of  $D = 11$  supergravity to one dimension had been conjectured already long ago by Julia [8], as a candidate symmetry underlying M theory (see also [9], and [10] where  $E_{11}$  was proposed as a fundamental symmetry of M theory).

Introducing a zero-shift slicing ( $N^i = 0$ ) of the 11-dimensional spacetime, and a *time-independent* spatial zehnbain  $\theta^a(x) \equiv E_i^a(x) dx^i$ , the metric and four-form  $\mathcal{F} = d\mathcal{A}$  become

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= -N^2(dx^0)^2 + G_{ab}\theta^a\theta^b, \\ \mathcal{F} &= \frac{1}{3!}\mathcal{F}_{0abc}dx^0 \wedge \theta^a \wedge \theta^b \wedge \theta^c \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4!}\mathcal{F}_{abcd}\theta^a \wedge \theta^b \wedge \theta^c \wedge \theta^d. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

We choose the time coordinate  $x^0$  so that the lapse  $N = \sqrt{G}$ , with  $G := \det G_{ab}$  (note that  $x^0$  is not the proper time  $T = \int N dx^0$ ; rather,  $x^0 \rightarrow \infty$  as  $T \rightarrow 0$ ). In this frame the complete evolution equations of  $D = 11$  supergravity read

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_0(G^{ac}\partial_0 G_{cb}) &= \frac{1}{6}G\mathcal{F}^{a\beta\gamma\delta}\mathcal{F}_{b\beta\gamma\delta} - \frac{1}{72}G\mathcal{F}^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}\mathcal{F}_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}\delta_b^a \\
&\quad - 2GR_b^a(\Gamma, C), \\
\partial_0(G\mathcal{F}^{0abc}) &= \frac{1}{144}\varepsilon^{abca_1a_2a_3b_1b_2b_3b_4}\mathcal{F}_{0a_1a_2a_3}\mathcal{F}_{b_1b_2b_3b_4} \\
&\quad + \frac{3}{2}G\mathcal{F}^{de[ab}C^c]_{de} - GC^e_{de}\mathcal{F}^{dabc} \\
&\quad - \partial_d(G\mathcal{F}^{dabc}), \\
\partial_0\mathcal{F}_{abcd} &= 6\mathcal{F}_{0e[ab}C^e_{cd]} + 4\partial_{[a}\mathcal{F}_{0bcd]}, \quad (2)
\end{aligned}$$

where  $a, b \in \{1, \dots, 10\}$  and  $\alpha, \beta \in \{0, 1, \dots, 10\}$ , and  $R_{ab}(\Gamma, C)$  denotes the spatial Ricci tensor; the (frame) connection components are given by  $2G_{ad}\Gamma^d_{bc} = C_{abc} + C_{bca} - C_{cab} + \partial_b G_{ca} + \partial_c G_{ab} - \partial_a G_{bc}$  with  $C^a_{bc} \equiv G^{ad}C_{dbc}$  being the structure coefficients of the zehnbien  $d\theta^a = \frac{1}{2}C^a_{bc}\theta^b \wedge \theta^c$ . The frame derivative is  $\partial_a \equiv E^i_a(x)\partial_i$  (with  $E^a_i E^i_b = \delta^a_b$ ). To determine the solution at any given spatial point  $x$  requires knowledge of an infinite tower of spatial gradients: one should thus augment (2) by evolution equations for  $\partial_a G_{bc}$ ,  $\partial_a \mathcal{F}_{0bcd}$ ,  $\partial_a \mathcal{F}_{bcde}$ , etc., which in turn would involve higher and higher spatial gradients.

The geodesic Lagrangian on  $E_{10}/K(E_{10})$  is defined by generalizing the standard Lagrangian on a finite dimensional coset space  $G/K$ , where  $K$  is a maximal compact subgroup of the Lie group  $G$ . All the elements entering the construction of  $\mathcal{L}$  have natural generalizations to the case where  $G$  is the group obtained by exponentiation of a hyperbolic KM algebra. We refer readers to [11] for basic definitions and results of the theory of KM algebras, and here recall only that a KM algebra  $\mathfrak{g} \equiv \mathfrak{g}(A)$  is generally defined by means of a Cartan matrix  $A$  and a set of generators  $\{e_i, f_i, h_i\}$  and relations (Chevalley-Serre presentation), where  $i, j = 1, \dots, r = \text{rank } \mathfrak{g}(A)$ . The elements  $\{h_i\}$  span the Cartan subalgebra (CSA)  $\mathfrak{h}$ , while  $e_i$  and  $f_i$  generate an infinite tower of raising and lowering operators, respectively. The ‘‘maximal compact’’ subalgebra  $\mathfrak{k}$  is defined as the subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}(A)$  left invariant under the Chevalley involution  $\omega(h_i) = -h_i$ ,  $\omega(e_i) = -f_i$ ,  $\omega(f_i) = -e_i$ . In other words,  $\mathfrak{k}$  is spanned by the ‘‘antisymmetric’’ elements  $E_{\alpha,s} - E_{\alpha,s}^T$ , where  $E_{\alpha,s}^T \equiv -\omega(E_{\alpha,s})$  is the ‘‘transpose’’ of some multiple commutator  $E_{\alpha,s}$  of the  $e_i$ 's associated with the root  $\alpha$  {i.e.,  $[h, E_{\alpha,s}] = \alpha(h)E_{\alpha,s}$  for  $h \in \mathfrak{h}$ }. Here  $s = 1, \dots, \text{mult}(\alpha)$  labels the different elements of  $\mathfrak{g}(A)$  having the same root  $\alpha$ .

The  $\sigma$  model is formulated in terms of a one-parameter dependent group element  $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}(t) \in E_{10}$  and its Lie algebra valued derivative

$$v(t) := \frac{d\mathcal{V}}{dt} \mathcal{V}^{-1}(t) \in \mathfrak{e}_{10} \equiv \text{Lie } E_{10}. \quad (3)$$

In physical terms,  $\mathcal{V}$  can be thought of as a vast extension of the vielbein of general relativity (an ‘‘ $\infty$ -bein’’), and  $E_{10}$  and  $K(E_{10})$  as infinite-dimensional generalizations of the  $\text{GL}(d, \mathbb{R})$  and local Lorentz symmetries of general relativity. The action is  $\int dt \mathcal{L}$  with

$$\mathcal{L} := n(t)^{-1} \langle v_{\text{sym}}(t) | v_{\text{sym}}(t) \rangle \quad (4)$$

with a ‘‘lapse’’ function  $n(t)$  (not to be confused with  $N$ ), whose variation gives rise to the Hamiltonian constraint ensuring that the trajectory is a null geodesic. The ‘‘symmetric’’ projection  $v_{\text{sym}} := \frac{1}{2}(v + v^T)$  eliminates the component of  $v$  corresponding to a displacement ‘‘along  $\mathfrak{k}$ ,’’ thereby defining an evolution on the coset space  $E_{10}/K(E_{10})$ .  $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$  is the standard invariant bilinear form on the KM algebra [11]. We note the existence of transcendental KM invariants [12] that might be added to (4) to represent nonperturbative effects.

Because no closed form construction exists for the raising operators  $E_{\alpha,s}$  nor their invariant scalar products  $\langle E_{\alpha,s} | E_{\beta,t} \rangle = N_{s,t}^{\alpha} \delta_{\alpha+\beta}^0$ , we have devised a recursive approach based on the decomposition of  $E_{10}$  into irreducible representations of its  $\text{SL}(10, \mathbb{R})$  subgroup. Let  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_9$  be the nine simple roots of  $A_9 \equiv \mathfrak{sl}(10)$  corresponding to the horizontal line in the  $E_{10}$  Dynkin diagram, and  $\alpha_0$  the ‘‘exceptional’’ root connected to  $\alpha_3$ . Its dual CSA element  $h_0$  enlarges  $A_9$  to the Lie algebra of  $\text{GL}(10)$ . Any positive root of  $E_{10}$  can be written as

$$\alpha = \ell\alpha_0 + \sum_{j=1}^9 m^j \alpha_j \quad (\ell, m^j \geq 0). \quad (5)$$

We call  $\ell \equiv \ell(\alpha)$  the ‘‘level’’ of the root  $\alpha$ . This definition differs from the usual one, where the (affine) level is identified with  $m^9$  and thus counts the number of appearances of the overextended root  $\alpha_9$  in  $\alpha$  [13,14]. Hence, our decomposition corresponds to a slicing (or ‘‘grading’’) of the forward light cone in the root lattice by spacelike hyperplanes, with only finitely many roots in each slice, as opposed to the lightlike slicing for the  $E_9$  representations (involving not only infinitely many roots but also infinitely many affine representations for  $m^9 \geq 2$  [13,14]).

The adjoint action of the  $A_9$  subalgebra leaves the level  $\ell(\alpha)$  invariant. The set of generators corresponding to a given level  $\ell$  can therefore be decomposed into a (finite) number of irreducible representations of  $A_9$ . The multiplicity of  $\alpha$  as a root of  $E_{10}$  is thus equal to the sum of its multiplicities as a weight occurring in the  $\text{SL}(10, \mathbb{R})$  representations. Each irreducible representation of  $A_9$  can be characterized by its highest weight  $\Lambda$  or, equivalently, by its Dynkin labels  $(p_1, \dots, p_9)$  where  $p_k(\Lambda) := (\alpha_k, \Lambda) \geq 0$  is the number of columns with  $k$  boxes in the associated Young tableau. For instance, the Dynkin labels (001000000) correspond to a Young tableau consisting of one column with three boxes, i.e., the antisymmetric tensor with three indices. The Dynkin labels are related to the 9-tuple of integers  $(m^1, \dots, m^9)$  appearing in (5) (for the highest weight  $\Lambda \equiv -\alpha$ ) by

$$S^{i3} \ell - \sum_{j=1}^9 S^{ij} p_j = m^i \geq 0, \quad (6)$$

where  $S^{ij}$  is the inverse Cartan matrix of  $A_9$ . This relation strongly constrains the representations that can appear at level  $\ell$ , because the entries of  $S^{ij}$  are all positive, and the 9-tuples  $(p_1, \dots, p_9)$  and  $(m_1, \dots, m_9)$  must both consist

of non-negative integers. In addition to satisfying the Diophantine Eqs. (6), the highest weights must be roots of  $E_{10}$ , which implies the inequality

$$\Lambda^2 = \alpha^2 = \sum_{i,j=1}^9 p_i S^{ij} p_j - \frac{1}{10} \ell^2 \leq 2. \quad (7)$$

All representations occurring at level  $\ell + 1$  are contained in the product of the level- $\ell$  representations with the  $\ell = 1$  representation. Imposing the Diophantine inequalities (6) and (7) allows one to discard many representations appearing in this product. The problem of finding a completely explicit and manageable representation of  $E_{10}$  in terms of an infinite tower of  $A_9$  representations is thereby reduced to the problem of determining the outer multiplicities of the surviving  $A_9$  representations, namely, the number of times each representation appears at a given level  $\ell$ . The Dynkin labels (all appearing with outer multiplicity one) for the first six levels of  $E_{10}$  are

$$\begin{aligned} \ell = 1: & \quad (001000000), \\ \ell = 2: & \quad (000001000), \\ \ell = 3: & \quad (100000010), \\ \ell = 4: & \quad (001000001), (200000000), \\ \ell = 5: & \quad (000001001), (100100000), \\ \ell = 6: & \quad (100000011), (010001000), \\ & \quad (100000100), (000000010). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The level  $\ell \leq 4$  representations can easily be determined by comparison with the decomposition of  $E_8$  under its  $A_7$  subalgebra (see [15,16]) and use of the Jacobi identity, which eliminates the representations (000000001) at level three and (010000000) at level four. By use of a computer and the  $E_{10}$  root multiplicities listed in [14,17], the calculation can be carried much further [18].

From (8) we can now directly read off the  $GL(10)$  tensors making up the low level elements of  $E_{10}$ . At level zero, we have the  $GL(10)$  generators  $K^a_b$  obeying  $[K^a_b, K^c_d] = K^a_d \delta^c_b - K^c_b \delta^a_d$ . The  $e_{10}$  elements at levels  $\ell = 1, 2, 3$  are the  $GL(10)$  tensors  $E^{a_1 a_2 a_3}$ ,  $E^{a_1 \dots a_6}$ , and  $E^{a_0 | a_1 \dots a_8}$  with the symmetries implied by the Dynkin labels (for the first three levels these representations occur for all  $E_n$ ; see [10,19]). The  $\sigma$  model associates with these generators a corresponding tower of “fields” (depending only on the “time”  $t$ ): a zehnbein  $h^a_b(t)$  at level zero, a three-form  $A_{abc}(t)$  at level one, a six-form  $A_{a_1 \dots a_6}(t)$  at level two, a Young-tensor  $A_{a_0 | a_1 \dots a_8}(t)$  at level 3, etc. Writing the generic  $E_{10}$  group element in Borel (triangular) gauge as  $\mathcal{V}(t) = \exp X_h(t) \exp X_A(t)$  with  $X_h(t) = h^a_b K^b_a$  and  $X_A(t) = \frac{1}{3!} A_{abc} E^{abc} + \frac{1}{6!} A_{a_1 \dots a_6} E^{a_1 \dots a_6} + \frac{1}{9!} A_{a_0 | a_1 \dots a_8} E^{a_0 | a_1 \dots a_8} + \dots$ , and using the  $E_{10}$  commutation relations in  $GL(10)$  form together with the bilinear form for  $E_{10}$ , we find up to third order in level

$$\begin{aligned} n \mathcal{L} = & \frac{1}{4} (g^{ac} g^{bd} - g^{ab} g^{cd}) \dot{g}_{ab} \dot{g}_{cd} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{3!} DA_{a_1 a_2 a_3} DA^{a_1 a_2 a_3} \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{6!} DA_{a_1 \dots a_6} DA^{a_1 \dots a_6} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{9!} DA_{a_0 | a_1 \dots a_8} DA^{a_0 | a_1 \dots a_8}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where  $g^{ab} = e^a_c e^b_c$  with  $e^a_b \equiv (\text{exp}h)^a_b$ , and all “contravariant indices” have been raised by  $g^{ab}$ . The “covariant” time derivatives are defined by (with  $\partial A \equiv \dot{A}$ )

$$\begin{aligned} DA_{a_1 a_2 a_3} & := \partial A_{a_1 a_2 a_3}, \quad (10) \\ DA_{a_1 \dots a_6} & := \partial A_{a_1 \dots a_6} + 10 A_{[a_1 a_2 a_3} \partial A_{a_4 a_5 a_6]}, \\ DA_{a_1 | a_2 \dots a_9} & := \partial A_{a_1 | a_2 \dots a_9} + 42 A_{\langle a_1 a_2 a_3} \partial A_{a_4 \dots a_9 \rangle} \\ & \quad - 42 \partial A_{\langle a_1 a_2 a_3} A_{a_4 \dots a_9 \rangle} \\ & \quad + 280 A_{\langle a_1 a_2 a_3} A_{a_4 a_5 a_6} \partial A_{a_7 a_8 a_9 \rangle}. \end{aligned}$$

Here antisymmetrization  $[\dots]$ , and projection on the  $\ell = 3$  representation  $\langle \dots \rangle$ , are normalized with strength one (e.g.,  $[[\dots]] = [\dots]$ ). Modulo field redefinitions, all numerical coefficients in (9) and (10) are uniquely fixed by the structure of  $E_{10}$ . Our expressions are reminiscent of similar algebraic constructions in [10,15]. However, this is the first time that an algorithmic scheme based on a Lagrangian in terms of the invariant bilinear form on the hyperbolic KM algebra has been proposed and worked out to low orders. Likewise, the general formulas (6) and (7) and the higher level representations in (8) have not been exhibited before.

The Lagrangian (4) is invariant under a nonlinear realization of  $E_{10}$  such that  $\mathcal{V}(t) \rightarrow k_g(t) \mathcal{V}(t) g$  with  $g \in E_{10}$ ; the compensating “rotation”  $k_g(t)$  being, in general, required to restore the “triangular gauge.” When  $g$  belongs to the nilpotent subgroup generated by the  $E^{abc}$ , etc., this symmetry reduces to the rather obvious “shift” symmetries of (9), and no compensating rotation is needed. The latter are, however, required for the transformations generated by  $F_{abc} = (E^{abc})^T$ , etc. The associated infinite number of conserved (Noether) charges are formally given by  $J = \mathcal{M}^{-1} \partial \mathcal{M}$ , where  $\mathcal{M} \equiv \mathcal{V}^T \mathcal{V}$ . The compatibility between the closed form solution  $\mathcal{M}(t) = \mathcal{M}(0) \exp(tJ)$  [indicative of the integrability of (9)] and the chaotic behavior of  $g_{ab}(t)$  near a spacelike singularity will be discussed elsewhere.

The main result that we report in this Letter is the following: there exists a map between geometrical quantities constructed at a given spatial point  $x$  from the supergravity fields  $G_{\mu\nu}(x^0, x)$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{\mu\nu\rho}(x^0, x)$  and the one-parameter-dependent quantities  $g_{ab}(t), A_{abc}(t), \dots$  entering the coset Lagrangian (9), under which the supergravity equations of motion (2) become equivalent, up to 30th order in height, to the Euler-Lagrange equations of (9). In the gauge (1) this map is defined by  $t = x^0 \equiv \int dT / \sqrt{G}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} g_{ab}(t) & = G_{ab}(t, x), \quad (11) \\ DA_{a_1 a_2 a_3}(t) & = \mathcal{F}_{0 a_1 a_2 a_3}(t, x), \\ DA^{a_1 \dots a_6}(t) & = -\frac{1}{4!} \varepsilon^{a_1 \dots a_6 b_1 b_2 b_3 b_4} \mathcal{F}_{b_1 b_2 b_3 b_4}(t, x), \\ DA^{b | a_1 \dots a_8}(t) & = \frac{3}{2} \varepsilon^{a_1 \dots a_8 b_1 b_2} [C^b_{b_1 b_2}(x) + \frac{2}{9} \delta^b_{[b_1} C^c_{b_2]c}(x)]. \end{aligned}$$

The expansion in height  $\text{ht}(\alpha) \equiv \ell + \sum m^j$ , which controls the iterative validity of this equivalence, is as follows: the Hamiltonian constraint of the coset model (9)

contains an infinite series of exponential coefficients  $\exp[-2\alpha(\beta)]$ , where  $\alpha$  runs over all positive roots of  $E_{10}$ , and where  $\beta^a \equiv -h^a_a$  parametrize the CSA of  $E_{10}$ . Previous work has shown that, near a spacelike singularity ( $t \rightarrow \infty$ ), the dynamics of the supergravity fields and of truncated versions of the  $E_{10}$  coset fields is asymptotically dominated by the (hyperbolic) Toda model defined by keeping only the exponentials involving the simple roots of  $E_{10}$ . Higher roots introduce smaller and smaller corrections as  $t$  increases. The “small tension expansion” of the equations of motion is then technically defined as a formal BKL-like expansion that corresponds to such an expansion in decreasing exponentials of the Hamiltonian constraint. On the supergravity side, this expansion amounts to an expansion in gradients of the fields in appropriate frames. Level one corresponds to the simplest one-dimensional reduction of (2), obtained by assuming that both  $G_{\mu\nu}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{\lambda\mu\nu}$  depend only on time [4]; levels two and three correspond to configurations of  $G_{\mu\nu}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{\lambda\mu\nu}$  with a more general, but still very restricted  $x$  dependence, so that, e.g., the frame derivatives of the electromagnetic field in (2) drop out [20]. When neglecting terms corresponding to  $\text{ht}(\alpha) \geq 30$ , the map (12) provides a *perfect match* between the supergravity evolution Eqs. (2) and the  $E_{10}$  coset ones, as well as between the associated Hamiltonian constraints. (In fact, the matching extends to *all real roots* of level  $\leq 3$ .)

It is natural to view our map as embedded in a hierarchical sequence of maps involving more and more spatial gradients of the basic supergravity fields. Our BKL-like expansion would then be a way of revealing step by step a hidden hyperbolic symmetry, implying the existence of a huge nonlocal symmetry of Einstein’s theory and its generalizations. Although the validity of this conjecture remains to be established, we can at least show that there is “enough room” in  $E_{10}$  for all the spatial gradients. Namely, the search for affine roots (with  $m^9 = 0$ ) in (6) and (7) reveals three infinite sets of admissible  $A_9$  Dynkin labels  $(00100000n)$ ,  $(00000100n)$ , and  $(10000001n)$  with highest weights obeying  $\Lambda^2 = 2$ , at levels  $\ell = 3n + 1, 3n + 2$ , and  $3n + 3$ , respectively. These correspond to three infinite towers of  $e_{10}$  elements

$$E_{a_1 \dots a_n}{}^{b_1 b_2 b_3}, \quad E_{a_1 \dots a_n}{}^{b_1 \dots b_6}, \quad E_{a_1 \dots a_n}{}^{b_0 b_1 \dots b_8}, \quad (12)$$

which are symmetric in the lower indices and all appear with outer multiplicity one (together with three transposed towers). Restricting the indices to  $a_i = 1$  and  $b_j \in \{2, \dots, 10\}$  and using the decomposition  $\mathbf{248} \rightarrow \mathbf{80} + \mathbf{84} + \mathbf{84}$  of  $E_8$  under its  $SL(9)$  subgroup one easily recovers the affine subalgebra  $E_9 \subset E_{10}$ . The appearance of higher order dual potentials (*à la* Geroch) in the  $E_9$ -based linear system for  $D = 2$  supergravity [21] indeed suggests that we associate the  $E_{10}$  Lie algebra elements (12) with the higher order spatial gradients  $\partial^{a_1} \dots \partial^{a_n} A_{b_1 b_2 b_3}$ ,

$\partial^{a_1} \dots \partial^{a_n} A_{b_1 \dots b_6}$  and  $\partial^{a_1} \dots \partial^{a_n} A_{b_0 b_1 \dots b_8}$  or to some of their nonlocal equivalents. Of course, the elements (12) generate only a tiny subspace of  $e_{10}$ , suggesting the existence of further M theoretic degrees of freedom and corrections beyond  $D = 11$  supergravity. Finally, we note that our approach based on a height expansion can be extended to other physically relevant KM algebras, such as  $BE_{10}$  [5,22] and  $AE_n$  [7].

We thank A. Feingold, T. Fischbacher, and V. Kac for informative discussions.

- 
- [1] D. Gross, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 1229 (1988).
  - [2] E. Cremmer, B. Julia, and J. Scherk, Phys. Lett. **76B**, 409 (1978).
  - [3] C. J. Isham, Proc. R. Soc. London A **351**, 209 (1976); C. Teitelboim, in *General Relativity and Gravitation*, edited by A. Held (Plenum Press, New York, 1980), Vol. 1.
  - [4] T. Damour and M. Henneaux, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 920 (2000); Phys. Lett. B **488**, 108 (2000).
  - [5] T. Damour and M. Henneaux, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 4749 (2001).
  - [6] V. A. Belinskii, I. M. Khalatnikov, and E. M. Lifshitz, Adv. Phys. **19**, 525 (1970); **31**, 639 (1982).
  - [7] T. Damour, M. Henneaux, B. Julia, and H. Nicolai, Phys. Lett. B **509**, 323 (2001).
  - [8] B. Julia, in *Lectures in Applied Mathematics* (AMS-SIAM, Providence, RI, 1985), Vol. 21, p. 335; Report No. LPTENS 80/16.
  - [9] S. Mizoguchi, Nucl. Phys. **B528**, 238 (1998).
  - [10] P. C. West, Classical Quantum Gravity **18**, 4443 (2001).
  - [11] V. G. Kac, *Infinite Dimensional Lie Algebras* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., 1990), 3rd ed.
  - [12] D. Peterson and V. G. Kac, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **80**, 1778 (1983).
  - [13] A. J. Feingold and I. B. Frenkel, Math. Ann. **263**, 87 (1983).
  - [14] V. G. Kac, R. V. Moody, and M. Wakimoto, in *Differential Geometric Methods in Theoretical Physics*, NATO Advanced Research Workshop, edited by K. Bleuler and M. Werner (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1988).
  - [15] E. Cremmer, B. Julia, H. Lu, and C. N. Pope, Nucl. Phys. **B523**, 73 (1998); **B535**, 242 (1998).
  - [16] K. Koepsell, H. Nicolai, and H. Samtleben, Classical Quantum Gravity **17**, 3689 (2000).
  - [17] O. Bärwald, R. W. Gebert, and H. Nicolai, Nucl. Phys. **B510**, 721 (1998).
  - [18] T. Fischbacher (private communication).
  - [19] N. A. Obers, B. Pioline, and E. Rabinovici, Nucl. Phys. **B525**, 163 (1998).
  - [20] J. Demaret, J. L. Hanquin, M. Henneaux, and P. Spindel, Nucl. Phys. **B252**, 538 (1985).
  - [21] P. Breitenlohner and D. Maison, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré **46**, 215 (1987); H. Nicolai, Phys. Lett. B **194**, 402 (1987).
  - [22] E. Cremmer, B. Julia, H. Lu, and C. N. Pope, hep-th/9909099.