## COMPATIBLE CONNECTIONS AND CURVATURE ON Cl(X)-MODULES

Let W be a  $\operatorname{Cl}(X)$ -module: a complex vector bundle W (of  $\mathbb{C}$ -fiber dimension N) with hermitian metric, endowed, at each point  $x \in X$ , with a Clifford multiplication  $\operatorname{Cl}(T_xX) \to \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{C}}(W_x)$  depending smoothly on x. (Recall this Clifford action must itself satisfy a local triviality condition.) We denote by  $F_X$  the orthonormal frame bundle of X, a principal  $SO_n$  bundle.

Let  $(s_a(x)), (e_i(x))$  be suitable local orthonormal frames for  $W_{|U}, F_{X|U}$ . The frames determine matrices of connection 1-forms for the Levi-Civita connection  $\nabla^g = \nabla^{LC}$  on (X, g) and the compatible connection D on the  $\operatorname{Cl}(X, g)$ -module  $W, \omega^g = \omega^{LC} \in T^*X_{|U} \otimes \mathfrak{so}_n, \omega \in T^*X_{|U} \otimes \mathfrak{u}_N$ :

$$\nabla_v^g e_i = \sum_j \omega_{ji}(v) e_j, \quad D_v s_a = \sum_b \omega_{ba}(v) s_b,$$

equivalently:

$$\omega_{ji}^g(v) = \langle \nabla_v^g e_i, e_j \rangle, \quad \omega_{ba} = \langle D_v s_a, s_b \rangle.$$

(Note the order of indices, the usual one for matrix elements when matrices multiply 'column vectors' on the left).

Note also the matrices  $\omega$  are complex-valued, and skew-hermitian:  $\omega^{\dagger} = -\omega$ . We also represent (locally) the Clifford action of  $e_i$  on W, in the frame  $(s_a)$ , by a skew-hermitian matrix  $C(e_i) \in \mathfrak{u}_N$ , with entries defined by:

$$C(e_i)s_a = \sum_b c_{ba}(e_i)s_b, \quad \text{or } c_{ba}(e_i) = \langle C(e_i)s_a, s_b \rangle.$$

('Suitable frames' means, by definition, the matrix entries  $c_{ab}(e_i)(x)$  are constant functions on U.)

Now compute, using the conditions defining compatibility:

$$\begin{aligned} e_k(c_{ba}(e_i)) &= \langle D_{e_k}(c(e_i)s_a), s_b \rangle + \langle C(e_i)s_a, D_{e_k}s_b \rangle \\ &= \langle c(\nabla_{e_k}^g e_i)s_a, s_b \rangle + \langle c(e_i)(D_{e_k}s_a), s_b \rangle + \langle C(e_i)s_a, D_{e_k}s_b \rangle \\ &= \langle \sum_j \omega_{ji}^g(e_k)C(e_j)s_a, s_b \rangle + \langle C(e_i)\sum_d \omega_{da}(e_k)s_d, s_b \rangle + \langle C(e_i)s_a, \sum_d \omega_{db}(e_k)s_d \rangle \\ &= \sum_i \omega_{ji}^g c_{ba}(e_j) + \sum_d \omega_{da}(e_k)c_{bd}(e_i) + \sum_d \bar{\omega}_{db}(e_k)c_{da}(e_i) \\ &= \sum_j \omega_{ji}^g(e_k)c_{ba}(e_j) + (c(e_i)\omega(e_k))_{ba} - (\omega(e_k)c(e_i))_{ba} \\ &= \sum_j \omega_{ji}^g(e_k)c_{ba}(e_j) - [\omega(e_k), c(e_i)]_{ba} \end{aligned}$$

Since the matrix coefficients  $c_{ba}(e_i)$  are constant over U for suitable frames, we conclude the connection matrices for a compatible connection must satisfy the relation:

$$\sum_{j} \omega_{ij}^g(e_k) C(e_j) + [\omega(e_k), C(e_i)] = 0, \quad \text{for all } i, k$$

We claim that a *solution* to this system is given by the matrices:

$$\omega^s(e_k) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{l,m} \omega^g_{ml}(e_k) C(e_l) C(e_m).$$

First, an easy calculation verifies these matrices are indeed skew-hermitian (exercise.)

Now compute, for  $i \neq k$ :

$$\begin{split} \omega^{s}(e_{k})C(e_{i}) &- C(e_{i})\omega^{s}(e_{k}) = \frac{1}{4}\sum_{l,m} \omega_{ml}^{g}(e_{k})[C(e_{l})C(e_{m})C(e_{i}) - C(e_{i})C(e_{l})C(e_{m})] \\ &= \frac{1}{4}\sum_{l,m} \omega_{ml}^{g}(e_{k})[-C(e_{l})C(e_{i})C(e_{m}) - 2\delta_{im}C(e_{l}) - (-C(e_{l})C(e_{i})C(e_{m}) - 2\delta_{il}C(e_{m}))] \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{l,m} \omega_{ml}^{g}(e_{k})[-\delta_{im}C(e_{l}) + \delta_{il}C(e_{m})] \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(-\sum_{l} \omega_{il}^{g}(e_{k})C(e_{l}) + \sum_{m} \omega_{mi}^{g}(e_{k})C(e_{m})) = \sum_{i,l} \omega_{li}^{g}(e_{k})C(e_{l}) \end{split}$$

Thus we see that, for all i, k:

$$[\omega^s(e_k), C(e_i)] = \sum_{ij} \omega^g_{ij}(e_k) C(e_i)$$

And therefore we indeed have:

$$\sum_{j} \omega_{ij}^{g}(e_k) C(e_j) + [\omega(e_k), C(e_i)] = \sum_{j} (\omega_{ij}^{g}(e_k) + \omega_{ji}^{g}(e_k)) C(e_j) = 0.$$

**Remark/exercise.** Recall (from Riemannian geometry) that connection 1forms  $\omega_{ij}$  associated to local frames (as well as the associated curvature 2-forms  $\Omega_{ij}$ ) must satisfy a compatibility condition under change of frames, if they are to define connections on Riemannian vector bundles. For the Levi-Civita connection on TX:

$$e_i = \sum_j e'_j g_{ji}, \quad g(x) = (g_{ij}(x)) \in SO_n \Rightarrow \omega^{LC} = g^t {\omega'}^{LC} g + g^t dg, \quad \Omega^{LC} = g^t {\Omega'}^{LC} g$$

And similarly for the hermitian complex vector bundle W:

$$s_a = \sum_b \tilde{s}_b u_{ba}, \quad U(x) = (u_{ab}(x)) \in U_N \Rightarrow \omega = U^{\dagger} \tilde{\omega} U + U^{\dagger} dU, \quad \Omega = U^{\dagger} \tilde{\Omega} U.$$

So, strictly speaking, we need to verify that the connection 1-forms  $\omega^s$  defined above satisfy this compatibility condition under change of frames, given that the  $\omega^{LC}$  do. Perhaps this follows directly from the condition found at the outset, connecting the  $\omega^{LC}$  and the  $\omega^s$ . Also, observe that if both pairs of frames (e, s) and  $(e', \tilde{s})$  are to be 'suitable' (as defined earlier), there should be a condition connecting the change of frame maps g and U. Can you find it?

Perhaps it is (check!):

$$dU(e_k)C(e_l)U^{\dagger} + UC(e_l)dU^{\dagger}(e_k) + \sum_i (g^t dg)_{li}(e_k)UC(e_i)U^{\dagger} = 0 \quad \forall k, l.$$

(There may be a geometric way to understand this constraint.)

**Exercise.** Use the constraint found above to establish that if the connection 1-forms  $\omega = (\omega_{ab}) \in \Lambda^1_U \otimes \mathfrak{u}_N$  (referring to suitable frames  $(e_i), (s_a)$  for TX and W) satisfy the equation for compatibility of the connection, then changing to another set  $(e'_i), (\tilde{s}_a)$  of suitable frames (as described above) yields new connection 1-forms  $\tilde{\omega}$  which still satisfy the compatibility condition (with respect to the Levi-Civita connection on Cl(X), corresponding to 1-forms  $\omega_{ij}^{LC}, \omega'_{ij}^{LC}$  in the frames  $(e_i), (e'_i)$  respectively.)