

Chiral bosonization on Riemann surfaces in an operator formalism

A. M. Semikhatov

P. N. Lebedev Physics Institute, Academy of Sciences of the USSR, Moscow

(Submitted 19 April 1988)

Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **47**, No. 11, 551–554 (10 June 1988)

An operator algebra of a fermion bc system on a Riemann surface C is represented globally in terms of operators of a conformal boson theory on C . The operator relations generate bosonization formulas for correlation functions. The construction is based on an operator generalization of the Baker-Akhiezer function.

One of the basic examples of a conformal theory on Riemann surfaces is given by a system of J - and $(1 - J)$ -differentials b and c (Ref. 1),¹⁾ an bosonization is apparently the most effective way to work with a bc system.^{2–5} The results of bosonization are expressions for the correlation functions of the bc system, which are interpreted as the correlation functions of some boson theory of the scalar-field type. Both in path-integral approaches^{2–4} and when a τ function is used,⁵ however, just which boson conformal theory on the Riemann surface corresponds to the bc system remains unknown. In the case of bosonization with the help of a τ function, the use of this function as an intermediate step obscures the question of the global construction for the boson operators corresponding to fermions. In the path-integral approach, on the

other hand, the boson theory is poorly defined since the global properties of the Riemann surface are dealt with through the introduction of a multivalued scalar field φ which has a local "quantum" part and a "classical" part, which allows (and even prescribes) the occurrence of jumps as nontrivial cycles are traced out.

Our purpose in the present letter is to construct a systematic operator bosonization of a (fermion) bc system. In other words, we wish to outline a conformal boson theory on a Riemann surface and a system of operators of this theory which globally represent the operators of a bc system. This construction essentially reduces to the realization of the three following comments: a) The scalar field $\varphi(z)$ which participates in local bosonization formulas,¹

$$\hat{b}(u) = e^{-\varphi(u)}, \quad \hat{c}(u) = e^{\varphi(u)}, \quad e^{-\varphi(u)} e^{\varphi(v)} = \frac{1}{v-u}; \quad e^{-\varphi(u)} e^{\varphi(v)} : (1)$$

($\hat{}$ means bosonization), and which is not a genuine conformal field, even locally,¹ must be regarded as a linear integral $\int_z \partial\varphi$ of the current $\partial\varphi$. In case (1), the latter is the same as the current j of the bc system, which is (we wish to stress this point) globally defined on a surface of an arbitrary type. b) The jumps in the field φ can now be interpreted in a natural way as the result of a coiling of the integration contour around a homology. c) An object which generalizes $\exp \int^z j$ but which is insensitive to the coiling of the contour is the Baker-Akhiezer function.⁷ The operator-valued Baker-Akhiezer functions perform a global bosonization [see Eqs. (3), (4), and (7) below].

1. The primary entity of the boson theory is thus the current \tilde{I} : the operator 1-differential on Riemann surface C of type g . Normalizing to zero a periods, we introduce the current $I = \tilde{I} - \sum_{j=1}^g \omega_j (1/2\pi i) \oint_{a_j} \tilde{I}$, where ω_j are holomorphic 1-differentials.⁸ In the equations that follow, the normal ordering of the constituent operators constructed from the current I is generally reached by subtracting all possible pairings; here

$$\overline{I(u)I(v)} \equiv \langle 0 | I(u)I(v) | 0 \rangle = d_u d_v \ln E(u, v), \quad (2)$$

where E is the principal form of the surface,⁸ and $|0\rangle$ is the vacuum in the boson theory.

2. The bosonization procedure should incorporate the ghost-number balance theorem, according to which the only nonvanishing bc correlation functions are those in which there are $L \equiv (2J-1)(g-1)$ more appearances of b than c . We can correspondingly suggest bosonization formulas only for operators which are (differential) polynomials in b and c with the specified predominance of the operators b .

In the simplest case we have only the product $b(P_1) \dots b(P_L), P_\alpha \in C$. We fix a point of common position $Q \in C$. We construct an operator $B_J(P_\alpha, Q)$ such that the following holds for correlation functions of C :

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle_c = \langle 0 | \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{B_J} | 0 \rangle.$$

We assume that \mathcal{P} represents the divisor $\mathcal{P} = \sum P_\alpha$, while Δ is the Riemann class.⁸ We can then write

$$B_J = ; \exp \left(\frac{2J-1}{2\pi i} \sum_{j=1}^g \oint_{Q_j} \phi_{a_j} \omega_j(y) \oint_I \right) \times \exp \left(- \oint_{(2J-1)\Delta} I \right) \theta \left(\mathcal{P} - (2J-1)\Delta - \phi_b I \right); \quad (3)$$

We will show that the argument of the θ function in (3) can be written in more detail as

$$\oint_{(2J-1)\Delta} \omega_i - \phi_b I = \sum_{\alpha=1}^L \sum_{j=1}^P \omega_i - (2J-1)\kappa_i^{(R)} - \phi_b I,$$

where $\kappa^{(R)}$ is the vector of Riemann constants. In (3) and in the equations below, we are also assuming θ functions with characteristics determined by the spinor structure of the bc theory.⁴ The first exponential factor in (3) specifies the background charge¹ $Q = 2J - 1$; the other factors determine the operator L -point Baker-Akhiezer function.

3. All that can appear in the correlation functions $\langle b...bc...c \rangle$ against the background of $b(P_1)...b(P_L)$ is a certain number of pairs $b(u)c(v)$. For this product (but not for the b and c operators separately!) we have

$$\widehat{b(u)c(v)} = \frac{1}{E(u, v)} : \exp \int_I : \left(\frac{E(v, Q)}{E(u, Q)} \right)^{(2J-1)g} \frac{E(u, (2J-1)\Delta)}{E(v, (2J-1)\Delta)}, \quad (4)$$

where for the divisor $\mathcal{A} = \sum P_i - \sum Q_i$ we have written

$$E(u, \mathcal{A}) = \prod_i E(u, P_i) \left(\prod_j E(u, Q_j) \right)^{-1}.$$

The product of all the principal forms in (4) is a J -differential with respect to u and a $(1 - J)$ differential with respect to v . We might note that expression (4) is a generalization of local formulas (1), which can be rewritten as

$$\widehat{b(u)c(v)} = \frac{1}{v-u} : \exp \int_u^v \partial \varphi :$$

On the right side of (4) we do not have a θ function of the type $\theta(\phi_b I + \dots)$ which compensates for the dependence of the integral on the coiling, in contrast with the Baker-Akhiezer function in (3). An attempt to introduce it explicitly in (4) would be unacceptable since it would prevent us from obtaining the expressions found in Ref. 4 for the correlation functions. The situation can be improved remarkably, however, by means of the following result regarding the normal ordering:

$$: \exp \int_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathcal{B}} I : : \theta \left(e - \phi_b I \right) : = : \theta \left(e + \mathcal{A} - \mathcal{B} - \phi_b I \right) \exp \int_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathcal{B}} I : \quad (5)$$

(\mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are divisors of degree n). Using this expression along with another, similar result,

$$\begin{aligned} &: \exp \int_u^v I : : \exp \frac{2J-1}{2\pi i} \sum_{j=1}^g \oint_{a_j} \omega_j(y) \int_Q^y I : \\ &= \left(\frac{\sigma(u)}{\sigma(v)} \right)^{2J-1} \left(\frac{E(u, Q)}{E(v, Q)} \right)^{(2J-1)g} \cdot (\text{norm. order}), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where

$$\sigma(u) = \exp \left(- \frac{1}{2\pi i} \sum_{i=1}^g \oint_{a_i} \omega_i(y) \ln E(y, u) \right),$$

we find

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{b(u)c(v)} B_J &= \frac{1}{E(u, v)} \left(\frac{\sigma(u)}{\sigma(v)} \right)^{2J-1} \frac{E(u, \mathcal{P})}{E(v, \mathcal{P})} : \exp \int_u^v I \exp - \int_{(2J-1)\Delta}^{\mathcal{P}} I \\ &\exp \frac{2J-1}{2\pi i} \sum_{i=1}^g \oint_{a_i} \omega_i(y) \int_Q^y I \frac{\theta(\mathcal{P} - (2J-1)\Delta + u - v - \oint_b I)}{\theta(\mathcal{P} - (2J-1)\Delta)} : . \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

The effect of (5) is to shift the argument of the θ function in (7) by an amount $u - v = - \int_u^v \omega_k$, which is exactly what we need in order to reconstruct the Baker-Akhiezer structure and thus to compensate for the coiling $\exp \oint_b I$. Furthermore, a "tuning" of the argument of the θ function occurs in a similar way for any number of pairs $b(u_i)c(v_i)$ on the left side of (7). On the right side of (7), yet other factors appear as a result of the normal ordering. They turn out to be of precisely such a nature that the correct expressions for the correlation functions are reproduced when we take the expectation value $\langle 0 | \dots | 0 \rangle$. In particular, we find directly from (7)

$$\begin{aligned} \langle 0 | \widehat{b(u)c(v)} B_J | 0 \rangle &= \frac{1}{E(u, v)} \left(\frac{\sigma(u)}{\sigma(v)} \right)^{2J-1} \\ &\times \frac{E(u, \mathcal{P})}{E(v, \mathcal{P})} \frac{\theta(u - v + \mathcal{P} - (2J-1)\Delta)}{\theta(\mathcal{P} - (2J-1)\Delta)}, \end{aligned}$$

which is the same as the expression for the bc propagator on a Riemann surface.⁴

4. Some significant simplifications arise in the case $J = 1/2$. In particular, comparing (3) with the equations of Ref. 9, we find the interesting operator identity predicted by A. O. Radul:

$$\exp \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^2 \oint_Q \oint_Q b(u) \oint_Q c(v) S(u, v) = \text{const } \theta \left(- \oint_b I \right),$$

where $S(u,v)$ is the regularized propagator for spin-1/2 fermions.^{9,4,8} Furthermore, for an arbitrary value of J we find from (3) the expression of Ref. 5 for an algebra-geometry τ function.

I am indebted to A. O. Radul for collaboration in the early stages of this study. I also thank V. Ya. Faĭnberg and A. A. Tseĭtlin for useful discussions.

¹In the case $J = 2$ we find ghosts in the boson string: a source of "applied" interest in bc systems. String requirements have also attracted interest in Riemann surfaces of type ≥ 2 (Refs. 2-6).

¹D. Friedan, E. Martinec, and S. Shenker, Nucl. Phys. **B271**, 93 (1986).

²L. Alvarez-Gaumé, G. Moore, and C. Vafa, Comm. Math. Phys. **106**, 1 (1986); L. Alvarez-Gaumé, J. B. Bost, G. Moore *et al.*, Comm. Math. Phys. **112**, 503 (1987).

³V. G. Knizhnik, Phys. Lett. **B180**, 247 (1986).

⁴E. Verlinde and H. Verlinde, Nucl. Phys. **B288**, 357 (1987).

⁵L. Alvarez-Gaumé, C. Gomez, G. Moore, and C. Vafa, "Strings in the operator formalism," CERN-TH 4883/87.

⁶Yu. I. Manin, Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **43**, 161 (1986) [JETP Lett. **43**, 204 (1986)]; V. G. Knizhnik, Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **46**, 8 (1987) [JETP Lett. **46**, 7 (1987)]; A. Yu. Morozov, Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **47**, 181 (1988) [JETP Lett. **47**, 219 (1988)].

⁷V. A. Dubrovin, Usp. Mat. Nauk **36**, 11 (1981); I. M. Krichever, Usp. Mat. Nauk **32**, 183 (1977).

⁸J. Fay, Theta functions of Riemann surfaces, LNM 352, 1973.

⁹N. Ishibashi, Y. Matsuo, and H. Ooguri, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A2**, 119 (1987); C. Vafa, Phys. Lett. **B190**, 47 (1987).

Translated by Dave Parsons