

Fusion Residues

Kenneth Intriligator

Lym an Laboratory of Physics

Harvard University

Cambridge, MA 02138

We discuss when and how the Verlinde dimensions of a rational conformal field theory can be expressed as correlation functions in a topological LG theory. It is seen that a necessary condition is that the RCFT fusion rules must exhibit an extra symmetry. We consider two particular perturbations of the Grassmannian superpotentials. The topological LG residues in one perturbation, introduced by Gepner, are shown to be a twisted version of the $SU(N)_k$ Verlinde dimensions. The residues in the other perturbation are the twisted Verlinde dimensions of another RCFT; these topological LG correlation functions are conjectured to be the correlation functions of the corresponding Grassmannian topological sigma model with a coupling in the action to instanton number.

1. Introduction

We can associate with any rational conformal field theory a topological theory whose correlation functions are the dimensions of the Friedan-Shenker [1] vector bundles:

$$h_{i_1 \dots i_n}^o = \dim H(g; i_1; \dots; i_n) \quad (1.1)$$

where $H(g; i_1; \dots; i_n)$ is the space of conformal blocks for the genus g surface with insertions of the primary fields $i_1; \dots; i_n$ (we will consider a related, "twisted", version of these correlation functions, hence the superscript). These topological integers can be expressed in terms of the modular transformation matrix S as:

$$h_{i_1 \dots i_n}^o = \sum_p \frac{1}{S_{op}^{2(g-1)}} \frac{S_{i_1 p}}{S_{op}} \frac{S_{i_n p}}{S_{op}} \quad (1.2)$$

where p runs over all primary fields [2,3]. This expression is of the expected topological form :

$$h_{i_1 \dots i_n}^o = \text{Tr} h^{g-1}_{i_1 \dots i_n}$$

where h is the operator which makes a handle [4]. The Verlinde dimensions (1.1) in G_k theories can be understood as Chern-Simons amplitudes on S^1 [5] or as amplitudes in $G = G$ theory [6,7].

The expression (1.2) is similar to the residue expression for correlation functions in topological LG theories [8]. The correlation function at genus g of an arbitrary function $F(X_i)$ of the chiral super fields X_i ($i = 1; \dots; N$) in a topological LG theory with superpotential $W(X_i)$ is given by [8]

$$h F i_g = \sum_{dW=0}^X h^{g-1} F \quad \text{where } h = (-1)^{N(N-1)/2} \det(\partial_i \partial_j W): \quad (1.3)$$

We have here modified the operator h from that obtained in [8] to include a convenient sign. This sign naturally arises in topological LG theory from the fermion zero mode integration upon ordering the terms in the Grassmann integrals so that the holomorphic pieces are all adjacent to each other. In this note we will study the connection between (1.2) and the residue expression (1.3) of topological LG theory.

The idea is to find a topological LG superpotential $W(X)$ with chiral primary fields $i(X)$ so that i at the p -th critical point (the p -th solution of $dW = 0$) is $i(p) = S_{ip} = S_{op}$. From [2], $i(p) = S_{ip} = S_{op}$ form diagonal representations of the fusion rules for every p .

This basis is the basis of critical points of W where fusion is diagonal ring multiplication. The fusion rules are thus represented by multiplication in the ring with ideal generated by $dW = 0$. This was recently accomplished by Gepner [9] for the case of $SU(N)_k$ theories.

The polynomial $W(X)$ whose ideal $dW = 0$ gives fusion rule relations for some rational conformal field theory must be a perturbed superpotential i.e. it can not be quasihomogeneous. This is clear since a quasihomogeneous superpotential has a conserved $U(1)$ charge which is positive for all elements in the chiral primary ring, additive under ring multiplication, and no element in the ring has charge greater than $\hat{c} = c/3$ [10]. Quasihomogeneous superpotentials thus always have nilpotent ring relations whereas fusion rules in conformal field theory, by duality, can never have zero on the RHS. Our fusion rule polynomial $W(X)$ is thus a perturbation of a quasihomogeneous superpotential $W^0(X)$ in some of the chiral ring elements ϕ_i . Under this perturbation, $\phi_i \rightarrow \phi_i + \delta\phi_i$ and the structure constants c_{ij}^{0k} for ring multiplication of the chiral primaries become the fusion rules N_{ij}^k .

We can now say something about the type of fusion rules which can be described as above as ring multiplication associated with some perturbed superpotential. As discussed in [11], the topological metric

$$i_{ij} = h_{i-j} i_{g=0} = N_{ij}^k h_{-k} i_{g=0} \quad (1:4)$$

is unchanged from that of the unperturbed theory. We thus have

$$i_{ij} = c_{ij}^{0k} h_{-k} i_{g=0} = c_{ij}^{0\hat{c}} = N_{ij}^{\hat{c}} \quad (1:5)$$

since $\phi_{\hat{c}}$, the unique chiral primary with the maximal $U(1)$ charge of \hat{c} (it generates one unit of spectral flow), is the only chiral primary with nonzero one point function on the sphere [8] (and we can choose our normalizations to make its one point function one) and the same holds in the perturbed theory. In any unperturbed LG theory it is natural and always possible to choose our basis of ϕ_i so that $c_{ij}^{0\hat{c}} = \delta_{ij}$ where the chiral primary $\phi_{\hat{c}}$ is given by applying $\phi_{\hat{c}}$ (one unit of spectral flow) to the anti-chiral primary dual to ϕ_i , i.e. $\phi_{\hat{c}} = \phi_{\hat{c}} \phi_i$. We thus naturally have $N_{ij}^{\hat{c}} = \delta_{ij}$. From this it follows that the fusion rule for the field $\phi_{\hat{c}}$ with any primary field ϕ_i satisfies

$$\phi_{\hat{c}} \phi_i = \phi_i^0 \quad (1:6)$$

with only one term on the RHS. Such fields were considered in [12,13]. They indicate an extra symmetry in the theory above that of the chiral algebra [12]. We thus expect

that only fusion rules with such fields (additional symmetries) can be represented as ring multiplication associated with some polynomial W . In G_k theories, the center of G is generated by fields that satisfy (1.6) [14]. The $(E_8)_3$ fusion rules obtained in [15], for example, contain no such field (E_8 has no center) and, therefore, can not be naturally represented as multiplication in the ring of some W .

Given a potential W and chiral primary fields ϕ_i with ring multiplication the fusion rules of some conformal field theory, genus one correlation functions computed with the residue expression (1.3) of topological LG theory will coincide with the genus one Verlinde dimensions (1.2) since they both follow from just the fusion rules. The genus zero correlation functions computed with (1.3), on the other hand, differ slightly from the corresponding Verlinde dimensions. The residue formula, for example, gives $h_{i_1 i_g=0} = \phi_{i_1} \phi$ whereas (1.2) gives $h_{i_1 i_g=0} = \phi_{i_1} \phi$ (ϕ denotes the identity). It is thus clear that the handle-making operator h of topological LG theory is a "twisted" version of that in the Verlinde formula (1.2):

$$h = h^\circ \phi: \quad (1.7)$$

The untwisted Verlinde dimensions (1.1) can thus be computed as topological LG residues by soaking up $1-g$ units of the spectral flow primary field ϕ on the genus g surface:

$$h_{i_1 \dots i_n} \phi_g^{\circ} = h_{i_1 \dots i_n} :: \phi_g^{\circ} \phi^{1-g}; \quad (1.8)$$

where the correlation function on the right is computed in the corresponding topological LG theory using the residue expression (1.3) and where ϕ_g° is well defined by (1.6) and equal to the dual to ϕ . The twisting (1.7) is familiar in twisted $N=2$ theories; the twisting of the spins requires the handle-making operator to carry a unit of spectral flow. It would be interesting to understand this twisting in G_k theory, where the twisting is by the center of G , in terms of Chern Simons or G/G theory.

We will apply these ideas to two particular perturbations of the Grassmannian superpotentials of [10]. The plan for this paper is as follows. In sect. 2 we discuss the cohomology ring of the Grassmannian manifolds and the superpotential of [10] which gives this ring. We also discuss the perturbation of these Grassmannian superpotentials in an interesting subset of the chiral primary fields, generalizing somewhat some results of [11]. In sect. 3 we consider the perturbed Grassmannian superpotentials found in [9] to give the $SU(N)_k$ fusion rules. We examine the residue expression and explicitly verify (1.7) in these theories. The Verlinde dimensions for $SU(N)_k$ can thus be expressed as residues, using

(1.3), as in (1.8). In Sect. 4 we write the Verlinde dimensions of the $N = 0$ unitary minimal models as TLG coset residues. In sect. 5 we consider another interesting perturbation of the Grassmannian superpotentials, the perturbation in only the most relevant operator (the Kahler form). The correlation functions (1.3) in this theory give the twisted Verlinde dimensions (1.8) for a RCFT. It is conjectured that these correlation functions are the correlation functions of a topological sigma model on the Grassmannian manifold with a coupling in the action to instanton number. Sect. 6 is the conclusion. We comment there about an apparent connection between the integrability of a perturbed $N = 2$ LG theory and having the perturbed structure constants being the fusion rules of some rational conformal field theory.

2. Grassmannian Superpotentials and Their Perturbations

The Grassmannian $U(N+M)/U(N)U(M)$ (with, say, $N \leq M$) is a NM complex dimensional compact complex manifold (a generalization of projective space) with a cohomology ring that is generated by the forms X_1, \dots, X_N where X_r is a $(r; r)$ form [16]. Writing

$$X^{(N)}(t) = \sum_{i=0}^N X_i t^i \quad \text{and} \quad Y^{(N)}(t) = (X^{(N)}(t))^{-1} = \sum_n Y_n^{(N)} t^n \quad (2.1)$$

with $X_0 = 1$, the ideal of our Grassmannian's cohomology ring is obtained by the requirements [16] that

$$Y_i^{(N)} = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad i = M+1, \dots, M+N : \quad (2.2)$$

The Grassmannian cohomology elements are described in terms of the generating X_i as follows [16]. For every formal, N dimensional vector $\mathbf{n} = \sum_{l=1}^N n_l e_l$ with components n_l that satisfy

$$n(\mathbf{n}) = \sum_{l=1}^N n_l \leq M \quad n_l = 0, 1, 2, \dots; \quad (2.3)$$

there is a $(r(\mathbf{n}); r(\mathbf{n}))$ form in the Grassmannian cohomology, where $r(\mathbf{n}) = \sum_{l=1}^N l n_l$, given in terms of the generating X_i by

$$Y^{(N)} = \det_{i,j} n(\mathbf{n}) X_{a_i + i - j} \quad (2.4)$$

where the a_i satisfy $a_i = a_{i+1}$ with n_1 of the a_i equal to 1 for each $i = 1, \dots, N$, and X_r is defined to be zero when $r < 0$ or $r > N$ and $X_0 = 1$. The $(N+M)!/(N!M!)$ forms with satisfying (2.3) are the Grassmannian cohomology elements. In particular, the $e_i = X_i$ with $e_1 = X_1$ the Kahler form, and $\sum_{i=1}^M e_i = X_N^M$ is the volume form. It is easily seen that the e_i satisfy $e_i = X_1 - (n-1)e_1 - X_2 - (n-2)e_1 + \dots$ from which it follows that $\binom{N}{n e_1} = Y_n^{(N)}(X_i)$ as defined by (2.1). From (2.3) it is clear that the Grassmannian Poincare polynomial is the generating function for the number of partitions of a number into no more than M parts with each part no greater than N :

$$Y^{(N)} = \prod_{i=1}^N \frac{(1 - (t^i)^{M+1})}{(1 - (t^i)^1)}; \quad (2.5)$$

We can represent the cohomology element with a Young tableaux containing n_1 columns of 1 boxes for $i = 1, \dots, N$. Condition (2.3) says that no tableaux has more than M columns. There is a duality under $N \leftrightarrow M$, $X_i \leftrightarrow Y_i$, and in terms of the tableaux, rows \leftrightarrow columns. In particular, define \hat{n}_1 to be the number of rows in the tableaux with 1 boxes for $i = 1, \dots, M$. The elements (2.4) can be expressed as:

$$= \det_{1 \leq i, j \leq \hat{n}_1} Y_{\hat{a}_i + i - j}; \quad (2.6)$$

where $\hat{n}_1 \leq N$ and the \hat{a}_i are defined in terms of the \hat{n}_1 as in (2.4). Writing $Y_r = \sum_{i=1}^N e_i$ in terms of the X_i as in (2.1), it can be verified that (2.6) is equivalent to (2.4).

The cohomology ring is obtained by multiplication of the elements (2.4) subject to the ideal (2.2). Before imposing the relations of the ideal, the product of any two elements (2.4) can be expanded as a sum of terms of the same type with nonnegative integer coefficients. The ideal sets to zero those terms in the sum which don't satisfy the inequality (2.3). This ring structure is known as the Schubert calculus [16].

The ideal (2.2) of the Grassmannian cohomology ring can be written as the ideal generated by setting to zero the derivatives of a polynomial in the X_i as follows. Following [9], we define

$$W^{(N)}(t) = \log(X^{(N)}(t)) = \sum_{i=1}^N W_i^{(N)} t^i; \quad (2.7)$$

Since

$$\frac{\partial W^{(N)}(t)}{\partial X_i} = Y^{(N)}(t) (t^i)^{-1} \quad i = 1, \dots, N; \quad (2.8)$$

our Grassmannian ideal (2.2) is generated by the derivatives of $W_{N+M+1}^{(N)}(X_i)$. If we write

$$X^{(N)}(t) = \prod_{i=1}^N (1 + q_i t); \quad (2.9)$$

it can be seen that

$$W_{N+M+1}^{(N)}(X_i) = \prod_{i=1}^N \frac{q_i^{N+M+1}}{N+M+1}$$

written in terms of the X_i , the form obtained in [10]. Using $W_{N+M+1}^{(N)}$ as a LG superpotential gives the $\hat{C} = C = N M = N + M + 1$ Kazama-Suzuki $N = 2$ coset theory $SU(N+1)_M = SU(N)U(1)$. The chiral primary fields (2.4) have $q = q = (N+M+1)^{-1} r(\cdot)$. The operator h defined in (1.3) is proportional to the top form $\hat{c} = \prod_{i=1}^M e_i = X_N^M$. The relation is

$$h = \frac{(N+M)!}{N!M!} \hat{c}; \quad (2.10)$$

The residue expression (1.3) thus gives $h \cdot i_{g=0} = 1$ with our normalizations.

We now consider deforming the Grassmannian superpotential in the chiral primary fields (2.4). As discussed in [8], only deformations in those with $q < 1$ are nice in that they don't change the number of critical points of W . Under the perturbation $W(X_i) \rightarrow W(X_i; a) = W(X_i) + O(a)$ terms and $X^{(N)}(X_i) \rightarrow X^{(N)}(X_i; a) = X^{(N)}(X_i) + O(a)$ terms such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial W^{(N)}(X_i; a)}{\partial a} &= X^{(N)}(X_i; a) \\ X^{(N)}_1(X_i; a) X^{(N)}_2(X_i; a) &= c_{12}^{(N)}(a) X^{(N)}_3(X_i; a); \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

where $c_{12}^{(N)}(a)$ are the perturbed structure constants (the perturbed three point functions with an index raised using the $(a$ independent) metric δ) [11].

The form of $W(X; a)$ and $X_{ne_1}(X; a)$ in the one variable case, $N = 1$, was obtained in [11]. We will generalize their results to the general N variable case when the Grassmannian superpotential is perturbed in only the chiral primary fields $X_{ne_1}^{(N)} = Y_n^{(N)}$ with $n = 1; \dots; M$ (note that these all satisfy the $q < 1$ condition). From (2.8) it is obvious that condition (2.11) for these perturbations:

$$\frac{\partial W_{N+M+1}^{(N)}(X_i; a)}{\partial a_n} = Y_n^{(N)}(X_i; a) \quad (2.12)$$

is satisfied by :

$$W_{N+M+1}^{(N)}(X_i; a) = W_{N+M+1}^{(N+M)}(X_i; X_{N+n})$$

$$Y_n^{(N)}(X_i; a) = Y_n^{(N+M)}(X_i; X_{N+n}) \quad (2.13)$$

$$\text{with } X_{N+n} = (-1)^{N+n} a_{M+1-n} \quad n = 1; \dots; M :$$

In particular, the perturbed $Y_n^{(N)}(X_i; a)$ are given as in (2.1) where, now ,

$$X(t; a) = \sum_{i=0}^N X_i(t)^i + \sum_{n=1}^M a_n t^{N+M+1-n} :$$

For the one variable ($N=1$) case these results are equivalent to those obtained in [11].

The perturbed cohomology ring (2.11) can be embedded in the unperturbed Grassmannian cohomology ring in $N+M$ variables:

$$Y_1^{(N+M)} Y_2^{(N+M)} = \sum_3 Y_3^{(N+M)} : \quad (2.14)$$

While Y_1 and Y_2 are of the form $\sum_{i=1}^N n_i e_i$, with components that satisfy (2.3), the terms on the right are of the form $Y_3 = \sum_{i=1}^{N+M} n_i e_i$ (since this is now the $N+M$ variable Schubert calculus). It is easily seen from (2.4) that the new terms with $n_{i>N} \neq 0$ go away when the perturbation is turned off. Using (2.4) and the ideal of the ring, obtained by setting to zero the X_i derivatives ($i = 1; \dots; N$) of the perturbed potential (2.13), all terms on the RHS can be expanded out in terms $n_{i>N} = 0$ basis $Y_n^{(N)}(X_i; a)$ in (2.13) times powers of the perturbing parameters a . The perturbed ring structure in (2.11) is thus easily obtained.

The topological LG correlation functions in the perturbed theory can be calculated using (1.3). It is sometimes convenient to work in terms of the variables q_i defined in (2.9). The Jacobian between these variables is $\det \partial q_i / \partial X_j = (-1)^{i+j}$ where $(-1)^{i+j}$ is the Vandermonde determinant $\prod_{i < j} (q_i - q_j)$. The critical points of W are the critical points of W in terms of the q_i other than those points $q_i = q_j$ where $(-1)^{i+j}$ blows up and modulo permutations of the q_i (this change of variables trick was used in [9] and [17]). The operator h in (1.3) can be written up to the equations of motion as $h = (-1)^N (N-1)!^2 \det(\partial^2 W / \partial q_i \partial q_j)$.

In the next two sections we will consider two interesting special cases: perturbing in only the most relevant operator $Y_1^{(N)} = Y_{e_1}^{(N)} = X_1$, and perturbing in only the least relevant operator of the type considered $Y_M^{(N)} = Y_{e_1}^{(N)}$.

3. $SU(N)_k$ Fusion Residues

In this section we consider a special perturbation of the Grassmannian potentials: perturbation in only the least relevant operator of the $\sum n e_i = Y_n$ type. This perturbation was found by Gepner to give the $SU(N)_k$ fusion rules. This perturbation is also special in that it is probably integrable [17,18] and its soliton structure is rather interesting [18]. It was also shown in [19] in the one variable case (the $SU(2)_k$ case) that the perturbed ring structure constants $c_{ij}^k(a)$ are symmetric in i, j, k (as the N_{ij}^k of $SU(2)_k$ are so symmetric) at precisely this perturbation.

The polynomial $W(X)$ found by Gepner [9] to give the fusion rules for $SU(N)_k$ is given by $W(X) = W_{N+k}^{(N)}(X_r; X_N = 1)$, the Grassmannian polynomial for $U(N+k-1) = U(N)U(k-1)$ subject to the constraint $X_N = 1$. This is the perturbation (2.13) of the Grassmannian polynomial $W_{N+k}^{(N-1)}(X_1; \dots; X_{N-1})$ for $U(N+k-1) = U(N-1)U(k)$ in the chiral primary field $\phi_{ke_1}^{(N-1)}$ with the perturbing parameter set to one. The Grassmannian chiral primaries $\phi_{\sum_{r=1}^P N-1 n_r e_r}^{(N-1)}$ with $\sum_{r=1}^P N-1 n_r e_r$ are given at the perturbed point by (2.13), $W_{N+k}^{(N)}(X_r; X_N = 1)$. This is precisely the polynomial found by Gepner [9] to represent the $SU(N)_k$ primary field with highest weight $\sum_{r=1}^P N-1 n_r e_r$. The Grassmannian structure constants at this perturbed point are the $SU(N)_k$ fusion rules of [20]. The X_r , in particular, represent the fundamental weights e_r , the fully antisymmetric representations. The j -th fully symmetric representation, $\phi_{je_1}^{(N)}$, is represented by the polynomial $Y_j^{(N)}(X_r; X_N = 1)$ (2.1). The field $\phi = \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} Y_j^{(N)}(X_r; X_N = 1) e_j$ satisfies the fusion rule (1.6). It generates the Z_N center of $SU(N)$.

We will now consider the residue formula (1.3) for topological amplitudes using the above superpotential. As discussed in the introduction we expect to get (1.7)

$$h = h^0_{k, N-1}; \quad (3.1)$$

from which it follows that the residue expression of topological LG theory gives a twisted version of the Verlinde dimensions (where the twisting is by the center of the group). We will explicitly verify (3.1) by computing (1.3)

$$h = (-1)^{(N-1)(N-2)/2} \det \left(\frac{\partial^2 W_{N+k}^{(N-1)}(X_r; a)}{\partial X_r \partial X_s} \right) \quad (3.2)$$

where, again, $W_{N+k}^{(N-1)}(X_r; a) = W_{N+k}^{(N)}(X_r; X_N = 1)$.

Following Gepner, we re-introduce the field X_N along with a Lagrange multiplier to set it to one:

$$W(X_r; X_N; \lambda) = W_{N+k}(X_r; X_N) - \lambda (X_N - 1) = \sum_{l=1}^N \frac{q_l^{N+k}}{N+k} - \sum_{l=1}^N q_l \lambda : \quad (3.3)$$

The equation of motion of the polynomial (3.3) for λ sets $X_N = 1$ and, using (2.7), the equation of motion for X_N gives, $\lambda = (-1)^{N+1} Y_k(X_r)$. It is easily seen that (3.2) is given by $h = (-1)^{(N-1)(N-2)/2} \det H$, where $\det H$ is the Hessian of $W(X_r; X_N; \lambda)$. In terms of the q_i , we have $\det H = (-1)^2 \det K$ where $K_{i,j} = \partial^2 W / \partial q_i \partial q_j$, $K_{i,i} = q_i$, $K_{i,j} = 0$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, N$ and, recall, λ is the Vandermonde determinant Jacobian. Using the equations of motion $q_i^{N+k} = \lambda = (-1)^{N+1} Y_k$ and $\sum_{i=1}^N q_i = 1$, we obtain $h = (-1)^{N(N-1)/2} (Y_k)^{N-1} \det A$, where $A_{i,j} = (N+k)_{i,j}$, $A_{i,i} = 1$, $A_{i,j} = 0$ and, thus, $\det A = N(N+k)^{N-1} = j(N+k)R$, the index of $(N+k)$ times the $SU(N)$ root lattice in the $SU(N)$ weight lattice. Since $(Y_k)^{N-1} = \lambda_{k-N-1}$ in the ring, we obtain

$$h = (-1)^{N(N-1)/2} \frac{W}{(k+N)R} \lambda_{k-N-1}^2 : \quad (3.4)$$

In [9] it was shown how to make the correspondence between weights of $SU(N)_k$ and the critical points $X_r^{(i)}$ of W . It was also shown that the Vandermonde determinant at the critical point λ is given by

$$(X_r^{(i)}) = \sum_{w \in W} (-1)^w e^{2i w(\lambda)} :$$

Thus, using the expression in [20] for the modular transformation matrix S , we have

$$h^0 = (-1)^{N(N-1)/2} \frac{W}{(k+N)R} \lambda_{k-N-1}^2$$

where, as usual, $h^0(X_r^{(i)}) = 1/S_{0,i}^2$. Relation (3.4) is thus the expected (3.1). We have thus explicitly verified relation (1.7). The Verlinde dimensions are then expressed as TLG residues as in (1.8).

4. Simple Cosets

We can give a LG description of the unitary $N = 0$ minimal models $SU(2)_1$ $SU(2)_{m-2} = SU(2)_{m-1}$, constructing the coset along the lines of [21]. The LG potential for the coset is

$$W(x; y) = \frac{1}{2} (W_m(x) - W_{m+1}(y)) \quad (4.1)$$

where $W_{k+2}(x) = W_{k+2}(X_1 = x; X_2 = 1)$ is the LG potential for the $SU(2)_k$ fusion rules, $W_{k+2}(2 \cos \frac{\pi}{k+2}) = (2=k+2) \cos(k+2) \frac{\pi}{k+2}$. The primary fields are given by

$$\phi_{r;s} = P_{r-1}(x)P_{s-1}(y) \quad r+s = \text{even}; \quad (4.2)$$

for $r = 1; \dots; m-1$ and $s = 1; \dots; m$, where $P_n(x) = P_{n-1} = Y_n(x; X_2 = 1)$; they are the Chebyshev polynomials $P_n(2 \cos \frac{\pi}{k+2}) = \sin(n+1) \frac{\pi}{k+2}$. The field identifications from the common Z_2 center of the coset has allowed us to write (4.1) without a field for the $SU(2)_1$. This center is generated by $(x; y) \mapsto (-x; -y)$ so the fields (4.2) with $r+s$ even are properly invariant. The Verlinde dimensions are given by

$$h_{i_1} \dots i_n i_g^o = \frac{1}{2} h_{i_1} \dots i_n (\epsilon)^{1-g} i_g \quad (4.3)$$

where the right side is computed using the topological LG residue formula (1.3) with the potential (4.1) and the field representations (4.2) with $\epsilon = \epsilon^1 = m-1, m$. The factor of $1/2$ in (4.3) is due to the center mentioned above; the sum over all critical points of W double counts. We properly obtain, for example, $h_{i_g^o} = 1$ and $h_{i_g^o} = m(m-1) = 2$.

5. Counting Instantons with Fusion Residues

Consider perturbing our original theory $W_{N+M+1}^{(N)}$ in X_1 , the most relevant operator. These perturbations were considered in [22] and were shown to be integrable; they describe a new $SU(N+M)$ Toda at an imaginary coupling. From (2.13) the perturbed potential is (with a convenient sign, corresponding to $X_{N+M} = (-1)^{M+1}$)

$$W_{N+M+1}^{(N)}(X_i) + (-1)^N X_1 \quad (5.1)$$

and the chiral primary fields $\phi^{(N)}$ are unchanged by this perturbation. We will show that the topological LG correlation functions of the $\phi^{(N)}$ in the perturbed theory (5.1), computed using (1.3), are the twisted Verlinde dimensions for a RCFT. We then discuss a conjectured connection between these correlation functions and intersections of surfaces in the moduli space of Grassmannian instantons.

The ideal $dW = 0$ of (5.1) gives the deformed cohomology relation $X_N Y_M =$. It is convenient to set $\epsilon = 1$ (the factors of ϵ can be put back in at the end by charge (form) counting). From (2.4) it is seen that $\phi_{+e_N} = X_N$ when ϕ_{+e_N} satisfies (2.3). In terms of Young tableaux, X_N acts on any cohomology element with less than M columns to give

an element with an extra column of N boxes. Likewise, using (2.6), it is easily seen that $Y_M = X_N^{-1}$ acts on any cohomology element with less than N rows in its tableaux to give an element with an extra row of M boxes. We thus obtain for the product of the element X_N with any element

$$X_N \quad = \quad s \quad ; \quad (5.2)$$

where, for any $\quad = \sum_{l=1}^P n_l e_l$,

$$\begin{aligned} s &= \quad + e_0 \quad \text{if } n(\quad) < M \\ s &= \sum_{l=1}^N n_l e_{l-1} \quad \text{if } n(\quad) = M ; \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

where $e_0 = 0$ and $n(\quad)$ is the sum (2.3). The element $s = X_N$, under the ring multiplication, maps any cohomology element to the cohomology element s defined above. In this way, the cohomology elements can be grouped into orbits under the action of s . From (5.3) we have $s^r = \quad_{re_N}$ for $r = 1 :: M$, $s^r = \quad_{M e_{N+M-r}}$ for $r = M :: M + N$. In particular, $s^{N+M} = 1$. Since s has a $Z_{N+M} = SU(N+M)_1$ action, the number of elements in the different s orbits will be divisors of $N+M$. This $SU(N+M)_1$ symmetry of the fusion rules is connected with the affine $SU(N+M)$ description of this theory.

In each s orbit we can pick a convenient element $[\quad]$ to be the orbit base point, the other elements in the orbit are of the form $s^r [\quad]$. Since the cohomology ring is commutative and associative, ring products of the elements $[\quad]$, one for each s orbit, suffice to give the ring multiplication of any two elements:

$$= s^{r+p} (\quad [\quad] \quad [\quad]) :$$

It is convenient to choose our s orbit representatives $[\quad]$ to have $n_N = 0$ (from (5.3) we can clearly make this choice).

If we were to mod out by the s action, we would set $s = X_N = (Y_M)^{-1} = 1$. Setting $X_N = 1$ reduces this theory to the theory discussed in [9] and in the last section. The product of our $n_N = 0$ orbit representatives, upon setting $X_N = 1$, thus satisfy the $SU(N)_M$ fusion rules. The ring structure without setting $s = 1$ is therefore a simple modification of the $SU(N)_M$ fusion rules. The product of any two elements, both with $n_N = 0$, is given by:

$$\quad_1 \quad_2 = \sum_{\quad_3} X \quad N \quad_3 \quad_2 S^{(r(\quad_1)+r(\quad_2)-r(\quad_3))=N} \quad_3 \quad (5.4)$$

where N_{12}^3 are the fusion rules of $SU(N)_M$, $r(\cdot)$ is the form number of \cdot , $r(\cdot) = \sum_{l=1}^{N-1} l n_l$, the powers of s follow from form counting, and $\sum_{i=1}^M e_i = s^{-1}$. In terms of $SU(N)_M$ Young tableaux multiplication, the idea is to replace each column of N boxes with a s rather than with a one, where $s = (\sum_{i=1}^M e_i)^{-1}$. It is thus seen that the deformed cohomology ring products of (5.1) are the fusion rules of a rational conformal field theory. The symmetry of the fusion rules is as discussed in [12]. The topological LG correlation functions (1.3) will give the twisted Verlinde dimensions for this RCFT.

For the CP^1 case ($N=M=1$), this ring deformation is that shown in [4] to arise in topological sigma models with target space CP^1 where $\theta = e^i$ with the coupling in the action to instanton number. It is conjectured [23] that the deformation (5.1) in the Kähler form generally gives the "quantum deformation" of the Grassmannian cohomology ring that arises in topological sigma models with target space the corresponding Grassmannian manifold and with a coupling as described above in the action to instanton number. The conjecture, in other words, is that correlation functions (1.3) in the perturbed topological LG theory (5.1) give information about the intersections of surfaces in the moduli space of Grassmannian instantons (some properties of this moduli space were discussed in [24]).

It is easy to see from charge counting that the correlation functions of the chiral ring elements (2.4) in the topological LG theory with potential (5.1) are given by

$$h_{i_1} \cdots h_{i_n} = F(i_1 \cdots i_n; g; k)^k \quad \text{if } r_T = (N+M)k + (1-g)NM; \quad (5.5)$$

and are zero if the condition on r_T is not satisfied, where $r_T = \sum_{i=1}^n r(i)$ is the total form number. The conjecture is that the coefficients $F(i_1 \cdots i_n; g; k)$ in the above correlation function give the number of intersections of n surfaces in the moduli space of degree k instanton maps from genus g Riemann surfaces into the Grassmannian space $U(N+M)/U(N)U(M)$. The i -th surface is that obtained by requiring the instanton map to satisfy $(z_i)^2 \sim \gamma_i$, where z_i is the i -th arbitrary point on the Riemann surface and where γ_i is a fixed cycle in the Grassmannian which is Poincaré dual to γ_i (e.g. if γ is the volume form, then γ is a point in the Grassmannian). The codimension of the i -th surface is thus $r(i)$. The number of intersections of these surfaces counts the number of instanton maps of a given degree which satisfy the above conditions; these are the observables in the topological sigma model.

A check on the conjecture is that the relation for r_T , the sum of the codimensions of the intersected surfaces, as given by simple charge counting in (5.5) in terms of k and

g , is the correct moduli space dimension [24,25]. It is also encouraging that, since the $F(g;k)$ are the twisted Verlinde dimensions for the RCFT discussed above, the $F(g;k)$ are nonnegative integers.

The correlation functions (5.5) are calculated using (1.3). It is sometimes convenient, as discussed in sect. 2, to calculate in terms of the q_i variables. In these variables, the critical points are simply given by $q_i = \omega^{n_i}$ where $\omega^{N+M} = 1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{N+M} n_i = (N-1)^2$ with $n_i = 1; \dots; N+M$ and $n_i < n_{i+1}$, $i = 1; \dots; N$. The Z_{N+M} structure obtained above is obvious in these variables. The operator h of (1.3) is $h = (\omega)^{N(N-1)/2} (N+M)^N \prod_{i=1}^N q_i^{N+M-1}$. As an example, the interested reader can easily verify our normalization $h|_{\epsilon=0} = 1$.

We now consider the $N=1$, i.e. CP^M , case. The potential (5.1) is

$$W = \frac{x^{M+2}}{M+2} \quad x: \quad (5.6)$$

The ring multiplication, setting $\omega = 1$, are the expected Z_{M+1} rational torus $(SU(M+1)_1)$ fusion rules for $s = x$. The operator h in (1.3) is given by $h = (M+1)x^M = h^0 x^M$ and the correlation functions are the twisted $SU(M+1)_1$ Verlinde dimensions:

$$hx^{r_1} \dots x^{r_n} |_{\epsilon} = (M+1)^{g-k} \quad \text{if} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n r_i = (M+1)k + (1-g)M \quad (5.7)$$

and zero otherwise. We, again, interpret these numbers as representing the number of intersections of n surfaces in the moduli space of degree k instanton maps from the genus g Riemann surface to CP^M where the i -th surface is obtained by requiring the map to take the i -th (arbitrary) point on the Riemann surface to any point which lies in some fixed cycle Poincare dual to x^{r_i} . The above result agrees with the analysis in [4] of CP^1 instantons and with Axelrod's analysis of CP^N instantons [25].

As another example, consider $U(5)=U(3)U(2)$, for which $W = X_1^6 = 6 X_1^4 X_2 + 3 = 2X_1^2 X_2^2 - 1 = 3X_2^3 + X_1$. The $\omega = 1$ RCFT ring relations are given by $\omega_{e_1} \omega_{e_1} = s + s^3 \omega_{e_1}$ with $s^5 = 1$ ($\omega_{e_1} = X_1$ satisfies the $SU(2)_3$ fusion rules modified as discussed above and $s = X_2$). The critical points of W are thus given by $s = \omega^p$ and $s^2 \omega_{e_1} = (\omega^{\frac{p-5}{2}})^2$ with $p = 0; \dots; 4$ and $\omega^5 = 1$. The operator h in (1.3) is as given in (1.7) with $\omega_{\epsilon} = s^3$ and $h^0 = 10 + 5 s^2 \omega_{e_1}$. Using (1.3) we easily calculate, for example, $hx_1^{r_i} |_{\epsilon} = F(g;k) \omega^{-k}$ if $r = 5k + 6(1-g)$ and zero otherwise with

$$F(g;k) = 5 \left(\omega^{\frac{p-5}{2}} \right)^{g-1} \frac{\omega^{\frac{p-5}{2}+1}}{2} \omega^{5(k-g+1)} + (\omega)^k \frac{\omega^{\frac{p-5}{2}}}{2} \omega^{5(k-g+1)}$$

which is a nonnegative integer (note that $F(g;k+2) = 11F(g;k+1) + F(g;k)$ and $F(g+2;k+2) = 125F(g;k)$). It would be interesting to check the conjecture by directly calculating the intersections in the moduli space of instantons for this space. It would also be interesting to connect this with the interpretation in terms of the twisted Verlinde dimensions.

6. Conclusions

We have seen that RCFT fusion rules which can be described as the chiral ring structure constants of some LG superpotential must have an extra symmetry (corresponding to spectral flow) and that the correlation functions in the corresponding topological LG theory give a twisted version of the RCFT's Verlinde dimensions. The symmetry (1.6) of the RCFT fusion rules also implies a symmetry of the deformed superpotential. In both of the perturbations considered here, this symmetry appears to be connected with the fact that the perturbed theories are integrable. It would be interesting to understand if there is a general connection between the integrability of a perturbed superpotential and having its ring give the fusion rules of a rational conformal field theory.

I would like to thank C. Vafa for many valuable suggestions and discussions. This work was also supported by NSF grant PHY-87-14654.

References

- [1] D. Friedan and S. Shenker, Nucl. Phys. B 281 (1987) 509
- [2] E. Verlinde, Nucl. Phys. B 300 (1988) 360
- [3] G. Moore and N. Seiberg, Lectures on RCFT in Superstrings '89 (Trieste proc.) M. Green et. al. (Eds.), World Scientific, and in Physics, Geometry, and Topology (Ban '89 proc.) NATO ASI B238, H.C. Lee (Ed.), Plenum (1990)
- [4] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B 340 (1990) 281
- [5] E. Witten, Commun. Math. Phys. 121 (1989) 351
- [6] M. Spiegelglas, Fusion Rules as Amplitudes in $G=G$ Theories, TECHNION-PH-35-90
- [7] E. Witten, On Holomorphic Factorization of WZW and Coset Models, IASSNS-HEP-91/25
- [8] C. Vafa, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 6 (1991) 337
- [9] D. Gepner, Fusion Rings and Geometry preprint NSF-ITP-90-184
- [10] W. Lerche, C. Vafa, N. Warner, Nucl. Phys. B 324 (1989) 427
- [11] R. Dijkgraaf, E. Verlinde, and H. Verlinde, Nucl. Phys. B 352 (1991) 59
- [12] K. Intriligator, Nucl. Phys. B 332 (1990) 541
- [13] A.N. Schellekens and S. Yankielowicz, Nucl. Phys. B 327 (1989) 673
- [14] J. Fuchs and D. Gepner, Nucl. Phys. B 294 (1987) 30
- [15] J. Fuchs and P. van Driel, Nucl. Phys. B 346 (1990) 632
- [16] R. Bott and L. Wu, Differential Forms in Algebraic Topology, Springer-Verlag (1982); P. Griffith and J. Harris Principles of Algebraic Geometry, J. Wiley and Sons (1978); W. Stoll, Invariant Forms on Grassmann Manifolds, Annals of Mathematics Studies 89, Princeton University Press, 1977
- [17] S. Cecotti and C. Vafa, Topological Anti-Topological Fusion, HUTP-91/A031, SISSA-69/91/EP
- [18] P. Fendley, K. Intriligator, in preparation
- [19] M. Spiegelglas, Setting Fusion Rings in Topological Landau-Ginzburg, TECHNION-PH-8-91
- [20] D. Gepner and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B 278 (1986) 493
- [21] G. Moore, N. Seiberg, Phys. Lett. B 220 (1989) 422
- [22] P. Fendley, W. Lerche, S.D. Mathur and N. Warner, Nucl. Phys. B 348 (1991) 66
- [23] C. Vafa, M. S. R. Conf. on Mirror Symmetry (1991) proceedings
- [24] S. Stromme, "On Parametrized Rational Curves in Grassmann Varieties" in Space Curves, F. Ghione et. al. (Eds.), Springer Verlag Lecture Notes in Mathematics (1987)
- [25] Scott Axelrod, communication