PHYSICS LETTERS

## CONFINEMENT IN TWO-DIMENSIONAL MODELS WITH FACTORIZATION

M. KAROWSKI, V. KURAK<sup>1</sup> and B. SCHROER

Institut für Theoretische Physik, Freie Universität Berlin, D-1000 Berlin 33, Arnimallee 3-5, Germany

Received 3 November 1978

We show that the particle triplet of the O(3)  $\sigma$ -model can be obtained from the SU(2) bound state model by letting the (quark) mass of the fundamental particle approach infinity.

By now one has a rather rich supply of two-dimensional field theories with an infinite number of conservation laws. The massive Thirring model [1], the O(n) nonlinear  $\sigma$ -model [2], the Gross-Neveu model [3], and their supersymmetric generalizations [4] have been studied by various authors, and there can be no serious doubt that in due time one will obtain all the generalized form factors and, hence, the correlation functions [5]. For the Gross-Neveu model in which the Lagrangians contain O(n) fields (n > 2), there are more fundamental objects [6] which transform with respect to the universal (two-fold) covering spin (n)-group. In this case a lagrangian formulation of the internal spin (n) particles as fundamental fields has not yet been constructed, however the form of the factorizing kink S-matrix was recently suggested [6]. This state of affairs leads to the question whether certain models without such particles in the covering representation, for example the  $O(n) \sigma$ -model studied by Zamolodchikov, can be interpreted as a "confinement" of these particles. A suggestion in favour for such an interpretation comes from a recent paper of Lüscher [7,8] who showed that the  $CP^{n-1}$   $\sigma$ -models, i.e. the  $\sigma$ -models for the adjoint representation of SU(n), have a lagrangian formulation in terms of a gauge theory. The long-range nature of the (composite) gauge field leads to  $\theta$ -vacua and confinement of the fundamental SU(n) field, so that only the adjoint representation particles survive. The O(3)  $\sigma$ -model is a special case in this class of models. We demonstrate in the following that all factorizing U(2) S-matrices with a meson bound state yield the O(3)  $\sigma$ -model S-matrix as the quark mass becomes infinitely heavy. In this limit the adjoint representation decouples completely other states.

There are several classes of U(2) S-matrices. The simplest one is the class II [9] using the language of Berg, Karowski, Weisz, and Kurak. The S-matrix in that class has the form (we take Bose-statistics)

$$S|\alpha(\theta_1)\beta(\theta_2)|^{\text{in}} = |\alpha(\theta_1)\beta(\theta_2)|^{\text{in}} u_1(\theta_{12}) + |\beta(\theta_1)\alpha(\theta_2)|^{\text{in}} u_2(\theta_{12}), \qquad (1a)$$

$$S|\alpha(\theta_1)\overline{\beta}(\theta_2)\rangle^{\text{in}} = |\alpha(\theta_1)\overline{\beta}(\theta_2)\rangle^{\text{in}} t_1(\theta_{12}) + \delta_{\alpha\beta} \sum_{\gamma} |\gamma(\theta_1)\overline{\gamma}(\theta_2)\rangle^{\text{in}} t_2(\theta_{12}), \qquad (1b)$$

 $\theta_i$  = rapidity. The  $t_2$  and  $u_1$  are related to  $t_1$  as follows:

$$t_2(\varphi) = \frac{1}{\varphi - 1} t_1(\varphi), \quad u_1(\varphi) = t_1(1 - \varphi), \quad u_2(\varphi) = -\frac{1}{\varphi} t_1(1 - \varphi), \quad (2a)$$

$$t_1^{\min}(\varphi) = \left[ \Gamma(1/2 + \varphi/2) \, \Gamma(1 - \varphi/2) \right] / \left[ \Gamma(1/2 - \varphi/2) \, \Gamma(1 + \varphi/2) \right] \,. \tag{2b}$$

Here we traded the rapidity for the more convenient  $\varphi = \theta/i\pi$ .

<sup>1</sup> Supported by DFG contract Az 160/5.

200

Volume 81B, number 2

PHYSICS LETTERS

12 February 1979

(4)

The  $t_1$  which defines our model is not the minimal one, but rather has a pole at say  $\varphi = \alpha$ ,  $0 < \alpha < 1$ 

$$t_1(\varphi) = t_1^{\min}(\varphi) \left[\sin \pi \varphi + \sin \pi \alpha\right] / \left[\sin \pi \varphi - \sin \pi \alpha\right].$$
(3)

This pole appears in the triplet  $t_1$  as well as in the singlet  $t_1 + 2t_2$  amplitude.

Following the derivation of the breather-breather scattering in the massive Thirring model [10], we write (suppressing the rapidity arguments which are assumed to have the canonical ordering  $\theta_1 > \theta_2 > \theta_3 > \theta_4$ )

$$S|\alpha\overline{\beta}\gamma\overline{\delta}\rangle = S_{23}S_{13}S_{24}S_{14}S_{12}S_{34}|\alpha\overline{\beta}\gamma\overline{\delta}\rangle.$$

The two-particle S-matrix for scattering of bound states (" $\pi^i$  and  $\eta$ -mesons") is [11]

$$S(\theta) = (P_{12}^{\pi} + P_{12}^{\eta}/r) (P_{34}^{\pi} + P_{34}^{\eta}/r) S_{23} S_{13} S_{24} S_{14} (P_{12}^{\pi} + r P_{12}^{\eta}) (P_{34}^{\pi} + r P_{34}^{\eta}) , \qquad (5)$$

where  $P_{ik}^{\pi}$  and  $P_{ik}^{\eta}$  are the projectors on the singlet and triplet states, respectively, of momenta  $p_i$  and  $p_k$ . The number r is given by the ratio of the residue of the singlet and triplet amplitudes

$$r = \left[ (-t_1 + 2t_2)/t_1 \right]^{1/2} |_{\varphi = \alpha} = \left[ (1+\alpha)/(1-\alpha) \right]^{1/2}.$$
(5a)

The rapidities of the constituent are determined by  $\theta_1 - \theta_2 = \theta_3 - \theta_4 = i\pi\alpha$  and  $\theta_1 + \theta_2 - \theta_3 - \theta_4 = \theta$  ( $\theta_1 + \theta_2$ ,  $\theta_3 + \theta_4$  real).

From this expression one may now compute

$$\langle \pi^k \pi^l | S | \pi^i \pi^j \rangle, \quad \langle \eta \eta | S | \eta \eta \rangle, \quad \langle \eta \eta | S | \pi^i \pi^j \rangle,$$
(6)

with

$$|\pi^{i}\rangle = \frac{1}{2} \left[ |\alpha(\theta_{1})\overline{\beta}(\theta_{2})\rangle - |\overline{\beta}(\theta_{1})\alpha(\theta_{2})\rangle \right] \tau^{i}_{\alpha\beta}, \quad |\eta\rangle = \frac{1}{2} \left[ |\alpha(\theta_{1})\overline{\alpha}(\theta_{2})\rangle + |\overline{\alpha}(\theta_{1})\alpha(\theta_{2})\rangle \right].$$
(7)

The last amplitude contains a factor  $r^{-2}$ . Since r approaches infinity for  $\alpha \to 1$ , the triplet-triplet scattering decouples from the singlet states, i.e. the former sub-S-matrix becomes unitary. Note that  $\alpha \to 1$  means that  $m_{\text{quark}}/m_{\text{meson}} \to \infty$ , a limit in which the U(2)-S-matrix looses its wave packet, i.e. Hilbert-space interpretation, however the new triplet-triplet S-matrix retains it. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 4\langle \pi^{k}\pi^{l}|S|\pi^{i}\pi^{j}\rangle &= t_{1}u_{1}u_{1}t_{1}\operatorname{tr}(\tau^{i}\tau^{k})\operatorname{tr}(\tau^{j}\tau^{l}) + t_{1}u_{2}u_{2}t_{1}\operatorname{tr}(\tau^{j}\tau^{k})\operatorname{tr}(\tau^{i}\tau^{l}) + t_{2}u_{1}u_{1}t_{2}\operatorname{tr}(\tau^{j}\tau^{k})\operatorname{tr}(\tau^{i}\tau^{l}) \\ &+ t_{2}u_{1}u_{1}t_{1}\operatorname{tr}(\tau^{l}\tau^{j}\tau^{i}\tau^{k}) + t_{1}u_{2}u_{1}t_{1}\operatorname{tr}(\tau^{k}\tau^{i}\tau^{l}\tau^{j}) + t_{1}u_{1}u_{2}t_{1}\operatorname{tr}(\tau^{k}\tau^{j}\tau^{i}\tau^{l}) \\ &+ t_{2}u_{2}u_{2}t_{1}\operatorname{tr}(\tau^{k}\tau^{l}\tau^{i}\tau^{j}) + t_{1}u_{1}u_{1}t_{2}\operatorname{tr}(\tau^{k}\tau^{i}\tau^{j}\tau^{l}) + t_{2}u_{2}u_{1}t_{2}\operatorname{tr}(\tau^{k}\tau^{l}\tau^{i}\tau^{j}) \\ &+ t_{2}u_{1}u_{2}t_{2}\operatorname{tr}(\tau^{k}\tau^{l}\tau^{i}\tau^{j}) + t_{1}u_{2}u_{2}t_{2}\operatorname{tr}(\tau^{k}\tau^{l}\tau^{i}\tau^{j}) + t_{2}u_{2}u_{2}t_{2}\operatorname{tr}(\tau^{k}\tau^{l}\tau^{i}\tau^{j}) \\ &+ t_{2}u_{1}u_{2}t_{2}\operatorname{tr}(\tau^{k}\tau^{l}\tau^{i}\tau^{j}) + t_{1}u_{2}u_{2}t_{2}\operatorname{tr}(\tau^{k}\tau^{l}\tau^{i}\tau^{j}) + 2t_{2}u_{2}u_{2}t_{2}\operatorname{tr}(\tau^{k}\tau^{l}\tau^{i}\tau^{j}) . \end{aligned}$$

The arguments are from the left to the right:  $\varphi - 1$ ,  $\varphi$ ,  $\varphi$ ,  $\varphi + 1$ . For the coefficient of  $\delta_{ik}\delta_{jl}$  we obtain (using eq. (2))

$$t_{1}(\varphi-1)t_{1}(1-\varphi)t_{1}(1-\varphi)t_{1}(\varphi+1)\frac{1}{2}\left[2-\frac{1}{2-\varphi}-\frac{1}{\varphi}-\frac{1}{2-\varphi}\frac{1}{\varphi^{2}}-\frac{1}{\varphi^{3}}+\frac{1}{2-\varphi}\frac{1}{\varphi^{3}}\right].$$
(9)

With [9]

$$t_1(1-\varphi)t_1(\varphi-1) = 1, \quad t_1(1-\varphi)t_1(1+\varphi) = \frac{\varphi^2}{(\varphi^2-1)},$$
 (10)

we obtain the Zamolodchikov's [2] coefficient

$$\sigma_2 = -\frac{\varphi}{2-\varphi}\frac{\varphi-1}{\varphi+1}\,. \tag{11}$$

Similarly the coefficient of  $\delta_{ik}\delta_{ik}$  turns out to be

201

Volume 81B, number 2

PHYSICS LETTERS

$$t_{1}(\varphi-1)t_{1}(1-\varphi)t_{1}(1-\varphi)t_{1}(\varphi+1)\frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{2}{\varphi^{2}}+\frac{1}{2-\varphi}-\frac{3}{\varphi}+\frac{1}{2-\varphi}\frac{1}{\varphi^{2}}+\frac{1}{\varphi^{3}}-\frac{2}{2-\varphi}\frac{1}{\varphi^{3}}\right]$$

$$=-(2/\varphi)\sigma_{2},$$
(12)

which checks with the known result [2]. The coefficient of 
$$\delta_{ij}\delta_{kl}$$
 is related to eq. (13) by crossing symmetry.

This S-matrix approach does not shine any light on the possible lagrangian field theory of our non-confining  $\alpha < 1$  model from which we started our discussion. It is believed that the  $\alpha \rightarrow 1$  limit of the unknown model is the confining  $CP^1$ -model studied by Lüscher. This model is a special case of the  $CP^{n-1}$  model which is formally equivalent to the "idempotent"  $\sigma$ -model studied in its classical version by Eichenherr [12]. It has been recently demonstrated by Berg and Weisz [13] that the only factorizing type of adjoint SU(n) representation  $\sigma$ -model reduces to the  $O(n^2 - 1) \sigma$ -model. In a subsequent paper we will return to the confinement mechanism for SU(n)  $n \ge 3$ . Since Lagrangian's  $CP^{n-1}$  model at least on a superficial level seems to be different from the  $O(n^2 - 1)$  model, one may indulge in the interesting speculation that the former model, which has infinitely many conservation laws, is the first example of a non-factorizing dynamical system.

We are very thankful to Bernd Berg and Peter Weisz for many illuminating discussions. We are also indebted to Klaus Rothe.

## References

- [1] A.B. Zamolodchikov, Pisma v JETP 25 (1977) 499;
- M. Karowski, H.J. Thun, T.T. Truong and P. Weisz, Phys. Lett. 67B (1977) 321.
- [2] A.B. Zamolodchikov and Al.B. Zamolodchikov, Nucl. Phys. 133B (1975) 525.
- [3] A.B. Zamolodchikov and Al.B. Zamolodchikov, Phys. Lett. 72B (1978) 481.
- [4] E. Witten and R. Shankar, Harvard preprint HUTP 77/AD76 (1977); See also P. Di Vecchia and S. Ferrara, Nucl. Phys. 130B (1977) 93.
- [5] For the Ising model this construction was shown to lead to the known field theory of this model, B. Berg, M. Karowski and P. Weisz, FU preprint 78/16.
- [6] E. Witten and R. Shankar, Yale Univ. preprint 5/78.
- [7] M. Lüscher, preprint NBI-HE-78-9.
- [8] A. D'Adda, M. Lüscher and P. di Vecchia, Copenhagen preprint August 1978.
- [9] B. Berg, M. Karowski, V. Kurak and P. Weisz, Nucl. Phys. 134B (1978) 125.
- [10] M. Karowski and H.J. Thun, Nucl. Phys. B130 (1977) 295;
  - A.B. Zamolodchikov, Moscow preprint ITEP-12 (1977).
- [11] M. Karowski, to be published.
- [12] H. Eichenherr, Freiburg preprint.
- [13] B. Berg and P. Weisz, FU-Berlin preprint August 78/18.