

## Roman Jackiw and Chern-Simons theories

R. D. Pisarski

To be published in "International Congress of Chinese Mathematicians"

October 2021

Physics Department  
**Brookhaven National Laboratory**

**U.S. Department of Energy**  
USDOE Office of Science (SC), Nuclear Physics (NP) (SC-26)

Notice: This manuscript has been authored by employees of Brookhaven Science Associates, LLC under Contract No. DE-SC0012704 with the U.S. Department of Energy. The publisher by accepting the manuscript for publication acknowledges that the United States Government retains a non-exclusive, paid-up, irrevocable, world-wide license to publish or reproduce the published form of this manuscript, or allow others to do so, for United States Government purposes.

## **DISCLAIMER**

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or any third party's use or the results of such use of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof or its contractors or subcontractors. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

# Roman Jackiw and Chern-Simons theories

Robert D. Pisarski<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY 11973*

I recount my personal experience interacting with Roman Jackiw in the 1980's, when we both worked on Chern-Simons theories in three dimensions.

Recently, the Center of Mathematical Sciences and Applications at Harvard initiated an excellent series of talks on Math-Science Literature. In the inaugural talk, S.-T. Yau spoke about S. S. Chern as a great geometer of the 20th century [1]. Particularly in the discussion section after the talk, Prof. Yau emphasized the essential role which Roman Jackiw played in bringing Chern-Simons theories into physics. In this note I wish to share some recollections of mine from those times, and especially my interactions with Roman. I do this because I most strongly agree with Prof. Yau's assessment of Roman's contribution. In this as other areas, Roman's work exhibits both the sheer joy of computation, all while continually pushing to understand the greater significance of what is truly new and exciting.

As a graduate student, with David Gross and Larry Yaffe we computed the fluctuations to one loop order about a single instanton at nonzero temperature [2]. I then went off to Yale University as a postdoc [3], where I worked with Tom Appelquist on gauge theories in three dimensions. Our motivation was to understand the behavior of gauge theories at high temperature, which for the static mode reduces to a gauge theory in three dimensions, and computed the gluon self energy to one and (in part) to two loop order. The gluon self energy isn't gauge invariant, so the greater significance of our analysis wasn't clear. But we also computed in an Abelian theory for a large number of scalars, which is a nice soluble model, and from Tom I learned the most useful craft of power counting diagrams. We concentrated on the gluons, since quarks are fermions, and decouple in the static limit.

Sometime in the fall of 1980, I went to MIT to give a talk on this work. It was a joint seminar with Harvard, and I remember it well to this day. Talks were then on transparencies, and the evening before I thought I would be clever, and added a comment that while topological charge in four dimensions is quantized classically, perhaps it isn't quantum mechanically. Sidney Coleman was sitting near the front, in a purple crushed velvet suit which looked to me like that of some Superfly. When he saw that slide, however, Coleman pounced, and did not let up until my abject surrender, admitting that my suggestion was idiotic.

During the talk and for the entire afternoon after, Roman grilled me about details of the calculation, how gauge theories in three dimensions work, everything. It was very intense and quite exhilarating. Roman and S. Templeton then wrote a paper on theories in three dimensions [4], which because Roman is a superb calculator,

appeared as a preprint a few weeks before ours.

When their paper came out, I remember looking at it, and thinking, ah, very good, they were spending their time on something irrelevant, two component fermions in three dimensions. Now if you forget about nonzero temperature and just do dimensional reduction, the natural thing is to go from four component fermions in four dimensions, to the same in three.

And thus I missed the most important physics, which Roman grasped. The most interesting part of the paper by Jackiw and Templeton appears a bit pedestrian, at the beginning of Sec. III, Eqs. (3.3) and (3.4). Under the Lorentz (or Euclidean) group in three dimensions, all one needs are two component fermions, since the Dirac matrices in three dimensions can just be taken as the Pauli matrices. What I missed is that under the discrete transformations of parity and charge conjugation, that a mass term for a *single* two component fermion is parity *odd*! They noted in Ref. (11) that the dimensional reduction of a four component fermion gives two two-component fermions, which are equal in magnitude, but of opposite sign, and this is how four dimensional fermions retain a parity even mass after dimensional reduction.

Thus while if wasn't present in the original paper by Roman and Templeton, if one computes the gauge self energy for *two*-component fermions in three dimensions, then a parity mass term for the gauge field will appear immediately. *This* is what I missed. Yes, it has nothing to do with nonzero temperature, but so what? It is an absolutely beautiful, novel, and gauge invariant mass term, special to three dimensions.

This was first proposed in two papers by S. Deser, Roman, and Templeton, a Physical Review Letter [5], and a long paper in Annals of Physics [6]. The year before, Jonathan Schonfeld has proposed the same theory [7, 8].

What Deser, Roman, and Templeton realized, however, which Schonfeld did not, is that there is something extraordinary about a non-Abelian Chern-Simons term [9]: the ratio of the Chern-Simons mass term to the gauge coupling is an integer,

$$q = \frac{4\pi m}{g^2} = \text{integer} , \quad (1)$$

where  $m$  is the Chern-Simons mass, and  $g^2$  is the coupling constant for the non-Abelian gauge theory. This quantization of the topological ratio  $q$  follows from invariance under large and topologically nontrivial gauge transformations, as the Chern-Simons term is related to the topological charge in four dimensions.

For years I didn't believe this result; it just seemed so *simple*, how could it possibly be right? Anyway, I went off in other directions. When I was at Fermilab, however, with Sumathi Rao we thought that if one computes perturbatively, as an expansion in  $g^2/m$ , then to one loop order the result will be a pure number, independent of  $g^2$  or  $m$ . And *surely* perturbation theory can't know about large gauge transformations, right?

Rao and I did the computation to one loop order by brute force, which was not trivial. We had to sort out differences with the previous results of Deser, Roman, and Templeton [6].

In the end, by computing a ratio of (finite) renormalization constants, we discovered that in a  $SU(N)$  gauge theory the topological ratio shifts as

$$q \rightarrow q + N . \quad (2)$$

That is, even perturbation theory knows about large gauge transformations! This is an example of how in physics, one can do good things for all the wrong reasons. I set out to prove that Roman was wrong, and instead, completely confirmed his results in a most beautiful and unexpected way.

I continued working on Chern-Simons theories, considering the effects of magnetic monopoles [10] and at nonzero temperature [11]. Magnetic monopoles have unusual effects: for example, the topological ratio is quantized even in the Abelian theory. At nonzero temperature, I showed that the topological ratio remains quantized [12].

However, this was the time of the Second String Revolution, and my work had little impact upon the field. Except for Roman, who would include me in correspondence to others working in the field, such as Andrei Linde and Oleg Kalashnikov. I include copies of these letters in the figures below. The most important quote is from Roman, which unfortunately is partially obscured by a marker I used on the original. He wrote:

*The gauge-invariant mass term that we have discovered may in fact provide the correct infra-red regulation at high*

*temperatures. At present we do not see how it can be derived from the four-dimensional high-temperature theory: perhaps it has its origin in the  $\theta FF$  term. I would be very interested in any comments you may have about this.*

I do not understand how a Chern-Simons mass term in three dimensions can arise from a  $\theta$  term in four dimensions, but that is really besides the point. Roman's work illustrates the virtue of following things where they lead. Don't solve the problem you want to solve, solve the problem waiting to be solved.

In 1988, Edward Witten did his magisterial work on the relationship between Chern-Simons theories and the Jones polynomial [13]. Along the way, almost as an aside, he derived the shift in the topological ratio  $q$ . The work by Rao and I had so little impact upon the field that Alvarez-Baume, Labastida, and Ramallo [14], and Chen, Semenoff, and Wu [15], were completely unaware of ours. In writing this article, I was rather amused to see that the shift in the topological ratio  $q$  was later derived by two mathematicians, Axelrod and Singer, using perturbative means [16]!

I close with a personal comment. After Fermilab I went to the High Energy Theory Group at Brookhaven. Years after I was hired, Bill Marciano mentioned to me once that Roman had most strongly supported my hire. Of course this wasn't the only support I had: surely kind words from my advisor David Gross, from Tom Appelquist, and from Larry McLerran [17], amongst others, helped. Nevertheless, I was most struck by Bill's comment. In a very real sense, a good part of why I have been blessed to pursue this bizarre and ahuman activity which is theoretical physics is due to Roman. This note is my way of thanking him.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy under contract DE-SC0012704 and the Office of Science National Quantum Information Science Research Centers under the award for the "Co-design Center for Quantum Advantage".

- 
- [1] Shing-Tung Yau, "Shiing-Shen Chern as a Great Geometer of 20th Century," (2020).
  - [2] David J. Gross, Robert D. Pisarski, and Laurence G. Yaffe, "QCD and Instantons at Finite Temperature," *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **53**, 43 (1981).
  - [3] I was a J. W. Gibbs Fellow, in fact the last. Since much of my career after working on Chern-Simons theories was devoted to the statistical mechanics of non-Abelian gauge theories, I am especially proud to have associated, in some way, with the first great American theoretical physicist. At Yale, they had a large model of the phase diagram of water, about  $3' \times 3' \times 2'$ , which Gibbs had had carved in wood.
  - [4] R. Jackiw and S. Templeton, "How Superrenormalizable Interactions Cure their Infrared Divergences," *Phys. Rev. D* **23**, 2291 (1981).
  - [5] Stanley Deser, R. Jackiw, and S. Templeton, "Three-Dimensional Massive Gauge Theories," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **48**, 975-978 (1982).
  - [6] Stanley Deser, R. Jackiw, and S. Templeton, "Topologically Massive Gauge Theories," *Annals Phys.* **140**, 372-411 (1982), [Erratum: *Annals Phys.* 185, 406 (1988)].
  - [7] Jonathan F. Schonfeld, "A Mass Term for Three-Dimensional Gauge Fields," *Nucl. Phys. B* **185**, 157-171 (1981).

- [8] Incidentally, when I was considering where to go to graduate school, I met Jonathan, who was then a graduate student with David Gross, and spent a long afternoon talking about solitons and other things. Jonathan had a most infectious enthusiasm which cemented my decision to go to Princeton.
- [9] Back then we used the term topologically massive, but here I refer to the mass term as Chern-Simons, since S. S. Chern and J. Simons did invent it first.
- [10] Robert D. Pisarski, “Magnetic Monopoles in Topologically Massive Gauge Theories,” *Phys. Rev. D* **34**, 3851 (1986).
- [11] Robert D. Pisarski, “Topologically Massive Chromodynamics at Finite Temperature,” *Phys. Rev. D* **35**, 664 (1987).
- [12] I was confused at to whether the quantization of  $q$  persists, and called Karen Uhlenbeck. Once I explained my problem, she immediately dispelled my doubts. As a physicist, I was thinking of large gauge transformations at spatial infinity: on  $R^3$  at zero temperature, and on  $R^2 \times S^1$  at nonzero temperature. Uhlenbeck pointed out that one should think of a compact manifold, so  $S^3$  at zero temperature, and  $S^2 \times S^1$  at nonzero temperature.
- Instead of spatial infinity, topological charge is then concentrated about a pinprick in the manifold. While reassured, I felt like the police officer in the movie *Ghost Dog: The Way of the Samurai*.
- [13] Edward Witten, “Quantum Field Theory and the Jones Polynomial,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **121**, 351–399 (1989).
- [14] Luis Alvarez-Gaume, J.M.F. Labastida, and A.V. Rammallo, “A Note on Perturbative Chern-Simons Theory,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **334**, 103–124 (1990).
- [15] Wei Chen, G.W. Semenoff, and Yong-Shi Wu, “Probing Topological Features in Perturbative {Chern-Simons} Gauge Theory,” *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **5**, 1833–1840 (1990).
- [16] S. Axelrod and I.M. Singer, “Chern-Simons perturbation theory,” in *International Conference on Differential Geometric Methods in Theoretical Physics* (1991) pp. 3–45, arXiv:hep-th/9110056.
- [17] While at Fermilab, Larry and Peter Arnold developed their analysis of sphaleron transitions, and I spent many hours arguing with them, convinced that they were wrong. As with the quantization of the topological charge, again it was I who erred.

АКАДЕМИЯ НАУК СОЮЗА ССР  
 ФИЗИЧЕСКИЙ ИНСТИТУТ имени П. Н. ЛЕБЕДЕВА  
 Москва, Ленинский проспект, 25

ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OF THE USSR  
 P. N. LEBEDEV PHYSICAL INSTITUTE  
 Moscow, Leningkiy prospect, 25, USSR.

Prof. R. Jackiw  
 Center for Theoretical Physics  
 Laboratory for Nuclear Science and  
 Department of Physics  
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
 Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139  
 USA

25 December 1980

Dear Professor Jackiw,  
 Thank you very much for your preprint with Templeton,  
 I study it now with a great interest. I am happy that you  
 investigate now the problems, which are important for the ther-  
 modynamics of the Yang-Mills gas. This problem is very interest-  
 ing for me. Indeed, as it was shown in my papers Rep. Progr. Phys.  
 42 (1979) 389 and Phys. Lett. 96 (1980) 289, 293 (see also a large  
 recent preprint by Gross, Pisarski and Yaffe), infrared problem in  
 thermodynamics of the Yang-Mills gas at any temperature, at which  
 gluons may be considered as free interacting particles (not only  
 near the critical temperature), is connected with the 3-dimensio-  
 nal Yang-Mills theory, and that an infrared cutoff (or instability)  
 may appear at momenta  $|p^2| \sim g^2 T^2$  (at  $|p^2| \sim g^2$  in the 3-di-  
 mensional theory). Understanding of the infrared behaviour of  
 thermodynamics of the Yang-Mills gas is very important for the  
 solution of the primordial monopole problem in grand unified  
 theories, and I expect that there will be much work in this di-  
 rection.

It might be of some interest for you that this problem has  
 been studied also by O.K. Kalashnikov and V.V. Klimov from our  
 institute. In particular in their preprint No 129 (1980) they  
 have obtained the term  $-g^2 C(-p^2)^2$  coinciding with the correspond-  
 ing term in your eq. (4.14a) and in a recent preprint No 195  
 by O.K. Kalashnikov some part of the term  $O(g^4)$  different from  
 that given in (4.14a) was obtained. I will inform them about  
 your work, and they will send you their preprints. Unfortunately  
 all these results are not quite informative in the most interesting

FIG. 1. Letter from A. Linde to Roman, Dec. 25, 1980

АКАДЕМИЯ НАУК СОЮЗА ССР  
 ФИЗИЧЕСКИЙ ИНСТИТУТ имени П. Н. ЛЕБЕДЕВА  
 Москва, Ленинский проспект, 25

ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OF THE USSR  
 P. N. LEBEDEV PHYSICAL INSTITUTE  
 Moscow, Leningkiy prospect, 25, USSR.

R. Jackiw  
 Center for Theoretical Physics  
 Department of Physics  
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
 Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

O.K. Kalashnikov  
 I.E. Tamm Department  
 of Theoretical Physics  
 P.N. Lebedev Physical  
 Institute

30.12. 1980

Dear Professor Jackiw,  
 Recently we have had an opportunity of acquainting with  
 your work "How super-renormalizable interactions cure their  
 infrared divergences", November, 1980 and have found it very  
 interesting. In particular we are interested in your study of  
 the 3-dimensional QED. As for the 3-dimensional Yang-Mills  
 theory we would like to inform you that starting with 1979 we,  
 too, are carrying out the investigations of the infrared beha-  
 viour of the finite-temperature Yang-Mills theory which is de-  
 termined by the 3-dimensional theory. Some of the results ob-  
 tained in your work overlap with those found earlier by us  
 and published as: O.K. Kalashnikov and V.V. Klimov, Lebedev Phys.  
 Inst. preprint No 129, July 1980 (Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR 253 (1981) 595).  
 More specifically, in these papers we obtained one-loop ex-  
 pressions (eqs. (2.9) and (3.5)) which are in agreement  
 with your results (eqs. 4.9a) and (4.9b)). As for the higher  
 approximations we think that your equation (4.14) is not valid  
 at  $p^2 < g^2$  and therefore it cannot be associated with the  
 infrared behaviour of the Yang-Mills theory. We do not see,  
 either, how your equation (4.10) can be put in accord with  
 the Slavnov-Taylor identities.

To our opinion eq. (4.10) should not be solved by itera-  
 tions but rather in a bootstrap way like it was done in  
 paper: O.K. Kalashnikov, Lebedev Phys. Inst. preprint No 195,  
 November 1980 (Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz; Pis'ma 20(18) No 2)  
 what resulted in

We hope that you will make acquaintance with our works  
 and will bear them in mind. We would appreciate very much in  
 future exchanging information and preprints on the work in  
 this field.


Very sincerely yours  
  
 O.K. Kalashnikov

FIG. 2. Letter from O. Kalashnikov to Roman, Dec. 30, 1980.

АКАДЕМИЯ НАУК СОЮЗА ССР  
 ФИЗИЧЕСКИЙ ИНСТИТУТ имени П. Н. ЛЕБЕДЕВА  
 Москва, Ленинский проспект, 25

ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OF THE USSR  
 P. N. LEBEDEV PHYSICAL INSTITUTE  
 Moscow, Leningky prospect, 25, USSR.

Prof. T. Appelquist  
 Prof. R. D. Pisarski,  
 J. W. Gibbs Laboratory of Physics,  
 Yale University,  
 New Haven, Connecticut 06520  
 USA

23 January 1980

Dear Professors Appelquist and Pisarski,

Thank you very much for your paper "Hot Yang-Mills Theories..." This paper is very interesting for me and contains a lot of new results. However I disagree with your objections to my work on the monopole confinement and with your interpretation of the magnetic screening.

Indeed, topological arguments are absolutely unnecessary to prove magnetic confinement. The only thing which is necessary is to prove that the monopole creates some massive field  $H_i^a$ , which satisfies eq.  $\partial_i H_i^a = 0$  and has nonvanishing energy (see my paper Phys. Lett. 96 (1980) 293). For quasibelian monopoles (sources of the magnetic fields with only one isotopic component  $H_i^a$  for each unbroken subgroup in some gauge) this field is just the "short" magnetic field  $H_i^a = \sum_{jk} \epsilon_{ijk} (\partial_j A_k^a - \partial_k A_j^a)$  (without  $\vec{A} \times \vec{A}$ ). Indeed, if  $A_\mu^a$  is massive, then  $H_i^a$  is also massive, eq.  $\partial_i H_i^a = 0$  is an identity, and it can be shown that the energy of the tube of this field is nonvanishing. This proves confinement of such monopoles.

Eq.  $\partial_i H_i^a = 0$  for "short" magnetic field does not hold only if this field is singular. Therefore magnetic field  $H_i^a$  actually can be screened by singular sources of the magnetic field, e.g. by Hooft-Polyakov monopoles (in the unitary gauge they are singular) or by Wu-Yang monopoles. However singular Wu-Yang monopoles have infinite energy, they are not sourceless, and their sources are not even distributions.

FIG. 3. Letter from A. Linde to Tom Appelquist and myself, Jan. 23, 1981.

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY  
 DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS  
 CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS 02139

4 February, 1981

Dr. O. Kalashnikov, Dr. V. Klimov,  
 and Dr. A. Linde  
 P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute  
 Moscow  
 Leninsky prospect 53  
 USSR

Dear Kalashnikov, Klimov and Linde:

Thank you very much for your letters of 25 and 30 December, as well as for the preprints #129 and #195. I have read them all, and also passed them to my colleague, Templeton. Now I wish to make the following comments.

The main purpose of our paper has perhaps been misunderstood. We are not primarily studying finite-temperature field theories, rather we are considering super-renormalizable, for the most part three-dimensional, models. That is why we include Fermions in the QED and QCD examples (c.f. our comments on p. 2). Of course we are aware that such three-dimensional models are relevant to the high-temperature limit of four-dimensional theories. This I consider part of common physics knowledge, as also the fact that three-dimensional massless theories are infra-red divergent. I am happy to know that Linde noted this as well, and we shall be pleased to reference the Rep. Progr. Phys. review.

— We agree that our results are informative only in the region  $\sqrt{-p^2} \gg e^2$  (c.f. discussion on pp. 18, 25, 29 and 31). Indeed the detailed and lengthy analysis of pp. 17-21, is necessitated by our desire to use only reliable, large  $p$  results in the computation. Consequently we believe that the calculation of the coefficient of the logarithm is entirely reliable and our principal contribution, which is not found in your papers, is the establishment of this logarithmic effect.

It is good to know that we agree on the vacuum polarization magnitude, though I view it as a merely technical calculation which is preliminary to the principal purpose of finding the logarithm. [However, I have some difficulty with your numbers:

FIG. 4. Letter from Roman to A. Linde and O. Kalashnikov, Feb. 4, 1981.