

**TWO-DIMENSIONAL QUANTUM FIELD MODELS
(WITH APPLICATIONS TO LATTICE STATISTICAL
MECHANICS)**

P. FALCO

ABSTRACT. Two dimensional toy models display, in a gentler setting, many salient aspects of Quantum Field Theory. Here I discuss a concrete two dimensional case, the Thirring model, which illustrates several important concepts of this theory: the anomalous dimension of the fields; the exact solvability; the anomalies of the Ward-Takahashi identities. Besides, I give a glimpse of the decisive role that this model plays in the study of an apparently unrelated topic: correlation critical exponents of two dimensional lattice systems of Statistical Mechanics.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Thirring model [1] is a toy model for a self-interacting 2-dimensional relativistic fermion field. An enormous number of articles in the physical and mathematical literatures testify its importance in the study of Quantum Field Theory (QFT).

In the first part of this review I will deal with physicists' conjectures (Sec. 2.1 and 2.2) and mathematical results (Sec 2.3) about the two most salient features of this model: the *bosonization* of the currents; the *exact solvability* of the massless case. In the second part (Sec. 3), I will discuss a third, less known, aspect: the Thirring model is the *scaling limit* of several lattice models of Statistical Mechanics. In prospective, I consider this latter feature as one of the most promising tool for the study of critical exponents in two dimensional Statistical Mechanics.

2. THIRRING MODEL

Spacetime is two-dimensional, $\mathbf{x} := (x_0, x_1)$ and, following physicists' conventions, a repeated index μ implies a sum over $\mu = 0, 1$. Put $\gamma^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\gamma^1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}$; let $\not{\partial} := \gamma^\mu \partial^\mu$ be the Dirac operator; and let $\bar{\psi}_{\mathbf{x}} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\psi}_{\mathbf{x},+} \\ \bar{\psi}_{\mathbf{x},-} \end{pmatrix}$ and $\psi_{\mathbf{x}} = (\psi_{\mathbf{x},+}, \psi_{\mathbf{x},-})$ be two-components anticommuting vector fields. Given two real parameters, the coupling constant λ and the mass m , the Euclidean Thirring Lagrangian is

$$(1) \quad \int d^2\mathbf{x} \bar{\psi}_{\mathbf{x}}(i \not{\partial} + m)\psi_{\mathbf{x}} + \frac{\lambda}{4} \int d^2\mathbf{x} (\bar{\psi}_{\mathbf{x}}\gamma^\mu\psi_{\mathbf{x}})(\bar{\psi}_{\mathbf{x}}\gamma^\mu\psi_{\mathbf{x}}) .$$

Let us consider separately the exact solvability and the bosonization.

Key words and phrases. Osterwalder-Schrader axioms, exact solutions, bosonization, Ward-Takahashi identities, anomalies, Ising model, Eight-Vertex model, Ashkin-Teller model.

2.1. Massless Thirring model: the formal exact solution. The sequence of early attempts at an exact solution of the massless model is quite an instructive piece of history of QFT[2]. At first, several scholars “derived” different sets of explicit formulas for all the Schwinger functions; however “. . . it was not clear which of the many partly contradictory equations written by the various authors were true and which false.”[2]. In this confusing status, the model fell into disrepute; until Johnson[3] was finally able to propose formulas for the two and the four points functions that were not susceptible to objections. Johnson’s two points function is

$$(2) \quad \frac{1}{Z} \langle \psi_{\mathbf{x}} \bar{\psi}_0 \rangle = C \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{x_0 + ix_1} |\mathbf{x}|^{-\eta} \\ \frac{1}{x_0 - ix_1} |\mathbf{x}|^{-\eta} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where C and η are constants; while Z is the *wave function renormalization*, i.e. an infinite or zero factor that one has to divide out in the end of the derivation in order to get a finite, non-identically vanishing, outcome.

Johnson’s approach was only partially a derivation; it was mostly a self-consistency argument. In principle (2) should be the solution of the integral equation which is obtained by plugging the Ward-Takahashi Identities (WTI) into the Schwinger-Dyson Equation (SDE). In actuality this method has a problem: if $J_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mu} := \bar{\psi}_{\mathbf{x}} \gamma^{\mu} \psi_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $J_{5,\mathbf{x}}^{\mu} := \bar{\psi}_{\mathbf{x}} \gamma^5 \gamma^{\mu} \psi_{\mathbf{x}}$ for $\gamma^5 = i\gamma^0 \gamma^1$, the *formal* WTI are

$$(3) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{Z} i \partial_{\mathbf{z}}^{\mu} \langle J_{\mathbf{z}}^{\mu} \psi_{\mathbf{x}} \bar{\psi}_{\mathbf{y}} \rangle &= \frac{a}{Z} [\delta(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}) - \delta(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y})] \langle \psi_{\mathbf{x}} \bar{\psi}_{\mathbf{y}} \rangle \\ \frac{1}{Z} i \partial_{\mathbf{z}}^{\mu} \langle J_{5,\mathbf{z}}^{\mu} \psi_{\mathbf{x}} \bar{\psi}_{\mathbf{y}} \rangle &= \frac{\bar{a}}{Z} [\delta(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}) - \delta(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y})] \gamma^5 \langle \psi_{\mathbf{x}} \bar{\psi}_{\mathbf{y}} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

with $a = \bar{a} = 1$; but then, plugging them into the SDE, one would obtain an integral equation that is solved by (2) with $\eta = 0$. Namely, one would arrive at the odd conclusion that the Thirring model, which is an interacting field theory, has the same two points function of the free field theory! Johnson’s idea was to allow for $a \neq 1$ and $\bar{a} \neq 1$, so that, after *formal operations with infinities*, he obtained (2), with

$$\eta = \frac{\lambda}{4\pi} (a - \bar{a}) .$$

a and \bar{a} are then fixed by consistency with the formula for the four points function: for $\nu = -\bar{\nu} = \frac{\lambda}{4\pi}$,

$$(4) \quad a = \frac{1}{1 - \nu} \quad \bar{a} = \frac{1}{1 - \bar{\nu}} .$$

Finally, Hagen[4] (by Johnson’s method) and Klaiber[5] (by a different ansatz), found the explicit formulas for all the n -points Schwinger functions.¹ The only non-zero ones are

$$(5) \quad \frac{1}{Z^n} \langle \psi_{\mathbf{x}_1, \omega_1} \cdots \psi_{\mathbf{x}_n, \omega_n} \bar{\psi}_{\mathbf{y}_1, \sigma_1} \cdots \bar{\psi}_{\mathbf{y}_n, \sigma_n} \rangle = \sum_{\pi} (-1)^{\pi} G_{\underline{\omega}, \pi(\underline{\sigma})}(\underline{\mathbf{x}}, \pi(\underline{\mathbf{y}}))$$

¹In fact they also generalized Johnson’s solution, since they obtained $\nu = \frac{\lambda}{2\pi}(1 - \xi)$ and $\bar{\nu} = -\frac{\lambda}{2\pi}\xi$, for any real ξ . Several years later ν and $\bar{\nu}$ would have been called Adler-Bell-Jackiw anomalies of the vector and the axial-vector WTI. The numerical value of ξ is regularization dependent: for example in the dimensional regularization $\xi = 1$ and only the axial-vector WTI, i.e. the latter of (3), is anomalous.

where π runs over the permutations of n elements and $(-1)^\pi$ is the signum of the permutation; and, for $\omega_j = \pm 1$ and $\sigma_j = \pm 1$,

$$(6) \quad G_{\underline{\omega}, \underline{\sigma}}(\underline{\mathbf{x}}, \underline{\mathbf{y}}) := \frac{1}{Z} \langle \psi_{\mathbf{x}_1, \omega_1} \bar{\psi}_{\mathbf{y}_1, \sigma_1} \rangle \cdots \frac{1}{Z} \langle \psi_{\mathbf{x}_n, \omega_n} \bar{\psi}_{\mathbf{y}_n, \sigma_n} \rangle \\ \cdot \frac{\prod_{i < j} |\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j|^{\eta_- \omega_i \omega_j} \prod_{i < j} |\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{y}_j|^{\eta_- \sigma_i \sigma_j}}{\prod_{i \neq j} |\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{y}_j|^{\eta_+ \omega_i \sigma_j}}$$

where $\eta_- = \eta$ and η_+ is a new coefficient. From these formulas, Wilson[6] derived the short-distance behavior of the Schwinger functions of local quadratic monomials of the field (i.e. the *currents*, see below).

Is this solution completely satisfactory? As we saw, it was not obtained by rigorous procedures. Yet Wightman[2] pointed out that if (5) satisfied some suitable set of axioms, say the Osterwalder-Schrader's ones, then one would be entitled to claim that (5) describes a model of QFT! In our case, surprisingly enough, although formulas are explicit, it has not been an easy task to verify the axiom of *reflection positivity*. I will return on this matter in the section on mathematical results.

2.2. General Thirring model: bosonization. Let us consider, now, two different models. The first is the Thirring model with a possible mass term (1). The second is a boson system, called *sine-Gordon* model: for two real parameters $\beta > 0$ and z , the Lagrangian is

$$\frac{1}{2\beta} \int d^2 \mathbf{x} (\partial^\mu \phi_{\mathbf{x}})^2 + z \int d^2 \mathbf{x} : \cos \phi_{\mathbf{x}} :$$

where $: \cos \phi_{\mathbf{x}} :$ is the *normal ordering* of $\cos \phi_{\mathbf{x}}$ (which corresponds to multiply $\cos \phi_{\mathbf{x}}$ by an infinite factor). Coleman[7] discovered a surprising relation between the two models. Define the fermion currents

$$J_{\mathbf{x}}^\mu := \bar{\psi}_{\mathbf{x}} \gamma^\mu \psi_{\mathbf{x}} \quad \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{x}}^\sigma := \bar{\psi}_{\mathbf{x}} (1 + \sigma \gamma^5) \psi_{\mathbf{x}}$$

(for $\mu = 0, 1$ and $\sigma = \pm 1$); and define the boson observables

$$\mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{x}}^\mu := -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \epsilon^{\mu\nu} \partial^\nu \phi_{\mathbf{x}} \quad \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{x}}^\sigma := e^{i\sigma \phi_{\mathbf{x}}}$$

where $: e^{i\sigma \phi_{\mathbf{x}}} :$ equals $e^{i\sigma \phi_{\mathbf{x}}}$ times an infinite factor. The bosonization is the claim that there exists a choice of β and z as function of λ and m , with $\beta = 4\pi + O(\lambda)$ and $z = O(m)$, such that, if $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_m$ are two by two different,

$$\zeta_J \zeta_O \langle J_{\mathbf{x}_1}^{\mu_1} \cdots J_{\mathbf{x}_n}^{\mu_n} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{y}_1}^{\sigma_1} \cdots \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{y}_m}^{\sigma_m} \rangle_{Th} = \langle \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{x}_1}^{\mu_1} \cdots \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{x}_n}^{\mu_n} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{y}_1}^{\sigma_1} \cdots \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{y}_m}^{\sigma_m} \rangle_{sG}$$

where ζ_J and ζ_O are possibly infinite or zero prefactor that are necessary to have finite, non-zero correlations of local products of fermions; and $\langle \cdot \rangle_{Th}$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle_{sG}$ are the Thirring and the sine-Gordon expectations in the sense of path-integrals. Note two facts. First, for $m = 0$ one has $z = 0$, therefore the current correlations of the massless Thirring model are *free boson correlations*. Second, for $m \neq 0$ the correlations of the Thirring model are expected to decay exponentially; and so are the boson correlations, then, even though the sine-Gordon model does not have a mass term in the Lagrangian: this suggests a *dynamically generated mass* for the boson field. Finally let me remark that the bosonization at $m = 0$ was known much earlier in Condensed Matter Physics[8, 9]; besides, the general Coleman's construction was later made more precise by Mandelstam[10].

2.3. Some Mathematical Results on the Thirring Model. As one might expect at this point of the reading, the first mathematical results on the Thirring model used the exact solvability or the bosonization as *tools* for constructing the model. In the massless case, one approach was to prove that Hagen's and Klaiber's formulas are reflection positive (the other Osterwalder-Schrader's axioms are clearly fulfilled)[11]; another approach was to obtain the Thirring model via a limiting procedure from the Luttinger model, a model of Condensed Matter Theory that had been exactly solved earlier by bosonization [9]. A survey of these results is in[12]. In regard to the massive case, bosonization is again the key idea, because the *spectrum* and the *scattering matrix* of the sine-Gordon model can be exactly computed; from that, it is expected that the asymptotic behavior of the fermion Schwinger functions can be reconstructed. For a survey the reader can consult the contribution of G. Niccoli to these proceedings [13].

Here we do not discuss further these methods. They are certainly of great mathematical interest. However, these methods are spoiled by physically irrelevant modifications of the model, such as: replacement of the continuum spacetime with a lattice; addition of interacting terms of order higher than four; small deformation of the linear dispersion; and others. Here we want to focus instead on approaches that are relevant for the application that we will emphasize in the next section: the study of the scaling limit of lattice models of Statistical Mechanics.

The main idea of such alternative viewpoint is a rigorous reformulation of the physicists' Renormalization Group (RG). A first result along this line was [14]. It contained the proof of analyticity in z of the sine-Gordon model for $|z|$ small enough and $\beta \in [0, 4\pi)$. This was an important achievement, for Coleman's conjecture was based on the identity of the coefficients of the perturbative expansion of the Thirring and of the sine-Gordon models. But it was not a *proof* of bosonization, because the authors could *not* deal with the perturbation theory of the Thirring model as well. (Besides, to avoid the mathematical difficulty of the spontaneous mass generation, in [14] a mass term $\mu^2 \int d^2\mathbf{x} \phi_{\mathbf{x}}^2$ is built in the Lagrangian of the sine-Gordon model, which then corresponds to the bosonization of a slightly different fermion system, called Schwinger-Thirring model). After some years, Dimock[15], using the RG approach of Brydges and Yau[16], extended the result of[14] to $\beta \in [0, \frac{16}{3}\pi)$. (He avoided the problem of the spontaneous mass generation by confining the boson interaction term to a finite volume). However, he still had no result for the Thirring model.

Some of the problems that were left open by these early papers were settled in a series of results in collaborations with G. Benfatto and V. Mastropietro. Starting from the path-integral formulation of the Thirring model, regularized by the presence of an ultraviolet and an infrared cutoffs, we proved the following facts[17, 18, 19].

- (1) *Massless case.* For $|\lambda|$ small enough, there exists the limit of removed cutoffs of all the n -points Schwinger functions. Such limiting functions satisfy the Osterwalder-Schrader axioms, and coincide with Hagen's and Klaiber's ansatz (5). Besides, bosonization is proved for $|\beta - 4\pi|$ small enough.
- (2) *Massive case.* For any m and $|\lambda|$ small enough, again there exists the limit of removed cutoffs of all the n -points Schwinger functions. The Osterwalder-Schrader axioms are fulfilled. Besides, bosonization is proved for $|\beta - 4\pi|$

small enough *if* both the fermion mass term and the boson interaction term are *confined to a finite volume* (to overcome the difficulty of the spontaneous mass generation).

The major problem that these works leave open, then, is the proof of bosonization when the spontaneous mass generation is not artificially avoided. On the other hand, to the best of my knowledge, these are the first rigorous results for the *Schwinger functions* of the massive Thirring model. And for the massless Thirring model, this was the first time that the exact solution is *derived from* (as opposed to *assumed in place of*) the regularized path-integral formulation. The general approach of these works is the RG technique developed by Gallavotti and Nicoló[20, 21], and a technical result called *vanishing of the beta function*[22, 23]. To understand the difficulty of the problem, let me spend a few more words on some aspects of these results. From the second line of (6) we see that, in the n -points functions, the decay for large separation of the points is not the same as in the products of two points functions. Besides, the two points function itself does not have the same large distance decay of the free field, but displays an *anomalous exponent*, η . In the jargon of the Renormalization Group, the Thirring model is said to describe a *Non-Gaussian Fixed Point* (in fact, since the value of η depends upon λ , here we have a case of an *interval* of non-Gaussian fixed points).

Let me also emphasize some differences w.r.t. Johnson's work (see[24] for more details). (i) Of course, we do not work with infinities, but the theory is regularized and the cutoffs are removed in the final results only. At the same time, we do not modify by hand the formal WTI: in our scheme the coefficients $\nu \neq 0$ and $\bar{\nu} \neq 0$ naturally arise in the limit of removed cutoffs from terms that, in formal treatments, are considered negligible. That is known to physicists as Adler-Bell-Jackiw mechanism[25, 26]. (ii) Our ν and $\bar{\nu}$ are not linear in λ ; besides, our value for $\frac{\eta}{a-\bar{a}}$ is not linear in λ either². Point (ii) does not mean that Johnson's solution is wrong. It is a general expectation in QFT that macroscopic quantities, such as η , are related to the bare parameters in the Lagrangian, such as λ , in a regularization-dependent way. Indeed, as counter-proof, a different regularization of the Thirring model, a "non-local" one, does give ν , $\bar{\nu}$ and $\frac{\eta}{a-\bar{a}}$ linear in λ [27]. That is known to physicists as Adler-Bardeen theorem[28].

Our RG approach has other applications in QFT. In two cases, exact solutions, previously conjectured by physicists, are rigorously derived from the regularized path-integral formulation of the problems: for the Thirring-Wess model (i.e. a fermion field interacting with a vector model), see[29]; and for a two colors generalization of the massless Thirring model (which can include also an interaction that is not rotational invariant), see[30]. For lack of space, I do not provide details here.

3. LATTICE MODELS OF STATISTICAL MECHANICS

The most basic lattice model of two-dimensional Statistical Mechanics is the square lattice Ising model with finite range interactions. In particular, let us consider the following Hamiltonian: for real J and K , and spin $\sigma_{\mathbf{x}} = \pm 1$,

$$H(\underline{\sigma}) := -J \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \\ \text{n.n.}}} \sigma_{\mathbf{x}} \sigma_{\mathbf{x}'} - K \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \\ \text{n.n.n.}}} \sigma_{\mathbf{x}} \sigma_{\mathbf{x}'}$$

²interesting enough, this fact is due to a "new anomaly" which is closely related to the exact solvability of the model whenever a "local" regularization is employed[17]

where: the first sum is over nearest-neighbor (n.n.) sites; the second is over next nearest-neighbor (n.n.n.) sites. The case $K = 0$ is the celebrated one, the one for which Onsager discovered the non-trivial exact formula of the free energy[31]. On the contrary, providing any rigorous result for $K \neq 0$ remained for many years an open problem; until very recently, when Spencer[32] proposed how to *rigorously* calculate certain critical exponents for $K \neq 0$. To understand his idea, it is important to mention that the reason behind the exact solvability at $K = 0$ is the equivalence of the Ising model with a system of *free* lattice fermions[33, 34, 35]. Spencer's suggestion is to use the same fermion re-phrasing also in the non-solvable case. Of course the lattice fermion field, this time, is not free, but self-interacting; yet, handled by RG, the self-interaction turns out to be an *irrelevant* perturbation of the fermion free field. As a consequence, if $|K|$ is small enough w.r.t. $|J|$, critical exponents should remain unchanged. Guided by these ideas, Pinson and Spencer proved the following result[36]. The *local energy* random variable is

$$O_{\mathbf{x}} := \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x}' \\ \text{n.n. of } \mathbf{x}}} \sigma_{\mathbf{x}} \sigma_{\mathbf{x}'} ;$$

then, if $|K|$ is small enough w.r.t. $|J|$, there exists one (J and K dependent) critical temperature at which, for large $|\mathbf{x}|$,

$$\langle O_{\mathbf{x}} O_0 \rangle = \frac{C}{|\mathbf{x}|^{2\kappa_+}} + o(1) \quad \text{with } \kappa_+ = 1 .$$

The fact that the *energy critical exponent*, κ_+ , is independent of K , hence coincides with the one of the n.n. Ising model, is a property called *universality*.

The method of the fermion equivalence, which I will call *interacting fermions picture* (IFP), has a much wider applicability. A most natural generalization of the model is the class of systems made of two (a priori independent) n.n. Ising models that are connected to each others by a quartic interaction. The Hamiltonian is

$$H(\underline{\sigma}, \underline{\tau}) := -J \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \\ \text{n.n.}}} \sigma_{\mathbf{x}} \sigma_{\mathbf{x}'} - J \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \\ \text{n.n.}}} \tau_{\mathbf{x}} \tau_{\mathbf{x}'} + K \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \\ \text{n.n.}}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}' \\ \text{n.n.}}} \sigma_{\mathbf{x}} \sigma_{\mathbf{x}'} v(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \tau_{\mathbf{y}} \tau_{\mathbf{y}'}$$

where: $\sigma_{\mathbf{x}} = \pm 1$ and $\tau_{\mathbf{x}} = \pm 1$ are two spins located at the same site; $|v(\mathbf{x})| \leq C e^{-c|\mathbf{x}|}$. This class of *double Ising models* (DIM) does not have just a mere academic interest, since it encompasses two lattice systems that are famous for historical and technical reasons: the Ashkin-Teller and the Eight Vertex models³. Of course at $K = 0$, called *free fermion point*, the model is again exactly solvable. And for $K \neq 0$ one can derive an equivalence with self-interacting lattice fermions. The novelty w.r.t. the previous case is that the self-interaction is *marginal*, and so it does change the large distance decay of the observables. The following facts were proved in [38]. Define the *energy* and the *crossover* random variables to be

$$O_{\mathbf{x}}^+ := \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x}' \\ \text{n.n. of } \mathbf{x}}} \sigma_{\mathbf{x}} \sigma_{\mathbf{x}'} + \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x}' \\ \text{n.n. of } \mathbf{x}}} \tau_{\mathbf{x}} \tau_{\mathbf{x}'}, \quad O_{\mathbf{x}}^- := \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x}' \\ \text{n.n. of } \mathbf{x}}} \sigma_{\mathbf{x}} \sigma_{\mathbf{x}'} - \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x}' \\ \text{n.n. of } \mathbf{x}}} \tau_{\mathbf{x}} \tau_{\mathbf{x}'} .$$

³an exact formula for the free energy of this two models (but not, in general, for all the DIM) is available[37]. Though, to avoid confusion, I will not call them exactly solvable models for, as opposed to what happens for the n.n. Ising model, no exact formula is known for correlation functions of local bulk observables.

Then, if $|K|/|J|$ is small enough, there exists one (J and K dependent) critical temperature at which, for large separation $|\mathbf{x}|$,

$$\langle O_{\mathbf{x}}^+ O_0^+ \rangle = \frac{C_+}{|\mathbf{x}|^{2\kappa_+}} + o(1), \quad \langle O_{\mathbf{x}}^- O_0^- \rangle = \frac{C_-}{|\mathbf{x}|^{2\kappa_-}} + o(1)$$

for $\kappa_+ \equiv \kappa_+(\lambda, v) = 1 + O(\lambda)$, $\kappa_- \equiv \kappa_-(\lambda, v) = 1 + O(\lambda)$ and $\lambda = \frac{K}{J}$. From a mathematical viewpoint this result is very interesting, because there was no result at all for correlations of any of the DIM. However, is this result physically significant? As opposed to the case of the Ising model, κ_+ and κ_- , that are macroscopic quantities, do depend upon λ and $v(\mathbf{x})$, the parameters that appear in the definition of the model. This means that the DIM class is *non-universal*. However, Kadanoff discovered that a weak form of universality still persists: on the basis of the fact that the scaling limit of this class of models turns out to be the Thirring model, he predicted the formula[39]

$$\kappa_+(\lambda, v) \cdot \kappa_-(\lambda, v) = 1.$$


Kadanoff's formula is now proven[40]. The idea of the proof is that the regularized path-integral formulation of the Thirring model and the fermion phrasing of the partition function of the DIM differ by irrelevant terms. Since large distances make irrelevant interactions negligible, as $\kappa_+ \cdot \kappa_- = 1$ is satisfied in the exact solution of the massless Thirring model, it has to hold also in the lattice model.

Let me emphasize that, in this chain of implications, the only knowledge of Hagen's and Klaiber's formulas, even if obtained with a rigorous limiting procedure from the Luttinger model exact solution, would not suffice to deal with the scaling limit of the lattice models: one really needs a mathematical derivation of the Schwinger functions from the regularized path-integral formula.

There are several other cases in which the IFP is, or could be, resolute. In [19, 41, 30] we proved similar formulas, called "Luttinger Liquid Relations", for the XYZ quantum chain and for a generalization of the (1+1)-dimensional Hubbard model. In prospective, I think that the study of critical exponents of local bulk observables of *weakly interacting dimers* (on square or hexagonal lattices, for instance) and of the *six vertex model* (close enough to the free fermion point) should be feasible by the IFP: the basic calculation for the former model is showed in[42].

4. CONCLUSIONS

What I discussed so far is only one side of the general picture that physicists discovered in the 70's and 80's, and which is represented in the following diagram.



The task is to compute critical exponents of lattice models (center-right of the diagram): classical two-dimensional lattice models, as well as quantum one dimensional lattice models with imaginary-time dependent operators (i.e. “1 + 1 dimensional models”). To achieve that, it is useful to compute the scaling limit (i.e. the continuum limit) of such models, which has more chances of being exactly solvable. There are ways of doing that. The one explained in this review is to use the IFP, the scaling limit of which is the Thirring model (upper part of the diagram). However, another approach is possible. I have no space for details, but basically it consists in re-casting the lattice model into a *lattice Coulomb gas*, the scaling limit of which is the free boson field. The agreement of the critical exponents computed in the two different approaches is explained by the bosonization of the massless Thirring model. The upper route, proposed by many, including Kadanoff[39] and den Nijs[43], has been made mathematically rigorous in some models: n.n. Ising with n.n.n. perturbation[36], the XYZ quantum chain[40], a generalization of the Hubbard model[30], the class of DIM[40] and the weakly interacting dimers[42]; perhaps it is also applicable to the six vertex model. The lower route was introduced by Kadanoff[44], Nienhuis[45] and others to compute critical exponents of many critical models, including: the q -states Potts model for $0 \leq q \leq 4$; the $O(n)$ loop model for $-2 \leq n \leq 2$. Some properties of the lattice Coulomb gas are now proved[46]; however, except for some initial progress made in [47], a rigorous implementation of the equivalence lattice model / Coulomb gas (i.e. the broken line in the diagram) is still missing.

REFERENCES

- [1] W. Thirring, *Ann. Phys.* **3**, 91 (1958).
- [2] A. Wightman, *Cargese lectures in theoretical physics*, Vol. II (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1964).
- [3] K. Johnson, *N. Cimento* **20**, 773 (1961).
- [4] C. Hagen, *N. Cimento B* **51**, 169 (1967).
- [5] B. Klaiber, *Lectures in Theoretical Physics*, Vol. X-A (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1968).
- [6] K. Wilson, *Phys. Rev. D* **2**, p. 1473 (1970).
- [7] S. Coleman, *Phys. Rev. D* **11**, p. 2088 (1975).
- [8] S. Tomonaga, *Progress of Theoretical Physics* **5**, 544 (1950).

- [9] D. Mattis and E. Lieb, *J. Math. Phys.* **6**, p. 304 (1965).
- [10] S. Mandelstam, *Phys. Rev. D* **11**, 3026 (1975).
- [11] A. Carey, S. Ruijsenaars and J. Wright, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **99**, 347 (1985).
- [12] A. Carey and E. Langmann, *Geometric analysis and applications to quantum field theory*, eds. P. Bouwknegt and S. Wu (Birkhäuser Boston, 2002)
- [13] G. Niccoli [arXiv:1301.4924](#) [*math-ph*]
- [14] J. Fröhlich and E. Seiler, *Helv. Phys. Acta* **49**, 889 (1976).
- [15] J. Dimock, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **198**, 247 (1998).
- [16] D. Brydges and H. Yau, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **129**, 351 (1990).
- [17] P. Falco, [arXiv:hep-th/0703274](#) (2006), PhD thesis. Università La Sapienza - Roma.
- [18] G. Benfatto, P. Falco and V. Mastropietro, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **273**, 67 (2007).
- [19] G. Benfatto, P. Falco and V. Mastropietro, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **285**, 713 (2009).
- [20] G. Gallavotti and F. Nicolò, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **100**, 545 (1985).
- [21] G. Gallavotti, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **57**, p. 471 (1985).
- [22] G. Benfatto, G. Gallavotti, A. Procacci and B. Scoppola, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **160**, 93 (1994).
- [23] G. Benfatto and V. Mastropietro, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **258**, 609 (2005).
- [24] G. Benfatto, P. Falco and V. Mastropietro, [arXiv:hep-th/0607043](#) (2006).
- [25] S. Adler, *Phys. Rev.* **177**, p. 2426 (1969).
- [26] J. Bell and R. Jackiw, *Il Nuovo Cimento A* **60**, 47 (1969).
- [27] V. Mastropietro, *J. Math. Phys.* **48**, p. 022302 (2007).
- [28] S. Adler and W. Bardeen, *Phys. Rev.* **182**, p. 1517 (1969).
- [29] P. Falco, *J. Math. Phys.* **51**, p. 082306 (2010).
- [30] G. Benfatto, P. Falco and V. Mastropietro, [arXiv:1106.0356](#) [*math-ph*] (2011).
- [31] L. Onsager, *Phys. Rev.* **65**, p. 117 (1944).
- [32] T. Spencer, *Phys. A* **279**, 250 (2000).
- [33] B. Kaufman and L. Onsager, *Phys. Rev.* **76**, p. 1244 (1949).
- [34] P. Kasteleyn, *J. Math. Phys.* **4**, p. 287 (1963).
- [35] T. Schultz, D. Mattis and E. Lieb, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **36**, p. 856 (1964).
- [36] H. Pinson and T. Spencer (2000), Unpublished.
- [37] R. Baxter, *Exactly solved models in statistical mechanics* (Academic press London, 1982).
- [38] V. Mastropietro, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **244**, 595 (2004).
- [39] L. Kadanoff, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **39**, 903 (1977).
- [40] G. Benfatto, P. Falco and V. Mastropietro, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **292**, 569 (2009).
- [41] G. Benfatto, P. Falco and V. Mastropietro, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, p. 75701 (2010).
- [42] P. Falco [arXiv:1212.6155](#) [*cond-mat.str-el*]
- [43] M. den Nijs, *J. Phys. A* **12**, p. 1857 (1979).
- [44] L. Kadanoff, *J. Phys. A: Mathematical and General* **11**, p. 1399 (1978).
- [45] B. Nienhuis, *J. Stat. Phys.* **34**, 731 (1984).
- [46] P. Falco, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **312**, 559 (2012).
- [47] J. Fröhlich and T. Spencer, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **81**, 527 (1981).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE, CA 91330,
E-MAIL: PIERLUIGI.FALCO@CSUN.COM, WWW.CSUN.EDU