

# Canonical brackets of a toy model for the Hodge theory without its canonical conjugate momenta

D. Shukla<sup>(a)</sup>, T. Bhanja<sup>(a)</sup>, R. P. Malik<sup>(a,b)</sup>

<sup>(a)</sup> *Physics Department, Centre of Advanced Studies,  
Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi - 221 005, (U.P.), India*

<sup>(b)</sup> *DST Centre for Interdisciplinary Mathematical Sciences,  
Faculty of Science, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi - 221 005, India*

E-mails: dheerajkumarshukla@gmail.com; tapobroto.bhanja@gmail.com; rpmalik1995@gmail.com

**Abstract:** We consider the toy model of a rigid rotor as an example of the Hodge theory within the framework of the Becchi-Rouet-Stora-Tyutin (BRST) formalism and show that the internal symmetries of this theory lead to the derivation of canonical brackets amongst the creation and annihilation operators of the dynamical variables where the definition of the canonical conjugate momenta is *not* required. We invoke *only* the spin-statistics theorem, normal ordering and basic concepts of continuous symmetries (and their generators) to derive the canonical brackets for the model of a one (0 + 1)-dimensional (1D) rigid rotor without using the definition of the canonical conjugate momenta anywhere. Our present method of derivation of the basic brackets is conjectured to be true for a class of theories that provide a set of tractable physical examples for the Hodge theory.

PACS numbers: 11.15.-q, 03.70.+k

Keywords: Canonical basic brackets, creation and annihilation operators, model of a 1D rigid rotor, Hodge theory, canonical conjugate momenta, (anti)commutators, symmetry principles, conserved Noether charges as generators, BRST formalism

# 1 Introduction

One of the earliest methods of quantization of a classical (physical) system is the standard canonical quantization scheme where the (graded)Poisson brackets of the classical mechanics are upgraded to the (anti)commutators at the quantum level. In this theoretical set-up, we invoke primarily *three* basic ideas. First, we distinguish between the fermionic and bosonic variables by invoking the idea of spin-statistics theorem. Second, we take the help of *mathematical* definition of the canonical conjugate momenta to obtain the momenta corresponding to all the dynamical variables of a given classical theory and define the (graded)Poisson brackets. These brackets are then elevated to the (anti)commutators between the variables and corresponding momenta in their operator form. If the equations of the motion of the theory support the existence of creation and annihilation operators, the above canonical (anti)commutators are translated into the basic (anti)commutators amongst the creation and annihilation operators (e.g. in the problem of simple harmonic oscillator of quantum mechanics) and the quantization follows (at the algebraic level amongst the creation and annihilation operators). Finally, to make the physical sense out of some important quantities like Hamiltonian, conserved charges, etc., it is essential to adopt the normal ordering procedure in which the creation operators are brought to the left in all the terms that are found to be present in the above mentioned physical quantities of interest in a given theory.

One can provide physical meaning to the concepts of spin-statistics theorem and normal ordering but the definition of the canonical conjugate momenta remains *mathematical* in nature. In our present endeavor, we demonstrate that one can perform the canonical quantization *without* taking the help of the definition of canonical conjugate momenta for a class of theories which are models for the Hodge theory. The latter models are physical examples where the symmetries of the theory provide the physical realizations of the de Rham cohomological operators\* of differential geometry [1-5]. To be precise, in our present investigation, we take up a toy model for a rigid rotor to demonstrate that one can quantize this theory (which is a model for the Hodge theory [6]) without taking the help of mathematical definition of the canonical conjugate momenta. In fact, we exploit the idea of symmetry principles to obtain the canonical basic brackets which are consistent with the canonical method of quantization for this system at the level of creation and annihilation operators.

It is crystal clear, from the above assertion, that we shall take the help of spin-statistics theorem as well as normal ordering in our present endeavour but we shall *not* use the mathematical definition of the canonical conjugate momenta *anywhere*. This exercise, in some sense, provides the physical meaning to the canonical conjugate momenta in the language of symmetry principles. Thus, the main result of our present investigation is the theoretical trick, we have developed over the years [7, 8], by which, we obtain the basic brackets for the model of the rigid rotor by exploiting the symmetry principles (instead of the mathematical definition of the canonical conjugate momenta) that are consistent (and in complete agreement) with the canonical quantization scheme. It is obvious that we have already exploited

---

\*On a compact manifold without a boundary, a set of *three* operators ( $d, \delta, \Delta$ ) are called the de Rham cohomological operators where  $d$  (with  $d^2 = 0$ ) is the exterior derivative,  $\delta = \pm * d *$  (with  $\delta^2 = 0$ ) is the co-exterior derivative and  $\Delta$  is the Laplacian operator which obey *together* the algebra:  $[\Delta, d] = [\Delta, \delta] = 0$ ,  $d^2 = \delta^2 = 0$ ,  $\Delta = (d + \delta)^2 = \{d, \delta\}$ . In the above, the (\*) operator is popularly known as the Hodge duality operation on a given manifold (see, e.g. [1-5] for details).

our present idea in the quantization of 2D *free* as well as *interacting* Abelian 1-form gauge theory [7, 8]. In the latter category, we have considered the topic of QED with Dirac fields.

In our present investigation, we have exploited six continuous symmetry transformations to obtain the canonical brackets that are in full agreement with the (anti)commutators obtained by using the standard canonical method of quantization. The key point, to be noted, is that *all* the six continuous symmetries and generators play important roles in the derivation of *all* the possible (non-)vanishing brackets that are allowed amongst six creation and six annihilation operators that are present in the normal mode expansions (see, (18) below) of the six variables of the first order Lagrangian (2) (see below). Thus, we observe that, for the 1D rigid rotor, all the continuous symmetries *together* play very crucial role in the derivation of *all* the appropriate (anti)commutators amongst the creation and annihilation operators at the quantum level (where we do not use the mathematical definition of the canonical conjugate momenta *anywhere* in the whole discussion).

Our present investigation is essential on the following counts. First and foremost, it is very important for us to put our ideas of previous works [7, 8] on firmer footings by applying those ideas to some new physical systems so that we could get an alternative to the canonical method of quantization for a specific class of models that are physical examples of the Hodge theory. Our present endeavor is an attempt in that direction. Second, it is always gratifying to replace some mathematical definitions by a few physical principles. In our present investigation, we have an alternative to the mathematical definition of the canonical conjugate momenta in the sense that we replace it by the symmetry principles (applied in the case of a model for the Hodge theory). Fourth, our method of quantization adds richness and variety in theoretical physics even though it is applied to a special class of theories that are examples of the Hodge theory. Finally, our present endeavor is a part of our first few steps towards our main goal of the proof that, for the models of the Hodge theory, the mathematical definition of the canonical conjugate momenta is *not* required as far as the quantization of these models is concerned within the framework of BRST formalism.

The material of our present investigation is organized as follows. We discuss the continuous symmetries and derive corresponding charges in our Sec. 2. In our forthcoming Sec. 3, we describe the standard canonical quantization of a 1D model for the rigid rotor. Sec. 4 contains the derivation of basic brackets from the ghost symmetry transformations. Our Sec. 5 is devoted to the derivation of (anti)commutators from the basic symmetry principles associated with the continuous (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations. We derive the (anti)commutators by taking the help of basic concepts of (anti-)co-BRST symmetry transformations in Sec. 6. Our Sec. 7 contains the derivation of the some brackets from the bosonic symmetry transformations. Finally, we make some concluding remarks in Sec. 8.

## 2 Preliminaries: Symmetries and Charges

We begin with the (anti-)BRST invariant first order Lagrangian (see e.g. [9, 6, 10]) for the rigid rotor (with mass  $m = 1$ ) as follows:

$$L_0 = \dot{r} p_r + \dot{\theta} p_\theta - \frac{p_\theta^2}{2r^2} - \lambda(r - a) + B(\dot{\lambda} - p_r) + \frac{1}{2} B^2 - i \dot{\bar{C}} \dot{C} + i \bar{C} C, \quad (1)$$

where  $(r, \theta)$  are the polar coordinates,  $(p_r, p_\theta)$  are the corresponding conjugate momenta,  $\lambda$  is the “gauge” variable,  $B$  is the Nakanishi-Lautrup type auxiliary variable and  $(\bar{C})C$  are the fermionic ( $C^2 = 0 = \bar{C}^2$ ,  $C\bar{C} + \bar{C}C = 0$ ) (anti-)ghost variables. Here  $\dot{\lambda} = d\lambda/dt$ ,  $\dot{r} = dr/dt$ ,  $\dot{\theta} = d\theta/dt$ , etc., are the generalized “velocities” of the dynamical variables with respect to the evolution parameter  $t$  of our theory. The auxiliary variable  $B$  is invoked to linearize the gauge-fixing term  $[-(\dot{\lambda} - p_r)^2/2]$  which contains  $\dot{\lambda}$  and  $p_r$  together. There are two first-class constraints on the theory which originate from  $(r - a) \approx 0$  and  $d/dt(r - a) \approx 0$  (where  $a$  is the radius of the circle on which a particle of mass ( $m = 1$ ) moves in the system of a rigid rotor). We can get rid of one of the auxiliary variables by using the Euler-Lagrange (EL) equations of motion (e.g.  $p_\theta = r^2 \dot{\theta}$ ). The ensuing Lagrangian

$$L_b = \dot{r} p_r + \frac{1}{2} r^2 \dot{\theta}^2 - \lambda (r - a) + B (\dot{\lambda} - p_r) + \frac{1}{2} B^2 - i \dot{\bar{C}} \dot{C} + i \bar{C} C, \quad (2)$$

respects the following off-shell nilpotent ( $s_{(a)b}^2 = 0$ ) continuous (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations ( $s_{(a)b}$ ) (see e.g. [9, 10, 6] for details):

$$\begin{aligned} s_b p_r &= -C, & s_b \lambda &= \dot{C}, & s_b \bar{C} &= +iB, & s_b [r, \theta, C, B] &= 0, \\ s_{ab} p_r &= -\bar{C}, & s_{ab} \lambda &= \dot{\bar{C}}, & s_{ab} C &= -iB, & s_{ab} [r, \theta, \bar{C}, B] &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

It is trivial to note that the off-shell nilpotency ( $s_{(a)b}^2 = 0$ ) and absolute anticommutativity ( $s_b s_{ab} + s_{ab} s_b = 0$ ) properties are *true* for the above transformations  $s_{(a)b}$ . Under the above continuous symmetry transformations (3), the Lagrangian (2) of our theory transforms to the total time derivatives as:

$$s_b L_b = \frac{d}{dt} [B \dot{C} - (r - a) C], \quad s_{ab} L_b = \frac{d}{dt} [B \dot{\bar{C}} - (r - a) \bar{C}]. \quad (4)$$

Thus, the transformations (3) are the *symmetry* transformations for the action integral ( $S = \int dt L_b$ ). The Noether charges (that emerge from the transformations (3)) are as follows:

$$Q_b = B \dot{C} - \dot{B} C, \quad Q_{ab} = B \dot{\bar{C}} - \dot{B} \bar{C}. \quad (5)$$

The conservation of the charges (according to Noether’s theorem) can be proven by exploiting the following EL equations of motion (EOM)

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{p}_r + \lambda &= r \dot{\theta}^2, & \dot{B} + (r - a) &= 0, & B + (\dot{\lambda} - p_r) &= 0, \\ B = \dot{r} &\Rightarrow B = \frac{d}{dt} (r - a), & \ddot{C} + C &= 0, & \ddot{\bar{C}} + \bar{C} &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

which emerge from the Lagrangian (2). It is clear that the physicality condition with the (anti-)BRST charges  $Q_{(a)b} | phys \rangle = 0$  implies that  $(r - a) | phys \rangle = 0$  and  $(\dot{\lambda} - p_r) | phys \rangle = 0$ . Translated in terms of  $B$ , these conditions imply that  $B | phys \rangle = 0$  and  $\dot{B} | phys \rangle = 0$ . Using the above equations of motion (6), we observe that  $(\dot{\lambda} - p_r) | phys \rangle = 0$  is equivalent to  $d/dt(r - a) | phys \rangle = 0$ . Physically, these conditions imply that the motion of the particle is confined to a circle of radius  $a$  (i.e.  $r = a$ ) and it remains time-evolution invariant (i.e.  $d/dt(r - a) = 0$ ). We note, in passing, that the above equations of motion

imply that  $\ddot{B} + B = 0$ ,  $\frac{d^2}{dt^2}(\dot{\lambda} - p_r) + (\dot{\lambda} - p_r) = 0$  and  $\ddot{R} + R = 0$  if we identify  $R$  with  $(r - a)$  (i.e.  $R = (r - a)$ ). With this identification, the conserved (anti-)BRST charges (5) can be re-expressed as:  $Q_b = RC + \dot{R}\dot{C}$ ,  $Q_{ab} = R\bar{C} + \dot{R}\dot{\bar{C}}$ .

We observe that the Lagrangian (2) respects another set of nilpotent ( $s_{(a)d}^2 = 0$ ) and absolutely anticommuting ( $s_d s_{ad} + s_{ad} s_d = 0$ ) (anti-)co-BRST symmetry transformations  $s_{(a)d}$ . These transformations are as follows (see, e.g. [6, 10] for details):

$$\begin{aligned} s_d \lambda &= \bar{C}, & s_d C &= i(r - a), & s_d p_r &= \dot{\bar{C}}, & s_d [B, \bar{C}, r, \theta] &= 0, \\ s_{ad} \lambda &= C, & s_{ad} \bar{C} &= -i(r - a), & s_{ad} p_r &= \dot{C}, & s_{ad} [B, C, r, \theta] &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

It is elementary to check that  $s_{(a)d} L_b = 0$ . We note that<sup>†</sup> ( $s_{(a)b}(\dot{\lambda} - p_r) = 0$ ,  $s_{(a)b} B = 0$ ) and the nilpotency and absolute anticommutativity of  $s_{(a)d}$  are valid *off-shell* where we do not use any EL-EOM. The generators of the symmetry transformations (7) are<sup>‡</sup>

$$Q_d = \dot{R}\bar{C} - R\dot{\bar{C}} \equiv B\bar{C} + \dot{B}\dot{\bar{C}}, \quad Q_{ad} = \dot{R}C - R\dot{C} \equiv BC + \dot{B}\dot{C}. \quad (8)$$

We note that these charges are nilpotent (i.e.  $Q_{(a)d}^2 = 0$ ) of order two and they are absolutely anticommuting ( $Q_d Q_{ad} + Q_{ad} Q_d = 0$ ) in nature, namely;

$$\begin{aligned} s_d Q_d &= -i \{Q_d, Q_d\} = 0, & s_d Q_{ad} &= -i \{Q_{ad}, Q_d\} = 0, \\ s_{ad} Q_{ad} &= -i \{Q_{ad}, Q_{ad}\} = 0, & s_{ad} Q_d &= -i \{Q_d, Q_{ad}\} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

when we use the equations of motion (6). We stress that the physicality criteria with the nilpotent and conserved (anti-)co-BRST charges  $Q_{(a)d} |phys\rangle = 0$  lead to the annihilation of the physical states by the operator form of the first-class constraints of the theory (as was the case with such kind of criteria with the conserved (anti-)BRST charges).

The anticommutator ( $\{s_b, s_d\} = -\{s_{ab}, s_{ad}\} = s_w$ ) of the (anti-)BRST and (anti-)co-BRST symmetry transformations leads to the definition of a unique<sup>§</sup> bosonic symmetry ( $s_w$ ) in our theory [6, 10]. The transformations of variables under this symmetry are

$$\begin{aligned} s_w p_r &= i [\dot{B} - (r - a)] \equiv i(\dot{B} - R), & s_w \lambda &= i \left[ B + \frac{d}{dt}(r - a) \right] \equiv i(\dot{R} + B), \\ s_w(r, \theta, C, \bar{C}, B) &= 0, & s_w L_b &= i \frac{d}{dt} \left[ B \frac{d}{dt}(r - a) - (r - a)^2 \right] = i \frac{d}{dt}(B\dot{R} - R^2), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

which demonstrate that the action integral  $S = \int dt L_b^{(0)}$  remains invariant under the bosonic transformations ( $s_w$ ). The conserved charge, corresponding to the above continuous symmetry transformations, is as follows:

$$Q_w = i(R^2 + B^2) \equiv i[B\dot{R} - R\dot{B}]. \quad (11)$$

---

<sup>†</sup>The total gauge-fixing term remains invariant under the (anti-)co-BRST symmetry transformations  $s_{(a)d}$ . This is a characteristic feature of the nilpotent (anti-)co-BRST symmetry transformations  $s_{(a)d}$  [6].

<sup>‡</sup>It will be noted that the Noether theorem yields the charges as  $Q_d = B\bar{C} - (r - a)\dot{\bar{C}}$  and  $Q_{ad} = BC - (r - a)\dot{C}$ . These are re-expressed as (8) by using the EL-EOM (6).

<sup>§</sup>The transformations  $s_w = \{s_b, s_d\}$  and  $\bar{s}_w = \{s_{ad}, s_{ab}\}$  look different in the beginning but it can be checked that  $s_w + \bar{s}_w = 0$  when we use the appropriate EL-EOM of our present theory.

The conservation law of this charge can be proven by using the the EOM listed in (6).

We observe that the Lagrangian  $L_b$  remains invariant under the following ghost-scale transformations for the variables of our theory, namely;

$$C \longrightarrow e^{+1\Lambda} C, \quad \bar{C} \longrightarrow e^{-1\Lambda} \bar{C}, \quad \Phi \longrightarrow e^{0\Lambda} \Phi, \quad (\Phi = r, \theta, p_r, \lambda, B), \quad (12)$$

where  $\Lambda$  is a global parameter and numerals in the exponential denote the ghost number of the variables. The infinitesimal version of the above transformations is:

$$s_g C = +C, \quad s_g \bar{C} = -\bar{C}, \quad s_g \Phi = 0, \quad (\Phi = r, \theta, p_r, \lambda, B), \quad (13)$$

where we have set, for the sake of brevity, the scale parameter (present in (12)) equal to one (i.e.  $\Lambda = 1$ ). The conserved charge corresponding to (13) is:

$$Q_g = i(\bar{C}\dot{C} - \dot{\bar{C}}C), \quad \dot{Q}_g = 0. \quad (14)$$

The above charge is also the generator of transformations (13) as it can be checked that

$$s_g C = +i[C, Q_g] = +C, \quad s_g \bar{C} = +i[\bar{C}, Q_g] = -\bar{C}. \quad (15)$$

Similarly, the trivial ghost-scale transformations on the variables  $\phi = r, \theta, B, \lambda, p_r$  can be written as  $s_g \phi = -i[\phi, Q_g] = 0$  because the variables  $r, \lambda, p_r, \theta, B$  commute with the ghost variables of the charge  $Q_g$ . Thus, ultimately, we conclude that there are *six* continuous symmetries in the toy model (i.e. 1D rigid rotor) of our present Hodge theory.

### 3 Canonical Quantization: Normal Mode Expansions

We note that the second term (i.e.  $r^2\dot{\theta}^2/2$ ) in the Lagrangian (2) does not contribute anything as far as the symmetries of the theory are concerned. For a definite kinetic energy of the rigid rotor, this term becomes a constant and, therefore, it can be ignored. In particular, if the angular velocity (i.e.  $\dot{\theta}$ ) is constant, the term ( $r^2\dot{\theta}^2/2$ ) becomes a constant (which could be a constant number). In view of these arguments, we ignore the second term of the Lagrangian. As pointed out earlier, the constraint-line of our theory is defined by the relations  $(r - a) \approx 0$  and  $d/dt(r - a) \approx 0$  which are the first-class constraints on our theory. If we confine our system to evolve on this constraint-line, the equations of motion (6) would reduce to the following *simple* form<sup>¶</sup>:

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{C} + C &= 0, & \ddot{\bar{C}} + \bar{C} &= 0, & \ddot{\lambda} + \lambda &= 0, \\ \ddot{p}_r + p_r &= 0, & \ddot{R} + R &= 0, & R &= (r - a). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

We re-emphasize that the above EL equations of motion are valid for a rigid rotor with a constant kinetic energy moving on a circle of radius  $r = a$  at *all times* during its physical evolution which is described by the following Lagrangian

$$L_b \longrightarrow L_b^{(0)} = \dot{r} p_r - \lambda(r - a) + B(\dot{\lambda} - p_r) + \frac{1}{2} B^2 - i\dot{\bar{C}}\dot{C} + i\bar{C}C. \quad (17)$$

---

<sup>¶</sup>It should be noted that the EOM (6) yield the relationship  $\frac{d^2}{dt^2}(\dot{\lambda} - p_r) + (\dot{\lambda} - p_r) = 0$  without any approximation. These equations can be re-expressed as  $\ddot{\lambda} + \dot{\lambda} - (\ddot{p}_r + p_r) = 0$ . One of its solutions of our interest is:  $\ddot{\lambda} + \dot{\lambda} = 0$  together with  $\ddot{p}_r + p_r = 0$ . These relations are also derived as EL-EOM when we ignore the second term  $[(r^2\dot{\theta}^2)/2]$  from the Lagrangian (2) of our theory (cf. Sec. 2).

This is the Lagrangian we shall focus on for the rest of our discussions.

The above EL equations of motion (16) have their solutions in terms of the mode expansions (see e.g. [9]) where the creation and annihilation operators appear at the quantum level. These mode expansions, in their explicit forms, are as follows

$$\begin{aligned} R(t) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [s e^{-it} + s^\dagger e^{+it}], & \lambda(t) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [d e^{-it} + d^\dagger e^{+it}], \\ C(t) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [c e^{-it} + c^\dagger e^{+it}], & \bar{C}(t) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [\bar{c} e^{-it} + \bar{c}^\dagger e^{+it}], \\ p_r(t) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [k e^{-it} + k^\dagger e^{+it}], & B(t) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [b e^{-it} + b^\dagger e^{+it}], \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where the time-independent dagger and non-dagger operators are the creation and annihilation operators. It is clear, from the Lagrangian (17), that we have the following canonically conjugate momenta in our present theory, namely;

$$\Pi_{(C)} = +i\dot{\bar{C}}, \quad \Pi_{(\bar{C})} = -i\dot{C}, \quad \Pi_{(\lambda)} = B, \quad \Pi_{(R)} = p_r, \quad (19)$$

which lead to the basic canonical brackets as

$$[R, \Pi_{(R)}] = i, \quad [\lambda, B] = i, \quad \{C, \Pi_{(C)}\} = i, \quad \{\bar{C}, \Pi_{(\bar{C})}\} = i, \quad (20)$$

and the rest of the brackets are zero. It is to be noted that the above (anti)commutators reduce to the following forms in terms of the explicit variables, namely;

$$[R(t), p_r(t)] = i, \quad [\lambda(t), B(t)] = i, \quad \{C(t), \dot{\bar{C}}(t)\} = 1, \quad \{\bar{C}(t), \dot{C}(t)\} = -1. \quad (21)$$

We shall concentrate on (21) for the rest of our discussions. The above (anti)commutators (21) can be re-expressed in terms of the creation and annihilation operators of the mode expansions (18) as

$$[s, k^\dagger] = i \equiv [s^\dagger, k], \quad \{c, \bar{c}^\dagger\} = -i, \quad \{\bar{c}, c^\dagger\} = +i, \quad [d, b^\dagger] = +i \equiv [d^\dagger, b], \quad (22)$$

and the rest of the (anti)commutators are zero. In other words, we have primarily *four* non-vanishing (anti)commutators at the *quantum* level and rest of *all* the (anti)commutators of the theory are zero as far as the canonical quantization scheme is concerned.

We would like to lay emphasis on the fact that we have utilized the spin-statistics theorem and the mathematical definition of the canonical conjugate momenta to derive the basic canonical (anti)commutators which quantize our system of a one (0 + 1)-dimensional rigid rotor. There has *not* been any urgent need to exploit the idea of normal ordering as we have not expressed the Hamiltonian of our present theory in terms of the creation and annihilation operators. However, the latter idea is also one of the important ingredients of the standard canonical quantization scheme for a given physical system. We shall see that, in our forthcoming sections, this idea of normal ordering would play an important role in the context of the proper expressions for the Noether conserved charges of our theory.

## 4 Ghost Symmetries: Basic Canonical Brackets

Using the mode expansions (18), we can express the conserved charge  $Q_g$  in terms of the creation and annihilation operators as

$$Q_g = \bar{c}^\dagger c - \bar{c} c^\dagger \implies : Q_g : = \bar{c}^\dagger c + c^\dagger \bar{c}, \quad (23)$$

where we have used the idea of normal ordering to re-arrange all the creation operators to the left and annihilation operators to the right so that the above conserved charge  $Q_g$  could make some physical sense for our present theory.

We exploit now the virtues of (15) in deriving the anticommutators amongst the creation and annihilation operators of the expansion for  $C(t)$  and  $\bar{C}(t)$ . Plugging in the expansion for  $C(t)$  in (15), we obtain the following

$$\begin{aligned} \{c, \bar{c}\} &= \{c, c^\dagger\} = \{c, c\} = 0, & \{c, \bar{c}^\dagger\} &= -i, \\ \{c^\dagger, \bar{c}^\dagger\} &= \{c^\dagger, c\} = \{c^\dagger, c^\dagger\} = 0, & \{c^\dagger, \bar{c}\} &= +i. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Similarly, the substitution of expansion for  $\bar{C}(t)$ , leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \{\bar{c}, c^\dagger\} &= \{\bar{c}, c\} = \{\bar{c}, \bar{c}\} = 0, & \{\bar{c}, c^\dagger\} &= +i, \\ \{\bar{c}^\dagger, \bar{c}\} &= \{\bar{c}^\dagger, c^\dagger\} = \{\bar{c}^\dagger, \bar{c}^\dagger\} = 0, & \{\bar{c}^\dagger, c\} &= -i, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where we have compared the coefficients of the exponentials<sup>||</sup>  $e^{-it}$  and  $e^{+it}$  from the l.h.s. and r.h.s. of (15). The bottom-line of this discussion is the observation that the non-vanishing brackets from (15) are  $\{c, \bar{c}^\dagger\} = -i$  and  $\{\bar{c}, c^\dagger\} = +i$  which are exactly same as the ones derived from the usual canonical method of quantization (cf. Sec. 3 for details).

We now concentrate on the trivial ghost-scale transformations

$$s_g \Phi = i [\Phi, Q_g] = 0, \quad \Phi = B, R, \lambda, p_r. \quad (26)$$

Using the expansions for  $Q_g$  (from (23)) and the mode expansions for  $\lambda, R, p_r, B$  from (18), it is evident that the relation (26) leads to the derivation of the following:

$$\begin{aligned} [b, c] &= 0, & [b, c^\dagger] &= 0, & [b, \bar{c}] &= 0, & [b, \bar{c}^\dagger] &= 0, \\ [b^\dagger, c] &= 0, & [b^\dagger, c^\dagger] &= 0, & [b^\dagger, \bar{c}] &= 0, & [b^\dagger, \bar{c}^\dagger] &= 0, \\ [s, c] &= 0, & [s, c^\dagger] &= 0, & [s, \bar{c}] &= 0, & [s, \bar{c}^\dagger] &= 0, \\ [s^\dagger, c] &= 0, & [s^\dagger, c^\dagger] &= 0, & [s^\dagger, \bar{c}] &= 0, & [s^\dagger, \bar{c}^\dagger] &= 0, \\ [d, c] &= 0, & [d, c^\dagger] &= 0, & [d, \bar{c}] &= 0, & [d, \bar{c}^\dagger] &= 0, \\ [d^\dagger, c] &= 0, & [d^\dagger, c^\dagger] &= 0, & [d^\dagger, \bar{c}] &= 0, & [d^\dagger, \bar{c}^\dagger] &= 0, \\ [k, c] &= 0, & [k, c^\dagger] &= 0, & [k, \bar{c}] &= 0, & [k, \bar{c}^\dagger] &= 0, \\ [k^\dagger, c] &= 0, & [k^\dagger, c^\dagger] &= 0, & [k^\dagger, \bar{c}] &= 0, & [k^\dagger, \bar{c}^\dagger] &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Ultimately, we conclude that, we have obtained *all* the brackets that emerge from the ghost-scale transformations (13) and the non-vanishing brackets are the anticommutators  $\{c, \bar{c}^\dagger\} =$

---

<sup>||</sup>This is due to the fact that  $e^{-it}$  and  $e^{+it}$  are linearly independent of each-other as they are the solutions of the generic EOM for the variable  $\Psi$ :  $(\frac{d^2}{dt^2} + 1)\Psi = 0$  where  $\Psi = C, \bar{C}$ .



$-i$  and  $\{\bar{c}, c^\dagger\} = +i$  which are consistent with the canonical anticommutators derived in Sec. 3. We lay stress on the fact that we have *not* used the definition of the canonical conjugate momenta w.r.t.  $C$  and  $\bar{C}$  in our derivations of the non-vanishing canonical anticommutators  $\{c, \bar{c}^\dagger\} = -i$  and  $\{\bar{c}, c^\dagger\} = +i$ . Instead, we have exploited the idea of symmetry principles where continuous symmetries and their generators play the decisive roles.

## 5 Nilpotent (Anti-)BRST Symmetries: Fundamental (Anti)commutators

From the expressions for the (anti-)BRST charges  $Q_{(a)b}$ , it is clear that these can be expressed in terms of the mode expansion (cf. (18)) as

$$: Q_b := (s^\dagger c + c^\dagger s) \equiv i(c^\dagger b - b^\dagger c), \quad : Q_{ab} := (s^\dagger \bar{c} + \bar{c}^\dagger s) \equiv i(\bar{c}^\dagger b - b^\dagger \bar{c}), \quad (28)$$

where we have used the equivalent expressions for (anti-)BRST charges as\*\*

$$Q_b = B\dot{C} - \dot{B}C \equiv \dot{R}\dot{C} + RC, \quad Q_{ab} = B\dot{\bar{C}} - \dot{B}\bar{C} \equiv \dot{R}\dot{\bar{C}} + R\bar{C}, \quad (29)$$

and taken the normal ordering into consideration in (28). The conservation law on  $Q_{(a)b}$  compels that these charges should be independent of time. In other words, the observation  $\dot{Q}_{(a)b} = 0$  turns out to be true if we use  $\ddot{R} + R = 0$ ,  $\ddot{C} + C = 0$ ,  $\ddot{\bar{C}} + \bar{C} = 0$ ,  $\ddot{B} + B = 0$ . The above normal ordered charges (28) are automatically conserved as the terms present in the above expressions are time-independent by their very definitions.

We observe that  $s_{(a)b}R = 0$  (since  $s_{(a)b}r = 0$  in (3)). Thus, it is clear that  $s_{(a)b}R = -i[R, Q_{(a)b}] = 0$ . Taking the mode expansion for  $R(t)$  from (18) and that for the  $Q_{(a)b}$  from (28), we find the creation and annihilation operators  $s$  and  $s^\dagger$  commute with all the creation and annihilation operators present in (28). In other words, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} [s, s^\dagger] &= [s, c] = [s, c^\dagger] = [s^\dagger, c] = [s^\dagger, c^\dagger] = 0, \\ [s, b] &= [s^\dagger, b] = [s, b^\dagger] = [s^\dagger, b^\dagger] = 0, \\ [s, \bar{c}^\dagger] &= [s^\dagger, \bar{c}] = [s^\dagger, \bar{c}^\dagger] = [s, \bar{c}] = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Thus, we have obtained a vanishing set of commutators from  $s_{(a)b}R = 0 = -i[R, Q_{(a)b}]$ . Now, we concentrate on the transformations  $s_b C = 0$  and  $s_{ab} \bar{C} = 0$ . These, finally, imply the following in terms of the (anti-)BRST charges, namely;

$$s_b C = -i\{C, Q_b\} = 0, \quad s_{ab} \bar{C} = -i\{\bar{C}, Q_{ab}\} = 0. \quad (31)$$

Using the mode expansions from (18) and exploiting the explicit expressions for  $Q_{(a)b}$  (from (28)), we obtain the following independent basic brackets:

$$\begin{aligned} \{c, c^\dagger\} &= [c, b] = [c, b^\dagger] = \{c, c\} = 0, \\ \{\bar{c}, \bar{c}^\dagger\} &= [\bar{c}, b] = [\bar{c}, b^\dagger] = \{\bar{c}, \bar{c}\} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

---

\*\*It will be noted that the Noether conserved charges emerge from the action principle where the mathematical definition of the canonical conjugate momenta does not play any role.

where we have used  $Q_b = B\dot{C} - \dot{B}C = i(c^\dagger b - b^\dagger c)$  and  $Q_{ab} = B\dot{\bar{C}} - \dot{B}\bar{C} = i(\bar{c}^\dagger b - b^\dagger \bar{c})$  because these are the forms that can be used for the computation of  $s_b \bar{C} = iB$ ,  $s_{ab} C = -iB$ . Thus, once again, we have obtained some vanishing (anti)commutators from the transformations  $s_b C = 0$  and  $s_{ab} \bar{C} = 0$  by exploiting the idea of symmetry generators.

Now, we set out to obtain the (non-)vanishing brackets from the relations  $s_b p_r = -C$  and  $s_{ab} p_r = -\bar{C}$  (that are present in (3)), as:

$$s_b p_r = -i [p_r, Q_b] = -C, \quad s_{ab} p_r = -i [p_r, Q_{ab}] = -\bar{C}. \quad (33)$$

Using the expansions from (18) and expressions (28), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} [s, k^\dagger] &= i = [s^\dagger, k], & [k, s] &= [k^\dagger, s^\dagger] = 0, \\ [k, c] &= [k, \bar{c}] = [k, c^\dagger] = [k, \bar{c}^\dagger] = 0, \\ [k^\dagger, c] &= [k^\dagger, \bar{c}] = [k^\dagger, c^\dagger] = [k^\dagger, \bar{c}^\dagger] = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

which shows that the non-vanishing (and consistent with the canonical brackets (22)) are the brackets  $[s, k^\dagger] = i$  and its Hermitian conjugate  $[s^\dagger, k] = i$ . The rest of the brackets are zero because the momentum operator  $p_r$  commutes with (anti-)ghost operators. Similar exercise with the symmetry transformations

$$s_b \lambda = -i [\lambda, Q_b] = \dot{C}, \quad s_{ab} \lambda = -i [\lambda, Q_{ab}] = \dot{\bar{C}}, \quad (35)$$

leads to the following (anti)commutators at the level of creation and annihilation operators:

$$\begin{aligned} [d, b^\dagger] &= i = [d^\dagger, b], & [d, b] &= 0 = [d^\dagger, b^\dagger], \\ [d, c] &= [d, c^\dagger] = [d, \bar{c}] = [d, \bar{c}^\dagger] = 0, \\ [d^\dagger, c] &= [d^\dagger, c^\dagger] = [d^\dagger, \bar{c}] = [d^\dagger, \bar{c}^\dagger] = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

We note that the non-vanishing bracket  $[d, b^\dagger] = i$  and its Hermitian conjugate  $[d^\dagger, b] = i$  are same as the canonical brackets listed in (22). We focus on the transformations

$$s_b \bar{C} = -i \{\bar{C}, Q_b\} = iB, \quad s_{ab} C = -i \{C, Q_{ab}\} = -iB \quad (37)$$

and perform the earlier exercise to obtain the non-vanishing anticommutators  $\{\bar{c}, c^\dagger\} = i$ ,  $\{c, \bar{c}^\dagger\} = -i$  that are consistent with the canonical brackets (22). The vanishing brackets from our present exercise are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} [c, b] &= [c, b^\dagger] = [c^\dagger, b] = [c^\dagger, b^\dagger] = 0, \\ [\bar{c}, b] &= [\bar{c}, b^\dagger] = [\bar{c}^\dagger, b] = [\bar{c}^\dagger, b^\dagger] = 0, \\ \{c, c\} &= \{c^\dagger, c^\dagger\} = \{\bar{c}, \bar{c}\} = \{\bar{c}^\dagger, \bar{c}^\dagger\} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

We emphasize that the above brackets are consistent with the canonical brackets (22).

We concentrate on the trivial transformations  $s_b B = 0$  and  $s_{ab} B = 0$ . These lead to the derivation of the following vanishing brackets (with both the expressions for  $Q_b$  and  $Q_{ab}$  listed in (28)), namely;

$$\begin{aligned} [b, c] &= [b, c^\dagger] = [b^\dagger, c] = [b^\dagger, c^\dagger] = [b^\dagger, s] = [b^\dagger, s^\dagger] = [b, b^\dagger] = 0, \\ [b, \bar{c}] &= [b, \bar{c}^\dagger] = [b^\dagger, \bar{c}] = [b^\dagger, \bar{c}^\dagger] = [b, s] = [b, s^\dagger] = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

We, finally, conclude that all the vanishing as well as non-vanishing canonical quantum brackets (i.e. basic (anti-)commutators) of the standard canonical quantization scheme can be derived by symmetry principles *alone* where the mathematical definition of the canonical conjugate momenta w.r.t. all the dynamical variables are *not* required.

## 6 (Anti-)co-BRST Symmetries: Basic Brackets

Using the expansions of (18), we note that the (anti-)co-BRST charges  $Q_{(a)d}$  (i.e.  $Q_d = B\bar{C} + \dot{B}\dot{\bar{C}} \equiv \dot{R}\bar{C} - R\dot{\bar{C}}$  and  $Q_{ad} = BC + \dot{B}\dot{C} \equiv \dot{R}C - R\dot{C}$ ) can be expressed as:

$$:Q_d := b^\dagger \bar{c} + \bar{c}^\dagger b \equiv i(s^\dagger \bar{c} - \bar{c}^\dagger s), \quad :Q_{ad} := b^\dagger c + c^\dagger b \equiv i(s^\dagger c - c^\dagger s), \quad (40)$$

where the process of normal ordering has been performed. We are in a position now to proceed in the manner as has been adopted in our previous section. It is trivial to note that  $s_{(a)d}(R, B) = 0$ ,  $s_d \bar{C} = 0$ ,  $s_{ad} C = 0$ . These can be expressed in terms of  $Q_{(a)d}$  as

$$\begin{aligned} s_{(a)d} B &= -i [B, Q_{(a)d}] = 0, & s_{(a)d} R &= -i [R, Q_{(a)d}] = 0, \\ s_d \bar{C} &= -i \{\bar{C}, Q_d\} = 0, & s_{ad} C &= -i \{C, Q_{ad}\} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

The above brackets lead to the following basic (anti)commutators amongst the creation and annihilation operators of the normal mode expansions (18), namely;

$$\begin{aligned} [s, b^\dagger] &= [s, b] = [s, \bar{c}^\dagger] = [s, \bar{c}] = [s^\dagger, b^\dagger] = [s^\dagger, b] = [s^\dagger, \bar{c}^\dagger] = [s^\dagger, \bar{c}] = 0, \\ [s, s^\dagger] &= \{c, c\} = [c, c^\dagger] = [c^\dagger, c^\dagger] = \{\bar{c}, \bar{c}\} = \{\bar{c}^\dagger, \bar{c}^\dagger\} = \{\bar{c}^\dagger, \bar{c}\} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

where we have quoted *only* the independent canonical quantum brackets that emerge from  $s_{(a)d} \phi = -i [\phi, Q_{(a)d}]_{\pm} = 0$  where  $(\pm)$  signs on the square bracket correspond to the (anti)commutator for the generic variables  $\phi = R, B, C, \bar{C}$  being (fermionic) bosonic in nature for our present theory under consideration.

We next focus on the derivation of basic brackets from the symmetry transformations  $s_d \lambda = \bar{C} = -i [\lambda, Q_d]$  and  $s_{ad} \lambda = C = -i [\lambda, Q_{ad}]$  where the conserved charges  $Q_d = B\bar{C} + \dot{B}\dot{\bar{C}}$  and  $Q_{ad} = BC + \dot{B}\dot{C}$  play important roles. Using the expansions from (18) and appropriate expressions for  $Q_{(a)d}$  from (40), we obtain the following (non-)vanishing basic (anti)commutators amongst the creation and annihilation operators, namely;

$$\begin{aligned} [d, b^\dagger] &= i = [d^\dagger, b], & [d, c] &= [d, \bar{c}] = [d, c^\dagger] = [d, \bar{c}^\dagger] = 0, \\ [d, b] &= 0 = [d^\dagger, b^\dagger], & [d^\dagger, c] &= [d^\dagger, \bar{c}] = [d^\dagger, c^\dagger] = [d^\dagger, \bar{c}^\dagger] = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Thus, we note that the non-vanishing basic brackets  $[d, b^\dagger] = i$  and its Hermitian conjugate  $[d^\dagger, b] = i$  are consistent with the canonical brackets defined in our Sec. 3. Similar exercise with the transformations  $s_d C = iR \equiv i(r - a)$  and  $s_{ad} \bar{C} = -iR = -i(r - a)$  with the (anti-)co-BRST charges, written in the following manner, namely;

$$\begin{aligned} s_d C &= -i \{C, Q_d\} \equiv -i \{C, \dot{R}\bar{C} - R\dot{\bar{C}}\} = iR, \\ s_{ad} \bar{C} &= -i \{\bar{C}, Q_{ad}\} \equiv -i \{\bar{C}, \dot{R}C - R\dot{C}\} = -iR, \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

leads to the derivation of the following basic (non-)vanishing brackets:

$$\begin{aligned}
\{c, \bar{c}^\dagger\} &= -i, & \{c^\dagger, \bar{c}\} &= +i, & \{\bar{c}^\dagger, c^\dagger\} &= \{c^\dagger, \bar{c}\} = 0, \\
[c, s] &= [c, s^\dagger] = \{c, \bar{c}\} = 0, & [c^\dagger, s] &= [c^\dagger, s^\dagger] = 0, \\
[\bar{c}, s] &= [\bar{c}, s^\dagger] = \{\bar{c}, \bar{c}\} = 0, & [\bar{c}^\dagger, s] &= [\bar{c}^\dagger, s^\dagger] = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

Thus, we observe that the symmetry transformations  $s_d C = i R$  and  $s_{ad} \bar{C} = -i R$  produce the non-vanishing anticommutators between the creation and annihilation operators for the (anti-)ghost variables as:  $\{c, \bar{c}^\dagger\} = -i$  and  $\{\bar{c}, c^\dagger\} = +i$  which are consistent with such basic anticommutators defined in the case of canonical method of quantization (cf. Sec. 3). Finally, we concentrate on the transformations  $s_d p_r = \dot{\bar{C}}$  and  $s_{ad} p_r = \dot{C}$ . These can be written (in terms of the (anti-)co-BRST charges  $Q_{(a)d}$ ) as:

$$\begin{aligned}
s_d p_r &= -i [p_r, Q_d] \equiv -i [p_r, \dot{R} \bar{C} - R \dot{\bar{C}}] = \dot{\bar{C}}, \\
s_{ad} p_r &= -i [p_r, Q_{ad}] \equiv -i [p_r, \dot{R} C - R \dot{C}] = \dot{C}.
\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

Plugging in the expansions from (18) and appropriate forms (i.e.  $Q_d = i(s^\dagger \bar{c} - \bar{c}^\dagger s)$ ,  $Q_{ad} = i(s^\dagger c - c^\dagger s)$ ) of the conserved (anti-)co-BRST charges  $Q_{(a)d}$ , we obtain the following fundamental (anti)commutator amongst the creation and annihilation operators:

$$\begin{aligned}
[s, k^\dagger] &= i = [s^\dagger, k], & [k, \bar{c}] &= [k, \bar{c}^\dagger] = [k, s] = [k^\dagger, \bar{c}] = 0, \\
[k, c] &= [k, c^\dagger] = [k^\dagger, c^\dagger] = [k^\dagger, c] = [k^\dagger, \bar{c}^\dagger] = [k^\dagger, s^\dagger] = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

These (non-)vanishing (anti-)commutators establish that the non-vanishing canonical brackets are  $[s, k^\dagger] = i$  and  $[s^\dagger, k] = i$ . These are consistent with such canonical brackets derived in Sec. 3. Thus, we conclude that all the basic brackets, derived from the (anti-)co-BRST charges and their corresponding symmetries, are consistent with the canonical brackets (i.e. (anti-)commutators) defined in Sec. 3. by standard canonical method.

## 7 Bosonic Symmetries: Fundamental Brackets

We devote time on the derivation of the basic canonical brackets that emerge from the symmetry transformations generators by the bosonic conserved charge  $Q_w = i(R^2 + B^2)$  (cf. Eq. (11)) which can be re-expressed, using the equations of motion (6), as

$$Q_w = i[B \dot{R} - \dot{B} R] \equiv i(R^2 + \dot{R}^2) \equiv i(B^2 + \dot{B}^2). \tag{48}$$

The above expansions can be written, in terms of the mode expansion (18), as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_w &= (b^\dagger s - b s^\dagger) \implies :Q_w: = (b^\dagger s - s^\dagger b), \\
Q_w &= i(s^\dagger s + s s^\dagger) \implies :Q_w: = 2i s^\dagger s, \\
Q_w &= (b^\dagger b + b b^\dagger) \implies :Q_w: = 2i b^\dagger b,
\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

where the procedure of normal ordering has been performed in the last forms of  $Q_w$ . These expressions would be suitably used for our computations of the basic canonical brackets

from the symmetry principles where  $Q_w$  would be utilized as the generator for the bosonic symmetry transformations.

We note, from the bosonic symmetry transformations (10), that *only* the transformations  $s_w p_r$  and  $s_w \lambda$  exist and rest of the variables of the theory do *not* transform at all. In particular, we observe that, the (anti-)ghost variables do not transform under  $s_w$ . We would also like to state a few words on the forms of the non-vanishing transformations  $s_w p_r$  and  $s_w \lambda$  (cf. (10)) which can be re-expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned} s_w p_r &= i(\dot{B} - R) \equiv -2iR \equiv 2i\dot{B}, \\ s_w \lambda &= i(\dot{R} + B) \equiv 2iB \equiv 2i\dot{R}, \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

by using EOM (6). It can be checked that, the following combinations:

$$\begin{aligned} s_w^{(1)} p_r &= -2iR, & s_w^{(1)} \lambda &= 2iB, \\ s_w^{(2)} p_r &= 2i\dot{B}, & s_w^{(2)} \lambda &= 2i\dot{R}, \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

are the symmetry transformations for the Lagrangian (17) and its corresponding action  $S = \int dt L_b^{(0)}$  because we observe that the following is true, namely;

$$s_w^{(1)} L_b^{(0)} = i \frac{d}{dt} (B^2 - R^2), \quad s_w^{(2)} L_b^{(0)} = i \frac{d}{dt} (2\dot{R}B - R^2 - B^2). \quad (52)$$

Both the above bosonic symmetry transformations lead to the derivation of the conserved Noether charge as  $Q_w = i(B^2 + R^2)$  which is also quoted in (11). The noteworthy point is that any other combinations of (50) are *not* found to be the symmetry of the Lagrangian  $L_b^{(0)}$  and the corresponding action (i.e.  $S = \int dt L_b^{(0)}$ ).

Now we dwell a bit on the derivation of the canonical basic brackets from the symmetry transformations (51) and the conserved charge  $Q_w$  defined in (49). These can be written as

$$s_w^{(1)} p_r = -i [p_r, Q_w] = -2iR \implies -i [p_r, 2i s^\dagger s] = \frac{-2i}{\sqrt{2}} (s e^{-it} + s^\dagger e^{+it}). \quad (53)$$

The comparison of the coefficients of  $e^{-it}$  and  $e^{+it}$  from the l.h.s. and r.h.s. leads to the following (non-)vanishing basic canonical brackets:

$$[k, s] = [k^\dagger, s^\dagger] = 0, \quad [k, s^\dagger] = i = [k^\dagger, s]. \quad (54)$$

It is to be noted that, even though the transformations  $s_w^{(2)}$ , are also symmetry transformations for the action  $S = \int dt L_b^{(0)}$ , these transformations are *not* interesting to us. Let us now concentrate on the following bosonic symmetry transformations:

$$s_w^{(1)} \lambda = -i [\lambda, Q_w] = 2iB \implies -[\lambda, 2i b^\dagger b] = \frac{2i}{\sqrt{2}} (b e^{-it} + b^\dagger e^{+it}). \quad (55)$$

Plugging in the expansion for  $\lambda$  from (18) and taking the appropriate form of  $Q_w = 2i b^\dagger b$  from (49), we obtain the following (non-)vanishing basic brackets:

$$[d, b] = [d^\dagger, b^\dagger] = 0, \quad [d, b^\dagger] = i = [d^\dagger, b]. \quad (56)$$

Thus, we note that we have derived the non-vanishing brackets as  $[d, b^\dagger] = i = [d^\dagger, b]$  which are in full agreement with the canonical brackets derived in Sec. 3, (cf. (22)). We re-emphasize that even though  $s_w^{(2)}$  exists as a symmetry of the Lagrangian  $L_b^{(0)}$  and corresponding action, it is not interesting for our purpose. Thus, we conclude that there is a *unique* bosonic symmetry  $s_w^{(1)} p_r = -2i R$ ,  $s_w^{(1)} \lambda = 2i B$ ,  $s_w^{(1)} (R, C, \bar{C}, B) = 0$  in our theory which is equivalent to the symmetry transformations (10).

We end this section with the remark that the trivial bosonic symmetry transformations  $s_w^{(1)} (R, C, \bar{C}, B) = 0$  lead to the derivation of the following vanishing brackets:

$$\begin{aligned}
[s, s^\dagger] &= [s, b] = [s, b^\dagger] = [s^\dagger, b] = [s^\dagger, b^\dagger] = 0, \\
[c, s] &= [c, s^\dagger] = [c, b] = [c, b^\dagger] = [b, b^\dagger] = 0, \\
[c^\dagger, s] &= [c^\dagger, s^\dagger] = [c^\dagger, b] = [c^\dagger, b^\dagger] = 0, \\
[\bar{c}, s] &= [\bar{c}, s^\dagger] = [\bar{c}, b] = [\bar{c}, b^\dagger] = 0, \\
[\bar{c}^\dagger, s] &= [\bar{c}^\dagger, s^\dagger] = [\bar{c}^\dagger, b] = [\bar{c}^\dagger, b^\dagger] = 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

which are in complete agreement with the canonical basic brackets, derived in Sec. 3 (cf. (22)). In a nut-shell, we draw the conclusion that *all* the six continuous symmetries of our present theory lead to the derivation of basic canonical brackets that are in total agreement with same brackets derived by the standard canonical method of quantization.

## 8 Conclusions

In our present endeavor, we have provided an alternative to the standard canonical method of quantization for a specific model of the Hodge theory which is nothing but the 1D rigid rotor. We have not used the definition of the canonical conjugate momenta w.r.t. the dynamical variables of this theory at any place in our approach which has led to the derivation of the canonical basic brackets at the level of creation and annihilation operators of this theory. Our method of quantization depends heavily on the symmetry principles which provide an alternative to the mathematical definition of the canonical conjugate momenta. However, we have taken the help of standard spin-statistic theorem in defining the (anti)commutators and utilized the concept of normal ordering to make sense out of the conserved Noether charges corresponding to the six continuous symmetries that are present in our theory.

We would like to pin-point some of the subtle features of our present investigation. To obtain the normal mode expansion (18) for all the relevant variables, we have made approximations where we have ignored the term  $[(1/2)(r^2 \dot{\theta}^2)]$  from the Lagrangian (2) because it does *not* contribute anything in the discussion of the continuous symmetries of our present theory. It has also been argued that, for a constant value of  $\dot{\theta}$ , this term becomes a constant in the case of a rigid rotor. As a consequence, we obtain the equations of motion:  $\ddot{p}_r + p_r = 0$  and  $\ddot{\lambda} + \lambda = 0$ , which have very nice normal mode expansion as illustrated in (18). We would like to add that, *even without* any approximations, we have the validity of the relationship:  $\frac{d^2}{dt^2}(\dot{\lambda} - p_r) + (\dot{\lambda} - p_r) = 0$ . One of the solutions of our interest for this relationship is  $\ddot{\lambda} + \lambda = 0$  and  $\ddot{p}_r + p_r = 0$ . These solutions are of utmost importance to us as they support the normal mode expansions given in (18) for  $\lambda(t)$  and  $p_r(t)$ .

We have applied our idea of quantization scheme to the discussion of 2D *free* Abelian gauge theory which is a model for the Hodge theory (see, e.g. [12]). It was interesting to extend this work to the case of *interacting*  $U(1)$  gauge theory (i.e. QED) where the 1-form gauge field couples to the Dirac fields [8]. It was very gratifying to observe that our method of quantization was true in the case of SUSY quantum mechanics where a SUSY harmonic oscillator was considered for its quantization [11]. We conjecture that our method of quantization could be valid for *all* the models for Hodge theory that would incorporate gauge theory, 1D toy models and SUSY theories. Having applied this method in the context of gauge theories and SUSY theories, it was a challenging problem for us to apply it to a 1D toy model. We have accomplished this goal in our present investigation for the case of a 1D rigid rotor which happens to be a model for the Hodge theory [6].

Our method of quantization is valid *only* for a specific class of theories which are the models for the Hodge theory. These theories respect *six* continuous symmetries that lead to the derivation of canonical basic brackets amongst the creation and annihilation operators (which are found to yield the appropriate (non-)vanishing (anti)commutators). The (non-)vanishing brackets are exactly same as the ones derived by the standard method of canonical quantization scheme. Of course, our method is algebraically more involved but it has aesthetic appeal in the sense that it is the symmetry principles that replace the mathematical definition of the canonical conjugate momenta. It is worth pointing out that, in a recent paper [11], we have applied our method of quantization to the supersymmetric (SUSY)  $N = 2$  harmonic oscillator and obtained the basic brackets from the symmetry principles. In this case, there are only *three* continuous symmetries and they lead to the derivation of the precise (anti)commutators that are also obtained by the standard canonical method.

We have proposed many models for the Hodge theory which are from the  $p$ -form ( $p = 1, 2, 3$ ) gauge theories [12-16] and  $N = 2$  SUSY quantum mechanics [17-19]. One of the decisive features of the models for the Hodge theories, connected with the  $p$ -form gauge theories, is that these theories are always endowed with six continuous symmetries within the framework of BRST formalism. On the contrary, all the models of  $N = 2$  SUSY quantum mechanics (that have been shown to be the physical examples of Hodge theory [17-19]) respect only *three* continuous symmetries. We have established in [11] that these three symmetries are good enough to yield the proper (anti)commutators which are found to be exactly same as the *ones* derived by the standard canonical quantization method. It would be nice future endeavor for us to obtain the quantization of the above models by using our proposed novel method so that this idea could be firmly established [20].

**Acknowledgements:** DS thanks UGC, Government of India, New Delhi, for financial support through RFSMS scheme and TB is grateful to BHU-fellowship, under which the present investigation has been carried out.

## References

- [1] T. Eguchi, P. B. Gilkey, A. Hanson, Phys. Rep. **66**, 213 (1980)

- [2] S. Mukhi, N. Mukunda, *Introduction to Topology, Differential Geometry and Group Theory for Physicists*, Wiley Eastern Pvt Ltd, New Delhi (1990)
- [3] J. W. van Holten, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2863 (1990)
- [4] K. Nishijima, Prog. Theor. Phys. **80**, 905 (1988)
- [5] K. Nishijima, Prog. Theor. Phys. **80**, 897 (1988)
- [6] S. Gupta, R. P. Malik, Eur. Phys. J C **68**, 325 (2010)
- [7] S. Gupta, R. Kumar, R. P. Malik, arXiv:1401.2590 [hep-th]
- [8] R. Kumar, S. Gupta, R. P. Malik, Commun. Theor. Phys. **61**, 715 (2014)
- [9] D. Nemeschansky, C.R. Preitschopf, M. Weinstein, Annals Phys. **183**, 226 (1988)
- [10] D. Shukla, T. Bhanja, R. P. Malik, arXiv:1407.6574 [hep-th]
- [11] A. Shukla, N. Srinivas, R. P. Malik arXiv:1410.2486 [hep-th]
- [12] R. P. Malik, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **16**, 477 (2001)
- [13] S. Gupta, R. Kumar, R. P. Malik, Eur. Phys. J. C **65**, 311 (2010)
- [14] R. Kumar, S. Krishna, A. Shukla, R. P. Malik, Eur. Phys. J. C **72**, 1980 (2012)
- [15] R. P. Malik, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **22**, 3521 (2007)
- [16] R. Kumar, S. Krishna, R. P. Malik, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **29**, 1450135 (2014)
- [17] R. Kumar, R. P. Malik, Euro. Phys. Lett. **98**, 11002 (2012)
- [18] R. Kumar, R. P. Malik, Eur. Phys. J. C **73**, 2514 (2013)
- [19] R. P. Malik, A. Khare, Ann. Phys. **334**, 142 (2013)
- [20] R. P. Malik, etal, in preperation