

December, 1998

**On Principal Admissible Representations
and
Conformal Field Theory[†]**

P. Mathieu and M.A. Walton

*Département de Physique, Université Laval
Québec (Québec) Canada G1K 7P4
pmathieu@phy.ulaval.ca*

*Physics Department, University of Lethbridge
Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada T1K 3M4
walton@uleth.ca*

Abstract: The principal admissible representations of affine Kac-Moody algebras are studied, with a view to their use in conformal field theory. We discuss the generation of the set of principal admissible highest weights, concentrating mainly on $A_r^{(1)}$ at rational level k . A related algorithm is described that produces the Malikov-Feigen-Fuchs null vectors of these representations. With the principal admissible description of the highest weights, we are able to prove that field identifications (including maverick ones) lead to the canonical description of the primary fields of the nonunitary diagonal coset theories.

[†] Supported in part by NSERC.

1. Introduction

The role in conformal field theory of integrable representations of affine Kac-Moody algebras is well understood. These occur at positive integer level k , and describe the excitations of primary fields in the Wess-Zumino-Witten (WZW) conformal field theories. Integer level is required for a single-valued Wess-Zumino contribution to the exponential of the WZW action.

The integrable representations also figure in other conformal field theories, by the Goddard-Kent-Olive (GKO) coset construction. For example, the unitary W_n minimal models are described by the coset $A_{n-1,1} \oplus A_{n-1,k}/A_{n-1,1+k}$, with $k \in \mathbb{N}$ (here $A_{n-1,k}$ denotes the affine untwisted algebra $A_{n-1}^{(1)}$ at fixed level k).

But there also exist nonunitary minimal models. In order to describe them by the same GKO coset, we need to consider representations of affine algebras at rational but noninteger (or fractional) level k . These admissible representations were discovered by Kac and Wakimoto [1][2], but their role in conformal field theory is still being written.

The admissible representations are nonunitary, except for the subclass of integrable representations. They nevertheless share many important properties with the integrable representations. For example, their characters obey a generalisation of the Weyl-Kac character formula, and they have nice modular properties. This last feature is inherited by the nonunitary coset conformal theories, as is necessary since they are rational conformal field theories, just like their unitary cousins.

In [3] we studied the modular properties of admissible characters, and their consequences in the Verlinde formula and for modular-invariant partition functions. In [4], the use of admissible representations in diagonal GKO cosets was studied. For example, a new class of intrinsically nonunitary field identifications was discovered that showed, at least in many examples, that the canonical description of the primary fields could be derived from the coset description. One of our results here is the proof that this works generally.

Key to the proof is the use of the so-called principal admissible representations [5]. Our main theme in this paper is that the description of admissible highest weights as principal admissible weights is very natural, and so should prove instrumental in clarifying the use of admissible representations in conformal field theory.

The main outstanding question does not have to do with GKO cosets, but rather with the affine Kac-Moody algebras at fractional level themselves. Certainly, naive use

of the WZW action does not make sense at noninteger level k .¹ But an action, and the geometrical setting of the WZW action, are luxuries not accorded most rational conformal field theories. One may still ask, therefore, if the affine algebras at fractional level might nevertheless be the chiral algebras of sensible (albeit nonunitary) rational conformal field theories.

For the simplest case of $A_{1,k}$, some correlation functions have been constructed that obey the affine Ward-Takahashi identities and the duality properties appropriate to a rational conformal field theory [7]. Some progress has also been made in generalising these results [8].

On the other hand, the fusion rules consistent with these $A_{1,k}$ results have not yet been reconciled with the Verlinde formula, which should hold for all rational conformal field theories.

It is clear that if the Verlinde formula is to apply, some modification must be made to the characters found by Kac and Wakimoto and so to their modular matrices. The Kac-Wakimoto modular S matrix in the Verlinde formula gives some fusion coefficients equal to negative integers [9][3]. The pathology of the modular matrices also shows in other ways: modular invariants can be constructed that would be the partition functions of theories with no identity primary field [10].

One suggestion [11] [12] is that the negative Verlinde coefficients are a sign (pun intended) that some of the highest-weight representations should be reinterpreted as lowest-weight representations. For the case $A_{1,k}$, this idea has motivated certain modifications of the affine characters and the modular S matrices [13][14] in order to produce non-negative integer Verlinde numbers. But these prescriptions are not compelling to us; in particular, they are not uniform as functions of the level denominator, and their generalisations to other algebras are not clear.

In [15][16] it is supposed that the fusion eigenvalue matrix is nonsymmetric in the fractional-level case. The fusion algebra is conjectured for $A_{2,3/u-3}$, with $u \in \mathbb{N}$ coprime to 3, by considering $A_{2,k}$ null-vector-decoupling equations. It seems to have the sensible non-negativity property. But the algebra is not reconciled with the Verlinde formula.

¹ A partial geometric interpretation was given in [6], however. But its physical relevance is not clear.

Another possibility is that the theories with fractional-level affine algebras as their chiral algebras (fractional-level theories, for short) are not rational conformal field theories. Perhaps only a part of the full (chiral) Hilbert space is represented by admissible representations. Other types of representations would be transparent to the null-vector decoupling calculations mentioned above [12][15], and so may exist in the fractional-level theories, so that they are non-rational [17].

Of course, one possibility is that the fractional-level theories simply do not exist. We feel that the results of [7] are a strong indication to the contrary, however.

It is our hope that the generalisation of the $A_{1,k}$ results to other affine algebras will help to clear up these issues, and this work is a contribution in that direction. Again, we believe that the principal admissible description of highest weights will be important in this area. And that the principal admissible description of highest weights is natural only becomes clear in the more general context.

In the next section, integrable, admissible and principal admissible representations and their highest weights are reviewed. We also specify in detail how to generate the full sets of principal admissible highest weights for the $A_{r,k}$ algebras, at any rank r and admissible level k . (We defer to an appendix the description of the C_2 and G_2 admissible highest weights.) In section 3, the null vectors of the principal admissible representations are described, in a way that connects directly with the results of section 2. Section 4 deals with the nonunitary diagonal coset theories, and contains the proof that the coset model leads to the canonical description of the primary fields in the corresponding minimal models. Section 5 is a conclusion.

2. Principal Admissible Representations

2.1. Affine untwisted algebras

We first review the theory of integrable representations of affine untwisted Kac-Moody algebras. For the most part, we will use notation already introduced by Kac and Wakimoto.

Let $X_{r,k}$ denote the untwisted affine algebra $X_r^{(1)}$, at fixed level k . For example, with $X = A$, we have the affine algebra sometimes indicated by $\widehat{su}(r+1)_k$. Let $\Pi = \{\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r\}$ and $\Pi^\vee = \{\alpha_0^\vee, \alpha_1^\vee, \dots, \alpha_r^\vee\}$ be the sets of simple roots and coroots of $X_{r,k}$, respectively. The corresponding set of fundamental weights are $(\Pi^\vee)^* =: \Psi =$

$\{\Lambda_j : j = 0, 1, \dots, r\}$, so that $(\alpha_j^\vee | \Lambda_\ell) = \delta_{j,\ell}$. The affine Weyl vector is defined to be $\rho := \sum_{i=0}^r \Lambda_i$.

The simple roots α_j for $j = 1, \dots, r$ can be identified with the simple roots of the horizontal subalgebra $X_r \subset X_{r,k}$. Generally, overbars will indicate objects associated with the finite-dimensional horizontal subalgebra. So, $\bar{\Pi} = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r\}$ and $\bar{\Pi}^\vee = \{\alpha_1^\vee, \dots, \alpha_r^\vee\}$ are the sets of simple roots and coroots of X_r . The ‘extra’ affine simple root is $\alpha_0 = \delta - \theta$, where θ is the highest root of X_r , and δ is the basic imaginary (null) root, i.e. $\{n\delta : 0 \neq n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is the complete set of imaginary roots. So

$$\Pi^\vee = \{\delta - \theta, \alpha_1^\vee, \dots, \alpha_r^\vee\} . \quad (2.1)$$

We have $\delta = \sum_{j=0}^r a_j \alpha_j$, where the a_j are the marks. We also use \mathcal{P} as the operator that projects an affine weight to the horizontal weight space, so that $\mathcal{P}\alpha_0 = -\theta$ for instance.

Let $\Delta, \Delta_+, \Delta^{re}, \Delta^{\vee re}, \Delta_+^{re}, \Delta_+^{\vee re}$ denote the sets of roots, positive roots, real roots, real coroots, positive real roots, and positive real coroots, respectively. Then $\bar{\Delta}, \bar{\Delta}^\vee, \bar{\Delta}_+, \bar{\Delta}_+^\vee$ will signify the sets of roots, coroots, positive roots and positive coroots, respectively, of X_r . The (co)root lattices will be denoted as follows: $Q := \mathbb{Z}\Pi$, $\bar{Q} := \mathbb{Z}\bar{\Pi}$, $Q^\vee := \mathbb{Z}\Pi^\vee$, $\bar{Q}^\vee := \mathbb{Z}\bar{\Pi}^\vee$. The weight lattices will be $P := \mathbb{Z}\Psi$, $\bar{P} := \mathbb{Z}\bar{\Psi}$, and the sets of positive weights $P_+ := \mathbb{Z}_+\Psi$, $\bar{P}_+ := \mathbb{Z}_+\bar{\Psi}$.

2.2. Integrable representations

The integrable representations are unitary, highest-weight representations, for level $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. For fixed $X_{r,k}$, the set of integrable highest weights is

$$P_+^k = \left\{ \lambda = \sum_{j=0}^r \lambda_j \Lambda_j : \lambda_j \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \sum_{i=0}^r \lambda_i a_i^\vee = k \right\} , \quad (2.2)$$

where a_j^\vee indicates the j -th comark. Let $K = \sum_{j=0}^r a_j^\vee \alpha_j^\vee$ be the canonical central element. Then we can rewrite

$$P_+^k = \left\{ \lambda : (\alpha | \lambda) \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \forall \alpha \in \Pi^\vee; (K | \lambda) = k \right\} . \quad (2.3)$$

A Weyl reflection r_α normal to the root α has action $r_\alpha \lambda = \lambda - (\alpha^\vee | \lambda) \alpha$ on weight λ . The primitive reflections are then just $r_i := r_{\alpha_i} = r_{\alpha_i^\vee}$, and they generate the affine Weyl group $W = \langle r_i : i = 0, 1, \dots, r \rangle = \langle r_\alpha : \alpha \in \Pi^\vee \rangle$.

The set of integrable weights P_+^k , or its horizontal projection $\bar{P}_+^k = \mathcal{P}(P_+^k)$ rather, can be pictured as follows. The set lies in an alcove of finite volume in the horizontal weight space \bar{P} . The elements of the affine Weyl group W carry this alcove into copies that fill out \bar{P} completely. The example of $X_r = A_2$ is shown in Figure 1.

There the various sectors are labelled by the affine Weyl group element that carries them into the dominant sector, the sector labelled by id . The elements are written as products of primitive affine reflections r_i . The first (i.e., rightmost) reflection is r_0 in all the expressions (except id), a choice we can always make. The lengths of these decompositions are minimal, so that the expressions are reduced decompositions. The number of factor primitive reflections is then the length of the corresponding element. The thicker lines bound the region containing the weights of \bar{P}_+ . This picture will be useful later.




Figure 1. The sectors of the weight space of the horizontal subalgebra $A_2 \subset A_{2,k}$, labelled by the affine Weyl group elements $y \in W$ that carry them into the dominant ($y = id$) sector. The thick lines bound the region of weights with positive horizontal Dynkin labels. The notation $ij \cdots k$ is used for the product $r_i r_j \cdots r_k$.

2.3. Characters and modular transformations

The formal character of an integrable representation $L(\lambda)$ of highest weight λ is defined

as

$$\text{ch}_\lambda = \sum_{\sigma \in P} \text{mult}_\lambda(\sigma) e^\sigma , \quad (2.4)$$

where $\text{mult}_\lambda(\sigma)$ is the multiplicity of weight σ in $L(\lambda)$. The elegant Weyl-Kac formula for this character is

$$\text{ch}_\lambda = \frac{\sum_{w \in W} \det(w) e^{w \cdot \lambda}}{\prod_{\alpha \in \Delta_+} (1 - e^{-\alpha})^{\text{mult}(\alpha)}} . \quad (2.5)$$

Here $\text{mult}(\alpha)$ is the multiplicity of the affine root α , and $w \cdot \lambda := w(\lambda + \rho) - \rho$ is the shifted action of w . The normalised character is

$$\chi_\lambda := e^{-\delta(h_\lambda - c/24)} \text{ch}_\lambda , \quad (2.6)$$

where $h_\lambda = (\lambda|\lambda + 2\rho)/2(k + h^\vee)$ is the conformal weight of the representation, and $c = k \dim X_r / (k + h^\vee)$ is the central charge. h^\vee stands for the dual Coxeter number: $h^\vee := (K|\rho) = \sum_{i=0}^r a_i^\vee$.

Suppose that a weight σ has imaginary part $-n\delta$. Define

$$e^\sigma(\tau, z, t) := \exp[2\pi i(n\tau + (\sigma|z) + kt)] , \quad (2.7)$$

where z is an element of the Cartan subalgebra of the horizontal subalgebra X_r . Then the normalised characters $\chi_\lambda(\tau, z, t)$ are the conformal blocks for the torus partition function of the WZW conformal field theory. Consequently, they transform nicely under the action of the torus modular group, $PSL(2, \mathbb{Z})$. This modular group is generated by $S : \tau \rightarrow -1/\tau$ and $T : \tau \rightarrow \tau + 1$. Kac and Peterson found

$$\chi_\lambda \left(\frac{-1}{\tau}, \frac{z}{\tau}, \frac{t - (z|z)}{2\tau} \right) = \sum_{\mu \in P_+^k} S_{\lambda, \mu}^{(k)} \chi_\mu(\tau, z, t) \quad (2.8)$$

and

$$\chi_\lambda(\tau + 1, z, t) = \sum_{\mu \in P_+^k} T_{\lambda, \mu}^{(k)} \chi_\mu(\tau, z, t) . \quad (2.9)$$

The $S_{\lambda, \mu}^{(k)}$ ($T_{\lambda, \mu}^{(k)}$) are the elements of a unitary, symmetric matrix $S^{(k)}$ ($T^{(k)}$). Their precise form will be written below.

Another expression for the normalised character is

$$\chi_\lambda(\tau, 0, 0) = e^{-2\pi i \tau (h_\lambda - c/24)} \text{Tr}_{L(\lambda)} e^{-2\pi i \tau L_0} , \quad (2.10)$$

where L_0 is the zero-mode of the Sugawara stress tensor. In [1], Kac and Wakimoto defined the concept of a modular-invariant representation (of a complex Lie algebra g), by isolating the features of this last expression that result in the nice modular properties above. Suppose there exists a fixed element E of a complex Lie algebra g that is diagonalisable in a representation V of g , so that $V = \bigoplus_{\mathcal{E} \in \text{Spec} E} V_{\mathcal{E}}$, with $V_{\mathcal{E}}$ a finite-dimensional fixed E -eigenvalue ($= \mathcal{E}$) subspace of V . If, furthermore, for some complex number a ,

$$e^{-2\pi i \tau a} \text{Tr}_V e^{-2\pi i \tau E} \quad (2.11)$$

is a modular function in τ for some principal congruence subgroup of $PSL(2, \mathbb{Z})$, then V is a modular-invariant representation.

The integrable representations are clearly modular-invariant representations of $X_{r,k}$, with $E = L_0$, and $a = h_{\lambda} - c/24$. The subspaces $V_{\mathcal{E}}$ are the horizontal subspaces of the affine representation at fixed L_0 eigenvalue. They represent the horizontal subalgebra X_r , and because the highest weight has non-negative integer Dynkin labels, the representations are indeed finite-dimensional.

2.4. Admissible representations

But Kac and Wakimoto [1] found other highest-weight representations of $X_{r,k}$ that are modular invariant. The general class they found, which includes the integrable representations, they dubbed the admissible representations. They have levels that are rational, in general: $(K|\lambda) = k = t/u$, with $u \in \mathbb{N}$, $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\text{gcd}(t, u) = 1$. Consequently, they have some Dynkin labels that are fractional (i.e. rational but not integer), when the level is not integer. In particular, there are admissible representations with highest weights having some horizontal Dynkin indices that are not integer. This means that the horizontal subspaces of these representations are not finite-dimensional, so that L_0 can not be identified with the energy operator E appropriate to them. It is a curious feature of these admissible representations that the operator E differs for different representations, in contrast with the special case of the integrable representations.

Kac and Wakimoto also derived a generalisation of the Weyl-Kac formula that applies to admissible representations:

$$\text{ch}_{\lambda} = \frac{\sum_{w \in W^{\lambda}} \det(w) e^{w \cdot \lambda}}{\prod_{\alpha \in \Delta_+} (1 - e^{-\alpha})^{\text{mult}(\alpha)}}, \quad (2.12)$$

which should perhaps be called the Weyl-Kac-Wakimoto formula. In it the affine Weyl group W of the Weyl-Kac formula is replaced by the group W^λ . The associated Weyl group W^λ of the admissible weight λ is determined by those real coroots that have integer inner product with λ :

$$W^\lambda := \langle r_\alpha : \alpha \in \Delta_+^{\vee re}, (\alpha|\lambda) \in \mathbb{Z} \rangle . \quad (2.13)$$

2.5. Principal admissible representations

We will restrict here to the subclass of the admissible representations that are known as the principal admissible representations [2]. In that case, the level $k = t/u$ must be principal admissible, meaning it satisfies

$$\gcd(u, r^\vee) = 1 \quad , \quad r^\vee := \max_i \{a_i/a_i^\vee\} \quad (2.14)$$

and

$$u(k + h^\vee) =: k^0 + h^\vee \quad , \quad k^0 \in \mathbb{Z}_+ , \quad (2.15)$$

so that k^0 is an integrable level. The reason for this condition will become clear later. We also have $W^\lambda \cong W$, for all principal admissible highest weights, although the action of W^λ on a weight λ is certainly different from the action of W .

To introduce the principal admissible highest weights, first notice that the description of integrable highest weights begins with the set (2.1) of simple coroots. Define the affine Weyl vector using the dual of Π^\vee :

$$\rho := \sum_{\Lambda \in \Psi} \Lambda = \sum_{i=0}^r \Lambda_i , \quad (2.16)$$

and let the shifted highest weight be $\lambda + \rho$. Let v_λ denote the highest-weight state in the Verma module of highest weight λ . The integrable condition $(\alpha|\lambda + \rho) \in \mathbb{N}$ guarantees the existence of a primitive null vector

$$f_{\alpha^\vee}^{(\alpha|\lambda+\rho)} v_\lambda \quad (2.17)$$

in the Verma module, for each $\alpha \in \Pi^\vee$. (Here f_α is the lowering operator corresponding to the positive root α .) This leads to the characters described by (2.5),(2.6), and so to their modular properties.

A simple modification of Π^\vee can be taken as the starting point for the more general class of principal admissible representations [2]. Consider

$$\Pi_{[u]}^\vee := \{u\delta - \theta, \alpha_1^\vee, \dots, \alpha_r^\vee\} \quad , \quad (2.18)$$

so that $\Pi_{[1]}^\vee = \Pi^\vee$. Among the principal admissible representations are those whose highest weights have the same relation to $\Pi_{[u]}^\vee$ that the integrable highest weights have to Π^\vee .

To make this precise, we first rewrite the definition (2.2),(2.3) of the set of integrable weights at level k as

$$P_+^k = \{ \lambda : (\alpha|\lambda + \rho) \in \mathbb{N}, \forall \alpha \in \Pi^\vee; (K|\lambda + \rho) = k + h^\vee \} . \quad (2.19)$$

This formula generalises to the principal admissible highest weights in the following way.

First, consider the analogues of K and ρ , defined in terms of the new set of coroots (2.18). The dual of $\Pi_{[u]}^\vee$ is

$$\begin{aligned} (\Pi_{[u]}^\vee)^* =: \Psi_{[u]} &= \{ \Lambda_0/u, \Lambda_1 - (u-1)a_1^\vee \Lambda_0/u, \dots, \Lambda_r - (u-1)a_r^\vee \Lambda_0/u \} \\ &= \{ \dot{\Lambda}_j := \Lambda_j - (u-1)a_j^\vee \Lambda_0/u : j = 0, 1, \dots, r \} . \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

Then

$$\dot{\rho} := \sum_{\Lambda \in \Psi_{[u]}} \Lambda = \rho - (u-1)h^\vee \Lambda_0/u . \quad (2.21)$$

If we define $\dot{\alpha}_0^\vee := u\delta - \theta$ and $\dot{\alpha}_j^\vee := \alpha_j^\vee$ for all $j \neq 0$, so that

$$\Pi_{[u]}^\vee := \{ \dot{\alpha}_j^\vee : j = 0, 1, \dots, r \} \quad , \quad (2.22)$$

we can imitate $K = \sum_{i=0}^r a_i^\vee \alpha_i^\vee$, and write

$$\dot{K} := \sum_{i=0}^r a_i^\vee \dot{\alpha}_i^\vee . \quad (2.23)$$

A subset $P_{u,id}^k$ of the set P^k of principal admissible highest weights is then simply

$$P_{u,id}^k = \{ \lambda : (\dot{\alpha}|\lambda + \dot{\rho}) \in \mathbb{N}, \forall \alpha \in \Pi_{[u]}^\vee; (\dot{K}|\lambda + \dot{\rho}) = k^0 + h^\vee \} . \quad (2.24)$$

The notation $P_{u,id}^k$ will be explained shortly. Here k^0 is a non-negative integer, i.e. an integrable level, by (2.15). So, with respect to the system (2.18), the principal admissible highest weights of $P_{u,id}^k$ are integrable!

But $P_{u,id}^k$ is only a subset of the set P^k of principal admissible weights at a fixed level k . The important criterion turns out to be that $\Pi_{[u]}^\vee$ is contained in the set of positive real coroots $\Delta_+^{\vee re}$, since $\dot{\alpha}_0^\vee = (u-1)K + \alpha_0^\vee$. This generalises to the condition

$$\tilde{y} \Pi_{[u]}^\vee \in \Delta_+^{\vee re} , \quad (2.25)$$

where \tilde{y} is an element of the enlarged affine Weyl group \tilde{W} , that leaves invariant the set of real coroots $\Delta^{\vee re}$. That is, there is a set of elements $\tilde{Y}_{[u]} \in \tilde{W}$ one can choose such that every principal admissible weight $\lambda \in P^k$ is related to $y\Pi_{[u]}^\vee$, in the way just outlined for $\tilde{y} = id$. The choice of set $\tilde{Y}_{[u]}$ is not unique, but the sets $P_{u,\tilde{y}}^k$ of weights related to the so-called simple admissible sets $\tilde{y}\Pi_{[u]}^\vee$ are disjoint for different \tilde{y} . In summary, we have

$$P^k = \cup_{\tilde{y} \in \tilde{Y}_{[u]}} P_{u,\tilde{y}}^k . \quad (2.26)$$

We can now rewrite (2.24) and its generalisation in the form given by Kac and Wakimoto:

$$P_{u,\tilde{y}}^k = \{ \lambda = \tilde{y} \cdot (\lambda^0 - (u-1)(k + h^\vee)\Lambda_0) : \lambda^0 \in P_+^{k^0} \} . \quad (2.27)$$

Of course, in order for the notation $P_+^{k^0}$ to make sense, we require (2.15), i.e. $k^0 = u(k + h^\vee) - h^\vee \in \mathbb{Z}_+$.

Roughly speaking then, principal admissible highest weights are integrable, but with respect to simple admissible sets $\tilde{y}\Pi_{[u]}^\vee$, rather than Π^\vee itself. The most important property of a principal admissible set is that the Cartan matrix it defines is isomorphic to that of $X_{r,k}$ (i.e. that of Π^\vee). This implies, among other things, that the Weyl group W^λ associated to the principal admissible weight λ is isomorphic to W .

Furthermore, the simplest of the simple admissible sets, $\Pi_{[u]}^\vee$ (i.e. the case $\tilde{y} = id$), differs from Π^\vee only in that the imaginary part δ of the affine simple root α_0 gets replaced by $u\delta$. Now, an affine root with imaginary part $u\delta$ corresponds to a current with mode number u . So, the replacement $\delta \rightarrow u\delta$ corresponds to a multiplication of the mode number by u . The affine algebra has as a so-called winding subalgebra [5], the algebra generated by the current modes (J_n , say) with mode numbers (n) divisible by u . So, we can say that principle admissible highest weights are integrable weights for a winding subalgebra, up to transformation by an element of $\tilde{Y}_{[u]}$.

2.6. The enlarged affine Weyl group

The specification of the set of principal admissible weights P^k boils down to a description of the set of enlarged Weyl group elements $\tilde{Y}_{[u]}$. We will give such a description in detail, but first we need to discuss the enlarged (affine) Weyl group \tilde{W} itself.

The group \tilde{W} can be described in (at least) two different ways. One will prove useful in the next section, when we describe the admissible null vectors, and the other is better suited to the treatment of coset field identifications of section 4.

First, define the group \tilde{W}_+ containing elements $\{w_j : a_j = 1\}$, with action $w_j \alpha_0 = \alpha_j$. Its action is similar on the fundamental weights, $w_j \Lambda_0 = \Lambda_j$, and the sets of principal admissible weights at fixed level are \tilde{W}_+ -invariant: $\tilde{W}_+ P^k = P^k$. This is a subgroup of the group of diagram automorphisms of the affine Coxeter-Dynkin diagrams. It is isomorphic to \bar{P}/\bar{Q} . For $A_{r,k}$, e.g., we have $\tilde{W}_+ \cong \mathbb{Z}_{r+1}$, and the relation $w_i r_j w_i^{-1} = r_{i+j \pmod{r+1}}$ holds, where r_j is any affine primitive reflection, and $w_i^{-1} = w_{r+1-i}$. The enlarged affine Weyl group is then

$$\tilde{W} = \tilde{W}_+ \rtimes W . \quad (2.28)$$

That is, every element $\tilde{y} \in \tilde{W}$ can be written as $\tilde{y} = \tilde{y}_+ y$, with $\tilde{y}_+ \in \tilde{W}_+$ and $y \in W$. With a similar expression for $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{W}$, we get

$$\tilde{x} \tilde{y} = (\tilde{x}_+ \tilde{y}_+) [(\tilde{y}_+^{-1} x \tilde{y}_+) y] . \quad (2.29)$$

A second description of \tilde{W} is similar to the description of W as the semidirect product of the finite Weyl group \bar{W} , and a translation group. Define

$$t_\beta \lambda := \lambda + (\lambda|\delta)\beta - \left[(\lambda|\beta) + \frac{1}{2}(\beta|\beta)(\lambda|\delta) \right] \delta . \quad (2.30)$$

Then the affine Weyl group is $W = t_{\bar{Q}^\vee} \rtimes \bar{W}$, where the first factor indicates the group of translations $\{t_\beta : \beta \in \bar{Q}^\vee\}$. The enlarged affine Weyl group is instead

$$\tilde{W} = t_{\bar{P}^\vee} \rtimes \bar{W} . \quad (2.31)$$

This means we can write $\tilde{y} = t_\beta \bar{y}$ with $\beta \in \bar{P}^\vee$ and $\bar{y} \in \bar{W}$, for every $\tilde{y} \in \tilde{W}$. The product of two elements $\tilde{x} = t_\gamma \bar{x}$, $\tilde{y} = t_\beta \bar{y} \in \tilde{W}$ has the decomposition

$$\tilde{x} \tilde{y} = (t_\gamma t_{\bar{x}\beta\bar{x}^{-1}}) (\bar{x}\bar{y}) . \quad (2.32)$$

2.7. The set $\tilde{Y}_{[u]}$: a first description

Now, to describe (a choice of) the set $\tilde{Y}_{[u]}$ of elements of \tilde{W} required for the specification (2.27) of the set of principal admissible weights, the important condition is (2.25). First we use the description (2.28). Clearly, if $y \in W$ satisfies this criterion, then so does $\tilde{y} = \tilde{y}_+ y$, for any $\tilde{y}_+ \in \tilde{W}_+$. So, the important task is to describe the set of required affine Weyl group elements $Y_{[u]}$, such that $\tilde{Y}_{[u]} = \tilde{W}_+ Y_{[u]}$.

Now (2.25) with $\tilde{y} \rightarrow y$ implies

$$(\Lambda_i | y \dot{\alpha}_j^\vee) = (y^{-1} \Lambda_i | \dot{\alpha}_j^\vee) \in \mathbb{Z}_+ , \quad (2.33)$$

for all $i, j \in \{0, 1, \dots, r\}$. First examine the case $j \neq 0$. Then we get

$$(y^{-1} \Lambda_i | \alpha_j^\vee) \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, r\} , \quad (2.34)$$

since $\dot{\alpha}_j^\vee = \alpha_j^\vee$, for $j \neq 0$. Now, the weights $\{\Lambda_i : i = 0, 1, \dots, r\}$ are contained in the set of integrable highest weights P_+^a , where $a = \max \{a_i^\vee : i = 0, 1, \dots, r\}$. The horizontal projection of this set of weights lies in an alcove of horizontal weight space, as Figure 1 illustrates for the case $X_r = A_2$. In that case, (2.34) says that only those elements $y \in W$ that label sectors in \bar{P} (bounded by the dark lines of Figure 1) need be considered. In other words, we can restrict to consideration of $y \in W/\bar{W}$ only.

With $j = 0$, (2.33) gives $(y^{-1} \Lambda_i | \dot{\alpha}_0^\vee) \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Since $\dot{\alpha}_0^\vee = u\delta - \theta$, this translates into

$$(y^{-1} \Lambda_i | \theta) \leq u, \quad \forall i \in \{0, 1, \dots, r\} . \quad (2.35)$$

For the case $X_r = A_2$, this means that the infinite cone of triangular sectors (labelled by elements $y \in W$) of Figure 1 is truncated to the large triangle containing u^2 smaller triangular sectors. This is illustrated in Figure 2, for the case $u = 4$.

As an aid to understanding how to generate the list $Y_{[4]}$ for A_2 , given in Figure 2, we redraw the list as a graph in Figure 3. The nodes are labelled by reduced decompositions of the elements y , and the lines indicate the action of primitive reflections. The arrows on the lines give the directions of increasing length. Notice that three distinct arrows arise at every node, and each node is surrounded by three hexagons. The three types of hexagons encode the three distinct relations:

$$(r_0 r_1)^3 = (r_0 r_2)^3 = (r_1 r_2)^3 = 1 . \quad (2.36)$$




Figure 2. The elements of $Y_{[4]}$ for the algebra $A_{2,k}$ (where $k = t/u$). They are indicated, as in Figure 1, by the sectors of \bar{P} they carry into the dominant sector.

It is now easy to see how to produce $Y_{[4]}$ for the case of $X_r = A_2$. One need only start with $y = id$, and add to the list by multiplying by simple reflections, such that the new elements are longer (up to a maximum length $\ell(y) = 6$) while ensuring the elements are included in the horizontal dominant sector. For A_2 , we find $\text{card } Y_{[u]} = u^2$, and $2(u - 1)$ as the maximum length of an element.

The length constraint provides a simple algebraic way to generate the elements of $Y_{[u]}$ for A_2 . One starts with $y = id$, and adds elements of increasing length, as long as one takes care to include only those in the horizontal dominant sector, i.e. only those y that are representatives of W/\bar{W} . There are different ways to characterise these ‘dominant elements’. For example, they satisfy the constraint

$$\ell(yr_j) \not\leq \ell(y) \text{ for } j = 1, 2. \quad (2.37)$$

Equivalently, we can choose representatives of the coset W/\bar{W} to have reduced decompositions $y = y'r_0$ for some $y' \in W$. Any y that cannot be so written is not considered.

But some that can be so written should also be discarded: if there exists another reduced decomposition of such a y with “first factor” not r_0 , it should be discarded. For instance, since $r_0 r_2 r_0 = r_2 r_0 r_2$, it should not be included in $Y_{[u]}$, since it is equivalent to $(r_2 r_0 r_2) r_2 = r_2 r_0$ in the coset W/\bar{W} . The elements of $Y_{[5]}$ that are not in $Y_{[4]}$ are easily generated from the algebraic prescription:

$$A_2 : \quad Y_{[5]} \setminus Y_{[4]} = \{0120120, 0210210, 1201210, 2101210, 20120120, \\ 10120120, 10210210, 20210210, 21201210\} . \quad (2.38)$$




Figure 3. A graph indicating the elements of $Y_{[4]}$ for A_2 . The arrows on the lines indicate the directions of increasing length.

A simple length constraint does not hold in general but a modified one also applies to the A_1 case, for which $Y_{[u]}$ is given by all the elements of W that start with r_0 and have $\ell(y) \leq u - 1$, e.g.

$$A_1 : \quad Y_{[5]} = \{id, 0, 10, 010, 1010\} \quad (2.39)$$

For the other algebras, no simple characterization has been found. Notice however that once the condition $y \in W/\bar{W}$, or equivalently

$$\ell(yr_j) \not\prec \ell(y) \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \dots, r, \quad (2.40)$$

has been taken into account, (2.25) (with $\tilde{y} \rightarrow y$) reduces to the single condition

$$y[u\alpha_0^\vee + (u-1)(\alpha_1^\vee + \dots + \alpha_r^\vee)] = y\alpha_0^\vee + (u-1)K \in \Delta_+^{\vee re}, \quad (2.41)$$

where we have used $yK = K$. In this way it is easy to generate for instance the set $Y_{[2]}$ for A_3 :

$$A_3 : Y_{[2]} = \{id, 0, 10, 30, 210, 230, 310, 0310\} . \quad (2.42)$$

The cases C_2 and G_2 are treated in an Appendix.

As mentioned above, we will otherwise restrict consideration to the algebras $A_{r,k}$. For them, all admissible highest weights are principal admissible. For other algebras, however, there are admissible highest weights that are not also principal admissible.

2.8. The set $\tilde{Y}_{[u]}$: a second description

A second description of the set $\tilde{Y}_{[u]}$ is obtained using (2.31). With $\tilde{y} = t_\beta \bar{y}$, β turns out to lie in the coset $\bar{P}^\vee/u\bar{Q}^\vee$ centered around the origin, that is, in

$$\bar{C} := \{ \beta \in \bar{P}^\vee = \bar{P} : -u < (\beta|\alpha) \leq u, \forall \alpha \in \bar{\Delta}_+^\vee \} . \quad (2.43)$$

Notice that this result determines

$$\text{card } \tilde{Y}_{[u]} = |\bar{P}^\vee/u\bar{Q}^\vee| = u^r |\bar{P}/\bar{Q}| = u^r |\tilde{W}_+| . \quad (2.44)$$

Given a value of β in this set, there is a unique \bar{y} that ensures (2.25) (as proved in [2]). Actually, this \bar{y} is the shortest element of \bar{W} such that

$$(\bar{y}^{-1}\beta|\alpha_j^\vee) \leq 0, \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, r . \quad (2.45)$$

The subset $Y_{[u]} \subset \tilde{Y}_{[u]}$ is obtained by restricting β to be an element of \bar{Q}^\vee .

To illustrate this second description, consider the elements of $Y_{[3]}$ for A_2 :

$$\begin{array}{lll} id = t_{(0,0)} & r_0 = t_{(1,1)} r_1 r_2 r_1 & r_1 r_0 = t_{(-1,2)} r_2 r_1 \\ r_2 r_0 = t_{(2,-1)} r_1 r_2 & r_1 r_2 r_0 = t_{(-2,1)} r_2 & r_2 r_1 r_0 = t_{(1,-2)} r_1 \\ r_0 r_2 r_1 r_0 = t_{(3,0)} r_1 r_2 & r_0 r_1 r_2 r_0 = t_{(0,3)} r_2 r_1 & r_1 r_2 r_1 r_0 = t_{(-1,-1)} \end{array} \quad (2.46)$$

Here we use the notation $(\beta_1, \beta_2) = \beta = \beta_1\Lambda_1 + \beta_2\Lambda_2$. All values of β appearing above span the set (β_1, β_2) such that

$$-3 < \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_1 + \beta_2 \leq 3. \quad (2.47)$$

with the additional constraint that $\beta_1 + 2\beta_2 = 0 \pmod 3$ (ensuring that $\beta \in \bar{Q}^\vee$). The above list of elements $t_\beta \bar{y}$ could thus have been derived by first specifying those (β_1, β_2) that satisfy the above conditions and fixing \bar{y} from the requirement that \bar{y}^{-1} be the shortest element of \bar{W} that maps a β that has at least one positive label to a weight with its two labels non-positive.

Most of this section is an account of our understanding of the results of Kac and Wakimoto [1][2]. What is new are the detailed descriptions of how to obtain the sets of principal admissible weights. (A different, less natural description was discussed in [3].) There is some overlap with the treatment in [15][16], where the authors concentrate on the special case $k^0 = 0$.

3. Malikov-Feigen-Fuchs Null Vectors

The existence of null vectors in a Verma module is responsible for the Weyl symmetry of the weight diagrams of the corresponding integrable highest-weight module. For example, an A_1 highest weight $\lambda = \lambda_1\Lambda_1$ produces a Verma null vector $f_1^{\lambda_1+1}v_\lambda$ if $\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, where we use the notation $f_1 = f_{\alpha_1}$. Then the corresponding integrable highest weight representation has a \mathbb{Z}_2 Weyl symmetry, generated by the reflection that takes the highest weight λ to the lowest weight. If $\lambda_1 \notin \mathbb{Z}$, however, there are no Verma null vectors and so no lowest weight; the highest-weight module and Verma module coincide. The highest-weight representation is infinite-dimensional, and there is no Weyl reflection symmetry.

The Weyl group W^λ associated to a principal admissible highest weight λ is isomorphic to the affine Weyl group W . This means there are, roughly speaking, just as many null vectors in a principal admissible representation as there are in an integrable representation of $X_{r,k}$. As already mentioned above (see (2.17)), the null vectors in a $X_{r,k}$ Verma module with integrable highest weight λ , are all descendants of $r + 1$ primitive null vectors, $n_j := f_j^{\lambda_j+1}v_\lambda$, with $j = 0, 1, \dots, r$. So, the principal admissible representations should also have $r + 1$ primitive null vectors.

Malikov, Feigen and Fuchs [18] showed how to write the null vectors of Verma modules with highest weights that are not integrable, in an unconventional, but beautiful form. Here we point out a simple, direct way of writing their expressions for the primitive null vectors of principal admissible representations.

Let $\{f_i, h_i, e_i : i = 0, 1, \dots, r\}$ denote the Chevalley generators of $X_{r,k}$. So

$$\begin{aligned} [h_i, e_j] &= A_{ij} e_j, & [h_i, f_j] &= -A_{ij} f_j, \\ [e_i, f_j] &= \delta_{ij} h_i, & \forall i, j &\in \{0, 1, \dots, r\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

where $A_{ij} = (\alpha_i | \alpha_j^\vee)$ are the elements of the Cartan matrix. What Malikov-Feigen-Fuchs (MFF) found was that (2.17) generalises to

$$f_{i_\ell}^{x_\ell} \cdots f_{i_2}^{x_2} f_{i_1}^{x_1} v_\lambda, \quad (3.2)$$

but with the exponents $\{x_j\}$ complex, not necessarily integer, depending on the highest weight λ . For admissible λ , the exponents are rational. Such expressions are meaningful because they can be rewritten in conventional form, i.e. as linear combinations of expressions of the type (3.2), but with non-negative integer exponents.

The rewriting procedure is straightforward, but tedious. Identities involving integral powers are derived, and when the coefficients that appear are polynomial, they can be continued to complex exponents. Such continued relations may be used to re-express the MFF “continued monomials” in conventional form. For a helpful simple example, see the Appendix of [19]. For more help, see [20]].

First notice that the integrable null vectors (2.17) are just

$$F_i v_\lambda, \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, r; \quad F_i := \mathcal{N}(f_i^{1+h_i}), \quad (3.3)$$

where the “normal ordering” \mathcal{N} simply specifies that the Cartan subalgebra operators should be moved to the right:

$$\mathcal{N}(h_i^b f_i^a) = \mathcal{N}(f_i^a h_i^b) = f_i^a h_i^b. \quad (3.4)$$

Operators like the F_i were considered in [21].

An MFF null vector exists whenever the highest weight λ satisfies $(\lambda + \rho | \alpha^\vee) = n \in \mathbb{N}$, for some real root $\alpha \in \Delta^{\vee re}$. By definition, a real root α is Weyl equivalent to a simple root: $\alpha = v\alpha_j$, where $\alpha_j \in \Pi$. Now, for admissible weight $\lambda \in P_{u, \tilde{y}}^k$, we have

$$(\lambda + \rho | \tilde{y}\alpha_j^\vee) = (\tilde{y}(\sum_{\ell=0}^r (\lambda_\ell^0 + 1)\dot{\Lambda}_\ell) | \tilde{y}\alpha_j^\vee) = \lambda_j^0 + 1 \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.5)$$

We find that the description of the element $\tilde{y} \in \tilde{Y}_{[u]}$ leads directly to an expression for the MFF null vectors, in terms of the operators F_j .

Precisely, suppose

$$\tilde{y} = \tilde{y}_+ y = \tilde{y}_+ (r_{i_\ell} \cdots r_{i_1}), \quad (3.6)$$

with $\tilde{y}_+ \in \tilde{W}_+$, and $(r_{i_\ell} \cdots r_{i_1})$ a reduced decomposition of $y \in W$. Define

$$\tilde{y}_+ F_j \tilde{y}_+^{-1} := F_\ell, \quad \text{if } \tilde{y}_+ \alpha_j = \alpha_\ell. \quad (3.7)$$

Then there are MFF null vectors of the form

$$n_j := \tilde{y}_+ (F_{i_\ell} (\cdots (F_{i_1} (F_j) F_{i_1}) \cdots) F_{i_\ell}) \tilde{y}_+^{-1} v_\lambda, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, r. \quad (3.8)$$

The remaining null vector, corresponding to the case $j = 0$, is only a little more complicated. The difference is that while $\hat{\alpha}_j^\vee = \alpha_j^\vee$ for $j \neq 0$, we have $\hat{\alpha}_0^\vee = (u-1)K + \alpha_0^\vee$. However, since $\hat{\alpha}_0^\vee$ is real, one always has $\hat{\alpha}_0^\vee = z\alpha_q^\vee$, for some $z \in W$, and some $q \in \{0, 1, \dots, r\}$. If $yz = r_{p_s} \cdots r_{p_1}$ is a reduced decomposition of yz , then we simply get

$$n_0 := \tilde{y}_+ (F_{p_s} (\cdots (F_{p_1} (F_q) F_{p_1}) \cdots) F_{p_s}) \tilde{y}_+^{-1} v_\lambda. \quad (3.9)$$

Another expression for the operators defined above is

$$F_i = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\ell!} (\log f_i)^\ell (1 + h_i)^\ell, \quad (3.10)$$

where we use

$$\log f_i = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{-1}{n} (1 - f_i)^n. \quad (3.11)$$

With these expansions, it is straightforward to verify that

$$[h_i, F_j] = -A_{ij} F_j (1 + h_j), \quad (3.12)$$

for example. This suffices to show that the expressions (3.8) and (3.9) reduce to those prescribed in [18].

For convenience, we point out that if $\alpha_0^{[u]}$ denotes $\hat{\alpha}_0^\vee$ at fixed u , then $\alpha_0^{[u+2]} = r_0 r_\theta \alpha_0^{[u]}$. Also, for the case of $X_r = A_r$, we have

$$r_\theta = (r_1 r_2 \cdots r_r) (r_1 \cdots r_{r-1}) \cdots (r_1 r_2) r_1, \quad (3.13)$$

and $\alpha_0^{[2]} = r_0 r_1 r_2 \cdots r_{r-1} \alpha_r^\vee$.

As a simple example, consider the four weights $[-\frac{1}{2}, 0]$, $[-\frac{3}{2}, 1]$, $[1, -\frac{3}{2}]$, $[0, -\frac{1}{2}]$, of $P^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, for $A_{1, -\frac{1}{2}}$. The first two can be considered elements of $P_{2, id}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, the third and fourth, elements of $P_{2, w_1}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. We also need $\dot{\alpha}_0^\vee = K + \alpha_0^\vee = r_0 \alpha_1^\vee$ for $u = 2$. For $[-\frac{1}{2}, 0]$, we get the null vectors

$$\begin{aligned} n_0 &= F_0 F_1 F_0 v_{[-\frac{1}{2}, 0]} = f_0^{\frac{7}{2}} f_1^2 f_0^{\frac{1}{2}} v_{[-\frac{1}{2}, 0]}, \\ n_1 &= F_1 v_{[-\frac{1}{2}, 0]} = f_1 v_{[-\frac{1}{2}, 0]}; \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

and for $[-\frac{3}{2}, 1]$

$$\begin{aligned} n_0 &= F_0 F_1 F_0 v_{[-\frac{3}{2}, 1]} = f_0^{\frac{5}{2}} f_1 f_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} v_{[-\frac{3}{2}, 1]}, \\ n_1 &= F_1 v_{[-\frac{3}{2}, 1]} = f_1^2 v_{[-\frac{3}{2}, 1]}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

The null vectors for highest weights $[1, -\frac{3}{2}]$ and $[0, -\frac{1}{2}]$ can be simply obtained from these by applying w_1 , which changes the highest weights and interchanges F_0 and F_1 .

A more compact notation suggests itself. Suppose α is a real root, so that $\alpha = \tilde{w} \alpha_j$, for some $\tilde{w} \in \tilde{W}$, and that $\tilde{w} = w_m w$ with $w \in W$ having reduced decomposition $w = r_{i_1} r_{i_2} \cdots r_{i_\ell}$. Then define

$$F(\alpha) := w_m (F_{i_\ell} (\cdots (F_{i_1} (F_j) F_{i_1}) \cdots) F_{i_\ell}) w_m^{-1}. \quad (3.16)$$

It would be interesting to investigate the properties these operators. What we have just observed is simply that the MFF null vectors take the form

$$n_j = F(\tilde{y} \dot{\alpha}_j^\vee) v_\lambda, \quad (3.17)$$

for principal admissible highest weights $\lambda \in P_{u, \tilde{y}}^k$.

A general feature of the null vector (3.17) is that its inner exponent is just the integer $1 + \lambda_j^0$. See the $A_{1, -\frac{1}{2}}$ example above, for instance, where for highest weights $\lambda = [-\frac{1}{2}, 0]$, $[-\frac{3}{2}, 1]$, $[1, -\frac{3}{2}]$, $[0, -\frac{1}{2}]$, the ‘‘integrable parts’’ are $\lambda^0 = [1, 0]$, $[0, 1]$, $[0, 1]$, $[1, 0]$, respectively. Explicitly, we can rewrite (3.17) as

$$n_j = w_m (F_{i_\ell} (\cdots (F_{i_1} (f_i^{1+\lambda_j^0}) F_{i_1}) \cdots) F_{i_\ell}) w_m^{-1} v_\lambda, \quad (3.18)$$

where for $j \neq 0$, $i = j$ and $\tilde{y} = w_m r_{i_1} \cdots r_{i_\ell}$; and for $j = 0$, $\dot{\alpha}_0^\vee = z \alpha_i^\vee$ and $\tilde{y} z = w_m r_{i_1} \cdots r_{i_\ell}$. This is helpful when writing the MFF expressions. For example, for $A_{2, k}$ with $u = 3$ and $\lambda = k \Lambda_0$, we have $\lambda^0 = k^0 \Lambda_0$ and $\dot{\alpha}_0^\vee = r_0 r_\theta \alpha_0^\vee = r_0 r_1 r_2 r_1 \alpha_0^\vee$. So we can write

$$\begin{aligned} n_0 &= F_0 F_1 F_2 F_1 (f_0^{1+k^0}) F_1 F_2 F_1 F_0 v_{k \Lambda_0} \\ &= f_0^{13+5k} f_1^{5+2k} f_2^{10+4k} f_1^{5+2k} f_0^{7+3k} f_1^{2+k} f_2^{4+2k} f_1^{2+k} f_0^{1+k} v_{k \Lambda_0}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

4. Field Identifications in Nonunitary Coset Models

4.1. The problem of field identifications

The Virasoro minimal models have a well-known A_1 diagonal coset description:

$$\frac{A_{1,1} \oplus A_{1,k}}{A_{1,k+1}} . \quad (4.1)$$

The level k is related to the usual parameters p, p' (p, p' coprime and $p > p'$) that appear in the expression of the central charge

$$c = 1 - \frac{6(p-p')^2}{pp'} \quad (4.2)$$

by the following relations:

$$p - p' = u \quad , \quad k = \frac{3p' - 2p}{p - p'} . \quad (4.3)$$

These models are unitary when $p = p' + 1$ and the Virasoro fields are expressed in terms of constituent integrable representations $\{\eta, \lambda; \lambda'\}$ of A_1 (at respective levels 1, k , $k + 1$).

The basic Virasoro field identification

$$\phi_{r,s} \sim \phi_{p'-r, p-s} \quad (4.4)$$

(where the labels r, s runs over the range $1 \leq r \leq p' - 1, 1 \leq s \leq p - 1$, i.e., $r = \lambda_1 + 1, s = \lambda'_1 + 1$) is simply a translation of the coset field identification

$$\{\eta, \lambda; \lambda'\} \sim \{A\eta, A\lambda; A\lambda'\} \quad (4.5)$$

where A is the outer automorphism that interchanges the roots α_0 and α_1 . In coset models, field identifications generically result from outer automorphisms [22] (exceptions define the so-called maverick cosets [23]).

From the Virasoro point of view, the distinction between unitary and nonunitary theories (apart from unitarity) is rather smooth. In particular, there is no dramatic increase in the number of distinct fields when passing from unitary to nonunitary models (for instance, with $p + p'$ fixed). However, from the coset perspective, there is quite a difference in the number of admissible representations (two of the three representations being admissible when $p > p' + 1$) when, say, we start with $k = k^0$ and then turn on the value of $u - 1$ from 0 to positive integers. Therefore, in the nonunitary case there must be a much larger number of field identifications than those resulting from the action of the outer automorphisms. Our goal is to unravel this whole set in a systematic way. We show in particular that these identifications have a natural formulation in terms of the description of the principal admissible representations presented in section 2.

4.2. Branching conditions

Let us consider the diagonal coset

$$\frac{X_{n,\ell} \oplus X_{n,k}}{X_{n,k+\ell}} \quad (4.6)$$

where ℓ is a non-negative integer and k is admissible. Let η be an integrable weight of level ℓ , λ and λ' be two admissible weights at levels k and $k + \ell$, respectively:

$$\lambda \in P_{u,\tilde{y}}^k, \quad \lambda' \in P_{u,\tilde{y}'}^{k+\ell}. \quad (4.7)$$

The basic condition for the triplet $\{\eta, \lambda; \lambda'\}$ to be a possible label of a coset field is that the following branching condition be satisfied:

$$\mathcal{P}(\gamma + \lambda - \lambda') \in \bar{Q}, \quad (4.8)$$

where, as above, \mathcal{P} projects an affine weight onto its horizontal part.

More explicitly, the branching condition reads

$$\mathcal{P}(\eta + \tilde{y} \cdot \lambda^0 + \tilde{y}((k - k^0)\Lambda_0) - \tilde{y}' \cdot (\lambda'^0) + \tilde{y}'((k + \ell - k^0 - u\ell)\Lambda_0)) \in \bar{Q} \quad (4.9)$$

This requires the cancellation of the fractional parts modulo $u\bar{Q}$, that is

$$\mathcal{P}(\tilde{y}k\Lambda_0 - \tilde{y}'k\Lambda_0) = 0 \pmod{\bar{Q}}. \quad (4.10)$$

This forces

$$\mathcal{P}(\tilde{y}\Lambda_0 - \tilde{y}'\Lambda_0) = 0 \pmod{u\bar{Q}} \quad (4.11)$$

With $\tilde{y} = t_\beta \bar{y}$ and given that $\bar{y} \in \bar{W}$ (so that $\bar{y}\Lambda_0 = \Lambda_0$) we have

$$t_\beta \Lambda_0 = t_{\beta'} \Lambda_0 + u\gamma \quad (4.12)$$

with $\gamma \in \bar{Q}$. This implies that

$$\beta = \beta' + u\gamma. \quad (4.13)$$

Since $\beta \in \bar{P}^\vee$, it is plain that $\gamma \in \bar{Q}^\vee$. Given that β and β' are associated to admissible weights, they can be taken to satisfy the condition

$$-u < (\beta|\alpha) \leq u \quad \text{and} \quad -u < (\beta'|\alpha) \leq u \quad (4.14)$$

for any positive root α . Hence the relation $\beta = \beta' + u\gamma$ can be satisfied only if $\gamma = 0$. Therefore $\beta = \beta'$ and since \bar{y} is uniquely specified by β , it follows that $\bar{y} = \bar{y}'$ and thus $\tilde{y} = \tilde{y}'$. This simplifies the branching condition substantially, reducing it to

$$\mathcal{P}(\eta + \tilde{y} \cdot [\lambda^0 - \lambda'^0 - \ell(1-u)\Lambda_0]) \in \bar{Q} \quad . \quad (4.15)$$

This is clearly equivalent to requiring

$$\mathcal{P}(\eta + \lambda^0 - \lambda'^0) \in \bar{Q} \quad . \quad (4.16)$$

Because the Weyl transformation of any weight does not affect the branching condition, it is clear that if $\{\eta, \lambda; \lambda'\}$ labels a coset field, $\{\eta, w.\lambda; w.\lambda'\}$ also labels a coset field provided that $w.\lambda$ is admissible (which thereby ensures the admissibility of $w.\lambda'$). (Of course there is no point in applying the Weyl transformation to the first weight since in that way, one can never reach an integrable weight. Also, the above analysis shows that the same Weyl transformation must be used for the two admissible weights.)

There is another general class of transformations of the coset field that preserve the branching condition. It involves the action of outer automorphisms. Every outer automorphism $A \in \tilde{W}_+$ can be put in a 1-1 correspondence with an element of the finite Weyl group w_A via the relation

$$A\lambda = k(A-1)\Lambda_0 + w_A\lambda \quad (4.17)$$

It readily follows from this that if $\{\eta, \lambda; \lambda'\}$ labels a coset field, $\{A\eta, A\lambda; A\lambda'\}$ also labels a coset field since

$$\mathcal{P}(\ell(A-1)\Lambda_0 + w_A\eta + k(A-1)\Lambda_0 + w_A\lambda - (k+\ell)(A-1)\Lambda_0 + w_A\lambda') \in \bar{Q} \quad (4.18)$$

reduces to the condition (4.8).

These transformations are candidates for field identifications, since they do not modify the branching conditions. To demonstrate that two coset fields can be identified, we must show that their characters are the same, or equivalently, that their modular transformation matrices are identical.

4.3. Field identifications via modular matrices

In terms of the coset components, the coset modular S matrix is

$$S_{\{\eta,\lambda;\lambda'\}\{\xi,\mu;\mu'\}}^{\text{coset}} = S_{\eta\xi}^{(\ell)} S_{\lambda\mu}^{(k)} S_{\lambda'\mu'}^{(k+\ell)*} \quad (4.19)$$

The S matrix entering on the rhs is

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\lambda\mu}^{(k)} &= F_k e^{-2\pi i[(\mu^0+\rho|\beta)+(\lambda^0+\rho|\gamma)+(k+h^\vee)(\beta|\gamma)]} \\ &\quad \times \sum_{w \in \bar{W}} (\det w) e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{k+h^\vee}[(w(\lambda^0+\rho)|\mu^0+\rho+(k+h^\vee)\gamma)]} \\ &= F_k e^{-2\pi i[(\mu+\rho|\beta)]} (\det \bar{x}) \sum_{w \in \bar{W}} (\det w) e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{k+h^\vee}[(w(\lambda^0+\rho)|\mu+\rho)]} \\ &= F_k e^{-2\pi i[(\lambda+\rho|\gamma)]} (\det \bar{y}) \sum_{w \in \bar{W}} (\det w) e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{k+h^\vee}[(w(\lambda+\rho)|\mu^0+\rho)]} \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

where F_k is a constant fixed by the unitarity of $S^{(k)}$, and we used the notation

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= \tilde{y} \cdot [\lambda^0 + (k - k^0)\Lambda_0], & \tilde{y} &= t_\beta \bar{y} \\ \mu &= \tilde{x} \cdot [\mu^0 + (k - k^0)\Lambda_0], & \tilde{x} &= t_\gamma \bar{x} \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

For the second line we used

$$(\beta|w\lambda) \equiv (\beta|\lambda) \pmod{1}, \quad (4.22)$$

for any λ (i.e., $\beta \in \bar{P}^\vee$) and

$$\begin{aligned} \mu + \rho &= \tilde{x} \cdot [\mu^0 + (k - k^0)\Lambda_0] + \rho \\ &= \bar{x}(\mu^0 + \rho) + (k^0 + h^\vee)\gamma + (k - k^0)[\Lambda_0 + \gamma] \\ &= \bar{x}(\mu^0 + \rho) + (k + h^\vee)\gamma + (k - k^0)\Lambda_0 \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

A simple analysis yields the following two relations:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{w,\lambda,\mu}^{(k)} &= (\det w) S_{\lambda,\mu}^{(k)} \\ S_{A\lambda,\mu}^{(k)} &= S_{\lambda,\mu}^{(k)} e^{-2\pi i(A\Lambda_0|\mu)} e^{-2\pi i((w_A-1)\beta|\mu+\rho)} \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

The first result follows readily from the third relation in (4.20). To obtain the second one, we use (4.17) – notice that if k is integer, the second phase factor in it disappears. From the first of these relations, it follows directly that

$$S_{\{\eta,w,\lambda;w,\lambda'\}\{\xi,\mu;\mu'\}}^{\text{coset}} = S_{\{\eta,\lambda;\lambda'\}\{\xi,\mu;\mu'\}}^{\text{coset}} \quad (4.25)$$

The second one implies

$$S_{\{A\eta, A\lambda; A\lambda'\}}^{\text{coset}} \{\xi, \mu; \mu'\} = S_{\{\eta, \lambda; \lambda'\}}^{\text{coset}} \{\xi, \mu; \mu'\} \phi \quad (4.26)$$

with

$$\phi = e^{-2\pi i(A\Lambda_0|\xi+\mu-\mu')} e^{-2\pi i[((w_A-1)\beta|\mu+\rho)-((w_A-1)\beta'|\mu'+\rho)]} \quad (4.27)$$

where β' refers to the weight λ' . But the branching condition requires $\beta' = \beta$, the second part of the phase reduces to $((w_A - 1)\beta, \mu - \mu')$. The branching condition for the coset field $\{\xi, \mu; \mu'\}$ forces $\mu - \mu'$ to be an integer weight. Now, because β is a coweight, the product of $(w - 1)\beta$ for any Weyl group element w with an integer weight is necessarily an integer. The second phase factor is thus 1. For the first one, we notice that the finite part of $\xi + \mu - \mu'$ (the part that contributes to the scalar product) is an element of \bar{Q} and since $A\Lambda_0 \in \bar{P}^\vee$, the scalar product $(A\Lambda_0|\xi + \mu - \mu')$ is also an integer. Therefore $\phi = 1$ and we have established the S -part of the field identifications.

The analysis of the T -part is much simpler since it relies solely on the behaviour of the conformal dimensions under the transformations under consideration. For any conformal field theory, the matrix T takes the following simple form

$$T_{ij} = e^{2\pi i(h_i - c/24)} \delta_{ij} \ , \quad (4.28)$$

where h_i is the i th conformal weight. The conformal weight corresponding to the $X_{r,k}$ representation of highest weight λ is defined above, after (2.6).

It is not simple to find an expression for the conformal dimension of the coset field $\{\eta, \lambda; \lambda'\}$ in terms of those of its ‘‘components’’. But it can only differ by an integer from the linear combination:

$$\Delta h = h_\eta + h_\lambda - h_{\lambda'} \ . \quad (4.29)$$

This is easily checked to be invariant under the two field transformations considered above (modulo an integer in the second case). We omit the details.

The S and T invariance proves then the coset field identifications [4]

$$\{\eta, \lambda; \lambda'\} \sim \{\eta, w.\lambda; w.\lambda'\} \sim \{A\eta, A\lambda; A\lambda'\} \sim \{A\eta, Aw.\lambda; Aw.\lambda'\} \ . \quad (4.30)$$

4.4. Coset representatives

Let us now consider a chain of field identifications that will lead to a canonical choice of coset field representatives. Let us start with admissible fields corresponding to the element $\tilde{y} = id$:

$$\lambda \equiv \Lambda \in P_{u,id}^k, \quad \lambda' \equiv \Lambda' \in P_{u,id}^{k+\ell} \quad (4.31)$$

by picking up two weights $\lambda^0 \in P^{k^0}$, $\lambda'^0 \in P^{k^0+\ell u}$ together with a coset partner $\eta \in P^\ell$ such that $\mathcal{P}(\eta + \lambda^0 - \lambda'^0) \in \bar{Q}$. We now construct a string of w -type field identifications, by choosing $w \in Y_{[u]}$ (the subset of affine and finite Weyl transformations among the whole set $\tilde{Y}_{[u]}$). This ensures that both $w.\Lambda$ and $w.\Lambda'$ are admissible. That yields then $|Y_{[u]}|$ field identifications: $\{\eta, \Lambda; \Lambda'\} \sim \{\eta, w.\Lambda; w.\Lambda'\}$. On each coset field, we then act on the three weights with all possible elements A of the outer automorphism group. This produces $|\tilde{W}_+|$ additional field identifications. Hence, starting from a coset field with $\tilde{y} = id$, we generate $|\tilde{Y}_{[u]}|$ field identifications. This is necessarily a complete set of field identifications. Indeed, all admissible weights at level k are generated by $\tilde{y}.\lambda^0 + (k - k^0)\Lambda_0$ with \tilde{y} and λ^0 spanning respectively the sets $\tilde{Y}_{[u]}$ and P^{k^0}/\tilde{W}_+ . Hence, all coset fields with weights having a nonvanishing finite fractional part are identified with cosets with zero finite fractional part. This completes the argument of [4]. Moreover, it shows that we can restrict to coset field representatives that have $\tilde{y} = id$, a point that was conjectured in [4]. As a result, we can always take as labels for coset fields, triplets of the form $\{\eta, \Lambda; \Lambda'\}$. That is, we can choose $\tilde{y} = id$, with $\eta \in P_+^\ell$, $\lambda^0 \in P_+^{k^0}$ and $\lambda'^0 \in P_+^{k^0+\ell u}$, and keep as the only residual field identifications those generated by outer automorphisms:

$$\{\eta, \Lambda; \Lambda'\} \sim \{A\eta, A\Lambda; A\Lambda'\}. \quad (4.32)$$

The entire analysis can therefore be completed in the $\tilde{y} = id$ sector. This is the canonical description of the primary fields in these diagonal coset theories.

It might appear somewhat more natural to reformulate the above result in terms of finite weights $\mathcal{P}\lambda^0$ and $\mathcal{P}\lambda'^0$ since these are integrable (i.e., elements of $\bar{P}_+^{k^0}$) in the $\tilde{y} = id$ sector. The residual field identification then reads

$$\{\mathcal{P}\eta, \mathcal{P}\lambda^0; \mathcal{P}\lambda'^0\} \sim \{\mathcal{P}A^u\eta, \mathcal{P}(A\lambda^0); \mathcal{P}(A\lambda'^0)\}. \quad (4.33)$$

The power u of A is simply justified by considering the branching conditions.

5. Conclusion

We have presented a simple, detailed description of the Kac-Wakimoto principal admissible representations, together with two applications in conformal field theory: 1 – an elegant transcription of the Malikov-Feigen-Fuchs null vectors and 2 – the complete analysis of the problem of field identifications in nonunitary diagonal cosets.

Coset models in which there are field identifications other than those generated by outer automorphisms were thought to be extremely rare. Examples are the trivial coset models associated with conformal embeddings, as well as the maverick cosets found in [23] (with a further example noticed in [24]). As we have shown, nonunitary coset models are also special in that respect; they are mavericks. Of course, maverick field identifications seem to be a generic feature of nonunitary cosets, whereas they are uncommon in unitary ones.

The results of [3] [4] and of the present paper constitute the coset counterpart to those obtained [25] from the hamiltonian-reduction point of view. In the few examples where the correspondence between the two methods is known, they yield equivalent results. It should be stressed, however, that the relation between hamiltonian reduction and coset theories is not worked out in general (even though both constructions may be realised as gauged WZW models [26]). For instance, no coset description is known for some W -algebra models constructed by hamiltonian reduction, and the existence of such coset descriptions has not yet been settled. This is one of our motivations for pursuing the development of coset models. Also, we think that the coset description has advantages over the method of hamiltonian reduction in the analysis of some properties, fusion rules being one example.

We hope to return to this question of fusion rules for (the conjectured) fractional-level WZW models. Our aim is to unravel the Verlinde formulation of the null-vector expression for fusion rules and to confront the different results². One tactic would be to study their application to coset models, where the final structure of fusion rules ought to be unambiguous.

Acknowledgements

² Notice also that the results derived in [11] using cohomology and in [27] using a vertex-operator algebra agree with those derived by the Verlinde formula when the latter yields positive fusion coefficients. So they differ from those found in [12].

For helpful conversations, M.W. thanks Wolfgang Eholzer, Matthias Gaberdiel, Terry Gannon, Adrian Kent and Gérard Watts; and acknowledges the hospitality of D.A.M.T.P., Cambridge, where some of this work was done.

Appendix: Principal Admissible Weights for C_2 and G_2

In this appendix, we describe the set $Y_{[u]}$ for the rank-two simple algebras other than A_2 . Let us start with C_2 . The list of all elements of $Y_{[4]}$ can be read off Figure 4 as those points in the fundamental domain limited by the dark lines. The different dashed lines indicate the reduction appropriate to smaller values of u . The two types of octagons reflect the Weyl group relations $(r_0r_1)^4 = (r_1r_2)^4 = 1$ while the diamond codes the simpler relation $(r_0r_2)^2 = 1$. The whole set of elements of $\tilde{Y}_{[u]}$ is obtained by the adjunction of the action of \tilde{W}_+ to the elements of $Y_{[u]}$. For C_2 , \tilde{W}_+ is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}_2 and its nontrivial element A has action $A\alpha_0 = \alpha_2$, $A\alpha_2 = \alpha_0$. Here is their decomposition in the form $t_{\beta\bar{y}}$ for the case $u = 3$:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
id = t_{(0,0)} id & A = t_{(1,0)} r_2r_1r_2 \\
r_0 = t_{(2,0)} r_1r_2r_1 & Ar_0 = t_{(2,-1)} r_1r_2 \\
r_1r_0 = t_{(-2,2)} r_2r_1 & Ar_1r_0 = t_{(-2,1)} r_2 \\
r_0r_1r_0 = t_{(0,2)} r_2r_1r_2 & Ar_0r_1r_0 = t_{(0,-1)} id \\
r_2r_1r_0 = t_{(2,-2)} r_1 & Ar_2r_1r_0 = t_{(2,1)} r_2r_1r_2r_1 \\
r_2r_0r_1r_0 = t_{(4,-2)} r_1r_2 & Ar_2r_0r_1r_0 = t_{(4,-1)} r_1r_2r_1 \\
r_1r_2r_1r_0 = t_{(-2,0)} id & Ar_1r_2r_1r_0 = t_{(-2,3)} r_2r_1r_2 \\
r_1r_2r_0r_1r_0 = t_{(-4,2)} r_2 & Ar_1r_2r_0r_1r_0 = t_{(-4,3)} r_2r_1 \\
r_2r_1r_2r_0r_1r_0 = t_{(0,-2)} id & Ar_2r_1r_2r_0r_1r_0 = t_{(0,3)} r_2r_1r_2
\end{array} \tag{5.1}$$

The values of β span the set $-3 < (\beta, \alpha) \leq 3$ with $\alpha \in \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_1 + \alpha_2, 2\alpha_1 + \alpha_2\}$ and $\beta \in \bar{P}^\vee$, meaning that $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2)$ with β_1 even. The set $\tilde{Y}_{[2]}$ is obtained by taking the first four elements in each column.

Consider now G_2 . The diagrammatic description of the elements of $Y_{[u]}$ is shown in Figure 5. Here the dodecagon, the hexagon and the rectangle translate the relations $(r_1r_2)^6 = (r_0r_1)^3 = (r_0r_2)^2 = id$, respectively. Every point within the region bounded by the dark lines is associated to an element of $Y_{[4]}$ and again the dashed lines indicated the




Figure 4. The graph indicating the elements of $Y_{[4]}$ for C_2 .

1

truncations resulting from decreasing u . The decomposition of the elements of $Y_{[3]}$ in the

form $t_\beta \bar{y}$ read

$$\begin{aligned}
id &= t_{(0,0)}id \\
r_0 &= t_{(1,0)}r_1r_2r_1r_2r_1 \\
r_1r_0 &= t_{(-1,3)}r_2r_1r_2r_1 \\
r_2r_1r_0 &= t_{(2,-3)}r_1r_2r_1 \\
r_1r_2r_1r_0 &= t_{(-2,3)}r_2r_1 \\
r_2r_1r_2r_1r_0 &= t_{(1,-3)}id \\
r_0r_1r_2r_1r_0 &= t_{(0,3)}r_2r_1r_2r_1r_2 \\
r_1r_2r_1r_2r_1r_0 &= t_{(-1,0)}id \\
r_2r_0r_1r_2r_1r_0 &= t_{(3,-3)}r_1r_2r_1r_2
\end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

The values of β span the set $-3 < (\beta, \alpha) \leq 3$ with $\alpha \in \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_1 + \alpha_2, \alpha_1 + 2\alpha_2, \alpha_1 + 3\alpha_2, 2\alpha_1 + 3\alpha_2\}$ and $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2)$ with $\beta_2 \in 3\mathbb{Z}$. If we restrict to the first four element above, we get $\tilde{Y}_{[2]} = Y_{[2]}$.

Notice that for these two examples, there is no simple characterisation of the elements of $Y_{[u]}$ in terms of the length of y .




Figure 5. The graph indicating the elements of $Y_{[4]}$ for G_2 .

References

- [1] V. Kac and M. Wakimoto, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA* **85** (1988) 4956
- [2] V. Kac and M. Wakimoto, *Adv. Ser. Math. Phys.* **7** (World Scientific, 1988) 138
- [3] P. Mathieu and M.A. Walton, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* (supplement) No. 102 (1990) 229
- [4] P. Mathieu, D. Sénéchal and M.A. Walton, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A7**, supplement 1B (1992) 3255
- [5] V. Kac and M. Wakimoto, *Acta Appl. Math.* **21** (1990) 3
- [6] B. Feigen and F. Malikov, *Lett. Math. Phys.* (1994) 315
- [7] J.L. Petersen, J. Rasmussen and M. Yu, *Nucl. Phys.* **B481** (1996) 577; P. Furlan, A.Ch. Ganchev and V.B. Petkova, *Nucl. Phys.* **B491** (1997) 635
- [8] J.L. Petersen, J. Rasmussen and M. Yu, *Nucl. Phys.* **B502** (1997) 649; J. Rasmussen, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A13** (1998) 1281; hep-th/9807153
- [9] I.G. Koh and P. Sorba, *Phys. Lett.* **B215** (1988) 723
- [10] S. Lu, *Phys. Lett.* **B218** (1989) 46
- [11] D. Bernard and G. Felder, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **127** (1990) 145
- [12] H. Awata and Y. Yamada, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A7** (1992) 1185
- [13] S. Ramgoolam, *New modular Hopf algebras related to rational $k \widehat{sl}(2)$* , hep-th/9301121.
- [14] C. Imbimbo, *New modular representations and fusion algebras from quantized $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ Chern-Simons theories*, hep-th/9301031
- [15] P. Furlan, A.Ch. Ganchev and V.B. Petkova, *Nucl. Phys.* **B518** (1998) 645.
- [16] P. Furlan, A.C. Ganchev and V.B. Petkova, *An extension of the character ring of $sl(3)$ and its quantization*, math.QA/9807106
- [17] M.R. Gaberdiel, private communication
- [18] F. Malikov, B. Feigen and D.B. Fuchs, *Funct. Anal. Appl.* **20** (1986) 103
- [19] M. Bauer and N. Sochen, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **152** (1993) 127
- [20] P. Furlan, A.Ch. Ganchev and V.B. Petkova, *Nucl. Phys.* **B431** (1994) 622.
- [21] P. Bowcock and A. Taormina, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 185 (1997) 467
- [22] G. Moore and Seiberg, *Phys. Lett.* **B220** (1989) 422; D. Gepner, *Phys. Lett.* **B222** (1989) 207; W. Lerche, C. Vafa and N. Warner, *Nucl. Phys.* **B324** (1989) 427; C. Ahn and M.A. Walton, *Phys. Rev.* **D41** (1990) 2558
- [23] D. Dunbar and K. G. Joshi, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A8** (1993) 2803 and 4103
- [24] J. Fuchs, B. Schellekens and C. Schweigert, *Nucl. Phys.* **B461** (1996) 371

- [25] E. Frenkel, V. Kac and M. Wakimoto, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **147** (1992) 295
- [26] see, e.g.: L. Feher et al, *On the general structure of Hamiltonian reductions of the WZNW theory*, hep-th/91112068; K. Gawedzki and A. Kupiainen, *Phys. Lett.* **B215** (1988) 119
- [27] C. Dong, H. Li and G. Mason, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **184** (1997) 65