

Hyperbolic Monopoles, (Semi-)Holomorphic Chern–Simons Theories, and Generalized Chiral Potts Models

Seyed Farough Moosavian^{*a}, Masahito Yamazaki^{†b,c,d}, and Yehao Zhou^{‡c,e}

^aMathematical Institute, University of Oxford, Woodstock Road, Oxford, OX2 6GG, UK

^bDepartment of Physics, University of Tokyo, Hongo, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan

^cKavli Institute for the Physics and Mathematics of the Universe, UTIAS, University of Tokyo, Kashiwa, Chiba 277-8583, Japan

^dTrans-Scale Quantum Science Institute, University of Tokyo, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan

^eShanghai Institute for Mathematics and Interdisciplinary Sciences, Block A, International Innovation Plaza, No. 657 Songhu Road, Yangpu District, Shanghai, China

Abstract

We study the relation between spectral data of magnetic monopoles in hyperbolic space and the curve of the spectral parameter of generalized chiral Potts models (gCPM) through the lens of (semi-)holomorphic field theories. We realize the identification of the data on the two sides, which we will call the hyperbolic monopole/gCPM correspondence. For the group $SU(2)$, this correspondence had been observed by Atiyah and Murray in the 80s. Here, we revisit and generalize this correspondence, and establish its origin. By invoking the work of Murray and Singer on the construction of spectral data of hyperbolic monopoles with arbitrary boundary values of the Higgs field, we first generalize the observation of Atiyah and Murray to the group $SU(n)$ and put the correspondence on solid ground. By embedding the classical and exceptional groups into $SU(n)$, we explore the correspondence for these groups. Next, we propose a technology to engineer gCPM within the 4d Chern–Simons (CS) theory, which explains various features of the model including the lack of rapidity-difference property of its R-matrix, and its peculiarity of having a genus ≥ 2 curve of the spectral parameter. Finally, we investigate the origin of the correspondence. We first clarify how the two sides of the correspondence can be realized from the 6d holomorphic CS theory formulated on $\mathbb{P}S(M)$, the projective spinor bundle of the Minkowski space $M = \mathbb{R}^{1,3}$, in the case of hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopoles, and the Euclidean space $M = \mathbb{R}^4$, in the case of the gCPM. We then establish that $\mathbb{P}S(M)$ for both $M = \mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ and \mathbb{R}^4 can be holomorphically embedded into $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$, the projective spinor bundle of the complexified Minkowski space $\mathbb{C}^{1,3}$, of complex dimension five equipped with a fixed complex structure. Finally, we explain how the 6d CS theory on $\mathbb{P}S(M)$ can be realized as the dimensional reduction of the 10d holomorphic CS theory formulated on $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$. As the latter theory is only sensitive to the complex structure of $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$, which has been fixed, we realize the correspondence as two incarnations of the same physics in ten dimensions.

*sfmoosavian@gmail.com

†masahito.yamazaki@ipmu.jp

‡yehaozhou1994@gmail.com

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Statement of Problems	7
1.2	Contributions of the Paper	8
1.3	Contents of the Paper	11
2	Generalized Chiral Potts Model	12
2.1	The Model	12
2.2	The Yang–Baxter Equation	14
3	Hyperbolic Monopoles and their Spectral Data	15
3.1	Monopoles on Hyperbolic Space	15
3.2	Twistor Correspondence for Hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -Monopoles	19
3.2.1	Twistor Space of Hyperbolic Space	19
3.2.2	The Correspondence	24
3.2.3	Spectral Data and Recovering Monopole Solutions	30
4	The Hyperbolic Monopole/gCPM Correspondence	33
4.1	General Considerations	33
4.2	Establishing the Correspondence for $SU(n)$	35
4.2.1	Hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -Monopoles from gCPMs	35
4.2.2	gCPM from Hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -Monopole	46
4.3	Generalization to Other Lie Algebras	50
5	Generalized CPM and 4d Chern–Simons Theory	53
5.1	CPM from 4d Chern–Simons Theory	53
5.1.1	The Curve of Spectral Parameter as a Ramified Cover of \mathbb{P}^1	54
5.1.2	The One-Form on the Curve of Spectral Parameter	56
5.1.3	Gauge Lie Algebra, Boundary Conditions, and R-Matrix	59
5.1.4	Lack of the Rapidity-Difference Property	62
5.2	Generalization to gCPM	63
6	Origin of the Hyperbolic Monopole/gCPM Correspondence	64
6.1	Hyperbolic Monopoles from Six Dimensions	67
6.1.1	Instantons from 6d Chern–Simons Theory	67
6.1.2	Hyperbolic Monopoles as Dilatation-Invariant Instantons	69
6.1.3	Masses, Charges, and Spectral Data from Six Dimensions	71
6.2	Generalized CPM from Six Dimensions	73
6.2.1	4d Holomorphic BF Theory from 6d Chern–Simons Theory	74
6.2.2	Emergence of 4d Chern–Simons Theory	76
6.3	The Correspondence from Ten Dimensions	78
6.3.1	6d hCS Theory from 10d hCS Theory	79

6.3.2	Chasing the Correspondence to Ten Dimensions	83
7	Discussion and Future Directions	85
A	More Details on Twistor Space of Hyperbolic Space	92
B	Some Basic Facts about Complete Intersections	95
C	Some Basic Lie Algebra Facts and Manipulations	97

1 Introduction

Due to the complexity of physical systems, it is rare to find physical situations that can be modeled and simultaneously solved exactly. As such, integrable models and their properties have fascinated physicists and mathematicians for centuries. In this work, we are concerned with two classes of integrable systems: (1) magnetic monopoles in hyperbolic space \mathbb{H}^3 , and (2) the generalized chiral Potts model (gCPM), a special two-dimensional integrable lattice model in which dynamical variables, called spins, live on lattice sites. Let us briefly explain each before elucidating the objectives of this work.

Monopoles in Hyperbolic Space. In quantum field theory, the study of classical solutions such as instantons, monopoles, and skyrmions is indispensable for understanding nonperturbative physics. A fascinating feature of these configurations is that they are intimately connected with integrable systems. The most famous of all is an (anti-)instanton in four dimensions, which is a solution of the (anti-)self-duality equation

$$F = \pm \star F, \tag{1.1}$$

where F is the curvature of a connection A on a principal G -bundle over the four-manifold and \star is the Hodge star operation. Moduli space of solutions of (1.1) has been extensively studied, in particular by Donaldson [1, 2]. There is considerable evidence that many integrable systems can be derived from the (anti-)self-duality equation and as such can be regarded as the master integrable system [3]. A useful tool in the study of integrability of (anti-)instantons is the twistor correspondence, according to which (anti-)instanton solutions give rise to holomorphic vector bundles over a certain complex manifold called the twistor space. For (anti-)instantons on \mathbb{R}^4 , such a correspondence was first realized by Ward [4, 5] and from a mathematical perspective, by Atiyah, Hitchin, and Singer [6, 7].

One of the most important integrable systems obtained from the (anti-)self-duality equation is the magnetic monopole. Traditionally, they have been realized as the reduction of (anti-)self-duality equation by assuming invariance under a one-dimensional group of symmetries. In the process, (anti-)self-duality equation reduces to the Bogomolny equation,

the defining equation of magnetic monopoles [8]¹

$$F = \star D\phi , \tag{1.2}$$

where the gauge covariant derivative D is defined with the connection A , ϕ is an adjoint-valued scalar (the Higgs field), and \star is now the Hodge star operation on a three-manifold.² The Bogomolny equation (1.2) has been studied on general three-manifolds and in particular hyperbolic ones by Braam [10, 11]. Monopoles in the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^3 , or Euclidean monopoles, have been the most well-studied case [12]. They can be realized as translation-invariant (anti-)instantons. The study of monopoles in hyperbolic space \mathbb{H}^3 , or hyperbolic monopoles, was initiated by Atiyah [13] who realized them as circle-invariant (anti-)instantons. The zero-curvature limit of hyperbolic monopoles gives Euclidean ones [13, 14, 15]. However, unlike Euclidean monopoles, hyperbolic monopoles are distinguished by boundary values of the Higgs field, which are also called magnetic monopole masses [16, 17, 18]. Therefore, it turns out to be convenient to distinguish two classes of hyperbolic monopoles based on the boundary values of the Higgs field: (1) Those with integer (or half-integer) boundary values of the Higgs field: these can be thought of as circle-invariant (anti-)instantons as conceived by Atiyah [13, 19, 20, 16, 21, 22], and (2) those with arbitrary real boundary values of the Higgs field: these can be thought of as dilatation-invariant (anti-)instantons, as have been realized by Murray and Singer [17].³ The difference between the boundary values of the Higgs field comes exactly because of their particular realization. The crux of the construction in [13, 16, 21, 22] is that hyperbolic monopoles are circle-invariant solutions of (1.1). The quantization of the asymptotic values is then forced by the compactness of the circle. Therefore, it is conceivable that to construct hyperbolic monopoles with arbitrary boundary values of the Higgs field, one should consider solutions of the (anti-)self-duality equation invariant under a non-compact group. Indeed, the construction of Murray and Singer in [17] exploits this idea: they realize hyperbolic monopoles as dilatation (i.e. \mathbb{R}_{+} -) invariant solutions of (1.1) on an open subset of Minkowski space.

Explicit examples of hyperbolic monopole configurations have been constructed in the literature [19, 25]. Interestingly, hyperbolic monopoles are also related to other integrable systems [26]: the Braam–Austin or discrete Nahm equation, which is a one-dimensional lattice equation [16], and a certain soliton system in three-dimensional AdS spacetime in the Lorentzian signature. Similar to (anti-)instantons, there is a twistor correspondence for magnetic monopoles. Through this correspondence, a monopole solution on a three-manifold determines a holomorphic vector bundle over the twistor space of that

¹The original paper of Bogomolny can be found in [9, pg. 389].

²It would be more accurate to write the Bogomolny equations as $F = \pm \star D\phi$, where \pm correspond to monopole/anti-monopole configurations, which come from the reduction of (anti-)instantons. To avoid cluttering, we just ignore this distinction in this work. It would not affect any of the results.

³Hyperbolic monopoles with non-integral boundary values of Higgs field and appropriate boundary conditions could be interpreted as solutions to the (anti-)self-duality equation with certain singularities along a codimension-two subspace [13, 23]. Furthermore, in general, the reduction of (anti-)self-duality equations on a generic curved spacetime does not need to lead to a Bogomolny-type equation once invariance under certain coordinate transformations are imposed [24].

three-manifold [27, 28, 29] (see also [30, 31]). The monopole solution can eventually be reconstructed in terms of its so-called spectral data in a unique fashion. The twistor correspondence for monopoles on \mathbb{R}^3 was first pointed out by Ward [29] and Hitchin [27] for the gauge group $SU(2)$, and then generalized to arbitrarily connected compact simple gauge groups in [32, 33, 34, 35, 36]. Hence, this correspondence is sometimes called the Ward–Hitchin correspondence, and can be thought of as a non-linear version of one of the special instances of the Penrose transform [37, 38, 39, 40]. The spectral data of hyperbolic $SU(2)$ -monopoles with integer (or half-integer) boundary values of the Higgs field is constructed in [13, 16] (see also [41] for the connection to ADHM construction), while for the group $SU(n)$ with arbitrary boundary values of the Higgs field is worked out by Murray and Singer in [17]. There are partial results on the spectral data of hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopoles with integer boundary values of the Higgs field in [22, §14]. This work uses boundary conditions different than the ones used by Murray and Singer.

Integrability and the Yang–Baxter Equation. (1+1)-dimensional integrable models are solvable models of statistical mechanics in which dynamical variables, or spins, live on sites of a quantum one-dimensional chain evolving in time. One can equivalently think of them as classical two-dimensional lattice models. Historically, the first systematic approach to solve the eigenvalue problem for such systems was the so-called coordinate Bethe ansatz [42]. Such models have been studied intensively since the complete analytic solution of the two-dimensional Ising model on a square lattice by Onsager [43]. Time and again it has been proven that the most successful and conceptual approach in uncovering the integrable structure of these models has been the so-called algebraic Bethe ansatz or quantum inverse scattering method [44, 45, 46] based on concepts such as Lax pair, R-matrix, and the Yang–Baxter (YB) equation [47, 43, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52].

Spins of an integrable model take value in representations of a symmetry algebra \mathfrak{g} . This leads to a useful way of thinking about R-matrix, whose components are denoted as $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{w}'}^{\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}'}(z, z')$: it is the intertwiner of the tensor product of two modules \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{V}' of \mathfrak{g} : $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{V}\mathcal{V}'}(z, z') : \mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{V}' \rightarrow \mathcal{V}' \otimes \mathcal{V}$. It depends on two types of variables (1) two spectral/rapidity parameters $z \neq z'$, and (2) the spin states $\{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}', \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}'\}$.




Figure 1: A graphical representation of the R-matrix of an integrable model.

The spectral parameters correspond to the inhomogeneity parameters of the integrable

model and the states correspond to weights in representations of \mathfrak{g} . If one thinks of the R-matrix as $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{V}\mathcal{V}'}(z, z') : \mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{V}' \rightarrow \mathcal{V}' \otimes \mathcal{V}$, then the YB equations can be obtained by acting on $\mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{V}' \otimes \mathcal{V}''$. It is given by

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{V}\mathcal{V}'}(z, z')\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{V}\mathcal{V}''}(z, z'')\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{V}'\mathcal{V}''}(z', z'') = \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{V}'\mathcal{V}''}(z', z'')\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{V}\mathcal{V}''}(z, z'')\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{V}\mathcal{V}'}(z, z'). \quad (1.3)$$

The YB equation is a sufficient condition for integrability whose origin goes back to the star-triangle relation mentioned in passing in the introduction of Onsager's paper [43]. It ensures the existence of enough number of conserved quantities in involution which in turns guarantees the complete quantum integrability of the model.⁴ By reading from bottom to top, a graphical representation of the YB equation is




Figure 2: A graphical representation of the Yang–Baxter equation.

Due to the fundamental importance of the YB equation, finding its solutions and their classification have been actively pursued in the 70s and 80s [54, 46, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66].⁵ For an integrable spin model associated with a Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} , its R-matrix can be expanded in terms of a formal parameter \hbar as $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{V}\mathcal{V}'}(z) = \mathbb{1} + \hbar r_{\mathcal{V}\mathcal{V}'}(z) + \mathcal{O}(\hbar^2)$, where $r_{\mathcal{V}\mathcal{V}'}(z) \in \text{End}(\mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathfrak{g})$ is called the classical R-matrix. As a result of (1.3), it satisfies the classical YB equation

$$[r_{\mathcal{V}\mathcal{V}'}(z, z'), r_{\mathcal{V}\mathcal{V}''}(z, z'')] + [r_{\mathcal{V}\mathcal{V}'}(z, z'), r_{\mathcal{V}'\mathcal{V}''}(z', z'')] + [r_{\mathcal{V}\mathcal{V}''}(z, z''), r_{\mathcal{V}'\mathcal{V}''}(z', z'')] = 0. \quad (1.4)$$

The classification of solutions of (1.4) is achieved in the celebrated work of Belavin and Drinfeld [55, 56, 57]. It was realized in loc. cit. that if one assumes the rapidity-difference property, i.e. $\mathcal{R}(z, z') = \mathcal{R}(z - z')$ or $\mathcal{R}(z/z')$, then the rapidity parameters in (1.4) would take value in $\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C}^\times$, or \mathbb{E} (an elliptic curve), which are called the curve of spectral parameter of the model. It then turns out that the corresponding classical R-matrix is a rational, trigonometric, or elliptic function of the spectral parameter. Such solutions are

⁴Strictly speaking, this is correct for the so-called ultra-local quantum integrable systems. The non-ultralocal quantum integrable systems are characterized by the braided quantum YB equation [53, §8].

⁵An explicit elliptic solution for the Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{sl}(1|1)$ was constructed in [67] using techniques from the Bethe/Gauge correspondence.

called rational, trigonometric, and elliptic, respectively. These classical R-matrices can be quantized and the solutions of the YB equation (1.3) can be constructed from the representation theory of Yangians, quantum affine, and quantum elliptic algebras, respectively [68]. Over the years, it has been proven difficult to construct integrable spin models that evade this classification scheme and have rapidity parameters belonging to curves of genus ≥ 2 .⁶

Chiral Potts Model and its Generalization. The most important assumption in the Belavin–Drinfeld classification is the assumption of the rapidity-difference property of the R-matrix, which can be relaxed.⁷ A model without this property was constructed by Shastry [70]. However, the most peculiar of such models is the chiral Potts (or chiral clock) model (CPM), first uncovered for $n = 2$ in [71, 72], and later generalized to $n \geq 2$ gCPM in [73, 74]. The interest in this model comes from its connection to commensurate-incommensurate phase transitions [75, 76] and also the so-called ripple phase in lipid-bilayer biological membranes [77]. We refer to [78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86] for various features of the model and [87, 88, 89, 90] for extensive review of its history.

The spins of the gCPM are $n - 1$ copies of \mathbb{Z}_N variables on a square lattice. The curve of the spectral parameter of the model is an algebraic curve $\tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n}$ in \mathbb{P}^{2n-1} characterized by the solution of the following equations

$$\begin{pmatrix} z_i^{+N} \\ z_i^{-N} \end{pmatrix} = K_{ij} \begin{pmatrix} z_j^{+N} \\ z_j^{-N} \end{pmatrix}, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n, \quad (1.5)$$

where $[z_1^+ : z_1^- : \dots : z_n^+ : z_n^-]$ denotes the homogeneous coordinates on \mathbb{P}^{2n-1} , and the matrices $K_{ij} \in \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ satisfy certain relations (see (2.4)). The genus of the curve is given by

$$g_{\tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n}} = N^{2(n-1)}(N(n-1) - n) + 1. \quad (1.6)$$

The original model in [71, 72] corresponds to $n = 2$. It is clear that g is always greater or equal to one and the only situation with $g = 1$ is $(n, N) = (2, 2)$, which is the Ising model. The proof that the R-matrix of the gCPM satisfies the YB equation appeared in [91, 92, 93] for odd values of N , using the representation theory of quantum affine algebra $U_q(\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}}(n, \mathbb{C}))$ with $q^N = 1$ being a root of unity,⁸ and for general N in [94]. More recently, it is also understood as a root-of-unity degeneration of more general integrable models with continuous spins [95, 96, 97], which in turn can be reproduced from supersymmetric indices of supersymmetric quiver gauge theories [98, 99, 100, 101]. Furthermore, the model has been studied in connection to knot theory [102]. However, it is fair to say that we are still very far from a complete understanding of the gCPMs.

⁶There are models whose rapidity parameter belong to higher-dimensional complex manifolds. An example of such models with three affine rapidity parameters lying on \mathbb{P}^3 is constructed in [69].

⁷Once the assumption of rapidity-difference is removed, it is not difficult to imagine that the curve of spectral parameter could have genus ≥ 2 . The reason is that we cannot make sense of expressions like $z - z'$ or z/z' on such curves without any additive structure. The closest analog objects on a higher-genus curve are the prime forms, which are sections of a holomorphic line bundle over the curve.

⁸The fact that gCPMs are related to the representation theory of $U_q(\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}}(n, \mathbb{C}))$ was conjectured in [74] and later proved in [93] for odd N .

Hyperbolic Monopoles and CPM. Shortly after the discovery of CPM, Atiyah and Murray [103, 104] observed a remarkable connection between the curve of the spectral parameter of CPM and the spectral curve of hyperbolic monopoles associated with the gauge group $SU(2)$: They noticed that by imposing a certain reality condition on the curve of CPM and taking the limit of vanishing boundary values of the Higgs field, the free \mathbb{Z}_N -quotient of the resulting curve of the spectral parameter of CPM can be identified with the spectral curve of the hyperbolic monopole. Despite tremendous progress in the theory of integrable models, the origin of this mysterious connection remained unknown, and relatively very little attention has been paid to it over the past decades since the observation of Atiyah and Murray. The main objective of this work is to revisit this observation.

4d Chern–Simons Theory. One of the most remarkable progress in the theory of integrable models in the last two decades has been the discovery of the 4d version of Chern–Simons (CS) theory by Costello [105]

$$S = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{C \times \Sigma} \omega \wedge \text{CS}(A) . \quad (1.7)$$

The theory defined on a product manifold of the form $C \times \Sigma$: it is topological along C and holomorphic along Σ .⁹ The one-form ω is along Σ : $\omega = \omega(z)dz$ with z being a local coordinate along Σ , and $\text{CS}(A)$ is the CS three-form for a connection $A = A_C + A_{\bar{z}}d\bar{z}$, with A_C being the connection along C . It has been realized that all integrable spin-chain models which fit into the Belavin–Drinfeld classification scheme, i.e. those whose curve of spectral parameter is either $\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C}^\times$, and \mathbb{E} , can be realized within this theory [106, 107, 108]. In particular, the R-matrix of these models can be constructed from a particular configuration of Wilson lines, equivalent to the configuration of Fig. 1.




Figure 3: The configuration of Wilson lines in the 4d CS theory for the computation of R-matrix. The wavy lines denote the gluon exchange and the gray circle shows the interaction in the bulk.

The two Wilson lines are stretched along the topological plane C and are supported at different points $z, z' \in \Sigma$. The evaluation of Feynman diagrams of gluon exchanges between

⁹It is expected that this theory makes sense on any four-manifold with a transverse holomorphic foliation.

the lines computes the R-matrix where the leading-order nontrivial term can be identified with the classical R-matrix of the model [107]. From this perspective, the YB equation in Fig. 2 is an immediate consequence of the existence of extra dimensions. Furthermore, many important classes of two-dimensional integrable field theories can be constructed, at least classically, by including certain surface defects in the theory [109]. In this sense, it seems that the 4d CS theory plays the role of a unifying framework of a significant portion of integrable systems in two dimensions. For a selection of works related to the role of 4d CS theory in integrability see [110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124].

1.1 Statement of Problems

Motivated by this circle of ideas, we explore three problems in this work.

Problem 1. We ask whether the observation of Atiyah and Murray in [103, 104] is restricted to the group $SU(2)$ or there exists a general correspondence between the curve of the spectral parameter of gCPMs and hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopoles.

We realize that there is indeed a general correspondence for the group $SU(n)$ with any $n \geq 2$. Hence, we will call it the hyperbolic monopole/gCPM correspondence. Furthermore, by embedding classical and exceptional groups into $SU(n)$, the correspondence can be explored for these groups. As we will explain, this forces us to work in the limit of vanishing boundary values of the Higgs field. Such configurations are not trivial and are called flat monopoles, as elucidated in §4.1. The zero-mass limit of hyperbolic monopoles is also called nullarons, a terminology due to Murray [125, Footnote 1].

Problem 2. Considering the unifying role of the 4d CS theory, we ask whether the gCPMs can be engineered within this theory.

It turns out that the answer is indeed yes. The main technique we use is to represent the curve of the spectral parameter of the gCPM as a branched cover of \mathbb{P}^1 , a construction that is always possible by virtue of Riemann's Existence Theorem. We then realize that the requirement of topological invariance along C together with \mathbb{Z}_N^{n-1} -invariance of the model fixes ω in (1.7).

Problem 3. As we elevate the connection between hyperbolic monopoles and gCPMs to the level of correspondence, we ask whether this is a coincidence or if there is a deeper explanation for it.

We realize that there is indeed a deeper reason for this correspondence. The key role is played by (1) our engineering of the gCPM using the 4d CS theory; (2) the connection of hyperbolic monopoles and gCPMs with the 6d holomorphic CS (hCS) theories on certain complex three-dimensional manifolds; (3) the connection between the 6d and 10d hCS theories on complex manifolds. The fact that the 10d hCS theory depends only on the

choice of complex structure unifies the two sides of the correspondence in ten-dimensional physics.

1.2 Contributions of the Paper

We now summarize the main results of this work.

Problem 1. The Hyperbolic Monopoles/gCPM Correspondence (§4)

We first establish the correspondence for the gauge group $SU(n)$. By starting from the curve of the spectral parameter of the gCPM, we reconstruct the spectral data of specific hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopoles. Conversely, we can start from the spectral data of hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopoles and construct the curve of the spectral parameter of the gCPM. In more details,

(1) **Hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -Monopoles from gCPM (§4.2.1).** The procedure is as follows. From the curve of spectral parameter of the gCPM (1.5), we construct $n - 1$ curves $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(1)}, \dots, \Sigma_{N,n}^{(n-1)}$ of bidegree (N, N) in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, each of which can be written as

$$\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)} : \begin{pmatrix} (z^+)^N \\ (z^-)^N \end{pmatrix} = K_i \begin{pmatrix} (w^+)^N \\ (w^-)^N \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n - 1, \quad (1.8)$$

where $[z^+, z^-]$ and $[w^+, w^-]$ are the homogeneous coordinates on the two copies of \mathbb{P}^1 , and $K_i = K_{i,i+1}$ in (1.5) are restricted to be in $\text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})$. We then show that these satisfy all the requirements of being the spectral curves of a hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopole. In particular, we show that

- (1) By demanding $K_i K_{i+1}^{-1}$ to be an elliptic element of $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ for $i = 1, \dots, n - 1$, we show that $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)} \cap \Sigma_{N,n}^{(i+1)}$ intersect at $2N^2$ points. These points determine two divisors, $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i,i+1)}$ and $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i+1,i)}$, each associated with N^2 points. $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i,i+1)}$ and $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i+1,i)}$ are exchanged by a certain real structure of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$.
- (2) Over $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$, certain line bundles determined by (n, N) are isomorphic to line bundles determined by the divisors $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i,i+1)}$, $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i+1,i)}$, and $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i,i+1)} + \Sigma_{N,n}^{(i+1,i)}$.

We then determine the hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopole configuration associated with this spectral data.

(2) **GCPM from Hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -Monopoles (§4.2.2).** We then consider the reverse construction. We start from the spectral curves of hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopoles subject to maximal symmetry-breaking. We describe how from this collection of $n - 1$ curves on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, we can construct a curve on \mathbb{P}^{2n-1} . After removing the reality condition, taking the limit of vanishing masses, and taking all the $n - 1$ monopole charges to be equal to N , we recover the curve of the spectral parameter of the gCPM as given in (1.5).

(3) The Correspondence. We summarize our findings in the form of a proposition

Proposition. There is a one-to-one correspondence between

- GCPMs whose curve of the spectral parameter $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{P}^{2n-1}$ defined by $n-1$ $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ -valued K -matrices $K_{i,i+1}$, $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ in (1.5) such that $K_i K_{i+1}^{-1}$, with $K_i := K_{i,i+1}$, is an elliptic element of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$; and
- Hyperbolic $\mathrm{SU}(n)$ -monopoles subject to maximal symmetry-breaking, magnetic charges $m_1 = \dots = m_{n-1} = N$, and vanishing asymptotic values of the Higgs field whose spectral data recovers the curve Σ .

For a more precise version of the proposition, see Proposition 4.1. The identification of parameters in the two sides is given in Table 1.

Hyperbolic $\mathrm{SU}(n)$ -Monopole	$(\mathbb{Z}_N)^{n-1}$ Generalized Chiral Potts Model
$\mathrm{rk}(\mathrm{SU}(n)) = n-1$	$n-1$ copies of \mathbb{Z}_N -spins
monopole charges m_i for with $m_1 = \dots = m_{n-1} = N$	$n-1$ spins taking value in $\mathbb{Z}_N = \{0, \dots, N-1\}$
monopole masses p_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$ with $p_1 = \dots = p_n = 0$	no counterpart, $p_1 = \dots = p_n = 0$
$n-1$ spectral curves	$n-1$ curves constructed out of $\tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n}$

Table 1: Parameters of the two sides of the hyperbolic monopole/gCPM correspondence.

(4) The Correspondence for Classical and Exceptional Groups (§4.3). We then explore the correspondence for other classical and exceptional Lie algebras by embedding them in $\mathrm{SU}(n)$. Denoting monopole charges for a Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} by $m^{\mathfrak{g}}$, we find the values of charges for hyperbolic monopoles, associated with classical groups, which correspond to the gCPM

$$\begin{aligned}
 B_n : \quad & m_1^{B_n} = \dots = m_{n-1}^{B_n} = 2N, & m_n^{B_n} = N, \\
 C_n : \quad & m_1^{C_n} = \dots = m_n^{C_n} = N, \\
 D_n : \quad & m_1^{D_n} = \dots = m_{n-2}^{D_n} = 2N, & m_{\pm}^{D_n} = N,
 \end{aligned} \tag{1.9}$$

while for exceptional groups \mathfrak{g}_2 and \mathfrak{f}_4 , we find

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathfrak{g}_2 : \quad & m_1^{\mathfrak{g}_2} = -3N, & m_2^{\mathfrak{g}_2} = -5N, \\
 \mathfrak{f}_4 : \quad & m_1^{\mathfrak{f}_4} = m_4^{\mathfrak{f}_4} = 2N, & m_2^{\mathfrak{f}_4} = m_3^{\mathfrak{f}_4} = 3N.
 \end{aligned} \tag{1.10}$$

We comment on the negative values of charges for \mathfrak{g}_2 in §4.3.

Problem 2. gCPM and 4d Chern–Simons Theory (§5).

We next explain how to realize the gCPM in the 4d CS theory. The punchline of our discussion is the following

- (1) We first realize the curve of the spectral parameter of gCPM as a branched cover of \mathbb{P}^1 (§5.1.1). From this point onward, we will exclusively work with $C \times \mathbb{P}^1$. From our considerations, it would turn out that the R-matrix of the gCPM can only be computed in a non-perturbative formulation of the 4d CS theory.
- (2) We then construct the one-form $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ of the 4d CS theory on $C \times \mathbb{P}^1$ (§5.1.2). We see that by demanding only (1) topological invariance and (2) \mathbb{Z}_N^{n-1} -invariance, $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ is strongly constrained and the minimal choice is given by

$$\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} = \frac{1}{N^{n-1} \sqrt{\prod_{i=1}^{2N^{n-1}} (z - z_{Q_i})}} dz, \quad (1.11)$$

where $\{Q_1, \dots, Q_{2N^{n-1}}\}$ are the branched points of the branched covering map. From this and the branched covering map, we would be able to construct the one-form on $\tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n}$ (see §5.1.2 and §5.2, in particular (5.27) and (5.42)). A remarkable feature of (1.11) which would be crucial for our developments is (see §5.1.2 for the derivation)

$$\partial_{\bar{z}} \omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} = 0. \quad (1.12)$$

This relation together with the form of $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ in (1.11) would provide arguments about the peculiarity of the gCPM (see, in particular, Remarks 5.2 and 6.6).

- (3) Although we are not looking to set up a perturbation theory, we see that as a consequence of (1.12), no requirement for imposing boundary conditions at Q_i is implied (see §5.1.3). This is in sharp contrast to all the other integrable spin models where $\partial_{\bar{z}} \omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ would lead to (derivatives of) delta functions at poles of $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$. A proper definition of perturbation theory would then require the imposition of appropriate boundary conditions on the gauge fields at the poles of ω [107, §9.1] (see 5.1.4).
- (4) Finally, we explain how the absence of rapidity-difference property can be explained from the form on $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ in (1.11).

Problem 3. The Origin of the Correspondence (§6)

Finally, we will uncover the origin of the hyperbolic monopole/gCPM correspondence. In particular,

(1) Hyperbolic Monopole from 6d Holomorphic Chern–Simons Theory (§6.1). We first explain how to construct hyperbolic monopoles from the 6d hCS theory on $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^{1,3})$, the projective spinor bundle of Minkowski space $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$. This involves

- Equipped with some results from Murray and Singer, we first establish in Proposition 6.1 and Corollary 6.1 that solutions of the self-duality equation on Minkowski space $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ (or an open set thereof) can be constructed from solutions of equations of motion of the 6d hCS theory, which describe connections of type (1, 1);

- We then see explicitly how hyperbolic monopoles (see §6.1.2), their charges, masses, and spectral data can be described in terms of six-dimensional gauge field (see §6.1.3). In particular, this reduction shows why there is no parameter corresponding to hyperbolic monopole masses in the gCPM side of the correspondence (see Remark 6.8), and also why there is no reality condition on the curve of the spectral parameter (see Remark 6.9).

(2) gCPM from 6d Holomorphic Chern–Simons Theory We then show how to realize the gCPM from the 6d hCS theory on $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^4)$, the projective spinor bundle of Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^4 . More concretely,

- In §6.2.1, we show that the dimensional reduction of the 6d hCS on $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^4)$ to $\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ gives the 4d holomorphic BF (hBF) theory;
- In §6.2.2, we then show how the 4d CS theory emerges from the 4d hBF theory at the finite value of a cut-off dictated by the volume of extra dimensions of $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^4)$.

(3) 6d Holomorphic Chern–Simons Theory from Ten Dimensions. Next, in §6.3.1, we explain the followings

- In Lemma 6.1, we show that the 6d hCS theory on a complex three-dimensional manifold can be realized from the dimensional reduction of the BV action of the 10d hCS theory on a complex five-dimensional manifold if the former manifold is embedded holomorphically in the latter;
- To connect this result to the correspondence, we show, in Proposition 6.2, that $\mathbb{P}S(M)$ for both $M = \mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ and \mathbb{R}^4 can be holomorphically-embedded into $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$, the projective spinor bundle of the complexified Minkowski space $\mathbb{C}^{1,3}$ equipped with a fixed complex structure $\mathcal{J}_{\mathbb{C}^{1,3}}$ given in (6.71).

(4) The Correspondence from Ten Dimensions (§6.3.2). Putting all these results together, we finally explain how the two sides of the correspondence can be realized by starting from the 10d hCS theory on $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$, equipped with the complex structure $\mathcal{J}_{\mathbb{C}^{1,3}}$, reducing it on $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^{1,3})$ and $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^4)$, which in turn reduce the two sides of the correspondence. In a naive sense, once everything is reduced to four dimensions, the correspondence is the result of a Wick or inverse Wick rotation followed by imposing or removing certain reality conditions, as we will explain in §6.3.2.

1.3 Contents of the Paper

We start in §2 by a brief review of the gCPM. The topic of hyperbolic monopole is not well-studied in the physics literature, and furthermore it forms an essential ingredient of our developments. Therefore, a rather extensive review of hyperbolic monopoles with arbitrary boundary values of the Higgs field and their spectral data is warranted. We fulfill

this task in §3. We then generalize the correspondence between hyperbolic monopoles and gCPM to the group $SU(n)$ in §4, with additional exploration of the correspondence for classical and exceptional Lie algebras in §4.3. The engineering of the gCPM within the 4d CS theory is the subject of §5. We establish the origin of the correspondence in §6. Several appendices complement the work. In Appendix A, we provide more details on the twistor space of hyperbolic space, especially from the perspective of the circle action on the twistor space of S^4 . The curve of the spectral parameter of the gCPM is a special case of complete intersections and, as such, we include some basic details on complete intersections in Appendix B. Finally, Appendix C includes all the details of computations in §4.3.

2 Generalized Chiral Potts Model

We start with a brief review of the relevant facts about the gCPMs and their curve of the spectral parameter following the original construction by Bazhanov et al. [74]. With the aid of minimal cyclic representations of $U_q(\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}}(n, \mathbb{C}))$, it was shown that the R-matrix satisfies the Yang-Baxter equation for odd N in [91, 92]. The proof for the general case later appeared in [73, 94]. We refer the reader to these references for the details.

2.1 The Model

The gCMP is a model obtained by considering $(n - 1)$ copies of spins taking values in \mathbb{Z}_N on a square lattice \mathcal{L} , while the rapidity parameters live on its medial lattice \mathcal{L}' :




Figure 4: The solid and dashed lines represent the lattice \mathcal{L} and its median lattice \mathcal{L}' , respectively, for gCPM. The spins are located on the square lattice while rapidities are located on its medial lattice.

The spin variables are denoted as¹⁰

$$\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_n), \quad v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{Z}_N = \{0, \dots, N - 1\}, \quad (2.1)$$

¹⁰What we will call v_i corresponds to $v_i - v_{i+1}$ in the original article [74].

satisfying the relation

$$\sum_{i=1}^n v_i = 0, \pmod{N}. \quad (2.2)$$

The horizontal (vertical) lines of \mathcal{L}' carry rapidity (i.e. spectral) variables p, p' (q, q') in alternating order and also in different directions. The NW-SE edges of \mathcal{L} have the same NW-SE directions while NE-SW edges are in a checkerboard orientation. The rapidity variable lives on the algebraic curve of the spectral parameter, which we denote as $\tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n}$. It is determined as the locus inside \mathbb{P}^{2n-1} determined by the following equations

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n} : \quad \begin{pmatrix} z_i^{+N} \\ z_i^{-N} \end{pmatrix} = K_{ij} \begin{pmatrix} z_j^{+N} \\ z_j^{-N} \end{pmatrix}, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n. \quad (2.3)$$

where $(z_1^+ : z_1^- : \dots : z_n^+ : z_n^-)$ are the set of $2n$ complex coordinates, and the 2×2 matrices K_{ij} satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \text{identity relation :} & \quad K_{ii} = \mathbf{1}, \\ \text{cocycle condition :} & \quad K_{ij}K_{jk}K_{ki} = \mathbf{1}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

The cocycle condition implies that only $n-1$ of the matrices K_{ij} with $i \neq j$ are independent. These $n-1$ matrices define $2n-2$ equations and hence (2.3) indeed defines a curve in \mathbb{P}^{2n-1} . We can conveniently choose these to be the matrices $K_{i,i+1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. The relations (2.4) have obvious solutions

$$K_{ij} = M_i M_j^{-1}, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n, \quad (2.5)$$

with $M_i \in \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$. There are $n-1$ matrices $K_{i,i+1}$ each of which contributes three complex moduli, hence in total there are $3n-3$ complex parameters. However, the curve is invariant under the combined transformations

$$\begin{pmatrix} z_i^+ \\ z_i^- \end{pmatrix} \mapsto U_i \begin{pmatrix} z_i^+ \\ z_i^- \end{pmatrix}, \quad K_{ij} \mapsto U_i^N K_{ij} U_j^{-N}, \quad (2.6)$$

with $U_i = \text{diag}(u_i, u_i^{-1})$. Removing these n redundancies, we are left with $2n-3$ complex parameters that parameterize the moduli of the curve of spectral parameters.

For the gCPM, we only make the identification

$$(z_1^+, z_1^-, \dots, z_n^+, z_n^-) \sim \lambda (z_1^+, z_1^-, \dots, z_n^+, z_n^-), \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}^\times, \quad (2.7)$$

i.e. these are homogeneous coordinates on \mathbb{P}^{2n-1} . The equations (2.3) determines the algebraic curve $\tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n}$ which is an N^{n-1} -fold covering of another curve, which is sometimes considered to be the curve of the spectral parameter of the gCMP. The latter is a further step quotient of $\tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n}$ by a free action of \mathbb{Z}_N^{n-1} :

$$(z_1^+, z_1^-, \dots, z_n^+, z_n^-) \mapsto (q^{k_1} z_1^+, q^{k_1} z_1^-, \dots, q^{k_{n-1}} z_{n-1}^+, q^{k_{n-1}} z_{n-1}^-, z_n^+, z_n^-), \quad (2.8)$$

where q is a primitive N -th root of unity and $k_1, \dots, k_{n-1} \in \{0, 1, \dots, N-1\}$.¹¹ We denote the actual curve of the spectral parameter of gCPM by $\tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n}$ whose genus can be computed using the Riemann–Hurwitz formula as (see Appendix B for some details)

$$g_{\tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n}} = N^{2(n-1)} (N(n-1) - n) + 1. \quad (2.9)$$

The curve obtained by the \mathbb{Z}_N^{n-1} -quotient of $\tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n}$, where the action is given in (2.8), is denoted as $\Sigma_{N,n}$

$$\Sigma_{N,n} := \tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n} / \mathbb{Z}_N^{n-1}. \quad (2.10)$$

2.2 The Yang–Baxter Equation

Depending on the orientation of solid and dashed lines in Fig. 4, there are only two possible Boltzmann weights as follows




Figure 5: The two possible Boltzmann weights of the gCPM.

The Boltzmann weight $\overline{W}_{pq}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})$ for rapidities p and q and the states \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{w} of the model can be written explicitly as follows

$$\overline{W}_{pq}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) = \omega^{Q(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})} \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}), \quad (2.11)$$

where $\omega := \exp(2\pi i/N)$,

$$Q(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) := \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} v_i \sum_{j=1}^i (v_j - w_j), \quad (2.12)$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{v}) := \frac{\prod_{I=1}^{|\mathbf{v}|-1} (z_0^+(p) z_0^-(q) - z_0^+(q) z_0^-(p) \omega^I)}{\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \prod_{I=0}^{v_i-1} (z_i^+(p) z_i^-(q) - z_i^+(q) z_i^-(p) \omega^{1+I_i})}, \quad (2.13)$$

with $|\mathbf{v}| := \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} v_i$ and $z_0^\pm(p)$ are local coordinates on the curve. $\overline{W}_{pq}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})$ is defined up to an overall normalization. Finally, the R-matrix of the model is defined as the product of Boltzmann weights associated with the following elementary box of \mathcal{L} :

¹¹The group of N^{th} root of unity is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}_N .




Figure 6: The elementary box in the gCPM which gives the R-matrix of the model. The product of the Boltzmann weights as in (2.14) gives the R-matrix.

and it is given by

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{w}'}^{v v'}(q, q'; p, p') := \frac{\overline{\mathcal{W}}_{qp}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}') \overline{\mathcal{W}}_{p'q}(\mathbf{v}', \mathbf{v}) \overline{\mathcal{W}}_{q'p'}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}')}{\overline{\mathcal{W}}_{q'p}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}')}. \quad (2.14)$$

Thinking of these R-matrices as intertwiners acting on a tensor product of some (representation) spaces $\mathcal{V}_1 \otimes \mathcal{V}_2 \otimes \mathcal{V}_3$, one can show that they satisfy the usual form of the Yang–Baxter equation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{12}(p, p'; q, q') \mathcal{R}_{13}(p, p'; r, r') \mathcal{R}_{23}(q, q'; r, r') \\ = \mathcal{R}_{23}(q, q'; r, r') \mathcal{R}_{13}(p, p'; r, r') \mathcal{R}_{12}(p, p'; q, q'). \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

3 Hyperbolic Monopoles and their Spectral Data

In this section, we review the construction of hyperbolic monopoles. We first explain some generalities on these monopoles. Next, we move to the elaboration of the twistor (or the Ward–Hitchin) correspondence for hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopoles with arbitrary boundary values of the Higgs field following [17, 35] to which we refer for further details. The case with integer or half-integer values of the Higgs field, for the case of $SU(2)$ has been treated in [13, 16] while the case of $SU(n)$ is considered in [21] and in more details in [22, §14].

3.1 Monopoles on Hyperbolic Space

We start with some generalities of hyperbolic monopoles. By a hyperbolic monopole, we mean a solution to the Bogomolny equation on the hyperbolic three space \mathbb{H}^3 . More concretely, consider a principal G -bundle over \mathbb{H}^3 equipped with a connection A and an adjoint-valued scalar ϕ , the Higgs field. The Bogomolny equation reads

$$F = \star_{\mathbb{H}^3} D\phi, \quad (3.1)$$

where $F := dA + A \wedge A$, $D\phi := d\phi + [A, \phi]_{\mathfrak{g}}$ and $\mathfrak{g} := \text{Lie}(G)$. We impose appropriate boundary conditions on the sphere at infinity $S_{\infty}^2 := \partial \overline{\mathbb{H}^3}$ with $\overline{\mathbb{H}^3}$ denoting the closure of \mathbb{H}^3 . The space of solutions of this equation, subject to appropriate boundary conditions and modulo gauge transformations, defines the moduli space of hyperbolic G -monopoles.

Choosing a local coordinate in the neighbourhood of $\partial\overline{\mathbb{H}}^3$, we can expand the fields as

$$\phi = \phi_\infty + \mathcal{O}(r^{n_\phi}), \quad F = F_\infty + \mathcal{O}(r^{n_F}), \quad (3.2)$$

with r being the radial coordinate away from $\partial\overline{\mathbb{H}}^3$, n_ϕ and n_F are positive numbers whose values depend on the boundary conditions, and we have used the notation

$$\phi_\infty := \phi|_{S_\infty^2}, \quad F_\infty := F|_{S_\infty^2}. \quad (3.3)$$

A more precise version of this expansion will be given later (see (3.70)).

Hyperbolic monopoles have two characteristic parameters: (1) magnetic charges, (2) asymptotic values of the Higgs field ϕ or its masses [13, 16, 17]. In the following, we explain how to compute these two parameters.

Magnetic Charges of a Hyperbolic Monopole. The definition of the magnetic charges of a monopole depends on the breaking pattern of the gauge invariance at S_∞^2 [126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131].

By an appropriate choice of basis, one can consider the Higgs field (and indeed any element of the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g}) in the Cartan subalgebra. We denote the generators of the Cartan subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} as H_a , $a = 1, \dots, \text{rk}(\mathfrak{g})$, and write the asymptotic value of the Higgs field as

$$\phi_\infty = \sum_{i=1}^{\text{rk}(\mathfrak{g})} p_i H_i, \quad p_1, \dots, p_{\text{rk}(\mathfrak{g})} \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (3.4)$$

Those generators of \mathfrak{g} that do commute with ϕ_∞ form the remaining gauge invariance. As ϕ_∞ belongs to the chosen Cartan subalgebra, these unbroken generators could be of two types: (1) maximal symmetry-breaking: all the generators of the Cartan subalgebra and for all roots α , $\alpha \cdot \mathbf{p} = \sum_i \alpha_i p_i \neq 0$, with $\mathbf{p} := (p_1, \dots, p_{\text{rk}(\mathfrak{g})})$. In this case, the unbroken subgroup would be $U(1)^{\text{rk}(\mathfrak{g})}$; (2) Non-maximal symmetry-breaking: those generators E_α labeled by roots α such that $\alpha \cdot \mathbf{p} = 0$. Such generators would then generate a semi-simple Lie algebra \mathfrak{k} whose corresponding group is K . The unbroken part of gauge invariance is then $K \times U(1)^{\text{rk}(\mathfrak{g}) - \text{rk}(\mathfrak{k})}$. In the following, we are exclusively considering the case of maximal symmetry-breaking. The reader interested in learning about the general case is referred to [33, §5], [129, §5], and [131, §6.1].

If the gauge group breaks from G to a subgroup H , the vacuum manifold is G/H [129, §5.3-5.5]. At infinity, the group of gauge transformations consists of maps $S_\infty^2 \rightarrow G/H$ ¹² and the non-trivial configurations are labeled by $\pi_2(G/H)$. Using the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow H \rightarrow G \rightarrow G/H \rightarrow 0, \quad (3.5)$$

¹²Note that this bundle, in this case, is trivial, as it is induced from a bundle on \mathbb{H}^3 , which is a contractible space and all bundles over which are trivial. If the three-space on which one studies the Bogomolny equation supports a non-trivial G -gauge bundle P , then the group of gauge transformations consists of global sections of $\text{Ad}P := P \times_G G$.

and by assuming that $\pi_1(G) = 0$ (by working with the universal cover of G if necessary) and $\pi_2(G) = 0$ (which holds for any connected Lie group), we have

$$\pi_1(G/H) \simeq \pi_0(H) , \quad \pi_2(G/H) \simeq \pi_1(H) . \quad (3.6)$$

In the case of maximal symmetry-breaking, we have

$$\pi_2(G/H) \simeq \pi_1(U(1)^{\text{rk}(\mathfrak{g})}) = \mathbb{Z}^{\text{rk}(\mathfrak{g})} , \quad (3.7)$$

and the configuration is characterized by $\text{rk}(\mathfrak{g})$ integer-valued topological quantum numbers, called magnetic charges.

For the maximal symmetry-breaking case, $H \simeq T$ with T being the maximal torus of G , determining magnetic charges amounts to finding a basis for $\pi_2(G/H)$, which classifies the magnetic charges. In the case of maximal symmetry-breaking, there is a natural basis $\{b_1, \dots, b_{\text{rk}(\mathfrak{g})}\}$ of $\pi_2(G/H)$ labeled by simple roots $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\text{rk}(\mathfrak{g})}\}$ with respect to a choice of fundamental Weyl chamber. A convenient choice is obtained by fixing a point $p \in S_\infty^2$ which fixes a torus T , as the isotropy subgroup of $\phi_\infty(p)$, and we set the fundamental Weyl chamber to be the one that contains $\phi_\infty(p)$. A set of fundamental weights $\{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{\text{rk}(\mathfrak{g})}\}$ would satisfy

$$\frac{2\langle \omega_i, \alpha_j \rangle}{\langle \alpha_j, \alpha_j \rangle} = \delta_{ij} , \quad i, j = 1, \dots, \text{rk}(\mathfrak{g}) . \quad (3.8)$$

Using the Killing form and identifying $\mathfrak{g} \simeq \mathfrak{g}^*$, we identify H_i with the set of simple coroots $2\alpha_i/\langle \alpha_i, \alpha_i \rangle$, which are dual to the set of fundamental weights through (3.8). Hence,

$$\omega_i(H_j) := \langle \omega_i, H_j \rangle = \delta_{ij} , \quad i, j = 1, \dots, \text{rk}(\mathfrak{g}) . \quad (3.9)$$

Let $\mathfrak{t} := \text{Lie}(T)$ be the Lie algebra of the maximal torus T of G , and let $\Lambda \subset \mathfrak{t}^*$ be the weight lattice of \mathfrak{g} .¹³ Then, for any $\lambda \in \Lambda$, there is a one-dimensional representation $\lambda : T \rightarrow U(1)$, and hence an associated line bundle $\mathcal{L}_{-\lambda} := G \times_H U(1)$ to the principal H -bundle $G \rightarrow G/H$. It is defined as pairs $[g, x]$, for $g \in G$ and $x \in U(1)$, satisfying the equivalence relation $(g, x) \sim (gh, \lambda(h)^{-1}x)$ over G/H for any $h \in H$. One can define the isomorphism $\Lambda \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow H^2(G/H, \mathbb{Q})$ which for a weight λ takes the Chern class of $\mathcal{L}_{-\lambda}$, i.e. $\lambda \rightarrow c(\mathcal{L}_{-\lambda})$ [132]. For a map $f : S_\infty^2 \rightarrow G/H$ (or more precisely a homotopy class $[f]$ of such maps), there is a natural pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \pi_2(G/H) \times H^2(G/H, \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow H^2(S_\infty^2, \mathbb{Q}) \simeq \mathbb{Q}$ given by

$$\langle [f], c(\mathcal{L}_{-\lambda}) \rangle := c(f^* \mathcal{L}_{-\lambda}) , \quad (3.10)$$

which in the basis $\{b_1, \dots, b_{\text{rk}(\mathfrak{g})}\}$ is given by [132]

$$\langle b_i, c(\mathcal{L}_{-\lambda}) \rangle = \frac{2\langle \lambda, \alpha_i \rangle}{\langle \alpha_i, \alpha_i \rangle} , \quad i = 1, \dots, \text{rk}(\mathfrak{g}) . \quad (3.11)$$

¹³Strictly speaking, we should work with the complexification $G_{\mathbb{C}}$ of G . But, when $H \simeq T$, then $G/H \simeq G_{\mathbb{C}}/B$ for a Borel subgroup $B \subset G_{\mathbb{C}}$ such that $G \cap B = H$.

Note that $f^*\mathcal{L}_{-\lambda}$ is a line bundle on S_∞^2 . The topological quantum numbers $\{m_1, \dots, m_{\text{rk}(\mathfrak{g})}\}$ can be defined by taking the class $[\phi_\infty] \in \pi_2(G/H)$ and set

$$[\phi_\infty] = \sum_{i=1}^{\text{rk}(\mathfrak{g})} m_i b_i . \quad (3.12)$$

Using (3.8), (3.11), and the fact that the pullback of $G \rightarrow G/H$ by ϕ_∞ is a principal H -bundle on S_∞^2 with $H = T$, we have¹⁴

$$\begin{aligned} m_i &= \langle [\phi_\infty], c(\mathcal{L}_{-\omega_i}) \rangle \\ &= c(\phi_\infty^* \mathcal{L}_{-\omega_i}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{S_\infty^2} \omega_i(F_\infty) \\ &= \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{S_\infty^2} \text{dVol}_{S_\infty^2} \omega_i(2 \star_{S_\infty^2} F_\infty) \\ &= \frac{1}{4\pi} \cdot 4\pi \cdot \omega_i(2 \star_{S_\infty^2} F_\infty) , \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

which leads to

$$m_i = \omega_i(2 \star_{S_\infty^2} F_\infty) , \quad i = 1, \dots, \text{rk}(\mathfrak{g}) . \quad (3.14)$$

Therefore, the i^{th} magnetic charge is the Chern number of the line bundle $\mathcal{L}_{-\omega_i}$, associated with the i^{th} fundamental weight ω_i , pulled back to S_∞^2 .

For the case of $G = \text{SU}(n)$ with which we are mostly concerned, we take $\star_{S_\infty^2} F = \text{diag}(k_1, \dots, k_n)/2$ for $k_1, \dots, k_n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\sum_i k_i = 0$. Using the fact that for $\text{SU}(n)$, $H_i = E_{i,i} - E_{i+1,i+1}$ with E_{ij} being the elementary matrices, we have

$$2 \star_{S_\infty^2} F_\infty = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{j=1}^i k_j \right) H_i , \quad (3.15)$$

and hence using (3.9), we arrive at

$$m_i = \omega_i(2 \star_{S_\infty^2} F_\infty) = \sum_{j=1}^i k_j , \quad i = 1, \dots, n . \quad (3.16)$$

In particular, we have $m_n = \sum_{i=1}^n k_i = 0$.

Masses of a Hyperbolic Monopole. The second feature of a hyperbolic monopole is its masses. To define this notion, consider the expansion (3.4). The i^{th} mass of the hyperbolic G -monopole is defined by the coefficient p_i in (3.4):

$$p_i = \omega_i(\phi_\infty) , \quad i = 1, \dots, \text{rk}(\mathfrak{g}) . \quad (3.17)$$

¹⁴Note that the Chern class of a line bundle L is typically given by $c(L) = \frac{i}{2\pi} F$ with F being the curvature of a connection on L . Here, we have chosen the normalization $c(L) = \frac{1}{2\pi} F$ instead.

3.2 Twistor Correspondence for Hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -Monopoles

One of the most important aspects of the theory of hyperbolic monopole which best describes its integrability is the twistor correspondence. It states that there is a one-to-one correspondence between solutions of the Bogomolny equation on \mathbb{H}^3 and certain holomorphic bundles over $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$, the twistor space of \mathbb{H}^3 . We begin in §3.2.1 with the description of the twistor space of \mathbb{H}^3 , and then discuss the correspondence in §3.2.2. From now on, we will take $G = SU(n)$.

3.2.1 Twistor Space of Hyperbolic Space

Let us describe the twistor space of hyperbolic three-space \mathbb{H}^3 . We provide two descriptions, first following [13], as a quotient space of some subspace of \mathbb{P}^3 by \mathbb{C}^\times -action, and then by considering \mathbb{H}^3 as the space of null rays in the upper cone of the Minkowski space, as described in [17]. We are mostly working with the latter description so we present it below, and relegate the first description to Appendix A. More detailed studies of the space of geodesics on \mathbb{H}^3 can be found in [133, 134].

Twistor Space from Null Rays in Minkowski Space. A convenient description of the twistor space can be given in terms of thinking of \mathbb{H}^3 as the space of rays of the future-pointing time-like vectors, denoted as \mathcal{U} , in the Minkowski space $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$. \mathcal{U} , as an open cone in $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$, is defined as

$$\mathcal{U} := \{x := (x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^{1,3} \mid -x_0^2 + x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 < 0, x_0 > 0\} . \quad (3.18)$$

Furthermore, recall that the hyperboloid model of \mathbb{H}^3 describes it as

$$\mathbb{H}^3 := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{1,3} \mid -x_0^2 + x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 = -1\} . \quad (3.19)$$

Therefore, if we consider the action of \mathbb{R}_+ , the set of positive real numbers, on \mathcal{U} given by rescaling

$$x \rightarrow \lambda x , \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+ , \quad (3.20)$$

the resulting quotient space can be identified with \mathbb{H}^3 . In the following, we use the notation

$$|x|^2 := -x_0^2 + x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 , \quad \forall x \in M . \quad (3.21)$$

From the above description, $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$, the twistor space of \mathbb{H}^3 , can be described from $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$, the twistor space of \mathcal{U} , as the orbit space of the quotient of the latter by the \mathbb{R}_+ -action. By definition, the twistor space of \mathcal{U} is the space of null geodesics (i.e. geodesics with null tangent vector) in \mathcal{U} . A null geodesic in \mathcal{U} is the intersection of a straight line in $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$, having a null tangent vector, with \mathcal{U} . More precisely, $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}} := \{[z, w] \in \mathbb{P}^3 \mid z, w \in \mathbb{C}^2, \langle z, w \rangle > 0\} , \quad (3.22)$$

where

$$\langle z, w \rangle := z^\dagger w = (\bar{z}_0, \bar{z}_1) \begin{pmatrix} w_0 \\ w_1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.23)$$

One considers a double fibration [135, 136]

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{U}} & \\ \mu \swarrow & & \searrow \nu \\ \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}} & & \mathcal{U} \end{array} \quad (3.24)$$

where the correspondence space $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is defined as the space of all pairs (γ, x) , where γ is a geodesic in \mathcal{U} together with a point $x \in \gamma$

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{U}} := \{(x, \gamma) \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}} \mid \gamma \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}, x \in \gamma\}. \quad (3.25)$$

If one identifies the Minkowski space with the space of Hermitian matrices through

$$x \longleftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} x^0 + x^3 & x^1 - ix^2 \\ x^1 + ix^2 & x^0 - x^3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.26)$$

then $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is defined through an incidence relation

$$w = x \cdot z, \quad (3.27)$$

where \cdot is the matrix product, and the maps μ and ν in (3.24) are restrictions of projections to the corresponding spaces.

Note that $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is defined by one real condition (3.22) in \mathbb{P}^3 , hence $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}} = 5$. While this space does not admit a complex structure, it instead admits a CR-structure, which describes a real hypersurface inside a complex manifold. One considers the CR-operator $\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}} : \Omega^{0, \bullet} \rightarrow \Omega^{0, \bullet+1}$. A locally-defined function on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is called a CR function f if $\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}} f = 0$. Given a CR-operator on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$, a CR-structure on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is induced by transition functions which are CR functions on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$. Next, consider a vector bundle $E \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$. A CR-operator $\bar{\partial}_E$ on E is an operator which (1) satisfies the Leibniz rule $\bar{\partial}_E(fe) = \bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}} fe + f\bar{\partial}_E e$ for any function f on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$ and $e \in \Gamma(E, \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}})$,¹⁵ and (2) $\bar{\partial}_E^2 = 0$. One then says $\bar{\partial}_E$ is integrable and $(E, \bar{\partial}_E)$ is a CR vector bundle.

To define the twistor space of \mathbb{H}^3 , we need to consider the \mathbb{R}_+ -invariant part of $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$. Hence, we first define the action of \mathbb{R}_+ on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$ as (compare it with (A.12))

$$\lambda \cdot (z, w) := (\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} z, \lambda^{+\frac{1}{2}} w), \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+, \quad \forall (w, z) \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}. \quad (3.28)$$

The action has two obvious fixed lines \mathbb{P}_+^1 and \mathbb{P}_-^1 (see (A.13)). Hence, the twistor space of \mathbb{H}^3 can be then defined as

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3} := \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}/\mathbb{R}_+ = \{([z], [w]) \in \mathbb{P}_+^1 \times \mathbb{P}_-^1 \mid \langle z, w \rangle \neq 0\}, \quad (3.29)$$

¹⁵In the following, $\Gamma(E, M)$ would denote the space of sections of a vector bundle E over M .

which leads to the following double fibration

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & \mathbb{C}_{\mathbb{H}^3} & \\
 \mu \swarrow & & \searrow \nu \\
 \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3} & & \mathbb{H}^3
 \end{array} \tag{3.30}$$

where the correspondence space is defined analogous to $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{U}}$

$$\mathbb{C}_{\mathbb{H}^3} := \{(x, \gamma) \in \mathbb{H}^3 \times \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3} \mid \gamma \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}, x \in \gamma\} . \tag{3.31}$$

Recall that geodesics on \mathbb{H}^3 are parameterized with their end-points on S_{∞}^2 . Let us denote the coordinates on \mathbb{P}_{\pm}^1 as $z := z_1/z_2$ and $w := z_3/z_4$. From (A.14) and (A.15), a point (z, w) of the minitwistor space (A.16) corresponds to a geodesic that starts at $z \in S_{\infty}^2$ and ends at $\bar{w} \in S_{\infty}^2$. We would like to avoid geodesics that start and end at the same point. This motivates the introduction of a real structure $\sigma : \mathbb{P}_{-}^1 \times \mathbb{P}_{+}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{-}^1 \times \mathbb{P}_{+}^1$, induced from (A.9)

$$\sigma(z, w) := (\bar{z}, \bar{w}) . \tag{3.32}$$

This means that the transformed geodesic associated with the point (\bar{z}, \bar{w}) starts at \bar{z} and ends at w . Therefore, the set of all geodesics that start and end at the same point are related by σ and correspond to $(z, \bar{z}) \in \mathbb{P}_{-}^1 \times \mathbb{P}_{+}^1$. We define the set of all such geodesics as

$$\Delta := \{(z, w) \in \mathbb{P}_{+}^1 \times \mathbb{P}_{-}^1 \mid \bar{w} = z\} . \tag{3.33}$$

Excluding these points from the minitwistor space (A.16), we end up with the twistor space of \mathbb{H}^3

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3} := \mathbb{P}_{-}^1 \times \mathbb{P}_{+}^1 - \Delta , \tag{3.34}$$

which is equipped with a real structure defined by σ .

A line $\mathbf{L} \subset \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$ is called a real line if it is invariant under σ

$$\sigma(\mathbf{L}) = \mathbf{L} , \tag{3.35}$$

or in more detail

$$\sigma(\mathbf{L}(z, w)) := \mathbf{L}(\sigma(z, w)) = \mathbf{L}(\bar{z}, \bar{w}) = \mathbf{L}(z, w) . \tag{3.36}$$

In other words, a line is real if and only if $(z, w) \in \mathbf{L}$ implies $\sigma(z, w) = (\bar{z}, \bar{w}) \in \mathbf{L}$.

Some Relevant Bundles. Bundles on spaces appearing in the double fibration (3.24) and their \mathbb{R}_{+} -invariant data play the main role in the twistor correspondence and also define the spectral data of hyperbolic monopoles. We thus spend some time on introducing some relevant bundles.

Holomorphic line bundles on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$ are constructed by the pullback from the factors in $\mathbb{P}_{-}^1 \times \mathbb{P}_{+}^1$. For $s_{\mp} \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have¹⁶

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(s_{-}, s_{+}) := \pi_{-}^{*}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{-}^1}(s_{-})) \otimes \pi_{+}^{*}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{+}^1}(s_{+})) \Big|_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}} , \tag{3.37}$$

¹⁶There are some differences between our conventions and the ones in [17]. For example, what we have denoted as $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(s_{-}, s_{+})$ is denoted as $\mathcal{O}(s_{+}, s_{-})$ in loc. cit.

with the projections $\pi_{\pm} : \mathbb{P}_-^1 \times \mathbb{P}_+^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\pm}^1$, and then restriction to $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$. An important line bundle on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$ is the (topologically) trivial one¹⁷

$$L := \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(-1, 1) . \quad (3.38)$$

The space of sections of the corresponding bundle on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$ are CR-functions $f(z, w)$ satisfying

$$f(\lambda^{-1/2}z, \lambda^{+1/2}w) = \lambda f(z, w) , \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{C}^{\times} . \quad (3.39)$$

More generally, for $p \in \mathbb{C}$ and $q \in \mathbb{Z}$, the most general holomorphic line bundles on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$ have the generic form $L^p(q)$. A section of this line bundle corresponds to a CR-section f of the corresponding bundle on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$ satisfying

$$f(\zeta\lambda^{-1/2}z, \zeta\lambda^{+1/2}w) = \zeta^q \lambda^p f(z, w) , \quad \mu, \lambda \in \mathbb{C}^{\times} . \quad (3.40)$$

These bundles on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$ are isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(s_-, s_+)$ whose sections transform as

$$\begin{aligned} f(\zeta\lambda^{-1/2}z, \zeta\lambda^{+1/2}w) &= \left(\zeta\lambda^{-1/2}\right)^{s_-} \left(\zeta\lambda^{+1/2}\right)^{s_+} f(z, w) \\ &= \zeta^{s_+ + s_-} \lambda^{\frac{s_+ - s_-}{2}} f(z_-, z_+) . \end{aligned} \quad (3.41)$$

Comparing with (3.40), we conclude that

$$p = \frac{s_+ - s_-}{2} , \quad q = s_+ + s_- . \quad (3.42)$$

We thus have

$$L^p(q) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}((q - 2p)/2, (q + 2p)/2) . \quad (3.43)$$

In particular, we have a topologically trivial bundle for $s_+ + s_- = 0$, such as L in (3.38). Furthermore, any tensor power of L^p is trivial. From (3.42), we can identify

$$L^{\frac{1}{2}}(1) := \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(0, 1) , \quad L^{-\frac{1}{2}}(1) := \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(1, 0) . \quad (3.44)$$

These bundles are (topologically) isomorphic: L^{-p} and L^p are both topologically trivial, and hence $L^p(q) \simeq L^{-p}(q)$. In particular,

$$L^{n/2}(n) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(0, n) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(n, 0) \simeq L^{-n/2}(n) . \quad (3.45)$$

By comparing (3.40) and (3.41) shows that¹⁸

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(p, p) \longleftrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}}(2p) . \quad (3.46)$$

We need some basic results about these bundles. Consider the following diagram associated with $\sigma : \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \sigma^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(m, n) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(m, n) \\ \pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi \\ \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3} & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3} \end{array} , \quad (3.47)$$

¹⁷In [17, §3.1, Example 3], this line bundle is denoted as \tilde{L} .

¹⁸While the two sides are bundles over two different bases, one should think of (3.46) as the correspondence between holomorphic vector bundles on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$ and CR-vector bundles on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$.

where

$$\sigma^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(m, n) = \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(m, n). \quad (3.48)$$

Note that the complex structure on $\sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3})$ is the complex conjugate of $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$, and a section of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(m, n)$ on $\sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3})$ would transform as $\bar{z}^m \bar{w}^n$. Pull this back with σ gives a section which transforms with $z^m w^n$, and hence a section of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(m, n)$.

Consider a real line defined by (3.35), for which we have

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \sigma^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{L}}(m, n) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{L}}(m, n) \\ \pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi \\ \mathbf{L} & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & \sigma(\mathbf{L}) = \mathbf{L} \end{array}. \quad (3.49)$$

The bundle $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{L}}(m, n)$ is defined by the embedding $\iota_{\mathbf{L}} : \mathbf{L} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$ as $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{L}}(m, n) := \iota_{\mathbf{L}}^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(m, n)$. In particular, on a real line \mathbf{L} , the isomorphism (3.47) holds. It furthermore implies

$$\sigma^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{L}}(n, n) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{L}}(n, n). \quad (3.50)$$

Remark 3.1. As we will explain below, spectral curves S of hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopoles are real lines which are sections of $\mathcal{O}_S(m, m)$ for some m . Therefore, this bundle should be invariant under σ , a fact which is implied by (3.50).

In the following, the bundle $\tilde{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ would denote the bundle of homogeneous functions on \mathcal{U} of degree +1, i.e. all functions satisfying $f(\lambda X) = \lambda f(X)$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Note that λ cannot be negative since it then maps $X_0 > 0$ to $\lambda X_0 < 0$, and hence does not preserve \mathcal{U} .

A holomorphic vector bundle $E \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$ is called non-degenerate if the restriction of E to any real line in $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$ is a holomorphically-trivial bundle. Furthermore, E is called a real bundle if there is an anti-holomorphic involution $\sigma_E : E \rightarrow E^*$, where E^* denotes the conjugate vector bundle of E , that covers the map $\sigma : \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$.

Next consider a vector bundle $V \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{U}}$. A \bar{d} -operator on V is a linear differential operator $\bar{d}_V : \Omega^{p,q} \rightarrow \Omega^{p,q+1}$, which satisfies the Leibniz rule. (V, \bar{d}_V) is called an integrable bundle if $\bar{d}_V^2 = 0$, and is called non-degenerate if its restriction to a fiber of ν in (3.24), which is isomorphic to \mathbb{P}^1 , is a holomorphically-trivial bundle.

Finally, we point out that holomorphic bundles over the twistor space $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$ are key parts of the spectral data of hyperbolic monopoles. The holomorphic structure on vector bundles on $V \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$ is induced by the CR-structure on the corresponding bundle on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$. The reason for this one-to-one correspondence is [17, §3.1, Example 2]

$$\Lambda_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}}^{0,1} \simeq \pi^* \Lambda_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}^{0,1}, \quad (3.51)$$

where the isomorphism is given by the pullback. Hence, a section of V is holomorphic if and only if the section of the corresponding bundle on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is CR.

3.2.2 The Correspondence

We now discuss the twistor correspondence, i.e. the one-to-one correspondence between solutions to the Bogomolny equation on \mathbb{H}^3 for the gauge group $SU(n)$ and holomorphic vector bundle on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$.

The basic idea of the twistor correspondence is encoded in the double fibration (3.24): mathematical structures on \mathcal{U} are pulled-back by ν to $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{U}}$ and then sent to the corresponding mathematical structures on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$ by μ . Consider the self-duality equation on \mathcal{U} , which is a connection on a principal G -bundle on \mathcal{U} . It is more convenient to work with the corresponding associated vector bundle equipped with a self-dual connection. The main result is that there is a one-to-one correspondence between such vector bundles and integrable bundles on $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{U}}$, and in turn, the latter bundles are in one-to-one correspondence with CR-bundles on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$. Restricting to \mathbb{R}_+ -invariant data will provide the twistor correspondence between the solutions of the Bogomolny equation on \mathbb{H}^3 and holomorphic vector bundles on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$.

Correspondence Between Bundles over the Double Fibration (3.24). We now briefly explain the correspondence between bundles with additional structures defined over spaces in the double fibration (3.24).

Consider an integrable bundle $(\tilde{E}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{U}}}, \bar{d}_{\tilde{E}_e})$ on $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{U}}$. Such a bundle naturally corresponds to a CR-bundle $E \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$ where the CR-structure is determined by the CR-operator $\bar{\partial}_E$ as follows: One first chooses a section $s : \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{U}}$, and then set

$$E_s := s^* \tilde{E}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{U}}}, \quad \bar{\partial}_{E_s} := s^* \bar{d}_{\tilde{E}_e}. \quad (3.52)$$

For two different sections, say s_1 and s_2 of $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$, there is a bundle map between bundles constructed by s_1 and s_2 as (3.52), which is given by the parallel transport of $\bar{d}_{\tilde{E}}$ along the fibers of μ in (3.24). On the other hand, having a CR-bundle $E \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$ equipped with the CR-operator $\bar{\partial}_E$, a bundle $(\tilde{E}, \bar{d}_{\tilde{E}})$ on \mathcal{C} is constructed by the pull-back operation

$$\tilde{E} := \mu^* E, \quad \bar{d}_{\tilde{E}} := \mu^* \bar{\partial}_E. \quad (3.53)$$

There is a one-to-one correspondence between CR-bundles on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$ and integrable bundles on \mathcal{C} , all modulo corresponding equivalences. For further details see [17, Proposition 3.2].

Next, consider a vector bundle $\tilde{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ equipped with a self-dual connection \tilde{A} . Then, one can define the bundle $\tilde{E}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{U}}} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{U}}$, with $\tilde{E}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{U}}} := \nu^* \tilde{E}$. The pulled-back connection induces a \bar{d} -operator on $\tilde{E}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{U}}}$, which we denote as $\bar{d}_{\tilde{E}_e}$. This bundle is integrable if and only if

$$\nu^* \tilde{F} \in \Gamma(\mu^* \Lambda_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}}^{1,0} \wedge \Lambda_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{U}}}^1), \quad (3.54)$$

with \tilde{F} being the curvature of \tilde{A} . Since \tilde{A} is self-dual, this is always the case. On the other hand, by construction, any vector bundle constructed from the pull-back of a vector bundle on \mathcal{U} would automatically be non-degenerate. This shows that there is a one-to-one

correspondence between vector bundle equipped with a self-dual connection (\tilde{E}, \tilde{A}) and non-degenerate integrable vector bundles $(\tilde{E}_e, \bar{d}_{\tilde{E}_e})$ given explicitly by

$$\tilde{E}_e := \nu^* \tilde{E}, \quad \bar{d}_{\tilde{E}_e} := \nu^* \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{A}}, \quad (3.55)$$

with $\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{A}}$ is the covariant derivative defined by \tilde{A} . This correspondence holds modulo corresponding equivalences. For further details see [17, Proposition 3.3].

Putting these two results together, one concludes that there is a one-to-one correspondence between rank- n vector bundle on \mathcal{U} equipped with a self-dual connection and CR-bundles on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$. More concretely, one consider a section $f : \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ which assigns the point $f(\gamma) \in \gamma \subset \mathcal{U}$ to $\gamma \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$. The choice of such section will provide a section s of the projection μ in (3.24) by setting

$$s(\gamma) := (\gamma, f(\gamma)), \quad \forall \gamma \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}. \quad (3.56)$$

Conversely, having such a section s , one can construct a section $f : \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ by setting $f = \nu \circ s$.

Now assume $\tilde{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ is a vector bundle equipped with a self-dual connection \tilde{A} . The corresponding CR-bundle $E \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$ can be defined by

$$E := f^* \tilde{E}, \quad (3.57)$$

where the CR-structure on E is induced by the CR-operator $\bar{\partial}_E$

$$\bar{\partial}_E := (f^* \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{A}})^{0,1}. \quad (3.58)$$

The CR-structure is defined as usual: a section ψ of E is CR if $\bar{\partial}_E \psi = 0$. The two relations (3.57) and (3.58) are called the Inverse Ward Transform (IWT) [17].

\mathbb{R}_+ -Invariant Data. The last step of establishing the twistor correspondence for hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopoles is to extract the \mathbb{R}_+ -invariant part of the IWT (i.e. relations (3.57) and (3.58)). Recall that the \mathbb{R}_+ -action on \mathcal{U} is given by (3.20). The crucial point is that the pullback under $\pi : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^3$ commutes with the \mathbb{R}_+ -action. This will give rise to the following picture: Consider a vector bundle $\tilde{E}_{\mathcal{U}} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ equipped with a self-dual connection \tilde{A} . The \mathbb{R}_+ -invariant part of the data of this vector bundle gives rise to a rank- n vector bundle $\tilde{E}_{\mathbb{H}^3} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^3$ together with a pair (\tilde{A}_+, ϕ) , where \tilde{A}_+ is a connection on $\tilde{E}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$ and ϕ ¹⁹ is an adjoint-valued scalar, satisfying the Bogomolny equation

$$\tilde{F}_+ = \star_{\mathbb{H}^3} \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{A}_+} \phi, \quad (3.59)$$

where $\tilde{F}_+ = \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{H}^3} \tilde{A}_+ + \frac{1}{2}[\tilde{A}_+, \tilde{A}_+]$. More explicitly, having the vector bundle $(\tilde{E}_{\mathbb{H}^3}, \tilde{A}_+, \phi)$, a vector bundle $(\tilde{E}_{\mathcal{U}}, \tilde{A})$, with a self-dual \tilde{A} , can be constructed where

$$\tilde{E}_{\mathcal{U}} = \pi^* \tilde{E}_{\mathbb{H}^3}, \quad (3.60)$$

¹⁹Murray and Singer use $i\phi$ for the self-adjoint Higgs field [17].

and

$$\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{A}} = \pi^* \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{A}_+} + \pi^* \phi \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{H}^3} \log |x| , \quad (3.61)$$

with $|x|$ is defined in (3.21). The \mathbb{R}_+ -invariance of the connection from this expression is easy to check. Conversely, having the vector bundle $(\tilde{E}_{\mathcal{U}}, \tilde{A})$, one can construct the corresponding vector bundle $(\tilde{E}_{\mathbb{H}^3}, \tilde{A}_+, \phi)$ by first choosing a section $s : \mathbb{H}^3 \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ of the projection π , and setting

$$\tilde{E}_{\mathbb{H}^3, s} := s^* \tilde{E}_{\mathcal{U}} , \quad (3.62)$$

For two sections s and s' , we get $\tilde{E}_{\mathbb{H}^3, s}$ and $\tilde{E}_{\mathbb{H}^3, s'}$, and we have

$$\tilde{E}_{\mathbb{H}^3, s} = s^* \tilde{E}_{\mathcal{U}} = s^* \circ \pi^* \tilde{E}_{\mathbb{H}^3, s'} = \tilde{E}_{\mathbb{H}^3, s'} , \quad (3.63)$$

so the two vector bundles are isomorphic.

The Reality Condition. The bundle of (anti)self-dual two-forms on $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ is not real, hence to get real solutions of the self-duality equation, one needs to impose additional reality conditions on the gauge field \tilde{A} on \mathcal{U} . This means that there would not be a real solution of the Bogomolny equations by looking into the \mathbb{R}_+ -invariant data. To get a real solution, one needs to impose appropriate real conditions on the gauge field \tilde{A}_+ and the Higgs field ϕ . An appropriate real condition turns out to be

$$\tilde{A}_+^* = -\tilde{A}_+ , \quad \phi^* = \phi . \quad (3.64)$$

This condition can be expressed in a more invariant manner, which the reader can find in [17, §3.3]. Furthermore, it imposes a condition on the corresponding CR bundle E on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$ defined in (3.57), which can be found in loc. cit.

Boundary Conditions. Up to now, we have explained the twistor correspondence for hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopoles, through which rank- n holomorphic vector bundles (with a real structure) on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$ is assigned to a solution of the Bogomolny equation on \mathbb{H}^3 . However, to be able to solve the Bogomolny equation, one needs to impose boundary conditions. In turn, these boundary conditions make sure that the bundle E , defined through the inverse Ward transform (3.57), exists. Furthermore, boundary conditions, through the twistor correspondence, would lead to two filtrations of E , which are the main ingredients in defining the spectral data of the monopole later on. Let us explain these ideas in some detail.

Let $\tilde{E}_{\mathbb{H}^3} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^3$ be a rank- n vector bundle equipped with a connection \tilde{A}_+ and an ad E -valued Higgs field ϕ . The corresponding vector bundle on \mathcal{U} is denoted as $\tilde{E}_{\mathcal{U}}$. On this data, we impose the following boundary conditions:

Boundary Condition 1. The first boundary condition is that the asymptotic value of the Higgs field exists on $\partial\overline{\mathbb{H}}^3$, and it is given by (3.17)

$$\phi_\infty = \begin{pmatrix} p_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & p_n \end{pmatrix}, \quad p_i \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 0, \quad (3.65)$$

where we hereafter assume without losing generality that $p_1 \geq p_2 \geq \dots \geq p_n$.

To specify other boundary conditions, we note that the gauge group $SU(n)$ breaks to $U(1)^{n-1}$ on $\partial\overline{\mathbb{H}}^3$, hence in a neighborhood \mathcal{N} of $\partial\overline{\mathbb{H}}^3$ homotopic to S^2 , where the vector bundle $\tilde{E}_{\mathcal{U}}$ can be written as

$$\tilde{E}_{\mathcal{U}}|_{\mathcal{N}} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \tilde{E}_{\mathcal{U},i}, \quad (3.66)$$

with each $\tilde{E}_{\mathcal{U},i}$ is a one-dimensional complex line bundle defined by

$$\tilde{E}_{\mathcal{U},i}: \quad \det(\phi - \lambda_i) = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (3.67)$$

and we have

$$\lambda_i|_{\partial\overline{\mathbb{H}}^3} = p_i, \quad i = 1 \dots, n. \quad (3.68)$$

Furthermore, the connection \tilde{A}_+ upon projection into the i^{th} factor of the summand (3.66) gives a $U(1)$ -connection on $\tilde{E}_{\mathcal{U},i}|_{\partial\overline{\mathbb{H}}^3}$. As $\overline{\mathcal{N}}$, the closure of \mathcal{N} , is homeomorphic to S^2 , one can integrate the curvature of \tilde{A}_i to obtain the degree of $\tilde{E}_{\mathcal{U},i}$

$$k_i := \deg \tilde{E}_{\mathcal{U},i} = \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}} F_{\tilde{A}_i} = \int_{\overline{\mathcal{N}}} c_1(\tilde{E}_{\mathcal{U},i}), \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (3.69)$$

where $F_{\tilde{A}_i}$ denotes the curvature of \tilde{A}_i , and $c_1(\tilde{E}_{\mathcal{U},i})$ denotes the first Chern class of $\tilde{E}_{\mathcal{U},i}$. Noting that $c_1(\bigoplus_{j=1}^i \tilde{E}_{\mathcal{U},j})$ is $\sum_{j=1}^i k_j$, comparing with (3.13) shows that $\sum_{j=1}^i k_j$, by construction, can be identified with (3.16), the i^{th} magnetic charge of the monopole.

The connection on $\tilde{E}|_{\mathcal{N}}$ would then have the following expansion

$$\nabla_{\tilde{A}_+} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \nabla_{\tilde{A}_i} + \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) d_{\mathcal{U}} \log |x| + \mathcal{E}, \quad (3.70)$$

with $\mathcal{E} \in \Lambda^1(\overline{\mathcal{N}}, \text{Hom}(\tilde{E}_{\mathcal{U}}))$, and x denotes a local coordinate on $\overline{\mathcal{N}}$. The components of \mathcal{E} are denoted as $\mathcal{E}_{ij} \in \Lambda^1(\overline{\mathcal{N}}, \text{Hom}(\tilde{E}_{\mathcal{U},i}, \tilde{E}_{\mathcal{U},j}))$. We can then express the rest of the boundary conditions as

Boundary Condition 2. It consists of three parts

- 2a. The connection $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \nabla_{\tilde{A}_i}$ on S_∞^2 has a smooth extension to $\overline{\mathcal{N}}$.
- 2b. One demands that $p_i - \lambda_i$ extend as sections $\phi_j \in \Gamma(\overline{\mathcal{N}}, \tilde{L}^{-2})$, so that $\phi_i = |x|^{-2}(p_i - \lambda_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.

2c. Finally, one requires that \mathcal{E}_{ij} extends as a section $\mathcal{E}_{ij}^{\text{ext}}$ of $\tilde{L}^{-|p_i-p_j|}$, so that $\mathcal{E}_{ij}^{\text{ext}} = |x|^{-|p_i-p_j|}\mathcal{E}_{ij}$.

All integral hyperbolic monopoles satisfy these boundary conditions, and they guarantee the existence of (1) solutions of the Bogomolny equation subject to the reality condition (3.64), and (2) a well-defined notion of spectral data. Another justification for these boundary conditions is given in [17, §4.2]. Using these boundary conditions, we write the connection (3.70) as

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\tilde{A}_+} &= \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \nabla_{\tilde{A}_i} + \text{diag}(p_1 - |x|^2\phi_1, \dots, p_n - |x|^2\phi_n) \mathbf{d}\mathcal{U} \log |x|, \\ &+ \mathbf{x}_p^{-1} \cdot \mathcal{E}_+^{\text{ext}} + \mathbf{x}_p \cdot \mathcal{E}_-^{\text{ext}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.71)$$

where

$$\mathbf{x}_p := \begin{pmatrix} |x|^{p_1} & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & |x|^{p_n} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.72)$$

To state the correspondence, we need to introduce a few more extra concepts. First consider the two maps $\pi_{\pm} : \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}} \rightarrow \partial\mathcal{U}$ ²⁰ for $\forall z, w \in \mathbb{C}$ (recall the definition of $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$ in (3.22))

$$\pi_+(z, w) := \frac{zz^\dagger}{\langle z, z \rangle}, \quad \pi_-(z, w) := \frac{\sigma(w)\sigma(w)^\dagger}{\langle w, w \rangle}, \quad (3.73)$$

where σz is defined through the real structure on \mathbb{P}^3 (A.9)

$$\sigma(w) = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{w}_0 \\ \bar{w}_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma(w^\dagger) = (w_0, w_1). \quad (3.74)$$

Recalling (3.28), we see that π_+ and π_- are both \mathbb{R}_+ -invariant (basically the numerator and denominator of the right-hand sides of (3.73) are multiplied by $\lambda^{\pm 1}$ for π_{\pm} , and hence in total are \mathbb{R}_+ -invariant). Therefore, they descend to maps $\pi_{\pm} : \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3} \rightarrow S_\infty^2 \subset \overline{\mathbb{H}^3}$: For a geodesic $\gamma \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$, $\pi_+(\gamma)$ and $\pi_-(\gamma)$ are its initial and final points, respectively. Therefore, they are sections of the correspondence space $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{U}}$ and can be used to perform the IWT (3.57) and (3.58). It is clear from (3.73) that π_+ is just the projection to S_∞^2 , so it is orientation-preserving, while π_- is the projection to S_∞^2 combined with the antipodal map, hence it is orientation-reversing in total (compare it with (A.14)).

We can now state the twistor correspondence for the hyperbolic monopoles (see [17, Theorem 4.1] for a proof)

Theorem 3.1 (The Twistor Correspondence for Non-Integral Hyperbolic $\text{SU}(n)$ -Monopoles). Let the pair (\tilde{A}, ϕ) be a solution of the Bogomolny equation (3.1) on \mathbb{H}^3 with \tilde{A} being a connection on a vector bundle \tilde{E} and ϕ belonging to the adjoint bundle of \tilde{E} , satisfying

²⁰By an abuse of notation, we have used the same notation as (3.37) for projection onto \mathbb{P}_\pm^1 . This hopefully does not cause any confusion for the cautious reader.

the boundary conditions 1 and 2. For the sections (3.73) of the correspondence restricted to $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$, there are two holomorphic vector bundles on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$ defined by

$$E^\pm := (\pi_\pm^* \tilde{E}, \bar{\partial}_{E^\pm}), \quad (3.75)$$

with

$$\bar{\partial}_{E^\pm} := \pi_\pm^* \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \nabla_{\tilde{A}_i} + \mathcal{E}_\pm^{\text{ext}} \right) \mp \text{diag}(p_1, \dots, p_n) \bar{\partial} \chi_\pm, \quad (3.76)$$

and the real-valued functions $\chi_\pm : \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are defined as

$$\chi_+(z, w) := \frac{\langle w, z \rangle}{\langle w, w \rangle}, \quad \chi_-(z, w) := \frac{\langle z, w \rangle}{\langle z, z \rangle}. \quad (3.77)$$

As a result, there are two holomorphic filtrations

$$0 \simeq E_0^\pm \subset E_1^\pm \subset \dots \subset E_{n-1}^\pm \subset E_n^\pm \simeq E^\pm, \quad (3.78)$$

where

$$E_i^+ := \pi_+^* \left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^i \tilde{E}_{\mathcal{U}, n-i+j} \right), \quad E_i^- := \pi_-^* \left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^i \tilde{E}_{\mathcal{U}, j} \right), \quad (3.79)$$

with the bundle $\tilde{E}_{\mathcal{U}, i}$ is defined in (3.67). Furthermore, the following isomorphisms hold

$$E_{n-i+1}^+ / E_{n-i}^+ \simeq L^{p_i+k_i/2}(k_i), \quad E_i^- / E_{i-1}^- \simeq L^{p_i+k_i/2}(-k_i), \quad (3.80)$$

where the bundle L is defined in (3.38). \square

Remark 3.2. For the sake of comparison, recall that in the context of Euclidean G -monopoles, E^\pm are the two bundles obtained by reductions of the structure group of the bundle E from $G_{\mathbb{C}}$ (the complexification of G) to a Borel subgroup B (for E^+) and its opposite subgroup \bar{B} (for E^-) [34, 32, 33, 35]. \square

Note that the degree of pullback of the bundle by projection π_\pm has a bidegree (\cdot, \cdot) referring to the degree over $(\mathbb{P}_-^1, \mathbb{P}_+^1)$. Therefore, the degree of E_i^\pm over \mathbb{P}_\mp^1 is zero. On the other hand, the degree of E_i^+ over \mathbb{P}_+^1 , which we denote by deg_\pm , is

$$\text{deg}_+ E_i^+ = \sum_{j=1}^i k_{n-i+j} = - \sum_{j=1}^i k_j, \quad (3.81)$$

while for the degree of E_i^- over \mathbb{P}_-^1 , one needs to take into account that the map π_- is orientation-reversing

$$\text{deg}_- E_i^- = - \sum_{j=1}^i k_j, \quad (3.82)$$

where the orientation-reversal is encoded in the additional -1 prefactor. Recalling (3.16), we get

$$\text{deg } E_i^+ = (0, -m_i), \quad \text{deg } E_i^- = (-m_i, 0). \quad (3.83)$$

Therefore, it follows that

$$\deg(E^+/E_i^+) = (0, +m_i), \quad \deg(E^-/E_i^-) = (+m_i, 0). \quad (3.84)$$

Also, recall that E is a real bundle with the real structure $\sigma_E : E \rightarrow E^*$. In a complete analogy with the Euclidean case, we have [27, 34, 32, 33]

$$\sigma_E(E_i^+) \simeq (E_{n-i}^-)^\perp, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (3.85)$$

where $(E_i^\pm)^\perp$ denotes the subspace of linear functionals on E vanishing on E_i^\pm .

3.2.3 Spectral Data and Recovering Monopole Solutions

The twistor correspondence gives a holomorphic bundle on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$ from the data of a monopole configuration on \mathbb{H}^3 and vice versa. However, one question remains to be answered, which is: *Given a solution of the Bogomolny equation (with maximal gauge-symmetry breaking), does it always come from such a construction?* To answer this question, one needs to introduce the notion of spectral data, a concept first introduced by Hitchin [27]. For hyperbolic monopoles, this concept is defined canonically through the two filtrations E_i^\pm constructed in Theorem 3.1. Then one argues that any solution of the Bogomolny equation on \mathbb{H}^3 can be completely determined from its spectral data, which is the answer to the question we wished to respond to.

Spectral Curves. Suppose that we have a hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopole associated with the holomorphic bundle E on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$ satisfying the boundary conditions 1 and 2, giving rise to filtrations (3.78) of E . The spectral curves of the hyperbolic monopole are defined in a complete analogy with the Euclidean case [27, 34, 32, 33]. Consider the maps

$$\Gamma_i^- : \bigwedge^i E_i^- \rightarrow \bigwedge^i (E^+/E_{n-i}^+), \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (3.86)$$

where \bigwedge^i denotes the i^{th} exterior power. The i^{th} spectral curve is defined as

$$S_i := \text{div}(\Gamma_i^-), \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (3.87)$$

with $\text{div}(\Gamma_i^-)$ denotes the divisor of the map Γ_i^- , i.e. its zero locus. Recall that $\bigwedge^i E_i^- = \det E_i^-$, the determinant line bundle of E_i^- . From (3.83), we see that the degree of $\det E_i^-$ is just $(-m_i, 0)$. From $\deg(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(D)) = \deg(D)$ for any divisor D , we conclude that the associated line bundle is isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(-m_i, 0)$ [137]. Similarly, $\bigwedge^i (E^+/E_{n-i}^+) = \det(E^+/E_{n-i}^+)$ with degree $+m_i$, and the associated line bundle is isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(0, +m_i)$. Therefore, the spectral curves are determined by the divisors of the following maps

$$\Gamma_i^- : \det E_i^- \rightarrow \det(E^+/E_{n-i}^+), \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (3.88)$$

and thus S_i is a section of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(m_i, m_i)$. Taking into account (3.46), we see that

$$S_i \in \Gamma(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(m_i, m_i)) \simeq \Gamma(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_U}(2m_i)), \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (3.89)$$

where \simeq should be understood as we explained around (3.46). Alternatively, S_i can be described as the divisor of

$$\Gamma_i^+ : \bigwedge^{n-i} E_{n-i}^+ \rightarrow \bigwedge^{n-i} (E^-/E_i^-) , \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1 , \quad (3.90)$$

where $\bigwedge^{n-i} E_{n-i}^+ \simeq \det E_{n-i}^+$ and $\bigwedge^{n-i} (E^-/E_i^-) \simeq \det (E^-/E_i^-)$ are of degree $(0, -m_i)$ and $(m_i, 0)$, respectively. Therefore, the spectral curve S_i is again a section of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(m_i, m_i)$, and the genus of each curve is given by

$$g_{S_i} = (m_i - 1)^2 , \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1 . \quad (3.91)$$

Furthermore, S_i is compact [17, Lemma on pg. 990], and real in the following sense

$$\sigma(S_i) = S_i , \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1 , \quad (3.92)$$

where this equation should be understood as in (3.35).

Spectral Data. It turns out the spectral curves S_i are not the only data needed for the recovery of a specific monopole solution, and the following extra details are necessary. Consider the sets $S_i \cap S_{i+1}$ of intersections of S_i and S_{i+1} . It can be decomposed as $S_{i,i+1} \cup S_{i+1,i}$ where

$$\begin{aligned} S_{i,i+1} &:= \left\{ s \in S_i \mid \dim (E_{n-i-1}^+ \cap E_i^-) \Big|_s \geq 1 \right\} , \\ S_{i+1,i} &:= \left\{ s \in S_i \mid \dim (E_{n-i}^+ \cap E_{i+1}^-) \Big|_s \geq 2 \right\} , \end{aligned} \quad (3.93)$$

which are exchanged by the real structure σ . A monopole is called generic if S_i and S_{i+1} intersect transversally and $S_{i,i+1}$ and $S_{i+1,i}$ are distinct set of points. Each one of the sets $S_{i,i+1}$ and $S_{i+1,i}$ consists generically of $m_i m_{i+1}$ points, which are exchanged by the real structure σ , hence in total the intersection locus

$$S_i \cap S_{i+1} = S_{i,i+1} \cup S_{i+1,i} , \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1 , \quad (3.94)$$

is a set of $2m_i m_{i+1}$ points. As there are $n-1$ spectral curves $\{S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}\}$, the condition of genericity means that there is a spectral curve associated with each node of the Dynkin diagram of $\mathfrak{su}(n) = \text{Lie}(\text{SU}(n))$, and curves associated with adjacent nodes are intersecting transversally. This means that spectral curves are labeled by simple roots or the associated fundamental weights (see (3.8)) of $\mathfrak{su}(n)$. The spectral curves $\{S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}\}$ together with the information of the decomposition of their intersection is called the spectral data of hyperbolic $\text{SU}(n)$ -monopoles.

Hyperbolic Monopoles from Spectral Data. The next and final question to wrap up the twistor correspondence of hyperbolic $\text{SU}(n)$ -monopoles is how to recover a monopole from its spectral data. Here, we sketched the results following [35, 17].²¹

²¹While [35] discussed monopoles in Euclidean space, their considerations can be adopted to hyperbolic space, as noted in [17].

One starts from the following sequence of sheaves

$$0 \rightarrow E^+ \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^n E^+ / (E_{n-i}^+ + E_{i-1}^-) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n-1} E^+ / (E_{n-i}^+ + E_i^-). \quad (3.95)$$

The first map is simply the projection to the corresponding equivalence class while the second map is given by [17, Proposition 1.12]

$$(e_1, \dots, e_n) \mapsto (\delta_1(e_1) - \gamma_2(e_2), \dots, \delta_{n-1}(e_{n-1}) - \gamma_n(e_n)), \quad (3.96)$$

with the maps γ_i and δ_i are the natural projections

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_i &: \frac{E^+}{E_{n-i}^+ + E_{i-1}^-} \mapsto \frac{E^+}{E_{n-i+1}^+ + E_{i-1}^-}, & i = 1, \dots, n-1, \\ \delta_i &: \frac{E^+}{E_{n-i}^+ + E_{i-1}^-} \mapsto \frac{E^+}{E_{n-i+1}^+ + E_i^-}, & i = 1, \dots, n-1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.97)$$

One can show that this is a short exact sequence [35, Proposition 1.12]. According to loc. cit. the first and second sums in the sequence are given by [35, eq. (1.11)]

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^n E^+ / (E_{n-i}^+ + E_{i-1}^-) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n L^{p_i+k_i/2}(m_{i-1} + m_i) \otimes \mathcal{I}(S_{i-1,i}), \quad (3.98)$$

and with $\mathcal{I}(S_{i-1,i})$ denoting the sheaf of functions vanishing on $S_{i-1,i}$, and

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^n E^+ / (E_{n-i}^+ + E_i^-) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n L^{p_{i+1}+k_{i+1}/2}(m_i + m_{i+1}) \otimes [-S_{i,i+1}] \Big|_{S_i}, \quad (3.99)$$

where L is the trivial line bundle (3.38), and $[D]$ denotes the line bundle associated with the divisor D . Therefore, the maps γ_i and δ_i in (3.97) can be understood as

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_i &: L^{p_i+k_i/2}(m_{i-1} + m_i) \otimes \mathcal{I}(S_{i-1,i}) \mapsto L^{p_i+k_i/2}(m_{i-1} + m_i) \otimes [-S_{i-1,i}] \Big|_{S_{i-1}}, \\ \delta_i &: L^{p_i+k_i/2}(m_i + m_{i+1}) \otimes \mathcal{I}(S_{i,i+1}) \mapsto L^{p_{i+1}+k_{i+1}/2}(m_i + m_{i+1}) \otimes [-S_{i,i+1}] \Big|_{S_i}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.100)$$

This means that γ_i is simply the restriction to S_{i-1} while δ_i is the restriction to S_i accompanied by multiplying with some meromorphic section. Its holomorphic part ζ_i can be read off from (3.100). This is a section of

$$\zeta_i \in \Gamma(L^{p_{i+1}+k_{i+1}/2-p_i-k_i/2}(m_{i-1} + m_{i+1}) \otimes [-S_{i-1,i} - S_{i,i+1}], S_i). \quad (3.101)$$

Therefore, over the i^{th} spectral curve S_i , there is a holomorphic section of the bundle $L^{p_{i+1}+k_{i+1}/2-p_i-k_i/2}(m_{i-1} + m_{i+1})$ with zeroes along $S_{i-1,i} \cup S_{i,i+1}$, i.e. [35, Lemma 1.8]

$$L^{p_{i+1}+k_{i+1}/2-p_i-k_i/2}(m_{i-1} + m_{i+1}) \otimes [-S_{i-1,i} - S_{i,i+1}] \Big|_{S_i} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{S_i}, \quad (3.102)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. This feature uniquely determines ζ_i . This completes the construction of the bundle E^+ , as the kernel of the second map of (3.95), from the spectral data.

Remark 3.3. For the case of $SU(2)$ hyperbolic monopole, there is only one spectral curve S and hence no intersection sets $S_{i-1,i}$ and $S_{i,i+1}$. The condition (3.102) reduces to

$$L^{p_2+k_2/2-p_1-k_1/2}(m_0 + m_2)\Big|_S \simeq \mathcal{O}_S . \quad (3.103)$$

We have $m_0 = 0 = m_2 = k_1 + k_2$, which gives $k_2 = -k_1 =: k$ and also $p_2 = -p_1 =: p$. Hence,

$$L^{2p+k}\Big|_S \simeq \mathcal{O}_S , \quad (3.104)$$

which is precisely the condition that defines the spectral curve S [13, eq. (3.7) and Proposition 3.5]. \square

Let us recapitulate the procedure of constructing the monopole solution

- (1) From the spectral data, i.e. curves together with the data of the splitting of their intersection locus, one constructs the sequence of sheaves (3.95);
- (2) Then, the bundle E^+ can be recovered as the kernel of the second map in (3.95);
- (3) The real structure on E^+ can be constructed using spectral data. We avoid explaining this and instead refer to [35, §1.1e, pg. 53];
- (4) One follows the procedure in [35, Theorem 1.19] to construct the monopole solution (\tilde{A}, ϕ) from the bundle E^+ .

For our purpose of comparison of the data above to the data constructed from the curve of the spectral parameter of the gCPM, (3.102) is essential and provides one of the key relations. We are now equipped with enough background and are in a position to establish the correspondence between the gCPM and hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopoles to which we now turn.

4 The Hyperbolic Monopole/gCPM Correspondence

We are now in a position to establish the correspondence between the spectral data of hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopoles and the curve of spectral parameter $\Sigma_{N,n}$, defined in (2.10), of the \mathbb{Z}_N^{n-1} generalized CPM. A point we would like to emphasize in the very beginning is the following: the correspondence works only when we consider special choices of the data, either on the gCPM side or the hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopole side, as we will explain below.

4.1 General Considerations

Before delving into the construction let us state an important assumption first.

An Important Assumption. In the process of the construction, it becomes mandatory to take the boundary values of the Higgs field to vanish. To define the spectral data of such a configuration, we will work with *non-integral* hyperbolic monopoles and their spectral data, as we explained in §3.2. Such monopoles, as their name suggests, can have arbitrary masses, hence it is possible to take the zero-mass limit. The existence of hyperbolic $SU(2)$ -monopoles with an arbitrary mass has been proven in [138, 139, 140], and it has been generalized by Murray and Singer to hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopoles [17]. The construction in loc. cit. involves certain analytical subtleties. In particular, the boundary conditions used in [17] to define the spectral data is a different set of boundary conditions compared to their integral counterpart [21, 22]. However, as has been emphasized in [103, 104, 17, 14], taking the zero-mass limit is a subtle issue. An important point to emphasize is that a hyperbolic monopole with $p_i = 0$, $i = 1, \dots$, is not a trivial configuration. For a gauge group G with the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} = \text{Lie}(G)$, this can be seen by noting that

$$\Delta|\phi|^2 = 2 \sum_{a=1}^{\dim \mathfrak{g}} \Delta\phi^a \phi_a + 2|D\phi|^2 = 2|D\phi|^2 \geq 0, \quad (4.1)$$

where the second equality follows from the Bianchi identity $DF = 0$ and the Bogomolny equation. Here, $\Delta := D^2$ is the gauge covariant Laplacian, $D := d + [A, \cdot]$, and the norm of the Higgs field is defined by²²

$$|\phi|^2 := \text{tr}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\phi^2) = \sum_{a=1}^{\dim \mathfrak{g}} \phi_a \phi^a. \quad (4.2)$$

From the Maximum Principle [141, p. 248], therefore, the value of the Higgs field is bounded by its value at the boundary, where the gauge group breaks to a subgroup. As we set $p_i = 0$, it follows from (4.1) that $D\phi = 0$. Then, the Bogomolny equation (3.1) leads to $F = 0$. Such monopoles are called flat.

On the other hand, there are separate constructions of hyperbolic monopoles for integer (or half-integer) masses. The reason is that these monopoles can be thought of as circle-invariant instantons, as we briefly reviewed in Appendix A. The spectral data for integral hyperbolic $SU(2)$ -monopoles and the relation to the discrete Nahm equations is described in [13, 16]. These results have been generalized to hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopoles in [21, 22]. A shortcoming of the latter references is that it has not been proven that the spectral data on the integral hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopole, with $n > 2$, uniquely determines the monopole solution, a result that has been established for $n = 2$ by Atiyah [13]. As the construction of both integral and non-integral hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopoles is available, there are two ways to construct hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopole configurations with vanishing masses: (1) One can either consider the Murray–Singer construction in [17] and take its zero-mass limit or (2) one can work with integral hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopoles, as formulated in [21, 22] and then simply set all the masses to zero. Presumably, either way, the resulting spectral data is

²²Here, we have $\text{tr}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\phi^2) = \text{tr}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\phi^a \phi^b J_a J_b) = \phi^a \phi^b \delta_{ab} = \phi^a \phi_a$, with $\{J^a, a = 1, \dots, \dim(\mathfrak{g})\}$ is a set of generators for \mathfrak{g} with the chosen normalization.

well-defined and uniquely determines a configuration of flat hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopole.²³ In this work, we exclusively consider the zero-mass limit of the construction of non-integral hyperbolic monopoles by Murray and Singer in [17] and assume that this limit exists and defines the spectral data of a flat hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopole. \square

With the understanding of this assumption, let us briefly summarize what we are aiming for in the following subsections

- (1) In §4.2.1, we start from the curve of spectral parameter $\Sigma_{N,n}$ for the gCMP defined in \mathbb{P}^{2n-1} and is given in (2.10). As there are $n - 1$ spectral curves for a hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopole on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$, we construct $n - 1$ curves out of $\Sigma_{N,n}$ from a natural \mathbb{C}^\times -action on \mathbb{P}^{2n-1} , which we call $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(1)}, \dots, \Sigma_{N,n}^{(n-1)}$ on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. We furthermore impose a reality condition on these curves which makes them candidates for the spectral curves of hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopoles. We show that these curves satisfy all the properties of the curves for a *particular* configuration of a hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopole with $n - 1$ charges (N, \dots, N) . Furthermore, we show that the bundle defined in the left-hand side of (3.102) is trivial upon restriction to $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$ and setting $p_i = 0$. This identifies the particular configuration of hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopoles and spectral curves S_1, \dots, S_{n-1} corresponding to curves $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(1)}, \dots, \Sigma_{N,n}^{(n-1)}$. In particular, we realize

$$\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)} \simeq S_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n - 1. \quad (4.3)$$

- (2) In §4.2.2, we reverse the construction, i.e. we start from $n - 1$ curves S_1, \dots, S_{n-1} of hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopoles. By removing the reality condition and gluing these curves together, we reconstruct the curve of the spectral parameter of the gCPM.

This provides a one-to-one correspondence between the spectral data of a (special) hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopole and the data coming from the curve of the spectral parameter of the gCPM.

4.2 Establishing the Correspondence for $SU(n)$

In this section, we provide the generalization of the observation in [103, 104] and put it into a sound ground.

4.2.1 Hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -Monopoles from gCPMs

We present the construction of the spectral data of a hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopole from the curve of the spectral parameter of the gCPM in three steps.

Step 1: Constructing $n - 1$ Curves in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ out of $\Sigma_{N,n}$. As we explained in §2, the curve of the spectral parameter of the model is defined in \mathbb{P}^{2n-1} . However, further scrutiny shows that (2.3) can indeed be regarded as a curve in the product of n copies of \mathbb{P}^1 . This

²³In the Euclidean setting, solutions with branch-type singularity along S^2 has been constructed in [23]. Such solutions have a nontrivial holonomy around S^2 .

can be seen as follows. Recall that, as we have stated around (2.7), the curve of spectral parameter for the gCPM can be quotiented to $\Sigma_{N,n} = \tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n}/\mathbb{Z}_N^{n-1}$, where $\tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n} \subset \mathbb{P}^{2n-1}$. As $\mathbb{Z}_N^{n-1} \subset (\mathbb{C}^\times)^{n-1}$, we can generalize (2.7) in a natural way and instead consider the following more general action of $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^{n-1}$ on \mathbb{P}^{2n-1}

$$[z_1^+ : z_1^- : \dots : z_n^+ : z_n^-] \mapsto [\lambda_1 z_1^+ : \lambda_1 z_1^- : \dots : \lambda_{n-1} z_{n-1}^+ : \lambda_{n-1} z_{n-1}^- : z_n^+ : z_n^-], \quad (4.4)$$

for any $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}) \in (\mathbb{C}^\times)^{n-1}$. This action has n fixed lines given by

$$\mathbb{P}_i := [z_i^+ : z_i^-] \simeq [0 : \dots : 0 : z_i^+ : z_i^- : 0 : \dots : 0], \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (4.5)$$

Therefore, the fixed locus \mathcal{F} is the union of n copies of \mathbb{P}^1 , which for convenience we label as \mathbb{P}_i^1 , $i = 1, \dots, n$

$$\mathcal{F} := \mathbb{P}_1^1 \cup \dots \cup \mathbb{P}_n^1. \quad (4.6)$$

The action is free elsewhere. A $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^{n-1}$ -orbit intersects $\mathbb{P}_1^1, \dots, \mathbb{P}_n^1$ and the set of free orbits can thus be identified with

$$\{\mathbb{P}^{2n-1} - \mathcal{F}\}/(\mathbb{C}^\times)^{n-1} \simeq \mathbb{P}_1^1 \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}_n^1. \quad (4.7)$$

For a point $([a_1 : b_1], \dots, [a_n : b_n]) \in \mathbb{P}_1^1 \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}_n^1$, the generic fiber of the $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^{n-1}$ -bundle $\{\mathbb{P}^{2n-1} - \mathcal{F}\} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_1^1 \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}_n^1$ is given by

$$[a_1/\lambda_1 : b_1/\lambda_1 : \dots : a_{n-1}/\lambda_{n-1} : b_{n-1}/\lambda_{n-1} : a_n : b_n], \quad (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}) \in (\mathbb{C}^\times)^{n-1}. \quad (4.8)$$

As we vary $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n-1})$, we generate the entire fiber, which is thus isomorphic to $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^{n-1}$, as it should be. Therefore, the projection $\{\mathbb{P}^{2n-1} - \mathcal{F}\} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_1^1 \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}_n^1$ defines a rank- $(n-1)$ $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^{n-1}$ -vector bundle over $\mathbb{P}_1^1 \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}_n^1$. For generic values of the matrices K_{ij} in (2.3), the curve $\tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n}$ does not intersect \mathcal{F} , which implies that the action of \mathbb{Z}_N^{n-1} on $\tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n}$ is free. We thus conclude that $\Sigma_{N,n}$ indeed defines a curve in $\mathbb{P}_1^1 \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}_n^1$.

Next, recall that only $n-1$ equations in (2.3) are independent due to the cocycle conditions (2.4). These equations can be conveniently chosen to be the ones defined by $K_{i,i+1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ and the rest will be determined through (2.4). We then define the following sequence of projections

$$\mathbb{P}_1^1 \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}_n^1 \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_i} \mathbb{P}_i^1 \times \mathbb{P}_{i+1}^1 \xrightarrow{f_i} \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1. \quad (4.9)$$

Under pr_i , the equations for $\tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n}$ are projected onto a curve in $\mathbb{P}_i^1 \times \mathbb{P}_{i+1}^1$ and under the forgetful map f_i , the i -dependence of coordinates of the curve is forgotten, and we land on a curve in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Notice that there is still a hidden i -dependence in the matrices $K_{i,i+1}$, and hence we generate $n-1$ distinguished curves by this procedure. Denoting a point in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ as $([z^+ : z^-], [w^+ : w^-])$, we can write these maps more explicitly. Under pr_i , we get the equations for the curve $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$ in $\mathbb{P}_i^1 \times \mathbb{P}_{i+1}^1$

$$\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)} : \begin{pmatrix} (z_i^+)^N \\ (z_i^-)^N \end{pmatrix} = K_i \begin{pmatrix} (z_{i+1}^+)^N \\ (z_{i+1}^-)^N \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (4.10)$$

and under f_i , we get the equations for the curve $\tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n}^{(i)}$ in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n}^{(i)} : \begin{pmatrix} (z^+)^N \\ (z^-)^N \end{pmatrix} = K_i \begin{pmatrix} (w^+)^N \\ (w^-)^N \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (4.11)$$

where for the sake of brevity, we have denote $K_{i,i+1}$ with K_i , $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Considering $f_i \circ \text{pr}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ produces $n-1$ curves. These curves have an obvious $\mathbb{Z}_N \times \mathbb{Z}_N$ symmetry, acting as

$$([z^+, z^-], [w^+, w^-]) \mapsto ([\omega z^+, z^-], [\omega' w^+, w^-]),$$

with $\omega^N = \omega'^N = 1$ are two N^{th} root of unity. In the following, we consider the $n-1$ quotient curves

$$\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)} := \tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n}^{(i)} / (\mathbb{Z}_N \times \mathbb{Z}_N) \subset \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1. \quad (4.12)$$

These are $n-1$ curves in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ we wished to construct.

Alternatively, we can think of these curves as follows. We consider the following embeddings $\iota_i : \mathbb{P}_i^3 \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^{2n-1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$

$$\mathbb{P}_i^3 : [z_i^+ : z_i^- : z_{i+1}^+ : z_{i+1}^-] \simeq [0 : \dots : z_i^+ : z_i^- : z_{i+1}^+ : z_{i+1}^- : 0 : \dots : 0] \in \mathbb{P}^{2n-1}. \quad (4.13)$$

We next consider the \mathbb{C}^\times -action on \mathbb{P}_i^3 as

$$[z_i^+ : z_i^- : z_{i+1}^+ : z_{i+1}^-] \mapsto [\lambda z_i^+ : \lambda z_i^- : z_{i+1}^+ : z_{i+1}^-], \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}^\times. \quad (4.14)$$

Following the same argument as the case of $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^{n-1}$ action on \mathbb{P}^{2n-1} , we end up with $n-1$ \mathbb{C}^\times -bundles

$$\{\mathbb{P}^3 - (\mathbb{P}_i^1 \cup \mathbb{P}_{i+1}^1)\} / \mathbb{C}^\times \simeq \mathbb{P}_i^1 \times \mathbb{P}_{i+1}^1, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (4.15)$$

with generic fibers \mathbb{C}^\times . Here \mathbb{P}_i^1 and \mathbb{P}_{i+1}^1 denote the two fixed lines of \mathbb{C}^\times -action defined analogous to (4.5). Therefore, the projection $\{\mathbb{P}^3 - (\mathbb{P}_i^1 \cup \mathbb{P}_{i+1}^1)\} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_i^1 \times \mathbb{P}_{i+1}^1$ defines a \mathbb{C}^\times -line bundle over $\mathbb{P}_i^1 \times \mathbb{P}_{i+1}^1$. Under the embedding ι_i , the equations (2.3) of $\tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n}$ become the ones for $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$ given in (4.10). If we now apply the forgetful map f_i , as defined in (4.9), we land on the equations for the curve $\tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n}^{(i)}$ given (4.11), that by passing to the $\mathbb{Z}_N \times \mathbb{Z}_N$ quotient produces the curve $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$. Considering all the embeddings ι_i gives the set of curves $\{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(1)}, \dots, \Sigma_{N,n}^{(n-1)}\}$. From this point of view, one can see each of the curves in the set $\{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(1)}, \dots, \Sigma_{N,n}^{(n-1)}\}$ as the curve of spectral parameter for an ordinary chiral Potts model, which would be useful later for identifying the corresponding hyperbolic $\text{SU}(n)$ -monopole configuration.

Finally, we would like to point out that the curves $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(1)}, \dots, \Sigma_{N,n}^{(n-1)}$ enjoy a global symmetry under which

$$\begin{pmatrix} z^{+N} \\ z^{-N} \end{pmatrix} \mapsto U \begin{pmatrix} z^{+N} \\ z^{-N} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} w^{+N} \\ w^{-N} \end{pmatrix} \mapsto V \begin{pmatrix} w^{+N} \\ w^{-N} \end{pmatrix}, \quad K_i \mapsto UK_i V^{-1}, \quad (4.16)$$

for some diagonal matrices $U = \text{diag}(u, u^{-1})$ and $V = \text{diag}(v, v^{-1})$. It is a global symmetry in the sense that, unlike (2.6), it acts the same way on all matrices K_i , $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Another difference of this transformation with (2.6) is that it does not preserve the cocycle condition (2.4). This is expected since the curves $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(1)}, \dots, \Sigma_{N,n}^{(n-1)}$ are considered independent. Defining K_i as

$$K_i = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_i & \beta_i \\ \gamma_i & \delta_i \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1. \quad (4.17)$$

Under (4.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_i &\mapsto (uv)\alpha_i, & \beta_i &\mapsto \left(\frac{u}{v}\right)\beta_i, \\ \gamma_i &\mapsto \left(\frac{v}{u}\right)\gamma_i, & \delta_i &\mapsto \left(\frac{1}{uv}\right)\delta_i. \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

To summarize, we started from the curve $\Sigma_{N,n}$, and constructed $n-1$ curves $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(1)}, \dots, \Sigma_{N,n}^{(n-1)}$ satisfying (4.11).

Step 2: Properties of the Curves $\{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(1)}, \dots, \Sigma_{N,n}^{(n-1)}\}$. We now determine the properties of the curves $\{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(1)}, \dots, \Sigma_{N,n}^{(n-1)}\}$. Once we described these properties it becomes evident that they are related to the spectral data of a *particular configuration* of hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopoles. In the next step, we then identify these monopole configurations.

The curves $\{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(1)}, \dots, \Sigma_{N,n}^{(n-1)}\}$ have the following properties.

$\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$ is a section of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(N, N)$. From (4.11), it is clear that $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$ has bi-degree (N, N) , and hence is a section of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(N, N) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}}(2N)$ (see (3.46)). Each curve has genus

$$g_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}} = (N-1)^2, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1. \quad (4.19)$$

$\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$ defines a real curve. The matrix K_i in (4.11) which defines the curve $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$ is in general complex matrices belonging to $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$. However, we would like to impose a constraint on them as follows. Recall that $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ had a real structure, given in (3.32), descended from the real structure (A.9) on \mathbb{P}^3 . Under this real structure, the equations (4.11) of the curve $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$ transform to²⁴

$$\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)} \mapsto \sigma(\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}) : \quad \begin{pmatrix} \bar{z}^{+N} \\ \bar{z}^{-N} \end{pmatrix} = K_i \begin{pmatrix} \bar{w}^{+N} \\ \bar{w}^{-N} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.20)$$

The extra constraint we put on our curve is the reality condition, i.e. we demand

$$\sigma(\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}) = \Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (4.21)$$

²⁴Under σ , the coordinates on the two copies of \mathbb{P}^1 is complex-conjugated; the coordinate z in (3.32) is the inhomogeneous coordinate on \mathbb{P}^1 and hence \bar{z} corresponds to $[\bar{z}^+ : \bar{z}^-]$. The same comment applies to w, w^+ , and w^- .

where this equation should be understood as in the sense of (3.35). Recall that this was one of the conditions on the spectral curves of hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopole (see (3.92)). Taking the complex conjugate of both sides of (4.11) and comparing the result with (4.20) show that (4.21) implies the following condition on matrices K_i

$$\overline{K}_i = K_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1. \quad (4.22)$$

We thus have $n-1$ real curves defined by (4.11) in which all matrices K_i satisfy (4.22) and belong to $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ (rather than $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$).

$\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)} \cap \Sigma_{N,n}^{(i+1)}$ **consists of $N^2 + N^2$ points exchanged by σ .** Recall that each of $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$ or $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i+1)}$ has bi-degree (N, N) in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Hence, by degree reasons (Bézout's Theorem), they intersect generically at $N^2 + N^2 = 2N^2$ points. With the aim of comparing the result with the monopole side (see [Spectral Data](#) in §3.2.3), we would like to see what extra condition matrices K_i need to satisfy such that the intersection points can be decomposed into two sets each of which contains N^2 points, and furthermore these sets are exchanged by the real structure σ given in (3.32).

Let us first determine the intersection loci of $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$ and $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i+1)}$. At intersection points, the equations for $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$ and $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i+1)}$ coincide. Considering (4.11), we arrive at

$$\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)} \cap \Sigma_{N,n}^{(i+1)} : \quad (K_i - \lambda_i K_{i+1}) \begin{pmatrix} (w^+)^N \\ (w^-)^N \end{pmatrix} = 0, \quad \lambda_i \in \mathbb{C}^\times, \quad (4.23)$$

where we have subtracted the equations of $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$ and $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i+1)}$, so

$$K_i - \lambda_i K_{i+1} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_i - \lambda_i \alpha_{i+1} & \beta_i - \lambda_i \beta_{i+1} \\ \gamma_i - \lambda_i \gamma_{i+1} & \delta_i - \lambda_i \delta_{i+1} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.24)$$

Furthermore, we considered that we are working in the projective line where we can rescale homogeneous coordinates by $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{C}^\times$. (4.23) will have a nontrivial solution if and only if

$$\det(K_i - \lambda_i K_{i+1}) = 0, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}^\times, \quad (4.25)$$

which can be written as

$$\lambda_i^2 - 2A_i \lambda_i + B_i = 0, \quad (4.26)$$

where

$$A_i := \frac{\text{Tr}(K_i K_{i+1}^{-1})}{2 \det K_{i+1}} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(K_i K_{i+1}^{-1}), \quad B_i := \frac{\det K_i}{\det K_{i+1}} = 1, \quad (4.27)$$

and we have used the fact that $\det K_i = 1$, $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. (4.26) has the following solutions

$$\lambda_i^\pm = A_i \pm \sqrt{A_i^2 - 1}. \quad (4.28)$$

Each of these values leads to a solution (w^{+N}, w^{-N}) . For λ_i^\pm , we can eliminate the second row of $K_i - \lambda_i K_{i+1}$ in (4.24), which leads to the equation

$$(\alpha_i - \lambda_i^\pm \alpha_{i+1}) w^{+N} + (\beta_i - \lambda_i^\pm \beta_{i+1}) w^{-N} = 0, \quad (4.29)$$

and we then take w^{+N} as a parametric solution of w^{-N} . The inhomogeneous coordinates z and w on $\mathbb{P}_z^1 \times \mathbb{P}_w^1$ are given by

$$z := \frac{z^+}{z^-}, \quad w := \frac{w^+}{w^-}, \quad (4.30)$$

in terms of which, we can write (4.29) as²⁵

$$w_{\pm,i}^N = -\frac{\beta_i - \lambda_i^\pm \beta_{i+1}}{\alpha_i - \lambda_i^\pm \alpha_{i+1}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-2. \quad (4.31)$$

For each of λ_i^\pm , this equation has N solutions, which we denote as $w_{\pm,i,I}$, $I = 1, \dots, N$. Putting these solutions into equation (4.11), and noting that $\det K_i \neq 0$, we arrive at the following equation for z

$$z_{\pm,i,I}^N = \frac{\alpha_i w_{\pm,i,I}^N + \beta_i}{\gamma_i w_{\pm,i,I}^N + \delta_i}, \quad (4.32)$$

which for each value of I has N solutions, and we denote them as $z_{\pm,i,IJ}$, $I, J = 1, \dots, N$. Introducing the following notation

$$P_{i,IJ}^\pm := (z_{\pm,i,IJ}, w_{\pm,i,I}), \quad i = 1, \dots, n-2, \quad I, J = 1, \dots, N, \quad (4.33)$$

the intersection points associated with λ_i^\pm define two divisors on $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_i^+ : \quad \Sigma_{N,n}^{(i,i+1)} &:= P_{i,11}^+ + \dots + P_{i,NN}^+, \\ \lambda_i^- : \quad \Sigma_{N,n}^{(i+1,i)} &:= P_{i,11}^- + \dots + P_{i,NN}^-. \end{aligned} \quad (4.34)$$

Each of these divisors contains N^2 distinct points and hence the total number of intersection points is $2N^2$.

Next, we would like to impose the constraint that these two sets of N^2 points are exchanged by the real structure σ in (3.32). By a suitable ordering of the points in the two sets in (4.34), we get the following action of σ on the solution set

$$\sigma(P_{i,IJ}^+) = P_{i,IJ}^-, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-2, \quad I, J = 1, \dots, N, \quad (4.35)$$

which, by (4.33) and (3.32), gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(z_{+,i,IJ}) &= \bar{z}_{+,i,IJ} = z_{-,i,IJ}, \\ \sigma(w_{+,i,I}) &= \bar{w}_{+,i,I} = w_{-,i,I}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.36)$$

As entries of K_i are real, from (4.31) and $\bar{w}_{+,i,I} = w_{-,i,I}$, we arrive at

$$\bar{\lambda}_i^\pm = \lambda_i^\mp, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-2. \quad (4.37)$$

Once this condition is satisfied, (4.32) implies that $\bar{z}_{+,i,IJ} = z_{-,i,IJ}$ is automatically satisfied. We thus need to make sure that (4.37) can always be satisfied. For this to happen, by (4.27) and (4.28), we should have

$$A_i^2 - B_i = \frac{1}{4} (\text{Tr}(K_i K_{i+1}^{-1}))^2 - 1 \leq 0. \quad (4.38)$$

²⁵Note that the index λ_i^\pm takes value from $i = 1, \dots, n-2$, and hence the range in (4.31).

Since $K_i \in \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$, the classification of elements of $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ ²⁶ implies that $K_i K_{i+1}^{-1}$ should be either an elliptic or parabolic element of $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$, a condition that can always be satisfied by an appropriate choice of the matrices K_1, \dots, K_{n-1} . In the following we will discuss the case where $K_i K_{i+1}^{-1}$ is elliptic, which is generically expected unless $\lambda_i^+ = \lambda_i^-$.

In summary, we demonstrated that $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)} \cap \Sigma_{N,n}^{(i+1)}$ consists of $2N^2$ points which can be assembled into the union of two sets $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i,i+1)} \cup \Sigma_{N,n}^{(i+1,i)}$, defined in (4.34), with the property that

$$\sigma(\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i,i+1)}) = \Sigma_{N,n}^{(i+1,i)}, \quad \sigma(\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i+1,i)}) = \Sigma_{N,n}^{(i,i+1)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1. \quad (4.39)$$

$\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$ is associated with the i^{th} simple root of $\text{SU}(n)$. The curves $\{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(1)}, \dots, \Sigma_{N,n}^{(n-1)}\}$ are independent and distinct curves intersect at a finite number of points. We can label these curves as follows. Since $\mathfrak{su}(n) = \text{Lie}(\text{SU}(n))$ has $n-1$ simple roots given by $\{e_1 - e_2, \dots, e_{n-1} - e_n\}$ with e_i being the standard basis of \mathbb{R}^n , we can make the following assignment

$$\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)} \longleftrightarrow e_i - e_{i+1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (4.40)$$

Taking into account the properties of $\{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(1)}, \dots, \Sigma_{N,n}^{(n-1)}\}$, we see that the curves intersect at $2N^2$ points whenever they are associated with simple roots that label the adjacent nodes of $\mathfrak{su}(n)$ Dynkin diagram. Finally, notice that for $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$ and $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(j)}$ with $j \neq i \pm 1$, we do not impose any specific requirement of transversality and finiteness of their intersection. However, in our case, it turns out that those curves also intersect at $2N^2$ points for the same reason as for the case of $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$ and $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i \pm 1)}$. According to [17], spectral curves of a hyperbolic $\text{SU}(n)$ -monopole are labeled by simple roots of $\text{SU}(n)$, and those associated with simple roots labeling the adjacent nodes of Dynkin diagram intersect at a finite number of points. As our main aim is to establish the connection to hyperbolic $\text{SU}(n)$ -monopoles, it motivates our assignment (4.40).

Remark 4.1. Regarding the correspondence established in [103, 104], the curve $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$ can be thought of as the curve of spectral parameter for the CPM with \mathbb{Z}_N spins, and as such, as the spectral curve of a hyperbolic $\text{SU}(2)$ -monopoles of magnetic charge N . We thus have a collection of $n-1$ curves associated with $n-1$ hyperbolic $\text{SU}(2)$ -monopoles, each of which has the charge N . These collection of $\text{SU}(2)$ monopole configurations realizes a hyperbolic $\text{SU}(n)$ -monopole through the embedding of the i^{th} hyperbolic $\text{SU}(2)$ -solution, called a fundamental monopole, along the i^{th} simple root of $\text{SU}(n)$ [126, 127]. \square

$\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$ and $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i \pm 1)}$ determine special line bundles. We would like to establish that the divisors associated with the intersection of curves $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$ define special line bundles. To

²⁶An element $M \in \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ is called hyperbolic, parabolic, or elliptic depending on whether $|\text{Tr}M| - 2$ is positive, zero, or negative. Hyperbolic elements are squeezing, parabolic elements are translation (shear), and elliptic elements are conjugate to a rotation.

see this, let us set $N = 1$ in (4.11). These are linear equations in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, which in the homogeneous coordinates are given by

$$[z_+ : z_-] = [\alpha_i w_+ + \beta_i : \gamma_i w + \delta_i], \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (4.41)$$

and imply $\lambda z = (\alpha_i w + \beta_i)/(\gamma_i w + \delta_i)$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ or the set of points $[z : \lambda z] \in \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Hence, these equations determine $n-1$ copies of \mathbb{P}^1 . The divisors $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i,i+1)}$ and $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i+1,i)}$ defined in (4.34) for a fixed value of i and $N = 1$ contain a single point, and hence each has degree $+1$. Therefore, the corresponding line bundle on \mathbb{P}^1 is $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)$. On the other hand, under the embedding $\iota : \mathbb{P}^1 \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, we have $\iota^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(m, n) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(m+n)$. Therefore, the corresponding line bundle on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, restricted to S_i , is either $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(0, 1)$ or $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(1, 0)$. Recall that the curves $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$ are real in the sense of (4.21), hence $\sigma^*(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(1, 0))|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(1, 0)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(0, 1)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}}$ where we have used (4.44). Using (4.39), we therefore get the isomorphism $[\Sigma_{1,n}^{(i,i+1)}] \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(0, 1)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}} \simeq L^{-\frac{1}{2}}(1)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}}$ and $[\Sigma_{1,n}^{(i+1,i)}] \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(1, 0)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}} \simeq L^{+\frac{1}{2}}(1)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}}$ where the notation $[\dots]$ denotes the line bundle associated with a divisor and we have used (3.44).

Switching to the general N , from (4.11), (4.17), and (4.30), the curves are given by

$$\gamma_i z^N w^N + \delta_i z^N - \alpha_i w^N - \beta_i = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1. \quad (4.42)$$

These are equations for N -fold branched covers of \mathbb{P}^1 as the coordinate transformations $(z, w) \mapsto (z^N, w^N)$ shows. Therefore, from the discussion of the case of $N = 1$, the degree of the pull-back of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(0, 1)$ to the cover is simply N , and hence we can identify it as

$$\begin{aligned} [\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i,i+1)}] &\simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(N, 0)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}} \simeq L^{-\frac{N}{2}}(N)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}}, \\ [\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i+1,i)}] &\simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(0, N)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}} \simeq L^{+\frac{N}{2}}(N)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}} \simeq L^{-\frac{N}{2}}(N)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.43)$$

where we have used (3.43) and (4.44).

Remark 4.2. Let us now explain the following isomorphism

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(kN, k'N)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}((k_- - k)N, (k_+ + k)N)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}}, \quad (4.44)$$

for integers k, k_\pm as holomorphic bundles. Consider the following sequence of maps

$$\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)} \xrightarrow{c_{N,N}^{(i)}} \mathbf{C}^{(i)} \xrightarrow{\iota^{(i)}} \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}, \quad (4.45)$$

where $c_{N,N}^{(i)}$ is the branched covering map of degree N^2 ,²⁷ and $\iota^{(i)}$ is the embedding in $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$. $\mathbf{C}^{(i)} \simeq \mathbb{P}^1$. From

$$\begin{aligned} \#([\mathbf{C}^{(i)}] \cap [\mathbb{P}^1 \times \{\text{pt}\}]) &= 1 \\ \#([\mathbf{C}^{(i)}] \cap [\{\text{pt}\} \times \mathbb{P}^1]) &= 1 \end{aligned} \quad (4.46)$$

²⁷For more on this map, see §5.1.1 and Appendix B.

where $\#$ denotes the intersection number, on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$, $[\mathbf{C}^{(i)}] \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(1, 1)$. $\mathbf{C}^{(i)} \cap \mathbf{C}^{(i+1)}$ is a divisor on $\mathbb{C}^{(i)}$ or $\mathbb{C}^{(i+1)}$, whose corresponding line bundle $[\mathbf{C}^{(i)} \cap \mathbf{C}^{(i+1)}]$ is $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(1, 1)$, restricted to either of these curves. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} [\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)} \cap \Sigma_{N,n}^{(i+1)}] &= c_{N,N}^{(i)*}[\mathbf{C}^{(i)} \cap \mathbf{C}^{(i+1)}] \\ &= c_{N,N}^{(i)*} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(1, 1)|_{\mathbf{C}^{(i)}} \\ &= \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(N, N)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.47)$$

From the isomorphism of $\mathbb{C}^{(i)}$ and the fact that $\mathbf{C}^{(i)} \cap \mathbf{C}^{(i+1)}$, we see that one of these points correspond to $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)$, hence we have

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(1, 0)|_{\mathbf{C}^{(i)}} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(0, 1)|_{\mathbf{C}^{(i)}}, \quad (4.48)$$

a fact that on $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$ translates to

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(N, 0)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(0, N)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}}. \quad (4.49)$$

More generally for any integer r

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(r, 0)|_{\mathbf{C}^{(i)}} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(0, r)|_{\mathbf{C}^{(i)}}, \quad (4.50)$$

which leads to

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(Nr, 0)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(0, Nr)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}}. \quad (4.51)$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(Nr, 0)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}} &\simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}((r-1)N, 0)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(N, 0)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}} \\ &= \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}((r-1)N, N)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}} \\ &= \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}((r-s)N, sN)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.52)$$

Even more generally, we can start from the bundle $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(k_+, k_-)|_{\mathbf{C}^{(i)}}$, which leads to the bundle $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(k_+N, k_-N)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}}$ upon pulling back by the branched covering map $c_{N,N}^{(i)}$. A computation similar to (4.52) shows the holomorphic isomorphism (4.44). In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(N, 0)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}} &\simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(0, N)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}}, \\ \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(2N, 0)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}} &\simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(N, N)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(0, 2N)|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.53)$$

We would like to emphasize that (4.44) does not hold away from $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$, generically. Instead, as the line bundle L , defined in (3.38) is topologically trivial, (3.45) holds. \square

Finally, due to the correspondence between line bundles and divisors on a curve X , we have the following

$$D_1 + D_2 \longleftrightarrow [D_1] \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} [D_2], \quad (4.54)$$

for any two divisors D_1 and D_2 on X . Applying this to our case, we get (where all bundles are restricted to $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$)

$$\begin{aligned}
[\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i,i+1)} + \Sigma_{N,n}^{(i+1,i+2)}] &= [\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i,i+1)}] \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}} [\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i+1,i+2)}] \\
&= \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(N, 0) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(N, 0) \\
&= \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(N, 0) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(0, N) \\
&\simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(N, N) ,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.55}$$

where in the third line, we have used (4.44). The line bundles (4.43) associated with the divisors (4.34) are the special line bundles we were looking for.

$\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$ **is compact.** $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$ is the solution of an algebraic equation (4.11) in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Therefore, it is a closed set in the Zariski topology²⁸ on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, and as such compact. \square

Remark 4.3. For compactness, arguments similar to [17, First Lemma of §5] can also be used.

In summary, from the curve of the spectral parameter of the gCPM $\Sigma_{N,n}$ defined in (2.3), we have constructed $n - 1$ curves $\{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(1)}, \dots, \Sigma_{N,n}^{(n-1)}\}$ whose equations are given by (4.11) (where the $\mathbb{Z}_N \times \mathbb{Z}_N$ quotient in (4.12) is understood). These curves are of bi-degree (N, N) in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, real, in the sense of (4.21), and compact. Their intersection defines divisors (4.34) whose corresponding line bundles upon restriction to $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$ satisfy (4.43).

Step 3: Identifying the Hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -Monopole Solution. We now would like to show that the curves $\{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(1)}, \dots, \Sigma_{N,n}^{(n-1)}\}$ constructed above determine the spectral data of a particular class of hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopoles. By a reordering of the curves, if necessary, we claim

$$\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)} \simeq S_i , \quad i = 1, \dots, n - 1 , \tag{4.56}$$

for some specific choice of magnetic charges, related to N , of the hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopole determined by curves $\{S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}\}$.

Proof of (4.56). We present the argument by comparing the properties of curves in the two sides of (4.56) and then identifying these properties as follows.

- As we have explained in §3.2.3, for the case of maximal symmetry-breaking, there are $n - 1$ spectral curves given by (3.89). Therefore, our curves correspond to such a monopole configuration.

²⁸Recall that the Zariski closed sets on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ are given precisely by the zero locus of homogeneous polynomials of some degree in homogeneous coordinates on the two copies of \mathbb{P}^1 .

- The spectral curves S_i are sections of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(m_i, m_i)$ while $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$ are sections of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(N, N)$, both on $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$. Therefore, the monopole configuration corresponding to spectral curves $\{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(1)}, \dots, \Sigma_{N,n}^{(n-1)}\}$ has the following magnetic charges

$$m_i = N, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1. \quad (4.57)$$

Then, (3.91) and (4.19) imply that S_i and $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$ have the same genus.

- Both S_i (see [17]) and $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$ (see (4.40)) are associated with simple root of $SU(n)$. Furthermore, those curves corresponding to adjacent nodes of the Dynkin diagram intersect at $2m_i m_{i+1} = 2N^2$ points, where we have used (4.57).
- Both S_i and $\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i)}$ are real curves in the sense of (3.92) and (4.21), respectively, and also compact.
- Consider the line bundle (3.102) with the values of m_i given in (4.57)

$$L^{p_{i+1}+k_{i+1}/2-p_i-k_i/2}(m_{i-1} + m_{i+1}) \Big|_{S_i} \simeq [S_{i-1,i} + S_{i,i+1}], \quad (4.58)$$

On the other hand, (3.16) and (4.57) imply

$$k_1 = N, \quad k_2 = \dots = k_{n-1} = 0, \quad k_n = -N, \quad (4.59)$$

where the last relation follows from $m_n = 0$. Then, (4.58) implies

$$\begin{aligned} L^{p_2-p_1-N/2}(N) \Big|_{S_1} &\simeq [S_{1,2}], \\ L^{p_3-p_2}(2N) \Big|_{S_2} &\simeq [S_{1,2} + S_{2,3}], \\ &\vdots \\ L^{p_{n-1}-p_{n-2}}(2N) \Big|_{S_{n-2}} &\simeq [S_{n-3,n-2} + S_{n-2,n-1}], \\ L^{p_n-N/2-p_{n-1}}(N) \Big|_{S_{n-1}} &\simeq [S_{n-2,n-1}], \end{aligned} \quad (4.60)$$

while (4.43) and (4.55) give

$$\begin{aligned} L^{-N/2}(N) \Big|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(1)}} &\simeq [\Sigma_{N,n}^{(1,2)}] \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(N, 0), \\ L^0(2N) \Big|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(2)}} &\simeq [\Sigma_{N,n}^{(2,1)} + \Sigma_{N,n}^{(2,3)}] \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(N, N), \\ &\vdots \\ L^0(2N) \Big|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(n-2)}} &\simeq [\Sigma_{N,n}^{(n-3,n-2)} + \Sigma_{N,n}^{(n-2,n-1)}] \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(N, N), \\ L^{-N/2}(N) \Big|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(n-1)}} &\simeq [\Sigma_{N,n}^{(n-2,n-1)}] \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(N, 0) \Big|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(n-1)}} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(0, N) \Big|_{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(n-1)}}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.61)$$

where we have used (4.44) and (3.43), from which it follows that $L^{-N/2}(N) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(0, N)$ and $L^0(2N) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(N, N)$. Therefore, if we take the limit

$$p_i \rightarrow 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (4.62)$$

we see that both sets of curves give the same line bundles upon restriction to the corresponding curves. Note that can identify the divisors $S_{i,i+1}$ and $S_{i+1,i}$ with those defined in (4.34)

$$\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i,i+1)} = S_{i,i+1}, \quad \Sigma_{N,n}^{(i+1,i)} = S_{i+1,i}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (4.63)$$

and hence the corresponding line bundles

$$[\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i,i+1)}] = [S_{i,i+1}], \quad [\Sigma_{N,n}^{(i+1,i)}] = [S_{i+1,i}], \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1. \quad (4.64)$$

Putting all these together, we see that the set of curves $\{\Sigma_{N,n}^{(1)}, \dots, \Sigma_{N,n}^{(n-1)}\}$ indeed define the spectral data of a configuration of flat hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopoles. We thus proved the claimed identification (4.56). \square

4.2.2 gCPM from Hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -Monopole

So far, we have seen that starting from the curve of the spectral parameter of the gCPM, we can construct the spectral data of a hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopole. A natural question is to reverse the construction: we start from the spectral data of a hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopole and construct the curve of the spectral parameter of the gCPM.

Consider the spectral data of a hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopole with a maximal symmetry-breaking $SU(n) \rightarrow U(1)^{n-1}$ at S_∞^2 . This means (1) the curves $\{S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}\}$ where S_i is a section of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(m_i, m_i)$; Therefore, they are described by equations of the form

$$S_i : F_i(z, w) = \sum_{\alpha, \beta=0}^{m_i} a_{\alpha, \beta}^{(i)} z^\alpha w^\beta = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (4.65)$$

where z and w are defined in (4.30), and with the assumption that

$$a_{m_i, m_i}^{(i)} \neq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (4.66)$$

and (2) $S_i \cap S_{i+1}$ consists of $2m_i m_{i+1}$ points. The asymptotic values of Higgs fields are $\{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ subject to the constraint $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 0$. The construction of the corresponding curve of the spectral parameter of the gCPM goes as follows:

S_i Determines a $\mathbb{Z}_{m_i} \times \mathbb{Z}_{m_i}$ -Invariant Curve. From S_i , we construct a $\mathbb{Z}_{m_i} \times \mathbb{Z}_{m_i}$ -symmetric curve as follows. $\mathbb{Z}_{m_i} \times \mathbb{Z}_{m_i}$ -invariance simply means

$$F_i(\omega z, \omega' w) = F_i(z, w), \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (4.67)$$

for two m_i^{th} roots of unity ω and ω' . From (4.65), $F_i(z, w)$ transforms as

$$F_i(\omega z, \omega' w) = \sum_{\alpha, \beta=0}^{m_i} a_{\alpha, \beta}^{(i)} \omega^\alpha \omega'^\beta z^\alpha w^\beta, \quad (4.68)$$

and equating this with $F_i(z, w)$ gives the following constraints

$$\omega^\alpha \omega'^\beta = 1, \quad (4.69)$$

Setting $\omega = \exp(2\pi i s/m_i)$ and $\omega' = \exp(2\pi i s'/m_i)$ for $s, s' = 0, \dots, m_i - 1$, we arrive at the following relation

$$s\alpha + s'\beta = 0, \quad \text{mod } m_i. \quad (4.70)$$

This relation must hold for all $s, s' = 0, \dots, m_i - 1$. Hence, we conclude

$$\alpha, \beta = 0, m_i. \quad (4.71)$$

Therefore, the $\mathbb{Z}_{m_i} \times \mathbb{Z}_{m_i}$ -invariant curve S_i^{sym} constructed out of S_i has the following equation

$$S_i^{\text{sym}} : F_i^{\text{sym}}(z, w) = \gamma_i z^{m_i} w^{m_i} + \delta_i z^{m_i} - \alpha_i w^{m_i} - \beta_i = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (4.72)$$

for some constants $\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i, \delta_i$. Recall that S_i (and S_i^{sym}) is real in the sense of (3.92), therefore $\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i, \delta_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence, we can write the equation in a more succinct form

$$S_i^{\text{sym}} : \begin{pmatrix} z^{+m_i} \\ z^{-m_i} \end{pmatrix} = K_i \begin{pmatrix} w^{+m_i} \\ w^{-m_i} \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (4.73)$$

where the homogeneous coordinates z^\pm and w^\pm on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ are defined in (4.30), and K_i is of the form (4.17).

$\{S_1^{\text{sym}}, \dots, S_{n-1}^{\text{sym}}\}$ Define a Curve in the Product of n Copies of \mathbb{P}^1 . Consider the product of n copies of \mathbb{P}^1 . For the sake of distinguishing them, we denote them as \mathbb{P}_i^1 for $i = 1, \dots, n$, their homogeneous coordinates as z_i^\pm , and their inhomogeneous coordinate as $z_i := z_i^+/z_i^-$. Then, we have the following embeddings

$$\iota_i : \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_1^1 \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}_i^1 \times \mathbb{P}_{i+1}^1 \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}_n^1, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1. \quad (4.74)$$

ι_i embeds $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$ inside $\mathbb{P}_i^1 \times \mathbb{P}_{i+1}^1$ and is given explicitly as

$$\iota_i(z, w) := (0, \dots, 0, z, w, 0, \dots, 0). \quad (4.75)$$

Under this embedding, the equation (4.73) of S_i^{sym} becomes

$$S_{n, \iota_i}^{\text{sym}} : \begin{pmatrix} (z_i^+)^{m_i} \\ (z_i^-)^{m_i} \end{pmatrix} = K_{i, i+1} \begin{pmatrix} (z_{i+1}^+)^{m_i} \\ (z_{i+1}^-)^{m_i} \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (4.76)$$

where we have redefined $K_i \rightarrow K_{i,i+1}$. Considering all these curves, we can consider their union, which is again a curve in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^1$

$$S_{n;m_1, \dots, m_{n-1}}^{\text{sym}} := \bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} S_{n, \nu_i}^{\text{sym}}. \quad (4.77)$$

Let us compute the genus of this curve. We first compute the degree of its canonical bundle. Let P_i be the divisor in $\mathbb{P}_1^1 \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}_n^1$ pull-backed from a point in \mathbb{P}_i^1 , and consider the embedding $\iota : S_{n;m_1, \dots, m_{n-1}}^{\text{sym}} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_1^1 \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}_n^1$. By the adjunction formula, the canonical bundle of the curve is

$$K_{S_{n;m_1, \dots, m_{n-1}}^{\text{sym}}} = \iota^* \left(K_{\mathbb{P}_1^1 \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}_n^1} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_1^1 \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}_n^1}} \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{O}(m_i P_i + m_i P_{i+1}) \right), \quad (4.78)$$

where

$$\mathcal{O}(m_i P_i + m_i P_{i+1}) := \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_1^1 \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}_n^1}(0, \dots, 0, m_i P_i, m_i P_{i+1}, 0, \dots, 0), \quad (4.79)$$

with no summation over i is understood and

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_1^1 \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}_n^1}(s_1, \dots, s_n) := \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \pi_i^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_i^1}(s_i), \quad s_1, \dots, s_n \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (4.80)$$

with $\pi_i : \mathbb{P}_1^1 \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}_n^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_i^1$ is the natural projection. Using the fact²⁹

$$K_{\mathbb{P}_1^1 \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}_n^1} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_1^1 \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}_n^1}(-2P_1, \dots, -2P_n), \quad (4.81)$$

we have

$$K_{S_{n;m_1, \dots, m_{n-1}}^{\text{sym}}} = \iota^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_1^1 \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}_n^1}(D), \quad (4.82)$$

where

$$D := ((m_1 - 2)P_1, (m_2 + m_1 - 2)P_2, \dots, (m_{n-1} + m_{n-2} - 2)P_{n-1}, (m_{n-1} - 2)P_n). \quad (4.83)$$

On the other hand, $\deg \iota = m_1 \dots m_{n-1}$. We thus can compute the degree of $K_{S_{n;m_1, \dots, m_{n-1}}^{\text{sym}}}$ from (4.82) to be ($m_n = 0$)

$$\begin{aligned} \deg K_{S_{n;m_1, \dots, m_{n-1}}^{\text{sym}}} &= \deg \iota \times \deg \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_1^1 \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}_n^1}(D) \\ &= \deg \iota \times \deg D \\ &= 2m_1 \dots m_{n-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} m_i - n \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.84)$$

By equating this with $2g_{S_{n;m_1, \dots, m_{n-1}}^{\text{sym}}} - 2$, we get $g_{S_{n;m_1, \dots, m_{n-1}}^{\text{sym}}}$, the genus of $S_{n;m_1, \dots, m_{n-1}}^{\text{sym}}$, to be

$$g_{S_{n;m_1, \dots, m_{n-1}}^{\text{sym}}} = m_1 \dots m_{n-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} m_i - n \right) + 1. \quad (4.85)$$

²⁹Recall that the canonical bundle of \mathbb{P}^1 is $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-2P)$ for any point $P \in \mathbb{P}^1$.

Remark 4.4. The curve we eventually compare with the curve of the spectral parameter of the gCPM is the $\mathbb{Z}_{m_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}_{m_{n-1}}$ covering of $S_{n;m_1,\dots,m_{n-1}}^{\text{sym}}$. Denoting that curve by $\tilde{S}_{n;m_1,\dots,m_{n-1}}^{\text{sym}}$, we have

$$S_{n;m_1,\dots,m_{n-1}}^{\text{sym}} = \tilde{S}_{n;m_1,\dots,m_{n-1}}^{\text{sym}} / (\mathbb{Z}_{m_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}_{m_{n-1}}). \quad (4.86)$$

From (4.84), we have

$$\deg K_{\tilde{S}_{n;m_1,\dots,m_{n-1}}^{\text{sym}}} = 2m_1^2 \dots m_{n-1}^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} m_i - n \right), \quad (4.87)$$

hence its genus is

$$g_{\tilde{S}_{n;m_1,\dots,m_{n-1}}^{\text{sym}}} = m_1^2 \dots m_{n-1}^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} m_i - n \right) + 1. \quad (4.88)$$

Recovering the Curve of the Spectral Parameter of the gCPM. The comparison between (4.76) and (4.11) shows that to connect the curve (4.77) to the curve of spectral parameter of the gCPM, we have to take all the magnetic charges to be the same

$$m_1 = \dots = m_{n-1} = N. \quad (4.89)$$

This would then implement certain restrictions on the matrices $K_{i,i+1}$. We can summarize them as

$$K_{i,i} = \mathbf{1}, \quad K_{i,j}K_{j,i} = \mathbf{1}, \quad K_{i,j}K_{j,k}K_{k,i} = \mathbf{1}. \quad (4.90)$$

The second condition implies that the matrices $K_{i,j}$ have to be invertible. Taking the determinant of both sides of the cocycle condition tells us that all K_i s should have a unit determinant for the cocycle condition to be satisfied for all values of i, j , and k . Therefore, K_i s belong to $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ subject to the redundancy (2.6). Furthermore, the discussion in **Step 1: Constructing $n - 1$ Curves in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ out of $\Sigma_{N,n}$** in §4.2.1 shows that the curve $\tilde{S}_{n;m_1,\dots,m_{n-1}}^{\text{sym}}$, defined in (4.86), can indeed be thought of as a curve in \mathbb{P}^{2n-1} whose genus can be computed from (4.88) to be

$$g_{\tilde{S}_{n;N,\dots,N}^{\text{sym}}} = N^{2(n-1)}(N(n-1) - n) + 1, \quad (4.91)$$

which coincides with (2.9). Finally, for (4.60) and (4.61) to match, all p_i s have to be sent to zero. We thus successfully recovered the curve of the spectral parameter of a particular class of the gCPMs

$$\tilde{S}_{n;N,\dots,N}^{\text{sym}} \simeq \tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n}, \quad (4.92)$$

where $\tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n}$ is defined in (2.3). Let us summarize our findings in the form of a proposition

Proposition 4.1. There is a one-to-one correspondence between

- the curve $\tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n}$ of the spectral parameter of the gCPM defined by $n-1$ $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ -valued K -matrices $K_{i,i+1}$, $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ in (2.3) such that $K_i K_{i+1}^{-1}$ with $K_i := K_{i,i+1}$, is an elliptic element of $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$; and

- a generic hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopole subject to maximal symmetry-breaking, $n - 1$ magnetic charges $m_1 = \dots = m_{n-1} = N$, and vanishing boundary values of the Higgs field whose spectral data defines the curve (4.86) which, upon setting the parameters, can be identified with $\tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n}$, as in (4.92).

4.3 Generalization to Other Lie Algebras

In this section, we explain how to extend the results on hyperbolic monopoles to other classical and exceptional Lie algebras. Spectral data of Euclidean monopoles associated with classical Lie groups is constructed in [35]. The method of loc. cit. can be applied to hyperbolic monopoles associated with classical Lie groups, as has been used for the case of $\mathfrak{su}(n)$ by Murray and Singer in [17]. We use this construction for other classical Lie algebras, $\mathfrak{so}(n)$ and $\mathfrak{sp}(n)$ in this section. The basic idea is that the spectral curves $S_i^{\mathfrak{g}}$ of a \mathfrak{g} -monopole, where \mathfrak{g} is a classical Lie algebra, are labeled by fundamental weights of \mathfrak{g} , which we denote as $\omega_i^{\mathfrak{g}}$ (see [Spectral Data](#) in §3.2.3). Once we embed \mathfrak{g} inside $\mathfrak{su}(n)$, the main point is to find the relation between the fundamental weights of the algebra and $\mathfrak{su}(n)$ under this embedding. The number of spectral curves depends on the symmetry-breaking pattern at infinity. We are exclusively concerned with the maximal symmetry-breaking case in which there are $\text{rk}(\mathfrak{g})$ spectral curves $\{S_1^{\mathfrak{g}}, \dots, S_{\text{rk}(\mathfrak{g})}^{\mathfrak{g}}\}$ and $\text{rk}(\mathfrak{g})$ number of magnetic charges $(m_1^{\mathfrak{g}}, \dots, m_{\text{rk}(\mathfrak{g})}^{\mathfrak{g}})$ associated with these fundamental weights, as can be seen from (3.14). This will provide the relation between spectral curves and magnetic charges of \mathfrak{g} -monopoles and the corresponding monopoles associated with classical Lie algebras.³⁰ All the details, which are based on some basic facts about Lie algebras, are collected in [Appendix C](#). Note that for the case of orthogonal and symplectic groups, the holomorphic vector bundles carry additional structures. Here, we impose these additional requirements on the curve [35].

Furthermore, to the best of our knowledge, a detailed study of the construction of spectral data for monopoles associated with exceptional Lie groups has not been carried out in the literature.³¹ In particular, we do not know (1) whether the spectral curves are labeled by fundamental weights; (2) whether the spectral data depends on additional conditions; and (3) whether the spectral data uniquely determines the monopole solution. Here, we assume that by embedding these Lie algebras in a classical Lie algebra the spectral data would characterize the monopole configuration. Therefore, whatever we present for the case of exceptional Lie groups should be considered as mere speculation, and a proper investigation is warranted.

Given the correspondence between the gCPM and hyperbolic monopoles for the $\mathfrak{su}(n)$ theories, it is natural to speculate on the existence of the generalizations of the gCPM associated with a general semisimple Lie algebra, whose spectral data matches that of the

³⁰For the relation between hyperbolic monopole solutions for orthogonal and symplectic groups and those for the group $SU(n)$ in terms of discrete Nahm data, see [22, pg. 105, Theorem 56].

³¹In this regard see the related works [142] and [143, §5.4]. The Euclidean \mathfrak{g}_2 -monopoles have been studied in [144].

hyperbolic monopoles associated with the same Lie algebra. It seems very few are known in this direction and we hope that our paper stimulates future exploration in this direction, see §7 for further discussion.

Lie Algebra $B_n := \mathfrak{so}(2n+1)$. Let us first consider the Lie algebra $B_n = \mathfrak{so}(2n+1)$, which can be embedded inside $\mathfrak{su}(2n+1)$. For maximal symmetry-breaking, there are n spectral curves $\{S_1^{B_n}, \dots, S_n^{B_n}\}$ for the case of $\mathfrak{so}(2n+1)$ and $2n$ spectral curves $\{S_1^{A_{2n}}, \dots, S_{2n}^{A_{2n}}\}$ for $\mathfrak{su}(2n+1)$. These curves are related as (see (C.8))

$$\begin{aligned} S_i^{A_{2n}} &= S_{2n+1-i}^{A_{2n}} = S_i^{B_n}, & a &= 1, \dots, n-1, \\ S_n^{A_{2n}} &= S_{n+1}^{A_{2n}} = 2S_n^{B_n}, & & \text{(with multiplicity 2)}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.93)$$

while the magnetic charges of the configuration related to the gCPMs are given by (see (C.11) and (C.12))

$$m_1^{B_n} = \dots = m_{n-1}^{B_n} = 2N, \quad m_n^{B_n} = N, \quad (4.94)$$

where N is some positive integer. The spectral curves associated with $\text{SO}(2n+1)$ should satisfy some extra conditions: (1) Over $S_n^{B_n}$, we have the isomorphism of line bundles $L^0(2N) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(N, N) \simeq [S_{n-1, n}^{A_{2n}}]$ [35, pg. 41, (C-1 $_k$)]. Recall from (3.93) and (3.94) that $S_{n-1}^{A_{2n}} \cap S_n^{A_{2n}} = S_{n-1, n}^{A_{2n}} \cup S_{n, n-1}^{A_{2n}}$. Furthermore, from (4.43) and $N \rightarrow 2N$,³² we have $[S_{n-1, n}^{A_{2n}}]_{S_i} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(0, 2N)|_{S_n^{A_{2n}}} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(N, 0)|_{S_n^{A_{2n}}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(0, N)|_{S_n^{A_{2n}}} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(N, N)|_{S_n^{A_{2n}}}$, where we have the isomorphism of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(N, 0)$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(0, N)$ on $S_n^{A_{2n}}$. This condition is thus satisfied on $S_n^{A_{2n}}$ and in particular over $S_n^{B_n}$; (2) Furthermore, there is a positivity condition on a real constant, stated in [35, pg. 41, (C-4 $_k$)], which we assume it holds. Due to the second relation in (4.93), there are n independent $K_{i, j}$, which are $K_{i, i+1}$, $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ and the rest are determined from the cocycle condition. However, we need all matrices $K_{i, i+1}$ $i = 1, \dots, 2n-1$ to define the spectral data of the corresponding A_{2n} -monopole. The rest of the construction of the corresponding gCPM follows the case of $\mathfrak{su}(2n+1)$ and the discussion in §4.2.2.

Lie Algebra $C_n := \mathfrak{sp}(2n)$. We next consider the algebra $C_n = \mathfrak{sp}(2n)$, which can be embedded in $\mathfrak{su}(2n)$. The relation between spectral curves is (see (C.16))

$$S_i^{A_{2n-1}} = S_{2n-i}^{A_{2n-1}} = S_i^{C_n}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (4.95)$$

and the charges are given by (see (C.19))

$$m_1^{C_n} = \dots = m_n^{C_n} = N, \quad (4.96)$$

for some positive integer N . There are no extra requirements for $\mathfrak{sp}(2n)$ monopoles [35], and the construction of the curve of the spectral parameter of the corresponding gCPM follows the case of $\mathfrak{su}(2n)$ in §4.2.2.

³²Recall that the corresponding $\mathfrak{su}(2n+1)$ monopole has $2n$ magnetic charges of value $2N$, see (C.11) and (C.12).

The Lie Algebra $D_n := \mathfrak{so}(2n)$. Finally consider $D_n = \mathfrak{so}(2n)$ that can be embedded in $\mathfrak{su}(2n)$. Their spectral curves are related as (see (C.23))

$$\begin{aligned} S_i^{A_{2n-1}} &= S_{2n-i}^{A_{2n-1}} = S_i^{D_n}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-2, \\ S_{n-1}^{A_{2n-1}} &= S_{n+1}^{A_{2n-1}} = S_+^{D_n} \cup S_-^{D_n}, \\ S_n^{A_{2n-1}} &= 2S_+^{D_n}, \quad (\text{with multiplicity } 2), \end{aligned} \tag{4.97}$$

with charges of the $\mathfrak{so}(2n)$ monopole are (see (C.26), (C.27), and (C.28))

$$m_1^{D_n} = \dots = m_{n-2}^{D_n} = 2N, \quad m_{\pm}^{D_n} = N, \tag{4.98}$$

Similar to the case of B_n , there are additional conditions on spectral data: (1) Over $S_+^{D_n}$, $L^0(2N) \simeq [S_{n-2, n-1}^{A_{2n-1}}]$ and over $S_-^{D_n}$, $L^0(2N) \simeq [S_{n-1, n-2}^{A_{2n-1}}]$ [35, pg. 40, (C-1 $_{\pm}$)]. Recall that $S_{k-2}^{A_{2n-1}} \cap S_{k-1}^{A_{2n-1}}$ consists of $8N^2$ points where $S_{n-2, n-1}^{A_{2n-1}}$ contains $4N^2$ of them. The divisor associated with these points defines a line bundle that, from (4.43), is $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(2N, 0)$ on both curves. On the other hand, $L^0(2N) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(N, N) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}}(2N, 0)$. Therefore, $L^0(2N) \simeq [S_{n-2, n-1}^{A_{2n-1}}]$ holds on the entire curve $S_{k-1}^{A_{2n-1}}$ including its $S_+^{D_n}$ segment. For the same reason $L^0(2N) \simeq [S_{n-1, n-2}^{A_{2n-1}}]$ also holds; (2) We also assume the extra positivity constrains [35, pg 40, (C-1 $_{\pm}$)]. The rest of the construction follows similar to the case of B_n and C_n groups.

Exceptional Lie Algebra \mathfrak{g}_2 . The Lie algebra \mathfrak{g}_2 has rank 2 and dimension 14, with fundamental representations of dimensions 7 and 17. This Lie algebra can be embedded into $\mathfrak{so}(7)$, and in turn in $\mathfrak{su}(7)$. The relation between magnetic charges imply that if we take $m_i^{\mathfrak{su}(7)} = 2N$, $i = 1, \dots, 6$, then (see (C.32))

$$m_1^{\mathfrak{g}_2} = -3N, \quad m_2^{\mathfrak{g}_2} = -5N. \tag{4.99}$$

In the mathematical literature, it is customary to take magnetic charges to have only positive values [33, §3] and [12]. However, physically, nothing prevents us from taking negative magnetic charges and it is consistent with Dirac's quantization condition [145, §2.1]. Therefore, (4.99) makes sense and would correspond to anti-monopoles with negative charges.

Exceptional Lie Algebra \mathfrak{f}_4 . The Lie algebra \mathfrak{f}_4 has rank 4, dimension 52, and has a fundamental representation of dimension 26. As such it can be embedded in $\mathfrak{so}(26)$, and in turn $\mathfrak{su}(26)$. Considerations similar to what we have explained above show that the magnetic charges of an \mathfrak{f}_4 -monopole associated with a gCPM are

$$m_1^{\mathfrak{f}_4} = 2N, \quad m_2^{\mathfrak{f}_4} = 3N, \quad m_3^{\mathfrak{f}_4} = 3N, \quad m_4^{\mathfrak{f}_4} = 2N. \tag{4.100}$$

Exceptional Lie Algebra $\mathfrak{e}_6, \mathfrak{e}_7$, and \mathfrak{e}_8 . The details for $\mathfrak{e}_6, \mathfrak{e}_7$, and \mathfrak{e}_8 follow the same arguments as above and we leave them to interested readers.

5 Generalized CPM and 4d Chern–Simons Theory

In recent years, it has been discovered that the 4d Chern–Simons (CS) theory provides a framework to unify and explain many aspects of discrete and continuous integrable models [105, 146, 107, 108, 109]. This theory is defined on a product manifold of the form $\Sigma \times C$.³³ The theory is topological along the topological plane C and holomorphic along the holomorphic plane Σ . The action is

$$S = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\Sigma \times C} \omega \wedge \text{CS}(A), \quad (5.1)$$

where ω is a meromorphic one-form on Σ , and

$$\text{CS}(A) \equiv \text{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}} \left(A \wedge dA + \frac{2}{3} A \wedge A \wedge A \right) \quad (5.2)$$

is the CS three-form and the trace is taken over the gauge Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} of the theory. A $(1+1)$ d quantum integrable spin-chain model (equivalently a two-dimensional lattice model) could be constructed by considering an arrangement of line defects lying along the topological plane C and supported at different points of Σ . These defects carry representations of the gauge Lie algebra (or quantum-mechanical deformations extension), which in turn gives the representations at sites of the spin-chain model. The Yang–Baxter (YB) equation is an immediate consequence of two extra dimensions. Furthermore, the R-matrix can be computed by a perturbative analysis of the exchange between line defects. This simple yet powerful method could reproduce many of the properties of integrable lattice models and integrable field theories. Related to our previous discussion, there are two natural questions then:

- (1) Can the gCPM be realized within 4d CS theory?
- (2) Can the 4d CS theory provide a conceptual explanation of the hyperbolic monopole/gCPM correspondence uncovered in §4?

In this section, we will investigate the first question and provide arguments that it is indeed possible to incorporate the gCPM into the 4d CS theory. We investigate the second question in §6 and discover that the 4d CS theory is part of a bigger picture within which we can unify the two sides of the correspondence.

5.1 CPM from 4d Chern–Simons Theory

As we just explained, the spectral parameter of an integrable model takes value in the holomorphic plane Σ . Therefore, applying the usual wisdom of the 4d CS theory, we would like to study the 4d CS theory on $\Sigma \times C$, where Σ is the curve $\tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n}$ of the spectral parameter of the gCPM, defined in (2.3). In this section, we exclusively consider the case of $n = 2$,

³³In fact, it should be possible to define the theory along any four-dimensional manifolds that admit a transverse holomorphic foliation.

corresponding to the ordinary CPM, and denote the corresponding curve as $\tilde{\Sigma}_N$, and its free \mathbb{Z}_N quotient by Σ_N . For the gCPMs, we only collect the results in §5.2 and leave the obvious generalization of details to the interested reader.

5.1.1 The Curve of Spectral Parameter as a Ramified Cover of \mathbb{P}^1

As a consequence of the Riemann–Roch theorem, any meromorphic one-form $\omega_{\tilde{\Sigma}_N}$ on $\tilde{\Sigma}_N$ satisfies³⁴

$$\text{on } \tilde{\Sigma}_N : \quad 2N^3 - 4N^2 = \# \text{ of zeroes of } \omega_{\tilde{\Sigma}_N} - \# \text{ of poles of } \omega_{\tilde{\Sigma}_N} , \quad (5.3)$$

Since there is no fixed-point for the \mathbb{Z}_N -action on $\tilde{\Sigma}_N$, we have an unramified covering map, and the one-form ω_{Σ_N} on Σ_N , corresponding to $\omega_{\tilde{\Sigma}_N}$, satisfies

$$\text{on } \Sigma_N : \quad 2N^2 - 4N = \# \text{ of zeroes of } \omega_{\Sigma_N} - \# \text{ of poles of } \omega_{\Sigma_N} . \quad (5.4)$$

This implies that the number of zeroes and poles of the one-form ω on Σ_N is not uniquely determined. Regarding the counting in [107, eq. (3.14)] and $N \geq 2$, this implies that the engineering of the CPM within the 4d CS theory has a unique feature: the meromorphic one-form ω must have zeroes as well as poles, while for the rest of integrable lattice models studied in [107, 108] it was sufficient to have a one-form with only poles. Furthermore, only the ratio ω_{Σ_N}/\hbar appears in the path integral, hence the existence of a zero for ω corresponds to the effective limit $\hbar \rightarrow \infty$ near the zero. As \hbar is the parameter in the series expansion of R-matrix computations in 4d CS theory, the perturbative methods in $\hbar \rightarrow \infty$ cannot be trusted and one has to resort to a non-perturbative formulation of the 4d CS theory. It should be possible to achieve such a non-perturbative definition along the lines of [147]. The construction of the 4d CS theory within string theory is known for the theory with a bosonic gauge Lie algebra [148, 149] and with a gauge Lie superalgebra [150]. However, none of these works provide a practical recipe for constructing the R-matrix of an integrable spin-chain model within a non-perturbative formulation of the 4d CS theory. This is an outstanding question, which we will not pursue it in this work.

The strategy we use in this work is to realize Σ_N as a branched cover of \mathbb{P}^1 . This will allow us to work over \mathbb{P}^1 instead of Σ_N and construct the one-form on Σ_N from the one on \mathbb{P}^1 . Recall that $\tilde{\Sigma}_N$ is obtained by the intersection of two hypersurfaces in \mathbb{P}^3 , and the genus of the curve is $N^3 - 2N^2 + 1$. By the Riemann’s Existence Theorem, every Riemann surface admits a nonconstant meromorphic function and as such can be realized as a branched cover of \mathbb{P}^1 , and $\tilde{\Sigma}_N$ is no exception. Let $\tilde{\pi}_N : \tilde{\Sigma}_N \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ denote the covering map ramified³⁵ at a finite number of points $\{P_1, \dots, P_s\}$ for some positive integer s , which

³⁴The left-hand side of (5.3) is the degree of any canonical divisor on $\tilde{\Sigma}_N$, which can be computed from the Riemann–Roch theorem, while the right-hand side is, by definition, the degree of the canonical divisor associated with $\omega_{\tilde{\Sigma}_N}$.

³⁵A map $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$ between two Riemann surfaces is ramified at a point $P \in X$ if in local coordinates around P and $\pi(P)$, π can be written as the map $z \mapsto z^r$ with $r \geq 2$. The point $\pi(P)$ is called the branch point of π . Such maps are called branched or ramified covering maps.

we determine momentarily. It is given explicitly by $\tilde{\pi}_N([x_0 : x_1 : x_2 : x_3]) = [x_0 : x_3]$ (see Appendix B). We have (see (B.9))

$$\deg R_{\tilde{\pi}_N} = \sum_{i=1}^s e_{P_i} - 1 = 2N^2(N-1), \quad (5.5)$$

where $R_{\tilde{\pi}_N}$ is the ramification divisor of $\tilde{\pi}_N$ and e_P denotes the ramification index at $P \in \tilde{\Sigma}_N$. If we consider the \mathbb{Z}_N -quotient of this curve (which is an unramified degree- N covering map $\text{pr}_N : \tilde{\Sigma}_N \rightarrow \Sigma_N$), we can think of Σ_N as a ramified cover of \mathbb{P}^1 , given by $\pi_N : \Sigma_N \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ with $\tilde{\pi}_N = \pi_N \circ \text{pr}_N$, where³⁶

$$\deg R_{\pi_N} = \sum_{i=1}^s e_{P_i} - 1 = 2N(N-1). \quad (5.6)$$

The ramification locus $\{P_1, \dots, P_{2N}\}$ can be determined by evaluating the Hessian of the defining equation (see Appendix B):

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -N\beta x_2^{N-1} \\ -Nx_1^{N-1} & -N\gamma x_2^{N-1} \end{pmatrix} = -N^2\beta x_1^{N-1} x_2^{N-1} = 0. \quad (5.7)$$

For obvious reasons, both x_1 and x_2 cannot vanish. Considering two sets of solutions by setting $x_1 = 0, x_2 = 1$ and $x_1 = 1, x_2 = 0$ and focusing on \mathbb{Z}_N -invariant solutions, we get the ramification loci to be the points $[\delta^{-1/N} : 0 : 1 : y]$ and $[(\beta\gamma^{-1})^{1/N} : 1 : 0 : y']$, where $y^N = -\gamma\delta^{-1}$ and $y'^N = \gamma^{-1}$, hence each of which contains N points. As such, there are $2N$ points at which $\pi_N : \Sigma_N \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ is ramified, hence $s = 2N$, with ramification indices $e_{P_i} = N, i = 1, \dots, s = 2N$. This means that the branched covering map has the following explicit form, in a suitable coordinate z around each point:

$$\pi_N(z) \sim \begin{cases} z, & \text{away from all } P_i, \\ z^N, & \text{near one of } P_i. \end{cases} \quad (5.8)$$

With this description in hand, the action of the 4d CS theory on $C \times \Sigma_N$ can be written as an action on $C \times \mathbb{P}^1$ as follows. From the identity,

$$\int_{\phi(X)} \Omega = \int_X \phi^* \Omega, \quad (5.9)$$

for a map $\phi : X \rightarrow \phi(X)$ and a differential form Ω , and using the fact that the branched covering map π is surjective, we arrive at

$$\int_{C \times \Sigma_N} \omega_{\Sigma_N} \wedge \text{CS}(A_{\Sigma_N}) = \int_{C \times \mathbb{P}^1} \omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} \wedge \text{CS}(A_{\mathbb{P}^1}), \quad (5.10)$$

where we have denoted the one-form on \mathbb{P}^1 by $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$, and

$$\omega_{\Sigma_N} \wedge \text{CS}(A_{\Sigma_N}) = \pi_N^* (\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} \wedge \text{CS}(A_{\mathbb{P}^1})). \quad (5.11)$$

³⁶Note that the genera of $\tilde{\Sigma}_N$ and Σ_N are related as $g_{\tilde{\Sigma}_N} - 1 = N(g_{\Sigma_N} - 1)$.

We have distinguished the gauge field on Σ_N and \mathbb{P}^1 by denoting them as A_{Σ_N} and $A_{\mathbb{P}^1}$, respectively. We thus get,

$$\omega_{\Sigma_N} = \pi_N^* \omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} , \quad \text{CS}(A_{\Sigma_N}) = \pi_N^* \text{CS}(A_{\mathbb{P}^1}) . \quad (5.12)$$

Remark 5.1 (The Necessity of Nonperturbative Formulation of the 4d CS Theory). We have explained above that the existence of zero for ω_{Σ_N} implies the necessity for a non-perturbative treatment of the 4d CS theory for the purpose of computation of the R-matrix of CPM. The reason was that the existence of zeroes demands the divergence of the loop-counting parameter \hbar , which appears in the path integral as $\hbar^{-1}S$ with S given in (5.1). However, the mapping (5.10) and the formulation on $C \times \mathbb{P}^1$ does not change the value of the loop-counting parameter and it still is divergent as $\hbar \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, the formulation on $C \times \mathbb{P}^1$ does not help with this major challenge. However, it is helpful in some respects as we will explain below (see in particular §5.1.2).

5.1.2 The One-Form on the Curve of Spectral Parameter

The next task is to obtain the one-form $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ and ω_{Σ_N} . What are the principles based on which we can proceed? However, we proceed by invoking the following two reasonable principles:

- (1) **Preserving Topological Invariance along C .** As the CPM is a discrete integrable system, the construction of its R-matrix using the 4d CS theory demands the preservation of topological invariance along C . On the other hand, the experience of engineering integrable fields theories using 4d CS theory has taught us that the existence of zeroes for the one-form ω in (5.1) often requires breaking topological invariance [109]. Therefore, to ensure the preservation of topological invariance along C , we require that the one-form ω in (5.1) does not have a zero. However (5.4) implies that it is impossible to require this on Σ_N . On the other hand, on \mathbb{P}^1 , as a consequence of the Riemann–Roch theorem, we have

$$-2 = \# \text{ of zeroes of } \omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} - \# \text{ of poles of } \omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} . \quad (5.13)$$

We can thus certainly require the one-form $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ not to have a zero, which we do in our construction of $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$.

- (2) **Imposing \mathbb{Z}_N -Invariance.** Recall that Σ_N is obtained from $\tilde{\Sigma}_N$ by the \mathbb{Z}_N -covering map pr_N . Therefore, any well-defined object in general, and ω_{Σ_N} in particular, must be \mathbb{Z}_N -invariant up to possibly an overall constant phase.

As we will explain below, these two requirements will almost uniquely determine $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ (up to possibly an overall constant phase).

Let us start with assuming that $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ does not have a zero. Then, the most general meromorphic one-form on \mathbb{P}^1 is given by

$$\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} = \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^{\#} (z^{r_i} - z_i)} dz , \quad (5.14)$$

for some integers $\#, \{r_1, \dots, r_\#\}$, and points $\{z_1, \dots, z_\#\}$ of \mathbb{P}^1 . Performing $z \rightarrow 1/z$ transformation, we get

$$\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} \mapsto \frac{z^{\sum_i r_i - 2}}{\prod_{i=1}^\# (1 - z_i z^{r_i})} dz. \quad (5.15)$$

If we require that $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ does not have a zero, $\sum_i r_i - 2 = 0$ should be zero. This gives the two possibilities $\# = 1$ and $r_1 = 2$ or $\# = 2$ and $r_1 = r_2 = 1$

$$\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}^{(1)} = \frac{1}{z^2 - z_1} dz, \quad \omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}^{(2)} = \frac{1}{(z - z_1)(z - z_2)} dz, \quad (5.16)$$

Using (5.8) and (5.12), we see that

$$\omega_{\Sigma_N}^{(1)} \sim \begin{cases} \frac{1}{z^2 - z_1} dz, & \text{away from all } P_i, \\ \frac{N z^{N-1}}{z^{2N} - z_1} dz, & \text{near one of } P_i, \end{cases} \quad (5.17)$$

and

$$\omega_{\Sigma_N}^{(2)} \sim \begin{cases} \frac{1}{(z - z_1)(z - z_2)} dz, & \text{away from all } P_i, \\ \frac{N z^{N-1}}{(z^N - z_1)(z^N - z_2)} dz, & \text{near one of } P_i. \end{cases} \quad (5.18)$$

If we perform a \mathbb{Z}_N -transformation $z \rightarrow qz$, with q being an N^{th} root of unity, none of these forms are invariant. Hence, neither is the correct form of the required one-form on Σ_N .

As the second attempt, we consider the following one-form

$$\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} = \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^\# (z^{r_i} - z_i)^{1/s_i}} dz, \quad (5.19)$$

for two sets of positive integers $\{r_1, \dots, r_\#\}$ and $\{s_1, \dots, s_\#\}$. s_i s cannot be negative as that would lead to a zero of $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$. The above analysis tells us that for having \mathbb{Z}_N -invariance, we should set³⁷

$$r_1 = \dots = r_\# = N. \quad (5.20)$$

Performing $z \mapsto 1/z$ transformation and demanding no zero for the resulting form, we get the constraint

$$N \sum_{i=1}^\# \frac{1}{s_i} - 2 = 0. \quad (5.21)$$

One of the simplest integer solutions of this constraint is³⁸

$$\# = 2, \quad s_1 = s_2 = N. \quad (5.22)$$

³⁷Instead of (5.20), one can instead take the non-minimal choice $r_i = n_i N$ for positive integers $\{n_1, \dots, n_\#\}$. However, this is not needed as we demand the minimal choice for \mathbb{Z}_N -invariance.

³⁸Similar to the choice of r_i s, explained in Footnote 37, this is the minimal solution. One can always choose non-minimal solutions such as $\# = 4$ and $s_i = 2N$.

We thus arrive at³⁹

$$\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt[N]{(z^N - z_1)(z^N - z_2)}} dz, \quad (5.23)$$

from which, by using (5.8) and (5.12), we get

$$\omega_{\Sigma_N} \sim \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt[N]{(z^N - z_1)(z^N - z_2)}} dz, & \text{away from all } P_i, \\ \frac{Nz^{N-1}}{\sqrt[N]{(z^{N^2} - z_1)(z^{N^2} - z_2)}} dz, & \text{near one of } P_i, \end{cases} \quad (5.24)$$

which, by construction, is \mathbb{Z}_N -invariant.⁴⁰ It is clear from this form that ω_{Σ_N} has zeroes of order $N-1$ near a ramification point of π_N . The one-form $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ (5.23) and the corresponding \mathbb{Z}_N -invariant one-form ω_{Σ_N} (5.24) are the unique one-forms required for engineering the CPM within the 4d CS theory. However, these forms have the undesirable feature of having branch cuts, which introduce a sort of non-locality into the problem. This is expected since we are trying to describe a higher-genus curve in terms of data on \mathbb{P}^1 . On the other hand, as we will see in §5.1.4, this structure explains the main property of the R-matrix of the model, namely the lack of rapidity-difference.

Remark 5.2 (Why is the gCPM a Peculiar Integrable Spin System?). Our construction of $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ suggests why the CPM (also gCPM, as we will see below) is so special. We derived $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ by demanding the topological invariance along C and the \mathbb{Z}_N (or \mathbb{Z}_N^{n-1} in the case of the gCPM) invariance, which then fixes $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$. To engineer any integrable spin model (not an integrable field theory), even those that are currently unknown, within 4d CS theory, it is not conceivable that the first requirement can be relaxed, as it is essential for the derivation of Yang–Baxter equation. However, this restricts the possibilities to either the two cases in (5.16), which has already been studied in [107], or (5.23) (and (5.41) below for the gCPM, also the more general situation discussed around (7.3)). Any other choice of $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ would necessarily have a zero, with the possibility of breaking the topological invariance along C . This seems to be a plausible explanation of why the gCPM is such a peculiar integrable spin model. Hence, it is not surprising that there are no other known integrable spin models whose curve of the spectral parameter has a genus greater than one. See also Remark 6.6 and also the discussion around (7.3).

We can fix the branched points of (5.23) and (5.24) as follows. Let $\{z_{1,1}, \dots, z_{1,N}\}$ and $\{z_{2,1}, \dots, z_{2,N}\}$ be the set of solutions of $z^N = z_1$ and $z^N = z_2$ and hence the $2N$ branched points of $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$. Let us first consider the case of $N = 2$, where Σ_N is an elliptic curve, and see whether we can recover the standard one-form dz on an elliptic curve. In this case, near a branch point, say $z_{1,1}$, $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ takes the form $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} \sim 1/\sqrt{z \times G(z)} dz$, for some

³⁹Here, we have assumed that all the N^{th} root factors belong to the same branch, i.e. $\sqrt[N]{z^{t_1}} \times \sqrt[N]{z^{t_2}} = \sqrt[N]{z^{t_1+t_2}}$, for some t_1 and t_2 , and similarly for other factors. If different factors belong to different branches of the N^{th} root function, we get an overall constant phase that does not affect manipulations.

⁴⁰Note that away from a ramification point, ω_{Σ_N} is invariant only up to an overall irrelevant constant phase that would not affect computations.

holomorphic function $G(z)$ that is not zero at $z_{1,1}$. Upon pulling back to Σ_2 , we have $\omega_{\Sigma_2} \sim 1/\sqrt{z \times G(z)} dz$ away from the ramification locus of π and $\omega_{\Sigma_2} \sim (2z)/\sqrt{z^2 \times G(z^2)} dz$ near a ramification point say $z_{1,1}$. Therefore, to recover the standard form dz , we need to take $z_{1,1}$ to be one of the branched points of π (the factor $1/\sqrt{G(z^2)}$ is irrelevant). This observation suggests the fixing of the branched points $\{z_{1,1}, \dots, z_{1,N}\}$ and $\{z_{2,1}, \dots, z_{2,N}\}$ as follows: Let $\{Q_1, \dots, Q_{2N}\}$ be the set of branched points of π on \mathbb{P}^1 defined by $Q_i := \pi_N(P_i)$, we then set

$$z_{1,i} = z_{Q_i}, \quad z_{2,i} = z_{Q_{N+i}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N. \quad (5.25)$$

We can thus write the one-forms (5.23) and (5.24) in a more compact form as

$$\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt[2N]{\prod_{i=1}^{2N} (z - z_{Q_i})}} dz, \quad (5.26)$$

and

$$\omega_{\Sigma_N} \sim \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt[2N]{\prod_{i=1}^{2N} (z - z_{Q_i})}} dz, & \text{away from all } P_i\text{s}, \\ \frac{Nz^{N-1}}{\sqrt[2N]{\prod_{i=1}^{2N} (z^N - z_{Q_i})}} dz, & \text{near one of } P_i\text{s}. \end{cases} \quad (5.27)$$

This concludes our construction of one-forms on \mathbb{P}^1 and Σ_N .

5.1.3 Gauge Lie Algebra, Boundary Conditions, and R-Matrix

In this section, we discuss the choice of the gauge Lie algebra for the theory, boundary conditions for the gauge fields, and the R-matrix.

The Gauge Lie Algebra. We need to specify the gauge Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} for the 4d CS theory, which appears explicitly in the definition of the theory in (5.1). In general, the spin models are related to the representation theory of quantum groups. In the case of the gCPM, it is known that the R-matrix of the model arises as the intertwiner of certain N^{n-1} -dimensional representations, the so-called minimal cyclic representations, of $U_q(\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}}(n, \mathbb{C}))$ with q being an N^{th} root of unity [74, 91, 92, 93]. Therefore, for $n = 2$, one has to take the gauge Lie algebra of the 4d CS to be $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$.

Boundary Conditions. To formulate a perturbation theory of the 4d CS theory on $C \times \mathbb{P}^1$, we need to impose boundary conditions on gauge fields. The location at which one needs to impose boundary conditions can be understood as follows. The only relevant term in the action is $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} \wedge \text{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}}(A \wedge dA)$. Indeed only $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} \wedge \text{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}}(A \wedge \partial_{\bar{z}} A)$ is relevant since, upon integration by parts, it leads to a term $\partial_{\bar{z}} \omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} \text{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}}(A \wedge \delta A)$ in the variation of the action. In the case of other integrable spin-chain models, $\partial_{\bar{z}} \omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ involves (a $\partial_{\bar{z}}$ -derivative of) delta functions at the location of the poles which, in turn, would lead to the term $\text{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}}(A \wedge \delta A)|_{C \times \{\text{set of poles of } \omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}\}}$ [107, §9.1]. One thus needs to impose appropriate

boundary conditions on the gauge fields at the poles of $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ to formulate a well-defined perturbation theory around a classical solution to the equations of motion. In our case, however, regarding the form (5.26), the situation is different due to the existence of branch points $\{z_{Q_1}, \dots, z_{Q_{2N}}\}$. Let us first compute $\partial_{\bar{z}}\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$. From (5.26), it is

$$\partial_{\bar{z}}\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} = 2\pi i \sum_{i=1}^{2N} \left\{ \sqrt[N]{\frac{(z - z_{Q_i})^{N-1}}{\prod_{j=1, j \neq i}^{2N} (z - z_{Q_j})}} \delta^{(2)}(z - z_{Q_i}, \bar{z} - \bar{z}_{Q_i}) \right\} dz, \quad (5.28)$$

with $\delta^{(2)}(z, \bar{z})$ denotes the delta-function distribution. However, this expression simply vanishes: away from the branched points, it vanishes due to delta functions, and at a branched point, say z_{Q_i} , it is zero due to the factor $(z - z_{Q_i})^{(N-1)/N}$ in the numerator. Hence

$$\partial_{\bar{z}}\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} = 0. \quad (5.29)$$

Therefore, the term $\partial_{\bar{z}}\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} \wedge \text{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}}(A \wedge \delta A)$ in the variation of the action is automatically zero, and we do not need to impose boundary conditions on the gauge field to kill it.

For completeness, let us explain the derivation of (5.28). Without loss of generality, we take a branch of the N^{th} -root function and take all factors involving the N^{th} -root function to belong to the same branch. We first multiply the numerator and denominator of $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ in (5.26) by⁴¹

$$\left(\prod_{j=1}^{2N} (z - z_{Q_j}) \right)^{(N-1)/N}, \quad (5.30)$$

which gives

$$\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} = \frac{\left(\prod_{j=1}^{2N} (z - z_{Q_j}) \right)^{(N-1)/N}}{\left(\prod_{j=1}^{2N} (z - z_{Q_j}) \right)} dz. \quad (5.31)$$

As the numerator is holomorphic, its $\partial_{\bar{z}}$ -derivative vanishes, and we only need to deal with the denominator. By using the identity

$$\partial_{\bar{z}} \left(\frac{1}{z - z_0} \right) = 2\pi i \delta^{(2)}(z - z_0, \bar{z} - \bar{z}_0) \quad (5.32)$$

in the $\partial_{\bar{z}}$ -derivative of the denominator of (5.31) repeatedly, we arrive at the expression (5.28).

As Σ_N and C do not have boundaries, we do not have any boundary condition. Since we are not setting up a perturbation theory, we would not pursue this further in this work. It is further evidence that the perturbation theory is not the right approach to the computation of R-matrix for the CPM and one indeed needs to resort to a non-perturbative definition.

⁴¹We can choose different branches for different factors but the final result of vanishing of $\partial_{\bar{z}}\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ will not be affected as different branches are related by an overall phase. Here, we have chosen the same branch to be able to multiply $\sqrt[N]{z} \times \sqrt[N]{z} = \sqrt{z^2}$ and similar type of manipulations without dealing with extra phases which would not affect the final result.

Remark 5.3 (Behavior of the Gauge Field at Ramification Points). To make the action finite near a ramification locus, we demand the mildest vanishing behavior that cures the issue. From (5.23), we see that near a branched point, $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ behaves as $z^{-1/N}$. As the action is quadratic in the gauge field, even a linear vanishing behavior would do the job. Note that this is *not* a boundary condition and we demand it to make the integrand of the action (5.1) of the 4d CS theory well-defined.

The R-Matrix and Bazhanov–Stroganov Procedure. The R-matrix of CPM can be presented in various ways: As the original weights \mathcal{W} and $\overline{\mathcal{W}}$, as vertex weights, or as IRF weights. These are related to each other [151, 152]. The computation of the R-matrix of the CPM from the 4d CS theory should follow the same procedure as the other integrable lattice models [107]. As the R-matrix is the intertwiner of tensor product of two N -dimensional minimal cyclic representations of $U_q(\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}}(2, \mathbb{C}))$ at q being a root of unity, one takes two lines in this representation, and then computes the R-matrix as in Fig. 7.




Figure 7: The representation of R-matrix of CPM as a vertex model. The two lines in the right carry minimal cyclic representations of $U_q(\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}}(2, \mathbb{C}))$ and their intertwiner computes the R-matrix.

By a procedure due to Bazhanov and Stroganov, it turns out that, at least for odd N , one only needs to compute the intertwiner of a minimal cyclic representation and a highest-weight spin-1/2 representation [81]. One starts from the R-matrix of the six-vertex model at $q^N = 1$ for odd N . The corresponding YB equation is satisfied by intertwiners of spin-1/2 representations, denoted as $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{V}'_{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{V}'_{\frac{1}{2}}}$. Let us assume that one can construct the intertwiner $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{V}_C\mathcal{V}'_{\frac{1}{2}}}$ of one minimal cyclic representation and one spin-1/2 representation. Then the YB equation associated with the triple tensor product $\mathcal{V}_C \otimes \mathcal{V}'_C \otimes \mathcal{V}'_{\frac{1}{2}}$ would depend quadratically on $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{V}_C\mathcal{V}'_{\frac{1}{2}}}$ and linearly on $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{V}_C\mathcal{V}'_C}$, the intertwiner of two minimal cyclic representations. Hence one can solve it for $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{V}_C\mathcal{V}'_C}$ easily. $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{V}_C\mathcal{V}'_C}$ is related to the R-matrix of CPM by some choice of parameters [81, §4]. Of course, according to our arguments in §5.1.1, any computation of this sort has to be performed in a nonperturbative completion of the 4d CS theory. We will not attempt it in this work.

5.1.4 Lack of the Rapidity-Difference Property

Up to this point, we have discussed the engineering of CPM within the 4d CS theory. However, to boost our proposal, we still need to argue for the main property of the R-matrix of CPM, i.e. the lack of rapidity-difference property. This property means that the R-matrix of an integrable spin model satisfies

$$\mathcal{R}(z_1, z_2) = \mathcal{R}(z_1 - z_2) , \quad (5.33)$$

i.e. the R-matrix, as a function of the rapidity parameter, is a *single-valued* function of the difference of rapidities on the curve of the spectral parameter. In the Belavin–Drinfeld classification of solutions to classical YB equation, the rapidity-difference property is assumed [55, 57]. This assumption restricts the possible choice of the curve of the spectral parameter to $\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C}^\times$, and the elliptic curve \mathbb{E}_τ , where in the latter case the complex structure τ can appear as a dynamical parameter in the YB equation [153, 154]. This result is compatible with the formal group law. Once, the rapidity-difference property is relaxed, it would not be surprising that there could be R-matrices where the curve of the spectral parameter has a genus higher than one. This is obvious because even the meaning of $z_1 - z_2$ on a higher-genus curve is unclear.

In our discussion, the lack of this property follows from the structure of $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$, given in (5.23), in particular having branch cuts. We consider Σ_N as a branched cover of \mathbb{P}^1 and studied everything on $C \times \mathbb{P}^1$ including the absence of the rapidity-difference property of the R-matrix. Although we do not set up a perturbation theory, we can still get a glimpse into the origin of this feature of the model in the formulation on $C \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Recall that the equations of motion of the 4d CS theory on $C \times \mathbb{P}^1$ are given by

$$\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} \wedge F = 0 , \quad (5.34)$$

where $F := dA + \frac{1}{2}[A, A]$ is the curvature of the connection A and $d = dx\partial_x + dy\partial_y + d\bar{z}\partial_{\bar{z}}$ with x and y denote the local coordinate on the topological plane C . Therefore, the free propagator two-form P of the theory satisfies the following relation

$$\frac{i}{2\pi} \omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} \wedge dP = \delta^{(4)}(x, y, z, \bar{z}) d\text{Vol}_{C \times \mathbb{P}^1} , \quad (5.35)$$

where $\delta^{(4)}(x, y, z, \bar{z})$ denotes the four-dimensional delta-function distribution on $C \times \mathbb{P}^1$ and $d\text{Vol}_{C \times \mathbb{P}^1}$ is the volume form of $C \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Using (5.29), we can write this equation as

$$\frac{i}{2\pi} dz \wedge d \left(\frac{P}{\sqrt[N]{\prod_{i=1}^{2N} (z - z_{Q_i})}} \right) = \delta^{(4)}(x, y, z, \bar{z}) d\text{Vol}_{C \times \mathbb{P}^1} . \quad (5.36)$$

What appears inside the bracket has already been computed in a Lorentz-like gauge in [107, eq. (4.5)]. Hence $(P = \text{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}}(P^{ab} J_a J_b))$ with $\{J_1, \dots, J_{\dim \mathfrak{g}}\}$ is a basis for the gauge Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} of the 4d CS theory)

$$P^{ab}(x, y, z, \bar{z}) = \left(\frac{\delta^{ab}}{2\pi} \cdot \frac{\sqrt[N]{\prod_{i=1}^{2N} (z - z_{Q_i})}}{(x^2 + y^2 + z\bar{z})^2} \right) (x dy \wedge d\bar{z} + y d\bar{z} \wedge dx + 2\bar{z} dx \wedge dy) . \quad (5.37)$$

In the cases that the R-matrix of the integrable spin model can be computed perturbatively, the classical R-matrix is essentially calculated by integrating the $dx \wedge dy$ component of P along x and y where two Wilson lines are stretched. In those cases, where the factor $\sqrt[N]{\prod_{i=1}^{2N}(z - z_{Q_i})}$ is absent, the rapidity-difference property is preserved as the R-matrix is a *single-valued* function of the rapidity parameter [107, eqs. (4.11)–(4.14)]. However, in the case of CPM, the presence of the factor $\sqrt[N]{\prod_{i=1}^{2N}(z - z_{Q_i})}$ in (5.37) is a sign of breaking of the rapidity-difference property. It is lost simply because (5.37) is not a single-valued function of z . In a full, nonperturbative treatment of the 4d CS theory, the propagator (5.37) is certainly modified but it is expected that the modification would not restore the rapidity-difference property. Therefore, the lack of this crucial feature of the R-matrix of the CPM can be seen from the formulation on $C \times \mathbb{P}^1$, although in a non-rigorous and heuristic manner.

5.2 Generalization to gCPM

What we have explained so far for CPM can be readily generalized to the gCPM. We would only quote the final results, as the interested reader can easily fill in the details by an obvious generalization of the arguments for the CPM.

The curve $\Sigma_{N,n}$ defined in (2.10) can be realized as a branched cover of \mathbb{P}^1 . From (B.9),⁴² the branched covering map $\pi_{N,n} : \Sigma_{N,n} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ is given by explicitly by (in a suitable coordinate z defined in a local neighborhood)

$$\pi_{N,n} \sim \begin{cases} z, & \text{away from the ramification points,} \\ z^{N(n-1)}, & \text{near a ramification point,} \end{cases} \quad (5.38)$$

and has degree

$$\deg \pi_{N,n} = N^{n-1}. \quad (5.39)$$

The degree of the ramification divisor again follows from (B.9) to be

$$\deg R_{\pi_{N,n}} = 2N^{(n-1)}(N-1)(n-1), \quad (5.40)$$

hence there are $2N^{n-1}$ ramification points each of which has the ramification index $(N-1)(n-1) + 1$. We denote these points as $\{P_1, \dots, P_{2N^{n-1}}\}$ and the corresponding branch points as $\{Q_1, \dots, Q_{2N^{n-1}}\}$.

The one-forms on \mathbb{P}^1 and $\Sigma_{N,n}$ are given by $(\#, r_i, s_i) = (2, N^{n-1}, N^{n-1})$ in (5.19))

$$\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt[N^{n-1}]{\prod_{i=1}^{2N^{n-1}}(z - z_{Q_i})}} dz, \quad (5.41)$$

⁴²Recall that $\Sigma_{N,n}$ is the free \mathbb{Z}_N^{n-1} -quotient of $\tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n}$.

and

$$\omega_{\Sigma_{N,n}} \sim \begin{cases} \frac{1}{N^{n-1} \sqrt{\prod_{i=1}^{2N^{n-1}} (z - z_{Q_i})}} dz, & \text{away from all } P_i\text{s} , \\ \frac{N^{n-1} z^{N^{n-1}-1}}{N^{n-1} \sqrt{\prod_{i=1}^{2N^{n-1}} (z^{N^{n-1}} - z_{Q_i})}} dz, & \text{near one of } P_i\text{s} . \end{cases} \quad (5.42)$$

The following relation still holds

$$\partial_{\bar{z}} \omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} = 0 . \quad (5.43)$$

The relevant gauge Lie algebra of the 4d CS would be $\mathfrak{sl}(n, \mathbb{C})$. The question of boundary condition and the lack of rapidity-difference property are verbatim for the case of the CPM.

With these results at hand, we conclude our discussion of the engineering of gCPM within 4d CS theory.

6 Origin of the Hyperbolic Monopole/gCPM Correspondence

In §4, we established a correspondence between the spectral data of hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopoles and a class of \mathbb{Z}_N^{n-1} gCPMs. An immediate question is whether this is just pure coincidence or there is a deeper reason for it. In this section, we argue that this correspondence is tied to the existence of 6d and eventually 10d theories whose two different incarnations describe the two sides of the hyperbolic monopole/gCPM correspondence.

The six-dimensional theory turns out to be a holomorphic version of CS theory in six dimensions introduced by Witten in the context of the open-string field theory [155]

$$S = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_X \Omega \wedge \text{CS}(\mathcal{A}) , \quad (6.1)$$

with

$$\text{CS}(\mathcal{A}) := \text{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}} \left(\mathcal{A} \wedge \bar{\partial} \mathcal{A} + \frac{2}{3} \mathcal{A} \wedge \mathcal{A} \wedge \mathcal{A} \right) . \quad (6.2)$$

Here, X is a complex three-manifold, Ω is a section of the canonical bundle of X of degree $(3, 0)$, \mathcal{A} is a connection on a principal G -bundle over X with $\mathfrak{g} := \text{Lie}(G)$, and $\bar{\partial}$ is the $(0, 1)$ -part of the exterior derivative $d = \partial + \bar{\partial}$. As usual, we are working with the corresponding associated bundle $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow X$. Let (z, w_1, w_2) be the local holomorphic coordinates on X , then

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_{\bar{z}} d\bar{z} + \sum_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{A}_{\bar{w}_i} d\bar{w}_i , \quad \bar{\partial} = d\bar{z} \partial_{\bar{z}} + \sum_{i=1}^2 d\bar{w}_i \partial_{\bar{w}_i} . \quad (6.3)$$

In general, to integrate $\Omega \wedge \text{CS}(\mathcal{A})$, a global section Ω of the canonical bundle of M is chosen. To have a global section, the canonical bundle has to be trivial, which is the case of Calabi–Yau (CY) manifolds (see also [156] and references in [157, pg. 1] for other examples). The condition for being CY is not necessary and (6.1) can be defined on more general complex

three-manifolds [158, §2]. In such situations, Ω is not a holomorphic volume form but is still a global section of the canonical bundle of X . The complex structure is irrelevant for integration, and one can always work with the underlying smooth manifold. One can define the integration on the underlying smooth manifold by choosing a partition of unity $\{\phi_\alpha\}$ supported on open sets of an open covering $\{U_\alpha\}$ of X . Then, the integration on X can be defined using the partition of unity arguments by defining the integral only on U_α . Therefore, working on general complex manifolds for which there is no holomorphic volume form poses no issue.

To relate this theory to hyperbolic monopoles on the one hand and the gCPM on the other hand, the basic idea is that both of these systems are intimately connected to four-dimensional physics: As we have seen in §3, hyperbolic monopoles of arbitrary mass can be constructed from instantons on \mathcal{U} , defined in (3.18), the solid cone of future-directed time-like vectors on the Minkowski space $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$. Hence, the relevant four-dimensional spacetime in this case is $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ or an open set \mathcal{U} thereof. On the other hand, based on our observations in §5, gCPM is related to 4d CS theory on $C \times \mathbb{P}^1$ with a certain choice of the one-form ω given in (5.23) and (5.41). It is then natural to think that this theory is the dimensional reduction of a six-dimensional theory on $T^2 \times C \times \mathbb{P}^1$, where T^2 is a torus with a small volume and becomes a copy of \mathbb{R}^2 in the microscopic regime. Therefore, the relevant spacetime in this case is $\mathbb{R}^2 \times C$, which can be taken to be \mathbb{R}^4 if we take $C = \mathbb{R}^2$. Due to the involvement of \mathbb{P}^1 , the relevant six-dimensional space turns out to be the (right-handed) projective spinor bundle⁴³ of a four-dimensional spacetime M which we denote as $\mathbb{P}S(M)$. This space is defined through an incidence relation which relates events in spacetime M to points in its twistor space \mathcal{Z}_M . For a spacetime M of arbitrary signature, $\mathbb{P}S(M) \simeq M \times \mathbb{P}^1$ as a smooth manifold, which has a natural almost-complex structure [159, §9.1]. This almost-complex structure is integrable if and only if M is antiself-dual [7, Theorem 4.1].⁴⁴ In both cases of interest, \mathbb{R}^4 and $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$, the spacetime is antiself-dual and indeed flat. Therefore, $\mathbb{P}S(M)$ has an integrable complex structure, hence a three-dimensional complex manifold. Since the 6d hCS theory, defined in (6.1), depends only on the choice of a complex structure, we can define it on $\mathbb{P}S(M)$

$$S = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{P}S(M)} \Omega \wedge \text{CS}(\mathcal{A}) . \quad (6.4)$$

⁴³To be more pedantic, we should say right-handed or left-handed projective spinor bundle and write $\mathbb{P}S_\pm(M)$ for these bundles. However, to avoid cluttering, we sometimes omit the right-/left-handed adjective. In the following, we assume this is understood.

⁴⁴Under the Hodge-star operation, the Weyl tensor of a Riemannian four-manifold M is decomposed as $W = W_+ + W_-$, where W_\pm corresponds to the two eigenvalues of the star operation. M is self-dual if $W_- = 0$ and anti-self-dual if $W_+ = 0$. For more details, see [7, §1, pg. 428]. Everything can be stated in terms of the left-handed projective spinor bundle.

The salient feature of $\mathbb{P}S(M)$ is that it defines a double fibration

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathbb{P}S(M) & \\ \pi_{\mathcal{Z}_M} \swarrow & & \searrow \pi_M \\ \mathcal{Z}_M & & M \end{array} \quad (6.5)$$

where π_M and $\pi_{\mathcal{Z}_M}$ would be defined momentarily. We will not need many details of twistor geometry. In the notation of [160, §1.4], a point of the projective spinor bundle is the equivalence class of pairs $[(x^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}, \psi_\beta)]$, where $\alpha, \dot{\alpha} = 1, 2$ are the 2-spinor indices,

$$[x^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}] := \begin{pmatrix} x^0 + x^3 & x^1 - ix^2 \\ x^1 + ix^2 & x^0 - x^3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6.6)$$

with (x^0, x^1, x^2, x^3) is a spacetime point and ψ_β is a projective spinor defined up to a multiplication by $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^\times$. Hence $[(x^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}), \psi_\beta] \sim [(x^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}), \lambda\psi_\beta]$. $\pi_M([(x^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}), \psi_\beta]) = [x^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}]$ is the projection to the spacetime points while $\pi_{\mathcal{Z}_M}([(x^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}), \psi_\beta]) = (x^{\beta\dot{\alpha}}\psi_\beta, \psi_\alpha)$ imposes the incidence relation.

To realize the two sides of the correspondence, we proceed as follows:

- **The Hyperbolic Monopole Side.** We take $M = \mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ or the open subset $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^{1,3}$,⁴⁵ defined in (3.18). Then, the spaces appearing in (6.5) become

$$M = \mathcal{U}, \quad \mathcal{Z}_M = \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}, \quad \mathbb{P}S(M) = \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{U}}, \quad (6.7)$$

as in (3.24). A further reduction of this double fibration by the dilatation (i.e. \mathbb{R}_+ -action) will give the double fibration (3.30) and the construction explained in §3. We shall explain how the 6d hCS theory describes antiself-dual instantons on \mathcal{U} , and hence hyperbolic monopoles.

- **The gCPM Side.** We take $M = \mathbb{R}^4$, and the space appearing in (6.5) become

$$M = \mathbb{R}^4, \quad \mathcal{Z}_M = \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{R}^4} = \mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1, \quad \mathbb{P}S(M) = \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{R}^4}, \quad (6.8)$$

where $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{R}^4}$ denotes the twistor space of \mathbb{R}^4 and the fibration is holomorphic. We then argue how the dimensional reduction of 6d hCS theory to $\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ gives the 4d CS theory that describes the gCPM.

Let us now explain how it works in detail.

⁴⁵The condition of being an (anti)self-dual manifold descends from $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ to its open sets including \mathcal{U} . It is an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ endowed with the usual Euclidean topology. This can be seen as follows: The cone of time-like vectors with respect to an event $x \in \mathbb{R}^{1,3}$, which we denote as $\text{Con}^T(x)$, is defined by $\{y \in \mathbb{R}^{1,3} \mid -(x_0 - y_0)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^3 (x_i - y_i)^2 < 0\}$. We then define $f : \mathbb{R}^{1,3} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $f(u) := -(x_0 - u_0)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^3 (x_i - u_i)^2$, which is obviously a continuous function. We have $f^{-1}(-\infty, 0) = \text{Con}^T(x) - \{x\}$. As $(-\infty, 0)$ is open in \mathbb{R} and f is continuous, we conclude that $\text{Con}^T(x) - \{x\}$ is open in Euclidean topology. On the other hand, $\text{Con}^T(x) - \{x\} = \mathcal{U}_+ \cup \mathcal{U}_-$, where $\mathcal{U}_+ = \mathcal{U}$ and \mathcal{U}_- denote the cone of future-directed and past-directed time-like vectors, respectively. Since \mathcal{U}_+ and \mathcal{U}_- are disjoint, and their union is open, both of them have to be open in Euclidean topology. If either or both of \mathcal{U}_\pm is closed, then their union would be closed. We emphasize that a general embedded submanifold of an (anti)self-dual manifold is not necessarily (anti)self-dual.

6.1 Hyperbolic Monopoles from Six Dimensions

We first discuss how to get hyperbolic monopoles from six dimensions.

Using (6.7), the double fibration (6.5) becomes

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & \mathbb{P}S(\mathcal{U}) & \\
 \pi_{\mathcal{Z}\mathcal{U}} \swarrow & & \searrow \pi_{\mathcal{U}} \\
 \mathcal{Z}\mathcal{U} & & \mathcal{U}
 \end{array} \tag{6.9}$$

where $\mathbb{P}S(\mathcal{U})$ is an \mathbb{R}_+ -fibration over $\mathcal{Z}\mathcal{U}$ [161]. We first explain how to realize self-dual connections on \mathcal{U} in terms of the 6d hCS theory. Upon \mathbb{R}_+ -action, these connections will give solutions of the Bogomolny equation in the hyperbolic space. Finally, we elaborate on how to realize the characteristic features of hyperbolic monopoles, i.e. their masses and charges, and their spectral data in this picture.

6.1.1 Instantons from 6d Chern–Simons Theory

Let us explain how instantons on \mathcal{U} descend from six dimensions. The basic idea is to use the results of Murray and Singer in [17, Propositions 3.2 and 3.3], as we briefly recalled in [Correspondence Between Bundles over the Double Fibration \(3.24\)](#) in §3.2.2. According to [17, Proposition 3.2], there is a one-to-one correspondence between CR-bundles over $\mathcal{Z}\mathcal{U}$ and integrable bundles over $\mathcal{C}\mathcal{U}$, and according to [17, Proposition 3.3], there is a one-to-one correspondence between the latter and bundles with self-dual connections on a vector bundle over \mathcal{U} . These results together with (3.24) and (6.9) give the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & \mathcal{C}\mathcal{U} & \\
 \mu \swarrow & & \searrow \nu \\
 \mathcal{Z}\mathcal{U} & & \mathcal{U} \\
 \pi_{\mathcal{Z}\mathcal{U}} \swarrow & & \searrow \pi_{\mathcal{U}} \\
 & \mathbb{P}S(\mathcal{U}) &
 \end{array} \tag{6.10}$$

The missing link is the following

Proposition 6.1. Let \mathcal{U} be the open cone of future-directed timelike vectors in Minkowski space, $\mathcal{Z}\mathcal{U}$ be its five-dimensional twistor space, and $\mathbb{P}S(\mathcal{U})$ be its projective spinor bundle. Then, there is a one-to-one correspondence between CR-bundles over $\mathcal{Z}\mathcal{U}$ and holomorphic vector bundles over $\mathbb{P}S(\mathcal{U})$ equipped with a Hermitian structure.

Proof. Let $(W, \bar{\partial}_W)$ be a CR bundle over $\mathcal{Z}\mathcal{U}$. Then, we define a vector bundle over $\mathbb{P}S(\mathcal{U})$ and a $\bar{\partial}$ operator on it by

$$\mathcal{W} := \pi_{\mathcal{Z}\mathcal{U}}^* W, \quad \bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{W}} := \pi_{\mathcal{Z}\mathcal{U}}^* \bar{\partial}_W. \tag{6.11}$$

As a CR vector bundle is always a complex vector bundle equipped with a CR structure, its pullback is also a complex vector bundle. It is easy to see that $\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{W}}$ induces a holomorphic

structure on the complex vector bundle \mathcal{W}

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{W}}^2 &= \bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{W}} \wedge \bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{W}} \\
&= \pi_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}}^* \bar{\partial}_W \wedge \pi_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}}^* \bar{\partial}_W \\
&= \pi_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}}^* (\bar{\partial}_W \wedge \bar{\partial}_W) \\
&= 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

where in the last line, we have used the fact that $\bar{\partial}_W$ defines a CR structure on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$ (i.e. $\bar{\partial}_W \wedge \bar{\partial}_W = 0$). Hence, $(\mathcal{W}, \bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{W}})$ is a holomorphic vector bundle over $\mathbb{P}S(\mathcal{U})$.

Conversely, assume $(\mathcal{W}, \bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{W}})$ is a holomorphic vector bundle on $\mathbb{P}S(\mathcal{U})$. Then, we define a bundle over $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$ by

$$W := s_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}}^* \mathcal{W}, \quad \bar{\partial}_W := s_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}}^* \bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{W}}, \tag{6.13}$$

where $s_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}}$ is a section of the \mathbb{R}_+ -projection $\mathbb{P}S(\mathcal{U}) \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$. A similar argument shows that $(W, \bar{\partial}_W)$ has a CR structure. If $s'_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}}$ is another section of $\mathbb{P}S(\mathcal{U}) \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$, with the corresponding CR vector bundle $(W', \bar{\partial}_{W'})$ given by $W' = s'^*_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}} \mathcal{W}$ and $\bar{\partial}_{W'} = s'^*_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}} \bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{W}}$, we need to show that $(W, \bar{\partial}_W)$ and $(W', \bar{\partial}_{W'})$ are isomorphic CR vector bundles. Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$ and define a curve $c : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{P}S(\mathcal{U})$ with $c(0) = s_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}}(\gamma)$ and $c(1) = s'_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}}(\gamma)$. As \mathcal{W} is equipped with a Hermitian structure, $\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{W}}$ defines the $(0, 1)$ -part of a unique connection ∇ on \mathcal{W} whose curvature is of type $(1, 1)$.⁴⁶ We define a parallel section $\psi \in \Gamma(\mathcal{W}, \mathbb{P}S(\mathcal{U}))$, which satisfies $\nabla_{\dot{c}} \psi = 0$ and $\psi(c(0)) = w$ with $w \in \rho^{-1}(c(0))$ is fixed, $\rho : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}S(\mathcal{U})$ is the vector bundle projection, and $\dot{c}(t)$ is the tangent to the curve $c(t)$. Such a section is unique, as it satisfies a first-order differential equation and a fixed boundary condition. Then, by construction, $\psi(c(1)) = w' \in \rho^{-1}(c(1))$, which provides a linear isomorphism between the fibers $\mathcal{W}_{c(0)}$ and $\mathcal{W}_{c(1)}$ over $c(0)$ and $c(1)$. As $W_{\gamma} = s_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}}^* \mathcal{W}_{c(0)}$ and $W'_{\gamma} = s'^*_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}} \mathcal{W}_{c(1)}$, we end-up with a unique bundle map $\Xi_{\psi} : W \rightarrow W'$ which intertwines the holomorphic structures, i.e. $\bar{\partial}_{W'} \circ \Xi_{\psi} = \Xi_{\psi} \circ \bar{\partial}_W$. Therefore, $(W, \bar{\partial}_W)$ and $(W', \bar{\partial}_{W'})$ are isomorphic CR vector bundles.

We can thus conclude the proposition. \square

This result has an immediate consequence

Corollary 6.1. There is a one-to-one correspondence between bundles with self-dual connections on \mathcal{U} and holomorphic vector bundle on $\mathbb{P}S(\mathcal{U})$ equipped with a Hermitian structure.

Proof. It immediately follows from [17, Propositions 3.2 and 3.3] and Proposition 6.1. \square

Recall that for any connection \mathcal{A} on a complex vector bundle $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow X$ over a complex manifold, we have

$$\mathcal{F}^{(0,2)} = (\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{A}})^2, \tag{6.14}$$

⁴⁶For a holomorphic vector bundle $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow X$ with a Hermitian structure H on a complex manifold X , there exists a unique compatible H -connection \mathcal{A} whose $(0, 1)$ -part coincides with the holomorphic structure on \mathcal{W} [162, Theorem 10.3]. It is easy to see that the curvature of this connection is of type $(1, 1)$.

with $\mathcal{F} = d\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{A} \wedge \mathcal{A}$ is the curvature of $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^{(1,0)} + \mathcal{A}^{(0,1)}$, and $\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{A}} := \bar{\partial} + \mathcal{A}^{(0,1)}$. Therefore, if $\mathcal{F}^{(0,2)} = 0$, the $(0,1)$ -part of the connection defines a holomorphic structure on \mathcal{W} given by $\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(0,1)}$, which then would be an integrable operator on \mathcal{W} .⁴⁷ Putting these results together, there is a clear way to obtain self-dual connections on \mathcal{U} from the 6d hCS theory: it amounts to showing that the 6d hCS theory, as formulated in (6.4), is the field theory description of connections on a vector bundle $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}S(\mathcal{U})$ whose curvature is of type $(1,1)$.

It is easy to show that the 6d hCS theory is such a theory. The equations of motion of (6.4) are

$$\Omega \wedge \mathcal{F} = 0. \quad (6.15)$$

\mathcal{F} has the decomposition $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}^{(2,0)} + \mathcal{F}^{(1,1)} + \mathcal{F}^{(0,2)}$ and (6.15) implies $\mathcal{F}^{(0,2)} = 0$. There are no other constraints on the components of \mathcal{F} . On the other hand, recall that \mathcal{A} in (6.3) has only anti-holomorphic components, hence $\mathcal{F}^{(2,0)} = 0$ automatically. Therefore, $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}^{(1,1)}$ and is of type $(1,1)$. As such, the 6d hCS theory serves the purpose of describing connections on a holomorphic bundle over $\mathbb{P}S(\mathcal{U})$ whose curvature is of type $(1,1)$. By Corollary 6.1, it then follows that any connection of this sort would give rise to a self-dual connection \tilde{A} on \mathcal{U} . To construct this self-dual connection explicitly, we choose a section $s_{\mathcal{U}} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}S(\mathcal{U})$ and define

$$\tilde{A} := s_{\mathcal{U}}^* \mathcal{A}. \quad (6.16)$$

The commutativity of the diagram (6.10) ensures the existence and uniqueness of \tilde{A} .

As a final comment, we would like to highlight [164, 165] where the following was realized: Let X be a three-dimensional complex manifold realized as a \mathbb{P}^1 -fibration over a self-dual Riemannian spacetime M . Then the condition of holomorphicity of a bundle $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow X$ is described by the 6d hCS theory on X and leads to self-duality equations on M . In particular, X could be the twistor space of \mathbb{R}^4 . However, the method used in loc. cit. is different than the ones we used here. This relation was later proposed more concretely in [166] based on which the realization of self-duality in the form of the Yang equation [167] was worked out explicitly in [168].

6.1.2 Hyperbolic Monopoles as Dilatation-Invariant Instantons

As we explained in §3, to construct hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopoles with arbitrary masses, Murray and Singer realize hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopoles as dilatation-invariant instantons on the open cone \mathcal{U} of future-pointing time-like vectors on the Minkowski spacetime [17]. Let us first establish this fact in an elementary fashion.

Recall that \mathcal{U} , defined in (3.18), is an open set of the Minkowski space and itself is a semi-Riemannian manifold. From the description of \mathbb{H}^3 given in (3.19), we can find an

⁴⁷The existence of a holomorphic structure on a complex vector bundle over a complex manifold is non-trivial. For a result in this direction see [163].

orthogonal decomposition of the tangent bundle of \mathcal{U} using the usual Minkowski inner product. Consider the embedding $\iota : \mathbb{H}^3 \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$. Then,

$$\iota^* T\mathcal{U} \simeq T\mathbb{H}^3 \oplus N_{\mathbb{H}^3/\mathcal{U}}, \quad (6.17)$$

where $N_{\mathbb{H}^3/\mathcal{U}}$ is the normal bundle of \mathbb{H}^3 in \mathcal{U} . Dually, we have

$$\iota^* T^*\mathcal{U} \simeq T^*\mathbb{H}^3 \oplus N_{\mathbb{H}^3/\mathcal{U}}^\vee, \quad (6.18)$$

where $N_{\mathbb{H}^3/\mathcal{U}}^\vee$ is the conormal bundle dual to $N_{\mathbb{H}^3/\mathcal{U}}$. Then, the metric can be decomposed as

$$g_{\mathcal{U}} = g_{\mathbb{H}^3} \oplus g_{N_{\mathbb{H}^3/\mathcal{U}}}, \quad (6.19)$$

where $g_{\mathbb{H}^3}$ and $g_{N_{\mathbb{H}^3/\mathcal{U}}}$ are metrics on $T\mathbb{H}^3$ and $N_{\mathbb{H}^3/\mathcal{U}}$, respectively. Since $g_{N_{\mathbb{H}^3/\mathcal{U}}} \in \Gamma(\text{Sym}^2(N_{\mathbb{H}^3/\mathcal{U}}^\vee))$, a section of the second symmetric power of the conormal bundle $N_{\mathbb{H}^3/\mathcal{U}}^\vee$, we can always choose a local coordinate such that its only component is -1 , as it is time-like, and hence $\det g_{\mathcal{U}} = -\det g_{\mathbb{H}^3}$. From (6.18), we have a decomposition of a connection \tilde{A} on a vector bundle on \mathcal{U} as

$$s_\pi^* \tilde{A} = A_{\mathbb{H}^3} + \phi dx^\perp, \quad (6.20)$$

with s_π is a section of $\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^3$, and $A_{\mathbb{H}^3}$ and ϕ denote the components of \tilde{A} along \mathbb{H}^3 and x^\perp , a local coordinate normal to \mathbb{H}^3 . Since we take \mathcal{U} as an \mathbb{R}_+ -fibration over \mathbb{H}^3 , the normal direction is \mathbb{R}_+ whose local coordinate is x^\perp . On the other hand, the self-duality equation is⁴⁸

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{F} &= \tilde{F}_{\rho'\sigma'} dx^{\rho'} \wedge dx^{\sigma'} = (\star_{\mathcal{U}} \tilde{F}) = \tilde{F}_{\mu\nu} \star_{\mathcal{U}} dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{|\det g_{\mathcal{U}}|} g_{\mathcal{U}}^{\mu\mu'} g_{\mathcal{U}}^{\nu\nu'} \varepsilon_{\mu'\nu'\rho'\sigma'} \tilde{F}_{\mu\nu} dx^{\rho'} \wedge dx^{\sigma'}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.21)$$

Assuming that \tilde{A} is x^\perp -independent (i.e. dilatation-invariant) $\tilde{F}_{ix^\perp} = D_i \phi$, and we get

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\mathbb{H}^3 ij} &= \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ijkx^\perp} \sqrt{\det g_{\mathbb{H}^3}} g_{\mathcal{U}}^{kl} g_{\mathcal{U}}^{x^\perp x^\perp} \tilde{F}_{lx^\perp} + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ijx^\perp k} \sqrt{\det g_{\mathbb{H}^3}} g_{\mathcal{U}}^{x^\perp x^\perp} g_{\mathcal{U}}^{lk} \tilde{F}_{x^\perp l} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{x^\perp ijk} \sqrt{\det g_{\mathbb{H}^3}} g_{\mathcal{U}}^{kl} g_{\mathcal{U}}^{x^\perp x^\perp} \tilde{F}_{lx^\perp} - \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{x^\perp ijk} \sqrt{\det g_{\mathbb{H}^3}} g_{\mathcal{U}}^{x^\perp x^\perp} g_{\mathcal{U}}^{lk} \tilde{F}_{lx^\perp} \\ &= \sqrt{\det g_{\mathbb{H}^3}} \varepsilon_{ij}{}^k D_k \phi = (\star_{\mathbb{H}^3} D\phi)_{ij}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.22)$$

where $F_{\mathbb{H}^3} := dA_{\mathbb{H}^3} + A_{\mathbb{H}^3} \wedge A_{\mathbb{H}^3}$ and in the last line, we have used $g_{\mathcal{U}}^{x^\perp x^\perp} = -1$. Comparing to (3.1), we see that the dilatation-invariant self-dual instantons on \mathcal{U} give the Bogomolny equation on \mathbb{H}^3 .

Under the \mathbb{R}_+ -quotient, we arrive at the following double fibration

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}} & \\ \mu \swarrow & & \searrow \nu \\ \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3} & & \mathbb{H}^3 \end{array}. \quad (6.23)$$

⁴⁸To avoid cluttering, we avoid using $s_\pi^* \tilde{A}$. Everything involving gauge potential $s_\pi^* \tilde{A}$ should be understood as $\tilde{A} \circ s_\pi$.

with $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}} \simeq \mathbb{P}S(\mathcal{U})/\mathbb{R}_+$, and by abuse of notation, we have used the same notation for the projection maps as is used for the case of instantons in diagram (6.9).

Remark 6.1 (Bundle of Self-Dual Two Forms on the Minkowski Space). We emphasize that the bundle of self-dual two-forms on the Minkowski space is not real and hence there could not be any real self-dual two-form on the Minkowski space. In particular no real solution to the self-duality equation on the Minkowski space exists. To get such real solutions, one has to impose certain reality conditions on complex solutions, as was implemented by Murray and Singer [17, §3.3] and we briefly reminded in [The Reality Condition](#) in §3.2.2. \square

With the relation (6.16), the decomposition (6.20), and the double fibration (6.23) at hand, we can easily deduce the properties of hyperbolic monopoles. These are done in §6.1.3.

6.1.3 Masses, Charges, and Spectral Data from Six Dimensions

Let us explain how to recover the masses, charges, and spectral data of hyperbolic monopoles from six dimensions.

Masses and Charges from Six Dimensions. Having the six-dimensional gauge field \mathcal{A} , we can define a self-dual gauge field on \mathcal{U} using (6.16), and then decompose it using (6.20), where both $A_{\mathbb{H}^3}$ and ϕ are x^\perp -independent. Hence, we can identify

$$A_{\mathbb{H}^3} = ((s_\pi \circ s_{\mathcal{U}})^* \mathcal{A})_{\mathbb{H}^3}, \quad \phi = ((s_\pi \circ s_{\mathcal{U}})^* \mathcal{A})_{x^\perp}, \quad (6.24)$$

where $s_\pi : \mathbb{H}^3 \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ is a section of the \mathbb{R}_+ projection, and the subscripts denote the components of $s_{\mathcal{U}}^* \mathcal{A}$ along those directions.

The definition of charges of a hyperbolic G -monopole, where $\mathfrak{g} = \text{Lie}(G)$ in (6.4), with the maximal symmetry-breaking pattern is given in (3.14). From (6.24), we have

$$m_i = \omega_i(2 \star_{S_\infty^2} F_{\mathbb{H}^3}|_{S_\infty^2}), \quad i = 1, \dots, \text{rk}(\mathfrak{g}), \quad (6.25)$$

and $F_{\mathbb{H}^3}$ is given explicitly in terms of \mathcal{A} as

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\mathbb{H}^3} &:= dA_{\mathbb{H}^3} + A_{\mathbb{H}^3} \wedge A_{\mathbb{H}^3} \\ &= d((s_\pi \circ s_{\mathcal{U}})^* \mathcal{A})_{\mathbb{H}^3} + ((s_\pi \circ s_{\mathcal{U}})^* \mathcal{A})_{\mathbb{H}^3} \wedge ((s_\pi \circ s_{\mathcal{U}})^* \mathcal{A})_{\mathbb{H}^3}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.26)$$

Recall that ω_i s are the set of fundamental weights of \mathfrak{g} .

On the other hand, the masses of a hyperbolic G -monopole are defined in (3.17). We can thus identify the masses of the hyperbolic monopoles as

$$p_i = \omega_i \left((s_\pi \circ s_{\mathcal{U}})^* \mathcal{A} \Big|_{S_\infty^2} \right), \quad i = 1, \dots, \text{rk}(\mathfrak{g}). \quad (6.27)$$

We thus successfully expressed the masses and charges of hyperbolic G -monopoles very explicitly from six dimensions.

Remark 6.2 (The Choice of Gauge Lie Algebra for 6d hCS Theory). We still need to specify the gauge Lie algebra of 6d theory in (6.4), which through the above procedure gives the gauge group $SU(n)$ for the hyperbolic monopole. From (6.24), we see that the natural choice is $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{su}(n)$. However, the 6d hCS is naturally formulated using a complex Lie algebra. Hence, $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}(n, \mathbb{C})$ is the natural candidate. We have explained in Remark 6.1 that some reality conditions must be imposed to make real solutions possible. Imposing the reality conditions leaves us with the real forms of $\mathfrak{sl}(n, \mathbb{C})$, which are either the compact real form $\mathfrak{su}(n)$, or the split (i.e. noncompact) real form $\mathfrak{sl}(n, \mathbb{R})$. The compactness of the gauge group follows from the charge quantization [169]. The latter, through the Dirac quantization condition, is connected to the existence of monopoles [128, 129]. Hence, there are no magnetic monopole solutions for non-compact gauge groups. We are thus left with the only possibility for the gauge group of the hyperbolic monopole which is $SU(n)$ whose gauge Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(n)$ is the compact real form of the gauge Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}(n, \mathbb{C})$ of the 6d hCS theory. See also Remark 6.7 \square

The next task is to work out the spectral data, which we do next.

Spectral Data from Six Dimensions. Let us finally explain how to recover the spectral data of a hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopole from six dimensions. Let $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}S(\mathcal{U})$ be a holomorphic vector bundle equipped with a holomorphic structure $\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{W}} = \bar{\partial} + \mathcal{A}$, where \mathcal{A} is a solution to the equations of motion (6.15) of the 6d hCS theory. By Corollary 6.1, we can choose a section $s_{\mathcal{U}} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}S(\mathcal{U})$ and define the corresponding bundle on \mathcal{U} by

$$\tilde{V} := s_{\mathcal{U}}^* \mathcal{W}, \quad (6.28)$$

with a self-dual connection as (6.16). Furthermore, from (3.62), we can define the corresponding bundles $\tilde{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^3$ as

$$\tilde{E} := s_{\pi}^* \tilde{V} = (s_{\pi} \circ s_{\mathcal{U}})^* \mathcal{W}. \quad (6.29)$$

It is equipped with a connection and Higgs field that by (6.20) are given in (6.24). This is essentially what one needs to construct the spectral data of hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopole. Let us briefly summarize the construction of the spectral data

- (1) We first impose boundary conditions, as explained in [Boundary Conditions](#) in §3.2.2.
- (2) By the breaking of gauge invariance near S_{∞}^2 as $SU(n) \rightarrow U(1)^{n-1}$, from (3.66), the bundle (6.29) would have a direct-sum decomposition

$$\tilde{E} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \tilde{E}_i, \quad (6.30)$$

where each one-dimensional bundle E_i is given by (3.67) and as such is determined by the Higgs field (6.24).

(3) From these bundles, one can define bundles

$$E^\pm = \pi_\pm^* \tilde{E}, \quad (6.31)$$

with π_\pm are given in (3.73), which in turn, by the virtue of (3.79), will have the decompositions

$$E_i^+ = \pi_+^* \left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^i \tilde{E}_{n-j+1} \right), \quad E_i^- = \pi_-^* \left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^i \tilde{E}_j \right). \quad (6.32)$$

By Theorem 3.1, these subbundles sit in filtrations

$$0 \simeq E_0^\pm \subset E_1^\pm \subset \dots \subset E_{n-1}^\pm \subset E_n^\pm \simeq E^\pm. \quad (6.33)$$

Note that we have to impose boundary conditions to be able to use Theorem 3.1.

(4) One can then define the i^{th} spectral curve S_i , using (3.88), as the divisor of the map

$$\det E_i^- \rightarrow \det E^+ / E_{n-1}^+, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (6.34)$$

which defines the spectral data of a generic monopole by the definition given in Spectral Data in §3.2.3.

(5) The spectral curves, by construction, would recover the monopole solution by what we have explained in §3.2.3.

One can thus reconstruct the spectral data of hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopoles from six dimensions. With this result, we conclude our construction of hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopole from the 6d hCS theory.

6.2 Generalized CPM from Six Dimensions

In this section, we discuss the other side of the hyperbolic monopole/gCPM correspondence. Based on discussions in §5, we explain how gCPM can be realized from the viewpoint of 6d hCS theory.

From (6.5) and (6.8), we consider the following double fibration

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^4) & \\ \pi_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{R}^4}} \swarrow & & \searrow \pi_{\mathbb{R}^4} \\ \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{R}^4} & & \mathbb{R}^4 \end{array}, \quad (6.35)$$

where $\pi_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{R}^4}}$ is trivial in this case since $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^4) \simeq \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{R}^4}$ with $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{R}^4}$ being the twistor space of \mathbb{R}^4 . From this, we would perform the following steps: We consider the 6d hCS theory on the $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^4) \simeq \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{R}^4}$. These spaces have many equivalent descriptions. We take the description $\mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$, where the projection is holomorphic. We explain how the integration over an \mathbb{R}^2 plane (or rather its compactification to a 2-torus) inside $\mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ will result in the 4d

holomorphic BF (hBF) theory on $\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. The latter theory would reduce to the 4d CS on $\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ in the limit of the small volume of the torus. We use a specific holomorphic volume form Ω on $\mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, which will coincide with the one-form $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ given in (5.41). Based on our discussion in §5, we recover the gCPM from this description of the 4d CS theory, hence from six dimensions.

Twistor Space of \mathbb{R}^4 . We have $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^4) = \mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ as a smooth manifold [7, §4, pg. 438, Example 1]. Topologically, $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{R}^4}$ can be considered as \mathbb{P}^3 from which a line is removed,⁴⁹ hence $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{R}^4} \simeq \mathbb{P}^3 \setminus \mathbb{P}^1$. $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{R}^4}$ can also be thought of as the total space of the fibration $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{R}^4} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ where the map is given by the projection onto the second factor. Since \mathbb{R}^4 is a hyper-Kähler manifold, it admits a \mathbb{P}^1 -worth of complex structures, which is the \mathbb{P}^1 factor in $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{R}^4}$, i.e. a complex structure on \mathbb{R}^4 is given by a point in \mathbb{P}^1 . An almost complex structure on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{R}^4}$ is given by a pair $(\mathcal{J}_z, \mathcal{J})$, where \mathcal{J}_z is the particular complex structure associated to a point $z \in \mathbb{P}^1$ and \mathcal{J} is the standard complex structure on \mathbb{P}^1 in which z is a holomorphic coordinate. One can then use the Newlander–Nirenberg theorem to show that this is integrable and indeed defines a complex structure on $\mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ with respect to which $\mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ is holomorphic. Another description of $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{R}^4}$ is as the total space of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$.

The Choice of Sections of Canonical Bundle. We will see that the section Ω of canonical bundle in (6.4) will take the following form

$$\Omega = \Omega(z) \, dw_1 \wedge dw_2 \wedge dz , \tag{6.36}$$

with $\Omega(z)$ a function of only z , which we will identify its form. To connect to the 4d CS theory, certain assumptions are needed and then this form will be dictated and there is not much freedom in choosing it. To have a well-defined action (6.4), the integrated should be invariant under the projective transformations of either number of holomorphic coordinates, a condition that is automatically satisfied since $\Omega \wedge \text{CS}(\mathcal{A})$ is a differential form. We only demand it to be locally nonvanishing (i.e. on an open set), not having a pole, and also closed. As we will see below, $\Omega(z)$ would be identified with $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$, given in (5.23) or (5.41), and as such is locally nonvanishing and closed top-degree holomorphic form and a well-defined section of the canonical bundle of $\mathbb{P}S(M)$.

6.2.1 4d Holomorphic BF Theory from 6d Chern–Simons Theory

As one of the main ingredients of our arguments is the dimensional reduction of the 6d hCS theory along a plane, let us briefly explain how the procedure will always give rise to the 4d holomorphic BF (hBF) theory in the orthogonal directions. The hBF theories have been introduced in [170] and have been further studied in [171, 172].

⁴⁹Recall from §A that the twistor space of S^4 is \mathbb{P}^3 . To get to \mathbb{R}^4 , one needs to remove the point at infinity from S^4 , which corresponds to removing the corresponding line \mathbb{P}^1 from \mathbb{P}^3 .

Consider the 6d hCS theory on $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^4) = \mathbb{R}_{w_1}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_{w_2}^2 \times \mathbb{P}_z^1$, where the subscripts show the holomorphic coordinates along the corresponding directions, the integrand of (6.4) can be written as

$$\Omega \wedge \text{CS}(\mathcal{A}) = (\Omega \wedge d\bar{w}_1 \wedge d\bar{w}_2 \wedge d\bar{z}) \text{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathcal{A}_{\bar{w}_1} \partial_{\bar{w}_2} \mathcal{A}_{\bar{z}} - \mathcal{A}_{\bar{z}} \partial_{\bar{w}_2} \mathcal{A}_{\bar{w}_1} + 2\mathcal{A}_{\bar{w}_2} \mathcal{F}_{\bar{z}\bar{w}_1}), \quad (6.37)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{\bar{z}\bar{w}_1} = \partial_{\bar{z}} \mathcal{A}_{\bar{w}_1} - \partial_{\bar{w}_1} \mathcal{A}_{\bar{z}} + [\mathcal{A}_{\bar{z}}, \mathcal{A}_{\bar{w}_1}]$, and we have performed some integration by parts, and have used (see Remark 6.6 for more details)

$$\partial_{\bar{z}} \Omega = 0 = \partial_{\bar{w}_1} \Omega, \quad (6.38)$$

which follows from (6.36) and our assumption that $\Omega(z)$ does not have a pole, and some properties of $\text{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}}$. We would like to integrate over the $\mathbb{R}_{w_2}^2$ part of the fiber of the fibration $\mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$. First notice that the 6d theory does not depend on the choice of a metric and only a complex structure. To integrate over the fiber, we first compactify $\mathbb{R}_{w_2}^2$ to a torus T^2 and choose a metric of the form

$$g_{\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^4)} = g_{T^2} \oplus g_{\mathbb{R}_{w_1}^2} \oplus g_{\mathbb{P}_z^1}. \quad (6.39)$$

The metric must be compatible with the chosen complex structure \mathcal{J}_z associated with $z \in \mathbb{P}^1$. It is always possible to choose such a metric on $\mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. For a complex structure

$$\mathcal{J}_z = \mathbf{i}(\partial_z \otimes dz - \partial_{\bar{z}} \otimes d\bar{z}) \oplus \mathbf{i} \sum_{i=1}^2 (\partial_{w_i} \otimes dw_i - \partial_{\bar{w}_i} \otimes d\bar{w}_i), \quad (6.40)$$

it is easy to see that the metric

$$ds_{\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^4)}^2 = (g_{z\bar{z}} dz \otimes d\bar{z}) \oplus \sum_{i=1}^2 g_{w_i \bar{w}_i} dw_i \otimes d\bar{w}_i, \quad (6.41)$$

for some functions $g_{z\bar{z}}$ and $g_{w_i \bar{w}_i}$, which in principle could depend on all of the coordinates $(z, \bar{z}, w_i, \bar{w}_i)$, is clearly compatible with the complex structure (6.40).

Remark 6.3. For the purpose of integration, it does not matter whether we think of $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^4)$ as a complex manifold or a smooth real manifold. We only need to keep the complex structure of $\mathbb{P}^1 \subset \mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^4)$. We think of it as a smooth real manifold isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ where \mathbb{R}^4 is equipped with a specific complex structure explained in Remark 6.4.

Remark 6.4 (The Choice of Complex Structure on $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^4)$). In the above construction, we have used a specific complex structure on $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^4)$ in which w_1 and w_2 are holomorphic. As we will explain in the proof of Proposition 6.2, the complex structure needs to be a very specific one, the one defined in (6.75). More specifically, the coordinates (w_1, w_2) must coincide with coordinates (x_E^+, x_E^-) defined in (6.75). This is mandatory to be able to use the result discussed in §6.3.1. As it will be clear, the construction does not have much freedom and indeed is very rigid.

As we would like to perform a dimensional reduction, we will assume that all fields and also $\Omega = \Omega(z, w_1, w_2)dw_1 \wedge dw_2 \wedge dz$ are (w_2, \bar{w}_2) -independent. We choose the metric g_{T^2} judiciously such that (1) it is only a function of (w_2, \bar{w}_2) and (2) $\text{Vol}(T^2) \rightarrow 0$ in the IR limit. Then, the first term inside the trace in (6.37) vanishes and by integrating over (w_2, \bar{w}_2) , we arrive at the action of the hBF theory on $\mathbb{R}_{w_1}^2 \times \mathbb{P}_z^1$

$$S = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1} \text{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}}(B^{(2,0)} \wedge F^{(0,2)}) , \quad (6.42)$$

with the following field redefinition ($w_1 \rightarrow w$)

$$\begin{aligned} B^{(2,0)} &:= \text{Vol}(T^2)\Omega(z, w)dz \wedge \mathcal{A}_{\bar{w}_2}dw , \\ F^{(0,2)} &:= \mathcal{F}_{\bar{w}\bar{z}}d\bar{w} \wedge d\bar{z} . \end{aligned} \quad (6.43)$$

We now explain how this action can be recovered from the action of the 4d CS theory.

Remark 6.5. In principle, we could have chosen a more general form of Ω which depends on w_2 . This would not affect the analysis drastically. The only difference would have been that integration of $\mathbb{R}_{w_2}^2$ would produce a prefactor $c \times \text{Vol}(T^2)$, for some finite constant c , instead of $\text{Vol}(T^2)$. This constant can always be reabsorbed in the field redefinition of four-dimensional fields. However, one can argue that Ω should not depend on w_2 . By (6.38) and Remark 6.6 below, Ω should not have a pole, and furthermore it should not have a zero, as Ω should be nonzero on an open set. This will reduce the possibilities to two cases: (1) Either one needs to impose appropriate boundary conditions at the location of poles of Ω ; or (2) Assume independence from w_1, w_2 , and z . As we will see, it is enough for us to take Ω to be independent of w_1 and w_2 . We will realize in §6.2.2 that connection to the 4d CS theory implies that Ω cannot be independent of z but (5.43) comes to the rescue. See in particular Remark 6.6.

6.2.2 Emergence of 4d Chern–Simons Theory

The theory (6.42) is not immediately connected to the 4d CS theory. However, the latter reduces to (6.42) in the appropriate limit, as we will now explain.

Consider the action (5.1) and the connection $A = A_w dw + A_{\bar{w}} d\bar{w} + A_{\bar{z}} d\bar{z}$. The integrated multiplied with $\text{Vol}(T^2)$, after some integration by parts, can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \omega \wedge \text{CS}(A) &= 2\text{Vol}(T^2)\text{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\omega \wedge (A_w dw) \wedge (F_{\bar{w}\bar{z}} d\bar{w} d\bar{z})) \\ &\quad + 2\text{Vol}(T^2)\text{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\omega \wedge (A_{\bar{z}} \partial_w A_{\bar{w}}) d\bar{z} \wedge dw \wedge d\bar{w}) \\ &= \text{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}}(B \wedge F) + 2\text{Vol}(T^2)\text{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\omega \wedge (A_{\bar{z}} \partial_w A_{\bar{w}}) d\bar{z} \wedge dw \wedge d\bar{w}) , \end{aligned} \quad (6.44)$$

where we have introduced the following field redefinitions

$$B := 2\text{Vol}(T^2)\omega \wedge A_w dw , \quad F := F_{\bar{w}\bar{z}} d\bar{w} d\bar{z} . \quad (6.45)$$

If we now send $\text{Vol}(T^2) \rightarrow 0$, we see that the second term of (6.44) drops out and the first term can be identified with (6.42) provided that we assume $\Omega(z, w) = \Omega(z)$ and

$$\Omega(z)dz = \omega(z)dz, \quad (6.46)$$

which in turn, using (6.43), will give the following identifications

$$B = B^{(0,2)}, \quad F = F^{(0,2)}. \quad (6.47)$$

By comparing (6.43) and (6.45), the fields of the 4d and 6d hCS theories can be identified as

$$2A_w = \mathcal{A}_{\bar{w}_2}, \quad F_{\bar{w}\bar{z}} = \mathcal{F}_{\bar{w}\bar{z}}. \quad (6.48)$$

Note that $(\text{Vol}(T^2))^{1/2}$ behaves like the scale of the effective field theory. The above computation shows that in the deep IR when $\text{Vol}(T^2) \rightarrow 0$, the effective theory is the 4d hBF theory while if we keep $\text{Vol}(T^2)$ small but finite, the effective theory is the 4d CS theory.

We still need to make contact with the gCPM. From (6.46), this is achieved by setting

$$\Omega(z)dz = \omega(z)dz = \omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}, \quad (6.49)$$

where the latter is given in (5.41). Recall from (5.43) that $\partial_{\bar{z}}\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} = 0$, and it is perfectly fine to identify it with $\Omega(z)$ due to (6.38). We thus see that, at the finite scale of effective field theory set by the volume of extra dimensions of $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^4)$, the action of the 6d hCS theory on $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^4)$ reduces to the following action of 4d CS theory on $\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1$

$$S = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1} \omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} \wedge \text{CS}(A), \quad (6.50)$$

with the identification (6.49) of 4d and 6d fields. Hence, by what we have explained in §5, this reduction realizes the discrete integrable-model side of the hyperbolic monopole/gCPM correspondence.

Remark 6.6 (The Importance of $\partial_{\bar{z}}\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} = 0$). The identification (6.49) shows the importance of (5.43), which is two-fold:

- **Potential Breaking of the Gauge Invariance.** One of the main concerns of [166, 168] was the danger of potential breaking of the gauge invariance at the location of poles of Ω . This is due to the fact that by performing the gauge transformation $\mathcal{A} + \bar{\partial}\alpha$, for some \mathfrak{g} -valued function α , the first term of (6.2) transforms as

$$\text{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathcal{A}\bar{\partial}\mathcal{A}) \mapsto \text{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathcal{A}\bar{\partial}\mathcal{A}) + \text{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\bar{\partial}\alpha \wedge \bar{\partial}\mathcal{A}). \quad (6.51)$$

By performing an integration by parts, the second term leads to $\bar{\partial}\Omega \wedge \alpha \wedge \bar{\partial}\mathcal{A}$. Arguments similar to what we have presented in §5.1.3 show that if Ω has a pole, then $\bar{\partial}\Omega$ is proportional to (possibly a derivative of) delta functions. This can potentially lead to the breaking of gauge invariance. In our case, the identification (6.49) and (5.43) guarantee that there are no contributions of this sort and the gauge invariance is preserved.

- **Peculiarity of gCPM.** One may naively think that the reductions from the 6d hCS to the 4d CS can be done such that the resulting theory describes other integrable models studied in [107] and possibly relate it to an integrable field theory. However, this is not possible precisely because of (5.43). In the case of other integrable spin models, $\partial_{\bar{z}}\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ gives a (possibly derivative of) delta function $\delta^{(2)}(z, \bar{z})$ [107, §9.1], and as a result, we cannot simply identify it with Ω , and in turn, we cannot apply the argument of reducing the 6d hCS theory to the 4d CS theory. This provides another explanation of the peculiarity of the gCPM. See also Remark 5.2.

These arguments demonstrate the essentiality of the relation (5.43). □

Remark 6.7 (The Choice of Gauge Lie Algebra for 6d hCS Theory). We still need to specify the gauge Lie algebra of the 6d theory in (6.4). Based on our discussion in §5.1.3, the natural choice of the gauge Lie algebra for the 4d CS theory is $\mathfrak{sl}(n, \mathbb{C})$. This naturally descends from the 6d hCS theory with the gauge algebra $\mathfrak{sl}(n, \mathbb{C})$. Recall from Remark 6.2 that we had to impose reality condition to get instanton solutions on the Minkowski space. Here, we do not need to impose such a reality condition and hence the gauge algebra of the 4d CS theory will be $\mathfrak{sl}(n, \mathbb{C})$. □

Remark 6.8 (No Parameters Corresponding to Masses of Higgs Fields in gCPM). In the gCPM side of the correspondence, there are no parameters corresponding to the boundary values $\{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ of the Higgs field. Recall that at the boundary sphere S_∞^2 , the gauge invariance breaks as $SU(n) \rightarrow U(1)^{n-1}$, due to the VEV of the Higgs field, which is an adjoint-valued scalar field emerges by reduction from 4d to 3d. These parameters deform the theory. However, there is no scalar field in the 6d and 4d CS theories for which we can turn on background VEV. It is not possible to give a background VEV to a gauge field as it breaks gauge invariance, which we do not want to do. This explains why there are no parameters corresponding to the masses of the Higgs fields in the gCPM. □

Remark 6.9 (No Reality Condition on the Data). We have seen two types of reality conditions one needs to impose on the data of hyperbolic monopoles (1) the reality condition to have real solutions of the Bogomolny equation (see [The Reality Condition](#) in §3.2.2), and (2) And the reality of spectral curves in $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}^3}$, in the sense of (3.92). Both of these reality conditions are absent in the gCPM side of the correspondence since we start from the 6d hCS theory on a different space $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^4)$ and compare it to the 6d hCS theory on $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^{1,3})$ that gives rise to the hyperbolic monopole side of the correspondence. In particular, the curve of the spectral parameter of the gCPM is a complex and not real curve.

6.3 The Correspondence from Ten Dimensions

Up to now, we have established that the two sides of the hyperbolic monopole/gCPM correspondence are described in terms of the 6d hCS theory on $\mathbb{P}S(M)$, where M is the Minkowski space $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ (or the open subset $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^{1,3}$) in the monopole side and the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^4 in the gCPM side. In this section, we explain how these two sides can be unified in ten-dimensional physics.

The basic idea is clear: $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ and \mathbb{R}^4 can both be realized as real slices of the complexified Minkowski spacetime, which we denote as $\mathbb{C}^{1,3}$. This space is simply \mathbb{C}^4 equipped with the Minkowski quadratic pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \mathbb{C}^{1,3} \times \mathbb{C}^{1,3} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$

$$\langle x, y \rangle := -x_0 y_0 + \sum_{i=1}^3 x_i y_i, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{C}^{1,3}. \quad (6.52)$$

It has a projective spinor bundle $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3}) \simeq \mathbb{C}^{1,3} \times \mathbb{P}^1$ of dimension $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})) = 5$ and sits in a double fibration

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3}) & \\ \pi_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{C}^{1,3}}} \swarrow & & \searrow \pi_{\mathbb{C}^{1,3}} \\ \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{C}^{1,3}} & & \mathbb{C}^{1,3} \end{array}, \quad (6.53)$$

where $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{C}^{1,3}} \simeq \mathbb{P}^3 \setminus \mathbb{P}^1$ is the twistor space of $\mathbb{C}^{1,3}$. $\pi_{\mathbb{C}^{1,3}}$ is simply projection to the spacetime points while $\pi_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{C}^{1,3}}}$ imposes the incidence relation (see below (6.6)).

Inclusion of $\mathbb{P}S(M)$ in $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$. The most obvious real slice is that of $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$, which can be included in $\mathbb{C}^{1,3}$ as

$$\iota_{\mathbb{R}^{1,3}}(x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3) = (x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3), \quad (6.54)$$

while \mathbb{R}^4 can be included as

$$\iota_{\mathbb{R}^4}(x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3) = (ix_0, x_1, x_2, x_3). \quad (6.55)$$

Consider the following diagram with $M = \mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ or \mathbb{R}^4

$$\begin{array}{ccc} i_M^* \mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3}) & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3}) \\ \pi_M \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi_{\mathbb{C}^{1,3}} \\ M & \xrightarrow{i_M} & \mathbb{C}^{1,3} \end{array}, \quad (6.56)$$

The fiber of $i_M^* \mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$ at a point $x \in M$ is simply the fiber over its image in $\mathbb{C}^{1,3}$. From what we explained below (6.6), we see that this fiber is just a projective spinor. Hence, $i_M^* \mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$ can be identified with $\mathbb{P}S(M)$. We can thus include $\mathbb{P}S(M) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$.

6.3.1 6d hCS Theory from 10d hCS Theory

We would like to identify a 10d theory on $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$ which reduces to the 6d hCS theory on $\mathbb{P}S(M)$ upon dimensional reduction. The basic idea is again clear from [173, pg. 34, Lemma 7.1.1] where the following is proven: The dimensional reduction of the hCS on \mathbb{C}^5 to any $\mathbb{C}^k \subset \mathbb{C}^5$ gives the hCS theory on \mathbb{C}^k , where the starting theory on \mathbb{C}^5 had been worked out by Baulieu [174]. The BV action of the hCS on \mathbb{C}^k is given by

$$S = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{C}^k |^{5-k}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{5-k} d\epsilon_i \wedge \prod_{j=1}^k dw_j \right) \wedge \text{CS}(\mathcal{A}), \quad (6.57)$$

with $\text{CS}(\mathcal{A})$ is the same as (6.2). Here, w_1, \dots, w_k are coordinates along \mathbb{C}^k , ϵ_i s are odd variables keeping track of the cohomological degree of the fields in the BV quantization, and $\mathcal{A} \in \Omega^{0,*}(\mathbb{C}^k|^{5-k}) \otimes \mathfrak{gl}(n, \mathbb{C})[1]$, where [1] means the shift in the cohomological degrees. One substitute \mathcal{A} , expanded in polynomials of ϵ_i , in (6.57) and picks up only the term in $\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{5-k} \Omega^{0,k}(\mathbb{C}^k)$.

However, we cannot directly use this result since $\mathbb{P}\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$ is not, strictly speaking, a copy of \mathbb{C}^5 . Instead, we prove the following

Lemma 6.1. Consider the hCS theory with gauge Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} on X with $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} X = 5$, and let Y be a holomorphically-embedded submanifold of X of $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} Y = k$. Then, the dimensional reduction of the hCS theory from X to Y gives the hCS theory on Y .

Proof. The basic idea is the same as loc. cit. We consider the dimensional reduction of the field content of the theory. The BV field content of hCS on X is given by

$$\mathcal{A}_X^{\text{BV}} \in \Omega^{(0,*)}(X) \otimes \mathfrak{g}[1]. \quad (6.58)$$

Consider the holomorphic embedding $\iota : Y \rightarrow X$. If we equip X with a metric g_X compatible with its complex structure \mathcal{J}_X , we would have

$$\iota^* T^{*(0,1)} X = T^{*(0,1)} Y \oplus N_{Y/X}^{\vee(0,1)}, \quad (6.59)$$

where $N_{Y/X}^{\vee(0,1)}$ is the anti-holomorphic conormal bundle of Y in X . This means $\bigwedge^* (\iota^* T^{*(0,1)} X)$ is the bundle

$$\left(\bigoplus_{n=0}^5 \bigoplus_{p=0}^k \bigoplus_{n-p=0}^{5-k} \bigwedge^p T^{*(0,1)} Y \bigwedge^{n-p} N_{Y/X}^{\vee} \right) \otimes \mathfrak{g}[1]. \quad (6.60)$$

Therefore, by identifying the anti-holomorphic conormal directions as $d\bar{v}_i \sim \epsilon_i$, $i = 1, \dots, 5-k$, where \bar{v}_i s are those of \bar{w}_i s that are normal to Y . Then, (6.60) gives a general field on Y as a section of the bundle

$$\left(\bigoplus_{n=0}^5 \bigoplus_{p=0}^k \bigoplus_{n-p=0}^{5-k} \bigwedge^p T^{*(0,1)} Y \bigwedge^{n-p} \mathbb{C}^{0|5-k} \right) \otimes \mathfrak{g}[1], \quad (6.61)$$

where $\mathbb{C}^{0|5-k}$ is a trivial vector bundle over X with purely $(5-k)$ -dimensional odd fibers, generated by odd variables $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{5-k}$. The space of sections of this bundle can thus be identified with $\Omega^{0,*}(Y^{k|5-k}) \otimes \mathfrak{g}[1]$, where $Y^{k|5-k}$ is the split supermanifold $Y \times \mathbb{C}^{0|5-k}$. The latter is the field content of hCS theory on Y with the action

$$S_Y = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{Y^{k|5-k}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{5-k} d\epsilon_i \wedge \Omega_Y \right) \wedge \text{CS}(\mathcal{A}_Y^{\text{BV}}), \quad (6.62)$$

where Ω_Y is a section of the canonical bundle of Y , $\text{CS}(\mathcal{A}_Y^{\text{BV}})$ is given by (6.2), and $\mathcal{A}_Y^{\text{BV}}$ can be expressed in terms of $\mathcal{A}_X^{\text{BV}}$. Recall that $\mathcal{A}_X^{\text{BV}}$ is the following formal sum

$$\mathcal{A}_X^{\text{BV}} = \sum_{p=0}^5 \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_p=1}^5 \frac{1}{p!} \mathcal{A}_{X, \bar{w}_{i_1} \dots \bar{w}_{i_p}}^{\text{BV}, (p)} d\bar{w}_{i_1} \dots d\bar{w}_{i_p}, \quad (6.63)$$

then $\mathcal{A}_Y^{\text{BV}}$ is determined by the identification $d\bar{v}_i \simeq \epsilon_i$, where (v_1, v_2) are normal directions to Y . For example, the one-form part of $\mathcal{A}_Y^{\text{BV}}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{A}_Y^{(1),\text{BV}} = \mathcal{A}_{Y,\bar{w}_i}^{(1),\text{BV}} d\bar{w}_i = \left(\mathcal{A}_{X,\bar{w}_i\bar{v}_1\bar{v}_2}^{(3),\text{BV}} \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 + \sum_{j=1}^2 \mathcal{A}_{X,\bar{w}_i\bar{v}_j}^{(2),\text{BV}} \epsilon_j + \mathcal{A}_{X,\bar{w}_i}^{(1),\text{BV}} \right) d\bar{w}_i, \quad (6.64)$$

where $\mathcal{A}_Y^{(1),\text{BV}}$ denotes the one-form part of the BV fields on Y . This completes the proof. \square

The case we are interested in is the following:

$$X = \mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3}), \quad Y = \mathbb{P}S(M), \quad M = \mathbb{R}^{1,3}, \mathbb{R}^4, \quad k = 3. \quad (6.65)$$

Note that (6.59) is true if and only if Y is a holomorphically-embedded submanifold of X . Hence, we first need to show that $\mathbb{P}S(M)$ can be holomorphically embedded in $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$. The following proposition is the proof of this fact

Proposition 6.2. Let $\mathbb{P}S(M)$ and $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$ be the projective spinor bundles of $M = \mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ or \mathbb{R}^4 , and $\mathbb{C}^{1,3}$, respectively. Then, $\mathbb{P}S(M)$ can be holomorphically embedded in $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$ equipped with a fixed complex structure.

Proof. Consider the inclusion map $\mathcal{I}_M : \mathbb{P}S(M) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$. By what we have explained around (6.6), this is defined by

$$\mathcal{I}_M([x^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}, \lambda_\beta]) := [(\iota_M(x^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}), \lambda_\beta)], \quad (6.66)$$

where ι_M is given by (6.54) or (6.55). Note that

$$\iota_M[x^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}] = \begin{pmatrix} \delta_M x^0 + x^3 & x^1 - \mathbf{i}x^2 \\ x^1 + \mathbf{i}x^2 & \delta_M x^0 - x^3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6.67)$$

with

$$\delta_M = \begin{cases} 1, & M = \mathbb{R}^{1,3}, \\ \mathbf{i}, & M = \mathbb{R}^4. \end{cases} \quad (6.68)$$

To prove the result, we proceed in two steps:

- (1) We first show that the inclusion \mathcal{I}_M realizes $\mathbb{P}S(M)$ as a smooth embedded submanifold of $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$;
- (2) We then show that there is a complex structure on $\mathbb{P}S(M)$ in which the inclusion \mathcal{I}_M is holomorphic.

To prove (1), we need to show that \mathcal{I}_M is a smooth immersion as well as a topological embedding. The tangent space of $\mathbb{P}S(M)$ at the point $[(x^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}, \psi_\beta)]$ is generated

by $\{\partial_{x^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}}, \partial_{\psi_\beta}\}$. Under \mathcal{I}_M , the basis is mapped to the basis $\{\partial_{y^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}}, \partial_{\lambda_\beta}\}$ over the point $[[y^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}], \chi_\beta] = \mathcal{I}_M[[x^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}], \psi_\beta] \in \mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$ with

$$\begin{aligned} y^{1\dot{1}} &= \delta_M x^0 + x^3, & y^{1\dot{2}} &= x^1 - ix^2, \\ y^{2\dot{1}} &= x^1 + ix^2, & y^{2\dot{2}} &= \delta_M x^0 - x^3, \end{aligned} \quad (6.69)$$

and $\chi_\beta = \psi_\beta$. Then, the differential $d\mathcal{I}_M$ maps $\partial_{y^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}} = \delta_M^{-1} \partial_{x^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}}$ for $(\alpha, \dot{\alpha}) = (1, \dot{1}), (2, \dot{2})$ while $\partial_{y^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}} = \partial_{x^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}}$ for $(\alpha, \dot{\alpha}) = (1, \dot{2}), (2, \dot{1})$. This is clearly an injective map. As we move the point $[[x^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}], \psi_\beta]$ around, the map changes smoothly. Hence, \mathcal{I}_M is indeed a smooth immersion. We next need to show that it is a topological embedding, i.e. it is a homeomorphism into its image. (6.66) shows that \mathcal{I}_M is smooth, injective, and surjective into its image with an obvious continuous inverse. Hence, \mathcal{I} is a topological embedding. We thus conclude that $\mathbb{P}S(M)$ is a smooth embedded submanifold of $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$.

To prove (2), we would be constructive and explicitly construct complex structures on $\mathbb{P}S(M)$ and $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$. Note from (6.69) that

$$\begin{aligned} y^{1\dot{1}} &= \frac{1}{2}(1 + \delta_M)x^{1\dot{1}} - \frac{1}{2}(1 - \delta_M)x^{2\dot{2}}, & y^{1\dot{2}} &= x^{1\dot{2}}, \\ y^{2\dot{2}} &= \frac{1}{2}(-1 + \delta_M)x^{1\dot{1}} + \frac{1}{2}(1 + \delta_M)x^{2\dot{2}}, & y^{2\dot{1}} &= x^{2\dot{1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.70)$$

For $M = \mathbb{R}^{1,3}$, we define a complex structure $\mathcal{J}_{\mathbb{C}^{1,3}}$ on $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$ in which the following coordinates are holomorphic:

$$\mathcal{J}_{\mathbb{C}^{1,3}} : \quad \left\{ y_1^\pm := y^{1\dot{1}} \pm iy^{1\dot{2}}, y_2^\pm := y^{2\dot{2}} \pm iy^{2\dot{1}}; \chi_\beta \right\}. \quad (6.71)$$

Note that $y^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}$ s are all complex coordinates and hence y_i^+ and y_i^- are not complex conjugates of each other. We also define a complex structure $\mathcal{J}_{\mathbb{R}^{1,3}}$ on $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^{1,3})$ in which the following coordinates are holomorphic

$$\mathcal{J}_{\mathbb{R}^{1,3}} : \quad \left\{ x_L^+ := x^{1\dot{1}} + ix^{1\dot{2}}, x_L^- := x^{2\dot{2}} - ix^{2\dot{1}}, \psi_\beta \right\}. \quad (6.72)$$

Then

$$(y_1^+, y_1^-, y_2^+, y_2^-; \chi_\beta) = \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{R}^{1,3}}(x_L^+, x_L^-, \psi_\beta) = (x_L^+, 0, 0, x_L^-; \psi_\beta). \quad (6.73)$$

It is evident that the inclusion \mathcal{I}_M is holomorphic in these complex structures.

On the other hand for $M = \mathbb{R}^4$, it follows from (6.69) that

$$y^{1\dot{1}} = \frac{1+i}{2}(x^{1\dot{1}} + ix^{2\dot{2}}), \quad y^{2\dot{2}} = \frac{-1+i}{2}(x^{1\dot{1}} - ix^{2\dot{2}}). \quad (6.74)$$

We define a complex structure $\mathcal{J}_{\mathbb{R}^4}$ on $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^4)$ in which the following coordinates are holomorphic

$$\mathcal{J}_{\mathbb{R}^4} : \quad \left\{ x_E^+ := x^{1\dot{1}} + ix^{2\dot{2}} + \frac{2i}{1+i}x^{1\dot{2}}, x_E^- := -x^{1\dot{1}} + ix^{2\dot{2}} + \frac{2i}{1-i}x^{2\dot{1}}, \psi_\beta \right\}. \quad (6.75)$$

Then in the complex structure on $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$ in which the holomorphic coordinates are (6.71), we have

$$(y_1^+, y_1^-, y_2^+, y_2^-, \chi_\beta) = \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{R}^4}(x_E^+, x_E^-, \chi_\beta) = \left(\frac{1+i}{2}x_E^+, 0, 0, \frac{1-i}{2}x_E^-, \psi_\beta \right), \quad (6.76)$$

It is again evident that $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{R}^4}$ is holomorphic in these complex structures.

We have thus shown that $\mathbb{P}S(M)$ with the complex structure \mathcal{J}_M given in (6.72) or (6.75) can be holomorphically embedded in $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$ with the complex structure $\mathcal{J}_{\mathbb{C}^{1,3}}$ given in (6.71). Hence \mathcal{I}_M is a holomorphic embedding for both $M = \mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ and $M = \mathbb{R}^4$. This concludes the proof. \square

Remark 6.10 (The Relevance of Open-String Field Theory). A B-brane in the B-model topological string theory is supported on a holomorphic submanifold Y of the target X , which is a CY manifold and is represented by the complex of coherent sheaves on Y modulo quasi-isomorphisms. The space of open-string states stretched between branes represented by the complexes \mathcal{B}_1^\bullet and \mathcal{B}_2^\bullet , which determines the field content of the theory living on Y , is given by $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{B}_1^\bullet, \mathcal{B}_2^\bullet)$. For the simplest case of n copies of the structure sheaf of \mathbb{C}^k , $k = 1, \dots, 5$, it is shown in [173, §7.1] that the field content of the theory matches with the field content of the hCS on \mathbb{C}^k . This is the basic idea of the relation between the holomorphic twist of the theory living on the brane and the hCS theory. In our case, $X = \mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3}) = \mathbb{C}^{1,3} \times \mathbb{P}^1$ and $Y = \mathbb{P}S(M)$ with $M = \mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ or \mathbb{R}^4 . As such, $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$ is not a CY manifold, and hence there cannot be a topological B-model onto it. However, the hCS theory on a complex five-dimensional manifold such as $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$ still makes sense, at least classically, which is the point we are using here. Whether the hCS theory on $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$ makes sense quantum-mechanically is not what we would consider in this work. Therefore, the relation of our construction to open-string field theory is not immediately clear. However, recall that the condition of being CY for the target comes from the requirement of conformal invariance of the sigma models into these targets. In the full formulation of string theory, it is expected that the theory can be defined on general backgrounds, including nonconformal ones [175]. In that context, conformal backgrounds are only classical solutions to the string-field-theory equations of motion, and it might be possible to define a topological version of the theory on non-CY targets. \square

With these results at hand, we are now ready to track the origin of the correspondence in ten dimensions.

6.3.2 Chasing the Correspondence to Ten Dimensions

We first would like to see explicitly that the dimensional reduction of the 10d hCS theory on $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$ to $\mathbb{P}S(M)$ gives the 6d hCS theory on $\mathbb{P}S(M)$. This is easy to establish. We only need to substitute (6.64) into (6.62), by which we can explicitly see that, after integration over $\mathbb{C}^{0|2}$ in the split supermanifold $Y^{3|2} = Y \times \mathbb{C}^{0|2}$, the BV action on Y is

given by

$$S_Y = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_Y \Omega_Y \wedge \text{CS}(\mathcal{A}_Y^{(1)}) + \dots, \quad (6.77)$$

where from (6.64), we have the ordinary gauge field $\mathcal{A}_Y^{(1)}$ expressed in terms of 10d fields as

$$\mathcal{A}_Y^{(1)} = \sum_{i=1}^3 \mathcal{A}_{Y, \bar{w}_i} d\bar{w}_i = \sum_{i=1}^3 \left(\mathcal{A}_{X, \bar{w}_i}^{(1), \text{BV}} + \sum_{j=1}^2 \mathcal{A}_{X, \bar{w}_i \bar{v}_j}^{(2), \text{BV}} + \mathcal{A}_{X, \bar{w}_i \bar{v}_1 \bar{v}_2}^{(3), \text{BV}} \right) d\bar{w}_i. \quad (6.78)$$

Note that here \bar{v}_i are not differential-form indices as those directions lie normal to Y . Furthermore, Ω_Y can be expressed in terms of Ω_X by first picking a metric g_X compatible with the complex structure, using which we would have the decomposition (6.59). We then choose two orthonormal sections \mathbf{n}_1 and \mathbf{n}_2 of $N_{Y/X}^{(1,0)}$, the holomorphic normal bundle of Y in X , and define

$$\Omega_Y := \iota_{\mathbf{n}_1} \iota_{\mathbf{n}_2} \Omega_X, \quad (6.79)$$

where $\iota_{\mathbf{n}_i}$ denotes the contraction with \mathbf{n}_i . The construction does not depend on the metric g_X and any metric compatible with the complex structure \mathcal{J}_X would do the job. The first term of (6.77) coincides with the action (6.4) of 6d hCS theory on the projective spinor bundle of M provided $Y = \mathbb{P}S(M)$, and \dots denotes the rest of the BV action.

We can thus realize the origin of the correspondence in ten dimensions as follows: One starts from the following BV action of 10 hCS theory

$$S_X = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_X \Omega_X \wedge \text{CS}(\mathcal{A}_X), \quad X = \mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3}), \quad (6.80)$$

where Ω_X is a section of the canonical bundle⁵⁰ of $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$ of degree $(5, 0)$, and the field $\mathcal{A}_X \in \Omega^{(0,*)}(\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})) \otimes \mathfrak{sl}(n, \mathbb{C})[1]$, hence it is given by the formal sum (6.63). We equip $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$ with the complex structure $\mathcal{J}_{\mathbb{C}^{1,3}}$ given in (6.71). One can then get to the two sides of the correspondence as follows:

The Hyperbolic $\text{SU}(n)$ -Monopole Side. We equip $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^{1,3})$ with the complex structure $\mathcal{J}_{\mathbb{R}^{1,3}}$ defined in (6.72), and holomorphically-embed it inside $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$ by the results of Proposition 6.2. We then dimensionally-reduce (6.80) to $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^{1,3})$, which, by what we have explained around (6.77) gives the following BV action of the 6d hCS theory

$$S_Y = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_Y \Omega_Y \wedge \text{CS}(\mathcal{A}_Y^{(1)}) + \dots, \quad Y = \mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^{1,3}), \quad (6.81)$$

where Ω_Y is a (not necessarily global) section of the canonical bundle of $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^{1,3})$, that can be constructed as in (6.79), $\mathcal{A}_Y^{(1)}$ is the gauge field of the 6d hCS theory and can be written explicitly in terms of 10d fields as (6.78), and \dots denotes the rest of the BV action. Once we are in six dimensions, one can recover the data of hyperbolic $\text{SU}(n)$ -monopoles,

⁵⁰Recall that holomorphic volume forms exist only for CY manifolds.

including its masses, charges, and spectral data, by what we have explained in §6.1.3. In particular, we have to impose a reality condition, which reduces the gauge Lie algebra from $\mathfrak{sl}(n, \mathbb{C})$ to $\mathfrak{su}(n)$, as we explained in Remark 6.1.

The gCPM Side. We proceed similarly. We equip $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^4)$ with the complex structure $\mathcal{J}_{\mathbb{R}^4}$ defined in (6.75), and embed it holomorphically inside $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$ by the results of Proposition 6.2. We then dimensionally-reduce (6.80) to $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^4)$, which, by what we have explained around (6.77) gives the following BV action of 6d hCS theory

$$S_Y = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_Y \Omega_Y \wedge \text{CS}(\mathcal{A}_Y^{(1)}) + \dots, \quad Y = \mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^4), \quad (6.82)$$

where Ω_Y is a section of the canonical bundle of $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^4)$, that again can be constructed as in (6.79), $\mathcal{A}_Y^{(1)}$ is the gauge field of 6d hCS theory and can be written explicitly in terms of 10d fields as (6.78), and \dots denotes the rest of the BV action. Once we are in six dimensions, the gCPM can be recovered from what we have explained in §6.2.

As $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$ is equipped with a fixed complex structure (6.71), and the physics of the 10d hCS theory only depends on the choice of complex structure, it follows that we can successfully recover the two sides of the hyperbolic monopoles/gCPM correspondence as two different manifestations of the same ten-dimensional physics of hCS theory on $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$.

In a naive sense, the correspondence can be summarized as performing a Wick rotation and imposing or lifting reality conditions on the data. In more detail, we start in 10d and dimensionally reduce to the 6d hCS on $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^{1,3})$, which realizes the hyperbolic monopole side after imposing reality conditions. We now Wick-rotate $\mathbb{R}^{1,3} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$, relax the reality condition on the spectral data, and realize the gCPM side of the correspondence. Conversely, we can start in 10d, and dimensionally reduce the theory to the 6d hCS on $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^4)$, which then realizes the gCPM side of the correspondence. We then perform an inverse Wick rotation $\mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{1,3}$, impose reality condition on the data, and recover the hyperbolic monopole side of the correspondence. With this heuristic comment, we finalize our discussion.

7 Discussion and Future Directions

In this work, we have explored the relationship between the spectral data of magnetic monopoles in hyperbolic space and the curve of the spectral parameter of the gCPM. We generalized the observation of Atiyah and Murray [103, 104] for the group $SU(2)$ to the group $SU(n)$ in §4. We then proposed a realization of the gCPM inside the 4d CS theory in §5, which explains its various features. Finally, we explored the origin of the correspondence in §6. This involved three steps: (1) we first showed in §6.1 and §6.2 that the two sides of the correspondence can be realized using the 6d hCS theory formulated on projective spinor bundle of the Minkowski space $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$, in the case of hyperbolic monopoles, and the projective spinor bundle of \mathbb{R}^4 , in the case of the gCPM; (2) We then explained that these

projective spinor bundles can be holomorphically-embedded in the projective spinor bundle of the complexified Minkowski space $\mathbb{C}^{1,3}$, which is a complex five-dimensional manifold whose complex structure we fix. (3) We then explained that the 6d hCS on projective spinor bundles of $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ and \mathbb{R}^4 can be realized as the dimensional reduction of the 10d hCS formulated on the projective spinor bundle of $\mathbb{C}^{1,3}$. These are the content of §6.3.1. Putting these three points together, we concluded in §6.3.2 that the hyperbolic monopole/gCPM correspondence is the incarnation of the single ten-dimensional physics.

Finally, we collect some of the most interesting puzzles for future investigation.

Explicit Computation of the R-Matrix of the gCPM. Our discussion of the relationship between the gCPM and the 4d CS theory lacks the explicit computation of the R-matrix of the gCPM. Our discussion in §5.1 indicates that this would not be a perturbative computation. This observation is consistent with the fact that gCPM does not have a classical R-matrix, and hence the full quantum R-matrix cannot be realized as a formal expansion whose first non-trivial term is the classical R-matrix. Therefore, the explicit computation of R-matrix is an outstanding challenge on multiple levels:

- (1) **Non-Perturbative Definition of 4d CS Theory.** The first issue is to formulate CS theory non-perturbatively. This is more than just writing the path integral formally as

$$\langle \mathbf{L}_h \mathbf{L}_v \rangle \sim \int \mathcal{D}A \mathbf{L}_h \mathbf{L}_v \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2\pi\hbar} \int_{C \times \mathbb{P}^1} \omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} \wedge \text{CS}(A) \right), \quad (7.1)$$

for some horizontal and vertical line defects \mathbf{L}_h and \mathbf{L}_v , respectively, and possibly sum over the saddle points, with $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ as in (5.41). One possible route to such a non-perturbative formulation is the realization of the theory within string theory. The latter is well-known [148, 149, 150]. Following [147], one of the most serious attempts to provide a nonperturbative formulation of the 4d CS theory is [149]. However, the recipe given in this work [149, eq. (3.14)] is formal and probably not useful for practical computations. One thus needs to provide a more practical nonperturbative recipe for the R-matrix computation. As is usual with any field theory, a proper nonperturbative formulation is a challenge; that 4d CS theory is a semi-holomorphic field theory might simplify the procedure but does not trivialize it.

Another route could be based on what we have explained in §6.2, where the 4d CS theory emerges as the dimensional reduction of the 6d hCS theory. Therefore, it is conceivable that the non-perturbative definition of the 4d CS theory would involve the 6d hCS theory, and eventually, based on what we have explained §6.3.1, the 10d hCS theory.

- (2) **4d CS Theory at the Roots of Unity.** It is known that the gCPMs are related to certain irreducible representations of the quantum group $U_q(\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}}(n, \mathbb{C}))$ (or more precisely a trivial extension thereof) at a root of unity, the so-called minimal cyclic representations [91, 92, 93]. These are families of N^{n-1} -dimensional representations

parameterized by $z \in (\mathbb{C}^\times)^{3n-1}$, where $N \geq 3$ is an odd number determining an N^{th} root of unity q . This means that a more elaborate incorporation of the gCPM in the 4d CS theory would involve the formulation of the latter at the roots of unity. Since this is intimately related to the nonperturbative formulation of the theory, it is expected that the loop-counting parameter \hbar in (7.1) will be related to parameters n and N through some relation. There are three different limits that might be helpful in figuring out the precise relationship between (n, N) and \hbar : (1) $N \rightarrow \infty$ while keeping n finite; (2) $N, n \rightarrow \infty$ while keeping n/N finite; (3) $N, n \rightarrow \infty$ while $n/N \rightarrow 0$ [176, 177]. It was also realized in [178, 179] that the intertwiners of some other irreducible cyclic representations are related to the gCPM.

- (3) **Line Defects Carrying Minimal Cyclic Representations.** The R-matrix $\mathcal{R}(z, z')$ is the intertwiner of certain tensor product $\pi_{z, z'}$ of minimal cyclic representations [91, 92, 93]. The existence of an R-matrix forces the parameters (z, z') to lie on a certain algebraic variety, i.e. the curve of the spectral parameter of the model. Therefore, based on what we explained in §4.3, one needs to consider two line defects carrying minimal cyclic representations of $U_q(\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}}(n, \mathbb{C}))$ and perform the computation of the R-matrix. Hence, the construction of such line defects is a significant and essential step. It is expected that the representation theory of quantum groups $U_q(\widehat{\mathfrak{so}}(2n+1, \mathbb{C}))$, $U_q(\widehat{\mathfrak{sp}}(2n, \mathbb{C}))$, and $U_q(\widehat{\mathfrak{so}}(2n, \mathbb{C}))$ and more generally $U_q(\widehat{\mathfrak{g}})$ should provide insight into the structure of the gCPM for these groups and may even lead to the realization of new integrable models with higher-genus curve of the spectral parameter. Certain irreducible representations of non-affine quantum groups have been considered in the literature [93, 180, 181, 182, 183]. See also the discussion in §5.1.3 for Bazhanov–Stroganov procedure, a generalization of which for gCPM should be straightforward.

It is clear that what we have explored in this work is just the tip of a huge iceberg.

Integrable Spin Models with Higher-Genus Curve of Spectral Parameter. From the basic philosophy of the 4d CS theory, the existence of an integrable lattice model is tied to the preservation of topological symmetry along the topological plane. Based on this idea, we have argued in §5.2 that together with the requirement of \mathbb{Z}_N^{n-1} -invariance, this would almost uniquely fix the form of the one-form of the 4d CS theory. Let us recall the most general form of one-form, other than the rational one, which does not have a zero

$$\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} = \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^{\#} (z^{r_i} - z_i)^{1/s_i}} dz, \quad (7.2)$$

with both r_i and s_i are positive integers. If we perform $z \rightarrow 1/z$ transformation, the requirement of not having a zero gives

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\#} \frac{r_i}{s_i} - 2 = 0. \quad (7.3)$$

This is a very stringent constraint. However, we cannot proceed further without further information. For example, one can ask about the existence of a model in which spins take value in $\mathbb{Z}_{N_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}_{N_n}$ with $N_i \neq N_j$ for $i \neq j$. This would set $r_i = N_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and (7.3) would reduce to

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{N_i}{s_i} - 2 = 0. \quad (7.4)$$

One of the minimal solutions is

$$\# = 2, \quad (r_1, r_2) = (N_1, N_2), \quad (s_1, s_2) = (N_1, N_2). \quad (7.5)$$

The gCPM is a particular instance of this solution for $r_i = s_i = N^{n-1}$, $i = 1, 2$. This simple analysis suggests that there may be an integrable model in which the spins take value in $\mathbb{Z}_{N_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{N_2}$ and the one-form $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ would take the form

$$\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt[N_1]{\prod_{i=1}^{N_1} (z - z_i)} \sqrt[N_2]{\prod_{i=1}^{N_2} (z - z'_i)}} dz, \quad i, j = 1, 2, i \neq j, \quad (7.6)$$

for some $\{z_1, \dots, z_{N_1}\}$ and $\{z'_1, \dots, z'_{N_2}\}$. This still satisfies $\partial_{\bar{z}} \omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} = 0$. It would be very interesting to explore this direction for two specific questions: (1) Would the requirement of not having a zero in the topological plane be enough to conclude that there is an integrable model whose associated one-form is determined by that requirement? (2) Would it be possible for $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ to have zeroes with the possibility of breaking topological invariance but then it is restored at the quantum level by some mechanism?

Treating Hyperbolic Monopoles as Circle-Invariant Instantons. In this work, we have used the work of Murray and Singer to work out the hyperbolic monopole/gCPM correspondence [17]. Using this work, it is at least meaningful to take the limit of vanishing boundary values of the Higgs field and define the spectral data. However, there are some partial results on the construction of spectral data of hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopole for integral boundary values of the Higgs field in the spirit of the original work of Atiyah [22, §14]. This work uses a different set of boundary conditions than Murray and Singer. It is unclear how one deals with vanishing boundary values of the Higgs field since there is no limit of this sort. It might be possible to set the boundary values to zero without taking a limit. It would be interesting to (1) complete the work of loc. cit. and provide a proper generalization of the work of Atiyah to the group $SU(n)$; in particular, it would be interesting to show that the spectral data uniquely recovers the hyperbolic monopole solution, and (2) work out the correspondence with gCPM and compare the results with what has been explored in §4. It might also be useful to provide a formal formulation of spectral data in the language of algebraic geometry along the lines of [36].

Possible Role of Kähler CS Theory. We have seen in §6.1.1 that instantons can be realized from the 6d CS theory (see also [164, 165, 166, 168]). Although the case we discussed was related to instantons on the Minkowski space, it is desirable to have an action

whose equations of motion describe (anti-)instantons on \mathbb{R}^4 , as hyperbolic monopoles with integer boundary values of Higgs field have been constructed as circle-invariant instantons on \mathbb{R}^4 [13, 19, 20]. Such an action does actually exist and is dubbed Kähler CS theory [184, 185]. Consider a five-dimensional product manifold of the form $M \times \mathbb{R}$, where (M, ω) is a Kähler manifold equipped with the Kähler structure ω . Then, the action of Kähler CS theory is given by

$$S = \frac{k}{2\pi} \int_{M \times \mathbb{R}} \omega \wedge \text{CS}(\mathcal{A}) + \int_{M \times \mathbb{R}} \text{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}} ((\Phi + \bar{\Phi})\mathcal{F}) , \quad (7.7)$$

where k denotes the coupling of the theory, \mathcal{A} is the gauge field on $M \times \mathbb{R}$, and Φ is a scalar field. If we denote by F the field strength on M , the relevant equations of motion of the theory are

$$F^{(2,0)} = 0 = F^{(0,2)} , \quad \omega \wedge F = 0 . \quad (7.8)$$

It turns out that Φ does not affect the analysis, and the space of solutions of these equations up to gauge transformations turns out to be the moduli space of anti-instantons on M . Therefore, one can get hyperbolic monopoles with integer boundary values of the Higgs field by circle-reduction of these equations as in [13]. However, it is not quite clear how to connect this theory to the gCPM. One possibility is that one can connect this theory to the 6d hCS theory on $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^4)$ and then to the gCPM following what has been explained in §6.2. It would be interesting to explore this direction further.

Possible Roles of Supersymmetric Gauge Theories, and String Field Theory.

It is known that supersymmetric gauge theories can be formulated in twistor spaces [186]. On the one hand, the holomorphic twist of the ten-dimensional maximally supersymmetric gauge theory on \mathbb{C}^5 is the 10d hCS theory [174]. To connect these ideas to this work, it would be interesting to see whether holomorphic twists of supersymmetric gauge theories on $\mathbb{P}S(M)$ for $M = \mathbb{R}^{1,3}, \mathbb{R}^4$ and $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$ are related to the hCS theories, in particular in six and ten dimensions. This may be a route to connect our results to string theory.

On the other hand, the action of the 6d CS theory describes the open sector of string field theory (i.e. spacetime) realization of the B-model topological string theory [155]. As we already mentioned in Remark 6.10, $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$, $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^{1,3})$, and $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{R}^4)$ are not CY manifolds: As smooth Riemannian manifolds, all of these are of the form $\mathbb{R}^{\#} \times S^2$ for some $\#$. The Ricci curvature R of such manifolds is $R(\mathbb{R}^{\#} \times S^2) = R(\mathbb{R}^{\#}) + R(S^2) = 1/2$. Therefore, it is not immediately clear how the construction of this work is related to string field theory. As we previously mentioned in Remark 6.10, such manifolds are expected to appear as backgrounds in the full formulation of the theory [175]. It would be highly desirable but extremely challenging to understand the set of possible backgrounds of string field theory. This work provides further evidence of the importance of this mostly-neglected question at the foundation of string theory. We leave this highly non-trivial follow-up of this work to ambitious readers. Another possible alternative route to string theory is detailed below.

Holomorphic Chern–Simons Theories in Complex $(2k+1)$ -Dimensions. We have discussed in §6 how the action of the hCS theory on $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$ reduces to the action of the 6d CS theory on $\mathbb{P}S(M)$ with $M = \mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ or \mathbb{R}^4 . Instead of the action of the BV action of the hCS theory, it is tempting to propose the following action in complex dimension $2k+1$

$$S_{2k+1} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_X \Omega_{2k+1} \wedge \text{CS}_{2k+1}(\mathcal{A}), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, \quad (7.9)$$

where X is a $(2k+1)$ -dimensional complex manifold with the holomorphic volume form Ω_{2k+1} and $\text{CS}_{2k+1}(\mathcal{A})$ is the Chern–Simons $(2k+1)$ -form depending on a connection $\mathcal{A} = \sum_{i=1}^{2k+1} \mathcal{A}_{\bar{z}_i} d\bar{z}_i$. In the simplest situation of $k=1$, this is just the action of the 6d CS theory which we have visited many times in this work. The next simplest case with $k=2$ gives a 10d theory. We can perform a dimensional reduction to six dimensions following the procedure explained in §6.2.1: One needs to choose a metric compatible with the complex structure of $\mathbb{P}S(\mathbb{C}^{1,3})$, choose a suitable metric along the two complex directions, say v_i , $i=1,2$, along which once to reduce the theory, assume the fields and Ω_{2k+1} are independent of v_1 and v_2 , and finally integrate over v_1 and v_2 . Taking $X = Y \times T^4$, with Y being complex three-dimensional and T^4 denotes a four-torus, the resulting action is

$$\tilde{S}_3 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \cdot \text{Vol}(T^4) \int_Y \Omega_3 \wedge \text{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}}([\mathcal{A}_{\bar{v}_1}, \mathcal{A}_{\bar{v}_2}] \text{CS}_3(\mathcal{A}_3)) + \dots, \quad (7.10)$$

where $\mathcal{A}_3 = \sum_{i=1}^3 \mathcal{A}_{\bar{w}_i} d\bar{w}_i$ and \dots denotes other terms coming from the dimensional reduction. If we take $\mathcal{A}_{\bar{v}_i}$ to be constants, then the first term almost resembles the action of the 6d hCS theory. To the best of our knowledge, the possible role of the hCS theories described by the actions (7.9) in integrability, gauge theory, string theory (for the particular case of $k=2$) have not been explored in the literature. It would be interesting to understand more about these theories.

Non-Maximal Symmetry Breaking. In this work, we have considered the maximal symmetry-breaking pattern of hyperbolic monopole solutions. To the best of our knowledge, the explicit proof that hyperbolic monopoles with arbitrary symmetry-breaking patterns are integrable and can be determined by their spectral data has not appeared in the literature. However, hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopoles are expected to be integrable for any values and numbers of monopole charges $(m_1, \dots, m_k) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq}^k$ ⁵¹ with $k \leq n-1$. This is associated with the symmetry-breaking pattern $SU(n) \rightarrow H \times U(1)^k$ with $H \subset SU(n)$ has rank $r-k$. Hence, the construction discussed in §4.2.2 suggests that there may be a corresponding lattice integrable model. It is plausible that such symmetry-breaking patterns are associated with gCPMs with spin variables taking values in \mathbb{Z}_N^{k-2} . It would be interesting to investigate whether one can construct new integrable models for such symmetry-breaking patterns of hyperbolic $SU(n)$ monopoles.

⁵¹ \mathbb{Z}_{\geq} denotes the set of non-negative integers.

Possible Generalization of the gCPM. The hyperbolic monopole/gCPM correspondence established in §4 may pave the way for the construction of generalizations of the gCPM. As hyperbolic $SU(n)$ -monopoles are expected to be integrable for any values of the monopole charge $(N_1, \dots, N_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$, the construction discussed in §4.2.2 suggests that the corresponding lattice integrable system, if exists, is also integrable. The curve Σ of the spectral parameter would be the curve defined by the following set of equations

$$\begin{pmatrix} (z_i^+)^{N_i} \\ (z_i^-)^{N_i} \end{pmatrix} = K_{ij} \begin{pmatrix} (z_j^+)^{N_j} \\ (z_j^-)^{N_j} \end{pmatrix}, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n, \quad (7.11)$$

where the matrices K_{ij} still satisfy the identity and cocycle conditions (2.4), and would have genus (see (4.88) or (B.8))

$$g_\Sigma = 1 + N_1^2 \dots N_{n-1}^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} N_i - n \right). \quad (7.12)$$

This supposed-to-be-integrable lattice model would be a further generalization of the generalized chiral Potts model where the $n-1$ spin variables are taking values in $\mathbb{Z}_{N_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}_{N_{n-1}}$. The existence of such an integrable model would be highly non-trivial. This is partially due to comments around (7.3).

Discrete Nahm Equations and String Theory. It is well-known [187, 35] that monopoles on \mathbb{R}^3 are in one-to-one correspondence with the solutions of Nahm's equations [188, 189]. On the other hand, Nahm's equations have a natural realization within string theory [190].

There is an analog to Nahm's equations and the ADHM data for hyperbolic monopoles. For the gauge group $SU(2)$, this was proposed by Braam and Austin [16] and their integrability is shown in [191]. Their generalization to the group $SU(n)$ was discussed in [21, 22]. Therefore, there are two natural questions (1) can hyperbolic monopoles be constructed in string theory? (2) have discrete Nahm's equations a realization in string theory? The answers to these questions pave the way for a possible understanding of the hyperbolic monopoles/gCPM correspondence as a (sequence) of string dualities, along the same lines as the Bethe/Gauge correspondence [148, 150].

Hyperbolic Monopoles and Rational Maps into Flags. It is well-known that the moduli space of monopoles on \mathbb{R}^3 can be realized as the space of rational maps into flag manifolds. This conjecture was first put forward by Atiyah [192] and proved by Donaldson for the gauge group $SU(2)$ [187]. For the case of maximal symmetry-breaking with classical gauge groups, it is proven by Hurtubise and Murray [193, 194, 35]. A further generalization for arbitrary compact semisimple gauge group and arbitrary symmetry-breaking pattern has been proved by Jarvis [195, 196].

There is a similar story for hyperbolic monopoles, conjectured by Atiyah [13]. The case with $SU(2)$ gauge group was established in [197], while the proof is still lacking for other gauge groups. This would provide a connection between the space of such maps

and the moduli space of hyperbolic monopoles, studied in [13, 11, 198, 15, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204] (see also [205] for the connection to the hyperbolic analog of Atiyah–Hitchin manifolds), along the lines of [206]. Furthermore, a natural question related to this work is which points/loci of the moduli space of hyperbolic monopoles or rational maps lead to a generalization of the CPM.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Roland Bittleston, Kevin Costello, and Edward Witten for stimulating discussion. The research of SFM is funded by the ERC Consolidator Grant #864828 “Algebraic Foundations of Supersymmetric Quantum Field Theory” (SCFTAlg). The work of MY was supported in part by the JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (Grant No. 20H05860, 23K17689, 23K25865), and by JST, Japan (PRESTO Grant No. JPMJPR225A, Moonshot R& D Grant No. JPMJMS2061). Kavli IPMU is supported by World Premier International Research Center Initiative (WPI), MEXT, Japan.

A More Details on Twistor Space of Hyperbolic Space

For the sake of completeness, in this appendix, we explain the construction of twistor space of hyperbolic space from the \mathbb{C}^\times -action on the twistor space of S^4 , i.e. \mathbb{P}^3 .

Recall that instantons on \mathbb{R}^4 are solutions of the (anti)self-duality equation

$$F = \pm \star_{\mathbb{R}^4} F, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

on \mathbb{R}^4 , where $\star_{\mathbb{R}^4}$ denotes the Hodge star operation on \mathbb{R}^4 . For convenience, we work with the antiself-dual solutions or anti-instantons. As an equality of differential forms, this equation is invariant under any coordinate transformation of \mathbb{R}^4 . In particular, it is invariant under a conformal rescaling. Denote the coordinate on \mathbb{R}^4 to be (x_1, x_2, r, θ) , in which the flat metric on \mathbb{R}^4 is

$$ds_{\mathbb{R}^4}^2 = r^2 \left(\frac{dx_1^2 + dx_2^2 + dr^2}{r^2} + d\theta^2 \right). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

The invariance of (A.1) under conformal rescaling implies that we can work with the conformally-rescaled metric on \mathbb{R}^4

$$ds'_{\mathbb{R}^4}{}^2 = \frac{dx_1^2 + dx_2^2 + dr^2}{r^2} + d\theta^2. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

This metric is singular at $r = 0$, which is simply a copy of x_1x_2 -plane that we denote as \mathbb{R}_{12}^2 . This metric is thus smooth only along $\mathbb{R}^4 - \mathbb{R}^2$. Identifying the first term of (A.3) as the Poincaré metric on \mathbb{H}^3 , we realize the conformal equivalence

$$\mathbb{R}^4 - \mathbb{R}^2 \simeq \mathbb{H}^3 \times S^1. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

This relation naturally leads to the study of S^1 -invariant solutions of (A.1), which can then be interpreted as hyperbolic monopoles on \mathbb{H}^3 . More precisely, this equivalence sends $(x_1, x_2, r, e^{i\theta}) \in \mathbb{H}^3 \times S^1$ to $(x_1, x_2, re^{i\theta}) \in \mathbb{R}^4 - \mathbb{R}^2$. If we consider the conformal compactification of $\mathbb{R}^4 - \mathbb{R}^2$ i.e. $S^4 - S^2$, this equivalence shows that S^4 is an S^1 -equivariant conformal compactification of $\mathbb{H}^3 \times S^1$. Finally, the boundary of \mathbb{H}^3 (or more precisely its closure $\overline{\mathbb{H}^3}$), located at $r = 0$ ⁵² is denoted as $S_\infty^2 := \partial\overline{\mathbb{H}^3}$. On the other hand, it is well-known that an anti-instanton $SU(n)$ solution on S^4 corresponds to a rank- n holomorphic vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^3 [207, Theorem 2.9]. Therefore, studying hyperbolic monopoles on \mathbb{H}^3 naturally leads to studying the S^1 -action (or its complexification \mathbb{C}^\times) on \mathbb{P}^3 .⁵³ This will lead to the notion of twistor space of \mathbb{H}^3 , which we elaborate on in the following.

Remark A.1. By defining hyperbolic monopoles as circle-invariant instantons, the role of the Higgs field is played by the component of the 4d gauge field along the circle, i.e. A_θ . Rescaling $R \rightarrow \lambda R$, changes $Rd\theta \rightarrow \lambda Rd\theta$ leads to $A_\theta \rightarrow \lambda^{-1}A_\theta$. Therefore, the values of the Higgs field and especially its masses would be rescaled. On the other hand, the scalar curvature \mathbf{R} of \mathbb{H}^3 will be rescaled as $\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \lambda^{-1}\mathbf{R}$ too. This means that p_i/\mathbf{R} is an invariant parameter of the configuration. If we send $p \rightarrow 0$, then $\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \infty$, and vice versa. Fixing $\mathbf{R} = -1$ means the i^{th} component of the Higgs field is p_i , and unlike the case of Euclidean monopoles cannot be gauged away. Due to the lack of an absolute scale in the Euclidean case, there is no such rescaling and we can always take the i^{th} component of the Higgs field to be 1. \square

\mathbb{R}^4 can be identified as the set of quaternions and its compactification S^4 can then be identified with the quaternionic projective line. The set of quaternions is defined as

$$\mathbb{H} := \{a_0 + a_1\mathbf{i} + a_2\mathbf{j} + a_3\mathbf{k} \mid a_i \in \mathbb{R}\}, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

with $\mathbf{i}^2 = \mathbf{j}^2 = \mathbf{k}^2 = -1$ and $\mathbf{ij} = \mathbf{k}$ and its cyclic permutations. We have

$$\begin{aligned} a_0 + a_1\mathbf{i} + a_2\mathbf{j} + a_3\mathbf{k} &= a_0 + a_1\mathbf{i} + a_2\mathbf{j} + a_3\mathbf{ij} \\ &= a_0 + a_1\mathbf{i} + (a_2 + a_3\mathbf{i})\mathbf{j}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Hence, \mathbb{H} can be identified with \mathbb{C}^2 as $\mathbb{H} \simeq \{z_1 + z_2\mathbf{j} \mid z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C}\} = \mathbb{C}^2$. We define the scalar multiplication from the left. The quaternionic projective line $\mathbb{H}\mathbb{P}^1$ is the quotient of \mathbb{H}^2 , the two-dimensional quaternionic space, by the right multiplication: we identify $(h_1, h_2) \sim \lambda(h_1, h_2)$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{H}^\times$ and $(h_1, h_2) \in \mathbb{H}^2 \simeq \mathbb{C}^4$. One then has the projection $\pi : \mathbb{P}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{H}\mathbb{P}^1$ is given by

$$\pi([z_1 : z_2 : z_3 : z_4]_{\mathbb{C}}) = [z_1 + z_3\mathbf{j} : z_2 + z_4\mathbf{j}]_{\mathbb{H}}, \quad (\text{A.7})$$

where the notation $[z_1 : z_2 : z_3 : z_4]_{\mathbb{C}}$ and $[z_1 + z_3\mathbf{j} : z_2 + z_4\mathbf{j}]_{\mathbb{H}}$ denote the homogeneous coordinates on \mathbb{P}^3 and $\mathbb{H}\mathbb{P}^1$, respectively. The fibration (A.7) defines the twistor fibration.

⁵²This is similar to the more familiar case of the upper half-plane \mathbb{H}^2 endowed with the hyperbolic metric where $\text{Im}(z) = 0$ is the boundary of $\overline{\mathbb{H}^2}$.

⁵³We denote the complex projective space simply as $\mathbb{P}^\#$ while for the quaternionic projective space we use the notation $\mathbb{H}\mathbb{P}^\#$.

The fiber $[z_1 : z_2 : z_3 : z_4]_{\mathbb{C}}$ over a generic point $[w_1 + w_2 \mathbf{j} : 1]_{\mathbb{H}}$ can be easily determined

$$\begin{pmatrix} z_1 \\ z_3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} w_1 & -\bar{w}_2 \\ w_2 & \bar{w}_1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} z_2 \\ z_4 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

The only parameters are z_2 and z_4 coordinates up to a rescaling by an element of \mathbb{C}^\times , and as such, the fiber over a generic point is a copy of \mathbb{P}^1 . Furthermore, the fiber over the point $[w_1 + w_2 \mathbf{j} : 0]_{\mathbb{H}} \sim [1 : 0]_{\mathbb{H}}$ is just $[1 : 0 : 0 : 0]_{\mathbb{C}}$.

There is an antiholomorphic involution $\tilde{\sigma}^{54}$ on \mathbb{P}^3

$$\tilde{\sigma}([z_1 : z_2 : z_3 : z_4]_{\mathbb{C}}) = [\bar{z}_1 : \bar{z}_2 : \bar{z}_3 : \bar{z}_4]_{\mathbb{C}}. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

There is no fixed point for the action of $\tilde{\sigma}$ but there are fixed lines which are called *real lines*. Therefore, $\tilde{\sigma}$ defines a real structure on \mathbb{P}^3 .

We can now consider the S^1 -action on the twistor fibration. Define the circle action on $S^4 \simeq \mathbb{H}\mathbb{P}^1$ by⁵⁵

$$[h_1 : h_2]_{\mathbb{H}} \mapsto [h_1 e^{+i\frac{\theta}{2}} : h_2 e^{+i\frac{\theta}{2}}]_{\mathbb{H}}, \quad h_1, h_2 \in \mathbb{H}. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Since $\mathbb{R}^4 \subset S^4$ due to $h \mapsto [h : 1]_{\mathbb{H}}$ (recall that $\mathbb{H} \simeq \mathbb{C}^2 \simeq \mathbb{R}^4$), the S^1 -action on \mathbb{R}^4 is

$$[h : 1]_{\mathbb{H}} \mapsto [e^{-i\frac{\theta}{2}} h e^{+i\frac{\theta}{2}} : 1]_{\mathbb{H}}. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

If we take $h = z_1 + z_3 \mathbf{j}$, then $z_1 + z_3 \mathbf{j} \mapsto z_1 + e^{-i\theta} z_3 \mathbf{j}$. The fixed loci of this action is a copy of \mathbb{R}^2 ($z_3 = 0$) or its conformal compactification S^2 , as before, which is the same as S^2_∞ . On the other hand, if we identify \mathbb{R}^4 as $[1 : h]$ with $h = z_2 + z_4 \mathbf{j}$, then the fixed loci is given by the plane $z_4 = 0$.

The lift and complexification of this action to \mathbb{P}^3 is a \mathbb{C}^\times -action given by

$$\lambda \cdot [z_1 : z_2 : z_3 : z_4]_{\mathbb{C}} = [z_1 : z_2 : \lambda z_3 : \lambda z_4]_{\mathbb{C}}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}^\times. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

This action has two fixed lines

$$\mathbb{P}_+^1 := \{z_1 = z_2 = 0\}, \quad \mathbb{P}_-^1 := \{z_3 = z_4 = 0\}. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Therefore, the space on which \mathbb{C}^\times -action is non-trivial is $\mathbb{P}^3 - (\mathbb{P}_+^1 \cup \mathbb{P}_-^1)$, and are clearly exchanged by (A.9). Under the twistor map (A.7), these lines are sent to S^2_∞

$$\begin{aligned} \pi([z_1 : z_2 : 0 : 0]_{\mathbb{C}}) &= [z_1 : z_2]_{\mathbb{H}} \in S^2_\infty, \\ \pi([0 : 0 : z_3 : z_4]_{\mathbb{C}}) &= [z_3 \mathbf{j}, z_4 \mathbf{j}]_{\mathbb{H}} = [\bar{z}_3 : \bar{z}_4]_{\mathbb{H}} \in S^2_\infty, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.14})$$

where in the second line and the second equality, we multiplied by \mathbf{j} from the right. Therefore, $\mathbb{P}_+^1 \rightarrow S^2_\infty$ is orientation-preserving while $\mathbb{P}_-^1 \rightarrow S^2$ is orientation-reversing.

⁵⁴It is an involution since $\tilde{\sigma}^2 = 1$.

⁵⁵It is more convenient to define the S^1 action from the left.

Finally, it follows from (A.12) that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \lambda \cdot [z_1 : z_2 : z_3 : z_4]_{\mathbb{C}} &= [z_1 : z_2 : 0 : 0]_{\mathbb{C}} \in \mathbb{P}_-^1, \\ \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \lambda \cdot [z_1 : z_2 : z_3 : z_4]_{\mathbb{C}} &= [0 : 0 : z_3 : z_4]_{\mathbb{C}} \in \mathbb{P}_+^1. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Hence, taking the quotient of \mathbb{C}^\times -action (A.12), we find that

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}^3 - (\mathbb{P}_+^1 \cup \mathbb{P}_-^1)}{\mathbb{C}^\times} \simeq \mathbb{P}_+^1 \times \mathbb{P}_-^1. \quad (\text{A.16})$$

This is the minitwistor space of $\overline{\mathbb{H}}^3$ which parameterizes geodesics on \mathbb{H}^3 [13].

B Some Basic Facts about Complete Intersections

In this appendix, we explain some basic facts about curves on projective space that are complete intersections. The motivation is that the curve of the spectral parameter of the gCPM, defined in (2.3), is a special case of complete intersections.

Smooth Complete Intersections. Consider $n-1$ polynomials $\{F_1, \dots, F_{n-1}\}$ of degree $\{d_1, \dots, d_{n-1}\}$. Consider the zero-locus

$$C := \{[x_0 : \dots, x_n] \in \mathbb{P}^n \mid F_1(x_0, \dots, x_n) = \dots = F_{n-1}(x_0, \dots, x_n) = 0\}, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

which is a curve in \mathbb{P}^n . This curve is called a smooth complete intersection if the $(n-1) \times (n+1)$ matrix $[\partial F_i / \partial x_\alpha]$ has the maximum rank $n-1$ at every point of C .

We would like to express C as a branched cover of \mathbb{P}^1 . By the Riemann's Existence Theorem, every Riemann surface carries a nonconstant meromorphic function, and as a result can be realized as a branched cover of \mathbb{P}^1 . The basic idea is that a meromorphic function on C can be written locally as $P(z)/Q(z)$ for some holomorphic functions $P(z)$ and $Q(z)$ and a local coordinate z on C . Then, the branched cover map $\pi : C \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ is given by $\pi(z) = [P(z) : Q(z)]$.

For a complete intersection C , consider the meromorphic function x_n/x_0 , which defines the branched covering map $\pi([x_0 : \dots : x_n]) = [x_0 : x_n]$. Using this map, we can compute the genus of C . Recall the Riemann–Hurwitz formula [208]

$$2g_C - 2 = \deg \pi (2g_{\mathbb{P}^1} - 2) + \deg R_\pi, \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where g_C is the genus of C , $\deg \pi$ is the degree of π , and $\deg R_\pi$ is the degree of the ramification divisor R_π of π . Hence, we need to determine $\deg \pi$ and $\deg R_\pi$ first. Consider a generic point $q := [x_0 : x_n] = [1 : \lambda] \in \mathbb{P}^1$. A fiber over q is given by points of the form $[1 : x_1 : x_2 : \dots : \lambda]$ which satisfy $F_i(1, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, \lambda) = 0$, $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Using say F_{n-1} , we can express x_{n-1} as a function of $\lambda, x_1, \dots, x_{n-2}$ as $\prod_{i=1}^{d_{n-1}} (x_{n-1} - \zeta_i^{(n-1)}(\lambda, x_1, \dots, x_{n-2}))$ for some functions $\zeta_i^{(n-1)}$. Plugging one of the roots into F_{n-2} , we can similarly express x_{n-2} as a function of $\lambda, x_1, \dots, x_{n-3}$ with d_{n-2} roots $\{\zeta_1^{(n-2)}(\lambda, x_1, \dots, x_{n-3}), \dots, \zeta_{d_{n-2}}^{(n-2)}(\lambda, x_1, \dots, x_{n-3})\}$.

Continuing in this fashion, we end up with x_1 in terms of λ , with d_1 roots $\zeta_1^{(1)}(\lambda), \dots, \zeta_{d_1}^{(2)}(\lambda)$. Therefore, there are $d_1 \dots d_{n-1}$ points in the fiber over q , each of multiplicity $+1$. We thus conclude

$$\deg \pi = d_1 \dots d_{n-1}. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Next, we determine $\deg R_\pi$. The map π is ramified at a point $p \in C$ if and only if

$$J(p) := \det \left(\frac{\partial(F_1, \dots, F_{n-1})}{\partial(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})} \right) (p) = 0, \quad (\text{B.4})$$

where

$$\frac{\partial(F_1, \dots, F_{n-1})}{\partial(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})} := \begin{pmatrix} \partial F_1 / \partial x_1 & \dots & \partial F_1 / \partial x_{n-1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \partial F_{n-1} / \partial x_1 & \dots & \partial F_{n-1} / \partial x_{n-1} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

We can see this as follows. Let $J(p) \neq 0$ and define the map $F : \mathbb{C}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ given by $F(x_0, \dots, x_n) := (F_1(x_0, \dots, x_n), \dots, F_{n-1}(x_0, \dots, x_n))$. Then, by Implicit Function Theorem, there is a unique function $g : U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$, for some open set $U \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ such $F = F(x_0, g_1(x_0, x_n), \dots, g_{n-1}(x_0, x_n), x_n)$ with $g = (g_1, \dots, g_{n-1})$. This would imply that, near p , $x_{n0} := x_n/x_0$ is a local coordinate on the curve C , which can be locally written as $[1 : g_1(x_{n0}) : \dots : g_{n-1}(x_{n0}) : x_{n0}]$. Therefore, in terms of local coordinates, the map π is given by $\pi(x_{n0}) = x_{n0}$, which is clearly unramified. Hence π is unramified at points $p \in C$ that $J(p) \neq 0$. Conversely, assume that $J(p) = 0$. Then, x_{n0} would not be a good local coordinate, and instead $x_{\alpha\beta} := x_\alpha/x_\beta$ with $1 \leq \alpha \neq \beta \leq n-1$ would serve as a local description of the curve. C can thus be locally written as $[h_0(x_{\alpha\beta}) : \dots : h_n(x_{\alpha\beta})]$ with $h_\alpha(x_{\alpha\beta}) = 1$ and $h_\beta(x_{\alpha\beta}) = x_{\alpha\beta}$. Therefore, the map π can be described locally as $\pi(x_{\alpha\beta}) = [h_0(x_{\alpha\beta}) : h_n(x_{\alpha\beta})]$. To show that there is a ramification, we notice $\partial_{x_{\alpha\beta}} F_i = \partial_{x_{\alpha\beta}} h_\gamma \partial_{x_\gamma} F_i = 0$, especially at p . This would imply

$$\begin{pmatrix} \partial F_1 / \partial x_0 & \dots & \partial F_1 / \partial x_n \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \partial F_{n-1} / \partial x_0 & \dots & \partial F_{n-1} / \partial x_n \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \partial_{x_{\alpha\beta}} h_0(x_{\alpha\beta}) \\ \vdots \\ \partial_{x_{\alpha\beta}} h_n(x_{\alpha\beta}) \end{pmatrix} = 0. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

As $[\partial F_i / \partial x_\alpha]$ has rank $n-1$, we conclude that $\partial_{x_{\alpha\beta}} h_\gamma(p) = 0$ with $\gamma \neq \alpha, \beta$. Therefore, we get $\partial_{x_{\alpha\beta}} \pi(x_{\alpha\beta}) = h_0(x_{\alpha\beta})^{-2} [\partial_{x_{\alpha\beta}} h_n(x_{\alpha\beta}) h_0(x_{\alpha\beta}) - h_n(x_{\alpha\beta}) \partial_{x_{\alpha\beta}} h_0(x_{\alpha\beta})](p) = 0$. Recall that the degree of ramification of π at a point p is given by $1 + \text{ord}_p \pi'$, where $\text{ord}_p \pi'$ is the order of vanishing of π' at p . As we saw $\partial_{x_{\alpha\beta}} \pi(x_{\alpha\beta})(p) = 0$ from which we see that the order of ramification of π at p is bigger than one, and hence π is ramified. Putting together, we conclude that π is ramified at $p \in C$ if and only if $J(p) = 0$, where $J(p)$ is defined in (B.4).

To determine $\deg R_\pi$, we use Bezout's Theorem according to which the degree of an intersection divisor, say $\text{div } G$ for a polynomial G , of a curve C is given generically by $\deg G \times \deg C$. In the case of a complete intersection, the relevant intersection divisor is given by the polynomial $\det[\partial(F_1, \dots, F_{n-1}) / \partial(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})]$, and we have $R_\pi =$

$\text{div}(\det[\partial F_i/\partial x_\alpha])$. The degree of this polynomial is $(d_1 + \dots + d_{n-1} - n + 1)$.⁵⁶ On the other hand, recall that the degree of a curve C is given by the degree of any hyperplane divisor on C . We consider the polynomial $G(x_0, \dots, x_n) = x_n$, and assume $[0 : \dots : 0 : 1 : 0 : \dots : 0]$ with 1 is put in the i^{th} slots with $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$. Hence, we can consider the function x_n/x_0 to compute the hyperplane divisor $\text{div} G$, which is the same as the divisors of zeroes of x_n/x_0 . The latter is the same as the inverse image divisor $\pi^*(0)$, with π defined above. We only need the degree of $\pi^*(0)$, which is the same as the degree of π ⁵⁷ given in (B.3). We thus conclude that

$$\deg R_\pi = d_1 \dots d_{n-1} (d_1 + \dots + d_{n-1} - n + 1) . \quad (\text{B.7})$$

Putting this and (B.3) into (B.2), we arrive at the genus of C

$$g_C = 1 + \frac{1}{2} d_1 \dots d_{n-1} (d_1 + \dots + d_{n-1} - n - 1) . \quad (\text{B.8})$$

Curve of the Spectral Parameter of gCPM as a Complete Intersection. The curve $\tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n}$ of the spectral parameter of gCPM is a special case of complete intersections. This can be seen by first noticing that for $[\partial F_i/\partial x_\alpha]$ has rank $2N$, which follows from (2.3). We can thus obtain the information about the curve from what we have explained for a complete intersection by setting $n \rightarrow 2n - 1$ and $d_1 = \dots = d_{2n-2} = N$ in (B.3), (B.7), and (B.8)

$$\begin{aligned} \deg \tilde{\pi}_{N,n} &= N^{2n-2} , & \deg R_{\tilde{\pi}_{N,n}} &= 2N^{2n-2}(N-1)(n-1) , \\ g_{\tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n}} &= N^{2n-2}(N(n-1) - n) + 1 , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.9})$$

where we have denoted the branched covering map as $\tilde{\pi}_{N,n} : \tilde{\Sigma}_{N,n} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$. The second line of (B.9) is the genus of the curve of the spectral parameter of gCPM given in (2.9).

C Some Basic Lie Algebra Facts and Manipulations

In this appendix, we collect some basic facts about classical and exceptional Lie algebras that would be useful to construct spectral curves of hyperbolic monopoles with gauge groups different than $\text{SU}(n)$. Based on the discussion in §4.3, we spell out the details of the relation between the fundamental weights of a classical or exceptional Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} and $\mathfrak{su}(n)$, which leads to the relation between spectral curves and charges associated with the two Lie algebras. In the following, we use [209, Appendix C], [210, §2.4.3], and [211, Chapter X, §3.3], to which we refer for further details.

We start with classical Lie algebras A_n, B_n, C_n , and D_n , and then spell out some details of exceptional Lie algebras. The compact real forms of the simple Lie groups over \mathbb{C} are described by Cartan [212, 213]. In particular, it is known that [214]

$$\begin{aligned} G_2 \subset B_3 &= \mathfrak{so}(7) , & F_4 \subset D_{13} &= \mathfrak{so}(26) , & E_6 \subset A_{26} &= \mathfrak{sl}(27) , \\ E_7 \subset C_{56} &= \mathfrak{sp}(56) , & E_8 \subset D_{124} &= \mathfrak{so}(248) . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.1})$$

⁵⁶Since F_i is homogeneous of degree d_i , $\partial_{x_\alpha} F_i$ is also homogeneous of degree $d_i - 1$.

⁵⁷Recall that for a finite morphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ between Riemann surfaces X and Y and a divisor D on Y , we have $\deg(f^*(D)) = \deg f \times \deg D$.

In constructing the corresponding monopole, we embed these algebras in $\mathfrak{su}(n)$ for some n in each case.

Lie Algebra $A_{n-1} := \mathfrak{sl}(n)$. Let us start with (the compact real form) of $A_{n-1} = \mathfrak{sl}(n)$ ($\mathfrak{su}(n)$). The simple roots are given by

$$\alpha_i^{A_n} = e_i - e_{i+1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (\text{C.2})$$

where $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ is an orthonormal basis ($\langle e_i, e_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}$) of \mathbb{R}^n . Therefore, the corresponding fundamental weights are given by (see (3.8))

$$\omega_i^{A_n} = \sum_{j=1}^i e_j, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1. \quad (\text{C.3})$$

The highest weight representations corresponding to fundamental weights are

$$\omega_i^{A_n} \iff \bigwedge^i \mathbb{C}^n, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (\text{C.4})$$

while $\bigwedge^n \mathbb{C}^n$ is one-dimensional and corresponds to the trivial representation of $\mathfrak{su}(n)$.

Lie Algebra $B_n := \mathfrak{so}(2n+1)$. The algebra $B_n = \mathfrak{so}(2n+1)$ has rank n . A set of simple roots are

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_i^{B_n} &= e_i - e_{i+1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \\ \alpha_n^{B_n} &= e_n, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.5})$$

and the corresponding fundamental weights are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_i^{B_n} &= \sum_{j=1}^i e_j, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \\ \omega_n^{B_n} &= \frac{1}{2}(e_1 + \dots + e_n). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.6})$$

Hence, fundamental highest-weight representations are

$$\omega_i^{B_n} \iff \bigwedge^i \mathbb{C}^{2n+1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (\text{C.7})$$

$\mathfrak{so}(2n+1)$ can be embedded in $\mathfrak{su}(2n+1)$. Under the embedding $\mathfrak{so}(2n+1) \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{su}(2n+1)$ and by comparing (C.3) and (C.6), we see the relation between fundamental weights

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_i^{B_n} &= \omega_i^{A_{2n}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \\ \omega_n^{B_n} &= \frac{1}{2}\omega_n^{A_{2n}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.8})$$

We can order the fundamental weights as

$$\left(\omega_1^{A_{2n}}, \dots, \omega_{2n}^{A_{2n}} \right) = \left(\omega_1^{B_n}, \dots, \omega_{n-1}^{B_n}, 2\omega_n^{B_n}, 2\omega_n^{B_n}, \omega_{n-1}^{B_n}, \dots, \omega_1^{B_n} \right), \quad (\text{C.9})$$

hence the corresponding fundamental highest-weight representations of $\mathfrak{so}(2n+1)$ are identified with the following fundamental representations of $\mathfrak{su}(2n+1)$

$$\left(\mathbb{C}^{2n+1}, \dots, \bigwedge^{n-1} \mathbb{C}^{2n+1}, \bigwedge^n \mathbb{C}^{2n+1}, \bigwedge^n \mathbb{C}^{2n+1}, \bigwedge^{n-1} \mathbb{C}^{2n+1}, \dots, \mathbb{C}^{2n+1} \right). \quad (\text{C.10})$$

Since spectral curves are labeled by fundamental weights, (4.93) is evident.

Furthermore, using (3.14) and (C.9), we can find the relation between charges of an $\mathfrak{su}(2n+1)$ monopole and the embedded $\mathfrak{so}(2n+1)$ monopole as

$$m_i^{B_n} = \omega_i^{B_n}(2 \star_{S_\infty^2} F) = \omega_i^{A_{2n}}(2 \star_{S_\infty^2} F) = m_i^{A_{2n}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (\text{C.11})$$

while

$$m_n^{B_n} = \omega_n^{B_n}(2 \star_{S_\infty^2} F) = \frac{1}{2} \omega_n^{A_{2n}}(2 \star_{S_\infty^2} F) = \frac{1}{2} m_n^{A_{2n}}. \quad (\text{C.12})$$

As magnetic charges should be integers, this means that the n^{th} monopole charge of the corresponding $\mathfrak{su}(2n+1)$ -monopole should be even. As we would like to get the spectral data of a gCPM for which all charges of monopole associated with the special unitary group should be the same, we set $m_i^{A_{2n}} = 2N$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, which then gives (4.94).

Lie Algebra $C_n := \mathfrak{sp}(2n)$. The rank- n algebra $C_n = \mathfrak{sp}(2n)$ has a set of simple roots given by

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1^{C_n} &= e_i - e_{i+1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \\ \alpha_n^{C_n} &= 2e_n, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.13})$$

and fundamental weights are

$$\omega_i^{C_n} = \sum_{j=1}^i e_j, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (\text{C.14})$$

The fundamental weights and corresponding highest-weights are⁵⁸

$$\omega_i^{C_n} \iff \bigwedge^i \mathbb{C}^{2n}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (\text{C.15})$$

This Lie algebra can be embedded in $\mathfrak{su}(2n)$. Under the embedding $\mathfrak{sp}(2n) \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{su}(2n)$ and by comparing (C.3) and (C.14), the relation between fundamental weights is

$$\omega_i^{C_n} = \omega_i^{A_{2n-1}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (\text{C.16})$$

⁵⁸Note that these representations are constructed with respect to a nondegenerate antisymmetric form Ω on \mathbb{C}^{2n} . The fundamental modules are in fact the space of Ω -harmonic elements. Consider the space

$$H(\bigwedge \mathbb{C}^{2n}, \Omega) = \bigoplus_{p=0}^n H(\bigwedge^p \mathbb{C}^{2n}, \Omega),$$

where $H(\bigwedge^p \mathbb{C}^{2n}, \Omega)$ is the space of Ω -harmonic p -vectors. Then, the fundamental representations are

$$\left(H(\mathbb{C}^{2n}, \Omega), \dots, H(\bigwedge^n \mathbb{C}^{2n}, \Omega) \right).$$

Also $H(\bigwedge^p \mathbb{C}^{2n}, \Omega) = 0$ for $p > n$. In the above construction, we assume that this subtlety is understood. For more details see [210, §5.5.2].

The fundamental weights can be ordered as

$$\left(\omega_1^{A_{2n-1}}, \dots, \omega_{2n-1}^{A_{2n-1}}\right) = \left(\omega_1^{C_n}, \dots, \omega_{n-1}^{C_n}, \omega_n^{C_n}, \omega_{n-1}^{C_n}, \dots, \omega_1^{C_n}\right), \quad (\text{C.17})$$

from which it follows that the relation between fundamental highest-weight representations is

$$\left(\mathbb{C}^{2n}, \bigwedge \mathbb{C}^{2n}, \dots, \bigwedge^{n-1} \mathbb{C}^{2n}, \bigwedge^n \mathbb{C}^{2n}, \bigwedge^{n-1} \mathbb{C}^{2n}, \dots, \mathbb{C}^{2n}\right), \quad (\text{C.18})$$

from which (4.95) is deduced.

Furthermore, from (3.14) and (C.16), we get the n charges of $\mathfrak{sp}(2n)$ -monopoles in terms of charges of the corresponding $\mathfrak{su}(2n)$ -monopoles

$$m_i^{C_n} = \omega_i^{C_n}(2 \star_{S_\infty^2} F) = \omega_i^{A_{2n-1}}(2 \star_{S_\infty^2} F) = m_i^{A_{2n-1}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (\text{C.19})$$

Setting $m_i^{A_{2n-1}} = N$, we get (4.96).

Lie Algebra $D_n := \mathfrak{so}(2n)$. This algebras has rank n . Simple roots are

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_i^{D_n} &= e_i - e_{i+1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \\ \alpha_n^{D_n} &= e_{n-1} + e_n, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.20})$$

and the corresponding fundamental weights are

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_i^{D_n} &= \sum_{j=1}^i e_j, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-2, \\ \omega_{n-1}^{D_n} &= \frac{1}{2}(e_1 + \dots + e_{n-1} - e_n), \quad \omega_n^{D_n} = \frac{1}{2}(e_1 + \dots + e_n). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.21})$$

The highest-weight representations corresponding to these fundamental weights are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_i^{D_n} &\iff \bigwedge^i \mathbb{C}^{2n}, \\ \omega_{n-1}^{D_n} + \omega_n^{D_n} &\iff \bigwedge^{n-1} \mathbb{C}^{2n}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.22})$$

and $\bigwedge^n \mathbb{C}^{2n}$ is the direct sum of two irreducible $\mathfrak{so}(2n)$ -module with highest weights $2\omega_{n-1}^{D_n}$ and $2\omega_n^{D_n}$.

D_n can be embedded in $\mathfrak{su}(2n)$. Under the embedding $\mathfrak{so}(2n) \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{su}(2n)$ and by comparing (C.3) and (C.21), the fundamental weights are related as

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_i^{D_n} &= \omega_i^{A_{2n-1}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-2, \\ \omega_{n-1}^{D_n} + \omega_n^{D_n} &= \omega_{n-1}^{A_{2n-1}}, \quad 2\omega_n^{D_n} = \omega_n^{A_{2n-1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.23})$$

If we order the fundamental weights as

$$\left(\omega_1^{A_{2n-1}}, \dots, \omega_n^{A_{2n-1}}, \dots, \omega_{2n-1}^{A_{2n-1}}\right) = \left(\omega_1^{D_n}, \dots, \omega_{n-2}^{D_n}, \omega_{n-1}^{D_n} + \omega_n^{D_n}, 2\omega_n^{D_n}, \omega_{n-1}^{D_n} + \omega_n^{D_n}, \omega_{n-2}^{D_n}, \dots, \omega_1^{D_n}\right), \quad (\text{C.24})$$

the corresponding highest-weight representations are

$$\left(\mathbb{C}^{2n}, \bigwedge \mathbb{C}^{2n}, \dots, \bigwedge^{n-1} \mathbb{C}^{2n}, \bigwedge^n \mathbb{C}^{2n}, \bigwedge^{n-1} \mathbb{C}^{2n}, \dots, \mathbb{C}^{2n} \right). \quad (\text{C.25})$$

Again, from (3.14) and (C.23), the relation of magnetic charges is

$$m_i^{D_n} = \omega_i^{D_n}(2 \star_{S_\infty^2} F_\infty) = \omega_i^{A_{2n-1}}(2 \star_{S_\infty^2} F_\infty) = m_i^{A_{2n-1}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-2, \quad (\text{C.26})$$

while

$$m_-^{D_n} + m_+^{D_n} = (\omega_{n-1}^{D_n} + \omega_n^{D_n})(2 \star_{S_\infty^2} F_\infty) = \omega_{n-1}^{A_{2n-1}}(2 \star_{S_\infty^2} F_\infty) = m_{n-1}^{A_{2n-1}}, \quad (\text{C.27})$$

and

$$m_n^{D_n} = \omega_n^{D_n}(2 \star_{S_\infty^2} F_\infty) = \frac{1}{2} \omega_n^{A_{2n-1}}(2 \star_{S_\infty^2} F_\infty) = \frac{1}{2} m_n^{A_{2n-1}}. \quad (\text{C.28})$$

We obtain (4.98) by setting $m_i^{A_{2n-1}} = 2N$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, as all charges have to be integer to get a meaningful generalization of the CPM.

Exceptional Lie Algebra \mathfrak{g}_2 . The Lie algebra \mathfrak{g}_2 has rank 2, dimension 14. There are two fundamental representations of dimensions 7 and 14. The dimension of adjoint representation is 14. The simple roots are given by

$$\{\alpha_1^{\mathfrak{g}_2}, \alpha_2^{\mathfrak{g}_2}\} = \{e_1 - e_2, -2e_1 + e_2 + e_3\}, \quad (\text{C.29})$$

and the corresponding fundamental weights are

$$\omega_1^{\mathfrak{g}_2} = -e_2 + e_3, \quad \omega_2^{\mathfrak{g}_2} = -e_1 - e_2 + 2e_3. \quad (\text{C.30})$$

As we noticed in (C.1), the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g}_2 can be embedded into $\mathfrak{so}(7)$. This can be seen by a technique called root folding (for more details, see [215, Chapter 30]). The Dynkin diagram of $\mathfrak{so}(7)$ can be folded to the Dynkin diagram of \mathfrak{g}_2 . This has been illustrated in Fig. 8.




Figure 8: The folding of $\mathfrak{so}(7)$ Dynkin diagram (left) onto \mathfrak{g}_2 Dynkin diagram (right).

The fundamental weights of \mathfrak{g}_2 can be written in terms of fundamental weights of $\mathfrak{so}(7)$, which in turn can be written in terms of fundamental weights of $\mathfrak{su}(7)$. The overall result is

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_1^{\mathfrak{g}_2} &= -\omega_1^{B_3} - \omega_2^{B_3} + \omega_3^{B_3} = -\omega_1^{A_6} - \omega_2^{A_6} + \frac{1}{2}\omega_3^{A_6}, \\ \omega_2^{\mathfrak{g}_2} &= -3\omega_2^{B_3} + \omega_3^{B_3} = -3\omega_2^{A_6} + \frac{1}{2}\omega_3^{A_6}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.31})$$

through which we can relate the magnetic charges of the corresponding monopoles analogously

$$\begin{aligned} m_1^{\mathfrak{g}_2} &= -m_1^{B_3} - m_2^{B_3} + m_3^{B_3} = -m_1^{A_6} - m_2^{A_6} + \frac{1}{2}m_3^{A_6} , \\ m_2^{\mathfrak{g}_2} &= -3m_2^{B_3} + m_3^{B_3} = -3m_2^{A_6} + \frac{1}{2}m_3^{A_6} . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.32})$$

Recall that to connect to gCPM, all charges associated with $\mathfrak{su}(7)$ monopoles should be the same. However, it is easy to see that it is impossible to have a \mathfrak{g}_2 -monopole whose corresponding $\mathfrak{su}(7)$ -monopole has equal charges: we simply set $m_i^{\mathfrak{su}(7)} = 2N$, $i = 1, 2, 3$ for some $N \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Then,

$$m_1^{\mathfrak{g}_2} = -3N , \quad m_2^{\mathfrak{g}_2} = -5N , \quad (\text{C.33})$$

which are both negative.

Exceptional Lie Algebra \mathfrak{f}_4 The Lie algebra \mathfrak{f}_4 has rank 4, dimension 52. The dimension of fundamental representation is 26 and the dimension of adjoint representation is 52. The simple roots are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1^{\mathfrak{f}_4} &= \frac{1}{2}(e_1 - e_2 - e_3 - e_4) , & \alpha_2^{\mathfrak{f}_4} &= e_4 , \\ \alpha_3^{\mathfrak{f}_4} &= e_3 - e_4 , & \alpha_4^{\mathfrak{f}_4} &= e_2 - e_3 , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.34})$$

and the corresponding fundamental weights are

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_1^{\mathfrak{f}_4} &= e_1 , & \omega_2^{\mathfrak{f}_4} &= \frac{1}{2}(3e_1 + e_2 + e_3 + e_4) , \\ \omega_3^{\mathfrak{f}_4} &= 2e_1 + e_2 + e_3 , & \omega_4^{\mathfrak{f}_4} &= e_1 + e_2 . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.35})$$

From (C.3) and (C.21), these can be written as fundamental weights of $\mathfrak{so}(26)$ and in turn those of $\mathfrak{su}(26)$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_1^{\mathfrak{f}_4} &= \omega_1^{D_{13}} = \omega_1^{A_{25}} , & \omega_2^{\mathfrak{f}_4} &= \omega_1^{D_{13}} + \frac{1}{2}\omega_4^{D_{13}} = \omega_1^{A_{25}} + \frac{1}{2}\omega_4^{A_{25}} , \\ \omega_4^{\mathfrak{f}_4} &= \omega_2^{D_{13}} = \omega_2^{A_{25}} , & \omega_3^{\mathfrak{f}_4} &= \omega_1^{D_{13}} + \frac{1}{2}\omega_3^{D_{13}} = \omega_1^{A_{25}} + \frac{1}{2}\omega_3^{A_{25}} . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.36})$$

Using this relation and (3.14), we have

$$\begin{aligned} m_1^{\mathfrak{f}_4} &= m_1^{D_{13}} = m_1^{A_{25}} , & m_2^{\mathfrak{f}_4} &= m_1^{D_{13}} + \frac{1}{2}m_4^{D_{13}} = m_1^{A_{25}} + \frac{1}{2}m_4^{D_{25}} , \\ m_4^{\mathfrak{f}_4} &= m_2^{D_{13}} = m_2^{A_{25}} , & m_3^{\mathfrak{f}_4} &= m_1^{D_{13}} + \frac{1}{2}m_3^{D_{13}} = m_1^{A_{25}} + \frac{1}{2}m_3^{D_{25}} . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.37})$$

Therefore, if we take $m_i^{A_{25}} = 2N$, $i = 1, \dots, 25$, we get the charges of an \mathfrak{f}_4 -monopole associated with a gCPM

$$\begin{aligned} m_1^{\mathfrak{f}_4} &= 2N , & m_2^{\mathfrak{f}_4} &= 3N , \\ m_4^{\mathfrak{f}_4} &= 2N , & m_3^{\mathfrak{f}_4} &= 3N . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.38})$$

Exceptional Lie Algebra \mathfrak{e}_6 , \mathfrak{e}_7 , and \mathfrak{e}_8 . The Lie algebra \mathfrak{e}_6 has rank 6, dimension 78. The dimension of fundamental representation is 27 and the dimension of adjoint representation is 78. The Lie algebra \mathfrak{e}_7 has rank 7, dimension 133. The dimension of fundamental representation is 56 and the dimension of adjoint representation is 133. The Lie algebra \mathfrak{e}_8 has rank 8, dimension 248. The dimension of the adjoint representation is 248. The rest of the computations are similar to what has been explained previously and can be figured out using [209, Appendix C]. We leave the details to the interested reader.

References

- [1] S. K. Donaldson, *An Application of Gauge Theory to Four-Dimensional Topology*, *J. Diff. Geom.* **18** (Feb, 1983) 279–315. 1
- [2] S. K. Donaldson, *Anti Self-Dual Yang–Mills Connections Over Complex Algebraic Surfaces and Stable Vector Bundles*, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.* **50** (Jan, 1985) 1–26. 1
- [3] R. S. Ward, *Integrable and Solvable Systems, and Relations Among Them*, *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **315** (Aug, 1985) 451–457. 1
- [4] R. S. Ward, *Curved Twistor Spaces*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Oxford, 1977. 1
- [5] R. S. Ward, *On Selfdual Gauge Fields*, *Phys. Lett. A* **61** (Apr, 1977) 81–82. 1
- [6] M. F. Atiyah, N. J. Hitchin and I. M. Singer, *Deformations of Instantons*, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* **74** (Jul, 1977) 2662–2663. 1
- [7] M. F. Atiyah, N. J. Hitchin and I. M. Singer, *Selfduality in Four-Dimensional Riemannian Geometry*, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **362** (Sep, 1978) 425–461. 1, 65, 74
- [8] E. B. Bogomolny, *The Stability of Classical Solutions*, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **24** (1976) 449. 2
- [9] E. B. Bogomolny, *The Stability of Classical Solutions*, in *Solitons and Particles* (C. Rebbi and G. Soliani, eds.). World Scientific, Dec, 1984. 2
- [10] P. J. Braam, *Magnetic Monopoles and Hyperbolic Three-Manifolds*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Oxford, 1987. 2
- [11] P. J. Braam, *Magnetic Monopoles on Three-Manifolds*, *J. Differ. Geom* **30** (Feb, 1989) 425–464. 2, 92
- [12] M. F. Atiyah and N. Hitchin, *The Geometry and Dynamics of Magnetic Monopoles*. Princeton University Press, Dec, 1988. 2, 52
- [13] M. Atiyah, *Magnetic Monopoles in Hyperbolic Spaces*, in *Proc. of Bombay Colloquium 1984 on Vector Bundles on Algebraic Varieties*, pp. 1–34, Oxford University Press, 1987. 2, 3, 15, 16, 19, 33, 34, 89, 91, 92, 95

- [14] S. Jarvis and P. Norbury, *Zero and Infinite Curvature Limits of Hyperbolic Monopoles*, *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* **29** (Nov, 1997) 737–744. 2, 34
- [15] O. Nash, *Singular Hyperbolic Monopoles*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **277** (Oct, 2008) 161–187. 2, 92
- [16] P. J. Braam and D. M. Austin, *Boundary Values of Hyperbolic Monopoles*, *Nonlinearity* **3** (Aug, 1990) 809–823. 2, 3, 15, 16, 34, 91
- [17] M. Murray and M. Singer, *Spectral Curves of Non-Integral Hyperbolic Monopoles*, *Nonlinearity* **9** (Jul, 1996) 973–997. 2, 3, 15, 16, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 31, 32, 34, 35, 41, 44, 45, 50, 67, 68, 69, 71, 88
- [18] P. Norbury, *Asymptotic Values of Hyperbolic Monopoles*, *J. London Math. Soc.* **64** (Aug, 2001) 245–256, [arXiv:math/9911146]. 2
- [19] A. Chakrabarti, *Construction of Hyperbolic Monopoles*, *J. Math. Phys.* **27** (Jan, 1986) 340. 2, 89
- [20] C. Nash, *Geometry of Hyperbolic Monopoles*, *J. Math. Phys.* **27** (1986) 2160. 2, 89
- [21] J. Y. Chan, *Discrete Nahm Equations for $SU(n)$ Hyperbolic Monopoles*, *J. Geom. Phys.* **132** (Oct, 2018) 239–256, [arXiv:1506.08736]. 2, 15, 34, 91
- [22] J. Y. C. Chan, *On Hyperbolic Monopoles*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Melbourne, 2017. 2, 3, 15, 34, 50, 88, 91
- [23] P. Forgacs, Z. Horvath and L. Palla, *Exact, Fractionally Charged Self-Dual Solution*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **46** (Feb, 1981) 392. 2, 35
- [24] A. Comtet, P. Forgacs and P. A. Horvathy, *Bogomolny-Type Equations in Curved Space-Time*, *Phys. Rev. D* **30** (Jul, 1984) 468. 2
- [25] N. S. Manton and P. M. Sutcliffe, *Platonic Hyperbolic Monopoles*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **325** (Jan, 2014) 821–845, [1207.2636]. 2
- [26] R. S. Ward, *Two Integrable Systems Related to Hyperbolic Monopoles*, *Asian J. Math.* **3** (Jan, 1999) 325–332, [arXiv:solv-int/9811012]. 2
- [27] N. J. Hitchin, *Monopoles and Geodesics*, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **83** (Dec, 1982) 579–602. 3, 30
- [28] N. J. Hitchin, *On the Construction of Monopoles*, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **89** (Jun, 1983) 145–190. 3
- [29] R. S. Ward, *A Yang–Mills–Higgs Monopole of Charge 2*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **79** (Sep, 1981) 317–325. 3

- [30] M. K. Prasad, *Exact Yang–Mills–Higgs Monopole Solutions of Arbitrary Topological Charge*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **80** (Mar, 1981) 137. [3](#)
- [31] M. K. Prasad and P. Rossi, *Construction of Exact Yang–Mills–Higgs Multimonopoles of Arbitrary Charge*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **46** (Mar, 1981) 806–809. [3](#)
- [32] M. K. Murray, *Monopoles and Spectral Curves for Arbitrary Lie Groups*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **90** (Jun, 1983) 263–271. [3](#), [29](#), [30](#)
- [33] M. K. Murray, *Non-Abelian Magnetic Monopoles*, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **96** (Dec, 1984) 539–565. [3](#), [16](#), [29](#), [30](#), [52](#)
- [34] M. K. Murray, *Non-Abelian Magnetic Monopoles*, Ph.D. thesis, Oxford University, 1983. [3](#), [29](#), [30](#)
- [35] J. Hurtubise and M. K. Murray, *On the Construction of Monopoles for the Classical Groups*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **122** (Mar, 1989) 35–89. [3](#), [15](#), [29](#), [31](#), [32](#), [33](#), [50](#), [51](#), [52](#), [91](#)
- [36] J. Hurtubise and M. K. Murray, *Monopoles and their Spectral Data*, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **133** (Nov., 1990) 487–508. [3](#), [88](#)
- [37] R. Penrose, *Twistor Algebra*, *J. Math. Phys.* **8** (Feb, 1967) 345. [3](#)
- [38] R. Penrose, *Twistor Quantization and Curved Space-Time*, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **1** (May, 1968) 61–99. [3](#)
- [39] R. Penrose, *Solutions of the Zero-Rest-Mass Equations*, *J. Math. Phys.* **10** (Jan, 1969) 38–39. [3](#)
- [40] M. G. Eastwood, *The Generalized Penrose–Ward Transform*, *Math. Proc. Camb. Philos. Soc.* **97** (Jan, 1985) 165–187. [3](#)
- [41] P. Sutcliffe, *Spectral Curves of Hyperbolic Monopoles from ADHM*, *J. Phys. A* **54** (Mar, 2021) 165401, [2008.00435]. [3](#)
- [42] H. Bethe, *Zur Theorie der Metalle - I. Eigenwerte und Eigenfunktionen der Linearen Atomkette*, *Z. Phys.* **71** (Mar, 1931) 205–226. [3](#)
- [43] L. Onsager, *Crystal Statistics. 1. A Two-Dimensional Model with an Order Disorder Transition*, *Phys. Rev.* **65** (Feb, 1944) 117–149. [3](#), [4](#)
- [44] E. K. Sklyanin, L. A. Takhtajan and L. D. Faddeev, *The Quantum Inverse Problem Method. I*, *Theor. Math. Phys.* **40** (Aug, 1979) 688–706. [3](#)
- [45] L. Faddeev and L. Takhtajan, *The Quantum Method of the Inverse Problem and the Heisenberg XYZ Model*, *Russ. Math. Surveys* **34** (Oct, 1979) 11–68. [3](#)

- [46] E. Sklyanin, *Quantum Version of the Method of Inverse Scattering Problem*, *J. Sov. Math.* **19** (Jul, 1982) 1546–1596. 3, 4
- [47] P. D. Lax, *Integrals of Nonlinear Equations of Evolution and Solitary Waves*, *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* **21** (Sep, 1968) 467–490. 3
- [48] J. B. McGuire, *Study of Exactly Soluble One-Dimensional N-Body Problems*, *J. Math. Phys.* **5** (May, 1964) 622–636. 3
- [49] C.-N. Yang, *Some Exact Results for the Many Body Problems in One Dimension with Repulsive Delta Function Interaction*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **19** (Dec, 1967) 1312–1314. 3
- [50] C.-N. Yang, *S-Matrix for the One-Dimensional N-Body Problem with Repulsive or Attractive Delta-Function Interaction*, *Phys. Rev.* **168** (Apr, 1968) 1920–1923. 3
- [51] R. J. Baxter, *Partition Function of the Eight-Vertex Lattice Model*, *Annals Phys.* **70** (Mar, 1972) 193–228. 3
- [52] R. J. Baxter, *Solvable Eight-Vertex Model on an Arbitrary Planar Lattice*, *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **289** (May, 1978) 315–346. 3
- [53] A. Kundu, *Quantum Integrable Systems: Construction, Solution, Algebraic Aspect*, *arXiv e-prints* (Dec., 1996) , [[hep-th/9612046](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9612046)]. 4
- [54] P. P. Kulish, N. Y. Reshetikhin and E. K. Sklyanin, *Yang–Baxter Equation and Representation Theory: I*, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **5** (Sep, 1981) 393–403. 4
- [55] A. A. Belavin and V. G. Drinfeld, *Solutions of the Classical Yang–Baxter Equation for Simple Lie Algebras*, *Funct. Anal. Its Appl.* **16** (Jul, 1982) 1–29. 4, 62
- [56] A. A. Belavin and V. G. Drinfeld, *Classical Young–Baxter Equation for Simple Lie Algebras*, *Funct. Anal. Its Appl.* **17** (Jul, 1984) 220–221. 4
- [57] A. A. Belavin and V. G. Drinfeld, *Triangle Equations and Simple Lie Algebras*. Harwood Academic, 1998. 4, 62
- [58] P. P. Kulish and E. K. Sklyanin, *Solutions of the Yang–Baxter Equation*, *J. Sov. Math.* **19** (Jul, 1982) 1596–1620. 4
- [59] V. V. Bazhanov and Y. G. Stroganov, *Trigonometric and S_n -Symmetric Solutions of Triangle Equations with Variables on the Faces*, *Nucl. Phys. B.* **205** (Jul, 1982) 505–526. 4
- [60] V. V. Bazhanov, *Integrable Quantum Systems and Classical Lie Algebras*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **113** (Sep, 1987) 471–503. 4
- [61] V. V. Bazhanov, *Quantum R-Matrices and Matrix Generalizations of Trigonometric Functions*, *Theor. Math. Phys.* **73** (Oct, 1987) 1035–1039. 4

- [62] N. Y. Reshetikhin, *The Spectrum of the Transfer Matrices Connected with Kac-Moody Algebras*, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **14** (Oct, 1987) 235–246. [4](#)
- [63] A. Stolin, *On Rational Solutions of Yang-Baxter Equation for $\mathfrak{sl}(n)$* , *Math. Scand.* **69** (Dec, 1991) 57. [4](#)
- [64] P. P. Kulish, *Integrable Graded Magnets*, *J. Sov. Math.*” **35** (Nov, 1986) 2648–2662. [4](#)
- [65] D. A. Leites and V. V. Serganova, *Solutions of the Classical Yang–Baxter Equation for Simple Superalgebras*, *Theor. Math. Phys.* **58** (Jan, 1984) 16–24. [4](#)
- [66] V. V. Bazhanov and A. G. Shadrnikov, *Trigonometric Solutions of Triangle Equations. Simple Lie Superalgebras*, *Theor. Math. Phys.* **73** (Dec, 1987) 1302–1312. [4](#)
- [67] N. Ishtiaque, S. F. Moosavian and Y. Zhou, *Elliptic Stable Envelopes for Certain Non-Symplectic Varieties and Dynamical R-Matrices for Superspin Chains from the Bethe/Gauge Correspondence*, *SIGMA* **20** (Oct, 2024) 099, [[2308.12333](#)]. [4](#)
- [68] P. Etingof and D. Kazhdan, *Quantization of Lie Bialgebras, I*, *Sel. Math.* **2** (Sep, 1996) 1–41, [[arXiv:q-alg/9506005](#)]. [5](#)
- [69] M. J. Martins, *An Integrable Nineteen Vertex Model Lying on a Hypersurface*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **892** (Jan, 2015) 306–336, [[1410.6749](#)]. [5](#)
- [70] B. Sriram Shastry, *Decorated Star-Triangle Relations and Exact Integrability of the One-Dimensional Hubbard Model*, *J. Stat. Phys.* **50** (Jan, 1988) 57–79. [5](#)
- [71] H. Au-Yang, B. M. McCoy, J. H. H. Perk, S. Tang and M.-L. Yan, *Commuting Transfer Matrices in the Chiral Potts Models: Solutions of Star Triangle Equations with Genus > 1* , *Phys. Lett. A* **123** (Aug, 1987) 219–223. [5](#)
- [72] R. J. Baxter, J. H. H. Perk and H. Au-Yang, *New Solutions of the Star Triangle Relations for the Chiral Potts Model*, *Phys. Lett. A* **128** (Mar, 1988) 138–142. [5](#)
- [73] V. V. Bazhanov, R. Kashaev and V. Mangazeev, *“ $\mathbb{Z}_N \times \mathbb{Z}_N$ Generalization of Chiral Potts Model.”* Institute for High Energy Physics, Protvino, Russia, 1990. [5](#), [12](#)
- [74] V. V. Bazhanov, R. M. Kashaev, V. V. Mangazeev and Y. G. Stroganov, *$\mathbb{Z}_N^{\times n-1}$ Generalization of the Chiral Potts Model*, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **138** (May, 1991) 393–408. [5](#), [12](#), [59](#)
- [75] S. Howes, L. P. Kadanoff and M. Den Nijs, *Quantum Model for Commensurate-Incommensurate Transitions*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **215** (Jan, 1983) 169–208. [5](#)

- [76] G. von Gehlen and V. Rittenberg, *\mathbb{Z}_N -Symmetric Quantum Chains with an Infinite Set of Conserved Charges and \mathbb{Z}_N Zero Modes*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **257** (1985) 351–370. [5](#)
- [77] H. Scott and P. Pearce, *Calculation of Intermolecular Interaction Strengths in the $P_{\beta'}$ Phase in Lipid Bilayers. Implications for Theoretical Models*, *Biophys. J.* **55** (Feb, 1989) 339–345. [5](#)
- [78] Baxter, R. J., *Free Energy of the Solvable Chiral Potts Model*, *J. Statist. Phys.* **52** (Aug, 1988) 639–667. [5](#)
- [79] G. Albertini, B. M. McCoy, J. H. H. Perk and S. Tang, *Excitation Spectrum and Order Parameter for the Integrable N -State Chiral Potts Model*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **314** (Mar, 1989) 741–763. [5](#)
- [80] R. J. Baxter, V. V. Bazhanov and J. H. H. Perk, *Functional Relations for Transfer Matrices of the Chiral Potts Model*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **4** (Apr, 1990) 803–870. [5](#)
- [81] V. V. Bazhanov and Y. G. Stroganov, *Chiral Potts Model as a Descendant of the Six Vertex Model*, *J. Statist. Phys.* **59** (May, 1990) 799–817. [5](#), [61](#)
- [82] R. J. Baxter, *Chiral Potts Model: Eigenvalues of the Transfer Matrix*, *Phys. Lett. A* **146** (May, 1990) 110–114. [5](#)
- [83] R. J. Baxter, *Corner Transfer Matrices of the Chiral Potts Model. 2. The Triangular Lattice*, *J. Statist. Phys.* **70** (Feb, 1993) 535–582. [5](#)
- [84] J. L. Cardy, *Critical Exponents of the Chiral Potts Model from Conformal Field Theory*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **389** (Jan, 1993) 577–586, [[hep-th/9210002](#)]. [5](#)
- [85] R. J. Baxter, *The Order Parameter of the Chiral Potts Model*, *J. Statist. Phys.* **120** (Aug, 2005) 1–36, [[cond-mat/0501226](#)]. [5](#)
- [86] R. J. Baxter, *Derivation of the Order Parameter of the Chiral Potts Model*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94** (Apr, 2005) 130602, [[cond-mat/0501227](#)]. [5](#)
- [87] H. Au-Yang and J. H. Perk, *Onsager’s Star-Triangle Equation: Master Key to Integrability*, in *Integrable Systems in Quantum Field Theory and Statistical Mechanics* (M. Jimbo, T. Miwa and A. Tsuchiya, eds.), pp. 57–94. Elsevier, 1989. [5](#)
- [88] H. Au-Yang and J. H. H. Perk, *The Many Faces of the Chiral Potts Model*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **11** (Jan, 1997) 11–26, [[q-alg/9609003](#)]. [5](#)
- [89] J. H. Perk, *The Early History of the Integrable Chiral Potts Model and the Odd-Even Problem*, *J. Phys. A* **49** (Mar, 2016) 153001, [[arXiv:1511.08526](#)]. [5](#)

- [90] H. Au-Yang and J. H. Perk, *About 30 Years of Integrable Chiral Potts Model, Quantum Groups at Roots of Unity and Cyclic Hyper*, in *Proceedings of the 2014 Maui and 2015 Qinhuangdao Conferences in Honour of Vaughan FR Jones' 60* (S. Morrison and D. Penneys, eds.), pp. 1–14, Australian National University, Mathematical Sciences Institute, 2017, [arXiv:1601.01014](#). 5
- [91] E. Date, M. Jimbo, K. Miki and T. Miwa, *R-Matrix for Cyclic Representations of $U_q(\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}}(3, \mathbb{C}))$ at $q^3 = 1$* , *Phys. Lett. A.* **148** (Aug, 1990) 45–49. 5, 12, 59, 86, 87
- [92] E. Date, M. Jimbo, K. Miki and T. Miwa, *Generalized Chiral Potts Models and Minimal Cyclic Representations of $U_q(\widehat{\mathfrak{gl}}(n, \mathbb{C}))$* , *Commun. Math. Phys.* **137** (Mar, 1991) 133–148. 5, 12, 59, 86, 87
- [93] E. Date, M. Jimbo, K. Miki and T. Miwa, *Cyclic Representations of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(n+1, \mathbb{C}))$ at $q^N = 1$* , *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.* **27** (Apr, 1991) 347–366. 5, 59, 86, 87
- [94] R. Kashaev, V. Mangazeev and T. Nakanishi, *Yang–Baxter Equation for the $\mathfrak{sl}(n)$ Chiral Potts Model*, *Nucl. Phys. B.* **362** (Sep, 1991) 563–582. 5, 12
- [95] V. V. Bazhanov and S. M. Sergeev, *A Master Solution of the Quantum Yang–Baxter Equation and Classical Discrete Integrable Equations*, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **16** (Jan, 2012) 65–95, [1006.0651]. 5
- [96] V. V. Bazhanov and S. M. Sergeev, *Elliptic Gamma-Function and Multi-Spin Solutions of the Yang–Baxter Equation*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **856** (Mar, 2012) 475–496, [1106.5874]. 5
- [97] A. P. Kels and M. Yamazaki, *Lens Elliptic Gamma Function Solution of the Yang–Baxter Equation at Roots of Unity*, *J. Stat. Mech.* **1802** (Feb, 2018) 023108, [1709.07148]. 5
- [98] M. Yamazaki, *Quivers, YBE and 3-Manifolds*, *J. High Energy Phys.* **05** (May, 2012) 147, [1203.5784]. 5
- [99] Y. Terashima and M. Yamazaki, *Emergent 3-Manifolds from 4d Superconformal Indices*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109** (2012) 091602, [1203.5792]. 5
- [100] M. Yamazaki, *New Integrable Models from the Gauge/YBE Correspondence*, *J. Statist. Phys.* **154** (Nov, 2014) 895, [1307.1128]. 5
- [101] M. Yamazaki, *Integrability As Duality: The Gauge/YBE Correspondence*, *Phys. Rept.* **859** (May, 2020) 1–20, [1808.04374]. 5
- [102] E. Date, M. Jimbo, K. Miki and T. Miwa, *Braid Group Representations Arising from the Generalized Chiral Potts Models*, *Pac. J. Math.* **154** (May, 1992) 37–66. 5

- [103] M. Atiyah, *Magnetic Monopoles and the Yang–Baxter Equations*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **06** (Jul, 1991) 2761–2774. [6](#), [7](#), [34](#), [35](#), [41](#), [85](#)
- [104] M. F. Atiyah and M. K. Murray, *Monopoles and Yang–Baxter Equations*, in *Further Advances in Twistor Theory: Integrable Systems, Conformal Geometry and Gravitation* (L. J. Mason, L. P. Hughston and P. Z. Kobak, eds.), vol. II of *Monographs and Surveys in Pure and Applied Mathematics*, pp. 13–14. CRC Press, 1st ed., 1995. [6](#), [7](#), [34](#), [35](#), [41](#), [85](#)
- [105] K. Costello, *Supersymmetric Gauge Theory and the Yangian*, [1303.2632](#). [6](#), [53](#)
- [106] E. Witten, *Integrable Lattice Models from Gauge Theory*, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **21** (Nov, 2017) 1819–1843, [[1611.00592](#)]. [6](#)
- [107] K. Costello, E. Witten and M. Yamazaki, *Gauge Theory and Integrability, I*, *ICCM Not.* **06** (Jul, 2018) 46–119, [[1709.09993](#)]. [6](#), [7](#), [10](#), [53](#), [54](#), [58](#), [59](#), [61](#), [62](#), [63](#), [78](#)
- [108] K. Costello, E. Witten and M. Yamazaki, *Gauge Theory and Integrability, II*, *ICCM Not.* **06** (Jul, 2018) 120–146, [[1802.01579](#)]. [6](#), [53](#), [54](#)
- [109] K. Costello and M. Yamazaki, *Gauge Theory And Integrability, III*, [1908.02289](#). [7](#), [53](#), [56](#)
- [110] B. Vicedo, *4D Chern–Simons Theory and Affine Gaudin Models*, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **111** (Feb, 2021) 24, [[1908.07511](#)]. [7](#)
- [111] F. Delduc, S. Lacroix, M. Magro and B. Vicedo, *A Unifying 2D Action for Integrable σ -Models from 4D Chern–Simons Theory*, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **110** (Feb, 2020) 1645–1687, [[1909.13824](#)]. [7](#)
- [112] M. Benini, A. Schenkel and B. Vicedo, *Homotopical Analysis of 4d Chern–Simons Theory and Integrable Field Theories*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **389** (Jan, 2022) 1417–1443, [[2008.01829](#)]. [7](#)
- [113] J. Liniado and B. Vicedo, *Integrable Degenerate \mathcal{E} -Models from 4d Chern–Simons Theory*, *Ann. Henri Poincaré* **24** (Apr, 2023) 3421–3459, [[2301.09583](#)]. [7](#)
- [114] O. Fukushima, J.-i. Sakamoto and K. Yoshida, *Comments on η -Deformed Principal Chiral Model from 4D Chern–Simons Theory*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **957** (Aug, 2020) 115080, [[2003.07309](#)]. [7](#)
- [115] K. Costello and B. Stefański, *Chern–Simons Origin of Superstring Integrability*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125** (Sep, 2020) 121602, [[2005.03064](#)]. [7](#)
- [116] J. Tian, *Comments on λ -Deformed Models from 4D Chern–Simons Theory*, [2005.14554](#). [7](#)

- [117] J. Tian, Y.-J. He and B. Chen, λ -Deformed $AdS_5 \times S^5$ Superstring from 4D Chern–Simons Theory, *Nucl. Phys. B* **972** (Nov, 2021) 115545, [2007.00422]. 7
- [118] J. Stedman, *Four-Dimensional Chern–Simons and Gauged Sigma Models*, 2109.08101. 7
- [119] O. Fukushima, J.-i. Sakamoto and K. Yoshida, *Integrable Deformed $T^{1,1}$ Sigma Models from 4D Chern–Simons Theory*, *J. High Energy Phys.* **09** (Sep, 2021) 037, [2105.14920]. 7
- [120] O. Fukushima, J.-i. Sakamoto and K. Yoshida, *Non-Abelian Toda Field Theories from a 4D Chern–Simons Theory*, *J. High Energy Phys.* **03** (Mar, 2022) 158, [2112.11276]. 7
- [121] Y.-J. He, J. Tian and B. Chen, *Deformed Integrable Models from Holomorphic Chern–Simons Theory*, *Sci. China Phys. Mech. Astron.* **65** (Sep, 2022) 100413, [2105.06826]. 7
- [122] N. Levine, *Equivalence of 1-Loop RG Flows in 4d Chern–Simons and Integrable 2d Sigma-Models*, 2309.16753. 7
- [123] M. Ashwinkumar, J.-i. Sakamoto and M. Yamazaki, *Dualities and Discretizations of Integrable Quantum Field Theories from 4d Chern–Simons Theory*, 2309.14412. 7
- [124] L. T. Cole and P. Weck, *Integrability in Gravity from Chern–Simons Theory*, *J. High Energy Phys.* **10** (Oct, 2024) 080, [2407.08782]. 7
- [125] P. Norbury and N. M. Romao, *Spectral Curves and the Mass of Hyperbolic Monopoles*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **270** (Dec, 2007) 295–333, [math-ph/0512083]. 7
- [126] E. J. Weinberg, *Fundamental Monopoles and Multimonopole Solutions for Arbitrary Simple Gauge Groups*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B167** (May, 1980) 500–524. 16, 41
- [127] E. J. Weinberg, *Fundamental Monopoles in Theories with Arbitrary Symmetry Breaking*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B203** (Aug., 1982) 445–471. 16, 41
- [128] P. Goddard, J. Nuyts and D. I. Olive, *Gauge Theories and Magnetic Charge*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B125** (Jul, 1977) 1–28. 16, 72
- [129] P. Goddard and D. I. Olive, *Magnetic Monopoles in Gauge Field Theories*, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **41** (Sep, 1978) 1357–1437. 16, 72
- [130] E. Corrigan and P. Goddard, *An n -Monopole Solution with $4n - 1$ Degrees of Freedom*, *Commun. Math. Phys* **80** (Aug, 1981) 575–587. 16
- [131] E. J. Weinberg and P. Yi, *Magnetic Monopole Dynamics, Supersymmetry, and Duality*, *Phys. Rept.* **438** (Jan, 2007) 65–236, [hep-th/0609055]. 16

- [132] I. N. Bernstein, I. M. Gel'fand and S. I. Gel'fand, *Schubert Cells and Cohomology of the Spaces G/P* , *Russ. Math. Surv.* **28** (Jun, 1973) 1–26. 17
- [133] N. Georgiou,
The Geometry Of the Space Of Oriented Geodesics Of Hyperbolic 3-Space, Ph.D. thesis, Munster Technological University, 2009. 19
- [134] N. Georgiou and B. Guilfoyle, *On the Space of Oriented Geodesics of Hyperbolic 3-Space*, *Rocky Mt. J. Math.* **40** (Aug, 2010) , [[arXiv:math/0702276](#)]. 19
- [135] R. O. Wells, *Complex Manifolds and Mathematical Physics*,
Bull. Am. Math. Soc. **1** (Mar, 1979) 296–336. 20
- [136] M. G. Eastwood, R. Penrose and R. O. Wells, *Cohomology and Massless Fields*,
Commun. Math. Phys. **78** (Jan, 1981) 305–351. 20
- [137] A. Grothendieck, *Sur La Classification des Fibres Holomorphes Sur La Sphere de Riemann*, *Am. J. Math.* **79** (Jan, 1957) 121. 30
- [138] L. M. Sibner and R. J. Sibner, *Classification of Singular Sobolev Connections by their Holonomy*, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **144** (Feb, 1992) 337–350. 34
- [139] L. M. Sibner and R. J. Sibner,
“*Existence of Hyperbolic Monopoles with Arbitrary Mass at Infinity.*” Online, 1995. 34
- [140] L. M. Sibner and R. J. Sibner, *Hyperbolic Multi-Monopoles with Arbitrary Mass*,
Commun. Math. Phys. **315** (2012) 383–399, [[arXiv:1210.0856](#)]. 34
- [141] A. M. Jaffe and C. H. Taubes,
Vortices and Monopoles: Structure of Static Gauge Theories. Progress in Physics 2. Birkhäuser Verlag, 1980. 34
- [142] J. Mendizabal, *A Hyper-Kähler Metric on the Moduli Spaces of Monopoles with Arbitrary Symmetry Breaking*, *Ann. Glob. Anal. Geom.* **66** (Jul, 2024) , [[arXiv:2306.03069](#)]. 50
- [143] J. Mendizabal,
On Monopoles with Arbitrary Symmetry Breaking and their Moduli Spaces, Ph.D. thesis, University Coll. London, 2024. 50
- [144] Y. Shnir and G. Zhilin, *G_2 Monopoles*, *Phys. Rev. D* **92** (Aug, 2015) 045025, [[1508.01871](#)]. 50
- [145] Y. M. Shnir, *Magnetic Monopoles*. Theoretical and Mathematical Physics. Springer, Berlin/Heidelberg, 2005. 52

- [146] K. Costello, *Integrable Lattice Models from Four-Dimensional Field Theories*, in *Proceedings of String-Math 2013* (R. Donagi, M. R. Douglas, L. Kamenova and M. Rocek, eds.), vol. 88, pp. 3–24, 2014, [1308.0370](#). [53](#)
- [147] E. Witten, *Fivebranes and Knots*, *Quantum Topol.* **3** (Nov, 2011) 1–137, [[arXiv:1101.3216](#)]. [54](#), [86](#)
- [148] K. Costello and J. Yagi, *Unification of Integrability in Supersymmetric Gauge Theories*, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **24** (Dec, 2020) 1931–2041, [[1810.01970](#)]. [54](#), [86](#), [91](#)
- [149] M. Ashwinkumar, M.-C. Tan and Q. Zhao, *Branes and Categorifying Integrable Lattice Models*, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **24** (Jan, 2020) 1–24, [[1806.02821](#)]. [54](#), [86](#)
- [150] N. Ishtiaque, S. F. Moosavian, S. Raghavendran and J. Yagi, *Superspin Chains from Superstring Theory*, *SciPost Phys.* **13** (Oct, 2022) 083, [[2110.15112](#)]. [54](#), [86](#), [91](#)
- [151] F. W. Wu, *Ising Model with Four-Spin Interactions*, *Phys. Rev. B* **4** (Oct, 1971) 2312–2314. [61](#)
- [152] L. P. Kadanoff and F. J. Wegner, *Some Critical Properties of the Eight-Vertex Model*, *Phys. Rev. B* **4** (Dec, 1971) 3989–3993. [61](#)
- [153] G. Felder, *Conformal Field Theory and Integrable Systems Associated to Elliptic Curves*, in *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians*, pp. 1247–1255. Birkhäuser Basel, 1995. [arXiv:hep-th/9407154](#). [62](#)
- [154] G. Felder, *Elliptic Quantum Groups*, in *11th International Conference on Mathematical Physics (ICMP-11) (Satellite colloquia: New Problems in the General Theory of Fields and Particles, Paris, France, 25-28 Jul 1994)* (D. Iagolnitzer, ed.), pp. 211–218, 7, 1994, [hep-th/9412207](#). [62](#)
- [155] E. Witten, *Chern–Simons Gauge Theory as a String Theory*, in *The Floer Memorial Volume* (H. Hofer, C. H. Taubes, A. Weinstein and E. Zehnder, eds.), vol. 133 of *Progress in Mathematics*, pp. 637–678. Birkhäuser, 1995. [hep-th/9207094](#). [64](#), [89](#)
- [156] M. L. Barberis, I. G. Dotti and M. Verbitsky, *Canonical Bundles of Complex Nilmanifolds, with Applications to Hypercomplex Geometry*, *Math. Res. Lett.* **16** (Mar, 2009) 331–347, [[arXiv:0712.3863](#)]. [64](#)
- [157] V. Tosatti, *Non-Kähler Calabi–Yau Manifolds*, in *Analysis, Complex Geometry, and Mathematical Physics: In Honor of Duong H. Phong* (P. M. N. Feehan, J. Song, B. Weinkove and R. A. Wentworth, eds.), pp. 261–277. American Mathematical Society, 2015. [arXiv:1401.4797](#). [64](#)

- [158] S. K. Donaldson and R. P. Thomas, *Gauge Theory in Higher Dimensions*, in *Conference on Geometric Issues in Foundations of Science in honor of Sir Roger Penrose's 65th Birthday*, pp. 31–47, 6, 1996. [65](#)
- [159] R. S. Ward and R. O. Wells, *Twistor Geometry and Field Theory*. Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics. Cambridge University Press, 8, 1991. [65](#)
- [160] T. Adamo, *Lectures on Twistor Theory*, in *Proceedings of XIII Modave Summer School in Mathematical Physics — PoS(Modave2017)*, vol. 323, p. 003, PoS Proc. Sci., Mar, 2018, [1712.02196](#). [66](#)
- [161] J. R. Porter, *Self-Dual Yang–Mills Fields on Minkowski Space-Time*, *J. Math. Phys.* **24** (May, 1983) 1233–1239. [67](#)
- [162] A. Moroianu, *Lectures on Kähler Geometry*. Cambridge University Press, Mar, 2007. [68](#)
- [163] C. Bănică and M. Putinar, *On Complex Vector Bundles on Projective Threefolds*, *Invent. Math.* **88** (Jun, 1987) 427–438. [69](#)
- [164] A. D. Popov, *Selfdual Yang–Mills: Symmetries and Moduli Space*, *Rev. Math. Phys.* **11** (Oct, 1999) 1091–1149, [[hep-th/9803183](#)]. [69](#), [88](#)
- [165] A. D. Popov, *Holomorphic Chern–Simons–Witten Theory: From 2D to 4D Conformal Field Theories*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **550** (Jun, 1999) 585–621, [[hep-th/9806239](#)]. [69](#), [88](#)
- [166] K. Costello, “*Topological Strings, Twistors, and Skyrmions.*” Talk at the Western Hemisphere Colloquium on Geometry and Physics, Apr, 2020. [69](#), [77](#), [88](#)
- [167] C. N. Yang, *Condition of Selfduality for $SU(2)$ Gauge Fields on Euclidean Four-Dimensional Space*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **38** (Jun, 1977) 1377. [69](#)
- [168] R. Bittleston and D. Skinner, *Twistors, the ASD Yang–Mills Equations and 4d Chern–Simons Theory*, *J. High Energy Phys.* **02** (2023) 227, [[2011.04638](#)]. [69](#), [77](#), [88](#)
- [169] C.-N. Yang, *Charge Quantization, Compactness of the Gauge Group, and Flux Quantization*, *Phys. Rev. D* **1** (Apr, 1970) 2360. [72](#)
- [170] A. D. Popov, *Holomorphic Analogs of Topological Gauge Theories*, *Phys. Lett. B* **473** (Jan, 2000) 65–72, [[hep-th/9909135](#)]. [74](#)
- [171] T. A. Ivanova and A. D. Popov, *Dressing Symmetries of Holomorphic BF Theories*, *J. Math. Phys.* **41** (May, 2000) 2604–2615, [[hep-th/0002120](#)]. [74](#)
- [172] L. Baulieu and A. Tanzini, *Topological Symmetry of Forms, $N = 1$ Supersymmetry and S-Duality on Special Manifolds*, *J. Geom. Phys.* **56** (Nov, 2006) 2379–2401, [[hep-th/0412014](#)]. [74](#)

- [173] K. Costello and S. Li, *Twisted Supergravity and its Quantization*, [1606.00365](#). [79](#), [83](#)
- [174] L. Baulieu, *SU(5)-Invariant Decomposition of Ten-Dimensional Yang–Mills Supersymmetry*, *Phys. Lett. B* **698** (Mar, 2011) 63–67, [[1009.3893](#)]. [79](#), [89](#)
- [175] B. Zwiebach, *Building String Field Theory Around Nonconformal Backgrounds*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **480** (Dec, 1996) 541–572, [[hep-th/9606153](#)]. [83](#), [89](#)
- [176] H. Au-Yang and J. H. H. Perk, *The $N \rightarrow \infty$ Limit of the Chiral Potts Model*, in *Differential Geometric Methods in Theoretical Physics - Proceedings of the XXI International Conference* (C. N. Yang, M. L. Ge and X. W. Zhou, eds.), p. 624pp, Sep, 1993, [[hep-th/9305171](#)]. [87](#)
- [177] H. Au-Yang and J. H. H. Perk, *The Large- N Limits of the Chiral Potts Model*, *Physica A* **268** (Jun, 1999) 175–206, [[math/9906029](#)]. [87](#)
- [178] V. O. Tarasov, *Cyclic Monodromy Matrices for the R-Matrix of the Six Vertex Model and the Chiral Potts Model with Fixed Spin Boundary Conditions*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **7S1B** (Apr, 1992) 963–975. [87](#)
- [179] V. Tarasov, *Cyclic Monodromy Matrices for $\mathfrak{sl}(n)$ Trigonometric R-Matrices*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **158** (Dec, 1993) 459–484, [[hep-th/9211105](#)]. [87](#)
- [180] C. De Concini and V. G. Kac, *Representations of Quantum Groups at Roots of 1*, in *Modern Quantum Field Theory - Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Modern Quantum Field Theory, TIFR, Bombay, India, 8 – 14 January 1990*, pp. 333–335, World Scientific Publishing River Edge, NJ, USA, 1991. [87](#)
- [181] V. Chari and A. Pressley, *Minimal Cyclic Representations of Quantum Groups at Roots of Unity*, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sr. I Math.* **313** (1991) 429. [87](#)
- [182] A. W. Schnizer, *Roots of Unity: Representations for Symplectic and Orthogonal Quantum Groups*, *J. Math. Phys.* **34** (Jul, 1993) 4340–4363. [87](#)
- [183] W. A. Schnizer, *Roots of Unity: Representations of Quantum Groups*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **163** (1994) 293–306, [[hep-th/9305180](#)]. [87](#)
- [184] V. P. Nair and J. Schiff, *A Kähler–Chern–Simons Theory and Quantization of Instanton Moduli Spaces*, *Phys. Lett. B* **246** (Aug, 1990) 423–429. [89](#)
- [185] V. P. Nair and J. Schiff, *Kähler Chern–Simons Theory and Symmetries of Antiselfdual Gauge Fields*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **371** (Mar, 1992) 329–352. [89](#)
- [186] R. Boels, L. J. Mason and D. Skinner, *Supersymmetric Gauge Theories in Twistor Space*, *J. High Energy Phys.* **02** (Feb, 2007) 014, [[hep-th/0604040](#)]. [89](#)

- [187] S. K. Donaldson, *Nahm's Equations and the Classification of Monopoles*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **96** (Sep, 1984) 387–407. [91](#)
- [188] W. Nahm, *All Self-Dual Multimono- poles for Arbitrary Gauge Group*, in *12th NATO Advanced Summer Institute on Theoretical Physics: Structural Elements in Particle Physics* (J. Honerkamp, K. Pohlmeyer and H. H. Römer, eds.), p. 378 pp, 9, 1981. [91](#)
- [189] W. Nahm, *The Algebraic Geometry of Multimono- poles*, in *11th International Colloquium on Group Theoretical Methods in Physics* (M. Serdaroglu and E. Inoenue, eds.), p. 569 pp, 11, 1982. [91](#)
- [190] D.-E. Diaconescu, *D-Branes, Monopoles and Nahm Equations*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **503** (Oct, 1997) 220–238, [[hep-th/9608163](#)]. [91](#)
- [191] M. K. Murray and M. A. Singer, *On the Complete Integrability of the Discrete Nahm Equations*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **210** (Mar, 2000) 497–519, [[math-ph/9903017](#)]. [91](#)
- [192] M. F. Atiyah, *Instantons in Two and Four Dimensions*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **93** (Dec, 1984) 437–451. [91](#)
- [193] J. Hurtubise, *Monopoles and Rational Maps: A Note on a Theorem of Donaldson*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **100** (Jun, 1985) 191–196. [91](#)
- [194] J. Hurtubise, *The Classification of Monopoles for the Classical Groups*, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **120** (Dec, 1989) 613–641. [91](#)
- [195] S. Jarvis, *Euclidian Monopoles and Rational Maps*, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.* **77** (Jul, 1998) 170–192. [91](#)
- [196] S. Jarvis, *A Rational Map of Euclidean Monopoles via Radial Scattering*, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **2000** (Jan, 2000) 17–41. [91](#)
- [197] S. Jarvis and P. Norbury, *Compactification of Hyperbolic Monopoles*, *Nonlinearity* **10** (Sep, 1997) 1073–1092. [91](#)
- [198] O. Nash, *Differential Geometry of Monopole Moduli Spaces*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Oxford, 2006. [math/0610295](#). [92](#)
- [199] N. Hitchin, *Einstein Metrics and Magnetic Monopoles*, in *Géométrie Différentielle, Physique Mathématique, Mathématiques et société (I) : Volume en l'honneur de Jean Pierre Bourguignon* (H. Oussama, ed.), no. 321 in Astérisque, pp. 5–29. Société mathématique de France, 2008. [92](#)
- [200] R. Bielawski and L. Schwachhofer, *Pluricomplex Geometry and Hyperbolic Monopoles*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **323** (Jul, 2013) 1–34, [[1104.2270](#)]. [92](#)

- [201] R. Bielawski and L. Schwachhofer, *Hypercomplex Limits of Pluricomplex Structures and the Euclidean Limit of Hyperbolic Monopoles*, [1201.0781](#). 92
- [202] J. Figueroa-O’Farrill and M. Gharamti, *Supersymmetry of Hyperbolic Monopoles*, *J. High Energy Phys.* **04** (2014) 074, [[1311.3588](#)]. 92
- [203] M. Gharamti, *Supersymmetry and Geometry of Hyperbolic Monopoles*, Ph.D. thesis, Edinburgh U., Edinburgh U., Sch. Math., Jul, 2015. 92
- [204] G. Franchetti and C. Ross, *The Asymptotic Structure of the Centred Hyperbolic 2-Monopole Moduli Space*, *SIGMA* **19** (Jul, 2023) 043, [[2302.13792](#)]. 92
- [205] P. Sutcliffe, *A Hyperbolic Analogue of the Atiyah-Hitchin Manifold*, *J. High Energy Phys.* **01** (2022) 090, [[2112.02949](#)]. 92
- [206] B. M. Mann and R. J. Milgram, *On the Moduli Space of $SU(n)$ Monopoles and Holomorphic Maps to Flag Manifolds*, *J. Diff. Geom.* **38** (Jul, 1993) 39–103. 92
- [207] M. F. Atiyah, *Geometry of Yang-Mills Fields*. Edizioni della Normale, 1979. 93
- [208] A. Hurwitz, *Ueber Riemann’sche Flächen mit Gegebenen Verzweigungspunkten*, *Math. Ann.* **39** (Mar, 1891) 1–60. 95
- [209] A. W. Knap, *Lie Groups Beyond an Introduction*, vol. 140 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Boston, 1996. 97, 103
- [210] R. Goodman and N. R. Wallach, *Symmetry, Representations, and Invariants*. Springer New York, 2009. 97, 99
- [211] S. Helgason, *Differential Geometry, Lie Groups, and Symmetric Spaces*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, Jun, 2001. 97
- [212] E. Cartan, *Les Groupes Réels Simples, Finis et Continus*, *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér.* **31** (1914) 263–355. 97
- [213] E. Cartan, *Sur Certaines Formes Riemanniennes Remarquables des Géométries á Groupe Fondamental Simple*, *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér.* **44** (1927) 345–467. 97
- [214] E. Cartan, *Sur la Structure des Groupes de Transformations Finis et Continus*, Ph.D. thesis, Sorbonne Université, 1894. 97
- [215] D. Bump, *Lie Groups*. Springer New York, 2013. 101