

# 1 Preface

Work partly finished (1110.1619), partly *in progress* with [Freed]. Builds on joint work with [Gaiotto-Moore].

Closely related to physics work of [Alexandrov-Persson-Pioline] and mathematical work of [Goncharov, Fock-Goncharov, Kontsevich-Solomonov, Haydys, Hitchin].

Another application of  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  supersymmetric QFT in four dimensions. If you study such a QFT on  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times S^1$ , at low energies, you see a sigma model whose target is a hyperkähler integrable system  $\mathcal{M}$ . Also see a recipe for constructing  $\mathcal{M}$ .

I'll describe an extension of the story, related to the physics of the theory on a circle *fibration* over  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . In this setting we meet  $\mathcal{M}$  as before, but also a construction of a canonically defined line bundle  $V$  over  $\mathcal{M}$ , with a hyperholomorphic connection.

Then ask: why does this construction exist? Say, in “theories of class  $S$ .” Not a complete answer yet, but partial answer: abelianization of Chern-Simons theory.

To ease the notation, I'll specialize to class  $S$  from the beginning.

## 2 Hitchin moduli space

Fix a compact complex curve  $C$ , and group  $G$ , say  $G = U(K)$ . The *Hitchin equations* for a tuple  $(E, h, \varphi, D)$  —  $E$  a  $C^\infty$  bundle,  $h$  a Hermitian metric in  $E$ ,  $\varphi$  a  $(1, 0)$ -form with values in  $End(E)$ ,  $D$  a  $h$ -unitary connection in  $E$  — are

$$F + [\varphi, \varphi^\dagger] = 0, \quad \bar{\partial}_D \varphi = 0.$$

The moduli space

$$\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(C, G)$$

parameterizing solutions modulo equivalence is a hyperkähler space.

## 2.1 Twistor family

Like any hyperkähler space,  $\mathcal{M}$  carries a family of complex structures  $J_\zeta$  and holomorphic symplectic forms  $\varpi_\zeta$ , for  $\zeta \in \mathbb{CP}^1$ . Organize them into *twistor family*

$$\mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}^1.$$

- Fiber over  $\zeta = 0$ :  $\mathcal{M}^{Higgs}(G, C)$ .
- Fiber over  $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ :  $\mathcal{M}^b(G, C)$ .
- Fiber over  $\zeta = \infty$ :  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{Higgs}(G, C)$ .

Points of  $\mathcal{M}$  give distinguished holomorphic sections of  $\mathcal{Z}$ .

Having  $\mathcal{Z}$  as a complex manifold, with fiberwise symplectic structure and real structure, is equivalent to having  $\mathcal{M}$  as a hyperkähler space.

## 2.2 The line bundle

Fact **[Haydys, Hitchin]**:  $\mathcal{Z}$  is carrying an interesting holomorphic line bundle  $\mathcal{V}$ .

- Over the special fiber  $\mathcal{M}^{Higgs}$ ,  $\mathcal{V}$  is the *determinant line bundle*, i.e. fiber over  $(E, \varphi)$  is  $\det H^*(E)$ .
- Over the generic fibers  $\mathcal{M}^b$ ,  $\mathcal{V}$  is the *Chern-Simons line bundle*: fiber over  $\nabla$  is  $CS(\nabla)$ .

Recall that for any flat  $GL(K)$ -connection  $\nabla$  over  $C$  there is a corresponding line  $CS(\nabla)$ , “Chern-Simons line.” If  $\nabla^3$  is a  $GL(K)$ -connection over a compact 3-manifold  $X$  then we can define a corresponding “classical Chern-Simons invariant”  $CS(\nabla^3) \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ ; if it’s on a trivial bundle,  $\nabla^3 = d + A$ , then

$$CS(\nabla^3) = \exp \left[ \frac{1}{4\pi i} \int_X \text{Tr}(A \wedge dA + \frac{2}{3} A \wedge A \wedge A) \right]$$

independent of trivialization. If  $X$  has boundary  $C$ , and  $\nabla^3$  restricts to a flat connection  $\nabla$  over  $C$ , there is a similar story except that  $CS(\nabla^3)$  depends on the trivialization at the boundary, in a fixed way; this defines a line, which we call  $CS(\nabla)$ .

Concrete consequence: having  $\mathcal{V}$  over  $\mathcal{Z}$ , trivial over sections, means that over  $\mathcal{M}$  we get a *hyperholomorphic* line bundle  $V$  [Ward, Hitchin, Feix, Goncharov], i.e. bundle with a Hermitian metric and a single unitary connection, compatible with *all* the holomorphic structures. In particular,  $F$  is of type  $(1, 1)_\zeta$  for all  $\zeta$ , i.e. a  $U(1)$  instanton over  $\mathcal{M}$ .

### 3 Direct construction

The  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SUSY QFT leads to a picture of  $\mathcal{Z}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  as “classical plus quantum corrections”: build a simple explicit hyperkähler space  $\mathcal{M}^{\text{sf}}$  with explicit hyperholomorphic line bundle  $V^{\text{sf}}$ , then construct  $\mathcal{Z}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  as  $C^\infty$  objects, plus a map

$$\Psi : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}^{\text{sf}}$$

and lift it to a map of line bundles. All structure pulled back. [Gaiotto-Moore-Neitzke]

The map  $\Psi$  turns out to be *discontinuous* — these discontinuities give the “quantum corrections” to the metric in  $\mathcal{M}$  and the hyperholomorphic structure in  $V$ . The precise construction of  $\Psi$  involves solving a Riemann-Hilbert problem.

The space  $\mathcal{Z}^{\text{sf}}$ , fiber by fiber, locally looks like a *torus*  $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^n$ . Gluing maps like  $(x, y) \rightarrow (x, y(1+x))$ . So  $\Psi$  is like cluster coordinates [\[Fock-Goncharov\]](#).

The line bundle  $\mathcal{V}^{\text{sf}}$  has explicit connection form

$$\frac{i}{4\pi}(\log x d \log y - \log y d \log x) + d \log \psi$$

Gluing then involves the dilogarithm:

$$\psi \rightarrow \psi e^{\frac{1}{2\pi i} Li_2(x)}$$

[\[Fock-Goncharov\]](#)

## 4 Abelianization

Now, how should we understand this construction? “Abelianization.”

- For  $\zeta = 0$ : for each  $(E, \varphi, \bar{\partial})$  in  $\mathcal{M}^{\text{Higgs}}$  there is a branched  $K$ -fold cover  $\Sigma \subset T^*C$ , holomorphic line bundle  $(\mathcal{L}, \bar{\partial})$  over  $\Sigma$ , and an isomorphism  $\iota : \pi_* \mathcal{L} \simeq E$  of holomorphic line bundles.
- For  $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ : for each  $(E, \nabla) \in \mathcal{M}^{\text{b}}$  there is a branched  $K$ -fold cover  $\Sigma \subset T^*C$ , line bundle  $\mathcal{L}$  with flat  $GL(1)$ -connection  $\nabla^{\text{ab}}$  over  $\Sigma$ , and an isomorphism  $\iota : \pi_* \mathcal{L} \simeq E$  — *but*, only on the complement of some “walls”  $\mathcal{W}$ , with unipotent jumps. So, concretely speaking,  $\nabla$  can be put in a local diagonal “gauge” everywhere away from the walls. Draw a “typical” example.

- For  $\zeta = \infty$ : complex conjugate of  $\zeta = 0$ .

Now what we claim for the lines:

- For  $\zeta = 0$ , have

$$\det H^*(\mathcal{L}, \bar{\partial}) \simeq \det H^*(E, \bar{\partial})$$

- For  $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ , also have (in progress!)

$$CS(\mathcal{L}, \nabla^{\text{ab}}) \simeq CS(E, \nabla)$$

Natural context for this: a broader story involving also 3-manifolds. So let's suppose we have a 3-manifold, and the same structure: then

- If you have a *diagonal* connection  $A$  then

$$\text{Tr}(A \wedge dA + \frac{2}{3}A \wedge A \wedge A) = \sum_{i=1}^K (A_i \wedge dA_i)$$

which is what you would get from integrating over the fibers.

- The contribution from “gluing in” the unipotent matrices vanishes.

- For  $\zeta = \infty$ : complex conjugate of  $\zeta = 0$ .

## 5 Gluing

This picture now “explains” the gluing construction from before: the tori that we considered are the tori of *abelian* connections over the spectral curves, and the explicit line bundle with connection that we used is the line bundle associated to  $GL(1)$  Chern-Simons.

To understand the dilogarithms we have to *compare* the abelianizations coming from two different spectral networks. This comparison gets most naturally interpreted in 3d, but this is a subject for another talk.