

Chiral and axial anomalies in the framework of generalized Hamiltonian BFV-quantization

I.Yu.Karataeva and S.L.Lyakhovich
Tomsk State University, Tomsk 634010, Russia

Abstract

The regularization scheme is proposed for the constrained Hamiltonian formulation of the gauge fields coupled to the chiral or axial fermions. The Schwinger terms in the regularized operator first-class constraint algebra are shown to be consistent with the covariant divergence anomaly of the corresponding current. Regularized quantum master equations are studied, and the Schwinger terms are found out to break down both nilpotency of the BRST-charge and its conservation law. Wess-Zumino consistency conditions are studied for the BRST anomaly and they are shown to contradict to the covariant Schwinger terms in the BRST algebra.

1 Introduction

The method of the generalized canonical BFV-quantization [1, 2, 3] is the most consistent general approach to quantization of the first-class constrained theories. In principle, it can also provide a tool for studying gauge anomalies, which is, in fact, widely applied in two-dimensional theories. In particular the method allows to find the critical parameters in such models as bosonic and fermionic strings [4, 5, 6], W-gravity [7], two-dimensional σ -models [8] and others. The attractive feature of the approach is also in its universal character that makes it possible to describe a full set of the anomalies in a theory with a pair of the BFV generating equations; moreover these principle equations are of an identical structure for all equal rank gauge theories (see in [3]). However, until recently there were no examples of describing anomalies in the framework of the operator Hamiltonian BFV-method in the case of $d > 2$. This is seemed to be induced partly by a known belief that "the canonical approach to quantization is theoretically useful but not practical" in particular due to the explicit relativistic noncovariance. It should be also mentioned that consistent regularization problem of equal-time commutators does really exist in Hamiltonian approach in $d > 2$ case, while it is not actual for $d = 2$ because the covariant OPE-technique can be used in the case.

We describe in the present paper the chiral nonabelian and axial abelian massless fermion anomalies [9, 10] in the framework of Hamiltonian BFV-quantization approach in $d = 4$. To do this uniformly we reformulate the global symmetry as a gauge one for both of the cases by introducing auxiliary fields which could be treated as analog of the Stuckelberg variables in a

massive theory. As a result the both symmetries are described by the BRST operator equations of the similar structure. Then we are proposing an explicitly covariant regularization scheme for the operator constrained Hamiltonian formalism and finding the Schwinger terms in the involution relations. These Schwinger terms induce the breakdown both of the BRST charge nilpotency and its conservation law, thereby the anomaly becomes of the BRST form. The mode of operation does not have a specific character for the both chiral and axial anomalies in its key points and the proposed procedure may serve as a possible tool in a study of other anomalies in $d > 2$.

Let us mention that the Schwinger terms turn out to be consistent with the covariant anomaly divergence of the corresponding current but they break down Wess-Zumino consistency condition for the operator BRST-algebra. It is worth noting that the contradiction between covariance and Wess-Zumino condition is the usual phenomenon for an anomalous theory itself (see [12]) and for the BRST-anomaly in particular. So, in an anomalous theory one usually has a difficult choice between the covariance and the Jacoby identity. We prefer the covariance for the following reason. We believe that the physically sensible theory should provide gauge anomalies to be mutually cancelled and thus it must have the nilpotent and conserved BRST charge (as far as an anomalous theory does not meet today any satisfactory physical interpretation). This mutual cancellation should be actual for an arbitrary coordinate system; thus we seemingly have to describe covariantly each of the anomalies, while the consistency condition could be provided for the total BRST charge as far as it becomes nilpotent in each coordinate system. Thus we may treat the considered theory as a part of a more wide one, where the proposed description of the anomaly could be applied for the anomaly cancelation covariant control.

Let us begin with a suitable (for our goal) outline of the symmetries in theory of the massless fermions chirally coupled to nonabelian massless vector field. The theory is described by the action

$$S = \int d^4x \left[i\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu\nabla_\mu\psi - \frac{1}{4}F^{a\mu\nu}F^a_{\mu\nu} \right]. \quad (1.1)$$

(hereafter we use the following notations: $\alpha, \beta, \mu, \nu, \rho, \sigma = 0, 1, 2, 3$; $i, j, k, l = 1, 2, 3$; $\eta_{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(-+++)$; $\gamma^\mu\gamma^\nu + \gamma^\nu\gamma^\mu = 2\eta^{\mu\nu}\mathbf{1}$, $\gamma^5 \equiv i\gamma^0\gamma^1\gamma^2\gamma^3$; $\gamma^5\gamma^5 = 1$; $\gamma^\mu\gamma^5 + \gamma^5\gamma^\mu = 0$; $\varepsilon^{0123} = 1$, t^a –anti-Hermitian normalized basis in the Lee algebra of symmetry group, f^{abc} – corresponding totally anti-symmetrical structural constants: $[t^a, t^b]_- = f^{abc}t^c$, $Sp[t^a, t^b] = -\frac{1}{2}\delta^{ab}$. A^a_ν and $F^b_{\mu\nu}$ — gauge vector field and strength tensor: $F^a_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A^a_\nu - \partial_\nu A^a_\mu - ie f^{abc} A^b_\mu A^c_\nu$; $\tilde{F}^a_{\mu\nu} = \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} F^{a\alpha\beta}$, $A_\nu = A^a_\nu t^a$, $F_{\mu\nu} = F^a_{\mu\nu} t^a$).

If the fermion connection in the covariant derivative involves nonabelian vector field only

$$\nabla_\mu\psi = \partial_\mu\psi - i\Gamma_\mu\psi, \quad \nabla_\mu\bar{\psi} = \partial_\mu\bar{\psi} + i\bar{\psi}\bar{\Gamma}_\mu \quad (1.2)$$

$$\Gamma_\mu = eA_\mu P_l, \quad \bar{\Gamma}_\mu = eA_\mu P_r, \quad P_l = \frac{1}{2}(1 \mp \gamma^5), \quad (1.3)$$

so the theory (1.1) with the connection (1.3) has the gauge symmetry, which is connected with the local transformations of the left fermions, and the global

invariance, which is connected to the transformations of the right fermions.

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_\varepsilon\psi &= ie\varepsilon P_l\psi, & \delta_\varepsilon\bar{\psi} &= -ie\bar{\psi}P_r, & \varepsilon &= \varepsilon^a(x)t^a. \\ \delta_\varepsilon A^a_\mu &= \partial_\mu\varepsilon^a + if^{abc}\varepsilon^b A^c_\mu\end{aligned}\quad (1.4)$$

The following Noether identities corresponding to the symmetries (1.4) hold off shell:

$$ie\left[\frac{\delta S}{\delta\psi(x)}t^a P_l\psi(x) - \bar{\psi}(x)P_r t^a \frac{\delta S}{\delta\bar{\psi}(x)}\right] - \partial_\mu\left[\frac{\delta S}{\delta A^a_\mu(x)}\right] + if^{abc}A^b_\mu \frac{\delta S}{\delta A^c_\mu} = 0$$

In Hamiltonian formulation the invariance (1.4) should appear as a set of the first-class constraints which generates gauge transformations in the phase space. Weakly conserving right current corresponds to the global symmetry transformations of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_\alpha\psi &= i\alpha P_r\psi, & \delta_\alpha\bar{\psi} &= -i\alpha P_l\bar{\psi}, \\ \delta_\alpha A_\mu &= 0, & \alpha &= \alpha^a t^a = \text{const.}\end{aligned}\quad (1.5)$$

The conservation law of the right current becomes strong when the spinor connection (1.3) is changed by another one which involves the additional pseudoscalar fields $\phi = \phi^a(x)t^a$ in the following form:

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_\mu &= eA_\mu P_l + K_\mu P_r, & \bar{\Gamma}_\mu &= eA_\mu P_r + K_\mu P_l, \\ K_\mu(x) &= K^a_\mu(x)t^a, & K^a_\mu &= \partial_\mu\phi^b(x)E^{-1ba}(x). \\ E^{-1ba}(x) &= \left[\frac{1 - \exp(-V(x))}{V(x)}\right]^{ba}, & V^{ab} &= -i\phi^c f^{abc}\end{aligned}\quad (1.6)$$

The theory (1.1) with the connection (1.6) possesses both the invariance (1.4) and the new symmetry which is gauged by the fields $\phi^a(x)$:

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_\alpha\psi &= i\alpha(x)P_r\psi, & \delta_\alpha\bar{\psi} &= -i\alpha(x)\bar{\psi}P_l, \\ \delta_\alpha\phi^a &= \alpha^a(x)E^{ba}, & \delta_\alpha A_\mu &= 0, \\ E^{ba}(x) &= \left[\frac{V(x)}{1 - \exp(-V(x))}\right]^{ba}.\end{aligned}\quad (1.7)$$

When the auxiliary fields are introduced in the action, than the new first-class constraints appear in the Hamiltonian formalism to generate the local transformations (1.7) on the theory phase space. The connection (1.6) apparently coincides with the standard one (1.3) being the gauge condition $\phi^a = 0$ imposed, that explicitly confirms classical equivalence of the both formulations of the nonabelian chiral theory. On the other hand the formulation using a localized invariance (that is the connection (1.7)) allows to regard the both symmetries on equal footing from the standpoint of the BV-quantization method. In this case, particularly, the BRST-charge will contain the first-class constraints corresponding to both of the invariances. Thus the anomalies of the full set theory symmetries will be described in a unified form by the unique set of the gauge algebra generating equations. We will study in this paper the quantum theory based on these generating equations.

Anomaly free operator canonical quantization of the theory (1.1) within the BV-approach [1, 2, 3] implies resolving of the following foremost problems:

- i) it is necessary to define the consistent regularization of the operator functionals (especially those ones which are actually involved into the principal generating equations) including the products of the noncommuting operators as well as the derivatives of such products at the same space point. In so doing the normal ordering should be introduced in a manner providing the regularized the operator functional algebra to be well-defined in the Fock space.
- ii) it implies to solve operatorial generating equations of the gauge algebra [2] –that is to find the nilpotent operator of the BRST-charge Ω and the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$ commuting with Ω . It is important to examine that the Schwinger terms in the commutators of regularized physical operators do not break the BRST-invariance.

Both of the requirements are studied in the paper and the solution is shown to be existed only for the first one within the given set of the fields and invariances. The Schwinger terms in the commutators of the generating operators Ω and $\mathcal{H}$ are evaluated explicitly, they describe the BRST-anomaly and never vanish.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 the regularized operator Hamiltonian formulation of the constraint theory (1.1) is constructed. The regularization scheme is chosen in a manner providing the explicit covariance for the operator functionals to be considered. The Schwinger terms in the commutators among the regularized first-class constraint operators and the Hamiltonian are further evaluated. It should be pointed out that it is the commutator of the constraints with the total Hamiltonian rather than with the Hamiltonian part involving current that make a contribution to the anomalous Schwinger terms of the involution relations (that is the current algebra is not enough to describe the anomalies of the constraint algebra). In so doing the anomaly in the conservation conditions of the constraints appears to be covariant and consistent with the covariant divergence anomaly of the left current obtained by Fujikawa [11, 12]. Note that no gauge for A^a_μ was used in the paper including the evaluation of the commutators of the constraints with the Hamiltonian and between them (in contrast to other papers on the Hamiltonian approach to the current algebra). In section 3 the anomaly in the Hamiltonian generating equations of the gauge algebra is evaluated. The nilpotency and conservation of the BRST-charge was demonstrated to be broken at the quantum level. In section 4 the axial invariance was presented as gauge one by the abelian analog of the connection (1.6). In much the same way as in sections 2 and 3 the axial anomaly is shown to be transform to the BRST-anomaly. The conclusion contains the discussion of the Wess–Zumino conditions for the anomaly and the concluding remarks. In appendix A all the quantum commutators contributing to the generating equations of the gauge algebra are evaluated. In appendix B all the vacuum expectation values which are needed for quantum commutators of the Hamiltonian nonabelian chiral and abelian axial theories are evaluated.

2 Constrained Hamiltonian formulation: regularization and Schwinger terms

Let us introduce in the theory (1.1) the momenta $p_k^a(\mathbf{x}, t)$ canonically conjugated to $A^{ak}(\mathbf{x}, t)$:

$$p_k^a(\mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_0 A^{ak}(\mathbf{x}, t))} = F_{0k}^a(\mathbf{x}, t) \quad (2.1)$$

whose equal time commutators are:

$$[A^{ai}(\mathbf{x}, t), p_k^b(\mathbf{y}, t)] = i\delta_k^i \delta^{ab} \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}). \quad (2.2)$$

The canonical commutation relations for the fermions are of the form:

$$[\psi(\mathbf{x}, t), \bar{\psi}(\mathbf{y}, t)] = -\gamma^0 \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \quad (2.3)$$

(the commutator is implied here for the bosonic variables and the anticommutator – for the fermionic ones)

There are the Gauss constraints in the Hamiltonian formulation of the theory (1.1)

$$\begin{aligned} G_l^a(x) &= (\nabla_k^l p^k(x))^a + e j_l^{a0}(x), \\ j_l^{a\mu} &= \bar{\psi} \gamma^\mu t^a P_l \psi, \\ (\nabla_k^l p^k(x))^a &= \partial_k p^{ak}(x) - i e f^{abc} A^{bk} p_k^c, \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

which generate the gauge transformations (1.4) in the phase space. If the invariance (1.5) is considered as a local one, then the connection (1.1) incorporates the fields ϕ^a (1.6), hence ϕ^a and the momenta p^a must be regarded as a one more canonical pair in the theory phase space:

$$[\phi^a(\mathbf{x}, t), p^b(\mathbf{y}, t)] = i\delta^{ab} \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}). \quad (2.5)$$

Then the following constraints appear in the Hamiltonian formulation

$$G_r^a(x) = p^a(x) - E^{-1ab}(x) j_r^{b0}(x), \quad (2.6)$$

to generate the local transformations (1.7) on the phase space.

The Hamiltonian of the theory is of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} H &= H_M + H_F, \quad H_F(t) = -i \int d\mathbf{x} \bar{\psi}(\mathbf{x}, t) \gamma^k \nabla_k \psi(\mathbf{x}, t), \\ H_M(t) &= \int d\mathbf{x} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} p_k^a(\mathbf{x}, t) p^{ak}(\mathbf{x}, t) + \frac{1}{4} F_{kl}^a(\mathbf{x}, t) F^{akl}(\mathbf{x}, t) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

On the classical level the constraints (2.4), (2.6) are nonabelian first class constraints commuting with the Hamiltonian (2.7).

In quantum theory the expressions incorporating the products of non-commuting operators at the same points as well as their derivatives need a regularization. The problem of regularization in the operator Hamiltonian

formulation connected with the issue of normal ordering as far the operators should be well defined in the Fock space. For the sake of unitarity in the physical subspace, the regularization and normal ordering must be compatible with the gauge invariance of the physical operators. The regularization is proposed for the quadratic forms of fermions to be consistent to the specific connection choice (as it is illustrated below by the example of the current and the covariant derivative thereof). The suggested regularization represents some modification of well-known point-splitting regularization [13]. The correct transformation properties of the product of the fermionic operators with the space-separated arguments are provided with multiplying by the specially constructed splitting function $R_l^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon)$, which is represented as a power series in the regularization parameter up to the third order inclusively, because the fermion propagator diverges as no more than ε^{-3} . It is the first order in the ε^{-1} which defines the anomaly value, while the second and the third orders do not contribute because of the regularizing function $R_l^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon)$ is taken up to the third order.

$$j_l^{\mu a reg}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon) = \bar{\psi}(\mathbf{x}_+, t) R_l^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon) \psi(\mathbf{x}_-, t), \mathbf{x}_{\pm} = \mathbf{x} \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \quad (2.8)$$

$$R_l^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon) = \mathbf{e}^+(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon) \gamma^{\mu} t^a P_l \mathbf{e}^-(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon) + \quad (2.9)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{6} \gamma^{\mu} t^a P_l [\bar{\mathbf{e}}^+(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon), \mathbf{e}^-(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon)]_-,$$

$$\mathbf{e}^+(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon) = \exp \left\{ i \int_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{x}_+} \bar{\Gamma}_j(\mathbf{z}, t) d\mathbf{z}^j \right\},$$

$$\mathbf{e}^-(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon) = \exp \left\{ i \int_{\mathbf{x}_-}^{\mathbf{x}} \Gamma_j(\mathbf{z}, t) d\mathbf{z}^j \right\},$$

$$\bar{\mathbf{e}}^+(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon) = \mathbf{e}^+(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon) (\bar{\Gamma}_j \rightarrow \Gamma_j).$$

The local form of regularized currents and covariant derivatives thereof are defined as:

$$j_l^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} j_l^{\mu a reg}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon), \quad (2.10)$$

$$\nabla_k^r j_l^{ka}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \partial_k j_l^{ka reg}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon) - i f^{abc} K_k^b(\mathbf{x}, t) j_l^{kc reg}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon) \right\}, \quad (2.11)$$

$$\nabla_k^l j_l^{ka}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \partial_k j_l^{ka reg}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon) - i e f^{abc} A_k^b(\mathbf{x}, t) j_l^{kc reg}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon) \right\}.$$

The derivatives and commutators are defined hereby in the following sense: at first all the differentiation and commutation of corresponding regularized operators perform and then the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ is taken as is done for example for a partial derivative in (2.11). The limit is taken to provide the spatial isotropy property:

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{\varepsilon^i \varepsilon^j}{\varepsilon^2} \right) = \frac{1}{3} \delta^{ij}. \quad (2.12)$$

If one need to define the quantum corrections to equal-time commutators of the fermion quadratic forms, in particular, of the currents, constraints and

Hamiltonian, it will be sufficient to know an equal-time normal coupling of fermions. It is evident from Wick theorem that the Schwinger terms are defined thereby as the contributions with two couplings. Let us introduce the fermionic vacuum $\langle 0|$ in the given fields A^μ and ϕ^a (the last mentioned—for the case of connection (1.6) only). Let us define the normal ordering of fermions in respect to the given vacuum in such a way that the normal coupling is the equal-time limit of the fermion propagator.

$$\bar{\psi}(\mathbf{x}_+, t)\psi(\mathbf{x}_-, t) = i \lim_{\varepsilon^0 \rightarrow -0} S^c(x_-, x_+) = iS^c(\mathbf{x}_-, t; \mathbf{x}_+, t), \quad (2.13)$$

where $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon^0, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$, $S^c(x_-, x_+)$ is the propagator

$$S^c(x_-, x_+) = -i\langle 0|T\bar{\psi}(x_+)\psi(x_-)|0\rangle,$$

obeying the equation

$$i\gamma^\mu \nabla_\mu^{(x)} S^c(x, y) = -\delta(x, y) \quad (2.14)$$

with the corresponding connection in the covariant derivative.

In the case of this normal ordering the Schwinger terms in the considered commutators can be expressed in terms of the corresponding vacuum expectation values of the quadratic forms of the fermions. The averaging is taken with respect to the fermionic vacuum in given fields A_μ and ϕ . All the vacuum expectation values are obtained in appendix B by means of the Schwinger–de Witt method [14]. Let us at first evaluate the divergence of the left and right currents in the chiral nonabelian theory without additional fields (the connection (1.2)) using the regularized quantum commutators, which are calculated in appendix A, and then the quantum constraint algebra of the same theory with the additional fields (the connection (1.6)) is examined too.

By making use of the Heisenberg equations with the Hamiltonian (2.7) without additional fields ($\phi = 0$) and the vacuum expectation values of the commutators $C_l^3(g; t)$, $C_l^4(g; t)$ (A.4; A.8; A.9) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle 0| \overset{l}{\nabla}_\mu j_l^\mu(g; t)|0\rangle &= \\ &= \langle 0| \overset{l}{\nabla}_i j_l^i(g; t)|0\rangle + \langle 0|i [H(t), j_l^0(g; t)] |0\rangle = \\ &= \frac{e^2}{32\pi^2} \int d\mathbf{y} Sp \left(g(\mathbf{y}, t) \tilde{F}^{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{y}, t) F_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{y}, t) \right), \\ \langle 0| \overset{r}{\nabla}_\mu j_r^\mu(g; t)|0\rangle &= \langle 0|\partial_i j_r^i(g; t)|0\rangle + \\ &+ \langle 0|i [H(t), j_r^0(g; t)] |0\rangle = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

where $J(f)$ means

$$J(f) = \int d\mathbf{x} f^a(\mathbf{x}) J^a(\mathbf{x}).$$

At the classical level the both of these divergences are obviously vanished, while the quantum divergence of the left current contains nonvanishing anomaly (2.15). In the constrained Hamiltonian formulation the corresponding anomaly arises in the involution relation of the Gauss law with the

Hamiltonian as it is shown below. The anomaly in the left current divergence derived here turns out to be explicitly covariant (although some vacuum expectation values may be noncovariant, for example see (A.7)) and it concurs with the covariant anomaly described by the path integral method [11, 12] but differs from the results of some other operator calculations [22, 24].

Let us consider the theory (1.1) with the Hamiltonian (2.7), connection (1.6) and the constraints (2.4), (2.6). Applying the quantum commutators from appendix A we obtain the following quantum corrections to the constraint algebra:

$$\langle 0 | [G_l(g, t), G_r(f, t)] | 0 \rangle = 0, \quad (2.16)$$

$$\langle 0 | [G_r(g, t), G_r(f, t)] | 0 \rangle = 0, \quad (2.17)$$

$$\langle 0 | i [H(t), G_r(f, t)] | 0 \rangle = 0, \quad (2.18)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle 0 | [G_l(g, t), G_l(f, t)] | 0 \rangle &= C^8(g, f; t) + e^2 C_l^{20}(g, f; t) + \\ &+ e C_l^1(g, f; t) - e C_l^1(f, g; t) = e \int d\mathbf{y} f^{abc} g^a(\mathbf{y}, t) f^b(\mathbf{y}, t) G_l^c(\mathbf{x}, t) + \\ &+ \frac{ie^3}{48\pi^2} \int d\mathbf{y} \tilde{F}^{a0i}(\mathbf{y}, t) \left(\overset{l}{\nabla}_i g(\mathbf{y}, t) \right)^b f^c(\mathbf{y}, t) d^{abc}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

where $d^{abc} = Sp \left(t^a [t^b, t^c]_+ \right)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \langle 0 | i [H(t), G_l(f, t)] | 0 \rangle &= C^6(g, t) + e C_l^3(g, t) + \\ &+ e C_l^4(g, t) = \frac{e^3}{32\pi^2} \int d\mathbf{y} Sp \left(g(\mathbf{y}, t) \tilde{F}^{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{y}, t) F_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{y}, t) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

The Schwinger terms in the Gauss law, that are seen from (2.16-2.20), may indicate the possible breaking of the gauge invariance (1.4) at the quantum level. This result does not depend on the presence of the auxiliary fields. The gauge invariance connected with the additional fields ϕ do not induce anomalous Schwinger terms. The quantum corrections to the commutator (2.20) are explicitly covariant and they correspond to the anomaly in the left current divergence (2.15). The anomaly in Gauss law commutators (2.19) is covariant and it differs from the consistent anomaly satisfied Wess-Zumino conditions [15] which has been considered in [16]–[21]. The covariant anomaly in Gauss law commutators found in [22, 23] differs from (2.19) by the coefficient. The anomaly in Gauss law commutators with the Hamiltonian (2.20) as well as in the left current divergence (2.15) derived by the Heisenberg equation was considered for example in [24] with the result consistent to the Wess-Zumino conditions and in [23] with the result agreed with our one. It should be mentioned, however, that we do not use gauge fixing conditions in our consideration in contrast to [22, 23].

The mere fact that there are Schwinger terms in constraint algebra does not imply an anomaly appearance, it may also be related to usual deformation of the gauge group representation. For example in the string theory the central extension of the Virasoro algebra does not imply an anomaly. However the loss of the nilpotency of the BRST charge and (or) the breaking of its conservation at a sacrifice of the Schwinger terms should be actually treated as a true manifestation of the anomaly. In the following section the question is studied how the generating equations are affected by the Schwinger terms.

3 The chiral anomaly and the BFB generating equations

In accordance to the general prescription of the BFB method let us introduce the ghosts $\mathcal{C}_l^a(x)$, $\mathcal{C}_r^a(x)$, $\mathcal{P}_l^a(x)$, $\mathcal{P}_r^a(x)$, $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_l^a(x)$, $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_r^a(x)$, $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_l^a(x)$, $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_r^a(x)$; the Lagrange multipliers λ_l^a , λ_r^a , π_l^a , π_r^a which have the following statistics, ghost numbers and (anti)commutation relations:

$$\begin{aligned} gh(\mathcal{C}_l^a) &= 1, \quad gh(\mathcal{C}_r^a) = 1, \quad gh(\mathcal{P}_l^a) = 1, \quad gh(\mathcal{P}_r^a) = 1, \\ gh(\bar{\mathcal{P}}_l^a) &= -1, \quad gh(\bar{\mathcal{P}}_r^a) = -1, \quad gh(\bar{\mathcal{C}}_l^a) = -1, \quad gh(\bar{\mathcal{C}}_r^a) = -1, \\ gh(\lambda_l^a) &= 0, \quad gh(\lambda_r^a) = 0, \quad gh(\pi_l^a) = 0, \quad gh(\pi_r^a) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{C}_l^a(\mathbf{x}, t), \bar{\mathcal{P}}_l^b(\mathbf{y}, t)] &= i\delta^{ab}\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \quad , \quad [\mathcal{C}_r^a(\mathbf{x}, t), \bar{\mathcal{P}}_r^b(\mathbf{y}, t)] = i\delta^{ab}\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}), \\ [\mathcal{P}_l^a(\mathbf{x}, t), \bar{\mathcal{C}}_l^b(\mathbf{y}, t)] &= i\delta^{ab}\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \quad , \quad [\mathcal{P}_r^a(\mathbf{x}, t), \bar{\mathcal{C}}_r^b(\mathbf{y}, t)] = i\delta^{ab}\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}), \\ [\pi_l^a(\mathbf{x}, t), \lambda_l^b(\mathbf{y}, t)] &= i\delta^{ab}\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \quad , \quad [\pi_r^a(\mathbf{x}, t), \lambda_r^b(\mathbf{y}, t)] = i\delta^{ab}\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}). \end{aligned}$$

The other possible (anti)commutators vanish. The Lagrange multipliers $\lambda_l^a, \lambda_r^a, \pi_l^a, \pi_r^a$ are bosons, the ghosts $\mathcal{C}_l^a(x)$, $\mathcal{C}_r^a(x)$, $\mathcal{P}_l^a(x)$, $\mathcal{P}_r^a(x)$, $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_l^a(x)$, $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_r^a(x)$, $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_l^a(x)$, $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_r^a(x)$ are fermions. Let regard the fermionic and bosonic generating operators of the gauge algebra corresponding to the constraints (2.4), (2.6) and Hamiltonian (2.7) (with the connection (1.6)).

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{min} &= \int d\mathbf{x} \left(\mathcal{C}_l^a(\mathbf{x}, t) G_l^a(\mathbf{x}, t) + \mathcal{C}_r^a(\mathbf{x}, t) G_r^a(\mathbf{x}, t) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{ie}{2} f^{abc} \mathcal{C}_l^a(\mathbf{x}, t) \mathcal{C}_l^b(\mathbf{x}, t) \bar{\mathcal{P}}_l^c(\mathbf{x}, t) \right), \end{aligned}$$

$$\Omega = \Omega_{min} + \int d\mathbf{x} \left(\pi_l^a(\mathbf{x}, t) \mathcal{P}_l^a(\mathbf{x}, t) + \pi_r^a(\mathbf{x}, t) \mathcal{P}_r^a(\mathbf{x}, t) \right), \quad (3.1)$$

$$\mathcal{H} = H. \quad (3.2)$$

The total unitarizing Hamiltonian is of the form:

$$H_\psi = \mathcal{H} - i [\Psi(t), \Omega(t)] \quad (3.3)$$

where Ψ is the gauge fixing fermion:

$$\Psi = \int d\mathbf{x} \left(\bar{\mathcal{C}}_l^a \chi_l^a + \bar{\mathcal{C}}_r^a \chi_r^a + \lambda_l^a \bar{\mathcal{P}}_l^a + \lambda_r^a \bar{\mathcal{P}}_r^a \right).$$

χ_l^a and χ_r^a are the spatial parts of the relativistic gauges Φ_l^a , Φ_r^a : $\Phi_l^a = \dot{\lambda}_l^a - \chi_l^a$, $\Phi_r^a = \dot{\lambda}_r^a - \chi_r^a$. As Φ_l^a it can be chosen the Lorentz gauge ($\lambda = A^0$) and $\Phi_r^a = \square \phi^a$ (because of $\lambda_r^a = \dot{\phi}^a$). If the theory is anomaly free, the BRST charge (3.1) must be nilpotent and commute with the Hamiltonian. By using the constraint algebra found in previous section as well as the involution relations of the constraints and Hamiltonian the following (anti)commutators are derived:

$$[\Omega_{min}, \Omega_{min}] = \frac{ie^3}{48\pi^2} \int d\mathbf{y} \tilde{F}^{a0i}(\mathbf{y}, t) \left(\nabla_i^l \mathcal{C}_l(\mathbf{y}, t) \right)^b \mathcal{C}_l^c(\mathbf{y}, t) d^{abc}, \quad (3.4)$$

$$i [\mathcal{H}, \Omega_{min}] = \frac{e^3}{32\pi^2} \int d\mathbf{y} Sp \left(\mathcal{C}_l(\mathbf{y}, t) \tilde{F}^{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{y}, t) F_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{y}, t) \right). \quad (3.5)$$

It is essential that the commutators of the terms cubic in ghosts do not have Schwinger terms. It is the circumstance that distinguishes the four-dimensional chiral symmetry from the two dimensional conformal one from the standpoint of the BFV formalism. In the $d = 2$ case the ghost Schwinger terms are not trivial and they may cancel the contribution of the Schwinger terms to the constraints commutators.

The relations (3.4) and (3.5) show that the both quantum generating equations do not valid for the generating operators (3.1),(3.2). The loss of the nilpotency of Ω and the breakdown $\mathcal{H}$ BRST invariance in the quantum theory means the chiral BRST anomaly in the true sense. It can be also shown that there are no local counterterms which could bring both the anomalous commutators (3.4), (3.5) to zero if they were added to the Hamiltonian and constraints. Thus there are no ways to remove the chiral anomaly from the generating equations. Although in the framework of the given model (1.1) with the invariances (1.4), (1.7) the chiral anomaly can not be eliminated, the previous consideration shows that the ghost sector may also have nontrivial Schwinger terms in the theory with a more wide invariance generated by first class constraints which have to be chiral spinors (and by the original constraints too). If the Gauss constraint might have nontrivial involution relations with the chiral spinor constraints, the cancelation of the anomalous chiral contribution of the form (3.4),(3.5) may become possible due to the Schwinger terms of the spinor ghost commutators. However, we can not find now an appropriate model of the desirable first class constraint structure to provide the mutual cancelation of the anomalous contributions to the generating equations.

4 Axial anomaly

Axial anomaly or Adler-Bell-Jackiw one [25, 26] historically was one of the first obtained and for many years it has been serving as a touchstone for new methods as well as for polishing traditional approaches to description an anomaly. In given section the techniques for the transformation of the axial anomaly to the corresponding BRST anomaly is suggested which allows to use the universal means of the Hamiltonian BFV-BRST formulation for description this anomaly. The Schwinger terms are evaluated much as it was done for the chiral anomaly in sections 2, 3 and appendixes. Therefore only final results are written out here – the anomaly in the conservation law of the axial current and the anomaly in the generating equations of the gauge algebra.

The theory of massless fermions interacting with the massless abelian vector field is described by the action (1.1) in the abelian case. If the fermion connection in the covariant derivative (1.2) includes the vector field $\Gamma_\mu = \bar{\Gamma}_\mu = eA_\mu$ only, the theory possesses an abelian gauge symmetry and a global axial one. Corresponding transformations are of the form:

$$\delta_\alpha \psi = ie\alpha\psi \quad , \quad \delta_\alpha \bar{\psi} = -ie\alpha\bar{\psi} \quad , \quad \delta_\alpha A_\mu = \partial_\mu \alpha; \quad (4.1)$$

$$\delta_{\alpha_5} \psi = i\alpha_5 \gamma^5 \psi \quad , \quad \delta_{\alpha_5} \bar{\psi} = -i\alpha_5 \bar{\psi} \gamma^5 \quad , \quad \delta_{\alpha_5} A_\mu = 0, \quad (4.2)$$

where $\alpha_5 = const, \alpha = \alpha(x)$. Classically the invariance (4.1) leads to the

identity connected to the strong charge conservation – the Gauss law. In the Hamiltonian formulation Gauss law is a first class constraint generating the gauge transformation on the phase space. The invariance (4.2) corresponds to the weakly conserved gauge invariant current. Because of this, in the Hamiltonian formulation the corresponding charge must commute with the Hamiltonian as well as with the first class constraint.

The conservation law of the axial current becomes strong, if the gradient of a pseudoscalar field ϕ_5 being treated as a new independent variable of the theory (1.1) is introduced into the spinor connection:

$$\Gamma_\mu = eA_\mu - \gamma^5 \partial_\mu \phi_5, \quad \bar{\Gamma}_\mu = eA_\mu + \gamma^5 \partial_\mu \phi_5. \quad (4.3)$$

Then the spinor transformations (4.2) become local and the field ϕ_5 becomes pure gauge field:

$$\alpha_5 = \alpha_5(x), \quad \phi_5^{(\alpha_5)} = \phi_5 - \alpha_5. \quad (4.4)$$

In so doing the first class constraint appears to generate local axial transformations (4.2), (4.4) on the phase space. The theory with the connection (4.3) coincides to the standard one under the gauge condition $\phi_5 = 0$. Thus the classical equivalence of the both theories is obvious. At the same time the formulation using localized axial invariance (the connection (4.3)) allows to regard the both symmetries on equal footing. In particular, in that case the BRST charge includes the first class constraints corresponding to both invariances. By this means the anomalies of the symmetries (4.1), (4.2), (4.4) are described by the same generating equations of the gauge algebra. The standard canonical relations (2.2), (2.3) are rewritten for the abelian case. The gauge field ϕ_5 and the momenta p_5 conjugated to them are regarded as a canonical pair:

$$[\phi_5(\mathbf{x}, t), p_5(\mathbf{y}, t)] = i\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})$$

Then there is the Gauss constraint in the theory (1.1):

$$T(\mathbf{x}, t) = \partial_k p^k(\mathbf{x}, t) + e j^0(\mathbf{x}, t) \quad (4.5)$$

generating gauge transformation (4.1) in the phase space. If the axial invariance is considered as a local one, that is the connection in (1.1) and (2.7) includes the field ϕ_5 , then there is one more constraint in the Hamiltonian formulation

$$T_5(\mathbf{x}, t) = p_5(\mathbf{x}, t) - j_5^0(\mathbf{x}, t) \quad (4.6)$$

which generates local axial transformations (4.2), (4.4). The Hamiltonian of the theory (1.1) is of the form (2.7) with the connection (4.3) in the abelian case. The constraints (4.5), (4.6) are of the first class and they are classically commuting with the Hamiltonian.

The following notations are used here:

$$j_{(5)}^\mu(\mathbf{x}, t) = (j^\mu(\mathbf{x}, t), j_5^\mu(\mathbf{x}, t)) = \bar{\psi}(\mathbf{x}, t)(\gamma^5)\gamma^\mu\psi(\mathbf{x}, t)$$

The following regularization accounting the connection is suggested for quadratic forms of fermions at the same point:

$$j_{(5)}^{\mu reg}(\mathbf{x}, t; \epsilon) = \bar{\psi}(\mathbf{x}_+, t) R_{(5)}^\mu(\mathbf{x}, t; \epsilon) \psi(\mathbf{x}_-, t), \quad \mathbf{x}_\pm = \mathbf{x} \pm \frac{\epsilon}{2},$$

$$R_{(5)}^\mu(\mathbf{x}, t; \epsilon) = (\gamma^5)\gamma^\mu \exp\left(i \int_{\mathbf{x}_-}^{\mathbf{x}_+} \bar{\Gamma}_j(\mathbf{z}, t) d\mathbf{z}^j\right).$$

The local form of regularized currents and derivatives is defined in much the same way as in (2.10) and (2.11).

By using canonical commutation relations only as well as the vacuum expectation values $V_{(5)}^\nu(\mathbf{x}, t; \epsilon)$ (B.14) and the space isotropic limit (2.12) we are coming to the following values of the quantum commutators:

$$\langle 0 | [T(g, t), T(f, t)] | 0 \rangle = 0 \quad (4.7)$$

$$\langle 0 | i [H(t), T(f, t)] | 0 \rangle = 0 \quad (4.8)$$

$$\langle 0 | [T_5(g, t), T_5(f, t)] | 0 \rangle = 0, \quad (4.9)$$

$$\langle 0 | [T(g, t), T_5(f, t)] | 0 \rangle = \quad (4.10)$$

$$= \frac{ie^2}{12\pi^2} \int d\mathbf{y} \partial_i g(\mathbf{y}) f(\mathbf{y}) \tilde{F}^{i0}(\mathbf{y}, t),$$

$$\langle 0 | i [H(t), T_5(f, t)] | 0 \rangle = \quad (4.11)$$

$$= -\frac{e^2}{4\pi^2} \int d\mathbf{x} \tilde{F}^{0i}(\mathbf{x}, t) p_i(\mathbf{x}, t) f(\mathbf{x}, t) =$$

$$= -\frac{e^2}{16\pi^2} \int d\mathbf{x} \tilde{F}^{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{x}, t) F_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{x}, t) f(\mathbf{x}, t).$$

Thus, as one can see from (4.7–4.11), the axial anomaly of the theory (1.1) with the connection (4.3) represents a quantum deformation of the constraint algebra that allows to describe it in the framework of BFV method in the same manner as it is done in the section 3 for the chiral anomaly.

If the theory considered without the auxiliary gauge field ϕ_5 , the quantum constraint algebra and the involution relation are of the form (4.7), (4.8). Then the anomaly in the Gauss law in the constrained Hamiltonian formulation is absent, while the weak conservation of the axial current $j_5^\mu(f, t)$ and the axial invariance are broken in the quantum theory:

$$\partial_\mu j_5^\mu(f, t) = \langle 0 | \partial_i j_5^i | 0 \rangle + \langle 0 | i [H(t), j_5^0(f, t)] | 0 \rangle = \quad (4.12)$$

$$= \frac{e^2}{4\pi^2} \int d\mathbf{x} \tilde{F}^{0i}(\mathbf{x}, t) p_i(\mathbf{x}, t) f(\mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{e^2}{16\pi^2} \int d\mathbf{x} \tilde{F}^{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{x}, t) F_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{x}, t) f(\mathbf{x}, t).$$

It is apparent that in the theory without the additional field the generating equations of the gauge algebra do not describe the anomaly. From this it follows that only the technique using additional field ϕ_5 allows to describe axial anomaly by the standard means of Hamiltonian BFV-BRST method.

According to the general prescription of BFV method we introduce the ghosts $\mathcal{C}(x), \mathcal{C}_5(x), \mathcal{P}(x), \mathcal{P}_5(x), \bar{\mathcal{P}}(x), \bar{\mathcal{P}}_5(x), \bar{\mathcal{C}}(x), \bar{\mathcal{C}}_5(x)$; the Lagrange multipliers $\lambda, \lambda_5, \pi, \pi_5$ with the following statistics, ghost numbers and (anti)commutation relations:

$$gh(\mathcal{C}) = 1, gh(\mathcal{C}_5) = 1 \quad , \quad gh(\mathcal{P}) = 1, gh(\mathcal{P}_5) = 1,$$

$$gh(\bar{\mathcal{P}}) = -1, gh(\bar{\mathcal{P}}_5) = -1 \quad , \quad gh(\bar{\mathcal{C}}) = -1, gh(\bar{\mathcal{C}}_5) = -1,$$

$$gh(\lambda) = 0, gh(\lambda_5) = 0 \quad , \quad gh(\pi) = 0, gh(\pi_5) = 0,$$

$$[\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}, t), \bar{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{y}, t)] = i\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \quad , \quad [\mathcal{C}_5(\mathbf{x}, t), \bar{\mathcal{P}}_5(\mathbf{y}, t)] = i\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}),$$

$$[\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{x}, t), \bar{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{y}, t)] = i\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \quad , \quad [\mathcal{P}_5(\mathbf{x}, t), \bar{\mathcal{C}}_5(\mathbf{y}, t)] = i\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}),$$

$$[\pi(\mathbf{x}, t), \lambda(\mathbf{y}, t)] = i\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \quad , \quad [\pi_5(\mathbf{x}, t), \lambda_5(\mathbf{y}, t)] = i\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}).$$

The other possible (anti)commutators vanish. The Lagrange multipliers λ , λ_5 , π , π_5 have the same statistics as the constraints T (4.5), T_5 (4.6), the ghosts $\mathcal{C}(x)$, $\mathcal{C}_5(x)$, $\mathcal{P}(x)$, $\mathcal{P}_5(x)$, $\bar{\mathcal{P}}(x)$, $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_5(x)$, $\bar{\mathcal{C}}(x)$, $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_5(x)$ have an opposite statistics to the constraints. Let us regard the fermion and boson generating operators of the gauge algebra corresponding to the constraints (4.5), (4.6) and the Hamiltonian (2.7) (with the connection (4.3)).

$$\Omega_{min} = \int d\mathbf{x} (\mathcal{C}T + \mathcal{C}_5T_5), \Omega = \Omega_{min} + \int d\mathbf{x} (\pi\mathcal{P} + \pi_5\mathcal{P}_5) \quad (4.13)$$

$$\mathcal{H} = H \quad (4.14)$$

The total unitarizing Hamiltonian is of the form:

$$H_\psi = \mathcal{H} - i [\Psi(t), \Omega(t)] \quad (4.15)$$

Ψ – is the gauge fermion:

$$\Psi = \int d\mathbf{x} (\bar{\mathcal{C}}\chi + \bar{\mathcal{C}}_5\chi_5 + \lambda\bar{\mathcal{P}} + \lambda_5\bar{\mathcal{P}}_5)$$

χ and χ_5 are the space parts of the relativistic gauges. The BRST charge (4.13) must be nilpotent and commuting with the Hamiltonian, if there are no anomalies in the theory. By making use of the found above constraint commutators and involution relations of the constraints with the Hamiltonian (4.7–4.11) we obtain the following quantum (anti)commutators for the charge and the Hamiltonian:

$$[\Omega_{min}, \Omega_{min}] = \frac{ie^2}{6\pi^2} \int d\mathbf{x} \mathcal{C} \partial_j \mathcal{C}_5 \tilde{F}^{0j}, \quad (4.16)$$

$$i[\mathcal{H}, \Omega_{min}] = -\frac{e^2}{4\pi^2} \int d\mathbf{x} \mathcal{C}_5 \tilde{F}^{0i} p_i = -\frac{e^2}{16\pi^2} \int d\mathbf{x} \mathcal{C}_5 \tilde{F}^{\alpha\beta} F_{\alpha\beta}. \quad (4.17)$$

The relations (4.16), (4.17) show that the nilpotency and the conservation condition of the BRST charge is broken on the quantum level, which is a consequence of an anomaly of the theory. The r.h.s. of the rel.(4.16), (4.17) are just the BRST-anomaly induced by the quantum breakdown of an axial symmetry of the theory and one can see the covariant character of this anomalous contribution. In the next Section we discuss the Wess-Zumino consistency conditions for the BRST-anomaly and summing up the results.

5 Discussion and Concluding Remarks

The theory of massless fermions chirally coupled to the nonabelian vector field is considered in the given paper as well as the axial abelian theory. The anomalies in the operator BGV generating equations of the gauge algebra are found in a covariant form. These anomalies are induced in their turn by the anomalous Schwinger terms in the commutators of Gauss law constraints with the Hamiltonian and between themselves. By making use of the Heisenberg equations the anomaly in left current divergence is obtained in the form which agreed with the covariant anomaly found before by the path integral method. To keep the gauge invariant form in the calculations

we use the splitting point regularization technique with the modified phase factor for the expressions quadratic in fermions and the Schwinger-deWitt approach to find the Green function. The theory of massless fermions interacting with the massless abelian vector field is also considered in the paper: the anomaly is found in the generating equations as well as in the divergence of axial current. In both of the theories additional fields are introduced to treat the global as well as the local invariances of the theory by means of the unique BRST charge on an equal footing. The anomaly of the generating equations in the axial theory arises by introducing additional field only which means that it is impossible to provide the local and global symmetries simultaneously in the quantum theory. While in the chiral theory the additional fields are not essential for the quantum generating equations because it is the purely gauge symmetry which is anomalous.

Let us discuss now the Wess–Zumino consistency conditions for the covariant anomalies in the BFV–generating equations considered in the paper. By making use of the rel (3.4),(3.5),(4.16),(4.17) for the BRST–anomaly we may have the following expressions for the cycled double commutators of the generating operators:

$$J_1 = [\Omega, [\Omega, \Omega]_+]_- = -\frac{ie^4}{48\pi^2} \int d\mathbf{x} d^{abh} f^{hcd} \tilde{F}^{a0i} (\nabla_i \mathcal{C})^b \mathcal{C}^c \mathcal{C}^d \quad (5.1)$$

$$J_2 = 2 [\Omega, i[H, \Omega]_-]_+ - i[H, [\Omega, \Omega]_+]_- = \frac{e^4}{24\pi^2} \int d\mathbf{x} d^{abh} f^{hcd} \tilde{F}^{a0i} p_i^b \mathcal{C}^c \mathcal{C}^d + \frac{ie^3}{24\pi^2} \int d\mathbf{x} d^{abc} \varepsilon^{0inm} p_i^a (\nabla_n \mathcal{C})^b (\nabla_m \mathcal{C})^c \quad (5.2)$$

For the axial anomaly one has for these commutators the following expressions:

$$J_1 = 0, \quad (5.3)$$

$$J_2 = -\frac{ie^2}{3\pi^2} \int d\mathbf{x} \varepsilon^{0inm} \partial_n p_m \mathcal{C} \partial_i \mathcal{C}_5 \quad (5.4)$$

If the operator algebra in the anomalous theory was consistent, than the r.h.s. of the rel.(5.1)–(5.4) would have to vanish to provide the Jacoby identity for the double commutators in the l.h.s. As we have already mentioned the covariant anomaly usually turns out to be inconsistent with the Wess–Zumino condition and the relations (5.1)–(5.4) demonstrate that the covariant BRST–anomaly is not an exceptional one.

We would like to mention that it may sometimes seem to be possible to transform a covariant anomaly into a consistent one by making use of two different tools. The first is to change the commutation relations between the momenta conjugated to the gauge fields

$$[p^i, p_5] = -\frac{ie^2}{12\pi^2} \tilde{F}^{0i}$$

for the axial case and

$$[p^{ai}, p^{bj}] = \frac{ie^3}{72\pi^2} \varepsilon^{0ijk} A_k^c d^{abc}$$

for the chiral one. This way was discussed in ref [27]. Although these commutation relations are inconsistent by themselves, they do restore the Wess-Zumino consistency conditions for the generating operators ($J_1 = 0$, $J_2 = 0$) for the abelian axial invariant theory. The explicit value of the anomaly for this case has the form

$$[\Omega, \Omega] = 0, \quad i[H, \Omega] = -\frac{e^2}{24\pi^2} \int d\mathbf{x} C_5 \tilde{F}^{\alpha\beta} F_{\alpha\beta}$$

As to the nonabelian chiral case this way may give only $J_1 = 0$, while the second Jacoby identity (5.2) still remains broken. Another way is to introduce an arbitrary constant multiplier to the connection in the regularizing function in the current. The hope is to find such a meaning for the multiplier which may provide both J_1 and J_2 to be vanished. This method was discussed in ref [13] with respect to the axial current anomaly. We can show that it may provide the consistency condition for the BRST-anomaly in the axial case but the nonabelian chiral case remains inconsistent again. Thus there are no known means to transform the operator covariant BRST-anomaly into the consistent one in the nonabelian chiral theory.

As far as the covariance and the consistency may contradict each other for an anomalous commutators one may have to choose one of the description methods: either inconsistent or noncovariant. Our point of view is in the following: the well defined physical theory should have its anomalies to be mutually cancelled in the gauge algebra generating equations. Then there will not appear a problem of this choice, while the anomalous model might be treated as a part of more wide theory with nilpotent and conserved BRST-charge. We believe the mutual cancelation of the anomalous contributions in the generating equations has to be described in the covariant form and the paper gives a scheme of such a description.

The authors wish to thank I.A.Batalin for helpful discussions. We are grateful also to the referee of the paper for a constructive criticism and very useful suggestions for improving the manuscript.

The work is partially supported by the ISF long term research grant No M2I000 and by the European Community grant INTAS-93-2058. One of us (SLL) is also thankful to the Royal Society for the support under Kapitza Fellowship Programme.

Appendix A

In appendix A we express the Schwinger terms of the quantum commutators involved into the constraint algebra, involution relations of the constraints with the Hamiltonian and in the Heisenberg equations for the currents in terms of the vacuum expectation values. The vacuum expectation values are obtained in appendix B.

The basic vacuum expectation value of the bilinear fermion operator has the following structure:

$$\begin{aligned}
 V_{l_r}^{\mu}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon | \hat{N}^q) &= \\
 &= \langle 0 | \bar{\psi}(\mathbf{x}_+, t) \left(\hat{N}^q R_{l_r}^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon) \right) \psi(\mathbf{x}_-, t) | 0 \rangle = \\
 &= \bar{\psi}(\mathbf{x}_+, t) \underbrace{\left(\hat{N}^q R_{l_r}^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon) \right)} \psi(\mathbf{x}_-, t)
 \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

$R_{l_r}^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon)$ is defined by (2.9), $\hat{N}^q$ are the operators acting on $R_{l_r}^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon)$ only:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{N}^{1b} R_{l_r}^{\mu a} &= \left[R_{l_r}^{\mu a}, t^b \right]_+; \\
 \hat{N}^{2b} R_{l_r}^{\mu a} &= \left[R_{l_r}^{\mu a}, t^b \right]_-; \\
 \hat{N}^{3b} R_{l_r}^{\mu a} &= \left[R_{l_r}^{\mu a}, t^b \right]_- - f^{abc} R_{l_r}^{\mu c}; \\
 \hat{N}_k^4 R_{l_r}^{ka} &= \partial_k R_{l_r}^{ka}; \\
 \hat{N}^{5kb}(\mathbf{y}, t) R_{l_r}^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon) &= \frac{\delta}{\delta A^{kb}(\mathbf{y}, t)} R_{l_r}^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon); \\
 \hat{N}^{6b}(\mathbf{y}, t) R_{l_r}^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon) &= \frac{\delta}{\delta \phi^b(\mathbf{y}, t)} R_{l_r}^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon);
 \end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

According to (2.13) we have:

$$V_{l_r}^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon | \hat{N}^q) = i \, Sp \, Tr \left(\hat{N}^q R_{l_r}^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon) S^c(\mathbf{x}_-, t; \mathbf{x}_+, t) \right), \tag{A.3}$$

the trace corresponding to t^a indices is denoted as Sp and the trace corresponding to the indices of γ -matrix as Tr .

The needed divergent and finite parts of the vacuum expectation values $V_{l_r}^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon | \hat{N}^q)$ (A.3) are found in appendix B by the proper time expansion of the Green function (2.14). It is apparent that all the Schwinger terms in the constraint algebra, in the involution relations of the constraints with the Hamiltonian and in the Heisenberg equations for the currents can be expressed in terms of the vacuum expectation values of the following commutators (or that is the same in terms of their Schwinger terms)

$$C_{l_r}^{1(g, f; t)} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle 0 | \left[\nabla_i^l p^i(g, t), j_{l_r}^{0reg}(f, t; \varepsilon) \right] | 0 \rangle,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
C_r^{l\,20}(g, f; t) &= \lim_{\substack{\varepsilon' \rightarrow 0 \\ \varepsilon \rightarrow 0}} \langle 0 | \left[j_r^{0reg}(g, t; \varepsilon), j_r^{0reg}(f, t; \varepsilon') \right] | 0 \rangle, \\
C_r^{l\,2i}(g, f; t) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle 0 | \left[j_r^{0reg}(g, t; \varepsilon), j_r^i(f, t) \right] | 0 \rangle, \\
C_r^{l\,3}(g; t) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle 0 | i \left[H_F(t), j_r^{0reg}(g, t; \varepsilon) \right] | 0 \rangle, \\
C_r^{l\,4}(g; t) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle 0 | i \left[H_M(t), j_r^{0reg}(g, t; \varepsilon) \right] | 0 \rangle, \\
C_r^{l\,5}(g, f; t) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle 0 | \left[j_r^{0reg}(g, t; \varepsilon), p(f, t) \right] | 0 \rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.4}$$

The vacuum expectation values (A.4) in their turn can be expressed in terms of $V_r^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon | \hat{N}^q)$ (A.3) by making use of the equal-time commutation relations (2.2), (2.3), (2.5) only (the coefficients for $V_r^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon | \hat{N}^q)$ are considered to the third order in ε because the fermion propagator includes divergences no more than ε^{-3}):

$$\begin{aligned}
C_r^{l\,1}(g, f; t) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{y} f^a(\mathbf{x}, t) \left(\nabla_j^l g(\mathbf{y}; t) \right)^b V_r^{0a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon | \hat{N}^{5jb}(\mathbf{y}, t)); \\
C_r^{l\,2\mu}(g, f; t) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int d\mathbf{y} g^a(\mathbf{y}, t) \left\{ f^b(\mathbf{y}, t) f^{abc} j_r^{\mu c reg}(\mathbf{y}, t; \varepsilon) + \right. \\
&+ f^b(\mathbf{y}, t) V_r^{\mu a}(\mathbf{y}, t; \varepsilon | \hat{N}^{3b}(\mathbf{y}, t)) - \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^j \partial_j f^b(\mathbf{y}, t) V_r^{\mu a}(\mathbf{y}, t; \varepsilon | \hat{N}^{1b}) + \\
&+ \frac{1}{8} \varepsilon^j \varepsilon^k \partial_j \partial_k f^b(\mathbf{y}, t) V_r^{\mu a}(\mathbf{y}, t; \varepsilon | \hat{N}^{2b}) - \\
&\left. - \frac{1}{48} \varepsilon^i \varepsilon^j \varepsilon^k \partial_i \partial_j \partial_k f^b(\mathbf{y}, t) V_r^{\mu a}(\mathbf{y}, t; \varepsilon | \hat{N}^{1b}) \right\};
\end{aligned}$$

(by the evaluation of $C_r^{l\,20}(g, f; t)$ (A.4) the result does not depend on in which order the local limit of either of the two regularization parameters is taken). The following notation are further used: $Z_l^i = eA^i$, $Z_r^i = K^i$.

$$\begin{aligned}
C_r^{l\,3}(g, t) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int d\mathbf{y} g^a(\mathbf{y}, t) \left\{ -\partial_i j_l^{ia reg}(\mathbf{y}, t; \varepsilon) + \right. \\
&\left. + V_r^{ia}(\mathbf{y}, t; \varepsilon | \hat{N}_i^4) \right\} + i C_r^{l\,2j}(g, Z_{lj}; t)
\end{aligned}$$

(The third term in this expression is the result of the commutation of the time-component of the regularized current with H_F^{int} , the first and the second ones — with the free part of the Hamiltonian H_F ; thus the both of these commutators have Schwinger terms, being anomalous in the case of the left current);

$$\begin{aligned}
C_r^{l\,4}(g; t) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{y} g^a(\mathbf{x}, t) p_j^b(\mathbf{y}; t) V_r^{0a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon | \hat{N}^{5jb}(\mathbf{y}, t)); \\
C_r^{l\,5}(g; t) &= i \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{y} g^a(\mathbf{x}, t) f^b(\mathbf{y}; t) V_r^{0a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon | \hat{N}^{6b}(\mathbf{y}, t));
\end{aligned}$$

When substituting the explicit form of the vacuum expectation value $V_r^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon | \hat{N}^q)$ from the appendix B and taking the local limit with the

spatial averaging (2.12) we obtain the following explicit expressions for the desired commutators (A.4):

$$C_l^1(g, f; t) = \frac{ie^2}{48\pi^2} \int d\mathbf{y} Sp \left\{ \tilde{F}^{0i}(\mathbf{y}, t) \left[\nabla_i^l g(\mathbf{y}, t), f(\mathbf{y}, t) \right]_+ \right\}; \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$C_r^1(g, f; t) = 0; \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$\begin{aligned} C_l^{2\mu}(g, f; t) &= \int d\mathbf{y} \left\{ g^a(\mathbf{y}, t) f^b(\mathbf{y}, t) f^{abc} \langle 0 | j_l^{\mu c}(\mathbf{y}, t) | 0 \rangle + \right. \\ &+ \frac{ie}{48\pi^2} Sp \left(g(\mathbf{y}, t) \left[\tilde{F}_l^{\mu i}(\mathbf{y}, t) \nabla_i^l f(\mathbf{y}, t) \right]_+ \right) - \\ &- \frac{i}{\pi^2 \epsilon^4} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(\epsilon^j \epsilon^k \eta_k^\mu \right) Sp \left(g(\mathbf{y}, t) \nabla_j^l f(\mathbf{y}, t) \right) - \\ &- \frac{i}{24\pi^2 \epsilon^4} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(\epsilon^j \epsilon^k \epsilon^m \epsilon^n \eta_n^\mu \right) Sp \left(g(\mathbf{y}, t) \nabla_j^l \nabla_k^l \nabla_m^l f(\mathbf{y}, t) \right) \left. \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

One may see from (A.4), (A.7) that the commutator of current time-component j_l^0 with the interaction part of the Hamiltonian H_F^{int} (which can be expressed in terms of the commutator of two currents) involves the contribution which is diverged as ϵ^{-2} and the finite contribution with the third derivatives. This part of the commutator is shown to cancel completely when one considers the commutator of j_l^0 with the total Hamiltonian H_F , namely:

$$\begin{aligned} C_l^3(g; t) &= - \langle 0 | \nabla_i j_l^{ic}(\mathbf{y}, t) | 0 \rangle + \\ &+ \frac{e^2}{48\pi^2} \int d\mathbf{y} Sp \left(g(\mathbf{y}, t) \left[\tilde{F}_l^{ij}(\mathbf{y}, t), F_{l ij}(\mathbf{y}, t) \right]_+ \right); \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

$$C_l^4(g; t) = \frac{e^2}{48\pi^2} \int d\mathbf{y} Sp \left(g(\mathbf{y}, t) \left[\tilde{F}_l^{0j}(\mathbf{y}, t), p_j(\mathbf{y}, t) \right]_+ \right), \quad (\text{A.9})$$

$$\begin{aligned} C_r^4(g; t) &= 0; \\ C_l^{5\mu}(g, f; t) &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

The following notations are used here: $\tilde{F}_l^{\mu\nu} = \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu}$; $\tilde{F}_r^{\mu\nu} = \epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} F_{r\alpha\beta}$; $F_{r\mu\nu}^a = - \left\{ \partial_\mu K_\nu^a - \partial_\nu K_\mu^a - i f^{abc} K_\mu^b K_\nu^c \right\}$. If K_μ^a are given by (1.6) than $F_{r\mu\nu}^a = 0$. The commutators given below do not contribute to the final expressions for the Schwinger terms of the current algebra and the involution relations, but they are accounted at the intervening calculations thereof.

$$C^6(g; t) = \langle 0 | i \left[H(t), \nabla_i^l p^i(g; t) \right] | 0 \rangle = \quad (\text{A.11})$$

$$= e \int d\mathbf{y} g^a(\mathbf{y}, t) \langle 0 | \left(\nabla_i^l j_l^i(\mathbf{y}, t) \right)^a | 0 \rangle,$$

$$C^7(g; t) = \langle 0 | i [H(t), p(g; t)] | 0 \rangle = \quad (\text{A.12})$$

$$= - \int d\mathbf{y} g^a(\mathbf{y}, t) E^{-1ab}(\mathbf{y}, t) \langle 0 | \left(\nabla_i^r j_r^i(\mathbf{y}, t) \right)^b | 0 \rangle,$$

$$C^8(g, f; t) = \langle 0 | \left[\nabla_i^l p^i(g; t), \nabla_j^l p^j(g; t) \right] | 0 \rangle = \quad (\text{A.13})$$

$$= e \int d\mathbf{y} f^{abc} g^a(\mathbf{y}, t) f^b(\mathbf{y}, t) \langle 0 | \left(\nabla_i^l p^i(\mathbf{y}, t) \right)^c | 0 \rangle.$$

Thus in (A.5–A.13) the vacuum expectation values of the quantum commutators (A.4) are explicitly given. They allow to describe completely the quantum contributions to the constraint algebra and the involution relations.

Appendix B

In appendix B we derive the finite and divergent parts of the vacuum expectation values $V_{lr}^\mu(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon | \hat{N}^q)$ being used to find the quantum commutators (A.4). The vacuum expectation values are defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} V_{lr}^\mu(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon | \hat{N}^q) &= \\ &= \langle 0 | \bar{\psi}(\mathbf{x}_+, t) \left(\hat{N}^q R_{lr}^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon) \right) \psi(\mathbf{x}_-, t) | 0 \rangle = \\ &= i \text{SpTr} \left(\hat{N}^q R_{lr}^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon) S^c(\mathbf{x}_-, t; \mathbf{x}_+, t) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where $R_{lr}^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon)$ and $S^c(\mathbf{x}_-, t; \mathbf{x}_+, t)$ are given by (2.9) and (2.13); $\hat{N}^q$ are the operators of the form (A.2) acting on $R_{lr}^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon)$ only. The equations for fermion propagator $S^c(x, y)$ (2.14) and for the $R_{lr}^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon)$ (2.9) use the connection which includes the additional fields ϕ^a .

The vacuum expectation value is derived in the following order. All functions in (B.1) are represented as the expansion in terms of ε with the coefficients depending on $(\mathbf{x}, t)$ only. Then the divergent and finite parts of (B.1) are extracted.

The expansion of $R_{lr}^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon)$ (2.9) in terms of ε is of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{lr}^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon) &= \gamma^\mu P_{lr} \left\{ t^a + b^{(1)a}{}_i \varepsilon^i + b^{(2)a}{}_{ij} \varepsilon^i \varepsilon^j + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + b^{(3)a}{}_{ijk} \varepsilon^i \varepsilon^j \varepsilon^k + \sim \varepsilon^4 \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} b^{(1)a}{}_i &= \frac{i}{2} [\Gamma_i, t^a]_+; \\ b^{(2)a}{}_{ij} &= -\frac{1}{8} [\Gamma_i \Gamma_j, t^a]_+ - \frac{i}{8} [t^a, \partial_i \Gamma_j]_- - \frac{1}{4} \Gamma_i t^a \Gamma_j; \\ b^{(3)a}{}_{ijk} &= \frac{i}{48} [\partial_i \partial_j \Gamma_k, t^a]_+ - \frac{i}{48} [\Gamma_i \Gamma_j \Gamma_k, t^a]_+ - \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{32} [\partial_i \Gamma_j \Gamma_k + \Gamma_k \partial_i \Gamma_j, t^a]_- + \frac{1}{16} (\Gamma_i t^a \partial_j \Gamma_k - \partial_i \Gamma_j t^a \Gamma_k) - \\ &\quad - \frac{i}{16} (\Gamma_i t^a \Gamma_j \Gamma_k + \Gamma_i \Gamma_j t^a \Gamma_k) + \frac{1}{48} t^a [\Gamma_i, \partial_j \Gamma_k]_- . \end{aligned}$$

The expansion need comprise terms up to ε^3 only because the fermion propagator diverges as no more than ε^{-3} .

The representation of $S^c(\mathbf{x}_-, t; \mathbf{x}_+, t)$ as a power series in ε is done in such a way. The fermion propagator $S^c(y_-, y_+)$ is expressed as a power series in ε with the coefficient depending on y only. Then the divergent and finite parts are separated and the limit $\varepsilon^0 \rightarrow 0$ is taken. The resulting expression is substituted into (B.1).

The derivation of the finite and divergent parts of the fermion propagator $S^c(y_-, y_+)$ is done covariantly by making use Schwinger deWitt technique [14] which does not have a need to fix a gauge for the vector field when the fermions are under the consideration.

Let us $S^c(y_-, y_+)$ is represented as

$$S^c(y_-, y_+) = -i\gamma^\nu \nabla_\nu \mathcal{G}^c(y_-, y_+), \quad (\text{B.3})$$

As is clear from (2.14) $\mathcal{G}^c(y_-, y_+)$ is subject to the equation:

$$\gamma^\nu \nabla_\nu \gamma^\alpha \nabla_\alpha \mathcal{G}^c(y_-, y_+) = -\delta(y_-, y_+). \quad (\text{B.4})$$

The covariant differentiation the two-point function in this paper is carried out with respect to the left argument only. The solution of (B.4) is expressed in form:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}^c(y_-, y_+) &= \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s^2} (is)^n \exp\left[\frac{i\sigma}{2s}\right] a_n(y_-, y_+), \\ \sigma &= \frac{1}{2}(y_- - y_+)^2 = \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2; \quad \sigma_\alpha = (y_- - y_+)\alpha. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

The coefficients $a_n(y_-, y_+)$ obey the following recurrent relations:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma^\alpha \gamma^\beta \sigma_\alpha \nabla_\beta a_0(y_-, y_+) + \gamma^\alpha \sigma_\beta \nabla_\alpha \gamma^\beta a_0(y_-, y_+) &= 0; \\ \frac{1}{2} \gamma^\alpha \gamma^\beta \sigma_\alpha \nabla_\beta a_n(y_-, y_+) + \frac{1}{2} \gamma^\alpha \sigma_\beta \nabla_\alpha \gamma^\beta a_n(y_-, y_+) + \\ + n a_n(y_-, y_+) &= \gamma^\alpha \nabla_\alpha \gamma^\beta \nabla_\beta a_{n-1}(y_-, y_+); \\ \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} a_0(y_-, y_+) &= 1. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

It should be mentioned that the covariant derivatives in (B.6) do not commute with γ -matrix. According to (B.3) and (B.5) the divergent and finite parts of $S^c(y_-, y_+)$ can be represented as:

$$\begin{aligned} S^c(y_-, y_+) &= \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \gamma^\nu \left\{ 8 \frac{\varepsilon_\nu}{\varepsilon^4} a_0(y_-, y_+) + \frac{4}{\varepsilon^2} \nabla_\nu a_0(y_-, y_+) + \right. \\ &+ 2 \frac{\varepsilon_\nu}{\varepsilon^2} a_1(y_-, y_+) + \nabla_\nu a_1(y_-, y_+) \int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s} \exp\left(\frac{i\sigma}{2s}\right) \Big\} + \sim \varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

First, all the two-points functions in (B.7) are represented as a power series in ε with the coefficients depending on $\Gamma(y)$ only (the differentiation the recurrent relations (B.6) and subsequent limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ give all the desired derivatives of $a_n(y_-, y_+)$ up to second order). Then, when setting $\varepsilon^0 \rightarrow 0$, the resulting expression is substituted to (B.1).

After taking the trace Tr of all the products of γ -matrix in $V_l^\mu(\mathbf{x}, t; \varepsilon | \hat{N}^q)$ (B.1) we obtain (with the accuracy to those order in ε which is used to define

the quantum commutators (A.4)):

$$V_r^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} | \hat{N}^{1b}) = \frac{i\varepsilon^i \eta^{\mu i}}{\pi^2 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^4} Sp[t^a, t^b]_+ + \quad (\text{B.8})$$

$$+ \frac{\varepsilon_i \varepsilon_j \varepsilon_k \eta^{\mu i}}{4\pi^2 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^4} Sp \left\{ -it^a \left[Z_r^j, \left[Z_r^k, t^a \right]_- \right]_- + \right. \\ \left. + t^a \left[\partial^j Z_r^k, t^a \right]_- \right\} - \frac{ie\varepsilon_i}{8\pi^2 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^2} Sp \left\{ [t^a, t^b]_+ \tilde{F}_r^{\mu i} \right\}; \\ V_r^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} | \hat{N}^{2b}) = \frac{i\varepsilon_i \varepsilon_j \eta^{\mu i}}{\pi^2 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^2} Sp \left\{ t^a \left[t^b, Z_r^j \right]_- \right\} - \quad (\text{B.9})$$

$$- \frac{ie\varepsilon_i}{8\pi^2 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^2} Sp \left\{ [t^a, t^b]_- \tilde{F}_r^{\mu i} \right\}; \\ V_r^{\mu a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} | \hat{N}^{3b}) = -\frac{i\varepsilon_i \varepsilon_j \eta^{\mu i}}{\pi^2 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^2} Sp \left\{ t^a \left[Z_r^j, t^b \right]_- \right\} + \quad (\text{B.10})$$

$$+ \frac{e\varepsilon_i \varepsilon_j}{16\pi^2 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^2} Sp \left\{ t^a \left[\tilde{F}_r^{\mu j}, \left[Z_r^i, t^b \right]_- \right]_+ \right\} + \\ + \frac{\varepsilon_i \varepsilon_j \varepsilon_k \varepsilon_l \eta^{\mu l}}{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^4} Sp \left\{ -\frac{1}{24\pi^2} t^a \left[t^b, Z_r^i Z_r^j Z_r^k \right]_- + \right. \\ + \frac{1}{8\pi^2} t^a Z_r^i \left[t^b, Z_r^j \right]_- Z_r^k + \frac{1}{24\pi^2} t^a \left[t^b, \partial^i \partial^j Z_r^k \right]_- - \\ - \frac{i}{16\pi^2} t^a \left[Z_r^i, \left[t^b, \partial^j Z_r^k \right]_- \right]_- - \\ - \frac{i}{16\pi^2} t^a \left[\partial^i Z_r^j, \left[t^b, Z_r^k \right]_- \right]_- - \\ \left. - \frac{i}{48\pi^2} t^a \left[t^b, \left[Z_r^i, \partial^j Z_r^k \right]_- \right]_- \right\};$$

$$V_r^{ia}(\mathbf{x}, t; \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} | \hat{N}_i^4) = -\frac{\varepsilon^i \varepsilon^j}{\pi^2 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^4} Sp \left[t^a \partial^i Z_r^j \right]_+ + \quad (\text{B.11})$$

$$+ \frac{e\varepsilon_i \varepsilon_j}{16\pi^2 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^2} Sp \left\{ t^a \left[\tilde{F}_r^{ki}, \partial_k Z_r^j \right]_+ \right\} + \\ + \frac{\varepsilon_i \varepsilon_j \varepsilon_k \varepsilon_l}{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^4} Sp \left\{ -\frac{1}{24\pi^2} t^a \partial^i \partial^j \partial^k Z_r^l + \right. \\ + \frac{1}{24\pi^2} t^a \left[Z_r^i, \left[Z_r^j, \partial^k Z_r^l \right]_- \right]_- + \\ \left. + \frac{i}{12\pi^2} t^a \left[Z_r^i, \partial^j \partial^k Z_r^l \right]_- \right\}.$$

$$V_l^{0a}(\mathbf{y}, t; \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} | \hat{N}^{5jb}(\mathbf{x}, t)) = \quad (\text{B.12})$$

$$= \frac{e^2 \varepsilon_i \varepsilon_j}{16\pi^2 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^2} Sp \left\{ [t^a, t^b]_+ \tilde{F}_l^{0i} \right\} \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y});$$

$$V_r^{0a}(\mathbf{y}, t; \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} | \hat{N}^{5jb}(\mathbf{x}, t)) = V_l^{0a}(\mathbf{x}, t; \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} | \hat{N}^{6b}(\mathbf{x}, t)) = 0. \quad (\text{B.13})$$

When the theory with the covariant derivative (1.2) is studied one should put $\phi = 0$ in (B.8–B.13). In the theory with the axial anomaly all the vacuum

expectation values of the regularized currents

$$V_{(5)}^\nu(\mathbf{x}, t; \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = \langle 0 | j_{(5)}^\nu(\mathbf{x}, t; \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) | 0 \rangle$$

are derived by the above method (all the comments upon the vacuum and normal ordering remain valid for this case). The following results are obtained for the vacuum expectation values to the order which contributes the desired quantum commutators:

$$V^\nu(\mathbf{x}, t; \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = -\frac{2\delta_k^\nu \varepsilon^k}{i\pi^2 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^4} ; \quad V_5^\nu(\mathbf{x}, t; \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = \frac{e\varepsilon_i}{4i\pi^2 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^2} \tilde{F}_r^{\nu i}(\mathbf{x}, t). \quad (\text{B.14})$$

The vacuum expectation values obtained in appendix B define the commutators considered in appendix A.

References

- [1] Batalin I.A., Vilkovisky G.A., Phys.Lett.B, 1977, V.69, N3, 309-312
- [2] Batalin I.A., Fradkin E.S., Phys.Lett.B, 1983, V.128, 303
- [3] Batalin I.A., Fradkin E.S., Ann.Inst.Henri Poincare, 1988, V.49, N2, 145-214
- [4] Hwang S., Phys.Rev.D, 1983, V.28, N10, 2614-2620
- [5] Kato M., Ogawa K., Nucl.Phys.B, 1983, V.212, 443-460
- [6] Ohta N., Phys.Rev.D, 1986, V.33, N6, 1681-1691
- [7] Thierry-Mieg J., Phys.Lett.B, 1987, V.197, 368
- [8] Fubini S., Maharana J., Roncadelli M., Veneziano G. Nucl.Phys. B, 1989, V.316, 36-58; Buchbinder I.L., Fradkin E.S., Lyakhovich S.L., Pershin V.D., Int.J.Mod.Phys. A, 1991, V.6, N 7, P.1211-1231
- [9] Jackiw R.: In Relativity, groups and topology 2, eds. B. deWitt, R. Stora (North - Holland, Amsterdam, 1984)
- [10] Zumino B.: In Relativity, groups and topology, eds. B. deWitt, R. Stora (North - Holland, Amsterdam, 1984)
- [11] Fujikawa K., Phys.Rev.D, 1980, V.21, 2848-2858; Phys.Rev.D, 1980, V.22, 1499(E)
- [12] Fujikawa K., Phys.Rev.D, 1984, V.29, 285; Phys.Rev.D, 1985, V.31, 341
- [13] Jackiw R.: In Lectures on current algebra and its applications. S. Treiman, et al (eds). (Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.Y., 1972.); Adler S.: In Lectures on elementary particles and quantum field theory, 1970, Brandeis University Summer Institute in Theoretical Physics, Vol.1, S. Deser et al (eds)
- [14] De Witt B.S., The Dynamical Theory of Groups and Fields, (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1965)
- [15] Wess J., Zumino B., Phys.Lett.B, 1971, V.37, 95
- [16] Faddeev L.D., Shatashvili S.L., Phys.Lett.B, 1986, V.167, 225
- [17] Faddeev L.D., Shatashvili S.L., Theor.Math.Phys., 1984, V.60, 206
- [18] Kobajashi M., Seo K., Sugamoto A., Nucl.Phys.B, 1986, V.273, 607
- [19] Kobajashi M., Sugamoto A., Phys.Lett.B, 1985, V.159, 315
- [20] Jo S.-G., Phys.Lett.B, 1985, V.163, 353; Nucl.Phys.B, 1985, V.259, 616
- [21] Fujikawa P., Phys.Lett.B, 1986, V.171, 424
- [22] Ghosh S., Banerjee R.Z., Z.Phys.C, 1988, V.41, 121

- [23] Hosono S., Seo K., Phys.Rev.D,1988,V.38,1296
- [24] Seo K., Phys.Rev.D,1990,V.42,2819
- [25] Adler S.L.,Phys.Rev.,1969,V.177,2426
- [26] Bell J.S.,Jackiw R.,Nuovo Cimento A,1960,V.60,47
- [27] Hosono S., Phys.Rev.D,1989,V.39,N 4,1745
- [28] Ghosh S., Banerjee R.Z.,Phys.Lett.B,1989,V.220,585