

Linear Response in the s.c. Bogolyubov model of Bose-Einstein Condensation.

L. A. Bányai, A. M. Bundaru , and P. Gartner^y

Institut für Theoretische Physik, J.W. Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt am Main

Abstract

We discuss the linear response of the Bogolyubov theory of a weakly interacting Bose gas below the critical temperature. The specific aspects, due to induced perturbation terms in the self-consistent treatment are discussed in detail. We show that Bogolyubov's model having a gap-less equilibrium spectrum nevertheless gives rise to an effective susceptibility which does not satisfy the super-fluidity criterion of Hohenberg and Martin.

1 Introduction.

The theoretical interest for Bose-Einstein Condensation (BEC) has largely increased in the last years due to spectacular experimental evidence with cold atoms in a magnetic trap [1, 2]. Most of the theoretical discussion for weakly interacting bosons is going within the frame of the equilibrium Bogolyubov model [3]. (See some recent books [4, 5] for the recent status of the theory as well as a discussion of this model related to some rigorous results in [6]). This model is actually also a self-consistent one, being however a truncation of the general self-consistent (s.c.) Hartree-Fock (HF) approximation with the purpose to obtain a gap-less quasi-particle spectrum, the former being from the variational point of view thermodynamically better. On the other hand, the evolution in real time towards equilibrium and the response of condensed bosonic systems to time-dependent external perturbations require a consideration of the self-consistent scheme out of equilibrium. Outside equilibrium the self-consistent averages, including the anomalous ones like the order parameter, are time-dependent and give rise to an induced perturbation. This aspect known also in the ordinary theory Hartree-Fock theory of Coulomb interacting particles modifies essentially the theory of linear response of a weakly interacting Bose gas. We revisit here the linear response properties of the Bogolyubov theory. Our analysis shows, that the Martin- Hohenberg [7] criterion for supra-fluidity is actually not satisfied in this model. Although the density-density fluctuation at $k = 0$ diverges logarithmically at small frequencies [5], the effective susceptibility remains finite.

2 The self-consistent Hartree-Fock approximation for weakly interacting bosons.

As it is well-known, the macro-canonical density matrix

Permanent address: Institute of Physics and Nuclear Engineering, Bucharest

^yPresent address: Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität, Bremen; Permanent address: National Institute for Materials Physics, Bucharest

$$= \frac{1}{Z} e^{-(H - N)}$$

is the solution of the following variational problem for the free energy:

$$G = \inf \text{Tr} (H - N) + \frac{1}{\beta} \ln(Z)$$

with $\beta > 0$ and $\text{Tr} \rho = 1$.

The equilibrium Hartree-Fock approximation is the approximate solution of this problem with the variational reservoir

$$\rho_{\text{test}} = \frac{1}{Z} e^{-(H_{\text{test}} - N)}$$

where H_{test} is the most general one-particle test Hamiltonian.

It is known [8], that if

$$H_{\text{test}} - N = \sum_i c_i A_i$$

with A_i given operators and c_i the corresponding variational parameters, the minimum of the above variational problem is achieved for

$$c_i = \frac{\partial \langle H_{\text{test}} - N \rangle}{\partial c_i} \quad \text{where} \quad \langle \dots \rangle = \text{Tr}(\rho_{\text{test}} \dots)$$

If the operators A_i are bilinear and linear combinations of creation and annihilation operators, then the (first) Wick theorem for equilibrium averages can be used to express $\langle H_{\text{test}} - N \rangle$ as a function of $\langle A_i \rangle$ for all i 's. This gives rise to the usual HF coefficients. While applying these results to bosonic systems one should take into account the existence of anomalous averages.

Actually the s.c. Hartree-Fock Hamiltonian is determined by the variational principle up to a constant ("HF constant"), which may be fixed by the requirement

$$\langle H \rangle = \langle H_{\text{test}} \rangle$$

Here of course the above described Wick's theorem must be applied also on the left hand side of this equation.

The resulting s.c. Hartree-Fock Hamiltonian may be generalized successfully under the same form also to non-equilibrium, however all the non-equilibrium the averages are now time dependent. It may be shown, that within this scheme (in the absence of time dependent external potentials), although the HF Hamiltonian is time-dependent, the average HF energy is still conserved.

Let us consider now the Hamiltonian of interacting bosons (in the presence of an external potential $U(\mathbf{x})$)

$$H = \int d\mathbf{x} \psi^\dagger(\mathbf{x}) \left(-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 + U(\mathbf{x}) \right) \psi(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2} \int d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{x}' w(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}') \psi^\dagger(\mathbf{x}) \psi^\dagger(\mathbf{x}') \psi(\mathbf{x}) \psi(\mathbf{x}') \quad : \quad (1)$$

This Hamiltonian conserves the number of bosons, but we are looking for a spontaneous symmetry breaking solution. Therefore in applying the HF-scheme we choose for the set \mathbf{A} the operators $(\mathbf{x})^+ (\mathbf{x}^0); (\mathbf{x}) (\mathbf{x}^0); (\mathbf{x})$ and their conjugates.

It can be shown that, for the case of spontaneous symmetry breaking with anomalous averages $\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle$ and $\langle \mathbf{x}^0 \rangle$, the first Wick theorem needed by the above stated recipe for equilibrium gives rise to

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (\mathbf{x})^+ (\mathbf{x}^0)^+ (\mathbf{x}^0) (\mathbf{x}) \rangle &= \langle (\mathbf{x})^+ (\mathbf{x}^0) \rangle \langle (\mathbf{x}^0)^+ (\mathbf{x}) \rangle + \langle (\mathbf{x})^+ (\mathbf{x}) \rangle \langle (\mathbf{x}^0)^+ (\mathbf{x}^0) \rangle \\ &+ \langle (\mathbf{x})^+ (\mathbf{x}^0)^+ \rangle \langle (\mathbf{x}^0) (\mathbf{x}) \rangle - 2 \langle (\mathbf{x}) \rangle \langle (\mathbf{x}^0) \rangle^2 : \end{aligned}$$

The last term is the correction to the usual Wick theorem. This result may be obtained also by separating $\mathbf{x} = \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle + (\mathbf{x} - \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle)$ and afterwards applying the usual Wick theorem. After reintroducing the old operators one gets the previous result.

Based on this Wick's theorem one obtains immediately, according to the recipe described above, the form of the s.c. HF Hamiltonian H_{HF}^0 (the upper index 0 indicates, that it refers to equilibrium)

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\text{HF}}^0 &= \int d\mathbf{x} (\mathbf{x})^+ \left[\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 + U(\mathbf{x}) \right] (\mathbf{x}) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \int d\mathbf{x} w(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^0) [(\mathbf{x})^+ (\mathbf{x}^0) + (\mathbf{x}^0)^+ (\mathbf{x})] \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \int d\mathbf{x} [(\mathbf{x})^+ (\mathbf{x}) + (\mathbf{x}^0)^+ (\mathbf{x}^0)] \\ &+ \left(\int d\mathbf{x} (\mathbf{x}) (\mathbf{x}^0) h(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^0) + \text{h.c.} \right) \\ &- 4 \langle (\mathbf{x}) \rangle \langle (\mathbf{x}^0) \rangle^2 + \text{h.c.} : \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Here we took into account also that $w(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^0) = w(\mathbf{x}^0 - \mathbf{x})$ and omitted the HF constant.

It is important to remark, that the above described procedure differs from a formal shift directly in the Hamiltonian followed by applying the operatorial (second) Wick theorem for contractions.

We shall not discuss here furthermore the existence and subtle definition of the Bose condensation in the presence of an external potential (see [11]), but we shall treat later the linear response to a time dependent external potential.

The above described s.c. Hartree-Fock Hamiltonian may be generalized also to non-equilibrium situations and in the case of a contact interaction is often called as The Bogolyubov-Popov model[9, 10].

In the absence of an external potential $U(\mathbf{x})$ we shall rewrite the s.c. HF Hamiltonian in the \mathbf{k} -space. One introduces the Fourier transforms

$$(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{V}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} b_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}}; \quad w(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} w_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}}$$

and one gets due to translational invariance (momentum conservation)

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{HF}^0 = & \sum_k \left(\frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m} + \frac{1}{V} \sum_p (w_{k+p} + w_0) \hbar b_p^\dagger b_p \right) b_k^\dagger b_k \\
& + \frac{1}{2V} \sum_p w_{k+p} [\hbar b_p b_p \dagger b_k b_k + \text{h.c.}] \\
& - \frac{2}{V} w_0 \hbar b_0 \dagger^2 (\hbar b_0 \dagger b_0 + \text{h.c.}) ;
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

or

$$H_{HF}^0 = \sum_k \epsilon_k b_k^\dagger b_k + \frac{1}{2} (c_k b_k b_k + c_k b_k^\dagger b_k^\dagger) - 2w_0 \frac{1}{V} \hbar b_0 \dagger^2 (\hbar b_0 \dagger b_0 + \hbar b_0 \dagger b_0^\dagger) \tag{4}$$

with the notations

$$\epsilon_k = \frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m} + \frac{1}{V} \sum_p (w_{k+p} + w_0) \hbar b_p^\dagger b_p ; \tag{5}$$

$$c_k = \frac{1}{V} \sum_p w_{k+p} \hbar b_p b_p \dagger \tag{6}$$

3 The s.c. equilibrium HF solution for interacting bosons.

In the case of a homogenous system in equilibrium one may study in more detail the self-consistency equations and therefore the properties of the solution. With the help of the Bogolyubov transformation one may bring the Hamiltonian Eq.(4) to the diagonal form

$$H_{HF}^0 = \sum_k \epsilon_k b_k^\dagger b_k + \text{const.}$$

with some new (bosonic) quasiparticle annihilation and creation operators b_k and b_k^\dagger .

1) Keeping only the terms of the HF Hamiltonian containing operators of the non-condensate, relevant for the elementary excitations, we have:

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \neq 0} (\epsilon_k - \mu) (b_k^\dagger b_k + b_k^\dagger b_k) + c_k b_k b_k + c_k b_k^\dagger b_k^\dagger$$

with μ being the chemical potential.

This Hamiltonian is diagonalized to the form $\sum_{k \neq 0} \epsilon_k b_k^\dagger b_k$ (up to a constant term) by the canonical transformation [3] to the new boson fields u_k and v_k :

$$b_k = u_k b_k + v_k b_k^\dagger \tag{7}$$

with

$$u_k = u_k; \quad v_k = v_k \quad \text{and} \quad u_k^2 + v_k^2 = 1:$$

One gets

$$u_k = \cosh(\epsilon_k) e^{\epsilon_k}; \quad v_k = \sinh(\epsilon_k) e^{\epsilon_k} e^{i\theta_k} \quad (8)$$

with ϵ_k defined by

$$\alpha_k = \frac{J_k}{J} e^{i\theta_k} \quad (9)$$

and

$$\tanh(2\epsilon_k) = \frac{J_k}{J} \frac{1}{e_k} : \quad (10)$$

One has to require of course

$$\frac{J_k}{J} < 1:$$

The phase θ_k remains arbitrary and the energies are given by

$$\epsilon_k = \text{sign}(e_k) \sqrt{e_k^2 - \frac{J_k^2}{J^2}} :$$

For reasons of stability one should have

$$e_k > 0$$

and therefore

$$\epsilon_k = \sqrt{e_k^2 - \frac{J_k^2}{J^2}} : \quad (11)$$

Both inequalities may be combined to a single one

$$e_k > \frac{J_k}{J} : \quad (12)$$

2) Now one must consider also the part of the Hamiltonian containing only the operators of the condensate ($\mathbf{k} = 0$)

$$(e_0) b_0^\dagger b_0 + \frac{1}{2} c_0 b_0^\dagger b_0^\dagger + \frac{1}{2} c_0 b_0 b_0 - 2w_0 \frac{1}{V} \sum_{\mathbf{p}} \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{p}} (P b_0 + P b_0^\dagger) :$$

Here we introduced the notation

$$P = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{\mathbf{p}} \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{p} : \quad (13)$$

The diagonalization of the bilinear terms is achieved by a similar canonical transformation

$$\mathbf{b}_0 = \mathbf{u}_0 \mathbf{a}_0 + \mathbf{v}_0 \mathbf{a}_0^\dagger \quad (14)$$

with

$$\tanh 2 \theta_0 = \frac{\mathfrak{J}_0 \mathfrak{j}}{e_0} \quad (15)$$

and the excitation energy is

$$\omega_0 = \frac{P}{(e_0)^2 - \mathfrak{J}_0^2 \mathfrak{j}^2} \quad (16)$$

having the similar condition

$$e_0 > \mathfrak{J}_0 \mathfrak{j} \quad (17)$$

But we have still to shift the operators \mathbf{a}_0 in order to eliminate the linear terms

$$2w_0 \frac{P}{V} \mathfrak{P} \mathfrak{j} (\mathfrak{P} \mathbf{u}_0 + P \mathbf{v}_0) \mathbf{a}_0 + \text{h.c.}$$

Then with

$$\mathbf{a}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{a}_0 + \frac{2w_0 \frac{P}{V} \mathfrak{P} \mathfrak{j}}{\omega_0} (\mathfrak{P} \mathbf{u}_0 + P \mathbf{v}_0) \quad (18)$$

we get a complete diagonalization in the form $\mathbf{a}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{a}_0$ (up to a constant term).

3) Now we must proceed to discuss the self-consistency requirements stemming from the fact, that the system is in macro-canonical equilibrium. Then

$$\langle \mathbf{h}_k \rangle = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \mathbf{h}_k^\dagger \mathbf{h}_k \rangle = \frac{1}{e^{-\beta \epsilon_k} - 1} \quad (19)$$

Since $\langle \mathbf{h}_0 \rangle = \mathbf{u}_0 \langle \mathbf{a}_0 \rangle + \mathbf{v}_0 \langle \mathbf{a}_0^\dagger \rangle$ it follows

$$P = \frac{2w_0}{\omega_0} \mathfrak{P} \mathfrak{j} ((e_0)P + c_0 P) \quad (20)$$

to be a self-consistency equation.

Since the phase of P may be chosen arbitrarily by a simple phase transformation of the operators \mathbf{b}_0 , it is convenient to chose P to be real and positive. Eq.(20) may have a symmetry breaking solution ($P \neq 0$) satisfying

$$\frac{2w_0}{\omega_0} (e_0 - c_0) P^2 = 1 \quad (21)$$

with any real α_0 , since for the positivity of α_0 we had to require already Eq.(17).

For $\alpha_0 > 0$, $\frac{1}{V} \langle \hat{h}_0^+ \hat{h}_0 \rangle \neq 0$ for $V \rightarrow \infty$. Then it follows also in the thermodynamic limit

$$\frac{1}{V} \langle \hat{h}_0^+ \hat{h}_0 \rangle = \frac{1}{V} \langle \hat{h}_0^+ \hat{h}_0 \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{V} \langle \hat{h}_0 \hat{h}_0 \rangle = \frac{1}{V} \langle \hat{h}_0 \hat{h}_0 \rangle : \quad (22)$$

The non-condensate parameters in equilibrium are given by

$$f_k = \langle \hat{h}_k^+ \hat{h}_k \rangle = \frac{e_k}{\epsilon_k} \frac{1}{(e^{-\beta \epsilon_k} - 1)} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{e_k}{\epsilon_k} - 1 \right) \quad (23)$$

and

$$F_k = \langle \hat{h}_k \hat{h}_k \rangle = \frac{c_k}{\epsilon_k} \frac{1}{(e^{-\beta \epsilon_k} - 1)} + \frac{1}{2} : \quad (24)$$

Thus the phase θ_k of c_k differs by π from the phase of F_k .

We may go now overall to the thermodynamic limit after separating the $\mathbf{p} = 0$ terms. We have in the thermodynamic limit the functions $w(\mathbf{k})$; $f(\mathbf{k})$; $F(\mathbf{k})$; $c(\mathbf{k})$; $e(\mathbf{k})$ and $\epsilon(\mathbf{k})$ and therefore using the definition of c_k Eq.(6) we get

$$c(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int d^3p w(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{p}) F(\mathbf{p}) + w(\mathbf{k}) P^2$$

or

$$c(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int d^3p w(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{p}) \frac{c(\mathbf{p})}{e^{-\beta \epsilon(\mathbf{p})} - 1} + \frac{1}{2} + w(\mathbf{p}) P^2 \quad (25)$$

with the excitation energies

$$\epsilon(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{p}{(e(\mathbf{k}) - 1)^2} \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{k}) f} \quad (26)$$

Then it follows from the last equation, due to the reality of $w(\mathbf{k})$ also, that $c(\mathbf{k})$ must be real (its imaginary part satisfies a homogeneous equation).

The parameters of the condensate are determined by

$$\alpha_0 = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int d^3p w(\mathbf{p}) \frac{c(\mathbf{p})}{e^{-\beta \epsilon(\mathbf{p})} - 1} + \frac{1}{2} + w(0) P^2 \quad (27)$$

and the relation Eq.(21).

The chemical potential may be found from the average particle number by

$$n_0 + \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int d^3k f(\mathbf{k}) = n : \quad (28)$$

(here $n_0 = P^2$), or

$$P^2 + \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int d^3p \frac{e(\mathbf{p})}{(e^{-\beta \epsilon(\mathbf{p})} - 1)} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{e(\mathbf{p})}{(e^{-\beta \epsilon(\mathbf{p})} - 1)} - 1 \right) = n : \quad (29)$$

In the case of a contact potential its Fourier transform is constant $w(\mathbf{k}) = w$ and as a consequence, also $c(\mathbf{k}) = c$ with

$$c = \frac{w P^2}{1 + \frac{w}{(2\pi)^3} \int d^3p \frac{1}{\epsilon(\mathbf{p})} \frac{1}{e^{\beta(\epsilon(\mathbf{p}) - \mu)} + 1} + \frac{1}{2}}$$

However without a cut-off the integral diverges and therefore $c = 0$

One should mention also, that for $T = 0$ these HF results coincide with those of the self-consistent variational model elaborated by Girardeau and Arnowitt [12].

On the other hand, the Hugenholtz-Pines theorem [13] (which is a generalization of the Goldstone theorem [14] to non-vanishing temperatures), requires that the spectrum of elementary excitations at vanishing momentum starts with vanishing energy.

Unfortunately, within the s.c. HF scheme the theorem is not satisfied and the elementary excitations start with a gap, except if $\mathbf{p}(0)^2 = \mathbf{p}(0)^2$. One may still try to choose a $w(\mathbf{q})$ to satisfy this condition [15].

The results of this section are well-known in the literature (see [15, 16] for variational approaches and other simplified presentations [10]). Here they are derived using des Cloizeaux's elegant formalism for the sake of further reference.

4 The Bogolyubov model.

The Bogolyubov theory [3] considers a contact interaction between the bosons, but in contrast to the full s.c. HF theory, it disregards the fluctuational part of the anomalous propagators. Therefore, while obviously from the variational point of view it is poorer, it obeys the Hugenholtz-Pines theorem. It may be regarded as the solution of the variational problem with a constraint given by the known property of the exact solution. We shall analyze in the next Section, which are the consequences of this fact for the linear response from the point of view of the super-fluidity condition of Martin and Hohenberg [7]. In this Section we just describe the model itself.

Although the original theory of Bogolyubov [3] was formulated for a spacial homogeneous system, we shall define here also its slight generalization in the presence of an external (time dependent) potential.

In the Bogolyubov model one disregards the fluctuational part of the anomalous propagators $h(\mathbf{x}) = h(\mathbf{x})i(\mathbf{x}) = h(\mathbf{x})i$ and considers the s.c. Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} H_B(t) = & \int d\mathbf{x} \left[\psi^\dagger(\mathbf{x}) \left(-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 + U(\mathbf{x};t) \right) \psi(\mathbf{x}) \right. \\ & + \frac{w}{2} \psi^\dagger(\mathbf{x}) \psi(\mathbf{x}) \psi^\dagger(\mathbf{x}) \psi(\mathbf{x}) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \left(\psi^\dagger(\mathbf{x}) \psi(\mathbf{x}) \right)^2 + h.c. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{2} \left(\psi^\dagger(\mathbf{x}) \psi(\mathbf{x}) \right)^2 + h.c. \right] \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Then one remains only with three s.c. entities $\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^+ = \langle \mathbf{x}^0 \rangle; \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle; \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^-$.

In the absence of any potential the equilibrium values of the averages in the homogenous system emerge from those of the previous Section after the replacement $\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{x}^0 \rangle_0$ by $\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle_0$. Since, we treat here a contact potential we have a unique coefficient c which in the absence of the anomalous propagator is given by

$$c = \frac{1}{V} \langle \mathbf{x}^0 \rangle^2 = \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle_0^2 \quad (31)$$

and we choose again P to be real and positive.

The equilibrium excitation spectrum is

$$\epsilon_k = \frac{P}{(\epsilon_k)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle_0^2} \quad (32)$$

where we took into account that $\epsilon(0) = 0$.

The analysis of the $k = 0$ part of the Hamiltonian gives rise to the s.c. condition for the existence of the anomalous solution Eq.(21), which may be written as

$$\epsilon_0 = \frac{c}{2 \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle_0^2} \quad (33)$$

From the last three equations results that $\epsilon_0 = 0$ and therefore it follows

$$\epsilon_0 = c = \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle_0^2 \quad (34)$$

To conclude, in the Bogolyubov model (in the absence of an external potential) in the thermodynamic limit

$$\epsilon(q) = \frac{S}{2 \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle_0^2 \frac{q^2}{2m} + \frac{q^2}{2m}} \quad (35)$$

$$u(q) = \frac{S}{2} \frac{\epsilon(q)}{\epsilon(q) + 1}; \quad v(q) = \frac{S}{2} \frac{\epsilon(q)}{\epsilon(q) - 1};$$

Hence the equilibrium excitation spectrum is gap-less and starts linearly with the momentum.

The average particle number is given by

$$\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle_0^2 + \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int d^3p \frac{\epsilon(p)}{\epsilon(p) - 1} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\epsilon(p)}{\epsilon(p) - 1} - 1 \right) = n$$

The introduction of a cut-off here is not necessary, since the integral converges for the Bogolyubov spectrum, which is linear in p at small momenta and quadratic at large momenta.

5 Linear response.

Although the linear response to an external potential within the frame the Bogolyubov model was already discussed in the literature in some detail[5] we want to reopen the discussion here, since important features due to the self-consistency have been ignored until now. The modifications shed a new light on the problem of supra-fluidity of the Bogolyubov model. According to Hohenberg and Martin [7] a sufficient and necessary condition for super-fluidity is that the density response to an external potential in Fourier-space diverges at vanishing frequency and wave vector. The Hugenholtz-Pines theorem [13] ensures this feature in the frame of the exact hamilton theory. In other words, the existence of gap-less quasi-particles in equilibrium is the key for the understanding of super-fluidity. Of course the nature of the singularity may be complicated by the fact, that multi-quasiparticle states have also a vanishing threshold.

The problem is however much more complicated in the case of self-consistent theories, like the HF or the Bogolyubov model, since s.c. parameters (averages) are present in the s.c. Hamiltonian and they are themselves modified by the external perturbation. In this sense one speaks about an induced perturbation. Our next purpose is to analyze this response in the case of Bogolyubov's model. We ignore here any dissipation, therefore any statement about singularities of the response theory has to be regarded with some caution. The inverse statement is however true: if without dissipation one gets no supra-fluid properties, no such properties will arise due to dissipation either.

5.1 General formalism

We consider now the time-dependent self-consistent linear response to a time dependent potential $U(\mathbf{x};t)$ starting from the s.c. HF equilibrium in the absence of the external potential.

We have to take into account however the peculiarities of the "equilibrium" distribution in the presence of spontaneous symmetry breaking. The broken symmetry is the particle number conservation and therefore, under condensation conditions, $H_0^{H F}$ does not commute with the particle number operator N . Therefore the macrocanonical density matrix $\frac{1}{Z} e^{-\beta(H_0^{H F} - \mu N)}$ is not a stationary state of the system in the usual sense [5, 19]. More precisely, stationarity is reached by the "rotated" density matrix:

$$\tilde{\rho}(t) = e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} N t} \rho(0) e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} N t}$$

which satisfies the Liouville equation

$$\left\{ \tilde{\rho}, \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right\} = [H_{H F}(t); \tilde{\rho}]$$

generated by the "Hamiltonian"

$$H_{H F}(t) = e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} N t} H_0^{H F} e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} N t} - \mu N :$$

Indeed, in the spirit of the Van Hove limit of weak coupling to a thermal bath, $\tilde{\rho}(t)$ approaches, for large times, the value $\frac{1}{Z} e^{-\beta(H_0^{H F} - \mu N)}$. In the absence of the spontaneous symmetry breaking, the rotated density matrix is, of course, identical to the density matrix itself.

We denote

$$\langle \hat{A} \rangle_t = \text{Tr}(\hat{\rho}(t) \hat{A})$$

and

$$\langle \hat{A} \rangle_t = \text{Tr}(\hat{\rho}(t) \hat{A}) = e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_0^t dt' \langle \hat{H} \rangle_{t'}} \langle \hat{A} \rangle_0 \quad (m = 0; 1; 2; \dots) :$$

We assumed here that the operator \hat{A} has the structure $(\hat{A}^\dagger)^\dagger = \hat{A}$. Then $m = n - n$. Obviously the normal entities ($n = n$) are stationary in the peculiar “equilibrium” state, however the anomalous ones ($n \neq n$) oscillate with a multiple of the chemical potential.

In the absence of the potential $U(\mathbf{x}; t)$ the system is supposed to be in “equilibrium”

$$\hat{\rho}_0 = \frac{1}{Z} e^{-\beta \hat{H}_0}$$

with translational invariant averages

$$\langle \hat{A}(\mathbf{x}) \rangle = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq 0} e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)} \langle \hat{A}_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle + \langle \hat{A} \rangle_0$$

$$\langle \hat{A}(\mathbf{x}) \rangle = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq 0} e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)} \langle \hat{A}_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle + \langle \hat{A} \rangle_0$$

where $\langle \hat{A}_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq 0} e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)} \langle \hat{A}_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle$ and $\langle \hat{A} \rangle_0$ have the same phase up to a multiple of $\frac{\pi}{2}$ and actually both may be taken to be real. Further it is assumed, that the self-consistency relations in equilibrium are satisfied.

Again, in order to simplify the calculations, we treat explicitly only the case of a contact particle interaction. In this case

$$\hat{H}_0 = \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 + U(\mathbf{x}) \right] \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{x}) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{x})$$

$$+ \frac{w}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{x}) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{x}) \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{x}) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{x})$$

$$+ \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{x}) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{x}) \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{x}) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{x}) + \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{x}) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{x}) \right]$$

According to linear response theory, for any observable \hat{A} one has

$$\langle \hat{A} \rangle_t = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \int_0^t dt' \langle \hat{A}(\mathbf{x}) \rangle_{t-t'} \langle \hat{A}(\mathbf{x}) \rangle_0$$

where

$$\hat{A}(\mathbf{x}) = e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_0^t dt' \hat{H}_0} \hat{A} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_0^t dt' \hat{H}_0}$$

or in Fourier transforms

$$\langle \hat{A} \rangle_t = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \int_0^t dt' \langle \hat{A}(\mathbf{x}) \rangle_{t-t'} \langle \hat{A}(\mathbf{x}) \rangle_0$$

Here $H_{HF}(t)$ contains all the terms of first order (direct and induced) of the difference $H_{HF}(t) - H_{HF}^0$. Thus, taking also into account that (with real P)

$$i\hbar \langle x \rangle_{tt} = 2P^2 \langle x \rangle + P^2 j \langle x \rangle = P^2 (2 \langle x \rangle + \langle x \rangle)$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_{HF}(t) = & \int dx U(x;t) + 2w \langle x \rangle^+ \langle x \rangle_{tt} \langle x \rangle^+ \langle x \rangle \\ & + \frac{w}{2} \langle x \rangle_{tt}^2 \langle x \rangle^2 + \text{h.c.} \\ & 2wP^2 [(\langle x \rangle_{tt} + 2 \langle x \rangle_{tt}) \langle x \rangle + \text{h.c.}] : \end{aligned}$$

In what follows we restrict further the discussion to the Bogolyubov version of the theory, where no anomalous correlations are taken into account. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_{HF}^B(t) = & \int dx U(x;t) + 2w \langle x \rangle^+ \langle x \rangle_{tt} \langle x \rangle^+ \langle x \rangle \\ & + \frac{w}{2} 2P \langle x \rangle_{tt} \langle x \rangle^2 + \text{h.c.} \\ & 2wP^2 [(\langle x \rangle_{tt} + 2 \langle x \rangle_{tt}) \langle x \rangle + \text{h.c.}] : \end{aligned}$$

In order to simplify the formulae let us define now

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ \langle x \rangle^+ \langle x \rangle & 0 \end{pmatrix}; \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \langle x \rangle^2 & 3P \langle x \rangle \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$H_{HF}^B(t) = \int dx B(x)^+ \langle x \rangle_{tt} A(x) + \int dx U(x;t) B_1(x) :$$

Then, after Fourier transforming ($f(k;!) = \int dx \int dt e^{i(kx - !t)} f(x;t)$)

$$\langle x \rangle_{tt} = \int_0 \langle k;! \rangle \langle x \rangle_{tt} + \frac{1}{2w} \langle k;! \rangle \langle x \rangle_{tt}$$

with

$$\langle k;! \rangle = \frac{2w}{\hbar} \int_0^Z dt \int dx e^{i(kx - !t)} \langle x \rangle_{tt} B_1^+(0;0) \langle x \rangle_{tt} :$$

Remark: By the interpretation of the susceptibility one has to perform eventually also a shift with $\tilde{m} = 0;1;2;:::$ in the case of particle number non-conserving terms!

The relation of the averages of the different entities A to the external potential $\langle k;! \rangle$, with matrix notations, is given by

$$\langle x \rangle_{tt} = \frac{\langle k;! \rangle}{1 - \langle k;! \rangle} \frac{1}{2w} \langle k;! \rangle = \frac{1}{2w} \langle k;! \rangle \langle k;! \rangle :$$

5.2 The structure of $(\mathbf{k}; !)$ at $T = 0$.

With the notation $\frac{p^2}{2} = n(0 < \dots < 1)$ one gets $\dots = (2 \dots)nw$. We chose $2nw$ as natural unit for energy and $\frac{2m_{nw}}{\hbar^2}$ for momenta. The new variables are :

$$! \ 1 \ \frac{1}{2}$$

$$e_q ! \ q^2 + 1$$

$$_q ! \ p \frac{1}{q^2 + q^4}$$

$$u_q = \frac{v}{t} \frac{1}{2} \frac{q^2 + \frac{1}{2}}{q^2 + q^4} + 1 ; v_q = \frac{v}{t} \frac{1}{2} \frac{q^2 + \frac{1}{2}}{q^2 + q^4} - 1$$

$$\sim ! \ ! \ ! = \frac{\sim !}{2nw} :$$

Since at $T ! \ 0$ we have

$$\int \frac{e_p}{p} \frac{1}{(e_p - 1)} ! \ 0$$

the self-consistency equation looks at $T = 0$ in the new units as as:

$$+ \frac{1}{(2)^3} \frac{1}{n} \int \frac{1}{2} \frac{q^2 + \frac{1}{2}}{q} - 1) = 1$$

giving rise to the simple dependence between parameter \dots and the density n

$$\frac{1}{(2)^2} \frac{1}{n} = \frac{6(1 - \frac{3}{2})}{(36)} : \tag{36}$$

We have to apply the commutations rules:

$$[\mathbf{q}; \mathbf{p}] = 0 ; [\mathbf{q}; \mathbf{p}^+] = -q\mathbf{p}$$

$$[\mathbf{q}; \mathbf{p}^+ \mathbf{p}^0] = -q (q\mathbf{p} + q\mathbf{p}^0)$$

$$_{13}(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{t}) = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} e^{i(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{q}) \cdot \mathbf{r}} \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{q}} \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}} u_{\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}} e^{i(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{q}) \cdot \mathbf{r}} \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{q}} \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{q}} u_{\mathbf{q}} v_{\mathbf{q}} \\ 2P^2 (u_{\mathbf{k}} + v_{\mathbf{k}}) v_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i \cdot \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} (u_{\mathbf{k}} + v_{\mathbf{k}}) u_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i \cdot \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}}$$

$$_{21}(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{t}) = P^2 u_{\mathbf{k}} (v_{\mathbf{k}} + u_{\mathbf{k}}) e^{i \cdot \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} v_{\mathbf{k}} (u_{\mathbf{k}} + v_{\mathbf{k}}) e^{i \cdot \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}}$$

$$_{22}(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{t}) = 2P^2 \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i \cdot \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i \cdot \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}}$$

$$_{23}(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{t}) = 2P^2 v_{\mathbf{k}} u_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i \cdot \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} u_{\mathbf{k}} v_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i \cdot \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}}$$

$$_{31}(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{t}) = P^2 v_{\mathbf{k}} (v_{\mathbf{k}} + u_{\mathbf{k}}) e^{i \cdot \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} u_{\mathbf{k}} (u_{\mathbf{k}} + v_{\mathbf{k}}) e^{i \cdot \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}}$$

$$_{32}(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{t}) = 2P^2 u_{\mathbf{k}} v_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i \cdot \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} v_{\mathbf{k}} u_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i \cdot \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}}$$

$$_{33}(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{t}) = 2P^2 \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i \cdot \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i \cdot \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}}$$

and

$$_{11}(\mathbf{k}; !) = \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{k}} + v_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{1}{! + \mathbf{k}} \frac{1}{! + \mathbf{k}} \\ + \frac{3}{n(2)^3} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} \frac{1}{! + \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}} \frac{1}{! + \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}} u_{\mathbf{q}} v_{\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}} (u_{\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}} v_{\mathbf{q}} + v_{\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}} u_{\mathbf{q}})$$

$$_{12}(\mathbf{k}; !) = 2 (u_{\mathbf{k}} + v_{\mathbf{k}}) u_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{1}{! + \mathbf{k}} v_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{1}{! + \mathbf{k}} \\ \frac{3}{n(2)^3} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} \frac{1}{! + \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}} v_{\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}} u_{\mathbf{q}}^2 u_{\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}} \frac{1}{! + \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}} u_{\mathbf{q}} v_{\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}}^2 v_{\mathbf{q}}$$

$$_{13}(\mathbf{k}; !) = 2 (u_{\mathbf{k}} + v_{\mathbf{k}}) v_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{1}{! + \mathbf{k}} u_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{1}{! + \mathbf{k}} \\ \frac{3}{n(2)^3} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} u_{\mathbf{q}} v_{\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}}^2 v_{\mathbf{q}} \frac{1}{! + \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}} \frac{1}{! + \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}} v_{\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}} u_{\mathbf{q}}^2 u_{\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}}$$

$$_{21}(\kappa;!) = (\mathfrak{u}_k + \mathfrak{v}_k) \mathfrak{u}_k \frac{1}{!_k} - \mathfrak{v}_k \frac{1}{!_k + 1}$$

$$_{22}(\kappa;!) = 2 \mathfrak{j}_k \mathfrak{j}^2 \frac{1}{!_k + 1} - \mathfrak{j}_k \mathfrak{j}^2 \frac{1}{!_k}$$

$$_{23}(\kappa;!) = 2 \mathfrak{u}_k \mathfrak{v}_k \frac{1}{!_k + 1} - \frac{1}{!_k}$$

$$_{31}(\kappa;!) = (\mathfrak{u}_k + \mathfrak{v}_k) \mathfrak{v}_k \frac{1}{!_k} - \mathfrak{u}_k \frac{1}{!_k + 1}$$

$$_{32}(\kappa;!) = 2 \mathfrak{u}_k \mathfrak{v}_k \frac{1}{!_k + 1} - \frac{1}{!_k}$$

$$_{33}(\kappa;!) = 2 \mathfrak{j}_k \mathfrak{j}^2 \frac{1}{!_k + 1} - \mathfrak{j}_k \mathfrak{j}^2 \frac{1}{!_k} :$$

As it may be seen, the susceptibilities have poles in the complex $!$ plane at $!_k$ and cuts on the real axis from $2_{k=2}$ to 1 , respectively from $2_{k=2}$ to -1 . Since $!_k < 2_{k=2}$, the poles are embedded in the cuts.

The density-density correlation $_{11}(\kappa;!)$ of the Bogolyubov model was already discussed at arbitrary temperatures in Ref.[5]. Our accent is on taking into account the induced perturbation and therefore needs the knowledge of the whole matrix $_{ij}(\kappa;!)$.

5.3 The density-density response at $\mathfrak{K} = 0$ and $! \rightarrow 0$.

At $\mathfrak{K} = 0$, with the notations

$$\mathfrak{c}_1(!) = \frac{2^3}{n(2^3)^3} \sum_{\mathfrak{q}} \frac{1}{!_q + 2} - \frac{1}{!_q - 2} \mathfrak{u}_q^2 \mathfrak{v}_q^2$$

$$\mathfrak{c}_2(!) = \frac{3}{n(2^3)^3} \sum_{\mathfrak{q}} \frac{1}{!_q + 2} \mathfrak{u}_q \mathfrak{v}_q^3 - \frac{1}{!_q - 2} \mathfrak{v}_q \mathfrak{u}_q^3$$

$$\mathfrak{c}_2(!) = \frac{3}{n(2^3)^3} \sum_{\mathfrak{q}} \frac{1}{!_q + 2} \mathfrak{u}_q^3 \mathfrak{v}_q - \frac{1}{!_q - 2} \mathfrak{v}_q^3 \mathfrak{u}_q$$

one gets

$$\chi_{11}(0; \omega) = \frac{\chi_1(\omega)}{1 - \chi_1(\omega)} = \frac{\frac{2}{\omega} + \chi_2(\omega)}{2 - (1 + 3\chi_1(\omega) + \chi_2(\omega) + \chi_3(\omega))} = \frac{\frac{2}{\omega} + \chi_3(\omega)}{1 - (\chi_1(\omega) + \chi_2(\omega) + \chi_3(\omega))} : \quad (37)$$

Of course the coefficients of the integrals are not independent entities and are related to the parameter ω by the self-consistency relation Eq.(36).

Remark, that

$$\chi_{11}(0; \omega) \sim \log \omega \quad \text{for} \quad \omega \rightarrow 0$$

since the residues of its poles vanish at $\omega = 0$. Thus the naive response theory[5], which ignores subtleties of the induced perturbation leads indeed to a singular response, although the singularity is only a logarithmic one. The cuts responsible for this behavior are due to excitations of two quasi-particles. These are however not present in the near-equilibrium oscillations of the solution of the Gross-Pitaevski equation.

However, taking into account the induced perturbation from Eq.(37) it follows

$$\chi_{11}(0; \omega) = \frac{\chi_1(\omega)}{1 - \chi_1(\omega)} = \frac{2 - (2 + 3\chi_1(\omega) + \chi_2(\omega) + \chi_3(\omega)) + \omega(\chi_1(\omega) + \chi_2(\omega) + \omega^2\chi_1(\omega))}{2 - (1 + 3\chi_1(\omega) + \chi_2(\omega) + \chi_3(\omega)) - \omega(\chi_1(\omega) + \chi_2(\omega)) + \omega^2(1 - \chi_1(\omega))} : \quad (38)$$

Since $\chi_1(\omega)$; $\chi_2(\omega)$; $\chi_3(\omega)$ behave like $\log \omega$ for $\omega \rightarrow 0$, it follows

$$\lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \chi_{11}(0; \omega) = 1 : \quad (39)$$

Thus we may conclude, that although the Bogolyubov model has quasi-particles with vanishing energy at $\omega \rightarrow 0$, the response to an external potential is not at all singular!

The special value 1 of the effective susceptibility implies that the Fourier transform of the effective induced potential for the non-condensate defined as $U_{eff}^{nc}(\mathbf{x}; t) = U(\mathbf{x}; t) + 2w \int d\mathbf{x}' \psi^\dagger(\mathbf{x}) \psi(\mathbf{x}')$ vanishes in the limit $k \rightarrow 0$ and $\omega \rightarrow 0$. The factor 2 in this definition stems from the fact, that in the case of a contact interaction the direct and exchange terms are identical. On the other hand, the effective induced potential for the condensate is different $U_{eff}^c(\mathbf{x}; t) = U_{eff}^{nc}(\mathbf{x}; t) - w \int d\mathbf{x}' \psi(\mathbf{x}) \psi^\dagger(\mathbf{x}')$ and does not vanish in this limit.

Superfluidity would require diverging density response to a finite external perturbation and this does not happen.

6 Conclusions

We have shown, that although the Bogolyubov model leads to a gap-less quasiparticle model, if one takes into account the induced perturbation, it leads to no low frequency, low wave-vector singularity of the response to a perturbation by an external potential. In this sense it does not fulfill the hopes to satisfy the criterion of Martin and Hohenberg for superfluidity. Earlier treatments of the linear response in Bose condensed systems either ignored the induced perturbation [5] or did not discuss in all detail his consequences, their attention being concentrated on improving the Hartree-Fock theory [17, 18]. As it is known, the Bogolyubov model is also not the best s.c. approximation from the

thermodynamical point of view, but still obeys the Huggenholz-Pines theorem, which the thermodynamically better Hartree-Fock theory does not obey. Seemingly none of the simple self-consistent approximations is quite satisfactory and better models have to be developed.

One of the authors (A.M.B) thanks the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft for the generous support allowing his stay at the Frankfurt University.

References

- [1] M.H. Anderson et al., Science **269**, 198 (1995)
- [2] K.B. Davis et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 3969 (1995)
- [3] N. N. Bogolyubov, Bull. Moscow State Univ. **7**, 43 (1947)
- [4] C. J. Pethick, H. Smith, Bose -Einstein Condensation in Dilute Gases, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2002)
- [5] L.Pitaevskii, S. Stringari, Bose-Einstein Condensation, Oxford Science Publication Clarendon Press, Oxford (2003)
- [6] V. Q. A. Zagrebnov, J. B. Bru, Phys. Reports **350**, 291 (2001)
- [7] P. C. Hohenberg and P. C. Martin, Ann. Phys. **34**, 291 (1965)
- [8] J. des Cloizeaux, in “Le problème à N corps (Many-body physics)”, Les Houches 1967, Gordon and Breach (1968), p.1
- [9] V.N. Popov, *Functional Integrals and Collective Modes (Cambridge University Press, New York, 1987), Chap. 6.*
- [10] A. Griffin, Phys.Rev. **B53**, 9341 (1996)
- [11] L. Bányai and P. Gartner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 210404-1, (2002)
- [12] M. Girardeau and R. Arnowitt, Phys. Rev. **113**, 755 (1959)
- [13] N. Hugenholtz and D. Pines, Phys. Rev. **116**, 489 (1959)
- [14] J. Goldstone, Nuovo Cim. **19**, 154 (1961)
- [15] P. Dörre, H. Haug and D. B. Tran Thoai, J. Low Temp. Phys. **35**, 465 (1979)
- [16] D.A. Huse and E.D. Siggia, J. Low Temp. Phys., **46**, 137 (1982)
- [17] S. Giorgini, Phys. Rev. **A57**, 2949 (1998)
- [18] M. Rusch and K. Burnett, Phys. Rev. **A59**, 3851 (1999)
- [19] O. M. Schmitt, D. B. Tran Thoai, L. Bányai, P. Gartner, and H. Haug, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 3839 (2001)