

December 1993

Spin gap fixed points in the double chain problem

D.V.Khveshchenko ^{a,b} and T.M.Rice ^c

^a *Department of Physics Princeton University,*

Princeton, NJ 08544, USA

^b *Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics,*

2,st.Kosygin, 117940, Moscow, Russia

^c *Theoretische Physik ETH-Hönggerberg,*

CH-8093, Zürich, Switzerland

Abstract

Applying the bosonization procedure to weakly coupled Hubbard chains we discuss the fixed points of the renormalization group procedure where all spin excitations are gapful and a singlet pairing becomes the dominant instability.

I. INTRODUCTION

Recently the field of non-Landau Fermi liquid states in various quasi-one dimensional systems has been very active. Although basic properties of purely one dimensional systems (chains) are quite well known by now, it still remains to be understood how these change under coupling between chains. In particular, if an infinite number of chains is coupled to form a two dimensional array then some kind of a dimensional crossover occurs. Despite numerous intensive studies of these questions, it still remains open how the non-Landau Fermi liquid one dimensional features evolve to isotropic two dimensional behavior.

On the other hand one may expect new physics in a system with a finite number of coupled chains which may exhibit an unusual amalgamation of both one- and two-dimensional features. Besides a general theoretical interest, such systems are also attractive because they can be found in real materials. Recently it was pointed out that some substances such as $Sr_2Cu_4O_6$ provide a physical realization of weakly coupled double chains [1]. Moreover higher stoichiometric compounds in the series $Sr_{n-1}Cu_{n+1}O_{2n}$ present examples of coupled N -chain ladders.

This expectation is reinforced by the behavior of $S = 1/2$ Heisenberg multichain or ladder systems. Whereas the single spin chain shows quasi-long range order with gapless spinon excitations, the double chain system shows spin liquid behavior [2], [3], [4] with strictly short range order and finite gap in the spin excitation spectrum. This contrast in behavior has led to the conjecture that a lightly doped double-chain system should preserve the spin gap and become superconducting [1]. Further in view of the insensitivity of the spin liquid state to the ratio of interchain to intrachain coupling [4], one expects that it is robust and should occur also for a Hubbard model even in the weak coupling regime. This expectation is strongly supported by a recent numerical study [5]. This is our motivation to examine the renormalization group (RG) theory of weakly coupled Hubbard double chains and to look for a spin liquid fixed point.

Recent weak coupling RG studies of the double-chain Hubbard model [6] revealed some

strong coupling fixed points characterized by enhanced singlet pairing. However the analysis performed in [6] is essentially restricted by the case of weak interactions between the fermions. These authors did not examine the half-filled case with weak interchain hopping where the Umklapp processes on the individual chains become relevant.

In the present paper we undertake an attempt to construct a description of the spin gap fixed point by using a bosonic representation. This is expected to be an adequate tool to demonstrate a development of the strong coupling regime in both cases of weakly coupled Hubbard chains and of a strongly correlated double chain $t - J$ model. The latter case will be considered in a later publication [7].

To clarify the essence of the double chain physics in the presence of strong correlations it is worthwhile to begin with a review of well known properties of the single chain Hubbard model.

Away from half filling the model can be only found in the so-called Tomonaga- Luttinger (TL) regime which corresponds to both gapless spin and charge excitations [8]. It is customary to describe the TL behavior in terms of spin and charge correlation exponents K_s and K_c .

The spin exponent K_s equals to unity everywhere in the TL regime while K_c gradually increases from the value $K_c = 1/2$ at values of the onsite repulsion $U = \infty$ and any electron density $\rho \neq 1$ (as well as at $\rho \rightarrow 1$ and arbitrary U/t (t : intrachain hopping)) as U increases or ρ gets smaller.

In the regime of strong correlation at ρ close to unity one can argue that gapless spin fluctuations drive the coupling constants of the charge sector to the repulsive region ($K_c < 1$). In this case we can expect a change of behavior when the exchange coupling between chains is introduced. The spin gap, which we have argued is a robust feature of the single rung ladder at $\rho = 1$, acts to cutoff the spin fluctuation spectrum at low energies so that these may not renormalize the charge couplings significantly. As a result there can be an effective attraction at $\rho \lesssim 1$ without a threshold value of the ratio U/t . This will manifest itself in a finite spin gap also at $\rho \lesssim 1$ and a scaling to the Luther-Emery line rather than the

Tomonaga-Luttinger line. Such behavior has been reported for single chains models with a spin gap caused by frustrated or modulated exchange couplings on the single chain [9], [10]. In the present case of a single rung ladder or double chain, we will choose the regime with the interchain hopping t_{\perp} weak ($t_{\perp} \ll U$) so that as $\rho \rightarrow 1$ real interchain kinetic energy processes characterized by t_{\perp} will scale to zero. In this limit the induced interchain exchange processes will remain finite and dominate.

A mean field analysis [11] of the $t - J$ model predicts that the spin gap remains upon doping and the RVB state at $\rho = 1$ evolves into a superconductor with approximate d-wave symmetry. Noack *et al* [5] found a similar behavior in their numerical studies of moderately coupled Hubbard ladders.

In this paper we investigate the case of a weakly coupled Hubbard ladder with $\rho \lesssim 1$ and $t_{\perp} < U < t$ using RG methods and look for a strong coupling fixed point with the same characteristics.

II. BOSONIZED WEAK COUPLING LIMIT OF THE DOUBLE-CHAIN PROBLEM

To get the first insight into the problem we start with a conventional bosonization of the small U/t Hubbard model on two weakly coupled chains.

$$H = t \sum (u_{i\sigma}^{\dagger} u_{i+1,\sigma} + d_{i\sigma}^{\dagger} d_{i+1,\sigma}) + t_{\perp} \sum (d_{i\sigma}^{\dagger} u_{i\sigma} + u_{i\sigma}^{\dagger} d_{i\sigma}) + U \sum (u_{i\sigma}^{\dagger} u_{i\sigma} u_{i,-\sigma}^{\dagger} u_{i,-\sigma} + d_{i\sigma}^{\dagger} d_{i\sigma} d_{i,-\sigma}^{\dagger} d_{i,-\sigma}) \quad (2.1)$$

Here $u_{i\sigma}$ and $d_{i\sigma}$ denote fermions on upper ("u") and lower ("d") chains.

Apparently, at $U \ll t_{\perp}, t$ the interaction term has to be treated as a small perturbation to the rest of the Hamiltonian (2.1) and the bare transverse hopping leads to the formation of two (bonding (B) and antibonding (A)) bands: $(A, B) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(u \mp d)$. Thus at $U \ll t_{\perp}$ a proper starting point is provided by the two-band model which was previously studied in the framework of a general weak coupling "g-ology" [12], [13]. The analysis carried out in [6] was also based on the two-band picture.

However, if the opposite condition $t_{\perp} \ll U$ is satisfied then the effect of band splitting is completely suppressed due to the requirement to avoid a double on-site occupancy. This behavior persists down to the quarter filling ($\rho = 1/2$). In the framework of the RG approach this phenomenon manifests itself as a vanishing of the renormalized t_{\perp} . In view of this we suppose that in the case $t_{\perp} \ll U$ one has to start from the picture of two degenerate bands to implement correctly the fermion correlations.

The preceding RG analysis of the general two-band model in absence of Umklapp processes [12], [13] already shows many technical complexities. For this reason the results of these studies are not simply physically transparent. Moreover it turns out that all nontrivial fixed points are located far in the strong coupling regime where the lowest orders RG calculations cease to be valid. So one might expect that a more informative investigation can be done on the basis of a bosonic representation which is usually capable of yield of a correct evolution toward strong coupling and even to provide an asymptotically exact solution of the Luther-Emery type [14]. Recently the method of bosonization was applied to the double chain problem in the context of a special model which includes only forward scattering [15]. This analysis [15] led to the prediction that coupled chains provide a proper basis for the occurrence of singlet pairing.

In this paper we will perform a more general analysis than that of [15] to see whether the above statement holds for a wider class of models.

To proceed with a bosonic representation we introduce a conventional set of bosonic fields ϕ_c^f, ϕ_s^f where the "flavor index" f has one of two values u or d . These fields describe fluctuations of charge (c) and spin (s) densities respectively. In the continuum limit the fermion operators can be written in terms of these variables as follows

$$\Psi_{\sigma}^f(x) \sim \sum_{\mu} \exp(i\mu k_F x + \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}(\mu\phi_c^f + \theta_c^f + \mu\sigma\phi_s^f + \sigma\theta_s^f)) \quad (2.2)$$

where $\theta_{c,s}^f$ are the dual fields to the $\phi_{c,s}^f$ ($\partial_{\mu}\theta_{c,s}^f = \epsilon_{\mu\nu}\partial_{\nu}\phi_{c,s}^f$).

Applying the formula (2.2) and introducing the linear combinations $\phi_{c,s}^{\pm} = \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}(\phi_{c,s}^u \pm \phi_{c,s}^d), \theta_{c,s}^{\pm} = \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}(\theta_{c,s}^u \pm \theta_{c,s}^d)$ corresponding to total (" + ") and relative (" - ") charge or spin

density fluctuations, one can readily obtain the bosonic form of the Hamiltonian (2.1)

$$\begin{aligned}
H_B = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\pm} & (v_c K_c^{\pm} (\partial \theta_c^{\pm})^2 + \frac{v_c}{K_c^{\pm}} (\partial \phi_c^{\pm})^2 + v_s K_s^{\pm} (\partial \theta_s^{\pm})^2 + \frac{v_s}{K_s^{\pm}} (\partial \phi_s^{\pm})^2) + \\
& + t_{\perp} (\cos \phi_c^- \cos \phi_s^- + \cos(\phi_c^+ + \delta x) \cos \phi_s^+) \cos \theta_c^- \cos \theta_s^- + \\
& g_{BS} \cos 2\phi_s^+ \cos 2\phi_s^- + g_U \cos(2\phi_c^+ + 2\delta x) \cos 2\phi_c^- \quad (2.3)
\end{aligned}$$

where last two cosine term represents spin backscattering and Umklapp processes respectively. Each of these terms is, in fact, a sum of two contributions $\cos 2\sqrt{2}\phi_{c,s}^f$ coming from u and d species. The Umklapp term becomes relevant when the doping $\delta(= \frac{\pi}{2} - k_F)$ vanishes. As usual, the bare values of the correlation exponents $K_{c,s}^{\pm} = \frac{v_F}{v_{c,s}}$ can be changed by shortwavelength renormalizations. Neglecting these corrections we obtain that the bare correlation exponents governing the charge dynamics $K_c^{\pm}(= (1 + \frac{U}{\pi t})^{-1/2})$ are smaller than unity while the spin exponents $K_s^{\pm}(= (1 + \frac{U}{\pi t})^{1/2})$ are opposite and $K_s^{\pm} > 1$. In addition, the bare values of the amplitudes g_{BS} and g_U are equal to $\frac{U}{\pi t}$.

To perform a renormalization procedure we divide up all variables on slow and fast components and then integrate out the fast variables. Using the bare values of correlation exponents one can estimate scaling dimensions of various terms in (2.3) according to the conventional formula [16] (γ and γ' are arbitrary):

$$\Delta(\cos \gamma \phi_{c,s}^{\pm} \cos \gamma' \theta_{c,s}^{\pm}) = \frac{1}{4} (\gamma^2 K_{c,s}^{\pm} + \frac{\gamma'^2}{K_{c,s}^{\pm}}) \quad (2.4)$$

The Hamiltonian (2.3) has to be supplemented by extra terms which are generated in the course of renormalization. Indeed, performing an expansion of the partition function $Z = Tr \exp(-\beta H_B)$ in t_{\perp} one immediately observes that the interchain hopping produces the following relevant terms (new couplings g_i should not be confused with the traditional geological notations):

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta H = & g_1 \cos 2\phi_c^- \cos 2\theta_s^- + g_2 \cos 2\theta_c^- \cos 2\phi_s^- + g_3 \cos 2\theta_c^- \cos 2\phi_s^+ + \\
& g_4 \cos(2\phi_c^+ + 2\delta x) \cos 2\theta_s^- + g_5 \cos 2\phi_c^- \cos 2\phi_s^- + g_6 \cos 2\phi_c^+ \cos 2\theta_s^- + \\
& g_7 \cos(2\phi_c^+ + 2\delta x) \cos 2\theta_c^- + g_8 \cos(2\phi_c^+ + 2\delta x) \cos 2\phi_s^+ + g_9 \cos 2\theta_c^- \cos 2\theta_s^- \quad (2.5)
\end{aligned}$$

All these terms have scaling dimensions not greater than two and result from the second order perturbation corrections to the single chain Hamiltonian $\Delta H \sim t_{\perp}^2 < (\sum_i u_i^{\dagger} d_i + d_i^{\dagger} u_i)^2 >$.

Physically these terms correspond to processes of coherent interchain particle-hole and particle-particle hopping triggered by the single particle one. The crucial importance of these processes was previously pointed out by many authors (see, for instance, [17], [18]).

In the second order in t_{\perp} the RG equations derived by the use of the method of [19] have the following form ($\xi = \ln x$):

$$\frac{dg_1}{d\xi} = (2 - K_c^- - \frac{1}{K_s^-})g_1 + \frac{t_{\perp}^2}{2}(K_c^- + \frac{1}{K_s^-} - K_s^- - \frac{1}{K_c^-}) - g_4g_U \quad (2.6)$$

$$\frac{dg_2}{d\xi} = (2 - K_s^- - \frac{1}{K_c^-})g_2 + \frac{t_{\perp}^2}{2}(K_s^- + \frac{1}{K_c^-} - K_c^- - \frac{1}{K_s^-}) - g_3g_{BS} \quad (2.7)$$

$$\frac{dg_3}{d\xi} = (2 - K_s^+ - \frac{1}{K_c^-})g_3 + \frac{t_{\perp}^2}{2}(K_s^+ + \frac{1}{K_c^-} - K_c^- - \frac{1}{K_s^+}) - g_2g_{BS} \quad (2.8)$$

$$\frac{dg_4}{d\xi} = (2 - K_c^+ - \frac{1}{K_s^-})g_4 + \frac{t_{\perp}^2}{2}(K_c^+ + \frac{1}{K_s^-} - K_s^+ - \frac{1}{K_c^-}) - g_1g_U \quad (2.9)$$

$$\frac{dg_5}{d\xi} = (2 - K_c^- - K_s^-)g_5 + \frac{t_{\perp}^2}{2}(K_c^- + K_s^- - \frac{1}{K_s^-} - \frac{1}{K_c^-}) \quad (2.10)$$

$$\frac{dg_6}{d\xi} = (2 - K_s^+ - \frac{1}{K_s^-})g_6 + \frac{t_{\perp}^2}{2}(K_s^+ + \frac{1}{K_s^-} - K_c^+ - \frac{1}{K_c^-}) - g_3g_9 - g_4g_8 \quad (2.11)$$

$$\frac{dg_7}{d\xi} = (2 - K_c^+ - \frac{1}{K_c^-})g_7 + \frac{t_{\perp}^2}{2}(K_c^+ + \frac{1}{K_c^-} - K_s^+ - \frac{1}{K_s^-}) - g_4g_9 \quad (2.12)$$

$$\frac{dg_8}{d\xi} = (2 - K_c^+ - \frac{1}{K_s^+})g_8 + \frac{t_{\perp}^2}{2}(K_c^+ - \frac{1}{K_s^+} + K_s^+ - \frac{1}{K_c^-}) - g_3g_7 \quad (2.13)$$

$$\frac{dg_9}{d\xi} = (2 - \frac{1}{K_c^-} - \frac{1}{K_s^-})g_9 + \frac{t_{\perp}^2}{2}(-K_c^- + \frac{2}{K_s^-} - K_s^- + \frac{2}{K_c^-} - K_s^+ - K_s^+) - g_4g_7 - g_3g_6 \quad (2.14)$$

$$\frac{dg_{BS}}{d\xi} = (2 - K_s^- - K_s^+)g_{BS} - g_2g_3 \quad (2.15)$$

$$\frac{dg_U}{d\xi} = (2 - K_c^- - K_c^+)g_U - g_1g_4 \quad (2.16)$$

$$\frac{d \log K_c^-}{d\xi} = \frac{1}{2}(-K_c^-(g_1^2 + g_5^2 + g_U^2) + \frac{1}{K_c^-}(g_2^2 + g_3^2 + g_7^2 + g_9^2)) \quad (2.17)$$

$$\frac{d \log K_s^-}{d\xi} = \frac{1}{2}(-K_s^-(g_2^2 + g_5^2 + g_{BS}^2) + \frac{1}{K_s^-}(g_1^2 + g_4^2 + g_6^2 + g_9^2)) \quad (2.18)$$

$$\frac{d \log K_c^+}{d\xi} = -\frac{1}{2}K_c^+(g_4^2 + g_7^2 + g_8^2 + g_U^2) \quad (2.19)$$

$$\frac{d \log K_s^+}{d\xi} = -\frac{1}{2}K_s^+(g_3^2 + g_6^2 + g_8^2 + g_{BS}^2) \quad (2.20)$$

$$\frac{d \log t_\perp}{d\xi} = 2 - \frac{1}{4}(K_c^- + \frac{1}{K_c^-} + K_s^- + \frac{1}{K_s^-}) \quad (2.21)$$

In addition, there are two equations describing evolutions of velocities $v_{c,s}$ but one can always include these corrections into the definition of the correlation exponents.

In comparison with the equations obtained in [12], [13] our RG equations (2.6-2.21) are already written in terms of physically relevant combinations of original "g-ological" couplings, so one could hope that this description might appear to be more transparent. As we shall show the above system consistently demonstrates a development of the strong coupling regime in rather general conditions, so we don't account next-to-leading order corrections which can be only necessary if one discusses fixed points at finite coupling.

First, in the case of spinless fermions away from half filling the only relevant couplings are g_1, g_2 and K_c^- and the equations (2.6-2.21) reduce to those found previously [20], [21], [22].

However in the physically relevant case of spin one half fermions away from $\rho = 1$ one can only neglect couplings g_4, g_7, g_8 and g_U associated with Umklapp processes and then the number of residual couplings is large (10) and coincides with that found in [6].

The fact that eq.(2.6-2.21) originate from the repulsive Hubbard model simplifies their analysis significantly. To see that one can choose a two-step renormalization procedure to that of Ref. [22] and integrate the above equations first up to the scale $\xi_0 = \ln \frac{t}{t_\perp}$ where the renormalized amplitude of single particle hopping $t_\perp(\xi)$ becomes of order unity (and stops). It can be easily seen that at $\xi \sim \xi_0$ one can still neglect renormalizations of the correlation exponents $K_c^\pm = 1 - \frac{z_c^\pm}{2}$ and $K_s^\pm = 1 - \frac{z_s^\pm}{2}$ from their bare values corresponding to $z_c^\pm = -z_s^\pm = \lambda = \frac{U}{\pi t}$.

By straightforward generalization of the analysis of [21], [22] one can obtain the evolution of couplings $g_i(\xi)$ given by the eq.(2.6-2.14) with only inhomogeneous terms proportional to t_\perp^2 kept

$$g_i(\xi) = C_i t_\perp^2(0) \frac{e^{2\Delta_{t_\perp}\xi} - e^{\Delta_i\xi}}{2\Delta_{t_\perp} - \Delta_i} \quad (2.22)$$

where $\Delta_i, i = 1, \dots, 9, BS, U$ denote dimensions of relevant operators and C_i are the coefficients standing in front of terms proportional to t_\perp^2 in the r.h.s. of (2.6-2.14).

It follows from (2.22) that $g_1(\xi_0) = -g_2(\xi_0) = -g_3(\xi_0) = g_4(\xi_0) = -\lambda/2$ while all the other couplings $g_i(\xi_0), i = 5, \dots, 9$ are of order λ^2 . On the other hand at $\xi > \xi_0$ one can also omit in (2.6-2.14) all inhomogeneous terms using $g(\xi_0)$ as bare values. Naively, it could mean that one has to account the leading couplings $g_{1,2,3,4}$ plus g_{BS}, g_U first and then to treat all the rest as additional perturbations. However it turns out that the solution is not so straightforward.

Let us consider first the case away from half filling. Then it can be shown that couplings g_2, g_3 and g_{BS} all tend to zero though g_1 diverges. Asymptotically the following relations hold

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{g_2(\xi)}{g_1(\xi)} &\sim \exp(\xi(K_c^- - \frac{1}{K_c^-} + \frac{1}{K_s^-} - K_s^-)) \rightarrow 0 \\ \frac{g_3(\xi)}{g_1(\xi)} &\sim \exp(\xi(K_c^- - \frac{1}{K_c^-} + \frac{1}{K_s^-} - K_s^+)) \rightarrow 0 \\ \frac{g_{BS}(\xi)}{g_1(\xi)} &\sim \exp(\xi(K_c^- + \frac{1}{K_s^-} - K_s^- - K_s^+)) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

$$\frac{1}{K_c^-(\xi)} - \frac{1}{K_c^-(0)} \sim K_s^-(\xi) \sim \frac{g_1^2(\xi) - g_1^2(0)}{2 - K_c^-(\xi) - \frac{1}{K_s^-(\xi)}} \quad (2.23)$$

Thus we infer that $K_c^-(\xi)$ vanishes while $K_s^-(\xi)$ goes to infinity. But this means that the assumption about smallness of couplings $g_{5,\dots,9}$ made on the basis of their values at $\xi = \xi_0$ was not quite correct. Namely one has to include those terms which contain one of the fields ϕ_c^- or θ_s^- which are "close" to get locked. A simple inspection yields that the second relevant coupling (besides g_1) is g_6 while in the case of $\rho = 1$ one has to keep $g_{4,8,U}$ as well. The resulting system of equations in the range $\xi_0 < \xi < \frac{1}{\lambda}$ reads as

$$\frac{dg_1}{d\xi} = \frac{1}{2}(z_c^- - z_s^-)g_1 - g_4g_U \quad (2.24)$$

$$\frac{dg_6}{d\xi} = \frac{1}{2}(z_s^- - z_c^-)g_6 - g_4g_8 \quad (2.25)$$

$$\frac{dz_c^-}{d\xi} = g_1^2 + g_U^2 \quad (2.26)$$

$$\frac{dz_s^-}{d\xi} = -g_1^2 - g_6^2 - g_4^2 \quad (2.27)$$

$$\frac{dz_s^+}{d\xi} = g_6^2 + g_8^2 \quad (2.28)$$

$$\frac{dz_c^+}{d\xi} = g_4^2 + g_8^2 + g_4^2 \quad (2.29)$$

Away from half filling all $g_{4,8,U}$ freeze at $\xi \sim \ln \frac{1}{\delta}$ (and, consequently, z_c^+ is frozen too) and there are only $g_{1,6}$ left over. Then the system (2.24-2.29) demonstrates a development of the strong coupling regime in all channels except the "+" charge one (namely, $g_1(\xi), g_6(\xi) \rightarrow -\infty$ and $z_c^-(\xi), z_s^+(\xi) \rightarrow \infty$ while $z_s^-(\xi) \rightarrow -\infty$). As usual, these tendencies have to be understood in such a way that at $\xi \sim \frac{1}{\lambda}$ all couplings reach values of order unity and don't vary further.

Including couplings $g_{4,8,U}$ at $\delta \rightarrow 0$ one can see that they don't alter the behavior found for the doped case while the "+" charge sector is also driven to the strong coupling regime in accordance with the complete freezing of charge degrees of freedom at $\rho = 1$.

To facilitate the analysis of leading instabilities of the complete Hamiltonian (2.3,2.5) one has to consider eight relevant order parameters where plus and minus correspond to intra- versus inter-chain type of ordering

$$CDW_+ = \sum \Psi_{\mu\sigma}^{f\dagger} \Psi_{-\mu,\sigma}^f \sim \cos(\phi_c^+ + \phi_c^-) \cos(\phi_s^+ + \phi_s^-) \quad (2.30)$$

$$CDW_- = \sum \Psi_{\mu\sigma}^{f\dagger} \Psi_{-\mu,\sigma}^{-f} \sim \cos(\phi_c^+ + \theta_c^-) \cos(\phi_s^+ + \theta_s^-) \quad (2.31)$$

$$SDW_+ = \sum \Psi_{\mu\sigma}^{f\dagger} \Psi_{-\mu,-\sigma}^f \sim \cos(\phi_c^+ + \phi_c^-) \cos(\theta_s^+ + \theta_s^-) \quad (2.32)$$

$$SDW_- = \sum \Psi_{\mu\sigma}^{f\dagger} \Psi_{-\mu,-\sigma}^{-f} \sim \cos(\phi_c^+ + \theta_c^-) \cos(\theta_s^+ + \phi_s^-) \quad (2.33)$$

$$SS_+ = \sum \sigma \Psi_{\mu\sigma}^f \Psi_{-\mu,-\sigma}^f \sim \cos(\theta_c^+ + \theta_c^-) \sin(\phi_s^+ + \phi_s^-) \quad (2.34)$$

$$SS_- = \sum \sigma \Psi_{\mu\sigma}^f \Psi_{-\mu,-\sigma}^{-f} \sim \cos(\theta_c^+ + \phi_c^-) \sin(\phi_s^+ + \theta_s^-) \quad (2.35)$$

$$TS_+ = \sum \sigma \Psi_{\mu\sigma}^f \Psi_{-\mu,\sigma}^f \sim \cos(\theta_c^+ + \theta_c^-) \sin(\theta_s^+ + \theta_s^-) \quad (2.36)$$

$$TS_- = \sum \sigma \Psi_{\mu\sigma}^f \Psi_{-\mu,\sigma}^{-f} \sim \cos(\theta_c^+ + \phi_c^-) \sin(\theta_s^+ + \phi_s^-) \quad (2.37)$$

We remind that if any of the fields ($\phi_{c,s}^\pm$ or $\theta_{c,s}^\pm$) gets locked then the corresponding cosine acquires a nonzero expectation value and $\langle \cos \phi(x) \cos \phi(0) \rangle \rightarrow |\langle \cos \phi(0) \rangle|^2$ as x tends to infinity. On the other hand, fluctuations of both this variable and its dual one become gapful. Formally one can identify the state where $\phi_{c,s}^\pm$ is ordered with the limit $K_{c,s}^\pm \rightarrow 0$ while $\theta_{c,s}^\pm$ becomes ordered at $K_{c,s}^\pm \rightarrow \infty$.

Then one can easily see that in the case when θ_s^- and ϕ_s^+ are locked the only competing instabilities are the interchain charge density wave corresponding to the order parameter $CDW_- \sim \cos(\phi_c^+ + \theta_c^-)$ and the interchain singlet pairing described by $SS_- \sim \cos(\theta_c^+ + \phi_c^-)$. In fact, the former state can be also recognized as a counterpart of the two-dimensional flux

phase. Indeed, this state is characterised by the commensurate with density flux $\Phi = 2k_F$ which is defined as a circulation of a phase of the on-rung order parameter $\langle u_i^\dagger d_i + d_i^\dagger u_i \rangle$ through a plaquette formed by two adjacent rungs of the ladder. In the case of spinless fermions this type of ordering called "Orbital Antiferromagnet" was first considered in [23] as a prototype of recently proposed two-dimensional flux states.

Although the flux phase can be in principal realized in some extended models we see that in our case of the double chain Hubbard model where the field ϕ_c^- also gets locked the ground state is a spin gapped singlet superconductor.

It is also instructive to express the above order parameters in terms of the hybridized one-particle states corresponding to the abovementioned "bonding" and "antibonding" bands

$$\begin{aligned} CDW_- &= \sum_{\sigma} A_{R\sigma}^\dagger A_{L\sigma} - B_{R\sigma}^\dagger B_{L\sigma} \\ SS_- &= \sum_{\sigma} A_{R\sigma}^\dagger A_{L,-\sigma}^\dagger - B_{R\sigma}^\dagger B_{L,-\sigma}^\dagger \end{aligned} \quad (2.38)$$

Considering the distribution of signs of the order parameter SS_- on the "four-point Fermi surface" ($\vec{k} = (k_F, 0), (-k_F, 0), (k_F, \pi), (-k_F, \pi)$) we observe that it corresponds to the "d-wave" type pairing. We conjecture that in a two-dimensional array of weakly coupled double chains with a continuum Fermi surface this type of ordering does transform into an ordinary d-wave pairing.

III. CONCLUSIONS

In the present paper we applied the bosonization method to find further arguments in support of the recently proposed scenario of singlet superconductivity in the spin gap state of doubled Luttinger chains. Previous results obtained in the framework of the mean field approach [11] as well as earlier numerical studies [3], [5] also testify in favor of this picture.

We also want to stress that our conclusions contradict with a recent claim about the existence of the strong coupling fixed point where some spin excitations remain gapless made in [24]. These authors considered the double chain $t - J$ model without an interchain

spin exchange ($J_{\perp} = 0$). Then on the bare level their Hamiltonian can be assigned to the universality class of the purely forward scattering model considered in [15]. In this special case indeed the only field becoming massive is θ_s^- . In principal, it can't be ruled out that for some specific double chain models only part of all relevant fields acquire masses and the others remain massless. One example of this type was discussed by the authors of [25] who found only ϕ_c^- and ϕ_s^+ to be massive in the framework of the model including solely an interchain interaction of fermions with opposite spins.

However our investigation of the Hubbard-type models shows that the presence of the interchain one particle hopping is already sufficient to generate the antiferromagnetic spin exchange term with $J_{\perp} \sim \frac{t_{\perp}^2}{\max(t, U)}$ which makes all spin modes gapful at $\rho \lesssim 1$. We believe that spin liquid behavior with a finite spin gap which evolves into "d-wave" pairing upon doping is a robust feature of a whole variety of isotropic spin models of weakly coupled and strongly correlated fermions on double chains.

IV. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are grateful to Profs. P.B.Wiegmann and F.D.M.Haldane for valuable discussions. This work was supported by the Swiss National Fund. One of the authors (D.V.K.) also acknowledges the support from the NSF Grant.

REFERENCES

- [1] T.M.Rice, S.Gopalan,M.Sigrist, Europhys. Lett. **23**, 445(1993).
- [2] R.Hirsch, Univ. of Köln, Diploma thesis, 1984.
- [3] E.Dagotto,J. Riera, and D.J.Scalapino,Phys,Rev.**B45**, 5744 (1992).
- [4] T.Barnes, E.Dagotto, J.Riera, and E.S.Swanson, Phys.Rev.**B47**, 3196 (1993).
- [5] R.M.Noack, S.R.White, and D.J.Scalapino, UC Irvine preprint, 1993.
- [6] M.Fabrizio,A.Parola and E.Tosatti, Phys.Rev.**B46**, 3159 (1992).
- [7] D.V.Khveshchenko, unpublished.
- [8] H.J.Schulz, Phys.Rev.Lett. **64**, 2831 (1990).
- [9] M. Imada, J.Phys.Soc.Japan **60**, 1877 (1991); Phys.Rev.**B48**, 550 (1993).
- [10] M. Ogata, M.U.Luchini, and T.M.Rice, Phys.Rev.**B44**, 12083 (1991).
- [11] M.Sigrist, T.M.Rice, and F.C.Zhang, preprint ETH-TH/93-35.
- [12] C.M.Varma and A.Zawadowski, Phys.Rev.**B32**, 7399 (1985).
- [13] K.Penc and J.Solyom, Phys.Rev.**B41**,704 (1990).
- [14] K.A.Muttalib and V.J. Emery, Phys.Rev.Lett.**57**, 1370 (1986).
- [15] A.M.Finkelstein and A.I.Larkin, Phys.Rev.**B47**, 10461 (1993).
- [16] S.Coleman, Phys.Rev.**D11**, 2088, (1975).
- [17] H.J.Schulz, Int.J.Mod.Phys.**B5**, 59 (1991).
- [18] C.Bourbonnais and L.G. Caron, Int.J.Mod.Phys.**B5**, 1033 (1991).
- [19] T. Giamarchi and H.J.Schulz, J.de Physique **49**, 819 (1988),
Phys.Rev.**B39**, 4620, (1989).

- [20] F.V.Kusmartsev, A.Luther, and A.A.Nersesyan , JETP Lett.**55**, 692 (1992).
- [21] V.M.Yakovenko, JETP Lett. **56**, 5101 (1992).
- [22] A.A.Nersesyan, A.Luther, and F.V.Kusmartsev, Phys. Lett. **A176**, 363 (1993).
- [23] A.A.Nersesyan, Phys.Lett.**A153**, 49 (1991).
- [24] G.M.Zhang,S.Feng, and Lu Yu, ICTP preprint, 1993.
- [25] D.Schmeltzer and J.L.Birman, J.Phys. Cond. Matter, **5**, 4843 (1993).