

On representation of the t - J model via spin-charge variables

Evgenii Kochetov and Vladimir Yarusin

Bogoliubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics,
Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, 141980 Dubna, Russia

Abstract

We show that the t - J Hamiltonian is not in general reduced to $H_{t-J} = H(S; f)$, where S and f stand for independent ($[S; f] = 0$) $SU(2)$ (spin) generators and spinless fermionic (hole) field, respectively. The proof is based upon an identification of the Hubbard operators with the generators of the $su(2|1)$ superalgebra in the degenerate fundamental representation and ensuing $SU(2|1)$ path integral representation of the partition function Z_{t-J} .

e-mail: kochetov@thsun1.jinr.dubna.su, fax number: (7) (096) (21) 65084

I. Introduction

It is by now widely accepted that the t - J model, that is, the one-band Hubbard model in the large U -limit, provides an adequate basis for the discussion of the essential physics for layered copper oxide compounds [1, 2]. An accurate description of the properties of charge carriers in high-temperature superconductors arising from their interaction with the spin of the Cu atoms seems to be crucial for the understanding of superconductivity in these materials. Since there occurs a strong coupling between charge and spin degrees of freedom [3], the problem of a proper separation of spin and charge degrees of freedom in the t - J model is of importance in order to get an insight into an interplay of magnetic and charge properties of relevant systems.

A popular approach has so far been that to introduce chargeless spinon and spinless holon operators in the framework of the slave fermion or slave boson method. The drawback of this approach is, however, that a certain local (at every lattice site) constraint on spinon and holon operators is to be imposed in order to ensure the single occupancy of the electrons. Although the spinon and holon degrees of freedom are separated on the mean field level, they are strongly coupled by the gauge field associated with fluctuations around a mean field [4]. It has been recognized that while the rigorous imposition of the constraint seems to pose a problem, its averaging, e.g., mean field treatment results in a large error.

It seems therefore desirable to attempt to explicitly formulate the t - J model in terms of independent local spin and holon operators so that no constraint would be necessary. Some recent developments point to the possibility to attain the goal starting from a new

kind of spin-fermion representation for the Hubbard operators [5, 6]. Although this representation agrees with the required commutation relations for the Hubbard operators, it implies that the original Hilbert space is to be enlarged, and as a result a certain constraint seems to be necessary anyway to get rid of unphysical degrees of freedom. Besides, the enlargement is not entirely fixed in the scope of this approach.

In the present paper we show that the t - J Hamiltonian is not in general reduced to a polynomial function of independent $SU(2)$ (spin) and fermion (hole) variables, though that happens in the so-called linear spin wave approximation. We address the problem from the general point of view, by considering the Hubbard operators as the generators of the $su(2|1)$ superalgebra and employing the ensuing $SU(2|1)$ path integral representation for the partition function. The $SU(2|1)$ supersymmetry happens to be the largest symmetry that underlies the t - J model [7]. In essence, our approach is nothing but the geometric quantization (also called the coherent state method) for quantum mechanics associated with a semisimple Lie algebra [8, 9, 10]. It provides an effective, in the sense it requires a minimal set of variables, description of a system with a Hamiltonian that can be embedded into a given Lie (super)algebra. As an example, we may refer to the $SU(2)$ path-integral representation of a partition function that has recently been employed to formulate a non-operator mean-field diagrammatic technique for the Heisenberg model [11]. Path integral associated with $su(2|1)$ supercoherent states has proved to be helpful in order to justify the adiabatic approximation in the periodic Anderson model in the large U -limit [12].

The proof of the statement given in the abstract is quite simple, though it requires that some necessary notation is to be introduced first, so that a bulk of the paper serves to that purpose. Section II, as well as Appendices A, B and C are necessary to make the proof given in section III quite transparent and plain. Section IV explains an exception that is provided by the linear spin wave theory. Section V contains some comments on earlier results and concluding remarks.

II. t - J model

We start by expressing the t - J model in terms of the Hubbard operators [13] X_i^0 , defined as

$$X_i^0 = c_i^\dagger (1 - n_i^-);$$

where c_i is the annihilation operator of an electron at site i with spin \uparrow , and $n_i^- = c_i^\dagger c_i$. In terms of these, the t - J Hamiltonians becomes

$$H_{t-J} = \sum_{ij} t X_i^0 X_j^0 + J \sum_{ij} Q_i Q_j; \quad (1)$$

where the electron spin operator

$$Q_i = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha\beta} X_i^{\alpha\beta} \tilde{\sigma}_{\alpha\beta};$$

and $\tilde{\sigma} = (\sigma^1; \sigma^2; \sigma^3)$ are the Pauli matrices.

For further convenience, though it is not necessary to prove our statement, we perform a π -rotation of the spins on the B-sublattice which leads to the changes

$$X_i^0 \rightarrow X_i^0; \quad Q_i \rightarrow Q_i; \quad Q_i^z \rightarrow -Q_i^z; \quad i \in B;$$

Hence from now on the spin background is effectively a ferromagnetic one and one should not distinguish between sublattices anymore. The original Hamiltonian (1) is then converted into

$$H_{t,J} = \sum_{ij} X_i^+ X_j^0 + X_i^0 X_j^{0+} + J \sum_{ij} Q_i^z Q_j^z + \frac{1}{2} (Q_i^+ Q_j^+ + Q_i^- Q_j^-) \quad (2)$$

X_i^0 projects the electron operator into the single-occupation state and in the basis $|j\rangle_i; |j\rangle$ it takes the form

$$X_i^0 = |j\rangle_i \langle 0|_j; \quad X_i^{0+} = |j\rangle_i \langle 0|_j \quad (3)$$

where $|j\rangle_i$ stands for a doped site (hole) and $|j\rangle_i$ for the state having an electron occupied with spin j . It is clear that there are eight linearly independent operators since

$$X_i^{00} + \sum_j X_i^{0j} = I; \quad (4)$$

X_i^0 appearing as a fermionic operator, whereas X_i^{0+} correspond to bosonic degrees of freedom. In fact, representation (3) means that the X -operators are closed into the $u(2|1)$ superalgebra, which in view of (4) is reduced to the eight-dimensional $su(2|1)$ superalgebra. The latter is generated by even generators $B; Q_3; Q_+; Q_-$ and the odd ones $W_+; W_-; V_+; V_-$ and the associated coherent state in the so-called $(q; q)$ representation (see Appendix A) reads

$$|j; i\rangle = (1 + |j|^2 + \dots)^{-q} e^{-V + zQ} |j; q; q; i\rangle \quad (5)$$

where $|j; q; q; i\rangle$ stands for a eigenvector of the operators $B; Q^2$ and Q_3 , respectively, and the variables z and q parametrize the super-two-sphere $SU(2|1) = U(1|1) = S^{(2|2)}$, the $N = 2$ supersymmetric extension of the two-sphere S^2 (for some details concerning a definition of $S^{2|2}$ see Appendix C).

Resolution of unity in the $(q; q)$ representation space holds

$$\int_{SU(2|1)} |j; i\rangle \langle j; i|_{SU(2|1)}(z; q) = I$$

$$= \sum_q X^{q1} |j; q; m\rangle \langle q; q; m|_j + \sum_{(q=1=2)} X^{q1=2} |j+1=2; q\rangle \langle 1=2; m|_q + |j+1=2; q\rangle \langle 1=2; m|_j$$

provided

$$d_{SU(2|1)} = \frac{dz dz}{2(1 + |j|^2 + \dots)} : \quad (6)$$

Evaluating a partition function in the $|j; i\rangle$ basis results eventually in the $SU(2|1)$ path integral representation [14]

$$\text{tr} \exp[-\beta H] = \int_{SU(2|1)} \int_{z(0)=z(\beta)} \mathcal{D}_{SU(2|1)}(z; q) \exp[-\beta \mathcal{A}]; \quad (7)$$

where $D_{SU(2|1)}(z; \cdot)$ stands for an infinite pointwise product of the $SU(2|1)$ invariant measures (6) and the classical action on $S^{2|2}$ with a Hamiltonian function $H^{cl} = hz; \dot{z}; \dot{z}; i$ reads

$$A = q \int_0^Z \frac{z\dot{z} - z\dot{z} + \dots}{1 + \dot{z}^2 + \dots} dt \int_0^Z H^{cl}(z; \cdot) dt; \quad (8)$$

A few important definitions concerning the notion of an integration on supermanifolds are given in Appendix C.

To explicitly evaluate H^{cl} one needs the $SU(2|1)$ covariant symbols of the generators. These are found to be $(A^{cl} = hz; \dot{z}; \dot{z}; i)$:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_3^{cl} &= q(1 - \dot{z}^2)w; & (Q^+)^{cl} &= 2qzw; & (Q^-)^{cl} &= 2qzw; \\ B^{cl} &= q(1 + \dot{z}^2 + 2)w; & (V^+)^{cl} &= 2qzw; & (V^-)^{cl} &= 2qzw; \\ (W^+)^{cl} &= 2qzw; & (W^-)^{cl} &= 2qzw; & w &= (1 + \dot{z}^2 + \dots)^{-1}; \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Turning back to the $t-J$ model one notices that the algebra of the X -operators can explicitly be identified with the degenerate $(1=2; 1=2)$ representation of $su(2|1)$ in the following way,

$$Q_3 = \frac{1}{2}(X^{++} - X^{--}); \quad Q_+ = X^{+-}; \quad Q_- = X^{-+}; \quad B = \frac{1}{2}(X^{++} + X^{--}) + X^{00}$$

and

$$V_+ = X^{00}; \quad V_- = X^{0+}; \quad W_+ = X^{+0}; \quad W_- = X^{-0};$$

the even (bosonic) states $j_1=2; j_2=2; j_3=2i$ and $j_1=2; j_2=2; j_3=-2i$ being identified with the spin up and spin down states, $j_1=i$ and $j_2=-i$, respectively, whereas the odd (fermionic) state $j_1=0; j_2=0i$ with the doped state $j_1=i$. Dimension of this representation is equal to 3 as should be. It is also clear that Eq. (A 2) holds true and hence we have explicitly identified the algebra of the Hubbard operators with the degenerate fundamental $(3|3)$ representation of the $su(2|1)$ superalgebra.

It is worth mentioning that $su(2|1)$ gives rise in a natural way to the slave fermion (slave boson) representation for the Hubbard operators. The latter appears as the so-called oscillator representation of the $su(2|1)$ algebra [15]. For instance, let $X_{00}; \dots; X_{00}^{00} = 1; 2; 3$ be a matrix corresponding to the operator X in the $(1=2; 1=2)$ representation. Consider a composite creation operator $d^Y = (a^Y; b^Y; f^Y)$, where a and b stand for bosonic fields and f for a fermionic one. Then, the slave fermion representation reads

$$\begin{aligned} X &= \sum_0^X d^Y X_{00} d^Y; \\ \sum_0^X d^Y d^Y &= a^Y a + b^Y b + f^Y f = 1; \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where the last line is the completeness relation (4). In fact, this is nothing but a linear Casimir operator of $u(2|1)$ whose eigenvalue fixes a representation. The lowest possible value taken by the rhs and equal to 1 corresponds to the lowest possible dimension of the representation space.

The $su(2|1)$ algebraic approach provides also a possible generalization of the standard $t-J$ Hamiltonian to include particles with spin higher than $1=2$, which is necessary to properly formulate a $1=s$ expansion. One possibility might be to consider spin s electrons,

which would correspond to the fundamental representation of the $su(2s+1|1)$ superalgebra instead of $su(2|1)$. An alternative procedure, since we are really interested in $s=1/2$, is to interpret the holes to be sites which have spin $s=1/2$ [3], so that the sites without a "hole" acquire spin $(s=1/2)+1/2=s$. The latter possibility amounts to considering the $(q=s; q=s)$ representation of $su(2|1)$ rather than the $(q=1/2; q=1/2)$ fundamental one. The hole space is then identified with the set

$$f_{j+1/2}; q_{1/2}; m_i; \quad q_{1/2} \rightarrow m \quad q_{1/2} \rightarrow g$$

whereas the "holeless" spin excitations form the set

$$f_{j+1/2}; q; m_i; \quad q \rightarrow m \quad q \rightarrow g:$$

This remark clarifies the physical meaning of the representation index q .

III. $SU(2|1)$ path integral for the $t-J$ model

With the necessary background displayed above, one easily arrives at the $SU(2|1)$ path integral representation for the partition function

$$Z_{t-J} = \text{tr} e^{-H_{t-J}}:$$

The result is

$$Z_{t-J} = \int_{S^{2|1}} \prod_j d\mathbf{z}_j \int_{SU(2|1)}^{(j)} \exp[A_{t-J}]; \quad \mathbf{z}_j(0) = \mathbf{z}_j(\beta); \quad \mathbf{j}(0) = \mathbf{j}(\beta); \quad (11)$$

where

$$A_{t-J} = q \sum_j \int_0^\beta \frac{z_j z_j + \mathbf{j}_j \cdot \mathbf{j}_j}{1 + \mathbf{j}_j^2 + \mathbf{j}_j \cdot \mathbf{j}_j} dt + \int_0^\beta H_{t-J}^{cl} dt \quad (12)$$

The first term of the action is purely geometric and reflects the structure of $S^{2|1}$ while the second is of a dynamical origin and in view of (9) is found to be

$$H_{t-J}^{cl} = t(2q)^2 \sum_{ij} \frac{[z_i z_j + z_i z_j]}{(1 + \mathbf{j}_i^2)(1 + \mathbf{j}_j^2)} + Jq^2 \sum_{ij} \frac{(1 - \mathbf{j}_i^2)(1 - \mathbf{j}_j^2) + 2(z_i z_j + z_i z_j)}{(1 + \mathbf{j}_i^2 + \mathbf{j}_i \cdot \mathbf{j}_i)(1 + \mathbf{j}_j^2 + \mathbf{j}_j \cdot \mathbf{j}_j)}: \quad (13)$$

To avoid an accumulation of indices, we will often drop the lattice site indication whenever no confusion is possible.

Representation (11-13) is the point we will start from to prove the main statement of the paper. We will proceed as follows. Suppose we are given a Hamiltonian to be a function (polynomial) of the spin generators S and spinless fermionic fields f, f^\dagger (for the notation see Appendix B),

$$H_{S-f} = H(S; f):$$

Then it follows (see Appendix B) that

$$Z_{S_f} = \int_{S^2} D_{SU(2)} D_F \exp[A_{S_f}]; \quad (14)$$

where

$$A_{S_f} = s \int_0^Z \frac{z_j z_j}{1 + \dot{z}_j^2} dt + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^Z (-\dot{z}_j \dot{z}_j) dt \int_0^Z H_{S_f}^{cl} dt; \quad (15)$$

and

$$H_{S_f}^{cl} = h_{j_{SU(2)}} h_{\dot{z}_j} H_{S_f} j_{i_F} \dot{z}_{i_{SU(2)}};$$

The first two terms in A_{S_f} are of a geometric origin, as well.

Let us now compare Eqs. (11) and (14). If it were possible by a change of variables to bring somehow the first equation to the form of the second one, it would mean that the t - J Hamiltonian can be reduced to a certain H_{S_f} . If one failed to do this, it would not in general mean that H_{t-J} coincides with no H_{S_f} . It may just mean that we have failed to find a proper transformation that would result in a decomposition

$$\int_0^Z \frac{z_j z_j}{1 + \dot{z}_j^2 + \dot{z}_j \dot{z}_j} dt = \int_0^Z \frac{z_j z_j}{1 + \dot{z}_j^2} dt + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^Z (-\dot{z}_j \dot{z}_j) dt; \quad (16)$$

where $s = s(q)$. This decomposition is necessary to arrive at in view of Eq. (15). It should be recognized that both lines of Eq. (16) are to be fulfilled simultaneously. It might also be possible that a corresponding change of variables does not exist in principle, though both Eqs. (11) and (14) may contain the same physical information, which would in turn mean that the path integral approach fails to provide a definite answer, which in itself is very unlikely.

Once, on the other hand, one has succeeded with Eq. (16) the next step to take would be to look at a form the t - J Hamiltonian is transformed to in accordance with (16). If the latter coincided with the covariant symbol of a certain H_{S_f} , then one could conclude

$$H_{t-J} = H_{S_f}; \quad (17)$$

Note that there is one-to-one correspondence between H_{S_f} and its covariant symbol [16]. In case the transformed H_{t-J}^{cl} cannot be identified with the covariant symbol of any H_{S_f} , Eq. (17) does not hold. It is just the case for the t - J model.

To prove that, let us in Eq. (11) make two successive changes of variables:

$$z_i \rightarrow z_i \sqrt{\frac{q}{1 + \dot{z}_i^2}}; \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{z}_i \rightarrow \dot{z}_i \sqrt{\frac{s}{1 + \dot{z}_i^2}}; \quad (18)$$

which results in

$$Z_{t-J} = \int_{S^2} D_{SU(2)}^{(j)} \int_{\dot{z}} D_F^{(j)} \exp[\tilde{A}_{t-J}]$$

$$\tilde{A}_{t-J} = q \int_0^X \frac{z_j z_j}{1 + \dot{z}_j^2} dt + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^X (-\dot{z}_j \dot{z}_j) dt \int_0^Z H_{t-J}^{cl} dt; \quad (19)$$

The important point concerning this representation is that $z(t)$ and $\bar{z}(t)$ can be considered to take values in S^2 in accordance with Eq. (C.3) of Appendix C. Hence, we have succeeded in converting the $SU(2|1)$ integral (11) into the $SU(2)$ and the purely fermionic ones. It is also seen from (19) and (B.1, B.2) that $s(q) = q$, that is, we have arrived at the $SU(2)$ representation with spin $s = q$. To summarize, we have separated spin and charge variables at the kinematical level. In other words, a possibility of the spin-charge variable separation for any model expressible in terms of the Hubbard operators depends solely on an explicit form of the Hamiltonian.

Let us write down the function $H_{t,J}^{cl}$ explicitly:

$$H_{t,J}^{cl} = \sum_{ij} t(2q) \frac{z_i \bar{z}_j + z_i \bar{z}_j}{(1 + \bar{z}_i z_i)(1 + \bar{z}_j z_j)} + \sum_{ij} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \bar{z}_i z_i} + \frac{z_i \bar{z}_i}{2} \right) \left(\frac{1}{1 + \bar{z}_j z_j} + \frac{z_j \bar{z}_j}{2} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{2qz_i}{1 + \bar{z}_i z_i} \frac{z_i \bar{z}_i}{2} + \frac{2qz_j}{1 + \bar{z}_j z_j} \frac{z_j \bar{z}_j}{2} + \text{h.c.} \quad (20)$$

What conclusion can be drawn from this representation? Some terms can be viewed as covariant symbols of spin-fermion interaction operators. For instance, the second line in Eq. (20) is simply a symbol of the operator (see Appendix B)

$$\sum_{ij} (S_i^z - n_i/2) (S_j^z - n_j/2);$$

where $n_i = f_i^\dagger f_i$ is the hole number operator. Besides, it is clear that

$$\frac{2qz_i}{1 + \bar{z}_i z_i} = hz_i \bar{f}_i^+ f_i;$$

etc. On the other hand, there is no a polynomial function $f(S)$ with the property

$$hz_i \bar{f}_i = z_i;$$

as well as there is no such $f(S)$ that would give rise to the square roots in the t -dependent term. It is also obvious that the change of the variables (B.5) is of no use in order to get rid of the unwanted terms, and we finally conclude, there is no $H_{S,f}$ such that Eq. (17) would hold.

To complete the proof, two remarks are in order. First, we compare in fact classical actions (Lagrangians) (12) and (15) as well as related integration measures (invariant volume elements) rather than partition functions $Z_{t,J}$ and $Z_{S,f}$. This implies that a path integral does not seem to be indispensable for the above consideration. Classical action can be obtained by standard methods. Namely, given a (super)coherent state $|z\rangle$ with z being a set of supercoordinates, one can obtain a corresponding action A with the help of equation

$$A = i \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \left(\dot{z} \frac{d}{dt} - H(z, \bar{z}) \right);$$

To evaluate this explicitly, representation

$$d = dt = z \partial_z + \bar{z} \partial_{\bar{z}}$$

is to be used. We prefer, however, to employ the path-integral formalism since it provides the most simple consideration.

Second, it is not sufficient for our purposes to merely compare Hamiltonians H_{tJ}^{cl} and H_{sf}^{cl} . The point is that canonical equations of motion that follow from the Hamiltonian action principle $\delta A = 0$ and read

$$\dot{z} = fH^{cl}; zg;$$

depend on both classical Hamiltonian and underlying geometry. Here $f;g$ stands for the Poisson brackets which involve different symplectic two-forms! for different manifolds. Actually, the form ω defines a kinetic term in an action which can be written in the form $i \int \omega$ where $d = \omega$. That is why it is necessary to compare either Lagrangians or Hamiltonians plus corresponding two-forms (invariant volume elements).

IV. Linear spin-wave approximation

As is shown in the preceding section it is in general impossible to reduce the $t-J$ hamiltonian to that of a spin-fermion interaction. Now we demonstrate how this can be achieved in the so-called linear spin-wave (LSW) approximation [17, 18], which effectively corresponds to small transverse fluctuations of a spin around the z axis. As is seen from Eq. (B.3), this mathematically means $j_z^2 = 1$ (in fact, $j_z^2 = 2q - 1$). The LSW theory has been successfully exploited in the $t-J$ model, see the paper [19] and references therein.

In the path-integral language the LSW approximation consists in converting the $SU(2)$ path integral representation (B.1, B.2) under the condition $j_z^2 = 1$ into the bosonic one. To proceed, one should expand the action (B.2) up to the second order in $z; \bar{z}$ and perform a change $z \rightarrow \sqrt{2q} \bar{z}$, the latter being needed to recover in the action the "at" kinetic term:

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_0^Z (\dot{z} \dot{\bar{z}} - z \bar{z}) dt;$$

With all this having been performed, Eq. (11) becomes

$$Z_{tJ} = Z_{tJ}^{LSW} = \int \prod_j D_B^{(j)}(z) D_F^{(j)}(\bar{z}) \exp[A_{tJ}^{LSW}]; \quad (21)$$

where

$$A_{tJ}^{LSW} = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^Z \sum_i (\dot{z}_i \dot{\bar{z}}_i - z_i \bar{z}_i) dt + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^Z \sum_i (\bar{z}_i \dot{z}_i - \dot{\bar{z}}_i z_i) dt - \int_0^Z H_{LSW}^{cl} dt; \quad (22)$$

and $D_B(z) = D[z] D[\bar{z}]$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} H_{tJ}^{cl} - H_{LSW}^{cl} &= \frac{1}{2q} \sum_{ij} X_{ij} (z_i z_j + \bar{z}_i \bar{z}_j) \\ &+ Jq \sum_{ij} X_{ij} z_i z_i (1 - \frac{j \cdot j}{2q}) + z_j z_j (1 - \frac{i \cdot i}{2q}) - q (1 - \frac{j \cdot j}{2q}) (1 - \frac{i \cdot i}{2q}) \\ &+ z_i z_j (1 - \frac{i \cdot i}{4q}) (1 - \frac{j \cdot j}{4q}) + z_i z_j (1 - \frac{i \cdot i}{4q}) (1 - \frac{j \cdot j}{4q}); \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

which may be regarded as the covariant symbol in the LSW limit of the operator

$$H_{tJ}^{LSW} = \sum_{ij}^X (f_i f_j^y S_j^+ + f_i f_j^y S_i^-) + J \sum_{ij}^X (S_i^z - n_i/2)(S_j^z - n_j/2) + \frac{1}{2} S_i^+ S_j^+ (1 - \frac{n_i}{4q})(1 - \frac{n_j}{4q}) + \frac{1}{2} S_i^- S_j^- (1 - \frac{n_i}{4q})(1 - \frac{n_j}{4q}) : \quad (24)$$

Here f^y and f stand for spinless hole operators, $n = f^y f$, while S describes a local spin, with $[S; f] = 0$. It is important to recognize that when deriving (24) we have not been forced to impose any constraints (cf. Ref. [19]), since we have started off with Eq. (1) that automatically implies no double occupied configurations and made no algebraic identifications of the Hubbard operators with spin-fermion bilinears (cf. Ref. [5]). Representation (23-24) coincides with that of Ref. [19], provided the mean-field approximation $n_i = 1$, where q is the concentration of holes, is used.

V. Comments and conclusion

As was already mentioned, there exist papers where some explicit representations of the form

$$H_{tJ} = H(S; f)$$

have been obtained, e.g., see [5, 6]. For instance, in Ref. [5] the following spin-fermion representation of the Hubbard operators

$$X^{+0} = f S^+ S^-; \quad X^{0+} = f^y S^+ S^-; \quad X^{00} = f S^-; \quad X^{0-} = f^y S^+ \quad (25)$$

has been suggested, which implies the identification

$$\begin{aligned} j \neq i! \quad \mathcal{H}_{\text{fermion}}; S^z = +1/2; \quad j \neq i! \quad \mathcal{H}_{\text{fermion}}; S^z = -1/2; \\ j \neq i! \quad \mathcal{H}_{\text{fermion}}; S^z = +1/2; \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Note that all the Hubbard operators vanish on the state $j \neq i! \quad \mathcal{H}_{\text{fermion}}; S^z = -1/2$.

A similar map has been employed in Ref. [6] except for a modification needed to explicitly recover the time-reversed symmetry of the $t-J$ model. The latter is of no importance for us here, so that later on we will keep referring to [5], the more so, as a trick suggested in [6] to consider an operator as a half-sum of the same operator taken in two different representations seems to pose a problem.

It can be easily checked that Eqs. (25) recover correctly the algebra of the Hubbard operators within the subspace (26). Nevertheless, operators S and f cannot be considered as those describing independently a local spin and a holon. This results from the $su(2|1)$ ($1=2; 1=2$) defining relation (4) which in terms of (25) reads

$$f^y f S^+ S^- + f f^y = 1: \quad (27)$$

This constraint is to be imposed in order to single out the three-dimensional subspace (26) and plays the same role as Eq. (10) in the slave fermion representation does.

To illustrate this point, consider the true fermionic correlator

$$G(t) = \text{tr} f^y(t) f(0) i \mathcal{H}_{f^y f S^+ S^- + f f^y = 1} = \text{tr} f e^{iH} f^y e^{-iH} f g i \mathcal{H}_{f^y f S^+ S^- + f f^y = 1}; \quad (28)$$

where H stands for any Hamiltonian that can be written in terms of Hubbard operators. On the other hand, consider

$$G(t) = \langle f^y(t) f(0) \rangle = \text{tr} f e^{itH} f^y e^{-itH} f g \quad (29)$$

It is easily seen that

$$G(t) = G(t) + F(t);$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F(t) &= \langle f_{Fermion}^y; S^z = 1/2 \rangle e^{itH} f^y e^{-itH} f_{Fermion}^y; S^z = 1/2 \rangle \\ &= \langle f_{Fermion}^y; S^z = 1/2 \rangle e^{itH} f_{Fermion}^y; S^z = 1/2 \rangle \end{aligned}$$

which means that the unphysical state $f_{Fermion}^y; S^z = 1/2$, if not excluded by Eq. (27), makes a nontrivial contribution.

Though at half filling constraint (27) turns into identity $1 = 1$, it is to be taken into consideration at any hole concentration > 0 . Otherwise, as the above mentioned example shows unphysical states may affect the situation drastically. In this regard, basic results of Ref. [5] where a motion of a hole has been investigated in representation (25) without the constraint, should have been revisited.

To look at all this from a viewpoint related to the path integral (11-12), consider the t -dependent term in [5]:

$$\sum_{ij} f_i f_j^y \left(\frac{1}{2} + S_i^z \right) S_j^+ + \left(\frac{1}{2} + S_j^z \right) S_i^- \quad (30)$$

It is easily seen that the first term in Eq. (13) would just correspond to this operator, provided one would consider z and \bar{z} to belong to S^2 . But this is not the case and one must perform the change (18) first to bring the $SU(2|1)$ integral to the $SU(2)$ form. As a result, one arrives at the first term of Eq. (20) that on no account corresponds to (30). All this amounts to saying that if one wrote down a path integral for a partition function with the Hamiltonian (30) over $D_{SU(2)} D_F$ and then performed the change of variables inverse to (18),

$$z \rightarrow \frac{2q}{1 + z^2}; \quad \bar{z} \rightarrow \frac{z}{1 + z^2};$$

then one would arrive at the representation (11) with a Hamiltonian function describing a system quite distinct from the t - J model.

For the sake of completeness, it should be also mentioned that one can face an assertion that spin-charge degrees of freedom are separated in certain instances, e.g., when H_{tJ} is treated on a mean-field level in a slave particle representation. This assertion is correct, though has nothing to do with Eq. (17). The point is that the above mentioned separation holds for auxiliary fields related to electron spin and charge degrees of freedom. Only some fixed combinations of those fields can be associated with true spin variables. In the slave fermion representation (10) one has

$$\frac{1}{2} (a^y a - b^y b) = S_z; \quad a b^y = S_+; \quad a^y b = S_-; \quad a^y a + b^y b = 2s/2N$$

whereas, for example, operator a taken in itself cannot be identified with a spin variable. It would be therefore appropriate to refer this case to as a spinon-charge separation rather

than the spin-charge one. Besides, this separation breaks down beyond the mean-field approximation.

To conclude, we have shown that the t - J Hamiltonian cannot be in general reduced to that describing an interaction of two independent fields: local $SU(2)$ spins and spinless fermions (holes), though this may occur in some particular cases, e. g., in the linear spin wave approximation. The consideration is based upon a crucial fact that the t - J Hamiltonian can be embedded into a representation of the $su(2|1)$ superalgebra, which provides us with the $SU(2|1)$ path integral representation of the partition function and, hence, with an effective total action describing the system.

V I. Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge the financial support of the Russian Foundation for Fundamental Research under grant No 96-01-00223.

Appendix A

To make the exposition self-contained and for the reader's convenience we place in Appendices A, B and C some information concerning a definition of the $su(2|1)$ superalgebra and its representations as well as of related coherent states and path integrals.

Appendix A serves to recapitulate the necessary ingredients concerning the $su(2|1)$ superalgebra and associated coherent states bearing in mind their relevance for the t - J model.

To visualize a route in general, we start with some preliminary remarks. Given a Lie (super)algebra g in an irreducible representation, one can construct associated (super)coherent states $|j(\)\rangle$ viewed as an overcomplete basis in the corresponding representation of a (super)group G , with $(\)$ specifying a point in the G -homogeneous (super)manifold, an orbit of G in the coadjoint representation [8, 9, 10]. Given further a Hamiltonian H that appears as an element of the g -enveloping algebra, one may evaluate a partition function in the coherent-state basis, which naturally leads to a relevant coherent-state path integral [20, 14]. The latter appears as a phase-space path integral and provides a quantization of H^{cl} on a coadjoint orbit. The crucial point is that this quantization respects the underlying dynamical (super)symmetry generated by g .

As is known, the $SU(2|1)$ supergroup in the fundamental representation is the group of $(2+1) \times (2+1)$ unitary, unimodular supermatrices with the Hermitian conjugate operation. It is generated by even generators $fB; Q_3; Q_+; Q_-$ and the odd ones $fW_+; W_-; V_+; V_-$ g which satisfy the following commutation rules [21]:

$$\begin{aligned} [Q_3; Q_\pm] &= \mp Q_\pm; [Q_+; Q_-] = 2Q_3; [B; Q_\pm] = [B; Q_3] = 0; \\ [B; V_\pm] &= \frac{1}{2}V_\pm; [B; W_\pm] = \frac{1}{2}W_\pm; [Q_3; V_\pm] = \frac{1}{2}V_\pm; [Q_3; W_\pm] = \frac{1}{2}W_\pm; \\ [Q_\pm; V_\pm] &= V_\pm; [Q_\pm; W_\pm] = W_\pm; [Q_\pm; V_\mp] = [Q_\pm; W_\mp] = 0; \\ fV_\pm; V_\mp g &= fV_\mp; V_\mp g = fW_\pm; W_\mp g = fW_\mp; W_\mp g = 0; \\ fV_\pm; W_\mp g &= \mp Q_\mp; fV_\mp; W_\mp g = \mp Q_3 - B. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathfrak{b}; \mathfrak{q}; \mathfrak{q}_3$ stand for a vector of any abstract representation of $su(2|1)$, where $\mathfrak{b}; \mathfrak{q}$ and

q_3 denote the eigenvalues of the operators $B; Q^2$ and Q_3 , respectively. When considering the highest-weight state as the fiducial state $|j, i\rangle$, the typical $SU(2|1)$ coherent state reads

$$|j, i\rangle = N \exp(-W - V + zQ) |j, q, q_i\rangle \quad (A.1)$$

where $(z, ;) \in SU(2|1) = U(1) \ltimes U(1)$. We will be interested later on in the so-called degenerate $b = q$ representation which happens to be relevant for the $t-J$ model. It is specified by

$$W |j, q, q_i\rangle = 0 \quad (A.2)$$

and is called the $(q; q)$ representation with the dimension $4q + 1$ [21]. This representation is spanned by $2q + 1$ vectors $f |j, q, m, i\rangle$ $q = m = q$ of the even (bosonic) sector and $2q$ vectors $f |j + 1/2, q - 1/2, m, i\rangle$ $q + 1/2 = m = q - 1/2$ that correspond to the odd (fermionic) one. Both the second and third order Casimir operators are zero in this representation. The coherent state (A.1) is reduced in the $(q; q)$ representation to

$$|j, i\rangle = (1 + j^2)^{-q} e^{-V + zQ} |j, q, q_i\rangle \quad (A.3)$$

wherein we have evaluated the normalization factor explicitly.

Appendix B

In this Appendix we describe the $SU(2)$ and standard "fermionic" path integrals, which is necessary to interpret properly the transformed $SU(2|1)$ path integral (19).

Consider the $SU(2)$ algebra

$$[S_z, S_\pm] = \pm S_\pm; \quad [S_+, S_-] = 2S_z;$$

Corresponding coherent states for the $U(1)$ with $s \in \mathbb{N}$; $S^2 = s(s + 1)$ are given by

$$|j, i\rangle_{SU(2)} = (1 + j^2)^{-s} e^{zS_+} |j, -s, i\rangle;$$

where $z \in SU(2) = U(1) \ltimes S^2$, and $S_z |j, m, i\rangle = m |j, m, i\rangle$. Given a Hamiltonian $H = H(S)$, the partition function reads

$$Z_{SU(2)} = \int_{z(0)=z(\beta)}^z \mathcal{D}_{SU(2)}(z; z) \exp[A(z; z)]; \quad (B.1)$$

where an effective $SU(2)$ action

$$A = s \int_0^\beta \frac{z \bar{z} - \bar{z} z}{1 + j^2} dt - \int_0^\beta H^{cl}(z; z) dt; \quad (B.2)$$

and $H^{cl} = h z j \bar{z} i$. The classical counterparts of the $SU(2)$ generators are easily found to be

$$S_z^{cl} = s(1 - j^2) w^{(0)}; \quad (S_+)^{cl} = 2s z w^{(0)}; \quad (S_-)^{cl} = 2s \bar{z} w^{(0)}; \quad (B.3)$$

where $w^{(0)} = (1 + \sum_j^2)^{-1}$: In Eq. (B.1) $D_{SU(2)}(z; z)$ stands for the infinite pointwise product of the $SU(2)$ invariant measures,

$$D_{SU(2)} = \prod_j \frac{2s+1}{2i} \frac{dz_j dz_{\bar{j}}}{(1 + \sum_j^2)^2}; \quad (B.4)$$

For more details see Ref. [22].

The $SU(2)$ action on S^2 reads

$$z \rightarrow gz = \frac{uz + v}{vz + u}; \quad (B.5)$$

where

$$\begin{pmatrix} u & v \\ v & u \end{pmatrix} \in SU(2):$$

As the second example consider the more familiar fermionic oscillator algebra generated by

$$f, f^\dagger; f^\dagger f, I;$$

with $ff^\dagger; f^\dagger f = 1$. The corresponding coherent states

$$|z\rangle_F = (1 + |z|^2)^{-1/2} e^{-f^\dagger z} |0\rangle_{Fock}$$

are parametrized by the generators of the Grassmann algebra Q_0, Q_1 :

$$f = g = 0; \quad z = \bar{z} = 0; \quad f^\dagger = 2Q_1; \quad 1 = 2Q_0;$$

These states give rise to the following representation

$$Z_F = \int D_F(\bar{\psi}; \psi) \exp[A(\bar{\psi}; \psi)]; \quad (B.6)$$

$$|0\rangle = \int d\bar{\psi} d\psi \delta(\bar{\psi}) \delta(\psi)$$

where

$$A = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^Z (-\bar{\psi} \dot{\psi}) dt - \int_0^Z H^{cl}(\bar{\psi}; \psi) dt; \quad H^{cl} = h[\bar{\psi}; \psi]; \quad (B.7)$$

with $f^{cl} = \bar{\psi}$; $(f^\dagger)^{cl} = \psi$ and $(f^\dagger f)^{cl} = 1$. Here D_F stands for

$$D_F = \prod_j d\bar{\psi}_j d\psi_j \quad (B.8)$$

that is clearly invariant with respect to a shift by a Grassmann parameter, $\bar{\psi} \rightarrow \bar{\psi} + \bar{\eta}$; combined with the phase transformation, $\psi \rightarrow e^i \psi$; $2Q_0$.

Appendix C

Suppose we are given two objects: a two-dimensional sphere S^2 with local complex coordinates $z; \bar{z}$ and a Grassmann algebra with two generators $\theta, \bar{\theta}$ and with a generic element

$$f(\theta, \bar{\theta}) = f_0 + f_1 \theta + f_2 \bar{\theta} + f_3 \theta \bar{\theta};$$

where f_i are complex numbers. The $N = 2$ supermanifold $S^{2|2}$ is the pair $(S^2; A_{S^2})$ where S^2 is the two-sphere and A_{S^2} is a sheaf of supercommutative (Grassmann valued) algebras on S^2 with a general section (element)

$$h(z; \bar{z}; \theta; \bar{\theta}) = h_0(z; \bar{z}) + h_1(z; \bar{z})\theta + h_2(z; \bar{z})\bar{\theta} + h_3(z; \bar{z})\theta\bar{\theta}; \quad (C.1)$$

where h_i belong to $C^1(S^2)$. We follow here a general definition of a supermanifold given by Berezin [23] (see also Refs. [9]).

The pair $(z; \bar{z})$ serves as supercoordinates on $S^{2|2}$. The very same role, however, can be played by any set of even and odd generators of A_{S^2} , provided Eq. (C.1) still holds in new variables. We are interested in a reparametrization of the specific type,

$$w = w(z; \bar{z}; \theta; \bar{\theta}); \quad \bar{w} = \bar{w}(z; \bar{z}; \theta; \bar{\theta}); \quad \theta = \theta(z; \bar{z}; w; \bar{w}); \quad \bar{\theta} = \bar{\theta}(z; \bar{z}; w; \bar{w}); \quad (C.2)$$

Under some restrictions on functions $w(\theta; \bar{\theta}); \bar{w}(\theta; \bar{\theta})$ Eq. (C.2) introduces a new set of coordinates on $S^{2|2}$. The most important requirement for us is that the map $(z; \bar{z}) \rightarrow \text{spec}(w; \bar{w})$ is to be a diffeomorphism $S^2 \rightarrow S^2$, where a spectrum of any element of the Grassmann algebra is defined by

$$\text{spec} f = \{f_j\}_{j=0}^3 = f_0 \in \mathbb{C};$$

Now we are in a position to define an integration on $S^{2|2}$. For a function $F(w; \bar{w}; \theta; \bar{\theta})$ we have by definition [23]

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S^{2|2}} F(w; \bar{w}; \theta; \bar{\theta}) (w; \bar{w}; \theta; \bar{\theta}) dw d\bar{w} d\theta d\bar{\theta} = \\ \int_{\text{spec}(w; \bar{w}) = S^2} F(v; \bar{v}; \theta; \bar{\theta}) (v; \bar{v}; \theta; \bar{\theta}) dv d\bar{v} d\theta d\bar{\theta}; \end{aligned} \quad (C.3)$$

where $(w; \bar{w}; \theta; \bar{\theta}) dw d\bar{w} d\theta d\bar{\theta}$ is the $SU(2|1)$ invariant volume element (6) and $v = w(z; \bar{z})$ and $\bar{v} = \bar{w}(z; \bar{z})$ are diffeomorphism $S^2 \rightarrow S^2$. Here an integration over $dv d\bar{v}$ is understood in a usual manner, whereas an integration over $d\theta d\bar{\theta}$ is to be carried out in accordance with the Berezin' convention. The last point to be noted is that any change of variables in the lhs of Eq. (C.3) gives rise to a superdeterminant (Berezian) of a corresponding transformation matrix.

R e f e r e n c e s

- [1] P.W. Anderson, *Science* 235, 1196 (1987)
- [2] F.C. Zhang and T.M. Rice, *Phys. Rev. B* 37, 3759 (1988)
- [3] C.L. Kane, P.A. Lee and N. Read, *Phys. Rev. B* 39, 6880 (1989)
- [4] P.A. Lee, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 63, 680 (1989); P.A. Lee and N. Nagaosa, *Phys. Rev. B* 46, 5621 (1992)
- [5] J.L. Richard and V.Yu. Yushankhai, *Phys. Rev. B* 47, 1103 (1993)
- [6] Y.R. Wang and M.J. Rice, *Phys. Rev. B* 49, 4360 (1994)
- [7] P.B. Wiegmann, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 60, 821 (1988)
- [8] A. Perelomov, "Generalized coherent states and their applications" (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1986); A.B. Balantekin, H.A. Schmitt and B.R. Barrett, *J. Math. Phys.* 29, 1634 (1988); A.B. Balantekin, H.A. Schmitt and P. Halse, *J. Math. Phys.* 30, 274 (1989)
- [9] A.M. ElGardechi, *J. Math. Phys.* 34, 5951 (1993); "Geometric Quantization of an $Osp(1|2)$ Orbit" Preprint CRM-1882 (1994); A.M. ElGardechi and L.M. Nieto, "Supercoherent states, Super Kähler Geometry and Geometric Quantization" Preprint CRM-1876 (1994)
- [10] A. Pelizzola and C. Topi, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* 5 (1991) 3073
- [11] E.A. K ochetov, *Phys. Rev. B* 52, 4402 (1995)
- [12] E.A. K ochetov, V.S. Yanunin and M.E. Zhuravlev, to be published
- [13] J. Hubbard, *Proc. R. Soc. London A* 285, 542 (1965)
- [14] E.A. K ochetov, *Phys. Lett. A* 217, 65 (1996); see also E.A. K ochetov, *J. Phys. A* 26, 3489 (1993)
- [15] I. Bars and M. Gunaydin, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 91, 31 (1983)
- [16] F.A. Berezin, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 40, 153 (1975)
- [17] P.W. Anderson, *Phys. Rev.* 86, 694 (1952)
- [18] R. Kubo, *Phys. Rev.* 87, 568 (1952)
- [19] G. Martinez and P. Horsch, *Phys. Rev. B* 44, 317 (1991)
- [20] E.A. K ochetov, *J. Math. Phys.* 36, 1666 (1995)
- [21] M. Scheunert, W. Nahm and V. Rittenberg, *J. Math. Phys.* 18, 155 (1977)
- [22] E.A. K ochetov, *J. Math. Phys.* 36, 4667 (1995)
- [23] F.A. Berezin, "Introduction to Superanalysis" (Reidel, Dordrecht, 1987)