

Test of Guttmann and Enting's conjecture in the eight-vertex model

Hiroshi Tsukahara and Takeo Inami

Department of Physics, Chuo University, Kasuga, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 112, Japan

(April 15, 2024)

Abstract

We investigate the analyticity property of the partially resummed series expansion (PRSE) of the partition function for the eight-vertex model. Developing a graphical technique, we have obtained a first few terms of the PRSE and found that these terms have a pole only at one point in the complex plane of the coupling constant. This result supports the conjecture proposed by Guttmann and Enting concerning the "solubility" in statistical mechanical lattice models.

Recently Guttmann and Enting introduced a new point of view into the study of the solubility of lattice models in the statistical mechanics, including models for combinatorial problems [1]. Their approach is based on a study of the connection between the solubility of lattice models by use of the inversion relation and the analyticity properties of their associated series expansion, which is called the partially resummed series expansion (PRSE). For exactly solvable models, the inversion relation for the partition function was derived using the star-triangle relation [2,3]. Subsequently, it was shown to hold true for the partition function of (so far) unsolved models and other physical quantities as well [4]. Thus the inversion relation can be used for clarifying the difference between exactly solved quantities and unsolved ones in statistical lattice models.

The importance of the analyticity properties of the PRSE was first pointed out by Baxter [5]. He considered the PRSE for the reduced free energy $\ln \langle t_1; t_2 \rangle$ of the

zero-field anisotropic Ising model on the square lattice, $\ln Z(t_1; t_2) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} R_n(t_1^2) t_2^{2n}$, and showed that the functions $R_n(t_1^2)$ can be determined recursively from the inversion relation, $\ln Z(t_1; t_2) + \ln Z(t_1^{-1}; t_2) = \ln(1 - t_2^2)$, and the symmetry relation $Z(t_1; t_2) = Z(t_2; t_1)$, provided $R_n(t_1^2)$ have singularities only at a single point in the t_1^2 -complex plane. This realization led to a series of investigations on the partial sums $R_n(t_1^2)$ for unsolved quantities such as the partition function of the 2D Ising model in a field [5], non-critical 2D Potts model [4], zero-field 3D Ising model [6] or the susceptibility of the 2D Ising model [1]. The results for these quantities indicate that infinitely many poles appear in partial sums R_n in the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ in clear contrast with the solvable case.

The new approach of Guttmann and Enting to the solvability of lattice models is as follows. They defined a given quantity to be solvable if its solution can be expressed with a D-finite function [7] as a function of the coupling constant. D-finite functions are defined as functions which satisfy a linear ordinary differential equation of finite order with polynomial coefficients. The definition of the solvability was extended so that solvable quantities do not necessarily have a closed form solution. However, it is restrictive in the sense that those quantities which are expressible with the solution of a nonlinear differential equation are classified as "unsolvable" ones.

Guttmann and Enting further put forward a criterion which determines whether a given quantity is solvable or not in the sense of D-finiteness. First, generalize the model such that it possesses two (or more) anisotropic coupling constants t_1 and t_2 . Let the wanted quantity be $f(t_1; t_2)$. One can calculate exact coefficients of the series expansion of f , $f(t_1; t_2) = \sum_{m,n} a_{m,n} t_1^m t_2^n$ (to a considerably high order with sophisticated techniques). Then, performing the infinite sum with respect to, say, t_2 first, one obtains the PRSE, $f(t_1; t_2) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} R_n(t_1^2) t_2^{2n}$. Let us assume that the poles in $R_n(t_1^2)$ all lie on the unit circle in the t_1 -complex plane (this is not essential, however). Their conjecture on the criterion is stated as follows: (i) If the number of poles of R_n remains finite as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $f(t_1; t_2)$ is a D-finite function of t_1 with t_2 being fixed. (ii) If there appear infinitely many poles densely distributed along the unit circle as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $f(t_1; t_2)$ cannot be expressed in terms of D-finite functions only.

It is illuminating to look at the spontaneous magnetization M of the 2D Ising model as an example of the case (i). The closed form solution is given as $M(u;v) = (1 - 16uv)^{-1/8} (1 - v)^2 (1 - u)^2$ in the low temperature phase, where $u = (1 - t_1)/(1 + t_1)$ and $v = (1 - t_2)/(1 + t_2)$. One can calculate a first few terms of the Taylor expansion $M(u;v) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} R_n(u) v^n$ by directly taking derivatives of the above expression. But this would soon become undoable. A concise way to calculate the coefficients is to make use of the differential equation satisfied by $M(u;v)$. By extending the argument in [8] one arrives at

$$(1 - u)[(1 - v)^2 u^2 - 2(1 + 6v + v^2)u + (1 - v)^2] \frac{\partial}{\partial u} M(u;v) + 2v(1 + u)M(u;v) = 0: \quad (1)$$

This shows that the spontaneous magnetization is D-finite. It is then determined implicitly from the recursion relation for R_n

$$\begin{aligned} (n + 3)(1 - u)^2 R_{n+3}(u) - [\beta(n + 2) + 2(5n + 9)u + 3(n + 2)u^2] R_{n+2}(u) \\ + [\beta(n + 1) + 2(5n + 6)u + 3(n + 1)u^2] R_{n+1}(u) - n(1 - u)^2 R_n(u) = 0: \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

From this recursion relation, it is clear that the partial sums R_n have poles only at $u = 1$. We should note that the recursion we have derived above from D-finiteness is different from that discussed by Baxter [5] and mentioned earlier. In the latter case, to calculate the term R_n one needs all R_k prior to R_n . By contrast, in the former case, only a fixed finite number of terms is sufficient to obtain the term R_n no matter how large n is.

Examples of the case (ii) are the zero-field susceptibility of the 2D anisotropic Ising model and generating functions for self-avoiding polygons on the square and hexagonal lattices. Guttmann and Enting argued using the finite-lattice method [9] that in finitely many poles will appear in partial sums for those quantities in the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ [1].

The few analyses mentioned above already indicate that Guttmann and Enting's conjecture unravels a new aspect of exactly solvable models, the connection of the solvability to the distribution of poles and D-finiteness of the solution. The conjecture deserves a further and detailed study. In particular, it is very important to examine whether Guttmann and Enting's conjecture has general applicability to a broad class of statistical mechanical

system s. The eight-vertex model is particularly suited to this end. It can be regarded as a nontrivial generalization of the 2D Ising model. It has three coupling constants and can be compared with the previous analyses of the zero-field 3D Ising model and the 2D Ising model in a field.

We adopt the spin-type model description of the eight-vertex model. The spin variable σ_i placed on each site of the square lattice consisting of N faces (Fig.1) takes the values ± 1 . The local Boltzmann weight is defined on each face f in the lattice and depend on the spin configuration around the face f $g_f = (a; b; c; d)$ as

$$w(f, g_f) = R \exp(K ac + L bd + M abcd); \quad (3)$$

The partition function is given by

$$Z_N(K; L; M) = \sum_{\{\sigma_i\}} \prod_f w(f, g_f); \quad (4)$$

where the summation is over all spin configurations on the lattice sites and the product is over all faces in the lattice. The lattice is assumed to have the periodic boundaries. This model can be regarded as a pair of Ising models with anisotropic coupling constants K and L , each living on one of the sublattices and coupled by the four-spin coupling M .

The local Boltzmann weight can be rearranged as

$$w(f, g_f) = (1 + z_1 ac + z_2 bd + z_3 abcd); \quad (5)$$

where

$$z_1 = \frac{t_1 + t_2 t_3}{1 + t_1 t_2 t_3}; \quad z_2 = \frac{t_2 + t_3 t_1}{1 + t_1 t_2 t_3}; \quad z_3 = \frac{t_3 + t_1 t_2}{1 + t_1 t_2 t_3}; \quad (6)$$

$$= R (\cosh K \cosh L \cosh M + \sinh K \sinh L \sinh M); \quad (7)$$

with $t_1 = \tanh K$, $t_2 = \tanh L$, $t_3 = \tanh M$. z_1, z_2, z_3 are high-temperature variables and is the normalization factor. Let us represent each term in RHS of (5) graphically by bonds as shown in Fig.2. We call the bonds shown in (b), (c), (d) of Fig.2 z_1 -, z_2 -, z_3 -bonds.

Substituting (5) into (4) and expanding the products yields all possible bond configurations over N faces in the lattice. The summation over spin configurations leaves only those

in which an even number of bonds are incident to each lattice site, i.e., closed graphs. The reduced partition function, $Z_N(z_1; z_2; z_3) = (2)^{-N} Z_N(K; L; M)$, also plays the role of the generating function for the enumeration of closed graphs in the lattice. They are classified in terms of the numbers of the z_1 -, z_2 -, z_3 -bonds, $l; m; n$. Then Z_N can be written as

$$Z_N(z_1; z_2; z_3) = \sum_{l=1}^N \sum_{m=1}^N \sum_{n=0}^N P_{lmn}(N) z_1^{2l} z_2^{2m} z_3^{2n}; \quad (8)$$

where $P_{lmn}(N)$ is the number of the closed graphs and is a polynomial in N . Define the reduced partition function per face in the thermodynamic limit by $\ln(z_1; z_2; z_3) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} (Z_N(z_1; z_2; z_3))^{1/N}$. Then the expansion of $\ln(z_1; z_2; z_3)$ in the connected closed graphs is given by

$$\ln(z_1; z_2; z_3) = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{lmn} z_1^{2l} z_2^{2m} z_3^{2n}; \quad (9)$$

where a_{lmn} is the coefficient of N in the polynomial P_{lmn} [10].

Our aim is to see whether or not $\ln(z_1; z_2; z_3)$ possesses the property conjectured by Guttmann and Enting. We begin by looking at the inversion relation for the eight-vertex model [5], which reads in the variables $z_1; z_2; z_3$ as

$$\ln(z_1; z_2; z_3) + \ln \left(\frac{1}{z_1^2} \frac{z_2^2}{z_3^2} z_1; \frac{1}{z_1^2} \frac{z_2^2}{z_3^2} z_3 \right) = \ln(1 - z_2^2); \quad (10)$$

Note that if one sets the four-spin coupling M to zero, i.e. $z_3 = z_1 z_2$, (10) reduces to the inversion relation for the anisotropic Ising model. Since (10) involves the inversion of two variables, z_1 and z_3 , one has to take the double infinite sum with respect to both to compare the series (9) with (10). In practice this turns out to be a hard task. Fortunately, one can circumvent the difficulty by a slight change of variables as $v_1 = z_1; v_2 = z_2$ and $v_3 = z_3/z_1$. Then (10) becomes

$$\ln(v_1; v_2; v_3) + \ln \left(\frac{1}{v_1} \frac{v_2^2}{v_3^2} v_1; \frac{1}{v_1} \frac{v_2^2}{v_3^2} v_3 \right) = \ln(1 - v_2^2); \quad (11)$$

In this case, only v_1 is inverted and one has only to take the partial resummation with respect to v_1 , which we write as

$$\ln (v_1; v_2; v_3) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} R_{mn}(v_1^2) v_2^{2m} v_3^{2n} : \quad (12)$$

The corresponding expansion of the second term in LHS of (11) can be obtained by computing the Taylor expansion of $R_{mn}((1-v_2^2)^2 = [v_1(1-v_3^2)]^2)$ with respect to v_2^2 and v_3^2 . Collecting the terms containing the same powers in v_2^2 and v_3^2 , one has the expansion,

$$\ln \frac{1}{1-v_3^2} v_1^{-1}; v_2; v_3 = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} Q_{mn}(v_1^2) v_2^{2m} v_3^{2n} : \quad (13)$$

The inversion relation (11) is now written as a perturbative relation,

$$R_{mn}(v_1^2) + Q_{mn}(v_1^2) = \frac{1}{m} \delta_{n0} : \quad (14)$$

Note that Q_{mn} depends only on R_{kl} with $k+l$ no greater than $m+n$. The relation (14) gives constraints on the partial sums $R_{mn}(v_1^2)$ and is used in the later analysis of the PRSE.

One might think that it is immediate to obtain the PRSE (12) for the eight-vertex model, since we have the exact solution at hand. However, the expression of the exact solution in terms of the elliptic parameters is very implicit. So far we have not been able to derive the PRSE from the exact solution and to find out the location of poles in the partial sums in v_1^2 .

Instead we employ a graphical approach to calculate $R_{mn}(v_1^2)$ in the series expansion (12). The closed graphs with $2m$ z_2 -bonds, $2n$ z_3 -bonds and an arbitrary number of z_1 -bonds contribute to R_{mn} . Because of the presence of the four-spin coupling constant, there appear vastly many types of closed graphs even at low orders. We have developed a scheme to classify the graphs by introducing the notion of minimal graph, the graph with the least number of z_1 -bonds among those in one class. The derivation of our method is lengthy and will be presented in a separate paper. Here we report the results of our analysis of a few terms of the expansion:

$m=1; n=0$ The minimal graph is the square (Fig 3(a)). The remaining graphs are obtained by successively adding a pair of z_1 -bonds vertically, which we call v_1^2 -extension. The weights of the v_1^2 -extended graphs in (a) of Fig 3 are $v_1^2 v_2^2, v_1^4 v_2^2, v_1^6 v_2^2$ and so on. Their contribution to R_{10} sums up to $v_1^2(1-v_1^2)$.

$m = 1; n = 1$ There are two classes of graphs with two z_2 -bonds and two z_3 -bonds which contribute to R_{11} . One of them is shown in (b) of Fig.3. Its minimal graph can be extended in three ways. It has two v_1^2 -extensions, extending either of the two squares independently. The third is a simultaneous extension of the two squares (see the third graph of Fig.3 (b)), which we call v_1^4 -extension. The weights of the graphs in (b) of Fig.3 are thus $v_1^4 v_2^2 v_3^2$, $v_1^6 v_2^2 v_3^2$, $v_1^8 v_2^2 v_3^2$ and so on. The contribution from these graphs sums up to $2v_1^4 = (1 - v_1^2)^2 (1 - v_1^4)$, where the factor 2 takes account of embeddings of graphs and their reflection. The contribution from the other class to R_{11} is given by $2v_1^6 = (1 - v_1^2)^2 (1 - v_1^4)$.

$m = 2; n = 0$ There are six classes of graph with four z_2 -bonds and zero z_3 -bonds which contribute to R_{20} . Five of the corresponding minimal graphs consist of connected graphs and the other of a disconnected graph with two squares. These graphs have only v_1^2 -extensions.

$m = 1; n = 2$ There are twelve classes of graphs which contribute to R_{12} . In each class the minimal graph can be extended in many different ways. Some of the twelve minimal graphs are shown in Fig.3 (c)-(e). The graphs of the class (c) are obtained from the minimal graph (c) by two ways of v_1^2 -extension and three ways of v_1^4 -extension. Their contributions yield $2v_1^6 = (1 - v_1^2)^2 (1 - v_1^4)^3$. The contributions of the graphs of the class (d) and (e) can be found by similar arguments: $4v_1^8 = (1 - v_1^2)^2 (1 - v_1^4)^3$ and $2v_1^{10} = (1 - v_1^2)^2 (1 - v_1^4)^3$ respectively. The sum of the contributions from the twelve classes turns out to take a surprisingly simple form, $3v_1^6 (1 + v_1^2) = (1 - v_1^2)^5$, which is free from the pole at $v_1^2 = 1$.

To summarize the above analysis, we have obtained the following expressions for the first four terms of the PRSE:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{10}(v_1^2) &= \frac{v_1^2}{1 - v_1^2}; & R_{11}(v_1^2) &= \frac{2v_1^4}{(1 - v_1^2)^3}; \\ R_{20}(v_1^2) &= \frac{v_1^2 (2 - 5v_1^2 + v_1^4)}{(1 - v_1^2)^3}; & R_{12}(v_1^2) &= \frac{3v_1^6 (1 + v_1^2)}{(1 - v_1^2)^5}; \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

The corresponding terms of $Q_{m,n}(v_1^2)$ can be easily obtained from these results as explained previously.

There are a few important points to be noted. First, we have checked that $R_{m,n}(v_1^2)$ and $Q_{m,n}(v_1^2)$ satisfy the perturbative form of the inversion relation (14). This is a highly

nontrivial check that the result (15) is correct. The second point is concerned with the pole structure of $R_{m,n}(v_1^2)$. As remarked above, $R_{10}(v_1^2)$ and $R_{20}(v_1^2)$ have a pole only at $v_1^2 = 1$ for a graphical reason. As for $R_{11}(v_1^2)$, both of the contributions from the two classes have poles at $v_1^2 = 1$ and $v_1^2 = -1$. Curiously, the extra pole at $v_1^2 = -1$ cancels out in the sum of two contributions, leaving the pole term $1=(1-v_1^2)^3$. It is even more miraculous that, as noted above, the same kind of cancellation of the poles at $v_1^2 = -1$ takes place for $R_{12}(v_1^2)$, leaving the pole term $1=(1-v_1^2)^5$.

We think that the absence of extra poles at $v_1^2 = -1$ in the first four terms of the PRSE is not a pure accident but that it has a *raison d'être*. It should be counted as a strong indication that poles in $R_{m,n}(v_1^2)$ will not appear at other values than $v_1^2 = 1$ for higher m and n , supporting the conjecture of Guttmann and Enting.

It is illuminating to compare the present result on the PRSE for the eight-vertex model with that for the 3D Ising model [6]. The latter model also has three coupling constants. The inversion relation and the PRSE in this model read as $\ln(t_1; t_2; t_3) + \ln(t_1^{-1}; t_2; t_3) = \ln(1-t_2^2)$ and $\ln(t_1; t_2; t_3) = \sum_{m,n} R_{m,n}(t_1^2) t_2^m t_3^{2n}$. Nontrivial results start to appear from $R_{12}(t_1^2)$ ($R_{m,0}(v_1^2) = R_{0m}(v_1^2)$ coincide with $R_m(t_1^2)$ of the 2D Ising model, $R_{11}(t_1^2)$ has no poles other than at $t_1^2 = 1$ for a straightforward graphical reason). Indeed, $R_{12}(t_1^2)$ was found to have poles of the form $1=(1-t_1^2)^5(1+t_1^2)$. An extra pole at $t_1^2 = -1$ already appears at the third order ($m+n=3$) term of $R_{m,n}(t_1^2)$. It is a sign that an infinite number of poles will appear in the limit $m, n \rightarrow \infty$. We note a clear difference in the pole structure of $R_{m,n}(t)$ between the eight-vertex model and the 3D Ising model even at low orders. Probably this difference reflects the fact that the former model is solvable while the latter is not.

Finally, we postulate the form of the partial sum $R_{m,n}(v_1^2)$ at all orders by extending our results at low orders and examine the role of the inversion relation regarding the exactly solvable partition function in the approach of the PRSE. Let us assume that the partial sums of the eight-vertex reduced partition function have only (multiple) poles at $v_1^2 = 1$. By a graphical consideration, one can guess the general form of the partial sums: $R_{m,n}(v_1^2) =$

$P_{m,n}(v_1^2) = (1 - v_1^2)^{2(m+n)-1}$, where $P_{m,n}(v_1^2)$ is a polynomial in v_1^2 , $P_{m,n}(v_1^2) = \sum_{k=0}^{2(m+n)-1} c_{m,n,k} v_1^{2k}$.

Then $P_{m,n}(v_1^2)$ can be determined recursively from the inversion and symmetry relations as follows. Suppose that $R_{k,l}$ with $k+l < L-1$ are known. Then from the symmetry,

$\ln(v_1; v_2; v_3) = \ln(v_2; v_1; v_1 v_3 = v_2)$, we have the system of linear equations,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \frac{0}{2(L-1)+r-k} c_{m,n,k} = \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \frac{0}{2(r-1)+L-k} c_{r-n,k}; \quad (16)$$

where $0 \leq r \leq L-1$ and $c_{m,n,k} = 0$ if $m < 1$. Since the RHS of (16) is written with known coefficients only, we have a half of the coefficients $c_{m,n,k} : m+n = L; 0 \leq k \leq L-1$. From the inversion relation (11) we have

$$R_{m,n}(v_1^2) = R_{m,n}(v_1^{-2}) + \text{known terms}; \quad (17)$$

which determine the other half of the coefficients $c_{m,n,k} : m+n = L; L-k \leq k \leq L-1$. Thus the solution for the eight-vertex partition function is reproduced by extending the method which was first used for the 2D Ising model by Baxter [5]. The first few terms of this solution agree with (15). Moreover, it reduces to the PRSE for the Onsager solution in the Ising limit. This remarkable coincidence further supports our argument on the pole structure of $R_{m,n}$ for the eight-vertex partition function.

The authors thank Makoto Katori for bringing the paper of Guttmann and Enting to their attention. They are indebted to Atsuo Kuniba for discussion at various stages of the present work, and to Satoru Odake for valuable comments on the manuscript. They are also grateful to Tony Guttmann for elucidating conversations, in particular on the differential equations to be obeyed by solvable quantities.

REFERENCES


- [1] A.J.Guttmann and I.G.Enting, Phys.Rev.Lett. 76, 344 (1996).
- [2] Yu.G.Stroganov, Phys.Lett. 74A , 116 (1979)
- [3] R.J.Baxter, J.Stat.Phys. 28, 1 (1982).
- [4] M.T.Jaekel and J.M.Maillard, J.Phys.A Math.Gen. 15, 2241 (1982); J.Phys.A Math.Gen. 16, 1975 (1983).
- [5] R.J.Baxter, in Fundamental Problems in Statistical Mechanics, edited by E.G.D.Cohen, Vol.5 (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1980).
- [6] D.Hansel, J.M.Maillard, J.Oitmaa and M.J.Velgakis, J.Stat.Phys. 48, 69 (1987).
- [7] R.P.Stanley, Europ.J.Combinatorics 1, 175 (1980).
- [8] A.J.Guttmann, in Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena, edited by C.Domb and J.L.Lebowitz, Vol.13 (Academic Press, London, 1989).
- [9] I.G.Enting, Nucl.Phys.B (Proc.Suppl.) 47, 180 (1996).
- [10] C.Domb, in Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena, edited by C.Domb and M.S.Green, Vol.3 (Academic Press, London, 1974).

FIGURES


FIG .1. The eight-vertex model.

FIG .2. Bond configurations on a face.


FIG .3. Minimal graphs and their extensions.




(a)




(b)




(c)




(d)




(a)




(b)



(c)



(d)



(e)

