

# The XXC Models

**Z. Maassarani\***

Département de Physique, Pav. A-Vachon  
Université Laval, Ste Foy, Qc, G1K 7P4 Canada<sup>†</sup>

## Abstract

A class of recently introduced multi-states XX models is generalized to include a deformation parameter. This corresponds to an additional nearest-neighbor  $CC$  interaction in the defining quadratic hamiltonian. Complete integrability of the one-dimensional models is shown in the context of the quantum inverse scattering method. The new  $R$ -matrix is derived. The diagonalization of the XXC models is carried out using the algebraic Bethe Ansatz.

December 8<sup>th</sup> 1997  
LAVAL-PHY-27/97  
solv-int/9712008

---

\*Work supported by NSERC (Canada) and FCAR (Québec).

<sup>†</sup>email address: zmaassar@phy.ulaval.ca

# 1 Introduction

Multi-states bosonic Hubbard models which generalize the usual  $su(2)$  model were recently introduced. These models were shown to be integrable and to have an extended symmetry [1, 2, 3]. They are built by coupling two copies of XX ‘free-fermions’ models [4, 5, 3]. These higher dimensional ‘fermion’ models were not obtained as part of a quantum group structure. The quantum group approach to the construction of solutions to the Yang-Baxter equation results in higher dimensional models with symmetries reflecting the root structure of the underlying algebra [6]. The combination lowering-raising operators in the  $R$ -matrix generically involves all the roots of the algebra. The ‘free-fermions’ models are also higher dimensional and they have simple expressions in terms of the generators of the fundamental representations of  $su(n)$ . However they involve only a subset of the set of roots of  $su(n)$ . The diagonalization of the models reveals an  $su(2)$  structure which does not correspond to the known integrable higher-spin representations.

An integrable deformation of the XX models is found and studied in this paper. For the lowest dimensional model the XXC model is nothing but the usual  $su(2)$  XXZ model. The  $R$ -matrix for the higher dimensional models retains the form of the XXZ model and can be seen as a multistate generalization of the latter model. The matrix is given and shown to satisfy the Yang-Baxter equation. Specific representations are given. Integrability of the models is a simple consequence of the quantum inverse scattering framework. The symmetries of the new models are obtained. Diagonalization of the XXC models using the algebraic Bethe Ansatz method shows that their spectrum is highly degenerate, and is a generalization of the  $su(2)$  XXZ spectrum. I conclude with some remarks.

## 2 The XXC models

Consider a matrix  $\check{R}$  of the form

$$\check{R}(\lambda; \gamma) = P^{(1)} \sin \gamma + P^{(2)} \sin(\gamma - \lambda) + P^{(3)} \sin \lambda \quad (1)$$

where  $\gamma$  is an arbitrary complex parameter and  $\lambda$  is the spectral parameter. The operators  $P^{(i)}$  act on the tensor product of two copies of the same space  $\mathbb{C}^n$ . They are taken to satisfy the algebra derived in [3]. Let  $E_i \equiv P_{ii+1}^{(3)}$ , that is,  $E_i$  acts non-trivially on the adjacent spaces  $i, i+1$ . The defining relations of the ‘free-fermions’ algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  are:

$$\{E_i^2, E_{i\pm 1}\} = E_{i\pm 1} \quad , \quad E_i^3 = E_i \quad (2)$$

$$E_i E_{i\pm 1} E_i = 0 \quad , \quad E_i E_j = E_j E_i \quad \text{for } |i - j| \geq 2 \quad (3)$$

where  $\{A, B\} = AB + BA$ . The fourth equation just expresses the fact that  $E_i$  and  $E_j$  commute when they act non-trivially on disjoint spaces. The operators  $P^{(1)}$  and  $P^{(2)}$  form a complete set of projectors on the tensor product space  $\mathbb{C}^n \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$ :

$$P^{(1)} + P^{(2)} = \mathbb{I} \quad , \quad (P^{(1)})^2 = P^{(1)} \quad , \quad (P^{(2)})^2 = P^{(2)} \quad , \quad P^{(1)} P^{(2)} = P^{(2)} P^{(1)} = 0 \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathbb{I}$  is the identity operator. The operator  $P^{(1)}$  is equal to the square of the operator  $P^{(3)}$ , and  $P^{(2)} P^{(3)} = P^{(3)} P^{(2)} = 0$ . At  $\gamma = \pi/2$  the matrix (1) is equal to the matrix found in [3].

One then checks that  $\check{R}$  satisfies the Yang-Baxter equation

$$\check{R}_{12}(\lambda; \gamma) \check{R}_{23}(\lambda + \mu; \gamma) \check{R}_{12}(\mu; \gamma) = \check{R}_{23}(\mu; \gamma) \check{R}_{12}(\lambda + \mu; \gamma) \check{R}_{23}(\lambda; \gamma) \quad (5)$$

where the parameter  $\gamma$  is the same for all six factors. The argument  $\gamma$  of  $\check{R}$  will not be written in what follows. The calculation is straightforward if tedious. One can expand both sides of the

YBE, use elementary trigonometric relations and the relations satisfied by the  $P^{(i)}$ 's to conclude. Alternatively, setting  $q = e^{i\gamma}$  and  $y = e^{i\lambda}$  and multiplying the YBE by  $2iqy$ , one can also verify that the YBE is satisfied for the six values  $q = 0, \pm 1, \pm i, \infty$ . It is then enough to check that the coefficient of  $q^1$  vanishes identically to conclude that the YBE is satisfied for all values of  $\lambda$ ,  $\mu$  and  $\gamma$ .

It is easy to check that the regularity and unitarity properties hold:

$$\check{R}(0) = \mathbb{I} \sin(\gamma) \quad , \quad \check{R}(\lambda)\check{R}(-\lambda) = \mathbb{I} \sin(\gamma + \lambda) \sin(\gamma - \lambda) \quad (6)$$

The rational limit of  $\check{R}$  is obtained by letting  $\lambda \rightarrow \gamma\lambda$ , dividing by  $\sin \gamma$  and taking the limit  $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ . These manipulations conserve all the properties of the  $\check{R}$ -matrix. In particular, one obtains

$$\check{R}(\lambda) = P^{(1)} + (1 - \lambda)P^{(2)} + \lambda P^{(3)} \quad (7)$$

$$\check{R}(0) = \mathbb{I} \quad , \quad \check{R}(\lambda)\check{R}(-\lambda) = \mathbb{I}(1 - \lambda^2) \quad (8)$$

Explicit representations of the foregoing algebra were given in [3]. Let  $E^{\alpha\beta}$  be the  $n \times n$  matrix with a one at row  $\alpha$  and column  $\beta$  and zeros otherwise. Let  $n$ ,  $n_1$  and  $n_2$  be three integers such that

$$2 \leq n \quad , \quad 1 \leq n_1 \leq n_2 \leq n - 1 \quad , \quad n_1 + n_2 = n \quad (9)$$

and  $A$ ,  $B$  be two disjoint sets whose union is the set of basis states of  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , with  $\text{card}(A) = n_1$  and  $\text{card}(B) = n_2$ . Let also

$$P^{(3)} = \sum_{a \in A} \sum_{\beta \in B} \left( x_{a\beta} E^{\beta a} \otimes E^{a\beta} + x_{a\beta}^{-1} E^{a\beta} \otimes E^{\beta a} \right) \quad (10)$$

$$P^{(1)} = (P^{(3)})^2 = \sum_{a \in A} \sum_{\beta \in B} \left( E^{\beta\beta} \otimes E^{aa} + E^{aa} \otimes E^{\beta\beta} \right) \quad (11)$$

$$P^{(2)} = \mathbb{I} - P^{(1)} = \sum_{a, a' \in A} E^{aa} \otimes E^{a'a'} + \sum_{\beta, \beta' \in B} E^{\beta\beta} \otimes E^{\beta'\beta'} \quad (12)$$

The  $n_1.n_2$  parameters  $x_{a\beta}$  are arbitrary complex numbers. Latin indices belong to  $A$  while greek indices belong to  $B$ . These operators satisfy all the defining relations of the algebra  $\mathcal{A}$ . The restriction  $n_1 \leq n_2$  just avoids a double counting of distinct models since one has the obvious symmetry  $A \leftrightarrow B$ . For  $n_1 = 1$ ,  $n_2 = n - 1$ , and all the  $x_{a\beta}$  equal to each other, one recovers the  $su(n)$  XX models found in [5]. Allowing the twist parameters  $x$  to be unequal amounts to a multiple deformation of these models.

It is possible to perform a ‘gauge’ transformation which puts these models in a Temperley-Lieb form. One obtains

$$\check{R}^{\text{TL}}(\lambda) = \mathbb{I} \sin(\gamma - \lambda) + (P^{(3)} + P_\gamma^{\text{TL}}) \sin(\lambda) \quad (13)$$

$$P_\gamma^{\text{TL}} = \sum_{a \in A} \sum_{\beta \in B} \left( e^{i\gamma} E^{\beta\beta} \otimes E^{aa} + e^{-i\gamma} E^{aa} \otimes E^{\beta\beta} \right) \quad (14)$$

$\check{R}^{\text{TL}}(\lambda)$  satisfies the Yang-Baxter equation.

The transfer matrix is the generating functional of the infinite set of conserved quantities. Its construction in the framework of the Quantum Inverse Scattering Method is by now well known [7, 8, 9]. The Lax operator on a chain at site  $i$  with inhomogeneity  $\mu_i$  is given by:

$$L_{0i}(\lambda) = R_{0i}(\lambda - \mu_i) = \mathcal{P}_{0i} \check{R}_{0i}(\lambda - \mu_i) \quad (15)$$

where  $\mathcal{P}$  is the permutation operator on  $\mathbb{C}^n \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$ . The monodromy matrix is a product of Lax operators,  $T(\lambda) = L_{0M}(\lambda) \dots L_{01}(\lambda)$ , where  $M$  is the number of sites on the chain and 0 is the auxiliary space. The transfer matrix is the trace of the monodromy matrix over the auxiliary space 0:  $\tau(\lambda) = \text{Tr}_0 [(L_{0M} \dots L_{01})(\lambda)]$ . A set of conserved quantities is then given by

$$H_{p+1} = \left( \frac{d^p \ln \tau(\lambda)}{d\lambda^p} \right)_{\lambda=0}, \quad p \geq 0 \quad (16)$$

The YBE implies the following intertwining relations for the elements of the monodromy matrix:

$$\check{R}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2) T(\lambda_1) \otimes T(\lambda_2) = T(\lambda_2) \otimes T(\lambda_1) \check{R}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2) \quad (17)$$

Taking the trace over the auxiliary spaces, and using the cyclicity property of the trace, one obtains  $[\tau(\lambda_1), \tau(\lambda_2)] = 0$ . The hamiltonians  $H_p$  therefore mutually commute.

The quadratic hamiltonian calculated from (16) is equal to

$$H_2 = \frac{1}{\sin \gamma} \sum_i \left( P_{ii+1}^{(3)} - P_{ii+1}^{(2)} \cos \gamma \right) \quad (18)$$

Periodic boundary conditions are implied. These hamiltonians can be written simply in terms of  $su(n)$  hermitian traceless matrices. For  $|x_{a\beta}| = 1$  and  $\gamma$  real the hamiltonians are hermitian. The rational limit yields:  $H_2 = \sum_i (P_{ii+1}^{(3)} - P_{ii+1}^{(2)})$ . It is possible to get a positive relative sign between  $P^{(3)}$  and  $P^{(2)}$ ; one lets  $\gamma \rightarrow \gamma + \pi$ , and takes the rational limit for the rational hamiltonian.

For all the representations of the operators  $P^{(i)}$  given above one can introduce the ‘conjugation’ matrix [3]

$$C = \sum_{\beta \in B} E^{\beta\beta} - \sum_{a \in A} E^{aa} \quad (19)$$

and verify that  $P^{(2)} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{I} + C \otimes C)$ . Dropping the part proportional to the identity in (18) gives the quadratic XXC hamiltonian. For  $n = 2$  this is nothing but the XXZ model for  $su(2)$ .

For all the parameters equal to one parameter,  $x_{a\beta} = x$ ,  $\forall a \in A$ ,  $\forall \beta \in B$ , the linear magnetic-field operators

$$H_1^{ab} = \sum_i E_i^{ab} \quad a, b \in A, \quad H_1^{\alpha\beta} = \sum_i E_i^{\alpha\beta} \quad \alpha, \beta \in B \quad (20)$$

commute with the transfer matrix. The proof of [3] still holds. The full local symmetry is  $su(n_1) \oplus su(n_2) \oplus u(1)$ . One consequence is that one can add magnetic-field terms for each symmetry generators, without spoiling the integrability of the models.

### 3 Algebraic Bethe Ansatz

The diagonalization by algebraic Bethe Ansatz of the XXC models is similar to the one for the XX models. We refer the reader to [3, 5] for details and give here the results. I am considering the case  $x_{a\beta} = x$  to avoid unessential complications which are peculiar to the higher dimensional models ( $n \geq 3$ ).

It is easy to see that the vector  $||1\rangle \equiv |1\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |1\rangle$  is an eigenvector of the transfer matrix. A set of Bethe Ansatz eigenvectors is then obtained from the action of certain elements of the monodromy matrix, the  $C_\alpha \equiv T_{1\alpha}$ , and is given by:

$$|\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p\rangle = \sum_{\alpha_p, \dots, \alpha_1} F^{\alpha_p, \dots, \alpha_1} C_{\alpha_1}(\lambda_1) \dots C_{\alpha_p}(\lambda_p) ||1\rangle \quad (21)$$

where the parameters  $\lambda_i$  and the coefficients  $F$  are to be determined. This Ansatz also vanishes identically if  $p > M$ ; the proof of this fact is similar to that of [3].

One then applies the transfer matrix on the state  $|\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p\rangle$  and with the help of relations (17) commutes it through the  $C_\alpha$ 's. The corresponding eigenvalues of  $\tau(\lambda)$  are

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^{((n_1, n_2), M)}(\lambda; \{\mu_i\}) &= \left( \prod_{i=1}^M \sin(\gamma - (\lambda - \mu_i)) \right) \prod_{j=1}^p f(\lambda_j - \lambda) + \prod_{i=1}^M x^{-1} \sin(\lambda - \mu_i) \\ &\times \Lambda^{(n_2, p)} \prod_{j=1}^p f(\lambda - \lambda_j) + (n_1 - 1) \left( \prod_{i=1}^M x \sin(\lambda - \mu_i) \right) \delta_{pM} \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where  $f(\lambda) = \frac{x \sin(\gamma - \lambda)}{\sin \lambda}$ . Here  $\Lambda^{(n_2, p)}$  is an eigenvalue of the unit-shift operator  $\tau^{(n_2, p)}$ , for a chain of  $p$  sites and  $n_2$  possible states at each site. The coefficients  $F^{\alpha_p, \dots, \alpha_1}$  are such  $F$  is an eigenvector of  $\tau^{(n_2, p)}$  for the eigenvalue  $\Lambda^{(n_2, p)}$ . Finally the Bethe Ansatz equations are just

$$(-1)^{p-1} \prod_{i=1}^M \frac{x \sin(\gamma - (\lambda_j - \mu_i))}{\sin(\lambda_j - \mu_i)} = \Lambda^{(n_2, p)} \prod_{k \neq j}^M \frac{\sin(\gamma - (\lambda_j - \lambda_k))}{\sin(\gamma - (\lambda_k - \lambda_j))}, \quad j = 1, \dots, p \quad (23)$$

Note that these equations imply the vanishing of the residues of  $\Lambda^{((n_1, n_2), M)}(\lambda; \{\mu_i\})$  at the  $\lambda_j$ 's.

The operator  $\tau^{(n_2, p)}$  can be written as a product of disjoint permutation cycles. One also has  $(\tau^{(n_2, p)})^p = \mathbb{I}$ . The eigenvalues  $\Lambda^{(n_2, p)}$  are then  $q^{\text{th}}$  roots of unity, where  $q$  is a divisor of  $p$ , and are highly degenerate. The degeneracy of an eigenvalue depends on  $p$  and  $n_2$ .

One can perform the above diagonalization procedure over the pseudo-vacuum  $||a\rangle$  ( $a \neq 1$ ). The set of eigenvalues is exactly the same as the one found above and the eigenvectors have the same structure but form a completely distinct set, at least for  $0 \leq p < M$ . One can also start with any of the vectors  $||\beta\rangle$ ,  $\beta \in B$  and obtain yet other sets of eigenvectors. The superscript  $n_2$  is replaced by  $n_1$  in (22),  $\Lambda^{(n_2, p)}$  and  $\tau^{(n_2, p)}$ . These features reflect a large degeneracy of the spectrum.

The rational limit is obtained by letting  $\lambda_* \rightarrow \gamma \lambda_*$ ,  $\mu_i \rightarrow \gamma \mu_i$ , dividing the eigenvalue (22) by  $(\sin \gamma)^M$  and taking the limit  $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ . For  $\gamma = \pi/2$  the above results reduce to those of [3]. For arbitrary  $\gamma$  the eigenvalues and the Bethe Ansatz equations have the form of those of the  $su(2)$  XXZ model, if one momentarily 'forgets' the  $\Lambda^{(n_2, p)}$  correction. One can also diagonalize the unit-shift operator by algebraic Bethe Ansatz, since this operator appears systematically as one of the conserved quantities for all the  $su(n)$  XXZ spin-chains. This reflects the underlying symmetry seen above.

A detailed study of the spectrum is desirable. In particular, the thermodynamic limit of the spectrum would shed some light on the differences between the XXZ spectrum and the XXC one. Taking the logarithm of the Bethe Ansatz equations shows that the distribution of integers characterizing the solutions will get a contribution from the  $\Lambda^{(n_2, p)}$  correction. This may result in a denser spectrum. Whether this influences the central charge and the conformal weights remains to be clarified.

A feature of the models with  $n \geq 3$ , is the term  $\delta_{pM}$  in the expression of the eigenvalues. This seems to imply a jump in the spectrum of  $\tau(\lambda)$ . However note that, because of the definition of the conserved quantities, the hamiltonians  $H_1, \dots, H_M$  are not affected by this  $\delta$ -term. For vanishing inhomogeneities, the  $M^{\text{th}}$  power of the eigenvalues of  $\tau(0)/(\sin \gamma)^M$  is equal to one because one has the unit-shift operator for  $M$  sites and  $n$  states; one can verify that the  $M^{\text{th}}$  power of the eigenvalues (22) is equal to one, after using equations (23). The eigenvalues of  $H_2$

(at  $\mu_i = 0$ ) for the trigonometric and rational cases are equal to

$$\frac{d \ln \Lambda}{d\lambda} \Big|_{\lambda=0} = -M \frac{\cos \gamma}{\sin \gamma} + \sin \gamma \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{1}{\sin(\lambda_j) \sin(\gamma - \lambda_j)} \quad (24)$$

$$\frac{d \ln \Lambda_r}{d\lambda} \Big|_{\lambda=0} = -M + \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{1}{\lambda_j(1 - \lambda_j)} \quad (25)$$

Finally, for  $\gamma \neq \pi/2 + ik\pi$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , the decorated YBE is not satisfied and it is not possible to couple, à la Shastry [4, 3], two XXC copies for generic values of  $\gamma$ .

## References

- [1] Z. Maassarani, *The  $su(n)$  Hubbard model*, LAVAL-PHY-24/97, cond-mat/9709252.
- [2] Z. Maassarani, *Exact integrability of the  $su(n)$  Hubbard model*, LAVAL-PHY-25/97, cond-mat/9710083.
- [3] Z. Maassarani, *Hubbard Models as Fusion Products of Free Fermions*, LAVAL-PHY-26/97, cond-mat/9711142.
- [4] B.S. Shastry, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 1529 (1986); Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 2453 (1986); B.S. Shastry, J. Stat. Phys. **50**, (1988) 57–79.
- [5] Z. Maassarani and P. Mathieu, *The  $su(n)$  XX model*, LAVAL-PHY-22/97, cond-mat/9709163.
- [6] M. Jimbo, Comm. Math. Phys. **102** (1986) 537; V.V. Bazhanov, Comm. Math. Phys. **113** (1987) 471.
- [7] L.D. Faddeev in *Recent Advances in Field Theory and Statistical Mechanics*, Les Houches (1982); L.A. Takhtajan and L.D. Faddeev, Rus. Math. Sur. **34** (1979) 11.
- [8] H.B. Thacker, Rev. Mod. Phys. **53** (1981) 253; H.J. de Vega, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A 4** (1989) 2371.
- [9] L.D. Faddeev, *How Algebraic Bethe Ansatz works for integrable model*, Les Houches lectures, hep-th/9605187, and references therein.