# INSTITUTO DE FÍSICA

# preprint

IFUSP/P-263

## ENERGY GAP, CLUSTERING, AND THE GOLDSTONE THEOREM IN STATISTICAL MECHANICS

by

L. Landau
Mathematics Department, Bedford College
University of London, England

and

J. Fernando Perez and W.F. Wreszinski
Instituto de Física, Universidade de São Paulo
São Paulo, Brazil

MARCH/1981

UNIVERSIDADE DE SÃO PAULO
INSTITUTO DE FÍSICA
Caixa Postal - 20.516
Cidade Universitária
São Paulo - BRASIL

# ENERGY GAP, CLUSTERING, AND THE GOLDSTONE THEOREM IN STATISTICAL MECHANICS

L. Landau*
Mathematics Department
Bedford College
University of London, England

J. Fernando Perez*+
W.F. Wreszinski+
Instituto de Física
Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil

ABSTRACT : We prove a Goldstone type theorem for a wide class of lattice and continuum quantum systems, both for the ground state and at non-zero temperature. For the ground state (T=0) spontaneous breakdown of a continuous symmetry implies no energy gap. For non-zero temperature, spontaneous symmetry breakdown implies slow clustering (no $L^1$ clustering). The methods apply also to non-zero temperature classical systems.

Key words : Energy Gap, Clustering, Goldstone Theorem

* Partial financial support by Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo.
+ Partial financial support by CNPq.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Given a physical system with short range forces and a continuous symmetry, if the ground state is not invariant under the symmetry the Goldstone theorem states that the system possesses excitations of arbitrarily low energy ([1], [2]). In the case of the ground state (vacuum) of local quantum field theory, the existence of an energy gap is equivalent to exponential clustering ([3]). In this framework the Goldstone theorem was proved in ([4]) and ([5]). For general ground states of nonrelativistic systems, the two properties (energy gap and clustering) are however independent and, in particular, the assumption that the ground state is the unique vector invariant under time translations does not necessarily follow from the assumption of space-like clustering, as remarked in ([6]). This point was not taken into account in the assumptions of ([7]) and ([8]). Another related aspect, of greater relevance to our discussion, is the fact that the rate of clustering is not expected to be related to symmetry breakdown and absence of an energy gap, since for example the ground state of the Heisenberg ferromagnet ([6]) has a broken symmetry and no energy gap, but is exponentially clustering (for the ground state is a product state of spins pointing in a fixed direction). On the other hand, for $T>0$ no energy gap is expected to occur, at least under general time-like clustering assumptions ([12], proposition 3); these assumptions may be verified for the free Bose gas ([13]).

At non-zero temperature it is the cluster properties that are important in connection with symmetry breakdown. At non-zero temperature we may then formulate the Goldstone theorem as follows. Given a system with short range forces and a continuous symmetry, if the equilibrium state is not invariant under the symmetry, then the system does not possess exponential clustering.

It is our purpose to explore the validity of the Goldstone theorem for a wide class of spin systems and many-body systems, both for the ground state and at non-zero temperature. The main tool we will use at non-zero temperature is the Bogoliubov inequality, which is valid for both classical and quantum systems (see, for example, ([9])). We shall however present the discussion in the framework of quantum statistical mechanics. At zero temperature our method is related to that of ([7]), where a version of the theorem was proved, valid for one space dimension. A different proof, valid for the ferromagnetic Heisenberg Hamiltonian of finite range, and in greater analogy to the quantum field theory proofs of ([4]) and ([5]), was given in ([6]), and generalized in ([8]) to quantum spin systems of finite range.

Our results apply to states which are invariant with respect to spatial translations by some discrete set $\mathcal{L}$ which is sufficiently dense. (For lattice systems this could be a sub-lattice and for continuum systems, a lattice imbedded in the continuum). More precisely we require the following condition.

Condition $\mathcal{L}$. There is a constant $\ell$ such that for all sufficiently large cubes $\Lambda$,

$$\frac{|\Lambda_{\mathcal{L}}|}{|\Lambda|} \geq \ell$$

where $|\Lambda|$ is the volume of $\Lambda$, $|\Lambda_{\mathcal{L}}|$ is the number of points in $\Lambda_{\mathcal{L}} = \Lambda \cap \mathcal{L}$.

We will prove that for interactions which are not too long range (see sections 3 and 4 for examples), for the ground state (T=0) spontaneous breakdown of a continuous symmetry implies no energy gap. For non-zero temperature $(T > 0)$ spontaneous symmetry breakdown implies no exponential clustering (in fact no $L^1$ clustering).

For continuous system our results cover the case of the breakdonw of translational invariance. However at T=0 and non-zero densities there is never an energy gap due to the breakdown of Galilean Invariance as remarked in ([11]).

Finally, we should like to stress that, although we present an informal treatment of the continuum case, our results for quantum spin systems are complete and rigorous.

## 2. GENERAL FRAMEWORK

The state of the system is described by the vector $\Omega$ in some Hilbert space. There is a symmetric Hamiltonian operator H and $H\Omega = 0$. To each cube $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ there is a set of observables $\mathfrak{A}_\Lambda$ such that $[A, B] = 0$ if $A \in \mathfrak{A}_{\Lambda_1}$, $B \in \mathfrak{A}_{\Lambda_2}$ and $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2$ are disjoint. The set of all observables is $\mathfrak{A} \quad \bigcup_\Lambda \mathfrak{A}_\Lambda$

We define $\hat{A} = A - (\Omega, A\Omega)$. We suppose $\hat{A}\Omega$ is in the domain of H for all $A \in \mathfrak{A}$.

Let $\tau_x$ denote spatial translation by x. (In the continuum case $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ in the lattice case $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$). The state $\Omega$ is invariant under translations in the discrete set $\mathcal{L}$, satisfying condition $\mathcal{L}$ of the introduction.

Thus $(\Omega, \tau_i A\Omega) = (\Omega, A\Omega) \quad \forall A \in \mathfrak{A}, \ \forall i \in \mathcal{L}$

There is a one-parameter group of symmetry transformations $\sigma_s$

of $\mathfrak{A}$ commuting with the Hamiltonian and with all spatial translations :

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_s H A \Omega &= H \sigma_s A \Omega \\ \sigma_s \tau_x &= \tau_x \sigma_s \qquad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d \ (\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}^d) \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

We suppose the symmetry $\sigma_s$ is generated by a current

$$J_x = \tau_x J_0$$

where $J_0 \in \mathfrak{A}_0$ (lattice case);

$J_0 \in \mathfrak{A}_\Delta$ (continuum case); $\Delta$ is a cube of side $\delta$.

(In the continuum case we may suppose $J_x$ is smooth in x by first averaging the current over the small cube $\Delta$).

Thus, if $A \in \mathfrak{A}_\Lambda$

$$\frac{d}{ds}\bigg|_{s=0} (\Omega, \sigma_s A \Omega) = i (\Omega, [J_\Lambda, A] \Omega)$$

where $J_\Lambda = \sum_{i \in \Lambda} J_i$ (lattice case)

$J_\Lambda = \int_{\Lambda_\delta} d^d x \ J_x$ (continuum case) $\Lambda_\delta$ = set of points within distance $\delta$ from $\Lambda$

By the group property, the invariance of $\Omega$ under the symmetry $\sigma_s$ follows from

$$(\Omega, [J_\Lambda, A] \Omega) = 0 \quad \text{for all } A \in \mathfrak{A}_\Lambda, \text{ and all cubes } \Lambda$$

The equilibrium property of $\Omega$ is given by

a) T=0 : $\Omega$ is a ground state; i.e. $(\psi, H \psi) \geq 0$ for all $\psi$ in the domain of H.

b) T>0 : $\Omega$ satisfies the Bogoliubov inequality; i.e. for all A, B $\in \mathfrak{A}$

$$|(\Omega, [B, A] \Omega)|^2 \leq \beta \quad (\Omega, \tfrac{1}{2}(A^+ A + A A^+) \Omega) \tfrac{1}{i} (\Omega, [B^+, \dot{B}] \Omega)$$

where $\dot{B} = i\,[H,B]$. Note that $\frac{1}{i}(\Omega, [B^{+}, \dot{B}]\Omega)$ may be written in the form $(B\Omega, HB\Omega) + (B^{+}\Omega, HB^{+}\Omega)$.

The basic hypothesis about the state $\Omega$ which leads to the absence of symmetry breaking is

a) T=0 : there is an energy gap $\varepsilon > 0$, i.e.

$(\psi, H\psi) \geqslant \varepsilon$ for all $\psi$ in the domain of H, orthogonal to $\Omega$, $\|\psi\| = 1$

b) T>0 : there is $L^1$ clustering; i.e. for each observable A,

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} |(\Omega, A^{+}\tau_i A\Omega) - (\Omega, A^{+}\Omega)(\Omega, \tau_i A\Omega)| < \infty$$

The basic strategy is as follows. For each self-adjoint observable $A \in \mathfrak{A}_{\Lambda_0}$ define $\gamma = \frac{d}{ds}\Big|_{s=0} (\Omega, \sigma_s A\Omega)$

We must show $\gamma = 0$.

Now by the translation invariance of $\Omega$ with respect to $\mathcal{L}$ we have for each cube $\Lambda$ (and $\sigma_s \tau_i = \tau_i \sigma_s$)

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{|\Lambda_{\mathcal{L}}|} \frac{d}{ds}\Big|_{s=0} (\Omega, \sigma_s \sum_{i \in \Lambda_{\mathcal{L}}} \tau_i A\Omega)$$

where $\Lambda_{\mathcal{L}} = \Lambda \cap \mathcal{L}$ and $|\Lambda_{\mathcal{L}}|$ is the number of points in $\mathcal{L}$.

Thus

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{|\Lambda_{\mathcal{L}}|}\, i\, (\Omega, [\hat{J}_{\tilde{\Lambda}}, \sum_{j \in \Lambda_{\mathcal{L}}} \tau_j \hat{A}]\Omega)$$

where $\tilde{\Lambda} = \bigcup_{i \in \Lambda} \tau_i \Lambda_0$

We estimate $\gamma$ as follows.

a) T=0 :

$$|\gamma|^2 \leq \frac{4}{|\Lambda_{\mathcal{L}}|^2} (\hat{J}_{\tilde{\Lambda}}\Omega, \hat{J}_{\tilde{\Lambda}}\Omega)(\sum_{i \in \Lambda_{\mathcal{L}}} \tau_i \hat{A}\Omega, \sum_{j \in \Lambda_{\mathcal{L}}} \tau_j \hat{A}\Omega)$$

Now for any observable B, $(\Omega, \hat{B}\Omega) = 0$ . Thus the assumption of an energy gap $\varepsilon > 0$ implies

$$(\hat{B}\Omega, \hat{B}\Omega) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (\hat{B}\Omega, H\hat{B}\Omega) \leq$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left[ (\hat{B}\Omega, H\hat{B}\Omega) + (\hat{B}^{+}\Omega, H\hat{B}^{+}\Omega) \right] =$$

$$= \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left( \Omega, [B^{+}, [H, B]]\Omega \right) = \frac{1}{i\varepsilon} \left( \Omega, [B^{+}, \dot{B}]\Omega \right)$$

Thus

$$|\gamma|^2 \leq \frac{4}{\varepsilon} \left[ \frac{1}{|\Lambda_{\ell}|} \frac{1}{i} (\Omega, [J_{\tilde{\Lambda}}, \dot{J}_{\tilde{\Lambda}}]\Omega) \right] \cdot \frac{1}{|\Lambda_{\ell}|} \left\| \sum_{j \in \Lambda_{\ell}} \tau_j \hat{A}\Omega \right\|^2 \tag{*}$$

b) $T > 0$ : using the Bogoliubov inequality,

$$|\gamma|^2 \leq \beta \left[ \frac{1}{|\Lambda_{\ell}|} \frac{1}{i} (\Omega, [J_{\tilde{\Lambda}}, \dot{J}_{\tilde{\Lambda}}]\Omega) \right] \frac{1}{|\Lambda_{\ell}|} \left\| \sum_{j \in \Lambda_{\ell}} \tau_j \hat{A}\Omega \right\|^2 \tag{**}$$

Notice the similarity of inequalities (*) and (**).

In one case the coefficient involves $\beta$ , the inverse temperature. In the other case the coefficient involves $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ , the inverse gap.

To prove absence of symmetry breakdown we will show in both cases ($T=0$ and $T>0$):

I) $\frac{1}{|\Lambda_{\ell}|} (\Omega, [J_{\tilde{\Lambda}}, \dot{J}_{\tilde{\Lambda}}]\Omega) \to 0$ as $\Lambda \nearrow \mathbb{R}^d$

and

II) $\frac{1}{|\Lambda_{\ell}|} \left\| \sum_{j \in \Lambda_{\ell}} \tau_j \hat{A}\Omega \right\|^2 \leq C$ uniformly in $\Lambda$ .

I) follows essentially from properties of the Hamiltonian.

II) follows from $L^1$ clustering ( T>0) or from properties of the Hamiltonian and the energy gap (T=0). Indeed from $L^1$ clustering, and invariance of $\Omega$ under $\tau_j$, $j \in \mathcal{L}$.

$$\frac{1}{|\Lambda_{\mathcal{L}}|} \left\| \sum_{j\in\Lambda_{\mathcal{L}}} \tau_j \hat{A}\Omega \right\|^2 \leq \sum_{j\in\mathcal{L}} \left| (\Omega, A\tau_j A\Omega) - (\Omega,A\Omega)(\Omega,A\Omega) \right| < \infty$$

In the case T=0, from the energy gap $\varepsilon$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{|\Lambda_{\mathcal{L}}|} \left\| \sum_{\tau\in\Lambda_{\mathcal{L}}} \tau_j \hat{A}\Omega \right\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{i\varepsilon} \frac{1}{|\Lambda_{\mathcal{L}}|} \left(\Omega, \left[ \sum_{j\in\Lambda_{\mathcal{L}}} \tau_j A , \sum_{k\in\Lambda_{\mathcal{L}}} \tau_k \dot{A} \right]\Omega\right) \leq$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{i\varepsilon} \sum_{k\in\mathcal{L}} \left| (\Omega, [A, \tau_k \dot{A}]\Omega) \right|$$

The finiteness of the sum over $\mathcal{L}$ will follow from properties of the Hamiltonian.

The system is said to have <u>property</u> $G_T$ if

$$\sup_{j\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \sum_{\substack{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d \\ |k-j|\geq D}} \left| (\Omega, [J_j, \dot{J}_k]\Omega) \right| \longrightarrow 0 \text{ as } D \nearrow \infty$$

or

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{|y-x|\geq D} d^d y \; \left| (\Omega, [J_x, \dot{J}_y]\Omega) \right| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } D \nearrow \infty$$

The system is said to have <u>property</u> $G_0$ if property $G_T$ holds and for each selfadjoint observable A,

$$\sum_{k\in\mathcal{L}} \left| (\Omega, [A, \tau_k \dot{A}]\Omega) \right| < \infty$$

We may now state Goldstone's theorem in the form

THEOREM 1.

a) T=0 : If the system possesses an energy gap and property $G_0$ then there is no spontaneous symmetry breakdown.

b) T>0 : If the system possesses $L^1$ clustering and property $G_T$ then there is no spontaneous symmetry breakdown.

Proof : We must show that I) follows from

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{|y-x|\geq D} d^d y \, |(\Omega, [J_x, \dot{J}_y]\Omega)| \xrightarrow[D\nearrow\infty]{} 0$$

(The lattice case is analogous).

Write $\mathcal{J}(x,y) = (\Omega, [J_x, \dot{J}_y]\Omega)$

Then

$$\int d^d y \, |\mathcal{J}(x,y)| < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{|y-x|\geq D} d^d y \, |\mathcal{J}(x,y)| \xrightarrow[D\nearrow\infty]{} 0$$

Now

$$\int d^d x \, \mathcal{J}(x,y) = \frac{d}{ds}\Big|_{s=0} (\Omega, \sigma_s H J_y \Omega) = \frac{d}{ds}\Big|_{s=0} (\Omega, H\sigma_s J_y \Omega) =$$
$$= 0 \qquad (***)$$

Also by the Jacobi identity $\mathcal{J}(x,y) = \mathcal{J}(y,x)$

Then since $|\Lambda_\ell| \geq \ell|\Lambda| \geq \frac{\ell}{|\Lambda_0|}|\tilde{\Lambda}|$ we estimate

$$\frac{1}{|\tilde\Lambda|}(\Omega, [J_{\tilde\Lambda}, \dot{J}_{\tilde\Lambda}]\Omega) = \frac{1}{|\tilde\Lambda|}\int d^d x \, d^d y \, \chi_{\tilde\Lambda_\delta}(x)\chi_{\tilde\Lambda_\delta}(y)\,\mathcal{J}(x,y) =$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2|\tilde\Lambda|}\int d^d x \, d^d y \, |\chi_{\tilde\Lambda_\delta}(x) - \chi_{\tilde\Lambda_\delta}(y)|^2 \, \mathcal{J}(x,y)$$

where $\chi_\Lambda$ is the characteristic function of $\Lambda$, using (***).

Thus

$$\left| \frac{1}{|\tilde{\Lambda}|} \left(\Omega, [J_{\tilde{\Lambda}}, \dot{J}_{\tilde{\Lambda}}]\Omega\right) \right| \leq$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{|\tilde{\Lambda}|} \int_{\tilde{\Lambda}_\delta} d^d x \int_{\tilde{\Lambda}_\delta^c} d^d y \, | g(x,y)| \equiv (2.2)$$

We write $\displaystyle\int_{\tilde{\Lambda}_\delta} d^d x = \int_{\Lambda_1} d^d x + \int_{\Lambda_2} d^d x$

where $\Lambda_2$ is the set of points in $\tilde{\Lambda}_\delta$ within distance D of the boundary and $\Lambda_1 = \tilde{\Lambda}_\delta - \Lambda_2$

Then

$$(2.2) \leq \sup_x \int_{|x-y| \geq D} d^d y \, | g(x,y)| + \frac{|\Lambda_2|}{|\tilde{\Lambda}|} \sup_x \int d^d y \, | g(x,y)|$$

The first term goes to zero by property $G_T$ and the second term goes to zero since $\dfrac{|\Lambda_2|}{|\tilde{\Lambda}|} \xrightarrow[\tilde{\Lambda} \nearrow \mathbb{R}^d]{} 0$.

The theorem gains content by analyzing when property $G_T$ or $G_0$ holds. This will be done in the following sections.

## 3. QUANTUM SPIN SYSTEMS

The interaction $\Phi$ is determined by specifying for each finite $X \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ the "connected" $X$ - body interaction $\Phi(X) \in \mathfrak{A}_X$. The Hamiltonian H is then defined by

$$H A \Omega = \sum_{X \cap \Lambda_0 \neq \phi} [\Phi(X), A] \Omega$$

for $A \in \mathfrak{A}_{\Lambda_0}$. Let $D(X)$ denote the diameter of $X$ : $D(X) \equiv \sup_{i,j \in X} |i-j|$

<u>THEOREM 2</u>.

The system satisfies $G_T$ and $G_0$ if $\displaystyle\sup_i \sum_{X \ni i} |X| \, \|\Phi(X)\| < \infty$ and

$$\sup_i \sum_{\substack{X \ni i \\ D(X) \geq d}} |X| \, \|\Phi(X)\| \to 0 \quad \text{as } d \nearrow \infty .$$

Note that if the interaction is translation invariant $\left(\Phi(X+i)=\tau_i\,\Phi(X)\right)$ then the above follows from

$$\sum_{X\ni 0} |X|\,\|\Phi(X)\| < \infty$$

If furthermore the interaction is at most N-body $\left(\Phi(X)=0 \text{ if } |X|>N\right)$ then the above is equivalent to $\sum_{X\ni 0} \|\Phi(X)\| < \infty$.

In particular for the Heisenberg Hamiltonian $\sum J(i-j)\,\sigma_i\cdot\sigma_j$ we require $\sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}^d} |J(i)| < \infty$.

Proof :

a) We must show

$$\sup_{j\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \sum_{\substack{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d\\ |k-j|\geq D}} |(\Omega, [J_j, \dot{J}_k]\,\Omega)| \xrightarrow[D\nearrow\infty]{} 0$$

Now

$$\sum_{\substack{k\\ |k-j|\geq D}} \|[J_j, \dot{J}_k]\| \leq \sum_{\substack{k\\ |k-j|\geq D}} \sum_{X\ni k,j} \|[J_j, [\Phi(X), J_k]\| \leq$$

$$\leq 4\,\|J_0\|^2 \sum_{\substack{k\\ |k-j|\geq D}} \sum_{X\ni k,j} \|\Phi(X)\| \leq 4\,\|J_0\|^2 \sum_{\substack{X\ni j\\ D(X)\geq D}} |X|\,\|\Phi(X)\|$$

which goes to zero as $D\nearrow\infty$ by the hypothesis of the theorem.

b) We will show $\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}^d} |(\Omega, [A, \tau_j\dot{A}]\,\Omega)| < \infty$ for each observable $A$

The proof is similar to a). Let $A\in\mathfrak{A}_{\Lambda_0}$.

$$\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \|[A, \tau_j\dot{A}]\| \leq 4\,\|A\|^2 \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \sum_{\substack{X\cap\tau_j\Lambda_0\neq\emptyset\\ X\cap\Lambda_0\neq\emptyset}} \|\phi(X)\| +$$

$$+ \; 4 \|A\|^2 \sum_{\substack{j \\ \Lambda_0 \cap \tau_j \Lambda_0 \neq \emptyset}} \; \sum_{X \cap \tau_j \Lambda_0 \neq \emptyset} \|\Phi(X)\| \leq$$

$$\leq 4 \|A\|^2 |\Lambda_0| \sup_i \sum_{X \ni i} |X| \, \|\Phi(X)\| \; +$$

$$+ \; 4 \|A\|^2 |\Lambda_0|^2 |\Lambda_0| \sup_i \sum_{X \ni i} \|\Phi(X)\| \leq$$

$$\leq 8 \|A\|^2 |\Lambda_0|^3 \sup_i \sum_{X \ni i} |X| \, \|\Phi(X)\| \; .$$

## 4. CONTINUUM SYSTEMS

In this section we will proceed in an informal way, emphasizing the procedure and type of estimates. In the continuum case unbounded operators will arise and, having constructed a particular equilibrium state, it would be necessary to verify that the correlation functions are indeed well-defined.

The Goldstone theorem is applicable to local quantum fields at zero and non-zero temperature. Indeed, properties $G_T$ and $G_0$ are immediate consequences of the finite propagation speed.

Non-relativistic many body systems may also be treated. We consider first the breakdown of an internal symmetry in a translation invariant system at non-zero temperature. The bose and fermi cases are treated in the same way. A particle with M internal degrees of freedom is described by the field operators

$$\psi_j(x) \; , \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, M$$

which satisfy

$$[\psi_j(x), \psi_k^+(y)]_{\pm} = \delta_{jk} \, \delta(x-y)$$

Let $\sigma^1, \ldots, \sigma^g$ be the selfadjoint $M \times M$ matrices of a representation of the Lie algebra of a compact semi-simple Lie group $\mathcal{G}$ with (totally antisymmetric ([10]) structure constants:

$$[\sigma^\alpha, \sigma^\beta] = i\, \Gamma^{\alpha\beta}_\gamma\, \sigma^\gamma$$

Define $\rho^\alpha(x) = \sum_{jk} \psi_j^+(x)\, \sigma^\alpha_{jk}\, \Psi_k(x)$

We also write this as $\psi^+(x)\, \sigma^\alpha\, \Psi(x)$

The operators $\rho^\alpha(x)$ are the local generators of the Lie group transformations on the fields $\Psi_k(x)$.

The Hamiltonian has the form $H = H_0 + V - \mu N$ , where

$$H_0 = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_j \int d^n x \; \underline{\nabla} \psi_j^+(x) \cdot \underline{\nabla} \Psi_j(x)$$

$$V = \sum_\alpha \int d^n x\, d^n y \;:\; \rho^\alpha(x)\, \rho^\alpha(y) \;:\; V(x-y)$$

$$N = \sum_j \int d^n x \; \psi_j^+(x)\, \Psi_j(x)$$

If the internal symmetry $\mathcal{G}$ is spontaneously broken, then the absence of $L^1$-clustering would follow from

$$\int dy \, |(\Omega, [J_0, \dot{J}_y]\, \Omega)| < \infty$$

where $J_y = \int d^n x \; h(y-x) \rho^\alpha(x)$ and h is a smooth function of compact support and $\int d^n x\, h(x) = 1$.

With

$$\underset{\sim}{J}^\alpha(x) = \frac{1}{2i} \left( \psi^+ \sigma^\alpha \underline{\nabla} \Psi - \underline{\nabla} \psi^+ \sigma^\alpha \Psi \right)$$

we have the following algebraic relations which hold in both the bose and fermi case :

$$[\rho^\alpha(x), \rho^\beta(y)] = i\, \delta(x-y)\, \Gamma^{\alpha\beta}_\gamma\, \rho^\gamma(y)$$

$$i\,[H_0,\ \rho^\alpha(x)] = -\,\underline{\nabla}\cdot\,\underset{\sim}{J}^\alpha(x)$$

$$[N,\ \rho^\alpha(x)] = 0$$

$$[\rho^\alpha(x), \underset{\sim}{J}^\beta(y)] = \frac{1}{i}\,\underline{\nabla}_x\left[\psi^\dagger(x)\,\frac{[\sigma^\alpha, \sigma^\beta]_+}{2}\,\underline{\Psi}(x)\,\delta(x-y)\right] +$$

$$+\, i\,\Gamma^{\alpha\beta}_\gamma\,\underset{\sim}{J}^\gamma(y)\,\delta(x-y)$$

$$[\rho^\alpha(y), [\rho^\alpha(x), V]] = \delta(y-x)\sum_{\beta\gamma\delta}\Gamma^{\alpha\beta}_\gamma\,\Gamma^{\alpha\beta}_\delta\,\cdot$$

$$\cdot\int dz\; V(x-z)\;:\,[\rho^\delta(x), \rho^\gamma(z)]_+\,:\; -$$

$$-\sum_{\beta\gamma\delta}\Gamma^{\alpha\beta}_\gamma\,\Gamma^{\alpha\beta}_\delta\;V(x-y)\;:[\rho^\gamma(x), \rho^\delta(y)]_+:$$

where we have used

$$:\rho^\alpha(x)\,\rho^\beta(y): = \rho^\alpha(x)\rho^\beta(y) - \delta(x-y)\,\psi^\dagger(y)\,\sigma^\alpha\sigma^\beta\,\Psi(y)$$

To show $\int dy\,|(\Omega, [J_0, \dot{J}_y]\Omega)| < \infty$ we need only consider the non-local term

$$\sum_{\beta\gamma\delta}\Gamma^{\alpha\beta}_\gamma\,\Gamma^{\alpha\beta}_\delta\;V(x-y)\;(\Omega, :\rho^\gamma(x)\,\rho^\delta(y):\Omega)$$

So if $\displaystyle\int dy\,|V(x-y)|\;|(\Omega, :\rho^\gamma(x)\,\rho^\delta(y):\Omega)| < \infty$

the result follows.

We note that there is a qualitative difference between abelian and non-abelian groups since in the abelian case $\Gamma^{\alpha\beta}_\gamma = 0$ and only local terms occur. (A similar analysis applies to the T=0 case, although here the distinction between abelian and non-abelian groups does not arise because the term $(\Omega, [A, \tau_j \cdot \dot{A}]\Omega)$ will in general have a term with $V(x-y)$ even in the abelian case).

We consider now the breakdown of translation invariance. We will for simplicity not consider internal degrees of freedom, so that now

$$H = H_0 + V - \mu N$$

where

$$H_0 = \frac{1}{2m} \int d^n x \ \underline{\nabla} \psi^+(x) \cdot \underline{\nabla} \psi(x)$$

$$\rho(x) = \psi^+(x)\psi(x)$$

$$N = \int d^n x \ \rho(x)$$

$$V = \int d^n x \, d^n y \ V(x-y) \ :\rho(x)\rho(y):$$

The local generator of the translation group is

$$\underset{\sim}{j}(x) = \frac{1}{2i}\left[\psi^+(x)\nabla\psi(x) - \nabla\psi^+(x)\ \psi(x)\right]$$

We consider the case T>0 with similar conclusions for the case T=0.

We must show

$$\sup_x \int_{|y-x|\geq D} dy \ |(\Omega, [J_k(x), \dot{J}_k(y)]\Omega)| \underset{D\nearrow\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$$

with $J_k(x) = \int d^n y \ h(x-y)\, j_k(y)$

Now

$$i\,[H, j_k(x)] = \frac{\partial S_{kl}(x)}{\partial x_l} - \psi^+(x)\int d^n y\ \partial_k V(x-y)\rho(y)\psi(x)$$

where

$$S_{k\ell}(x) = -\frac{1}{2}\left[\partial_k \psi^{+}(x)\,\partial_\ell \psi(x) + \partial_\ell \psi^{+}(x)\,\partial_k \psi(x)\right] +$$

$$+ \frac{\delta_{k\ell}}{4}\left[\nabla^2 \psi^{+}(x)\,\psi(x) + 2\,\underline{\nabla}\cdot\psi^{+}(x)\cdot\underline{\nabla}\,\psi(x) + \psi^{+}(x)\,\nabla^2\psi(x)\right]$$

where $\partial_k V(\xi) = \dfrac{\partial V(\xi)}{\partial \xi_k}$.

Now since $S_{k\ell}$ is a local term it will not contribute to the estimate, as $D \nearrow \infty$

$$[\dot{j}_k(x), [V, \dot{j}_k(y)]] = 2\{-V_{kk}(x-y) : \rho(x)\rho(y): +$$

$$+ \int d^n z\; V_{kk}(z-y) : \rho(z)\rho(y): \;\delta(x-y)\}$$

where $V_{kk}(\xi) = \dfrac{d^2 V(\xi)}{d\xi_k^2}$

Thus the only term of importance in the estimate is

$$\sup_x \int_{|y-x|\geq D} dy \quad |V_{kk}(x-y)|\,|(\Omega, :\rho(x)\rho(y):\Omega)|$$

Thus if $\sup_{x,y} |(\Omega, :\rho(x)\rho(y):\Omega)| < \infty$

and $\int dx\; |V_{kk}(x)| < \infty$

the result follows.

REFERENCES


([1]) - J. Goldstone, A. Salam and S. Weinberg - Phys.Rev. 127, 965 (1972).

([2]) - S.A. Bludman and A. Klein - Phys.Rev. 131,2364 (1964).

([3]) - H. Araki, K. Hepp and D. Ruelle - Helv.Phys.Acta 35, 164 (1962).

([4]) - D. Kastler, D.W. Robinson and J.A. Swieca - Comm.Math.Phys. 2,108 (1966).

([5]) - H. Ezawa and J.A. Swieca - Comm.Math.Phys. 5,330 (1967).

([6]) - R.F. Streater - Comm.Math.Phys. 6,233 (1967).

([7]) - H. Reeh - Nuovo Cim. B17,7 (1973).

([8]) - W.F. Wreszinski - J.Math.Phys. 17,109 (1976).

([9]) - W. Driessler, L. Landau and J.F. Perez - J.Stat.Phys. 20, 123 (1979).

([10]) - M. Hammermesh, "Group Theory" Addison - Wesley p c N.Y. 1962.

([11]) - J.A. Swieca - Comm.Math.Phys. 4,1 (1967).

([12]) - R. Haag, D. Kastler and E.B. Trych-Pohlmeyer - Comm.Math. Phys. 38,173 (1974).

([13]) - R. Haag and E.B. Trych-Pohlmeyer - Comm.Math.Phys. 56,213 (1977).