

# QCD<sub>1+1</sub> with Static Quarks as Supersymmetric Quantum Mechanics

M. Seeger\* and M. Thies†

*Department of Physics, State University of New York, Stony Brook, NY 11794*

*and*

*Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Erlangen–Nürnberg,  
Staudtstr. 7, 91058 Erlangen, Germany‡*

## Abstract

We reexamine the solvable model problem of two static, fundamental quarks interacting with a SU(2) Yang–Mills field on a spatial circle, introduced by Engelhardt and Schreiber. If the quarks are at the same point, the model exhibits a quantum mechanical supersymmetry. At finite separation, the supersymmetry is explicitly broken in a way which naturally explains the geometrical nature of spectrum and state vectors of this system.

---

\*mseeger@theorie3.physik.uni-erlangen.de

†thies@theorie3.physik.uni-erlangen.de

‡Home institution of both authors

The problem of two opposite static electric charges in QED<sub>1+1</sub> on a spatial circle is a rather trivial one: In a canonical formulation, the only gauge invariant degree of freedom of the Maxwell field is the zero mode of  $A_1(x)$ . Its quantum mechanics is that of a free particle, totally decoupled from the sources which only contribute a c-number to the Hamiltonian, their (periodic) Coulomb potential. By contrast, the analogue problem in Yang–Mills theory on a circle exhibits a much richer dynamics. This was exposed in detail in a recent gauge fixed canonical study [1], and further analyzed from the point of view of Hamiltonian lattice gauge theory in [2].

The non-Abelian SU(2) case shares with QED the property that only a single quantum mechanical degree of freedom survives gauge fixing, here the eigenphase of the Wilson loop winding around the circle,  $\text{P exp } ig \int_0^L A_1(x) dx$ . However, as a compact variable with the character of a polar angle, this phase has very different properties from the corresponding cartesian variable in the Maxwell case. Moreover, it remains coupled to the color spins of the static charges. As a result, an intricate discrete spectrum emerges which displays several remarkable features: If the separation between the static quarks goes to zero, all but one states become doubly degenerate. For finite distance  $d$  between the sources, the energy is strictly linear in  $d$ , no matter how large the ratio  $d/L$  is (this is not the case in QED on a circle, since the periodic Coulomb potential is a succession of inverted parabolae). Although this model has been solved analytically in Ref. [1], these features have remained somewhat mysterious.

It is the purpose of this short note to point out that an underlying quantum mechanical supersymmetry is responsible for these regularities. In this way, we hope to round off the discussion of this instructive toy model and enhance its pedagogical value. More importantly, we find it interesting that a model which was not manufactured to be supersymmetric in the first place can develop such a symmetry dynamically. In view of the fact that we are dealing with an (admittedly, extremely simple) non-Abelian gauge theory, we feel that this phenomenon deserves some attention.

We do not discuss the resolution of the Gauss law and the resulting reduction of the Hamiltonian to a quantum mechanical problem, as this has been described elsewhere in great detail [3, 4]. Instead, we proceed immediately to the Hamiltonian given by Engelhardt and Schreiber in Eq. (14) of Ref. [1]. It describes quantum mechanics of the variable  $c$ , proportional to the eigenphase of the spatial Wilson line, coupled to a two state system of the quark color spins. If the quarks are sitting at the same point,  $\text{Tr } Q_q^2$  (with  $Q_q$  the quark color charge) is both gauge invariant and conserved, therefore the natural basis vectors are the color singlet and triplet states  $|S\rangle, |T\rangle$ . At finite separation between the static sources,  $\text{Tr } Q_q^2$  ceases to be gauge invariant and there is no particular reason to diagonalize it. In Ref. [1], a rotated basis  $|\tilde{S}\rangle, |\tilde{T}\rangle$  has been found to be most convenient which can be shown to diagonalize the gauge invariant (but no longer conserved) operator obtained from  $\text{Tr } Q_q^2$  by inserting gauge strings between the two separated charges.

In order to clarify the structure of this Hamiltonian, we found it useful to transform to “radial” wavefunctions (i.e. pull out a Jacobian factor  $1/\sin(\pi c)$ ), convert the kinetic energy explicitly to the  $\tilde{S}, \tilde{T}$  basis, and use the notation  $\theta = \pi c, d = y - x \geq 0$  ( $\theta$  as a

reminder that this angle runs only from 0 to  $\pi$ ). Then we obtain

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{g^2}{4} (L\mathcal{H}_0 + d\mathcal{H}_1) , \quad (1)$$

where we have exhibited the dependence on the coupling constant  $g$  (dimension of a mass), the size  $L$  of the system and the distance  $d$  between the sources, and introduced the dimensionless Hamiltonians

$$\mathcal{H}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta^2} - \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta^2} - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\sin^2\theta} \end{pmatrix} , \quad (2)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{3}{2} & -i\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta} + \cot\theta\right) \\ i\left(-\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta} + \cot\theta\right) & -\frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix} . \quad (3)$$

$\mathcal{H}_0$  is the part which survives if we let the distance between the charges go to zero. In its present form (2), one easily recognizes the structure characteristic of a ‘‘supersymmetric quantum mechanical system’’ (for recent reviews cf. [5] and the monograph [6]), namely

$$\mathcal{H}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} Q^+Q^- & 0 \\ 0 & Q^-Q^+ \end{pmatrix} \quad (4)$$

with

$$Q^\pm = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( \pm \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta} + \cot\theta \right) . \quad (5)$$

$\mathcal{H}_1$ , the part accounting for the  $d$ -dependence of the spectrum, breaks the supersymmetry, but its structure is also closely related to the operators  $Q^\pm$ ,

$$\mathcal{H}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{3}{2} & i\sqrt{2}Q^+ \\ -i\sqrt{2}Q^- & -\frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix} . \quad (6)$$

In order to clarify both the supersymmetry of  $\mathcal{H}_0$  and the nature of the breaking term  $\mathcal{H}_1$ , we introduce the (non-hermitean) ‘‘supercharge operator’’

$$\mathcal{Q} = -i\sqrt{2}Q^-\sigma^- , \quad (7)$$

where  $\sigma^- = (\sigma^1 - i\sigma^2)/2$  is a Pauli matrix playing the part of the fermion creation operator. In terms of  $\mathcal{Q}$ ,  $\mathcal{Q}^\dagger$ , we then have the superalgebra

$$\mathcal{H}_0 = \frac{1}{2} \{ \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{Q}^\dagger \} , \quad \{ \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{Q} \} = 0 , \quad [ \mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{Q} ] = 0 . \quad (8)$$

As usual in applications of supersymmetry to quantum mechanics, the ‘‘bosonic’’ and ‘‘fermionic’’ sectors of the theory should not be taken literally, but can refer to any two-state system. Here, they correspond to the quark color spin ‘‘singlet’’ ( $\tilde{S}$ ) and ‘‘triplet’’ ( $\tilde{T}$ ) sectors, where we reemphasize that for finite separations these can be defined in a gauge invariant way by inserting appropriate strings [1]. The supercharge together with the ‘‘fermion number operator’’

$$\mathcal{N}_F = \sigma^-\sigma^+ = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (9)$$

allows us to express  $\mathcal{H}_1$  in a more concise form as well,

$$\mathcal{H}_1 = \frac{3}{2} - 2\mathcal{N}_F + \mathcal{Q} + \mathcal{Q}^\dagger . \quad (10)$$

Since  $\mathcal{H}_0$  conserves both supercharge and fermion number, we see at once that

$$[\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1] = 0 , \quad (11)$$

a rather useful property which immediately tells us that the eigenvalues will be linear in  $L$  and  $d$ .

Having exhibited the symmetry structure of the Hamiltonian, we turn to its diagonalization which now does not require any particular skills:  $\mathcal{H}_0$  coincides with one of the most elementary examples of supersymmetric quantum mechanics, the infinite square well and its superpartner, a Pöschl–Teller potential [7]. The trivial solutions of the square well potential,

$$\langle \theta | n \rangle = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sin(n\theta) , \quad n = 1, 2, \dots , \quad \epsilon_n = \frac{1}{2} (n^2 - 1) \quad (12)$$

yield at once the (normalized) degenerate solutions of the  $1/\sin^2 \theta$  potential [5],

$$|\tilde{n}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon_n}} Q^- |n\rangle . \quad (13)$$

In the case at hand,

$$\langle \theta | \tilde{n} \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n^2 - 1}} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} - \cot \theta \right) \langle \theta | n \rangle = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi(n^2 - 1)}} (n \cos n\theta - \cot \theta \sin n\theta) . \quad (14)$$

Here, we label the states in the “fermionic” sector by  $2, 3, \dots$  so that degenerate ones have the same index. The state with  $n = 1$  is missing because  $Q^-$  annihilates  $|0\rangle$ .

For  $d = 0$  we can identify the bosonic sector with a pointlike *color neutral* object and the fermionic sector with a pointlike *adjoint* charge. Hence after subtracting the masses, there is a degeneracy between excited states of pure Yang–Mills theory on the circle and states containing an additional adjoint charge. While it is perhaps not surprising that the energies are the same as both involve strings winding around the circle, the result is non-trivial since the gluonic wavefunctions are different. In particular, their number of nodes differs by one. The groundstate is at zero energy and non-degenerate, as it must be for unbroken supersymmetry. Note that we did not have to subtract any constant from the Hamiltonian in order to achieve this, since the  $-\frac{1}{2}$  term in Eq. (2) arises from the transformation to radial wavefunctions as an “effective potential” [4]. The full ground state wavefunction is a constant ( $\sin \theta$  is canceled by the Jacobian factor), which is evidently annihilated by the kinetic energy operator.

Let us now turn to the case  $d > 0$  where the supersymmetry gets explicitly broken, and diagonalize  $\mathcal{H}_1$ . Writing down the eigenvalue equation for  $\mathcal{H}_1$  in terms of a vector with

components  $u, v$  and the eigenvalue  $\eta$ , and eliminating one of the two components, say  $v$ , we get

$$Q^+Q^-u = \frac{1}{2} \left( \eta + \frac{1}{2} \right) \left( \eta - \frac{3}{2} \right) u, \quad \left( \eta + \frac{1}{2} \right) v = -i\sqrt{2}Q^-u. \quad (15)$$

Inserting the known eigenvalues  $\frac{n^2-1}{2}$  of  $Q^+Q^-$  from above, this yields the two solutions

$$\eta = \frac{1}{2} \pm n. \quad (16)$$

The full result for the eigenvalues of  $H$  is therefore

$$E_n^\pm = \frac{g^2}{4} \left[ L \left( \frac{n^2-1}{2} \right) + d \left( \frac{1}{2} \pm n \right) \right], \quad (17)$$

where  $E_1^-$  should be omitted. The corresponding eigenfunctions are

$$\Psi_n^\pm(\theta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n(n \pm 1)}} \begin{pmatrix} (\pm n + 1) \sin n\theta \\ i(\cot \theta \sin n\theta - n \cos n\theta) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (18)$$

again discarding the  $(n = 1, -)$  case. (The normalization factor can be obtained without evaluating an integral, along the same lines which lead to Eq. (13)). These results agree with those obtained in Ref. [1], where however the wavefunctions were not explicitly given. Note that the state vectors depend neither on  $g$  nor on  $L$  or  $d$  but are purely geometrical. The dependence of the energy on these constants only comes through the Hamiltonian, cf. Eq. (1).

Instrumental for the strict linear  $d$ -dependence is the fact that  $\mathcal{H}_0$  and  $\mathcal{H}_1$  commute (first order degenerate perturbation theory is exact in this case). The supersymmetry gets explicitly broken by the finite separation of the static quarks. Nevertheless, this symmetry is useful for understanding the spectrum, in much the same way as rotational symmetry is useful for understanding the spectrum of the hydrogen atom in a uniform magnetic field. In this familiar case, the interaction is also linear in the generators of the symmetry group, thus yielding a simple, geometrical level splitting pattern.

It is worth emphasizing that the supersymmetry has nothing to do with the residual gauge symmetry after gauge fixing related to topologically non-trivial, “large” gauge transformations. For pure Yang Mills theory on a circle, the corresponding “center symmetry” is the reflection symmetry around the point  $\theta = \pi/2$ , in accordance with the homotopy group  $\pi_1[\text{SU}(2)/\mathbb{Z}_2] = \mathbb{Z}_2$  (see e.g. [8]). Unlike dynamical quarks, static (fundamental) sources do not destroy the center symmetry, since they are insensitive to the spatial boundary conditions and therefore cannot distinguish between periodic, “small” and antiperiodic, “large” gauge transformations. The  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  symmetry of the full Hamiltonian (1) is simply

$$\mathcal{H}(\theta) = \sigma_3 \mathcal{H}(\pi - \theta) \sigma_3. \quad (19)$$

Thus, we can classify the eigenstates according to their  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  parity,

$$\sigma_3 \Psi(\pi - \theta) = \pm \Psi(\theta). \quad (20)$$

This explains why the “bosonic” and “fermionic” components of our solutions (18) have definite (but opposite) parity under  $\theta \rightarrow \pi - \theta$ . We also note that the supercharge (7) is invariant under the center symmetry, so that there is no conflict between the two symmetries.

Summarizing, we have identified a quantum mechanical supersymmetric structure in a model consisting of two static quarks and a SU(2) Yang–Mills field on a circle. As demonstrated in previous works [1, 2], it is not necessary to account for this particular symmetry in order to solve the model. However, it is then difficult to understand the dependence of the spectrum on the distance between the quarks, in particular the degeneracies at  $d = 0$ . The emergence of a supersymmetry in a model where it has not been put in “by hand” is interesting in its own right. As an additional bonus, supersymmetry helps to determine the full spectrum and set of eigenvectors of this model with remarkably little effort.

It will be interesting to see whether this line of attack is useful for dealing with other types of non-Abelian gauge theories.

We should like to thank the members of the Nuclear Theory Group at Stony Brook, where this work was carried out, for the hospitality extended to us. Financial support from the Volkswagen-Stiftung is gratefully acknowledged.

## References

- [1] M. Engelhardt and B. Schreiber, *Z. Phys.* **A351** (1995) 71.
- [2] D. Stoll, S. Takeuchi, and K. Yazaki, *Phys. Lett.* **B338** (1994) 313.
- [3] F. Lenz, M. Thies, S. Levit, and K. Yazaki, *Ann. Phys.* **208** (1991) 1.
- [4] F. Lenz, H.W.L. Naus, and M. Thies, *Ann. Phys.* **233** (1994) 317.
- [5] F. Cooper, A. Khare, and U. Sukhatme, *Phys. Rep.* **251** (1995) 267.
- [6] G. Junker, *Supersymmetric Methods in Quantum and Statistical Physics* (Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1996).
- [7] G. Pöschl and E. Teller, *Z. Physik* **83** (1933) 143.
- [8] F. Lenz, M. Shifman, and M. Thies, *Phys. Rev.* **D51** (1995) 7060.