

Exactly integrable family of generalized Hubbard models with twisted Yangian symmetry

Anjan Kundu*

Theory Division, Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, 1/AF Bidhan Nagar,
700 064 Calcutta, India.

August 13, 2018

Abstract

A strongly correlated electron system with controlled hopping, in the line of the recently proposed generalized Hubbard models as candidates for high T_c -superconductors, is considered. The model along with a whole class of such systems are shown to be completely integrable with explicit quantum R -matrices and the Lax operators. In spite of novelties in the Bethe ansatz solution, the final results do not deviate much from those of the standard Hubbard model. However, the symmetry of the model is changed to a recently discovered twisted Yangian symmetry.

PACS numbers: 04.20.Jb, 03.65.Fd, 71.10.Pm, 75.10.Jm

Key words: Quantum integrability, Bethe ansatz, Generalized Hubbard model with correlated hopping, twisted Yangian symmetry

Subject Classification: Nonlinear Systems

*e-mail: anjan@tnp.saha.ernet.in

Some unusual but universal behavior of interacting fermion systems, especially in two dimensions, named as the Luttinger liquid theory was speculated to be the basis for the high T_c -superconductivity [1, 2]. Most significant among such properties is the separation of charge and spin degrees of freedom. Thus the charges of electrons are given to the pseudoparticle modes holons and anti-holons with charges but without spins, while the spins are given to the spinons with spins but without any charge. These are many-body collective modes with strong nonperturbative nature and unlike the quasiparticles of usual Fermi liquid which in the limit of vanishing interactions map into free electrons, they can not exist without many-body interactions. Such characteristic behavior of Luttinger liquid however is more common in one dimension and can be observed explicitly in Bethe ansatz solvable correlated electron models like Hubbard model [3, 4]. Due to this fact the investigation of correlated electron systems in one-dimension has become immensely important [3, 4, 5, 6].

Though the study of the standard Hubbard model itself was identified to be promising [7], more general models including higher nonlinear interactions with correlated hopping are being proposed [8, 9, 10] for better description of the cuprate superconductors. Though ignoring certain terms and restricting coupling parameters, some exact results were obtained in [9] and [10], such generalized Hubbard models are not Bethe ansatz solvable and clearly do not show complete integrability in one dimension.

Our aim is to propose a related though different strongly correlated electron model given by the Hamiltonian

$$H_\eta = - \sum_{j,\sigma} c_{j(-\sigma)}^\dagger c_{j+1(-\sigma)} \{ t_{AA} + (t_{AB}^\sigma - t_{AA})(n_{j(\sigma)} + n_{j+1(\sigma)}) + (t_{AA} + t_{BB}^\sigma - 2t_{AB}^\sigma)n_{j(\sigma)}n_{j+1(\sigma)} \} + U \sum_j n_{i(+)}n_{i(-)} + \text{h.c.}, \quad (1)$$

where $c_{j(\sigma)}^\dagger (c_{j(\sigma)})$ is the creation (annihilation) operator for an electron with spin $\sigma = \pm$ at site j and $n_{j(\sigma)} = c_{j(\sigma)}^\dagger c_{j(\sigma)}$ is the number operator at site j with N_a being the total number of sites. The coupling constants are taken as $t_{BB}^\pm = (t_{AB}^\pm)^2 = e^{\pm i2\eta}$ and scaled by putting $t_{AA} = 1$, where the real parameters η and U are kept arbitrary. Notice that apart from the standard Hubbard interaction represented by the double occupancy term $H_U = U \sum_j n_{j(+)}n_{j(-)}$ and the free hopping, the model (1) contains additional interacting terms influencing hopping. These are the Hirsch-like interaction [8] given by the second term and higher nonlinear interaction involving different sites given by the third term. In particular, the hopping of up (down) spin electron is controlled by the presence of down (up) spin electron at the same or at neighboring sites. Moreover, since the coupling constants are different for up and down spins as well as for left and right hoppings, their hopping rates might be different. It may be mentioned that the model proposed in [10] is of the form (1) with coupling constants independent of spins: $t_{AB}^\sigma = t_{AB}$, $t_{BB}^\sigma = t_{BB}$.

We show that, as opposed to the model of [10] the generalized Hubbard model (1) is exactly solvable by the Bethe ansatz with unusual features. Moreover, the corresponding Bethe ansatz results do not deviate much from those of the standard Hubbard model and proceeding

analogously one can expect to find similar Luttinger liquid like behavior. However, the present model exhibits a new type of symmetry discovered very recently, namely the twisted Yangian symmetry at the infinite chain limit. Furthermore, along with a whole class it belong to the completely integrable quantum systems with sufficient number of independent conservation laws. The associated R -matrix and the Lax operators satisfying the quantum Yang-Baxter equation can be extracted in the explicit form, which are found to be intimately related with those of the Hubbard model.

Using the fermionic property $(n_{j(\pm)})^2 = n_{j(\pm)}$, it is convenient to rewrite Hamiltonian (1) with our choice of parameters in the form

$$H_\eta = - \sum_j c_{j+1(+)}^\dagger c_{j(+)} e^{i\eta[n_{j(-)} + n_{j+1(-)}]} + c_{j+1(-)}^\dagger c_{j(-)} e^{-i\eta[n_{j(+)} + n_{j+1(+)}]} + U n_{j(+)} n_{j(-)} + \text{h.c.} \quad (2)$$

We show below that the eigenvalue problem of the model can be solved exactly by using the coordinate formulation of the Bethe ansatz. Though this method proposed first by Bethe [11] has been applied since to a number of models and by now has become almost an algorithmized problem, the present model shows surprises in its Bethe ansatz solution.

This subtle feature is manifested already in the simple two-particle case, if we consider the wave function involving one up and one down-spin electrons created respectively at the sites x_1 and x_2 . We have to distinguish naturally between the state $\psi^{(+)}(x_1, x_2)$ in the sector $x_1 < x_2$, i.e when the up-spin is created left to the down-spin and the state $\psi^{(-)}(x_1, x_2)$ in $x_1 > x_2$ with the up-spin to the right of the down-spin. Since the interactions are short-ranged appearing only for the opposite spins occupying the same or the nearest-neighbor sites, all interactions naturally vanish when spins are placed well apart.

Therefore for x_1, x_2 far apart the wave functions $\psi^{(\pm)}(x_1, x_2)$ should satisfy the free discrete Schrödinger equation

$$\begin{aligned} \psi^{(\pm)}(x_1 - 1, x_2) + \psi^{(\pm)}(x_1 + 1, x_2) &+ \psi^{(\pm)}(x_1, x_2 - 1) + \psi^{(\pm)}(x_1, x_2 + 1) \\ &= -E\psi^{(\pm)}(x_1, x_2). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

On the other hand for the nearest neighbor occupation of the opposite spins the interactions of the hopping terms come into play, resulting for $x_2 = x_1 + 1, x_1 = x$, the Schrödinger equation

$$\begin{aligned} \psi^{(+)}(x - 1, x + 1) + \psi^{(+)}(x + 1, x + 1)e^{-i\eta} &+ \psi^{(+)}(x, x)e^{-i\eta} + \psi^{(+)}(x, x + 2) \\ &= -E\psi^{(+)}(x, x + 1). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

and similarly for $x_2 = x_1 - 1, x_1 = x$, related to $\psi^{(-)}$. Now as the Bethe ansatz demands, the same solution $\psi^{(+)}$ must hold for both these equations, i.e. eqn. (3) at the limit $x_2 \rightarrow x_1 + 1$ should formally coincide with (4). This leads to the unexpected result

$$\psi^{(+)}(x_1, x_2) |_{x_1 \rightarrow x_2} = e^{-i\eta} \psi(x_2, x_2), \quad \text{and similarly} \quad \psi^{(-)}(x_1, x_2) |_{x_1 \rightarrow x_2} = e^{i\eta} \psi(x_2, x_2), \quad (5)$$

where $\psi(x, x) \equiv \psi^{(+)}(x, x) = \psi^{(-)}(x, x)$ at the coinciding points. This unusual *anyonic* type feature introduced through coupling constant η can be understood also at the operator level, as will be demonstrated below.

We notice further that at $x_2 = x_1 = x$ both interactions involving hopping terms with parameter η as well as the Coulomb term with coefficient U become active resulting the Schrödinger equation

$$\begin{aligned} \psi^{(+)}(x-1, x)e^{i\eta} + \psi^{(-)}(x+1, x)e^{-i\eta} + \psi^{(+)}(x, x-1)e^{-i\eta} + \psi^{(+)}(x, x+1)e^{i\eta} \\ + U\psi(x, x) = -E\psi(x, x). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Demanding again that (3) should be compatible with (6) when $x_1 \rightarrow x_2$ and using the relations (5) at the coinciding points we arrive at the consistency condition

$$\begin{aligned} \psi^{(+)}(x+1, x) - \psi^{(-)}(x+1, x)e^{-2i\eta} + \psi^{(+)}(x, x-1) - \psi^{(-)}(x, x-1)e^{-2i\eta} \\ - U\psi^{(+)}(x_1, x_2) |_{x_1 \rightarrow x_2 = x} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Defining now the wave functions in the standard Bethe ansatz form

$$\psi^{(\pm)}(x_1, x_2) = A_{p_1 p_2}^{\pm} e^{i(p_1 x_1 + p_2 x_2)} - A_{p_2 p_1}^{\pm} e^{i(p_2 x_1 + p_1 x_2)}, \quad (8)$$

which is valid basically in the sectors $x_1 \neq x_2$, one can easily calculate the energy eigenvalue from (3) as $E = -2(\cos p_1 + \cos p_2)$. To evaluate (8) at the coinciding points, one has to consider (5) yielding $\psi^{(+)}(x_1, x_2) |_{x_1 \rightarrow x_2} = e^{-2i\eta} \psi^{(-)}(x_1, x_2) |_{x_1 \rightarrow x_2}$, which in turn leads to the nonstandard relation

$$A_{p_1 p_2}^{+-} - A_{p_2 p_1}^{+-} = e^{-2i\eta} (A_{p_1 p_2}^{-+} - A_{p_2 p_1}^{-+}). \quad (9)$$

Inserting ansatz (8) in the consistency condition (7) and using relation (9) one gets finally the two-particle scattering matrix

$$S(\lambda_1^0 - \lambda_2^0) = \frac{(\lambda_1^0 - \lambda_2^0)\Sigma + i\frac{U}{2}\hat{P}}{\lambda_1^0 - \lambda_2^0 + i\frac{U}{2}} \quad (10)$$

defined as $A_{p_2 p_1}^{ab} = \sum_{cd} S(\lambda_1^0 - \lambda_2^0)_{cd}^{ba} A_{p_1 p_2}^{cd}$, where the obvious relations like $A_{p_2 p_1}^{\pm\pm} = A_{p_1 p_2}^{\pm\pm}$ are imposed. Here $\lambda_i^0 = \sin p_i$, $\hat{P} = \frac{1}{2}(I + \vec{\sigma} \otimes \vec{\sigma})$ is the permutation operator and

$$\Sigma = \text{diag}(1, e^{2i\eta}, e^{-2i\eta}, 1). \quad (11)$$

It is crucial to note that the S -matrix (10) satisfies the well known Yang-Baxter equation [16]

$$S_{12}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)S_{13}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3)S_{23}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3) = S_{23}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)S_{13}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3)S_{12}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2), \quad (12)$$

representing the factorizability condition for the many-particle scattering into the two-particle ones. This enables us to solve the general N -body problem through the Bethe ansatz, when the state corresponds to the presence of total N number of electrons with M down-spin electrons. Each particle scattering through the rest and returning to its original position would generate a string of S -matrices (10) in the factorized form. On the other hand, for a closed chain with

the periodic boundary condition this would be equivalent to the shift operator over the total number of lattice sites N_a . Diagonalizing this relation, as seen from (10) one gets

$$e^{ip_j N_a} = e^{-i2\eta M} \prod_{\alpha=1}^M \frac{\lambda_\alpha - \lambda_j^0 + i\frac{U}{2}}{\lambda_\alpha - \lambda_j^0}, \quad (13)$$

along with the relations

$$e^{-i2\eta N} \prod_{j=1}^N \frac{\lambda_\alpha - \lambda_j^0 + i\frac{U}{2}}{\lambda_\alpha - \lambda_j^0} = \prod_{\beta=1}^M \frac{\lambda_\alpha - \lambda_\beta + i\frac{U}{2}}{\lambda_\alpha - \lambda_\beta - i\frac{U}{2}}. \quad (14)$$

Taking logarithm of these Bethe equations we get

$$\begin{aligned} p_j N_a &= 2\pi I_j + 2 \sum_{\alpha=1}^M \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{4}{U}(\lambda_\alpha - \sin p_j)\right) - 2\eta M \\ 2 \sum_{j=1}^N \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{4}{U}(\lambda_\alpha - \sin p_j)\right) &= 2\pi J_\alpha + 2 \sum_{\beta=1}^M \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{2}{U}(\lambda_\alpha - \lambda_\beta)\right) + 2\eta N \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where I_j, J_α are integers or half odd integers.

We define charge and spin rapidities as $p_j(q_j), j = 1, 2, \dots, N$ and $\lambda_\alpha(\rho_\alpha), \alpha = 1, 2, \dots, M$, respectively, where $q_j = \frac{2\pi}{N_a} I_j$ and $\rho_\alpha = \frac{2\pi}{N_a} J_\alpha$ are given through two independent sets of quantum numbers I_j and J_α . Comparing (15) with the Bethe ansatz results of the Hubbard model [12] we may conclude that, though due to the inclusion of various interacting terms influencing hopping our generalization differs considerably from the standard Hubbard model, the final Bethe ansatz results do not show significant changes. Nevertheless, though the energy eigenvalue is obtained in the same form, the determining equations for $p(q)$ and $\lambda(\rho)$ are modified due to the appearance of additional phases involving coupling constant η and particle numbers N and M . Going to the thermodynamic limit, analogous to the Hubbard model [3, 4, 13], one expects to show that all low lying excitation modes of the system are expressed through the decoupled charge and spin degrees of freedom.

Interestingly, for our choice of the coupling constants, the model (1) not only becomes Bethe ansatz solvable, as we have seen above, but also turns out to be a completely integrable quantum system with higher conservation laws like the original Hubbard model [15]. The $R^{\text{Hub}}(\lambda, \mu)$ -matrix and the Lax operator $L^{\text{Hub}}(\lambda)$ of the Hubbard model as a solution of the quantum Yang-Baxter equation [16]

$$R_{12}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) L_{1j}(\lambda_1) L_{2j}(\lambda_2) = L_{2j}(\lambda_2) L_{1j}(\lambda_1) R_{12}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \quad (16)$$

were given in a convenient form in [17] as

$$L_{aj}^{\text{Hub}}(\lambda_a) = (L_{aj}^{\sigma(+)}(\lambda_a) \otimes L_{aj}^{\sigma(-)}(\lambda_a)) \exp(h_a \sigma_{(+a)}^3 \sigma_{(-a)}^3) \quad (17)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} R_{12}^{\text{Hub}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) &= [\cos \tilde{\theta}_{12} \cosh h_{12} (L_{12}^{\sigma(+)}(\theta_{12}) \otimes L_{12}^{\sigma(-)}(\theta_{12})) \\ &\quad + \cos \theta_{12} \sinh h_{12} (L_{12}^{\sigma(+)}(\tilde{\theta}_{12}) \otimes L_{12}^{\sigma(-)}(\tilde{\theta}_{12})) (\sigma_{(+1)}^3 \sigma_{(-2)}^3)] \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where $L^{\sigma(\pm)}$ correspond to the 6-vertex free-fermionic model, $h_{12} = h_1 - h_2$ and $\theta_{12} = \lambda_1 - \lambda_2$, $\tilde{\theta}_{12} = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2$ represent the dependence on the difference and the sum of the spectral parameters. The Pauli matrices $\sigma_{(\pm)}$ correspond to the spin up/down fermion operators $c_{(\pm)}$ and the parameters h_a are defined as $\sinh 2h_a = \frac{U}{4} \sin 2\lambda_a$ [17]. The Lax-operator and the R -matrix for the present model are linked intimately with those of the Hubbard model and can be obtained easily from (17) and (18) through twisting transformation:

$$R_{12}(\eta, \lambda_1, \lambda_2) = F_{12}(\eta) R_{12}^{\text{Hub}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) F_{12}(\eta); \quad L_{aj}(\eta, \lambda_1) = F_{aj}(\eta) L_{aj}^{\text{Hub}}(\lambda) F_{aj}(\eta), \quad (19)$$

where the twist operator is given by

$$F_{aj}(\eta) = e^{i\eta(\sigma_{(-)a}^3 \sigma_{(+)j}^3 - \sigma_{(+)a}^3 \sigma_{(-)j}^3)}. \quad (20)$$

Recall that the twisting transformation [14] generates new R -matrix and L -operator solutions exploiting a nontrivial symmetry of the Yang-Baxter equation.

Another important issue is to study the effect of the additional terms is changing the symmetry of this model. It is well known that the Hubbard model exhibits a Yangian symmetry in the infinite chain limit [18, 19]. It is therefore intriguing to ask whether the present generalization destroys the original symmetry completely or deforms it to another one. The origin of the Yangian symmetry in the Hubbard model is the rational R -matrix of the XXX spin chain embedded in it, which gets associated with the algebra of the monodromy matrix at the infinite interval [19]. The corresponding rational R -matrix here is its twisted version (10), which gives the present model a new type of twisted Yangian symmetry, discovered recently [20, 21]. The expansion of the monodromy matrix: $T^{\alpha\beta} = \tau^{\alpha\alpha} \delta_{\alpha\beta} + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\tilde{t}_{(n)}^{\alpha\beta}}{\lambda^{n+1}}$, $\alpha, \beta = 1, 2$ yields generators $\tau^{\alpha\alpha}, \tilde{t}_n^{\alpha\beta}$ of the infinite dimensional twisted Yangian algebra $Y_\eta(gl_2)$, defining relations of which are given in explicit form in [20]. We can find a realization of this algebra through the fermionic operators by expressing first the generators as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{t}_{(n)}^{\alpha\beta} &= \sum_j \tau_{j-}^{\alpha\alpha} (\tau_j^{\alpha\alpha})^{\frac{1}{2}} t_{j(n)}^{\alpha\beta} (\tau_j^{\beta\beta})^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau_{j+}^{\beta\beta}, \quad \text{for } \alpha \neq \beta, \\ \tilde{t}_{(n)}^{\alpha\alpha} &= \tau^{\alpha\alpha} t_n^{\alpha\alpha}(n) \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

with the notations $\tau_{j\pm}^{\alpha\alpha} \equiv \prod_{k>j(k<j)} \tau_k^{\alpha\alpha}$, and $\tau^{\alpha\alpha} = \prod_k \tau_k^{\alpha\alpha}$. Note that for $\tau_k^{\alpha\alpha} = 1$ the expressions (21) reduce to the undeformed $Y(sl_2)$ Yangian generators $t_{(n)}^{\alpha\beta} = \sum_j t_{j(n)}^{\alpha\beta}$. Therefore using the well known Yangian representation for the Hubbard model [18] involving $c_{j(\pm)}^\dagger, c_{j(\pm)}$ and $n_{j(\pm)} = c_{j(\pm)}^\dagger c_{j(\pm)}$, along with additional expressions

$$\tau_j^{11} = e^{2i\eta n_{j(-)}}, \quad \tau_j^{22} = e^{-2i\eta n_{j(+)}} , \quad \text{and } t_{j(0)}^{11} = n_{j(-)}, \quad t_{j(0)}^{22} = n_{j(+)}, \quad (22)$$

we can obtain an exact representation of the twisted Yangian in fermion operators. In the line of [18], it can be shown now by direct check that the Hamiltonian (2) for infinite chain commutes with the generators of this twisted algebra along with a complementary set of such generators obtained by replacing

$$c_{j(-)} \rightarrow c_{j(-)} e^{-2i\eta j}, \quad c_{j(+)} \rightarrow (-1)^j c_{j(+)}^\dagger, \quad \text{with } U \rightarrow -U, \quad \eta \rightarrow -\eta, \quad (23)$$

since under (23) the Hamiltonian remains invariant. This proves a novel twisted $Y_\eta(gl_2) \oplus Y_{-\eta}(gl_2)$ Yangian symmetry for our generalized Hubbard model H_η (2) at the infinite chain limit. It is easy to check that at $\eta = 0$ one recovers the result related to the standard Hubbard model [18].

Finally we mention about a possibility of extending the present model to an one-parameter family of integrable models by introducing an additional coupling constant g in the form

$$H_{\eta g} = - \sum_j (c_{j+1(+)}^\dagger c_{j(+)} e^{i[(\eta-g)n_{j(-)} + (\eta+g)n_{j+1(-)}]} + c_{j+1(-)}^\dagger c_{j(-)} e^{-i[(\eta+g)n_{j(+)} + (\eta-g)n_{j+1(+)}]}) + Un_{j(+)}n_{j(-)} + \text{h.c.}, \quad (24)$$

which reduces to H_η (2) at $g = 0$ and generates at $g = \pm\eta$ new type of models like

$$H_{\eta\pm} = - \sum_j c_{j+1(+)}^\dagger c_{j(+)} e^{i2\eta n_{j+1(-)}} + c_{j+1(-)}^\dagger c_{j(-)} e^{-i2\eta n_{j(+)}} + Un_{j(+)}n_{j(-)} + \text{h.c.} \quad (25)$$

Note that these models are different from those proposed in [6] or [27]. Remarkably, though the coupling constants in (24) are given as combinations of $\eta \pm g$, the eigenvalues as well as the scattering matrix remain independent of the parameter g . This family of models producing the same Bethe ansatz results and sharing the same symmetry can be represented by the R -matrices and the Lax operators, which may be obtained from those with $g = 0$ through a simple gauge transformation

$$R_{12}(\eta, g, \lambda_1, \lambda_2) = A_{12}(g)R_{12}(\eta, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)A_{12}^{-1}(g); \quad L_{aj}(\eta, g, \lambda_1) = A_{aj}(g)L_{aj}(\eta, \lambda)A_{aj}^{-1}(g) \quad (26)$$

as an operator dependent similarity transformation through $A_{aj}(g) = e^{ig(\sigma_{(-)a}^3 \sigma_{(+)a}^3 + \sigma_{(+)j}^3 \sigma_{(-)j}^3)}$.

The present study of the generalized Hubbard model shows that additional terms influencing hopping with resemblance to the recently proposed models for high T_c superconductors, may be introduced retaining its integrability in one dimension with nearest-neighbor interactions. Moreover, for a change in operators as

$$c_{j(\pm)}^\dagger \rightarrow \tilde{c}_{j(\pm)}^\dagger = e^{\pm i\eta n_{j(\mp)}} c_{j(\pm)}^\dagger, \quad c_{j(\pm)} \rightarrow \tilde{c}_{j(\pm)} = e^{\pm i\eta n_{j(\mp)}} c_{j(\pm)}, \quad (27)$$

the generalized model (2) can be transformed back to the original form of the Hubbard model. However the resultant operators would show not free fermionic but anyonic type of commutation relations

$$\tilde{c}_{j(+)}^\dagger \tilde{c}_{j(-)}^\dagger + e^{2i\eta} \tilde{c}_{j(-)}^\dagger \tilde{c}_{j(+)}^\dagger = 0, \quad \{\tilde{c}_{j(\pm)}^\dagger, \tilde{c}_{j(\pm)}\} = e^{\pm 2i\eta n_{j(\mp)}} \quad (28)$$

etc. We have witnessed the reflection of this intriguing feature in the Bethe ansatz procedure with the wave functions suffering phase jumps at the boundaries of two different sectors. Usually in the Bethe ansatz, the matching of the wave functions at the boundaries is assumed. However, the present model suggests for a more careful comparison with the consideration of their phase factors.

In spite of many nontrivialities involved in the generalized model, the final Bethe ansatz results are not much different from the original Hubbard model, apart from a symmetry change and modification in the Bethe equations. This effect is like putting the corresponding vertex model in vertical and horizontal electric fields, which spoils the invariance of the Boltzmann weights under inversion of all arrows, as happens in the asymmetric 6-vertex model [22] or the Dzyaloshinsky-Moriya interaction [23]. Only in the present model the fields are not external but caused by the interaction of different kinds of bonds. The original Yangian symmetry of the Hubbard model is deformed to the twisted Yangian symmetry, while the quantum R -matrix, Lax operators etc. are related through twisting transformation.

Nevertheless, like the twisted Heisenberg spin chain [25] or the Hubbard model with Ahronov-Bhohm period [27] such interactions, as shown in a recent work [26], can also be absorbed in the boundary conditions, though in a more involved way. This also makes the investigation of some important problems, like the influence on the effective period [27], changes in the finite temperature behavior [24] and related conformal properties [28, 29, 30] and also the modification of correlation functions worth studying. Similar idea can also be used for generating integrable coupled anisotropic spin chains [31]. Following a different approach an integrable coupled spin chain and a quasi two dimensional extension of the Hubbard model had been obtained in some earlier works [32, 33].

The author thanks Dr. Indrani Bose for valuable discussions and the referee for his constructive comments.

References

- [1] Haldane, J. Phys. C 14 (1981) 2535
- [2] P. W. Anderson and Z. Zhan, Phys. Rev. B 37 (1988) 627
P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 64 (1990) 1839
P. W. Anderson, *The theory of superconductivity in the high T_c cuprates*, (Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 1997)
- [3] J. Carmelo and A. Ovchinnikov, J. Phys. C3 (1991) 757
J. Carmelo, P. Horsch, P. A. Bares and A. Ovchinnikov, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B 5 (1991) 3
- [4] H. Frahm and V. E. Korepin, Phys. Rev. B 42 (1990) 10553; *ibid*, Phys. Rev. B 43 (1991) 5653
F. H. L. Essler and V. E. Korepin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72 (1994) 908; *ibid*, Nucl. Phys. B 426 (1994) 505
- [5] G. Albertini, V. E. Korepin and A. Schadschneider, J. Phys. A 28 (1995) L303
- [6] R. Z. Bariev, J. Phys. A24 (1991) L549
R. Z. Bariev, A. Klümper, A. Schadschneider and J. Zittartz, Phys. Rev. B 50 (1994) 9676
- [7] P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 64 (1990) 1839
- [8] J. Hirsch, Phys. Lett. A 134 (1989) 451;
J. Hirsch, Physica 158C (1989) 326
- [9] R. Strack and D. Vollhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70 (1993) 2637
A. A. Ovchinnikov, Mod. Phys. Lett. 7 (1993) 1397
- [10] L. Arrachea and Aligia, Phys. Rev. Lett. 73 (1994) 2240
- [11] H. Bethe, Z. Phys. 71 (1931) 205
- [12] E. H. Lieb and F. Y. Wu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 20 (1968) 1445
- [13] C. F. Coll, Phys. Rev. B 9 (1974) 2150
- [14] M. Wadati, T. Deguchi and Y. Akutsu, Phys. Report, 180 (1989) 247
N. Reshetikhin, Lett. Math. Phys. 20 (1990) 331
- [15] B. S. Shastry, Phys. Rev. Lett. 56 (1986) 2453; J. Stat. Phys. 50 (1988) 57
E. Olmedilla and M. Wadati, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60 (1988) 1595

- [16] H. J. de Vega , Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 4 (1989) 2371
- [17] M. Shiroishi and M. Wadati, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 64 (1995) 57
- [18] D. B. Uglov and V. E. Korepin, Phys. Lett. A190 (1994) 238
- [19] S. Murakami and F. Göhmann, Phys. Lett. A 227 (1997) 216
F. Göhmann and V. Inozemtsev, Phys. Lett. A 214 (1996) 161
- [20] B. Basumallick and P. Ramadevi, Phys. Lett. A 211 (1996) 339
- [21] A. Stolin and P. Kulish, *New rational solution of Yang-Baxter equation and deformed Yangians* q-alg/9608011
- [22] B. Sutherland, C. N. Yang and C. P. Yang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 19 (1967) 588
- [23] F. C. Alcaraz and W. F. Wreszinski, J. Stat. Phys. 58 (1990) 45
- [24] J. Suzuki, Y. Akutsu and M. Wadati, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn 59 (1990) 2667
A. Klümper and R. Z. Bariev, Nucl. Phys. B 458 [FS] (1996) 623
- [25] S. Shastry and B. Sutherland, Phys. Rev. Lett., 65 (1990) 243;
B. Sutherland, Phys. Rev. Lett., 74 (1995) 816
- [26] H. J. Schulz and B. S. Shastry, Phys. Rev. Lett, 80 (1998) 1924
- [27] K. Kusakabe, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn., 66 (1997) 2075
- [28] F. Woynarovich, J. Phys. A 22 (1989) 4243:
C. Destri and H. J. de Vega, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69 (1992) 2313
- [29] A Klümper, M. T. Batchelor and P. A. Pearce, J. Phys. A 24 (1991) 3111
- [30] M. Karowski, Nucl. Phys. B300 [FS22] (1988) 473
- [31] Anjan Kundu, *Quantum integrable systems: construction, solution, algebraic aspect*, hep-th/9612046
- [32] A. E. Borovik, S. I. kulinich, V. Yu. Popkov and Yu. M. Strzhemechny, Phys. Lett. A 174 (1993) 407
- [33] A. A. Zvyagin, Sov, J. Low Temp. Phys. 18 (1992) 723