

Incompleteness of Representation Theory: Hidden symmetries and Quantum Non-Integrability

Dimitri Kusnezov *

Center for Theoretical Physics, Sloane Physics Laboratory, Yale University, New Haven, CT 06520-8120

(December 12, 1996)

Representation theory is shown to be incomplete in terms of enumerating all integrable limits of quantum systems. As a consequence, one can find exactly solvable Hamiltonians which have *apparently* strongly broken symmetry. The number of these hidden symmetries depends upon the realization of the Hamiltonian.

PACS numbers: 05.45.+b, 02.20.-a, 21.60.Fw, 03.65.-w

When regular regions are discovered in the parameter space of a system, where the parameter might be an external field applied to the Hydrogen atom, it usually indicates the existence of new (approximate) integrals of motion, and consequently quantum numbers [1]. In studies of many-body systems, the large number of degrees of freedom generally precludes one from using methods introduced in simpler one and two dimensional problems. However, one often starts with a group theoretical formalism, and while classical analyses stop being practical, group theory can readily identify exactly solvable limits of such systems, and correspondingly, quantum numbers. These exactly solvable limits are referred to as dynamical symmetries since they arise from the nature of the interactions. It has long been assumed that there is a precise relation between the exactly solvable limits or integrability of Hamiltonians based on some Lie algebra \mathcal{G} [2], and the dynamical symmetries obtained from representation theory [3]. Indeed there is now a large literature on studies relating classical chaos to breaking of dynamical symmetries, its consequences in random matrix theory, as well as relations to exactly solvable systems [4]. It is interesting to consider now, whether group theory as it stands actually identifies all integrable limits, or whether there are hidden symmetries lingering in the parameter space of interactions.

A common starting point of group theoretical analyses is the identification of a dynamical algebra \mathcal{G} for a given quantum system. There is such an algebra when a Hamiltonian H can be expressed in terms of the generators of \mathcal{G} . (For this study, we will focus on models based on real forms of simple and semi-simple classical Lie algebras, denoted by \mathcal{G} .) The next step is to use the techniques of representation theory to identify all subalgebra embeddings, or group chains, consistent with the problem at hand. If there are n such group chains, one arrives at a decomposition of the form:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & \mathcal{G}_{11} & \supset & \mathcal{G}_{12} & \supset & \cdots \\ \mathcal{G} & \supset & & & \vdots & & \\ & & \mathcal{G}_{n1} & \supset & \mathcal{G}_{n2} & \supset & \cdots \end{array} \quad (1)$$

Associated with each of the algebras are Casimir invariants $C(\mathcal{G}_{kl})$. All the invariants along a particular group chain (row) are in involution, and these form (together with invariants associated with missing labels) a complete set of constants of the motion. When the Hamiltonian can be expressed in terms of the invariants along a single chain, then the system is said to have a dynamical symmetry, and the problem is exactly solvable. Generally, it is found that the linear and quadratic Casimir invariants from all the limits in (1) provide a complete basis for a Hamiltonian written in terms of one and two body interactions. These arguments, and the studies up to now, have hinged on the belief that the group chains obtained from representation theory uniquely enumerate all exactly solvable forms of the Hamiltonian. We will see that a revision of this assertion is necessary.

Each of the dynamical symmetry limits characterized in Eq. (1) can be obtained from Dynkin's theory of the embedding of subalgebras [5]. However, they are only defined up to inner automorphisms. That is to say, each embedded subalgebra is only a representative element of an equivalence class of subalgebras, each with the same set of induced quantum numbers. We will show here that while representation theory does provide all of the embeddings, it does not provide all the dynamical symmetries. The inner automorphisms, which are neglected, can provide 'hidden' symmetries. One can have Hamiltonians which are linear combinations of invariants from several or even all of the different group chains in (1), which nevertheless is still exactly solvable. In this sense, *representation theory is incomplete in terms of defining all dynamical symmetries of a system*. Specific examples will be shown for Hamiltonians which would be argued to be non-integrable, but which in fact are exactly solvable (or equivalently, integrable). In general, the number of dynamical symmetries can be richer than previously thought.

Consider a Hamiltonian H which can be written in terms of generators of a Lie algebra \mathcal{G} . We consider first the *automorphisms* of the algebra \mathcal{G} . These are one-to-one mappings \mathcal{T} of the generators onto themselves, which naturally preserves the commutation relations: $\mathcal{T} : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$. There are many well known automorphisms, such as the elements of the Weyl group \mathcal{W} ,

which generate rotations in the root space of the algebra, or the complex conjugation operation, which transforms generators X_k to $-X_k^*$, generating the contragredient representations. Non-trivial automorphisms can be readily identified from the symmetries of the Dynkin diagrams [5]. Of the various automorphisms, only a certain class of seemingly irrelevant ones are important here.

Let \mathfrak{g} be the Lie group associated with the Lie algebra \mathcal{G} of a Hamiltonian H . There are two classes of automorphisms of \mathcal{G} : inner and outer. The inner automorphisms are transformations of the elements of \mathcal{G} generated by a fixed member g of the group \mathfrak{g} . They are of the form:

$$X \rightarrow gXg^{-1}, \quad \text{all } X \in \mathcal{G}, \quad (2)$$

where $g \in \mathfrak{g}$ is held fixed and all generators X are transformed. Outer automorphisms are by definition all automorphisms not of this type. Consequently, embeddings of subalgebras $\mathcal{G}' \subset \mathcal{G}$ fall into two categories: those considered equivalent (or conjugate) and those considered inequivalent (or non-conjugate). Two embeddings of $\mathcal{G}' \subset \mathcal{G}$ are said to be conjugate if they are related to each other through an inner automorphism of \mathcal{G} . Otherwise the embeddings are non-conjugate, and are related by outer automorphisms of \mathcal{G} . Non-conjugate embeddings are important because the embeddings are distinct (and consequently the quantum numbers associated with the subalgebra as well), and they are (essentially) all identified from Dynkin's theory for the classification of subalgebras [5]. What is not classified are the inner automorphisms. The equivalence class of conjugate embeddings are generally neglected, since there are an infinite number of these and any member of this class provides an equivalent result from the point of view of representation theory: the embeddings generated are isomorphic, and the induced representations are identical. Interestingly, this is not the case when one considers dynamical symmetries of the Hamiltonian.

To understand the origins of these conjugate embeddings, it is convenient (and still completely general) to consider bosonic or fermionic realizations of \mathcal{G} . We will use bosons, although all our results hold equally well for fermions. Denoting the boson creation and annihilation operators as $b_{\ell\mu}^\dagger$, $b_{\ell\mu}$, the generators of a Lie algebra can be expressed in terms of bilinears $b_{\ell,\mu}^\dagger b_{\ell',\mu'}$. The boson carries angular momentum ℓ and projection μ , where $\mu = -\ell, \dots, \ell$, which allows for the construction of scalar, Hermitian Hamiltonians. (This implicitly requires the explicit construction of the $O(3)$ algebra, which then appears in all the chains in Eq. (1).) The inner automorphisms we explore are generated by gauge rotations of one type of boson with respect to the others. In order to preserve their spherical tensor character, one must transform all components of the boson simultaneously: $b_{\ell,\mu} \rightarrow e^{i\phi_\ell} b_{\ell,\mu}$. However, each type of boson can be separately transformed. In the phase space representation

of the boson operators, $b_{\ell,\mu} = (q_{\ell,\mu} + ip_{\ell,\mu})/\sqrt{2}$, this can be viewed as inducing certain canonical transformations. The effect of some of these transformations will be to generate new families of exactly solvable Hamiltonians. This type of automorphism will not effect the R-subalgebras (in the language of Dynkin [5]) such as $U(n) \supset U(n-1)$, $O(n) \supset O(n-1)$ and $Sp(2n) \supset Sp(2(n-1))$, but can appear only for the S-subalgebras $\mathcal{G}' \subset \mathcal{G}$, such as $U(n) \supset O(n)$, and so forth. The main distinction is that S-subalgebra embeddings are formed from linear combinations of generators of \mathcal{G} where as R-subalgebras are not. Another way to view the conjugate embeddings is in the Cartan-Weyl basis $\{h_i, e_\alpha\}$. For a given root β , if we perform the trivial rescaling $e_\beta \rightarrow \mu e_\beta$, $e_{-\beta} \rightarrow \mu^{-1} e_{-\beta}$, with $|\mu| = 1$, then the commutation relations of \mathcal{G} are preserved, including those of the embedded subalgebra \mathcal{G}' . (This acts as the identity operation in the Weyl group.) However, this inner automorphism is precisely the gauge rotation discussed above. The effect is to take generators of a subalgebra which are linear combinations of the generators of \mathcal{G} , and alter their form, by changing the relative phases. It is for this reason that only S-subalgebras are effected. As a consequence the new generators of \mathcal{G}' do not commute with the old ones. Because we often have additional physical requirements on the Hamiltonian, not all of these automorphisms are allowed (e.g. the $O(3)$ generators must remain invariant, since physical angular momentum should not be changed). Thus necessary (albeit not sufficient) conditions for the existence of conjugate subalgebras which results in new dynamical symmetry limits are (i) \mathcal{G} must be generated by at least two types of bosons (or fermions) and (ii) \mathcal{G}' must be an S-subalgebra.

To exemplify this, consider two models. The first is the Vibron model [3], which is based on $\mathcal{G} = U(4)$ and describes collective excitations in molecules. The basic ingredients are the scalar, σ^\dagger ($\ell^\pi = 0^+$), and vector π_μ^\dagger ($\ell^\pi = 1^-, \mu = 0, \pm 1$) boson creation operators, and the corresponding annihilation operators σ , $\tilde{\pi}_\mu = (-)^\mu \pi_{-\mu}$. The generators are created in the usual way from all bilinears $\sigma^\dagger \sigma$, $\sigma^\dagger \tilde{\pi}_\mu$, $\pi_\mu^\dagger \sigma$, $\pi_\mu^\dagger \tilde{\pi}_\nu$. Under the constraint that physical dynamical symmetries contain the angular momentum algebra $O(3)$, representation theory gives two dynamical symmetries [3]:

$$U(4) \supset \begin{array}{c} U(3) \\ O(4) \end{array} \supset O(3) \supset O(2), \quad (3)$$

which correspond to non-rigid ($U(3)$) and rovibrator ($O(4)$) molecules. The $U(3)$ R-subalgebra is generated only by π bosons, and hence does not contain any relevant inner automorphisms. The $O(4)$ S-subalgebra satisfies our criteria and indeed there are two conjugate embeddings of $U(4) \supset O(4)$, related by the transformation $\pi_\mu \rightarrow -i\pi_\mu$, $\sigma \rightarrow \sigma$. Define $L_\mu = \sqrt{2}[\pi^\dagger \tilde{\pi}]_\mu^{(1)}$

$D_\mu = [\pi^\dagger \sigma + \sigma^\dagger \tilde{\pi}]_\mu^{(1)}$, and $D'_\mu = i[\pi^\dagger \sigma - \sigma^\dagger \tilde{\pi}]_\mu^{(1)}$, where $\mu = \pm 1, 0$ (the square brackets represent the usual angular momentum coupling of spherical tensors). Then the two conjugate embeddings, denoted $O(4)$ and $\overline{O(4)}$, are obtained by the six generators $\{L_\mu, D_\nu\}$ and $\{L_\mu, D'_\nu\}$ [6]. Both contain the same $O(3)$ subalgebra as the $U(3)$ chain, generated by L_μ . Their respective Cartan subalgebras are generated by L_0, D_0 and L_0, D'_0 . Since $[D_0, D'_0] \neq 0$, the two algebras are not related by Weyl reflections. However, they are related by a similarity transformation in $U(4)$ (but not in $O(4)$) of the form (2). The full classification (3) from the dynamical symmetry point of view should include (iii) $U(4) \supset \overline{O(4)} \supset O(3) \supset O(2)$.

As another illustration, consider the Interacting Boson Model (IBM) [3], which describes collective excitations in nuclei. The basic ingredients are s^\dagger and d_μ^\dagger ($\mu = \pm 2, \pm 1, 0$) bosons, which represent nucleons paired to $L = 0$ similar to a cooper pair, and to $L = 2$ describing two-nucleon (or hole) excitations, respectively. The dynamical group is $U(6)$ which is built from the 36 bilinears $s^\dagger s, s^\dagger d_\mu, d_\mu^\dagger s, d_\mu^\dagger d_\nu$, and representation theory provides three well known dynamical symmetries: (i) $U(6) \supset O(6) \supset O(5) \supset O(3) \supset O(2)$, (ii) $U(6) \supset U(5) \supset O(5) \supset O(3) \supset O(2)$, and (iii) $U(6) \supset SU(3) \supset O(3) \supset O(2)$. The most general expansion of the Hamiltonian into one- and two-body interactions, which is Hermitian, time-reversal invariant and scalar, can be expanded into six terms consisting of the linear and quadratic Casimir operators from all three limits [3]. Using our requirements, we find that there are two conjugate embeddings, denoted $\overline{O(6)}$ and $\overline{SU(3)}$. While the generators of these limits have been explored in the past [7,3], new dynamical symmetries were not associated with them. Consider first $O(6)$, which is generated by the 15 operators $\{L_\mu, U_\mu, Q_\mu\}$, where $L_\mu = \sqrt{10}[d^\dagger \tilde{d}]_\mu^{(1)}$ is the angular momentum, $U_\mu = [d^\dagger \tilde{d}]_\mu^{(3)}$ and $Q_\mu = [s^\dagger \tilde{d}_\mu + d_\mu^\dagger s]$. The conjugate $O(6)$, denoted $\overline{O(6)}$, is generated by $\{L_\mu, U_\mu, \overline{Q}_\mu\}$, where the difference is in the 5 generators $\overline{Q}_\mu = i[s^\dagger \tilde{d}_\mu - d_\mu^\dagger s]$. As with $O(4)$ and $\overline{O(4)}$, the invariants of the two conjugate $O(6)$ algebras do not commute, nor do their Cartan subalgebras.

Unlike $U(4)$, the algebra of $U(6)$ admits another conjugate subalgebra. This is the $U(6) \supset SU(3)$ embedding. $SU(3)$ can be generated by the quadrupole operator $Q_\mu^\pm = [s^\dagger \tilde{d}_\mu + d_\mu^\dagger s] \pm (\sqrt{7}/2)[d^\dagger \tilde{d}]_\mu^{(2)}$ and the angular momentum L_μ , using either $\{Q_\mu^-, L_\nu\}$ or $\{Q_\mu^+, L_\nu\}$ [3]. The Cartan generators of these $SU(3)$ algebras are $\{L_0, Q_0^-\}$ or $\{L_0, Q_0^+\}$, which do not commute but are related through an inner automorphism. Physically this inner automorphism transforms the Hamiltonian of a prolate nucleus into one for an oblate nucleus, or equivalently, it can be related to particle-hole conjugation. Thus the complete dynamical symmetry classification of the $U(6)$ model includes the two additional ones (iv) $U(6) \supset \overline{SU(3)} \supset O(3) \supset O(2)$ and (v)

$$U(6) \supset \overline{O(6)} \supset O(5) \supset O(3) \supset O(2).$$

Consider now the consequences of these conjugate subalgebras. A conjugate dynamical symmetry Hamiltonian, written in terms of the invariants $\{\overline{C}\}$ of a conjugate subalgebra group chain, can be re-expressed as an expansion into some or all of the invariants $\{C\}$ predicted from representation theory, Eq. (1):

$$H = f(\{\overline{C}\}) = \sum_{ijk} \alpha_{ijk} g_i(C(\mathcal{G}_{jk})). \quad (4)$$

The right side of (4) is a general expansion into the Casimir invariants of various (or all) group chains in (1). The left hand side is an exact dynamical symmetry. Again, this type of mapping is not necessarily outside the range of physical interest. In the examples discussed above, we can now realize additional dynamical symmetries. If we defined the $\overline{O(4)}$ Hamiltonian in terms of the quadratic invariants (denoted C_2) of that chain, $H(\overline{O(4)}) = \alpha C_2[\overline{O(4)}] + \beta C_2[O(3)]$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} H(\overline{O(4)}) &= -\alpha C_2[O(4)] + 4\alpha(N-1)C_1[U(3)] \\ &\quad -4\alpha C_2[U(3)] + (2\alpha + \beta)C_2[O(3)] + 6\alpha N. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

This relation (and (6),(7) below) can be obtained by expanding H into the generators of \mathcal{G} and then re-expressing them in the Casimir invariants of the other limits. Here $C_1[U(3)] = \hat{n}_\pi = \pi^\dagger \cdot \tilde{\pi}$ and $C_2[U(3)] = \hat{n}_\pi^2$ are the linear and quadratic Casimir operators for $U(3)$, and $C_2[O(3)] = \hat{L}^2$ is the quadratic Casimir of $O(3)$. While this strongly mixes the two group chains given from representation theory in (3), the inner automorphism allows for this new parametric family of exactly solvable Hamiltonians, in this case with an $O(4)$ spectrum. In fact it has the same spectrum as $H = \alpha C_2[O(4)] + \beta C_2[O(3)]$. A consequence is that one can view the equivalence of these two Hamiltonians as a parameter symmetry in the space in one- and two-body interactions. This conjugate $O(4)$ Casimir have been recently examined, including such a parameter transformation [8].

In the IBM, we can take the general forms of the $\overline{O(6)}$ and $\overline{SU(3)}$ dynamical symmetry Hamiltonians, which we write as $H(\overline{O(6)}) = \alpha P^\dagger P + \beta U \cdot U + \gamma L \cdot L$ and $H(\overline{SU(3)}) = \alpha Q^+ \cdot Q^+ + \beta L \cdot L$, and obtain the two families of exactly solvable Hamiltonians:

$$\begin{aligned} H(\overline{O(6)}) &= -\alpha P^\dagger P + (\beta - 4\alpha)U \cdot U \\ &\quad + (\gamma - \frac{2}{5}\alpha)L \cdot L + 4\alpha(2-N)\hat{n}_d \\ &\quad + 4\alpha\hat{n}_d^2 + 2N(N-1). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} H(\overline{SU(3)}) &= 5\alpha\hat{n}_d + \alpha\hat{n}_d^2 - \alpha Q^- \cdot Q^- - 2\alpha P^\dagger P \\ &\quad - 6\alpha U \cdot U + (\beta - \frac{7}{20}\alpha)L \cdot L \\ &\quad + 2N(N+4) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

(In the $O(6)$ limits, $C_2[O(6)]$ is related to the pairing operator P [3]. In the usual $O(6)$ limit, $P = ss - \vec{d} \cdot \vec{d}$, while in $\overline{O(6)}$ it is $P' = ss + \vec{d} \cdot \vec{d}$.) Eq. (6) involves Casimir operators from both the $O(6)$ and $U(5)$ limits, and is known to be classically integrable, due to the common $O(5)$ subalgebra [2]. But our statement here is stronger than that. We see here that this particular combination of operators is not only integrable, but is an $O(6)$ dynamical symmetry. Eq. (7) would have been termed non-integrable, because it appears to be a case of strongly broken $SU(3)$, as it includes Casimir invariants from all three distinct dynamical symmetries of the IBM. However, it is clearly exactly solvable, and is diagonal in an $SU(3)$ basis.

In terms of the gauge rotations of the bosons, for the conjugate $SU(3)$ algebras, $\phi_2 = 0, \pi$ ($\pi/2, 3\pi/2$ are not allowed by time-reversal invariance), while for the $O(6)$ ($O(4)$) algebra, $\phi_2(\phi_1) = 0, 3\pi/2$ ($\pi, \pi/2$ being equivalent). Other values of ϕ are not allowed due to the constraints that the Hamiltonians are time-reversal invariant. Generally, the number of conjugate embeddings depends upon the system of interest. For example, in the IBM, the $SU(3) \supset O(3)$ embeddings is unique due to the constraint that the Hamiltonian is scalar. However, in the molecular $SU(3)$ model of Ref. [9] for planar rotations and vibrations, there are two $O(3)$ embeddings according to our criteria. In other models, such as the proton-neutron IBM, there are even more examples since one can perform independent rotations of neutron and proton boson operators, resulting in many additional dynamical symmetries, or in the study of octupole deformed nuclei where one can transform s, p, d and f bosons [10]. Similarly, this will also be possible in the extensions of the vibron model to polyatomic molecules, which is based in $U(4) \otimes \dots \otimes U(4)$ [11]. In studies of chaos in triatomic molecules using $U(4) \otimes U(4)$, it is the conjugate embedding of $\overline{U(4)}$ which explains the recently observed regularity in the parameter space [11].

We have shown that the number of group chains provided by representation theory does not necessarily correspond to the number of dynamical symmetries of a system. We have further seen that (apparent) breaking of dynamical symmetries does not guarantee non-integrability. These hidden symmetries generate new families of dynamical symmetry Hamiltonians which contain generators from some or all of the different group chains in Eq. (1). They can also have different physical properties, as in the case of $SU(3)$ and $\overline{SU(3)}$ in the IBM. The former corresponds to the spectra of oblate deformed nuclei, with negative quadrupole moment; the latter to prolate nuclei with positive quadrupole moment - these are not only physically distinct, but both cases are needed for a complete physical picture. In the studies of chaos and quantum-nonintegrability, one must clearly consider conjugate embeddings which will generally suppress chaos in regions in the parameter space which would

have previously been expected to be chaotic. In general there are an infinite number of inner automorphisms - however only a finite number may be consistent with physics (in the above examples, these are scalar, Hermitian Hamiltonians with time reversal invariance). In nuclei, it is evident that strongly deformed or γ -soft nuclei are not limited to Hamiltonians in one of the group chains. In principle, all conjugate embeddings can be enumerated. It would be interesting to see whether one can develop within representation theory, a general prescription to classify the non-trivial inner automorphisms, and to explore supersymmetric automorphisms which relate fermions to bosons.

I would like to thank A. Dieperink, K. Heyde, J. Ginocchio, F. Iachello, P. Van Isacker and A. Leviatan for useful discussions, and the ECT* for their support. This work was supported by DOE grant DE-FG02-91ER40608.

-
- [1] D. Delande and J.C. Gay, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59** (1987) 1809.
 - [2] W.M.Zhang and D.H.Feng, *Phys. Rep.* **252** (1995) 1; W.M.Zhang, C. Martens, D.H.Feng and J.M.Yuan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61** (1988) 2167; W.M.Zhang and D.H.Feng, *Phys. Rev.* **C43** (1991) 1127; Y. Alhassid, A. Novoselsky and N.Whelan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65** (1990) 2971; Y. Alhassid and N.Whelan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67** (1991) 816.
 - [3] See for example: F. Iachello and A. Arima, *The Interacting Boson Model* (Cambridge Press, Cambridge, 1987); F. Iachello and R. Levine, *Algebraic Theory of Molecules* (Oxford Press, Oxford, 1995).
 - [4] *Dynamical Groups and Spectrum Generating Algebras*, Eds. A.Barut, A. Bohm and Y.Ne'eman (World Scientific, Singapore, 1987); *Few Body Methods, Principles and Applications*, Eds. T.K.Lim, C.G.Bao, D.P.Hou and J.S.Huber (World Scientific, Singapore, 1986); *Symmetries in Science V*, Eds. B. Gruber, L.C. Biedenharn, and H.D. Doebner, (Plenum, New York, 1991).
 - [5] E. Dynkin, *Mat. Sb.* **30** (1952) 349; *Amer. Math. Soc. Trans. [2]*, **6** (1957) 111; *Tr. Mosk. Mat. Obsc.* **1** (1952) 39; *Amer. Math. Soc. Trans. [2]*, **6** (1957) 245.
 - [6] O.van Roosmalen, Ph.D. thesis, (1982) unpublished.
 - [7] P. Van Isacker, A. Frank and J.Dukelsky, *Phys. Rev.* **C31** (1985) 671.
 - [8] A.M.Shirokov and N.A.Smirnova, Moscow State University preprint (1996).
 - [9] F. Iachello and S. Oss, *J. Chem. Phys.* **104** (1996) 1.
 - [10] D.Kusnezov, *J. Phys. A: Math. and General* **23**, 5673 (1990); *J. Phys. A: Math. and General* **22**, 4271 (1989).
 - [11] J.M. Champion, Ph.D. thesis, Univ. J.Fourier, Grenoble (1996).