Національна академія наук України

ІНСТИТУТ ФІЗИКИ КОНДЕНСОВАНИХ СИСТЕМ

ICMP–97–27E

Yu.Kozitsky, M.Kozlovskii, T.Krokhmalskii

ANALYTIC AND NUMERICAL STUDY OF A HIERARCHICAL SPIN MODEL

ЛЬВІВ

УДК: 536.7; 519.25

PACS: 05.50.+q, 64.60.Cn, 64.60.Fr, 75.10.Hr

Аналітичне і чисельне дослідження ієрархічної спінової моделі

Ю.Козицький, М.Козловський, Т.Крохмальський

Анотація. На основі аналітичних і чисельних методів вивчається проста ієрархічна скалярна спінова модель в околі її критичної точки. Аналітично описані залежності сприйнятливості і локалізації нулів статистичної суми моделі скінченого розміру (тобто, великого, але скінченого числа спінів) від кількості спінів поблизу критичної точки. Шляхом аналітичного розрахунку, в тому числі, показано, що кореляційна довжина моделі скінченого розміру розбігається в критичній точці слабше ніж це передбачалось скейлінговою теорією. Обчислена критична температура і знайдений критичний показник параметра порядку для різних значень параметра взаємодії.

Analytic and numerical study of a hierarchical spin model

Yu.Kozitsky, M.Kozlovskii, T.Krokhmalskii

Abstract. A simple hierarchical scalar spin model is studied analytically and numerically in the vicinity of its critical point. The dependence of the finite size (i.e. calculated for large but finite number of spins) susceptibility and the location of zeros of the model partition function, on the number of spins at the critical point is described analytically. It is shown, also analytically, that the finite size correlation length in such a model diverges at the critical point slowly than it is supposed in the finite size scaling theory. Certain numerical information about the critical point and ordered phase is given. In particular, the critical temperature of the model and the critical index describing the order parameter are calculated for various values of the interaction parameter.

Подається в Condensed Matter Physics
Submitted to Condensed Matter Physics

1. Introduction

Hierarchical models have played a significant role in modern classical statistical physics. First such a model was introduced by F.Dyson [6] in 1969 as a tool in the study of one dimensional Ising–like spin models with long–range interaction potentials. Since that time these models have been studied and utilized. An excellent survey of ideas and results in this domain can be found in [3].

The main idea of F.Dyson was to substitute the one dimensional Ising-like spin model with the translation invariant interaction potential which decays as a power of the spin-spin distance by a model with the interaction decaying as the same power but of the distance defined by special non–Euclidean metric and possessing some other symmetry instead of the translation invariance. This new symmetry was designed to allow more detailed and deep mathematically strict description which would yield also some information about properties of the initial translation invariant model.

At the other hand, during the seventieths I.R.Yukhnovskii with the collaborators have developed an approach to the study of the three dimensional Ising model based on the collective variables method (see e.g. [21], [22]). The main tool of this approach was a step–by–step integration scheme, which allowed to obtain the model partition function, free energy, other thermodynamic functions in the vicinity of the critical point [17]. The peculiarity of this scheme lies in the fact that the partition function is calculated as a product of the partial partition functions describing a sequence of growing boxes of spins. It was considered as a realization of known heuristic Kadanoff's block–spin construction which was intended to describe the critical points of such spin models. This construction was based on the idea that the ensembles of properly renormalized total spins of cubic blocks of various linear sizes are distributed identically whenever the model is taken at its critical point. Such a property is known as a critical point self–similarity [20] or as a critical point scale invariance. The latter is considered as the main symmetry appearing at the critical point.

In fact, the level of strictness of the Yukhnovskii's approach is rather physical which means that certain approximations with no quantitatively controlled consequences were employed. Later it was understood [13] that the qualitative result of these approximations lies in the replacement of the translation invariance of the model considered by the self–similarity symmetry which was embodied in the Kadanoff's construction. Moreover, it was shown in the paper [13] (see also [14] and [10]) that the

step–by–step integration scheme being applied to a translation invariant spin model transforms it into the model identical to the Dyson's hierarchical model. In what follows, one can consider the Dyson's model as a realization of the Yukhnovskii's scheme of study of translation invariant Ising–like spin models.

Since early seventieths, the Dyson's hierarchical model was being studied mainly analytically. At the same time, the investigations of the three dimensional Ising model within the collective variables method by I.R.Yukhnovskii and his collaborators (including also numerical ones) were performed. As a result, universal and nonuniversal aspects of the specific heat behaviour in the vicinity of the critical point were analyzed [22], [15]. The equation of state was derived, its analytic solution describing the order parameter dependence on temperature, external magnetic field, and microscopic model parameters in the vicinity of the critical point was found [5], [16]. It should be noted that a number of additional approximations was used to obtain these results.

The aim of our work is to study – analytically and numerically – a simple hierarchical model, considering it also as an emanation from the Yukhnovskii's scheme, in the vicinity of its critical point without additional approximations just mentioned. The main question here is how do the quantities, which describe the behaviour of the model in the vicinity of the critical point (such as susceptibility, order parameter, correlation length, location of zeros of the partition function, and so on), calculated for the fixed large but finite number of spins, depend on thermodynamic variables, or how do they depend on the number of spins if the thermodynamic variables are fixed at their critical values. Our analytic study is performed by means of rigorous methods. We discuss the asymptotic behaviour of the mentioned quantities, calculated at the critical point, when the number of spins tends to infinity. For this aim the facts which were already known are taken from the corresponding papers, whereas a number of new ones are proven here. As a result, we have suggested how to calculate numerically the order parameter for zero values of the external magnetic field, how to find corresponding critical index, how to calculate the critical temperature. Such an approach is partially inspired by the works on the finite size scaling, [8] and [9] in particular. We suppose to apply the finite size scaling methods to describe our model on the base of the data obtained here – it will be done in our next work. To prepare it we check the basic assumption of this method concerning the critical point correlation length asymptotics, with the size of the model tending to infinity, and find that it should be changed in the case of our model.

As tools we use the methods developed earlier [14], [10], [11]. as well as direct numerical calculations of corresponding quantities for sufficiently large number of spins, based on the analysis mentioned before. Such calculations became possible also due to the special (hierarchical) structure of the model considered.

2. The Model

Here we deliver the description of the models and the facts from their theory which are related to our investigation. Some of these facts are proven here, another ones are taken from the papers where they have been published earlier.

Let us consider a countable set of one-dimensional spins $\{\sigma_s \in \mathbf{R},\ s \in \mathbf{N}\}$ which we choose to be indexed simply by positive integers. The formal Hamiltonians of the translation invariant and hierarchical models are

$$H^{\rm tr} = -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{s,s'\in\mathbf{N}} J^{\rm tr}_{ss'}\sigma_s\sigma_{s'} - h\sum_{s\in\mathbf{N}}\sigma_s; \tag{2.1}$$

$$H = -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{s,s'\in\mathbf{N}} J_{ss'}\sigma_s\sigma_{s'} - h\sum_{s\in\mathbf{N}}\sigma_s; \tag{2.2}$$

where h is an external magnetic field, and

$$J^{\rm tr}_{ss'} = -J(\mid s-s'\mid +1)^{-1-\lambda},\quad J>0. \tag{2.3}$$

Here $\mid a \mid$ stands for the absolute value of $a \in \mathbf{Z}$. The function $\mid s-s' \mid$ can be considered as the Euclidean distance on $\mathbf{N}$, it is invariant with respect to the shifts (translations) along $\mathbf{N}$. The parameter λ describes the decay of the potential $J^{\rm tr}_{ss'}$, it is *a priori* set being positive. As for the potential $J_{ss'}$ in the Hamiltonian (2.2), it is put to be of the form (2.3) but with the "hierarchical distance" between s and s' instead of $\mid s-s' \mid$. This new distance can be set by means of the hierarchical structure on $\mathbf{N}$. The latter is the sequence $\mathcal{L} = \{\mathcal{L}_n, n \in \mathbf{Z}_+\}$ of families $\mathcal{L}_n = \{\Lambda_{n,r},\ r \in \mathbf{N}\}$, where

$$\Lambda_{n,r} = \{s \in \mathbf{N}\ \mid\ 2^n(r-1)+1 \le s \le 2^n r\}. \tag{2.4}$$

These subsets of $\mathbf{N}$ obey the following recursive rule

$$\Lambda_{n,r} = \bigcup_{s\in\Lambda_{1,r}} \Lambda_{n-1,s}. \tag{2.5}$$

Definition 2.1 *Let n, s, s' be chosen in $\mathbf{N}$. The points s and s' are said to be separated on the hierarchy level n if they belong to different subsets Λ from $\mathcal{L}_n$.*

Proposition 2.1 *For arbitrary noncoinsiding pair of points $s,\ s' \in \mathbf{N}$, there exits $n \in \mathbf{N}$ such that these points are separated on the hierarchy level $n-1$ and are not separated on the levels $n,\ n+1,\ \ldots$.*

This number is denoted as $n(s,s')$, that is

$$n(s,s') = \min\{n \in \mathbf{N} \mid (\exists\Lambda \in \mathcal{L}_n)(s\in\Lambda)\&(s'\in\Lambda)\} \tag{2.6}$$

For example, $n(1,2)=1$; $n(2,3)=2$; $n(4,5)=3$. By means of $n(s,s')$, we can define the hierarchical distance on $\mathbf{N}$:

$$\mathrm{dist}(s,s') = 2^{n(s,s')} - 1. \tag{2.7}$$

Then the interaction potential in the Hamiltonian (2.2) is written as follows:

$$J_{ss'} = -J(\mathrm{dist}(s,s')+1)^{-1-\lambda}, \tag{2.8}$$

where λ and J are the same as in (2.3). In order to relate such a model to the d-dimensional translation invariant model considered within the Yukhnovskii's scheme, one should put $\lambda = 2/d$ (see [13], [14], [10]).

The following assertion can be proven directly from the definition.

Proposition 2.2 *For arbitrary pair of points $s,\ s' \in \mathbf{N}$,*

$$\mid s-s'\mid \ge \mathrm{dist}(s,s'), \tag{2.9}$$

that yields

$$J^{\rm tr}_{ss'} \ge J_{ss'}. \tag{2.10}$$

Thermodynamic properties of the model can be described by passing to the limit $\Lambda \nearrow \mathbf{N}$ for the expectations $<..>_\Lambda$, computed at finite subset Λ with the help of Gibbs measures $\mu^{\beta,h}_\Lambda$. They are defined as probability measures on the configuration spaces $\mathbf{R}^\Lambda$ by means of local Hamiltonians $H_\Lambda(\sigma_\Lambda)$, where $\sigma_\Lambda = \{\sigma_s, s \in \Lambda\}$. The local Hamiltonians are constructed accordingly to the formal ones (2.1), (2.2) that is described just below. Here we consider only the Gibbs measures which correspond to zero boundary conditions. Thus

$$d\mu^{\beta,h}_\Lambda(\sigma_\Lambda) = \frac{1}{Z^{\beta,h}_\Lambda}\exp(-\beta H_\Lambda(\sigma_\Lambda))\prod_{s\in\Lambda} d\chi(\sigma_s), \tag{2.11}$$

where $Z_\Lambda^{\beta,h}$ is the normalizing constant which provides for $\mu_\Lambda^{\beta,h}$ to be probabilistic, and the measure χ describes the single-spin (even) probability distribution. The simplest case of the latter is the measure concentrated at points ± 1 that corresponds to the Ising–like spins.

For the hierarchical models, the thermodynamic limit is naturally be achieved within the hierarchical structure, that is by choosing $\Lambda \in \mathcal{L}_n$ and putting $n \to \infty$. Hence we may set the hierarchical local Hamiltonians only for such Λ. Thus we use the relation (2.5) and define the family of local Hamiltonians $\{H_{\Lambda_{n,r}} \mid n \in \mathbf{Z}_+, r \in \mathbf{N}\}$ recursively by putting

$$H_{\Lambda_{n,r}}(\sigma_{\Lambda_{n,r}}) = -\frac{1}{2}2^{-n(1+\lambda)}(1-2^{-1-\lambda})J\sigma^2(\Lambda_{n,r}) + \sum_{s\in\Lambda_{1,r}} H_{\Lambda_{n-1,s}}(\sigma_{\Lambda_{n-1,s}}) \tag{2.12}$$

with

$$H_{\Lambda_{0,s}}(\sigma_s) = -\frac{1}{2}(1-2^{-1-\lambda})J\sigma_s^2 - h\sigma_s\,, \tag{2.13}$$

where

$$\sigma(\Lambda) = \sum_{s\in\Lambda}\sigma_s\,. \tag{2.14}$$

Clearly, these Hamiltonians are invariant with respect to those permutations of $\mathbf{N}$ which preserve the hierarchical structure. Such permutations form a group which is the symmetry group of the model. In particular, all Hamiltonians with the same n and different $r \in \mathbf{N}$ are identical, therefore, can be represented by one of them, $H_{\Lambda_{n,1}}$ for example. The relationship between the Hamiltonians (2.2) and (2.12) can be established as follows. We rewrite $H_{\Lambda_{n,1}}$ given by (2.12)

$$H_{\Lambda_{n,1}}(\sigma_{\Lambda_{n,1}}) = -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{s,s'\in\Lambda_{n,1}} J_{ss'}^{(n)}\sigma_s\sigma_{s'} - h\sum_{s\in\Lambda_{n,1}}\sigma_s\,; \tag{2.15}$$

that can be used as a definition of $J_{ss'}^{(n)}$. Having in mind that $\Lambda_{n,1}$ absorbs $\mathbf{N}$ when $n \to \infty$ and using the relations (2.12)–(2.14), one can prove such a statement.

Proposition 2.3

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} J_{ss'}^{(n)} = -2^{-n(s,s')(1+\lambda)}J.$$

Along with the Hamiltonians (2.15) we also will consider the local Hamiltonian defined by the Hamiltonian (2.1)

$$H_{\Lambda_{n,r}}^{\rm tr}(\sigma) = -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{s,s'\in\Lambda_{n,r}} J_{ss'}^{\rm tr}\sigma_s\sigma_{s'} - h\sum_{s\in\Lambda_{n,r}}\sigma_s\,, \tag{2.16}$$

where $J_{ss'}^{\rm tr}$ is given by (2.3).

Consider the Gibbs measures (2.11) of the hierarchical model with $\Lambda = \Lambda_{n,r}$. The relation (2.12) yields the following recursion formula

$$d\mu_{\Lambda_{n,r}}^{\beta,h}(\sigma_{\Lambda_{n,r}}) = Y_n^{\beta,h}\exp\left\{\frac{\beta}{2}(1-2^{-1-\lambda})2^{-n(1+\lambda)}J\sigma^2(\Lambda_{n,r})\right\} \prod_{s\in\Lambda_{1,r}} d\mu_{\Lambda_{n-1,s}}^{\beta,h}(\sigma_{\Lambda_{n-1,s}}). \tag{2.17}$$

where

$$Y_n^{\beta,h} = \frac{\left(Z_{\Lambda_{n-1,1}}^{\beta,h}\right)^2}{Z_{\Lambda_{n,1}}^{\beta,h}}.$$

Here we have taken into account that $Z_{\Lambda_{n,r}}^{\beta,h} = Z_{\Lambda_{n,1}}^{\beta,h}$ for all $r \in \mathbf{Z}$. Due to the hierarchical symmetry of the model all sums $\sigma(\Lambda_{n,r})$ with the same n and different r are distributed identically. Denote

$$P_{\Lambda_{n,r}}^{\beta,h}(A) = \mathrm{Prob}(\sigma(\Lambda_{n,r}) \in A)$$

for every Borel subset $A \subset \mathbf{R}$. Then

$$\frac{dP_{\Lambda_{n,r}}^{\beta,h}(\xi)}{d\xi} = \int_{\mathbf{R}^{\Lambda_{n,r}}} \delta(\sigma(\Lambda_{n,r}) - \xi)\, d\mu_{\Lambda_{n,r}}^{\beta,h}(\sigma_{\Lambda_{n,r}}), \tag{2.18}$$

where $\delta(\ldots)$ is the Dirac δ – function. Thus the relation (2.17) yields for such $P_{\Lambda_{n,r}}^{\beta,h}$:

$$dP_{\Lambda_{n,r}}^{\beta,h}(\xi) = Y_{\Lambda_{n,1}}^{\beta,h} \exp\left\{\frac{\beta}{2}2^{-n(1+\lambda)}(1-2^{-1-\lambda})J\xi^2\right\} Q_{\Lambda_{n,r}}^{\beta,h}(\xi)d\xi, \tag{2.19}$$

$$Q_{\Lambda_{n,r}}^{\beta,h}(\xi) = \int_{\mathbf{R}} \delta\Big(\sum_{s\in\Lambda_{1,r}}\xi_s - \xi\Big) \prod_{s\in\Lambda_{1,r}} dP_{\Lambda_{n-1,s}}^{\beta,h}(\xi_s)\,. \tag{2.20}$$

In the case where the initial measure $P_{\Lambda_{0,s}}^{\beta,h}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbf{R}$, all $P_{\Lambda_{n,r}}^{\beta,h}$ possess this property.

It means that the tempered distribution introduced by (2.18) now is a suitable function. We denote it as

$$\frac{dP^{\beta,h}_{\Lambda_{n,r}}(\xi)}{d\xi} = T^{\beta,h}_n(\xi), \tag{2.21}$$

and remark that the so called "small" partition function $F^{\beta,h}_n(x)$ studied in the papers [1], [2] is related to our $T^{\beta,h}_n$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} F^{\beta,h}_n(x) &:= \int_{\Lambda_{n,1}} \delta(2^{-n}\sigma(\Lambda_{n,1}) - x) d\mu^{\beta,h}_{\Lambda_{n,1}}(\sigma_{\Lambda_{n,1}}) \\ &= T^{\beta,h}_n(2^n x), \quad x \in \mathbf{R}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

The recursive relation given by (2.19), (2.20) now takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} T^{\beta,h}_n(\xi) &= \frac{1}{K^{\beta,h}_n} \exp(\frac{\beta}{2} 2^{-n(1+\lambda)}(1-2^{-1-\lambda}) J\xi^2) \\ &\int_{\mathbf{R}} T^{\beta,h}_{n-1}(\frac{\xi}{2}+\eta) T^{\beta,h}_{n-1}(\frac{\xi}{2}-\eta) d\eta, \end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} K^{\beta,h}_n &= \int_{\mathbf{R}^2} \exp(\frac{\beta}{2} 2^{-n(1+\lambda)}(1-2^{-1-\lambda}) J\xi^2) \\ &T^{\beta,h}_{n-1}(\frac{\xi}{2}+\eta) T^{\beta,h}_{n-1}(\frac{\xi}{2}-\eta) d\xi d\eta. \end{aligned} \tag{2.24}$$

Here we have taken into account that all $\Lambda_{1,r}$ consist of two points, and all $\sigma(\Lambda_{n,r})$ with the same n and different r are distributed identically.

Now let us describe in more details the family of measures which are to be chosen in this research as initial single–spin measures χ. The first condition imposed on these measures is the existence of their Laplace transforms

$$f_\chi(z) = \int_{\mathbf{R}} \exp(z\sigma) d\chi(\sigma), \quad z \in \mathbf{C}, \tag{2.25}$$

as entire functions. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a family of entire functions of one complex variable possessing the following canonical representation

$$f(z) = \exp(\theta z^2) \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} (1+\gamma_j z^2), \tag{2.26}$$

$$\theta \geq 0, \quad \gamma_j \geq 0, \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \gamma_j < \infty, \quad \gamma_j \geq \gamma_{j+1}.$$

In other words, the family $\mathcal{F}$ consists of entire functions with the order of growth at most two which either have purely imaginary zeros or have them none.

Definition 2.2 *A probability measure χ is said to possess the Lee–Yang property if its Laplace transform (2.25) belongs to the family $\mathcal{F}$.*

It can be shown that the measures

$$d\chi(\sigma) = \frac{1}{2}\{\delta(\sigma-1) + \delta(\sigma+1)\} d\sigma, \tag{2.27}$$

and

$$d\chi(\sigma) = \frac{\exp(-\frac{1}{2}u\sigma^2 - \frac{1}{4}v\sigma^4) d\sigma}{\int_{\mathbf{R}} \exp(-\frac{1}{2}u\sigma^2 - \frac{1}{4}v\sigma^4) d\sigma}, \ u \in \mathbf{R}, \ v > 0, \tag{2.28}$$

possess the Lee–Yang property. Further details can be found in the paper [12]. Here we discuss only the properties of these measures which are relevant to our research. As can be seen from the definition (2.25), the moments of each such a measure can be computed as corresponding derivatives at zero of its Laplace transform f_χ. The following derivatives

$$u^{(2k)}_\chi = (D^{2k} \log f_\chi)(0), \ k \in \mathbf{N}, \ D = \frac{d}{dz}, \tag{2.29}$$

are known as semiinvariants or cumulants of χ. Directly from the definition (2.26) one obtains the following representations for these parameters

$$\begin{aligned} u^{(2)}_\chi &= 2(\theta + \Gamma_1), \\ u^{(2k)}_\chi &= (-1)^{k-1} 2(2k-1)! \Gamma_k, \ k \geq 2 \\ \Gamma_k &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \gamma_j^k, \quad k \in \mathbf{N}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.30}$$

The only one measure possessing the Lee–Yang property, the Laplace transform of which has no zeros, is the Gaussian measure. All other ones can be characterized by the location of its zeros which are nearest to the origin of the imaginary axis. These are at points $\pm z_1 = \pm i\gamma_1^{-1/2}$ (see (2.26)).

Proposition 2.4 *Let for a non-Gaussian measure χ possessing the Lee–Yang property, the semiinvariants be defined by (2.29). Then the location of the nearest zeros of its Laplace transform obeys the following two sided estimate*

$$\left[40 \frac{|u^{(4)}_\chi|}{u^{(2)}_\chi u^{(6)}_\chi}\right]^{\frac{1}{4}} \leq |z_1| \leq \left[6 \frac{u^{(2)}_\chi}{|u^{(4)}_\chi|}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{2.31}$$

The proof of this statement can be done by showing the validity of such two sided estimate for γ_1:

$$\frac{\Gamma_2}{\theta+\Gamma_1} \le \gamma_1 \le \sqrt{\frac{(\theta+\Gamma_1)\Gamma_3}{\Gamma_2}}, \tag{2.32}$$

which in turn immediately implies (2.31). To prove (2.32) one can use the following form of the Cauchy inequality

$$\Gamma_2^2 = \left[\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \gamma_j^{1/2}\gamma_j^{3/2}\right]^2 \le \left[\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\gamma_j\right]\left[\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\gamma_j^3\right],$$

which yields $\Gamma_2^2 \le \Gamma_1\Gamma_3 \le (\theta+\Gamma_1)\Gamma_3$. The latter estimate together with the obvious relation $\gamma_1^2 \le \Gamma_2$ gives the upper bound for γ_1 in (2.32). The lower bound is the simple consequence of the following estimate $\Gamma_2 \le \gamma_1\Gamma_1 \le \gamma_1(\theta+\Gamma_1)$.

For a measure χ, we set

$$a_\chi = -\frac{u_\chi^{(4)}}{(u_\chi^{(2)})^2}. \tag{2.33}$$

By means of methods of the paper [12] one can prove

Proposition 2.5 *Let the measure χ possess the Lee–Yang property. Then*

$$0 \le a_\chi \le 2$$

Moreover, $a_\chi = 0$ if and only if χ is Gaussian; $a_\chi = 2$ if and only if χ is concentrated at points $\pm a$, i.e. is of the type of (2.27) with some $a > 0$ instead of 1.

The following statement is a base for the application of the Lee– Yang property in the theory of hierarchical models. It was proven in [10] and applied in [11].

Proposition 2.6 *Let the initial single–spin measure χ possess the Lee–Yang property. Then all $P^{\beta,0}_{\Lambda_{n,r}}$ defined by (2.11), (2.18), (2.19), (2.20) possess this property provided they exist as measures.*

It was shown [11] that all $P^{\beta,h}_{\Lambda_{n,r}}$ exist as measures for all values of β if the initial measure χ is such that f_χ possesses the representation (2.26) with $\theta = 0$. Only such initial measures are considered below, the measures (2.27), (2.28) obey this restriction.

3. Critical Point and Ordered Phase

We start with the description of the ordered phase. For this purpose we will need an order parameter. In the spin models it should be a magnitization per spin in zero external field. It can be computed by means of corresponding Gibbs measures. Consider the following expectations:

$$\begin{aligned} M_n^{(l)}(\beta,h) &= <(\sigma(\Lambda_{n,1}))^l>_{\Lambda_{n,1}} = \\ &\int_{\mathbf{R}^{\Lambda_{n,1}}} (\sigma(\Lambda_{n,1}))^l d\mu^{\beta,h}_{\Lambda_{n,1}}(\sigma_{\Lambda_{n,1}}) = \\ &\int_{\mathbf{R}} \xi^l dP^{\beta,h}_{\Lambda_{n,1}}(\xi),\ l \in \mathbf{N}; \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{M}_n(\beta) &= \int_{\mathbf{R}^{\Lambda_{n,1}}} |\sigma(\Lambda_{n,1})| d\mu^{\beta,0}_{\Lambda_{n,1}}(\sigma_{\Lambda_{n,1}}) = \\ &\int_{\mathbf{R}} |\xi| dP^{\beta,0}_{\Lambda_{n,1}}(\xi), \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

$$\bar{m}_n(\beta) = \int_{\mathbf{R}^{\Lambda_{n,1}}} |\sigma_1| d\mu^{\beta,0}_{\Lambda_{n,1}}(\sigma_{\Lambda_{n,1}}); \tag{3.3}$$

$$\tilde{m}_n^{(2)}(\beta) = \min_{r,s\in\Lambda_{n,1}} \int_{\mathbf{R}^{\Lambda_{n,1}}} \sigma_r\sigma_s d\mu^{\beta,0}_{\Lambda_{n,1}}(\sigma_{\Lambda_{n,1}}). \tag{3.4}$$

Having in mind that each $\Lambda_{n,r}$ consists of 2^n points we introduce the following parameters

$$m_1(\beta) = \lim_{h\to 0+}\lim_{n\to\infty} 2^{-n} M_n^{(1)}(\beta,h); \tag{3.5}$$

$$m_2(\beta) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt{2^{-2n} M_n^{(2)}(\beta,0)}; \tag{3.6}$$

$$m_3(\beta) = \lim_{n\to\infty} 2^{-n}\bar{M}_n(\beta); \tag{3.7}$$

$$m_4(\beta) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \bar{m}_n(\beta); \tag{3.8}$$

$$m_5(\beta) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt{\tilde{m}_n^{(2)}(\beta)}. \tag{3.9}$$

Let also $m_l^{\mathrm{tr}}(\beta)$, $l = 1,2$ be defined by the expressions (2.11), (3.1) with $H^{\mathrm{tr}}_{\Lambda_{n,r}}(\sigma)$ instead of $H_{\Lambda_{n,r}}(\sigma)$. In fact, only $m_1(\beta)$ and $m_1^{\mathrm{tr}}(\beta)$ are

the order parameters in the hierarchical and translation invariant models respectively. The other parameters introduced above are being used to prove the positivity of the order parameters for given values of β. In what follows, Propositions 2.2, 2.3 and the Griffiths inequality, which holds for all types of measures χ considered in this work, imply

$$m_2(\beta) \le m_2^{\rm tr}(\beta). \tag{3.10}$$

At the other hand, in the case of classical (nonquantum) spin models one has [7]

$$m_2(\beta) \le m_1(\beta) \qquad m_2^{\rm tr}(\beta) \le m_1^{\rm tr}(\beta) \tag{3.11}$$

Employing these estimates F.Dyson has proven the existence of the long–range order in both models – hierarchical and translation invariant.

Proposition 3.1 (Dyson's theorem) *Let $\lambda \in (0,1)$ and the measure χ be of the form (2.27) Then there exists β_* such that for $\beta > \beta_*$, $m_2(\beta) > 0$.*

Applying standard arguments (see e.g. [19]) one can extend the validity of this assertion also for the single–spin measures of the type of (2.28). Much more information about the long-range order in such models has been obtained by P.Bleher in his works [1], [2] (see also [3]). In particular, one can deduce from these papers the following facts.

Proposition 3.2 *Let the single–spin measure χ be of the form (2.28). Then there exists $\beta_* > 0$ such that for $\beta > \beta_*$*

$$m_4(\beta) = m_5(\beta) := m(\beta) > 0. \tag{3.12}$$

For $\beta \to \beta_*+$, holds $m(\beta) \to 0$ in such a way that

$$\lim_{\beta \to \beta_*+} \frac{\log m(\beta)}{\log(\beta - \beta_*)} := b > 0 \tag{3.13}$$

This property is preserved with the same value of the critical index b for small perturbations of the single–spin measure χ.

Directly from the definitions (3.1) – (3.9) one gets

$$m_3(\beta) \le m_4(\beta), \qquad m_5(\beta) \le m_2(\beta).$$

Combining these estimates with (3.10), (3.11), and (3.13), one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} &m_3(\beta) \le m(\beta) \le m_2^{\rm tr}(\beta) \le m_1^{\rm tr}(\beta), \\ &m_3(\beta) \le m(\beta) \le m_2(\beta) \le m_1(\beta). \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

For our model, the most convenient parameter, for the numerical calculation, is

$$m_3^{(n)}(\beta) := 2^{-n} \bar{M}_n(\beta), \tag{3.15}$$

it may be taken as an approximate (finite size) value of $m_3(\beta)$. The fact, that the latter parameter is a lower bound for the genuine order parameter, shows that it may be used to describe the ordering phase transition in the model considered.

It should be noted here that the considerable description of the ordered phase in such hierarchical models was performed in the papers [1] and [2] where the asymptotics (for $n \to \infty$) of the "small" partition function (2.22) was obtained. In particular, Theorem A of the paper [1] and Theorem 2.1 of the paper [2] imply the following assertion.

Proposition 3.3 *For any $\lambda \in (0,1)$, there exist positive β_*, a function $\phi(\beta)$, and a sequence of functions $\{m_n(\beta),\ n \in \mathbf{N}\}$, such that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{n\to\infty} m_n(\beta) = m(\beta);\ m_n(\beta) > 0, \quad \forall \beta > \beta_*, \\ &\lim_{\beta \to \beta_*+} \phi(\beta) = +\infty, \quad \phi(\beta) > 0, \quad \forall \beta > \beta_*, \end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

where $m(\beta)$ was introduced in (3.12). For these functions and for the density (2.21), the following convergence takes place:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{\xi \in \mathbf{R}} |T_n^{\beta,0}(2^{n/2}\xi) - B(\xi; 2^{n/2} m_n(\beta), \phi(\beta))| = 0, \tag{3.17}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} B(\xi; m, \phi) &= \frac{1}{2}(G(\xi + m; \phi) + G(\xi - m; \phi)), \\ G(\xi; \phi) &= (2\pi\phi)^{-1/2} \exp(-\frac{\xi^2}{2\phi}). \end{aligned}$$

Let $a_n(\beta)$ be defined as a_χ by (2.33) with $\chi = P^{\beta,0}_{\Lambda_{n,1}}$. Then the assertion just formulated implies

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} a_n = 2, \quad \forall \beta > \beta_*. \tag{3.18}$$

Now let us describe the critical point behaviour of the hierarchical model. One can deduce from (3.7) and (3.14)

$$M_n^{(2)}(\beta, 0) = O(2^{2n}), \quad \text{for} \quad \beta > \beta_*. \tag{3.19}$$

At the other hand, for the disordered phase, only bulk divergences should appear

$$M_n^{(2)}(\beta,0) = O(2^n), \quad \text{for} \quad \beta < \beta_*. \tag{3.20}$$

As for the critical point itself, the intermediate type of divergences is expected

$$M_n^{(2)}(\beta_*,0) = O(2^{n(1+\rho)}), \tag{3.21}$$

with some $\rho \in (0,1)$. In order to prove this conjecture and to find ρ, we proceed as follows. Define the sequence of random variables $\{\tau_n^\rho, n \in \mathbf{N}\}$, where

$$\tau_n^\rho = 2^{-\frac{n}{2}(1+\rho)}\sigma(\Lambda_{n,r}), \quad \rho \geq 0. \tag{3.22}$$

The probability distribution of each τ_n^ρ can be described by means of the measure (2.18), where we put $h = 0$. If the sequence $\{\tau_n^0\}$ is asymptotically normal, the dependence between the spins is weak or absent as in the case described by the standard central limit theorem. It corresponds to the asymptotics (3.20). In the case of positive ρ in (3.22), one has the abnormal normalization of the sums $\sigma(\Lambda)$. For weakly dependent spins, the sequence $\{\tau_n^0\}$ is asymptotically normal, then the sequences $\{\tau_n^\rho,\ \rho > 0\}$ are asymptotically degenerate at zero. Therefore, the convergence of such a sequence to some nondegenerate random variable would correspond to the appearance of a strong dependence between the spins. The latter is assumed to occur at the critical point of the model. Such critical point convergences were proven.

Proposition 3.4 ([11]) *Let $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and the measure χ possess the Lee – Yang property. Then there exists $\beta_* > 0$ such that:* (i) *for $\beta = \beta_*$, the sequence $\{\tau_n^\lambda\}$ is asymptotically normal;* (ii) *for $\beta < \beta_*$ the sequence $\{\tau_n^0\}$ is asymptotically normal,*

Proposition 3.5 ([4]) *Let the initial measure χ be chosen of the form (2.28) with $u = 1$. Then there exist $\varepsilon > 0$, $v_0 > 0$, and β_* such that for $\lambda \in (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon)$, $v \in (0, v_0)$, $\beta = \beta_*$, the sequence $\{\tau_n^\lambda\}$ converges to some non-Gaussian random variable.*

For some Borel subset $A \subset \mathbf{R}$, we denote

$$\tilde{P}_n^\beta(A) = \mathrm{Prob}(\tau_n^\lambda \in A). \tag{3.23}$$

In the case where the initial measure χ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbf{R}$, these are all $\tilde{P}_n^\beta$. Denote

$$\frac{d\tilde{P}_n^\beta(\xi)}{d\xi} = \tilde{T}_n(\xi). \tag{3.24}$$

Making use of the definition (3.22), one obtains from the recursion relations (2.19), (2.20)

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{T}_n(\xi) &= \frac{1}{\tilde{K}_n}\exp(\beta q\xi^2) \\ &\int_{\mathbf{R}} \tilde{T}_{n-1}(2^{-\frac{1-\lambda}{2}}\xi + \eta)\tilde{T}_{n-1}(2^{-\frac{1-\lambda}{2}}\xi - \eta)d\eta, \end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{K}_n &= \int_{\mathbf{R}^2}\exp(\beta q\xi^2) \\ &\tilde{T}_{n-1}(2^{-\frac{1-\lambda}{2}}\xi + \eta)\tilde{T}_{n-1}(2^{-\frac{1-\lambda}{2}}\xi - \eta)d\xi d\eta, \end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

and

$$q = \frac{1}{2}(1 - 2^{-1-\lambda})J \tag{3.27}$$

Thus, the direct corollary of Propositions 3.4 , 3.5 is the following assertion

Proposition 3.6 (i) *Let the conditions of Proposition 3.4 be satisfied. Then there exists β_* such that for $\beta = \beta_*$, the sequence $\{\tilde{P}_n^\beta, n \in \mathbf{N}\}$ weakly converges to some Gaussian measure.*
(ii) *Let the conditions of Proposition 3.5 be satisfied. Then there exists β_* such that for $\beta = \beta_*$, the sequence $\{\tilde{P}_n^\beta, n \in \mathbf{N}\}$ weakly converges to some non-Gaussian measure.*
(iii) *In both cases described above the following asymptotics holds true*

$$M_n^{(2)}(\beta_*,0) = O(2^{n(1+\lambda)}). \tag{3.28}$$

Remark 3.1 *The restriction for λ to be in the small interval $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon)$, mentioned in Proposition 3.5, seems to be purely technical. One can expect that the convergence stated there holds for all $\lambda \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. It is confirmed by the numerical results given in the paper [4]*

Hence having in mind (3.18) one can deduce

Proposition 3.7 *Let λ be chosen in the interval $(1/2, 1)$ and $a_n(\beta)$ be as in (3.18), then*

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{n\to\infty} a_n(\beta) = 0, \quad \text{for } \beta < \beta_*; \\ &\lim_{n\to\infty} a_n(\beta_*) = a \in (0,2); \\ &\lim_{n\to\infty} a_n(\beta) = 2, \quad \text{for } \beta > \beta_*. \end{aligned} \tag{3.29}$$

Now let us consider some consequences of the critical point asymptotics (3.28), just established. First we find how does the correlation length ξ_n, which describes the decay of the spin–spin correlations in $\Lambda_{n,1}$ in such a model, diverge when $n \to \infty$ and $\beta = \beta_*$. It may be used to check the assumptions of the finite size scaling method [8], [9]. We follow the latter paper where the main assumption of this method is formulated as a rule for a thermodynamic quantity $A_L(t)$, calculated on a finite lattice of linear size L, to depend on this size and on $t = (\beta_* - \beta)/\beta_*$ as

$$A_L(t) = L^{\rho/\nu} f_A(s(L,t)), \quad s(L,t) = L/\xi(t). \tag{3.30}$$

Here a power–law critical singularity for a bulk (i.e. obtained in the thermodynamic limit $L \to \infty$) quantity $A = O(t^{-\rho})$ is assumed, and $\xi(t) = O(t^{-\nu})$ stands for the bulk value of ξ. Let us choose $A = \xi$, which means $\rho = \nu$, and put $\beta = \beta_*$, that is $t = 0$. Then one has in (3.30) $s(L,0) = 0$, which yields in turn

$$\xi_L(0) = L f_\xi(0). \tag{3.31}$$

To check this assumption we use the definition (3.1) and obtain

$$M_n^{(2)}(\beta, 0) = \sum_{s,s' \in \Lambda_{n,r}} < \sigma_s \sigma_{s'} >_{\Lambda_{n,r}} . \tag{3.32}$$

The correlation function $< \sigma_s \sigma_{s'} >_{\Lambda_{n,r}}$ depends on the hierarchical distance between s and s'. We set

$$< \sigma_s \sigma_{s'} >_{\Lambda_{n,1}} = \Phi_n(\mathrm{dist(s,s')}) \tag{3.33}$$

It is known (see [3]) that the so called "small" critical exponent η equals to zero for one-dimensional and hierarchical models (see also the footnote [11] in the paper [9]). Then we can substitute in (3.32) $\Phi_n(x)$ in its asymptotic form

$$\Phi_n(x) = \Phi_0 \exp(-\kappa_n x), \ \kappa_n > 0, \tag{3.34}$$

where κ_n stands for the inverse correlation length, i.e. $\kappa_{\Lambda_{n,1}} := \kappa_n = \xi_n^{-1}$. In what follows, the ξ_n critical point asymptotics prescribed by the finite size scaling assumption (3.31) reads as

$$\xi_n = O(2^n). \tag{3.35}$$

To check whether it really holds, we put

$$\kappa_n = \kappa_0 2^{-n\rho}, \tag{3.36}$$

and find the value of ρ which corresponds to the critical point asymptotics of $M_n^{(2)}(\beta_*, 0)$ (3.28). Denote

$$S_n(\lambda, \rho) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} 2^{k-n\lambda} \exp(-\kappa_0 2^{k-n\rho}), \ \kappa_0 > 0. \tag{3.37}$$

Proposition 3.8 *Let the correlation function (3.33) have the form (3.34) with κ_n obeying (3.36). Then*

$$2^{-n(1+\lambda)} M_n^{(2)}(\beta_*, 0) = \frac{\Phi_0}{2}(2^{-n\lambda} + \exp(\kappa_n) S_n(\lambda, \rho)). \tag{3.38}$$

Proof. One has:

$$M_n^{(2)}(\beta, 0) = \sum_{s,s' \in \Lambda_{n,1}} \Phi_0 \exp\left\{-\kappa_n (2^{n(s,s')} - 1)\right\} \tag{3.39}$$

$$= \Phi_0 \exp(\kappa_n) \sum_{k=0}^{n} \Delta_n(k) \exp(-\kappa_n 2^k). \tag{3.40}$$

Here $\Delta_n(k)$ stands for the number of pairs $\{s, s'\}$ in $\Lambda_{n,1}$ such that $n(s,s') = k$, where the latter is given by (2.6). This number depends on the number $\#(\Lambda_{n,r})$ of elements in $\Lambda_{n,r}$ and can easily be computed if its following properties being utilized:

$$\Delta_n(0) = \#(\Lambda_{n,r}) = 2^n; \tag{3.41}$$

$$\Delta_n(n) = 2\#(\Lambda_{n-1,1})\#(\Lambda_{n-1,2}) = 2 \cdot 2^{2(n-1)};$$

$$\Delta_n(k) = 2\Delta_{n-1}(k), \quad k < n.$$

Thus one obtains

$$\Delta_n(k) = 2^{n+k-1}, \ k = 1, 2 \ldots n. \tag{3.42}$$

Inserting this into (3.39), one arrives at

$$M_n^{(2)}(\beta, 0) = \Phi_0 2^{n-1} + \frac{\Phi_0}{2} \exp(\kappa_n) \sum_{k=0}^{n} 2^{n+k} \exp(-\kappa_n 2^k).$$

Now one uses (3.36) and (3.37) and obtains (3.38). **QED**

Proposition 3.9 *There exist positive bounds $S^{\pm}$ such that*

$$S^- \le S_n(\lambda, \lambda) \le S^+, \quad \forall n \in \mathbf{N}, \quad \forall \lambda \in (0,1). \tag{3.43}$$

Proof. For given λ, let $[n\lambda]$ denote an integer part of $n\lambda$ and $\nu(n,\lambda) = n\lambda - [n\lambda]$. Then one has from (3.37)

$$S_n(\lambda,\lambda) = \sum_{k=-[n\lambda]}^{n-[n\lambda]} 2^{k-\nu(n,\lambda)} \exp(-\kappa_0 2^{k-\nu(n,\lambda)}). \qquad (3.44)$$

For $\lambda \in (0,1)$, $n-[n\lambda] \to +\infty$ when n tends to infinity, thus the number of summands in the right hand side of (3.44) will increase to infinity.

Let us consider the function

$$\psi_k(\nu) = 2^{k-\nu} \exp(-\kappa_0 2^{k-\nu}), \quad k \in \mathbf{Z}, \quad \nu \in [0,1]. \qquad (3.45)$$

It is not hard to show that for $\lambda \in (0,1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\psi_k(1) \le \psi_k(\lambda) \le \psi_k(0) \quad \text{for} \quad \kappa_0 2^k \le 1, \\ &\psi_k(0) \le \psi_k(\lambda) \le \psi_k(1) \quad \text{for} \quad \kappa_0 2^k \ge 2. \end{aligned} \qquad (3.46)$$

The parameter $-\log_2 \kappa_0$ may belong or not to the set of integer numbers. In the first case we denote this integer number by k_0 and conclude that the first line of the estimates (3.46) holds for $k \le k_0$ whereas the second one holds for $k \ge k_0 + 1$. If the mentioned parameter is not integer, there exists an unique integer number k obeying the estimate

$$\kappa_0^{-1} < 2^k < 2\kappa_0^{-1}. \qquad (3.47)$$

We denote this number by k_0 and conclude that the first line of the estimates (3.46) holds for $k < k_0$ and the second one holds for $k > k_0$. For $k = k_0$, one has the following estimates

$$\frac{1}{\kappa_0 e^2} \le \psi_{k_0}(\lambda) \le \frac{1}{\kappa_0 e}. \qquad (3.48)$$

Now we are able to construct the bounds $S^{\pm}$. We put

$$S^- = \min\{\psi_0(0),\ \psi_0(1),\ (\kappa_0 e^2)^{-1}\}. \qquad (3.49)$$

If $-\log_2 \kappa_0 := k_0$ belongs to $\mathbf{Z}$, we set

$$S^+ = \sum_{-\infty}^{k_0} \psi_k(0) + \sum_{k_0+1}^{+\infty} \psi_k(1). \qquad (3.50)$$

For noninteger $\log_2 \kappa_0$, we put

$$S^+ = \sum_{-\infty}^{k_0-1} \psi_k(0) + \frac{1}{\kappa_0 e} + \sum_{k_0+1}^{+\infty} \psi_k(1), \qquad (3.51)$$

where k_0 is the solution of the inequalities (3.47). Clearly, all series in (3.50), (3.51) are convergent. Now we rewrite (3.44)

$$S_n(\lambda,\lambda) = \sum_{k=-[n\lambda]}^{n-[n\lambda]} \psi_k(\nu(n,\lambda)).$$

Making use of the estimates (3.46), (3.48) one can show that (3.43) holds. **QED**

Consider also the asymptotics of $S_n(1,1)$. One has

$$\begin{aligned} S_n(1,1) \quad &= \sum_{k=-n}^{0} 2^k \exp(-\kappa_0 2^k) \\ &\to \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-k} \exp(-\kappa_0 2^{-k}) \ < \infty. \end{aligned} \qquad (3.52)$$

The corollary of (3.43) and (3.52) can be formulated as the following assertion.

Proposition 3.10 *Let $S_n(\lambda,\rho)$ be defined by (3.37) with $\lambda, \rho \in (0,1]$. Then for $n \to \infty$:*

$$\begin{aligned} &S_n(\lambda,\rho) \to +\infty, \quad \text{for} \quad \lambda < \rho, \\ &S_n(\lambda,\rho) \to 0, \quad \text{for} \quad \lambda > \rho. \end{aligned} \qquad (3.53)$$

As a result, one may conclude that the finite scaling asumption (3.31) should be revised.

Proposition 3.11 *Let the inverse correlation length κ_n have the form (3.36) with $\rho \ne \lambda$, then the asymptotics (3.28) does not hold.*

The case of $\rho = \lambda$ in (3.36) is more subtle, it needs some modification of this dependence that is probably caused by the hierarchical nature of the model.

The last question which is to be discussed in this section is the Lee--Yang edge singularities at the critical point, similar discussion for the case of exactly soluble models may be found in [18]. Due to Proposition 2.6 all $P^{\beta,0}_{\Lambda_{n,r}}$ possess the Lee–Yang property and may be characterized by the location of zeros of their Laplace transforms which are nearest to the origin of the imaginary axis. Let $f_n(z)$ be the Laplace transform (2.25) of $P^{\beta,0}_{\Lambda_{n,r}}$, then its derivatives define the moments of this measure. In particular

$$M_n^{(l)}(\beta,0) = (D^l f_n)(0), \quad l \in \mathbf{N},$$

where $M_n^{(l)}$ are defined by (3.1). Let $z_1^{(n)}$ define the location of the nearest zero of f_n and $u_n^{(2k)}$ be the semiinvariants of $P^{\beta,0}_{\Lambda_{n,r}}$ defined by (2.29). Then for $z_1^{(n)}$, Proposition 2.4 gives the estimate (2.31) with just mentioned semiinvariants. In the cases described by Proposition 3.5 or by part (ii) of Proposition 3.6, that is in the cases where the critical point convergence of $\{\tilde{P}_n^\beta\}$ holds to a non-Gaussian limit, it is expected that $|z_1^{(n)}|$ tends to zero. We describe this phenomenon as follows.

Proposition 3.12 *For $z_1^{(n)}$, the following critical point asymptotics holds true*

$$|z_1^{(n)}| = O(2^{-n(1+\lambda)/2}).$$

To prove this statement one employs the estimate (2.31) provided the asymptotics of the semiinvariants are known. Here part (ii) of Proposition 3.6 implies

$$u_n^{(2k)} = O(2^{(1+\lambda)kn}). \tag{3.54}$$

In particular $u_n^{(2)} = M_n^{(2)}(\beta_*, 0)$ has the asymptotics (3.28). By means of (3.54) one simply gets the proof.

4. Numerical Results

The main advantage of hierarchical models is that they are very suitable for direct numerical calculations. By means of relatively weak computer, one can calculate recursively from (2.23), (2.24) the Radon-Nikodym derivatives $T_n = T_n^{\beta,0}$ starting from some suitable measure (e.g. of the type of (2.28)) up to sufficiently high values of n. In this section, we present the results of such calculations. We choose the initial measure $P^{\beta,0}_{\Lambda_{0,r}} = \tilde{P}_0^\beta = \chi$ to be of the form given by (2.28) with $v = 1$ and $u = 0.1$. This is the simplest non-Gaussian measure possessing the Lee–Yang property. Another choice of v would change only the scale of β. The dependence of the results on the choice of u will be considered in a separate work, we expect it has only quantitative character. The scale of β is defined also by the choice of J in (3.27). We have put

$$J = 2\frac{1-2^{-\lambda}}{1-2^{-1-\lambda}},$$

that gives

$$q = 1 - 2^{-\lambda}. \tag{4.1}$$

The first our object is the Radon-Nikodym derivative $T_n(\xi)$ defined recursively by (2.23), (2.24) with $T_0(\xi) = d\chi(\xi)/d\xi$. For $u = 0.1$, this

function has only one maximum at $\xi = 0$. For $\beta = 0$, all these T_n will have such a property. Therefore, for small β, one may expect that this property of T_n will hold. The appearance of the long-range order in turn, one may connect with the appearance – at some n_0 – of maxima of T_{n_0} at $\xi = \pm y_{n_0}$. The number n_0 must tend to infinity with β approaching β_* from above. Such a picture was proven by means of large deviation method [1], [2]. We have obtained it numerically. For the value of the parameter λ, we have been often choosing $2/3$ which corresponds to $d = 3$ if the hierarchical model is used to describe the Yukhnovskii's approach to the d–dimensional Ising model. Fig.1 shows the evolution of $T_n(\xi)$ with n for $\lambda = 2/3$ and $\beta^{-1} = 0.50$. Here $n_0 = 4$. Fig.2 shows further evolution of T_n with the same values of the parameters. It can be seen that new maximum transforms subsequently into a sharp peak, that shows the corresponding P_n becomes more and more close to the distribution concentrated at two point $\pm m_n(\beta)$ in full agreement with Proposition 3.3. Fig.3 and Fig.4 show the same behaviour of T_n for $\lambda = 2/3$ and $\beta^{-1} = 0.61$. This behaviour is similar to that of the previous case but here $n_0 = 12$. Therefore, these two values of β are greater than β_*. The behaviour of T_n between the peaks $\pm m_n(\beta)$ is shown on Fig.5. Here the dependence of $-\log T_n$ on $x := \xi/m_n(\beta)$ is plotted for $\lambda = 0.65$, $\beta^{-1} = 0.624$, and subsequently $n = 15, 20, 23, 25$ (the highest curve corresponds to $n = 25$). This picture has been theoretically predicted by P.Bleher in his research [1]. To calculate the values of the critical temperature $T_c = \beta_*^{-1}$ for $\lambda \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, we use the parameter $a_n(\beta)$ described by Proposition 3.7. Hence we study evolution of $a_n(\beta)$ with n for different fixed values of β, and $\lambda \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. Fig.6 shows such an evolution for $\lambda = 2/3$ and eight values of $T = \beta^{-1}$. It is as described by (3.29), and one may evaluate $T_{cr} = \beta_*^{-1} = 0.61868$.

The following object of our investigation is the order parameter. In fact, it is very hard to study the genuine order parameter given by (3.5) directly. Instead of this, we have studied the lowest one $m_3(\beta)$ (see (3.7), (3.14)). Fig.7 shows the $T := \beta^{-1}$-dependence of this order parameter for $\lambda = 2/3$ and three values of $n = 10;\ 15;\ 20$. Having this dependence, one may compute the value of critical index b, given by (3.13). Fig.8 shows the dependence of b and T_{cr} evaluated from (3.13) on the values of λ from the interval $(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$.

5. Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by the Fundamental Researches Fund of Ukraine (Grant No 2.4/173).

References

1. P.M.Bleher Phases Separation Phenomenon in ϕ^4–hierarchical Model. *Theoret. and Math. Phys.* **61**: 226–240 (1984).
2. P.M.Bleher Large Deviations Theorem Near the Critical Point of ϕ^4–hierarchical Model. *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen.* **30**: 499–510 (1985).
3. P.M.Bleher and P.Major. Critical phenomena and universal exponents in statistical physics. On Dyson's hierarchical model. *Ann. Probability* **15**: 431 - 477 (1987).
4. P.M.Bleher and Ja.G. Sinai. Critical Indices for Dyson's Asymptotically Hierarchical Model. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **45**: 247–278 (1975).
5. V.V.Dukhovii, M.P.Kozlovskii, and I.V.Pylyuk. Calculation on the Microscopic Level of the Equation of State of 3D Ising Model. *Theoret. and Math. Phys.* **107**: 288–306 (1996).
6. F.J.Dyson. Existence of a Phase Transition in a One–Dimensional Ising Ferromagnets. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **12**: 91–107 (1969).
7. F.J.Dyson, E.H.Lieb, and B.Simon. Phase Transitions in Quantum Spin Systems with Isotropic and Nonisotropic Interactions. *Journal of Statistical Physics* **18**: 335–383 (1978).
8. M.E.Fisher. The Theory of Critical Point Singularities. in Proceedings of the 51st Enrico Fermi Summer School (edited by M.S.Green). New York, Academic Press 1972.
9. Jae-Kwon Kim, Adauto J.F.de Souza, D.P.Landau. Numerical Computation of Finite Size Scaling Functions: An Alternative Approach to Finite Size Scaling. *Phys.Rev.* **E54**: 2291–2297 (1996).
10. Yu.V.Kozitsky. Hierarchical Model of a Vector Ferromagnet. Self–Similar Block–Spin Distributions and the Lee–Yang Theorem. *Reports on Math. Phys.* **26**: 429–445 (1988).
11. Yu.V.Kozitsky. Hierarchical Ferromagnetic Vector Spin Model Possessing the Lee–Yang Property. Thermodynamic Limit at the Critical Point and Above. *Journal of Statistical Physics* (1997).
12. Yu.V.Kozitsky and N.O.Melnik. Random Vectors with the Lee–Yang Property. *Theoret. and Math. Phys.* **78**: 177–186 (1989).
13. Yu.V.Kozitsky and I.R.Yukhnovskii. Generalized Hierarchical Model of a Scalar Ferromagnet in the Collective Variables Method. *Theoret. and Math. Phys.* **51**: 268–277 (1982).
14. M.P.Kozlovskii, M.A.Korinevskii, and Yu.V.Kozitsky. An Application of the Collective Variables Method in the Theory of Second Order Phase Transitions. Ising Model, Cluster Models, Hierarchical Models. in Problems of Modern Statistical Physics (edited by N.N. Bogolyubov). Kiev, Naukova Dumka 1985 (in Russian).
15. M.P.Kozlovskii and I.V.Pylyuk. Entropy and Specific Heat of the 3D Ising Model as Functions of Temperature and Microscopic Parameters of the System. *Phys. Stat. Sol. (B)* **183**: 243–249 (1994).
16. M.P.Kozlovskii, I.V.Pylyuk, and V.V.Dukhovii. Equation of State of the 3D Ising Model with an Exponentially Decreasing Potential in the External Field. *Jour. of Magn. Magn. Materials* **169**: 335–342 (1997).
17. M.P.Kozlovskii, I.V.Pylyuk, I.R.Yukhnovskii. Thermodynamic Functions of Tree–Dimensional Ising Model Near the Phase Transition Point with Allowance for Correction to Scaling. I. The Case $T > T_c$. *Theoret. and Math. Phys.* **87**: 293–316 (1991); II. The Case $T < T_c$. *ibid* **87**: 434–455 (1991).
18. D.A.Kurtze. The Lee–Yang Edge Singularity in One–Dimensional Ising and N–vector Models. *Journal of Statistical Physics.* **30**:15–35 (1983).
19. B.Simon and R.B.Griffiths. The $(\phi^4)_2$ Field Theory as a Classical Ising Model. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **33**: 145–164 (1973).
20. Ja.G.Sinai. Self–similar Probability Distributions. *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen.* **21**: 63 – 80 (1976).
21. I.R.Yukhnovskiii. Phase Transitions of the Second Order. The Collective Variables Method.World Scientific Publ. Co., Singapore 1987, p. 327.
22. I.R.Yukhnovskii and M.P.Kozlovskii. Description of the Phase Transition in 3D Systems. *Journ. of Magn. Magn. Materials* **140–144**: 1477–1478 (1995).



Figure 1. $T_n(\xi)$ via ξ for $n = 2, 3, \ldots, 6$ and $\lambda = 2/3, \beta^{-1} = 0.50$.



Figure 2. The same as Fig.1 for $n = 6, 7, 8, 9$.



Figure 3. $T_n(\xi)$ via ξ for $n = 9, \ldots, 13$ and $\lambda = 2/3, \beta^{-1} = 0.61$.



Figure 4. The same as Fig.3 for $n = 13, \ldots, 18$.



Figure 5. $-\log T_n(x)$ via $x = \xi/m_n(\beta)$ for $n = 15, 20, 23, 25$ subsequently, the lowest curve is for $n = 15$.



Figure 6. Evolution of $a_n(\beta)$ with n for eight subsequent values of $T = \beta^{-1}$.



Figure 7. $m_3^{(n)}(\beta)$ given by (3.15) via $T = \beta^{-1}$ for $\lambda = 2/3$ and $n = 10, 15, 20$ subsequently, the lowest curve is for $n = 10$.



Figure 8. Critical index b defined by $m_3(\beta) = A(T_{\rm cr} - T/T_{\rm cr})^b$ and $T_{\rm cr}$ via λ .

Препринти Інституту фізики конденсованих систем НАН України розповсюджуються серед наукових та інформаційних установ. Вони також доступні по електронній комп'ютерній мережі на WWW-сервері інституту за адресою http://www.icmp.lviv.ua/

The preprints of the Institute for Condensed Matter Physics of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine are distributed to scientific and informational institutions. They also are available by computer network from Institute's WWW server (http://www.icmp.lviv.ua/)

Юрій Васильович Козицький
Михайло Павлович Козловський
Тарас Євстахович Крохмальський

Аналітичне і чисельне дослідження ієрархічної спінової моделі

Роботу отримано 26 листопада 1997 р.

Затверджено до друку Вченою радою ІФКС НАН України

Рекомендовано до друку семінаром відділу статистичної теорії конденсованих систем

Виготовлено при ІФКС НАН України