

## Gibbs measures and finite systems

Let  $\Lambda$  and  $S$  be finite sets and let  $H : S^\Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function. By definition, the *Gibbs measure* belonging to the *Hamiltonian* (or *energy function*)  $H$  and *inverse temperature*  $\beta$  is the probability measure on  $S^\Lambda$  given by

$$\mu(\{x\}) = \frac{1}{Z_\beta} e^{-\beta H(x)} \quad (x \in S^\Lambda), \quad (1)$$

where

$$Z_\beta := \sum_{x \in S^\Lambda} e^{-\beta H(x)} \quad (2)$$

is a normalization constant, also called the *partition sum*. Note that if  $H, H'$  are two energy functions that differ only by a constant, then the associated Gibbs measures are the same. Indeed, if  $H(x) = H'(x) + c$  and  $\mu, \mu'$  are the associated Gibbs measures, then all probabilities in  $\mu'$  get an extra factor  $e^{-\beta c}$ , but this disappears in the normalization. Indeed, we make the following simple observation.

### Lemma 1 (Relative probabilities)

If  $\Lambda$  is a finite set and  $\mu$  is the Gibbs measure on  $S^\Lambda$  with Hamiltonian  $H$  and inverse temperature  $\beta$ , then

$$\frac{\mu(\{x'\})}{\mu(\{x\})} = e^{-\beta(H(x') - H(x))} \quad (x, x' \in S^\Lambda). \quad (3)$$

Conversely, if  $\mu$  is a probability measure on  $S^\Lambda$  and (3) holds for all  $x, x'$  that differ only at a single site  $i \in \Lambda$ , then  $\mu$  is the Gibbs measure on  $S^\Lambda$  associated with  $H$  and  $\beta$ .

**Proof** If  $\mu$  is the Gibbs measure associated with  $H$  and  $\beta$ , then it is obvious that (3) holds. To prove the converse, we note that for each  $x, x' \in S^\Lambda$  we can find  $x_0, \dots, x_n$  such that  $x = x_0$ ,  $x' = x_n$ , and  $x_k$  differs only in one site from  $x_{k-1}$  ( $k = 1, \dots, n$ ). In view of this, if (3) holds for all  $x, x'$  that differ only at a single site, then it actually holds for all  $x, x'$ . Choosing some arbitrary reference state  $x'$ , we see that (3) determines all probabilities up to an overall multiplicative constant, which follows from the normalization. ■

Instead of looking at the proportion of two probabilities, it is often more natural to look at conditional probabilities. For our next lemma we need to introduce some notation. If  $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2$  are disjoint sets,  $x \in S^{\Lambda_1}$ , and  $y \in S^{\Lambda_2}$ , then we define  $x \& y \in S^{\Lambda_1 \cup \Lambda_2}$  as  $(x \& y)(i) := x(i)$  if  $i \in \Lambda_1$  and  $(x \& y)(i) := y(i)$  if  $i \in \Lambda_2$ . If

$H : S^\Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a function and  $\Delta \subset \Lambda$ , then for all  $y \in S^{\Lambda \setminus \Delta}$  we define  $H_y^\Delta : S^\Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$H_y^\Delta(x) := H(x \& y) \quad (x \in S^\Delta, y \in S^{\Lambda \setminus \Delta}). \quad (4)$$

**Lemma 2 (Conditional distributions)**

Let  $(X(i))_{i \in \Lambda}$  be random variables whose joint law is the Gibbs measure on  $S^\Lambda$  with Hamiltonian  $H$  and inverse temperature  $\beta$ . Then for each  $\Delta \subset \Lambda$  and  $y \in S^{\Lambda \setminus \Delta}$ , one has

$$\mathbb{P}[(X(i))_{i \in \Delta} \in \cdot \mid (X(i))_{i \in \Lambda \setminus \Delta} = y] = \mu_y^{\Delta, \beta}, \quad (5)$$

where  $\mu_y^{\Delta, \beta}$  is the Gibbs measure on  $S^\Delta$  with Hamiltonian  $H_y^\Delta$  and inverse temperature  $\beta$ . Conversely, if (5) holds for all  $\Delta$  that consist of a single element, then the law of  $(X(i))_{i \in \Lambda}$  is the Gibbs measure associated with  $H$  and  $\beta$ .

**Proof** We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\mathbb{P}[(X(i))_{i \in \Delta} = x' \mid (X(i))_{i \in \Lambda \setminus \Delta} = y]}{\mathbb{P}[(X(i))_{i \in \Delta} = x \mid (X(i))_{i \in \Lambda \setminus \Delta} = y]} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}[(X(i))_{i \in \Delta} = x', (X(i))_{i \in \Lambda \setminus \Delta} = y]}{\mathbb{P}[(X(i))_{i \in \Delta} = x, (X(i))_{i \in \Lambda \setminus \Delta} = y]} = \frac{e^{-\beta H(x' \& y)}}{e^{-\beta H(x \& y)}} = e^{-\beta(H_y^\Delta(x') - H_y^\Delta(x))}. \end{aligned}$$

In view of this, the statements follow from Lemma 1. ■

**Remark** By our earlier remarks, in Lemma 2, we can replace  $H_y^\Delta(x)$  by  $H_y^\Delta(x) + c_y^\Delta$ , where  $c_y^\Delta$  is a constant that may depend on  $\Delta$  and  $y$  but not on  $x$ .