

EUCLIDEAN GIBBS MEASURES ON LOOP LATTICES: EXISTENCE AND A PRIORI ESTIMATES

BY SERGIO ALBEVERIO, YURI KONDRATIEV, TATIANA PASUREK AND
MICHAEL RÖCKNER

*Universität Bonn, Universität Bielefeld, Universität Bielefeld
and Universität Bielefeld*

We present a new method to prove existence and uniform a priori estimates for Euclidean Gibbs measures corresponding to quantum anharmonic crystals. It is based first on the alternative characterization of Gibbs measures in terms of their logarithmic derivatives through integration by parts formulas, and second on the choice of appropriate Lyapunov functionals.

1. Introduction. This paper is concerned with models of quantum anharmonic lattice systems. In statistical physics they are commonly viewed as models for *quantum crystals* (see, e.g., [3, 29, 34, 39, 54]). A mathematical description of equilibrium properties of quantum systems might be given in terms of their Gibbs states defined on proper algebras of observables (cf. [22]). However, in the realization of this general concept for the considered quantum models there occur principal difficulties (see, e.g., the discussion in [3]). In order to overcome these difficulties we shall take the *Euclidean* (or *path space*) *approach*, which is conceptually analogous to the well-known Euclidean strategy in quantum field theory (see, e.g., [34, 39, 64]). This analogy was pointed out and first implemented to quantum lattice systems in [1]; for the recent developments see the review articles [3, 15] and the bibliography therein. More precisely, the Euclidean approach transforms the problem of constructing *quantum Gibbs states* G_β as functionals on the algebra of observables into the problem of studying certain *Euclidean Gibbs measures* μ on the *loop lattice* $\Omega_\beta := [C(S_\beta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d)]^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ (cf. Section 2.1 for details). Here $\beta := 1/T > 0$ is the inverse (absolute) temperature and $S_\beta \cong [0, \beta]$ is a circle of length β . As a consequence, various probabilistic techniques become available for investigating equilibrium properties of quantum infinite-particle systems. But, as compared with classical lattice systems, the situation with Euclidean Gibbs measures is much more involved, since now the spin (i.e., loop) spaces themselves are *infinite-dimensional* and their topological features should be taken into account carefully. Also, as is typical for noncompact spin spaces, we have to restrict ourselves to the set \mathcal{G}_β^t of *tempered* Gibbs measures μ , which we specify by some natural support condition [cf. (2.7) and (2.15)].

Received May 2002; revised December 2002.

¹Supported in part by the DFG Research Projects AL 214/17-2 and RO 1195/5-1.

AMS 2000 subject classifications. Primary 60H30; secondary 60G60, 82B10.

Key words and phrases. Quantum lattice systems, Euclidean Gibbs states, smooth measures on vector spaces, integration by parts formulae, Lyapunov functionals.

The aim of this paper is to establish *a new method for proving existence and a priori estimates* for tempered Euclidean Gibbs measures. We obtain improvements and generalizations of essentially all corresponding existence results known so far in the literature (see the discussion in Section 2.4). Moreover, this method seems to be quite universal for lattice models and gives structural insight. It had been first implemented for classical lattice systems in [13, 14]. But the concrete technique suggested in those papers does not apply to loop spaces, so that a proper (highly nontrivial) modification for the quantum case is necessary (see Section 4).

One basic idea of our method is to use an *alternative characterization of Gibbs measures via integration by parts* (instead of the usual one in terms of local specifications through the Dobrushin–Lanford–Ruelle equations). Let us note that such alternative descriptions of Gibbs measures via integration by parts (for short, IbP) formulas or via their Radon–Nikodym derivatives w.r.t. shift transformations of the underlying configuration spaces (*flow characterization*) have long been known for a number of specific models in statistical mechanics and field theory (see, e.g., [26, 32–35, 43–45, 52, 60–62]). But for the quantum lattice systems under consideration, a complete characterization of the measures $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_\beta^t$ in terms of their Radon–Nikodym derivatives was first proved in [10], Theorem 4.6 (cf. also its extension in Proposition 1). Assuming that the interaction potentials are differentiable, we further show that this flow characterization of Gibbs measures is equivalent to their characterization as differentiable measures satisfying (IbP)-formulas with prescribed logarithmic derivatives (cf. Proposition 2).

Relying on this characterization of $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_\beta^t$, in a *direct analytical way* we then prove the two main results of the paper: the *existence* of tempered Euclidean Gibbs measures (Theorem 1) and *a priori estimates* on their moments in terms of parameters of the interaction (Theorem 2). The essential ingredient of the proofs is that by the characterization of Gibbs measures via integration by parts we can deal with them as solutions of an infinite system of first-order PDEs [cf. (3.13)]. This enables us to employ the *Lyapunov function method* (in a similar way, as in finite-dimensional PDEs) in order to get a priori moment estimates on $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_\beta^t$. The local Gibbs specifications also satisfy the same (IbP)-formulas, from which we deduce moment estimates *uniformly* in volume. The latter is crucial for our proof of existence for Euclidean Gibbs measures μ , that is, that $\mathcal{G}_\beta^t \neq \emptyset$. In addition, from the a priori estimates we obtain precise information on support properties of all tempered Euclidean Gibbs measures.

Some results on the existence of Euclidean Gibbs measures, concerning special classes of anharmonic interactions and based on various other techniques, have been already known before (see Section 2.4 for the references and a more detailed discussion). But we emphasize that our tools are completely different and rather elementary, provided one has the (IbP)-description of Gibbs measures. To demonstrate our method and present the main ideas, we analyze a class of concrete lattice models given by a system of *d-dimensional* quantum anharmonic

oscillators interacting via potentials of *superquadratic* growth [cf. (2.2)]. Trying to keep the exposition more transparent, in the main body of the paper we restrict ourselves further to the case of translation invariant pair interactions between nearest neighbors only. However, our method can be easily extended to *general* (not necessarily translation invariant) *many-particle interactions* of unbounded order and infinite range, not covered at all by any previous work. This extension will be briefly described in Section 5. For a detailed exposition of the latter case we also refer to the forthcoming paper [7].

Finally, let us notice that the method proposed here can be also modified to apply to the more difficult and less studied case of zero absolute temperature, that is, $\beta = \infty$, and corresponding Gibbs measures (so-called Euclidean ground states, cf. [49, 53, 54]) on the “path lattice” $\Omega_\infty := C(\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$. This case is under present investigation.

The organization of this paper is as follows. Section 2 is devoted to general aspects of the theory of Euclidean Gibbs measures. Here we introduce the models of quantum lattice systems (“anharmonic crystals”). We recall details on the corresponding Gibbsian formalism for Euclidean Gibbs measures μ on the loop lattice Ω_β . The transform from quantum Gibbs states to Euclidean Gibbs measures, however, is described in more detail in the Appendix. Then we formulate our main Theorems 1 (resp. 2) on the existence, respectively, a priori estimates for tempered Euclidean Gibbs measures $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_\beta^t$ and compare them with previous results obtained by other methods. In Section 3 we discuss the above mentioned alternative description of $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_\beta$ in terms of their shift-Radon–Nikodym derivatives and (its infinitesimal form) in terms of their logarithmic derivatives via the (IbP)-formulas. In Section 4 we give complete proofs of our main Theorems 1 and 2, which we divide into several sequential steps formulated as Lemmas 2–5. In Section 5 we outline some possible generalizations of our method.

Finally, we mention that the results of this paper have been announced in [5, 6] and presented in various talks since December 2000 during seminars or conferences, among others, in Berlin, Kiev, Moscow, Oberwolfach and Pisa.

2. Euclidean Gibbs measures on loop spaces. We begin this section with the description of a model of interacting multidimensional quantum anharmonic oscillators on a lattice (so-called “quantum crystals”). For simplicity of the exposition, we concentrate on a specific case of *translation invariant* systems with pair interactions of *nearest neighbor* type and with *isotropic* self-interaction. Then we give a rigorous definition of the corresponding Euclidean Gibbs measures as classical Gibbs measures but with *infinite-dimensional* single spin (i.e., *loop*) spaces. We close the section with the formulation of our main results on the existence and a priori estimates for tempered Gibbs measures on loop lattices.

2.1. *A model of quantum anharmonic crystals.* Consider the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d , $d \in \mathbb{N}$, with distance $|\cdot| = (\cdot, \cdot)^{1/2}$ and basis $(e_\alpha)_{\alpha=1}^d$, and let \mathbb{Z}^d be the integer lattice in \mathbb{R}^d . We study a translation invariant system of interacting quantum particles performing d -dimensional oscillations around their equilibrium positions at points $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Each particle individually is described by the quantum mechanical Hamiltonian

$$(2.1) \quad H_k := -\frac{1}{2m} \Delta + \frac{a^2}{2} |q_k|^2 + V(q_k)$$

acting in the (physical) Hilbert state space $\mathcal{H}_k := L^2(\mathbb{R}^d, dq_k)$. Here Δ is the usual Laplacian on \mathbb{R}^d , $m > 0$ is the (reduced) particle mass, $a^2 > 0$ is their rigidity w.r.t. the harmonic oscillations, and $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an anharmonic self-interaction potential. Next, we add a nearest neighbor interaction between the particles, given by a symmetric potential $W : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and taken over all (unordered) pairs $\langle k, k' \rangle \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $|k - k'| = 1$. The whole system is then described by the heuristic Hamiltonian of the form

$$(2.2) \quad H := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} H_k + \sum_{\langle k, k' \rangle \subset \mathbb{Z}^d} W(q_k, q_{k'}).$$

The infinite-volume Hamiltonian (2.2) cannot be defined directly as a mathematical object and is represented by the local (i.e., indexed by finite-volumes $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$) Hamiltonians

$$(2.3) \quad H_\Lambda := \sum_{k \in \Lambda} H_k + \sum_{\langle k, k' \rangle \subset \Lambda} W(q_k, q_{k'})$$

acting in the Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_\Lambda := \otimes_{k \in \Lambda} \mathcal{H}_k$.

Concerning the interaction potentials, we shall suppose that they are twice continuously differentiable, that is,

$$V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}), \quad W \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}).$$

By $\nabla^{(l)} V(q)$, $\nabla_q^{(l)} W(q, q') \in \mathbb{R}^{dl}$, we shall denote their l th derivative, $l = 0, 1, 2$, w.r.t. the coordinate $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Moreover, we impose the following bounds on the asymptotic behavior of the interaction potentials at the infinity:

ASSUMPTION. There exist some constants $P > R \geq 2$ and $C_V, C_W > 0$ such that:

(V) $V(q) = v(|q|)$, $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and a function $v : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies, for all $s \geq s_0$,

$$C_V^{-1} s^{P-l} \leq v^{(l)}(s) \leq C_V s^{P-l}, \quad l = 0, 1, 2.$$

(W) For all $q, q' \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\min\{|q|, |q'|\} \geq s_0$, holds

$$|\nabla_q^{(l)} W(q, q')| \leq C_W (|q|^{R-l} + |q'|^{R-l}), \quad l = 0, 1, 2.$$

EXAMPLE. Typical potentials satisfying Assumptions (V) and (W) are the polynomials

$$(2.4) \quad V(q) := \sum_{n=0}^p b_{2n} |q|^{2n}, \quad W(q, q') := (S(q - q'), q - q')^r,$$

where S is a symmetric $d \times d$ matrix, $p, r \in \mathbb{N}$, $p > r$ and $b_{2p} > 0$.

NOTATION. For a set $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, by $|\Lambda|$ we denote its *cardinality*, by $\Lambda^c := \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \Lambda$ its *complement*, and by $\partial\Lambda := \{k' \in \Lambda^c \mid \exists k \in \Lambda, |k - k'| = 1\}$ its *boundary*. In particular, $\partial k := \{k' \in \mathbb{Z}^d \mid |k - k'| = 1\}$ is the set of all neighbors of k consisting of $2d$ points. We write $\Lambda \Subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ whenever $1 \leq |\Lambda| < \infty$. As usual, $\Lambda \nearrow \mathbb{Z}^d$ means the limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$ along any increasing sequence of volumes $\Lambda^{(N)} \subset \Lambda^{(N+1)} \Subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $\bigcup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \Lambda^{(N)} = \mathbb{Z}^d$.

As was already mentioned in the Introduction, we take the *Euclidean approach* to study the quantum lattice system (2.2). Such approach involves intricate relations between quantum statistical mechanics and stochastic processes, which for convenience of the nonexpert reader we shall briefly discuss in the Appendix. In Sections 2.2 and 2.3 we proceed with the rigorous description of the corresponding Gibbsian Euclidean formalism.

2.2. *Loop spaces.* Let us fix some $\beta > 0$ having the meaning of inverse (absolute) temperature. Let $S_\beta \cong [0, \beta]$ be a circle of length β [considered as a compact Riemannian manifold with Lebesgue measure $d\tau$ as a volume element and distance $\rho(\tau, \tau') := \min(|\tau - \tau'|, \beta - |\tau - \tau'|)$, $\tau, \tau' \in S_\beta$]. For each $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, denote by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{L}_\beta^r &:= L^r(S_\beta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, d\tau), & r \geq 1, \\ \mathbb{C}_\beta^{n+\eta} &:= C^{n+\eta}(S_\beta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d), & n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}, \eta \in (0, 1), \end{aligned}$$

the Banach spaces of all integrable, respectively, (Hölder) continuous functions (i.e., loops) $\omega_k = (\omega_{k,\alpha})_{\alpha=1}^d : S_\beta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ with the norms

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} |\omega_k|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^r} &:= \left[\int_{S_\beta} |\omega_k(\tau)|^r d\tau \right]^{1/r}, \\ |\omega_k|_{\mathbb{C}_\beta^{n+\eta}} &:= \sum_{l=0}^n \sup_{\tau \in S_\beta} |\omega_k^{(l)}|_{\mathbb{C}_\beta} + \sup_{\tau, \tau' \in S_\beta, \tau \neq \tau'} \frac{|\omega_k^{(n)}(\tau) - \omega_k^{(n)}(\tau')|}{\rho^\eta(\tau, \tau')}. \end{aligned}$$

If $d = 1$, we simply write $L_\beta^r := \mathbb{L}_\beta^r$ and $\mathbb{C}_\beta^{n+\eta} := \mathbb{C}_\beta^{n+\eta}$. In particular, \mathbb{C}_β with the sup-norm $|\cdot|_{\mathbb{C}_\beta}$ will be treated as the *single spin space*, whereas, \mathbb{L}_β^2 with the inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^2} := |\cdot|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^2}^2$ as the Hilbert space tangent to \mathbb{C}_β .

As the *configuration space* for the infinite-volume system we define the space of all loop sequences over \mathbb{Z}^d

$$(2.6) \quad \Omega_\beta := [\mathbb{C}_\beta]^{\mathbb{Z}^d} = \{\omega = (\omega_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mid \omega : S_\beta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}, \omega_k \in \mathbb{C}_\beta\}.$$

We endow Ω_β with the *product topology* (i.e., the weakest topology on Ω_β such that all finite-volume projections

$$\Omega_\beta \ni \omega \mapsto \mathbb{P}_\Lambda \omega := \omega_\Lambda := (\omega_k)_{k \in \Lambda} \in [\mathbb{C}_\beta]^\Lambda =: \Omega_{\beta, \Lambda}, \quad \Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^d,$$

are continuous) and with the corresponding *Borel σ -algebra* $\mathcal{B}(\Omega_\beta)$, which coincides with the σ -algebra generated by all cylinder sets

$$\{\omega \in \Omega_\beta \mid \omega_\Lambda \in \Delta_\Lambda\}, \quad \Delta_\Lambda \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega_{\beta, \Lambda}), \quad \Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^d.$$

Let $\mathcal{M}(\Omega_\beta)$ denote the set of all probability measures on $(\Omega_\beta, \mathcal{B}(\Omega_\beta))$. Next, we define the subset of (*exponentially*) *tempered configurations*

$$(2.7) \quad \Omega_\beta^t := \left\{ \omega \in \Omega_\beta \mid \forall \delta \in (0, 1) : \|\omega\|_\delta := \left[\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} e^{-\delta|k|} |\omega_k|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^R}^R \right]^{1/R} < \infty \right\},$$

where the parameter $R \geq 2$ describes a possible order of polynomial growth of the pair potential $W(q, q')$ [cf. Assumption (W)]. In the context below, $\Omega_\beta^t \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega_\beta)$ will always be viewed as a *locally convex Polish space* with the topology induced by the system of norms $(\|\omega\|_\delta, |\omega_k|_{\mathbb{C}_\beta})_{\delta > 0, k \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$. Correspondingly, we specify the subset of *tempered measures* as those supported by Ω_β^t , that is,

$$(2.8) \quad \mathcal{M}_\beta^t := \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega_\beta) \mid \mu(\Omega_\beta^t) = 1\}.$$

REMARK 1. Our definition of temperedness (as well as its modification to the classical case with $|q_k|$ substituting $|\omega_k|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^R}$) is *more extended* (and simpler) as those usually used in the literature (cf., see, e.g., [17, 25]). So, Ω_β^t contains all (slowly increasing) configurations $\omega \in \Omega_\beta$, for which

$$\exists p = p(\omega) > 0 : \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (1 + |k|)^{-2p} |\omega_k|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^R} < \infty.$$

Moreover, \mathcal{M}_β^t contains all measures $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega_\beta)$ satisfying the following condition in terms of their moment sequence:

$$\exists p = p(\mu) > 0 : \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (1 + |k|)^{-2p} E_\mu |\omega_k|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^R} < \infty,$$

in particular, those having the so-called Ruelle support (see Section 5). Here and further on, we write $E_\mu f := \int f d\mu$ for any μ -integrable f .

2.3. *Definition of Euclidean Gibbs measures.* Heuristically, the Euclidean Gibbs measures μ we are interested in have the following representation:

$$(2.9) \quad d\mu(\omega) := Z^{-1} \exp\{-\mathcal{E}(\omega)\} \prod_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} d\gamma(\omega_k).$$

Here Z is the normalization factor and the map

$$\Omega_\beta \ni \omega \mapsto \mathcal{E}(\omega) := \int_{S_\beta} \left[\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} V(\omega_k) + \sum_{\langle k, k' \rangle \subset \mathbb{Z}^d} W(\omega_k, \omega_{k'}) \right] d\tau$$

might be viewed as a potential energy functional describing an *interacting system of loops* $\omega_k \in \mathbb{C}_\beta$ indexed by $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, whereas every single spin space \mathbb{C}_β is equipped with the Gaussian measure γ canonically generated by the oscillator bridge process of length β . A rigorous meaning to μ as probability measures on $(\Omega_\beta, \mathcal{B}(\Omega_\beta))$ can be given by the *Dobrushin–Lanford–Ruelle (DLR) formalism* (cf. [28, 38, 56]). Namely, we define μ as random fields on \mathbb{Z}^d with a prescribed family of local specifications $\{\pi_\Lambda\}_{\Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ as follows.

We first need to construct a measure $\times_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} d\gamma(\omega_k)$ on $(\Omega_\beta, \mathcal{B}(\Omega_\beta))$ corresponding to $V = W = 0$ and the harmonic system (2.2) without interaction. With this aim, in the Hilbert space $L^2_\beta := L^2(S_\beta \rightarrow \mathbb{R})$, we consider the shifted Laplace–Beltrami operator $A := -m d^2/d\tau^2 + a^2 \mathbf{1}$ on its maximal domain $\mathcal{D}(A)$ [which is the closure of $C^2_\beta := C^2(S_\beta \rightarrow \mathbb{R})$ for the norm $|\varphi|_{W^{2,2}_\beta} := |A\varphi|_{L^2_\beta}$]. It is well known that the operator A is self-adjoint with the resolvent of trace class, that is, $\text{Tr}_{L^2_\beta} A^{-1} < \infty$. Respectively, in the Hilbert space $\mathbb{L}^2_\beta := L^2(S_\beta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d)$ we consider the operator $\mathbb{A} := A \otimes \mathbb{I}_d$, where \mathbb{I}_d is the identity matrix in \mathbb{R}^d . Let now γ be a Gaussian measure on $(\mathbb{C}_\beta, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}_\beta))$ with correlation operator \mathbb{A}^{-1} , which is uniquely determined by its Fourier transform

$$(2.10) \quad \int_{\mathbb{L}^2_\beta} \exp i(\phi, \omega_k)_{\mathbb{L}^2_\beta} d\gamma(\omega_k) = \exp\{-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{A}^{-1}\phi, \phi)_{\mathbb{L}^2_\beta}\}, \quad \phi \in \mathbb{L}^2_\beta.$$

Actually, γ is supported by the Hölder continuous loops, that is, $\gamma(\mathbb{C}^\eta_\beta) = 1$, $\forall \eta \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$ and has finite moments $E_\gamma |\omega_k|_{\mathbb{C}^\eta_\beta}^Q < \infty \forall Q \geq 1$ (see, e.g., [65]).

For every $\Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we then define a probability kernel

$$\mathcal{B}(\Omega_\beta) \times \Omega_\beta \ni (\Delta, \xi) \rightarrow \pi_\Lambda(\Delta|\xi) \in [0, 1]$$

by

$$(2.11) \quad \pi_\Lambda(\Delta|\xi) := Z_\Lambda^{-1}(\xi) \int_{\Omega_{\beta,\Lambda}} \exp\{-\mathcal{E}_\Lambda(\omega|\xi)\} \mathbf{1}_\Delta(\omega_\Lambda, \xi_{\Lambda^c})_{k \in \Lambda} d\gamma(\omega_k)$$

(where $\mathbf{1}_\Delta$ denotes the indicator on Δ). Here $Z_\Lambda(\xi)$ is the normalization factor, and

$$(2.12) \quad \mathcal{E}_\Lambda(\omega|\xi) := \int_{S_\beta} \left[\sum_{k \in \Lambda} V(\omega_k) + \sum_{\langle k, k' \rangle \subset \Lambda} W(\omega_k, \omega_{k'}) + \sum_{k \in \Lambda, k' \in \Lambda^c} W(\omega_k, \xi_{k'}) \right] d\tau$$

is the interaction in the volume Λ under the boundary condition $\xi_{\Lambda^c} := (\xi_{k'})_{k' \in \Lambda^c}$. Due to Assumptions (V) and (W)

$$(2.13) \quad \inf_{\omega \in \Omega_\beta} \mathcal{E}_\Lambda(\omega|\xi) > -\infty \quad \forall \Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \forall \xi \in \Omega_\beta,$$

and, thus, the right-hand side in (2.12) makes sense. Moreover, the additive structure of the functional $\mathcal{E}_\Lambda(\omega|\xi)$ yields the *consistency* property for $\{\pi_\Lambda\}_{\Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$: for all $\Lambda \subset \Lambda' \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $\xi \in \Omega_\beta$ and $\Delta \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega_\beta)$

$$(\pi_{\Lambda'} \pi_\Lambda)(\Delta|\xi) := \int_{\Omega_\beta} \pi_{\Lambda'}(d\omega|\xi) \pi_\Lambda(\Delta|\omega) = \pi_{\Lambda'}(\Delta|\xi).$$

DEFINITION 1. A probability measure μ on $(\Omega_\beta, \mathcal{B}(\Omega_\beta))$ is called Euclidean Gibbs measure for the specification $\{\pi_\Lambda\}_{\Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ [corresponding to the quantum lattice system (2.2) at inverse temperature $\beta > 0$] if it satisfies the DLR equilibrium equations: for all $\Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $\Delta \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega_\beta)$,

$$(2.14) \quad \mu \pi_\Lambda(\Delta) := \int_{\Omega_\beta} \mu(d\omega) \pi_\Lambda(\Delta|\omega) = \mu(\Delta).$$

Fixing $\beta > 0$, let \mathcal{G}_β denote the set of all such measures μ . We shall mostly be concerned with the subset \mathcal{G}_β^t of *tempered Gibbs measures* supported by Ω_β^t , that is,

$$(2.15) \quad \mathcal{G}_\beta^t := \mathcal{G}_\beta \cap \mathcal{M}_\beta^t = \{\mu \in \mathcal{G}_\beta | \mu(\Omega_\beta^t) = 1\}.$$

2.4. Formulation of the main results: Theorems 1 and 2. Now we present our results on the existence and a priori estimates for Euclidean Gibbs states:

THEOREM 1 (Existence of tempered Gibbs states). *Let Assumptions (V) and (W) on the potentials V and W be fulfilled. Then for all values of the mass $m > 0$ and the inverse temperature $\beta > 0$,*

$$\mathcal{G}_\beta^t \neq \emptyset.$$

THEOREM 2 (A priori estimates on tempered Gibbs states). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, every $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_\beta^t$ is supported by the set of Hölder loops $\bigcap_{0 \leq \eta < 1/2} [\mathbb{C}_\beta^\eta]^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$. Moreover, for all $Q \geq 1$ and $\eta \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$,*

$$(2.16) \quad \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{G}_\beta^t} \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{\Omega_\beta} |\omega_k|_{\mathbb{C}_\beta^\eta}^Q d\mu(\omega) < \infty.$$

COROLLARY 1. *Under the assumptions of Theorems 1 and 2 above, the set \mathcal{G}_β^t is compact w.r.t. the topology of weak convergence of measures on the Polish space Ω_β^t .*

Let us make some comments on Theorems 1 and 2. As is typical for systems with noncompact (in our case, even infinite-dimensional) spin spaces, the existence of $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_\beta^t$ stated by Theorem 1 is not evident at all. Depending on the specific class of quantum lattice models one considers, this problem has been examined in the literature by the following main methods:

(i) *General Dobrushin’s criterion for existence of Gibbs distributions:* So far, no technical means are available to verify the sufficient conditions of the Dobrushin existence theorem [28] in the case of Euclidean Gibbs measures with single spin spaces \mathbb{L}_β^r or \mathbb{C}_β (in contrast with classical lattice systems with spins in \mathbb{R}^d successfully dealt with, e.g., in [17, 25]).

(ii) *Ruelle’s technique of superstability estimates:* This technique (cf. the original papers [50, 63] and resp. [57] for its modification to the quantum case) otherwise requires that the interaction is *translation invariant* and the many-particle potentials are of *at most quadratic growth* [i.e., (W) holds with $R = 2$].

(iii) *Cluster expansions* is one of the most powerful methods to study $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_\beta^t$ in a *perturbative regime*, that is, when an effective parameter of the interaction is small (see, e.g., [8, 36, 53, 54, 58] and references therein).

(iv) *Method of correlation inequalities* involves more detailed information about the structure of the interaction potentials (for instance, whether they are ferromagnetic or convex). A number of correlation inequalities (such as FKG, GKS, Lebowitz, Brascamp-Lieb, etc.) commonly known for classical lattice systems can be extended also to the quantum case (see, e.g., [1–4, 40, 55]).

(v) *Method of reflection positivity* [as a part of (iv)] applies to *translation invariant* systems of type (2.2) with *nearest-neighbor* pair interactions and gives the existence of so-called *periodic* Gibbs states, at least under the assumptions on the potentials V, W imposed in Section 2.1 (cf. [18]).

Theorem 2 contributes to the fundamental problem of getting *uniform estimates* on correlation functionals of Gibbs measures $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_\beta^t$ in terms of parameters of the interaction. This problem was initially posed for classical lattice systems in [17, 25] and is closely related with the compactness of the set of tempered Gibbs

states (cf. Corollary 1). To the best of our knowledge, all previous results on a priori integrability of Gibbs measures on path spaces were based on the *method of stochastic dynamics* (also referred to in mathematical physics as “*stochastic quantization*”); see, for example, [15, 30, 35] and the related bibliography therein. Since in this method the Gibbs measures are treated as invariant distributions for the so-called Langevin stochastic dynamics, it requires *additional restrictions* on the interaction (among them at most quadratic growth of the pair potential W) to ensure the solvability of the corresponding stochastic equations in infinite dimensions (not to mention the extremely difficult ergodicity problem for them). Besides, a priori information about the finiteness of the moments of the measures $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_\beta^t$ is also needed for the study of Gibbs measures by means of the associated Dirichlet operators in the spaces $L^p(\mu)$, $p \geq 1$, (this is known as the Holley–Stroock approach [9, 10, 43]).

As already mentioned in the Introduction, in order to prove Theorems 1 and 2 we shall propose a new technique, which completely differs from those listed under (i)–(v) and relies on the alternative description of $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_\beta$ via integration by parts. Moreover, this technique obviously extends (cf. Section 5) to *general many-particle interactions* (not necessarily translation invariant and possibly having superquadratic growth, unbounded order and infinite range), which were not covered at all by any previous work. On the other hand, our approach is conceptually more straightforward and technically easier in comparison to the stochastic dynamics method mentioned above. This alternative approach was first realized in [13, 14], however, in the much simpler situation of classical lattice systems with finite-dimensional spins. In contrast with those papers, in the quantum case we have to do not only a “*lattice analysis*” (depending on the properties of the interaction potentials V , W), but also an additional “*single spin space analysis*” (taking into account the spectral properties of the elliptic operator \mathbb{A}). It should also be mentioned, that in the recent preprint [42] some (deterministic) version of integration by parts for local specifications has been used to prove existence of Gibbs measures relative to Brownian motion on the path space $C(\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d)$. The study of such Gibbsian (in general non-Markovian) processes has been initiated in [55]. As a special case they include the so-called $P(\varphi)_1$ -processes as Gibbs distributions corresponding to a single quantum particle at zero temperature, that is, $\beta = \infty$ (see, e.g., [19, 44]).

Finally, let us note that sufficient conditions implying uniqueness of tempered Euclidean Gibbs measures for quantum lattice systems like (2.2) have been proved in [2–4, 11, 12], whereas the possibility of phase transitions in such models has been discussed in [8, 18, 29, 41].

3. Flow and (IbP)-characterization of Euclidean Gibbs measures. In this section we give an alternative description of Euclidean Gibbs measures (cf. Propositions 1 and 2). These are the following: first, the *flow characterization* of

$\mu \in \mathcal{G}_\beta$ in terms of their *Radon–Nikodym derivatives* w.r.t. shift transformations of the configuration space Ω_β ; second, the characterization (resulting from the previous one) in terms of their *logarithmic derivatives* via corresponding (IbP)-formulas. If the interaction potentials are differentiable (as they are in our case), both characterizations are equivalent. Also, we observe that the local Gibbs specifications π_Λ , $\Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, also satisfy the same flow and (IbP)-descriptions, which later will be crucial for our proof of the existence of $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_\beta^t$.

3.1. *Flow description of Euclidean Gibbs measures.* We start with the flow description of $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_\beta$ in terms of their “*shift*”-*Radon–Nikodym derivatives* $a_{\theta h_i}$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, along some set of admissible directions h_i , $i \in \mathcal{I}$, whose linear span is dense in Ω_β .

With this aim, we shall consider the Hilbert space

$$(3.1) \quad \mathcal{H}_\beta := \left\{ \omega = (\omega_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \in [\mathbb{L}_\beta^2]^{\mathbb{Z}^d} \mid \|\omega\|_\beta^2 := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\omega_k|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^2}^2 < \infty \right\}$$

with the inner product $\langle \omega, \omega \rangle_\beta := \|\omega\|_\beta^2$ as *tangent space* to Ω_β . For the remainder of this paper, we fix an *orthonormal basis* in \mathcal{H}_β consisting of the vectors

$$(3.2) \quad h_i := (\delta_{k-k'} \delta_{\alpha-\alpha'} \varphi_n)_{k' \in \mathbb{Z}^d, 1 \leq \alpha' \leq d}$$

indexed by $i = (k, n, \alpha) \in \mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{Z} \times \{1, \dots, d\} =: \mathcal{I}$,

where φ_n are the eigenvectors of the operator A in L_β^2 , that is, $A\varphi_n = \lambda_n \varphi_n$. Recall that the operator A has discrete spectrum

$$(3.3) \quad \lambda_n := \left(\frac{2\pi}{\beta} n \right)^2 m + a^2, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z},$$

and a complete orthonormal system of trigonometric functions

$$(3.4) \quad \varphi_n(\tau) := \begin{cases} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\beta}}, & n = 0, \\ \sqrt{\frac{2}{\beta}} \cos \frac{2\pi}{\beta} n\tau, & n = 1, 2, \dots, \\ -\sqrt{\frac{2}{\beta}} \sin \frac{2\pi}{\beta} n\tau, & n = -1, -2, \dots \end{cases}$$

Moreover, the set of all trigonometric polynomials

$$\mathcal{T}_\beta := \text{lin.span}\{\varphi_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$$

is a domain of essential self-adjointness for A . Respectively, $\phi_{(n,\alpha)} := (\delta_{\alpha-\alpha'} \varphi_n)_{\alpha'=1}^d$ are the eigenvectors of the operator \mathbb{A} in \mathbb{L}_β^2 , that is, $\mathbb{A}\phi_{(n,\alpha)} = \lambda_n \phi_{(n,\alpha)}$.

PROPOSITION 1 (Flow description of $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_\beta$). *For a given direction $h_i, i \in \mathcal{I}$, let \mathcal{M}_{a,h_i} denote the set of all probability measures μ on $(\Omega_\beta, \mathcal{B}(\Omega_\beta))$ which are quasi-invariant w.r.t. the shifts $\omega \mapsto \omega + \theta h_i, \theta \in \mathbb{R}$, with Radon–Nikodym derivatives*

$$\begin{aligned}
 a_{\theta h_i}(\omega) &:= \frac{d\mu(\omega + \theta h_i)}{d\mu(\omega)} \\
 &= \exp \left\{ -\theta (\mathbb{A}\phi_{(n,\alpha)}, \omega_k)_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^2} - \frac{\theta^2}{2} (\mathbb{A}\phi_{(n,\alpha)}, \phi_{(n,\alpha)})_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^2} \right\} \\
 (3.5) \quad &\times \exp \int_{S_\beta} \left\{ V(\omega_k) - V(\omega_k + \theta \phi_{(n,\alpha)}) \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \sum_{k' \in \partial k} [W(\omega_k, \omega_{k'}) - W(\omega_k + \theta \phi_{(n,\alpha)}, \omega_{k'})] \right\} d\tau.
 \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$(3.6) \quad \mathcal{G}_\beta = \bigcap_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{M}_{a,h_i} =: \mathcal{M}_a.$$

PROOF. Proposition 1 extends the analogous result of Theorem 4.6 in [10], where (for simplicity only) the particular case of harmonic pair interactions was treated. Thus, here we sketch the proof very roughly; for missing details, as well as possible generalizations, we also refer to [7].

(i) $\mathcal{G}_\beta \subseteq \mathcal{M}_a$: this inclusion obviously follows from the DLR equations (2.14) and the quasi-invariance of the probability kernels $\pi_\Lambda(d\omega|\xi)$.

(ii) $\mathcal{M}_a \subseteq \mathcal{G}_\beta$: Keeping the notation of Section 2, for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ define $\Lambda_k := \{k\}$, $\Lambda_k^c := \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{k\}$ and $\omega_{\Lambda_k^c} := \mathbb{P}_{\Lambda_k^c} \omega \in \Omega_{\beta, \Lambda_k^c}$. Let us disintegrate any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_a$ w.r.t. its projection $\mu_{\Lambda_k^c} := \mu \mathbb{P}_{\Lambda_k^c}^{-1}$ onto $\Omega_{\beta, \Lambda_k^c}$:

$$\mu(d\omega_k, d\omega_{\Lambda_k^c}) = v_{\omega_{\Lambda_k^c}}(d\omega_k) \mu_{\Lambda_k^c}(d\omega_{\Lambda_k^c}),$$

here $v_{\omega_{\Lambda_k^c}}(d\omega_k)$ are some probability measures (= regular conditional distributions given $\omega_{\Lambda_k^c}$) on $(\mathbb{C}_\beta, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}_\beta))$. Moreover, one can verify (cf. [60], Proposition 3) the quasi-invariance of the measures $v_{\omega_{\Lambda_k^c}}$ in the following sense: There exists a Borel subset $\Delta_{\Lambda_k^c} \subseteq \Omega_{\beta, \Lambda_k^c}$ such that $\mu_{\Lambda_k^c}(\Delta_{\Lambda_k^c}) = 1$ and for every $\omega_{\Lambda_k^c} \in \Delta_{\Lambda_k^c}$, $h_i := (\delta_{k-k'} \phi_{(n,\alpha)})_{k' \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$(3.7) \quad \frac{dv_{\omega_{\Lambda_k^c}}(\omega_k + \theta \phi_{(n,\alpha)})}{dv_{\omega_{\Lambda_k^c}}(d\omega_k)} = a_{\theta h_i}(\omega_k, \omega_{\Lambda_k^c}), \quad \omega_k \in \mathbb{C}_\beta \pmod{v_{\omega_{\Lambda_k^c}}}.$$

From now on fix any $\xi_{\Lambda_k^c} \in \Delta_{\Lambda_k^c}$, and let us show that (3.7) implies

$$(3.8) \quad v_{\xi_{\Lambda_k^c}}(d\omega_k) = Z^{-1} \exp \left\{ - \int_{S_\beta} \left[V(\omega_k) + \sum_{k' \in \partial k} W(\omega_k, \xi_{k'}) \right] d\tau \right\} \gamma(d\omega_k).$$

However, $\nu := \nu_{\xi_{\Lambda_k^c}}(d\omega_k)$ is the unique probability measure on $(\mathbb{C}_\beta, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}_\beta))$ which satisfies the flow description

$$(3.9) \quad \frac{d\nu(\omega_k + \phi)}{d\nu(\omega_k)} = a_\phi(\omega_k), \quad \omega_k \in \mathbb{C}_\beta(\text{mod } \nu),$$

for all $\phi \in \text{lin. span}\{\phi_{(n,\alpha)}\}$ with the cocycle

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} a_\phi(\omega_k) := & \exp\left\{-\langle \mathbb{A}\phi, \omega_k \rangle_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^2} - \frac{1}{2}\langle \mathbb{A}\phi, \phi \rangle_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^2}\right\} \\ & \times \exp \int_{S_\beta} \left\{ V(\omega_k) - V(\omega_k + \phi) \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{k' \in \partial k} [W(\omega_k, \xi_{k'}) - W(\omega_k + \phi, \xi_{k'})] \right\} d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

To check this, let us introduce the new measure

$$(3.11) \quad \sigma(d\omega_k) := \exp \left\{ \int_{S_\beta} \left[V(\omega_k) + \sum_{k' \in \partial k} W(\omega_k, \xi_{k'}) \right] d\tau \right\} \nu(d\omega_k),$$

which (due to our assumptions on the potentials V and W) is at least σ -finite on $(\mathbb{C}_\beta, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}_\beta))$. By (3.9)–(3.11) we have that

$$(3.12) \quad \frac{d\sigma(\omega_k + \phi)}{d\sigma(\omega_k)} = \exp \left\{ -\langle \mathbb{A}\phi, \omega_k \rangle_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^2} - \frac{1}{2}\langle \mathbb{A}\phi, \phi \rangle_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^2} \right\}.$$

But, as it is well known and could be straightforwardly verified (see, e.g., [60], Proposition 4), (3.12) implies $\sigma(\mathbb{C}_\beta) < \infty$ and $\sigma(d\omega_k) = \text{const} \cdot \gamma(d\omega_k)$. Consequently, combining (3.8) and (3.11), we deduce that $\nu(d\omega_k) = \text{const} \cdot \nu_{\xi_{\Lambda_k^c}}(d\omega_k)$ and, since both are probability measures, they coincide. And finally, noting that \mathcal{G}_β is fully determined by $\{\pi_{\Lambda_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ (cf. [38], Theorem 1.33), we get the desired inclusion $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_\beta$. \square

Actually, (3.6) is true under minimal assumptions on the potentials V, W , which guarantee (besides the well-definedness of the local specifications $\pi_{\beta, \Lambda}$) continuity and local boundedness of the functions $\mathbb{R} \times \Omega_\beta \ni (\theta, \omega) \mapsto a_{\theta h_i}(\omega) \in \mathbb{R}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$. However, in applications it is more convenient to use not the flow characterization (3.6) itself, but its infinitesimal form which we describe in the next section.

3.2. (IbP)-formula for Euclidean Gibbs measures. We shall show that the above flow characterization of $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_\beta$ is equivalent to their characterization as differentiable measures satisfying the (IbP)-formulas

$$(3.13) \quad \partial_{h_i} \mu(d\omega) = b_{h_i}(\omega) \mu(d\omega) \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I},$$

with the given *logarithmic derivatives* b_{h_i} along basis vectors h_i . More precisely, for the basis vector $h_i = (\delta_{k-k'}\phi_{(n,\alpha)})_{k' \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$, $i = (k, n, \alpha) \in \mathcal{I}$, we define the function $b_{h_i} : \Omega_\beta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$(3.14) \quad b_{h_i}(\omega) := \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} a_{\theta h_i}(\omega) \Big|_{\theta=0} = -(\mathbb{A}\phi_{(n,\alpha)}, \omega_k)_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^2} - (F_{k,\alpha}(\omega), \phi_{(n,\alpha)})_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^2},$$

where $F_k = (F_{k,\alpha})_{\alpha=1}^d : \Omega_\beta \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_\beta$ is the nonlinear Nemytskii-type operator acting by

$$(3.15) \quad F_k(\omega) := \nabla V(\omega_k) + \sum_{k' \in \partial k} \nabla_q W(q, q')|_{q=\omega_k, q'=\omega_{k'}}.$$

We stress that the main difficulty in dealing with the (IbP)-formulas (3.13) is that *we do not know in advance* (until Theorem 2) *whether* $b_{h_i} \in L^1(\Omega_\beta, \mu)$. Thus, we first have to introduce proper classes of differentiable functions on Ω_β to which we can correctly apply the distributional identity (3.13).

For this purpose it is helpful to recall some facts from convex analysis (cf., e.g., [27]): Let X be a locally convex space, and let $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The *partial derivatives on the right*, respectively, *left in the direction* $h \in X$ of the function Φ at a point $x \in X$ are defined by

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_h^+ \Phi(x) &:= \lim_{\theta \rightarrow +0} \frac{\Phi(x + \theta h) - \Phi(x)}{\theta}, \\ \partial_h^- \Phi(x) &:= \lim_{\theta \rightarrow -0} \frac{\Phi(x + \theta h) - \Phi(x)}{\theta}. \end{aligned}$$

If the right and left limits in (3.16) coincide, one says that there exists the *derivative* $\partial_h \Phi(x)$ *in the direction* h . By $C^1(X; h)$ [resp. $C_{b,\text{loc}}^1(X; h)$ or $C_b^1(X; h)$] we denote the spaces of all functions $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which are *continuous* (and, moreover, *locally* or *globally bounded*) together with their partial derivatives $\partial_h \Phi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Actually, the existence either or both of $\partial_h^+ \Phi$ and $\partial_h^- \Phi$ along some total set of $h \in X$ will be quite enough for our applications, so we do not discuss here the more involved notions of Gâteaux or Fréchet differentiability. On the other hand, later we shall also need to consider $X := C_\beta$, for which, as is well known, the norm-function $|\cdot|_{C_\beta}$ is not (Gâteaux) differentiable everywhere on $C_\beta \setminus \{0\}$: indeed,

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \exists \partial_h |x|_{C_\beta} = \partial_h^\pm |x|_{C_\beta} \quad &\text{for } x, h \in C_\beta \text{ iff} \\ h(\tau) = \pm h(\tau') \quad &\text{for all } \tau, \tau' \in S_\beta \text{ such that} \\ x(\tau) = \pm x(\tau') = |x|_{C_\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

In general, for any Banach space $(X, |\cdot|_X)$ and all $x, h \in X$, there exist both $\partial_h^- |x|_X$ and $\partial_h^+ |x|_X$, which are uniformly bounded by

$$(3.18) \quad -|h|_X \leq \partial_h^- |x|_X \leq \partial_h^+ |x|_X \leq |h|_X$$

and, which for fixed $h \in X$, are semicontinuous (above resp. below) functions of $x \in X$.

REMARK 2. Under the assumptions on the potentials V, W imposed in Section 2.1, we have that $a_{\theta h_i}, b_{h_i} \in C^1(\Omega_\beta; h_i)$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $i = (k, n, \alpha) \in \mathcal{I}$. Moreover, the functions $a_{\theta h_i}, b_{h_i}$, as well as their partial derivatives $\partial_{h_i} a_{\theta h_i}, \partial_{h_i} b_{h_i}$, are bounded on the cylinder sets

$$B_{\Lambda, \rho} := \{\omega \in \Omega_\beta \mid |\omega_{k'}|_{\mathbb{C}_\beta} \leq \rho, \forall k' \in \Lambda\} \quad \text{where } \Lambda \supseteq \{k\} \cup \partial k, \rho \in (0, \infty).$$

Further, by a straightforward calculation,

$$(3.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_{h_i} a_{\theta h_i}(\omega) &= a_{\theta h_i}(\omega)[b_{h_i}(\omega + \theta h_i) - b_{h_i}(\omega)], \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} a_{\theta h_i}(\omega) &= a_{\theta h_i}(\omega) b_{h_i}(\omega + \theta h_i), \end{aligned}$$

and thus one can recover $a_{\theta h_i}$ from b_{h_i} by

$$(3.20) \quad a_{\theta h_i}(\omega) = \exp \int_0^\theta b_{h_i}(\omega + \vartheta h_i) d\vartheta.$$

DEFINITION 2. Fixing a basis vector $h_i, i = (k, n, \alpha) \in \mathcal{I}$, by $C_{\text{dec}}^1(\Omega_\beta; h_i)$ we denote the set of all functions $f \in C_b^1(\Omega_\beta; h_i)$, which satisfy the extra decay condition

$$(3.21) \quad \sup_{\omega \in \Omega_\beta} |f(\omega)(1 + |\omega_k|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^1} + |F_k(\omega)|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^1})| < \infty.$$

Below we shall need a simple approximation lemma (true even in a more general setting on locally convex spaces) in order to justify the (IbP)-formula (3.13) for all $f \in C_{\text{dec}}^1(\Omega_\beta; h_i)$.

LEMMA 1. (i) For any given $\Lambda \Subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $h \in \Omega_\beta$, there exists a sequence $\{\psi^{(N)}\}_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \subset C_b^1(\Omega_\beta; h)$ approximating $\psi \equiv 1$ in the following sense:

$$(3.22) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 \leq \psi^{(N)}(\omega) := \psi^{(N)}(\omega_\Lambda) \leq 1, \quad \text{supp } \psi^{(N)} \subset B_{\Lambda, \rho^{(N)}}, \quad \rho^{(N)} \in (0, \infty), \\ \psi^{(N)} \rightarrow 1, \quad \partial_h \psi^{(N)} \rightarrow 0 \\ \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \|\partial_h \psi^{(N)}\|_{C_b(\Omega_\beta)} < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) For each $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega_\beta)$ and $h_i, i \in \mathcal{I}$, the set $C_{\text{dec}}^1(\Omega_\beta; h_i)$ is dense in all spaces $L^r(\Omega_\beta, \mu), 1 \leq r < \infty$.

PROOF. (i) Let us first take any cut-off sequence $\{\chi_N\}_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \subset C_0^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ with the properties:

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_N(s) &= 1 \quad \text{for } s \in [0, N], \quad \chi_N(s) = 0 \quad \text{for } s \in [N + 1, \infty), \\ 0 \leq \chi_{N+1}(s + 1) = \chi_N(s) \leq 1 \quad &\text{for every } s \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Next, for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ define the boundedly supported functions on \mathbb{C}_β ,

$$\psi_k^{(N)}(\omega_k) := N \int_0^{1/N} \chi_N(|(\omega + \theta h)_k|_{\mathbb{C}_\beta}) d\theta,$$

and calculate their derivatives,

$$\partial_h \psi_k^{(N)}(\omega_k) = N \left[\chi_N \left(\left| \left(\omega + \frac{1}{N} h \right)_k \right|_{\mathbb{C}_\beta} \right) - \chi_N(|\omega_k|_{\mathbb{C}_\beta}) \right].$$

Then it is easy to check that $\psi^{(N)} := \prod_{k \in \Lambda} \psi_k^{(N)} \rightarrow 1$, as $N \rightarrow \infty$, in the sense of (3.22).

(ii) By the regularity property of any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega_\beta)$ (considered as a Borel measure on the product space $[\mathbb{L}_\beta^2]^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$), the set $C_b^1(\Omega_\beta; h_i)$ (as such containing smooth cylinder functions w.r.t. the base $\{h_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$) is dense in every $L^r(\Omega_\beta, \mu)$, $1 \leq r < \infty$. Now let us fix $h := h_i$, $\Lambda \supseteq \{k\} \cup \partial k$, and let $\psi^{(N)} \rightarrow 1$, $N \rightarrow \infty$, as in (3.22). Then, by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, each $f \in C_b^1(\Omega_\beta; h_i)$ can be approximated in $L^r(\Omega_\beta, \mu)$ by the corresponding sequence $f^{(N)} := f \psi^{(N)} \in C_{\text{dec}}^1(\Omega_\beta; h_i)$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$. \square

PROPOSITION 2 [(IbP)-description of $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_\beta$]. *Given any direction h_i , $i \in \mathcal{I}$, let \mathcal{M}_{b,h_i} denote the set of all probability measures μ on $(\Omega_\beta, \mathcal{B}(\Omega_\beta))$ which satisfy the (IbP)-formula*

$$(3.23) \quad \int_{\Omega_\beta} \partial_{h_i} f(\omega) d\mu(\omega) = - \int_{\Omega_\beta} f(\omega) b_{h_i}(\omega) d\mu(\omega)$$

for all functions $f \in C_{\text{dec}}^1(\Omega_\beta; h_i)$. Then

$$(3.24) \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I} : \mathcal{M}_{b,h_i} = \mathcal{M}_{a,h_i}, \quad \text{and thus, } \mathcal{G}_\beta = \mathcal{M}_a = \bigcap_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{M}_{b,h_i} =: \mathcal{M}_b.$$

PROOF. The line of reasoning is close to the proof in [16, 31] of the well-known fact that every probability measure μ on a vector space X , which is differentiable along some direction $h \in X$ with corresponding logarithmic derivative $b_h \in L^1(\mu)$, is for sure also quasi-invariant w.r.t. all shifts $x \mapsto x + \theta h$. The new difficulty and the principal difference compared with the above mentioned papers is that no assumptions on the global integrability of the logarithmic derivatives b_{h_i} are imposed here. Instead, we shall crucially use the approximation procedure given by Lemma 1 and the observation that $a_{\theta h_i}$, b_{h_i} are continuous locally bounded functions on Ω_β [and hence, by Remark 2 for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, there exist $\partial_\theta a_{\theta h_i}$, $\partial_{h_i} a_{\theta h_i} \in C_{b,\text{loc}}(\Omega_\beta)$].

(i) $\mathcal{M}_{a,h_i} \subset \mathcal{M}_{b,h_i}$: By Proposition 1, for each $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{a,h_i}$ and $f \in C_{\text{dec}}^1(\Omega_\beta; h_i)$,

$$(3.25) \quad \int_{\Omega_\beta} f(\omega) a_{\theta h_i}(\omega) d\mu(\omega) = \int_{\Omega_\beta} f(\omega - \theta h_i) d\mu(\omega),$$

and thus, for all $\theta \neq 0$,

$$(3.26) \quad \int_{\Omega_\beta} f(\omega) \frac{a_{\theta h_i}(\omega) - 1}{\theta} d\mu(\omega) = \int_{\Omega_\beta} \frac{f(\omega - \theta h_i) - f(\omega)}{\theta} d\mu(\omega).$$

Let again $f^{(N)} := f\psi^{(N)}$ and $\{\psi^{(N)}\}_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the cut-off sequence constructed in Lemma 1 for $h := h_i$ and $\Lambda \supseteq \{k\} \cup \partial k$. Hence, combining (3.19) and (3.22), for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{0 < |\theta| \leq 1, \omega \in \Omega_\beta} \left| \frac{f^{(N)}(\omega + \theta h_i) - f^{(N)}(\omega)}{\theta} \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{\omega \in \Omega_\beta} |\partial_{h_i} f^{(N)}(\omega)| < \infty, \\ & \sup_{0 < |\theta| \leq 1, \omega \in \Omega_\beta} \left| f^{(N)}(\omega) \frac{a_{\theta h_i}(\omega) - 1}{\theta} \right| \\ & \leq \|f\|_{C_b(\Omega_\beta)} \sup_{0 < |\theta| \leq 1, \omega \in B_{\Lambda, \rho(N)}} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} a_{\theta h_i}(\omega_\Lambda) \right| < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, in order to get the (IbP)-formula (3.23), by Lebesgue’s dominated convergence theorem one can pass to the limit, first $\theta \rightarrow \pm 0$ and thereafter $N \rightarrow \infty$, in both sides of (3.26) with $f^{(N)}$ replacing f .

(ii) $\mathcal{M}_{a, h_i} \supset \mathcal{M}_{b, h_i}$: We claim that each $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{b, h_i}$ is quasi-invariant w.r.t. the shifts $\omega \mapsto \omega + \theta h_i$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, with the Radon–Nikodym derivatives

$$(3.27) \quad \frac{d\mu(\omega + \theta h_i)}{d\mu(\omega)} = \exp \int_0^\theta b_i(\omega + \vartheta h_i) d\vartheta.$$

By Remark 2 this readily implies that $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{a, h_i}$.

So, given as before any $f \in C^1_{\text{dec}}(\Omega_\beta; h_i)$ and its approximations $f^{(N)} := f\psi^{(N)}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let us define a family of functions indexed by $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$(3.28) \quad f^{(N)}(\theta, \cdot) \in C^1_{\text{dec}}(\Omega_\beta; h_i), \quad f^{(N)}(\theta, \omega) := f^{(N)}(\omega + \theta h_i) a_{\theta h_i}(\omega).$$

Moreover, one can check by a direct calculation that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{d\theta} \int_{\Omega_\beta} f^{(N)}(\theta, \omega) d\mu(\omega) \\ (3.29) \quad & = \int_{\Omega_\beta} [\partial_{h_i} f^{(N)}(\omega + \theta h_i) \\ & \quad + f^{(N)}(\omega + \theta h_i) b_{h_i}(\omega + \theta h_i)] a_{\theta h_i}(\omega) d\mu(\omega). \end{aligned}$$

Substituting the exact expression (3.19) for $\partial_{h_i} a_{\theta h_i}(\omega)$ in (3.29) and then applying the (IbP)-formula (3.23) to $f^{(N)}(\theta, \cdot)$, we find that

$$\frac{d}{d\theta} \int_{\Omega_\beta} f^{(N)}(\theta, \omega) d\mu(\omega) = 0 \quad \forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Due to the continuity of $\theta \mapsto E_\mu f^{(N)}(\theta, \cdot)$, the latter yields

$$\int_{\Omega_\beta} f^{(N)}(\omega + \theta h_i) a_{\theta h_i}(\omega) d\mu(\omega) = \int_{\Omega_\beta} f^{(N)}(\omega) d\mu(\omega) \quad \forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Herefrom, letting $N \rightarrow \infty$, by Fatou’s lemma and Lemma 1 we conclude that the description via “shift”-Radon–Nikodym derivatives (3.27) holds for all $f \in L^1(\Omega_\beta, \mu)$. \square

REMARK 3. We briefly discuss here some useful modifications and corollaries of Proposition 2:

(i) Denote by $C_{\text{dec}}^{1,\pm}(\Omega_\beta; h_i)$ the set of all continuous functions $f \in C_b(\Omega_\beta)$ which satisfy the decay condition (3.21) and have globally bounded (but not necessarily continuous) *right* and *left derivatives* $\partial_{h_i}^+ f$ and $\partial_{h_i}^- f$ along the direction h_i . If $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{b,h_i}$, then the (IbP)-formula (3.23) extends to all $f \in C_{\text{dec}}^{1,\pm}(\Omega_\beta; h_i)$ by

$$(3.30) \quad \int_{\Omega_\beta} \partial_{h_i}^\pm f(\omega) d\mu(\omega) = - \int_{\Omega_\beta} f(\omega) b_{h_i}(\omega) d\mu(\omega).$$

To this end, it suffices to repeat the proof of part (i) of Proposition 2, recalling definition (3.16) of $\partial_{h_i}^\pm f$ and using the fact that $\partial_{h_i}^+ a_{\theta h_i} = \partial_{h_i}^- a_{\theta h_i}$. Respectively, if μ is tempered (i.e., supported by Ω_β^t), then (3.30) also holds for all $f \in C_{\text{dec}}^{1,\pm}(\Omega_\beta^t; h_i)$, where the set $C_{\text{dec}}^{1,\pm}(\Omega_\beta^t; h_i)$ is defined just as above, but with Ω_β^t instead of Ω_β . Namely, in such *extended form* (3.30) the (IbP)-formula will be applied to proper test functions (among others, depending on $|\omega_k|_{C_\beta}$) in the proofs of Lemmas 2–5.

(ii) Fix $i = (k, n, \alpha) \in \mathcal{I}$, and let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{b,h_i}$. If in the (IbP)-formula (3.30) we make the special choice of $f(\omega) := g(\omega)|\omega_{k,\alpha}|_{C_\beta}$ with arbitrary $g \in C_{\text{dec}}^1(\Omega_\beta; h_i)$ such that $\text{supp } g \subset B_{\Lambda,\rho}$ for some $\Lambda \supseteq \{k\} \cup \partial k$ and $\rho \in (0, \infty)$, we get that $E_\mu(g \partial_{h_i}^+ |\omega_{k,\alpha}|_{C_\beta}) = E_\mu(g \partial_{h_i}^- |\omega_{k,\alpha}|_{C_\beta})$. Thus, by Lemma 1(ii),

$$(3.31) \quad \mu(\omega \in \Omega_\beta \mid \partial_{\varphi_n}^+ |\omega_{k,\alpha}|_{C_\beta} = \partial_{\varphi_n}^- |\omega_{k,\alpha}|_{C_\beta}) = 1.$$

The last identity might also be derived from a result in [46], Lemma 1.3 on the so-called stochastic Gâteaux differentiability of Lipschitz continuous functions on abstract Wiener spaces. Moreover, if $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_b$, then one can conclude from (3.31) [using the description of $\partial_\varphi |\omega_{k,\alpha}|_{C_\beta}$ by (3.17) and taking into account that the set of trigonometric polynomials \mathcal{T}_β is dense in C_β] the uniqueness of the global extrema for loops $\omega_{k,\alpha} \in C_\beta$,

$$(3.32) \quad \mu(\omega \in \Omega_\beta \mid \exists \text{ unique } \tau \in S_\beta : |\omega_{k,\alpha}(\tau)| = |\omega_{k,\alpha}|_{C_\beta}) = 1.$$

This generalizes the well-known property of the oscillator bridge process γ ; see, for example, [59].

So, based on Proposition 2, instead of Euclidean Gibbs measures $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_\beta$ initially defined as random fields on the lattice \mathbb{Z}^d , we can just study probability measures on Ω_β satisfying the (IbP)-formula (3.23) with the prescribed logarithmic derivatives b_{h_i} , $i \in \mathcal{I}$. Let us stress that the b_{h_i} only depend on the given potentials V and W and, hence, are the same for all $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_\beta$ associated with the heuristic Hamiltonian (2.2). Solutions $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_b$ to the (IbP)-formula (3.23) will also be called *symmetrizing* measures. For further connections to reversible diffusion processes and Dirichlet operators in infinite dimensions we refer, for example, to [9, 10, 15, 20, 21].

3.3. (IbP)-formula for the probability kernels of the local specification. As is immediate to see from definitions (2.11), (2.12) and for classical lattice systems already mentioned in [61], the following observation is true:

Measures $\pi_\Lambda(d\omega|\xi)$ are quasi-invariant w.r.t. the shifts $\omega \mapsto \omega + \theta h_i$ with the same Radon–Nikodym derivatives as those for the corresponding Gibbs measures $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_\beta$. More precisely, for every $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, $\xi \in \Omega_\beta$, $\Lambda \Subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $i = (k, n, \alpha) \in \mathcal{I}$ with $k \in \Lambda$,

$$(3.33) \quad \frac{d\pi_\Lambda(\omega + \theta h_i|\xi)}{d\pi_\Lambda(\omega|\xi)} = a_{\theta h_i}(\omega) \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega_\beta(\pi_\Lambda(d\omega|\xi)\text{-a.e.}),$$

or, equivalently, for all $f \in L^1(\Omega_\beta, \pi_\Lambda(\cdot|\xi))$,

$$(3.34) \quad \int_{\Omega_\beta} f(\omega) a_{\theta h_i}(\omega) \pi_\Lambda(d\omega|\xi) = \int_{\Omega_\beta} f(\omega - \theta h_i) \pi_\Lambda(d\omega|\xi).$$

A reasoning similar to that used in the proof of Proposition 2 then shows that, for every $\xi \in \Omega_\beta$, $\Lambda \Subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $i = (k, n, \alpha) \in \mathcal{I}$ with $k \in \Lambda$, the (IbP)-formula

$$(3.35) \quad \int_{\Omega_\beta} \partial_{h_i} f(\omega) \pi_\Lambda(d\omega|\xi) = - \int_{\Omega_\beta} f(\omega) b_{h_i}(\omega) \pi_\Lambda(d\omega|\xi)$$

holds for all functions $f \in C^1_{\text{dec}}(\Omega_\beta; h_i)$.

Suppose now that a sequence $\pi_{\Lambda^{(N)}}(d\omega|\xi^{(N)})$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\xi^{(N)} \in \Omega_\beta$ and $\Lambda^{(N)} \nearrow \mathbb{Z}^d$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$, weakly converges on the metric space Ω_β to some probability measure $\mu_* \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega_\beta)$. Taking into account that $a_{\theta h_i}, b_{h_i} \in C_{b,\text{loc}}(\Omega_\beta)$ and using the same approximation for $f \in C^1_{\text{dec}}(\Omega_\beta; h_i)$ as in the proof of Proposition 2, one can also pass to the limit in both sides of (3.34) and (3.35). So, for any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ and any direction h_i , $i = (k, n, \alpha) \in \mathcal{I}$, we again have the flow description (3.25) and the (IbP)-formula (3.23), which hold for $\mu := \mu_*$ and all $f \in C^1_{\text{dec}}(\Omega_\beta; h_i)$. Combining these properties of μ_* with Propositions 1 and 2, we have thus proved the following:

PROPOSITION 3 (Thermodynamic limit points are Gibbs). *Consider any sequence of measures $\pi_{\Lambda^{(N)}}(d\omega|\xi^{(N)})$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\xi^{(N)} \in \Omega_\beta$ and $\Lambda^{(N)} \nearrow \mathbb{Z}^d$*

as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Then each of its accumulation points $\mu^* \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega_\beta)$ (w.r.t. the topology of weak convergence of measures on the Polish space Ω_β), provided such exist, is Gibbs.

In this way, the alternative characterization of Euclidean Gibbs measures enables us to study the existence problem for $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_\beta$ just by showing the tightness of the family of their probability kernels.

4. Proof of Theorems 1 and 2. Assumptions (V) and (W) on the asymptotic behavior of the potentials $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $W \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ imposed in Section 2 obviously imply the following global bounds:

(W*) There exist $R \geq 2$ and $J, I \geq 0$ such that for all $q, q' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ holds

$$|\nabla_q^{(l)} W(q, q')|(1 + |q|^l + |q'|^l) \leq J(|q|^R + |q'|^R) + I, \quad l = 0, 1, 2.$$

(V*) The function V and its derivatives are polynomially bounded [i.e., there exist $R' \geq R$ such that

$$\sup_{q \in \mathbb{R}^d} \{ |\nabla^{(l)} V(q)|(1 + |q|^l)^{-R'} \} < \infty, \quad l = 0, 1, 2]$$

and, moreover, satisfy the *coercivity* estimate

$$(i) \quad (\nabla V(q), q) \geq K^{-1}|q|^R + L^{-1} \sum_{l=1,2} |\nabla^{(l)} V(q)|(1 + |q|^l) - M$$

with some $K, L, M > 0$, uniformly for all $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Additionally, the following relation between the parameters holds:

$$(ii) \quad \Theta := 2dJKR < 1 \quad \text{and, hence, also} \quad \Theta_0 := 4dJK < 1.$$

Below we shall only use (V*) and (W*). So, Theorems 1 and 2, in fact, hold under these much weaker conditions.

In order to control the properties of the logarithmic derivatives b_{h_i} , we introduce (*conventionally* in this paper) the following characteristic of the vector field ∇V .

DEFINITION 3. The functional

$$(4.1) \quad \mathbb{C}_\beta \ni \phi \mapsto \Phi(\phi) := (\nabla V(\phi), \phi)_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^2} \in \mathbb{R},$$

is called the coercivity functional corresponding to the vector field $\mathbb{C}_\beta \ni \phi \mapsto \nabla V(\phi) \in \mathbb{C}_\beta$ w.r.t. the tangent Hilbert space \mathbb{L}_β^2 .

Assumption V*(ii) obviously implies the *uniform lower boundedness* of Φ , that is, that

$$(4.2) \quad \hat{\Phi}(\phi) := \Phi(\phi) + \beta M \geq 0 \quad \forall \phi \in \mathbb{C}_\beta.$$

Because of the identity $\mathcal{G}_\beta = \mathcal{M}_b$, it is equivalent to prove the statements of our main Theorems 1 and 2 for tempered measures $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_b^t := \mathcal{M}_b \cap \mathcal{M}_\beta^t$. The proof of Theorems 1 and 2 will be based on Lemmas 2–5.

4.1. *Integrability of \mathbb{L}_β^R -norms.* As a first preliminary result we prove a priori estimates in the spaces \mathbb{L}_β^R .

LEMMA 2. *Suppose that the parameters in Assumptions (V*) and (W*) satisfy the following relation:*

$$(4.3) \quad \Theta_0 := 4dJK < 1.$$

Then, for every $Q \geq 1$, there exists $\mathcal{C}_Q \in (0, \infty)$ such that a priori for all $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_b^t$,

$$(4.4) \quad \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{\Omega_\beta} |\omega_k|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^R}^{RQ} d\mu(\omega) \leq \mathcal{C}_Q.$$

PROOF. We perform induction on $Q \in \mathbb{N}$ and, respectively, divide the proof into several steps.

Step 1. Fix an arbitrary, but small enough $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ such that

$$(4.5) \quad \Theta_\delta := 2dJK(1 + e^\delta) + \kappa d\delta[1 + 2dK(1 + e^\delta)] < 1 - 2\delta.$$

In view of the definition (2.7) of Ω_β^t , we introduce a sequence of weights $\gamma_{\delta,k}$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$,

$$\gamma_{\delta,k} := \exp(-\delta|k|), \quad |\gamma_\delta|_{l^1} := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \gamma_{\delta,k} < \infty.$$

To get the required estimate (4.4) uniformly in $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we endow the space Ω_β^t with the system of (mutually equivalent) norms $\|\cdot\|_{\delta,k_0}$, $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^d$,

$$(4.6) \quad \|\omega\|_{\delta,k_0} := \left[\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \gamma_{\delta,k-k_0} |\omega_k|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^R}^R \right]^{1/R} \leq (\gamma_{\delta,k_0})^{-1/R} \|\omega\|_\delta < \infty.$$

Now let us take any measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_b^t$. For given $Q \geq 1$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, consider the following family of test functions on Ω_β^t :

$$(4.7) \quad f(\omega) := f_{\tau,\sigma,\varepsilon}(\omega) := (\|\omega\|_{\delta,k_0} + \sigma)^{R(Q-1)} F_{k,\alpha}(\omega(\tau)) Z_{\sigma,\varepsilon}^{-1}(\omega),$$

$$\tau \in S_\beta, \sigma, \varepsilon > 0,$$

where the mapping $F_{k,\alpha} : \Omega_\beta \rightarrow C_\beta$ is defined by (3.15). Here we set

$$(4.8) \quad Z(\omega) := Z_{\sigma,\varepsilon}(\omega) := 1 + \sigma \|\omega\|_{\delta,k_0}^{2RQ} + \varepsilon |\omega_k|_{\mathbb{C}_\beta}^{2R'Q}$$

with a large enough $R' \geq R$ from Assumption (V*). Then $f \in C_{\text{dec}}^{1,\pm}(\Omega_\beta^t; h_i)$ for each $i = (k, n, \alpha) \in \mathcal{I}$. Hence, according to Remark 3 one can correctly apply to such f and μ the extended version (3.30) of integration by parts in all (e.g., not

necessarily basis) directions $h \in \Omega_\beta$ of the form (3.2) with any $0 \neq \varphi \in \mathcal{T}_\beta$ instead of φ_n . By the chain rule, for all $\omega \in \Omega'_\beta$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \partial_h^\pm f(\omega) &= (\|\omega\|_{\delta, k_0} + \sigma)^{R(Q-1)} [\partial_h F_{k, \alpha}(\omega(\tau))] Z^{-1}(\omega) \\
 &\quad + R(Q-1)(\|\omega\|_{\delta, k_0} + \sigma)^{R(Q-1)-1} \\
 (4.9) \quad &\quad \times [\partial_h^\pm \|\omega\|_{\delta, k_0}] F_{k, \alpha}(\omega(\tau)) Z^{-1}(\omega) \\
 &\quad - (\|\omega\|_{\delta, k_0} + \sigma)^{R(Q-1)} F_{k, \alpha}(\omega(\tau)) [\partial_h^\pm Z(\omega)] Z^{-2}(\omega).
 \end{aligned}$$

Due to Young's inequality and Assumptions (V*) and (W*), one has the following bounds in the right-hand side of (4.9):

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\varphi|_{C_\beta}^{-1} |\partial_h^\pm Z(\omega)| Z^{-1}(\omega) \\
 \leq 2QR'(\sigma\beta^{1/R} \|\omega\|_{\delta, k_0}^{2RQ-1} + \varepsilon |\omega_k|_{C_\beta}^{2R'Q-1}) Z^{-1}(\omega) \\
 (4.10) \quad \leq 2QR'(\sigma^{1/2RQ} \beta^{1/R} + \varepsilon^{1/2R'Q}) =: \mathcal{Z}_{\sigma, \varepsilon} =: \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow 0, \\
 \sigma, \varepsilon \rightarrow +0,
 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 \max \{ |F_{k, \alpha}(\omega)|, |\varphi|_{C_\beta}^{-1} |\partial_h F_{k, \alpha}(\omega)| \} \\
 (4.11) \quad \leq \delta \left[\sum_{k' \in \partial k} (|\omega_k|^R + |\omega_{k'}|^R) + (\nabla V(\omega_k), \omega_k) + M \right] + I_\delta =: \hat{F}_{\delta, k}(\omega)
 \end{aligned}$$

with some absolute constant $I_\delta > 0$ (which could be calculated explicitly). Substituting (4.9)–(4.11) into (3.30), we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_{\Omega_\beta} (\|\omega\|_{\delta, k_0} + \sigma)^{R(Q-1)} F_{k, \alpha}(\omega(\tau)) (A\varphi, \omega_{k, \alpha})_{L_\beta^2} Z^{-1} d\mu \\
 \leq |\varphi|_{C_\beta} \int_{\Omega_\beta} (\|\omega\|_{\delta, k_0} + \sigma)^{R(Q-1)-1} \\
 (4.12) \quad \quad \times [(1 + \mathcal{Z}) \|\omega\|_{\delta, k_0} + \beta^{1/R} R(Q-1)] \\
 \quad \quad \times \hat{F}_{\delta, k}(\omega(\tau)) Z^{-1} d\mu \\
 - \int_{\Omega_\beta} (\|\omega\|_{\delta, k_0} + \sigma)^{R(Q-1)} F_{k, \alpha}(\omega(\tau)) (F_{k, \alpha}(\omega), \varphi)_{L_\beta^2} Z^{-1} d\mu.
 \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality obviously extends by continuity to arbitrary $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(A)$.

Step 2. Now we would like to replace φ in (4.13) by the Green function $\mathfrak{G}_\tau := A^{-1}\delta_\tau$, $\tau \in S_\beta$, which is given by the well-known representation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{G}_\tau(\tau') &:= (A^{-1}\delta_\tau)(\tau') = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \lambda_n^{-1} \varphi_n(\tau) \varphi_n(\tau') \\ (4.13) \quad &= \frac{\kappa}{2} (e^{(-a/\sqrt{m})(\beta - \rho(\tau, \tau'))} + e^{(-a/\sqrt{m})\rho(\tau, \tau')}), \quad \tau, \tau' \in S_\beta. \end{aligned}$$

Here, for the sake of convenience, we introduce a parameter:

$$(4.14) \quad \kappa := [2a\sqrt{m}(1 - e^{(-a/\sqrt{m})\beta})]^{-1}.$$

Moreover, from (4.13) one easily gets the following regularity properties of $\mathfrak{G}_\tau \in \mathcal{D}(A^{1/2}) := W_\beta^{2,1}$ to be crucially used below in the proofs of Lemmas 2–5:

$$(4.15) \quad |\mathfrak{G}_\tau|_{C_\beta} \leq \kappa, \quad |\mathfrak{G}_\tau - \mathfrak{G}_{\tau'}|_{C_\beta} \leq \kappa \frac{a}{\sqrt{m}} \rho(\tau, \tau') \quad \forall \tau, \tau' \in S_\beta.$$

To this end, we construct the (so-called Yosida) approximation of $\varphi_\tau := \mathfrak{G}_\tau$ by $\varphi_\tau^{(N)} \in \mathcal{D}(A)$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(4.16) \quad \varphi_\tau^{(N)} := (1 + N^{-1}A)^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_\tau, \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} |\varphi_\tau^{(N)} - \mathfrak{G}_\tau|_{C_\beta} = 0.$$

Using the fact that A generates a contractive semigroup on C_β , one can easily check that for all $\omega \in \Omega_\beta$,

$$(4.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} (A\varphi_\tau^{(N)}, \omega_{k,\alpha})_{L_\beta^2} &= \omega_{k,\alpha}(\tau), \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} (F_{k,\alpha}(\omega), \varphi_\tau^{(N)})_{L_\beta^2} &= (A^{-1}F_{k,\alpha}(\omega))(\tau), \end{aligned}$$

with the uniform bounds

$$(4.18) \quad |(A\varphi_\tau^{(N)}, \omega_{k,\alpha})_{L_\beta^2}| \leq |\omega_k|_{\mathbb{C}_\beta}, \quad |(F_{k,\alpha}(\omega), \varphi_\tau^{(N)})_{L_\beta^2}| \leq \kappa |F_k(\omega)|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^1}.$$

Letting $N \rightarrow \infty$ in (4.12) with $\varphi_\tau^{(N)}$ replacing φ , by (4.16)–(4.18) and Lebesgue’s dominated convergence theorem we get that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega_\beta} (\|\omega\|_{\delta,k_0} + \sigma)^{R(Q-1)} F_{k,\alpha}(\omega(\tau)) \omega_{k,\alpha}(\tau) Z^{-1} d\mu \\ &\leq \kappa \int_{\Omega_\beta} (\|\omega\|_{\delta,k_0} + \sigma)^{R(Q-1)-1} \\ (4.19) \quad &\times [(1 + \mathcal{Z})\|\omega\|_{\delta,k_0} + \beta^{1/R} R(Q-1)] \\ &\times \hat{F}_{\delta,k}(\omega(\tau)) Z^{-1} d\mu \\ &- \int_{\Omega_\beta} (\|\omega\|_{\delta,k_0} + \sigma)^{R(Q-1)} F_{k,\alpha}(\omega(\tau)) (A^{-1}F_{k,\alpha}(\omega))(\tau) Z^{-1} d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we take the sum of (4.19) over all α and integrate them over $\tau \in S_\beta$. Simply dropping the nonnegative term with $(\mathbb{A}^{-1}F_k(\omega), F_k(\omega))_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^2}$, we obtain the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\Omega_\beta} (\|\omega\|_{\delta,k_0} + \sigma)^{R(Q-1)} (F_k(\omega), \omega_k)_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^2} Z^{-1} d\mu \\
 & \leq \kappa d \int_{\Omega_\beta} (\|\omega\|_{\delta,k_0} + \sigma)^{R(Q-1)-1} \\
 (4.20) \quad & \times [(1 + \mathcal{Z})\|\omega\|_{\delta,k_0} + \beta^{1/R}R(Q-1)] \\
 & \times |\hat{F}_{\delta,k}(\omega)|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^1} Z^{-1} d\mu.
 \end{aligned}$$

We note that, because of (4.3) and (4.10), the parameters $\delta, \sigma, \varepsilon > 0$ in (4.20) can be chosen so small that the following relation holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Xi & := \Xi_{\delta,\sigma,\varepsilon} := \kappa d \delta (1 + \mathcal{Z}_{\sigma,\varepsilon}) \\
 (4.21) \quad & < \Xi_{\delta,\sigma,\varepsilon} [1 + 2dK(1 + e^\delta)] \\
 & + 2dJK(1 + e^\delta) =: \Theta_{\delta,\sigma,\varepsilon} < 1 - 2\delta.
 \end{aligned}$$

Step 3. In particular, for $Q = 1$, we have from (4.20), (4.21) and Assumptions (V*) and (W*) that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\Omega_\beta} |\omega_k|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^R}^R Z^{-1} d\mu \leq K \int_{\Omega_\beta} \hat{\Phi}(\omega_k) Z^{-1} d\mu \\
 (4.22) \quad & \leq K(J + \Xi)(1 - \Xi)^{-1} \\
 & \times \int_{\Omega_\beta} \sum_{k' \in \partial k} (|\omega_k|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^R}^R + |\omega_{k'}|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^R}^R) Z^{-1} d\mu \\
 & + \beta K(M + 2dI + \delta^{-1}I_\delta \Xi)(1 - \Xi)^{-1}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Letting first $\varepsilon \rightarrow +0$ in (4.22) and then summing with the weights $\gamma_{\delta,k-k_0}$ over $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, by Lebesgue’s dominated convergence theorem we find that

$$(4.23) \quad \int_{\Omega_\beta} \|\omega\|_{\delta,k_0}^R Z_{\sigma,0}^{-1} d\mu \leq \beta K(2\delta)^{-1} |\gamma_\delta|_1 (M + 2dI + \delta^{-1}I_\delta + 1) =: \mathcal{C}_1.$$

Finally, letting $\sigma \rightarrow +0$ in (4.23), by Fatou’s lemma we conclude that

$$(4.24) \quad \sup_{k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{\Omega_\beta} |\omega_{k_0}|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^R}^R d\mu(\omega) \leq \sup_{k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{\Omega_\beta} \|\omega\|_{\delta,k_0}^R d\mu(\omega) \leq \mathcal{C}_1$$

and thus, getting back to (4.22),

$$(4.25) \quad \sup_{k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{\Omega_\beta} \hat{\Phi}(\omega_{k_0}) d\mu(\omega) \leq \mathcal{C}_1(\delta^{-1}K^{-1} + 1) =: \mathcal{C}_1(\hat{\Phi}).$$

Step 4. Let us consider the general case of $Q \geq 2$ provided it is already known that

$$(4.26) \quad \sup_{k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{\Omega_\beta} \|\omega\|_{\delta, k_0}^{R(Q-1)} d\mu(\omega) \leq \mathcal{C}_{Q-1} < \infty$$

[as proved by (4.24) for $Q = 2$]. Analogously to deriving estimates (4.22)–(4.25), we reduce (4.20) to

$$(4.27) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_\beta} \|\omega\|_{\delta, k_0}^{R(Q-1)} |\omega_k|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^R}^R Z^{-1} d\mu \\ & \leq \int_{\Omega_\beta} K \|\omega\|_{\delta, k_0}^{R(Q-1)} \hat{\Phi}(\omega_k) Z^{-1} d\mu \\ & \leq K(J + \Xi)(1 - \Xi - \delta)^{-1} \\ & \times \int_{\Omega_\beta} \|\omega\|_{\delta, k_0}^{R(Q-1)} \sum_{k' \in \partial k} (|\omega_k|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^R}^R + |\omega_{k'}|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^R}^R) Z^{-1} d\mu \\ & + I_{Q, \delta} \int_{\Omega_\beta} \left[\|\omega\|_{\delta, k_0}^{R(Q-1)} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \sum_{k' \in \partial k} (|\omega_k|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^R}^R + |\omega_{k'}|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^R}^R) + \hat{\Phi}(\omega_k) + 1 \right] d\mu \end{aligned}$$

with some constant $I_{Q, \delta} > 0$ which is independent of $k, k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Again, letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow +0$ in (4.27) and then summing with the weights $\gamma_{\delta, k-k_0}$ over $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, by (4.24)–(4.26) and Lebesgue’s dominated convergence theorem we get that

$$(4.28) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_\beta} \|\omega\|_{\delta, k_0}^{RQ} Z_{\sigma, 0}^{-1} d\mu(\omega) \\ & \leq \delta^{-1} I_{Q, \delta} |\gamma_\delta|_{l^1} [\mathcal{C}_{Q-1} + 4d\mathcal{C}_1 + \mathcal{C}_1(\hat{\Phi}) + 1] =: \mathcal{C}_{Q, \delta} =: \mathcal{C}_Q. \end{aligned}$$

Thereafter, letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow +0$ in (4.28), by Fatou’s lemma we readily obtain that

$$(4.29) \quad \sup_{k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{\Omega_\beta} |\omega_{k_0}|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^R}^{RQ} d\mu(\omega) \leq \sup_{k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{\Omega_\beta} \|\omega\|_{\delta, k_0}^{RQ} d\mu(\omega) \leq \mathcal{C}_Q.$$

Hence, by induction the required estimate (4.4) is valid for all $Q \geq 1$. \square

Analogous a priori estimates hold also for the corresponding local Gibbs specification.

LEMMA 3. *Fix any boundary condition*

$$(4.30) \quad \xi \in \Omega_\beta^t \quad \text{with} \quad \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\xi_k|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^R} =: c_\xi < \infty.$$

Then, under the assumptions of Lemma 2, for every $Q \geq 1$ there exists $\mathcal{C}_{Q,\xi} \in (0, \infty)$ such that uniformly for all $\Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^d$,

$$(4.31) \quad \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{\Omega_\beta} |\omega_k|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^R}^{RQ} \pi_\Lambda(d\omega|\xi) \leq \mathcal{C}_{Q,\xi}.$$

PROOF. Setting $\mu(d\omega) := \pi_\Lambda(d\omega|\xi)$ with arbitrary $\Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, let us go step by step through the proof of Lemma 2. Since $\omega_{\Lambda^c} = \xi_{\Lambda^c}$ ($\pi_\Lambda(d\omega|\xi)$ -a.e.) and $\pi_\Lambda(d\omega|\xi) \in \mathcal{M}_{b,h_i}^t$ provided $k \in \Lambda$, all the above formulas (4.19)–(4.21) are still valid for such k . Now we take in (4.22) [resp. (4.27)] the weighted sum over all $k \in \Lambda$ and add the term $E_\mu(\|\omega\|_{\delta,k_0}^{R(Q-1)} \|\xi_{\Lambda^c}\|_{\delta,k_0})$ to both sides of the resulting inequality. If $Q = 1$, in a straightforward way one gets that

$$(4.32) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sup_{k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{\Omega_\beta} |\omega_{k_0}|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^R}^R \pi_\Lambda(d\omega|\xi) \\ & \leq \sup_{k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{\Omega_\beta} \|\omega\|_{\delta,k_0}^R \pi_\Lambda(d\omega|\xi) \\ & \leq (2\delta)^{-1} |\gamma_\delta|_{l^1} [\beta K(M + 2dI + \delta^{-1}I_\delta + 1) + c_\xi] =: \mathcal{C}_{1,\xi} \end{aligned}$$

and, thus,

$$(4.33) \quad \sup_{k_0 \in \Lambda} \int_{\Omega_\beta} \hat{\Phi}(\omega_{k_0}) \pi_\Lambda(d\omega|\xi) \leq \mathcal{C}_{1,\xi} (\delta^{-1}K^{-1} + 1) =: \mathcal{C}_{1,\xi}(\hat{\Phi})$$

uniformly for all $\Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Thereafter, by induction over $Q \in \mathbb{N}$, we conclude that

$$(4.34) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sup_{k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{\Omega_\beta} |\omega_{k_0}|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^R}^{RQ} \pi_\Lambda(d\omega|\xi) \\ & \leq \sup_{k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{\Omega_\beta} \|\omega\|_{\delta,k_0}^{RQ} \pi_\Lambda(d\omega|\xi) \\ & \leq \delta^{-1} I_{Q,\delta} |\gamma_\delta^R|_{l^1} [\mathcal{C}_{Q-1,\xi} + 4d\mathcal{C}_{1,\xi} + \mathcal{C}_{1,\xi}(\hat{\Phi}) + 1 + c_\xi \mathcal{C}_{Q-1,\xi} I_{Q,\delta}^{-1}] \\ & =: \mathcal{C}_{Q,\xi}, \end{aligned}$$

as was required. \square

4.2. *Integrability of the coercivity functional.* Next, we strengthen the assertions of Lemmas 1 and 2 by proving a priori integrability estimates for the coercivity functional Φ .

LEMMA 4. For fixed $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, suppose that μ is a measure satisfying the (IbP)-formula (3.30) along all directions h_i , $i = (k, n, \alpha)$ with $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $1 \leq \alpha \leq d$, that is,

$$\mu \in \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{Z}, 1 \leq \alpha \leq d} \mathcal{M}_{b,h_i},$$

and, moreover, obeys the moment estimate

$$(4.35) \quad \sup_{k' \in \{k\} \cup \partial k} \int_{\Omega_\beta} |\omega_{k'}|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^R}^{RQ} d\mu(\omega) \leq \mathcal{C}_Q$$

with some given $Q \geq 1$ and $\mathcal{C}_Q \in (0, \infty)$. Under Assumptions (V*) and (W*), (4.35) then implies the (even stronger) integrability property

$$(4.36) \quad \int_{\Omega_\beta} |\Phi(\omega_k)|^Q d\mu(\omega) \leq \mathcal{C}_Q(\Phi)$$

with a uniform (i.e., independent of μ and k) constant $\mathcal{C}_Q(\Phi) \in (0, \infty)$.

PROOF. We proceed in much the same way as in the proof of Lemma 2 and keep all the notation used there. For $1 \leq \alpha \leq d$ and $0 \neq \varphi \in \mathcal{T}_\beta$, let us perform integration by parts w.r.t. μ along the corresponding direction $h \in \Omega_\beta$, but for a suitable family of test functions g on Ω_β^t , namely those of type,

$$(4.37) \quad g(\omega) := g_{\tau, \varepsilon}(\omega) := (\hat{\Phi}(\omega_k) + \varepsilon)^{Q-1} F_{k, \alpha}(\omega(\tau)) Z_\varepsilon^{-1}(\omega),$$

$\tau \in S_\beta, \varepsilon > 0.$

Since $|\omega_k|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^R}^{QR} \in L^1(\mu)$, in definition (4.8) one can already set $\sigma = 0$ so that

$$(4.38) \quad Z(\omega_k) := Z_\varepsilon(\omega_k) := 1 + \varepsilon |\omega_k|_{\mathbb{C}_\beta}^{2R'Q} \quad \text{and}$$

$$|\varphi|_{\mathbb{C}_\beta}^{-1} |\partial_h^\pm Z(\omega_k)| Z^{-1}(\omega_k) \leq 2\varepsilon^{1/(2R'Q)} R'Q =: \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon := \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow 0,$$

$\varepsilon \rightarrow +0.$

Next, we choose small enough $\delta, \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ so that

$$(4.39) \quad \Xi := \Xi_{\delta, \varepsilon} := \kappa d \delta [1 + L(Q - 1) + \mathcal{Z}_\varepsilon] < 1 - \delta.$$

The corresponding derivatives

$$(4.40) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_h^\pm g(\omega) &= (\hat{\Phi}(\omega_k) + \varepsilon)^{Q-1} [\partial_h F_{k, \alpha}(\omega(\tau))] Z^{-1}(\omega_k) \\ &+ (Q - 1)(\hat{\Phi}(\omega_k) + \varepsilon)^{Q-2} [\partial_h \hat{\Phi}(\omega_k)] F_{k, \alpha}(\omega(\tau)) Z^{-1}(\omega_k) \\ &- (\hat{\Phi}(\omega_k) + \varepsilon)^{Q-1} F_{k, \alpha}(\omega(\tau)) [\partial_h^\pm Z(\omega_k)] Z^{-2}(\omega_k) \end{aligned}$$

can be obviously estimated by means of (4.11), (4.38) and the following bound in the right-hand side of (4.40):

$$|\varphi|_{\mathbb{C}_\beta}^{-1} |\partial_h \hat{\Phi}(\omega_k)| \leq |\nabla V(\omega_k)|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^1} + |(\nabla^{(2)} V(\omega_k)) \omega_k|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^1} \leq L \hat{\Phi}(\omega_k).$$

Hence, the (IbP)-formula (3.30) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_\beta} (\hat{\Phi}(\omega_k) + \varepsilon)^{Q-1} F_{k,\alpha}(\omega(\tau))(A\varphi, \omega_{k,\alpha})_{L_\beta^2} Z^{-1} d\mu \\ & \leq |\varphi|_{C_\beta} [1 + L(Q-1) + \mathcal{Z}] \int_{\Omega_\beta} (\hat{\Phi}(\omega_k) + \varepsilon)^{Q-1} \hat{F}_{\delta,k}(\omega(\tau)) Z^{-1} d\mu \\ & \quad - \int_{\Omega_\beta} (\hat{\Phi}(\omega_k) + \varepsilon)^{Q-1} F_{k,\alpha}(\omega(\tau))(F_{k,\alpha}(\omega), \varphi)_{L_\beta^2} Z^{-1} d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Taking for φ the Green function $\mathfrak{G}_\tau := A^{-1}\delta_\tau$ and integrating over $\tau \in S_\beta$ [cf. the arguments (4.16)–(4.20)], we arrive at the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - \Xi) \int_{\Omega_\beta} (\hat{\Phi}(\omega_k) + \varepsilon)^Q Z^{-1} d\mu \\ & \leq (J + \Xi) \int_{\Omega_\beta} (\hat{\Phi}(\omega_k) + \varepsilon)^{Q-1} \sum_{k' \in \partial k} (|\omega_k|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^R}^R + |\omega_{k'}|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^R}^R) Z^{-1} d\mu \\ & \quad + \beta(M + 2dI + \delta^{-1}I_\delta \Xi + \varepsilon) \int_{\Omega_\beta} (\hat{\Phi}(\omega_k) + \varepsilon)^{Q-1} Z^{-1} d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Then by Hölder's inequality it immediately follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - \Xi) \left\{ \int_{\Omega_\beta} (\hat{\Phi}(\omega_k) + \varepsilon)^Q Z^{-1} d\mu \right\}^{1/Q} \\ & \leq (J + \Xi) \left\{ \int_{\Omega_\beta} \left[\sum_{k' \in \partial k} (|\omega_k|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^R}^R + |\omega_{k'}|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^R}^R) \right]^Q d\mu \right\}^{1/Q} \\ & \quad + \beta(M + 2dI + \delta^{-1}I_\delta \Xi + \varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow +0$, we conclude by (4.39) and Fatou's lemma that

$$(4.41) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{\Omega_\beta} [\hat{\Phi}(\omega_k)]^Q d\mu(\omega) \\ & \leq \delta^{-Q} [4d\mathcal{C}_Q^{1/Q}(J+1) + \beta(M + 2dI + \delta^{-1}I_\delta)]^Q =: \mathcal{C}_Q(\hat{\Phi}), \end{aligned}$$

which in turn yields the required estimate (4.36). \square

COROLLARY 2. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 4,*

$$(4.42) \quad \int_{\Omega_\beta} |F_k(\omega_k)|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^1}^Q d\mu(\omega) \leq \mathcal{C}_Q(F) < \infty.$$

PROOF. The statement follows immediately from (4.35), (4.36) and Assumptions (V*) and (W*). \square

4.3. *Kolmogorov type moment estimates.* This is the crucial step toward the proof of Theorems 1 and 2.

LEMMA 5. *For given $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, let the measure*

$$\mu \in \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}, 1 \leq \alpha \leq d} \mathcal{M}_{b, h_i}, \quad i = (k, n, \alpha) \in \mathcal{I},$$

be such that

$$(4.43) \quad \int_{\Omega_\beta} |F_k(\omega_k)|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^1}^{2Q} d\mu(\omega) \leq \mathcal{C}_{2Q}(F)$$

with some fixed $Q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{2Q}(F) \in (0, \infty)$. Then (4.43) implies the moment estimates

$$(4.44) \quad \int_{\Omega_\beta} |\omega_k(\tau) - \omega_k(\tau')|^{2Q} d\mu(\omega) \leq \Delta \mathcal{K}_{2Q} \cdot \rho^Q(\tau, \tau'),$$

$$(4.45) \quad \int_{\Omega_\beta} |\omega_k(\tau)|^{2Q} d\mu(\omega) \leq \mathcal{K}_{2Q}$$

for all $\tau, \tau' \in S_\beta$ and with uniform (i.e., independent of μ and k) constants $\Delta \mathcal{K}_{2Q}$, $\mathcal{K}_{2Q} \in (0, \infty)$.

PROOF. The proof of Lemma 5 follows the same pattern as in Lemmas 2–4. In order to prove (4.44), let us consider the following family of test functions on Ω_β^t :

$$(4.46) \quad f(\omega) := f_{\tau, \tau', \varepsilon}(\omega) := [\Delta \omega_{k, \alpha}]^{2Q-1} Z^{-1}(\omega_k), \quad \tau, \tau' \in S_\beta, \quad \varepsilon > 0,$$

where we set

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \omega_k &:= \Delta \omega_k(\tau, \tau') := \omega_k(\tau) - \omega_k(\tau'), \\ Z(\omega_k) &:= Z_\varepsilon(\omega_k) := 1 + \varepsilon |\omega_k|_{\mathbb{C}_\beta}^{2Q}. \end{aligned}$$

Since we already know that $|F_k|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^1} \in L^1(\mu)$, one can apply the (IbP)-formula (3.30) to such f in all directions, $h \in \Omega_\beta$ of the form (3.2) with any $\varphi \in \mathcal{T}_\beta$, instead of the basis vectors φ_n . The partial derivatives

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_h^\pm f(\omega) &= (2Q - 1) |\Delta \omega_{k, \alpha}|^{2Q-2} [\varphi(\tau) - \varphi(\tau')] Z^{-1}(\omega_k) \\ &\quad - 2\varepsilon Q [\Delta \omega_{k, \alpha}]^{2Q-1} |\omega_k|_{\mathbb{C}_\beta}^{2Q-1} [\partial_\varphi^\pm |\omega_{k, \alpha}|_{\mathbb{C}_\beta}] Z^{-2}(\omega_k) \end{aligned}$$

can be uniformly estimated for all $\varepsilon > 0$ by

$$(4.47) \quad |\partial_h^\pm f(\omega)| \leq 8Q |\varphi|_{\mathbb{C}_\beta} |\Delta \omega_{k, \alpha}|^{2Q-2} Z^{-1}(\omega_k).$$

Thus, combining (3.18), (4.46) and (4.47), we get that

$$(4.48) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_\beta} [\Delta\omega_{k,\alpha}]^{2Q-1} (A\varphi, \omega_{k,\alpha})_{L^2_\beta} Z^{-1} d\mu \\ & \leq |\varphi|_{C_\beta} \int_{\Omega_\beta} [8Q|\Delta\omega_{k,\alpha}|^{2Q-2} + |\Delta\omega_{k,\alpha}|^{2Q-1} |F_k(\omega)|_{\mathbb{L}^1_\beta}] Z^{-1} d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting $\Delta\varphi_{\tau,\tau'} := \mathfrak{G}_\tau - \mathfrak{G}_{\tau'}$ for φ in (4.48), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_\beta} |\Delta\omega_{k,\alpha}|^{2Q} Z^{-1} d\mu \\ & \leq |\mathfrak{G}_\tau - \mathfrak{G}_{\tau'}|_{C_\beta} \int_{\Omega_\beta} [8Q|\Delta\omega_{k,\alpha}|^{2Q-2} + |\Delta\omega_{k,\alpha}|^{2Q-1} |F_k(\omega)|_{\mathbb{L}^1_\beta}] Z^{-1} d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\int_{\Omega_\beta} |\Delta\omega_{k,\alpha}|^{2Q} Z^{-1} d\mu \right)^{1/Q} \\ & \leq |\mathfrak{G}_\tau - \mathfrak{G}_{\tau'}|_{C_\beta} \left[8Q + \mathfrak{C}_{2Q}^{1/Q}(F) + \left(\int_{\Omega_\beta} |\Delta\omega_{k,\alpha}|^{2Q} Z^{-1} d\mu \right)^{1/2Q} \right], \end{aligned}$$

which obviously implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\int_{\Omega_\beta} |\Delta\omega_k|^{2Q} Z^{-1} d\mu \right)^{1/2Q} \\ & \leq d|\mathfrak{G}_\tau - \mathfrak{G}_{\tau'}|_{C_\beta}^{1/2} [(8Q)^{1/2} + |\mathfrak{G}_\tau - \mathfrak{G}_{\tau'}|_{C_\beta}^{1/2} [\mathfrak{C}_{2Q}(F)]^{1/2Q}]. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow +0$ and using the Lipschitz-continuity of the Green function \mathfrak{G}_τ [cf. (4.15)], we obtain the required estimate

$$\int_{\Omega_\beta} |\Delta\omega_k(\tau, \tau')|^{2Q} d\mu \leq \Delta\mathcal{K}_{2Q} \cdot \rho^Q(\tau, \tau')$$

with the constant

$$(4.49) \quad \Delta\mathcal{K}_{2Q} := \left(4d^2k \frac{a}{\sqrt{m}} \right)^Q \left[(8Q)^Q + \left(\beta\kappa \frac{a}{\sqrt{m}} \right)^Q \mathfrak{C}_{2Q}(F) \right].$$

The proof of estimate (4.45) is analogous except that one should start from the test functions

$$(4.50) \quad g(\omega) := g_{\tau,\varepsilon}(\omega) := [\omega_{k,\alpha}(\tau)]^{2Q-1} Z^{-1}(\omega_k), \quad \tau \in S_\beta, \varepsilon > 0.$$

After integrating by parts with these test functions and substituting \mathfrak{G}_τ for φ , we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_\beta} |\omega_{k,\alpha}(\tau)|^{2Q} Z^{-1} d\mu \\ & \leq |\mathfrak{G}_\tau|_{C_\beta} \int_{\Omega_\beta} [4Q|\omega_{k,\alpha}(\tau)|^{2Q-2} + |F_k(\omega)|_{\mathbb{L}^1_\beta} |\omega_k^\alpha(\tau)|^{2Q-1}] Z^{-1} d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow +0$ by Fatou’s lemma the latter implies the required estimate, that is,

$$(4.51) \quad \int_{\Omega_\beta} |\omega_k(\tau)|^{2Q} d\mu \leq (4d^2\kappa)^Q [(4Q)^Q + \kappa^Q \mathcal{C}_{2Q}(F)] =: \mathcal{K}_{2Q}. \quad \square$$

REMARK 4. Contrary to the previous Lemmas 2–4, the coercivity property of ∇V is no more needed for the proof of Lemma 5. In fact, the result only depends on the regularity properties of the Green function \mathfrak{G}_τ of the elliptic operator A .

4.4. *Proofs of Theorems 1 and 2.* Having shown for $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_b^t$ the *a priori* estimates from the lemmas above, we are able to prove immediately the main Theorems 1 and 2.

PROOF OF THEOREM 2. Consecutively applying Lemmas 2, 4 and 5 to $\mu \in \mathfrak{G}_\beta^t = \mathcal{M}_b^t$, we get the following uniform estimates with finite $\Delta\mathcal{K}_{2Q}$, $\mathcal{K}_{2Q} > 0$

$$(4.52) \quad \int_{\Omega_\beta} |\omega_k(\tau) - \omega_k(\tau')|^{2Q} d\mu(\omega) \leq \Delta\mathcal{K}_{2Q} |\tau - \tau'|^Q,$$

$$(4.53) \quad \int_{\Omega_\beta} |\omega_k(\tau)|^{2Q} d\mu(\omega) \leq \mathcal{K}_{2Q}.$$

Now we employ a standard argument related to Kolmogorov’s continuity criterion. More precisely, using the Garsia–Rodemich–Rumsey lemma (see, e.g., in [23], Section 3), one can deduce from (4.52) that

$$(4.54) \quad \sup_{\mu \in \mathfrak{G}_\beta^t} \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{\Omega_\beta} \sup_{\tau \neq \tau'} \left[\frac{|\omega_k(\tau) - \omega_k(\tau')|}{\rho^\eta(\tau, \tau')} \right]^Q d\mu(\omega) < \infty,$$

for all $Q > 2$ and $\eta \in [0, \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{Q})$. When $Q \rightarrow \infty$, both (4.53) and (4.54) give us the required regularity of $\mu \in \mathfrak{G}_\beta^t$, namely that

$$(4.55) \quad \mu([\mathbb{C}_\beta^\eta]^{\mathbb{Z}^d}) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{\mu \in \mathfrak{G}_\beta^t} \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{\Omega_\beta} |\omega_k|_{\mathbb{C}_\beta^\eta}^Q d\mu(\omega) < \infty,$$

for all $Q \geq 1$ and $\eta \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$. \square

PROOF OF THEOREM 1. Let $Q > 2$ and $\eta \in (0, \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{Q})$, and fix any boundary condition $\xi \in \Omega_\beta^t$ with $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\xi_k|_{\mathbb{C}_\beta^\eta} < \infty$ (for instance, one can take $\xi = 0$).

Applying Lemmas 3–5 to the probability kernels $\pi_\Lambda(d\omega|\xi) \in \mathcal{M}_{b, h_i}^t$, provided $i = (k, n, \alpha) \in \mathcal{I}$ and $k \in \Lambda$, we get the following moment estimates with finite $\Delta\mathcal{K}_{2Q, \xi}$, $\mathcal{K}_{2Q, \xi} > 0$:

$$(4.56) \quad \int_{\Omega_\beta} |\omega_k(\tau) - \omega_k(\tau')|^{2Q} \pi_\Lambda(d\omega|\xi) \leq \Delta\mathcal{K}_{2Q, \xi} |\tau - \tau'|^Q,$$

$$(4.57) \quad \int_{\Omega_\beta} |\omega_k(\tau)|^{2Q} \pi_\Lambda(d\omega|\xi) \leq \mathcal{K}_{2Q, \xi}$$

uniformly for all $\Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. By the same arguments as those used in the proof of Theorem 2, (4.56) and (4.57) together imply that

$$(4.58) \quad \sup_{\Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{\Omega_\beta} |\omega_k|_{\mathbb{C}_\beta^\eta}^Q \pi_\Lambda(d\omega|\xi) < \infty.$$

From (4.58) we conclude, using Prokhorov’s criterion and the compactness of the embedding of \mathbb{C}_β^η into $\mathbb{C}_\beta^{\eta'}$ when $0 \leq \eta' < \eta$, that the family of distributions $\{\pi_\Lambda(d\omega|\xi)\}_{\Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ is tight on the Polish space Ω_β . So, there exists a sequence $\pi_{\Lambda^{(N)}}(d\omega|\xi)$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, which converges weakly on Ω_β , as $\Lambda^{(N)} \nearrow \mathbb{Z}^d$, to some probability measure $\mu^* \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega_\beta)$. This means by Proposition 3 that $\mu^* \in \mathcal{M}_b = \mathcal{G}_\beta$. But, in fact, by (4.58) $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} E_{\mu^*} |\omega_k|_{\mathbb{C}_\beta^Q} < \infty$, and thus, by Remark 2 $\mu^* \in \mathcal{G}_\beta^t$. \square

PROOF OF COROLLARY 1. The assertion follows from estimates (4.56) and (4.57) similarly as in the proof of Theorem 1. \square

REMARK 5. (i) Coercivity assumptions on potentials like $V^*(i)$ are standardly used in mathematical physics, especially when one studies stability properties of dynamical systems (for more concrete applications to the infinite-dimensional SDEs see, e.g., [24, 30]). If the initial estimate (V) holds with some $P > R$, then so does $V^*(i)$ with arbitrary small $K > 0$. Moreover, it is easy to show that $V^*(i)$ implies that the potential V grows strongly enough: for any $K_1 > K$ there exists $M_1 := M_1(K_1) > 0$ such that for all $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$(4.59) \quad V(q) \geq K_1^{-1} R^{-1} |q|^R - M_1.$$

(ii) Roughly speaking, our assumptions mean that the pair interaction is dominated by the single-particle one (so-called *lattice stabilization*). At first, $\Theta < 1$ guarantees by (4.59) the semiboundedness from below of the interaction in all finite volumes $\Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, and thus, the well-definedness of the corresponding Gibbs specifications π_Λ (cf. Section 2.3). Secondly, $V^*(ii)$ ensures that also $\Theta_0 < 1$, which was crucial for our proof of the a priori estimates for symmetrizing measures on loop spaces. In fact, from the potential V one can always extract the quadratic term $\frac{a^2}{2} |q_k|^2$ with a small $a^2 > 0$, so that $V^*(ii)$ is still true.

5. Possible generalizations and concluding remarks.

(i) *Existence of superstable Gibbs states.* According to its definition (2.15), \mathcal{G}_β^t contains a class $\mathcal{G}_\beta^{\text{sst}}$ of so-called Ruelle type “*superstable*” Gibbs measures, which (for the particular case $R = 2$) has been introduced in [57] as those measures satisfying the following support condition

$$(5.1) \quad \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ (1 + 2N)^{-d} \sum_{|k| \leq N} |\omega_k|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^2}^2 \right\} \leq C(\omega) < \infty \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega_\beta \text{ } (\mu\text{-a.e.}).$$

On the other hand, by an obvious modification of the arguments used in the proof of Theorem 1, one can also construct *periodic* Euclidean Gibbs measures $\mu^{\text{per}} \in \mathcal{G}'_{\beta}$ which are invariant w.r.t. the group of translations of the lattice \mathbb{Z}^d . But for any measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega_{\beta})$, which is *translation invariant* and satisfies the a priori estimates (2.16), the support condition [even stronger than (5.1)] holds for all $Q \geq 1$ and $\eta \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$, namely,

$$(5.2) \quad \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ (1 + 2N)^{-d} \sum_{|k| \leq N} |\omega_k|_{C^{\eta}_{\beta}}^Q \right\} \leq C_{Q,\eta}(\omega) < \infty \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega_{\beta} \text{ } (\mu\text{-a.e.}).$$

The latter follows from the Birkhoff–Khinchin ergodic theorem applied to the stationary process $\omega_k, k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, on the probability space $(\Omega_{\beta}, \mathcal{B}(\Omega_{\beta}), \mu)$. This means that we can refine the statement of Theorem 1, claiming the existence of $\mu \in \mathcal{G}^{\text{sst}}_{\beta}$ satisfying the support condition (5.1).

(ii) *Generalization* to many-particle interactions with possibly infinite range and infinite order. Our results generalize to quantum lattice systems with (*not necessarily translation-invariant*) many-particle interactions. Such systems are described by the heuristic infinite-dimensional Hamiltonian

$$(5.3) \quad H = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} H_k + \sum_{n=2}^N \sum_{\{k_1, \dots, k_n\} \subset \mathbb{Z}^d} W_{\{k_1, \dots, k_n\}}(q_{k_1}, \dots, q_{k_n}),$$

where the n -particle interaction potentials, taken over all *finite* sets $\{k_1, \dots, k_n\} \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ with $n = 2, \dots, N$ and $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{+\infty\}$, are given by twice continuously differentiable *symmetric* functions $W_{\{k_1, \dots, k_n\}} \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^{dn} \rightarrow \mathbb{R})$. Then the statements of Theorems 1 and 2 for corresponding Euclidean Gibbs measures still hold under Assumptions (V) and (W**), where (W**) is the following modification of (W*):

(W*) There exist $R \geq 2, I \geq 0$ and symmetric matrices $\{J_{k_1, \dots, k_n}\}_{(k_1, \dots, k_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^{nd}}$ with positive entries, such that for all $n \leq N, \{k_1, \dots, k_n\} \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $q_1, \dots, q_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$(i) \quad |\nabla_{q_1}^{(l)} W_{\{k_1, \dots, k_n\}}(q_1, \dots, q_n)| \left(1 + \sum_{m=1}^n |q_m|^l \right) \leq J_{k_1, \dots, k_n} \sum_{m=1}^n |q_m|^R + I, \quad l = 0, 1, 2.$$

Moreover, the matrices $\{J_{k_1, \dots, k_n}\}_{(k_1, \dots, k_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^{dn}, n = 2, \dots, N$, are *exponentially fastly decreasing*, that is, for any $\delta > 0$,

$$(ii) \quad \|J\|_{\delta} := \sum_{n=2}^N n^R \sup_{k_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left\{ \sum_{\{k_2, \dots, k_n\} \subset \mathbb{Z}^d} J_{k_1, \dots, k_n} \exp \left(\delta \sum_{m=1}^n |k_1 - k_m| \right) \right\} < \infty.$$

The proofs are as before (at least in spirit). For details we refer to the forthcoming paper [7].

APPENDIX

Here we briefly illustrate the connection between quantum states and measures on loop spaces following the initial paper [1]; for a more extended discussion we refer, for example, to [3, 7, 40, 47, 51]. Let us start with the one-particle case. Due to Assumption (V), for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, the Hamiltonian H_k is a self-adjoint operator with trace class semigroup $e^{-\tau H_k}$, $\tau \geq 0$. On the algebra $\mathcal{A}_k := \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_k)$ of all bounded linear operators in \mathcal{H}_k , we may then define the (time-evolution) automorphism group $\alpha_{\theta,k}$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, and the quantum Gibbs state $G_{\beta,k}$ acting, respectively, by

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{\theta,k}(B) &:= e^{i\theta H_k} B e^{-i\theta H_k}, \\ G_{\beta,k}(B) &:= \text{Tr}(B e^{-\beta H_k}) / \text{Tr}(e^{-\beta H_k}), \quad B \in \mathcal{A}_k. \end{aligned}$$

For any finite set of multiplication operators $(B_i)_{i=1}^n \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we construct the so-called temperature (or *Euclidean*) *Green functions*

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\beta,k}^{B_1, \dots, B_n}(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n) &:= \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_k} \left(\prod_{i=1}^n e^{-(\tau_{i+1} - \tau_i) H_k} B_i \right) / \text{Tr}(e^{-\beta H_k}), \\ (6.1) \qquad \qquad \qquad &0 \leq \tau_1 \leq \dots \leq \tau_n \leq \tau_{n+1} := \tau_1 + \beta. \end{aligned}$$

These functions have analytic continuations to the complex domain

$$\{(z_i := \tau_i + i\theta_i)_{i=1}^n \subset \mathbb{C}^n \mid 0 < \tau_1 < \dots < \tau_n < \beta\}$$

with the boundary values

$$(6.2) \qquad \Gamma_{\beta,k}^{B_1, \dots, B_n}(-i\theta_1, \dots, -i\theta_n) = G_{\beta,k} \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \alpha_{\theta_i,k}(B_i) \right).$$

Since the algebra spanned by the operators $\alpha_{\theta_i,k}(B_i)$ is dense in \mathcal{A}_k , (6.2) *fully* determines the Gibbs state $G_{\beta,k}$. A *crucial* observation is that the Green functions (6.1) may be represented (by the Feynman–Kac formula) as the moments

$$(6.3) \qquad \Gamma_{\beta,k}^{B_1, \dots, B_n}(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n) = E_{\mu_k} \left(\prod_{i=1}^n B_i(\omega_k(\tau_i)) \right)$$

of a certain probability measure μ_k on the loop space

$$(6.4) \qquad \mathbb{C}_\beta := \{\omega_k \in C([0, \beta] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d) \mid \omega_k(0) = \omega_k(\beta)\}.$$

More precisely (for simplicity putting here $m = 1$ and $a = 0$),

$$(6.5) \qquad d\mu_k(\omega_k) = \frac{1}{Z} E_\beta^{(x,x)} \left\{ - \exp \int_0^\beta V(\omega_k(\tau)) d\tau \right\} dx,$$

where Z is a normalization constant and $E_\beta^{(x,x)}$ is the conditional expectation, given that $\omega_k(0) = \omega_k(\beta) = x$, w.r.t. the Brownian bridge process of length β

in \mathbb{R}^d (cf. [65]). So, we get a *one-to-one correspondence* between the quantum Gibbs state $G_{\beta,k}$ on the algebra \mathcal{A}_k , Euclidean Green functions (6.1) and the measure μ_k on the loop space \mathbb{C}_β . Moreover, for all local Hamiltonians H_Λ in volumes $\Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, relations similar to (6.1)–(6.3) are valid for the associated Gibbs states $G_{\beta,\Lambda}$ on the algebra $\mathcal{A}_\Lambda := \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_\Lambda)$ and the measures μ_Λ on the loop space $[\mathbb{C}_\beta]^\Lambda$. This gives a possible way to construct the limiting states when $\Lambda \nearrow \mathbb{Z}^d$, and, hence, motivates us to consider the set \mathcal{G}_β of all Gibbs measures μ on the “*temperature loop lattice*” $\Omega_\beta := [\mathbb{C}_\beta]^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$, as a natural set of states which for sure contains all accumulation points for $\{\mu_\Lambda\}_{\Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$. What is important, is the nontrivial fact that (analogously to the well-known Osterwalder–Schrader reconstruction theorem in Euclidean field theory, see, e.g., [34, 39, 64]) from each such Gibbs measure μ it is possible to *reconstruct* (in a certain sense even uniquely) the quantum Gibbs state G_β of the system (2.2) on the algebra of local observables $\mathcal{A}_{\text{loc}} := \bigcup_{\Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathcal{A}_\Lambda$. For the above reasons the measures $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_\beta$ are called *Euclidean Gibbs states (in the temperature loop space representation)* for the quantum lattice system (2.2).

REFERENCES

- [1] ALBEVERIO, S. and HØEGH-KROHN, R. (1975). Homogeneous random fields and quantum statistical mechanics. *J. Funct. Anal.* **19** 241–272.
- [2] ALBEVERIO, S., KONDRATIEV, YU. G., KOZITZKY, YU. V. and RÖCKNER, M. (2001). Uniqueness of Gibbs states of quantum lattices in small mass regime. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.* **37** 43–69.
- [3] ALBEVERIO, S., KONDRATIEV, YU. G., KOZITZKY, YU. V. and RÖCKNER, M. (2002). Euclidean Gibbs states of quantum lattice systems. *Rev. Math. Phys.* **14** 1–67.
- [4] ALBEVERIO, S., KONDRATIEV, YU. G., KOZITZKY, YU. V. and RÖCKNER, M. (2004). Small mass implies uniqueness of Gibbs states of a quantum crystal. *Comm. Math. Phys.* To appear.
- [5] ALBEVERIO, S., KONDRATIEV, YU. G., PASUREK (TSIKALENKO), T. and RÖCKNER, M. (2001). Gibbs states on loop lattices: Existence and a priori estimates. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* **33** 1–5.
- [6] ALBEVERIO, S., KONDRATIEV, YU. G., PASUREK (TSIKALENKO), T. and RÖCKNER, M. (2001). Euclidean Gibbs states of quantum crystals. *Mosc. Math. J.* **1** 1–7.
- [7] ALBEVERIO, S., KONDRATIEV, YU. G., PASUREK (TSIKALENKO), T. and RÖCKNER, M. (2002). A priori estimates and existence for Euclidean Gibbs states. Preprint.
- [8] ALBEVERIO, S., KONDRATIEV, A. YU. and REBENKO, L. (1998). Peierls argument and long-range order behaviour of quantum lattice systems with unbounded spins. *J. Statist. Phys.* **92** 1137–1152.
- [9] ALBEVERIO, S., KONDRATIEV, YU. G. and RÖCKNER, M. (1997). Ergodicity of L^2 -semigroups and extremality of Gibbs states. *J. Funct. Anal.* **144** 394–423.
- [10] ALBEVERIO, S., KONDRATIEV, YU. G. and RÖCKNER, M. (1997). Ergodicity of the stochastic dynamics of quasi-invariant measures and applications to Gibbs states. *J. Funct. Anal.* **149** 415–469.
- [11] ALBEVERIO, S., KONDRATIEV, YU. G., RÖCKNER, M. and TSIKALENKO, T. V. (1997). Uniqueness of Gibbs states for quantum lattice systems. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **108** 193–218.

- [12] ALBEVERIO, S., KONDRATIEV, YU. G., RÖCKNER, M. and TSIKALENKO, T. V. (1997). Dobrushin's uniqueness for quantum lattice systems with nonlocal interaction. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **189** 621–630.
- [13] ALBEVERIO, S., KONDRATIEV, YU. G., RÖCKNER, M. and TSIKALENKO, T. V. (1999). A priori estimates and existence of Gibbs measures: A simplified proof. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* **328** 1049–1054.
- [14] ALBEVERIO, S., KONDRATIEV, YU. G., RÖCKNER, M. and TSIKALENKO, T. V. (2000). A priori estimates for symmetrizing measures and their applications to Gibbs states. *J. Funct. Anal.* **171** 366–400.
- [15] ALBEVERIO, S., KONDRATIEV, YU. G., RÖCKNER, M. and TSIKALENKO, T. V. (2001). Glauber dynamics for quantum lattice systems. *Rev. Math. Phys.* **13** 51–124.
- [16] BELL, D. (1985). A quasi-invariance theorem for measures on Banach spaces. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **290** 851–855.
- [17] BELLISSARD, J. and HØEGH-KROHN, R. (1982). Compactness and the maximal Gibbs states for random Gibbs fields on a lattice. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **84** 297–327.
- [18] BARBULYAK, V. S. and KONDRATIEV, YU. G. (1991). Functional integrals and quantum lattice systems. *Rep. Nat. Acad. Sci. Ukraine* **8** 38–40; **9** 31–34; **10** 19–21.
- [19] BETZ, V. and LÓRINCZI, J. (2000). A Gibbsian description of $P(\phi)_1$ -process. Preprint.
- [20] BOGACHEV, V. I. and RÖCKNER, M. (2001). Elliptic equations for measures on infinite-dimensional spaces and applications. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **120** 445–496.
- [21] BOGACHEV, V. I., RÖCKNER, M. and WANG, F.-Y. (2001). Elliptic equations for invariant measures on finite and infinite dimensional manifolds. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **80** 177–221.
- [22] BRATTELI, O. and ROBINSON, D. W. (1981). *Operator Algebras and Quantum Statistical Mechanics, I, II*. Springer, New York.
- [23] BARLOW, M. T. and YOR, M. (1982). Semi-martingale inequalities via the Garsia–Rodemich–Rumsey lemma and applications to local times. *J. Funct. Anal.* **49** 198–229.
- [24] CERRAI, S. (2001). *Second Order PDE's in Finite and Infinite Dimensions. A Probabilistic Approach. Lecture Notes in Math.* **1762**. Springer, New York.
- [25] CASSANDRO, M., OLIVIERI, E., PELLEGRINOTTI, A. and PRESUTTI, E. (1978). Existence and uniqueness of DLR measures for unbounded spin systems. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete* **41** 313–334.
- [26] COURRÈGE, PH. and RENOARD, P. (1975). *Oscillateurs Anharmoniques, Mesures Quasi-Invariantes Sur $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ et Théorie Quantique des Champs en Dimension 1*. *Astérisque* **22–23**. Soc. Math. France, Paris.
- [27] DEIMLING, K. (1985). *Nonlinear Functional Analysis*. Springer, New York.
- [28] DOBRUSHIN, R. L. (1970). Prescribing a system of random variables by conditional distributions. *Theory Probab. Appl.* **15** 458–486.
- [29] DRIESLER, W., LANDAU, L. and PEREZ, J. F. (1979). Estimates of critical length and critical temperatures for classical and quantum lattice systems. *J. Statist. Phys.* **20** 123–162.
- [30] DA PRATO, G. and ZABCZYK, J. (1996). *Ergodicity for Infinite-Dimensional Systems*. Cambridge Univ. Press.
- [31] DALETSKII, YU. L. and SOKHADZE, G. A. (1988). Absolute continuity of smooth measures. *Funct. Anal. Appl.* **22** 149–150.
- [32] FÖLLMER, H. (1988). Random fields and diffusion processes. *Lecture Notes in Math.* **1362** 101–204. Springer, New York.
- [33] FRITZ, J. (1982). Stationary measures of stochastic gradient dynamics, infinite lattice models. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete* **59** 479–490.
- [34] FRÖHLICH, J. (1977). Schwinger functions and their generating functionals II. *Adv. Math.* **33** 119–180.

- [35] FUNAKI, T. (1991). The reversible measures of multi-dimensional Ginzburg–Landau type continuum model. *Osaka J. Math.* **28** 462–494.
- [36] FARIS, W. G. and MINLOS, R. A. (1999). A quantum crystal with multidimensional anharmonic oscillators. *J. Statist. Phys.* **94** 365–387.
- [37] GARET, O. (2002). Harmonic oscillators on an Hilbert space: A Gibbsian approach. *Potential Anal.* **17** 65–88.
- [38] GEORGII, H.-O. (1988). *Gibbs Measures and Phase Transitions*. **9**. Walter de Gruyter, New York.
- [39] GLIMM, J. and JAFFE, A. (1981). *Quantum Physics. A Functional Integral Point of View*. Springer, New York.
- [40] GLOBALA, S. A. and KONDRATIEV, YU. G. (1990). The construction of Gibbs states of quantum lattice systems. *Selecta Math. Sov.* **9** 297–307.
- [41] HELFFER, B. (1998). Splitting in large dimensions and infrared estimates. II. Moment inequalities. *J. Math. Phys.* **39** 760–776.
- [42] HARIYA, Y. (2001). A new approach to constructing Gibbs measures on $C(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R}^d)$ —an application for hard-wall Gibbs measures on $C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$. Preprint.
- [43] HOLLEY, R. and STROOCK, D. (1976). L_2 -theory for the stochastic Ising model. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete* **35** 87–101.
- [44] IWATA, K. (1985). Reversible measures of a $P(\varphi)_1$ -time evolution. *Proc. Taniguchi Symp. PMMP* 195–209.
- [45] KIRILLOV, A. I. (1995). On the reconstruction of measures from their logarithmic derivatives. *Izvestiya RAN: Ser. Mat.* **59** 121–138.
- [46] KUSUOKA, S. (1982). Dirichlet forms and diffusion processes on Banach space. *J. Fac. Science Univ. Tokyo* **29** 79–95.
- [47] KLEIN, A. and LANDAU, L. (1981). Stochastic processes associated with KMS states. *J. Funct. Anal.* **42** 368–428.
- [48] LÖRINCZI, J. and MINLOS, R. A. (2001). Gibbs measures for Brownian paths under the effect of an external and a small pair potential. *J. Statist. Phys.* **105** 607–649.
- [49] LÖRINCZI, J., MINLOS, R. A. and SPOHN, H. (2002). Infrared regular representation of the three dimensional massless Nelson model. *Lett. Math. Phys.* **59** 189–198.
- [50] LEBOWITZ, J. L. and PRESUTTI, E. (1976). Statistical mechanics of systems of unbounded spins. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **50** 195–218.
- [51] MALYSHEV, V. A. and MINLOS, R. A. (1995). *Linear Infinite-Particle Operators*. AMS Translations **143**.
- [52] MOULIN-OLLAGNIER, J. (1985). *Ergodic Theory and Statistical Mechanics. Lecture Notes in Math.* **1115**. Springer, New York.
- [53] MINLOS, R. A., ROELLY, S. and ZESSIN, H. (2000). Gibbs states on space-time. *Potential Anal.* **13** 367–408.
- [54] MINLOS, R. A., VERBEURE, A. and ZAGREBNOV, V. (2000). A quantum crystal model in the light mass limit: Gibbs state. *Rev. Math. Phys.* **12** 981–1032.
- [55] OSADA, H. and SPOHN, H. (1999). Gibbs measures relative to Brownian motion. *Ann. Probab.* **27** 1183–1207.
- [56] PRESTON, C. (1976). *Random Fields. Lecture Notes in Math.* **534**. Springer, Berlin.
- [57] PARK, Y. M. and YOO, H. J. (1994). A characterization of Gibbs states of lattice boson systems. *J. Statist. Phys.* **75** 215–239.
- [58] PARK, Y. M. and YOO, H. J. (1995). Uniqueness and clustering properties of Gibbs states for classical and quantum unbounded spin systems. *J. Statist. Phys.* **80** 223–271.
- [59] REVUZ, D. and YOR, M. (1991). *Continuous Martingales and Brownian Motion*. Springer, New York.

- [60] ROYER, G. (1975). Unicité de certaines mesures quasi-invariantes sur $C(\mathbb{R})$. *Ann. Scient. Éc. Norm. Sup.* 4^e **8** 319–338.
- [61] ROYER, G. (1977). Étude des champs Euclidiens sur un resau \mathbb{Z}^Y . *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **56** 455–478.
- [62] ROYER, G. and YOR, M. (1976). Représentation intégrale de certaines mesures quasi-invariantes sur $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R})$; mesures extrémales et propriété de Markov. *Ann. Inst. Fourier* **26** 7–24.
- [63] RUELLE, D. (1969). *Statistical Mechanics. Rigorous Results*. Benjamin, New York.
- [64] SIMON, B. (1974). *The $P(\varphi)_2$ Euclidean Field Theory*. Princeton Univ. Press.
- [65] SIMON, B. (1979). *Functional Integration and Quantum Physics*. Academic Press, New York.

S. ALBEVERIO
 INSTITUT FÜR ANGEWANDTE MATHEMATIK
 UNIVERSITÄT BONN 53155
 GERMANY
 AND
 BiBOS RESEARCH CENTRE
 UNIVERSITÄT BIELEFELD 33615
 GERMANY
 AND
 CERFIM
 LOCARNO
 SWITZERLAND
 E-MAIL: albeverio@uni-bonn.de

YU. KONDRATIEV
 FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK
 AND BiBOS RESEARCH CENTRE
 UNIVERSITÄT BIELEFELD 33615
 GERMANY
 AND
 INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS
 NASU
 KIEV
 UKRAINE
 E-MAIL: kondrat@mathematik.uni-bielefeld.de

T. PASUREK
 M. RÖCKNER
 FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK
 AND BiBOS RESEARCH CENTRE
 UNIVERSITÄT BIELEFELD 33615
 GERMANY
 E-MAIL: pasurek@physik.uni-bielefeld.de
 roeckner@mathematik.uni-bielefeld.de