arXiv:cond-mat/0310442v1 [cond-mat.str-el] 20 Oct 2003

PREDICTION OF THE IN-GAP STATES ABOVE THE TOP OF THE VALENCE BAND IN THE UNDOPED INSULATING CUPRATES DUE TO SPIN-POLARON EFFECT

S.G. Ovchinnikov,* A.A. Borisov, V.A. Gavrichkov, and M.M. Korshunov
L.V. Kirensky Institute of Physics Siberian Branch of Russian Academy of Science, Krasnoyarsk, 660036, Russia
(Dated: March 22, 2022)

In the framework of the generalized tight binding method we have calculated the quasiparticle band structure and the spectral functions of the undoped cuprates like La_2CuO_4, $Sr_2CuO_2Cl_2$ etc. Due to spin fluctuations the in-gap state appears above the top of the valence band in the undoped antiferromagnetic insulator similar to in-gap states induced by hole doping. In the ARPES experiments the in-gap states can be detected as weak low energy satellites.

PACS numbers: 74.25.Jb, 71.18.+y, 79.60.-i

I. INTRODUCTION

The key issue to understand the nature of high-temperature superconductivity in the cuprates is the evolution of the electronic structure from an antiferromagnetic insulator to a superconductor with hole doping. The appearance of the in-gap states above the top of the valence band in slightly doped cuprates has been found experimentally [1-4]. In the metallic underdoped regime the ARPES measurements [5] reveal the concentration dependent band structure of Bi-2212. With improving the ARPES resolution recently the formation of the new quasiparticle states at the transition from insulator to metal in $La_{2-x}Sr_xCuO_4$ has been found [6, 7].

The formation of the in-gap states with doping has been obtained theoretically in the numerical studies of small cluster in the framework of the $t-J$ model, Hubbard model, and the 3-band $p-d$ model [8-11]. The band structure calculations of the CuO_2 layer in the framework of the multiband $p-d$ model by the generalized tight-binding (GTB) method [12] with account for strong electron correlations have revealed the unusual in-gap state at the top of the valence band with zero spectral weight for undoped insulator that acquire the dispersion and non-zero spectral weight with hole doping [13]. In all models of strongly correlated electrons the hopping of hole in the antiferromagnetic background is renormalized by spin fluctuations. To clarify the origin of the in-gap state we have studied in this paper a spin-polaron effect both analytically in the framework of the $t-t'-J$ model and numerically by the GTB method similar to [13]. We have found that the spin fluctuations provides non-zero spectral weight and dispersion of the in-gap state as well as hole doping does – even without doping the spin excitations that are present in the antiferromagnetic state due to the quantum spin fluctuations at all temperatures including $T=0$ results in the non-zero in-gap spectral weight and dispersion above the top of the valence band. This state can be detected by the ARPES measurement as a weak satellite at the low energy shoulder of the main peak. Moreover the concentration of spin fluctuations n_{sf} increases with temperature, and we expect the growth of the in-gap spectral weight $\sim n_{sf}$.

*Electronic address: sgo@iph.krasn.ru

II. GTB METHOD RESULTS

A dispersion equation of the GTB method for the quasiparticle band structure of the CuO_2 layer looks like [13]

$$\left\| \left(E-\Omega_m^A\right)\delta_{mn} - 2F_\sigma^A(m)\sum_{\lambda\lambda'}\gamma^*_{\lambda\sigma}(m)\,T^{AB}_{\lambda\lambda'}\left(\vec{k}\right)\gamma_{\lambda'\sigma}(n)\right\| = 0 \quad (1)$$

Here m is a quasiparticle band indexes given by a pair (p,q) of the initial and final multielectron configurations $E_p(n+1)$ and $E_q(n)$, $\Omega_m = E_p(n+1)-E_q(n)$ is a local excitation energy. The local excitation $|q\rangle \to |p\rangle$ is described by the Hubbard operator $X^{pq}=|p\rangle\langle q|$, a filling factor $F(m)=\langle X^{pp}\rangle+\langle X^{qq}\rangle$. Two magnetic sublattices are denoted by indexes A and B, and σ is a spin projection. The interatomic hopping is $T^{AB}_{\lambda\lambda'}$, where the single hole basis set λ includes 5 orbitals: copper $d(x^2-y^2)$, $d(3z^2-r^2)$, in-plane oxygen $p(x)$, $p(y)$ and apical oxygen $p(z)$, $\gamma_{\lambda\sigma}(m)$ is a parameter of a single hole annihilation operator in term of the Hubbard operators

$$a_{\lambda\sigma}=\sum_m \gamma_{\lambda\sigma}(m)X^m \quad (2)$$

The local multielectron energies and parameters $\gamma_{\lambda\sigma}(m)$ are obtained after the exact diagonalization of the multiband $p-d$ model Hamiltonian for the unit cell. In our case the unit cell is CuO_2 cluster for La_2CuO_4 and CuO_4Cl_2 for $Sr_2CuO_2Cl_2$. The similar equation has been known long ago for the nondegenerate Hubbard model as the Hubbard I solution and has been used recently to study magnetic properties of transition metals [14, 15].

The essential for undoped cuprates multielectron configurations are $d^{10}p^6$ (vacuum state $|0\rangle$ in a hole representation), single-hole configurations d^9p^6, $d^{10}p^5$, and two-hole configurations d^8p^5, d^9p^5, $d^{10}p^4$, $d^{10}p^5p^5$. The minimal energy in the single-hole sector of the Hilbert space has the b_{1g} molecular orbital, and in the two-hole sector the $^1A_{1g}$ singlet that besides Zhang-Rice singlet contains several more local singlets. A staggered magnetic field split b_{1g} levels by spin:

$$\varepsilon_{A\sigma} = \varepsilon_1 - \sigma h, \quad \varepsilon_{B\sigma} = \varepsilon_1 + \sigma h. \tag{3}$$

The top of the valence band is given by the quasiparticles with $m = 1$: $X^1_A = |b_{1g,\uparrow}\rangle \langle {}^1A_{1g}|$ and $X^1_B = |b_{1g,\downarrow}\rangle \langle {}^1A_{1g}|$, as usually there is spin degeneracy of the band in the antiferromagnetic state. The occupation number $n_p \equiv \langle X^{pp}\rangle$ are calculated self-consistently via the chemical potential equation. In the mean-field Hubbard I approximation the solution of this equation for the hole-doped cuprates with hole concentration $n_h = 1 + x$ is given by

$$n_{1\uparrow} \equiv n_{A\uparrow}(b_{1g}) = 1 - x, n_{1\downarrow} = 0, n_2 \equiv n(^1A_{1g}) = x. \tag{4}$$

For the band $m = 1$ we get $F_{A\uparrow}(1) = 1$ while for the band $m = 2$ with $X^2_A = |b_{1g,\downarrow}\rangle \langle {}^1A_{1g}|$ the filling factor is $F_{A\downarrow}(2) = x$. The quasiparticle spectral weight is proportional to the filling factor, thus it is the band $m = 2$ that forms the in-gap state. In the limit $x \to 0$ its spectral weight is zero, when $x \neq 0$ this band acquires both dispersion and nonzero spectral weight. The corresponding concentration dependent bands structure has been obtained for $La_{2-x}Sr_xCuO_4$ in [13] and the chemical potential $\mu(x)$ dependence, the Fermi surface evolution with doping have been studied in [16].

To go beyond the mean-field Hubbard I approximation one has to calculate single-loop diagrams for the self-energy [17]. In the ferromagnetic or antiferromagnetic state the most important contribution is given by loops with spin-wave excitations [18] (a spin-polaron effect). According to [18], the main effect of the spin excitations is given by the spin-wave renormalization of the multielectron configuration's occupation numbers, so instead of (4) one gets

$$n_{1\uparrow} = (1 - x)(1 - n_{sf}), n_{1\downarrow} = (1 - x)n_{sf}, n_2 = x, \tag{5}$$

where n_{sf} is the occupation of the spin-minority level and it determines the spin-fluctuation decrease of the sublattice magnetization

$$\langle S^z_A\rangle = (1 - x)(1/2 - n_{sf}). \tag{6}$$

Concentration of the spin fluctuations is equal to $2n_{sf}$.

Thus the filling factors for the valence band $F(1) = 1 - n_{sf}$, and for the in-gap states $F(2) = x + n_{sf}$. It means that the spin-polaron effect results in the nonzero spectral weight of the in-gap states even for undoped cuprates La_2CuO_4 and $Sr_2CuO_2Cl_2$. The quasiparticle band structure and the spectral function for the undoped




FIG. 1: The quasiparticle band structure (a) and the spectral function (b) of the undoped La_2CuO_4 with a spin-fluctuations $n_{sf} = 0.2$ calculated by the GTB method. The Fermi level is above all bands shown here

La_2CuO_4 with $n_{sf} = 0.1$ are given in the Fig. 1. Here the lowest band is formed by hole hopping via 2-hole triplet $^3B_{1g}$ state – this aspect was discussed in [13, 19]. The next band ($m = 1$) is the top of the valence band without spin fluctuations with a maximum at $k = (\pi/2, \pi/2)$. The upper band ($m = 2$) formed by the dispersion of the in-gap states. Despite of its width each state has a low spectral weight as seen in the Fig. 1b and the total number of states in this in-gap band (without doping) is equal to n_{sf}. The appearance of such non-Fermi liquid states is the direct effect of strong electron correlations. The maximal spectral weight of the in-gap state is near $(\pi, 0)$ point of the Brillouin zone (BZ). At the $(\pi/2, \pi/2)$ point the two bands are degenerate, and we cannot separate the contribution of the in-gap band to the spectral function $A_k(E)$.

III. $t-t'-J$ MODEL TREATMENT

To clarify the properties of the in-gap band we study the spin-polaron effect in the $t-t'-J$ model, which is an effective low energy model for the multiband $p-d$ model [20], with the Hamiltonian:

$$H_{t-J} = (\varepsilon_1-\mu)\sum_{f,\sigma} X_f^{\sigma\sigma} + \sum_{<f,g>,\sigma} t_{fg} X_f^{\sigma 0} X_g^{0\sigma} + \sum_{<f,g>} J_{fg}\left(\mathbf{S}_f\mathbf{S}_g - \frac{1}{4}n_f n_g\right), \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbf{S}_f$ are spin operators and n_f are number of particle operator, t_{fg} and J_{fg} are the hopping and exchange integrals correspondingly. In the Hubbard I approximation it is easy to obtain in the undoped case the following intrasublattice and intersublattice Green functions ($f\in A, g\in B$)

$$\left\langle\left\langle X_f^{0\sigma} \mid X_f^{\prime\sigma 0}\right\rangle\right\rangle_E = \frac{2}{N}\sum_k G_{k\sigma}^{AA}(E) e^{i\vec{k}(\vec{f}-\vec{f}')},$$

$$\left\langle\left\langle X_g^{0\sigma} \mid X_f^{\prime\sigma 0}\right\rangle\right\rangle_E = \frac{2}{N}\sum_k G_{k\sigma}^{BA}(E) e^{i\vec{k}(\vec{g}-\vec{f}')}.$$

Matrix Grin function in momentum space could be written as:

$$\hat{G}_{k\sigma} = \begin{pmatrix} G_{k\sigma}^{AA} & G_{k\sigma}^{AB} \\ G_{k\sigma}^{BA} & G_{k\sigma}^{BB}\end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{D}\begin{pmatrix} n_{A\sigma}\left(E-\varepsilon_{k\sigma}^B\right) & n_{A\sigma}n_{B\sigma}t_k^B \\ n_{A\sigma}n_{B\sigma}t_k^B & n_{B\sigma}\left(E-\varepsilon_{k\sigma}^A\right)\end{pmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

where $D = \left(E-E_{k\sigma}^+\right)\left(E-E_{k\sigma}^-\right)$, $\varepsilon_{k\sigma}^\alpha = (\varepsilon_1-\mu) - \left(J_0^B - t_k^A\right)n_{\alpha\sigma} - J_0^A n_{\alpha\bar{\sigma}}$, with $\alpha = A, B$.

Here t_k^B and t_k^A (J_0^B and J_0^A) are the hoppings (exchanges) in momentum space between different and the same sublattices correspondingly. In simple case of next-nearest-neighbors approximation we have

$$t_k^B = 2t\left(\cos k_x + \cos k_y\right), \quad t_k^A = 4t'\cos k_x \cos k_y,$$

$$J_0^B = 4J, \quad J_0^A = 4J',$$

with primed values corresponding to next-nearest hoppings and exchanges. The occupation factors of one particle state with different spin projections are denoted by $n_{A\sigma}$ and $n_{B\sigma}$. In the mean field Hubbard I approximation $n_{A\uparrow} = (1-n_{sf})$ and $n_{A\downarrow} = 0$ at $T=0$. Using the same arguments as in the Section II, we go beyond the Hubbard I approximation by renormalization the occupation numbers with spin fluctuations. It results in the undoped La_2CuO_4 in

$$n_{A\uparrow} = (1-n_{sf}), n_{A\downarrow} = n_{sf}, n_{B\sigma} = n_{A\bar{\sigma}}. \quad (9)$$

The condition $D=0$ gives two branches of quasiparticle spectrum:

$$E_{k\uparrow}^{\pm} = \varepsilon_1 - \mu + \frac{1}{2}\left[t_k^A - J_0^B - J_0^A \pm \sqrt{\beta_k}\right]. \quad (10)$$

where

$$\beta_k = \left(t_k^A - J_0^B + J_0^A\right)^2(1-2n_{sf})^2 + 4\left(t_k^B\right)^2(1-n_{sf})n_{sf}.$$

If we set concentration of the magnons to zero we immediately get one dispersionless state and one dispersive state with dispersion governed by hoppings between different sublattices:

$$E_{k\uparrow}^+\Big|_{n_{sf}=0} = \varepsilon_1 - \mu - J_0^A,\ E_{k\uparrow}^-\Big|_{n_{sf}=0} = \varepsilon_1 - \mu + t_k^A - J_0^B. \quad (11)$$

If the values of inter-sublattice hoppings and exchange are small then the difference between two energy levels is of order J:

$$\Delta E|_{n_{sf}=0} = \left(E_{k\uparrow}^+ - E_{k\uparrow}^-\right)\Big|_{n_{sf}=0} \approx 4J. \quad (12)$$

In Fig. 2 the quasiparticle dispersions corresponding to equations (10) and (11) are shown. Parameters were taken from effective low-energy model [20] of multiband $p-d$ model and equal to $t=-0.587$, $t'/t=-0.085$, $J/t=0.392$, $J'/t=0.00037$. The value n_{sf} is calculated in the effective quasi-two-dimensional Heisenberg antiferromagnetic model, $n_{sf}=0.2$ for typical in La_2CuO_4 ratio 10^{-5} of the interplane and intraplane exchange parameters [21].

The distance between two spectrum branches for non-zero concentration of the magnons is less then distance (12) for $n_{sf}=0$ by factor proportional to $(1-2n_{sf}) = 2\langle S^z\rangle$.

The lower quasiparticle branch for $n_{sf}=0.2$ (but not for $n_{sf}=0$!) clearly resembles dispersion obtained in self-consistent Born approximation [22] and GTB method [13]. This proves that two different approaches to treat spin fluctuations lead to the similar results.

Introducing energy difference $\Delta E_k \equiv E_{k\uparrow}^+ - E_{k\uparrow}^-$ we can write down spectral functions $A_{k\sigma}(E) = -\frac{1}{\pi}Im\left[Sp\hat{G}_{k\sigma}\right]$ in the form:

$$A_{k\uparrow}(E) = u_k^2\delta\left(E-E_{k\uparrow}^+\right) + v_k^2\delta\left(E-E_{k\uparrow}^-\right), \quad (13)$$

$$A_{k\downarrow}(E) = v_k^2\delta\left(E-E_{k\downarrow}^+\right) + u_k^2\delta\left(E-E_{k\downarrow}^-\right), \quad (14)$$

where

$$u_k^2 = \frac{1}{2} - (1-2n_{sf})^2\frac{\left(J_0^B - J_0^A - t_k^A\right)}{2\Delta E_k}, \quad v_k^2 = 1-u_k^2.$$

Obviously, for $n_{sf}=0$ the value $u_k^2=0$, $v_k^2=1$ and there will be the non-zero spectral function $A_{k\uparrow}(E) = \delta\left(E-E_{k\uparrow}^-\right)$ corresponding to only one dispersive state (11). In Fig. 2b the spectral functions versus energy for different symmetric points in momentum space are shown. Comparison of spectral intensities in case of presence and absence of n_{sf} (solid and dash-dotted lines) indicates that the second satellite peak appears above the main peak in $(\pi/2,\pi/2)$ and $(\pi,0)$ points. It is the




FIG. 2: Quasiparticle dispersion (a) and spectral function peaks (b) in the $t-J$ model for $x=0$ and $n_{sf}=0.2$ (solid lines) and $n_{sf}=0$ (dot-dashed lines)

satellite peak that represents the in-gap state. In the $(\pi/2,\pi/2)$ point the distance between two peaks is proportional to J (see equation (12)) but at $(\pi,0)$ point the distance is proportional to $|J+t'|$ (or, generally, $\left|J_0^B - t_k^A\right|$) and will also take place even at zero J. The last statement emphasizes importance of next-nearest-neighbor hoppings t' at low doping. Indeed, if one consider $t-J$ model with only nearest-neighbor hoppings then the doped hole will not even be able to move without spin fluctuations ($n_{sf}=0$, see equation (11)) and at low n_{sf} the dispersion will be governed by $\left(t_k^A - J_0^B\right)$ term in equation (10) but not by nearest neighbor hopping t_k^B.

Now we will discuss the higher-order corrections to previous results. Two main effects are expected: i) quasiparticle decay and ii) renormalization of the real part of the self-energy. The main change with introduction of finite quasiparticle lifetime will be broadening of spectral peaks. This effect indirectly presented in Fig. 2b where the delta function peaks in spectral function are artificially broadened by the Lorentzian. To analyze renormalization of the real part of self-energy we will use more rigorous approximation – generalized Hartree-Fock approximation [23]. In this approximation the equation of motion for operator $X_f^{0\sigma}$ is renormalized by two-sites static correlation functions:

$$i\frac{d}{dt}X_f^{0\sigma} = \left[(\varepsilon_1-\mu)+M_{f\sigma}\right]X_f^{0\sigma} + \sum_g \tau_{fg,\sigma}X_g^{0\sigma}, \quad (15)$$

where $M_{f\sigma}$ and $\tau_{fg,\sigma}$ are the renormalized chemical potential (exchange integral) and hopping integrals correspondingly:

$$\begin{aligned} M_{f\sigma} &= \sum_g t_{fg}\left\langle X_f^{0\bar{\sigma}}X_g^{\bar{\sigma}0}\right\rangle \\ &- \sum_g J_{fg}\left[\left\langle X_f^{00}X_g^{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}\right\rangle + \left\langle X_f^{\sigma\bar{\sigma}}X_g^{\bar{\sigma}\sigma}\right\rangle - \left\langle X_f^{\sigma\sigma}X_g^{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}}\right\rangle\right], \\ \tau_{fg,\sigma} &= t_{fg}\left[\left\langle X_f^{00}X_g^{00}\right\rangle + \left\langle X_f^{00}X_g^{\sigma\sigma}\right\rangle + \left\langle X_f^{\sigma\sigma}X_g^{00}\right\rangle\right. \\ &+ \left.\left\langle X_f^{\sigma\sigma}X_g^{\sigma\sigma}\right\rangle + \left\langle X_f^{\bar{\sigma}\sigma}X_g^{\sigma\bar{\sigma}}\right\rangle\right] + J_{fg}\left\langle X_f^{0\bar{\sigma}}X_g^{\bar{\sigma}0}\right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that the equation (15) has the same linearized form as in Hubbard I approximation but with renormalized chemical potential and hopping integrals. It means the qualitative results of Hubbard I consideration will be the same but quantitatively they may change. Namely, due to renormalization of the exchange integral the distance between the in-gap and main spectral peaks will be shorter then expected from (12) and the concentration dependence of peak positions will appear due to both renormalizations. Meanwhile, the underlying physics of the in-gap state will be unchanged and its dispersion will be governed by spin fluctuations.

IV. CONCLUSION

It is clear from the spectral function both in the Fig. 1b and Fig. 2b that there is a pseudogap between the in-gap band and the valence band, for the undoped cuprate both bands are occupied and the chemical potential lies above the in-gap band. With doping $\mu(x)$ is pinned to the in-gap state [16] up to optimal doping. The pseudogap is k-dependent. In the $(\pi/2,\pi/2)$ point of the BZ the value of the gap is $\Delta E\left(\pi/2,\pi/2\right) \sim J\left(1-2n_{sf}\right)$, while in the $(\pi,0)$ point $\Delta E\left(\pi,0\right) \sim |J+t'|\left(1-2n_{sf}\right)$. We can compare results of the $p-d$ model and the $t-J$ model in our solution only in the limit $U\to\infty$ ($J\to 0$), then we get $\Delta E\left(\pi/2,\pi/2\right)\to 0$ and $\Delta E\left(\pi,0\right)\to |t'|\left(1-2n_{sf}\right)$ that corresponds to the Fig. 1. At $J\neq 0$ there is the additional contribution to the pseudogap, and we may expect the in-gap satellite both in $(\pi/2,\pi/2)$ and $(\pi,0)$ points of the BZ.

In conclusion, we have shown that the spin-polaron effect results in the formation of the in-gap band above the top of the valence band even in the undoped cuprates. The spectral function of the in-gap states has a form of small low energy satellite that can be detected by ARPES measurements. The most interesting to the ARPES studies are $(\pi,0)$ and $(\pi/2,\pi/2)$ points of the BZ. For the hole

doped cuprates there are two contributions to the in-gap spectral weight: the mean field contribution is given by doping concentration x and the spin-fluctuation contribution is given by the magnon concentration $2n_{sf}$. The latter is temperature dependent resulting in the increasing satellite intensity with the temperature growth.

Acknowledgments

The authors are thankful to Yu.A. Izyumov and V.I. Anisimov for the stimulating discussion. This work was supported by RFFI grant 03-02-16124, INTAS grant 01-0654, Russian Academy of Science Program "Quantum macrophysics", Joint Integration Program of Ural and Siberian Branches of RAS and Siberian Branch of RAS (Lavrent'yev Contest for Young Scientists).

[1] M. Suzuki, Phys. Rev. B **39**, 2312 (1989)
[2] S. Uchida et al, Phys. Rev. B **43**, 7942 (1991)
[3] A. Fujimori, N. Namatame, Physica C **185-189**, 51 (1991)
[4] A.V. Bazhenov, V.A. Gorbunov, V.E. Timofeev, JETP **104**, 3193 (1993)
[5] D.S. Marshall, et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 4841 (1996)
[6] A. Ino, C. Kim, M. Nakamura, et al, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 4137 (2000)
[7] T. Yoshida, X.J. Zhon, T. Sasagawa et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 027001 (2003)
[8] W. Stephan, P. Horsh, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 2258 (1991)
[9] E. Dagotto et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 1918 (1991)
[10] T. Tohyama, S. Maekawa, Physica C **191**, 193 (1992)
[11] R. Press, W. Hanke, W. von der Linden, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 1344 (1995)
[12] S.G. Ovchinnikov, I.S. Sandalov, Physica C **198**, 607 (1989)
[13] V.A. Gavrichkov, S.G. Ovchinnikov, A.A. Borisov, E.G. Goryachev, JETP **91**, 369 (2000)
[14] R.O. Zaitsev, JETP Lett. **65**, 881 (1997)
[15] R.O. Zaitsev, JETP Lett. **72**, 109 (2000)
[16] A.A. Borisov, V.A. Gavrichkov, S.G. Ovchinnikov, JETP **97**, 773 (2003)
[17] R.O. Zaitsev, JETP **41**, 100 (1975)
[18] A.N. Podmarkov, I.S. Sandalov, JETP **86**, 146 (1984)
[19] V.A. Gavrichkov, S.G. Ovchinnikov, A.A. Borisov, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 235124 (2001)
[20] M.M. Korshunov, S.G. Ovchinnikov, Phys. Sol. State **43**, 416 (2001)
[21] P. Horsch, W. von der Linden, Z. Phys. B: Condens. Matter **72**, 181 (1988)
[22] A. Nazarenko, K.J.E. Vos, S. Haas et al, Phys. Rev. B **51**, 8676 (1995)
[23] S.V. Tyablikov, Methods of Quantum Theory of Magnetism, 2nd ed, Moscow: "Nauka", 1975