

Van Hove Excitons and High- T_c Superconductivity: V IIIIC
 Dynamic Jahn-Teller Effects vs Spin-Orbit Coupling in the LTO Phase of $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$

R.S. Markiewicz

Physics Department and Barrett Institute, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115

Running Title: Dynamic JT in LSCO

Keywords: charge-density waves, electron-phonon coupling, structural phase transition, excitonic mechanism, fluctuations

The possible role of the van Hove singularity (vHs) in stabilizing the low-temperature orthorhombic (LTO) phase transition in $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$ (LSCO) is discussed. It is found that the vHs can drive a structural distortion in two different ways, either due to spin-orbit coupling or to dynamic Jahn-Teller (JT) effects. This paper discusses the latter effect in some detail. It is shown that a model Hamiltonian introduced earlier to describe the coupled electron { octahedral tilt motions ('basons') has a series of phase transitions, from a high-temperature disordered JT phase (similar to the high-temperature tetragonal phase of LSCO) to an intermediate temperature dynamic JT phase, of average orthorhombic symmetry (the LTO phase) to a low temperature static JT phase (the low temperature tetragonal phase). For some parameter values, the static JT phase is absent.

1. Introduction

The high- T_c superconductors $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Ba}_x\text{CuO}_4$ (LBCO) and $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$ (LSCO) have structural phase transitions from a high-temperature tetragonal (HTT) to a low-temperature orthorhombic (LTO) to (in doped LBCO) a low-temperature tetragonal (LTT) phase [1]. There is a clear association of the LTT phase with electronic properties { the transition causes a decrease in the Hall density and interferes destructively with superconductivity [2]. Moreover, the transition is complete only at a fixed hole density, $x \approx 0.125$ [3]. These features can be understood [4] in terms of the LTT phase splitting the degeneracy of the two van Hove singularities (vHs's) [5-7], at the X- and Y-points of the (HTT) Brillouin zone.

The role of electron-phonon coupling in the LTO phase is less clear, since transport properties are only weakly affected by the HTT-LTO transition. While a uniform LTO phase could be stabilized by purely non-electronic mechanisms, this does not explain why high- T_c superconductivity appears to occur only in the orthorhombic phase [8]. It had early been suggested that the LTO phase was a charge-density wave (CDW) phase, associated with the vHs, but Pouget, et al. [9] suggested that this interpretation was untenable, since the LTO transition does not split the degeneracy of the two vHs's. In the present paper, I show that the analysis of Pouget, et al., is incomplete: the vHs can actually drive two transitions of macroscopic LTO symmetry, to either a CDW-like phase or to a spin-density wave (SDW)-like phase.

I have recently suggested [10,11] that both LTT and LTO phases are manifestations of a novel form of band Jahn-Teller (JT) effect [12-14], in which the degenerate electronic states are associated with the two vHs's. Thus, the LTT phase involves an essentially static band JT distortion, splitting the degeneracy of the two vHs's. The HTT and LTO phases can then both be interpreted as dynamic Jahn-Teller phases, involving tunneling between the X- and Y-point JT distortions of the LTT phase. In Ref. [10], a mean field calculation was made, approximating the dynamic JT effect by 'valence bond density waves', a coherent superposition of two charge density waves (CDW's). The resulting phase diagram reproduced the HTT ! LTO ! superconducting phases as a function of hole doping in LSCO. Ref. [11] introduced a model Hamiltonian to describe the (nonlinear) electron-phonon interaction, based on similar calculations for the A15 compounds [15,16], and applied it to an analysis of the static JT effect. The present paper extends these calculations to include the dynamic JT effect. For a single cell, the combined electron-tilt phonon ('bason') problem can be reduced to the problem of a particle moving among four potential wells, and a solution can be found in terms of Mathieu's functions. The ground states are linear combinations of tilted octahedra. Adding intercell coupling leads to phase transitions with a net macroscopic average tilt, and the accompanying static strains. A dynamic LTO phase can be stabilized over a considerable temperature range by entropic effects, and the sequence HTT ! LTO ! LTT is naturally reproduced. A sequence of transitions is found, from a high

temperature disordered JT phase (equivalent to the HTT phase of LSCO) to an intermediate dynamic JT phase, with equal tilts along the orthogonal x and y axes (an LTO phase) to a low temperature static JT phase (LTT phase). The transition to the LTO phase is second order, while that between LTO and LTT is first order. Within a certain parameter range, the LTT phase does not occur, leaving the dynamic JT phase as the stable low- T phase.

The dynamic JT phase offers an interpretation of the LTO phase as having only macroscopic average orthorhombic symmetry, with local dynamic disorder. The question of whether the vHs can induce a transition into a uniform LTO phase is also reanalyzed, on the basis of group theory. It is found that umklapp scattering can split the vHs degeneracy, but only in the presence of spin-orbit coupling. Thus there are two vHs-based mechanisms of driving the LTO transition, in competition with each other. While considerably more complicated, these transitions are reminiscent of the competition between CDW and SDW transitions in the theory of nesting instabilities in lower-dimensional metals.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the proposed role of band JT effects in the cuprates, and their relation to ferroelectric perovskites. Section 3 introduces a modified form of the electron-tilt-strain coupled Hamiltonian of Ref. [11], including umklapp scattering terms. Section 4 and Appendix II show how the acoustic strains can be formally eliminated, leading to an effective electron-electron interaction. Section 5 and Appendix III carefully analyze the problem of structural phase transitions in the uniform LTO phase. It is shown that, whereas umklapp scattering can in principle lead to a density wave instability, the transition is symmetry forbidden for the LTO space group, unless spin-orbit interaction is included. Section 6 analyzes the dynamic JT state, reducing the Hamiltonian to an intracell plus near neighbor coupling form, and shows the relation between the present Hamiltonian and previous JT calculations. Section 7 presents the calculation of the dynamic JT effects at a mean-field level, including phase diagrams of the transitions from HTT! LTO! LTT. A discussion is given in Section 8, while the interpretation of the ‘bagnon’ in terms of polarons or solitons is briefly discussed in Section 9. A number of Appendices provide details of calculations: a renormalization of the band structure to reveal separate subbands associated with each vHs (Appendix I); a group theoretical analysis of the uniform LTO phase (Appendix III); a pseudospin approximation of the electronic operators (Appendix IV); and a discussion of the solutions of the four-well Mathieu equation (Appendix V).

2. First-Order Band JT Effect

The JT theorem states that any orbital electronic degeneracy in a molecule is unstable: there always exists some structural distortion which lowers the energy of the molecule by lifting the degeneracy. A similar effect can arise in a solid, either for a local impurity or for a collective JT effect in the crystal as a whole. Many perovskites and related structures have a phase transition to either a ferroelectric or antiferrodistortive phase, which can be interpreted as a collective JT effect [13].

In the cuprates, the structural transitions are complicated, involving tilts of the oxygen octahedra (optical phonons), static strains and acoustic phonons, as well as electron-phonon coupling. Moreover, the coupling of the optical phonons to both the strains and the electrons is nonlinear. A model for these interactions was introduced in Ref. [11]. There, it was suggested that both the LTO and LTT phase transitions were driven by the diverging electronic susceptibility associated with the vHs. Indeed, these transitions can be considered as a generalization to two dimensions of the Peierls instability.

The LTT phase transition can be thought of as a vHs-JT transition. The presence of two vHs’s, at the X and Y points of the Brillouin zone, provides the electronic degeneracy, while the tilting of the octahedra splits this degeneracy, as in a traditional (band) JT effect. Interpretation of the LTO phase is more complicated, since the associated octahedral tilting leaves the vHs’s degenerate, essentially because the two in-plane Cu-O distances are equal in the LTO phase [9]. However, this rules out only the simplest model of the CDW/SDW phase. In the present paper, I show that there remain a large number of potential ground states, stabilized by (partial) splitting of the vHs degeneracy. I suggest that two of these states may be actually realized in LSCO: a static, SDW-like phase near half filling (Section 5), and a dynamic, CDW-like phase in the doped material (Section 7).

The difference between the two transitions can be understood from Fig. 1, which illustrates two different means of splitting the vHs peak in the dos. This Figure illustrates the Fermi surfaces corresponding to the LTT phase (Fig. 1a) and to a possible LTO phase (Fig. 1b). The Fermi surfaces at the vHs have been

distorted from square by including a finite oxygen-oxygen hopping energy, t_{00} in the dispersion relations.

Figure 1a shows Fermi surfaces of the LTT phase for two different dopings { the Fermi level coincides with the X-point vHs at one doping, and with the Y-point vHs at the other. In the LTT phase, the two Cu-O distances are no longer degenerate, so the Cu-O hopping parameter becomes anisotropic, splitting the vHs degeneracy [4]. (Due to the unusual layering, this compound has a complicated c-axis dispersion: the roles of X-point and Y-point vHs's are interchanged on every other layer. It might be thought that such a large c-axis dispersion would wash out the effects of the vHs, but in fact, it is a consequence of the vHs splitting in the LTT phase.) In the dynamic model of the LTO phase, the symmetry is microscopically LTT, thereby locally splitting the vHs degeneracy, but with a macroscopic orthorhombic strain.

This is to be contrasted with the situation in the uniform LTO phase, Fig. 1b. The LTO transition doubles the unit cell volume, thereby reducing the Brillouin zone volume by the same factor, and introducing a two-fold degeneracy in all bands. Unklapp scattering can in principle lift the degeneracy of the two bands, so that their respective vHs's coincide with the Fermi level at two different dopings, as illustrated in Fig. 1b. Note that in Fig. 1a, the Fermi surface of a single band is illustrated at two different dopings, whereas Fig. 1b shows the Fermi surfaces of two different bands at a single doping level. Note further that, within either band in Fig. 1b, the two vHs's remain degenerate [9]. The splitting of Fig. 1b can be used, for instance, to describe interlayer coupling in the cuprates. In this case, the two bands' would correspond to the Fermi surfaces at $k_z = 0; =c$, which are degenerate when interlayer hopping is neglected. However, interlayer coupling is weak in these materials, and for simplicity it will be neglected.

Of more interest is the possibility of introducing a gap by coherently coupling excitations between the two vHs's. Such in-plane coupling was introduced by Schulz [17], and is very similar to that introduced in the flux phase [18] of a doped antiferromagnet. However, a group theoretical analysis rules out such a possibility for a CDW-like excitation: there is a two-fold degeneracy of electronic levels on the Brillouin zone face, which can only be split by spin-orbit coupling. This suggests that vHs splitting can lead to a uniform LTO phase only in the presence of antiferromagnetic order { i.e., close to half filling. Away from half filling, the magnetic state becomes inhomogeneous [19]. Hence, in the doping range associated with superconductivity, there is competition between a disordered magnetic state and a dynamic JT state. Both phases will be described in greater detail below.

It seems likely that dynamic effects are important in the higher- T_c phases, and that the sequence HTT! LTO! LTT may parallel the sequence of structural transitions in the perovskite, BaTiO_3 [20]. Here, four successive phase transitions are observed as temperature is lowered, from cubic to tetragonal to orthorhombic to rhombohedral. The rhombohedral phase can be identified as a static JT phase, in which the Ti are all distorted along one of the eight octahedral directions. The higher T phases correspond to dynamic JT phases, in which the Ti tunnels between successively two, four, or all eight octahedral sites. In particular, the 'cubic' phase is not microscopically of cubic symmetry, but is a disordered phase with microscopic rhombohedral and macroscopic average cubic symmetry. A similar model can apply to LSCO , with a disordered or dynamic JT phase consisting of a random tilting of the oxygen octahedra about each Cu, with tunneling between all four allowed tilts in the HTT phase, between two in the LTO phase, and with only one tilt (static JT) in the LTT phase. Section 7 shows that such a sequence of phase transitions naturally follows from the Hamiltonian introduced [11] to describe this system.

Recent calculations [11,21] have confirmed the close relation between the ferroelectric perovskites and the superconducting cuprates. In [11] it was pointed out that electron-phonon interaction can lead to a structural instability (negative harmonic phonon frequency) even in a filled band, as long as the Fermi level fell between the bonding and antibonding bands associated with hybridizing atoms. This is clearly the case in La_2CuO_4 , and Cohen [21] has shown that Ti-O hybridization is essential for ferroelectricity in BaTiO_3 and PbTiO_3 .

3. Theory of the Structural Transition

The present calculations are based on the nonlinear electron-phonon Hamiltonian introduced in Ref. [11]. For convenience, when referring to equations from References [10] or [11], I will pre x them with a letter A or B respectively (i.e., Eq. 10 of Ref. [11] will be referred to as Eq. B10, etc.).

It is convenient to rewrite the Hamiltonian of Ref. [11] as

$$H = H_{\text{str}} + H_{\text{ph}} + H_e + H_{\text{ps}} + H_{\text{es}} + H_{\text{ep}} : \quad (1)$$

The various terms of Eq. 1 refer to static strains and acoustic phonons

$$H_{\text{str}} = \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} P(\mathbf{q}) P(-\mathbf{q}) + \sum_{\mathbf{q}} C_{+} e_{+}(\mathbf{q}) e_{+}(\mathbf{q}) + C_{-} e_{-}(\mathbf{q}) e_{-}(\mathbf{q}) + 2C_{66} e_{12}(\mathbf{q}) e_{12}(\mathbf{q}) : \quad (2)$$

Here, e_{ij} is the usual strain tensor, the elastic constants are C_{ij} [6], and $e = (e_{11} \ e_{22})/2$, $C_{+} = C_{11} - C_{22}$. The strain tensor includes both static and dynamic parts (both strains and acoustic phonons), and the $P(\mathbf{q})$'s are the momenta associated with the acoustic phonons. In the HTT phase, there may be static strains due to (anisotropic) thermal expansion: $e_{11} \neq 0$. A non-vanishing e_{12} arises in the LTO phase. In the HTT and LTO phases, $e_{11} = e_{22}$. This is also true in the LTT phase of LBCO, due to interlayer strains [11], but need not be true in general. To simplify the present calculations, I will apply them to a 'single layer' model of LBCO, for which $e \neq 0$ in the LTT phase.

electronic modes

In the vHs model, there is a single, hybridized Cu-O band at the Fermi level. However, as discussed in Section 2, it is convenient to treat the two vHs as independent, since they have opposite responses to e_{\pm} strains. Hence, the carriers will be assumed to belong to group 1 or 2, depending on whether they are nearer the X- or Y-point vHs, respectively. In Appendix I, this assumption will be justified by calculating such subbands from a renormalized microscopic Hamiltonian of the hybridized Cu-O planes. The electronic energy may be written as

$$H_e = \sum_{i,k} E_i(\mathbf{k}) a_{ik}^{\dagger} a_{ik} ; \quad (3)$$

with $i = 1, 2$. It is convenient to define the integrated density of states for each vHs as

$$\rho_{ij}(\mathbf{q}) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \langle a_{ik}^{\dagger} a_{j,k+\mathbf{q}} \rangle ; \quad (4a)$$

$$\rho(\mathbf{q}) = \rho_{11}(\mathbf{q}) - \rho_{22}(\mathbf{q}) : \quad (4b)$$

In the HTT and LTO phases, $\rho_{11} = \rho_{22}$, whereas they are unequal (the JT splitting) in the LTT phase. The term involving ρ_{12} , which is in general allowed by symmetry, corresponds to inter-vHs coupling. This term is related to umklapp scattering between the two vHs, and can act as a competing mechanism to the dynamic JT effect. In Section 5 it will be shown that such a term could drive a structural transition within a purely orthorhombic phase. However, it will further be shown that ρ_{12} is symmetry forbidden at the vHs in the uniform LTO phase, in the absence of spin-orbit coupling.

In the present paper, only intraband inter-vHs coupling will be considered, with ρ_{12} coupling the vHs's separated by wave vector $\mathbf{Q}_0 = (\pi/a; \pi/a)$, as in Refs. [10,11]. It should, however, be noted that similar considerations could be applied to interlayer coupling, as discussed in Section 2 (Fig. 1b).

optical (tilting) modes

Tilting of the oxygen octahedra can be described in terms of (pseudo)rotation operators, for rotations about the in-plane x- and y-axes [11,22], with R_x and R_y being the magnitude of the tilt. To simplify the resulting expressions, it is convenient to define some auxiliary pair tilting operators. Thus,

$$R_{ij}(\mathbf{q}; \mathbf{q}^0) = R_i(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{q}^0) R_j(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}^0) ; \quad (5a)$$

$$R_{ij}^{(1)}(\mathbf{q}) = \sum_{\mathbf{q}^0} R_{ij}(\mathbf{q}; \mathbf{q}^0) ; \quad (5b)$$

$$R_{ii}^{(2)}(\mathbf{q}) = \sum_{\mathbf{q}^0; j} R_{ii}(\mathbf{q}; \mathbf{q}^0)_{ij} (\cos(\mathbf{q}_j a) - \cos(\mathbf{q}_j^0 a)) ; \quad (5c)$$

with $\delta_{ij} = 1$ if $i = j$, $\delta_{ij} = 0$ when $i \neq j$, $i, j = 1, 2$. In this case, H_{ph} becomes [11]

$$H_{ph} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} \sum_{\alpha} K_{\alpha}(\mathbf{q}) P_{\alpha}(\mathbf{q}) P_{\alpha}(-\mathbf{q}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} \left[R_{11}^{(0)}(\mathbf{q}) (R_{11}^{(0)}(0; \mathbf{q}) + R_{22}^{(0)}(0; \mathbf{q})) \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1}{4} R_{11}^{(2)}(\mathbf{q}) R_{11}^{(2)}(-\mathbf{q}) + R_{22}^{(2)}(\mathbf{q}) R_{22}^{(2)}(-\mathbf{q}) \right] \\ + \frac{1}{2} R_{11}^{(1)}(\mathbf{q}) R_{11}^{(1)}(-\mathbf{q}) + R_{22}^{(1)}(\mathbf{q}) R_{22}^{(1)}(-\mathbf{q}) + \frac{1}{2} R_{11}^{(1)}(\mathbf{q}) R_{22}^{(1)}(-\mathbf{q}) ; \quad (5d)$$

where P_{α} is the momentum conjugate to R_{α} , α runs over 1 and 2 (x and y), and K_{α} is defined in Eq. B17a. The electron-strain coupling The strain-electronic interaction is

$$H_{es} = \sum_{\mathbf{q}} G_{+} e_{+}(\mathbf{q}) + e_{-}(\mathbf{q}) + G_{-} e_{-}(\mathbf{q}) + 2G_{66} e_{12}(\mathbf{q}) : \quad (6)$$

with $G_{-} = G_{11} - G_{22}$. The term in G_{66} couples the orthorhombic shear strain e_{12} of the LTO phase to the umklapp term, $\langle e_{12} \rangle$.

strain-tilt coupling

The optical phonon coupling with strain (H_{ps}) can be written

$$H_{ps} = \sum_{\mathbf{q}} F_{+} e_{+}(\mathbf{q}) R_{+}^{(3)}\left(\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2}\right) + F_{-} e_{-}(\mathbf{q}) R_{-}^{(3)}\left(\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2}\right) + F_{66} e_{12}(\mathbf{q}) R_0^{(3)}\left(\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2}\right) : \quad (7a)$$

Here, I have introduced the combination

$$R_{\pm}^{(3)}(\mathbf{q}) = \cos(\mathbf{q}_y a) R_{11}^{(2)}(\mathbf{q}) \pm \cos(\mathbf{q}_x a) R_{22}^{(2)}(\mathbf{q}) ; \quad (7b)$$

and

$$R_0^{(3)}(\mathbf{q}) = \sum_{\mathbf{q}^0} R_{12}(\mathbf{q}; \mathbf{q}^0) (1 \pm \cos((\mathbf{q}_y + \mathbf{q}_y^0) a)) (1 \pm \cos(\mathbf{q}_x \mp \mathbf{q}_x^0) a) : \quad (7c)$$

These equations reduce to the corresponding expressions in Ref. [11] when $\mathbf{q} = 0$. In that reference, the Hamiltonian was evaluated only for wave numbers near the soft mode, $\mathbf{q} = 0$, \mathbf{q}^0 at one of the vHs (either $(0; \pm a)$ or $(\pm a; 0)$).

electron-tilt coupling The optical phonon coupling with electrons (H_{ep}) can be written

$$H_{ep} = \sum_{\mathbf{q}} \tilde{e}_{+}^{e} + e_{+}(\mathbf{q}) R_{+}^{(3)}\left(\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2}\right) + \tilde{e}_{-}^{e} + e_{-}(\mathbf{q}) R_{-}^{(3)}\left(\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2}\right) + \tilde{e}_{12}^{e} + e_{12}(\mathbf{q}) R_0^{(3)}\left(\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2}\right) : \quad (8)$$

In the notation of Ref. [11], $\tilde{e}_{\pm}^{e} = (e_{\pm}^{e} - e_{\mp}^{e})/2m$, $\tilde{e}_{12}^{e} = (e_{12}^{e} - e_{21}^{e})/2m$. This is a nonlinear electron-phonon coupling, similar to terms which have recently been introduced [23].

All of the above terms involve a sum over \mathbf{q} . In an RPA approximation, the various \mathbf{q} 's are decoupled. The soft mode is associated with $\mathbf{q} = 0$, so in many applications the non-0 \mathbf{q} -terms may be neglected (e.g., only terms in $R_{\pm}^{(3)}(0)$ remain). Moreover, except for the tilt term, Eq. 5d, the Hamiltonian separates into three parts, involving $(e_{+}, e_{-}, R_{\pm}^{(3)})$, $(e_{12}, e_{21}, R_0^{(3)})$, and $(e_{12}, e_{21}, R_0^{(3)})$. In Appendix II, a toy model is introduced which allows a similar separation of the tilt terms, Eq. 5d, as well.

The three groups of terms play very different roles in the structural transitions, particularly in the presence of dynamic JT effects. At high temperatures, corresponding to the HTT phase, there are local tilts of the octahedra, but with no long-range correlations. In this case, $\langle R_x^2 + R_y^2 \rangle \neq 0$, while $\langle R_x \rangle = \langle R_y \rangle = 0$. Hence, the first set of terms controls short range order, and is non-vanishing in the HTT phase. These terms will have a weak temperature dependence at lower temperatures, which can be neglected to simplify the study of the dynamics { i.e., the first group of terms contributes a constant value to the Hamiltonian and can be neglected.

The second group of terms is nonzero in the LTT phase, and the last in the LTO phase. Hence, these terms describe the dynamic competition between the LTT and LTO phases.

4. Eliminating the Strain and Acoustic Phonon Modes

The elastic strain tensor e_{ij} has static components associated with static strains and time-dependent components associated with acoustic phonons[11,22]. However, in studying structural phase transitions, it is often convenient to treat the strains separately from the acoustic phonons. For instance, condensation of an optical mode may induce a static strain. Consider a line of corner-shared octahedra: if the interatomic distances remain fixed, a static, antiferrodistortive tilt distortion of the octahedra will reduce the overall length of the chain. This seems to be the case in the cuprates: the octahedral strain in the LTO phase is found to be a secondary order parameter, proportional to the square of the octahedral tilt angle[24]. These strains may be formally decoupled from the problem, following standard practice[12-14], by defining

$$e_p = e_p + p; \quad (9)$$

($p = \frac{1}{2}e_{12}$) and choosing p in such a way as to eliminate the cross terms between e_p and $p; R_i R_j$. The procedure is carried out in detail in Appendix II, but for illustrative purposes, a simpler calculation is given here. Consider the sub-Hamiltonian

$$H^0 = 2C_{66}e_{12}^2 + 2G_{66}e_{12} \quad (10a)$$

Taking $e_{12} = G_{66}^{-1}e_{12} = 2C_{66}^{-1}$ transforms the Hamiltonian to

$$H^0 = 2C_{66}e_{12}^2 - \frac{J_{12}}{2}e_{12}; \quad (10b)$$

with $J_{12} = G_{66}^2 = C_{66}$. Thus, the phonon motion is formally decoupled from the electron, leading to an attractive interaction between electrons. However, an electronic phase transition is accompanied by a static distortion: since when $\langle e_{12} \rangle = 0$, then

$$\langle e_{12} \rangle = -\frac{G_{66}}{2C_{66}} \langle e_{12} \rangle; \quad (11)$$

The separation of charge and phonon variables is not complete (e_{12} does not commute with e_{12}), but it has been argued that the additional complications of noncommutativity are unimportant (see discussion in Ref. [14], pp. 24-25, and references cited therein). The resulting attractive interaction between electrons is very similar to that found in the density wave calculation [10,25], Eq. 2.8 of Ref. [25], which, in the present notation, becomes

$$V_{kq} = \frac{G_{66}^2 \hbar^2 q^2}{(E_k - E_{k+q})^2 (\hbar^2 q^2)^2} = \frac{G_{66}^2}{2\hbar^2 q^2}; \quad (12)$$

Equations 11 and 12 differ only in the denominator, with one equation containing C_{66} , the other $\hbar^2 q^2$. This substitution arises quite naturally. In Eq. 2, the term $e_{12}(q)$ includes both static strains and acoustic phonons. If the phonons only were included, the term $2C_{66}e_{12}(q)e_{12}(q) = c_q^\dagger c_q (\hbar^2 q^2 + 1/2)$, where the c_q are phonon operators. Elimination of the electron-phonon coupling as above would then lead to an effective electron-electron coupling, Eq. 11 with $C_{66} \rightarrow \hbar^2 q^2$.

In Appendix II, a toy model Hamiltonian is introduced, which allows the optical phonon coupling to be eliminated in the same fashion, leaving a purely electronic Hamiltonian with an attractive effective electron-electron interaction. There is also the decoupled phonon Hamiltonian, which splits into two parts: (1) an acoustic phonon part which, being purely harmonic, can be neglected; (2) an optical phonon part, which remains anharmonic, but with renormalized coefficients.

5. Uniform LTO Phase

Before analyzing the dynamic JT phase, it is important to reexamine the question of whether a structural transition from the HTT phase to a uniform phase of microscopic LTO symmetry could somehow be driven

by the vHs. At first sight, it would appear that this question has already been answered in the negative by the work of Pouget, et al.[9]. However, their analysis did not consider all possible mechanisms for driving a structural instability.

Electron-phonon interaction can lead to a structural instability if the structural distortion drives a significant density of electronic states below the Fermi level, as in the one-dimensional CDW problem, due to Fermi surface nesting. In the presence of two degenerate vHs, there are two different ways in which a large DOS could be shifted below the Fermi level. First, the structural distortion could split the degeneracy of the two vHs, so that one vHs is shifted below the Fermi level, the other above. This is clearly what happens in the LTT phase of LBCO, Fig. 1a, and is the basis for the dynamic JT model of the LTO phase, discussed in Sections 6 and 7. As shown by Pouget, et al.[9], the vHs degeneracy is not lifted in the uniform LTO phase.

However, there is an alternate mechanism for structural distortion, which could in principle provide a static model for a uniform LTO phase. In this mechanism, umklapp scattering couples electronic states on degenerate bands of the Fermi surface, Fig. 1b, leading to coherent superpositions of the two states with a corresponding gap between the superposed states. In the LTO phase, there is no splitting of the vHs (Fig. 1b), but the two vHs are now at symmetry-equivalent points of the Brillouin zone, thereby allowing inter-vHs umklapp scattering. By introducing a gap at the vHs, this mechanism can again stabilize a lattice instability. In the Equations, 1-8, this inter-vHs coherence corresponds to a finite expectation value for η_{12} , and the umklapp scattering to the G_{66} and \tilde{e} terms. For the calculations of this section, it will be assumed that the two vHs's are separated by $Q_0 = (\pi/a; \pi/a)$, although, as discussed below Eq. 4, other Q -vectors are possible.

The present section is arranged as follows. In Section 5a, the umklapp mechanism is discussed, and it is shown that it is likely to be weak in doped LSCO: it is symmetry-forbidden in the absence of spin-orbit interaction. Section 5b will further demonstrate that the static model cannot explain the sequence of transitions from HTT to LTO to LTT in terms of competition between η_{12} and η_{11} . There is indeed competition, but the present calculations suggest an either/or situation: if there is a static structural instability, it will be either to an LTO phase or to the LTT phase, depending on the relative parameter values. Thus, the experimentally observed sequence of phases suggests rather a dynamic LTO phase { as in the perovskite ferroelectrics. The calculations of Sections 6 and 7 confirm this possibility. The correct sequence of phase transitions is found, even though umklapp scattering is explicitly neglected (G_{66} and \tilde{e} set equal to zero).

5a. Interpretation of η_{12}

The significance of the term η_{12} , Eq. 4, can be clarified by recalling the usual manner in which gaps in the electronic spectrum open at a Brillouin zone boundary [26]. Umklapp scattering mixes states at k and $k + Q$. Thus, the electron at the zone boundary $k = Q/2$ mixes with that at $k = -Q/2$,

$$= a_+ c_{Q/2}^y + a_- c_{-Q/2}^y; \quad (13a)$$

with the a 's determined by the eigenvalue equation

$$(E_{Q/2} - E) a_+ + U_Q a_- = 0; \quad (13b)$$

$$U_Q a_+ + (E_{-Q/2} - E) a_- = 0; \quad (13c)$$

where U_Q is a measure of the coupling. Now in the LTO phase, the X and Y point vHs's are separated by a reciprocal lattice vector, so a similar coupling can arise. In the present formalism, this coupling arises by rederiving Eq. B24 in the presence of the term in e_{12} . Neglecting fluctuating quantities, Eq. B24 becomes

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} a_{nk} = \tilde{E}_n(k) a_{nk} + \tilde{E} a_{m, k-m}; \quad (14)$$

$$\tilde{E}_1(k) = E_1(k) + G e + \tilde{e} R^2; \quad (15a)$$

$$\tilde{E}_2(k) = E_2(k) - G e - \tilde{e} R^2; \quad (15b)$$

$$\tilde{E}(k) = 2G_{66} e_{12} + \tilde{e} R_1 R_2; \quad (15c)$$

Equation 14 shows that, because of the ϵ_{12} -term, carriers from the two vHs interact with each other, in the presence of an orthorhombic strain ($\epsilon_{12} \neq 0$ or $R_1 = -R_2 \neq 0$). In this case, the correct eigenstates can be found by the Bogoliubov construction. Defining

$$a_{1k} = \cos(\theta_k) q_k + \sin(\theta_k) q_{2k}; \quad (16a)$$

$$a_{2k} = -\sin(\theta_k) q_k + \cos(\theta_k) q_{2k}; \quad (16b)$$

then the equations of motion for the c_{ik} 's are decoupled if

$$\tan(2\theta_k) = \frac{2E_-(k)}{E_2(k) - E_1(k)}; \quad (17a)$$

and the eigenenergies become

$$E_{\pm} = E_+ \pm \frac{q}{E_+^2 + E_-^2}; \quad (17b)$$

with $E_+ = (E_1 + E_2)/2$. The term E_+ may be neglected in Eq. 17b, since any term which shifts both electronic bands equally will be compensated by a corresponding shift of the Fermi level. Thus, when a static orthorhombic strain appears ($\epsilon_{12} > 0$), a gap $2E_-$ arises in the electron spectrum, driving the high density of states associated with the vHs below the Fermi level.

In fact, however, the terms in ϵ_{12} must vanish identically in a uniform LTO phase, in the absence of spin-orbit interaction. This follows from the symmetry group Bmab of the LTO phase, and can be considered as a generalization of Pouget, et al.'s result [9]. Because the lattice contains glide planes, the eigenfunctions must be two-fold degenerate on one face of the Brillouin zone, so no gap ($\epsilon_{12} \neq 0$) can arise. However, spin-orbit interaction splits most of the residual degeneracy, allowing a gap to open at the vHs. The group theoretical arguments are discussed in more detail in Appendix III, and the effect of such spin-orbit coupling on the vHs will be discussed in Section 8.

5b. Mean Field Transition in Electronic Hamiltonian

The above formalism can also be used to study the competition between static distortions of LTO vs LTT symmetry. This is most clearly seen by analyzing the effective electron-electron coupling terms in Eq. 10b. To simplify this analysis, it is convenient to temporarily neglect the tilt coupling and study just the electronic Hamiltonian. Ultimately, the toy Hamiltonian of Appendix II can be used to formally eliminate the tilt-electron coupling. From Appendix II the effective electronic Hamiltonian is found to be

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \sum_q J_+(q) (q) (q) + J_0 \epsilon_{12} (q) \epsilon_{12}(q); \quad (18)$$

with the coupling constants, J_i , defined in Eq. II6. A term in ϵ_+ has been neglected in Eq. 18. From charge conservation, $\epsilon_+(0)$ must be a fixed constant, which can be set equal to zero by adjusting the Fermi level. Due to the logarithmic divergence of the electronic susceptibility at the vHs, the dominant singularity (soft mode) corresponds to $q = 0$, and at the RPA level of approximation, this is the only mode which need be discussed.

The mean field solution can be found easily, as in Section 5a and Ref. [10]. The mean field Hamiltonian becomes

$$H_{MF}^e = \sum_k E_k (a_{1k}^\dagger a_{1k} + a_{2k}^\dagger a_{2k}) - D_+ (a_{1k}^\dagger a_{1k} - a_{2k}^\dagger a_{2k}) - D_0 (a_{1k}^\dagger a_{2k} + a_{2k}^\dagger a_{1k}); \quad (19a)$$

with

$$D_+ = \frac{J}{2} < \epsilon_+(0) >; \quad (19b)$$

$$D_0 = \frac{J_0}{2} < \epsilon_{12}(0) >; \quad (19c)$$

H_{MF}^e can be diagonalized as in Eqs. 16, 17, yielding eigenvalues

$$E_k = E_k - D; \quad (20)$$

with $D^2 = D^2 + D_0^2$. The self-consistency conditions, Eqs. 19b,c, yield equations for the two gaps

$$D = \frac{J D}{2D} \sum_k f(E_{k+}) - f(E_k); \quad (21a)$$

$$D_0 = \frac{J_0 D_0}{2D} \sum_k f(E_{k+}) - f(E_k); \quad (21b)$$

where $f(E) = 1/(\exp((E - E_F)/k_B T) + 1)$. Except in the special case $J = J_0$, Eqs. 21a,b cannot simultaneously have nonvanishing solutions. Instead, the solution with the larger value of J_i prevails. This makes good physical sense: the two transitions, LTO and LTT, are both driven by the same dos peak. Whichever phase is stabilized first uses up the available dos, and prevents the other from occurring.

In this case, the calculation may be simplified by ignoring terms of the non-condensing symmetry. This was in effect what was done in Refs. [10] and [11]. In Ref. [10], only the LTO solution appeared, while the calculations of Ref. [11] neglected terms involving γ_{12} , and predominantly described the LTT phase. It should be particularly noted that the present calculation has reproduced the BCS-like calculations of Ref. [10], but starting from the more microscopic Hamiltonian of Ref. [11], thereby explicitly displaying the close connection between the two works.

To compare with the results of Ref. [10], assume the LTO phase is favored, i.e., $J_0 > J$. Then $D = 0$, and the gap $D = D_0$ is given by the solution of

$$1 = \frac{J_0}{2D} \int_{-D}^D dE N(E) f(E - D) - f(E + D); \quad (22)$$

For a logarithmic dos,

$$N(E) = \frac{1}{B} \ln \frac{B}{2E}; \quad (23)$$

the zero temperature gap is

$$D(0) = \frac{eB}{2} e^{-B/J_0}; \quad (24)$$

This should be compared to Eq. 14 of Ref. [26]. Figure 2 illustrates the temperature dependence of the gap, found by solving Eq. 22-23 numerically. Note that, based on Eq. 11, there will be a nonvanishing orthorhombic strain in the LTO phase, $\langle e_{12} \rangle / \langle \epsilon_{12} \rangle$. Indeed, the present solution is similar to that found in Ref. [11], Model 2, except that inclusion of umklapp processes drives the large vHs dos below the Fermi level.

This section has explored the role of the term γ_{12} in stabilizing a static LTO phase. However, symmetry arguments suggest that such terms are small in the absence of spin-orbit coupling. Hence, in Sections 6 and 7, the opposite limit will be explored. Terms in γ_{12} will formally be retained in the Hamiltonian, but I will attempt to determine under what circumstances an LTO-type phase might arise when the γ_{12} terms are small or vanishing. It will be shown that the LTO phase can be interpreted as a dynamic JT phase.

6. Dynamic JT Hamiltonian

6a. Real-Space Hamiltonian: Intracell and Intercell Coupling

This section will present a more accurate treatment of the combined electron-optical-phonon Hamiltonian, following a conventional treatment of the dynamic JT effect. It is convenient to first transform the Hamiltonian, Eq. 1, back into real space:

$$H = \sum_i \frac{X}{4} \left[\left(\frac{R_1(\Omega)}{2} - \frac{R_1(\Omega + a\hat{y})}{2} \right)^4 + \left(\frac{R_2(\Omega)}{2} - \frac{R_2(\Omega + a\hat{x})}{2} \right)^4 \right] + \frac{a}{2} [R_1^4(\Omega) + R_2^4(\Omega)] + \frac{2}{2} R_1^2(\Omega) R_2^2(\Omega)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + (\tilde{e}_+^e + \Omega + F_+ e_+ \Omega) \left[\left(\frac{R_1(\Omega) - R_1(\Omega + a\hat{y})}{2} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{R_2(\Omega) - R_2(\Omega + a\hat{x})}{2} \right)^2 \right] \\
& + (\tilde{e}^e - \Omega + F_- e_- \Omega) \left[\left(\frac{R_1(\Omega) - R_1(\Omega + a\hat{y})}{2} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{R_2(\Omega) - R_2(\Omega + a\hat{x})}{2} \right)^2 \right] \\
& + \left(\frac{\tilde{e}_{12}^e \Omega + F_{66} e_{12} \Omega}{4} \right) \sum_{\mathbf{0}} [R_1(\Omega) - R_1(\Omega + \hat{y}a)][R_2(\Omega) - R_2(\Omega + \hat{x}a)] \\
& + \frac{\epsilon_0^2}{2} (R_1(\Omega)^2 + R_2(\Omega)^2) + C_+ e_+^2 \Omega + C_- e_-^2 \Omega + 2C_{66} e_{12}^2 \Omega \\
& + G_+ e_+ \Omega + \Omega + G_- e_- \Omega - \Omega + 2G_{66} e_{12} \Omega - \Omega; \tag{25}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{0}$ are summed over $\mathbf{1}$ and

$$\Omega = a_{11}^y a_{11} - a_{21}^y a_{21}; \tag{26}$$

with a similar expression for Ω . To form the full Hamiltonian, Eq. 1, the electronic energy, Eq. 3, and the kinetic energy terms of Eqs. 2 and 5d must be added to Eq. 25. Moreover, a possible q -dependence of ϵ_0 has been neglected. Eliminating the strain terms from Eq. 25, as in Appendix II, yields

$$\begin{aligned}
H = H_{\text{str}} + \sum_{\mathbf{1}} & \left[\frac{\epsilon_0}{4} \left[\left(\frac{R_1(\Omega) - R_1(\Omega + a\hat{y})}{2} \right)^4 + \left(\frac{R_2(\Omega) - R_2(\Omega + a\hat{x})}{2} \right)^4 \right] + \frac{a}{2} R_1^4(\Omega) + R_2^4(\Omega) \right] + \frac{2}{2} R_1^2(\Omega) R_2^2(\Omega) \\
& + \tilde{e}_+^{e0} + \Omega \left[\left(\frac{R_1(\Omega) - R_1(\Omega + a\hat{y})}{2} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{R_2(\Omega) - R_2(\Omega + a\hat{x})}{2} \right)^2 \right] \\
& + \tilde{e}^{e0} - \Omega \left[\left(\frac{R_1(\Omega) - R_1(\Omega + a\hat{y})}{2} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{R_2(\Omega) - R_2(\Omega + a\hat{x})}{2} \right)^2 \right] \\
& + \frac{\tilde{e}_{12}^{e0}}{4} \sum_{\mathbf{0}} [R_1(\Omega) - R_1(\Omega + \hat{y}a)][R_2(\Omega) - R_2(\Omega + \hat{x}a)] \\
& + \frac{\epsilon_0^2}{2} (R_1(\Omega)^2 + R_2(\Omega)^2) - \frac{J_+^0}{2} \Omega + \Omega - \frac{J_-^0}{2} \Omega - \frac{J_0^0}{2} \Omega + H; \tag{27a}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0}$, $F_+^2 = C_+$, $F_-^2 = C_-$, $\tilde{e}_+^{e0} = \tilde{e}_+ - G_+ F_+ = 4C_+$, $\tilde{e}^{e0} = \tilde{e} - G_{66} F_{66} = 2C_{66}$, $J^0 = G^2 = 2C_-$, and $J_0^0 = G_{66}^2 = C_{66}$; H_{str} is a quadratic pseudostrain Hamiltonian (Eq. IIa1) decoupled from the remaining terms and of no further interest; and

$$\begin{aligned}
H = & \frac{1}{32} \sum_{\mathbf{1}} \left[(R_1(\Omega) - R_1(\Omega + a\hat{y}))^2 (R_1(\Omega) - R_1(\Omega + a\hat{y}))^2 + \right. \\
& \left. (R_2(\Omega) - R_2(\Omega + a\hat{x}))^2 (R_2(\Omega) - R_2(\Omega + a\hat{x}))^2 \right] \\
& + \sum_{\mathbf{0}} [(R_1(\Omega) - R_1(\Omega + a\hat{y}))^2 + (R_1(\Omega) - R_1(\Omega + a\hat{y}))^2] [(R_2(\Omega) - R_2(\Omega + a\hat{x}))^2 + (R_2(\Omega) - R_2(\Omega + a\hat{x}))^2] \\
& + \sum_{\mathbf{00}} [R_1(\Omega) - R_1(\Omega + \hat{y}a)][R_2(\Omega) - R_2(\Omega + \hat{x}a)]^2; \tag{27b}
\end{aligned}$$

with $\mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0}$, $F_+^2 = C_+$, $F_-^2 = C_-$, $\mathbf{00} = F_{66}^2 = 8C_{66}$.

The role of the strain forces can be determined by comparing Eqs. 25 and 27. In addition to the effective electron-electron interaction terms, the strain has introduced longer-range tilt-tilt interactions. All of the terms of Eq. 25 are either on-site or nearest neighbor interactions, except the terms in \tilde{e}^e and F_{66} . In contrast, all of the terms of H involve further neighbor interactions.

In a mean field treatment, it is assumed that there is a nonzero tilt present on each lattice site, even in the HTT phase

$$\langle R_1^2(\mathbf{l}) + R_2^2(\mathbf{l}) \rangle = R^2 \neq 0; \quad (28a)$$

independent of \mathbf{l} . Then the dynamic variable is the tilt direction, $\hat{\mathbf{l}}$, with

$$R_1(\mathbf{l}) = (\hat{\mathbf{l}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{e}}_1) R \cos \theta_1; \quad (28b)$$

$$R_2(\mathbf{l}) = (\hat{\mathbf{l}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{e}}_2) R \sin \theta_1; \quad (28c)$$

with $\hat{\mathbf{l}} = (i\hat{\mathbf{a}}; j\hat{\mathbf{a}})$. Note the factor $(\hat{\mathbf{l}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{e}}_1)^{i+j}$ { this is introduced because the intercell coupling must locally be antiferrodistortive, due to the corner sharing of the octahedra. By explicitly taking out this factor, it can be expected that $\hat{\mathbf{l}}$ will be a smooth function of position, with a well behaved continuum limit.

Equation 27 can be separated into intracell and intercell terms, as $H = \sum_{\mathbf{l}} (H_0^0 + H_1^0 + H_2^0)$, with

$$H_0^0 = \frac{1}{2} (\epsilon_0^0 + \epsilon_2^0) R^4 + \left(\frac{J_0^0}{2} + \frac{\tilde{e}_0^0}{2} \right) R^2 - \frac{J_+^0}{2} \epsilon_+^2; \quad (29a)$$

$$H_1^0 = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_2^0 R^4 \cos 4\theta_1 + \frac{\tilde{e}_0^0}{2} R^2 \cos 2\theta_1 + \frac{\tilde{e}_0^0}{2} \epsilon_{12} R^2 \sin 2\theta_1 - \frac{J_0^0}{2} \epsilon_+^2 - \frac{J_0^0}{2} \epsilon_{12}^2; \quad (29b)$$

with $\epsilon_0^0 = \epsilon_0^0 + (\epsilon_0^0 - \epsilon_0^0) = 16$ and $\epsilon_2^0 = (\epsilon_2^0 - \epsilon_2^0 - \epsilon_0^0 - \epsilon_0^0) = 8$. Since all terms refer to the same cell, the \mathbf{l} -dependence is not explicitly displayed. Here, H_0^0 is \mathbf{l} -independent, H_1^0 is a single cell Hamiltonian, while H_2^0 incorporates the intercell coupling. The intercell coupling term is complicated, and will be explicitly displayed only at the mean field level, for which $\cos(\mathbf{l}^0) = \langle \cos \rangle$ and $\sin(\mathbf{l}^0) = \langle \sin \rangle$ for all $\mathbf{l}^0 \in \mathbf{L}$. In this case, $H_2^0 = H_2^0(\langle \cos \rangle; \langle \sin \rangle) = H_2^0(0; 0)$, with

$$\begin{aligned} H_2^0(\langle \cos \rangle; \langle \sin \rangle) &= \frac{\epsilon_0^0}{32} R^4 (\cos^2 + \langle \cos \rangle^4) + (\sin^2 + \langle \sin \rangle^4) \\ &\quad - \frac{\epsilon_0^0 + 4\epsilon_0^0}{8} R^4 (\cos^2 + \langle \cos \rangle^2)(\sin^2 + \langle \sin \rangle^2) \\ &\quad + \frac{\tilde{e}_+^0 + R^2}{2} (\cos^2 + \langle \cos \rangle^2) + (\sin^2 + \langle \sin \rangle^2) \\ &\quad + \frac{\tilde{e}_0^0 R^2}{2} (\cos^2 + \langle \cos \rangle^2) - (\sin^2 + \langle \sin \rangle^2) \\ &\quad + \tilde{e}_{12}^0 R^2 (\cos^2 + \langle \cos \rangle^2)(\sin^2 + \langle \sin \rangle^2); \end{aligned} \quad (29c)$$

As discussed in [11], the terms in \tilde{e}_+ are non-critical, and can be eliminated from Eq. 27. Thus, ϵ_+ ($q = 0$) is just the number of holes in the conduction band, $\epsilon_+(0) = 1$ in the present case, where $\epsilon_0(0)$ (or ϵ_{12}) becomes non-zero only in the low- T phase, and hence can be taken as an order parameter of the transition. Thus, we may assume $\epsilon_+(q) = \epsilon_+(0)$, and eliminate the q -dependent terms from Eq. 27. The harmonic phonon frequency is renormalized $\omega_0^2 = \omega_0^2 + \tilde{e}_+^0(\epsilon_+(0) - 2)$. In this equation, I have incorporated an additional correction [11], the term in ϵ_2^0 , due to the filled, bonding band of the hybridized Cu-O band. This term is important in destabilizing the lattice, $\epsilon_2^0 < 0$, both in the present problem and in ferroelectrics and other structural instabilities.

While the ϵ_+ terms are neglected in the present analysis, they may yet have important effects in these materials. They provide a coupling between the tilt and the local average electronic density, and lead to the possibility of a microscopically heterogeneous phase. Such nanoscopic disorder has previously been suggested to play an important role in doping these materials away from the vHS [28], while a related phase heterogeneity has been proposed to arise on doping away from the antiferromagnetic phase at half-filling [17].

6b. Intracell Hamiltonian: Static JT Effect

It is convenient to begin by discussing the JT effect within a single cell. The terms in H_0^o lead to a tilting of the octahedron, $R \neq 0$, but with no preferred orientation. If R is assumed to be a fixed constant, then the JT effect involves the angular orientation of the tilted octahedron, θ . For the single cell problem, this involves H_1^o , Eq. 29b. The solution to Eq. 29b depends on whether the system is in the static or dynamic JT limit. In the dynamic limit, the tilt kinetic energy operator associated with θ must be added to Eq. 29b; in the opposite limit, the tilts are static, and the kinetic energy can be neglected. In this static case, the electronic operators can be diagonalized by a transformation similar to Eq. 16. Alternatively, a pseudospin formalism [12-14,29] (Appendix IV) can be employed. In the two-dimensional subspace spanned by the electronic operators $a_1^y(I)$, $a_2^y(I)$, the operators can be represented by Pauli matrices

$$a_1^y(I) = \sigma_z / 2;$$

$$a_2^y(I) = \sigma_x / 2;$$

hence, the θ^2 -terms in Eq. 29b reduce to constants, and can be eliminated. Transforming the electronic states by Eq. 16, the eigenenergies of Eq. 29b become

$$E_1^o = \frac{1}{2} \omega_R^4 \cos 4\theta - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\tilde{e}^0 \omega_R^4 \cos^2 2\theta + \tilde{e}^0 \omega_R^4 \sin^2 2\theta} : \quad (30)$$

Equation 30 demonstrates the JT effect in the present system. If E_1^o were minimized with respect to R , the electronic term would always give rise to a non-vanishing JT distortion ($R \neq 0$); incorporation of other terms from the original Hamiltonian of order R^4 would not change this result. However, since the electron-phonon coupling is quadratic in R , there are also harmonic terms in the Hamiltonian of order R^2 , and a JT splitting will arise only if the coupling coefficient (e.g., \tilde{e}^0) is large enough (or the harmonic coefficient is negative (see [11])).

Equation 30 represents a potential with four degenerate energy minima. Depending on the parameter values, these minima may lie either along the x and y axes, or at 45° to this. It is expected that $\tilde{e}^0 > \tilde{e}^0$; if $\tilde{e}^0 = 0$, the minima would lie along the principal axes when $2 \frac{\omega_R^2}{2} \tilde{e}^0 < 0$, and at 45° when the inequality is reversed. In the static limit, the tilted octahedron will be located at one of the four equivalent minima. In the absence of intercell coupling, there can be no macroscopic phase transition: at low temperatures the octahedra will be randomly distributed among all four minima; as the temperature is raised, the octahedra can hop among the various minima.

In what follows, it will be convenient to approximate the lower JT solution, E_1^o of Eq. 30 by a simpler form

$$E_1^o \approx E_a - E_b \cos 4\theta : \quad (31)$$

For instance, if $\tilde{e}^0 = 0$, $2E_b \approx \tilde{e}^0 \omega_R^2 = 2 + \frac{\omega_R^4}{2}$. For nonzero \tilde{e}^0 , the angle dependence is a function of $\tilde{e}^0 / \tilde{e}^0$. The terms which comprise E_b tend to appear as the difference between two quantities (e.g., $\frac{\omega_R^4}{2} - \tilde{e}^0$). This occurs because for an isolated free molecule the JT distortions amount to a pure rotation of the molecule; the distortion is a solid-state effect, due purely to crystalline anisotropy (this fact appears to have been first pointed out in Ref. [30]). The constant E_a can be absorbed into the angle-independent part of the Hamiltonian, H_0^o .

6c. Dynamic JT Effect and Relation to Conventional (Eg) JT Effect

When dynamic effects are important, the ionic kinetic energy operator from Eq. 5d must be retained in the Hamiltonian, Eq. 29b. The exact eigenstates no longer can be written in Born-Oppenheimer form, but are of the form

$$\psi_n(R; \theta) = \psi_{n1}(R; \theta) \phi_1(R; \theta) + \psi_{n2}(R; \theta) \phi_2(R; \theta);$$

where ϕ_i is the electronic wavefunction corresponding to the energy E_i^o , Eq. 30, and the ψ_{ni} are wavefunctions of the nuclear motions. In the limit of strong JT coupling, the upper JT level can be neglected, and a Born-Oppenheimer wave function is approximately recovered:

$$\psi_n \approx \phi(R) \psi_n(\theta) \phi(R; \theta);$$

where ψ is the lower energy electronic wave function and the nuclear wave function has been separated into a radial part, $f(R)$, assumed to be approximately constant, and an angular part, χ_n , which satisfies

$$\frac{\hbar^2}{2R^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \chi_n + \cos(4\theta) \chi_n = E_n \chi_n; \quad (32a)$$

where the first term in Eq. 32a is the angular contribution to the tilt kinetic energy, and

$$\frac{\hbar^2}{2R^2} = E_b; \quad (32b)$$

This distorted octahedron, strongly and nonlinearly coupling the tilt and the electronic state, constitutes the polaron of the present problem. For convenience, this tilt polaron will be referred to as a 'bigeon'.

Equation 32a is a form of Mathieu's equation [31-33] which often arises in the dynamic JT problem. The vibronic potential here has four minima, along the positive and negative x- and y-axes (for $\theta > 0$), corresponding to the four possible static JT tilts of the CuO_6 octahedron. When E_b is very large, the lowest-energy state is fourfold degenerate, corresponding to these static distortions, with a weak tunneling between the states. For smaller barriers, this quartet of states breaks up into a pair of doublets. The solutions of Eq. 32a are discussed further in Appendix V.

In the closely related E_g JT effect [12-14], a similar Mathieu's equation arises, but with three-fold degeneracy (corresponding to elongation of the octahedron along an x, y, or z axis). This problem is often simplified by approximating the intercell coupling by a quadratic form. In this case, the weak tunneling limit reduces to a three-states Potts model [34,35]. For the present, four-fold degenerate model, this would correspond either to a pseudo-spin 3/2 system, or to a four-states Potts model.

7. Intercell Coupling

7a. High-Temperature Limit (Disordered JT Phase)

In the intercell coupling term, $\langle \sin \theta \rangle$ and $\langle \cos \theta \rangle$ are independent variables, constrained by $(\langle \sin \theta \rangle)^2 + (\langle \cos \theta \rangle)^2 = 1$. Two classes of solution are of particular interest: $\langle \cos \theta \rangle \neq 0, \langle \sin \theta \rangle = 0$, the LTT solution, and $\langle \sin \theta \rangle = \langle \cos \theta \rangle \neq 0$, the LTO solution.

The analysis is most straightforward in the weak tunneling limit, when only the four lowest-lying levels of each octahedron need be considered. In the high-temperature limit, $\langle \sin \theta \rangle = \langle \cos \theta \rangle = 0$, and only the single cell Hamiltonian, Eq. 29a,b, need be considered. If tunneling is completely absent, the four wave functions are each localized in one of the potential minima of $\cos 4\theta$. Near the minimum, the potential is quadratic in θ , and the wave functions are well approximated by harmonic oscillator wave functions. In particular, the ground state will be approximately a Gaussian wave function,

$$\psi_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-\frac{r^2}{2}}; \quad (33)$$

with $r = \frac{\theta}{\sqrt{2}}$. Inclusion of overlap between Gaussians centered on different wells splits the degeneracy. However, just as in the 3-well model, it is important to recognize that the total wave function is a combined electron-phonon wave function. The electronic wave functions are only symmetric under a 4 rotation: $\psi(\theta + 2\pi) = \psi(\theta)$. Thus, the nuclear wave function must also satisfy

$$\psi_n(\theta + 2\pi) = \psi_n(\theta); \quad (34)$$

so that the total wave function ψ_n has 2 symmetry. In the $n=3$ case, this changes the sign of the overlap, thereby reversing the order of the levels [12,31,36]. This sign change is now recognized to be an example of Berry's phase [37].

In a perturbation calculation of the four-well problem, this means diagonalizing an 8x8 matrix. However, since the wave functions 5-8 are just the negative of wave functions 1-4, this immediately reduces to a 4x4 matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & H_{11} & E & H_{12} & SE & 0 & (H_{12} & SE)^1 \\ B & H_{12} & SE & H_{11} & E & H_{12} & SE & 0 \\ C & 0 & H_{12} & SE & H_{11} & E & H_{12} & SE \\ (H_{12} & SE) & 0 & H_{12} & SE & H_{11} & E \end{pmatrix} A = 0; \quad (35)$$

with S the wave function overlap, H_{12} the nearest-neighbor Hamiltonian overlap, and H_{11} the diagonal Hamiltonian. For the present problem, these matrix elements are

$$H_{11} = \left(1 - \frac{e^{-2a}}{2}\right); \quad (36a)$$

$$H_{12} = S \left(1 + \frac{e^{-2a}}{2} - \frac{e^{-4a}}{2}\right); \quad (36b)$$

$$S = e^{-2a}; \quad (36c)$$

with $a = \hbar^2/2mR^2$. This overlap splits the four degenerate levels into two pairs of levels, with energies

$$E_{\pm} = \frac{H_{11} \pm 2H_{12}}{1 \pm 2S}; \quad (36d)$$

The wave functions associated with E_{+} are in the subspace spanned by the vectors $(1/\sqrt{2}; 1/\sqrt{2}; 0)$ and $(0; 1/\sqrt{2}; 1/\sqrt{2})$, where the various elements refer to the amplitudes in the separate minima, while the E_{-} wave functions correspond to $(1/\sqrt{2}; -1/\sqrt{2}; 0)$ and $(0; 1/\sqrt{2}; -1/\sqrt{2})$. These latter are higher in energy by a factor

$$E_{-} = E_{+} - \frac{2S(1 - e^{-2a})}{1 - 2S^2}; \quad (37)$$

As $S \rightarrow 0$, E_{-} vanishes, leading to a static, but disordered JT phase, with the octahedra equally likely to have any of the four tilt distortions. The resulting lattice symmetry is pseudo-cubic, in that all orientations are equally likely. This four well approximation becomes exact as $a \rightarrow \infty$, and Figure 3 shows that it remains qualitatively correct for all values of a . The solid lines in Fig. 3 are the exact eigenvalues of Eq. 32a, as discussed in Appendix V. The axes of Fig. 3 are in normalized units, introduced in Appendix V: $\tilde{E} = E/4a$, $\tilde{a} = a/a_0$.

There appears to be an asymmetry in the above wavefunctions, since they are all centered on wells 2 or 3. However, linear combinations of these wavefunctions can be generated which are centered on the other wells. For example, $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(0; 1/\sqrt{2}; 1/\sqrt{2}) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1/\sqrt{2}; 1/\sqrt{2}; 0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(-1/\sqrt{2}; 0; 1/\sqrt{2})$.

7b. Phase Transitions: Dynamic JT Phases

As the temperature is lowered, intercell coupling will lead to an ordered low temperature phase, with $\langle \cos \theta \rangle$ or $\langle \sin \theta \rangle$ non zero. A complete solution of Eq. 29 is prohibitively difficult, particularly since most of the parameters are not well known. In this section, a number of simplifications are introduced to make the problem more tractable, allowing a determination of the conditions under which an LTO (dynamic JT) phase might be stable. These simplifications are: (1) since a key question will be to establish whether an LTO-like phase can be stabilized in the absence of strong umklapp scattering, it will be assumed that $\tilde{e}^0 = 0$. (2) It will be assumed that $\langle \cos \theta \rangle$ and $\langle \sin \theta \rangle$ are small near the transition (i.e., that the transition is second order, or weakly first order), so that H_2^0 can be linearized in these quantities.

(3) Even with these assumptions, H_2^0 remains complicated:

$$\begin{aligned} H_2^0 = & \frac{[\frac{0}{0} \quad 0_+ + 2 \quad 0 \quad + 8 \quad 0_0]}{8} R^4 (\cos^3 \langle \cos \theta \rangle + \sin^3 \langle \sin \theta \rangle) \\ & + [\tilde{e}_+^0 \quad (\quad 0_0 + \frac{0}{4}) R^2] R^2 (\cos \langle \cos \theta \rangle + \sin \langle \sin \theta \rangle) \\ & + \tilde{e}^0 R^2 (\cos \langle \cos \theta \rangle - \sin \langle \sin \theta \rangle); \end{aligned} \quad (38a)$$

In the same spirit of replacing Eq. 30 by Eq. 31, this may be replaced by the simpler form

$$H_2^0 = H_0^0 (\cos \langle \cos \theta \rangle + \sin \langle \sin \theta \rangle); \quad (38b)$$

which involves only one unknown parameter, H_0^0 . To see how good this approximation is, consider the case in which the tilting Hamiltonian, $H_{\text{tilt}} = H_1^0 + H_2^0$ of Eq. 29, is dominated by the vHs JT effect (i.e. the terms involving $\sim e^0$). In this case, the electronic term can be integrated out as in Eq. 30, leading to

$$H_{\text{tilt}} = \frac{\sim e^0 R^2}{2} (\cos \theta + \langle \cos \theta \rangle)^2 - (\sin \theta + \langle \sin \theta \rangle)^2 : \quad (39)$$

Figure 4 shows that even for this highly singular potential, the simpler form of Eq. 31 plus 38b provides a reasonable approximation. In approximating Eq. 39, the parameter H_0^0 must be chosen to be negative; hence, only this regime will be explored in detail below.

With the intercell coupling given by Eq. 38b, the perturbation matrix may be recalculated. The Hamiltonian matrix, Eq. 35, becomes

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & x + AH_1 & y + (A - B)H_2 & 0 & (y + (A + B)H_2)^{1/2} \\ y + (B - A)H_2 & x + BH_1 & y + (A + B)H_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & y & (A + B)H_2 & x + AH_1 & y + (B - A)H_2 \\ (y + (A + B)H_2) & 0 & y + (A - B)H_2 & x + BH_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = 0; \quad (39)$$

where $x = H_{11} - E$, $y = H_{12} - SE$, $A = \langle \cos \theta \rangle$, $B = \langle \sin \theta \rangle$, $H_1 = H_0^0 \exp(-1/8)$, and $H_2 = H_1 S = \frac{1}{2}$. For arbitrary $\langle \sin \theta \rangle \neq 0$, Eq. 39 must be diagonalized numerically. However, for the LTT phase ($\langle \sin \theta \rangle = 0$), the solutions can be found analytically. The potential wells are labelled in such a way that the $\langle \cos \theta \rangle$ terms lower the state $(1;0;0;0)$ (state $_1$) and raise the state $(0;0;1;0)$ ($_3$) in energy. Then, in the LTT phase ($B = 0$), two solutions have $_1 = 0$, with energies

$$E_{1,2} = \frac{2SH - AH_1 = 2}{1 - 2S^2} \frac{P}{2H^2 + A^2(H_1^2 = 4 - 2H_2^2(1 - 2S^2)) - 2SHAH_1}; \quad (40a)$$

while the other two have $_3 = 0$ and

$$E_{3,4} = \frac{2SH + AH_1 = 2}{1 - 2S^2} \frac{P}{2H^2 + A^2(H_1^2 = 4 - 2H_2^2(1 - 2S^2)) + 2SHAH_1}; \quad (40b)$$

In the above equations, E is measured from H_{11} , and $H = H_{11}S - H_{12}$. Figure 5 illustrates how the energies in the four wells vary as a function of $\langle \cos \theta \rangle$, for several values of S , both for the LTT phase ($\langle \sin \theta \rangle = 0$ {dashed lines}) and for the LTO phase ($\langle \sin \theta \rangle = \langle \cos \theta \rangle$ {solid lines}). Note that there is a break in slope in the LTT phase at $(\langle \cos \theta \rangle)^2 = 1/2$, since the constraint $(\langle \sin \theta \rangle)^2 + (\langle \cos \theta \rangle)^2 = 1$ comes into play. In the figure, it is assumed that $\langle \sin \theta \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\langle \cos \theta \rangle)^2$ in this case. However, this regime has no immediate relevance, since $\langle \cos \theta \rangle$ is always found to be < 0.7 in the numerical calculations for the LTO phase.]

From Figure 5, the energy is always lowered when $\langle \cos \theta \rangle \neq 0$, and at low enough temperatures there will be a transition to a dynamic JT phase. In mean field theory, the phase diagram may readily be calculated from the self-consistency condition for $\langle \cos \theta \rangle$:

$$\langle \cos \theta \rangle = \frac{\text{Tr} \cos \theta e^{H/k_B T}}{\text{Tr} e^{H/k_B T}}; \quad (41)$$

where Tr stands for the trace. In the four-state model, $\cos \theta$ vanishes on average in wells 2 and 4, and $\cos \theta = e^{-1/8}$ in wells 1 (+) and 3 (−). Thus

$$\langle \cos \theta \rangle = e^{-1/8} \frac{P}{e^{E_1/k_B T} + e^{E_2/k_B T} + e^{E_3/k_B T} + e^{E_4/k_B T}} \frac{\sum_j (p_{1j} - p_{3j}) e^{E_j/k_B T}}{e^{E_1/k_B T} + e^{E_2/k_B T} + e^{E_3/k_B T} + e^{E_4/k_B T}}; \quad (42)$$

where p_{ij} is the probability that well i is occupied in the state of energy E_j . Note that any term common to all the E_i 's cancels out of the ratio in Eq. 42. Thus, Eq. 42 depends on three parameters, S (or, equivalently θ), H , and H_0^0 . At sufficiently high temperatures, Eq. 42 has no non-zero solutions. As T is lowered, there is

a critical temperature below which there are values of $\langle \cos \rangle \neq 0$. Figure 6 illustrates the solution for the LTT phase, plotting the right-hand side of Eq. 42 against $\langle \cos \rangle$ at a number of different temperatures. The solutions of Eq. 42 correspond to the intersection of the solid and dashed lines. These solutions lead to the evolution of the ordered phases, $\langle \cos \rangle(T)$ shown in Figure 7.

7c. Phase Transitions: LTO vs LTT Phase

Figure 7 compares the resulting phase diagrams for both the LTT and the LTO phases, for several sets of parameters. The parameters were chosen to approximately match the critical temperature of the LTO phase in La_2CuO_4 . Figure 8 shows the free energies of the two phases,

$$e^{F/k_B T} = T \exp^{H/k_B T}; \quad (43)$$

for the same sets of parameters.

From the above figures, it is possible to understand the competition between the LTT and LTO phases as a competition between energy and entropy. First, consider the small overlap case, Fig. 5a. As $S \rightarrow 0$, the LTO phase becomes two independent LTT-type transitions, in wells 1 and 2, so two branches of the energy curve are lowered by virtually the same amount as the single branch in the LTT phase. Thus, for a fixed value of $\langle \cos \rangle$, the LTO phase has a greater entropy associated with it. However, this greater entropy in turn means that at a fixed temperature, the self-consistent value of $\langle \cos \rangle$ will be smaller in the LTO phase than in the LTT phase, Eq. 41. Hence, for small S values, the LTT phase is always energetically preferred.

As S increases, however, the factor of level repulsion adds a further stabilization to the LTO phase (Fig 5b-d). The splitting of the originally degenerate pair of LTO levels drives one lower in energy than the corresponding LTT level. Also, the mixing of different wells brings two LTT levels fairly close together, so the entropy differences between the LTO and LTT phases are reduced. The result is that both phases are close in free energy over most of the temperature range, Fig. 8, and that both phases allow non-zero solutions for $\langle \cos \rangle$ out to significantly higher temperatures as S increases. However, the LTO phase wins out at the higher temperatures, and over a wider temperature range as S gets larger (the phase diagram is illustrated in Fig. 9). Other choices for the parameters H and H_0^0 would mainly shift the scales of the phase diagram, without altering its fundamental character. Note that the LTT phase never increases its transition temperature significantly above the $S \rightarrow 0$ limit, whereas the LTO phase turns on at higher T 's with increasing S .

While the above behavior is qualitatively what might be expected, it should be cautioned that the above calculations are perturbative in S , so the detailed nature of the large S results should be treated with caution (for instance, the LTO transition temperature appears to diverge as $S^2 \rightarrow 1/2$). A more detailed calculation would require the inclusion of more distant overlaps in Eq. 39. However, the reduction of the Mathieu problem to a four-state problem remains valid, as long as 4 is large compared to $k_B T$. Moreover, as Fig. 9 illustrates, for some parameter choices the LTO phase remains stable down to small S -values.

From Fig. 7, the transition from the disordered JT phase (HTT) to the LTT phase is second order, with $\langle \cos \rangle$ acting as an order parameter, but the LTO \rightarrow HTT and LTO \rightarrow LTT phase transitions are first order, with discontinuous jumps in $\langle \cos \rangle$. Note that in the LTO phase, for $S \rightarrow 0.1$, $\langle \cos \rangle \rightarrow 0.4$ at low temperatures (i.e., the macroscopic average tilt is noticeably smaller than its instantaneous value, $\langle \cos \rangle^2 + \langle \sin \rangle^2 \rightarrow 0.56$).

While the present dynamic JT calculation has been carried out for the high- T_c cuprates, it is interesting to compare it with calculations of the multiple phase transitions in the ferroelectric perovskite BaTiO_3 [38]. There, a similar competition between energy and entropy was found, with the largest energy lowering associated with the static (rhombohedral) JT phase, and increasingly large entropy contributions in the case of two, four, or eight potential minima being involved in the dynamic JT effect. However, in the simplest calculation, all four phases had a transition at the same temperature, so the static JT phase was stable at all temperatures. By assuming that the interaction energy was different in the different phases, it was possible to reproduce the observed sequence of phase transitions. In the present calculation, the overlap parameter naturally provides the stabilization for the dynamic phases, with only the static phase stable as $S \rightarrow 0$.

8. Discussion

8a. Dynamic JT

Figure 9 is the chief result of this paper. It confirms the suggestion [10,11] that the LTO phase can be described as a dynamic JT phase involving a splitting of the vHs degeneracy.

The present paper has contrasted two possible origins of the LTO phase, as a static JT phase stabilized by umklapp scattering (Section 5), and as a dynamic JT phase, Section 7c, which is naturally related to the LTT phase. By comparing the gap functions of the two models, Figs. 2 vs 7a, it can be seen that, for small S values, the dynamic JT effect can mimic the effect of a static transition driven by umklapp scattering, thereby confirming the speculation made in Paper V IIIA [10]. For larger S values, the situation is more complicated, with the LTO transition becoming first order.

Much work remains to be done, particularly in simultaneously accounting for both the electronic and structural aspects of the transition, and in understanding how electronic properties are modified within the dynamic JT phase (antiferromagnetism, superconductivity, ...). Before this can be done, however, some more fundamental questions must be answered, such as, what does the Fermi surface (or even the Brillouin zone) mean in a dynamic JT system, where the local symmetry is not the same as the global symmetry, and indeed where the local symmetry can fluctuate in space and time.

8b. SDW-CDW Competition Revisited

This paper has explored possible generalizations of CDW's and SDW's in the presence of a vHs. While the simple CDW can describe the LTT phase, it seems to be ruled out by a symmetry argument in the LTO phase (Ref. [9] and Appendix III). Nevertheless, there are at least two mechanisms by which vHs-related effects could stabilize an LTO phase. Which of these mechanisms is actually operative in LSCO is a question which requires considerably more research. Nevertheless, it seems appropriate to point out that even at the molecular level, there is often a competition between JT and spin-orbit effects [12,13], and this competition is reminiscent of the usual CDW-spin-density wave (SDW) competition in lower-dimensional metals in the presence of a peak in the dos.

Near half filling, correlation effects become important in destabilizing CDW-like phases. On the other hand, there has been clear experimental [39] and theoretical [40] evidence for the importance of spin-orbit coupling in the undoped materials, and specially in the Neel antiferromagnetic or spiral magnetic phases. This can be understood, in the context of the present paper, as follows. To split the vHs degeneracy requires breaking the degeneracy of the two Cu's in the orthorhombic unit cell. This can be done if they have opposite spins, but this requires spin-orbit coupling to modify the electronic bands.

I earlier suggested that the phase diagram of LSCO resembled a crossover from SDW-like behavior near half filling (the antiferromagnetic state) to 'incipient CDW-like' behavior, including Peierls distortion, as hole doping is increased [28]. The present results suggest the following modification: the hole-doped LTO phase is stabilized by the dynamic JT effect, whereas near half filling spin-orbit effects are more important (due to on-site Coulomb repulsion), and may stabilize a static LTO phase. This phase may be related to the proposed 'flux phase' [18]. Whereas in principle, a single spin-orbit coupled phase could persist for all dopings, there is considerable experimental evidence for a transition between two phases as a function of doping, with a (nanoscale) two-phase regime between the vHs and half filling [28].

In Section 2, it was briefly noted that c -axis dispersion acted in the same way as a CDW to split the vHs degeneracy. It would be interesting to study in more detail whether changes in interlayer hopping could drive a phase transition, particularly in light of Anderson's ideas that interlayer coupling plays a special role in stabilizing high- T_c superconductivity [41].

9. Excitons' vs Cageons'

When I initiated this series of calculations on the vHs [42], a major premise was that inter-vHs scattering could promote large electron-phonon coupling via vHs nesting [NB. not conventional nesting], leading to short-range CDW order. Indeed, the term 'exciton' was introduced to point out that the strong scattering is associated with electron-like sections of one vHs scattering off hole-like sections of the second vHs. The CDW order in this case would be an 'excitonic instability' analogous to the spin-density wave instability of chromium.

The 'excitonic' properties of the model were discussed in paper IV [43]; the CDW in V [27]. The present series of papers, V IIIA-C, are an extension of V: there is a structural instability, but it is not simply

describable as a CDW (the formalism of V is still relevant for extending the present model to a quasi-two-dimensional system and incorporating mode-mode coupling).

Under these circumstances, the term 'excitonic' does not seem to be particularly suitable for describing the system, since the strong electron-phonon coupling will lead to excitations closer to polarons (or even solitons, as discussed below). Hence, I am introducing the term 'bgeon', which is intended to better describe the JT excitations of electrons coupled to tilts of the octahedral CuO_6 cages.

Going beyond the mean field calculation, the corner sharing of the CuO_6 octahedra suggests that there should be long chains of LTT phase, and that defects must be introduced into the chains. A plausible model would be to have islands of LTT phase separated by LTO-like domain walls, which would switch an x-directed domain into a y-directed one. Such domain walls would behave as solitons, and the doping dependence of LBCO could be interpreted in terms of the generation of these solitons. Thus, at $x = 0.12$ (6% of the La replaced by Ba), the material is in a pure LTT phase. As x is reduced, the material transforms to the LTO phase. This transformation could be accomplished via soliton generation (as x is decreased, the density of LTO solitons increases). The octahedral shear e_{12} would simply be proportional to the soliton density. This idea will be pursued further in a future publication.

In particular, it has been found that the degeneracy of the vHs's is split in the solitonic model. It is just this splitting which underlies the 'valence bond density wave' calculations of Ref. [10]. Hence, it seems likely that the results of that paper hold for the dynamic JT model of the LTO phase (in particular, the phase diagram of the transitions $\text{H TT} \rightarrow \text{L TO} \rightarrow \text{superconductor}$ should continue to hold in the dynamic JT model).

I would like to thank J. Zak for explaining the role of the Berry phase in the JT effect. Publication 545 from the Barnett Institute.

Appendix I: Renormalized Microscopic JT Band Structure

The present analysis, in terms of V , is very convenient, but how can it be related to a microscopic Hamiltonian, such as that developed in V IIIB, Appendix I? In particular, the analysis of Section 5 requires being able to define $a_1^y(\mathbf{l})$, $a_2^y(\mathbf{l})$ (i.e., on each atomic site. By contrast, the microscopic Hamiltonian involves interatomic hopping between Cu and O atoms. In this Appendix, I show that a site model can be derived from the microscopic Hamiltonian, if the sites are not individual atoms, but clusters of atoms.

The simplest cluster is a single octahedron (or more simply, a Cu atom with the four surrounding planar O's, since the present model does not incorporate either the $\text{Cu } d_{z^2}$ nor the apical O p orbitals). However, one octahedron is too small. There is only a single Cu-O antibonding level (twofold degenerate due to spin) per Cu atom, and hence no JT degeneracy. Hence, the appropriate cluster contains a square of four octahedra. The antibonding 'band' contains four levels, the middle two of which are degenerate, in the absence of strain or tilt coupling. This is a JT degeneracy, since the antibonding 'band' is half filled (the model of V IIIB contains no O-O hopping, so the vHs falls exactly at half filling).

The dispersion of the four levels can readily be recovered from V IIIB.

$$E = \frac{E}{2} \pm \sqrt{\left(\frac{E}{2}\right)^2 + 4W}; \quad (\text{IIa})$$

$$W = t_{\text{CuOx}}^2 \left[\cos^2 x \sin^2 \left(\frac{k_x a}{2}\right) + \sin^2 x \cos^2 \left(\frac{k_x a}{2}\right) \right] + t_{\text{CuOy}}^2 \left[\cos^2 y \sin^2 \left(\frac{k_y a}{2}\right) + \sin^2 y \cos^2 \left(\frac{k_y a}{2}\right) \right]; \quad (\text{IIb})$$

Here, E is the splitting of the Cu and O levels, and t_{CuOx} (t_{CuOy}) and x (y) are the Cu-O hopping energy and octahedral tilt along the x (y) axis, respectively. For a 'sample' two cells by two cells, $k_x a = 2$ and $k_y a = 2$ are restricted to the values 0 and π , leading to four possible values of E , Eq. IIa, with eigenfunctions shown in Fig. 10 (top). (Strictly speaking, these are not small clusters, because periodic boundary conditions are assumed. Calculations on real clusters would reveal eigenstates of the same overall symmetry as in Fig. 10, but with modified eigenvalues.)

This same procedure may readily be generalized to larger 'samples'. For a sample $N \times N$ cells, there are N^2 levels in the antibonding band, of which N states are degenerate (when the strains and tilts are absent).

at the vH s energy level { those states for which $k_x + k_y = \pi$. For these states, the energy can be written as Eq. 11, with

$$W = W_a + W_b \cos(k_x a); \quad (I2a)$$

$$W_a = t_{CuO}^2 \left[1 - \frac{a}{r} e_+ + \frac{4(\epsilon^2 + 1)}{3m a^2} R^2 \right]; \quad (I2b)$$

$$W_b = t_{CuO}^2 \left[\frac{a}{r} e_- + \frac{4(\epsilon^2 + 1)}{3m a^2} (R_1^2 - R_2^2) \right]; \quad (I2c)$$

where $r = \sqrt{a^2 + b^2}$, $R_i^2 = 3m a^2 \sin^2 \theta_i = 8$, and $t_{CuO}^2 = t_{CuO}^2 (1 - 2ae_{ii} = r)$, as discussed in V IIIB (see also the last paragraph of this appendix). This equation offers a convenient microscopic estimate of the electron-phonon coupling constants.

In order to find the renormalized bands corresponding to ϵ_{ij} of Eq. 4, it is convenient to look at how larger clusters are built up. Fig. 10 (bottom) shows the eigenfunctions associated with the 4×4 clusters. Beneath each figure, the corresponding eigenvalue is indicated in the form ϵ_{ij} . For simplicity, this notation corresponds to the untilted clusters ($\theta_x = \theta_y = 0$), for which W in Eq. 11b is given by $4W = it_{CuOx}^2 + jt_{CuOy}^2$. The 4×4 eigenfunctions are built up from the 2 solutions by repeated tiling of the 4×4 cell by the 2×2 cell or its negative. Since there is no intercell mixing, the Cu-O band separates into a superposition of four overlapping but noninteracting subbands. This pattern holds for larger cells, but with some minor complications: (a) all of the '+' Cu atoms need not have the same amplitude [example: for the one-dimensional chain 8 cells long, the eigenfunction (+ + + + + + + +) is really (a;b;b;a; a; b; b; a), with $a=b = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$]; and (b) most levels are degenerate in pairs, leading to eigenvalues of more complicated form. These complications do not affect the subband separation.

From studying larger cells, a separate energy dispersion can be determined for each subband. These energy dispersions have the form of Eq. 11, with a restricted range of k_x, k_y , for each subband. Thus, for subband I (IV), k_x and k_y must both be less than (greater than) $\pi/2$, while for subband II (III), k_x (k_y) is greater, while k_y (k_x) is less than $\pi/2$. This restriction can most elegantly be carried out by introducing new artificial Brillouin zone boundaries, as illustrated by the dashed lines in the inset to Fig. 11. For the case of untilted molecules, the subband dispersions are illustrated in Fig. 11. It can be seen that subbands II and III are degenerate (in the untilted case), and overlap the vH s, while band I(IV) lies below (resp. above) the vH s. For the purposes of the present calculation, bands I and IV may be neglected, while bands II and III correspond to the electronic bands discussed in the text, e.g., Eq. 4. In particular, since these bands are asymmetric in k_x vs k_y , their degeneracy will be lifted by a nonvanishing LTT-type tilt.

It should be noted that Schulz[17] has introduced a similar formalism with (spin-dependent) creation operators associated with each vH s.

ADDENDUM to Paper V IIIB [11]. In Paper V IIIB, the covalent overlap enhancement factor was introduced as

$$= 1 + \frac{2}{\epsilon - 3} :$$

Here ϵ and ϵ' are related to the Slater-Koster[44] parameters of p-d overlap of σ or π symmetry as follows: $\epsilon = V_{pd} / \epsilon'$, $\epsilon' = V_{pd} / (N B + V_{pd})$ ($N B$, V_{pd} is negative). At the time of writing, I was unable to find theoretical values for the two overlaps separately. Now Grant and McMahon[45] have provided ab initio calculations for tetragonal La_2CuO_4 of sufficient detail to allow an estimate of these parameters. Their calculations provide two estimates of ϵ . From McMahon and Grant, Table I: $t(d_{x^2-y^2}; p) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \epsilon' = 2 = 1.47 \text{ eV}$; $t(d_{3z^2-r^2}; p) = \epsilon' = 0.50 \text{ eV}$. These estimates are not exactly equal, since the wave functions are Wannier functions which are not pure p and d states, due to overlap with higher orbitals. From Grant, Table 2.5 $t(d_{xy}; p) = \epsilon' = 0.72 \text{ eV}$. Averaging the estimates, this leads to a theoretical value for $\epsilon' = 1.6$, somewhat smaller than the value used in Ref. [11]. This value is in good agreement with recent cluster calculations[46]: $V_{pd} = 1.5 \text{ eV}$, $V_{pd} = -0.7 \text{ eV}$, yielding $\epsilon = 1.5$. I would like to thank A. McMahon for providing me with copies of Ref. [45].

The strain terms can be decoupled from the Hamiltonian, Eq. 1, by defining

$$\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{q}) = \mathbf{e}_0(\mathbf{q}) + \frac{G}{2C} \left(\mathbf{q} + F R^{(3)} \left(\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2} \right) \right); \quad (\text{II1a})$$

$$\mathbf{e}_{12}(\mathbf{q}) = \mathbf{e}_{12}^0(\mathbf{q}) + \frac{2G_{66} \mathbf{12}(\mathbf{q}) + F_{66} R_0^{(3)} \left(\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2} \right)}{4C_{66}}; \quad (\text{II1b})$$

The reduced Hamiltonian becomes $H = H_{\text{str}}^0 + H_+^0 + H_-^0 + H_0^0 + H_{\text{ph}} + H_e$, with

$$H_{\text{str}}^0 = \sum_{\mathbf{q}} C_+ \mathbf{e}_+(\mathbf{q}) \mathbf{e}_+(\mathbf{q}) + C_- \mathbf{e}_-(\mathbf{q}) \mathbf{e}_-(\mathbf{q}) + 2C_{66} \mathbf{e}_{12}(\mathbf{q}) \mathbf{e}_{12}(\mathbf{q}); \quad (\text{II2a})$$

$$H_+^0 = \sum_{\mathbf{q}} R^{(3)} \left(\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2} \right) \cdot \frac{0}{0} R^{(3)} \left(\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2} \right) + \tilde{e}^0(\mathbf{q}) \sum_{\mathbf{q}} \frac{J^0}{2}(\mathbf{q}) \cdot (\mathbf{q}); \quad (\text{II2b})$$

$$H_0^0 = \sum_{\mathbf{q}} R_0^{(3)} \left(\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2} \right) \cdot \frac{0}{2} R_0^{(3)} \left(\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2} \right) + \tilde{e}^0_{12}(\mathbf{q}) \sum_{\mathbf{q}} \frac{J_0^0}{2}(\mathbf{q}) \cdot \mathbf{12}(\mathbf{q}); \quad (\text{II2c})$$

where $\frac{0}{0} = F^2 = 2C$, $\frac{0}{2} = F_{66}^2 = 16C_{66}$, $\tilde{e}^0 = \tilde{e} G F = 2C$, $\tilde{e}^0_{12} = \tilde{e} G_{66} F_{66} = 4C_{66}$, $J^0 = G^2 = 2C$, and $J_0^0 = G_{66}^2 = 2C_{66}$. The term H_{str}^0 is decoupled from the remaining terms, and since it is purely quadratic, does not contain any interesting dynamics, hence can be neglected.

The form of H_{ph} , Eq. 5d, does not allow a similar decoupling of the tilt terms. Such a separation can be obtained for a related 'toy' Hamiltonian, which consists of Eq. 1, with H_{ph} replaced by

$$H_{\text{ph}}^T = \frac{!^{20}}{2} R_+^{(3)}(0) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} [\tilde{0} R_+^{(3)} \left(\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2} \right) R_+^{(3)} \left(\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2} \right) + R^{(3)} \left(\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2} \right) R^{(3)} \left(\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2} \right)] + \frac{\tilde{2}}{2} R_0^{(3)} \left(\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2} \right) R_0^{(3)} \left(\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2} \right); \quad (\text{II3a})$$

If $\tilde{0} = (\frac{0}{0} + \frac{a}{0}) = 16$, $\tilde{2} = \frac{2}{2} = 16$, and $!^{20} = !^2(\mathbf{q}_R)$, then Eq. II3 will be identical to Eq. 5d for the soft mode, $\mathbf{q} = 0$, $\mathbf{q}^0 = \mathbf{q}_R$ ($=a; 0$) or $(0; =a)$. Equation II3 can now be incorporated into Eqs. II2b,c by substituting $\frac{0}{0} \rightarrow \frac{0}{0} \rightarrow \tilde{0} + \frac{0}{0}$ and $\frac{0}{2} \rightarrow \frac{0}{2} \rightarrow \tilde{2} + \frac{0}{2}$ into the latter equations, and replacing $H_{\text{ph}}^T \rightarrow H_{\text{ph}}^0$, with

$$H_{\text{ph}}^0 = !^{20} R_+^{(3)}(0); \quad (\text{II3b})$$

At this point, the tilt couplings can be formally decoupled from the toy Hamiltonian by a procedure similar to the strain decoupling, by defining

$$\tilde{R}^{(3)} \left(\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2} \right) = R^{(3)} \left(\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2} \right) + \frac{\tilde{e}^0}{2 \frac{0}{0}} \left(\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2} \right); \quad (\text{II4a})$$

$$\tilde{R}_0^{(3)} \left(\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2} \right) = R_0^{(3)} \left(\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2} \right) + \frac{2\tilde{e}^0_{12}(\mathbf{q})}{2 \frac{0}{2}}; \quad (\text{II4b})$$

In this case, $H = H_{\text{str}}^0 + H_R + H$, with

$$H_R = !^{20} \tilde{R}_+^{(3)}(0) + \sum_{\mathbf{q}} \sum_{i=1}^X [\frac{0}{0} \tilde{R}_i^2 \left(\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2} \right) \tilde{R}_i^2 \left(\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2} \right)] + \frac{0}{2} \tilde{R}_0^2 \left(\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2} \right) \tilde{R}_0^2 \left(\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2} \right); \quad (\text{II5a})$$

$$H = \sum_{\mathbf{q}} \frac{J_+}{2} + (\mathbf{q}) + (\mathbf{q}) + \frac{J}{2}(\mathbf{q}) \cdot (\mathbf{q}) + \frac{J_0}{2}(\mathbf{q}) \cdot \mathbf{12}(\mathbf{q}) \cdot \mathbf{12}(\mathbf{q}); \quad (\text{II5b})$$

with

$$J = \frac{G^2}{2C} + \frac{\tilde{e}^0}{2 \frac{0}{0}} \quad (\text{II6a})$$

and

$$J_0 = \frac{G_{66}^2}{2C_{66}} + \frac{4\epsilon_{02}}{2} : \quad (\text{II6b})$$

Even for the toy model, this separation must be treated with caution, because of the unusual form of the substitution, Eq. II4. In the strain case, the separation can be carried out by a canonical transformation, whereas in the present problem, this does not seem to be the case, due to the quadratic term in R in Eq. II4.

Appendix III: Structural Instabilities in the Uniform LTO Phase

This Appendix analyzes the question of whether a uniform LTO phase could be brought about by electron-phonon interaction. That is, can the large dos associated with the vH's be driven below the Fermi level by a lattice distortion. It has been shown that the LTO transition does not split the degeneracy of the vH's [9], but in itself, this is not sufficient. There are two alternative means by which the dos could be shifted below the Fermi level, without splitting the vH's degeneracy. Here it is shown that neither of these effects arises in LSCO, in the absence of spin-orbit interaction.

These effects are: (1) there is a single peak in the dos, due to both (degenerate) vH's, but the structural transition shifts this peak below the Fermi level; or (2) umklapp scattering couples two vH's opening a gap in the dos, as discussed in Section 5. Case (1), which will be discussed in Section IIIa, would arise if, for example, due to the orthorhombic distortion, the vH's no longer occurred at the corners of the orthorhombic Brillouin zone, or if the transition reduced the magnitude of the average O-O hopping matrix element.

IIIa: Orthorhombic Distortion

The Brillouin zone of Fig. 1b for the LTO phase has been oversimplified by the neglect of the orthorhombic splitting. The LTO phase modifies the Brillouin zone of the HTT tetragonal phase in two ways. First, the principal axes a and b are rotated by 45° with respect to the tetragonal axes, a and b , Fig. 1b. (The real space cell is doubled in area, so the Brillouin zone is halved.) Secondly, there is a small orthorhombic distortion, $a \neq b$, which was neglected in Fig. 1b.

This distortion can readily be incorporated into the tight-binding calculations of Appendix I. When these calculations are repeated for the larger LTO unit cell, two changes arise. First, each band becomes two-fold degenerate (due to the two Cu's per unit cell). Secondly, in all dispersion relations, such as Eqs. II, I2, the following substitutions must be made:

$$k_x a \rightarrow \frac{k_+ a}{2}; \quad (\text{III1a})$$

$$k_y a \rightarrow \frac{k_- a}{2}; \quad (\text{III1b})$$

with $k_+ = k_x a$, $k_- = k_y a$, and k the wave vectors along the new principal axes. As a result of this transformation, the topology of the Fermi surfaces is maintained as the Brillouin zone is stretched into a rectangle. In particular, the vH's continue to intersect the Brillouin zone boundaries in the corners of the zone, as in Fig. 1b. Thus, the orthorhombic distortion does not alter the ratio of the area of a given Fermi surface to the total Brillouin zone area, and hence does not change the doping at which the vH's coincide with the Fermi level.

This still does not rule out the possibility of a shift of the vH's away from the Fermi level. Thus, the doping $x = x_c$ at which the vH's coincide with the Fermi surface is controlled by the curvature of the Fermi surface at the vH's. The ratio of the area of the hole Fermi surface to the total Brillouin zone area is $(1 + x_c)/2$. But the curvature of the Fermi surface is proportional to the O-O hopping parameter, t_{00} : when $t_{00} = 0$, the Fermi surface is square. Since the orthorhombic distortion changes all O-O distances (and produces two inequivalent distances), it could lead to a change in the average value of t_{00} , and hence a shift of x_c . Such an effect is likely to be small, since one O-O separation increases while the other decreases, so the corresponding changes in t_{00} tend to cancel.

IIIb: Umklapp Scattering and Group Theory

The role of umklapp scattering can best be appreciated by analyzing a Fermi surface away from the vHs, on the side of overdoping, Fig. 12a. Simple zone folding from the tetragonal to the orthorhombic Brillouin zone produces the lens-shaped orbits shown in Fig. 12a. However, these orbits are anomalous, having discontinuous slopes at the Brillouin zone boundary. In most band structures, umklapp scattering causes an interaction between carriers from opposite sides of the Brillouin zone, opening a gap between successive bands. This causes the Fermi surfaces of each band to intersect the Brillouin zone boundaries orthogonally, so that in crossing the zone boundary (in an extended-zone scheme) the carrier stays within the same band, and there is no slope discontinuity.

Such an interaction will arise in a tight-binding model in the following fashion. The orthorhombic unit cell contains twice as many atoms as the original tetragonal cell. This will double the size of the energy eigenvalue matrix, and the number of bands, leaving the bands degenerate in pairs. To split the degeneracy of the bands requires that the matrix elements of formerly equivalent atoms (e.g., the two Cu atoms in the cell) be different. However, there is a (glide) symmetry operation which can translate one Cu into the other, so the matrix elements can only differ in overall sign (e.g., terms proportional to \sin , in Appendix I. Since these terms enter the eigenvalue equation only in the square, they cannot produce an energy splitting. Thus, umklapp coupling is absent ($\gamma_{12} = 0$).

But how can the slope discontinuities of the lens orbits be accounted for? This can best be understood by a general symmetry argument, based on the Bmab space group of the LTO phase. There is a glide plane perpendicular to the b direction, which interchanges the two Cu atoms in a cell. Because of this, all eigenfunctions on the a -face of the Brillouin zone must be doubly degenerate [47]. In the presence of such degeneracy, the slope of the $E(k)$ curves can be discontinuous. Such a situation always arises in the presence of glide planes, and is perhaps best known for the hexagonal close packed space group [48]. In this case, one zone boundary does not introduce a gap, and the $E(k)$ curve from the first band merges continuously into the second band on crossing the zone boundary. It is often convenient to ignore the zone boundary, and work with a larger k -space zone [49]. Such a double zone for the LTO phase is illustrated in Fig. 12b: the zone is doubled in the X direction (along a), while a gap is allowed along the Y direction. Thus, lens orbits appear only along the zone face at Y , with open orbits along X [50].

IIIc: Spin-Orbit Interaction

Spin-orbit coupling lifts most of these degeneracies, so that the enlarged k -space zone can no longer be used [51]. The Bmab space group is equivalent to the Cmma space group, which includes the structure of the elements Br, I, and Ga. The group theoretical analysis for Ga has been carried out by Koster [52], who finds that spin-orbit coupling eliminates most of the degeneracy on the faces of the Brillouin zone. This is illustrated in Fig. 13. A complication arises in that the orthorhombic unit cell, with axes a , b , and c is not primitive. Figure 13a shows this cell, with the primitive cell (containing only half as many atoms) inscribed in it. The Figure also shows the Brillouin zones corresponding to the primitive cell (Fig. 13b) and the orthorhombic cell (Fig. 13c) (for convenience, the latter zone will be called the pseudozone. Its importance arises because it is the natural zone for tight-binding model calculations, particularly in the two-dimensional limit when the energy bands are assumed independent of k_z . Figure 13 illustrates how the true zone may be folded into the pseudozone. Figure 13b shows the first pseudozone inscribed in the full zone, while Fig. 13d shows how the second pseudozone is reassembled from the leftover parts of the full zone. This folding produces two bands, which are degenerate within a tight-binding calculation such as that of Appendix I. Note the relative orientation of the two pseudozones in the full zone: the second zone is predominantly displaced from the first by the Q -vector $Z' = Z/2$. This is because the unit cell (Fig. 13a) includes contributions from two CuO_2 planes displaced along the c -axis, which are equivalent in the tight-binding scheme.

By including additional terms in the tight-binding calculation, it is in principle possible to couple the two bands and remove the twofold degeneracy. However, a group theoretical analysis shows that not all of the degeneracy can be lifted. In Figs. 13b,c, the hatched areas show the regions in the Brillouin zone (all connected to the surface of the zone) in which the wave functions are two-fold degenerate (neglecting spin degeneracy) in the absence of spin-orbit coupling; this happens throughout the $L-X-N$ plane and along

the line M-N. When spin-orbit coupling is included, the degeneracy is lifted except on the regions which are heavily shaded: along the X-L line and at the M-point.

From the pseudozone of Fig. 13c, the approximate two-dimensional Brillouin zone (Figs. 1b, 12a) is found by neglecting the band dispersion along the c-axis, which should be a good approximation for the cuprates. From Figure 12, it can be seen that spin-orbit coupling lifts the degeneracy over most of the Brillouin zone boundary. In particular, the lens orbits will be continuous at the zone boundary, due to the opening of a gap, and spin-orbit coupling can lead to an umklapp gap even at the vHs, thereby stabilizing a uniform LTO phase, as discussed in Section 5.

Appendix IV. Pseudospin Formalism

The calculations of Sections 6b,c are similar to previous studies of structural phase transitions [12-14,29], which have introduced pseudospin formalisms, to describe either the electronic or the phonon modes. These formalisms are often based on an imperfect analogy, but are valuable because spin systems are understood so much better than nonlinear phonon systems. To clarify comparison with these works, the formalism is discussed in this Appendix. The pseudospin formalism applies to the order-disorder limit of structural phase transitions. That is, it is assumed that at each lattice site the system is disordered into one of two (or more) possible configurations. In the present problem, an electronic pseudospin can be introduced, with the 'up' spin associated with occupancy of the \uparrow_{11} vHs, and the 'down' spin with \downarrow_{22} electrons. Then

$$z_i = a_{1i}^y a_{1i} - a_{2i}^y a_{2i}; \quad (\text{IV } 1a)$$

$$x_i = a_{1i}^y a_{2i} + a_{2i}^y a_{1i}; \quad (\text{IV } 1b)$$

$$y_i = i(a_{2i}^y a_{1i} - a_{1i}^y a_{2i}); \quad (\text{IV } 1c)$$

where the subscript i labels the atomic site. The spin operators satisfy the commutation relations

$$[s_i, s_j] = 2i s_{ijk} s_{lmk}; \quad (\text{IV } 2)$$

The operators can then be rewritten in terms of pseudospins. In particular,

$$\langle 0 \rangle = \sum_k a_{1k}^y a_{1k} - a_{2k}^y a_{2k} = \sum_i z_i S_z; \quad (\text{IV } 3a)$$

$$\langle q \rangle = \sum_i z_i e^{iq \cdot r} S_z(q); \quad (\text{IV } 3b)$$

Thus, condensation into the LTT phase corresponds to a pseudospin ferromagnetic transition within the plane, $\langle S_z \rangle \neq 0$; the overall tetragonal symmetry arises because the interlayer coupling is antiferromagnetic.

In the present model, the pseudospins are again only of approximate validity. The problem lies in the term $\sum_{ik} E_k a_{ik}^y a_{ik}$. In an order-disorder model, each electronic state would have to be either in state 1, associated with the X-point vHs, or state 2, associated with the Y-point vHs, in which case $a_{1k}^y a_{1k} + a_{2k}^y a_{2k} = 1$ for each k -value. In fact, while the dospeaks are split, there remains a significant overlap of the two bands, and for these states, the sum can reach a value 2. Hence, the E_k -term must be retained in Eq. 19a, leading to a very different form of gap equation from a pseudospin calculation.

Appendix V: Solutions of Mathieu's Equation (Eq. 32a)

The solutions of Eq. 32a can be written in the form of a Fourier series [31]

$$= \sum_{m=-1}^{\infty} a_m e^{im\theta}; \quad (\text{V } 1)$$

where the boundary conditions require that $m+1/2$ is an integer. Substituting V 1 into Eq. 32a yields the recursion relation

$$a_m (E_m - m^2) + \frac{1}{2} (a_{m-4} + a_{m+4}) = 0; \quad (\text{V } 2)$$

where E_m is the eigenvalue and $\hbar^2 = 2R^2$. Eq. V 2 only mixes m -values separated by 4, so there are four families of solution, depending on whether the series V 1 contains terms with m equal to $3/2, 1/2, -1/2$, or $-3/2$. Since the recursion relation contains only m^2 , these terms are degenerate in pairs for any value of l . When $l = 0$, each term in V 1 is an exact solution, with eigenvalue $E_m = m^2$. Nonzero l leads to mixing of these states, and for large l , each level is fourfold degenerate (corresponding to independent oscillations about one of the four potential minima).

In finding the eigenvalues of Eq. 32a, it is convenient to generalize the equation to:

$$\frac{d^2 y}{dz^2} + (a^0 - 2q^0 \cos(lz^0))y = 0; \quad (V 3)$$

where the number of m in a, l , is arbitrary, and the boundary condition is that $y(z^0 + l) = y(z^0)$. This agrees with Eq. 32a when $a^0 = E_n = m^2$, $q^0 = l^2/4$, $z^0 = z$, and $l = 4$. In turn, Eq. V 3 can be reduced to the canonical form of a Mathieu function of fractional order [33] by the substitution $z = lz^0/2$, $a = 4a^0/l^2$, $q = 4q^0/l^2$, so

$$\frac{d^2 y}{dz^2} + (a - 2q \cos(2z))y = 0; \quad (V 4)$$

From the boundary condition, the solution can be written in the form of series V 1, with $m = n + p/2$, where n is an arbitrary integer and p is an odd integer $\leq l$. These solutions are the fractional Mathieu functions of order $p/2$, and the eigenvalues can be read off of Fig. 11 of McLachlan [33] (p. 98). For fixed n , there are l solutions lying between the solutions of the integral Mathieu functions, of orders n and $n + 1$ (actually, in the 'stable' zone between the solutions a_n and b_{n+1}) { see Fig. 14 for $l = 3; 4; 5$. For even l , the solutions are all doubly degenerate, while for odd l , there is an additional singly degenerate level whenever $p = l$. As l increases, the allowed states fill the 'stable' intervals of Mathieu's equation, with gaps between successive n values, much as the band structure of a one-dimensional metal fills in as more and more atoms are added to the chain.

Specializing now to the case of interest, $l = 4$, the eigenvalues are shown in Fig. 14, constructed by interpolation from McLachlan's Fig. 11. The nature of the eigenstates can be appreciated by going to the $q = 0$ limit. In this case, the eigenstates are $y_{pc} = \cos(pz/2)$ or $y_{ps} = \sin(pz/2)$, with $p = 1; 3$. Thus, $y_{pc}^2 = 1, 0.5, 0$, or 0.5 in the wells 1, 2, 3, and 4, for either value of p . The difference is that y_{3c} has additional maxima outside of the potential minima. The functions y_{ps} are similar, with wells 1 and 3 interchanged. Since y_{1c} and y_{1s} are degenerate, a number of alternative solutions can be constructed, including ones centered on wells 2 or 4. As q increases, the interwell tunneling probability decreases, and for sufficiently large barriers, the wave functions should localize within a single well. It might be anticipated that the individual wave functions would narrow, causing the overlap of wave functions between wells to decrease. A plausible measure of this decrease would be $y_{pc}^2(2)/y_{pc}^2(1)$ { i.e., the overlap probability of the wave function being found at the center of well 2 given that its peak value is centered in a neighboring well, 1. Surprisingly, $y_{pc}^2(2)/y_{pc}^2(1) = 0.5$, independent of q . Localization arises from the mixing of the $p = 3$ states into the $p = 1$ states, so that the gap E between these two levels can be taken as a delocalization energy.

The eigenvalues may be found more precisely (Fig. 3) by deriving a continued-fraction eigenvalue equation. Letting $v_{np} = a_m/a_{m-4}$, with $m = (p + 8n)/2$, Eq. V 2 can be rewritten

$$v_{np} = \frac{q}{a - (p + 8n)^2 - qv_{n+1,p}}; \quad (V 5)$$

Here p is a positive integer which labels the four series, $p = 1; 3; 5; 7$. Equation V 5 is readily solved as a continued fraction

$$v_{np} = \frac{q}{a - (p + 8n)^2 - \frac{q^2}{a - (p + 8(n + 1))^2 - \frac{q^2}{a - (p + 8(n + 2))^2 - \dots}}}; \quad (V 6)$$

Equations V 2 and consequently V 6 hold for $n \geq 1$, but the equation for $n = 0$ is more complicated, since it mixes the series for p and $p - 8$. This equation can be written in the form

$$v_{1p} = \frac{a - q - p^2}{q}; \quad (V 7a)$$

$$v_{1p} = \frac{a - q - p^2}{q}; \quad (V 7b)$$

with $a_{p=2} = a_{p=2}$. Equating the right-hand side of Eq. 6, for $n = 1$, to the right-hand side of Eq. 7 gives the eigenvalue equation for the Mathieu function (actually a pair of equations for v_{1p} and $v_{1\bar{p}}$). The quantity can be found by subtracting the two equations. Letting

$$y = \frac{p^2 - p^2 + q(v_{1p} - v_{1\bar{p}})}{2q};$$

then

$$= y \frac{p}{1 + y^2};$$

The two possible values give the two degenerate eigenstates for each energy. Substituting either into Eq. V 7a yields a single eigenvalue equation for $a(q)$, which is solved numerically to generate Fig. 3.

References

- [1] J.D. Axe, A.H. Moudden, D. Hohlwein, D.E. Cox, K.M. Mohanty, A.R. Mouddenbaugh, and Y. Xu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 62, 2751 (1989); T. Suzuki and T. Fujita, J. Phys. Soc. Japan 58, 1883 (1990).
- [2] M. Sera, Y. Ando, S. Kondoh, K. Fukuda, M. Sato, I. Watanabe, S. Nakashima, and K. Kumagai, Sol. St. Commun. 69, 851 (1989).
- [3] Y. Koike, T. Kawaguchi, N. Watanabe, T. Noji, and Y. Saito, Sol. St. Commun. 79, 155 (1991); Y. Maeno, N. Kakehi, M. Kato, and T. Fujita, to be published, Phys. Rev. B., and Physica C 185-9, 909 (1991); M. Sato, N. Sera, S. Shamoto, and S. Yamagata, Physica C 185-9, 905 (1991).
- [4] R.S. Markiewicz, J. Phys. Condens. Matt. 2, 6223 (1990); S. Barisic and J. Zelenko, Sol. St. Commun. 74, 367 (1990); W.E. Pickett, R.E. Cohen, and H. Krakauer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67, 228 (1991).
- [5] J. Friedel, J. Phys. Cond. Matt. 1, 7757 (1989).
- [6] R.S. Markiewicz, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B 5, 2037 (1991).
- [7] D.M. News, C.C. Tsuei, P.C. Pattnaik, and C.L. Kane, Comments in Condensed Matter Physics 15, 273 (1992).
- [8] H. Tagaki, R.J. Cava, M. Marezio, B. Batlogg, J.J. Krajewski, W.F. Peck, Jr., P. Bordet, and D.E. Cox, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 3777 (1992).
- [9] J.P. Pouget, C. Noguera, and R. Moret, J. Phys. (France) 49, 375 (1988).
- [10] R.S. Markiewicz, Physica C 193, 323 (1992).
- [11] R.S. Markiewicz, Physica C 200, 65 (1992).
- [12] R. Engman, "The Jahn-Teller Effect in Molecules and Crystals" (London, Wiley, 1972); F.S. Ham, in "Electron Paramagnetic Resonance", ed. by S. Geschwind (N.Y., Plenum, 1972), p. 1.
- [13] I. Bersuker and V.Z. Polinger, "Vibronic Interactions in Molecules and Crystals" (Berlin, Springer, 1989).
- [14] G.A. Gehring and K.A. Gehring, Rep. Prog. Phys. 38, 1 (1975).
- [15] J. Labbe and J. Friedel, J. Phys. (Paris) 27, 153, 303, 708 (1966).
- [16] E. Pytte, Phys. Rev. Lett. 25, 1176 (1970); Phys. Rev B 4, 1094 (1971).
- [17] H.J. Schulz, Phys. Rev. B 39, 2940 (1989).
- [18] G. Kotliar, Phys. Rev. B 37, 3664 (1988); I. Aeck and J.B. Marston, Phys. Rev. B 37, 3774 (1988); and T.C. Hu, J.B. Marston, and I. Aeck, Phys. Rev. B 43, 2866 (1991); P.A. Lee and N. Nagaosa, Phys. Rev. B 46, 5621 (1992).
- [19] E.L. Nagaev, "Physics of Magnetic Semiconductors" (Mir, Moscow, 1983); V.J. Emery, S.A. Kivelson, and H.Q. Lin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 64, 475 (1990).

- [20] K.A. Muller, in "Nonlinearity in Condensed Matter", ed. by A.R. Bishop, D.K. Campbell, P. Kumar, and S.E. Trullinger (Berlin, Springer, 1987), p. 234.
- [21] R.E. Cohen, Nature 358, 136 (1992).
- [22] E. Pytte and J. Feder, Phys. Rev. 187, 1077 (1969); J. Feder and E. Pytte, Phys. Rev. B1, 4803 (1970).
- [23] A. Bussmann-Holder, A. Migliori, Z. Fisk, J.L. Sarrao, R.G. Leisure, and S.-W. Cheong, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67, 512 (1991).
- [24] S. Barisic and I. Batistic, J. Phys. (France) 49, 153 (1988).
- [25] C.A. Balseiro and L.M. Falicov, Phys. Rev. B20, 4457 (1979).
- [26] C. Kittel, "Introduction to Solid State Physics", 5th Ed. (NY, Wiley, 1976), p. 199.
- [27] R.S. Markiewicz, Physica C169, 63 (1990).
- [28] R.S. Markiewicz, J. Phys. Condens. Matt. 2, 665 (1990); Physica C170, 29 (1990); and in "High-Temperature Superconductivity", ed. by J. Ashkenazi, S.E. Barnes, F. Zuo, G.C. Vezzoli, and B.M. Klein (Plenum, NY, 1991), p. 555.
- [29] R.J. Elliott and A.P. Young, Ferroelectrics 7, 23 (1974); L. Novakovic, "The Pseudospin Method in Magnetism and Ferroelectricity" (Oxford, Pergamon, 1975).
- [30] M.D. Kaplan, Physica C180, 351 (1991).
- [31] M.C.M. O'Brien, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A281, 323 (1964).
- [32] M. Abramowitz and I.A. Stegun, Eds. "Handbook of Mathematical Functions" (Dover, Mineola, NY, 1964).
- [33] N.W. McLachlan, "Theory and Applications of Mathieu Functions", (N.Y., Dover, 1964).
- [34] K.-H. Hock, G. Schroder, and H. Thomas, Z. Phys. B30, 403 (1978).
- [35] R.B. Potts, Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. 48, 106 (1952); F.Y. Wu, Rev. Mod. Phys. 54, 235 (1982).
- [36] R. Engman and B. Halperin, Phys. Rev. B2, 75 (1970); B. Halperin and R. Engman, Phys. Rev. B3, 1698 (1971).
- [37] M.V. Berry, Proc. Roy. Soc., London A 392, 45 (1984); G. Delacretaz, E.R. G rant, R.L. Whetten, L. Woste, and J.W. Zwanziger, Phys. Rev. Lett. 56, 2598 (1986).
- [38] A.S. Chaves, F.C.S. Barreto, R.A. Nogueira, and B. Zeks, Phys. Rev. B13, 207 (1976).
- [39] T. Thio, T.R. Thurston, N.W. Preyer, P.J. Picone, M.A. Kastner, H.P. Jenssen, D.R. Gabbe, C.Y. Chen, R.J. Birgeneau, and A. Aharony, Phys. Rev. B38, 905 (1988).
- [40] D. Coey, T.M. Rice, and F.C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. B44, 10112 (1991); N.E. Bonesteel, T.M. Rice, and F.C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 2684 (1992); and L. Shekhtman, O. Entin-Wohlman, and A. Aharony, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 836 (1992).
- [41] J. Wheatley, T.C. Hsu, and P.W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. B37, 5897 (1988).
- [42] R.S. Markiewicz, J. Phys. Condens. Matt. 1, 8911 (1989).
- [43] R.S. Markiewicz, Physica C168, 195 (1990).
- [44] J.C. Slater and G.F. Oster, Phys. Rev. 94, 1498 (1954); Table 20-1 in W.A. Harrison, "Electronic Structure and the Properties of Solids" (Freeman, San Francisco, 1980), p. 481.
- [45] J.B. G rant, Ph.D. Thesis, Lawrence Livermore Nat. Lab. (1991); J.B. G rant and A.K. Mc Mahan, Phys. Rev. B46, to be published.
- [46] H. Eskes and G.A. Sawatzky, Phys. Rev. B43, 119 (1991).
- [47] R.V. Kasowski, W.Y. Hsu, and F. Herman, Sol. St. Commun. 63, 1077 (1987).
- [47] H. Jones, "The Theory of Brillouin Zones and Electronic States in Crystals", 2d Ed. (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1975), pp. 132-155.
- [49] A.P. Cracknell and K.C. Wong, "The Fermi Surface" (Clarendon, Oxford, 1973), pp. 66-70.
- [50] S.T. Chui, R.V. Kasowski, and W.Y. Hsu, Europhys. Lett. 9, 385 (1989).

- [51] R.J.Elliott, Phys. Rev. 96, 280 (1954); L.M.Falicov and M.H.Cohen, Phys. Rev. 130, 92 (1963).
 [52] G.F.Koster, Phys. Rev. 127, 2044 (1962).

Figure Captions

- Fig. 1 Fermi surfaces at vH s associated with (a) LTT phase; (b) LTO phase.
- Fig. 2 LTO phase diagram based on strong umklapp scattering (Eq. 22). Solid lines correspond to $J_0 = 200, 300, 400, \text{ or } 500K$, in order of increasing gap, D .
- Fig. 3 Lowest energy eigenvalues of Mathieu's equation, Eq. 32a. Both the exact solutions (solid lines) and the approximate solutions of Eq. 36d (E_+ = dashed line; E_- = dotted line) are shown.
- Fig. 4 Solid lines = potential well of Eq. 39, $E_{\text{tilt}} = \sim e^0 R^2$, with $\langle \cos \rangle = 0.2$, for (a) LTT and (b) LTO phases. Dashed lines are approximations to the potential using Eqs. 31 + 38b.
- Fig. 5 Eigenfunctions of Eq. 39 for the LTT (dashed lines) and LTO phases (solid lines), assuming $H = 400K$, $H_0^0 = -200K$, for several values of the overlap $S = 0.001$ (a), 0.01 (b), 0.1 (c), and 0.5 (d).
- Fig. 6 Graphical solution of Eq. 42, where A_{rg} is the right hand side of Eq. 42 (solid lines) and the dashed line is $\langle \cos \rangle$. The solution of Eq. 42 is at the point where solid and dashed lines intersect (filled circles). The calculations assume the same parameters as Fig. 5, with $S = 0.01$, and the various solid lines correspond to $T = 100, 80, 60, 40, \text{ or } 20K$, in order of increasing $\langle \cos \rangle$.
- Fig. 7 Equilibrium values of $\langle \cos \rangle$ (solutions of Eq. 42) for the LTT (dashed lines) and LTO phases (solid lines). The parameters of Eq. 42 were chosen as $H = 400K$, $H_0^0 = -200K$, with variable S . In order of decreasing values of $\langle \cos \rangle$ or T_c , the values of S in part (a) are $0.0001, 0.01, 0.02, 0.05, \text{ and } 0.1$. In part (b), the values of S are, in order of increasing T_c , $0.3, 0.4, 0.48, 0.5, 0.52, \text{ and } 0.55$. The transition temperature T_c has a minimum around $S \approx 0.2$.
- Fig. 8 Free energies of LTT (dashed lines) and LTO phases (solid lines), for the same parameters as in Fig. 7. Increasing S corresponds to increasing magnitude of F in part (a), but decreasing magnitude of F in part (b). Filled circles in part (b) show LTO-LTT crossover.
- Fig. 9 Phase diagram of dynamic JT transitions. Solid lines show LTT ! LTO and LTO ! LTT phase boundaries, $T_c(S)$, for the same parameters as Figs. 5-8: $H = 400K$, $H_0^0 = -200K$. Dashed lines are for the alternative parameters $H = 600K$, $H_0^0 = -900K$.
- Fig. 10 Eigenfunctions of Eq. 11, for 2×2 (top) and 4×4 (bottom) clusters. In each cluster, only the Cu's are indicated. The $-$ sign corresponds to the relative phase of the Cu $d_{x^2-y^2}$ orbitals (periodic boundary conditions assumed).
- Fig. 11 Partial densities of states for the four subbands corresponding to Fig. 10a (dashed lines) along with the total dos (solid lines). Inset: Brillouin zone showing subband boundaries.
- Fig. 12 Fermi surfaces of LTO phase, with orthorhombic distortion: (a) ordinary cell, including spin-orbit coupling. Circles on zone boundary show points where bands must be degenerate, filled circle implies degeneracy for all points along k_z , open circle implies degeneracy for special points only. (b) Double zone appropriate when spin-orbit coupling is absent.
- Fig. 13 Group theoretical analysis of orthorhombic Brillouin zone. (a) Real space cell of orthorhombic phase, showing orthorhombic cell (long dashed lines) and inscribed primitive cell (short dashed lines). Dotted lines = glide planes. The open and filled circles represent Cu atoms, with filled circles representing

atoms at $x = 0; a$, and open circles atoms at $x = a/2$. The solid lines represent the canted planes of the planar O' s. (b) Full Brillouin zone, corresponding to primitive cell. Dashed lines = inscribed pseudocell. Light shading represents portions of Brillouin zone surface where the bands are twofold degenerate in the absence of spin-orbit coupling (i.e., the $X-L-N$ face and the line $N-M$). Heavy shading indicates those portions where the degeneracy persists in the presence of spin-orbit coupling (the line $L-X$ and the point M). (c) Orthorhombic pseudozone. Shading has same meaning as in Fig. 13b. (d) Zone folding construction of second pseudozone. Here shading illustrates how sections are folded from the full zone into the pseudozone.

Fig. 14 Eigenvalues of fractional Mathieu's function. Solid lines = solutions to the integral Mathieu's function and boundaries of stability for the fractional values. Fractional solutions are shown for orders $1/3$ (short dashed lines), $1/4$ (long dashed lines), and $1/5$ (dotted lines). [After Ref. [33].]