# Low Field M agnetic R esponse of the G ranular Superconductor $La_{1.8}Sr_{0.2}CuO_4$

L.Leylekian, M.O cio and L.A.G urevich Service de Physique de l'Etat Condense, CEA, CE Saclay, 91191 G if sur Y vette Cedex

M.V.Feigelm an Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics, Moscow, 117940, Russia.

January 13, 2022

#### A bstract

The properties of the low excitation eld m agnetic response of the granular high tem perature (H T<sub>c</sub>) superconductor  $La_{1:8}Sr_{0:2}CuO_4$  have been analyzed at low tem peratures. The response of the Josephson currents has been extracted from the data. It is shown that intergrain current response is fully inteversible, producing shielding response, but do not carry M eissner m agnetization. A nalysis of the data shows that the system of Josephson currents freezes into a glassy state even in the absence of external m agnetic eld, which is argued to be a consequence of the d-w ave nature of superconductivity in  $La_{1:8}Sr_{0:2}CuO_4$ . The m acroscopic diam agnetic response to very weak variations of the m agnetic eld is shown to be strongly inteversible but still qualitatively di erent from any previously known kind of the critical-state behaviour in superconductors. A phenom enological description of these data is given in terms of a new ly proposed \fractal<sup>m</sup> m odel of inteversibility in superconductors.

PACS num bers 74.50.+ r, 74.60 G e, 74.80 B j

Perm anent address: Institute of Solid State Physics, Chernogolovka, Moscow Region, 142432, Russia. Current address: Delft University of Technology, Lorentzweg 1, 2628 CJD elft, The Netherlands.

### I Introduction

Granular superconductors (SC) are composed of a very large number of small (micron-size) superconductive grains which are coupled together due to the Josephson tunnelling (or, in some cases, due to the proxim ity e ect). These systems are inherently disordered due to random ness in the sizes of grains and in their mutual distances. U sually the strength of Josephson coupling between grains is rather weak, so the maximum Josephson energy of the contact between two grains is much below the intragrain superconductive condensation energy. Therefore granular SC can be considered as systems with a two-level organization: their shortscale properties are determined by the superconductivity of individual grains, whereas the macroscopic SC behaviour is governed by the weak intergrain couplings. In the treatment of the latter, one can neglect any internal structure of SC grains and describe them just by the phases i of their superconductive order parameters  $j = j j_i \exp(i j)$ . As a result, the macroscopic behaviour of granular SC can be described by a classical free energy functional of the form (cf. Ref. [1, 2, 3]):

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij}^{X} E_{J}^{ij} \cos(i j ij) + Z_{d^{3}r} \frac{1}{8} (rotA)^{2} \frac{1}{4} rotA \quad H_{xt}$$
(I.1)

where  $ij = \frac{2}{\sigma} \prod_{i=1}^{n} A dr$  is the phase di erence induced by the electrom agnetic vector potential A and  $_0 = hc=e$ , whereas the coupling strengths  $E_{J}^{ij}$  are proportional to the maximum Josephson currents:  $E_{J}^{ij} = \frac{h}{2e}I_{ij}^{c}$ . The vector potential A in Eq.(I.1) is the sum of the vector potentialA ext of the external magnetic eld H ext and of the Josephson currents-induced vector potential A ind. In the absence of external magnetic eld, the lowestenergy state for the \Ham iltonian" (I.1) is, clearly, a m acroscopically superconductive state with all phases i equal to each other. Thus that granular SC system looks sim ilar to the random XY ferrom agnet with random ness in the values of the coupling strengths  $E_{...}^{ij}$ 's (apart from the possible role of the induced vector potential A ind which will be dicussed later); within this analogy the role of XY \spin components" is taken by  $S_x = \cos i$ ,  $S_v = \sin i$ .

The situation becomes a bt more complicated in the presence of non-zero external magnetic eld H<sub>ext</sub>, which makes the system random ly frustrated (since magnetic uxespenetrating plaquettes between neighbouring grains are random fractional parts of 0). When the external eld is su ciently strong, H<sub>ext</sub> H<sub>0</sub> =  $_{0}=a_{0}^{2}$ 

(here  $a_0$  is the characteristic intergrain distance), the random phases in become of the order of or larger, which means complete frustration of the intergrain couplings { i.e. the system is then expected to resemble the XY spin glass. A ctually the random Josephson network in a magnetic eld is not exactly identical to the XY spin glass due to the following reasons [1]: i). The e ective couplings  $E_{J}^{ij} = E_{J}^{ij} \exp(i_{ij})$  between \spins" S<sub>i</sub> of the frustrated SC network are random complex num bers whereas in the XY spin glassm odel, they are real random num bers. ii). Generally the phases ij depend on the totalm agnetic induction  $B = H_{ext} + B_{ind}$ , i.e. the e ective  $\operatorname{couplings} \mathbf{E}_{I}^{ij}$  depend on the phase variables j determ ining the intergrain currents  $I_{ij} = I_{ij}^{c} \sin(j)$ ij). In some cases the e ects produced by the self-induced magnetic eld B ind are weak and can be neglected (the quantitative criterion will be discussed later on), so that phases ij can be considered as being xed by the external eld.

The model described by the Hamiltonian (I.1) with xed  $_{ij}$ 's and H  $_{ext}$  H  $_0$  is usually called \gauge glass" m odel. It is expected on the basis of the analytical [2, 3, 4,5] as well as num erical [6,7] results that the gauge glass model in 3D space exhibits a true phase transition into a low-tem perature glassy superconductive (nonergodic) state. The mean-eld theory of such a low-tem perature state shows [3, 5] that it is characterized by the presense of a nite e ective penetration depth for the variation of an external eld, nonzero macroscopic critical current, and the absence of a macroscopic Meissner e ect. The full model (I.1) with 's containing contribution from B  $_{ind}$  is sometimes called \gauge glass with screening" [8]. The e ect of screening on the presence and properties of the phase transition into a glassy state is not com pletely clear; som e num erical results [8] indicate the absence of a true phase transtion in a 3D model with screening. Quantitatively, the strengh of screening is determ ined by the ratio  $_{\rm L}$  = 2  $\rm L\,I_c$ =c  $_0$  where L is the characteristic inductance of an elementary intergrain current loop [9]. In the ceram ics with  $_{\rm L}$ 1, screening e ects becom e  $a_0 = 1$  only (i.e. important on a long-distance scale they are sim ilar to the strongly type-II superconductors with disorder).

A part from its relevance for the description of granular superconductors, the gauge glass model with screening is rather offen considered (e.g. Ref. [10]) as a simplied model describing the large-scale behaviour of disordered bulk type-II superconductors in the mixed state (so-called vortex glass problem). A ctually it is unclear a priori how these two problems are related; an obvious di erence between them is that the basic ingredient of the latter is the vortex lattice which is clearly an an isotropic object, whereas the form er does not contain any prescribed direction in the 3D space. On the other hand, the granular superconductor in a moderate magnetic eld H<sub>ext</sub> H<sub>0</sub> may be considered as a kind of disordered type-II superconductor, where the notion of a hypervortex (which is the macroscopic analogue of the Abrikosov vortex) can be introduced [2, 11]. Therefore, the macroscopic properties of a granular network at H <sub>ext</sub>  $H_0$  m ay resemble those of the vortex glass; in such a scenario a phase transtion between vortex glass and gauge glass phases would be expected in a granular superconductive network at H<sub>ext</sub>  $H_0$  (cf. Ref.[1] for a m ore detailed discussion of this subject).

Recently, it was noted that granular superconductors m ay become glassy even in the absence of external magnetic eld, if a large enough part of Josephson junctions are anom alous, i.e. their minimum Josephson coupling energy corresponds to a phase di erence = instead of 0 (so-called -junctions). Two completely di erent origins of -junctions were proposed: mesoscopic uctuations in dirty superconductors [12] and the pairing with non-zero momentum [13, 14]. Recent experiments revealing the d-w ave nature of pairing in high-tem perature superconductors [15] indicate the possibility of observing glassy superconductive behaviour in HTSC ceram ics in virtually zero magnetic eld. Note that ceram ics with equal concentrations of usual and -junctions are com pletely equivalent (if screening e ects can be neglected) to the XY spin glass. Contrary to the 3D gauge glass model, the XY spin glass in 3D is expected to have no true therm odynam ic phase transition at nite tem perature [7]; recently, it has been suggested that the XY spinglass and d-wave ceram ic superconductor m ight have a new equilibrium ordered phase, the so-called chiral-glass phase [16]. However, these issues are hardly relevant for the measurable response at temperatures much below \bare" glass transition temperature  $T_{q}$ , which we consider in this paper.

Experimental studies of granular superconductors reveal [9, 17] an appearance of magnetic irreversibility (a di erence between M eissner and shielding magnetizations or, in other terms, between Field Cooled (F C.) and Zero Field Cooled (Z F C.) magnetizations) below some temperature  $T_g$ , which is lower than the SC transition temperature  $T_c$  of the grains. However, detailed analysis of the magnetic response in such systems is usually com – plicated by the mixing of contributions from individual grains and from the intergrain currents. The goal of this paper is to develop a method which makes it possible to extract from the raw data on d.c. magnetic response the intergrain contributions.

The compound La<sub>1:8</sub>Sr<sub>0:2</sub>CuO<sub>4</sub> was chosen in this study for experim ental convenience, since its critical tem perature ( 32K) is within the optimal temperature range of our noise and a.c. susceptibility m easurem ents setup. The sample was fabricated by standard solid state reaction of La<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, SrCO<sub>3</sub> and CuO [18]. M ixed powder was pressed into pellets which were sintered in air at 920 C for 12 hours. The material was then submitted to three cycles of regrinding, sifting to 20 m, pressing and sintering again at 1100 C for 12 hours. Sam ples prepared in two successive runs were used in this study. In the st one (sample A), pellets 1 mm thick and 10 mm diameter were obtained, with a density about 80% of the theoreticalbulk value. In the second one (sam ple B), cylinders of diameter 6mm and length 5 to 6mm were prepared with a density ratio about 88%. In both preparations, grains sizes were in the range 1 { 10 m. Room temperature X-ray powder di raction patterns showed the presence of a sm all am ount (< 5%) of the non superconductive com pound La<sub>1 2x</sub>  $Sr_{2x}Cu_2O_5$ .

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II the general analysis of the magnetic response data obtained on two di erent samples (A and B) of  $La_{1:8}Sr_{0:2}CuO_4$  ceram ics is presented and the intergrain (Josephson) contribution to the overall response is extracted. Section III is devoted to the detailed study of them agnetic response of Josephson intergrain network in the low - eld range. It is found that them acroscopic critical current is suppressed considerably (by a factor 2), in a magnetic eld of only about 2G. The lower- eld d.c.{ response to eld variations of order 0.05 0.5G was analyzed for the F  $\mathcal{L}$ .states obtained at H  $_{\rm FC}$  = 0 10G and two tem peratures, 10K and 20K. The data at T = 10K and H  $_{\rm FC}$  = 0 and 0.1G are shown to be compatible with the Bean critical-state picture [19] and the low -

eld critical current value is identi ed. The rest of the data are in a sharp contrast with Bean-model predictions: the screening current grows sublinearly (approximately as a square root) with increasing exitation eld. Very low eld, low frequency a.c. measurements are presented, which reveal the strongly irreversible nature of that anom alous response. A new phenom enological model is proposed for the treatment of these data. Its

rst predictions are found to be in a reasonable agreem ent with the data. In Section IV, the theoretical analysis of our experim ental results is given in term s of the existing theories of \gauge-glass" state. It is shown that the observed transition temperature to the low-temperature state of the network and the magnitude of the (low-B;T) critical current are in sharp contradiction with the (usual) assumption that the zero-eld granular network is unfrustrated. On the contrary, under the assum ption of a strongly frustrated network at B = 0, all basic m easured param eters of the ceram ic network are in mutualagreem ent. W e believe that these estim ates indicate the existence of a large proportion of -junctions in the La<sub>1:8</sub>Sr<sub>0:2</sub>CuO<sub>4</sub> ceram ics, possibly due to the d-wave nature of superconductivity in cuprates. The Section V is devoted to the developm ent of a new model of diamagnetic response in glassy superconductors, which is necessary for the description of the anom alous data described at the end of Section III. This new model (in som e sense, interm ediate between the Bean [19] and the Campbell [20] ones) is based on two ideas: i) the existence of two characteristic \critical" currents ( $J_{c1}$  and J<sub>c1</sub>), and ii) the fractal nature of free energy valleys Jc in the ceram ic network. Our conclusions are presented in Section VI, whereas some technical calculations can be found in the Appendix.

For convenience, the em u system of units will be used for experim ental data, and G aussian units for the theoretical discussions.

## II General Properties of D.C. Magnetic Response

The d.c. magnetization was measured by the classical extraction method. Two SQUID magnetometers were used: one a homemade apparatus used in several previous spin-glass studies [21], the other a commercial system (Cryogenics S500).

In this section, we describe successively the static magnetic response of sam ples A and B and present a prelim – inary treatment of these data, in order to distinguish between the magnetic response of individual grains and intergrain currents [9, 22] (a detailed study of the latter is the subject of the next section). Firstly, we present results obtained after cooling the sam ples in various d.c.

elds and applying small eld increases. Secondly, we will derive from the results the response of the Josephson currents as a function of eld and tem perature. Finally, we will show that the behavior of the eld cooled (F  $\mathcal{L}$ .) susceptibility can be satisfactorily accounted for if the system of Josephson currents does not carry M eissner m agnetization. It will be shown that the same interpretation accounts fairly well for the F  $\mathcal{L}$ . results which, at rst sight, are rather di erent for the sam ples A and B.

#### II-A Sample A

Sample A is a 1mm thick pellet with an approximately ellipsoidal shape of 2 6mm. Its calculated volume is  $V = 8.5mm^3$  and the demagnetizing eld coe cient for

Figure 1: M agnetic m om ent of the sam ple A as a function of eld applied in the zero eld cooled state (em .u. units of m om ent correspond to cm  $^3$  G).

Fig.1 displays the magnetic dipole moment of the sample cooled to 10K in zero eld and submitted to cycles  $0 \ H_{max} \ 0$  for several values of  $H_{max}$  up to 2G. At the lowest increasing elds, the moment increases initially with a slope P<sub>1</sub>. Above 1.5G, it approaches a slope P 2. The remanent positive moment saturates for  $H_{max}$  1G. The calculated moment of the sample for perfect volume shielding in an homogeneous eld is (em.u. system):

$$M = \frac{H V}{4 (1 N)} = 0.72 10^{3} H \text{ cm}^{3} - \text{G} :$$

O wing to the error in the evaluation of the volume, this value is determ ined with an accuracy of only 5%. Nevertheless, it is in fair agreement with the slope P1 in Fig.1. On the other hand, the slope P2 is about 53%, a rather small value since the density ratio of the sam ple is about 80%. At such low temperatures (in comparison with  $T_c$  32K), where the lower critical eld of the grain's material is above 100 G, one would expect expulsion of the eld by the grains with a penetration depth. The expected value for the magnetization M = M = V of the system of uncoupled grains system can be calculated as [24]:

$$\frac{M}{H} = \frac{1}{4} \frac{f}{1 \text{ fN} (1 \text{ f})n}$$
(II2)

where f is the volume fraction of the superconductive material and n is the demagnetizing eld for the

grains. For an estim ate, we assume grains to be spherical (n = 1=3) and, using M =H 0.53 1=4 and N = 0.06, we nd f 0.41. This value is considerably below the volume fraction of the sample led by grains (0.8); we assume that the di erence is due to the intergrain penetration depth being comparable to the grain size r and estim ate an elective value of as

$$f = 0.41 = 0.8 \ 1 \ \frac{1}{r}$$
 yielding = 0.2r:

Taking an average size of 5  $\,$  m for the grains, we obtain

 $500 \,\text{nm}$ . Values reported for the m ean penetration depth in La<sub>1:8</sub>Sr<sub>0:2</sub>CuO<sub>4</sub> are about 200 nm [25]. The value found here is larger than the expected m ean value for the hom ogeneous m aterial, indicating that the grains are not m onocrystalline. This will be con m ed below by the results of eld-cooling experiments.

Figure 2: Shielding susceptibility of the sample A as a function of tem perature, norm alized to the moment for complete shielding. Curves are arranged in the same ascending order as in the legend.

The shielding susceptibility is plotted in Fig. 2, as a function of temperature and for several values of the ambient F  $\mathcal{L}$ . eld. The m easurem ents were performed according to the following procedure: the sample was cooled in a eld H<sub>dc</sub> down to the working temperature and the moment was measured after waiting 300 sec; then the eld was increased by a small amount H H<sub>dc</sub>=10 and the moment was measured again after waiting 300 sec. The gure displays the experimental shielding susceptibility normalized to the value for total shielding, i.e.:

$$_{\rm sh} = \frac{M (H + H) M (H)}{H} \frac{4 (1 N)}{V}$$

The curves show the double step usually ascribed to the action of both intragrain currents and Josephson intergrain currents [26]. At high tem perature, the onset of grains diam agnetism occurs at about 32K. Above 25K, the response corresponds to the diam agnetism of the grains. At a xed temperature, it is  $H_{dc}$  independent for H<sub>dc</sub> 5G, and decreases for increasing  $H_{dc} > 5G$ . Below 25K, the onset of Josephson currents manifests as a second step of the diam agnetic response. This second step appears at a decreasing tem perature as H  $_{\rm dc}$  increases. At the lowest tem peratures, the diamagnetic moment amounts to about 100% of ux expulsion at  $H_{dc} = 0$  and decreases with increasing  $H_{dc}$ . At  $H_{dc} > 8G$ , the ux expulsion saturates at a value slightly above 50% which corresponds roughly to the level of 53% determ ined above for the grains response.

The susceptibility in Fig.2 contains the contributions of grains and Josephson currents. The contributions can be separated on the line of the work by Dersh and Blatter [22]. The induction in the sample is given by  $B = H + 4 (M_g + M_j)$  where  $M_g$  and  $M_j$  stand respectively for the magnetization of grains and of the Josephson currents. It should be noted that the magnetization due to macroscopic circulating currents in a superconductor is sample-size dependent, i.e. the corresponding susceptibility is not a local quantity. At the macroscopic scale of the circulating currents, the magnetization  $M_g$  can always be written as  $_{gH local}$ , where

 $_{\rm g}\,({\rm H}\,)$  is hom ogeneous over the sam ple. In what follows, we consider quantities averaged over the volum e of the sam ple: in that case, M  $_{\rm j}$  is the averaged moment per volum e unit due to the currents. The demagnetizing eld e ect will be neglected in the calculations. We have veri ed that, ow ing to the small value of the demagnetizing factor, this does not modify the essential features of the result while allowing a simpler derivation (the e ect of demagnetizing factor will be taken into account when analyzing the data from the sam ple B). We get M  $_{\rm g}$  =  $_{\rm g}\,({\rm H}\,+\,4\,\,{\rm M}_{\,\rm j})$ : Then M = M  $_{\rm g}$  + M  $_{\rm j}$  =  $_{\rm g}\,{\rm H}\,+\,{\rm M}_{\,\rm j}$  g (with  $_{\rm g}$  = 1 + 4  $_{\rm g}$ ), and

$$M_{j} = \frac{M_{g}H}{g} : \qquad (II.3)$$

Eq. (II.3) must be considered with care since g is history and eld dependent. In fact it is well-adapted to the description of the result of zero (or sm all) eld cooling experiments. M ore generally, we must consider the response to eld increments H to obtain = M = H : Then, the polarizability [27] j of the Josephson network reads:

$$j = \frac{g}{g}$$
: (II.4)

Note that we can equivalently consider the response of the currents system in an homogeneous medium with permeability  $_{g}$ . If the applied eld is varied by H, the Josephson network sees a variation of internal eld  $H_{i} = _{g}$  H and develops a polarization  $M_{j} = _{j}$  H<sub>i</sub>. Then, we recover Eq. (II.4).

The value of a could be determined in principle if we were able to obtain a packing of disconnected grains equivalent to the packing of the sintered sam ple. In practice this was not possible. Indeed, mechanical grinding resulted in breaking a large part of the grains and thus m odifying the characteristics of the material. Nevertheless, it is possible to extract q, at least approximately, from the data of Fig. 2. At high temperature, above the onset of intergrain currents at 25K, the shielding susceptibility sh is due to the grains alone, independent on  $H_{dc}$  below 6G. At low tem peratures, for  $H_{dc}$ 6G , the  $_{\rm sh}$  curves superpose and there is no above manifestation of the onset of intergrain currents. Thus, here also, sh represents the response of the grains alone. Hence, the response q of the grains can be reasonnably approxim ated by an interpolation between these two lim its. The interpolation curve, obtained by a smoothing procedure between both curves at  $H_{dc} = 0G$  and  $H_{dc} = 20 G$  is displayed on Fig. 2 (dotted curve). The values of j derived from Eq. (II.4) are plotted versus tem perature in Fig. 3, for  $H_{dc} < 6G$ .

Figure 3: Josephson currents susceptibility in the sam – ple A as a function of temperature. Values have been calculated from data of Fig. 2 and using Eq. (II.4).

Note that the dependence of  $_{\rm j}$  on H  $_{\rm dc}$ ; seen in the gure is supposed to re ect the behavior of the initial shielding properties of the Josephson network with the increase of H  $_{\rm dc}$ . Nevertheless, non linearity of the re-

sponse due to the correlative increase of the value of H (H = H = 10) cannot be excluded: this aspect will be studied in detail in sample B.F inally, one can note the sim ilarity of our data with the results of earlier num eric simulations on a gauge glass system [17].

Above we have dicussed the system's responses to the variation of magnetic eld at xed temperature (i.e. shielding responses) and extracted from these data the polarizability  $_{\rm j}$  of the intergrain system . Now we turn to the description of the results of the Field Cooling (F.C.) measurements. F.C. (M eissner) magnetization was measured by the standard procedure between 10K and 40K for elds from 0.01 to 20G. The results are reported in Fig. 4 versus temperature and Fig. 5 versus applied eld. Data are normalized to the value of the moment for 100% shielding.

Figure 4: F.C. (M eissner) susceptibility of sample A as a function of temperature for elds up to 20G. Curves are arranged in the same ascending order as in the legend.

Even at the smallest eld, the ux expulsion rate is no more than 45%, less than the 53% shielding by the grains. At low elds, below 1G, there is an approximate a nity between the curves of M = H versus T.M = H can be extrapolated linearly to H ! 0. The result is plotted in Fig. 2 (solid circles): one can see that the extrapolated F C. susceptibility superposes exactly with the low dc. eld shielding susceptibility above 25K. Therefore, at low dc. eld above 25K, the response of the grains system is reversible and it is well described by the low dc. eld shielding curves; this justies the hypothesis used above for the calculation of  $_j$ . On the other hand (see Fig. 5), the behavior of the FC. susceptibility as a function of H is not trivial. M = H decreases with increasing eld and reaches a stable level (about 25% at Figure 5: F.C. (M eissner) susceptibility of sample A as a function of eld for selected temperatures Curves are arranged in the same ascending order as in the legend.

the lowest tem peratures) at roughly 1G.W hatever the tem perature, this decrease is centered at a constant value of the eld, about 0:1 0:3G. Above 5G, M =H decreases once m ore with increasing eld. Note an essential di erence between the F  $\mathcal{L}$ . results presented on Fig. 4 and the shielding results above (Fig. 2): the F  $\mathcal{L}$ . curves do not show any increase of the response M =H with the tem perature decrease below 20K, where the intergrain coupling grows considerably (as it is seen from Fig. 2). This means that the network of intergrain currents does not produce M eissner (F  $\mathcal{L}$ .) m agnetization, whereas it does produce shielding m agnetization.

The behavior of the F.C. susceptibility  $_{FC} = M_{FC} = M_{FC} = H$  as a function of the applied eld H depicted in Fig. 5 shows two nontrivial features: i) crossover between two plateaus (at low and moderate values of H), which takes place between 0:1G and 1G independent of tem perature, and ii) the value of the low - eld  $_{FC}$  is noticeably lower than the M eissner response of uncoupled grains (45% versus 53%). These features can be understood in term s of (i), a polycrystalline structure of the grains, which can be suspected from the large values of the penetration depth obtained from the results of Fig. 1, and (ii), self-shielding (pinning of the magnetic ux) by the Josephson currents when lowering the temperature in an applied eld.

W e start from the feature i); the curves of F c .m agnetization in Fig. 5 are rather sim ilar to those which were m easured by Ruppel et al. [28] in YBaCuO ceram ics. The authors interpreted their results on the basis of a theory of the ux expulsion by strongly anisotopic ran-

dom ly oriented crystallites as derived by W ohllebeen et al. [29]. We stress that the model is not based on any activated ux creep m echanism. It is thus well-adapted to the analysis of our results: indeed, ux creep e ects can hardly be invoked here since the tem perature has no apparent e ect of on the characteristic eld related to the decrease of magnetization. The starting point of the model is that, provided the size b of the crystallites is such that <sub>k</sub> b ?, the longitudinal magnetization of a crystallite whose c-axis makes an angle with the eld is given by M =(H=4)  $(\cos^2)$  where is a factor close to 1, depending on the ratio  $_{k}$  =b. A fter averaging over , one obtains M = H = (=3)(1=4). It must be stressed that the system of intragrain crystallites is a strongly-coupled system, contrary to the system of grains which composes the ceram ic. Therefore, a grain consists of an ensemble of interconnected Josephson loops surrounding crystallites whose planes are nearly along the eld and are thus transparent to the eld. At low elds, this system will expel the ux with a penetration depth depending on the junction coupling energy. Nevertheless, when the eld is such that a loop sees a ux larger than

 $_{o}$ =2, the m acroscopic m agnetization of the Josephson currents vanishes and the system reacts as an ensemble of disconnected crystallites [30]. The characteristic eld of this crossover is such that [29]:

$$\frac{H_{m} s_{c}}{\circ} \quad 0:1 \qquad (II.5)$$

Recently determ ined values for the penetration depth in  $La_{1:8}Sr_{0:2}CuO_4$  [31] are  $_{k} = 150 \text{ nm}$  and  $_{?} = 1500 \text{ nm}$ . O lderm easurem ents indicate a higher anisotropy, up to a factor 14 [32]. W e can thus reasonnably consider that the model can be applied in our case. Taking  $H_m = 0.3G$ , we obtain  $s_c = 7:4$  $1^{\circ}$  cm  $^2$  . With s<sub>c</sub> b this leads to a mean diameter b = 1.5 m for the crystallites. Above  ${\tt H}_{\,\rm m}$  , the system acts as an ensemble of crystallites whose average susceptibility is (=3)(1=4). W ith the density ratio f = 0.8, taking = 1 and supposing spherical crystallites we obtain from Eq. (II2) $4 \frac{M}{H} = 0.31$  which is above the experimental value (the latter being about 0:25). Nevertheless, it must be noted that we have neglected here the elect of the factor and used a rather unrealistic spherical approximation for the shape of crystallites. Finally, it has been seen that above 5G, the F C.m agnetization starts to decrease once m ore with increasing eld although H <sub>c1</sub> is larger than 100G in  $La_{1:8}Sr_{0:2}CuO_4$ . This can be due to intrinsic pinning inside the crystallites them selves when the applied eld is such that the ux in the cross section of one crystallite is larger than o.W ith a mean radius of 0:8 m for the crystallites, this crossover occurs at about 10G .

Now we turn to the discussion of the feature ii) mentioned above. At tem peratures below 25K, the Josephson currents becom e active. Their e ect is that, at 10 K , the shielding response of the system of grains amounts at about 53%, while the F C. susceptibility saturates at about 45%. This di erence is enough to be signi cant and can be interpreted as the result of pinning by the Josephson network. In fact, this pinning can be understood as a back shielding e ect of the Josephson currents against the decrease of local internal eld, due to the tem perature dependence of the grain's system permeability g. We have seen above that the response of the system consists of the two parts: (i) for an applied eld H, the internal eld due to the grains seen by the intergrain currents is  $H_i = {}_{q}H$ , and (ii) the intergrain currents system reacts to all variation of H i with a polarizability j and generates a magnetization  $M_j = H_i$ . Thus, when the tem perature is decreased by dT, the internal eld decreases by H d  $_q$ =dT and the Josephson network tends to screen this variation. Since the intergrain currents give no M eissner e ect, we consider their response as totally irreversible. Thus for a variation dT of the tem perature, in a eld H , the variation of induction is:

 $dB = (1 + 4 j) \frac{d_g}{dT} H dT$ 

On the other hand,  $B = (1 + 4_{FC})H$ . With  $g = 1 + 4_{g}$ , we nally obtain:

$$F_{C} = g + 4 \int_{T_{c}}^{Z_{T}} j \frac{d_{g}}{dT} dT = g + j^{C} :$$
 (II.6)

 $M_{j}^{FC} = \int_{j}^{FC} H$  is the magnetization produced by the Josephson currents due to variation of  $_{g}$  with decreasing temperature. As  $_{g}$  is known only in the lim it  $H_{dc}$  ! 0, Eq. (II.6) has been used to calculate  $_{FC}$  versus T in the lim it of low eld. In order to do it, we started from the values of  $_{g}$  (H ! 0) as derived above; for  $_{j}$ , we have used the values given in Fig.3 for the smallest eld  $H_{dc} = 0.06G$ . The result is plotted on Fig. 6. The agreem ent of calculated values with experimental data is rather satisfactory, although not perfect.

This discrepancy is emphasized if Eq. (II.6) is reversed in order to calculate  $_{\rm j}$  as a function of  $_{\rm g}$  and  $_{\rm FC}$ . The reason is that we have used here the sim plest linearm odel of back shielding. In fact, as we will see later, the response of the currents system is strongly non-linear, with the susceptibility  $_{\rm j}$  decreasing with increasing H , and thise ect becomes stronger as the temperature increases. The result is that the calculated e ciency of back shielding is underestimated, since the value of the experimental susceptibility is determined by applying nite increments H .

Figure 6:  $_{FC}$  calculated with Eq. (II.6) from the values of  $_{q}$  and  $_{j}(0)$  (see text).

#### II-B Sample B

Sam ple B was machined from one of the original cylinders, in form of a parallelepiped of dimensions approximately 3 3  $6 \text{ mm}^3$ . Its calculated volume is V 52:6m m<sup>3</sup> and its demagnetizing eld coe cient for a longitudinal eld is N 0:19. In a longitudinal eld, its calculated moment for perfect ux expulsion is given by M = 5:1 0:2 1°0 H cm<sup>3</sup>-G

M easurements of the initial magnetization at 10K are in fair agreement with this value. For H<sub>dc</sub> above 3G and up to 30G M = H reaches a stable level about  $3210^{3}$  cm<sup>3</sup> which corresponds to the response of the grains alone. With the density ratio of 88% for this sam – ple and using Eq. (II2) one nds f = 0:46, yielding = 0:19r, i.e. the sam e value as derived for sam ple A.

The shielding susceptibility was measured in this sam – ple by using a more sophisticated method, in order to reduce the e ect of non linearity. A fler cooling the sam – ple at the working temperature in the d.c. eld, the eld was increased by 5 successive steps H, and M was measured. At the lowest elds, H = 10 mG and (to keep a good signal/noise ratio)  $H = H_{\text{plc}}=50$  at the highest ones. Then, the value of M  $_{n} = {}_{n}$  H was extrapolated to H = 0 by least square t.

Like in the case of sam  $p \ge A$ , all curves at  $H_{dc}$  10G m erge at high temperatures to a common curve which corresponds to the ux expulsion by the grains. The main di erence with the sam  $p \ge A$  is that in the sam  $-p \ge B$  the onset of Josephson currents shielding occurs at higher temperatures. This is consistent with the fact that sam  $p \ge B$  is more dense, resulting in a better cou-

pling between grains; moreover, its size is larger, which also increases the total shielding magnetization. At low temperature, the magnetization curve at  $H_{\rm dc} = 20$  G reaches a level slightly above 60%, which corresponds to the low temperature level for the grains.

The shielding response of the Josephson currents is obtained with the procedure already used for the sam ple A. Here the dem agnetizing factor cannot be neglected 0:19). Two kind of quantities are to be consid-(N ered: (i) the responses g and of an equivalent sam ple without dem agnetizing eld (e.g. an in nitely long cylinder with the same cross-section for instance); here g is the response of the system of grains alone, without intergrain currents, and is the total response of the system of intragrain plus intergrain currents, and (ii), the measured responses <sup>-</sup> and <sup>-</sup> ; they correspond to the m easured m om ent for each case, norm alized to the m oment for total ux expulsion in the volume of the sample. The relation between both kinds of quantities is given by  $\frac{M}{H} = \frac{1}{1 N} = \frac{1}{1+4 N}$ . A relation of the same kind holds for  $_{\rm g}$  and  ${\rm \bar{_q}}$  . W ith the use of Eq. (II.4), we nally obtain:

$$j = \frac{--g}{(1 N^{-})^{-}g}$$
 (II.7)

where = 1+4 -,  $-_{g} = 1+4$   $-_{g}$ . Sim ilar to the case of the sam pleA, an approxim ate curve has been determ ined for  $-_{g}$  by interpolating between the small H<sub>dc</sub> curves at high tem peratures, and the curve at H<sub>dc</sub> = 20G at low tem peratures. Then the values of  $_{j}$  have been derived from Eq. (II.7) and plotted on Fig. 7. The set of curves is sim ilar to the set for sam ple A, except for the higher onset tem perature of the intergrains currents.

Figure 7: Josephson currents shielding susceptibility as derived from the data and use of Eq. (II.7).

Field Cooled magnetization data, normalized to the value of the moment for full ux expulsion, are reported in Fig. 8 as a function of elds up to 30 G.

Figure 8: F.C. (M eissner) susceptibility of sample B normalized to the moment for total ux expulsion, as a function of eld.

At the lowest eld and temperature, the F C.magnetization does not exceed 28% of its value for full ux expulsion. Furtherm ore, at low temperatures the curves versus eld present a second maximum at about 5G.W e expect that this complicated behavior is due to the back shielding e ect of the intergrain currents, as discussed for sample A.To take them into account, a relation sim ilar to Eq. (II.6) (but with the dem agnetizing e ect taken into account) should be derived. The internal eld is given as usual by  $H_i = H = 4 \text{ NM}$ , and the value of the local eld seen by the currents is  $H_1 = {}_g H_i$ . Thus, under a temperature variation dT,

$$\frac{dH_1}{dT} = \frac{d_g}{dT} (H - 4 NM) - 4 N_g \frac{dM}{dT}:$$

W ith dB =dT =  $_{j}$  dH  $_{1}$ =dT , and using the relation

$$M = \frac{-}{1} \frac{H}{N} = \frac{1}{4} \frac{T}{T_{c}} \frac{d(B + H_{i})}{dT} dT$$

one obtains after integration:

$$\frac{1}{F_{C}} = \frac{1}{4} \frac{N}{N} (1 \exp(4 N I)); \qquad I = \frac{1}{T_{c}} \frac{j}{1 + \frac{1}{N} (1 - g)}$$
(II.8)

Here j = 1 + 4 j, with j reported on Fig.7, whereas the value of g was obtained using the relation  $g = (1 \ N \ \Gamma_g = (1 \ N^-g))$  from the value of  $\overline{g}$  as derived above. The values of  $_{FC}$  for H ! 0 have been calculated using the values of  $_{g}$  as determ ined above, and the values of  $_{j}$  at H  $_{dc} = 0$ . The calculated value of  $_{FC}$  was found to be about 0:35 at T = 10K, whereas its measured value was about 0:28. The discrepancy between m easured and calculated values is larger here than in corresponding results for sam ple A.W e believe that the origin of this discrepancy is the same as in the case of sam ple A, i.e. it stems from the nonlinear response effect. This e ect is num erically larger in sam ple B since here the onset of Josephson currents occurs in a range oftem perature where  $_{g}$  still varies strongly, contrary to the case of sam ple A.

The above analysis show s (irrespectively to the abovementioned discrepancy) that the back shielding e ect leads to a strong reduction of the eld cooled susceptibility as compared with the susceptibility of the grains alone. It is then easy to understand the complex behavior of  $_{\rm FC}$  as a function of eld: at 10K for instance, the onset of back shielding occurs at about 20G, and its amplitude increases with decreasing eld due to the increase of  $_{\rm j}$ . Starting from the two-step behavior of  $_{\rm g}$  expected from the theory of W ohllebeen et al. [29] (and seen in the data of sam ple A, where back shielding is less important), back shielding results on the double maximum shape of the measured curves.

## III Detailed Study of the Josephson Network Response.

#### III-A Determ ination of the global critical current.

In this subsection we will present the procedure we used to extract the value of the m acroscopic critical current in our sam ple B.This procedure is not quite trivial since we are interested in the dependence of the critical current on the background d.c. eld in the sam ple, so we need to analyse the magnetization curves which depend both on the cooling eld H  $_{\rm dx:}$  and on the eld variation H.

M agnetization has been recorded at 10 and 20K as a function of increasing H with the smallest possible eld steps (H = 10mG), and starting from several F  $\mathcal{L}$ . states. From the M data, it is possible to derive the value of the current response M  $_{\rm j}$  as a function of H. For this, we use Eq. (II.7) which can be written as :

$$M_{j} = \frac{M_{j}}{(1 N_{j})^{-}g} :$$
(III.9)

where M  $_{\rm g}$  is the magnetization of the grains alone; and  $_{\rm q}$  are de ned in Section II-B. The value of the grains system response is approximately derived in the same section: M  $_{\rm g}$  3210<sup>3</sup> H cm<sup>3</sup> G at 10K and M  $_{\rm g}$  2:910<sup>3</sup> H cm<sup>3</sup> G at 20K. Calculated values of M  $_{\rm j}$  at 10K are plotted in Fig. 9. Note the analogy of these results to the magnetization curves of classical type II superconductors with strong pinning (the di erence is that here H plays the role of H).

Figure 9: Shielding m om ent of the Josephson currents after cooling the sample at 10K in a d.c. eld in the range 0 10G.

A fter cooling the sam ple at zero d.c. eld, its response is obviously symmetric with respect to H. When it is cooled in a nite d.c. eld, it is not the case anymore, as was explained in the previous section. The magnetic moment of the sample just after cooling is  $M_{FC} = M_{g} + M_{j}^{FC}$  where  $M_{j}^{FC}$  is the positive mom ent due to the back shielding by the Josephson currents which have been developed during the cooling process (see Eq. (II.4 and II.7)). So, the totalm om ent produced by the intergrain currents after increasing the eld by H is  $M_j = M_j^{FC} + M_j$ . It is this moment which vanishes when  $J_c$  ! 0 (at large enough H), and thus M  $_{j}$  approaches  $\,$  M  $_{j}^{\rm F\,C}$  . In Fig.10 we show the data recorded at T = 10 K and  $H_{dc}$  = 2G. Curves recorded at positive and negative H both converge to the value corresponding to  $M_{j}^{FC}$ : at 10K,  $M_{j}^{FC}$  is about 1:110<sup>3</sup>emu.

When  $H > H_{dc}$ , it is natural to expect that the response of the Josephson network does not depend on the initial state. A simple illustration can be given by analogy with Bean-like pinning in type II superconductors [19]. At large H, when the induction pro le has penetrated up to the center of the sample, the m agnetization no longer depends on H but only on  $J_c$ . If, as it

Figure 10: Shielding m om ent of the Josephson currents after cooling the sample at 10K in a d.c. eld H  $_{dc}$  = 2G. D ata are for positive and negative eld steps.

is the case in realm aterials, J<sub>c</sub> varies with the induction in the sample, the magnetization depends on the total H , whatever the value of H  $_{\rm dc}$  in which the sample was cooled. A ctually, when plotted as a function of the total eld H  $_{\rm dc}$  +  $\,$  H , the curves giving the total m om ent of network currents  $M_{i}^{FC} + M_{i}$  m erge in their "large" eld part (i.e. above their maximum). The values have been calculated, with  $M_{i}^{FC} = 1:110^{3}$  em u and  $0.710^{-3}$  em u for H<sub>dc</sub> = 2G and 4G respectively. In order to obtain an optim al overlap between the curves, the following values have been used for M  $_{\rm q}$ : 3:2510  $^3$ H cm<sup>3</sup> G at  $H_{dc} = 0$ G, 3:2210<sup>3</sup> H cm<sup>3</sup> G at  $H_{dc} = 2G$  and 4G. Indeed, the calculated values for M i at large H are extremely sensitive to those for M  $_{\rm q}$  . This allows us to re ne the determ ination of M  $_{\rm q}$  . Note that the values quoted above do not di er by m ore than 1%, which is com patible with experim ental accuracy and the possible variations of grains response with H<sub>dc</sub>.

Finally, from the knowledge of the true Josephson shielding response, in large" elds we can now derive a rough evaluation of the critical current. Namely, above the maximum of M  $_{\rm j}$ , we calculate the value  $J_{\rm c}$  of the average critical current which would give the value of the measured moment by use of the Bean formula [19] in a cylindrical geometry. For strong penetration, the magnetization is given in emu. by M =  $J_{\rm c}^{\rm c}R$ =3. W ith R = 0:15 cm and the values of the moment measured at 10K and 20K with H<sub>dc</sub> = 0G, we obtain the data displayed in Fig. 11. Note that the data are limited to elds such that H = 4  $J_{\rm c}^{\rm c}R$  below which the above

Figure 11: Calculated values of the averaged critical current  $J_c$  as a function of total eld for strong eld penetration. The big square corresponds to the initial  $J_c$  as determined in III-B

#### III-B Low Field d.c. Response.

We can now concentrate on the behavior of the Josephson currents m om ent at sm all H. For this discussion, the currents susceptibility M  $_{j}$ = H is plotted versus H at 10K and 20K in Fig. 12 and 13, respectively.

At 10K , after zero eld cooling or cooling in a small eld H<sub>dc</sub> = 0:1G, the response varies linearly with H for small values of H up to about 0:5G. This linear slope of M<sub>j</sub>= H is considered as the result of classical Bean-like pinning with critical current density  $J_c = H = 4 R$ , where 1=4 H is the initial slope of the curve [19]. This initial slope is reported on the gure as the short dashed line which corresponds to H = 2G, leading to  $J_c$  3:7A=cm<sup>2</sup>.

At larger H , the behaviour of currents susceptibility M  $_{j}$ = H deviates from linear, which is the result of both the magnetic-eld dependence of the critical current J<sub>c</sub>, an intrinsic e ect, and of the increasing degree of ux penetration into the sample, a purely size-dependent e ect. U sually one uses the Bean m odel (generally with some B-dependent critical current) in an appropriate geometry in order to deconvolute these two e ects. However, one should keep in mind that the Bean m odel is a severe sim plication of the problem of constant pinning force, corresponding to the lim it

! 0 (i.e. the London penetration depth is supposed to be negligible with respect to the Bean penetration

Figure 12: Josephson currents susceptibility at 10 K vs. applied variation H of eld, after cooling in d.c. eld H  $_{\rm dc}$ . The meaning of dashed and dot dashed lines is explained in the text.

Figure 13: Josephson currents susceptibility at 20 K vs. applied variation H of eld, after cooling in d.c. eld H  $_{\rm dc}$ .

length). For the simplest sample shapes (thin slab or cylinder) it means that the condition R should be ful lled, which is usually the case. However the situation is more complicated for samples of square crosssection (like our one), where the e ect of corners may become important even at R. For such a geom etry, the use of Bean model leads to exactly the same relation between critical current, external eld and m easured m agnetization as for the cylindrical ones, w hereas one expects some di erence if nite- corrections are taken into account. At the present stage, we are not able to evaluate these corrections and therefore the values of the magnetization corresponding to our experimental geom etry with non negligible . Nevertheless, we expect that it lies between the curves for two extreme lim its. The upper one corresponds to the ! 0 lim it, where the magnetization is given simply by the Bean's form ula for the cylinder: 4 M = H = 1 + H = H $H^2 = 3H^2$ for H < H and 4 M = H = H = 3H for H > H. A lower limit (thought rather articial) consists of the "double slab" case in which the variation of magnetization is counted twice (once for each pair of edges): 4 M = H = 1 + H = H for H < H = 2 and 4 M = H = 1 + H = 1H = 4H for H > H = 2. Both curves are plotted in the Fig. 12 (dot dashed and long dashed curves respectively) for  $J_c = 3:7A = cm^2$  and  $M_i = H = 5:0510^3 cm^3$  at н! О.

Let us now discuss the data starting from those obtained for low d.c. elds, H<sub>d.c.</sub> = 0;0:1 G. One can see that, after the initial linear part, the absolute value of the measured susceptibility is always smaller than the calculated ones. This corresponds to the decrease of  $J_c$ with increasing induction, as it is classically expected in granular materials, due to the suppression of intergrain critical currents by magnetic eld penetration into the Josephson junctions[9]. This \classical" behavior for granular superconductors is usually analyzed by considering the volum e-averaged Josephson medium as a kind of type II superconductor in the dirty lim it, provided its m acroscopic penetration depth  $_J$  is large as com pared with the grains size [11, 35].

At  $H_{dc}$  2G the behavior of  $M_j = H$  is quite different: there is no initial linear slope, but a monotonic curvature is present down to the smallest H. It is no longer possible to adjust a Bean like curve to the data. For instance, the Bean curve plotted on the lowest H data for  $H_{dc} = 2G$  is reported on the Fig. 12 as a dashed line. It corresponds to a very small critical current of order  $0.2A = cm^2$ , and it is evident that the e ective screening current becomes much larger with increasing H. Here, contrary to the case of  $H_{dc} = 0G$ , the absolute value of the measured susceptibility is always

larger than the calculated one for a constant shielding current corresponding to the lim it H ! 0. This means that, whereas at  $H_{dc} = 0$  the elective screening current density stays constant and then slow ly decreases with increasing H (which corresponds to classical Josephson pinning), at H<sub>dc</sub> 2G it increases with H sublinearly (since a linear increase would correspond to a susceptibility independent of H). Such behaviour is quite unusual within the commonly accepted picture of screening in superconductors; indeed, we know that, for vanishing eld excitations, the screening current m ay be either i) linear in H and reversible, as in the London (or C am pbell [20]) shielding regime, or ii) constant (equal to the initial critical current  $J_c$ ) and irreversible as in the case of the Bean-type critical state (or of any other known critical model, e.g.K im model [33], exponentialmodel [34], etc).

The above anomalous screening behaviour is even more pronounced at 20K where, even after zero eld cooling, no initial linear slope of M  $_{i}$  = H can be seen in the data. All curves show the same anom alous behavior as the data at 10K in elds from 2G. This speci c behavior is emphasized by plotting the di erence between the measured susceptibility M  $_{j}$ = H and its value for total ux expulsion M  $_{i}(0) = H$ , versus H on a Log{Log scale. In such a plot, at least in the regime of weak penetration, i.e. where  $M_{i} = H$  is larger than  $0.8 \text{ M}_{1}(0) = H$  , sublinear variation of the shielding current density results in a logarithm ic slope smaller than 1 for the curves of M  $_{j}$ = H (for M  $_{j}$ = H smaller than 0:8 M  $_{i}(0)$  = H , we are in a regime of strong penetration where it is no longer possible to relate simply the variations of the moment response to those of the shielding current). In Fig. 14, we have reported the three curves for which data are found in the range above 0:8 M  $_{i}(0)$  = H , i.e. at T = 10K ;H  $_{dc}$  = 0G and 2G , and T = 20K  $H_{dc}$  = 0G.

At 10K and H  $_{\rm dc}$  = 0G, the logarithm ic slope is about 1 as expected, although at the sm allest elds the curve crosses over to a sm aller logarithm ic slope closer to 0.5. At 20K and H  $_{\rm dc}$  = 0G the logarithm ic slope is about 0.4 at the lowest H . Approximately the same value of the slope characterizes the data obtained at 10K and H  $_{\rm dc}$  = 2G, although the dispersion of data points at lowest H makes its accurate determination di cult.

The above anom alous behaviour makes it tempting to try a simple Ansatz for the behavior of the response current density of the system versus induction variations. Let us suppose that J / B with between 0 and 1. The case with = 1 corresponds simply to classical screening with penetration length (since J / B); the case with = 0 corresponds to constant J, i.e. the classical Bean case. A nom alous response arises for non Figure 14: D i erence between the measured susceptibility and its value for perfect shielding for selected data at 10K and 20K. The short dashed line represents a logarithm ic slope 1 expected for a Bean critical state.

integer . For very small excitation H, the length of induction penetration is small as compared with the size of the sample and we need to consider the e ect of the excitation in the lowest order in B only. For the purpose of illustration we consider the simplest slab geometry. Then the induction prole is determined by the M axwell equation

$$\frac{dB}{dx} = 4 J_{1} \frac{B}{B_{1}}$$
(III.10)

where x is the coordinate perpendicular to the edge of the sample. For an external eld H , the induction in the sample is given by

$$B(x) = \frac{(1 ) 4 J}{B_{1}} (x_{H} x)^{1=(1)}$$
(III.11)

where  $x_H$  is the coordinate of penetration and  $J_1$  and  $B_1$  are normalizing factors; for x = 0, B = H, i.e.  $x_H = B_1 = (4 \ J_1 (1 \ ))$   $H^1$ . Then, integrating the eld pro le (III.11) over x, we get

$$\frac{4 \text{ M} + \text{H}}{\text{H}} / \text{H}^{1} ; \qquad (\text{III.12})$$

where M = M = V is the mean magnetization variation due to the eld variation H .

If we now compare the result (III.12) with the data shown in Fig.14, we nd values of in the range 0:4 0:5 at both 10K and 20K.

Thus a simple choice for the relation between the screening current  $J_c$  and the induction variation B allows us to in itate the experimental results for the simplest protocolofa weak monotonic H variation on top of a hom ogeneous state of the network. Nevertheless, it is evident that B has no clear meaning if the variation of H is non-monotonic or if the initial state is obtained by non-zero eld cooling. Indeed, in the later case, induction in the sample varies during cooling due to the variation of  $_g$  with T, giving the response M  $_j^{F,C}$  as seen before. Furthermore, we will see below that the response is inteversible even for extrem ely low exitation elds.

#### 

Problems of sensitivity limit the range of small excitations which can be used in d.c. experiments. The preceding results clearly show the sublinear nature of the low eld response, but they do not allow its precise determ ination. In order to extend by several orders of m agnitude the range of our lower excitations investigation, we have been led to perform a.c. susceptibility measurements. The use of a.c. response measurements is always questionnable when equilibrium (or quasi-equilibrium) properties are under investigation, since the results can be a ected by the time-dependent part of the response function. It has been shown that the latter is the response of a very good conductor with complex conductivity [36, 37]. Hence, it is necessary to work at low frequency, in a range where the susceptibility is roughly frequency independent.

We present here prelim inary results obtained on a long cylinder obtained by stacking several of the original sam ple B cylinders. M easurem ents were done at 20K, at a working frequency of 1:7 H z in the equipment used for noise experiments [37]. The sample was simply shifted into the upper half of the third order gradiom eter. At this tem perature and frequency, we have veri ed that the in-phase susceptibility is alm ost frequency independent, which ensures that the results are mainly dependent on the (quasi) static part of the response. The susceptibility was recorded using classical method of SQUID magnetometry. We used a.c. excitation elds in the range 310<sup>2</sup> {30m G and the sample was cooled in d.c. elds from 0 to 8:8G. From the data, the values of the Josephson network susceptibility was extacted using the m ethod developed in Section II, with the susceptibilities in Eq. (II.7) being com plex quantities. The susceptibility measured at 42K at the lowest a.c. amplitude was taken as the level for perfect diam agnetism . Fig. 15 displays a log-log plot of the out-of-phase susceptibility  $\int_{j}^{00}$  versus the am plitude of the a.c. eld, and for several values of the F.C. static eld. The response is interversible down to the low est a c am plitudes, and the interversibility increases with the superimposed d.c. eld. All curves

Figure 15: Out-of-phase susceptibility at 1:7H z as a function of a.c. eld am plitude.

Figure 16: In-phase susceptibility at 1:7 H z as a function of the power of a.c. eld am plitude H  $_{\rm ac}^{0:5}$ .

follow a power law , with the same exponent close to 0.5. Going towards the smallest a.c. excitations, they show some downward bend which could be related with the approach to a linear regime (with  $_{j}^{0} = 0$ ) below 0.1 m G , although the dispersion of the data is too high to conclude. The in-phase susceptibility  $_{j}^{0}$  is plotted as a function of H  $_{ac}^{0.5}$  in Fig. 16. Here as well, the anom a-

Figure 17: P lot of 4  $_{j}^{0}$  as a function of 1 + 4  $_{j}^{0}$  for the di erent values of H  $_{dc}$ .

lous nature of the response is clearly seen. 4  $\frac{0}{1}$  behaves like  $(1 + H_{ac}^{0.5})$  where both the constant and the slope increase with increasing superim posed static eld H<sub>dc</sub>. The dependence of the harm onic susceptibility on the a.c. eld am plitude is a genuine proof of the existence of static irreversibility in the response. This is not astonishing by itself, but these results stress the anom alous aspect of this irreversibility. For instance, in the classicalBean case with a weak penetration, it is known that 1+4 <sup>0</sup><sub>j</sub> and <sup>00</sup><sub>j</sub> are proportional to H<sub>ac</sub> whereas Fig. 15 and 16 clearly show the proportionality to H  $_{\rm ac}^{0.5}$  . A further evidence is provided by plotting  $\int_{j}^{0}$  versus 1 + 4  $\int_{j}^{0}$ as displayed in gure 17. It can be shown that if the a.c. response is driven only by static irreversibility, both are proportional. In the Bean case, the coe cient of proportionality is 4=3 . In the gure 17, the part of data which lie in the range of 20% variation of  $\frac{0}{1}$  (where the relations for slab geometry are approximately valid) show that  $\frac{00}{1}$  is indeed proportional to  $1 + 4 = \frac{0}{1}$ , but with a bitsmaller coe cient 0:28 0:03.

In order to understand the meaning of the above results, we generalize the crude ad hoc model of Section III-B to the irreversible case. In order to do it, we generalize the protocol of the Bean model. Namely, in the Bean model, the current is given by a step function of the variation of induction,  $J = J_c \text{sgn}(B)$  according to the sign of B, as long as the induction variation is monotonous. If the sign of variation of B is reversed, J also changes sign, which can be written in terms of the variation of the current density (with respect to the initial current distribution obtained after monotonous variation of the eld,  $J_{\text{init}}$ ,  $J = 2J_{\text{init}}$  (B new) where (x) = (1=2)(1 + sgn(x)) and  $B_{new} = B_{init}$ . Such a representation (which is not needed in the analysis of the Bean m odel itself) will allow us to construct the necessary generalization of the relation between current and variation of the eld used in Eq.( III.10). Actually our goal here is rather lim ited: we are going to nd a consistent description of the simplest hysteresis cycle which consists of the initial increase of B from zero to B in it, then reversing the sign of the eld variation until the value of B =B in it is reached, and then reversing dB = dt once m ore and nishing at B final = B in it. The description of this cycle will be consistent if we nd that the value of the current density at the end-point, J<sub>final</sub>, coincides with the one after the original increase of the eld B  $_{in\,it}$ ,  $J_{in\,it}$ . This simply means that the hysteresis loop is closed. It is easy to check that the above condition will be ful led by the following choice of the J(B<sub>new</sub>) dependence:

$$J = sgn (J_{init})2^{1} J_{1} \frac{B_{new}}{B_{1}} (B_{new}):$$
(III.13)

where  $J_1$  and  $B_1$  have the same meaning as in Eq.(III.10). Actually the only difference between the Eq. (III.13) and the original used in the Eq.(III.10) is the coefficient  $2^1$ . The Bean model limit then corresponds to ! 0, so the above coefficient approaches 2 as it should. Then instead of Eq. (III.10) we obtain:

$$d B = dx = 2^1 A B$$
(III.14)

where  $A = 4 J_1 = B_1$ . The induction pro le, induced magnetization and harm onic response are calculated in the Appendix. The main conclusions are that the fundam ental com ponents 1 + 4  $\frac{0}{1}$  and  $\frac{00}{1}$  are both proportional to  $h_0^{1}$  , and that their ratio  $R = \frac{0}{1} = (1 + 4)$ 0 i) decreases from 4=3 to 0 when goes from 0 to 1. For = 0.5, we get (cf. Fig. 21) R 0:25, a value which is in good agreement with the data presented on Fig. 17. Note that the degree of irreversibility (measured by this ratio) is similar (although a bit lower) to the one of the Bean model. It should be emphasized that the num erical coe cient in Eq. (III.13) was  $\$  tted" in order to obtain consistent (i.e. closed) hysteresis loop; one can expect that an analogous equation describing current variation after som e m ore com plicated history of the eld variations will contain another (history-dependent) num erical coe cient instead of 2<sup>1</sup>

It can be seen from Figs. 15 and 16 that A =  $4 J_1 = B_1$  increases with increasing ambient d.c. eld. It is natural to expect a decrease of  $J_1$  with increasing H<sub>dc</sub>. The increase of A with H<sub>dc</sub> means that B<sub>1</sub> decreases more quickly than  $J_1$  when H<sub>dc</sub> increases. The presence and behavior of the constant cannot be predicted on the basis of the above simple model. In fact, the latter neglects the possibility of elastic displacem ent of ux lines under the action of the external applied eld. Such an e ect would result in a response analogous to the Campbell response due to the elastic displacement of vortices in their pinning potential in type II superconductors [20]. Campbell's response is linear, so it would result in an a.c. eld independent positive contribution to <sup>0</sup>, whose amplitude would be inversely proportional to the strength of the restoring force of the pinning potential wells. It is natural to expect that the pinning force decreases with increasing am bient d.c. eld in our granular system, due to the reduction of the junctions critical currents. Hence, such an e ect would give a positive contribution to <sup>0</sup>, which would increase with increasing d.c. eld. This corresponds rather well to the behavior of the oset seen in the data.

## IV C om parison w ith an existing theory of gauge glass: frustration at H = 0

In this Section we compare the experim ental results described above with the theoretical results available for the random ly frustrated Josephson networks. W e start from a simple estimate for the mean energy  $E_J = hI_c=2e$ using the experimental value of the low-temperature,  $Z F \mathcal{L}$ . (T = 10K; H<sub>dc</sub> = 0) critical current density 3:7A =  $cm^2$ . Using the estimate  $a_0$ 5 m for J<sub>c</sub> the mean size of the grains, one could naively obtain Ja₁ 1 A and the corresponding low-tem perature I<sub>C</sub> Josephson energy E \_\_\_ 20K (this value was derived from  $J_c$  measured at T = 10K , but we do not expect much di erence in the intrinsic Josephson energies at T = 10K and at T ! 0 since the bulk transition tem perature in La<sub>1:8</sub>Sr<sub>0:2</sub>CuO<sub>4</sub> is T<sub>c</sub> 32K). However such an estimate is in contradiction with the measured value of the glass transition tem perature T<sub>q</sub> 29K . Indeed, let us assume that the mean coordination number (number of \interacting neighbours") Z in the ceram ics is around 6, as for a simple cubic lattice. Then for the estim ate of the relation between E  $_{\rm J}$  and T  $_{\rm g}$  one can use the simulation data [6, 7] which give  $T_g = 0.5E_J (T_g) =$  $0.5E_{J_{0}}$  (1 <sub>g</sub>FT<sub>c</sub>), where we took into account the linear dependence of  $E_J$  on  $T_c$  T close to the bulk transition tem perature. As a result, one gets

$$\frac{E_{J_{o}}}{k_{B}} = \frac{2T_{g}}{1 - T_{g} = T_{c}}$$
 600K (IV 15)

i.e. a factor 30 larger than the naive estimate above. However we will show now that this discrepancy may be resolved if we assume that the current network producing the measured critical current density  $J_c$  was actually strongly frustrated in spite of the absence of background d.c. eld in this measurement.

The macroscopic critical current density  $J_c$  for a strongly frustrated Josephson network was calculated in Ref. [5] within the mean-eld approach (we are not aware of any calculations of this kind beyond the scope of the mean-eld theory). It was shown that frustration strongly reduces  $J_{\rm c}$  as compared to its value  $J_0$  for an unfrustrated system,  $J_c=J_0 = \frac{3^{\frac{p}{3}}\overline{3}}{8} (1 T = T_g)^{5=2}$ , where the factor 0:065 was obtained by num erical solution of the slow cooling equations [3, 38, 39] describing the evolution of the glassy state under slow variations of tem perature and m agnetic eld. In the low-tem perature lim it, this relation amounts to a factor 25 reduction of the  $J_c$  value with respect to  $J_0$ . Correspondingly, the characteristic value of the critical current for an individ-25.Ja^2 ual junction will be obtained as  $I_c$ 25 A and results in a Josephson coupling energy E J. 500K , in a fairly good agreem ent with the above estim ate (IV .15).

The above estim ates show that the network of Josephson junctions in La1:8 Sr0:2 C uO 4 is frustrated even in the absence of an external magnetic eld. A careful reader could question this conclusion since we have used some results from the mean-eld theory which may be a poor approximation for a 3D gauge-glass. We believe, however that the qualitative result of the above estim ates is su ciently robust because a strong reduction of J c with respect to J<sub>0</sub> should be a general feature of a glassy network, so that unaccuracy due to mean-eld approxim ation cannot com pensate for a huge discrepancy obtained between  $E_{T}^{naive}$  and the estimate (IV 15). Additional evidence in favor of the glassy nature of our system is provided by the similarity of the low - H diam agnetic response at T = 20K with zero as well as non-zero H  $_{dc}$ , as described in Section III above, as well as the low frequency noise data obtained in Ref. [36] on the same type of ceram ics.

W hat could be the origin of that fustration? We believe that most probably it is the result of the d-wave nature of superconductivity in cuprates [15] and random – ness of the crystalline orientations in ceram ics [13, 14]. It was shown there that the form of the elective phasedependent H am iltonian for such ceram ics is of the same form as in (I.1) except for the fact that the random phases  $i_{j}$  at B = 0 are just 0 or depending on the mutual orientation of grains i and j. Therefore such a system at B = 0 is equivalent to the X Y spin glass, with the low-tem perature state characterized by a completely random orientation of phases  $_{i}$ , as in the gauge-glass model with uniform ly random distribution of  $_{ij}$ 's.

Therefore the low-temperature state is characterized by the presence of random ly distributed intergrain currents and, therefore, of the magnetic eld generated by these currents. It means that the actual phases  $_{ij}$  will contain contributions due to the self-induced magnetic eld. Its relative in portance is characterized by the ratio of the corresponding magnetic ux penetrating elem entary loops of the ceramics  $_{sf}$  to the ux quantum  $_{0}$ , i.e. just by the parameter  $_{L} = 2 \text{ LI}_c = c_{0}$  where L is the characteristic inductance of an elementary loop [9]. Estimating the elementary inductance as L  $_{2}$  ag  $_{g}$ and using Eq.(IV 15) to estimate I<sub>c</sub>, we obtain

$${}_{\rm L} \quad \frac{4^{2} {a_{0}}_{\rm g} {\rm I}_{\rm c}}{{\rm c}_{0}} = \frac{8^{3}_{\rm g} {a_{0}} {\rm E}_{\rm J}}{\frac{2}{0}} \quad 0.1 \qquad ({\rm IV}.16)$$

so the self-eld (screening) e ects are relatively weak, though perhaps not always negligible.

It is also of interest to estim ate the e ective penetration depth cer of a very weak magnetic eld perturbation H into the ceramics. Roughly, the value of cer can be estimated as  $a_0 = \frac{P_{L}}{L}$  15 m. Another (hopefully m ore accurate) estimate can be obtained using m eaneld results [5] which allow one to express cer via the

critical current density J<sub>c</sub>:

cer = 
$$\frac{C_0}{3^2 J_{c0q}}$$
 <sup>1=2</sup> 25 m (IV 17)

where we inserted (as compared with Ref. [5])  $_{\rm g}$  0:35 and approximated the random nearest-neighbour network by a cubic lattice with coordination number Z = 6, which amounts to the relation  $_0^2 = a_0^2 = 6$  between the e ective interaction range  $_0$  and the intergrain distance  $a_0$ .

The characteristic magnetic eld variation producing the critical current density  $J_c$  at the boundary can be estimated as H  $_c$  4  $_{cer}J_c=c$  15m G, whereas the num erical solution [5] gives

$$H_{c} = \frac{1}{2c} 4_{cer} J_{c}$$
 30m G (IV .18)

W ithin the theoretical approach of Ref. [5], H  $_{\rm c}$  m arks a crossover between reversible (although still non-linear at H  $_{\rm c}$ ) and irreversible penetration of the magnetic eld into the intergrain network. The value of H  $_{\rm c}$  obtained in Eq.(IV 18) is on the lower border of the range of the eld variations used to measure our d c. magnetization curves, so we could just conclude that we always have H H  $_{\rm c}$  and thus are producing the Bean-like critical state. Indeed, the data at H  $_{\rm dc} = 0$ ,

T = 10K look compatible with such an interpretation (cf. Fig.(14), where some deviations from the logarithmic slope 1 (which is the characteristic of a Bean state) are seen at lowest H 50m G).

However, as far as the data obtained at 10K with d.c. elds H dc ' 2G, or all data at higher tem perature (T = 20K), including d.c. and a.c. results at zero-H  $_{dc}$ , are concerned (cf. Figs.(12-16)), the low - eld m agnetization response is drastically di erent from Bean-type predictions, as explained at the end of Section III. Qualitatively, the most surprising feature of these data is the existence of a very broad range of H within which the response is non-linear but still not like the critical-state one. We are not aware of any microscopic theory which predicts fractional-power behaviour of the shielding susceptibility over such a broad range of H variations. It cannot be excluded a priori that such a behaviour is related to a very wide range of intergrain critical currents, which might exist in ceram ics (till now we have neglected inhom ogenity of intergrain coupling strengths in our theoretical discussion). M oreover, we may expect that the relative in portance of such inhom ogenities increases with the eld and/or tem perature (cf. R ef. [40])

In Section V, we will try to form ulate a new phenom enological model appropriate for the understanding of our data (leaving its theoretical justi cation for a future study); thism odelwill be seen to be an interpolation between C am pbell's and B ean's regimes of ux penetration into hard superconductors.

## V Fractal m odel of diam agnetic response

W e showed at the end of Section III-C that a simple generalization, Eq.(III.14), of B ean's relation between variation of the applied magnetic induction B and current J results in reasonably good agreement with our data. However, contrary to the original B ean relation, the new one was not based on any physical picture; it was just a convenient description of the data. In this Section we propose a phenom enological model which provides a qualitative understanding of the irreversible diam agnetic behaviour m in icked by Eq.(III.14).

We start from the picture of non-linear response of the current J to a variation of the vector potential A derived in Ref. [5] within the mean-eld approximation and presented in Fig. 2 of that paper. Here the current induced by a variation of A is linear at very small A, then grows sublinearly, and nally reaches its maximum value  $J_c$  at the critical  $A_c$  such that the di erential response (dJ=dA)  $_{A_c}$  ! 0.At A >  $A_c$  the num erical in-

stability of the slow cooling equations was detected and interpreted as an indication of the absence of any solution which would interpolate smoothly between zero and large (i.e.  $A_{\rm c}$ ) values of A. In other term s, some kind of \phase slip" was expected to happen in the model [5], leading to a new metastable state, which would have lower (free) energy at the new value of the vector potential  $A^0 = A + A$  (in other terms, a state similar to the one obtained by the F  $\mathcal L$  . procedure at constant A<sup>0</sup>, which does not carry m acroscopic current). Further increase of  $A^0 = A$   $A^0$  again induces a m acroscopic current until it reaches the maximum value  $J_c$  at  $A^0 = A_c$ , and so on. Thus the whole J (A) dependence emerging from the mean-eld solution [5] is periodic; it leads im m ediately to the irreversibility of the response, since the inverse function A(J) is multivalued: di erent vector potential values m ay correspond to the sam e value of current. Of course, such a periodic J ( A ) dependence does not correspond to the usual C am pbell -Bean picture, which would better be represented by

$$J_{C:B:}(A) = J(A) (A A) + J(A A)$$
(V.19)

It is important to note that the J(A) dependence Ref. [5] was obtained from the space-independent solution for the glassy correlation function  $Q_{ij}(t;t^0) = <$  $(t^0)$  >; such an approximation, being  $\cos(i(t))$ reasonable for the description of smooth \adiabatic" transformations in a system with long-range interactions, will probably break down when the jump from one m etastable state to another happens. In other term s, the above-m entioned \phase slip" should have som ething to do with spatially inhom ogeneous processes like vortex penetration in hard type-II superconductors. The problem of the solution of the general history- and spacedependent system of integral equations (which may be derived following the method of Ref. [5]) is form idable and the m ethod to solve it is still unknown. Therefore we can only speculate on possible properties of its solution. The simplest idea would be that the macroscopic J(A)response becom es (after averaging over inhom ogenities of the space-dependent solution) sim ilar to the C am pbell-Bean type of the response (V.19). Indeed, our analysis of the low - eld diam agnetic response at T = 10K and  $H_{ext} = 0$  (Section III-B) developed in Section IV on the basis of such an assumption, is in reasonable agreem ent with the data. However other sets of data (for higher tem perature and/or lower eld) are described by com pletely di erent Ansatz (III.13). W e will now propose a (phenom enological) generalization of the J ( A ) relation com patible with Eq.(III.13). The relation we are looking for should be an intrinsic (i.e. independent on the sam ple geom etry) and general (i.e. usable for an arbitrary m agnetic history of the sam ple) relation between the current and variation of the vector potential. Remember that Eq. (III.13) was written for the sim plest nonmonotonic variation of B, and that it relates the true vector J and the pseudovector B. So, in writing this equation, som e additional information on the geometry of the sam – ple has been used (we use the sim plest slab geometry). Thus a natural basic equation should relate the current density J and the variation of the vector potential A.

In a generalized model, the diamagnetic current response should possess two major properties: i) it must scale as some fractional power 0.5 with

i) it must scale as some fractional power 0:5 with the amplitude of exitation eld B, and

ii) it must be strongly irreversible (as it follows from the analysis of the ratio 4  $^{00}=(1 \ 4 \ ^{0}) \ 0.28$ ). We consider these two conditions in sequence.

The condition i) is rather easy to full: it is enough to suppose that the di erential response of the current to the variation of the vector potential A is given by a non-linear generalization of the London relation

$$\frac{\mathrm{dJ}}{\mathrm{dA}} = \frac{\mathrm{C}}{4} \, \mathop{}_{\mathrm{eff}}^{2} (\mathrm{J}) \qquad (V 20)$$

where the current-dependent \e ective penetration depth" is given by

$$_{eff} = _{1}jJ = J_{1}j$$
: (V 21)

In the case of a monotonic eld variation applied to an initially uniform induction distribution, the Eqs.(V 20, V 21) lead to the simple relation J / B with =  $(1 + )^{1}$ . Indeed, with dA = B dx and approximating d B=dx by B =  $_{eff}$ , one obtains J / B  $\frac{1}{1+}$ . Thus we need to choose 1 in order to reproduce the observed scaling with 0:5.

However, the set of equations (V 20, V 21) does not full the second condition ii) above: the corresponding solutions are reversible, as it follows from the existence of a single-valued function  $A(J) / J^{1+2}$  which follows from Eqs.(V 20, V 21). In other words, the system described by Eqs.(V 20, V 21) would exhibit nonlinearity and harm onics generation, but would not show nite

 $^{(0)}$  (!) in the !! 0 lim it. In order to avoid this inconsistency, we need to form ulate a model with the same kind of scaling between A and J as in Eqs.(V 20, V 21), but with a nonm onotonic J (A) dependence allowing for the irreversible behaviour.

A model obeying very similar properties was form ulated and studied in Ref. [41] in a di erent physical context (one-dimensional spin glass). The low-energy spin con gurations in this model are described by a phase variable '(x) 2 (; ) such that two such con gurations (local energy minima) which di er by a phase shift

 $(x_0) = in a region around some point x_0, have$ a characteristic energy di erence E ( ) /  $\,^{5=3}$  and a characteristic spatial extent of the phase deform ation X () / 1=3. This scaling holds for the intermediate range of phase deform ations ' 0 ; at sm aller ′ <sub>0</sub> 1 the energy cost of deformation is / <sup>2</sup>, the energy growth obviously satuwhereas at rates due to 2 periodicity. The above E () scaling leads to a sublinear growth of the characteristic \force"  $^{2=3}$  with in the same intermediate f() = dE = d / range. The main contribution to the second derivative  $d^2E = d^2$  (curvature of the energy valleys) com es from the smallest scale ' o, i.e. from the curvature of individual local minima. It was explained in Ref. [41] that such a scaling means a fractal organization of the energy minima as a function of ' with fractal dimensionality  $D_f = 1=3$ . It means that the number of energy minimadiscernable on a scale ' grows as N / '  $^{1=3}$ at ner scales; new minim a appear primarily due to the splitting the older (broader) ones. This picture em erged in Ref. [41] from the microscopic analysis of the original Ham iltonian for a one-dimensional spin-glass model formulated in Ref. [42]. We can borrow the qualitative features of this construction for our present purpose (leaving for future studies the problem of its microscopic justi cation for the case of superconductive glasses).

Suppose that the free energy F (A) of the Josephson network behaves (as a function of vector potential variations with respect to a \virgin" state with a hom ogeneous induction) in a way similar to E (') at '. Nam ely, suppose that the free energy is parabolic,  $F / (A^{2})$ , at very small variations of vector potential  $A = A_{1}$ , but on a larger scale,  $A = A_{c1}$ , it contains many localm inim a whose characteristic free energies scale (with respect to the lowest state with A = 0) as

$$F(A) / (A)^{+1}$$
 for  $A_{c1}$  A  $A_{c}$  (V.22)

with the exponent 2 (0;1) (see the denition of  $A_c$  below). Then the characteristic value of the current  $J = \frac{1}{c}$  @F = @A scales as

$$J_{char}(A) = J_1 - \frac{A}{A_{c1}}$$
 (V 23)

in the same interval of A.At large A Avariations, the growth of the induced current should saturate at the true critical current value  $J_c$ , so we can estim ate

$$A_c = A_{c1} (J_c = J_{c1})^{1=}$$
 (V.24)

O n the other hand, weak A  $A_{c1}$  leads to the usual linear London (or C am pbell) response with an elective

penetration depth  $_1$ ; matching at A  $A_1$  leads to the following estimate:

$$A_{c1} = \frac{4}{c} J_{c1} \frac{2}{1}$$
 (V.25)

The estimate (V 23) boks very much like the previous version de ned by (V 20, V 21), so one can nd the relation between the exponents:

$$= 1 = (1 + 2) = = (2) \quad 0:3 \quad (V 26)$$

Figure 18: Picture of a fractal J(A) landscape. An example of a hysteresis loop is show n.

How ever the whole picture is substantially altered: the current is now supposed to be an (irregularly) oscillating function of A (see Fig. 18), thus only its envelope J<sub>char</sub> (A) de ned on a scale A follows the scaling relation (V 23). As a result, the inverse function A (J) is multivalued and the irreversibility of the response is ensured. Similar to the spin-glass model of Ref. [41], the fractal dimensionality D  $_{\rm f}$  of the low-energy valleys can be de ned; it is given now by  $D_f = 1$ 0:7. The proposed picture is based on the existence of two substantially di erent scales of currents, J<sub>c1</sub> and J<sub>c</sub>, and corresponding vector potential variations A<sub>c1</sub> and A<sub>c</sub>; thus it can be compared with the usual C am pbell-B ean picture of critical currents in the same way as the therm odynam ics of type-II superconductors is compared with that of the type-I ones.

In order to describe quantitatively the diam agnetic response in the fractal" range (V 22) we need to determ ine the distribution function P [J ( A)] (which would lead, in particular, to the estimate (V 23) for  $J_{char}$  ( A)). Moreover, in general, a relation of the type of (V 23) could be nonlocal (i.e. the current depends on the A (x) distribution in some region of space, whose size m ay depend on A itself (see again Ref. [41]). We leave this com – plicated problem for future studies, and just note here that m erely the existence of relation (V 23) is su cient for the existence of some  $\natural"$  properties of the response (like the presence of a closed hysteresis loop, as it was assumed in Section III-C).

## VI Summary and conclusions

In this paper, we have presented experim ental results on the low temperature (10K and 20K) response of the granular HT<sub>c</sub> superconductor La<sub>1:8</sub>Sr<sub>0:2</sub>CuO<sub>4</sub> to sm all eld excitations. The general properties of the magnetic response were investigated in two samples (A and B) di ering by the strength of the coupling between grains. By cooling the sam ples in various d.c. elds up to 20G and applying sm all eld increases, we were able to measure the shielding response of the material and to derive a method, inspired by the work of Dersh and Blatter [22], to extract from the data the polarizability of the intergrain currents system. The eld cooled (F.C.) magnetization was measured in elds up to 20G. A nalysis of the results led to the conclusion that i) the structure of the grains is polycrystalline, resulting in a step decrease of the F.C. magnetization with increasing eld, which can be interpreted on the basis of the model by Wohllebeen et al. [29]; ii) self shielding (pinning) by the intergrain currents when lowering the tem perature strongly reduces the value of the F C .m agnetization; iii) there is no macroscopic M eissner magnetization due to the system of intergrain currents.

Further detailed study of the response of the Josephson network was performed in sample B. It was shown that the response is asymmetric with respect to the sign of variation of the applied eld after eld cooling; this is due to the shielding currents pinned during cooling. The macroscopic critical current is found to be strongly reduced by moderate values of the external d.c. eld, about 2G.

Very low eld magnetization measurements were performed by applying eld steps of 10 m G or low frequency a.c. elds in the range 50 G to 30 m G, after cooling in d.c. elds up to 8.8 G. The results show that the response is strongly non linear, the shielding current grow-ing sublinearly with increasing applied eld. Furthermore, the a.c. results show that it is strongly irreversible down to the smallest excitations used. It is shown that a non-linear relation between the shielding current and the induction, J / B with 0.5, together with a

natural assumption about the existence of a closed hysteresis loop, give predictions in a reasonable agreement with the data.

Theoretical analysis of our experim ental results was developed on the frame of the existing \gauge-glass" theories. It was show that the extremely low value of the low-tem perature, zero-eld critical current density  $3:7A = cm^2$  at 10K ) together with the rather high (J<sub>C</sub> tem perature of the transition to the low-tem perature glassy state, can be coherently interpreted only under the assumption that the Josephson network is strongly frustrated even at zero applied eld. This contradicts the usual assumption that frustration in the interactions arises only due to the local magnetic induction, but supports the hypothesis of the existence of a large proportiont of -junctions in the granular system. These junctions are possibly due to the d-wave nature of the pairing, com bined with the random ness of grain orientations in La1:8 Sr0:2 CuO 4 ceram ics.

Finally, a new model of diam agnetic response in the glassy state of granular superconductors was developed in order to describe the anom alous (fractional-power) behavior of the shielding current response. This model, based on the idea of a fractal organization of the free energy landscape in the granular network, can provide a qualitative account for the main features of the anom alous response. Its further developm ent will be the subject of future studies.

## VII Acknow ledgem ents

W e are gratefulto L.B. Io e form any important discussions which helped to clarify a number of issues considered in this paper. Research of M.V.F. was supported by the DGA grant # 94-1189, by the joint grant M 6M 300 from the International Science Foundation and the Russian Government, and by the grant # 95-02-05720 from the Russian Foundation for Fundamental Research.

## A Appendix

The hysteretic behavior of the current as a function of the induction variations is represented by the relation:

$$J = 2^{(1)} J_c \frac{j B j}{B_c}$$
 (A 27)

= 0 when starting from zero induction state, and 1 otherwise. J = J  $J_{\circ}$  and B = B  $B_{\circ}$  where  $J_{\circ}$  and  $B_{\circ}$  are the (old) values just before the last reversal of the sign of variation of B. The Ansatz A 27 ensures that we

have a stable closed hysteresis loop, and that there is no hysteresis for = 1 which describes the London case. Figure 19 displays the shape of the hysteresis loops for three characteristic values of . The induction pro le is

Figure 19: Hysteretic behavior of the current for a variation of the induction between  $$B_c$$  and  $B_c$  .

determ ined by the M axwell equation which leads, for the case of weak penetration, to

$$\frac{d B}{dx} = 2^{(1)} A j B j$$
 (A 28)

where  $A = 4 J_c=B_c$ ; x is the distance from the edge of the sample. A fler increasing applied eld from 0 to  $h_o$ , starting from zero induction state, the induction pro le is given by B dB = A dx, leading to:

$$x = \frac{1}{A} \Big|_{h_{o}}^{L_{B}} d = \frac{B^{1}}{(1)} \Big|_{A}^{h_{o}}$$

where

$$B = h_0^1$$
 (1 )A  $x^{\frac{1}{1}}$ : (A 29)

Field penetrates till  $x = x_{h_o} = h_o^1 = (1 )A$ .

W hen h decreases from  $h_o$ , we get (B  $_o$  B) dB =  $2^i$  dx. Hence:

$$x = \frac{1}{2^{1} A^{2}} \begin{bmatrix} z & B_{\circ} & B \\ B_{\circ} & h \end{bmatrix}^{1} = \frac{1}{2^{1} A^{2} (1 - 1)^{2}} \begin{bmatrix} B_{\circ} & B \end{bmatrix}^{1} \begin{bmatrix} B_{\circ} & B \end{bmatrix}^{1} \begin{bmatrix} B_{\circ} & h \end{bmatrix}^{1}$$

M odi cation of induction relative to B  $_{\rm o}$  extends up to  $x_{\rm h}$  = (h\_o  $~~h)^1~~=2^1~~$  A . For 0 < x <  $x_{\rm h}$  ,

$$B = B_{o} \quad 2 \quad \frac{h_{o} \quad h}{2}^{1} \qquad (1 \quad )A \quad x \quad (A \quad 30)$$

Figure 20: Induction pro leasa function of applied eld.  $R_{\circ}$  is the maximum abcissa of eld penetration.

where  $B_{\circ}$  is given by Eq. (A 29). When  $h = h_{\circ}$  is reached, Eq. (A 30) gives simply  $B = B_{\circ}$ . After reversing the sign of variation of h once more, the proles are simply symmetrical of those given by Eq. (A 30). Examples of induction proles are given on Fig. 20 for

= 0.5. The average induction can be derived now. A fler som e algebra, one obtains:

$$< B > = \frac{A}{2}$$
  $h_0^2$   $1$   $2$   $\frac{1}{2}$   $h_0^{-2}$   $h_0^{-2}$ 

for  $h_o > 0$  , and

< B > = 
$$\frac{1}{2}$$
  $h_0^2$   $1+2$   $\frac{1+h=h_0}{2}$  (A.31)

for  $h_o < 0$ :

For a sinusoidal excitation  $h = h_0 \cos! t$ , one gets

$$\frac{\langle B \rangle}{h_o} = \frac{A h_o^1}{2} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad \frac{1 \quad \cos!t}{2}^2$$

$$\frac{\langle B \rangle}{h_{o}} = \frac{A h_{o}^{1}}{2} \qquad 1+2 \frac{1+\cos!t}{2} \qquad (A 32)$$

for  $(2n \ 1) < !t < 2n :$ 

Since  $\langle B \rangle = h_0 = 1 + \langle M \rangle = h_0$ , Fourier transformation gives the values of 1 + 4 = 0 and 4 = 0. This can be done numerically. Figure 21 displays the ratio 4 = 0 = 1 + 4 = 0 as a function of  $\cdot$ .


Figure 21: Values of 4  $^{00}=1+4$   $^{0}$  as a function of .


## References


- For a review, see G. Blatter, M. V. Feigelfm an, V.
   B. Geshkenbein, A. I. Larkin and V. M. Vinokur, Rev. M od. Phys. 66, 1125 (1994)
- [2] S. John and T. C. Lubensky, Phys. Rev. B 34, 4815 (1986).
- [3] V.M.Vinokur, L.B. Io e, A.I. Larkin and M.V. Feigel'man, Sov. Phys. JETP 6, 1986 (1987).
- [4] V.S.Dotsenko, M.V.Feigelm an and LB. Io e in Spin G lasses and R elated P roblem s, Soviet Scienti c Review /Section A, Chapter IV.
- [5] M.V.Feigel'm an and L.B. Io e, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 3447 (1995).
- [6] J.D. Reger, T.A. Tokuyasu, A.P. Young and M. P.A. Fisher Phys Rev. B 44, 7147 (1991).
- [7] D.Huse and H.Seung, PhysRev.B 42, 1059 (1990).
- [8] H.S.Bokiland A.P.Young Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 3021 (1995).
- [9] M. Borik, M. Chemikov, V. Velasago and V. Stepankin, J. Low Temp. Phys. 85, 283 (1991).
- [10] D.S.Fisher, M.P.A.Fisher and D.A.Huse, Phys. Rev. B 43, 130 (1991).
- [11] E. B. Sonin, JETP Lett. 47, 496 (1988); E. B. Sonin and A.K. Tagancev, Sov Phys. JETP 68, 572 (1989).


- [12] B. Z. Spivak and A. Yu. Zyuzin JETP Lett. 47, 267 (1988); B.Z. Spivak and S.K ivelson Phys. Rev. B 43, 3740 (1991).
- [13] V.B.Geshkenbein, A.I.Larkin and A.Barone, Phys.Rev.B 36, 235 (1987).
- [14] M. Signist and T. M. Rice, Reviews of Modern Physics 67, 503 (1995).
- [15] J.R.Kittley, C.C.Tsuei, J.Z.Sun, C.C.Chi, L.S. Yu-Jahnes, A.Gupta, M.Rupp and M.B.Ketchen, Nature 373, 225 (1995).
- [16] H.Kawamura, Phys. Rev. B 51, 12398 (1995) and J.Phys. Soc. Japan 64, 711 (1995).
- [17] I.M orgenstern, K.A.M uller and J.G.Bednorz, Z. Phys. B 69, 33 (1987).
- [18] P. Imbert and G. Jehanno, Hyper ne Interactions 47 (48, 233 (1989).
- [19] C.P.Bean, Rev.M od.Phys. 36, 31 (1964).
- [20] A.M.Cam pbell, JP hys.C 2, 3186 (1969).
- [21] M. Ocio, M. A Iba and J. Hammann, J. Physique Lett. 46, 1101 (1985).
- [22] H. Dersh and G. Blatter, Phys. Rev. B 38,11391 (1988).
- [23] J.A.Osborn, Phys. Rev. 67, 351 (1945).
- [24] U.Yaron, Y.Komyushin and I.Felner, Phys. Rev. B 46, 14823 (1992).
- [25] C. P. Poole, T. Datte and H. A. Farach, Copper Oxide Superconductors, John W iley & Sons, New-York 1988.
- [26] R. Renker, I. Apfelstedt, H. Kupfer, C. Politis, H. Rietschel, W. Shauer, W. Wull, U. Gottwick, H. Kneissel, U. Rauchschwalbe, H. Spille and F. Steglich, Z. Phys. B 67, 1 (1987).
- [27] The susceptibility, which in the usual sense is a local quantity representing (B H)=H, has no meaning in the case of circulating currents in a conductor.W e speak rather of a polarizability  $_{j}$  which represents the average value < B H > =H, and describes the global e ect of the currents over the whole volum e of the sample.
- [28] S.Ruppel, G.Michels, H.Geus, J.Kalenborn, W. Schlabitz, B.Roden and D.Wohllebeen, Physica C 174, 233 (1991).


- [29] D.W ohllebeen, G.M ichels and S.Ruppel, Physica C 174, 242 (1991).
- [30] C. Ebner and D. Stroud, Phys. Rev B 31, 165 (1985).
- [31] T. Shibauchi, H.K itano, K.U chinokura, A.M aeda, T.K im ura and K.K ishio, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 2263 (1994).
- [32] M. Suzuki, Physica C 185 { 189, 2243 (1991).
- [33] Y.B.Kim, C.F.Hempstead and A.R.Stmad, Phys.Rev.Lett. 9, 306 (1962).
- [34] S.Senoussi, M.Oussena, G.Collin and I.A.Campbell, Phys. Rev. B 37, 9772 (1988).
- [35] J.R.Chem, Physica C 153 { 155, 50 (1988).
- [36] L. Leylekian, M. Ocio and J. Hammann, Physica B 194 (196, 1865 (1994).
- [37] L. Leylekian, M. Ocio and J. Hammann, Physica C 185 (189, 2243 (1991).
- [38] L.B. To e, PhysRev. B 38, 5181 (1988).
- [39] see the review Ref.[4], p.183.
- [40] L. G lazman, A. Koshelev and A. Lebed', ZhETF 94, 259 (1988); Sov Phys. JETP 67, 1235 (1988).
- [41] see the review Ref.[4], Section 3.2.
- [42] M.V.Feigel'm an and L.B. Io e, Z PhysB 51, 237 (1983).















































δΑ

