

Glassy dynamics as a quantum corollary of the liquid to solid transition

Zohar Nussinov^{1,2}

¹*Department of Physics, Washington University, St. Louis, MO 63130, U.S.A.*

²*Department of Condensed Matter Physics, Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot 76100, Israel**

(Dated: May 1, 2022)

We apply microcanonical ensemble and Eigenstate Thermalization Hypothesis considerations to posit that, whenever it may thermalize, a general disorder-free many-body Hamiltonian of a typical atomic system harbors solid-like eigenstates at low energies and fluid-type (and gaseous, plasma) eigenstates associated with energy densities exceeding those present in the melting (and, respectively, higher energy) transition(s). In particular, the lowest energy density at which the eigenstates of such a clean many body atomic system undergo a non-analytic change is that of the melting (or freezing) transition. We invoke this observation to analyze the evolution of a liquid upon supercooling (i.e., cooling rapidly enough to thwart solidification below the freezing temperature). Expanding the wavefunction of a supercooled liquid in the complete eigenbasis of the many-body Hamiltonian, only the higher energy liquid-type eigenstates contribute significantly to measurable hydrodynamic relaxations (e.g., those probed by viscosity) while static thermodynamic observables become weighted averages over both solid- and liquid-type eigenstates. Consequently, when extrapolated to low temperatures, hydrodynamic relaxation times of deeply supercooled liquids (i.e., glasses) may seem to diverge at nearly the same temperature at which the extrapolated entropy of the supercooled liquid becomes that of the solid. In this formal quantum framework, the increasingly sluggish (and spatially heterogeneous) dynamics in supercooled liquids as their temperature is lowered stems from the existence of the single non-analytic change of the eigenstates of the clean many-body Hamiltonian at the equilibrium melting transition (and associated translational and rotational symmetry breaking) present in low energy solid-type eigenstates. We provide a single parameter fit to the viscosity and suggest testable predictions.

PACS numbers: 75.10.Jm, 75.10.Kt, 75.40.-s, 75.40.Gb

The enigmatic “glass transition” [1, 2] appears in nearly all liquids. The basic observation (employed for millennia) is that liquids may be cooled sufficiently rapidly (or, so-called, “supercooled”) past their freezing temperatures so that they may bypass crystallization and at sufficiently low temperatures ($T < T_g$) form an amorphous solid like material, a “glass”, instead. This “transition” into a glass differs significantly from conventional thermodynamic transitions in numerous aspects. Perhaps most notable is the disparity between dynamic and thermodynamic features. It is not uncommon to find a capricious., e.g., 10^{14} -fold, increase in the relaxation time as the temperature of a supercooled liquid is dropped [3, 4] (see, e.g., panel (a) of Fig. 1). However, such a spectacular change in the dynamics is, typically, not accompanied by matching sizable signatures in thermodynamic measurements (such as that of specific heat). There have been many penetrating works that provided illuminating ideas (see, e.g., [5–24] for only a small subset of a very vast array) to address this question. Collectively, the concepts that these works advanced have proven to be of great utility in numerous fields. There has been ample evidence in support of many ideas introduced by these theories yet no model is currently universally accepted. A vexing complication facing many *classical* descriptions of glasses is rooted in the plethora of low energy states. The most celebrated fit for the viscosity of supercooled liquids (claimed by most, yet not all [9, 18, 20–24] theories) is the Vogel-Fulcher-Tammann-Hesse (VFTH) fit [25], $\eta_{VFTH} = \eta_0 e^{DT_0/(T-T_0)}$, where η_0 , D , and T_0 are liquid dependent constants. The VFTH function asserts that at $T = T_0$

the viscosity (and relaxation times) diverge. The theories deriving VFTH and most others imply various special temperatures. We will approach the problem via another path and suggest that genuine phase transitions must either coincide with (i) non-analytic changes in the eigenstates of the Hamiltonian governing the system (such as the far higher melting temperature $T_{melt} > T_0$) or (ii) are associated with a singular temperature dependence of a density of states function that we introduce. In this work, we will explain how the increasing relaxation times can appear naturally without a phase transition at any temperature $T \neq T_{melt}$. Our investigation will lead to a fit very different from that of VFTH that, in its minimal form, will have only one parameter. More generally, we will illustrate that *quantum* considerations for general seemingly “classical” (i.e., non-cryogenic) liquids mandate that upon supercooling, dramatically increasing relaxation times may appear without concomitant large thermodynamic signatures.

The disorder free many-body Hamiltonian. Unlike “spinglasses” [26, 27] harboring quenched disorder, the supercooled liquids described above have no externally imposed randomness; these liquids would crystallize if cooled slowly enough. For emphasis, we write the *exact* many-body Hamiltonian of disorder free liquids,

$$H = - \sum_i \frac{\hbar^2}{2M_i} \nabla_{R_i}^2 - \sum_j \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_e} \nabla_{r_j}^2 - \sum_{i,j} \frac{Z_i e^2}{|R_i - r_j|} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq i'} \frac{Z_i Z_{i'} e^2}{|R_i - R_{i'}|} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \neq j'} \frac{e^2}{|r_j - r_{j'}|}. \quad (1)$$

In Eq. (1), M_i , R_i , and Z_i are, correspondingly, the mass, position, and atomic number of the i -th nucleus, while r_j is the

* zohar@wuphys.wustl.edu




FIG. 1. (a) Published viscosity data [28] of o-terphenyl (OTP), a quintessential “fragile” glass former. (A “fragile” liquid [3] is one in which the viscosity increases dramatically at low T .) (b) Result of a simplified rendition of our theory provided by Eq. (10). This fit has only a *single parameter*. In Eq. (10), we set the melting temperature to its experimental value $T_m=329.35$ K and the effective width to be $\bar{\sigma} = AT$ with the single fitting parameter $A \approx 0.049$. (c) A numerical evaluation of the effective width $\bar{\sigma}$ when equating Eq. (10) to the experimental value in panel (a). The linear increase in $\bar{\sigma}$ in T is manifest in (c).

location of the j -th electron (whose mass and charge are m_e and $(-e)$ respectively). In systems of practical interest, the number of ions and electrons in the system is indeed huge (e.g., $O(10^{24})$). Finding tangible exact (or even approximate) eigenstates to the Hamiltonian of Eq. (1) is impossible (or, at best, is extremely challenging). Insightful simplified renditions of this Hamiltonian have been extremely fruitful in disparate arenas of physics and chemistry. Our far more modest goal is not solve the spectral problem posed by Eq. (1) nor advance any intuitive approximations in various realizations. Rather, we will, far more weakly, rely on the mere *existence* of this Hamiltonian and that of its corresponding eigenstates.

The general character of the eigenstates at different energies. For our purposes, it will suffice to know the distinctive features of the eigenstates of Eq. (1). To this end, we will “read off” traits of these eigenstates from knowledge of the thermodynamic behavior of equilibrated systems defined by Eq. (1) at different temperatures. In the microcanonical (mc) ensemble, the average of any operator O at an energy E is

$$\langle O(E) \rangle_{mc} \equiv \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}[E, E + \Delta E]} \sum_{E \leq E_n \leq E + \Delta E} \langle \phi_n | O | \phi_n \rangle. \quad (2)$$

In Eq. (2), ΔE is a system size independent energy window, $\mathcal{N}[E, E + \Delta E]$ is the number of the eigenstates $|\phi_n\rangle$ of energy E_n lying in the interval $E \leq E_n \leq E + \Delta E$. In principle, ΔE may be taken to be arbitrarily small. In the extreme case, only a single eigenstate lies in the interval $[E, E + \Delta E]$, i.e., $\langle O(E) \rangle_{mc} = \langle \phi_n | O | \phi_n \rangle$. Stated equivalently if, in the thermodynamic limit, the micro-canonical and canonical ensembles yield the same results then

$$Tr(\rho O) = \langle \phi_n | O | \phi_n \rangle, \quad (3)$$

where ρ is a density matrix associated with energy $E = E_n$

(or temperature T such that the internal energy $E(T) = E_n$). When Eq. (3) holds, the system satisfies the “Eigenstate Thermalization Hypothesis” [29–32]. “Many body localized” systems [33–38], particularly those with disorder, do not thermalize and may violate Eq. (3) even at infinite temperature.

We now start with our first, very simple, observation. The disorder free Hamiltonian of Eq. (1) is *experimentally* known to typically lead to an equilibrated solid at low temperatures and an equilibrated liquid (or gas) at higher temperatures or energies. In the low energy solid phase, the system breaks rotational and translational symmetries and is not fully ergodic; there are degenerate states $|\phi_n\rangle$ related to each other by such symmetry operations. In these low energy states, we may apply the microcanonical ensemble relation of Eq. (2) when the lefthand side is confined to a subvolume of phase space (associated with quantum numbers defining $|\phi_n\rangle$ such as the center of mass of the system that differs in translated solids) over which the system is ergodic and thermally equilibrated. Eq. (2) and the more refined Eigenstate Thermalization equality of Eq. (3) may then be invoked for computing thermodynamic observables whose behaviors are empirically known. As the character of the averages on the lefthand sides of Eqs. (2, 3) is empirically known, we will be able to ascertain correlations and the nature of the expectation values on the righthand sides of Eqs. (2, 3). The equilibrium problem posed by Eq. (1) leads to solids at low temperatures (or energy densities), liquids at energies above melting, gases above the boiling temperatures, and so on. With V the volume, it follows that, *as a function of the energy density (E_n/V), the eigenstates $|\phi_n\rangle$ of Eq. (1) undergo corresponding transitions.* Thus,

(A) Eigenstates of Eq. (1) of energy density larger than (E_{melt}/V) are delocalized liquid like states.

(B) Eigenstates of Eq. (1) of energy density smaller than




FIG. 2. A schematic of the eigenstates of Eq. (1). From Eqs. (2, 3), we establish that at energy densities below that of melting, the eigenstates are localized solid-like states while at energies above melting the eigenstates are delocalized fluid type states. In the vicinity of the melting temperature T_{melt} , there is (in general) an interval of energies associated with latent heat. We plot a schematic of Gaussian type densities of states $p_T(E)$ at different temperatures that must adhere to Eq.(5). At very low temperatures, only a small cumulative density of states $\int_{E_{melt}}^{\infty} p_T(E')dE'$ is associated with energies above the melting transition. Thus at extremely low T the system may be nearly localized and consequently exhibit extremely large relaxation times.

(E_{melt}/V) are localized solid like states.

In Fig. 2, we sketch this conclusion. If the lowest eigenstates of Eq. (1) correspond to a crystalline solid then as energy is increased the first non-analyticity will appear at the melting energy, $E = E_{melt}$. Whenever a latent heat of fusion ΔQ_{fusion} is absorbed/released during heating/cooling between the equilibrium solid and liquid phases, by Eqs. (2, 3), there must be a range of energy densities (and corresponding energies) where the eigenstates of Eq. (1) exhibit coexisting liquid and solid-type structures (as highlighted by the shaded region in Fig. 2). More precise than the broad-brush statements of (A) and (B) above, the energy density bounds on the solid like and liquid states are set by (E_{melt}^{\pm}/V) where E_{melt}^{\pm} correspond to the upper and lower limits of this latent heat energy region.

Supercooling as an evolution operator. Formally, an equilibrated liquid in an initial state $|\psi(t_{initial})\rangle$ is supercooled to a final state $|\psi\rangle$ at time $t = t_{final}$ via an evolution operator, $|\psi\rangle = U(t_{final}, t_{initial})|\psi(t_{initial})\rangle$; $U(t_{final}, t_{initial}) = \mathcal{T} e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_{t_{initial}}^{t_{final}} dt' \tilde{H}(t')}$, where \mathcal{T} is the time ordering operator. The time dependent Hamiltonian \tilde{H} augments the Hamiltonian of Eq. (1) during the time interval $t_{initial} < t < t_{final}$ by coupling to an external heat source ($[\tilde{H}(t), H] \neq 0$). Regardless of any specific model Hamiltonian $\tilde{H}(t)$ with time dependent couplings to external fields emulating a particular cooling protocol, it is clear after that supercooling we are no longer in the original state. We may expand $|\psi\rangle$ in the complete eigenbasis of the Hamiltonian H of Eq. (1),

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_n c_n |\phi_n\rangle. \quad (4)$$

By Eq. (3), an eigenstate of H corresponds to an equilibrated system. Similar conclusions may be drawn, via the microcanonical ensemble, for a superposition of eigenstates over a narrow energy interval ΔE . As the supercooled liquid is, by its nature, out of equilibrium, a broad range of energy densities must appear in the sum of Eq. (4). The density of states $p_T(E) = \sum_n |c_n|^2 \delta(E - E_n)$ may, simultaneously have its support from both (i) low energy solid-like states ($E_n < E_{melt}$) and (ii) higher energy fluid-type eigenstates ($E_n > E_{melt}$). As the temperature T to which the liquid is supercooled corresponds

to an internal energy $E_{final} = E(T)$ of the equilibrated system,

$$E(T) = \langle \psi | H | \psi \rangle = \int dE p_T(E) E \equiv \langle E \rangle. \quad (5)$$

At all times after the cooling, $t > t_{final}$, the Hamiltonian becomes again that of Eq. (1) and $|\psi(t)\rangle = e^{-iH(t-t_{final})/\hbar} |\psi\rangle$.

Long time averages and relaxation rates in the supercooled state. Given Eq. (4), we next invoke standard quantum mechanical calculations similar to those appearing in works on the Eigenstate Thermalization Hypothesis [29–31]. The long time average (l.t.a.) of a quantity O which we may consider to be a local operator (or derived from a sum of such operators),

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{O}_{l.t.a.} &= \lim_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}} \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}} \int_{t_{final}}^{t_{final} + \tilde{\mathcal{T}}} dt' \langle \psi(t') | O | \psi(t') \rangle \\ &= \lim_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}} \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}} \sum_{n,m} c_n^* c_m \langle \phi_n | O | \phi_m \rangle \int_{t_{final}}^{t_{final} + \tilde{\mathcal{T}}} dt' e^{i(E_n - E_m)t'/\hbar}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

In the absence of any special coherence, as $\int_0^{\infty} dt' e^{i(E_n - E_m)t'} = (1 + i\pi) \delta(E_n - E_m) + \frac{1}{E_n - E_m}$, in the limit $\tilde{\mathcal{T}} \rightarrow \infty$, only (i) diagonal matrix elements of O and (ii) matrix elements of O between degenerate states will remain. Putting all of the pieces together, our next principal observation is that when, in the thermodynamic limit, off-diagonal matrix elements of the local operators O vanish between degenerate orthogonal eigenstates of Eq. (1) (e.g., those between solid type eigenstates related by global translations), then the long time average in the supercooled (s.c.) state of Eq. (4) will read

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{O}_{l.t.a.,s.c.} &= \sum_n |c_n|^2 \langle \phi_n | O | \phi_n \rangle = \int_{E_{g.s.}}^{\infty} dE p_T(E) O(E) \\ &= \int_0^{\infty} dT' O(T') p_T(E(T')) C_V(T') \\ &+ \int_{\mathcal{PTEI}} dE p_T(E) O(E), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where in the last equality, the integrand of the first term is evaluated for an equilibrated system at a temperature T' and $C_V(T') = (dE/dT')$ is the specific heat at constant volume.

When a latent heat interval is present, the last integral spans the corresponding ‘‘phase transition energy interval’’ (\mathcal{PTEI}) at $T = T_{melt}$ (indicated by the shaded region in Fig. 2). The empirical value of E at all temperatures and within the \mathcal{PTEI} may be obtained by integrating the specific heat and total heat transferred to the system. Eq. (7) transforms the average of a general O in the supercooled state into a weighted integral over the expected value of O for an equilibrated solid or liquid at temperatures T' augmented by contributions from equilibrium states with latent heat. The distribution p_T is the only quantity not known from experimental measurements of the equilibrated system. By Eq. (7), if the range of energies over which an assumed analytic $p_T(E)$ has its pertinent support does not correspond to an energy density (or associated T) at which the equilibrated system exhibits a phase transition then, all observables O will not display the standard hallmarks of a phase transition. For conventional liquid state realizations of Eq. (1), the lowest temperatures at which bona fide transitions may be discerned by probes O must either (1) correspond to the conventional melting or freezing temperature or (2) are associated with a singular temperature dependence of the distribution $p_T(E)$ generated by supercooling.

In a similar vein, we find that the relaxation rates $r_{s.c.}$ associated with (arbitrarily large) general time dependent perturbations from $|\psi\rangle$ to any set of initially unoccupied states $\{|\phi_m\rangle\}$ become a sum over diagonal contributions

$$\begin{aligned} r_{s.c.} &= \frac{d}{dt} \sum_m |\langle \phi_m | U_{pert.}(t) | \psi \rangle|^2 = \sum_n |c_n|^2 \frac{d}{dt} \sum_m |\langle \phi_m | U_{pert.}(t) | \phi_n \rangle|^2 \\ &= \sum_n |c_n|^2 r_n = \int_0^\infty dT' r(T') p_T(E(T')) C_V(T') \\ &+ \int_{\mathcal{PTEI}} dE p_T(E) r(E), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where r_n is the relaxation rate of a particular eigenstate $|\phi_n\rangle$ to the set of states $\{|\phi_m\rangle\}$ subject to the same time dependent perturbation Hamiltonian that defines $U_{pert.}(t)$ for the supercooled liquid. While the rates r_n may be estimated via Fermi’s golden rule, the matrix elements equalities of Eq. (8) are identities that *do not rely on perturbation theory*. We reiterate that r_n is equal to the relaxation rate $r(T')$ of an equilibrated solid or liquid at the temperature T' for which the internal energy $E(T') = E_n$. *The equilibrium rates $r(T')$ in response to disparate perturbations may be determined from experimental relaxation rate measurements.* Canonically, in the righthand side of Eq. (8), the liquid ($T' > T_{melt}$) equilibrium relaxation is governed by an Eyring type rate [39] $r(T') = r(T_{melt}) \frac{T}{T_{melt}} \exp[\frac{\Delta G(T_{melt})}{k_B T_{melt}} - \frac{\Delta G(T')}{k_B T'}]$ with $\Delta G(T)$ a Gibbs free energy barrier. We remark that when $T_{melt} + \bar{\sigma} > T' > T_{melt}$ with $\bar{\sigma} \ll T_{melt}$, the Gibbs free energy barrier varies weakly, $\Delta G(T') \approx \Delta G(T_{melt})$, and the equilibrium relaxation rate $r(T') \approx r(T_{melt})$.

Likewise, as we noted earlier, *the internal energy $E(T)$ in Eqs. (7,8) may be determined by specific heat measurements.* At high T , the specific heat of a simple equilibrated harmonic solid of N atoms is $C_v = 3Nk_B$ (and $E(T) = 3Nk_B T$). As T is lowered, the specific heat depreciates. In the Debye model (e.g., [40]) $E(T) = (3Nk_B T) F_D(\frac{T_D}{T})$ with the Debye

function $F_D(z) = \frac{3}{z^3} \int_0^z \frac{t^3 dt}{e^t - 1}$; $\lim_{z \rightarrow 0} F_D(z) = 1$. For many solids, the Debye temperature T_D setting the cross-over scale to the limiting high T value lies in the range $[\frac{T_{melt}}{2}, \frac{T_{melt}}{4}]$. The glass transition temperature T_g similarly varies. Across many glass former, $T_g \sim 0.7 T_{melt}$ [2] while, e.g., in metallic glasses, $T_g \sim T_{melt}/2$ [41]. An Einstein model for optical phonon contributions exhibits a stronger deviation from a linear $E(T)$. When present, weaker magnetic and other effects may amend the phonon contributions. Regardless of these models or other approximations, the specific heat of the solid (i.e., for $T < T_{melt}$) is monotonic in T . Consequently, $(E_{melt} - E)$ increases (as T is continuously lowered) faster than linear in $(T_{melt} - T)$. As, typically, the glass transition temperature (T_g/T_D) is of order unity, we will set $E(T) = \langle E \rangle = CT$ with C a constant.

The viscosity. As an application of Eq. (8), we examine the relaxation rate (for temperatures $T < T_{melt}$) following an external shear. The relevant higher energy ($E_m = CT' > E_{melt} = CT_{melt}$) liquid like states $\{|\phi_m\rangle\}$ enabling hydrodynamic flow to new atomic locations favored by the perturbation are initially unoccupied. With $r^{hydro}(T')$ the relaxation rate of the equilibrated system at temperature T' , we may estimate the relaxation rate of the supercooled liquid $r_{s.c.}^{hydro}(T) \simeq r^{hydro}(T_{melt}) \int_{E_{melt}}^\infty p_T(E') dE'$. The viscosity scales with the relaxation time $\tau = 1/r$. As hydrodynamic relaxation due to shear is largely absent in the solid phase (i.e., $r^{hydro}(T' < T_{melt}) = 0$), the viscosity of a supercooled liquid

$$\eta_{s.c.}(T) \simeq \frac{\eta(T_{melt}^+)}{\int_{E_{melt}}^\infty p_T(E') dE'}, \quad (9)$$

where $\eta(T_{melt}^+)$ is the viscosity of an equilibrated liquid at temperatures infinitesimally above melting. If latent heat effects are incorporated from the \mathcal{PTEI} of Eq. (8), the resulting lower cutoff in Eq. (9) may be less sharp—partial contributions appear from a range of energies that have eigenstates with spatially coexisting liquid and solid regions. By the constraint of Eq. (5), the energy distribution $p_T(E')$ will be centered about the internal energy of the equilibrated liquid at a temperature T . By Eq. (5), when T is far smaller than T_{melt} , the denominator in Eq. (9) is a near vanishing integral enabling a very large viscosity. At the temperatures T at which the viscosity grows, the attendant thermodynamic and other static observables of Eq. (7) need not exhibit a striking change.

A Gaussian density of states. Thus far, albeit their simplicity, our results involved no particular assumptions. For the evaluation of the integrals in Eqs. (7, 8, 9), the ‘‘only’’ unknown not accessible from experiments on equilibrated liquids is the density of states $p_T(E')$. This density clear depends on the system and specifics of the cooling procedure. To make headway, we next consider the minimal ‘‘normal’’ form of $p_T(E)$ —a Gaussian of width $\sigma_E(T)$ about its temperature constrained average (Eq. (5)). Eq. (9) then becomes

$$\eta_{s.c.}(T) = \frac{\eta_{s.c.}(T_{melt})}{\text{erfc}(\frac{E_{melt} - \langle E \rangle}{\sigma_E \sqrt{2}})} = \frac{\eta_{s.c.}(T_{melt})}{\text{erfc}(\frac{T_{melt} - T}{\bar{\sigma}})}, \quad (10)$$

where $\bar{\sigma} \equiv \frac{\sqrt{2}\sigma_E}{C}$ is a scale of the distribution $p_T(E)$ when expressed in terms of T' . As in the approximation of Eq. (9),

valid for a Gaussian $p_T(E)$ when $\bar{\sigma} \ll T_{melt}$, as at $T = T_{melt}$, a “half” of the $p_T(E)$ includes localized states while the other half is comprised of delocalized states (see Fig. 2b), the relaxation rate of the equilibrated liquid is double that of the supercooled fluid. Accordingly, the viscosity of the supercooled liquid at $T = T_{melt}$ is half that of the equilibrated liquid just above melting, i.e., $\eta_{s.c.}(T_{melt}) = 2\eta(T_{melt}^+)$ [42]. In deriving Eq. (10), we further set $\langle E \rangle = CT$ and $E_{melt} = CT_{melt}$. Generally, the width $\bar{\sigma}$ of the distribution p_T depends on the temperature T to which the liquid is being supercooled (and supercooling rate). Clearly, if any excited states are occupied then the energy will be larger than the ground state energy $E(T = 0)$. Therefore, by Eq. (5), we must have $\bar{\sigma}(T \rightarrow 0) = 0$. Thus, in the simplest approximation, at low temperatures, $\bar{\sigma} = AT$ with a constant A . In Fig. 1b, we plot Eq. (10) with a single fitting parameter $A \ll 1$ (consistent with our assumption of $\bar{\sigma} \ll T_{melt}$). In the Gaussian approximation to $p_T(E')$, we may determine the T dependence of $\bar{\sigma}$ by equating the numerical value of $\eta_{s.c.}(T)$ in measured data (Fig. 1a) with the theoretical prediction of Eq. (10). The linearity of $\bar{\sigma}$ in T is evident in Fig. 1c. Clearly, in the general case, a more complicated density of states may appear. We briefly discuss aspects of a bimodal Gaussian distribution in the supplementary information (SI). We conclude this section by underscoring a simple point. As is well known, *in equilibrium* the constraint of Eq. (5) gives rise to a Boltzmann distribution: a very sharply peaked (in the thermodynamic limit) Gaussian for the energy density about $E(T)/V$. By contrast, for the supercooled state $|\psi\rangle$, one may not search for the most likely $p_T(E)$ subject to Eq. (5) as the system is not ergodic.

Low temperature glasses. From Eq. (5), at low temperatures only the ground and proximate low lying excited states have a measurable weight amplitude $|c_n|^2$ in Eq. (4). The system may then emulate two-level theories of low T glasses [43] and other related approaches. Thus, our quantum theory, very naturally, links high and low T behavior in a general unified manner.

Predictions and conclusions. The central prediction of our approach is that the experimental thermodynamic and dynamic measures of supercooled fluids will, respectively, be given by Eq. (7) and Eq. (8). In these equations, all quantities are measurable for the equilibrated system apart from the density of states $p_T(E)$. This density is constrained by Eq. (10). As a proof of principle, in Fig. 1b we fitted viscosity data of a glass forming liquid with a single parameter that, as we note in the SI, is linked with a deviation from an Arrhenius behavior. While the current single parameter theory works quite well, we have no doubt that more complicated bimodal or other distributions arise (see SI). In theory, the energy and quantities appearing in Eqs. (7, 8) may be varied by applying external magnetic fields in metallic glass systems or external strains on more general systems; these will then trigger changes in measured thermodynamic and dynamic response as predicted by these equations. Each measurement of a different observable O or a relaxation rate will lead to an additional independent constraint on $p_T(E)$. Future work [44] will investigate other fluids. In the SI, we sketch how the theory advanced in this work may naturally lead to the empirical facts underlying the Kauzmann paradox, breakdown of ergodicity as evinced by a violation of the Stokes-Einstein relation, liquid-liquid transitions, and dynamical heterogeneity.

Acknowledgements. I am extremely grateful to N. Weingartner for help with the numerical fits. I also gratefully acknowledge ongoing works with F. S. Nogueira, N. Weingartner, K. F. Kelton, M. Blodgett, E. Altman, S. Banerjee, and L. Rademaker on related problems. In particular, much work was done in [39] on quantum effects in equilibrated high temperature fluids. I wish to thank G. Biroli, G. Parisi, and T. Schaefer for earlier encouraging remarks and for prompting me to write up this approach as a brief article. Lastly, I am particularly appreciative to the late D. Kivelson, S. A. Kivelson, and G. Tarjus for joyful investigation of the “avoided critical theory” of glasses. This research was supported by the NSF DMR-140911229 and the Feinberg foundation visiting faculty program at Weizmann Institute.

-
- [1] P. W. Anderson, *Science* **267**, 1615 (1995).
 [2] S. A. Kivelson and G. Tarjus, *Nature Materials* **7**, 831 (2008).
 [3] C. A. Angell, *Science* **267**, 1924 (1995).
 [4] R. Busch, *JOM* **52**, 39 (2000).
 [5] G. Adam and J. H. Gibbs, *J. Chem. Phys.* **43**, 139 (1965).
 [6] T. R. Kirkpatrick, D. Thirumalai, and P. G. Wolynes, *Phys. Rev. A* **40**, 1045 (1989).
 [7] G. Parisi and M. Mezard, *J. Chem. Phys.* **111** (1999).
 [8] X. Xia and P. G. Wolynes, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **97**, 2990 (2000).
 [9] M. H. Cohen and G. S. Grest, *Phys. Rev. B* **20**, 1077 (1979); G. S. Grest and M. H. Cohen, *Phys. Rev. B* **21**, 4113 (1980); G. S. Grest and M. H. Cohen, *Adv. Chem. Phys.* **48**, 455 (1981); M. H. Cohen and G. S. Grest, *J. Non-Cryst. Solids* **61/62**, 749 (1984).
 [10] V. Lubchenko and P. G. Wolynes, *Ann. Rev. of Phys. Chemistry* **58**, 235 (2007).
 [11] F. Stillinger and P. G. Debenedetti, *Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys.* **4**, 263 (2013).
 [12] J. S. Langer, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **77**, 042501 (2014).
 [13] G. Tarjus, arXiv:1010.2938 (2010).
 [14] L. Berthier and G. Biroli, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **83**, 587 (2011).
 [15] S. Sastry, P. G. Debenedetti, and F. H. Stillinger, *Nature* **393**, 554 (1998).
 [16] W. Gotze in *Liquids, Freezing and the Glass Transition* (Eds. J. P. Hansen, D. Levesque, and J. Zinn-Justin) p. 287-503 (North-Holland) (1991).
 [17] S. P. Das, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **76**, 785 (2004).
 [18] Y. S. Elmatad, R. L. Jack, D. Chandler, and J. P. Garrahan, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **107**, 12793 (2010).
 [19] M. A. Moore and J. Yeo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 095701 (2006).
 [20] J. C. Mauro, Y. Yue, A. J. Ellison, P. K. Gupta, D. C. Allan, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **106**, 19780 (2009).
 [21] M. D. Demetriou, J. S. Harmon, M. Tao, G. Duan, K. Samwer, and W. L. Johnson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 065502 (2006).
 [22] D. Kivelson, S. A. Kivelson, X. Zhao, Z. Nussinov, and G. Tar-

- jus, *Physica A* **219**, 27 (1995).
- [23] Z. Nussinov, *Physical Review B* **69**, 014208 (2004).
- [24] G. Tarjus, S. A. Kivelson, Z. Nussinov, and P. Viot, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **17**, R1143 (2005).
- [25] H. Vogel, *Z. Phys.* **22**, 645 (1921); G. S. Fulcher, *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* **8**, 339 (1925); G. Tammann and W. Z. Hesse, *Anorg. Allgem. Chem.* **156**, 245 (1926).
- [26] K. Binder and A. P. Young, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **58**, 801 (1986).
- [27] M. Mezard, G. Parisi, and M. A. Virasoro, *Spin glass theory and beyond*, Singapore: World Scientific (1987)
- [28] E. Rossler, and H. Sillescu, *Organic Glasses and Polymers*, Materials Science and Technology, ISBN: 3527313958 (2006).
- [29] J. M. Deutsch, *Phys. Rev. A* **43**, 2046 (1991).
- [30] M. Srednicki, *Phys. Rev. E* **50**, 888 (1994).
- [31] M. Rigol, V. Dunjko, and M. Olshanii, *Nature* **452**, 854 (2008).
- [32] J. von Neumann, *Z. Phys.* **57**, 30 (1929); English translation by R. Tumulka, *J. Eur. Phys. H* **35**, 201 (2010); Peter Reimann, arXiv:1507.00262 (2015).
- [33] D. Basko, I. Aleiner, and B. Altshuler, *Annals of Physics* **321**, 1126 (2006).
- [34] V. Oganesyan and D. A. Huse, *Phys. Rev. B* **75**, 155111 (2007).
- [35] R. Vosk and E. Altman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 067204 (2013).
- [36] J. Z. Imbrie, arXiv:1403.7837 (2014).
- [37] Rahul Nandkishore and David A. Huse, *Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics*, **6**, 15 (2015).
- [38] M. Schreiber, S. S. Hodgman, P. Bordia, H. P. Luschen, M. H. Fischer, R. Vosk, E. Altman, U. Schneider, and I. Bloch, arXiv:1501.05661 (2015).
- [39] Z. Nussinov, F. S. Nogueira, M. Blodgett, and K. F. Kelton, arXiv:1409.1915.
- [40] N. W. Aschcroft and N. D. Mermin, *Solid State Physics*, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston (1976).
- [41] M. Blodgett, T. Egami, Z. Nussinov, and K. F. Kelton, *Scientific Reports* **5**, 13837 (2015).
- [42] This relation between $\eta_{s.c.}(T_{melt})$ and $\eta(T_{melt}^+)$ will, of course, generally break down for a bimodal or other non-Gaussian $p_T(E)$.
- [43] W. A. Phillips, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **50**, 1657 (1987).
- [44] N. Weingartner *et al.*, in preparation.

Supplementary Information.

Hallmarks of the Kauzmann paradox. Eqs. (7,8) of the main text tie both the thermodynamics and dynamics of supercooled liquids to a single object- the density of states function $p_T(E)$. As we now describe, this dependence seems to *qualitatively* give rise to the phenomenology underlying the ‘‘Kauzmann paradox’’ [1]. The crux of this paradox is that when the measured entropy of a supercooled liquid is extrapolated to low temperatures, it nearly coincides with that of the equilibrium solid at the (Kauzmann) temperature $T = T_K$. At yet lower temperatures, $T < T_K$, the extrapolation will lead to the paradoxical situation that the entropy of the supercooled liquid would be lower than that of the equilibrated solid. Empirically, T_K is close to T_0 of the VFTH viscosity fit. A commonly held viewpoint is that an ‘‘ideal glass’’ transition intervenes as T is lowered (leading to a divergent relaxation time) and resolving the paradox at the inaccessible temperatures $T < T_K$.

Our framework specifically rationalizes the essential phenomenology without assuming an ideal glass transition. Suppose (as consistent with the constraint of Eq. (5)) that seemingly, by extrapolation, the integral $\lim_{T \rightarrow T_0^+} \int_{E_{\text{melt}}}^{\infty} p_T(E') dE' = 0$ then, by Eqs. (8, 9), $\lim_{T \rightarrow T_0} r_{s.c.}(T) = 0$ and, consequently, $\lim_{T \rightarrow T_0} \eta_{s.c.}(T) = \infty$. On the other hand, from Eq. (7), when the above extrapolated integral vanishes, the long time average of a thermodynamic quantity \mathcal{O} in the supercooled liquid must coincide with its average over equilibrated low-temperature solid-like states. This is so as $p_T(E)$ has all of its support from the solid like states once the above integral vanishes. (Stronger still, when the operators \mathcal{O} are general functions of the Hamiltonian, $\mathcal{O} = g(H)$, Eq. (7) becomes an identity that does not necessitate a long time average.) With Eq. (7), we may calculate the internal energy and its T derivative (C_v) with which (upon integration of $(C_v(T)/T)$) the entropy is experimentally accessed. Thus, the entropy (similar to static measures \mathcal{O}) of the supercooled liquid may approach that of the solid when $T \rightarrow T_0$. This suggests that $T_K \approx T_0$ yet not necessarily as a precise equality as the phenomenon concerns a low T extrapolation of $p_T(E)$ as it appears in Eqs. (7, 8). Experimentally, for different liquids, (T_K/T_0) is not exactly unity but rather lies in the range 0.9 – 1.1 [2].

Onset of localization and non-ergodicity below the equilibrium freezing transition. Another natural consequence of the theory is that there exists a temperature T_{coop} , such that for $T < T_{\text{coop}}$, cooperative effects onsets and the supercooled liquid is no longer ergodic and *may violate the Stokes-Einstein and other relations that hold for fully ergodic thermal systems*. The key observation is that at temperatures $T < T_{\text{melt}}$, an equilibrated solid is no longer fully ergodic; Eq. (3) may be violated for low energy solid like eigenstates if its left-hand side is evaluated with a density matrix ρ that does not break the translational and rotational symmetries of the liquid as, e.g., that of the microcanonical ensemble of Eq. (2)). Rather, the solid exhibits ergodicity in disjoint phase space regions or ‘‘ergodic sectors’’ [3] (related to each other by translations and rotations). In that regard, the system is reminiscent of localized systems below the ‘‘mobility edge’’ [4] that

is set, in our case, by the melting energy density. As the density of states $p_T(E)$ of the supercooled state $|\psi\rangle$ may generally have a substantial spread of energies, it follows that already at some temperature T_{coop} , the distribution $p_T(E)$ may start to have substantial weight associated with the solid-like states becomes significant and the system will not be fully ergodic. For a Gaussian $p_T(E)$ of width σ_E such as that discussed earlier, $(T_{\text{coop}} - T_{\text{melt}}) = \mathcal{O}(\bar{\sigma})$ with $\bar{\sigma}$ the corresponding width in temperatures previously introduced. Indeed, concurrent numerical simulations of metallic glass formers [5, 6] indicate the breakdown of the Stokes-Einstein relation at temperatures only slightly above that of melting. Interestingly, a low temperature deviation from an Arrhenius behavior for the viscosity (i.e., $\eta \sim \exp(\Delta/T)$ with a fixed free energy barrier $\Delta \equiv [\Delta G(T_{\text{melt}})]/k_B$ typical of equilibrated liquids above melting) [5] onsets at the same temperature T_{coop} at which the breakdown of the Stokes-Einstein relation occurs. Within the framework of the current theory, a larger than Arrhenius (so-called ‘‘super-Arrhenius’’) viscosity must appear when $p_T(E)$ includes low-temperature solid type states (as indeed occurs below the same temperature $T_{\text{coop}} > T_{\text{melt}}$). In the viscosity fits displayed in [7] for multiple types of glass formers, a deviation from Arrhenius behavior appeared at a temperature T_A that, on average, for the 11 glass formers investigated therein, was 9.6% higher than the melting temperature [8]. A similar average value of $(T_{\text{coop}} - T_{\text{melt}})/T_{\text{melt}}$ (of 7.5%) was found [9] for the 23 metallic glass formers analyzed in [41]. We speculate that for each liquid, this scale may coincide with $\bar{\sigma}(T_{\text{melt}})/T_{\text{melt}} \equiv A \ll 1$. Indeed, for the glass forming liquid o-terphenyl (see Fig. 1), we found when contrasting the simple theoretical prediction of Eq. (10) with data, a value $A = 4.9\%$ while, experimentally, deviations from bare Arrhenius behavior are indeed already observed an ‘‘avoided critical temperature’’ that is 5.7% higher than melting [7, 8]. If the density of states is not that of the Gaussian type but rather, e.g., bimodal then the situation may be richer as we next comment on.

Bimodal density of states. In the main text, we discussed the minimal Gaussian distribution consistent with Eq. (5). This led to the single parameter fit (‘‘A’’) of Fig. 1b following Eq. (10). In principle, far richer densities of states are possible. In this brief section, we would like to suggest that these may naturally lead to seeming ‘‘strong’’ to ‘‘fragile’’ liquid and similar ‘‘liquid-iliquid’’ transitions [11] as we now explain.

Illuminating simulations, e.g., [12] demonstrate that the effective free energy barriers may follow a bimodal distribution. Within our framework, these results would suggest that the density of states $p_T(E')$ may, similarly, be bimodal. We remark that one may, of course, trivially justify, such a distribution. For instance, if upon supercooling, (a) spatially jammed solid regions nucleate and grow and become progressively quiescent as T is lowered while (b) the remaining unjammed fluid regions occupy a diminishing volume within which they retain their mobility then $p_T(E)$ may be the sum of (a) a Gaussian at low energies (denoted below by ‘‘ E_2 ’’) of weight $x(T)$ and (b) another Gaussian of weight $(1 - x(T))$ with its support at energies near the melting energy, $p_T(E) =$

$\left(\frac{x(T)}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_1^2(T)}} e^{-(E-E_{\text{melt}})^2/(2\sigma_1^2(T))} + \frac{1-x(T)}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_2^2(T)}} e^{-(E-E_2(T))^2/(2\sigma_2^2(T))} \right)$, with the functions $x(T)$, $E_2(T)$, $\sigma_1(T)$, and $\sigma_2(T)$ subject to Eq. (5). If, at low temperatures, $x \rightarrow 0$ then a dramatic (so-called “fragile” [3]) rise of the viscosity with decreasing temperature (as in, e.g., Eq. (10)) is anticipated. In the diametrically opposite limit (that of $x \approx 1$), a near Arrhenius (or “strong”) $\eta_{s.c.}$ arises. Such cross-overs in $x(T)$ may give the impression that phase transitions occur from strong to fragile liquids and for general $x(T)$ also fragile to fragile or strong to strong transitions [11]. For non-analytic $x(T)$ such changes will lead to real transitions. We reiterate that according to Eqs. (7, 8), all

true singularities are either triggered by (a) the melting/liquid transition at T_{melt} or (b) all finite T singularities in the density of states $p_T(E)$ (if and when these are present).

Dynamical heterogeneities. The low energy solid-like eigenstates of Eq. (1) of energies $E_n < E_{\text{melting}}$ break translational and rotational symmetries. When the density of states $p_T(E)$ has a very significant part of weight associated with the solid-like eigenstates, this symmetry breaking may trigger spatially non-uniform dynamics as has been experimentally observed [13].

-
- [1] W. Kauzmann, Chemical Reviews **43**, 219 (1948).
 [2] C. A. Angell, Jour. Res. NIST, **102**, 171 (1997); R. Richert and C. A. Angell, J. Chem. Phys. **108**, 9016 (1998).
 [3] N. Goldenfeld, *Lectures on Phase Transitions and the Renormalization Group*, Frontiers in Physics (1992).
 [4] P. W. Anderson, Physical Review, **109**, 1492 (1958); N. F. Mott, Adv. Phys. **16**, 49 (1967).
 [5] R. Soklaski, V. Tran, Z. Nussinov, K. F. Kelton, and L. Yang, preprint arXiv:1502.01739 (2015).
 [6] Abhishek Jaiswal, Takeshi Egami, and Yang Zhang, Phys. Rev. B **91**, 134204 (2015).
 [7] D. Kivelson, S. A. Kivelson, X. Zhao, Z. Nussinov, and G. Tarjus, Physica A **219**, 27 (1995).
 [8] Zohar Nussinov, Physical Review B **69**, 014208 (2004).
 [9] Z. Nussinov, F. S. Nogueira, M. Blodgett, and K. F. Kelton, arXiv:1409.1915.
 [10] M. Blodgett, T. Egami, Z. Nussinov, and K. F. Kelton, Scientific Reports **5**, 13837 (2015).
 [11] Srikanth Sastry and C. Austen Angell, Nature Materials **2**, 739 (2003).
 [12] H. George E. Hentschel, Smarajit Karmakar, Itamar Procaccia, and Jacques Zylberg, Phys. Rev. E **85**, 061501 (2012).
 [13] H. Sillescu, J. Non-Cryst. Solids **243**, 81 (1999); M.D. Ediger, Ann. Rev. Phys. Chem. **51**, 99 (2000); R. Richert, J. Phys.: Condens. Mat. **14**, R703 (2002); W. Kob, C. Donati, S. J. Plimpton, P. H. Poole, and S. C. Glotzer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 2827 (1997); C. Donati, J. F. Douglas, W. Kob, S. J. Plimpton, P. H. Poole, and S. C. Glotzer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2338 (1998); S. C. Glotzer, J. Non-Cryst. Solids **274**, 342 (2000); Y. Gebremichael, T. B. Schroder, F. W. Starr, and S. C. Glotzer, Phys. Rev. E **64**, 051503 (2001).