e of the elas. he minor poto the bu imental value nich have benperature. T respect they mportant sin ection for or the elastic %. The most ay be obtain essure depend. periments have 0°C and 75°C tion, which tion4 for some lly no change etals. Further. a significant negative. We strain derivaonly a small

in derivative rpretation. A pressure dermodynamics the result is  $B_T$  differ by d the uncerthe modulus cho method. he contributo the elastic rivatives are most be rediscussion is it has been nergy of the term is the the valence hysically  $E_0$  $-3 - br^{-1}$  in the kinetic tate. In the  $E_0$  appears stiffnesses

o the bulk re has been ion of this and  $E_0^{\prime\prime\prime}$  $E_0$  is large ecause the plicitly by and Alloys

sistently omitting first derivatives of all energy conbutions. It is commonly presumed25 that the second givative  $E_0''$  is small because the actual equilibrium larger than the value of r for the minimum of  $E_0$ . milibrium r then occurs in the neighborhood of the ection point of  $E_0$ , as is shown by the available culations for copper26 and silver27 and by the analytiapproximation given above. The contribution of " to the bulk modulus and its hydrostatic strain crivative is probably small therefore. The third erivative  $E_0^{\prime\prime\prime}$  contributes to the hydrostatic strain erivative only; it is felt that it is also likely to be mall in view of the fact that  $E_0^{\prime\prime\prime}$  is zero at a value of , just beyond the inflection point of E0, according to the analytical approximation, and hence also near the quilibrium value of r. Quantitative estimates of the possible values of  $\Omega B_0 = r^2 E_0''/9$  and  $\Omega d B_0/d \ln r$  $=(r^3E_0'''-3r^2E_0'')/9$  can be made by using the analytical approximation, equating br-1 to the Coulomb energy if the structure22 and invoking the physical condition that  $r(\text{equilibrium}) > r(E_0'=0)$ ; these support the statements that have been made, the possible fractional error in the hydrostatic strain derivative being negligible while those in the bulk modulus may be significant but are not serious to the conclusions of this paper.

The long-range bulk modulus which has been used here is then the Fermi term only, and furthermore for this term we have used an effective mass,  $m^*/m$ , of unity for all three metals. This value of the effective mass agrees with the theoretical values of Kambe<sup>28</sup> which characterize the electrons at the bottom of the valence band for copper, silver, and gold. It also agrees with electronic specific heat effective masses29 for silver and gold, but not for copper in which this  $m^*/m$ = 1.47. We feel, however, that a "bulk modulus effective mass," which characterizes the change with volume of the average Fermi energy, is more likely to be equal to the theoretical value than to an effective mass describing the density of states at the Fermi level only.29 We have therefore used unity for copper also.

As mentioned above, the long-range contributions to the shear stiffnesses which have been used are the Coulomb stiffnesses of Fuchs, and these have been taken at their full value. Since these terms have been taken at reduced values in other papers2.3 in which elastic constants have been decomposed into contributions, we state our reasons. In the first place, the Fuchs values have long been known to account for the

shear stiffnesses of bcc Na and K,21 and recently this has been found30 to be true in Li also. In the alkali metals the long-range term is the major if not the only one and the agreement argues for the validity of the Fuchs calculation. There is no direct evidence for such a longrange stiffness in copper, silver, and gold but extensive studies of the elastic constants of copper31 and silver alloys17 in our laboratories provide good indirect evidence. The alloy results require that sizable long-range and short-range terms must both be present, and that C/C' (long range) must be about the Fuchs ratio. These two reasons lead us to regard the Fuchs values as very reasonable estimates of the long-range shear stiffness.

In some previous decompositions of elastic stiffnesses into contributions a van der Waals term has been introduced explicitly.26 We have omitted such a term as we feel it adds nothing to the analysis which has been carried through and is a numerically uncertain contribution at best. If a contribution to the total energy of the physical nature of the van der Waals interaction is present, it is absorbed, in our treatment, in the short-range repulsive interaction W=A exp  $(-pr/r_0)$  which we have deduced empirically. Formally the van der Waals interaction is radial and of short range and cannot be separated empirically from the repulsive term.

The uncertainties in the analysis presented in the previous section thus reside almost entirely in the theoretical long-range terms. We emphasize again that these terms are small and even large individual errors would leave the conclusions unchanged. The cumulative effect of these uncertainties added to the experimental error, particularly in B and dB/dP, could be considerable, however, so that the individual numerical values of the closure failures which have been quoted and assigned to noncentral short-range interaction should be treated with caution. Nevertheless the relative values of the closure failures appear to be reasonable for the two shear constants and for the three metals.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was supported by the Office of Naval Research and the National Carbon Company. One of the authors, W. B. Daniels, is also indebted to the National Carbon Company for a fellowship. The authors wish to thank Professor J. R. Reitz for many valuable discussions, and particularly Mr. A. A. Hruschka and his excellent shop for cooperation which made possible the construction of the high-pressure apparatus.

H. Jones, Physica 15, 13 (1949).
 K. Fuchs, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A151, 585 (1935).
 Reference 24, p. 78.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> K. Kambe, Phys. Rev. 99, 419 (1955).

<sup>29</sup> C. Kittel, *Introduction to Solid State Physics* (John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1953), second edition, pp. 259, 319.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>30</sup> H. C. Nash and C. S. Smith (to be published). <sup>31</sup> J. R. Neighbours and C. S. Smith, Acta Metallurgica 2, 591 (1954).