

Fig. 2. Interaction energy (full line) between, and force exerted on (broken line) first to fourth nearest neighbours in a body-centred cubic crystal with a Morse a=4potential. The changes caused by a 2 per cent lattice expansion or contraction are also shown.

Table 4. Lattice energies, E_G for different potentials and the differences caused by small variations of the lattice parameter from its value for minimum E_G. Since E_G is itself negative, the quoted increases are in fact decreases in the absolute value of EG

Potential	$-E_{G}/E_{0}$		Per cent increase in $E_{\mathcal{G}}$ for lattice expansion of contraction of			
	f.c.c.	b.c.c.		2 per cent		
Morse: $a =$						
3	22.802	22.806	0.04	0.17	0.05	0.19
3.25	15.895	15.881	0.07	0.27	0.07	0.30
3.5	12.819	12.788	0.09	0.35	0.10	0.40
3.75	11.049	11.000	0.11	0.44	0.12	0.50
4	9.900	9.830	0.13	0.52	0.15	0.60
4.25	9.097	9.007	0.16	0.60	0.17	0.71
4.5	8.509	8.397	0.18	0.69	0.20	0.82
4.75	8.064	7.927	0.20	0.78	0.22	0.93
5	7.718	7.555	0.23	0.87	0.25	1.05
5.25	7.443	7.253	0.25	0.96	0.28	1.18
5.5	7.222	7.003	0.28	1.06	0.31	1.31
5.75	7.041	6.793	0.31	1.15	0.34	1.45
6	6.892	6.612	0.33	1.26	0.38	1.59
Mie:(m,n)=						
(4.5, 6)	24.840	24.609	0.13	0.49	0.14	0.59
(4.5, 14)	12.410	11.951	0.29	1.10	0.34	1.46
(5, 7)	15.423	15.198	0.17	0.63	0.18	0.77
(5, 8)	13.567	13.319	0.19	0.72	0.21	0.89
(6, 12)	8.610	8.237	0.34	1.26	0.39	1.66
(9, 14)	6.656	6.089	0.58	2.13	0.69	3.01

potential in a body-centred cubic crystal, how the with $a \lesssim 3.1$. Thus even for quite large comenergies of interaction between first to fourth pressions, second-neighbour interactions should nearest-neighbours are related for $r_1/r_1^* = 0.98$, 1.0, and 1.02. The derivative of this energy, which Fig. 4(a) shows that a nearest-neighbour interacgives the force on one atom exerted by the appropriate neighbours, is also plotted here. More a > 3.8 and this effect is reinforced in the condetails of these energies are given in Fig. 3 for a variety of Morse constants, while Fig. 4 shows the Fig. 5(a)]. For Mie potentials, calculations show variation with parameter of $E(r_1)/E(r_2)$. Figure 5 that $E(r_1)/E(r_2) > 1$ whenever 2m+n > 17 and shows E_i^s (i=1, ..., 4) as functions of the that $E_1^s/E_2^s > 1$ whenever 2m+n > 16. parameter for two different Morse constants.

4. DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

Although the variation of E_G with lattice parameter, as shown in Table 4, is in fact small, the third neighbours become repulsive only for following generalizations are of interest.

in parameter and given potential is effectively the same for each structure. This can be shown to be 5 show that, with potentials appropriate to ideal rigorously true for Mie functions and the maximum variation for Morse functions is 0.003 per nearest-neighbour interaction for a > 5.1 or cent, at a = 6.

the potential functions, the changes for compression exceed those for expansion.

of E_G , the Mie potentials give a greater variation 5.1 is sensitive to such changes, decreasing to with parameter than do the Morse potentials.

For particular interactions, it is clear on physical lead to an r_1 * less than r_0 , i.e. to a repulsive force crystal. Any compression obviously increases this repulsion while Table 1 shows that, after 2 per cent expansion, the force is still repulsive on this model for most potentials, the exceptions being body-centred cubic crystals, the region with those few for which $r_1*/r_0 > 0.98$.

For second-neighbour interactions, whose significance has been discussed in some detail by Drechsler and Liepack, (13) the force will be nearest-neighbour interaction becomes of opposite attractive so long as

$$r_1/r_0 > 1/b_2 = \left\{ egin{array}{l} 0.7071 & \text{for face-centred cubic} \\ \text{crystals,} \\ 0.8660 & \text{for body-centred cubic} \\ \text{crystals.} \end{array} \right.$$

that this limit is attained only for Morse potentials theory based on nearest-neighbour interactions

remain attractive. In terms of energy contributions, tion exceeds that of a second neighbour for tributions to lattice energy since $M_1/M_2 = 2$ [see

In body-centred cubic crystals, a very different situation prevails. Table 1 shows that for Morse potentials with a < 4, the second-neighbour interactions will be repulsive and this is also true for some of the Mie potentials. Since $r_1/r_0 < 1/b_3 = 0.6124$, interactions from these (i) The fractional change in E_G for a given change and further neighbours should be attractive. In terms of energy, calculations of $E(r_i)$ for i = 1, ...,crystals, the largest energy is associated with the 3m+n > 29, with the second-neighbour interac-(ii) As is to be expected from the asymmetry of tion for 5.1 > a > 3.3 or 3m+n < 29, and with the third neighbour interaction for a < 3.3. The limit of 3.3 is insensitive to changes in parameter (iii) For potentials producing comparable values but, as can be seen from Fig. 4(b), the limit at about 4.6 for 2.5 per cent lattice expansion. In summary, it appears that for most potentials and grounds that minimizing the lattice energy must most parameter values, the largest energy is in fact associated with a second-neighbour interaction. between nearest-neighbours in the unstrained This of course follows also from Table 1 since r_1/r_0 near 0.87 implies that the second neighbours are separated by about r_0 , where the interaction energy approaches its maximum value of E_0 . For a < 3.5 which may be appropriate for the alkali metals (Table 2) shows a further interesting feature. For these relatively flat potentials (see Fig. 1), the sign to the other interactions [Fig. 4(b)] and may be of considerable magnitude. At this stage, as pointed out above, the effect of third neighbours is very significant, particularly in contributions to total lattice energy since $M_1: M_2: M_3 = 8:6:12.$

The considerations above point out the con-For face-centred cubic crystals, Table 1 shows siderable errors which can be introduced by a