lies between -0.8 and cient has been given by d on the assumption of the assumption of free

imate constancy of the cure might perhaps be is is unlikely; it is more functional thermal

## tivity

n temperature on the ce of alloys of the noble ecent review article by impurity' was usually peaking, alloys of the pressure coefficients\* atm, corresponding to n a semi-quantitative en small concentration example, Friedel 1956) anding thermo-electric

by transition elements ie 1949). The pressure impurity atom which by generalization from of residual resistivity ide correlated some of ature arises from the that a process analoctron scattering with hing the complex be-

or the volume depenal impurities. On the section is effectively , and that this paraese assumptions are

ive pressure coefficients.

Experimentally we find that, for sample I,  $d \ln \rho_0/d \ln V \simeq -0.7$  and for sample II,  $\simeq -0.3$ . It is difficult to know what are the predominant scattering processes that contribute to the residual resistances; although iron is nominally the dominant impurity it is almost certainly not present in solid solution in these two specimens because they show no resistance minimum (cf. Pearson 1955). Zinc does not produce a resistance minimum in copper and it may be that this is the main impurity present in solid solution. Various physical defects were presumably present also, and the difference between the measured pressure coefficients can probably be accounted for by the different contributions from impurities and strains.

## TABLE 2

T(°K)	$10^3R_{i} \ (\Omega)$	$10^3 R_0$ ( $\Omega$ )	$10^{5} \frac{\mathrm{d}R_{i} \dagger}{\mathrm{d}T} $ $(\Omega/^{\circ} \mathrm{C})$	$\frac{T}{\rho_i} \frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_i}{\mathrm{d}T}$	$\frac{1}{\rho_0} \frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_0 \ddagger}{\mathrm{d}p} \ddagger $ (%/1000 atm)
291-1	$42.4 \pm 2$	$18.1 \pm 2$	17.3	$1.19 \pm 0.1$	$-0.2 \pm 0.05$
80.0	$5.47 \pm 0.3$	$14.17 \pm 0.2$	15.6	$2.3 \pm 0.2$	$+0.01 \pm 0.02$
78.0	$5.15 \pm 0.3$	$14.32 \pm 0.2$	_		$+0.021\pm0.014$
26.5	$0.108 \pm 0.005$	$13.15 \pm 0.01$		-	$+0.019 \pm 0.005$
4.2		$15.048 \pm 0.001$			$+0.034 \pm 0.015$

†  $dR_0/dT = 2.1 \pm 0.5 \times 10^{-5} \Omega/^{\circ} C$  between 26.5 and 291.1° K.

‡ We have used the following mean values of  $\frac{1}{\rho_i} \frac{\mathrm{d} \rho_i}{\mathrm{d} p}$  in estimating this coefficient

T (° K)	$\frac{1}{\rho_i} \frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_i}{\mathrm{d}p} (\%/1000 \mathrm{atm})$		
291	-0.22		
80	-0.39		
78	-0.40		

In sample III we know that the only important impurity is iron (0.056 at. %). Because the impurity resistance of this specimen is relatively large, we have been able to make some tentative deductions concerning the change with temperature of both this resistance itself and its pressure coefficient. By comparing the values of the total resistivity of this sample with that for ideally pure copper (i.e. we assume  $\theta_R$  is not changed for this small impurity concentration) we have deduced values of  $\rho_0$  at several temperatures (assuming always that it is meaningful to write  $\rho_{\text{total}} = \rho_i + \rho_0$ ). Using these values of  $\rho_0$  and an average of the measured values of  $(1/\rho_i) d\rho_i/dp$ , we could then deduce on the same basis what should be the values of  $(1/\rho_0) d\rho_0/dp$  at these temperatures. The results of these calculations are given in table 2. We find that at 78° K the value of  $(1/\rho_0) d\rho_0/dp$  is practically unchanged from its low temperature value; whereas at room temperature, this coefficient has changed sign and its magnitude has increased ten-fold. Unfortunately, Linde reports no pressure measurements on copper+iron alloys, but a comparison with his results on gold+iron alloys shows that their pressure coefficients at room temperature (at least for the larger concentrations measured by Linde) are opposite in sign to that of this copper + iron alloy and about ten times smaller - of about the same size, in fact, as we find at the low temperatures. From the values of  $\rho_0$  at