

Fig. 1 (left). The electrical resistivity of potassium as a function of temperature. The solid line shows the resistivity at a fin retica volume (that at 0°K under zero pressure); this is the quantity which is most convenient for direct comparison with theory. Fig. 10. 150 (right). The pressure coefficient of electrical resistivity of lithium, sodium, and potassium as a function of temperature at constain th density (13).

volume) in terms of readily observable quantities.

Considerations of this kind can also be applied to the discussion of the pressure dependence of the electrical resistivity of metals, but first I must describe briefly how this resistivity depends on the temperature (5). It is convenient to distinguish between two sources of electrical resistivity: (i) a temperature-dependent part  $\rho_i$  (the ideal resistivity), due to the thermal vibrations of the lattice, which vanishes as the temperature approaches zero, and (ii) a temperature-independent part  $\rho_o$  (the residual resistivity), which is due to chemical and physical imperfections in the lattice.

In a perfectly periodic lattice the conduction electrons can move without hindrance; that is to say, the electrical resistance of the metal is then zero. If physical imperfections or chemical impurities are introduced into the lattice, these will then upset the perfect periodicity and cause electrical resistance by scattering the electrons when they are accelerated by an electric field. If, in addition, the lattice temperature is raised so that thermal vibrations of the ions begin, these vibrations also contribute to the electrical resistance. The part of the resistance caused by the lattice vibrations may be thought of as approximately proportional to the mean square amplitude of vibration of the

ions. If the mass of the ions is M, characteristic vibrational fretheir quency is  $\omega$ , and their amplitude of vibration is x, then at a high temperature T

$$A\omega^2 \bar{x^2} = kT$$

by the classical theorem of the equipartition of energy. Therefore, by introducing a characteristic temperature  $\theta$ such that  $\hbar \omega = k\theta$ ,

$$\overline{x^2} = \frac{\hbar^2}{k} \frac{T}{M\theta^2}$$

and the resistivity due to thermal vibrations,  $\rho_i$ , is proportional to  $T/M\theta^2$ . At the lowest temperatures  $\rho_i$  is no longer proportional to the mean square amplitude of the lattice vibrations because at these temperatures the lattice waves are less efficient in scattering electrons; in fact,  $\rho_i \propto T^5/\theta^6$  in this temperature region. In quantum language, it is usual to discuss the scattering of electrons by lattice waves in terms of "phonons." A phonon is a quantum of lattice energy analogous to the photon in electromagnetic radiation. The total number of phonons in the lattice varies as T at high temperatures and as  $T^3$  at low temperatures. The temperature dependence of the number of phonons largely determines the temperature dependence of the ideal resistivity. At low temperatures, however, the "momentum" of the phonons falls off and t din o resistivity, as indicated above, falls e d in I as  $T^5$ —that is, more rapidly than t The t number of phonons. Figure 1 illustration th the temperature dependence of t electr electrical resistivity of a typical mon should valent metal, potassium:

If the effect of pressure on the id peratu electrical resistivity arises solely fre d ln b the change produced in  $\theta$ , we show tells t expect that at high temperatures

$$\frac{d\ln\rho_i}{dp} = -\frac{2d\ln\theta}{dp}$$

and at low temperatures

$$\frac{d\ln\rho_i}{dp} = -\frac{6d\ln\theta}{dp} \qquad 0 \quad \text{term}$$

Since  $\theta$  increases with pressure, we depen at once that as far as the lattice of since tribution is concerned the effect d lou pressure is to diminish the electric ture resistivity (6). Moreover we see the Fqu the pressure coefficient of ideal retivity at low temperatures should the p three times that at high temperatur vients Figure 2 shows how the pressure : We ca efficient of resistivity of lithium, so din K um, potassium, and copper varies w disting temperature. The temperature deper the pr ence is of the general form to Mabuti expected. Note, however, that in lie Heford um the pressure coefficient at h fesults 1 shot temperatures is anomalous, being po the ex tive.

> 14 JUL SCIENCE, VOL.

tempo the te resisti lurn. chim peratt

chang

D.

In