Electrical resistance of rubidium and caesium

4.4.2. Caesium

In caesium the Fermi surface is appreciably distorted (see table 12). According to Ham's calculations the Fermi surface of caesium distorts under pressure, thereby causing those parts of the surface near the zone boundaries to get nearer. This could then account for the minimum in the resistivity-pressure curve illustrated in figure 7. The general idea is that the distortion of the Fermi surface enhances the probability of umklapp processes; presumably this effect eventually overrides that due to the diminishing amplitude of the lattice vibrations and other effects which tend to reduce the resistivity. (Hasegawa has shown that this kind of explanation can account for the anomalous pressure dependence of ρ_i in lithium.) However, as we emphasized earlier, there could be changes in the anisotropy of the phonon spectrum which would have a similar effect. To find out which effect is more important we need further experiments to find out both how the Fermi surface and how the elastic constants change with pressure.

We are grateful to our colleagues in the laboratory for many valuable discussions. We would also like to thank Dr M. Bailyn and Dr A. M. Guénault for reading the manuscript and Miss B. A. Cotton for help with the calculations. We are very much indebted to Mr A. A. M. Croxon for his help in the experiments and to Mr F. W. Richardson for supplying liquid helium and hydrogen.

References

Bailyn, M. 1960 Phys. Rev. 120, 381. Bailyn, M. & Brooks, H. 1956 Bull. Amer. Phys. Soc. 1, 300. Bardeen, J. 1937 Phys. Rev. 52, 688. Bloch, F. 1928 Z. Phys. 52, 555. Bloch, F. 1930 Z. Phys. 59, 208. Bridgman, P. W. 1923 Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts Sci. 58, 149. Bridgman, P. W. 1925 Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts Sci. 60, 385. Bridgman, P. W. 1952 Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts Sci. 81, 165. Bross, H. & Holz, A. 1963 Physica Stat. Sol. 3, 1141. Cohen, M. H. & Heine, V. 1958 Adv. Phys. 7, 395. Collins, J. G. & Ziman, J. M. 1961 Proc. Roy. Soc. A, 264, 60. Daniels, W. B. 1960 Phys. Rev. 119, 1246. Darby, J. K. & March, N. H. 1964 Proc. Phys. Soc. 84, 591. Dugdale, J. S. 1961 Science, N.Y. 134, 77. Dugdale, J. S. & Gugan, D. 1960 Proc. Roy. Soc. A, 254, 184. Dugdale, J. S. & Gugan, D. 1962 Proc. Roy. Soc. A, 270, 186. Dugdale, J. S. & Gugan, D. 1963 J. Sci. Instrum. 40, 28. Greene, M. P. & Kohn, W. 1965 Phys. Rev. 137, A513. Guntz, A. & Broniewski, W. 1909 J. Chim. Phys. 7, 464. Hackspill, L. 1910 C.R. Acad. Sci., Paris, 151, 305. Hackspill, L. 1911 C.R. Acad. Sci., Paris, 152, 259. Ham, F. S. 1962 Phys. Rev. 128, 82, 2524. Hasegawa, A. 1964 J. Phys. Soc. Japan, 19, 504. Justi, E. 1948 Ann. Phys., Lpz. 3, 183. Kelly, F. M. & MacDonald, D. K. C. 1953 Canad. J. Phys. 31, 147. MacDonald, D. K. C. 1952 Phil. Mag. 43, 479. MacDonald, D. K. C. & Mendelssohn, K. 1950 Proc. Roy. Soc. A, 202, 103. MacDonald, D. K. C., White, G. K. & Woods, S. B. 1956 Proc. Roy. Soc. A, 235, 358.

401

McLennan, J. C., Niven, C. D. & Wilhelm, J. O. 1928 Phil. Mag. 6, 672.

Martin, D. L. 1965 Phys. Rev. 139, A150.

Meissner, W. & Voigt, B. 1930 Ann. Phys., Lpz. 7, 761.

Nash, H. C. & Smith, C. S. 1959 J. Phys. Chem. Solids, 9, 113.

Okumura, K. & Templeton, I. M. 1962 Phil. Mag. 7, 1239.

Okumura, K. & Templeton, I. M. 1963 Phil. Mag. 8, 889.

Okumura, K. & Templeton, I. M. 1965 Proc. Roy. Soc. A, 287, 89.

Shoenberg, P. & Stiles, P. J. 1964 Proc. Roy. Soc. A, 281, 62.

Smith, P. A. & Smith, C. S. 1964 Bull. Amer. Phys. Soc. 9, 238.

Stager, R. A & Drickamer, H. G. 1963 Phys. Rev. 132, 124.

- Stewart, A. T., Donaghy, J. J., Kusmiss, J. H. & Rockmore, D. M. 1964 Bull. Amer. Phys. Soc. 9, 238.
- Woods, A. D. B., Brockhouse, B. N., March, R. H., Stewart, A. T. & Bowers, R. 1962 Phys. Rev. 128, 1112.

Ziman, J. M. 1954 Proc. Roy. Soc. A, 226, 436.

Ziman, J. M. 1959 Phil. Mag. 4, 371.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN AT THE UNIVERSITY PRINTING HOUSE, CAMBRIDGE (BROOKE CRUTCHLEY, UNIVERSITY PRINTER)