

$(d \ln \gamma^*/dP)$  in (18)}, we obtain

$$d \ln N(0)/dP = d \ln \gamma^*/dP = -8.31 \times 10^{-6} \text{ per atm.} \quad (23)$$

This result is very different from that expected from the free-electron model, according to which  $N(0) \propto n^{1/3}$ , where  $n$  is the number of electrons per unit volume. However, in general,

$$d \ln n/dP = -d \ln v/dP = \kappa, \quad (24)$$

where  $v$  is the molar volume and  $\kappa$  is the compressibility, and so the free electron model predicts

$$\begin{aligned} [d \ln N(0)/dP]_{\text{fr. el.}} &= \frac{1}{3} (d \ln n/dP) \\ &= \kappa/3 \simeq +5.6 \times 10^{-7} \text{ per atm,} \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

a result 15 times smaller than the measured value and of the wrong sign. The implication is clear that the free-electron model is not very satisfactory for dealing with the pressure effect in the case of Pb.

Consider now a density of states curve having the shape near the Fermi energy as suggested by Gold.<sup>29</sup> On the basis of Steele's measured values of the absolute thermoelectric power of Pb,<sup>30</sup> Gold obtains

$$\frac{1}{N(E_F)} \left( \frac{\partial N(E)}{\partial E} \right)_{E_F} = -0.90 \text{ per ev,} \quad (26)$$

where  $N(E_F)$  is the density of states for both spins, i.e.,  $N(E_F) = 2N(0)$ . The Fermi energy,  $E_F$ , is defined by the equation

$$\int_0^{E_F} N(E) dE = n. \quad (27)$$

Differentiating (27) with respect to pressure

$$\frac{dn}{dP} = n\kappa = \int_0^{E_F} \frac{\partial N(E)}{\partial P} dE + N(E_F) \frac{dE_F}{dP} \quad (28)$$

and, solving for  $(dE_F/dP)$ , we obtain

$$\left( \frac{dE_F}{dP} \right) = \frac{n\kappa}{N(E_F)} - \frac{1}{N(E_F)} \int_0^{E_F} \frac{\partial N(E)}{\partial P} dE. \quad (29)$$

<sup>29</sup> A. V. Gold, Phil. Mag. 49, 73 (1960).

<sup>30</sup> M. C. Steele, Phys. Rev. 81, 262 (1951).

A detailed calculation is required to evaluate  $[\partial N(E)/\partial P]$ , but, as a rough approximation, we shall take it to be zero. We thus obtain from (20)

$$\frac{dE_F}{dP} \simeq \frac{n\kappa}{N(E_F)} = 5.15 \times 10^{-6} \text{ ev/atm,} \quad (30)$$

where we have used the values,  $N(E_F) = 1.30$  per ev per atom from the value of  $\gamma$  given by Decker<sup>12</sup> and  $n = 4$  per atom.

A general expression for the pressure variation in the density of states at the Fermi surface is

$$\frac{dN(E_F)}{dP} = \left( \frac{\partial N(E)}{\partial P} \right)_{E_F} + \left( \frac{\partial N(E)}{\partial E} \right)_{E_F} \frac{dE_F}{dP}. \quad (31)$$

According to the present approximation  $[\partial N(E)/\partial P] = 0$ , and so we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d \ln N(E_F)}{dP} &\simeq \frac{1}{N(E_F)} \left( \frac{\partial N(E)}{\partial E} \right)_{E_F} \frac{dE_F}{dP} \\ &= -4.6 \times 10^{-6} \text{ per atm} \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

upon inserting the values from (26) and (30).

The approximate result in (32) compares reasonably well with the experimental value of  $-8.31 \times 10^{-6}$  per atm. Moreover it can be seen from (29) and (31) that the effect of including the neglected  $[\partial N(E)/\partial P]$  term would make  $[dN(E_F)/dP]$  more negative. Since pressure decreases the interatomic distance and therefore broadens the energy bands, it is to be expected that  $[\partial N(E)/\partial P]$  is negative. It is thus possible that an improved calculation will result in still better agreement with our experimental result.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We take this opportunity to thank R. Wilson and J. Simpson for their help in measuring temperatures and reducing the data. We also acknowledge several useful discussions with R. W. Shaw. Finally, we are particularly indebted to J. Bardeen for his interest and assistance in the theoretical interpretation of the results.