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#### Abstract

The compressibility, $\beta=-(1 / V)(\partial V / \partial P)_{T}$, of liquid $\mathrm{He}^{4}$ was measured from 1 atm to the melting pressure and between 1.6 and $2.5^{\circ} \mathrm{K} . \Delta V$ and $\Delta P$ were determined from deflections of the cell walls. The normal decrease of $\beta$ with increasing $P$ was observed except in an area below the $\lambda$ line. For an isotherm crossing the $\lambda$ line, $\beta$ showed a minimum at $P<P_{\lambda}$ and a peak at $P_{\lambda}$. The minimum also occurred between the lowest $T_{\lambda}$ $\left(1.76^{\circ} \mathrm{K}\right)$ and $1.70^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$. The variation of $\beta$ with $P$ near $P_{\lambda}$, relative to $\beta$ at $2.20^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$, followed an equation of the form $\beta_{T}-\beta_{2.2}=a-b \log \left|P-P_{\lambda}\right|$, where $a$ and $b$ for $P<P_{\lambda}$ are greater than $a$ and $b$ for $P>P_{\lambda}$. Between the $T$ limits of the $\lambda$ line, $(\partial \beta / \partial T)_{P}$ was definitely negative for $P$ just above $P_{\lambda}$, but it approached zero for $P \gg P_{\lambda}$.


## I. INTRODUCTION

IN general, the isothermal compressibility coefficient, $\beta \equiv-(1 / V)(\partial V / \partial P)_{T}$, of a liquid decreases with decreasing temperature and with increasing pressure. The anomalous increase of $\beta$ with increasing pressure in liquid $\mathrm{He}^{4}$ near the $\lambda$ transition was first indicated by the density measurements of Keesom and Keesom. ${ }^{1}$ Their Fig. 3 seems to show $(\partial \rho / \partial P)_{T}$ at 30 atm rising above the values at 25 and 20 atm in a narrow temperature interval $1.80-1.85^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$. However, the authors left the point without comment while they noted "as a remarkable fact that the He ir parts of the curves seem to approach at decreasing temperatures to a production of the He I parts. It looks as if there is an intermediary region of increased compressibility, which abruptly ends at the $\lambda$ curve." On the other hand, no pressure anomaly was shown by the adiabatic compressibility derived from sound-velocity data of Atkins and Stasior. ${ }^{2}$ Direct measurements of $\beta$, i.e., through small $\Delta P$ and $\Delta V$ at constant temperature, were made by Grilly and Mills ${ }^{3}$ over a short range of pressure and at several temperatures. The values of $\beta$ peaked at $P_{\lambda}$, but the continuity of $\beta$ was indefinite. However, it was clear that $\beta$ had an anomalous variation with temperature near the $\lambda$ transition for $P>P_{\lambda}$. Then, Lounasmaa ${ }^{4}$ measured $\beta$ with very high resolution in the immediate vicinity (within $10^{-3}$ to $10^{-2} \mathrm{~atm}$ ) of one $\lambda$ point $\left(2.023^{\circ} \mathrm{K}\right.$ and 13.04 atm$)$. He obtained a linear variation of $\beta$ with pressure on each side of $P_{\lambda}$ and a discontinuity of $10 \%$ in $\beta$ at $P_{\lambda}$.
All these measurements left unanswered some questions. What is the nature of the expected minimum in the $\beta$ versus $P$ curve? Does the abnormal variation of $\beta$ with temperature near the $\lambda$ transition revert to normalcy at $(P, T)$ far above $\left(P_{\lambda}, T_{\lambda}\right)$ ? To answer them,

[^0]$\beta$ was measured directly as a function of pressure at several constant temperatures.

## II. EXPERIMENTAL

## A. Method

The present measurements of compressibility in liquid $\mathrm{He}^{4}$ were done in a cell designed for general $P-V-T$ work in liquid and solid $\mathrm{He}^{4}$ and $\mathrm{He}^{3}$. Essentially, each $\Delta P$ and $\Delta V$ was measured by the deflection of diaphragms. The cell, shown in Fig. 1, consisted of three diaphragms joined circumferentially and left separated by two gaps, each of which was connected to a capillary tube leading to room temperature. The upper gap acted as the sample chamber, whose volume $V_{U}$ could be changed at will by the pressure of the liquid in the lower gap. The sample under study was confined to $V_{U}$ by a valve near the cell. The upper chamber pressure $P_{U}$ was determined from the deflection of the top diaphragm, while the lower chamber pressure $P_{L}$ was measured at room temperature through the capillary. At any time, $V_{U}$ could be determined from $P_{U}$ and $P_{L}$ through the formula

$$
V_{U}=V_{U_{0}}+\left(S_{U}+S_{L}\right) P_{U}-S_{L} P_{L},
$$

where $V_{U_{0}}$ is the volume of the upper chamber for no deflection of the diaphragms, $S_{U}$ is the sensitivity of the upper diaphragm in terms of volume change per unit pressure difference, and $S_{L}$ is the sensitivity of the middle diaphragm. Therefore, the compressibility of

Fig. 1. The $P-V-T$ cell.

the sample in $V_{U}$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta=-\frac{1}{V_{U}} \frac{d V_{U}}{d P_{U}}=\frac{S_{L}}{V_{U}}\left(\frac{d P_{L}}{d P_{U}}-\frac{S_{U}+S_{L}}{S_{L}}\right) . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Generally, the values of $\Delta P$ are small enough to represent the differentials directly. With the cell characteristics $V_{U_{0}}=0.3380 \mathrm{~cm}^{3}, S_{U}=1.31 \times 10^{-3} \mathrm{~cm}^{3}$ $\mathrm{atm}^{-1}$, and $S_{L}=1.09 \times 10^{-3} \mathrm{~cm}^{3} \mathrm{~atm}^{-1}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta \approx 2.5 \times 10^{-3}\left(\Delta P_{L} / \Delta P_{U}-2.2\right) \mathrm{atm}^{-1} . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

## B. Apparatus

The $P-V-T$ cell was made from $\mathrm{Be}-\mathrm{Cu}$ (Berylco-25) disks, welded together by an electron beam, then heattreated for favorable strength and elasticity. The cell was designed to measure a range of $\Delta V / V$ values from $5 \times 10^{-5}$ for thermal expansion to $10^{-1}$ for melting, a much greater range than needed here for the liquid compressibility. At $4^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$, the diaphragm displacement at the center was $3 \times 10^{-4} \mathrm{~cm} \mathrm{~atm}^{-1}$ up to the maximum working pressure of 68 atm . The upper diaphragm deflection was measured with a Sanborn 959 DT 005 differential transformer, whose output was put through a Sanborn 311 amplifier and read on a Weston dc voltmeter. The resolution of 0.01 V corresponded to $10^{-3}$ atm . The sensitivity was frequently checked between compressibility measurements against a room-temperature gauge. The diaphragm behavior seemed to stay constant, but the over-all sensitivity varied slightly with bath height (an effect of lead resistance) and with axial position of the transformer core.
The volume of the upper (sample) chamber was calibrated against various pressures in the upper and lower chambers by metering withdrawn helium, gas at 296 and $76^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$, liquid at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$. The molar volumes at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ were taken from Edeskuty and Sherman ${ }^{5}$ after a $-0.30 \%$ correction. The observed values of the volume sensitivity increased with temperature, $5 \%$ for 4 to $76^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ and $14 \%$ for 4 to $296^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ but were constant with pressure to 68 atm .
A rigid requirement in the $\Delta V$ measurements was the tightness of the valve sealing the sample in the cell. The valve tip was a $55^{\circ}$ cone of Teflon; its seat was a $0.5-\mathrm{mm}$ hole in the brass body. A leak test after each closing showed the valve to be tight in all cases.
The pressure standards were: (a) a Consolidated Electrodynamics Corp. 6-201 gas piston gauge to 34 atm ; and (b) an Ashcroft 1313A oil piston gauge to 68 atm . The first was calibrated against other standard gauges and the $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ sublimation pressure at the ice point; accuracy was better than $0.01 \%$. Both piston gauges had calibrated weights so that pressure changes

[^1]

FIg. 2. Isothermal compressibility coefficient versus pressure for liquid $\mathrm{He}^{4}$ at several temperatures. The measurements show no deviation from the curves on this scale.
of 0.3 atm were known to $0.01 \%$; this was useful in checking the consistency of the $P-V-T$ cell diaphragm sensitivity. Routine pressure measurements were made with Heise and Seegers Bourdon-type and Consolidated diaphragm-type gauges.

Temperatures of the liquid $\mathrm{He}^{4}$ bath were determined from vapor pressures on the "1958 Scale". ${ }^{6}$ The bath pressure was regulated to less than 0.5 mdeg equivalent.

## III. RESULTS

The isothermal compressibility coefficient $\beta$ was measured directly over a wide pressure range, usually from about 1 atm to the melting pressure, for temperatures between 1.60 and $2.50^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$. Typical results are shown in Fig. 2. The $2.20^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ curve illustrates the monotonic decrease of $\beta$ with increasing pressure for


Fig. 3. Deviations of liquid $\mathrm{He}^{4}$ compressibility at $2.200^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ from $0.30 \times 10^{-3}+(72.0 \times 6.66 P)^{-1}$. - present measurements; o derived from density data of Keesom and Keesom (Ref. 1); $\square$ derived from density of Edeskuty and Sherman (Ref. 5).

[^2]$T>2.17^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$. It was fitted with an empirical formula,
$\beta^{\prime}\left(2.200^{\circ} \mathrm{K}\right)=0.30 \times 10^{-3}+(72.0+6.66 P)^{-1} \mathrm{~atm}^{-1}$,
to about $1.5 \%$; deviations of the measurements are given in Fig. 3. Also given there is a comparison with $\beta$ derived from density data of Keesom and Keesom ${ }^{1}$ and of Edeskuty and Sherman. ${ }^{5}$ Agreement between the three sets of results seems reasonable and the comparison is valid since no $\lambda$ anomalies exist at this temperature.

A view of Fig. 2 again shows that a compressibility curve between 1.80 and $2.05^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ parallels the $2.20^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ curve at low pressures, but with increasing pressure it rises above the $2.20^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ curve, reaching a peak at $P_{\lambda}$. At $P>P_{\lambda}$, the values of $\beta$ drop continuously and approach the $2.20^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ value. The minima in the $\beta$-versus- $P$ curves increase in depth and breadth as $P_{\lambda}$ increases, but they seem flattest in the middle of the $P_{\lambda}$ range. Although the peaks become more distinct with increased $P_{\lambda}$, the sharpness of all the peak tips required a


Fig. 4. Compressibility of liquid $\mathrm{He}^{4}$ at 1.95 and $2.200^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$.
higher than normal resolution; therefore the pressure increment of a measurement was reduced from the usual 0.27 to 0.05 atm in the vicinity of the peak. Portions of the 1.95 and $1.80^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ curves are shown in Figs. 4 and 5, respectively, along with the $2.20^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ values for comparison. The peak at $P_{\lambda}$ fades away with increasing temperature until it almost disappears at $2.05^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$, although the compressibility excess over the $2.20^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ value is still obvious.

In the region between 1.60 and $1.75^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$, no $\lambda$ transition occurs. However, the results in Fig. 6 show that a minimum in the $\beta$-versus- $P$ curve persists down to $1.70^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$; at $1.75^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$, the rate of rise beyond the minimum is similar to that at $1.80^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$. Below $1.70^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$, (the $1.65^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ curve is omitted for clarity) the minimum disappears, but a compressibility excess over the $2.20^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ curve remains, amounting to $15 \%$ at $1.60^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ near the melting pressure.

The temperature variation of $\beta$ at constant pressure changed according to the proximity of $(T, P)$ to $\left(T_{\lambda}, P_{\lambda}\right)$. For all temperatures, $\beta$ at $P \ll P_{\lambda}$ increased with in-


Fig. 5. Compressibility of liquid $\mathrm{He}^{4}$ at 1.80 and $2.200^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$.
creasing temperature. Near the $\lambda$ transition, the variation of $\beta$ with temperature became inverted. The reversion of $(\partial \beta / \partial T)_{P}$ to the normal plus sign at $P \gg P_{\lambda}$ was not indicated-the compressibilities for different temperatures merged to a common value within $\sim 2 \%$, the experimental error, at the highest pressures.
The accuracy of the measurements is summarized here. From a straight sum of possible individual errors in cell calibration plus those from readings of $\Delta V$ and $\Delta P$, the maximum error in an individual $\beta$ should be 2.5 to $5.0 \%$ for high to low values of $\beta$, respectively; from the root mean square of individual errors, a probable error in $\beta$ is 1.5 to $3.0 \%$ for high to low values. Consideration of $\Delta P_{L} / \Delta P_{U}$ alone in Eq. (2) leads to a precision error of 1.0 to $1.7 \%$ for high to low values of $\beta$. Near the $\lambda$ transition, the decrease in $\Delta P$ for greater resolution probably lowered the accuracy, but here we are mainly interested in the reproducibility of results over a short range of pressure and time. Error in these results is estimated at $2 \%$.

## IV. DISCUSSION

The present compressibility measurements provide a view of normal and abnormal behavior in liquid $\mathrm{He}^{4}$


Fig. 6. Compressibility of liquid $\mathrm{He}^{4}$ at several temperatures below 1.76 and at $2.200^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$.

Table I. Compressibility minima in liquid $\mathrm{He}^{4}$.

| $T$ <br> $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}\right)$ | $\beta_{\text {min }}$ <br> $\left(10^{-3} \mathrm{~atm}^{-1}\right)$ | $P\left(\beta_{\text {min }}\right)$ <br> $(\mathrm{atm})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2.050 | 8.20 | $10.3 \pm 0.3$ |
| 2.000 | 7.42 | $13.7 \pm 0.5$ |
| 1.949 | 6.75 | $17.0 \pm 0.7$ |
| 1.899 | 6.35 | $19.0 \pm 1.0$ |
| 1.880 | 6.27 | $20.0 \pm 1.0$ |
| 1.865 | 6.15 | $20.5 \pm 0.5$ |
| 1.799 | 5.65 | $23.0 \pm 0.5$ |
| 1.750 | 5.35 | $24.5 \pm 0.5$ |
| 1.339 | 5.27 | $250 \pm 0.5$ |
| 1.700 | 5.07 | $26.0 \pm 0.5$ |

through pressure variations. Generally, $(\partial \beta / \partial P)_{T}$ is negative because of the increase in intermolecular repulsive force. In this sense, the present results show liquid $\mathrm{He}^{4}$ is normal for all pressures at $T>2.17^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$. In particular, the liquid at $2.200^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ seems to have a high degree of normalcy, as here $\beta$ versus $P$ closely follows Tait's relation

$$
\begin{equation*}
V \beta=J(L+P)^{-1}, \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $V$ is the corrected molar volume of Edeskuty and Sherman ${ }^{5}$ and $J=3.390$ and $L=8.47$ are empirical constants. This relation fits a wide variety of liquids and was given a fundamental basis for liquids in general by Ginell. ${ }^{7}$
At $T<2.17^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$, the sign of $(\partial \beta / \partial P)_{T}$ changes as $P \rightarrow P_{\lambda}$ from below. The minimum shown in $\beta$ versus $P$ is lacking in the curves of specific heat and thermal expansion versus temperature, which simply continue the trends set by the low-temperature portions of their curves, albeit at accelerated rates. The minima in the $\beta$-versus- $P$ curves follow a regular pattern for both


Fig. 7. Phase diagram of $\mathrm{He}^{4}$ showing the melting curve, the $\lambda$ line, the locus of zero expansion coefficient, and the locus of minimum in compressibility.
${ }^{7}$ R. Ginell, J. Chem. Phys. 34, 1249 (1961).
$\beta_{\text {min }}$ and $P\left(\beta_{\text {min }}\right)$. The values given in Table I show that $\beta_{\min }$ decreases linearly with increasing $P\left(\beta_{\min }\right)$. In the phase diagram of Fig. 7 are shown the locus of $\beta_{\text {min }}$ and the locus of zero thermal expansion, determined by Grilly and Mills. ${ }^{3}$ These two loci indicate a sizable area of anomalous behavior in the $P-V-T$ relations. Goldstein ${ }^{8}$ gave a possible explanation for the value of $(\partial \beta / \partial P)_{r}>0$ as $P$ increases toward $P_{\lambda}$ : The exchange-energy density, decreasing rapidly as the number of normal atoms increases with pressure, provides a net decrease in energy density, which is measured by $1 / \beta$. The same mechanism could account for the minima shown at $T<1.76^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$, where a $\lambda$ transition is cut short by the formation of solid.

Near $P_{\lambda}$, the variation of $\beta$ with $P$ is best expressed by a logarithmic fit

$$
\begin{align*}
10^{3}\left(\beta_{T}-\beta_{2.2}\right) & =a_{-}-b-\log _{10}\left|P-P_{\lambda}\right| \text { for } P<P_{\lambda} \\
& =a_{+}-b_{+} \log _{10}\left|P-P_{\lambda}\right| \text { for } P>P_{\lambda} . \tag{5}
\end{align*}
$$

Here, $\beta_{T}$ and $\beta_{2.2}$ are the measured compressibilities


Fig. 8. $\beta_{T}-\beta_{2.2}$ versus $\log \left|P-P_{\lambda}\right|$ for liquid $\mathrm{He}^{4}$ at several temperatures. The upper curve is for $P<P_{\lambda}$ and the lower curve is for $P>P_{\lambda}$ at each $T$.
at $(T, P)$ and at $\left(2.200^{\circ} \mathrm{K}, P\right)$, respectively, and $P$ is in atmospheres. The constants $a, b$, and $P_{\lambda}$ were determined from plots of $\beta_{T}-\beta_{2.2}$ versus $\log \left|P-P_{\lambda}\right|$. Some graphical examples are given in Fig. 8, while the constants are given in Table II. We see that the linear plots become more definite as the temperature is decreased, or as the $\lambda$ transition of $\beta$ is accented. At the lowest observed $T_{\lambda}$ values, 1.86 and $1.80^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$, Eq. (5) appears to hold for $5 \times 10^{-2}<\left|P-P_{\lambda}\right|<10 \mathrm{~atm}$. This resembles the linear functions of $\log \left|T-T_{\lambda}\right|$ fitted to the thermal expansion, $\alpha_{P}=(1 / V)(\partial V / \partial T)_{P},{ }^{9-12}$ and

[^3]the constant-pressure specific heat, $C_{p},{ }^{13}$ derived from measurements on the saturated liquid. If the relations hold at higher pressures, then for the limits $5 \times 10^{-2}$ $<\left|P-P_{\lambda}\right|<10 \mathrm{~atm}$ or $5 \times 10^{-4}<\left|T-T_{\lambda}\right|<10^{-1}{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}, \beta$ tends to vary linearly with $\alpha_{P}$ and $C_{p}$, which is consistent with the Buckingham-Fairbank ${ }^{14}$ derivations. Unfortunately, the experimental ranges of pressure do not overlap. Therefore direct comparisons between the data cannot be made. However, at the $\lambda$ point of $2.023^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ and 13.04 atm Lounasmaa ${ }^{4}$ found that $\beta$, measured with $10^{-3} \mathrm{~atm}$ resolution, varied linearly with $\left|P-P_{\lambda}\right|$ for $10^{-3}<\left|P-P_{\lambda}\right|<10^{-2} \mathrm{~atm}$. At $\left|P-P_{\lambda}\right|=10^{-3} \mathrm{~atm}$, his results coincide with the values from Eqs. (3) and (5), namely, $\beta_{-}=8.8$ and $\beta_{+}=7.9$ in $10^{-3} \mathrm{~atm}^{-1}$ units. At $\left|P-P_{\lambda}\right|=10^{-2} \mathrm{~atm}$, the agreement is poorer but still acceptable. It is notable that the highest values of $\beta$ observed near a $\lambda$ point are only $\sim 10^{-2} \mathrm{~atm}^{-1}$.

Table II. Constants in Eq. (5).

| $T$ <br> $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}\right)$ | $P_{\lambda}$ <br> $(\mathrm{atm})$ | $a_{-}$ <br> $\left(\mathrm{atm}^{-1}\right)$ | $b_{-}$ <br> $\left(\mathrm{atm}^{-1}\right)$ | $a_{+}$ <br> $\left(\mathrm{atm}^{-1}\right)$ | $b_{+}$ <br> $\left(\mathrm{atm}^{-1}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2.050 | 10.92 | 0.75 | 0.42 | 0.16 | 0.34 |
| 2.000 | 14.62 | 0.93 | 0.48 | 0.20 | 0.41 |
| 1.949 | 18.27 | 1.08 | 0.58 | 0.25 | 0.46 |
| 1.899 | 21.65 | 1.38 | 0.74 | 0.55 | 0.53 |
| 1.880 | 22.86 | 1.52 | 0.77 | 0.55 | 0.44 |
| 1.865 | 23.81 | 1.78 | 0.92 | 0.58 | 0.53 |
| 1.799 | 27.74 | 1.79 | 1.23 | 0.62 | 0.60 |

Therefore, the validity of an expression like Eq. (5) cannot continue indefinitely as the $\lambda$ point is approached. Goldstein ${ }^{15}$ pointed out that the root-meansquare temperature fluctuations of the system, the upper limit of meaningful $\left|T-T_{\lambda}\right|$ values, is $\sim 10^{-12^{\circ}} \mathrm{K}$.

The sound velocities of Atkins and Stasior ${ }^{2}$ were combined with the densities of Keesom and Keesom ${ }^{1}$ to derive the adiabatic compressibilities, $\beta_{S}=\left(\rho u^{2}\right)^{-1}$. Although the velocities should have high resolution, no anomalous variation of $\beta_{S}$ with pressure was seen near

[^4]

Fig. 9. The ratio of specific heats $C_{P} / C_{V}$ versus pressure for liquid $\mathrm{He}^{4}$ at several temperatures.
the $\lambda$ transition. The $\beta_{S}$ values were combined with the present isothermal compressibilities to derive $C_{P} / C_{V}$ $=\beta / \beta_{S}$, the ratio of specific heats. Figure 9 shows $C_{P} / C_{V}$ rising with pressure, reaching peaks of $\sim 1.6$ at the $\lambda$ transition, before dropping to the values at $2.20^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$, which are at most 1.05 . The peak heights of the $C_{P} / C_{V}$ ratio are indefinite, as are those of $\beta$, whereas the derivations of Buckingham and Fairbank ${ }^{14}$ indicate that if $C_{P} \rightarrow \infty, \beta \rightarrow \infty$ while $C_{V}$ and $\beta_{S}$ remain finite. However, this behavior of $C_{V}$ and $\beta_{S}$ can be questioned if the $\lambda$ transition is connected with the liquid-gas critical point [see Tisza ${ }^{16}$ and Green ${ }^{17}$ ]. As the critical point is approached, singular functions are indicated for $\beta_{S}$ and $C_{V}$ by Chase, Williamson, and Tisza ${ }^{18}$ and by Moldover and Little, ${ }^{19}$ respectively. Therefore, the functions for $\beta_{S}$ and $C_{V}$ might be similar enough to those for $\beta$ and $C_{P}$ that $C_{P} / C_{V}=\beta / \beta_{S}$ remains finite at the $\lambda$ transition.
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