hyperfine splittings will also give information regarding the hyperine structure constant and magnetic moments of the nuclei; however, it is not likely that these measurements can be made to any greater accuracy than by existing methods.

VII. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are indebted to Professor Dehmelt for suggesting this work and for his assistance, and to Mr. H. R. Lawler for constructing most of the apparatus. The absorption cells were prepared by Mr. E. Hodges.

PHYSICAL REVIEW VOLUME 107, NUMBER 6 SEPTEMBER 15, 1957

Electronic Polarizabilities of Ions*

R. M. STERNHEIMER

Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York, and Enrico Fermi Institute for Nuclear Studies, † University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois (Received June 6, 1957)

The dipole polarizability α_d and the quadrupole polarizability α_q have been calculated for several ions by solving the Schrodinger equation satisfied by the first-order perturbation of the wave functions of the electrons of the core. The results for α_d of the helium-like ions are in good agreement with those obtained previously by an analytic method. The calculated quadrupole polarizability α_q of the alkali ions increases very rapidly with increasing Z, from 0.056 A⁵ for Na⁺ to 7.80 A⁵ for Cs⁺.

I. INTRODUCTION

~HE electronic polarizabilities of a number of ions have been calculated previously by means of a numerical solution of the Schrödinger equation satisfied by the perturbation of the wave functions of the electrons of the core.' For the unperturbed wave functions, the Hartree or Hartree-Fock wave functions of the core were used. The calculated results for the dipole polarizability α_d were shown to be in reasonable agreement with the experimental data. The purpose of this paper is to give the results of additional calculations of the dipole polarizability α_d of the helium-like ions and of the quadrupole polarizability α_q of several helium-like and alkali ions.

II. DIPOLE POLARIZABILITY

The method of calculation of α_d was the same as that with atomic number Z, the perturbation is given by used in I. Thus, for the helium-like ions, which involve only the 1s— ψ excitation, α_d is given by

$$
\alpha_d = (8/3) \int_0^\infty u' \, \mathrm{d} u' \, \mathrm{d} u' \, \mathrm{d} v, \tag{1}
$$

where u' ₀ is r times the radial 1s function, normalized according to: $\int_0^\infty (u'_0)^2 dr = 1$; $u'_{1, 0 \to 1}$ is r times the radial part of the $1s \rightarrow p$ perturbation, and is determined by

$$
\left(-\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{2}{r^2} + V_0 - E_0\right)u'_{1,0\to 1} = u'_{0}r.\tag{2}
$$

In Eq. (2), V_0 is the spherical potential and E_0 is the unperturbed Is eigenvalue. Actually the function,

$$
P \equiv V_0 - E_0 = (1/u'_0)(d^2u'_0/dr^2), \tag{3}
$$

is obtained directly from the second derivative of u'_{0} , as shown by Eq. (53) of I. We note that Eq. (1) gives α_d in units a_H^3 (a_H = Bohr radius) and must be multiplied by $(0.529)^3$ = 0.148 to obtain α_d in units A³.

For the helium-like ions, values of α_d have been presented in Table II of I. In obtaining these values, $u'_{1,0\rightarrow 1}$ was not derived by numerical solution of the Schrödinger Eq. (2), but was obtained analytically in the following manner. One notes that for a hydrogenic wave function u'_{0} ,

$$
u'_{0} = 2Z^{\frac{3}{2}}r\exp(-Zr),\tag{4}
$$

$$
u'_{1,0\to 1} = Z^{-\frac{1}{2}}r^2(1+\frac{1}{2}Zr)\exp(-Zr). \tag{5}
$$

The zero-order wave functions u' ₀ for the helium-like ions which were used in I and in the present work are the wave functions obtained by Löwdin,² which are of the following form:

$$
u'_{0} = c_{1} [2Z_{1}^{\frac{3}{2}} r \exp(-Z_{1} r)] + c_{2} [2Z_{2}^{\frac{3}{2}} r \exp(-Z_{2} r)], \quad (6)
$$

where Z_1 and Z_2 are two effective values of the atomic number; c_1 and c_2 are coefficients. In the work of I we assumed that $u'_{1, 0 \to 1}$ is given to a good approximation by a linear combination of the functions (5), corresponding to Z_1 and Z_2 , i.e., we took [see Eq. (71) of I]:

$$
u'_{1,0\to 1} = c_1 \big[Z_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} r^2 (1 + \frac{1}{2} Z_1 r) \exp(-Z_1 r) \big] + c_2 \big[Z_2^{-\frac{1}{2}} r^2 (1 + \frac{1}{2} Z_2 r) \exp(-Z_2 r) \big]. \tag{7}
$$

² P. O. Löwdin, Phys. Rev. 90, 120 (1953).

^{*}The work done at Brookhaven National Laboratory was carried out under the auspices of the U. S. Atomic Energy Com-

mission.
† Supported by the Office of Naval Research.
† R. M. Sternheimer, Phys. Rev. 96, 951 (1954). This paper wil
be referred to as I.

TABLE I. Calculated values of the dipole polarizability α_d and
quadrupole polarizability α_q of several helium-like ions. The
second column lists the present values obtained from a numerical
solution of Eqs. (2) and units A^3 and A^5 , respectively.

Ion	Numerical	Analytic	
$\alpha_d(H^-)$	13.4	16.1	
α_d (He)	0.224	0.236	
$\alpha_d(L_i^+)$	0.0307	0.0316	
α_d (Be ⁺⁺)	8.25×10^{-3}	8.3×10^{-3}	
$\alpha_q(\mathrm{H}^-)$	66.5	71.1	
α_q (He)	0.0993	0.101	
$\alpha_q(Li^+)$	4.73×10^{-3}	4.77×10^{-3}	
$\alpha_q(Be^{++})$	6.37×10^{-4}	6.40×10^{-4}	

It was shown in I that for the case of Li⁺ and presumably also for the heavier helium-like ions (Be⁺⁺, B³⁺, C⁴⁺), the approximation of using Eq. (7) for $u'_{1,0\rightarrow 1}$ introduces a negligible error in the calculated value of α_d . Thus for Li⁺, the value of α_d obtained by means of Eq. (7) is 0.0316 A³ as compared to a value of 0.0306 A^3 gotten by solving Eq. (2) numerically for $u'_{1,0\rightarrow1}$, with V_0-E_0 determined directly from the Löwdin function u' ₀ by means of Eq. (3).

Recently Wikner and Das' have obtained values of α_d for the helium-like ions by means of a variational method. In order to compare with their results, it seemed of interest to recalculate the values of α_d for several helium-like ions by numerical solution of the Schrödinger equation. The procedure of the numerical integration has been described⁴ in I. The results are given in the upper part of Table I, which lists both the present values obtained numerically and the previous values of I. It is seen that the previously used analytic approximation is already quite good for He, where the error is only 5% . For Be⁺⁺, the analytic approximation agrees within 1% with the numerical result, so that the values given in I for α_d of B³⁺ and C⁴⁺, (0.00308 A³ and 0.00139 A', respectively) are probably also accurate within 1% . The only case where there is an appreciable discrepancy between the two results is that of H^- , where the extended charge distribution is probably responsible for the inaccuracy of the analytic approximation. Thus the maximum of $u'_{1, 0 \to 1}$ for H⁻ occurs at $r=6a_H$, and there are significant contributions to the integral of (1) up to radii $r \sim 12a_H$.

The present results are in good agreement with the variational results of Wikner and Das.' These authors have used for u' ₀ the wave functions of Green, Mulder, Lewis, and Woll,⁵ which differ slightly from the Löwdin functions' used in the present work. They have obtained the following values for α_d (in units A³): for H⁻: 14.88; for He: 0.218 ; for Li⁺: 0.0305 ; for Be⁺⁺: 0.00813 ; for

 B^{3+} : 0.00303. Except for H⁻, the agreement between these values and ours is very good. Wikner and Das' have given a critical comparison of these calculated results with the experimental values of α_d for the helium-like ions.

III. QUADRUPOLE POLARIZABILITY

The quadrupole polarizability⁶ α_q measures the quadrupole moment induced in the ion Q_{ind} by an externally applied field gradient $\partial E_x/\partial x$, in the same manner as the ordinary (dipole) polarizability α_d is related to the induced dipole moment. The quantity α_{q} is defined as follows¹:

$$
\alpha_q = -\frac{eQ_{\text{ind}}}{\partial E_\pi/\partial x}.\tag{8}
$$

Values of α_q for several helium-like ions and for Na⁺ and Cs+ have been previously obtained (see Table III of I). For the helium-like ions, α_q (in units a_H^2) is given by¹

$$
\alpha_q = (8/5) \int_0^\infty u' \, u' \, 1, \, 0 \to 2r^2 \, dr,\tag{9}
$$

where $u'_{1,0\rightarrow 2}$ is r times the radial wave function for the $1s \rightarrow d$ perturbation; $u'_{1, 0 \rightarrow 2}$ is determined by:

$$
\left(-\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{6}{r^2} + V_0 - E_0\right)u'_{1, 0 \to 2} = u'_{0}r^2. \tag{10}
$$

In the work of I, $u'_{1, 0\rightarrow 2}$ was not obtained from Eq. (10) for the helium-like ions, but instead, in the same manner as for α_d , use was made of the analytic form of $u'_{1, 0 \rightarrow 2}$ for the case of a hydrogenic field [see Eq. (102) of I]. Thus $u'_{1,0\rightarrow 2}$ was taken as

$$
u'_{1,0\to 2} = c_1 \left[\frac{1}{2} Z_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} r^3 (1 + \frac{2}{3} Z_1 r) \exp(-Z_1 r) \right] + c_2 \left[\frac{1}{2} Z_2^{-\frac{1}{2}} r^3 (1 + \frac{2}{3} Z_2 r) \exp(-Z_2 r) \right], \quad (11)
$$

where c_1 , c_2 , Z_1 , and Z_2 are the parameters of the Löwdin wave function, Eq. (6). In order to determine the accuracy of Eq. (11) for $u'_{1, 0 \to 2}$, we have obtained $u'_{1, 0 \rightarrow 2}$ by solving Eq. (10) numerically. The resulting values of α_q are listed in the lower part of Table I, together with the values previously obtained by means of the $u'_{1, 0 \rightarrow 2}$ of Eq. (11). It is seen that for H⁻, the analytic method overestimates α_q by 7%, but that for He, the analytic approximation is already very good. For Li⁺ and Be⁺⁺ the error is less than 1% , and therefore, the values for B^{3+} and C^{4+} , given in Table III of I are probably accurate to within 1% (1.40 \times 10⁻⁴ A⁵ and 4.31×10^{-5} A⁵ for B³⁺ and C⁴⁺, respectively).

Results for α_q for Na⁺ and Cs⁺ have been obtained in I. These values have been recalculated to somewhat higher accuracy in the present work, and we have also obtained results for Cl⁻, K⁺, Cu⁺, and Rb⁺. For these ions with several closed shells, only the outermost shell

³ E. G. Wikner and T. P. Das, Phys. Rev. 107, 497 (1957). I would like to thank Dr. Das for sending me a copy of this paper before publication.

⁴ Reference 1, p. 955.

⁵ Green, Mulder, Lewis, and Woll, Phys. Rev. 93, 757 (1954).

J. E. Mayer and M. G. Mayer, Phys, Rev. 43, 605 (1933).

makes a significant contribution¹ to α_q . It has been shown in I that α_q is given by

$$
\alpha_{q} = \frac{8}{5} (J_{0\to 2})_{n_0 s} + \left(\frac{48}{25} J_{1\to 1} + \frac{72}{25} J_{1\to 3}\right)_{n_0 p} + \left(\frac{8}{5} J_{2\to 0} + \frac{16}{7} J_{2\to 2} + \frac{144}{35} J_{2\to 4}\right)_{n_0 d}, \quad (12)
$$

where n_0 is the principal quantum number of the highest filled shell, $J_{l\rightarrow l'}$ is the radial integral corre-Inglest lined shell, $J_{l\rightarrow l'}$ is the radial integral cosponding to the $n_0 l \rightarrow l'$ excitation. $J_{l\rightarrow l'}$ is given by

$$
J_{l \to l'} = \int_0^\infty u'_{0} u'_{1, l \to l'} r^2 dr, \qquad (13)
$$

where u'_{0} is the unperturbed radial $n_{0}l$ wave function and $u'_{1, l \to l'}$ is the radial wave function for the perturbation and is determined by the equation:

$$
\left[-\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{l'(l'+1)}{r^2} + V_0 - E_0\right]u'_{1, l \to l'} = u'_0(r^2 - \langle r^2 \rangle_{n_0 l} \delta_{l l'}).
$$
 (14)

Here $\langle r^2 \rangle_{n_0}$ is the average value of r^2 over the unperturbed function u'_{0} . As is seen from Eq. (14), this term enters only for $n_0 p \rightarrow p$ and $n_0 d \rightarrow d$ excitations.

Equation (14) was integrated numerically in all cases. For Na⁺, Cl⁻, K⁺, and Cu⁺, the Hartree-Fock func-For Na⁺, Cl⁻, K⁺, and Cu⁺, the Hartree-Fock func
tions⁷⁻¹⁰ were used for the u' ₀. For Rb⁺ and Cs⁺, only Hartree functions (excluding exchange effects) are avail-Hartree functions (excluding exchange effects) are available.^{11,12} The $n_0 p \rightarrow p$ and $n_0 d \rightarrow d$ perturbations $u'_{1, l}$ have been previously obtained by Sternheimer and Foley.¹³ For the perturbations with $l'\neq l$, the calculations Foley.¹³ For the perturbations with $\widetilde{l'} \neq l$, the calculation were carried out as follows. First Eq. (14) was integrated numerically inward starting from large r. Then Eq. (14) was integrated outward starting from small r by means of an appropriate power series expansion. The two solutions were joined at an intermediate radius $(r\sim 0.5a_{\rm H})$, and the resulting function $u'_{1, l\rightarrow l'}$ was used in Eq. (13) to obtain $J_{l\rightarrow l'}$. It may be noted that the inward integration must be repeated several times with various assumed values of $u'_{1, l \to l'}(r_1)$ at the large radius r_1 at which the integration is started. Unless $u'_{1, l \to l'}(r_1)$ has the correct value, the function $u'_{1, l \to l'}(r)$ will diverge near $r=0$. Of course, the actual solution is found by the procedure of joining with the internal solution at small r . This situation is similar to that which arises in

-
- ¹³ R. M. Sternheimer and H. M. Foley, Phys. Rev. 102, 731

TABLE II. Calculated values of the quadrupole polarizability α_q . The rows above α_q list the contributions to α_q of the various modes of excitation of the (outermost) shell with highest principal quantum number n_0 . All values are in units A^5 .

Ion	$Na+$	Cl^-	K^+	$Cu+$	Rb+	$Cs+$
$\alpha_q(n_0 s \rightarrow d)$	0.0133	0.635	0.132	0.00451	0.324	0.884
$\alpha_a(n_0 p \rightarrow p)$	0.0173	5.38	0.183	0.00380	0.759	1.702
$\alpha_a(n_0 p \rightarrow f)$	0.0256	7.75	0.418	0.00937	1.907	5.21
$\alpha_q(n_0d\rightarrow s)$				0.840		
$\alpha_q(n_0d \rightarrow d)$				0.192		
$\alpha_a(n_0d\rightarrow g)$				0.230		
α_o	0.0562	13.77	0.733	1.280	2.990	7.80

the calculation of the dipole polarizability $\lceil \text{Eq.} (58) \rceil$ of I ⁴.

The results of the calculations of α_q are given in Table II. It is estimated that each of the terms is accurate to $\pm 5\%$. For Na⁺ and Cs⁺, the present results differ very little from those previously published¹ (α_q for $Na⁺=0.0562$ A⁵ as compared to the previous value 0.058 A^5 ; for Cs⁺: 7.80 A^5 as compared to 7.62 A^5). The significant increase of α_q in going from K⁺ to Cl⁻ show that α_q is very sensitive to the radius of the charge distribution. There is also a large increase with increasing Z for the alkali ions, in going from $Na⁺$ to $Cs⁺$.

For the case of Cu+, it may be noted that the inner electrons among the $n_0=3$ group, i.e., 3s and 3p, contribute very little to α_q , which is due almost entirely to the 3d electrons. This result is in accordance with the fact that α_q depends essentially¹ on $\left[\langle r^2 \rangle_{n_0} l\right]^2/\langle \Delta E \rangle$, where $\langle \Delta E \rangle$ is a mean energy denominator for quadrupole excitation. The value of $\sqrt{(r^2)_{n_0}r}$ is a factor of \sim 4 times larger for 3d than for 3s and 3p. Moreover $\langle \Delta E \rangle$ is considerably larger for 3s and $3p$ than for $3d \sim 10$ ry for 3s and 3p, as compared to ≤ 1 ry for 3d). Within the 3d group, the 3d— \rightarrow s term is \sim 4 times larger than the 3d— \rightarrow d or $3d \rightarrow g$ term. This is due to the fact that the energy of the 4s state E_{4s} is very close to the 3d energy E_{3d} . Thus $u'_{1, 2 \to 0}$ for the $3d \rightarrow s$ excitation contains a contribution $a_{4s}u'_{0,4s}$, where $u'_{0,4s}$ is the unperturbed 4s function and the coefficient a_{4s} is given by

$$
a_{4s} = \left[\int_0^\infty u'_{0,3d} r^2 u'_{0,4s} dr \right] / (E_{4s} - E_{3d}). \tag{15}
$$

The 4s eigenfunction $u'_{0,4s}$ has been calculated for the same effective potential V_0 in which the 3d electrons move, and it was found that $E_{4s}-E_{3d}=0.334$ ry. (The Hartree-Fock eigenvalue¹⁰ E_{3d} is -1.613 ry, so that E_{4s} = -1.279 ry in the effective-field approximation.) The integral $\int_0^\infty u'_{0,3} d r' u'_{0,4} dr$ was found to be -2.020 , so that the 4s term of $u'_{1, 2 \to 0}$ is $(-2.020/0.334)u'_{0, 4s}$ $=-6.048u'_{0,4s}$. A comparison of $a_{4s}u'_{0,4s}$ with the complete perturbation $u'_{1, 2 \to 0}$ shows clearly that the 4s term almost completely accounts for the total $u'_{1, 2 \to 0}$, as was expected from the smallness of the energy denominator. Thus $a_{4s}u'_{0,4s}$ is very close to $u'_{1,2\rightarrow 0}$ for all values of r. The ratio $\rho = a_{4s}u'_{0,4s}/u'_{1,2\rightarrow 0}$ is 0.984 at the outermos

^{&#}x27;V. Fock and M. Petrashen, Physik. Z. Sowjetunion 6, ³⁶⁸ (1934).

⁸ D. R. Hartree and W. Hartree, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A156, 45 (1936).

⁹ D. R. Hartree and W. Hartree, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A166, 450 (1938).

 $A157, 490$ (1936). $A157, 490$ (1936). A157, 490 (1936).

¹¹ D. R. Hartree, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A151, 96 (1935).

¹² D. R. Hartree, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A143, 506 (1934).

¹³ R. M. Sternheimer and H. M. Foley, Phys. Rev. 102, 731

(fourth) maximum of $u'_{0, 4s}$ at $r=2.0a_H$; ρ is 0.964 at the third maximum of $u'_{0, 4s}$ at $r=0.55a_{\text{H}}$, and $\rho=0.912$ at $r=4a_H$. Another way of showing the predominance of the 4s term consists in evaluating the $3d \rightarrow 4s$ contribution to α_g , which is equal to

$$
\alpha_q(3d\rightarrow 4s) = (8/5)(0.0415)(2.020)^2/0.334
$$

= 0.811 A⁵. (16)

Here $0.0415 = (0.529)^5$ is a factor needed to convert to units A'. Comparison with Table II shows that $\alpha_{q}(3d \rightarrow 4s)$ accounts for 0.811/0.840=0.965 of the complete $3d \rightarrow s$ term.

The large magnitude of the $3d \rightarrow 4s$ excitation raises the question as to the applicability of the first-order perturbation theory which has been used here. In particular, the difference $E_{4s}-E_{3d}$ depends sensitively on the effective potential V_0 used in the calculations, and one may inquire about the magnitude of the induced quadrupole moment Q_{ind} for the case that the 3d and 4s states are exactly degenerate $(E_{3d} = E_{4s})$.¹⁴ In 3d and 4s states are exactly degenerate $(E_{3d} = E_{4s})$.¹⁴ In this case, following the usual methods of perturbation theory, one must solve the secular determinant¹⁵:

$$
\begin{vmatrix} H_{1,aa} - E_1 & H_{1,ab} \\ H_{1,ba} & H_{1,bb} - E_1 \end{vmatrix} = 0.
$$
 (17)

Here $H_{1, aq}$, $H_{1, aq}$, \cdots are matrix elements of the perturbation H_1 , and E_1 is the first-order change of the energy due to H_1 . For a unit point charge placed along the positive x axis at $x=R$, H_1 is given by¹

$$
H_1 = -(r^2/R^3)(3\cos^2\theta - 1),\tag{18}
$$

where θ is the angle between the radius vector (of length r) and the x axis. In Eq. (18), H_1 is given in Rydberg units, if r and R are in units a_H . We denote the 3d state by a and the 4s state by b . It may be noted that the only 3d state of interest here is the state with magnetic quantum number $m=0$. One obtains

$$
H_{1,aa} = -(4/7)R^{-3} \int_0^{\infty} u'^2_{0,3d} r^2 dr
$$

= -0.734R⁻³rydberg, (19)

$$
H_{1, ab} = H_{1, ba} = -(2/5^{\frac{1}{2}})R^{-3} \int_0^{\infty} u'_{0, 3d} r^2 u'_{0, 4s} dr
$$

= 1.806R⁻³rydberg, (20)

$$
H_{1, b b} = 0. \tag{21}
$$

In Eqs. (19) and (20), the factors $4/7$ and $2/5^{\frac{1}{2}}$ arise from the integration over the angular wave functions. The integral $\int_0^\infty u'^2_{0,3}u'^2dr$ over the Hartree-Fock function¹⁰ has the value $1.285a_{\text{H}}^2$. Upon solving Eq. (17), one obtains two roots: $E_{1\alpha} = -2.210R^{-3}$, $E_{1\beta} = 1.476R^{-3}$ rydbergs. The wave function ψ_{α} corresponding to the lower energy $E_{1\alpha}$ is found to be¹⁵:

$$
\psi_{\alpha} = 0.775\psi_{3d,0} - 0.633\psi_{4s},\tag{22}
$$

where $\psi_{3d,0}$ and ψ_{4s} are the unperturbed 3d function (with $m=0$) and the 4s function, respectively. In order to obtain the induced quadrupole moment Q_{ind} , we note that if the 3d electrons with $m=0$ had the wave function $\psi_{3d,0}$, the total quadrupole moment of the ion would be zero, because of the equal population of the $3d$, $m=0$, ± 1 , and ± 2 states which results in spherical symmetry. Thus the replacement of $\psi_{3d,0}$ by ψ_α leads to a quadrupole moment:

$$
Q_{\rm ind} = 2 \int (\psi_a^2 - \psi_{3d,0}^2) r^2 (3 \cos^2 \theta - 1) dV = 2.96 a_{\rm H}^2, \quad (23)
$$

where the factor 2 arises from the presence of the two electrons with $m=0$. The numerical result 2.96 a_{H}^2 for Q_{ind} is obtained in a straightforward manner, using the values of $\int_0^{\infty} u'^2_{0,3} dr^2 dr = 1.285 a_{\text{H}}^2$ and $\int_0^{\infty} u'_{0,3} dr^2 u'_{0,4} dr$ $=-2.020a_{\rm H}^2$.

Equation (23) gives the maximum value of Q_{ind} due to the $3d \rightarrow 4s$ excitation. In order to determine whether the first-order perturbation result for $\alpha_q(3d\rightarrow 4s)$ $=0.811$ A⁵ is adequate in a typical case, we will obtain the corresponding value of Q_{ind} and compare it with (23). It will be assumed that the external charge (e.g., the neighboring ion in a polar molecule) is at a distance $R = 5a_H = 2.65$ A. By virtue of Eq. (8), Q_{ind} is given by

$$
Q_{\text{ind}} = \frac{2\alpha_q}{R^3} = \frac{(2)(0.811)}{2.65^3} = 0.0871 \text{ A}^2 = 0.311 a_{\text{H}}^2, \quad (24)
$$

which is a factor of \sim 10 smaller than the maximum value $2.96a_{\text{H}}^2$. Another way of making the comparison is to obtain the 4s admixture coefficient b_{4s} which is found to be

$$
b_{4s} = -\frac{H_{1, ab}}{E_{4s} - E_{3d}} = -\frac{1.806}{(125)(0.334)} = -0.0431, \quad (25)
$$

where Eq. (20) has been used. It may be noted that b_{4s} differs from a_{4s} of Eq. (15) by a factor $\left(\frac{2}{5^{4}}\right)R^{-3}$, which comes from the integration over the angular wave functions and the definition of H_1 [Eq. (18)].

The results of Eqs. (24) and (25) show that Q_{ind} and b_{4s} are sufficiently small that the first-order perturbation value $\alpha_q(3d\rightarrow 4s) = 0.811 \text{ A}^5$ is expected to be quite accurate. Actually, one can carry out an exact treatment of the 3d—4s admixture also when the zero-order energies E_{3d} and E_{4s} are different. One obtains a secular determinant similar to (17). Upon taking the next higher order term in the admixture, one finds that b_{4s} is

¹⁴ I wish to thank Professor R. H. Dalitz for suggesting to me a

consideration of the case of degenerate 3d and 4s levels.
¹⁵ See, for example, Eyring, Walter, and Kimball, *Quantun*
Chemistry (John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York and London
1944), p. 96.

changed by an amount

$$
\delta b_{4s} = \frac{(H_{1, b\,b} - H_{1, a\,a})H_{1, a\,b}}{(E_{4s} - E_{3d})^2} = 7.5 \times 10^{-4}.\tag{26}
$$

Upon including δb_{4s} and a term (αb_{4s}^2) due to the normalization of the perturbed wave function, one obtains $Q_{\text{ind}} = 0.303a_{\text{H}}^2$, so that the correction to (24) is less than 3% . This conclusion depends, of course, on the value of $E_{4s}-E_{3d}$. If this energy difference were substantially less than 0.3 ry, the actual Q_{ind} would be appreciably smaller than the first-order result and would have to be obtained from an exact calculation of the 4s admixture.

As has been discussed in I, the induced quadrupole

moment contributes to the spectral term defects of the alkalis, for which it gives of the order of 10 to 30% of the amount contributed by the induced dipole moment.⁶ The perturbed wave functions obtained in the present work may also be of interest in the construction of appropriate wave functions for polar molecules.¹⁶ appropriate wave functions for polar molecules.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. T. P. Das and Dr. E. G. Wikner for very helpful communications and for informing me of their results before publication. I am also very much indebted to Professor R. H. Dalitz for helpful discussions.

¹⁶ L. C. Allen, Bull. Am. Phys. Soc. Ser. II, 2, 43 (1957).

PHYSICAL REVIEW VOLUME 107, NUMBER 6 SEPTEMBER 15, 1957

Inelastic Scattering of 20-kev Electrons in Metal Vapors*

LEwIs B.LEDER National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D. C. (Received June 13, 1957)

The low-energy losses of 20-kev electrons passing through the vapors of Zn, Cd, Hg, Na, K, Mg, Ca, Sb, Pb, and KC1, have been measured by using an electrostatic analyzer previously used for measuring electron energy losses in thin metal films. The atomic transitions corresponding to the measured energy losses are in many cases fairly easily established. However, there remain some which are questionable due to the fact that there is more than one feasible transition with energy differences of the order of the given energy loss. It is established that the principal interaction results in the excitation from the ground state of the neutral atom to the first excited level—the resonance excitation. It is also found that dipole excitations predominate

INTRODUCTION

TROM the time that Franck and Hertz¹ first demon strated in 1914 the existence of quantized inelastic collisions between electrons and gas atoms, many experiments were performed to measure such quanta of energy loss. This work was summarized up to 1925 by compton and Mohler.² Brode,³ in 1933, reviewed the study of the collisions of electrons with atoms, and more recently Massey and Burhop4 have brought this information up to date. The energy losses have been called resonance losses and critical potentials. Most of the measurements were made for the permanent gases although a few were made for the metal vapors. All of these measurements were made at very low primaryelectron energies, generally not extending beyond. the value of the first ionization potential of the atom.

The measurements to be described were performed with primary electrons of 20-kev energy, principally because we were interested in obtaining the energy losses in metal vapors under the same conditions as our measurements previously reported' for the energy losses of 20–30 kev electrons in thin metal films.⁶ With high-energy electrons one is not limited, in principle, to exciting only dipole and higher multipole transitions as is the case with electromagnetic radiation; it should be possible to excite monopole transitions as well.⁷ However, the Born approximation predicts that dipole excitations of the atomic electrons should predominate. Fano⁸ has described the relative probabilities of excitation and ionization when a high-energy electron (1—100 kev) interacts with hydrogen atoms. In Fig.

^{*}This work was supported in part by the V. S. Atomic Energy

Commission.
- 1 J. Franck and G. Hertz, Verhandl. deut. physik. Ges. 16,
457 (1914).
- ² K. T. Compton and F. L. Mohler, National Research Council

U.S.) Bull. 48, Vol. 9 (1924–1925).
³ R. B. Brode, Revs. Modern Phys. 5, 257 (1933).
⁴ H. S. W. Massey and E. H. S. Burhop, *Electronic and Ionic*
Impact Phenomena (Clarendon Press, Oxford, England, 1952).

⁵ Marton, Leder, and Mendlowitz in Advances in Electronic and Electron Physics, edited by L. Marton (Academic Press, Inc., New York, 1955), Vol. 7, p. 183.

 $^{\circ}$ E. J. Sternglass, Nature 178, 1387 (1956), has stated that measurement of the energy losses of electrons in metal vapors may provide a test for distinguishing between individual atomic and collective losses of electrons in thin solid 6lms.

^{&#}x27;In what follows, all transitions other than dipole will be referred to as optically forbidden or forbidden transitions.

U. Fano in Radiation Biology, edited by A. Hollaender (McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1954),Vol. 1,p. 56.