UCRL-11175

University of California

Ernest O. Lawrence Radiation Laboratory

TWO-WEEK LOAN COPY

This is a Library Circulating Copy which may be borrowed for two weeks. For a personal retention copy, call Tech. Info. Division, Ext. 5545

ELECTROSTATICALLY CORRELATED SPIN-ORBIT INTERACTIONS IN ℓ^N-TYPE CONFIGURATIONS

Berkeley, California

DISCLAIMER

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. While this document is believed to contain correct information, neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor the Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or the Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof or the Regents of the University of California.

Submitted for publication in
Physical Review

UCRL-11175

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Lawrence Radiation Laboratory
Berkeley, California

AEC Contract No. W-7405-eng-48

ELECTROSTATICALLY CORRELATED SPIN-ORBIT INTERACTIONS IN ℓ^N-TYPE CONFIGURATIONS

K. Rajnak and B. G. Wybourne

December 1963

Electrostatically Correlated Spin-Orbit Interactions in ℓ^N-Type Configurations*

K. RAJNAK

Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley, California

AND

B. G. WYBOURNE

Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois

It is shown that, in second-order perturbation theory, electrostatically correlated spin-orbit interactions give rise to a "screening" of the spin-orbit coupling constant of an ℓ^N-type configuration. In addition to this "screening" effect these interactions also lead to an effective spin-other-orbit interaction which is not included in the usual empirical least squares determination of the Coulomb and spin-orbit parameters. The consequences of this overt effect are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

It has been a tradition among theoretical spectroscopists to treat the radial integrals that characterize the Coulomb and spin-orbit interactions within a particular configuration as parameters. These parameters have been deduced empirically by making least squares fits of the calculated energy levels to the corresponding observed energy levels. In general, only the states of the particular configuration under study have been considered in the calculation of the energy matrices. Thus the effects of electrostatically correlated interactions with other configurations have been explicitly ignored. However, in deriving the parameters of a particular configuration by the method of least squares, it cannot be assumed that the parameters have not accommodated a large part of the effects of the electrostatically correlated interactions with other configurations. Furthermore, this implies that the eigenvectors resulting from the diagonalization of the energy matrices do not reflect the composition of the states of the configuration under study alone but will also represent contributions from the states of many other configurations. In the traditional empirical treatment only a few specific angular dependent quantities are considered; namely, those of the Coulomb repulsion and the spin-orbit interaction within the configuration under study. Electrostatically correlated interactions that give rise

to effects having a different angular dependence will not be adequately represented by the parameters of the configuration under study. We shall refer to these effects as "overt" since they may only be accommodated by introducing additional parameters. As part of a continuing study of the empirical calculation of energy levels we have endeavored to determine the angular dependence of these overt effects and to determine what electrostatically correlated interactions are included in the usual least-squares method.

The effects of weak electrostatic configuration interactions on the energy level structure of ℓ^N-type configurations have been considered in an earlier paper[1] (referred to here as I). However, in the heavy elements, especially the actinides, where spin-orbit interactions are appreciable,[2,3] the combined effects of spin-orbit and electrostatic configuration interactions should also be investigated. Since the spin-orbit interaction may be represented by a one-particle operator that is rigorously diagonal with respect to ℓ but not n,[4] it will only couple $n\ell^N$ with the configurations $n\ell^{N-1}n'\ell$, $n'\ell^{4\ell+1}n\ell^{N+1}$ and $n'\ell^{4\ell'+1}n\ell^N n''\ell'$. Inasmuch as these perturbing configurations will be energetically well separated from the perturbed $n\ell^N$ configuration it is a reasonable approximation to apply second-order perturbation theory as in I.

The bulk of these configuration interactions may be taken into account by modifying the energy matrices of $n\ell^N$ in the same manner as in I. In the present paper an attempt is made to determine the angular dependence of these corrections. It is shown

that the angular dependence of the correction may be represented by a sum of two terms, one proportional to the matrix elements of the spin-orbit interaction and the other to those of the spin-other-orbit interaction. In the usual determination of the Coulomb and spin-orbit parameters from experimental data by the method of least squares, the first term is absorbed as an effective "screening" of the spin-orbit coupling constant of the $n\ell^N$ configuration. The second term, being an overt effect, is usually neglected in the least squares analysis.

EXPRESSIONS FOR THE CONFIGURATION INTERACTIONS

The interacting configurations to be discussed differ only by the substitution of a single orbital of the same symmetry type and as a result it is necessary to consider both the one- and the two- electron terms of the Hamiltonian. The Hamiltonian for an N-electron atom, with the inclusion of spin-orbit interaction, may be written as

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^{N} H_i + \sum_{i>j=1}^{N} e^2/r_{ij} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \xi(r_i)(\underset{\sim}{s}_i \cdot \underset{\sim}{\ell}_i) \qquad (1)$$

where

$$H_i = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\nabla_i^2 - \frac{Ze^2}{r_i} . \qquad (2)$$

The Hamiltonian may be divided into $H = H_o + H_1$ such that

$$H_o = \sum_{i=1}^{N} (H_i + v_i) \qquad (3)$$

and

$$H_1 = -\sum_{i=1}^{N} v_i + \sum_{i>j=1}^{N} e^2/r_{ij} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \xi(r_i)(\underset{\sim}{s}_i \cdot \underset{\sim}{\ell}_i) \qquad (4)$$

$$= -V + G + \Lambda,$$

where v_i is an average potential that acts on the i-th electron and is chosen to minimize the energy E_1, while

$$V = \sum_{i=1}^{N} v_i, \quad G = \sum_{i>j=1}^{N} e^2/r_{ij}, \text{ and } \Lambda = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \xi(r_i)(\underset{\sim}{s}_i \cdot \ell_i) .$$

Using the notation of I, let two particular states, $(\alpha SLJ|$ and $|\alpha' S' L' J)$, of ℓ^N be designated by $(\psi J|$ and $|\psi' J)$ and consider a perturbing state $|mJ)$ belonging to a particular perturbing configuration. Then the energy matrix for the ℓ^N configuration will contain elements of the form

$$(\ell^N \psi J | H_1 | \ell^N \psi' J) . \qquad (5)$$

Following Eq. (3) of I, the correction $C(\psi,\psi'; J)$ to this matrix element, due to the effects of all the perturbing states $|mJ)$ of the perturbing configuration, may be written as the sum of six distinct terms viz.,

$$C(\psi,\psi';J) = \frac{-1}{\Delta E_c} \sum_m (\psi J | H_1 | mJ)(mJ | H_1 | \psi' J) = \sum_{x=1}^{6} C_x(\psi,\psi';J),$$

where

$$C_1(\psi,\psi';J) = \frac{-1}{\Delta E_c} \sum_m (\psi J|V|mJ)(mJ|V|\psi' J) , \tag{6}$$

$$C_2(\psi,\psi';J) = \frac{-1}{\Delta E_c} \sum_m (\psi J|G|mJ)(mJ|G|\psi' J) , \tag{7}$$

$$C_3(\psi,\psi';J) = \frac{-1}{\Delta E_c} \sum_m (\psi J|\Lambda|mJ)(mJ|\Lambda|\psi' J) , \tag{8}$$

$$C_4(\psi,\psi';J) = \frac{-2}{\Delta E_c} \sum_m (\psi J|\Lambda|mJ)(mJ|G|\psi' J) , \tag{9}$$

$$C_5(\psi,\psi';J) = \frac{+2}{\Delta E_c} \sum_m (\psi J|\Lambda|mJ)(mJ|V|\psi' J) , \tag{10}$$

and

$$C_6(\psi,\psi';J) = \frac{+2}{\Delta E_c} \sum_m (\psi J|G|mJ)(mJ|V|\psi' J) . \tag{11}$$

where ΔE_c is a mean excitation energy and we have used the fact that the matrix elements are invariant with respect to interchange of ψ and ψ'.

The first correction term, Eq. (6), can only lead to a shift in the center of gravity of the $n\ell^N$ configuration which in the usual parametrization will be absorbed in the $F^\circ(n\ell n\ell)$ parameter. The second term, Eq. (7), has been discussed in the previous paper. The third term, Eq. (8) represents the effect of configuration interaction induced solely by the spin-orbit interaction while the corrections of Eqs. (9) and (10) may be regarded as electrostatically correlated spin-orbit interaction between the configurations. The last correction term, Eq.(11), leads to a simple screening of the Slater F^k parameters of the ℓ^N configuration without introducing any new angular dependent factors. In the present paper we shall be concerned with the evaluation of the corrections represented by Eqs.(8),(9) and (10).

The summations over the perturbing states may be performed following the methods outlined in I and as a result, we shall only sketch the derivations.

(A). $n\ell^N$ WITH $n\ell^{N-1}n'\ell$.

Noting that

$$(n\ell^N\alpha SLJ|\zeta(n\ell;n'\ell)\sum_i(\underset{\sim}{s}_i\cdot\underset{\sim}{\ell}_i)|n\ell^{N-1}\alpha_1S_1L_1,n's\ell;S''L''J)$$

$$= (-1)^{J+S+S''+S_1+L_1+\ell+s}\begin{Bmatrix}L & L'' & 1\\ S'' & S & J\end{Bmatrix}\begin{Bmatrix}L & L'' & 1\\ \ell & \ell & L_1\end{Bmatrix}\begin{Bmatrix}S & S'' & 1\\ s & s & S_1\end{Bmatrix}$$

$$\left[Ns(s+1)(2s+1)\ell(\ell+1)(2\ell+1)[S][L][S''][L'']\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}(\ell^N\psi|\ell^{N-1}\psi_1)\zeta(n\ell;n'\ell)\ , \quad (12)$$

and using Eq. (39) of I, the summations in Eqs. (8) and (9) may be obtained as

$$C_3(\psi,\psi';J) = \frac{\zeta^2(n\ell,n'\ell)}{2\Delta E_c}\left[(\ell^N\psi J|\sum_{i=1}^{N}(\underset{\sim}{s}_i\cdot\underset{\sim}{\ell}_i)|\ell^N\psi'J) - \frac{N\ell(\ell+1)}{2}\right], \quad (13)$$

and

$$C_4(\psi,\psi';J) = \frac{2\zeta(n\ell,n'\ell)}{\Delta E_c}\sum_k X^k\left[(\ell^N\psi J|\sum_{i=1}^{N}(\underset{\sim}{s}_i\cdot\underset{\sim}{\ell}_i)|\ell^N\psi'J)/[\ell]\right.$$

$$-\sum_t[t]\begin{Bmatrix}1 & k & t\\ \ell & \ell & \ell\end{Bmatrix}(-1)^{J+L'+S'}\begin{Bmatrix}L & L' & 1\\ S' & S & J\end{Bmatrix}[\ell(\ell+1)(2\ell+1)]^{\frac{1}{2}}\sum_{\tilde{\psi}}\begin{Bmatrix}\tilde{L} & L' & t\\ 1 & k & L\end{Bmatrix}$$

$$\left.\times(\ell^N\psi||\underset{\sim}{U}^{(k)}||\ell^N\tilde{\psi})(\ell^N\tilde{\psi}||\underset{\sim}{V}^{(1t)}||\ell^N\psi')\right], \quad (14)$$

where

$$\underset{\sim}{V}^{(1t)} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\underset{\sim}{s}_i^{(1)} \underset{\sim}{u}_i^{(t)}), \tag{15}$$

and

$$X^k = (\ell || \underset{\sim}{C}^{(k)} || \ell)^2 R^k(n\ell, n\ell; n\ell, n'\ell) \ . \tag{16}$$

The second part of Eq. (14) has the same angular dependence as the spin-other-orbit interaction[5] and, hence gives rise to an overt effect. The term with k = 0 in this part simplifies to

$$\frac{-2N\ R^0(n\ell, n\ell; n\ell n'\ell)}{\Delta E_c}\ \zeta(n\ell; n'\ell)\ (\ell^N \psi J | \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\underset{\sim}{s}_i \cdot \ell_i) | \ell^N \psi' J) \ . \tag{17}$$

To evaluate $C_5(\psi, \psi'; J)$ we first note that

$$(n\ell^N \alpha SL | \sum_{i=1}^{N} v_i | n\ell^{N-1} \alpha_1 S_1 L_1 n'\ell; SL) = N^{\frac{1}{2}} (\psi \{ | \psi_1) \ (n\ell | v \ | n'\ell) \tag{18}$$

Summing over the perturbing states in Eq. (10) then yields

$$C_5(\psi, \psi'; J) = \frac{2}{\Delta E_c} (\ell^N \psi J | \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\underset{\sim}{s}_i \cdot \underset{\sim}{\ell}_i) | \ell^N \psi' J) \zeta(n\ell; n'\ell)(n\ell | v | n'\ell) \ . \tag{19}$$

Using Eqs. (13), (14), (17) and (19) we obtain the total corrections, $C_{SO}(\psi, \psi'; J)$, to the spin-orbit matrix element $(\ell^N \psi J | \Lambda | \ell^N \psi' J)$ of the $n\ell^N$ energy matrix for this particular perturbing configuration as

$$\begin{aligned} C_{SO}(\psi, \psi'; J) &= C_3(\psi, \psi'; J) + C_4(\psi, \psi'; J) + C_5(\psi, \psi'; J) \\ &= (\alpha + \beta)(\ell^N \psi J | \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\underset{\sim}{s}_i \cdot \underset{\sim}{\ell}_i) | \ell^N \psi' J) \end{aligned}$$

$$- \sum_{k>0,t} \gamma(k)[t] \begin{Bmatrix} 1 & k & t \\ \ell & \ell & \ell \end{Bmatrix} (-1)^{J+L'+S'} \begin{Bmatrix} L & L' & 1 \\ S' & S & J \end{Bmatrix} [\ell(\ell+1)(2\ell+1)]^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{\tilde{\psi}} \begin{Bmatrix} \tilde{L} & L' & t \\ 1 & k & L \end{Bmatrix}$$

$$(\ell^N \psi || \underset{\sim}{U}^{(k)} || \ell^N \tilde{\psi})(\ell^N \tilde{\psi} || \underset{\sim}{V}^{(1t)} || \ell^N \psi') - \delta \ N, \tag{20}$$

where

$$\alpha = \frac{\zeta(n\ell;n'\ell)}{\Delta E_c[\ell]}\left[\frac{[\ell]}{2}\zeta(n\ell;n'\ell) + 2\sum_{k>0} X^k\right], \tag{21}$$

$$\beta = \frac{2\zeta(n\ell;n'\ell)}{\Delta E_c}\left[(1-N)R^\circ(n\ell,n\ell;n\ell,n'\ell) + (n\ell|v|n'\ell)\right], \tag{22}$$

$$\gamma(k) = \frac{2X^k}{\Delta E_c}\ \zeta(n\ell;n'\ell), \tag{23}$$

and

$$\delta = \frac{\zeta^2(n\ell;n'\ell)}{4\Delta E_c}\ \ell(\ell+1). \tag{24}$$

For the particular case of the $n\ell^2$ configuration the coefficient of fractional parentage in the expansions of the matrix elements of $\underset{\sim}{U}^{(k)}$ and $\underset{\sim}{V}^{(1t)}$ are unity and the sums over $\tilde{\psi}$ and t may be readily performed to yield

$$C(n\ell^2) = (\ell^2SLJ|\sum_{i=1}^{2} s_i\cdot\ell_i\ |\ell^2S'L'J)\left[\alpha+\beta-2\sum_{k>0}\frac{\gamma(k)}{[\ell]}\right] - 2\ \delta. \tag{25}$$

Thus for the $n\ell^2$ configuration the effect of configuration mixing is simply to "screen" the spin-orbit coupling constant $\zeta_{n\ell}$. For more than two electrons, however, the summation over $\tilde{\psi}$ is no longer tractable and a correction proportional to the angular dependence of the spin-other-orbit interaction should be added to the energy matrices of $n\ell^N$.

(B). $n\ell^N$ WITH $n'\ell^{4\ell+1}$ $n\ell^{N+1}$.

Using Eq. (44) of I, and noting that

$$(n\ell^{N+1}\psi_1 n'\ell^{4\ell+1}\ {}^2\ell;S'L'J|\Lambda|n\ell^N\psi n'\ell^{4\ell+2}\ {}^1S;SLJ)$$

$$= (-1)^{2S+S'+L+J+1}\begin{Bmatrix} L & L' & 1 \\ S' & S & J\end{Bmatrix}\begin{Bmatrix} L & L' & 1 \\ \ell & \ell & L_1\end{Bmatrix}\begin{Bmatrix} S & S' & 1 \\ s & s & S_1\end{Bmatrix}\Big[(N+1)s(s+1)(2s+1)$$

a result that follows from Eq. (28) of Racah,[6] it may be shown that the resultant correction is identical in form with Eq. (20) apart from a linear shift of all the terms of the configuration. It should be noted that these types of interaction only arise in configurations $n\ell^N$ with $n > \ell + 1$. Thus they will occur in the actinides ($5f^N$) but not in the corresponding lanthanides ($4f^N$).

(C). $n\ell^N n'\ell'^{4\ell'+2}$ WITH $n\ell^N n'\ell'^{4\ell'+1} n''\ell'$.

It may be readily shown that,[1]

$$(n\ell^N\alpha SL(n'\ell'^{4\ell'+1}n''\ell')\sigma\lambda;S'L'J|\Lambda|n\ell^N\alpha SL\,n'\ell'^{4\ell'+2}\,{}^1S;SLJ)$$

$$= (-1)^{J+L'+S}\delta(\sigma,1)\delta(\lambda,1)\begin{Bmatrix} L & L' & 1 \\ S' & S & J \end{Bmatrix}\left[\ell'(\ell'+1)(2\ell'+1)s(s+1)(2s+1)[S'][L']\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$\frac{\zeta(n'\ell';n''\ell')}{3} \quad . \tag{27}$$

Using this result, together with Eq. (33) of I, we find that the corrections $C_3(\psi,\psi';J)$ and $C_5(\psi,\psi';J)$ can at the most lead to a linear shift of the terms of the $n\ell^N$ configuration. For $C_4(\psi,\psi';J)$ we have

$$C_4(\psi,\psi';J) = (\ell^N\alpha SLJ|\sum_{i=1}^{N}(\underline{s}_i\cdot\underline{\ell}_i)|\ell^N\alpha'S'L'J)\,\frac{\zeta(n'\ell';n''\ell')}{\Delta E_c}$$

$$\left[-2R^\circ(n\ell n''\ell;n'\ell n\ell)\delta(\ell,\ell') + \sum_{k>0}(-1)^{\ell+\ell'}\frac{[k(k+1)-\ell(\ell+1)-\ell'(\ell'+1)]}{\ell(\ell+1)(2\ell+1)}\right.$$

$$\left. X^k(n\ell,n''\ell';n'\ell'n\ell)\right] \tag{28}$$

The occurrence of $(\ell+\ell')$ in the phase factor of the second part of Eq. (28) leads to both "screening" and "antiscreening of the spin-

orbit coupling constant $\zeta_{n\ell}$ of the ℓ^N configuration but does not produce any overt effects. The term with $\ell = \ell'$ will arise in the actinides as the result of the excitation of a 4f electron from the $4f^{14}$ closed shell into the unfilled 6f, or higher f, orbital.

DISCUSSION

It is apparent from the cases just considered that the spin-orbit parameters deduced from the least-squares fitting of energy levels will contain contributions from many configurations and cannot be considered as being associated purely with the ℓ^N- configuration. The "screening" produced by the mechanism of Eq. (8) is probably negligible due to the weakness of the coupling of the configurations by the spin-orbit interaction. However, the "screening" produced by the electrostatically correlated spin-orbit interactions of Eqs. (9) and (10) need not be negligible since if there is appreciable electrostatic coupling of the configurations these will more than offset the weakness of the spin-orbit coupling. The magnitude of this screening will be largely determined by the radial factor,

$$[(1-N)R^{o}(n\ell, n\ell; n\ell, n'\ell) + (nl|v|n'l)], \tag{29}$$

appearing in Eq. (22). The size of this factor will depend upon the choice of zero order wave functions and the form of the average potential v which is used. Until the necessary radial integrals have been computed for several specific cases, however, it is difficult to make any general statements about magnitude of the screening.

The appearance of a term proportional to the spin-other-orbit interaction will lead to overt effects which the usual parameters will be unable to adequately accomodate. In the limit of LS coupling this interaction will not produce deviations from the Lande interval[4] rule but would lead to a different spin-orbit coupling constant for each multiplet. These overt effects could be included by introducing ℓ additional parameters. It should be

noted that due to the presence of these overt effects a spin-orbit coupling constant deduced from a single multiplet that follows the Lande interval rule need not be representative of the entire configuration.

When the parameters are derived from a least squares method it is impossible to distinguish the contributions to the spin-orbit coupling constant that arise from the effects of electrostatically correlated interactions with other configurations and those that arise from the spin-orbit interactions within the configuration. Likewise, in empirical determinations of the spin-other-orbit interactions for a configuration it is impossible to decide whether the derived spin-other-orbit parameters represent a real spin-other-orbit interaction within the configuration or whether they are attributable to a pseudo-spin-other-orbit interaction that arises out of the effects of electrostatically correlated spin-orbit interactions.

Electrostatically correlated spin-orbit interactions are by no means the only possible correlated interactions that couple configurations. In fact, these interactions are probably of lesser significance than the electrostatically correlated two-particle orbit-orbit, spin-spin and spin-other-orbit interactions between configurations. The properties of these interactions will be taken up in a later paper.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We wish to thank Drs. G. L. Goodman and R. E. Watson for helpful discussion of several points.

/hw-8/22/63

REFERENCES AND FOOTNOTE

* Based on work performed under the auspices of the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

[1] K. Rajnak and B. G. Wybourne, Phys. Rev. 132, 280 (1963).

[2] B. G. Wybourne, J. Chem. Phys. 36, 2301 (1962).

[3] H. Lammermann and J. G. Conway, J. Chem. Phys. 38, 259 (1963).

[4] E. U. Condon and G. H. Shortley, "Theory of Atomic Spectra," Cambridge University Press, New York (1935).

[5] H. Horie, Prog. Theoret. Phys. (Japan) 10, 296 (1953).

[6] G. Racah, Phys. Rev. 63, 367 (1943).

This report was prepared as an account of Government sponsored work. Neither the United States, nor the Commission, nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission:

A. Makes any warranty or representation, expressed or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of the information contained in this report, or that the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report may not infringe privately owned rights; or

B. Assumes any liabilities with respect to the use of, or for damages resulting from the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report.

As used in the above, "person acting on behalf of the Commission" includes any employee or contractor of the Commission, or employee of such contractor, to the extent that such employee or contractor of the Commission, or employee of such contractor prepares, disseminates, or provides access to, any information pursuant to his employment or contract with the Commission, or his employment with such contractor.