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ABSTRACT

The formulation of the Grüneisen coefficient based on the velocity doubling approximation is used to define a normalized Grüneisen coefficient. A new integral formulation for the free surface velocity is then written in terms of this normalized coefficient. On the assumption that the specific energy of the solid at 0^\circ K is a known function of the specific volume and that the bulk sound speed in the uncompressed state is a known quantity, the Hugoniot of the solid is chosen to be that curve, among a family of curves lying on a Mie-Grüneisen constraint surface, which maximizes the free surface velocity. A differential equation for the resulting Hugoniot is determined and its solution is approximated by the first three terms of a series expansion. This expansion furnishes a quadratic expression for the shock velocity in terms of the particle velocity all of whose coefficients are given by formulas involving physically meaningful quantities. Calculations have been made in the case of aluminum and have been found to agree with the experimental data out to 340 kb very closely. A preliminary check for sodium metal is also given.
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THE HUGONIOT OF A SOLID DETERMINED BY MEANS OF A VARIATIONAL PRINCIPLE

I. INTRODUCTION

A much used form of an equation of state for solids is the so-called Mie-Grüneisen relation,

\[ p - p_c(v) = \frac{\Gamma(v)}{v} \left( E_c(v) - E(v) \right), \]

where \( p_c \) and \( E_c \) are the pressure and specific internal energy at \( 0^\circ K \), and \( \Gamma \), the Grüneisen coefficient, is a function of volume only. One way of implementing this relation for arbitrary \((p, v, E)\) states involves taking \( p, E \) to be known Hugoniot states \( p_H, E_H \), noting that \( p_c = -E_c'(v) \), and taking for \( \Gamma \) one of the several formulas available from the theory of lattice dynamics (Slater\(^1\), Dugdale-MacDonald\(^2\), Zubarev-Vashchenko\(^3\)), which express \( \Gamma \) in terms of \( E_c \) and its derivatives. The resulting nonlinear differential equation is then solved for \( E_c \). With \( p_c, E_c \) and \( \Gamma \) then known functions of \( v \), the Mie-Grüneisen relation can be used to describe off-Hugoniot states.

The shortcomings and inconsistencies of these lattice-dynamical formulas for the Grüneisen coefficient, and an account of what this implies in geophysical calculations relating to the internal structure of the earth, have been given by Shapiro and Knopoff\(^4\). Considerable interest therefore attends the possibility of determining the Grüneisen coefficient by an independent approach. In the work reported here, based on a variational principle, an equation is derived which relates the cold energy function \( E_c \) and the Hugoniot, so that knowledge of one yields the other and hence the Grüneisen coefficient. This result is illustrated in the case of aluminum, where an analytic formulation for \( E_c \) due to McKenna and Pastine\(^5\) is used to derive the Hugoniot function. The latter function is found to agree with available experimental data very closely up to 340 kb. An interesting
by-product in this regard is a quadratic expansion in the particle velocity, which approximates the shock velocity; the coefficients of this expansion are simple formulas involving physically meaningful quantities.
II. ANALYSIS

As was shown recently by Heyda\(^{6}\) the temperature-independent Grüneisen coefficient of a solid, \(\Gamma(u)\), may be expressed in the form

\[
\Gamma(u) = \Gamma^*(u) G , \quad (1)
\]

where \(\Gamma^*(u)\) is the form which \(\Gamma\) takes on the basis of the approximate doubling of the particle velocity \(u\) behind a planar shock wave moving through the solid with speed \(D\) and arriving at a free surface parallel to the shock front. The function \(\Gamma^*(u)\) was found to be

\[
\Gamma^*(u) = \frac{(D - u)(D +uD')D'}{D^2} , \quad (2)
\]

where the prime indicates differentiation with respect to \(u\). The function \(G\), which can be regarded as a normalized Grüneisen coefficient,

\[
G = \frac{\Gamma(u)}{\Gamma^*(u)} , \quad (3)
\]

was shown in turn to be given by

\[
G = \left( \frac{D}{uD'} \right)^2 \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{u_r^2} \right] + \frac{1}{u_r^2} , \quad (4)
\]

where \(u_r = u_{fs} - u\) and \(u_{fs}\) is the free surface velocity.

Solving Eq. (4) for \(u_r\) and integrating with respect to \(u\), we may write

\[
u_r = \int_{0}^{u} \sqrt{\frac{1 - \epsilon^2}{1 - \epsilon^2 G}} \, du , \quad (5)
\]

where

\[
\epsilon = \frac{uD'}{D} . \quad (6)
\]
It is convenient to change the independent variable from \( u \) to \( \varepsilon \) and to regard \( u, G, \ u' \) and \( D \) as functions of \( \varepsilon \). If \( \varepsilon \) should be known from an independent source as a function of \( u \), the relation \( \theta \) may be looked upon as a differential equation for the determination of the Hugoniot function \( D(u) \). Making this change we can rewrite Eq. (5) in the form

\[
\frac{u}{r} = \int_0^\varepsilon u'(\varepsilon) \sqrt{\frac{1 - \varepsilon^2}{1 - \varepsilon^2 G(\varepsilon)}} \, d\varepsilon ,
\]

where now the prime indicates differentiation with respect to \( \varepsilon \).

For \( \varepsilon \) arbitrary but fixed it is natural to regard \( u_r = u_r(G, u) \) as a functional defined on the set of functions \( G \) and \( u \) and to consider extremizing \( u_r(G, u) \) over a family of curves \( G = G(\varepsilon), \ u = u(\varepsilon) \) lying on some constraint surface \( g = g(\varepsilon, G, u) = 0 \).

To obtain a suitable function \( g \) we refer to the Mie-Grüneisen form of the equation of state of a solid, namely,

\[
p - p_c(v) = \frac{\Gamma(v)}{v} \left[ E - E_c(v) \right] ,
\]

where \( v \) is specific volume and \( p, E \) denote pressure and specific energy, respectively; the subscript \( c \) indicates pressure and specific energy at 0°C. Taking \( p, E \) along the Hugoniot of the solid centered at the normal conditions

\[
p_H = 0, \ E_H = E_c(v_o) + E_o,
\]

where \( v_o \) is the specific volume of the solid at \( T = T_o, p = 0 \), and \( E_o \) is the specific thermal energy of the solid at these same conditions, (in our calculations of the aluminum hydrostat we shall take \( T_o = 300°C \), we may write

\[
\frac{\Gamma}{v} \left[ E_c - E_H \right] - p_c + p_H = 0 .
\]
Since
\[ r_c - E'_{c}(v) \]  
and
\[ E_H = E_H^c + \frac{p_H}{2} (v_0 - v) \]
we can, upon making the definition:
\[ E^*_c(v) = F_c(v) - E_c(v_0) - E_0 \]
rewrite Eq. (10) as
\[ \frac{\Gamma}{v} \left[ E^*_c - \frac{p_H}{2} (v_0 - v) \right] + E'_c(v) + p_H = 0 \]
From the Hugoniot relation (for a derivation of the Pankine-Hugoniot relations, see Ref. (7))
\[ v = v_0 \left( 1 - \frac{u}{D} \right) \]
we obtain
\[ \frac{dv}{du} = - \frac{v_0 (1 - c)}{D} \]
so that
\[ \frac{dE_c}{dv} = - \frac{D}{v_0 (1 - c)} \frac{dE_c}{du} \]
or, in a less accurate but more convenient notation,
\[ E'_c(v) = - \frac{D}{v_0 (1 - c)} E'_c(u) \]
we find, upon substituting from Eqs. (15), (17), (18) into Eq. (14), that

\[
\frac{\Gamma}{D-u} \left( E_{c}^{*} - \frac{1}{2} u^2 \right) - \frac{E'_{c}(u)}{1 - \epsilon} + u = 0 .
\]  

From Eqs. (1) and (2), however, it follows that

\[
\frac{\Gamma}{D-u} = \epsilon (1 + \epsilon) \frac{G(\epsilon)}{u} ,
\]  

which, substituted into Eq. (19), yields the desired form of the constraint surface \( g = 0 \), namely,

\[
g(\epsilon, G, u) = \epsilon (1 + \epsilon) G(\epsilon) - H(u, \epsilon) = 0 ,
\]  

where the function \( H \) is defined by

\[
H(u, \epsilon) = \left[ \frac{u E'_{c}(u)}{1 - \epsilon} - u^2 \right] \sqrt{\left[ E_{c}^{*} - \frac{1}{2} u^2 \right]} .
\]  

In the space of the variables \( \epsilon, G, u \) the equation (21) constitutes a surface passing through the curve \( G = G(\epsilon), u = u(\epsilon) \). For each choice of the function \( G \), there is determined a corresponding function \( u(\epsilon) \).

Assume then that the functional \( u [G, u] \) has an extremum for the curve

\[
G = G(\epsilon), \quad u = u(\epsilon) .
\]  

Then since \( g_{G} \) and \( g_{u} \) do not vanish simultaneously at any point of the surface (21), there exists (see Theorem 2, p. 46 of reference (8)) a function \( \lambda(\epsilon) \) such that the curve (23) is an extremal of the function

\[
\int_{0}^{\epsilon} \left[ F + \lambda(\tilde{\epsilon}) g \right] d\tilde{\epsilon} ,
\]  

\[
\rho_{H} = \rho_{0} Du, \quad p_{H}(v_{o} - v) = u^2 , \quad \rho_{0} = 1/v_{o} .
\]  

(18)
where $F$ is defined by

$$ F = u'(\epsilon) \sqrt{\frac{1 - \epsilon^2}{1 - \epsilon^2 G(\epsilon)}}. \quad (24) $$

the necessary conditions for which are given by

$$ F_G + \lambda g_G = 0, \quad \lambda g_u = \frac{d}{d\epsilon} F u'. \quad (25) $$

Eliminating $\lambda$ in Eqs. (25) and, for convenience, letting

$$ P = \sqrt{\frac{1 - \epsilon^2}{1 - \epsilon^2 G}}. \quad (26) $$

we obtain the single equation

$$ u' P G u = \epsilon (1 + \epsilon) \left[ P e + G' P_G \right]. \quad (27) $$

However, from Eq. (21) we have

$$ \epsilon (1 + \epsilon) G' + (1 + 2\epsilon) G = H u' + H'_\epsilon, \quad (28) $$

so that $u'$ and $G'$ can be eliminated simultaneously from Eqs. (27), (28) and no differential equation need be solved to obtain $G(\epsilon)$ and $u(\epsilon)$. The result is

$$ \left[(1 + 2\epsilon) G - H'_\epsilon\right] P_G = \epsilon (1 + \epsilon) P_G. \quad (29) $$

When Eq. (26) is taken into account in Eq. (29) and the resulting differentiations carried out, we find the result

$$ G(\epsilon) = \frac{2 - (1 - \epsilon) H'_\epsilon}{1 - \epsilon + 2\epsilon^2}. \quad (30) $$
From Eq. (22) we note that

\[(1 - \varepsilon) H' = H + \frac{u^2}{E_c^* - \frac{1}{2} u^2}\]

\[= \varepsilon (1 + \varepsilon) G + \frac{u^2}{E_c^* - \frac{1}{2} u^2},\]

so that Eq. (30) assumes the final form

\[G(\varepsilon) = \frac{2}{1 + 3\varepsilon^2} \cdot \left(\frac{u^2 - E_c^*}{\frac{1}{2} u^2 - E_c^*}\right),\]

(31)

where the function \(u = u(\varepsilon)\) is obtained by eliminating \(G(\varepsilon)\) between the Eqs. (21), (31), the function \(E_c^*\) being assumed to be known. Actually, it is easier to obtain the function \(\varepsilon = \varepsilon(u)\). We find that it satisfies the equation

\[\varepsilon^3 \left[2E_c^* + u^2\right] + 3\varepsilon^2 u \left[E_c'(u) - u\right] + \varepsilon \left[3u^2 - 2E_c^*\right] + u \left[E_c'(u) - u\right] = 0.\]

(32)

From the relation (17) we may readily show that

\[u E_c'(u) = (1 - \varepsilon)(x - x_0) E_c'(x),\]

(33)

where \(x = v/v_0\) and \(v_0\) is the specific volume at \(T = 0\) K and \(p = 0\).

With the relation (33) we may then recast the cubic equation (32) in the form

\[(u^2 - E_c^*)(1 - \varepsilon)^2 = (1 + 3\varepsilon^2) \left[(x - x_0) E_c'(x) - E_c^*\right],\]

(34)

where a factor \((1 - \varepsilon)\) has been divided out. Equation (34) can now be solved for \(\varepsilon\), and hence for \(D'\), to get
where
\[ Q = \frac{(x - x_0)^\prime(x) - E_c^*}{u^2 - E_c^*} \]

Since
\[ E_c^\prime(x) = -\nu o K P_c \]
and
\[ x = x_0 (1 - \frac{u}{D}) , \quad x_0 = \nu_o / \nu o K \] (36)
we may rewrite \( Q \) as
\[ Q = \frac{\frac{\nu_o u P_c}{D} - E_c + E_{Ho}}{u^2 - E_c + E_{Ho}} \]
upon using the relations (13) and (9).

We note that \( Q \to 1 \) as \( u \to 0 \). Hence the minus sign in Eq. (35) must be chosen in order that \( D' \) remain finite. The indeterminacy in the right member of Eq. (35) at \( u = 0 \) may be resolved by rewriting it in the form
\[ \frac{D}{u} \left[ \frac{1 - Q}{1 + \sqrt{4Q - 3Q^2}} \right] \]
and noting that
\[ \frac{1 - Q}{u} = \frac{\nu_o u P_c}{D} \frac{u - \frac{\nu_o P_c}{D}}{u^2 - E_c + E_{Ho}} \]
Since $E_c$ and $p_c$ are generally known as functions of $x$, and $x$ in turn may be expressed in terms of $u$ and $D$ by means of relation (36), we see that the Hugoniot function $D = D(u)$ may be obtained by solving the first order nonlinear differential equation

$$D' = f(u, D), \quad (37)$$

where

$$f(u, D) = \frac{R(u, D)}{1 + \sqrt{4Q(u, D) - 3Q^2(u, D)}} \quad (38)$$

and

$$Q = \frac{v_o p_c}{D} \frac{E_c + E_{H_0}}{u^2 - E_c + E_{H_0}}, \quad R = \frac{uD - v_o p_c}{u^2 - E_c + E_{H_0}} \quad (39)$$

subject to the initial condition

$$u = 0, \quad D = D(0) = c_0 \quad (40)$$

Since a closed form solution of Eq. (37) appears unlikely, the solution $D(u)$ must be obtained either through numerical integration or expansion in series. If we denote the expansion for $D$ through the quadratic term by

$$D = c_o + su + bu^2 \quad (41)$$

we find by putting $u = 0$ in Eq. (38) that $s$ is given by the simple formula

$$s = -\frac{v_o p_c (v_o)}{2E_o} \quad (42)$$

or equivalently,
Continuing, we find upon differentiating (37) with respect to \( u \) and then putting \( u = 0 \) that

\[
b = \frac{D''(0)}{2} = \frac{\frac{2}{c_o^2} - \frac{2}{c_o} E''(x_o) - 6 s^2 E_o}{4 E_o c_o}.
\]  

(44)

It might be noted that the value of \( s \) given by formula (43) will normally differ from tabulated values of the slope of the "linear" shock velocity-particle velocity relation since the latter represents an empirical fit to experimental data over a range of particle velocities well beyond \( u = 0 \). The Hugoniot formulation (38) will in addition reflect passage through a minimum point on the curve \( E_c = E_c(v) \) at \( v = v_o \), as \( v \) decreases from \( v_o \), i.e. as \( u \) increases from \( u = 0 \).

Additional coefficients beyond \( D''(0)/2 \) may be calculated by the same procedure. However existing analytical formulations for \( E^*_c(x) \) do not offer sufficient accuracy in the values of \( E^*_c(n)(x_o) \) beyond \( n = 2 \). Anticipating that such formulations may become more accurate in the future we have calculated one additional coefficient:

\[
h = \frac{D'''(0)}{6} = \frac{x_o^3 E'''(x_o) - 24 s E c D''(0) - 8 E_o s^3 + 2 c_o^2}{12 E_o c_o^2}.
\]  

(45)

The Grüneisen coefficient \( \Gamma(u) \) is now readily available from Eqs. (2), (3), and (31). We find

\[
\Gamma(u) = \frac{2 \left[ D'(u) - \varepsilon \right] (1 + \varepsilon)}{1 + 3 \varepsilon^2} \begin{pmatrix} E_o + u^2 - \left[ E_c - E_c(v_o) \right] \\ E_o + \frac{1}{2} u^2 - \left[ E_c - E_c(v_o) \right] \end{pmatrix}.
\]  

(46)
or, equivalently,

\[
\Gamma (u) = (D - u) \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{E'_c (u)}{1 - \varepsilon} - u \\
\frac{E^*}{E_c - \frac{1}{2} u^2} 
\end{bmatrix}.
\]  

(47)

The initial value of \( \Gamma \) turns out to be \( \Gamma (0) = 2s \), whence from Eq. (43) we obtain

\[
\Gamma (0) = 2s = \frac{\varepsilon E'_c (0)}{E_0} , \quad \left( G(0) = 2 \right) ,
\]

(48)

a result which follows directly from the Mie-Grüneisen relation (14) by putting \( \nu = \nu_0 \).

That the extremal (23), where \( G(\varepsilon) \) and \( u(\varepsilon) \) are defined by the relations (31) and (32), maximizes the functional \( u_r [G, u] \) is evident from the fact that for the choice \( G = 1 \) (which corresponds to taking \( \Gamma \) in accordance with the velocity doubling approximation) we obtain \( u_r = u \), whereas a three term expansion of the integral in Eq. (5) yields the result

\[
u_r = u + \frac{s \left[ \Gamma (0) - s \right]}{6c_0^2} u^3 ,
\]

(49)

which in view of the result (48) shows that \( u_r > u \). Indeed, with \( c_0 \) assumed to be known and with \( D \approx c_0 + su \), the D function (or, equivalently, the G function) which maximizes \( u_r \) is that for which \( s[\Gamma (0) - s] \), considered as a function of \( s \), is a maximum. This occurs evidently for \( \Gamma (0) = 2s \), in agreement with relation (48).

The approximate relation (49) is of interest in its own right as it gives good agreement with tabulated values of \( u_r /u \) for many of the metals studied by Rice, McQueen, and Walsh (7). Using the \( \Gamma_0 \) and \( s \) values listed there, we find the comparisons for copper, 24 ST aluminum, silver, and zinc shown in Table I.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$u$ (cm/µsec)</th>
<th>$u_r/u$ [Eq. (49)]</th>
<th>$u_r/u$ [Ref. 7]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Copper</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.0263</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>1.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.0681</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>1.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.1025</td>
<td>1.010</td>
<td>1.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24 ST Aluminum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.0580</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>1.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.1465</td>
<td>1.013</td>
<td>1.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.2145</td>
<td>1.028</td>
<td>1.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silver</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.0256</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>1.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.0658</td>
<td>1.011</td>
<td>1.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.0992</td>
<td>1.024</td>
<td>1.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zinc</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.0378</td>
<td>1.003</td>
<td>1.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.0925</td>
<td>1.019</td>
<td>1.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.1373</td>
<td>1.043</td>
<td>1.042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. EXAMPLE FOR ALUMINUM

For aluminum we employ the analytical formulation given by McKenna and Pastine in Ref. 5,

\[ E_c(x) = v_{oK} \left( \frac{3A}{2\beta} \right) \left[ e^{2\beta(1-x^{1/3})} - 2e^{\beta(1-x^{1/3})} \right] , \]  

(50)

where

\[ v_{oK} = 0.366 \text{ cc/gm}, \quad v_o = 0.371 \text{ cc/gm}, \]
\[ A = 0.6271 \text{ Mb}, \quad \beta = 3.772 \]
\[ E_o = 0.00164 \text{ Mb cc/gm}, \quad c_o = 0.5404 \text{ cm/\mu sec}, \quad T_o = 300^\circ \text{K} \]

Substituting into formulas (43), (44), and (48) we obtain

\[ s = 1.171, \quad b = 1.303 \text{ \mu sec/cm}, \quad \Gamma_o = 2.342, \]

so that the Hugoniot function \( D \) is approximated by the three term expansion

\[ D = 0.5404 + 1.171 u + 1.303 u^2 . \]  

(51)

This function is plotted in Figure 1 and agrees with the experimental data for 24 ST aluminum, given by Walsh and Christian in Ref. (9) and Walsh, Rice, McQueen and Yarger in Ref. (10), remarkably well up to \( u = 0.165 \text{ cm/\mu sec} \), which corresponds to a pressure of approximately 340 kb. Beyond this point the curve diverges slowly from the data taken from Ref. (10). An additional term in Eq. (51) would remedy this if derivatives of \( E_c(x) \) of the third and higher orders were known at \( x = x_o \) with sufficient accuracy. This, however, puts too great a strain on the empirical form (50).
IV. CONCLUSION

The tentative conclusion is that the aluminum hydrostat is determinable from the variational principle proposed here and that the same may well be true for other solids. Accepted as a general principle, the procedure may be reversed and the cold energy may be obtained by solving the linear differential equation (32) for $E_c$ with an accurate experimentally determined Hugoniot as input. Calculation of the Grüneisen coefficient can then be made directly from the Mie-Grüneisen relation (8), thereby avoiding any use of formulas based on the theory of lattice dynamics.
Figure 1. Curve represents the theoretical Hugoniot $D = 0.5404 + 1.171u + 1.303u^2$ cm/μsec determined by maximizing the free surface velocity subject to a Mie-Grüneisen constraint condition over the class of all possible Hugoniots.
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APPENDIX

We list here some additional formulas of interest which are derivable from those obtained in Section II.

First of all we may readily show that Eq. (32) may be converted to the form

\[
p_c = \left[ \frac{1 - \varepsilon + 2\varepsilon^2 - \frac{2}{G(e)}}{1 + 3\varepsilon^2 - \frac{2}{G(e)}} \right] p_H ,
\]

(A-1)

which relates the Hugoniot and the cold pressure in an interesting way.

Next by requiring this relation to hold in the limit as \( \varepsilon \to 0 \), we obtain

\[
G'(\varepsilon) \bigg|_{\varepsilon=0} = 0 , \quad G''(\varepsilon) \bigg|_{\varepsilon=0} = -12 + \frac{2c_o^2}{E_o s^2} ,
\]

(A-2)

and the limiting result

\[
p_c(v_o) = -\frac{4\rho_o c_o^2}{s \left[ 12 + G''(\varepsilon) \bigg|_{\varepsilon=0} \right]} = -2 \rho_o E_o s .
\]

(A-3)

From Eq. (4), however, we find that

\[
G'(0) = \frac{1}{3} \left( \frac{c_o}{s} \right)^3 u_r(4)(0) - \frac{2(\Gamma_o - s)}{s^3} \left[ \frac{c_o D''(0) - s^2}{s^3} \right] ,
\]

so that in conjunction with relation (A-2) we obtain an additional term for the series (49), namely,
Finally, by differentiating Eq. (3), taking note of Eq. (2), and again employing relation (A-2), we find

\[ \Gamma'(v_o) = \frac{2}{v_o} \left[ c_o D''(0) + s(1 - s) \right] \]  \hspace{1cm} (A-5)

Close to \( x = x_o \), then, we have

\[ \Gamma(x) \approx \Gamma(x_o) + \Gamma'(x_o) \cdot (x - x_o), \quad x = v_o/v_{oK} \]

Thus for aluminum,

\[ \Gamma(1) = \Gamma(1.01366) + 3.714(1 - 1.01366) = 2.300 \]

This compares favorably with McKenna and Pastine\(^{(11)}\), who find \( \Gamma(1) = 2.301 \).

A final example is the evaluation of \( \Gamma_o = 2s \) for metallic sodium. From Eq. (43) we have

\[ \Gamma_o = \frac{x_o E'_c(x_o)}{E_o} = \frac{(1.0299)(0.00314)}{0.002784} = 1.16 \]

which compares well with the value of 1.15 obtained by Pastine in Ref. 11, in which he evaluated the role of anharmonic contributions in determining \( \Gamma \) by a lattice dynamical approach. In this calculation we obtained

\[ p_o = .00314 \text{ Mb by interpolating in Table I of Ref. (11).} \]

The value of \( E_o \) was obtained from the Debye expression

\[ E_o = \frac{3RT_o}{A} D_1 \left( \frac{\theta(x_o)}{T_o} \right) \]
where \( R = 8.314 \times 10^{-5} \text{ Mb cm}^3/\text{deg} \), \( T_o = 300^\circ \text{K} \), \( A = 22.997 \text{ gm} \), and \( D_1 \) is the Debye function with argument \( \theta(x_o) = 140^\circ \text{K} \) obtained from an approximate formula given by Pastine(11). The value of \( D_1(140) \) turns out to be 0.85578.