

# Chapter 1: Chemical Bonding

Linus Pauling (1901–1994)

January 30, 2017

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>The development of Bands and their filling</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Different Types of Bonds</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1	Covalent Bonding . . . . .	8
2.2	Ionic Bonding . . . . .	12
2.2.1	Madelung Sums . . . . .	14
2.3	Metallic Bonding . . . . .	15
2.4	Van der Waals Bonds . . . . .	15
2.4.1	Van der Waals-London Interaction . . . . .	17

## Periodic Table

1																		18																	
1	<b>H</b> 1 Hydrogen 1.008																	<b>He</b> 2 Helium 4.003																	
2	<b>Li</b> 3 Lithium 6.941	<b>Be</b> 4 Beryllium 9.012																	<b>B</b> 5 Boron 10.811	<b>C</b> 6 Carbon 12.011	<b>N</b> 7 Nitrogen 14.007	<b>O</b> 8 Oxygen 15.999	<b>F</b> 9 Fluorine 18.998	<b>Ne</b> 10 Neon 20.180											
3	<b>Na</b> 11 Sodium 22.990	<b>Mg</b> 12 Magnesium 24.305																	<b>Al</b> 13 Aluminum 26.982	<b>Si</b> 14 Silicon 28.086	<b>P</b> 15 Phosphorus 30.974	<b>S</b> 16 Sulfur 32.066	<b>Cl</b> 17 Chlorine 35.453	<b>Ar</b> 18 Argon 39.948											
4	<b>K</b> 19 Potassium 39.098	<b>Ca</b> 20 Calcium 40.078	<b>Sc</b> 21 Scandium 44.956	<b>Ti</b> 22 Titanium 47.88	<b>V</b> 23 Vanadium 50.942	<b>Cr</b> 24 Chromium 51.996	<b>Mn</b> 25 Manganese 54.938	<b>Fe</b> 26 Iron 55.847	<b>Co</b> 27 Cobalt 58.933	<b>Ni</b> 28 Nickel 58.69	<b>Cu</b> 29 Copper 63.546	<b>Zn</b> 30 Zinc 65.39	<b>Ga</b> 31 Gallium 69.723	<b>Ge</b> 32 Germanium 72.61	<b>As</b> 33 Arsenic 74.922	<b>Se</b> 34 Selenium 78.96	<b>Br</b> 35 Bromine 79.904	<b>Kr</b> 36 Krypton 83.80																	
5	<b>Rb</b> 37 Rubidium 85.468	<b>Sr</b> 38 Strontium 87.62	<b>Y</b> 39 Yttrium 88.906	<b>Zr</b> 40 Zirconium 91.224	<b>Nb</b> 41 Niobium 92.906	<b>Mo</b> 42 Molybdenum 95.94	<b>Tc</b> 43 Technetium (99)	<b>Ru</b> 44 Ruthenium 101.07	<b>Rh</b> 45 Rhodium 102.906	<b>Pd</b> 46 Palladium 106.42	<b>Ag</b> 47 Silver 107.868	<b>Cd</b> 48 Cadmium 112.411	<b>In</b> 49 Indium 114.82	<b>Sn</b> 50 Tin 118.71	<b>Sb</b> 51 Antimony 121.75	<b>Te</b> 52 Tellurium 127.60	<b>I</b> 53 Iodine 126.905	<b>Xe</b> 54 Xenon 131.29																	
6	<b>Cs</b> 55 Cesium 132.905	<b>Ba</b> 56 Barium 137.327	<b>Lu</b> 71 Lutetium 174.967	<b>Hf</b> 72 Hafnium 178.49	<b>Ta</b> 73 Tantalum 180.948	<b>W</b> 74 Tungsten 183.85	<b>Re</b> 75 Rhenium 186.207	<b>Os</b> 76 Osmium 190.2	<b>Ir</b> 77 Iridium 192.22	<b>Pt</b> 78 Platinum 195.08	<b>Au</b> 79 Gold 196.967	<b>Hg</b> 80 Mercury 200.59	<b>Tl</b> 81 Thallium 204.383	<b>Pb</b> 82 Lead 207.2	<b>Bi</b> 83 Bismuth 208.980	<b>Po</b> 84 Polonium (209)	<b>At</b> 85 Astatine (210)	<b>Rn</b> 86 Radon (222)																	
7	<b>Fr</b> 87 Francium (223)	<b>Ra</b> 88 Radium 226.025	<b>Lr</b> 103 Lawrencium (260)																																
																		<b>La</b> 57 Lanthanum 138.906		<b>Ce</b> 58 Cerium 140.115	<b>Pr</b> 59 Praseodymium 140.908	<b>Nd</b> 60 Neodymium 144.24	<b>Pm</b> 61 Promethium (145)	<b>Sm</b> 62 Samarium 150.36	<b>Eu</b> 63 Europium 151.965	<b>Gd</b> 64 Gadolinium 157.25	<b>Tb</b> 65 Terbium 158.925	<b>Dy</b> 66 Dysprosium 162.50	<b>Ho</b> 67 Holmium 164.93	<b>Er</b> 68 Erbium 167.26	<b>Tm</b> 69 Thulium 168.934	<b>Yb</b> 70 Ytterbium 173.04			
																		<b>Ac</b> 89 Actinium 227.028	<b>Th</b> 90 Thorium 232.038	<b>Pa</b> 91 Protactinium 231.036	<b>U</b> 92 Uranium 238.029	<b>Np</b> 93 Neptunium 237.044	<b>Pu</b> 94 Plutonium (244)	<b>Am</b> 95 Americium (243)	<b>Cm</b> 96 Curium (247)	<b>Bk</b> 97 Berkelium (247)	<b>Cf</b> 98 Californium (251)	<b>Es</b> 99 Einsteinium (252)	<b>Fm</b> 100 Fermium (257)	<b>Md</b> 101 Mendelevium (258)	<b>No</b> 102 Nobelium (259)				

Figure 1: *Periodic Chart*

Solid state physics is the study of mainly periodic systems (or things that are close to periodic) in the thermodynamic limit  $\approx 10^{21}$  atoms/cm<sup>3</sup>. At first this would appear to be a hopeless task, to solve such a large system.




Figure 2: *The simplest model of a solid is a periodic array of valance orbitals embedded in a matrix of atomic cores.*

However, the self-similar, translationally invariant nature of the periodic solid and the fact that the core electrons are *very* tightly bound at each site (so we may ignore their dynamics) makes approximate solutions possible. Thus, the simplest model of a solid is a periodic array of valance orbitals embedded in a matrix of atomic cores. Solving the problem in one of the irreducible elements of the periodic solid (cf. one of the spheres in Fig. 2), is often equivalent to solving the whole system. For this reason we must study the periodicity and the mechanism (chemical bonding) which binds the lattice into a periodic structure. The latter is the emphasis of this chapter.

## 1 The development of Bands and their filling

We will imagine that each atom (cf. one of the spheres in Fig. 2) is composed of Hydrogenic orbitals which we describe by a screened Coulomb potential

$$V(r) = \frac{-Z_{nl}e^2}{r} \quad (1)$$

nl	elemental solid
1s	H,He
2s	Li,Be
2p	B→Ne
3s	Na,Mg
3p	Al→Ar
4s	K,Ca
3d	transition metals Sc→Zn
4p	Ga→Kr
5s	Rb,Sr
4d	transition metals Y→Cd
5p	In-Xe
6s	Cs,Ba
4f	Rare Earths (Lanthanides) Ce→Lu
5d	Transition metals La→Hg
6p	Tl→Rn

Table 1: *Orbital filling scheme for the first few atomic orbitals*

where  $Z_{nl}$  describes the effective charge seen by each electron (in principle, it will then be a function of  $n$  and  $l$ ). As electrons are added to the solid, they then fill up the one-electron states 1s 2s 3s 3p 3d 4s 4p 4d 4f $\dots$ , where the correspondence between spdf and  $l$  is  $s \rightarrow l = 0$ ,  $p \rightarrow l = 1$ , etc. The elemental solids are then made up by filling these orbitals systematically (as shown in Table 1) starting with the lowest energy states (where  $E_{nl} = \frac{me^4 Z_{nl}^2}{2\hbar^2 n^2}$

Note that for large  $n$ , the orbitals do not fill up simply as a function of  $n$  as we would expect from a simple Hydrogenic model with  $E_n = \frac{mZ^2 e^4}{2\hbar^2 n^2}$  (with all electrons seeing the same nuclear charge  $Z$ ). For example, the 5s orbitals fill *before* the 4d! This is because the situation is complicated by atomic screening. I.e. s-electrons can sample the core and so are not very well screened whereas d and f states face the




Figure 3: *Level crossings due to atomic screening. The potential felt by states with large  $l$  are screened since they cannot access the nucleus. Thus, orbitals of different principle quantum numbers can be close in energy. I.e., in elemental Ce,  $(4f^1 5d^1 6s^2)$  both the 5d and 4f orbitals may be considered to be in the valence shell, and form metallic bands. However, the 5d orbitals are much larger and of higher symmetry than the 4f ones. Thus, electrons tend to hybridize (move on or off) with the 5d orbitals more effectively. The Coulomb repulsion between electrons on the same 4f orbital will be strong, so these electrons on these orbitals tend to form magnetic moments.*

angular momentum barrier which keeps them away from the atomic core so that they feel a potential that is screened by the electrons of smaller  $n$  and  $l$ . To put it another way, the effective  $Z_{5s}$  is larger than  $Z_{4d}$ . A schematic atomic level structure, accounting for screening, is shown in Fig. 3.

Now let's consider the process of constructing a periodic solid. The simplest model of a solid is a periodic array of valence orbitals embedded in a matrix of atomic cores (Fig. 2). As a simple model of how the eigenstates of the individual atoms are modified when brought together to form a solid, consider a pair of isolated orbitals. If they are far apart, each orbital has a Hamiltonian  $H_0 = \epsilon n$ , where  $n$  is the orbital occupancy and we have ignored the effects of electronic correlations (which would contribute

terms proportional to  $n_\uparrow n_\downarrow$ ). If we bring them together so that they can exchange



Figure 4: *Two isolated orbitals. If they are far apart, each has a Hamiltonian  $H_0 = \epsilon n$ , where  $n$  is the orbital occupancy.*

electrons, i.e. hybridize, then the degeneracy of the two orbitals is lifted. Suppose the




Figure 5: *Two orbitals close enough to gain energy by hybridization. The hybridization lifts the degeneracy of the orbitals, creating bonding and antibonding states.*

system can gain an amount of energy  $t$  by moving the electrons from site to site (Our conclusions will not depend upon the sign of  $t$ . We will see that  $t$  is proportional to the overlap of the atomic orbitals). Then

$$H = \epsilon(n_1 + n_2) - t(c_1^\dagger c_2 + c_2^\dagger c_1). \quad (2)$$

where  $c_1$  ( $c_1^\dagger$ ) destroys (creates) an electron on orbital 1. If we rewrite this in matrix form

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} c_1^\dagger & c_2^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon & -t \\ -t & \epsilon \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ c_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (3)$$

then it is apparent that system has eigenenergies  $\epsilon \pm t$ . Thus the two states split their degeneracy, the splitting is proportional to  $|t|$ , and they remain centered at  $\epsilon$

If we continue this process of bringing in more isolated orbitals into the region where they can hybridize with the others, then a band of states is formed, again with




Figure 6: *If we bring many orbitals into proximity so that they may exchange electrons (hybridize), then a band is formed centered around the location of the isolated orbital, and with width proportional to the strength of the hybridization*

width proportional to  $t$ , and centered around  $\epsilon$  (cf. Fig. 6). This, of course, is an oversimplification. Real solids are composed of elements with multiple orbitals that produce multiple bonds. Now imagine what happens if we have several orbitals on each site (ie s,p, etc.), as we reduce the separation between the orbitals and increase their overlap, these bonds increase in width and may eventually overlap, forming bands.

The valance orbitals, which generally have a greater spatial extent, will overlap more so their bands will broaden more. Of course, eventually we will stop gaining energy ( $\tilde{t}$ ) from bringing the atoms closer together, due to overlap of the cores. Once we have reached the optimal point we fill the states 2 particles per, until we run out of electrons. Electronic correlations complicate this simple picture of band formation since they tend to try to keep the orbitals from being multiply occupied.

## 2 Different Types of Bonds

These complications aside, the overlap of the orbitals is bonding. The type of bonding is determined to a large degree by the amount of overlap. Three different general categories of bonds form in solids (cf. Table 2).

Bond	Overlap	Lattice	constituents
Ionic	very small ( $< a$ )	closest unfrustrated packing	dissimilar
Covalent	small ( $\sim a$ )	determined by the structure of the orbitals	similar
Metallic	very large ( $\gg a$ )	closest packed	unfilled valence orbitals

Table 2: *The type of bond that forms between two orbitals is dictated largely by the amount that these orbitals overlap relative to their separation  $a$ .*

## 2.1 Covalent Bonding

Covalent bonding is distinguished as being orientationally sensitive. It is also short ranged so that the interaction between nearest neighbors is of prime importance and that between more distant neighbors is often neglected. It is therefore possible to describe many of its properties using the chemistry of the constituent molecules.

Consider a simple diatomic molecule  $O_2$  with a single electron and

$$H = -\frac{\nabla^2}{2m} - \frac{Ze^2}{r_a} - \frac{Ze^2}{r_b} + \frac{Z^2e^2}{R} \quad (4)$$

We will search for a variational solution to the the problem of the molecule ( $H\Psi_{mol} = E\Psi_{mol}$ ), by constructing a variational wavefunction from the atomic orbitals  $\psi_a$  and  $\psi_b$ . Consider the variational molecular wavefunction

$$\Psi' = c_a\psi_a + c_b\psi_b \quad (5)$$

$$E' = \frac{\int \Psi'^* H \Psi'}{\int \Psi'^* \Psi'} \geq E \quad (6)$$

The best  $\Psi'$  is that which minimizes  $E'$ . We now define the quantum integrals

$$S = \int \psi_a^* \psi_b \quad H_{aa} = H_{bb} = \int \psi_a^* H \psi_a \quad H_{ab} = \int \psi_a^* H \psi_b. \quad (7)$$



Note that  $1 > S_r > 0$ , and that  $H_{abr} < 0$  since  $\psi_a$  and  $\psi_b$  are bound states [where  $S_r = \text{Re}S$  and  $H_{abr} = \text{Re}H_{ab}$ ]. With these definitions,

$$E' = \frac{(c_a^2 + c_b^2)H_{aa} + 2c_a c_b H_{abr}}{c_a^2 + c_b^2 + 2c_a c_b S_r} \quad (8)$$

and we search for an extremum  $\frac{\partial E'}{\partial c_a} = \frac{\partial E'}{\partial c_b} = 0$ . From the first condition,  $\frac{\partial E'}{\partial c_a} = 0$  and after some simplification, and re-substitution of  $E'$  into the above equation, we get the condition

$$c_a(H_{aa} - E') + c_b(H_{abr} - E'S_r) = 0 \quad (9)$$

The second condition,  $\frac{\partial E'}{\partial c_b} = 0$ , gives

$$c_a(H_{abr} - E'S) + c_b(H_{aa} - E') = 0. \quad (10)$$

Together, these form a set of secular equations, with eigenvalues

$$E' = \frac{H_{aa} \pm H_{abr}}{1 \pm S_r}. \quad (11)$$

Remember,  $H_{abr} < 0$ , so the lowest energy state is the + state. If we substitute Eq. 10 into Eqs. 8 and 9, we find that the + state corresponds to the eigenvector  $c_a = c_b = 1/\sqrt{2}$ ; i.e. it is the bonding state.

$$\Psi'_{bonding} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\psi_a + \psi_b) \quad E'_{bonding} = \frac{H_{aa} + H_{abr}}{1 + S_r}. \quad (12)$$

For the -, or antibonding state,  $c_a = -c_b = 1/\sqrt{2}$ . Thus, in the bonding state, the wavefunctions add between the atoms, which corresponds to a build-up of charge between the oxygen molecules (cf. Fig. 7). In the antibonding state, there is a deficiency of charge between the molecules.

Energetically the bonding state is lower and if there are two electrons, both will occupy the lower state (ie., the molecule gains energy by bonding in a singlet spin configuration!). Energy is lost if there are more electrons which must fill the antibonding states. Thus the covalent bond is only effective with partially occupied single-atomic orbitals. If the orbitals are full, then the energy loss of occupying the




Figure 7: *Two oxygen ions, each with charge  $Ze$ , bind an electron with charge  $e$ . The electron, which is bound in the oxygen valence orbitals will form a covalent bond between the oxygens*

antibonding states would counteract the gain of the occupying the bonding state and no bond (conventional) would occur. Of course, in reality it is much worse than this since electronic correlation energies would also increase.

The pile-up of charge which is inherent to the covalent bond is important for the lattice symmetry. The reason is that the covalent bond is sensitive to the orientation of the orbitals. For example, as shown in Fig. 8 an S and a  $P_\sigma$  orbital can bond if both are in the same plane; whereas an S and a  $P_\pi$  orbital cannot. I.e., covalent bonds are directional! An excellent example of this is diamond (C) in which the (tetragonal) lattice structure is dictated by bond symmetry. However at first sight one might assume that C with a  $1s^2 2s^2 2p^2$  configuration could form only 2-bonds with the two electrons in the partially filled p-shell. However, significant energy is gained from bonding, and 2s and 2p are close in energy (cf. Fig. 3) so that sufficient energy is gained from the bond to promote one of the 2s electrons. A linear combination of the




Figure 8: A bond between an  $S$  and a  $P$  orbital can only happen if the  $P$ -orbital is oriented with either its plus or minus lobe closer to the  $S$ -orbital. I.e., covalent bonds are directional!

$2s$ ,  $2p_x$ ,  $2p_y$  and  $2p_z$  orbitals form a  $sp^3$  hybridized state, and C often forms structures (diamond) with tetragonal symmetry.

Another example occurs most often in transition metals where the  $d$ -orbitals try to form covalent bonds (the larger  $s$ -orbitals usually form metallic bonds as described later in this chapter). For example, consider a set of  $d$ -orbitals in a metal with a face-centered cubic (fcc) structure, as shown in Fig. 9. The  $xy$ ,  $xz$ , and  $yz$  orbitals all face towards a neighboring site, and can thus form bonds with these sites; however, the  $x^2 - y^2$  and  $3z^2 - r^2$  orbitals do not point towards neighboring sites and therefore do not participate in bonding. If the metal had a simple cubic structure, the situation would be reversed and the  $x^2 - y^2$  and  $3z^2 - r^2$  orbitals, but not the  $xy$ ,  $xz$ , and  $yz$  orbitals, would participate much in the bonding. Since energy is gained from bonding, this energetically favors an fcc lattice in the transition metals (although this may not be the dominant factor determining lattice structure).

One can also form covalent bonds from dissimilar atoms, but these will also have some ionic character, since the bonding electron will no longer be shared equally by the bonding atoms.




Figure 9: *In the fcc structure, the  $xy$ ,  $xz$ , and  $yz$  orbitals all face towards a neighboring site, and can thus form bonds with these sites; however, the  $x^2-y^2$  and  $3z^2-r^2$  orbitals do not point towards neighboring sites and therefore do not participate in bonding*

## 2.2 Ionic Bonding

The ionic bond occurs by charge transfer between dissimilar atoms which initially have open electronic shells and closed shells afterwards. Bonding then occurs by Coulombic attraction between the ions. The energy of this attraction is called the cohesive energy. This, when added to the ionization energies yields the energy released when the solid is formed from separated neutral atoms (cf. Fig. 10). The cohesive energy is determined roughly by the ionic radii of the elements. For example, for NaCl

$$E_{cohesive} = \frac{e^2}{a_o} \frac{a_o}{r_{Na} + r_{Cl}} = 5.19eV. \quad (13)$$

Note that this does not agree with the experimental figure given in the caption of Fig. 10. This is due to uncertainties in the definitions of the ionic radii, and to oversimplification of the model. However, such calculations are often sufficient to determine the energy of the ionic structure (see below). Clearly, ionic solids are

insulators since such a large amount of energy  $\sim 10\text{eV}$  is required for an electron to move freely.




Figure 10: *The energy per molecule of a crystal of sodium chloride is  $(7.9 - 5.1 + 3.6) \text{ eV} = 6.4 \text{ eV}$  lower than the energy of the separated neutral atoms. The cohesive energy with respect to separated ions is  $7.9 \text{ eV}$  per molecular unit. All values on the figure are experimental. This figure is from Kittel.*

The crystal structure in ionic crystals is determined by balancing the needs of keeping the unlike charges close while keeping like charges apart. For systems with like ionic radii (i.e.  $\text{CsCl}$ ,  $r_{\text{Cs}} \approx 1.60 \text{ \AA}$ ,  $r_{\text{Cl}} \approx 1.81 \text{ \AA}$ ) this means the crystal structure will be the closest unfrustrated packing. Since the face-centered cubic (fcc) structure is frustrated (like charges would be nearest neighbors), this means a body-centered cubic (bcc) structure is favored for systems with like ionic radii (see Fig. 11). For systems with dissimilar radii like  $\text{NaCl}$  (cf. Fig. 10), a simple cubic structure is favored.

This is because the larger Cl atoms requires more room. If the cores approach closer than their ionic radii, then since they are filled cores, a covalent bond including both bonding and anti-bonding states would form. As discussed before, Coulomb repulsion makes this energetically unfavorable.




Figure 11: *Possible salt lattice structures. In the simple cubic and bcc lattices all the nearest neighbors are of a different species than the element on the site. These ionic lattices are unfrustrated. However, it not possible to make an unfrustrated fcc lattice using like amounts of each element.*

### 2.2.1 Madelung Sums

This repulsive contribution to the total energy requires a fully-quantum calculation. However, the attractive Coulombic contribution may be easily calculated, and the repulsive potential modeled by a power-law. Thus, the potential between any two sites  $i$  and  $j$ , is approximated by

$$\phi_{ij} = \pm \frac{e^2}{r_{ij}} + \frac{B}{r_{ij}^n} \quad (14)$$

where the first term describes the Coulombic interaction and the plus (minus) sign is for the potential between similar (dissimilar) elements. The second term heuristically describes the repulsion due to the overlap of the electronic clouds, and contains two free parameters  $n$  and  $B$  (Kittel, pp. 66–71, approximates this heuristic term with

an exponential,  $B \exp(-r_{ij}/\rho)$ , also with two free parameters). These are usually determined from fits to experiment. If  $a$  is the separation of nearest neighbors,  $r_{ij} = ap_{ij}$ , and there are  $N$  sites in the system, then the total potential energy may be written as

$$\Phi = N\Phi_i = N \left[ -\frac{e^2}{a} \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{\pm}{p_{ij}} + \frac{B}{a^n} \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{1}{p_{ij}^n} \right]. \quad (15)$$

The quantity  $A = \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{\pm}{p_{ij}}$ , is known as the Madelung constant.  $A$  depends upon the type of lattice only (not its size). For example  $A_{NaCl} = 1.748$ , and  $A_{CsCl} = 1.763$ . Due to the short range of the potential  $1/p^n$ , the second term may be approximated by its nearest neighbor sum.

### 2.3 Metallic Bonding

Metallic bonding is characterized by at least some long ranged and non-directional bonds (typically between s orbitals), closest packed lattice structures and partially filled valence bands. From the first characteristic, we expect some of the valence orbitals to encompass many other lattice sites, as discussed in Fig. 12. Thus, metallic bonds lack the directional sensitivity of the covalent bonds and form non-directional bonds and closest packed lattice structures determined by an optimal filling of space. In addition, since the bands are composed of partially filled orbitals, it is possible to supply a small external electric field and move the valence electrons through the lattice. Thus, metallic bonding leads to a relatively high electronic conductivity. In the transition metals (Ca, Sr, Ba) the d-band is narrow, but the s and p bands are extensive and result in conduction. Partially filled bands can occur by bond overlap too; ie., in Be and Mg since here the full S bonds overlap with the empty p-bands.

### 2.4 Van der Waals Bonds

As a final subject involving bonds, consider solids formed of Noble gases or composed of molecules with saturated orbitals. Here, of course, there is neither an ionic nor covalent bonding possibility. Furthermore, if the charge distributions on the atoms




Figure 12: In metallic Ni (fcc,  $3d^8 4s^2$ ), the  $4s$  and  $3d$  bands (orbitals) are almost degenerate (cf. Fig. 3) and thus, both participate in the bonding. However, the  $4s$  orbitals are so large compared to the  $3d$  orbitals that they encompass many other lattice sites, forming non-directional bonds. In addition, they hybridize weakly with the  $d$ -orbitals (the different symmetries of the orbitals causes their overlap to almost cancel) which in turn hybridize weakly with each other. Thus, whereas the  $s$  orbitals form a broad metallic band, the  $d$  orbitals form a narrow one.

were rigid, then the interaction between atoms would be zero, because the electrostatic potential of a spherical distribution of electronic charge is canceled outside a neutral atom by the electrostatic potential of the charge on the nucleus. Bonding can result from small quantum fluctuations in the charge which induce electric dipole moments.

As shown in Fig. 13 we can model the constituents as either induced dipoles, or more correctly, dipoles formed of harmonic oscillators. Suppose a quantum fluctuation on 1 induces a dipole moment  $\mathbf{p}_1$ . Then dipole 1 exerts a field

$$\mathbf{E}_1 = \frac{3\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{p}_1 \cdot \mathbf{n}) - \mathbf{p}_1}{r^3} \quad (16)$$

which is felt by 2, which in turn induces a dipole moment  $\mathbf{p}_2 \propto E_1 \propto 1/r^3$ . This in turn, generates a dipole field  $E_2$  felt by 1  $\propto \mathbf{p}_2/r^3 \propto 1/r^6$ . Thus, the energy of the






Figure 13: *Noble gasses and molecules with saturated orbitals can form short ranged van der Waals bonds by inducing fluctuating electric dipole moments in each other. This may be modeled by two harmonic oscillators binding a positive and negative charge each.*

interaction is very small and short ranged.

$$W = -\mathbf{p}_1 \cdot \mathbf{E}_2 \propto 1/r^6 \quad (17)$$

#### 2.4.1 Van der Waals-London Interaction

Of course, a more proper treatment of the van der Waals interaction should account for quantum effects in induced dipoles modeled as harmonic oscillators (here we follow Kittel).

As a model we consider two identical linear harmonic oscillators 1 and 2 separated by  $R$ . Each oscillator bears charges  $\pm e$  with separations  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , as shown in Fig. 13. The particles oscillate along the  $x$  axis with frequency  $\omega_0$  (the strongest optical absorption line of the atom), and momenta  $\mathbf{P}_1$  and  $\mathbf{P}_2$ . If we ignore the interaction between the charges (other than the self-interaction between the dipole's charges which is accounted for in the harmonic oscillator potentials), then the Hamiltonian of the system is

$$H_0 = \frac{P_1^2 + P_2^2}{2m} + \frac{1}{2}m\omega_0^2(x_1^2 + x_2^2). \quad (18)$$

If we approximate each pair of charges as point dipoles, then they interact with a Hamiltonian

$$H_1 \approx \frac{-3(\mathbf{p}_2 \cdot \mathbf{n})(\mathbf{p}_1 \cdot \mathbf{n}) + \mathbf{p}_1 \cdot \mathbf{p}_2}{|\mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbf{R} - \mathbf{x}_2|^3} = -\frac{2p_1 p_2}{R^3} = -\frac{2e^2 x_1 x_2}{R^3}. \quad (19)$$

The total Hamiltonian  $H_0 + H_1$  can be diagonalized a normal mode transformation that isolates the the symmetric mode (where both oscillators move together) from the antisymmetric one where they move in opposition

$$x_s = (x_1 + x_2)/\sqrt{2} \quad x_a = (x_1 - x_2)/\sqrt{2} \quad (20)$$

$$P_s = (P_1 + P_2)/\sqrt{2} \quad P_a = (P_1 - P_2)/\sqrt{2} \quad (21)$$

After these substitutions, the total Hamiltonian becomes

$$H = \frac{P_s^2 + P_a^2}{2m} + \frac{1}{2} \left( m\omega_0^2 - \frac{2e^2}{R^3} \right) x_s^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left( m\omega_0^2 + \frac{2e^2}{R^3} \right) x_a^2 \quad (22)$$

The new eigenfrequencies of these two modes are then

$$\omega_s = \left( \omega_0^2 - \frac{2e^2}{mR^3} \right)^{1/2} \quad \omega_a = \left( \omega_0^2 + \frac{2e^2}{mR^3} \right)^{1/2} \quad (23)$$

The zero point energy of the system is now

$$E_0 = \frac{1}{2} \hbar (\omega_s + \omega_a) \approx \hbar \omega_0 \left( 1 - \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{2e^2}{m\omega_0^2 R^3} \right)^2 + \dots \right) \quad (24)$$

or, the zero point energy is lowered by the dipole interaction by an amount

$$\Delta U \approx \frac{\hbar \omega_0}{4} \left( \frac{2e^2}{m\omega_0^2 R^3} \right)^2 \quad (25)$$

which is typically a small fraction of an electron volt.

This is called the Van der Waals interaction, known also as the London interaction or the induced dipole-dipole interaction. It is the principal attractive interaction in crystals of inert gases and also in crystals of many organic molecules. The interaction is a quantum effect, in the sense that  $\Delta U \rightarrow 0$  as  $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ .