

along the  $y$  axis and is equal to  $E = (aev_x/c) 4\pi I_z$ . Therefore the Lorentz force is  $F_y = e(E - v_x B_z/c)$ , and the Hall current density is  $j_y = -(\sigma v_x/c)(B_z - ae \cdot 4\pi I_z)$ . This current vanishes after appearance of surface charges that produce an electric field  $E_{H1} = j_y/\sigma$ . The Hall field intensity is  $E_{Hy} = E_{H1} + E = v_x B_z/c$ , whence  $R_0 = 1/cne$ . Thus in the case of free electrons possessing magnetization, the Hall constant remains the same as if the whole magnetization were produced exclusively by bound electrons. In this case the derivation given differs from the usual one only in the treatment of the physical interpretation of the terms that enter  $E_{Hy}$ .

The effect considered plays an essential role in the Nernst effect, where because of the electrical polarization connected with current carriers that possess a magnetization, there can arise a field, two orders of magnitude larger than the usual Nernst field, which is produced by the difference of speeds of electrons moving toward the hot and the cold ends of the conductor.

Current carriers of any type moving toward the hot end of the metal have a larger mean magnetization than carriers that are moving in the opposite direction. Therefore when a heat current flows along the conductor, there is a transfer not only of energy but also of magnetic moment. As a result, in this case also there is produced an electric polarization, which leads to the appearance of a transverse electric field. Calculation of the part  $Q_{se}$  of the ferromagnetic Nernst constant  $Q_S$  that is due to the effect under consideration leads to the expression

$$Q_{se} = \frac{2\tau(\eta)\eta a_e}{3cm^*I_s} \frac{\partial I_s}{\partial T} \cdot 300 = \frac{Ka_e}{cC_0I_s} \frac{\partial I_s}{\partial T} \cdot 300 \text{ [v/deg-gauss]}. \quad (1)$$

Here  $\tau(\eta)$  is the relaxation time,  $\eta$  is the Fermi energy,  $K$  is the thermal conductivity,  $C_0$  is the electronic heat capacity, and  $I_S$  is the spontaneous magnetization. It is easily demonstrated that at temperatures near the Curie point and for  $|a_e| \geq 0.1$ , we have  $Q_{se} \gg Q'_S$ , where  $Q'_S$  is the usual Nernst constant.

In the Nernst field there is also included a field connected with spin-orbit interaction of the current carriers with the ions. If in first approximation, as was done by Karplus and Luttinger,<sup>2-3</sup> we describe the spin-orbit interaction by means of an effective field  $H_{eff} = H_{spo}I_e/I_S$ , then we can derive a formula for the part of the Nernst constant connected with this interaction; it will differ from (1) only by a positive multiplier. Comparison with experimental data<sup>4-5</sup> on nickel and on iron-nickel alloys shows that (1) describes well the temperature dependence of  $Q_S$  from room tem-

perature to the Curie point and gives the right order of magnitude for the value of  $Q_S$ .

It follows from (1) that, independently of the type of current carrier, the coefficient  $Q_S$  is positive if the magnetization of the carriers is directed opposite to the spontaneous magnetization of the metal, and is negative if both magnetizations are parallel. Thus from the sign of  $Q_S$  it is possible to determine the signs of the magnetizations of the current carriers. As Smith's<sup>4</sup> experimental data show,  $Q_S$  is negative in iron and positive in nickel and cobalt. Consequently, the magnetization of the current carriers is directed along the spontaneous magnetization in iron and opposite to it in cobalt and in nickel.

<sup>1</sup>S. V. Vonsovskii, Современное учение о магнетизме (Modern Theories of Magnetism), Gostekhizdat, 1953, pp. 224-227.

<sup>2</sup>R. Karplus and J. M. Luttinger, Phys. Rev. **95**, 1154 (1954).

<sup>3</sup>J. M. Luttinger, Phys. Rev. **112**, 739 (1958).

<sup>4</sup>A. Smith, Phys. Rev. **33**, 295 (1911); **17**, 23 (1921).

<sup>5</sup>R. P. Ivanova, Физика металлов и металловедение (Phys. of Metals and Metallography) **8**, 851 (1959).

Translated by W. F. Brown, Jr.

57

*CORRECTION TO THE ARTICLE BY  
D. P. GRECHUKHIN 'SOME EXPERIMENTAL  
POSSIBILITIES FOR VERIFICATION OF THE  
MODEL OF NONAXIAL NUCLEI WITH A  
ROTATIONAL SPECTRUM'*

JETP **38**, 1891 (1960), Soviet Phys. JETP **12**,  
1359 (1960).

THROUGH an oversight on the part of the author, the coefficient of the third term of Eq. (4) is in error. The rigorously correct formula is

$$\langle r^2 \rangle_{DF} = \frac{3}{5} Z R_0^2 \left\{ 1 + \frac{5}{4\pi} \beta^2 + \frac{25}{12\pi} \sqrt{\frac{5}{4\pi}} (C_{2020}^{20})^2 \beta^3 \cos \gamma [1 - 4 \sin^2 \gamma] \right\}.$$

Recognizing that  $(C_{2020}^{20})^2 = 2/7$  and  $(50/21)\sqrt{5/\pi} \approx 3.004$ , we obtain, with sufficient accuracy

$$\langle r^2 \rangle_{DF} = \frac{3}{5} Z R_0^2 \left\{ 1 + \frac{5}{4\pi} \beta^2 + \frac{3}{8\pi} \beta^2 \cos \gamma [1 - 4 \sin^2 \gamma] \right\}.$$

The author is deeply grateful to É. E. Fradkin for calling his attention to the error and for undertaking the recalculation of  $\langle r^2 \rangle_{DF}$ .