$\Phi_{10} = P[(2\rho_{0a}2\rho_{0a})1s_b']$ $\Phi_{11} = 2P\left[(2p_{+1a}2p_{-1a})1s_b' \right],$

 $\Phi_{12} = P \left[(1s_a 1s_a) 2 \phi_{0a} \right],$

 $\Phi_{13} = 2P\Gamma(1s_a2\rho_{0a})1s_b$,

 $\Phi_{14} = 2P\Gamma(2s_a2p_{0a})1s_b$ '],

 $\Phi_{17} = P[(3p_{0a}3p_{0a})1s_b']$

 $\Phi_{18} = 2P[(3p_{+1a}3p_{-1a})1s_b']$

 $\Phi_{20} = 2\mathbf{P}\left\{ \left[(2p_{-1}a^3p_{+1a})1s_b' \right] + \left[(2p_{+1}a^3p_{-1a})1s_b' \right] \right\},$

 $\Phi_{19} = 2P[(2\rho_{0a}3\rho_{0a})1s_b']$

 $\Phi_{21} = \mathbf{P}[(3d_{0a}3d_{0a})1s_b']$

 $\Phi_{24} = 2P[(1s_a3p_{0a})1s_b']$

 $\Phi_{25} = 2P[(1s_a3d_{0a})1s_b']$

 $\Phi_{26} = 2P\Gamma(2s_a3p_{0a})1s_b$ '].

 $\Phi_{22} = 2\mathbf{P}[(3d_{+1a}3d_{-1a})1s_b']$

 $\Phi_{23} = 2P\Gamma(3d_{+2a}3d_{-2a})1s_b$ '],

 $\Phi_{15} = P[(1s_a 1s_a) 2s_b],$

 $\Phi_{16} = \mathbf{P} \left[(1s_a 1s_a) 3s_b \right],$

APPENDIX II

Wave Functions

 $P = \frac{1}{2}(I - i),$ ¹³ $(ab:c) \equiv det[a(1)\alpha(1)b(2)\alpha(2)c(3)\beta(3)],$ $\lceil (ac)b \rceil = (ab:c) + (cb:a),$ $\Phi_1 = \mathbf{P} \left[(1s_a 1s_a) 1s_b' \right],$ $\Phi_2 = \mathbf{P} \left[(2s_a 2s_a) 1s_b{}' \right],$ $\Phi_3 = \mathbf{P}[(3s_a 3s_a) 1s_b']$ $\Phi_4 = 2P\Gamma(1s_a 2s_a)1s_b$ '], $\Phi_5 = 2P\Gamma(1s_a 3s_a)1s_b$ '], $\Phi_6 = 2P[(2s_a 3s_a)1s_b']$ $\Phi_7 = 2P[(2s_a 1s_b') 1s_a],$ $\Phi_8 = \mathbf{P} \left[(1s_a 1s_a) 2s_a \right],$ $\Phi_9 = P \left[(1s_a 1s_a) 3s_a \right],$

¹³ The operator **P** produces the ungerade symmetry. *I* is the identity transformation and i is the inversion through the center of the molecule.

PHYSICAL REVIEW

VOLUME 132, NUMBER 1

1 OCTOBER 1963

Potential Curve of the Metastable Helium Molecule*

R. D. POSHUSTA AND F. A. MATSEN

Department of Physics and Department of Chemistry, The University of Texas, Austin, Texas (Received 17 May 1963)

The potential curve of the He₂($\delta\Sigma_{u}$ ⁺) molecule was computed using a twelve-term function containing orbitals through 3d. The curve shows a potential maximum near 4.5 a_0 which lies 0.081 eV above the calculated energy of the separated atoms. A similar maximum was obtained in two previous calculations which used a more restricted basis set. The maximum appears to be supported by experiment. In this calculation, $E_{\rm exp}(\text{atoms}) - E_{\rm calc}(r_e) = 0.94$ eV and $E_{\rm calc}(\text{atoms}) - E_{\rm calc}(r_e) = 1.24$ eV.

INTRODUCTION

THE potential curve of ${}^{3}\Sigma_{u}{}^{+}$ He₂ (He₂^{*}) using simple one-configuration wave functions has been computed by Buckingham and Dalgarno¹ and Brigman, Brient, and Matsen.² Both calculations show a potential maximum near $4a_0$ (a_0 =first Bohr radius) which is a feature of considerable experimental interest. The present calculations extend the work of Brigman, Brient, and Matsen by adding polarization to the wave function. The calculations were performed using the CDC 1604 computer at the Computation Center at The University of Texas, and programs³ written by

members of the Molecular Physics Group at The University of Texas.

WAVE FUNCTIONS

The wave functions used in these calculations are constructed from Slater atomic orbitals. The ${}^{3}\Sigma_{u}{}^{+}$ symmetry is achieved by forming bond functions⁴ from Slater determinants, and projecting the result with

$$
\mathbf{P} = \frac{1}{4} (\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{\sigma}_v)(\mathbf{E} - \mathbf{i}). \tag{1a}
$$

Here **E** is the identity transformation, σ_n is a reflection in a plane containing the molecular axis, and i is an inversion through the center of the molecule.

The bond functions have the form

$$
[(ab)cd] \equiv (ac:bd) + (bc:ad) + (ad:cb) + (bd:ca),
$$
 (1b)

where

$$
(ab:cd) \equiv \det[a(1)\alpha(1)b(2)\alpha(2)c(3)\beta(3)d(4)\beta(4)].
$$
 (1c)

^{*} This research was supported in part by the Robert A. Welch Foundation of Houston, Texas, and the U.S. Air Force Office of Scientific Research, Contract AF-AFOSR-273-63.

¹ R. A. Buckingham and A. Dalgarno, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London)
A213, 327 (1952). ² G. H. Brigman, S. J. Brient, and F. A. Matsen, J. Chem. Phys.

^{34, 958 (1961).}

³ James Miller and J. C. Browne, Collection Formulas for Diatomic Integrals (Molecular Physics Group, 1962, The University of Texas, Austin, Texas).

⁴ H. Eyring, J. Walter, and G. E. Kimball, *Quantum Chemistry* (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1958).

TABLE I. The configurations of the closed-shell wave function.

Orbital $\delta(1s)$ $\delta(1s')$ $\frac{\delta(2s)}{\delta(2s')}$ $\delta(2s')\ \delta(2p_{+1})=\delta(2p_{-1})$ δ(2p₀)
δ(2p₀′) *8 (3s)* $\delta(3d_{+2}) = \delta(3d_{-2})$ δ ³ δ ²₀^{δ} $\delta(3d_{-1}) = \delta(3d_{+1})$ $R < 4.0$ 1.420 0 1.997 9 1.848 8 0.563 7 2.522 0 2.462 0 0.564 6 1.227 0 3.629 0 3.609 0 3.629 0 $R\!\geq\!4.0$ 1.420 0 1.994 8 1.843 5 0.563 7 2.482 0 2.462 0 0.564 6 1.2270 3.629 0 3.609 0 3.629 0

TABLE II. Closed-shell orbital exponents.

Calculations were performed using two types of wave function; an open-shell wave function with nine configurations, and a closed-shell wave function with twelve configurations,

 $\psi_9 = 2P\{-\left[(3d_{-1a}3d_{+1a})1s_b'2s_b'\right]+\left[(3d_{-2a}3d_{+2a})1s_b'2s_b'\right]\}$

$$
\psi = \sum_{i=1}^{12} c_i \psi_i.
$$
 (2)

The configurations of the closed-shell wave function are listed in Table I using the notation of Eqs. (1) and (2), and the conventional notation for the Slater atomic orbitals.

RESULTS

Partial optimization of nonlinear parameters was carried out on (2) and on the open-shell wave function at several internuclear separations. The resulting orbital exponents for the closed-shell wave function are given in Table II. The eigenvector of linear coefficients and the corresponding eigenvalue of the secular equation are shown in Table III. When the internuclear separation is increased without limit, the wave functions approach a triplet helium atom wave function and a singlet helium atom wave function. The resulting total separated atom energies for the closed-shell and openshell wave functions are -5.06960 and -5.07071 a.u., respectively $(1 \text{ a.u.} = 27.21 \text{ eV})$. These results are depicted in Fig. 1 where the potential energy is drawn as a smooth curve through the points calculated with the closed-shell wave function. As may be seen from Fig. 1 the energy computed from the open-shell wave function is higher than that with the closed-shell wave function at internuclear separations less than 5 a_0 . For this reason and because the closed-shell function re-

TABLE III. Eigenvalues and eigenvectors for closed-shell wave functions.

	1.500 R	1.800	1.900	2.015	2.130	2.245	2.360	2.500
E	-5.00980	-5.09392	-5.10492	-5.11147	-5.11346	-5.11240	-5.10946	-5.10443
c ₁	$+0.958861$	$+0.848926$	$+0.824883$	$+0.802768$	$+0.785154$	$+0.771204$	$+0.760227$	$+0.749872$
c ₂	-0.223369	-0.136878	-0.116702	-0.097330	-0.081 123	-0.067554	-0.056285	-0.045004
c_3	-0.065370	-0.122610	-0.136113	-0.149304	-0.160 593	-0.170370	-0.178757	-0.187502
c ₄	-0.023205	-0.019302	-0.018731	-0.018307	-0.018050	-0.017895	-0.017824	-0.017784
c_{5}	-0.018143	-0.017572	-0.017457	$-0.017,361$	-0.017292	-0.017248	-0.017216	-0.017 198
c ₆	$+0.020113$	$+0.012590$	$+0.010795$	$+0.009020$	$+0.007518$	$+0.006276$	$+0.005163$	$+0.004099$
c ₇	-0.013410	-0.018983	-0.018772	-0.017393	-0.014913	-0.011460	-0.007 149	-0.001 108
c_8	$+0.003144$	$+0.003$ 129	$+0.003094$	$+0.003050$	$+0.003008$	$+0.002969$	$+0.002935$	$+0.002900$
c ₉	$+0.003017$	$+0.002929$	$+0.002903$	$+0.002875$	$+0.002852$	$+0.002831$	$+0.002814$	$+0.002797$
	$-0.018\,006$ C_{10}	-0.018720	-0.018335	-0.017702	-0.016923	-0.016046	-0.015 103	-0.013916
	-0.089083 c_{11}	-0.098758	-0.100486	-0.101493	-0.101508	-0.100638	-0.098936	-0.096045
	-0.005559 C_{12}	-0.005510	-0.005311	-0.004952	-0.004465	-0.003877	-0.003218	-0.002371
	3.000	3.500	4.000	4.500	5.000	5.500	6.000	15.000
	-5.08503	-5.07235	-5.06642	-5.06450	-5.06455	-5.06528	-5.06638	-5.069 72
	$+0.729881$	$+0.723627$	$+0.722800$	$+0.722749$	$+0.722462$	$+0.721617$	$+0.720510$	$+0.715809$
	-0.020746	-0.011664	-0.009919	-0.009354	-0.009326	-0.009319	-0.009311	-0.009169
	-0.207838	-0.216212	-0.217235	-0.217429	-0.216992	-0.216489	-0.216018	-0.214684
	-0.017807	-0.017828	-0.017875	-0.017927	-0.017972	-0.018004	-0.018027	-0.018056
	-0.017224	-0.017305	-0.017637	-0.017731	-0.017808	-0.017864	-0.017898	-0.017938
	$+0.002069$	$+0.001664$	$+0.002412$	$+0.002475$	$+0.002495$	$+0.002431$	$+0.002282$	$+0.001746$
	$+0.021966$	$+0.037001$	$+0.040573$	$+0.036602$	$+0.029570$	$+0.022335$	$+0.016$ 143	-0.000000
	$+0.002825$	$+0.002798$	$+0.002794$	$+0.002$ 799	$+0.002807$	$+0.002814$	$+0.002819$	$+0.002825$
	$+0.002765$	$+0.002760$	$+0.002768$	$+0.002780$	$+0.002791$	$+0.002$ 799	$+0.002805$	$+0.002811$
	-0.009767	-0.006511	-0.004217	-0.002741	-0.001791	-0.001154	-0.000751	-0.000000
	-0.082 191	-0.069031	-0.058767	-0.050237	-0.042832	-0.036169	-0.030217	-0.000489
	$+0.000296$	$+0.001760$	$+0.002233$	$+0.002230$	$+0.002023$	$+0.001\ 753$	$+0.001489$	$+0.000031$

 $\psi_1 = \mathbf{P}[(1s_a 1s_a) 2s_b' 1s_b']$ $\psi_2 = 2P[(1s_a 2s_a)2s_b'1s_b]$ $\psi_3 = P[(2s_a2s_a)2s_b'1s_b']$ $\psi_4 = P[(2\rho_{0a}2\rho_{0a})2s_b'1s_b']$ $\psi_5 = 2P[(2p_{+1a}2p_{-1a})1s_b'2s_b']$ $\psi_6 = \Pr[(1_{s_a}1_{s_a})3_{s_b}/2_{s_b}]$ $\psi_7 = \mathbf{P}[(1s_a1s_a)2p_{0b}1s_b']$ $\psi_8 = \mathbf{P}[(3d_{0a}3d_{0a})1s_b'2s_b']$

 $\psi_{10} = 2P[(1s_a2\rho_{0a})1s_b'2s_b']$ $\psi_{11} = P[(1s_a 1s_a) 2s_a 1s_b']$ $\psi_{12} = P[(1s_a1s_a)2p_{0a}1s_b']$

TABLE IV. Properties of ${}^3\Sigma_u{}^+$ He₂

Property	Calculated	Experimental
Potential energy	-14.7417 a.u.	.
Kinetic energy	$+5.1336$ a.u.	.
Value of the wave function at the atomic nuclei	3.1426 $(a_0)^{-3}$	
$\langle Z^2\rangle$	13.7540 $(a_0)^2$.
Quadrupole moment	7.6248 $(a_0)^2$.
$r_{\scriptstyle e}$ D_e ω_{e} $\omega_e x_e$ B_{α} α_{s}	$2.139(a_0)$ See text 1743.4 cm ⁻¹ 91.7 cm^{-1} 6.6 cm^{-1} 0.26 cm ⁻¹	$1.981a_0$ (2.6) eV 1811.2 cm^{-1} 39.2 cm^{-1} 7.66 cm ⁻¹ 0.131 cm ⁻¹

quires less computing time, we do not present the results from the open-shell function in detail.

In the course of these calculations, the work of Brigman, Brient, and Matsen² was repeated. Large discrepancies were found at small internuclear separations, but in the neighborhood of the hump the discrepancies are negligible. Figure 1 shows these corrected results, labeled BB&M. The highest curve in Fig. 1 is that computed by Buckingham and Dalgarno and is labeled B&D.

Table IV contains several molecular properties as computed from the present closed-shell wave function and, where available, the experimental results⁵ for these same properties. A third-order polynomial was fitted to the potential energy curve in the neighborhood of the minimum to find the values of spectroscopic constants reported in Table IV.

DISCUSSION

According to the variation theorem, the quantity $E_{\text{exp}}(\text{atoms}) - E_{\text{calc}}(r_e)$ (=0.939 eV from our calculation) is a rigorous lower bound for the dissociation energy of $He₂[*]$. The calculations produced a rationalized binding energy, $E_{\text{calc}}(\text{atoms}) - E_{\text{calc}}(r_e)$ of 1.24 eV for the closed-shell wave function and 1.08 eV for the open-shell wave function.

Meyerott⁶ has estimated the binding energy to be 1.70 eV by the relation $D_e(\text{He}_2^*) = D_e(\text{He}_2^+) + I(\text{He}_2^*)$ $-I(He[*])$. The last two quantities are determined experimentally to be 4.25 and 4.77 eV, respectively. For $D_e(\text{He}_2^+)$ Meyerott⁶ used the rationalized binding energy of 2.20 eV calculated by Weinbaum to obtain $D_e(\text{He}_2^*)$ = 1.70 eV. Recently, Reagan, Browne, and

FIG. 1. Potential curves of ${}^{3}\Sigma_{u}{}^{+}$ He₂.

Matsen⁷ established a rigorous lower limit of 2.24 eV for the former quantity. This permits the establishment of a lower limit of 1.76 eV for the dissociation energy of the metastable helium molecule. We see that, although our calculation is a considerable improvement over the two previous calculations which employed more restricted basis sets, it is still far short of being an acceptable energy calculation. The agreement with experimental spectroscopic constants is fair.

The calculation yields a maximum at 4.5 *do* in the potential curve which lies 0.081 eV above the calculated energy of the separated atoms. A maximum similar to this has been obtained in the two previous calculations. The experimental arguments for its existence are based on the temperature coefficients of the diffusion of triplet helium atom through helium atoms and the rate constant for the process $He(^{3}S) + 2He \rightarrow He^{*} + He$. Recently,⁸ it has been shown that the rate constant for the process ${}^4\text{He}({}^3S) + {}^3\text{He} \rightarrow {}^4\text{He} + {}^3\text{He}({}^3S)$ goes to zero at liquid-helium temperatures, which fact provides additional experimental support for the existence of the hump.

⁵ G. Herzberg, *Molecular Spectra and Molecular Structure I.*

⁽D. Van Nostrand, Inc., New York, 1950), 2nd ed. ⁶R. Meyerott, Phys. Rev. 70, 671 (1946).

⁷ P. N. Reagan, J. C. Browne, and F. A. Matsen, preceding paper, Phys. Rev. 131, 304 (1963).
⁸ F. D. Colegrove, L. D. Schearer, and G. K. Walters, Bull. Am.

Phys. Soc. 8, 112 (1963).