

SUPERFLUID HELIUM AS THE CONDENSATE OF BOUND ATOMS PAIRS

N.M.Blagoveshchenskii

Institute of Physics and Power Engineering, 249033, Obninsk, Russia

E-mail: blagoveshchenskii@rambler.ru

ABSTRACT. Based upon the hypothesis of simultaneous participation of helium particles in atom - atom and pair – pair motions, the proof of Feynman and Bogoliubov formulas validity for elementary excitations spectrum in superfluid helium is carried out, with the double mass of particle, $2M$. The value of effective mass for such a motion, $1.5M$, leads to the more close value $2.09K$ for λ – transition temperature ($2.17K$), with respect to the value of $3.14K$ obtained with use of single mass M .

KEY WORDS: Memory function; bound pair state; dynamical condensation.

INTRODUCTION. The pioneering theory of superfluidity [1] based upon the hypothesis that the majority of liquid helium atoms obeys the condition for Bose – Einstein Condensation (BEC) into the zero momentum state. The experimental investigation of single atom condensate density by means of inelastic neutrons scattering [2] has revealed, however, that the BEC state belongs not to the majority of atoms, but to the part of about 10% only. The further theoretical investigations [3,4] have allowed the possibility of the superfluidity phenomenon to occur just for BEC density of the order $\sim 10\%$. The main disadvantage of these theories was too small value of sound velocity, namely $c \sim \sqrt{n(\text{BEC})}$ with respect to needed $c \sim \sqrt{n}$.

The next step come with the hypothesis of the the possible existence of macroscopic fraction of pair condensate in liquid helium [5,6]. In these theories either the single atom BEC fraction was ignored at all, or the parts of single and pair (and of higher orders) condensates were studied independently [7].

In present work we assume the helium atoms participating in both the single atom – atom and pair – pair motions, thus possessing the independent relaxation times for ground state of liquid helium. In this spirit the pair condensation [5] is not more stationary but commonly dynamical, and the “momental” density of dynamical bose – condensate, in addition with density of conventional single BEC is equal 100%, at least at $T \rightarrow 0$.

1. Microdynamics of liquid helium from a point of establishing the structure of the ground state can be developed in terms of so-called memory function $\Gamma(t)$, which is the kernel of integro – differential Volterra equation [8] for Velocity Autocorrelation Function (VACF), $\Psi(t)$:

$$\partial\Psi/\partial t = - \int \Gamma(\tau)\Psi(t-\tau)d\tau \quad . \quad (1)$$

Memory function is usually two – component and can be written:

$$\Gamma(Q,t) = \Gamma(Q,0)[\alpha(Q)\exp(-t/\tau(\mu)) + (1-\alpha(Q))\exp(-t/\tau(\alpha))] , \quad (2)$$

here $\tau(\mu)$ and $\tau(\alpha)$ – times of fast (single atom – atom) and slow (corresponded to the nearest surrounding decay) relaxation of atom or cluster with momentum Q , and $\alpha(Q)$ and $(1-\alpha(Q))$ – weights of slow and fast components of $\Gamma(t)$.

Assuming that the minimal cluster of slow relaxation is tetrahedron constructed from two pairs of interactive atoms, one can estimate [9] the ratio of densities k for atoms taking place both pair – pair and atom – atom motions:

$$k = 2 \tau(\alpha) / \tau(\mu) [1 - \alpha(Q)] \quad (3)$$

As shown in [9], for liquid potassium $k = 0.2$; for liquid sodium $k = 0.4$; for liquid lithium $k = 1.0$. Thus, lithium can be regarded as liquid, those excitation spectrum is forming as in single – atom, both in two – atom densities. The analogues picture we have in liquid helium. As shown in [9], time of fast relaxation $\tau(\mu)$ is equal to the decay time τ , inferred from the VACF analysis by the decaying cosine formula [10]:

$$\Psi(t) = \text{sech}(t/\tau) \cos(\omega t) , \quad (4)$$

By analogy, we can propose that for slow relaxation time $\tau(\alpha)$ one can detect the same resemblance in two – component model (4), and for the case of liquid helium we hold the analysis of VACF $\Psi(t)$ instead of direct analysis of memory function $\Gamma(t)$.

VACF of liquid helium for $T = 3\text{K}$ has been obtained with use of standard molecular-dynamical program MOLDY [11] (see fig.1) and demonstrated sharply two – component structure. Times relaxation ratio $\tau(\alpha) / \tau(\mu)$ is nearly 5, while components areas ratio $N(\alpha)/N(\mu) = 0.61$.

Not numerous data [12] of liquid helium VACF analysis at other temperatures shows $k \sim 0.1$ at $T = 4\text{K}$, and, likely $k = 1.0$ near λ – point. Thus, atoms of normal liquid helium I take place both in atom – atom, and pair – pair motions with densities ratio $N(\alpha)/N(\mu)$, varying from 0 (at boiling point $T = 4.2\text{K}$) to about 1 (at λ – point $T = 2.17\text{K}$).

Propose now, that at the interval from 0 up to 2.17K, the ratio $N(\alpha)/N(\mu) = \text{const} = 1$, but the ratio of bound pairs number to the number of total interacting pairs is varying. So the λ – point can be determined as the temperature where the pairs with non-zero bound constant in helium II are appearing. Perhaps they produce the superfluid component, and their energy at $T = 0$ is equal to the zero – oscillations energy Δ .

2. Namely this pattern is reproduced by paper [13], where the possible existence of bound pairs appears due to off-diagonal part of interaction Hamiltonian:

$$U(\Lambda) = 1/2V \sum_{\mathbf{k}} v(\mathbf{k}) [a^\times(\mathbf{k})a^\times(-\mathbf{k})a(0)^2 + a^*(0)^2 a(\mathbf{k})a(-\mathbf{k})] \quad (5)$$

Bound pairs are the cause of appearance of so-called dynamical bose-condensation for pairs with zero-total momentum, and the bounding constant is defined as follows:

$$g(\Lambda,00) = -1/4(2\pi)^3 \int d^3k [v(k)]^2/\varepsilon(k) , \quad (6)$$

here $\varepsilon(k) = k^2/2M$, and $v(k) = \int d^3x \varphi(x) \exp(-ikx)$ – Fourier-transform of potential.

Then we take $v(k)$ from the Bogoluibov theory [1] calculated with experimental form of elementary excitation spectrum $\varepsilon(k)$ [14]:

$$\varepsilon(k)^2 = [k^2/2M]^2 + k^2 n v(k)/M . \quad (7)$$

and get $g(\Lambda,00) = 0.135$ meV.

On the other hand, executing the numerical estimation by formula (6), we suppose that all the atoms of density n , taking place in creation of the bound pairs, have the same modulus of momentum k ($T \sim 0$ situation). Calculating the value of $g(\Lambda,00)$, we let the level of zero oscillations near $T = 0$ equal 1.1 meV[15]. Then we get $g(\Lambda,00) = 0.04$ meV, - the value 3 times less than straightforward estimation of $g(\Lambda,00)$ by formula (6). This contradiction can be understood by the fact that really the renormalized potential $v(k)$ takes place, leading to the modification [5] of initial part in $v(k)$, thus leading to the reduced value of integrand (6). This leads to the correct evaluation [13] of $E(b)$ sign:

$$E(b) = 1/2 v(0) + g(\Lambda,00) , \quad (8)$$

where $v(0)$ – value of $v(k)$ at $k = 0$. Bounding rule reads $E(b) < 0$.

We have pointed out that the value of bounding constant is much less than level of zero oscillations Δ , and each atom of interacting pair possesses $\sim 1/2\Delta = 0.55$ meV energy. Average (effective) temperature of zero oscillations level is $\langle T \rangle = 0.45$ meV, with respect to existence of single particle BEC participation ($\sim 10\%$ n) in the kinetic energy. This value of $\langle T \rangle$ will be used below for calculation of one-atom and two-atom densities in $S(Q)$ correction for demonstration of Feinman formula [16] validity,

$$\varepsilon(Q) = Q^2/[2MS(Q)] , \quad (9)$$

which appears to work at *double* mass of helium atom $M \rightarrow 2M$ in wide Q area .

3. Indeed, as is shown in Fig.2, formal setting of structure factor $S(Q)$ into expression (9) reveals for $M \rightarrow 2M$ the remarkable proximity of calculated $\varepsilon(Q)$ with experimental spectrum, in the area of Q near roton minimum. Now let us demonstrate the marked coincidence in the phonon area as well, with thorough correction of $S(Q)$.

Notice that at small momenta, $S(Q)$ is equal to the intensity of neutron scattering by helium, $Z(Q)$. Moreover, assuming the experimental $Z(Q)$ [17] to be consisted of

scattering part by one-atom density, and part of scattering by two-atom density (the dynamical bose-condensate), let us write these parts separately as:

$$Z(1) = 4\pi Q^2 \exp[-cQ/\langle T \rangle] \quad (10)$$

$$\text{and} \quad Z(2) = 4\pi Q^2 \exp[-\varepsilon(Q)/\langle T \rangle] \quad , \quad (11)$$

where cQ – phonon part of spectrum $\varepsilon(Q)$. The sound velocity c is the same both in one-atom, and in two-atom densities and can be expressed in small wavenumber limit as

$$c = \sqrt{[1/M(\partial P/\partial \rho)]} \quad , \quad (12)$$

where P is pressure, and ρ – density.

Fig. 3 demonstrates that neutron scattering by one-atom density leads to the reduction of the $Z(Q)$ slope by factor of 2 and exhibits $\partial Z(2)/\partial Q = \partial Z(1)/\partial Q = 1/(4Mc)$, while experimentally observed (summary) slope (curve 3) is $\partial Z/\partial Q = 1/(2Mc)$, and calculated curve (3) nicely accords with experimental [13] $Z(Q)$, revealing the so-called prepeak in $Z(Q)$ and $S(Q)$, at $Q \sim 0.5$.

The curve (2) exhibits the correction $Z(1)$ (expression (10) with effective energy or temperature $\langle T \rangle = 0.45$ meV). This correction needed to be extracted from $S(Q)$ to get final structure factor, shown in Fig. 4 (circles). It is of interest that its slope is $1/(4Mc)$, not $1/(2Mc)$, what demonstrates the $S(Q)$ to be formed indeed by pair-pair interaction, and that the Feynman formula (9) works correctly with *double* mass $M \rightarrow 2M$. The result of calculation is shown at Fig. 5. It demonstrates the excellent agreement with experimental excitation spectrum [14].

It should be noted also the other attempt [6] to transform the structure factor for demonstration of Feynman formula validity just for $M \rightarrow 2M$. However, paper [6] is based on changing of $S(Q)$ by the value $\Delta S(Q) = \text{const}(Q) = S(0)$ but not on the hypothesis of one-atom component $Z(1)$ participation in the observed $S(Q)$. It must be noted that formally the agreement of calculation using theory [6] with neutron experiment on $\varepsilon(Q)$ [14] seems to be good, and shows the appropriate resemblance in both roton and phonon areas of the elementary excitation spectrum. It must be underlined that paper [6], as far as theory [5] operates in terms of *stationary* pair condensation, while our approach and theory [13] work in terms of *dynamical* pair condensation, simultaneously with existence of conventional BEC ($\sim 10\%$).

CONCLUSION. Relying upon the hypothesis of existence in superfluid helium the dynamical condensate of bound atoms pairs, one can affirm the validity for Bogoliubov theory [1], demanding the particles state in condensed majority. Such the condensate of bound atoms pairs together with traditional one-atom BEC determines the ground state for superfluid helium system. Also, the validity of Feynman formula (9) [16] is established for $M \rightarrow 2M$ and with thorough correction of $S(Q)$ on the one-atom part of motion in unperturbed density. It is interestingly that contemporary investigation of

excitation helium spectra [19] shows in fact the existence of two-component phonon picture, thus affirming the two-component structure of memory function, leading to existence in superfluid helium of the dynamical condensate of bound atoms pairs. Certainly, namely bound atoms pairs together with ordinary one-atom BEC forms the superfluid component of liquid helium II: its density at absolute zero temperature is 100%; at λ – point 0%, accordingly to density of BEC equal zero at $T > 2.17\text{K}$.

Based on fact of two-component memory function below λ – point, it is seen that reduced effective mass of helium atom is 1.5M. So the conventional estimation of λ – transition temperature leads to the 1.5 times less value than one with single mass, namely:

$$T(\lambda) = 3.14/1.5 = 2.09\text{K} - \text{number more close with } 2.17\text{K} \text{ than } 3.14\text{K}.$$

It is pleasure to thank A.G.Novikov and A.V.Puchkov for instant interest in this work; V.V.Savostin for technical assistance and A.V.Mokshin for valuable remark.

REFERENCES

- [1] N.N. Bogoliubov, *Izv. Akad. Nauk USSR* 11 (1947) 77.
- [2] I. V. Bogoyavlenskii, L. V. Karhatsevich, Zh. A. Kozlov, and A. V. Puchkov, *Physica B* 176 (1992) 151.
- [3] S.T.Belyaev, *Sov.Phys JETP* 34 (1958) 433.
- [4] V.N.Minasyan, K.J.Touryan, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* 90 (2003) 235301.
- [5] E. A. Pashitskii, S.V. Mashkevich, and S. I. Vilchynskyy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 89(7) (2002) 075301.
- [6] Yatendra S.Jain, *American Journ. of Cond. Matt. Phys.* 2(2) (2012) 32.
- [7] M.Tomchenko, *J.Low Temp. Phys.*32(1) (2006) 53.
- [8] N. March and M. Tosi, *Motion of Atoms in Liquids* (Metallurgiya, Moscow, 1980) [in Russian].
- [9] N. M. Blagoveshchenskii, A. G. Novikov, and V. V. Savostin, *Crystallography Reports* 56(7) (2011) 1096.
- [10] Shaminder Singh and K. Tankeshwar, *Phys.Rev E*67 (2003) 012201.
- [11] Molecular Dynamics Program MOLLY by Keith Reifson.
- [12] Eran Rabani, Goran Krilov, David R. Reichman, and B. J. Berne, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 123 (2005) 184506.
- [13] J-B.Bru , V.A. Zagrebnov, *Physics Letters A* 247 (1998) 37.
- [14] N.M.Blagoveshchenskii, I.V.Bogoyavlenskii, L.V.Karnatsevich , Zh.A.Kozlov, V.G.Kolobrodov, V.B.Priezzhev, A.V.Puchkov, A.N.Skomorokhov and V.S.Yarunin, *Phys. Rev B*50 (1994) 16550.
- [15] N.M.Blagoveshchenskii, I.V.Bogoyavlenskii, L.V.Karnatsevich, Zh.A.Kozlov, Yu.Ya.Milenko, V.A.Parfenov, A.V.Puchkov, *JETP lett.*, 37(3) (1983) 184.
- [16] R.P.Feynman, *Phys.Rev.*94 (1954) 262.
- [17] Exp. Rep. No. 6-02-680, <http://club.ill.fr/cv/servlet/ReportFind>.
- [18] E.C.Svensson, V.F.Sears, A.D.B.Woods, and P.Martel, *Phys.Rev.B*21 (1980) 3638.
- [19] K.Beauvois, J.Dawidowski, B.Fak, H.Godfrin, E.Krotschek, J.Ollivier and A.Sultan, ArXiv: 1802.08120v3 [Cond-Mat.Other] 3May2018.




Fig. 1 Liquid helium VACF at $T = 3.0\text{K}$ obtained by the use of molecular – dynamical program MOLDY [11]. Calculation by two-component formula (4) shows the areas ratio (slow to fast) $k = 0.61$.




Fig. 2 Excitation spectrum calculated by Feinman formula (9) with single (upper curve) and double mass (lower curve). The structure factor $S(Q)$ is from the paper [18]. Mark the coincidence with experimental $\varepsilon(Q)$ [14] near roton minimum, for $M \rightarrow 2M$.




Fig.3 (1) – Scattering by two-atom density $Z(2)$ (formula 11); (2) – scattering by one-atom density $Z(1)$ (formula 10); (3) – summary neutron scattering $Z(Q)$ in comparison with experimental [13] (circles).




Fig. 4 Structure factor $S(Q)$ [18] – solid line. Circles: $S(Q) - Z(1)$. Slope at $Q \rightarrow 0$ is $1/(4Mc)$. Pay attention that the corrected $S(Q)$ exhibits no any prepeak at $Q \sim 0.5$.




Fig. 5 Elementary excitation spectrum of helium II, calculated by expression (9) with structure factor $S(Q)$ corrected for one-atom part $Z(1)$ by formula (10) and double mass. Circles – the experimentally observed spectrum [14].