

The development of the concept of exchange forces in the 1930s: close encounters between Europe and Japan and the birth of nuclear theory

Marco Di Mauro¹, Salvatore Esposito^{2,3*}, Adele Naddeo^{3†}

¹ Department of Physics, University of Trento, Via Sommarive, Povo (TN), 38123, Italy.

^{2*} Department of Physics “Ettore Pancini”, University of Naples “Federico II”, Piazzale Tecchio 80, Naples, 80125, Italy.

³ Naples’ Unit, I.N.F.N., Complesso Universitario di Monte S. Angelo, Via Cinthia, Naples, 80126, Italy.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): salvatore.esposito@na.infn.it, salvatore.esposito12@unina.it;

Contributing authors: marco.dimauro@unitn.it; anaddeo@na.infn.it;

†These authors contributed equally to this work.

Abstract

The onset and the development of the concept of exchange force in quantum physics are historically reconstructed, starting from Heisenberg’s seminal contributions in 1926 and going through the great developments in nuclear physics, which allowed the emergence of the idea of force mediating virtual quanta. Although most of such work was performed in Europe, the last and decisive effort in this long path was carried out by Japanese scientists in the 1930s. This is the main focus of the present work, which retraces the achievements of Yukawa and Tomonaga, whose results and mutual interactions are carefully analyzed and related to those of European physicists.

1 Introduction

The concept of exchange interactions dates back to the second half of 1920s and is deeply related to the quantum mechanical description of a system of identical particles. The idea was conceived by Werner Heisenberg shortly after the final theory of quantum mechanics had been developed [1, 2, 3] and immediately applied by him to the hard problem of the spectrum of the helium atom [4], which had defied all attempts to make sense of it within the old quantum theory. Exchange interactions underlie the successful explanation of a variety of phenomena besides multi-electron atomic spectra, such as homopolar bonds in quantum chemistry, ferromagnetism, and electron-atom collisions, although the interpretation of the exchange mechanism is different in each case [5, 6]. The discovery of the neutron by James Chadwick in 1932 [7, 8] brought about, in the hands of Heisenberg himself, the application of the concept of exchange forces to the domain of nuclear physics and, finally, of quantum field theory [9, 10], paving the way to the understanding of fundamental forces as mediated by virtual particle exchange. The Heisenberg theory of nuclear structure, based on an exchange mechanism responsible for the interaction between protons and neutrons [11, 12, 13], Ettore Majorana's further refinement of nuclear exchange forces [14, 15] and Enrico Fermi's theory of β -decay [16, 17, 18, 19] are the first fruitful developments of Heisenberg's ideas. Despite none of them could successfully explain the whole complexity of the nuclear binding force, they constitute very important milestone towards that difficult task. These works strongly affected Yukawa Hideki¹ [20] as well as Tomonaga Shin'ichirō [21], who already had been exposed to the principles of the new quantum mechanics, by taking part to a cycle of lectures given by Heisenberg and Dirac in Japan in 1929 and promoted by Nishina Yoshio [22, 23, 24, 25]. It took a couple of years until Yukawa conceived his key idea of a mediating virtual meson [26, 27, 28, 29]. In the same period, Tomonaga was working on the range of proton-neutron interactions in Nishina's laboratory [30] and had fruitful exchanges with Yukawa.

In this paper, we retrace the above developments, with particular attention to the contribution given by Japanese physicists to the modern understanding of fundamental forces in the 1930s, which is carefully analyzed and related to previous key results. A clear picture emerges also of the influence of European scientists in shaping the development of quantum concepts in Japan. The paper is organized as follows. Sections 2, 3 and 4 are devoted to a brief but careful analysis of the key ideas underlying the seminal contributions provided by Heisenberg, Majorana and Fermi, with emphasis on conceptual issues. Their results are indeed mandatory steps for a thorough reconstruction of the role played by Japanese physicists in building the nuclear force theory, which is the content of Sections 6 and 7. Before that, a brief account of the situation of theoretical physics in Japan up to the period of interest is given in Section 5, with the aim of providing the general context in which Yukawa's as well as Tomonaga's contributions grew up and developed. Finally, Section 8 contains our concluding remarks.

¹In this paper, excluding quotes, we adopt the Hepburn system to transliterate Japanese names and, when referring to Japanese people, we follow the Japanese use of writing the surname before the first name.

2 Heisenberg's seminal contributions

The aim of this Section is to give an account of the key ideas underlying Heisenberg's theory of exchange forces, which marked the birth of nuclear theory [11, 12, 13].

2.1 The introduction and first applications of exchange interactions

The very roots of Heisenberg's work can be found in his famous paper on quantum resonance [1], dated June 1926, in which he introduced the peculiar non-classical concept of intrinsic symmetry in a concrete attempt to address many-body systems. Besides the obvious desire of extending his brainchild, matrix mechanics, to situations in which more than one particle were involved, Heisenberg's primary concern was to explain the splitting between singlet and triplet states in the spectrum of the helium atom, whose value was inconsistent with the one expected as a consequence of spin interactions between the two atomic electrons. Another problem was the mismatch between the theoretical number of stationary states of a quantum many-body system (obtained by means of Boltzmann statistics) and the stationary states actually observed in nature. According to Heisenberg, the solution of these puzzling issues depended on the understanding of the relationship between Bose-Einstein statistics, quantum mechanics and Pauli's exclusion principle. In his words:

We have found a rather decisive argument that your exclusion of equivalent orbits is connected with the singlet-triplet separation [...]. Consider the energy written as a function of the transition probabilities. Then a large difference results, if one – at the energy of H atoms – has transitions to $1S$, or if, according to your ban [exclusion principle], one puts them equal to zero. That is, para- and ortho-[helium] do have different energies, independently of the interaction between magnets [i.e., the magnetic moments associated with the spinning electrons] (Postcard addressed to W. Pauli, 5 May 1926, cited in [31], p. 737).

Indeed, the solution of three-body problems, in particular of the H_2^+ molecular ion and of the helium atom, was the stumbling stone which marked the failure of the old Bohr-Sommerfeld atomic theory, as already experienced by Heisenberg himself together with Born in 1923 [32]. It soon became clear that new developments were needed in order to attack the problem and this consideration led Heisenberg in 1926, now armed with the new quantum mechanics, to tackle the many-body problem again, trying to extend his matrix mechanics to the simplest case of the helium atom [1, 4]. He also considered the general case of a system composed of n identical components, coupled by two-body interactions. As a useful toy model, Heisenberg considered two weakly coupled identical harmonic oscillators. The term “resonance” comes in fact from the classical behavior of such a system.

Besides pointing out the role of the electron-electron interaction as crucial for the resonance idea, his conclusions rely strongly on the application of Bose-Einstein statistics as well as Pauli's exclusion principle. Then, in a second paper [33], the relevance of the notion of indistinguishable particles with respect to the application of Bose-Einstein statistics is recognized and the problem of the stability of the helium atom addressed via the concept of exchange energy. It is worth pointing out that, in the

above papers, Heisenberg missed the incompatibility between Bose-Einstein statistics and Pauli's exclusion principle, even if a few months earlier Fermi had already introduced a different quantum statistics of the ideal gas based on a generalization of Pauli's principle [34]. The same quantum statistics would have been independently obtained shortly after also by Paul A. M. Dirac, in his paper on the quantum mechanical treatment of many particles systems [35]: it is now known as Fermi-Dirac statistics.

The idea of exchange forces grew up in the subsequent years, switching from the atomic physics context to quantum chemistry² and ferromagnetism,³ as well as electron-atom collisions.⁴

The application of the idea to nuclear physics dates from 1932, with Heisenberg's seminal contributions [11, 12, 13], paving the way for future developments that culminated into the application to quantum electrodynamics and quantum field theory.⁵

2.2 Exchange forces and nuclear physics

Let us now analyze Heisenberg's important work on nuclear theory.⁶ As a previous mandatory step, we shall briefly summarize the state of art of research in nuclear physics in 1932.

Chadwick's discovery of a neutral particle of mass comparable with that of the proton, i.e. the neutron [7, 8], is, without any doubt, one of the most relevant experimental findings of the early 1930s. Indeed, it provided the solution of some puzzling issues concerning the nuclear structure, such as the wrong spin and statistics of several nuclei, for example the ^{14}N nucleus. This last feature was a direct consequence of the existing model for the nucleus, as built of protons and electrons, which in the case of the ^{14}N nucleus led to fourteen protons and seven electrons, thus implying that this nucleus should have half-integer spin and obey Fermi-Dirac statistics,⁷ at

²The idea of exchange forces was introduced in molecular physics by Walter Heitler and Fritz London [36] and soon became the basis of the quantum theory of homopolar chemical bond [37, 38, 39]. Heitler and London set up a perturbative approach for the solution of the Schrödinger equation for the hydrogen molecule H_2 , by taking as unperturbed eigenfunctions the products of single particle eigenfunctions corresponding to the configuration in which one of the two electrons is on one of the two nuclei, and the remaining electron on the other nucleus. The twofold degeneracy leads to take two linear combinations of the previous products as unperturbed eigenfunctions, the first one being symmetric and the second one antisymmetric, respectively. Due to the perturbation, the symmetric combination corresponds to a lower energy, hence to the formation of a stable molecule. According to Heitler and London there is a finite probability for the electron of the first nucleus to be found around the other nucleus, so that a resonance phenomenon arises, similar to that already introduced by Heisenberg for the helium atom. Such a phenomenon (termed in German *Austausch*), allowing electrons to exchange places around the two different nuclei, is crucial for the explanation of the homopolar chemical bond: in Heitler and London's words, it is "a characteristic quantum mechanical effect".

³Heisenberg's theory of ferromagnetism relies on the forces responsible for magnetic order being identified with quantum mechanical exchange interactions between electrons [40]. According to Heisenberg, the same mechanism responsible of level splittings between electrons in singlet and triplet states of two-electron atoms, in this new context, gives rise to spin alignment.

⁴Here the exchange of the incoming electron with one of the atomic electrons produces interference terms modifying the cross-section [41].

⁵We refer to Refs. [5, 6] for a careful analysis of the historical development of the notion of exchange interactions, and in particular of its modifications when passing from a context to a different one, the final output of this process being the actual interpretation of fundamental forces as virtual particle exchange.

⁶See Refs. [42, 43] for a thorough discussion of the connections between visualization and intuition and, in particular, of the guiding role that changes in intuition play in determining a corresponding change in the visual representation used to describe subatomic phenomena.

⁷In fact, according to the Ehrenfest-Oppenheimer rule [44], any composite, including nuclei, containing an odd (resp. even) number of fermionic particles should follow the Fermi-Dirac (resp. Bose-Einstein)

odds with observations of band spectra of the N_2^+ molecule, consistent with spin-1 and Bose statistics for those nuclei (see [9, 21] for a discussion). In order to address this problem, some strange properties had to be hypothesized for nuclear electrons, for instance that they did not contribute to the spin and statistics of the nucleus because their spins and statistics would get somehow suppressed, so their behavior would not follow quantum theory and Dirac's equation.⁸ Other inconsistencies brought by the hypothesis of nuclear electrons were the incorrect value of the magnetic moments of nuclei and the inconsistency of the energies expected for nuclear electrons from the momentum-position uncertainty relation due to their confinement in the nucleus, as well as both the average binding energy for a nuclear particle and the typical kinetic energies of electrons emitted as β -rays. Related to this, there was the well-known problem of the continuous spectrum of such β -rays, which seemed to threaten the validity of energy and momentum conservation. All these problems induced some scientists, most notably Niels Bohr, to believe that quantum mechanics, as well as the cherished conservation laws of energy, momentum and angular momentum, did not work at nuclear scales, and that somehow the electrons "lost their individuality" when confined to such a small scale.⁹ Bohr's position is vividly expressed by Tomonaga as follows:

Bohr asserted that this difficulty appeared because quantum mechanics did not work in the nucleus, and therefore the law of energy conservation was violated. Bohr said that since an electron with a Compton wavelength of 10^{-11} cm was confined in the small nucleus with a 10^{-13} cm radius, the individuality of the electron was lost in the nucleus. [...] The bottom line is that according to Bohr's idea, the interior of a nucleus was a sanctuary that could not be penetrated by quantum mechanics ([21], pp. 159-160).

As we will see now, the "sanctuary" began instead to be penetrated by Heisenberg who brought quantum mechanics into the nucleus. The starting point of Heisenberg's first paper on nuclear forces [11] is the key assumption that atomic nuclei are built up with protons and neutrons, with no electrons. Besides a relevant simplification of the theory, which now only involves heavy and slow particles and thus can be formulated using ordinary non-relativistic quantum mechanics, the correct statistics of nuclei such as ^{14}N follows at once from further assuming that the neutron has spin $\frac{1}{2}\hbar$ and satisfies Fermi statistics. But the problem with the β -decay energy spectra remained. To address this and other issues such as the interaction of nuclei with γ -rays, in all three papers Heisenberg adopted a kind of "hybrid" approach in which the neutron is sometimes considered as an elementary particle, and sometimes as a composite of an electron and a proton, despite this being obviously in contrast with the assumptions made for spin and statistics. As a matter of fact, Heisenberg was sweeping all the problems of the quantum mechanical description of a proton-electron nucleus inside the neutron:

statistics. Notice that at the time the issues of spin and statistics were in principle separated, as the general spin-statistics theorem had still to come [9].

⁸See Refs. [9, 45] for comprehensive accounts of the problems arising within an electron-proton model of the nucleus.

⁹Sometimes, as a (rather weak) argument in favor of such speculations, the fact was adduced that the classical electron radius is of the same order of magnitude of the nuclear scale, which in fact is purely accidental.

The neutron will be taken as an independent fundamental particle which, however, can split, under favorable conditions, into a proton and an electron, violating the law of conservation of energy and momentum ([11], translated in [10], p. 145).

At this stage, Pauli's neutrino hypothesis¹⁰ had not yet been recognized by Heisenberg, while β -decay would have been the subject of a careful analysis at the end of the paper.

The core of Heisenberg's work is the consideration that a correct description of the nuclei can be given in terms of quantum mechanics and, in particular, of the interaction between protons and neutrons. The nature of this interaction needs to be established. Two main guidelines were followed: first, the force must be very strong, in order to bind protons and neutrons within a region of the order of 10^{-13} cm, i.e., the nuclear radius, as can be inferred also from proton-nuclei scattering experiments, which also pointed at this force being of very short range; second, experiments indicated a saturation property of nuclear forces, namely that the binding energy of the nuclei is proportional to the mass number A (i.e. the number of particles inside the nucleus), rather than A^2 as would be the case for a force in which each nucleon interacted with all other nucleons. The conclusion was that the required interaction could not be of electromagnetic origin, and should be analogous to the one responsible of the existence and stability of the H_2^+ -ion within the domain of molecular physics. The proton and the neutron were seen as analogues of a hydrogen nucleus and a hydrogen atom, and the interaction could be seen, as its molecular-theoretic counterpart, as due to the exchange of an electron between the two. Notice that this picture requires the mentioned problematic composite picture of the neutron. In Heisenberg's words:

If one brings a neutron and a proton to within a distance comparable to the dimensions of the nucleus, then – in analogy with the H_2^+ ion – a change of place [Platzwechsel] of the negative charge will occur with frequency $\frac{1}{h}J(r)$. The quantity $J(r)$ corresponds to the Austausch- or more correctly the Platzwechsel-integral of molecular theory. One can illustrate this Platzwechsel again with the picture of electrons that have no spin and obey Bose statistics. But it is probably more correct to regard the exchange integral $J(r)$ as a fundamental property of the proton-neutron pair, without wanting to reduce it to motions of electrons ([11], p. 2; translated in [6], p. 104).

Notice that Heisenberg speaks here about an electron without spin obeying Bose statistics, in this way preserving the fermionic nature and the half-integer spin of the neutron. Within such a picture, the mechanism of the interaction between the neutron and the proton can be viewed as an exchange of an electron between the neutron and the proton: the neutron which loses its electron turns into a proton while the proton, which captures the electron, becomes a neutron.¹¹ However he will end up by hinting

¹⁰The proposal of a new neutral particle with a tiny mass in order to get rid of the problem of energy non-conservation in β -decay was put forward for the first time by Pauli in an open letter addressed to Hans W. Geiger and Lise Meitner at a meeting in Tübingen in December 1930 [46], and later publicly expressed at the American Physical Society meeting held in Pasadena in June 1931. This circumstance is recalled by Pauli himself at the Solvay Conference in Brussels in 1933: "In June 1931, during a conference in Pasadena, I proposed the following interpretation: the conservation laws hold, the emission of beta particles occurring together with the emission of a very penetrating radiation of neutral particles, which has not been observed yet. The sum of the energies of the beta particle and the neutral particle (or the neutral particles, since one doesn't know whether there is one or many) emitted by the nucleus in one process, will be equal to the energy which corresponds to the upper limit of the beta spectrum" ([47], p. 324). A detailed account of Pauli's neutrino hypothesis can be found in Ref. [9].

¹¹This interpretation of Heisenberg's exchange forces has been discussed in detail by A. I. Miller [42, 43].

to a different interpretation of the exchange integral $J(r)$, without any reference to moving electrons, but as related to the exchange of the proton and the neutron themselves.¹² As we will see in the following, the introduction of the concept of isospin, which permits considering the proton and the neutron as different states of otherwise identical particles, allowed Heisenberg to implement the idea of exchange between the neutron and the proton without resorting to the picture of a moving Bose electron.¹³ Summing up, the above quote shows that Heisenberg considered two different exchange mechanisms at the basis of the interaction that keeps nuclei together, one modeled after the interaction of the constituent atoms of a molecule, the other one modeled instead after the electrons in a many-body system. As we shall see, the second mechanism will underlie the Majorana theory (Section 3), while the first one will be at the basis of the subsequent developments based on the Fermi theory (Section 4) and on the meson theory (Section 6), leading to the current picture of interactions mediated by exchange of virtual particles. An interesting consideration is in order here [5, 6]. According to the standard interpretation of the wave function in quantum mechanics, which by 1932 was already accepted by many physicists, including Heisenberg, the wave functions of electrons in molecules are to be considered as stationary states, hence the mental pictures of electrons that exchange their position or of an electron bouncing back and forth is approximate at best:¹⁴ there is no net motion of charge in an isolated molecule. Nevertheless, in 1932 Heisenberg adopted the picture of the exchange of an electron, and this will lead over the years to the current representation of fundamental interactions.

Heisenberg assumed that exchange interactions, modeled as we just described, act between a neutron and a proton (with the exchange integral denoted by $J(r)$ and assumed to be positive), and that similar interactions acted between a neutron and a neutron (the exchange integral in this case denoted by $K(r)$, with the assumption that $J(r) > K(r)$), but not between a proton and a proton, where only the Coulomb repulsion $\frac{e^2}{r}$ acts.¹⁵ Denoting with D the mass defect of the proton with respect to the neutron, and finally neglecting all relativistic effects (allowed by the large mass of all particles), the complete Hamiltonian for the nucleus proposed by Heisenberg was

¹²As can be seen from the above quote, Heisenberg underlines this conceptual shift using a linguistic subtlety, that has been lost in some translations from German to English (such as that in [10]). Indeed, Heisenberg ([11], p. 2) first referred to the exchange integral as *Platzwechsel*, which literally means “change of position”, rather than as *Austausch*, which instead is adopted within a quantum chemistry context in the case of systems with two or more identical particles, such as the hydrogen molecule with two electrons. Indeed, as said, the case of neutron-proton interaction is the nuclear analogue of the hydrogen molecular ion, with only one electron moving from one nucleus to the other and vice versa. Hence in such cases the interaction is not related to exchanges of identical particles, but to a single particle being in a superposition of different position states. The different picture suggested later by Heisenberg returns to the *Austausch* of a proton and a neutron. A careful discussion of this interpretative issue is carried out in Refs. [6] and [43] and references therein.

¹³Isospin is just a formal device that is equivalent to the usual formalism, and then it is not really crucial in Heisenberg’s theory. Majorana [15] will not use it in his formulation of exchange nuclear interactions.

¹⁴Such pictures appeared frequently among the pioneering papers on molecular physics in the late 1920s, but then the mentioned interpretation was not so established.

¹⁵Of course, there is no electron that can be exchanged in this case. Notice that the charge independence of nuclear forces had not been discovered yet [9].

the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
H = & \frac{1}{2M} \sum_k \mathbf{p}_k^2 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k>l} J(r_{kl})(\rho_k^\xi \rho_l^\xi + \rho_k^\eta \rho_l^\eta) - \frac{1}{4} \sum_{k>l} K(r_{kl})(1 + \rho_k^\zeta)(1 + \rho_l^\zeta) \\
& + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{k>l} \frac{e^2}{r_{kl}} (1 - \rho_k^\zeta)(1 - \rho_l^\zeta) - \frac{1}{2} D \sum_k (1 + \rho_k^\zeta),
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where M is the proton or neutron mass, $r_{kl} = |\mathbf{r}_k - \mathbf{r}_l|$ are distances of the order of the nuclear dimensions and \mathbf{p}_k is the momentum of the k -th nucleon. This formula involves a fifth quantity for the characterization of each particle in addition to the usual ones (i.e. the three position coordinates and the spin σ^z along the z -axis), namely a *charge* ρ^ζ , whose values are $\rho^\zeta = +1$ for a neutron and $\rho^\zeta = -1$ for a proton respectively. The following matrices were introduced in the space ξ, η, ζ :

$$\rho^\xi = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho^\eta = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho^\zeta = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2}$$

The fifth quantity ρ^ζ allowed Heisenberg to interpret the neutron and the proton as the two different states of a “nucleon”, so that the Hamiltonian (1) contains transition elements which change $\rho^\zeta = +1$ into $\rho^\zeta = -1$, i.e. they transfer a *charge* between the neutron and the proton. Later, ρ^ζ would have been dubbed isotopic spin by Eugene P. Wigner¹⁶ [48].

Then Heisenberg switched to the discussion of the behavior of a nucleus made of n particles, with n_1 neutrons and n_2 protons, starting from Eq. (1) and retaining only the first two terms, which are symmetrical with respect to protons and neutrons. In this situation the minimum energy corresponds to a nucleus with $n_1 = n_2$, in agreement with experimental results. By including the last three terms, the minimum energy changes, and corresponds to a different situation in which the ratio between n_1 and n_2 is higher than one. However, as Heisenberg noticed, the application to concrete cases needs a careful discussion of nuclear stability. The solution is immediate only for the simplest case of hydrogen isotope of weight two, which is made of one proton and one neutron. The resulting eigenfunction in the lowest energy state is symmetric in the spatial and charge coordinates of the two particles, as a consequence of their spin. This conclusion is a consequence of the positive sign that Heisenberg assumed for $J(r)$,¹⁷ and is in fact contradicted by experiments, as we shall discuss later.

Heisenberg carried out only a qualitative discussion of the general case, starting from the analysis of nuclei containing neutrons only. On the basis of Eq. (1), a nucleus with two neutrons is expected to be stable, as well as the He nucleus which is made of two protons and two neutrons. Then, he addressed the issue of the stability of the nucleus, taken as a structure containing both neutrons and protons, with the number of neutrons slightly higher than that of protons. He focused on intermediate as well as

¹⁶Nuclear physicists actually prefer the term *isobaric* spin, which is in fact more correct, since two nuclei which differ by the state of one or more nucleons are termed isobaric, not isotopes.

¹⁷As in the helium atom or in molecular physics, the character of exchange interaction depends on the spin of the state, and the sign of the exchange integral determines whether the interaction is attractive in a singlet or in a triplet state.

heavy nuclei, and his primary concern was to find the conditions for stability (against β - as well as α -decay) and characterize the decay following instability. In particular he carried out a qualitative study of the binding energy of the nuclei as a function of n_1 and n_2 . These topics were deepened in the second paper [12], where the energy differences between nuclei with even n_1 and n_2 , odd n_1 and n_2 , odd n_1 or n_2 , were studied.

In Ref. [12], Heisenberg addressed two further issues, the scattering of γ -rays by atomic nuclei and the properties of the neutron, which will be the topic of the third paper of the series, published in 1933 [13]. With respect to the scattering of γ -rays, Heisenberg's explanation made crucial use of the assumption of the neutron as a bound state of a proton and an electron. The composite structure of the neutron implies that not only the motion of the protons and neutrons changes due to the effect of the external radiation, but also that the nuclear electrons inside neutrons get excited. Though wrong, these hypotheses lead him to a satisfactory explanation of the anomalous scattering of γ -rays on nuclei (known as the Meitner-Hüpfeld effect [49, 50, 51]). The second mechanism is more effective thanks to the small mass of the electron and gives a significant contribution to the total scattering, which could be in agreement with experimental data.¹⁸ Concerning the properties of the neutron, Heisenberg made a comparison between the two hypotheses on the nature of this particle (elementary particle without structure versus composite system of a proton and an electron). While the second hypothesis seemed to work well both in the case of β -decay and in explaining the nature of exchange interaction within the nuclei, it brought about several conceptual difficulties, which led him again to question the validity of quantum mechanics at the nuclear scale. In particular, the uncertainty principle gives for the mass defect of the neutron an energy of the order of $137 mc^2$, while the observed mass defect is about a hundred times smaller and has the opposite sign. Furthermore, quite different values of the binding energy of the nuclear electron are obtained depending on the experiments devised to measure it.

Heisenberg's third paper on nuclear forces [13] further extends the ideas introduced in the previous papers [11, 12] starting from a generalized Hamiltonian, obtained by augmenting Eq. (1) with the term $+\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k>l} L(r_{kl})(1 - \rho_k^\zeta \rho_l^\zeta)$, which adds ordinary *static* interactions between protons and neutrons to the exchange forces. Then, an approximate solution was found by applying the Thomas-Fermi method to the case of many-particle nuclei. In this method, the nucleus is modeled as a gas of free particles which obey Fermi statistics, bound together by forces whose potential energy is:

$$U(r) = -2 \frac{n_1 n_2}{n(n-1)} [J(r) - L(r)] - \frac{n_1(n_1-1)}{n(n-1)} K(r) + \frac{n_2(n_2-1)}{n(n+1)} \frac{e^2}{r}, \quad (3)$$

while the total energy in the lowest state is:

$$E = \frac{h^2}{M} \frac{4\pi}{5} \left(\frac{3}{8\pi} \right)^{\frac{5}{3}} \int \rho(\mathbf{r})^{\frac{5}{3}} d\tau + \frac{1}{2} \iint \rho(\mathbf{r}) \rho(\mathbf{r}') U(|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|) d\tau d\tau' - n_1 D. \quad (4)$$

¹⁸It would later be established that the anomalously large cross section is due to the creation of electron-positron pair from the γ photon in the intense electric field close to the nucleus [52].

Here the density distribution $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ can be found by minimizing E under the constraint $\int \rho(\mathbf{r}) d\tau = n$. The drawback of this expression is that, for values of $|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|$ such that the effective potential $U(|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|)$ suddenly increases, the double integral may develop a divergence. This means that, in order to have saturation, the effective potential $U(|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|)$ has to be strongly repulsive at short distances. Technically, Heisenberg obtained the result by putting $U(|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|)$ equal to zero for values of $|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|$ smaller than the minimum separation between two particles.

Summing up, it is clear that despite being a milestone in the quantum theory of nuclear structure, Heisenberg's work on nuclear forces suffers from a number of drawbacks. The analysis of these drawbacks was the starting point of Majorana's work.

3 Majorana's contribution on nuclear forces

Before talking about Majorana's celebrated contribution [15, 53, 54, 55], we focus on the scientific environment in which his work was conceived and developed. The circumstances which brought Majorana to deal with the issues of the nature of neutron and the exchange forces can be found in a detailed account by his colleagues working in Rome under the leadership of Fermi, i.e., mainly Edoardo Amaldi [53, 56, 57, 58]. The story went on as follows.

The beginning of 1932 was marked by the experiments by Frédéric Joliot and Irène Curie [59], which Majorana soon understood as the very discovery of the *neutral proton* (e.g. the neutron) even if the Joliot-Curies did not realize it. Hence, Majorana succeeded in providing an explanation of the structure and the stability of atomic nuclei only in terms of neutrons and protons, and this probably happened, as vividly remembered by Amaldi [56, 57], before both the announcement of the discovery of the neutron by Chadwick [8] and the work by Dmitriy D. Ivanenko [60]:

Soon after Chadwick's discovery, various authors understood that the neutron must be one of the components of the nucleus and began to propose various models which included alpha particles, protons, electrons and neutrons. The first to publish the idea that the nucleus consists solely of protons and neutrons was probably Iwanenko [...] What is certain is that before Easter of that year [Ettore Majorana] tried to work out a theory on light nuclei, assuming that they consisted solely of protons and neutrons (or "neutral protons" as he then said) and that the former interacted with the latter through exchange forces. He also reached the conclusion that these exchange forces must act only on the space coordinates (and not on the spin) if one wanted the alpha particle, and not the deuteron, to be the system saturated with respect to binding energy ([61], p. 31).

Majorana gave a brief account of his theory to Fermi and his group but he did not proceed to publish his results, despite Fermi's advice. Heisenberg's first work on exchange forces appeared in the *Zeitschrift für Physik* in July 1932, but it was only later that Majorana, strongly encouraged by Fermi, applied for a grant of the Italian National Research Council (CNR) in order to spend a semester abroad, first in Leipzig and then in Copenhagen, to meet Heisenberg. During his research visit in Leipzig, started in January 1933, he was convinced by Heisenberg to publish his results on nuclear theory in a paper, which appeared in the *Zeitschrift für Physik* in March 1933.

Majorana's contribution starts with an enlightening critical analysis of Heisenberg's theory:

In order to find a suitable interaction between the components of the nuclei Heisenberg was guided by an obvious analogy. He treats the neutron as a combination of a proton and an electron, i.e. like a hydrogen atom bound by a process not fully understood by present theories, in such a way that it changes its statistical properties and its spin. He further assumes that there are exchange forces between protons and neutrons similar to those responsible for the molecular binding of H and H^+ . [...] One may doubt the validity of this analogy as the theory does not explain the inner structure of the neutron, and the interaction between neutron and proton seems rather big compared with the mass-defect of the neutron as determined by Chadwick. We think, therefore, that it may be quite interesting to find a Hamiltonian very similar to Heisenberg's which represents in the simplest way the most general and most obvious properties of the nucleus. [...] If we assume that nuclei consist of protons and neutrons we have to formulate the simplest law of interaction between them which will lead, if the electrostatic repulsion is negligible, to a constant density for nuclear matter ([14], pp. 186-187).

Here Majorana clearly states his program, pointing out his search for the *simplest law* which could describe the neutron-proton interaction and provide the correct observed properties of nuclei, mainly the so called saturation. This may be obtained in whole analogy to the structure of solid and liquid matter by taking an attractive force for large distances and a short range strong repulsive force in order to take into account impenetrability of particles. But this solution is considered by Majorana "aesthetically unsatisfactory", so that he concludes:

We shall, therefore, try to find another solution and introduce as few arbitrary elements as possible. The main problem is this: How can we obtain a density independent of the nuclear mass without obstructing the free movement of the particles by an artificial impenetrability? We must try to find an interaction whose average energy per particle never exceeds a certain limit however great the density. This might occur through a sort of saturation phenomenon more or less analogous to valence saturation ([14], p. 188).

Accordingly, he devised an exchange interaction which had an opposite sign with respect to that postulated by Heisenberg and, in particular, which exchanged only the position coordinates of proton and neutron (while Heisenberg's interaction exchanged both position and spin coordinates). Following Dirac [62], he writes down this interaction as:

$$\left(Q', q' | J | Q'', q'' \right) = -\delta(q' - Q'') \delta(q'' - Q') J(r). \quad (5)$$

Here $r = |q' - Q'|$, where Q and q are the position coordinates of a neutron and a proton. Regarding $J(r)$, it is taken positive and only at the end of the paper Majorana hints to its functional form, to be chosen in order to reproduce experimental data. At variance with Heisenberg's exchange force, which saturates in the deuteron, Majorana's force, Eq. (5), allows each neutron (proton) to bind to two protons (neutrons), so that saturation takes place in the α -particle:

Thus we find that both neutrons act on each proton in the α -particle instead of only one and vice versa, since we assume a symmetrical function in the position coordinates of all protons and neutrons (which is true only if we neglect the Coulomb energy of the protons). In the α -particle all four particles are in the same state so that it is a closed shell. If we proceed from an α -particle to heavier nuclei we can have no more particles in the same state because of the Pauli principle. Also, the exchange energy is usually large only if a proton and a neutron are in the same state and we may expect, which agrees with experiments, that in heavy nuclei the mass defect per particle is not noticeably bigger than in the α -particle ([14], pp. 189).

These stability properties of Majorana's exchange force gained a wide consensus within the scientific community, starting from the endorsement which he received by Heisenberg during his speech at the Solvay Conference, held in October 1933 [63]. There, Heisenberg expressed Majorana's exchange force (5) as:

$$\frac{1}{4}J(r_{kl})(\rho_k^\xi\rho_l^\xi + \rho_k^\eta\rho_l^\eta)(1 + \sigma_k\sigma_l), \quad (6)$$

or, without introducing isotopic spin, as:

$$-J(r_{kl})P_{kl}, \quad (7)$$

P_{kl} being an operator giving the permutation of the spatial coordinates r_k and r_l . Then he compared his own expressions for exchange forces,

$$\frac{1}{2}J(r_{kl})(\rho_k^\xi\rho_l^\xi + \rho_k^\eta\rho_l^\eta), \quad (8)$$

or

$$-J(r_{kl})P'_{kl}, \quad (9)$$

(P'_{kl} being an operator permuting spatial as well as spin coordinates r_k , σ_k and r_l , σ_l) with the ones by Majorana, Eqs. (6)-(7), and soon recognized the validity of Majorana's approach.

After pointing out the qualifying points of his approach, Majorana switched to the explicit proof of the density saturation of the nuclear components, which had been found experimentally. The calculation is carried out by applying the Thomas-Fermi model to nuclear matter, as had also been done by Heisenberg in his third paper on nuclear forces [13]. As a starting point, the eigenfunction ψ of the nucleus, built up of n_1 neutrons and n_2 protons, is written as a product of two functions, ψ_N and ψ_P , dependent on the coordinates (position and spin) of the n_1 neutrons and n_2 protons, respectively. In turn, ψ_N and ψ_P can be written as Slater's determinants, constructed starting from orthogonal single particle eigenfunctions. Then the calculation proceeds by taking the average value of the total energy W over the chosen wave function ψ and then looking for its minimum. W is taken as the sum of the kinetic energy, the electrostatic energy of the proton and the exchange energy. By introducing the Dirac density matrices [62] ρ_N and ρ_P for neutrons and protons, respectively, and

then neglecting the Coulomb repulsion among protons, while fixing the ratio $\frac{n_1}{n_2}$, the potential energy per particle reduces to the exchange energy contribution and can be written as a function $a(\mu)$ of the total nuclear density:

$$\mu = \frac{8\pi}{3h^3} (P_N^3 + P_P^3), \quad (10)$$

where, as usual within the Thomas-Fermi framework, P_N and P_P are the Fermi momenta of neutrons and protons. The behavior of $a(\mu)$ as a function of density is studied starting from the two limiting cases $\mu = 0$ and $\mu \rightarrow \infty$. It vanishes in the first case, while approaching the constant value $-\frac{2n_2}{n_1+n_2}J(0)$ in the second case. For an intermediate density, the following expression for $a(\mu)$ is derived:

$$a(\mu) = \frac{1}{\mu(q)} \iint \frac{\rho_N(p, q)\rho_P(p', q)}{h^6} G(p, p') dp dp', \quad (11)$$

where

$$G(p, p') = \int e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{h}(p-p', v)} J|v| dv, \quad (12)$$

while the kinetic energy per particle is $\kappa\mu^{2/3}$. Then Majorana was able to show that there exists a minimum of the total energy $a + t$ per particle for a particular value μ_0 of the density, which depends only on the ratio $\frac{n_1}{n_2}$ and corresponds to a stable nucleus.

Finally he focused on the search for the best analytic form of the function $J(r)$, which could be in agreement with experimental data. His first proposal is $J(r) = \lambda \frac{e^2}{r}$, dependent on one arbitrary constant and showing a divergence at $r = 0$, but it is soon discarded:

For great distances, however, it must be modified as it gives an infinite cross section for the collision between protons and neutrons. Also, it seems to provide too small a ratio for the mass defects of the α -particle and the hydrogen isotope. Thus, we have to use an expression with at least two constants, e.g. an exponential function, [...] ([14], p. 193).

Thus he proposed the two constants function $J(r) = Ae^{-\beta r}$, but apparently he didn't pursue the calculations further. In his words:

We shall not follow this up since it has been shown that the first statistical approximation can lead to considerable errors however large the number of particles ([14], p. 193).

While Majorana did not pursue this matter in the published work, unpublished research notes [64] by the same author show that he did in fact carry out calculations and provided numerical estimates for both proposals, also trying to further generalize his work.

Let us notice that the same two constants function for $J(r)$ was later taken by Heisenberg [63] to carry out Thomas-Fermi calculations for a nucleus built of a large number of constituents, in whole analogy with Majorana. A similar two constants expression, $J(r) = -g^2 \frac{e^{-\lambda r}}{r}$, would have been introduced by Yukawa in 1935, g being

the coupling constant for the interaction between neutron, proton and the so called U -particle [26, 27, 28, 29].

But neither Heisenberg nor Majorana addressed the problem of energy non-conservation in β -decay. Furthermore, even if Majorana's formulation of exchange forces gained a wide consensus, it was Heisenberg's isotopic spin framework that became widespread in nuclear physics, and it was used in particular in Fermi's theory of β -decay, to which we now turn.

4 The solution to the β -decay puzzle: Fermi's theory

The β -decay puzzle found a solution in 1934, when Fermi published a theory where the process was modeled in a way strongly relying on the analogy with the emission of a photon by a decaying atom [16, 17, 18, 19]. Fermi's quantum theory of β -decay put together Pauli's neutrino hypothesis, Heisenberg's isotopic spin framework and second quantization [65]. It provided expressions for the lifetime and the shape of the β -ray emission spectra to be compared with experimental data. As Tomonaga pointed out in his book "The story of spin":

[...] even Heisenberg apparently was not free from Bohr's influence, and he dared not touch the problem of β -decay, believing that quantum mechanics was not applicable. It was none other than Fermi who rejected Bohr's idea and incorporated β -decay into the framework of quantum mechanics utilizing Pauli's neutrino ([21], p. 176).

Fermi's starting point was, besides neutrino's hypothesis, the assumption that nuclear constituents are only neutrons and protons (heavy particles). The qualifying point of his strategy is the analogy with the electromagnetic case, as clearly stated at the beginning of his work:

[...] in order to understand that β emission is possible, we want to try to construct a theory of the emission of lightweight particles from the nucleus in analogy with the theory of emission of light quanta from an excited atom by the usual radiation process. In radiation theory, the total number of light quanta is not constant. Light quanta are created when they are emitted from an atom, and are annihilated when they are absorbed ([19], p. 1151).

These considerations on the electromagnetic case led Fermi to assume that also in β -decay the total number of electrons is not constant, and that the same holds for neutrinos. This implies the possibility both for electrons and neutrinos to be created and annihilated, thus getting rid at once of all the problems associated with electrons being confined in the nucleus. Furthermore neutron and proton are considered, as done by Heisenberg, as two internal quantum states of the nucleon, so that a isospin coordinate ρ is introduced, such that $\rho = 1$ for the neutron and $\rho = -1$ for the proton. Finally, the Hamiltonian of the system including heavy and light particles can be constructed in order to implement the following processes, while satisfying charge conservation: a transition from a neutron to a proton accompanied by the creation of an electron and a neutrino and the inverse transition (proton to neutron) together with the annihilation of an electron and a neutrino.

As a result of the above guidelines, the following Hamiltonian is introduced, as a sum of the energy of the heavy particles H_{hp} , that of the lightweight particles H_{lp} ,

and finally the interaction energy H_{int} between the heavy and lightweight particles:

$$H_F = H_{hp} + H_{lp} + H_{int}. \quad (13)$$

Here the first term is written for a single heavy particle as:

$$H_{hp} = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \rho)N + \frac{1}{2}(1 - \rho)P, \quad (14)$$

where ρ is the isospin variable, N and P are the energy operators of the neutron and the proton, respectively. For the second term one has:

$$H_{lp} = \sum_s H_s N_s + \sum_\sigma K_\sigma M_\sigma, \quad (15)$$

where $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_s, \dots$ and $K_1, K_2, \dots, K_\sigma, \dots$ are the energies of electrons and neutrinos, respectively, while $N_1, N_2, \dots, N_s, \dots$ and $M_1, M_2, \dots, M_\sigma, \dots$ are the occupation numbers of the individual quantum states $\psi_1, \psi_2, \dots, \psi_s, \dots$ of the electrons and $\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_\sigma, \dots$ of the neutrinos. Annihilation and creation operators a_s and a_s^* for electrons have been introduced such that $\psi = \sum_s \psi_s a_s$ and $\psi^* = \sum_s \psi_s^* a_s^*$. Similar operators, b_σ and b_σ^* , have been introduced for neutrinos such that $\phi = \sum_\sigma \phi_\sigma b_\sigma$ and $\phi^* = \sum_\sigma \phi_\sigma^* b_\sigma^*$.

Finally, for the interaction term the following simple choice has been adopted by neglecting relativistic corrections and spin interaction:

$$H_{int} = g [Q\psi(x)\phi(x) + Q^*\psi^*(x)\phi^*(x)], \quad (16)$$

where g is a dimensional constant, x are the coordinates of heavy particles, such that the field operators $\psi, \phi, \psi^*, \phi^*$ have to be evaluated at the position of heavy particles, while $Q = \frac{1}{2}(\rho^\xi - i\rho^\eta) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $Q^* = \frac{1}{2}(\rho^\xi + i\rho^\eta) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ are operators implementing the transition from a proton to a neutron, as well as that from a neutron to a proton, acting on the functions of the isospin variable ρ .

The interaction term was also generalized by Fermi to the case in which at least for the lightweight particles a relativistic treatment could be carried out. This required the introduction of Dirac 4-spinors ψ and ϕ and their Hermitian conjugates $\tilde{\psi}$ and $\tilde{\phi}$ for electrons and neutrinos, respectively, but the velocities of heavy particles are usually small if compared with the speed of light c , so that only the scalar potential term is retained. The resulting interaction term is:

$$H_{int} = g \left[Q\tilde{\psi}^* \delta\phi + Q^* \tilde{\psi} \delta\phi^* \right], \quad (17)$$

where δ is a matrix defined as

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

With the above Hamiltonian the theory of β -decay was fully developed in whole analogy with quantum radiation theory, by carrying out perturbative calculations with the interaction term H_{int} taken as perturbation. A comparison with available experimental data was performed, unveiling a good agreement with theory, as recognized by Fermi himself:

To summarize, one can say that this comparison of theory and experiment gives as good an agreement as one could expect ([19], p. 1159).

Fermi provided also an estimate of the coupling constant g , whose order of magnitude was found to be $4 \cdot 10^{-50}$ erg cm³.

The success of Fermi's theory of β -decay triggered subsequent work towards the application of his ideas to the mechanism of exchange force, in which an electron-neutrino pair could play the role of the Bose electron. This picture was implemented by Heisenberg, who mentioned his results in a letter written to Pauli on 18 January 1934 [66]. By carrying out a second order perturbative calculation, he found that the Fermi interaction would give rise to an exchange energy $J(r) \simeq \frac{const}{r^5}$, which is very small for $r \leq \frac{\hbar}{Mc}$ and does not match the order of magnitude of the interaction of neutron and proton observed in experiments. Subsequent independent work by Igor Tamm [67] and Ivanenko [68] confirmed Heisenberg's negative results, demanding for new ideas. The puzzle would have been solved by Yukawa one year later, as we will see below.

5 Brief interlude: theoretical physics and quantum mechanics in Japan from the late 1920s to the 1930s

Here we briefly summarize the state of art of theoretical physics and, in particular, of quantum mechanics in Japan, starting from the late 1920s (for further details, see e.g. [23, 24] and references therein). The focus is also on the scientific exchanges with European physicists, which contributed to shape the work and the career of Yukawa [20] and Tomonaga [21].

After the forced opening of the country to international trade in 1854 and the re-establishment of the emperor in 1868, a number of Japanese scientists was sent abroad to study science, engineering and medicine, with the aim to bring back in Japan what they had learnt. In the same period many universities were founded in Tōkyō, Kyōto and other places. Nagaoka Hantarō was the first physicist to go to Europe, in 1893. Back in Japan, in 1904 he proposed a “Saturnian” model of the atom, built of a positive nucleus surrounded by a ring of negative electrons, which

is historically the first atomic model containing a nucleus. In the meantime, research laboratories were being established throughout the country, including the Institute of Chemical and Physical Research (RIKEN) laid down in Tōkyō in 1917 and funded also by government. Although its mission was to support industries with applicative and technological studies, basic research was carried out there too. In 1921 Nishina Yoshiō, a student of Nagaoka, went abroad, in Germany, England and mainly at the Niels Bohr Institute in Copenhagen, where he spent six years, thus witnessing the unfolding of the quantum revolutions and greatly contributing himself.¹⁹ Back in Japan in 1928, he brought in his country the Copenhagen spirit, which meant a new style in doing research, and the ideas of new quantum mechanics. Theoretical physics began to wide spread in Japan just thanks to Nishina. It is also worth to mention the famous Einstein visit in 1922 in Japan [70], where he met Nagaoka, Tamaki Kajuro and Ishiwara Jun, who would have published a book on relativity and contributed to promote Einstein’s theories in their country. All these scientists were in charge at Kyōto University when Yukawa and Tomonaga would have been undergraduate students. In 1931, Nishina established his laboratory at RIKEN, where he trained many young physicists, including Yukawa and Tomonaga, and where experimental work on cosmic rays and nuclear physics was performed too.

6 Yukawa and the meson theory of nuclear forces

In this Section we introduce Yukawa’s contribution to the theory of nuclear forces, but, as a preliminary step, a short biographical sketch, including his early interactions with Tomonaga, is given [20, 28, 71, 72, 73].

6.1 Short biographical notes

Born in Tōkyō on January 23, 1907, Ogawa Hideki was the third son of a staff member of the governmental Geological Survey Bureau. In 1908 his father was appointed professor of Geography at the Faculty of Arts of Kyōto University, so Hideki and his family moved to Kyōto. He began to study the Chinese classics with his grandfather, later discovering (when adolescent) the writings of Taoists sages. He was strongly attracted by a sort of dialectical materialism, very different from Marx’ and Engels’ ideas: with placing nature at the center of the universe, indeed, Taoism strongly influenced the young Yukawa’s thinking. In 1923 he was enrolled into the Third High School while in 1926 he began his physics studies in Kyōto Imperial University. He had Tomonaga as classmate since high school, and both went to study physics in Kyōto. Hideki began studying quantum mechanics also by checking the academic journals available in the library of the physics department, thus reading original research papers ([21], p. 222). After the graduation in 1929, both Yukawa and Tomonaga continued to study quantum mechanics by themselves as unpaid research assistants in Kyōto, while Nishina had just returned to Japan after his research visit in Europe. Besides lecturing on the new physics, Nishina was the main organizer of a cycle of lectures held in Kyōto and

¹⁹His most well-known result is the celebrated Klein-Nishina formula [69]. See Tomonaga’s recollections (in [21], pp. 220-221) for an interesting account of Nishina’s experience in deriving his results in collaboration with Oskar Klein.

Tōkyō by Heisenberg and Dirac [22, 23, 24, 25]. The aim was to engage young physics students and stimulate them to pursue research on new and cutting edge topics.²⁰ Without any doubt, these events played a crucial role in shaping the future scientific career of both Yukawa and Tomonaga, who attended those lectures. As Yukawa recalled in his autobiography [20]:

During the two years following my graduation, Bunsaku Arakatsu, Yoshikatsu Sugiura, and Yoshio Nishina lectured on quantum mechanics, presenting different points of view. All of them had studied the new physics in Europe; Professor Nishina had the greatest influence on us. At that time, the phrase “Copenhagen spirit” was frequently heard in the physics world, referring to the Institute of Theoretical Physics at Copenhagen University, with Niels Bohr as its head. The best theoretical physicists came from all over the world to learn from Bohr, including some Japanese scientists. Yoshio Nishina had a particularly long stay in Copenhagen. His lectures were not only explanations of quantum physics, for he carried with him the spirit of Copenhagen, the spirit of that leading group of theoretical physicists with Niels Bohr as its center. If I asked to describe the spirit of Copenhagen, I would not be able to do so in a few words. However, it is certain that it had much in common with the spirit of generosity. Having been liberally educated, I was especially attracted by that, but I was also attracted by Professor Nishina himself ([20], pp. 292-293).

Hideki started to work as an unpaid research associate in theoretical physics in professor Tamaki Kajuro’s lab, and in the following years he studied and translated Heisenberg’s and Dirac’s papers [74]. In 1932 he married Yukawa Sumiko and was adopted by the family of his wife, taking also the new family name. Thus he moved to Ōsaka, while appointed lecturer at Faculty of Science in Kyōto, where he started teaching quantum mechanics and carrying out research in nuclear and cosmic ray physics. Among his students there were Sakata Shōichi, Kobayashi Minoru and Takekuni Mitsuo, who later would collaborate with him and contribute to the development of the new theory of nuclear forces [20]. In April 1934 he moved to Ōsaka University, where he built up and led his new research group. Those years were very productive, as we will see in the following sections. Back to Kyōto Imperial University since 1938, he became a member of the National Research Council and continued carrying out research on meson theory and nuclear physics while pursuing the new field of elementary particle physics. In 1939 Yukawa made his first travel abroad, in Europe, on the occasion of an invitation to Solvay Conference. In the same period Tomonaga, driven by Nishina’s advice, was carrying out research in Leipzig in Heisenberg’s group.²¹ In 1948 Yukawa joined the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton as a visiting professor, upon invitation by J. Robert Oppenheimer, and his research mainly focused on

²⁰Some detail about these lectures is given in Tomonaga’s recollections ([21], p. 222), where it is explicitly stated that Heisenberg lectured in Tōkyō, both at University and at RIKEN, from September 2 to 9 (1929). The titles of his lectures are as follows: 1) “Theory of Ferromagnetism”; 2) “Theory of Conduction” (Bloch’s theory of electric conduction); 3) “Retarded Potential in the Quantum Theory” (Heisenberg-Pauli theory); “The Indeterminacy Relations and the Physical Principles of the Quantum Theory”. Dirac’s lectures at University of Tōkyō were: 1) “The Basis of Statistical Quantum Mechanics” (the density matrix); 2) “Quantum Mechanics of Many-Electron Systems” (i.e. the representation of permutation operator of electron coordinates in terms of spin variables and applications); 3) “Relativistic Theory of the Electron” (i.e. the Dirac equation); while the last one, 4) “The Principle of Superposition and the Two-Dimensional Harmonic Oscillator”, was given at RIKEN.

²¹See Ref. [75] for a scientific biography of Tomonaga, where a detailed account of the Leipzig years is given.

non-local field theory and extended models of elementary particles. Appointed professor at Columbia University in 1949, in the same year he was awarded the Nobel Prize in physics [76] and elected to the Science Council of Japan. In 1953 Yukawa returned in Japan and became the first director of the newly established Research Institute for Fundamental Physics in Kyōto, a position which he held until his retirement in 1970.

6.2 Preliminary work on nuclear forces

A turning point in Yukawa's scientific career came in 1932, as he recalled in his autobiography [20] when talking about the scientific events of that year:

The year 1932 was even more turbulent for physics than it was for my personal life. Events, each of which, taken alone, could be called revolutionary, occurred three in a row: first, there was the discovery of the neutron; second, the discovery of the positron; third, the atomic nucleus was broken up by artificial means, namely by the use of the particle accelerators. The discipline that is now called nuclear physics was until then a minor branch of study, but because of those three events, it suddenly became the mainstream ([20], pp. 310-311).

According to Yukawa, the discovery of neutron was a very significant event for theoretical physics, because it brought into play the idea that the nucleus is built of protons and neutrons. Heisenberg's papers on nuclear structure [11, 12, 13] deeply impressed the young Yukawa, who wrote an introduction to the Japanese translation of these papers to be published in the Proceedings of the Physico-Mathematical Society of Japan [20, 28]. This event marked the beginning of his struggle towards the building of his new theory of nuclear forces. In Yukawa's own words:

The problem that I focused on was that the nature of the forces that act upon the neutrons and protons making up the nucleus – that is, the nature of the nuclear forces. By confronting this difficult problem, I committed myself to long days of suffering. [...] The fact that I was suffering, however, was very satisfying to me; I felt like a traveler carrying a heavy burden and struggling up a slope ([20], p. 312).

His starting point was the consideration that, after the introduction of quantum mechanics, the only primary (or fundamental) forces in nature were identified with gravity and electromagnetism. As a main and common feature, both forces were expressed in terms of fields. Thus, an answer had to be provided to the question whether nuclear forces were additional primary ones or not. In principle, in fact, the weakness of both gravity and electromagnetic force prevents them to be the source of nuclear force. Furthermore, electromagnetism could not account for the attraction of protons within the nucleus as well as for the interactions of neutrons, which are electrically neutral. Thus the consideration that strange things happen when thinking to the nuclear force as a secondary one, to be derived from electromagnetism, led Yukawa to view nuclear forces as new fundamental ones and, as such, described by means of a suitable field. Quantum mechanics then played a crucial role, as recalled by Yukawa in his autobiography, in driving him to conceive the idea of meson. But, despite having conceived the general idea early on, the actual implementation of his program would turn out to be very hard, and lasted two years:

I had this idea of a nuclear force field very early. Looked at from the quantum mechanical viewpoint, a field of force, almost by necessity, implies that there is a particle accompanying

that field. [...] I had to take a wrong path first, before I could arrive at my destination. [...] In retrospect, I was very close to my destination in 1932. Had I pursued the notion of the field of nuclear force, and applied quantum mechanical reasoning, I should have been able to come up with the idea of the meson. Instead, I spent the next two years searching in the dark ([20], pp. 320-321).

Yukawa started his investigations by following Heisenberg's idea of the nuclear force as an exchange of an electron between protons and neutrons [11] and presented some preliminary results at the meeting of the Physico-Mathematical Society of Japan held in April 1933 at the Tōhoku University in Sendai. He gave a talk entitled "A Comment on the Problem of Electrons in the Nucleus", but he did not publish the corresponding manuscript in a journal. This and his subsequent work in 1933-34, most of which is unpublished, were an important preliminary step towards the research he would have carried out in the following years, and as such are of great historical interest in order to reconstruct his path to meson theory.²² In Sendai, Yukawa also met Yagi Hidetsugu, head of the Physics Department of Ōsaka University, and this circumstance led him to move to Ōsaka to join the nuclear research group, which had a Cockroft-Walton accelerator. He recalled that "it was very stimulating to know that experiments would take place simultaneously with the theoretical studies" ([20], p. 326).

The 1933 talk contains Yukawa's first idea of an exchange force due to an electron shuttling between the neutron and the proton, along with a careful analysis of the many difficulties he met. In the abstract²³ we can find his program:

We can consider that, by analogy with radiation (in the same sense that the radiation is the mediator of interactions between electrons, protons and other charged particles), the electron is the mediator of the interaction between proton and neutron and acts like a kind of field in the inside of nuclei. Then, we may solve the [...] equation for the electron to find the form of interaction between neutron and proton. From the fact that the electron has the finite rest mass, we may expect that the interaction energy would decrease rapidly as the distance between neutron and proton becomes large in comparison with $h/(2\pi mc)$.

A critical analysis of Heisenberg's papers on nuclear forces [11, 12, 13] led Yukawa to exclude the picture of the neutron as a bound state made of a proton and an electron, because of the incompatibility with quantum mechanics.²⁴ In fact, he noticed that the uncertainty relation would give a value $E = 137 mc^2$ for the neutron mass defect, which differs by a factor 10^2 from the correct value mc^2 (such a discrepancy had been noticed also by Heisenberg [12]). Likewise, the analysis of the anomalous dispersion of γ -rays as due mainly to neutrons gives the value $42.6 mc^2$ for the eigenfrequency of neutron, which is again very different from that obtained with the correct mass defect and, moreover, different from the previous one. Thus Yukawa made the assumption that the neutron is an elementary particle, and reinterpreted Heisenberg's exchange interaction

²²Historical materials related to Yukawa, ranging from calculation notes to manuscripts' drafts and laboratory records, are collected in the Yukawa Hall Archival Library (YHAL) at Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics (YITP), Kyōto University [77]. Some documents are also available in the Archive of historical materials, Ōsaka University Yukawa Memorial and available via web [78]. A very useful English translation of some key archival documents related to Yukawa's preliminary works on nuclear forces and relativistic quantum field theory has been given by Kawabe Rokuo in Ref. [79].

²³The English translation of the abstract of the 1933 talk can be found in Ref. [79], p. 247

²⁴Details can be found in the manuscript entitled "The Roles of the Electron for Nuclear Structure", collected as document E05 060 U01 in the Yukawa Hall Archival Library, YITP, Kyōto University, translated in Ref. [79], pp. 250-252.

between the proton and the neutron, as well as that between two neutrons, as due to a mediator, the electron, whose role would be analog to that played by radiation in the electromagnetic interaction.²⁵ Following these guidelines he expected to derive the form of the interaction between proton and neutron and to explain β -decay. In fact, after the recognition that the mediator of the interaction could not be the electron but a new, much heavier bosonic particle, he basically followed the same steps outlined in his 1933 talk (as we shall see below). Before trying to implement his program, Yukawa dwelled on some interesting considerations concerning the mathematical expression of the exchange interaction $J(r)$. These are very interesting in view of understanding how Yukawa arrived at the form $J(r) = -g^2 \frac{e^{-\lambda r}}{r}$, which would later be the basis of his meson theory. He suggested that this form could be obtained by a phenomenological approach:

To solve this problem, the most effective method at present might be to calculate the scattering of neutrons on nuclei by assuming a suitable interaction between neutrons and nuclei, and comparing the results with experiment ([79], p. 251).

In particular he hinted to a force decreasing rapidly with the distance and made reference to a paper by Harrie S. W. Massey [80], where elastic collisions of neutrons with material particles were considered. In this paper the neutron was modeled as an atom with an electron moving in a field of very high effective nuclear charge Z (to account for its smallness with respect to a hydrogen atom), given by

$$V(r) = e^2 \left(\frac{1}{r} + \frac{Z}{a_0} \right) e^{-\frac{2Zr}{a_0}}, \quad (18)$$

a_0 being the Bohr radius and a_0/Z the radius of the neutron.²⁶ This expression shows a similar behavior if compared with Yukawa's interaction. Calculations on collisions of neutrons with matter were also carried out in the same years by Nishina, Tomonaga and collaborators, who worked also on the neutron-proton interaction by using various expressions for the potential $J(r)$, including $A \frac{e^{-\mu r}}{r}$ [21, 30]. Furthermore the topic was the subject of a talk given by Tomonaga, again at the meeting of the Physico-Mathematical Society of Japan of April 1933 in Sendai, and of a subsequent interplay between Tomonaga and Yukawa [82, 83, 84]. We will deal in detail with Tomonaga's contribution in the next Section. One can infer that in 1933 both Yukawa and Tomonaga had an idea of the interaction $A \frac{e^{-\mu r}}{r}$, but the deep meaning of this formula, and in particular the implications for the range and the mass of the virtual mediating particle, were still unknown.

After these considerations, Yukawa went back to his theoretical program, describing it as follows:

²⁵The role of analogies with quantum electrodynamics in Yukawa's meson theory has been analyzed by Darrigol in Ref. [29]

²⁶In Ref. [79] it is also pointed out that in a previous paper by Massey [81], dealing with the theory of collision of α -particles on atomic nuclei, a calculation of the anomalous scattering of α -particles is carried out by assuming the form $V(r) = -A \frac{e^{-\mu r}}{r}$ for the nuclear field near the top of the potential barrier. According to Kawabe, Yukawa probably was aware also of this paper, even if he did not quote it in his talk nor in his notes.

A neutron can emit an electron and change to a proton, and a proton can absorb an electron and change to a neutron. This fact is itself the cause of the interaction between proton and neutron; in other words, neutron and proton create the electron field, i.e., the field of the electron wave, and are affected by it ([79], pp. 251-252).

In such a situation the total number of electrons changes with time, so that the electron has to obey to a Dirac equation which contains a source term involving neutrons and protons. Likewise protons and neutrons obey a similar Dirac equation with a source term involving both neutron, proton and electron. These equations are as follows (Yukawa also included an electromagnetic vector potential, but he subsequently set it to zero, hence we do not include it here):²⁷

$$\frac{1}{c}L_1 = \left\{ \frac{W}{c} + \rho_1 \sigma \cdot \mathbf{p} + \rho_3 mc \right\} \psi = \chi^\dagger \gamma \chi, \quad (19)$$

$$\frac{1}{c}L_2 = \left\{ \frac{W}{c} + \rho'_1 \sigma \cdot \mathbf{p} + \rho_3 \left(\frac{1 + \tau_3}{2} Mc + \frac{1 - \tau_3}{2} M'c \right) \right\} \chi = (\gamma \psi^\dagger + \gamma^\dagger \psi) \chi, \quad (20)$$

where ψ is the wave function of the electron, χ is the wave function of the proton and of the neutron, L_1 and L_2 are the Dirac operators for electron and neutron-proton respectively, τ_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) are the isotopic spin matrices and γ, γ^\dagger are two unknown 4×4 matrices to be determined in order to find the form of the interaction between electrons, protons and neutrons. Both equations are derived from the general Lagrangian:

$$L = \iint [\psi^\dagger L_1 \psi + \chi^\dagger L_2 \chi - c \chi^\dagger (\gamma \psi^\dagger + \gamma^\dagger \psi) \chi] dv dt. \quad (21)$$

The γ matrices are obtained by requiring that the continuity equation of electric charge holds on: the final result is $\gamma = \frac{(\tau_1 + i\tau_2)}{2} \lambda$, $\gamma^\dagger = \frac{(\tau_1 - i\tau_2)}{2} \lambda^\dagger$, with λ an arbitrary matrix commuting with τ_i .

After having determined the Lagrangian, Yukawa wrote down the corresponding Hamiltonian and proceeded to the quantization by imposing Fermi statistics for neutrons, protons and electrons, that is, anticommutation relations on ψ and χ . From these, he derived the Heisenberg equations of motion for the nuclear field operators, which were in perfect agreement with the previous ones (20), while for the electron field operators the result was different from Eq. (19). He noticed that, if Bose statistics (i.e., commutation relations) is assumed instead for the electron, the results were in agreement with previous equations of motion.²⁸ At this point, Yukawa assumed the validity of equations (19) and (20) and switched to the task of finding the specific form of the proton-neutron interaction from them. He looked for a particular solution

²⁷From this point Yukawa's work is contained in the manuscript entitled "Bose Electron", collected as document F01 010 U01 in Yukawa Hall Archival Library, YITP, Kyoto University ([79], pp. 253-257), to which we refer for details.

²⁸Yukawa recalled in an interview [85] that the idea that electrons within nuclei had to satisfy Bose-Einstein statistics was suggested to him by Nishina.

of the electron wave equation satisfying the condition $\psi = 0$ for $\chi = 0$, obtaining:

$$\psi_0 = \left(\frac{p_0}{c} - \rho_1 \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{p} - \rho_3 mc \right) \frac{1}{4\pi\hbar^2} \iiint \frac{\chi^\dagger \gamma e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \rho_3 mc |\mathbf{r}' - \mathbf{r}|} \chi \left(\mathbf{r}', t - \frac{|\mathbf{r}' - \mathbf{r}|}{c} \right)}{|\mathbf{r}' - \mathbf{r}|} dv' + \dots (22)$$

Then, upon substituting this solution into the Hamiltonian, he finally obtained the interaction energy, which however had a Coulomb form, not the expected behavior. He concluded that a well behaved result could be obtained by taking into account the Fermi statistics for the electron, but the calculations appeared to be too hard to deal with. This failure was acknowledged in the talk,²⁹ where Yukawa admitted that

In any case, the practical calculation does not yield the looked-for result that the interaction term decreases rapidly as the distance becomes larger than $h/(2\pi mc)$,³⁰ unlike what I wrote in the abstract of this talk ([79], p.249).

In Yukawa's opinion, the failure had its roots in the incompleteness of relativistic quantum mechanics, which led him to study quantum field theoretical issues and, in particular, foundational problems in the following year. Indeed, the 1933 talk begins right away with the words:

The problems of atomic nuclei, especially the problem of electrons in the nucleus, might not be solved until we reflect on the foundation of quantum mechanics and complete the correct relativistic quantum theory. It cannot be solved only by partial and formal modification of the theory ([79], p. 248).

Accordingly, in April 1934, again at the annual meeting of the Physico-Mathematical Society of Japan, he gave the talk "On the Probability Amplitude in Relativistic Quantum Mechanics", focusing on topics related to the foundations of quantum field theory, where an early attempt at a better foundation for relativistic quantum mechanics was reported. In this talk he introduced for the first time his idea of the *maru*, which literally means "circle", but in fact denotes a closed surface within the four dimensional space-time on which fields should be quantized.³¹ This work was a precursor of the non-local field theory he would have developed in 1950s, while it later inspired Tomonaga in developing his super-many-time theory [86], which formed the basis of his Nobel prize winning approach to covariant QED. Yukawa strongly believed that a solution of the internal inconsistency problem in relativistic quantum field theory would provide useful insights for the construction of an unifying picture of elementary particles.

6.3 Yukawa's theory of nuclear forces and the meson

There were no novelties in Yukawa's research on nuclear forces until late spring 1934, when Yukawa read Fermi's paper on β -decay and became aware of Pauli's neutrino

²⁹The presumed text of the talk is the manuscript entitled "A Comment on the Problem of Electrons in the Nucleus", collected as document E05 080 U01 in the Yukawa Hall Archival Library, YITP, Kyoto University, translated in [79], pp. 248-249.

³⁰Interestingly, neither here nor in the abstract, a mention is made of the fact that a range determined by the Compton wavelength of the electron, $h/(2\pi mc)$, would have been in any case too large.

³¹See the manuscript entitled "On Probability Amplitudes in Relativistic Quantum Mechanics", collected as document F01 030 T02 in the Yukawa Hall Archival Library, YITP, Kyoto University ([79], pp. 258-261).

hypothesis. Then he independently tried to construct a model of nuclear force based on the exchange of the pair electron-neutrino but, as Heisenberg and other physicists before him, he found that the resulting force was too small to be a viable candidate. So he changed his strategy. Instead of trying to get the nuclear forces from the existing theory, he started focusing on the characteristics of the nuclear force field which were inferred from experiment. He postulated the existence of a brand-new field which would be in the same relation to nuclear forces as the electromagnetic field is to electrostatic forces, and was tailored to meet the phenomenological requirements. His struggle ended in October, when the fog disappeared and the truth arose:

The nuclear force is effective at extremely small distances, on the order of 0.02 trillionth of a centimeter. That much I knew already. My new insight was the realization that this distance and the mass of the new particle that I was seeking are inversely related to each other. Why had I not noticed that before? The next morning, I tackled the problem of the mass of the new particle and found it to be about two hundred times that of the electron. It also had to have the charge of plus or minus that of the electron. Such a particle had not, of course, been found, so I asked myself, “Why not?” The answer was simple: an energy of 100 million electron volts would be needed to create such a particle, and there was no accelerator, at that time, with that much energy available ([20], p. 324).

The work was presented in November 1934 to the meeting of the Tōkyō Center of the Physico-Mathematical Society of Japan and met the interest of Nishina.³² The corresponding paper, Yukawa’s famous meson paper, was written and submitted for publication by the end of the same month.

Before addressing Yukawa’s work, it is very useful to quote a passage of his first publication, i.e. the introduction to the Japanese translation of the 1932 Heisenberg’s papers on nuclear structure, written in 1933 [28]:

Though Heisenberg does not present a definite view on whether neutrons should be seen as separate entities or as combinations of a proton and an electron, this problem, like the β decay problem stated above, cannot be resolved with today’s theory. And unless these problems are resolved, one cannot say whether the view that electrons have no independent existence in the nucleus is correct ([28], p. 122).

As testified by his words, the starting point of his investigation is a deep analysis of Heisenberg’s picture of neutrons and of unsolved problems, like β decay. Indeed Fermi’s theory would have been published a year later, in 1934, and would have been taken as a reference in his 1935 seminal work [26], together with the *Platzwechsel* interaction postulated by Heisenberg and the conclusions by Tamm [67] and Iwanenko [68], which led to rule out a neutron-proton interaction mediated by an exchange of an electron-neutrino pair.³³ Then he clearly outlines his strategy and the ultimate goal of his work:

³²This circumstance is clarified by Kawabe [87]. Indeed in his autobiography [20] Yukawa mentions a talk given at the regular meeting of the Ōsaka branch of the Physico-Mathematical Society of Japan and then a second talk given in November in Tokyo. The passage including this talk in Tōkyō is missing in the English translation by L. Brown and R. Yoshida. Furthermore, as pointed out by Kawabe [87] on the basis of archival sources, the Ōsaka branch of the Physico-Mathematical Society of Japan started only on June 1, 1935. The Tōkyō talk is also quoted by Kobayashi in his recollections [73].

³³The content of Yukawa’s first paper on nuclear forces had already been anticipated in a talk given at the meeting of the Physico-Mathematical Society of Japan, held at Tokyo University in November, 1934. But, as Kobayashi reported in his recollections, “his hypothesis was too bold to be in line with common sense and, at best, gave one the impression of being somewhat interesting if the proposed particle indeed

To remove this defect, it seems natural to modify the theory of Heisenberg and Fermi in the following way. The transition of a heavy particle from neutron state to proton state is not always accompanied by the emission of light particles, i.e., a neutrino and an electron, but the energy liberated by the transition is taken up sometimes by another heavy particle, which in turn will be transformed from proton state into neutron state. If the probability of occurrence of the latter process is much larger than that of the former, the interaction between the neutron and the proton will be much larger than in the case of Fermi, whereas the probability of emission of light particles is not affected essentially. Now such interaction between the elementary particles can be described by means of a field of force, just as the interaction between the charged particles is described by the electromagnetic field. The above considerations show that the interaction of heavy particles with this field is much larger than that of light particles with it ([26], p. 48).

Also here the analogy with the electromagnetic case is pursued, so that Yukawa's purpose is to look for this new field, to define its quantum and to investigate the corresponding properties. As a starting point, he adopts a semiclassical approach. The required scalar field $U(x, y, z, t)$ has to decrease rapidly with the distance, so its behavior is assumed to be described by the following function:

$$\pm g^2 \frac{e^{-\lambda r}}{r}, \quad (23)$$

which is the static, spherically symmetric solution of the Klein-Gordon equation in vacuum:

$$\left(\Delta - \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} - \lambda^2 \right) U = 0. \quad (24)$$

In Eq. (23), g and λ are constants with the dimensions of an electric charge and of cm^{-1} , respectively, so that the range of forces is of the order of $1/\lambda$.

Then Yukawa adds heavy particles (i.e., neutrons and protons) in order to study their interaction with the U -field, whose effect is the transition from the neutron state to the proton state. This new situation is implemented by adding a source term to Eq. (24), so that the U -field satisfies the new equation:

$$\left(\Delta - \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} - \lambda^2 \right) U = -4\pi g \tilde{\psi} \left(\frac{\rho^\xi - i\rho^\eta}{2} \right) \psi, \quad (25)$$

ρ^ξ and ρ^η being the isotopic spin matrices introduced in Eq. (2) and ψ is the wave function of the heavy particles (which is a function of time, position, spin and isotopic spin).

Likewise, the complex conjugate field $\tilde{U}(x, y, z, t)$ is introduced, satisfying the equation

$$\left(\Delta - \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} - \lambda^2 \right) \tilde{U} = -4\pi g \tilde{\psi} \left(\frac{\rho^\xi + i\rho^\eta}{2} \right) \psi, \quad (26)$$

existed" ([73], p.7). Yukawa also submitted an article with an outline of his proposal to *Physical Review* but it was rejected.

and gives rise to the inverse transition from the proton state to the neutron state. In pursuing the analogy with the electromagnetic case, at this point Yukawa does not take into account the *vector* potential “as there’s no correct relativistic theory for the heavy particles” ([26], p. 50). He would have worked out the complete vector meson theory only later, in 1938 [88]. Then, from a non relativistic wave equation for the heavy particle, by neglecting the spin and a constant term, he was able to derive the full Hamiltonian for a system of two heavy particles at positions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) and with a small relative velocity:

$$H = \frac{\mathbf{p}_1^2}{2M} + \frac{\mathbf{p}_2^2}{2M} + \frac{g^2}{2} \left(\rho_1^\xi \rho_2^\xi + \rho_1^\eta \rho_2^\eta \right) \frac{e^{-\lambda r_{12}}}{r_{12}} + \left(\rho_1^\zeta + \rho_2^\zeta \right) D, \quad (27)$$

where $\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2$ are the momenta of the heavy particles, $(\rho_1^\xi, \rho_1^\eta, \rho_1^\zeta)$ and $(\rho_2^\xi, \rho_2^\eta, \rho_2^\zeta)$ are the corresponding isotopic spin matrices, r_{12} is the distance between them and D is the mass defect between proton and neutron. As he pointed out:³⁴

This Hamiltonian is equivalent to Heisenberg’s Hamiltonian, if we take for “Platzwechseintegral” $J(r) = -g^2 \frac{e^{-\lambda r}}{r}$, except that the interaction between the neutrons and the electrostatic repulsion between the protons are not taken into account ([26], p. 51).

Indeed a comparison with Heisenberg’s expression in Eq. (1) clearly shows analogies and differences. Besides the explicit expression of $J(r)$, its overall sign comes out negative, so that the lowest energy state of H^2 has spin 1 as required by experiments. This happens at odds with Heisenberg’s choice, which brought to a lowest energy state with spin 0. Finally, the constants g and λ can be determined from experimental data, and an agreement is found when taking λ between 10^{12} cm^{-1} and 10^{13} cm^{-1} and g as a multiple of the elementary charge e . Here Yukawa briefly hints to a possible derivation of the range of the interaction between neutron and proton, starting from the calculation of the mass defect of H^2 and the probability of the neutron-proton scattering under the assumption that the relative velocity is small with respect to the speed of light. In this respect, in a footnote he very interestingly mentions similar calculations carried out by Tomonaga:

These calculations were made previously, according to the theory of Heisenberg, by Mr. Tomonaga, to whom the writer owes much. A little modification is necessary in our case. Detailed accounts will be made in the next paper ([26], p. 52).

From archival documents [77, 78, 82, 83] and recollections by Tomonaga [21], the role he played in the early stages of the birth of meson’s theory, which is hinted at in this footnote, clearly emerges [84]. We will come to this issue in the following Section.

Yukawa’s next step is to determine the nature of the quanta that the general principles of quantum field theory associate to the U -field (which would then play for this field the same role that photons play for the electromagnetic field), by taking into account the fact that they should follow Bose statistics and have a charge equal to $+e$ or $-e$. As such, the operator associated to U works by decreasing by one the

³⁴Notice that here Yukawa identifies $J(r)$ with Heisenberg’s “Platzwechseintegral”, as noted by Carson [6], as well as Miller [43], and interprets it as a real migration of a Bose particle, which will be soon identified with the quantum of his U -field.

number of quanta with negative charge, or increasing by one the number of quanta with positive charge, and satisfies the relativistic wave equation:

$$\left(p_x^2 + p_y^2 + p_z^2 - \frac{W^2}{c^2} + \lambda^2 \right) U = 0, \quad (28)$$

which can be obtained from Eq. (24) by identifying $p_x = -i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial x}$, $p_y = -i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial y}$, $p_z = -i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial z}$, $W = i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t}$. This equation shows that the quantum associated to the U -field has – unlike the photon – a finite mass $m_U = \lambda\hbar/c$, which is related to the finite range of the nuclear force. By substituting $\lambda = 5 \cdot 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-1}$, an estimate of m_U is obtained which is about 200 times the electron mass.³⁵ The new particle was called *heavy quantum*³⁶ while the term *meson* was coined by Homi Bhabha in 1939 to point out that its mass is intermediate between the electron and the proton masses [90]. A comment is made on the possible observation of this massive particle in nuclear transformations, and Yukawa shows how the energies required for its production are not available in ordinary nuclear reactions. In fact, he shows that with typical nuclear energies, the wave function associated to U -quanta is an evanescent function, leading to a negligible probability of observing a U -quantum outside the nucleus.³⁷ In his concluding remarks at the end of the paper, he suggests that the predicted massive quanta “may have some bearing on the shower produced by cosmic rays” ([26], p. 57). Indeed, many particles with such a huge energy could be found within cosmic rays, and a year later, in 1936, a particle compatible with that predicted by Yukawa was actually discovered in cosmic ray showers [91]. This particle was later identified with the *muon* while the true meson (the *pion*) would have been discovered only in 1947 [92]. In fact, with his work, Yukawa began to go beyond the domain of nuclear physics, paving the way towards the regime of high energy physics. The particle physics era was about to start, as noticed by Brown [28].

The final part of Yukawa’s seminal work is devoted to an alternative formulation of β -decay theory in which the quanta of the U -field are assumed to interact with a light particle, which jumps from a neutrino state of negative energy to an electron state of positive energy. This process is implemented by making the U -field to interact with an electron Ψ_k and a neutrino φ_k field ($k = 1, 2, 3, 4$), which amounts to add the new source term $-4\pi g' \sum_{k=1}^4 \tilde{\Psi}_k \varphi_k$ to the right hand side of Eq. (26). Here g' is a coupling constant with the same dimension as g . A comparison between the matrix element corresponding to the above process and Fermi’s result shows that there is perfect agreement upon identifying $\frac{4\pi g g'}{\lambda^2}$ with Fermi’s g constant, whose value is $4 \cdot 10^{-50} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ erg}$. By substituting $\lambda = 5 \cdot 10^{12}$ and $g = 2 \cdot 10^{-9}$, Yukawa found $g' = 4 \cdot 10^{-17}$, which is smaller than g by a factor 10^{-8} . So his final comment is:

³⁵ Later Gian Carlo Wick found that the relation between the mass of the mediator of the nuclear force and the range of this force in Yukawa’s theory could be understood simply as a consequence of Heisenberg’s uncertainty relations, rather than a result of perturbation theory [89].

³⁶ As opposed to *light* quantum, i.e., electrons and neutrinos which had been previously thought to be associated with the nuclear force. Notice the possible pun here, related to the double meaning of the word “light”.

³⁷ At the time the concept of virtual particles and of their role in interactions was not clear yet [5, 6].

This means that the interaction between the neutrino and the electron is much smaller than that between the neutron and the proton so that the neutrino will be far more penetrating than the neutron and consequently more difficult to observe ([26], p. 56).

For the first time a clear difference emerges between the weak and the strong nuclear force: a qualifying feature of Yukawa's theory is that it provides a double mechanism able to explain the force between neutrons and protons, via the exchange of a meson, which carries energy, momentum and electric charge, as well as nuclear β -decay, via the decay with small probability of an electrically negative (positive) meson into an electron-antineutrino (positron-neutrino) pair. Notice, moreover, that this view is very similar to the modern understanding of weak interactions as mediated by intermediate vector bosons.

Yukawa's work was quite ignored abroad for a few years, given the fact that western scientists were not inclined to accept the idea of a new particle without experimental evidence. This is testified, for instance, by Pauli's reluctance to publicly mention his neutrino's hypothesis [9, 46, 47] or by Bohr's negative attitude towards Yukawa's results, clearly expressed during his visit to Japan in the spring of 1937 [29, 71]. To this respect, a comment by Tomonaga is enlightening:

It seems to me [...] that the reason for this rejection is that although one wall after another was being removed and although there were many new discoveries, there remained the stubborn prejudice that there was a sanctuary inside nuclei, and the physics community was allergic to new particles. I might note that the workplaces of Heisenberg, Fermi and Yukawa, who successively removed the walls of the sanctuary, get farther and farther from Copenhagen where Bohr resided. This might mean that Bohr's influence gets weaker as you move farther away ([21], p. 183).

These circumstances probably concurred to determine the successful endeavor of Yukawa, rather than that of some European physicist, despite the principles of new quantum mechanics had begun to spread in Japan only in 1929, after Nishina's return from Europe [28]. Only after the discovery of a new charged particle in cosmic ray showers by Anderson and Neddermeyer [91], whose mass was compatible with meson's mass, there appeared the first reference to Yukawa's paper outside Japan, in a work by Oppenheimer and Serber [93]. A paper was then submitted by Yukawa [94], where he suggested the identification of his meson with the new particle discovered in cosmic rays. This prompted him to resume his theory and to develop it in a series of papers with various collaborators [88, 95, 96] until 1938, when his idea finally began to find wider acceptance.

7 Tomonaga and the neutron-proton interactions

The aim of this Section is to reconstruct the role played by Tomonaga Shin'ichirō in the birth of meson theory, by analyzing archival documents as well as Tomonaga's recollections [21]. Some further biographical information about Tomonaga is included as well.

A useful starting point is Lecture 12 of Tomonaga's book [21], referring to his time as third year undergraduate student and Yukawa's classmate at Kyōto University, as well as to the beginning of his career as a scientist in Nishina's Lab at RIKEN.

Indeed, as already remarked, for the young Tomonaga (as well as for Yukawa) the undergraduate period marked the beginning of a deep interest in quantum mechanics. The reading of Heisenberg's quantum resonance paper [1] strongly impressed him:

[...] I think I was attracted to this paper more because of Heisenberg's expert use of analogy. I was attracted by the deftness of the analogy in which he started from the resonance of two pendula, which is a very ordinary, everyday phenomenon, and gradually proceeded to the sophisticated problem of the symmetry of ψ and the statistics of the particle ([21], pp. 221-222).

Heisenberg's and Dirac's 1929 lectures in Japan were, however, even more significant for his scientific growth.

Miraculously, I remember, I could more or less understand the content of the lectures because fortunately I had already looked through papers related to these talks. [...] This was the first time I had come from rural Kyoto to Tokyo and seen in person distinguished people like Professor Hantaro Nagaoka, Professor Nishina, and Professor Sugiura and also the brilliant graduates of the University of Tokyo, who obviously looked very bright. I listened to the lectures, hiding myself toward the last row of the room, overwhelmed by those luminaries ([21], p. 222).

A further intensive series of lectures on quantum mechanics took place in Kyōto at the beginning of 1930, organized by the spectroscopist Kimura Masamichi, who also recognized the relevance of theoretical physics, with particular regard to quantum physics, after visiting Europe and America. The lectures were given by Sugiura Yoshikatsu³⁸ of RIKEN, while in the early summer of the subsequent year also Nishina came to lecture in Kyōto. The style of lecturing of Nishina was very different from Sugiura's one, as vividly recalled by Tomonaga, who was deeply impressed:

Heisenberg's book *Physikalische Prinzipien der Quantentheorie* (The physical principles of quantum theory) was used as the text for Professor Nishina's lectures. When Professor Sugiura would lecture, he would write a long, long formula [...] from one end to the other of a long blackboard, and he would lecture about his own work. It might have been a creative work, but it was too detailed for a beginner to make sense out of it. On the other, Professor Nishina's lecture, albeit much of it was from the book used and much credit should go to Heisenberg, was impressive, especially the discussions after the lectures ([21], p. 226).

Tomonaga's scientific career would have been significantly shaped by Nishina who, in 1932, invited him to carry out research in his lab at RIKEN. Chadwick's discovery of the neutron [7, 8] and Heisenberg's subsequent papers on nuclear theory [11, 12, 13] drew Nishina and Tomonaga interest towards the investigation of the properties of nuclear forces. In this context the deuteron, as a simple two-body system, soon appeared the ideal candidate to work out:

³⁸Sugiura's lectures began on 13 January 1930 and went on for about a month at a pace of three lectures per week. The focus was mainly on applications of quantum mechanics, even though he made a quick introduction to general concepts and framework, such as matrix mechanics, wave mechanics, q -numbers and group theory. Then he dealt with the study of periodic and non-periodic systems, ending with a discussion of the molecule problem and further applications of quantum mechanics to chemistry. See Ref. [97] and references therein for further details on his lectures, his scientific trajectory and his role in spreading quantum mechanics ideas in Japan.

[...] I started calculations related to phenomena such as the binding energy of the deuteron and the scattering or capture of a neutron by a proton. Heisenberg regarded the nuclear force as an exchange force and introduced the potential $J(r)$ for it. He figured that the nuclear force must act only over a very short range and that the potential goes to zero if $r \geq 10^{13}$ cm. Now, it was necessary to determine the magnitude of the potential. Since the binding energy of the deuteron was known experimentally, it was possible to determine the magnitude of the nuclear force so that the theoretical value for the binding energy agreed with experiment. Using the potential, we can discuss neutron scattering and capture. As more and more experimental facts surfaced, both the cross-section of elastic collision and that of the capture of a neutron by a proton were found to be abnormally large for slow neutrons, and this drew Professor Nishina's attention ([21], pp. 227-228).

Unfortunately, neutron-proton scattering calculations based on the potential $J(r)$, previously extracted from the binding energy of the deuteron, did not agree with experimental findings. Tomonaga carried out calculations by assuming various forms for the short-range interaction $J(r)$, among which we find $A\frac{e^{-\lambda r}}{r}$, which coincides with the one later introduced by Yukawa, but the conclusions did not change. Indeed, he found that a very large scattering cross-section could be obtained only by postulating the existence of a novel S state of the deuteron with zero energy, in addition to the usual one. However, in order to get this additional level, Majorana exchange force had to be added to Heisenberg's force,³⁹ Tomonaga providing also the ratio of the forces, and obtaining a good agreement with experimental results. Nishina and Tomonaga reported on their calculations at the spring meeting of the Physico-Mathematical Society of Japan held in April 1933 in Sendai [21][84] (see also subsection 6.2); the abstract of their talk entitled "Scattering of neutron by proton" reads:

We have analyzed scattering of neutron by proton using Heisenberg's theory on nuclear structure, assuming the shape of interactions between neutron and proton, and taking into account the mass defect of hydrogen 2. Our result has been compared with experimental results ([83], p. 013009-2).

At Yukawa's request, a detailed seven page letter of Tomonaga followed (probably written in May or June 1933), in which he gave further details on his scattering calculations [82, 84]. Also here, various forms of $J(r)$ are mentioned, including $A\frac{e^{-\lambda r}}{r}$, and an estimate of the corresponding range of interaction λ is provided by fitting the experimental data with the theoretical curve, giving the value $7 \cdot 10^{12}$ cm⁻¹. A very interesting interplay between the two young physicists started, as testified by a number of letters, in addition to the one quoted above [78, 79, 83]. Tomonaga's own interesting results were not promptly published:

I was quite elated with this achievement, and Professor Nishina was also satisfied, and our results were reported [...] in Sendai, 1933 [...]. However, probably because he was so busy with a variety of experimental work, Professor Nishina put off publishing this paper. While

³⁹Notice that here Tomonaga is clearly referring to Majorana's work on exchange forces [15]. Interestingly, he mentions Majorana also in the letter addressed to Yukawa [82] after the 1933 Sendai talk. Thus we can conclude that Tomonaga was aware of Majorana's results. We may guess that also Yukawa was aware of this work as well, as in fact is claimed by Brown (cf. [28], p. 97), but he never mentions Majorana's paper in his celebrated meson article [26]. He will hint at Majorana's exchange force only later, in his Nobel Lecture [76]. We are grateful to Francesco Guerra for pointing out to us the latter point.

I was agonizing about this, Bethe and Peierls did exactly the same thing and published it. I was extremely upset, and I was livid with Professor Nishina ([21], p. 228).

Here Tomonaga referred to analogous calculations carried out and published by Bethe and Peierls in 1935 [98, 99], while his paper would have been published only later, in 1936 [30].

In the same 1933 letter to Yukawa, Tomonaga also included the results of a calculation on the neutron capture by the proton. In such a case, the same strategy adopted for the scattering problem did not work, because the transition involved should be $P \rightarrow S$ and the assumption of the additional S level had no influence on the P wave. A possible solution would have been to assume a further P level very close to zero energy, but a price had to be paid by changing the mathematical expression of $J(r)$, thus loosing the agreement with experimental results [21]. Here, the following potential forms were adopted [78, 79],

$$\frac{Pe^{-\lambda r}}{1 - e^{-\lambda r}}, \quad \frac{P}{(1 + e^{\lambda r})(1 + e^{-\lambda r})}, \quad (29)$$

because the radial Schrödinger equation was solvable for $\ell = 0$. The problem would have been later solved by Fermi by taking into account also the magnetic moments of the neutron and the proton, and allowing emission via magnetic dipole in addition to the usual one via electric dipole when the capture takes place.

In summary, during the years 1933-35 also Tomonaga and Nishina were working on the neutron-proton force and its range, and, interestingly, in their calculations they adopted various mathematical forms for the short range interaction potential $J(r)$, including Yukawa's one.

8 Concluding remarks

In this paper we focused on the development of the concept of exchange forces in the realm of nuclear physics, starting from Heisenberg's pioneering papers. Then we analyzed Majorana's decisive improvements to Heisenberg's theory, as well as Fermi's theory of β -decay, which proved to be crucial intermediate steps towards the idea of a force mediated by virtual quanta, the last step in this path being Yukawa's meson theory, whose genesis has been carefully reconstructed. Fermi's and Yukawa's theories were the first quantum field theories after quantum electrodynamics to be established.

The relevance of Japanese contributions to nuclear as well as particle physics can hardly be underestimated, and this conclusion applies as well to the rapidity of assimilation of European science. Indeed, starting from the 1920s and throughout the 1930s, Japanese physicists became a consolidated presence in European universities, so that they could absorb there the new developments, contribute to them and bring them back to their country. It was Nishina who, back in Japan in 1929 after a eight-years research stay in Europe, brought in his country the "Copenhagen spirit", and with it the new quantum mechanics. He strongly contributed to the spreading of the new ideas and to the engagement of the new generation of physicists, also by inviting distinguished European scientists in Japan, such as Heisenberg and Dirac. Young Japanese

physicists were able to go beyond the common thinking, thus making the decisive steps toward a quantum field theory of the nuclear interactions just by postulating the existence of new particles. Yukawa and Tomonaga were among them; they both were deeply impressed by the new quantum mechanics, and both gave decisive contributions to nuclear theory. Yukawa's key assumptions were that the principles of quantum theory did apply inside the nucleus, and that the nuclear interaction was a fundamental force just as electromagnetism. His main achievement was the introduction of a mediating virtual particle for nuclear forces, also establishing the inverse proportionality between the range of a force and the mass of its mediator, but he finally conceived also the actual distinction between the two nuclear forces – the strong and weak nuclear interactions – with different coupling constants. All these concepts would have reached full maturity only after World War II, but Yukawa's theory was undoubtedly a decisive step towards it. In the course of these developments, a fruitful interplay between Yukawa and Tomonaga emerged in 1933-34, as testified by various sources, hinting to a role played by Tomonaga in the birth of meson theory that is interesting, and certainly deserves further investigation.

References

- [1] W. Heisenberg, *Mehrkörperproblem und Resonanz in der Quantenmechanik*, Zeitschrift für Physik **38** (1926), 411-426; Partial English translation: *Many-body Problem and Resonance in Quantum Mechanics*, in Ref. [2], pp. 115-125.
- [2] I. Duck, E. C. G. Sudarshan, *Pauli and the spin-statistics theorem*, World Scientific, Singapore, 1997.
- [3] W. Heisenberg, *Mehrkörperproblem und Resonanz in der Quantenmechanik II*, Zeitschrift für Physik **41** (1927), 239-267.
- [4] W. Heisenberg, *Über die Spektren von Atomsystemen mit zwei Elektronen*, Zeitschrift für Physik **39** (1926), 499-518.
- [5] C. Carson, *The Peculiar Notion of Exchange Forces-I*, Stud. Hist. Phil. Mod. Phys. **27** (1996), 23-45.
- [6] C. Carson, *The Peculiar Notion of Exchange Forces-II*, Stud. Hist. Phil. Mod. Phys. **27** (1996), 99-131.
- [7] J. Chadwick, *The existence of a neutron*, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A **136** (1932), 692-708.
- [8] J. Chadwick, *Possible Existence of a Neutron*, Nature **129** (1932), 312.
- [9] A. Pais, *Inward Bound: Of Matter and Forces in the Physical World*, Clarendon, Oxford, 1986.
- [10] D. Brink, *Nuclear Forces*, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1965.
- [11] W. Heisenberg, *Über den Bau der Atomkerne I*, Zeitschrift für Physik **77** (1932), 1-11; (English) *On the Structure of Atomic Nuclei. I*, in Ref. [10], pp. 144-154.
- [12] W. Heisenberg, *Über den Bau der Atomkerne II*, Zeitschrift für Physik **78** (1932), 156-164.
- [13] W. Heisenberg, *Über den Bau der Atomkerne III*, Zeitschrift für Physik **80** (1933), 587-596; (English) *On the Structure of Atomic Nuclei. III*, in Ref. [10], pp. 155-160.

- [14] G. F. Bassani and the Council of the Italian Physical Society (eds.), *Ettore Majorana Scientific Papers. On occasion of the centenary of his birth*, SIF, Bologna-Springer Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 2006.
- [15] E. Majorana, *Über die Kerntheorie*, Zeitschrift für Physik **82** (1933), 137-145; (English) *On nuclear theory*, in Ref. [14], pp. 186-193.
- [16] E. Fermi, *Tentativo di una teoria dell'emissione dei raggi beta*, Ricerca Scientifica **4** (1933), 491-495.
- [17] E. Fermi, *Tentativo di una teoria dei raggi β* , Nuovo Cimento **11** (1934), 1-19.
- [18] E. Fermi, *Versuch einer Theorie der β -Strahlen. I.*, Zeitschrift für Physik **88** (1934), 161-171.
- [19] F. L. Wilson, *Fermi's Theory of Beta Decay*, American Journal of Physics **36** (1968), 1150-1160.
- [20] H. Yukawa, *Tabibito (The Traveller)*, World Scientific, Singapore, 1982.
- [21] S. Tomonaga, *The story of spin*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 1997.
- [22] D. Konagaya, *Heisenberg's visit to Kyoto in 1929 and its stimulation of young Japanese physicists*, Historia Scientiarum **29** (2020), 280-299.
- [23] K. Ito, *The question of research in prewar Japanese physics*, in D. G. Wittner and P. C. Brown (eds.), *Science, Technology, and Medicine in the Modern Japanese Empire*, Routledge, London and New York, 2016, pp. 193-210.
- [24] K. Ito, *Making Sense of Ryoshiro (Quantum Theory): Introduction of Quantum Mechanics into Japan, 1920-1940*, Ph.D. Thesis, Harvard University, Cambridge (MA), 2002.
- [25] D. W. Kim, *Yoshio Nishina: Father of Modern Physics in Japan*, Taylor & Francis, New York, 2007.
- [26] H. Yukawa, *On the Interaction of Elementary Particles, I*, Proceedings of the Physico-Mathematical Society of Japan **17** (1935), 48-57; reprinted in Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **1** (1955), 1-10.
- [27] L. M. Brown, *How Yukawa arrived at the Meson Theory*, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **85** (1985), 13-19.
- [28] L. M. Brown, *Yukawa's Prediction of the Meson*, Centaurus **25** (1981), 71-132.
- [29] O. Darrigol, *The Quantum Electrodynamical Analogy in Early Nuclear Theory or the Roots of Yukawa's Theory*, Revue d'histoire des sciences **41** (1988), 225-297.
- [30] Y. Nishina, S. Tomonaga, H. Tamaki, *A Note on the Interaction of the Neutron and the Proton*, Scientific Papers of the Institute of Physical and Chemical Research **30** (1936), 61-69.
- [31] J. Mehra, H. Rechenberg, *The Historical Development of Quantum Theory, Volume 5: Erwin Schrödinger and the Rise of Wave Mechanics. Part 2: The Creation of Wave Mechanics; Early Response and Applications 1925-1926*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1987.
- [32] M. Born, W. Heisenberg, *Die Elektronenbahnen im angeregten Heliumatom*, Zeitschrift für Physik **16** (1923), 229-243.
- [33] W. Heisenberg, *Quantenmechanik*, Die Naturwissenschaften **14** (1926), 989-994.
- [34] E. Fermi, *Sulla quantizzazione del gas perfetto monoatomico*, Rendiconti della Accademia dei Lincei **3** (1926), 145-149.

- [35] P. A. M. Dirac, *On the Theory of Quantum Mechanics*, Proceedings of the Royal Society A **112** (1926), 661-677.
- [36] W. Heitler, F. London, *Wechselwirkung neutraler Atome und homopolare Bindung nach der Quantenmechanik*, Zeitschrift für Physik **44** (1927), 455-472.
- [37] S. Esposito, A. Naddeo, *Majorana, Pauling and the quantum theory of the chemical bond*, Annalen der Physik **527** (2015), A29-A33.
- [38] S. Esposito, A. Naddeo, *Homopolar bond and ionic structures: two contributions by Majorana*, Annales de la Fondation Louis de Broglie, **40** (2015), 157-179.
- [39] S. Esposito, A. Naddeo, *The Genesis of the Quantum Theory of the Chemical Bond*, Advances in Historical Studies, **3** (2014), 229-257.
- [40] W. Heisenberg, *Zur Theorie des Ferromagnetismus*, Zeitschrift für Physik **49** (1928), 619-636.
- [41] J. R. Oppenheimer, *On the Quantum Theory of Electronic Impacts*, Physical Review **32** (1928), 361-376.
- [42] A. I. Miller, *Werner Heisenberg and the Beginning of Nuclear Physics*, Physics Today **38** (1985), 60-68.
- [43] A. I. Miller, *Early quantum electrodynamics: a source book*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994.
- [44] P. Ehrenfest, J. R. Oppenheimer, *Note on the Statistics of Nuclei*, Physical Review **37** (1931), 333-338.
- [45] G. Gamow, *Constitution of Atomic Nuclei and Radioactivity*, Clarendon, Oxford, 1931.
- [46] W. Pauli, letter to a physicists' gathering at Tübingen, December 4, 1930, reprinted in R. Kronig and V. Weisskopf (eds.), *W. Pauli, collected scientific papers*, Vol. 2, Interscience, New York, 1964, p. 1313.
- [47] W. Pauli, in *Discussion du rapport de M. Heisenberg*, in *Structure et propriétés des noyaux atomiques: rapports et discussions du septième Conseil de physique tenu à Bruxelles du 22 au 29 octobre 1933*, Institut international de physique Solvay, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 1934, p. 324.
- [48] E. Wigner, *On the Consequences of the Symmetry of the Nuclear Hamiltonian on the Spectroscopy of Nuclei*, Physical Review **51** (1937), 106-119.
- [49] G. T. P. Tarrant, *The Absorption of Hard Monochromatic γ -Radiation*, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, Series A **128** (1930), 345-359.
- [50] L. Meitner, H. H. Hüpfeld, *Über die Prüfung der Streuungsformel von Klein und Nishina an kurzweilliger γ -Strahlung*, Naturwissenschaften **18** (1930) 534-535.
- [51] C. Y. Chao, *The Absorption Coefficient of Hard γ -Rays*, Proceedings of National Academy of Sciences U.S.A. **16** (1930), 431-433.
- [52] L. M. Brown, D. F. Moyer *Lady or tiger? - The Meitner-Hupfeld effect and Heisenberg's neutron theory*, Am. J. Phys. **52** (1984), 130-136.
- [53] E. Recami, *Majorana, the neutron, and the neutrino: some elementary historical memories*, Hadronic Journal **40** (2017), 149-186; arXiv:1712.02209 [physics.gen-ph].
- [54] S. Esposito, *The physics of Ettore Majorana*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2015.
- [55] D. Brink, *The story of Majorana's exchange force*, Proceedings of Science **037**

- (2007), 002.
- [56] E. Amaldi, *Ricordo di Ettore Majorana*, *Giornale di Fisica* **9** (1968), 300.
 - [57] E. Amaldi, *From the discovery of the neutron to the discovery of nuclear fission*, *Physics Reports* **111** (1984), 1-322.
 - [58] E. Recami, *Il caso Majorana: epistolario, documenti, testimonianze*, Di Renzo, Roma, 2011.
 - [59] I. Curie, F. Joliot, *The emission of high energy photons from hydrogenous substances irradiated with very penetrating alpha rays*, *Comptes Rendus de l'Academie des Sciences Paris* **194** (1932), 273-275.
 - [60] D. Iwanenko, *The Neutron Hypothesis*, *Nature* **129** (1932), 798.
 - [61] E. Amaldi, *Ettore Majorana, man and scientist*, in A. Zichichi (ed.), *Strong and Weak Interactions*, Academic Press, New York, 1966, pp. 10-75.
 - [62] P. A. M. Dirac, *Note on Exchange Phenomena in the Thomas Atom*, *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **26** (1930), 376-385.
 - [63] W. Heisenberg, *La Structure du Noyau*, in *Structure et propriétés des noyaux atomiques: rapports et discussions du septième Conseil de physique tenu à Bruxelles du 22 au 29 octobre 1933*, Institut international de physique Solvay, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 1934, pp. 289-323.
 - [64] S. Esposito, E. Recami, A. van der Merwe and R. Battiston (eds.), *Ettore Majorana: Unpublished Research Notes on Theoretical Physics*, Springer, Berlin, 2009.
 - [65] P. Jordan, E. Wigner, *Über das Paulische Äquivalenzverbot*, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **47** (1928), 631-651.
 - [66] W. Heisenberg, Letter 341 to W. Pauli, 18 January 1934, https://archiv.heisenberg-gesellschaft.de/heisenberg_0017-064r.pdf.
 - [67] I. Tamm, *Exchange Forces between Neutrons and Protons, and Fermi's Theory*, *Nature* **133** (1934), 981.
 - [68] D. Iwanenko, *Interaction of Neutrons and Protons*, *Nature* **133** (1934), 981-982.
 - [69] O. Klein, Y. Nishina, *Über die Streuung von Strahlung durch freie Elektronen nach der neuen relativistischen Quantendynamik von Dirac*, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **52** (1929), 853-868.
 - [70] I. Okamoto, K. Koizumi, *Albert Einstein in Japan: 1922*, *American Journal of Physics* **49** (1981), 930-940.
 - [71] J. L. Spradley, *Yukawa and the birth of meson theory fiftieth anniversary for nuclear forces*, *The Physics Teacher* **23** (1985), 283-289.
 - [72] H. Sato, *Biography of Hideki Yukawa*, *Nuclear Physics A* **805** (2008), 21c-28c.
 - [73] M. Kobayasi, *The Birth of the Yukawa Theory*, *Progress of Theoretical Physics Supplement* **85** (1985), 6-8.
 - [74] R. Gaudenzi, *Historical Roots of Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking. Steps Towards an Analogy*, Springer, Switzerland, 2022.
 - [75] O. Darrigol, *Elements of a Scientific Biography of Tomonaga Sin-itiro*, *Historia Scientiarum* **35** (1988), 1-29.
 - [76] H. Yukawa, *Meson theory in its developments*, Nobel Lecture, December 12, 1949, <https://www.nobelprize.org/uploads/2018/06/yukawa-lecture.pdf>.
 - [77] R. Kawabe, *The Yukawa Hall Archival Library, Kyoto*, Progress of Theoretical

- Physics Supplement **105** (1991), 307-311.
- [78] Archive of historical materials, Osaka University Yukawa Memorial, <https://www-yukawa.phys.sci.osaka-u.ac.jp/en/archive>.
- [79] R. Kawabe, *Yukawa's First Two Talks*, Progress of Theoretical Physics Supplement **105** (1991), 241-261.
- [80] H. S. W. Massey, *The Passage of Neutrons through Matter*, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A **138** (1932), 460-469.
- [81] H. S. W. Massey, *The Collision of α -Particles with Atomic Nuclei*, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A **137** (1932), 447-463.
- [82] S. Tomonaga, letter to H. Yukawa, Yukawa Hall Archival Library, YITP, Kyoto University, document F02 080 C01; also available at Archive of historical materials, Osaka University Yukawa Memorial, document OU1934-B5-s04-03-009.
- [83] M. Konuma, M. Bando, H. Gotoh, H. Hayakawa, K. Hirata, Kazuyuki Ito, Kenjii Ito, K. Kanaya, D. Konaagaya, T. Kugo, C. Namba, T. Nishitani, Y. Takaiwa, M. Tanabashi, K. Tanaka, F. Ukegawa, T. Yoshikawa, *The Legacy of Hideki Yukawa, Sin-itiro Tomonaga, and Shoichi Sakata: Some Aspects from their Archives*, in *Proceedings of the 12th Asia Pacific Physics Conference*, JPS Conference Proceedings **1** (2014), 013009-1-013009-7.
- [84] T. Yamazaki, *Interplay between Yukawa and Tomonaga in the Birth of Mesons*, Nuclear Physics A **805** (2008), 29c-35c.
- [85] Interview of Hideki Yukawa by John A. Wheeler on 1962 July 10, Niels Bohr Library & Archives, American Institute of Physics, College Park, MD USA, www.aip.org/history-programs/niels-bohr-library/oral-histories/868.
- [86] S. Tomonaga, *On a Relativistically Invariant Formulation of the Quantum Theory of Wave Fields*, Progress of Theoretical Physics **1** (1946), 27-42.
- [87] R. Kawabe, *Appendix. A Grand Illusion*, Progress of Theoretical Physics Supplement **105** (1991), 84-85.
- [88] H. Yukawa, S. Sakata, M. Taketani, *On the Interaction of Elementary Particles, III*, Proceedings of the Physico-Mathematical Society of Japan **20** (1938), 319-340; reprinted in Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **1** (1955), 24-45.
- [89] G. C. Wick, *Range of nuclear forces in Yukawa's theory*, Nature **142** (1938), 993-994.
- [90] H. J. Bhabha, *The Fundamental Length Introduced by the Theory of the Mesotron (Meson)*, Nature **143** (1939), 276-277.
- [91] C. D. Anderson, S. H. Neddermeyer, *Cloud Chamber Observations of Cosmic Rays at 4300 Meters Elevation and Near Sea-Level*, Physical Review **50** (1936), 993-994.
- [92] C. Lattes, H. Muirhead, G. Occhialini, C. Powell, *Processes Involving Charged Masses*, Nature **159** (1947), 694-697.
- [93] J. R. Oppenheimer, R. Serber, *Note on the Nature of Cosmic-Ray Particles*, Physical Review **51** (1937), 1113.
- [94] H. Yukawa, *On a Possible Interpretation of the Penetrating Component of the Cosmic Rays*, Proceedings of the Physico-Mathematical Society of Japan **19** (1937), 712-713.
- [95] H. Yukawa, S. Sakata, *On the Interaction of Elementary Particles, II*, Proceedings

- of the Physico-Mathematical Society of Japan **19** (1937), 1084-1093; reprinted in Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **1** (1955), 14-23.
- [96] H. Yukawa, S. Sakata, M. Kobayasi, M. Taketani, *On the Interaction of Elementary Particles, IV*, Proceedings of the Physico-Mathematical Society of Japan **20** (1938), 720-745; reprinted in Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **1** (1955), 46-71.
- [97] M. Nakane, *Yoshikatsu Sugiura's Contribution to the Development of Quantum Physics in Japan*, Berichte zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte / History of Science and Humanities **42** (2019), 338-356.
- [98] H. Bethe, R. Peierls, *Quantum Theory of the Deuteron*, Proceedings of the Royal Society A **148** (1935), 146-156.
- [99] H. Bethe, R. Peierls, *The Scattering of Neutrons by Protons*, Proceedings of the Royal Society A **149** (1935), 176-183.