

# Exchange Interactions in $\text{Cu}(\text{NH}_3)_4\text{SO}_4 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}^\dagger$

TAKEHIKO OGUCHI\*

*Department of Physics, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania*

(Received 8 August 1963)

Considering the specific heat, the magnetic susceptibility, and the crystal structure of  $\text{Cu}(\text{NH}_3)_4\text{SO}_4 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}$ , we conclude that this substance has the magnetic linear chain property. The ratio of the exchange integrals  $|J_1|$  within the chain and  $|J_2|$  between the chains cannot be determined by the former theories. In this paper we have determined it as about 0.01 by the Green function method.

THE specific heat of  $\text{Cu}(\text{NH}_3)_4\text{SO}_4 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}$  has been measured by Fritz and Pinch<sup>1</sup> from 4.2 to 1.3°K and by Haseda and Miedema<sup>2</sup> extended down to 0.03°K. Both groups have observed a broad Schottky-type maximum near 3°K, and Haseda and Miedema have also observed a small sharp maximum at 0.37°K.

The magnetic susceptibilities measured by Watanabe and Haseda<sup>3</sup> are anisotropic along the three principal crystalline axes. Each of them has a broad maximum near 3°K. Below 0.37°K the susceptibility along the  $c$  axis becomes independent of the temperature.

The crystal structure of  $\text{Cu}(\text{NH}_3)_4\text{SO}_4 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}$  has been determined by Mazzi.<sup>4</sup> The Cu ions are located in linear chains parallel to the  $c$  axis and are linked as  $-\text{Cu}^{++}-\text{H}_2\text{O}-\text{Cu}^{++}-\text{H}_2\text{O}-$ . The linkage between two Cu ions in neighboring chains is  $-\text{Cu}^{++}-\text{NH}_3-\text{SO}_4-\text{NH}_3-\text{Cu}^{++}-$ . Therefore, we can expect that the exchange interaction between two Cu ions within a chain is much larger than that between the chains.

We denote the exchange integrals in the chain and between the chains by  $J_1$  and  $J_2$ , respectively. From the magnetic susceptibility behavior mentioned above, it may be concluded that  $J_1$  is negative (antiferromagnetic). If we neglect  $J_2$  completely, the crystal can be regarded as a bundle of isolated antiferromagnetic linear chains. Many theories predict that a linear chain with antiferromagnetic exchange interactions cannot become antiferromagnetic, and that the specific heat and the magnetic susceptibility will have a broad maximum at a certain temperature. This temperature is given approximately by  $|J_1|/k$ , where  $k$  is the Boltzmann constant. In  $\text{Cu}(\text{NH}_3)_4\text{SO}_4 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}$  both maxima are located at about 3°K. Consequently, we may estimate that  $|J_1|/k$  is about 3 deg.

If we introduce a nonvanishing  $J_2$ , it is possible to get theoretically a Néel point  $T_N$  of finite temperature. As pointed out by Haseda and Miedema, the small sharp peak of the specific heat at 0.37°K and the temperature-independent susceptibility below 0.37°K indicate that  $\text{Cu}(\text{NH}_3)_4\text{SO}_4 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}$  becomes antiferromagnetic below

0.37°K, that is,  $T_N=0.37^\circ\text{K}$ . This suggests that  $J_2$  in this crystal is not zero, although it may be quite small.

Several years ago the author<sup>5</sup> and Marshall<sup>6</sup> independently explained a large residual specific heat above the Néel point in  $\text{CuCl}_2 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$  observed by Friedberg.<sup>7</sup> Both theories are based on the model that a Cu ion in  $\text{CuCl}_2 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$  is strongly coupled by the exchange integral  $|J_1|$  with neighboring Cu ions along the  $c$  axis, and is weakly coupled by the exchange integral  $J_2$  with neighboring Cu ions in the  $ab$  plane. The author used the refined molecular field theory for the Heisenberg model, while Marshall used the Bethe-Peierls theory for the Ising model. The expression for  $T_N$  derived by the author is

$$\exp[2|J_1|/kT_N] = (4+z\eta)/(z\eta), \quad (1)$$

where

$$\eta \equiv |J_2|/|J_1|, \quad (2)$$

and  $z$  is the number of neighbors in the  $ab$  plane (in this case  $z=4$ ). This formula gave  $\eta=0.3$  for  $\text{CuCl}_2 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$ , while Marshall obtained  $\eta=0.2$ .

If we apply this formula to  $\text{Cu}(\text{NH}_3)_4\text{SO}_4 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}$  by putting  $|J_1|/k=3$ ,  $T_N=0.37$ , and  $z=4$ , we get  $\eta \approx e^{-16}$ , which is exceedingly small. Marshall's theory gives a similar result. This means that these theories are not applicable to the case of small  $\eta$ .

Recently the two-time and temperature-dependent Green function method has been used in the antiferromagnetic problem by the author and Honma.<sup>8</sup> We apply this theory to  $\text{Cu}(\text{NH}_3)_4\text{SO}_4 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}$ . We follow their derivation to get the expression for the Néel point by assuming that the Cu ions are placed on the tetragonal lattice sites and that the exchange integrals between neighbors is  $|J_1|$  along the  $z$  axis and  $|J_2|$  along both the  $x$  and  $y$  axes. We then obtain an expression for the Néel point as follows:

$$\frac{kT_N}{|J_1|} = \frac{4S(S+1)/3}{I(\eta)}, \quad (3)$$

where

$$I(\eta) = \frac{1}{\pi^3} \int_0^\pi \int_0^\pi \int_0^\pi \frac{dq_x dq_y dq_z}{\eta(1-\cos q_x) + \eta(1-\cos q_y) + (1-\cos q_z)}.$$

<sup>†</sup> Supported in part by the U. S. Office of Naval Research and the National Science Foundation.

\* Permanent address: Department of Physics, Tokyo University of Education, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

<sup>1</sup> J. J. Fritz and H. L. Pinch, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **79**, 3644 (1959).

<sup>2</sup> T. Haseda and A. R. Miedema, *Physica* **27**, 1102 (1961).

<sup>3</sup> T. Watanabe and T. Haseda, *J. Chem. Phys.* **29**, 1429 (1958).

<sup>4</sup> F. Mazzi, *Acta Cryst.* **8**, 137 (1955).

<sup>5</sup> T. Oguchi, *Progr. Theoret. Phys. (Kyoto)* **13**, 148 (1955).

<sup>6</sup> W. Marshall, *Phys. Chem. Solids* **7**, 159 (1958).

<sup>7</sup> S. A. Friedberg, *Physica* **18**, 714 (1952).

<sup>8</sup> T. Oguchi and A. Honma, *J. Appl. Phys.* **34**, 1153 (1963).

Here  $\eta$  has been defined in (2) and  $q_x, q_y$ , and  $q_z$  are the components of a wave number vector  $\mathbf{q}$ . The triple integral in (3) can be easily reduced to a single integral. This single integral was evaluated by an electronic computer. The results<sup>9</sup> for various  $\eta$  are shown in Table I. Inserting the numerical values,  $T_N=0.37$ ,  $|J_1|/k=3$ ,  $S=\frac{1}{2}$  into (3) and using Table I, we obtain  $\eta \approx 0.01$ .

The expression for  $T_N$  obtained by the modified molecular field theory or the Bethe-Peierls theory contains only the number of neighbors  $z$ . Consequently, these theories do not take account of dependence on structure. On the other hand, the expression of  $T_N$  by the Green function method contains  $\sum \mathbf{q}$ , where  $\mathbf{q}$  is the wave number vector. This indicates the Green function method takes account of structure much more precisely

<sup>9</sup> Dr. E. W. Montroll informed me that he has calculated the triple integral analytically. [*Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, December 1954 and June and July 1955* (University of California Press, 1955), p. 209.] The numerical values in Table I are in quite good agreement with his results.

TABLE I. Numerical values for the integral  $I(\eta)$ .

$\eta$	$I(\eta)$
1	0.505
0.1	1.963
0.01	6.405
0.001	20.323

than the other theories. In the present problem the structure dependence is essentially important. In other words, the magnetic property of  $\text{Cu}(\text{NH}_3)_4\text{SO}_4 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}$  is well described by the linear chain model, but it is slightly modified by the exchange interactions between the chains. This is the reason why the Green function method can give a reasonable value for  $|J_2|/|J_1|$ , although the other theories fail.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author thanks J. Skalyo for calculating the numerical values in Table I by the computer.

## "Forbidden" Hyperfine Transitions in the Electron Paramagnetic Resonance of $\text{Mn}^{++}$ in Cubic $\text{MgO}$

JOHN E. DRUMHELLER

*Physik-Institut der Universität Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland*

AND

R. S. RUBINS\*

*Battelle Memorial Institute, Geneva, Switzerland*

(Received 27 September 1963)

The so-called "forbidden" hyperfine transitions of the  $S$ -state ion  $\text{Mn}^{++}$  with selection rules  $|\Delta M| = 1$ ,  $\Delta m = \pm 1$  have been observed in the cubic field of  $\text{MgO}$ . These transitions are shown to be observable in cubic fields because of the mixture of the zero-field splitting parameter  $a$  with the off-diagonal hyperfine terms in the spin Hamiltonian which mixes neighboring hyperfine levels. Until now the intensities of these transitions had been calculated only in crystals of axial symmetry and were due to the mixing of levels with axial-field splitting  $D$ . The intensity for the cubic-field case is calculated and shows an interesting  $(\sin 4\theta)^2$  dependence, as compared with  $(\sin 2\theta)^2$  in the axial field case. The splittings of the "forbidden" doublets are calculated to third-order perturbation theory and both the intensities and the splittings agree well with the experimental data.

## INTRODUCTION

THE electron paramagnetic spectra of divalent manganese in several single crystals of axial symmetry have shown weak lines occurring between the usual intense main hyperfine lines.<sup>1-7</sup> These were

first observed by Bleaney and Ingram<sup>8</sup> and are due to the mixing of hyperfine levels by the interaction of the axial-field splitting  $D$  with the hyperfine interaction  $A$ . Bleaney and Rubins, however, point out that this mixing should occur whenever the magnetic field is not directed along an axis of twofold or higher symmetry.<sup>3</sup> In the present paper, we have observed the forbidden lines in the cubic field of  $\text{MgO}$  and have shown that they are due to hyperfine mixing with the zero-field cubic splitting  $a$ .

\* Present address: Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel.

<sup>1</sup> E. Friedman and W. Low, *Phys. Rev.* **120**, 408 (1960).<sup>2</sup> L. M. Matarrese, *J. Chem. Phys.* **34**, 336 (1961).<sup>3</sup> B. Bleaney and R. S. Rubins, *Proc. Phys. Soc. (London)* **77**, 103 (1961).<sup>4</sup> V. J. Folen, *Phys. Rev.* **125**, 1581 (1962).<sup>5</sup> J. Schneider and S. R. Sircar, *Z. Naturforsch.* **17a**, 651 (1962).<sup>6</sup> F. Waldner, *Helv. Phys. Acta* **35**, 756 (1962).<sup>7</sup> M. Odenhal, *Czech. J. Phys.* **B13**, 566 (1963).<sup>8</sup> B. Bleaney and D. J. E. Ingram, *Proc. Roy. Soc. (London)* **A205**, 336 (1951).